BLACKWELL COMPANIONS TO THE ANCIENT WORLD

A COMPANION TO MARCUS AURELIUS

EDITED BY MARCEL VAN ACKEREN

WILEY-BLACKWELL

A COMPANION TO MARCUS AURELIUS

Edited by

Marcel van Ackeren

WILEY-BLACKWELL

A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

This edition first published 2012

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing program has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148–5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to Marcus Aurelius / edited by Marcel van Ackeren.
p. cm. – (Blackwell companions to the ancient world)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4051-9285-9 (hardcover : alk. paper) 1. Marcus Aurelius, Emperor of Rome, 121-180.
2. Rome–History–Marcus Aurelius, 161-180. 3. Emperors–Rome–Biography. I. Ackeren, Marcel van.
DG297.C66 2012
937′.07092–dc23

2011040483

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Set in 11/13.5pt Galliard by Thomson Digital, India

1 2012

Contents

Figures

(1994), *Römische Philosophie* (1997), *Platon* (2006), *Platon. Die Philosophie der Antike Band 2/2* (2007).

Thomas Fischer is Professor of the Archaeology of Roman Provinces at the University of Cologne, Germany. He is the author of *Die römischen Provinzen. Eine Einführung in das Studium ihrer Archäologie* (2002).

Pascale Fleury is Professor of Classics at the Institut d'études anciennes of the Département des littératures, Université Laval, Québec, Canada. She has published a French translation of the Letters of Fronto (2003) and a study on the literary traditions of the corpus (2006).

Angelo Giavatto (PhD, Bologna 2006) is currently Alexander von Humboldt Stipendiat at the University of Cologne, Germany. He dedicated a study to Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* (*Interlocutore di se stesso. La dialettica di Marco Aurelio*, 2008). His main research focuses are Roman Stoicism, Plato and Platonism as well as linguistic theories in Antiquity.

Christopher Gill is Professor of Ancient Thought at the University of Exeter. He is author of *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue* (1996), *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought* (2006), and *Naturalistic Psychology in Galen and Stoicism* (2010).

Jean-Baptiste Gourinat is Directeur de recherche (Senior Researcher) in Philosophy at the CNRS, Paris, and Directeur-adjoint of the Centre de recherches sur la pensée antique 'Léon Robin' at the University of Paris-Sorbonne. He is the author or editor of several books on Stoicism including *La dialectique des stoïciens* (2000), *Les stoïciens* (2007, 3rd edition 2011), and *Lire les stoïciens*, co-edited with Jonathan Barnes (2009). He is currently revising and completing Pierre Hadot's translation and commentary for the Budé edition of Marcus Aurelius.

Olivier Hekster is Professor in Ancient History at the Radboud University Nijmegen, and chair of the international network *Impact of Empire*. He is author of *Commodus: An Emperor at the Crossroads* (2002) and *Rome and Its Empire, AD 193–284* (2008), as well as a number of articles and edited volumes on Roman imperial history.

Katrin Herrmann has been granted a scholarship at the University of Erfurt, Germany. Her field of interest is the Roman Empire, mainly the third century AD.

Leofranc Holford-Strevens was before retirement Consultant Scholar-Editor at Oxford University Press. He is the author of *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement* (2005) and of numerous works on classical studies, modern literatures, musicology, and computistics.

Péter Kovács (1969) is Professor in Classics at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University in Piliscsaba, Hungary. He is the author of the monograph *Marcus Aurelius' Rain Miracle and the Marcomannic Wars,* the editor of the series *Fontes Pannoniae Antiquae* and the co-editor with Géza Alföldy of the Pannonian fasciculi of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* III^2.

Jill Kraye is Librarian and Professor of the History of Renaissance Philosophy at the Warburg Institute, London. She is the author of numerous articles on Renaissance humanism and philosophy as well as on the later influence of classical philosophy. She is the co-editor (with Martin Stone) of *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy* (2000).

Anthony A. Long is Professor of Classics, Irving Stone Professor of Literature, and Affiliated Professor of Philosophy and of Rhetoric at the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author of various books on Ancient Philosophy, including most recently *Epictetus. A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (2002) and *From Epicurus to Epictetus. Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy* (2006).

Irmgard Männlein-Robert is orderly Professor of Classics (Greek Philology) at the University of Tübingen, Germany. She writes on various themes in the fields of literary theory, poetics, and Greek philosophy, and she is co-editor with Dietmar Koch and Niels Weidtmann of *Platon und das Göttliche*, *Antike-Studien Band 1* (2010, collected volume of the first 'Tübinger Platon-Tage' 2008).

Gretchen Reydams-Schils is Professor in the Program of Liberal Studies at the University of Notre Dame, with concurrent appointments in Philosophy and Theology. She works in the areas of Platonism and Stoicism, and is the author of *Demiurge and Providence: Stoic and Platonist Readings of Plato's 'Timaeus'* (1999) and *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection* (2005). She also directs the Notre Dame Workshop on Ancient Philosophy.

Amy Richlin is Professor of Classics at UCLA, and has published widely on the history of sexuality and on Latin literature; her books include *The Garden of Priapus* (1983, 2nd edition 1992) and *Marcus Aurelius in Love* (2006). She is at work on a long-term project on the reception of Fronto's letter-book: *How Fronto's Letters Got Lost: Reading Roman Pederasty in Modern Europe.*

David Sedley is Laurence Professor of Ancient Philosophy at the University of Cambridge, where he is also a Fellow of Christ's College. He is co-author (with Anthony A. Long) of *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (1987), and his most recent monograph is *Creationism and Its Critics in Antiquity* (2007).

John Sellars is Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of the West of England, Bristol, and a member of Wolfson College, Oxford. He is the author of *The Art of Living: The Stoics on the Nature and Function of Philosophy* (2003, 2nd edition 2009) and *Stoicism* (2006), as well as a number of articles on ancient Stoicism and its reception.

Peter Stewart is Director of the Classical Art Research Centre and University Lecturer in Classical Art and Archaeology at the University of Oxford. His publications include *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (2003), *Roman Art* (2004), and *The Social History of Roman Art* (2008).

Preface

Another *Companion* . . . At the beginning, the idea of editing a *Companion to Marcus Aurelius* seemed to be unattractive to me. Colleagues pointed out that this would imply an enormous amount of work and that there are already many, if not too many, companions. Not really amazed by the fact that the latter was mentioned even by those who had already edited (or written for) a companion, I started a survey that revealed to me that the initial idea was not about editing *another* companion on Marcus, but the first one. That changed my mind and I quickly realized that all of my colleagues were quite right about the amount of work this project meant. On the one hand, I had to plan the volume without being able to glance at previous companions to Marcus Aurelius and on the other, I envisaged a volume bringing together as many disciplines as necessary in order to present as much as possible of Marcus Aurelius. Therefore, I would not have been able to start or finish this without the help of many kinds of persons and I would like to thank at least some of them.

The most important gratitude belongs to the contributors. They wrote the volume, so it is theirs, not mine. As this volume tries to gather perspectives from many academic disciplines, and I am only a historian of philosophy, I sometimes was in need of the expertise of the contributors, on which to base my editorial decisions. Many contributors were enthusiastic about the volume and supported me by making helpful suggestions.

Christopher Gill was the first to convince me that such a companion would be a good idea. He intensively discussed my plans for the volume and my own work on Marcus with me. All of this was very helpful.

The Fritz Thyssen Foundation generously financed a three-year research period devoid of any administrative or otherwise distracting duties and thereby enabled me to develop my own ideas on Marcus' *Meditations* and to work on this volume.

Edward Champlain, Simon Swain, Christopher Jones, and some anonymous reviewers gave valuable hints and recommendations.

The Study of Marcus Aurelius

Introduction

Marcel van Ackeren

Marcus Annius Verus was born in April, AD 121, at Rome. Under his later name, Marcus Aurelius, he is still a well known figure. How do we account for that? He was heir to the throne for 23 years (from 138) and then Roman emperor (from 161 until his death in 180). However, not all Roman emperors are as well known as Marcus beyond the small circle of ancient historians. Marcus Aurelius was also a philosopher; in fact the last important Stoic philosopher of antiquity. His philosophical work – the *Meditations* – is one of the most widely read philosophical texts from antiquity (it is not read only by scholars). Images of him, such as the equestrian statue, are familiar icons that have often been copied and which have inspired subsequent artworks. From Cassius Dio (71.1.1) and Herodian (*History of the Empire from the Death of Marcus* 2, 10, 3) to Machiavelli (*Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livy* I, ch. 10) and modern rulers, he has been considered a paragon of a good political leader. Especially since early modern times, ruling politicians, for instance Frederick the Great or Bill Clinton, have wanted to be known as enthusiastic readers of Marcus' work and have announced that Marcus is their favorite philosopher and their paradigm (whatever that means and whatever consequences that might have had – or not had – on their own actions). The figure of Marcus Aurelius has even featured in popular novels (*The World According to Garp* by John Irving) and Hollywood blockbusters (*The Fall of the Roman Empire* (1964) and *Gladiator* (2000)).

A Companion to Marcus Aurelius, First Edition. Edited by M. van Ackeren.

1. The Conjunction of Philosophy and Politics

Marcus' reception and reputation does not rest on the two independent pillars of being an emperor and being a philosopher. It is their combination that intrigues, and has always intrigued. Most famous and influential was Plato's demand for philosopher-kings (*Respublica* 473c–e). The 'conjunction of these two things, political power and philosophic intelligence' can be obtained in two ways, for 'either philosophers become kings in our states or those whom we now call our kings and rulers take to the pursuit of philosophy seriously and adequately'. During his reign, Marcus quickly gained a reputation as the personification of a conjunction of this sort.

At first glance it is easy to see why this is so. Marcus was born into a rich and politically influential family, and his ancestors had already held high office; however, this fact alone would not have guaranteed that he became emperor. At a very young age, Marcus won the favor of Hadrian, which might be explained – at least partially – by Marcus' character. Hadrian nicknamed him *Verissimus* (the most true, *HA Marcus* 1.10, 2.1). And it was Hadrian himself who picked Marcus for the highest office. When Hadrian adopted Antoninus Pius in order for Pius become his successor, he made Pius adopt the young Marcus in order for Marcus to become Pius' successor (*HA Pius* 4.4–7). According to his biographer, young Marcus was not only an eager student of philosophy; he literally wanted to live like a philosopher (*HA Marcus* 6.1–4). From letters, which Marcus wrote to his Latin teacher Cornelius Fronto, we also know that he preferred (Stoic) philosophy to rhetoric, which was at that time a highly respected art (*Fronto* 1.1.214, 2.66.17). That Marcus was regarded as a special, philosophical ruler is highlighted in the *Historia Augusta*, by the fact that his biography is the only one with a title that does not only list his name but also characterizes him: *vita Marci Antonini philosophi* (Life of Marcus Antoninus the Philosopher).

Although Marcus allegedly liked to quote Plato's dictum (*HA Marcus* 27.7), we may not assume that Marcus was a Platonic philosopher-king or thought of himself as such. He was less ambitious:

> So set to work, if you are able, and do not look around you to see if anyone will notice. You should not hope for Plato's ideal state, but be satisfied to make even the smallest advance. . . . The work of philosophy is simple and modest; do not seduce me into vain ostentation. (*Meditations* 9, 29)

In fact, it is not clear that Marcus thought of himself as a philosopher. In the *Meditations* he bluntly states that he had 'resigned any hopes of excelling in dialectics and natural philosophy' (7, 67). Though Marcus' education was excellent, he had to abandon his plans of a life devoted entirely to philosophy.

He knew that he could not have become a professional philosopher, and he was aware that the philosophers in Plato's *Republic* need more than five decades of training before they can engage in political affairs. Hence Marcus did not regard himself as sufficiently well educated to be a Platonic philosopher-king. But there are two more substantial reasons why Marcus was not a *Platonic* philosopher-king. Plato naturally assumed that it should be *Platonic* philosophy that guides our political affairs. However, Marcus was a Stoic philosopher. Marcus' contemporaries knew that he had philosophical ambitions; but the most important and detailed source of Marcus' philosophical convictions, the *Meditations*, was – as far as we know – a completely private work. We do not have any evidence that anybody else knew about its contents or even its existence before the end of the fourth century. It is only from the work itself that we (modern readers) know for certain that Marcus was definitely a Stoic philosopher. This conviction may have been in contrast to his public actions as emperor, since in this role he did not openly favor Stoicism over other philosophical schools or above rhetoric. As an emperor he was always eager to be impartial. He founded chairs of philosophy (for Platonists, Peripatetics, Epicureans, and Stoics) and rhetoric in Athens, which were enormously prestigious positions; however, Marcus did not pick the persons who held these chairs himself (Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum* 2.2.566). In public he even avoided criticizing the Sophists openly or arguing with them (Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum* 2.1.652–53). In the *Meditations* (1, 7; 1, 16; 6, 30), however, he shows he despised them. This already indicates that, in the case of Marcus, the relation between philosophy and politics is a complex one; although Marcus had clear-cut philosophical ambitions, he somehow concealed his firm convictions, probably for the sake of his political duties. This leads to the second reason why one should not too hastily assume that Marcus Aurelius was a *Platonic* philosopher-king: Plato called for a direct application of philosophy in the realm of politics. The objects of knowledge with which the philosopher has become acquainted were also supposed to function as paradigms, that is, guidelines for his policies. Knowledge will automatically turn into politics (*Respublica* 500a–501e).

It is open to question whether Marcus really thought that philosophy had this kind of direct and dominant impact on his reign. This is not the place to decide if we can find actual traces of his philosophy in his political decisions and to pinpoint influences. It is enough to claim that, from a methodological point of view, it is very difficult to find traces of his philosophical beliefs in his political and judicial decisions. Results are rare, despite the fact that we moderns are in a better position than Marcus' contemporaries, since we know the *Meditations*. It seems more plausible to think that Marcus had some kind of confidence in philosophy, or that the philosopher Marcus was supporting the emperor Marcus by stressing that one has do one's duty, no matter what one's nature is or what place one has in society.

