

Leonidas at Sphacteria

Annalisa Paradiso

*Dedicated to the memory of John L. Moles,
a great scholar and a generous man*

TWO *SUDA* ENTRIES transmit an odd piece of information, the presence of Leonidas at Sphacteria. Leonidas had been the hero of the battle of Thermopylae, fought in 480 B.C.; the island of Sphacteria was the theatre, in 425, of a fundamental episode of the Peloponnesian War, the Athenian siege and capture of 292 Spartan warriors, 120 of whom were Spartiates.¹ My purpose is to explain the historical mistake by inquiring into its textual dimension, thereby identifying the common source of the two entries.

The first entry is *Suda* λ 272 (Adler):

¹ Thermopylae: Hdt. 7.198–238; Sphacteria: Thuc. 4.3–6, 8–23, 26–41. On Leonidas and Thermopylae see, within a huge bibliography, A. Daskalakis, *Problèmes historiques autour de la bataille des Thermopyles* (Paris 1962); J. Dillery, “Reconfiguring the Past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and Narrative Patterns in Herodotus,” *AJP* 117 (1996) 217–254; M. A. Flower, “Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae,” *CQ* 48 (1998) 365–379; J. Christien and J. Le Tallec, *Léonidas. Histoire et mémoire d’un sacrifice* (Paris 2013). On the episode of Sphacteria see W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography I* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1965) 6–29; P. Huart, “L’épisode de Pylos-Sphactérie dans Thucydide: ses répercussions à Sparte,” *AFL Nice* 11 (1970) 27–45; J. B. Wilson, *Pylos 425 B.C. A Historical and Topographical Study of Thucydides’ Account of the Campaign* (Warminster 1979); D. Babut, “L’épisode de Pylos-Sphactérie chez Thucydide: l’agencement du récit et les intentions de l’historien,” *RPhil* 60 (1986) 59–79 (repr. *Parerga. Choix d’articles de Daniel Babut* [Lyon 1994] 641–661); L. J. Samons II, “Thucydides’ Sources and the Spartan Plan at Pylos,” *Hesperia* 75 (2006) 525–540.

Λεωνίδης· Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς, Ἀναξανδρίδου, ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους κ' βασιλεύς. οὗτος ἡγεμὼν τῶν εἰς Θερμοπύλας ἀπαντησάντων Ἑλλήνων ἦν. ἐν δὲ τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ λέγεται τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀποθέμενον τὸ σῶμα ἀποθεωθῆναι. Λεωνίδης δὲ ἀπαγγελθέντος, ὅτι τοξευόντων τῶν Περσῶν ὁ ἥλιος ἀφανῆς γίνεται· θαρρῶμεν, ἔφη, ὅτι ὑπὸ σκιᾷ μαχησόμεθα. ἀριστοποιούμενοι δὲ τοῖς στρατιώταις, ἀριστᾶτε, ἔφη, ὡς ἐν ἄδου δειπνήσοντες. ἐπελθόντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως, οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι πάντες τὸ πλῆθος εὐλαβηθέντες ἔφυγον, Θηβαῖοι δὲ ἠὺτομόλησαν· οὐδ' λαβὼν ἔστιξε βασιλεύς σὺν στρατιώταις τριακοσίοις Σπαρτιάταις. ἐπιγράφεται ἐπὶ Λεωνίδου ἐπίγραμμα· ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγελλε Λακεδαιμονίοις, ὅτι τῆδε κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι. οὗτος ὁ Λεωνίδης περὶ Σφακτηρίαν ἅμα τριακοσίοις ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ. καὶ ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε κυκλωθεὶς ἐκ προδοσίας, Ἐφιάλτου τινὸς δείξαντος Πέρσας τὴν διὰ τῶν ὀπῶν ὁδόν. ὁ δὲ Μακεδὼν ἐκεῖνος εἴτε Λεωνίδης τὸ φρόνημα ἢ Καλλίμαχος ἢ Κυναίγειρος, ἀρκέσει δὲ τὸ Ῥωμαῖον ἀποκαλεῖν, ὡς τῶν λόγων τῶν ἰατρικῶν ὑπήσθητο, ἦρετο, εἰ τὸ Ῥωμαϊκὸν εἶη νενικηκός.

