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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.
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The scholia to the Hesiodic Aspis have not received much attention from modern scholars. The scholia vetera were last published by Ranke in 1840. Some substantial efforts have been made to assess the textual history of this material more fully, 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) 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.
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, and since then no study has been made of them save for the publication of a handful of emendations. 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.

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. Later, Corralez Pérez added Matritensis 4607 as a

---

4  Gaisford 1823, 639-654.
5  Mason 2015. The Pediasimus scholia are very briefly introduced in Russo 1965, 56.
The Manuscripts of the Scholia to the Hesiodic Aspis

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 Pediasimus in this article will follow the page and line numbering of this edition.
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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] ἱκέταις codd. This error is so absurd as a paraphrase of Sc. 85 ἱκέτησι, 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. 2r-13r the scholia paraphrastica have been written into the margins next to the text of the Aspis. At the beginning of fol. 2r 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 ἱκέταις] τοῖς οἰκεταῖς, 623.8 θῆκε δὲ] έθηκε δὲ, 625.9 before the text of the scholium we find the title ἔκφρασις τῆς ἀσπίδος πάνυ εὐφυῶς ἔχουσα, 625.9 ἐζωγραφισμένος] ἐζωγραφημένος, 627.2 ἐζωγραφοῦντο] ἐζωγράφηντο, 630.24 κασσιτέρου, κασιτέρου,

7 Corrales Pérez 1994, 41. For help with obtaining images of manuscripts I wish to thank Rostislav Krušinský (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 Pediasimus, Domenico Bassi omitted to list any manuscripts of the scholia paraphrastica or technologia; see Bassi 1898, 1408.
11 Id., 272-275.
632.23 κίβυσις, 635.27 πιπτόντων ὠρμώσαι ὠσπερ, 635.28 πάσαι δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ πάσαι γάρ, 635.33 αἱ δὲ χεῖρες, αἱ δὲ Κῆρες, 639.14 ἤγουν τῇ φλιᾷ, ἥγουν τῇ φλοίᾳ, 645.25 στερίσῃς ἁλιλάξαντες, 650.3 ἀλαλάξαντες, 652.23 μάχεσθαι, 652.23 ἐστίν ἐναντίος τοῦ Ἄρεος, ἐστίν 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. On ff. 215r-225v the scholia paraphrastica have been written into the margins next to the text of the Aspis. At the beginning of fol. 215r 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 οἰκεταῖς, 622.14 ὄρειχαλκὸς τὸ λευκὸν χάλκωμα, 623.8 ἥθη δὲ ἔθηκε δὲ, 627.2 ἐξωγραφοῦντο, ἐξωγράφηντο, 630.24 κασιτέρου, 632.23 κιβυσις, 632.27 καταπιεῖν, 635.27 πιπτόντων ὥσπερ, 635.28 πάσαι δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ πάσαι γάρ, 635.29 ἐπεθύμου ποιεῖν, 635.33 αἱ δὲ χεῖρες, αἱ δὲ Κῆρες, 639.14 τῇ φλιᾷ, 645.25 στερίσῃς, 647.1 λέγει δ᾽ ἂν (οἱ written above ει in superscript), 647.2 μὲν τοῦ Ἰολάου, 649.35 αἴγειροι, 650.26 κέγχριοι. Collated from high-quality colour images: 611.7 Ἱπποθόης τῆς θυγατριδῆς Πέλοπος, 612.21 καὶ ὁ Ἀμφιτρύων, 619.7 ἄριά ἀπεδέξαντο, 619.8 τοῖς οἰκεταῖς, 623.7 θῆκε δὲ, 624.23 εἰς τὴν ἅλω, εἰς τὴν ἅλω, 627.26 ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν, 630.24 κασιτέρου, 635.33 αἱ δὲ χεῖρες, αἱ δὲ Κῆρες, 639.14 τῇ φλιᾷ, 645.25 στερίσῃς, 649.35 αἴγειροι, 650.26 κέγχριοι. 651.11 τὰ ῥάμφοι (ἡ written over οι in superscript), 652.20 τοὺς ἐκείνου τοῦ σώματος ὤμους τῇ οὐρᾷ μαστίζων, τοὺς ὤμους ἑαυτοῦ τῇ οὐρᾷ μαστίζων, 653.30 τοῖς ὀπίσου του πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τοῖς ὀπίσου του 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 ράμφοι T] ράμφοι 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 Αθήνη | ἔξεισεν Οὐλυμπόν τε μέγαν καὶ δῶματα πατρός, where Pediasimus T paraphrases: ἡ δὲ Αθηνᾶ ἀφίκετο εἰς τὸν μέγαν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ δῶματα τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ (653.28-30).

