



The Chronology of Fronto

Author(s): Edward Champlin

Source: *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 64 (1974), pp. 136-159

Published by: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/299265>

Accessed: 23/03/2010 20:03

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sprs>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Roman Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE CHRONOLOGY OF FRONTO

By EDWARD CHAMPLIN*

I. INTRODUCTION

A reconsideration of the chronological data for Fronto's extant works is desirable on several counts, not least in providing a firmer base for the investigation of Antonine history. Various systems have been devised,¹ but there is great room for improvement even in the little that is known. It is now almost forty years since the last full attempt, and much knowledge has accrued, notably from the Ostian *fasti*. Also, unfortunately, a 'date' has too often been engendered by simple *horror vacui*. More serious are the many misinterpretations, often quite small but some of wider significance, which have become lodged in print and then used by others as a firm base for other researches. Conflicting views on matters of some import, notably the year of Fronto's death (the main estimates vary by a decade), require examination. Most misleading of all, some investigators have wreaked Procrustean violence on the corpus by discerning and ruthlessly applying an alleged underlying editorial principle. On that account, an agnostic method of considering each piece on its own merit will be used here, letting that editorial principle emerge if it will. The evidence, where available, for each work will be set down in the manuscript order, preceded by a discussion of the date of Fronto's demise and followed by some remarks on the original edition of the corpus and a section tabulating the results.

The unhappy vicissitudes of the unique fifth-century codex of Fronto demand some comment.² Several factors hamper the scholar. The manuscript is a palimpsest with something above (the *Acta Concilii Chalcedonensis*) and apparently something below Fronto. At some date it was broken up for re-use and mixed with other leaves, part going to Milan and part to Rome. Even now the manuscript order is far from secure, as the latest editor (van den Hout) warned, and indeed fresh investigation has upset the standard reconstruction of one of the 43 known quaternions.³ Further, the original editor (Cardinal Mai) is accused of using reagents which obliterated portions of the Ambrosian manuscript at Milan; Dr. Hauler of Vienna spent almost fifty years in close investigation of the text without producing an edition; and M. P. J. van den Hout never saw the manuscript.⁴ Finally, it has been estimated that some three-sevenths of the codex has been simply lost.⁵

It will be apparent that the physical state of the manuscript (and its lacunae) demands exceptional caution. Some aids are available, notably existing salutations and the book subscriptions,⁶ none of which (so far as they can be controlled) is incorrect.⁷ Modern supplements (easily recognized in van den Hout's edition) should be ignored. Certain books retain valuable indices of addresses and opening words.⁸ And a second hand has made marginal notations which often supply the meaning of a lacunose text, but these should be used with care.⁹ As very few of the extant letters and essays are intact, it would be tedious to make a note of every gap in the manuscript. Rather a general caution must be applied, that where substantial gaps occur, no argument can be claimed as proven.

* I am most grateful for the kind criticisms of Dr. F. G. B. Millar and Professors T. D. Barnes and C. P. Jones. The many imperfections which remain in this paper are mine alone.

¹ Notably by T. Mommsen, *Hermes* 8 (1874), 198-216 = *Gesammelte Schriften* 4 (1906), 469-86; by C. R. Haines, *CQ* 8 (1914), 112-20, developed in his Loeb Classical Library edition (1919-20); and by R. Hanslik, *Commentationes Vindobonenses* 1 (1935), 21-47. Also the remarks of C. Brakman, *Frontoniana* ii (Utrecht, 1902), 24-42, and of certain editors: A. Mai (1815, 1823, 1846), B. G. Niebuhr (1816, important introduction), S. Naber (1867). References to Haines followed by I or II are to the Loeb edition, otherwise to his article. References to the letters follow the edition of M. P. J. van den Hout (Leiden, 1954).

² For most of what follows, consult the preface of van den Hout, ix-lxv.

³ B. Bischoff, 'Der Fronto-Palimpsest der Mauriner', *SBAW, Phil. Hist. Kl.* 1958, 2.

⁴ Compare J. Willis, *JRS* 45 (1955), 235: 'The history of Fronto's letters is little more than a record of the crimes, the follies, and the misfortunes of his editors' etc.

⁵ Haines I, xiii-xiv.

⁶ Subscriptions: *Ad M. Caes.* III, IV, V; *Ad Ant. Imp.* II; *Ad Ver.* I; *de Orat.*; *Ad Ant. Pium*; *Ad Am.* I, II; *Princ. Hist.*; *Bell. Parth.*; *Fer. Als.*; *de Nep. Am.*; *Arion*.

⁷ Excepting the simple muddle of v.d.H. 114, 1-2, hardly due to the editor.

⁸ *Ad M. Caes.* IV, V; *Ad Ant. Imp.* I, *Ad Ant. Pium*; *Ad Am.* I, II.

⁹ Thus, at *Ad Am.* II, 7, 15, the *m*² note to v.d.H. 184, 7 ff. serves only to confuse,

II. THE DATE OF FRONTO'S DEATH

The standard date of *c.* 166 was derived from the simple conclusion that no letter could be assigned to any period after that year. Recently, however, G. W. Bowersock has resurrected the claim of Mommsen (followed by A. Stein) based on an interpretation of *De Orationibus* 18, that the orator survived in fact to 176.¹⁰ 'Ad Antoninum de Orationibus' follows (not unexpectedly) the letters *de Eloquentia* in the manuscript, for it too is an appeal for Eloquence but contains as it stands no attack on philosophy. There are several tantalizing clues to chronology. A slighting reference in 15 to 'Gallicanus quidam declamator' must remain unexploited, for it could hardly concern Fronto's friend, the renowned Favorinus of Arles, nor yet his correspondent, M. Gavius Squilla Gallicanus (*cos. ord.* 150). (He may be the otherwise quite unknown Gadullius Gallicanus cited once by Nonius Marcellus.¹¹) The edict of Marcus dealing with the youth of municipal Italy, criticized in 17, is otherwise unknown, but Fronto's language ('unum edictum tuum memini me animadvertisse') suggests a period some time after Marcus' accession. The notorious crux, however, appears at 18: 'Quid igitur? Non malim mihi nummum Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii?' Here, asserted Mommsen, was proof positive that Fronto lived until 175 at least, for before that year there were no coins struck with the name of Commodus.¹² Bowersock has developed Mommsen's position: there was no 'nummus Commodi' before the grant of *imperium* to the prince on 27th November, 176.¹³ (This is incorrect.) However, A. R. Birley has resisted this attempt: *nummus* could mean not only coin but medallion, perhaps an issue commemorating Commodus' Caesarship (166).¹⁴ Further, he quotes the objection of Haines based on 13: 'Dicas fortasse: quid in orationibus meis novicium, quid crispulum, quid luscum, quid purpurisso litum aut <t> umi <dum aut> pollutum? Nondum quicquam; sed vereor . . .' 'Not yet, when Marcus was fifty-six and had reigned sixteen years, and Fronto would have been eighty.'¹⁵ (That argument is hardly less applicable in the 160s!) Birley makes further attempts at precision. The phrase 'oculos convenientes' (11) from a speech by Marcus may refer (as Haines suggested) to Marcus and Lucius, or it may not. Better, perhaps, regarding the edict noted above, 'it would be reasonable to conjecture that M. Aurelius' augmentation of the *alimenta* system, in commemoration of the betrothal of L. Verus and Lucilla in A.D. 162, would have been a particularly fitting occasion.'¹⁶ Therefore, according to Birley, the early 160s, and 'Commodus' must be L. Verus.

Two points must be stressed. First, if a medallion of Commodus the future emperor is concerned, the letter ought not to be *c.* 166 (an alternative suggested by Birley), but after the summer of 169, for Commodus' partner Annius Verus should have been included. However, the medallion objection is irrelevant if we consider the passage in context (17-18):

Revertere potius ad verba apta et propria et suo suco imbuta. Scabies porrigo ex eius modi libris concipiture. Monetam illam veterem sectator. Plumbei nummi et cuiusce modi adulterini in istis recentibus nummis saepius inveniuntur quam in vetustis, quibus signatus est Perperna, arte factis pristina. (18) Quid igitur? Non malim mihi nummum Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii? Polluta et contaminata et varia et maculosa maculosioraque quam nutricis pallium.

There can be no doubt that Fronto is referring to coinage in daily use, as Bowersock suggests. Therefore only Lucius (161/169) or Commodus (175/180).¹⁷ Second, the name Commodus. The future emperor L. Verus was known as Commodus from the time of his birth to the period of his accession, Ceionius before his adoption, Aelius and/or Aurelius after, but always Commodus.¹⁸ In 161, Marcus raised him to partnership and 'Verum vocari praecepit, suum in eum transferrens nomen' (*HA Verus* 4, 1). The move was a subtle one, reflecting honour on both Augusti yet sharply defining their roles: Marcus advances to his father's position as Antoninus, while Lucius assumes *his* persona as Verus. Fronto duly adopts the new etiquette in his salutations, and even in the epistles them-

¹⁰ *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), 124-26, with bibliography.

¹¹ *PIR*² G 14.

¹² Mommsen, 486.

¹³ *O.c.* 124-25.

¹⁴ *Chiron* 2 (1972), 469-70.

¹⁵ Haines, 118; cf. II, III, n.1.

¹⁶ *O.c.*, quoting *HA Marcus* 7, 8 and II, 2. Another

of Birley's arguments is based on a faulty passage at Galen xiv, 651 K: cf. V. Nutton, *Chiron* 3 (1973), 429 ff.

¹⁷ Commodus' first coins (*BMC Cat.* iv, Marcus Aurelius 625, 633 ff.) appear in 175, in the context of German victories.

¹⁸ *PIR*² C 606 for the inscriptional evidence, and note *HA Verus* 4, 1.

selves.¹⁹ (Unfortunately, Verus is never addressed as such outside of the salutations in the letters as they stand, but we may assume by analogy with his brother that Fronto did so.) Nevertheless, a more intimate tone is by no means absent, reminiscent of earlier days. The old address 'M. Aurelius' (e.g. *M. Caes.* ii, 10, 2) reappears once (*Ant. Imp.* iv, 2, 1); better, the familiar 'Marcus' is used three times (*De Eloq.* 4, 10; *Fer. Als.* 3, 14; *Nep. Am.* 4), twice as 'meus'. Before 161 the most common form is undoubtedly 'M. Caesar'. By comparison, the familiar 'Lucius tuus' is used at least once after 161 (by Verus himself, *Ver. Imp.* ii, 2, 1, cf. *Princ. Hist. passim*). Before 161, he was surely known most simply as 'L. Commodus'. It would be foolhardy to deny that the old form of 'Commodus', borne by 'Verus' for 30 of his 38 years, could not have been used after 161, even after the birth of Marcus' son. Marcus, above all, would have appreciated it.

The 'Commodus' question is crucial. Professor Bowersock adduces further arguments for a late date. Two are prosopographical, based on identifications of the recipients of *Ad. Am.* i, 9 and 1, neither of them convincing, one incorrect (cf. the discussion below). He also notes the lacunose state of the manuscript. However, neither the books nor their contents are in chronological order; the gaps are spread throughout.²⁰ The argument from silence is accordingly very feeble. In short, the case for the late date is based solely on the disputed interpretation of 'nummus Commodi'.

On the other hand, various items lend support to a date of (to be safe) *c.* 167. Fronto's ill-health has not received due emphasis. About one-quarter of the correspondence as it survives in some way considers the orator's physical woes. The exponent of the later date will infer hypochondria, his rival will cite contemporary examples of premature demise.²¹ However, there should be no doubt that Fronto was in very bad health for a number of years.²² One alarming illustration will suffice, an attack which occurred at least a decade before 166:

Cholera usque eo adlictus sum, ut vocem amitterem, singultirem, suspirio tum angerer, postremo venae deficerent, sine ullo pulsu venarum animo male fieret; denique conclamatus sum a nostris; neque sensi aliquandiu; ne balneo quidem aut frigida aut cibo recreandi me ac fovendi medicis tempus aut occasio data, nisi post vesperam micularum minimum cum vino destillatum glutivi. Ita fociatus totus sum. Postea per continuum triduum vocem non recipravi. (*Ad M. Caes.* v, 55, 1).

Another relevant problem which has received little consideration is the date of Fronto's birth. The consulship is usually the only evidence submitted. The minimum age of 32 years should guarantee a birthdate before 110, while the average of 42 for a new man yields a date *c.* 100.²³ Death in the later 60s adequately conforms with the orator's frequent assertions of old age, approaching death, continual illness and crushing grief. Perhaps, however, he was even older. Several philosophers living 'nostra memoria' were as famed for their eloquence as for their wisdom: Euphrates, Dio, Timocrates, Athenodotus (*De Eloq.* 1, 4). (The text is unfortunately much mutilated, so that it must remain unclear whether Fronto actually heard the great men,²⁴ but Athenodotus is assured.) Euphrates put an end to his own life in 119 (with Hadrian's 'permission'), and Dio of Prusa is not heard of after 112, while Athenodotus (Fronto's own master) was but the subject of anecdote for a boy born in 121.²⁵ Another less pleasant reminiscence likewise carries us back to Trajan's reign:

Ut olim Crassus tristis risum oderat, ut nostra hic memoria Crassus lucem fugitabat, ut nostra itidem memoria vir consularis campos formidabat, Pomptinum cam<pum> ---
(*m*² *in margine*: Crassus tristis risum oderat; alter Crassus minor lucem fugitavat multaque loca clausa lecticula praetervehebatur.) (*De Eloq.* 4, 8)

¹⁹ 'Antoninus': *Ad Ant. Imp.* i, 2, 2 and 4; ii, 1, 1; *Ad Ver. Imp.* ii, 1, 5, 6.

²⁰ As observed by Birley, 473.

²¹ Bowersock, 124; Birley, 473.

²² See the list of ailments at Haines, ii, 333, col. 1.

²³ Syme, *Tacitus* 652.

²⁴ The phrase 'memoria nostra' need not (for Fronto) imply personal involvement, cf. *Princ. Hist.* 2, 4 on Trajan's Parthian War.

²⁵ Euphrates: Dio lxix, 8, 3. Dio: based on the last possible date of Pliny's second year in the East. (Dio is last mentioned at Pliny, *Epp.* x, 81-82.) It was the opinion of H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin, 1898), 574, that Dio could not have survived Pliny (a much younger man) by much. Athenodotus: M. Aurelius, *Med.* i, 13.

The unhappy Crassus should be C. Calpurnius Crassus Frugi Licinianus (*cos. suff.* 87), an inveterate intriguer of impeccable pedigree who was warned by Nerva, relegated to an island by Trajan (perhaps before 113) and there executed in the early days of Hadrian.²⁶ If so, the activities recalled by Fronto are confined to the period before Crassus' relegation.

