



<https://publications.dainst.org>

# iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES  
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

## Vivian Nutton Sextus or Commodus?

aus / from

### Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **3 • 1973**

Seite / Page **429–438**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/769/5138> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1973-3-p429-438-v5138.4

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

**Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München**

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

**©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut**

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: [info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://dainst.org)

**Nutzungsbedingungen:** Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

**Terms of use:** By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut ([info@dainst.de](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

VIVIAN NUTTON

## Sextus or Commodus?

The friends and patients of Galen of Pergamum were drawn from all classes of society both in Rome and in the provinces. Peasants, local worthies, sophists, senators and even the emperor himself received medical instruction and advice from him and had their cures recorded in his voluminous writings. But, although many of them were discussed by J. ILBERG in a famous and still valuable article, much information about Galen's connections and, in general, about society in the Roman Empire in the last half of the second century still remains to be extracted from the mass of the *Corpus Galenicum*.<sup>1</sup> Great caution is necessary, however, for a text transmitted by manuscripts is frequently less reliable than one preserved upon an inscription, and an argument that is based upon an emendation may often be circular. These dangers lurk undetected in many of the writings of Galen, for the standard edition, that produced by C. G. KÜHN at Leipzig from 1821 to 1833, is recognised by all later editors to be full of errors and mistakes of every kind, and, in some treatises, of which 'On prognosis' is one (XIV 599–673 K), to be inferior even to that of R. CHARTIER (Paris, 1679–1689). The absence of any apparatus criticus and of any discussion of its constituent manuscripts disguises the feeble foundations on which it rests, and the illiteracies of mediaeval scribes and of subsequent editors, especially when dealing with proper names, have combined to furnish a text whose corruptions only approximate to the truth.<sup>2</sup> Thus A. R. BIRLEY, who, in a recent article in this journal, endeavoured to prove on the authority of Galen that Commodus was nicknamed Sextus, may easily be pardoned for coming to a wrong conclusion through following a deceitful text.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> J. ILBERG, *Aus Galens Praxis*, *Neue Jahrbücher* 15, 1905, 276–312, reprinted in H. FLASHAR (ed.), *Antike Medizin*, 1971, 361–416. See also G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, 1969, 59–75 (which brings up to date some of the information given by ILBERG, without superseding the earlier article); and D. E. EICHHOLZ, *Galen and his environment*, G & R 20, 1951, 60–71.

<sup>2</sup> And not only in KÜHN's edition, for, even though B. BORGHESI, *Oeuvres* IX, 1879, 317, had identified Βίκτωρι τῷ Ῥώμης ἐπάρχῳ (XV 723 K) as C. Aufidius Victorinus, the old reading was still retained by G. HELMREICH in his edition, *CMG* V 9, 1 (1914) 265. BORGHESI's conclusion was further confirmed by the discovery of Victorinus' name in an Arabic translation of Galen, *CMG Suppl. Orientale* II, 1969, 77.

<sup>3</sup> A. R. BIRLEY, *A Nickname for Commodus and the Date of Fronto's Death*, *Chiron* 2, 1972, 463–473.

It was A. STEIN in PIR<sup>2</sup> IV. 1 (1952) 5 f. (G 24) who first proposed that Sextus, who stubbornly set out to defeat the prediction of the course of his fever made by Galen (XIV 651–657 K), was the same as Commodus, the son of Marcus Aurelius, one of whose illnesses is described later in the same treatise (XIV 661–665 K), although he never set out in full his reasons for making the identification. These are expounded by BIRLEY, who further explains the name Sextus by supposing that it was a nickname given to Commodus by his family because he was the sixth surviving child of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina the Younger. His discussion of the emperor's children and of their dates of birth is of considerable interest, but it does not replace the evidence of 'On prognosis' as the basis for the identification of Sextus with Commodus, and it is here that his hypothesis fails. His argument makes the best of the difficult Greek of KÜHN: it is the text itself that is at fault.

