

## VIII. Pausanias in the Middle Ages\*

AUBREY DILLER

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Pausanias wrote the ten books of the *Hellados Periêgêsis* at intervals during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180),<sup>1</sup> apparently residing at least part of the time in the province of Asia, the ancient Lydia.<sup>2</sup> On his own showing he had traveled in Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, and Italy. It is recognized now that his work is based largely on autopsy rather than plagiarized wholesale from some earlier author such as Polemon. Little else is known of the man unless we identify him with one of the other contemporary authors named Pausanias. If he was the same as Philostratus' sophist Pausanias, he later became professor of rhetoric in Athens and Rome and teacher of Claudius Aelianus. There is actually a citation of Pausanias in our text of Aelian's *Varia historia* 12.61, which, if genuine (see below), would be the only clear trace of the *Periegesis* before the sixth century.

What conception are we to have of the publication of a work that made no impression or very little on contemporary literature? How many copies of it were produced and how far were they distributed? There was not much overproduction of books before the printing press, at least not of big ones.<sup>3</sup> Whatever the author's intentions, Pausanias' *Periegesis* probably did not become an object of commercial undertaking. Rather, if it was published at all, it was in a limited issue for private circulation among the author's acquaintances. But we may not assume even that much. If the author's copy was deposited in some great library in Rome or the East, where

\* This article is a sequel to "The authors named Pausanias," *TAPA* 86 (1955) 268–79. I shall supplement without repeating what I said there on the early history of Pausanias' *Periegesis*, particularly in Stephanus Byzantius.

<sup>1</sup> The new Odeum of Herodes Atticus (Paus. 7.20.6) has long served as an *ante quem* for Book I, but it appears now that the old Odeum in the Agora (1.8.6, 14.1) is a still earlier one, as it was remodelled and converted to other uses *ca.* 150. See Homer A. Thompson in *Hesperia* 19 (1950) 131–3. So Book I will have to be dated somewhat before 161.

<sup>2</sup> Besides the famous *παρ' ἡμῶν* in 5.13.7 consider *ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡπείρου ταύτης* in 3.2.1.

<sup>3</sup> W. Schubart, "Die Vervielfältigung und der Buchhandel," *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*, 2nd ed. (Berlin 1921), 146–70.

it would have been preserved, that alone would have been a sufficient beginning for the history we are about to trace.

To Stephanus Byzantius probably belongs the credit of discovering the *Periegesis* and saving it from the oblivion that destroyed so much ancient literature during the Dark Age. Stephanus (fl. ca. 535) was a *grammaticus* and royal professor in Constantinople under Justinian.<sup>4</sup> His one work, the *Ethnica*, in more than fifty books, was a sort of gazetteer, based largely on a previous work of the same title and scope by Orus of Miletus. Pausanias' *Periegesis* was a rich source for such a work, but it is certain that Orus did not use it, that it remained to be discovered and used first by Stephanus himself.<sup>5</sup>

The relation between Stephanus' text of the *Periegesis* and the text of our codices is not easy to establish. The basis of comparison is restricted and unreliable, as Stephanus did not quote accurately and his own work survives only in an epitome itself subject to the usual corruptions of tradition. Seldom, if ever, do Stephanus and the codices agree in an error.<sup>6</sup> In several places the text of the codices has been emended from Stephanus.<sup>7</sup> More numerous are the errors on the part of Stephanus, some of which are of interest for the text-history of the *Periegesis*. The Carthaginian colonies in Sardinia, Karalis and Sylkoi, mentioned in Paus. 10.17.9, both have articles in the *Ethnica*. But Karalis appears as *Charmis*, with a double error of X for K and M for AA. The first occurs again in *Chorsia* for Korseia (Paus. 9.24.5).<sup>8</sup> It is not necessary to attribute these errors to Stephanus' copy of the *Periegesis* and thus exclude it from being the ancestor of our codices. The errors are due to misreading majuscule letters, but the one who misread may have been Stephanus himself as well as an earlier copyist. *Sylkoi* is a doublet of *Solkoi*, which Stephanus gives in another article from another source, unaware of the identity.<sup>9</sup> Stephanus' *Phoibia* is a mistake for Phoubia (Paus. 9.15.4) and a doublet of his *Bouphia*. Stephanus

<sup>4</sup> E. Honigmann in *RE* 6A (1929) 2369–74.

<sup>5</sup> F. Atenstädt, "De Hecataei Milesii fragmentis," *Leips. Stud.* 14 (1893) 6–27.

<sup>6</sup> 3.2.2 *περσέως* codd. St.B. *Kynoura*, *Πυρασέως* C. Müller; 6.10.8 *ἐπὶ ἡμῶν* codd. St.B. *Dyrrhachion*, *ἐφ' ἡμῶν* A. Rüger.

<sup>7</sup> See Fr. Spiro, ed. Paus. (Leipzig, Teubner 1903) *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> See Hitzig and Blümner, ed. Paus. (Berlin and Leipzig 1896–1910), on 2.37.3 (p. 477.7) and 6.17.8 (p. 500.5).

