

Antisthenes the Ἀπλοκύων

A Critical and Exegetical Note on Diogenes Laertios 6,13

PIETRO ZACCARIA (Leuven)

Abstract – In D.L. 6,13 (= FGrHist 84 F 24) the biographer Neanthes attributes to Antisthenes of Athens the symbolic act of ἀπλῶσαι θοιμάτιον, which must mean ‘unfolding the mantle’. This attribution was meant to indicate that Antisthenes has to be considered the real founder of Cynicism, being even superior to Diogenes of Sinope in his ‘endurance’. The nickname Ἀπλοκύων, also attributed to Antisthenes by D.L. 6,13, should therefore be translated ‘Dog with the unfolded mantle’. Finally, the same nickname was probably also used as a reference to Antisthenes by Plu. Brut. 34,4, where it is attributed to the Roman Favonius.

Keywords – Neanthes, Antisthenes, Cynicism, textual criticism

1. Introduction: D.L. 6,13 and the ‘invention’ of Cynicism

In the ‘Life of Antisthenes’ included by Diogenes Laertios at the very beginning of the 6th book of his *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Antisthenes is presented as the master of Diogenes of Sinope and the founder of the Cynic movement.¹

However, in 6,13 (SSR V A 22 = fr. 136 A Decleva Caizzi) Diogenes Laertios testifies to the existence of different traditions concerning the role played by Antisthenes in the ‘invention’ of Cynicism:

διελέγετο (sc. Antisthenes) δ’ ἐν τῷ Κυνοσάργει γυμνασίῳ μικρὸν ἄπωθεν τῶν πυλῶν· ὅθεν τινὲς καὶ τὴν κυνικὴν ἐντεῦθεν ὀνομασθῆναι· αὐτός τε ἐπεκαλεῖτο Ἀπλοκύων. καὶ πρῶτος ἐδίπλωσε τὸν τρίβωνα, καθά φησι Διοκλῆς, καὶ μόνῳ αὐτῷ ἐχρήτο· βᾶκτρον τε ἀνέλαβε καὶ πήραν. πρῶτον [πρῶτον Z (*Frob.*): πρῶτος BPF] δὲ καὶ Νεάνθης φησὶν ἀπλῶσαι [ἀπλῶσαι BPF: διπλῶσαι Salmasius 1622,

* I would like to thank Professor Stefan Schorn for reading and discussing with me the content of this article.

¹ See D.L. 6,2 (SSR V A 12); 6,6 (SSR V A 23); 6,15 (SSR V A 22); 6,19 (SSR V A 38). See also 1,15 (SSR I H 6); 2,47 (SSR V A 23); 6,104f. (SSR V A 135).

367f.] θοιμάτιον, Σωσικράτης δ' ἐν τρίτῃ Διαδοχῶν Διόδωρον τὸν Ἀσπένδιον καὶ πώγωνα καθεῖναι καὶ βάκτρῳ καὶ πήρᾳ χρῆσθαι.

The Loeb translation by Hicks, which reflects the conventional interpretation of this passage, runs as follows:²

He [*sc.* Antisthenes] used to converse in the gymnasium of Cynosarges (White hound) at no great distance from the gates, and some think that the Cynic school derived its name from Cynosarges. Antisthenes himself too was nicknamed a hound pure and simple. And he was the first, Diocles tells us, to double his cloak and be content with that one garment and to take up a staff and a wallet. Neanthes too asserts that he was the first [πρῶτον] to double [διπλῶσαι] his mantle. Sosicrates, however, in the third book of his *Successions of Philosophers* says this was first done by Diodorus of Aspendus, who also let his beard grow and used a staff and a wallet.

The ‘invention’ of Cynicism is mainly represented in this passage by the symbolic actions of wearing a ‘double’ mantle and taking up a staff and a wallet. This outfit was ascribed to Antisthenes by Diokles and – according to the conventional view – by Neanthes; Sosikrates, on the other hand, attributed it to the Pythagorean Diodoros of Aspendos, while others – according to other traditions – attributed it to Diogenes of Sinope (see below).

Even nowadays the ‘invention’ of Cynicism and the related problem of the relationship between Antisthenes and Diogenes are highly debated issues. Two opposite views have been held by scholars. Some accept the tradition – considerably widespread in the ancient sources – which makes Diogenes a pupil of Antisthenes;³ according to others, on the contrary, this tradition has to be considered nothing more than a fabrication invented by some authors of ‘Successions’, and those Stoics who were interested in connecting themselves with Sokrates via Antisthenes.⁴

What I would like to do here is to discuss some philological and historiographical problems related to the above passage and to put forward

² Hicks 1925, 13-15.

³ See in particular Höistad 1948, 10-12; Döring 1995; Fuentes González 2013.

⁴ See in particular Dudley 1937, ix-xii. 1-15; Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 223-233; id. 1993, 15-34.

some new insights which could be relevant for the history of Cynicism and the assessment of Antisthenes' role in its 'invention'.

2. Ἀπλῶσαι θοιμάτιον: *unfolding the mantle*

The sentence which I would like to start with is the short fragment of Neanthes (FGrHist 84 F 24). The punctuation accepted by Huebner, Hicks, Long, Gigante, Decleva Caizzi, Giannattasio Andria, Giannantoni, Apelt, and more recently defended with convincing arguments by Schorn, makes Neanthes the source of the first part of the sentence, which runs: πρῶτον δὲ καὶ Νεάνθης φησὶν ἀπλῶσαι θοιμάτιον. The rest has thus to be considered a fragment of Sosikrates (fr. 15 Giannattasio Andria): Σωσικράτης δ' ἐν τρίτῃ Διαδοχῶν Διόδωρον τὸν Ἀσπένδιον καὶ πώγωνα καθεῖναι καὶ βάκτρῳ καὶ πήρᾳ χρῆσθαι.⁵

⁵ See Huebner 1828-1833; Hicks 1925; Long 1964; Gigante 2010; Decleva Caizzi 1966, fr. 136 A; Giannattasio Andria 1989, fr. 15; Giannantoni in SSR V A 22; Apelt/Zekl/Reich 2008. Following the punctuation accepted by Cobet 1878, 90 – but in Cobet 1862 we find the other way of punctuation – Wilamowitz 1880, 155; Jacoby in FGrHist 84 F 24; Goulet-Cazé 1999; Marcovich 1999; Reale/Girgenti/Ramelli 2006; Dorandi 2013 and Prince 2015 printed the following text: πρῶτον δὲ καὶ Νεάνθης φησὶν ἀπλῶσαι [or διπλῶσαι] θοιμάτιον (Σωσικράτης δ' ἐν τρίτῃ Διαδοχῶν Διόδωρον τὸν Ἀσπένδιον) καὶ πώγωνα καθεῖναι καὶ βάκτρῳ καὶ πήρᾳ χρῆσθαι ('And then Neanthes says that he was the first to unfold [or to double] the mantle (but Sosikrates in the third book of the *Successions* says it was Diodoros of Aspendos) and to let his beard grow and to use a stick and a pouch'). Both readings seem possible from a linguistic point of view. However, as pointed out by Schorn 2004, 166 n. 78; id. 2007, 140 n. 143, the first way of punctuation seems the correct one because of two main reasons. The first one is given by the comparison with Ath. 4,163f p. 369 Kaibel where, among other stories about Diodoros of Aspendos, we read: Σωσικράτης δ' ἐν τρίτῳ φιλοσόφων διαδοχῆς βαθεῖ πώγωνι χρῆσασθαι τὸν Διόδωρον ἰστορεῖ καὶ τρίβωνα ἀναλαβεῖν κόμην τε φορῆσαι ('Sosikrates in the third book of the *Succession of Philosophers* says that Diodoros had a thick beard, put on a threadbare cloak and wore long hair'). It seems clear that the two quotations from Sosikrates come from the same passage of the third book of his *Succession* and that the two passages of Diogenes Laertios and Athenaios represent different quotations from this common source, since a) the wording πώγωνι χρῆσασθαι in Ath. 4,163f p. 369 Kaibel corresponds to the πώγωνα ... χρῆσθαι of our passage; b) Diogenes Laertios seems to put first the most relevant piece of information to him, i.e. the fact that Diodoros used the τρίβωνα. He keeps only those elements which are relevant for the problem of the 'invention' of Cynicism: the beard, the βάκτρον and the πήρα, leaving out the el-

A correct interpretation of this short fragment mainly depends on which solution of two textual problems is chosen.

The first one arises at the very beginning of the fragment, where the most ancient manuscripts (BPF: 11th-13th cent.) present the reading *πρῶτος*, while the *recentior* Z (end of the 15th cent.) and the *editio Frobeniana* (Basel 1533) have *πρῶτον*. Although the latter form is likely to be an emendation *ope ingenii*, all the editors of Diogenes Laertios have rightly regarded it as correct. Indeed, although *πρῶτος* could make sense from a grammatical point of view, and although Neanthes is indeed the first author attesting the use of the Cynic mantle by Antisthenes, the nominative does not fit the context from a logical point of view, since the discussion focuses here on the ‘first inventor’ of Cynicism, not on the ‘first author’ who wrote about him. Thus the reading *πρῶτον* seems to be more convincing: the textual corruption *πρῶτον* > *πρῶτος* might in fact be well explained by the presence of another *πρῶτος* at the beginning of the previous sentence (*καὶ πρῶτος ἐδίπλωσε ...*).

