Three Historical Fragments in the *Suda*

*Andrea Favuzzi*

Eheu quam multa ignoraremus, nisi Suidas indefessa opera et herculeo labore, quicquid ad posteros transferri dignum putabat ex vasto Scriptorum numero collegisset!

J. L. Schulze, *Specimen observationum miscellanearum in Suidam* (1761) 13

I.

The *Suda* entry ἐδήμευσαν (e 225 Adler) has preserved the following adespoton fragment:

καὶ ἐκράτησεν ὁ φθόνος, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐδήμευσαν αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ ὑπεξαιρεῖται χρυσίου τ´ τάλαντα.

Et invidia vicit, ut eius bona publicarent. decem tamen auri talenta ille subtraxit.¹

The text provides helpful information to identify the anonymous protagonists of the quotation. The most relevant elements are the φθόνος that would have befallen personage A (αὐτῷ), the confiscation of the property (οὐσίαν) he would have suffered from personage B (which is a community, as is clear from the plural ἐδήμευσαν), and the ten golden talents (χρυσίου τ´ τάλαντα) the man would have been able to “reserve/put aside in safety” (ὑπεξαιρεῖται),² clearly before the confiscation itself. These details perfectly suit the history of the Athenian Themistocles, as the extant sources have transmitted it to us.


² Cf. LSJ s.v. 4. For this meaning of the verb in the middle voice, cf. also the 19th-century makeover of the *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* of Stephanus: “Est etiam ὑπεξαιροῦμαι Excipio, vel Recipio, i.e. Retineo mihi in re alienanda. There follow citations of Dem. 19.78 (ὁμεῖς τῶν ἑδίων τι καθήμενον ὑπεξαιρούμενοι τὴν τῶν συμμάχων σωτηρίαν προήκασθε) and Plut. *Alc.* 31.5 (μηδὲν αὐτοῖς ἔδιοι ὑπεξεξομένου).
Let us begin with the envy-theme. While dealing with the compromising letters that would have been discovered after the execution of Pausanias, Plutarch relates that Themistocles was indicted by his political opponents—literally by “those citizens who were envious of him” (κατηγόρουν δ᾽ οἱ φθονοῦντες τῶν πολιτῶν).\(^3\) He returns to the motif of envy several times, for instance when reporting Themistocles’ flight to Admetus, the king of the Molossians, with whom he was nonetheless on very bad terms: under the circumstances, the clear hostility (the “envy”) shown to him by his fellow citizens frightened him more than a king’s long-standing anger (24.2, μάλλον ... φοβηθεὶς συγγενῆ καὶ πρόσφατον φθόνον ὀργής πολαίως καὶ βασιλικῆς). Plutarch returns to the theme once more when he relates that Aristides, though a opponent of Themistocles, did not take pleasure in his rival’s misfortune, and in the past “had not been envious” of his success (25.7, οὐδὲ ἑπελάυσεν ἔχθρον δυστυχοῦντος, ὡσπερ οὖν εὐημεροῦντι πρότερον ἐφθόνησε).\(^4\)

As to the confiscation of Themistocles’ property, which arose from his crime of treason (προδοσία), we have at our disposal the testimonies of Idomeneus of Lampsacus (BNJ 338 F 1) and Critias (BNJ 338A F 18), quoted by a scholion to Ar. Ran. 947

---

\(^3\) Plut. Them. 23.3. Later they are introduced as the “accusers” who persuaded the demos to have Themistocles arrested and tried (συμπεισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν κατηγοροῦντος ὁ δῆμος ἐπέμψεν ἀνδρας, οἷς εἴρητο συλλαβάνειν καὶ ἀνάγειν αὐτὸν κριθῆσον ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν). Plut. Arist. 25.7 names two of them, Alcmeon and Cimon. For other possible opponents see the commentary of L. Piccirilli, Plutarco, Le vite di Temistocle e Camillo (Milan 1983) 266–269.

