

# Unpublished Conjectures at Leiden on the Greek Dramatists

*P. J. Finglass*

**I**N THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY at Leiden there are many unpublished autograph manuscripts and marginalia in printed editions which contain numerous conjectures on the Greek dramatists.<sup>1</sup> In July 2007 and July 2008 I spent a total of ten days examining some of them. The results are presented in this article, which is divided into four parts: I, The conjectures themselves; II, An assessment of the consequences of this discovery; III, An investigation into why Valckenaer never published his extensive work on Sophocles; IV, The fate of other manuscripts on Greek drama written by Valckenaer and Pierson.

## I. *The conjectures*

The manuscripts and marginalia present dozens of conjectures which anticipate the work of later scholars, or which have subsequently appeared in manuscripts uncollated at that time,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The manuscripts are catalogued in [P. C. Molhuysen], *Codices Bibliothecae Publicae Latini* (*Codices Manuscripti* III [Leiden 1912]: “BPL” in the manuscript shelfmarks) and online (see under <http://ub.leidenuniv.nl/collecties/bijzonder/> [checked 20<sup>th</sup> February 2009]). The online book catalogue (U-CAT) records whether a given volume has scholarly marginalia, and its author (for a given entry click on “[Show](#)” next to “Availability”).

<sup>2</sup> Particular caution is required with this kind of anticipatory conjecture, since we cannot always tell which manuscripts were available to scholars at different times. For the value of this information cf. M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* (Stuttgart 1973) 87 n.13: “Conjectures that have been confirmed e.g. by a papyrus deserve to be recorded as such, for the honour of their authors and as evidence that emendation is a worthwhile endeavour.”

as well as a few reasonable emendations which do not appear to have been suggested by anyone else. I go through the scholars in order of their birth dates: Scaliger, Hemsterhuis, Wesseling, D'Arnaud, Valckenaer, Reiske, Bernard, Pierson. For each scholar, I take each dramatist in turn, again in birth date order. A given manuscript sometimes contains conjectures by more than one scholar; a given scholar sometimes makes the same conjecture in more than one place.

As well as the Leiden manuscripts, I include two manuscripts now held at the National Art Library in London which record conjectures by a Dutch scholar; it would be artificial to treat them separately from the Leiden material. Indeed, as we shall see in section IV below, these were not the only such documents which crossed the Channel.

After each conjecture I cite in brackets the scholar who first made the conjecture in a published work, together with the year in which it was published, if I have managed to find this. I had intended to give the exact places of publication, but the sheer number of anticipatory conjectures means that this would have added considerable bulk to the article for little gain: after all, the unpublished material makes such details obsolete. When a conjecture has subsequently appeared in manuscripts which were unknown at the time, I write "MS" or "MSS" after the conjecture. Throughout I mark with an asterisk emendations adopted in the following critical editions: for Aeschylus the Teubner, for Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes the OCT, and for fragments, *TrGF* and *PCG*.

Many conjectures in these manuscripts are not published here, on grounds of quality. Selection is vital in a task like this: neither past nor present scholars are served if every last piece of long-buried marginalia is exhumed irrespective of its plausibility. But quality is a subjective criterion, and I cannot be sure that I have recorded every conjecture that might have a reasonable claim to a place in the apparatus of a critical edition.

#### 1. SCALIGER

J. J. Scaliger (1540–1609) is one of the greatest of all classical scholars. For his work see A. T. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger. A Study*

in the *History of Classical Scholarship* I–II (Oxford 1983–1893).<sup>3</sup>

(i) Aeschylus

Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes in Aeschylum et Euripidem* (BPL 387) attributes the following to Scaliger:

*Suppl.* 879 φουάζεις (Stanley)

(ii) Sophocles

A copy of H. Stephanus's edition of Sophocles (Geneva 1568) which belonged to Scaliger and contains his marginalia is preserved in the library at Leiden under the shelfmark 756 D 25.<sup>4</sup> The title page has a note "Ger. Vossius [i.e. Gerhard

<sup>3</sup> Some of Scaliger's marginalia on two of the tragedians have already been investigated. The marginalia in the edition of Aeschylus at Leiden by P. Victorius (Geneva 1557), shelfmark 756 D 21, have long been known to scholars: see e.g. E. D. M. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950) I 66–67, and M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990) 359. C. Collard investigated two editions of Euripides with marginalia by Scaliger in the Bodleian Library in Oxford: "J. J. Scaliger's Euripidean *Marginalia*," *CQ* N.S. 24 (1974) 242–249.

<sup>4</sup> This book is mentioned by J. J. Reiske in a letter to Valckenaer dated 22<sup>nd</sup> June 1743 (see 203 below; the reference is on p.114 n.1), in which he gives its correct shelfmark and cites a reading from it. He later refers to it in the unpaginated introduction to his *Animadversiones ad Sophoclem* (Leipzig 1753), where he says that Valckenaer had shown it to him. J. Burton published some of the conjectures in it in his *Πενταλογία sive Tragoediarum Graecarum delectus* (Oxford 1758). From Burton's citations, P. Elmsley, *Sophoclis Oedipus Coloneus* (Oxford 1823) v–vi, deduced that the edition in question was that of Stephanus published in 1568. Dobree, in his review of Elmsley's edition (*Classical Journal* vol. 28 no. 56 [1823] 356–363, at 360), says "Unless our memory fails us, there is a copy of Stephens' edition with Scaliger's notes amongst Isaac Vossius' books in the Leyden library. It contains, as far as we remember, very little." The review is anonymous, but C. Stray *ap.* P. J. Finglass, "A Newly-discovered Edition of Sophocles by Peter Elmsley," *GRBS* 47 (2007) 101–116, at 105 n.8, suggested on stylistic grounds that the author of this piece may be Dobree. I can now confirm Stray's attribution, since the account of Elmsley's suppressed edition of Sophocles given on p.362 of the review (quoted in my article at 105–106) is also found in the following undated marginal comment by Dobree (published in his *Adversaria* [ed. J. Scholefield (Cambridge 1831–1833)] II 34): "504–5. χρη στέμμι — τουξειθεν ἄλσος — τὸδ' Elmsl. E.R. 37 p. 80. et, ni fallor, in textu Sophoclis, quem olim impressum ipse abolevit. Memini emendationem, in textum istum receptum, Porsono minus certam esse visam." "Memini" indicates

Vossius (1577–1649)] emit me sibi in auctione librorum maximi viri Jos. Scaligeri, cuius manu non pauca ad oram codicis adscripta.” The book includes several conjectures already attributed to Scaliger,<sup>5</sup> but also several which are not, and which anticipate the work of later scholars:

- Aj.* 1077 μέγας (Spanheim [1629–1710], teste Lobeck 1835)  
*OT* 189 εὐῶπι (Erfurdt 1811; noluit Lobeck 1809)  
 1134 lacuna of one line (Kennedy 1885)  
 1279 αίματόεις (αίματούς Heath 1762)  
 1505 περούδης (Dawes 1745)  
*Ant.* 212 lacuna of one line (Bruhn 1913)  
 695 φθίνειν (Nauck 1886)  
*Phil.* 491 δειράδ’ ἦ (Pierson 1762)  
 \*576 μή νυν (Brunck 1786, tacite)

There are four further points of interest:

At *El.* 1065 Scaliger writes γ’ ἀρ’ after δαρὸν. In 1815 Fröhlich inserted only γ’ in the same place. It would be misleading to say that that Scaliger anticipated Fröhlich: but perhaps an apparatus could read “γ’ Fröhlich (γ’ ἀρ’ iam Scaliger).”

Scaliger transposes *Trach.* 84 and 85, and emends ἦ in 84 to καί, but this change is proposed by Willem Canter in the unpaginated notes at the end of his edition (Antwerp 1579), who probably anticipates Scaliger. Scaliger does propose another transposition, that of *OC* 1376–1379 to after 1368. These are the earliest transpositions known to me in the text of Sophocles.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, the lacunae which Scaliger suggests at *OT* 1134 (above), and also after *OT* 1255 and *OC* 1119, are to the best of

---

that Dobree is referring to personal experience of Porson’s reaction, not to knowledge of it taken from the review.

<sup>5</sup> *Ant.* 110 ὅς (but not Πολυνείκους), 355 φώνημα, 955 ὀξύχολος, *Trach.* 292 τὰ, *Phil.* 1330 ἕως (attributed to Scaliger by Jebb, but more correctly awarded to Lambinus: see J. Masson, “A Lost Edition of Sophocles’ Philoctetes,” *JPh* vol. 16 no. 31 [1887] 114–123, at 118), *OC* 786 τῆσδε, 942 αὐτοῖς, 1210 σώς, 1259 πίνος.

<sup>6</sup> West, *Studies* 364, writes of Casaubon (1559–1614): “Among his conjectures are three transpositions in *Supplices* ... In Aeschylus, at any rate—I cannot speak for other authors—Casaubon seems to be a pioneer of this form of emendation.”

my knowledge the first posited for Sophocles' text, together with those proposed by Canter.

At *Ant.* 782 Scaliger writes ἤγουν κτήνεσι. This is presumably an interpretation of transmitted κτήμασι rather than a conjecture, and as such anticipates Brunck 1786.

At *OC* 1454 after ἐπεὶ μὲν ἔτερα Scaliger writes τὸ ἐναντίον τῷ αὐξει, which suggests that he was the first to recognise the need for a participle balancing αὐξων.

Three of the above conjectures (*Aj.* 1077, *OT* 1505, *Ant.* 695), together with others which I am not publishing, are attributed to Scaliger by Valckenaer in his manuscript *Observationes in Sophoclem* (BPL 384). When citing Scaliger's work, Valckenaer sometimes specifies that he found it "in notis MSS." (p.23 verso) or "in ora libri" (16 recto and 50 recto). All of these citations, however, can be found in Scaliger's edition of Sophocles. So while it is possible that "in notis MSS." and "in ora libri" refer to different sources, this is not necessary.

One more conjecture is attributed to Scaliger in an edition of Sophocles published in Cambridge in 1669 and owned by Valckenaer (shelfmark 755 D 12):

*Trach.* 636 Μαλίδα (Heusinger 1745)<sup>7</sup>

(iii) Euripides

Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes in Aeschylum et Euripidem* (BPL 387) attributes the following to Scaliger:

*HF* \*149 τε κοινεών (Heath 1762)

## 2. HEMSTERHUIS

Born in 1685, Tiberius Hemsterhuis was Professor of Greek at Franeker from 1717 until he moved to a chair at Leiden in 1740, where he remained until his death in 1766. A famous eulogy delivered after his death by David Ruhnkenius has recently been issued in a new edition: H. Nikitinski, *David Ruhnkenius. Elogium Tiberii Hemsterhusii* (Munich/Leipzig 2006), on which see D. J. Butterfield, *BMCR* 2007.05.34.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Scaliger's comment in *Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* (Paris 1577) 85: "Sophocles qui Attice loquebatur μηλίδα dixit: Sed ipsi Trachinii, qui loquebatur Dorice, μαλίδα dicebant." This may be Valckenaer's source.