If it is not the strict Platonic version of the conjunction of philosophical intelligence and political power, what kind of combination of these two things made Marcus so attractive? Marcus personifies something that has been appealing for many centuries, in which the understanding both of politics and philosophy has changed substantially many times. Although the *Meditations* do not contain any narrative of specific events or references to the current state of affairs, Marcus clearly exhibited a certain type of character or attitude towards the world and politics. Also, according to historical sources, he managed to a large extent to live up to his ideals. Marcus was given the title of 'Caesar' in 140 (Dio 71.35.5; *HA Marcus* 6.3) and held it for more than 40 years, that is, for more than two-thirds of his life. However, in the *Meditations*, written after more than 30 years of being a Caesar, he still worries about the effects this might have on him:

> Take care that you are not turned into a Caesar, that you are not stained with purple; for such things do come about. Keep yourself simple, then, and good and sincere, dignified, free from affection, a friend to justice, reverend to the gods, affectionate, and firm in performance of your duties. Struggle to remain such a man as philosophy wished to make you. Honour the Gods, protect your fellows. Life is short; and our earthly existence yields but a single harvest, a holy disposition and acts that serve the common good. (6, 30)

This commitment to doing his duty, simply and modestly, even when he was the most powerful person in the Roman Empire, could at least partially explain the attraction Marcus has had on readers in high-ranking positions and on those who longed for politicians like that. Thus, even if our judgments about Plato's theory of philosopher-kings, Stoicism, and the absolute power of Roman emperors may have changed over time and are in any case matters of continuing debate, the idea that political leaders should fulfill some moral requirements and should have at least an ethically decent character is still very appealing. Consider the following quote as stark contrast: In 1948 Stalin was proofreading his *Short Biography*. In his own handwriting he added the following sentence:

> Although he did his duty as leader of the party and the people with perfect virtuosity, . . . Stalin never allowed this perfection to be outshone by any kind of vanity or haughtiness or self-laudation. (Stalin (1947), 46; translation mine)

Instead of misusing his wide-ranging powers, Marcus had a philosophically based and serious interest in his character, his duty, and the world. If we compare Marcus with Stalin, and other examples of political degeneration or if we compare him with much better examples of leadership, many people can still appreciate Marcus' attitude. But, leaving aside these speculations about why

leads to conferences and studies under headings such as 'interdisciplinarity', 'multi-disciplinarity', or 'trans-disciplinarity'. Such terms imply the existence of quite distinct disciplines (an assumption which is not always valid). In the case of Marcus Aurelius it is obvious that research combining several academic disciplines is highly desirable. It is also clear that Marcus Aurelius has often been neglected from this standpoint (Barnes and Griffin (1997)) and attempts to form a synthesis are rare (Klein (1979) and van Ackeren, Boschung, and Opsomer (2012)). That is the rationale for the project of this *Companion*.

3. This Volume and Its Aims

As there is no previous collection that tries to give an overview of every essential facet of contemporary studies on Marcus Aurelius, this volume tries to fill that gap. Since it is a compendium, the volume has interdisciplinary ambitions, but it also aims to show the specialist work being done in different areas. Thus, some chapters necessarily overlap with others as regards the material or texts they refer to; but they are written from different angles, dealing with different questions which are sometimes specific to a certain academic discipline.

The first section of the book offers a study of the core source material for the history of Marcus' life and reign, including the reports by Cassius Dio and the *Historia Augusta*, archaeological evidence, Marcus' own writings, such as the *Meditations* (including an account of its transmission) and the correspondence with Fronto, as well as the epigraphic record.

The second section seeks to locate Marcus' life within his own time and place with special emphasis on the political situation and Marcus' cultural and intellectual background.

The third section has as its main focus Marcus the emperor, discussing his legislation, jurisdiction, and administration, as well as the wars and revolts that had a considerable impact on his reign. Two chapters take up questions of special interest in connection with Marcus, on the relationship between politics and philosophy in his reign and on religion, especially Christianity. The final chapter of this section aims to give an overview of the state of the Roman Empire after Marcus' death.

Discussions of the various types of material representation of Marcus Aurelius constitute the fourth section. The column of Marcus Aurelius, the equestrian statue, coins, statues, and busts are discussed in separate chapters.

The fifth section is devoted to the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius. This will discuss the form and structure of Marcus' text, its style and character as a kind of autobiography; the question is also raised whether the work has an oral dimension. As Marcus was a Stoic philosopher, three chapters will consider Marcus' place within the Stoic tradition and explore his views on the main

branches of Stoic philosophy, that is, physics, logic, and ethics. Key features of his thought, namely social ethics and politics as well as questions concerning the idea of self in the *Meditations* are treated in further chapters.

The sixth and final section is devoted to the reception of Marcus Aurelius, considering to what extent he was seen as a good emperor in late antiquity and in medieval times and studying how the first translations and commentaries have contributed to the popular image of Marcus. The last two chapters examine his reception in early modern philosophy, especially in Neostoicism, and Marcus' role in contemporary philosophy.

FURTHER READING

Primary sources

Gill, Ch., ed. (forthcoming, 2013), *Marcus Aurelius, Meditations 1–6*. Translated with introduction and commentary. Oxford.

Haines, C.R., trans. (1920), *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto*. 2 vols. London.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

Farquharson, A.S.L., ed. and trans. (1944, repr. 1968), *Markos Antōninou Autokratoros: Ta Eis Heauton. The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*. Vol. I–II. Oxford.

Secondary sources

Ackeren, M. van (2006), '"Sage zu dir selbst" – Zur Dialogizität bei Marc Aurel', in M. Meyer, ed., *Die Geschichte des Dialoges*. Darmstadt. 54–67.

Ackeren, M. van (2011), *Die Philosophie Marc Aurels*, Vol. I: *Textform – Stilmerkmale – Selbstdialog*. Berlin. Vol. II: *Themen – Begriffe – Argumente*. Berlin.

Ackeren, M. van, D. Boschung, and J. Opsomer, eds. (2012), *Meditations and Representations. Marcus Aurelius in Interdisciplinary Light*. Wiesbaden.

Annas, J. (2004), 'Marcus Aurelius. Ethics and Its Background', *Rhizai* 2: 103–19.

Barnes, J. and M.T. Griffin (1997), *Philosophia Togata*. Oxford.

Foucault, M. (2005), *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*. New York.

Gill, Ch. (2007a), 'Marcus Aurelius', in R.W. Sharples and R. Sorabji, eds., *Greek and Roman Philosophy 100 BC – 200 AD*. Vol. II. London. 175–89.

Gill, Ch. (2007b), 'Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*: How Stoic and How Platonic?', in M. Bonazzi and Ch. Helmig, eds., *Platonic Stoicism – Stoic Platonism. The Dialogue between Platonism and Stoicism in Antiquity*. Leuven. 189–208.

Hadot, I. (1969), *Seneca und die griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung*. Berlin.
Hadot, P. (1998), *The Inner Citadel: The Meditations by Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge, MA.
Hirzel, R. (1895), *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*. Leipzig.
Klein, R., ed. (1979), *Marc Aurel*. Darmstadt.
Rabbow, P. (1954), *Seelenführung. Methode der Exerzitien in der Antike*. Munich.
Rist, J.M. (1983), 'Are You a Stoic? The Case of Marcus Aurelius', in B.F. Meyer and E.P. Sanders, eds., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Vol. III: *Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World*. Philadelphia. 23–45.
Rutherford, R.B. (1989), *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. A Study*. Oxford.
Stalin, J.W. (1947), *Kurze Lebensbeschreibung*. Moscow.
Zuntz, G. (1946), 'Notes on Antoninus', *Classical Quarterly* 40: 47–55.

PART I

THE MAIN SOURCES

excerpts. Dio's Book 70, on the reign of Antoninus Pius, was already missing when Xiphilinus was composing his *Epitome*:

> It should be known that the account of Antoninus Pius is not found in the copies of Dio, probably because something happened to the books, and hence the history of his reign is almost completely unknown.

He can only offer the information, repeated from his summary of Book 69, that Antoninus was adopted by Hadrian and became emperor, Hadrian's first choice Lucius Commodus (who had been renamed Lucius Aelius Caesar) having died before Hadrian himself; and that Antoninus insisted, against opposition from the senate, on Hadrian's deification, as a result of which he was given the name Pius. Dio is also cited for an alternative reason for the name, Antoninus' refusal to punish 'many who had been accused' (70.1.1–2.1).

In his summary of Dio's Book 69, Xiphilinus had reported how

> Hadrian caused Antoninus, since the latter had no sons, to adopt both Lucius Commodus' son Commodus [who was renamed Lucius Verus on becoming emperor], and, in addition to him, Marcus Annius Verus, a grandson of Annius Verus, three times consul and city prefect. And while he was ordering Antoninus to adopt both, he preferred Verus on account of his kinship and his age and because he was already showing his very great strength of character, for which reason Hadrian used to call him '*Verissimus*' ['truest'], playing on the meaning of his name in Latin. (Dio 69.21.1–2)

Xiphilinus added that 'the first part of Dio's account of Marcus Verus, Antoninus' successor' was also missing:

> what he did regarding Lucius, Commodus' son, whom Marcus made his son-in-law, and what the latter did in the war against Vologaesus, having been sent there by his father-in-law. Therefore I shall tell briefly what I have read about these matters in other books. (Dio 70.2.2)[2]

Xiphilinus' brief substitute, derived from 'other books', for the missing first part of Dio's Book 71 begins with the following: Antoninus' death after a 24-year reign; Marcus' accession and the appointment of his adoptive brother Lucius as co-emperor; and the latter's marriage to Marcus' daughter Lucilla and dispatch to the Parthian War. Next he reports how the Parthian king Vologaesus had begun the war by attacking and destroying a Roman legion at Elegeia and then invading Syria; how Lucius, based at Antioch, entrusted command to Cassius, who in due course advanced into Parthian territory and destroyed Vologaesus' palace; then that Lucius, who 'took great pride in these exploits', later plotted against Marcus but died from poison

before he could achieve anything. Although none of this came from Dio, it is conventionally labelled Dio 71.1.1[1]–3.1[1]. Modern editors have tacked on to this two genuine passages from Dio, quoted in the Byzantine encyclopedia, the *Suda*: one is on Roman bridge-building, in this case carried out by Cassius; the other relates how Sohaemus, the king of Armenia, first installed by Lucius in 164, was re-installed by Martius Verus, governor of Cappadocia, to which is added a laudatory character-sketch of this general. The first *Suda* excerpt clearly comes from Dio's account of Lucius' Parthian war in the 160s, but the second one must refer to an episode in the 170s. It belongs in the same context as a report taken from Dio in one of the *Excerpta Valesiana* (no. 304; Dio 71[72].14.2), on trouble in Armenia caused by a satrap called Tiridates: he had threatened Martius Verus and was deported to Britain (see *PIR*^{2} M 348, S 761, T 239).

Apart from Cassius' bridge-building, only one other episode from the earlier part of Dio's Book 71, not available to Xiphilinus, is preserved in an excerpt. This relates the invasion of the empire by 6 000 Langobardi and Obii, their rout by cavalry under Vindex and infantry under Candidus, and the barbarians' subsequent negotiations with the governor of (Upper) Pannonia, Iallius Bassus. The episode was transmitted via Petrus Patricius (*Excerpta de legationibus*^{G} 6; Dio 71[72].3.1a), and is datable to about 166 or 167, thanks to independent information about the careers of Vindex and Bassus (*PIR*^{2} M 22, I 4).

At all events, it is clear that Xiphilinus' epitome of Dio on Marcus' reign only covers events after the death of Lucius Verus, which occurred early in 169. The same seems to apply to the collections of excerpts from Dio, principally the *Excerpta Ursiniana* 56–66 and *Valesiana* 302–312b, as well as the other passages in Petrus Patricius, and a few more in the *excerpta Salmasiana* and *Vaticana*. Not all of the events in these excerpts are easy to date and the order in the editions by Boissevain or Cary (Loeb) is not always satisfactory. The parts of Xiphilinus derived from Dio's Book 71 begin with further, introductory comments on Avidius Cassius and on Marcus. Cassius

> was ordered by Marcus to administer the whole of Asia, whereas Marcus himself spent a long time, so to speak his entire life, having Pannonia as his base, making war on the Danube barbarians, Jazyges [i.e. Sarmatians] and Marcomanni, one after the other. (Xiphilinus 259; Dio 71[72].3.1[2])[3]

Cassius' appointment 'to administer the whole of Asia' belongs to the 170s, and the proper context is the paragraph on Cassius' suppression of the Egyptian Bucoli (Xiphilinus 259–60; Dio 71[72].4.1–2).

Sandwiched between these two mentions of Cassius is Xiphilinus' account of the barbarian invasion of Italy and its repulse by Pompeianus and Pertinax (Xiphilinus 259; Dio 71[72].3.2–4). As Xiphilinus has no information from

Dio about the time before Lucius' death, this demonstrates that the invasion was later than this, in 169 or 170. The only apparent difficulty is Xiphilinus' expression referring to the invaders as 'also many of the Celts from beyond the Rhine'. 'Celts', as often in Greek writers, means 'Germans', but Dio or perhaps Xiphilinus probably just added 'from beyond the Rhine' to distinguish them from the Gauls: this did not mean that the invaders actually came from that area (see Zwikker (1941) 156f.). There is no good reason to doubt that the invasion in question was that by the Marcomanni and Quadi, otherwise known only from an episode in Lucian's *Alexander* (48) and a retrospective passage in Ammianus Marcellinus (29.6.1). As to the date, comparison with the *Historia Augusta*'s treatment of Pertinax's role in the latter's *vita* makes the year 170 far likelier, *Pertinax* 2.4–5:

> From there . . . he [Pertinax] was transferred to Dacia . . . and subsequently, through Claudius Pompeianus, Marcus' son-in-law, was appointed, to be, as it were, his assistant, to command detachments; in which post he won approval and was enrolled into the senate.