<sup>9</sup> Compare *Aiboura Ebora*, *Babyle Kabyle Kalybe*, etc. Such cases have been used to prove direct use of certain sources (Honigmann [see note 4] 2385 f.).

seems to have read 'Ελαῦτων in Paus. 5.24.6 as Λαῦτων, which he cites under *Laeia*. Compare also Stephanus' 'Ερινιάτης κώμη Μεγαρίδος, Πανσανίας *ā*, with Pausanias 1.44.5 ἐν 'Ερενείᾳ τῇ Μεγαρέων κώμῃ. The Laconian town Belemina (Paus. 8.35.4, 3.21.3) is confused with the island *Belbina* in the Saronic gulf, and Kallion in Aetolia (Paus. 10.22.3–7) is confused with *Kalliai* in Arcadia, but these errors may be due to the epitomator of the *Ethnica*.<sup>10</sup>

After Stephanus Byzantius we find no other trace of the *Periegesis* until after the Dark Age.<sup>11</sup> The origins of the revival of learning in Constantinople in the ninth century are obscure. The greatest if not the first leader in the movement was the patriarch Photius (d. *ca.* 890). In the next generation Arethas, archbishop of Caesarea (d. *ca.* 935), is well known from several extant codices annotated by his own hand and numerous writings and other testimonies of his reading.<sup>12</sup> There is no indication that Photius knew Pausanias' *Periegesis*, but Arethas is attested as a reader by a single scholium preserved in a single manuscript: *περὶ Πατρῶν, τοῦ τῆς ἐμῆς γενέσεως Ἀρέθα ἀρχιεπισκόπου Καισαρίας τόπου χωρογραφία* (codex Paris. gr. 1410 fol. 194r on Paus. 7.21.10). This scholium raises the question of the origin of the other scholia on the *Periegesis*. We will have to consider them all, together with the mss. that have them, anticipating the stemmatization of the mss., which is reserved for a separate article.

There exist eighteen mss. of Pausanias, but none is earlier than 1450. Four are primary: Marc. gr. 413 (Vn), Laur. 56–11 (Fb), Paris. gr. 1410 (Pc), Matrit. 4564 (Mt, only half of Book I). The fourteen others are all derived from Vn and Fb. The four primary mss. were probably copied from the same exemplar, which belonged to Niccolò Niccoli of Florence as early as 1418, but has not survived (see below). There are scholia in many of the mss., but for our purpose it is necessary to eliminate those that do not occur in VnFbPc (Mt has none), as they must be and often clearly are of Renaissance origin. Even some of those in VnFbPc may be recent; for Niccoli's codex itself may have received secondary scholia in Florence or elsewhere before the apographs were copied from it, just as several of the apographs themselves have received secondary scholia.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Atenstädt (see note 5) points out other vagaries in Stephanus' use of Pausanias.

<sup>11</sup> On Agathias see note 17.

<sup>12</sup> S. B. Kougeas, 'Ο Καισαρείας Ἀρέθας (Athens 1913).

<sup>13</sup> Spiro (see note 14) did not know the whole situation in regard to the mss., and by ascribing to Arethas the recent scholium on 2.32.2 in codex Ms he brought the

The scholia on Pausanias are not extensive, amounting at the most to only a few pages.<sup>14</sup> They are mingled with a much larger quantity of marginal indices, as in the case of Strabo<sup>15</sup> and other authors. On surveying them all together Reitzenstein observed that they seem to fall into two distinct parts. Most of the scholia on Book I and a long scholium on 5.7.6 are derived from the *Etymologicum genuinum* and Hesychius' lexicon. The scholia on VI–X<sup>16</sup> show no trace of these sources, but instead are enriched by four primary citations of lost works of Callimachus (fr. 98, 100, 666, 667 Pfeiffer) and one of Pindar (fr. 31 Turyn). Probably these two parts of the scholia had different origins, and I shall suggest presently a recent origin for the scholia on Book I. Reitzenstein tentatively attributed the scholia on VI–X to Agathias (sixth century),<sup>17</sup> but that was before the unique scholium of Arethas had been discovered in codex Pc. Now the obvious attribution is to Arethas, although we would rather it were more circumstantial. No connections have been found between these scholia and other works of Arethas. But at least it is certain that he read the *Periegesis*, whether or not he wrote the scholia on it.

There is another solitary trace of the *Periegesis* in the scholia on Lucian, a single citation of Pausanias (2.2.4) preserved in a single ms. (Palat. gr. 73, 13th cent.).<sup>18</sup> Hugo Rabe regards this ms. as

Byzantine cleric to Rimini to study folklore! He errs still more in ascribing to Arethas the division and titles of the books of the *Periegesis*, which are attested by Steph. Byz. Kougeas follows him uncritically, but Lampros, in *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 2 (1905) 31, doubts the ascription to Arethas of some of the personal scholia in codex Pc.

