162

STRATO AND RUFINUS*

The last book we shall have from the hand of Denys Page is an edition of that 'talented but inscrutable writer' the epigrammatist Rufinus.[1] It is a model of its kind, distinguished by all the virtues we have come to associate with Page's work – erudition, intelligence and judgement. But on the long-debated question of Rufinus' date he may be as much as three centuries out.

The epigrams themselves allude to no datable person or event, nor is Rufinus mentioned by any other ancient writer. Since he was not included in the *Garland* of Philip of Thessalonica, published under Nero,[2] it is a fair assumption that he was not active before the second half of the first century A.D. And since poems by him were translated by both Ausonius and Claudian, they must have been in circulation by *c.* 390 at latest.

On general impression rather than solid evidence he has usually been placed at the turn of the first century. Since Page does not mention it, it is perhaps worth drawing attention here to A. Wifstrand's remarks on the three hexameter lines *AP* V. 77 attributed to Rufinus in *AP*. Having shown that in the second century it became fashionable to write epigrams in hexameters rather than elegiacs, he concluded that these lines were 'eines der ersten literarischen Hexameterepigramme nach der Wiederbelebung dieser Form'.[3]

If the ascription could be regarded as secure, this would certainly be a useful if necessarily imprecise chronological pointer. But the epic diction and style and the lack of point are quite unlike Rufinus' usual manner, and could only be accepted as his on the hypothesis of a deliberate experiment in a style appropriate for hexameters.[4] Furthermore, the so-called *Appendix Barberino-Vaticana* marks the poem ἄδηλον, and though itself a late and careless compilation, it clearly derives ultimately from a copy of Cephalas independent of *AP*.[5] Its alternative ascriptions are sometimes wrong, but the error can usually be explained as the mistaken repetition of a τοῦ αὐτοῦ heading. ἄδηλον, which amounts to a denial of an ascription, is less likely to be the result of carelessness, and here it might well rather be the scribe of *AP* who continued his τοῦ αὐτοῦ heading one too far after V. 73–6 (Page, xxvii–xxx). Page dismissed the ascription to Rufinus with a curt 'surely not his work' (p. 105). It would be rash, I think, to claim Rufinus as the pioneer of the new hexameter epigram.

The most valuable part of Page's introduction is his very full discussion of Rufinus' prosody and metrical practice. Much of interest emerges from his comparisons with the practice of the poets of Philip's *Garland*, Strato, Palladas and the poets of Agathias' *Cycle* (pp. 28–43). But nothing, it seems, to fix Rufinus' date nearer A.D. 390 than A.D. 60.

On the other hand Page sees decisive proof against a date before *c.* A.D. 150 in 'the

evidence of vocabulary', and after a long discussion of Rufinus' language (pp. 44–8), concludes that 'a preference for the latest possible period, the fourth century, seems reasonable'. I do not believe that such a preference is justified. Page's argument calls forth two reservations, one general and one particular.

First, while Page rightly refuses to tamper with examples of 'vernacular' syntax in Rufinus, he is reluctant to allow that a 'good' writer of the first century would admit a word like σπάταλος ('wanton'), which 'though common in the vernacular...was below the level of literature' (p. 46). Yet (if it ever had been) the epigram was no longer literature of the highest pretensions. Rudolf Keydell has recently shown that there are a surprisingly large number of vulgarisms in the Greek of the mid-first-century Lucillius.[6] Who, for example, would have expected to find the earliest datable example of the vulgar form πεῖν for πιεῖν, absent from the Ptolemaic papyri and the New Testament, in a Neronian epigrammatist (*AP* XI. 140. 3, confirmed by *propin* in Martial XII. 82. 11)? As we shall see, Rufinus may actually have been a contemporary of Lucillius.

Second, and more particularly, Page is clearly impressed by the fact that a number of these words are first 'freely admitted to the higher poetry' by the poets of Agathias' *Cycle*, which suggests to him that Rufinus 'is not very far from the period of the *Cycle*', namely the sixth century. But there is an alternative and to my mind far more probable explanation of this phenomenon. One of the things that emerges most clearly from the material collected in Page's excellent commentary on Rufinus' epigrams is how extensively they were imitated by the poets of the *Cycle*. So the most natural explanation for the reappearance of these rare or vulgar words in the *Cycle* poets is that they got them directly from Rufinus. But Rufinus got them from the vernacular.

The best example is a word Page did not include in his survey, the final touch to XXXV (*AP* V. 94):

> εὐδαίμων ὁ βλέπων σε, τρισόλβιος ὅστις ἀκούει,
> ἡμίθεος δ' ὁ φιλῶν, ἀθάνατος δ' ὁ γαμῶν.

'Happy is he who looks at you, thrice blessed he who hears you, demigod he who kisses you – and immortal he who * you.' Surely something less permanent than marriage is envisaged. γαμῶν is the reading of P; Planudes offers συνών. E. Degani recently argued that γαμῶν is a bowdlerization of the more explicit συνών.[7] But elsewhere it is always (and frequently) Planudes who bowdlerizes where P is explicit. Page, rightly preferring γαμῶν, was driven to conclude that συνών, though incorrect, was none the less the reading of Planudes' source, since he 'would certainly not have substituted συνών for a verb which *prima facie* means "marry"'.

