

S. 211f. zur ‚Ereignisabfolge‘ im Kontext von Pompeius’ Traum). Dabei sollte aber in noch höherem Maß beachtet werden, dass auch Historiographie und Biographie sich gezielter literarischer Strategien bedienen, sodass die Interaktion zwischen den Gattungen sich komplexer darstellt. In Ansätzen erfolgt eine solcher Vergleich, wenn die Verwendung von bildsprachlichen Elementen bei Plutarch und Cicero herangezogen wird (S. 338–343). Schließlich müsste als Gegenprobe auch der Einsatz der Bildsprache in anderen Epen (und wie ansatzweise gezeigt auch bei Seneca tragicus) stärker im Hinblick auf deren Funktion im Kontext der Figurenkonzeption untersucht werden. Leider bleiben die Analysen jedoch meist auf eine Feststellung intertextueller Bezüge zwischen den Gleichnissen selbst beschränkt, obwohl sich auch hier durchaus über die bisherige Forschung hinausführende Beobachtungen finden (etwa auf S. 76 zum Ersatz des Kriegspferds durch das Rennpferd im Kontext des Bürgerkriegs als ‚Wettkampf‘). Die Markierung solcher Bezüge (zum hier vorausgesetzten Konzept der ‚offenkundigen‘ Intertextualität aus der Rezipientenperspektive vgl. Kap. 2.2) überzeugt aber nicht in jedem Fall (z. B. S. 106 zu Catull 64,338–341 als angeblichem Prätext von *BC* 5,403–508). Erst in einem kurzen Abschnitt im Schlusskapitel (5.0) wird Lucans eigenständige Gestaltung der Gleichnisse auf einer übergreifenden Ebene mit der seiner epischen Vorgänger Homer, Apollonios Rhodios und Vergil verglichen und eine Entwicklung hin zu einer komplexen und systematischen Bildsprache im Dienst der Figurenkonstellation und der Deutung des Epos insgesamt postuliert.

Die Bibliographie weist eine repräsentative Auswahl aus der älteren und neueren Literatur auf und berücksichtigt die meisten einschlägigen Titel, auch wenn einige Lücken vor allem im Bereich der Bildsprache wohl unvermeidlich sind (z. B. A. Loupiac, *La poétique des éléments dans La Pharsale de Lucain*, Bruxelles 1998; zu Caesar und Pompeius vgl. jetzt auch H. J. M. Day, *Lucan and the Sublime: Power, Representation and Aesthetic Experience*, Cambridge 2013). Merkwürdigerweise sind aber gerade die beiden in derselben Reihe erschienenen Dissertationen von Lisa Sannicandro (*I personaggi femminili del Bellum civile di Lucano*, 2010) und von Daniel Groß (*Plenus litteris Lucanus: Zur Rezeption der horazischen Oden und Epoden in Lucans Bellum Civile*, 2013; ebenfalls mit einem Methodenkapitel zur Intertextualität) nicht zitiert, obwohl in anderen Fällen neueste Literatur durchaus noch eingearbeitet wurde.

Die Gestaltung des Buches ist im Allgemeinen leserfreundlich, auch wenn die Fußnoten etwas komprimiert hätten werden können. Die Interpretationen werden anhand vieler Originalzitate illustriert, denen jeweils eine Übersetzung beigegeben ist; die eigenen Übersetzungen der Lucan-Passagen versuchen dabei die Bilder möglichst textnah zu vermitteln (oft werden Überset-

zungsvarianten diskutiert), enthalten aber leider Fehler (nur ein Beispiel: *BC* 10,465 auf S. 130 *ultorem metuens regnique fugaeque* ist nicht als ‚weil sie die Rache des Königshauses und ihre Flucht fürchtete‘ zu übersetzen, sondern als ‚weil sie [sc. Medea] den Rächer [sc. Aetes] seines Königreiches und ihrer Flucht fürchtete‘). Auf die Tabellen folgt auch ein (mit über zehn Seiten alleine zu Lucan) extrem detaillierter Stellenindex. Druckfehler und sprachliche Versehen finden sich relativ wenige, dagegen einige inhaltliche Irrtümer (z. B. S. 76 und 149: Elisches, nicht Eleusisches Rennpferd), etwa wenn weibliche Forscherinnen mit männlichen Pronomina bezeichnet sind (so z. B. [Helga] Nehr Korn auf S. 13 [korrekt dagegen auf S. 79 Anm. 157], [Berthe M.] Marti auf S. 109 Anm. 218, [Susan H.] Braund auf S. 306 Anm. 584).