<sup>14</sup> Spiro discovered these scholia and edited them for the first time from codd. FaFbRcVt in *Hermes* 29 (1894) 143–9. They were discussed promptly by Reitzenstein and Wilamowitz *ibid.* 231–9 and 240–8. Later Spiro discovered additional scholia in codex Pc and discussed them in *Festschrift Johannes Vahlen* (Berlin 1900) 135–8, together with two recent scholia in codd. MsPa. Finally Spiro edited the whole lot again in his Teubner edition of Pausanias, 3 pp. 218–22, adding some new ones but omitting some of the old. To those given by Spiro I can add the following: 1.14.4 *περὶ Ἐπιμενίδου τοῦ καθήραντος Ἀθήνας καὶ τοῦ ὕπνου αὐτοῦ, τοῦ βόλλου (?)* VnFbPc; 1.1.3 *Λαμρίαν* αὕτη νῦν Ζητούριον λέγεται VnPc; 2.25.10 *περὶ Ἐπιδαύρου ἢ νῦν Μενομβασία (sic)* Pc; 2.34.10 *τὸ νῦν Καστρίν καὶ Θερμίσσην* Pc. Probably other bits of scholia remain to be found in the marginal indices. I can also eliminate the scholium on 9.27.4, which is lacking in VnFbPc; Spiro does not say where he found it. N. A. Bees in *Philologus* 75 (1919) 231 f. discusses some recent scholia in codex Va (cf. Spiro 1 p. vi).

<sup>15</sup> A. Diller, "The scholia on Strabo," *Traditio* 10 (1954) 29–50.

<sup>16</sup> It is odd that the restriction to VI–X recurs in the *Suda*.

<sup>17</sup> Reitzenstein (see note 14) supports the attribution by detecting three reminiscences of Pausanias in Agathias' epigrams and by determining the age of the scholia on 6.26.7 and 7.5.11, but none of this is convincing.

<sup>18</sup> H. Rabe, *Scholia in Lucianum* (Leipzig 1906) 251.23, praef. III f.

preserving scholia on Lucian by Arethas and thus attributes another citation of the *Periegesis* to that reader. The two citations, in Paris. 1410 and Palat. 73, may be taken to confirm each other. Unfortunately the passage of Lucian this scholium refers to does not occur in Arethas' autograph codex of Lucian (Harley 5694). There are no other certain traces of the *Periegesis* in the scholia on Lucian.<sup>19</sup>

If the citation of Pausanias in Aelian's *Varia historia* 12.61 (see above) is interpolated, it probably belongs to the same period and possibly to the same author as the citation of Pausanias in the scholia on Lucian, which it resembles in form. It occurs in the abridged latter part of the *Varia historia*<sup>20</sup> and would be dated later than the abridgment, since one reason for suspecting it is that it would scarcely have survived the abridging. (The main reasons are that it is not integrated in the context and such a citation is out of character in the *Varia historia*.<sup>21</sup>) The oldest ms. (Paris. suppl. gr. 352) is of the thirteenth century, and the unabridged text seems to be represented still in the excerpts in the *Suda* (see below), so that the abridgment would fall in the tenth to twelfth century. However, there is no indication that Arethas knew the *Varia historia*.

To the tenth century also belong the excerpts from Pausanias in the *Suda*. This large work, long known by the false author's name Suidas, was compiled in the reign of Basil II (976–1025) from many earlier Byzantine compilations of various materials and forms. It is fairly certain that the excerpts from the *Periegesis* were not taken directly from the original work, but from some more recent intermediary. One of the most extensive and valuable sources of the *Suda* was the great topical collection of excerpts from the Greek historians compiled under the direction of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (d. 959). Ada Adler, in her account of the sources of the *Suda*, thinks the excerpts from Pausanias came from the Constantinian collection.<sup>22</sup> However, Pausanias does not occur in the extant portions of that work, and there is no other reason to think it

<sup>19</sup> C. Helm, *De Luciani scholiorum fontibus* (Diss. Marburg 1908), reviewed by R. Winter in *Berliner phil. Woch.* 30 (1910) 1035–8.

<sup>20</sup> R. Hercher, *Aeliani de natura animalium etc.* (Paris 1858) praef.; H. Bloch in *TAPA* 71 (1940) 27–31.

<sup>21</sup> It was athetized by T. Faber, *Claudii Aeliani varia historia* (Saumur 1667).

<sup>22</sup> A. Adler, ed. Suidas 1 (Leipzig 1928) p. xx; *RE* 7A (1931) 700–6. Adler's suggestion that some of the excerpts from Pausanias came to the *Suda* from a different source (a collection of oracles) seems unlikely to me.

occurred in the lost portions, so that Büttner-Wobst, in his study of the Constantinian collection, does not mention Pausanias.<sup>23</sup> The *Periegesis* is somewhat out of line with Constantine's other sources, not being exactly a history. Its case in the *Suda* may be compared with that of the works of Aelian, with which we have already suggested an association for it. The works of Aelian, especially the lost *De providentia*, have excerpts in the *Suda*, but it is uncertain how they came there, though Adler attributes them also to the Constantinian collection. There is this difference, however, that Aelian is often cited by name and title in the *Suda*, but Pausanias never at all. So the history of the excerpts from Pausanias in the *Suda* remains problematical.