Not only does γαμέω 'not always imply marriage' (Page); not only is it occasionally used 'of mere sexual intercourse' (*LSJ* s.v. I. 2); by the Roman period it had degenerated into a *crude* term for sexual intercourse, as was long ago made clear in the Byzantine Lexicon of Sophocles, s.v.:

ΓΑΜΕΩ, ῶ, a euphemism for βινέω, *futuo*...In modern Greek it is always used κακ-εμφάτως, the words corresponding to the classical γαμέω, *to marry*, being νυμφεύομαι, said of the man, and ὑπανδρεύομαι, of both the man and the wife.

More recently Louis Robert has discussed many further examples,[8] concluding that this late usage 'ne peut nullement devenir une preuve ni même l'indice le plus léger, que Rufin devrait être "descendu" vers l'époque du Bas-Empire'. That is true enough,

---

[6] 'Zur Sprache des Epigrammatikers Lukillios', *Philologus* 112 (1968), 141–5.

[7] *Helikon* 4 (1964), 341–2.

[8] 'Sur des inscriptions d'Éphèse: 9', *Rev. de Philol.* 41 (1967), 77–81. See too n. 30 below on περιλαμβάνω.

but we can also draw a wider conclusion. γαμέω is not, like σπάταλος, a vulgarism which (on Page's hypothesis) was eventually admitted to 'the higher poetry'. It was (and remained) downright coarse, so offensive that Planudes, unable to cloak or eliminate the sexual reference, could do no more, *salvo metro*, than substitute the more euphemistic συνών. The power of the word to shock the Byzantine ear is neatly illustrated by an example cited by Robert: coming across the word in a passage of Lucian, the scholiast remarked[9] οὐ τὸ αἰσχρὸν τοῦτο σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ τῷ νόμῳ ἀγαγέσθαι ἅτε γαμετήν. That is to say, he was surprised to discover that the crude connotations that first sprang to his mind were mistaken. So if Rufinus could use a coarse word like this to give his poem its final punch, there is clearly no basis for Page's contention that such vulgarisms as he uses were hallowed by age and had become respectable. The parallels Page notes with the vocabulary of Lucillius and Nicarchus (p. 46) are perhaps more chronologically significant than those with the poets of Agathias' *Cycle*. At all events, there is certainly no pointer here to the later rather than earlier part of the period A.D. 60–390. It may in fact ,be possible to narrow the limits towards the earlier end by a closer examination of the relationship between Rufinus and Strato.

Page considers only a selection of the parallels between Rufinus and Strato – and in a very perfunctory way. Yet it is not as if they were writers with nothing in common who need never have heard of each other. The heyday of the Greek erotic epigram was the third century B.C., with an Indian summer in the first century B.C., Meleager, Philodemus and finally Marcus Argentarius. The contributors to Philip's *Garland* were mainly preoccupied with epideictic poetry, and the epigrammatists of the second half of the first century A.D. with satirical themes.[10] After this there are few firmly datable epigrammatists before Palladas, but certainly none of them wrote love poetry. In fact Rufinus and Strato are the only erotic epigrammatists on record between the age of Augustus and the age of Justinian. It is not clear from the broken sequence of 37 epigrams preserved in the first section of *AP* V. whether Rufinus himself published a book of his poems,[11] but their popularity in later times shows that such a collection did come into existence. Strato certainly published a collection, his Μοῦσα παιδική.

So on the face of it one of the two revived the genre after a long interval during which epigrammatists had been concerning themselves with very different themes. It is surely likely that whichever was the later of the two was familiar with the work and influenced by the example of the earlier. They both even came from the same part of the world: Strato was remembered by the ethnic 'Sardianus' (see too p. 169 below), and Rufinus lived (as we shall see) within a day's journey of Ephesus, which was little more than 50 miles from Sardis on a main road.

The most clearcut case is Rufinus I Page (*AP* V. 9) and Strato *AP* XII. 226:

> 'Ρουφῖνος τῇ 'μῇ γλυκερωτάτῃ 'Ελπίδι πολλά
>   χαίρειν, εἰ χαίρειν χωρὶς ἐμοῦ δύνασαι.
> οὐκέτι βαστάζω, μὰ τὰ σ' ὄμματα, τὴν φιλέρημον
>   καὶ τὴν μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίην·
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ δακρύοισι πεφυρμένος ἢ 'πὶ Κορησόν
>   ἔρχομαι ἢ μεγάλης νηὸν ἐς 'Αρτέμιδος.
> αὔριον ἀλλὰ πάτρη με δεδέξεται· ἐς δὲ σὸν ὄμμα
>   πτήσομαι, ἐρρῶσθαι μυρία σ' εὐχόμενος   (Rufinus).

---

[9] *Scholia in Lucianum*, ed. H. Rabe, p. 270.

[10] The best sketch of the change in direction in the early imperial epigram is by P. Laurens, 'Martial et l'épigramme grecque du 1er siècle après J.-C.', *REL* 43 (1965), 315 f.

[11] See Page's discussion of the so-called 'sylloge Rufiniana', pp. 3 f., with my *Greek Anthology*, ch. 4.