The most promising indicator is an anecdote related by Cassius Dio, from the period of Fronto's supremacy at the bar under Hadrian. 'One night he was returning home from dinner very late, and ascertained from a man whose counsel he had promised to be that Turbo was already holding court. Accordingly just as he was, in his dinner dress, he went into Turbo's court-room and greeted him, not with the morning salutation, *salve*, but with the one appropriate to the evening, *vale*.' (69, 18, 3, Loeb translation). The emperor Hadrian had appointed the tireless Marcus Turbo his praetorian prefect in 119, together with C. Septicius Clarus.²⁷ The latter fell from grace in 122;²⁸ the date of Turbo's departure (or demise) is quite unknown, but sooner or later he was bitterly persecuted by his imperial patron.²⁹ Unfortunately, our knowledge of Hadrianic guard prefects is almost non-existent. However, an unusually long tenure by Turbo, even one of more than a decade, ought to have been worthy of a notice in the *Historia Augusta* comparable to the remark on Gavius Maximus. (Under the principate only Sejanus, Gavius and Claudius Livianus are known to have passed ten years in the office.) If Dio's tale be assigned to the 120s rather than to the 130s, the date of Fronto's birth should be closer to A.D. 90 than to 100.³⁰

The termination of the Frontonian correspondence coincides with the triumphant return of Lucius' victorious troops from the Orient in 166. With them arrived the notorious plague.³¹ The *HA*'s account begins thus: 'Et multa quidem milia pestilentia consumpsit multosque ex proceribus, quorum amplissimus Antoninus statuas conlocavit' (*HA Marcus* 13, 5). Marcus had a habit of erecting posthumous statues at public expense, notably for those killed in the northern wars and even for his parents' friends.³² Fronto too received a statue, whether in his lifetime or not is unclear.³³ This could all be merest coincidence. Nevertheless, detailed examination of each item of the correspondence will show that no letter can be assigned to the period after the return of L. Verus from the East in 166, that is after *Ad Ver. Imp.* ii, 4-5. Similarly, there is no trace of the projected History of the Parthian War, in the preparation of which the old man had invested so much effort.³⁴ In brief, there can be little hope that the unhappy 'orator, consul and teacher of the emperors Lucius and Antoninus' ³⁵ survived the year 167.

III. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE LETTERS

Ad Marcum Caesarem I-II

Books I and II *Ad M. Caes.* are agreed on all sides to be in generally chronological order, and dateable in (and perhaps shortly after) A.D. 143.³⁶ The cornerstone of this edifice is I, 9, 4, wherein Marcus' age is given as twenty-two. The letter is therefore firmly dated 26 April, 143/144.³⁷ Fronto is 'consul tuus' in the salutation. He held the office in July and August, as is implied in II, 9-12, betraying an impatience to lay down its burdens on 1st September. On this basis a sizeable group of 'consular' letters can be assigned to July/August 143. First, a sequence II, 7; I, 9; II, 5 is assured by consecutive references to the great sophist Polemo of Smyrna: in II, 7 (Fronto is called consul,

²⁶ *PIR*² C 259. If Dio lxviii, 16, 2 be pressed to imply Trajan's presence in Rome, 113 is the latest possible year for Crassus' exploits.

²⁷ *HA Hadr.* 9, 4-5.

²⁸ *ibid.* 11, 3.

²⁹ *ibid.* 15, 7.

³⁰ I hesitate to exploit a fragmentary stone from Lepcis Magna (*PBSR* 10 (1955), 132 = *IRT* 624), dedicated to one . . . us Fronto, pontifex of the colony and granted the broad stripe, (apparently) by the divine Trajan Parthicus (i.e., A.D. 116 or 117). That would entail lengthy analysis of the African contribution to the Roman senate before the Antonine period. However, the possibility that this is the Fronto should not be rejected out of hand.

³¹ J. F. Gilliam has collected the evidence, *AJP* 82 (1961), 227-44.

³² The evidence for Marcus' statues is assembled by A. E. Gordon, *Quintus Veranius, consul A.D. 49* (*Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Archaeol.* ii, 5), 325-26.

³³ *HA Marcus* 2, 5.

³⁴ Noted at Birley, 473.

³⁵ *ILS* 1129.

³⁶ Mommsen, 473; Haines, 114; Hanslik, 22-28.

³⁷ Marcus was born 26th April, 121: *HA Marcus* 1, 5. The phrase used by Fronto is 'duos et viginti annos natum'. Strictly this should mean 22 years completed. However, ancient writers are notoriously free in their use of such chronological terms (cf. M. Reinhold, *CW* 26 (1932/33), 172-75), so the meaning 'in the 22nd year' can not be excluded, and Fronto's consulship *might* have been held in 142. A similar caution applies to IV, 13.

II, 7, 3) Marcus records an unfavourable opinion of the declaimer's talents; in I, 9, Fronto recalls Marcus' comments on Polemo the rhetor 'in epistula tua proxime', for coincidentally he had referred in a senate speech to Polemo the antique philosopher, and he quotes the lines of the 'memorabilis poeta' Horatius Flaccus on the latter (*Sat.* II, 3, 254-57); in II, 5, 3 (Fronto is still 'Consul amplissimus') Marcus replies, 'Polemonis tui quom meministi, rogo ne Horatii memineris, qui mihi cum Pollione est emortuus'. The published sequence is startling, inexplicable either chronologically or thematically. The lesson is clear (but has been consistently ignored) that when other indications are lacking we can *not* assume that two adjacent letters are chronologically related.

II, I and 2 are Fronto's excuse for delaying his *actio gratiarum* to Pius until 13 August because of the care being expended in its composition; and Marcus' reply (Fronto is consul, II, 2, 1) conveying the imperial pleasure at such a delay. II, 3 shows Marcus' unbounded delight in the speech (Fronto is 'consul amplissimus', II, 3, 2), just after 13th August, 143, therefore. In I, 9, Fronto quotes two lines from a speech which has been wrongly identified with the *actio* of II, 1-3.³⁸ The clue is I, 10, a Greek epistle inserted into the manuscript after I, 9. I, 9, 8 refers to a letter enclosed for Marcus' mother, Domitia Lucilla, in Greek and perhaps containing barbarisms which Marcus must correct. I, 10 is in Greek, is addressed to Caesar's mother, and continues the 'barbarous' conceit (I, 10, 5). Fronto excuses his tardiness in corresponding, alleging that his leisure time was absorbed in the composition of an encomium of the emperor, a work gratifying to Lucilla both in itself and as praising herself and her son (I, 10, 1, 4). (Marcus was embarrassed by the speech's fulsome praise in the event, II, 3, 3.) Patently the oration spoken of in the Lucilla letter is the *actio gratiarum* on which the orator lavished such time and care (II, 1, 1). I, 9 and 10 are therefore before 13 August, 143, as Hanslik wished. However, they must follow II, 1-2 on the grounds that if Marcus did correct the barbarisms of I, 10 (as Fronto requests at I, 9, 8) he would learn the very thing explained to him in detail in II, 1, that is the reason for the delay. The sequence thus far is II, 1, 2, 7; I, 9, 10; II, 5, 3.

Finally, II, 9-12 all belong to late August 143. In 9 the consul longs for 1st September, and in 10 he sends his wife Cratia to celebrate Lucilla's birthday, pledging to fly to her side himself as soon as he has laid down his office. II, 11 is Marcus' reply, thanking him for Cratia's company, and in 12, 1 Fronto excuses himself for not attending Lucilla in person, as it is not lawful and the last days of his office are filled with duties. Further, in II, 8 Marcus is discovered holidaying at Naples, passing days of idleness in longing (he asserts) for his master, the 'consul amplissimus'; the sentiment is echoed in II, 10 by Fronto in Rome, all his fortunes, all his joys are in Naples. Unless we assume two sojourns of the imperial family in Naples during Fronto's consulship, one before and one after 13th August, II, 8 should be from the same period as 9-12.³⁹ II, 6, addressed 'amplissimo consuli', cannot be more precisely dated than July/August. Perhaps it concluded with an expression of longing to echo its neighbours 5 and 7. The consular letters are therefore in an assured sequence of (before 13th August) II, 1, 2, 7; I, 9, 10; II, 5; (after 13th August) II, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, with II, 6 uncertain. So far there is little problem.

Next, by common consent I, 1-5 are accepted in that order and dated to January/June, 143.⁴⁰ I, 1 is a fragment. I, 2 reveals Marcus' concern for Fronto's health (he is lamed by pain in the foot) and advises a spa treatment.⁴¹ I, 3 is a lengthy protestation of Fronto's love for Marcus, and is surely a reply to I, 2 for it thanks Marcus for his prayers (I, 3, 2, cf. I, 2, 2) and his wish to run to Fronto's side (I, 3, 1, cf. I, 2, 1), and it mocks the lameness.⁴² Further, a link with I, 1 might be surmised, for both end with somewhat similar thoughts.⁴³ I, 4 and 5 are a short *jeu d'esprit* of Marcus', *Pro Insomnio*, and his master's indulgent critique. At I, 4, 2, Marcus begins, 'Nunc, quando apud Baias agimus . . .' At I, 3, 5, Fronto praises natural as opposed to artificial love: 'Baiarum ego calidos specus malo quam istas fornaculas balnearum, in quibus ignis cum sumptu atque fumo accenditur brevique restingitur.' Therefore it has been assumed we have a sequence 1-5 in which the imperial family is domiciled at Baiae. Thence they naturally moved on to Naples, where they stayed during Fronto's consulship.⁴⁴ The latter assumption is quite baseless, wishful thinking arising from the presumed chronological homogeneity in Books I and II and from the proximity of Baiae and Naples.⁴⁵ In fact, the imperial

³⁸ By Haines, I, 108. Rightly denied by Hanslik, 24-26. The place of delivery cannot be deduced from 9, 2, but it need not even be the senate.

³⁹ One would expect Marcus to attend his master's greatest hour in person. Fronto certainly did: 'Ceterum quidem in idus Augustas tibi expectandum est ut quid vis, quale vis audias' (II, 1, 2). Compare Pliny's apologies (*Epp.* ix, 37, 1) for not attending the installation of a *familiaris* as consul.

⁴⁰ Haines, I, 80 ff.; Hanslik, 21-22.

⁴¹ Or enquires which spa Fronto will attend. The passage is uncertain, cf. v.d.H. 2, 3-8, with app. crit.

⁴² 'vigeo, valeo, exulto; quo vis veniam, quo vis curram' I, 3, 3.

⁴³ I, 1, 2: 'Vale Caesar, et ride et omnem vitam

laetare et parentibus optimis et eximio ingenio tuo fruire.' I, 3, 13: 'Vale Caesar, cum tuis parentibus et ingenium tuum excole.'

⁴⁴ Hanslik, loc. cit., based on Brakman, 26. The imperial family at Baiae: *HA Hadrian* 25, 6, cf. *Pius* 5, 1.

⁴⁵ The phrase 'apud Baias agimus in hoc diurno Ulixi labyrintho' is said to lend support to the theory. Haines, I, 92, n. 1 makes it refer to Ulysses being driven backwards forwards along the coast, followed by J. H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970), 106. Other interpretations are possible, and the use of 'labyrinth' is unusual. T. D. Barnes suggests (by letter) an allusion to the sojourn with Circe or to the visit to the Underworld.

family may have visited those resorts any time and any number of times. Also, as noted above, such a construction would require a break in the holiday to attend the senate on 13th August. The first proposition is equally tenuous, based on the repetition of the name Baiae. The reference to the caves at that place in no way presupposes the addressee's presence there. Further, the contexts of 1-3 and 4-5 diverge. The latter pair betrays no hint of illness, a favourite topic whenever present, while 2 and 3 take their existence from it. 1, 4 is the product of idleness at Baiae, a game (1, 4, 6). Its author declares, '... adsiduo dies ac noctes somno adsum neque eum desero neque sino deserat, adeo sumus familiares' (1, 4, 1). However, the same Caesar complains in 1, 2, 1 of 'istam necessitatem meam durissimam' which binds him prisoner and keeps him from Fronto. Hard necessity does not befit a holiday at Baiae nor is it a happy description of devotion to Antoninus Pius, whose side he never left,⁴⁶ if the imperial pair were indeed merely holidaying at Baiae. Rather it fits the crowded days of hard work at Rome of which Marcus so often later complained.⁴⁷ With the best of wills, the only contact between 1-3 and 4-5 is Baiae. Thus a valuable clue is indicated as to the principles of arrangement behind the collection. Further, none of these five letters is closely dateable.

1, 6-8 yield further problems. Fronto has sent 'particulae' of a speech *de testamentis transmarinis* (a modern title) to Marcus. These the prince declaimed to the delight of the emperor (as he relates in 1, 6), copying out a long passage. His tutor's reply (1, 7) is a note replete with pride in the distinction of declaimer and auditor. At the end of 1, 6 Marcus has added, 'Herodi filius natus hodie mortuus est; id Herodes non aequo fert animo', with a request that Fronto write a note of consolation to the distraught sophist. The acephalous 1, 8, in Greek, is patently that note. At 1, 7, 2 the orator asks, 'Consulatum mihi putas tanto gaudio fuisse, quanto tua tot in una re summi amoris indicia?' Mommsen and Hanslik, anxious to preserve a chronological order, interpret the joy as arising from the designation to the consulship, but it is surely special pleading to deny the literal understanding.⁴⁸ 'Fuisse' is ambiguous, but the meaning 'has been (and still is)' is excluded by the salutation of 1, 6, 'magistro suo' (see below). Therefore after August 143. How long could a man savour the reminiscence of the supreme honour? Not very long, thought Haines, assigning the group to ?144/145.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, Herodes Atticus is of no assistance, the dates of his visits to Italy being unclear. There may be, but need not be, a connection with his consulship (143), or with his tutelage of Marcus Aurelius, or simply with an unattested visit to friends and estates in Italy. Likewise, our knowledge of Herodes' family is of no help, for crucial deductions have been based on the assumed date of 143 for this very passage from Fronto.⁵⁰ And finally, this may be either before or after the notorious legal battle between Fronto and Herodes, for relations were patched up. Thus, any date between later 143 and c. 160 (the death of Regilla, Herodes' wife) is possible, perhaps the closer to 143 and Fronto's consulship the better.

Next, an oddity which may or may not be significant. Book II, 1-12 are demonstrably dated July/August 143, although out of order. However, the fragmentary II, 4 should not be included. First, it is addressed 'magistro meo'. Of the other consular letters written by Marcus, four preserve the address, and all are to Fronto 'consuli' (II, 2, 6, 8, 11). The salutations in the correspondence are, as far as they can be controlled, perfectly authentic and a valuable aid to dating. There is no need to reject this one. Second, the circumstances of II, 4 may be suspicious. Two phrases stand out, 'Catonis multa legi' and 'O quam diu te non vidi'. The first echoes II, 3, 1, where Cato is twice recalled—Fronto's *actio gratiarum* contained praise more perfect than even Cato's invective—while the second looks forward to II, 5, 4, 'Eritne quom te videbo?' Further, we have seen that II, 5 is anterior to II, 3, an uncomfortable arrangement for anyone inserting II, 4. That said, however, it must be remembered here and everywhere that over two-fifths of the manuscript is quite defective, and certainty is seldom possible. Unfortunately, two manuscript pages are missing between II, 4 and 5. The date of II, 4 remains unclear.

II, 13-16 may or may not form a group, despite common assurance that the former is the case. 13 relates a rustic incident involving a band of shepherds met by Marcus and his entourage while out riding, after his father's return from the vineyards. It is tempting to see the time of year as early autumn, say October, the time of the vine-harvest, with the imperial family on holiday. 'Vindemias privati modo cum amicis agebat,' says the biographer of Pius.⁵¹ If that is so, the letter should not be

⁴⁶ cf. *HA Marcus* 7, 2-3.

⁴⁷ e.g. *Ad M. Caes.* IV, 7.

⁴⁸ Mommsen, 481; Hanslik, 22-23.

⁴⁹ Haines, I, 155.

⁵⁰ T. D. Barnes, *Latomus* 27 (1968), 581-86, is indispensable on Herodes' family. However, certain points must be stressed. The date of the marriage of Herodes and Regilla is quite unknown and cannot be deduced, and the precise date of 143, accepted by Barnes for 1, 6-8, is invalid. Barnes satisfactorily establishes the birth of Elpinice as probably pre-145, but further precision is impossible. Up to three

children remain unaccounted for: Lucian, *Demonax* 25; Philostratus, *VS* 555; *MDAI(A)* 67 (1942), 136-39. The value of Marcellus' account of Herodes' children (*IGRR* I, 194, A. 14-18) is thus reduced for our purposes. Barnes demonstrates what can be known about those who survived, but precision is impossible as to the birthdates of those shadowy infants of whom the boy in 1, 6 is one.

