

# A Collection of Apophthegmata in an Oxford Manuscript

Jan Fredrik Kindstrand

## Introduction

The codex Baroccianus graecus 51,<sup>1</sup> which is preserved in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, contains on ff. 52<sup>r</sup>–59<sup>r</sup> a small collection of gnomological material, consisting of 42 sentences, which have not so far been published.<sup>2</sup> The greater number of the sentences are attributed to Greek philosophers, among whom Socrates and Diogenes the Cynic are particularly well represented, but statesmen, orators, poets etc. occur too. In fact the majority of the names are well known to us from the Greek gnomological tradition. Most sentences are of the ἀπόφθεγμα-type,<sup>3</sup> i.e. the speaker's name is mentioned; there is often an indication of the situation and an element of dialogue by means of a participle; in some cases the interlocutor is named; the reply is given a pointed form.<sup>4</sup> This small collection is worthy of note because some of

<sup>1</sup> Cod. Bar. gr. 51, chartaceus, ff. 66, 200 × 145 mm., saeculi XV exeuntis (scripsit Andreas Donos), continet anonymi cuiusdam in artem rhetoricam prolegomena ff. 1<sup>r</sup>–8<sup>v</sup>, Agapeti diaconi ad Iustinianum Imperatorem capita paraenetica (initio mutil.) ff. 9<sup>r</sup>–21<sup>r</sup>, Isocratis Atheniensis ad Nicoclem Orationem (mutil.) ff. 36<sup>r</sup>–40<sup>v</sup>, 25<sup>r</sup>–32<sup>v</sup>, 49<sup>r</sup>–v, eiusdem ad Demonicum orationem (initio mutil.) ff. 42–48, 33–40, Sapientium apud Graecos apophthegmata ff. 52<sup>r</sup>–59<sup>v</sup>, Epistolas varias ff. 60<sup>r</sup>–60<sup>r</sup>. Cf. H. O. Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars prima recensioem codicum graecorum continens* (Oxonii, 1853), coll. 78–79; H. E. Salter (ed.), *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, 9 (Publications of the Oxford Historical Society, 72; Oxford, 1921), p. 406.—For the scribe Andreas Donos see M. Vogel–V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Beiheft zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 33; Leipzig, 1909) pp. 433–434; Ch. G. Patrinelis, 'Ἑλληνες κωδικογράφοι τῶν χρόνων τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως', *Ἐπετηρὶς τοῦ Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου*, 8–9 (1958–59), pp. 80–82; E. Gamillscheg–D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600, 1: Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Grossbritanniens, A: Verzeichnis der Kopisten* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik, 3:1 A; Wien, 1981), pp. 32–34.

<sup>2</sup> It was quoted however as MS no. 17 by B. E. Perry for his collection of Aesop's sentences; cf. his *Aesopica: A Series of Texts relating to Aesop or ascribed to him or closely connected with the literary tradition that bears his name*, 1 (Urbana, 1952), pp. 247 and 249.

<sup>3</sup> The following definition has been established for Troilus: ἀπόφθεγμά ἐστι λόγος σύντομος καὶ εὖστοχος; cf. Troilus *Proleg. ad Rhet.* p. 50.13–14 Walz 6; O. Schissel, 'Apophthegma bei Troilos von Side', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 28 (1928), pp. 241–250.

<sup>4</sup> For a survey of the terminology see J. F. Kindstrand, 'Diogenes Laertius and the "χρεῖα" Tradition', *Elenchos*, 7 (1986), pp. 221–225; K.-H. Stanzel, *Dicta Platonis: Die unter Platons Namen überlieferten Aussprüche* (Diss. Würzburg, 1987), pp. 2–14.

its items are rarely documented, and because *per se* it shows traces of originality, as far as attributions and literary form are concerned. I shall here discuss the composition, the source(s), the attributions, and the literary form before giving the actual text.

Our collection of apophthegmata is remarkable because of its composition or rather its lack of composition. The items are not presented in alphabetical order according to author, as they are in e.g. *Gnomologium Vaticanum* and related collections; nor are they arranged by author, albeit not in alphabetical order, as they are in one part of the so called *Corpus Parisinum*, i.e. cod. Par. gr. 1168 ff. 83<sup>r</sup>–121<sup>v</sup>, and similar collections; nor is here even an arrangement by subject-matter, a common form of composition, which we find in e.g. Stobaeus and the huge, late, sacro-profane collections, associated with names such as Maximus Confessor and Antonius Melissa. However there are indications that a collection arranged according to subject-matter may at one stage of the transmission have underlain our text, as sayings, which would fall under the same title, are sometimes presented together; e.g. nos. 8 and 9, attributed to Socrates and Plato, could belong to a chapter entitled *περὶ ψόγου καὶ διαβολῆς*, and nos. 33 and 34, belonging to Cleobulus and Xenophon, to one with the title *περὶ φίλων*. Still this principle in no way dominates, and we may instead regard the composition as completely free. Indeed this method of composition is not unknown, as we can see from a collection in cod. Par. suppl. gr. 134 ff. 232<sup>v</sup>–271<sup>r</sup>, which has been edited under the title *Gnomologium Parisinum*.

If we want to compare this with other collections, we can easily see from the *apparatus parallelorum* that the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* and related collections<sup>5</sup> form the closest parallels, and no less than 35 items

