

inscription, "let him make any prayer he wishes at the altar and he will be heard at any time, day or night."³⁴ More generally, the ancient and widespread belief in miraculous and curative statues was still tenacious enough to give material to Athenagoras' contemporary, Lucian. One of Lucian's targets claimed to have been cured of the fever by a statue of the Corinthian general Pellichos, and inlaid it with gold leaf just as the Alexandrians inlaid that of Neryllinus; another was a doctor who made annual sacrifice to a miraculous statuette of Hippocrates.³⁵

At Alexandria, there may have been a further impulse to worship Neryllinus in local rivalry. It is striking that Athenagoras names "Troas" and Parion together, since these two cities had much else in common besides their healing statues: both were Roman colonies, probably of triumviral foundation, the only two in the province of Asia, and both possessed the *ius Italicum*.³⁶ There seems no other evidence of rivalry between them; it would not be surprising, however, that once the death of Peregrinus in 165 had made Parion the home of a posthumous wonder-worker, the Alexandrians discovered similar powers in their own prominent citizen, Neryllinus.³⁷

C. P. JONES

*Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton/
University of Toronto*

34. Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, pp. 130–33; Nilsson, *GGR*, 2³: 475.

35. *Philops.* 19, 21. On such statues, see esp. Weinreich, *Antike Heiligungswunder*, 137–46; P. Lacau, *MMAI* 25 (1922): 189–209 (Egypt); Nilsson, *GGR*, 2³: 524–25.

36. Foundations: Fr. Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik*, Abh. Akad. Wiss. Mainz 14 (1951), pp. 130–31. *Ius Italicum*: *Dig.* 50. 15. 7, 50. 15. 8, 9; cf. Levick, *Roman Colonies*, p. 84, n. 7.

37. It is perhaps worth comparing the rivalry of Alexandria and Erythrae in Ionia over the tomb of the Sibyl Herophile (Paus. 10. 12. 5–7): the verse inscription at Erythrae referring to this dispute is plausibly dated to 162 (*IERYthrai* 2.224; see now L. Robert, *REG* 94 [1981]: 354–55).

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *ANTHOLOGIA LATINA* 899

Poem 899 of A. Riese's *Anthologia Latina* purports to be from the pen of the Roman encyclopedist-physician Cornelius Celsus:

CORNELII CELSI

Dictantes Medici quandoque et Apollinis artes
Musas Romano iussimus ore loqui.
Nec minus est nobis per pauca volumina famae,
Quam quos nulla satis bibliotheca capit.¹

The piece—clearly not Celsus'—owes its presence in the various versions of the Latin Anthology to P. Pithoeus, who had included it, along with a number of other poems of dubious antiquity, in his collection *Epigrammata et poematia vetera* (Paris, 1590). The Celsus-poem is certainly anything but ancient: it is the work of the German humanist Helius Eobanus Hessus (1488–1540), author of the

1. Cf. Martial 14. 190: "Livius ingens, / quem mea non totum bybliothea capit."

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

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^v), in the edition of 1531 in the antepenultimate (fol. D5^v, 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,¹ 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.