

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὐροῖς
ἔς Ἵπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29–30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA
DENIS KEYER ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 20

2014

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ ΑΡΕΤΑΣ

Donum natalicium
BERNARDO SEIDENSTICKER
ab amicis oblatum

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
PETROPOLI
MMXV

CONSPECTUS

Carmen natalicium	5
Vorwort	7
WOLFGANG RÖSLER	
Die Hikesie des Phemios und die Bedeutung von ἀὐτοδίδακτος in der <i>Odyssee</i> (22, 344–353)	11
THERESE FUHRER	
Teichoskopie: Der (weibliche) Blick auf den Krieg	23
GERSON SCHADE	
Archilochus, 196a <i>IEG</i> ²	42
NINA ALMAZOVA	
When Was the Pythian Nome Performed?	56
MICHAEL GAGARIN	
Aeschylus' Prometheus: Regress, Progress, and the Nature of Woman ...	92
OLIVER TAPLIN	
A Couple of Conjectures that Point to Hands in Sophocles	101
VICTOR BERS	
“Dame Disease?”: A Note on the Gender of Philoctetes' Wound	105
JENS HOLZHAUSEN	
“Fürchten oder Lieben?” Zu Sophokles, <i>Oidipus Tyrannos</i> , Vers 11 ...	109
PATRICIA E. EASTERLING	
Σεμνός and its Cognates in the Sophoclean Scholia	120
ISTVÁN BODNÁR	
A Testimony of Oenopides in Pliny	126
KLAUS HALLOF	
De epigrammate Coe aetatis classicae	137
RALF KRUMEICH	
Silen und Theater. Zu Ikonographie und Funktion des betagten Halbtieres in der attischen Vasenmalerei des 5. Jhs. v. Chr.	139
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
Lysias' Chronology and the Dramatic Date of Plato's <i>Republic</i>	158
NORBERT BLÖSSNER	
Platons Demokratiekapitel (Pl. <i>Rep.</i> 555 b 4 – 562 a 3) und das sokratische Argument	199

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English

BERND MANUWALD	
Bürger als politische Akteure. Überlegungen zur allgemeinen Politikkompetenz bei Platon und Aristoteles	225
ECKART E. SCHÜTRUMPF	
Aristotle on the Philosophical Nature of Poetry. The Object of <i>Mimesis</i> According to <i>Poet.</i> 9	244
WIDU-WOLFGANG EHLERS	
<i>Libertino patre nati</i>	274
DENIS KEYER	
<i>Venimus ad summum Fortunae</i> : Prosperity and Flourishing of Arts in Horace (<i>Epist.</i> 2. 1. 32–33)	279
ALEXANDER GAVRILOV	
Who Wrote the <i>Encheiridion</i> of Epictetus?	295
FRITZ FELGENTREU	
Κτήμα ἐξ ἄεῖ. Überlegungen zu Eigentum und Historiographie in den Plinius-Briefen	317
CARLO M. LUCARINI	
Emendamenti a Svetonio	331
PETER HABERMEHL	
Origenes' Welten Frühchristliche Kosmologie im Spannungsfeld zwischen Platonismus und Heilsgeschichte	350
ELENA ERMOLAEVA	
A School Ancient Greek Epic Parody from Kellis	370
REINHART MEYER-KALKUS	
Deklamation im antiken Theater und im 18. Jahrhundert. Die Re-Interpretation von Melopoie und Rhythmopoie durch Abbé Dubos und Gotthold Ephraim Lessing	383
STEFAN REBENICH	
Eduard Schwartz und die Altertumswissenschaften seiner Zeit	406
DANIEL P. TOMPKINS	
What Happened in Stockholm? Moses Finley, the Mainz Akademie, and East Bloc Historians	436
Bernd Seidensticker Schriftenverzeichnis	453
Hyperborei vol. XI–XX conspectus	462
Hyperborei vol. XI–XX auctores alphabetico ordine dispositi	472
Key Words	481
Правила для авторов	484
Guidelines for contributors	486

WHO WROTE THE *ENCHEIRIDION* OF EPICTETUS?

In memory of Trudi Seidensticker

In my opinion the late Pierre Hadot, a connoisseur and explorer of ancient philosophic tradition, gave excellent title *Écrits pour lui-même* to the text of Marcus Aurelius best known to the literary public in European translations as *Pensées*, *Meditations*, *Selbstbetrachtungen* and the like. The traditional name, however, does not correspond to anything written by Marcus Aurelius, as the words Εἰς or Καθ' ἑαυτὸν preserved by the manuscript tradition are not a title at all – they are but technical adscription by one of the emperor's people and not belonging to the work itself, serving as a mark for its content: “(Documents) for himself”, “Personal materials” and the like. (In Russian it would be *Для себя* or *Личное*.) Just by *not* creating a title of the narrative type as *Wege zu sich selbst* or, in Russian tradition, *Наедине с самим собой* (i. e. *Alone with Oneself*) and the like, P. Hadot with his *Écrits pour lui-même* avoids this type of title, replacing them with the analogue of a mark on the scroll-case.

I was surprised all the more when I saw a new French translation of the Stoic *Encheiridion* along with a succulent commentary by Pierre Hadot to what we are used to call *Encheiridion* of Epictetus with the following title page: “*A r r i e n. Manuel d'Épictète. Introduction, traduction et notes par Pierre Hadot. Paris 2000*”. I felt more comfortable about it when I saw that Ilsetraut Hadot nevertheless stuck to tradition when she named her book, edited the same year: “*Simplicius. Commentaire sur le MANUEL d'Épictète. Texte établi et traduit par Ilsetraut Hadot. Paris 2000*”.¹ As we see, the name of Arrian does not appear here on the title page at all.

This unexpected trait brings to light a difficulty that, after lurking about for a long time, has now come to the surface. Of course nobody will deny that Flavius Arrian contributed to Epictetan Stoicism, while Epictetus –

¹ I seize the opportunity to say how much the present author owes to the learned union *Hadot* for the invariable and generous help with their substantial publications in the field: theirs was an unflinching readiness to help persons embarking on the same journey.

a truly wise man – wrote nothing. It is evident that the role of a person who put the oral teachings of another into a book and made it accessible to the public is important and even – thanks to the arduousness of the task – somehow concurrent with it. It is not surprising that the problem of authorship of the *Discourses* (Διατριβαί = *Dissertationes* = *Entretiens* etc) was raised pointedly by Th. Wirth² and H. Selle.³ But even admitting that this attitude to the role of Arrian has the merit of placing this question under close consideration, I will try to discuss the question anew.

The title of Wirth's paper implying the work usually called *Discourses of Epictetus* may remind us of a neat formula hatched in the authorship controversy on Shakespeare: "Who wrote Shakespeare's plays?" That does not mean that Wirth or Selle actually possessed new historical data about Arrian and/or Epictetus. Instead, their theses arise from a different evaluation of the known facts. Also, this opinion is not totally new, as the editors of Epictetus show in their apparatus criticus that some manuscripts read: Ἀρριανοῦ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβῶν Βιβλία, that is: *Books of Epictetus' Discourses of Arrian!*⁴ Hence there seems to have long been some inner contradiction in the generally accepted picture of two different participants of the same work and in the idea that each of them might have been regarded as a sort of (co)author of the same work. Taking into account the seriousness of this situation from the standpoint of literary history we must be cautious here indeed and avoid jumping to conclusions.

