

Nikos Kokkinos

## JULIUS CASSIANUS, PSEUDO-THALLUS, AND THE IDENTITY OF ‘CASSIUS LONGINUS’ IN THE *CHRONOGRAPHIA* OF EUSEBIUS\*

Eusebius’ *Chronika* was a remarkable achievement in the field of ancient chronography, not least as the conclusion of extensive research running since the beginning of the Hellenistic period. It was a double work, composed some time before AD 311 and expanded shortly after AD 325. The first part, now usually called *Chronographia*, was a detailed introduction, aiming at collecting the raw material from all sources then available, and setting out the plan of the project. The second part, known as *Kanones* (*Chronikoi Kanones*), which carried its own preface, was a grand exposition (utilising the data of the first part) in the form of a table consisting of up to nine parallel columns to be read across, thus presenting a synchronistic universal history at a glance.<sup>1</sup> Only fragments survive of the Greek original, primarily in George the Syncellus (ca. AD 800) and an anonymous excerptor (known as ‘Excerpta Eusebiana’ from a MS of the 15th century AD). But we have a nearly complete Armenian translation (earliest copy ca. 13th century AD), a Latin translation of the second part by Jerome (with his own preface and extended to AD 380/1), as well as two Syriac epitomes, one of which is believed to have been compiled by Joshua the Stylite (8th century AD), and other witnesses including two very early Arab chroniclers, one being Agapius of Hierapolis, ca. AD 942.<sup>2</sup>

### The Summary List of Sources for the Olympic Victors

Eusebius began the *Chronographia* by mentioning some 23 areas of study which were to divide this introductory part into corresponding chapters, for each of which a summary was to be provided acknowledging the main sources. These areas reflect the individual chronographies of the major ancient kingdoms, as determined by their king-lists

---

\*The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

ANRW = H. Temporini, W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin–New York.

BNJ = *Brill’s New Jacoby*, ed. by I. Worthington, Leiden.

FGrH = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden.

HRR = H. Peter (ed.), *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1906–1914.

LGPN = P.M. Fraser, E. Matthews et al., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. 5, Oxford.

PIR<sup>2</sup> = E. Groag et al., *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I, II, III* (edition altera), Berlin.

RE = *Paulys Real-encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart 1892–1980.

<sup>1</sup> Mosshammer 1979; Adler 1992: 467–491; Burgess 1997; Grafton & Williams 2006: 135–177.

<sup>2</sup> See Burgess 1999: 23–27; cf. references in Kokkinos 2009a: 2–3, notes 3–5.

and other dating systems, both in the east and the west. Not necessarily in this order, the east is represented by Chaldaeans, Assyrians, Medes, Lydians, Persians, Hebrews (and Phoenicians), Egyptians, Ptolemies, Asian Greeks, and Seleucids; and the west by Athenians, Argives, Sicyonians, Lacedaemonians, Corinthians, Thalassocrats, Olympic Victors, Macedonians, Thessalians, Latins, Roman Kings, Emperors, and Consuls.<sup>3</sup> The related sources (at first, second, or third hand)<sup>4</sup> are reasonably clear throughout, but there is no explicit attribution concerning the information Eusebius provides for the Medes, Lydians, and Persians.<sup>5</sup> Also, the sources for the Olympic Victors can only be gathered from a summary list (neither stated to be complete, nor claimed to be citing sources at first hand) to be found at the beginning of the Roman chapter,<sup>6</sup> somewhat misplaced there perhaps by Eusebius' copiers. This summary list, which survives only in the Armenian translation, and which includes one figure evidently corrupted, has been debated since the time it became known.<sup>7</sup> Yet it is now almost certain that the Olympic sources mentioned, which are the subject of the present paper, reached Eusebius through Julius Africanus (and perhaps also Porphyry of Tyre) – whether or not any of these sources could still have been available to Eusebius at first hand. Here is an English translation of the relevant part:

From the eighteen books of Cassius Longinus, containing an epitome of 228 Olympiads [i.e. to AD 133–136]

From the fourteen books of Phlegon, the freedman of Caesar, containing excerpts of an epitome of 229 Olympiads [i.e. to AD 137–140]

From the six books of Castor, containing an epitome from Ninus moving down 181 Olympiads [i.e. to 56–53 BC]

From the three books of Thallus, containing an outline of an epitome from the Fall of Troy to the 167th Olympiad [i.e. 112–109 BC].

<sup>3</sup> The Armenian translation lacks the last two chapters on Roman emperors and consuls, but it has now been suggested (Greenwood 2008) that there may be found in the Armenian *Anonymous Chronicle* (ca. AD 686–690). A garbled version of these chapters is also thought to be present in the *Excerpta Latina Barbari* (Frick: 183–371).

<sup>4</sup> At third hand, for example, is Eusebius' knowledge of Berossus, who is given as the ultimate source for his Chaldaean chapter (Karst 1911: 6–9; Syncellus 28–30). Berossus is said to be copied from Alexander Polyhistor (presumably at first hand), who nevertheless twice refers to Apollodorus in the quotations (*FGrH* 244, FF 83–84). This is taken to be pseudepigraphical (Schwartz 1894: 2861–2862) because Apollodorus' *Chronika* did not extend before the Trojan War (*FGrH* 244, TT 2, 6b). However, Apollodorus wrote several works, such as the *Peri Theōn* or the mythological study which lies partly behind the pseudepigraphical *Bibliothēkē* (Diller 1935), and the prehistoric events may have been included in one of them. For the suggestion that Apollodorus must have had access to Babylonian material, see Kokkinos 2009a: 17. Under the circumstances, the name of Apollodorus should also be restored in the corrupted reading of Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 9.6.2 (conjectured to be 'Athenodorus'), where it is explicitly said that he followed Berossus in astrological study. Vitruvius mentions him together with 'Antipater', who must therefore be Antipater of Tarsus, Apollodorus' fellow-student under Diogenes the Babylonian (Kokkinos 2009a: 17; cf. Kokkinos 2009b: 43, n. 21).