Insgesamt liegt hier eine lesenswerte Studie vor, die Lucans Bildsprache und deren innovative Funktion im Epos anschaulich vor Augen führt, aber auch nach eigener Aussage der Verfasserin (S. 425) das Potential dieses Themas noch nicht voll ausschöpft.

August 2016

Annemarie Ambühl
Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

ULRIKE BRANDT

Kommentar zu Epiktets Encheiridion

Heidelberg, Winter. 2015. 411. S. Gr.–8°

(Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern)

This work is a slightly revised version of the author’s dissertation accepted by the Philological Faculty of the University of Leipzig in 2014. It contains a brief foreword, a table of contents, an introduction (32 pages), a chapter by chapter commentary on Epictetus’ *Encheiridion* (280 pages), a bibliography (18 pages), a two-columned index of subjects and persons (18 pages), a two-columned index of Greek terms (6 pages), and an index of passages cited (45 pages). After discussing the introduction I will remark on features of the commentary.

The introduction divides into five sections: the state of research, the origin of the *Encheiridion*, its relationship to Epictetus’ much longer work the *Diatribai* (*Dissertationes*), the form of the *Ench.*, and finally its tradition and reception. The bulk of the introduction is devoted to the form of the text, as this aspect is the predominant focus of the commentary proper. Brandt discusses the genre and title of the *Ench.*, its organization and function, and its style and addressees.

She observes that those modern day scholars who have placed the *Ench.* at the center of their investigations have almost exclusively confined themselves to its historical influence (11–12). This commentary aims to remedy the lack of studies of the literary form of the

Ench. The explicit goals of this work are (a) to closely scrutinize the Greek text of the *Ench.* in order to discuss the terminology, (b) to discuss its philosophical and historical classifications, (c) to expound its peculiar synthesis of rhetorical and argumentative presentation in order to elucidate the function of the *Ench.* as a book of exercises for the self-formation of one's character, and (d) to demonstrate the significance of the *Ench.* in its own right, independent of the *Diatribai*, as one of the first philosophical handbooks ever (13). This commentary meets with greater success in reaching goals (a), (c), and (d) than aspects of (b).

Brandt dates the arrangement of the *Ench.* by Arrian no earlier than 107–110 AD. She argues that the Maximus mentioned in *Diss.* iii.7.3–10, whom Trajan sent to the seaport Cassiope on Corcyra (Corfu), is probably identical to the governor addressed by Pliny in *Ep.* 8. 24, dated to c. 107–110 AD. Moreover, she notes that in his commentary on the *Ench.* Simplicius reports that Arrian dedicated the *Handbook* to a Messaleno. Brandt presumes this man is C. Prastina Pacatus Messalinus, *consul ordinarius* in the year 147 AD. She suggests that Arrian produced the *Handbook* at about this time, after having already written down the *Diatribai* c. 130 AD, when Epictetus was probably already dead. Thus, Brandt dates the composition of the *Ench.* by Arrian to between 130 and 147 AD, when he lived in Athens, where he held honorary political posts and wrote his historical works (14).

