

PHILO OR SANCHUNIATHON? A PHOENICEAN COSMOGONY

Herennius Philo of Byblos is the subject of a notice in the *Suda*, which states that he was a grammarian born in Nero's time who lived to such an advanced age that he was still composing works in the reign of Hadrian. The titles listed include: *On the Acquisition and Choice of Books*; *On Cities and their Eminent Citizens*; and *On the Reign of Hadrian* (= Fr. 1 Jacoby).¹ His name, like that of Flavius Josephus, could imply the patronage of a Roman family;² we may suppose that, like Porphyry and Maximus of Tyre, he was a Phoenician by origin who had adopted the tongue and culture of the Greeks.

Philo's most famous labour was to translate from his native language the works of a certain Sanchuniathon, for whose writings and biography he was perhaps the only source.³ The existence of this figure, or at least the veracity of Philo's account of him, has always been doubted and frequently denied;⁴ but modern research has shown that he bears a name which might have belonged to a Phoenician, and that many of the ingredients of the work attributed to him are of high antiquity and native provenance.⁵ Thus Philo must have employed a Phoenician source, on which he would have no reason to bestow a fictitious name. It need hardly be said, however, that a belief in the existence of a document from the hand of Sanchuniathon does not oblige us to credit the early date that Philo assigns to him, or the veracity of all that is asserted on his behalf.

It has been said by Orientalists that the name Sanchuniathon cannot have been current at an epoch so early as that to which Philo appeals.⁶ It is evident to all that there is much in the present version of the history that was written to solicit the taste of Hellenistic readers,⁷ and must therefore be the translator's contribution. This essay

¹ The fragments can be found in F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, iii (Leiden, 1958), pp. 802–24. Fragments of Philo and other historians will hereafter be referred to under the name of Jacoby with the relevant number.

² For the name Herennius Philo see Jacoby F5 (Lydus) and F9 (Origen), both taken from reliable witnesses. The only other Greek to bear the name Herennios appears to have been the pupil of Ammonius Saccas: see Pauly–Wissowa, *RE* 8 (1912), 649ff.; for the Oscan origin of the name and its Roman bearers see pp. 662ff.

³ On the compatibility of our sources with this statement and with one another see Appendix.

⁴ The most useful modern work, though I shall here disagree with some of its conclusions, is A. I. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos* (Leiden, 1981). Baumgarten holds, as I do, that the history is a Hellenistic treatment of Phoenician materials. P. Nautin, 'Sanchuniathon chez Philo de Byblos et chez Porphyre', in *Revue Biblique* 56 (1949), 272, treats the Sanchuniathon of Philo as a Hellenistic fantasy, though admitting that the name itself is of Phoenician provenance. The accuracy of Eusebius, though not as Baumgarten asserts (45 n. 26) the existence of Sanchuniathon, is denied by C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, ii.1265–79. The chief proponent of a more credulous estimate of Philo has been O. Eissfeldt, some of whose writings are cited below. For a judicious review of the many controversies surrounding Sanchuniathon, see J. Barr, 'Philo of Byblos and his "Phoenician History"', *BJRL* 57 (1974), 17–68.

⁵ The most important modern work on the Phoenician ingredients has been O. Eissfeldt, *Taautos und Sanchuniathon* (Berlin, 1952).

⁶ Barr (1974), 36 and n. 2, after Albright but against Eissfeldt.

⁷ E.g. the equation of Phoenician names with Greek counterparts, and the eclectic borrowings from other national historians, treated below.

is concerned with one of the earliest chapters of the *History*, the *Cosmogony*, which I do not think it possible to date to an earlier period than that of the Achaemenids. The arguments for this view are presented in detail in the second part; in the first I offer some cursory observations on the methods and aims of Philo, and the caution that a knowledge of these methods and aims must impose on a modern reader of his works.

I

During the Hellenistic and Roman periods antiquity was the proof of national virtue. The conquests of Alexander had annexed to the Greek world a number of ancient kingdoms, whose usurping potentates were soon at war.⁸ Nation was thus induced to compete with nation, and the works of such men as Berossus, Manetho and Hecataeus of Abdera are the progeny of cultures with long histories which had suffered the eclipse of political power. On the one hand, these cultures sought the esteem of foreign masters, correcting the disingenuous representations by which they had hitherto been deceived; on the other hand, peoples who had been rivals for a millennium could be expected to strive as earnestly for literary pre-eminence as once for dominion over lands and men.