The second textual problem is more difficult to solve. Among the modern editors of Diogenes Laertios, only Huebner and Dorandi⁶ have accepted the *textus traditus* *ἀπλῶσαι* as the correct form of the infinitive, while all the others accepted the conjecture *διπλῶσαι*, which was first proposed by Salmasius in 1622 and soon gained general acceptance.⁷

ement of the long hair, which was certainly less relevant in that context; *ι*) Athenaios, on the other hand, keeps only those elements which were more relevant for his context (those focusing on the physical appearance of this philosopher), leaving out the external objects Diodoros of Aspendos used to have with him, because they were not interesting in that context. The second reason is one of historical content. The three elements we find attributed to Antisthenes in our passage are those which were traditionally attributed to Diogenes, i.e. the *τρίβων*, the *βάκτρον* and the *πήρα*. But the *βάκτρον* and the *πήρα* were not part of the standard outfit of the historical Diogenes, while his only characteristic habit was to wear the double *τρίβων*: see Leo 1906, 442f.; Schwartz 1919, 7f.; Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 499-505; Schorn 2004, 165-167; id. 2007, 140f. If it is not strange to find these elements in an author of the second century, like Sosikrates, it would be highly improbable to find them in Neanthes, as he is likely to have visited Athens towards the end of the fourth century, when Diogenes could have been still alive (for Neanthes’ chronology, see below).

⁶ See also Prince 2015.

⁷ See e.g. Ferrarius 1685, vol. 2, 197 and Menagius in Huebner 1828-1833, vol. 4, 8f. It is worth noticing that in Eudoc. Violar. 96,56,19 the manuscript tradition

The expression ἀπλῶσαι or διπλῶσαι θοῖμάτιον has to be interpreted in the light of the Greek clothing practice.⁸ While in fourth-century Athens the normal practice was to wear a mantle on top of a *chiton*, which was the undergarment, it was considered as typical of the Cynics that they did not wear the *chiton* and – for this reason – ‘doubled’ the mantle (ἰμάτιον or τρίβων, the ‘threadbare cloak’). Even though the opposition between ‘double’ and ‘simple’ mantles is older than Cynicism,⁹ the ‘double mantle’ became the most typical trait of the Cynic outfit. Accordingly, as said above, ‘being the first to double the mantle’ meant ‘being the founder of Cynicism’. Diokles too, as testified by the passage quoted at the beginning, regarded Antisthenes as the inventor of this practice.¹⁰ However, according to a more widespread tradition which probably goes back to the time of Diogenes himself (see below), it was Diogenes.¹¹ The latter supposedly doubled his cloak to sleep inside it,¹² or against the cold (*propter frigus*).¹³

If from a Cynic perspective διπλῶσαι (‘to double’) was thus a meaningful verb, one could well expect its presence in the Neanthes’ fragment in the context of a discussion about the ‘invention’ of Cynicism. But what is more, διπλῶσαι could also fit the context very well from a logical point of view: it would imply that Neanthes held the same position as Diokles (πρῶτον δὲ καὶ Νεάνθης φησὶν ...). Furthermore, the *textus traditus* ἀπλῶσαι (‘to open’), a verb which is not attested elsewhere in connection

reports both the forms ἐδίπλωσε (F) and ἤπλωσε (PV): see the *apparatus* in Flach 1880.

⁸ I rely on the results of Schwartz 1919, 7f.; Heuzey 1922, 85-106; Bieber 1928, 22-24; Geddes 1987, 307-331; Losfeld 1991, 136-158; Hirschmann 2000, 201; id. 2002, 794f.; Hartmann 2011, 159-176, who mainly focuses on the social meaning of the mantle; Conti 2015, 166-172.

⁹ A ‘simple’ *chlaina* is mentioned e.g. in Hom. Il. 24,230; a ‘doubled’ *chlaina* in Hom. Il. 10,133. Cf. also Ar. Nu. 267; Lycurg. Leocr. 40; Plu. Amat. 754f.

¹⁰ I am currently preparing the first edition of the fragments of Diokles of Magnesia for the series *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Continued Part IV*.

¹¹ See Satyr. fr. 2 Schorn (= Hier. adv. Jovin. 2,14 = SSR V B 175; D.L. 6,22f. = SSR V B 174), with commentary; see also Cerc. fr. 60 Lomiento = D.L. 6,76; Ps.-Diog. Ep. 7,1 (SSR V B 537); 15 (SSR V B 545); 30,3 (SSR V B 560); Hor. epist. 1,17,25; D.L. 6,6; 6,22 (SSR V B 174). In Phld. Stoici col. 18 Dorandi the doubled garment is presented as typical of the Cynic-Stoic tradition. For a full list of passages in which the τρίβων of Diogenes is mentioned, see Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 499.

¹² D.L. 6,22 (SSR V B 174).

¹³ Satyr. fr. 2 Schorn (= Hier. adv. Jovin. 2,14 = SSR V B 175).

with Cynicism and which has a meaning opposite to that of διπλῶσαι (see below), hardly seems to fit our context, at least at first sight. It is thus not surprising that Salmasius' conjecture was generally accepted.

It is however worth inquiring whether ἀπλῶσαι could possibly represent a *lectio difficilior*, given that διπλῶσαι is not even a *lectio*, but a simple conjecture. Let us first examine the references listed by Dorandi in his *apparatus* to defend his choice of ἀπλῶσαι. Firstly, he recalls a passage from Jerome, where we read: [*Antisthenes*] *nihil sibi amplius quam palliolum reservavit*.¹⁴ But even though this passage is certainly important for our knowledge of Antisthenes' clothing practice, it simply implies that he used to wear only a *pallium* (i.e. a mantle: τρίβων / ἱμάτιον) without a *chiton*: accordingly, one could not exclude that Antisthenes wore his cloak doubled.¹⁵ After this reference, Dorandi mentions two contributions by Leo, in which the latter accepts the *textus traditus*, but without discussing the reasons of this choice.¹⁶ If we want to try to keep the form ἀπλῶσαι, we should look for other arguments.

The basic meaning of ἀπλῶσαι is 'to make single', 'to open', 'to unfold'. The objects we usually find after this verb are things that can be 'opened' (also in a metaphorical sense), such as ἰστία, σαγήνη, φάλαγξ, σῶμα,¹⁷ but the verb is not usually used in connection with clothes. There are only a few late occurrences in which it means 'to unfold' a mantle or a blanket in order to cover a surface or an object.¹⁸ There

¹⁴ Hier. adv. Iovin. 2,14 (SSR V A 12).

¹⁵ The context of this passage, focusing on Antisthenes' renunciation to his riches, makes it clear that it is not possible to translate our sentence 'Antisthenes did not keep for himself anything bigger than a little mantle': *statimque venditis quae habebat, et publice distributis, nihil sibi amplius quam palliolum reservavit paupertatisque eius et laboris et Xenophon testis est in Symposio, et innumerabiles libri eius: quorum alios philosophico, alios rhetorico genere conscriptis*. Cf. Goulet-Cazé 1992, 3961: 'Il est dit chez Jérôme qu'Antisthène vendit tout ce qu'il avait et qu'il ne conserva rien de plus qu'un *palliolum*, c'est-à-dire un *tribôn*'.

¹⁶ Leo 1901, 121 n. 1; id. 1906, 443.

¹⁷ See Pape-Sengebusch; LSJ; DGE; Montanari *s.v.*

¹⁸ See Sor. Gynaeciorum libri IV CMG 4 p. 76 Ilberg (ἐπὶ τῶν μηρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων ἀπλώσασαν ὠμόλινον <ἦ> ῥάκος); Historia Alexandri Magni, Rec. F (cod. Flor. Laurentianus Ashburn 1444) 125,3 (πεύκια μεγάλα ἀπλώσαν ἐπὶ τὸν κάμπον καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐστάθησαν); Eriph. haer. GCS vol. 3 p. 476 Holl (ἀπλώσασαι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὀθόνην); Acta Thomae 49 (παρέθησαν δὲ συμψέλλιον ὃ εὖρον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἀπλώσας σινδόνα ἐπ' αὐτὸ ἐπέθηκεν ἄρτον τῆς εὐλογίας); Evangelium Nicode-

are also a few passages in which someone ‘opens the mantle’ in order to clean or dry it: in these cases, however, we have to assume that the mantle was not actually being worn while being so opened.¹⁹ In any case, ἀπλῶσαι θοιμάτιον cannot mean ‘to wear a simple mantle’, as held by Huebner, or to ‘simplify someone’s clothing, reducing it to the mantle’, as recently proposed by Fuentes Gonzáles, since these meanings are not known to be attested in the sources.²⁰