Brandt regards the *Diatribai* and *Ench.* as not really Arrian's works, but instead considers Epictetus as their intellectual originator, even though Epictetus' views are transmitted most fully only through the writings of his student (14). Though she cites Dobbin's commentary,¹ she neither reports nor comments on his untraditional view on authorship of the *Diatribai*. Dobbin, persuaded by Stellwag,² holds that "Epictetus is responsible for composing the *Discourses* as we have them, but ... he tried to preserve the dramatic context from which they probably developed."³ Instead of addressing Dobbin's provocative view, Brandt sidesteps this controversy altogether. Like others before her, she notes that stylistically Arrian's historical writings clearly differ from those which he compiled in the name of Epictetus. In the *Anabasis of Alexander* Arrian imitates the Attic style of Thucydides and Xenophon, whereas in the *Indica* he writes in the Ionic dialect. In Epictetus' works, however, he writes in Hellenistic colloquial Koine (14). Though she grants that these stylistic differences could be seen as an indication of Arrian's effort to make it clear that Epictetus is the actual originator of the *Diatribai* and

Ench., Brandt points out that the linguistic differences between Epictetus' writings and Arrian's other works could also be due to the dissimilar genres. She concludes that it remains uncertain to what degree Arrian was influenced by Epictetus not only conceptually, but also in the editorial preparation of these works. With the letter of dedication directed to Messalinus, Brandt thinks that Arrian intended the *Ench.* to convey the best of the content and impact of the philosophy of Epictetus (15).

Distrustful of Simplicius' remark that Arrian compiled the *Handbook* from a compendium ἐκ τῶν Ἐπικτήτου λόγων, Brandt rejects the prevailing judgment that the *Ench.* is a second-rate excerpt and mere summary of the *Diatribai*. She believes that almost half of the chapters of the *Handbook* relate either not at all, or only loosely, to the textual material transmitted in the *Discourses*. She does not consider the possibility that those chapters derive from the lost books of the *Diatribai*. A key goal of her commentary is to establish the importance of the *Ench.* in its own right (17).

Particularly useful is Brandt's overview of the conceptual history, and the historical development of the genre, of the ἐγχειρίδιον. She observes that the original usage of the word ἐγχειρίδιον designated a hand weapon, especially a dagger or short sword, in Herodotus and Thucydides in the 5th c. BCE, and in Plato, Sophilos, and Menander in the 4th and 3rd c. BCE. The term designates a textual genre for the first time in the title of the synopsis of the Epicurean Demetrius Lakon handed down in the 2nd c. BCE. On the basis of a 1st c. AD reference of Longinus to the Ἐγχειρίδιον of the metrist Heliodorus, Brandt deduces that ἐγχειρίδιον denotes a **handbook** even without the postscript βιβλίον (19). Yet she notes that the title of the Epictetan *Handbook* retains its ambivalence. Ἐγχειρίδιον refers, on the one hand, to the booklet compiled by Arrian that presents Epictetus' philosophical principles in a "handy" way. On the other, Ἐγχειρίδιον refers to the practical aim of this ethical knowledge, to the handling of the Epictetan principles, namely, to continuously have them on hand and by means of them to arm oneself against every difficult "assault on life" so as to perfect oneself in the art of mastering life (19–20). Brandt notes that Epictetus' *Manual* is not only handed down with the title ἐγχειρίδιον, but also under the name *Gnomologion*. She thinks that as Arrian composed the *Ench.*, he might possibly have oriented himself to the Epicurean Κύρια δόξαι or the Pythagorean Gnomologies. This section of the introduction ends with her conclusion that the concept ἐγχειρίδιον designates no clearly defined type of text, since it could be exchanged for functionally similar expressions, and that handbook-like texts in multifarious forms, with different uses, aims, and value have come down to us (21).

The arrangement of the fifty-three chapters of the *Ench.* is not arbitrary, according to Brandt, since the

¹ Dobbin, Robert F. *Epictetus, Discourses Book 1*. Translated with an introduction and commentary. Oxford, 1998.

² Stellwag, Helena W. F. *Epictetus: Het Eerste Boek der Diatriben*. Amsterdam, 1933.

