

2016

# The Case for Another Son of P. Quinctilius Varus: a Re-examination of the Textual and Scholarly Traditions Around Joseph. BJ 2.68 and AJ 17.288

Daniel J. Crosby

*Bryn Mawr College*, [djcrosby@brynmawr.edu](mailto:djcrosby@brynmawr.edu)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/gsas\\_pubs](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/gsas_pubs)

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), and the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

---

## Citation

Daniel Crosby, "The Case for Another Son of P. Quinctilius Varus: a Re-examination of the Textual and Scholarly Traditions Around Joseph. BJ 2.68 and AJ 17.288," *Journal of Ancient History* 4 (2016): 113-129.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/gsas\\_pubs/3](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/gsas_pubs/3)

For more information, please contact [repository@brynmawr.edu](mailto:repository@brynmawr.edu).

Daniel J. Crosby\*

## The Case for Another Son of P. Quinctilius Varus: a re-examination of the textual and scholarly traditions around Joseph. BJ 2.68 and AJ 17.288

DOI 10.1515/jah-2015-0017

**Abstract:** This paper addresses the issue of the historicity of another, older son of P. Quinctilius Varus who is attested in Joseph. *AJ* 17.288, but not in the parallel version at *BJ* 2.68. Modern scholarship, as evidenced by Ladislav Vidman (1998) and Klaus Wachtel (1999), finds itself at a loss as to which opinion, that of Walther John (1958) or of Meyer Reinhold (1972), to support. Whereas John rejects the evidence for an older son of Varus in *AJ* and proposes L. Nonius Asprenas (cos. suff. 6 CE) instead, Reinhold tersely rebuts John, supporting the validity of the text. This article examines the textual and prosopographical bases upon which scholars have built their cases for and against the existence of an older son of Varus. In the process, it is shown that there is greater reason to take the evidence for another son of Varus at face value than to follow John's problematic argument, and further, that Reinhold's article left unexamined significant details upon which his argument needed to be built.

**Keywords:** Josephus, Quinctilius Varus, Roman prosopography, Roman Syria, Roman military history

In the year 4 BCE, a rebellion arose in Judea against the Roman legions stationed there. Judea fell under the province of Syria, whose governor was P. Quinctilius Varus, a man most often remembered for the loss of the three legions under his command in the Teutoburg Forest in 9 CE. Responding to the situation in Syria, Varus gathered his forces near Ptolemaïs and sent out a portion of his army with a man in his *cohors amicorum*, whom Josephus names Gaius in *De Bello Judaico* (*BJ*) but calls the son of Varus in *Antiquitates Judaicae* (*AJ*). The latest scholarly opinion, represented by Ladislav Vidman and Klaus Wachtel in *PIR*<sup>2</sup>, accepts two potential identifications of this figure: that proposed by Walther John, who

---

\*Corresponding author: Daniel J. Crosby, Bryn Mawr College, 101 N. Merion Ave. Box C-1661, Bryn Mawr, PA, 19010-2899, E-Mail: djcrosby@brynmawr.edu

supports an identification of the individual with L. Nonius Asprenas (cos. suff. 6 CE), and that of Meyer Reinhold, who supports an identification with a rarely acknowledged older son of the infamous Varus.<sup>1</sup> There are concerns with both opinions, however. John's argument is exceedingly problematic logically in light of the text and more recent evidence, and Reinhold's opposition to John amounts merely to a pair of footnotes in which he cites the opinion of Paul von Rohden, whom John argues against, and asserts that John had rejected von Rohden "without adequate grounds." In fact, Reinhold's opinion on the identity of the figure in the works of Josephus is an inadequately supported assumption (and the major premise), and this assumption is what is cited as evidence in *PIR*<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the differing accounts of this event in the works of Josephus, our only literary source, are as muddled as the modern approaches to those passages with regard to the identity of the person involved. This paper represents an effort to bring lucidity to this difficult issue in scholarship.

In order to understand the modern scholarly tradition, it will be helpful first to look at the primary sources upon which the scholars have made their cases, since the difficulties begin here. Niese's *editio maior* of *BJ* has the following:

μέρος τῆς στρατιᾶς εὐθέως ἔπεμπεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν γειτινῶσαν τῇ Πτολεμαίδι καὶ Γάιον ἡγεμόνα τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων, ὃς τοὺς τε ὑπαντίαςαντας τρέπεται καὶ Σέπφωριν πόλιν ἐλῶν αὐτὴν μὲν ἐμπύρησι, τοὺς δ' ἐνοικοῦντας ἀνδραποδίζειται.

Varus at once sent a detachment of his army into the region of Galilee adjoining Ptolemais, under the command of his friend Gaius; the latter routed all who opposed him, captured and burnt the city of Sepphoris and reduced its inhabitants to slavery.<sup>2</sup>

The passage, as it is found in this edition, presents no real difficulties. Gaius is clearly in charge of a contingent of Varus' army, and after he takes the soldiers to Galilee, he sacks the town of Sepphoris. However, this is not the same as the story presented in Josephus' *AJ*, which was completed between 93 and 94 CE at least fourteen years after the Greek edition of *BJ*.<sup>3</sup> Niese's *editio maior* of *AJ* reads:

σταθείσης δ' ἐν Πτολεμαίδι πάσης ἤδη τῆς δυνάμεως μέρος τι ταύτης τῷ υἱῷ παραδούς [καὶ] ἐνὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων Γαλιλαίου ἐξέπεμπεν πολεμῆν, οἱ ὑπὲρ τῆς Πτολεμαίδος ἐχόμενοι

<sup>1</sup> Vidman, (1987a), 368; (1998), 336. Wachtel (1999), 19, 30. John (1958), 251–255. Reinhold (1972), 119.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph. *BJ* 2.68 (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray).

<sup>3</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 20.267. For a concise argument relating to the second Greek edition of *AJ* in antiquity, see Thackeray (1930), x. The earliest edition of *BJ* was actually composed in Aramaic. Joseph. *BJ* 1.3, 6. See Thackeray (1967), 23–29.

κατοικοῦσιν. ὃς ἐμβάλων τοὺς τε ἀντικαταστάντας εἰς μάχην τρέπεται καὶ Σέπφωριν ἔλων τοὺς μὲν οἰκήτορας ἡνδραποδίσαστο, τὴν δὲ πόλιν ἐνέπρησεν.

