

The ascent from the Underworld, then, is a dramatic contrivance created to deny Aeneas—but not the audience—retention of what he has just witnessed, knowledge of the future of Rome. The device is impressionistic,⁴ dealing with Aeneas' perception, rather than with the "truth" of the vision. But Virgil is working with a highly sophisticated conception, one fraught with technical challenges but, nonetheless, central to the *Aeneid*. In producing Rome's national epic, Virgil must devise tragedy in the historical context of military and political success. To do this, he must deny Aeneas *all* knowledge of that success; for the tragedy Aeneas needs no more emphatic lessons than his own experience. The vision of Roman history presented in the Underworld, although by no means unmixed with tragedy, is not one that Aeneas can take with him from the Underworld to the world above.⁵ His passage through the gate of false dreams is Virgil's way of erasing that knowledge from Aeneas' mind, casting a haze of uncertainty and unreality over the clearly viewed vignettes Anchises had so recently pointed out to him.

HAROLD C. GOTOFF
University of Illinois,
Urbana-Champaign

4. For other examples of an "impressionistic" Virgil, we need look no further than the last two lines of the description of the death of Priam (2. 557–58). Virgil, in mid-story, changes the venue and alludes to a variation of the tradition in order to conjure up the memory of Pompey the Great. Similarly "illogical" is the reference to "disiectis oppida muris" (8. 355), with its impression of historical cycles and temporal continuity on what at first seemed to be the primeval site of Rome.

5. "The oblique connection of Aeneas and his *falsa insomnia*, however it operates, must have a negative effect; the associations of deception, illusion, and unreality are disturbing, even ominous" (Tarrant, p. 53).

NERYLLINUS

In a passage of his *Plea for the Christians*,¹ written in the later 170s,² Athenagoras argues that demons work the miracles ascribed to pagan statues, not those whom the statues represent:³

3. τοῦ τοίνυν ἄλλους μὲν εἶναι τοὺς ἐνεργοῦντας, ἐφ' ἑτέρων δὲ ἀνίστασθαι τὰς εἰκόνας, ἐκεῖνο μέγιστον τεκμήριον, Τρωᾶς καὶ Πάριον ἢ μὲν Νερυλλίνου εἰκόνας ἔχει (ὁ ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς), τὸ δὲ Πάριον Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Πρωτέως· τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔτι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ ὁ τάφος καὶ ἡ εἰκών. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι ἀνδριάντες τοῦ Νερυλλίνου κόσμημά εἰσι δημόσιον, εἴπερ καὶ τούτοις κοσμεῖται πόλις, εἰς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ χρηματίζειν καὶ ἰᾶσθαι νοσοῦντας νομίζεται, καὶ θύουσιν τε δι' αὐτὰ καὶ χρυσῶ περιλαίφουσιν καὶ στεφανοῦσιν τὸν ἀνδριάντα οἱ Τρωαδεῖς.

4. ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ὁ τοῦ Πρωτέως (τοῦτον οὐκ ἄννοεῖτε ρίψαντα ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ πῦρ περὶ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν), ὁ μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς λέγεται χρηματίζειν, τῷ δὲ τοῦ

1. I have used the following special abbreviations: Cook, *Troad* = J. M. Cook, *The Troad* (Oxford, 1973); Magie, *Roman Rule* = D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950); Levick, *Roman Colonies* = B. M. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1967); Schoedel, *Athenagoras* = W. R. Schoedel, ed. and trans., *Athenagoras: "Legatio" and "De Resurrectione"* (Oxford, 1972). I am grateful to Peter Frisch for answering my inquiries.

2. See now Schoedel, *Athenagoras*, pp. x–xi (between 176 and 180). T. D. Barnes, "The Embassy of Athenagoras," *JThS* 26 (1975): 111–14, suggests September 176.

3. *Leg. pro Christ.* 26. 3–4.

Ἄλεξάνδρου (Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές) δημοτελεῖς ἄγονται θυσία καὶ ἑορταὶ ὡς ἐπηκόῳ θεῷ.

