

nichtaristotelischen Texten wurden mit allen grundsätzlichen Vorbehalten nur solche berücksichtigt, die in ihrem Kern ganz offensichtlich auf Aristoteles zurückgehen.

1. *Stellen zur akustischen Dihairesis*

1. *Historia animalium* I 1, 488a31ff.
2. *Historia animalium* IV 9, 535a26ff.
3. *de anima* II 8, 420b4ff.

2. *Artikulationsorgane*

1. *de partibus animalium* II 16, 659b27ff.
2. *de partibus animalium* II 17, 660a14ff.

3. *λόγος/φωνή*

1. *de generatione animalium* V 7, 786b17ff.
2. *Politica* I 2, 1253a7ff.

4. *Konventionalität des sprachlichen Zeichens*

1. *de interpretatione* 16a26ff. (bei Bekker eigentlich 27ff.)
2. *de interpretatione* 16a3ff.
3. *Sophistici elenchi* I 1, 165a6ff.
4. *de sensu* 437a3ff.

5. *στοιχείον*

1. *Poetica* 20, 1456b22ff.
2. *Metaphysica* IV 3, 1014a26ff.

6. *Unecht*

1. *Historia animalium* IX 1, 608a17ff.
2. *Problemata* X 38f., 895a4ff.

Concerning *θεόταυρος*

By PETER COLACLIDES, Irvine

To the compounds with *θεο-* already adduced as being parallel to Moschus' *θεόταυρος*¹⁾ (*Europa* 135) one might add the patristic *θεάνθρωπος*²⁾, based on the asyndetic construction *θεός ἄνθρωπος*.

Although not used in the New Testament, the coordination of *θεός* and *ἄνθρωπος*, as either *θεός ἄνθρωπος* or *θεάνθρωπος*, summarizes the process described by Paul in Philippians 2. 6–7: *ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων . . . ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι*

¹⁾ Cf. M. L. West, *Glotta* 54, 1976, 100–101.

²⁾ Cf. G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961), 616, s. v.

ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος³). Similarly, the coordination of θεός and ταῦρος in θεόταυρος epitomizes what Moschus describes in Europa 79:

κρύψε θεὸν καὶ τρέψε δέμας καὶ γίνετο ταῦρος⁴).

What has taken place in both cases is the transition from a true to an adopted form of existence. The two compounds reflect the simultaneous presence⁵) of these two forms of existence. In this manner, they illustrate what R. Jakobson⁶) calls the iconic or diagrammatic aspect of language. The arrangement of their parts in the *signans* is analogous to the hierarchical order of their parts in the *signatum*.

“A god who has changed himself into a bull”⁷), “a bull-like god”: this is what θεόταυρος means for the reader of the poem, to whom Moschus has already revealed the identity of the bull. But to Europa herself, amazed at the sight and the miraculous⁸) doings of the unknown bull, θεόταυρος is a θεῖος or θεοειδὴς ταῦρος “godlike bull” (Europa 140: θεοῖς γ’ ἐπεικότα ῥέζεις⁹)). This second meaning is superimposed upon the first, of which Europa is not aware. The poetic effect of θεόταυρος is due primarily to the tension between these two coexistent meanings.

³) Cf. John 1.14: καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.

⁴) Cf. Europa 155–156:

αὐτός τοι Ζεὺς εἰμι, καὶ ἐγγύθεν εἶδομαι εἶναι
ταῦρος, ἐπεὶ δύναμαι γε φανήμεναι ὅττι θέλωμι.

⁵) According to W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos* (Hermes Einzelschr. 13, 1960), 179, θεόταυρος refers to one of the “Mischwesen . . . die ‚zugleich‘ das im Hinterglied und das im Vorderglied genannte Wesen sind”.

⁶) *Selected Writings II*, 1971, 349–351.

⁷) Cf. Kühner-Blass 2, 318: “θεόταυρος . . . Gottstier (der in einen Stier verwandelte Zeus)”.

⁸) Cf. R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen 1941), 40: „Der Offenbarer muß — so gewiß er in menschlicher Gestalt erscheinen muß — doch etwas Strahlendes, Mysteriöses oder Faszinierendes haben als Heros oder θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, als Wundertäter oder Mystagoge“.

⁹) Cf. Homer, *Iliad* XXIV, 483:

ὧς Ἀχιλεὺς θάμβησεν ἰδὼν Πηλεΐδην θεοειδέα.