When, therefore, his whole army had assembled in Ptolemais, Varus turned over part of it to his son and to one of his friends, and sent them out to fight against the Galilaeans who inhabit the region adjoining Ptolemais. His son attacked all who opposed him and routed them, and after capturing Sepphoris, he reduced its inhabitants to slavery and burnt the city.<sup>4</sup>

Here, Varus seems to be giving command of the soldiers “to his son and to one of his [Varus’] friends,” and at least a pair of modern translations renders the passage in such a way.<sup>5</sup> This translation is the one that von Rohden prefers. In fact, von Rohden attempts to harmonize the two versions of the story in his work by naming the “one of his friends” referred to in *AJ* “Gaius” as he is named in *BJ*. Varus, then, had given command both “to his son and to Gaius,” and Josephus, in his opinion, merely neglected to mention the son of Varus in *BJ*.<sup>6</sup> The difference between these two accounts, which is examined in detail below, is the central issue for which later scholarship has attempted to account.

Paul von Rohden’s case seems to be made reasonably well enough, but John challenges his conclusions in the *Realencyclopädie*. John’s major premise for his argument is that the word καὶ in the passage of *AJ* is a corruption since it is not well attested in the manuscript tradition.<sup>7</sup> His observation is certainly true to some extent. The manuscripts *A* (s. xi) and *M* (s. xv) omit the conjunction,<sup>8</sup> leaving the phrase τῷ υἱῷ παραδοῦς ἐνὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων, where “one of his friends” functions appositionally. Thus, John prefers this reading of manuscripts *A* and *M*, and according to him, Josephus, in both *BJ* and *AJ*, meant us to understand a single person. More evidence from the text itself could be used to corroborate

<sup>4</sup> Joseph. *AJ* 17.288–289 (trans. R. Marcus).

<sup>5</sup> Whiston, (1895); Ricciotti (1949), 195 n. 68.

<sup>6</sup> *Non vidi* von Rohden (1890). The relevant passage is cited by John (1958), 253.

<sup>7</sup> John (1963), 965; John (1958), 253. There are only two authoritative editions of the text that call the positive reading of the conjunction/adverb into question: Niese’s *editio maior* and *editio minor*. He places the καὶ in square brackets. The brackets do not appear in his edition of the epitome of *AJ* that was published in 1896. Niese’s note in the app. crit. (1890), “καὶ om. AM Lat.,” is followed almost verbatim in later editions like Marcus and Wirkgren (1969). See Naber (1893), who does not have a note in his *adnotatio critica* that is relevant to the issue. Neither the Marcus and Wirkgren nor the Naber editions have the καὶ in brackets. Some of the MSS. of the Latin version indicate that *cum* might have been used in the place of the strong conjunction *et* (*infra*). For the relative quality of the various editions, see Feldman (1984), 20–21, 24.

<sup>8</sup> See Niese’s app. crit. in his *editio maior* (1890). Niese’s note that the Latin version of *AJ* omits the conjunction here certainly seems to be correct based on a compilation of a number of MSS.

John's conclusion about the singular number of the actor. Both versions of the story resume their prose with nominative, singular relative pronouns and third-person, singular verbs. Although it is possible to represent a group as a singular unit grammatically,<sup>9</sup> it is not the norm. To complicate matters further though, καί may not even be a conjunction here; it could be the adverb, "also," used to indicate an additional connection to Varus.

There is some evidence in support for the reading of the word καί in our text, although that support does not extend all of the way to the archetype(s). A small collation of some manuscripts of the Latin version of *AJ* indicate that the translator(s), who some believed began work at the instigation of Cassiodorus (sixth century CE),<sup>10</sup> easily understood all of the Greek up to the point where καί would have appeared in the exemplar—this includes the translation *partem (unam) filio tradens*, "giving (one) part [of the army] to his son."<sup>11</sup> There is a broader range of readings in our witnesses following where we would expect to find the conjunction. This difficulty here may be taken to indicate that the copyists were just as confused as more recent scholars about what the translator(s) made of καί and its relation to the preceding and succeeding phrases. Additionally, the reading of *cum* in some of the manuscripts is very interesting since it allows for a second agent of Varus, as a conjunctive καί might be interpreted to do, and it vindicates the use of the singular verbs that follow in the Latin just as they do in the Greek. In this way, the presence of *cum* in some of the manuscripts and the diversity of readings following where we would expect the conjunction/adverb to be found

<sup>9</sup> This possibility is, at least, recognized by Mason and Chapman (2008), n. 421.

<sup>10</sup> Cassiod. *Inst.* 1.17.1. For possible translators, see Blatt (1958), 17–18.

<sup>11</sup> A complete collation of the MSS. would be unmanageable. I provide a number of transcriptions of the Latin MSS. of *AJ* that I was able to consult. The sigla correspond to those used by Blatt (1958), 114–116. *Congregato itaq(ue) in tolo(m)aida om(n)i exercitu (l) exinde parte(m) filio tradens. unu(m) amicoru(m) suor(um) galileos desti(-)nat expugnatu(m). qui sup(er) ptolomaida(m) habitabant.* (MS. p, s. xii or xiii) Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5047: fol. 115ra16–18. *Congregato itaq(ue) in ptholomaida om(n)i (l) exercitu et inde parte(m) filio tradens. [] cum uno (l) amicor(um) suor(um) galileos destinat expugnatu(m). q(u)i sup(er) ptholomaida(m) habita\ba\nt.* (MS. Ne, s. xi or xii<sup>1/4</sup>) Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5045: fol. 68rb3-4. *Cong(re)gato (l) i\g(itur) i(n) ptholomaida om(n)i exercitu. exin(de) parte(m) una(m) filio tradens destinat eu(m) in galilea(m) ad expugnandos eos q(u)i sup(er) ptholomaida(m) habitant.* (MS. Pd, s. xiii) Kungliga Biblioteket, Codex Gigas: fol. 170ra81–83. *Congregato itaq(ue) in ptolo(-)maida o(mn)i exercitu(m) et in(de) p(ar)te(m) filio tra(-)dens. cu(m) uno amicor(um) suor(um) galileos (l) destinat expugnatu(m). qui s(upe)r ptolomaidam habitabant.* (MS. pa, s. xiii or xiv) Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5050, Flavius Josephus: fol. 332ra30–b1. *Congregato itaq(ue) i(n) ptho(-)lomaida o(mn)i ex(er)citu exinde p(ar)te(m) filio trade(n)s unu(m) a(m)icor(um) suor(um) galileos destinat expugnatu(m) q(u)i super tptholomaida(m) h(ab)itant.* (MS. par, s. xv<sup>1</sup>) Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5051: fol. 200rb31–34.