<sup>5</sup> The *Gnomologium Vaticanum* was edited from cod. Vat. gr. 743 by L. Sternbach in *Wiener Studien*, 9–11 (1887–89), reprinted in *Texte und Kommentare*, 2 (Berlin, 1963). Other versions of the same collection can be found in cod. Mon. gr. 8, i.e. *Florilegium Monacense* nos. 155–270 (ed. Chr. Walz, 1832; A. Meineke, 1857); cod. Voss. gr. Q 13, i.e. *Florilegium Leidense* nos. 145–257 (ed. L. R. Beynen, 1837); cod. Vind. Theol. gr. 149, i.e. *Die Wiener Apophthegmen-Sammlung* (ed. C. Wachsmuth, 1882); cod. Par. suppl. gr. 690, cod. Vat. gr. 742, cod. Laur. Plut. 86,8, i.e. *Appendix Gnomica* (102 nos.) (ed. L. Sternbach, 1894); cod. Vat. gr. 1144, i.e. *Appendix Vaticana* 1 (nos. 1–120) and 2 (nos. 1–147) (ed. L. Sternbach, 1894); cod. Neapol. II D 22 and cod. Neapol. II C 37, edited in Fr. Sbordone, 'Sentenze di filosofi e detti celebri d'antichi Spartani', *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica di Filologia-Lingua-Antichità*, 19 (1935), pp. 115–126 (= *Scritti di varia filologia* (Napoli, 1971) pp. 164–181). The collection in the so-called *Corpus Parisinum*, i.e. cod. Par. gr. 1168 ff. 146<sup>v</sup>–162<sup>v</sup> (221 nos.) remains unpublished, but for a survey of its contents see H. Schenkl, 'Die epiktetischen Fragmente: Eine Untersuchung zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen Florilegien', *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-hist. Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (zu Wien)*, 115 (1888), pp. 482–490. Other MSS have also been adduced,

have parallels here. For the rest different explanations are possible. Our text may be founded on a larger collection than the versions which we know today, or there may be later additions from other sources, or both explanations may be true. On the whole it seems most likely that the compiler of our collection has used more than one source.

The question of sources is closely linked to that of attribution, which constitutes a thorny problem for anyone intending to use material from gnomological collections. Some of the attributions in our collection are surprising and unparalleled, but can be explained with the help of possible sources or by a knowledge of the errors which are typical of this kind of literature. Two examples serve to illustrate the first aspect. No. 5 is here attributed to Hyperides, although in most sources it belongs to Solon. If we consult Stobaeus, who is the oldest source, we see that this item (2.31.77) is attributed to Solon but followed by an item ascribed to Hyperides (2.31.78). This arrangement may well be the reason for the faulty attribution in our collection, as at some point in the transmission the lemmata must somehow have been confused. We find a similar case in no. 19, which in our collection is attributed to Pythagoras, while in most parallel cases it belongs to Pittacus, who is the most probable author. In explanation hereof we may adduce the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, which presents this item as no. 458, attributing it to Pittacus. However, it is followed immediately in no. 459 by a saying attributed to Pythagoras, and obviously in this case too we have a confusion of lemmata.

As an example of a corrupt text the following case may be noted. The attribution of no. 7 to Simonides is probably due to a mistake, which frequently occurs, i.e. when one part of a composite Greek name is exchanged for another possible element. In this case the well known name Simonides has probably replaced a less known but similar name, such as Eumonidas (*Gnom. Vat.* 284) or Damonidas (Plutarch *Mor.* 18 D).<sup>6</sup> A more thorough confusion can be found in nos. 15, 20–21, 23–24, which we find connected with Bias, Aristotle, Plato, Solon, Diogenes instead of the better documented names Chrysippus, Pausanias, Aristippus, Antisthenes, Themistocles. It does not seem possible to provide an explanation here, and the attributions may well be due to the compiler himself. This is however a good illustration of the difficulties involved in the use of material of this kind.

---

such as cod. Patm. 263 and cod. Vat. gr. 151 by Wachsmuth, op. cit., p. 36, but this procedure seems doubtful. For this collection cf. also D. Gutas, *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation: A Study of the Graeco-Arabic Gnomologia* (American Oriental Series, 60; New Haven, Conn., 1975), pp. 23–25.

<sup>6</sup> For mistakes of this kind in Diogenes Laertius see J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background* (Hermes Einzelschriften, 40; Wiesbaden, 1978), pp. 25–28.

When we turn our attention to the literary form of the items of our collection, some facts leap to the eye. Our text is remarkably generous in giving the interlocutor a name, while in most parallel cases he remains anonymous, being mentioned as *τις* or *ὁ δεῖνα* (cf. nos. 5, 8, 21, 23, 24, 38, 39, 41, 42). In these cases we are faced with alternative explanations: the names represent an old tradition, otherwise unknown, or are later additions by the compiler. The second alternative is certainly correct, as we shall see. In a majority of cases we find common names, but with no special connection with the author in question, as far as we know (cf. nos. 5, 8, 21, 24, 42). In no. 8 Socrates is associated with the names Lysander and Anytus, while the parallel transmission usually presents *τινος* and *ὁ δεῖνα*. The name Anytus can have been added by anyone with a knowledge of the historical Socrates, and is probably secondary. When the same item is associated with Demosthenes in *Gnom. Vat.* 222, we find very appropriately the name Philip instead. We may also observe no. 39, where Plato is associated with Chabrias, while the parallel transmission does not mention the interlocutor by name. The name here is perhaps not the result only of the compiler's imagination, as the name Chabrias occurs in gnomological contexts and Plato is said to be pleading for Chabrias (D.L. 3.24; cf. 3.20). In some cases however the names are so surprising as to deserve a more detailed discussion. In no. 23 we find Solon combined with a certain *Φαῦστος*, which Latin name is of course impossible in connection with the historical Solon. We find it in a passage, which is probably a later development of the original text (cf. below), and the phrase *ὑπὸ Φαύστου* may have its origin in the preceding *ὑπὸ φαύλων*; moreover we should perhaps read *ὑπὸ <τινος> φαύλου* instead. No. 38 connects Anacharsis with a certain *Ἀρίστυλος*, who is otherwise unknown in the Anacharsis tradition. The name, in the form of *Ἀρίστυλλος*, is known from e.g. Aristophanes and Plutarch, and therefore perhaps acceptable as a later addition. However it is also possible that the name is due to a corruption of the text and that instead of *ὑπ' Ἀριστύλου* we should read e.g. *ὑπὸ <τινος> στωμύλου* (cf. Arsenius *Violetum* p. 118). Finally we have no. 41, where Aesop is associated with a *Κελαίτης*. This form of name does not seem to exist elsewhere, and perhaps we should read *ὑπὸ <τινος> Κελαι<νί>του* instead. If this correction is accepted, we may be faced with a certain knowledge on the part of the compiler, as it was well known that Aesop came from Phrygia, although the tradition contains no information about a connection with the Phrygian town of *Κελαιναί*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. St. Byz. p. 103.9–11 M.: ἔστι καὶ τῆς μικρᾶς Φρυγίας, ἣ τις ἐκαλεῖτο Κελαιναί. τὰ

