

## PEDIASIMUS ON THE HESIODIC *SHIELD OF HERACLES*\*

The scholia on the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* fall into two distinct groups.<sup>1</sup> The scholia vetera, which have traditionally been ascribed to Tzetzes, preserve traces of ancient learning and make some important contributions to the text. Despite this, they have never been satisfactorily edited: they must still be cited from Ranke who, although he makes some advances over his predecessor Gaisford, falls far short of the standards of presentation one expects nowadays; Schultz published important preparatory studies but died before his time.<sup>2</sup> A new edition of the scholia vetera that promises to take proper account of the manuscript tradition is therefore eagerly awaited.<sup>3</sup>

The second body of scholia on the *Shield* comprises the notes of John Pediasimus (c. 1240–c. 1310),<sup>4</sup> who wrote both a paraphrase of and grammatical notes (technologica) on the poem. None of this has been edited since Gaisford,<sup>5</sup> and it has in general received very little attention. The reasons are not far to seek. First, it seems that only very rarely did Pediasimus draw on sources that are unavailable to us, and his text was no better than ours. It was in fact sometimes inferior: for example, Pediasimus glosses Sc. 439 ἀντεβόλησεν as ἀντήχησε (p. 652.31), which implies the corruption ἀντεβόησεν (found also in Rzach's H). Moreover, he paraphrases Sc. 172 ἦδη γὰρ σφιν ἔκειτο μέγας λῖς as ἦδη γὰρ ἐπῆλθε τοῖς κάπροις μέγας λέων (p. 627.25), suggesting that his copy had ἔκειτο, an imagined middle form of κῖω; if we are less generous, we may suppose that Pediasimus himself misread the word ἔκειτο. Either way, Pediasimus' interpretation makes nonsense of the scene that the poet is describing and offers modern scholars little enticement to study his notes.

---

\*) For constructive criticism I wish to thank Mr N. G. Wilson and the editors of RhM. This work was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

1) Cf. e. g. C. F. Russo, *Hesiodi Scutum*, Florence <sup>2</sup>1965, 52–57. On the advice of F. A. Wolf, C. F. Ranke, *Hesiodi quod fertur Scutum Herculis*, Quedlinburg / Leipzig 1840, 41–65, also printed an anonymous paraphrase with which we are not here concerned.

2) T. Gaisford, *Poetae Minores Graeci III*, Oxford 1820, reprinted in the second volume of the 1823 Leipzig edition; Ranke (n. 1 above) 23–40; H. Schultz, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Hesiod-Scholien*, Berlin (Abh. Gött. Ak.) 1910 (4); id., *Zur Nebenüberlieferung der Hesiodscholien*, NGG 2, 1913, 252–263.

3) Cf. A. Martano, *Scolii e glosse allo Scudo di Eracle dal manoscritto Ambrosiano C 222 inf.*, *Aevum* 76, 2002, 151–200; id., *La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo Scudo di Eracle esiodeo: due gruppi di codici (sec. XIV–XVI)*, *Aevum* 79, 2005, 461–489; id., *La tradizione manoscritta dell'esegesi antica allo Scudo di Eracle esiodeo: la famiglia del Vat. gr. 1332 (sec. XIII–XV)*, *Aevum* 82, 2008, 543–580.

4) PLP no. 22235; cf. N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London <sup>2</sup>1996, 242–243; Russo (n. 1 above) 56.

5) Gaisford (n. 2 above); citations of Pediasimus are by page and line of the Leipzig edition.

This brings us to the second reason for the lack of interest in Pediasimus' commentaries: his reputation as a scholar. In the judgement of one critic, "his literary productions do not suggest a man of more than mediocre talent. Wide interests are not matched by competence"; his scholia on the *Shield*, meanwhile, are "linguistic notes of the most humdrum kind imaginable".<sup>6</sup> This is not entirely fair, since in the paraphrase Pediasimus does attempt some literary criticism, notably in relation to the horrors detailed at Sc. 264–270 (pp. 637.34–638.17);<sup>7</sup> other original, or at least interesting, thoughts are to be found at pp. 624.18–33 (the shield represents the cosmos, καὶ θανυμάσεις οἶμαι τόν τε τὴν ἀσπίδα κατασκευάσαντα Ἴφαιστον καὶ τὸν ταύτην ἐκφράσαντα ποιητήν) and 646.26–647.8 (Athena ascending the chariot alongside Heracles and Iolaus represents Iolaus' ἠνιοχευτικὴ ἐπιστήμη καὶ φρόνησις). Pediasimus is moreover capable of pictorial embellishment. Here, for instance, is his paraphrase of Sc. 250–252, the memorable description of the Keres on the battlefield vying over the corpses of the slain:

φοβεραὶ δὲ καὶ φονικαὶ καὶ ἄγρια οὔσαι ἐμάχοντο ὑπὲρ τῶν πιπτόντων, ὀρμῶσαι ὡσπερ γῦπες ἢ κόρακες εἰς τὰ πτώματα. πᾶσαι δ' ἄρ' ... ἐπεθύμουν πτεῖν αἶμα νεκρμαίων (p. 635.26–30).