⁵¹ *HA Pius* II, 2. A common duty of the landed magnate was to oversee the harvest, e.g. Pliny, *Epp.* ix, 20.

related to II, 14-15, in which Marcus is exhausted after listening to lawyers all day, for courts recessed at the time of the vine-harvest.⁵² 14 and 15 are joined by Marcus waiting for Fronto's visit, and by two references to Fronto reading Cato. The mention of Cratia Minor is of no use, for we have no *terminus a quo* for her date of birth. From 14, 2 it might appear that Marcus was not in Rome.⁵³ On the other hand, the fragment II, 16, if connected, will be somewhat later, for Marcus refers to Fronto's daily visits to Lorium and his waiting till late, perhaps a reflection of his own long hours with the *causidici*. Precise attribution of II, 13-16 to 143 is quite hazardous.⁵⁴

In these first two books the editorial chaos is immediately evident in the consular group of letters. Further, I, 1-8 and II, 4, 13-16, for which no close dating avails, give rise in certain cases (e.g. I, 1-5 and II, 4, q.v.) to the suspicion that the original editor was grasping at straws in his arrangement. It must be reiterated, however, that without the complete manuscript certainty is impossible. No editorial principle is immediately apparent. At best, we may say that the salutations to Marcus as Caesar are correct, for no epistle can be assigned beyond their implied limits of A.D. 139 and 161.

Ad Marcum Caesarem III

The fragment III, 1 is quite undateable, with the proviso that Marcus has spoken more than once in both senate and *contio*. It has been assigned⁵⁵ to a time after III, 9, but that depends on the disputed interpretation of 'Caesaris oratio' in that epistle (q.v.).

III, 2-6 concern the notorious clash of Cornelius Fronto and Herodes Atticus which arose out of Herodes' actions in the matter of his father's will. Professor Bowersock's clear exposition has rendered close examination superfluous.⁵⁶ He quite rightly dismisses out of hand as 'tenuous argument' the assumption of previous scholars (at greatest length R. Hanslik⁵⁷) that the affair must antedate Herodes' ordinary consulship (143). Indeed, that assumption requires little refutation. It suggests that Marcus is 'audax puerulus' (III, 2, 1) and still a pupil of the orator. The former, especially in such a warm relationship, need not be literal, indeed is surely ironic, while the latter is unknown. Similarly, Fronto might hardly attack an *ex-consul ordinarius* and relative by marriage of the imperial dynasty. The first is manifestly erroneous, the second based on an unproved and most improbable kinship.⁵⁸ Finally, and more disturbing, it could appear that Herodes was not yet Marcus' tutor, else why Fronto's surprise at the prince's intervention? Bowersock provides little comfort: 'It is easy to over-estimate just how much the fastidious Fronto knew of the affairs of the boy he tutored.'⁵⁹ The problem is one of interpretation. Fronto must have known of Marcus' relationship with Herodes, either as family friend (III, 2, 1) or as tutor; what surprises him is that Marcus will *actively* intervene for Herodes. 'Sed illud verius est, probum virum esse, quem tu dignum tutela tua iudicas. Quod si unquam scissem, tum me di omnes male adfixint, si ego verbo laedere ausus fuissem quemquam amicum tibi' (III, 3, 2). The early dating is thus an illusion. Bowersock suggests that the *cognitio* be assigned to the later years of Pius' reign, bringing it closer to the subsequent and related trial at Sirmium, c. 174. One small clue may be noted in support of this. 'Acturi (*sc.* with Fronto against Herodes) videntur Capreolus, qui nunc abest, et Marcianus noster, videtur etiam Villianus' (III, 4, 2). The first and last are not closely identifiable.⁶⁰ 'Marcianus noster' is a different matter. A close friend of Fronto's, since 'noster' and acting with him, he is all but certain to be the contemporary Cirtan senator P. Iulius Geminus Marcianus, *cos. suff. c.* 167.⁶¹ If that is, so, a trial date pre-143 is completely ruled out, and the 150s indicated.

There is no connection with the subsequent pair, III, 7-8, wherein the pupil Marcus asks for and receives Fronto's aid in constructing a simile. Obviously very early, can a date be assigned? Marcus is Pius' 'socium dignitatis gloriae bonorumque participem'. Therefore the date should be early 140, the year when Marcus and Pius held the consulship jointly, or perhaps 139 when Marcus was promoted Caesar.⁶² It is assumed that Marcus is making a speech of thanks to his father, and the following is cited in support: 'Igitur hac imagine multimodis uti potes ubi patri tuo gratias ages, in

⁵² Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 2, 3, and J. Beaujeu, ad loc. Hanslik, 27 overlooks this slight difficulty.

⁵³ 'Die senatus huius magis hic futuri quam illuc venturi videmur.'

⁵⁴ It is here taken for granted that the letters printed by Naber (pp. 37, 10-39, 17) as the last two in this book were in fact the last two in the second book *Ad Ant. Imp.* Cf. Mommsen, 470 for the correct reconstruction of the manuscript.

⁵⁵ Hanslik, 28.

⁵⁶ *GSRE* 93-100.

⁵⁷ *Opuscula Philologica* 6 (1934), 25-34.

⁵⁸ i.e., that Herodes' wife Regilla was related to the Annii Veri of Baetica (*HA Marcus* 1, 4); in fact she descends from the Etruscan Annii Galli (cf. M. Torelli, *Dial. Arch.* 3 (1969), 301-02).

⁵⁹ O.c. 99.

⁶⁰ Note however the Latin *litterator* of Commodus, Antistius Capella (*HA Comm.* 1, 6). One might suspect error in the *HA* or humour in Fronto, and conflate Capella with Capreolus; if so, some very slight support for the later date.

⁶¹ *PIR*² I, 340. There are no other Marciani available, and the Cirtan connection should render identity most probable. (I hope to investigate elsewhere Fronto's close and considerable circle of Cirtan friends.) Marcianus was in Pannonia as legate of legio X Gemina at the time of Pius' death (7th March 161), therefore 161 and 160 are probably ruled out as dates for the trial.

⁶² Haines, 115-16; 1, 32 ff.; Hanslik, 28.

qua oratione locupletissimum et copiosissimum te esse oportet' (III, 8, 1). This confidence is perhaps excessive. First, there would be many other occasions when Marcus might deliver an *actio gratiarum*, notably the second joint consulship (145) or even the grant of *tribunicia potestas* (147). (Note that even in the latter year Marcus was still doing exercises for Fronto, cf. IV, 13, below.) On the other hand, 'ubi' here may simply signify 'whenever'. The subject of the exchange is, after all, similes, and the master may merely be pointing to an apt occasion. The date is admittedly early, certainly before III, 6, but precision is illusory.

III, 9 has been placed sometime in the second half of 139: 'Sed me Caesaris oratio unceis unguibus adinet.' Marcus was probably created Caesar in that period, certainly in that year, and this will be his *actio gratiarum*.⁶³ However, the context quite undermines this interpretation. Fronto has sent Marcus 'materia cruenta', including an excerpt from Coelius (the historian Coelius Antipater) which he has not yet tackled. Could the 'Caesaris oratio' be a speech of Caesar the dictator, whom Fronto considered 'vir ingenii praecellentis, sermonis praeter alios suae aetatis castissimi'?⁶⁴ His example would surely teach Marcus the amount of effort required to turn out three or five lines. To be safe then we can only assign this note roughly, to the period of Fronto's active supervision.

III, 10 conveys birthday greetings from Marcus to Fronto, and III, 11 is the thanks in reply. 'Domina mea' could be either Marcus' mother or his wife. III, 12 is early, for Marcus has composed maxims worthy of Sallust. III, 13 is his reply in thanks for this praise, and mentions another letter from Fronto which had arrived simultaneously, scolding him for writing a *sententia* carelessly. This should not be IV, 3 as Haines thought⁶⁵ (the circumstances are different), nor is there any need to adduce the fragmentary III, 1 with Hanslik. Further letters are missing before III, 14, but the milieu is much later, for Marcus is distracted 'tot negotiis quot officiis, quot rescribendis per provincias litteris' (III, 14, 1). Fronto chafes at being cut off from Marcus (3, 4). Hanslik constructs a strange edifice, assigning this letter and IV, 7 (wherein Marcus complains of having dictated almost thirty letters) to 147. In IV, 7, Marcus is out of Rome ('... cum ... ad urbem veniemus') and Hanslik presumes the same is true of III, 14 from a remark by Fronto there ('at tamen proxime cum proficiscerere...') which need imply nothing of the sort or, if it did, need not refer to the same absence. Hanslik's point is that Marcus is out of the city and writing to the provinces, therefore the date is soon after his assumption of the *tribunicia potestas* with *imperium extra urbem proconsulare* (10th December, 146).⁶⁶ In fact the date could be any time after that event, or indeed before it, for nothing precludes Marcus from writing on his own behalf as Caesar. III, 15, a fragment, is no more dateable.

In III, 16, Fronto defends the artifices of oratory against Marcus' doubts, summoning philosophers as witnesses. The dating (Hanslik, *c.* 147; Haines, 143) is quite insecure, perhaps depending on Marcus' much discussed conversion to philosophy (cf. IV, 7, below), although it could easily be either before or after. In III, 17-18, Marcus is a real pupil, writing an epideictic 'hypothesis' for his master, who worries over his progress. (Note that III, 18 is *not* the reply to 17, but could be mistaken for it.) In III, 19, Marcus is reading speeches of Gracchus, but he need not be a pupil. Finally, III, 20-22 are likewise undateable. Fronto is ill, Marcus still his pupil.

Again, no sustained chronological order is suggested and a large number of letters are simply undateable beyond the broad limits of Marcus' Caesarship. Again, the clumps of letters appear joined by a common theme, real (e.g. 2-6) or contrived (7-9), and the incompetence of the ancient editor is again joined by modern over-confidence.

Ad Marcum Caesarem IV

IV, 1 contains a fable by Fronto on Orpheus, concerning *invidia* among the friends of a prince. Fronto has visited Iulianus (IV, 1, 4) on Marcus' account, for which visit the Caesar thanks him (2.1). A reference is made to a sometime opponent ('Et Herodes te amat et ego istic hoc ago...') IV, 2, 3) which makes sense only during or after the trial, therefore in the 150s. Further, a *terminus ante quem* is provided by IV, 2, 5: 'Haec cursim ad te scripsi quia Maecianus urgebat.' The jurispudent L. Volusius Maecianus was prefect of Egypt by 160.⁶⁷ IV, 3, on the other hand, is to be dated (with Haines) very early.⁶⁸ It should be the 'prima illa longiuscula ad te epistula' mentioned by Fronto in 161 (*Ad Ant. Imp.* I, 2, 5), which concerned diligence in searching out the apt *sententia*, written by him soon after Marcus had delivered a speech in the senate 'vixdum pueritiam egressus'. The

⁶³ *BMC Cat.* iv, Antoninus Pius, 124-31. On the date, H.-G. Pflaum, *BHAC* 1963, 110 ff.

⁶⁴ Gellius xix, 8, 3. I am greatly indebted to Professor C. P. Jones for this suggestion.

⁶⁵ cf. Hanslik, 28-29.

⁶⁶ *ibid.* 29-30.

⁶⁷ O. Reinmuth, *BASP* 4 (1967), 98. The name Iulianus is of little help, but a thought should go to the future emperor M. Didius Iulianus. The invalid in question is Marcus' friend, Fronto's visit 'mea

maxime gratia'. Didius had especially close relations with the Caesar. He was brought up at the house of Domitia Lucilla, who secured for him the vigintivirate, and Marcus favoured his career throughout, commending him for the aedileship, the praetorship and the consulship (*HA Did. Iul.* I, 3-2, 3). He was born in either 133 or 137 (Dio lxxiv, 17, 5 *vs.* *HA* 9, 3); if he is the man of *Ad M. Caes.* IV, 2, 3, another indication of the late 150s.

⁶⁸ Haines, 116; *vs.* Hanslik, 31-32.

date suggested by Haines is ?139,⁶⁹ and surely before the consulship which should have been mentioned (if already held) at iv, 3, 6, where Marcus' status is rehearsed at length. The formal tone of the epistle concurs, by no means the intimate and lavishly affectionate style of later (even academic) letters, and it befits a new relationship. The conclusion (iv, 3, 8) is brusque and businesslike. The date should be 138 or 139, and long before iv, 1-2.

iv, 4, retailing an antiquarian excursion and inquiring after Fronto's vintage, is undateable. 5 and 6 show Marcus in the country, reading and writing; Fronto's daughter is 'minuscula', therefore probably we are in the 140s. iv, 7, as we have seen (page 143), is undateable. 8 and 9 deal with undateable illnesses of Marcus and of Fronto respectively. They are not temporally connected, iv, 9, 1 revealing an 'intervallum' in the correspondance. iv, 10, a fragment, concludes, 'consulem nostrum saluta et matronam nostram.' The latter is probably Cratia minor, the former perhaps C. Aufidius Victorinus, Fronto's pupil and Marcus' intimate companion, suffect consul May/June 155; the couple may have been betrothed by that date.⁷⁰ iv, 11 and 12 concern the illness of Marcus' 'parvola nostra Faustina', Annia Galeria Faustina, his eldest daughter, born 30 November, 147.⁷¹ As the child is an infant (cf. 12, 7) the date will be shortly thereafter.

iv, 13 is prior to this, written by Marcus at the age of twenty-five, therefore 26th April, 146/147. The date is secure,⁷² one of the few firm footholds in the correspondence, but its application has been abused. Scholarship has unanimously used it to signal the defection of Marcus from rhetoric to philosophy. The break, however, is surely not so sharp, and this epistle may have little connection. It commences with an affectionate sketch of Aufidius extolling the judge to the discredit of the orator, Marcus being the butt of his remarks. Marcus then refers with embarrassment to Fronto's forthcoming visit. He has not done the work assigned by his master. Cicero and an unnamed playwright have been supplanted by the books of Ariston, full of 'bonae opiniones et puriores rationes' which make the Caesar blush at the defects in his own character. However, he will now turn to his writing. 'Nonnumquam permittendum legibus dormire', as the Attic orator asserted, and Ariston's books will be laid aside. But Fronto must not expect Marcus to defend both sides of a question now, for Ariston will not allow him.

Ariston is usually identified with the Stoic philosopher of the early third century B.C., Ariston the Bald of Chios, a pupil of Zeno.⁷³ The identification is unfortunate, for of the books ascribed to the Stoic only the *Letters* were held to be genuine, the rest being attributed by ancient scholarship to Ariston the Peripatetic.⁷⁴ A better persona can be offered, not a philosopher, but the juriconsult Titius Ariston. A respectable list of his works can be compiled from citations in the *Digest*, and Marcus' contemporary student, A. Gellius, knew a 'liber Aristonis iureconsulti, hautquaquam indocti viri.'⁷⁵ The context of the latter demands a jurispudent. Aufidius not only praises the judge *vis-à-vis* the orator, but also jeers at Marcus, 'facile esse oscitantem iudici assidere, ceterum quidem iudicare praeclarum opus.' Who else but a juriconsult sits yawning next the judge? The point of Aufidius' jibe becomes clear: Marcus is wasting his time studying jurisprudence. Thus the connection (otherwise obscure) is established between section 1 and sections 2 and 3. Second, 'the laws must sometimes be allowed to sleep' heralds the setting aside of Ariston's *libri*. The remark loses much of its aptness if referred to a philosopher. Third, Ariston the jurist would be no less opposed to arguing both sides of a case. And note Marcus' language: 'Ariston will never *sleep so soundly* (numquam ita dormiet) as to allow me to do that'. As for the noble doctrines and purer principles, Ariston's friend the younger Pliny has left an admirable portrait of his character, austere, learned and saintly.⁷⁶ The works of such a man could easily teach the 'better way'. The letter iv, 13, therefore, is concerned with jurisprudence, not with philosophy. Any attempts to date others dealing with philosophy by it will be in error and, needless to add, the course of Marcus' education and thought will have to be reconsidered.