³ Dobbin, xxii.

first and last chapters frame the rest in two respects. First, in a metaethical respect, they each introduce the fundamental practice to have on hand (πρόχειρον ἔχειν) correct judgments to measure and to judge truly the value of particular events (21). Second, in a systematic respect, *Ench.* 1 teaches the reader in an introductory way how to examine his presentations (χρήσις τῶν φαντασιῶν) correctly and recall the method of correctly refining judgment. *Ench.* 53 sets for the reader the goal of indelibly remembering true presentations and always applying them. The remaining 51 chapters lead the reader from the correct testing of presentations to habitually having correct impressions. Chapters 2 through 21 aim to help the reader cultivate more judicious testing of presentations, a calm demeanor, and a προαίρεσις (decision) in accordance with nature. Chapters 22 through 52 aim chiefly at putting to the test this acquired calm demeanor under all conceivable circumstances of social life and making it a permanent feature of his moral individuality (22).

Brandt relies heavily on Paul Rabbow,⁴ often citing and quoting him on topics including μελετᾶν (23), ἀσκεῖν (25), sittliches Exerzitiium/sittliche Übung (27), the *praemeditatio* (72, 244), προσοχή (137, 228–229), χρήσις φαντασιῶν (149), reflection on death (153), self-examination through monologue (172), rational exchange (ἀντικατάλλαξις) (180), ἀποκρίνεσθαι (239), and self-criticism (251).

She argues that the *Ench.* offers meletic exercises and ascetic exercises equally, not solely one or the other (28). The concept of self-care (ἐπιμέλεια ἑαυτοῦ) coined by Socrates is taken up by Epictetus. But whereas self-care for Socrates includes care of the condition of the *polis*, for Epictetus self-care reduces to care of one's inner state of mind independently of all external political and economic circumstances. Brandt observes that in the *Ench.* self-care consists in self-formation, self-education, and self-preservation. So, whereas in Epictetus' *Diatribai* mental cultivation develops out of educational discussions with a teacher, the *Ench.* assigns to its reader full responsibility for looking after himself in all situations in life (29). Brandt makes a persuasive case that the *Ench.* is designed to be read not at the beginning, but at the end of Epictetus' educational program. The student reading the *Ench.* has already learned Stoic theories of physics and logic. Now he can take up this book of exercises and convert his theoretical understanding of Stoic philosophy into a permanent state of character that trains him in correct practice (30). The mediating text of the *Ench.* can in fact be dispensed with once the good life is actually being lived in long-lasting, ethically correct practice (31).

Brandt notes that over the course of the fifty-three chapters of the *Ench.* both the forms of exercise and

forms of address change. The imperative μέμνησο becomes less frequent while the exhortation to incessant προσοχή increases. Instructions to begin with the smallest thing give way to warnings to take seriously one's progress in education. She concludes that this pattern indicates that the proficiency of the addressed παιδευόμενοι increases as the *Ench.* unfolds (36). Brandt sees the *Ench.* as addressed above all to male, well-to-do Roman citizens aspiring to political or military careers. It is not primarily intended for those seeking to become Cynics or teachers of Stoicism, because such lives are determined by divine calling, not by one's own conviction (36). Brandt provides a good, compact account of the tradition and reception of the *Ench.*

The commentary on each chapter begins with a brief overview, followed by dissection of each phrase of the Greek text, with comments running from a paragraph to a page or more. Philological scrutiny is the primary focus of the commentary. Brandt's comments on the ideas conveyed in the text are sometimes obvious or pedestrian. More could have been done to relate the details of Epictetus' philosophy as presented in the *Ench.* with other imperial age Stoics. For example, attention to the influence of Epictetus' teacher Musonius Rufus on the doctrines, pedagogies, and exercises in the *Ench.* is sparse and shallow.