That the beings who operate in statues are different from those to whom the statues are set up is most clearly shown by Troas and Parion. The former has statues of Neryllinus, a man of our time, the latter of Alexander and Proteus: Alexander's tomb and statue both stand in the agora. Now the other statues of Neryllinus are a public ornament, if indeed these, too, give adornment to a city, but one of them is thought to give oracles and to heal the sick, and the Troadeis sacrifice because of all this and overlay the statue with gold and crown it. But of the statues of Alexander and Proteus (the latter, as you know, threw himself into the pyre near Olympia), the second is also said to give oracles, while for that of Alexander, "Unlucky Paris, fairest in form, women-mad," public sacrifices and feasts are celebrated as for a god that hears prayers.

Athenagoras proceeds to argue that mere bronze cannot work miracles; the persons represented can no longer help the sick, and indeed Neryllinus' statue was already said to do so when he was alive and sick himself;⁴ it must follow that the supposed miracles are the work of demons operating on the impressionable minds of the ignorant.

The two persons represented in Parion cause, or ought to cause, no difficulty. Alexander is obviously not Alexander of Abonuteichos, Lucian's "false prophet," but the Homeric Paris.⁵ Proteus is, however, one of Lucian's targets, the Cynic who immolated himself at Olympia in 165. In what is generally taken as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, Lucian foresees that the dead Peregrinus will be supposed to cure quartan fever, that an oracle and an *adyton* will be raised at his pyre, and that "many statues will be set up to him by the Eleans and the other Greeks."⁶

Neryllinus, however, has caused a long controversy. It seems to have been L. Friedländer who first suggested that he was M. Suillius Nerullinus, consul in 50 and usually thought to have been proconsul of Asia in 69/70, though the evidence is uncomfortably slender.⁷ Others argued against Friedländer that Athenagoras' words, "a man of our time," could not refer to this man, but rather to a descendant or some otherwise unknown wonder-worker of the second century.⁸ The latest person to express an opinion seems to have been M. P. Nilsson, who returned to the view of Friedländer. Athenagoras' phrase, he suggested, is "perhaps not to be taken literally," and "it is very unlikely that an otherwise unknown

4. The context requires the emendation ἐνίπρησι in 26. 5.

5. This was apparently not noticed before Fr. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*, Religionsgesch. Vers. u. Vorarb. 5 (Giessen, 1909), p. 286; thereafter, A. D. Nock, "Alexander of Abonuteichos," *CQ* 22 (1928): 160, n. 3; Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1932), p. 513, n. 1, characterizing the other view as "lächerlich": it survives, however, in Schoedel's note ad loc.

6. *Peregr.* 41; cf. 27–28.

7. *Sittengeschichte*, vol. 3⁶ (Leipzig, 1890), p. 577; in the revised edition, vol. 3¹⁰ (Leipzig, 1923), p. 176, n. 11, this view is ascribed to W. Drexler (Roscher *Lex.*, s.n. "Neryllinos"), who had in fact rejected it. The basis for this proconsulate is a solitary coin of Smyrna not seen since Morell (1734): the best discussion is Dessau's in *PIR*¹ S 699 (later works are usually content to cite Mionnet, *Supplément* 6, Ionie no. 1661, or one another).

8. Thus J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1907), pp. 222–23; O. Weinreich, *Antike Heiligungswunder*, Religionsgesch. Vers. u. Vorarb. 8.1 (Giessen, 1909), p. 141; Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, 3¹⁰: 176 (a second-century wonder-worker); Drexler in Roscher *Lex.*, s.n. "Neryllinos"; Fluss, *RE* 4A (1931): 719 (a descendant of the proconsul); J. Miller, *RE* 17 (1936): 65, holds both views at once. Schoedel, *Athenagoras*, ad loc., comments, "otherwise unknown."

