As last edited by Kassel and Austin 2001, 146 (henceforth K.-A. I)\(^1\) the text of the pseudo-Epicharmean fragment 249 runs as follows (4troch.\(^\wedge\)):

εὐσεβὴς βίος μέγιστον ἐφόδιον θνητοῖς † ἐστι

a pious life †is† the greatest travelling supply for mortals

This γνώμη is transmitted only in the Paris manuscript (Par. Gr. 1166 c. 310 v.)\(^2\) of the florilegium known as Φιλοσόφων λόγοι,\(^3\) where it is followed by an

\(^{1}\) No new textual suggestions have been advanced since the publication of K.-A. I. Kerkhof 2001, 103 prints the text of K.-A. without further comments.

\(^{2}\) This manuscript is variously dated to the 10th century AD (Odorico 1986, 38-39) or to the 11th-12th centuries AD (Studemund 1887, 24).

\(^{3}\) The text of the florilegium in the Paris manuscript was first edited by Boissonade 1829 (the pseudo-Epicharmean fragment is at page 125). The complete edition of this collection of
admonition-like interpretamentum (φρόνει δικαιοσύνην). The content of the maxim is common wisdom. The paradox, however, is clearly defective, for ἐστι is incompatible with the ~ = sequence required at verse end. Most editors of the fragment try to substitute ἐστι with metrically acceptable shorter words, such as ἔνι, or rather its Sicilian Doric variant ἔνο, and ἔπι, but these emendations do not give plausible meaning for the context (‘a pious life is the greatest travelling supply inside mortals’?). Kaibel suggested changing the word-order, writing ἐφόδιον θνητοῖς μέγιστόν ἐστιν εὐσεβῆς βίος. This solution presupposes a complete re-writing and an unlikely process of corruption; additionally, it oddly places the metaphorical ἐφόδιον, rather than the key phrase ‘pious life’, at the very beginning of the sentence. However, a change in word order is probably the easiest way to emend the line.

I would propose the following text:

εὐσεβῆς βίος μέγιστόν ἐστι θνητοῖς ἐφόδιον

a pious life is the greatest travelling supply for mortals

sayings was later published by Schenkl 1888 (the pseudo-Epicharmean fragment is number 54a at page 10). I checked the readings of the fragment against a digitalised copy of the Paris manuscript, available at http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107242707/f324.item.r=1166.zoom (last consulted in December 2016).

5 Lorenz 1864, 258 (Epich. B. Ἄδηλα fr. 9 of his edition) and Olivieri 1946, 120 ([Epich.] fr. 234 of his edition) do not apparently consider the metrical fault unacceptable in this type of text.
6 Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén 1996, 212 ([Epich.] fr. 38i of her edition) prints the crux at the beginning of the line in her edition of the text of the fragment, but she correctly places it before the last two syllables of the line in the metrical analysis of the fragment.
7 Boissonade 1829, 125. This solution is approved by Polman Kruseman 1834, 98 (Epich. Incertarum fabularum fragmenta fr. XLVI of his edition).
8 K.-A. I (146) after ἔνο in [Epich.] fr. 244,5 K.-A.