## (i) Sophocles

A copy of Stephanus' edition of Sophocles (Geneva 1568), shelfmark 755 B 22, is signed "L. C. Valckenari 1743" on the flyleaf, and contains Valckenaer's marginalia. On the title page Valckenaer has written "cum collatione accurata Cod. Reg. Paris. instituta a clar. Ti. Hemst." Then, above the section marked ΓΕΝΟΣ ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ is written: "MS. Regium Paris ad edit. Pauli Stephani contulerat Cl. T. H. qui editionem, ad quam MS. contulerat, mihi utendam concessit mense Augusto 1764 Leidae—indidem enotata recepi in hanc editionem eodem modo descripta quo ea notaverat ὁ πάνυ." A further note on p.144 reveals that the collation was limited to the whole of *Ajax* and *Electra*, together with the choral sections of the other plays.

The edition by P. Stephanus (Geneva 1603) to which Valckenaer refers is also in the Leiden library, shelfmark 757 C 1, signed "Hemst." on the flyleaf. It records many readings from **A** as Valckenaer describes. There are no conjectures in the volume. I discuss the significance of Hemsterhuis's collation in section II below.

## (ii) Aristophanes

Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes Criticae in Scriptores Graecos* (BPL 493, dated 1757) attributes the following to Hemsterhuis:

*Eq.* 635 Κοάλεμοί τε (Dobree 1833 e schol.; he died in 1825)  
The manuscript also attributes *Plut.* 1020 με to Hemsterhuis, which Wilson attributes to "edd." This was already known to be Hemsterhuis's, however, since he published it in his edition (Harlingen 1744, p.370).

## 3. WESSELING

Petrus Wesseling (1692–1764) was Professor of rhetoric at Franeker (from 1723) and then Professor of rhetoric, history, and Greek at Utrecht (from 1735 until his death).

## (i) Sophocles

The National Art Library in London owns two manuscripts by Wesseling on Sophocles. Both are primarily exegetical, but do have a very small number of conjectures. The first (Dyce MS 59 25.F.55) is entitled *Viri clarissimi et doctissimi Petri Wesselingii eloquentia* [sic] & *historiarum ut et Graecae linguae in alma*

*academica civitatis Trajectinae ordinarii professoris in Sophoclis Ajacem dictata* and dates to 1751. In it we find the following:

- Aj. \*122 ἔμπαζ (Heath 1762)  
 \*554b: *del.*, citing Stobaeus (Valckenaer 1768)  
 \*954/5: κελαινώπη (and so presumably θυμῶ) (Lloyd-Jones and Wilson 1990, who prefer κελαινώπα)

This manuscript also records the \*deletion of 839–842 already known to be by Wesseling, although its location was not known. The source of this attribution appears to be C. G. A. Erfurdt, who remarks in his edition (Leipzig 1811, p.594) “Wesselingius non alienus erat ab eorum sententia, qui hunc versum [839] cum tribus insequentibus obelo configerent.” Erfurdt helpfully records his source as follows (p.659): “Commentario huic inserta Wesselingiana sciat Lector desumpta esse ex Viri Celeberrimi dictatis ad Ajacem, quae in manus meas venerunt ex auctione librorum D. Hoola van Nooten Trai. 1808. divenditorum.”<sup>8</sup> These lines were also deleted by J. Toup (1713–1785) *ap.* Anonymous, “In Sophoclis Ajacem emendationes,” *The Classical Journal* vol. 15 no. 30 (1817) 371–372. The three volumes of Toup’s first book, his *Emendationes in Suidam* (Oxford), appeared in 1760, 1764, and 1766, which indicates that he was actively pursuing classical scholarship in the late 1750s. But nothing suggests that he was making conjectures as early as 1751, so we should retain the attribution to Wesseling.

A second manuscript (Dyce MS 58 25.F.54), dated to 1745, is entitled *Dictata Petri Wesselingii in Sophoclis Philoctetem*. In it we find the conjecture βίον at *Phil.* 1282, which he had earlier rejected in his book *Observationum Variarum Libri Duo* (Amsterdam 1727) 214–215. But Wesseling was anticipated in proposing the change by Samuel Battier (1667–1744), Professor of Greek at Basel from 1704, whose conjecture was published in the posthumous article “Samuelis Battierii notae quaedam in Sophoclis tragoedias,” *Museum Helveticum ad iuvandas literas in publicos usus apertum* 24 (1752) 612–617, at 617. All this is long before E. Mehler, “Inter ambulandum decerpta,” *Mnemosyne* N.S. 17

<sup>8</sup> According to a note in the manuscript, it subsequently came into the possession of B. F. Tydeman (1784–1829), and was acquired at a sale of his books by Alexander Dyce in Leiden in 1832; he then left it to the library.

(1889) 98–113, at 100–101, to whom Lloyd-Jones and Wilson award the conjecture. Hence the apparatus should read “βίον] βιὸν Battier (noluit Wesseling).”

#### 4. D’ARNAUD

George D’Arnaud (1711–1740) published his first book at the age of seventeen: *Specimen animadversionum criticarum. Ad aliquos scriptores graecos* (Harlingen 1728<sup>1</sup>, Amsterdam 1730<sup>2</sup>). An account of his life is provided in Hemsterhuis’s “Oratio in obitum Georgii Arnaldi,”<sup>9</sup> which describes his visit to Leiden some time in the 1730s as follows:

Interea, ut cupiditati suae velificaretur, susceptum est iter Leidense ... Maxime tamen oculos praestringebat Bibliothecae Lugduno Batavae voluminum cariosorum manuque descriptorum thesaurus dives; ex quibus oculo curioso consultis comparatisque quod in rem suam esset, cultamque summa cum laude studiorum rationem magis magisque firmaret, colligere ardebat. Hoc autem ARNALDI institutum ad Sophoclem praecipue pertinebat: illum explicare, illum subsidiis undecumque collatis nova luce donare meditabatur. Huius quidem operae, quae haud temere a quovis alio melior aut instructor expectari poterat, damnum molestissime ferremus, nisi maiore lucro et sibi et orbi literato pensasset.

As we shall see, he will not be the only scholar at Leiden from whom an edition of Sophocles would be desired in vain. For the use of the vernacular “D’Arnaud” rather than “Arnaldus” see West, *Studies* 366 n.37.

##### (i) Aeschylus

In his manuscript *Observationes in Aeschylum et Euripidem* (BPL 387) Valckenaer attributes one conjecture to D’Arnaud:

*Suppl.* \*747 κατεργινωμένους (Voss)

#### 5. VALCKENAER

Ludovicus Caspar Valckenaer (1715–1785) was Professor of

<sup>9</sup> Published in *Ti. Hemsterhusii orationes, quarum prima est de Paulo Apostolo. L. C. Valckenari tres orationes, quibus subiectum est Schediasma, specimen exhibens Adnotationum Criticarum in loca quaedam Librorum Sacrorum Novi Foederis. Praefiguntur duae orationes Ioannis Chrysostomi in laudem Pauli apostoli, cum veteri versione Latina Aniani, ex Cod. MS. hic illic emendata* (Leiden 1784) 157–180 (quotation from 173).



Greek at Franeker from 1741 and then at Leiden from 1766 until his death. He is best known in this field for his editions of Euripides' *Phoenissae* (Franeker 1755) and *Hippolytus* (Leiden 1768); in these, and his other books, he emends many passages across the whole of Greek drama.<sup>10</sup> He is particularly renowned as the first scholar to employ deletion as a frequent critical tool.<sup>11</sup>

In what follows I do not record the extensive conjectures on the scholia of the dramatists found in these manuscripts, since I have no expertise in this area, and would be unable to assess their quality and significance. But future editors of the scholia should certainly consult them.

(i) Aeschylus

Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes in Aeschylum et Euripidem* (BPL 387) contains the following. The part of the manuscript which relates to Aeschylus is undated; for the Euripidean section, see (iii) below.

- Pers.* 702 λέξων (Herwerden 1877)  
*Suppl.* 186 τεθυμμένος (Abresch 1763)  
 250 πάρεμι' (Burges 1811)  
 355 πρόπονθ' ὄμιλον (Hermann)  
 383 τούς (Tournier)  
 405 μεταλλάς (Maas)  
 456 χ' ἄ (Wakefield)  
 \*510 <σ'> (Porson 1806)  
 597 κράτος (Heath 1762)

<sup>10</sup> For a bibliography of Valckenaer's published works see Anonymous, review of J. O. Sluiter, *Lectiones Andocidae* (Leiden 1804), *The British Critic* 26 (1805) 413–432, at 426–431.

<sup>11</sup> For Valckenaer as a deleter see D. Ruhnkenius, *Epistola Critica I in Homeridarum Hymnos et Hesiodum, ad virum clarissimum, Ludov. Casp. Valckenarium* (Leiden 1749) 6–8, especially 7: “certe si a Josepho Scaligero, Nicolao Heinsio, Richardo Bentleio, paucisque aliis discesseris, quotusquisque ex immensa ista Emendatorum turba ullum spurium versum obelo confodit?”; and W. Dindorf, *Sophoclis Tragoediae* (Leipzig 1825) p. lvii: “quem [sc. *Aj.* 554b] ab Stobaeo Serm. LXXVIII.9. omissum primus notavit peritissimus hoc genus rerum iudex Valckenarius.” The earliest securely dated deletion in the text of Sophocles known to me was proposed by Jean Boivin de Ville-neuve (1663–1726) in 1718: see the appendix to my article “The Ending of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*,” *Philologus* 153 (2009).

