

PARISINUS GRAECUS 1962 AND THE WRITINGS OF ALBINUS

JOHN WHITTAKER

Part 2

FINALLY we must give some attention to the matter of the authorship of the *Didaskalikos*. We have already noted¹ that whereas the manuscript tradition unanimously ascribes the *Didaskalikos* to an Alcinous, it has been customary since Freudenthal's day to assign the work to the second-century Platonist Albinus who is known to us from a variety of sources.² However, a further century of research into the history of the transmission of texts on the one hand, and into the history of ideas in later antiquity on the other makes it increasingly apparent that Freudenthal's case,

¹See Part 1 of this paper in *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 320–354.

²The *testimonia* concerning Albinus have been collected by H. Diels and W. Schubart, *Anonymer Kommentar zu Platons Theaetetus* (Berliner Klassikertexte 2 [Berlin 1905]) XXVI ff., and H. Dörrie in the new article on "Albinus" in RE Suppl. 12 (Stuttgart 1970) 14 ff. To these must be added Ephraim the Syrian's mention of an Albinus as the author of a work "Concerning the Incorporeal;" cf. Ephraim's *Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan*, translated by C. W. Mitchell, vol. 2 (London 1921) p. III, and also H. J. W. Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa* (Assen 1966) 163 ff. E. Orth believes Albinus' *Concerning the Incorporeal* to be identical with the anti-Stoic *De qualitatibus incorporeis* preserved amongst the writings of Galen (vol. 19, 463 ff. [Kühn]); cf. Orth's "Les œuvres d'Albinos le Platonicien," *AntClass* 16 (1947) 113 f., and "Curae Criticae," *Emerita* 26 (1958) 209 f. *Didaskalikos* XI, p. 166.14 ff. [Hermann], offers a series of arguments in defence of the incorporeality of qualities, but the argumentation is quite different from that of the *De qualitatibus incorporeis*. The fact that both works attack the materialistic view of the Stoics indicates in no way that both were written (as Orth argues) by the same author, but only that Stoicism was in the second century still a force to be reckoned with. P. Merlan (*The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. A. H. Armstrong [Cambridge 1967] 70 n. 3) not only mistakenly stated that M. Giusta, in his "'Αλβίνου Ἐπιτομή ο' Ἀλκινόου Διδασκαλικός?" *AttiTor* (Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche) 95 (1960–61) 167 ff., was not aware of the evidence put forward by Orth, but also implied that this evidence somehow invalidated Giusta's case. But since there are no significant links between the *Didaskalikos* and the *De qualitatibus incorporeis*, the fact that Albinus wrote a work *Concerning the Incorporeal* and the question whether or not this work is identical with the *De qualitatibus incorporeis* have no direct bearing upon the problem of the authorship of the *Didaskalikos*. And in fact Giusta refers to Orth on p. 190 of his *op. cit.*: "Un'opera di Albino Sull'incorporeo, citata da Ephraem Siro, andrebbe secondo l'Orth identificata con lo scritto pseudo-galenico *ὅτι αἱ ποιότητες ἀσώματοι*: vera o no l'ipotesi, anche un'opera siffatta sembra superare i limiti culturali dell'autore del *Διδασκαλικός*." I do not share Giusta's low opinion of the author of the *Didaskalikos*!

persuasive though it may have seemed at first blush, owes more to its author's rhetorical presentation than to any intrinsic probability.