Again, the results for book iv are negative, mainly a demolition of previously accepted datings. Order by chronology is absent, order by theme indiscernible.

Ad Marcum Caesarem v

Book v, an aggregation of brief notes, is a chronological morass. One need deal here only with those for which a date can be established or rejected. v, 1 and 2 need not refer (*pace* Haines) to

⁶⁹ Haines, 1, 2, n. 1.

⁷⁰ Victorinus' consulship: *CIL* vi, 2086, 23. For the date of the marriage (c. 158) see below.

⁷¹ *FO* xxviii. The subject of these letters is unlikely to be Domitia Faustina, known only from her epitaph (*ILS* 385, before A.D. 161). 'Faustina' would be the prerogative of the elder. Haines, 1, 203 confuses the two.

⁷² But cf. n. 37 above.

⁷³ e.g. by A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London,

1966), 120. I know of no divergence from the *communis opinio*.

⁷⁴ *Diog. Laert.* vii, 160-64.

⁷⁵ *Gell.* xi, 18, 16. Works: *PW Suppl.-Bd.* viii 857 ff. (Titius 27a), cf. ix, 1395 ff. Fragments: O. Lenel, *Palingenesia iuris civilis* (Leipzig 1888) 59-70.

⁷⁶ Pliny, *Epp.* i, 22, 1-7. It is singular that Pliny's letter is addressed to Marcus' kinsman, Catilius Severus, whose name he bore for a time. The relationship is unclear: Syme, *Tacitus* 793.

Marcus' thanks for the tribunician power, nor need the 'oratio' of 3 and 4 refer back to 1-2. 3 and 4 mention 'mater domina', that is Domitia Lucilla, and are therefore dateable before her death *c.* 156;⁷⁷ likewise 19-20, 27-32, 41-42, 44, 45-46, 47-48, 53-54, 55-56, 57-58, 59-60, 70, 71-72. v, 21 refers to Marcus' wife Faustina ('Augusta tua'), as do 25-26, 45-45, 49-50, 57, 60, 67: all therefore after April 145, 'Augusta tua' after 1st December, 147.⁷⁸ v, 23 refers to Marcus' sister, Cornificia, therefore before her death in 152.⁷⁹ 27-32 appear to form a series, mutual pronouncements on illnesses and sympathy; in fact, 27-28 clearly refer to another occasion. No modern editor could hope to date such material. v, 33 and 34 mention 'parvolae nostrae', therefore after the birth of the second daughter Lucilla, 7th March, 149; likewise 49-50, 57-58 (very young).⁸⁰ v, 37-38 and 41-43, however, are much earlier, Fronto proposing a theme for his pupil. 39-40 refer to 'domnula mea', Faustina, born 30th November, 147, therefore probably from the early 150s, for the child is able to converse with her father.⁸¹ 45-46 convey New Year's wishes from Fronto and Marcus' reciprocations; only one daughter exists, therefore 1st January, 148 or 149. v, 47-48 are Marcus' birthday greetings to Fronto and Fronto's reply. Marcus has only one daughter again ('matrona tua', 'filia mea') so the date is *c.* October, 148.⁸² v, 51 is shortly before Fronto's expected proconsulship of Asia, therefore *c.* 158,⁸³ 53-54 refer to an *actio gratiarum* of Lucius Verus, perhaps for his consulship (154),⁸⁴ perhaps not, at any rate not before his quaestorship (153). A new daughter of Marcus is noted, identity unsure, in 67-68, but at least after 30th November, 147. Finally, v, 74 takes the reader back to the era of Marcus' pupilship (he is composing maxims); its only connection with the preceding is illness. Chronological order is totally absent in Book v but a good case can be made out here, at least, for a thematic order.^{84a}

Ad Antoninum Imp. 1

Ad Ant. Imp. 1, 1-2, birthday greetings from Marcus to Fronto and the orator's reply, are most important for the chronology of the correspondence. They may be closely dated. Marcus and Lucius Verus are now co-emperors, while their tutor is now 'senex' and has acquired a son-in-law and grandchildren. Marcus' child, 'pullus noster Antoninus', has a cough (1, 1, 3). The child is an infant with a wet-nurse, and the weather is now 'clementior' (1, 2, 8). He is T. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus, twin brother of Commodus, born 31st August, 161, at Lanuvium.⁸⁵ In the first letter Faustina is still recovering her health, presumably after the birth, but (unless the *Historia Augusta* is wrong about the birthplace) she is well enough to have moved from Lanuvium to Lorium (1, 1, 3). The more clement weather (hardly applicable to the September days of the sirocco) and the period elapsed since the birth should afford us an approximate date of October 161. Further, Marcus' absence from Rome (1, 1, 3) might indicate a time during the senate's annual recess, September/October.⁸⁶ One other point clinches the matter. In the last senate session Marcus had spoken of the 'gravis causa' of the Cyzicenes (1, 2, 6), even calling upon the gods in their behalf (2, 9); he spoke so earnestly and so well 'ut non ocius aut vehementius terra urbem illam quam animos audientium tua oratio moverit.' The earthquakes which shook Asia Minor can be dated quite closely to the period of Pius' death and Marcus' accession in early 161.⁸⁷ It is difficult to imagine Marcus, the beneficent emperor and apparently the hereditary patron of Cyzicus,⁸⁸ delaying his plea for the city until November 161 (or spring 162, if the more clement weather be considered). The 'oratio Cyzicena' will have been delivered 'proximo senatu' on 13th August, 161, the last legitimate day for a meeting (barring extraordinary sessions) before the September/October break (and before the twin birth). The date of these letters, and of Fronto's birthday, should be *c.* October, 161.

1, 3-5 follow chronologically and are interrelated: 4 is Marcus' answer to 3; 5 is the reply (after a short delay) to 4, which it quotes (5, 2, cf. 4, 1). Modern dating is uniformly misleading. Fronto has just seen the infant twins. Various factors point to late 161/early 162, that is, soon after 1, 1-2. First, he calls them 'pulluli tui', echoing 1, 3 and 2, 8. Second, he visits them at Lorium (cf. 1, 3). Third, the tone of 3, 1 should suggest that this is the first time he has glimpsed the infants: 'Vidi pullulos tuos, quod quidem libentissime in vita mea viderim, tam simili facie tibi, ut nihil sit hoc simili similium'

⁷⁷ Haines, 114. Cf. *PIR*³ D 183 for the date.

⁷⁸ *FO* xxvii.

⁷⁹ *FO* xxix.

⁸⁰ On the date of Lucilla's birth, Birley, 139, n. 2.

⁸¹ cf. n. 71 above.

⁸² For Fronto's birthday see below, on *Ad Ant. Imp. 1, 1-2*.

⁸³ See below, on *Ad Pium 8*.

⁸⁴ Mommsen, 483.

^{84a} Hanslik, 35.

⁸⁵ *HA Comm.* 1, 2. Cf. Hanslik, 36-38 for a discussion of the date, quite wrong in joining it with *Ad Ver. 1, 3* (q.v.).

⁸⁶ Suet., *DA* 35. Imperial attendance at the senate is by no means to be assumed. However, the *HA* outlines in some detail Marcus' respect for and interest in that body, *HA Marcus* 10, 1-9, especially 7: 'Semper autem, cum potuit, interfuit senatui, etiamsi nihil esset referendum, si Romae fuit; si vero aliquid referre voluit, etiam de Campania ipse venit.'

⁸⁷ G. W. Bowersock, *HSCP* 72 (1967), 289-94, especially 291-92.

⁸⁸ *ILS* 7190 (A.D. 139) displays three generations of the family interested in Cyzicene affairs.

(compare his description of them in 1, 2). However, some time has passed, for Marcus has left Lorium (but his family remains there, 3, 4), the senate is in session (5, 1), and the weather has apparently worsened.⁸⁹ The date should be approximately November/December 161. These letters are, however, commonly assigned a later date, 163,⁹⁰ because Lucius is absent, presumably in the East, and the twins are eating solids and speaking. Both of these assumptions are unwarranted. The first is based on 4, 2, where Marcus asks Fronto to write to Lucius at Lucius' request, the second on 1, 3, 2, where Fronto describes the twins as holding bread in their hands, and their voices as 'pipuli'. Lucius need not be absent, nor need the infants be eating or speaking, indeed 'pipulus' might suggest the contrary.⁹¹ 1, 6-10 are fragments (that is, the first three or four words of each exist only in the index), but 1-5 form an obvious chronological group.

Ad Antoninum Imp. II-III-IV

Ad Ant. Imp. II, 1-2 concern the will of Marcus' kinswoman the younger Matidia, and are therefore posterior to IV, 1, where she is still alive. Lucius is absent (II, 2, 2), probably in the East, and Victorinus is probably in Germany (he is informed of the affair in *Ad Am.* I, 14). Lucius was gone ?summer 162-summer 166, Victorinus ?summer 161-late 164/early 165.⁹²

Book III commences with a lengthy and acephalous essay on the styles of oratory and history (with large *excerpta* from Sallust), quite undateable. III, 2, 6, 7, 11 are fragments. III, 3-5, of some historical interest, are to be assigned to late 164/early 165, for III, 4 quotes from *Ad Ver. Imp.* II, 9 (q.v.). The dating of III, 8 concerns that of *De Nepote Amisso* (q.v.). III, 9 and 10 are quite undateable: Marcus is very busy and Fronto is ill, but at the emperor's request Fronto sends extracts from Cicero's letters.

IV, 1 is anterior to II, 1-2, 'nam parvolae nostrae nunc apud Matidiam in oppido hospitantur'. Lucius Verus has not yet departed for the East (he sends his greetings *via* Marcus), therefore the letter is before summer 162, and if brought into conjunction with *de Bello Parthico* (q.v.), it should be assigned to autumn 161 or after. IV, 2, as it stands, is unconnected with IV, 1 and undateable.

These last three books are too mutilated to allow any conclusion. The upset sequence of II, 1-2 and IV, 1 is noteworthy.

Ad Verum I

Ad Ver. I, 1 furnishes a delusive chronological clue: the pantomime Pylades is compared to Apolaustus. The latter is known as a favourite of Verus, L. Aurelius Augg. lib. Apolaustus Memphius, brought back in his entourage from Syria, hence the date is 166 or after.⁹³ However, an earlier Apolaustus is also known, [L.A.]elius Aug.lib. [Aur.]elius Apolaustus, also a pantomime and freedman of Lucius, and he will be produced by those who insist on the chronological order of the collection, assigning the letter to 161/162.⁹⁴ Both are epigraphically attested.⁹⁵ If the earlier Apolaustus be identified with the homonym executed by Commodus—Apolaustus Memphius survived to at least 199—both flourished after the war.⁹⁶ The date is thus quite unsure.

Ad Ver. I, 2-3 afford a real problem. In 2, Lucius reproaches Fronto for not seeing him at the palace; in 3, Fronto excuses himself. Unfortunately, the text is lacunose at the critical juncture. 'Nam ex hortis ego redii Romam ante diem quintum kal. April. diluculo, ut <sem>per illa, si possem, die longo post tempore †comsuero†. Sed eo... (over three lines missing) ...est...nae ego pergerem...ut facerem? 'Satin salve' ut percontarer? an ut exoscularer? an ut confabularer? an ego quarto post mense lacrimas vestras spectatum measque ostentatum venirem?' (I, 3, 2). The next day he wrote to the freedman Charilas, asking if it were convenient to visit his masters. Mommsen declined to speculate on this grief in the imperial family, dating it only c. 162, that is between the death of Pius and the departure of Lucius.⁹⁷ Brakman and Haines, following Naber, referred the event to the period immediately after Pius' death (7th March, 161), but Hanslik, noting the obvious chronological difficulty, reverted to early 162, claiming the deceased to be the Faustina who was regaining her health in late 161 (*Ad Ant. Imp.* I, 1, 3).⁹⁸ This is demonstrably incorrect, for no Faustina died under the joint Augusti.⁹⁹ Fronto returned to Rome 28th March, that is if in 161 only three weeks after Pius' death. The stumbling-block is the interpretation of 'quarto post mense'. According to Mommsen

⁸⁹ 'Feci prorsus compendium itineris Lorium usque, compendium viae lubricae, compendium clivorum arduorum . . .' I, 3, 1.

⁹⁰ E.g. Haines, II, 118; Hanslik, 38.

⁹¹ For the confused problem of Fronto's grandchildren, mentioned here, see the discussion below of *De Nepote Amisso*.

⁹² For these dates, see the relevant discussions below.

⁹³ *HA Verus* 8, 10. Haines, 117; Hanslik, 39.

⁹⁴ Mommsen, 483-84, followed by T. D. Barnes, *JRS* 57 (1967), 72.

⁹⁵ On the two Apolausti: P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris* (Cambridge, 1972), 27-28.

⁹⁶ *HA Comm.* 7, 2; *ILS* 5191.

⁹⁷ Mommsen, 483.

⁹⁸ Haines, I, 297, n. 1; Brakman, 35; Hanslik, 36-37.

⁹⁹ cf. n. 71 above.

and Hanslik, this should mean four months after a death in the imperial family, obviously not Pius' therefore. On that view, not only was the court in mourning for four months (at least), but also an intimate of both emperors hesitated even then to disturb them in their sorrow. Such diffidence is suspect. After the death of Pius, Marcus and Lucius could not afford such leisurely grief, indeed were plunged into activity; after the death of M. Annius Verus Caesar, Marcus' youngest son, the emperor mourned the child for only five days, continued to attend to public affairs and refused to interrupt the games with public mourning.¹⁰⁰ Are we to believe, then, that the loss of the unknown deceased kept Marcus and Lucius in seclusion for four months? That period of time must surely be the absence of Fronto, who returns only to mingle his tears with those of his pupils. The date is just after 28th March, 161, and the death of the emperor has recalled Fronto posthaste.

The corollary of this is that *Ad Ver.* I, 1 is chronologically misplaced. Verus is patently emperor: 'iube Valerium istum Antonium dare mihi libellum, uti rescriptione quoque nostra gratia sententiae nostrae fiat.' As the light tone of the note will hardly accord with the tears of March 161, it will be some time subsequent to I, 2-3. It should be noted, however, that correspondence with Lucius as a private individual is not ruled out, for the most recent editor signals a break of no fewer than eighty manuscript pages between *Ad Ant. Imp.* IV, 2 and *Ad Ver.* I, 1.¹⁰¹ Thus the embarrassing absence of such letters may well be fortuitous. The book title and the salutation of I, 1 are both lost, but the the subscription of the book reads significantly 'Ad Verum'. (Compare Book II, headed 'M. Frontonis ad Verum Imperatorem Aurelium Caesarem' (sic).)

I, 4 is quite undateable. 'Tranquillus noster' will hardly be the biographer Suetonius.¹⁰² The letter is tantalizingly lacunose, perhaps a sad loss for the historian of polite society.

