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In *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 (1957), 212-25, Pierre Nautin published some admirable criticisms of the text of the second book of Theophilus. The purpose of the present article is to suggest emendations which may serve to bring some order out the chaos now present in the third book, especially in regard to chronological matters.

First comes a minor matter of consistency. In I 13 (38, 9 Otto) Th. begins a sentence with τι δὲ καὶ οὐχὶ (with no verb); elsewhere he uses the expression τι δὲ οὐχὶ καὶ, sometimes with a verb (III 3, p. 192, 16; III 5, p. 198, 5; III 17, p. 228, 13-230, 1), sometimes without (II 23, p. 120, 17; II 37, p. 180, 1; III 7, p. 204, 1). Where a verb follows, Otto emends to τι δὲ; probably it should be so emended in every case (cf. Aeschylus, frag. 310 Nauck, p. 96).

Next we turn to the manifold aberrations in Theophilus’ chronological materials. There are two quotations from Plato in III 16, the first from *Leg.* 677 c-d (though ascribed to the *Republic*), in which faulty word separation has led V to read τούτο ἔχειν ἄδελφονς for τὸτε χλια δ’ ἄφ’ οὖ (p. 228, 1, corrected by all the editors). The second quotation, from *Leg.* 683b, ends in the middle of a sentence which could be completed by the addition of 56 letters from Plato. Professor Benedict Einarson has noted that this addition would make more sense and that its length would correspond to the lines of about 27 letters in the archetype of V.

Also in III 16 (cf. III 26) Theophilus refers to Apollonius the Egyptian, who calculated the age of the cosmos as 153,075 years. If Apollonius was an Egyptian, he was presumably interested in Sothic years, periods of 1461 years, with which the figure given by Theophilus has no relation. Another figure is provided for the “great year” with a synodos of all the stars if we look at Johannes Lydus, *De mensibus* 3, 16 (p. 57, 7 Wunisch). This is 1,753,200, or 1200 × 1461. If we drop the final 200, which may bear upon
Apollonius' date (note that in De mens. 4, 11, p. 76, 18, the authority of an Apollonius is cited for the story of the phoenix's return), we could write the numbers out as follows:

Lydus: myriads of years a hundred seventy-five and three thousand 
Th.: myriads of years fifteen and three thousand and seventy-five. 
This is close enough to make one suspect that some displacement has taken place either in Theophilus' text or in his source, and that his fifteen (ε) is an error for Lydus' (Apollonius'?) hundred (ε).

In III 20-22 Theophilus is following one chronological source, that provided by Josephus in his apologetic treatise Contra Apionem on the basis of some writings of Manetho and Menander of Ephesus. There is no reason for assuming that Theophilus had any other source. Even when he does not say that he is following Josephus he is doing so, often word for word, and in III 23 he finally gets around to mentioning Josephus as author of the Jewish War. Something has gone badly wrong in the text of V, since the totals which it provides for the regnal years of the various kings are, almost without exception, wrong.

The first example is to be found in the transcription of the names of various kings of Egypt and the lengths of their reigns (III 20, from Manetho in Josephus, C. Ap. 1, 94-103). V has the following names and numbers:

1. Moses (for Tethmosis), 25 years, 4 months (same in Josephus)
2. Chebron, 13 years
3. Amenophis, 20 years, 7 months
4. Amessis, 21 years, 1 month
5. Mephres, 12 years, 9 months
6. Mephrammouthis, 20 years, 10 months
7. Tuthmosis, 9 years, 8 months
8. Damphenophis, 30 years, 10 months
9. Horos, 36 years, 5 months
10. daughter, 10 years, 3 months
11. - - - -
12. - - - -
13. Mercheres, 12 years, 3 months
14. Armais, 4 years, 1 month
15. Messes Miammou, 6 years
16. Ramesses, 1 year, 4 months, 2 mo.
17. Amenophis, 19 years, 6 months
18. Thoissos and Ramesses, 10 years