

To conclude: Antigonus transmits the original reading of *h. Merc.* 51 (i.e. the one that goes back to the hymn's composer), which deserves to be adopted by editors in preference to *συμφώνους*. Antigonus' close adherence to both his prose and poetic sources supports this conclusion, as does the absence of any other attestation of *σύμφωνος* (and cognates) referring to strings until later technical writing. And finally the hymn's overall emphasis on female animals as a means of Hermes' acquisition of divine honours reinforces the reading *θηλυτέρων*. *συμφώνους* should be taken as a marginal intrusion that found its way into the text. In view of Antigonus' use of *εὐφώνος* (and the *Paradoxographus Palatinus'* *ἔμφωνος*) vs. *ἄφωνος* in the introduction to this citation,<sup>28</sup> it is not difficult to see how such a substitution may have arisen.

Franklin and Marshall College

ATHANASSIOS VERGADOS

athanassios.vergados@fandm.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838807000651

address gender-related problems in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* in the introduction to my commentary on the hymn.

<sup>28</sup> See above p. 737, n. 2 and p. 738, n. 4.

## UNPUBLISHED EMENDATIONS BY PETER ELMSLEY ON EURIPIDES AND ARISTOPHANES

Several books once owned by the English classicist Peter Elmsley (1774–1825) are now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Some contain extensive annotations in Elmsley's hand. These are written in different inks (sometimes in pencil), which indicates (as we might have expected) that they were not all composed in a single sitting. No dates are given, however. Almost all the notes are emendations. Much of the material contained in these marginalia was published by Elmsley during his lifetime, in his own printed editions or in reviews of the editions of others. But some of it has never previously appeared. Of the unpublished emendations, several can be immediately discarded because they have subsequently been found in manuscripts, or were anticipated by scholars writing before Elmsley. Other emendations were made by Elmsley's contemporaries or successors, or do not appear to have been made before. It is with these that I am concerned.

The most interesting volumes are both dated to 1806: anonymous editions of Euripides' *Electra* (Auct. S inf. 1.11)<sup>1</sup> and *Alcestis* (Auct. S inf. 1.12),<sup>2</sup> published at Oxford for use in Westminster School, Elmsley's *alma mater*.<sup>3</sup> The catalogues of the

<sup>1</sup> *Euripidou Elektra. Euripidis Electra. Ex editione Musgravii. Cum variarum lectionum delectu, in usum Scholæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis. Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1806.* Sixty-three pages.

<sup>2</sup> *Euripidou Alkestis. Euripidis Alcestis ex optimis exemplaribus expressa. Cum variis lectionibus, in usum Scholæ Regiæ Westmonasteriensis. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano, MDCCCVI.* Fifty-nine pages.

<sup>3</sup> Apart from the volumes at Oxford, copies of the plays can be found in the British Library, London (*Electra*: 995.f.21.(2.), 995.f.21.(3.); *Alcestis*: 995.f.21.(3.)), the Palace Green Library, Durham (*Electra*: Routh 21.D. 24; *Alcestis*: Routh 21.D.23), the Cambridge University Library

Bodleian and British libraries attribute the *Electra* edition to Peter Elmsley, although there is no external evidence to support this.<sup>4</sup> Recent editors of Euripides' *Electra*<sup>5</sup> do not refer to the book, although it contains one emendation which they attribute to a later scholar, F. A. Paley (at line 1141, δαίμοσιν θύειν σε χρή in place of transmitted χρή σε δαίμοσιν θύη). This should now be awarded to 'anon., fort. Elmsley'. Apart from this there are no significant printed emendations in the book. The *Alcestis* edition is attributed to Thomas Gaisford in the British Library catalogue and to Elmsley in the Durham catalogue. The former is almost certainly correct, as J. H. Monk also attributes the edition to Gaisford in his edition of the *Alcestis* (Cambridge, 1816).