The strongest evidence that he produces is that at XIV 651, 17 K Galen calls Sextus «son of Antoninus» and that (p. 464) «in the concluding sentence Galen once more makes it absolutely clear who Ἐξστος or Sextus is, with the phrase τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Κομμόδου (XIV 657 K)». An examination of other persons named in the two case-histories, Peitholaus, Claudius Severus and Annia Faustina, leads to the conclusion that «the sole surviving son of M. Aurelius (Commodus/Sextus) was entrusted in the absence of both his parents, not only to the immediate supervision of a τροφεύς, as would be normal whether his parents were away or not, but also to the general care of his eldest sister and her husband . . . The infant Commodus was called Sextus, especially, perhaps, by his sisters for some time after his birth: and the circumstance, that it was his eldest sister and her husband who were looking after the boy when Galen treated him, may well explain why Galen uses the name: he will simply be recording the name he heard them use». But an investigation of the manuscripts of 'On prognosis' is sufficient to reveal the fragility of the first two arguments, and the historical context, taken by itself, separates, rather than unites, the two patients.

In 1965 J. KOLLESCH, in a valuable discussion of this problem, showed that the words Ἀντωνίνου υἱός were not to be found in the oldest manuscript of this treatise, Laurentianus 74, 5, but she was unable to specify how they came to appear in the text of KÜHN.<sup>4</sup> They are absent from the two Greek manuscripts of 'On prognosis' (which descend from the same uncial source) and also from the Aldine edition, and were introduced by the Basle editors of 1538, who took them from the mediaeval Latin version ascribed to NICCOLÒ DA REGGIO (fl. 1308–1345). In the printed editions of the Latin Galen, which were the source of the editors' knowledge of this *de verbo ad verbum* translation,<sup>5</sup> the opening words of this

<sup>4</sup> J. KOLLESCH, *Aus Galens Praxis am römischen Kaiserhof*, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt, Band II, 1965, 57–61.

<sup>5</sup> It is impossible to say which of the six printed editions of Galen was used, but the question is unimportant, since they all present the same text: there are a few minor differences among the five Latin manuscripts, none of which affect the interpretation of the

chapter read: *Extus autem antonii filius cepit acutissime febrile*. The Basle editors' use of the mediaeval Latin versions to supplement the deficiencies of the Greek is often convincing, but, because they had made no detailed study of mediaeval translation technique, they were unable to distinguish consistently between a good reading preserved only in the Latin, a change made necessary in the Latin simply by the differences of grammar and syntax between the two languages, and a plausible guess by a translator determined to make sense out of even the obscurest passages. Even if it is allowed that Ἀντωνίνου stood in NICCOLÒ's exemplar and that either he or his scribe wrongly turned it to <Antonii>, the reading of all five manuscripts, the words Ἀντωνίνου υἱός are at best a manuscript variant to be weighed upon its merits; at worst an erroneous gloss of a mediaeval scribe or translator. Only if evidence is produced from other passages that Commodus was also called Sextus, can «the son of Antoninus» be accepted without hesitation; if it can be shown that he was not or that Sextus had a different father, the words should be resolutely excluded.