\(^4\) The motif of φθόνος is already attested in both Diodorus 11.54 (οἱ μὲν φοβηθείς αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπεροχήν, οἳ δὲ φθονήσαντες τῇ δόξῃ τῶν μὲν εὐεργεσίων ἐπελάθοντο, τὴν δ᾽ ἑχθρὰν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ φόνῳ ταπεινοῦσιν έσπευδον) and Nepos Them. 8.1 (tamen non effugit civium suorum invidiam). But it should be noted that other public personages in Athens were hit by envy as well. Of Cimon’s ostracism, Nepos (Cim. 3.1) writes quibus rebus cum unus in civitate maxime florenti, induit in eandem invidiam, quam pauper suee ceterique Atheniensium principes, and about Alcibiades he speaks of enrim invidiae (Alc. 4.1). On this topic see E. Sanders, Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens. A Socio-Psychological Approach (Oxford 2014).
and Aelian V H 10.17 respectively, and those of Theopompus (BNJ 115 F 86) and Theophratus, quoted in turn by Plutarch. Idomeneus is quoted directly: οἱ μὲν τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένους ἀειφυγίαν κατέγνωσαν προδίδοντος τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἡ οὐσία ἐδημεύθη. The fragment of Critias, though not direct, is relevant because it mentions the confiscation in the same terms: ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν κοινῶν προέστη, ἔτα ἤφυγε καὶ ἐδημεύθη αὐτοῦ ἡ οὐσία. As to Theopompus and Theophratus, Plutarch (Them. 25.3) quotes them for the sum of Themistocles’ “real property, confiscated to the public treasury”: τῶν δὲ φανερῶν γενομένων καὶ συναχθέντων εἰς τὸ δημόσιον.

The last piece of information provided by the Suda confirms beyond all reasonable doubt the reference to Themistocles: only with regard to his history do the extant sources mention, besides the confiscation of property, also the sequestering of a part of it. In Thucydides’ report of Themistocles’ adventurous flight from Argos to Asia Minor, we are told that he was able to reach Ephesus thanks to the help of a ναύκληρος, whom he rewarded generously, χρημάτων δόσει: “in fact he received from Athens, through his friends, and from Argos the goods he had secretly secured ἥλθε γὰρ αὐτῷ ύπεκκλαπέντα διὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ εξ Ἀργους ἐκείνης ἔπλει. Even Plutarch mentions that he received, thanks to his friends and across the sea, “much of his property that had been secretly abstracted (sc. from the confiscation)” (25.3, τῶν δὲ χρημάτων αὐτῷ πολλά μὲν ύπεκκλαπέντα διὰ τῶν φίλων εἰς Ἀσίαν ἔπλει). Accordingly, if the

5 For commentary see Craig Cooper on BNJ 338.

6 See William S. Morison on BNJ 338A. Other personages too suffered confiscation of property after a public conviction, e.g. Alcibiades: Nepos Alc. 4.5, postquam autem se capitis damnatum bonis publicatis audivit … Lacedaemonem demigravit.

7 The verb ὑπέκκειμαι, “to be carried out to a place of safety/to be stowed safe away” (LSJ) is not common: in addition to Thucydides, it is attested only in Herodotus and Isocrates in the classical period.

8 The verb ύπεκκλέπτω, used by Plutarch or his source, is significantly composed of the same double preposition as Thucydides’ ὑπέκκεμαι and
fragment deals with Themistocles, the detail on the secured riches (ten gold talents) is unique, since the extant sources only refer to the total of the confiscated wealth: more than 100 talents according to Critias and Theopompus, 80 in Theophrastus. This is a further reason to investigate the authorship of the fragment.

II.

The second fragment to be examined is quoted by the Suda s.v. Ὄμηρευειν (ο 244 Adler):

οι δὲ Σάμιοι καίπερ ἔξομηρευσομένων αὐτοῖς τῶν νεανίσκων ὡμοίς οὐκ ἐπέμειναν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπανέστησαν τοῖς φυλάσσουσι τὴν πόλιν τῶν Μακεδόνων.

This entry is one of the many cases of inconsistency between lemma and interpretamentum on the one hand (ὁ μηρεύειν = συμφωνεῖν “agree”), and quotation on the other. Secondly, since the text does not show the simple form of Ὄμηρευῳ but the compound, the lemma should be listed suo loco, before the lemmata ε 1789 (Ἐξομηρευσάμενος: καλὸς διοικήσας) and ε 1790 (Ἐξομηρευσάμενοι: ὁμογνώμονας ποιήσαντες), not where it has been recorded. Such imperfections have been recognized and partly explained by Kusterus, and there is no need to dwell on them. Instead, what attracts attention is its content and the information it provides.

