Unpublished Conjectures on Sophocles
by Jeremiah Markland

P. J. Finglass

A copy of a reprint of Thomas Johnson’s edition of Sophocles in the National Art Library in London’s Victoria and Albert Museum contains undated autograph notes by Jeremiah Markland, that acute but reclusive eighteenth-century English critic. Markland had previously sent notes on Sophocles to the printer responsible for this very edition. He may have transferred the contents of his copy of these notes into the margins of the book when it appeared, in which case some of the notes would date to before 1758; but others might have been entered subsequently, up to his death in 1779.

I dedicate this paper to the memory of Colin Austin, who so helped and encouraged me in my work on classical scholarship.

1 T. Johnson (ed.), Sophoclis tragœdiae septem scholiis veteribus illustratae I–II (London 1758). The shelfmark is Dyce 9298.

2 For Markland’s life and scholarship see C. Collard, “Jeremiah Markland (1693–1776),” PCPS N.S. 22 (1976) 1–13 = Tragedy, Euripides and Euripideans (Exeter 2007) 213–228 (with additions). He is best known today for his work on Euripides and Latin poetry. Collard’s list of Markland’s marginalia in the British Library (12 n.34 = 225–226 n.34, supplemented at 288 nn.34, 36) does not include anything on Sophocles.

3 “Mr. Markland assisted Mr. Bowyer in an edition of Seven Plays of Sophocles, 1758, by the notes which he communicated to him” (J. Nichols, Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century; comprizing biographical memoirs of William Bowyer, Printer, F.S.A. and many of his learned friends IV [London 1812] 286). The edition does not attribute any conjectures to Markland; perhaps Bowyer for whatever reason was unable to incorporate Markland’s contribution in the reprint. See also Collard (n.2) 3 = 215.
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The discovery of these marginalia enables us to reattribute many conjectures to Markland which modern editions assign to later scholars; he also now shares the credit for several put forward by his contemporaries in their marginalia. In the list that follows, asterisks and plus signs signify emendations printed respectively in the text or the apparatus of the OCT.\textsuperscript{4} I add in brackets the name of the earliest scholar known to me to have published each conjecture, together with the date of publication, if available. I write II or MS(s) if the conjecture has subsequently appeared in an ancient or a mediaeval manuscript unknown in Markland’s day. I do not record emendations found in the books which Markland published and which are hence already known to be his.

\textit{Aj.}
\begin{itemize}
\item *54 removes comma after λείας (Schaefer 1810)
\item *77 introduces apopseis (Brunck 1786)
\item *79 οὐκοῦν (Brunck 1786)
\item +85 δεδορκότος (anon. ap. Dindorf 1869)
\item 194 ποδί (πόδα Morstadt 1864)
\item *649 χαί (Musgrave pre-1780, published 1800)
\item *756 ἐθ (MS, Bothe 1826) and ἐν (Lobeck 1809)
\item *778 ἐθ (Lobeck 1809)
\item 782 ἀφυστερήθησα (Wakefield 1792)
\item 842 ἐκγόνων τ’ (MSS, Musgrave pre-1780, published 1800)
\item 1009 τε σῶν (M. Schmidt \textit{testibus} Lloyd-Jones/Wilson 1990)
\item *1096 λόγους ἐπεί (Mekler 1885)
\item *1098 τὸν δ’ (MS)
\item *1274 ἐντός (MSS)
\end{itemize}

\textit{El.}
\begin{itemize}
\item 199 μομφάν (Wakefield 1792)\textsuperscript{5}
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{5} This reading is partially obscured by the binder’s shears; but the last stroke of the mu, as well as the accent on the alpha, suggests that this was the original word.
Markland crosses this conjecture out, suggesting that he later rejected it. So also with Ant. 599 and Trach. 440, below.
263 ἔφυγε τὸ μὴ ὀδέναι (Porson 1801)
296 νόσημ’ (Pallis teste Jebb)
*384 ἦ (MS, Brunck 1779)
*406 γρέθη (MS, Schaefer 1811)
+599 ὁπερ (MS, Hermann 1823) [crossed out]
*742 question mark (Hermann 1823)
+754 <μ’> (Blaydes 1905)
+1056 δὲ γε (Seager 1813)
+1238 ἐμβάλλει (Π, Mitchell 1842)
1305 βαξεῖς (Heimsoeth 1865)
1350 μηδέν’ (MSS)