Nor does the second Galenic reference (XIV 657, 10–15 K) help BIRLEY's cause. I give it in full in my own text together with such critical notes as are necessary: αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ πρόρρησις, ὡς ἔφην, εἰ καὶ θαυμαστὴ τοῖς πολλοῖς τούτοις ἰατροῖς ἔδοξεν, ἀλλ' οὐ τοιαύτη γε κατ' ἀληθείαν, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἡ (εἰ Κῦην) μετὰ γνώσεως τῶν ἐνεστώτων θεραπεία τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Κομμόδου κατὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν ἐκείνου γενομένη. For ὥσπερ . . . γενομένη, the Latin version has: *sicut et que post horum notitiam cura Comodi filii Pitholai dum ille esset in peregrinatione*, from which the Basle editors emended ἐπιδημίαν to ἀποδημίαν. Leaving aside *filii Pitholai* as a stupid gloss – which must cast doubt on the similar <Antonii filius> – let us consider the textual difficulties of the last clause. If the emendation of the Basle editors is accepted, ἐκείνου must refer to M. Aurelius, since Galen never says that he accompanied Commodus to the front, even on the short visit suggested by BARBIERI.<sup>6</sup> But, although the emperor is mentioned in the next sentence, ἐκείνου surely looks back to a previous reference to him, that is, to XIV 655 or even to 650 K, unless αὐτοῦ is emended to τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος. So many changes in the Greek text may well be thought unnecessary in view of the fallibility of the Latin translation, and I have chosen to retain the reading of the manuscripts, with the meaning «Commodus' stay in Rome». How, then, should we understand αὐτοῦ? BIRLEY gives no indication of his opinion, but the position of αὐτοῦ without the article, rules out a version of it as «the same boy, Commodus». Probably, it simply means «the afore-mentioned boy, Commodus», a common usage in late Greek.<sup>7</sup> With the text and translation settled, we may proceed to an interpretation. There

---

text materially. A full discussion of the Greek manuscripts, Laurentianus 74, 5 and Marcianus 281, their affiliations, and the methods of the mediaeval translator will be found in my forthcoming edition of «On prognosis».

<sup>6</sup> G. BARBIERI, Nuove iscrizioni di Marsala, Kokalos 7, 1961, 15–52, at pp. 19 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. XIV 657 K, ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως.

is no doubt that the prorrhesis, the formal announcement by a doctor of his prognosis, is that propounded by Galen to Sextus, and ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἡ . . . θεραπεία carefully marks it off from his cure of Commodus. As KOLLESCH (60) observed, the case-history of Sextus, apart from a reference to therapy at XIV 655 K, is entirely concerned with prediction and prognostic theory, not with the method that was used to cure the invalid. The two cases are distinguished from each other: only a mistranslation of αὐτοῦ suggests that the patient is the same in both.

The historical context, which, at first sight, appears to favour BIRLEY's view, in fact argues against it. It is true that Sextus is closely connected with the imperial court: Peitholaus, the τροφεύς of Commodus, enquires after the course of Sextus' disease: Claudius Severus brings Galen to see Sextus, just as Annia Faustina, who may possibly be his wife,<sup>8</sup> complains to Galen during the illness of Commodus: and Peitholaus informed the emperor about Galen's prognosis (XIV 655, 13 K). But is this enough to prove that the invalid Sextus was Commodus, rather than a member of family connected with the court? The date of the illness of Sextus must fall either in summer 169, between Galen's second arrival in Rome and M. Aurelius' departure for the North, or between late 176 and summer 178,<sup>9</sup> since Peitholaus' revelation to the emperor of Galen's prognosis, which persuaded him that he would not fail in his prognosis and treatment, occurred in the early stages of Sextus' illness and implies that M. Aurelius was still in Rome, not on campaign. The general chronological order of the case-histories contained in «On prognosis» leads me to prefer 169, when Commodus was only seven or eight years old. If that date is accepted and if we equate Sextus with Commodus, it is difficult to understand why he should have been left in the care of Peitholaus and Severus when his father was still in Rome. Besides, the child Commodus would then have his own house and servants (XIV 653, 654 K); he is sufficiently contentious (a fault not noted elsewhere by Galen in the young Commodus) and ingenious to be able to devise a diet that would defeat Galen's prediction. BIRLEY's «sulky adolescent»

---

<sup>8</sup> She is described by Galen as: συγγενῆς οὖσα τῷ αὐτοκράτορι ἔγγιστα, which, as BIRLEY (465) says, is a strange circumlocution if it applies to Annia Faustina, the wife of Marcus Aurelius. It is equally odd if it refers to Annia Galeria Aurelia Faustina, his daughter, and ILBERG (276) called her the cousin of the emperor, Annia Fundania Faustina (PIR<sup>2</sup> A 713). Against BIRLEY's view, it should be noted that (1) she is accompanied by a hostile Methodist doctor, whom she leads by the hand and introduces to Galen (*pace* BIRLEY, who believes that it is Galen's hand that she shakes): (2) her compliments are ironical (παίξουσα) and tendentious: and that (3) Galen regards her intervention as harmful to his cause (ἐποίησάς με πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ πρόσθεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν μισεῖσθαι). If she is the wife of Severus, her attitude towards Galen differs greatly from that of her husband. Although I am inclined to favour ILBERG's opinion, the identification is best left open.

