BRILL

MNEMOSYNE 74 (2021) 99–110

MNEMOSYNE
A Journal
of
Classical Studies
brill.com/mnem

The Manuscripts of the Scholia to the Hesiodic *Aspis*

Pediasimus' Scholia Paraphrastica

Konstantine Panegyres

Trinity College, Oxford

konstantine.panegyres@classics.ox.ac.uk

Received September 2019 | Accepted September 2019

Abstract

This paper presents a collation and investigation of some manuscripts of Ioannes Pediasimus' *scholia paraphrastica* to the Hesiodic *Aspis*. The paper demonstrates that the editions currently used by scholars are based on an insecure textual foundation.

Keywords

Hesiod – The Shield of Herakles – scholia – Byzantine scholarship

1

The scholia to the Hesiodic *Aspis* have not received much attention from modern scholars. The *scholia vetera* were last published by Ranke in 1840.¹ Some substantial efforts have been made to assess the textual history of this material more fully,² but there is still a need for further study in this area. A separate group of scholia has fared much less well. Ioannes Pediasimus (c.1240–c.1310)³ wrote two sets of scholia on the *Aspis*: a set of paraphrastic scholia (called Σχόλια παραφραστικά in the manuscripts), and a set of grammatical

¹ Ranke 1840.

² Schultz 1910; Martano 2002, 2005, 2006, and 2008.

³ PLP no. 22235; Wilson 1996, 242–243; Levrie 2018, 1–10.

notes (called Τεχνολογία in the manuscripts). Pediasimus was at one point the leading professor at Constantinople and held the post of ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων, and so his scholia are important for an understanding of how the Hesiodic *Aspis* was read and understood by major scholars in the Palaeologan age. The scholia of Pediasimus were last published by Gaisford in 1823,⁴ and since then no study has been made of them save for the publication of a handful of emendations.⁵ Unfortunately, in the available editions of the text these separate scholia are conflated and printed together, so that it can be difficult for a reader to tell exactly where the *scholia paraphrastica* end and the *technologia* begins. In fact, these works were clearly demarcated in the manuscripts by different titles, and should be treated as distinct pieces of scholarship. The present article deals only with the manuscripts of Pediasimus' *scholia paraphrastica*. The aim is to place understanding of this work on a more secure textual foundation by providing information about the readings of the manuscripts.

2

The number of manuscripts known to me, in which Pediasimus' *scholia paraphrastica* can be found, is nine.

- T Marcianus gr. Z. 464, fourteenth century.
- M Marcianus gr. Z. 480, fifteenth century.
- V Vindobonensis Phil. gr. 25, fifteenth/sixteenth century.
- G Monacensis Cod. graec. 283, fifteenth/sixteenth century.
- B Vaticanus Barb. gr. 98, sixteenth century.
- H Harvardensis Houghton MS. gr. 20, sixteenth century.
- Olomucensis M 79, fifteenth century (excerpts only).
- Laurentianus Plut. 31.24, fifteenth century (excerpts only).
- Matritensis 4607, fifteenth century (paraphrase only).

Scholars of the scholia to the Hesiodic *Aspis* have previously known of the existence of Pediasimus' *scholia paraphrastica* in most of these manuscripts. In his catalogue, Schultz mentioned the presence of the text in T, M, G, V, and Laurentianus 31.24.⁶ Later, Corralez Pérez added Matritensis 4607 as a

⁴ Gaisford 1823, 609-654.

⁵ Mason 2015. The Pediasimus scholia are very briefly introduced in Russo 1965, 56.

⁶ Schultz 1910, 8, 16, 29-31.

witness.⁷ For the preparation of the *editio princeps* of 1537, Trincavelli used T and M; later editors (Heinsius, Heinrichius, and Gaisford) do not mention manuscripts. The text of the *scholia paraphrastica* in these manuscripts has not been examined in modern times.⁸ Gaisford's Leipzig edition is the one most commonly used and referred to by scholars: T. Gaisford, *Poetae Minores Graeci*, II, Leipzig 1823, 609-654.⁹ References to Peditasimus in this article will follow the page and line numbering of this edition.

3

The tradition of the *scholia paraphrastica* is comprised of complete manuscripts containing the entirety of the transmitted text on the one hand, and manuscripts containing short excerpts or paraphrases on the other.

All the manuscripts descend from an archetype which had an error at 619.8 οἰκέταις] ἰκέταις *codd.* This error is so absurd as a paraphrase of Sc. 85 ἰκέτησι, that one is compelled to postulate that it belongs to the common ancestor of all the manuscripts.

The manuscripts T, M, and V share a very similar text, with only a handful of variants distinguishing them from one another.

