

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 (ε 225 Adler) has preserved the following adespota fragment:

καὶ ἐκράτησεν ὁ φθόνος, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐδήμευσαν αὐτῷ. ὁ
δὲ ὑπεξαίρειται χρυσίου ἑτάλαντα.

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 ἑτάλαντα) the man would have been able to “reserve/put aside in safety” (ὑπεξαίρειται),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.

¹ G. Bernhardt, *Suidae Lexicon graece et latine* I.2 (Halle 1853) 101–102.

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 ὑπεξαίρουμαι Excipio, vel Recipio, i.e. Retineo mihi in re alienanda. There follow citations of Dem. 19.78 (ὑμεῖς τῶν ἰδίων τι κτημάτων ὑπεξαιρούμενοι τὴν τῶν συμμάχων σωτηρίαν προήκασθε) and Plut. *Alc.* 31.5 (μηδὲν αὐτοῖς ἴδιον ὑπεξελόμενοι).

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 ὀργῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ βασιλικῆς). Plutarch returns to the theme once more when he relates that Aristides, though an 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, οὐδ’ ἀπέλαυσεν ἐχθροῦ δυστυχούντος, ὥσπερ οὐδ’ 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 κατηγορούντων ὁ δῆμος ἔπεμψεν ἄνδρας, οἷς εἶρητο συλλαμβάνειν καὶ ἀνάγειν αὐτὸν κριθησόμενον ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν). 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 φοβηθέντες αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν, οἱ δὲ φθονήσαντες τῆι δόξει, τῶν μὲν εὐεργεσιῶν ἐπελάθοντο, τὴν δὲ ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ φρόνημα ταπεινοῦν ἔσπευδον) 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 floret, incidit in eandem invidiam, quam pater suus ceterique Atheniensium principes*, and about Alcibiades he speaks of *crimen invidiae* (*Alc.* 4.1). On this topic see E. Sanders, *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens. A Socio-Psychological Approach* (Oxford 2014).

and Aelian *VH* 10.17 respectively, and those of Theopompus (*BNJ* 115 F 86) and Theophrastus, quoted in turn by Plutarch. Idomeneus is quoted directly: οἱ μέντοι Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ γένους ἀειφυγίαν κατέγνωσαν προδιδόντος τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἢ οὐσία ἐδημεύθη.⁵ The fragment of Critias, though not direct, is relevant because it mentions the confiscation in the same terms: ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν κοινῶν προέστη, εἶτα ἔφυγε καὶ ἐδημεύθη αὐτοῦ ἢ οὐσία.⁶ As to Theopompus and Theophrastus, 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 (ἦλθε γὰρ αὐτῷ ὕστερον ἔκ τε Ἀθηνῶν παρὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ ἐξ Ἄργους ἃ ὑπεξέκειτο, 1.137.3).⁷ 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 πολλὰ μὲν ὑπεκκλαπέντα διὰ τῶν φίλων εἰς Ἀσίαν ἔπλει).⁸ 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 ὑπεκκλέπτω, used by Plutarch or his source, is significantly composed of the same double preposition as Thucydides' ὑπέκκειμαι 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.⁹ 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. Ὀμηρεύειν (o 244 Adler):

οἱ δὲ Σάμιοι καίπερ ἐξομηρευομένων αὐτοῖς τῶν νεανίσκων
ὅμως οὐκ ἐπέμειναν, ἀλλ' ἐπανεστήσαν τοῖς φυλάσσουσι τὴν
πόλιν τῶν Μακεδόνων.

This entry is one of the many cases of inconsistency between lemma and *interpretamentum* on the one hand (ὀμηρεύειν = συμφωνεῖν “agree”), and quotation on the other. Secondly, since the text does not show the simple form of ὀμηρεύω but the compound, the lemma should be listed *suo loco*, before the lemmata ε 1789 (Ἐξομηρευσάμενος: καλῶς διοικήσας) and ε 1790 (Ἐξομηρευσάμενοι: ὁμογνώμονας ποιήσαντες), not where it has been recorded. Such imperfections have been recognized and partly explained by Kusterus,¹⁰ and there is no need to dwell on them. Instead, what attracts attention is its content and the information it provides.

ὕπεξαιρέω in the *Suda*.

⁹ *BNJ* 338A F 18 κατεφωράθη ἑκατὸν ταλάντων πλείω οὐσίαν ἔχων; *BNJ* 115 F 86 Θεόποπος μὲν ἑκατὸν τάλαντα ... [φησι] γενέσθαι τὸ πλῆθος; *Plut. Them.* 25.3 Θεόφραστος δὲ ὀγδοήκοντα.