<sup>5</sup> For the suggestion that the Median, Lydian and Persian material came from Porphyry of Tyre, and probably also through Julius Africanus, see Kokkinos 2009a: 11–12.

<sup>6</sup> Karst 1911: 125, lines 6–24; cf. Aucher 1818: 359; Schoene & Petermann 1875: 263–265.

<sup>7</sup> For a recent discussion, see Chapter 4.4 of the substantial study on the Olympic Victor Lists by P. Christesen (2007: 250–276) – but with reservations regarding the quality of judgement in many issues throughout this book. Christesen's chapter on the question of the sources of Eusebius' list, which begins by supporting Mosshammer and ends by supporting Burgess, seems unrevised at best.

Let us first analyse this list:

(1) Assuming that there is a descending order here from the most recent to the oldest compilation (as suggested by the numbers of Olympiads), each updating the previous one (as implied by the numbers of books), the first compilation in the list, that of 'Cassius Longinus', must originally have carried a number higher than '228' – certainly higher than that of the second compilation of Phlegon ('229'). This corruption in the Armenian text was further confused as J. B. Aucher in his Latin translation (1818) mistook it for '128', while J. Karst in his German translation (1911) accidentally wrote '138'. The current reading '228' follows the Latin translation of H. Petermann (1875), now confirmed by R. Varteni Chétanian (see *BNJ* 259 T1). For the higher number required, it has been proposed that '228' should be read as 2[47], based on the fact that the prologue to the table of the Olympic Victors in the *Chronographia*, says that it covers 247 Olympiads (though the table itself continues to the 249th Olympiad).<sup>8</sup> But, apart from the sheer arbitrariness of such an emendation (as far as the figure itself is concerned), this proposal merely assumes that there was no intermediary source between 'Cassius Longinus' and Eusebius, when in fact all other evidence suggests that the information for the Olympiads was copied from Julius Africanus, a major source of Eusebius – even if Africanus remained unacknowledged in this particular context, ultimately conveying only the sources of Eusebius' main source.<sup>9</sup> We know that Africanus completed his *Chronographiai* in AD 221 (Photius, *Bibl.* 34), and this is in perfect agreement with the 249th Olympiad (AD 217–220) included in his list of Olympic Victors. The small extension from the 247th Olympiad (AD 209–212) is reasonably explained by a second edition undertaken by Africanus, or by 'a long process of collecting and elaborating the material' as M. Wallraff *et al.* would have it.<sup>10</sup> So a reading of 2[47] instead of '228', reflecting Africanus, cannot be applied to the compilation of 'Cassius Longinus'. But modern adjustments curiously fail to keep to the probabilities of error in the writing of the actual figure – according to which 2[3]8 (AD 173–176) is the likeliest correction (given that [3]28 is chronologically out of the question), which would be a simple copying error from the Greek (ΣΚΗ instead of ΣΛΗ) to the Armenian.

(2) By adopting the likeliest emendation of 2[3]8 (AD 173–176) for 'Cassius Longinus', the second compilation in the list is now consistent. Phlegon was a freedman of Hadrian (*FGrH* 257 T 2 = *Hist. Aug.* 10.20.1, earliest such attestation) and therefore his '229' Olympiads (ending with that of AD 137–140) are exact to the point. Hadrian died in AD 138.

<sup>8</sup> This prologue (for which see Cramer 1839: 141, lines 30–31; Karst 1911: 90, lines 32–33; Wallraff *et al.* 2007: F 65, lines 42–43) says that the list will go down to Olympiad 247 (AD 209–212) when Antoninus the son of Severus (i.e. Caracalla, named M. Aurelius Antoninus in AD 196) was emperor (AD 198–217), while the list itself continues with the victors of Olympiads 248 (AD 213–216) and 249 (AD 217–220). Since Caracalla became sole emperor only upon the death of Geta in December AD 211, the list must have originally been completed in AD 212 and in any case before Olympiad 248 which began in the summer of AD 213 (see Burgess 1999: 32, n. 12).

<sup>9</sup> *Contra* Mosshammer 1979: 138–146; see now Burgess 2006: 37–38, n. 78; Wallraff 2006: 50–53; cf. Drews 1982; Croke 1983a. Eusebius in the *Chronographia* refers to Africanus only in the chapter on the Hebrews (Karst 1911: 46–48), but that Africanus was a major source of chronography is clear in Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.31.2.

<sup>10</sup> Wallraff *et al.* 2007: xviii–xix; for the date, see discussion in pp. xvii–xviii.

(3) The third compilation, that of Castor, is also consistent enough. At the close of the *Chronographia* (*FGrH* 250 F 5), Castor's work is said to have ended with the consulship of 'Marcus Valerius Messalla and Marcus Piso' (61 BC). This falls within the last year of the 179th Olympiad (64–61 BC), but again it is reasonable to allow a second edition by Castor or a brief updating by a copier to the 181st Olympiad (56–53 BC).<sup>11</sup>

(4) The fourth compilation presents only an apparent problem. The '167th Olympiad' (112–109 BC) of Thallus, clearly indicates the Hellenistic period, but since we are told by Africanus (*FGrH* 256 F 1) that 'Thallus' interpreted the 'darkness' in the narrative of the crucifixion of Jesus (Mk 15: 33) as being an eclipse of the sun, and since such an eclipse occurred in AD 29, it is assumed that this Olympiad number also requires to be emended to something over [202] (AD 29–32), and so perhaps [20]7 (AD 49–52). But such an emendation, apart again from being totally arbitrary and from running against the so far established order in Eusebius' summary list, places too much faith in a fragment which otherwise is acknowledged as being fraught with problems.<sup>12</sup> First, to make such an academic comment on a detail of the Christian story (and thus using a written Gospel), the pagan Thallus<sup>13</sup> would have had to be living later than the first century AD, and hardly earlier than Celsus (ca. AD 178), the first scholarly critic of Christianity. Celsus does not know 'Thallus' (based on Origen's very detailed *Contra Celsum* – see particularly 2.33, 59). A legitimate emendation of the Olympiad to [2]67 (AD 289–292) is excluded by the fact that the earliest attestation of 'Thallus', by Theophilus of Antioch (*FGrH* 256 F 2), dates to ca. AD 180, while the latest possible emendation of 1[9]7 (AD 9–12) would place Thallus near the end of Augustus' reign.<sup>14</sup> Second, Thallus could not have been so ill-informed astronomically as to imagine that a solar eclipse could have happened at the time of a full moon during a Jewish Passover at Jerusalem. The highly educated Africanus murdered this interpretation by frankly calling it 'nonsense' (ἄλογος).<sup>15</sup> Third, even the artificial chronology of the early Christian Church for the crucifixion,<sup>16</sup> for example '25 March AD 29' by Tertullian (*Adv. Iud.* 8.16), based uncritically on the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry in AD 28/29 (Luke 3: 1) and no doubt influenced by 'Thallus', does not match the actual date of this eclipse on 24th November AD 29 – thus the subsequent emendations of the eclipse by