mi, Recensiones M 1 et M 2, 1,2 (Ἀπῆλθε τοίνυν ὁ ὑπηρετής καὶ εὐρών τὸν Ἰησοῦν προσεκαλεῖτο τοῦτον, ἀπλώσας ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τὸ τοῦ Πιλάτου μανδύλιον καὶ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ πατεῖν αὐτὸν προτρεπόμενος); Anonymi Historia Imperatorum, Historia imperatorum liber II (Anastasio-Irene) 1510 (Ὁ δὲ Μαυρίκιος δακρύσας καὶ ἀπλώσας τὴν ποδιὰν τῆς χλαμίδος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκοπτον τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν παιδίων αὐτοῦ); Choerob. in Theod. p. 392 Hilgard (κατὰ λίτα πετάσας, οἶονεὶ καταπετάσας καὶ ἀπλώσας λιτὸν ἱμάτιον); EM p. 568 Gaisford (Κατὰ λίτα πετάσας. Ἰλιάδος θ’, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἱμάτιον λινοῦν ἢ λιτὸν καταπετάσας, τουτέστιν ἀπλώσας); Schol. in Il. 8,441 [*scholia vetera* = *D scholia*] (Κατὰ λίτα πετάσας. Καταπετάσας λινοῦν ἱμάτιον. ἀπλώσας); Historia Alexandri Magni, Recensio E (cod. Eton College 163) 125,3 (ἤπλωσαν μεγάλα πεύκια εἰς τὸν κάμπον); Chrys. scand. 7,11 (σινδόνης καθαρᾶς καὶ διαυγοῦς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἠπλωμένου); Chrys. a. exil. MPG vol. 52 p. 431 (τάπητας οὐχ ἠπλώσα); Rom. Mel. 27,3 (Ἦπλωσαν οὖν χιτῶνας οἱ ὄχλοι); Ps.-Jo. D. ep. Thphl. MPG vol. 95 p. 380 (Ἐὰν εὐρω, φησὶν, ἱερέα ἢ μοναχὸν ἔν τι παραπτώματι, ἐγὼ αὐτὸς τὴν χλαμύδα μου ἠπλώσα ἂν καὶ ἐσκέπαζον αὐτόν).

¹⁹ Cyr. S. v. Sab. p. 89 Schwartz (ὁ ἀρτοκόπος τοῦ μοναστηρίου ἐν ὥραι χειμῶνος ἀπλώσας τὰ ἑαυτοῦ βραχέντα ἱμάτια ἔνδον ἐν τῇ θέρμῃ τοῦ φούρνου); p. 131 (τοῦτο ἀπλώσας ἐξήρανε); Cosm. Ind. top. 1,25 (Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πλύνων τις ἱμάτιον καὶ ἀπλώσας ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἐπειδὴν ξηρανθῆ ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου); Hsch. 351 (ἠλιάσαι· ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἀπλῶσαι, ἢ θερμαίνεσθαι ἐν ἡλίῳ); Vitae S. Danielis Styli-tae, Vita antiquior 76 (ἐπέτρεψε αὐτῷ ἀπλῶσαι τὴν χλαμύδα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκτιναξάμενος τὸν ὑπολειφθέντα κονιορτὸν εἰς τὴν χλαμύδα αὐτοῦ); cf. also Vitae et Miracula Sancti Anastasii Persae, *De translatione corporis mortui sancti Anastasii Persae* 4 (ἀνοίξας τῇ μαχαίρῃ αὐτοῦ τὸ γλωσσόκομον, ἀπλώσας αὐτοῦ τὸ παλλίον, μετέβαλεν εἰς αὐτὸ τὰ λείψανα).

²⁰ See Huebner 1828-1833, vol. 2, 9: ‘Primus autem, ut Neanthes tradit, simplicis quoque pallii usum habuit’; Fuentes Gonzáles 2013, 245 n. 83: ‘En cualquier caso, el término implicaría igualmente que Antístenes habría simplificado su vestimenta, reduciéndola al manto. No se excluye aquí, por tanto, la práctica del doblado, como medio para rentabilizar la versatilidad y eficacia de la prenda de vestir.’ Cf. also Prince 2015, 77: ‘Neanthes also says he was the first to use his outer garment only’.

But ἀπλῶσαι can also mean ‘to unfold’ something which was previously ‘folded’.²¹ It seems to me that this meaning could fit our context very well. Indeed, if we recall that *a*) our passage focuses on the ‘invention’ of Cynicism; *b*) such an invention was represented by the action of διπλῶσαι θοῖμάτιον, which means, ‘to double – [so, ‘to fold’] – the mantle’; *c*) ἀπλῶσαι could mean the action opposite to διπλῶσαι, then ἀπλῶσαι θοῖμάτιον could intentionally have been used in opposition to the contrary action of διπλῶσαι θοῖμάτιον (or τὸν τρίβωνα).

But what kind of contrast could have been meant by Neanthes? And what was his intention in making it? If Diogenes ‘doubled’ his mantle in order to sleep inside it, or to protect himself from the cold, Antisthenes, choosing to ἀπλῶσαι θοῖμάτιον without wearing a *chiton* as undergarment, would have been ‘superior’ to Diogenes in his endurance.

What do the ancient sources actually tell us about Antisthenes’ clothing? In X. Smp. 4,37f. we find Antisthenes himself speaking of his own clothes: he wears clothes – he says – only in order to avoid the cold. He does not say what he wears, but he compares the walls of his simple house to ‘exceedingly warm tunics’ (ἀλλεινοὶ χιτῶνες) and the roof to ‘exceptionally thick mantles’ (παχεῖαι ἐφεστρίδες).²² Does this mean that Antisthenes used to wear neither a *chiton* nor a mantle in his house? Without going too far with our deductions, we can at least infer that Antisthenes showed some interest in the matter of clothing and used to wear only what was strictly necessary to avoid the cold.²³ But in Hier. adv. Iovin. 2,14 (SSR V A 12), as seen above, we heard that Antisthenes used to wear only a *pallium* (i.e. a mantle) without a *chiton*, and the same habit is also testified by D.L. 6,6 (SSR V B 23). Furthermore, according to a rather widespread anecdote, Sokrates is said to have reproached him, when he once turned the torn part of the cloak in order to let it come into view, with the following remark: ‘I

²¹ Paul. Aeg. CMG 9.2 p. 104 Heiberg (καὶ πτύγμα τριπλοῦν ἢ τετραπλοῦν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀπλώσαντες); Ach. Tat. 5,3,5; cf. also Epiph. *Liturgia praesanctificationum* 3 (μετὰ τὸ ἀπλῶσαι τὸ εἰλητόν).

²² Cf. the commentary by Huss 1999, 277-279.

²³ Huss 1999, 277f. rightly refutes the view of Woldinga 1938-1939, 327f., who thinks that the historical Antisthenes used to have the same outfit as the Cynics: this is not what we read in Xenophon. This view has also recently been proposed by Fuentes Gonzáles 2013, 239-246.

can see your love of fame through your cloak (τρίβων)²⁴. Unfortunately, this anecdote does not tell us whether the mantle was ‘single’ or ‘double’; however, it surely implies that Antisthenes was not wearing a *chiton* under the τρίβων. Finally, Antisthenes wrote in his own works that Odysseus, his hero, had the same dignity dressed in rags or in his purple mantle.²⁵

To sum up, we can conclude *a*) that the historical Antisthenes was surely interested in the matter of clothing (as testified by his fragments and by the contemporary works of Xenophon) and *b*) that the story that he used to wear only a mantle without the *chiton* is well attested in our sources. On the other hand, no sources imply that Antisthenes did use a *chiton* as undergarment.

Thus, if we assume that the action of ἀπλῶσαι could be considered ‘superior’ to that of διπλῶσαι, we should look for the existence of other traditions which make Antisthenes ‘superior’ to Diogenes or at least his ‘teacher of poverty’. In fact, hints pointing to such traditions do exist. Indeed, Plutarch has Diogenes say that Antisthenes was the man who ‘clothed me in rags and compelled me to be beggar and outcast from my home’.²⁶ Even more interesting is D.L. 6,6 (SSR V B 23), where we read: ‘When Diogenes asked him for a *chiton*, he (*sc.* Antisthenes) ordered him to fold his mantle’ (Διογένει χιτῶνα αἰτοῦντι πτύξαι προσέταξε θοῖμάτιον). This anecdote testifies to a tradition in which: *a*) Antisthenes is Diogenes’ teacher of poverty; *b*) he advises Diogenes to ‘fold’, i.e. to ‘double’,²⁷ his mantle because – we can imagine – he is not able to bear the cold. It seems thus possible to infer that Antisthenes, on the other hand, wears only a ‘simple’ (i.e. ‘unfolded’) mantle without a *chiton*.

As we find such traditions attested in our sources, there are no reasons to refute the *textus traditus* in our fragment. Accordingly, we should think that according to Neanthes Antisthenes was the first to wear an ‘unfolded’,

²⁴ D.L. 2,36. 6,8; Ael. VH 9,35. The τρίβων is presented as typical of Antisthenes also in Luc. Fug. 20.

²⁵ Epict. fr. 11 Schenkl = Stob. 4,33,28 p. 807f. Hense: this is probably a fragment from the *Archelaos*: see Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 353f. and Brancacci 2002, 73f., with bibliographical references. The image of Odysseus dressed with rags is found also in the *Aiaks* (SSR V A 53,6).

²⁶ Plu. QConv. 632e (= TrGF I 88 5): ὡς Διογένης περὶ Ἀντισθένης ἔλεγε ‘ὅς με ῥάκη τ’ ἤμπισχε κάξηνάγκασεν / πτωχὸν γενέσθαι κακὸν δόμων ἀνάστατον’.

²⁷ It is clear that πτύξαι stands here for διπλῶσαι.

i.e. a ‘not-doubled’ mantle. Such a claim must have been invented only *a posteriori*, after the circulation of the tradition according to which Diogenes was the first to ‘double’ his mantle. Antisthenes was instead to be considered the first Cynic and even superior in his ‘endurance’ to Diogenes himself.²⁸ A debate on the origin of Cynicism must thus have started very early, probably already in the fourth century, if the biographer Neanthes, as it has been convincingly held,²⁹ was already active in Athens in the last decades of that century.

