

PHILOSTRATUS' *LIVES OF THE SOPHISTS*: A NEW OCT

RUDOLF S. STEFEC. *Flavii Philostrati Vitas sophistarum. Ad quas accedunt Polemonis Laodicensis Declamationes quae exstant duae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, xiv+177 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-872370-7.

The text of Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* (VS) did not have a good twentieth century. The twenty-first promises to be much kinder. In Rudolf Stefec's new OCT, we now at last have a text of the VS that meets (in exemplary fashion) modern standards of editing. The VS is vital to our understanding of Greco-Roman literary culture in the second and third centuries CE, and scholars now have a version of the Greek that they can use with confidence and critical understanding. To this Stefec has added new texts of the surviving declamations of Polemo, which also represent a welcome advance and a well-chosen supplement.

The wait has been a long one for Philostrateans. Work on the Second Sophistic has been accelerating ever since the late 1960s, and many books have come out that cite the VS seemingly on every page. They have all had to rely, directly or otherwise, on one of the several editions put out in the mid-nineteenth century by C.L. Kayser, most often his 1871 Teubner of the complete Philostratean corpus. Kayser had thirty years' experience with the VS, but he was not conversant with then-emerging text-critical techniques. The most commonly available version of his text does not have an *apparatus criticus*, only a preface and a very few pages of *adnotatio critica* at the start. All subsequent editions have been adaptations of his text, notably Wilmer Cave Wright's 1921 Loeb (which selectively incorporates other conjectures), Maurizio Civiletti's 2002 Italian translation and commentary (which prints Kayser's text unaltered but mentions some variants in the commentary) and Kai Brodersen's 2014 Greek-German bilingual edition (which incorporates some of Stefec's then-published preliminary observations on the text).¹

Stefec's edition consists of a brief English-language preface, list of sigla and abbreviations, the texts and then indices of proper nouns for the VS and for Polemo. The preface confines itself to briefly listing the principal

¹ W.C. Wright, *Philostratus: Lives of the Sophists and Eunapius: Lives of the Philosophers*, Cambridge, Mass. 1921; M. Civiletti, *Filostrato: Vite dei sofisti*, Milan 2002; K. Brodersen, *Philostratos: Leben der Sophisten*, Wiesbaden 2014.

manuscripts for each text (the declamations have come down as a unit, separately from the *VS*) and their relationships, with stemmata. That for the *VS* is rather more complicated due to cross-contamination of the various families. Readers who want fuller explanations of how these stemmata were generated are directed to Stefec's existing publications on the topic.² Stefec has been extremely painstaking in his pursuit and collation of manuscripts. This includes bringing to bear his knowledge of Byzantine scribal culture, which has allowed him to make historical connections between manuscripts to supplement those based on purely textual phenomena. Thus for the *VS*, his stemma includes twelve independent witnesses to the text, which means Stefec has been able to eliminate from consideration more than half of the manuscripts listed in Kayser's edition while adding in a few that were unknown to the earlier editor. Thus Stefec is able to rule out several readings that Kayser took from manuscripts that are not in fact independent. Stefec also takes advantage of a century-plus worth of conjectures, both published (notably by Cobet, Valckenaer and Lucarini, the former two being often also adopted in Wright's Loeb) and otherwise (by Gerard Boter, Christopher Jones, Heinz-Günther Nesselrath and Stephan Schröder).

Regarding the quality of the text, one can only say that it represents a vast improvement. A list of *loci* of particular interpretive significance is given in the appendix, but a few general observations may be made. Many of these are predictable for a modern critical edition that supersedes a mid-nineteenth-century predecessor.

Overall, the Greek of Stefec's text is a bit more unfamiliar and difficult, because he tends to favor the *lectio difficilior* more than Kayser did on the lexical, morphological and orthographical levels.³ Perhaps most noticeably, Stefec prints ξυv- in many places where Kayser has συv-, although in both editions Philostratus' usage remains inconsistent, since Stefec does not "correct" to ξυv- where there is no manuscript support. The same is true of several analogous variants, thus yielding a Greek that overall has a slightly more classicizing feel. Stefec is also more restrained in his approach to lacunae, using *crucēs* in several places where Kayser ventured emendations or supplements.⁴ Another large set of divergences is generated by Kayser's tendency to favor manuscripts of the α tradition, perhaps simply on grounds of greater age, whereas Stefec is rather more even-handed in printing β variants.