Leonidas, king of the Lacedaemonians, the son of Anaxandrides, the twentieth king from Heracles. This man was the chief of the Greeks who stood at Thermopylae. In this place, Heracles is said, having laid aside his body, to have been deified. And Leonidas, when it was related that the sun disappears when the Persians shoot their arrows, said "Have no fear, as we shall fight in the shade." And to the warriors who were eating their breakfast, he said "Get your breakfast, for you shall have dinner in Hades." When the Great King approached, all the others were wary of the great number and fled, whereas the Thebans deserted: the King captured and tattooed them, with the three hundred Spartiate warriors. A commemorative inscription was inscribed for Leonidas: "O stranger, announce to the Lacedaemonians that we lie here, in obedience to their laws." This Leonidas resisted Xerxes at Sphacteria, along with the Three Hundred. He was the best and died, being surrounded through betrayal, since a certain Ephialtes showed to the Persians the way through the openings. And that man, a Macedonian or a Leonidas for courage, or a Callimachus or a Cynaegirus—but it will be sufficient to call him a 'Roman', since he overheard the words of the doctors and asked whether the Romans had won.

The entry devoted to Leonidas clearly preserves materials of mixed—Herodotean and other—origin. The source, Herodotus, or a *Mittelquelle* originally drawing on Herodotus, seems however freely and badly compiled. The genealogical information on the father and ancestors of the king goes back ultimately to Herodotus 7.204, who presents the complete *stemma* of the Agiads. Heracles' burning is found in Herodotus 7.198.2, where it is related with fewer details and no explicit apotheosis. The first apophthegm, on the arrows and the shadow, is also found in Herodotus, where it is not uttered by Leonidas but by Dienece, the second-best warrior on the battlefield (7.226).² The second apophthegm, on taking the next dinner in Hades, appears instead in Ps.-Plutarch *Parallela minora* 4.Ab (*Mor.* 306D), where it is said to have been drawn from Aristides of Miletus (*FGrHist/BNJ* 286 F 20abc). It also appears in Plutarch's *Apophthegmata laconica* (225D) and other sources as well, and probably goes back ultimately to Ephorus.³ The information on the Thebans' desertion also appears in Herodotus (7.233), as well as the detail of the treatment Xerxes reserved for them, although that treatment was, of course, not also applied to the Three Hundred as the entry states.⁴ To the

² In Herodotus, Leonidas does not leave the memory of any apophthegm: he will do so in the Ephorean tradition, transmitted by Diod. 11.4.3–4 and 11.9.4.

³ See also Cic. *Tusc.* 1.42.101; Diod. 11.9.4; Sen. *Suas.* 2.12; Val. Max. 3.2 *ext.* 3; Sen. *Ep.* 10.82.21; cf. E. N. Tigerstedt, *The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity* (Stockholm 1965–1974) I 216–218, II 254–255. Ephorus could be a common source for Diodorus and Plutarch according to N. G. L. Hammond, “Sparta at Thermopylae,” *Historia* 45 (1996) 1–20.

⁴ Two solutions have been suggested for this textual problem: either to link *σὺν στρατιώταις τριακοσίοις Σπαρτιάταις το ἐπιγέγραπται ἐπὶ Λεωνίδου ἐπίγραμμα* or to delete it. Cf., respectively, D. Whitehead, E. Vandiver, and C. Roth, in *Suda on line* s.v. *λ* 272 (www.stoa.org/sol/) and *Suidae Lexicon graece et latine ... versionem latinam Aemilii Porti ... correxit ... Ludolphus Kusterus II* (Cantabrigiae 1705) 428, “haec verba ut supervacanea delenda puto,” followed by *Suidae Lexicon graece et latine ... post Thomam Gaisfordum recensuit Godofredus Bernhardy II* (Halle/Braunschweig 1853) 533–534.