Of course, quarrels about the authorship of *Discourses* and *Encheiridion* in this situation may seem like idle play with ideas. But they are not so innocent, as the following hermeneutic episode shows. An attentive researcher noticed that M. Iulius Sophron, a comic actor from Hierapolis attested in a local inscription, very probably might be identical to a favorite of the public mentioned in the *Discourses* (3. 4. 9).⁵ This observation stated, the author continues: "In his *Discourses of Epictetus* Arrian gives a vivid and amusing account..." This leaves us in a perplexity. The festival called Actiaca took place in the neighborhood of Nicopolis where Epictetus lived for decades. Of course Arrian was there also for some months. But is it not more probable that the Sophron mentioned in the *Discourses* reflects the experiences of Epictetus – for him it was most natural and easy to recall his Epirotic acquaintance (and Phrygian countryman in addition) – whereas Arrian, who visited Nicopolis for only a short time, hardly could

² Wirth 1967 (the author is speaking about *Discourses of Epictetus*).

³ Selle 2001 (the "Autor" is here Flavius Arrian).

⁴ Schenkl 1894; Boter 2007.

⁵ Jones 1987.

know such a person and, what is more, that Epictetus knew him? Therefore introducing this person in the (supposedly fictive) speeches of Epictetus would have been a piece of superhuman sagacity on Arrian's part.

Let us cast a glance at the cultural achievements of both Arrian and Epictetus. If the former played a substantial part in creating a written text from the latter's Stoic teachings, it should be only natural that Stoic ideas bear some traces of their heritage in Arrian's writings. Conversely, his style should be impregnated or at least tinged by the unique manner of the Roman libertine Epictetus. Is this the case with Arrian? No, Arrian is a stylist, somewhat of an Attic snob. He was not by chance called a new Xenophon. Even a quick inspection for the sake of comparison of the work of both authors shows the differences between Arrian and Epictetus: while Epictetus abhors any description of complex events, let alone persons or places, Arrian is especially fond of all these. Epictetus is extremely vivid in elaboration of moral details and those forms of behavior traditionally discussed and analyzed by Stoic thinkers. As for Arrian, he takes delight in descriptions fascinating for him as such, without any scholastic moralizing. He readily portrays Alexander the Great or even some minor personages of the epoch or describes cities and sites on the coast of Pontos in his *Periplus Ponti Euxini*. An individual can occasionally awake Epictetus' interest, as he is an excellent observer of human nature, but it happens mostly when it may be useful for didactic reasons and for moral improvement of other persons in the Stoic sense.

Characteristic for Arrian is a loving description of his favored she-dog, Horme (Ὅρμη) by name (*Cyneget.* 5. 3), meaning *Rush* or *Jerky*. The name could in principle allude to the Stoic term ὁρμή contrasted in the anthropology of the school with ὄρεξις and ἐπιθυμία. But there is no sign of such a joke in Arrian. Instead, no effort is spared to show admiration of his animal friend: while she waits for him during a stroll, he sees her smile from afar (ἐπιμειδιάσασα); at home she greets him leaping and barking and trying to give her master a specially smart kiss: τὸ στόμα ἐφαρμόζει τῷ στόματι ὡς φιλοῦσα. She is φιλανθρωποτάτη. Evidently, Horme personally makes him happy, presumably even more than virtue *en personne* can cause joy to a true Stoic. Feeling such love for a being without reason is an absolute scandal for a person who sees the *summum bonum* in the community of the divine mind.

The two men's differing attitudes to culture in general and works of art in particular seem typical. Epictetus is at best indifferent to this sphere of interests. He is a freedman, but for him artists are something despicable, βάνουσοι. No wonder that his imperial follower Marcus Aurelius, who is well versed in arts, which surrounded him from his childhood at the palace and elsewhere, is maliciously sarcastic about them (*Ad se ipsum*

8. 25; 4. 48 et al.). Now, Arrian is quite the reverse: he finds everything connected with the arts *most* edifying and attractive. At any moment of his narrative about the events that changed the world in the last part of the 4th century BCE, Arrian is ready to narrate dramatic episodes from Hellenic cultural history: these include the happy fate of the house of Pindar amid the picture of general ruin (*Anab.* 1. 9). Also, describing the victims at the Granicus he does not forget to mention Lysippus as the only person dignified enough to create statues of the fallen heroes (*ibid.* 1. 16), and of course, he relates how the sculptural group of Harmodius and Aristogeiton was sent back to Athens from Babylon, where they had got to after the *Kunstraub* committed by Xerxes (*ibid.* 3. 16). In other words Arrian adores the arts, which are for him a source of delight and meaning as such. For him – as is typical for any person both active and refined – images and situations of life make more sense than any system of ideas which would necessarily keep his personal attitudes within arbitrary limits.

If we compare both authors, we see a sort of moralistic Stoicism in the works usually regarded as those of Epictetus, that is the *Discourses* and *Encheiridion*, while worldly and slightly philosophical motifs serve as seasoning in various works of Arrian. The latter writes diligently for present and future admirers of his style, while Epictetus throws to the four winds his smart replies to persons who have provoked his prompt and often caustic wit. Arrian is informative and descriptive, whereas Epictetus is instructive and didactic. Arrian is placid, objective, unobtrusive, tinted with mild humour; Epictetus is unrestrained, dogmatic, and enjoys satire and invective. At the same time the Atticism and imitation of Xenophon the Athenian as a pupil of Socrates favoured a close connection of Arrian with a great Teacher at Nicopolis.

Arrian admires philosophy as such less than observation of life and human characters, of παιδεία as a whole. If he goes into raptures at Epictetus this is probably not because he admires the Stoic system itself, even though it is strikingly clever, but because of the personality of this Teacher (Διδάσκαλος), fervently expounding his system in exile. Arrian wants to use and enjoy human experience, while Epictetus is willing to build a fortress and to defend principles much more dear to him than life itself. As Arrian began to care for the ideas of Epictetus he worked, presumably, not for philosophy but because of his impulse to enrich his own life.

Flavius Arrian was not coincidentally called a new Xenophon, writing his prose in somewhat simplified Attic style with the function of a new literary *koine*. Its vividness does not imply a radical simplification of syntax or coarsening of vocabulary. Even if we concede that the younger was strongly impressed by the style and zeal of the lame Master, it is

highly improbable that Arrian was prone and able to imitate the oral style of Epictetus, let alone the idea that he (if we consider him for a moment as the author of *Discourses* and *Encheiridion*)⁶ created the image of Epictetus and developed *sub persona Epicteti* his own Stoic ideas. The authors citing Epictetus in Stoic passages that we call his fragments are speaking of him, not of Arrian, who was later sometimes called “philosopher” in the most vague sense of the word.⁷

It is not easy to be Epictetus. But it is much more difficult to create both the wisdom and character of Epictetus by means of literary imagination. There is no evidence that Epictetus as person and thinker is not historical. At the same time there are no signs that Arrian was either capable or willing to dwell endlessly on Stoic themes and thought. So a comparative look at both men shows us that the idea of any substantial participation of Arrian in Stoic trains of thought seems so far removed from Arrian that it is very improbable that Arrian could have been the author or even co-author of the *Discourses*, if we understand authorship in the traditional sense of the word.

