

THE EARLY MODERN RECEPTION OF THE *MEDITATIONS*

John Sellars

ABSTRACT: This chapter examines the reception of the *Meditations* in early modern Europe, focusing primarily on the period from the first publication of the *Meditations* in 1559 to the end of the eighteenth century. In particular it discusses the way in which the text was read as either a generic source of ancient moral maxims or a serious work of Stoic philosophy. Key figures in the early modern debate include Isaac Casaubon, his son Meric, Thomas Gataker, the Cambridge Platonists Henry More and Ralph Cudworth, Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, Francis Hutcheson, and on the continent Joannes Franciscus Buddeus and Johann Jakob Brucker.

Preamble: From Antiquity to the Renaissance

We do not know what happened to Marcus' private writings immediately after his death. Assuming that they were written towards the end of his life while on campaign, presumably they were (along with any other personal effects) taken back to Rome. Perhaps there they were deposited into the imperial library. Evidently something was done to preserve them.

The earliest explicit mention that we have of writings by Marcus Aurelius was by Themistius, writing in the fourth century AD. In his *Orations* he referred to the *Admonitions* (*parangelmata*) of Marcus.¹ Themistius had studied in Constantinople, where he was a senator and eventually prefect of the city. If Themistius did read the *Meditations* he presumably did so there, perhaps in the relocated imperial library. It is conceivable that one of Themistius' contemporaries, the emperor Julian, also read the *Meditations* in Constantinople. Like Marcus, Julian had more than a passing interest in philosophy. Indeed, given Julian's range of intellectual interests, it would be unsurprising if he had taken a particular interest in his predecessor's writing, if he knew of its existence. In a letter to Themistius, Julian expressed his admiration for the 'perfect virtue' (*teleia aretē*) of Marcus and his doubts about being able to live up to such an example.² By this point in time, Constantinople was increasingly the main centre of operations for the Roman emperor (Julian had been born there) and so it seems reasonable to assume that much of the Imperial library at Rome was transferred there. Given that these earliest brief mentions of Marcus were by people based in Constantinople, it seems likely that Marcus' notes had made the journey east. Indeed, the next firm sighting of the *Meditations* was also in the eastern Mediterranean, in the works of Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea.

¹ Them. *Or.* 6, 81c. On the reception of the *Meditations* in antiquity see Farquharson 1944 I: xiii-xvi, Hadot and Luna 1998: xii-xix, and Ceperina 2012: 46-9.

² Julian, *Ep. ad Them.* 253a-b.

Arethas reports that he owned his own copy of the *Meditations*. At some time around 900, he had a new copy of this made and sent the original one to a friend, Demetrius.³ Elsewhere, Arethas refers to Marcus' book using the title *To Himself* (*en tois eis heauton*).⁴ This is the first mention of what has become the standard Greek title of the work.

Although it does not appear to have circulated widely, the *Meditations* remained at least accessible to some readers in the Byzantine world. The tenth century *Suda* lexicon quotes from it multiple times, also noting that it is a work in twelve books.⁵ A little later, in the thirteenth century, Maximos Planudes produced an edition of selections from the *Meditations*.⁶ In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Joseph Bryennius quoted from the *Meditations* multiple times, although without naming the source.⁷ Selections of excerpts from the *Meditations* – possibly descended from Planudes' edition – circulated in manuscript in fifteenth century Italy but, for the most part, Marcus Aurelius did not feature in the great Renaissance rediscovery of Greek philosophical literature. Marcus the emperor was known as a respected figure via the history of Cassius Dio and the biography in the *Scriptores Historia Augustae*, but the *Meditations* remained largely unknown.

There was, however, one exception to this. The German humanist Johann Reuchlin (1455-1522), remembered for his expertise in both Greek and Hebrew, evidently knew the *Meditations* because he quoted from them in both his published works and his letters.⁸ In his *De verbo mirifico* of 1494 he quoted (that is, translated into Latin) five passages from the *Meditations* without attributing their source. He also quoted Marcus in a number of letters to contemporaries, including Erasmus. In one of these letters he refers to the *Meditations* by the title *Ad se ipsum*, well before that title appeared in print in the *editio princeps*, quoting Marcus saying 'simplify yourself'.⁹ This idea evidently caught Reuchlin's attention, because he quoted it again in his later work *De arte cabalistica* of 1517. But there is nothing to suggest that Reuchlin saw the *Meditations* as a work embodying Stoic ideas. Instead it was simply an ancient source of wise sayings.

³ See Arethas, *Ep.* 44 (Westerink 1968-72 I: 305). The letter was written at some time before 907. For further discussion see Cortassa 1997; Ceperina 2012: 48-9.

⁴ See Arethas' scholia in Lucian (Rabe 1906: 207,6-7). In his letter to Demetrius (previous note), he referred to it as Marcus' 'most beneficial book' (*megalōphelestaton biblion*).

⁵ See esp. *Suda* M214 (Adler 1928-38 III: 328), with further details in Ceperina 2012: 49-53. For a full list of quotations from the *Meditations* in the *Suda*, see Hadot and Luna 1998: xxv.

⁶ See Fryde 2000: 147, 240-1;

⁷ See further Rees 2000; Ceperina 2012: 53-4.

⁸ See Vesperini and Ceperina 2015 for all the relevant passages and discussion. Note also Hadot and Luna 1998: clxxxviii.

⁹ See Reuchlin's letter to Domenico Grimani of 1 July 1515, in Vesperini and Ceperina 2015: 133: 'Hoc illud est, quod M. Antoninus imperator in philosophicorum Ad se ipsum quarto ait: *haplōson seauton*'. This comes from *Med.* 4.26.

Apart from Reuchlin, no one else seems to have been reading the *Meditations* in the early sixteenth century. Even so, Marcus Aurelius was to become something of a bestseller thanks to *Libro aureo de Marco Aurelio*, first printed in 1528 in Spanish and quickly translated into all the major European vernacular languages.¹⁰ This was the work of Antonio de Guevara (1480-1545), a courtier who would later become a monk. He claimed that it was based on a Greek manuscript, but there is no evidence that such a manuscript ever existed.¹¹ He also implies that he did not know Greek and so some unnamed friends translated this manuscript into Latin for him, which he then translated into Spanish.¹² The *Libro aureo* mixes biographical details (about, for instance, the Antonine plague) with fictitious letters and imaginary dialogues (between Marcus and his wife, for example).¹³ The first printing was made without Guevara's knowledge from an unfinished manuscript and so the following year he issued a fuller, authorized version under the title *Libro del emperador Marco Aurelio co relox de principes*.¹⁴ Both versions were quickly translated into French, Italian, and English, and, along with the Spanish original, reprinted many times.¹⁵ While Guevara's work had little, if anything, to do with the *Meditations*, it did contribute to the wider image of Marcus as a source of worldly wisdom and an ideal philosopher-prince.¹⁶

The *editio princeps*

It was only relatively late, in 1559, that the *Meditations* were printed for the first time.¹⁷ The edition was overseen by the respected humanist Conrad Gesner and based on a

¹⁰ For further information on its publishing history see Lino and Canedo 1946: 449-72. It was translated into English in 1535 under the title *The Golden Booke of Marcus Aurelius Emperour and Eloquent Oratour*. Unhelpfully, the title *The Golden Book* was sometimes used for reprints of Meric Casaubon's translation of the *Meditations* (e.g. 'The Temple Classics', 1898; 'Everyman's Library', 1900, both published by J. M. Dent).

¹¹ See Guevara 1535: A4r, 'I found this treatise in Florence, among the books left there by Cosimo de Medici' (trans. modernized).

¹² See Guevara 1557: b5v, 'I have drawn this out of Greek through the help of my friends, and afterwards out of Latin into our vulgar tongue' (trans. modernized).

¹³ On the place of letters in Guevara's book see Fleury 2014: 143-52.