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Apollodorus' *Chronika*, which ended in 144/3 BC, but which was extended at least to 120/19 BC – see conveniently Pfeiffer 1968: 254.

<sup>12</sup> See the commentary in Adler & Tuffin 2002: 466, n. 4.

<sup>13</sup> The most we can say about the background of Thallus is that he wrote in Greek and that he may have been a Hellenised Phoenician. The theory that he came from Samaria (whether his origins were Hellenised Phoenician or not) is unwarranted, merely based on an emendation of such a name for a different individual under Tiberius mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 18.167). There is also no evidence that he was a Jew by religion or that he referred to Moses (see below). On Thallus, see Holladay 1983: 343–369; Schürer 1986: 543–545; van Voorst 2000: 20–23; Christensen 2007: 322–326; and *BNJ* 256.

<sup>14</sup> A Thallus is known as a secretary of Augustus (Suet., *Aug.* 67.2), but such an identification not only spoils the assumed order in Eusebius' summary list, but also does not fit with the reference to the 'darkness' at the crucifixion.

<sup>15</sup> There may be a word play here by Africanus, reckoning 'Thallus' among the so-called Alogoi ('Deniers of the Word'), who rejected the *Logos* form in the Gospel of John and the 'millenium' scheme in the Apocalypse (Epiphanius, *Panar.* 51).

<sup>16</sup> The artificiality was revealed in Kokkinos 1998b: 123, n. 12, and has since become the basis of a broad study by A.A. Mosshammer (see Mosshammer 2008).

Christian chronographers (for example AD 32/33 in Eusebius),<sup>17</sup> and even the audacious interpolation of some MSS of the Gospel of Luke (at 23: 45) accepting the 'darkness' as being an eclipse of the sun!<sup>18</sup>

There can only be one conclusion here. Thallus' work must have been extended by a Christian 'Pseudo-Thallus' (using Castor, Phlegon and 'Cassius Longinus') to shortly before AD 180 (when it is first attested in Theophilus). 'Pseudo-Thallus' inserted the interpretation of 'the darkness' at the crucifixion under the entry in which Phlegon had simply recorded a natural phenomenon marking the first year of the 202nd Olympiad, that is to say the eclipse of AD 29 (*FGrH* 257 F 16). The real Thallus was apparently older than Castor (with whom he is usually paired) and thus his last mentioned Olympiad may well have been the 167th (112–109 BC), exactly as found in Eusebius. His work is said to have begun with the Trojan War, and if this is right then the fragments predating this event (e.g. *FGrH* 256 FF 2–3) would also belong to Pseudo-Thallus, who would have extended it backwards, following 'Cassius Longinus', in order to include Moses (*FGrH* 256 F 5b). It is interesting that Pseudo-Thallus was later further confused with Phlegon himself. Origen (*Contra Celsum* 2.14; cf. 33, 59), attributes from memory to 'Phlegon' not only the mention of the 'darkness' at the crucifixion, but also some remarks about the foreknowledge of future events by Jesus! This is another fragment now to be restored to Pseudo-Thallus.

### 'Cassius Longinus'

But while Thallus, Castor and Phlegon, are at least names recognisable in their context, even if we know little or nothing about them as individuals, one must surely question the full name of the first author in the summary list, who lived after them as argued here. Can the *cognomen* in the reading 'Cassius Longinus' (*Κασεαυ Longenay*) be an attempted interpretation for a lost author in Eusebius' time (and more so in his copiers' time), whose common and apparently uninformative *nomen* was found by Eusebius in Julius Africanus? No ancient chronographer is known by these *nomina*, and the Armenian passage is the sole attestation (*FGrH* 259 T 1). A Cassius Longinus, a rhetorician who was executed by Aurelian in AD 272/3 for urging Zenobia to war (Suda, s.v. Λογγίνος ὁ Κάσσιος; cf. Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 265; Syncellus 470), was a celebrated teacher of Porphyry, the anti-Christian philosopher,<sup>19</sup> who was another major source of Eusebius. The connection attracted the attention of F. Jacoby (*FGrH* 259 Komm.), who believed that Porphyry's *Chronicle* will therefore have been a continuation of an unfinished work by his master.<sup>20</sup> But neither did Porphyry really write such a chronicle,<sup>21</sup> nor is it anywhere said that his

<sup>17</sup> Helm 1984: 174–175.

<sup>18</sup> See Kokkinos 1989: 152. For the historical chronology of the crucifixion, see also Kokkinos 1986; Kokkinos 1998a: 266–270. It makes one really wonder how could it be possible for any scholar today to argue for an AD 29 date for this event – see Depuydt 2002: 466–480; cf. MacAdam 1999; MacAdam 2003.

<sup>19</sup> See Brisson & Patillon 1994: 5221.

<sup>20</sup> Followed by Mosshammer 1979: 142.