Thus, M. Giusta has recently re-examined the supposed parallels adduced by Freudenthal between the *Didaskalikos* and the opinions ascribed to Albinus in the ancient *testimonia* or contained in his surviving *Prologue*.³ Giusta shows convincingly that these opinions are either not identical with those of the *Didaskalikos* or so commonplace as to lend no weight to Freudenthal's case. For example, the explanation at *Didask.* 169.26 ff. (Hermann) of how the universe may be termed γενητός⁴ is not, as Freudenthal⁵ and Witt⁶ claim, identical with the doctrine ascribed to Albinus by Proclus at *In Tim.* 1.219.2 ff. (Diehl).⁷ This may be seen most clearly with the assistance of Calvisius Taurus' catalogue (quoted *verbatim* by Philoponus at *De aetern.* 145.13 ff. [Rabel]) of the possible meanings of the term γενητός in the context of the interpretation of the *Timaeus*. The doctrine expressed in the *Didaskalikos* is a combination of the fourth (λέγεται γενητός ὁ κόσμος, καθὼ αἰεὶ ἐν τῷ γίνεσθαι ἔστιν ὡς ὁ Πρωτεὺς μεταβάλλων εἰς παντοδαπὰς μορφάς)⁸ and fifth (λέγοιτο δὲ γενητός, ὅτι καὶ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῷ ἀλλαχόθεν ἔστιν καὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς δὲν κεκόσμηται)⁹ meanings of γενητός as defined by Taurus. The doctrine ascribed to Albinus by Proclus, on the other hand, is a combination of Taurus' fifth and third (λέγεται γενητόν καὶ τὸ ἐπινοία σύνθετον, καὶ εἰ μὴ συντεθῇ)¹⁰ meanings. In any case the latter doctrine was by no means the peculiar property of Albinus. Apart from being the view which Proclus describes as his own it is also precisely

³Cf. Giusta (above, note 2).

⁴Following *Parisinus gr.* 1962, *Vindobonensis phil. gr.* 314 and the almost unanimous mss tradition one must read γενητόν and not γεννητόν at *Didask.* 169.27 H. The passage reads: ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ γενητόν εἶναι τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ οὕτως ἀκουστέον αὐτοῦ, ὡς ὄντος ποτὲ χρόνου, ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ἦν κόσμος· ἀλλὰ διότι αἰεὶ ἐν γενέσει ἔστι καὶ ἐμφαίνει τῆς αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσεως ἀρχικώτερόν τι αἷτιον. On this text see also my "*Timaeus* 27 D 5 ff.," *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 181 ff.

⁵After quoting the relevant passage of the *Didaskalikos* Freudenthal (*Der Platoniker Albinus und der falsche Alkinoos* [Berlin 1879] 298) writes: "Dieselbe Ansicht schreibt Proklos mit unverkennbarer Anspielung auf die angeführten Worte dem Albinos zu. . ."

⁶*Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* (Cambridge 1937) 107: "But the most convincing proof that Albinus is the author of the *Didaskalikos* is supplied by Proclus in discussing the sense in which the universe may be said to have been begotten."

⁷καὶ ὁ γε Πλατωνικός 'Αλβίνος ἀξιοῖ κατὰ Πλάτωνα τὸν κόσμον ἀγέννητον ὄντα γενέσεως ἀρχὴν ἔχειν· ᾧ καὶ πλεονάζειν τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος, ἐκείνου μόνως αἰεὶ ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ κόσμου πρὸς τῷ αἰεὶ εἶναι καὶ γενέσεως ἔχοντος ἀρχὴν, 'ὅτι καὶ αἰεὶ ὢν καὶ γενητός, οὐχ οὕτως ὢν γενητός ὡς κατὰ χρόνον—οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦν καὶ αἰεὶ ὢν—ἀλλ' ὡς λόγον ἔχων γενέσεως διὰ τὴν ἐκ πλείονων καὶ ἀνομοίων σύνθεσιν, ἣν ἀναγκαῖον εἰς ἄλλην αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἀναπέμπειν πρεσβυτέραν, δι' ἣν πρῶτως αἰεὶ οὖσαν ἔστι πῃ καὶ αὐτὸς αἰεὶ ὢν καὶ οὐ μόνον γενητός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγέννητος. Cf. Giusta (above, note 2) 173 ff.

⁸*De aetern.* 146.20 ff. R.

⁹*Ibid.* 147.5 ff. R.