<sup>9</sup> That is, between the return of Marcus from the East and the date of composition of this treatise, which ILBERG, RhM 47, 1872, 493 and 497, placed in 178 on the evidence of XIV 630, 9–11 K. K. BARDONG, NGG 1942, 609 f., argued for a date early in 177, but his argument is not convincing and it may be best to place it in late 177 or the first months of 178.

is an excellent description of Sextus which fits the evidence well, and we must conclude either that Sextus in 169 is a friend of the emperor, the details of whose illness Peitholaus transmits to M. Aurelius, or that, if Sextus is the same as Commodus, the case occurred seven years or more later. It could well be that the later date, 176 to 178, should be preferred, and that the cases are described out of chronological order, for Galen's cure of Marcus Aurelius (XIV 657–661 K) apparently postdates his cure of Commodus, made when his father was absent (XIV 661–665 K), but it is then remarkable that Galen should continue, even after 176, to use a childhood nickname for Commodus, who was still under the supervision of his *nutritor* and his uncle. Whichever date is preferred, it should be noted that the patient in the first case is called Sextus ten times and that no age is given for him: in the second, the patient is either called Commodus or *παῖς*. It is unlikely that Galen, who elsewhere attacks his opponents at length for irrelevant and confusing changes of name for fevers, pulses and parts of the body (especially in «On the different types of pulses», VIII 567–589 K) and who praises consistency and clarity of thought and expression, should within three chapters give two different names to one and the same person without giving any indication of a change or of any reason for it. Even if Commodus was called Sextus by his sisters and Galen used the nickname because, at the time he treated him, the boy was in the care of Severus and Annia Faustina (BIRLEY, 468), this does not explain why in the second case, when the guardians remained the same, he reverted to the normal name, Commodus. The evidence of the context, like that of the Greek manuscripts at XIV 651, 17 and 657, 7 K, is in favour equating Sextus, not with Commodus, the son of Antoninus, but with a young member of a family closely connected with the imperial household.

After J. ILBERG had identified Sextus with the mysterious «son of Quintilianus», mentioned a few lines previously (XV 651, 8 K), C. CICHORIUS, no mean prosopographer, argued that this was none other than Sextus Quintilius Sex. f. Condianus, *cos. ord.* 180.<sup>10</sup> But, although this suggestion has much to recommend it, it is open to attack on three counts: first, because an imperial *nutritor* has nothing to do with a private citizen of mature years; secondly, because, in BIRLEY's words (464), «the case of the son of Quintilianus need not have any relevance at all to the case of Sextus; it is mentioned only as an example for Epigenes to study, presumably in the writings which Galen has just mentioned that he had been working on in the absence of Marcus Aurelius»; and thirdly, because it does not correspond to the text given by KÜHN.

The first objection is not difficult to answer. Although Galen's description of Peitholaus, first as the *τροφεύς* of Commodus (XIV 650 K), and then, in the case-

---

<sup>10</sup> ILBERG 296 n. 5; C. CICHORIUS, *Sextus bei Galen*, *Neue Jahrbücher* 15, 1905, 624. KOLLESCH (58) demolished the theory of J. WALSH, *Galen's Second Sojourn in Italy and His Treatment of the Family of Marcus Aurelius*, *Medical Life* 37, 1930, 473–506, that Sextus was not Commodus, but Annianus Verus.

history of Sextus, as a *cubicularius*, may indicate that he was in service with Sextus as a chamberlain before becoming an imperial servant, this elaborate explanation is unnecessary. As KOLLESCH insisted (60), there is no reason why a member of the imperial *familia* should not discuss the illness of a friend of the emperor and pass on news of it to him, and, by itself, this does not prove that Condius, aged about twenty in 169, still had Peitholaus as his *τροφεύς*.

