

THE PHILOSOPHER AQUILA

(Charisius, *Ars gramm.* p. 251.22ff. Barw.)1. *Ars grammatica*

In his *Ars grammatica* Fl. Sosipater Charisius¹ quotes long portions of text which he has taken over from books of other grammarians. One of these quotations starts at 246.18 ('C. Iulius Romanus ita refert de adverbio sub titulo ἀφορμών') and continues up to 289.17. At 246.19–252.31 we find a long argument in which Romanus offers a sort of introduction to the theory of the adverb. This introduction is a surprise to modern readers because it is written in a very rhetorical manner.² I mention this because otherwise one cannot understand why at 251.22ff. the author of a Latin treatise on grammar should quote from a Greek work on Aristotle's *Categories* by a certain Aquila.

At 251.19 Romanus had finished a discussion of adverbial endings in -e or -o and now passes on to another item. Before doing so he introduces a comparison with what happens in the field of dialectic – by implication a very respected discipline. There philosophers do not agree on the definition of dialectic (251.20–252.2). Consequently – another implication – if philosophers do not agree among themselves, he has the more reason to ask for *impunitas disserendi*.³ He asks for this freedom of speech because he tackles a much debated subject which, as the subsequent discussion (252.6ff.) will prove, involves him in problems of *auctoritas*, *ratio* and *consuetudo*. I quote the relevant parts from the passage 251.20–252.5:

nam et cum dialecticae statum non eadem via nec substantia<m> terminarint [et caetera quae Graece sequuntur]⁴ aliqui, ut ὁ Ἀκύλας περὶ κατηγοριῶν δέκα Ἀριστοτέλους· διαλεκτικὴ ἐστὶ μέθοδος καὶ ἐπιστήμη τῶν σημαίνουσάν καὶ σημαινομένων φωνῶν· οἱ δέ τινες, ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ὁδὸς ἐπὶ τὴν φύσιν φέρουσα πρότερον, multo magis ego, cui danda quidem est sed tamen cautior impunitas disserendi, etc.⁵

Because they [sc. philosophers] have not defined the condition and essence of dialectic in the same way, – some, like Aquila in *On the ten Categories of Aristotle*, [thus]: 'Dialectic is the method and science of sounds which signify and are signified'; others: 'the path according to nature leading first to nature', [because of this diversity] the more will I, to whom one should give impunity of speaking, albeit with restrictions, etc.

¹ *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V*, ed. K. Barwick (Leipzig, 1925, repr. with corrections by F. Kühnert, Leipzig, 1954). This edition is a great improvement on that of H. Keil in *Gramm. Latini*, i.1–296 (Leipzig, 1857, repr. Hildesheim, 1981).

² I am preparing a monograph on Romanus' introduction and other parts of his work.

³ A quotation in Greek would heighten the admiration for Romanus' erudition – a third implication. Also at other places Romanus has quotations in Greek, e.g. 149.22ff. but these are more to the point.

⁴ The correction *substantia<m>* is mine. *Et caetera quae Graece sequuntur* is found in one MSS family and is, of course, an indication that the scribe left out Greek words, perhaps because he could not read them.

⁵ In the margin of the Greek text stand the following characters ΜΑΣ ΕΙΝ ΤΥ ΤΑ ΥΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΝΕΩΝ (Corr. ΝΕΡΙΩΝ) ΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ ΙΑΝΑΟΥΜΕΝΑ, which Keil (*GL* i.609) interprets from τὰ onwards as: τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν νέων τοῦ λόγου διανοούμενα. David Runia (private communication) suggests ὀνομάζεται δ' ὑπὸ τῶν νέων (i.e. recent commentators) τὰ τοῦ λόγου διαιρούμενα (or: διανοούμενα) or something like τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου διανοούμενα. I shall be grateful for further suggestions. For the second definition Runia suggests ἢ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν ὁδὸς ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν φέρουσα πρότερον, <ἔπειτα ἐπὶ τὰ συμβεβηκότα> and compares Alcinoüs/Albinus, *Didasc.* v *init.* τῆς διαλεκτικῆς δὲ στοιχειωδέστατον ἡγείται πρῶτον μὲν τὸ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐπιβλέπειν..., ἔπειτα περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων.

