

Emendations of Alcinous' *Didaskalikos* from the Witt-Dodds *Briefwechsel*

Ben Cartlidge

THIS ARTICLE concerns the text of two letters addressed to E. R. Dodds by R. E. Witt, and Dodds' reply to the first letter.¹ They have some interest for the history of twentieth-century classical scholarship, including details of two unpublished emendations. Because of these emendations, the discussion they are embedded in, and the atmosphere of the mid-twentieth century scholarly world they reveal, they are worthy of being made known to a wider audience. I begin by detailing the emendations, followed by some comment on the scholarly background to them; I give the full text of the letters at the end of the article, with the odd explanatory footnote.

1. *The letters*

The two letters from R. E. Witt came to me tucked into a copy of C. F. Hermann, *Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli Tetralogias dispositi* VI (Leipzig 1902), containing the *Epistles*; the Platonic spuria (*Definitions, On Justice, On Virtue, Demodocus, Sisyphus, Halcyon, Eryxias, and Axiochus*); the “appendix Platonica” (Albinus, Alcinous, Olympiodorus' *Life*, and *Prolegomena*); and a selection of scholia to Plato.² The emendations concern the “appendix

¹ I am grateful for the assistance of Annette Lawrence, Assistant Librarian (University Library, University of Lancaster), Donald Russell (Oxford), Christopher Pelling (Oxford), Anne Sheppard (Royal Holloway), and Richard Witt, by whose gracious permission I am publishing the contents of these letters. I also thank the editors of *GRBS*, the anonymous reviewer, and the support of the Leverhulme Trust. Further acknowledgements on specific points are made in their proper place.

² A subsidiary point of interest is that the volume had also belonged to

Platonica,” in particular the text *Didaskalikos* recorded by Hermann under the name Alcinous, but who was identified for much of the twentieth century with Albinus. The two letters refer to the author as “Albinus,” in spite of Hermann’s text using the name “Alcinous.”

The copy has a bookplate in the front with the text “Lancaster University Library, from the library of Prof. E. R. Dodds.” The volume is marked with an accession stamp dated 3rd June 1985. Dodds bequeathed his library to Lancaster on his death; the plan seems to have been formed as early as 1969, and was intended to enrich the holdings of the fledgling department.³ In the event, Classics at Lancaster closed in 1989.⁴ According to Annette Lawrence, Librarian at Lancaster, the book had been part of a reserved collection for books that were neither frequently consulted nor particularly valuable in their own right. The book had, according to the slip in the back cover, never been taken out of the library, which no doubt accounts for the preservation of the notes (though remarkably the volume appears to have been rebound). It is hard to explain why the library stamped the book only in 1985, but it may have taken a relatively long time to catalogue the books and determine which were to be kept.

The letter from Dodds has a somewhat different history. Study of the letters from Witt led me to contact Dr Richard Witt, R. E. Witt’s son, who is named in the correspondence. He has

Reginald Hackforth (1887–1957), whose signature is on the flyleaf; Dodds has not written his name (but did in the Hesiod volume discussed in B. Cartlidge, “E. R. Dodds’ Lecture Notes on Hesiod’s *Works and Days*,” *HCS* 1 [2020], which was acquired at the same time). Hackforth used the Epistles section of the book intensively, in particular noting the frequency per page of hiatus; see R. Hackforth, *The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles* (Manchester 1913) 14–15, for the published results which refer specifically to the use of Hermann’s text.

³ I am grateful to Prof. Gerard O’Daly, who responded generously to an email request for information on this point.

⁴ On the history of Lancaster’s Classics department see T. Jim, “Classics at Lancaster,” *CUCD Bulletin* 44.3 (2015) 1–3.

generously made several documents from his father's archive available to me. Among other treasures, he was able to locate the letter that Dodds wrote in reply to Witt's initial inquiry, thus completing the *Briefwechsel*.

2. *The emendations*

The emendations, as Witt gives them in the first letter, are as follows:

“(a) 169,13 τὰ μὲν δὴ σώματα εἰς τὰ(ς) τῶν ἐμφαινομένων: read σώματα συγγενεστάτων ἐμφαινομένων κτα.