seem to be additional evidences in favor of the theory that the word καί may have been present in the text of *AJ* as early as the translation of *AJ* into Latin, which happened around the sixth century CE. If καί is part of the original reading, there is no difficulty in understanding the meaning of Josephus. Either he is talking about two individuals, a son of Varus and “one of his friends” (i.e., καί conjunctively)—this is not preferable in light of the clear singularity of the agent of Varus in *BJ*—or he is referring only to the son of Varus (i.e., καί adverbially). If the phrase τῷ υἱῷ παραδούς ἐνὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων is the original one, as John holds, this reading can be justified too since there is a pair of other places—there are six more if we exclude the number εἷς as a criterion for our search (*infra* note 18)—in the works of Josephus in which such a phrase appears and clearly indicates a single individual.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, there is limited reason to prefer one reading to the other—with and without the καί, the phrases can convey an equivalent meaning—and the evidence is still clear that the text is referring to a son of Varus. That being said, it is easier to believe along with Koenen that καί was “a subsequent addition;” for it seems more likely that the word would enter into the textual tradition as an attempt to clarify the meaning that a reader took rather than fall out of it.<sup>13</sup>

What, then, are we to make of a Gaius in *BJ* and a son of Varus in *AJ*? It might be supposed that the easiest solution would be to propose that the two are one in the same. It would, indeed, seem to resolve our predicament easily if one could demonstrate that Gaius was the praenomen of the son of Varus referred to in *AJ*, but there is simply no Gaius to be found among the known members of the Quinctilii Vari.<sup>14</sup> The easy solution is untenable, and answers need to be sought within the text of *BJ*.

<sup>12</sup> κομίσαι μὲν Ἀντίφιλον ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὸ φάρμακον ἕνα τῶν Ἀντιπάτρου φίλων (Joseph. *AJ* 17.70); Νικολάω δ' ἐνὶ τῶν φίλων (Joseph. *AJ* 16.29).

<sup>13</sup> Koenen (1970), 267 n. 103 believes that the καί was “a subsequent addition” (“eine nachträgliche Hinzufügung”). Copyists do occasionally infer their own material into their transcriptions in order to clarify meaning. Since the Greek without the καί is indeed a bit clumsy, this theory ought to be retained as the best explanation of the evidence. If this theory is true, the “subsequent addition” likely happened sometime before the Latin translation in the sixth century CE and around the same time that the text began dividing into families.

Please note that the argument of this paper is unaffected by the acceptance or rejection of the proposed originality of the καί in *AJ*. All of the witnesses of the *AJ*, of which the writer is aware, affirm that Varus gave a portion of his army to his son. The issue of the presence of καί in the MSS. only holds importance to von Rohden's theory, which was mentioned above, and John's reasons for supposing that Josephus had copied an error from his source (*infra*).

<sup>14</sup> The Quinctilii Vari seem to have been a prominent family in the Roman state at least as early as the mid-fifth century BCE when Sex. Quinctilius Sex. f. P. n. Varus was elected consul of 453

The manuscripts of *BJ* present a more difficult problem than first meets the eye, for there is a variant reading that comes from the Latin version, which may date back to the fourth century CE: *amici sui galli filio his rectore praeposito*, “when the son of his [Varus] friend Gallus had been put in command.”<sup>15</sup> Thus, the son of some Gallus led the troops to Galilee according to this Latin version. Interestingly, the word *υἱός* does not appear in the Greek manuscripts of *BJ*, only (*filio*) in the early Latin translation of *BJ* and all the manuscripts, both Latin and Greek, of *AJ*. There certainly seems to be an issue with the textual tradition of *BJ*: there is a great discrepancy between the early Latin version and the later Greek manuscripts that affects the understanding of the personality in the passage significantly. Unfortunately, the independent version or “free paraphrase” of *BJ* in Latin, whose author is uncertain, is not of any help here since Varus only appears in the trial of Herod’s son, Antipater.<sup>16</sup> The difficulties with this passage in *BJ* have led Steve Mason to propose an interesting theory.

---

(Livy 2.32). Excepting evidence from filiation, two other Sexti are known: Cicero mentions one (*post Red.* 9), and the other is the father of our P. Quinctilius Varus. Two others may have existed as well: one may have been a moneyer, and the other, a pontifex in 69. Broughton (1960), 450. Two Marci are known: a M. Quinctilius L. f. L. n. Varus, who was elected *tribunus militum consulari potestate* in 403 during the era of the “Struggle of the Orders” (Livy 5.1); and M. Quinctilius Varus, who fought in battle with his father Publius, the praetor of 203 (Livy 29.38; 30.1, 18). Additional Publilii appear as a *flamen martialis* of the mid-second century (Livy 44.18), as a praetor in 167 (Livy 45.44), and in one of Cicero’s defenses (Cic. *Pro Cluentio* 19). Finally, there is a single T. Quinctilius Varus, who was a legate under C. Calpurnius Piso in 185 (Livy 39.31, 38). Thus, there appear to be only five *praenomina* among the Quinctilii Vari: Sextus, Lucius, Publius, Marcus, and Titus.

**15** The critical editions of the text done by Niese (1894 and 1895), Naber (1895), and Thackeray (1967) all agree on the reading and call attention to it; some even call attention the reading in *AJ*. Niese’s editions are the only ones to comment further, saying, “Lat. [version] which seems to have rendered the name of the general more correctly” (1894) and “Lat. [version] seems to have read Γαλλον” (1895). The reading of the Latin version that is cited by these editions is affirmed in a number of Latin MSS: (s. ix) St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 627: fol. 33va25–28; (s. ix<sup>1</sup>) Cologne, Fondation Bodmer, Cod. Bodmer 98: fol. 50vb24–31; (MS. *W*, s. ix<sup>2</sup>) Wolfenbüttel Herzog Augustus Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 23 Weiss: fol. 40va2–5; (MS. *p*, s. xii or xiii) Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5047: fol. 149vb50–52; (s. xii) Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5057: fol. 31va23–26; (MS. *Pd*, s. xiii<sup>1</sup>) Kungliga Biblioteket, Codex Gigas: fol. 183vb99–100; (s. xiv) Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS. Latin 5059: fol. 38rb37–41; and (1475) Valencia Universitat de Valencia, Bibliothek Historica, BH MS. 836: fol. 62r12–14; (1479) Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS. Latin 16032: fol. 54v14–16. Also Greek MS. *P* has Γαίον ἡγεμόνα τὸν αὐτοῦ φίλον. Perhaps the Latin translator(s) somehow conflated the slightly similar storyline of the incident involving a Cestius Gallus, who also invaded Galilee. Although found in the same book of *BJ*, the story took place in 66 CE at Joseph. *BJ* 2.502–512.