same Herodotean context also belongs the data on the inscription set up in honour of Leonidas (7.228.2). There, however, the inscription was devoted to all the Three Hundred and transmitted in a more correct way.⁵ With οὗτος ὁ Λεωνίδης περὶ Σφακτηρίαν ἅμα τριακοσίοις ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ, the compiler of the *Suda* entry seems to start a new beginning, where he decides to repeat the essential (and already supplied) data of Leonidas' resistance to Xerxes along with the Three Hundred. He no longer locates the stand at Thermopylae but, quite surprisingly, at Sphacteria. Of course, it is not evident at all how the name 'Sphacteria' may have penetrated into this entry, which only deals with Thermopylae. After that, the compiler seems to come back to the source—Herodotus, or someone inspired by the historian—from whom he derives the judgement on Leonidas' *aristeia* (7.224.1) and some details on his defeat and death, due to the betrayal by Ephialtes who showed the Persians the path through which they passed and encircled the Greeks (7.213). The *lemma* is closed by a quotation from the seventh-century historian Theophylact Simocatta (2.6.6), transmitted with minor variants (*Suda*: εἴτε Λεωνίδης, Κυναίγειρος, τῶν ἰατρικῶν ὑπήσθητο; Theophylact: ἢ Λεωνίδα, Κυνέγειρος, τῶν ἰατρῶν ὑπήσθάνετο). The Byzantine historian suggested a comparison between an anonymous and brave Roman warrior in Heraclius' army and some historical personages, the best known of whom are Leonidas and "the famous Macedonian," most likely Alexander.

A second entry connects Leonidas to Sphacteria (*Suda* σ 1713):

Σφακτηρία· τόπος στενὸς τῆς Λακωνικῆς, διείργων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων καὶ ἀποφράττων τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εἰσβολάς. ἐνθα καὶ Λεωνίδης πρότερον Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς ...

More simply, a bad summary of the source can have produced such an awkward sentence and the text does not need emendation.

⁵ *Anth.Gr.* 7.249; Page, *FGE* Simon. XXIIb.

Sphacteria, a narrow place in Laconia which prevents, separates from, and blocks off invasions from Thessaly and Lacedaemonia. Here Leonidas, formerly king of the Lacedaemonians ...

This entry should deal merely with Sphacteria: nonetheless, it introduces Leonidas at the end of the text, which suddenly breaks off, according to Ada Adler's edition (ἔνθα καὶ Λεωνίδης πρότερον Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς...). The geography of the places is overturned: the island of Sphacteria, which is located in Messenia, is described as a τόπος στενὸς τῆς Λακωνικῆς, so in Laconia, thanks to the common confusion (or equation) of Laconia and Messenia. More surprisingly, Sphacteria—adjacent to the promontory of Pylos, located in turn on the northern side of modern Bay of Navarino—is said to prevent invasions both from far-off Thessaly and from nearby Lacedaemonia (a late, post-classical, toponym for Laconia): but the Lacedaemonians, who controlled Messenia at that time, did not need to invade it.

The source of the entry is a *scholium vetus* to Aristophanes *Knights* 55a.⁶ In the scholion, some information is provided about Pylos rather than Sphacteria. Pylos was mentioned at line 55 of the comedy by the First Slave, namely Demosthenes of Aphidna who in 425 proposed to fortify this place.⁷

Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 55a.III (VEΓΘ):

ἄλλως· ἐν τῇ Πύλῳ· τόπος δὲ οὗτος τῆς Λακωνικῆς στενός, διείργων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εἰσβολάς. ἔνθα καὶ Λεωνίδας πρότερον τῶν Μακεδόνων

⁶ p.23.6–11 Jones-Wilson. The scholion is transmitted by the *Venetus Marc.gr.* 474 (V), the *Estensis* α.U.5.10 (E), the *Laur.Plut.* 31.15 (Γ), and the *Laur.Conv.Soppr.* 140 (Θ). The identification of the source was made by P. Wesseling, *Probabilium liber singularis* (Franeker 1731) 257. Cf. Adler IV 484, “Ar.” in *margin* and “sch. Ar. Eq. 55” in *apparatu*, and *Suda on line* s.v. σ 1713. On the scholia to Aristophanes as a source of the *Suda* see Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* I (Leipzig 1928) XVIII.