² These are: R. Stefec, "Zur Überlieferung und Textkritik der Sophistenviten Philostrats", *WS* 123, 2010, 63-93; *id.* "Der Handschriften der Sophistenviten Philostrats", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 56, 2014, 137-206; *id.* "Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Deklamationen Polemos", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 55, 2013, 99-154.

³ E.g. 72.21 (παιχθέντα for παισθέντα), 86.4 (ἐφαρμόττοντα for ἐφαρμόζοντα), 103.13 (ἄττει for πηδᾶ). All citations from Stefec's text are given by page and line numbers.

⁴ E.g. 25.9; 92.16, 102.16.

The text is presented with a minimal apparatus, along with an upper register containing citations for other authors who are quoted or closely paraphrased in Philostratus. Stefec seems to have restricted himself to instances of close verbal parallels that have a bearing on reconstructing Philostratus' text. Readers in search of a comprehensive guide to allusions and intertexts in the *VS* should consult Civiletti or the Loeb edition.

The declamations attributed to Polemo are a paired set of speeches running 30 pages in Stefec's edition. They are in the personae of the fathers of two notable heroes of Marathon, Cynegirus and Callimachus. Each father insists, in the purplest of prose, that his son died the most heroic death of all those fallen in the battle. Once again, Stefec's edition fills a gap. For a long time, the best available edition was a Teubner of 1873 by Hugo Hinck, which had an apparatus but no stemma. A new edition was published in 1996 by William Reader and Anthony Chvala-Smith which does incorporate modern stemmatic methods.⁵ This edition, while prodigiously thorough in its commentary, has substantial drawbacks that make it unsuitable as a standard scholarly text.⁶

Stefec's text is based on a stemma much simpler than that of the Atlanta edition.⁷ It incorporates numerous conjectures not found in previous editions (notably by Erwin Rohde, as well as unpublished ones by the same scholars as cited above for Philostratus). The editor's task must have been the more difficult because Polemo's rhetorical technique naturally relies on unusual turns of phrase and convolutions of logic. The result is a text that on nearly every page shows substantial divergences from either Hinck or Reader. Stefec is once again more cautious than his nineteenth-century predecessor, and *crucis* and deletions are more common than in Hinck.⁸ The text still has a much smoother flow than Reader's, given the latter's avoidance of conjectural emendation. Stefec concurs with Reader in seeing the last 40-odd words of

⁵ William W. Reader, in collaboration with Anthony J. Chvala-Smith, *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo*, Atlanta 1996. The earlier edition is Hugo Hinck, *Polemonis declamationes quae exstant duae*, Lipsiae 1873.

⁶ The most evident of these drawbacks are the many eccentricities of methodology and presentation. Significantly for our purposes, these include: (a) an apparatus that lists all variant readings regardless of their quality, and is thus too large for convenient use, besides that it replaces standard Latin abbreviations with the editors' own set of symbols; (b) the editors' principle of attempting only to reconstruct the text of the nearest archetype of all surviving witnesses, and thus refraining from printing any emendation that has no manuscript support (see p. 87-88: conjectures are listed in a secondary apparatus). Stefec, in a caustic assessment of his immediate predecessors (2013, 113-4), further taxes them with errors of collation and stemmatic method. There are places (e.g. 138.8) where Stefec's apparatus reports different readings from Reader's.

⁷ In particular, Stefec has isolated a two-manuscript α family as his best witnesses, and has rehabilitated a manuscript (*Par. gr.* 1733) that Reader had seen as heavily contaminated.

⁸ This is true above all for the latter part of the second declamation, e.g. 157.10.

the second declamation's manuscripts as a later addition, and his text thus ends in mid-sentence at τὸν μὲν Ἡρακλέους, with the final words relegated to the apparatus.⁹

There is little to complain of.¹⁰ At times Stefec is overly doctrinaire in the minimalism of his apparatus and preface, which can be confusing to the uninitiated. The *VS* is not an easy text to cite. Stefec provides the three-digit numbers (pages from the Olearius edition of 1709) that are the standard but unsatisfactory method, and then supplements these by consecutively numbering the text's 96 paragraphs (which follow the same divisions which follow the same divisions as in Kayser). This is helpful, but given all these sets of numbers plus line-numbering, all in Arabic numerals, Stefec's margins are more than usually crowded and one can easily lose track of which sequence a given marginal figure belongs to. Still, it is difficult to think of a solution that would be more visually elegant. For Polemo, Stefec has used the same numbering system as Hinck and Reader, but also prints page numbers from Hinck's edition. It is not clear what end this serves, and it once again produces crowding and potential confusion.¹¹