πάννυχα μυδαλόεντα πεφυρμένος ὄμματα κλαυθμῷ
  ἄγρυπνον ἀμπαύω θυμὸν ἀδημονίῃ,
ἤ με κατ᾽ οὖν ἐδάμασσεν ἀποζευχθέντος ἑταίρου,
  μοῦνον ἐπεί με λιπὼν εἰς ἰδίην Ἔφεσον
χθιζὸς ἔβη Θεόδωρος· ὃς εἰ πάλι μὴ ταχὺς ἔλθοι,
  οὐκέτι μουνολεχεῖς κοίτας ἀνεξόμεθα   (Strato).

There are five points of resemblance:[12] (1) identity of theme, unendurable but apparently temporary separation from the beloved; (2) the scene, Ephesus (in Rufinus the location of the lover, in Strato of the beloved); (3) in both cases there is a similar chronological pointer, tomorrow in Rufinus, yesterday in Strato; (4) both lovers are πεφυρμένος with tears; (5) the obvious similarity between οὐκέτι βαστάζω . . . μουνολεχῆ σεῖο διαζυγίην (Rufinus) and οὐκέτι μουνολεχεῖς κοίτας ἀνεξόμεθα (Strato). In both places the rare word μουνολεχής is being used, not in its usual sense as in epitaphs, 'sleeping with only the one bedfellow' – like Latin univira of faithful spouses –, but perversely enough of one who sleeps alone. These are the only two passages where the word is so used.

Now while it is essential to exercise discrimination and caution in the weighing of such parallels, there is also a point beyond which scepticism is misplaced. Page allows the force of the last item but curiously minimizes the others. Yet if one detail is conceded to be decisive, then it is an abuse of scholarly caution to dismiss the others as 'negligible', 'fortuitous' and 'insignificant'. The natural conclusion is that one of the poems was influenced in all these details by the other. Nor is it difficult to see which. Page has already made the general observation that the occasion of Rufinus' poem looks 'more likely to be real than fictitious' (p. 71). It has been justly admired for the originality of its conception, with no close parallel in either the erotic epigram or the literary love letter. It would be surprising if so much of its detail had been modelled on a much less striking poem such as AP XII. 226, the more so since Rufinus does not in general borrow so extensively from his models.

More particularly, while in 4 out of the 5 points of contact listed above Rufinus might as easily be judged the borrower as Strato, it is surely more plausible to suppose that Strato took the Ephesian location from Rufinus than vice versa. If Rufinus were the borrower, then the Ephesian location would be just one of the details he adapted from his model. Yet while it is just a detail for Strato (any other city would have done), it is an integral element in Rufinus' poem.

In his distraught state Rufinus walks to and fro between the quarter of Koresos (exact location uncertain)[13] and the world-famous temple of Artemis. Not, as Page supposes, because 'he cannot make up his mind whether to stay or leave'. There is no hint of any such indecision in the poem. On the contrary he is looking forward to his return, firmly scheduled for tomorrow (1. 7). Surely he is walking to and fro inspecting the local sights so as to distract himself until his boat leaves. His destination is 'home' (πάτρη, 7), which he does not need to name any more than he needs to name Ephesus itself rather than nearby Koresos and the Artemisium. His beloved Elpis evidently knew where he was and where he was going.

Of course, a poet's biography is not to be inferred straightforwardly from his erotic

---

[12] I do not think that Page's summary of the similarities (p. 5) quite does justice to the facts.
[13] None of the relevant texts or bibliography is quoted by Page; on the location of Koresus, see J. Keil, Jahreshefte 21–2 (1922–4), 96–112; L. Robert, Hellenica 11–12 (1960), 139–44 and Rev. de Philol. 41 (1967), 73–7. The best evidence turns out to be Rufinus' poem, namely its implication that Koresus and the Artemision were at opposite ends of town: 'disons, pour traduire Rufin dans le langage d'un Parisien: "je suis en pleurs, que j'aille à Montmartre ou à Montparnasse"'.

poetry, but it might seem reasonable to conclude at any rate that Rufinus did live a
day's journey from Ephesus, where he once paid an unhappy visit. Robert has drawn
attention to two local details in the poem.[14] First, the description of the Artemision
as the 'temple of Great Artemis' in the local manner (as in *Acts* 29, τὸ τῆς
μεγάλης θεᾶς 'Αρτέμιδος ἱερόν). Second, P's corrupt ἢ ἐπιορκήσων, which A. Hecker
brilliantly corrected to ἢ 'πὶ Κορησόν, points to the spelling with one sigma given by
the majority of local inscriptions (editors of the Anthology, without good reason, print
two sigmas).

Yet even Rufinus' presence in Ephesus would be cast in doubt if it turned out that
he had borrowed his location from Strato – unless we are prepared to assume that
it was a visit to Ephesus that reminded him of Strato's poem. It is surely both simpler
and more plausible to conclude that it is Strato who is the borrower.