(b) 178,29 (τὰς ψυχὰς) διαμείβειν πολλὰ σώματα καὶ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ ἀριθμούς μενούσας ἢ βουλήσει θεῶν ἢ δι' ἀκολασίαν ἢ διὰ φιλοσοματίαν. For καὶ ἀριθμούς substitute καθαρμούς. Cf. *Tim.* 92A - B.”⁵

Dodds accepts the first emendation, which applies to the first sentence in chapter 14 of the work, with considerable enthusiasm: in addition to his response, he has written it into his copy of Hermann in ink,⁶ and adds no further suggestions about the passage. In the second letter, however, Witt returns to the passage himself, recording a further conjecture on this passage from his son: for εἰς τὰ(ς) τῶν read ἕκαστα ἑκάστων.

The second emendation is more complex. Dodds has circled καὶ (before ἀριθμούς) in the letter and added in the margin “ἢ

⁵ Pl. *Ti.* 92A-C: τὸ δὲ τέταρτον γένος ἔνυδρον γέγονεν ἐκ τῶν μάλιστα ἀνοητοτάτων καὶ ἀμαθεστάτων, οὓς οὐδ' ἀναπνοῆς καθαρῶς ἔτι ἠξίωσαν οἱ μεταπλάττοντες, ὡς τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ πλημμελείας πάσης ἀκαθάρτως ἐχόντων, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ λεπτῆς καὶ καθαρῶς ἀναπνοῆς ἀέρος εἰς ὕδατος θολερὰν καὶ βαθεῖαν ἔωσαν ἀνάπνευσιν εἰληχότων. For the dense and complex use of Plato's text in the *Didaskalikos* see J. Whittaker, “The Value of Indirect Tradition in the Establishment of Greek Philosophical Texts or the Art of Misquotation,” in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York 1989) 63–95. Such references to Plato's text must be easy prey for corruption in those cases where short extracts (even individual words) are taken out of context.

⁶ D. T. Runia, “A Note on Albinus / Alcinous *Didaskalikos* XIV,” *Mnemosyne* SER. IV 39 (1986) 131–133, addresses a different textual problem in these lines; he is aware of Witt's 1934 text of “Albinus” but not of later textual work.

in my text of Hermann.”⁷ In the edition, Dodds has written in a marginal note: “?μη καθαρὰς ERD, κατ’ ἀριθμούς Sandbach.”⁸ This seems to be written in the same ink as used to record Witt’s συγγενεστάτων; it seems that Dodds turned his critical attention on the passage on receipt of the letter. Witt, in the second letter, approves of μη καθαρὰς, but makes a further suggestion “that {ἦ / καὶ} ἀριθμούς μενούσας is a corruption of μη κεκαθαρμένας,” comparing Pl. *Phd.* 69C ὁ δὲ κεκαθαρμένος τε καὶ τετελεσμένος ἐκεῖσε ἀφικόμενος μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει.

3. Scholarly context

Witt’s major scholarly interests were in Middle Platonism, on which he completed a Ph.D. at Cambridge in 1934, and Graeco-Roman religion.⁹ The subject of post-Platonic philosophy had been introduced to him by Dodds in lectures at Birmingham, where Witt had gone as a postgraduate in 1927.¹⁰ According to the first letter, Witt was in the process of completing a text and translation of Albinus, which was to be published by Hakkert. I can find no other evidence of such a text. Witt had submitted an

⁷ Thus also J. Whittaker, *Alcinoos. Enseignement des doctrines de Platon* (Paris 1990) 51, but see J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien III Der Platoniker Albinos und der falsche Alcinoos* (Berlin 1879) 320, for details: four MSS. at least (*Laurent.* 71.33, *Laurent.* 85.9, *Venet.* 525, and *Paris.* 1977) read καὶ.

⁸ I am unsure where Sandbach made this suggestion as I have not found it in print, but a more intensive search might turn it up.

⁹ A revised portion his 1934 Cambridge doctoral thesis was published as R. E. Witt, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* (Cambridge 1937); see further his *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Ithaca 1971); “Iamblichus as a Forerunner of Julian,” in H. Dörrie (ed.), *De Jamblique à Proclus* (Geneva 1975) 35–67. For details of Witt’s life and career see J. G. Griffiths, “Reginald Eldred Witt,” *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 806–807; there is a further obituary notice in the *Times*, 1st May 1980.