Though Hellenistic Phoenicea had no part in this royal theatre, the polemics between the nations were sustained throughout the centuries which intervene between Hecataeus and Philo. It may be that before his period Philo's countrymen addressed themselves to a smaller audience,⁹ but under the Roman Empire the obscurer nations found a more audible voice. Philo perhaps aspired to that metropolitan celebrity which was attained for the Jews by Josephus in his own time and at a later one for the Phoeniceans by Maximus and Porphyry of Tyre. His works display the characteristic marks of a national history in at least three important respects.

(a) He imitates, in his reduction of mythology to a tale of human vicissitudes, the notable examples of Euhemerus and Hecataeus of Abdera.

(b) He equips his Sanchuniathon with the same sources and the same methods of research that were alleged to be available to other such inquirers.

(c) He adopts and refines the practice, conventional in Phoenicea as elsewhere, of attacking the Jews.

These remarks may be illustrated in detail, as follows.

(1) Hecataeus of Abdera, the first to defend a race against its detractors, was also the first to assert that the gods of mythology were mortal and glorified men.¹⁰ His most illustrious imitator in this respect was Euhemerus, the unhistorical character of whose narrative is partly concealed by the parsimony of its style. Containing little more than names, genealogies and locations, the excerpt preserved by Lactantius from Ennius' Latin rendering is palpably the model for those which Eusebius copied from Philo.¹¹ Philo resembles Euhemerus in his assertion that the generations of gods were mortal dynasties, and indicates his acquaintance with other Hellenistic philosophies by his practice of restricting the title *Θεός* to the authors of beneficent

⁸ On this see O. Murray, 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship', *JEA* 56 (1970), 141–71.

⁹ That is, against the Jews. See Menander F1 Jacoby on the solution of Solomon's riddles by an adviser of Hiram of Tyre; Mochus F1 Jacoby on the trade between Hiram and Solomon; Dios F1 Jacoby on the failure of the 'tyrant' Solomon to solve the riddles of Hiram.

¹⁰ Hecataeus is no. 264 in Vol. iiiia of Jacoby. On his anticipations of Euhemerus see Murray (1970), 151 and n. 4.

¹¹ Euhemerus is no. 63 in Jacoby, Vol. i; for the Ennian passage see F14.

inventions.¹² It thus appears that this version of Sanchuniathon evinced a generic colouring which it cannot have acquired before appearing in its Greek dress.

(2) Philo makes the same asseveration on Sanchuniathon's behalf that others made about Euhemerus:¹³ that, whereas the mythographers had laboured to embellish the truths of history, he alone had brought them naked into the light of day:¹⁴

But the more recent of the sacred writers have eschewed the record of real events from the beginning, and, fashioning myths and allegories, and, inventing a sympathy with meteorological occurrences, have set up mysteries and added a great deal of nonsense to them. [Sanchuniathon] however, encountering the hidden writings deposited in the shrines of Ammon, works which were not known to all, disseminated knowledge of these himself. In completing the work he put away the original myth and allegory, and accomplished his purpose, until the priests who came after him elected to conceal his work and return to the mythical style (*P.E.* 1.9.25 = Fr. 1 Jacoby).

An excerpt made by Eusebius from an unnamed work by Porphyry plots the itinerary of another group of archives:

Sanchuniathon of Berytus speaks the truest things concerning the Jews, as his report is closest to them in place and vocabulary. He received his records from Hierombalos, priest of the God Jeu, who, having dedicated the book to Abibalos King of the Berytians, was endorsed by him and the scholars around him. The times of these men fall even before the Trojan War, and come close to that of Moses, as the Phoenician King-lists show. Sanchuniathon wrote faithfully in the Phoenician tongue the whole history of antiquity, gathering information from the records of every city and the archives of the temples. He wrote it down in the time of Semiramis Queen of Assyria, who is said to have lived either before or at the time of the Trojan war. Philo of Byblos translated Sanchuniathon's works into Greek. (*P.E.* 1.9.21 = Fr. 1 Jacoby).