Neryllinos had so many statues, while it perhaps suits a deserving proconsul of Asia."⁹

Athenagoras locates the statues of Neryllinus in "Troas," which he subsequently calls a "city." That eliminates the translation, "in the Troad";¹⁰ but "Troy" is no better, since the city which Homer calls "Troia" or "Ilios" was only "Ilion" in historical times and never "Troas."¹¹ "Troas," with "Troadeis" for the citizens, is the city better known as Alexandria Troas (though this designation is much more favored by moderns than by ancients), and officially called *Colonia Augusta* (or *Alexandria Troadensis*). A Roman colony perhaps of triumviral foundation, it was one of the great cities of the empire, though its antiquities have suffered so badly that its importance is now hard to realize.¹²

In 1879 A. H. Sayce, then near the beginning of a long and distinguished career, copied a fragmentary Latin inscription "while waiting for dinner" in "İki-Stambül," that is, the village Kestambul just east of Alexandria and a source of many of its inscriptions.¹³ No one seems to have seen the stone since, but in 1902 Mommsen included it in the first supplement of *CIL* III, giving the following text:¹⁴

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| [imp. Caes., divi Traiani] Hadr[iani f.,] | |
| [divi Traiani Pa]rthici nepot[i, divi] | |
| [Nervae pron., T. A]elio Hadrian[o Anto-] | |
| [nino Aug. Pio.,] pontif. max., trib. p[ot.,] | |
| [|] Neryllinus, flam[e]n |
| [|] O aedil. conse[cravit.] |

5

In 1934 W. M. Ramsay treated the inscription in a note entitled "Neryllinus."¹⁵ None of these authors mentions Athenagoras.

The inscription must honor Antoninus Pius, though there is some doubt as to the exact restoration of the first four lines.¹⁶ In line 5, the *cognomen* was presumably preceded by Neryllinus' *praenomen* and *gentilicium*, but there scarcely seems room for his filiation. To the right, *flamen* was followed by Ramsay with [*Aug(usti)*], while others have taken the inscription as evidence for a flaminatus of Antoninus Pius at Alexandria.¹⁷ The only inscriptions of the city which qualify

9. *GGR*, vol. 2¹ (Munich, 1974), p. 525 and n. 3.

10. *Ibid.*

11. "Troy"; Schoedel, *Athenagoras*, p. 65. On Ilion, cf. E. Meyer, *RE Suppl.* 14 (1974): 815–17.

12. For the sources, see G. Hirschfeld, *RE* I (1893): 1396, no. 16; Magie, *Roman Rule*, pp. 1334–35, n. 15. On "Troas" and "Troadeis," cf. W. Ruge, *RE* 7A (1939): 583–84; L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris, 1940), p. 296, n. 2; Chr. Habicht, *Altertümer von Pergamon VIII 3: Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (Berlin, 1969), p. 111. Importance: Strab. 13. 593 τῶν ἐλλογιμῶν πόλεων (Levick, *Roman Colonies*, p. 105, talks of its "comparative insignificance"). Destruction: Cook, *Troad*, pp. 200–202; A. C. G. Smith, *AS* 29 (1979): 24–32.

13. See *JHS* I (1880): 81–82; on Sayce, best known as a pioneer in Assyriology, see *The Dictionary of National Biography 1931–1940* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 786–88. On Kestambul and the older pronunciation "İki-Stambül," cf. Cook, *Troad*, pp. 199, n. 1, 201, 211–12.

14. *Eph. Epigr.* 5 (1884): 56, no. 141; *CIL* 3 Suppl. (1902), no. 7071. By a slip, Mommsen in *CIL* attributed the stone to Eski-Stambul, the modern name for the site of Alexandria.

15. *CR* 48 (1934): 9–13 (a slightly different version in his posthumous *Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor* [Aberdeen, 1941], pp. 20–22). I follow Mommsen in placing the fragment near the right margin; Ramsay wanted it near the left.

16. There seems to be room for *p(atri) p(atriae)* after *Pio*, and for a numeral after *trib. pot.*

17. Thus Magie, *Roman Rule*, pp. 633 and 1493, no. 10; thence G. E. Bean in Cook, *Troad*, p. 413.

the title *flamen* with a genitive seem to be the series set up, each by a *vicus* of the colony, in honor of a C. Antonius Rufus, *flamen* of the deified Julius.¹⁸ Recently, however, an inscription has been published from the Smintheion, the sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus in the southern Troad which depended on Alexandria and was its principal shrine. The stone was complete to the right and below, and is presented thus:¹⁹

[ἱερασά]μενον Ἀπόλλω-
[νος Σμιν]θέος, ἱππῶι δημο-
[σίῳι τετ]ιμημένον, ἱερέα
[τῶν Σεβ]αστῶν, τὸν ΠΡΟΣ
[± 8]NON φλαμίνα.