From the data in *Pertinax's vita*, his post in Dacia, which preceded his service under Pompeianus and was followed by a period without employment, can hardly be dated earlier than 169 (Alföldy (1987) 326ff.; Piso (1993) 117ff.).

As will be seen, virtually the whole of what remains of Dio's Book 71 dealt with warfare, most of it being Marcus' Danubian campaigns, apart from the brief mentions of the intervention in Egypt by Avidius Cassius and that by Martius Verus in Armenia; further, Xiphilinus also gave fairly full treatment to the rebellion of Cassius in 175 and its aftermath. His *Epitome* devotes most space to certain episodes: the death of the Guard prefect Vindex at the hands of the Marcomanni and their eventual defeat, giving Marcus the title Germanicus, and the revolt of the Egyptian Bucoli, suppressed by Avidius Cassius (259–60; Dio 71[72].3.5–4.2); Marcus' industriousness in dealing with court cases and his ill-health, and a battle with the Jazyges on the frozen river, with the concluding remark that 'Marcus thus subdued the Marcomanni and Jazyges after many hard struggles and dangers' (250–51; Dio 71 [72].6.1–8.1); the battle of the 'Rain Miracle' against the Quadi, into which Xiphilinus inserted the Christian interpretation (260–62; Dio 71 [72].8.1–10.5); the rebellion of Cassius and its aftermath, including Faustina's death, then Marcus' return to Rome via Athens and the renewal of the northern wars (262–67; Dio 71[72].22.2–33.4[1]), followed directly by Marcus' death and a long summary of his life and reign (267–68; Dio 71 [72].33.4[2]–36.4). Xiphilinus (or the scribes) misplaced the second of these passages (250–51), as well as a shorter previous one with two anecdotes about

the war (249–50): they precede a string of passages from Dio's Book 69 (252ff.) and Xiphilinus' substitute summary for the missing parts of Dio, Book 70 and the first part of 71.

Some information in parts of these Xiphilinus passages is repeated in the *excerpta*, particularly the *Valesiana*, of which nos. 302–312a deal with Marcus' reign. Only nos. 304, on the treatment of Ariogaesus, king of the Quadi (see below) and the Armenian satrap Tiridates (see above), 305, on Marcus' refusal to look at Cassius' severed head, 306, on his treatment of Cassius' supporters, and 310, on his godfearingness, add anything. No. 117 of the *excerpta Salmasiana* has a brief report of the auction of imperial property in AD 169, given at a little greater length by Zonaras 12.1, both surely taken from Dio's Book 71, and best known from the detailed accounts in Eutropius (8.11) and the *Historia Augusta* (17.4–6, based on Eutropius, and again at 21.9). The most important excerpts are in the *excerpta Ursiniana*^{G}, 57–66, which recount mainly diplomatic activity in the northern wars. The first, no. 57 (Dio 71[72].11.1–5), describes Marcus staying in Pannonia, receiving barbarian embassies. The Quadi sued for peace, which was granted, to prevent them joining the Marcomanni and Jazyges, and they handed back thousands of deserters and prisoners. Other peoples also surrendered; some supplied troops and others were allocated lands in the northern provinces and even in Italy – but those settled in Italy later seized Ravenna and were removed, which meant that Marcus did not settle barbarians in Italy again. In no. 58 (Dio 71[72].12.1–3), it is reported how the governor of Dacia Clemens attempted to manipulate two branches of the Vandals and on the unsuccessful mission to the Cotini of the *ab epistulis* Paternus. The next excerpt, 59 (Dio 71[72].13.1–4), records the Jazyges unsuccessfully suing for peace and Marcus' refusal to recognize king Ariogaesus; one of the *excerpta Valesiana*, 304, reports Ariogaesus' eventual capture and deportation to Alexandria. No. 60 (Dio 71[72].15) has the Marcomanni sending envoys to Marcus: as they had fulfilled previous conditions, he (albeit with reluctance) reduced by half the neutral zone on the Danube left bank. Nos. 61 (Dio 71[72].16.1–2) and 62 (Dio 71[72].17) both refer to Marcus being obliged, because of Cassius' revolt, to make terms with the Jazyges, who had, indeed, sued for peace; they had to return 100 000 captives and supply 8 000 cavalry, of whom 5 500 were sent to Britain. The Jazyges are also the subject of the next excerpt, no. 63 (Dio 71[72].18), which clearly belongs to the period of the renewed war, AD 178–80: it reports that they asked for relaxation of the terms previously imposed, and that both they and the Buri sought assurances that Marcus would 'prosecute the war to the uttermost' and not make peace with the Quadi. Excerpt no. 64 (Dio 71[72].19.1–2) reports how Marcus received envoys from various peoples, who received varying privileges, including in some cases Roman citizenship or exemption from taxation or tribute; he gave favorable treatment to the Jazyges.

By contrast, in no. 65 (Dio 71[72].20.1–2) the situation of the Quadi and Marcomanni was portrayed as desperate: 20 000 Roman soldiers were stationed in well equipped forts in the territory of each people, who were suffering such hardship that the Quadi tried to migrate beyond Rome's reach to the land of the Semnones. 'But Marcus . . . blocked the passes and prevented this. Thus he did not want to acquire their land but to punish the men.' This clearly refers to the last winter of the war, AD 179–80 – it must be noted that the final sentence is Dio's own interpretation. The last excerpt from Book 71, no. 66, describes the contrasting action of 3 000 men from one of the smaller Germanic people in this region, the Naristae, deserting to Rome and 'receiving land in our territory' (Dio 71[72].21).

2. The *Historia Augusta*

As the value of what survives from Dio's history is limited, one must rely heavily on the so-called *Historia Augusta*. First, a bare description must be given of the *HA*'s nature and content. It contains *vitae*, biographies, of emperors, both legitimate and 'usurpers' (*tyranni*), and their heirs, for the years 117–285. There is a lacuna for the years 244–60: hence there are no *vitae* of Philip and Decius and their respective sons, Aemilianus, and Gallus and his son Volusian; and that of Valerian only begins after his capture by the Persians. There are 30 *vitae*: from Hadrian to Elagabalus each minor figure has a separate *vita*; from the two Maximini onwards a single *vita* covers joint rulers, and usurpers are grouped together, 32 in one *vita*, four in another. The quality of these *vitae* is very varied. The early *vitae* of legitimate emperors of the second and early third century, i.e. from Hadrian to Caracalla, seem to be mainly factual and are thought to be based mainly on a good source. This is assumed by most scholars to be the lost *vitae Caesarum* of Marius Maximus, written in the early third century as a successor to Suetonius' *Twelve Caesars*, but evidently much more extensive. But both the later *vitae*, as well as those of the secondary figures, are to a considerable extent fictional.

Apart from two other writers, to be discussed shortly, Maximus and his *vitae* are known only from references in the *HA*, which quotes his *vitae* of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, Pertinax, Severus, and Elagabalus. It also has one unspecific citation, 'as Marius Maximus says in the life of many [sc. emperors]' (*Alexander Severus* 21.4), and two comments about him. In the first, Maximus is said to have been one of those biographers who transmitted accurate information although not writing in the historians' high style (*Probus* 2.6–7). But in the second one he is castigated as 'the most long-winded man of all' (*homo omnium verbosissimus*), unlike Suetonius, who loved brevity – and because he 'involved himself in mythological history',

whatsoever have attained to either the fame or the hope of the principate [i.e. usurpers]'. Shortly afterwards (*Aelius* 2.2) he refers to Galerius and Constantius as Caesars, implying a date between 293 and 305. The supposed author, of the *Marcus* (19.12) and *Verus* (11.4), 'Julius Capitolinus', likewise addresses Diocletian. Then comes the first usurper, Avidius Cassius, portrayed very positively, in the only *vita* under the name of 'Vulcacius Gallicanus', who informs Diocletian that he plans *lives* of all who had the title *imperator*, 'whether justly or unjustly, so that you. Augustus, may take cognisance of all wearers of the purple' (*Avidius Cassius* 3.3).

It was then as part of his attempt at originality that the author produced a separate *vita* of Lucius Verus, evidently hived off from Maximus' lengthy *vita* of Marcus, and, even worse, created largely fictional *vitae* of two minor figures, Aelius Caesar and the usurper Avidius Cassius. Chopping up his source got the author into a muddle: the *Marcus* goes to pieces from Verus' death in 169 onwards. The author first tried to cut his losses and finish his account by inserting a long passage of Eutropius, then decided that more was needed after all. Further items on the 170s were added, followed by some fiction. The result is that such major events as the invasions of Italy and Greece were not mentioned at all. In addition to the *Marcus* and *Verus* there is relevant information on Marcus' early life in the *Hadrian* and *Pius*, which are, fortunately, almost free of fiction, even if the former is muddled and repetitive in places. Further, there are useful items relevant to Marcus' reign in the *vitae* of Commodus, Pertinax, Didius Julianus, and Severus.

Structure of the *Marcus*:

1.1–7.4	life up to accession, AD 121–61
7.5–14–8	reign up to death of Lucius, AD 161–69
15.1–2	two anecdotes
15.3–19.5	a section dealing with the reign from AD 169 to 180, derived from different sources, the major part, 16.3–18.3, being adapted from Eutropius, *Breviarium* 8.11–14, while what precedes is based partly on Eutropius, partly on Aurelius Victor
19.6–11	elaborates 19.1–5 on Commodus and Faustina
19.12	an address to Diocletian, which looks as if it marked the original end of the *vita*, followed by the words 'this of course briefly and concisely', which may well be a comment by the author, taken into the manuscript mistakenly by his stenographer: it suggests second thoughts, which led to a further section, repeating the material covered in 15.3ff. with greater accuracy and more detail

20.1–28.10	the reign from AD 169 to 110, and a final chapter dealing with Marcus' death
29.1–10	further anecdotes and comments

Structure of the *Verus*:

1.1–2	comment on other treatments of the joint reign
1.3–3.7	life of Lucius Verus up to his accession, from his birth (AD 131 or 134) to AD 161
3.8–6.6	characterization of Lucius and his conduct (mostly unfavorable)
6.7–7.10	Parthian War
8.1–9.6	further comments of a similar kind to those in 3.8–6.6
9.7–11	the German expedition of AD 168 and Lucius' death (probably in January 169)
10.1–5	anecdotes about his death and relations with his sister Fabia, his wife Lucilla and with his mother-in-law Faustina
10.6–11.1	personalia and burial
11.2–3	another anecdote about his death
11.4	address to Diocletian

Structure of the *Avidius Cassius*:

1.1–3.5	fiction
3.6–7	story about Marcus lecturing on philosophy before leaving for the northern war, similar to that in Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus* 16.9
6.5–9.4	on the revolt, presumably based on Maximus, who is cited at 6.6, 7 and 9.5
9.5	readers are referred for more detail to Maximus' 'second book on the Life of Marcus'
9.6–13.5	fiction
13.6–7	treatment of Cassius' family and their fate under Commodus
13.8–14.8	fiction

There are dozens of personal names in both the first part of the *Marcus* and the *Verus* (discussed by Pflaum (1970) and (1976)), but the second part of the former has very few. One can only repeat that the reason is probably that the chopping up of his (no doubt very long) source to compose *vitae* of Lucius Verus and of Avidius Cassius, wore the author out or made him bored or confused. This might also explain why such an important event as the invasion of Italy, with the siege of Aquileia, is not mentioned. It could be argued that the author deliberately suppressed it, as discreditable to his

hero. It is clear that much material in the *lives* covering this period is designed to reflect favorably on Marcus – and unfavorably on Lucius Verus and Commodus. Still, it could well be that the author was muddled. Aquileia is mentioned at *Marcus* 14.1–6 when he reports on the expedition of 168,

> while the Victuali and Marcomanni were throwing everything into confusion and other peoples were ready to invade if not received [sc. into the empire] . . . That *profectio* was not unprofitable, for after they had come to Aquileia, several kings retreated with their peoples and executed the authors of the disturbance.

The author may have thought that what he was describing was the siege and its relief; and indeed some modern commentators have been so persuaded.[4]

After reaching Lucius' death at *Marcus* 14.8, the author may have already turned aside to compose the *Verus*, where at 9.7–11 he reached the *bellum Germanicum* and Lucius' death again. At *Verus* 9.7–8 he reports the emperors' arrival at Aquileia and their crossing the Alps; then at 9.9, he refers to his previous treatment:

> regarding this war – what was accomplished by the envoys, *legatos*, of the barbarians and what was achieved by our generals, *duces* – has already been very fully discussed in the *vita Marci*.

This suggests that he had already written his *Marcus*. In fact, *Marcus* 14.4 merely registers how 'several barbarian (peoples) sent (ambassadors) to the legates, *legatos* [i.e. governors] of the emperors'; and there is no detail later in the *vita* about what was 'achieved by our generals', let alone a very full discussion. Instead, a very abbreviated account of Marcus' life from AD 169 onwards follows, *Marcus* 15–19, beginning with inconsequential sentences, on how Marcus read and wrote during circus spectacles, 15.1, and on the power of the freedmen Geminus and Agaclytus, 15.2 – perhaps that passage was only added because the author remembered that at *Verus* 9.3–4 he had prefaced his remarks about the power of Geminus and Agaclytus with 'as we said in the *Life of Marcus*'. After reporting Lucius' deification at 3–4, he has a passage, 5–6, close to Victor, *De Caesaribus* 16.5–8: the rumor that Marcus poisoned Verus. Immediately after this is the abrupt remark at the end of 15.6: 'Cassius defected from Marcus after Verus' death'. Here is a clue that the author had again laid aside his *Marcus*, this time to compose the *Avidius Cassius*. Cassius played an important part in the Parthian War, so had already received mentions at *Verus* 7.1 and 8.3. Most of the *Avidius Cassius* is fiction, but 7.1–9.4 seems to be

taken from a good source, spoiled by the anachronistic insertion (the words 'about Pertinax and' at 8.5, when reporting comments by Marcus). This long passage is followed by 9.5:

> if anyone wishes to know about all this history, let him read the second book of Marius Maximus on the life of Marcus, in which he tells what Marcus did alone when Verus was already dead.