¹⁴ There were minor variations in the title among the early printings. The edition I have consulted (Guevara 1534) is entitled *Marco aurelio con el relox de principes*. It was translated into English in 1557 as *The Diall of Princes* by Thomas North. See further Lino and Canedo 1946: 472-503.

¹⁵ See further Lino and Canedo 1946: 449-503, who list over two hundred editions and translations of these two works, the majority issued in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

¹⁶ On the influence of Guevara's portrait of Marcus see Mezzatesta 1984 and Dandeleit 2016.

¹⁷ See Xylander 1559. There has been a longstanding uncertainty about the true date of publication. The *editio princeps* survives in two states, one without a date on the title page and one with the date 1559. In both cases the preface is signed and dated October 1558. This has led some to conclude that copies without a date on the title page are from the true first printing, which took place in late 1558, while those

manuscript in the Palatine library in Heidelberg, where Gesner was librarian. The manuscript itself is now lost, but that is not uncommon in the case of first printings of classical texts: compositors would take the manuscript copy apart so that they could consult each page separately during typesetting, effectively destroying it in the process. Gesner commissioned Wilhelm Holtzmann to prepare a translation of the text into Latin. Holtzmann styled himself ‘Xylander’ in Latin and it is under this affected name of the translator that the first edition of the *Meditations* is usually known.

This first edition of the *Meditations* evidently generated some interest. Xylander added corrections to a second edition printed in 1568 and it was reprinted again in 1590.¹⁸ However, it does not seem to have made much of an impact. In the 1630s Meric Casaubon commented on the rarity of the text, at least in England.¹⁹ Michel de Montaigne makes no mention of Marcus Aurelius, although the publication of a translation into French as early as 1570 suggests at least some interest in France. As others have noted, the *Meditations* does not feature as a key Stoic text in the handbooks to Stoic philosophy assembled by Justus Lipsius and printed in 1604.²⁰ One reason for this might have been that Lipsius’ main aim in those works was to explicate the works of Seneca; Marcus, writing after Seneca, was simply not relevant to the task at hand. Another reason might have been the way in which the *Meditations* was presented in Xylander’s edition. The title, *De vita sua (On his own Life)* might be taken to imply an autobiography, and a casual reader picking it up and starting with Book 1 might easily have that impression confirmed.²¹ That mistaken impression could have gained further weight from the fact that for publication it was paired with the biography of Proclus by Marinus. There was also little in the *editio princeps* to suggest that this was a book connected to Stoic philosophy.

with the date 1559 come from a second printing made the following year. Others are inclined to see all copies coming from a single printing in early 1559, during which the date – inadvertently left out – was added part way through the process. I find the second view more likely. See also Wickham Legg 1910: 26 and, for further discussion, Ceperina 2012: 55-6.

¹⁸ For full bibliographical details of these printings (and others referred to in this chapter), see Wickham Legg 1910.

¹⁹ Casaubon 1634: ‘Preface’ 13: ‘as by my owne experience I know the Booke, (though twice printed,) to be so rare, that it is not to be found in many private studies, and sometimes not for many years together, in any Booke-sellers shop’. In fact, by this date the text had been printed four times (1559, 1568, 1590, 1626) and Xylander’s Latin translation issued separately in a pirated edition (1559).

²⁰ See Kraye 2000: 109. Lipsius does mention Marcus a handful of times as an example of a great individual (e.g. *Manuductio ad Stoicam Philosophiam* 1.17, in Lipsius 1675 IV: 674; *Monita et Exempla Politica* 1.8, in *ibid.* IV: 183 [misnumbered]). He identifies Marcus as a philosopher and a Stoic, but this information probably came from the biography in the *Scriptores Historia Augusta* – indeed, he cites from it in *ibid.* III: 904 and IV: 54. However, he did know the *Meditations*, quoting *Med.* 1.5 in his *Saturnalium Sermorum* 2.24 (*ibid.* III: 982).

²¹ See Kraye 2000: 109.

The Casaubons

The first person who seems to have made extensive use of the *Meditations* and connected the work with Stoicism was Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614). In 1603 he edited the collection of biographies of Roman emperors known as the *Scriptores Historia Augusta*, which includes a biography of Marcus Aurelius traditionally attributed to Julius Capitolinus. In his commentary on Marcus' biography, Casaubon quoted the *Meditations* a number of times, often citing material in Book 1 regarding figures in Marcus' life that were mentioned in the ancient biography.²²

Two years later, in 1605, Casaubon published an edition of the *Satires* of the Stoic poet Persius along with a substantial commentary (23 pages of Persius received 522 pages of comment). Central to Casaubon's interpretative approach was to highlight Persius' use of Stoic ideas. His commentary is consequently full of discussion of Stoic doctrine along with illustrative quotations from a wide range of Stoic material. It is within this context that Casaubon often cites the *Meditations*, which he evidently knew well. By way of example, in his first satire, Persius mentions praise (*Sat.* 1.47) and in his commentary Casaubon connects this to the Stoic doctrine of preferred and dispreferred 'indifferents' (*adiaphora*), citing Diogenes Laertius, Cicero, Galen, and Seneca (1605: 90). This careful explication of a key Stoic doctrine culminates with a quotation from *Meditations* 4.33: 'In any case, what is it to be remembered forever? Nothing but vanity'. When in the second satire, Persius refers to a 'soul steeped in nobleness and honour' (*Sat.* 2.74), Casaubon again interprets this in the light of Stoic themes, citing doxographical material from Plutarch and Lactantius alongside Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius (1605: 224-5), in this case *Meditations* 3.4.4: 'an athlete contending for the greatest of all prizes (that of never being thrown by passion), deep-dyed in justice'. When at *Sat.* 3.54 Persius mentions a 'sleepless and close-cropped youth' attracted to the doctrines of the Stoa, Casaubon cites *Meditations* 1.6.8 where Marcus mentions his own youthful asceticism when he was a student of Stoicism (1605: 263). In these and many similar places, Casaubon cites the *Meditations* as a source for Stoic doctrine and Marcus – whom he calls *sapientissimus* – as an example of a Stoic.

Isaac's son Meric Casaubon (1599-1671) inherited his father's interest in the *Meditations*.²³ In 1634 he published a translation into English – indeed, the first English translation. He titled his version *Meditations Concerning Himselfe*, in the process coining

²² See Casaubon 1603: 91, 105, 121, 124, 126, 127, 128, 131, 132, 322 (references are to the separate pagination of his commentary). See esp. 128 and 131 where Casaubon cites the *Meditations* on Marcus' teachers Sextus (*Med.* 1.9) and Diogenatus (*Med.* 1.6) respectively.

²³ All subsequent uses of 'Casaubon' refer to Meric, unless Isaac is explicitly named.

what has become the standard English title.²⁴ Unlike Xylander, Meric explicitly presented Marcus as a Stoic, describing him as ‘much addicted’ to the sect of the Stoics (1634: 12).

In his opening *Discourse*, Meric acknowledged that there existed a popular image of the Stoics as holding opinions that are contrary to (human) nature, including rejecting the emotions and the needs of the body. Yet, at the same time, Stoicism seems to have been extremely popular in antiquity. Why were Stoic ideas so popular back then if they fundamentally conflicted with human nature? Indeed, the irony was that it was the Stoics who proclaimed that one ought to live according to nature. Marcus himself affirmed this doctrine, saying (in Casaubon’s version) ‘remember that philosophie requireth nothing of thee, but what thy nature requireth, and wouldest thou thy selfe desire any thing that is not according to nature?’ (*Med.* 5.9). One of the problems with Christian thought, Meric continued, is that many of the vices it identified seemed to spring naturally from human nature, placing it at odds with divine law. Yet by instinct everyone is drawn to live according to their own nature, creating a never-ending tension.