ὑπεξαιρέω in the Suda.

9 BNJ 338A F 18 κατεφωράθη ἐκατόν ταλάντων πλείω οὐσίαν ἐχον; BNJ 115 F 86 Θεόφραστος δὲ ὀγδοήκοντα.

10 L. Kusterus, Suidae Lexicon I (Cambridge 1705) praef. V (not numbered), “Est et alias Lexici hujus naevus, qui in eo consistit, quod sexcentis in locis exempla, quae ex scriptoribus veteribus adducuntur, a capite articuli aliena sint, nec quicquam faciant ad probandam significacionem vocis propositae. Sed istius rei culpam non tam in Suidam confero, quam in eos, qui varia auctorum loca Lexico luic vel ipsi adduxerunt, vel ea, quae ad marginem scripta erant, absque judicio et electu in textum receperunt. Multa enim esse apud Suidam loca, quae ex margin in textum irrepererint, et imperitiam librariorum manifesto prodant, nemo nisi plane in Lexico hoc hospes negabit.”
Before addressing the details, we should consider the verb ἐξομηρέω. It has few occurrences and several meanings; however, none of those recorded in the dictionaries seems to fit our fragment. The verb is found in the active form only in Arist. Oec. 1344b17 (δεὶ δὲ καὶ ἐξομηρεύειν [sc. τοὺς δούλους] τοῖς τεκνοποιίαις),11 where it is the equivalent of either “pignorum caritate obstringere” (Stephanus) or “bind slaves to one’s service by the pledges of wives and children” (LSJ).12 In the middle voice, more often attested, it always has a transitive sense. In Strabo 6.4.2 (παῖδας ἐπίστευσε Φραάτης τῷ Σεβαστῷ Καίσαρι καὶ παίδων παῖδας ἐξομηρεύσαμεν τὴν φιλίαν) it means either “obsidibus datis emereor et assequor” (Stephanus) or “produce by hostages” (LSJ).13 In Diodorus 27.7 it means “bind to oneself” (τήν τοῖς Ὑποκάτοις ἐξομηρεύσας ἑυπρεπὴς [sc. Σοφόνβα καὶ τοῖς τρόποις ποικίλη καὶ πᾶν ἐξομηρεύσασθαι δυναμένῃ]. This meaning is also found in Onasander Strat. 1.12 (ἐὰν γὰρ ὑποκάτοις τύχωσι νήπιοι, γυναῖκας εἰσὶν ἱσχυρὰ φίλτρα περὶ τὴν εὔνοιαν ἐξομηρεύσασθαι δυνάμενα στρατηγοῖν πρὸς πατρίδα); Plutarch Sert. 14.3 (τοὺς γὰρ εὐγενεστάτους ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνεγαγὼν εἰς Ὀσκαν πόλιν μεγάλην, διδασκάλους ἐπιστήσας Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων μαθημάτων ἐργάζετο μὲν ἐξομηρεύσας, λόγῳ δὲ ἐπαίδευεν); and finally in Syll.3 656.21 (ἐντυγχάνοντες μὲν τοῖς ἤγομένιοις Ὕστεραν καὶ ἐξομηρεύομενοι διὰ τῆς καθ’ ἡμέραν τοῦ προσκυνήσεως).14

11 Philodem. Περὶ οἰκονομίας col. X.15 (p.28 Tsouna), where the same verb appears, is only a quotation from Aristotle.

12 The meaning of Aristotle’s statement is explained by his source (Xen. Oec. 9.5: μὴ τεκνοποιήσῃς οἱ σπήλαιοι ἑνεκείσας γνώμης, οἱ μὲν γὰρ χρηστοὶ παιδόποιησάμενοι εὑνούστεροι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ). The noun ἐξομηρεύσις, which means “obsidum dato” (Stephanus) rather than “demand for hostages” (LSJ), is also rare. It is found only in two passages of Plutarch that refer to the same episode and are textually similar, Rom. 29.7 and Cam. 33.4.