The *Electra* contains thirty-two emendations, the *Alcestis* sixteen. These exclude readings which were (a) already proposed by earlier scholars, (b) later published by Elmsley himself, or (c) which have subsequently been found in medieval manuscripts. They fall into three categories, listed below. I have marked with an asterisk those emendations which Diggle accepts into his text. I begin with the *Electra*.<sup>6</sup>

- (i) 7 are attributed to a scholar who postdates Elmsley: 7 γ' ἔθηκε (R. Haupt, who has \*ἔθηκε), 14 ἔλειπ' (Paley), 22 παῖδ' ὑπ' (Paley), \*117 Τυνδάρειω (Dindorf), 315 ἔδραισιν Ἀσιάδες (Zuntz)<sup>7</sup>, 490 πόδα (Diggle), \*776 καινός (Kvíčala).
- (ii) 12 are attributed to a scholar contemporary with Elmsley: \*19 ἦ (Seidler 1813), \*27 σφε βουλευσάντος (Seidler), \*121 ζόας (Hermann 1816), \*324 οὐπω χοάς ποτ' (Porson 1807), \*374 τᾶρα (Seidler), \*513 οἶν (Schaefer 1811), \*548 ἐρέσθαι (Matthiae 1815), 672 οἴκτειρον (Dobree), 685 κτανεῖν (Seidler), 1117 καὶ σύ γ' (Blomfield), \*1148 <ἐν> (Seidler), \*1207 φοναῖσιν (Seidler).
- (iii) 13 are unattributed: 8 ἡτύχησεν, 23 εἶχε νιν, 122 Αἶδα (Αἶδα Hermann 1816), 243 τῶνδ' ἔτ', 442 Εὐβώιδας (Εὐβοῖδας Seidler), 571 παῖδα, 751 εἵχομεν, 793 ὁ δ', 967 οὐ (for ἦ), 972 ἦν, 1106 ἔπι, 1149 ἀρχέλας, 1250 σε πτόλιν.

And for the *Alcestis*:

- (i) None is attributed to a scholar postdating Elmsley.

(*Alcestis*: Rare Books Room 8700.d.1314), and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (*Electra*: BV001420394). In the United States copies of the *Electra* volume are held by the College of William and Mary, Virginia (881 E8d 1806), Sewanee: The University of the South, Tennessee (PA3973.E5 1806) and Brigham Young University, Utah (Harold B. Lee Library, PA 3462 .W34x 1844). I owe my knowledge of the American copies to Dr Christopher Stray.

<sup>4</sup> Elmsley's chief scholarly concern at this period was his edition of Sophocles, published in Edinburgh in 1805 or shortly afterwards, and of which only one copy survives (see my article 'A newly discovered edition of Sophocles by Peter Elmsley', *GRBS* 47 (2007), 101–6). But he was also working on Euripides. In a letter to his old friend Charles Watkin Williams Wynn (1775–1850), written at Edinburgh on 10 June 1803, he says 'I have finished the text of Sophocles and am employed in the notes, or rather, various readings. I have printed an Edition of the Medea of Euripides, by way of experiment, with many alterations in the orthography. Among others I mark the long vowels (A, I, Y.) whenever they occur. The printers have not the common mark ā, ē, ī, ō, ū united to Greek characters, for which reasons I am forced to use the soft spirit, of which I make no other use. This will appear uncouth to the eye, but in a single play it is of no consequence' (National Library of Wales, Coed y Maen bundle no. 10 (92 letters, dating 1796–1824, numbered 776–869), letter 792). Elmsley later published an edition of the *Medea* in Oxford in 1818 (2nd edn. 1828). The preface makes no reference to an earlier version, nor have I found any mention of it elsewhere.

<sup>5</sup> J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis Fabulae. Tomus II* (Oxford, 1981); G. Basta Donzelli (ed.), *Euripides. Electra*, (Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1995).

<sup>6</sup> Donzelli's edition provides the precise place of publication for many of these conjectures.

<sup>7</sup> G. Zuntz, 'Eine Anmerkung zu Aischylos' "Persern": Αἰς oder Αἰάς?', *Philologus* 127 (1983), 293–5, at 294–5. I owe this reference to Professor James Diggle.

