

**ANTHOLOGIAE GRAECAE EROTICA:  
THE LOVE EPIGRAMS OR BOOK V.  
OF THE PALATINE ANTHOLOGY. THE  
LOVE EPIGRAMS OF THE PALATINE  
ANTHOLOGY**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649058891

Anthologiae Graecae Erotica: The Love Epigrams or Book V. Of the Palatine Anthology. The Love Epigrams of the Palatine Anthology by W. R. Paton

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**W. R. PATON**

**ANTHOLOGIAE GRAECAE EROTICA:  
THE LOVE EPIGRAMS OR BOOK V.  
OF THE PALATINE ANTHOLOGY. THE  
LOVE EPIGRAMS OF THE PALATINE  
ANTHOLOGY**



THE LOVE EPIGRAMS OF THE  
PALATINE ANTHOLOGY

Constantinus Sept. rtos.  
**ANTHOLOGIÆ GRÆCÆ**  
**EROTICA**

THE LOVE EPIGRAMS OR BOOK V.  
OF THE PALATINE ANTHOLOGY,  
EDITED, AND PARTLY RENDERED  
INTO ENGLISH VERSE, BY

W. R. PATON



LONDON: DAVID NUTT

270-271 STRAND

1898

## P R E F A C E

THE *apparatus criticus* of the present edition is entirely dependent on Stadtmüller's (*Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*, Lipsiae 1894). I have had no opportunity of visiting a library since I began it, and I rely on his references, as I rely on the accuracy of his collations. His statement of the latter is admirably clear and full, but owing to the closeness of the printing it is difficult for the eye to find readily the essential things, and I conceived the notion of printing an edition of the epigrams with only the strictly essential *apparatus*.

This, as far as the mss. as original authorities are concerned, is, it seems to me, in the main, the readings of the Palatine ms. The text Planudes had before him does indeed seem to have been independent of the two texts represented by the two hands (A and C) of the Palatine ms., but this independence is so slight,

and Planudes' or Cephalus' treatment of the text is so drastic, that it is best to ignore the Planudean Anthology altogether, when one can.

As to Suidas, the relation of the text he used to that of the Palatine ms. could not be discussed without discussing Book VI. (the Dedicatory Epigrams), from which he quotes so largely that he almost stands in the position of a separate ms. of the whole. It is, however, evident that the text he had before him very closely resembled, if it were not identical with, that which the first hand (A) of the Palatine ms. transcribed.

This hand (A) is that of an unusually unintelligent scribe, and commits very many blunders. The corrector (C) corrects, as he tells us (see Stadtmüller's edition, p. 373, note to VI. 269), from the copy of a certain Michael. That this ms. represented a tradition independent of the ms. transcribed by A, is shown by the fact that in the passage just referred to (VI. 269), it omitted a couplet which A prefixes to an epigram of Sappho's,<sup>1</sup> a couplet which certainly does not belong to this epigram. There is at the same

<sup>1</sup> The epigram, if not Sappho's, is from a Lesbian stone. A dedication, by a lady, to Artemis Aithopia has been found at Mytilene, and published by M. Theodore Reinach.



time no doubt that it had been revised by a scholar of some learning and taste, who introduced emendations of his own. One case will speak for all. In No. CCXII., line 2, if we did not know from CLIII. that A's Νικῶν is certainly genuine, we should not hesitate in accepting C's pretty correction μικρόν. (Stadtmüller, in fact, has done it.) Therefore, although the greater number of C's corrections are quite certainly right, we must, in cases where there is any internal doubt, give A the preference, allowing at the same time for this scribe's extraordinary carelessness. In these disputed cases confirmation of one reading or the other by Planudes or (when available) Suidas should decide not always as to what the poet wrote, but as to the genuine tradition, as far as we can trace it; although, of course, it is possible that Planudes in some cases may have hit upon the same emendation as C.

I have as a rule neglected all unessential differences between A and C, such as divisions of words, stops, accents, breathings and homophonous letters and diphthongs (*e.g.* ω and ο, or α: and ε). Perhaps I have done this in excess, as A transcribed from a cursive text.

I have, I am sure I shall be told, both intro-

duced too many of my own conjectures into the text, and given, in the notes, too many suggestions of my own as compared with those of others. As regards the latter fault, I would only plead that the conjectures of others are all accessible in Stadtmüller's edition, and that it is not because I think my own more valuable, but because they have, at least, the merit of novelty, that I have done what at first sight may seem arrogant. As regards the former more serious fault I have a better excuse. When one prints a version of a poem based on an emendation, it seems only sensible to print the Greek as one thinks or thought it should be. I have been more careful, or have tried to be more careful, in the epigrams I have not rendered.

The versions I began to make with the view of thoroughly understanding the text of epigrams which I did not understand. To put them into verse is very helpful. Afterwards I went on making versions of other epigrams because the task was pleasant. In the earlier part of the book, and especially in the Stephanus of Meleager, I have tried to be as literal as I could, although, I fear, this has fallen far short of being as literal as I should. In the Byzantine poems

which are written in a language and style dead to the writers—poems to appreciate which one must strip of much of the false gold of their diction and almost reduce to the skeleton of their sentiment—I have allowed myself more liberty.

I have followed Stadtmüller in his division of the book into four sections. His designation of the first section as the Anthology of Rufinus has been questioned, I do not know quite on what grounds; but it is at least a convenient and I think it is a justifiable designation.

In conclusion, I would say to those who do not know it, that the best account in English of the Anthology as a whole is to be found in the Introduction to Mr. Mackail's admirable selection (London, 1890). I should myself diverge slightly from the view he takes as to the nature and poetical treatment of the passion of love in ancient and modern times, but what he says seems to me largely true and well said.

W. R. PATON.

SAMOS,  
*September 1st, 1897.*