13 In this instance, the presence of hostages is implied by the preceding παίδας ἐπίστευσε rather than by the verb itself.

14 “Win over” is the meaning LSJ assigns to the verb; appropriate as well would be “bind to one self” since ἐξομηρεύομενοι clearly has the Romans,
Which, then, is the precise meaning of ἐξομηρεύομαι in our text? In my opinion, it is “be hostage,” the same meaning that the uncompounded ὁμηρέω has in the one passage of Greek literature where it is used in the middle voice. The passage is Aeneas Tacticus 10.23:

πόλεως δ’ ὁμηρευομένης, ὅταν ἐκ’ αὐτὴς στρατεία γίγνηται, τοὺς γονεῖς τῶν ὁμηρευόντων καὶ τοὺς ἐγγὺς τὰ γένη μεθίστασθαι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ἔχρις οὖν ἡ πολιορκία παρέλθη, ἵνα μὴ ἐφορώσην ἐν ταῖς προσαγωγαῖς τῶν πολεμίων τοὺς αὐτών παιδες συμπροσ- αγομένους καὶ τὰ ἔσχατα πάσχοντας.

Though LSJ translate “give hostages,”16 it is evident that this meaning, which can be found in all the modern translations of Aeneas,17 is not the original but the ‘implicit’ one, since just named, as understood object.

15 A second instance is given in the TLG, Plut. Rom. 14.2: ἐλπίζων δὲ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀκινύους τρόπον τινὰ συγκράσεως καὶ κοινωνίας ἁρχὴν αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀδίκημα ποιήσειν ὁμηρευσάμενοι τὰς γυναίκας, ἐπεχείρησε τῷ ἔργῳ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. In fact, this is an emendation of the transmitted ἧμηρωσάμενοι proposed by Augustin Bryan. It is confined to the ap. crit. by both Sintenis and the editors of Les Belles Lettres, but has been accepted into the text only by Konrad Ziegler. According to Bryan, to ascribe to Romulus the idea that “vinculum aliquod suis … cum Sabinis et commercium nasciturum, ubi eas demulsiissent,” would be “vana quidem spes et tenui nimis innixa fundamento.” So he concluded: “Lege autem ὁμηρευσάμενοι et fæteberis Romulus non frustra sibi pollicitum esse futurum aliquando cum Sabinis commercium, quando virgines tanquam obsides acceptas secum haberet” (Augustinus Bryanus, Plutarchi chaeronensis vitae parallele I (London 1729) 73 of the Notae). To support it he cites Plut. Sert. 14.3 (see the text above). Ultimately, however, the meaning of the simple verb cannot be “take hostage” but “bind to oneself,” as the whole passage on Sertorius shows. In fact, τὸ ἀδίκημα, i.e. the abduction of women, could have been for the Romans the beginning of a new alliance with the Sabines, provided they “would have bound to themselves” the abducted women, and not “have kept them as hostages”; and to express such a bond ἧμηροσαμένους is quite appropriate. That is why I believe the reading of the manuscripts must be retained.

16 D. Barends, Lexicon Aenéium (Assen 1955) 98, even translates “have given hostages.”

17 From that of Oldfather (Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander [London/ Cambridge (Mass.) 1923], to those of Bon (A. Dain and A.-M. Bon, Enée le
ὁμηρεύομαι, in the present tense, points out the status, the condition of the city (as a result of surrendering hostages), that of “being held hostage” itself. This nativa vocis significatio is to some extent confirmed by the fact that ὁμηρεύω, in the active voice, may also mean not just “to be or serve as a hostage” but even “take as a hostage” (LSJ).

To return to the Suda entry, in addition to the strong resemblance between Aeneas’ πόλεως δ’ ὁμηρευομένης and the Suda’s ἔξομηρευομένων τῶν νεανίσκων, there is a further element in favour of the suggested interpretation: the explicit subject in the Suda, “the young people.” Thus, if the meaning of ἔξομηρευομαι is what we have proposed, the translation of the text will be: “The Samians, though their young people were held hostage, did not delay but rose up against the Macedonians’

---

18 A list of verbs used by Aeneas in the middle voice (and with a passive value) that are “unparalleled in contemporary literature” is in L. W. Hunter, Aeneas on Siegecraft (Oxford 1927) LXXII.