¹⁰*Ibid.* 146.13 f. R.

the one which he ascribes to Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus.¹¹ It is in other words a standard Neoplatonic version of the non-literal interpretation of the *Timaeus*. The doctrine expressed in the *Didaskalikos* is no doubt a variation on the same theme, and one to which Neoplatonists would readily subscribe, but Giusta is right in distinguishing, as does Albinus' approximate contemporary Taurus, the relevant meanings of *γενητός*. Moreover, by the second century after Christ the non-literal interpretation of the account of creation in the *Timaeus* was adhered to by many if not most Platonists (cf. Plutarch, *De an. procr. in Tim.* 1013d f.: . . . οἱ πλείστοι τῶν χρωμένων Πλάτωνι φοβούμενοι καὶ παραμυθούμενοι πάντα μηχανῶνται καὶ παραβιάζονται καὶ στρέφουσιν, ὥς τι δεινὸν καὶ ἄρρητον οἴονται δεῖν περικαλύπτειν καὶ ἀρνέσθαι, τὴν τε τοῦ κόσμου τὴν τε τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ γένεσιν καὶ σύστασιν, . . .), and though some of these Platonists may have gone no farther than to argue, like Xenocrates (fr. 54 [Heinze]), Theophrastus (fr. 29 [Wimmer]), and probably Speusippus,¹² that in the *Timaeus* Plato had chosen to describe the permanent structure of the universe in the form of a creation-myth *θεωρίας ἕνεκα* (Plutarch, *De an. procr. in Tim.* 1013a) or *σαφηνείας ἕνεκα διδασκαλικῆς* (Proclus *In Tim.* 1.290.9 D.), Albinus and the *Didaskalikos* were far from being the only pre-Neoplatonists to argue that in the case of the universe the term *γενητός* implies dependence upon an outside cause. Proclus indeed claims (*In Tim.* 1.277.8 ff. D.) that οἱ δὲ περὶ Κράντορα τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐξηγηταὶ φασὶ γενητὸν λέγεσθαι τὸν κόσμον ὡς ἀπ' αἰτίας ἄλλης παραγόμενον καὶ οὐκ ὄντα αὐτόγονον οὐδὲ αὐθυπόστατον. Thus, according to Proclus the doctrine in question can be traced back to the third century B.C. It certainly appears, as we have just seen, in Calvisius Taurus, but also in Seneca (*Ep.* 58.28: *Manent enim cuncta, non quia aeterna sunt, sed quia defenduntur cura regentis: immortalia tutore non egerent. Haec conservat artifex fragilitatem materiae vi sua vincens.*),¹³ and already in the Pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo* (397b13 ff.: ἀρχαῖος μὲν οὖν τις λόγος καὶ πατριός ἐστι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ πάντα καὶ διὰ θεοῦ ἡμῖν συνέστηκεν, οὐδεμία δὲ φύσις αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐστὶν αὐτάρκης, ἐρημωθεῖσα τῆς ἐκ τούτου σωτηρίας). Thus, *Didask.* 169.29 f. H. (ἐμφαίνει [sc. ὁ κόσμος] τῆς αὐτοῦ ὑποστάσεως ἀρχικώτερόν τι αἷτιον) simply

¹¹Cf. Proclus *In Tim.* 1.277.10 ff. D. Πλωτῖνος δὲ καὶ οἱ μετὰ Πλωτῖνον φιλόσοφοι, Πορφύριος καὶ Ἰάμβλιχος, τὸ σύνθετον φασιν ἐν τούτοις (sc. *Tim.* 28b 6 f.) κεκλήσθαι γενητὸν, τούτῳ δὲ συνυπάρχειν καὶ τὸ ἀφ' ἑτέρας αἰτίας ἀπογεννᾶσθαι. ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἶναι φάμεν πάντων ἀληθέστατα, καὶ εἶναι γενητὸν τὸν κόσμον καὶ ὡς σύνθετον καὶ ὡς ἄλλων αἰτίων εἰς τὸ εἶναι δεόμενον.

¹²Cf. L. Tarán, "The Creation Myth in Plato's *Timaeus*," in *Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy* (edd. J. P. Anton and G. L. Kustas, New York 1971) 405 n. 152.

¹³This section of Seneca's letter is probably inspired by a commentary on the *Timaeus*; cf. my "Ammonius on the Delphic E," *CQ* 19 (1969) 185 ff., and my "Seneca, *Ep.* 58.17," forthcoming in *SymbOslo*.

reflects a commonplace conception of later antiquity. One must therefore conclude that not only is the doctrine which is referred to Albinus by Proclus at *In Tim.* 1.219.2 ff. D. not precisely identical with that propounded at *Didask.* 169.26 ff. H., but that even if these doctrines had been identical, this alone (in view of the commonplace nature in the relevant period of the non-literal interpretation of the *Timaeus*) would in no way prove, or even render it probable, that Albinus was the author of the *Didaskalikos*.

