The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Theophilus Ad Autolycum II, 7

Arthur Bernard Cook

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 06 / June 1894, pp 246 - 248

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188304, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188304

How to cite this article:

Arthur Bernard Cook (1894). Theophilus Ad Autolycum II, 7. The Classical Review, 8, pp 246-248 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188304

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

from Herod to Pilate, the difficulty—if it did not amount to an impossibility before—would certainly amount to one now.

Strong evidence would be needed to make us believe that John departed from the synoptic method of reckoning the hours of the day. The substance of the synoptic Gospels—it is generally admitted—was widely read and recognized as authoritative at the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Gospel—according to a very ancient and general tradition—was composed to supplement them and to give a more spiritual aspect of Christ's life, but not to supersede them. But if the Fourth

was intended to be read with the Three, would it not have been a grievous and even culpable error to introduce, without warning or even suggestion of difference, a method of reckoning the hours (and more especially as regards the Passion, where the four authors cover the same ground and all enter into considerable detail) wholly different from that of the Synoptists, and certain to create confusion in the minds of all readers? So far, the evidence alleged by Westcott (and I have dealt with no other) appears insufficient to prove such a departure.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

THEOPHILUS AD AUTOLYCUM II, 7.

ἀλλὰ καὶ Σάτυρος, ἱστορῶν τοὺς δῆμους Ἀλεξανδρέων, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Φιλοπάτορος τοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου προσαγορευθέντος, τούτου μηνύει Διόνυσον ἀρχηγέτην γεγονέναι· διὸ καὶ φυλὴν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος πρώτην κατέστησεν. Λέγει οὖν ὁ Σάτυρος οὕτως·

Here follows the genealogy purporting to connect the Ptolemies with Dionusos; after which Theophilus continues:—

Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρὸς Διόνυσον τοῖς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλεύσασι συγγένεια, οὕτω περιέχει. Ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Διονυσίᾳ φυλὴ δῆμοι εἰσὶ κατακεχωρισμένοι· Ἀλθῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης γυναικὸς Διονύσου, θυγατρὸς δὲ Θεστίου Ἀλθῆας· Δηϊανείρης ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Διονύσου καὶ Ἀλθῆας, γυναικὸς δὲ Ἑρακλέους, ὅθεν καὶ τὰς προσω- νυμίας ἔχουσιν οἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς δῆμοι· Ἀριάδνης ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Μίνω, γυναικὸς δὲ Διονύσου, παιδὸς πατροφίλης, τῆς μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν μορφῇ πρύμνιδι· Θεστὶς ἀπὸ Θεστίου τοῦ Ἀλθῆας πατρὸς· Θεαντὶς ἀπὸ Θεάντος παιδὸς Διονύσου· Σταφυλὶς ἀπὸ Σταφύλου υἱοῦ Διονύσου· Μαρωνὶς ἀπὸ Μάρωνος υἱοῦ Ἀριάδνης καὶ Διονύσου· οὗτοι γὰρ πάντες υἱοὶ Διονύσου.

I give the passage 'with all faults' as it stands in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* tom. vi., coll. 1057—60, since I am here concerned only with the obscure words underlined. An Appendix containing the conjectures and emendations of J. H. Nolte speaks thus of the clause in question:—

Locus haud dubie corruptus. Neque interpretum explicationes neque Toupii ep. p. 177 et Meinekei Anal. Alex. et Mulleri *Frag. Histor. Graec.* iv. p. 660, coniecturae

probabiles sunt. Legendum *πρυμνητοῦ* aut *προσύμνου* (cf. Clem. Alex. *Prot.* p. 29 P et Arnob. c. nat. 5, 29) alibi olim proposui.