**16** Ps.-Hegesipp. *De excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae* 1.44–45.

“There is room for confusion with the words themselves, since copyists who did not know the referents might easily confuse ‘Gaius’ (ΓΑΙΟΣ) with ‘son’ (ΥΙΟΣ) and possibly even ‘Galilee’ in the accusative (ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑΝ) with a form of ‘Gallus’ (ΓΑΛΛΟΝ) ... the simplest solution ... might be that ΓΑΙΟΣ misreads an original ΥΙΟΣ.”<sup>17</sup>

In Mason’s opinion, the original version of the text may have been the phrase υἰὸν ἡγεμόνα τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων or τὸν αὐτοῦ φίλον (MS. P). Mason must have leaned partially on the stable reading of τῷ υἱῷ in *AJ* and the reading of *filio* in the Latin version of *BJ* and of *AJ* in the process of drawing this conclusion—it only makes sense to rely on the more stable reading of the parallel version to inform the more difficult and not the other way around as other scholars seem to have done (*infra*). Again, the understanding of the passage is not made difficult by the syntax, since there are similarities between this and other passages in Josephus. When Josephus presents a figure as a friend of a particular person, instead of employing εἷς, as in *AJ* 17.288, or τις with the genitive plural τῶν φίλων, he can simply omit εἷς or τις. This phenomenon can be found six other times in the works of Josephus, so although it seems to be an odd construction, it is neither without precedent nor unclear.<sup>18</sup> The meaning is quite apparent in these examples: someone is “among the friends” of someone else.

If Mason’s theory about the confusion of Γάιος for υἰός is accepted, the issue is not resolved, however. This proposition accounts only for the difference between the Greek *BJ* and *AJ*. One still needs to explain the origin of *galli* in the Latin version of *BJ*. Mason’s suggestion that it may have been confused with “ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑΝ” does not seem likely since that word is translated only a few words earlier in the Latin. Alternatively, one can see how the translator(s) or copyists might confuse Γάιος and Γάλλος, but then one needs to explain whence came *filius* in the Latin translation. A satisfactory resolution does not seem to be

<sup>17</sup> Mason and Chapman (2008), n. 421. Koenen (1970), 267 n. 103 concurs about the possible confusion of Γάιος and υἰός in the MSS., but he draws the opposite conclusion, namely that the reading in *AJ* should be τῷ Γάιῳ παραδούς ἐνὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων. However, it is difficult to justify the proposed original use of Γάιῳ since the article is used with names when the individual is “previously mentioned ... or specially marked as well known.” Smyth (1984), 1136. The only other person named Gaius in book seventeen of *AJ* was apparently in Rome at that time, nor is the figure who took command of the soldiers either famous or contrasted directly with another Gaius. Vitucci (1974), 624 n. 2 believes only that Josephus indicated a legate of Varus named Gaius.

<sup>18</sup> καὶ τῶν φίλων Ὀλυμπον (Joseph. *BJ* 1.535); Φρόντωνα δὲ τῶν φίλων (Joseph. *BJ* 1.416); τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων Εὐπόλεμον (Joseph. *AJ* 12.514); Σαββίῳ τῶν ἐκείνης φίλων (Joseph. *AJ* 15.47); Οὐιτέλλιος Μάρκελλον τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων ἐκπέμφας (Joseph. *AJ* 18.89); Ἄτομον ὀνόματι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων Ἰουδαῖον (Joseph. *AJ* 20.142).

attainable.<sup>19</sup> Ultimately, Mason decides that he must lean more on the authority of the Greek manuscripts of *BJ*. He is, after all, editing and commenting on just that work, and it would be difficult to justify emending the Greek text with the Latin when there is no disagreement between the Greek witnesses.<sup>20</sup> He retains the reading of “Gaius.” However, it is very curious that the Greek *AJ* and the witnesses of the early Latin translations of both *BJ* and *AJ*, which were done separately,<sup>21</sup> indicate that a form of  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  was read in their respective exemplars. This should be enough evidence to suspect that a form of  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  was found somewhere around this place in the archetype of *BJ*.

Additionally, the *praenomen* “Gaius,” standing alone as it is in *BJ*, appears to be an exceedingly odd feature. It is not in keeping with Josephus’ style of nomenclature. This can be shown by a word study on *praenomina* in Josephus. Taking a count of the occurrences of eight common *praenomina* in Josephus—Gaius, Lucius, Marcus, Publius, Quintus, Sextus, Tiberius, and Titus—we can demonstrate how Josephus and his aides preferred to use them. From this study it can be shown that when *praenomina* are provided in our texts, another identifying feature is usually included. These include: 1) the *nomen* or *cognomen* of the person (92 times); 2) filiation (7 times); 3) the filiation of another individual (22 times); or 4) the referent is made clear either by the proximity of the *praenomen* to other passages about that particular individual or by the person’s fame, like the emperors Tiberius, Gaius, and Titus (403 times). Only twice in the works of Josephus are we left wondering to whom the stated *praenomina* belong: the citation in the *BJ* with which we are dealing here, and *BJ* 6.188—this is a far more detailed story about how a certain Lucius, who was apparently in the army of Titus during the siege of Jerusalem, foolishly lost his life when trying to catch his friend as he jumped from a burning building. Although the Greek manuscripts of *BJ* are universal in their opinion that Gaius was the man’s name, Josephus’ style of nomenclature should provide additional evidentiary weight to the suspicion that there was some kind of error very early in the textual tradition.

---

**19** On the possible infiltration of Cestius Gallus, see the note above.

**20** There should be some word on the condition of the Greek MSS. of *BJ*. A late-third century papyrus fragment, Graeca Vindobonensis 29810, which contains only seventy-four words in whole or in part, indicates that the current state of the Greek MSS. of *BJ* is not as solid as had once been thought. Feldman writes: “The fact, however, that there are nine places ... where the fragment differs with all the manuscripts collated by Niese leads us to conclude that the text of the ‘War’ ... is even less secure than we had supposed.” Feldman (1984), 25.

**21** Blatt believes that this fact is adequately demonstrated by the observation that the translation of *BJ* appears to be less literal than the translation of *AJ*. Blatt (1958), 17.

It should be surprising, given the clarity of *AJ*, at least, regarding the son of Varus that scholarly opinion over the last century has doubted or denied the evidence of his existence, although von Rohden first took *AJ* at face value. He proposed in the *PIR*<sup>1</sup> that Varus must have had a wife previous to Claudia Pulchra, whom he married in the last decade of the first century BCE. “Varus took a wife, whom I do not know, around 25 and 23 BCE, by whom he sired that son to whom he gave a part of his army in the year 4 BCE in order to lead it.”<sup>22</sup> If Varus had a son that was old enough to lead troops in 4 BCE, he could not have been the son of the woman who, at that time, was his only known wife.<sup>23</sup> Varus needed to have had a wife before the year 20 BCE in order to have a son with whom to serve in Syria. Who this woman was, he did not speculate. There was no additional evidence available at the time to support his supposition.