¹⁰ Witt, *Albinus* x, thanks Dodds for introducing him to Albinus; see further Griffiths, *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 806 (giving details of Witt’s early articles); E. R. Dodds, *Missing Persons* (Oxford 1977) 90; and A. Sheppard, “Dodds’ Influence on Neoplatonic Studies,” in C. A. Stray et al. (eds.), *Rediscovering E. R. Dodds: Scholarship, Education, Poetry, and the Paranormal* (Oxford 2019), on Dodds’ role in fostering British scholarship on Neoplatonism.

emended text, introduction, and translation as part of his Cambridge doctoral thesis in 1934, but this part had remained unpublished, while the discussion was revised and published as *Albinus* (1937). Witt identifies a new text and apparatus as an urgent desideratum, and had plainly begun to work at producing such a text.¹¹ What is less clear is why it never appeared. In 1972 Hakkert reprinted Witt's original CUP book,¹² but this did not include a "text and translation" of *Albinus* as per the letter.

The first letter refers to two passages of "Albinus": 169.13 and 178.29. These references are based on the page numbers of Hermann's Teubner. However, the page references take the reader to what Hermann prints as Alcinous' *Didaskalikos*.¹³ Witt held the view, first proposed by Freudenthal, that the *Didaskalikos* was the work of Albinus rather than Alcinous.¹⁴ Freudenthal's argument took as its starting point a thorough comparison of the thought of Albinus and Alcinous, pointing out that they shared not only their "eclecticism," but also the manner and style of their eclecticism.¹⁵ The real proof, however, is the fact of MSS. readings

¹¹ "Pressingly required in view of Hermann's misleading preface," Witt, *Albinus* ix. In a letter dated 26.12.31 to F. H. Sandbach made available to me by Richard Witt, R. E. Witt demonstrates at great length the respects in which Hermann's preface fails to do justice to the manuscript evidence. This view was anticipated by Freudenthal, *Der Platoniker Albinos* 317–320, who gives a textual commentary on chapter 10 (164.7–166.14 Hermann) designed to show "wie viel Hermanns Abdruck der Lehrschrift einem künftigen Herausgeber zu thun übrig gelassen hat" (320).

¹² Griffiths, *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 806. The book was further reprinted by CUP in 2013.

¹³ Still a problem: I had been unable to track down the 1990 Budé edition of Alcinous by Whittaker in the Sydney Jones Library in Liverpool, precisely because it had been catalogued under Albinus, in spite of being entitled *Alcinous. Enseignement des doctrines de Platon!*

¹⁴ On the genuine work of Albinus, the *Eisagoge*, see O. Nüsser, *Albins Prolog und die Dialogtheorie des Platonismus* (Stuttgart 1991), and especially B. Reis, *Der Platoniker Albinos und sein so genannter Prologos* (Wiesbaden 1999), who reviews the question of "Albinus/Alcinous" at 1–26.

¹⁵ Freudenthal, *Der Platoniker Albinos* 292; and for Freudenthal's conception of "eclecticism" see 269. For a modern, nuanced view of "eclecticism" see J.

αλκίνοσ, which Freudenthal supposed, plausibly enough, to be an error for Ἀλβῖνος in minuscule that had subsequently been corrected to Ἀλκίνοος.¹⁶ The view that Albinus was the author of the *Didaskalikos* was widely endorsed through much of the twentieth century. As late as 1991, Reedy could still produce a translation of the *Didaskalikos* attributing it to Albinus.¹⁷ Reedy based his work on the unpublished portion of Witt's Ph.D. thesis, of which he obtained a photocopy. To judge from Reedy's translation, neither of the emendations in the letters to Dodds were in his 1934 text.

The counterarguments against Freudenthal had been marshalled long before Reedy's translation, in the main by John Whittaker, who would go on to re-edit the *Didaskalikos* in 1990 as a work of Alcinous.¹⁸ The difference can be traced in John Dillon's 1977 book on the Middle Platonists, which discusses the *Didaskalikos* in great detail, calling the author "Albinus," and his textually informed translation and commentary on the work, published in 1992, which adopts Alcinous' name in the title and "A." throughout the text.¹⁹

Even if the identification is rejected, the second-century date of the two writers seems correct. Galen heard Albinus lecture in A.D. 151–152 (*De libr. prop.* 2). Indeed, most scholars argue that

M. Dillon and A. A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism."* *Studies in Later Greek Philosophy* (Berkeley 1988).

¹⁶ Freudenthal, *Der Platoniker Albinos* 300.