The editor, G. E. Bean, tentatively suggested προσ[εἰλημμέ]νον in lines 4–5, and understood it as *adlectum*: but, even if a *flamen* could be adlected, προσλαμβάνειν is not one of the usual Greek translations of *adlego*, and none of the others is suitable.²⁰ Moreover, in a Roman colony the *flamen* and the priest of the Augusti are identical, and ἱερεύς is the standard translation.²¹ It may therefore be better to remove the comma after Σεβαστῶν and to take the phrase τὸν . . . φλαμίνα in apposition to what precedes, “priest of the Augusti who is . . . *flamen*.” An attractive supplement would then be προσ[αγορευόμε]νον, “called,” or perhaps, if one with nine letters is too long, προσ[ηγορευμέ]νον. Phrases such as οἱ καλούμενοι φλαμίνιοι or (more rarely) οἱ ἐπὶ ἄνδρες ὀνομασμένοι are found in literature,²² and in the *Res gestae* the words *ludos saeculares* are rendered θέας τὰς διὰ ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν γεινομένας ὀνομαζομένας σαικλάρεις,²³ while προσαγορεύειν is regularly used to mean “call, name.”²⁴

In the inscription from Kestambul, Ramsay’s *Aug(usti)*, or perhaps *Aug(ustorum)*, could still be right: there is no warrant to assume a special *flamen* of Antoninus Pius. In line 6, Ramsay made the good suggestion that the unwelcome *O* should rather be the *Q* of [*iivir quin*]q(*ennalis*).²⁵ If that, too, is right, there may not have been room for anything more to the left of line 6, since Sayce’s drawing suggests that the words in this line were widely spaced. To sum up, the last three lines could have run thus:

[nino Aug. Pio, p. p.] pontif. max., trib. p[ot. (numeral?)]
[*(praenomen, gentilicium)*] Neryllinus, flame[n Aug. ?.]
[*iivir quin*]q., aedil., consec[ravit.]

18. *CIL* 3.386; cf. addenda, p. 977 (*ILS* 2718). The *apex* depicted on one of the stones is illustrated in Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. “*Flamen*,” vol. 2.2, p. 1179, fig. 3108.

19. By Bean in Cook, *Troad*, pp. 412–13, no. 51, whence *L’année épigraphique* 1973, p. 502.

20. See H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Toronto, 1974), p. 175; προσκαταλέγει-μενον, the only one beginning with προσ-, is too long. *L’année épigraphique* (previous n.) includes προσ[εἰλημμέ]νον in the text with no sign of doubt.

21. For ἱερεύς as the translation of *flamen*, see D. Magie, *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis* (Leipzig, 1905), p. 144, s. vv. “*Flamen Dialis*,” “*Flamen Martialis*”; *TLL*, s.v. “*flamen*,” 849 lines 62 ff. For the form φλαμίνην, see *LSJ*², s.v. φλαμέντας; *LSJ Supplement* (1968), s.v. φλαμέντας.

22. Plut. *Marc.* 5. 5; Cass. Dio 48. 32; these and other examples in Magie, *De Romanorum iuris . . . vocabulis*, pp. 144–47, s. vv. “*Flamines*,” “*Auguratus*,” “*Quindecimvir Sacris Faciundis*,” “*Septemvir Epulonum*,” “*Pater Patratus*.”

23. Aug. *RG* 22. 2.

24. Examples in Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. 2; note esp. *POxy.* 34 i 13 (A.D. 127) τὰ προσαγορευόμενα συνκολλήσιμα.