After this, fiction takes over again for the remainder of the *vita*, 9.6–14.8, except for 13.6–7, the treatment of Cassius' family and their fate under Commodus.

To return to the *Marcus*, 15.6 is followed by a long sentence, 16.1, registering Marcus' generosity to all his family, especially to Commodus; 16.2 is on their joint triumph at the end of AD 176. Most of 16.3–17.6 is very close to Eutropius 8.11.1–2 and 12.2–14.1. All eight sections of 18 look like sententious padding by the author, while 19.1–11, on Faustina and gladiators, is almost entirely fiction elaborated from Victor, *De Caesaribus* 16.2. Chapter 19 ends with an address to Diocletian, 19.12, then the words *et quidem haec breviter et congeste*, 'this of course briefly and concisely'. These words may well be an aside, mistakenly taken into the text by a stenographer. At all events, evidently feeling that he had been too brief, the author started again, at 20.1, to cover Marcus' life from AD 169 to 180. First he reports Marcus' critical statements about Lucius in the senate, his generosity to the latter's family and freedmen and his sensitivity about his own reputation (20.1–5). Then he seems about to resume a narrative, with Marcus' departure for the front, *profectio*, on the eve of which came the marriage of his widowed daughter to Claudius Pompeianus, to which is noted Lucilla's and her mother's unfavorable reaction, 20.6–7. But first there is an interruption: the invasion of 'all the Spains' by the Moors and 'successes achieved though his legates', with no names or further details, 21.1, then the revolt of the Bucoli in Egypt and its suppression by Cassius, 21.2. After reverting to the delayed *profectio*, the death of Marcus' younger son Annius Verus Caesar is reported, with the restricted mourning and posthumous honors, 21.3–5. But instead of going on to report where Marcus went when he finally departed in autumn 169, and what he did next, the author reverts to the preparations for war, presumably undertaken in spring and summer of that year: because the plague was still raging, Marcus renewed the cult of the gods very diligently and recruited slaves for military service, 21.6; he also armed gladiators, and made Dalmatian and Dardanian bandits into soldiers; he armed *diogmitae* (local policemen in the east) too and even purchased German mercenaries to fight against Germans, 21.7. Besides this, he prepared the legions with all diligence for the German or Marcomannic war, 21.8. The auction of imperial treasures in the Forum of Trajan, already

described in some detail at 17.4–7, in part of the passage based on Eutropius (8.13), is briefly reported again, 21.9, with an acknowledgment that he is repeating himself, 'as we have said', *ut diximus.*

At this point one would have expected an account of the next five campaigning seasons, AD 170–74. But the author was either unable or unwilling to tackle this. Instead, he jumps to what must be the aftermath of the invasion of Italy, when the Marcomanni had been chased back north, in AD 171: 'he wiped out the Marcomanni at the very crossing of the Danube and restored the plunder to the provincials', 21.10. The preceding invasion of Italy by the Marcomanni and Quadi is not mentioned, just a 'conspiracy' of all the peoples beyond the northern *limes* (several names are hopelessly corrupt in the MSS) – as well as the threat of a Parthian and a British war, 22.1. J. Burian, perhaps rightly, regards this list as drawn from a geographical source and reflecting the concerns of the author's own time (Burian (1987) 117). Most of the rest of 22, viz. 2–9, deals with the northern wars but with no hint of chronological order. At 22.10–11 there is suddenly brief mention of disturbances among the Sequani, 22.10, and in Lusitania, 22.11. Only at 22.12 is a datable event mentioned, the summoning of Commodus to the *limes* and his assumption of the *toga virilis*, which *Commodus* 2.2 allows one to assign to the Nones of July 175, as well as his designation to the consulship, which was to be held in AD 177.

The passage from 23.1 to 24.3 deals mainly with legal measures from the reign. At 24.3 the author suddenly reverts to the war, citing first Marcus' equitable treatment of enemy prisoners and the settling of 'countless numbers' of them on Roman soil, then, at 24.4, in only 15 words in the Latin, 'by his prayers he summoned a thunderbolt from heaven against a military device of the enemy and obtained rain for his men when they were suffering from thirst', in other words the Lightning and Rain Miracles. These are depicted in scenes 11 and 16 of the Aurelian Column, while the Rain Miracle was the subject of a long passage in Xiphilinus. The remaining narrative covers the period from spring 175 to Marcus' death in March 180, 24.5–28.10. Much of this, up to 27.5, is relatively detailed. It begins with Marcus' wish to make a province of *Marcomannia*, likewise of *Sarmatia*, and the claim that he would have done this had not Cassius rebelled, 24.5. Cassius' coup, its background and end, the journey to the east, the return to Rome via Athens, the triumph and the promotion of Commodus, with *congiarium* and spectacles, are treated fairly fully, 24.6–27.5. The latter section ends with a curt remark, 'he corrected many civilian matters', exemplified by the measure limiting the price of gladiators, 27.6; then come Marcus' supposed regular quotation of Plato's philosopher-king ideal, 27.7, and the marriage of Commodus. The final expedition, from August 178 to March 180, is allotted two sentences only, 27.9–10, the second being the claim that 'if he had survived for one year he would have made provinces out of them [the Marcomanni and their neighbours, and the

Cary, E., ed. and trans. (1914–1927), *Dio's Roman History, with an English translation*. 9 vols. (Loeb Classical Library). London.
Chastagnol, A., ed. and trans. (1994), *Histoire Auguste. Les empereurs romains des IIe et IIIe siècles. Édition bilingue latin-français*. Paris.
Hohl, E., ed. (1927), *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
Magie, D., trans. (1921–1932), *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. 3 vols. (Loeb Classical Library). London.

Secondary sources

Alföldy, G. (1987), *Römische Heeresgeschichte*. Amsterdam.
Birley, A.R. (1967), 'The Augustan History', in T.A. Dorey, ed., *Latin Biography*. London. 113–38.
Birley, A.R. (1997), 'Marius Maximus the Consular Biographer', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.34.3: 2678–2757.
Birley, A.R. (2003), 'The *Historia Augusta* and Pagan Historiography', in G. Marasco, ed., *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity, Fourth to Sixth Century* AD. Leiden. 127–49.
Burian, J. (1987), 'Die Darstellung der Markomannenkriege in den SHA (Vita Marci) und ihre Glaubwürdigkeit', *Listy Filologické* 110: 114–18.
Dessau, H. (1889), 'Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Hermes* 24: 337–92.
Dessau, H. (1892), 'Über die *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*', *Hermes* 27: 561–605.
Gowing, A.M. (1990), 'Dio's Name', *Classical Philology* 85: 49–54.
Millar, F. (1964), *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.
Morris, J. (1964), '*Leges annales* under the Principate. I. Legal and Constitutional', *Listy filologické* 87: 316–37.
Pflaum, H.-G. (1970), 'La valeur de la source inspiratrice de la *Vita Hadriani* et de la *Vita Marci* à la lumière des personnalités contemporains nommément citées', in Straub, ed., 173–99.
Pflaum, H.-G. (1976), 'Les personnages nommément cités par la *Vita Veri* de l'*H.A.*', in Alföldi/Straub, eds., 173–87.
Piso, I. (1993), *Fasti Provinciae Daciae I*. Bonn.
Syme, R. (1968), *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*. Oxford.
Syme, R. (1971a), *Emperors and Biography. Studies in the Historia Augusta*. Oxford.
Syme, R. (1971b), *The Historia Augusta. A Call for* [misprinted as *of*] *Clarity*. Bonn.
Syme, R. (1983), *Historia Augusta Papers*. Oxford.
Zwikker, W. (1941), *Studien zur Markussäule* I. Amsterdam.

CHAPTER 2

Archaeological Evidence of the Marcomannic Wars of Marcus Aurelius (AD 166–80)

*Thomas Fischer**

1. Preliminary Remarks

After long years of relative peace on the northern borders of the Roman Empire, the Marcomannic wars (AD 166–80) suddenly plunged the Empire into a serious crisis. The heavy losses incurred in these fights brought the Empire to the brink of catastrophe and ironically occurred during the reign of the 'philosopher on the throne' Marcus Aurelius (AD 161–80). This most difficult political trial of Marcus Aurelius' reign involved not only a dangerous two-front war fought on the eastern border with Parthia and on the northern border at the Donau, but on top of that also the pestilence which had been introduced into the Empire from the East. In historiography, the prolonged military conflicts of these wars are seen as marking the turning point from the 'golden age' of the Middle Empire to the relatively dark periods of the Crisis of the Empire during the third century AD and Late Antiquity. The historical and epigraphical material on the Marcomannic wars is not very abundant, but has increasingly been amended by archaeological records (Böhme (1975) 153; Friesinger et al. (1994); Kehne (2009)). This chapter will demonstrate how the historical information on the Marcomannic wars can be comprehended and occasionally validated with the help of the present archaeological evidence.

It is obvious that the knowledge of the archaeological find places connected to the Marcomannic wars is very much dependant on the state of research in the region and cannot mirror historical reality. This is aptly illustrated by the fact

A Companion to Marcus Aurelius, First Edition. Edited by M. van Ackeren.

that many relevant find places are known from Raetia, which was only marginally affected by the destructions of the wars. In contrast to this, Pannonia, which was at the centre of the fights, still is archaeologically underrepresented – as is Northern Italy. A first comprehensive synopsis of the state of research was presented by H.-W. Böhme (Böhme (1975)), the latest attempts are more recent (Fischer (2009); Komoróczy (2009)).

2. The Marcomannic Theater of War

The main theater of the war with the Marcomanni from Bohemia and their Germanic, Sarmatian, and other allies can safely be assumed to have been in the Noric-Pannonian part of the Danubian border on both sides of the river (Böhme (1975); Friesinger et al. (1994); Komoróczy (2009)). But northern Italy too had to endure the ravages of war for the first time after the Civil War following the death of Nero in AD 68/69: the provincial town of Opitergum/Oderzo was destroyed by the barbarians penetrating into the Empire and Aquileia was besieged (Kehne (2009) 104) – a truly shocking event for contemporaries. Even a special force for the protection of the Alpine region and Italy (*praetentura Italiae et Alpium*), hastily assembled in the Eastern Alpine region in AD 168, was unable to prevent these events (Böhme (1975) 160). After this catastrophe, the protection of Italy was strengthened by the formation of two new legions (Leg. II and III Italica). The latter legion (Leg. II Italica) was shortly camped in Locica near Celje in Slovenia, before being sent to the Danubian border to protect Noricum (Böhme (1975) 169–71). The – fairly imprecise – historical information furthermore informs us that Raetia, to the west of the main theater of war, also was affected by the Marcomannic wars of AD 166–80. A somewhat unreliable source from Late Antiquity has the later emperor Pertinax cleansing Reatia and Noricum from enemies that had penetrated it (*HA Helvius Pertinax* 2.4–6). The Leg. III Italica participated in these fights and was finally camped in Regensburg for the protection of Raetia (Fischer (1994) 350).

3. Archaeological Evidence

3.1. Column of Marcus Aurelius

The first and foremost monument among the archaeological evidence is of course the fantastic column of Marcus Aurelius in Rome. This 42m-high monument with its spiral of relief depicting episodes from the Marcomannic wars was largely destroyed during the Middle Ages and the interpretation of

the scenes is controversial among scholars (Petersen et al. (1896); Zwikker (1941); Waurick (1983)). Modern scholars agree that the relief on the column of Marcus Aurelius (like that on the column of Trajan) does not depict a naturalistically illustrated history of the events, corresponding with the historical sources. It is doubtful that this was ever the purpose of this monument. In addition to that, the comparison of the depictions of Roman weapons on the column with the archaeological finds shows up many distinct differences as well as some matches (Böhme (1975) 200f.; Waurick (1983); Wolff (1994) 73–83).

3.2. Coinage

The coinage of the Marcomannic wars has not been the subject of longer study yet, but W. Szaivert has published a first outline (Szaivert (1994) 497–505). He mainly relied on depictions on the reverse of coins pertinent to the subject. As a rule, these depictions follow the familiar Roman iconography of victory, well known from coins from earlier and later periods: Piles of weapons with the inscription DE GERMANIS or DE SARMATIS, Tropaia (some with bound prisoners averting their faces) and Victories in different attitudes. In contrast to this, the depiction of a laurel wreath is singular for the Marcomannic wars.

3.3. Find Places

Apart from pictorial and epigraphical evidence, three kinds of primary archaeological data can illustrate the repercussions of the Marcomannic wars in the Roman Empire (Fischer (1994) 341f.):

1. Well documented destruction layers in Roman military or civil settlements of the second half of the second century AD, which can be dated accurately in the period of the Marcomannic wars. Ideally, these are larger features, excluding the possibility of a locally limited destruction by a common fire.
2. Hoard horizons dated by their latest coin into the second half of the second century AD.
3. Newly erected and sometimes only shortly occupied camps, which may be linked to the Marcomannic wars. Precise dating of the camps by several archaeological methods independent from each other is an important prerequisite for a correct evaluation here.

On the basis of some prominent examples, I would now like to present some find places, starting in the west and going eastwards. Most places can be linked with some certainty to the destruction of the Marcomannic wars, while others are less securely dated.

Raetia

Direct and indirect traces of the Marcomannic wars were mainly found in the eastern part of Raetia, on the Danubian border between Böhming (LK Eichstätt) and Straubing. In addition to coin hoards dated to the period of the Marcomannic wars with differing accuracy (Fischer (1994) 347f.; Fischer (2009) 109), there are many places with destruction layers dated securely by coins, relief-decorated Terra Sigillata and inscriptions. The find situation in Regensburg is especially characteristic, because different find contexts provide a clear picture, which may be used as a standard for less consistent find places.

Raetia seems not to have been affected as a whole by the Marcomannic wars, as archaeological research suggests that the destruction from this period was regionally contained. The archaeologically well-documented forts of Künzing and Passau do not exhibit the Marcomannic destruction layers so typical of Regensburg and Straubing, which points to the fact that the Germanic invasions only involved the eastern Limes of Raetia and the Danubian border from Böhming to Straubing.