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


5. B = Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. gr. 98, ff. 12r-17r, saec. XVI (beginning), copied in Otranto. 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. 127r-139r, saec. XVI (c. 1520), copied in Otranto; the manuscript belonged to Joannes Baptista Rota. 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. These are the major omissions in common: 627.11 καὶ τὰς σιαγόνας TMV] om. r, 650.11 φέρεται ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἐν θυμῷ ὥστε μαχέσασθαι TVM] om. r, 652.19 πίπλαται δὲ ἄρα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ TVM] om. r.

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 δεδεῖει] δεδείει, 617.4 ἄντυγες] ἄντυγες, 618.1 αὐτός] γὰρ ὅ Ἀπέλλων] γὰρ om., 623.13 ἐκαλύπτοντο ἐν πτεροῖς] ἐν om., 623.21 δύσβατον] δύσβατος, 625.4 παμποίκιλον] πανποίκιλον, 624.22 καὶ τῶν] καὶ om., 624.28 τούτων] τούτων, 628.7 Λαμπίδων] Λαμπιθῶν, 630.28-29 ὅν ... ἰχθύες om., 632.16 μέλαιναν] μέλαινα, 633.5 ὅ ὅρη

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 Trivilis.\(^{22}\) Collated from high-quality colour images. On ff. 1r-9v 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 Pediasimus’ *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 *σεσαρυῖα*  σεσαρῆα; 638.16 ἀφρωστοῦσιν ἡ καὶ ᾠλως] ἡ *om.*, 646.33 αὕτη γὰρ ἡ αἰγίς] γάρ *om.*, 648.3 Κηῆξ δὲ οὐ μόνον] ὁ Κηῆξ οὐ μόνον, 649.10 τὸ πύλου] ὁ πύλου, 649.13 καὶ τὸ θῆλυς] τὸ *om.*, 649.13 καὶ παρ’ Εὐριπίδη *om.*, 649.15 γάρ ἐστι θηλυκόν] ἐστι *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 δὲ’ 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. 51r-53v 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 παραφραστικὰ εἰς τὴν Ἀσπίδα τοῦ Ἡσιόδου. This manuscript offers a paraphrase of the contents of Pediasimus’ *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 ἐζωφραγημένη μάχη τῶν πολεμικῶν Λαπιθῶν. For this Lascaris has ἐν τούτοις (φησὶν) ἦν ἐζωφραγημένη καὶ μάχη τῶν Λαπιθῶν. At 635.33-35, the full version reads: αἱ δὲ Κῆρες ἡνίκα ἐπλήσθησαν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου αἵματος, ἐκείνον μὲν τὸν νεκρὸν ἔῤῥιπτον ὀπίσω, ὑπέστρεφον δὲ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον πάλιν. For this Lascaris has αἱ δὲ Κῆρες 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 Trivilis, 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. 68r–69r, 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. 142r-143r 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 Θηβαί] ἔτεκεν. Θηβαί ἐν ἐπταπύλω: τρεῖς εἰσὶ Θηβαί (the addition is a quotation of Sc. 49), 619.2 φυγάς ἦλθεν] φυγών ἦλθεν, 619.4 ἔῤῥιψε γὰρ, ὡς εἴρηται, ῥάβδον] ὡς εἴρηται om., 620.5 ἢ Ἡρα] ἢ om.. On the right-hand margin of fol. 143r a line has been drawn around the final scholion, from 624.18-624.33 (ἰστέον ... κατασκευή), and the word ἡμέτερον has been added as a note.
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I now turn to the editions of the text. This particular set of scholia has been edited five times:

V. Trincavellus, Hesiodi Ascaei Opera et Dies, Theogonia, Scutum Herculis. Omnia vero cum multis optimisque expositionibus, Venice 1537, fol. clxix-lxxxviii.
C.F. Heinrichius, Hesiodi Scutum Herculis, Breslau 1802, 60-106.

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 ἐζωφραγμένος T ἐζωγραφισμένος M, Trinc., 652.23 μαχέσασθαι T μάχεσθαι M, Trinc., 652.23 ἔστη 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 κέγχριοι 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 τὸ λευκὸν om. M, 632.27 καταπιεῖν T καταποιεῖν M, 635.29 πιεῖν T ποιεῖν M, 647.1 λέγοι 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.] ικέταις Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
623.8 ἐθηκε ω, Trinc.] θήκε Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
627.2 ἐξωγράφηντο ω] ἐξωγραφόντο sic Trinc., ἐξωγραφοῦντο Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
635.27 πιπτόντων ὥσπερ ω, Trinc.] πιπτόντων ὀρμώσατi ὥσπερ Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
635.28 γὰρ ω, Trinc.] δ᾽ ἂρ Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
639.14 φλοιᾷ ω, Trinc.] φλιᾷ Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
645.25 θερίσῃς ω, Trinc.] στερίσῃς Heinsius, Heinrichius, Gaisford
650.3 ἀλλαλάξαντες ω, Trinc.] ἀλλαλάξαντες 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 read-
ings 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 there-
fore to be expected.
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