In both quotations the testimony appears to have been concocted from familiar materials. Manetho and Hecataeus both professed to have their information from priests whose highest divinity was Ammon,¹⁵ while the fantastic investigations of Euhemerus are said to have led him both to the pyramids and to a locality where the people of Ammon had ousted those who originally frequented the shrine of Zeus.¹⁶ The earliest Greek historians, Hecataeus of Miletus and Herodotus, had both invoked the sacerdotal history of Egypt,¹⁷ so that a multitude of precedents conspired to demand the invention for Sanchuniathon of an itinerary which appears to be unparalleled in Middle Eastern documents from the time of the Trojan War.

Our author is one who was neither afraid to fabricate nor bold in fabrication. Hierombalos and Abibalos of Berytus are unknown to Classical or Phoenician studies, but history knows of more than one Abibalos in other Phoenician cities and of a Hierom of Tyre.¹⁸ The use of the Trojan War as an extreme point of antiquity

¹² See Philo F10 (on Taaautos and Sourmobelos), F3 (on Taaautos) at *P.E.* 1.10.36 and 38. Though the plural form is more widely applied, the singular appears to be the privilege of the scholars. On the Hellenistic deification of benefactors in chronographic writing see Murray (1970), 160–1.

¹³ See Euhemerus F2 Jacoby at Diodorus Siculus 6.1.3; T4c Jacoby (Aetius). The language applied by Porphyry to Sanchuniathon resembles the encomium of Eunapius on Porphyry himself at *Lives of the Philosophers* 456 Boissonade.

¹⁴ I follow the rendering of Nautin (1949), 261–6. Despite the strictures of Baumgarten and others, it seems to me not improbable that Philo should have included the shrines of Ammon among the repositories whose archives Sanchuniathon is said to have perused. The assimilation of Hermes to Thoth would encourage such a conceit.

¹⁵ See Manetho F1 Jacoby. For Ammon in Hecataeus see F4 Jacoby. All the information concerning Egypt in Hecataeus F1–F6 is of the kind that one would expect to obtain from priests.

¹⁶ See Euhemerus F3 Jacoby.

¹⁷ See Herodotus, *Histories* 2.143.4.

¹⁸ See Baumgarten (1981), pp. 59ff. on the bearers of the name Abibalos. Hierom is more commonly known to modern readers as Hiram: for the form see Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 3.22. In this author, as in the Phoenician chroniclers, Hiram himself is the son of an Abibalos.

is another conventional answer to the conventional boasts of Jewish and Greek chronographers;¹⁹ since Sanchuniathon shows himself acquainted in his treatise on the alphabet with the works of Zoroaster,²⁰ Philo's date is not consistent with even the putative character of his source.

(3) Porphyry's statement that Sanchuniathon wrote a Jewish history is by no means incompatible, as Baumgarten supposes, with his having indited the history of all nations; in fact the latter claim implies the first.²¹ The Jews might be expected to figure in Philo's history as objects of particular animosity, since they were the common butt of all peoples in antiquity, but had found in his contemporary Josephus an apologist who could not be judged unworthy of respect. In perusing the strictures of Manetho, Philo might recollect the long antipathy which had existed between the religions of Phoenicea and the prophets of northern Israel, and he would have known that Phoenician chroniclers such as Menander, Mochus and Dios, when they describe the trade between Hiram and Solomon, are always (despite the Jewish nationality of our witnesses) observed to express some disparagement of the Jewish sovereign. Porphyry would not have commended Philo unless his evidence were hostile, and the citation of authorities whose dates approach those of Moses would no doubt be the preliminary to irreverent speculation upon the origins of the Chosen Race.

That Philo wrote of the Jews, but lent no ear to their pretensions, appears from a passage in Origen (*Contra Celsum* 1.15), in which he is said to have stigmatized as an imposture a laudatory account of Jewish history and customs which was ascribed to Hecataeus of Abdera.²² He is also cited as evidence for the curious tradition that Moses received the title Alpha because his body was covered in leprous spots.²³ The calumny was advanced by three grammarians, all nearly contemporary;²⁴ but if, as Gager has argued, the name was invented by one of these grammarians,²⁵ it is Philo who was the most likely to devise it, as a corollary to his own notion that the letters of the Phoenician alphabet arose from depictions of living men.²⁶ Whereas Cronos bequeathed to the Phoenician alphabet an icon of power, it was only the humiliation of Moses that enables us to liken him to the first character of a late and derivative script.

II

The silence of Eusebius on this head is that of the shrewd polemicist who knows that he is more likely to spread than to stifle a heathen prejudice if he pauses to abuse it. Porphyry, for his part, is reluctant to confess that Philo enhanced the claims of his countrymen not only by impugning the Hebrew Scriptures, but by despoiling the mythology of the Greeks.

¹⁹ See Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I, *passim* and such Christian apologists as Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 19, Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 31, Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 3.21. All these authorities argue for the superior antiquity of Moses, which Porphyry himself, indeed, appears to have conceded.

²⁰ F4 Jacoby at *P.E.* 1.10.52. On the classification of this work see my Appendix.

²¹ Baumgarten (1981), p. 59.

²² On the spurious character of this work see M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, i (Jerusalem, 1974), pp. 23–4 and O. Murray, 'Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship', *JTS* 18 (1967), 342ff.

²³ F11 Jacoby, from Helladius *apud* Photium.

²⁴ See J. Gager, 'Moses as Alpha', *JTS* 20 (1969), 245–6.

²⁵ Gager (1969), 247–8, suggesting that the statement means 'We grammarians call Moses Alpha'. I do not know why Gager assumes that the Philo in question was the Alexandrian, when he was neither a grammarian nor a hater of the Jews, and does not say anything in his extant writings which is susceptible of Helladius' interpretation.

²⁶ Philo F3 Jacoby at *P.E.* 1.10.37.

Bearing in mind the characteristics delineated above – the propensity to magnify the distinction of Phoenicea at the expense of other nations, the zealous but artless borrowing from notorious models, the ostentatious antipathy to the Jews – we may now turn to Philo's cosmogony, the atheistical tenor of which is clear enough to Eusebius, though one of its cardinal sources has escaped his indignant eye:

He [Taaautos] says that the origin of all was a caliginous and windy air (or an exhalation of caliginous air) and a dense, benighted Chaos. This, he says, was infinite, and through many aeons no bounds were set to it. 'But when,' he says, 'the Spirit fell in love with its own first principles, and a mingling occurred, the interweaving of the two was called Pothos [Desire]... And from this interweaving of the Spirit was born Mot [Mud or Slime]... And from this came every seed of creation and the birth of all things... And [intelligent creatures] were called *Ζωφασημῖν*, that is, Watchers of the heavens. And it was fashioned anew in the form of an egg. And Mot shone forth, together with the sun, the moon, the stars and the great signs... And the air divided [creating thunder and clouds]... And when the thunder sounded, the aforementioned intelligent creatures awoke and were attracted to the sound, and man and woman (*ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ*) moved on the land and sea (P.E. 1.10.1–5 = Fr. 2 Jacoby).

The author of this cosmogony Philo implies to have been a Phoenician man by the name of Taaautos, who as the inventor of writing received divine honours throughout the world under the names of Hermes and Thoth.²⁷ While Eissfeldt has shown that the appellation may be of Phoenician origin,²⁸ it remains possible that it is merely a whimsical variant of the Egyptian one, designed to confer upon the work of Philo the verisimilitude of a recondite name. None of the inventions of Philo's Taaautos is known to have been ascribed to his supposed Phoenician original, and all are attested elsewhere as works of Thoth. Egypt is his inheritance from Cronus,²⁹ and Sanchuniathon unearthed his works in the 'shrines of Ammon'. The information furnished in one excerpt, that Taaautos, having rescued religious knowledge from the extravagances of the vulgar, suffered eclipse and required illumination in his turn,³⁰ is a jejune double of Philo's testimony concerning the fate of his more immediate source.

This is not to deny that Philo has availed himself of matter which is as ancient as he pretends. Fragments unearthed at Ugarit reveal that the shadowy demon Mot combined a seat in the underworld with the Lordship of the waters.³¹ Pothos exercises a creative function only in one other antique cosmogony, which the scholar who preserved it declares to be of Phoenician origin. It will be evident that this and the cosmogony of Taaautos have not a little in common:

According to this author [Eudemos] the Sidonians postulate before all things Desire and Mist. When Desire and Mist had mingled as the two first principles, Air and Wind were engendered. By Air they signify the unmixed nature of the mind, by Wind the living representation of mind which proceeds from this. From both of these came an Egg... (Damascius, *De Principiis* 1.125).

The claims of the passage to represent a Phoenician original must be treated with respect, but it has other traits which are no mere Semitisms. The anaphoric use of *καί* to open a sentence is rare in Philo and no more common even in other cosmogonies of the Near East.³² It is, however, very much in the style of that Priestly record which

²⁷ So one gathers from F1 at P.E. 1.9.24. Since Taaautos is one of Philo's earliest characters and cannot have written the history of his descendants, we must suppose that he was consulted for his theological acumen rather than for his knowledge of the past.

²⁸ Eissfeldt (1952), pp. 12–24; See Barr (1974).

²⁹ F3 Jacoby at P.E. 1.10.38.

³⁰ So F10 Jacoby.

³¹ So M. Pope, *Job* (Garden City, 1961), pp. 73–4, with the endorsement of Baumgarten (1981), pp. 111–12.

³² For the few analogies to the contents that can be gleaned from Semitic literature, see O. Eissfeldt, 'Das Chaos in der Biblischen und in der Phonizischen Cosmogonie' in his *Kleine Schriften*, iii (Tübingen, 1963), pp. 258–62. As to the use of *καί*, consultation of J. B. Pritchard,

opens the book of Genesis, and at least one critic has felt that the resemblance between the language and the style of these two documents is the result of calculation rather than chance.³³

The word 'creation' (κτίσις) is usually enough to betoken the use of a Jewish source.³⁴ The formula ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ serves, as in the Septuagint at Genesis 1:27, to indicate the union of two sexes in humanity. Since God cannot be allowed to divide the light from darkness, the darkness divides itself. The first illumination coincides with the creation of sun and moon; by postponing the birth of these bodies to the third day after light came into being, the author of Genesis embarrassed many readers, and a similar modification has occurred in other treatments of his theme.³⁵ The other great act of separation in Genesis, that of the land from the sea, is presupposed but not described.

Whether or not the Ζωφασήμιν are the Watchers, the fallen angels, who people the dawn of the world in the Book of Enoch,³⁶ it appears that the Priestly document, itself not thought to be earlier than the time of the first Achaemenids,³⁷ has been treated in a fashion that bespeaks a much later date. The mating of Spirit and Chaos is found typically as an episode of those fantastic narratives which the Gnostics evolved from the stately diction of the Hebrew original,³⁸ and the origins of Gnosticism are to be sought in the period after Alexander, if not in events that were subsequent to the birth of the Christian Church.³⁹

Why should Philo adapt such a narrative to his Phoenician history? The opening verses of Genesis were famous in late antiquity even to those who had never opened the Jewish Scriptures,⁴⁰ and Philo's desire to excel in every Hellenistic commonplace would naturally induce him to employ it as the source of his own exiguous fabrication. Nor, since only the oldest of authorities could give a true account of the Creation, could he have chosen a better method of exhibiting the superior antiquity of his nation to that of Moses than by insinuating that in Tautos he had discovered

Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (Princeton, 1955) reveals no case in which the incidence of the conjunction is so high. The reason is, no doubt, that the epic style is more prolix; but the avoidance of the epic style in this excerpt is itself a significant fact.

³³ W. B. Scott, *Hermetica*, ii (London, 1925), pp. 112–17 on *Hermeticum III*. The latter text affords the closest parallel: with regard to the Jewish influence on the *Hermetica* see C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935).

³⁴ See Foerster in G. Kittel (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, iii (Stuttgart, 1938), pp. 1022–7.

³⁵ See, e.g. *Hermeticum* iii.2b, where, after a series of dichotomies, light appears at last when the heavens 'are seen' complete with the astral bodies.

³⁶ For this suggestion see Baumgarten (1981), pp. 114–15. On the other hand, the allusion may be to the Hellenistic commonplace that man alone of animals was so made as to contemplate the heavens. The form of the word, at least, is undoubtedly Semitic.

³⁷ For a modern contribution to the tortuous discussions on this subject see J. A. Emerton, 'The Priestly Writer in Genesis', *JTS* 39 (1988), 381–400.

³⁸ See the collection of texts in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (Leiden, 1977). Note especially *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, described on p. 152 as 'an esoteric interpretation of Genesis 1–6', which has the Spirit (or Incorruptibility) become enamoured of the watery Chaos, and descend with the result that it quickens man.