Now, Arrian’s tiny introductions to the speeches of the Teacher in the text of *Discourses* are very modest and do not reflect the blazing style of Epictetus. Neither are there any signs of Epictetean influence in the work of Arrian. The impression is that these two intellectuals are extremely far from one another in many respects. What could be more different than Arrian, born into a Greek family that had Roman citizenship and had been prominent in the Roman state for one or two generations, and a former slave like Epictetus? What could be more unequal than a friend of the emperor Hadrian (to whom Arrian dedicates his *Periplus Ponti Euxini*) and a freedman who became victim of the malign Domitian and was exiled to Epirus for the rest of his life? A person who often is called a second Xenophon and another one who speaks very much in the same tone as Saul-Paul communicating with some obscure early Christian communities in dreary spots of the empire?

These are general observations regarding the striking discrepancies between two persons, brought together as co-authors of important Stoic productions of the 2nd century CE. What do we know about the first appearance and subsequent destinies of two works involved, which are

⁶ Photius s.v. Ἀρριανός, mentions also Ὀμιλία in 12 books.

⁷ This word “philosopher” occurs in short entries about Arrian from Greek encyclopedias of the late time (e.g. Suda s.v. Ἀρριανός; Ἀρριανός Νικομηδεύς; φιλόσοφος Ἐπικτήτειος; Photius s.v. Ἀρριανός) – it is an important sign that the combination of these two names belonged to common knowledge.

somehow connected with names Epictetus and Arrian together – *Diatribai* and *Encheiridion*? Manumitted by Epaphroditus, Epictetus was exiled along with some other Roman philosophers in 92–93 CE⁸ to Nicopolis, not far from Actium, and taught there till his end. He is a character and a thinker – he does not write, but preaches his Stoicism ferociously to the public, which is very fond of coming to this pretty modest place to hear the lessons of a former slave who is now an arrogant teacher. As to Flavius Arrianus he was born c. 85–90 in Bithynian Nicomedia and already given the prerequisites for a high position as a child.⁹ Arrian was well-educated, gifted and self-conscious person of special standing in Roman society – an officer, administrator,¹⁰ author. Though I see no traces that he was personally fond of Stoic ideas (not present yet in the time of his idol Xenophon), there is no doubt that young Arrian went to Nicopolis to hear the lame Stoic – just as one of those aristocrats who were so fond of being called ἀνδράποδα (something as ‘two-legged creature’) by the reckless Preacher (1. 4. 14; 6. 30; 7. 31 etc.). Arrian’s visit to Nicopolis took place c. 107–108 (R. Syme). This visit became an important event in the life of both persons as applied to their heritage.

We would not know, how the *Discourses* (Διατριβαί)¹¹ were published, if a letter of Arrian to a certain Lucius Gellius, later identified with L. Gellius Menander,¹² had not appeared as a sort of preface to the *Discourses*, that is to four extant books of this collection (*Dissert.* I proœm. ed. min. p. 5–6 Schenkl).

Ἀρριανὸς Λουκίῳ Γελλίῳ χαίρειν. Οὔτε συνέγραψα ἐγὼ τοὺς Ἐπικτήτου λόγους οὕτως ὅπως ἂν τις συγγράψει τὰ τοιαῦτα οὔτε ἐξήνεγκα εἰς ἀνθρώπους αὐτός, ὅς γε οὐδὲ συγγράψαι φημί. ὅσα δὲ ἤκουον αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, ταῦτα αὐτὰ ἐπειράθημ ἀποτοῖς ὀνόμασιν ὡς

⁸ The Russian-Soviet history knows a parallel to the *expulsions of philosophers from Rome*, namely the so-called “philosophic steamship”: in autumn 1922, two German ships and some other transports helped c. 225 outstanding Russian intellectuals out of the country, which did not need them any more.

⁹ Syme 1982.

¹⁰ Alföldy 1977, 267 (list of magistrates; cf. 238 f.).

¹¹ The title is not only traditional, but seems natural if we put trust in Photius; Ὀμιλία in 12 books could have been a synonym to describe the same sylloge, let it be that the number of books is a consequence of some confusion. At the same time it is not less probable that 12 books of Ὀμιλία could be a collection of some other kind of talks, e.g. as a type of *Vorlesungen*. Who could have converted these into a written text? It is in this case plausible that not Arrian but another person edited them.

¹² So Syme 1982, 186, relying on a newly found inscription from Corinth; cf. Bowersock 1967, 279 f. On L. Gellius s. *PIR* IV² 132.

οἷόν τε ἦν γραψάμενος ὑπομνήματα εἰς ὕστερον ἐμαντῶ διαφυλάττει τῆς ἐκείνου διανοίας καὶ παρρησίας. ἔστι δὴ τοιαῦτα ὡσπερ εἰκὸς ὅποια ἂν τις αὐτόθεν ὀρηθεὶς εἴποι πρὸς ἕτερον, οὐχ ὅποια ἂν ἐπὶ τῷ ὕστερον ἐντυγχάνειν τινὰς αὐτοῖς συγγράφοι. τοιαῦτα δ' ὄντα οὐκ οἶδα ὅπως οὔτε ἐκόντος ἐμοῦ οὔτε εἰδότης ἐξέπεσεν εἰς ἀνθρώπους. ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ γε οὐ πολὺς λόγος, εἰ οὐχ ἰκανὸς φανοῦμαι συγγράφειν, Ἐπικτήτῳ τε οὐδ' ὀλίγος, εἰ καταφρονήσει τις αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων, ἐπεὶ καὶ λέγων αὐτοὺς οὐδενὸς ἄλλου δηλὸς ἦν ἐφιέμενος ὅτι μὴ κινήσει τὰς γνώμας τῶν ἀκούοντων πρὸς τὰ βέλτιστα.

The text (we quote its first half here) is of substantial importance for all existing opinions about the early story of the Epictetan texts and for the role of Arrian in their publication. There are many remarkable points here, but the thing most surprising for us is that the question of authorship had been raised already in all its acuteness at this crucial stage in the history of these texts by the middle of the 2nd century CE. Arrian seems to be snarling here at some remark by his correspondent presupposing a sort of authorship on his part. Perhaps L. Gellius made a reference to some people who had insisted recently on Arrian's authorship and at the same time in one or another manner had criticized the literary form of the text, which is very far indeed from the traditional Hellenistic idiolect of the philosophers.¹³ Probably this language question was combined with the allegation that such sub-literary texts can be of only second-rate efficacy. At any event, Arrian seems to feel uncomfortable about being associated with this sort of language in which the *Discourses* had been spoken and written down to appear in public under his aegis,¹⁴ for it is not only a kind of colloquial but a sort of creolized language, which would be made fun of by the *petits-mâtres* of the Second Sophistic. A philosopher should write as Plato or Aristotle did, not as a sort of new Aesop or a mimologos, they claimed. One therefore feels the ambivalent nature of the relationship of Arrian to Epictetus: on the one hand, Arrian is carried away by the inspired preacher, on the other, there is a sort of embarrassment about the trivial (i.e. un-Atticist) language, linked with too much of the folksy humour typical of Epictetus but alien to Arrian. As a whole, with his precious self-made copy

¹³ It is not only *koine*, but its vernacular form, full of popular idioms and verve, in contrast to the language of such writers as Attic as Xenophon and Thucydides with traces of a literary level of *koine* (so Kretschmer 1912, 1, 551). As to the popular *koine* of the epoch, see rich literature devoted to comparison between language of Epictetus and that of St. Paul.