Giusta has also correctly emphasized¹⁴ that such terminological similarities as exist between the *Prologue* of Albinus and the *Didaskalikos* result from the fact that both works are written in the philosophical jargon of the second century: they indicate that the two works derive from the same intellectual milieu but not that they were written by the same pen. Though one may hesitate to follow Giusta in identifying the author of the *Didaskalikos* with the Stoic Alcinous mentioned by Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* 1.24, p. 40. 29 [Kayser]) and in regarding the work as no more than an epitome of the *περὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων Πλάτωνι* of Arius Didymus,¹⁵ there can be no question but that Giusta has thoroughly invalidated Freudenthal's case in so far as it builds upon the consideration of the content and style of the *Didaskalikos*.

However, the matter must also be considered from another angle: that of the history of the transmission of the text. According to Freudenthal the ascription of the *Didaskalikos* by the unanimous manuscript tradition to Alcinous rather than Albinus is simply the result of scribal error in transcription. "Das [i.e., the insertion of the wrong name] konnte um so leichter geschehen," Freudenthal writes,¹⁶ "als in der Genetivform, die allein in den Ueber- und Nachschriften des λόγος διδασκαλικός vorkommt, der Name 'Αλκίνοος mit der entsprechenden Form von 'Αλβίνος nahezu identisch ist; denn 'Αλκίνου ist in manchen Schriftweisen von 'Αλβίνου gar nicht zu unterscheiden.¹⁷ Ein Abschreiber brauchte also bloss 'Αλκίνου statt 'Αλβίνου zu lesen, ein anderer dann 'Αλκινῶου zu schreiben und die ganze Verwirrung ist erklärt." Freudenthal does not attempt to pinpoint the date at which these hypothetical errors in transcription might be supposed to have taken place, but claims that the form 'Αλκινῶου was already present in the "Stammcodex".¹⁸ Diels, however, not only

¹⁴*Op. cit.* (above, note 2) 180 ff.

¹⁵*Ibid.* 186 ff.

¹⁶*Op. cit.* (above, note 5) 300.

¹⁷This claim is in itself a gross exaggeration, and in consequence an oversimplification of the palaeographical problems involved in Freudenthal's thesis. At no stage in the development of Greek script do β and κ become indistinguishable.

¹⁸*Loc. cit.*

approved Freudenthal's hypothesis but went on to suggest that the supposed errors must have arisen as late as the ninth century, on the ground that¹⁹ "ΑΑΒΙΝΟΤ in ΑΑΚΙΝΟΤ zu verlesen ist in Majuskel weniger leicht als in der Minuskel." Diels' suggestion was taken up by Witt,²⁰ and even Giusta does not attempt to deny to it palaeographical validity.²¹ Nonetheless, Diels' reasoning is not unimpeachable. It must first of all be emphasized that in the early minuscule period titles and subscriptions are almost always, if not exclusively, written in uncials or semi-uncials, so that there is very little possibility that the ascription of the *Didaskalikos* to Alcinous could be the result of a confusion of early minuscule β and κ;²² and secondly, that a confusion of uncial B and K is a rare but feasible form of transcriptional error at any date. Just such a confusion occurs, for example, already in the British Museum Papyrus 733 of Bacchylides, dating probably from the first century B.C.,²³ in which the copyist has written at XII.87 ΝΕΚΡΟΣ instead of ΝΕΒΡΟΣ! The passage reads (83 ff.):

¹⁹*Op. cit.* (above, note 2) XXVIII, n. 2.

²⁰*Op. cit.* (above, note 6) 109: "This false form [*sc.* 'Αλκίνοος] may be supposed to have crept in during the earliest period of minuscule writing, at about the beginning of the ninth century. An earlier date is unlikely owing to the circumstance that, whereas B and K in minuscule of this period (e.g., in Cod. Vind. 314) are easily confused, such confusion is practically impossible in majuscule."

²¹*Op. cit.* (above, note 2) 172.

²²Giusta ([above, note 2] 169 f.) rightly discredits two supposed instances, put forward by Freudenthal and his supporters, of the corruption of the form 'Αλβίνος to 'Αλκίνος by copyists transcribing from texts in early minuscule script.