It should further be noted that the text as such of our collection, although in many cases very close to the parallel transmission, still contains many changes. While many are unimportant and concern choice of words and word-order, they are so numerous as to give the impression that someone has deliberately edited the text. There are also cases, where the text has been considerably expanded, as compared with the parallels. For example we may adduce no. 23, where the passage ἐθρήνει . . . ἐπαινούμενος, i.e. eight words, as compared with the parallels, forms an addition, which cannot be considered as a necessary element. Another clear case is no. 30, which contains numerous additions and elaborations compared with parallel cases. How should this characteristic of our collection be explained? In these cases too we are faced with the possibilities that we have here a longer original or a later development. There can hardly be any doubt that we should accept the second alternative as the true explanation, since it seems to reflect a general tendency to rework and expand the original form.<sup>8</sup>

This tendency may help us to understand the origin of our collection. It is probably the product of a student of rhetoric, who has collected material from different sources, while giving the material a partly new form. The Greek treatises on *Progymnasmata* may further our understanding of this phenomenon. Among the *Progymnasmata*, which constitute elementary rhetorical exercises, we find one form entitled περὶ χρείας, which deals with sayings by analyzing the different types and indicating how the student of rhetoric could use this material for educational purposes.<sup>9</sup> These exercises of manipulating the χρεία could take different forms, but the elaboration (ἐργασία) was particularly important, as we can see from e.g. Hermogenes *Prog.* 3 p. 7.11–13 R. and Aphthonius *Prog.* 23 p. 4.12–15 R. The preserved material shows that the original χρεία was subjected especially to paraphrase and expansion. This is well exemplified also in our small collection.

### *The Text*

In this edition of the 42 apophthegmata the items are provided with an *apparatus criticus* and an *apparatus parallelorum*. The first includes

---

ἐθνικὰ Κελαινίτης καὶ Ἀπαμεύς; *RE*, 11:2 (1921), s.v. Kelainai, coll. 133–134 (W. Ruge).

<sup>8</sup> This is repeatedly stressed in S. A. Tuck, *The form and function of sayings-material in Hellenistic biographies of philosophers* (Diss. Harvard University, 1985), *passim*.

<sup>9</sup> The material dealing with the χρεία in ancient sources has been conveniently collected and edited with translations and commentaries in R. F. Hock–E. N. O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric, 1: The Progymnasmata* (Texts and Translations, 27; Graeco-Roman Religion Series, 9; Atlanta, 1986).

only a few items from the MS and some corrections. On the other hand deviations from the parallel transmission are not noted, as this would demand too much space. The second *apparatus*, which has no claim to being complete, which would be impossible, gives a number of comparatively close parallels from the most important collections with a view chiefly to the question of sources. No unpublished material is included, with the exception of the so-called *Corpus Parisinum*, i.e. cod. Par. gr. 1168, and the *Florilegium Baroccianum* (cf. below). The material is presented in the following order and groups: 1. The earlier sources such as Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius, including Stobaeus; 2. *Gnomologium Vaticanum* and related collections (cf. above n. 5); 3. Other collections of gnomological material such as *Corpus Parisinum* (the first part), *Gnomologium Parisinum*, *Gnomologium Byzantinum*, Ἀριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα, the Patmos collection, the material in Boissonade etc.; 4. The sacro-profane collections, i.e. the two published versions of Maximus Confessor, Antonius Melissa, Joannes Georgides, *Florilegium Baroccianum*, which is quoted with reference to the only complete MS, cod. Mon. gr. 429, *Gnomica Basileensia*. References to Arsenius *Violetum* are not given, since it is based only on extant material.<sup>10</sup>

## QUAEDAM PHILOSOPHORUM DICTA

1. (f. 52<sup>r</sup>) Διογένης ἐπεὶ ἔμελλε πωλεῖσθαι ἐν Κορίνθῳ, διερωτώμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ κήρυκος τί ἐπίσταται 'ἀνθρώπων' εἶπεν 'ἄρχειν'. γελάσας οὖν ὁ κήρυξ εἶπε 'πωλῶ, εἴ τις θέλει κύριον'.

cf. Stob. 3.3.52; = Diog. fr. V B 75 Giannantoni

2. Ἀλέξανδρος παρακαλούμενος ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀμαζόνας στρατεύσασθαι ἔφη 'νικᾶν μὲν γυναῖκας αἰσχροῦν, νικᾶσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ γυναικῶν αἰσχροτέρων'.

<sup>10</sup> Bibliographical references to the gnomological collections used here will be found in A. Bertini Malgarini, 'Αρχαίων φιλοσόφων γνῶμαι καὶ ἀποφθέγματα in un manoscritto di Patmos', *Elenchos*, 5 (1984), pp. 159–164. The following titles may be added: E. Miller, 'Fragments inédits de littérature grecque, 1: Apophthegmes anciens', *Mélanges Orientaux: Textes et Traductions* (Publications de l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, 2<sup>e</sup> Série, 9; Paris, 1883), pp. 215–255 (quoted for nos. 2, 16, 21, 33); W. Studemund, 'Αποφθέγματα διάφορα', in *Menandri et Philistionis Comparatio cum appendicibus edita* (Univ.-Progr. Breslau, 1887), p. 5 (quoted for no. 8); P. Odorico, 'Lo Gnomologium byzantinum e la recensione del Cod. Bibl. Nat. Athen. 1070', *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi*, 2 (1982), pp. 41–70 (quoted for no. 34). The item attributed to Favorinus in cod. Bar. gr. 50 f. 108<sup>r</sup> (quoted for no. 18) has been published in Schenkl, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 469 and K. Callanan-A. Bertini Malgarini, 'Uebersene Favorin-Fragmente aus einer Oxforder Handschrift', *Rheinisches Museum*, NF 129 (1986), pp. 173–174.

ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν αὐτοῦ in mg. add.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 94; *Wien. Apophth.* 5; Miller 60 p. 230

3. Σωκράτης ἔφη ‘χαλεπὸν ἐστὶ γενέσθαι ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν, καὶ γερόμενον χαλεπώτερον ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον διαμεῖναι. ἀντίκειται γὰρ αὐτῷ φθόνος, ἐπιβουλὴ καὶ τύχη’.

cf. *Pl. Prt.* 343 D et 344 B–C; Sbordone 1: 18 (Thphr.)

4. (f. 52<sup>v</sup>) Ἴσοκράτης ἔφη ‘δεῖ τοὺς διδασκάλους λαμβάνειν μισθοὺς μεγάλους παρὰ τῶν μαθητῶν, παρὰ μὲν τῶν εὐφυῶν, ὅτι πολλὰ μανθάνουσι, παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀφυῶν, ὅτι πολλοὺς κόπους παρέχουσιν’.

cf. *Stob.* 2.31.110c; *Gnom. Vat.* 355 (cf. 57 (post Arist.)); *App. Vat.* 2: 5 (post Arist.); *Gnom. Par.* 162 (anon.); *Max. Conf.* 17.57 (anon.); *Max. Conf.* col. 825 B (post Capion.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 38 f. 106<sup>v</sup> (anon.); *Exc. Flor.* 2.13.145 p. 227 M. (anon.); = *Aristipp. fr.* IV A 6 Giannantoni

5. Ὑπερίδης ἐπιτιμῶν Νικοκλεῖ κυβεύοντι κἀκείνῳ περὶ μικροῦ παιζεῖν εἰπόντι ἔφη ‘ἄλλ’ οὐ μικρὸν τὸ ἔθος’.

κἀκείνῳ] καὶ ἐκείνῳ / κἀκείνῳ in mg.

cf. *D.L.* 3.38 (Pl.); *Stob.* 2.31.77 (Sol.); *Gnom. Vat.* 502 (post Sol.); *Wien. Apophth.* 118 (post Sol.); *App. Vat.* 2: 94 (post Sol.); *Exc. Flor.* 2.13.77 p. 199 M. (Sol.); = *Sol. fr.* 208 Martina; = *Pl. Sent.* 64 Stanzel

6. Ἀλέξανδρος ἰδὼν τινα γέροντα τὰς αὐτοῦ τρίχας βάπτοντα ἔφη ‘μὴ τὰς τρίχας βάπτε ἀλλὰ τὰ γόνατα’.

αὐτοῦ] αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ τὰς ἰδίας τρίχας in mg.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 95; *Wien. Apophth.* 26; *Flor. Leid.* 150; *Flor. Mon.* 160; *Corp. Par.* f. 108<sup>v</sup>; *APM Schenkl* 98 (Ulpian); *Max. Conf.* 41.37; *Max. Conf.* col. 920 A; *Gnom. Bas.* p. 146; *Flor. Bar.* c. 49 f. 123<sup>r</sup>

7. (f. 53<sup>r</sup>) Σιμωνίδης ἔχων στρεβλοὺς τοὺς πόδας καὶ ἀπολέσας τὰ ὑποδήματα ἤρξατο θεοῖς ἀρμόσαι ταῦτα τῷ κλέψαντι.

Σιμωνίδης scripsi Σιμονίδης cod.

cf. *Plu. Mor.* 18 D (Damonidas); *Ath.* 8.338 A (Dorion); *Script. Prog.* p. 310 Hock-O’Neil (Damon); *Gnom. Vat.* 284 (Eumonidas)

8. Σωκράτης ἀπαγγείλαντι Λυσάνδρῳ ὅτι ‘Ἄνυτός σε κακῶς λέγει’ ‘καὶ τυπτέτω με’ ἔφη ‘μὴ παρόντα’.

cf. D.L. 5.18 (Arist.); *Gnom. Vat.* 222 (post Demosth.); *Flor. Leid.* 237; *Flor. Mon.* 250; *App. Vat.* 2: 7 (post Arist.); *Corp. Par.* f. 99<sup>v</sup> (= *Exc. Par.* Socrates no. 39); *Gnom. Par.* 129; Bertini Malgarini 106 (anon.); Studemund 14 p. 5 (post Arist.); Max. Conf. 10.16; Max. Conf. col. 785 A; Ant. Mel. 2.69 col. 1168 A (post Diog.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 30 f. 90<sup>v</sup>

9. Πλάτων λέγοντος αὐτῷ φαύλου τινὸς ὡς ‘Σωκράτης λέγει σε κακῶς’ ἔφη ‘εἰ μὲν σοι ἄλλος εἶρηκε, μὴ πίστευε. εἰ δὲ σὺ λέγεις ἀκηκοέναι, ἐγὼ σοι οὐ πιστεύω’.

cf. *App. Vat.* 1: 9 (Arist.); Sbordone 1: 37 et 107 (Arist.); *Corp. Par.* f. 156<sup>v</sup> (post Xanth.); *APM Schenkl* 90 (post Xanth.)