¹⁰ L. Kusterus, *Suidae Lexicon* I (Cambridge 1705) *praef.* v (not numbered). “Est et alius 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 significationem vocis propositae. Sed istius rei culpam non tam in Suidam confero, quam in eos, qui varia auctorum loca Lexico huic vel ipsi adsuerunt, vel ea, quae ad marginem scripta erant, absque iudicio et delectu in textum receperunt. Multa enim esse apud Suidam loca, quae ex margine in textum irreperint, et imperitiam librariorum manifesto prodant, nemo nisi plane in Lexico hoc hospes negabit.”

Before addressing the details, we should consider the verb ἐξομηρεύω. 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 (δεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐξομηρεύειν [sc. τοὺς δούλους] ταῖς τεκνοποιΐαις),¹¹ where it is the equivalent of either “rignorum 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 ἐξομηρευσάμενος θεραπευτικῶς 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” (τὴν τε ὄψιν ἦν εὐπρεπῆς [sc. Σοφόνβα] καὶ τοῖς τρόποις ποικίλη καὶ πᾶν ἐξομηρεύσασθαι δυναμένη). This meaning is also found in Onasander *Strat.* 1.12 (ἐάν τε γὰρ ὄντες τύχῳσι νήπιοι, ψυχῆς εἰσιν ἰσχυρὰ φίλτρα περὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν ἐξομηρεύσασθαι δυνάμενα στρατηγὸν πρὸς πατρίδα); Plutarch *Sert.* 14.3 (τοὺς γὰρ εὐγενεστάτους ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν συναγαγὼν εἰς Ὀσκαν πόλιν μεγάλην, διδασκάλους ἐπιστήσας Ἑλληνικῶν τε καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῶν μαθημάτων ἔργῳ μὲν ἐξομηρεύσατο, λόγῳ δ’ ἐπαίδευεν); and finally in *Syll.*³ 656.21 (ἐντυγχάνοντες μὲν τοῖς ἡγουμένοις Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐξομηρευόμενοι διὰ τῆς καθ’ ἡμέραν 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: μήτε τεκνοποιῶνται οἱ οἰκέται ἄνευ τῆς ἡμετέρας γνώμης. οἱ μὲν γὰρ χρηστοὶ παιδοποιησάμενοι εὐνοῦστεροι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ). The noun ἐξομηρεύσις, which means “obsidum datio” (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 παῖδας 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 ἐξομηρευόμενοι 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 ὀμηρεύω has in the one passage of Greek literature where it is used in the middle voice.¹⁵ The passage is Aeneas Tacticus 10.23:

πόλεως δ' ὀμηρευομένης, ὅταν ἐπ' αὐτὴν στρατεία γίγνηται, τοὺς γονεῖς τῶν ὀμηρευόντων καὶ τοὺς ἐγγυὺς τὰ γένη μεθίστασθαι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ἄχρις ἂν ἡ πολιορκία παρέλθῃ, ἵνα μὴ ἐφορῶσιν ἐν ταῖς προσαγωγαῖς τῶν πολεμίων τοὺς αὐτῶν παῖδας συμπροσαγομένους 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 Σαβίνους τρόπον τινὰ συγκράσεως καὶ κοινωνίας ἀρχὴν αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀδίκημα ποιῆσειν ὀμηρευσαμένοις τὰς γυναῖκας, ἐπεχείρησε τῷ ἔργῳ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. In fact, this is an emendation of the transmitted ἡμηρωσαμένοις 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 demulsissent,” would be “vana quidem spes et tenui nimis innixa fundamento.” So he concluded: “Lege autem ὀμηρευσαμένοις et fateberis Romulum non frustra sibi pollicitum esse futurum aliquando cum Sabinis commercium, quando virgines tanquam obsides acceptas secum haberet” (Augustinus Bryanus, *Plutarchi chaeronensis vitae parallelae* 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 ἡμηρωσαμένοις is quite appropriate. That is why I believe the reading of the manuscripts must be retained.

