

often reprinted *Bonae valetudinis conservandae praecepta* (Erfurt, 1524; rev. ed., Nuremberg, 1531).<sup>2</sup>

Our poem does not derive from the *praecepta*, but from one of the companion pieces following the main text, the *Chorus nobilium medicorum in Musaeo Sturtiano Erphurdiae*. This is a series of tetrastichs on the famous (and, occasionally, infamous) physicians whose likenesses adorned the private library of Eobanus' friend and patron, the Erfurt physician Georg Sturz. The editio princeps contains seventeen such epigrams, the revised edition twenty-six. Their subjects range from the mythical (Apollo) and the legendary (Aesculapius, Podalirius, Machaon) to the historical (Hippocrates, Galen, Pliny, Celsus, Avicenna). In the edition of 1524 the Celsus-epigram is in the penultimate position (fol. G2<sup>v</sup>), in the edition of 1531 in the antepenultimate (fol. D5<sup>v</sup>, wrongly printed as C4).

How could this Neo-Latin poem have ended up in Pithoeus' collection of ancient verse? One might conjecture that fairly early on someone had copied the piece out of its original context and without attribution to Eobanus Hessus. A later hunter of antique texts, mistaking the heading "Cornelius Celsus" for the author, passed the epigram on to Pithoeus, who (while no doubt skeptical) could not bring himself to suppress a possibly ancient poem. And so, once included, the piece inevitably found its way into the subsequent versions of the Latin Anthology, where it obviously does not belong.

HARRY VREDEVELD  
The Ohio State University

2. See C. Krause, *Helius Eobanus Hessus: Sein Leben und seine Werke*, 2 vols. (1879; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1963), esp. I: 388–97.

#### FURTHER ON EARLY ENGLISH MANUSCRIPTS OF CASSIODORUS' *EXPOSITIO PSALMORUM*

In 1975, when I sent a copy of my article (*CP* 69 [1974]: 124–25) to Bernhard Bischoff, he wrote back to say that he did not think that the Düsseldorf fragment could have been an original part of Durham B. II. 30. I am pleased to learn that R. N. Bailey and R. Handley (*CP* 78 [1983]: 51–55) have proved Bischoff's contention. They go too far, however, in their conclusion, namely, that there existed *two* copies of the epitome now preserved in the Durham MS. It is beyond the bounds of probability that of this epitome, which had no future,<sup>1</sup> a second copy was made of which the only surviving leaf contains a portion of the text not found in Durham B. II. 30. What they have shown is that it was not a part of the original Durham B. II. 30. The marked differences in format and in the quality of the script that Bailey and Handley observe are clear evidence not of a second copy, but of very early damage at the end of the codex: this should occasion no surprise, in view of the many possibilities for loss at this point in a MS.

1. The only other epitome, Salzburg St. Peter a. VIII. 5, differs in all respects. See J. W. Halporn, "The Manuscripts of Cassiodorus' *Expositio Psalmorum*," *Traditio* 37 (1981): 393.

As they show (citing the discussion of R. A. B. Mynors in his *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* [Oxford, 1939]), when the MS was rebound in the twelfth century, the text of the present folio 265 was copied from the original 265 and 266 recto. The verso of 266 had clearly served as the back cover of the codex and, as a result, it was "probably illegible already from dirt and wear" (Mynors, *op. cit.*, cited by Bailey and Handley, p. 52). It is a much more economical and more likely hypothesis that Durham B. II. 30 early on lost its concluding leaves, which were recopied at a later date than the original writing and attached to the codex. There is also the possibility that when the epitome was made the monastery did not possess the text of the last Psalms of Cassiodorus' commentary, but had obtained a copy of the third volume (see below, n. 7) of the full commentary which had lost its concluding leaves. Later, when this deficiency was made up, the necessary text was added. Naturally, this later addition would also have corrections and annotations that differ from those in the original text.

It is true that there were multiple copies of certain texts made at Wearmouth-Jarrow. We know of two important cases: the Pandect Bibles, of which the Codex Amiatinus survives as a complete codex, and copies of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. But in both of these cases we have direct evidence in the form of surviving duplicate texts (or leaves) and of contemporary testimonia confirming the existence of such copies.<sup>2</sup> Of the *Expositio Psalmorum* of Cassiodorus at Wearmouth-Jarrow, we know that a copy of the unabridged text was there, because Bede cited it in his discussion of the temple and tabernacle of Solomon, citing a passage from the work of Cassiodorus which does not appear in the epitome.<sup>3</sup> There is no reference in Bede to the epitome, no appearance of the epitome in discussions of the later writers, no textual evidence of the existence of a second codex. When there appears a leaf, whole or partial, of this epitome containing a text which overlaps that in Durham B. II. 30, I shall be ready to admit the existence of such a second copy of this version. The editor of the text will, in any case, continue to regard the Düsseldorf fragment as part of the same codex and not multiply entities beyond necessity.