Walther John opposed von Rohden’s submission of a second wife for Varus, and to make his point, he attacked the legitimacy of the evidence for a son of Varus in Josephus, evidence upon which von Rohden’s case hinged, the reading of the manuscripts of *AJ*: “Because the καί in the textual transmission of the text is faulty, one can further assume that here Josephus has, in fact, adopted an existing textual corruption from his source.”<sup>24</sup> Based on the uncertain transmission of the καί, he proposed two different ways to understand what had happened in the text. First, he claimed that the name “Gaius” actually referred to the oldest son of C. Sentius

---

**22** von Rohden (1898), 119.

**23** In von Rohden’s analysis of another attested son of Varus (*infra*), he states (1898, 118): “Having been born not before the year 6 BCE, he is, therefore, different from the son of P. Quinctilius Varus, who, having gone with his father into Syria, received from him a part of the army for the purpose of leading it in the year 4 BCE.” He is almost certainly incorrect, though, about the possible years of birth for this son of Varus by Claudia Pulchra. On this matter, see John (1958), 251–252.

**24** John (1963), 965: “Da in dem Text der ant. das καί mangelhaft überliefert ist, kann man weiter vermuten, daß Iosephos hier eine Textverderbnis bereits aus seiner Quelle übernommen hat, ....” cf. Koenen (1970), 267 n. 103. John (1958), 253: explains further: Josephus “... statt τῷ τῆς ἀδελφῆς υἱῷ in seiner Vorlage τῷ υἱῷ las, an den ältesten Sohn des Saturninus Gaius dachte und so die völlig abwegige Lesart im bell. Jud. zustande brachte, während er später in den Antiquitates seine Quelle getreuer wiedergegeben hätte.” Josephus “... instead of τῷ τῆς ἀδελφῆς υἱῷ had read τῷ υἱῷ in his original, and he thought about Gaius the oldest son of Saturninus, and thus the fully aberrant reading in *BJ* comes into existence, whereas later in the *AJ*, he would have more faithfully reflected his source.” Josephus’ source was perhaps Nicolaus of Damascus (first century BCE). He was an eyewitness to the events in Judaea during this time period, particularly the trial of Herod’s son Antipater: see *FHG* 3.351–354, 423–426 (frag. 5, 95), and *FGrHist* 90. This historian was an important source to Josephus for other events in Syria in earlier books, including books 15–18. Büchler (1897), 311–349; Shutt (1961), 84–92. Unfortunately, the known fragments of Nicolas’ works do not give additional insight into this particular event.

Saturninus, the man who had immediately preceded Varus' tenure as the governor of Syria, and that Josephus mistakenly applied this name to the figure in *BJ*.<sup>25</sup> Second, since he believed that the textual tradition of *AJ* was corrupt, he sought to emend the text to read the following: τῷ <τῆς ἀδελφῆς> υἱῷ παραδούς, ἐνὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φίλων. The “son of his sister,” to whom the passage would then refer, would be L. Nonius Asprenas (cos. suff. 6 CE). John argued that if one traces back his *cursus*, it is discovered that Asprenas would have been around the right age before his quaestorship to serve on his uncle's staff in Syria, and since the same L. Nonius Asprenas ends up going to Germany with Varus, “it is very well possible, indeed nearly probable” that he did just that. Having concluded that these passages were not references to a son of Varus, there was no need to agree with von Rohden's conclusions regarding a wife for Varus previous to Claudia Pulchra.<sup>26</sup>

There are several concerns about John's argumentation. 1) His proposition is far too tenuous. Gaius is among the most common *praenomina* in Roman culture, and there is a very short list of others. Any number of other Gaii might be offered just as well as the son of C. Sentius Saturninus, so the fact that John supposes that this figure was the feature of a hypothetical blunder by Josephus or his source is almost meaningless. 2) John's emendation does violence to the text, forcing connections where there need not be any. The fact that καί is missing in some manuscripts of *AJ* should not be taken as a sufficient reason to warrant emendation of the text, and a difficult reading in one text does not necessarily mean that a parallel version of the story in a different work is misunderstood or incorrect. 3) Assuming that John's emendation represents the original reading of the text, it seems odd that Josephus would have used the construction τῷ <τῆς ἀδελφῆς> υἱῷ when there is a perfectly good word in Greek that means “nephew.” The word ἀνεψιός appears thirteen times in the entirety of the works of Josephus.<sup>27</sup> Only

---

25 John (1963), 965: “Angesichts der häufigen Verwechslungen von Persönlichkeiten, die wir bei Iosephos antreffen, liegt es auch hier sehr nahe zu vermuten, daß Iosephos im bell. Iud. dem angeblichen Sohn des V. den Namen des ältesten Sohnes des C. Sentius Saturnius [sic], des Vorgängers des V. in Syrien, gegeben hat, da dieser Gaius tatsächlich—vermutlich sogar als Militärtribun—im Heere seines Vaters in Syrien gedient hatte.” “In view of the frequent confusion of personalities that we encounter in Josephus, it is very reasonable here to suppose that Josephus in the *BJ* has given the alleged son of Varus the name of the oldest son of C. Sentius Saturnius [no doubt, John meant Saturninus], Varus' predecessor in Syria, since this Gaius actually—presumably even as military tribune—had served in his father's army in Syria.” See also John (1958), 254.

26 Additionally, John (1958), 254–255 erroneously believed that Claudia Pulchra could have been born between 29 and 25 BCE (*infra*), and as a result, Varus could have owed his favored position to an early engagement to her.

