

G. J. BOTER, ed., *Epictetus, Encheiridion*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Berlin - New York: W. de Gruyter, 2007, xxxvi + 82 pp., ISBN 978-3110195033.

To say that this slim volume is a work of tidying up would be true, but at the same time seriously undervalue the achievement it represents, and the thanks and congratulations that are due to its editor. The lack of a modern critical edition of the *Encheiridion* is a long-standing curiosity of scholarship. When Heinrich Schenkl completed his *editio maior* of the *Dissertations* for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana in 1916, he stopped short of adding his own version of the *Encheiridion*, and instead simply reprinted Johann Schweighäuser's text of 1798. It was thus a wait of two centuries that Professor Boter brought to an end with his *editio maior* not only of the *Encheiridion*, but also of its three Christian paraphrases, which was published by Brill in 1999; and it is an elegantly slimmed version of the principal constituent of this distinguished work to Teubner scale that has produced the present, most welcome volume.

As Boter's work has made apparent with a new sharpness and fullness, the popularity and influence of the *Encheiridion* with later ancient readers makes it a particularly involved and absorbing editorial challenge. The constitution of the text of Arrian's original boiling down of the wisdom of Epictetus has to take account not only of the direct manuscript tradition, but also of that of Simplicius's commentary, of the lemmata to the commentary, and the Christian paraphrases, as well as of more incidental later quotations and references of the kind more normally encountered in the secondary tradition of an ancient author. It makes for an intricate task, which has been discharged by Boter both in his 1999 *editio maior* and here with exemplary patience, scrupulousness, accuracy and scholarship. It is entirely understandable that in the constitution of his *apparatus*, he

should err on the side of inclusiveness, and defend this as deliberate choice, as he does on p. xvii of the *editio maior*: ‘Even so, the apparatus of *Ench.* does not make for easy reading; however, I would rather bear the odium of giving too much information to the user of my text than incur the reproach of withholding essential information.’ It is indeed not easy reading, and for long stretches does no more than remind the reader of how manuscripts can go wrong, and paraphrasts depart both casually and purposefully from their base text. But there is an equally undeniable pay-off in the map that cumulatively emerges of the inter-relations between the different versions, and of the range of variation between them; it seems very unlikely that any as yet unexamined manuscript – if there is such a thing – will not be easily locatable within the framework thus established.

The real test of an edition is the difference it makes to its text – what does it change? It might be supposed that the *Encheiridion* is not a specially promising field for editorial cleaning up and re-pointing, consisting as it does of a mere fifty-three often quite short chapters. Boter has no difficulty in giving this impression the lie, making over sixty substantial changes vis-à-vis Schweighäuser’s text, not counting alterations to punctuation, and chapter-division. Where he varies, the variation is always sensible and well considered, and for around half the total number of departures the reader can refer back to an explicit discussion and justification in the introduction to the 1999 *editio maior* (pp. 120–46). Boter stands a better than fair chance of being correct in most of these instances, and in many is quite obviously in the right. What follows is simply a selection of passages where I feel the argument might be kept just a little more open.

14a.2 πάντως ζῆν Boter cum TSA *Nil Simp XXI* 14: πάντοτε ζῆν ACTt SEG<sup>1st</sup>J<sup>sl</sup>κ *Par Vat*: om. *Sa Simp XXI* 12. Boter observes that πάντοτε occurs nowhere else in *Dissertations* or *Encheiridion*, whereas πάντως is found twice elsewhere in *Ench.* and seven or eight times in *Diss.*; where the same substantial point as is at issue in 14a is made in *Diss.* 4.1.67, the wording used is ζῆν .. ἐξ ἄπαντος. In those other passages, however, πάντως tends to mean (epistemically) ‘absolutely’,

or ‘at all events’, rather than the ‘unconditionally’ or ‘under all circumstances’ expressed by ἐξ ἅπαντος. Πάντοτε for its part is a perfectly good Imperial period Greek word, even if it happens not to appear in the surviving stretches of Arrian’s Epictetus; the fact that it is reported to have been looked down on by some Atticists if anything makes it a more rather than a less appropriate word for use by Arrian’s demoticizing sage.

24.6-7 εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀτιμία ἐστὶ κακόν (ὥσπερ ἐστίν) Boter cum *Siδ* (praeter *SiH*) *TSiC Nil Vat Simp*: om. ACδ*SiH*. It is doctrinally wrong for the Stoic Epictetus to assert that ἀτιμία is a κακόν, as for him nothing which is not in our power to control can be a κακόν. The furthest he can legitimately go is to float the possibility that someone might (wrongly) think it to be so – which is precisely what, without the parenthesis, he does; ‘(ὥσπερ ἐστίν)’ looks very like an addition by a non-Stoic reader.