1. T = Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marcianus gr. Z. 464 (= coll. 762), saec. XIV (dated to AD 1316-1319), written by Demetrius Triclinius.¹⁰ The manuscript belonged to Cardinal Bessarion.¹¹ On ff. 2^r-13^r the *scholia paraphrastica* have been written into the margins next to the text of the *Aspis*. At the beginning of fol. 2^r the text of the scholia is preceded by the title τοῦ ὑπάτου τῶν φιλοσόφων Ἰωάννου διακόνου τοῦ Πεδιασίμου σχόλια παραφραστικά. The manuscript was collated by me from high-quality colour images.

The results of the collation with Gaisford were as follows: 619.8 τοῖς ἰκέταις] τοῖς οἰκεταῖς, 623.8 θήκε δὲ] ἔθηκε δὲ, 625.9 before the text of the scholium we find the title ἔκφρασις τῆς ἀσπίδος πᾶντι εὐφυῶς ἔχουσα, 625.9 ἐζωγραφισμένος] ἐζωγραφημένος, 627.2 ἐζωγραφοῦντο] ἐζωγράφηντο, 630.24 κασιτέρου] κασιτέρου,

7 Corrales Pérez 1994, 41. For help with obtaining images of manuscripts I wish to thank Rostislav Krušínský (Olomouc), Ingeborg Formann and Hans Peter Zimmer (Vienna), Will Gregg (Harvard), Pierre Augustin (Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes), and Alessandro Moro (Venice).

8 In his study of the manuscripts of Peditasimus, Domenico Bassi omitted to list any manuscripts of the *scholia paraphrastica* or *technologia*: see Bassi 1898, 1408.

9 The printing errors in this Leipzig edition (not present in the earlier Oxford edition) need to be overlooked for the purposes of collation: 615.13 ἐν αὐτῇ (φησι) τῇ νυκτὶ Oxford] νυκτὶ *om.* Leipzig; 619.5 πένθερόν Oxford] πννθερόν Leipzig.

10 Mioni 1985, 248-251.

11 *Id.*, 272-275.

632.23 κίβυσσις] κίβησις, 635.27 πιπτόντων ὁρμῶσαι ὥσπερ] πιπτόντων ὥσπερ, 635.28 πᾶσαι δ' ἄρ] πᾶσαι γάρ, 635.33 αἱ δὲ χεῖρες] αἱ δὲ Κῆρες, 639.14 ἤγουν τῇ φλοιᾷ] ἤγουν τῇ φλοιᾷ, 645.25 στερίσης] θερίσης, 650.3 ἀλαλάξαντες] ἀλλαλάξαντες, 652.23 μάχεσθαι] μαχέσασθαι, 652.23 ἔστιν ἐναντίος τοῦ Ἄρεος] ἔστι ἐναντίος τοῦ Ἄρεος.

2. M = Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marcianus gr. Z. 480 (= coll. 589), saec. XV (middle), written by Georgios Tribizias. The manuscript belonged to Cardinal Bessarion.¹² On ff. 215^r-225^v the *scholia paraphrastica* have been written into the margins next to the text of the *Aspis*. At the beginning of fol. 215^r the text of the scholia is preceded by the title τοῦ ὑπάτου τῶν φιλοσόφων Ἰωάννου διακόνου τοῦ Πεδιασίμου σχόλια παραφραστικά.

Collated from black and white images: 619.8 τοῖς ἰκεταῖς] τοῖς οἰκεταῖς, 622.14 ὀρείχαλκος τὸ λευκὸν χάλκωμα] ὀρείχαλκος χάλκωμα, 623.8 θῆκε δὲ] ἔθηκε δὲ, 627.2 ἐζωγραφούντο] ἐζωγράφητο, 630.24 κασιτέρου] κασιτέρου, 632.23 κίβυσσις] κίβησις, 632.27 καταπιεῖν] καταποιεῖν, 635.27 πιπτόντων ὁρμῶσαι ὥσπερ] πιπτόντων ὥσπερ, 635.28 πᾶσαι δ' ἄρ'] πᾶσαι γάρ, 635.29 ἐπεθύμουν πιεῖν] ἐπεθύμουν ποιεῖν, 635.33 αἱ δὲ χεῖρες] αἱ δὲ Κῆρες, 639.14 τῇ φλοιᾷ] τῇ φλοιᾷ, 645.25 στερίσης] θερίσης, 647.1 λέγοι δ' ἄν] λέγει δ' ἄν (οἱ written above εἰ in superscript), 647.2 μὲν τοῦ Ἰολάου] μὲν τὴν τοῦ Ἰολάου, 649.35 αἰγυροῖ] αἰγυροῖ, 650.26 κέγχροι] κέγχριοι.