- (ii) 11 are attributed to a scholar contemporary with Elmsley: 34 σφήλαντα (Monk 1816),<sup>8</sup> \*49 χρῆ (Schaefer), \*118 ἀπότομος (Blomfield, *ap.* Monk 1816), 206 τᾶσδ' (Lenting *teste* Wecklein),<sup>9</sup> \*229 πελάσσαι (Erfurdt), 523 μοῖραν (Blaydes),<sup>10</sup> 674 ἄναξ (for ὦ παῖ; Monk 1816 has ὦναξ), 795 πίει (Herwerden *teste* Wecklein),<sup>11</sup> \*1002 προὔθαν' (Monk 1816), 1110 δόμους (Monk 1816), 1119 νῦν (for ναῖ) (Weil).<sup>12</sup>
- (iii) 5 are unattributed: 64 καὶ (for ἦ), 329 ἐμοί, 342 ἀμαρτάνοντα, 347 με (for μου), 625 παῖδ' (for τόνδ').

These emendations could have been made at any point between 1806 (the publication date of the editions) and 1825 (the date of Elmsley's death). Three marginal emendations which Elmsley subsequently published appeared in the years 1812, 1813 and 1814, although this need not mean that the others must come from before this period. However, the fact that many of Elmsley's other published emendations on the text of these plays do not find a place in his marginalia may suggest an earlier rather than a later date for these notes. In the case of group (ii), it is unlikely that Elmsley took the emendations from the published works of those scholars who are traditionally credited with them. If he were doing that, he would most likely have included many more, given the great number of excellent emendations which, say, Seidler included in his edition (cf. e.g. his palmary τακόμαν for τὰν κόμαν at *El.* 1209<sup>13</sup>). Since we do not know whether Elmsley had priority in the case of any given emendation, all those in group (ii) should now be attributed to him as well as to their traditional author. The emendations in group (i) can all be awarded to Elmsley, except that at *Electra* line 7 our apparatus should read 'ἐθῆκε R. Haupt (γ' ἐθῆκε iam Elmsley)'.

What of the new emendations, those in group (iii)? None is certain. Some are best forgotten, such as *El.* 1149 ἀρχέλας. But several are attractive without being compelling, such as *El.* 751 εἴχομεν, 967 οὐ. It would be surprising if none of them found at least a place in the apparatus of a future edition.

I take the remaining Euripidean volumes in order of publication, followed by an edition of Aristophanes. Again, an asterisk before an emendation means that Diggle prints it in his text, or, for Aristophanes, that N. G. Wilson prints it in his forthcoming Oxford Classical Text. Groups (i) and (ii) refer to emendations made by scholars after Elmsley and contemporary with Elmsley respectively. Emendations in the former should henceforth be attributed to Elmsley alone, and those in the latter to Elmsley as well as to their traditional author.

1. Auct. S. infr. 1.10: R. Porson (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba* (Cambridge, 1802), *Euripidis Orestes* (London, 1798), *Euripidis Phoenissae* (London, 1799), *Euripidis Medea* (London, 1801).

- (i) *Or.* \*793 τὸ δ' (Paley), 1578 κτενεῖν (Wecklein).

<sup>8</sup> See J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981), 44.

<sup>9</sup> R. Prinz (ed.), *Euripidis Alceste, editio altera quam curavit N. Wecklein* (Leipzig, 1899), 52. I have not found the conjecture in J. Lenting, *Epistola Critica in Euripidis Alceste* (Zutphen, 1821).

<sup>10</sup> F. H. M. Blaydes, *Miscellanea Critica* (Halle, 1907), 255.

<sup>11</sup> Prinz (n. 9), 57.

<sup>12</sup> H. Weil (ed.), *Euripide. Alceste* (Paris, 1891).

<sup>13</sup> First published in 'Epistola Critica Seidleri', *ap.* C. A. Lobeck (ed.), *Sophoclis Ajax graece* (Leipzig 1809), 433–40, at 438. The letter is dated May 1809, and is not reprinted in Lobeck's two subsequent editions.