- \*746 ἐν μεσημβρίᾳς (Schütz 1794)  
 748 μέ (Blaydes 1902)  
 864 βᾶτ' ἐπὶ βᾶριν πρὸ (πρὶν Heath) κακοπαθεῖν (Heath 1762)
- Ag.* 492 τερπνῶν (F. W. Schmidt 1886)  
 801 τεθραμμένος (Meineke)  
 \*814 φθορᾶς (Dobree 1833)  
 1416 εὐτόκοις λοχεύμασιν (Maehly)
- Cho.* \*95 καλῶν (Elmsley 1813)  
 172 πλὴν ἑνός (Dobree 1833)  
 567 ἔστ' (Orelli)  
 786 καιρίως (Burney)
- Eum.* 213 ἦρκεσεν (Wellauer 1824; -ε iam Musgrave)  
 446 ἐφημμένη (Doederlein 1820)
- PV* 157 ἐγγήθει (MSS, Elmsley 1810)  
 446 ἔννοιαν (Wakefield 1793)

In his Teubner Aeschylus (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1990, revised 1998), M. L. West cites two emendations (*Suppl.* 507, 750) by Valckenaer “in schedis ineditis” (p. LXXVI), two (*Ag.* 454, 474) “in exemplari quod Hermannus possedit” (probably the book which Moritz Haupt mentions in his preface to Hermann’s edition [Leipzig 1852, I xvii]: “Scaligeri coniecturas etiam a Valckenario exemplari Stephaniano adscriptae Hermannus possidebat”), and three (*Suppl.* 502, 1067, *Eum.* 693) whose location he was unable to trace. Of these, *Suppl.* 502, 507, and 750 are in BPL 387.

(ii) Sophocles

In Valckenaer’s manuscript *Observationes in Sophoclem* (shelf-mark BPL 384) we find the following. Although there is no date for the manuscript as a whole, various dates jotted in it by Valckenaer suggest that it was composed between 1743 and 1746.<sup>12</sup>

- Aj.* 64 ἄγων (Blaydes 1875)<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> They are: July 1746 (24 verso), 11<sup>th</sup> January 1744 (37 recto), November 1744 (58 verso), 13<sup>th</sup> December 1743, 14<sup>th</sup> February, and 2<sup>nd</sup> November 1744 (all 66 recto), 20<sup>th</sup> December 1743 (78 recto), 9<sup>th</sup> January 1744 (85 verso). This dating is also confirmed by Valckenaer’s correspondence, cited below, section III.

<sup>13</sup> Valckenaer cites *Aj.* 234, 296, and *Ant.* 202 in support of the conjecture.

- \*79 adds question mark (Brunck 1786)<sup>14</sup>  
 85 δεδοκότι (Toup)<sup>15</sup>  
 560 ὑβρίσει (MS, Brunck 1786)  
 569 Ἐριβοίαν (Schaefer 1808)  
 715 ἀναύδατον (Lobeck 1809)  
 \*1051 οὔκουν (MS, Brunck 1786 tacite)  
 1054 ζητοῦντ' ἔτ' (van Eldik 1764)  
 1087 ῥέπει (Mekler)<sup>16</sup>  
*El.* \*917 αὐτός (Brunck 1779)  
 1170 *del.* (Zippmann 1864)  
*OT* 54 ἦσπερ (Blaydes 1859)<sup>17</sup>  
 1461 ποτ' ἴσχειν (Blaydes 1859)  
 \*1474 ἐκγόνοιον (MSS)  
*Ant.* 46 *del.* (Benedict 1820)<sup>18</sup>  
 169 ἐμπέδους (Reiske 1753)  
 1081 καθηγίσαν (Reiske 1753)  
 \*1149 *del.* παῖ (Schubert)<sup>19</sup>  
*Trach.* 280 *del.* (van Deventer 1851)  
 283 γ' (Erfurdt 1802)  
 368 ἐκτεθέρμανται (Dindorf 1860)  
 396 κἀνανεώσασθαι (\*κἀνν- Hermann 1827)  
 825 ἀνακωχάν (ἀνο- MS)  
 1054 πνευμόνων (πλ- Süvern 1802)  
*Phil.* 228 γ' ἀλώμενον (Heath 1762)  
 \*1379 κἀποσώσοντας (Heath 1762)  
*OC* 75 ἴσθ' (*Paris.gr.* 2886)<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Valckenaer retains οὐκοῦν: Brunck is the first to print οὔκουν.

<sup>15</sup> J. Toup, in the posthumous article cited 193 above (p.372); for the reason stated there, Valckenaer can be presumed to have anticipated him.

<sup>16</sup> S. Mekler, *teste* A. Nauck, *Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin* I (Berlin 1888<sup>9</sup>) 196. It does not appear in W. Dindorf, *Sophoclis Tragoediae*, rev. S. Mekler (Leipzig 1885<sup>6</sup>), nor in S. Mekler, *Lectio-num Graecarum Specimen* (Vienna 1882).

<sup>17</sup> Valckenaer compares *OT* 237.

<sup>18</sup> Valckenaer cites *Aj.* 1267 as a possible source for the line.

<sup>19</sup> F(riedrich) Schubert, *Sophokles' Antigone* (Vienna/Leipzig 1906<sup>7</sup>) or earlier (though not in his first edition, Prague/Leipzig 1883).

<sup>20</sup> This manuscript is a 16<sup>th</sup>-century apograph of *Laurentianus* 32.9 written by Aristobulus Apostolides and incorporating some alterations by him, from whatever source (cf. A. Turyn, *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles* [Urbana 1952] 184). If these are his own emendations, he would

92 οἰκίσαντα (Doederlein 1812)  
 \*180 προβίβαζε (MSS)  
 368 μήτε (Benedict 1820)  
 1069 *del.* φάλαρα (Bothe 1806)<sup>21</sup>

The following reasonable new emendations also appear in the manuscript:

*OT* 1388 ἀθλιού (comparing *OC* 344)  
*Ant.* 414 λόγοισι (comparing *Trach.* 263–264)  
*Trach.* 1168 παλαιγλώσσου  
*Phil.* 249 οὐκ ἄρ'  
*OC* 1118 *del.*  
 1191 εἰς ἐκείνον

There is also a copy of the edition of Sophocles published in Cambridge in 1669 (shelfmark 755 D 12) which contains Valckenaer's conjectures.<sup>22</sup> There is no date on the flyleaf to indicate when the book came into Valckenaer's possession, but on p.443 he refers to a letter from van Eldik to Ruhnkenius dated 28<sup>th</sup> April 1770, which indicates that he was annotating the volume towards the end of his life.

*Aj.* 378 ἔχη (MS)  
 \*776 τοι (Hermann 1825 and Dobree 1833)  
 \*1141 τοῦθ' ἔν (Wecklein 1869) [also Pierson, BPL 551]  
 1237 ποῖ (MS) (citing *Phil.* 833–834)  
*El.* \*1044 ποιήσεις (MSS)  
 \*1226 ἔχοις (MSS)  
*OT* 31 ἰσοῦμενοι (Musgrave 1800; he died in 1780)  
 728 ἐπιστραφεῖς (Blaydes 1859)  
 778 *del.* (om. *P.Oxy.* 1369)  
 845 *del.* (van Deventer 1851)  
 \*1348 μηδαμὰ γνῶναι (Dobree 1833)  
 1379 ἰερά θ', ὄν (Nauck 1872) [also Pierson, BPL 551]

anticipate Valckenaer.

<sup>21</sup> Valckenaer writes that the word is probably a gloss, referring to Hesych. α 3820 (I 133 Latte) ἀμπυκτήρια· τὰ φάλαρα. Σοφοκλῆς Οἰδίποδι ἐν Κολωνῶ.

<sup>22</sup> As well as the ones cited below, it also includes emendations which appear in BPL 384 (*Aj.* 1054, *El.* 917, *Ant.* 46, *Trach.* 368, *Phil.* 1379, *OC* 92, 1069), and some already known to be Valckenaer's (*Ant.* 994, *Phil.* 498, 1386).

- Ant.* 130 ὑπεροπλίας (Dorville teste Jebb 1900)  
 177 θρόνοισι (Tournier teste Nauck 1886; not in his first edition [1867], so presumably in his second [1877])  
 443 μῆ <οὐ> (Hermann 1808)  
 888 νυμφεύσει (Reiske 1753)  
 930 ἐπέχουσιν (Reiske 1753)  
 \*938 προγενεῖς (MS)
- Trach.* 90 μῆ <οὐ> (Brunck 1786)  
 \*730 οἴκοι (Wakefield 1794)  
 \*747 κού (MSS)  
 954 Ἰστιώτις (Blaydes 1871)
- Phil.* 80 τοιαῦθ' ὑφαίνειν (Mehler 1889)  
 \*108 δῆτα τό (Vauvilliers 1781)  
 \*228 κακούμενον (Brunck 1786) [also Pierson, BPL 551; Valckenaer adds "sic et Pi." in later ink]  
 251 οὐ τοῦνομ' (J. F. Martin)  
 369 ὦ σχέτλιοι ἄτολμήσατ' (Musgrave 1800)  
 \*614 ἤκουσ' (MSS)  
 \*872 εὐφόρως (Brunck 1786)  
 896 λόγων (MS, Brunck 1786)<sup>23</sup>  
 1033 κλαύσαντος (Pierson 1752)
- OC* \*57 ὁδός (Brunck 1786)  
 1294 γεραίτερος (Jacobs)

One reasonable proposal in the book which I have not been able to attribute to a later scholar is the deletion of *Ant.* 1014.

Various conjectures are jotted on the reverse side of a letter stuck in the front of the volume, dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 1746, of which three appear in BPL 384 (*Aj.* 569, 1054, *El.* 917) and one in the volume itself (*OT* 728). But one anticipates another scholar and is not found elsewhere in Valckenaer's marginalia:

*Ant.* \*76 σύ (MSS, Elmsley 1818)

(iii) Euripides

Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes in Aeschylum et Euripidem* (BPL 387) contains the following anticipatory conjectures on Euripides. A note on p.87 verso, at the end of the notes on Euripides, states "absolvi 24 Febr. 1749." Owing to pressure of time I did not investigate Valckenaer's notes on *Phoenissae* and

<sup>23</sup> Valckenaer here refers to "Miscell. Obs. Nov. T 3 p. 23," which I have not identified.