There are twenty-six excerpts from Pausanias in the *Suda*, including eight duplicates.<sup>24</sup> Most of them are about the athletes in Book VI; six (two duplicates) are from VIII, two from X, none from the other books. Even when they give the original text in full the excerpts do not copy it faithfully, but often reverse the order of words, substitute other words, omit prefixes, change orthography, etc. The sense sometimes suffers. Part of the feats of the athlete Theagenes in Paus. 6.11 are given to a non-existent *Nicôn*; the feats of Capros in 6.15 are confused with those of *Cleitomachos*. Agesipolis' stratagem at Mantinea (8.8.7-8) is given to *Agis*, with a mention of baked bricks foreign to Pausanias. In the article *Sôstratos* the roles of Clearchos and Chilon in 6.4 are misstated. The article *Epaminôndas* consists of two separate excerpts and ends abruptly.

The stemmatic relation between the text of the excerpts in the *Suda* and the text of our codices of Pausanias is easier to define than in the case of Stephanus Byzantius. Being independent of the codices the excerpts of course furnish some emendations of their text.<sup>25</sup> It is more significant when the two texts agree in error.

6.6.11 λύβαντα codd., ἀλύβαντα *Suda*, Λύκαν τὰ edd.

6.9.7. ἐφέλκυσάμενος codd. *Suda*, -μένου edd.

6.13.3 θρακία καρία codd., θράκη καρίας *Suda*, del. θρακία edd.

8.49.7 μισθοφόρος codd. *Suda*, -οις edd.

10.13.7 καὶ codd. *Suda*, del. edd.

<sup>23</sup> Th. Büttner-Wobst, "Die Anlage der historischen Encyclopädie des Konstantinos Prophyrogenetos," *BZ* 15 (1906) 88-120.

<sup>24</sup> See the index in Adler's edition of Suidas 5 (1938) 117. The Pausanias in the article *Agis* is the king of Sparta, not the Periegete, who is not named in the *Suda*.

<sup>25</sup> Spiro (see note 7) *passim*. The most interesting instance is in 6.10.2 ὦ παῖ, τὴν ἀπ' ἀρότρου codd., παῖε τὴν ἐπ' ἀρότρου *Suda*.

In the first instance  $\beta$  for  $\kappa$  is a mistake in reading a minuscule letter and if pressed would indicate that the common archetype of the excerpts and our codices was itself copied from an exemplar in minuscule script. In 6.5.8 Pausanias alludes to Iliad Z 407 without quoting the verse, but the excerpt in the *Suda* s.v. *Polydamas* does quote it. In codices PcPa and in Planudes' excerpts (see below) the verse is given in the margin; apparently it was an old scholium (omitted by Spiro). In 8.11.11 Pausanias alludes to the prophecy on the death of Hannibal<sup>26</sup> without quoting it; in Planudes' excerpts again the verse is given in the margin, but this time it does not occur in the *Suda* or the codices.

After the tenth century Pausanias' *Periegesis* disappears for three hundred years. The twelfth-century philologists Tzetzes and Eustathius did not know it. With the disaster of 1204 Byzantine learning went into an eclipse, but after the restoration of 1261 there came a last revival in Constantinople, which rescued ancient literature once again and delivered it to the Italian Renaissance. The main leader in this movement was Maximus Planudes (d. ca. 1310), among whose many and varied works is a collection (*Synagôgê*) of excerpts from Strabo, Pausanias, Roman histories, Joannes Lydus, Plato, etc., which give us a fairly extensive view of the texts represented in the form Planudes knew them.<sup>27</sup> For Strabo, but not for Pausanias, we are fortunate enough to have extant the very codex Planudes excerpted from (Paris. gr. 1393). There are about sixty pages from Strabo and thirty from Pausanias. The names of these authors are not given. The excerpts, each beginning with  $\delta\tau\iota$ , keep the order of the original text. I count 168 excerpts from Pausanias, drawn from the ten books more equally than the citations in Stephanus Byzantius. The titles of the books are in the margins: Κορινθιακά, Λακωνικά, Μεσσηνικά, Ἡλιακά, Ἀχαιϊκά (*sic*), Ἀρκαδικά, Βοιωτικά, Λοκρικά. These titles agree with those in codices VnFbPc, particularly in the lack of a title for Book I ('Ἀθηναϊκά subscr. Pc, Ἀττικά subscr. Vt etc.), except that the codices have Ἡλιακῶν  $\bar{\alpha}$ ,  $\beta$

<sup>26</sup> Plut. *Flamin.* 20, Appian *Syr.* 11 (44), Arrian 156 F 28 Jacoby in Tzetzes *Chil.* 1.803.

<sup>27</sup> A. Diller, "Codices Planudei," *BZ* 37 (1937) 295–301; C. Wendel in *RE* 40 (1950) 2232–6. (I do not see why Wendel flatly denies my suggestion that Laur. 59–30 is the master-copy.) Planudes' excerpts figure in the existing apparatus criticus on Pausanias under the name of the scribe of Paris. gr. 1409, doubtfully read as Phralites. They were introduced by L'abbé Sevin, "Observations sur le texte de Pausanias (1739)," *Histoire de l'Acad. roy. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres* 14 (1743) 195–207.

(so also Steph. Byz. s. v. *Τυραϊον*), Ἀχαϊκῶν, and Φωκικὰ Λοκρῶν Ὀζολῶν.