- (ii) *Phoen.* \*423 καὶ δωκέ γ' (Schaefer),<sup>14</sup> *Med.* \*753 ἐμμενεῖν (Lenting),<sup>15</sup> \*1281 ὄν (Seidler 1811),<sup>16</sup> \*1290 δῆτ' (Hermann).<sup>17</sup>
2. Auct. S. infr. 1.13: R. Porson (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba* (London, 1808), *Euripidis Orestes* (London, 1811), *Euripidis Phoenissae* (London, 1811), *Euripidis Medea* (London, 1812).
- (i) *Phoen.* 927 δῆτα (Wecklein).
- (ii) *Or.* 701 θέλοις (Schaefer 1824), 737 εἰκὸς ἦν (Seager, denuo Hermann), \*1527 σ' ἄν (Monk), *Phoen.* \*345 ματέρι (Seidler (n. 16), i. 90), \*1710 χέρα (Hermann),<sup>18</sup> \*1746 σκότια (Hermann).<sup>19</sup>

This volume also includes *Phoen.* \*423 καὶ δωκέ γ' (Schaefer), and *Med.* \*1290 δῆτ' (Hermann), which are in Auct. S. infr. 1.10.

3. Auct. S. infr. 1.14: J. Markland (ed.), *Euripidis Supplices Mulieres* (Oxford, 1811) and *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide et in Tauris* (Oxford, 1811).
- (i) *IT* 468 τοὺν ξένου (Diggle), *IA* 84 δῆτα (Nauck, noluit Markland), 967 ἐστρατεύομεν (Monk),<sup>20</sup> 1026 ποῖ (Wecklein).
4. Auct. S. infr. 1.18: P. Invernizi (ed.), *Aristophanis Comoediae* (Leipzig, 1794).
- (i) *Eq.* \*1270 <ἀεῖ> (Dindorf), *Vesp.* \*665–6 speaker attributions (Liston),<sup>21</sup> *Eccl.* \*367 ἀνῆρ (Reisig).
- (ii) *Vesp.* \*1262 τᾶρ' (in fact τᾶρ') (Hermann),<sup>22</sup> *Av.* \*1438 τοῖ (Dobree).<sup>23</sup>

This volume contains an emendation on the *Acharnians* which is also found in Elmsley's 1809 edition of the play: namely, ἀνῆρ at 494 (written ἀ'νῆρ), which is attributed to van Leeuwen in S. D. Olson's recent commentary (Oxford, 2002).<sup>24</sup>

Elmsley's papers also include two sets of notes preparatory to an edition of the *Helen*.<sup>25</sup> In the former we find the emendation ἐχθίστης line \*72, which Diggle

<sup>14</sup> R. Porson (ed.), *Euripidis Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae et Medea* (Leipzig, 1824) (with notes by G. H. Schaefer).

<sup>15</sup> J. Lenting (ed.), *Euripidis Medea* (Zutphen, 1819).

<sup>16</sup> J. F. A. Seidler, *De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1811–12), 1.155–6.

<sup>17</sup> J. G. J. Hermann (ed.), *Euripidis Medea* (Leipzig, 1822).

<sup>18</sup> J. G. J. Hermann, *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae* (Leipzig, 1816), 761.

<sup>19</sup> In A. Matthiae (ed.), *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta*, 10 vols. (Leipzig, 1813–37), 1.239 (1813) (emendation in text), 6.416 (1821) (emendation attributed to Hermann).

<sup>20</sup> J. H. Monk (ed.), *Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide* (Cambridge, 1840).

<sup>21</sup> H. Liston, 'Notes on the *Vespae* of Aristophanes. Part II', *CJ* 32.63 (September, 1825), 40–6, at 44–5.

<sup>22</sup> J. G. J. Hermann (ed.), *Orphica* (Leipzig, 1805), on *Argonautica* 1176 (p. 216).

<sup>23</sup> P. P. Dobree, *Adversaria*, ed. J. Scholfield, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1833–43), 2.229.