3. V = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Phil. gr. 25, saec. XV according to Schultz,¹³ but now thought to be saec. XVI (first half); probably written by Aristoboulos Apostolis (Arsenius of Monembasia).¹⁴ The manuscript belonged to George, Count of Corinth.¹⁵ It was later purchased in Florence by Johannes Sambucus.¹⁶ The *scholia paraphrastica* are found at ff. 81^r-88^r. The title given in the manuscript is Ἡσιόδου ἄσπις Ἡρακλέους, τοῦ ὑπάτου τῶν φιλοσόφων Ἰωάννου διακόνου τοῦ Πεδιασίμου σχόλια παραφραστικά.

Collated from high-quality colour images: 611.7 Ἱποθόης τῆς θυγατριδῆς Πέλοπος] Ἱποθόης τῶν θυγατριδῶν Πέλοπος, 611.21 καὶ ὁ Ἀμφιτρώων] καὶ Ἀμφιτρώων, 619.7 ἀπεδέξαντο] ὑπεδέξαντο, 619.8 τοῖς οἰκεταῖς] τοῖς ἰκεταῖς, 623.7 θῆκε δὲ] ἔθηκε δὲ, 624.23 εἰς τὴν ἄλλω] εἰς τὴν ἄλλω, 627.26 ἀπ' αὐτῶν] ἐπ' αὐτῶν, 630.24 κασιτέρου] κασιτέρου, 635.33 αἱ δὲ χεῖρες] αἱ δὲ Κῆρες, 639.14 τῇ φλοιᾷ] τῇ φλοιᾷ, 645.25 στερίσης] θερίσης, 650.3 ἀλαλάξαντες] ἀλλαλάξαντες, 651.11 τὰ ῥάμφη] τὰ ῥάμφοι (ἡ written over οἱ in superscript), 652.20 τοὺς ἐκείνου τοῦ σώματος ὧμους τῇ οὐρᾷ μαστίζων] τοὺς ὧμους ἐαυτοῦ τῇ οὐρᾷ μαστίζων, 653.30 τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ] τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς.

¹² *Id.*, 272-275.

¹³ Schultz 1910, 31.

¹⁴ Hunger 1961, 154-156.

¹⁵ Pingree 1977, 359.

¹⁶ Hunger 1961, 156.

The manuscripts **M** and **V** are both apographs of **T**. In the few places where they diverge from the text of **T**, their errors are trivial. Some examples: 622.14 ὀρείχαλκος τὸ λευκὸν χάλκωμα **T**] *om.* τὸ λευκὸν **M**, 632.27 καταπιεῖν **T**] καταποιεῖν **M**, 651.11 ῥάμφη **T**] ῥάμφοι *pr. corr.* (η written over οι in superscript) **V**. In one place a simple error found in **T** and **M** is corrected by **V**: 653.30 τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ *male* **TM** (τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς *recte* **V**). This correction was easy to make when we look at the text: *Sc.* 470-471 Ἀθήνη | ἐξίκετ' Οὔλυμπόν τε μέγαν καὶ δώματα πατρὸς, where Pediasimus **T** paraphrases: ἡ δὲ Ἀθηνᾶ ἀφίκετο εἰς τὸν μέγαν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ δώματα τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ (653.28-30).

4

An important group of manuscripts is represented by some *recentiores*. These are the following:

4. **G** = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Monacensis graec. 283, ff. 58^r-66^v, saec. XV/XVI (first half), written by Michael Rosaitos.¹⁷ The manuscript belonged to Johann Albrecht Widmannstetter. Collated from black and white images.

5. **B** = Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. gr. 98, ff. 12^r-17^r, saec. XVI (beginning), copied in Otranto.¹⁸ The manuscript was owned by Girolamo Seripando and later by Giovanni Paolo Parrasio. In the margins there are many notes in Latin and some in Greek; parts of the Greek text have been corrected by a second hand. Collated from high-quality colour images.

6. **H** = Harvard University, The Houghton Library, MS gr. 20, ff. 127^r-139^r, saec. XVI (c. 1520), copied in Otranto; the manuscript belonged to Joannes Baptista Rota.¹⁹ Collated from high-quality colour images.

The three manuscripts are related to one another, and were probably derived from a common exemplar, which I shall call **r**. This is demonstrated by the following places where they agree in error against all other manuscripts.²⁰ These are the major omissions in common: 627.11 καὶ τὰς σιαγόνας **TMV**] *om.* **r**, 650.11 φέρεται ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσιν ἐν θυμῷ ὥστε μαχέσασθαι **TVM**] *om.* **r**, 652.19 πῖμπλαται δὲ ἄρα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ **TVM**] *om.* **r**.

¹⁷ Hajdú and Schreiner 2013, 25-52, at 42-43.

¹⁸ Capocci 1958, n. 98; Vendruscolo 2005, 512-524, at 517; Formentin 2010, 401-408, at 406 n. 13; Ferreri 2002, 196-197, 199-203.

¹⁹ Kavrus-Hoffmann 2010, 207-274, at 232-238.