Up to now, Marcomannic destruction layers were excavated in the interior of Raetia only in Gauting (a massive layer) and quite likely also in Augsburg. It is possible to conclude from this regional distribution of the destruction that the enemy did not come from the eastern theater of war on the middle part of the Danube via the Roman Danube road, but apparently chose to use the natural mountain passes from the Bohemian region into the Danube valley and from there advanced onwards into the interior of the province. This natural road of the Cham-Furth gap leads from the Bavarian Forest and the Bohemian Forest along the valley of the River Regen towards Regensburg and through the Stallwang gap towards Straubing. This is especially interesting since Regensburg and Straubing, both lying at the end of the natural road from Bohemia, were the only places on the Raetian Limes safeguarded with remarkable strength by two contemporary forts even before the Marcomannic wars. The subsequent events of the Marcomannic wars fully vindicated these precautions – one might even say that they let them appear not prudent enough. Considering this geo-strategical background, the stationing of the Legio III Italica in Regensburg opposite the river mouth of the Regen after the Marcomannic wars becomes logical: This was the invasion route from Bohemia. At the same time, one could also control another ancient invasion route from Central Germany along the valley of the Naab, which joins the Danube near Regensburg (Fischer (1994) 350).

Böhming

The most westernmost place where destruction layers connected to the Marcomannic wars have been found is the small fort of Böhming in the valley of the Altmühl river. Previous speculations on this (Fischer (1994) 345; Fischer

been convincingly argued to have been a reaction to the Marcomannic wars. The erection of the wall seems to have been carried out with the help of the Legio II Italica, as a building camp of this unit has recently been found (Fischer (1994) 341–54; Fischer (2009) 112).

Gauting

In the *vicus* of Gauting on the Roman road from Kempten to Salzburg a destruction layer was excavated in which a depot of burnt Terra Sigillata was found. The spectrum of this depot is identical to the spectrum of the relief-decorated Terra Sigillatas from the layers at Regensburg-Kumpfmühl. The *vicus* of Gauting seems thus to be one of the few places in the interior of Raetia that can be assumed to have been destructed during the Marcomannic wars (Fischer (1994) 341–54; Fischer (2009) 113).

Eining-Unterfeld

Many new finds have verified the dating of the camp of the Legio III Italica at Eining-Unterfeld into the Marcomannic wars. The vexillation camp build for half a legion plus mounted auxiliary troops, was only used for a short period. This period can be limited by two dates: AD 172 as the earliest possible destruction date for Regensburg-Kumpfmühl and AD 179, the date of the completion of the legionary camp at Regensburg (Fischer (1994) 348f.; Fischer (2009) 113).

3.4. Noricum

In 1995, M. Pollak collected the archaeological finds and contexts linked to the Marcomannic wars in Noricum (Pollak (1994) 431–37). She names coin hoards (Pollak (1994) 432) and destruction layers, some of which can be linked with more certainty to the Marcomannic wars than others. Interestingly, Linz is the only military base where well-dated destruction layers from a fire make it likely that the camp was destroyed during the conflicts. All the other evidence for similar attacks from enemies in Noricum comes from *vici* and *municipia*. The region to the north of the Danube opposite Noricum was separated from the regions of Germanic settlement in Bohemia by impenetrable wooded mountains. It therefore seems likely that the attackers came from more easterly regions of Germanic settlement in today's Lower Austria, Moravia, and Slovakia. The attackers probably skirted the border defenses on the Danube and thus could advance into the unprotected interior of the province to loot and pillage. The destructions in Flavia Solva suggest that the Barbarians did not use the passes of the Central Alps to get to Italy, but went via the Eastern Alps.

Salzburg/Juvavum

In Noricum's two other *municipia* to the north of the Alps, Salzburg/Juvavum and Wels/Ovilava, both securely dated destruction layers and less well dated complexes have come to light (Krammer (2007); Fischer (2009) 113).

Hallstadt

In the *vicus* of Hallstatt, which was linked to the Roman salt mining in the region, a conflagration layer from the second half of the second century AD was found. This suggests that this wealthy *vicus* had also fallen victim to the pillaging enemies (Pollak (1994) 432).

Wels/Ovilava

The burnt Terra Sigillata from the destruction layers in the *municipium* of Ovilava displays an almost identical spectrum to the horizon of Regensburg-Kumpfmühl, which dates the destruction at this place to the period of the Marcomannic wars (Fischer (2009) 113).

St. Pölten/Cetium

In St. Pölten, the conflagration layers can be dated with the help of coins to a terminus post quem of AD 170. In addition to that, an inscription on the reconstruction of the settlement in the years AD 169/72 prove the seriousness of these destructions (Scherrer (1994) 447–55).

Flavia Solva

Clear evidence of destruction can also be found in the *municipium* of Flavia Solva to the south of the Alps, marking the advance of the Barbarians to Northern Italy (Groh (1996)).

Lauriacum/Lorch

After the Marcomannic wars, the Lagion II Italica was stationed in Noricum, which previously did not have a legion. Similar to the situation in Raetia, this is interpreted by scholars as an intensification of the border defenses in reaction to the Marcomannic wars. The location was chosen because of the crossing of the southern Danube road with an old road from the Alps into the Barbaricum to the north of the Danube. The legion was first camped in Albing, before moving to Lauriacum/Lorch (Pollak (1994) 433; Fischer (2009) 113).

3.5. Pannonia

In the main theater of war Pannonia, we can be fairly certain of large-scale destructions. But the state of research is such that no representative picture of the finds emerges. Some conflagration layers dated into the right bracket are an indication of the destruction (Gabler (1994) 355–69).

3.6. Barbaricum

The region to the north of the Danube on the border of Noricum and Pannonia – Lower Austria, Moravia, and Slovakia – were the ancestral lands of the Marcomanni, Quadi and the other tribes which participated in the Marcomannic wars. Here, a very dynamic archaeological research has managed to make good progress on the Marcomannic wars (Tejral (1992); Komoróczy (2009)).

Inner Germanic Migrations

The ancient sources allude to the pressure that must have been applied to the Marcomanni and other Germanic tribes living directly on the borders of the Roman Empire by their inner-German neighbors, which seems to have been one of the major causes of the war. Archaeological indicators of this pressure have been discovered recently (Godłowski (1994) 115–28; Böhme (1975) 212–15).

Inscription of Trencín

A rock-cut inscription near the Slovakian city of Trencín records an episode from the last winter of the war in AD 179/80: A vexillatio of 855 men of the Legio II Adiutrix from Budapest under their commander M. Valerius Maximianus spent the winter at a place by the name of Laugaricio, to close the Trencín gap in the valley of the River Waag. The Romans thus occupied the key point for the control of the main road between the Germanic tribes of the Quadi and the Vandals (Böhme (1975) 210f.; Komoróczy (2009) 116, fig. 4).

The Roman Import to the Barbaricum during the Marcomannic Wars

The research of A. Stuppner has given us an indication of the disturbances the Marcomannic wars caused in the economic relations between the Roman Empire and the Barbaricum (Stuppner (1994) 285–98). During the second and third century AD, many finds imported from the Roman Empire – such as

fibulae, metal vessels, and pottery – have been found in the trans-Danubian region on the other side of the Limes. Among these finds, the relief-decorated Terra Sigillata is especially important as it gives us quite precise datings. Stuppner could demonstrate that relief-decorated Terra Sigillata and other pottery present in large numbers in the destruction layers from the Marcomannic war on the Roman side of the border is absent in the Barbaricum after the hostilities have begun – except on Roman military sites. Not only does he interpret this as an interruption of the trade between the Roman and the Germanic side, but he also regards this as evidence for the discontinuation of Germanic settlement in the border zone to the north of the Danube. Such a temporary prohibition of settlement can be linked to historic sources reporting that one of the conditions in the peace treaties of Rome with the Germanic tribes was an evacuation of the border zone to the north of the Danube.

The Circulation of Roman Currency in the Barbaricum during the Marcomannic Wars

A further effect of the Marcomannic wars was the large influx of Roman coins of the second century AD – most of them denarii – deep into the interior regions of the Barbaricum (Bursche (1994) 471–85). That this money could have included Roman tributary payments to the Germanic tribes as well as the ransom of prisoners is a plausible theory, which will probably never be verified. A detailed analysis by E. Kolníková charters the effect of the Marcomannic wars as mirrored in the coinage found in the Barbaricum (Kolníková (1994) 487–96). She can identify an increased influx of Roman coinage into the border zone of the Barbaricum during the wars, a phenomenon which stops in the period directly after the wars.

The Fort of Iza

The fort of Iza is about 3ha in size and situated on the northern banks of the Danube in today's Slovakia. It was built during the Marcomannic wars as a bridgehead of the camp of the Legio I Adjutrix in Brigetio/Komaron, in today's Hungary. In its first phase, the fort had a turf and timber wall of unknown construction with two V-shaped ditches and adobe interior buildings. According to recent coin finds from the destruction layers, it was destroyed and burned to the ground – most likely by a Germanic attack – in AD 179, shortly before the end of the war in AD 180. Many belongings, which would have been taken out of the fort by the troops under normal circumstances, were left behind in the chaotic destruction of the fort and discovered by the archaeologists in the destruction layers. Among them were fibulae, coins, and pottery, but also a large number of weapons: swords, the heads of lances

and spears, parts of lorica segmentata, scale armor and mail armor as well as parts of shields and helmets. Some iron trilobate arrowheads and bone laths of composite bows were also found. Iron shoe nails prove the presence of lost caligae, which suggests chaotic conditions during the abandonment of the fort. The finds also hint at the garrison of the fort, which must have consisted of infantry and eastern archers (Rajtár (2009)).

Roman Marching Camps

With the introduction of aerial archaeology in Austria, ditch systems interpreted as the remains of shortly occupied marching camps were discovered frequently to the north of the Danube. Since the fall of the Iron Curtain made aerial archaeology possible in the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe as well, such ditch systems of marching camps were also discovered in the region to the north of the Danube in Pannonia. At the moment around 30 such camps are known and it does not seem rash to expect more of these finds in the coming years. Many can be dated by their own finds and as these installations often either lie on top of Germanic settlements or under them, the finds from these settlements also help to date the camps into the period of the Marcomannic wars (Komorócy (2009) 114–19). The northernmost installation of this kind was found near Olomouc-Neredín (Olmütz) and could be dated securely into the period of the Marcomannic wars by the finds from overlaying or overlaid Germanic settlements. The camp controlled the Moravian Gate on an important road into the settlement region of the Germanic Przeworsk culture in today's Poland. Most of these installations conform to the usual plan of Roman camps in a rectangular or trapezoid form with rounded corners ('Spielkartenschema', playing-card plan). The construction of towers, gates, or interior buildings could not be identified. The dimensions were varying from smaller camps of circa 1–2ha, up to installations of 50ha that could house several legions. A common occurrence is the discovery of several installations at the same place, occasionally even overlapping each other.

3.7. Other Roman Military Bases in the Barbaricum

Some military installations in the trans-Danubian Barbaricum seem to have been occupied by the Roman army for a longer period during the Marcomannic wars. Among those are some fortified places with a supra-regional function as important command posts, which in some cases seem to have been required to defend that position in bitter fights. These installations do not conform to the usual regular plan of Roman camps mentioned above (playing card plan), but are fortifications irregular and varied in both form and size, which often use

continues unabatedly. Finally, the excavations in Musov continuously provide new results on the command structure and logistics of the Roman army in enemy country during the wars. In addition to that, archaeological evidence points towards an abandonment of the Germanic settlements in the border zone to the north of the Danube as one result of the peace treaties after the end of the wars in AD 180.

NOTE

* The author thanks Stefanie Hoss for the translation.

FURTHER READING

Secondary Sources

Boos, A., L.-M. Dallmaier, and B. Overbeck (2000), *Der römische Schatz von Regensburg-Kumpfmühl*. Regensburg.

Jütting, I. (1995), 'Die Kleinfunde aus dem römischen Lager Eining-Unterfeld', *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 60: 143–230.

Ortisi, S. (2001), 'Die Stadtmauer der raetischen Provinzhauptstadt Aelia Augusta – Augsburg', *Augsburger Beiträge zur Archäologie* 2: 80–82, 94.

REFERENCES

Secondary Sources

Böhme, H.W. (1975), 'Archäologische Zeugnisse zur Geschichte der Markomannenkriege (166–180 n. Chr.)', *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* 22: 153–217.

Bursche, A. (1994), 'Die Markomannenkriege und der Zufluß römischer Münzen in das Barbaricum', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 471–86.

Dietz, K. and Th. Fischer (1996), *Die Römer in Regensburg*. Regensburg.

Fischer, Th. (1994), 'Archäologische Zeugnisse der Markomannenkriege (166–180 n. Chr.) in Raetien und Obergermanien', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 341–54.

Fischer, Th. (2009), 'Zerstörungshorizonte. Germanische Übergriffe und ihr archäologischer Niederschlag', in Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land GmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese, ed., *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht. Konflikt. Ausstellungskatalog Kalkriese 2009*. Stuttgart. 109–13.

Friesinger, H., J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno.

Gabler, D. (1994), 'Über die Aussagekraft der Terra-Sigillata-Funde bezüglich der Zerstörungen in den Provinzen', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 355–70.

Gnade, B. (2010). 'Das römische Kastell. Böhming am Raetischen Limes', *Berichte der Bayerischen Bodendenkmalpflege* 51, 199–286.

Godłowski, K. (1994), 'Die Synchronisierung der Chronologie des germanischen Fundstoffes zur Zeit der Markomannenkriege', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 115–28.

Groh, S. (1996), 'Die Insula 41 von Flavia Solva. Ergebnisse der Grabungen 1959 und 1989 bis 1992', *Sonderschriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes* 28: 179–81.

Kehne, P. (2009), 'Rom in Not. Zur Geschichte der Markomannenkriege', in Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land GmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese, ed., *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht. Konflikt. Ausstellungskatalog Kalkriese 2009*. Stuttgart. 98–108.