¹⁷ J. Reedy, *The Platonic Doctrines of Albinus* (Michigan 1991); cf. "Albinus, as I will call him," A. A. Long, "Ptolemy *On the Criterion*: An Epistemology for the Practising Scientist," in *The Question of "Eclecticism"* 178–207, at 187, and contrast T. Göransson, *Albinus, Alcinous, Arius Didymus* (Göteborg 1995) 19 n.3.

¹⁸ J. Whittaker, "*Parisinus Graecus* 1962 and the Writings of Albinus. Part 2," *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 450–456, repr. Whittaker, *Studies in Platonism and Patristic Thought* (London 1989) (no pagination); Whittaker, *Alcinoos* VII–XIII.

¹⁹ J. M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London 1977) 266–340, and *Alcinous. The Handbook of Platonism* (Oxford 1990) xi. On the whole question see further Göransson, *Albinus, Alcinous, Arius Didymus* 13–23; Reis, *Der Platoniker Albinos* 1–26.

the question whether Albinus or Alcinous wrote the *Didaskalikos* has almost no implications for the reconstruction of intellectual history in the period: whether two individuals or one composed handbooks designed as introductions to Platonic philosophy in a roughly similar intellectual context is not of great import. Subsequent philosophical scholarship has been happy to treat Albinus and Alcinous as separate figures.²⁰

As a result, it is interesting to speculate about the place in this story of Witt's text and translation of Albinus and Alcinous. Suppose that Witt's translation had appeared according to the schedule he indicates in the letter. It is impossible to know how soon "very shortly (as soon as possible)" might have been; Witt will not be the only scholar to take an overly optimistic view of his own completion and publishing schedule, and in any case the existence of these letters shows that he was considering text critical matters deeply and in a great deal of detail at even this late stage. We might still be able to guess that the book could have appeared ca. 1975. This however puts us squarely in the period that John Whittaker published his own studies of the text of Albinus, which challenged Freudenthal's conjecture.²¹ It is possible that Witt held his book back in the knowledge of Whittaker's work.²²

Whittaker's Budé thus still holds the field as the most recent and thorough edition of the Greek text of the *Didaskalikos*.²³ This

²⁰ Göransson, *Albinus, Alcinous, Arius Didymus*; M. Trapp, *Philosophy in the Roman Empire* (Aldershot 2007) 258 and *passim*.

²¹ J. Whittaker, "Lost and Found: Some Manuscripts of the *Didaskalikos* of Alcinous," *SO* 49 (1973) 127–139; "*Parisinus Graecus* 1962 and the writings of Albinus. Part 1," *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 320–354; and *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 450–456, all repr. in *Studies in Platonism*.

²² Richard Witt informs me that much correspondence about this translation with various scholars including Whittaker is still extant, but that the text itself seems to have vanished without trace.

²³ The edition by O. F. Summerell and T. Zimmer, *Alkinoos, Didaskalikos. Lehrbuch der Grundsätze Platons* (Berlin 2007), is in reality a German translation of Whittaker's text with some minor changes; the commentary mentions the occasional MS. reading, but it is not a critical edition. They mark 169.13 as

was an entirely new critical edition, updating the earlier work by Louis, and was greeted with enthusiasm by the scholarly community.²⁴ Whittaker had corresponded with Witt, and notes in his apparatus various suggestions on the text made by R. E. Witt and R. C. H. Witt; in the introduction we read: “En 1970 ils sont généreusement mis à notre disposition tous les matériaux qu’ils avaient rassemblés.” Yet the two conjectures in these letters are recorded neither in the apparatus nor in the “notes complémentaires.” By contrast, conjectures of Witt are recorded in four places (160.10, 169.13, 173.21, 180.9), and accepted in as many again: 160.13 (παντὸς ὄνομα), 161.14 (del. ὄν), 174.15 (ἡμιγενὲς δὲ pro ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν αἰς), 188.27 (αὐτόνομον ἦ).²⁵ Some of these are palmary, but others are corrections at least as ambitious as the proposals in the letters, and it is reasonable to suppose that Whittaker would have mentioned these had he known about them.

A further refinement on Whittaker’s work is the textually informed translation and commentary by John Dillon in 1993. Dillon records his dissatisfaction with all the available conjectures, but is apparently unaware of the conjectures proposed in the letters. I quote his translation and comments at length. The first passage, the start of chapter 14, is translated by Dillon as follows:

Having given an account of the composition of bodies, he draws on the powers that make their appearance in the soul in presenting his teaching about it(?).