⁷ Thuc. 4.2 ff. On Pylos as a pre-Hellenist settlement not attested as a polis see M. H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford 2004) 557.

βασιλεὺς ἅμα τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ τῷ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεῖ, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Περσῶν ἀποκτείνας, ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε, κυκλωθεὶς ἐκ προδοσίας, Ἐφιάλτου τινὸς δείξαντος τοῖς Πέρσαις διὰ τῶν ὄρων ὁδόν.

Differently: at Pylos: this is a narrow place in Laconia which prevents and separates invasions from Thessaly and Lacedaemonia. Here Leonidas, formerly king of the Macedonians, along with the Spartiates, resisted Xerxes, the king of the Persians. And having killed many Persians, he was the best and died, being surrounded through betrayal, since a certain Ephialtes showed to the Persians the way through the mountains.

Apparently, the entry σ 1713 Σφακτηρία offers a better text than its source, the scholion. For instance, στενός, in τόπος ... τῆς Λακωνικῆς στενός, seems to better fit the long and narrow shape of the island of Sphacteria (*Suda*) than the promontory of Pylos (scholion).⁸ Thucydides in fact mentions the στενοχωρία of the island (4.30.2). He also says that Sphacteria, which stretches along the harbour and is quite close to it, makes it safe and the entrances narrow (4.8.6, ἡ γὰρ νῆσος ... τὸν τε λιμένα, παρατείνουσα καὶ ἐγγὺς ἐπικειμένη, ἐχυρὸν ποιεῖ καὶ τοὺς ἔσπλους στενούς). Still, the *Suda* entry slightly amplifies the text of the scholion διείργων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εἰσβολάς, by adding καὶ ἀποφράττων. In both texts, the allusion to improbable invasions from Thessaly and Λακεδαιμονία/Laconia is identical and, of course, incongruous if referred to both Pylos and Sphacteria. How did the mention of Leonidas slide into σ 1713 on Sphacteria and the latter into *Suda* λ 272 on Thermopylae?

The textual configuration of the scholion explains those anachronistic features and even helps to date their incorporation into the two entries. The obscure allusion to Thessalian and Lacedaemonian invasions does not belong to the *Suda* compiler but to the scholiast, and presumably depends on the

⁸ Sphacteria instead of Pylos as a narrow place in Laconia is also attested in the *scholium vetus* to Ar. *Eq.* 55b: εἰς Φακτηρίαν (τόπος δὲ οὗτος τῆς Λακωνικῆς στενός).

relationship between the latter and his own source, an ancient *hypomnema* on *Knights*. In his source, the scholiast probably found information on both Thermopylae and Sphacteria, compared either by the author of the commentary himself or by an older source.

In fact, a comparison between the Spartiates surrounded at Sphacteria and the Three Hundred encircled at Thermopylae had been suggested by Thucydides in the well-known passage of Book 4 which stated the greater importance of the Sphacteria episode when compared to the stand at Thermopylae.⁹ Therefore, the comparison presupposed by the scholion and probably found in the commentary could ultimately go back to Thucydides, who was the single most reliable ancient source on that episode and was also quoted in other scholia on the same subject.¹⁰ It could be a development of Thucydides' analogy.