Kolníková, E. (1994), 'Die Markomannenkriege im Lichte der Fundmünzen aus der Slowakei', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 487–96.

Komoróczy, B. (2009), 'Marcomannia. Der Militärschlag gegen die Markomannen und Quaden – ein archäologischer Survey', in Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land GmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese, ed., *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht. Konflikt. Ausstellungskatalog Kalkriese 2009*. Stuttgart. 114–25.

Krammer, A. (2007), 'Ein mittelkaiserzeitlicher Zerstörungshorizont in Juvavum/Salzburg. Die Ausgrabungen im Furtwänglerpark in den Jahren 1987/88', *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 72: 7–75.

Petersen, E., A. von Domaszewski, and G. Calderini, eds. (1896), *Die Marcus-Säule auf der Piazza Colonna*. Berlin.

Pollak, M. (1994), 'Auswirkungen der Markomannenkriege beiderseits des westnorischen Limes', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 431–38.

Rajtár, J. (2009), 'Im Handstreich genommen. Der Fall des Römerlagers von Iza', in Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land GmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese, ed., *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht. Konflikt. Ausstellungskatalog Kalkriese 2009*. Stuttgart. 126–27.

Scherrer, P. (1994), 'Der große Markomanneneinfall des Jahres 170 und seine Folgen im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen in Aelium Cetium/St. Pölten', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 447–56.

Stuppner, A. (1994), 'Zu den Auswirkungen der Markomannenkriege im niederösterreichischen Limesvorland', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 285–98.

Szaivert, W. (1994), 'Die Markomannenkriege in der römischen Münzprägung', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 497–505.

Tejral, J. (1992), 'Die Probleme der römisch-germanischen Beziehungen unter Berücksichtigung der neuen Forschungsergebnisse im niederösterreichisch-

südmährischen Thayaflussgebiet', *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 73: 377–468.

Tejral, J. (2009), 'Römisch-germanisch bis zum Tod', in Varusschlacht im Osnabrücker Land GmbH – Museum und Park Kalkriese, ed., *2000 Jahre Varusschlacht. Konflikt. Ausstellungskatalog Kalkriese 2009*. Stuttgart. 128–30.

Waurick, G. (1983), 'Untersuchungen zur historisierenden Rüstung in der Römischen Kunst', *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* 30: 265–301.

Wolff, H. (1994), 'Die Markus-Säule als Quelle für die Markomannenkriege', in H. Friesinger, J. Tejral, and A. Stuppner, eds., *Markomannenkriege: Ursachen und Wirkungen*. Brno. 73–84.

Zwikker, W. (1941), *Studien zur Markussäule I*. Amsterdam.

CHAPTER 3

The *Meditations*

*Matteo Ceporina**

1. The Dating of the *Meditations*

Very little can be said with certainty about the dating and the time span over which this collection of writings was compiled, for which Marcus Aurelius used the generic term *hypomnēmátia*, that is to say 'notes' or 'notelets' (*Meditations* 3.14.1). Since there is no definite data concerning the chronology of the *Meditations*, it is impossible to assert that it is the work of a whole lifetime.[1] Nevertheless, the fragmentary nature and heterogeneity of the various chapters, as well as the discontinuity of writing, now refined and artfully constructed, now plain or less controlled, would lead us to think of a rather wide time span, maybe several years. The references to the emperor's advanced age are too frequent not to arouse the suspicion that at least part of the work dates back to his late maturity, after his accession to the throne (cf. especially 6.30.1): in 2.2.4 Marcus Aurelius explicitly calls himself 'old' (cf. also 2.6.2: 'this life you have almost brought to an end . . .', 5.31.3, 10.15.1). References to the time or to significant biographical events are scarce. Two chapters of the eighth book (8.25.1, 37.1) certainly come after the death of his adoptive brother Lucius Verus, who died in AD 169. The recollection of the plague (9.2.4–5) most probably refers to a time no earlier than the year 166 when, according to the sources, Verus's legions, victorious on the Mesopotamian front, spread the contagious disease in the west. The reference to the Sarmatians, in *Meditations* 10.10.1, somewhat recalls the military operations conducted by Marcus Aurelius on the north-east front starting in 174, but is not necessarily connected to any event in particular, such as the conferment of the title of Sarmaticus in 175 or the celebration of the triumph in Rome the following year. A few other inferences are possible but without knowing to which part of

A Companion to Marcus Aurelius, First Edition. Edited by M. van Ackeren.

the text exactly correspond some termini post quos: the double portrait of Antoninus Pius (1.16, 6.30.5–15) definitely looks like a posthumous homage (in which case it would be after 161, although the reference is rather vague), whereas any other link is so uncertain as to deserve no mention. The two inside inscriptions should give more precise information about dating but in actual fact they are not conclusive. The first one, in Xylander's *editio princeps*, reads, at the end of the first book: 'Written in the territory of the Quadi, near the river Granua. I'. However, due to the fact that the first book – which, as it has been unanimously recognized, is a sort of introduction to the work – was written later than others, the above-mentioned *subscriptio* is preferably moved to the second book (which therefore becomes 'the first book written during the campaign against the Quadi'), of which it becomes the heading. The second one, instead, is found at the beginning of the third book: 'Written in Carnuntum'. But does it really only refer to the third book or also to one or more of the ones that follow? It is difficult to declare an opinion, since there is no guarantee that the current division in books reflects the original one. The river Granua (now Hron or Gran) is a tributary of the Danube. Carnuntum, not far from the river, is now called Petronell (near Bad-Deutsch-Altemburg), not far from Vienna and Bratislava, where important ruins can be found. Marcus Aurelius lived there from 170 to 173, during the campaigns against the Quadi and the Marcomanni (who invaded the Empire in 168). And that was probably where he composed the *Meditations* from the second book onwards. Nevertheless, the uncertain dating of the campaigns against the Barbarians leads to a significant fluctuation, between 172 and 178 approximately; however, it is likely that the books from the 4th to the 12th were written after 173. As far as the first book is concerned, which is so different in content and general tone, it may have been composed in Rome, between 176 and 180, on the way back from the east after Avidius Cassius's revolt, or in Sirmio (now Sremska Mitrovica), Marcus Aurelius's headquarters between 178 and 180, during his last German campaigns.

2. The History of the *Meditations* in the Early Centuries

The 12 books of the *Meditations* were neither conceived nor organized to be published, as is undoubtedly proved by their content, which lacks the necessary references for an outside reader and whose intelligibility and importance can be fully understood only by the author itself. In fact, most allusions, images, hints, and above all suggestions and warnings make sense only if addressed to oneself.[2] The fact that this text was conceived for personal use is also confirmed

manuscript, which had reached him in circumstances that remain unknown (*Epistols* 44, vol. 1, p. 305, ed. Westerink). This is the first clear mention, datable with reasonably safe approximation and of known authorship, of the work by Marcus Aurelius, and it is very likely that the important information contained in it will enable us to discover the origin of the manuscript tradition of the *Meditations* (Cortassa (1997) 112). However, nothing in the letter suggests that Arethas considered this book as a real rarity or that he had brought it to light again on his own: on the contrary, he writes of this work as if his correspondent was quite familiar with it (Farquharson (1944) XVII). As has successfully been demonstrated by Hadot and Luna ((1998) XIX–XXI), who politely question the overall interpretation given by Cortassa ((1997) 115–21), Aretha's copy was not in the least 'completely in pieces' (*pantápasi dierrhuēkós*): the expression *ou mèn hóti* (not, however, because), which is essential in order to correctly understand the *incipit* of the letter in its exact meaning, cannot be equivalent to *ouch'hóti* (although) (Ronconi (2003) 21).[4] It is therefore likely that Arethas had a perfectly legible copy, no matter how old, of the *Meditations* by Marcus Aurelius and that he only had it transcribed in order to hand it down to posterity in a renewed state. Thus, it is no longer appropriate to attribute the work's supposed corruptions to the bad condition of its archetype: the successful restoration of *Meditations* 7.24, one of the passages which has been by far the most abused by philologists and editors,[5] and the provocative remarks made by Giangrande (2003), eloquently bear witness to a tradition that is often unjustly suspected.

Further indications may be provided by another text, the anonymous epigram contained in the *Greek Anthology* (*AP* 15.23). These verses, which undoubtedly refer to a copy of the *Meditations* by Marcus Aurelius, appear again as *colophon* in the *Vaticanus Graecus 1950* codex. It is very likely that Marcus's reader, who introduced the poem to the *Anthology*, was Arethas (Maas (1913) 297). If credit is given to the hypothesis formulated by Hadot and Luna ((1998) XXII–XXIV), who ascribe the epigram to the historian and epigrammist Theophylact Simocatta (late sixth to early seventh century), the first piece of evidence of the existence of the *golden booklet* by Marcus Aurelius would be advanced by about three centuries.

3. The Indirect Tradition

3.1. The Text of the Meditations *as Preserved by Suida*

After Arethas of Caesarea, the most ancient indirect piece of evidence of Marcus Aurelius's work is the Byzantine lexicon called *Suida*, which dates back to the 10th century. It is difficult to ascertain whether its author had directly read and

quoted Marcus Aurelius's text or whether he had reproduced some extracts gathered by a compiler. Both the distribution of the quotations (15 from the first book, four from the second, two from the third, one from the fourth, two from the fifth, four from the ninth and one from the 11th) and the abundance of miscellaneous codices which have survived in the manuscript tradition, in which only some selected passages were collected, would lead one to think that it is rather a work of *excerpta*, an anthology of the *Meditations*. Whatever the case, the *Suida* was fully aware of the existence of the book written by the philosopher-emperor, since the biographical entry on Marcus Antoninus reads: 'He wrote a guide for his own life in 12 books.' In five quotations it specifically says that Marcus Aurelius is the author of this work, in the following words: 'in Marcus Antoninus'; 'says Marcus, the philosopher-emperor'; 'from the work by Marcus Antoninus'; 'even Marcus Antoninus says', or, more simply, 'Marcus'. The other 21 quotations are anonymous. Generally, but not always, these quotations are inserted in order to explain rare words, usually very peculiar ones. Some are long and literal – you can therefore find all, or at least most of the wording from some chapters, for example 2.12.3, 2.13.1–4, 2.14.1–4, 3.5.2–4; whereas others are freer, but the differences are minimal.

These characteristics, which imply the original reworking of the text, are mainly found in the passages taken from the first book, which has distinctive features compared to the other 11 books and provides a sort of preamble to the whole work; in fact, in this book, Marcus lists the benefits and the teachings he received from various people during his life. The book is characterized by an extremely concise syntax and by the substantivization of all elements of grammar, obtained by adding the neuter article *tó* in front of the word or syntagm to be substantivized, in order to make the speech as abstract as possible. The *Suida* eliminated these substantivizations, avoiding *tó* (Schironi (2000) 214). Thus, Marcus Aurelius's list of the things he had learnt from Apollonius (I. 8. 3) becomes the portrait of the ideal conduct of the sage: 'The sage must always be like himself, in acute pain, during the loss of a child, during chronic diseases.' Similarly, what Marcus Aurelius says about Sextus (1.9.1–10) is turned into the description of what *should* be done, that is to say in order to live like a sage. The same change can be found when speaking of Antoninus Pius (1.16.10 and 20) (Hadot and Luna (1998) CLXXXVI). However, it is clear that the author of the *Suida* was aware of the peculiar features of the first book, since he quotes the passage concerning Diognetus using the words: 'From Diognetus I learnt', which express the meaning of the stereotyped formula used by Marcus Aurelius at the beginning of each chapter, i.e. *pará* (followed by the proper noun of the person to whom the chapter is dedicated) + *tó* (with the content of the teaching).

Both quotation procedures, which undoubtedly refer to the formulas typically used in anthologies, can be found exactly alike in the collection of

extracts contained in the *Darmstadtinus 2773* codex (=D).[6] Nevertheless, the hypothesis according to which the *Suida* drew on a work of *excerpta* from Marcus Aurelius that was preserved, with some alterations and loss of material, at least until the 14th century, when it was copied in the D miscellaneous codex, is treacherous to say the least (Schironi (2000) 225). However, it could be legitimately assumed that the *Suida* was only acquainted with the *Meditations* in an anthological form (Hadot and Luna (1998) CLXXXVII). This mainly because the tendency for D to simplify sentences by adding elements that aim at making their meaning explicit, which sometimes take the form of real clarifying paraphrases, is significantly common to all the manuscripts of group C. Furthermore, the occasional Christianization inferred in the work by Marcus Aurelius, for which both the author of the *Suida* and the compiler of D replace the plural *theói* (the gods) with the singular *theós* (God) (however, never in the same passages), does not prove anything in itself: it is one of the most frequent mistakes made in medieval manuscripts, which can be found exactly alike, for example, in the version of 6.35.2 that can be read in the *excerpta* of group W. Final confirmation is given by another extremely important piece of indirect evidence: the frequent Christianization seems to be one of the distinctive characteristics of the paraphrases of Marcus Aurelius contained in the writings by Joseph Bryennius (Rees (2000) 586 and 596). The preference given to the first book of the *Meditations* by the copyist of the D codex is common to the *Suida*, which, like D, also focuses its attention on the first three books in general. However, this is not an exclusive feature: the same situation is found in the extracts from Marcus Aurelius in the manuscripts of group C. This is precisely why Paul Maas, in his suggested stemma, was inclined to associate C with the manuscript tradition that goes back to the *Suida* (Maas (1945) 145). If you compare the text of the *Meditations* quoted by the *Suida* and the one contained in D, you will notice that they mostly correspond, except in three passages: the beginning (1.5–6, omitted in D), a central chapter (5.8, omitted in D), and the final part (11.18, omitted in D) (Schironi (2000) 220). On the one hand, the evident mutilation undergone by D, which probably deprived us of the extracts from the last three books, does not give evidence against the original presence of 11.18 in D, but on the other it certainly does not give a positive contribution to support this. The hypothesis that the copyist of D had a mutilated copy of the text from which the *Suida* had also taken its extracts is certainly legitimate, but cannot be taken into serious consideration. What if the person who copied the extracts from Marcus Aurelius in the Darmstadt codex had *deliberately* decided to cut out the first part of the text? In actual fact, it appears that the compiler of D deliberately omitted all the parts of the text containing too intimate an autobiographical subject, which could not be referred to more general ethical precepts. This would explain the omissions of chapters 1.1–6, in which Marcus Aurelius mentions some of his closest

relatives and the teachers who marked his childhood apprenticeship. The same can be said about chapter 1.17, in which the emperor expresses his heartfelt thanks to the gods for all the benefits received during his lifetime. Something similar must have happened during the substantial reworking which 4.3.2 underwent. Furthermore, if you have a look at the chart published in Dalfen ((1979) XXI–XXII), you will immediately notice the peculiar alternation of the *excerpta* contained in D and those contained in the manuscripts of groups W and X. In actual fact, there are very few chapters that can be read both in D and in WX, whereas there are many in common with C. Furthermore, the copyist of D gives preference to the first three books, and even though he did copy a certain amount of extracts from the first part of the fourth book, this later happened less and less. It seems therefore not inappropriate to assume that whoever assembled the collection of extracts contained in D was acquainted with a copy belonging to the group of manuscripts W or X, and chose Marcus Aurelius's text with the precise aim of integrating the anthology of the *Meditations* contained in it. Having said that, it is needless to say that, except for the *Suida*, chapters 5.8 and 11.18, omitted in D, can only be read in WX. The *Suida* is an extremely important witness to the *Meditations*, since it offers a generally correct text, if not, in at least three cases, even better than the manuscript tradition. Whereas nothing can be said about 1.6.3, since this paragraph is not contained in D, as far as 1.7.4 and 1.16.20 are concerned, D conforms to the manuscript tradition instead of quoting the correct variants transmitted by the *Suida*. If the *Suida* extracts and the anthology contained in D had really been taken from the same common model, this circumstance could not but appear bizarre.

