

SADYATTES AND HIS NIECE: A NOTE ON SUDA *α* 1423 AND *α* 441*

Abstract: This paper deals with two *Suda*-entries on Lydian kings, *α* 1423 and *α* 441, the latter of which reproduces two lines of the former. Both *α* 441 and *α* 1423, along with their source Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrHist* 90 F 63 and Xenophilus *FGrHist* 767 F 1, require a textual emendation: ἀδελφιδήν must be restored in all cases in place of the transmitted ἀδελφήν.

Keywords: *Suda*, *Excerpta Constantiniana*, Alyattes, Sadyattes, Nicolaus of Damascus, Xanthus of Lydia

The *Suda*-entry *α* 1423 Ἀλυάττης is devoted to a Lydian king ‘Alyattes’, father of Alyattes and grandfather of Croesus:

Ἀλυάττης· Λυδῶν βασιλεύς, ὃς ἦν μὲν τὰ πολέμια γενναῖος, ἄλλως δὲ ἀκόλαστος· καὶ γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφὴν ἤσχυεν. ἐγέννησε δὲ Ἀλυάττην, ὅστις ἕως μὲν νέος ἦν, ὑβριστὴς ἦν καὶ ἀκόλαστος, ἐκβὰς δὲ εἰς ἄνδρα σωφρονέστατος καὶ δικαιοτάτος. ἐπολέμησε δὲ Σμυρναίοις καὶ εἶλε τὸ ἄστυ. οὗτος δὲ γεννᾷ τὸν Κροῖσον· στρατεύσας ἐπὶ Καρίαν περιήγγειλε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ στρατὸν ἄγειν εἰς Σάρδεις, ἐν οἷς καὶ Κροίσω, ὅστις ἦν αὐτοῦ πρεσβύτατος τῶν παίδων, ἄρχων ἀποδεδειγμένος Ἀδραμυττείου τε καὶ Θήβης πεδίου. Ἀλυάττου πολιορκοῦντος Πριήνην φησίν.

Alyattes, king of the Lydians, who was a brave king in war even if without restraint in other respects. Once he raped his own sister. He was the father of Alyattes, who was violent and without restraint while a youth but extremely self-controlled and righteous as an adult. He made war against Smyrna and took the city. This man was the father of Croesus. When campaigning against Caria, he ordered his commanders to lead the army to Sardis. Among these was Croesus, his eldest son, who had been designated as governor of Adramytteion and the plain of Thebe. While Alyattes was besieging Priene, he says.¹

* Thanks are due to Andrea Favuzzi, John Moles, James Roy, and the anonymous referee for helping me greatly to improve these pages through precious suggestions.

¹ All translations are mine.

Another *Suda*-entry, *Suda a* 441 ἀδελφείος, reproduces some lines of *Suda a* 1423 at the end of its own grammatical section:

ἀδελφείος· ὁ ἀδελφός· ἀδελφιδούς δὲ ὁ ἀνεψιός. καὶ τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν. καὶ ἀδελφίζειν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδελφὸν καλεῖν. οὕτως Ἴσοκράτης καὶ ὁ Μιλήσιος Ἑκαταῖος καὶ Ἀπολλοφάνης ἐχρήσαντο. καὶ τὸ θηλυκὸν τὴν ἀδελφιδήν, ἢ ἀδελφιδή, τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς. ὅτι Ἀλυάττης ὁ τῶν Λυδῶν βασιλεὺς ἤσχυνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν.

ἀδελφείος (means) brother; ἀδελφιδούς (means) nephew.² And (*sc.* the accusative is) τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν. Also (*sc.* attested is the verb) ἀδελφίζειν, meaning ‘to call (someone) brother’. That was how Isocrates and Hecataeus of Miletus and Apollonphanes used it. And the feminine forms are τὴν ἀδελφιδήν, ἢ ἀδελφιδή, τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς.³ That Alyattes the king of the Lydians raped his own sister.