Although the Greek text apparently contained more than is given here (see note 5), it is clear that Romanus quotes from a certain Aquila a definition of dialectic, mentioned in his book, or chapter of a book, on Aristotle's *Categories*. The definition as we now have it is evidently faulty, for in general *φωναί* signify but are not signified. Therefore, one should read *ἐπιστήμη τῶν σημαινουσῶν* <φωνῶν> καὶ <τῶν> *σημαινομένων* [φωνῶν]; a scribe may have switched the position of *φωνῶν* because he thought that *φωνῶν* had to be taken with *τῶν σημαινομένων* as well. But, of course, the definition contains the two parts of Stoic dialectic, *τὰ σημαίνοντα* and *τὰ σημαίνόμενα*, of which the first has been equated with *φωναί σημαίνουσαι*, as e.g. in S.E. *Adv. Math.* viii.11f. Further, to call dialectic a science (*ἐπιστήμη*), and not a *τέχνη*, points to an anti-Aristotelian stance, and the definition brings its author closer to Stoic and Platonic views. Finally, a discussion of dialectic in a treatise, or a chapter, on Aristotle's *Categories* need not surprise, for we have other examples.⁶

2. Identity of Aquila

Of more importance, however, is the question, who was this Aquila? Froehde⁷ suggested that Aquila *libertus Maecenatis notarum inventor* is meant. This man is mentioned by Suetonius fr. 135 Reiff. and Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.* 55.7.6, but the identification is quite uncertain and Froehde cannot give any arguments. I have not found further discussions,⁸ so I shall try myself to answer the question of identity, after first seeking to determine the period in which Aquila lived.⁹ This procedure involves one in many problems, solutions of which are unavoidably dependent upon assumptions.

As Tolkiehn has argued very persuasively,¹⁰ Charisius wrote his *Ars* between 361 and 363. The dates of C. Iulius Romanus are known only approximately. The latest datable author quoted by him is Apuleius (314.4, 323.9). So we have a *terminus post quem*, for Apuleius lived from c. 125 to c. 160. *Terminus ante* is of course Charisius' time. Now Stein¹¹ has pointed out that at 262.10 and 297.8 Romanus quotes Marcius Salutaris, on the latter occasion adding the title *vir perfectissimus*. In the Roman hierarchy this title refers to a higher grade than *vir egregius*, Gr. *κράτιστος*. This latter title is used in connection with a Marcius Salutaris who is mentioned in several papyri and one inscription, all dating from 244–248.¹² If one identifies both Marcii Salutare

⁶ Cf. e.g. J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1977), pp. 49–51, 121f. and 233–6.

⁷ O. Froehde, *De C. Iulio Romano Charisii auctore*, Jhb. f. class. Philol., Suppl. xviii (Leipzig, 1892), p. 650.

⁸ The absence of discussion is not surprising, for in his edition (p. 193.25) Keil did not yet give the Greek words. They were printed in his *Addenda* from the annotations written by Ioannes Cauchius (c. 1540) in the margin of his copy of the *editio princeps* (cf. pp. xxiv–xxvii). Cauchius based these annotations on a MS. which disappeared during the sixteenth century. Barwick was the first editor to make full use of Cauchius' notes. See his *praef.* pp. xii ff. and 'Zur Geschichte und Rekonstruktion des Charisius-Textes', *Hermes* 59 (1924), 322ff. When Barwick's edition appeared the study of ancient grammar had started a decline which was not halted before the sixties.

⁹ Correspondence with the editor of the *Dict. des phil. antiques* in 1988–9 led to the inclusion of Romanus' Aquila under the relevant entry (see note 19 below).

¹⁰ J. Tolkiehn, 'Die Lebenszeit des Grammatikers Charisius', *BPhW* 30 (1910), 1054f., cf. *BPhW* 35 (1915), 188f.

¹¹ A. Stein, *Hermes* 63 (1928), 480–1. Cf. P. Parsons, *JRS* 57 (1967), 134ff. and *Prosop. Imp. Rom.* (PIR)² v. no. 247 (I owe the latter reference to Dr K. Worp).