*Hippolytus*; I omitted them, rather than his writings on other dramas, since he published large editions of both these plays.<sup>24</sup>

- Alc.* 1051 μετ' (Hermann 1824)  
1157 μεθωρομίσαμεθα (Purgold, after Wakefield 1794)
- Med.* 996 μέγα στένομαι (Herwerden)  
\*1012 κατηφέξ (Cobet 1873)
- Hcld.* 260 ἔρουμα (Diggle 1984)  
280 λαβρός (Herwerden)
- Andr.* 441 τὸνδ' ἀπὸ πτερῶν (Pierson)  
723 δεσμὰ μητέρος (\*-τρος Heath 1762)  
776 κᾶν (Reiske 1754)
- Hec.* 214 κατακλαίομαι (Schaefer)  
\*295 αὐτός (Porson; written ὠῦτος, which is now found in a MS)  
931 Ἰλιάδος (MSS)  
1040 ἀναρρήξω μοχλοῦς (Reiske 1754)
- Suppl.* 1066 πολλῶν (Reiske 1754)  
\*1171 παισίν (Reiske 1754)
- El.* 641 οὐ (Jacobs)  
\*785 θοίνης (Reiske 1754)  
\*1046 ἦπερ (Boissonade 1826)
- Tro.* 638 τητώμενος (Pierson)  
1175 ἐκήδευσ' (Bothe)
- IT* \*45 παρθενῶσι ... μέσοις (Markland 1771)  
48 ἐρέψιμον (Reiske 1754)<sup>25</sup>  
\*73 θριγνώματα (Ruhnkenius 1751) (R.'s contribution is recognised in a later note)  
258 ἐξ ὅτου (Heath 1762)
- Ion* \*33 ἔνεγκε Δελφῶν (Reiske 1754)  
\*245 οὐ (Pierson) ("sic et Pierson," in dark ink)  
529 συντρέχων (Kayser)  
572 τοῦδε κᾶμ' ἔχει πόσις (Badham)  
801 ἀκήρυκτον (Nauck)  
\*1178 κοινόν (Musgrave 1778)  
\*1196 δόμους (Badham 1853)

<sup>24</sup> The notes include several emendations already known to be his: at *Alc.* 7, 181, *Med.* 1006–1007, *Hcld.* 436, *Hec.* 274 (later ink—"Phoen. 1688" [1755]), 921, *Ion* 739, 875 (later ink—"Diatr. c. 16" [1767]), *Bacch.* 201, *Rhes.* 413, 848.

<sup>25</sup> Valckenaer adds "prob. Ruhnken Tim. p. 135"; i.e. in his edition of 1754.

- 1421 Γοργώ (L. Dindorf)  
*Or.* \*67 εἰς ὁδόν (Musgrave 1778)  
 99–102 *del.* (99–100 Herwerden 1855)  
 239 φέροις (MSS)  
 294 ἀνακαλύπτου (MSS)  
 \*329 ἄπο φάτιν (MSS)  
 399 ἰλάσιμος (Weil 1904 or earlier)  
 \*955 Πύθειον (West 1987) [also Pierson, same manuscript]  
 \*1020 σ' ἰδοῦσ' (Porson)  
 1302 *del.* φονεύετε (om. Triclinius; Hermann 1841 or earlier)  
 1589 πάρος (Markland 1771)  
 1632 *del.* (\*1631–1632 Paley 1860)  
*Bacch.* \*308 πάλλοντα (Matthiae 1824)  
*IA* 556 μετέχοιμ' ἴσας Ἀφροδίτας (Bremi)  
*Rhes.* \*974 ῥᾶον (Musgrave 1762)

## (iv) Aristophanes

The manuscript by Valckenaer entitled *Observationes Criticae in Scriptorum Graecorum* (BPL 493) contains, among other things, conjectures on Aristophanes and his scholia (folia 55–113). The beginning of this section of the document is dated 10<sup>th</sup> October 1757 (56 verso), the end 31<sup>st</sup> December 1757 (113 verso). Conjectures made on verso pages can be dated to 1757; the recto sides, however, appear originally to have been left blank, and so anything found there will probably date to after 1757. I have indicated below when a conjecture comes from a recto page.<sup>26</sup>

- Ach.* \*Hypoth. I line 3 Wilson ἑξαπατώντας (Brunck 1783)  
 (recto)  
 242 προίθ' ἐς (\*προίτω 'ς F. A. Wolf)  
 \*401 σοφῶς (MS)  
 970 κιγλῶν (MS)  
*Eq.* \*143 ἐξελῶν (MS, schol.) (V. cites the scholia)  
 \*278 ἠνδείκνυμι (Dobree 1831 e schol.)  
 407 παιδοπίπην (e schol.)  
 602 ἀνεφρούραξαν (ἀνεφρούραξανθ' Walsh 1837)  
 \*881 τηλικούτον (MS)

<sup>26</sup> Emendations in the manuscript already known to be by Valckenaer are found on the following passages: *Ach.* 384, 508, *Nub.* 819 (recto), *Thesm.* 74 (attributed to him by Dobree), *Lys.* 565 (attributed to him by Dobree), *Plut.* 115, 368, 531, Pherocrates fr.180 *PCG* (published in 1767).

- \*1324 ἴδοιμεν (Brunck 1783)  
 \*1324 <τιν'> (Porson 1820)
- Nub.* \*507 μελιτοῦτταν (MS) (recto)  
*Vesp.* \*1132 ἀναβαλοῦ (MS)  
 \*1135 ἀναβαλοῦ (MS)
- Pax* \*175 στροβεῖ (Wilson 2007; noluit Herwerden 1897)  
 605 ταραχῆς κατήρξε, γὰρ deleted (sim. Holford-Strevens 2007)  
 964 ὅσοι πάρεισι (Bergk 1857)  
 \*1013 ἀποκηρωθεῖς (MS)
- Av.* \*19 ἦστην (Porson 1820) (both in text and scholia)  
 \*75 γ' ἄτ' (MS)  
 1314 καλοῖ (MSS)  
 \*1598 ἀλλά (Tyrwhitt)  
 \*1693 δότω (MSS)
- Lys.* \*126 μοιμῶτε (schol., L. Dindorf 1841)  
 240 ἄδ' ὀλολυγά (Brunck 1783)  
 \*243 ὑμῖν (Reisig 1844)  
 336 ἔρπειν (Ravius 1850)  
 427 ἄλλ' (MS, teste Brunck 1781)  
 563 τήρης (Kaehler 1889)  
 \*736 αὐτῆ ἴτερα (Dindorf 1837)  
 \*983 κάρυξ (Dindorf 1837)  
 \*1164 βλιμάδδομες (Brunck 1783)
- Thesm.* 99 γὰρ (Burgess 1820 tacite)
- Ran.* 269 τῷ κωπίῳ (MSS, Blass 1897)  
 \*673 νοῆσαι (MS)  
 \*690 ἐκγένεσθαι (MSS)  
 743 ὄμωξε (MS)
- Eccl.* \*51 Φιλοδωρήτου (MS)  
 \*150 διερεισαμένη (Schaefer 1808 e schol.)  
 587 ἀρετῆς (Bergk 1857)  
 \*707 λαβόντας, tacite (MSS)  
 \*756 μῆν (Ussher 1973)  
 891 φύλε νητῆριον (Blaydes)  
 \*1124 ἔχη, tacite (MS)
- Plut.* 126 συμκρόν ("codd. recce" teste Wilson)  
 1018 παγκάλους (MSS)  
 \*1037 τυγχάνοι (MS)  
 \*1116 ἔτι θύει (MS)
- fr.* \*299.1 σταθμόν (Brunck 1783)  
 299.2 οἶν (οἶν Blaydes 1885)



## 6. REISKE

J. J. Reiske (1716–1774) was a scholar in Leipzig with (from 1748) the title of Professor; earlier he had been a student at Leiden (1738–1746). For his scholarship, which encompassed several fields outside classical studies, see H.-G. Ebert and T. Hanstein (eds.), *Johann Jacob Reiske: Persönlichkeit und Wirkung* (Leipzig 2005).

## (i) Sophocles

In a letter to Valckenaer dated 22<sup>nd</sup> June 1743 Reiske suggests various conjectures on Sophocles; Valckenaer's reply is dated 23<sup>rd</sup> November 1744. Reiske's letter is now in the Leiden University Library at BPL 339 nr. 21; it was published by R. Foerster, *Johann Jacob Reiske's Briefe* (*AbhLeip* 16 [1897]) 104–111 (with Valckenaer's reply at 111–114). Sophoclean scholars appear not to have noticed it, however, and so denied Reiske credit for the following emendations which are rightfully his:

- El.* \*92 κήδη (Fröhlich 1815)
- OT* \*270 γῆς (Vauvilliers 1781)<sup>27</sup>
- Ant.* 130 ὑπεροπλίαις (Vauvilliers 1781)
- \*217 γ' (Mudge 1762)
- 613 ἔρπειν (Heath 1762)<sup>28</sup>
- Trach.* \*948 μέλεα (Musgrave 1800)
- OC* 35 ἀδημοῦμεν (Bergk 1858)
- \*213 γεγώνω (MSS)
- 313 ἡλιοστεγής (Coraë's)
- \*986 δυσστομεῖν (Vauvilliers 1781)
- \*1340 ξυμπαραστήση (MSS)
- \*1515 στράψαντα (MSS, Pierson 1752)

The letter also contains conjectures on the following passages which later appear in Reiske's book *Animadversiones ad Sophoclem*

<sup>27</sup> This conjecture is also found in a letter to Reiske from F. L. Abresch (1699–1782, Rector of the Gymnasium at Zwolle from 1741), dated 8<sup>th</sup> July 1740, printed in Reiske's autobiography, *D. Johann Jacob Reiskens von ihm selbst aufgesetzte Lebensbeschreibung* (Leipzig 1783) 185–189. Abresch (187) cites Reiske's conjecture on *OT* 270 μήτ' ἄρτον αὐτοῖς γῆς (for transmitted μήτ' ἄρτον αὐτοῖς γῆν), and approves the latter (but not the former) change.

<sup>28</sup> This is also found in Valckenaer's marginalia in the edition of Sophocles cited above, shelfmark 755 D 12: but Reiske almost certainly has priority.

(Leipzig 1753): *Ant.* 601/2,<sup>29</sup> 1069,<sup>30</sup> *Phil.* 1085, 1196, *OC* 59, 178, 251, 381, 907, 1220, 1361.

A copy of Reiske's book of 1753 in the Library (shelfmark 755 D 13) was once in Reiske's possession. He sent it to the Leiden scholar David Ruhnkenius at the latter's request, and the volume now includes the letter which accompanied it, dated 28<sup>th</sup> April 1769, and strongly deprecating the quality of the work. A very small number of marginalia were written by Reiske in the volume, of which three are significant:

- Aj.*       \*349/350 ξτ' (Hermann 1811)  
               \*406 R. is the first scholar known to me who identifies that  
               a lacuna is needed somewhere here.  
*Phil.*     443 ἀνείχεται' (Dobree 1833)

#### 7. BERNARD

J. S. Bernard (1718–1793) came to study at the University of Leiden in 1739 and was a frequent correspondent of Valckenaer's. See further E. Mehler, "Jo. Steph. Bernardi Commercium Litterarium," *Mnemosyne* 1 (1852) 50–68, 330–354. J. Diggle, *Theophrastus. Characters* (Cambridge 2004) 55, argues for spelling his name "Bernhard"; I print it without the aspirate because that is the form which Valckenaer uses (see below).