10. (f. 53<sup>v</sup>) Στρατόνικος εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἐλθὼν καὶ φαῦλον οἶνον πιὼν τήν τε ἄμπελον ἰδὼν εἰς ὕψος ἀνηρτημένην ἐκ τῶν φυτῶν ἔφη ‘δικαίως κρεμᾶται φέρουσα τοιοῦτον οἶνον’.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 530

11. Εἶπερ ἴσην ῥώμην γνώμη, Δημόσθενες, εἶχες, / οὔποτ’ ἂν Ἑλλήνων ἥρξεν Ἄρης Μακεδόν.

cf. *Plu. Mor.* 847 A; *Plu. Dem.* 30.5; = Caec. fr. 134 Ofenloch; = *PLG*, 2 p. 331 Bergk

12. Εὐριπίδης ὁ ποιητὴς ὑπὸ τινος φαλακροῦ λοιδορούμενος ἔφη ‘ἐπαινῶ τὰς τρίχας σου, ὅτι μάταιον κρανίον ἐξέλιπον’.

cf. *Aesopus Fab. gr.* 248 p. 418 Perry (Diog.); *Flor. Leid.* 202; *Flor. Mon.* 214; *App. Gnom.* 74; *Corp. Par.* f. 148<sup>r</sup> (post Biant.); *Corp. Par.* f. 111<sup>v</sup> (post Diog.); *Gnom. Par.* 131 (Diog.); *APM Schenkl* 79 (anon.); Boissonade, 3 p. 468 (τις); Max. Conf. 10.30 (Diog.); Max. Conf. col. 785 B (Diog.); Ant. Mel. 1.53 col. 948 B (Diog.) et 2.69 col. 1165 C-D (post Democr.); *Gnom. Bas.* p. 173 (Diog.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 30 f. 91<sup>r</sup> (Diog.); = Diog. fr. V B 458 Giannantoni

13. (f. 54<sup>r</sup>) Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος ὀδυρομένῳ τινί, ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ ξένης ἔμελλε τελευτᾶν, ἔφη ‘τί ὀδύρη, μάταιε. πανταχόθεν γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ ὁδὸς ἐστὶν εἰς Ἀιδην’.

cf. *Phld. Mort.* XXVII fr. 16 p. 45 Bassi (anon.); *Epict.* 2.6.18 (anon.); D.L. 2.11 (Anaxag.) et 4.31 (Arcesilaus); *Stob.* 3.40.8 (Aristipp.); *Gnom. Vat.* 115 (Anaxag.); *Wien. Apophth.* 33 (Anaxag.); *App. Gnom.* 8 (Anaxag.); *Corp. Par.* f. 148<sup>r</sup> (post Biant.); *Corp. Par.* f. 113<sup>v</sup>; *Gnom. Par.* 212; Bertini Malgarini 23 (Anaxag.); Max. Conf. 36.22; Max. Conf. col. 904 A-B; Ant. Mel. 1.58 col. 957 C; *Gnom. Bas.* p. 175 (post Diog.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 47 f. 120<sup>r</sup>; = Anaxag. fr. A 34 FVS 59; = Aristipp. fr. IV A 103 Giannantoni; = Diog. fr. V B 86 Giannantoni

14. Δημοσθένης ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐρωτηθεὶς πῶς ἔχει τὸ στόμα δυσῶδες ἔφη ‘ὅτι πολλὰ τῶν ἀπορρήτων αὐτῷ ἐγκατεσάπη’.

τὸ στόμα] τῷ στόματι in mg.

cf. Stob. 3.41.6 (Eur.); Max. Conf. 20.58; Max. Conf. col. 849 A; Ant. Mel. 1.73 col. 993 A; *Gnom. Bas.* p. 158 (post Biant.)

15. Βίας ἐρωτηθεὶς τίνα ἔσται τὰ ἐν ᾿Αιδῇ ἔφη ‘οὔτε ἐγὼ ἐκεῖσε πεπόρευμαι οὔτε τινὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐλθόντι συντετύχηκα’.

cf. *Wien. Apophth.* 151 (Chabrias); *Corp. Par.* ff. 161<sup>v</sup>–162<sup>r</sup> (post Chrysipp.); *Gnom. Par.* 219 (post Socr.); Max. Conf. 36.47 (post Socr.); Max. Conf. col. 905 A (post Socr.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 47 f. 120<sup>r</sup> (post Socr.)

16. (f. 54<sup>v</sup>) Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος ἰδὼν τινα υἱὸν ἐταίρας λίθους βάλλοντα εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἔφη ‘οὐκ εὐλαβῇ, ἵνα μὴ πλήξῃς τὸν πατέρα’.

cf. Theon *Prog.* 5 pp. 100–101 Sp.; D.L. 6.62; Eust. *Comm. ad Il.* 24.499 p. 1361.30; *Gnom. Vat.* 178; *App. Gnom.* 35; *Corp. Par.* f. 106<sup>v</sup> (= Favorin. fr. 112 Barigazzi); Miller 81 p. 233; = Diog. fr. V B 211 Giannantoni

17. Σωκράτης λοιδορούσης αὐτόν ποτε Ξανθίππης τῆς ἰδίας γυναικός, ἔπειτα καὶ ὕδωρ ἐπάνω τούτου ἐκ μετεώρου διὰ θυρίδος χεάσης ἔφη ‘εἰνῶσκον ὅτι βροντῶσα ἡ Ξανθίππη καὶ βρέξει’.

cf. D.L. 2.36; *Gnom. Vat.* 491; *App. Vat.* 2: 88; Sbordone 2: 31

18. Ἀλεξάνδρῳ λαβόντι τὰς τοῦ Δαρείου θυγατέρας αἰχμαλώτους συνε (f. 55<sup>r</sup>) βούλευον οἱ φίλοι συγγενέσθαι αὐταῖς. ὁ δὲ ἔφη ‘αἰσχρὸν ἔστι τοὺς νικήσαντας ἄνδρας ὑπὸ γυναικῶν ἡττηθῆναι’.

cf. Favorin. no. 8 (in cod. Bar. gr. 50 f. 108<sup>r</sup>); Stob. 3.5.41; *Wien. Apophth.* 9; *Corp. Par.* f. 109<sup>r</sup>; *Gnom. Par.* 315; Bertini Malgarini 136; Boissonade, 3 p. 468; Max. Conf. 3.27; Max. Conf. col. 741 B–C; *Flor. Bar.* c. 41 f. 112<sup>r</sup>

19. Πυθαγόρας παρακαλούμενος υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ δικάσαι ἔφη πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν ‘εἰ μὲν δικαιότερα τοῦ πατρὸς μέλλεις λέγειν, ἄξιος εἶ κατακεκρίσθαι, εἰ δὲ ἄδικα, καὶ μᾶλλον οὕτως εἶ ἄξιος κατακεκρίσθαι’.

cf. Stob. 4.25.41 (Pittac.); *Gnom. Vat.* 458 (post Pittac.); *Gnom. Par.* 10 et 78 (Pittac.)