<sup>21</sup> See discussion in Kokkinos 2009a: 10–12, in reference to Croke 1983a, and add Barnes 1994.

teacher have been interested in chronography. Besides, the time in which the rhetorician flourished does not fit – had he been the compiler of the table of Olympic Victors, he would not have stopped with the 247th Olympiad (AD 209–212).<sup>22</sup> So the *cognomen* ‘Longinus’, familiar from its use in the plebeian *gens* Cassia, seems to be inappropriate as a guess. It could simply have been added to qualify an otherwise unknown individual who carried the *nomen* ‘Cassius’. This has been widely accepted and suggestions offered for its replacement involved two people: Cassius Hemina and Cassius Severus (see *BNJ* 259).

Unfortunately not only do the dates of both run against the so far established order in Eusebius’ summary list, but moreover both wrote in Latin, and as far as we can see the sources cited by Eusebius in his *Chronographia* were all Greek without exception. Yet, one may say that they could have been found translated in Africanus, who should have been able to read Latin.<sup>23</sup> However, judging from the surviving fragments of L. Cassius Hemina, a Roman historian writing in the second century BC, no chronographical study can be attributed to him, and particularly not one which would have incorporated in Latin an early Olympiad chronicle!<sup>24</sup> Further, Hemina’s work consisted probably of five books or possibly up to seven,<sup>25</sup> but by no means 18 as given in the Armenian summary list of Eusebius. Hemina’s work is usually identified in the reference found in Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 21.4: *Cassius in historia*; cf. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 1.13.8), where the context is the genealogy of Jupiter. It is part of an argument by one Octavius Januarius defending Christianity against one Caecilius Natalis (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 65), trying to prove that Roman gods, such as Jupiter the son of Saturn, had been presented as having human origins by ‘Cassius’ (and others), and so Jesus’ background should not be surprising if he is worshipped also as god. However, having also mentioned ‘Thallus’ in the same context, Minucius cannot have meant Cassius Hemina, but the unknown ‘Cassius’ under discussion (that is to say ‘Cassius Longinus’) – the latest source of Pseudo-Thallus, as suggested above. It is generally agreed that Minucius depended on Tertullian, thus writing not earlier than the beginning of the third century AD,<sup>26</sup> and since Tertullian (*Ad Nat.* 2.12.26; *Apolog.* 10.7) had identified ‘Cassius’ not with Hemina but with one Severus, Minucius must have dropped the *cognomen*. This shows the perennial uncertainty over the ‘Cassius’ attested in Pseudo-Thallus. Tertullian’s alternative orator, Cassius Severus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 522),

<sup>22</sup> As Burgess (1999: 33, n. 12) notes, the rhetorician cannot be the author for he ‘was born c. 213, the date of the compilation of the Olympiad chronicle.’

<sup>23</sup> Julius Africanus seems to have been born a Roman citizen in the colony of Aelia Capitolina, which he calls ἀρχαία πατρίδα (*Cest.* 5.51; for an account of the study of Africanus’ work through the ages, see Thee 1984: 11–59). He was also entrusted with the task of instituting in Rome, πρὸς τὰς Ἀλεξάνδρου θερμαῖς, ἐν Πανθείῳ βιβλιοθήκη (*Cest.* 5.53; see speculatively Granger 1933; cf. Adler 2004: 540–541). Situated, it seems, by the Pantheon towards the Thermae Alexandrinae (see Platner 1926: 519), one assumes that this was a library both of Greek and Latin literature.

<sup>24</sup> For Cassius Hemina’s fragments, see *HRR* 1: 98–111; for a discussion and bibliography, see Forsythe 1990. The first history of Rome, written in Greek by Q. Fabius Pictor late in the third century BC, was translated into Latin only around the time of Cassius Hemina, showing only a basic chronographical interest by providing a date for the foundation of the city (‘in the first year of the eighth Olympiad’ according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *R.A.* 1.74.1 – that is to say 747 BC).

<sup>25</sup> Scholz 1989: 172.

<sup>26</sup> Note the existence of a Q. Caecilius Natalis, magistrate in Cirta in AD 210, as pointed out by G.H. Rendall in his introduction to Minucius Felix’s *Octavius* of the Loeb Classical Library (1931: 307). Also note that no Christian work in Latin is known to have been written before Tertullian’s *Apologeticum* at the very end of the second century AD – see conveniently Daniélou 1977.

who was exiled to Crete under Augustus and to Seriphus under Tiberius, while his books were burned (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.72; 4.21), is even worse a candidate. He is only known to have written court speeches (Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.116),<sup>27</sup> and even if Suetonius (*Cal.* 16) associates him broadly with historians, there is no indication that he would have been involved in chronography as such. The conclusion of the commentary in *BJN* 259 is therefore correct: that if the 'Longinus' of Eusebius is not Cassius Hemina (and we have seen that he is certainly not), he is 'simply an unknown author'.

## Julius Cassianus

Attempting to break through this impasse, a new identification is here in order. Suspending judgement on the *cognomen* 'Longinus', we may rethink the precise use of the *nomen* 'Cassius'. Can it be a coincidence that elsewhere we find a shadowy character who was supposed to be the earliest Christian 'chronographer', carrying the *cognomen* 'Cassianus', which derives from the *nomen* 'Cassius' as a result of adoption into a new family? Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.21/101.2) in his chronographical chapter, and in reference to the dating of Moses, says:

...we must now speak of the epoch of Moses, by which the philosophy of the Hebrews will be demonstrated beyond all contradiction to be the most ancient of all wisdom. This has been discussed with accuracy by Tatian in his book *To the Greeks*, and by Cassian in the first book of his *Exegetika* (...εἴρηται δὲ καὶ Κασσιανῶ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἑξηγητικῶν).

The passage is copied verbatim by Eusebius in his *Preparation for the Gospel* (10.12), and the Church historian is impressed enough to put it in context in his *Ecclesiastical History* (6.13):

He [Clement] mentions also Tatian's discourse *To the Greeks*, and speaks of Cassian as the author of a work on chronography (... Κασσιανοῦ ὡς καὶ αὐτοῦ χρονογραφίαν πεποιημένου).