¹² *PLord.* 3.1157, *PWisc.* 2.86, *POxy.* 17.2123, *POxy.* 33.2664, *POxy.* 1.78 and *Bodl. Gr. Inscr.* 3018. See also R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language. The Grammarians and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1988), pp. 427f.

as the same man,¹³ he was promoted after 246.¹⁴ This identification is very plausible because no other men of this name are known in the period A.D. 150–350.¹⁵ We will not go wrong in thinking that Romanus wrote his *Ἀφορμαί* after 250, say between 260 and 320.¹⁶ Starting from this inference we cannot but conclude that the Aquila of 251.22 wrote his book on Aristotle's *Categories* before 320.

3. Other sources

The next question is whether we have more knowledge about Aquila from other sources. A quick look in *RE* II (1895) col. 314, s.v. reveals that the best candidate is an Aquila mentioned in the *Suda* s.v. (A 1041): *Ἀκύλας φιλόσοφος, σχόλια λογικὰ γεγραφὼς περὶ συλλογισμῶν*. The identification with our Aquila is attractive because of the close connection between the subjects they discussed. Very probably we meet the same man in Proclus, *In Timaeum* 3.263.7 Diehl, where a philosopher Aquila is mentioned. However, nothing more is known about these men. Now the Aquila of the *Suda* is being referred to in the context of the discussion of yet another Aquila, about whom much more is known, namely, the *RE*'s Aquila (6), who is more than once mentioned together with a certain Evagoras. The author of the article, Brzoska, refers to texts from Syrianus, *In Hermog. Comm.* Rabe, from which it appears that Aquila and Evagoras were Neoplatonic philosophers who wrote on rhetorical subjects. After Brzoska, Gloeckner and Schilling added more data about Aquila's rhetorical theories from unpublished commentaries on Hermogenes' *Staseis* by George of Alexandria and Nilus.¹⁷ Finally, in 1907 Bruno Keil extensively discussed the dates of Evagoras and Aquila,¹⁸ proposing to place Aquila *towards the end of 330–365* and Evagoras a generation earlier. Both Keil's thesis and his argumentation have been taken over by scholars, e.g. in *Der kleine Pauly*, and in the most recent discussion Laurent Pernot, too, voices general agreement, although he does not go further than 'on peut placer Evagoras et son successeur Aquila au IV^e'.¹⁹

The difference in the dating of both men named Aquila is small, about 50 years, and the gap may be bridged by bringing both datings up and down respectively. However, the manner in which Charisius refers to Romanus as *disertissimus artis scriptor*

¹³ In *Prosopogr. of the Later Roman Empire (PLRE)*, i.800 it is left open that the one may, be a son of the other, but in *PIR* v. no. 247 the identification is accepted *sine dubio*.

¹⁴ Romanus is not in the habit of adding titles, and Stein therefore supposes that he knew Marcus Salutaris personally.

¹⁵ Kaster, op. cit. (n. 12), p. 428 neglects this fact and, therefore, thinks it also possible that the Salutaris of Romanus was a son of the Salutaris of the papyri, or even an ancestor.

¹⁶ See also Kaster, op. cit. (n. 12), pp. 424ff. The statement in *PIR* iv. no. 520 *paulo post medium saeculum tertium* is based upon the inference by Stein. In this connection it is unimportant that L. Jeep, *Rhein Mus.* 51 (1989), 401ff., argues that the parts from Romanus were added later after Diomedes had used Charisius. For even if he should be correct (but see Barwick (above n. 8) 335ff.), it would be wrong to date Romanus later than Charisius, as J. Tolkiehn, *BPhW* 28 (1908), 1168 rightly remarks.

¹⁷ St. Gloeckner, *Quaestiones rhetoricae. Historiae artis rhetoricae qualis fuerit aeo imperatorio capita selecta*, Breslauer philol. Abhandl. viii, 2 (Breslau, 1901), pp. 64ff. (p. 69: 'Quod attinet ad Euagorae et Aquilae aetatem, non ante annum 250 eos floruisse coniecerim'); L. Schilling, *Quaestiones rhetoricae selectae*, Jhrb. f. class. Philol., Suppl. 28 (1905), pp. 693ff. On George and Nilus see G. A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 115 and 131f.