To be sure, Brandt's philological analysis is utterly painstaking. But the *philosophical* pay-off of this meticulous terminological parsing is wanting. Direct, substantive philosophical engagement with Epictetus' ideas is not to be found in this commentary. Engagement with interpretative controversies among Epictetus scholars is limited to the introduction, and is both rare and brief. For example, consider *Ench.* 37: "If you undertake a role beyond your means, you will not only embarrass yourself in that, you miss the chance of a role that you might have filled successfully."⁵ The comments on this single-sentence chapter run to two full pages, yet include really no discussion of how roles figure into Epictetus' philosophy. Brandt is aware of a recent work on Epictetus' role theory,⁶ so it is odd that no citation of this work appears in the commentary on *Ench.* 37. It is disappointing that Brandt eschews altogether engaging with this fresh treatment of Epictetus' theory of roles.

To a modern reader, some of the most striking chapters of the *Ench.* include Ch. 3, on kissing loved ones while remembering that they will die, so as not to be upset when they do; Ch. 11, on thinking of loved ones as on loan, like travelers treat an inn; and Ch. 16, on outwardly comforting those grieving with words, but not commiserating with them on the inside. Critics

⁴ Rabbow, Paul. *Seelenführung*. München, 1954.

⁵ This is the translation of Robert Dobbin, *Epictetus: Discourses and Selected Writings*. London, 2008, 239.

⁶ Johnson, Brian E. *The Role Ethics of Epictetus: Stoicism in Ordinary Life*. Lanham, 2014, is cited only once, in passing, in the comments on *Ench.* 17 (142, n. 612).

who read these chapters condemn Stoics for being inhumanly callous and duplicitous. Sadly, Brandt's lengthy comments on these chapters pass over all such criticisms in silence. Epictetus' rhetorical techniques also receive far more attention than the logic of his arguments.

A great strength of this book its huge breadth of scholarly citations. The bibliography is excellent. One omission occurs in the commentary on *Ench.* 27, where reference to a fine discussion of the archer analogy and archery as a stochastic craft⁷ is absent. I found few printing errors.⁸

September 2016

William O. Stephens
Creighton University (Omaha, NE)

ALBERTO CAMEROTTO

Gli occhi e la lingua della satira. Studi sull'eroe satirico in Luciano di Samosata

Mailand/Udine, Mimesis. 2014. 357 S. 8°
(*Classici contro*, 2.)

Alberto Camerotto (C.), der als Gräzist an der Universität Ca' Foscari in Venedig tätig ist, legt mit seinen „Studien zum satirischen Helden bei Lukian von Samosata“ (so lautet der Untertitel des Buchs wörtlich auf Deutsch) gewissermaßen eine Synthese seiner bisherigen Forschungen – einerseits zu Helden-Konzeptionen im Epos der Archais,¹ andererseits zur satirischen Schreibweise Lukians² – vor, indem er sich die Aufgabe stellt, die ‚Aretalogie‘ des satirischen Helden bei Lukian herauszuarbeiten. Im Vorwort („Premessa“, S. 11–13) formuliert C. sein Hauptanliegen genauer: Statt satirische Themen in den Texten aufzulisten, frage er vielmehr danach, „cos'è la voce della satira e come sono fatti quelli che chiamiamo eroi satirici. Ossia come bisogna essere, quali virtù speciali bisogna avere e che cosa si deve fare per poter parlare liberamente e criticare il mondo che ci sta attorno.“ (11–12).

Das Buch gliedert sich in sechs Kapitel, die man thematisch zu vier Übereinheiten zusammenfassen könnte (Kap. 2–4 beschreiben in Variation Grundlinien desselben Themas, s. u.); in inhaltlicher Folge werden zuerst die satirischen Stimmen und Sprachrohre bzw. ‚Heldenfiguren‘ (Kap. 1), sodann im Einzelnen Wesen

(Kap. 2), Taten (Kap. 3), Beobachtungsgabe (Kap. 4), Freimut (Kap. 5) und schließlich Lachen (Kap. 6) des satirischen Helden beleuchtet; abschließend folgen ein Literaturverzeichnis (S. 325–339) und drei hilfreiche Indices (S. 341–357) zu Namen, Sachen und Textstellen.