##### (i) Sophocles

In an edition of Sophocles published in Cambridge in 1669 (shelfmark 755 D 12), Valckenaer records the following:

- OT*     1276 "πειρων Bernard in literis 1746 – male!" (Nauck 1860)

#### 8. PIERSON

Johannes Pierson (1731–1759) was a pupil first of Valckenaer at Franeker and then of Hemsterhuis at Leiden. When he was only twenty, David Ruhnkenius referred to him as a "iuvenis

<sup>29</sup> Reiske first published this conjecture (κοπίς) in his "Specimen emendationum in Graecos auctores," *Miscellanea Lipsiensia Nova* 5 (1747) 717–729, at 727–728. It was also conjectured by J. Jortin (1698–1770) and published in the posthumous work *Tracts, Philological, Critical, and Miscellaneous* (London 1790) II 135. Priority between the two has not yet been determined.

<sup>30</sup> This conjecture (the deletion of τε) is wrongly attributed to Bothe by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson in the OCT.

scito ac pereleganti praeditus ingenio.”<sup>31</sup> In his short life he published two books, both including emendations on Greek drama: *Verisimilium Libri Duo* (Leiden 1752) and *Moeridis Atticistae Lexicon Atticum* (Leipzig 1759).

(i) Sophocles

The undated manuscript *Io. Pierson Studia Critica in Scriptores Graecos* (BPL 551), folia 194–219 “In Sophoclis Tragoedias,”<sup>32</sup> offers numerous conjectures on Sophocles. Some are found in his *Verisimilia*; since it would be odd for him to repropose conjectures in this way which he had already published, we may guess that at least some of the manuscript was written before 1752.

- Aj.* 45 ἐξέπραξ' ἄν (Schneidewin 1853)<sup>33</sup>  
 \*179 σοι (Reiske 1753)  
 531 ἐξερουσάμην (Ast [1776–1841] teste Lobeck 1809; -qq-Hermann 1848)  
 773 τόδ' (MS, Musgrave 1800)  
 916 ῥάλυφα (Wecklein teste Nauck 1882)  
 917 κοῦ (Brunck 1786)  
 \*1141 τοῦθ' ἔν (Wecklein 1869) [also Valckenaer, 755 D 12]  
 1243 ἦρκεσε (MS)
- El.* 952 γ' (*Paris.gr.* 2820)  
 \*1029 πάθης (MSS)
- OT* \*258 ἐπεὶ κυρῶ (MSS, Burton 1758)  
 258 γ' (Erfurdt 1809)  
 \*1245 καλεῖ (MS, Erfurdt 1809)  
 1379 ἱερά θ', ὄν (Nauck 1872) [also Valckenaer, 755 D 12]  
 1453 ζῶντι (MS, Toup 1775)
- Ant.* 161 καινῶ (W. Schmid)<sup>34</sup>  
 279 ἦ (Nauck 1852)  
 \*342 κουφονόων (MSS)

<sup>31</sup> D. Ruhnkenius, *Epistola Critica II in Callimachum et Apollonium Rhodium, ad virum clarissimum, Joan. Augustum Ernesti* (Leiden 1751) 72.

<sup>32</sup> The printed library catalogue wrongly states that this section covers only folia 210–211.

<sup>33</sup> Pierson in addition adopts καὶ for καὶν.

<sup>34</sup> *Teste* Dawe in his first edition (Leipzig 1979): i.e. Wilhelm Schmid (1859–1951)?

- \*591 δυσήνεμοι (δυσάνεμοι Hartung 1850)  
 \*592 βρέμουσιν (MS, Jacobs 1796)  
 695 ἐπ' (MS)  
 836 φθιμένα (MSS)  
 1004 εὔσημος (Pallis 1885)<sup>35</sup>  
 \*1080 ἔχθρα (Reiske 1753)  
 1209 περισαίνει (Schaefer 1810)  
 1219 ὄξυθύμου (Meerdervoort 1881)<sup>36</sup>  
*Trach.* \*158 ἀμοί (Brunck 1786)  
 239 κραιών (Nauck 1864)  
*Phil.* \*228 κακούμενον (Brunck 1786) [also Valckenaer, 755 D  
 12]  
 344 δόλιος (Valckenaer)<sup>37</sup>  
 \*1028 ἔβαλον (MSS)  
 1304 καλόν *post* σοί (Wakefield 1794)  
*OC* 16 ἐπεικάσαι (Wesseling 1763)  
 85 γυί' (Burgess teste Nauck 1861)  
 \*566 *del.* σ' (MSS)  
 1043 προθυμίας (Herwerden 1866)

There are also two new conjectures worth mentioning:

- Ant.* 878 τάνδε κοίναν  
*Trach.* 395 βραχεί

The manuscript also contains the conjecture τῆσδ' ἔθηκε which modern editors attribute to Heath. But this should already have been awarded to Pierson, since it is found in his *Verisimilia* (62).

Some of the conjectures above appear in the manuscript **A**, which we now know was investigated by Hemsterhuis in 1764 or earlier (see 192 above). But only the entries for *El.* 1029 and *Ant.* 836 are recorded in Hemsterhuis's partial collation. In any case, since Valckenaer only received the collation in 1764, there is no reason to suppose that Pierson had access to it when these conjectures were written, even supposing it was made

<sup>35</sup> "Pallis," *teste* Nauck (1886 ed.) 169, specified on 157 as A. Pallis, *Σοφοκλέους Ἀντιγόνη μετὰ κριτικῶν ὑπομνημάτων* (Athens 1885).

<sup>36</sup> J. P. Pompe van Meerdervoort *ap.* S. A. Naber, "Sophoclea," *Mnemosyne* N.S. 9 (1881) 210–244, at 219–220. Naber identifies the author as "Pompilius"; his full name is owed to Nauck (previous n.) 171.

<sup>37</sup> Valckenaer himself attributes this conjecture to Pierson in the margin of his edition mentioned above, 755 D 12.

before his death in 1759.

In the copy of the edition of Sophocles published in Cambridge in 1669 (shelfmark 755 D 12) Valckenaer attributes the following to Pierson:

*OT* 1276 ἔπαισεν (new)

*Trach.* 300 χήρας (Reiske)

Valckenaer also records conjectures by Pierson on the following passages, all of which are also found in BPL 551: *Aj.* 773, 916, 917, *OT* 258 (*bis*), 1453, *Ant.* 279, 342, 591, 836, 878, 1004, 1080, 1209, *Trach.* 395, *Phil.* 344, *OC* 16, 85.

(ii) Euripides

At the end of Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes in Aeschylum et Euripidem* (BPL 387) the following conjectures are attributed to Pierson. A note on 116 verso says that these were written before his books of 1752 and 1759 (as I have already guessed was the case for at least some of his Sophoclean conjectures).

*Hec.* 580 \*λέγων (MSS)

1153 Ἡδωνήν (Blaydes)

*Or.* 132 αἰ δ' (Brunck 1779)

621 ἀνηκέστω (Wecklein)

803 ἔνοντα (Beck)

\*955 Πύθειον (West 1987) [also Valckenaer, same manuscript]

1036 δέξη (Musgrave)

1046 ὄμμα (Tyrwhitt 1762)

1092 ἐπήνεσας (Kirchhoff 1855)

1256 συθείς (Herwerden)

*Med.* 525 γλωσσαργίαν (Gnomology)

*HF* \*215 βίαν (Reiske 1754)

\*241 ἐλθόντες (Dobree)

## II. *Consequences of this discovery*

This material allows us to reattribute more than 275 conjectures to these eight scholars, of which 111 are printed in the texts of the recent critical editions mentioned above. The gain is considerable for all four dramatists, but the most significant find is the haul of Sophoclean conjectures, especially by Valckenaer and Pierson. Their discovery necessitates a radical overhaul of the Sophoclean *apparatus criticus*; put another way, it changes our picture of Sophoclean scholarship. Previously,

Reiske and Heath were the two big names from the eighteenth century in this field. H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson accurately represent our previous state of knowledge when they cite those latter scholars as the most significant from the eighteenth century, and include Valckenaer and Pierson in a list of less important emenders.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, the account of Sophoclean scholarship in this period by R. C. Jebb<sup>39</sup> relegates Valckenaer to a footnote; Pierson and other Dutch scholars are not mentioned. Now we can give Valckenaer and Pierson the prominence which they deserve. Moreover, the overall contribution of the eighteenth century to our understanding of the text of Sophocles is now seen to be considerably greater than previously realised. So too the significance of Dutch scholarship on the poet is now much enhanced.

I have already mentioned that I am not publishing every conjecture in these documents, since they are of uneven quality. But (quite apart from the inevitable subjectivity involved in judging whether a conjecture is worth publishing), by restricting the selection in this way I have skewed the picture of what Valckenaer and Pierson (in particular) were actually

<sup>38</sup> H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford 1990) 2. Cf. and contrast the extraordinarily patronising judgment of J. C. H[are] (for the identification of the author see C. Stray, "From one Museum to Another: the *Museum Criticum* (1813–26) and the *Philological Museum* (1831–33)," *Victorian Periodicals Review* 37 [2004] 289–314, at 304) in his review of Dobree's *Adversaria* (n.4 above), *The Philological Museum* 1 (1832) 204–208, at 206–207: "The great Dutch scholars, though in Latin they can boast of Gronovius and Heinsius, seldom make much of their conjectures upon Greek authors, notwithstanding their vast learning: perhaps that very learning almost weighed them down; and while they were extending their reading over the whole compass of Greek literature, they failed to acquire that familiarity with any one particular region, which alone enables one to see in a moment when anything is wrong, and how it ought to be set right. When the Dutch scholars make a successful conjecture, it is usually one they have been led to by the sense of the context, not one on which they have glanced in a lucky moment of divination." Dobree himself would have had no sympathy with such a verdict. Ironically enough, several of the conjectures credited to Dobree in his *Adversaria* must now be reattributed to Valckenaer, who was almost certainly Dobree's source (see section IV).