It is clear that Eusebius had no direct access to Cassian, and the fact that his work had been lost at an early age, agrees with the comment of Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus* 38) that he searched hopelessly for it:

He [Clement] also mentions in his volumes of *Stromata* the work of Tatian *Against the Nations*, which we mentioned above, and a *Chronography* of one Cassian, a work which I have not been able to find (... *et Cassiani cujusdam χρονογραφίας, quod opusculum invenire non potui*).<sup>28</sup>

Clement's pairing of Cassian with Tatian is significant. Tatian of 'Assyria'<sup>29</sup> is thought to be the earliest Christian writer to employ chronology as an apologetic tool, for in his work *To the Greeks* he included seven chronographical chapters (31 and 36

<sup>27</sup> Winterbottom 1964.

<sup>28</sup> Translated in Greek by Sophronius (ed. Fabricius) as ... καὶ Κασσιανοῦ τινος χρονογραφίας, ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς εὕρεϊν οὐκ ἔδυνήθημεν.

<sup>29</sup> The term was used sometimes for 'Syria', and Tatian's contemporary satirist Lucian, who was also known as an 'Assyrian', had been born in Samosata of Commagene, now part of Syria – see Millar 1993:

to 41). Apparently neither his teacher, the first Christian self-styled philosopher, Justin the Martyr,<sup>30</sup> nor of what we know of possible earlier apologists – be it the anonymous author of the *Epistle to Diognetus*,<sup>31</sup> Quadratus and Aristides, or only Aristo of Pella in his *Disputation* – used chronological arguments. Tatian's work is dated by M. Marcovich between AD 165 and 172,<sup>32</sup> and if Cassian is to be identified with 'Cassius', the date of whose work can now be emended to Olympiad 2[3]8 (AD 173–176), then Tatian would have written a little before Cassian. Yet Marcovich decides to ignore the repeated, if allusive, arguments by R.M. Grant for dating Tatian's work precisely to AD 177/8.<sup>33</sup> If Grant is right, then Tatian's chronological source must have been his slightly older contemporary Cassian.

In any case, the question is who was this 'Cassian', who evidently kept his family's *nomen* as a *cognomen* after entering a new *gens* (which was his prerogative following regulation of Roman nomenclature)? Did he really precede Tatian, despite the order of the two names in the passage of Clement above? Luckily more information is at hand. At a later point, and after referring to Tatian again, Clement (*Strom.* 3.13–14, 17) re-introduces Cassian, this time as 'Julius Cassianus' (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 248).<sup>34</sup> So, for the sake of argument, if we are to save the Armenian reading of his full name in Eusebius, a case can be made by which what might originally have been [L.?] Cassius Longinus (cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 502: L. Cassius Longinus), could have been transformed after adoption to [L.?] Iulius Cassianus (cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 314: L. Iulius Flavianus).<sup>35</sup> Obviously this would have created a problem for any guess at his identity. More importantly, we are further told that Cassian was a student of Valentinus,<sup>36</sup> that he was a leading figure in Docetism (ὁ τῆς δοκῆσεως ἐξάρχων), that he made use of the apocryphal *Gospel According to the Egyptians*,<sup>37</sup> and that, having also written a treatise concerning continence and celibacy, entitled *On En-*

227. But one may wonder whether the term at this time was commonly applied to people with eastern origins around the Euphrates, or even beyond it.

<sup>30</sup> But it is true to say that most of Justin's works have been lost, and it would be difficult to disprove that chronological fragments belonging to him were incorporated in the *Exhortation to the Greeks* of Pseudo-Justin, dated to the early third century AD – see Riedweg 1994. In fact, Justin in his *Apology* 1.31.8 reveals a chronological system which reckons a historical period of 5000 years to the appearance of Jesus (with intervals of 3000, 2000, 1000 and 800 when prophets predicted his coming). He is also well aware of the Hellenistic Jewish chronological argument for the priority of Moses over the Greek philosophers (*Apol.* 1.23.1; 1.54–60).

<sup>31</sup> See now the arguments of Hill 2006, identifying the author of the *Epistle to Diognetus* as Polycarp of Smyrna.

<sup>32</sup> Marcovich 1995: 1–3. He believes that Tatian wrote in Rome after Justin's death ca. AD 165, and since Tatian returned to the East where he established his own school (Epiphanius, *Panar.* 46.1), dated by Eusebius to AD 172 (Helm 1984: 206e), this year is the *terminus ante quem* for his departure. Yet, it is not certain that the *To the Greeks* was written in Rome.

<sup>33</sup> Grant 1953; Grant 1988: 10–13. He believes that Tatian wrote after the persecutions in Gaul of AD 177 (Eusebius, *H.E.* 5.1.62), for which he sees an allusion in *Orat.* 6.2 among other arguments.

<sup>34</sup> For the personal name 'Cassianus', see *LGPN* 1 (Cyrene, 2nd–3rd centuries AD); *LGPN* 2 (Athens, 2nd–3rd centuries AD).

<sup>35</sup> With the same *cognomen* compare for example, P. Antonius Cassianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 818); M. Aurelius Cassianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1477); Ti. Licinius Cassius Cassianus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 181); and even Cn. Pompeius Cassianus Longinus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 617).

<sup>36</sup> A further inaccurate reading of the name of Cassian, as 'Cossian', is found in the list of Valentinus' students by Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* 1.8).

<sup>37</sup> A passage to which Cassian refers, is also found in the pseudo-epigraphic Second Epistle of Clement, which was one of the reasons that Cassian was once also thought to be its author – see Harris 1924.



*cratism* or *On Eunuchism* (Περὶ Ἐγκρατείας ἢ Περὶ Ἐὐνουχίας), his Encratite views were very similar to those of Tatian. Indeed Jerome (*Ep.* 48.2; cf. Epiphanius, *Panar.* 46–47) calls Tatian the *princeps encratarum*, besides also knowing, so it seems, Cassian's later work, if we accept the reading 'Cassianus' of the two oldest MSS in his *Commentariorum in epistolam ad Galatas* (3/526 – on Gal. 6: 8).