Casaubon went on to suggest that if one returns to the Gospels, in fact one finds very little at odds with human nature; the problem is with the subsequent Christian tradition. By doing this, the tension between divine (moral) law and human nature can be ‘mollified and lessned’ (1634: 4). The great value of Marcus’ *Meditations* in this context is that it offers a model for how one might live a life equally committed to both human nature and divine law without conflict. For Casaubon,

The chieftest subject of the Booke [the *Meditations*], is, the vanity of the world and all worldly things, as wealth, honour, life, &c. and the end and scope of it, to teach a man how to submit himself wholly to Gods providence, and to live content and thankfull in what estate or calling soever. (1634: 5)

Yet despite its great merits, some readers might dismiss the *Meditations* because it is the work of a heathen, based only on natural reason rather than revelation.²⁵ Casaubon tried to defend his admiration for Marcus by insisting that he was both a very great man and a very good one, who ‘lived as he did write’ (1634: 6). Indeed, one of the noteworthy features of Marcus’ reflections are his rejection of excessive pleasure and the vanity of wealth and honour. Casaubon wryly comments that it is easy for a person without these things to talk them down when they don’t have them, without any real first-hand knowledge and without their constant temptation. Marcus, by contrast, knew these things all too well and so his rejection of them is both more laudable and authentic. As he himself

²⁴ See Casaubon 1634. Subsequent references are to the pagination of the ‘Discourse by Way of Preface’, which is distinct from the pagination of the translation itself.

²⁵ Some readers might also have been sceptical due to the fact that under Marcus’ rule many Christians were persecuted. Casaubon responded to this concern by noting that no early Christian writers criticized Marcus about this. See further Kraye 2000: 113.

comments in *Meditations* 8.1, he had tried to enjoy a good life by pursuing wealth, fame, and pleasure, but failed, and it was in the light of this experience that he came to the view that the only way to achieve it is by living in accord with human nature. When Marcus said that the constant praise of others was vain and empty, he knew what he was talking about. That, according to Casaubon, is what gives the *Meditations* its power as a work of ethical guidance.

Casaubon's translation proved popular and was reprinted throughout the seventeenth century (1635, 1663, 1673, 1692). The process of preparing the translation, which involved critically assessing Xylander's Latin translation and his claims about how corrupted the text was, led Casaubon to think about preparing his own edition of the Greek text. Indeed, a good part of the preface to Casaubon's English translation had been taken up with pouring scorn on Xylander's translation: 'sometimes in a whole page, he hath not two lines of Antoninus his sense, and meaning' (1634: 14). Xylander blamed his difficulties on the corruption of the text (which implies that he was well aware of the shortcomings of his own version), but Casaubon defended the integrity of the received text by noting its deliberate aphoristic and compressed style. Marcus was extremely well read and when writing these notes to himself he often alluded to ideas and other works without fully spelling them out. In order to understand the *Meditations* properly, Casaubon argued, one must read them against the background of Stoic philosophy. When one does this, much of the apparent obscurity will disappear:

Howsoever to them that are any thing versed in the writings of ancient Philosophers, Stoicks especially, there will not occurre many such [obscure] places. If a man take but Arrianus, and Seneca, and compare them diligently with Antoninus, he will find a marvellous consent, and many obscure places of Antoninus, illustrated and explained by their larger discourse. (1634: 23)

Casaubon, then, highlights the way in which the *Meditations* presupposes various Stoic doctrines; he notes its unusual literary style and lack of structure, connects this to the fact that Marcus was primarily writing for himself, and comments on the way it incorporates quotations from other authors (some of which may not be acknowledged). In short, many of the topics that have become central themes in recent scholarship on the *Meditations* had already been marshalled in Marcus' defence by Casaubon almost four hundred years ago.

Even so, despite this vigorous defence of the text against Xylander's complaints, textual issues remained and a more reliable Latin version was clearly needed. Casaubon embarked on preparing both a new text and Latin translation and it was during this work that he paid a visit to Thomas Gataker (1574-1654), the vicar of Rotherhithe, just outside the city of London. During their conversation, Gataker showed Casaubon two large notebooks containing his own new edition of the *Meditations* that he had been working

on for some years. The two of them had been working independently on the same project. Gataker doubted whether his own work would ever see the light of day, so he urged Casaubon to proceed to publication.²⁶ Meric Casaubon's edition was printed in 1643.

Thomas Gataker

It would be almost a decade after the publication of Casaubon's edition that Gataker's finally saw the light of day, even though it had been started much earlier. It was printed in Cambridge in 1652, thanks to the efforts of various friends in high places at the university.²⁷ The final version often cites Casaubon's edition, so Gataker evidently kept working on his manuscript well after their meeting.

Gataker's edition is notable for many things. It included a substantial commentary that continues to be considered a valuable resource.²⁸ Its division of the text of each book into sections – different to that employed by previous editions – has become the standard one still used today.²⁹ More significant, though, was its interpretive agenda, set out in the lengthy introduction.³⁰ There, Gataker sought to show the proximity between Stoicism and Christianity. For him, no other school of ancient philosophy places as much weight on piety and virtue as the Stoics did. The only serious contender apart from the Stoics was Aristotle, who valued virtue above all else but also claimed that external circumstances can impinge on someone's ability to live a good life. For the Stoics, by contrast, only the virtues are genuinely good and this, Gataker argued, brings the Stoics closest to Christianity. As part of this project to defend the moral standing of the Stoics, Gataker also distanced them from the Cynics, despite ancient sources claiming their kinship, and he insisted on a stark opposition between Stoicism and Epicureanism, attacking Seneca's conciliatory remarks about Epicurus.³¹ Indeed, a significant proportion of Gataker's introduction is devoted to the moral dangers of Epicureanism, as

²⁶ See Krayer 2000: 114 with Casaubon 1643: A2v.

²⁷ See Krayer 2000: 114.

²⁸ See e.g. Rutherford 1989: 265 who calls it an 'irreplaceable treasure-house of learning'. Farquharson 1944 I: xlix commented that it 'will always remain the principal authority for any one undertaking to study or edit the *Meditations*'.

²⁹ Xylander's edition did not divide the text into numbered sections. The first edition to do so, by Amadeus Sally, was printed in 1626. Casaubon's translation of 1634 divided the text differently, and his edition of 1643 did so differently again.

³⁰ Gataker's introduction is entitled 'Praeloquium'. Its pages are unnumbered, but it is at *3r-Av. Around the first two-thirds of it were translated as 'Gataker's Preliminary Discourse' in Collier 1708: 1-35. Collier omitted the final section, part of which was later translated by Hutcheson and Moor [1742] 2008: 161-4.

³¹ Later, Gataker comments that he thinks Seneca's works the least valuable of the Roman Stoics (1652: ***3v).

if to deflect any doubts readers might have about Stoicism, insisting that the real enemy lay elsewhere.

The Stoics are to be admired, Gataker insisted, because they hold that God governs the universe in a providential manner. In particular, they counsel us to embrace the providential ordering of the world and to accept whatever happens with good grace. They encourage us to love all humankind and to act well towards others. Stoicism is, says Gataker, a philosophy of piety, charity, humanity, and magnanimity (1652: ***v). Among the ancient Stoics, the ones to be admired the most are those that lived according to their precepts, notably Cato the Younger, Thræseas Paetus, Helvidius Priscus, and, of course, Marcus Aurelius. For Gataker the highest expression of Stoic philosophy is to be found in the works of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, whose sentiments come closest to Christianity. Many of the core teachings of the Gospels can be found in the *Meditations*, such as avoiding evil intentions and violent emotions, acting with moderation, and bearing injuries with equanimity (1652: ***4v). As to why someone who already has the Gospels would bother reading the *Meditations* as well, if they merely repeat the same teachings, Gataker says that the great value of the *Meditations* is that they show how one might put these ideas into practice in the context of everyday life.