⁹ Thuc. 4.36.2: καὶ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι βαλλόμενοι τε ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἤδη καὶ γινόμενοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ξυμπτόματι, ὡς μικρὸν μεγάλῳ εἰκάσαι, τῷ ἐν Θερμοπύλαις κτλ. Cf. S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Rome/Bari 1983 [1966]) 275; L. Canfora, *Totalità e selezione nella storiografia classica* (Bari 1972) 73–75 and n.12; A. Favuzzi, *Tucidide, La guerra del Peloponneso* II (Rome/Bari 1986) 323. For a more traditional view of this passage, which sees Thermopylae as the more important episode, see F. W. Ullrich, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Thukydides* (Hamburg 1849) 104 n.23, followed by both Gomme, *HCT* III (Oxford 1956) 477, and S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* II (Oxford 1996) 191–192.

¹⁰ For instance, Thuc. 4.28 (on Pylos/Sphacteria) is cited in both scholia Ar. *Eq.* 55a.ii and 1054a. Cf. schol. *Eq.* 393a and *MPER* N.S. III 20 (*CLGP* 15; Pack² 1725; MP³ 146.1), a fifth-century commentary on Aristophanes' *Clouds* whose lines 1–4 refer to line 186 and transmit Thucydidean materials still on the same episode. See on it *TrGF* II 676; G. Zuntz, *Die Aristophanes-scholien der Papyri*² (Berlin 1975) 29–47; M. Gronewald, “Zwei Hypomnema zu Aristophanes,” *ZPE* 45 (1982) 61–69, at 61–64; N. Athanassiou, *Marginalia and Commentaries in the Papyri of Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes* (diss. University College London 1999) 114–115; S. Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur alten Komödie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Philologie* (Munich/Leipzig 2002) 38–39; F. Montana, “L'esegesi ad Aristofane su papiro,” in F. Montana (ed.), *Interpretazioni antiche di Aristofane* (Rome 2006) 27–28; M. Stroppa, “Lista di codici tardoantichi contenenti *hypomnema*,” *Aegyptus* 88 (2008) 49–69, at 57.

However, in our *Suda* entries the association of Thermopylae and Sphacteria must have clumsily arisen from the close affinity between the two names, Πύλος and Πύλαι, namely the other, epichoric, name of Θερμοπύλαι (Hdt. 7.201). In other words, the ancient scholar who commented on Aristophanes' *Knights*, and precisely on Pylos, must have provided information on both 'Pylos' and 'Pylae', rather than 'Thermopylae', either playing on the similarity of the two names or else following the lead of Thucydides' comparison. Later on, the scholiast confused and mixed up the double information on the two places—Pylos and Pylae—while 'cutting and pasting' material from his source.¹¹ In yet other words, the scholiast looked for some information on Pylos, carelessly derived some data on it but did not realize they concerned Pylae (Thermopylae) rather than Pylos. Indeed, the description that we find in the scholion does not suit the topography of Pylos, which is neither a τόπος στενός nor an outpost against invasions from both Thessaly and Laconia: clearly, the text does not fit its context and τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εἰσβολάς is nonsense. The same words also appear in the textual tradition of the matching *Suda* entry σ 1713, except in one manuscript, *Paris.gr.* 2623 of the fifteenth century (G), whose copyist tried to 'normalize' the text to τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ εἰς Λακεδαιμονίαν εἰσβολάς, "the invasions from Thessaly towards Lacedaemonia." Such a textual solution perfectly fits the geography of Thermopylae, which is located between Thessaly and the south of Greece, namely the Peloponnese, i.e. Laconia: however, it does not suit so well the whole sentence of the entry, as Sphacteria is not midway between Thessaly and Laconia.¹²

Clearly, also the text of the scholion, τόπος ... στενός, διείρων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακε-

¹¹ A confusion (by the scholiast) between Pylae and Pylos was first supposed by Wesseling, *Probabilium liber singularis* 257–258.

¹² For another bad localization in the Lexicon cf. *Suda* θ 248, where Thermopylae even becomes "a place at Athens."