However, two further problems concerning the relation between the fragment of Neanthes and those of Diokles and Sosikrates need to be solved.

Firstly, if we keep the form ἀπλωσαι, the wording πρῶτον δὲ καὶ Νεάνθης φησὶν cannot be translated in the conventional way: ‘Neanthes too asserts that he was the first ...’ In fact, the latter biographer must have said something different from Diokles, who attributed the action of διπλωσαι θοιμάτιον to Antisthenes. It seems to me that the wording ‘δὲ καί’ might here introduce a ‘variation on the theme’, a use of καί which we also find in Diogenes Laertios just a few lines above our fragment,³⁰ and which is not far from the one listed by Denniston in 7 (ii):³¹

²⁸ This is the only fragment of Neanthes on the Cynics, but we know that he used Cynic authorities as a source for his biography of Plato: see Schorn 2007, 115. 119f.

²⁹ See Burkert 2000, 79; Schorn 2004, 160 n. 61. 166 n. 78; id. 2007, 115f.; id. 2014, 307; Fuentes González 2005, 587f., with *status quaestionis* and bibliographical references.

³⁰ In D.L. 6,12 the Antisthenian doxography reported by Diokles is introduced by the wording: ἀναγράφει δ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ Διοκλῆς ταυτί. This quotation follows another doxographical section (6,11) from an unnamed source. The position of the καί was considered wrong by Roeper 1846, 658, who proposed to place it after Διοκλῆς and to read: ‘Diokles reports also the following sayings of his’. According to this interpretation, Diogenes used Diokles as a source also for the doxography found in 6,11. Moreover, according to Von der Muehll (see Dorandi 2013: 413 app. ad loc.), ‘verba ἀναγράφει κτλ. antiquam continuationem interrumpere videntur’. However, it seems better to keep the *textus traditus*, since some of the sentences taken from Diokles (6,12) are variations of other similar statements found in 6,11 (αὐτάρκη τ’ εἶναι τὸν σοφόν· πάντα γὰρ αὐτοῦ εἶναι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ~ τῷ γὰρ σοφῷ ξένον οὐδὲν οὐδ’ ἄ<το>πο<ν>; καὶ ἐρασθήσεσθαι δέ· μόνον γὰρ εἰδέναι τὸν σοφὸν τίνων χρῆ ἐρᾶν ~ ἀξιέραστος ὁ ἀγαθός); furthermore, in 6,12 there are many military metaphors which are not found in 6,11. Therefore, it seems not possible to think that

(7) In co-ordinated clauses *καί* is sometimes used in conjunction with other particles: with *τε*, to strengthen the idea of addition, ‘and also’: with *δέ* and *ἤ*, to supplement the adversative or disjunctive sense with the idea of addition. ... (ii) *δέ καί* (*καί* often approximating in sense to *αὐ*).

I would thus translate this wording as follows: ‘Neanthes in his turn says that he was the first ...’.

Secondly, we learn from our passage that the action of *ἀπλῶσαι* the mantle was also attributed to Diodoros of Aspendos, namely by Sosikrates. But in Ath. 4,163f p. 369 Kaibel (fr. 16 Giannattasio Andria) – a *locus parallelus* which must derive from the same passage of Sosikrates – we read: *Σωσικράτης δ’ ἐν τρίτῳ φιλοσόφων διαδοχῆς βαθεῖ πάγωνι χρήσασθαι τὸν Διόδωρον ἱστορεῖ καὶ τρίβωνα ἀναλαβεῖν κόμην τε φορῆσαι* (‘Sosikrates in the third book of the *Succession of Philosophers* says that Diodoros had a thick beard, put on a threadbare cloak and wore long hair’). The action which is here attributed to Diodoros of Aspendos is *τρίβωνα ἀναλαβεῖν*, which is something different from that of *ἀπλῶσαι* (and also from that of *διπλῶσαι*) *θοῖμάτιον*, since it simply wants to stress that this philosopher ‘put on a threadbare cloak’. It seems hardly possible to say whether the verb originally used by Sosikrates in relation to Diodoros of Aspendos’ mantle was the *ἀπλῶσαι* we find in Neanthes (in Diogenes Laertios) or the *ἀναλαβεῖν* we find in Athenaios. Both solutions are possible. If Sosikrates used the verb *ἀναλαβεῖν*, this would mean that his text was slightly ‘adapted’ or misinterpreted by Diogenes Laertios or one of his sources. On the other hand, if he used the verb *ἀπλῶσαι*, Sosikrates probably took the term from Neanthes and attributed it to Diodoros of Aspendos. In this case, it would also be possible that the quotation of Neanthes came to Diogenes Laertios via Sosikrates, who could have quoted his predecessor with a polemical aim. This would not be the only case in which Sosikrates refers to a previous authority.³²

the doxography in 6,11 also comes from Diokles. In conclusion, the *καί* means here nor ‘and’ (it is not a simple addition), neither ‘also’ (it is not the same content): it rather introduces a sort of ‘variation on the theme’.

³¹ Denniston 1966, 305.

³² See D.L. 1,106 = fr. 8 Giannattasio Andria.

3. Ἀπλοκῦων: *the Dog with the unfolded mantle*

The above analysis can also help us to correctly understand the meaning of the word Ἀπλοκῦων, which is said in our passage to have been Antisthenes' nickname. Apart from Ps.-Hsch. *vir. ill.* 7, p. 97 Marcovich – which is in turn derived from Diogenes Laertios – and Plu. *Brut.* 34,4, where it is probably used as a reference to Antisthenes (see the *Appendix* below), this nickname is not attested elsewhere.

It is usually translated with expressions like 'Simple Dog', 'Absolute Dog', 'True Dog', referring to the 'simple' and 'genuine' character of Antisthenes.³³ But these translations do not appear very convincing to me.

³³ See Aldobrandinus in Huebner 1828-1833, vol. 4, 8: 'simplex canis'; Huebner 1828-1833, vol. 2, 9: 'Purus putus canis'; Cobet 1862, 136: 'Purus putus canis'; Pape-Sengebusch *s.v.*: 'der schlichte, grobe Cyniker'; Hicks 1925, vol. 2, 15: 'a hound pure and simple'; Brown 1949, 26: 'Plain Dog'; Schulz-Falkenthal 1977, 47 n. 10: 'Die Bedeutung des Wortes Haplokyon ist problematisch; es wird daher verschieden übersetzt: 'einfacher', 'schlichter', 'grober Hund', wobei auf die einfache Lebensart und schlichte, grobe Kleidung (abgeschabter, derber Mantel) des Antisthenes Bezug genommen wird, die auch die unteren Bevölkerungsschichten trugen (Tribon). Von einem, der so lebte und herumliefe, sagte man wohl auch: Das ist ein 'armer Hund'. Denkbar wäre noch 'leibhaftiger' (lat. *purus putus*), 'echter' oder 'schlechthin Hund'. VI 19 heißt es von Antisthenes: 'Eine Hundennatur, Antisthenes, warst du im Leben; mit deinem bissigen Wort trafst du die Menschen ins Herz'. Daß aus einem Schimpfwort ein Ehrenname werden kann, sehen wir auch später z.B. bei den Geusen (Bettlern) und den Tories (Straßenräubern)'; Rankin 1986, 183: 'Absolute dog'; *DGE s.v.*: 'simple perro'; Paquet 1988, 31: 'Vrai Chien'; Navia 1998, 52; id. 2001, 27: 'Absolute dog'; Goulet-Cazé 1999, 691 n. 6: 'J. J. Reiske ... proposa (p. 313) de remplacer Ἀπλοκῦων par Αὐτοκῦων. Certes le sens exact du terme Ἀπλοκῦων n'est pas très clair: 'chien franc', allusion à la franchise cynique?, 'chien au manteau simple', comme le propose, à la suite de Stephanus, LSJ?, 'chien naturel', c'est-à-dire dont les mœurs ne concèdent rien aux conventions sociales? Cependant nous ne voyons pas de raison pour remplacer la leçon des manuscrits par un autre terme dont le sens n'est pas plus clair. Nous comprenons, en nous fondant sur le premier sens d'ἀπλοῦς, que ce surnom signifie: 'qui a la simplicité d'un chien'. C'est ce que nous essayons de rendre par 'Vrai Chien'; cf. also Goulet-Cazé 1994, 247; Reale/Girgenti/Ramelli 2006, 619: 'Verocane'; Apelt/Zekl/Reich 2008, 284: 'schlechtweg Hund'; Desmond 2008, 17: 'The pure dog'; Gigante 2010, 207: 'il puro Cane o il Cinico schietto'; Prince 2015, 77: 'Simple Dog'. More interesting is the interpretation recently put forward by Fuentes Gonzáles 2013, 240, according to whom the correct translation of Ἀπλοκῦων is 'Perro vulgar'. This interpretation is built upon the comparison with X. *Cyn.* 4,7, where, speaking about hunting dogs, Xenophon says: τὰ δὲ χρώματα

It has never been noticed so far that it would be strange to find the adjective ἄπλοῦς used in relation to Antisthenes with this kind of meaning, since in Porph. ad Od. 1,1 = SSR V A 187 the ‘negative’ Achilles and Ajax are said to have been ἄπλοῦς,³⁴ in opposition to Odysseus, who was πολύτροπος. Even if in its original dialogical frame this passage probably reflected the position of Antisthenes’ opponent (Hippias?),³⁵ nevertheless the opposition itself between ἄπλοῦς and πολύτροπος was probably accepted by Antisthenes, whose aim was to give a new, positive meaning to the latter adjective.