<sup>39</sup> *Sophocles. The Text of the Seven Plays* (Cambridge 1897) vii–xliv, at xxxviii–xlii; footnote at p. xl n.3.

doing at this time. Their level of conjectural activity sometimes makes one think of the period of radical emenders in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

More generally, this discovery acts as a reminder that so much scholarship on Greek drama remains to be discovered. After all, these conjectures were sitting in the Library of one of the greatest universities in Europe, fully catalogued since at least 1912: and yet nobody published them. I cannot believe that no other such hoard is still awaiting rediscovery.<sup>40</sup> There are also many other manuscripts in Leiden with conjectures on other authors: it would take months to go through and assess them all, as well as an extraordinary range of interests on the part of those who examined them. The majority are still unpublished.<sup>41</sup>

Hemsterhuis's investigation of the manuscript **A** in or before 1764 also merits discussion. The exploitation of this manuscript would later prove a cardinal point in the history of Sophoclean scholarship, when "in 1786 the Alsatian scholar R. P. F. [sic]

<sup>40</sup> For another instance where a great scholar's marginal emendations lay available yet unconsulted in the library of a prominent university see my article "Unpublished Emendations by Peter Elmsley on Euripides and Aristophanes," *CQ.N.S.* 57 (2007) 742–746.

<sup>41</sup> Some of Valckenaer's notes appear, at least in part, in the following works: *L. C. Valckenaerii Observationes academicae, quibus via munitur ad origines Graecas investigandas, lexicorumque defectus resarciendos; et Io. Dan. a Lennep Praelectiones academicae, De analogia linguae Graecae exposito* [sic]. *Ad exempla mss. recensuit, suasque animadversiones adiecit, Everardus Scheidius* (Utrecht 1790); *Selecta e scholis Lud. Casp. Valckenaerii in libros quosdam Novi Testamenti editore discipulo Ev. Wassenbergh, qui dissertationem praemisit de glossis Novi Testamenti* (Amsterdam 1795–1797); *J. O. Sluiter, Lectiones Andocidae. Interiectae sunt Lud. Casp. Valckenaerii ineditae et Io. Luzacii in Andocidem animadversiones; item nonnulla ex codicibus mss. excerpta* (Leiden 1804); *Ludovici Caspari Valckenaerii Opuscula Philologica, Critica, Oratoria, nunc primum coniunctim edita I–II* (Leipzig 1808–1809); *G. Vitelli, "I manoscritti di Palefato," StIt* 1 (1893) 241–379 (see 291–292 n.3: he cites Valckenaer from BPL 394); *Timaeus Locrus de anima mundi et natura. Scholia et varietatem lectiones e manuscriptis parisiensibus, L. C. Valckenaerii conjecturas ineditas, suamque annotationem addidit J. J. de Gelder* (Leiden 1836); *B. Keil, Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia II* (Berlin 1898) (see p. xxxvii: he cites BPL 551, 488, 389, by Pierson and Valckenaer); *C. Carey, Lysiae orationes cum fragmentis* (Oxford 2007) (see p. xxvi: he cites BPL 439, dated for Lysias to October 1756).

Brunck initiated a new phase of Sophoclean criticism by abandoning the reliance on Triclinius initiated by Turnebus and basing his text instead upon the Parisinus A.”<sup>42</sup> Yet here we have a Dutch scholar investigating this precious book more than twenty years before Brunck, recording its readings, and passing them to the Dutch scholar known to be preparing an edition of the poet (see section III). Moreover, he notices in the text of *Electra* something in the manuscript which anticipates an important conjecture, and which has escaped the notice of every subsequent editor of the play. Most manuscripts give lines 78–79 to the Paedagogus, 80–81 to Orestes, and 82–85 to the Paedagogus. Hemsterhuis saw that **A** gives 78–81 to the Paedagogus and 82–85 to Orestes; I have checked a microfilm (Bodley MS Film 1866) and can confirm that he is right. This arrangement was first proposed by Nauck in 1860, then (independently) by Sandbach in 1977, and is adopted by Dawe in his Teubner edition (1984, 1996) and by Raeburn in his Penguin (2008). Whether or not they accept it, future editors should take care to record that the distribution is found in **A**.

### III. *Why did Valckenaer never publish his Sophoclean emendations?*

Valckenaer lived for over forty years after making the first Sophoclean emendations recorded in this article. Some of the conjectures in his manuscripts appeared in subsequent books of his, but the great majority remained unknown. Why was this, when he had ample opportunity to publish them? (Pierson, by contrast, died so young that the question does not arise.) Of course, many scholars in this and other periods have kept sometimes brilliant emendations confined to the margins of their own books. But Valckenaer’s failure to publish his work on Sophocles became somewhat notorious, as is revealed from his correspondence, also held in Leiden (shelfmark BPL 339), and from published remarks by him and other scholars.

Right from the start he appears to have been intending an edition of Sophocles, but with some concern at the prospect of a competitor. In a letter to F. L. Abresch (see n.27 above) dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 1743, he writes:

<sup>42</sup> Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, *Sophoclea* 2.



Cum Sophocle prae ceteris familiariter consuevi et ex fontibus tuis hortulum meum pulcre irrigavi. Frequens erit tui vir clarissime facienda cum debito laude mentio, si quando Sophocles a me in lucem proferetur, quod fieri posset, modo Pauwius a Tragico edendo manus abstineret.

He refers to Jan Cornelis de Pauw (d. 1749). I am not aware of work by him on an edition of Sophocles. But a little later, Valckenaer is afraid of a different competitor. January 1746 sees him writing to Matthias Röver (letter 6, recto) as follows:

Nuperrime a Celeb<errimo> Wesselingio accepi, Wolfium Sapphus editorem in Sophocle edendo occupari, eumque brevi Gottingae proditurum. Is nuncius, non quidem q<uo>d facile suspicaberis, gratus accidit, neque tamen aegre ferre debui, rem in mediam positam ab alio occupari. Supererit semper in Principe Tragico, q<uo>d et nos aliquando agamus. Et forte (patere libere tecum confabulantem) materiem congeret Wolfius, e qua aedificemus. Id nollem, me in editionibus Aldina Turnebi Canteri etc. conferendis tantum temporis perdidisse.

Valckenaer refers to Johann Christian Wolf (1689–1770), Professor at an academic Gymnasium from 1725, and editor of Sappho.<sup>43</sup> Again, I am not aware of work by him on Sophocles.<sup>44</sup>

A letter<sup>45</sup> which Valckenaer published in 1747 makes the

<sup>43</sup> J. C. Wolf, *Sapphus, poëtriae Lesbiae, fragmenta et elogia, quotquot in auctoribus antiquis Graecis et Latinis reperiuntur, cum virorum doctorum notis integris* (Hamburg 1733). In a letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 1748 David Ruhnkenius wrote to Valckenaer “De Sophocle Wolfiano nihil certi accepi, neque eius apud me magna est exspectatio” (in G. L. Mahne, *Epistolae mutuae duumvirorum clarissimorum, Davidis Ruhnkenii et Lud. Casp. Valckenaerii, nunc primum ex autographis editae* [Vlissingen 1832] 9), which indicates Valckenaer’s continued interest in his progress.

<sup>44</sup> M. I. F. Heusinger, *Codicis M. S. Aiacem et Electram Sophoclis continet brevem descriptionem et in easdem tragoedias observationum specimen* (Jena 1745) p. II recto, describes how in 1742 he too was put off further work on Sophocles (initially prompted by his discovery of the manuscript **J**, *Jenensis Bos.* q. 7) by the prospect of a forthcoming edition by Wolf. But since the book did not appear he proceeded with his work (hence the dissertation in question); and indeed on p. XX verso he makes clear that Wolf has yet to produce.

<sup>45</sup> “Epistola ad virum nobilissimum Matthiam Roeverum, iurisconsultum,” in *Virgilius collatione scriptorum Graecorum illustratus opera et industria Fulvii*

following statement for public consumption:

Poëtam circumspicienti, cuius loca quaedam possent tractari, primus occurrebat *Sophocles*, et propter suam dignitatem, et quod poteram videri cum ipso consuevisse familiariter. Verum, dum ita me comparabam, ut qui e loculis suis Sophoclea carperet, cum *Roevero* communicanda, consilium illud damnavi. Non unis Literis intellexeram, Virum humanitatis et literarum cultu ornatissimum alibi terrarum in *Sophocle* vulgando esse occupatum. Nolebam profecto cuipiam videri captasse occasionem hanc, emendatiunculas depromendi, ne illae alterius labore praeriperentur, atque ego tum scilicet! fraudarer inventionis gloriola.<sup>46</sup>

The reasoning here is odd. The information that someone else is at work on a topic with which one is already occupied might, in some circumstances, prompt one to move to a different field of study. But if one has already done the work, it is strange for the same piece of information to cause one not to publish it. Moreover, Valckenaer would eventually have realised that neither de Pauw nor Wolf was going to bring out an edition of *Sophocles*, leaving his path clear. Yet still the conjectures remained unpublished.

We now begin to find other scholars referring to Valckenaer's Sophoclean studies. In 1749 David Ruhnkenius made the following public appeal to his elder contemporary:

Illud iam publico nomine a Te contenderim, ut ne nobis diutius Sophoclem Tuum inideas, Phidiacum, ut auguramur, & immortale opus. Quicquid enim ad Tragicorum principem expoliendum afferri potest, ingenium, acumen, doctrina, linguae peritia, haec omnia in Te eiusmodi cognovimus, ut omnium expectationem, quamlibet summam, superare videantur.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>46</sup> *Vrsini. Editioni ad exemplar Plantini renovatae accesserunt Ludo. Casp. Valckenari I Epistola ad Matthiam Röverum, ICtum.* [etc.] (Leeuwarden 1747) I–LXXX, at VI–VII = L. C. Valckenaer, *Opuscula* (n.41 above) I 317–395, at 323–324.

<sup>46</sup> On this letter see J. G. Gerretzen, *Schola Hemsterhusiana. De herleving der grieksche studiën aan de Nederlandsche universiteiten in de achttiende eeuw van Perizonius tot en met Valckenaer* (Nijmegen/Utrecht 1940), 211: “Hij had in dezen brief eerst Sophocles willen behandelen, doch vernomen, dat een ander hiermede bezig was.”

<sup>47</sup> Ruhnkenius, *Epistola* (n.11 above) 78. Born in 1723, he came to Leiden as a student in 1743 and remained there until his death in 1798.