1) Freudenthal ([above, note 5] 300) drew attention to a quotation from the then unpublished Proclus *In Remp.* made by Cardinal Mai in his *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus I* (Rome 1828) XIII. Mai, in quoting from *Vaticanus gr.* 2197, fol. 117 verso, Proclus' list of τῶν Πλατωνικῶν οἱ κορυφαῖοι (= Proclus *In Remp.* 2.96.12 [Kroll]; cf. note 29 below), does indeed read 'Αλκίνος, but in fact the scribe of *Vaticanus gr.* 2197 has written here, as he always does, a very clear and unequivocal early minuscule β. Neither L. Holstenius in writing *Barberinianus gr.* 65 (cf. V. Capocci, *Codices Barberiniani graeci*, Tomus 1. Codices 1–163 [Vatican 1958] 67 ff.) nor the writer of *Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale II. X.* 145 (cf. A. Olivieri, "Indicis codicum graecorum Magliabechianorum supplementum," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 5 [1897] 403 f.) has had any difficulty in correctly transcribing the 'Αλβίνος of the *Vaticanus*. Thus the error is that of Mai and not that of a scribe of the early minuscule period.

2) Similarly, the form 'Αλκίνος in a list of Platonists quoted by J. A. Cramer (*Anecdota graeca e codicibus manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis* 4 [Oxford 1841] 196) from *Bodleianus Auct.* T.2.11, fol. 359 recto, turns out on examination to be simply an instance of Cramer's carelessness (cf. Witt, [above, note 6; Cambridge 1937] 106 and the revised version of this page in the reprint [Amsterdam 1971]). The scribe of the *Bodleianus* affects an archaising early minuscule, but nevertheless entirely unequivocal, β. Here again we are faced with an error which can be traced back, not to the early minuscule period, but no farther than to a modern editor.

²³Cf. *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments* ed. by R. C. Jebb (Cambridge 1905) 126 f.

τό γε σὸ[ν κλέος αἰ]νεῖ
καὶ τις ὑφανχῆς κό[ρα,
[λευκοῖς ἀνὰ γὰν ἱερὰν]
πόδεσσι ταρφέω[ς,
ἥντε νεβρός ἀπενθῆς,
ἀνθεμέντας ἐπ' [ῥχθους
κούφα σὺν ἀγχιδό[μοις
θρώσκουσ' ἀγακλειτα[ῖς ἐταίραις·

The context shows quite clearly not merely that the correct reading must be *νεβρός* but also that the source of the error can only be a confusion of uncial B and K.²⁴ Thus, even if the *'Αλκινόου* of the manuscripts had been a corruption of *'Αλβίνου*, there would be no reason to locate the origin of this error in the early minuscule period.

But even at any stage of the transmission the occurrence of such an error seems hardly plausible. Freudenthal himself admitted that the supposed transition from *'Αλβίνου* to *'Αλκινόου* could not have been effected in one step:²⁵ "Ein Abschreiber brauchte also bloss *'Αλκίνου* statt *'Αλβίνου* zu lesen, ein anderer dann *'Αλκινόου* zu schreiben und die ganze Verwirrung ist erklärt." It is, however, highly questionable whether a transition in two stages from *'Αλβίνου* to *'Αλκινόου* could be so easily achieved. Greek manuscripts normally indicate the title and author both at the beginning and end of a work,²⁶ so that the supposed substitution of *'Αλκίνου* for *'Αλβίνου* at, e.g., the beginning of the work would be more likely to have been corrected by reference to the entry at the end of the work than to have induced a copyist to make the further error of substituting *'Αλκινόου* for *'Αλκίνου*. But even supposing that a copyist did make this additional error, one still has to explain how the mistake became transplanted from the title at the beginning of the work to that at the close (or *vice versa*). One might perhaps suppose that the transition from *'Αλβίνου* to *'Αλκίνου* had taken place at a very early date when the listing of the title and author at the beginning of a work was perhaps less common.²⁷ But considerable difficulty would also attach to such a view. In the case of a

²⁴In editing the text R. C. Jebb correctly noted ([above, note 23] 342) that the error is "noteworthy as showing how mechanically [the copyist] sometimes worked." I cannot accept the claim of A. Dain (*Les Manuscrits* [Paris 1964] 48) that "Dans ce témoin ancien de Bacchylide (XII, 87) il ne peut s'agir que de confusion de mot, et non de confusion de lettre." Since *νεβρός* fits the context admirably whilst *νεκρός* is highly inappropriate, only a confusion of B and K can have induced the copyist to substitute the latter word for the former!