¹⁶ D. Barends, *Lexicon Aeneium* (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, *Énée le*

ὄμηρεύομαι, 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.¹⁸ This *nativa vocis significatio* is to some extent confirmed by the fact that ὄμηρεύω, in the active voice, may also mean not just “to be or serve as a hostage” but even “take as a hostage” (LSJ).¹⁹

To return to the *Suda* entry, in addition to the strong resemblance between Aeneas’ πόλεως δ’ ὄμηρευομένης and the *Suda*’s ἐξομηρευομένων τῶν νεανίσκων, there is a further element in favour of the suggested interpretation: the explicit subject in the *Suda*, “the young people.”²⁰ Thus, if the meaning of ἐξομηρεύομαι 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’

Tacticien, Poliorcétique [Paris 1967, 2002²], Whitehead (D. Whitehead, *Aeneias the Tactician, How to Survive Under Siege* [Oxford 1990, Bristol 2002²]), Bettalli (M. Bettalli, *Enea Tattico, La difesa di una città assediata* [Pisa 1990]), and Brodersen (K. Brodersen, *Aeneias/Aeneas Tacticus. Stadtverteidigung/Poliorketika* [Berlin/Boston 2017]). The likely origin of this secondary meaning attributed to the verb and also attested in Stephanus is the Latin translation by Isaac Casaubon in the *Appendix* to his Polybius (Paris 1609) and reproduced in that by Ernesti, from which I quote: “Cum urbs aliqua obsides hosti dedit, adveniente eius exercitu, parentes obsidum et genere propinquos secedere urbe oportet, donec finita sit obsidio, ne, dum adversarii machinas ad muros admoverent, liberos itidem suos admoveri et ultima pati supplicia videant” (Io. Aug. Ernesti, *Polybii Historiarum quae supersunt III* [Vienna 1763] 413).

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 Sieecraft* (Oxford 1927) LXXII.

¹⁹ Cf. Eur. *Rhes.* 434, ἐπεὶ δ’ ἔπερσα, τῶνδ’ ὄμηρεύσας τέκνα / τάξας ἔτειον δασμὸν ἐς δόμους φέρειν, / ἦκω περάσας ναυσὶ Πόντιον στόμα, with the note in A. Fries, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus* (Berlin/Boston 2014) 282.

²⁰ On the practice of giving up hostages in the Greek world, see M. Amit, “Hostages in Ancient Greece” *RivFil* 98 (1970) 129–147; R. Lonis, “Les otages dans les relations internationales en Grèce classique,” in *Mélanges offerts à Léopold Sédar Senghor* (Dakar 1977) 215–234; Andreas Panagopoulos, *Captives and Hostages in the Peloponnesian War* (Athens 1978).

garrison of the city.”²¹

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.²² 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 Σάμον ναυσὶ τεσσαράκοντα δημοκρατίαν κατέστησαν, καὶ ὁμήρους ἔλαβον τῶν Σαμίων πενήκοντα μὲν παῖδας, ἴσους δὲ ἄνδρας, καὶ κατέθεντο ἐς Λῆμον, καὶ φρουρὰν 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 ἐπανάστησαν 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 adolescentes obsides essent peregrī, non permanserunt tamen in fide Macedonibus data: sed in Macedones urbis custodes insurrexerunt” (the adverb *peregrī* evidently derives from an over-interpretation of the value of the prefix ἐξ-). That of Bernhardt (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 [ἐξομερευομένων], nevertheless did not continue, but revolted against the Macedonian garrison in their city.”

²² The revolt is also related by both Diodorus and Plutarch. For a synopsis of the sources see <http://demo.fragmentarytexts.org/en/revolt-of-samos/the-revolt.html>; M. Mernitz, “The Digital Hill Project Sources on the Revolt of Samos,” *Digital Classics Online* 2.3 (2016) 33–56.

στων, ἔπειτα τοὺς ὀμήρους ἐκκλέψαντες ἐκ Λήμνου τοὺς αὐτῶν ἀπέστησαν, καὶ τοὺς φρουροὺς τοὺς Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας οἱ ἦσαν παρὰ σφίσιν ἐξέδοσαν Πισσοῦθνη).

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,²³ and, on the other, that in the *Suda* errors involving exchange of names are frequent,²⁴ 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):

ὁ δὲ γράφει παντὶ τρόπῳ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἀποσκευάσασθαι.

Ille vero scribit, ut Alcibiadem quavis ratione de medio tollat.²⁵

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

²³ Cf. Th. Panofka, *Res Samiorum* (Berlin 1822), and G. Shipley, *A History of Samos* (Oxford 1987).