The question mark is well-placed, since the text at this point is indeed uncertain; but this is plainly no translation of συγγενεστάτων. Indeed Dillon is explicit about the Greek he is

corrupt and adopt the reading ἰσαριθμοὺς in 178.29.

²⁴ “La richesse des rapprochements et des discussions de question controversées en fait un apport de premier order à l’étude du moyen-platonisme,” in the words of E. Des Places, *RPhil* 70–71 (1992) 211.

²⁵ Two of these seem to have come to Whittaker’s attention later in the making of his edition, as in the introduction he says of Witt’s emendations that “nous en adoptons deux dans notre texte” (*Alcinoos* LVIII), omitting reference to 161.14 and 188.27.

translating (*Alcinous* 121):

The beginning of the chapter is corrupt in the MSS. I translate the emendation proposed by Louis (*sunistas* for *eis ta*, and *ek* inserted before *tōn emphainomenōn*), as it gives reasonable sense, but, as Cherniss (1949: 76 n. 5) pointed out in his review of Louis, it leaves an awkward *men* at the beginning without a balancing *de*, so that some further lacuna is to be suspected.

Dillon is thus broadly following Whittaker's text, but here accepts an earlier emendation proposed by the previous editor for Budé, Louis, even as he acknowledges that the correction requires the assumption of a further lacuna. The passage as the MSS. have it is untranslatable, and so some drastic intervention is required. To assume an itacistic mistake of *συνειστὰς* followed by misreading in *scriptio plena* as *εἰς τὰ(ς)* is a relatively easy emendation; but the problem is that even as it emends, it requires a further assumption of a lacuna. Supposing this the best that philological ingenuity has yet contrived, there is plenty of space for further attempts on the passage, of the sort discussed by Witt and Dodds.

In the second passage, in the penultimate paragraph of ch. 25, Dillon translates (34):

...and that they should pass through many bodies both human and non-human, either following their turn in a numbered sequence, or by the will of the gods, or through intemperance, or through love of the body...

The corresponding textual remark:²⁶

following their turn in a numbered sequence: this is my rendering of the troublesome phrase *arithmous menousas*, "waiting for numbers" – perhaps "waiting for their number to come up."... One should mention, though, Freudenthal's suggestion (1879: 320), rejected as unnecessary by Whittaker, but which seems to me to have some merit, *isarithmous menousas*, which would mean something like "waiting to make up the number," which comes to very much the same thing, but is somewhat better syntactically, perhaps.

²⁶ *Alcinoos* 156–157. Freudenthal, *Der Platoniker Albinos* 320, adduces Pl. *Ti.* 41D as a parallel for this.

Dillon quite candidly acknowledges the textual problems in these passages, together with some of the alternative solutions, and shows that the ingenuity of Dodds and Witt was being applied to a worthy crux. Furthermore, the solutions discussed by Dillon show how comparatively radical Witt's solution was.

4. *Assessment of the emendations*

Both emendations are rather "elaborate,"²⁷ and it is entirely possible that neither is correct. They are however both worth serious consideration, as they certainly turn nonsense into sense. The first emendation, in Witt's first formulation, is perhaps adventurous, but makes superb sense of the puzzling sequence εἰς τὰς τῶν, and thereby obviates the need for the lacuna marked by Hermann after δυνάμεων.

The second emendation, in Witt's first formulation, depends on καὶ being in the text. However, as Dodds observed in his reply, the reading is ἦ. I find Dodds' statement that a καθαρμοῦς is not a soul puzzling, however; I assume Dodds took Witt's meaning to be that he would also delete μενούσας. Nevertheless, the emendation μὴ καθαρὰς μενούσας, "if they did not remain pure," fits the sense beautifully. The original reading ἀριθμοὺς μενούσας is puzzling both on its own terms—"waiting for numbers" is rather opaque—but nor does it seem to correspond to any particular Platonic doctrine available elsewhere. Waiting to become pure, however, is a natural thing to do for the soul after death, and easily paralleled. The conjecture ἰσαρίθμους accepted by other editors may even have a part to play in this. Suppose the original reading was καθαρμοῦς; this could be read as ἰσαθαρμοῦς (κ being interpreted as ι),²⁸ thence as εἰς ἀριθμοὺς and finally as ἀριθμοὺς (εἰς being deleted as meaningless). Whether any of these ideas will command enough support to be printed when the *Didaskalikos* is edited again is for others to decide; but they perhaps merit inclusion in an ap-

²⁷ J. Dillon, *per litteras*, to whom I am grateful for a useful discussion.