Toup *l.c.* remarks: 'Appello omnes monstrorum averruncatures, an quidquam viderint hac lectione monstrosius,' and comparing the statement in Hom. *Od.* A 325 rewrites the passage with confidence ('procul dubio') as follows: τῆς *μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ Διᾷ*. Meineke *op. cit.* p. 347 hazards τῆς *μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν ὀροφῇ πρυμναίᾳ*, which C. Müller *l.c.* rightly condemns as 'nimis quaesita' and unwarranted by tradition. He himself offers with some hesitation ἐν *κορυφῇ δρυμώδει*, citing Diodorus v. 51, 4: Διόνυσος δὲ νυκτὸς ἀπήγαγε τὴν Ἀριάδνην εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Δρύος. As an alternative he suggests that the words *παιδὸς...πρύμνιδι* may have crept into the text from some such gloss as the following: τῆς Μίνω *παιδὸς καὶ Πασιφάης τῆς μιχθείσης [Μινωταύρω] ἐν [βοδὸς] μορφῇ πρυνίην*.

It will be seen that these scholars unanimously proceed on the assumption that the words *παιδὸς...πρύμνιδι* are descriptive of Ariadne. Dr. Jackson, however, who first drew my attention to the passage, observes that in that case the iteration of the word *Διονύσῳ* is strange. It is not used more than once in any of the parallel clauses, and had a repetition been required we should have expected the pronoun αὐτῇ. This may be taken as an indication that the words *παιδὸς...πρύμνιδι* cover the name and eponym of another deme.

Assuming, then, that in the clause *παιδὸς πατροφίλης, τῆς μιχθείσης Διονύσῳ ἐν μορφῇ πρύμνιδι* we have to look for the name of a

fresh deme and its mythological derivation, we first note that the MSS. read not *πατροφίλῃς*—which is a conjecture of Wolf's—but *πατροφίλας*. Now it is true that *πατροφίλας* is an incredible form for a prose writer of the second century of our era; but so also is *πατροφίλης*. The probability is that such a writer would not have used such a compound at all; and, had he done so, he would assuredly have written *πατροφίλου* for its genitive case singular. But the form *πατροφίλας*, though foreign to prose, would be perfectly legitimate in verse; indeed it actually occurs in an epigram by an anonymous author, *Anth. Pal.* vii. 221, 2. This consideration leads me to suppose (1) that the words *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* are the beginning of a hexameter verse, and (2) that they have ousted from the text the name which they were intended to illustrate.

Can we, it may be asked, go a step further and restore the lost eponym? I think we can, though in the absence of documentary proof the matter must of course remain conjectural. Among the traditional amours of Dionusos there is one to which the words *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* seem peculiarly applicable, and that one is not Ariadne. For Wolf's suggestion that *πατροφίλος* is used ironically to denote 'betraying her father' is a mere makeshift. The Greek for 'loving her father,' whether in jest or earnest, would be *φιλοπάτωρ* (cp. *φιλομήτωρ*, *φιλάδελφος*, κ.τ.λ.): our word must be passive (cp. 'Ἀρηίφιλος, Λεώφιλος, κ.τ.λ.) and means 'loved by her father,' an epithet which in its present connection suits Pallene and no one else. The main outlines of the story are these. Dionusos journeying through Thrace encountered King Sithon—

Παλλήνης γενέτην θανατηφόρον, ὃς ποτε κούρης
οἶστρον ἔχων ἀθέμιστον ἀμαρτιγάμων ὑμεναίων,
συζυγίην ἀνέκοπτεν· ἀμετρήτους δὲ δαΐζων
μελλογάμους μνηστῆρας ἀπέθρισεν, ὦν ὑπὸ
λύθρῳ
κτεινομένων καναχρδὸν ἐφοινίσσοντο παλαί-
στραι.

(Nonnos: *Dion.* xlviii. 93—7.)

Undeterred by the fate of previous wooers, Dionusos demanded Pallene as his bride,

καὶ αἰτίζοντι Λναίῳ
φρικτὸς ἀνὴρ κήρυξε παλαιμοσύνην ὑμεναίων.
(Id. *ib.* 101—2.)

Pallene in the guise of a wrestler entered the lists. The god was victorious, wedded his antagonist, and slew her importunate

parent. It is patent that the phrase *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* exactly hits off the daughter of this *δυσέρωτα τοκῆα* (Id. *ib.* 205).