30.9 ἀπὸ τοῦ πολίτου, ἀπὸ τοῦ γείτονος, ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Boter cum *Tt T Nil fons codicis SiC Simp*: ἀπὸ τοῦ γείτονος, ἀπὸ τοῦ πολίτου, ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ AC*Siδ Vat*<sup>2pc</sup>. Epictetus is here speaking of *oikeiosis* and *taxis*, relative distances and closenesses of relationship and the obligations (*kathekonta*, *officia*) they impose (cf. in general Hierocles *ap. Stob.* 4.71.7ff. = 57G Long-Sedley). In such a context, neighbour – fellow citizen – commander makes a more considered sequence than fellow citizen – neighbour – commander, and should perhaps be preferred on those grounds.

32.2.5-9 ὅποῖον δ’ ἄν ᾗ conj. Slings: ὅποῖον δ’ ἄν ᾗ AC*SiG TSiC Vat*: ὅποῖον ἄν ᾗ *SiJ* Reiske Casaubon. This is a very difficult passage, and Boter freely confesses that his version of it, involving both a parenthesis and an anacoluthon, is ‘at best only an attempt.’ Slings’s δ’ ἄν (for δὴ ἄν, on the model of κάν), however, looks like an unnecessarily strained endeavour to save a paradosis not worth saving; the simple ἄν is much easier, and δ’ ἄν can with slightly less strain be explained away as an error induced either by a faulty understanding of the syntax (as if a new start after a heavy punctuation mark at the preceding πρὸς σέ), or by the preceding οὐδέν.

33.2.4 ἐπὶ τὸ λέγειν τι ἤξομεν AC*Siδ T Stob Nil Vat*: ἐπὶ τὸ λέγειν, λέξον μὲν *SiC*. Another extremely difficult passage.

Boter again handles it eminently sensibly, but is perhaps too easily satisfied that the reading of ACSiδ T *Stob Nil Vat* can stand without any further attention. It remains awkward (and indeed the reason for the conjectural alteration to λέξον μέν) that the first person plural indicative ἤξομεν comes in between sentences couched in the second and third (*implicitly* second) person imperative. There may well be a deeper seated problem with the text here, but as at 32.2.5-9 and 36.6-7, Boter seems somewhat unwilling to countenance the possibility.

36.6-7 ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἐστιάτορα οἶαν (οἶον T<sup>uv</sup> *Nil*) δεῖ φυλαχθῆναι AXΤτΣιδ· αἰδῶ φυλάξαι Schweighäuser. Boter evidently has his doubts about the paradosis, but pleads that the ‘transmitted reading can just be swallowed, although I admit that the phrase is awkward’. To my mind, this again underestimates the difficulty (and by the same token the force of Schweighäuser’s diagnostic conjecture). What about τῆν πρὸς τὸν ἐστιάτορα <σχέσιν> or τῆν πρὸς τὸν ἐστιάτορα <κοινωνίαν>?

Boter’s Introduction is deliberately kept economical and austere, referring back to the *editio maior* for a more expansive discussion (and in English rather than in Latin). His chief concern, entirely properly, is to give an account of the manuscript tradition and of earlier editions, and he has correspondingly little to say about the nature of the *Encheiridion* itself. In what he does say, he seems happy to give the principal credit for the work to Epictetus rather than to Arrian, and characterises it as a presentation of ‘*praecepta Stoica nuda*’, in contrast to the ‘*viva vox magistri cum discipulis disputantis*’ to be found in the *Dissertations*. Both of these are questionable emphases. Epictetus’s distinctive voice is still heard in the *Encheiridion*, even when shorn of its dramatic setting(s), and in both cases it is a voice mediated through, and so at least in part constructed by, Arrian. If the *Dissertations* are Epictetus’s discourses as chronicled by Arrian (in the words of the old Teubner title, taken from Gellius, *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*), the *Encheiridion* is Arrian’s selection from and re-formatting of what is already his work, and the title ‘*Epictetus, Encheiridion*’ something of an evasion.

Technically, the whole volume is extremely elegantly and accurately presented; I have yet to find a single typographical error. And this is unquestionably the right note on which to end a review. This is a work of admirable scholarship, neatly and stylishly filling a real gap in the record, and deservedly canonizing Boter's own contribution in a standard series.

MICHAEL TRAPP  
King's College London  
michael.trapp@kcl.ac.uk