δαιμονίας εισβολάς, roughly suits Thermopylae rather than Pylos/Sphacteria: in fact, the information it preserves distorts a Herodotean passage from Book 7 on the second Persian war. Herodotus explained through a similar argument, and almost the same vocabulary, the decision to defend the pass of Thermopylae, chosen by the Greeks because it was narrow (thus allowing them to stop invasions from Thessaly) and the nearest to their country, namely central and southern Greece (to which, clearly, they could return: the text makes no mention of invasions of or from Laconia!). Thus Herodotus 7.175.1, ἡ νικῶσα δὲ γνώμη ἐγίνετο τὴν ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι ἐσβολὴν φυλάξαι· στεινότερῃ γὰρ ἐφαίνετο εὐῶσα τῆς ἐς Θεσσαλίην καὶ μία ἀγχοτέρῃ τε τῆς ἐωυτῶν, “the prevailing decision was to protect the pass of Thermopylae, which seemed to be more narrow than that into Thessaly and the only one quite near to their country”; 175.2, ταύτην ὧν ἐβουλεύσαντο φυλάσσοντες τὴν ἐσβολὴν μὴ παρῆναι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὸν βάρβαρον, “so they decided not to let the barbarian come into Greece, by defending this pass”; and 176.2, οὐ μέντοι κατὰ τοῦτό γε ἐστὶ τὸ στεινότατον τῆς χώρας τῆς ἄλλης, ἀλλ’ ἔμπροσθε τε Θερμοπυλέων καὶ ὀπισθε, “however, the most narrow part of all the country is not here, but before and behind Thermopylae”; cf. 176.4 about the wall that the Phocians set up in order to prevent Thessalian invasions, ὅπως μὴ σφι ἐσβάλοιν οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ ἐς τὴν χώραν.

Either the commentator on *Knights* distorted the Herodotean information or (more probably) the scholiast badly summarized it. The latter then referred to Pylos the description of Pylae and adapted it to the new context, by adding τῆς Λακωνικῆς and probably even καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας, in τόπος δὲ οὗτος τῆς Λακωνικῆς στενός, διείργων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εισβολάς. But in the scholion, I wonder whether Λακεδαιμονίας, in τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλίας καὶ Λακεδαιμονίας εισβολάς, is a mistake in place of Μακεδο-

νίας, which would suit perfectly Thermopylae.¹³ After all, the scholiast himself made the same, and opposite, mistake only some lines thereafter, by introducing Leonidas as the king of the “Macedonians” in place of “Lacedaemonians.”¹⁴ Finally, if one admits that the scholion involves Thermopylae and not Pylos, the following ἔνθα will be correctly referred to the pass where Leonidas and the Three Hundred stood against Xerxes.

The compiler of *Suda* σ 1713 made himself no mistake and only inherited those made by his source, the scholiast to Aristophanes’ *Knights*. He adapted the description of Pylae/Pylos to the narrow island of Sphacteria. In fact, he recorded that material under the entry ‘Sphacteria’, rather than ‘Pylos’, since both places had been mentioned side-by-side in his source.¹⁵ The compiler depends on the scholion but he seems to know a slightly different redaction of it, as he adds the verb ἀποφράττων to διείργων καὶ ἀποχωρίζων and correctly writes Λεωνίδης ... Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς in place of the wrong Λεωνίδα ... τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεύς, unless the addition and/or the correction are due to himself.¹⁶ The text of the *Suda* entry stops suddenly after ἔνθα καὶ Λεωνίδης πρότερον Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς, at least in Adler’s edition. In fact, Adler deleted two final words, which are omitted by a part of the manuscript tra-

¹³ The Greeks at first deliberated to defend the Tempe pass, located between Macedon and Thessaly: Hdt. 7.172–173.

¹⁴ τῶν Μακεδόνων VE: Θ has instead, more correctly, τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων; the first hand of Γ also has τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, corrected by the fourth hand to τῶν Μακεδόνων. The *Suda* entry transmits, correctly, τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.

¹⁵ Sphacteria is mentioned in other scholia to *Eq.* 55a, so in the matching commentary: cf. scholion II, παραπλέων τὴν Πύλον καὶ Σφακτηρίαν, and IV, ἔνιοι δὲ κατέφυγον ... εἰς τὴν καταντικρὸν νησίδα τὴν Σφακτηρίαν. On the other hand, the scholar who composed the *Argumentum* 2 of the comedy even wrote confusedly Ἀθηναῖοι πόλιν Πύλου, λεγομένην Σφακτηρίαν, ἐπολιόρκουν (p.2.9–10 Jones-Wilson).

