having the same layout (20 lines to a page) and the same dimensions (228 × 148 mm. for the Parma MS according to E. Martini, Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistente nelle biblioteche italiane I, 1 [Milano 1893], 175 ff.), 224 × 147 mm. for the Paris MS).

In the Parma MS the following quire-signatures can be seen: f. 12 β, f. 20 γ, f. 28 δ, f. 36 ε, f. 44 ζ, f. 52 η, f. 68 θ, f. 76 υ, f. 84 ικ. The remaining signatures have been cut away or at least they cannot be seen on my microfilm. But since the MS, according to Martini, loc. cit., consists of regular quaternions (apart from the first gathering which is a quinion), f. 92 must have had the number ιβ, f. 100 ιγ, and f. 108 ιδ. Martini, loc. cit., says that ιδ is visible, but I cannot see the number on my microfilm. The last page in the MS is f. 115 which is then the last folio in the quaternion 108-115. The numbering of the pages begins with the number 2 on the first page of the MS, folios 2-II being a quinion. The signatures have been placed in the Parma MS in the same position as in the Paris MS (older series) and have been written by the same hand. Thus I do not think that we can reasonably doubt that the two MSS originally made up a single volume.

The Paris part can be dated by watermarks c. 1367 (Briquet 3230); for the Parma part I have not been able to obtain sufficiently detailed information. At any rate the watermark in the Parma MS is not the same as that in the Paris MS.

The breaking-up of the original volume must have occurred at some time before c. 1500; the Paris MS was in the possession of Cardinal Ridolfi (there is an index in the hand of Matthaeus Devaris on the fly-leaf) and Nicolaus Michelotius (1447-c. 1527) owned the Parma MS (note on f. 2).
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THE LOCATION OF CIBYRA AT ANTH. PAL. IX 648; 649

In the Greek Anthology there are two consecutive poems by Macedonius Consul on his own house, Anth. Pal. IX 648; 649. The scribes of the Palatine and Planudean MSS remark (ad loc.) that this house was in Cibyra: εἰς ὦν Κιβόρα 1). Certainty in matters relating to Macedonius is very hard to achieve: usually probability is all that can be attained. This is true in the case of the location of Cibyra. There were two towns of that name, Κιβόρα ἦ μεγάλη in Phrygia and Κιβόρα ἦ μικρὰ in Pamphylia 2). It has commonly

1) Cf. e.g. H. Beckby, Anthologia Graeca (München, 1966-67), 111, apparatus criticus ad Anth. Pal. IX 648; 649.
2) Cf. RE XI, I, 374-77 s.v. Kibyra Nr. 1; 2.
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been accepted that Macedonius’ house was built in Cibyra in Phrygia \(^3\). But this is just a guess, based, it would appear, on the fact that \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\) was the bigger and better known of the two. There is no reason for linking Macedonius with \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\). On the contrary a plausible case can be made for \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\).

The likelihood is that Macedonius, who belonged to the court of Justinian I in Constantinople \(^4\), would have owned land, or have had a holiday resort, or have been on some business in Cibyra. This last possibility—business—seems most likely. And \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\) suits it better. That town had once been a flourishing city but faded from history about the first century B.C. After centuries of obscurity it emerged again to become a very important naval base in the eighth century and gave its name to the principal theme of the Byzantine empire \(^5\). During the years of its eclipse, however, mention is made in the Notitiae of a new foundation in Pamphylia named Justinianopolis Mylome. It is most likely that this new foundation was the port of Cibyra \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\), for the town itself (Cibyra) according to Ptolemy, lay a little way inland. On this point A. H. M. Jones remarked: “If Justinian rebuilt and fortified its (i.e. Cibyra \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\)) port, this fact would account for its later importance” \(^6\). If we accept this hypothesis, and it seems reasonable, we now have official imperial business in progress in Cibyra \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\) during the reign of Justinian I. It is a logical next step (for want of a better one) to suggest that Macedonius, as imperial official and curator \(^7\), was in some way connected with the reconstruction work here at Justinianopolis Mylome, and that, while he was so engaged, had a house built for himself at the site of the old town in Cibyra \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\).

If we are correct so far, then our poems can most likely be dated to the period A.D. 532-39. For it was during these years that

\(^3\) Cf. e.g. A. Cameron and A. Cameron, The Cycle of Agathias, JHS 86 (1966), 17; W. R. Paton, The Greek Anthology (Loeb Classical Library) III, 450; Beckby (supra n. 1), n. ad loc.

\(^4\) Cf. Suda s.v. ‘Αγαθίας.

\(^5\) Cf. Const. Porphyr. Themat. 1, 14. The location of \(\text{η} \mu\nu\xi\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu\) will be found in a useful map at the end of A. Pertusi, Costantino Porfrogenito: De thematibus. Studi e testi, Vol. CLX (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1952).

\(^6\) Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces (2nd ed., Oxford 1971), 414. See also ibid., 200; 213-14 and W. M. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor (London 1890), 420.

\(^7\) The identification of Macedonius with the curator mentioned in the inscription to the Constitution of Justinian VII 37, 3 and Jo. Mal. Chron. 439-40 (ed. Dindorf) seems safe; cf. Cameron and Cameron (supra n. 3) and R. C. McCail, The Cycle of Agathias: New Identifications Scrutinised, JHS 89 (1969), 89.