These are minor quibbles. Overall, Stefec has earned much gratitude from scholars of Attic rhetorical prose and of Imperial Greek literature. Any new edition was bound to be a substantial improvement over the existing state of affairs. However, a less able editor might have produced far less of an improvement, leaving us with a text that was unsatisfactory but not bad enough to make it worth anyone's trouble to do better. Instead we have a text that is definitive in itself but still gives scholars the tools to enable further discussion of remaining textual problems.

APPENDIX

The following is a (necessarily subjective) list of divergences between Stefec and Kayser or Wright (her text being the most commonly available) that appear to have particular interpretive significance for historians or literary scholars.¹² This seems necessary because, given the methodological gap between the two editions, such *loci* are unusually numerous and Stefec's version has a certain presumed authority, albeit not beyond question. My intent is not to provide a critical survey of my own so much as to illuminate

⁹ For a rationale, see Stefec 2013, 123–25.

¹⁰ The only clear typo I have found is actually in Stefec's citation of one of his own articles in his preface (v n.1, "55" should be "56"). The apparatus at 19.11 and at 138.11 appears to misreport the texts of Kayser and Hinck respectively, and the note at 41.10 appears superfluous as printed. Some minor typesetting problems have resulted in a few misplaced hyphens (p. 18) and some incorrect (by one) line numbers in the apparatus.

¹¹ Notably on p. 154, line 25 is also the start of Hinck page 25 and only two lines below the start of section 25.

¹² A few of these are listed at Stefec (2010, 87–93), but he appears to have selected his examples on grounds of technical rather than interpretive interest.

the places where others may wish to focus their efforts now that they have an edition that adequately lays out the problems. I have included my own comments only where the issue concerns the text's logical sense or factual accuracy rather than questions of palaeography or stemmatology.

These are listed by page-and-line numbers in Stefec: the number in parentheses is the Olearius pagination that can be found in all modern editions. The lemma is Stefec's text. It should be noted that Stefec's apparatus does not register all divergences from Kayser (e.g. where Kayser followed a manuscript that Stefec has demonstrated to be a valueless witness) and it is possible that some such instances have escaped my notice.

1.1 (479): Τοὺς ἐν δόξει τοῦ σοφιστεῦσαι φιλοσοφήσαντας. Stefec has re-ordered the first words of the dedication to bring them closer to the manuscript reading. Kayser had Τοὺς φιλοσοφήσαντας ἐν δόξει τοῦ σοφιστεῦσαι. Such re-orderings make up a substantial portion of the differences between the two texts.

2.14 (481): μορίοις ἀστέρων στοχαζόμενοι τοῦ ὄντος. Referring to astrology. Kayser had followed the manuscript variant μορίοις ("tens of thousands") for μορίοις ("regions").

9.15 (489): Ἀρελάτου πόλεως, ἢ ἐπ' Ἡριδανῶ ποταμῶ. Referring to Favorinus' birthplace. Here Kayser and Stefec agree, but Wright printed Cobet's (and Salmاسius') emendation to Ῥοδανῶ. Philostratus clearly means the Rhône and not the Po (and surely knew the difference) but Stefec cites Dionysius Periegetes 289 for Ἡριδανός seemingly referring to the Rhône, as argued by Müller in his ed. of *Geographi Graeci Minores*.¹³

11.12 (490): φιλοτιμίας, ἢ πολλὸν ἐκκαίει καὶ σοφοῖς ἀνδράσι τὸν πόλεμον. Referring to the Polemo-Favorinus feud. For πόλεμον, Kayser preferred manuscript variant φθόνον, with different word-order.

12.1 (491): τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λήρῳ. The title of one of Favorinus, speeches becomes "On the Frivolous" *vel sim.* rather than Kayser's manuscript variant of ἐπὶ τῷ ἀώρῳ ("On the Untimely Dead").

15.20-21 (495): οὗς ὁ Πλάτων <ἐν> τῷ Γοργία ἐπισκώπτε. Referring to the inhabitants of Inycus in Sicily. Since the passage in question occurs in the *Hippias Major*, we have an error, which Stefec attributes to Philostratus. Kayser evidently preferred to blame a glossator and deleted τῷ Γοργία.