¹⁸ 'Zwei Identificationen', *Hermes* 42 (1907), 548–61.

¹⁹ *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* (Paris, 1989), vol. i, s.v. *Aquila (Akylas)*. In the final version of his article Pernot discusses an earlier draft of my article, in which I had put Aquila earlier than A.D. 270 – Kennedy, op. cit. (n. 17), pp. 74f. says 'they [Evagoras and Aquila] cannot be dated securely before or after Porphyry', but does not seem to be aware of Keil's discussion.

(301.17), probably means that Charisius did not know much about him,²⁰ and for this reason I am reluctant to date Romanus after 320. On the other hand, as we shall see, Keil's argument makes it quite impossible to bring his Aquila down to 300–320. This is to be regretted, for among the results of such an identification would be the solution of the following problem. Syrianus calls Aquila an excellent *philosopher* but from the references to the theories of this man one rather gets the impression that Aquila was a *rhetorician*. This problem would be solved if one accepted the identification with Romanus' Aquila, the author of a study on Aristotle's *Categories* and therefore liable to be classified as a philosopher. A further reason for regret is that in the event of non-identification we have two men named Aquila, both of them philosophers, both living in approximately the same period, and each being active in a subject which matches that of his namesake.²¹

However, at a decisive point Keil's argument is open to discussion. Syrianus (*In Hermog. Comm.* 2.35.2, 37.26 etc.), he observes, refers to Aquila, often together with a certain Evagoras, and qualifies both as 'excellent philosophers (ἀρίστους φιλοσόφους, 56.20), who mixed the knowledge derived from the divine philosophy (ἐκ τῆς θείας φιλοσοφίας) into their theories on the *staseis*' (128.24ff.). From 56.16ff. it appears that Evagoras and Aquila are Syrianus' main sources for his detailed exposition of the *staseis*. The manner in which Syrianus refers to these philosophers makes it plausible that Aquila was a pupil of Evagoras, and that Syrianus knew of Evagoras indirectly only by way of Aquila's writings. So far I agree with Keil, but he continues as follows. Syrianus 3.23–4.19 tells us that according to his own statement Evagoras knew of a sophist at Athens, a man with three hundred pupils, who disdained serious study of rhetorical theory and propagated free improvisation. That man continuously called out to 'his pitiful pupils that well-known proverb τὸ λαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ λαλεῖν'. Syrianus also records Evagoras' criticism of this behaviour. In *Rhet. Gr.* v.610.15ff. W. (= *Proll. Sylloge* 346.14–347.9 Rabe) the same story and criticism recur, this time with the name of the sophist, Phrynichus.²² Which Phrynichus is meant we do not know, but probably not the famous grammarian, who lived in the second century A.D. Now, as Keil observes, Himerius, *Or.* 74.4 (Col. = 24.4 W.) tells the same story, this time giving neither a name nor a place, but with great approval because Himerius himself is delivering an impromptu oration. Keil identifies the two sophists as being the same person, named Phrynichus, a teacher in Athens. Himerius lived from c. 300 to c. 385, coming to Athens 315–20 and teaching rhetoric there privately. He made several journeys, and his impromptu oration must have been delivered during one of these, most probably between 362 and 367, before his final return to Athens (Keil, p. 555). From this oration it appears that at the time of its delivery Phrynichus had already been dead for some time (σοφὸς γὰρ ἦν, see below). Therefore Phrynichus' time was c. 315–50 (Keil, p. 557). Evagoras is speaking of the sophist as one who lived in his own time (ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Εὐαγόρου τοῦ φιλοσόφου χρόνων, ὡς αὐτὸς [...] φησί). Because in all probability Aquila was a pupil of Evagoras, Keil (p. 559) concludes that Aquila was living 'Ende des zweiten Drittels des 4. Jahrhunderts'.

²⁰ Cf. Kaster, op. cit. (n. 12), p. 425.

²¹ Application of the principle that persons of the same name ought not to be multiplied beyond necessity cannot prove, of course, that I am right. Moreover, as the referee of my paper reminds me, in the third century there are numerous cases of two contemporaries possessing similar traits and identical names, e.g. two Origenes, both Platonists and both pupils of an Ammonius; two men named Dionysius, both bishops.