Das erste und zugleich längste Kapitel (S. 15–107: „Voci ed eroi della satira“) bietet eine Galerie satirischer Heldenfiguren in den Texten Lukians, „tra autorappresentazione dell'autore, i suoi *alias* e gli eroi satirici“ (12). Die textimmanenten Identifikationsfiguren³ sind insofern Repräsentanten einer die Einzeltexte zum Werk verklammernden Autorfigur – nicht als realer Autor verstanden, eher im Sinne einer „*rappresentazione di sé*“ (S. 18) bzw. einer inszenierten „*figura dell'autore satirico*“ (S. 63) –, als sie mit der in vielen Texten anonym bleibenden satirischen Textstimme, dem ‚Ich‘ („la voce satirica“, u. a. 23), funktionale Ähnlichkeiten aufweisen: besonders den Hang zu genauer Beobachtung, Beschreibung und Kritik moralischer Missstände einer Person, Gruppe oder Gesellschaft, denen Hohn und Spott gilt (vgl. S. 21: „in rilievo sono sempre le funzioni dell'osservare, dell'indagare, del narrare, della critica e del riso.“). Insgesamt betrachtet C. den satirischen Helden – gemäß der programmatischen Passage *Bis Accusatus* 33 – als Produkt einer Hybridisierung der Sokrates-Figur (v. a. von deren Strategien wie *eironeia* und *elenchos*) mit Aristophanischen Helden wie Dikaiopolis, Trygaios oder Kremylos, mit anderen Worten als ‚seriokomisch‘. Dabei werden auch die Unterschiede zwischen dem komischen und dem satirischen Helden hervorgehoben (S. 103–105): Während der eine auf eine Verkehrung und Veränderung der Welt mittels seines ‚Großen Planes‘ ziele, beschränke sich der andere auf die Beobachtung und offene Kritik einer heuchlerischen Welt, deren wahres Sein er gleichsam als Außenstehender demaskiere. Für C. ist der satirische Held notwendigerweise durch Alterität und Marginalität gekennzeichnet, die – vergleichbar auch dem kynischen Habitus – einen unparteiischen Blick ‚von außen‘ auf die Dinge gewährleisten (S. 105–108).

In den folgenden drei Kapiteln wird eine ‚Aretalogie‘ („le virtù“) des satirischen Helden vertiefend und umfassend, anhand einschlägiger Textpassagen, dargestellt; dabei hält C. fest, dass dessen Charakterzüge niemals Selbstzweck sind, sondern zu je bestimmten Zwecken im Text funktionalisiert werden. Kapitel 2 („Le virtù dell'essere“: S. 109–169) nimmt Bezug auf das Handeln dieses so andersartigen Helden (vgl. S. 105: „L'eroe satirico è per natura un eroe *altro*“) sowie seine besondere Lebensweise. Kennzeichen sind hier das paradoxe, äußerlich befremdliche, ja bisweilen ins Exo-

⁷ Striker, Gisela. „Following nature: A study in Stoic ethics.“ *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 9: 1–73 (1991); reprinted as pp. 221–280 in *Essays in Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Cambridge, 1996.

⁸ ‚Doktovater‘ for ‚Doktorvater‘ (5); ‚adressed‘ for ‚addressed‘ (31, n. 109); ‚Wahnehmung‘ for ‚Wahrnehmung‘ (58); ‚Dergestelt‘ for ‚Dergestalt‘ (137); ‚graucht‘ for ‚braucht‘ (142).

¹ Vgl. hierzu Alberto Camerotto, *Fare gli eroi*. Le storie, le imprese, le virtù: composizione e racconto nell'epica greca arcaica, Padua 2009.

² Vgl. ders., *Le metamorfosi della parola*. Studi sulla parodia in Luciano di Samosata, Pisa/Rom 1998.

³ Dazu zählen etwa Loukianos, Lykinos, Tychiades, Menippos, Kyniskos, Mikyllos, der Hahn in der gleichnamigen Schrift, Anacharsis, Timon, Nigrinos, Demonax oder Momos.