Planudes, an intelligent and attentive reader, never does such violence to the original sense as is found in the *Suda* and even in Stephanus Byzantius. He does not always quote *verbatim*, but omits, compresses, smooths over, and rounds off occasionally. He does not introduce foreign material into his excerpts, but there are places in Strabo where he contaminates the text with the marginal scholia. In Pausanias there are four marginal notes on the excerpts themselves. Two of them have already been discussed in connection with the *Suda*. In 7.24 the three types of earthquakes described by Pausanias are named in the margin: *παλματίας, ὥστης, βράστης*.<sup>28</sup> (In codd. VnFbPc they are merely numbered.) In 3.19.6 the epithet of Dionysus at Amyclae and its Doric etymon are read in VnFbPc as *πτίλα καὶ* and *ὀψιλά*, and in Planudes as *ψιλάκαν* and *ψίλα* with *πτίλα* in the margin. In the future, when the primary codices VnFbPc have been collated accurately, it will be interesting to compare their common text with Planudes' readings; but at present we can only say that Planudes could and did correct corruptions in the original texts and in his excerpts probably anticipated many modern emendations.

For the fourteenth century several testimonia on Pausanias can be gleaned from the miscellaneous codices written at this time by Byzantine scholars reading widely and taking notes by excerpting passages or copying pieces that interested them as they came upon them. A number of these codices have been preserved, often containing fragments of lost works among much other material of little value. The exploitation of such evidence for the history of texts and of learning is still far from exhaustive, since the reading of these mss. and the identification of the numerous excerpts is tedious. The identification of the author of the codex himself is an important collateral problem, which in most cases has not been solved, although it probably could be with proper application, as a recent instance has shown (see below). I have collected the following testimonia on Pausanias from published notices and my own inspection of the codices. Probably more will come to light in the future.

Paris. gr. 1630 is a miscellaneous codex of about 1300, well

<sup>28</sup> Aristotle *De mundo* 396a. This treatise is excerpted briefly further on in Planudes' *Synagōgē*.



known for its unique fragments of Aristophanes Byzantius, Joannes Antiochenus, Joannes Lydus, etc.<sup>29</sup> It also contains works of Maximus Planudes and his contemporaries Leon Bardales and Manuel Philes. The authorship of the codex has not been established. On fol. 96rv and 99r I found two excerpts from Paus. 9.28.3–4 and 8.17.3, the latter citing Pausanias by name. They occur among other excerpts from Procopius, Strabo, Diodorus, Lydus, Josephus.

Palatinus gr. 129 in Heidelberg contains excerpts more minute and confused than Paris. 1630, with little of unique value. However, the codex is the subject of a brilliant discovery by the late Artur Biedl, which imparts to it an unusual bibliographical interest, that is, that it is the autograph note-book of the well-known Byzantine polyhistor Nicephorus Gregoras (*ca.* 1290–1360).<sup>30</sup> Gregoras resided most of his life in the monastery of the Chora in the northwest part of Constantinople,<sup>31</sup> which the grand logothete Theodore Metochites (d. 1332)<sup>32</sup> restored in 1303 and endowed with a rich library<sup>33</sup> and bequeathed to Gregoras, his protégé. Maximus Planudes had resided there in his time,<sup>34</sup> and the library may have included his books. It is tempting to think the excerpts in Pal. 129 represent Gregoras' reading in this library, but actually they may as well represent his reading outside the library; it is a recurrent problem whether such excerpts represent books possessed or books bor-

<sup>29</sup> H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des mss. grecs de la Bibl. Nat.* 2 (Paris 1888) 109–13; *Cat. codd. astrol. graec.* 8.3 (Brussels 1912) No. 32, pp. 7–10; R. Wuensch, *Joan. Laur. Lydi liber de mensibus* (Leipzig 1898) xxxi–v; R. Foerster, *Libanii opera* 9 (Leipzig 1927) 13–5. The codex has much in common with Paris. gr. 39 and 854; certain pieces in it were copied from Paris. suppl. gr. 690 (*WS* 14 [1892] 52–63, *BZ* 1 [1892] 416–8, *RhM* 47 [1892] 457–9). On codex 690 see G. Rochefort in *Scriptorium* 4 (1950) 3–17.

<sup>30</sup> A. Biedl, "Der Heidelberger cod. Pal. gr. 129 — die Notizensammlung eines byzantinischen Gelehrten," *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 3 (1948) 100–6. On the date of Gregoras' birth see V. Grecu in *BZ* 43 (1950) 61; on his residence in the Chora see Greg. *Hist. Rom.* 8 pp. 303, 308 f., 9 pp. 458 f., 21 p. 1013, 22 pp. 1045 f. ed. Bonn., *Cantac. Hist.* 4.24 p. 172 ed. Bonn.

<sup>31</sup> R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin* 1.3 (Paris 1953) 545–53.

<sup>32</sup> I. Ševčenko, "Observations sur les recueils des discours et des poèmes de Th. Métochite et sur la bibliothèque de Chora à Constantinople," *Scriptorium* 5 (1951) 279–88; H. Hunger, "Theodoros Metochites als Vorläufer des Humanismus in Byzanz," *BZ* 45 (1952) 4–19.