20.25 (501): παρ' οἷς ἀγερωχία κατὰ κρατος. Referring to a stereotype of Thessalians to which Critias became assimilated. This is Jahn's emendation. Kayser, with the manuscripts, had παρ' οἷς ἀγερωχία καὶ ἄκρατος.

27.9 (510): καθήπτοντο τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὡς παρανομούντων. Referring to sympathizers of Aeschines, regarding the failure of the *Against Ctesiphon*. Kayser preferred the variant παρανοοῦντων.

¹³ I am grateful to Janet Downie for her assistance on this point.

28.22 (512): γράφει πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Νέρωνα. Referring to an enemy of Nicetes. Kayser printed Νερούαν, which is (with orthographical variations) the reading of all but one manuscripts. Stefec, along with Wright, Brodersen and historical common sense, follows the one manuscript that gives ἔρωνα. Assuming Nero is indeed meant, he is the earliest Roman emperor in whose reign Philostratus' Second Sophistic is active.

31.13 (515): πεπεδημένοι τὴν γλῶτταν. Referring to envious calumniators of Scopelian. Kayser had πεπηδημένοι (from πηδάω, "leap"), which in context makes far less sense than πεπεδημένοι ("bound" "shackled," from πεδάω). As Stefec's apparatus does not mention the change, it is not clear what the manuscript situation is. πεπεδημένοι was suggested already by Civiletti (2002, 443).

34.1 (517): τῆς τοῦ Σκοπελιανοῦ νεότητός. Explaining why it was shocking that Scopelian was defeated in court by his father's freedman. Stefec here follows the manuscripts, but Kayser had emended to δεινότητος on grounds of narrative logic.

38.3 (521): ἐπερρώσθη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Describing the effect Scopelian's declamation had on young Herodes Atticus. Kayser followed the variant ἐπερώθη (lit. "given feathers/wings").

38.6 (521): πεντακόσια ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τάλαντα. Referring to an amount Herodes received from his father after delivering a declamation. Stefec, Kayser and all manuscripts agree on 500, but Wright preferred to emend the enormous sum to πεντήκοντα. The amount seems less outrageous if thought of as an advance on Herodes' inheritance.

40.7-9 (523): οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε θνητὰ νομισθεῖν τὰ ἀνθρώπεια οὐτ' αὖ διδακτά, ἃ ἐμάθομεν, εἰ <μη> μνήμη συνεπολιτεύετο ἀνθρώποις. The passage is part of a strained argument as to why memory cannot be the object of a τέχνη. There are no interpretively significant manuscript variations, but different editors have tried to produce more intelligible reasoning by inserting the μή and/or emending θνητὰ to ἀθάνατα. None of the available logical variations appears obviously more lucid than the others.

41.3 (524): πλείστοις ἐνομιλῆσας ἔθνεσιν. Regarding Dionysius' career and orderly habits. The manuscript reading for the last word is ἤθεσιν. Stefec here agrees with Kayser *et al.* in emending to the (in context more logical) ἔθνεσιν, but thus disagrees with his own previously published opinion (2010, p. 91), which had in the meantime been adopted by Brodersen.

45.27 (529): τραχὺ βλέψας «καὶ προβαλῶ μάν», ἔφη, «καὶ μελετασεῦμαι». Describing Marcus of Byzantium responding to Polemo's challenge. Kayser had ἀνακύψας «καὶ προβαλοῦμαι» ἔφη «καὶ μελετήσομαι». The first difference is a manuscript variant. Thereafter, Stefec has restored Doricizing forms not transmitted in manuscripts but suggested by Philostratus' own subsequent remarks in the text.

46.19 (530): δυνατωτέρα δὲ τῆς ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ. Referring to Carian Laodicea, the birthplace of Polemo. Kayser and the manuscripts have τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ, referring to coastal communities generally, where the emendation (Lucarini's) would refer specifically to the city's maritime namesake.

47.5 (531): ἐξειλεγμένης τε καὶ καθαρᾶς. Referring to the youths attracted to Smyrna by Polemo. Kayser added Ἑλλάδος at the end, attested in some manuscripts.

57.27 (542): ὃ τε μοιχὸς ὁ ἐγκεκαλυμμένος. Given as the title of one of Polemo's declamations ("The Seducer Concealed"). This is the manuscript reading, Kayser preferred the emendation ἐκκεκαλυμμένος ("unmasked").