Page considers only two other possible links between Rufinus and Strato. I entirely
agree that Rufinus II (*AP* V. 12) and Strato XI. 19 have nothing in common beyond
a popular theme and one commonplace verb. But the link between Strato XII. 229
and Rufinus VII (*AP* V. 21) is closer. The poems describe how Alexis and Prodice,
heedless of the future while they were young and beautiful, have now lost their charms
and are ignored by their former lovers:

> ὡς ἀγαθὴ θεός ἐστι, δι᾽ ἣν ὑπὸ κόλπον, "Αλεξι,
> πτύομεν, ὑστερόπουν ἁζόμενοι Νέμεσιν.
> ἣν σὺ μετερχομένην οὐκ ἔβλεπες, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνόμιζες
> ἕξειν τὸ φθονερὸν κάλλος ἀειχρόνιον.
> νῦν δὲ τὸ μὲν διόλωλεν· ἐλήλυθε δ᾽ ἡ τριχάλεπτος
> δαίμων· χοἰ θέραπες νῦν σε παρερχόμεθα   (Strato).

> οὐκ ἔλεγον, Προδίκη, "γηράσκομεν"; οὐ προεφώνουν
> "ἥξουσιν ταξέως αἱ διαλυσίφιλοι";
> νῦν ῥυτίδες καὶ θρὶξ πολίη καὶ σῶμα ῥακῶδες
> καὶ στόμα τὰς προτέρας οὐκέτ᾽ ἔχον χάριτας.
> μή τίς σοι, μετέωρε, προσέρχεται ἢ κολακεύων
> λίσσεται; ὡς δὲ τάφον νῦν σε παρερχόμεθα   (Rufinus).

Clearly there are differences. Strato is mainly preoccupied with the motif of Nemesis
(as in XII. 193), to whom Alexis paid insufficient respect while his good looks were
intact. But then there is the general theme, with its contrast between past heedlessness
and present neglect, the identical last three words and the similar pause after the first
foot of the final line. If one poet did know the other, as Page concedes, is it not pushing
caution too far to conclude that it was by 'mere coincidence' (p. 24) that both
independently hit on the same thematic, verbal and structural combination?

Keydell, in a paper apparently unknown to Page,[15] even thought that he could detect
a pointer to priority in what he considered the greater appropriateness of the
νῦν in the last line of Strato's poem: 'Während dieses zweite νῦν bei Straton notwendig
ist, damit man richtig οἱ πρὶν θέραπες verstehe, ist es bei Rufin völlig überflüssig, da
es nach dem ersten nichts neues auszusagen hat.' But the θέραπες of Strato's last line
are surely not Alexis' former admirers (that would be an odd use of the word), but
the 'servants' of Nemesis,[16] those who do pay due respect to her (ἁζόμενοι

---

[14] *Rev. de Philol.* 41 (1967), 76.

[15] 'Bemerkungen zu griechischen Epigrammen: 3', *Hermes* 80 (1952), 499.

[16] It is of course immaterial to this distinction that the 'Nemesis-worshippers' will also have
been Alexis' admirers.

Νέμεσιν, 1. 2) by spitting in their bosoms, and are now therefore in a position to judge him. So since there is no πρίν to be 'understood', the νῦν in Strato's last line has no more point then the νῦν in Rufinus' last line. Indeed, contrary to what Keydell thought, it seems to me that Strato's final νῦν sits rather awkwardly third word in its clause, adding nothing by way of emphasis, whereas Rufinus' νῦν stands quite naturally where it is, qualifying the new idea contained in the phrase ὡς δὲ τάφον· 'it is as though you were now only a tomb that we pass you by'. It might be added that the verb παρέρχεσθαι is particularly well suited to the idea of wayfarers passing by a wayside tomb, whereas, though in no way inappropriate in the general sense 'disregard' (LSJ s.v. IV), there is no such suitable or precise context for it in Strato. Here too such indications as there are point to the priority of Rufinus.

There are three further sets of parallels not discussed by Page. First Rufinus XV (V. 42) and Strato XII. 200, both on the desirability of a lover who is neither too quick nor too slow to give in. Rufinus' poem is a model of conciseness (quoted below, p. 172), Strato's is much longer and more elaborate; beyond the theme they have nothing in common except that both begin with the word μισῶ. There are parallels for this opening,[17] but not elsewhere in connection with this theme, which is not as 'commonplace' as Page alleges, referring to his note on Philodemus, AP XII. 173. 5–6 (Garland of Philip 3528–9). The passages there collected refer to the quite different motif of the attraction of what is forbidden over what is available. Of course it is no great step from the one to the other, but the reason why the coincidence between Rufinus and Strato here is so striking is precisely because they are the only two examples in extant Greek epigram of just this motif. It is this, coupled with the same arresting opening and the other evidence connecting the two poets, that supports the possibility of a connection here too. And if one was inspired by the other, then it must surely have been Strato by Rufinus.

Next the rare word γαλακτοπαγής, which both Rufinus (XXI. 2) and Strato (XII. 204. 4) use purely as a colour term, 'milky white', that is to say ignoring the implication of the second half of the compound. No other example is known, and while it would be rash to exclude the possibility that another poet did so use the word, unless he was an early imperial erotic epigrammatist, even so he would seem in principle to be a less likely source.[18]

Lastly, Rufinus XXVII. 3, reminding a recalcitrant female that she is not so young as she was:

ἤδη καὶ λευκαί σοι ἐπισκιρτῶσιν ἔθειραι.

Theme, vocabulary and structure alike are obviously taken direct from Philodemus XVIII (AP XI. 41). 3:

ἤδη καὶ λευκαί με κατασπείρουσιν ἔθειραι.

