APPENDIX VI

The Contents of Par. Suppl. gr. 690

For a great number of poems I discussed in this book, Par. Suppl. gr. 690 (s. XII) is the only manuscript to have come down to us; for many other poems it is by far the oldest text witness we possess. Thus, if only for its extraordinary value, Par. Suppl. gr. 690 deserves to be described in detail. Regrettably, most modern scholars rely on the description of the manuscript by Rochefort 1950 – a publication which may seem thorough, but is in fact neither exhaustive nor entirely reliable. I will give a few examples. Rochefort omits to mention that Pisides' poem In Resurrectionem can be found on fol. 46. He incorrectly ascribes anonymous poems to well-known authors: for instance, he attributes the monodies on Christopher Lekapenos to Symeon the Metaphrast (ignoring the lacuna between fol. 65 and fol. 68), the gnomology in verses at fols. 73–74 to Pisides (misunderstanding the Latin of its first editor, Sternbach), and so forth. He also ignores previous editions: for instance, the catanyctic alphabet by Kyriakos of Chonai at fols. 106–107, which he considers to be unpublished (in fact, edited by Anastasijewič 1907: 494–495).

Rochefort dates Par. Suppl. gr. 690 to 1075–1085 for palaeographic reasons that remain obscure. Most philologists (except those who follow Rochefort's inaccurate dating) assign a twelfth-century date to the manuscript. And most significantly, experienced palaeographers, such as Irigoin and Follieri¹, unanimously date the manuscript to the second half of the twelfth century.

The manuscript is badly damaged. It has no less than sixteen lacunas, which are also probably quite large: see the description below. The manuscript is made of parchment; blank paper pages have been added at a later date, probably by Minoïdes Mynas, to fill up some of the lacunas: fols. 1–13, 66–67, 77–78, 80–81, 84–85, 87–88, 91–94, 96, 114–115, 120–122 and 136–137. Nowadays the manuscript has only loose folia; it is impossible to discern the original quires. It is clear from the contents of certain poems and prose texts that a few folia are not in their original place: fol. 22 should be placed before fol. 21, fol. 39 between fol. 46 and 47, fol. 75 after fol. 124, and fol. 76 after fol. 119. To make matters worse, someone has cut away two strips of parchment, in the middle of fol. 46 and at the bottom of fol. 52.

J. IRIGOIN, JÖB 18 (1969) 49 and E. FOLLIERI, I calendari in metro innografico di Cristoforo Mitileneo, vol. I. Brussels 1980, 12, n. 48 and 69, n. 9.

14^r-31^v

With the great number of lacunas, the unrecognizable quires and the folia that have been misplaced, we must sadly conclude that we have absolutely no idea what the manuscript originally looked like. We do not know whether the series of poems and prose texts we find in Par. Suppl. gr. 690 correspond in any way to the original design of the anthologist. At the most, we might be able to establish how the present manuscript consists of separate text blocks of consequent folia, each divided from the next by a clearly distinguishable lacuna; but even then, it is impossible to be certain whether each separate text block stands where the anthologist intended it.

In the following description of the manuscript, I will comment only on those poems that are relevant for the subject of the present book; for further information, see Rochefort 1950. Due to the great number of lacunas, many poems or groups of poems lack lemmata mentioning the author; wherever possible, I have supplied the names. For the few attributions that may seem doubtful, I refer to the pages where I deal with the delicate problem of who wrote what: see the respective entries in the index.

various gnomologies

14 -91		various gnomologies		
	lacuna			
32^{r} – 38^{v} & 40^{r} – 45^{v}	Pisides	Hexaemeron, vv. 143 ff.		
45°	anonymous	book epigram on the Hexae-		
		meron		
45^{v} – 46^{r}	Pisides	epigrams (Q. 1–7 and St. 108)		
46 ° -46 °	Pisides	In Resurrectionem, vv. 3–116b		
lacuna				
$39^{\rm r-v} \ \& \ 47^{\rm r} - 52^{\rm r}$	Geometres	De Panteleemone, vv. 120 ff.		
52^{v} – 53^{r}	Pisides	satirical poem on Alypios		
53 ^r – 54 ^r	Pisides	In Sanctae Crucis Restitu-		
		tionem		
54 °- 56 °	Pisides	De Vanitate Vitae		
$56^{v} - 57^{v}$	Pisides	In Heraclium ex Africa rede-		
		untem		
57^{v} – 59^{r}	Pisides	In Bonum Patricium		
59 ° -64 °	Pisides	Expeditio Persica I, II		
64 ° -65 °	Pisides	epigrams (St. 5–49)		
65 ^v	Symeon the Metaphrast	catanyctic alphabet, vv. 1–28		
lacuna				
68 ^{r-v}	anonymous	monodies on Christopher Leka-		
		penos, beginning and end miss-		
		ing		