The second argument is also weak. There is no further mention of «the son of Quintilianus» in any of Galen's surviving writings, even in «On crises», the tract to which Galen refers Epigenes. It is very unusual that Galen, who often takes considerable pains to provide cross references, and who repeats sentences and paragraphs from other treatises in order to make his meaning unmistakably clear, should direct his readers to a fuller version of the case elsewhere, when, in the later tract, only the name of the patient is given, without any description of his ailment, and when, in the earlier one, although there is a case-history of a young man (On crises, IX 680 ff. K = 151 ff. ALEXANDERSON), the youth is not named and the discussion there concerns the treatment of tertian fevers in conjunction, not prognostic signs. But the words of Galen: ἦν οὖν πρόγνωσιν ἐποησάμην ἐπὶ θατέρου τῶν Κυντιλιάνου υἱῶν ἔξ αὐτοῦ βουλευθέντι σοι μαθεῖν ἐκ τίνος θεωρίας ἐγένετο, ἑρδία καὶ καταφανῆς ἔσται τὴν περὶ κρίσεων πραγματεῖαν ἀναγνόντι (given in KÜHN's text, XIV 651, 7–11), make it clear that it was not the prognosis of the illness of «the son of Quintilianus» that was described in «On crises», but the theory that lay behind it, which is given in greater detail at IX 717–724 and 745–747 K = 176–181, 195 f. ALEXANDERSON. Thus the mention of «the son of Quintilianus» is intended to refer, not just to a case familiar to Galen and Epigenes alone or to one described in another treatise, but, in all probability, following Galen's custom, to an incident to be described later in the same work.<sup>11</sup>

Neither CICHORIUS nor KOLLESCH commented upon the strange opening of the case-history of Sextus, Ἐξῆτος οὖν ἠρξάτο. The particle is here resumptive, rather than conclusive, and its use implies that the case has been mentioned earlier, if only in an allusion; and the introduction of Sextus simply by his *praenomen* alone differs from Galen's normal practice of adding a few words of description. In «On prognosis» there is Eudemus, the Peripatetic philosopher (XIV 606 K); Antigenes, a pupil of Quintus and Marinus (XIV 613 K); a servant of Charilampes, the chamberlain (XIV 624 K); Diomedes, the orator (XIV 625 K); Annia Faustina, a very close relative of the emperor (XIV 663 K); and careful and precise descriptions of Sergius Paullus, Flavius Boethus, Claudius Severus and Civica Barbarus (XIV 612 and 617 K). Only Epigenes and Iustus are mentioned by name and without context:

---

<sup>11</sup> I know of no example in the *Corpus Galenicum* of a case being hinted at only by the name of the patient. Cf. the case of the wife of Iustus, first mentioned at XIV 626 K, and described fully in XIV 630–635 K; or that of Commodus, alluded to at XIV 657, and described at 661–665 K.

the first is the dedicatee, the second merely the husband of a patient.<sup>12</sup> Ἐξοτος οὖν looks back to an earlier reference: the case of «the son of Quintilianus» requires a fuller citation later in the treatise: to identify Sextus with «the son of Quintilianus» resolves both difficulties at once.