¹⁶ The *Suda* compilers had access to a more complete corpus of Aristophanic scholia, according to E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007) 29.

dition of the Lexicon, ἀγωνιζόμενος τετελευτήκει: she judged them completely alien to the text, following the lead of Gottfried Bernhardt.¹⁷ But those two words, which were included by Ludolph Kuster in his 1705 edition, are needed in the context, since they also depend on the scholion, and precisely on ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε, with a slight and careless adaptation.¹⁸

The final section of the scholion to *Knights* 55a may be singled out as a source for another entry of the *Suda*, λ 272:

scholion: ἔνθα καὶ Λεωνίδας πρότερον τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς ἅμα τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ τῷ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεῖ, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Περσῶν ἀποκτείνας, ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε, κυκλωθεὶς ἐκ προδοσίας, Ἐφιάλτου τινὸς δείξαντος τοῖς Πέρσαις διὰ τῶν ὀρῶν ὁδόν

Suda: οὗτος ὁ Λεωνίδης περὶ Σφακτηρίαν ἅμα τριακοσίοις ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ. καὶ ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε κυκλωθεὶς ἐκ προδοσίας, Ἐφιάλτου τινὸς δείξαντος Πέρσαις τὴν διὰ τῶν ὀπῶν ὁδόν

Of course, the compiler of λ 272 adapted the text of the scholion to the new context both by omitting the introductions of Leonidas and Xerxes, which had already been provided, and by interpreting ἔνθα (Pylos in the scholion) as περὶ Σφακτηρίαν. The dependence of *Suda* λ 272 on the scholion invites us to emend the wrong, and meaningless, ὀπῶν of the *Suda* (τὴν διὰ τῶν ὀπῶν ὁδόν) to the correct, and Herodotean, ὀρῶν of the scholion (τὴν διὰ τῶν ὀρῶν ὁδόν), as Kuster and Bernhardt already did but Adler did not.¹⁹ Instead, περὶ Σφακτηρίαν in λ 272 must not be normalized to either περὶ Θερμοπύλας φυλα-

¹⁷ Bernhardt, *Suidae Lexicon* II 995–996: “Suidam tamen ne in eiusdem imperitiae culpam adduci patiamur, obstat et brevitatis annotationis et imperfectus sermo, quem expulsis novissimis ἀγωνιζόμενος τετελευτήκει cum A.B.V. reliquimus. Malim igitur ista ad studiosos homines revocari.” A is *Paris.gr.* 2626, B is *Paris.gr.* 2622, V is *Vossian.gr.* fol. 2.

¹⁸ Kusterus, *Suidae Lexicon* III 415.

¹⁹ Hdt. 7.213 (τὴν ἀτραπὸν τὴν διὰ τοῦ ὄρεος) and 217; Kusterus, *Suidae Lexicon* II 428; Bernhardt, *Suidae Lexicon* II 533–534. On the path see P. W. Wallace, “The Anopaia Path at Thermopylae,” *AJA* 84 (1980) 15–23.

κτήριον (Hermann) or περὶ Θερμοπύλας (Bernhardy), since the compiler of the *Lexicon* only reproduced here a mistake already made by the scholiast. As to the words καὶ ἡγησαμένου αὐτῶν νυκτός, which close, in λ 272, the section derived from the scholion but do not appear in ABV and have been deleted by both Bernhardy and Adler, but not by Kuster, I wonder whether they should be restored to the text, as they possibly depend on the scholion as well and ultimately on the Herodotean ὁρμέατο περὶ λύχων ἀφάς ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου ... οἱ Πέρσαι ἐπορεύοντο πᾶσαν τὴν νύκτα ... ἔτι νυκτός (7.215, 217, 219). In this case, they would depend on a different redaction of the scholion, since the one we have does not know them.