<sup>33</sup> Unfortunately only two extant codices are known to have been in this library: Vatic. gr. 177 (Ptol. *Geogr.*) and 1365 (Theod. Metoch. *Astron. stoich.*); see G. Mercati, *Scritti d'Isidoro Ruteno* (*Studi e Testi* 46, 1926) 72, 74. Codex Meteor. Metamorph. 548 was dated in the Chora in 1089; see Lake and Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Mss.* 10 (1939) no. 401.

<sup>34</sup> C. Wendel in *BZ* 40 (1940) 406–10.

rowed by the reader. Excerpts from Pausanias occur in several places in Pal. 129, but not all from the same source. On fol. 90r–93v, 95v–96r are excerpts from Planudes' *Synagōgē*, including a number from Pausanias with an index in the margin (95v) *πανσανίου* [ἐκ τῶν] *πλανούδου*.<sup>35</sup> Since Planudes omitted Pausanias' name, Gregoras must have known and recognized the source of the excerpts himself, and in fact there are other excerpts from Pausanias on fol. 31r, 44v–46r, 48v, 100v,<sup>36</sup> which are foreign to Planudes and must have been taken from the original text by Gregoras. (There are also Planudean and non-Planudean excerpts from Strabo.) A copy of part of these excerpts was sent to Siebelis by G. F. Creuzer in 1821,<sup>37</sup> and they are thus cited occasionally in the apparatus on the first three books by Siebelis, Schubart and Hitzig.

Darmstadt ms. 2773 is another miscellaneous Greek codex, known chiefly for its lexicological and grammatical material and excerpts from Marcus Aurelius.<sup>38</sup> Although over twelve different hands are recognized in various parts of the codex, the paper, format and general appearance suggest a single origin, probably some Byzantine school of the late fourteenth century. There are anonymous excerpts from Paus. 1.8.5 and 2.28.3 on fol. 16v and from 3.8.9 on 42v and 109v.<sup>39</sup>

Vatic. gr. 701, of the late fourteenth century, contains commentaries on Ptolemy's *Almagest* and other astronomica.<sup>40</sup> In blank spaces at the end of the codex, on fol. 87v, 88rv, 89v, a later hand has written a series of articles on geographical names in alphabetical order.<sup>41</sup> A title, partly trimmed away, cites Pausanias, Thucydides,

<sup>35</sup> Biedl (see note 30) 103 f.

<sup>36</sup> H. Haupt in *Hermes* 14 (1879) 57–64. I also used the manuscript index of Pal. gr. 129 prepared by M. Treu, which was shown to me in Heidelberg (cf. Biedl 101 n. 8).

<sup>37</sup> C. G. Siebelis, ed. Pausanias 1.1 (Leipzig 1822) xxxii–iv.

<sup>38</sup> L. Voltz and W. Crönert, "Der Codex 2773 misc. graec. der Grossherzoglichen Hofbibliothek zu Darmstadt," *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 14 (1897) 537–71; C. Denig, *Mitteilungen aus dem griech. Miscellancodex 2773 zu Darmstadt* (Progr. Mainz 1899, cf. *WKP* 17 [1900] 451 f.). The latest sources seem to be Gregoras and Palamas. The excerpts from Marcus Aurelius are from cod. Vatic. gr. 1950 (P. Maas in *JRS* 35 [1945] 145), and those from Proclus on Plat. *Alcib.* are probably from Neapol. III E 17 (edition by L. G. Westerink [Amsterdam 1954] p. viii).

<sup>39</sup> Voltz and Crönert p. 565.

<sup>40</sup> J. L. Heiberg, *Claudii Ptolemaei opera* 2 (Leipzig 1907) cxliii f.; G. Mercati (see note 33) 14 n. 3; R. Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani Graeci* 3 (1950) 179.

<sup>41</sup> Quotations from this text by L. Holstenius (1596–1661) in his posthumous commentary on Steph. Byz. are collected by G. Bernhardt, *Analecta in geogr. graec. min.* (Halle 1850) 12 f.

Josephus and Zonaras; but the main source was a list of πόλεις μετονομασθῆσαι such as occurs in many other mss.<sup>42</sup> Without analyzing the whole text, I found material from Paus. 1.1.4–5, 1.2.6, 1.4.5–6. Reitzenstein says that “. . . die spätbyzantinischen [*n.b.*] Scholien zu Pausanias [1.1.4–5?] schon mit benutzt sind”<sup>43</sup> — an important point, which unfortunately I cannot verify now.