But Rufinus has replaced Philodemus' rather ordinary κατασπείρουσιν, 'sprinkle', with the more vivid ἐπισκιρτῶσιν. Compare now Strato XII. 10. 1 (also of hair as a disincentive to love, though in this case that bane of the pederast, the development of facial hair):

εἰ καί σοι τριχόφοιτος ἐπεσκίρτησεν ἴουλος.

Not surprisingly, no other erotic poet seems to have used this bizarre metaphor of hair 'leaping onto' the head of his beloved (whether chin or skull). It is not easy to

[17] e.g. O. Weinreich, Die Distichen des Catull (Tübingen, 1926), 61 f. (taking the influence of Rufinus on Strato for granted) and Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, Odes I. 38. 1 (p. 424).

[18] In my forthcoming book, The Greek Anthology, I shall be discussing a further probable case of Rufinus' influence on Strato, but the argument is too dependent on the wider context there presented to summarize here.

believe that Strato and Rufinus hit on it independently. And here there is a clear
indication of who got the word from whom. Rufinus' point is the *swiftness* with which
the girl's hair is turning white, a warning that she ought to oblige him before it is too
late. ἐπισκιρτᾶν is certainly a dramatic and colourful way of suggesting this. Strato's
point is quite different: for once, he claims, his love is strong enough to survive the
onset of facial hair – even a beard (line 4). Nothing in the rest of the poem suggests
that the appearance of the usually fatal down has been sudden or unexpected. In this
context the violence of ἐπεσκίρτησεν seems unnecessary and unmotivated. It must be
Strato who was the borrower, not perceiving that the metaphor he admired in Rufinus
worked less well in his own context.

All the indications point the same way. It seems clear that Rufinus is the earlier
of the two. The *terminus ante quem* for Rufinus has now become Strato. How closely
can Strato's dates be fixed? Since (like Rufinus) he was not included in Philip's
Garland, and since he is first quoted by Diogenes Laertius (whose own dates cannot
be fixed with any precision), the outside limits would seem to be *c.* A.D. 60 and *c.* A.D.
250. He has generally (and I think rightly) been assigned to the age of Hadrian, though
the evidence has often been disputed, most recently by Keydell and Page.

Here is the poem, a lampoon on an incompetent eye-doctor called Capito (*AP* XI.
117):

> Ἰητρὸς Καπίτων Χρύσην ἐνέχρισεν ὁρῶντα
>   ὀκτὼ μὲν μακρὸν πύργον ἀπὸ σταδίων,
> ἄνδρα δ' ἀπὸ σταδίου, διὰ δώδεκα δ' ὄρτυγα πηχῶν,
>   φθεῖρα δ' ἀπὸ σπιθαμῶν καὶ δύο δερκόμενον.
> νῦν δ' ἀπὸ μὲν σταδίου πόλιν οὐ βλέπει, ἐκ δὲ διπλέθρου   5
>   καιόμενον κατιδεῖν τὸν φάρον οὐ δύναται·
> ἵππον ἀπὸ σπιθαμῆς δὲ μόλις βλέπει, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ πρὶν
>   ὄρτυγος οὐδὲ μέγαν στρουθὸν ἰδεῖν δύναται.
> ἂν δὲ προσεγχρίσας αὐτὸν φθάσῃ, οὐδ' ἐλέφαντα
>   οὐκέτι μήποτ' ἴδῃ πλησίον ἑσταότα.   10

'When Capito the doctor put his ointment on Chryses' eyes he could see (i.e. before
the treatment) a high tower from 8 stades (1416 m), a man from 1 stade (177 m), a
quail from 12 cubits (5·28 m) and a louse from 2 spans (0·44 m). Now he cannot see
the city from 1 stade (177 m) or the lighthouse fire from 2 plethra (59·2 m). He can
scarcely see a horse at 1 span (0·22 m) nor a large ostrich where he could previously
see a quail (i.e. at 12 cubits, 5·28 m). If Capito continues with his ointment, Chryses
won't be able to see an elephant standing right in front of him.'

It was J. G. Schneider who first suggested that Artemidorus Capito, a medical
scholar whose edition of Hippocrates won the favour of Hadrian (Galen, XV. 21
Kühn), was the Capito of this poem. Both the identification and Strato's authorship
of the poem have been denied.

Keydell and Page both object that this is the only non-pederastic poem transmitted
under Strato's name, both strongly suspecting that the ascription is erroneous. R.
Aubreton, editor of the new Budé *AP* XI, athetizes without argument ('titulum
Stratoni perperam tributum...'). Yet it is clearly ascribed to Strato in both *AP* and
APl, and it seems unreasonable to exclude on principle the possibility that an erotic
poet might also on occasion write a satirical poem. That it is an unexpected ascription
is in its favour rather than the reverse; it would not have been an obvious guess – or
even error. The poem would not of course have been included in the μοῦσα παιδική.
Most probably, like other sceptica of the late first and early second century in *AP*
XI, it was taken by Cephalas from the 'Anthology of epigrams' of Diogenianus of
Heraclea. Diogenianus' Anthology may have appeared under Marcus, though his

earliest works go back to Hadrian.[19] Obviously such a person would have been in a particularly good position to lay his hands on an occasional poem by a contemporary poet about a contemporary figure – an argument in favour of the authenticity of poem and subject alike.