²² But without a reference to Evagoras, although, to all appearances, both texts have as their source the same text, Evagoras' *περὶ τῶν στάσεων* (Syrianus 3.24).

Of course, it is not necessary to accept the whole of Keil's argument, but, nevertheless, it is virtually impossible to date this Aquila before 330, provided one accepts the following assumptions: (a) Himerius' statement is true; (b) Evagoras heard the same man, Phrynichus, saying the same words Himerius heard; (c) Aquila was a pupil of Evagoras. Given these assumptions, Himerius cannot have heard Phrynichus before 315–20 and Aquila has to be dated after 330.

However, when one looks at the text of Himerius and appreciates the character of an extemporaneous speech, one will have reason to query assumption (a) and be inclined to scepticism rather than to the trust shown by Keil. Himerius says *ἤκουσα δὲ ἐγὼ ποτε ἀνδρὸς σοφοῦ* – *σοφὸς γὰρ ἦν οὗτος τὰ περὶ τὴν τέχνην, ἐφ' ἣν σπουδάζομεν* – *καὶ τοιαύτην τινὰ γνώμην ἀποφαινομένου περὶ τοῦ πράγματος, ὡς 'ἐκ τοῦ λαλεῖν αἰεὶ τὸ λαλεῖν' παραγίνεται*. Evidently, Himerius and Evagoras are alluding to the same sophist, but to what extent shall we trust Himerius' claim that he himself heard the sophist? Several considerations tell against doing so. Firstly, in this kind of oration the lesson of the story is more important than the source, and we can easily imagine that Himerius was acting as if he spoke from his own experience. This impression, then, is strengthened by the circumstance that many times in Greek texts the expression *ἤκουσα* *X* *λέγοντος* has to be interpreted as 'I've read somewhere'.²³ Moreover, – and this, I think, settles the matter of Himerius' veracity – in the theory of extempore talks (*λαλίσαι*) an orator is advised to invent and introduce dreams and stories, E.g. Menander Rhetor 2.4 (390.4ff. Sp.) says: *χρὴ δὲ καὶ ὄνειράτα πλάττειν καὶ ἀκοὴν τινὰ προσποιεῖσθαι ἀκηκοέναι, καὶ ταύτην βούλεσθαι ἐξαγγέλλειν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ὄνειράτα μὲν, ὡς εἰ λέγομεν ὅτι παραστὰς νύκτωρ ὁ 'Ερμῆς προσέειπε κηρύττειν [...] καὶ [...] ἐρῶ κατὰ μέσον θέατρον ἅπερ ἐκείνου λέγοντος ἤκουσα. ἀκοὴν δέ, ὡς εἰ λέγομεν οὕτως, ὅτι ἀπήγγειλέ τις ἐμοὶ τῶν ἀπὸ ἀστυγείτονος πόλεως κτλ.*²⁴

These considerations taken together show that to put as much trust in Himerius' words as Keil did is too tenuous a base for fixing Evagoras' date, and, accordingly, that of this Aquila.²⁵ Himerius, I think, has read about Phrynichus in some book, e.g. that of Evagoras, but acts as if he has heard Phrynichus personally. Under this explanation we now can understand why Himerius added the words *σοφὸς γὰρ ἦν κτλ.*: he is reacting to Evagoras' very critical remarks about this sophist.

4. Chronology

Rejection of Himerius' alleged claim clears the way to date Evagoras, and, accordingly, Aquila earlier than Keil has done. In that case this Aquila may well have lived in the same period I have claimed for the Aquila cited by Romanus, i.e. before 320. Then identification of the two becomes the preferable hypothesis.

²³ E.g. Julianus, *Or.* v.162c says *τοιαῦτα γὰρ ἐγὼ μέμνημαι τοῦ Ξενάρχου λέγοντος ἀκηκοώς*. Xenarchus lived in the time of Augustus. I borrow this example from Anne D. R. Sheppard, *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentaries on the Republic* (Göttingen, 1980), p. 31 n. 29, but there are many more examples. I treat this matter in a forthcoming article.