Ad Verum Imp. II

The long II, 1, an essay on the general officer and 'eloquentiae virtus', allows a close dating, after the fall of Dausara, Nicephorium and Artaxata (II, 1, 5). Strangely, Haines and Hanslik assign the letter to the actual year of the Armenian victories, 163, thereby ignoring both Fronto and Mommsen.¹⁰³ Marcus (the letter informs us) had formerly refused the title *Armeniacus*, but now Lucius has stormed even the citadel of his resistance. Lucius did not assume the title until late in 163, coins first proclaim Marcus as *Armeniacus* after some months into 164.¹⁰⁴ Likewise, II, 1, 18 proclaims that Lucius had given Armenia to Sohaemus, an action duly commemorated by coins of 164.¹⁰⁵

Again, with II, 2, chronology is upset. Lucius writes to apologize to his old tutor for a long delay in the correspondence. The date is 163, but before the summer victories of Statius Priscus in Armenia.¹⁰⁶ Lucius has been too busy and too burdened with cares to spare time for writing, and nothing has yet been accomplished to occasion mutual joy (II, 2, 1). On the other hand, it is legitimate to infer from Lucius' tone that he is actually in Syria and in command. Lucius' progress to the East had been notoriously, even scandalously, slow. A grave illness detained him at Canusium, and the Eleusinian mysteries had to be celebrated a second time for him when he reached Athens. The *Historia Augusta* waxes indignant. While the Orient was in turmoil, 'ille in Apulia venabatur et apud Corinthum et Athenas inter symphonias et cantica navigabat et per singulas maritimas civitates Asiae Pamphyliae Ciliciaeque clariores voluptatibus immorabatur.'¹⁰⁷ The universally accepted date for his departure is spring 162, arising partially from the misinterpretation of *Ad Ver.* I, 2-3 (q.v.) which assigns them to late March 162.¹⁰⁸ Even if that were correct—it is not—it would provide only a *terminus post quem*. The lyricism of the *HA* is suspicious. Could the emperor really have taken seven or eight months merely to reach Athens while the East was purportedly crumbling? Even the delay brought about by Verus' self-induced illness would be sufficient to account for the *HA*'s righteous indignation. Let us conjecture that he left Rome in the summer of 162, was held up by serious illness, reached Athens October/December 162,¹⁰⁹ and perhaps (as one attractive theory would have it) was in Ephesus on 3rd January, 163.¹¹⁰ At any rate, there is no need to see him in Antioch before 163.¹¹¹ *Ad Ver. Imp.* II, 2 should probably be dated c. spring 163.

¹⁰⁰ *HA Marcus* 7, 5-8; 21, 3-5. Compare the austerity of Tiberius: Dio lvii, 14, 6 and 22, 3; Tac., *Ann.* iii, 6.

¹⁰¹ V.d.H. on 110, 13. Mommsen correctly assumed that the correspondence with Commodus Caesar (sic) has perished (p. 471).

¹⁰² cf. R. Syme, *Historia* 9 (1960), 379, n. 80.

¹⁰³ Haines, II, 128, n. 2; Hanslik, 39; Mommsen, 484. For the text of II, 1 the article cited in n. 3 above must be consulted.

¹⁰⁴ *BMC Cat.* IV, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus 261 ff. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *NC* 11 (1911), 221-22.

¹⁰⁵ *BMC Cat.* 300 ff.

¹⁰⁶ *ibid.* 233 ff. Dodd, 216-17 for the date. He calculated that the victory leading to Lucius'

'Armeniacus' and 'Imp. II' occurred about September.

¹⁰⁷ *HA Verus* 6, 7-9.

¹⁰⁸ Dodd, 215; J. Schwendemann, *Der historische Wert der Vita Marci bei den Scriptoribus Historiae Augustae* (Heidelberg, 1923), 143; P. Lambrechts, *AC* 3 (1934), 194; *CAH* xi, 346; Birley, 167-68; etc.

¹⁰⁹ The Greater Mysteries were celebrated from the 15th to the 23rd Boedromion, September/early October: G. E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton, 1961), 243 ff.

¹¹⁰ C. P. Jones, *GRBS* 13 (1972), 484-85.

¹¹¹ *CIL* iii, 129 (Dmeir) does not prove his presence in Syria before 10th December, 162, *contra* Dodd, 215, n. 16.

From the tone of II, 3 it has been assumed that the war is over. Lucius has not yet returned, therefore before 12th October, 166, perhaps before 23 August (he was probably still in Syria 24th May), for Fronto is to ask one Fulvianus to supplement the written accounts of the war.¹¹² Considerable successes may be assumed if Avidius Cassius and Martius Verus, the commanders in Mesopotamia, have the leisure to compose *commentarii* for future historians, and if Lucius can contemplate 'causas et initia belli', the war should be at or near the end. The occupation of the Parthian capital Seleucia and its subsequent sack, c. December 165, should be the earliest *terminus a quo*.¹¹³ Therefore, II, 3 is to be assigned to c. January/June 166.

II, 4 should be more or less contemporary, and certainly before the triumph of 12th October. If the text of 'socrum et liberos vestros saluta' is sound (and there is no sound reason why it should not be) Lucius has returned to Italy, but not yet to Rome, either being met by Marcus or visiting him en route; 'vestri' will then be plural, referring to the two Augusti. II, 5 is Verus' reply.

II, 6 may again upset the chronology. It is commonly assigned to the early stages of Lucius' *profectio* to the East.¹¹⁴ The *HA* tells us that Verus, 'cumque inde per omnium villas se ingurgitaret, morbo implicitus apud Canusium aegrotavit. quo ad eum visendum frater contendit'. The illness was serious and vows were taken for the emperor's recovery.¹¹⁵ In II, 6, Fronto speaks of the 'perturbatio' of his mind, of his relief that Lucius has fasted for three days and has been subjected to heavy bloodletting (6, 1). He beseeches Lucius to be more moderate in all his desires, and bids him greet Marcus (2, 3). The circumstances certainly fit the incident of 162, but Mommsen insisted that identity was not proved, and that the letter could be anytime 161/162 or 166/169.¹¹⁶ However, we know of no other comparable illnesses in Lucius' life, and repeated collapse induced by debauchery would have received a wide press, notably from the *HA*. (Yet that work asserts (4, 10) that Lucius was 'digestionis facillimae'!) II, 6 may then be entered ?summer 162.

II, 7 is not more closely dateable than 163/166, during Lucius' sojourn in Syria. Fronto requests him to aid a certain Gavius Clarus whom he has sent off 'in Suriam ad legata, quae ei in testamento hominis amicissimi obvenerunt, persequenda' (II, 7, 5). II, 8 is quite undateable beyond the limits of Lucius' reign and of Fronto's demise (161/c. 167), although some have assigned it a date with unwarranted assurance.¹¹⁷ II, 9 (part of which is transcribed in *Ad Ant. Imp.* III, 4) and 10 to Lucius in the East (cf. 9, 1), concern the problem of Fronto's grandchildren, on which see below. Their date should be ?late 164/early 165.

De Eloquentia

The five epistles *de Eloquentia* (so-called by moderns) afford few chronological indications, but Haines has hazarded a date of ?162.¹¹⁸ 1-3 have lost their salutations, 4-5 are addressed 'Antonino Augusto', therefore after 7th March, 161. The common theme is eloquence and its value, the common antagonist philosophy. A marginal note to 2, 18 (v.d.H. 141, 23-24) offers the gloss, 'An maiorem tragoediam putas Amphiarum scribere quam de terrarum hiatu dicere?' This should be a reference to Marcus' 'oratio Cyzicena', therefore probably in the vicinity of 13th August, 161 (cf. *Ad Ant. Imp.* I, 1-2 above). The fragment 3 praises a speech (?) of the emperor which may be the same; likewise the polite criticism of 4, 1-2 may refer to it. However, there is no apparent need to bind together in time these five letters simply because of a common theme, and that one the closest to Fronto's heart.

Ad Antoninum Pium

The correspondence with Antoninus Pius is a surprise, a single book containing only nine items in no readily discernible order. It might appear that the editor had no more at his disposal and resorted to embarrassed padding. There are only five epistles of Fronto and two of Pius (one a re-script). Therefore a letter to Marcus Caesar (4) and one to the prefect Gavius Maximus (7 = *Ad Am.* II, 5) are imported, both concerned with the subject of *Ad Ant. Pium* 3. Further, for no apparent reason *Ad Amicos* II, 2-4, none of which betrays a connection with Pius, are included wholesale as *Ad Ant. Pium* 10-12.¹¹⁹ Finally, the letter to Marcus (4) mentions both 3 and 7. Not only is 7 placed after 4, two quite unrelated letters on the anniversary of Pius' accession are inserted gratuitously. According to one scholar the editor is striving for *variatio!*¹²⁰

¹¹² The triumph was celebrated 12th October (*HA Marcus* 12, 8 with *Comm.* II, 13). That Lucius was in Rome late August is suggested at Barnes, 72, relying on *ILS* 366 (not quite secure). The Misene fleet was still in the East 24th May: *FIRA*² iii, 132.

¹¹³ R. H. McDowell, *Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris* (Ann Arbor, 1935), 234.

¹¹⁴ Haines, II, 85; Hanslik, 39-40.

¹¹⁵ *HA Verus* 6, 7; *Marcus* 8, 11; *BMC Cat.* 198, 208 (by implication).

¹¹⁶ Mommsen, 485-86, misinterpreted by Barnes, 70 to say that the letter *must* be 166 or later.

¹¹⁷ Haines, II, 239; Birley, 197: 'This is the last surviving letter of Fronto to either of his imperial pupils, and he must have died soon after this.'

¹¹⁸ Haines, II, 46 ff. No one else has been so foolhardy.

¹¹⁹ cf. v.d.H. 156, 14 ff., and the note at 162, 37 ff.

¹²⁰ Hanslik, 41-42.

In the fragment 1, Fronto refers to an 'actio gratiarum' which he delivered to Pius in the senate, and *Ad Ant. Pium* 2 is, apparently, the emperor's gracious reply. By common consent this should be the oft-mentioned speech of 13th August, 143, for his consulship.¹²¹ It may well be, but confidence is unwarranted. At least one other *actio gratiarum* exists, on behalf of the Carthaginians (v.d.H. 241-42), and the orator 'gave praise' to Pius upon the completion of a British War.¹²² Many other occasions must have existed for a display by the leading orator of the age. Further, the etiquette noted above should apply here also. If Fronto were consul he should be addressed as such, but 2 begins simply 'M. Frontoni Antoninus Caesar'.¹²³ Therefore *not* July/August 143. Unfortunately, the reference to 'Faustina mea' (2, 2) is of no help. She could be either the wife (alive or dead) or the daughter. Precision is impossible. Also, as they stand, 1 and 2 need not be connected; if they are, they should be reversed, Pius' note of thanks preceding Fronto's reminder.

Ad Ant. Pium 3, 4 and 7 offer more hope, concerning the awkward affair of the testament of C. Censorius Niger, by which Fronto inherited 5/12 of the estate, and the praetorian prefect M. Gavius Maximus was roundly abused. A *terminus ante quem* is provided by Pius' biographer: 'successorem viventi bono iudici nulli dedit . . . nam Gavius Maximus praefectus praetorii usque ad vicensimum annum sub eo pervenit, vir severissimus, cui Tattius Maximus successit.'¹²⁴ That the *HA* is trustworthy and that Gavius Maximus died in office are acceptable, for by then he will have been near eighty.¹²⁵ He is first attested in office by 1st March, 139 (*ILS* 2182). However, he may have been appointed by Hadrian—the *HA* text does not contradict this—so the standard date of either *c.* 157 or *c.* 158 is not quite secure, 156 or early 159 being also possible *termini* for his death. To be safe we may say *c.* 157/158. A *terminus post* for the letter is provided by the reference to Erucius Clarus, head of the senatorial order, as clearly deceased ('erat'). Sex. Erucius Clarus, *praefectus urbi*, died in late February or early March 146.¹²⁶ *Ad Ant. Pium*. 3, 7, 4 (in that order) can be assigned only roughly, to 146/*c.* 158.

5 and 6 are undateable, best wishes from Fronto on the anniversary of Antoninus Pius' accession (10th July) and the emperor's reply. 8 refers to Fronto's projected proconsulship of Asia, *c.* 158. There is no reason to assume any special acceleration of it for him.¹²⁷

9 is an *Empfehlungsbrief* for the historian Appian, whose old age should be solaced with a procuratorship. Fronto has been petitioning the emperor for two years now (9, 2) so the date should be after 10th July, 140 (if calculated from Pius' sole rule). Another rough *terminus* may be provided by the Preface to Appian's great work, in which he writes (*praef.* 62) that he has been honoured with a procuratorship. The preface may be dated very roughly from references in it and subsequent books to the years around 150.¹²⁸ Therefore, the 140s are indicated. At any rate it is difficult to push the date of the preface as late as Haines does the letter, ?157/161.¹²⁹ This relies on the last surviving sentence ('Fecerit exemplo nostro, si ipse quoque se tibi impetraverit excusare'), which he refers to Fronto's throwing up of his own proconsulship. But the *exemplum* mentioned echoes that of two lines earlier, that is of a two year petition. To retain the symmetry, the honour for which excuse has been sought should be one which has been petitioned for (not a proconsulship), and as Fronto reminds the emperor, he has asked for and received four favours on behalf of Sex. Calpurnius Iulianus, 'bis cum dedisti procuraciones itemque bis cum excusationes recepisti' (9, 1). The 'exemplum nostrum' should be the affair of Calpurnius.

Ad Amicos 1

At first glance the two books of letters to friends offer numerous points of reference, but in fact these are disappointingly few, partially due to our quite inadequate store of second-century prosopography. Thus, 1, 1, a treatise on 'commendandi mos' and appropriately at the head of the collection, is addressed to a man of noble birth, Claudius Severus, but which Claudius Severus, the philosopher Arabianus (*cos. suff.* 146), or his son, the husband of Marcus Aurelius' daughter (*cos. II ord.* 173)?¹³⁰

¹²¹ Mommsen, 481; Haines, 114; Hanslik, 41.

¹²² *Pan. Lat.* viii (v), 14, 2.

¹²³ Compare the correct opening of Fronto's letter, 'Imp. Antonino Pio Augusto Fronto'.

¹²⁴ *HA Pius* 8, 6-7.

¹²⁵ Note the full discussion of his career by F. Zevi, *RAL* 26 (1971), 449-63, combining for the first time *CIL* xiv, 191 and 4471 (Ostia). If we accept the *HA*, Maximus did not 'give up' his office; *contra* Birley, 148.

¹²⁶ *FO* xxvii. In the same sentence, Fronto refers to another old friend of Niger, Marcus Turbo, 'primarius equestris ordinis', obviously Hadrian's celebrated guard prefect, the date of whose demise is unknown. However, Hanslik (41) identified him with the Marcus Turbo attested as legate of Moesia

Inferior in 155 (*CIL* iii, 7749), thereby affording himself an illusory *terminus post quem*. He failed to notice that this person must have been a senator. On these people and their family: R. Syme, *JRS* 52 (1962), 87-96.

¹²⁷ On the normal interval between consulship and proconsulship in this age see R. Syme, *REA* 61 (1959), 310-11.

¹²⁸ F. Reuss, *RhM* 54 (1899), 464-65 for the calculation.

¹²⁹ Haines, 1, 263; Hanslik, 42.

¹³⁰ *PIR*² C 1027 and H.-G. Pflaum, 'Les correspondants de l'orateur M. Cornelius Fronto de Cirta', *Hommages à Jean Bayet* (Bruxelles, 1964), 547-48, prefer the father; for the son see n. 131.

Dating has varied accordingly. Haines put the letter ?157/161. Hanslik, assuming the recipient to be the emperor's son-in-law, then needlessly assumed that the letter must have been written after the marriage, i.e., not before 165/166. Bowersock, following Groag's suggestion that the recipient might be *praefectus urbi*—he appears to be judging a lawsuit—assigns it to the 170s.¹³¹ Strictly, none of these conjectures is legitimate for firmly dating the letter.¹³² Further, the excellent Sulpicius Cornelianus whom Fronto commends may be but is by no means necessarily the patron of Phrynichus, Cornelianus, *ab epistulis graecis* in the late 170s.¹³³ The shadowy figure is also recommended in 1, 2 to an otherwise unknown Appius Apollonides.