58.3 (542): ὁ μετὰ Χαιρώνειάν ἴτεῖ προσάγων ἑαυτὸν. The title of another declamation of Polemo's, in the persona of Demosthenes. Kayser (supported by some manuscripts) simply omitted the τε and construed the remaining text unproblematically.

59.8 (544): «δότε μοι σῶμα καὶ μελετήσομαι». Polemo's dying exclamation. Stefec here agrees with existing editions, but had previously (2010: 91) preferred μετεμβήσομαι ("I will be reincarnated"), the reading of most manuscripts. It appears (2010: 71) that in his earlier publication Stefec had not yet been able to consult the one manuscript that does read μελετήσομαι.

66.1-4 (552):¹⁴ Δοκεῖ γάρ μοι τὸ ρῆξι τὸν Ἴσθμὸν Ποσειδῶνος δεῖσθαι ἢ ἀνδρός, ὃν ἐκάλουν οἱ πολλοὶ Ἡρώδου Ἡρακλέα. νεανίας οὗτος ἦν ἐν ὑπήνῃ πρώτη Κελτῶ μεγάλῳ ἴσος καὶ ἐς ὀκτὼ πόδας τὸ μέγεθος. The words of the text are not in much dispute, but Stefec has drastically (and quite convincingly) repunctuated. In Kayser, the words down to ἀνδρός were their own sentence and were included in the previous paragraph, which is entirely concerned with the Isthmus project. Kayser's paragraph thus began with "Ὁν <δ> ἐκάλουν οἱ πολλοὶ Ἡρώδου Ἡρακλέα, νεανίας οὗτος ἦν etc., and there was no transition from the Isthmus-digging to Agathion-Hercules.

66.18 (553): ἐν τῷ Βοιωτίῳ Δηλίῳ. Referring to Agathion-Hercules' supposed birthplace. Kayser had gone with the variant ἐν τῷ Βοιωτίῳ δήμῳ.

66.20 (553): γυνὴ βουκόλος οὕτω τι ἐπερρωμένη, ὡς βουκτονεῖν. Describing the mother of Agathion-Hercules. For βουκτονεῖν, the manuscripts have the redundant βουκολεῖν. Stefec has followed a conjecture of Jacobs. Kayser's solution was to retain βουκολεῖν but delete the earlier βουκόλος.

66.26 (553): με βόσκουσιν αἰγές τε καὶ ποιῦναι. Agathion-Hercules describing his means of sustenance. ποιῦναι is again a conjecture of Jacobs, Kayser had the manuscript ποιμένες. Since the next clause also refers to animals, the improvement in sense is clear.

¹⁴ Explained more fully by Stefec 2010, 92.

67.9 (553): ἀγαθὸν διδασκαλεῖον ἀνδρὶ βουλομένῳ <καθαρῶς> διαλέγεσθαι. Agathion-Hercules speaking of the Attic *mesogeia*. Supplement suggested by Schröder, Kayser printed the manuscript reading unaltered.

69.11 (555): ἐπικόπτων αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρώδης. Describing an altercation between Herodes and Braduas. Kayser had ἐπισκώπτων (“mocking”), which does make more sense in context than “striking,” albeit its manuscript support appears weaker.

70.5 (556): Μουσωνίῳ δὲ τῷ Τυρρηῶ. Referring to the teacher of one Lucius, a contemporary of Herodes. Manuscripts and Kayser have Μουσωνίῳ δὲ τῷ Τυρίῳ. No “Musonius of Tyre” is known elsewhere, while “Musonius the Etruscan” would be the well-known Musonius Rufus. This involves an error on Philostratus’ part, since it is unlikely a student of Musonius’ (d. before 102) would have been active in Marcus Aurelius’ reign. For discussion, see Civiletti (n. 1), p. 515.

74.10 (561): θάνατον αὐτῷ φήσαντος. Prefect Bassaeus speaking to Herodes after his courtroom debacle, with the sense of “threaten him with death.” This is the manuscript reading with which Kayser concurs, but Wright follows Cobet’s conjecture of θανατᾶν αὐτὸν φήσαντος (“said that [Herodes] wanted to die”).