	lacuna			
$69^{\mathrm{r}}-70^{\mathrm{r}}$	Christopher Mitylenaios	poems nos. 122 (vv. 30 ff.), 125–		
70 °- 73 °	Psellos	127, 134–135, 137		
70 – 73° 73°	Ps. Psellos	poems nos. 17, 10 poem no. 91		
73°	Julian the Apostate	epigram		
73°–74°	ounan the Apostate	gnomology: alphabetic, ends		
.0 .1		with the letter Ξ		
	lacuna			
$79^{\mathrm{r-v}}$		various short texts, the last one		
		without its ending		
lacuna				
$82^{r} - 83^{v}$		canon, acephalous		
83 ^v	Kosmas the Melode	canon, end missing		
	lacuna			
86 ^{r-v}	Kosmas the Melode	two canons, the first acephal-		
		ous, the second without its end-		
		ing		
	lacuma			
89°-90°	lacuna Kosmas the Melode	canons, end missing		
03-30	Rosmas the Melode	canons, end missing		
	lacuna			
$95^{\text{r-v}}$	Kosmas the Melode	two canons, the first acephal-		
		ous, the second without its end-		
		ıng		
	lacuna			
97°-106°	Kosmas the Melode,			
100v 105v	John of Damaseus	canons		
106°-107°	Kyriakos of Chonai	catanyctic alphabet		
107 ^r –108 ^r 108 ^r	Ignatios the Deacon Eustathios Kanikles	poem on Adam and Eve riddle		
108 ^r	anonymous	epitaph to the wife of Emperor		
100	anonymous	Maurice		
$108^{\rm r}$	Leo the Philosopher	epigram		
108 ^{r-v}	Nicholas the Patrician	two gnomic epigrams		
$108^{v} - 109^{r}$	Leo of Sardis, Parthenios,	book epigrams		
	Theodore of Kyzikos	on the Oktoechos		
$109^{r}-112^{v}$	Geometres	Metaphrasis of the Odes		
112^{v} – 113^{r}	Ps. Psellos	poem no. 62		

113 ^{r-v}	John Kommerkiarios	Life of St. Mary of Egypt, end missing
	lacuna	
116^{r} – 117^{r}	Pisides	epigrams, acephalous (St. 50–106)
117 ^{r-v} 117 ^v 117 ^v -118 ^r	Methodios anonymous Ignatios the Deacon	epigram on the Chalke epigram on a reliquary of the Holy Cross poem on Lazaros and the Rich
118 ^{r-v} 118 ^v -119 ^v & 76 ^{r-v}	Geometres	epigrams (nos. S. 1–13) various prose texts
	lacuna	
123 ^r -124 ^v & 75 ^{r-v} 75 ^v 125 ^r -132 ^v	Niketas the Philosopher	Oneirokritika and fragments of the Old Testament five epigrams Oneirokritika
	lacuna	
133 ^r –135 ^v		religious prose texts, acephalous
138 ^r –223 ^v	lacuna	various texts in prose and verse: Theophylaktos Simokattes, letters, acephalous; Lucian, Philogelos, Aesop, riddles, synaxarion verses by Christopher Mitylenaios, poems by Gregory of Nazianzos, commentary on Gregory of Nazianzos by Nonnos, and Maximos the Confessor
224 ^r –249 ^r	lacuna	various texts: for instance, Patria, Batrachomyomachia, Phocylides
249 ^r 249 ^r 249 ^r –253 ^v	Mauropous anonymous	poems nos. 62, 42, 40, 41 five monostichs on works of art various texts in prose, the last one without its ending

lacuna

Almost all Byzantine poems can be found at the beginning of what is left of Par. Suppl. gr. 690 (fols. 14-118), with the exception of Christopher Mitvlenaios' hexametric synaxarion verses (fols. 183°–190°), John Mauropous' poems (fol. 249° and fols. 254°–255°), and Niketas the Philosopher's epigrams (fol. 75°, following after fol. 124). But to repeat what I stated in the above, we cannot be absolutely certain that the present order of the folia corresponds to the original one. Of course, it is beyond doubt that each of the text blocks (divided by lacunas) presents the original order in which the texts were arranged, but unfortunately we do not know the exact position of these text blocks in the original manuscript. Neither can we establish with absolute certainty what is lost in the lacunas: a great deal, no doubt about that, but how much exactly? For instance, at fols. 69-70 we find an excerpt from the end of Christopher Mitylenaios' collection of poems (nos. 122, 125–127, 134–135 and 137). Although it is reasonable to assume that a great quantity of poems by Christopher Mitylenaios could once be found in the lacuna between fol. 68 and 69, it is impossible to establish with any accuracy the size of the lacuna and the number of poems it once contained.

Par. Suppl. gr. 690 is an extremely valuable manuscript. Without it, our picture of Byzantine poetry would certainly not be the same; but considering its present state and Rochefort's inaccurate description, caution is called for before one draws any facile conclusions.