Others have proposed to emend the text and to read ἀπλῶς Κύων³⁶ or Αὐτοκύων.³⁷ However, the first solution (‘simpliciter et absolute Canis vocabatur’) implies an unjustified change of the *textus traditus*, while, as regards the second one – the conjecture Αὐτοκύων – ‘nous ne voyons pas de raison pour remplacer la leçon des manuscrits par un autre terme dont le sens n’est pas plus clair’.³⁸

It seems to me that our analysis of the fragment of Neanthes might allow another interpretation of the nickname Ἀπλοκύων. I would like to argue that it is likely that between this nickname and the act of ἀπλῶσαι

οὐ χρὴ εἶναι τῶν κυνῶν οὔτε πυρρὰ οὔτε μέλανα οὔτε λευκὰ παντελῶς· ἔστι γὰρ οὐ γενναῖον τοῦτο, ἀλλ’ ἀπλοῦν καὶ θηριῶδες (‘The colour of the coat should not be uniformly brown, or black, or white; for this is not good breeding, but ordinary and like wild animals’ (trans. Phillips/Willcock 1999, 45, but note that this interpretation does not take into account the conjecture by Radermacher ἀλλ<ἄ τὸ>). According to Fuentes Gonzáles, this passage reveals that the adjective ἄπλοῦς, referred to a dog, could carry the meaning of ‘vulgar’. This adjective was probably attributed to Antisthenes because of his ‘apariencia descuidada’ and his connection with Kynosarges. This adjective later gained a positive connotation, related to the idea of ‘simplicidad’, which also characterized Antisthenes’ clothes, as testified by Neanthes (see below). This interpretation is undoubtedly interesting and worthy of consideration, but to my mind it cannot be the right one, since it does not properly explain the connection between the nickname Ἀπλοκύων and the action of ἀπλῶσαι θοιμάτιον attributed to Antisthenes by Neanthes: see below. For the same reason, the attempt by Porter 1996, 186 to connect this nickname with Antisthenes’ theory of language is not convincing.

³⁴ For Antisthenes’ ‘negative’ view on Achilles and Ajax, see Schorn (forthcoming).

³⁵ See Schorn (forthcoming), and the opposite views held by Luzzatto 1996, 275-357 and Brancacci 1996, 359-406.

³⁶ See the references listed by Menagius in Huebner 1828-1833, vol. 4, 8.

³⁷ Reiske in Diels 1889, 313.

³⁸ Goulet-Cazé 1999, 691 n. 6.

θοϊμάτιον there exists a relation, which means that the former should be interpreted in the light of the meaning of the latter.

As has been convincingly argued by Von Fritz and others,³⁹ Ἀπλοκύων, being a compound formed by ἀπλοῦς ('simple') and κύων ('dog'), must have been invented after the nickname Κύων. Given that Κύων was the well-known nickname of Diogenes of Sinope, and not of Antisthenes,⁴⁰ it follows that the nickname Ἀπλοκύων is likely to imply some kind of reference or comparison between Antisthenes and Diogenes. Such a comparison might therefore be the one implied by the action of ἀπλῶσαι θοϊμάτιον, which Neanthes attributed to Antisthenes, meaning that he was superior to Diogenes, since he used to wear an 'unfolded' mantle, while Diogenes needed a 'double' mantle.

This connection between the nickname Ἀπλοκύων and the action of ἀπλῶσαι θοϊμάτιον has mainly passed unnoticed so far, because of the fact that, as seen above, all the modern editors of Diogenes Laertios (with the only exceptions of Huebner and Dorandi) have accepted the conjecture διπλῶσαι, first put forward by Salmasius in 1622. But 50 years before it had already been noticed by H. Stephanus, who wrote in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*: Ἀπλοκύων, Cynicus simplici veste utens: cognomen Antisthenis apud Diog. Laert. p. 267, quem Neanthes scribit primum ἀπλῶσαι θοϊμάτιον.⁴¹ However, Salmasius' conjecture, having gained the scholars' approval, relegated Stephanus' original view to oblivion. Thus, in the re-edition of the *Thesaurus* by C.B. Hase, W. Dindorf, and L. Dindorf, after the original entry by Stephanus, a passage of Wytttenbach is quoted: 'Sed legendum διπλῶσαι reliqua pars loci arguit et Salmasius docuit ad Tertullianum, et ita receptum in ed. Meibom. Viri Cynici erat διπλοῦν pallium;

³⁹ See Von Fritz 1926, 49; id. 1927, 133; Sayre 1938, 67; Brown 1949, 25f.; Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 229; Brancacci 1992, 4055; Prince 2015, 78. *Contra* Fuentes González 2013, 240, without convincing arguments.

⁴⁰ If Antisthenes is called κύων in a few late sources, this is because he was recognized by the biographical tradition and that of the *Successions* as the founder of Cynicism: see Ath. 5,216b p. 478f. Kaibel; D.L. 6,19 (one of Diogenes Laertios' own epigrams). Cf. also Clem.Al. Strom. 1,14,63. The mention of a 'Dog' (Κύων) by Arist. Rh. 3,10 1411a24-25 should be interpreted as a reference to Diogenes, and not to Antisthenes, as was argued by Goulet-Cazé 1996, 414-415: see Zaccaria (forthcoming).

⁴¹ Stephanus 1572, vol. 2, 521c. He had published an edition of Diogenes Laertios in 1570.

commentitii Cynici simplex ἀπλοῦν, sed sub eo χιτῶνα gestabant. Itaque ἀπλοκῦων est delicatus et mollis Cynicus'.⁴² In the original passage Wyttenbach, however, also tries to reconstruct the background for his interpretation: while Diogenes or Krates would have been the first to 'double' the mantle, Antisthenes would have worn a 'simple' mantle, with the *chiton*. Thus, those 'delicatiores' Cynics who did not want to wear the 'double' mantle (without the *chiton*) found a forerunner of their choice in Antisthenes. Therefore, they must have invented the nickname Ἀπλοκῦων for Antisthenes in order to justify their choice.⁴³

Even though this interpretation sounds appealing, it cannot be correct. It is an attempt to save both Stephanus' interpretation and Salmasius' emendation. But the conjecture διπλῶσαι, as I argued above, has to be refuted. Furthermore, as we have seen, all the anecdotes about Antisthenes' use of the mantle presuppose that the τρίβων was worn without the *chiton*. Finally, there are no ancient passages attesting this pretended distinction between true Cynics (with the 'double' mantle) and 'delicatiores' Cynics (with the *chiton* and a 'simple' mantle).

The translation proposed by the *Thesaurus* ('Ἀπλοκῦων: Cynicus simplici veste utens') became one – although not the most widespread – of the standard translations of our nickname (see above). It was followed, e.g., by LSJ (*s.v.*): 'nickname of a Cynic who wore his coat single instead of double'.⁴⁴ However, it seems that those scholars who took into account this translation did not notice the original connection seen by Stephanus between Ἀπλοκῦων and ἀπλῶσαι, which apparently was 'lost', once Salmasius' conjecture was accepted.⁴⁵

I would thus argue that the interpretation proposed by Stephanus in 1572 is the most convincing one. The full meaning of Ἀπλοκῦων must therefore be: 'nickname of Antisthenes, who, without wearing a *chiton*, wore

⁴² Hase/Dindorf/Dindorf 1831-1856, vol. 1, 1343, who quoted Wyttenbach 1835, vol. 1, 100.

⁴³ Wyttenbach 1831-1856, vol. 1, 100. It is worth noticing that he thinks necessary to emend the passage and to read αὐτός τε ἐπεκαλεῖτο Ἀπλοκῦων καίτοι πρῶτος ...; otherwise, he argues, the sentence αὐτός τε ἐπεκαλεῖτο Ἀπλοκῦων should be considered a 'glossa'.

⁴⁴ Cf. also Montanari *s.v.*: 'dog with a single-fold cloak, of a Cynic philosopher (oth. true dog)'.
⁴⁵ Cf. Schulz-Falkenthal 1977, 47 n. 10; Goulet-Cazé 1999, 691f. n. 6.

his coat single, in contrast to Diogenes, who, without wearing a *chiton*, wore a double mantle'. As a translation, 'Dog with the unfolded mantle' sounds both correct and short enough.

Finally, even if it is not possible to say whether the nickname Ἀπλοκύων was invented by Neanthes himself, it nonetheless seems reasonable to think that it was invented at the time of Neanthes' work, i.e. in the late 4th/early 3rd century, by someone who shared similar views.

4. Conclusions

Taking into account the textual choices and the interpretations put forward above, I would propose the following translation of our passage:

He used to converse in the gymnasium of Kynosarges, not far from the gates: for this reason some think that the Cynic school also took its name from that place; and he himself was called the 'Dog with the Unfolded Mantle'. And he was the first to double the cloak, as Diokles says, to use only it, and to take up a stick and a pouch. Neanthes in his turn says that he was the first to unfold the mantle, while Sosikrates in the third book of the 'Successions' says it was Diodoros of Aspendos, who also let his beard grow and used a stick and a pouch.