The comparison of the Keres to vultures or crows (emphasised in the quotation above) is Pediasimus' own: there is no basis for it in the text of the poem. The same unprompted comparison of demons to carrion birds occurs to him again when commenting on Sc. 257 (pp. 637.38–638.1). But despite such occasional flashes, the majority of Pediasimus' comments are, it must be admitted, rather unadventurous.

Nonetheless, what Pediasimus wrote ought to be printed correctly, as it is not in the still-standard edition of Gaisford. Gaisford made use of the work of Heinsius and Heinrich,<sup>8</sup> but he left much to be done. Many improvements are self-evident, such as correcting accents and regularising punctuation and dialect: Peditasimus will not have fluctuated within the same sentence between Τρῆχίς and Τρᾶχίς (p. 648.2–3). But other corruptions are less readily healed, and so I offer here corrections to four passages of Peditasimus' paraphrase and one of the scholia vetera. If these emendations seem obvious to the reader, it is only because our editions are shamefully substandard. There is still great progress to be made: Heinsius has reaped but he has left more than a stubble. In particular, future research would undoubtedly benefit from the collation of more manuscripts; such resources were unfortunately not at my disposal.

1. Peditasimus on Sc. 86 (p. 620.4–8). Peditasimus is telling the story of how Heracles' birth was delayed through Hera's machinations, and he cites Theocritus as an authority: ἡ Ἥρα ζηλοτυποῦσα πρὸς τὴν Ἀλκμήνην ἐποίησε τὸν μὲν Εὐρυσθέα ἑπταμηνιαῖον γεννηθῆναι, τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλέα δεκαμηνιαῖον, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Θεό-

6) Wilson (n. 4 above) 242. Peditasimus is damned already by J. G. Graevius, *Lectiones Hesiodae*, Amsterdam 1667, 103, "iste homo supra triviales Grammaticorum canones non sapit".

7) The impossibility of his interpretation is, however, exposed by M. L. West, *Ἀχνύς*, ZPE 67, 1987, 17–19, at 18.

8) D. Heinsius, *Hesiodi Ascraei quae extant*, Leiden 1603; C. F. Heinrich, *Hesiodi Scutum Herculis*, Breslau 1802.

κριτος. φησὶ γὰρ Ἡρακλέα δεκάμηνον ἔοντα γείνατο μήτηρ. Pediasimus has in mind the beginning of *Idyll* 24:

Ἡρακλέα δεκάμηνον ἔοντα ποχ' ἅ Μιδεαῖτις  
 Ἀλκμήνα καὶ νυκτὶ νεώτερον Ἴφικλῆα,  
 ἀμφοτέρους λούσασα καὶ ἐμπλήσασα γάλακτος,  
 χαλκείαν κατέθηκεν ἐς ἀσπίδα, τὰν Πτερελάου  
 Ἀμφιτρύων καλὸν ὄπλον ἀπεσκύλευσε πεσόντος.

Pediasimus may merely be paraphrasing Theocritus, in which case we should change γείνατο μήτηρ to γεννήσασα τὴν μητέρα; the corruption will be due to reminiscence of the Homeric clausula γείνατο μήτηρ (1.280, 3.238, etc.). ἔοντα, however, will be an error of Pediasimus' own (he has the Theocritus passage in view) and ought not to be emended further to ὄντα.

Heinsius took a different line. He thought that Pediasimus had quoted only the first three words of Theocritus' poem, the sentence being too long for his purposes, and had patched up the verse with γείνατο μήτηρ, creating an unmetrical jumble.<sup>9</sup> If indeed Pediasimus is directly quoting Theocritus, this is a very attractive theory. In support of it one might note that Pediasimus' source does not even corroborate the point for which he adduces it: δεκάμηνος refers to the ten months that the infant Heracles has spent outside the womb, not to the gestation period. If Pediasimus was capable of such ineptitude in his use of Theocritus, he may also justly be held responsible for foisting on that poet the miserable non-hexameter Ἡρακλέα δεκάμηνον ἔοντα γείνατο μήτηρ. In all probability, then, we should not emend. "Du sollst keinen Schriftsteller klüger machen als er war."<sup>10</sup>

2. Scholia vetera on Sc. 89 (p. 27 Ranke). Heracles tells the otherwise unattested story of how his brother Iphicles (rather than he himself) went off into servitude to Eurystheus (Sc. 89–93):

... τοῦ μὲν φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς,  
 ὃς προλιπὼν σφετέρων τε δόμον σφετέρους τε τοκῆας 90  
 ᾤχετο τιμῆσων ἀλιτήμενον Εὐρυσθεῖα,  
 σχέτλιος ἢ που πολλὰ μετεστοναχίζει' ὀπίσσω  
 ἦν ἄτην ὀχέων· ἢ δ' οὐ παλινάγρετός ἐστιν.