Page also argues (a) that the 40-odd names in Strato's pederastic poems are likely to be fictitious, and (b) that most of the names in the scoptica of AP XI are also fictitious, concluding that the Capito of XI. 117 (whoever wrote it) is 'at least as likely to be fictitious as real' (p. 27). But the fact that Strato no doubt used a series of fictitious names for his ἐρώμενοι hardly proves that he would not have used a real name when writing satire. It is true that XI. 117 is embedded in a series of scoptica on doctors (XI. 112–26), most of which are certainly directed against types rather than individuals. But it is fair to point out that 117 stands out from the rest in mildness and the nature of its satire. Most of the others are variations on the monotonous theme of the doctor having only to touch the patient to kill or blind him. In 126, for example, the doctor uses a fork instead of a spatula to anoint his patient's eye and yanks it out. We hardly need to study the stock names to see that these are not poems about real doctors and real patients; 117 is a refreshing change. The sharpness of Chryses' sight before treatment is not exaggerated; after all he must have gone to the doctor for help, and if he could only just make out a man at 177 m and a louse at 44 cm, then he needed help. Nor is the deterioration noted after treatment even grotesque, much less (as usual) fatal. The highest extent of the hyperbole is the prospect of not being able to identify an elephant if he continues with the treatment. The humour of the poem turns less on the doctor's incompetence, in fact, than on the incongruous series of objects by which the patient's vision is measured. Now while the fact that Capito is not demonstrably a 'type' like the doctors of Lucillius and Nicarchus does not in itself guarantee that he was a real person, it does eliminate the only serious argument against. There are other real doctors among the 'types' of AP XI. For example, AP XI. 281 by Palladas on Magnus: a stock name, it might have been assumed, if we did not know Palladas' dates exactly enough to be able to identify Magnus with his celebrated contemporary Magnus of Nisibis, like Palladas a holder of a public chair at Alexandria.[20]

Keydell raised another, quite different sort of objection: the reference to the lighthouse (φάρον) in line 6, he argued, points to Alexandria, whereas on the evidence of the epigrams Strato's world was bounded by Sardis, Smyrna and Ephesus (XII. 193, 202, 226).[21] But the anonymous inscriptional epigram AP IX. 671 commemorates the building of a lighthouse precisely at Smyrna. The man who built it is generally identified, on grounds that are less than compelling, with a proconsul of the same name (Ambrosius) who rebuilt the theatre at Ephesus in the fourth century.[22] Even so, at that date his achievement would surely have been the rebuilding rather than the building of a lighthouse at so important a port; any first- or second-century erection would have fallen in the earthquake that destroyed Smyrna in A.D. 178. So inasmuch as the poet presupposes a lighthouse as a conspicuous local landmark (τὸν φάρον, 'the lighthouse') – and there was one at Smyrna – Keydell's observation tells in favour of rather than against the ascription to Strato and the circumstantial nature of the epigram. [See Addendum, p. 173.]

[19] See the useful discussion in P. Sakolowski, 'De anthologia palatina quaestiones', Diss. Leipzig, 1893, pp. 1–58, and for his date and use by Cephalas, my forthcoming book, ch. 4.
[20] PLRE i s.v. Magnus 7, p. 534.
[21] The reference to the twin Nemesises of Smyrna in XII. 193 suggests local knowledge: cf. C. J. Cadoux, Ancient Smyrna (1938), 220–3.
[22] L. Robert, Hellenica 4 (1948), 62; B. Malcus, 'Die Proconsuln von Asien von Diokletian bis Theodosius II', Opusc. Athen 7 (1967), 134–5; PLRE i. 52.

Page argues that 'the medical scholar who enjoyed the patronage of the emperor was not a likely target for satire of this kind', but we do not know how seriously the satire was intended, how long Capito enjoyed the emperor's favour or what Strato's social position was. V. Buchheit objected that the name Capito was 'im römischen Reich nicht gerade selten'.[23] Over the length and breadth of the Roman world, no doubt, but the question is, how many Greek doctors in the early Empire were called Capito?

To be sure the editor of Hippocrates does not look much like the bad eye-doctor of *AP* XI. 117. But no one who has ever discussed the identification has ever referred to Book IV. 7 of Galen's *de compositione medicamentorum secundum locos* (XII. 731–2 Kühn), where a Capito is twice quoted for medicinal compounds designed to cure sore eyes. There is no direct proof that this is the editor of Hippocrates, but it should be noted that after introducing Artemidorus Capito in full as Ἀρτεμίδωρος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Καπίτων (XV. 21; cf. XVII B. 631, XIX. 83), Galen regularly elsewhere refers to him as simply Καπίτων (XV. 24, 358; XVI. 485, 837; XVII A. 154, 730, 795; XVII B. 97–8, 104, 310), just like the eye-doctor of XII. 731–2. There is no good reason to doubt that they are one and the same man. There would be nothing surprising in the same man being both scholar and practitioner. Galen himself was at once an enormously productive scholar (inter alia he criticized Capito's edition of Hippocrates)[24] and a highly successful practitioner. Medical books did not pay the rent, nor was imperial patronage a dependable source of income.