Hadot also rightly accepts from the *Suida dià toióutou trópou* in 1.12, and this undoubtedly confirms T's variant. On the contrary, the integration and complete rewriting of 1.16.20 would require extreme caution. However, the *Suida* extract corresponding to 1.6.2 in modern editions, as well as 1.9.6, very close to A's tradition, should have aroused much more interest.

Prudently leaving to one side 2.14.3, in which the *Suida* shows a singular discrepancy between the reading of the lemma *akéraion*, which can be read in AD, and that of the gloss *akariaîon*, which can be read in TC, none of the variants mentioned by Schironi ((2000) 218), except for 2.14.4 and, with some reservations, 2.13.1, enable us to ascertain the relationship between the text of the *Suida* and D's tradition only: the coincidence in 1.7.7, for instance, is totally accidental since the epitomist, after deliberately omitting to copy, immediately before, a whole sentence, no longer needs a coordinating conjunction, but a single negative. On the contrary, the correspondence between the *Suida* and T in 2.12.3, with *emphantazómena* versus *emphanizómena* in AD, although it is the correct reading, is particularly important because it is preceded by a typical separative error, *ídēi* AD: *eidêi Suida* and T. Finally, as far

as 9.22.2 is concerned, no one can deny that in this point the *Suida* is undoubtedly close to T.

3.2. Joseph Bryennius and Johannes Reuchlin as Further Evidence for the Meditations

Between the 14th and the 15th centuries, Joseph Bryennius (circa 1350–1431), a monk, preacher and theologian rather hostile to the union of the Western Church, abundantly quotes Marcus Aurelius's *Meditations*, but always anonymously. A study on these quotations was outlined by Meyer ((1896) 99–100 and 110): the extensive essay by D.A. Rees (2000) now enables us to fully appreciate its testimonial value for the text's constitution. There is no reason at all to doubt that J.B. was reading the complete text of the *Meditations* (Rees (2000) 586): the possibility that he had drawn on an independent tradition, though, is most remote. The fact that in V. 19 J.B. differs from the two main witnesses A and T, thereby anticipating Schultz's conjecture centuries in advance, obviously does not prove anything. The same can be said about 7.56.2, where J.B.'s text transmits the reading which was then independently suggested by Coraìs. In actual fact, both cases can be explained as simple corrections made by J.B. However, none of the readings reported by Rees ((2000) 586–87), enables us to associate with certainty J.B.'s text with one or the other manuscript mentioned each time. The variant *entéuxomai*, which can be found in 2.2.1, rather than indicating a clear relationship with C, should be considered as the simplification of the correct form *suntéuxomai*, probably due to the fact that he was quoting from memory. Even 2.1.5 is useless: the confusion between the verbs *apotrépesthai* and *apostréphesthai*, a mistake peculiar to J.B. and the manuscripts of group C in this passage, recurs in 11.9.1, but this time it is common to v_8, a manuscript of group W, and to all codices of group X. They are ordinary slips, too common to appear really significant. The same applies to the mistakes in 8.48.3 and 9.42.8, which are common to J.B. and the manuscripts of groups W and X: often the text is not consistent even within manuscripts belonging to the same group. The addition of *oûn* in 10.34.6, which can also be found in WX, is ascribable to J.B.'s paraphrase, and the same applies, shortly after, to the evident replacement of *édē*, which can be found only in the two main witnesses A and T, with *met'olígon*. Since it is not a matter of mistakes but of correct readings, the correspondence between J.B. and T versus A in 4.29.2 and 8.52.2 does not give evidence of their close relationship, all the more so because in the latter case A's itacism is clearly evident. On the contrary, the hypothesis of an affiliation to A seems more promising. In 11.18.9 the variant *pathêin*, refused by all editors but certainly correct,[7] belongs exclusively to A's tradition. Further clues can be found in 8.51.2: the form *blýzousa*, that can be read in J.B., recalls AD's

Gesner from Heidelberg. The latter would be identical to the *Pal. Gr. 404* codex (f.73–101), which can now be found in the Vatican. On the contrary, Toxites would have taken hold of Marcus Aurelius's text in an indefinite place. However, the identity with the *Pal. Gr. 404* was proved to be false, and the hypothesis that Marcus Aurelius's manuscript didn't come from the library of Heidelberg is therefore unfounded. In the *editio princeps* the text of *The Life of Proclus* ends at the beginning of current chapter 22, whereas the *Pal. Gr. 404* contains the entire work and, what is more, was written in Madrid by Andreas Darmarius in 1579 (Farquharson (1944) XXVII).

5.2. The Textual Criticism and the Following Editions

For several decades the text established by Xylander was repeated in its various editions, among which it is worth mentioning in particular the one published in Lyon in 1626, since that was the text on which Saumaise worked. A crucial step towards a more correct text was made with the edition by Meric Casaubon (1643), published in London, who also used the *excerpta* of the *Monacensis Gr. 529* codex (=B), and above all with the edition by Thomas Gataker (1652), published in Canterbury, valuable for its vast fund of learning and for some successful critical contributions. Due to its value, Gataker's text was the basis for several editions during the 18th century, sometimes accompanied by significant critical notes: the reprinting in Leipzig (1775), published with the corrections made by S.F.N. Morus, became a sort of 'authorized version' until the end of the 19th century. The Frenchman J.P. de Joly was the first to use the *Vaticanus Gr. 1950* text (=A), the only complete manuscript of the work which has been preserved. Joly's work (1774) inaugurates a series of modern editions, which mainly differ in the different reliance placed by editors on one or the other of the two intact witnesses, and in the greater or lesser tendency to change the transmitted text, whereas the contribution made by other partial witnesses (codices containing *excerpta*) remains negligible. It is worth mentioning J.M. Schultz's editions, published in Schleswig in 1802 and reprinted in Leipzig in 1821; A. Coraìs (1816), published in Paris; C. Lofft (1861), published in New York under the pseudonym C.L. Porcher; J. Stich, published in Leipzig in 1882 and reprinted in the same town in 1903. The most important editions of the 20th century are those edited by J.H. Leopold (1908) for the series *Oxford Classical Texts*; H. Schenkl (1913), published in Leipzig for the well-known *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*; C.R. Haines (1916), published in London for the series *Loeb Classical Library*; A.I. Trannoy (1925), published in Paris for the *Collection des Universités de France* and now replaced, but only as far as the first book is concerned, by the excellent edition by P. Hadot (1998). Separate mention is deserved by the momentous work by A.S.L. Farquharson (1944) who provides, as well as a text supported by rather balanced choices and

solutions, an extensive description of Marcus Aurelius's philosophical personality and a rich commentary on the different aspects of the work. Very concise information comes from the notes in Willy Theiler's edition (1951), published in Zurich; Theiler's work has now been replaced by R. Nickel's edition (1990), which follows Trannoy's text, with few changes. J. Dalfen's edition, published in Leipzig in 1979 and reprinted in the same town in 1987, is the result of an accurate examination of the whole manuscript tradition, in which the relations among witnesses are reconstructed on an entirely new basis. His contribution proved to be particularly significant in defining the precise relations among the different manuscripts containing *excerpta*, in which he identified a new group, referred to as W. His work is particularly valuable for the extensive documentation provided in the apparatus, an irreplaceable tool for the interpreter of the *Meditations* who, dealing with a text which has been greatly damaged by tradition and which, from the 16th century up to now, has undergone constant restoration, is often bound to make arduous and crucial decisions among the various contributions. The complex preface also offers a detailed account of the relations among A, D, and T, even though the proposed reconstruction is not always convincing. Despite its many positive contributions, Dalfen's edition raises doubts about the constitution of the text. In a hypercritical attitude towards the manuscript tradition, which too often leads him to see a massive presence of glosses and marginal notes, and to insert emendations, sometimes even radical, Dalfen carries out a lot of expunctions. To be honest, these expunctions often appear to be arbitrary, because they are carried out even in points which, if compared with other passages, reflect some of the stylistic features peculiar to the *Meditations*.

6. Translations

Among the authors of the various Latin translations, which often accompanied Marcus Aurelius's work in the editions between the 16th and the 18th centuries, it is sufficient to mention Xylander and Gataker, whose versions have been repeatedly revived and modified. The text's translations in the various modern languages, due to the increasing number of readers interested in Marcus Aurelius, are innumerable and keep proliferating. Among the French translations it is worth mentioning those by A. Couat and P. Fournier (Bordeaux/Paris 1904), A.-P. Lemercier (Paris 1910), L.L. Grateloup (Paris 1998), as well as those by Trannoy, in the edition mentioned, and by Hadot (first book). All the English translations prior to his have been accurately described and reviewed in detail by Haines ((1916) XVI–XX): his translation, along with Farquharson's (1944), are still unequalled. The latter has recently been updated by R.B. Rutherford and revived in a book which also includes the

translation of selected correspondence between Marcus Aurelius and Marcus Cornelius Fronto (Oxford 1990). Among the German translations which are worth mentioning are the above-mentioned ones edited by Theiler and Nickel, as well as those edited by C.F. Schneider (Essen 1996) and O. Kiefer (Frankfurt am Main 1992). The clear translation by G. Cortassa (Turin 1984), based on Farquharson's text – even though it successfully differs from it in some passages – is an excellent work, accompanied by appropriate notes. Among the most recent Italian translations it is worth mentioning the one by E.V. Maltese (Milan 1994), which also contains the Greek parallel text established by Dalfen, though significantly improved, and the one by A. Marchiori (Rome 2005), who offers interesting adjustments to Dalfen's text.

NOTES

* I would like to thank my tutor, Prof. Davide Susanetti, and Prof. E. V. Maltese from the University of Turin for discussing with me many points of great importance. I also thank Deborah Boscarini for expressing my thoughts in the best possible way in a language that is not mine.

1. A general outline of the chronology of the *Meditations* is sketched by Haines (1914). Further clarification is given by Brunt ((1974) 18–19). The matter is now being dealt with in detail once again by Hadot and Luna ((1998) XLVI–LIII).
2. This appears to be unquestionable now, especially after the convincing arguments produced by Brunt ((1974) 1–5) (a fundamental contribution towards the overall interpretation of the *Meditations*).
3. Dalfen ((1978) 6, n. 2), is certainly not wrong when he states that the best documented title of the *Meditations* can be found in the codices belonging to group X: 'writings concerning himself' or 'private writings' (*tà kath'heautón*).
4. The essential part of the letter will have to be interpreted as follows: 'Although I had long owned an old copy of the most useful book of emperor Marcus, however, since I happened to make a copy of it and to hand it down, renewed, to posterity (not, however, because it was completely in pieces and prevented whoever wished to do so from benefiting from its usefulness) . . . I deemed it right to make your venerable holiness the heir to my previous possession.'
5. See Giavatto (2005).
6. The data concerning the manuscript tradition of the *Meditations* are reported following the concise chart provided by Dalfen ((1979) XLI–XLII).
7. It is the principle of the *lectio difficilior*. In later Stoic philosophy *páschō* is 'to be acted upon by outward objects, take impressions from them'; mostly followed by *hóti*, 'to be led to suppose that' (cf. *Meditations* 10.33.2); also with the accusative 'have experience of' (LSJ[9] *s.v.* 4): the alternative *mathêin* ('to learn'), that can be found in T, is obviously a simplification.

8. Rees (2000) 586. See, in addition to Dalfen's edition, Dalfen (1974) and (1978). On these, however, see Sandbach (1981).
9. See, in addition to Hadot and Luna (1998) CLXXXVIII–CXCI; Bergson (1986) 165–69; Rees (1971) 188–92.
10. The essential points of the history of the text, and the evaluation of the manuscript tradition, remain those outlined by Schenkl ((1913) III–XXVII). Further clarification is given by Farquharson ((1944) XXII–XLII) and Rees (1971).

FURTHER READING

1. *Studies on the manuscript tradition of the* Meditations

Astruc, C. (1975), 'Un fragment de manuscrit grec (extraits de M.-A. et d'Elien) conservé à la Bibliothèque Mazarine dans la collection Faugère', in J.L. Heller, ed., *Serta Turyniana: Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in Honor of Alexander Turyn*. Urbana, IL, Chicago, London. 525–46.