The scholium reads: τοῦ μὲν φρένας] τοῦ Ἰφίκλου, τοῦ πατέρος Ἰολάου· ἐπεὶ ἀπολιπὼν τῷ Εὐρυσθεῖ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον ἀπεχώρησε. Iphicles did not gift his house to Eurystheus; rather, he left his home and went off to serve his new master. An economical solution would be to alter the word order to: ἐπεὶ ἀπολιπὼν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον τῷ Εὐρυσθεῖ ἀπεχώρησε; the dative of motion would convey the sense of 'advantage' for Eurystheus.<sup>11</sup>

9) Heinsius (n. 8 above), at p. 118 of the second, separately paginated section entitled "Introductio in doctrinam, quae libris Ἔργων καὶ Ἡμερῶν continetur... item notae, emendationes, observationes in Hesiodum, eiusque Interpretes".

10) U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen 1848–1914*, Leipzig 1928, 103.

11) Cf. e. g. Kühner / Gerth II.1 417–420, esp. 418; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge MA 21956, §1485.

We have, however, no equivalent here for τιμήσων, and it may be doubted whether merely changing the word order goes far enough. A more convincing solution (prompted by a suggestion of Mr Wilson's) is not only to alter the word order as above, but also to supply δουλεύσων as a gloss on τιμήσων (as in Pediasimus' paraphrase of this same passage at p.619.33): ἐπεὶ ἀπολιπὼν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον τῷ Εὐρύσθει (δουλεύσων) ἀπεχώρησε. This is attractive because it gives us equivalents for each of προλιπὼν (ἀπολιπὼν), τιμήσων (δουλεύσων) and ὄχρητο (ἀπεχώρησε).<sup>12</sup>

3. Pediasimus on Sc. 229–231 (p. 632.26–27). The poet describes Perseus pursued by the Gorgons, and Pediasimus paraphrases Sc. 229–231,

... ταὶ δὲ μετ' αὐτόν  
Γοργόνες ἄπλητοί τε καὶ οὐ φαταὶ ἐρρώντο  
ιέμεναι μαπέειν,

as follows: ὄπισθεν δὲ ἐκείνου ἐδίωκον αἱ Γοργόνες, ὁρμῶσαι καταπιεῖν αὐτόν. Neither the poet of the *Shield* (for all his bizarrerie) nor his Byzantine commentator suggested that the Gorgons wished to ingest Perseus. For καταπιεῖν read καταλαβεῖν. μάρπτω is thus glossed by Pediasimus at pp. 635.1, 635.30, 636.35–36, 637.2–3 and 641.24, and by the scholia vetera on 231 and 245 (pp. 33 and 34 Ranke).

4. Pediasimus on Sc. 255–257 (p. 635.33–35). The corrupt portion of the paraphrase relates to 255–257, the terrifying description of the Keres ranging over the battlefield and casting their victims' souls to Tartarus:

... αἶ δὲ φρένας εὖτ' ἀρέσαντο  
αἵματος ἀνδρομέου, τὸν μὲν ρίπτασκον ὀπίσω,  
ἄψ δ' ὄμαδον καὶ μῶλον ἐθύνεον αὐτίς ἰοῦσαι.

Pediasimus explains this as follows: αἶ δὲ χεῖρες ἠνίκα ἐπλήσθησαν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου αἵματος, ἐκείνον μὲν τὸν νεκρὸν ἔρριπτον ὀπίσω, ὑπέστρεφον δὲ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον πάλιν. But it is not the Fates' hands that are filled with blood, it is their φρένες that are sated with it. For χεῖρες read Κῆρες; the corruption is paralleled at Il. 21.548, and for this sense of πῖμπλημι see LSJ s.v. III.2. Without additional manuscript evidence we cannot know whether the error is due to an accident of transmission or to Pediasimus himself; but he had discussed the two words together a short while before (p. 627.12–14), which makes a 'lapsus calami' on his part a distinct possibility.

5. Pediasimus on Sc. 431–434 (p. 652.22–24). The text of the poem runs as follows:

... οὐδέ τις αὐτόν  
ἔτλη ἔς ἄντα ἰδὼν σχεδὸν ἐλθέμεν οὐδὲ μάχεσθαι  
τοῖος ἄρ' Ἀμφιτρωνιάδης, ἀκόρητος αὐτίς,  
ἀντίος ἔσση Ἄρηος κτλ.

12) It might be wondered whether τῷ Εὐρύσθει is intrusive; but the king is so essential to the story that the scholiast would surely have mentioned him, and ἐπεὶ ἀπολιπὼν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον ἀπεχώρησε would be both flat and tautologous.

Pediasimus' close paraphrase is: οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν ἰδὼν ὑπέμεινεν ἐξ ἐναντίας πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἐλθεῖν, οὐδέ μαχεσθῆαι. τοιοῦτος ἄρα ἔστιν ἐναντίος τοῦ Ἄρεος ὁ Ἀμφιτρωνιάδης Ἡρακλῆς κτλ. For ἔστιν read of course ἔστη.

Oxford

H. C. Mason