1, 3 and 4 are by contrast dateable with precision, both directed to known proconsuls of Africa. 3 is addressed to (L. Hedius Rufus) Lollianus Avitus, requesting him to welcome and counsel a certain Licinius Montanus on his arrival from Cirta. Obviously, the fitting occasion is Lollianus' proconsulship of Africa, now firmly dated to 157/158.¹³⁴ Further discussion of this important epistle will be offered with that on 11, 11 (below), for the understanding and dating of which it is crucial.

1, 4 commends the most learned and eloquent philosopher Iulius Aquilinus, whose lectures at Rome had been attended and applauded by senators, a sure gauge of professional status. Several factors combine to indicate its recipient as (Q.) Egrilius Plarianus, proconsul of Africa 159/160,¹³⁵ but nowhere has the evidence been set out to vindicate the assumption. Natives of the African colony of Sicca Veneria, it has recently been pointed out, attained a remarkable prominence under Antoninus Pius, unheralded and unsustainable: (M?) Tuticius Proculus, a *grammaticus*, was a tutor to Marcus Caesar and advanced to a proconsulship, while P. Licinius Papirianus had risen to a *rationibus* by 161/169; and a tenuous argument might assign to Sicca no less a personage than the guard prefect Sex. Cornelius Repentinus.¹³⁶ A certain Iulius Fidus Aquila, procurator of Dacia Inferior in 140, was honoured at Sicca by his brother Q. Iulius Aquila, knight and *iudex*, and both were presumably kin to [Iu]lius C.f. Quir. [A]quilinus, knight and *iudex* of the same colony.¹³⁷ The last named has been plausibly identified with Fronto's friend—the example of contemporary Greek men of learning will lead us to expect the high social status—and it is attractive to envisage a Siccan 'circle' of acquaintances for the Cirtan orator, including surely all of the men of note mentioned above. Now the occasion for Aquilinus' visit to Egrilius is suggestive: 'Officio necessario inductus est ut hinc profisceretur ad consolandam consobrinam suam casu gravi adflictam' (1, 4, 2). It is reasonable to locate that cousin in the *patria*, Sicca Veneria, a conjecture which coincides admirably with the province of Africa and a date of 159/160.

Likewise, a terminus can perhaps be assigned to 1, 5, addressed to the orator's very dear friend Ti. Claudius Iulianus (*cos. suff.* 159 or 158).¹³⁸ Fronto recommends one, Faustianus, 'rei militaris peritus' and son of his friend Statianus, to Iulianus; 'tu provinciam cum exercitu administrares' (1, 5, 1). As it happens, Claudius Iulianus is attested as legate of Lower Germany in 160.¹³⁹ Further, a Calvisius Faustianus is noted as an *idiologus* in Egypt before 6th August, 173, serving doubtless under his father C. Calvisius Statianus, *praefectus Aegypti*; the son's high position by 173 suggests an early date for the letter, perhaps 160 precisely.¹⁴⁰ However, the possibility must be admitted that Iulianus is a praetorian governing an unknown province in the 150s.

1, 6 is a note to the renowned Avidius Cassius, praising the tribune Iunius Maximus who has brought his laurelled despatches to Rome and privately eulogized his general to Fronto. Cassius had not won any victories, it appears, before 164, so the date should be 164/166.¹⁴¹

1, 7 is directed to Aufidius Victorinus, requesting him to find employment in his province for an Antoninus Aquila, ῥητόρων ἄριστος. The province is usually assumed to be Upper Germany and the date 162/165, but of course they need not be. Our knowledge of Victorinus' career is quite incomplete, and the unknown province may have been held any time after his praetorship in the early 150s. Indeed, one might wonder what position a Greek rhetor would covet in Germany, and whether a legate concerned with repelling a barbarian influx would care about such unwarlike patronage.

¹³¹ Haines, 1, 283; Hanslik, 43; Bowersock, 125–126.

¹³² cf. A. R. Birley, *Chiron* 2 (1972), 472–73. The urban prefecture is quite conjectural.

¹³³ On whom see Bowersock, 54–55.

¹³⁴ J. Guey, *REL* 29 (1951), 307 ff.; R. Syme, *REA* 61 (1959), 316.

¹³⁵ cf. *PIR*² I 169; F. Zevi, *MEFR* 82 (1970), 309–20.

cf. ¹³⁶ Proculus: *CIL* viii, 1625 and *HA Marcus* 2, 3, A. R. Birley, *BHAC* 1966/67, 39–40. Papirianus: viii, 1641. Repentinus: exploiting an argument of G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (Wiesbaden, 1969), 143–45, which would identify his grandson on an acephalous stone from Sicca (viii, 15869). Note that *ILS* 6898, recording Marcus and Commodus as

'sanctissimi imp.' is very relevant to Alföldy's argument (q.v.).

¹³⁷ *CIL* viii, 15872, 27572. On all this see M. G. Jarrett, *Epig. St.* 9 (1972), 186.

¹³⁸ On his literary connections, Bowersock, 78–79.

¹³⁹ *ILS* 2907 (Bonn).

¹⁴⁰ *PSI* x, 1105. On father and son see H.-G. Pflaum *Carrières*, nos. 177 (with page 981), 166.

¹⁴¹ Avidius did not assume the Syrian command until 164 (P-W ii, 2379–80). Dodd, 234–48 argued that the Parthian campaign did not commence until 165, with the first important victory *c.* August/September, but the capture of Dausara and Nicephorium were surely contemporary with or before the afterglow of Armenian successes, i.e. 164. Cf. the comments on *Ad Ver. Imp.* 11, 1, above.

Aquila may be the shadowy Aquila of Galatia, pupil of Chrestus of Byzantium, or one or more of a handful of literary homonyms.¹⁴² No clear dating is available.

1, 8 concerns an unknown Aemilius Pius (the name is unremarkable), recommended on literary grounds to a Passienus Rufus whom Fronto addresses as 'frater' (therefore a contemporary, see below) but with whom he has never before corresponded. The name recalls an Augustan L. Passienus Rufus, consul 4 B.C. and proconsul of Africa. The family disappears with his son Sallustius Crispus, (*cos.* II, 44) the husband of Agrippina. However, contemporaries of Fronto may be resurrected from an inscription of Thugga: 'Passieno Ru/fo tribuno mil./ legionis XII Ful/minatae Pass[ieni]/ Rufi filio [Thug]/genses pro [ami]/citia quae eis [cum]/ patre est libentes/ dederunt' (*CIL* viii, 26580). These Passieni are usually equated with the Augustan proconsul and an unknown son.¹⁴³ A problem arises, for the theatre which exhibited the memorial to their *amicitia* was built between 166 and 169, so that one had to assume that the stone was recut.¹⁴⁴ Nothing however prevents identity of the father with Fronto's correspondent, either as hereditary patron or provincial officer. The point of the dedication may then have been the son's service in XII Fulminata during the late successful war in the East.¹⁴⁵ The father is likely to be a near relative of, or if polyonymous the same as, Q. Passienus Licinus, who as consul suffect in 149 could qualify as 'frater'. Unfortunately, no precise date is possible.

The note 1, 9 recommends Sardius Saturninus to one Caelius Optatus. It precedes 1, 10 (q.v.) but the date of that is insecure. A P. Caelius Optatus is recorded as legate of legio III Augusta in Numidia, 166/167.¹⁴⁶ Identity is by no means certain, nor need the province implied in the missive be Numidia. (The Sardii had no known connection with that province, being natives of North-East Italy, of Venetia and Istria.¹⁴⁷) Further, the word 'frater' raises real doubt, and has provoked comment. Pflaum denied identity because of it, making the correspondent father of the legate. Bowersock rejected this, citing Fronto's address to Cornelius Repentinus (*praefectus praetorio* from c. 160), but in reply Birley pointed out that praetorian prefects were not likely to be under fifty.¹⁴⁸ In fact, 'frater' is decisive, excluding a man young enough to be a praetorian legate in 166/167. Fronto uses the word four times in *Ad Am.*: once here, once to Passienus Rufus (perhaps consul 149 and father of a military tribune of c. 165), once to Repentinus (prefect by 161), once to M. Gavius Squilla Gallicanus (*cos. ord.* 150). More important, he addresses a man suffect consul c. 167 as 'dominus filius' (*Ad Am.* II, 7). A negative conclusion results, for the letter cannot be addressed to the legate of Numidia.

The recipient of 1, 10, Petronius Mamertinus, bears the dubious distinction of three different modern identifications, three generations of the same family, all Marci.¹⁴⁹ The first rose to be prefect of Egypt between 133 and 137, and partner of Gavius Maximus as praetorian prefect in 139, but dead by 143. Hanslik favoured him, mentioned in (but not necessarily author of) a metrical inscription, for Fronto recommends the erudite and eloquent Sardius Lupus as 'frequentissimum auditorem tuum et maximum laudatorem carminum tuorum'.¹⁵⁰ Pflaum chooses his nephew, M. Petronius Mamertinus (*cos. suff.* 150), while Bowersock proposes his son, M. Petronius Sura Mamertinus (*cos. ord.* 182), another son-in-law of Marcus Aurelius.¹⁵¹ No sure identification (or date) is to be derived from the text as it stands.¹⁵²

1, 11 is addressed to Velius Rufus senex on matters of oratory. The family is well-known, extending from the successful C. Velius Rufus, a soldier whose talents raised him to the procuratorship of Raetia by A.D. 92, to D. Velius Rufus Iulianus (*cos. ord.* 178), who was executed by Commodus.¹⁵³ Fronto's friend should be the latter's father, probably the Velius Rufus referred to by Marcus in his *Meditations* as an example of indignant retirement, and perhaps the same as D. Velius Fidus legate of

¹⁴² Philostratus, *VS* 591. Identity is denied by V. Nutton, *Latomus* 29 (1970), 726-27, n. 4, but he assumes that the province is Germany and overlooks Aquila's oriental origin. On various other possibilities, A. R. Birley in *Britain and Rome* (Kendal, 1966), 58-60. The essay of E. Orth, *Phil. Woch.* 53 (1933), 364-67 is worthless.

¹⁴³ P-W Passienus 6, 7; B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus* (Lund, 1960), II, 17-18; cf. Pflaum (1964), 554.

¹⁴⁴ cf. viii, 26528 a, b; 26606.

¹⁴⁵ Service of that legion in the Parthian War is quite unattested (P-W xii, 1707-08) but surely probable: it was stationed at Melitene in Cappadocia on the Armenian frontier, and an inscription from

Pessinus (*IGRR* iii, 230) offers a laticlave tribune of either this legion or III Cyrenaica awarded *dona militaria* by two Augusti.

¹⁴⁶ *CIL* viii, 2736, 18067 (Lambaesis).

¹⁴⁷ Pflaum, 555 collects the evidence.

¹⁴⁸ Pflaum, 547; Bowersock, 125; Birley (1972), 471, n. 27. Cf. the aged Gavius Maximus.

¹⁴⁹ On whom see P. Lambrechts, *AC* 5 (1936), 187-89.

¹⁵⁰ Hanslik, 44; *CIL* iii, 77, cf. 44.

¹⁵¹ Pflaum, 549-50; Bowersock, 125, dependent partially on his dating of 1, 9 (q.v.).

¹⁵² Hauler never published his fuller reading of the Ms, cf. *WS* 47 (1928), 181.

¹⁵³ *ILS* 9200, cf. Pflaum, *Carrières* no. 50; *HA Comm.* 4, 10.

Syria, pontifex in 155.¹⁵⁴ If the same as this last, or close to him, he will be a contemporary of Fronto's and qualifies for the adjective 'senex' in the 160s.

I, 12-14 are all to Aufidius Victorinus. 12 offers some indications of date. Fronto is 'senex' (12, 3) and is in charge of two grandsons (12, 2) while Victorinus is absent. (For the family, and date, see below.) 13, dealing with illness, is fragmentary and offers no clues. 14 is dated by *Ad Ant. Imp.* II, 1-2 (q.v.), after October 161. The Bithynian oration mentioned (14, 2) is considered again in 15, 1, a letter on literary matters to Praecilius Pompeianus. The two are also connected in time, both referring clearly to a newly published and revised edition of the speech. However, the fragment I, 16, also to Praecilius, is obscure in matter and impossible to date.

I, 17-18, to Claudius Iulianus and Aufidius Victorinus are lost. I, 19, again to Iulianus, refers (apparently) to some discord between Fronto and Gellius over work published by the latter against Fronto's wishes.¹⁵⁵ If this is Aulus Gellius (which is likely), an enthusiastic disciple of Fronto, the subject under dispute may be those conversations of Fronto and his friends recorded in the *Noctes Atticae*. However, no satisfactory *terminus ante quem* has been established for that work¹⁵⁶; a quite different work may be involved; and the interpretation of the letter is somewhat unclear. More helpful is 'aetate sic aspera mea senis'. A date in the 160s is indicated. Fronto is 'senex' only in *Ad Am.* I, 12 and *Nep. Am.* II, 7, and he refers to approaching death in *Ad Ver. Imp.* I, 3, 4 and *Nep. Am.* II, 8: all of these were written after the accession of Marcus Aurelius.

I, 20, likewise to Claudius Iulianus, is certainly after 7th March, 161, referring to 'domini nostri imperatores' (20, 2). Advice is proffered to Iulianus on dealings with 'provinciales' (20, 1), and Iulianus is to take care of his health, 'ut fortis ad nos venias. Di praestabunt ut me quoque forticulum invenias' (20, 4). Iulianus is about to return, so if the province is Germania Inferior the date should be c. 163.

I, 21 is addressed to a Fulvianus, possibly the same as 'Sallustius noster, qui nunc Fulvianus' of *Ad Ver. Imp.* II, 3, 1. From the latter text Stein conjectured that Fulvianus was Lucius' *ab epistulis* in the Orient, but Pflaum held that in *Ad Am.* I, 21 he was called 'amicus et comes' of Verus, a title incompatible with the functions of an *ab epistulis*, therefore merely a friend and agent.¹⁵⁷ In fact neither view is satisfactory. The former necessitates a secretary absent from his master's side, the latter makes an unsupported assumption from a fragmentary phrase ('—amicis et comitibus—') which need have nothing to do with Fulvianus or Verus. The two Fulviani were possibly identical given the restricted circle of a man's acquaintanceship, but that will not allow us to extract a date from I, 21.

I, 22 is a note of consolation to Sardius Saturninus on the loss of his son 'recenti malo'. No date may be suggested, but the sequence of letters dealing with the Sardii is easily established: I, 9, 22, 10. Here the chronological order is patently overridden by one of theme, for 1-10 are letters of recommendation, many of 11-21 deal with literary matters, while 22-25 (23-25 all but lost) appear to be letters of consolation.

I, 26 is addressed to Iunius Maximus. No sure chronological indications are available, there being several possible candidates for 'Ulpius noster'. However, if we may infer from I, 6 (to Avidius Cassius) that Maximus was a *youthful* military tribune in 165/166, I, 26 (and I, 23) will be of that period, limited only by Fronto's death.

Finally, despite its position, I, 27 to M. Gavius Squilla Gallicanus (*cos. ord.* 150) should be much earlier than its predecessors. Curious misconceptions arise over this epistle. Haines put it at the very end of his collection, 1166.¹⁵⁸ Pflaum suggested that the letter be assigned to Gallicanus' proconsulship of Asia (165/166, possibly 164/165¹⁵⁹) and that the place of his son's forensic triumph might be Ephesus.¹⁶⁰ Indeed, Gallicanus' son M. Cornelius Cethegus (*cos. ord.* 170) attended his father there as *legatus*.¹⁶¹ However, the place must be Rome, for Fronto sat at home during the speech, waiting for his *contubernales* to bring him news of the success. Further, both Fronto and Gallicanus have felt 'trepidatio' over the son's endeavour, an unlikely anxiety if he were of praetorian rank. We are surely

¹⁵⁴ *Med.* xii, 27; *CIL* iii, 14387e (Baalbek): D. Velio Fido leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. . . .; vi, 2120, Velius Fidus as pontifex. The two are perhaps identical. The P-W article of R. Hanslik (Velius 4) is confused and erroneous. He argues that the Syrian command should in fact be that of Syria Palestina (formerly Iudaea), making Fido the recipient of *PSI* ix, 1026. That man is in fact Vilnius Kadus, a known governor of Palestine. Hence Hanslik's dates of *cos. c.* 144 and 'legatus Augustis pro praetore provinciae Iudaeae' 149/150 are invalid. The editor of *IGLS* 2777 is confused.