For Gataker, then, the philosophy of Marcus Aurelius largely agrees with the Gospels and offers a valuable model of how to put those ideas into practice. His substantial commentary on the text continues this line of interpretation by noting numerous parallels with Biblical passages, all listed in a lengthy index ‘*locorum Scripturae Sacrae*’ at the end of the volume. However, it is also worth stressing that the bulk of the commentary is spent fleshing out the Stoic ideas in the *Meditations*, adducing relevant passages from a wide range of ancient sources. Indeed, it has been suggested that there is little in von Arnim’s *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* that is not already in Gataker.³² Both Gataker and Casaubon shared the common goals of showing that i) the *Meditations* is a work of Stoic philosophy, ii) its contents are broadly in line with the teaching of the Gospels, and iii) despite being the work of a pagan, its highly practical advice can benefit Christian readers.

The Cambridge Platonists

The publication of these new editions by Casaubon and Gataker, along with Casaubon’s translation into English, all within a relatively short period of time, made the *Meditations* available to readers in a way that it had not been before.³³ It was really only in the second half of the seventeenth century, in the wake of their efforts, that the *Meditations* started to attract wider attention. One such reader was Henry More (1614-1687), one of a number of philosopher-theologians active in Cambridge in the seventeenth century and often

³² So Krayer 2000: 117.

³³ As noted above, Casaubon had remarked on the rarity of the book when preparing his translation.

collectively referred to as the Cambridge Platonists. More's handbook of ethics, the *Enchiridion Ethicum*, drew extensively on the *Meditations* alongside a wide range of other ancient philosophical texts.³⁴ It is clear that More made use of Gataker's edition that had been published in Cambridge just a decade or so earlier.

Although More was no great admirer of what he called 'sullen and inconsiderate Stoicism',³⁵ he evidently had an affection for Marcus Aurelius whom he mentions or quotes some forty times in the *Enchiridion Ethicum*.³⁶ He often cited Marcus for the claim that one ought to act in accord with reason which, for a rational animal, is equivalent to acting in accord with (one's) nature. This, More notes, can also be identified with acting in accord with virtue, and he aligns these ideas in Marcus with similar ones in Aristotle.³⁷ More admired Marcus, then, as one of a number of ancient authorities that agreed with the view he wanted to defend. However, he was not beyond taking liberties with Marcus' text. At one point More quotes from *Meditations* 10.25 – 'the power that directs the universe, which is law, the law that assigns our due to each of us' – adding in his own reference to God: it is now God the law (*theos nomos*) who does these things.³⁸ Elsewhere he takes similar liberties with the text, making Marcus more theological and less Stoic in order to bring him into line with More's own views. When he quotes from *Meditations* 10.8, for instance, he silently amends Marcus' 'gods' to 'God'.³⁹ Despite this, More clearly admired Marcus as a writer and praised the quality and clarity of his ethical exhortations.⁴⁰ Marcus functions for More as one among a number of ancient authorities that can be cited to show that all philosophers agree on certain points. Thus he is quoted alongside Pythagoras and Plato on the virtues, Cicero on natural law, Plato on the nature of the soul, and Aristotle on the importance of virtue for a good life.

More's fellow Cambridge Platonist, Ralph Cudworth (1617-1688), was also reading the *Meditations*. Cudworth had a deeply ambivalent attitude towards Stoicism, conscious that it was possible to find statements and phrases among the works of the Roman Stoics that accorded with his own theological beliefs, while remaining suspicious that, ultimately, Stoicism was a form of materialism.⁴¹ His *magnum opus*, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*, published posthumously in 1678, contained an extended discussion of Stoic views about God.⁴² Cudworth was one of the first to see that

³⁴ First published in More 1668 and translated into English under the title *An Account of Virtue* in More 1690.

³⁵ See More 1739: 25.

³⁶ For a complete list and a fuller discussion see Sellars 2017.

³⁷ See *Enchiridion Ethicum* 1.2.4 (More 1668: 4-5).

³⁸ See *Enchiridion Ethicum* 2.1.7 (More 1668: 82), with further discussion in Sellars 2017: 922.

³⁹ See *Enchiridion Ethicum* 2.5.8 (More 1668: 104).

⁴⁰ See e.g. *Enchiridion Ethicum* 2.8.16 (More 1668: 123).

⁴¹ On Cudworth and Stoic theology, see further Sellars 2011.

⁴² See Cudworth 1678, which is, despite its length, in fact only the first part out of a projected three parts.

the Stoics were committed to the claim that only bodies exist and so even the human soul was, on their account, something corporeal (1678: 419). Even so, they were not strictly speaking atheists: they believed in a God and gave arguments for its existence. The world, according to the Stoics is, as Cudworth put it, ‘an Animal enformed and enlivened by an Intellectual Soul’ (1678: 423). This intellectual soul animating nature was, for the Stoics, the one, universal deity, yet at the same time they often made reference to a plurality of gods. It is within this context that Cudworth drew on the *Meditations*, citing numerous passages that refer to gods in plural (1678: 426). But Cudworth also turned to other passages by Marcus that demonstrate his commitment to the idea that there is just one rational, governing principle in Nature (1678: 427), concluding that ‘this Jupiter or Universal Numen of the World, was honoured by these Stoicks far above all other Particular Gods’ (1678: 428). Cudworth also appears to have admired Marcus’ reminders to act with reference to God and to rely on the ‘Governour of the Whole World’ (*Med.* 6.10),⁴³ commenting that he ‘excellently exhorteth men’ (1678: 431).

Cudworth was an accomplished scholar of ancient philosophy. In his account of Stoic theology he drew on Epictetus alongside Marcus Aurelius, as well as doxographical material in Cicero and Plutarch. His account – seemingly defending the theological credentials of the Stoics – culminated by quoting in full Cleanthes’ *Hymn to Zeus* (1678: 432-4). The important point in the present context is that Cudworth read and made use of the *Meditations* not merely as a collection of generic wise sayings – as More had done – but instead as an authoritative source of information for Stoic theology. This was a good example of the *Meditations* being taken seriously as a repository of Stoic doctrine.

Shaftesbury

Marcus found a more attentive and sympathetic admirer in Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713). Central to Shaftesbury’s philosophy was the idea that humans have an innate moral sense, a social instinct that generates a natural affinity for others. There is thus no need for divine revelation, promise of future reward, or threat of future punishment in order for people to act morally. Furthermore, Shaftesbury argued, to act out of hope or fear is ultimately to act in self-interest rather than to do so from a genuine moral sense.⁴⁴ Famously, Alexander Pope is reported to have said that as a consequence of this view Shaftesbury’s work ‘had done more harm to Revealed Religion in England than all the works of Infidelity put together’.⁴⁵ It was within this context that Shaftesbury became a devoted admirer of the *Meditations*. He owned copies of the Greek

⁴³ Cudworth cites this passage as *Med.* 6.8, as per Casaubon 1643. He evidently did not use Gataker’s edition.

⁴⁴ See his *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue, or Merit* 1.3.3 (first published 1699, repr. in his *Charactisticks*, 1711; I have used the 4th edition of 1727), in Shaftesbury 1727 II: 57-8.

⁴⁵ Warburton 1809: 36 (Letter XVII, 30th January, 1749-50).

text and Casaubon's translation, annotating them both; he also studied the editions by Casaubon and Gataker closely.⁴⁶ Like Casaubon, Shaftesbury saw it as a work promoting an ethical way of life grounded on natural reason, independent of (though compatible with) Christian belief.