20. Ἀριστοτέλης ἐρωτηθεὶς παρὰ τινος ἱατροῦ ἰδιώτου ‘πῶς γέγονας λίαν γέρων’ ἔφη ‘διότι οὐκ ἐχρησάμην σοι ἱατρῷ’.

cf. Plu. *Mor.* 231 A (Pausanias no. 6); *App. Vat.* 1: 86 (Pausanias); Sbordone 1: 81 (Pausanias); *Gnom. Pal.* 129 (σοφός); *Gnom. Bar.* 155 (σοφός); *GB Matino* 128 (σοφός); *Corp. Par.* f. 144<sup>r</sup> (σοφός); Ant. Mel. 1.56 col. 953 B (σοφός); Jo. Georg. δ 7 Odorico (anon.)

21. (f. 55<sup>v</sup>) Πλάτων συντυχὼν Διοκλεῖ αὐτὸν ἀδικήσαντι καὶ περιφεύγοντι καὶ ἀπαντᾶν αἰσχυνομένῳ ἔφη ‘οὐ χρή σε φεύγειν ἐμέ, ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ φεύγειν σε πονηρὸν ὄντα’.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 27 (post Aristipp.); *App. Gnom.* 27 (post Aristipp.); *Sbordone* 1: 3 (post Aristipp.); *Miller* 77 p. 233 (post Aristipp.); *Max. Conf.* 1 col. 728 B (post Plu.); = *Aristipp. fr.* IV A 113 Giannantoni

22. a) Τὸν ἀληθῆ φίλον πρὸς μὲν τὰς εὐφροσύνας κληθέντα δεῖ παρεῖναι, πρὸς δὲ τὰς περιστάσεις αὐτόκλητον δεῖ παρεῖναι. b) 'Φίλον γὰρ ἡγητέον' ἔφη Φίλων 'τὸν βοηθεῖν ἐθέλοντα, καὶ μὴ δύνηται'.

δύνηται scripsi δύναται cod.

cf. a) *Corp. Par.* f. 93<sup>v</sup> (= *Exc. Par.* Democritus no. 7); *Gnom. Byz.* 165; *Gnom. Bar.* 153; *Max. Conf.* 6.99 (Democr.); *Max. Conf.* p. 191.22 R. (Democr.); *Ant. Mel.* 1.24 col. 849 D (Democr.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 11 f. 37<sup>r</sup> (post Socr.); = *Democr. fr.* B 302.169 FVS 68; b) *Corp. Par.* f. 71<sup>v</sup>; *Max. Conf.* 6.35; *Max. Conf.* col. 757 C; *Ant. Mel.* 1.24 col. 849 A; *Flor. Bar.* c. 11 f. 34<sup>v</sup>

23. Σόλων ἐπαινούμενος ὑπὸ φαύλων ἀνθρώπων ἐθρήνει. καὶ ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Φαύστου 'διατί θρηνεῖς (f. 56<sup>r</sup>) ἐπαινούμενος' ἔφη 'ἀγωνιῶ, μή τι κακὸν εἰργασταί μοι, ὅτι τοιούτοις ἀνδράσιν ἀρέσκω'.

ὑπὸ Φαύστου] fortasse ὑπό < τινος > φαύλου

cf. *D.L.* 6.5 (Antisth.); *Gnom. Vat.* 9 (Antisth.); *Ant. Mel.* 2.32 col. 1084 C (Antisth.); = *Antisth. fr.* V A 88 Giannantoni

24. Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Θέωνος 'τίνι δώσω τὴν θυγατέρα μου πρὸς γάμον, πλουσίῳ ἀπαιδεύτῳ ἢ πένητι πεπαιδευμένῳ' 'μᾶλλον δός' εἶπεν 'αὐτὴν ἀνδρὶ χρημάτων δεομένῳ ἢ χρήμασιν ἀνδρὸς δεομένῳ'.

cf. *Plu. Mor.* 185 D (Themistocles no. 11); *Plu. Them.* 18.9; *Stob.* 4.28.11 (Themistocles)

25. Σωκράτης ἔλεγεν 'ἐκεῖνον χρὴ μόνον βασιλεύειν, τὸν δυνάμενον ἄρχειν τῶν οἰκείων παθῶν'.

cf. *Stob.* 4.7.26; *Gnom. Vat.* 472; *Flor. Leid.* 228; *Flor. Mon.* 241; *App. Gnom.* 90; *App. Vat.* 1: 43 (Democr. Parrh.); *Sbordone* 2: 23; *Corp. Par.* f. 94<sup>r-v</sup> (= *Exc. Par.* Democritus no. 15); = *Democr. fr.* B 302.178 FVS 68

26. (f. 56<sup>v</sup>) Θαλῆς ἀποσκοπῶν νύκτωρ εἰς τὰ μετέωρα κατηνέχθη εἰς φρέαρ. πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου φωνὴν ὁ προσεδρεύων θεράπων ἐλθὼν μόλις ἀνείλκυσε διὰ κλίμακος, ἐπειπὼν 'τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ σκοπῶν τὰ ἐν γῇ οὐχ ὁρᾷς'.

cf. *Pl. Tht.* 174 A; *D.L.* 1.34; *Stob.* 2.1.22; *Gnom. Vat.* 319; *App. Vat.* 2: 24; *Corp. Par.* f. 121<sup>v</sup>; *Max. Conf.* 21.25; *Max. Conf.* col. 853 A; *Ant. Mel.* 2.76 col. 1192 B; *Flor. Bar.* c. 54 f. 126<sup>v</sup>; = *Thal. fr.* A 1 FVS 11

27. Λεωνίδης χωλὸς ὢν ἐπὶ παράταξιν ἦλθε. 'τί τοῦτο;' τοῦ στρατηγοῦ αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσαντος 'πῶς ὢν τοιοῦτος ἐπὶ παράταξιν ἦλθες;' ἡδέως πρὸς τοῦτό γε ἀπεκρίνατο 'οὐ γὰρ φευγόντων, ἀλλ' ἐστώτων ἐστὶ χρεία'.