²⁰ I do not include here variant late spellings, such as 611.19 ἀφανίσαι **TVM**] ἀφανῆσαι **r**.

There are also many smaller errors shared between them: 614.23 ὅθεν ἦλθεν εἰς TVM] *om.* ἦλθεν r, 615.25 κάλλυνσιν TVM] κάλλωσιν *sic* r, 616.14 ἐξ ὧν καὶ "Ομηρος TVM] *om.* καὶ r, 619.5 τὸν ἴδιον TVM] *om.* τὸν r, 625.6 λαμπρὸν ἦν ἐν γύψῳ TVM] *om.* ἦν r, 627.27 ἔκειντο ὑποκάτω TVM] *om.* ἔκειντο r, 629.26 τριττῷ γὰρ ἢ κεφαλῇ TVM] *om.* γὰρ r, 632.19 πᾶσαν TVM] πάντα r, 635.30 ὃν δὲ TVM] οὐδὲ r, 641.4 οἱ δ' αὖτ' ἐς TVM] οἱ δ' αὖτην ἐς *sic* r, 641.9 τὸ δὲ κλυτὰ TVM] τὰ δὲ κλυτὰ r, 644.35 κατεσκεύασε TVM] κατεσκεύασαι r, 647.3 αἰγίδα δὲ μύωπα TVM] *om.* δὲ r, 650.25 ὅτε καὶ ὁ ἥλιος TVM] *om.* καὶ r, 650.31 τῶν ἀμπέλων μόχθον TVM] *om.* μόχθον r, 652.5 κατεβλήθη TVM] κατεκλήθη r, 650.23 βρώσις καὶ πόσις ἐστὶν TVM] *om.* καὶ πόσις r, 653.29 δώματα τοῦ Διὸς TVM] *om.* τοῦ Διὸς r. The manuscripts offer about a dozen variants, but none of them are certainly true.

When we look at the relations between G, B, and H, it becomes apparent that no clear internal relations between these manuscripts will emerge. In some places B and H agree against G: 639.14 κεκλεσμένοι TVM, κεκλεισμένοι G] κεκεκλεσμένοι B, κεκεκλεισμένοι H, 639.16 ἐν τε χοροῖς TMVG] *om.* τε BH, 639.25 τοῦ αὐλοῦ TMVG] τῇ αὐλοῦ BH, 652.23 ἔστη TVG] ἔστιν MBH. In other places G and H agree against B: 623.16 ἀδάμαντα ἐνταῦθα TMVB] ἀδάμαντι ἐνταῦθα GH, 646.29 ἀπὸ Διὸς TMVB] ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς GH, 648.5 ἀπαγγελεῖν TMV, ἀπαγγελῆν B (late spelling)] ἐπαγγελεῖν GH, 653.8 κατακτείνει αὐτόν TMVB] *om.* αὐτόν GH, 653.27 ἀφίκοντο TMVB] ἐφίκοντο GH. In one case B and H err in different ways over the copying of a word transmitted correctly in G: 651.11 ῥάμφη TMG] ῥάμφοι VB, γὰρ ἄμφοι H. But B elsewhere agrees in error with G against H: 611.21 τῇ Ἀλκμήνῃ Ζεὺς ἡμέρας TMVH] *om.* Ζεὺς BG. In another instance H errs in the same way as BG but in a different number: 626.38 ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον TVM] ἱμάτια βεβλημμένα BG, ἱμάτιον βεβλημμένον H.

Each manuscript is descended from r but has many of its own unique errors, and also shares errors sometimes with one manuscript in the group and sometimes with another. Hence B sometimes shares errors with H against G, but also sometimes shares errors with G against H. An explanation for this is contamination. It will be difficult to determine the internal relations of these manuscripts without the discovery of other related manuscript witnesses descended from r.

The least corrupt manuscript in this group is G, which is also the earliest manuscript in the group. It has unique variants in the following places: 617.3 δεδήξει] δεδείει, 617.4 ἄντιγες] ἄντιγες, 618.1 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἀπόλλων] γὰρ *om.*, 623.13 ἐκαλύπτοντο ἐν πτεροῖς] ἐν *om.*, 623.21 δύσβατον] δύσβατος, 625.4 παμποίκιον] πανποίκιον, 624.22 καὶ τῶν] καὶ *om.*, 624.28 τούτοις] τούτων, 628.7 Λαπιθῶν] Λαμπιθῶν, 630.28-29 ὧν ... ἰχθύες *om.*, 632.16 μέλαιναν] μέλαινα, 633.5 ἐν ὀργῇ