More importantly, since Bailey and Handley were using the flawed edition of the *Expositio Psalmorum* of Adriaen (CCSL 98), they were unable to report correctly the relationship of the English texts with one another or with the other tradition (which I shall call, for the sake of brevity, the Continental). The spelling

2. We know that three copies were made at Wearmouth-Jarrow of a great Bible pandect, one copy of which survives as Florence Amiatinus I, because we are told this by Bede in his *History of the Abbots* 15 (379 Plummer). Leaves of a second copy, duplicating those in the Codex Amiatinus, are found in London BL Add. 37777 + 45025. See E. A. Lowe, *English Uncial* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 8, 19, and plate X; Lowe, *CLA* 2. 177 (p. 17). There were at least five Northumbrian copies of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* by the end of the eighth century, four of which are still extant (although BM Cotton Tiberius A. xiv [CLA Suppl. 1703] is damaged), and the fifth represented by early Carolingian copies. One early copy (the Leningrad Bede, by A.D. 747) is definitely from Wearmouth-Jarrow, and a second (the Moore Bede, in or soon after A.D. 737) may have been copied there, and Lowe suggests that the Cotton MS, too, was written at Wearmouth-Jarrow. See B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, eds., *Bede's "Ecclesiastical History"* (Oxford, 1969), pp. xlii–xlvii.

3. *De tabernaculo* II (CCSL 119A. 81. 1565–82. 1570 Hurst); *De templo* II (CCSL 119A. 192. 28–193. 40 Hurst). There is no question that Cassiodorus' *Psalm Commentary* arrived in England together with other works of his, among the books collected by Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrid for Wearmouth-Jarrow; see J. W. Halporn, "Pandectes, Pandecta, and the Cassiodorian Commentary on the Psalms," *RBen* 90 (1980): 296–300, and the bibliography cited.

variants they offered do not, unfortunately, support their argument, since they are widespread throughout the MS tradition, as shall be seen shortly.<sup>4</sup> In addition, since the Durham MS is an epitome, it is essential to see what passages are missing from it when discussing the variants. I have therefore supplied here a full collation of the principal witnesses for the portion of the text covered by the St. John's fragment and indicated the relations of these texts to the wider tradition. In the following list, the English tradition will be represented by codices **g** and **D**; the Continental tradition by two codices from the area of northern France around Paris (**G**, written at Chelles, and **F**, written at St. Denis), a south German codex from Freising (**H**), a codex from Stavelot (E. Belgium; **e**), a Visigothic codex (provenance, S. Pedro de Cardena; **m**), and a codex from Alsace (**W**); I have also included the readings of the editio princeps, the work of Johann Heynlin, probably from a codex either in his possession or from the Carthusian monastery at Basel (a codex no longer, to my knowledge, extant).

Sigla:

- g** = Cambridge St. John's College AA. 5. 1 (olim H. 6). *CLA* Suppl. 1679. saec. ix  
**D** = Durham Cathedral Library B. II. 30. *CLA* 2. 152. saec. viii  
**F** = Paris BN lat. 15305. *CLA* 5. 665. A.D. 793–806  
**G** = Paris BN lat. 12240. *CLA* 5. 638. saec. viii/ix  
**e** = Brussels Bibl. royale II. 2571. saec. x (ca. 975)  
**m** = Manchester John Rylands 89. saec. x (A.D. 949)  
**H** = Munich Bay. Staatsbibl. clm 6254. saec. ix (1st or 2d quarter)  
**W** = Wolfenbüttel Weissenburg 24. *CLA* 9. 1384. saec. viii/ix  
**a** = editio princeps, Basel: Amerbach, 1491  
< = *omisit*  
+ = *addidit*  
~ = *transposuit*

Omissions in MS **D** in area of text covered by MS **g**<sup>5</sup> (*mirabili ordinatione* [ExpPs. 76. 89]–*obnoxium* [76. 117], and *neque credunt* [76. 137]–*confidebat* [76. 165]):

- 89–90 mirabili . . . dispensans  
91 tam innumerabilia  
92–93 sicut . . . expavi  
100–104 istas usus . . . vacuantur  
105–6 ostendit . . . perquirat  
112–15 ingreditur . . . enim (+ redditur causa *ante* quare)  
136–39 est enim . . . acceperunt  
142–44 cum illa . . . conflagimus  
145 proprie . . . exprimitur

4. If the spelling of the St. John's MS correctly reported the tradition at 76. 97–98 by reading *narationem*, it would be important, since this spelling of *narratio* is recommended by Cassiodorus at *Instit.* 1. 15. 9 (47. 2–4 Mynors).