τί τοῦτο scripsi τί του δὲ cod.

cf. Plu. *Mor.* 210 F (Agesilaus no. 34) et 234 E (anon. no. 45); *Gnom. Vat.* 389; *Flor. Leid.* 201; *Flor. Mon.* 213; *App. Gnom.* 73; *App. Vat.* 2: 69; Sbordone 2: 16; *Corp. Par.* f. 154<sup>v</sup>; *Gnom. Par.* 95 (Lacon); Max. Conf. 4.18 (Lacon); Max. Conf. col. 748 A (Lacon); *Flor. Bar.* c. 40 f. 110<sup>r-v</sup> (Lacon)

28. (f. 57<sup>r</sup>) Κράτης ὁ Θηβαῖος θέλων φιλοσοφῆσαι ἔρριψε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ τῷ δήμῳ, κηρύξας οὕτω 'Κράτης ἀπολύει τὰ Κράτητος, ἵνα μὴ τὰ Κράτητος κρατήσῃ τὸν Κράτητα'.

cf. Apostol. 10.5; Eudocia *Violarium* 591 pp. 448–449; = Crates frr. V H 4 et 10 Giannantoni

29. Φιλόξενος ὁ ποιητής ποτε ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν σχολαστικῶν 'διατί Σοφοκλῆς χρηστὰς παρεισάγει τὰς γυναῖκας, σὺ δὲ φαύλας' εἶπεν 'ὅτι Σοφοκλῆς μὲν οἷας δεῖ εἶναι τὰς γυναῖκας λέγει, ἐγὼ δὲ οἷαί εἰσιν'.

cf. Arist. *Po.* 25 1460b32–35; *Gnom. Vat.* 518; *Wien. Apophth.* 132; *Corp. Par.* f. 161<sup>r</sup>; *Gnom. Par.* 223; Max. Conf. 39.24; Max. Conf. coll. 912 D–913 A; Ant. Mel. 2.34 col. 1092 C; *Flor. Bar.* c. 56 f. 130<sup>v</sup>; = Soph. T 53 et 172 *TrGF* 4

30. Ζήνων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἄκρως πενιτεύσας ἀπέπλεεν εἰς Ἀσίαν. χειμῶνος δὲ συμβάντος καὶ ναυαγίου γενομένου (f. 57<sup>v</sup>) εὐχαρίστως φέρων τὴν προσοῦσαν αὐτῷ πενίαν ἐφθέγγετο πρὸς τὴν Τύχην 'εὖ γε, ὦ Τύχη, ὁμολογῶ σοι χάριν, ὅτι τὴν ἐμὴν οὐσίαν ἄχρι τοῦ τριβωνίου τούτου περιέστησας'.

cf. Plu. *Mor.* 87 A et 467 C et 603 D; D.L. 7.4–5; *Gnom. Vat.* 298; *App. Vat.* 1: 66; Sbordone 1: 75; *Corp. Par.* f. 151<sup>r</sup>; Max. Conf. 18.57; Max. Conf. col. 836 A; *Flor. Bar.* c. 31 f. 92<sup>v</sup>; = Zeno fr. 277 *SVF* 1

31. Ζήνων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἀσίαν ἐζήτησέ τι παρὰ τινος τῶν πλουσίων. ὁ δὲ προσκαλεσάμενος χωλόν τινα πλησίον ὄντα δέδωκεν ἐκείνῳ. ὁ δὲ Ζήνων ἔφη 'εὖ γε, ὦ ἄνερ, χωλὸς μὲν προσδοκᾷ γενέσθαι, φιλόσοφος δὲ οὐποτε'.

cf. D.L. 6.56 (Diog.); *Gnom. Vat.* 413 (Xenoph.); *App. Vat.* 2: 116 (Xenoph.); Sbordone 2: 37 (Xenoph.); *Corp. Par.* f. 156<sup>r-v</sup> (Xenoph.); Max. Conf. 8.45 (Diog.); Max. Conf. col. 773 D (Diog.); *Gnom. Bas.* p. 172 (Diog.); = Diog. fr. V B 366 Giannantoni

32. Νικοκλῆς τοὺς ἰατροὺς εὐτυχεῖς ἔλεγεν, ὅτι τὰς μὲν ἐπιτυχίας αὐτῶν ὁ ἥλιος ὀρᾷ, τὰς δ' ἀποτυχίας ἡ γῆ καλύπτει.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 412; *Flor. Leid.* 205; *Flor. Mon.* 217; *App. Vat.* 2: 115; *Corp. Par.* f. 156, *Gnom. Par.* 239; *Max. Conf.* 50.17; *Max. Conf. coll.* 948 D–949 A; *Ant. Mel.* 1.56 col. 953 A; *Flor. Bar.* c. 52 f. 125<sup>r</sup>

33. (f. 58<sup>r</sup>) Κλεόβουλος ἔφη ‘δεῖ μὲν αἰεὶ τὸν φίλον εὐεργετεῖν, ἵνα ἢ μᾶλλον φίλος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν, ἵνα γένηται φίλος. καὶ τὸν μὲν φθόνον τῶν φίλων φρονίμως φεύγειν, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπιβουλήν’.

cf. *D.L.* 1.91; *Stob.* 4.7.23 (Theobulus); *Gnom. Vat.* 370; *Flor. Leid.* 195; *Flor. Mon.* 207; *App. Gnom.* 69 (post Cleanth.); *App. Vat.* 2: 55; *Sbordone* 2: 7; *Corp. Par.* f. 106<sup>r-v</sup> (= Favorin. fr. 111 Barigazzi); Bertini Malgarini 11; Miller 96 p. 235 (Cleanth.); *Max. Conf.* 54.40; *Max. Conf. col.* 961 B; *Ant. Mel.* 1.62 col. 969 B; *Flor. Bar.* c. 36 f. 102<sup>v</sup>

34. Ξενοφῶν ἔφη ‘μηδένα φίλον ποιοῦ, πρὶν ἂν ἐξετάσης, πῶς κέχρηται τοῖς προτέροις φίλοις. ἔλπιζε γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ περὶ σὲ γενέσθαι τοιοῦτον, οἷος καὶ περὶ ἐκείνους ἐγένετο’.

cf. *Isoc.* 1.24; *Corp. Par.* f. 91<sup>r-v</sup> (post Isoc.); *Gnom. Byz.* 147 (anon); *Gnom. Bar.* 138 (anon.); *GB Odorico* 44 (anon.); *Max. Conf.* 6.72 (post Isoc.); *Max. Conf. col.* 760 A (post Isoc.); *Ant. Mel.* 1.25 col. 853 A–B; *Jo. Georg. G* 683 Odorico (anon.); *Flor. Bar.* c. 11 f. 35<sup>v</sup> (post Isoc.)