δὲ] *om.* δὲ, 635.30 νεότρωτον] νέοπρωτον, 638.6-7 τὸ πρόσωπον ὑπὸ τοῦ λιμοῦ παχύπους ὡς ὑδεριῶσα μακροὺς *om.*, 638.14 χῶμα] τὸ χῶμα, 638.15-16 ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρμόζουσι τοῖς ἐγγὺς θανάτου οὔσι καὶ *om.*, 639.16 ἑπταπύλους] ἑπταπύλας, 639.27 αὐλιητῇ] αὐλιτῇ, 640.31 δρεπάναις] δρεπάνες, 644.32 ἐφώνουν] ἐφόνουν, 647.5 τοῦτο γάρ] τοῦτου γάρ, 648.4 ἴσως γάρ κλέπτοντος] γάρ *om.*, 649.38 καὶ ἡ Ἑλίκη] ἡ *om.*, 650.11 κεχλασμένους] κεχλασμένους, 653.8 κατακτείνει αὐτόν] αὐτόν *om.*

The character of B's text is demonstrated by the following errors:²¹ 611.3 χωρὶς] χωρῆς, 611.5 ἀδελφῶν] ἀδελφῶν, 611.7 Ἰπποθόης τῆς θυγατρὶδῆς] Ἰπποθῆτης θυγατρὶδος *pr. corr.*, 611.19 πρὶν] πρὴν, 616.10 κατὰ πολὺ] κατὰ πόλιν, 619.34 ἀνωφελῶς] ἀνελῶς, 619.37 ὅς νῦν] ὡς νῦν, 622.11 σὺ δέ] οὐ δέ, 622.16 ἡ νῦν] ἡ νῦν *sic*, 623.8 χρυσοῦν] χρυσοῦν, 623.10 ἦν καὶ εἰς] καὶ *om.*, 624.30 τόν τε τὴν] τε *om.*, 625.7 κύκλῳ] Κύκνον, 627.28 λέοντες μάλλον διηγέρεθσαν] μάλλον *om.*, 628.2 λέγω δῆ] λέγω δὴ δῆ, 629.6 ἴσταντο, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἄρης] καὶ αὐτὸς *om.*, 629.8 βεβαμμένος] βεβλαμμένος, 629.28 κρατοῦσα] κατοῦσα, 630.16 συνάθροισμα] συνάθρισμα *pr. corr.*, 630.25 δὲ δελφίνες] δὲ φῖνες, 631.28 κατεσκεύασεν, ὥστε δοκεῖν μὴ ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τινος *om.*, 632.15 γὰρ συντάσσεται ἡ ἀμφί. εἴη δ' ἂν μελάνδετον, ἢ τὸ μέλαιναν *om.*, 636.1 ἐπικληροῦσαν] ἐπικληροῦσα, 638.6 συμπεπτωκός] συμπεπτωκώς, 638.6 χῶμα] χῶμα, 638.11 ἐν δάκρυσι διάβροχος] ἐν δάκρυσι διάβροχος οὔσα ἐν δάκρυσι, 641.3 ψαλίδας φαμέν ἰδιωτικῶς] φαμέν *om.*, 641.14 πλησίον δὲ αὐτῶν] δὲ *om.*, 641.17 καταβαρούμενον] ἀποβαρούμενον, 643.25 ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν αὐτοῖς ἐμάχοντο *om.*, 647.1 Ἀμαθείας] Ἀλμαθείας, 649.35 πολλὰ δρῦς] πολλὰ δὲ δρῦς, 649.35 πεῦκαι καὶ αἴγειροι] καὶ *om.*, 649.38 Ἑλίκη] Ἑλία, 651.10 ἐπικαμπεῖς] ἐπικαμφεῖς, 652.4 νεῦρα] ῥευνᾶ, 652.18 ἐκόρεσε] ἐκόκεσε, 652.21 σώματος ὅμους τῇ οὐρῇ] ὅμους *om.*

H has the most errors among these manuscripts. Reported here are only some samples, selected from the beginning (610-611), middle (625, 627, 639), and end (652-654.2) of the text: 611.10 ἐκείνῳ] ἐκείνου, 625.5 βαλῶν] λαβῶν, 627.2 ἐζωγραφοῦντο] ἐζωγραφῆν, 627.3 αἱ δὲ ἐφόβουν] αἱ ἀνεφόβουν, 627.22 εὐτάκτως] εὐτέκτως, 627.24 and 28 λέοντες] λέγοντες *pr. corr.* (in both cases corrected by a later hand), 639.27 γελῶντες] λέγοντες, 652.16 δηλονότι] δηλοῖ, 652.31 ἀντήχησε] ἀντίχησε, 652.31 ᾧ τινι δὴ ὄρει] ὡς τινι ἔρει, 653.3 ἴστασο] ἴστασω, 653.9 ἔρριψεν] ἔρριψαι, 653.21-22 εἰς τὸν δίφρον τὸν ποικίλον. ταχέως δὲ πάλιν ἐμάστιξαν τοὺς ἵππους, καὶ ἀφίκοντο *om.*, 653.37-38 ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἠνίζατο καὶ ἐμαντεύσατο, ὅτι δὴ *om.*

21 Not included here are places where B has late orthography: 616.10 κρείττονα] κρύττονα B, 618.5 ἀλσώδεις] ἀλσώδης B, 648.5 ἀπαγγελεῖν] ἀπαγγελεῖν B, 649.23 πειθόμενος] πυθόμενος B.