In conclusion, *Suda* λ 272 seems to depend on at least three different sources. The first section (lines 17–27 Adler, from Λεωνίδης, Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι) clearly preserves Herodotean materials, badly compiled and reworked with some inclusions or transmitted through a vulgate. One of these inclusions is Leonidas' apophthegm on dinner in Hades, which is absent in the Herodotean tradition but present in the Plutarchean one and seems to go back to Ephorus through Aristides of Miletus. Another inclusion concerns Heracles' apotheosis (ἐν δὲ τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ—*sc.* at Thermopylae—λέγεται τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀποθέμενον τὸ σῶμα ἀποθεωθῆναι). In this form, it does not appear in Herodotus, who devotes to it only a vague allusion at 7.198.2 (ποταμὸς ... Δύρας, τὸν βοηθέοντα τῷ Ἡρακλεί καιομένῳ λόγος ἐστὶ ἀναφανῆναι).²⁰

The second section of the entry (lines 27–30) is introduced by οὗτος which usually marks, in the *Lexicon*, a change of source: οὗτος ὁ Λεωνίδης περὶ Σφακτηρίαν ἅμα τριακοσίοις ἀντέστη Ξέρξῃ. καὶ ἀριστεύων ἐτελεύτησε κυκλωθεὶς ἐκ προδοσίας, Ἐφιάλτου τινὸς δείξαντος Πέρσαις τὴν διὰ τῶν ὀπῶν ὁδόν.²¹ It

²⁰ For the hot thermal springs and an altar to Heracles cf. Hdt. 7.176, Philaias (or Phileas) in both Harp. s.v. Θερμοπύλαι and *Suda* θ 249.

²¹ οὗτος often signals in the *Lexicon* transition to a new subject or source

goes back to schol. Ar. *Knights* 55a.

The final section of the *lemma* (lines 30–33, ὁ δὲ Μακεδὼν ἐκεῖνος εἴτε Λεωνίδης τὸ φρόνημα ἢ Καλλίμαχος ἢ Κυναίγειρος, ἀρκέσει δὲ τὸ Ῥωμαῖον ἀποκαλεῖν, ὡς τῶν λόγων τῶν ἰατρικῶν ὑπήσθετο, ἤρετο, εἰ τὸ Ῥωμαϊκὸν εἴη νενικηκός) goes back instead to a lost Constantinian excerpt which transmitted a quotation from Theophylact Simocatta.²²

To sum up, I wonder whether the first section of λ 272 depends on a longer scholion to *Knights* 55 than the one which is known to our Aristophanic manuscripts, a scholion which preserved, in a sense, the comparison between Pylos and Pylae/Thermopylae of its source (the *hypomnema*) and whose final part would be the extant scholion 55a. If *Suda* λ 272 would depend on a longer scholion to *Knights* 55, which also preserved the name Pylae for Thermopylae, οὗτος would signal the transition to another point of the source rather than a change of the source itself.

January, 2016

Dipartimento delle Culture Europee
e del Mediterraneo
Università della Basilicata
Matera, Italy
annalisa.paradiso@unibas.it

or even a new start in the ‘cut and paste’ operations: cf. A. Daub, “De Suidae biographicorum origine et fide,” *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* Suppl. 11 (1880) 401–490, at 474–482. See also M. Ornaghi, “I Policrati ibicei. Ibico, Anacreonte, Policrate e la cronografia dei poeti della ‘corte’ di Samo,” *Annali Online di Ferrara – Lettere* III.1 (2008: <http://annali.unife.it/lettere/article/view/143>) 14–72, at 35–36.

²² Adler III 249, “E” *in margine*. On the dependence of the historical entries of the *Suda* on the *Excerpta Constantiniana* see C. de Boor, “Suidas und die Konstantinsche Exzerptsammlung,” *BZ* 21 (1912) 381–424, 23 (1914–1919) 1–127; Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* I XIX–XXI.