Let us now examine the content. Which revolt is this? To answer this question one must start from the striking similarity which this short text shows to some moments of the revolt of Samos in 440–439 B.C., as it may be reconstructed on the basis of Thucydides’ report. The historian writes (1.115.3–5) that, following the conflict between Samos and Miletos for control of Priene, the Athenians intervened and established democracy at Samos on the request of the Mytileneans and with the support of some Samians. Next, the Athenians obliged them to give up as hostages fifty young men and as many adults whom they settled on Lemnos, and then left Samos after leaving a garrison (πλεύσαντες οὖν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς Σάμων ναυσὶ τεσσάροις δημοκρατίαις κατέστησαν, καὶ ὀμήρους ἐλαβον τῶν Σαμίων πεντήκοντα μὲν παῖδας, ἵσους δὲ ἄνδρας, καὶ κατέθεντο ἐς Λῆμνον, καὶ φρουρᾶν ἐγκαταλιπόντες ἀνεχώρησαν). Some of the Samians who managed to flee to the continent—in agreement with Pissuthnes and the most powerful persons still on the island—landed on Samos overnight, overthrew the democratic government, brought the hostages back from Lemnos, revolted and brought to Pissuthnes the soldiers of the Athenian garrison (καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τῷ δήμῳ ἐπανέστησαν καὶ ἐκράτησαν τῶν πλεί-

21 The first Latin version of this text, that of Aemilius Portus (Suidas II [Geneva 1619] 298) is: “Samī vero, quamvis ipsorum adolescents obsides essent peregri, non permanserunt tamen in fide Macedonibus data: sed in Macedones urbis custodes insurrexerunt” (the adverb peregri evidently derives from an over-interpretation of the value of the prefix ἐξ-). That of Bernhardy (II.1 1091–1092) seems to me a free interpretation: “Samii vero, quamvis Adolescentes suos obsides dedissent, haud tamen pactis steterunt, sed in Macedones urbis custodes insurrexerunt.” Similar to ours is the translation in Suda On Line: “The Samians, although their young men were hostages [ἐξομερωσμένον], nevertheless did not continue, but revolted against the Macedonian garrison in their city.”

Apart for some small details, such as the identity and number of the hostages (the “young people,” without further specification, in the *Suda*; fifty young men with as many adult males in Thucydides and the rest of the tradition) and the target of the revolt (the garrison in the *Suda*; both the *demos* and the garrison in Thucydides), the one apparently insurmountable difference concerns the men against whom the Samians revolted: in the *Suda* they are Macedonians, in Thucydides the Athenians. But if one bears in mind, on the one hand, that Samos throughout its history never gave up hostages to the Macedonians or hosted in its own territory one of their garrisons, and, on the other, that in the *Suda* errors involving exchange of names are frequent, one must recognize that our fragment refers precisely to the revolt of 440–439. Thus, τῶν Μακεδόνων must be either emended to τῶν Ἀθηναίων or deleted as a (wrong) marginal note entered into the text at a later date.

III.

The third fragment of our short collection is preserved s.v. Ἀποσκευαζόμενος (α 3523 Adler):

ο δὲ γράφει παντὶ τρόπῳ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἀποσκευάσασθαι.

Ille vero scribit, ut Alcibiadem quavis ratione de medio tollat.

This particular meaning of ἀποσκευάζομαι (“De medio prorsus tollo, Neco” Stephanus; “make away with, kill” LSJ)—a mean-


24 Among the most remarkable instances of name exchange are α 3025 (Athens in place of Thebes) and π 2758 (Caesar in place of Crassus). Those *adespota* fragments have been attributed: see “False attribuzioni e nuovi riconoscimenti nella Suda,” *AnnBari* 51 (2008) 53–61 (at 54 and 59). Cf. also α 3064 (Spartiates in place of Helots) in the *Suda On Line*.

25 So Portus, *Suidas* I 390, and his translation is reproduced without modification in the editions of Kusterus and Bernhardy.
ing that the lexicographer knows but only records, oddly, in the next lemma— is confirmed by the episode to which the quotation likely refers.