¹⁵⁵ Thus it was deciphered by E. Hauler, *WS* 46 (1928), 244-46.

¹⁵⁶ cf. most recently the Budé edition of R. Marache (Paris, 1967) I, ix-xii. He insists on a date prior to

158, the year in which he supposes Apuleius to have delivered his Apology. There is an undoubted echo between *Apol.* 9 and *NA* 19, 9, but a common source is by no means excluded, nor the precedence of the *Apologia*. 165 might seem preferable, the year of Peregrinus Proteus' self-immolation, of which there is no sign at *NA* 8, 3 and 12, 11.

¹⁵⁷ *PIR*² F 520; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres sous le haut-empire romain* (Paris, 1950), 69-71, but retracted by reason of uncertainty at Pflaum (1964), 556-57.

¹⁵⁸ Haines, II, 245.

¹⁵⁹ Date: T. D. Barnes, *JTS* 21 (1970), 407, on *OGIS* 512.

¹⁶⁰ Pflaum (1964), 552-53.

¹⁶¹ *PIR*² G 98.

dealing with a maiden speech: 'In forum descendit natalibus nobilis, de foro rediit eloquentia quam genere nobilior' (I, 27, 2. note = v.d.H. 178, 26-27). If Pliny, pleading in court for the first time at the age of eighteen (*Epp.* v, 8, 8), be taken as a model, the youth here should hardly be much more than twenty. If the consul of 170 is meant, son and grandson of *consules ordinarii*, the date should be not after 158. However, Cethegus' talent was not admired by all. As Lucian tells us with malicious glee, he talked and acted most foolishly while in Greece en route to Asia. Several called him a great good-for-nothing, but the philosopher Demonax objected to the adjective 'great'.¹⁶² Another son might be more suitable, and one (not noted as such by the handbooks) can be produced, M. Gavius Orfitus (*cos. ord.* 165).¹⁶³ If he is meant—yet other sons are not excluded—the date could be c. 153. It is safest to assign the incident merely to the 150s.

Few firm dates are available for *Ad Amicos* I, but chronology is very obviously upset. Nor does there seem to be any real sequence by recipient. Patently the letters are to some extent grouped by kind: 1-10 are commendations, 22-25 were probably consolations, perhaps 11-21 dealt with literary affairs. However, within these categories there is no apparent logical order.

Ad Amicos II

Ad Amicos II, 1-3 afford glimpses of the man of letters benignly assisting a would-be *littérateur*, Volumnius Quadratus. There is no internal indication of the date. Groag conjectured identity with another Quadratus, procurator of Achaia 179/180, but that is hardly necessary.¹⁶⁴ 'Castricius noster' will be familiar as the teacher of Aulus Gellius but his dates are quite unknown.¹⁶⁵

II, 4 thanks Cornelius Repentinus 'pro tua perpetua consuetudine et benignitate' in conserving the 'existimatio' of Fronto's intimate, Fabianus. Repentinus was praetorian prefect in the last years of Pius and first of the two emperors, but the affair need not be connected with that or any other public office, nor is Fabianus likely to be the consul suffect of 158, Q. Servilius Fabianus Maximus.

II, 5, to Gavius Maximus = *Ad Ant. Pium* 7 (q.v.).

II, 6-9 concern C. Arrius Antoninus (*cos. suff.* c. 167), Fronto's compatriot and the closest of his younger disciples. 7, the longest, is an investigation of the disputed status of Volumnius Serenus of Concordia (in Venetia), and it is precisely at that town that we discover a public monument to the career and splendid services of Arrius Antoninus, 'iuridicus per Italiam regionis Transpadanae primus'.¹⁶⁶ The same inscription suggests that he had been praetor under the two emperors (the first with *iurisdictio pupillaris*), and that subsequent to the Transpadane post he was *praefectus aerari Saturni*, still under two emperors. The widest possible termini are therefore 163 and 168, with Fronto's death a limiting factor. On no account, however, need we assign the other three letters to Arrius to this period. II, 6 offers the conclusion of a probably much longer epistle. It recommends a certain Volumnius as worthy of the honour and opportunity of winning Arrius' friendship; he in turn has been commended to Fronto by learned men and close friends. In II, 7, 'Volumnius Serenus Concordiensis' is presented as if afresh, by Fronto actively interceding for him and rehearsing his defence in great detail. There is no connection with 'viri docti' here. The unknown Volumnius is thus more likely to be the literary recipient of II, 1-3, Volumnius Quadratus. (Hence one could see an editorial pattern to the book: three letters to Quadratus, two to praetorian prefects, one on Quadratus again, one on another Volumnius and thus into the Antoninus letters. If such a pattern be discerned, it is surely too childish to be Fronto's work.) II, 8 presses the claims of a lady named Baburiana against a 'sententia' of Arrius, and II, 9 perhaps recommends a certain Valerianus Clitanius, possibly the same as 'Valerianus magister' of I, 20, 1. We are thus compelled to assign none of II, 6, 8 or 9 to the period of II, 7, nor even to a period of public office in Antoninus' life.

Finally, II, 10-11 are addressed 'IIIviris et decurionibus' of Cirta, Fronto's *patria*. II, 10 has perished. II, 11, however, with its rich material on patronage is one of the most important documents in the collection. It is deceptive, at face value the reply of a senior statesman to an appeal for patronage from the place of his birth. His advice is reasoned and sound, to select the younger and more able patrons he suggests. The city fathers will be delighted with the advantages gained by the outstanding talent of such men. It is clear that a specific 'res' is involved, concerning the 'tutela' of Cirta, for which Fronto had always cared in his active youth. In a mutilated passage he advises his correspondents as to the best course for the present. He has changed his mind on one matter, having

¹⁶² Lucian, *Demonax* 30.

¹⁶³ The consul of 150, Squilla Gallicanus, married Pompeia Agrippina, daughter of a long line of senators from Miletus and descendant of the historian Theophanes. (On the family see R. Syme, *Tacitus* 748-49, and for the Antonine period A. Vogliano and F. Cumont, *AYA* 37 (1933), 215-63.) It happens that the delightful estate of a certain Orfitus is praised in a Greek verse inscription from Lesbos, where the Pompeii were held in high honour (*IG* xii, 2, 129,

see now *Ant. J.* 51 (1971), 263-66). The owner should be M. Gavius Orfitus (*cos.* 165), who will have inherited that estate from his mother.

¹⁶⁴ *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (Wien, 1939), 150, n. 623. The procurator is now known to be a Caelius Quadratus: E. Birley, *Latomus* 31 (1972), 916, for facts and conjectures.

¹⁶⁵ Gell. i, 6, 4-6, ii, 27, 3-5; xi, 13, 1 ff; xiii 22, 1 ff.

¹⁶⁶ *ILS* 1118.

originally intended to defend the republic himself. The key lies in a most ambiguous sentence which loses much from lack of context: 'Tres facite ut e meis cognoscitis non quasi qui familiares essent Liciniae familiae et adesse adversus rem <eam> noluerint.'¹⁶⁷ 'Select three patrons as being of my circle of friends, not as if they were intimates of the Licinian family . . .' The remainder is unclear: 'adversus rem' seems to have no parallel in ancient literature; something has perhaps dropped out after 'rem'; and 'voluerint' might seem preferable to 'noluerint'. It may be deduced that the interests of Cirta and those of the Licinii, if not quite opposed, at least do not coincide, and further that the advocates suggested by Fronto were acquainted with the Licinii but not to be rejected on that account. Also, one may surmise that despite his protestations of age and ill-health, the uncomfortable Fronto's real reason for declining the task was the same embarrassing familiarity with the Licinii.

Here we may revert to *Ad Am.* 1, 3, addressed to the proconsul of Africa in 157/158 concerning the troubles of a certain Licinius Montanus of Cirta. From the tone of that letter it is clear that Lollianus is not an intimate. The only point of contact between the three principals is eloquence, a factor upon which Fronto duly capitalizes.¹⁶⁸ Nevertheless, it is singularly and persistently passionate. Of all Fronto's guests Montanus is the dearest. He lives with Fronto whenever he comes to Rome, shares intimately in all his actions and counsels. He is loved as few others. Beneath this enthusiasm and obscured by lacunae, lies a more sombre note. The modest Montanus asks for nothing but that which is right and honourable for him to request and Lollianus to grant. One fragment asks that Lollianus give something from his extraordinary store of 'benignitas', another reiterates Montanus' probity and temperance. He asks for a refuge on the coast and whatever else is just; he wants the air, not the sea. Fronto himself has been criticized for cutting a sick and wretched man out of his society, for it seemed that Montanus could have returned from Cirta, his infirmity of the chest ameliorated by Cirta's most delightful climate. For that return Fronto in fact prays heartily. When Montanus presents himself to Lollianus the latter must welcome him, win him with kind solicitude, give him help and friendly advice, and care for his health. The evidence is fragmentary but a scandal is clearly indicated. The emphasis on Montanus' honesty and uprightness, the appeal to the compassion of the proconsul, the breakdown in health, the need for an asylum on the coast (with the suspicion of flight by sea), the slander that Fronto has abjured his acquaintance, the need for sound advice from an honourable man: all point to the disgrace of the learned and eloquent Licinius Montanus, for whom Fronto pleads so passionately. In the epistle to the Cirtans he asks that three of his friends be not considered as acquaintances of the Licinii and unwilling to act (presumably) for the Four Colonies. Naturally the tactful orator as *contubernalis* of Licinius Montanus felt unable to act, for he had other friends and relatives in Cirta.

The coincidence in subject matter should imply one in date. Indeed, a most convenient *terminus ante quem* may be suggested for II, 11: at the time of writing Aufidius Victorinus was betrothed to Fronto's surviving child, Cratia minor (II, 11, 1). Close consideration of the lament *De Nepote Amisso* (q.v.) suggests that the marriage cannot have been celebrated after 159. If that is so, the period of betrothal and the date of II, 11 coincide very comfortably with 157/158.

Ad Amicos II yields few firm dates and no strict order, although one approaching stream-of-consciousness has been suggested above. Nor is there any apparent reason for Fronto's letters to his friends being divided into two books. No correspondent appears in both books, however. Further, it is singular that several letters to a single correspondent are set down together in Book II (Volumnius Quadratus, Arrius Antoninus, Cirta), but invariably divided in Book I (Claudius Iulianus, Aufidius Victorinus, Praecilius Pompeianus, Sardius Saturninus, Iunius Maximus). That might suggest that the arrangement by theme noticed in I was not employed in II, but the motive is obscure.

Principia Historiae; Laudes Fumi et Pulveris; Laudes Neglegentiae

The *Principia Historiae* may be dated with some precision if aligned with *Ad Ver. Imp.* II, 3 (q.v.). The *commentarii* there mentioned are still being awaited (I, 1, 2), so the *Principia* are submitted as a foretaste of the projected history. The date, therefore, will be 166, before the return of Lucius.

The *Laudes Fumi et Pulveris* is addressed 'Caesari suo', as was probably the *Laudes Neglegentiae*. For the former, Haines rightly suggested a very early date, ?139.¹⁶⁹ In an essay written after Marcus' accession (*De Fer. Als.* 3, 8), Fronto sighs, 'Vellem autem tantum mihi vigoris aut studii adesse, quantum adfuit cum illa olim nugalia conscripsi "Laudem Fumi et Pulveris".' The date of the Praise of Negligence is less obvious, for over half of it is lost from beginning and end. Indeed, it may fall a great deal later, at a time when Marcus was burdened with the cares of empire. One might see a reproach in 'Nam qui nimis anxie munia conficiunt, parum amicitiae confidunt' (*Laud. Neg.* I, note = v.d.H. 203, 25-26).¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ V.d.H. 189, 15-17.

¹⁶⁸ Montanus' eloquence, *Ad Am.* 1, 3, 2; Fronto's, I, 3, 3 note (v.d.H. 166, 27); Lollianus', I, 3, 4 note (v.d.H. 166, 32), cf. Apuleius, *Apol.* 95.

¹⁶⁹ Haines, I, 39.

¹⁷⁰ 'Favorinus noster' in 3 need not be alive; in any event the date of his death is not closely ascertainable. Cf. with this passage Gell. ii, 26, where Fronto 'consularis' and Favorinus are also discussing colour.

De Bello Parthico

The so-called *De Bello Parthico*, actually a consolation to Marcus after an early reverse in that war, can be dated with some precision by section 9: 'Quod te vix quicquam nisi raptim et furtim legere posse prae curis praesentibus scripsisti . . .' As Haines saw, this is a close echo of a phrase of Marcus (*Ad Ant. Imp.* iv, 1, 1), ' . . . lio paululum et ex Ciceronis oratione, sed quasi furtim, certe quidem raptim.'¹⁷¹ Note further that Fronto, also refers in 10 to 'orationem istam M. Tulli, quam tibi legendam misi.' The date of Marcus' letter (q.v.) lies between his accession and Lucius' departure for the East (summer, 162). Fronto's moralizing about early Roman defeats followed by glorious victories must belong (at the earliest) to the period after the defeat of M. Sedatius Severianus, legate of Cappadocia, at Elegeia. Severianus is attested as legate under Marcus and Lucius,¹⁷² so we must allow time for news of their accession (7th March) to reach the East, time for Severianus to march into Armenia, and time for news of his defeat to get back to Rome. We should then, at the earliest, be in the summer of 161. Further, in *Ad Ant. Imp.* iv, 1, Marcus informs Fronto that his young girls are staying with Matidia in Rome, 'igitur vespera ad me ventitare non possunt propter aurae rigorem.' From these last words we should be justified in assigning *Ad Ant. Imp.* iv, 1 and *De Bell. Parth.* to autumn 161/spring 162.

De Feriis Alsiensibus

The four letters on the holidays at Alsium fall after the accession of Marcus, for he is 'dominus meus Antoninus Augustus'. Beyond that there is no certainty. The 'domnula mea' of 1 and 4, 1, who is ill at Lorium, is not certainly identifiable. Certain passages have been unduly exploited by modern scholars. At 3, 5, Fronto turns to history for examples of leisure: 'Quid maiores vestri, qui rem p. et imperium Romanum magnis auctibus auxerunt?' A. R. Birley reads, 'even though they were occupied with extending the frontiers of the empire', and assigns the letters to the period of the Parthian War.¹⁷³ However, the passage need not be taken literally to imply conquest and annexation, indeed of the trio then named by Fronto only Trajan was 'summus bellator'. Likewise it need not imply that Marcus was engaged in such a policy, but may intend a contrast between him and his even busier predecessors who still found time for relaxation. C. Brakman, followed by Hanslik, saw in 4, 2 a reference to *De Bell. Parth.* 11.¹⁷⁴ In the latter, Fronto apologizes for not writing in his own hand. 'Digitis admodum invalidis nunc utor et detrectantibus.' In the former Marcus enquires, 'Sed oro te, illud quid est, quod in fine epistulae manum condoluisset dicis?' (Patently 4 is not the reply to 3, which has no such conclusion.) A connection is possible, but given Fronto's chronic and very real ill-health, no assumption should be made. Several letters refer to pain in Fronto's hands or their impotence; all of those which are dateable fall after Marcus' elevation, but they vary in date demonstrably.¹⁷⁵ Therefore, no firm date for the letters *De Feriis Alsiensibus*.