One of the key concepts in Shaftesbury's philosophy was *sensus communis*, not 'common sense' understood as having good sense, but an instinct to natural sociability. In his book entitled *Sensus Communis* Shaftesbury defined it as 'Love of the Community or Society, natural Affection, Humanity, Obligingness, or that sort of Civility which rises from a just Sense of the common Rights of Mankind, and the natural Equality there is among those of the same Species'.⁴⁷ He set this out while commenting on a passage in Juvenal that used the phrase *sensus communis*, noting further examples from Horace and Seneca.⁴⁸ In an extended note he argued that this phrase ought to be understood as this social instinct and not as mere good sense. In support of this view he cited Isaac Casaubon, Claudius Salmasius, Meric Casaubon, and Thomas Gataker – the first two from their commentaries on the life of Marcus Aurelius in the *Scriptores Historia Augusta* and the second two from their notes on the *Meditations*.⁴⁹ Shaftesbury noted that both Meric Casaubon and Gataker connected Juvenal's use of *sensus communis* with Marcus' use of *koinonoēmosunē* in *Mediations* 1.16.⁵⁰ Marcus is the only ancient author to use this term and so it was suggested that this might have been his attempt to render *sensus communis* into Greek when writing the *Meditations*.⁵¹ What is noteworthy in the present context is that Marcus Aurelius and his commentators were key points of reference in Shaftesbury's formulation of a central concept in his own philosophy.

In general, explicit mentions of Marcus Aurelius are few and far between in Shaftesbury's published works. In his *Soliloquy, or Advice to an Author* he describes Marcus at one point as 'one of the wisest, and most serious of antient Authors; whose single Authority wou'd be acknowledg'd to have equal force with that of many concurring Writers'.⁵² That Marcus was a key point of reference for Shaftesbury only really becomes clear when one ventures beyond his published works and examines his notebooks. In two notebooks, filled over a number of years (1698-1712), Shaftesbury gathered a wide range of material from Marcus Aurelius, Epictetus, and other ancient sources directed towards living a broadly Stoic life. He gave these notebooks the title

⁴⁶ See further Collis 2016, who, 265, notes that Shaftesbury owned a total of six copies of the *Meditations*.

⁴⁷ See *Sensus Communis: An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour* 3.1 (first printed 1709), in Shaftesbury 1727 I: 104.

⁴⁸ See Juv. 8.73; Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.66; Sen. *Ep.* 105.4.

⁴⁹ See Shaftesbury 1727 I: 103-5.

⁵⁰ See Casaubon 1643: 'Notae' 19-20 and Gataker 1652: 'Annotationes' 31-2.

⁵¹ See Farquharson 1944 II: 467 for the same view. Note also Hadot and Luna 1998: 34 n. 7; Gill 2013: 75-6.

⁵² *Soliloquy, or Advice to an Author* 2.2 (first printed 1710), in Shaftesbury 1727 I: 252.

Askēmata (Exercises).⁵³ Firmly in the spirit of the *Meditations* and, like Marcus, guided by the exhortations of Epictetus, these notebooks contain Shaftesbury's own 'spiritual exercises' – his attempts to digest key Stoic ideas in order to transform his own way of life.⁵⁴ These remained deliberately unpublished and in his *Soliloquy* Shaftesbury commented that it would be 'very indecent for any one to publish his *Meditations*, *Occasional Reflections*, *Solitary Thoughts*, or other such Exercises' produced for the sake of self-cultivation.⁵⁵ Shaftesbury would have been well aware that Marcus' *Meditations* had not been intended for wider circulation, or at least he would have read Casaubon's comment that 'what Antoninus wrote, he wrote it not for the publick, but for his owne private use'.⁵⁶

For Shaftesbury, who was perhaps above all else a disciple of Socrates, it was this kind of self-cultivation based on self-knowledge, acquired through the practice of writing, that constituted the 'proper Object of Philosophy'.⁵⁷ In the *Askēmata* notebooks he commented to himself that he had little interest in the sort of philosophy that tried to explain knowledge, ideas, words, and sounds; instead he wanted to devote himself to philosophy that grappled with problems such as how does one live in accord with one's idea of a good life and how does one avoid mental disturbances (2011: 282-4). The issues that mattered most to him were 'how to free my Self from the contradictory Pursuits & opposite Passions which make me inconsistent with my Self & own Resolutions [...] how to calm my Anger; how to quell Resentment & Reveng' (2011: 286). Much of the notebooks contain reflections very much in the spirit of the *Meditations* and in some instances what one might call imitations. Consider, for instance, the following passage that Shaftesbury wrote immediately under a quotation from *Meditations* 4.48:

Consider the several Ages of Mankind; the Revolutions of the World; the Rise, Declension, & Extinction of Nations, one after another; after what manner the Earth is peopled; sometimes in one part, & then in another; first, desert; then cultivated; & then desert again. [F]rom Woods, & Wilderness; to Cityes & Culture: and from Cityes, & Culture; again into Woods. [O]ne while Barbarouse; then Civiliz'd; and then Barbarouse again. [A]fter Darkness, & Ignorance; Arts & Sciences: and then again Darkness & Ignorance as before. Now, therefore,

⁵³ The notebooks are in The National Archives at Kew, London (PRO 30/24/27/10). They were first published, without much attention to their original form, in Shaftesbury 1900 and are now available in a meticulous critical edition in Shaftesbury 2011.

⁵⁴ See further Sellars 2016.

⁵⁵ *Soliloquy* 1.1, in Shaftesbury 1727 I: 164.

⁵⁶ Casaubon 1634: 24. Shaftesbury owned a copy of Casaubon's translation, which he annotated extensively; see further Collis 2016: 281-8.

⁵⁷ *Soliloquy* 3.1, in Shaftesbury 1727 I: 285. On Shaftesbury's admiration for Socrates, note his *Chartae Socraticae*, an unfinished project that survives in a notebook, edited in Shaftesbury 2008. See further Sellars 2016: 405.

remember this: Whenever thou art intent & earnest on any action that seems highly important to the World; whenever it seems that great things are in hand; remember to call this to mind: that allis but of a Moment: all must again decline. (2011: 145)

Like Marcus, Shaftesbury combined this sort of reflection on the transience and vanity of human affairs with an emphatic commitment to act for the common good out of a *sensus communis*:

What remains, then, but that the thing yet is Just, Sociable, & in appearance tending to ye Good of Mankind; that, & that alone thou should'st intend, & that perform as far as lyes in thee, without regard to what was in time past, or to what shall be in time to come, or to what is now present in this Age. (2011: 147)

As he put it elsewhere, ‘The End & Design of Nature in Man is Society’ (2011: 127), a sentiment often expressed by Marcus Aurelius.⁵⁸ In both form and content, then, Shaftesbury’s *Askēmata* notebooks are his own *Meditations*, inspired and informed by his close study of Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus. They were written for the most part during extended periods of retreat, away from the pressures of his role as a member of Parliament. Like Marcus, Shaftesbury seems to have by instinct desired a quiet life of study and reflection, but a sense of duty to fulfil the roles he found himself him meant that he never fully achieved it. One can image that Shaftesbury felt a strong sense of affinity with the philosopher-emperor.

Hutcheson

Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746) – originally from Ireland but who would go on to become a key figure in the Scottish Enlightenment – was a diligent reader of both More and Shaftesbury, so it is perhaps unsurprising that he too came to admire the *Meditations*. His early work, such as *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, published in 1725, was heavily influenced by Shaftesbury in particular.⁵⁹ There he pitted himself and Shaftesbury against Hobbes and Shaftesbury’s recent critic Mandeville. The key issue in question was whether humans are by nature benevolent or selfish. Hutcheson was keen to challenge the Hobbesian image of the state of nature, arguing that, on the contrary, people have a natural moral sense. Following Shaftesbury, he insisted that people have an inherent social instinct and automatically come to live together, not out

⁵⁸ See e.g. *Med.* 4.24, 5.16, 7.55, 9.1, 9.42.

⁵⁹ See the recent edition in Hutcheson 2008.

of any underlying motivation of self-interest or mutual benefit. We can and do want the best for others even when there is no advantage for ourselves, Hutcheson argued.