According to Plutarch, the day after the capitulation of Athens and the establishment of the regime of the Thirty in 404, Critias let Lysander know that, if alive, Alcibiades would not allow the city to adapt to the present situation (τέλος δὲ Κριτίας ἐδίδασκε Λύσανδρον ὡς ... Ἀθηναίους ... οὐκ εὔσετι ζῶν Ἀλκιβιάδης ἀτρέμειν ἐπὶ τῶν καθεστῶτων). Lysander did not listen to him, until he received from Sparta the written order to eliminate Alcibiades (οὐ μὴ ἔπεισθη γε πρῶτον τούτως ὁ Λύσανδρος ἦ παρὰ τῶν οἴκων τελῶν σκυτάλην ἐλθεῖν κελεύσωσαν ἐκ τοδῶν ποιήσασθαι τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην). Then he sent a message to Pharnabazus, urging him to proceed (ὁ Λύσανδρος ἔπεψε πρὸς τὸν Φαρνάβαζον ταῦτα πράττειν κελεύων).

Nepos’ report is similar. While Alcibiades was engaged in freeing his country,

εἰς τὴν θέσιν τοῦ φίλου τοῦ Ἀθηναίου Κριτίας ἐδίδασκε Λύσανδρον ὡς ... Ἀθηναίους ... οὐκ εὔσετι ζῶν Ἀλκιβιάδης ἀτρέμειν ἐπὶ τῶν καθεστῶτων). Lysander did not listen to him, until he received from Sparta the written order to eliminate Alcibiades (οὐ μὴ ἔπεισθη γε πρῶτον τούτως ὁ Λύσανδρος ἦ παρὰ τῶν οἴκων τελῶν σκυτάλην ἐλθεῖν κελεύσωσαν ἐκ τοδῶν ποιήσασθαι τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην). Then he sent a message to Pharnabazus, urging him to proceed (ὁ Λύσανδρος ἔπεψε πρὸς τὸν Φαρνάβαζον ταῦτα πράττειν κελεύων).

Accordingly, ὁ δὲ will be Lysander and the recipient of his letter (γράφει) will be the satrap Pharnabazus.

With the historical contexts of the three Suda fragments so reconstructed, we can ask about their authorship. First, it necessary to summarize the established facts about the historical sources of the Suda lexicon. Never challenged, at least openly,

26 S.v. ἀποσκευάζοντες (α3524 Adler): καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύσειν ἐμελλέν, εἰ μὴ φθάσας τὸ μετώπιον ἀποσκευάζατο. The quotation is from the History of Theophilact Simocatta 3.7.4, and its interpretamentum explains that the optative ἀποσκευάζατο “is equivalent to put out of the way by killing” (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποθοῖτο ἐνέλλον).


28 Nepos Alc. 10. See also Isocrates On the Team of Horses 16.40.
those points are very often neglected by those who prefer to judge vain, if not completely useless, any attempt to resolve the anonymity and attribute authorship to the many quotations, more or less short, that have yet to be recognized and possibly ascribed. These points are:

1) The historical quotations in the Lexicon are derived to a very large extent from the Excerpta Constantiniana.

2) The Excerpta used by the Lexicographer, even if he did not use all 53 sections of that work, were nonetheless more numerous than the sections that have been transmitted to us (De virtutibus et vitis, De legationibus, De sententiis, and De insidiis). In any case, the lost sections must have preserved the same authors as the surviving ones.

3) The historians (in the wider sense) cited in the Lexicon are hardly more than thirty.29

If one combines these general data with the fact that our three fragments concern fifth-century history and can be traced back to none of the authors who wrote on that period and whose works have been transmitted to us via direct tradition, the names that can be suggested are only two: Aelian and John of Antioch—not e.g. Nicolaus of Damascus, whose first seven books, the only ones the Lexicographer read, are unlikely to have dealt with that historical period.30 Aelian was the author of a miscellaneous work entitled On Providence or On Divine Manifestations, a work that is often quoted by the Suida, as is shown not only by the more than 300 fragments gathered by both Rudolph Hercher and Domingo Forasté,31 but also by other fragments


30 Adler, Suidae Lexicon I XIX: “Nicolai Damasceni … septem primi historiarum libri.”

31 R. Hercher, Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia, Epistolae, Fragmenta (Leipzig 1866), 189–291; D. Domingo-Forasté, Claudii Aeliani Epistulae et Fragmenta
subsequently attributed to Aelian. John of Antioch wrote a *Universal Chronicle* (Χρονικὴ ἱστορία) from mythical times to Heraclius, also often quoted in the *Suda*.