²⁸ Precisely this misreading was implicated by Freudenthal, *Der Platoniker Albinos* 320, in the readings καὶ and ἦ.

paratus that is hardly clogged with scholarly interventions to date.

Dodds is reported by M. L. West to have claimed that emendations were available for prose texts in numbers that outstripped those remaining in verse.²⁹ This is a wonderful demonstration of the improvement possible in our texts for critical and sensitive readers.

5. *The full text of the letters*

I.

1 OAKWOOD PARK ROAD

March 2, 1968.

Southgate, N14

01—886 2436

Dear Professor Dodds,

You might like to know that the text and translation of Albinus will very shortly be sent off to Hakkert in Holland.*

Professor Sandbach³⁰ has been kind enough to look at the stuff. He has written encouragingly: "It seems to me a good and helpful translation."

Two emendations have suggested themselves which might seem somewhat startling.

If you have an odd moment your opinion about them would be welcome. (I give the reference in the Teubner edition)

(a) 169,13. τὰ μὲν δὴ σώματα εἰς τὰ(ς) τῶν ἐμφανομένων: read σώματα συγγενεστάτων ἐμφανομένων κτα.

(b) 178,29 (τὰς ψυχὰς) διαμείβειν πολλὰ σώματα καὶ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ ἀριθμούς μενούσας ἢ βουλήσει θεῶν ἢ δι' ἀκολασίαν [sic] ἢ διὰ φιλοσωματίαν. For καὶ ἀριθμούς substitute καθαρούς. Cf. Tim. 92A - B.

With best wishes,

²⁹ M. L. West, "Forward into the Past," in P. J. Finglass et al. (eds.), *Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford 2007) xx–xxviii, at xxii.

³⁰ F. H. Sandbach, 1903–1991; Asst. Lecturer, University of Manchester, 1926–1929; Fellow, Trinity College, Cambridge 1927–1950; Brereton Reader in Classics, 1951–; Professor, 1967–1970.

*As soon as possible.

Yours sincerely
R. E. Witt

II.

Cromwell's House
Old Marston
Oxford

11 March 1968

Dear Witt,

Thank you for your letter of the 2nd. As to your emendations, the one on p.169 seems an ingenious way of introducing both sense and syntax into a desperate passage. And on p.178 you may be right in expecting a reference to impurity on the evidence of Tim. 92 b. But I don't understand in what sense a $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon$ can be called a $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\mu}\omicron\varsigma$. Also my Teubner text of 1902 has not $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ but $\eta \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ without critical note: is $\kappa\alpha\iota$ an emendation? If MSS have η , perhaps we should read $\mu\grave{\eta} \kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$?

Yours sincerely
E. R. Dodds

III.

1 OAKWOOD PARK ROAD
Southgate, N14
01—886 2436

March 15, 1968.

Dear Prof. Dodds,

Your kindness in dealing with my questions on the text of Albinus is very much appreciated.

The judgement passed on my $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ almost settles the question of what to print in the forthcoming edition. Richard my son,³¹ however, has another proposal, which I must allow is attractive: $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\mu\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\grave{\eta} \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\grave{\eta} \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$. Does this strike you as better than the other?

Your $\mu\grave{\eta} \kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ seems to fit in well. Do you think it possible that $\{\eta / \kappa\alpha\iota\} \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\omicron\varsigma \mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ is a corruption of

³¹ Richard Witt, 1944–, Byzantinist.

μὴ κεκαθαμένους? (I note that the p.p. appears in Phaedo 69C).

On an utterly different topic, I have just received from someone in Turin certain offprints of his articles (letter D) from the Grande Dizionario Enciclopedio. He is one Furio Jesi.³² Besides writing on Delfi, Dio, Donna (Edipo, Eleusi and Ellenismo) he has a half column about you.

Would you like me to send it on?

I have had just a little correspondence with him on religion in pre-historic times. I know him also as an enthusiast for Milton and Donne!

With kindest regards,
Yours sincerely,
R. E. Witt

June, 2019

Department of Archaeology,
Classics and Egyptology
University of Liverpool
12-14 Abercromby Square
Liverpool L69 7WZ, UK
benjamin.cartlidge@liverpool.ac.uk

³² Furio Jesi, 1941–1980, independent scholar and translator.