In the fifteenth century we find no more traces of Pausanias in Constantinople or Greece, but our history is continued without interruption by traces rather early in the Italian Renaissance. From a letter of Ambrogio Traversari we learn that in 1418 Niccolò Niccoli in Florence agreed to send Pausanias to Francesco Barbaro in Venice.<sup>44</sup> Probably in consequence of this loan Guarino Veronese, writing to Niccoli from Padua in an undated letter, expresses his pleasure in reading Pausanias' *Corinthiaca* in Niccoli's codex.<sup>45</sup> Niccolò Niccoli (1364–1437) distinguished himself by collecting codices, Greek as well as Latin. After his death Cosimo de' Medici had his library placed in the convent of St. Mark in Florence for public use.<sup>46</sup> In the catalogue of St. Mark's library drawn up about 1500 is listed *Pausanie historia in membranis*.<sup>47</sup> In the sixteenth century the Florentine scholar Petrus Victorius (Pier Vettori, 1499–1585) collated several codices in St. Mark's library, including some that are not extant now.<sup>48</sup> There is a collation of Pausanias by Victorius in the margins of a copy of the Aldine edition in the Staatsbibliothek in Munich,<sup>49</sup> which may be a collation of Niccoli's old codex in St. Mark's. That codex has not survived, as none of the

<sup>42</sup> A. Burckhardt, *Hieroclis synecdemus* (Leipzig 1893) 61–9.

<sup>43</sup> R. Reitzenstein, *Gesch. der griech. Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897) 335.

<sup>44</sup> L. Mehus, *A. Traversari epistolae et orationes* (Florence 1759), lib. VI epist. XIV. On the date of this letter see R. Sabbadini in *StItal* 7 (1899) 101 f. and A. C. Clark in *CR* 13 (1899) 126.

<sup>45</sup> R. Sabbadini, *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese* (Venice 1915–19) No. 59, vol. 1 p. 125, 3 pp. 57 f. The heading of this undated letter in the ms. is *Guarinus Veronensis suo Ni. sal. d.* For insufficient reasons Sabbadini thinks it was addressed to Johannes Quirinus in 1416–7; but since the addressee owned Pausanias and since Niccoli was sending his Pausanias to Venice in 1418, I think the addressee was Niccoli, as actually indicated in the ms., and the date 1418–9.

<sup>46</sup> G. Zippel, *Niccolò Niccoli* (Florence 1890) 41–4, 66–70.

<sup>47</sup> *Repertorium sive index librorum latine et grece bibliothecae conventus Sancti Marci de Florentia ordinis Predicatorum*, original in Modena, copy in Florence in the Laurentian Library. The Pausanias was No. 1 in *bancho quinto ex parte occidentis*.

<sup>48</sup> Cato and Varro on agriculture, see *RE* 43 (1953) 156; J. Häussner, *Die handschr. Überlieferung des Columella* (Progr. Karlsruhe 1889); Earnest Cary, “Victorius and codex Γ of Aristophanes,” *TAPA* 37 (1906) 199–216.

<sup>49</sup> Siebelis (see note 37) xxix, xxxii–iv.

existing codices of Pausanias is as early as Niccoli. Perhaps a future history of St. Mark's library will throw some light on what became of it.

In all probability Niccoli's codex of Pausanias in St. Mark's in Florence was the source of the extensive traces of the *Periegesis* that appear during the second half of the fifteenth century in manuscript copies of the whole work and in citations and excerpts by the later humanists. The manuscript copies and the particular traces of them will be the subject of another article. The following remain to be mentioned here. In 1473 Theodore Gaza in Rome offered to pay Demetrius Sguropulus in Florence if he would copy Pausanias for him,<sup>50</sup> and in 1478 Domizio Calderini in Rome asked Lorenzo de' Medici for permission to have his codex of Pausanias copied.<sup>51</sup> The Florentine bookdealer Vespasiano da Bisticci mistakenly names Pausanias among the Greek historians procured by Federigo of Urbino (d. 1482) for his famous library.<sup>52</sup> In 1485 a codex of Pausanias was sent from Florence to Rome to be copied for Giovanni Lorenzi Veneto.<sup>53</sup> Angelo Poliziano quotes Pausanias in his *Miscellanea* 56 (printed in 1489) and elsewhere.<sup>54</sup> Eleven folios of excerpts *ἐκ τοῦ πανσανίου ἀνάλεκτά τινα*, found in two mss. in the Vatican and Florence, resemble Planudes' excerpts in form, with eight titles of books and *ὅτι* beginning each excerpt.<sup>55</sup> An anonymous miscellany entitled *ἀναγκαῖα γραμματικὰ ζητήματα* in codex Paris. suppl. gr. 1194 includes a few brief excerpts from Pausanias.<sup>56</sup> Some notes on the names of the months in a ms. in Ferrara cite

<sup>50</sup> G. Cammelli in *Miscellanea G. Mercati* 3 (*Studi e Testi* 123, 1946) 263.

<sup>51</sup> S. Ciampi, Italian translation of Pausanias, 1 (Milan 1826) p. xxix, citing "indice ms. del regio Archivio Mediceo di Firenze, filza xxxvi, lettere di Lorenzo." I owe this reference to Mr. N. C. Conomis, who kindly looked it up for me in the Bodleian Library.

<sup>52</sup> Dorothy M. Robathan in J. W. Thompson, *The Medieval Library* (Chicago 1939) 542.

<sup>53</sup> *Mél. d'arch. et d'hist.* 8 (1888) 14–8.

<sup>54</sup> P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris 1887) 208–12; G. Pesenti in *Boll. di filol. class.* 27 (1921) 33.