Four years later Reiske added his voice, referring to Valckenaer's public letter of 1747:

Hortandus igitur Tu mihi es, Valkenari doctissime, ut, quod olim conceptum excutere deinceps tam levi de caussa non debueras, consilium edendi Sophoclis resumas, eique operi, cui Tu, si quis alius, par es, alacriter Te accingas. mendacem et claudicantem famam, quae Teque nosque ludi fecit, e Germaniae septentrione coorta, miror tantum in te valuisse, ut a praeclara destinatione Te detraheret.<sup>48</sup>

Clearly expectations had been aroused and left unsatisfied. In the preface to his edition of Euripides' *Phoenissae* (hardly a work which requires an apology), Valckenaer feels the need to account for his neglect of Sophocles in favour of his younger contemporary:<sup>49</sup>

Sophoclis perfectius Euripideo cur non anteposuerim exemplar, si qui, quod futurum auguror, fortasse mirabuntur, de me meoque in Sophoclem studio nimis benigne sentientes, ad illuminanda tamen Sophoclea Codices praesertim vetustos adhibendos esse fatebuntur: desinent itaque mirari, ubi cognoverint, ex antiquis membranis excerptas habere me lectiones multo plures et vero meliores, quibus diversae possint Euripidis expoliri Tragoedias ... [He goes on to describe how he was encouraged to edit Euripides by his "simplex ac nativa facilitas," as well as by the existence of a good Latin translation of the poet by Grotius.]

Could Hemsterhuis have been prompted by this preface to pass on his partial collation of **A** to Valckenaer in 1764?

A last reference to his work on Sophocles can be found in a letter to Brunck (again from BPL 339; I retain the original accentuation). It is undated, but a pencil note in a hand not Valckenaer's records that it was written in 1772, which suits the contents. Brunck has heard that Valckenaer is on the point of producing editions of Sophocles and Theocritus, but Valckenaer protests:

La verité est, Monsieur, que je ne pense ni a donner une Edition de Sophocle ni de Theocrite.<sup>50</sup> Il y a 25 ans que j'ai beaucoup

<sup>48</sup> Reiske, in the unpaginated introduction to his *Animadversiones*.

<sup>49</sup> *Euripidis Phoenissae* (Francker 1755) p. v.

<sup>50</sup> Valckenaer did in fact publish an edition of Theocritus in the following

travaillé sur Sophocle: dans mes lectures je n'ai jamais laissé échapper aucune citation de ce Poëte: si j'avais eü de bonnes leçons diverses d'anciens MSS. je me ferais fait autrefois un plaisir de donner une Edition de ce Poëte mais surtout depuis qu'on m'a fait Professeur a Leide [1766], et qu'on m'a donné aussi à traiter l'Histoire de ces Provinces, je suis tombé dans un genre tout différent, et je n'ai plus pensé à donner une Edition de Sophocle. On ne peut pourtant être plus sensible que je le suis à votre politesse d'avoir voulu conférer votre MS et de m'offrir de la maniere la plus gracieuse les variantes des deux premieres Tragedies.

Brunck in his own edition of Sophocles laments that Valckenaer, who had died the previous year, had not continued with his own work on the poet:<sup>51</sup>

Unus aetate nostra Sophocli operam suam dicaverat, qui eum, proinde ut dignus est, exornare et illustrare poterat, vir doctrinae et ingenii laude excellens LUDOV. CASP. VALCKENARIUS, qui superiore anno exstinctus Musarum alumnis tristissimum reliquit desiderium. Is nescio quo modo a Sophocle sevocatus olim, operam suam aliorum contulit. Derelictam a summo viro provinciam animose suscepi ...

In the event it fell to Brunck, not Valckenaer, to produce arguably the most important edition of Sophocles of all time. Like Brunck, we must regret that Valckenaer did not take his work on Sophocles further. But we can at least give him credit, after nearly three hundred years, for the considerable achievement which his work represents.

#### IV. *The fate of other manuscripts on Greek drama written by Valckenaer and Pierson*

I have already (n.41) set out how scholars quarried several of Valckenaer's manuscripts for their conjectures on other authors. In this section I describe how four English scholars consulted, and in some cases acquired, Valckenaer's papers during the thirty or so years after his death in 1785. This information

---

year: *Theocriti decem Eidyllia* (Leiden 1773).

<sup>51</sup> R. F. P. Brunck, *Sophoclis quae exstant omnia* (Strasbourg 1786) I p. i. For Brunck's use of Valckenaer's work on the fragments of Sophocles in this edition see below, section IV.

is significant not only as a contribution to the intellectual history of the period, but also because it appears that some of the works which they examined have subsequently disappeared. This brief account may enable others to track them down. Since that period, I know of only two scholars who have investigated Valckenaer's papers on drama, and I conclude by giving an account of their work.

(i) BURGESS

Thomas Burgess (1756–1837), successively Bishop of St David's (1803–1823) and Salisbury (1823–1837), was a notable classical scholar in his youth, publishing new editions of Burton's *Πενταλογία* (Oxford 1779) and Dawes's *Miscellanea Critica* (Oxford 1781). From J. S. Harford, *The Life of Thomas Burgess* (London 1840), we learn that Burgess wrote to Valckenaer before 7<sup>th</sup> May 1783 (p.71) and visited Paris and Holland in the summer of 1787, "fraught with schemes of classical research and investigation," where he met Ruhnkenius (p.114). His work *Sententiae Philosophorum e Codice Leidensi Vossiano* (Durham 1795) is presumably a result of this visit. He also appears to have acquired some of Valckenaer's papers, since he donated four manuscript volumes by him on biblical topics, dated 1756–1758, to the library of St David's College, Lampeter (now the University of Wales, Lampeter), which he founded in 1822 (shelfmark GB 1953 LVMS). But despite his classical interests, I have not found evidence that he investigated Valckenaer's papers in this area too.

(ii) DOBREE

The Cambridge classicist Peter Paul Dobree (1782–1825) visited Leiden in 1815, where he consulted manuscripts by Valckenaer on Demosthenes, Lysias, and Aristophanes, some of which were in the house of Valckenaer's grandson L. C. Luzac,<sup>52</sup> who subsequently left them to the University Library

<sup>52</sup> David Butterfield kindly gives me permission to cite the following communication from him: "Dobree visited Leiden in 1815 and in an undated letter in my possession, written to the judge Lodewijk Caspar Luzac (1786–1861), later Curator of the University of Leiden, he states as a postscript '[j]e compte avoir le plaisir de vous revoir le printemps prochain'. Since he sent with the letter three copies of Porson's *Tracts* (1815), a work described

at Leiden on his death in 1861.<sup>53</sup> Dobree's name occurs seven times in the lists of conjectures above as the proposer of emendations now found in Valckenaer's papers. They were not published by Dobree himself, but were taken after his death from his marginalia. I suspect that in many, perhaps all, of these cases he had copied an emendation from Valckenaer's notes, for his own purposes and with no desire to pass it off as his own. But the transcribers of his marginalia were not aware that they belonged not to Dobree, but to Valckenaer and other scholars whose work he records, and so they have been passed down under Dobree's name ever since.

In at least one case Dobree appears to have acquired one of Valckenaer's manuscripts himself. Carey (n.41, at p. xxvi n.61) writes of BPL 439 "This notebook was at one stage in the possession of Peter Paul Dobree and on his death was returned to the Netherlands by his executors. Parts of it were published by Sluiter in his *Lectiones andocidae* [see n.41]."

(iii) GAISFORD

Thomas Gaisford (1779–1855), Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford (1811–1855) and Dean of Christ Church (1831–1855), visited Leiden in 1816 to consult Valckenaer's manuscripts. Gaisford mentions the debt which he owes them in two of his prefaces, one of which states that a member of the Luzac

---

as 'recemment publié', and since the letter precedes Gaisford's 1816 trip to Leiden, it is probably to be dated to the spring of 1816. I know of no evidence that Dobree's hopes to visit Leiden in the following spring (1817) were realised." This visit is also described in J. Bake, *Scholica Hypomnemata* II (Leiden 1839) pp. ii–vii; I owe this reference to Mr Butterfield. In the preface to his edition of *Ricardi Porsoni Notae in Aristophanem* (Cambridge 1820), Dobree states (p. xi) "Valckenaerii adversaria mihi utenda concesserunt haeredes, Valckenaerius filius, et Luzacii." This follows a remark saying that he consulted manuscripts written by Hemsterhuis in Leiden.

<sup>53</sup> The electronic catalogue (n.1 above) says "Door aankoop en vererving verzameld door Valckenaers achterneef, L.C. Luzac (1786–1861). Na Luzacs dood door diens weduwe in 1861 geschonken." L. C. Luzac was the son of Valckenaer's daughter Johanna Suzanna (1756–1826) and Etienne Luzac (1754–1827). Etienne and his brother Jean (1746–1807) were the sons of Valckenaer's sister Anna Hillegonda (1718–1760) and Jean Luzac (1702–1783).

family held an auction in 1811 in which at least some of Valckenaer's annotated books were sold.<sup>54</sup> Evidently not all were, or else Dobree would not have been able to consult them at L. C. Luzac's house four years later.

(iv) BURGES

The classical scholar George Burges (1786–1864) published an edition of Euripides' *Troades* in 1807 in which he expressed his admiration for Valckenaer in the strongest terms. When giving an account of what prompted him to edit Euripides, he declares "Movit Valckenarii vox, (omnium harum litterarum cultoribus habenda divina prope vox) qui nostram fabulam inter optimas Euripideas recenset."<sup>55</sup> His unique admiration of Valckenaer (he writes of no other scholar in this way) seems to have encouraged him to investigate his papers, as is revealed by a later collection of literary anecdotes.<sup>56</sup> In a section devoted to anecdotes on Burges, we are told that "Luzac's house was blown up by the ignition of a vessel containing 20,000 lbs of gunpowder; he [i.e. Burges] has some of Valckenaer's MSS. or

<sup>54</sup> T. Gaisford, *Joannis Stobaei Florilegium* (Oxford 1822) I p. x: "ex adversariis Valckenaerii omnia ad Stobaeum pertinentia mecum humanissime communicavit L. C. Luzacius. nec multa sunt ea, neque valde ab iis diversa, quae in animadversionibus ad Euripideas fabulas et alibi protulerat vir summus: at sunt pauca tamen nova, nec Valckenaerio indigna. reliquerat autem Valckenaerius exemplum Stobaei sua manu passim notatum, quod cum caeteris eius libris auctione Luzaciana a. 1811. distractum quo devenerit prorsus ignoro." Id., *Suidae Lexicon* (Oxford 1834) I p. xlvi: "Hemsterhusii et Valckenaerii notulas ineditas ex autographis hodie Leidae servatis descripsi." A third preface, to the third volume of his *Poetae Minores Graeci* (Oxford 1814, 1816, 1820), records Gaisford's use of the manuscripts of Valckenaer's contemporaries (on an unpaginated sheet entitled "Index Manuscriptorum"): "Ipse Lugduni Batavorum a. 1816. evolvi Etymologicon MS. Vossianum, ibidemque descripsi annotationes MSS. Hemsterhusii et Ruhnkenii ... Ruhnkeniana plura habet Bibliotheca Leidensis, quibus frui mihi non contigit." For this visit see Bake, *Scholica Hypomnemata* v–vii.