But we have still to examine the words *ἐν μορφῇ πρύνινδι*. Despite Wolf's attempted rendering 'forma obversa' and W. G. Humphry's 'aliena forma,' *πρύνινδι* is a *vox nihili*. Correction must, I think, be based on the foregoing legend. The only metamorphosis there described is that Pallene, the personified promontory, met Dionusos *in the guise of a female wrestler*. Hence I submit that possibly, if not probably, we should read *ἐν μορφῇ γυνάδι*. The Γ of *γυνάδι* may by a well-known error (see Bast, *Comment. Palaeog.* p. 710) have passed into the short-limbed Γ, and the meaningless *πρύνινδι* have resulted from the consequent confusion. But if *γυνάδι* be accepted as palaeographically possible, it must be confessed that *ἐν μορφῇ γυνάδι* is an odd phrase to denote 'in the guise of a female wrestler.' In fact, for a writer of plain prose I should say that it was out of the question: at the same time it appears to me just such an extravagant expression as we should look for in a poet of the decadence. I am therefore inclined to suppose that *ἐν μορφῇ γυνάδι* formed part of the verse quotation from which I conceive the words *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* to be an excerpt. I refrain from including *τῆς μυχθείσης Διονύσῳ* in the inverted commas, although as the text stands *παιδὸς...Διονύσῳ* is a passable hexameter, because it seems to me probable that the writer would cull two isolated phrases or perhaps the first five feet of a line, rather than one complete verse and three words from the middle of another without interpolation of his own.

In brief, I hold that Theophilus, who in Book ii. is constantly quoting scraps of Greek poetry, penned the passage somewhat as follows:—

1. Ἀριαδνεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς
2. Μίνω γυναικὸς δὲ Διονύσου·
3. <Παλληνεῖς ἀπὸ Παλλήνης>
4. 'παιδὸς πατροφίλας τῆς
5. μυχθείσης Διονύσῳ 'ἐν μορφῇ
6. γυνάδι.' Θεστιεῖς κ.τ.λ.

Line 3 would be likely enough to drop out before line 4, since both begin with ΠΔ and both end with ΗC, the resultant text being the MS. reading.

I gather, then, that in the Alexandrine *φνλὴ Διονυσία* there was a ninth deme called

Pallene. This in itself will not appear improbable, when we recollect that it was the Greeks in Alexandria who were thus divided into tribes and demes (see Pauly, *Real-Encyc.* ed. 2, col. 1378 *fin.*), and that

at Athens there was in fact an important deme belonging to the tribe Antiochis which bore the name Pallene (see Indices to *C.I.G.* and *C.I.A.*).

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

AD BABRII FABULAS NUPER REPERTAS.

BABRII fabulam inscriptam νῖος καὶ λέων γεγραμμένος e tabulis ceratis Lugdunensibus inde a vs. 12 sic repraesentavit collega meus aestimatissimus van Leeuwen in *Mnemosyne Batava* a. 1894, 2, p. 225 :

καὶ δὴ ποτε στὰς τοῦ λέοντος οὐ πόρρω
 “κακείστε σὺ τὸν ψεύστην
 ὄνειρον ὄμμα[σιν πα]τρὸς δείξας
 15 ἔχεις με φρουρᾷ πε[ριβα]λὼν γυναικεία.
 τί δὴ ἐπὶ σοὶ λόγοισιν κοῦκ ἔργον
 ποιῶ”
 τοίχῳ δὲ χεῖρας (del. v. L.) ἐπέβαλε τὸν
 λέοντα τυφλώσων.
 σκόλοψ δὲ τοῦτῳ ὑποδυνακεκα-
 θαίμωδους
 τῆς σαρκὸς εἰσδὺς ἡσσηνυσθοίων
 20 θέρμα δ’ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἦν.
 ὁ πρέσβυς οὕτως οὐκ ἔσωσε τὸν παῖδα
 μέλλοντα θνήσκειν. ταῦτα τλήθι γενναίως
 καὶ μὴ σοφίζου· τὸ χρεὼν γὰρ οὐ φεύξει.