An examination of the manuscripts of «On prognosis», begun by KOLLESCH (61), resolves the third difficulty, that of «the son of Quintilianus». Although the two Greek manuscripts have Κοιντιαλίων and Κυιντιαλίων, the Aldine editors changed the plural to the singular, either through misreading the compendium in the manuscripts of -ων, or because they were influenced by singular, *Quintiliani*, of the Latin version, or, more likely, because they did not understand why the sons should have more than one father. The Basle editors, refusing to recognise *Quintialis* as a Latin *nomen* or *cognomen*, introduced the reading of NICCOLÒ into their Greek text, where it has remained as a trap for unwary prosopographers and where it leaves the paternity of Sextus still uncertain. KOLLESCH advocated the simple emendation Κοιντι[α]λίου but there is one strong objection to this. The second generation of Quintilii, Condianus and Maximus, were cousins, not brothers, for Cassius Dio (LXXII 5 and 6) shows that Condianus II, *cos. ord.* 180, was the son of Maximus I, *cos. ord.* 151, and that Maximus II, *cos. ord.* 172, was the son of Condianus I, *cos. ord.* 151.<sup>13</sup> Since we have no other evidence that Sextus Quintilius Condianus II had a brother – and Dio's testimony is against this –, an emendation that makes him «one of the sons of Quintilius» either imputes an ignorant error to Galen or is wrong itself. The plural Κοιντι[α]λίων should be retained, for two reasons. The first is that υἱός is regularly found on inscriptions to indicate that the second generation of a family bears the same *nomen* and *cognomen* as the first (cf. GRBS 11, 1970, 335 ff.): here Sextus Quintilius Condianus and Sextus Quintilius Maximus have the same *praenomen*, *nomen* and *cognomen* as their uncles. Secondly, as J. H. OLIVER has stressed in his elucidation of the tangled careers of the family, the famous pair of brothers, *cos. ord.* 151, alone are men-

<sup>12</sup> Who Iustus was is very uncertain. F. E. KIND, *Bursians Jahresbericht* 180, 1919, 59, and L. PETERSEN, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 874, identified him with the oculist Iustus (X 1019 K), but the general impression gained from Galen's account is that he was a man of wealth and social standing in Rome, hardly a mere oculist. E. WICKERSHEIMER, *Actes du Xème Congrès d'histoire des sciences*, 1964, 525, rightly believed that he was the same as the recipient of Galen's tract «On the divisions of the medical art» (CMG Suppl. *Oriente* II, 1969, 25, 2 and 129, 3), but this does not help us to identify him with any known senator. C. Curtius C. f. Iustus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1613) and C. Modius Iustus, *cos.* 171 or, more likely, 172 (RE 15 [1932] 2332), are possibilities, but it is probable that the man is an otherwise unknown senator or one of Galen's friends from Pergamum.

<sup>13</sup> R. HANSLIK, RE 24 (1963) 985, s. v. *Quintilius* 23 (Sex. Quintilius Condianus I) saw that the younger pair were cousins, but elsewhere in his confused notices of the family (s. v. *Quintilius* 24, 26 and 27) he regards them as brothers. He also introduces Quintilianus (*ibid.* 1268) as «Zeitgenosse des Galen».



tioned as the Quintilii without further qualification, and the younger pair of cousins require a distinguishing mark, such as υἱῶν.<sup>14</sup>

But there is a further corruption that has escaped notice until now and which confirms the plural form of the manuscripts. No satisfactory meaning can be adduced for ἐξ αὐτοῦ (which also stood in NICCOLÒ's exemplar and which he translated as «*ex hoc*»). If Epigenes wished to seek an explanation of the theory of prognosis «from him», i. e. from the patient, Galen's advice to him to read his tract «On crises» is perverse: if he wished to seek it «from it», i. e. from the prognosis itself, the feminine αὐτῆς is required, not the neuter. The simple change to Ἐξστου (>ἐξ τοῦ > ἐξ αὐτοῦ) resolves this difficulty and provides an accurate designation «Sextus, one of the younger Quintilii», which is picked up later simply by «Sextus». It is apposite here to note that the epitomators of Cassius Dio in their account of the end of the family of the Quintilii (Dio, LXXII 6, 4 and 7, 1 ff.), after introducing Sextus Quintilius Condianus II as Sextus Condianus, the son of Maximus, continue to refer to him either as Condianus or as Sextus.<sup>15</sup>