5

The next three manuscripts of the fifteenth century offer an abridged form of the text. They have proved to be textually unhelpful. Sigla have not been accorded to them.

7. Olomouc, Státní Vědecká Knihovna, Olomucensis M 79, saec. XV (middle), written by Demetrius Trivolis.²² Collated from high-quality colour images. On ff. 1^r-9^v the *scholia paraphrastica* have been written into the margins next to the text of the *Aspis*. There is no title. The manuscript only contains minor excerpts from Peditasimus' *scholia paraphrastica*, rather than the complete work, so we are not given a full picture of the text available to its copyist. The manuscript does not contain enough material to establish its affinities with any certainty. Its errors are not shared with other manuscripts: 638.13 σεσαρυία] σεσαρηα; 638.16 ἀρρωστοῦσιν ἢ καὶ ἄλλως] ἢ *om.*, 646.33 αὕτη γὰρ ἡ αἰγίς] γὰρ *om.*, 648.3 Κήϋξ δὲ οὐ μόνον] ὁ Κήϋξ οὐ μόνον, 649.10 τὸ πύλου] ὁ πύλου, 649.13 καὶ τὸ θήλυς] τὸ *om.*, 649.13 καὶ παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ *om.*, 649.15 γὰρ ἐστὶ θηλυκόν] ἐστὶ *om.* After 649.15 this manuscript has a small addition to the scholion based partly on the entry in *technologia* 646.13, where Pind. *Ol.* I.6, ἐρήμης δι' αἰθέρος, is quoted.²³

8. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Matritensis 4607, saec. XV (1458-1465), written by Konstantinos Lascaris.²⁴ Collated from colour images. On ff. 51^v-53^v the scholia have been presented as a single body of text, rather than in the margins of the *Aspis*. The title given is Ἰωάννου Διακόνου τοῦ Πεδιασίμου τοῦ ὑπάτου σχόλια παραφραστικά εἰς τὴν Ἀσπίδα τοῦ Ἡσιόδου. This manuscript offers a paraphrase of the contents of Peditasimus' *scholia paraphrastica*.

Here are two examples displaying the character of the paraphrase. At 628.1-2, the full version of the text reads: ἐν τούτοις (φησὶν) ἦν ἐξωφραγμένη μάχη τῶν πολεμικῶν Λαπιθῶν. For this Lascaris has ἐν τούτοις (φησὶν) ἦν ἐξωφραγμένη καὶ ἡ μάχη τῶν Λαπιθῶν. At 635.33-35, the full version reads: αἱ δὲ Κήρες ἡνίκα ἐπλησθησαν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου αἵματος, ἐκείνον μὲν τὸν νεκρὸν ἔρριπτον ὀπίσω, ὑπέστρεφον δὲ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον πάλιν. For this Lascaris has αἱ δὲ Κήρες πεπλησμέναι αἵματος ὑπέστρεφον εἰς τὸν πόλεμον πάλιν.

Lascaris was fond of paraphrase and abbreviation. Elsewhere in this same manuscript there is an anonymous paraphrase of the *Aspis* (from f. 121),²⁵

22 Olivier and Monégier du Sorbier 1983, 22-23; for support of Gamillscheg's identification of the scribe as Demetrius Trivolis, see further Wilson 1985, 175.

23 Noted already in Olivier and Monégier du Sorbier 1983, 176.

24 Iriarte 1769, 24-27; Schultz 1910, 11; Vogel and Gardthausen 1909, 244.

25 Iriarte 1769, 25.

which I have not been able to examine. There is also an abbreviated version of Pediasimus' *technologia* in Matr. 4629, ff. 68^v-69^v, and, according to Corrales Pérez, Lascaris used this to annotate his text of the *Aspis*.²⁶ Corrales Pérez reported that in the margins of the text of the *Aspis* in Matr. 4607 a few mythological scholia can be found, and that these have been adapted from Pediasimus' *scholia paraphrastica*.²⁷ I have not been able to check the text of these.

9. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Laur. Plut. 31.24, saec. XV (perhaps 1480s), written by George Hermonymus.²⁸ The manuscript belonged to Piero de' Medici, to whom it was given by his father, Lorenzo. Collated from high-quality colour images. On ff. 142^r-143^r there is a small selected excerpt from the *scholia paraphrastica* of Pediasimus, headed by the title καὶ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν Ἀσπίδα τοῦ Ἡσιόδου.