5. The lineation is taken from Adriaen's edition, *CCSL* 98. pp. 700–702. His text is used as the lemma text, whether it is correct or not.

- 147 et quasi . . . fatigamur  
 154–55 et spiritus . . . exerceatur  
 157 beneficia  
 157–58 qui de caelestis . . . tractabat  
 164–65 nam quamvis . . . confidebat

Variants:

76. 90 dispensans (**GFemW<sup>2</sup>a**) dispensas **gH** <**D**  
 76. 93 etsi (**GFemHWa**) si **g<sup>ac</sup>** (et + *suprascript.* **g<sup>2</sup>**) **D**  
 76. 95 recreari (**FeagD**) recreare **GW** creari **H**  
 76. 97–98 narationem(!) **g** narrationem **Dcett.**  
 76. 100 sollemniter **em**] solemniter **GFHWgD** solenniter **a**  
 76. 100 ussus **g** usus **cett.** <**D**  
 76. 106 animi] animam **g<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 108 aliis] alis **gD**  
 76. 110 solatium (**GFH**) solacium **emagW<sup>2</sup>D** seclacium **W<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 110–11 colloqui **Geg** conloqui **FmHW<sup>2</sup>D** conloqui **W<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 111 quicumque **GFg** (quicunque **ea**) quocumque **m** quaecumque **HWD**  
 76. 114 RT in *mg* **Gg** (RHE in *mg* **a**) <**FemHWD**  
 76. 116 adae (**GFemHDa**) ad te **g** ad hoc **W**  
 76. 140 cum (**g cett.**) in **D**  
 76. 143 soli sumus] solimus **g<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 143 alteratione **g<sup>ac</sup>** <**D**  
 76. 143–44 configimus **g<sup>ac</sup>** <**D**  
 76. 146 retractationes (**g cett.**) retractiones **D**  
 76. 146–47 aestuamus] aestuamur **gD**  
 76. 149 celerrim **D<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 152 apponet (**a**) adponet **GFW<sup>2</sup>gD** adponat **H** adponit **W<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 157 beneficia <**D**  
 76. 157 futura Domini ~ **gD**  
 76. 159 apponet (**egDa**) adponet **GFH** adponat **W**  
 76. 159 ei <**g** ei(?) *post* adhuc in *mg* **D**  
 76. 160 affirmantis **emH<sup>2</sup>a**] adfirmantis **GFH<sup>ac</sup>WgD**  
 76. 160–61 apponet (**e<sup>2</sup>H<sup>2</sup>a**) apponit **GFe<sup>ac</sup>mWgD** adponit **H<sup>ac</sup>**  
 76. 163 mysteria **FHWga**] misteria **GmD**  
 76. 163 ait] dicit **gD**

If we consider the agreements in spelling between **g** and **D**, we find that there are six, only one of which, *alis* at 76. 108, is unique to them. In spelling disagreements, there are two that do not appear in other MSS: *narationem g* at 76. 97–98 and *retractiones D* at 76. 146.

If we consider the agreements in readings, there are four in which they agree against the rest of the MSS: 76. 93 *si* (but **g** agrees with the rest after correction), 76. 146–47 *aestuamur*, 76. 157 inversion of *futura Domini*, 76. 163 *dicit*.<sup>6</sup>

6. At 76. 159, I cannot tell from my microfilm whether the *ei* is omitted by **D** altogether, as Bailey and Handley suggest, or whether it is in the margin. I have, therefore, ignored this reading in my discussion.

The cases where they disagree need to be examined in more detail. 76. 106 *animam* **g** is an obvious error of the scribe, who assumed that an object for *recogitans* would immediately follow, and the error was corrected. A similar obvious error at 76. 143 was also soon corrected. The four remaining disagreements point to a separation in the tradition between the two MSS. There is a possible separative error at 76. 111 *quicumque* **g** *quaecumque* **D**; but such variations so frequently involve the expansion of abbreviations for these pronouns that the disagreement cannot be regarded as a definite proof in the absence of stronger evidence. This disagreement, taken together with the variants at 76. 116 *ad te* **g**, 76. 140 *in* **D**, and the omission of *beneficia* at 76. 157 in **D**, suggests that, whatever the relation may have been between **g** and **D**, the ultimate source of the readings is too far removed from these MSS to assume that they are copies of one and the same MS.<sup>7</sup>

JAMES W. HALPORN  
*Indiana University*

7. I want to thank the Editor and the anonymous referees for their assistance and advice, which helped me very much in trying to explain, as briefly as possible, this rather complicated set of problems. I agree very strongly with one of the referees that there is a need for "a wider discussion of the full MS tradition." The textual history of Cassiodorus' *Psalm Commentary* L1–C (the treatise, divided from its inception into three volumes, shows a similar division in its textual history) is still to be written, and a discussion of this matter here would go well beyond the limits of a note.