This theme was developed further in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Glasgow in 1730, entitled *On the Natural Sociability of Mankind*.⁶⁰ Here his interest in Stoicism also starts to come into view, such as when he comments that it was ‘the best of the ancients’ who identified a life of virtue with living in accordance with nature (1730: 3; 2006: 193-4). As before, Hutcheson’s principal target was the Epicurean Hobbes, who posited that the state of nature is barbarous, people are only motivated by self-interested pleasure, and society only exists due to an ultimately self-interested social contract. By contrast, Hutcheson, following the Stoic Shaftesbury, argued that by nature people are ‘social and kindly’ with a ‘natural conscience’, and this conscience or moral sense can be identified with what Hutcheson calls our *hēgemonikon*, using a key term from the *Meditations* (1730: 8; 2006: 199; cf. 2007: 49).⁶¹

It is not clear whether Hutcheson was directly influenced by Marcus Aurelius in these early works. Yet his debts to Shaftesbury are explicit and we have already noted Shaftesbury’s close reading of the *Meditations*. It may be that Hutcheson already knew the *Meditations* early on, that he was introduced to Marcus Aurelius via Shaftesbury, or that he stumbled across Marcus himself later having already formed his own views, simply recognizing a kindred spirit. Either way, he felt a deep enough connection with the work to decide to translate the *Meditations* afresh himself. At this time, there were only two translations into English: Meric Casaubon’s and a more recent one by Jeremy Collier, first printed in 1701 (and reprinted in 1708, 1726). Hutcheson found Casaubon’s version somewhat antiquated by this point and felt that Collier’s failed to grasp Marcus’ unique style.⁶² He collaborated on the project with James Moor, Professor of Greek in Glasgow, although Hutcheson did the bulk of the work.⁶³ They based their translation on Gataker’s text, translating part of his introduction as well, reflecting their sympathy towards his interpretative agenda. For Hutcheson, Marcus was certainly a thinker whose ideas were compatible with Christian thought. Indeed, in some respects Marcus was a better Christian than many Christians. Hutcheson’s approach to this issue was shaped by his commitment to Shaftesbury’s idea that people have an inherent moral sense. This meant that there was no reason in principle why someone without knowledge of divine

⁶⁰ See Hutcheson 1730 for the original Latin text; it is translated in Hutcheson 2006.

⁶¹ On the concept of *hēgemonikon* in Marcus, see Willms in this volume.

⁶² See Hutcheson and Moor 2008: 3-4. Of Collier’s version, Hutcheson wrote that it lacked the ‘grand simplicity of the original’. Later, Alice Zimmern, in an introductory essay to a reprint, defended it as having ‘a charm all its own’ and ‘far more spirit than the original’ (1887: xxvi). Those claims are, of course, not incompatible. However, most other translators (e.g. Thomson 1747, Graves 1792, Long 1862, Haines 1916) have been highly critical of Collier’s effort; see further Haines 1916: xvii.

⁶³ Moor probably translated just two books, 9 and 10, while Hutcheson did the rest. Moore and Silverthorne make the case for this view in their Introduction to Hutcheson and Moor 2008: x-xi.

relation could not be an ethical role model. It was in particular the idea of natural sociability that made the *Meditations* so attractive to Hutcheson. This he contrasted with Christian ideas in both the Protestant (i.e. Calvinist) and Catholic (i.e. Augustinian) traditions that claimed that humans are by nature sinful.

Unlike Henry More, who admired Marcus' moral sentiments but paid little attention to his Stoic commitments, Hutcheson was highly sensitive to the fact that Marcus often used technical Stoic vocabulary.⁶⁴ In his notes to the translation he often makes connections between remarks by Marcus and wider Stoic doctrine. For example, when Marcus uses the term 'reservation' (*hupexairesis*) in *Meditations* 4.1, Hutcheson comments that this is an important term in Stoicism, often used by Epictetus. When Marcus refers to 'periods of dissolution and renovation' in 5.13, Hutcheson outlines the Stoic theory of conflagration. Mention of things of no importance in 5.36 prompts a note outlining the Stoic theory of 'indifferents' (*adiaphora*). When at 11.38 (now taken to be a quotation from Epictetus) Marcus mentions madness, Hutcheson connects this with the famous Stoic paradox that anyone who is not a sage is mad (*Cic. Parad.* 4).

Hutcheson and Moor's new translation was published anonymously in 1742. In the same year, Hutcheson also published his *Philosophiae Moralis Institutio Compendiaria*, intended as a student textbook and translated into English in 1747.⁶⁵ This has been described as a neo-Stoic work, based on 'belief in the benevolence of God, the harmony of the universe, and men's sociable dispositions' – all central themes in the *Meditations*.⁶⁶ It is prefaced by seven epigraphs, two of which come from the *Meditations* and three from Epictetus.⁶⁷ Hutcheson also made clear his debts to Cicero when composing the work, whom he read as a spokesman for Stoicism.⁶⁸ This can be seen throughout the opening chapters of the work, where Hutcheson sets out core Stoic ideas such as the origin of value and different types of emotions.⁶⁹ At one point, stressing our natural social bonds with other people, Hutcheson comments that 'benevolent affections still spread further [beyond the family], among acquaintance and neighbours [...] nay they diffuse themselves even to all our Countrymen [...] and in men of reflection there's a more extensive good-will embracing all mankind' (2007: 81). Although here, Hutcheson was probably drawing on Cicero, the important point to note is that his translation of the

⁶⁴ See Moore and Silverthorne's Introduction, in Hutcheson and Moor 2008: xiii.

⁶⁵ See Hutcheson 2007, which prints the Latin text and the English translation on facing pages. The translation is anonymous and unauthorized: Hutcheson did not want the text translated into English because he expected his students to be proficient in Latin.

⁶⁶ Hutcheson 2007: ix.

⁶⁷ See Hutcheson 2007: 6, quoting *Med.* 6.7 and 7.39. The remaining two texts come from Pythagoras and Plato.

⁶⁸ See Hutcheson 2007: 3-4 where he says that his principal ancient sources were Cicero and Aristotle, and among Cicero's works he drew on *De officiis*, *De finibus*, and the *Tusculanae disputationes*, noting that Cicero acknowledged that 'he follows the Soicks, and uses their way of treating this subject'.

⁶⁹ See e.g. Hutcheson 2007: 26 and 30.

Meditations was undertaken at the same time as he was developing a consciously Stoic account of moral philosophy.

The *Meditations* remained a popular text in Scotland after Hutcheson's death.⁷⁰ His translation was reprinted a number of times (1749, 1752, 1764) and followers of his philosophy could see the important influence that Marcus Aurelius had been on his work. One such admirer was Adam Smith (1723-1790) who wrote at length about Stoicism in his *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*.⁷¹ At one point in that work, Smith commented that Marcus' commitment to the idea of divine benevolence, running throughout the *Meditations*, had 'contributed more, perhaps, to the general admiration of his character, than all the different transactions of his just, merciful, and beneficent reign' (1790 II: 118). Indeed, Smith did admire Marcus' character, describing him as 'the mild, the humane, the benevolent Antoninus' in contrast to the 'often harsh' Epictetus (1790 II: 251).

Buddeus

Marcus found other readers in the eighteenth century equally admiring of his ethical outlook. However, they were increasingly aware that, no matter how close Stoic ethics might come to Christian teaching on some points, there was nevertheless a profound distance when it came to the underpinning theoretical worldview. One among these was Joannes Franciscus Buddeus (1667-1729), Professor of Theology at Jena. Buddeus wrote an extended introduction to Stoic philosophy based on the *Meditations* – *Introductio ad Philosophiam Stoicam ex Mente Sententiaque M. Aurelii Antonini Imp.* – which was published alongside Marcus' text in 1729.⁷² Buddeus noted that Marcus was largely absent from Justus Lipsius' important works on Stoicism and so his own account of Stoic philosophy based on the *Meditations* was intended to rectify that neglect.⁷³

Unlike Gataker and other earlier admirers of the *Meditations*, Buddeus was all too aware of what he took to be the errors of the Stoics. In the intervening period, with more attention having been paid to reconstructing the views of the early Stoa, the materialism and pantheism of Stoicism were increasingly apparent.⁷⁴ The arrival of the pantheist

⁷⁰ On the influence of Stoicism in general on the Scottish Enlightenment, see Stewart 1991 and Maurer 2016.