35. Σιμωνίδης ἔφη ‘τὰ παθήματα γίνεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις περὶ τὸν βίον μαθήματα. πολλοὶ γὰρ οὐ δυνάμενοι τῷ λόγῳ προορᾶν τὸ μέλλον τῷ πάσχειν αἰσθάνονται τῶν πραγμάτων’.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 511; *App. Vat.* 2: 101; *Sbordone* 2: 40; *Corp. Par.* f. 159<sup>v</sup> (post Romylum); *Max. Conf.* 18.61 (post Romylum); *Max. Conf. col.* 836 B–C (post Romylum); *Ant. Mel.* 1.70 col. 984 C (post Romylum)

36. (f. 58<sup>v</sup>) Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν θεασάμενός τινα ὁμώνυμον αὐτῷ δειλὸν ὄντα ἔφη ‘ὦ νεανίσκε, ἢ τὸ ὄνομα ἄλλαξον ἢ τὸν τρόπον’.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 83; *Wien. Apophth.* 22; *Gnom. Par.* 93; *Max. Conf.* 4.15; *Max. Conf. col.* 745 D; *Flor. Bar.* c. 40 f. 110<sup>r</sup>

37. Ῥωμύλος κατεγκαλούμενος ὅτι σύνεστι πονηροῖς ἀνδράσιν ἔφη ‘καὶ ἱατροὶ μὲν τοῖς νοσοῦσι σύνεισιν, ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ ὑγιαίνουσιν’.

cf. *Flor. Leid.* 225; *Flor. Mon.* 238; *App. Gnom.* 87; *Corp. Par.* f. 159<sup>r</sup>; *Gnom. Par.* 108; *Max. Conf.* 6.133; *Max. Conf. col.* 761 D

38. Ἀνάχαρσις ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπ’ Ἀριστύλου πῶς ἂν τις οὐ γένοιτο φιλοπότης ἔφη ‘εἰ τὰς τῶν μεθυόντων ἀσχημοσύνας πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχει’.

ὑπ’ Ἀριστύλου] fortasse ὑπό < τινος > στωμύλου

cf. D.L. 1.103; *Wien. Apophth.* 57; *App. Gnom.* 10; *Gnom. Par.* 198 (Pythag.); *APM Schenkl* 113 (σοφός); *Gnom. Byz.* 236 (anon.); *Corp. Par.* f. 144<sup>r-v</sup> (anon.); *Gnom. Bar.* 215 (anon.); Bertini Malgarini 15; *Ant. Mel.* 1.41 col. 920 C (σοφός); *Jo. Georg. G* 817 Odorico (anon.); = Anacharsis A 28 Kindstrand

39. Πλάτων ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Χαβρίου πῶς ἂν τις τὸν ἐχθρὸν λυπήσειεν ἄκρως ἔφη ‘παρασκευάζων ἑαυτὸν ἄριστα πράττειν’.

cf. *Gnom. Vat.* 432; Sbordone 2: 49; *Corp. Par.* f. 157<sup>r</sup> (Socr.); *Max. Conf.* 28.28 (post Epict.); *Max. Conf.* col. 880 B (Epict.); *Ant. Mel.* 1.72 col. 989 C (Epict.); = *Pl. Sent.* 43 Stanzel

40. (f. 59<sup>r</sup>) Ἀλέξανδρος ἀκούσας ὅτι Δαρεῖος ἄγει τριάκοντα μυριάδας ἀνδρῶν εἰς παράταξιν ἔφη ‘εἷς μάγειρος πρόβατα πολλὰ οὐ φοβεῖται’.

cf. *Wien. Apophth.* 10; *Corp. Par.* f. 108<sup>v</sup>; *Gnom. Par.* 252; *APM Schenkl* 14; *Max. Conf.* 71.17; *Max. Conf.* col. 1017 C; *Ant.* 1.37 col. 904 C; *Gnom. Bas.* p. 146; *Flor. Bar.* c. 40 f. 110<sup>r</sup>

41. Αἴσωπος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Κελαίτου πότ’ ἂν ἔμελλε γενέσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ταραχὴ μεγίστη ἔφη ‘εἰ οἱ τελευτήσαντες ἀναστάντες ἀπαιτοῖεν ἕκαστος τὰ ἴδια’.

ὑπὸ Κελαίτου] ὑπὸ Κροίσου Perry fortasse ὑπό < τινος > Κελαι < νί > του

cf. *Aesop. Vita G* 47 Perry; *Gnom. Vat.* 128; *Wien. Apophth.* 94; = *Aesop. Sent.* 4 Perry p. 249

42. Δημοσθένης ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Τιμοθέου ‘τί τὸν υἱόν μου διδάξω’ ἔφη ‘εἰ μὲν βούλοιτο ζῆν μετὰ θεῶν, δίδαξον εἶναι φιλόσοφον, εἰ δὲ μετ’ ἀνθρώπων, ῥήτορα’.

cf. *Stob.* 2.31.76 (Antisth.); *Gnom. Vat.* 7 (post Antisth.); *Flor. Leid.* 171; *Flor. Mon.* 182; *Exc. Flor.* 2.13.76 p. 199 M. (Antisth.); = Antisth. fr. V A 173 Giannantoni

University of Uppsala