<sup>55</sup> *Euripidis Troades partim codicum manuscriptorum, partim ope coniecturarum emendata. Subjicitur appendix, in qua carminibus Euripideis, quae vulgo habentur monostrophica verus et vetus ordo nunc demum restituitur studio G. Burges* (Cambridge 1807) p. i.

<sup>56</sup> *Literary Anecdotes and Contemporary Reminiscences, of Professor Porson and others, from the papers of E. H. Barker* (London 1852) II 12.

copies of them, which Luzac gave to him, or allowed him to take, before the occurrence. He has seen a reference to the fire in some modern publication.” However, according to the most recent scholarship on the disaster (which took place on 12<sup>th</sup> January 1807), Jean Luzac was killed while out walking, whereas his house was spared.<sup>57</sup> And indeed, as Luzac was the source of the many manuscripts of Valckenaer and Pierson which ended up in the Leiden University Library, this explosion evidently did not destroy all his papers, if any were lost at all.<sup>58</sup> Despite the inaccuracy of this part of the anecdote, it could still be accurate in its claim that Burges had acquired some of Valckenaer’s manuscripts before the disaster.

Burges exploits his Valckenaerian acquisitions in a number of his publications. In an article published in 1820, while discussing *OC* 19, he rejects transmitted οὐ by saying “Id senserunt Valckenaer et Pierson: quorum hic in Notis Mss. penes me voluit θοῦ, ille σὺ, quod praestat.”<sup>59</sup> In 1822<sup>60</sup> Burges reveals that Valckenaer “in Notis Mss.” conjectured πάντα δρῶν on *Aj.* 379, which today is attributed to Wakefield.<sup>61</sup> Two years later,

<sup>57</sup> H. J. Reitsma and A. Ponsen, “The Leiden Disaster of 1807,” [www.dtu.dk/upload/institutter/dtv/tekhist/icohtec/presentations/the\\_leiden\\_disaster\\_of\\_1807\\_paper.pdf](http://www.dtu.dk/upload/institutter/dtv/tekhist/icohtec/presentations/the_leiden_disaster_of_1807_paper.pdf) (accessed 20<sup>th</sup> February 2009) 7: “The most distinguished victim was professor Jean Luzac, who lived outside the destroyed neighbourhood but that afternoon unfortunately went to visit a friend and was just walking past the ship when it exploded.” I have not seen A. Ponsen and E. van der Vlist (eds.), *Het Fataal Evenement. De buskruitramp van 1807 in Leiden* (Leiden 2007).

<sup>58</sup> Valckenaer’s work on the fragments of Sophocles was less fortunate. He sent it to Brunck for use in his 1786 edition of the poet (n.51 above), and it remained with his papers in Strasbourg until its destruction during the German siege of that city in 1870. Although Brunck fully acknowledges his debt to Valckenaer in general terms in his introduction (I p. vii), he does not specify which of the emendations that he prints belong to him. On this see further S. L. Radt, *TGrF IV Sophocles* (Göttingen 1977<sup>1</sup>, 1999<sup>2</sup>) 9–13.

<sup>59</sup> G. Burges, “Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta. Specimen editionis,” *The Classical Journal* vol. 22 no. 44 (1820) 277–288, at 281.

<sup>60</sup> G. Burges, *Aeschyli, quae supersunt, fabulae et fragmenta. Eumenides* (London 1822), on 995.

<sup>61</sup> G. Wakefield, *Silva Critica: sive in auctores sacros profanosque commentarius philologus IV* (London 1793) 138.



in a discussion of Eur. *Bacch.* 791, he writes “δῶσαι Tyrwhitto, et πόδα debetur Piersono in Notis Mss. penes me.”<sup>62</sup> I did not find these four conjectures in the papers of Valckenaer and Pierson at Leiden. They could have been embedded in discussions of other authors. More likely, however, is that they come from a separate manuscript (or manuscripts) which Burges had procured for himself (cf. “penes me” in two of the citations).

Burges again refers to manuscript notes by Valckenaer in his edition of *Philoctetes* published in 1833.<sup>63</sup> He cites conjectures by Valckenaer on lines 47, 344, 1386, and 1429, of which the first and last are found in BPL 384, while the second and third appear in the volume 755 D 12. In the latter, however, Valckenaer clearly attributes the conjecture at 344 to Pierson. Burges is not always as careful as an editor should be in these matters,<sup>64</sup> and so may have taken the emendation from the edition owned by Valckenaer and failed to attribute it correctly. Or else his source may be a manuscript currently unknown, in which Valckenaer had made this conjecture himself before becoming aware of Pierson’s contribution. (This happens more than once among the conjectures cited in section I above.) So again the possibility remains that we are dealing with a different set of notes from the ones in the Leiden University Library. The conjecture which Burges cites on *Phil.* 47 had previously been suggested by him in his edition of Euripides’ *Troades* (on 95). Since Burges had already come into contact with Valckenaer’s papers at this early stage, and was sometimes erratic in his attributions, he may have accidentally put forward one of the conjectures which he found in them as if it were his own.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>62</sup> G. Burges, “In Sophoclis Oedip. Colon. emendationes,” *The Classical Journal* vol. 29 no. 58 (1824) 286–297, at 291 and 294.

<sup>63</sup> G. Burges, *The Philoctetes of Sophocles* (London 1833) p. viii: “The Mss. notes of Valckenaer, though much rarer than could be desired, are enough to show that minds of every calibre must be directed to an author like Sophocles, before we can hope to read his writings in the shape he left them.”

<sup>64</sup> For an instance where he erroneously gives credit to another scholar for his own suggestion see my article “Orthographica Sophoclea,” forthcoming in *Philologus*, section 4 n.49 (on Soph. *Aj.* 108).

<sup>65</sup> The National Art Library in London also possesses two manuscripts by

## (v) PEPPINK and AUSTIN

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century I know of only one attempt to investigate Valckenaer's papers on tragedy. In a paper published in 1934,<sup>66</sup> Peppink cites Valckenaer's conjectures on *Aj.* 569, *Trach.* 368, 396, and *OC* 92. (He also mentions *Aj.* 1369, where Valckenaer took the reading βροτοῖς from the scholia.) At the end of his paper he writes "Valckenarii schedae quas hic illic laudavi adservantur in bibl. Lugd. Bat. Permulta inter huius viri praestantissimi notas reperiuntur quae complures editores neglexerunt ut leves suas suspiciones proiicerent." The conjectures which he cites are all found in Valckenaer's manuscript *Observationes in Sophoclem*.

Peppink also made use of unpublished material, including some by Valckenaer, in his work on Athenaeus.<sup>67</sup> His early death in 1938, at the age of 32, prevented him from further exploiting Valckenaer's papers. Not only did no-one attempt to continue the work which he had begun, but even the conjectures which he had recorded were ignored. The editions of Sophocles in the Teubner and Oxford Classical Text series both record four of the five conjectures mentioned by Peppink,

---

Valckenaer. The first (Dyce MS 54 25.F.50) is made up of several documents, including one entitled *Observationes in Aristophanis Plutum* (a very dense collection of exegetical rather than conjectural notes: the next person to attempt an edition of this play should consult it) and another *Observationes quibus via panditur ad Origenes Graecas investigandas, Lexicographorum defectus resarciendos*. A book of almost exactly that title was published from Valckenaer's notes in 1790 at Utrecht by Valckenaer's pupil Everard Scheidius (1742–1795) (see n.41 above). The manuscript was bought in Amsterdam in 1827, but is not in Valckenaer's hand. The second is entitled *In Acta Apost. In Evangelii Marci. In Epist. ad Colossenses* (Dyce MS 55 25.F.51), which does seem to be in his hand. Both these manuscripts were the gift of Alexander Dyce (1798–1869). Dyce was a friend of Burges (see *The Reminiscences of Alexander Dyce*, ed. R. J. Schrader [Columbus 1972] 149–159), and so may have acquired the manuscripts from him.

<sup>66</sup> S. P. Peppink, "Ad Sophoclem eiusque scholiastam," *Mnemosyne* III.1 (1934) 67–78 = *Opera Minora Simonis Petri Peppink* (Leiden 1938) 35–46. The conjectures are cited on 72–73 = 39–41, the quotation from 78 = 46.

<sup>67</sup> S. P. Peppink, *Observationes in Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Leiden 1936) 1: "promam notas Valckenarii Hemsterhusii Cobeti quae neglectae iacent in Bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batavae."

but fail to reassign them to their original proposer.

The most important study of Valckenaer's work on Sophocles appeared in a recent article by Colin Austin.<sup>68</sup> In it, he explores the provenance of the seventeen conjectures by Valckenaer which appear in either of the two Oxford Classical Texts of Sophocles. He was unable to track down two of them, *OT* 111 and *Ant.* 452, neither of which appears in the notes which I consulted. These may also be contained in a manuscript now unaccounted for.

The above survey indicates that much more unpublished work by Valckenaer and Pierson remains to be exploited. Many manuscripts on different authors at Leiden would probably repay scrutiny, while some manuscripts on Sophocles arrived in Britain after Valckenaer's death and are still unaccounted for. The contribution of these two scholars to our understanding of Greek drama is probably even more important than we now realise.<sup>69</sup>

*November, 2008*

Department of Classics  
University of Nottingham  
Nottingham NG7 2RD, U.K.  
patrick.finglass@nottingham.ac.uk

<sup>68</sup> C. F. L. Austin, "The Girl who said 'No' (Sophocles' *Antigone*)," *Eikasmos* 17 (2006), 103–115, at 106–107.

<sup>69</sup> I am grateful to the School of Humanities at the University of Nottingham and the British Academy for funding my visits to Leiden; to the staff of the Universiteitsbibliotheek in Leiden, the British and National Art Libraries in London, and the Bodleian and Sackler Libraries in Oxford for their exemplary efficiency; and to Professor Colin Austin, Mr David Butterfield, and Professor Christopher Collard for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article. Many of the dates given above for individual conjectures were generously supplied by Professor Austin (for Aristophanes) and Professor James Diggle (for Euripides). Dr Almut Fries and Miss Cressida Ryan each checked a reference for me in far-off libraries; while Professor Kent Rigsby, Miss Ryan, and *GRBS*'s anonymous referee pointed out several typographical errors in the final draft. Finally, I would like to thank Professor Austin a third time, for stimulating and nourishing my interest in Valckenaer over the past three years.