<sup>24</sup> Elmsley also adopts ἀνῆρ (which he prints ἀ'νῆρ) at *Ach.* 423 and 479 (in his printed edition and in his marginalia to Invernizi), but in these cases he is anticipated by Bentley ('Bentleii emendationes ineditae in Aristophanem No. IV', *CJ* 12.24 (December 1815), 352–66, at 362) and Brunck (his edition, Strasbourg, 1783) respectively (I owe these references to Professor Colin Austin). Bentley advocates ὄνῆρ, while Brunck prints ὠ'νῆρ: both of these are simply different ways of representing crasis of ὄ + ἀνῆρ. Olson attributes these changes to Ribbeck *duce Bentleio* and van Leeuwen respectively (noting in the latter that Brunck has ὄνῆρ).

<sup>25</sup> Bodley MS Clar. Press d. 28 (fols. 267–364) and 30 (130–82, 215–318).

attributes to Dingelstad.<sup>26</sup> In a letter to Blomfield written on 8 February 1813<sup>27</sup> Elmsley says that he is preparing an edition of the *Helen* similar to that of his *Heracidae*, so the notes probably date to around that time.<sup>28</sup>

*All Souls College, Oxford*

P. J. FINGLASS

patrick.finglass@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0009838807000663

<sup>26</sup> H. Dingelstad, *De Euripidis Helena* (Munich, 1865), 51. I am grateful to Miss Claire Wilkinson for checking this reference for me in the Cambridge University Library.

<sup>27</sup> Bodley MS Autogr. d. 24 150–1.

<sup>28</sup> I am grateful to Professor Christopher Collard, Professor James Diggle and Mr Nigel Wilson for helpful comments; and to Professor Colin Austin, Dr Christopher Stray and Miss Claire Wilkinson for assistance acknowledged in earlier notes.

## EURIPIDES, *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS* 123–36<sup>1</sup>

### ΧΟΡΟΣ

εὐφραμεῖτ' ὦ  
πόντου δισσὰς συγχωρούσας  
πέτρας ἀξείνου ναίοντες. 125

ὦ παῖ τὰς Λατοῦς  
Δίκτυνν' οὐρεῖα,  
πρὸς σὰν ἀλλὰν κεῦστύλων  
ναῶν χρυσήρεις θριγκοὺς  
όσας ὅσιον πόδα παρθένιον 130

κληιδούχου δούλα πέμπω,  
'Ελλάδος εὐίππου πύργους  
καὶ τεῖχ' ἡρότων τ' ἐὺδένδρων  
ἐξαλλάξας † Εὐρώπαν† 135

— ἔμολον· τί νέον; τίνα φροντίδ' ἔχεις;  
τί με πρὸς ναοὺς ἄγαγες ἄγαγες,  
ὦ παῖ τοῦ . . . ;

123n ΧΟΡΟΣ Tyrwhitt: *Ιφ.* L (cf. 137) 125 ἀξείνου Markland:

εὐξ- L 127 Δίκτυνν' Barnes: -υν' L 128 κεῦστύλων Koechly:

εὐστ- L 130 ὅσιον πό- πα- Seidler: πό- πα- ὅσιον ὅσιος L

132 εὐίππου p: τὰς εὐ- L 137n Χο. hic L 138 ἄγες bis L, corr. Tr<sup>2</sup>

Kovacs and Cropp both have the assignation right here (as above), with most editors. Previously Diggle had accepted Taplin's 'tentative' speaker-change at 126 between 123–5 (*Ιφ.*) and 126–42 (*Χο.*);<sup>2</sup> and this has recently been followed by

<sup>1</sup> I have discussed the First Stasimon (*I.T.* 392–455) in *CQ* 56 (2006), 404–13. I refer especially to the Oxford Text of J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1981) and the editions of M. Platnauer (Oxford, 1938), D. Kovacs, *Euripides*, vol. 4, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1999) and M. J. Cropp (Warminster, 2000). The most recent commentary on *I.T.* is that of P. Kyriakou (Berlin, 2006). The text and apparatus given follow those of Diggle in matters not covered by my discussion.

<sup>2</sup> O. P. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), 194, n. 3.