What is being revealed here is that while Cassian was clearly a Gnostic, Tatian shared with him at least the Gnostic tendency of Encratism. This would not disagree with their theological background, graduating from contemporary, but presumably opposing, Christian schools in Rome – the first from the Gnostic school of Valentinus (AD 136/40–155/66), who came from Alexandria, and the second from the quasi-Orthodox school of Justin (ca. 148–163/8),<sup>38</sup> who came from Hellenised Phoenician-Samaritan Shechem, now the Roman colony of Flavia Neapolis. Opinions as between early Christian schools will have been exchanged more freely than we appreciate. Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 1.28.1; cf. Epiphanius, *Panar.* 46.1) believed that Tatian was misled into a Gnostic path only after the death of Justin (AD 163/8), but Justin in his *Apology* (early in the 150s AD) does not classify Valentinus with the heretics, and he may even be praising Valentinus' student Ptolemaeus (*Apol.* 2.2). It seems that Justin changed his mind subsequently, for he attacks the Valentinians in his *Dialogue* (35.6), which is thought to date ca. AD 155, but which may belong to a later period. Therefore Tatian could have left Rome (while already influenced by Gnosticism) before the death of Justin around the time of the writing of the *Apology*, even if Tatian's own school in the east was established only in AD 172 according to Eusebius.<sup>39</sup> Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 1.28.1; cf. Epiphanius, *Panar.* 48.1) hints that Tatian's Encratite views were also very close to the other major heretical school in Rome, that of Marcion of Pontus (AD 144–160). At all events, the slight seniority of Valentinus to Justin may suggest the slight seniority of Cassian to Tatian.

## The Origins of Christian Chronography

It is thus striking to realise that ancient chronography became a subject among Christians first in a Gnostic circle (even if the initial idea may already have existed in Justin's quasi-orthodox work), and that it obviously followed the path of the long-established Hellenistic Jewish and Phoenician-Samaritan chronography, which began in Alexandria in the third century BC (e.g. Demetrius),<sup>40</sup> continued in Jerusalem (e.g. Eupolemus) and then arguably in Shechem (e.g. Cleodemus Malchus and Theophilus), while ending in Pnias (in the royal court of which Justus of Tiberias would have worked).<sup>41</sup> It must

<sup>38</sup> Justin's school was not fully orthodox (*Dial.* 80.2–5), if such was meant to be represented by the Roman 'bishops' during his time (i.e. Pius, Anicetus and Soter). For early Christianity in Rome and the Christian schools, see the important study of P. Lampe (2003) – on the present question of Justin, see pp. 376, 390.

<sup>39</sup> See above note 32.

<sup>40</sup> See Kokkinos 2003a: 9–11.

<sup>41</sup> Croke 1983b: 121–122, seems to have cut a significant corner by saying that early Christian chronography (beginning with Justin) simply based itself on the tested arguments of Josephus (no doubt a reference primarily to the *Against Apion*). However, Christian use of Josephus becomes evident to us for the first time only in Theophilus of Antioch (ca. AD 180) – see Hardwick 1989.

be noted that Justin was born around the time of the publication of Justus' work entitled Ἰουδαίων Βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς Στέμμασι, which covered chronography from Moses to the death of Agrippa II (AD 100), and which was named similarly to the works of Demetrius and Eupolemus, both called Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ Βασιλέων.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, Justus is reckoned to be a major source of Julius Africanus,<sup>43</sup> who was a major source of the chronographical work of Eusebius, as mentioned above.

The link to Hellenistic Jewish chronography may be traced in another fragment of Cassian, attributed to him by Alfred von Gutschmid, which is to be found in the closing words of a fragment of Eupolemus also preserved by Clement (*Strom.* 1.21/141.4–5).<sup>44</sup> The MS indeed reads *Kasianou* and the attribution is sound (*FGrH* 723 F 4), although it has been challenged on the grounds that the work of 'Julius Cassianus' would not have been chronographical, for it is not described as such by Clement himself (only by Eusebius), and this is presumably why Jerome failed to locate it.<sup>45</sup> Yet, this challenge is weak. Nor was Tatian's *To the Greeks* chronographical in nature, but, as we have said, it adopted the apologetic tool of chronology over seven chapters. Cassian's *Exegetika* would have done the same, conceivably in more detail. Further, the fact that Eupolemus' fragment in question ends with a date calculated by the consuls of 40 BC, may only refer to Cassian's source, and thus it is not a problem for von Gutschmid's view, as has been asserted.

The genre of *Exēgētika* would have employed various tools. It is worth noting that the Greek title itself, which was also carried earlier by the 24 books of the Gnostic Basilides in Alexandria, who was a student of Menander of Samaria and past associate of Cassian's teacher Valentinus (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.24; Clement, *Strom.* 4.12; Hippolytus, *Philosoph.* 7.2; cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.7.6–7), seems to imitate the tradition of the *exēgētai* going all the way back to Classical Athens in the 5th century BC. Among these professional interpreters of sacred knowledge, came later Clidemus, who wrote his *Exēgētikon* in ca. 350 BC (*FGrH* 323 F 14), but who went on to engage himself with the writing of local history (thus also combining genealogy upon which much of chronography was based), becoming the first Athenian 'Atthidographer'.<sup>46</sup> Interestingly, Tertullian (*De Anima* 52) is aware of Clidemus, of whom he says that he died from an excess of pride when he received a golden crown for his historical excellence. It is further worth noting that the five books of the lost work of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who would have written even before Basilides, possibly as early as under Trajan (AD 98–117),<sup>47</sup> were named Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξηγήσεις, while they included at least a relevant discussion to chronology in the form of an approving reference to what appears to have been Gnostic 'millenarianism' (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.39.12; Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 18) – perhaps not unlike that of Justin (see above note 30).

<sup>42</sup> For the argument of connecting Justin to Justus in reference to the Ascalonite origins of Herod the Great (*Dial.* 52.3), see Kokkinos 1998a: 104–106, 346; for Justus' work, see Kokkinos 2003b: 163–167; for Demetrius and Eupolemus, see Holladay 1983: 51–156.

<sup>43</sup> Gelzer 1880: 246–265; Bowman 1987: 365–366.

<sup>44</sup> See Holladay 1983: 155–156, n. 121; cf. discussion in Wacholder 1974: 40–44.

<sup>45</sup> Walter 1961.

<sup>46</sup> See Pearson 1942: 57–69; Jacoby 1949: 56; McInerney 1994: 22.

<sup>47</sup> For a recent statement on the date of Papias, see Bauckham 2006: 13–14.

## Conclusion

The identity of 'Cassius Longinus' in Eusebius' summary list of sources for the Olympic Victors, does not fit the homonymous rhetorician executed in AD 272/3. Neither does it fit the historian L. Cassius Hemina of the second century BC, nor the orator Cassius Severus under Augustus and Tiberius. Given the date of his work, corrected here as ending in AD 173–176, and given its context in chronography, 'Cassius Longinus' may be identified with the first Christian chronographer Julius Cassianus, or Cassian, writing under Marcus Aurelius. His work (largely based on Thallus, Castor and Phlegon) must have been adopted by a Christian Pseudo-Thallus shortly before AD 180.

Chronography, as a tool to be used by Christians, may have been suggested in the writings (and perhaps the lost *Syntagma* – *Apol.* 1.26.8) of the quasi-Orthodox Justin the Martyr (ca. AD 150), who would have been influenced by the Hellenistic Jewish and Phoenician-Samaritan schools of thought ending with Justus of Tiberias (AD 100), as explained above. However, as a subject for extensive research it appears to us only in the Gnostic Cassian (ca. AD 173–176) and Tatian (ca. AD 177/8), before proceeding to Pseudo-Thallus (ca. 179) and Theophilus of Antioch (ca. AD 180). The early connection of chronography to a branch of Gnosticism would agree at least with the special Gnostic interest in arithmosophy (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 2 pref.), as much as in the 'chiliastic' or 'millenarian' beliefs found first among Gnostics (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.28; 7.25).

Chronography was subsequently taken up partly by Irenaeus of Lyons in his *Adversus Haereses* (ca. 185), which included two chapters on Daniel bearing on chronology (5.25–26); clearly by Clement of Alexandria in his extraordinary chapter in *Stromateis* 1.21 (ca. AD 190), but for some reason not in his *Protreptikos pros Helēnas*; by Tertullian of Carthage in his *Apologeticum* 19 (ca. AD 197); presumably by a certain Judas in a lost *Commentary on Daniel* (AD 202 – Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.7.1); and by Pseudo-Justin in his *Logos Parainetikos pros Helēnas* 9–13 (early third century AD). A first major re-assessment was undertaken by the polymath Julius Africanus in his *Chronographiai* (AD 213–221), and continued by Hippolytus of Rome in his *Chronika* (AD 234). After a century of Christian effort, the pagan critic Porphyry of Tyre had therefore a lot to reckon with in the chronological chapters included in his works, particularly in the lost *Against the Christians* (ca. AD 270–295), before Eusebius took over chronography on a massive scale in his *Chronika* (ca. AD 311).

It should be noted that this Christian activity ran in parallel to other apologies post-Tatian (ca. AD 177/8), which did not come to deploy chronography – at least as far as we know: Athenagoras of Athens (*Apology*), Claudius Apollinarius of Hierapolis (*To the Greeks*), Miltiades (*Against the Greeks*), Melito of Sardis (*Apology*), Gaius (*Dialogue with Proclus*), Minucius Felix (*Octavius*), Cyprian (*Quod idola dei non sint*), Arnobius (*Adversus Nationes*), Lactantius (*Divinae Institutiones*), and even Athanasius (*Contra Gentes*), slightly later than Eusebius. More importantly, it should also be noted, that shortly before Cassian and Tatian, writing under Marcus Aurelius, the pagan world had shown a renewed interest in the subject of chronography, as much as 'scientific' chronology (that is to say involving technical astronomy), with Phlegon of Tralles writing his *Olympiads* under Hadrian, and Claudius Ptolemy writing his monumental *Almagest* under Antoninus Pius. It was on the work of Ptolemy that Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria

(AD 189–232), based himself later (at least according to the Coptic tradition),<sup>48</sup> to produce the first Christian table of Paschal calculations, in an attempt to solve the persisting problem posed by the Quartodecimans.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, W. (1992): Eusebius' *Chronicle* and its Legacy, in: H.W. Attridge, G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity and Judaism*, Detroit, MI.
- Adler, W. (2004): Sextus Julius Africanus and the Roman Near East in the Third Century, *Journal of Theological Studies* 55: 520–550.
- Adler, W., Tuffin, P. (2002): *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, Oxford.
- Aucher, J.B. (1818): *Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopi Chronicon Bipartitum, Pars I: Historico-Chronographica*, Venice.
- Barnes, T. (1994): Scholarship or Propaganda: Porphyry *Against the Christians* and its Historical Setting, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 39: 53–65.
- Bauckham, R. (2006): *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Bowman, S. (1987): Josephus in Byzantium, in: L.H. Feldman, G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, Detroit, MI: 362–385.
- Brisson, L., Patillon, M. (1994): Longinus Platonicus Philosophus et Philologus: I. Longinus Philosophus, *ANRW II*, 36.7: 5214–5299.
- Burgess, R.W. (1997): The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronici Canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Journal of Theological Studies* 48: 471–504.
- Burgess, R.W. (1999): *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*, Stuttgart.
- Burgess, R.W. (2006): Apologetic and Chronography. The Antecedents of Julius Africanus, in: M. Wallraff (ed.), *Julius Africanus und die Christliche Weltchronistik*, Berlin: 17–42.
- Cramer, J.A. (ed.) (1839), Excerpta Eusebiana, in: *Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, vol. 2, Oxford: 118–163.
- Christensen, P. (2007): *Olympic Victor Lists and Ancient Greek History*, Cambridge.
- Croke, B. (1983a): Porphyry's Anti-Christian Chronology, *Journal of Theological Studies* 34: 168–185.
- Croke, B. (1983b): The Origins of the Christian World Chronicle, in: B. Croke, A.M. Emmett (eds.), *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, Sydney–Oxford: 116–131.
- Daniélou, J. (1977): *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, Engl. trans. D. Smith and J.A. Baker, London–Philadelphia, PA.
- Depuydt, L. (2002): The Date of Death of Jesus of Nazareth, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122: 466–480.
- Diller, A. (1935): The Text History of the Bibliotheca of Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 66: 296–313.
- Draws, R. (1982): Review of A.A. Mosshammer's *The Chronicle of Eusebius*, *Classical Philology* 77: 178–183.
- Forsythe, G. (1990): Some Notes on the History of Cassius Hemina, *Phoenix* 44: 326–344.
- Gelzer, H. (1880): *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, vol. 1, Leipzig.
- Grafton, A., Williams, M. (2006): *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius and the Library of Caesarea*, Cambridge, MA.
- Granger, F. (1933): Julius Africanus and the Library of the Pantheon, *Journal of Theological Studies* 34: 157–161.