¹⁴ Numerous examples taken from Arrian's writings in the *Suda* show that for a long time he was a source of correct literary language for posterity.

of the *Discourses* Arrian seems to have thought not about humanity and posterity, but primarily of his own pleasure and convenience.¹⁵

Arrian's letter gave a stinging rebuke to L. Gellius and those people who should have expressed an opinion that the *Diatribai* contain too much material alien to a Roman officer like Arrian. It is both true and natural that the latter denied resolutely any authorship connected with these texts, explaining that his part of the work was restricted only to writing down the speeches of Epictetus, as he had spoken them. Such practice was not unheard of, but presumably rare. Arrian's diction in this letter betrays strong feelings, as the author forgets here to some degree his refined Attic style: the words ὕστερον and ἀνάγκη occur twice each in a paragraph; the forms of συγγράφειν within the same passage are used five times etc. The end of the letter to Gellius, which is not cited here, is as abrupt as its beginning. Nevertheless this replica, made in a moment of irritation, was preserved forever as a sort of introduction to one of valuable creations of the human spirit. It seems plausible that it was either Arrian himself or L. Gellius, who (it seems natural to assume that) edited Arrian's text of Epictetus in the form preserved to our time with this letter as a sort of introduction.¹⁶

It would be important to know *when* the letter of Arrian to L. Gellius was written. We come across contradictory data here: if the delight with the Stoic authority indicates a recent sojourn at Nicopolis (though we know that Arrian did not become a Stoic writer in his long literary career), the defiance towards public evaluation he declared in a letter appears to be a consequence of the high repute as a writer he had already enjoyed for a long time. As for Epictetus (c. 50–130), one would think that he was yet alive at this moment – otherwise Arrian would probably have referred to Epictetus' death in his answer). On the whole the letter seems to have been written at least during the more mature period of Arrian's life, e.g. between 130 and 140.¹⁷ As a just observer of the school of Epictetus Arrian means that the Teacher at Nicopolis made stones move. Accordingly Arrian – if the texts of *Diatribai* are said by some people to be inadequate – is ready to take the fault upon himself, which is not in his usual vein (see e.g. his self-evaluation at the beginning of his *Anabasis* 1, proem. 3).

¹⁵ παρησία seems to be unexpected here. I think it emphasizes the impromptu character of philosophic speeches of Epictetus in contrast to a well-prepared, let it be oral, philosophic lecture.

¹⁶ For Th. Wirth the irritation of the *Letter to L. Gellius* as well as 'Bescheidenheit' Arrian's are due to the 'Fiktivität' of his enterprise (Wirth 1967, 158 f.).

¹⁷ The expression εἰς ὕστερον can be interpreted as taken in retrospect, referring to the time of Arrian's visit to Nicopolis.

As to the motif of the powerful character of the Stoic doctrine in the form given to it by Epictetus, it seems to have been reiterated and developed in the *Commentary* of Simplicius *In Epict. Enchir.* (Préambule p. 2, l. 28–34, I. Hadot) expressed not in Arrian's fashionable way, but with an Epictetean vehemence. As a university professor and the last member of the Academy of Athens, Simplicius was more polite than a Prophet preaching in a wilderness. It was the latter's rendering of the words he obviously had found in Arrian's *Letter to Gellius* 8 (τυχὸν δὲ καὶ ἀνάγκη οὕτως ἔχειν), when Simplicius says bluntly that only a *grave may correct those* who did not change under the mighty influence of the Stoic Sermon (*loc. cit.*): Καὶ εἴ τις ὑπὸ τούτων μὴ πάσχει τῶν λόγων, ὑπὸ μόνων ἂν τῶν ἐν ἄδου δικαστηρίων ἀπευθυνθείη.

The *title* of Epictetus' speeches is an essential matter for our consideration. The fluctuation was great, especially at the beginning. Of course, each work of this kind could be referred to as Λόγοι, and the letter of Arrian to L. Gellius (*Diss.* 1, proœm. §§ 1, 6, 8) as well as Simplicius in the introduction to his *Commentary*, citing vaguely Arrian's letter to Messalinus introducing the latter's edition of the *Encheiridion* (*Simpl. in Epict. Enchirid.* p. 1, l. 11 f.) speaks of οἱ Ἐπικτήτου λόγοι, along, however, with the expression διατριβαί (*ibid.* l. 5 f.; cf. l. 16 f.) to describe the same literary unit (scil. *Discourses*). Λόγος is always convenient but *eo ipso* too general; διατριβαί could have been present in the title as it occurs when the *Discourses* are mentioned in some texts, passing very well to the half-dialogue form (i.e. the one reproducing mainly the Teacher's answers) in the collection presented by Arrian.

Finally, the expression ὑπομνήματα should also be considered. The word is mentioned in the same passage – though not directly as a title – in a letter of Arrian to the L. Gellius. What strengthens the possibility that the word could have served for some time as a title is a (historically important) remark of Marcus Aurelius in his catalogue of thanksgivings (*Ad se ipsum* 1. 7. 8): καὶ τὸ ἐντυχεῖν τοῖς Ἐπικτητείοις ὑπομνήμασιν, ὧν οἴκοθεν μετέδωκεν. This means that the text Q. Iunius Rusticus (c. 100–170, 133 cos. suff., 162 cos.) shared with the young prince Marcus¹⁸ was formally called or rather commonly known as

¹⁸ μεταδιδόναι hints at the situation of not giving a present, but sharing a book with somebody for a period. It is even possible that Rusticus had a loaned copy which he had to return. (By chance, it could have been directly Arrian's copy or a next one from one of his friends.) As to οἴκοθεν applied to Rusticus, it may be understood differently: (1) from his own library; (2) on his own initiative, out of a deep inner conviction (cf. Plut. *Quomodo ab adulatore discernatur amicus* 55 F 11). The first possibility seems preferable to me in the *Ad se ipsum* 1. 7.

Ἔπομνήματα of Epictetus. Most probably these were our *Discourses* (in complete form) and the copy made for himself by Arrian and given some publicity by such people as L. Gellius or Junius Rusticus, who made the text well known in the circle of the interested. It seems clear that even if *Encheiridion* had already existed by then, it is the *Discourses* which are mentioned by Marcus in his later years among thanks to Rusticus (*Ad se ipsum* 1. 7), which should have been proper reading for such a diligent student as the young Verissimus was. As an instrument of initiation this breviary was good indeed for a person already versed in the details of the Stoic dogma, but it was hardly capable of provoking the deep enthusiasm Rusticus had reckoned upon. A final remark: if Marcus mentions Epictetus – a figure of a gigantic importance to him – only at the very end of the entry 1. 7, it is, I think, an expression of courtesy towards Rusticus – sharing the book (even the crucial one) would be too impersonal as praise for a man *personally* important for the moral growth of Marcus in his formative years.

As to the date of reading of Epictetus by Marcus, remember it was, roughly speaking, the interval between 140 and 145: Epictetus was presumably no longer alive, while Marcus was a spirited youth, choosing in the mid-40s between rhetoric and philosophy.¹⁹ It seemed to him that he took to the latter, but it was fortunate for us that actually he rather combined *both* rhetoric and philosophy, making out of philosophy an object of rhetoric for his innermost self. The immense meaning of the *Discourses* for him, expressed in his thanks to Rusticus, explains why this act, which seems quite ordinary, found its way into the register of Marcus' thanksgivings in his old age (now Book 1 of *Ad se ipsum*).