De Nepote Amisso

A complex problem is posed by Fronto's grandchildren and the date of Aufidius Victorinus' command in Upper Germany, a problem which most have overlooked. In a letter to be dated c. October 161, Marcus wishes Fronto a happy birthday: 'Vale et perennem multis annis bonam valetudinem, mi magister, obtine laetissimum incoluntate filiae nepotum generi' (*Ad Ant. Imp.* 1, 1, 2). In three undoubtedly subsequent letters, *Ad Ant. Imp.* 1, 4 (q.v., very soon after), III, 3, 8, he bids him, 'Nepotem saluta.' And from *De Nep. Am.* 2, 6 it is confirmed that Fronto was indeed caring for only one child, whose visage reminds him of the one he has never seen. This switch from plural to singular has gone unremarked. To confuse the issue yet further, there exists a letter from Fronto to Victorinus in which he paints a picture for his son-in-law of the progress of their young Victorinus and young Fronto (*Ad Am.* 1, 12). However, it is obviously incorrect to assert that these two were living with their grandfather while their parents were in the North.¹⁷⁶ The solution of this tangle may commence with *De Nep. Am.* 2, which is more a testament than an epistle. It would seem inconceivable in the account of his own woes (five children of his own dead) and of the grief of Victorinus (2, 1-3), that if there were a third grandson, alive or dead, he would not be mentioned; it is fair to presume that at this time there were only two, the one being reared by Fronto at Rome and the dead child whom his grandfather never saw, who died in Germany aged three.¹⁷⁷ It is a fair assumption that the child was born there or en route. Hence it may be deduced from *Ad Ant. Imp.* 1, 1, 2 (quoted above) that Aufidius Victorinus was already in Germania Superior in October 161.

¹⁷¹ Haines, II, 28, n.1.¹⁷² P-W ii A, 1009-10; Sedatius 1.¹⁷³ Birley, 169.¹⁷⁴ Brakman, 36; Hanslik, 46, n. 85.¹⁷⁵ *Ad Ant. Imp.* 1, 2, 10; *Ad Ver. Imp.* II, 7, 4; *De Elog.* 3, 2; *Ad Am.* 1, 15, 2; II, 1, 3.¹⁷⁶ As does, e.g., Birley, 177.¹⁷⁷ This information emerges from the combination of *De Nep. Am.* 2, 6 and 4, with *Ad Ver. Imp.* II, 9, 1.

The dates of Victorinus' German command (as of much of his career) are by no means fixed.¹⁷⁸ The only secure clue is afforded by *HA Marcus* 8, 7-8. Soon after the succession of Marcus and Lucius, it is implied, a series of disasters beset the empire, a flood of the Tiber, the Parthian defeats, threatened war in Britain and an irruption of the Chatti into Germany and Raetia (8, 1-7). Calpurnius Agricola was despatched against the Britons, Aufidius Victorinus against the Chatti and Lucius himself against the Parthians (8, 8-9). As the author of the standard work on the German command remarks, the year should be 162 at the latest, perhaps even the autumn of 161.¹⁷⁹ Here it may be suggested that the summer or autumn of 161 is necessarily the correct date for Victorinus' departure to Germany. The grandson was 'trimulus' at the time of his death, therefore in late 164/early 165.¹⁸⁰ Thus, Victorinus' northern employment can be neither proved nor disproved to have extended into 165 (the standard date for its termination).¹⁸¹

It follows from the above that the letter to Victorinus (*Ad Am.* 1, 12) concerning young Victorinus and young Fronto must come after the death of the other child and probably after their father's return from Germany. In due course these two infants grew up to fill the ordinary consulship, M. Aufidius Fronto in 199, C. Aufidius Victorinus in 200. Presuming on their ancestry, we may allow them the minimum age in holding that office and assign them respective birth dates of 166 and 167. However, they acceded under a new *princeps* and a new dynasty, after a period of prolonged civil war. At least one may well have waited a good deal beyond the absolute minimum. In brief, we may put Fronto's birth in 160 (or slightly earlier, allowing at least for the birth of the ill-fated brother in 161) and make him the grandson whom Marcus salutes. His parents' marriage will then have been performed in 159 or earlier. (This provides a concrete *terminus ante quem* for *Ad Am.* 11, 11, q.v.) The younger Victorinus' birth will be c. 165/166, before his grandfather's death at least. The talk of *Ad Am.* 1, 12 is all of the activity of the orator's namesake, who is by then speaking, while Victorinus is barely mentioned. Nothing prohibits a five year difference in their ages.

Arion; Epistulae Variae

The brief essay on Arion is dateless. Haines was perhaps correct in putting it early, ?140/143: 'Fronto probably intended this piece to be a model of narrative for his pupil.'¹⁸²

Certain epistles are grouped by van den Hout at the end of his edition. One (numbered 4) is from Appian to Fronto defending a gift which Fronto had returned, another (5) is Fronto's *apologia*. There is no hint that the gift was connected with the procuratorship obtained by Fronto for Appian, and no clue as to the date. Finally, a Discourse on Love addressed by Fronto to his 'beloved boy' (8) and Marcus' ecstatic reply (9). Obviously very early, perhaps (with Haines) ?139. It may (but need not) be the piece referred to at *Ad M. Caes.* III, 9, 2 ('Grace nescio quid ais te conpegisse, quod ut aequae pauca a te scripta placeat tibi') in which case the two pieces may be assigned precisely to 139 or to the 140s.

IV. THE PRESENT EDITION

Some scholars have seen the organization of the corpus as predominantly Fronto's work.¹⁸⁴ Better is the hypothesis of H. Peter that Fronto published several books in his lifetime but no complete edition. That goes a long way to explaining both manifest errors and duplications, and also the aimless order of the manuscript.¹⁸⁵ Fronto apparently kept copies of his correspondence (*Ad Ant. Imp.* 1, 2, 5), and certainly published some speeches (*Ad. Ver. Imp.* 11, 9; ?*Ad Am.* 1, 14-15). Indeed, two speeches (at least) were current in the third century¹⁸⁶ and several others are known, but there is no reason to assume that they

¹⁷⁸ Dio lxxii, 11, 3 and *CIL* xiii, 11808 offer on clue. The cursus of L. Dasumius Tullius Tuscus (xi, 3365) included the governance of Germania Superior and Pannonia Superior. The latter is independently witnessed (iii, 4117) as held under the two emperors, therefore it is assumed (by E. Ritterling, *Fasti des römischen Deutschlands unter dem Prinzipat* (Wien, 1932) 31) that the former was held c. 160/161, immediately before Victorinus. In fact, it may well have been earlier, for only one post (a curatorship) was held between the consulship (152) and the German command.

¹⁷⁹ Ritterling 32; H.-G. Pflaum, 'Les Sodales Antoniniani de l'époque de Marc-Aurèle' (*Mem. Acad. Inscr.* 15, 2 (1966), 181 ff.), dates it from 163 on the authority of *CIL* vi, 1546, the relevance of which is quite dubious.

¹⁸⁰ Mommsen, 479-80 wrongly assigned the death to a date 166/169, after Lucius' return from the East.

It is clear from the letters he cites (*Ad. Ver. Imp.* 11, 9-10) that Lucius is absent. Also, the child died in Germany, obviously during his father's stay there.

¹⁸¹ He was *comes* of the emperors in *expeditione Germanica* (*AE* 1957, 121), A.D. 168/169, having held one other legateship before that.

¹⁸² Haines, I, 55, n. 5.

¹⁸³ cf. Haines, I, 21, 19, and above on *Ad M. Caes.* III, 9.

¹⁸⁴ Mommsen, 472; Hanslik, 42.

¹⁸⁵ H. Peter, *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1901), 128 ff.

¹⁸⁶ *Pan. Lat.* viii (v), 14, 1-2; and Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 9, 6-7, the so-called 'In Christianos' fragment which should rather (I think) be identified as a speech 'In Pelopem' recorded by Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epp.* viii, 10, 3, and which has little to do with Christianity. (I hope to discuss this matter elsewhere.)

were published with the correspondence or even collected at all. Individual books of letters are cited in the fourth century, but no clue as to the existence of a general collection.¹⁸⁷ Indeed, the unique organization of Fronto's correspondence suggests a collection of different editions, that is, separate books to Marcus, Lucius, Pius and friends, followed by epistolary essays on various and unrelated topics. In fact, the only *terminus ante quem* for such a collection is rather remote, the later fifth century, that is the actual date of our manuscript.

Comparison with the letters of Symmachus might suggest itself. They were published by his son soon after his death and betrayed several similarities with the Frontonian corpus: chronological order may or may not be followed, letters to the same recipient need not be together or in any order, epistles may be duplicated in different books, and so forth.¹⁸⁸ It has been the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that no single principle, especially chronological, lies behind the present state of the Frontonian corpus. Order by chronology, by theme, and by recipient can be discerned very rarely (e.g., respectively, at *Ad. Ant. Imp.* I, *Ad. Am.* I and *Ad. Am.* II), but the state of the manuscript alone prohibits the extension of these principles to other books, and if the books were originally published separately such a method has even less validity.

Nowhere does Fronto betray a hint of intending to publish any letters, and we need not discern his hand behind any of the arrangement. Nor is it easy to envisage the orator taking pride in the publication of many of the letters, notably the trivia of *Ad. M. Caes.* v which, if anything, smack of the hagiographer ready to publish the master's every scrap. Further, death probably supervened, entailing the publication of at least some of the letters posthumously. Victorinus, it has been noted, is the most likely candidate for the first editor.¹⁸⁹ It might even be suggested that letters to or concerning Avidius Cassius must have appeared before A.D. 175 (hence, incidentally, an argument against those who would extend the orator's span beyond that date).¹⁹⁰ However, the legendary lenience of Marcus, who considered the 'Cassiani furor' more in sorrow than in anger, could hardly frown on praise of the great general written before madness overcame him, nor would later ages be less impartial.¹⁹¹ (Cassius' descendants 'vixerunt . . . securi et ad honores admissi sunt.'¹⁹²) If Victorinus need not be invoked, then perhaps the grandsons or even more distant descendants were involved.¹⁹³ Thus, two great-grandsons of Fronto's friend and junior, Postumius Festus (*cos.* 160) styled themselves the *sectatores* of their ancestor.¹⁹⁴ Otherwise any disciple of the orator will suffice, such as the inept Iulius Titianus, known by his fellow 'Frontoniani' as the Orators' Ape.¹⁹⁵

The question of the first edition must obviously remain unresolved. It is not impossible that several editors brought the various books out at different times after Fronto's death, bringing into play different intelligences and different methods. The problem has been compounded by modern mistreatment and neglect. Nevertheless, Fronto's works could be a first-rate source of imperial history, whatever their literary merit. The establishment of a chronological frame, however incomplete, and the separation of what can be known from what is merely surmised, are the first steps towards their rehabilitation.

¹⁸⁷ cf. the fragments i-iv (all from Charisius) at v.d.H., 240. Fr. vi (also Charisius) is perhaps from one of *Ad. Am.* I, 12, 13, 14, or 18 (all to Victorinus). It might be argued that *Pan. Lat.* viii (v) 14, 1-2 ('Romanae eloquentiae non secundum sed alterum decus') betrays in A.D. 297 a knowledge of *Ad. M. Caes.* II, 3, 2 ('Igitur vale, decus eloquentiae Romanae . . .').

¹⁸⁸ O. Seeck, ed. (Berlin, 1888), xxii ff.

¹⁸⁹ Haines, 119, cf. I, xxi.

¹⁹⁰ T. D. Barnes, by letter.

¹⁹¹ Marcus' lenience: Dio lxxi, 27-28; *HA Marcus* 26, 2.

¹⁹² *HA Cassius* 13, 6, borne out by other evidence, cf. S. Jameson, *AS* 16 (1966), 126-27.

¹⁹³ e.g., Petronius Victorinus c.i. and his son Petronius Aufidius Victorinus, flourishing in 256 (*ILS* 7218, Pisaurum).

¹⁹⁴ *CIL* vi, 1416, 1418.

¹⁹⁵ *PIR*³ I 604.

V. PROPOSED DATES

(For the date 161, understand 7 March 161 throughout. The date of Fronto's death is taken as c.167. In the following list, a=after, b=before.)

		<i>Loeb</i>	<i>Date</i>			<i>Loeb</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Ad M. Caes.</i>	I, 1	I, 80	139/161	<i>Ad M. Caes.</i>	v, 23	196	139/153
	2	80	"		24	"	139/161
	3	82	"		25	194	Apr. 145/161
	4	90	"		26	"	"
	5	96	"		27	198	139/c. 156
	6	154	Sept. 143/c. 160		28	"	"
	7	162	"		29	"	"
	8	168	"		30	200	"
	9	118	1 July/13 Aug. 143		31	"	"
	10	130	"		32	"	"
II,	1	108	"		33	224	"
	2	112	"		34	"	a. 7 Mar. 149
	3	128	13/31 Aug. 143		35	226	"
	4	116	139/161		36	"	139/161
	5	136	1 July/13 Aug. 143		37	210	early 140s
	6	140	July/Aug. 143		38	"	"
	7	116	1 July/13 Aug. 143		39	212	c. 150
	8	140	13/31 Aug. 143		40	"	"
	9	144	"		41	"	early 140s
	10	144	"		42	214	"
	11	146	"		43	208	"
	12	146	"		44	218	139/c. 156
	13	150	139/161		45	228	1 Jan. 148 or 149
	14	152	"		46	230	"
	15	152	"		47	"	c. Oct. 148
	16	154	"		48	232	"
III,	1	52	a. 139		49	"	a. 7 Mar. 149
	2	58	150s		50	234	"
	3	62	"		51	"	c. 158
	4	66	"		52	238	139/161
	5	66	"		53	240	154? (153/c. 156)
	6	68	"		54	"	"
	7	32	140s		55	"	139/c. 156
	8	34	"		56	242	"
	9	18	139 or 140s		57	244	7 Mar. 149/c. 156
	10	50	139/161		58	"	"
	11	52	"		59	246	139/c. 156
	12	12	140s		60	"	Apr. 145/c. 156
	13	14	"		61	248	139/161
	14	218	139/161		62-64	"	"
	15	100	"		65	224	"
	16	100	"		66	226	"
	17	104	early 140s		67	250	30 Nov. 147/161
	18	106	"		68	"	"
	19	78	139/161		69	"	139/161
	20	170	140s		70	I, 252	139/c. 156
	21	172	"		71	"	"
	22	172	139/161		72	"	"
IV,	1	70	150s		73	186	139/161
	2	74	"		74	52	early 140s
	3	2	138/139	<i>Ant. Imp.</i>	I, 1	II, 30	?Oct. 161
	4	174	139/161		2	32	"
	5	178	140s		3	118	late 161
	6	180	"		4	120	"
	7	184	139/161		5	122	"
	8	184	"		6	126	161/c. 167
	9	186	"		7-8	"	"
	10	188	May/June 155?		9-10	128	"
	11	1,202	soon a. 30 Nov. 147		II, 1	94	summer 162/early 165
	12	202	"		2	96	"
	13	214	26 Apr. 146/147		III, 1	158	161/c. 167
V,	1	188	139/161		2	168	"
	2	"	"		3	218	late 164/early 165
	3	"	139/c. 156		4	220	"
	4	190	"		5	218	"
	5	"	139/161		6	"	161/c. 167
	6-18	"	"		7	"	"
	19	"	139/c. 156		8	128	?summer 161/ ?early 165
	20	192	"		9	156	161/c. 167
	21	"	1 Dec. 147/161		10	"	"
	22	194	139/161				