<sup>55</sup> Codd. Barberin. gr. 237 fol. 52–63 (55–7 should follow 63) and Riccard. gr. 10 fol. 344–55. The two mss. correspond almost page for page; in both the last folio is blank. Other excerpts from Pausanias are found in codex Riccard. gr. 27 fol. 88–180 (114–55 should go between 179 and 180), but they are later.

<sup>56</sup> H. Omont, *Cat. des mss. recueillis par feu E. Miller* (Paris 1897) 105–14. With the title, written in red and almost invisible, compare *παρακολουθήματα καὶ ζητήματα γραμματικὰ ἀναγκαῖα* in codex Paris. gr. 2720 (*olim Angeli Politiani*) fol. 228v (J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota graeca Parisiensia* 4 [Oxford 1841] 4, 216, 245).

Pausanias.<sup>57</sup> While the precise bearing of these testimonia is uncertain, I think most of them refer to the old codex in Florence.

In view of this Florentine episode in the text-history of the *Periegesis* I wish to venture a new theory of the origin of some of the scholia on Pausanias. Reitzenstein showed that several long scholia on Book I and a single one on 5.7.6 derive from the *Etymologicum genuinum* and Hesychius' lexicon together.<sup>58</sup> Now one of the two existing codices of the *Etymologicum* belonged to Niccolò Niccoli and St. Mark's<sup>59</sup> and so in the fifteenth century stood near the lost master-codex of Pausanias. Since both of these codices were actually used by the Florentine humanists, it seems to me more likely than not that the scholia on Pausanias drawn from the *Etymologicum genuinum* were written into the master-codex in Florence before the apographs were taken from it, that is, before 1468, the *ante quem* for codex Vn, the oldest apograph. As for Hesychius' lexicon, although there is no trace of it *chez* Niccoli or St. Mark's, the one existing codex of this work, now in the Marcian Library in Venice, was written apparently by Caesar Strategus,<sup>60</sup> who worked in Florence about 1492 and nowhere else as far as we know.<sup>61</sup> Hesychius' lexicon appears in Sicily in the twelfth or thirteenth century,<sup>62</sup> so that the exemplar Caesar Strategus copied from was of southern rather than eastern provenance. Nothing else is known of its whereabouts or its end,<sup>63</sup> but anyway it was apparently in Florence in the fifteenth century and so could have come into contact with the master-codex of Pausanias. It seems likely, then, that the citations of Hesychius also in the scholia on Pausanias were of Florentine rather than Byzantine origin.

With the *editio princeps*, entitled *Pausaniae commentarii Graeciam describentes*, by Musurus and Aldus in 1516 begins the modern phase of the history of the text. We shall conclude the survey of the mediaeval phase with some general remarks and a story of the

<sup>57</sup> E. Martini, *Catalogo di mss. greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane* 1 (Milan 1893) 358, codex 253 fol. 94–97.

<sup>58</sup> See note 14.

<sup>59</sup> Reitzenstein (see note 43) 1–6.

<sup>60</sup> This identification is my own; see *CP* 50 (1955) 285–7.

<sup>61</sup> M. Vogel and V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber* (Leipzig 1909) 224 f.

<sup>62</sup> K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon* 1 (Copenhagen 1953) xxii f.

<sup>63</sup> The only other trace of Hesychius' lexicon in the fifteenth century, and the only other citation by name at all, is in a letter of Francesco Filelfo in Milan in 1476 (see A. Calderini in *StItal* 20 [1913] 325); but it may be a second-hand citation and so is of uncertain significance.

book, which is not supposed to be more than a plausible illustration of the possibilities implied in the evidence we have presented. The meagre evidence of the *Periegesis* is blank before 500 and confined to Constantinople from 500 to 1400 and then to Florence until after 1450. I doubt if there ever existed more than one copy at a time during these centuries. There are no old variants in the tradition. A single tradition is indicated, a succession of unique codices copied one from another as required by the expiring durability of material and legibility of script. The author's copy or an early apograph of it, in ten rolls of papyrus kept together in a box, was preserved in some permanent library until it came into the hands of Stephanus Byzantius about 535, who valued the work and had it transcribed into a parchment codex in uncial script. This codex was found about 900 by Arethas of Caesarea, who had the whole work transcribed in the new minuscule script. This codex in turn was found by Maximus Planudes about 1300 and placed in the library of the Chora, where it was read by Nicephorus Gregoras a generation later. By 1418 it had been taken to Italy and acquired by Niccolò Niccoli of Florence and hence passed to the convent of St. Mark, where it was preserved until the next century and then disappeared. Meanwhile it had been read by several Italian humanists and copied three times in the extant codices VnFbPc, which are the basis of the text we have today.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Compare the text-history of Athenaeus: citations in Stephanus Byzantius, unique codex of Arethas used by Eustathius in the 12th century, brought to Italy by Aurispa in 1423, acquired by Bessarion (No. 301 in 1468), still preserved in Venice (Marc. gr. 447), citations and apographs in the late 15th century. That Eustathius used this very codex is a theory of P. Maas, which is disputed by some, although I find it quite plausible; see at the latest P. Maas in *BZ* 45 (1952) 1-3.