The title and the title page. Concerning the analogue of the modern title page as a whole, in the case of the manuscripts of the *Discourses* we find: Ἀρριανοῦ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβῶν Βιβλία (supposedly H'). It seems that this is not just a combination of the author's name with a specific title of the work, given to it by the author or at least by the editor, but a general indication of the authorship and the work sometimes not named but only *described* or *referred to* by the editor (we have spoken earlier about the title or rather the title page inscription of the specific diary of Marcus Aurelius, which caused the difficulty mentioned to at the beginning of this paper to the new European tradition. Moreover it is not in vain that this formula has been so sternly associated with the work itself

¹⁹ See Marcus' *Letter to Fronto* 1. 214 f. Haines = *Ad Marc. Caes.* 4. 13. 3 van den Hout 1988, where he writes that he is reading the Stoic Ariston of Chios and that henceforth he will reject rhetoric (written 146 CE – van den Hout 1999, 186).

in our manuscripts, and we cannot exclude that this ‘title’ had occurred to Arrian himself; but as it was brought back to him by L. Gellius, who asked: “Are you then the author of these *Discourses*?”, this could only throw Arrian into confusion and push him into a temper.

In other words, it was perhaps exactly Arrian’s copy which was marked with the words Ἀρριανοῦ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβῶν Βιβλία, where his own name Ἀρριανοῦ was to be taken as gen. possess. whereas Ἐπικτήτου stood nearer to the gen. explicat. in the sense of direct authorship. A label on the manuscript is not a phrase of regular grammatical construction, but mere heterogeneous information, esp. indicating ownership. In such a juxtaposition the name Arrian at the beginning of the manuscript was a sign of the ownership over the material copy of the *Discourses*, while the gen. of the name Epictetus would have indicated the spiritual owner. In a situation where apparently there was no name given to the book from the very outset (because in the beginning the manuscript was hardly meant to serve as a normal publication), it seems possible that some persons (falsely) assumed that the combination of words marking the work in some way or another was the title. As Ἀρριανοῦ stood first, the possibility occurred to think about Arrian as the author of the work called *Epictetan Discourses* as an authentic (though fantastic) title, which would mean that Epictetus was taken here for a literary figure in the work created by Arrian. Presumably, something like this was an idea Arrian had to reject with indignation in his *Letter to L. Gellius*. In any event the ambiguity in the title page of the *Discourses* remained and could from time to time produce some confusion in the public. Hence, the formula used by Simplicius in his *Commentary* to the *Encheiridion* (loc. cit.) ἐν τοῖς Ἀρριανοῦ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβῶν γραφομένοις, i.e. “in Arrian’s script of the *Discourses* of Epictetus”, is very remarkable, for we know in any case how this learned historian of Greek thought understood the situation: Epictetus is a great Teacher of Stoicism, while Arrian a person who saved the latter’s teaching for the public. It is reasonable to think so, for had it been otherwise Epictetus would have become a literary figure and Arrian a genius without parallel, for it is easier to be Epictetus than to create the image of such a person along with his ideas and utterances. Marcus Aurelius at least seems to have had no doubts that Epictetus was a phenomenon of superhuman wisdom and universal significance and not a happy literary implementation.

It seems that the *Encheiridion* had not been compiled yet when Arrian wrote his letter to L. Gellius concerning the *Discourses*. It is plausible that only after a formal publication of these did Arrian decide to make a brief Stoic synopsis without adding any words of his own (being even more reserved than in the *Discourses*, where there are some minor

insertions by the editor). Compiling the *Manual*, Arrian could lean on his excellent knowledge of already-extant Epictetean texts for the distribution of passages from Epictetus according to a certain plan. It would be interesting to know whether this plan was inspired in any way by the lectures of Epictetus himself, outlined personally by Arrian or adopted by the latter from someone else, e.g. under the influence of some suitable Stoic textbook. We do not know when exactly the inscription Ἐπικτήτου ἐγχειρίδιον was created, but it is clear that ἐγχειρίδιον was a neutral and readily used tag for breviaries of different types precisely in the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE.²⁰

We have seen how the manuscript of the *Discourses* produced by Arrian for himself (we have no grounds to doubt his words from the *Letter to Gellius*) began to spread through certain circles. This is natural as there are no books or manuscripts as slippery as those one takes special care of. It seems that the 30s or 40s of the 2nd cent. were especially suited for that.²¹ Once published, the book with the Epictetean *Discourses* was doomed to success, for it was not only an unprecedented manner of preaching Stoicism (just compare his diction with that of Arius Didymus or even of Epictetus' teacher, Musonius Rufus). Moreover it was a sort of miracle: a resuscitation on a large scale of a vivid speech in written form, which was partly a merit of Arrian, partly of the ancient tachygraphy (the

²⁰ There is a small monograph on the theme (Broccia 1979), which I hope to return to in more detail in the Russian introduction to my translation and commentary of the Epictetean *Encheiridion*. The word, meaning sometimes 'dagger', sometimes 'manual', was adapted to handbooks on any matter in the age of Antonines – such was a summary of metrics in the absolutely inoffensive handbook by Hephaestion or a juridical summa of Sextus Pomponius, which were more or less contemporary to the Stoic one we are preoccupied with. ἐγχειρίδιον at this time could only mean 'manual' without any shadow of the notion 'sword', 'dagger' et sim. It is typical that Augustine composed *Enchiridion vel ad Laurentium de fide, spe et caritate*, where the military semantic would be drastically misplaced. Later, however, the old parallel meanings of the adjective ἐγχειρίδιος could be combined indeed to some new unity: ἐγχειρίδιον became a *manual* understood as a *weapon* against the enemy, so giving birth to such titles as *Pugio*, *Capistrum* and the like; the variant *Pugiunculus*, as well as the Russian *Мечець духовный* betrays the trace of a (false) understanding of ἐγχειρίδιον as a diminutive. Similar development on the semantic line 'Manual' we can observe in the German word adopted to render *Encheiridion*, that is *Handbüchlein* (which is in its turn a consequence of the same misunderstanding of Greek ending -ίδιον; cp. κούριδιος, αἰφνίδιος and the like, which are not diminutive at all).

²¹ Marcus calls Epictetus by name five times and cites some of his passages (more than a dozen on the whole, whereas there are no mentions of Arrian at all). One sees moreover that after having become emperor, he continued to have *Discourses* close at hand.

prevalent name for ancient shorthand), about which it would be natural to add some words here.

The words of Arrian from his *Letter* which we often refer to in this paper – αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασιν ὡς οἶόν τε ἦν γραψάμενος – are a paraphrase of the term tachygraphy.²² At first it is not sufficiently clear whether he used this technique himself or made use of a skilled person. The form γραψάμενος from the same *Letter* would seem to imply rather using one's own hand. But a glance at the systems of tachygraphy in the ancient world, which had already existed long before this time,²³ makes it very improbable that a gentleman of the type of Arrian could take upon himself such a task, mastering such tremendously huge and awkward system as Greek tachygraphy should have been at this moment. The skill was of course admirable in its results but practiced, in certainty, only by people who had been compelled by circumstances and subjected to early and very hard training.²⁴

I find remarkable that in the history of tachygraphy (along with its kindred, such as stenography, German *Engschrift*; brachygraphy or cryptographic writing) there appears a trait that could have influenced the behavior of Arrian. We are told by Diogenes Laertius that Xenophon the Athenian, the idol and a sort of a patronym for Arrian, was associated with the first steps of the Greeks in this craftsmanship.²⁵ So Arrian's ζῆλος Ξενοφώντειος could have been inspired mightily at this very point. In my view it was hardly a pure chance that Arrian decided to make use of shorthand to write down the discourses of Epictetus if he knew that Xenophon had done the same 500 years earlier.

