The rain and lightning miracles of Marcus Aurelius that occurred during his German-Sarmatian wars between A.D. 171 and 174 inspired the popular imagination even after the end of antiquity. The story of the rain miracle appears in Western Latin sources based mainly on Jerome and Orosius, but also in Byzantine texts. Naturally, the main basis for the survival of the legend was the Christian version of the miracle, but some versions of the pagan tradition were preserved as well. Here I will deal with the late tradition of the rain miracle by medieval authors, a topic not often discussed before.

As noted above, the scene of the rain miracle is depicted relatively rarely in Christian Latin sources. After the two works by Tertullian (Apol. V.25, Ad Scap. 4), the next place it appeared was the Latin translation of Eusebius’ two major works from the end of the 4th century. Rufinus gives the original Greek text in his translation of the Historia Ecclesiastica, albeit with omissions (V.5) and Jerome followed the original Greek in his Chronicon (Chron. 206i Helm), as can be seen compared to the Armenian (and Syriac) translation (222.1 [Karst]). The only modification is that Jerome changed the last sentence, quoting the original passage from Tertullian (Apol. V.25). Another difference between the Latin and the Armenian versions is that the event is dated to A.D. 173 by the former and A.D. 172 by the latter. From the later period, there is only information on the usage of these two translations (i.e., neither of the pagan versions were preserved any longer). The source nearest in time to the miracle, Book 7 of Orosius (Historiarum adversum paganos libri 7.15.8–9), also relies mainly on them. Although the same motifs appear in Orosius, the accounts were strongly reformulated and
coloured by the author.\textsuperscript{5} The only exception is the sentence referring to Marcus’ letter, which is almost literally taken from Jerome. According to R. Klein’s interesting observation, Orosius speaks of rain and other natural miracles when describing important events (Hannibal against Rome: 4.17.5 as a consequence of Theodosius’ personal prayer in the battle near Frigidus: 7.35.12–14).\textsuperscript{6} Orosius mentions the letter twice, which might be explained by the divergence of his sources or that he only had the second letter at hand and treated it with some distrust.\textsuperscript{7} The World Chronicle of Prosper Tiro from the mid-5th century takes the text of Jerome almost verbatim (P. L. 51 [1846] 564). The writer of the Chronica Gallica, did the same at the beginning of the 6th century, with minor changes and simplifications (Chron. Min. I 641, 372), as did Fredegarius Scholasticus in his World Chronicle in the middle of the same century (II.37).\textsuperscript{8} Jordanes records only the victory against the Quadi and does not mention the miracle: Rom. 272: senior vero multis bellis sepe interfuit sepiusque per duces suos triumphum revexit, maxime de gente Quadorum.

Another thread in the later perception of the miracle was added by historiographers, who attributed the victory of the Roman/Byzantine army similarly to a rain miracle. This was done, e.g., by Theophanes the Confessor in his Chronographia when describing the following story in his account of Chosroes’ campaign in 624–625, during the reign of Heraclius:

\textit{τὸ δὲ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν πρεσβειῶν τῆς πανυμνήτου θεοτόκου συνεργάσαντος, καὶ πολέμου κρατηθέντος, χάλαζα παραδόξως κατὰ τῶν βαρβάρων κατεκόμη, καὶ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπάταξεν, ἢ δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων παράταξες γαλήνης ἀπῆλοθεν.}

The motifs of the storm bursting over the enemy (here the Persians), bringing hail(!) and helping the Roman army, and divine intervention (the mediator here is, naturally, Mary) could hardly evoke any other event than the rain miracle. It was well-known from the sources and
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