27 Buck et al. (2002), s.v. “ἀνεψιός.” The word had a double meaning. In the two parallel accounts of a rebellion in both the *BJ* and *AJ*, a man named Joseph is described as the ἀνεψιός of

once in all of Josephus' writing does a construction similar to the one that John proposes appear, and this phrase is showing a relation to someone mentioned previously, Haran, who was the brother of Abram.<sup>28</sup> A previous mention of Varus' sister Quinctilia is not found here or anywhere else in Josephus. 4) The whole argument in favor of L. Nonius Asprenas—it should be noted that he is not even a Gaius—depends upon evidence that, as John himself acknowledges, does not exist. It is an argument from silence. We know nothing about the early career of L. Nonius Asprenas. It seems probable that he was with Varus in Syria, but the fact that he served later under his uncle in Germany and that he has an empty spot in his *cursus* that includes the period around 4 BCE does not prove that he is the one being referred to in *BJ*. 5) That either a textual corruption in the source of Josephus or a misreading by the author himself are responsible for the fact that the words τῆς ἀδελφῆς are not present in any of the manuscripts is too convenient an explanation to be persuasive. In the final estimation, John's argumentation ends up being a bit circular: the citations in Josephus cannot be legitimate references to a son of Varus because there is no evidence of a marriage of Varus before Claudia Pulchra, and there is no evidence of a marriage for Varus before Claudia Pulchra because these citations are not evidence for a son of Varus.<sup>29</sup>

---

King Herod in one, and the ἀνεψιός of Archelaus, Herod's son, in the other. Joseph could not be both the cousin of Herod and the cousin of Herod's son Archelaus. In fact, in another mention of Joseph we learn that he is the son of Herod's brother (Joseph. *AJ* 17.20).

**28** In the story of Abram's adoption of his nephew, Lot is described as τὸν Ἀράβου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ υἱὸν (Joseph. *AJ* 1.154).

**29** John's influence on this issue is so thorough—perhaps because of the value of the *Realencyclopädie* in Classical Studies—that his argument is followed by a number of scholars writing in some works of the utmost authority in the field and in the specialty of the writings of Josephus: Vogel-Widemann (1982), 50; Syme (1986), 314–315; Vidman, (1987a), 368, (1998), 336; Wachtel (1999a), 11–12; Mason and Chapman (2008), n. 421. Wachtel's is an interesting case. The mess that scholarly opinion has created out of this issue finally becomes fully apparent with his entries in the second edition of *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* (1999). In the entry for P. Quinctilius Varus, Wachtel (1999c), 22 says:

“But be careful lest you reckon this son, who is remembered among the comrades of Varus in Syria in the year 750 = 4 BCE at Josephus *Antiquities* 17.288 ... to be a son from this marriage [i. e., the marriage of Varus to a woman previous to Claudia Pulchra and Vipsania Agrippina]: unless he is more fittingly the son of Quinctilia, the sister of Varus [i. e., L. Nonius Asprenas] ... , it is also possible that he was born from Vipsania, the daughter of Agrippa, ... .”

Wachtel has made use of the opinions of John, whose argument has been shown to be lacking in a number of ways, and Reinhold, whose imputation of an additional son of Varus is a foundational and unexamined assumption, into this entry without any further justification for either. In the entry dedicated to the supposed son of Varus, after Wachtel (1999a), 11–12 summarizes John's article and entry in the *Realencyclopädie* and Reinhold's article, he merely states, “Let the matter

One of the issues with denying a previous marriage for Varus before Claudia Pulchra is apparent even to John: the rise of Varus to importance in the Roman state between the 20s and 10s BCE appears odd without an accompanying marriage. As early as 28 BCE, there is evidence that Augustus was very concerned about Roman private lives, and by 18 BCE he had promulgated laws that rewarded those men who were married and had children with preferential treatment when in consideration for political office.<sup>30</sup> It only seems reasonable to presume an early marriage to account for Varus' accession of the quaestorship in 21 BCE. In order to explain Varus' advancement, John proposes that he had an early engagement to the infant Claudia Pulchra, the grandniece of Augustus.<sup>31</sup> However, it appears that relying with certainty upon the parentage of Claudia Pulchra as evidence for a date of birth or a conjectured period for her engagement and marriage to Varus is out of the question both in the time that John writes and still even now.<sup>32</sup> No major advancements in the area of scholarship surrounding the issues of Varus' marriages came until 1970, when a fortunate discovery added more evidence into the mix. A portion of the *laudatio funebris* given by Augustus on behalf of M. Vipsanius Agrippa in the year 12 BCE was discovered on a papyrus fragment and published by L. Koenen. In this document, Tiberius, the future emperor, and P. Quinctilius Varus are described as γαμβροί (lat. generes), "sons-in-law," of Agrippa.<sup>33</sup> Koenen goes through a number of negative proofs in his

---

remain subject to one's judgment." Wachtel's attitude is, therefore, ambivalent, and he merely accepts the authority of John and Reinhold. This fact, however, may have been occasioned by the burden of brevity placed on him. See also Vidman (1998), 336, who does the same.

**30** On the relevant section of the *lex Iulia maritandis ordinibus* of 18 BCE, see Gell. *NA* 2.15.3–7. Syme (1963), 443–444 shows that Augustus attempted to pass legislation of this kind as early as 28 BCE. As Propert. 2.7 tells us, the legislation failed. Even though the legislation did not pass, it seems likely on the evidence in Cass. Dio 53.13.2 that Augustus gave preferential political consideration to those who were married and had kids from early in his rule. See Mette-Dittmann (1991), 147.

**31** John (1958), 254–255.

**32** One possibility is that Claudia Pulchra was the daughter of M. Valerius Messalla Barbatus Appianus (cos. 12) and Claudia Marcella minor. Borghesi (1862), 417. See also Groag (1936a), 268; Koenen (1970), 259–261. Stein (1936), 265–267 considers that this conclusion is "scarcely able to be believed," since it would mean that Claudia Marcella minor had given birth to three children by two fathers in the span of about three years. See also Wiseman (1970), 215–217 on this point. If Claudia Pulchra was the daughter of M. Valerius Messalla Barbatus Appianus, she would have been born in the year 14 BCE, which is perhaps preferable, considering that her only known son was born around 2 or 3 CE. For the conjectured year of the birth of this son of Varus, see John (1963), 964, (1958), 251.

**33** Τιβερίου Νέρωνος καὶ Κινντιλίου Οὐάρου γαμβρῶν τῶν σῶν. ll. 5–7. P. Köln I 10. See Koenen (1970), 226.

article, supposing various kinships in order to refute the theory that Claudia Pulchra was the daughter of Agrippa, a fact which would have made Varus, even during a protracted engagement, like a son-in-law of Agrippa as early as 12 BCE.<sup>34</sup> He found none of the propositions to be satisfactory; no relationship between Agrippa and Claudia Pulchra could be produced that would also confirm Tacitus' remark that she was a *sobrīna*, "cousin," of Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus.<sup>35</sup> He then concluded that if Claudia Pulchra could not make Varus like a son-in-law of Agrippa in time for the delivery of the *laudatio funebris* in 12 BCE, P. Quinctilius Varus must have been married to some other woman, a daughter of Agrippa, in that year.