This has the text of the *scholia paraphrastica* from 610.36 to 624.33. Here are its errors or variants: 611.13 ἦν ἡ Ἀλκμήνη] ἡ *om.*, 616.12 ἔτεκεν. τρεῖς εἰσὶ Θῆβαι] ἔτεκεν. Θῆβη ἐν ἑπταπύλῳ: τρεῖς εἰσὶ Θῆβαι (the addition is a quotation of Sc. 49), 619.2 φυγάς ἦλθεν] φυγὼν ἦλθεν, 619.4 ἔρριψε γὰρ, ὡς εἴρηται, ῥάβδον] ὡς εἴρηται *om.*, 620.5 ἀλλ' ἡ Ἥρα] ἡ *om.*. On the right-hand margin of fol. 143^r a line has been drawn around the final scholion, from 624.18-624.33 (ἰστέον ... κατασκευῇ), and the word ἡμέτερον has been added as a note.

6

I now turn to the editions of the text. This particular set of scholia has been edited five times:

V. Trincavellus, Hesiodi Ascræi Opera et Dies, Theogonia, Scutum Herculis. Omnia vero cum multis optimisque expositionibus, Venice 1537, fol. clxix-lxxxviii.

D. Heinsius, Hesiodi Ascræi quae extant, Leiden 1603, 187-224.

C.F. Heinrichius, Hesiodi Scutum Herculis, Breslau 1802, 60-106.

T. Gaisford, Poetae Minores Graeci, III, Oxford 1820, 499-534.

T. Gaisford, Poetae Minores Graeci, II, Leipzig 1823, 609-654.

In 1537 Vettore Trincavelli published the *editio princeps* of the *scholia paraphrastica* of Pediasimus in the printing-house of Bartolomeo Zanetti.

²⁶ Corrales Pérez 1994, 218.

²⁷ Corrales Pérez 1994, 218, with a collated sample of the text.

²⁸ Speranzi 2016, 79-80; Schultz 1910, 8.

The manuscript basis of this edition was a combination of T and M. Trincavelli carries over the readings of M against those of T in the following places: 625.9 ἐζωφραφημένος T] ἐζωγραφισμένος M, Trinc., 652.23 μαχέσασθαι T] μάχεσθαι M, Trinc., 652.23 ἔσται T] ἔστιν M, Trinc.

In orthographical matters, too, Trincavelli sides with M against T: 649.35 αἴγειροι T] αἴγυροι M, Trinc., 650.26 κέγχροι T] κέγγροι M, Trinc. In some places, however, Trincavelli must have corrected M against T, as the following examples seem to suggest: 622.14 ὀρείχαλκος τὸ λευκὸν χάλκωμα T, Trinc.] τὸ λευκὸν *om.* M, 632.27 καταπιεῖν T, Trinc.] καταποιεῖν M, 635.29 πιεῖν T, Trinc.] ποιεῖν M, 647.1 λέγει δ' ἂν T, Trinc.] λέγει δ' ἂν *pr. corr.* M.

The most important error in Trincavelli's edition comes at 635.33, where the mistake has influenced all later editions (the lemma is the agreement of all the manuscripts):

635.33 Κῆρες ω] χεῖρες Trinc., Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

This common error suggests that Trincavelli's collation of the text was not checked against the manuscripts by any later editors.

In 1603 Heinsius published the *scholia paraphrastica* of Pediasimus as part of his edition of the text of Hesiod. Heinsius says nothing about the manuscript sources of his text. The significance of Heinsius' edition lies in the fact that he incorporated his own corrections in various places, and these in turn were integrated into the later editions of Heinrichius and Gaisford:

619.8 οἰκέταις ω, Trinc.] ἰκέταις Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

623.8 ἔθηκε ω, Trinc.] θήκε Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

627.2 ἐζωγράφηντο ω] ἐζωγράφοντο *sic* Trinc., ἐζωγραφούντο Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

635.27 πιπτόντων ὥσπερ ω, Trinc.] πιπτόντων ὀρμῶσαι ὥσπερ Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

635.28 γάρ ω, Trinc.] δ' ἄρ Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

639.14 φλοιᾷ ω, Trinc.] φλιᾷ Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

645.25 θερίσης ω, Trinc.] στερίσης Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

650.3 ἀλλαλάξαντες ω, Trinc.] ἀλαλάξαντες Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford

Neither Heinrichius nor Gaisford used new manuscript material. Heinrichius mentioned no manuscripts at all. In the case of Gaisford, who dedicated his volume to Heinsius, none of the manuscripts listed in his *index codicum* contains the text of the *scholia paraphrastica* of Pediasimus. The editions of Heinrichius and Gaisford are therefore derivative of the work of Trincavellus and Heinsius.