The criteria for the attribution of a fragment are its content and the form of expression, its style (above all its lexicon). But in our instance the lexicon is not so crucial as in other cases: two of the three more relevant verbs (ὑπεξαιροῦμαι and ἐξομηρεύομαι) are hapax legomena for both Aelian and John, who nonetheless use other compound verbs with double preposition (ὑπεκ-/ὑπεξ-). The third verb (ἀποσκευάζομαι) does appear in John, but the passages where it is attested are all copied from his source Herodian. As to the concessive conjunction καίπερ, attested only in John, it is a very common particle whose presence or absence seems to me not a solid base for any attribution. However, if one proceeds to consider the episodes and the personages dealt with in the fragments, one sees that in John (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1994) 18–126. In an appendix to his edition of Aelian’s *Various History*, J. Perizonius republished the first collection, by Joachim Kuhnus, of the “Fragmenta quae vel apposito Aeliani nomine laudat Suidas vel stylo Indice Auctori Nostro asserenda sunt visa.” In the *Praefatio* he wrote: “pleraque, si non omnia, manifeste sunt sumpta ex Aelianii Libris, peri provoic, seu peri Theou Εναρχειων, de Providentia, seu Divina providentiae manifestis documentis … Quatuor tantum in hisce omnibus reperies fragmentis, quae Suidas nominavit adscriptis Aelianii poiei ἀφηγήσεως, vel poiei ἱστορίας, Variae Narrationi, vel Variae Historiae, Vide Ασέλγεια, Δώς, Κάκη, & Φιλωθέσς, sed quae non dubito vel ipsius Suidae ἀμαρτήματι μηνημονικῷ tribuenda, vel Librariorum Errori & Audaciae, non tantum, quia in hac Nostra Aelianii Historia nusquam occurrunt, sed & quia aliud nihil, quod ex ea constet vere sumpsum, habet Suidas” (*Claudii Aeliani Sophistae, Varia Historia* II [Leiden 1701] 932 = 1003 in Gronovius’ edition [Amsterdam 1731]).


33 John of Antioch F 205.3 Roberto = Herod. 3.5.3; F 213.59 = Herod. 4.3.2; F 218.28 = Herod. 5.8.8; F 220.32 = Herod. 6.8.4. On Herodian as a source for John see Roberto cxxviii.

34 FF 162.1.9, 167.1, 258.3 Roberto.

---

*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 58 (2018) 279–291
fifth-century history is completely absent, but in Aelian, and especially in the *VH* (a work whose content should resemble the lost *On Divine Manifestations*), not only do Themistocles and Alcibiades appear but so do the Samians. For Themistocles, *VH* 2.12 (preserving an anecdote on Themistocles and envy); 3.47 (Themistocles banished from Athens and from the whole of Greece); 10.17 (see above, on Themistocles’ patrimony). For Alcibiades, 9.29 (the relationship between him and Socrates); 11.7 (the relationship between him and Athens); and 13.38 (some apophthegms of Alcibiades). As to Samos, 2.9 (again an episode in the war between Athens and Samos: the Samian prisoners are branded with the Athenian owl). 

In light of these things, and aware that in such research no absolute certainty exists but only a more or less high level of approximation and plausibility, I think that the *Suda* fragments in question may be ascribed to Aelian.

*January, 2018*

Università di Bari “Aldo Moro”
andrea.favuzzi@alice.it
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35 Of fourth-century history there is only a reference to Darius III and Alexander the Great: f 71 Roberto.

36 On the envy-theme see also Aelian frs.338 and 349 Hercher (= fr.335 and 345 Domingo-Forasté).

37 See also *Suda* σ 77 Σαμίων ὁ δήμος: … Αθήναιοι μὲν τοὺς ληφθέντας ἐν πολέμῳ Σαμίους ἐστιζον γλαυκί, Σάμιοι τῆς συμαίνης). Plut. *Per.* 26.3–4 offers a different version.
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