To sum up, we can conclude that Neanthes held an original view on the origin of Cynicism: Antisthenes was the first to 'unfold the mantle', i.e. he wore a mantle without the *chiton*, and on top of this he even refused to double this mantle (as Diogenes did against the cold). So, he was tougher and could endure more than Diogenes. Therefore, he was considered the real founder of this philosophical movement. Relying on this alleged symbolic act, someone invented *a posteriori* the nickname Ἀπλοκύων, which was used to distinguish Antisthenes from Diogenes (who doubled his *chiton*-less mantle) and to present the former as the first true Cynic.

To my mind our passage deserves to play a much more important role in the discussion on the origin of Cynicism than the one which is usually given it. Its importance is usually underestimated because of the widespread wrong assumption that the biographer Neanthes has to be identified with the homonym historian who, having written a 'History of Attalos', must therefore have lived – if this is Attalos I (241-197) – not before

the late 3rd/early 2nd century.⁴⁶ But if our biographer was already active in Athens in the last decades of the 4th century, it follows that Antisthenes was already given a role in the invention of Cynicism while Diogenes of Sinope was still alive, or at least soon after his death.⁴⁷ For this reason, even though I regard the attribution of the Cynic outfit to Antisthenes as an *a posteriori* construction, I would argue that the antiquity of Neanthes' testimony suggests that some kind of personal relationship (more than a generic philosophical heritage) between Diogenes and Antisthenes did exist. Otherwise, it hardly would have been possible for Neanthes to present Antisthenes as even more 'Cynical' than Diogenes.

⁴⁶ See e.g. Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 232: 'È dunque solo con Neante di Cizico, tra la fine del III e l'inizio del II secolo a.C., che inizia il collegamento di Antistene al κωνισμός mediante l'attribuzione ad Antistene del 'raddoppio del mantello'; Gugliermi 2006, 170: 'Tel est Néanthe de Cyzique, des III^e-II^e siècle avant J.-C., qui fait d'Antisthène le fondateur du cynisme, puisqu'il voit en lui le premier à adopter le redoublement du manteau'.

⁴⁷ According to Plu. QConv. 717c (SSR V B 92); D.L. 6,79 (Dem.Magn. F 19 Mejer = SSR V B 92) Diogenes died on the same day as Alexander the Great, that is in 323. The same claim is repeated by *Suda* Δ 1143, *s.v.* Διογένης (SSR V B 92), which also adds that this happened during the 113th Olympiad (328-325/4): however, the latter piece of information, patently wrong, seems to stem from a misunderstanding of D.L. 6,79 (Dem.Magn. fr. 19 Mejer = SSR V B 92), where we are told that Diogenes was old (not that he died!) at that time. Whatever the credibility of these reports, Diogenes is usually thought to have lived until the second half of the 320s: see Giannantoni 1990, vol. 4, 421-423; Goulet-Cazé 1994b, 813f.; Döring 1995, 126-128.

Appendix: Favonius the Ἀπλοκύων

Besides the passage of Diogenes Laertios discussed above, the only other occurrence of the word Ἀπλοκύων is Plu. Brut. 34,4. In the following, I would argue that in this passage our nickname is also used as a reference to Antisthenes. It is worth reading the whole section:

Μάρκος δὲ Φαώνιος, ἐραστής γεγωνὸς Κάτωνος, οὐ λόγῳ μᾶλλον ἢ φορᾷ τινὶ καὶ πάθει μανικῶ φιλοσοφῶν, ἐβάδιζεν εἴσω πρὸς αὐτούς, κωλυόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκετῶν. ἀλλ' ἔργον ἦν ἐπιλαβέσθαι Φαωνίου πρὸς ὀτιοῦν ὀρούσαντος· σφοδρὸς γὰρ ἦν ἐν πᾶσι καὶ πρόχειρος. ἐπεὶ τό γε βουλευτὴν εἶναι Ῥωμαίων ἑαυτὸν οὐδενὸς ἄξιον ἠγεῖτο, τῷ δὲ κυνικῷ τῆς παρρησίας πολλάκις ἀφήρει τὴν χαλεπότητα, καὶ τὸ ἄκαιρον αὐτοῦ μετὰ παιδιᾶς δεχομένων. βία δὴ τότε τῶν παρόντων διωσάμενος τὰς θύρας εἰσῆλθε, μετὰ πλάσματος φωνῆς ἔπη περαίνων οἷς τὸν Νέστορα χρώμενον Ὅμηρος πεποίηκεν (Hom. Il. 1,259)·

ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ'· ἄμφω δὲ νεωτέρω ἐστὸν ἐμεῖο,

καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. ἐφ' οἷς ὁ μὲν Κάσσιος ἐγέλασεν, ὁ δὲ Βρούτος ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, Ἀπλόκυνα καὶ Ψευδόκυνα προσαγορεύων.

But Marcus Favonius, who had become a devotee of Cato, and was more impetuous and frenzied than reasonable in his pursuit of philosophy, tried to go in to them, and was prevented by their servants. It was no easy matter, however, to stop Favonius when he sprang to do anything, for he was always vehement and rash. The fact that he was a Roman senator was of no importance in his eyes, and by the 'cynical' boldness of his speech he often took away its offensiveness, and therefore men put up with his impertinence as a joke. And so at this time he forced his way through the bystanders and entered the room, reciting in an affected voice the verses wherein Homer represents Nestor as saying (Hom. Il. 1,259):

“But do ye harken to me, for ye both are younger than I am”,

and so forth. At this Cassius burst out laughing; but Brutus drove Favonius out of the room, calling him a mere dog [Ἀπλοκύων] and a counterfeit Cynic [Ψευδοκύων].⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Trans. Perrin 1918.

The context of this passage is the meeting between Brutus and Cassius in Sardis, which took place just a few months before their defeat at Philippi (October 42). Nobody else but them was inside their tent. As soon as the meeting started, their friends, outside the tent, ‘amazed at the harshness and intensity of their anger, feared some untoward result’, but they were forbidden to enter. Only Marcus Favonius – we are told – managed to enter the tent, but was immediately driven out by Brutus, who called him Ἀπλοκύων and Ψευδοκύων.

Scholars have seen a wordplay in Ἀπλοκύων / Ψευδοκύων and interpreted this wording as ‘true dog and false Cynic’.⁴⁹ However, it seems to me rather improbable that Brutus would have used the expression ‘true dog’ together with ‘false Cynic’ as an insult, since the Cynics used to consider the ‘dog’ as their own symbol and model of behavior.⁵⁰

Others have proposed to emend the text. According to Geiger,⁵¹ indeed, one should read Ψευδοκάτωνα instead of Ψευδόκυνα. A similar emendation had been proposed by Ziegler⁵² in Cat. Mi. 19,9, where Plutarch says that some men who were degraded in their life, but severe in their speech were mockingly called ‘Catos’ (‘Pseudo-Catos’, accordingly to Ziegler). The basis for both the emendations is a passage by Cicero, where a Cornutus is called *Pseudocato*.⁵³ However, such an emendation would be out of place in our passage: a reference to the Cynic movement seems in fact to be required by the context, since the Cynic element of Favonius’

⁴⁹ See Paukstadt 1891, 41: ‘echter Hund und lascher Cyniker’; Pape/Sengebusch *s.v.*: ‘der schlichte, grobe Cyniker ... Bei Plut. Brut. 34 dem ψευδοκύων entgeg(e)g(enge)s(e)tzt, also von ἀπλοῦς, nicht von ἀπλοῖς’; Perrin 1918, 203; Dudley 1937, 121 paraphrases: ‘You call yourself a Cynic, Favonius, but you are really a dog’; Everts 1941, 35: ‘een eenvoudig-echte (brutale) hond, maar een namaakcynicus’; Babut 1969, 169 paraphrases: ‘Brutus ... juge sévèrement la naïveté et le faux cynisme de l’énergumène’; Goulet-Cazé 2000, 417: ‘Par ces termes Brutus voulait certainement dire que Favonius était un vrai chien, mais un faux Cynique’; Desmond 2008, 46: ‘Absolute dog’.

⁵⁰ Cf. also Geiger 1974, 168f. In Tac. ann. 16,22 Favonius is called a Stoic. On the Roman views on Stoicism and Cynicism, see Griffin 1993, 241-258.

⁵¹ Geiger 1974, 168f.

⁵² Ziegler 1932, 62.

⁵³ Cic. Att. 1,14,6: *Cornuto vero Pseudocatone*. Cf. also Plu. Cat. Mi. 64,5.

behavior is mentioned just a few lines before our sentence (τῷ δὲ κυνικῷ τῆς παρρησίας ...).⁵⁴ We should therefore look for a different solution.

If Ψευδοκύων ('False Dog or Cynic') is likely to have been used by Brutus to mock Favonius' pretensions to behave like a Cynic, the use of the term Ἀπλοκύων seems more difficult to explain. However, the fact that we find this term used elsewhere only in connection with Antisthenes makes it worth asking if Plutarch's Brutus could have had this philosopher in his mind. In order to do this, it is necessary to examine the pictures Plutarch presents of the characters involved in our passage, namely Favonius and Brutus.