Now we come to *the make-up of the edition of the Encheiridion*. Different from the *Letter to L. Gellius* concerning the story with publication of the *Discourses* is the destiny of another letter by Arrian introducing his edition of the *Encheiridion*. The addressee was this time a certain Μασσαληνός, a person who was at first identified by Claude Saumaise²⁶

²² On Greek tachygraphy s.: Wessely 1896; Milne 1934 (next considerable step in these studies).

²³ Gardthausen 1913, II, 270 ff., plate 44.

²⁴ Milne 1934, 2, speaking about the time of Antoninus Pius, cites a document published among the Oxyrhynchus papyri (P. Oxy. 724); dating from the eighteenth year of the Emperor (A. D. 155) it “shows us the system in full working order”: a certain owner is negotiating about the price for sending his slave for a time of two years to the teacher of cursive writing and adjacent tasks.

²⁵ Diog. Laert. 2. 48: καὶ πρῶτος ὑποσημειωσάμενος τὰ λεγόμενα εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἤγαγεν [scil. Xenophon], Ἀπομνημονεύματα ἐπιγράψας.

²⁶ So Salmasius 1640, 5, treating the introductory remarks of Simplicius.

as M. Valerius Messalinus, cos. 148, nowadays specified more exactly as C. Ulpius Prastina Pacatus Messalinus.²⁷ We know something about this letter only thanks to Simplicius who was very familiar with the history of Greek philosophical writing of different epochs; at least it is clear that he knew the *Vita of Epictetus* written by Arrian and edited – either by Messalinus or by Arrian himself – together with the *Encheiridion*.²⁸ Possessing neither *Vita* nor the *Letter to Messalinus* (admirer of Epictetus and good friend of Arrian), we at least dispose of the picture present to the mind of highly monotonous, but thoroughly learned Simplicius concerning things which had been treated in those texts (this is so called *Prologue* to this text of the 6th century CE).

ΣΙΜΠΛΙΚΙΟΥ ΕΧΗΓΗΣΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΚΤΗΤΟΥ ΕΓΧΕΙΡΙΔΙΟΝ

Περὶ μὲν τοῦ βίου τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου, καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς, Ἀρρίανος ἔγραψεν, ὁ τὰς Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβὰς ἐν πολυστίχοις συντάξας βιβλίαις· καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου μαθεῖν ἔστιν, ὅποῖος γέγονε τὸν βίον ὁ ἀνήρ. Τὸ δὲ βιβλίον τοῦτο, τὸ Ἐπικτήτου Ἐγχειρίδιον ἐπιγεγραμμένον, καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ συνέταξεν ὁ Ἀρρίανος, τὰ καιριώτατα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ κινητικώτατα τῶν ψυχῶν ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐκ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου λόγων· ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Μασσαληνὸν ἐπιστολῇ ἔγραψεν ὁ Ἀρρίανος, ᾧ καὶ τὸ σύνταγμα προσεφώνησεν, ὡς ἑαυτῷ μὲν φιλότατῳ, μάλιστα δὲ τὸν Ἐπικτήτων τεθαυμακότι. Τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ σχεδὸν καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ὀνομάτων σποράδην ἐν τοῖς Ἀρρίανου τῶν Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβῶν γραφόμενα εὐρίσκεται.

Hence, *Encheiridion* is a much shorter and, as a result, much more successful compilation made by Arrian on the basis of the *Discourses*, that is, in any case, *after* them. Arrian had to know the *Discourses* thoroughly to fit together the mosaic of the *Encheiridion* (*Manual*) from the speeches written down by himself or under his direction in the *Discourses*. This task needed effort and a firm grip of the Stoic system, not to mention some literary dexterity. This was a kind of creative composition from Epictetean excerpts – to produce a Stoic breviary that would prove important to different (mostly, Christian) cultures for one and half millennia. The technique can be described as a kind of philosophic *cento* from Epictetus

²⁷ See Alföldy 1977, 152; *PIR*² V 2, p. 259; I. Hadot 2001, 131 n. 6.

²⁸ The *Vita of Epictetus*, written by Arrian as a parallel to Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, was at the same time an interesting pendant to Arrian's *Anabasis*; it is a pity that we cannot compare Arrian's portrayal of Epictetus both with Xenophon's Socrates and with his own Alexander the Great.

as quickly established hero of late Roman Stoicism. Arrian succeeded in replacing the vibrant speeches of the Teacher with a pungent synopsis of the Stoic system, presented with persistent quotation from the eight Books of the *Discourses* of Epictetus as an overall source.

Who is then the author of the Epictetean works? It is clear that in the case both of the *Discourses* and the *Manual* we have an unintentional conflict of author's rights, which (as we have seen) may lead to epistemological discrepancies. It is true that the persons, who address themselves to the Teacher in the extensive *Discourses* (even the four books remaining build a big corpus), are often introduced by an anonymous person who had observed or heard of some occasions, on which a consultation or a speech of the Master took place in the Nicopolitan school. It is only natural, of course, to identify this observer as the person named first on the title page of the *Discourses* – Arrian. These, however, are only short introductory words as in 1. 26. 1; or 1. 15. 1 and 6; or brief replicas as in the middle of 1. 15. From time to time the editor introduces some person with typical questions and troubles as in 1. 11 or 2. 4, sometimes providing pertinent but superficial information about persons inquiring. These preambles are useful for making a speech of the Teacher understandable without composing a broader introductory scene and attracting too much attention to this element of the narrative. Arrian obviously does not pretend to compose sermons on behalf and *sub persona* of Epictetus himself. Of course he uses techniques of the Greek biographical genre as well as modalities of constructing a dialogue in the diatribe.²⁹ Mostly, however, Arrian tries to render not only the ideas but also the words of the Teacher faithfully and through his own editorial skills to bring the Stoic to a broader public, notwithstanding the fact that speeches of the Teacher do not correspond to his own ideas of fine literary style. As a stylist he enjoys this difference and this peculiarity of the former slave, now a Master Epictetus.

In other words, ascribing the authorship of any work to someone is tantamount to the capital recognition that the prevailing majority of its elements as well as their hierarchy within the whole work reflect pieces of the inner life and multifarious experience of the person called its author. The concrete personality seems to be a prerequisite to the practice of

²⁹ These are finely described and analyzed by Wirth 1967; it is not this, but the overall evaluation of the role of Arrian which does not convince me from the side which I would call quantitative. Wirth says himself (p. 213): “Zwar stammt die Gestaltung von Arrian, aber das Material, das er benützt, ist epiktetisch und wird in seinem Sinne verwendet”. Who is who, then?

authorship. The consequences of historical nature are liable to be inferred from every creative work, even if it is not easy task to go back from a work to its existential and especially psychological preconditions. At the same time it is clear that a title such as “Arrien. *Manuel d’Epictète*” may be described as enigmatic and/or contradictory, especially if we remember that Arrian had indeed worked to compose the *Encheiridion*, but that the text itself consists *totally* of quotations from the *Discourses*, which by the majority of ancient witnesses are connected with the person called Epictetus, with his thoughts and life experiences as well. Is it helpful to make Arrian a plagiarist?