Greek eye-doctors called Capito are surely not to be multiplied beyond necessity – and it would not be surprising if the unpromising-looking remedies reported by Galen had worked as badly as Strato describes. For what solid grounds are there for doubting Strato's authorship of *AP* XI. 117? If so, then Strato wrote in the age of Hadrian, who reigned from A.D. 117 to 138.

Keydell was for dating him much earlier, in fact to the reign of Nero, arguing that he was known to Martial. It will suffice to quote what Keydell himself claimed as the closest parallel between the two poets, Martial IX. 25 and Strato XII. 175:

> Dantem vina tuum quotiens aspeximus Hyllum,
>   lumine nos, Afer, turbidiore notas.
> quod, rogo, quod scelus est mollem spectare ministrum?
>   aspicimus solem sidera templa deos.
> avertam vultus, tamquam mihi pocula Gorgon
>   porrigat atque oculos oraque nostra petat?
> trux erat Alcides, et Hylam spectare licebat;
>   ludere Mercurio cum Ganymede licet.
> si non vis teneros spectet conviva ministros,
>   Phineas invites, Afer, et Oidipodas.

> ἢ μὴ ζηλοτύπει δούλοις ἐπὶ παισὶν ἑταίρους,
>   ἢ μὴ θηλυπρεπεῖς οἰνοχόους πάρεχε.
> τίς γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἐς ἔρωτ' ἀδαμάντινος; ἢ τίς ἀτειρής
>   οἴνῳ; τίς δὲ καλοὺς οὐ περίεργα βλέπει;
> ζώντων ἔργα τάδ' ἐστίν· ὅπου δ' οὐκ εἰσὶν ἔρωτες
>   οὐδὲ μέθαι, Διοφῶν, ἢν ἐθέλῃς, ἄπιθι·
> κἀκεῖ Τειρεσίαν ἢ Τάνταλον ἐς πότον ἕλκε,
>   τὸν μὲν ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἰδεῖν, τὸν δ' ἐπὶ μοῦνον ἰδεῖν.

---

[23] *Studien zum corpus Priapeorum* (*Zetemata* 28) (München, 1962), 111, alleging also that it is a 'sprechender Name'.

[24] Whence all our knowledge of the man: see the passages from Galen collected by J. Illberg, 'Die Hippokratesausgaben des Artemidorus Kapiton und Dioskurides', *Rheinisches Museum* 45 (1890), 111–37; cf. too F. Pfaff, 'Die Überlieferung des corpus Hippocraticum in der nach-alexandrinischen Zeit', *Wien. Studien* 50 (1932), 67–82.

It is true enough, as Keydell observes, that there is not only a thematic parallel – don't be surprised if your guests stare at your pretty boy slaves – but also a structural parallel, in that both conclude with a similar mythological point. Nevertheless, I believe that this is one of the cases where the differences are as important as the similarities. Martial's poem is much simpler; it is entirely concerned with the guests *looking* at the slaves. Strato's has another element running right through, the effect of the *wine* on the guests in this situation: οἰνοχόους (2), οἴνῳ (4), μέθαι (6), πότον (7), concluding with a more complicated double point. Martial tells the host who does not want his slaves ogled in future to invite only Phineuses and Oedipuses; Strato tells him to invite a Teiresias, that is to say another figure from myth who cannot see, or a Tantalus, who cannot *drink*. One might argue that Martial simplified his model, but it is at least as likely that Strato elaborated his; after all, that was the essence of epigrammatography. One might also note that the pederastic element in the poem is curiously muted for Strato. The implication is that the host did not realize that his guests might find his slave boys attractive. It is surprising to find a friend of Strato making such a mistake. Nor does Strato elsewhere explain the attractiveness of boys by comparing them to girls (cf. θηλυπρεπεῖς, 1. 2); rather he takes it for granted that his readers will find no sexual attraction whatever in the female form (XII. 7, 192, 245). No doubt someone will now query the ascription to Strato; I should prefer to recognize the traces of an original written by a less blatantly pederastic poet.

In fact I think a common source the more likely explanation of all the parallels so far alleged between Martial and Strato. Rather more convincing is V. Buchheit's suggestion[25] that the two introductory poems to the *corpus Priapeorum* were modelled on the two introductory poems to Strato's μοῦσα παιδική. *Priap.* 2 announces that in view of his subject matter the poet will not call on the Muses but on Priapus for inspiration; Strato 1 says that he too will not bother the Muses, but call on Zeus (a notorious pederast). *Priap.* 1 and Strato 2 both tell the reader that he will not find the themes of classical mythology in what follows, but Priapus and Eros respectively, both adding that frowns will not be in place. It is less the parallels by themselves that suggest direct imitation of Strato than the way they are distributed evenly between two separate but complementary prefaces.

I have nothing to add either for or against Buchheit's case, except to remark that the author of the *Priapea* was familiar with both the *Garlands* and, if it had been available, might certainly be expected to have studied the μοῦσα παιδική, an obvious quarry for neat allusions to oral and anal sex, central themes of Priapean poetry.