²⁵*Op. cit.* (above, note 5) 300.

²⁶Cf. R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des Manuscrits grecs* (Paris 1954) 8 f. and 60.

²⁷Cf. E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1971) 16 f., and E. Arns, *La Technique du Livre d'après Saint Jérôme* (Paris 1953) 109 ff.

papyrus roll, the title and author, even if not listed at the beginning of the text, would probably appear not only at the end of the text but also either on a glued-on tag or on the back of the roll.²⁸ Moreover, the corruption of the name of a famous Platonist like Albinus²⁹ is hardly likely to have occurred before the close of antiquity.³⁰ But as Diels points out,³¹ the works listed in the pinax of *Parisinus gr.* 1962 probably constitute "ein im Ausgang des Altertums in platonischen Kreisen entstandenes Einleitungskorpus der älteren, populären Akademiker des zweiten Jahrhunderts. . . ." In putting together such a *corpus* Platonists of the fourth, fifth, or sixth century are hardly likely to have confused the name of Albinus, and once such a *corpus* had been constituted the possibility of such a confusion arising becomes very remote indeed.

It seems therefore that we must conclude not only that the works of Albinus listed in the pinax of *Parisinus gr.* 1962 are lost beyond all reasonable hope of retrieval but also that there is no evidence to support the ascription of the *Didaskalikos* to Albinus. There is an important corollary to this latter conclusion: if the *Didaskalikos* was written not by Albinus but by an Alcinous, then one can no longer assume that the teaching which it propounds is in any way related to that of Gaius, the teacher of Albinus. Modern reconstructions of the course of Middle Platonism must in consequence be revised.³²

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN'S

²⁸Cf. Turner, *loc. cit.*

²⁹Cf. Proclus *In Remp.* 2.96.11 ff. (Kroll): τῶν Πλατωνικῶν οἱ κορυφαῖοι, Νουμῆνιος, Ἀλβίνος, Γάιος, Μάξιμος ὁ Νικαεὺς, Ἀρποκρατίων, Εὐκλείδης, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Πορφύριος, Albinus appears also in a Byzantine list of useful Platonic commentators preserved in *Coislinianus* 387, fol. 154 verso, and *Bodleianus Auct. T.* 2.11, fol. 359 recto (cf. note 22 above). The relevant portion of the list reads as follows: ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ διέπρεψαν Πλάτων καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ τοῦτου μαθητῆς· ὦν τὸν μὲν Πλάτωνα ὑπομνηματίζουσι πλείστοι· χρησιμώτεροι δὲ Γάιος, Ἀλβίνος, Πρισκιανός, Ταῦρος, Πρόκλος, Δαμάσκιος, Ἰωάννης ὁ φιλόπονος, ὅστις καὶ κατὰ Πρισκιανοῦ ἠγωνίσαστο, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀριστοτέλους.

³⁰W. Theiler, *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin 1966) 82, has suggested that "Ἀλκίνους war graphische Gräzisierung des römischen Namens Albinus, der dem in Smyrna lebenden Professor oder seinen Studenten nicht ganz stilvoll erschien." Since there are, as we have seen, no plausible grounds for identifying Albinus with the author of the *Didaskalikos*, Theiler's suggestion appears both far-fetched and unnecessary.

³¹*Op. cit.* (above, note 2) XXVII f. It is unfortunate that neither Diels (XXVIII) nor Giusta ([above, note 2] 171) was aware that the works listed in the pinax of *Parisinus gr.* 1962 were contained in the *codex* of which the *Parisinus* originally formed a part.

³²I take this opportunity of recording my gratitude to the Canada Council, and to the many libraries which I have visited in the course of compiling this paper. I owe an especial debt of gratitude to M. Ch. Astruc at the Bibliothèque Nationale.