The importance and the problem of being an author. Of course, the familiar idea that every work has a unique and unambiguously defined author – an analogue of a physical progenitor – is somewhat simplistic. The analogy shows that relations in the world of the mind are more complex than in biology. Even if the work in question was created largely by a single author, somebody – or even several people – could have helped him or her in this or another way at different stages of creation. The author had to come to the idea, master his experiences and assimilate alien influences, choose or generate a form appropriate to his work, find technical means at the stage of creative production and, finally, succeed in delivering it to the public. Sometimes a person who does the auxiliary work (writer’s secretary, his partner or friends) or the person directing his efforts (one’s teacher, tutor or critic) can greatly influence an author. People busy editing or censoring the new work also give it some touches, which now and then might add something substantial or eliminate some feature; when needed, they can bring a work to completion along with their own ideas about the author and/or themselves. We know that some work for great painters was done by their pupils; that the *Requiem* of Mozart was finished by another person; that Maurice Ravel in 1922 orchestrated the *Pictures at an Exhibition* of Mussorgsky written in 1874. Among sculptors we know that it was not Maurice Falconet but Marie-Anne Collot who made the head of Peter the Great for the stature of the Bronze Rider in Petersburg, relying, in turn, on the mask made once by Carlo B. Rastrelli the elder, and so on. But not only ordinary people speak in all these cases normally of the works of Mozart, Mussorgsky or Falconet – even historians of art, who keep in mind those participants or helpers and their respective roles, usually do the same, thoughtfully reminding us of the highly valuable and often indispensable roles of other contributors to the accomplishment of works of art in more detailed exposition of their history. At the same time there are some traits in every work of art or scholarship worth of the name that bear the main characteristics of the whole and imply its inherent *personal* content.

Even if somebody shares in general the idea which is common to every person, conscious of the greatness of Epictetus and his role in the culture of the human spirit, this does not impede him from recognizing *two* persons being at work on one production. In the introductory phrases of his Commentary to the *Encheiridion*, Simplicius refers to both Epictetus and Arrian, but there is no possibility of understanding both of them on the same level or even comparing them in general terms. In such a situation of concurrency it is salutary to combine justice with delicacy, and to be equally inventive and precise, despite the narrow space of the title-page, where very complicated relationships happen to be presented with a graphic obtrusiveness and simplification; every lapse of attention can become a great distortion in this mirror.

How to combine the due esteem for the personal creativity with meticulous attitude to collaborative action in the creative process? Initially we asked: Who wrote the *Discourses* and *Encheiridion*, Epictetus or Arrian? The correct answer could be: nobody, as neither Epictetus who did not write anything nor Arrian who wrote many books, but always those of his own, gave birth to the Stoic message in the texts contained in the Epictetean books. The question should be put in a more complex way: Who and to what degree participated in the fact that both the *Discourses* and *Encheiridion* became a remarkable part of Greek literature? Epictetus had formed Stoic values of the later Roman empire as the following generations knew them from the *Discourses* and from a sort of Stoic Tables called *Encheiridion*, i.e. their author in a fundamental sense of the word, was Epictetus, while his pupil, statesman and prolific author, Flavius Arrianus, participated substantially in the lot of this heritage as to its book-form. Each of them has a unique merit of his own in this story – the Teacher as to the new implementation of Stoic ideas, using his own life experiences and giving to the Stoic system a stamp of his individuality, and Arrian showing his unique cultural will and high literary skills.³⁰

On the level of graphic presentation *on a title page* both promoters of these works should be shown according to the specific merit of each. For all that, Epictetus *has* to be regarded as the principal author, while Arrian *must* be considered in his role of indispensable and thoughtful editorial manager. Arrian should not, of course, be written over Epictetus, but if

³⁰ On the title ἐγχειρίδιον see supra n. 20. A history of (mis)understanding of the word is sometimes expressed graphically: in the translation of the ἐγχειρίδιον by E. Cattin we see a picture of a *sword*, while on the book-jacket of the Commentary to the same by P. Hadot depicted are the *hands* touching an old codex, which might have contained the *Manual*. The second is much more adequate.

we want to be adequate in the presentation of the responsibilities for this work, he decidedly deserves to be mentioned on the title page. Arrian is *not* the author of these texts, as they do not express his individual experience or personal ideas, nor is it his own style in which most of these texts are told. In return he was the enthusiastic recipient, careful editor, intelligent disseminator of the Stoic preaching in the *Discourses* and a masterful compiler of these in the *Encheiridion* – in cases similar to the latter we sometimes speak of the *author of a handbook or even of a primer* – an authorship, of course, of a very special kind, handling the material which becomes impersonal through the anonymity of the process. It is not by coincidence that there are famous anthologies, collections of quotations and the like, which not only remain important for generations, but standing at the side of the elements collected with their authors.³¹ The presence of the compiler in the *Encheiridion* may be more actual, though less realized, than in the *Discourses*.

That is why, already on the title page, a publisher should carefully point out the responsibility and merit of those who participated essentially during the growth and completion of the work in question. He should make use of all editorial means at hand – distribution of substantial data on the page: space, type-size for each line, different fonts and the like. Sometimes it is necessary to make a title a bit longer than was typical at the time, when authorship was taken in the oversimplified form. Thus we have the problem of how to present authorship, through words or otherwise, on the title page. A very broad meaning of the word ‘author’ seems to play a role in the difficulties we encounter here, for it is a question of the distinct use of the notions and ability to express a complex state of affairs both briefly and with precision.

The thesis defended by Th. Wirth and H. Selle has demonstrated that Arrian is present indeed in the *Discourses*, even if this is not usually noted and the book is considered solely as Epictetus’ property. If somebody takes care of the work of another person, it cannot be that absolutely no trace of this involvement is left in the resulting work. We must therefore mention this editing person on the title page of the work and make him co-author of this work. It may seem competent and generous, but the

³¹ For example the *Anthologia Planudea* is a product of the toil and taste of Maximus Planudes, omitting in its title the names of his predecessors Meleager and Kephala, not to mention the hundreds of authors included in this anthology. In the famous German collection called *Geflügelte Worte* its editor, G. Büchmann, may either be absent from the title page of the innumerable editions or represent in the common usage everything else which can be found in this popular volume, e.g. “He knows it all from Büchmann”.

fallacy is that if we apply this equalizing manner of qualification and disregard the myriads of features the creative product consists of, the different levels of the work become mixed up and the idea of authorship – as fundamental as the descending line in genetics yet more subtle, of course – begins to reel. This precisely is the dangerous side of the title page of the *Encheiridion* with the name Arrian at the top of the page. It is remarkable, as we have seen, that classical writers connected the name of Arrian with the *Discourses* rather than with the *Encheiridion*, even if it may seem to us that his role was more creative in the latter than in the former. At the same time, can the person without whom a work would not exist at all not be as good as its author? That seems to have been a psychological basis that led to the *occasional* designation of Arrian as a kind of the additional author of Epictetean works in ancient times.

On the other hand, attempts to find adequate expression of the often intricate phenomenon of authorship are not as new as they sometimes appear to be. On the contrary, the problems originated long ago. The modern trend is to privilege the persons whose rights are liable to be endangered in comparison with those of others, who may seem to have been over-privileged earlier. The glorification of the persons forgotten or considered to be underrated reflects a latent craving for more egalitarianism regarding the idea of authorship, but we should not follow a generous principle *ad absurdum* by mixing up the levels and facets it consists of. Details about individual peculiarities that almost any work could provide should be studied attentively without the hope of presenting all results on the title page. At the same time true authorship of *every* element within a work of art or scholarship is fundamentally important for the historians of culture and explorers of human creativity, but it is seldom of primary value for the public.