⁷¹ There is no mention of Marcus in the early editions of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (first published in 1759) but he is mentioned multiple times in the expanded sixth edition published at the end of Smith's life, in 1790.

⁷² The edition, based on an Oxford edition of 1704 which was in turn based on Gataker's, was edited by Christoph Wolle. I cite Buddeus' introduction (which is printed after the *Meditations*) by its separate pagination.

⁷³ See Buddeus 1729: 4-5, with Krayer 2000: 120.

⁷⁴ A key point of reference here was Jakob Thomasius, on whose work Buddeus drew; see e.g. Buddeus 1729: 34-5 citing Thomasius 1676: 178.

philosophy of Benedict de Spinoza had made this a topical and controversial subject. Buddeus himself had commented on this elsewhere: in a short work called *De Spinozismo ante Spinozam*, Buddeus argued that the Stoics were, in effect, the Spinozists of antiquity.⁷⁵ Given that Spinoza's pantheism was widely held to be merely a form of atheism, similarities between Stoicism and Spinozism had important implications for the reception of Stoicism. Despite all this, Buddeus still found much of value in the *Meditations*, so long as it was separated from what he held to be the more problematic parts of Stoic philosophy.

Buddeus' approach to the *Meditations* stands at an interesting point in the early modern reception of Stoicism. On the one hand, Marcus Aurelius was now firmly seen as an exponent of Stoicism and not merely an author of generic moral maxims. On the other hand, developments in the study of early Stoic doxography made that commitment to Stoicism increasingly problematic for what remained a predominantly Christian audience. References to a single personalist deity in not just the *Meditations* but also the works of Epictetus and Seneca that had made these works attractive to previous readers were now taken less literally when placed against the background of Stoic metaphysics. Marcus' own statements about God were, on their own terms, less problematic, and this might perhaps explain Buddeus' decision to try to write an introduction to Stoic philosophy based around the *Meditations* as the key point of reference.

Brucker

By the mid-eighteenth century not only was the *Meditations* becoming a popular and widely-read book, translated into all the major European vernaculars,⁷⁶ it had also found an established place in the history of Stoicism. Its canonization, so to speak, can be seen in the extended discussion it received in Johann Jakob Brucker's monumental *Historia critica philosophiae*, first published in five volumes in the 1740s.⁷⁷ This vast history of philosophy – probably still the longest written by a single individual – devoted twenty pages to Marcus as a significant figure in the history of Roman Stoicism (1766-67 II: 578-98); this was more space than either Seneca or Epictetus were allotted. During the course of his discussion, Brucker insisted that the *Meditations* should not be read as 'detached

⁷⁵ See Buddeus 1706a: 22, reprinted in idem 1706b: 340. Note also his 'De erroribus stoicorum', in Buddeus 1706b: 87-203. See further Piaia and Santinello 2011: 343-73; Brooke 2012: 139-48.

⁷⁶ In English we have already noted Casaubon (1634), Collier (1701), and Hutcheson and Moor (1742). To these we can add Thomson (1747). In French there was Du Prat (1570), anon. (1651), the Daciers (1690-91), de Joly (1742); in Italian, Dragondelli (1667); in German, Stolten (1705, selections), Hoffmann (1723). Many of these were reprinted multiple times. For full details of these translations see Wickham Legg 1910.

⁷⁷ It was first published in 1742-44. I have consulted the second edition (in 6 vols) of 1766-67. An abridged translation into English was published in 1791 (I have consulted the second edition, Enfield 1819). On Brucker and Marcus see also Krayer 2012: 527-8.

moral maxims, or reflections, but as connected with, and founded upon, the principles of Stoicism'.⁷⁸ As it happened, Brucker was, following Buddeus, not especially sympathetic towards Stoicism, but even so, he both echoed and reinforced the view that the *Meditations* were a serious work of Stoic philosophy.

Epilogue

The early nineteenth century was a period of relative neglect for Hellenistic and Roman philosophy; attention shifted away from Latin sources such as Cicero and back to the Greek philosophy of Plato and Aristotle.⁷⁹ Yet Marcus continued to attract a wide general readership. In Victorian Britain, the *Meditations* became a bestseller, especially in the translation of George Long, which was reprinted multiple times.⁸⁰ Writing in the wake of Long's new version, Matthew Arnold praised Marcus as 'perhaps the most beautiful figure in history' and he called the *Meditations* a 'masterpiece on morals' (1865: 278-9). In a similar spirit, John Stuart Mill described the *Meditations* as 'the highest ethical product of the ancient mind' (1859: 49). This sort of praise has been called part of the 'sanctification' of Marcus Aurelius, whereby he was transformed in the minds of readers into a sage-like figure.⁸¹ But, as the *Meditations* reveal so clearly, Marcus was in fact all too human, painfully honest to himself about his own weaknesses and those areas of his own character that might benefit from improvement. That is perhaps one of the reasons why the *Meditations* have attracted so many readers since they were first printed.

References

- Adler, A. 1928–38. *Suidae Lexicon*. 5 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Behlman, L. 2011. 'The Victorian Marcus Aurelius: Mill, Arnold, and the Appeal of the Quasi-Christian', *Journal of Victorian Culture* 16: 1–24.
- Brooke, C. 2012. *Philosophic Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brucker, J. 1766–67. *Historia Critica Philosophiae*. Editio Secunda. 6 vols. Leipzig: Impensis Haered. Weidemannii et Reichii.
- Buddeus, J. F. 1706a. *Dissertatio Philosophica de Spinozismo ante Spinozam*. Halae Magdeburgicae: Typis Chr. Henckelii.

⁷⁸ See Brucker 1766-7 II: 597; I quote from the paraphrase in Enfield 1819 II: 126.

⁷⁹ See Ierodiakonou 1999: 4-15.

⁸⁰ Long's translation was first published in 1862 and reprinted over twenty times by 1905 (see Wickham Legg 1910: 66-78). On the reception of Marcus Aurelius in the nineteenth century see Behlman 2011, Sellars 2012b, and note also Ellis 2016.

⁸¹ See Richlin 2012.