It is premature to offer broad conclusions about the transmission of Pediasimus' *scholia paraphrastica* before all of the manuscripts containing scholia to the *Aspis* have been thoroughly collated and investigated. No stemma can yet be drawn safely. The aim of this discussion has been to bring attention to the readings found in the manuscripts, not to provide a full history of the text. Since Pediasimus' scholia are in general poorly catalogued, versions of the *scholia paraphrastica* might still lie undetected in the margins of manuscripts of the *Aspis* not yet fully studied or accurately described. More discoveries are therefore to be expected.

Bibliography

- Bassi, D. (1898). I manoscritti di Giovanni Pediasimo. *Reale Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere, Rendiconti*, ser. II, 31, pp. 1399-1418.
- Capocci, V. (1958). *Codices Barberiniani Graeci, Vol. I: Codices 1-163*. Vatican City.
- Corrales Pérez, Y. (1994). *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des pseudo-hesiodischen Scutum Herculis*. Dissertation, Hamburg.
- Ferreri, L. (2002). I codici parrasiani della Biblioteca Vaticana, con particolare riguardo al Barberiniano greco 194, appartenuto a Giano Lascaris. *AION(filol)* 24, pp. 189-223.
- Formentin, M. (2010). Un nuovo codice di Giovanni Lido, autografo di Aulo Giano Parrasio. In: M. D'Agostino and P. Degni, eds., *Alethes philia. Studi in onore di Giancarlo Prato, Vol. 2*, Spoleto, pp. 401-408.
- Gaisford, T. (1823). *Poetae Minores Graeci, Vol. 2*. Leipzig.
- Hajdú, K., and Schreiner, P. (2013). Nikolaos von Otranto und ein angeblicher Plagiator im Cod. graec. 262 der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek. Mit einem Anhang zur Provenienz der griechischen Handschriften aus der Sammlung Johann Albrecht Widmannstetters. *Codices Manuscripti & Impressi* 87-88, pp. 25-52.
- Hunger, H. (1961). *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Vol. 1*. Vienna.
- Iriarte, J. (1769). *Regiae Bibliothecae Matritensis Codices Graeci Manuscripti, Vol. 1*. Madrid.
- Kavrus-Hoffmann, N. (2010). Catalogue of Greek Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Collections of the United States of America, Part V.2: Harvard University, The Houghton Library. *Manuscripta* 54, pp. 207-274.
- Levie, K. (2018). *Jean Pédiásimos. Essai sur les douze travaux d' Héracles. Édition critique, traduction et introduction*. Leuven.

- Martano, A. (2002). Scolii e glosse allo *Scudo di Eracle* dal manoscritto Ambrosiano C 222 inf. *Aevum* 76, pp. 151-200.
- Martano, A. (2005). La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo *Scudo di Eracle* esiodeo. La famiglia del Vat. gr. 1332 (sec. XIII-XV). *Aevum* 79, pp. 461-489.
- Martano, A. (2006). L'esegesi antica allo *Scudo di Eracle* nell'*Etymologicum Genuinum e Gudianum*. In: G. Avezzi and P. Scattolin, eds., *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali. Atti del convegno, Rovereto, 20 ottobre 2006*, Rovereto, pp. 85-119.
- Martano, A. (2008). La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo *Scudo di Eracle* esiodeo. Due gruppi di codici (sec. XIV-XVI). *Aevum* 82, pp. 543-580.
- Mason, H.C. (2015). Pediasimus on the Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles*. *RhM* 158, pp. 220-224.
- Mioni, E. (1985). *Bibliothecae Diui Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti, Vol. 2: Thesaurus Antiquus. Codices 300-625*. Rome.
- Olivier, J.-M., and Monégier du Sorbier, M.-A. (1983). *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de Tchecoslovaquie*. Paris.
- Pingree, D. (1977). The Library of George, Count of Corinth. In: K. Treu, ed., *Studia codicologica*, Berlin, pp. 351-362.
- Ranke, C.F. (1840). *Hesiodi quod fertur Scutum Herculis*. Quedlinburg/Leipzig.
- Russo, C.F. (1965). *Hesiodi Scutum*. Florence.
- Schultz, H. (1910). *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Hesiod-Scholien*. Berlin.
- Speranzi, D. (2016). *Omero, i cardinali e gli esuli. Copisti greci di un manoscritto di Stoccarda*. Madrid.
- Vendruscolo, F. (2005). Codici greci del Parrasio e di S. Giovanni a Carbonara nel fondo Barberini della Vaticana. *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 12, pp. 512-524.
- Vogel, M., and Gardthausen, V. (1909). *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*. Leipzig.
- Wilson, N.G. (1985). [Review of Olivier and Monégier du Sorbier 1983]. *CR* 35, pp. 175-176.
- Wilson, N.G. (1996). *Scholars of Byzantium*. London.