79.17 (566): τοὺς μὲν Πλατωνεῖους καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς καὶ τοῦ Περιπάτου καὶ αὐτὸν Ἐπικούρου προσέταξεν ὁ Μάρκος τῷ Ἡρώδῃ κρίναι. Kayser has αὐτοῦ Ἐπικούρου, for discussion see Stefec 2010, 93.

83.10 (570): παρὰ τὸν πρῶτον Ἀντωνῖνον. Referring to an embassy including Alexander Clay-Plato. πρῶτον is omitted by Kayser on the basis of one manuscript. There is no question that Antoninus Pius is meant, but the designation by ordinal number is unusual.

104.27 (594): ἀπέθανε γηράσκων ἤδη †καὶ μετέχων δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἀθήνησιν†. Referring to Pausanias of Caesarea. Kayser inserted a series of supplements and emendations which indicated that Pausanias held the chairs of rhetoric at both Athens and Rome.¹⁵

107.28 (597): ἐγκειμένως γὰρ τοῦ ἥθους καὶ ἀπανούργως ἔχων. Describing Rufus of Perinthus. ἐγκειμένως (“vehement”) is the manuscript reading, but editors going back to Morel emended to ἐκκειμένως (“frank”).

109.4 (599): φωνὴν μελιτοῦσαν ἀεί. A quotation from Onomarchus’ declamation *The Man in Love with a Statue*. Kayser had the manuscript reading φωνὴν μέλλουσαν ἀεί, in the sense of “always hesitating or about to speak.” This seems entirely appropriate to the subject matter, and it is not clear why the emendation to “honeyed” is needed.¹⁶

¹⁵ There appears to be no independent evidence for his holding either position, see I. Avotins, “The Holders of the Chairs of Rhetoric at Athens”, *HSPH* 79, 1975, 313-24.

¹⁶ The emendation is suggested without comment in C.B. Van Wullften Palthe, *Dissertatio litteraria continens observationes grammaticas et criticas in Philostratum, habita imprimis Vitae Apollonii ratione*, Lugduni Batavorum 1887, p. 72.

114.18 (605) ἔστι δὲ αὕτη στοὰ ἐπὶ <ἐξ> στάδια λίθου πᾶσα. Referring to a construction of Damianus in Ephesus. Kayser had limited Damianus to the one stade (ἐπὶ στάδιον λίθου).

120.9 (612) Ῥωμαῖοι μεγάλων ἀξιοῦσιν. Referring to the high-priesthood of Lycia. Kayser had the manuscript reading Ῥωμαίων μεγάλων ἀξιοῦσιν, with no explicit subject. Wright already printed the emendation, which dates back to Valesius.

124.4 (617) πομπείαν οὐ πρεσβυτικὴν. Referring to a scurrilous work by Proclus of Naucratis. Kayser had the manuscript reading πρεσβευτικὴν (“appropriate for a diplomat”). πρεσβυτικὴν (“appropriate for an old man”) is Cobet’s emendation, adopted already by Wright.

125.22 (618) οὔτε ἐν θαλάττῃ. Referring to Hippodromus’ refusal to stop working. Kayser again had the manuscript ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ, which is Hippodromus’ home region. The emendation is Jahn’s and adopted once again by Wright.

134.12 (627) βασιλεῖ τε ξυνὼν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. Referring to Aspasius of Ravenna’s travels. Ἀλεξάνδρῳ does not appear in Kayser’s text, although it is attested in several independent manuscripts. If correct, the naming of Alexander Severus is significant for the dating of the *VS*, since it corroborates the *terminus post quem* of c. 230 derived from a reference to Nicagoras’ priesthood. The text indeed rather sounds as if the peregrinations in question are over, which would push the *terminus* to 233 or later.¹⁷

134.21 (627): Πίγρητος τοῦ Λυδοῦ. Referring to the only significant student of Cassianus. Stefec has taken Reiske’s emendation over the manuscript Περίγητος, “Pigres” being a more common name in the region than “Periges.”¹⁸

ADAM KEMEZIS
University of Alberta
kemezis@ualberta.ca

¹⁷ See A. M. Kemezis, *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian*, Cambridge, 2014, p. 294. Alexander Severus took the throne in 222 but did not travel significantly outside of Rome until his Persian expedition of 231-33. See H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart 1986, 231-32.

¹⁸ It has been suggested that this sophistes is the same person as the P. Aelius Pigres epigraphically attested as performing an embassy from Philadelphia to the imperial court in 255. See B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*, Paris 2002, 387-89.