Buchheit himself believed in a Neronian Strato, early enough to have been read by a poet who (so Buchheit argued) wrote soon after and under the influence of Martial.[26] But we do not need to push him quite so far back to save Buchheit's case. Martial died *c.* A.D. 104. Even if the Capito identification holds, the poem might belong near the beginning of Hadrian's reign (A.D. 117–38) and the μοῦσα παιδική earlier. In any case, there seems no obvious objection to placing the Priapean poet under Hadrian too. It would be ironic but not perhaps wholly inappropriate if two of the more substantial surviving poetical products of the age of Hadrian turned out to be the μοῦσα παιδική and the *Priapea*.

If Strato wrote in the second or third decade of the second century, then Rufinus presumably wrote not long after *c.* A.D. 100 at latest, and quite possibly up to two

---

[25] *Studien zum corpus Priapeorum* (n. 23 above), 109 f.

[26] Buchheit's main thesis that the *Priapea* are the work of one poet writing after Martial has been generally (and rightly) accepted: cf. (e.g.) Zicari, *RFIC* 41 (1963), 355 f.; Kenney, *CR* n.s. 13 (1963), 72 f.

or three decades earlier. That is to say he might well be a contemporary of Martial: born *c.* 40, publishing *c.* 80–100, died *c.* 104. Indeed it is natural to wonder whether he might have been known to Martial.

Page dismisses the idea in a peremptory footnote: 'Martial is no help. Some popular themes are common to Martial and Rufinus, but no epigram by the one is at all like any epigram by the other. Boas gives sufficient answer to Sakolowski on this point.' The facts are that Sakolowski quoted two pairs of parallels,[27] one of them quite unlike, the other very like each other; Boas dismissed the former without argument and the latter by disputing Rufinus' authorship of the epigram in question, on grounds so frivolous that Page (quite rightly) did not bother to mention them.[28] More recently several more parallels, most of them to be sure quite unconvincing, have been quoted by Orsola Autore – who rashly decided that it was Rufinus who was imitating Martial.[29] But it would be rare enough to find an Asiatic Greek of the Second Sophistic who could read Latin at all, much less imitate a Roman poet. Since the matter is not without interest for the study of Martial and potentially crucial for the date of Rufinus, I quote the only two cases that seem to me worth discussing.

First·Rufinus XV (V. 42) and Martial I. 57:

> μισῶ τὴν ἀφελῆ, μισῶ τὴν σώφρονα λίαν·
> ἡ μὲν γὰρ βραδέως, ἡ δὲ θέλει ταχέως.

> Qualem, Flacce, velim quaeris nolimve puellam?
>   nolo nimis facilem difficilemque nimis.
> illud quod medium est atque inter utrumque probamus:
>   nec volo quod cruciat nec volo quod satiat.

We have already seen that the epigrammatic formulation of this motif is not 'commonplace'. Just as Martial repeats *nimis* with both adjectives in his line 1, so too Rufinus wants us to understand λίαν with both adjectives in his line 2. It is not relevant to the possible connection of the two poems that Martial adds a fresh point in another couplet, a girl who neither tortures nor gluts.

Second, Rufinus XIII (V. 37) and Martial XI. 100:

> μήτ' ἰσχνὴν λίην περιλάμβανε[30] μήτε παχεῖαν,
>   τούτων δ' ἀμφοτέρων τὴν μεσότητα θέλε (1–2)...

> habere amicam nolo, Flacce, subtilem...
> sed idem amicam nolo mille librarum:
> carnarius sum, pinguiarius non sum (1, 5–6).

Here both poets develop the theme quite differently, Rufinus rather feebly, Martial going into sundry coarse details. A 'variation on a common theme', comments Page, quoting examples of 'neither very young nor very old' and 'neither too willing nor too reluctant' (that is to say Rufinus XV just quoted), but for 'neither too thin nor too fat' he can only quote οὔτε κατάξηρος οὔτε κατάσαρκος from Alciphron fr. 5 (p. 340 Benner–Fobes), which comes from a description – and Martial XI. 100, which, like Rufinus XIII, is a similar epigrammatic debate about the virtues of thin versus fat, similarly deciding for a compromise.

[27] *De anth. pal. quaest.* (1893), 71.
[28] 'Die Sylloge Rufiniana', *Philologus* 73 (1914), 18.
[29] *Marziale e l'epigramma greco* (Palermo, 1937), 57 f. She also thinks that Strato drew on Martial (winning the support of R. Helm in *Lustrum* 2 (1957), 193–4), but, as already indicated above, I do not find the parallels close enough to convince.
[30] Robert argued that περιλαμβάνω has explicit sexual connotations, quoting several examples, including other first-century epigrammatists, Automedon *AP* V. 129. 7 and Nicarchus, *AP* V. 38. 3: cf. *Rev. de Philol.* 41 (1967), 80.

The most striking thing is less the similarities between the two pairs taken by themselves than the fact that Martial has analogues to *both* these obviously linked and almost consecutive poems of Rufinus.

If Rufinus was known to Martial, then he can hardly have been writing much later than the 70s of the first century. He might after all have only just missed the *Garland* of Philip.

Columbia University   **ALAN CAMERON**

Addendum to p. 169: *AP* ix. 675 also commemorates the erection of a pharos at Smyrna, this time by the Asclepiadae (apparently an association of doctors: E. J. and L. Edelstein, *Asclepius* ii (1945), 54–61; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* i (1972), 343) – perhaps the one destroyed in the earthquake of 178.