Favonius, a Roman politician who reached the praetorship in 49, is presented by Plutarch and by other sources as an emulator of Cato the Younger. The terms used in the sources are clear: he was *aemulus*,⁵⁵ *zelotes*,⁵⁶ and *erastes*⁵⁷ of Cato, always with him as a supporter.⁵⁸ But, we are told, he was too excessive and impulsive to be able to really emulate his friend.⁵⁹ In Plu. Cat. Mi. 46,1, in particular, we are told that his relationship with Cato was similar to that between Apollodoros Phalereus and Sokrates: he was 'impulsive, and easily moved by argument, which did not affect him moderately or mildly, but like unmixed wine, and to the point of frenzy'.⁶⁰ This presentation of Apollodoros comes from the 'Symposium'⁶¹ and the 'Phaedo'⁶² of Plato.

⁵⁴ Cf. also Plu. Pomp. 60,7. 67,5; Caes. 33,5. 41,3.

⁵⁵ Svet. Aug. 13,3.

⁵⁶ Plu. Cat. Mi. 46,1; Caes. 21,8.

⁵⁷ Plu. Brut. 12,3; 34,4.

⁵⁸ Cic. Att. 1,14; Plu. Cat. Mi. 32,11.

⁵⁹ See our passage and e.g. Plu. Pomp. 60,7: Φαώνιος δέ τις, ἀνὴρ τὰλλα μὲν οὐ πονηρός, αὐθαδεῖα δὲ καὶ ὕβρει πολλάκις τὴν Κάτωνος οἰόμενος ἀπομιμῆσθαι παρρησίαν

⁶⁰ Trans. by Perrin 1919: ἦν δὲ Μάρκος Φαώνιος ἐταῖρος αὐτοῦ καὶ ζηλωτής, οἷος ὁ Φαληρεὺς Ἀπολλόδωρος ἱστορεῖται περὶ Σωκράτην γενέσθαι τὸν παλαιόν, ἐμπαθῆς καὶ παρακεκινηκῶς πρὸς τὸν λόγον, οὐ σχέδην οὐδὲ πρᾶως, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ οἶνον ἄκρατον αὐτοῦ καθαψάμενον καὶ μανικώτερον.

⁶¹ Pl. Smp. 172a-174a.

⁶² Pl. Phd. 59a-b. 117d.

Brutus is also presented by Plutarch as a good pupil and *zelotes* of Cato,⁶³ fond of philosophy (in particular that of Plato),⁶⁴ but also as an opponent of Favonius.⁶⁵

The common teacher of Favonius and Brutus, Cato, is depicted not only as a philosopher interested in Stoicism,⁶⁶ but also as a ‘new’ Sokrates: his relationship with Favonius is thus compared to that between Sokrates and Apollodoros, and he chooses to die with the same resolution as Sokrates’. Before committing suicide, indeed, he reads the ‘Phaedo’ of Plato, i.e. the account of Sokrates’ death.⁶⁷ The comparison with Sokrates is also used by Plutarch as a *trait d’union* between Cato and Phokion (the hero of the parallel ‘Life’), who also died in a way similar to Sokrates.⁶⁸ Finally, like Sokrates and others after him, he used to wear neither shoes nor the *chiton*.⁶⁹

It seems to me that the use of the epithet Ἀπλοκύων has to be explained in the light of the comparison made by Plutarch between the Roman ‘philosophers’ and the Socratic circle. We know that, besides Apollodoros, another Socratic was also presented in the ancient tradition – namely in the *Symposium* of Xenophon – as a very passionate pupil of Sokrates: Antisthenes. Like Apollodoros and Favonius, he is presented as emotive, impulsive, and excessive in his reactions.⁷⁰ Furthermore, he is explicitly paired together with Apollodoros as a pupil really close to Sokrates;⁷¹ and just as Favonius is silenced by Brutus in our passage, Antisthenes is silenced by Sokrates in the ‘Symposium’ in two occasions, once with the epithet of *sophistes*.⁷² Antisthenes and Favonius, then, are both good pupils close to their masters, but too emotive and impulsive to

⁶³ Plu. Brut. 2,1. 40,7f.

⁶⁴ Plu. Brut. 2,2f. 24,1. 40,1. 52,2; Dio 1,2.

⁶⁵ Plu. Brut. 12,3.

⁶⁶ Plu. Cat. Mi. 21,7. 67,1-3.

⁶⁷ Plu. Cat. Mi. 68,2: cf. also App. BC 2,98,409; D.C. 43,11,2. It is interesting to note that also Brutus chose to die (Plu. Brut. 52) and is said to have approved of Cato’s choice of committing suicide (Plu. Brut. 40,7f.). On the other hand, we are told that Favonius ‘was killed’ after Philippi (D.C. 47,49,4).

⁶⁸ Plu. Phoc. 36. 38,5.

⁶⁹ Plu. Cat. Mi. 5,6. 6,6. 44,1. 50,1. Cf. also Val. Max. 3,6,7.

⁷⁰ X. Smp. 4,62-64. 8,3-6.

⁷¹ Xen. Mem. 3,11,17 (SSR V A 14).

⁷² Xen. Smp. 4,2-5. 6,8-10. Cf. also Smp. 6,5.

really be and act like them. Therefore, it seems to me probable that Plutarch's Brutus had in mind this picture of Antisthenes when he called Favonius Ἀπλοκύων. Entering the room he is, like Antisthenes, impulsive and troublesome. Furthermore, he quotes Homer: as is well known, the analysis of the Homeric poems was one of the central themes of Antisthenes' philosophy. Favonius is too emotive and impulsive, and needs to be silenced, just as Antisthenes. I would also add that the foundation of Cynicism by Antisthenes – as seen above – was an issue highly debated in antiquity. It seems thus probable that the association of the terms Ἀπλοκύων and Ψευδοκύων might also have a connection with this problem: Antisthenes could well have been called Ψευδοκύων by someone who did not consider him as the real founder of Cynicism.

Finally: is it probable that Plutarch's Brutus had in mind the picture of Antisthenes presented in the *Symposium* of Xenophon? This could well have been the case, since this work is often quoted as a primary source for Antisthenes' personality.⁷³ Furthermore, as seen above, the comparison between Favonius and Apollodoros also stems from two passages of Plato.

pietro.zaccaria@kuleuven.be

⁷³ See Plu. QConv. 632e; D.L. 6,14 (SSR V A 22); 6,15; Hier. adv. Jovin. 2,14 (SSR V A 12).

Bibliography

- Adrados, F.R. (ed.), *Diccionario Griego-Español (DGE)*, vol. 2, Madrid 1986.
- Apelt, O./Zekl, H.G./Reich, K. (edd.), *Diogenes Laertius. Leben und Meinungen berühmter Philosophen*, 2 vols., Hamburg 2008.
- Babut, D., *Plutarque et le Stoïcisme*, Paris 1969.
- Bieber, M., *Griechische Kleidung*, Berlin/Leipzig 1928.
- Brancacci, A., *I κοινῆ ἀρέσκοντα dei Cinici e la κοινωνία tra cinismo e stoicismo nel libro VI (103-105) delle "Vite" di Diogene Laerzio*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.36.6.* (1992) 4049-4075.
- , *Dialettica e retorica in Antistene*, in: *Elenchos* 17 (1996) 359-406.
- , *L'attore e il cambiamento di ruolo nel cinismo*, in: *Philologus* 146 (2002) 65-86.
- Branham, R.B./Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. (edd.), *The Cynics. The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, Berkeley 1996.
- Brown, T.S., *Onesicritus. A Study in Hellenistic Historiography*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1949.
- Burkert, W., *Neanthes von Kyzikos über Platon. Ein Hinweis aus Herculaneum*, in: *Museum Helveticum* 57 (2000) 76-80.
- Cobet, C.G. (ed.), *Diogenis Laertii De clarorum philosophorum vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus libri decem, ex Italicis codicibus nunc primum excussis recensuit*, Parisiis 1862.
- Cobet, C.G., *Collectanea Critica*, Lugduni Batavorum 1878.
- Conti, E.A., *τήριβων, "mantello" (di stoffa grezza?)*, in: *Comunicazioni dell'Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli"* 12 (2015) 166-172.
- Decleva Caizzi, F. (ed.), *Antisthenis fragmenta*, Milano/Varese 1966.
- Denniston, J.D., *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1966².
- Desmond, W., *Cynics*, Stocksfield 2008.
- Diels, H., *Reiskii animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem*, in: *Hermes* 1 (1889) 302-325.
- Dorandi, T., *Filodemo. Gli stoici (PHerc. 155 e 339)*, in: *Cronache Ercolanesi* 12 (1982) 91-133.
- Dorandi, T. (ed.), *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, edited with introduction, Cambridge 2013.
- Döring, K., *Diogenes und Antisthenes*, in: *Giannantoni, G./Gigante, M./Martens, E. (edd.), La tradizione socratica. Seminario di studi*, Napoli 1995, 125-150.
- Dudley, D.R., *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.*, London 1937.
- Everts, P.S. (ed.), *Plutarchi Vita Bruti, met inleiding en aantekeningen*, Zwolle 1941.
- Ferrarius, O., *De re vestiaria libri septem*, Patavii 1685.