Suda a 1423 and the final section of *Suda a* 441 depend on Nicolaus of Damascus FF 63–5 Jacoby, as compiled by the Byzantine author(s) of the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*,⁴ even though F 63 actually deals with Sadyattes, king of Lydia, who was a famous example of vice, and who was the father of the Alyattes in question and the grandfather of Croesus, as Herodotus 1.16 also testifies.

(F 63) ὅτι Σαδυάττης ὁ Λυδῶν βασιλεὺς, Ἀλυάττεω παῖς, ἦν μὲν τὰ πολέμια γενναῖος, ἄλλως δὲ ἀκόλαστος. καὶ γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν, γυναῖκα Μιλήτου ἀνδρὸς δοκίμου, καλέσας ἐφ’ ἱερὰ βία ἤσχυεν καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτὴν ἴσχει γυναῖκα. (2) ὁ δὲ Μίλητος ἦν Μέλανος τοῦ Γύγου γαμβροῦ ἀπόγονος. δυσανασχετῶν δ’ ἐπὶ τούτοις, φεύγων ᾗχετο εἰς Δασκύλιον. Σαδυάττης δὲ κάκειθεν αὐτὸν ἐξέωσεν. ὁ δὲ ἀπεχώρησεν εἰς Προκόνησον. (3) Σαδυάττης δὲ ὀλίγον ὕστερον ἔγημεν ἑτέρας δύο γυναῖκας ἀλλήλαις ἀδελφάς, καὶ ἴσχει παῖδας ἐκ μὲν τῆς Ἀττάλην, ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἀδραμυν νόθους, ἐκ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀδελφῆς γνήσιον

² *LSJ* s.v. ἀδελφιδούς: *nephew*, that is the brother’s or sister’s son (cf. e.g. Hdt. 1.65 and 4.147). See Miller (1953) 46.

³ *Niece*, brother’s or sister’s daughter (*LSJ*, s.v. ἀδελφιδῆ). See Ar. *Nu.* 47; Lys. 3.6 etc.

⁴ On the derivation of *Suda a* 1423 Ἀλυάττης (hence also the end of *Suda a* 441) from Nicolaus FF 63–5, cf. Adler *in apparatus*. For the exegetical problems posed by *Suda a* 1423, see Paradiso (2009). On the relationship between the historical *lemmata* of the *Suda*-lexicon and the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, see de Boor (1912) and (1914–19); Becker (1915) 10–16, at 13; Adler (1928–38) I.xix–xxi; *eadem* (1931) 700–6. On the compositional practices of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, see Brunt (1980); Luciani (2003); Roberto (2009).

Ἄλυάττην. (F 64) ὅτι Ἄλυάττης ὁ Σαδυάττειω υἱός, βασιλεὺς Λυδῶν, ἕως μὲν νέος ἦν ὑβριστῆς ἦν καὶ ἀκόλαστος, ἐκβὰς δὲ εἰς ἄνδρα σωφρονέστατος καὶ δικαιοτάτος. (2) ἐπολέμησε δὲ Σμυρναίοις καὶ εἶλεν αὐτῶν τὸ ἄστυ. (F 65) ὅτι Ἄλυάττης ὁ Κροίσου πατὴρ τοῦ Λυδῶν βασιλέως ἐπὶ Καρίαν στρατεύων περιήγγειλε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ στρατὸν ἄγειν εἰς Σάρδεις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τακτῆς, ἐν οἷς καὶ Κροίσω, ὅστις ἦν αὐτοῦ πρεσβύτατος τῶν παίδων, ἄρχων ἀποδεδειγμένος Ἀδραμυττείου τε καὶ Θήβης πεδίου ...

(F 63) That Sadyattes, king of the Lydians, son of Alyattes, was a brave king in war even if without restraint in other respects. Once he called his own sister, the wife of Miletus, an important man, for a sacrifice, raped her and took her afterwards as wife. (2) Miletus was a descendant of Melas, brother-in-law of Gyges.⁵ Being greatly vexed at the situation, Miletus fled to Daskylion. Sadyattes expelled him from there, and he fled to Proconesus. (3) Sadyattes soon after married two other women, sisters. By them, he had two bastards, Attales by one and Adramys by the other: by his own sister he had the legitimate son, Alyattes. (F 64) That Alyattes, the son of Sadyattes, king of the Lydians, was violent and without restraint while a youth but extremely self-controlled and righteous as an adult. (2) He made war against Smyrna and took the city. (F 65) That Alyattes, father of Croesus, the king of Lydia, was campaigning against Caria. He ordered his commanders to lead the army into Sardis on a fixed day. Among these was Croesus, his eldest son, who had been designated governor of Adramytteion and the plain of Thebe ...

In the first *lemma* (α 1423), the compiler of the *Suda* draws on Nicolaus FF 63–5 and puts together, under the name of Alyattes, different pieces of information concerning not only this king but also his father Sadyattes and his son Croesus. He mistakenly attributes to Alyattes the ἀκολασία (criminal ‘lack of restraint’) of his father Sadyattes, who is the true protagonist of the historical portrait of the first lines. The compiler chose to classify these different pieces of information under the letter *alpha* of ‘Alyattes’ (and not under the *sigma* of ‘Sadyattes’) in his work, so the transcriptional misreading Σαδυάττης > Ἄλυάττης cannot be attributed to the textual tradition of the lexicon but must go back to an earlier stage. Either this compiler himself mistakenly classified the whole information under the name of ‘Alyattes’ while drawing from the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis* (maybe as he kept in mind ‘Alyattes’—which

⁵ For this interpretation of γαμβροῦ in ὁ δὲ Μίλητος ἦν Μέλανος τοῦ Γύγου γαμβροῦ ἀπόγονος, see Lombardo (1980) 312 n. 19.

opens and closes the *lemma*—rather than the similarly ending ‘Sadyattes’, which has six letters in common with it), or he found the reading Ἄλυάττης, instead of Σαδυάττης, already in his manuscript of the *Excerpta*. As Theodor Büttner-Wobst has proved, the compiler(s) of the *Suda* depended in fact not on the *Turonensis* C 980, which uniquely preserves the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, but on another manuscript of the same work, lost to us and generally more accurate than the *Turonensis*, as it offered better readings and also filled some lacunas in the latter, as we can deduce from the corresponding *Suda*-entries.⁶ This lost manuscript possibly transmitted, at the head of the fragment, the reading Ἄλυάττης instead of the Nicolaeian Σαδυάττης, correctly attested in the *Turonensis*, at f. 155v, 17. That is, it probably transmitted ὅτι Ἄλυάττης ὁ Λυδῶν βασιλεύς, Ἄλυάττειω παῖς, ἦν μὲν τὰ πολέμα γενναῖος, where the misreading Σαδυάττης > Ἄλυάττης would have been made easier by the mention of Alyattes in the immediately following Ἄλυάττειω παῖς.⁷

Now the *lemma* α 441 follows, contrary to alphabetical order, *Suda* α 440 ἀδελφίος· ὄνομα κύριον, and precedes *Suda* α 442 ἀδελφὸς παρείη· ὅτι προτιμητέον τοὺς οἰκείους εἰς βοήθειαν ἐν καιρῷ περιστάσεως (‘May a brother be nearby: because it is preferable (to enjoy) the help of relatives in a time of crisis’). It presents, in the heading, the epic/Ionic form of ἀδελφός, that is,

⁶ On this manuscript of the *Excerpta*, employed by the compiler(s) of the lexicon *Suda*, cf. Büttner-Wobst–Roos (1906) xxix–xxxviii. The *Turonensis* C 980 (formerly *Peirescianus*) has been dated to the eleventh century by Büttner-Wobst–Roos (1906) xxi; to the mid-tenth century, instead, by Irigoien (1958) and above all Irigoien (1959) 177–81. Recently, however, it has been re-dated to the 970s or 980s by Németh (2013) 242, on the grounds both of the decorated headpieces and of the script. The closest analogy for the heart palmettes of the headpieces is found in Basil II’s *Menologium* (c. 985); the hand of the manuscript resembles that of Ephraim the Monk and manuscripts dated to the second half of the tenth century. If so, both the *Turonensis* C 980 and the lost manuscript, source of the *Suda*-lexicon, should be dated to the second half of the tenth century, before the *Suda*-lexicon, which seems to have been completed c. 1000.

⁷ In Nicolaus F 63 itself (ὅτι Σαδυάττης ὁ Λυδῶν βασιλεύς, Ἄλυάττειω παῖς), the mention of Alyattes is also wrong, unless it attests a different genealogical *stemma*. For according to Hdt. 1.16, Sadyattes was not the son of Alyattes but of Ardys. The beginnings and endings of the *Excerpta* often retain mistakes, which stem from the adaptation, by the compilers, of their material. The same transcriptional misreading Σαδυάττης > Ἄλυάττης is also attested in *Suda* κ 2498, which depends on Nicolaus F 65 and transmits Ἄλυάττην τὸν ἔμπορον, whereas the *Turonensis* has Σαδυάττην τὸν ἔπαρχον. Jacoby emended F 65 into Σαδυάττην τὸν ἔμπορον: that this Sadyattes was a merchant is proved by the following lines of the excerpt. More generally, the misreading Sadyattes/Alyattes/Adyattes is widespread: cf. Nicolaus F47, where the last of the Lydian Heraclids is named Ἀδυάττης at §§ 1, 5, 8 and Σαδυάττης at §§ 4, 5, 6, 8, 11 (see also Nicolaus F 44a § 11, F 46). Cf. also *Suda* α 1289 Ἀλκμάν ... ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς κζ’ Ὀλυμπιάδος, βασιλεύοντος Λυδῶν Ἄρδυος, τοῦ Ἄλυάττου πατρός, where Rohde (1878) 199 n. 2/(1901) 156 n. 1 corrected Ἄλυάττου into Σαδυάττου, followed by Page (1951) 164.

ἀδελφείος.⁸ It then goes on with cognate nouns and verbs, listing the noun ἀδελφιδούς, explained by ὁ ἀνεψιός, and the verb ἀδελφίζειν, explained with ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδελφὸν καλεῖν, ‘to call (someone) brother’, and illustrated by the quotation of three sources, i.e. Isocrates 19.30, Hecataeus *FGrHist* I F 8 (= 10 Nenci), and Apollonophanes fr. 4 K.-A. Harpocration s.v. ἀδελφίζειν, who also quotes these authors, adds the titles of the works and says more precisely ‘Strattis or Apollonophanes’: ἀδελφίζειν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδελφὸν καλεῖν παρ’ Ἰσοκράτει ἐν Αἰγινητικῷ καὶ Ἑκαταίῳ τῷ Μιλησίῳ ἐν β̄ Ἡρωολογίας καὶ Στράτιδι ἢ Ἀπολλωφάνει ἐν Ἰφιγέροντι (fr. 4 K.-A.).⁹ At the end of the *lemma* (α 441), and after analysing the verb ἀδελφίζειν, the compiler of the *Suda* seems to come back to ἀδελφιδούς, displaying the feminine form, in different grammatical cases, accusative, nominative, and genitive, as if he found in some text these occurrences in this order: καὶ τὸ θηλυκὸν τὴν ἀδελφιδήν, ἢ ἀδελφιδή, τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς. In the very last words of the *lemma* there appears the quotation from Nicolaus F 63 which is reproduced also in *Suda* α 1423: ὅτι Ἀλυάττης ὁ τῶν Λυδῶν βασιλεὺς ἤσχυνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν.¹⁰ The presence of ὅτι, which normally introduces a new ‘beginning’, the starting point of a new compilation or quotation, allows us to infer that the author of the *Suda* is here changing his source. This source cannot therefore be any of the authors cited before. All of them are quoted as testimonies of the verb ἀδελφίζειν, and only of that, as seems proved by Isocrates himself (19.30). Nor can that source be Hecataeus, the only fragmentary historian of the four.

The textual tradition of *Suda* α 441 presents numerous problems: before and after ἀδελφίζειν ... ἐχρήσαντο, the words καὶ τὸν ἀδελφιδούν are omitted by S or overwritten by A; the words καὶ τὸ ... ἀδελφιδῆς are written on the margin of A, but overwritten in M. τὴν ἀδελφιδήν is omitted by GITM, τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς by M. Above all, ὅτι Ἀλυάττης ὁ τῶν Λυδῶν βασιλεὺς ἤσχυνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν is omitted by GIT. These variations explain why G. Bernhardt, following L. Küster, deleted these crucial words from the text, considering them to be more recent additions by an interpolator. Ada Adler printed them in smaller print, finally judging them to be an interpolation by the compiler of the lexicon.¹¹ In fact, there are no cogent considerations for excluding the possibility that the words ὅτι Ἀλυάττης ὁ τῶν Λυδῶν βασιλεὺς ἤσχυνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν, attested as they are in a part of the textual tradi-

⁸ See, on this *lemma*, Anderson–Hutton–Roth–Whitehead.

⁹ Harp. α 27 Keaney = p. 9, 9 Dindorf.

¹⁰ Cf. *Suda* α 1423 καὶ γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν ἤσχυνε, which is the perfect abridgement of καὶ γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφήν, γυναῖκα Μιλήτου ἀνδρὸς δοκίμου, καλέσας ἐφ’ ἑρὰ βία ἤσχυνε, attested in Nicolaus F 63.

¹¹ Cf. ‘Suid.’ in *margin* of her edition, explained as ‘Glossae e Suida ipso interpolatae’. See Adler (1928) I.xxxi; cf. also xv–xvi.

tion of the lexicon, have been added at *a* 441 by the *Suda*-compiler himself, simply repeating them from *a* 1423. But whether interpolated or not by the compiler, the final quotation ought anyway to ‘explain’ the immediately preceding words καὶ τὸ θηλυκὸν τὴν ἀδελφιδήν, ἢ ἀδελφιδή, τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς, to which it has been intentionally tied, evidently to provide a literary attestation of the feminine form ἢ ἀδελφιδή. Yet it transmits the *facilior* feminine form ἀδελφήν, instead of the *difficilior* ἀδελφιδήν, which is absolutely needed here and whose restoration has recently been suggested by Michele Cataudella.¹² On the other hand, ἀδελφήν in *Suda a* 441 seems textually ‘protected’ by ἀδελφήν, attested in *Suda a* 1423, both depending on Nicolaus F 63 ἀδελφήν. It seems confirmed, from a historical point of view, also by Xenophilus *FGrHist* 767 F 1 (= *BNJ* 767 F 1), that is Anonymous, *On Women* 9 (p. 216 Westermann). In fact, Xenophilus wrote of Lyde as the wife and sister (ἀδελφήν) of Sadyattes (here mistakenly called Alyattes), and the mother of Alyattes: Λύδη. ταύτην φησὶν Ξενοφίλος ὁ τὰς Λυδικὰς ἱστορίας γράψας γυναικὰ τε καὶ ἀδελφήν εἶναι Ἀλυάτew τοῦ Κροίσου προπάτορος. Nicolaus’ ἀδελφήν is the reading attested in the *Turonensis* C 980, at f. 155v, 19 (see also l. 27). However, as we have seen, the compiler of the *Suda*-entry depends not on it, but on a lost manuscript of the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*. Very likely, this lost manuscript transmitted ἀδελφιδήν. Therefore, it is possible that the compiler of the *Suda*-entry really read ἀδελφιδήν in Nicolaus, that is, in his manuscript of the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis* which transmitted Nicolaus’ F 63. Probably he copied this correct reading in both *Suda a* 1423 Ἀλυάττης and *Suda a* 441 ἀδελφειός: the *difficilior* ἀδελφιδήν, however, was corrupted in both passages into the *facilior* ἀδελφήν during the process of the textual transmission of the *Suda*, but left some traces of its presence in the second *Suda*-entry (*a* 441), where Nicolaus’ quotation should explain and provide a literary example of the feminine form καὶ τὸ θηλυκὸν τὴν ἀδελφιδήν, ἢ ἀδελφιδή, τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς. Hence in the text of the *Excerpta* (Nicolaus F 63) and in both *Suda*-entries depending on it (not merely in *Suda a* 441, as proposed by Cataudella), ἀδελφήν should be emended into ἀδελφιδήν. This noun, ἀδελφιδήν, evidently belongs to the source of Nicolaus, that is Xanthus of Lydia, but has been corrupted in almost all the passages which depend on him: not only Nicolaus’ F 63 (as transmitted by the *Turonensis*, at f. 155v, 17–27), and the *Suda*-entries drawn from him, but also Xenophilus *FGrHist* 767 F 1. Here too, in my opinion, ἀδελφήν should be emended into ἀδελφιδήν. Indeed, the most probable hypothesis is that the Hellenistic author Xenophilus

¹² See Cataudella (2010) 80. In his contribution, however, he proposes a completely different interpretation of the relationship among Nicolaus F 63, *Suda a* 441 ἀδελφειός, and *Suda a* 1423 Ἀλυάττης, considering the two *Suda*-entries to be independent *lemmata*, and of the fragment of Nicolaus.

wrote some *Lydian Histories*, drawing on the only reliable ancient authority on the subject, that is, Xanthus of Lydia, who very probably introduced Lyde as the ἀδελφιδή rather than the ἀδελφή of Sadyattes.¹³ In Nicolaus F 63, ἀδελφή should be emended into ἀδελφιδή twice: not only at the beginning of the fragment (τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφιδῆν ... ἥσχυεν), but also at its end (ἐκ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀδελφιδῆς). The misreading ἀδελφή/ἀδελφιδή is an easy and well-attested slip, possibly due to a palaeographical abbreviation. For instance, it may explain why Plutarch makes Lucullus' wife Servilia a *sister* of Marcus Cato, although we know from Cicero that she was Cato's *niece*: maybe there was a misreading in Plutarch's tradition between ἀδελφή and ἀδελφιδή.¹⁴ The misreading ἀδελφή/ἀδελφιδή could also explain why Gorgo, who is the wife and niece of Leonidas in Herodotus, is instead his sister in Justin.¹⁵ Finally, ἀδελφήν is a famous *crux* in the textual tradition of Isaeus' *On the Estate of Dicaeogenes* 26, where it has been persuasively corrected into ἀδελφιδῆν by Weissenborn, followed by Scheibe, and Hitzig.¹⁶ Thus there are cogent parallels for this paper's proposed emendation.

Università della Basilicata

ANNALISA PARADISO
annalisa.paradiso@unibas.it

¹³ On the dependence of Xenophilus on Xanthus, see Regenbogen (1943) 23–4 and Herter (1967) 1363. See also Paradiso (2013).

¹⁴ Cf. Plut. *Luc.* 38.1; *Cat. Min.* 1.1, 24.3–5, 29.6, 54.1 (where most manuscripts have ἀδελφιδῆν, except for DM^b, which transmit ἀδελφήν), and Cicero, *Fin.* 3.2.8, with Cichorius (1921) 73–7, Münzer (1923) 1821, and Geiger (1973) 144–7.

¹⁵ Cf. Hdt. 7.205 and 239, and Justin 2.10.

¹⁶ Cf. the long discussion devoted to the subject by Wyse (1904) 442–6. See also Roussel (1922) 97 and 84 n. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, A. (1928–38) *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. (Lipsiae).
 — (1931) ‘Suidas 1’, *RE* 4 A 1: 700–6.
- Anderson, P., W. Hutton, C. Roth and D. Whitehead, *Suda on line* (<http://www.stoa.org/sol/>), s.v. ἀδελφείως.
- Becker, J. (1915) *De Suidae excerptis historicis* (Diss. Bonn).
- Brunt, P. A. (1980) ‘On Historical Fragments and Epitomes’, *CQ* 30: 477–94.
- Büttner-Wobst, T. and A. G. Roos (1906) *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, vol. 1 (Berolini).
- Cataudella, M. (2010) ‘Frammenti di storia del regno di Lidia nella *Suda*’, in G. Vanotti, ed., *Il lessico Suda e gli storici greci in frammenti* (Rome) 79–96.
- Cichorius, C. (1921) ‘Ein Heiratsprojekt im Hause Caesars’, in *Festgabe Friederich von Bezold* (Bonn-Leipzig) 59–80.
- de Boor, C. (1912) ‘Suidas und die Konstantinsche Exzerptsammlung I’, *BZ* 21: 381–424.
 — (1914–19) ‘Suidas und die Konstantinsche Exzerptsammlung II’, *BZ* 23: 1–127.
- Geiger, J. (1973) ‘The last Servilii Caepiones of the Republic’, *AncSoc* 4: 143–56.
- Herter, H. (1967) ‘Xanthos (25) der Lyder’, *RE* 9 A 2: 1353–74.
- Irigoin, J. (1958) ‘Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins’, *Scriptorium* 12: 208–27.
 — (1959) ‘Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins (suite)’, *Scriptorium* 13: 177–209.
- Lombardo, M. (1980) ‘Osservazioni cronologiche e storiche sul regno di Sadiatte’, *ASNP* 10: 307–62.
- Luciani, A. (2003) ‘Manipolazione strumentale e decontestualizzazione della fonte negli *Excerpta Historica* costantiniani’, *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 1: 143–7.
- Miller, M. (1953) ‘Greek Kinship Terminology’, *JHS* 73: 46–52.
- Münzer, F. (1923) ‘Servilia (102)’, *RE* 2.2: 1821.
- Németh, A. (2013) ‘The Imperial Systematisation of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine VII and his *Historical Excerpts*’, in J. König and G. Woolf, edd., *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Cambridge) 232–58.
- Page, D. (1951) *Alcman: The Partheneion* (Oxford).
- Paradiso, A. (2009) ‘Aliatte a Priene?’, *RFIC* 137: 257–64.
 — (2013) ‘Xenophilos (767)’, *Brill’s New Jacoby*, Brill Online.
- Regenbogen, O. (1943) ‘Review of Lionel Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*’, *Gnomon* 19: 8–26.
- Roberto, U. (2009) ‘Byzantine Collections of Late Antique Authors: Some Remarks on the *Excerpta historica Constantini*’, in M. Wallraff and L.

- Mecella, edd., *Die Kestoi des Julius Africanus und ihre Überlieferung. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin and New York) 71–84.
- Rohde, E. (1878) 'Τέγρονε in den Biographica des Suidas', *RhM* 33: 161–220 (= *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 1 (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901 = Hildesheim, 1969) 114–84).
- Roussel, P. (1922) *Isée, Discours, texte établi et traduit par Pierre Roussel* (Paris).
- Wyse, W. (1904) *The Speeches of Isaeus, with Critical and Explanatory Notes* (Cambridge).