Who was this daughter of Agrippa? Koenen proposes as a fitting match a daughter of the union of Agrippa and Claudia Marcella maior. Their marriage was contracted between 28 and 29 BCE and yielded an unknown number of children.<sup>36</sup> An early engagement to one of those supposed daughters might have been responsible for the favor Augustus showed to Varus by taking him along as *quaestor Augusti* on his trip to the East between 21 and 19 BCE, at a time when it is presumed that Varus may have been between twenty-five and thirty years old.<sup>37</sup> Meyer Reinhold proposes a different solution and one that took better account of the evidence, at least as far as Varus' marriage is concerned. Pointing out that Caecilia Attica, daughter of the famous Atticus, had been born at least four years previous to what some scholars had thought, he proposes that another Vipsania Agrippina, resulting from the marriage of Agrippa and Caecilia Attica, "would have been old enough to have married Varus before the year 25 BC, and to have had a son old enough in 4 BC to serve on his father's staff when he was governor of Syria."<sup>38</sup> On top of the evidence of the *laudatio funebris* and the probabilities involved in the availability of a Vipsania Agrippina at an early date falls reasonable suspicion. "Vipsania was probably not the first wife of Quinctilius Varus. One would expect him to find a bride by the time of his quaestorship (he was quaestor Augusti c. 21)."<sup>39</sup> In Syme's judgment, therefore, it seemed probable on

---

<sup>34</sup> Koenen (1970), 257–268.

<sup>35</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 4.52.1.

<sup>36</sup> Koenen (1970), 266–268. See *IGRom.* 4.418, 419.

<sup>37</sup> John (1963), 908–909.

<sup>38</sup> Reinhold (1972), 119–121.

<sup>39</sup> Syme (1986), 146, 314–315. See also Koenen (1970), 265; Syme (1984), 916 n. 14, (1988), 427 n. 52, (1991), 6.243. Although it has been generally accepted now that Varus had been married to another woman before Claudia Pulchra, it would be a mistake to claim, as Reinhold (1972), 119 does, that the evidence of a son of Varus in Josephus was the reason upon which most scholars made that claim. The few scholars who treat this issue specifically deny the existence or legitimacy of the evidence. See Syme (1986), 314–315; John (1963), 965.

account of the favor Varus was shown in the middle of the 20s BCE that he had obtained some kind of fitting marriage before that time, whether to a relation of M. Vipsanius Agrippa or not. Therefore, both solid evidence and an amount of circumstantial evidence require that we ignore John's objection to such an earlier marriage of P. Quinctilius Varus. If this is done, then the reading of the passage in *AJ* need not be emended to clarify the personality to whom it refers. Varus could have had a son from a previous marriage who was old enough to serve under him, and for this reason, we ought to accept the authority of Josephus' account in *AJ* more readily at face value.

John's objection to von Rohden's argument was occasioned by the anecdotal nature of evidence. In 1958 when John was writing, the evidence did not yet support the fact that P. Quinctilius Varus had been married to a woman before Claudia Pulchra. Thus, it was necessary that John call von Rohden's position what it was, merely an assumption of a previous marriage that helped explain the reference to an older son of Varus. The fact that Varus was not known at the time to have had another wife led John to propose his alternative theory of the evidence. His greatest error is his theory that the ambiguously transmitted  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  indicated a problem with Josephus or his source (i.e., before the archetype was formed) rather than the result of later copying and editing of manuscripts, which seems far more probable. When new evidence emerged in 1970 that confirmed the fact that Varus had been married previously, the impetus behind John's theory and the lynchpin of his argument evaporated, but his opinions on both the text and the prosopographical issue have lingered in scholarship. To be sure, John's proposal that L. Nonius Asprenas was in Syria with his uncle is still a possibility; it is only the logical foundation of his emendation that has eroded with the passage of time. In addition to this development, the *laudatio funebris* gave a more solid foundation for the theory that the figure mentioned by Josephus was the son of Varus, as Reinhold believes, who never treats John's position in detail.

The text of Josephus' *BJ* itself will likely not reveal the true identity of Varus' lieutenant under further scrutiny, as the discrepancies between the Greek and Latin versions are beyond reconciliation. Errors in translation, copying, or both seem to have occurred very early in the textual tradition, considering the facts that the Latin translation, which may date to the fourth century CE, disagrees completely with our late Greek manuscripts and that the appearance of a stand-alone *praenomen* in the Greek is highly suspicious in the works of Josephus. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that the individual(s) who translated the *BJ* into Greek read the word "son" at this place in the exemplar. On the other hand, the reading of the parallel version of this passage in the Greek manuscripts of *AJ* is not as corrupt as has been claimed despite the state of the text of *AJ* as a whole. Scholars have unfortunately allowed the issue of the  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  to become a stumbling

block to the interpretation of the passage. The *καί*, although perhaps present in the text by the sixth century CE based on the manuscripts of the Latin translation, was probably only added to the original text by a copyist in an attempt to clarify the reading. Without *καί* the reading ought to be clear, albeit somewhat clumsy, given the phrase's analogy with others in the works of Josephus. Even if *καί* were in the archetype, which I think is not as likely, one can understand the word adverbially as setting off a phrase in apposition to "son." Lastly, the presence of the word in only some of the manuscripts should not be taken as an adequate justification for emendation, and neither the word's presence, even taken conjunctively, nor absence casts doubt on the fact that all of our witnesses for the text of *AJ*, both Greek and Latin, mention a son of Varus. Thus, the textual support for an additional son of Varus is better than modern scholarship has represented.

On the prosopographical side of the issue, the publication of the papyrus fragment of the *laudatio funebris* of Agrippa in 1970 guarantees the historicity of a marriage of Varus to one of Agrippa's daughters, and the issue of Varus' conjectured age and the political environment in Augustan Rome recommend that we acknowledge a marriage sometime before the late 20s whether or not to an Agrippina. When this is done there is nothing to stand in the way of the historical possibility of another, older son of Varus. Thus, the situation in scholarship on this issue is not exactly what is presented in *PIR*<sup>2</sup>. It is clear now that only one of the two positions proposed in these entries is supported at all by our prosopographical evidence and the texts of Josephus as they stand, and that position is the one originally put forth by von Rohden, which the editors attribute to Reinhold. Of the already well-acknowledged son of Varus, von Rohden says: "Born not before the year 6 BCE, he is, therefore, different from the son of P. Quinctilius Varus, who, having gone with his father into Syria, received from him a part of the army in order to lead it in the year 4 BCE."<sup>40</sup> This son of Varus and Claudia Pulchra, only called Quintilius Varus in our sources, therefore, had not even been born at the time of his father's service in Syria.<sup>41</sup> Varus, therefore, probably had another son about whom we know almost nothing.<sup>42</sup> In light of all of the evidence,

---

<sup>40</sup> von Rohden (1898), 118.