²⁴ See Russell-Wilson on Menander Rhetor, pp. 295 and 300 and D. A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 77ff. for more information on extempore speeches in late antiquity and their links with philosophical *διατριβαί*.

²⁵ Because of the many details Evagoras gives, the same scepticism cannot be extended to his declaration of having personally witnessed the sophist's performance. But in that case it would be easier to identify the sophist with the grammarian Phrynichus, an identification defended by H. Rabe, *RhM* 62 (1907), 260 n. 1. The latter Phrynichus dedicated a *praeparatio sophistica* to the Emperor Commodus. However, to date Evagoras as early as c. 190 seems quite wrong.

One objection against this redating of Syrianus' Aquila might be that because of their Neoplatonism it is better to discount the possibility of a comparatively early dating, and to date him and Evagoras later than A.D. 300.²⁶ However, the distinction between Neoplatonism and Middle Platonism is a modern one, not adopted in antiquity; further, we know that as early as Porphyry (232–c. 305) Neoplatonists combined philosophy with rhetoric.²⁷ His being a Neoplatonist, therefore, is no obstacle to dating this Aquila earlier than is usually done.²⁸ As for the Aquila of Romanus, his definition of dialectic in Stoic terms is no reason to exclude the possibility that he was a Neoplatonist. Examples of Platonists using Stoic terminology, and even defending Stoic tenets, can be quoted from the first century B.C. onwards.²⁹

5. Conclusions

The result of the foregoing is first that there is no longer a real obstacle to the identification of Syrianus' Aquila with the Aquila of Romanus. The gain, however, is twofold. One advantage is that we no longer have to reckon with another Aquila and can simplify the problem of who is who.³⁰ The other is that our knowledge of Syrianus' Aquila has been deepened, for apart from his rhetorical activities we now have solid evidence for his philosophical pursuits, i.e. a book (or part thereof) on the *Categories* of Aristotle, in which he offered a definition of dialectic. In this connection I refer to *Proll. Sylloge* 196.22ff. (= *Rhet. Gr.* 7.12.20ff. W.), where it is stated that οἱ *Εὐαγόρειοι* distinguished five types of rhetoric. One of these was rhetoric as the counterpart of dialectic. In such a context Evagoras may have had occasion to quote a definition of dialectic, in the same way that Aquila will have done in his book. Another parallel is the text from Nilus (Gloeckner, p. 66) which contains a reference by Aquila to the philosophical use of the words *ὅρος*: *ὅρος λέγεται...παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ἀκύλας, τὸ μέρος τῆς προτάσεως τοῦ συλλογισμοῦ*. I may recall here the probable identification of Syrianus' Aquila with the Aquila mentioned in the *Suda* (see above), which now can be extended to the Aquila cited by Romanus.³¹

Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

D. M. SCHENKEVELD

²⁶ Thus *PLRE* i.284 on Evagoras: '...he was probably a Neoplatonist, and *therefore* [my italics] at earliest late third century and probably early fourth century'. Similarly on Aquila (i.90), who because of his being a pupil of Evagoras has to be dated accordingly.

²⁷ Cf. Kennedy, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 78.

²⁸ Under the entry 'Aquila E' Pernot discusses the possibility that Syrianus' Aquila and his teacher Evagoras are mentioned by Libanius, who in 363–4 addressed three letters (*Epist.* 809, 1132 and 1440; cp. 137 and 1351 Förster) to a certain Evagoras, a younger colleague of Libanius, and in 392 a letter (*ibid.* 469, 4 and 1130) to an Aquila, who at that time is a young man and is encouraged to finish the long enterprise he has started. Pernot himself concedes, however, that Libanius neither says that Evagoras and Aquila know each other nor indicates the nature of Aquila's work.

²⁹ See e.g. Dillon, *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 180, 228, 235 and 262, and A. Graeser, *Plotinus and the Stoics* (Leiden, 1972).

³⁰ In the same way as the Aquila mentioned in the *Suda* (above) and the Aquila referred to by Proclus have been identified by others with Syrianus' Aquila. See Pernot s.v.

³¹ I am grateful to David Runia and the anonymous referee of this journal for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper.