

An Unpublished *Ethopoea* of Severus of Alexandria

Eugenio Amato

THE FRAGMENTS of the sophist Severus of Alexandria known at the time, in all six διηγήματα and eight ἠθοποιΐαι, were collected for the first and last time in 1832 by Christian Walz.¹ Such texts, however much in need of re-examination, still remain the exclusive, even élite, property of the dedicated few, mostly specialists in ancient rhetoric or students of early Byzantine literature. Thus there is no study of Severus and no comprehensive edition on a more scientific and reliable basis than the texts in Walz's *Rhetores Graeci*, no com-

¹ Chr. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* I (Stuttgart 1832) 534–548. The republication (with commentary and German translation) of the entire corpus of Severus' *Progymnasmata*, undertaken at the beginning of the last century by Otmar Schissel and his pupils, did not proceed beyond *ethop.* 2–5, 7–8 Walz: in chronological order, O. Schissel, "Severus von Alexandria. Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929–30) 1–13 [*ethop.* 7]; Fr. P. Karthaler, "Severus von Alexandria. Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. II," *ibid.* 327–330 [*ethop.* 5]; O. Schissel, "Theodoros von Kynopolis," *ibid.* 331–349 [*ethop.* 2, but attributed to Theodore of Cynopolis]; J. Glettner, "Severos von Alexandria. Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. III," *ibid.* 9 (1930–31/1931–32) 96–103 [*ethop.* 3]; A. Staudacher, "Severos von Alexandria. Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. IV," *ibid.* 10 (1932–33/1933–34) 321–324 [*ethop.* 4]; K. Pichler, "Severos von Alexandria. Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. V," *ibid.* 11 (1934–35) 11–24 [*ethop.* 8]. For the *Narrationes* see too the editions by A. Westermann, *ΜΥΘΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. Scriptores poeticae historiae Graeci* (Brunswick 1843) 362, 363, 373, 373–374, 378, 387 [= *Narr.* 6, 4, 5, 1, 3, 2 Walz]—a critical revision of Walz's text—and J. Jacobs, *De progymnasticorum studiis mythographicis* (diss. Marburg 1899) 43–44, 64–65, 22–23, 41–42, 18–19 [= *Narr.* 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 Walz]), useful mainly for the parallels and ancient sources.

plete translation into any modern language.

For Severus, in particular, undeservedly absent from the dictionaries of reference—not only from LSJ, where, for example, for the word συγγεύομαι, found in the title of *ethop.* 6 Walz, the only attestation cited is Σ Ar. *Pax* 115, but also from the recent and important *Diccionario Griego-Español* under the general editorship of Francisco Adrados,² only belatedly admitted to the *Realencyclopädie*,³ excluded or forgotten in Lesky's *Geschichte* and also in Christ-Schmid-Stählin's *Handbuch*—a new examination of the manuscript tradition is more than ever urgent, as is a careful and systematic study of his language and style, which might help resolve the controversy over the paternity of numerous writings in the certainly vaster Libanian corpus, the mark of a probable *Schulzusammengehörigkeit*,⁴ but in reality utterly alien to the Antiochene's prose.

An obvious instance is Ps.-Libanius *Ethopoea* 26 (Τίνας ἄν εἴποι λόγους εὐνοῦχος ἔρων),⁵ which, peremptorily attributed to

² See the *Lista I (Autores y Obras)* and the *Suplemento* on the webpage <http://www.filol.csic.es/dge/lst/lst-int.htm>.

³ K. Gerth, "Severos von Alexandria," *RE Suppl.* 8 (1956) 715–718.

⁴ On Severus' identity most scholars adopt Schissel's conclusions, *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929–30) 2–3, that he was the pupil of Libanius against whom the latter directed an entire speech ca. 389: see R. Foerster, *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 113 (1876) 640–641, no. 57 (Κατὰ Σεβήρου) in Foerster's edition (*Libanii Opera* IV [Leipzig 1908] 150–174). This conclusion seems now to be challenged on rhythmical grounds by M. Steinrück, "Éthos et rythme dans les éthopées de Sévère d'Alexandrie," in E. Amato and E. Schamp (eds.), *ἨΘΟΠΟΙΑ. La représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive* (Salerno 2005) 157–164. It has also been thought that this sophist's name concealed the *consul ordinarius* Messius Phoebus Severus, who lived under Anthemius (467–472) and is mentioned by Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 142 = VI 9.16, 21.4, 22.31 and 10, 30.6, 47.21 Henry) and the *Suda* (s.v. Σεβήρος [Σ 182]): see J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*² VI (Hamburg 1712) 138, followed uncritically by Walz, *Rhetores* 356; Westermann, *MYΘΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ* xix; J. Puiggali, "Art et folie: à propos d'Aristénète II 10," *Littérature, médecine et société* 6 (1984) 29–40, at 32. However that may be, B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale* (Paris 2002) 450, is clearly wrong to propose identifying the sophist Aelius Severus mentioned in an epitaph of the 2nd–3rd century A.D. (*CIL* VI 10868, *IG UrbRom* II 296) with the Severus of Anthemius' day.

⁵ Foerster, *Libanii Opera* VIII (Leipzig 1913) 434–435.

Severus by Schissel,⁶ has been properly established as his work by attentive examination of style, language, and content together with the detailed investigation of the manuscript tradition I have recently published elsewhere.⁷

This investigation in particular has also permitted the recovery from *Paris.gr.* 2544 a fragment of an unpublished ethopoea by Severus, hitherto unknown to scholars, whose theme is the words pronounced by Demosthenes on the death of Philip (Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Δημοσθένης τοῦ Φιλίππου ἀποθανόντος). It is on this discovery that I intend to dwell here in order to present the first edition of the text, a translation, and a commentary. But let us begin by introducing the manuscript and its contents.⁸

It is a miscellaneous manuscript, on paper, containing 127 folios all told, certainly dating from the second half of the six-

⁶ O. Schissel, "Rhetorische Progymnasmatik der Byzantiner," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 11 (1934–35) 1–10, at 6 n.1, in opposition to K. Orinsky, *De Nicolai Myrensis et Libanii quae feruntur progymnasmatis* (diss. Breslau 1920), who had supported Nicholas of Myra (see E. Richtsteig, *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 2 [1921] 209); Schissel is followed uncritically by H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* I (Munich 1978) 109, and Chr. Heusch, *Die Achilles-Ethopöie des Codex Salmasiensis. Untersuchungen zu einer spätlateinischen Versdeklamation* (Paderborn 1997) 35. Contra, B. Schouler, *La tradition hellénique chez Libanios* I (Lille/Paris 1984) 123–124, and J.-L. Fournet, "Une éthopée de Caïn dans le Codex des Visions de la Fondation Bodmer," *ZPE* 92 (1992) 253–266, at 254 n.9, who still attribute the piece to Libanius. Indeed, Schissel offers no proof: cf. A. Stramaglia, "Amori impossibili. PKöln 250, le raccolte progimnasmatiche e la tradizione retorica dell' 'amanti di un ritratto'," in B.-J. and J.-P. Schröder (eds.), *Studium declamatorium. Untersuchungen zu Schülübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* (Leipzig 2003) 213–239, at 223 n.26.

⁷ E. Amato, "L'autore dell'Εὐνοῦχος ἐρῶν (Ps.-Lib., *ethop.* 26 Foerster) ed il più antico frammento in prosa di etopea d'autore," in E. Amato (ed. with the assistance of A. Roduit and M. Steinrück), *Approches de la Troisième Sophistique. Hommages à Jacques Schamp* II (Brussels 2005) 3–17; E. Amato, "Prolegomeni all'edizione critica dei *Progimnasmata* di Severo Alessandrino," *Medioevo greco* 5 (2005) 1–42. Only W. Hörandner, *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur des Byzantiner* (Vienna 1981) 69, had previously proposed attribution to Severus following analysis of the rhythmical clausulae.

⁸ For a brief account of the MS., see H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* III (Paris 1898) 1.

teenth century, partly written by the Cretan Zachary Scordylis (Ζαχαρίας Σκορδύλης or Σκορδύλιος), ἐπίτροπος of the patriarch of Constantinople Josaphat II (1555–1565)⁹ and subsequently in the service of the French ambassador to Venice Jean Hurault de Boistaillé,¹⁰ for whom he became agent for acquiring books and also copied several manuscripts.¹¹ Comparison with the handwriting in these manuscripts, and above all in *Vind. Theol. gr.* 72,¹² leaves no doubt about the attribution to Scordylis of a part of *Paris.* 2544.¹³

The manuscript, which includes amongst other things excerpts from Alexander of Aphrodisias, Michael Psellus, and Plethon, ends with an anthology of quotations from Severus' ethopoeae (headed σεβήρου σοφιστοῦ ἀλεξανδρείας, ἠθοποιΐαι); in fact from eight ethopoeae, of which only the first six correspond to known texts. These are nos. 5, 7, 4, 6, 1, 2 Walz, copied respectively on ff. 123^r.2–8, 123^r.9–24, 123^r.25–123^v.19, 123^v.20–124^r.11, 124^r.12–124^v.5, 124^v.6–25.¹⁴

⁹ See N. B. Tomadakes, “Ἐπισκοπὴ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι Κυδωνίας,” *KretChron* 11 (1957) 1–42, at 35–36.

¹⁰ He appears first as a historical figure in 1558 when he was entrusted with delivery of a letter dated 30 December 1557 from Henry II to the sultan Suleiman at Constantinople: E. Carrière, *Négociations de la France dans le Levant* II (Paris 1850) 421, 437, 452.

¹¹ See D. F. Jackson, “The Greek Manuscripts of Jean Hurault de Boistaillé,” *StIt* IV 2 (2004) 209–252. For the manuscripts copied by Scordylis in general, see M. Vogel and V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leipzig 1909) 126; Ch. G. Patrinelis, “Ἐλληνες κωδικογράφοι τῶν χρόνων τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως,” *ἘπετΜεσαίωνArch* 8–9 (1958–59) 63–125, at 107; P. Canart, “Scribes grecs de la Renaissance. Additions et corrections aux répertoires de Vogel-Gardthausen et de Patrinelis,” *Scriptorium* 17 (1963) 56–82, at 68; E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, II *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Frankreichs und Nachträge zu den Bibliotheken Grossbritanniens*, A. *Verzeichnis der Kopisten* (Vienna 1983) 76.

¹² See Gamillscheg and Harlfinger, *Repertorium* II, C. *Tafeln* (Vienna 1989) Tab. 84.

¹³ See Jackson, *StIt* IV 2 (2004) 228: Zachary bought the MS. for J. Hurault de Boistaillé “ab Andrea Graeco 5 aureis” and he also wrote the text from folio 104 to the end.

¹⁴ And not on ff. 123–127 and 142^v, as wrongly stated by Schissel, *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929–30) 8–9, 334.

There thus follow two other ethopoeae, which have so far at least in part escaped scholars' notice. The final text (ff. 125^v.13–126^v, τίνας ἄν εἶπη λόγους ὁ ἔρως ἰδὼν ἰδρυτόμον κόπτειν τὴν μύρραν ἐπιχειροῦντα ἔτι ἐγκυμονοῦσαν τὸν ἄδωνιν) in fact attracted Schissel's attention, but he confined himself to reporting its title, albeit without investigating its authorship.¹⁵ In reality, as I have been able to establish, it is *Progymn.* 51 in Pignani's edition of Nicephorus Basilaces, falsely attributed to Severus.¹⁶

Such errors of attribution are far from rare in works of this type. I hardly need stress that progymnastic literature, being a product of the schools and as such less protected in its textual integrity than high literature, was often subjected to reworking and reuse in educational circles by successive readers, be they professors of rhetoric or skilful adaptors.¹⁷ It is therefore no surprise that in *Vind.Phil.gr.* 321 Severus' *ethop.* 3 Walz appears without a heading precisely amongst the *Progymnasmata* of the same Basilaces.¹⁸ However, so far as the Paris manuscript is concerned the reasons for the false ascription of Basilaces' ethopoea to Severus may also be codicological.

The ethopoea (τίνας ἄν εἶπη λόγους δημοσθένης, τοῦ φιλιππου ἀποθανόντος) preceding the extract from Basilaces runs from f.

¹⁵ Schissel, *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929–30) 334 n.5.

¹⁶ The testimonium escaped the attentive and scrupulous researches of A. Pignani, "Prolegomeni all'edizione critica dei *Progimnasmata* di Niceforo Basilace," *Bollettino dei Classici* N.S. 21 (1973) 41–57, at 41–43; ead., *Niceforo Basilace. Progimnasmata e monodie* (Naples 1983) 51–57.

¹⁷ Cf. Stramaglia, in *Studium* 230; id., "Le *Declamationes maiores* pseudo-quintilianee: genesi di una raccolta declamatoria e fisiognomia della sua trasmissione testuale," in Amato, *Approches* 195–224; Amato, *Medioevo greco* 5 (2005) 28–30; id., "Costantino Porfirogenito ha realmente contribuito alla redazione dei *Geoponica*?" *GFA* 8 (2005) [forthcoming]. Severus himself is not exempt from this dynamic: for example, in *Leid.Vulc.gr.* 2, *ethop.* 4 Walz is wrongly ascribed to Libanius. In *Urb.gr.* 152, *ethop.* 4 and 6 bear an alternative ascription to Procopius of Gaza; the same thing happens in *Reg.gr.* 147 to no. 4, in which no. 3 is inserted among the letters of Julian and Basil (f. 141^v) and no. 7 among the ethopoeae of Libanius (131^v), neither with any kind of heading, so as to bring the correct attribution into confusion.

¹⁸ Cf. Pignani, *Bollettino dei Classici* N.S. 21 (1973) 43; Amato, *Medioevo greco* 5 (2005) 32.

124^v.26 to 125^v.12. Consideration of the text, however, shows that it ought to be divided in two. Only the portion from f. 124^v.26 to 125^r.7 (τῆς πλεονεξίας) corresponds to the title of the ethopoea in question. Not being known from another source, it may be confidently identified as a damaged fragment of an unpublished ethopoea that as we shall see is the work of Severus of Alexander. The following lines (f. 125^r.8–125^v.12, γέγονεν ἡ παῖς – δοκεῖ μοι ὑφέξονται), by contrast, correspond to Nicol. *Progymn.* 6 (I p.305.8–21 Walz).¹⁹ How is this gap to be explained?

I maintain that our manuscript faithfully reproduces a copy (how remote cannot be established) in which the loss of an indefinite number of intervening folios can be presumed to have caused a leap from the new ethopoea to Nicolaus, the two texts being copied back-to-back without the scribe's noticing.

Be that as it may, the evidence of *Paris.gr.* 2544 represents a good example of Pasquali's well-known principle *recentiores non deteriores*.²⁰ What is surprising is the perfunctory and negligent treatment of the manuscript by Severus' previous editors.

The manuscript, which Schissel at first merely recorded²¹ without thinking it worth considering for establishing the text of *ethop.* 7 Walz, suddenly appears in the apparatus of nos. 2, 4 and 5 Walz as edited by Schissel himself and his pupils Staudacher and Karnthaler.²² None of them, however, took the trouble to give a preliminary description of the manuscript or at least study its relation to the other witnesses. That explains

¹⁹ Walz did not know the evidence of the Paris MS., which offers an abridged text.

²⁰ Collation of the MS. does not reveal heavy corruption, thus making it an important witness within its family. The order in which Severus' ethopoeae are transmitted and the readings shared with other MSS. or peculiar to it indicate that it belongs to what I call the *b* family, along with *Vind.Phil.gr.* 321 (XIII med.), *Paris.gr.* 2918 (XIV ex.), *Barocci* 131 (XIII), *Neapol.gr.* 209 [III.AA.6] (XIII/XIV), *Cantabr.* 1158 [O.2.54] (XVII), *Virens.* 124 (XVII), *Langb.* 9 (XVII–XVIII), but is not dependent on any of them. For details see Amato, *Medioevo greco* 5 (2005) 28.

²¹ Schissel, *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929–30) 8.

²² *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929–30) 325 and n.1, 334; 10 (1932–33/1933–34) 322.

for example why Staudacher considers our very manuscript to be the original of the much older *Paris.gr.* 2918!²³

I present an edition and translation of the new fragment:

*Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Δημοσθένης
τοῦ Φιλίππου ἀποθανόντος;*

Εὖγε τῆς τύχης, καιρὸς ἐλευθερίας ἦκει τοῖς Ἕλλησι καὶ δυστυχημάτων ἀνάπαυλα. πάλιν ἀνειλήφαμεν ἅπαντες ἃ τὸ πρὶν ἀφηρέθημεν, καὶ γέγονα τὴν γλῶσσαν μετὰ τῆς πολιτείας ἐλεύθερος, πρώην τῷ δέει τῆς παρουσίας ἀναπτόμενος.

Εὖγε τοῦ θανάτου, μόνον γὰρ τοῦτον οὐκ ἐχειρώσατο Φίλιππος, ἀλλὰ πάντων κρατήσας, ὑπὸ τούτου κεκράτηται, καὶ γέγονε δοῦλος ὁ πᾶσι περιθεὶς ὡς τοῦνομα. πανήγυρις ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ θεοὶς χαριστήρια.

ὦ πόσα κατ' ἐκείνου δημηγορήσας τῆς πλεονεξίας ...

Tit. εἴπη cod.: correxi Sev. tit. *ethop.* 2 et 5 Walz coll. || 2 ἀνειλήφειμεν cod.: correxi || 4–5 ἀναπτόμενος cum codice ego coll. Lib. *Or.* 33.15: possis ἀναπτούμενος.

What would Demosthenes say on the death of Philip?

Well done, Fortune! A time of freedom has returned for the Greeks and relief from woes. Once more we have recovered everything of which we had previously been deprived; I have regained the freedom to speak along with the democratic constitution, I who yesterday was inflamed with fear of his presence.

Well done, Death! Only him could Philip not bring under his power, but he who conquered all was by him conquered, and he has become a slave who imposed his name on all. Let there be a festival for this and libations to the gods!

Oh, how often have I spoken against his greed ...

We are clearly faced with the beginning of an ethopoea of the “pathetic,” “indefinite,” and “simple” type,²⁴ whose at-

²³ This is a rhetorical anthology datable to the fourteenth century, containing *ethop.* 5, 7, 4, 6, 1, 2 Walz (ff. 140^v–141^r). For a brief account of the MS., see Omont, *Inventaire* 59; for a detailed analysis, I. Lana, *I Progimnasmī di Elio Teone I* (Torino 1959) 32–41, 46–47, and G. Ballaira, *Tiberii de figuris Demosthenicis libellus cum deperditorum operum fragmentis* (Rome 1968) 85–91; cf. also Pignani, *Bollettino dei Classici* N.S. 21 (1973) 43.

²⁴ For these terms, see Ps.-Hermog. *Progymn.* 9 (pp.20.24–21.5 Rabe). They are not immune to criticism, above all as regards “ethical,” “pathetic,” and “mixed” ethopoea: see Joh. Geom. ap. Joh. Doxap. at II 499.20–28 Walz. The technical writers (see especially Ps.-Hermog. pp.

tribution to Severus seems to me unarguable both for reasons of style and language and on grounds of content.

To pursue this last topic, even if as R. Kohl writes “Aeschines et Demosthenes longe primum declamationum themata praebuerunt inter omnes viros qui afferuntur in ludis rhetoricorum” (in particular events relating to Philip II),²⁵ the only other ethopoeae to develop this theme are Severus nos. 1 (Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Αἰσχίνης εὐρῶν παρὰ Δημοσθένει εἰκόνα Φιλίππου) and 2 (Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Αἰσχίνης ἐν τῇ φυγῇ Δημοσθένους διδόντος αὐτῷ ἐφόδιον). Thus the content of the new ethopoea from the Paris manuscript fits perfectly within a framework well attested for the Alexandrian sophist.²⁶

Passing to the other two aspects, it must first be emphasized that Meyer’s Law is obeyed almost throughout: there is only one ternary pause of the PPr type in a strong clausula (παρουσίας ἀναπτόμενος) and one in a weak (εὖγε τοῦ θανάτου). This lines up excellently with W. Hörandner’s finding that in Severus’ ethopoeae the deviation from the norm is 2.6% for strong clausulae and 3.4% for weak.²⁷

How, moreover, can one fail to cite for the conceit of Death the dispenser of justice and righteous bringer of peace (Εὖγε τοῦ θανάτου, μόνον γὰρ τοῦτον οὐκ ἐχειρώσατο Φίλιππος, ἀλλὰ

21.19–22.3 Rabe; Aphthon. p.35.13–14 Rabe; Nicol. pp.65.11–66.8 Felten) also envisage a διαίρεσις κατὰ τοὺς τρεῖς χρόνους (present/past/future; different subdivisions in Anaxim. pp.71.20–23 and 90.21–92.2 Fuhrmann²; Cic. *Inv.* 1.36; Ps.-Dion. Hal. *Opusc.* II p.269.9–11 Usener-Radermacher; Empor. p.563.19–31 Helm), which cannot be employed in our case (only the present [Εὖγε τῆς τύχης – χαριστήρια] and the past [ᾧ πόσα κτλ.] are identified).

²⁵ R. Kohl, *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis* (diss. Paderborn 1915) 66, who provides (259–328) a useful repertory of declamations and in general of *progymnasmata* on Demosthenes and Aeschines. The subject became highly fashionable from the Second Sophistic onwards: see D. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge 1983) 118–120; G. Anderson, *Philostratus. Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* (London 1986) 28, 34–35, 47, 68.

²⁶ For a detailed analysis of the content and sources of *ethop.* 1–2, see J. Schamp, “Un viatique pour la critique: le cas de l’éthopée,” in Amato, *ἨΘΟΠΟΙΙΑ* 143–156.

²⁷ Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus* 162.

πάντων κρατήσας, ὑπὸ τούτου κεκράτηται) the parallel of *ethop.* 5, where Briseis calls on Death as follows: καὶ εἰ μὴ μόνος, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐλευθερώσει με θάνατος, βίος δουλεύων οὐ παύσεται? Indeed, the entire Homeric *ethopoea* demonstrates stylistic and linguistic devices typical of Severus that we also find in the new Paris fragment. I quote the brief text in its entirety (the results of comparing our fragment with Severus' other *ethopoeae* are of course the same), so as to make the echoes clearer (Sev. *ethop.* 5 Walz):

Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Βρισηῖς ἀπαγομένη ὑπὸ τῶν κηρύκων;
 Μετὰ πατρίδος ἀπώλειαν, μετὰ βασιλέως ἀναίρεσιν, μετὰ
 τοσοῦτον δυστυχημάτων κατάλογον ἐκ δευτέρου πάλιν αἰχ-
 μάλωτος γίνομαι· Ἕλληνες καθ' ἡμῶν ἐστρατεύσαντο, καὶ
 γέγονα δορυάλωτος· Ἕλληνες καθ' Ἕλλήνων γέγονασι, καὶ
 πρὸς δουλείαν ἀπάγομαι. καὶ εἰ μὴ μόνος, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐλευ-
 θερώσει με θάνατος, βίος δουλεύων οὐ παύσεται.

What would Briseis say when carried off by the heralds?

After the loss of my country, after the killing of the king, after such a list of many woes I am taken captive anew for the second time: the Greeks marched against us, and I became their prisoner; the Greeks took on the Greeks, and I am led away to slavery; if Death alone, so it appears, does not free me, life will not cease to make me be a slave.

Note first of all the same preference for short, broken cola, almost sobbing as it were, such as also recur in the new Paris fragment. Identical, too, are the abundance and careful disposition of rhetorical figures: whereas in the *ethopoea* edited above we encounter in a bare eight lines instances of homoeoteleuton (ἀνειλήφαμεν ἀφηρέθημεν ~ πολιτείας ἐλεύθερος ~ παρουσίας ἀναπτόμενος), chiasmus (καιρὸς ἐλευθερίας ~ δυστυχημάτων ἀνάπαυλα), polyptoton and alliterative word-play (κρατήσας, ὑπὸ τούτου κεκράτηται)²⁸, epianaphora (Εὖγε τῆς τύχης ... Εὖγε τοῦ θανάτου), and ellipsis of the verb (πανήγυρις ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ θεοῖς χαριστήρια), in this piece a mere six lines exhibit epianaphora (μετὰ ... μετὰ ... μετὰ), double anaphora (Ἕλληνες ...

²⁸ It may be observed that this passage has a very similar precedent in Favorinus *Fort.* 22: ὁ δὲ Πολιορκητῆς Δημήτριος αἰχμάλωτος γενόμενος ἐξ οἴνου καὶ μέθης ἀτίμως ἀπέθανεν, ὑπὸ τῆς Τύχης πολιορκούμενος.

καὶ ~ Ἑλληνας ... καὶ), polyptoton (Ἑλληνας καθ' Ἑλλήνων; γίνομαι ~ γέγονα ~ γεγόνασι), *epembole* (ὡς ἔοικεν), chiasmus (ἐλευθέρωσει με θάνατος, βίος δουλεύων οὐ παύσεται), parallelism and isosyllabism (μετὰ πατρίδος ἀπώλειαν, μετὰ βασιλέως ἀνάίρεσιν; Ἑλληνας καθ' ἡμῶν ἐστρατεύσαντο ~ Ἑλληνας καθ' Ἑλλήνων γεγόνασι), paronomasia (μὴ ~ με), and alliteration (μὴ μόνος).

In particular, too, the syntagm εὖγε+genitive seems typical of Severus: see *ethop.* 1 (p.539.23 Walz) Εὖγε τῆς δίκης, and 7 (p. 545.21) Εὖγε τῆς φύσεως. Similarly, I should like to note the use of *δυστύχημα* and *καιρός*, for which see *ethop.* 4 (p.543.10–11 and 544.9) ἐπικουφίζουσιν ἐθέλων τοῦ δυστυχήματος and στρατεύουσιν κατ' ἐκείνου καιρός. Of great interest, finally, for the lines πάλιν ἀνειλήφασιν ἅπαντες ἃ τὸ πρὶν ἀφῆρέθημεν, καὶ γέγονα τὴν γλῶσσαν μετὰ τῆς πολιτείας ἐλεύθερος, are the parallels of *ethop.* 7 (p.546.5–6), ἀνῆρέθημεν ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν καὶ πάλιν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς διὰ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀνῆρήκαμεν, and 4 (p.543.3–4), ἡτυχήσαμεν εὐσεβήσαντες, καὶ ξένον ἀποδεξάμενοι ξένοι τῶν οἰκείων γεγόναμεν.

In conclusion, there is no reason, in the light of this examination of style, language, and content, to doubt the passage's attribution to the sophist Severus of Alexandria, as recorded in the Paris manuscript.²⁹

August, 2005

Départ. de Sciences de l'Antiquité
 Université de Fribourg
 Rue Pierre-Aeby, 16
 CH-1700 Fribourg
 eugenio.amato@unifr.ch

²⁹ I thank heartily Leofranc Holford-Strevens (Oxford University Press) and Jesús Ureña Bracero (University of Extremadura), both of whom have been enormously helpful. I wish to express too my gratitude to the anonymous reader for *GRBS*.