<sup>41</sup> Sen. *Con.* 1.3.10. John (1958), 251–252 concludes that Quintilius Varus must have been born between 3 and 2 BCE. See also John (1963), 964–965; Wachtel (1999c), 20. This son of Varus is apparently the same one who was tried by Domitius Afer and P. Dolabella in the year 27 CE (*Tac. Ann.* 4.66).

<sup>42</sup> Levick (2003), 36 asserts that Sex. Nonius Quinctilianus (cos. 8 CE) was the natural son of P. Quinctilius Varus and that he was adopted by the elder L. Nonius Asprenas, presumably based on the adjectival form of his *cognomen*, which is sometimes a signal of adoption. The respective ages of the son of Varus mentioned in *AJ* and of Sex. Nonius Quinctilianus coincide fairly well: both would likely have been born sometime in the mid to late 20s BCE. The scholarly consensus,

then, it is necessary to prefer this interpretation to what John offers as an alternative explanation.

**Acknowledgment:** There are several people to whom I want to express my deepest appreciation for their invaluable assistance in the process of bringing this paper into its current form. Dr. W. Marshall Johnston (Fresno Pacific University), Dr. Pamela Lackie Johnston (Fresno Pacific University), Dr. Honora Chapman (CSU, Fresno), and Dr. Richard Evans (UNISA) were all gracious enough to read and provide constructive feedback and fresh avenues of inquiry for this paper at various stages of its development. Lastly, I thank Dr. Bruce Boeckel, who helped correct my translations from German at a few points. The credit for any errors in argument or translation, however, is still mine.

## Bibliography

- Blatt, Franz. *The Latin Josephus I: introduction and text: the Antiquities: Books I–V*. Copenhagen: Munskgaard, 1958.
- Borghesi, Bartolomeo. *Oeuvres Complètes*. Volume 1. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1862.
- Broughton, T. R. S. *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Volume 2. New York: American Philological Association, 1960.
- Büchler, Adolf. “The sources of Josephus for the history of Syria (In ‘Antiquities,’ XII, 3–XII, 14).” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 9.2 (January 1897): 311–349.
- Buck, Erwin, et al. *The Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Dessau, Hermann. “118: SEX. NONIVS QVINCTILIANVS.” In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, first edition, Volume 2, edited by Hermann Dessau, 414. Berlin: Apud Georgium Reimerum, 1897.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984.
- Groag, Edmund. “1116: CLAVDIA PVLCHRA.” In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 2, edited by Edmund Groag and Arthur Stein, 268. New York: de Gruyter, 1936.
- Groag, Edmund. “46) Sex. Nonius Quinctilianus.” In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterumswissenschaft*, Volume 17, edited by Wilhelm Kroll, 898–899. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1936.
- John, Walther. “20) P. Quinctilius Varus.” In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterumswissenschaft*, Volume 24, edited by Konrat Ziegler, 907–984. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1963.
- John, Walther. “Zu den Familienhältnissen des P. Quinctilius Varus.” *Hermes* 86.2 (1958): 251–255.

---

however, is that Sex. Nonius Quinctilianus was the natural son of L. Nonius Asprenas, the father of the consul of 6 CE by the same name, and of Quinctilia, the sister of Varus, from whom he took his *cognomen*: Dessau (1897), 414; Groag (1936b), 898; Vidman (1987b), 380.

- Koenen, L. "Die 'Laudatio funebris' des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 5 (1970): 217–284.
- Mason, Steve and Honora Chapman, editors. *Flavius Josephus: translation and commentary*. Volume 1b. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Mette-Dittmann, Angelika. *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus: eine Untersuchung in Rahmen der Gesellschaftspolitik des Princeps*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1991.
- Reinhold, Meyer. "Marcus Agrippa's son-in-law P. Quinctilius Varus." *Classical Philology* 67.2 (1972): 119.
- Ricciotti, Guisepppe, editor. *La Guerra Giudaica: Libri I-II-III*. Volume 2 of *Flavio Quiseppe Tradotto e Commentato*. Second edition. Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1949.
- von Rohden, Paul. "P. QVINCTILIVS VARVS." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, first edition, Volume 3, edited by Paul von Rohden and Hermann Dessau, 118–120. Berlin: Apud Georgium Reimerum, 1898.
- von Rohden, Paul. "QVINTILIVS VARVS." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, first edition, Volume 3, edited by Paul von Rohden and Hermann Dessau, 118. Berlin: Apud Georgium Reimerum, 1898.
- Shutt, R. J. H. *Studies in Josephus*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 1984.
- Stein, Arthur. "1103: (CLAUDIA) MARCELLA minor." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, first edition, Volume 2, edited by Edmund Groag and Arthur Stein, 265–266. New York: de Gruyter, 1936.
- Syme, Ronald. *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.
- Syme, Ronald. *Roman Papers*. Volumes 3, 4, and 6. Edited by Anthony R. Birley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984, 1988, 1991.
- Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1963.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., editor. *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities: Books I–IV*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 1930.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *Josephus: the man and the historian*. New York: KTAV, 1967.
- Vidman, L. "118: L. NONIVS ASPRENAS." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 5, edited by Leiva Peterson, 367–368. New York: de Gruyter, 1987.
- Vidman, L. "152: SEX. NONIVS QVINCTILIANVS." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 5, edited by Leiva Peterson, 380. New York: de Gruyter, 1987.
- Vidman, L. "769: (POMPONIA) CAECILIA ATTICA." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 6, edited by Leiva Peterson and Klaus Wachtel, 336–338. New York: de Gruyter, 1998.
- Vitucci, Giovanni, translator. *La Guerra Giudaica*. Volume 1. Milan: Mondadori, *Fondazione Lorenzo Valla*, 1974.
- Vogel-Weidemann, Ursula. *Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14–68 n. Chr.* Bonn: Habelt, 1982.
- Wachtel, Klaus. "19: (QVINCTILIVS)." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 7, edited by Klaus Wachtel, 11–12. New York: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Wachtel, Klaus. "30: P. QVINCTILIVS VARVS." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 7, edited by Klaus Wachtel, 20–26. New York: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Wachtel, Klaus. "29: QVINTILIVS VARVS." In *Prosopographia Imperii Romani: Saec. I. II. III.*, second edition, Volume 7, edited by Klaus Wachtel, 20. New York: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Whiston, William, translator. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Auburn: John E. Beardsley, 1895.
- Wiseman, T. P. "Pulcher Claudius." *HSCP* 74 (1970): 207–221.