Locum foede depravatam, in quo diductis litteris significavi verba corrupta aut suspecta, sic corrigere conatus sum :

καὶ δὴ ποτε στὰς τοῦ λέοντος οὐ πόρρω
 κάκιστε [θηρῶν, εἶπε φάς,] σὺ τὸν ψεύστην
 ὄνειρον [ἄλλως] ὄμμασιν πατρὸς δείξας
 15 ἔχεις με φρουρᾷ πε[ριβα]λὼν γυναικεία.
 τί δ’ ἡ πύω λόγους κοῦκ ἔργον ποιῶ; (?)
 τοίχῳ δ’ ἐπέβαλε τὸν λέοντα σιφλώσων.
 σκόλοψ δὲ τοῦτῳ (?) σὺν ὁδύναϊς καθ’
 αἰμώδους
 τῆς σαρκὸς εἰσδὺς σῆψιν ἡνυσ’
 ἐμποιῶν (?)
 20 θέρμα δ’ ἀπ’ (ὑπ’ ?) αὐτὸν ἦ [γαγ’ ἐκ
 βίου θάττον ?].

Vs. 13] non male van Leeuwen κάκιστον, εἶπε, θηρίον, sed si re vera κακείστε est in tabella, alio opus est supplemento. Praefero tamen meo supplemento id quod Polak (qui in sequenti *Mnemosynes* fasciculo de his fabulis scribet), mecum communicavit: κάκιστε [, φησί, θηρίων] κ.τ.έ., quod ipsa simplicitate commendatur. Eidem debetur

quod versui proximo intuli supplementum. Furiae paraphrasis: τὸ ὄναρ—ὁ αὐτὸς ἐώρακεν ἐν ὑπνοῖς μάτην, unde non praefarendum arbitror [μάτην] ὄνειρον κ.τ.λ. Vs. 17] τυφλώσων pro ἀφανῶν accipi posse vix credo. In idem se incidisse mihi scripsit Polak. Vs. 18] τοῦτῳ, scil. τῷ παιδί, usurpatum pro αὐτῷ suspectum. Cogitavi de τοῦτῳ, sc. τοῦ τοίχου, sed aegre careo pueri significatione. αἰμώδους proleptice dictum esse vix est quod moneam. Vs. 19] Hesselting dederat εἰσδύσης ἦνυσε ποιῶν. Ceterum quod e.g. dedi dubitationi valde obnoxium esse me non latet, nam et accentus in voce tradita ποιῶν pugnat cum metro Babriano et parum respondet paraphrasis Bodleiana ἄλγῃμα ὁξὺ καὶ φλεγμονὴν μέχρι βουβώνων εἰργάσατο. Prior quidem difficultas tolleretur coniectura π[λ]εῖσ[τον] ἦνυσ(εν) πῦον, sed altera restat. Accentus premit etiam ποιῶ vs. 16 et ὑμῶν fab. v, 9. Vs. 20] De forma θέρμα pro θέρμη consulatur Lobeck *ad Phrygichum* p. 331. Reliqua correctio incerta. Paraphr. Bodl. habet πυρετός τε ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνάψας τὸν παῖδα θάττον τοῦ βίου ὑπεξήγαγεν. De sequentibus plane satisfaciet Polak meus, cuius sagacitati imprimis commendo vs. 16 et 19, de quibus ipse despero. Mediocriter enim placet quod praeterea venit in mentem τί δὴ ἐπὶ σοὶ λόγοις κοῦκ ἔργον (οἰς ?) θύω; i.e. μαίνομαι. Nihil ibi auxilii est in paraphrasi ἀτί δέ σοι ἐγὼ ἄρτι ποιήσω;

In fabula ἔλαφος καὶ κυνηγέται (tab. vii. *init.*)

τὸν δ’ οἱ πόδες μὲν οἷς τὸ πρόσθεν ἠθύμει
 διέσωζον· ὥς δ’ ἦλθεν εἰς μέσας ὕλας,
 ὅζους τὰ κέρατα συμπλακεῖς ἐθηρεύθη κ.τ.έ.

recte improbat van Leeuwen Hesseltingii coniecturam ὥς δὴ ἦλθεν. Equidem nihil melius reperio quam ὥς δ’ εἰσῆλθεν.

H. VAN HERWERDEN.

*Scribam Traiecti ad Rh.
 Kalendis April. 1894.*