³⁹ See R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and the Early Church* (New York, 1964) for the theory that Gnostic literature was precipitated by the Fall of Jerusalem. The most convincing proponent of the Jewish origins of Gnosticism is G. Quispel, whose *Gnostic Studies* were collected in 1974 (Istanbul).

⁴⁰ On Galen see R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* (Oxford, 1949) pp. 11 and 23–37; on Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 9.9 see D. A. Russell, *Longinus: On the Sublime* (Oxford, 1964) pp. 92–3; and on Numenius, Fr. 30.5 Des Places see M. J. Edwards, 'Atticizing Moses? Numenius, the Fathers and the Jews', *Vigiliae Christianae* 43.3 (1989).

Moses' source. In his revision Euhemeristic principles have divested the Priestly account of all particulars that might suggest the operation of the hand of God; we are left to infer that the man whom the Jews represented as the original of Hermes⁴¹ has overlaid his original with allegories of a kind that Sanchuniathon wrote to dispel.

The gods were venerated in ancient Phoenicea as elsewhere; their absence from this cosmogony betrays the author's apprenticeship to Euhemerus and Hecataeus of Abdera. Thus, while large claims have been advanced by certain scholars for the antiquity of the cosmogony of Taaautos,⁴² there are three considerations – its irreligious character, its indebtedness to the style of Jewish authors and the ease with which these features can be explained by an inspection of the methods and aims of Philo himself – which suffice to demonstrate that it is a Hellenistic imposture, though many of the ingredients employed must antedate its present form.

New College, Oxford

M. J. EDWARDS

APPENDIX

I have assumed in this essay two positions not universally received among those who have worked on this subject: (a) that Porphyry's evidence on Philo is compatible with that of Eusebius; (b) that Philo was the only source for ancient knowledge of Sanchuniathon's work and life. Proof of either position is impossible, but I briefly tender here the reasons for my adherence to them.

(a) Porphyry states (Eusebius, *P.E.* 1.9.21) that Philo translated the *Phoenicean History* in eight books; Eusebius himself (1.9.23) that the whole work consisted of nine. It seems to me all but incredible that Eusebius should either have failed to observe the contradiction or, observing it, have left it unremarked. I therefore suggest that by 'the whole work' (τὴν πᾶσαν πραγματείαν) he intended to denote something more than the *History*, and I believe the ninth book to have been Sanchuniathon's treatise *On the Phoenicean Alphabet*.

This work is referred to at *P.E.* 1.10.45 with the formula πάλιν ἐκ τῶν Σαγχουνιάθωνος μεταβάλλων. Since Eusebius, having quoted a number of passages serially from the *History*, has recently turned from this to Philo's own work *On the Jews*,⁴³ it is natural to suppose that by this new rubric he means to adduce a new source. The character of the excerpt that follows the rubric differs in many respects from that of the *History*: the subject is the birth of the letter (θ), not the origin of the gods, and the informants are not buried in the archives of imaginary temples, but are rather familiar characters like Ostanes and Zoroaster, who supply not so much historical authority as corroborative parallels in the manner that is proper for an expository work. This monograph will therefore have been the last book in a corpus of nine.

(b) Athenaeus alludes to Sanchuniathon in conjunction with other Phoenicean historians at *Deipnosophistae* 3.100, but, since he displays no further knowledge of him, we need not suppose that he knew the Phoenicean author from any source but Philo's version. The *Suda* supplies a catalogue of works otherwise unknown: *The*

⁴¹ See Artapanus in Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.27.6ff.

⁴² As by Eissfeldt (1963). For a collection of more cautious notices see Barr (1974), 20 and n. 2.

⁴³ One fragment of which is introduced at *P.E.* 4.16.6 as a quotation from the first book of the *History*. I agree with Baumgarten *ad loc.* that Philo will have been quoting his own translation of Sanchuniathon in his treatise against the Jews, just as Cicero cites his own translations in his *Cato* (78–81) and *De Divinatione* (1.13–16).

Philosophy of Hermes, The Egyptian Theology and an *Aegyptiaca*. While every one of these subjects finds a place in Philo's History, it is unlikely that a Phoenician would be credited with separate publications under such titles. It therefore seems most reasonable to conjecture that these works were not distinct, but were rather sections of the *Phoenician History*, a composition which, like many others, had not come down to the lexicographer in its original form.