- Flach, I. (ed.), *Eudociae Augustae Violarium, recensuit et emendabat, fontium testimonia subscripsit*, Leipzig 1880.
- Fritz, K. von, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu Leben und Philosophie des Diogenes von Sinope*, Leipzig 1926.
- , *Antistene e Diogene. Le loro relazioni reciproche e la loro importanza per la setta cinica*, in: *Studi italiani di filologia classica n.s.* 5 (1927) 133-149.
- Fuentes Gonzáles, P.P., *Néanthe de Cyzique*, in: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 4 (2005) 587-594.
- , *En defensa del encuentro entre dos Perros, Antístenes y Diógenes: historia de una tensa amistad*, in: *Cuadernos de filología clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 23 (2013) 225-267.
- Gaisford, T. (ed.), *Etymologicum magnum*, Oxford 1848 [repr. Amsterdam 1967].
- Geddes, A.G., *Rags and Riches: The Costume of Athenian Men in the Fifth Century*, in: *Classical Quarterly* 37 (1987) 307-331.
- Geiger, J., *M. Favonius: Three Notes*, in: *Rivista storica dell'Antichità* 4 (1974) 161-170.
- Giannantoni, G. (ed.), *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae, collegit, disposuit, apparatibus notisque instruxit*, 4 vols., Napoli 1990.
- Giannantoni, G., *Antistene fondatore della scuola cinica?*, in: *Goulet-Cazé/Goulet* 1993, 15-34.
- Giannattasio Andria, R. (ed.), *I frammenti delle "Successioni dei filosofi"*, Napoli 1989.
- Gigante, M. (ed.), *Diogene Laerzio. Vite dei filosofi*, a cura di, 2 vols., Roma/Bari 2010⁸.
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O., *Le Cynisme à l'époque impériale*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.36.4* (1990) 2720-2833.
- , *Le livre VI de Diogène Laërce: analyse de sa structure et réflexions méthodologiques*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.36.6* (1992) 3880-4048.
- , *Antisthène*, in: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 1 (1994) 245-253 [= 1994a].
- , *Diogène de Sinope*, in: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 2 (1994) 812-820 [= 1994b].
- , *Who Was the First Dog?*, in: *Branham/Goulet-Cazé* 1996, 414-415.
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. (ed.), *Diogène Laërce, Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres*, traduction française sous la direction de, Paris 1999².
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O., *Favonius*, in: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 3 (2000) 416-417.

- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O./Goulet, R. (edd.), *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements. Actes du Colloque International du CNRS (Paris, 22-25 juillet 1991)*, Paris 1993.
- Griffin, M.T., *Le mouvement cynique et les Romains: attraction et répulsion*, in: Goulet-Cazé/Goulet 1993, 241-258.
- Gugliermi, I., *Diogène Laërce et le Cynisme*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2006.
- Hartmann, E., ‚Mäntel Machen Bürger‘ – Darstellungen von Männern mit Mantel im klassischen Athen, in: Formisano, M./Fuhrer, Th. (edd.), *Gender Studies in den Altertumswissenschaften: Gender-Inszenierungen in der antiken Literatur*, Publikationen der 5. Gender-Tagung in den Altertumswissenschaften an der Freien Universität Berlin, 3./4. Juli 2009, Trier 2011, 159-176.
- Hase, C.B./Dindorf, W./Dindorf, L. (edd.), *Thesaurus Graecae linguae, ab Henrico Stephano constructus*, vol. 1.2, Parisii 1831-1856.
- Heiberg, J.L. (ed.), *Paulus Aegineta. Pars altera. Libri V-VII, Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 9.2*, Leipzig/Berlin 1924.
- Hense, O. (ed.), *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo posteriores, recensuit*, vol. 5, Berlin 1912.
- Heuzey, L., *Histoire du costume antique*, Paris 1922.
- Hicks, R.D. (ed.), *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 2 vols., translated by, Cambridge (Mass.)/London 1925.
- Hilgard, A., *Grammatici Graeci. Recogniti et apparatu critico instructi*, vol. 4.1, Leipzig, 1894.
- Höistad, R., *Cynic Hero and Cynic King. Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*, Lund 1948.
- Holl, K. (ed.), *Epiphanius, Bände 1-3: Ancoratus und Panarion, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 25. 31. 37*, Leipzig (vol. 1 1915; vol. 2 1922; vol. 3 1933).
- Huebner, H.G. (ed.), *Diogenes Laertius. De vitis, dogmatis et apophthegmatis clarorum philosophorum libri decem*, Graeca emendatiora edidit, notatione emendationum, latina Ambrosii interpretatione castigata, appendice critica atque indicibus instruxit, 4 vols., Lipsiae 1828-1833.
- Hirschmann, R., *Pallium*, in: *Der neue Pauly* 9 (2000) 201.
- , *Tribon*, in: *Der neue Pauly* 12.1 (2002) 794-795.
- Huss, B. (ed.), *Xenophons Symposion. Ein Kommentar*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1999.
- Ilberg, J. (ed.), *Sorani Gynaeciorum libri IV, De signis fracturarum, De fasciis, Vita Hippocratis secundum Soranum*, Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 4, Leipzig/Berlin 1927.
- Kaibel, G. (ed.), *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum libri I-XV*, recensuit, 3 vols., Leipzig 1887-1890.

- Leo, F., *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach ihrer Literarischen Form*, Leipzig 1901.
- , Diogenes bei Plautus, in: *Hermes* 41 (1906) 441-446.
- Lomiento, L. (ed.), *Cercida*, Roma 1993.
- Long, H. (ed.), *Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum, recognovit brevisque adnotatione critica instruxit*, 2 vols., Oxonii 1964.
- Losfeld, G., *Essai sur le costume grec*, Paris 1991.
- Luzzatto, M.T., *Dialettica o retorica? La polytropia di Odisseo da Antistene a Porfirio*, in: *Elenchos* 17 (1996) 275-357.
- Marcovich, M. (ed.), *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, 3 vols., Stuttgart/Leipzig 1999.
- Mejer, J., *Demetrius of Magnesia: On Poets and Authors of the Same Name*, in: *Hermes* 109 (1981) 447-472.
- Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Patrologiae Graecae cursus completus*, 161 vols., Paris 1857-1866.
- Montanari, F., *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden/Boston 2015.
- Navia, L., *Diogenes of Sinope. The Man in the Tub*, London 1998.
- , *Antisthenes of Athens. Setting the World Aright*, London 2001.
- Pape, W./Sengebusch, M., *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache*, Braunschweig 1914.
- Paquet, L. (ed.), *Les Cyniques grecs. Fragments et témoignages*, Ottawa 1988².
- Paukstadt, R. (ed.), *Brutus von Plutarch. Ausgabe für den Schulgebrauch*, Gotha 1891.
- Perrin, B. (ed.), *Plutarch's Lives in Eleven Volumes, with an English translation*, vol. 6, *Dion and Brutus – Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus*, London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1918.
- , *Plutarch's Lives in Eleven Volumes, with an English translation*, vol. 8, *Sertorius and Eumenes – Phocion and Cato the Younger*, London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1919.
- Phillips, A.A./Willcock, M.M. (edd.), *Xenophon & Arrian. On Hunting*, edited and translated, Warminster 1999.
- Porter, J.I., *The Philosophy of Aristo of Chios*, in: *Branham/Goulet-Cazé* 1996, 156-189.
- Prince, S. (ed.), *Antisthenes of Athens, texts, translations, and commentary*, Ann Arbor 2015.
- Rankin, H.D., *Anthisthenes Sokraticos*, Amsterdam 1986.
- Reale, G./Girgenti, G./Ramelli, I. (edd.), *Diogene Laerzio. Vite e dottrine dei più celebri filosofi*, a cura di, Milano 2006².
- Roeper, G., *Emendationen zu Diogenes Laertius*, in: *Philologus* 1 (1946) 652-663.

- Salmasius, C. (ed.), *Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani Liber de Pallio*, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1622.
- Sayre, F., *Diogenes of Sinope. A Study of Greek Cynicism*, Baltimore 1938.
- Schenkl, H. (ed.), *Epicteti dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, ad fidem codicis Bodleiani iterum recensuit*, Leipzig 1916.
- Schorn, S. (ed.), *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar*, Basel 2004.
- Schorn, S., 'Periegetische Biographie'-'Historische Biographie': Neanthes von Kyzikos (FgrHist 84) als Biograph, in: Erler, M./Schorn, S. (edd.), *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit. Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.-29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg*, Berlin/New York 2007, 115-156.
- , *Pythagoras in the Historical Tradition: From Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, in: Huffmann, C.A. (ed.), *A History of Pythagoreanism*, Cambridge 2014, 296-314.
- , *Das Bild des weisen Idealherrschers in Antisthenes' Herakles*, forthcoming.
- Schulz-Falkenthal, H., *Kyniker. Zur inhaltlichen Deutung des Namens*, in: *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin Luther Universität Halle* 26.2 (1977) 41-49.
- Schwartz, E. (ed.), *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, Leipzig 1939.
- Schwartz, E., *Diogenes der Hund und Krates der Kyniker*, in: Schwartz, E., *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*, 2 vols., Leipzig/Berlin 1919³, 1-23.
- Stephanus, H., *Thesaurus Graecae linguae*, 4 vols., 1572.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, *Ad Ernestum Maassium epistula*, Berlin 1880.
- Woldinga, G.J. (ed.), *Xenophons Symposium, prolegomena en commentaar*, Hilversum 1938-1939.
- Wytttenbach, D., *Index Graecitatis in Plutarchi opera, Pars I*, Lipsiae 1835.
- Zaccaria, P., *The First Dog: Diogenes (Aristot. Rhet. 3,10,1411a24-25)*, in: *Hermes*, forthcoming.
- Ziegler, K., *Plutarchstudien*, in: *Rheinisches Museum* 81 (1932) 51-87.