If these emendations and interpretations of this passage are accepted (which exclude «the son of Antoninus» from the text of XIV 651 K), we still have to discover why Condianus' health is of interest to Claudius Severus, the emperor and to Peitholaus, but not, apparently, to his father. As OLIVER has demonstrated, the Quintilii brothers were among the most trusted of the friends of Marcus Aurelius, and it is only to be expected that their sons should be counted among the *pueri eminentes* whose health and upbringing were looked after by imperial servants. *P. Aelius Aug. lib. Epaphroditus, magister, iatroliptes puerorum eminentium Caesaris nostri* (CIL VI 8981), was in charge of the gymnastic exercises of the young Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus and their friends, and, if the emperor could entrust the health of Commodus to the care of Galen, who, although living in his own house (XIV 658), was an imperial physician, there is no reason why his friends should not do likewise with their sons. While Peitholaus obviously cannot be the *nutritor* of a man of some twenty years, his close friendship with Galen, his knowledge of his abilities, and his links with the emperor and court, are all reasons why he should take an interest in the health of Sextus and report it to the emperor. But it was not Peitholaus, the imperial servant, who was able to influence the stubborn young man to accept the advice of an immigrant from Pergamum, but Claudius Severus, the friend of his father. Why is there no mention of Condianus' father? E. GROAG, followed by HANSLIK, concluded that the Quintilii brothers were together in Greece as governors from 169, and if the supposition that this case took place in 169 is correct, their absence abroad explains their omission

<sup>14</sup> J. H. OLIVER, Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East, *Hesperia Supplement* 13, 1970, 69.

<sup>15</sup> Note also that two of the manuscripts of Dio, LXXII 5, 3 read Κωντιλιάνους for the correct Κωντιλίους.

from Galen's account.<sup>16</sup> But GROAG's argument for 169 is not conclusive, and if OLIVER is right to date their tenure of office from 170, or, at the latest, 171, to 175,<sup>17</sup> we must either assume that Quintilius Maximus was absent from Rome for some reason unknown to us or, with less plausibility, redate this case to 177/8, when the Quintilii were fighting on the Danube front and when Condius was aged about twenty-nine.

The argument for identifying Sextus, not with Commodus, the son of Antoninus, but with Sextus Quintilius Condius is strong, and is made even stronger by two simple emendations in the text of Galen. There is one corollary that follows and one lesson to be learned from it. The case-history of Sextus lends no support to any theory that Commodus was called Sextus or to any investigation based upon the nicknames of Roman emperors.<sup>18</sup> Instead, it demonstrates the dangers of relying solely upon the text of KÜHN in an examination of the friends of Galen, and also the fallibility of the Basle editors of 1538, whose injudicious use of the mediaeval Latin versions of Galenic treatises, while excellent in theory, has left a legacy of error to deceive and embroil later generations of scholars.

<sup>16</sup> E. GROAG, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia I*, 1939, 128 ff.; R. HANSLIK, *op. cit.* (note 13), s. v. Quintilius 23.

<sup>17</sup> J. H. OLIVER, *loc. cit.* (note 14). His reason for placing their tenure later was that they do not appear to have been involved with the invasion of the Costoboci in 170 or 171, and may have been appointed to clear up the mess left by the invaders.

<sup>18</sup> The second part of BIRLEY's article (468–473) argues that, if Commodus could retain his nickname Sextus, Lucius Verus could continue to be called Commodus after his accession: thus the passage in Fronto, *De orationibus* 17 f., *nummum Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii*, could have been written before 175, the date of the first coins of Commodus, the son of Marcus Aurelius, and thus that there is no cogent evidence that Fronto lived into the 170s. His case loses one argument, and not a strong one at that, but still remains powerful, especially when it is noted that, in Fronto's rhetorical prose, the sequence *aut Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii* (a tricolon of 4, 3 and 2 syllables) is much more pleasing than one that substitutes *Veri* for *Commodi* (4, 2, 2). The order of the names also seems to favour Lucius Verus rather than Commodus as Caesar, but this should not be pressed too hard.