Taking this in account I propose to make a sort of mediating title of the works traditionally attributed to the eccentric and great philosopher whose fame was substantially due to Arrian: “**Epictetus. Discourses. Written down and arranged by Flavius Arrian. With an introductory Letter of Arrian to L. Gellius**”. If we knew whether the edition was due to Arrian himself or e.g. to L. Gellius (the latter seems slightly more probable), we could already mark this circumstance on the title page.

In the case of *Encheiridion*, it seems reasonable to write: “**Encheiridion or A Concise Manual. Selected from the Discourses of Epictetus and systematized by Flavius Arrian**”. If it were not only a pious guess, one could add: Edited by Messalinus.

On the whole we can call the booklet *Encheiridion*, which was a product of the successive cooperation of two outstanding persons, Epictetus and Arrian, “one of Those Great Little Books”. Regarding our question, we

arrive at a conclusion that is more or less common and traditional,³² but thanks to the attempts of its radical revision we are now more conscious of the question's aesthetic and social aspects.³³

Alexander K. Gavrilov
St. Petersburg Institute for History, RAN;
Bibliotheca classica Petropolitana
 polivan@bibliotheca-classica.org

Bibliography

- G. Alföldy, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen. Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Führungsschicht*, Antiquitas. Reihe 1. Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte (Bonn 1977).
- G. J. Boter (ed.), *Epictetus. Encheiridion* (Berolini – Novi Eboraci 2007).
- G. W. Bowersock, “A New Inscription of Arrian”, *GRBS* 8 (1967) 279–280.
- G. Broccia, *Enchiridion. Per la storia di una denominazione libraria*, Note e discussioni erudite 14 (Roma 1979).
- E. Cattin (transl.), *Manuel d'Épictète* (Paris 1997).
- V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie* 2 (Leipzig 21913).
- I. Hadot (ed.), *Simplicius. Commentaire sur le Manuel d'Épictète* (Paris 2001).
- P. Hadot (intr., trad., notes), *Arrien. Manuel d'Épictète* (Paris 2000).
- M. P. J. van der Hout (ed.), *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae* (Leipzig 1988).
- M. P. J. van den Hout, *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 190 (Leiden etc. 1999).
- C. P. Jones, “Sophron the comoedos”, *CQ* 37 (1987) 208–212.
- P. Kretschmer, “Sprache”, in: *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*. Hg. von A. Gercke, E. Norden. Bd 1 (Leipzig – Berlin 21912) 463–566.

³² The literary difference of opinion served for more general analysis. But we should not forget that as a result we return to the habitual Latin title: *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* (Schenkl 1894) – that's it! The title *Epicteti Manuale* by the same H. Schenkl is neither false nor exact – it is a little unjust to Arrian indeed, contrary to the title given to the same work by P. Hadot, where Arrian gets too much.

³³ I began work on this topic during some weeks as a guest at Johns Hopkins University in 2009, when I was taken care of by my friends Ruth Leys and Michael Fried. The first draft was read at the session of the Classical department at St Petersburg University in June 2013 and in February 2015 at the St Petersburg Institute for History. I am grateful to Olga Budaragina (at the moment fellow of NEC in Bucharest) for brushing up my Stoic English.

- H. J. J. Milne, *Greek Shorthand Manuals. Syllabary and Commentary* (London 1934).
- Cl. Salmasius, *Notae et animadversiones in Epictetum et Simplicium* (Lugduni Batavorum 1640).
- H. Schenkl (rec.), *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* (Lipsiae 1894).
- H. Selle, “Dichtung oder Wahrheit: der Autor der epiktetischen Predigten”, *Philologus* 145: 2 (2001) 269–290.
- R. Syme, “The Career of Arrian”, *HSCP* 86 (1982) 181–211.
- C. Wessely, *Ein System altgriechischer Tachygraphie*, Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 44 (Wien 1896).
- Th. Wirth, “Arrians Erinnerungen an Epiktet”, *MusHelv* 24 (1967) 149–189, 197–216.

Some critics (Wirth 1967, Selle 2001) have emphasized the fact that Flavius Arrian, who wrote down, collected and disposed texts stemming from the talks of Epictetus, did work that was more than technical and earned him the right to be mentioned in the title of the Epictetean *Discourses* and *Manual*. The modern trend to be meticulously delicate with every contribution to any work has led to the consequence that Arrian is sometimes represented as a co-author or even *the* author of the *Discourses* as well as of the *Manual of Epictetus* (so P. Hadot on the title-page of the *Manual*). The question discussed in this paper treats the nature of authorship: its main parts consist of a certain content presented in a chosen form and based deeply on personal experience. The registration of all persons involved in the process of cultivating and completing a work makes the object of study a matter of literary history, and it is difficult to communicate this to the public on the title page. In the case of Epictetus the author was a teacher of the old philosophical system that he preached in his own way in the oral form. As a smart literary person conscious of the value of the great Stoic teacher, Arrian became an editor of the *Discourses* and composer of the *Manual* (Ἐγχειρίδιον). Knowing both the Prologue of Simplicius' *Commentary in Enchiridium* and of Arrian's *Letter to L. Gellius* we should take into account the formulations of Arrian himself, who was already confronted with a problem similar to that discussed in this paper. The author ends with a discussion of how to correctly present Epictetean works on the title page of modern editions.

С некоторых пор (Т. Вирт, Г. Зелле) вопрос авторства в отношении эпиктетовых *Бесед* и *Энхиридиона* стал осложняться, так как исследователи стали подчеркивать роль Арриана в судьбе этих книг; крайним выражением этого подхода стала титульная страница солидного комментария к *Энхиридиону*: *Arrian. Manuel d'Épictète* (Paris 2000). В статье заново разбирается вопрос, в чем именно состояло участие Арриана в каждом из двух названных произведений. Арриан, бесспорно, составитель *Бесед*, слышанных им из уст Эпиктета в начале II в. н. э.: без привлеченного Аррианом искусства стенографии

Беседы не существовали бы как текст. Роль Арриана была радикально важна, поскольку ясно, что даже при отличной стенографической записи в таком тексте не может не быть следов редакторской работы. Хотя без Арриана *Бесед* не было бы, это не делает его их автором, ибо это понятие (как аналог природной наследственности) подразумевает бесчисленные связи произведения с индивидуальностью и личным опытом автора, притом на всех уровнях произведения. В *Энхиридионе* участие Арриана еще менее заметно, но не менее существенно. У Эпиктета вряд ли было намерение создать стоический брeвиарий; идея выстроить стоическое пособие в виде мозаики из имевшейся теперь записи *Бесед* Эпиктета, скорее всего, принадлежала Арриану, между тем как стиль бесед и акценты в передаче стоических идей остаются, как кажется, Эпиктетовыми. В случае *Энхиридиона* можно говорить о двух авторах на различных уровнях этого произведения: тексты, взятые из полного издания *Бесед*, принадлежат Эпиктету, а автором учебника, задуманного в виде аранжировки Эпиктетовых текстов, был Арриан. Учитывая, что в жизни любого произведения в той или иной степени принимают участие другие лица, необходимо признать, что их вклад в судьбу произведения существен для глубокого восприятия произведения, а значит и для историков культуры, однако на титульной странице следует соблюдать иерархию авторских отношений, кратко обозначая самое главное.