- Buddeus, J. F. 1706b. *Analecta Historiae Philosophicae*. Halae Saxonum: Sumptibus Orphanotrophii.
- Buddeus, J. F. 1729. *Introductio ad Philosophiam Stoicam ex Mente Sententiaque M. Aurelii Antonimi Imp.*, published with *Marci Antonini Imperatoris ac Philosophy Libri XII eorum quae de seipso as seipsum*. Leipzig: Samuel Benjamin Walther.
- Casaubon, I. 1603. *Historiae Augustae Scriptores Sex*. Paris: Ambrosius & Hieronymus Drovart.
- Casaubon, I. 1605. *Auli Persi Flacci Satirarum Liber*. Paris: Ambrosius & Hieronymus Drovart.
- Casaubon, M. 1634. *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus The Roman Emperor, His Meditations Concerning Himselfe*. London: Richard Mynne.
- Casaubon, M. 1643. *Marci Antonini Imperatoris De Seipso et Ad Seipsum Libri XII*. London: R. Mynne.
- Ceporina, M. 2012. 'The *Meditations*', in M. van Ackeren (ed.), *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 45–61.
- Collier, J. 1708. *The Emperor Marcus Antoninus, his Conversation With Himself*. Second Edition. London: Richard Sare.
- Collis, K. 2016. 'How Shaftesbury Read Marcus Aurelius: Two 'Curious and Interesting' Volumes with his Manuscript Annotations', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 79: 263–93.
- Cortassa, G. 1997. 'La missione del bibliofilo: Areta e la 'riscoperta' dell' "A se stesso" di Marco Aurelio', *Orpheus: Rivista di umanità Classica e Cristiana* 18: 112–40.
- Cudworth, R. 1678. *The True Intellectual System of the Universe: The First Part wherein all the Reason and Philosophy of Atheism is Confuted and its Impossibility Demonstrated*. London: Richard Royston.
- Dandele, T. 2016. 'Imagining Marcus Aurelius in the Renaissance: Forgery, Fiction, and History in the Creation of the Imperial Ideal', in A. Blair and A.-S. Goeing, eds, *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in Honor of Anthony Grafton* (Leiden: Brill), 729–43.
- Ellis, H. 2016. 'Stoicism in Victorian Culture', in J. Sellars, (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook to The Stoic Tradition*. Abingdon: Routledge, 319–30.
- Enfield, W. 1819. *The History of Philosophy, From the Earliest Times to the Beginnings of the Present Century, Drawn up from Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiae*. 2 vols. London: William Baynes and R. Priestley.
- Farquharson, A. S. L. 1944. *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fleury, P. 2014. 'Marc Aurèle épistolier: comment faire écrire un empereur romain de l'Antiquité au XVIe siècle?', *Anabases* 19: 133–53.
- Fryde, E. 2000. *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261 – c. 1360)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gataker, T. 1652. *Marci Antonini Imperatoris de rebus suis, sive de eis quae ad se pertinere censebat, Libri XII*. Cambridge: Thomas Buck.

- Gill, C. 2013. *Marcus Aurelius, Meditations Books 1–6*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graves, R. 1792. *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*. London: G. G. J. and J. Robinson.
- Guevara, A. de. 1534. *Marco aurelio con el relox de principes*. Seville: Juan Cromberger.
- Guevara, A. de. 1535. *The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius Emperour and Eloquent Oratour*, trans. John Bouchier. London: Thomas Bertheletus.
- Guevara, A. de. 1557. *The Diall of Princes*, trans. Thomas North. London: John Waylande.
- Hadot, P., and Luna, C. 1998. *Marc Aurèle: Écrits pour lui-même, Tome I*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Haines, C. R. 1916. *The Communings with Himself of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*. London: William Heinemann.
- Hutcheson, F. 1730. *De Naturali Hominum Socialitate Oratio Inauguralis*. Glasgow: Typis Academicis.
- Hutcheson, F. 2006. *Logic, Metaphysics, and the Natural Sociability of Mankind*, ed. J. Moore and M. Silverthorne. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Hutcheson, F. 2007. *Philosophiae Moralis Institutio Compendiaria with A Short Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, ed. L. Turco. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Hutcheson, F. 2008. *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue in Two Treatises*, ed. W. Leidhold. Revised Edition. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Hutcheson, F., and Moor, J. 2008. *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, ed. J. Moore and M. Silverthorne. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Ierodiakonou, K. 1999. 'Introduction. The Study of Stoicism: Its Decline and Revival', in K. Ierodiakonou (ed.), *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1–22.
- Kraye, J. 2000. "'Ethnicorum omnium sanctissimus': Marcus Aurelius and his *Meditations* from Xylander to Diderot', in J. Kraye and M. W. F. Stone (eds.), *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 107–34.
- Kraye, J. 2012. 'Marcus Aurelius and Neostoicism in Early Modern Philosophy', in M. van Ackeren (ed.), *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 515–31.
- Lino, P., and Canedo, G. 1946. 'Las obras de Fray Antonio de Guevara', *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 6: 441–603.
- Lipsius, J. 1675. *Opera Omnia*. 4 vols. Wesel: Andreas ab Hoogenhuysen et Societas.
- Long, G. 1862. *The Thoughts of the Emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus*. London: Bell and Daldy.
- Maurer, C. 2016. 'Stoicism and the Scottish Enlightenment', in J. Sellars, (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook to The Stoic Tradition*. Abingdon: Routledge, 254–69.
- Mezzatesta, M.P. 1984. 'Marcus Aurelius, Fray Antonio de Guevara, and the Ideal of the Perfect Prince in the Sixteenth Century', *The Art Bulletin* 66: 620–33.
- More, H. 1668. *Enchiridion Ethicum*. London: J. Flesher.

- More, H. 1690. *An Account of Virtue*. London: B. Tooke.
- More, H. 1739. *Enthusiasm Explained*. London: T. Gardner.
- Piaia, G., and Santinello, G. 2011. *Models of the History of Philosophy II: From the Cartesian Age to Brucker*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rabe, H. 1906. *Scholia in Lucianum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Rees, D. A. 2000. 'Joseph Bryennius and the Text of Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations*', *Classical Quarterly* 50: 584–96.
- Richlin, A. 2012. 'The Sanctification of Marcus Aurelius', in M. van Ackeren (ed.), *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 497–514.
- Rutherford, R. B. 1989. *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius: A Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sellars, J. 2011. 'Is God a Mindless Vegetable? Cudworth on Stoic Theology', *Intellectual History Review* 21: 121–33.
- Sellars, J. 2012b. 'Marcus Aurelius in Modern Philosophy', in M. van Ackeren (ed.), *A Companion to Marcus Aurelius*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 532–44.
- Sellars, J. 2016. 'Shaftesbury, Stoicism, and Philosophy as a Way of Life', *Sophia* 55: 395–408.
- Sellars, J. 2017. 'Henry More as Reader of Marcus Aurelius', *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 25: 916–31.
- Shaftesbury, A. Ashley Cooper, Earl of. 1727. *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. 4th edn. 3 vols. [London.]
- Shaftesbury, A. Ashley Cooper, Earl of. 1900. *The Life, Unpublished Letters, and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*. London: Sawn Sonnenschein.
- Shaftesbury, A. Ashley Cooper, Earl of. 2008. *Standard Edition: Complete Works, Correspondence and Posthumous Writings, II,5 Chartae Socraticae: Design of a Socratic History*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Shaftesbury, A. Ashley Cooper, Earl of. 2011. *Standard Edition: Complete Works, Correspondence and Posthumous Writings, II,6 Askêmata*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Smith, A. 1790. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. The Sixth Edition, with Considerable Additions and Corrections. 2 vols. London: A. Strahan, etc.
- Stewart, M. A. 1991. 'The Stoic Legacy in the Early Scottish Enlightenment', in M. J. Osler, (ed.), *Atoms, Pneuma, and Tranquillity: Epicurean and Stoic Themes in European Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 273–96.
- Thomasius, J. 1676. *Exercitatio de Stoica Mundi Exustione*. Leipzig: Friedrich Lankisch.
- Thomson, J. 1747. *The Commentaries of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, containing his Maxims of Science and Rules of Life, wrote for his own Use and addressed to Himself*. London: T. Parker.

- Vesperini, P., and Ceporina, M. 2015. 'Quinze citations de Marc Aurèle dans Reuchlin', *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 89: 123–50.
- Warburton, W. 1809. *Letters from a Late Prelate to One of his Friends*. Second Edition. London: Cadell and Davies.
- Westerink, L. G. 1968–72. *Arethae Archiepiscopi Caesariensis Scripta Minora*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Wickham Legg, J. 1910. 'A Bibliography of the *Thoughts* of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus', *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 10: 15–81.
- Xylander, G. 1559. *M. Antonini Imperatoris Romani, et Philosophi De seipso seu vita sua Libri XII*. Zurich: Andreas Gesner.
- Zimmern, A. 1887. 'Marcus Aurelius', in *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius, Translated from the Greek by Jeremy Collier, Revised, with an Introduction and Notes, by Alice Zimmern*. London: Walter Scott, vii–xxvii.