25. Cf. *CIL* 3.392, line 3 (Alexandria): *iivir iter. iivir quinq. aed.*

Neryllinus' *cognomen* is exceedingly rare:²⁶ it might be connected with the proconsul, but Roman colonies preserve other strange specimens of Italic nomenclature, and it could be inherited. The spelling with *Y* rather than *V* is not significant, and nothing can be built on it.²⁷ Neryllinus was clearly a person of consequence. He began his career in the usual way as aedile, but then (if the text is correctly restored) passed without an intermediate term as ordinary *iivir* to hold the prestigious position of *iivir quinquennalis*. Finally, the imperial flamine was the chief religious office of a Roman colony, and the holders were always wealthy.²⁸

Neryllinus is presumably to be identified with the man in Athenagoras: not only does he have the same very rare name in the same city, but a person who flourished under Pius fits very well as one who lived in Athenagoras' time and was dead by the later 170s. Athenagoras mentions that he was honored with several statues which constituted a public ornament.²⁹ It was a characteristic practice of Roman colonies, borrowed from the metropolis, to honor a benefactor with a statue set up in each of the *vici*.³⁰ At Alexandria this was done for the *flamen* C. Antonius Rufus, and also for the eminent Sex. Quinctilius Maximus, the founder of the fortunes of the great Quinctilii in the second century.³¹ The statues of Neryllinus, one of which received cult even during his lifetime, may well have formed such a series, though the present one set up by him to Pius is evidently different.

Although the ultimate reasons for the cult must remain unknown, certain conditions may be guessed to have favored its birth and growth. The chief god of Alexandria was Apollo Smintheus, worshipped in the Smintheion some thirty kilometers to the south: this sanctuary must have had an active oracle, since a *prophetes* is attested, and may also have given cures.³² The most prominent sanctuary in the city itself appears to have been the Asclepieion, devoted to Apollo's son and like the Smintheion probably both curative and oracular.³³ It is possible that Neryllinus had some connection with one or both of these two sanctuaries and was believed to have the special favor of the presiding god. A funerary altar of Thyatira, perhaps not far away in date, commemorates an Ammias, priestess of gods who are not named: "if anyone wishes to hear the truth from me," so runs the

26. Apart from the consul of 50 and this man, *CIL* has only 8.6202 (Arsacal, Numidia). R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), p. 90, is sceptical of the notion that the consul's father named him in order to flatter the Claudii.

27. On this spelling, see Dessau, *ILS* 3.2, p. 838.

28. R. Etienne, *Le culte impérial dans la Péninsule Ibérique*, BEFAR 191 (Paris, 1958), p. 231.

29. Κοσμεῖν is the regular term for the adornment of cities with buildings and the like: L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), p. 349, n. 1; id., *CRAI* 1969, p. 44, n. 4.

30. Levick, *Roman Colonies*, p. 76.

31. C. Antonius Rufus: *CIL* 3.386 (*ILS* 2718). Sex. Quinctilius Maximus: *CIL* 3.384 (*ILS* 1018).

32. For the Smintheion, see Ruge, *RE* 7A (1939): 564–65; in the Roman period, the most important literary sources are Strab. 13. 604–5; Paus. 10. 12. 6–7; Men. Rh. 2. 17 (pp. 206–24) Russell and Wilson. For the inscriptions and coins, see L. Robert, *Études de numismatique grecque* (Paris, 1951), p. 39, n. 4; id., *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Paris, 1966), pp. 41–42; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1968, 434. For the archaeology of the site, cf. Cook, *Troad*, pp. 228–31; H. Weber, *The Princeton Encyclopaedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 846–47; excavation has recently resumed: see M. Mellink, *AJA* 86 (1982): 573. *Prophetes*: *IG* 12.2.519 (*IGR* 4.6), shown by L. Robert, *RPh* ser. 3.3 (1929): 132–33 (*Opera minora selecta*, vol. 2, pp. 1098–99), to be from the Smintheion; compare Men. Rh. p. 216 on the god's prophetic powers.

33. Le Bas-Waddington no. 1036 (*IGR* 4.246), a pancratiast honored with a statue "in the Smintheion and here in the Asclepieion." On Asclepius at Alexandria, see also Chr. Habicht, *Altertümer von Pergamon VIII* 3, no. 74, with his discussion.

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."