Denig, C. (1899), *Beiträge zur Kritik des Marc Aurel*. Schulprogramm. Mainz.

Köhler, F. (1913), *Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel, 4. Abt. Die Gudischen Handschriften: die griechische Handschriften bearb. von Franz Köhler*. Wolfenbüttel.

Sonny, A. (1895), 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von M. Aurelius' *eis heautón*', *Philologus* 54: 181–83.

Stefani, E.L. de (1904), 'Gli excerpta della Historia Animalium di Eliano', *Studi Italiani* 12: 145–80.

Thomsen, P. (1932), 'Verlorene Handschriften von Justins Werken und Marc Aurels Selbstbetrachtungen', *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 52: 1055–56.

Voltz, L., W. Crönert (1897), 'Der codex 2773 misc. Graec. der Grossherzoglichen Hoffbibliothek zu Darmstadt', *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 14: 537–71.

Weyland, W. (1914), 'Zu Schenkls Marc Aurel', *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 34: 1180–84.

2. *Textual criticism*

Cortassa, G. (1981), *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 109: 223–26.

Hadot, P. (1987), 'Remarques sur certains passages du livre I des Pensées de Marc Aurèle', *Revue de Philologie*: 285–94.

Maltese, E.V. (1986), 'Postille ai Pensieri di Marco Aurelio', *Studi Italiani* 79: 222–32.

Maltese, E.V. (1994), 'Note a Marco Aurelio (3.16.2; 4.3.3; 8.6.2)', in C. Corti and C. Crimi, eds., *Studi classici e cristiani offerti a Francesco Corsaro* vol. II. Catania. 431–33.

Polak, H.J. (1886), 'In Marci Antonini commentarios analecta critica', *Hermes* 21: 321–56.

Polak, H.J. (1893), 'In Marci Antonini commentarios observata quaedam', in *Sylloge quam C. Conto obtulerunt philologi Batavi*. Leiden. 87–94.
Schenkl, H. (1912), 'Zum ersten Buche der Selbstbetrachtungen des Kaisers Marcus Antoninus', *Wiener Studien* 34: 82–96.
Stich, J. (1881a), 'Adnotationes criticae ad Marcum Antoninum', *Programm Zweibrücken*.
Stich, J. (1881b), 'In Marci Antonini commentarios', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 36: 175–77.
Zuntz, G. (1946), 'Notes on Antoninus', *Classical Quarterly* 40: 47–55.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

Dalfen, J., ed. (1979, 2nd edn. 1987), *Marcus Aurelius. Ad se ipsum libri XII*. Leipzig.
Farquharson, A.S.L., trans. (1944, 2nd edn. 1968), *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*. Oxford.
Hadot, P. and C. Luna, eds. (1998), *Marc Aurèle. Écrits pour lui-même, 1: Livre 1*. Paris.
Haines, C.R., ed. and trans. (1916), *The Communings with Himself of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*. London.
Schenkl, H., ed. (1913), *Marci Antonini Imperatoris in Semet Ipsum Libri* XII. Leipzig.

Secondary sources

Bergson, L. (1986), 'Fragment einer Marc-Aurel Handschrift', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 129: 157–69.
Brunt, P.A. (1974), 'Marcus Aurelius in his Meditations', *Journal of Roman Studies* 64: 1–20.
Cortassa, G. (1997), 'La missione del bibliofilo: Areta e la 'riscoperta' dell' "A se stesso" di Marco Aurelio', *Orpheus* 18: 112–40.
Dalfen, J. (1974), 'Einige Interpolationen im Text von Marc Aurels *tà eis heautón*', *Hermes* 102: 47–57.
Dalfen, J. (1978), 'Scholien und Interlinearglossen in M.A.-Handschriften', *Studi Italiani* 51, 1979: 5–26.
Giangrande, G. (2003), 'Texto y lengua de Marco Aurelio Antonino', *Myrtia* 18: 225–36.
Giavatto, A. (2005), 'Marc. Aur. VII. 24', *Eikasmos* 16: 235–41.
Haines, C.R. (1914), 'The Composition and Chronology of the Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius', *Journal of Philology* 33: 278–95.
Maas, P. (1913), 'Das Epigramm auf Marcus *eis heautón*', *Hermes* 48: 295–99.
Maas, P. (1945), 'Review of: *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus. Edited with translation and commentary by A.S.L. Farquharson*', *Journal of Roman Studies* 35: 144–46.

2. Brief History of the Text

Among the texts mentioned above, however, only the correspondence with Fronto contains a complete series of authentic letters. With the exception of the incomplete manuscript of Paris that does contain letters of Lucius Verus to Fronto but none of Marcus Aurelius' (Bischoff (1958)), the correspondence was transmitted in a single manuscript, which is today preserved in two parts in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana (E 147 sup.) and in the Vatican Library (*Vaticanus latinus* 5750). Originally the codex might have had approximately 680 pages: of this only 282 pages remain in the Ambrosianus codex and 106 in the Vatican manuscript. The codex has an almost square form; the text presents itself in two parallel columns; each column has 24 lines. The principal text of the manuscript is written in uncials of the fifth century. Three distinct hands can be discerned in the manuscript; the foremost of these made some corrections and emendations; the lesser two consist of a large number of semi-uncial annotations from the beginning of the sixth century, which mention different readings and so made use of at least another manuscript (m^2), and one (m^3) in cursive from the end of the seventh century whose efforts were confined solely to making minor corrections to the text. The dating of this last hand seems to show that the reuse of the manuscript to transcribe the *Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (451) happened a little after the seventh century. It is very likely that the codex arrived already mangled at the library of Bobbio, around 1600, where it was divided into two parts. This resulted in the loss of the central folios and the housing of the two, now separated, parts in two different libraries. The manuscript arrived in 1606 at the Ambrosiana and in 1618 at the Vatican Library. Before the rediscovery of the manuscript by A. Mai at the beginning of the 19th century, no reliable testimonials about the letters of Marcus Aurelius existed (cf. Soupé (1873) 81): those mentioned by Louis-Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont (*Histoire des empereurs*, vol. II (1720)), Isaac Casaubon (in his edition of *HA* (1620)) and Pierre Bayle (*Dictionnaire historique et critique*, vol. II) were probably forgeries. Therefore, nothing indicates that we had a complete copy of Fronto and Marcus Aurelius' letters between the 7th and the 19th century (on these questions, see the introduction of the edition of van den Hout (1988)).

3. Hypothesis on the First Diffusion of the Correspondence

Although at first sight it may appear that certain letters, namely Fronto's treatise in epistolary form (*De eloquentia*, *De orationibus*), were intended for a

larger audience than the emperor's ear alone, the extremely narrow distribution of these letters in antiquity suggests that the publication owed neither to Fronto nor to Marcus Aurelius themselves and may have only occurred after the deaths of the two correspondents (*contra* Pflaum (1964)). Cova ((2004) 501) put forth the seductive theory that the spreading of these letters was initiated by a descendant of Fronto and aimed to re-establish the name of the family after the forced suicide of Victorinus, Fronto's son-in-law, and the coming of a new ruling family. This supposition is given credence by an inscription dating from the end of the second century (*CIL* XI 6334), in which Fronto's great-grandson highlights the *cursus* of his great grandfather and grandfather. In this case, the spreading of the letters would date from the beginning of the third century, which in turn would explain the presence in that century of a single direct quotation of the correspondence (Solinus, *Collectanea mirabilium*, Praef. 5 Mommsen^2). It is not, moreover, until the fourth century that direct and explicit quotations of the correspondence appear (it is certainly mentioned in Charisius 161, 13; 256, 8; 267, 6; 287, 26; 288, 19 Barwick; and maybe by Artemidorus IV, 22). The fact that the direct citations do not quote Marcus Aurelius' letters, they all refer to the writings of Fronto, lends further weight to Cova's argument.

4. Miscellaneous Editions and Translations of the Correspondence

A. Mai rediscovered the Milan manuscript and published it in 1815; this publication was quickly followed by a new edition by Niebuhr (1816). Not long afterward, in 1819, A. Mai discovered the second half of the original manuscript at the Vatican Library and published an edition that rejoined the separated sections in 1823. The publishing work of Mai, though, quick and not particularly thorough, combined with problems related to the reading of the palimpsest, gave way to sustained German commentaries that led to a third edition from Mai (1846) and to the publication by Naber, based on readings by Du Rieu, of a more scientific new edition in 1867. To complicate matters further, and in accordance with preservation methods contemporaneous to the 19th century, A. Mai coated the manuscripts with chemical reagents, which damaged them permanently. Therefore, the 20th century editions are almost exclusively based on readings done in the first 50 years following their initial discovery and on the continual work of Naber and later of Erhenthal (1881) to establish a readable text. These philological works, published or not, gave birth to the first scientific edition of the text by M. van den Hout (1954), followed some 30 years later by an improved edition (1988) and, more

recently, a line-by-line explicative commentary of the editor's choices and of *realia* found in the correspondence (1999). As for the letters of Marcus Aurelius themselves, they benefited from separate translations and commentaries, notably by L. Pepe (1957) and G. Cortassa (1984). Translations without an edition but with punctual discussions of the text were also made; in French by A. Cassan (1830), based on the second edition of A. Mai; in English by C. Haines (1919–1920), consisting of a complete translation of the correspondence based on the text of Naber in a chronological order; in Italian by F. Portalupi (1974), that is also a complete translation of the correspondence based on the text of van den Hout[1]; and in Spanish by A. Palacios Martin (1992), which is a complete translation of the correspondence based on the text of van den Hout[2]. Partial translations of Marcus Aurelius' letters also sometimes follow publications of the *Meditations* (Pierron (1843); Rutherford (1989)), or can alternatively appear as an independent set of selected letters (MacQuige (1824); Richlin (2006)).

5. Marcus Aurelius' Letters: Vocabulary and the Epistolary Genre

The letters of Marcus Aurelius in the frontonian corpus amount to 88 letters and extend in time from 139 to the death of Fronto, probably in 166 or 167. They are almost entirely contained in the books of the *Ad Marcum Caesarem et inuicem* (72), to which the letter *Additamentum Epistularum* 7, dating from 139, could also be added. The other letters that exist probably date from the time that Marcus Aurelius was emperor (11 in the books *Ad Antoninum imperatorem* and the letters *De feriis Alsiensibus* 1 and 4 (161); *De nepote amisso* 1 and 3 (165–66)). The conservation status of all of these varies from complete to only a few words from the *incipit* or the opening address.

The vocabulary and style of Marcus Aurelius' letters are more familiar than Fronto's: the princeps seems to work towards intimacy through the reproduction of spoken language, a technique prescribed by various ancient epistolary theorists (Demetrius 234; Julius Victor 105, 10 Giomini). Among the many familiar expressions that he uses to make the written exchanges seems like a real dialogue (e.g. *Ad Marcum* I, 2, 1), are the ellipsis of verbs other than *esse* (*Ad Marcum* I, 2, 1; I, 6, 1; IV, 5, 2), and the rhetorical question constructed with the second person singular. The review of Marcus Aurelius' particular forms by van den Hout ((1999) 4–5, 26, 168–69) seems to indicate that Marcus Aurelius was inspired by the colloquialisms of Latin comedy. Notable are his allusions to Plautus, who is also an author mentioned in the frontonian canon (*Ad Marcum* IV, 3, 2; cf. Selvatico (1981) 248–54). This same concern

with building an epistolary intimacy seems to have led to the use of Greek in Marcus Aurelius' letters. Greek is frequently used as formula for common expressions outside of all literary referent. This practice suggests that, at least in bilingual circles, the use of Greek in this period was not seen as pedantic but was rather a common practice within the everyday experience of educated men.

The inclusion of affectionate words also seems to result from the epistolary form. Although Marcus Aurelius' fondness for his master is expressed in various ways, the exceptionality of affectionate superlatives at the end of missives was stressed (Cortassa (1984) 19). The most common of these superlatives in Marcus Aurelius' letters are 'homo suauissimus', 'magister optatissimus', 'dulcissimus', 'benignissimus', 'carissimus', 'amicus desiderantissimus', 'Fronto iucundissimus', 'consul amplissimus', 'amicissimus et rarissimus homo', 'dulcissima anima'. The most used of these is perhaps 'iucundissimus', which reappears over 20 times under Marcus Aurelius' pen (van den Hout (1999) 106). Superlatives and diminutives are in general one of the tools of epistolary vocabulary employed to generate intimacy between correspondents. Affectionate superlatives and discourses on the intimate bonds that join the two correspondents are part of the epistolary rhetoric, already present in Cicero (e.g. *Ad familiares* XIV, 2, 2). They are brought to their highest perfection by Symmachus, whose letters most often can be reduced to an expression of intimacy merely to serve the purpose of providing tangible proof of the connection which ties the two correspondents (e.g. III, 17, 2; Stowers (1986) 19; Brugisser (1993) 8). Besides superlatives, the affection of Marcus Aurelius for Fronto is expressed through imagery and a vocabulary sometimes drawn from an elegiac background, as was highlighted by Richlin ((2006) 69, 109, 132).

The question of homosexuality in the relationship between Marcus Aurelius and Fronto, posited by Richlin (2006), cannot be settled only on the basis of vocabulary. In the first place, as we do not have other examples of a male proximity for the period with which to compare, it would be hasty to rule on the exceptionality of this relationship between master and student. Instead, the possibility that this vocabulary can be linked to existing literary models suggests that the correspondents' subject matter was aimed at the construction of epistolary intimacy and was rooted principally in a cultural connection. That this rhetoric is exaggerated in Marcus Aurelius and Fronto's letters should not come as a surprise when the literary trends of the time are considered. After all it was during this period that sophists tended to rely on the most common topics to push their speeches in the realm of rhetoric (e.g. the proliferation of adoxographies during the Second Sophistic). The reading and analysis of Fronto's letters lead to the same conclusion. Subjects, even the most ordinary, are often lifted to a thetic level, by the use of images. The most exemplary letters that bear witness to this are the exchange in Greek