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 Bernhardt.

ing that the lexicographer knows but only records, oddly, in the next lemma²⁶—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 ἐάσει ζῶν Ἀλκιβιάδης ἀτρεμεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν καθεστώτων). Lysander did not listen to him, until he received from Sparta the written order to eliminate Alcibiades (οὐ μὴν ἐπέισθη γε πρότερον τούτοις ὁ Λύσανδρος ἢ παρὰ τῶν οἴκοι τελῶν σκυτάλην ἐλθεῖν κελεύουσιν ἐκ ποδῶν ποιήσασθαι τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην). Then he sent a message to Pharnabazus, urging him to proceed (ὁ Λύσανδρος ἔπεμψε πρὸς τὸν Φαρνάβαζον ταῦτα πράττειν κελεύων).²⁷ Nepos' report is similar.²⁸ While Alcibiades was engaged in freeing his country,

eodem tempore Critias ceterique tyranni Atheniensium certos homines ad Lysandrum in Asiam miserant, qui eum certiozem facerent, nisi Alcibiadem sustulisset, nihil earum rerum fore ratum, quas ipse Athenis constituisset ... his Laco rebus commotus statuit accuratius sibi agendum cum Pharnabazo. huic ergo renuntiat, quae regi cum Lacedaemoniis essent, nisi Alcibiadem vivum aut mortuum sibi tradidisset.

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 is necessary to summarize the established facts about the historical sources of the *Suda* lexicon. Never challenged, at least openly,

²⁶ S.v. ἀποσκευάζοντες (α 3524 Adler): καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύσειν ἔμελλεν, εἰ μὴ φθάσας τὸ μειράκιον ἀποσκευάσαιτο. The quotation is from the *History* of Theophilact Simocatta 3.7.4, and its *interpretamentum* explains that the optative ἀποσκευάσαιτο “is equivalent to put out of the way by killing” (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποθοῦτο ἀνελῶν).

²⁷ Plut. *Alc.* 38.3–39.1; see on this S. Verdegem, *Plutarch's Life of Alcibiades: Story, Text and Moralism* (Leuven 2010) 385–394.

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 vitiis*, *De legationibus*, *De sentiis*, 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 *Suda*, 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

²⁹ The canonical texts are C. De Boor, “Suidas und die Konstantinsche Exzerptensammlung I–II,” *BZ* 21 (1912) 381–424 and 23 (1914) 1–127; J. Becker, *De Suidae excerptis historicis* (diss. Bonn 1915); A. Adler, *Prolegomena in Suidae Lexicon* I (Stuttgart 1928) xix–xxi (*Fontes Historici*) and “Suida,” *RE* 4A (1931) 675–717, at 700–706.

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* (Χρονική ἱστορία) from mythical times to Heraclius,³² 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 (ὑπεξαίρουμαι and ἐξομηρεύομαι) are hapax legomena for both Aelian and John, who nonetheless use other compound verbs with double preposition (ὑπεκ-/ὑπεξ-). The third verb (ἄποσκευάζομαι) does appear in John, but the passages where it is attested are all copied from his source Herodian.³³ As to the concessive conjunction καίπερ, attested only in John,³⁴ 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 Kuhnius, 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 Aeliani Libris, περὶ προνοίας, seu περὶ Θείων Ἐναργειῶν, de Providentia, seu Divina providentiae manifestis documentis ... Quatuor tantum in hisce omnibus reperies fragmentis, quae Suidas nominatim adscripsit Aeliani ποικίλη ἀφηγήσει, vel ποικίλη ἱστορία, Variarum Narrationum, vel Variarum Historiarum, (Vide Ἀσέλγεια, Δώς, Κάκη, & Φιλωθέντες), sed quae non dubito vel ipsius Suidae ἀμαρτήματι μνημονικῶν tribuenda, vel Librarium Errori & Audaciae, non tantum, quia in hac Nostra Aeliani Historia nusquam occurrunt, sed & quia aliud nihil, quod ex ea constet vere sumptum, habet Suidas" (*Claudii Aeliani Sophistae, Varia Historia* II [Leiden 1701] 932 = 1003 in Gronovius' edition [Amsterdam 1731]).

³² Ed. U. Roberto, *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica* (Berlin/New York 2005).

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 cxxxviii.

³⁴ FF 162.1.9, 167.1, 258.3 Roberto.

fifth-century history is completely absent,³⁵ 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);³⁶ 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).³⁷

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

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 fr.338 and 349 Hercher (= fr.335 and 345 Domingo-Forasté).

³⁷ See also *Suda* σ 77 Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος: ... Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν τοὺς ληφθέντας ἐν πολέμῳ Σαμίους ἔστιζον γλαυκί, Σάμιοι τῆς σαμαίνης). Plut. *Per.* 26.3–4 offers a different version.