<sup>48</sup> See discussion in Mosshammer 2008: 109–116.

- Grant, R.M. (1953): The Date of Tatian's Oration, *Harvard Theological Review* 46: 99–101.
- Grant, R.M. (1988): Five Apologists and Marcus Aurelius, *Vigiliae Christianae* 42: 1–17.
- Greenwood, T. (2008): "New Light from the East": Chronography and Ecclesiastical History through a Late Seventh-Century Armenian Source, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16: 197–254.
- Hardwick, M.E. (1989): *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius*, Atlanta, GA.
- Harris, J.R. (1924): The Authorship of the So-called Second Epistle of Clement, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 23: 193–200.
- Helm, R. (ed.) (1984): *Eusebius Werke VII: Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, Berlin.
- Hill, C.E. (2006): *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp*, Tübingen.
- Holladay, C.R. (1983): *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 1, Chico, CA.
- Jacoby, F. (1949): *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford.
- Karst, J. (ed.) (1911): *Eusebius Werke V: Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt*, Leipzig.
- Kokkinos, N. (1986): Which Salome Did Aristobulus Marry?, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 118: 33–50.
- Kokkinos, N. (1989): Crucifixion in AD 36: The Keystone for Dating the Birth of Jesus, in: E.J. Vardaman, E.M. Yamauchi (eds.), *Chronos, Kairos, Christos: Nativity and Chronological Studies Presented to Jack Finegan*, Winona Lake, IN: 133–163.
- Kokkinos, N. (1998a): *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*, Sheffield.
- Kokkinos, N. (1998b): The Relative Chronology of the Nativity in Tertullian, in: E.J. Vardaman (ed.), *Chronos, Kairos, Christos II: Chronological, Nativity, and Religious Studies in Memory of Ray Summers*, Macon, GA: 119–131.
- Kokkinos, N. (2003a): Second Thoughts on the Date and Identity of the Teacher of Righteousness, *SJC* 2: 7–15.
- Kokkinos, N. (2003b): Justus, Josephus, Agrippa II and his Coins, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22: 163–180.
- Kokkinos, N. (2009a): Re-dating the Fall of Sardis, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 28: 1–23.
- Kokkinos, N. (2009b): Ancient Chronography, Eratosthenes and the Dating of the Fall of Troy, *Ancient West and East* 8: 37–56.
- Lampe, P. (2003): *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*, Engl. trans. M. Steinhauser, New York.
- MacAdam, H.I. (1999): ΣΚΟΤΟΣ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ: Luke 3:1, 23:44 and the Four First Century Solar Eclipses at Antioch, *Irish Biblical Studies* 21: 2–39.
- MacAdam, H.I. (2003): New Testament Chronology (Luke 3:1–2 & 23:44–5) and Solar Eclipses at Syrian Antioch: A Byzantine Datum, *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 3: 37–44.
- McInerney, J. (1994): Politicizing the Past: the *Atthis* of Kleidemos, *Classical Antiquity* 13: 17–37.
- Marcovich, M. (ed.) (1995): *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos / Theophili Antiocheni ad Autolyicum*, Berlin.
- Millar, F. (1993): *The Roman Near East, 31 BC – AD 337*, Cambridge, MA – London.
- Mosshammer, A.A. (1979): *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*, Lewisberg, PA.
- Mosshammer, A.A. (2008): *The Easter Computus and the Origins of the Christian Era*, Oxford.
- Pearson, L. (1942): *The Local Historians of Attica*, Philadelphia, PA.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968): *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Platner, S.B. (1926): *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, rev. by T. Ashby, Oxford.
- Riedweg, C. (1994): *Ps.-Justin (Markell von Ankyra?)*, *Ad Graecos de vera religione (bisher 'Cohortatio ad Graecos')*, 2 vols., Basel.
- Schoene, A., Petermann, H. (eds.) (1875): *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo: Eusebi Chronicorum Liber Prior*, Berlin.
- Scholz, W. (1989): Zu L. Cassius Hemina, *Hermes* 117: 167–181.
- Schürer, E. (1986): *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, vol. 3.1, rev. by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman, Edinburgh.

- Schwartz, E. (1894): Apollodoros, *RE* 1.2: 2855–2866.
- Thee, F.C.R. (1984): *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*, Tübingen.
- van Voorst, R.E. (2000): *Jesus Outside the New Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Wacholder, B.Z. (1974): *Eupolemus. A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*, Cincinnati–New York.
- Wallraff, M. (2006): Die neue Fragmentensammlung der Chronographie des Julius Africanus Bemerkungen zur Methodik anhand einiger Dubia vel Spuria, in: M. Wallraff (ed.), *Julius Africanus und die Christliche Weltchronistik*, Berlin–New York: 45–59.
- Wallraff, M. et al. (eds.) (2007): *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments*, Berlin–New York.
- Walter, N. (1961): Der angebliche Chronograph Julius Cassianus. Ein Beitrag zu der Frage nach den Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus, in: *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Patristik. Erich Klostermann zum 90. Geburtstag dargebracht*, Berlin: 177–192.
- Winterbottom, M. (1964): Quintilian and the *Vir Bonus*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 54: 90–97.