Tiarh.
+71 τλαίη (Walter 1884)\(^7\)
+88–89 del. (Hermann 1822)
+90 μὴ <οὐ> (Valckenaer pre-1775)
+93 πῦθον (Blaydes 1871)
+98 γας (Schneidewin 1854)
+114 <εν> (Erfurdt 1802)
+171 ὦς (Blaydes 1871)
*205 δόμος (Burges teste Dindorf 1885)
+206 ἐφεστίουσιν (Blaydes 1871)
302 οἶκων (Blaydes 1871)
313 εἴκεν (Schneidewin 1854)
*326 δακρυρρροεῖ (MSS, Brunck 1786)
*328 αὐτή (MSS)
344 κείνους (Blaydes 1871)
+356–357 del. (Wunder 1841)
377 ἦ (Blaydes 1871)
+440 πεφύκασ’ (Nauck 1866) [crossed out]
*549 τοῦδ’ (Zippmann 1868)
628 προσβέγματ’ (Hermann 1848)
*747 κού (MS, Valckenaer pre-1775)
866 εὐσημον (Hense 1880; noluit Walter 1877)

\(^7\) Walter writes τλείη (K. Walter, “Kritische bemerkungen zu Sophokles,” *Philologia* 42 [1884] 266–274, at 274), which is presumably a misprint.
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968 αἵ ter (Musgrave pre-1780, published 1800)

*977 γέρων (MSS)

999 del. καταδερχθήναι (Fröhlich 1815)

1112 <σφ'> εἰσορῷ (Blaydes 1871)

Phil.

+43 φορβῆν (Burges teste Nauck)

203 <του> before τείρομένου (*after it, Porson 1802)

242 ὁ κ φίλης (Blaydes 1870)

+256 πω (MSS)

+304 del. (Bergk 1858)

+369 ὁ σχέπλων τομήσατ’ (Valckenaer pre-1775)

*371 κυρεῖ (Porson 1801)

*457 δειλὸς (Brunck 1786)

478 μέρος (Blaydes 1870)

*491 δεράδα (Τουπ 1780)

+558 πέφυκα γ’, ἀσφαλὴς (Blaydes 1870)

+572 οὖν (Disson 1813)

*614 ἄποκρισι’ (MSS, Valckenaer pre-1775)

786 ἔργαζη (-ει Wecklein 1869)

*994 οὐ φημ’. (Ὁδ. ἐγὼ δὲ (Gernhard 1803 post Wakefield 1794))

*1035 ὀλείσθη (Brunck 1786)

*1071 λειψθήσαμαι δή (Wakefield 1794)

*1238 ταῦτα (MSS)

+1265 νέον (Schneidewin 1855)

*1288 del. οὖκ (Porson 1801)

+1330 οὔτος (Brunck 1786)

*1386 ἐχθροῖσι μ’ (Valckenaer pre-1775, ἀφ. Burges 1833)

+1406 Ἡρακλέους (Brunck 1786)

1422 κὰκ (Wakefield 1794)

OC

*42 ἄν (Vauvilliers 1781)

+307 ἔπει (Brunck 1786)

+454 ἕρεσιν (Wunder 1867)

+534 αὐτ’ ἀρ’ (MSS)

+572 κὰκ (Blaydes 1859)

*644 marks aposiopesis (Brunck 1786)
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There are also some emendations which I have not seen attributed to a later scholar, but which are worth recording in case they are of interest to future editors:

**Aj.**

813–814 delendi ("pueriliter")

**El.**

1210 τέφρας
1449 τοῦ φιλτάτου

**OT**

105 ἀκούσας
308 αὐ
407 μαντείαράστα
1005 μάλιστ' ἐς

**Ant.**

27 μὴ ὁ
414 λόγουσι
745 ἦ ...;
748 οὔκουν ...;
1014 delendus

*Phil.*
55 πλέκων

*OC*
1375 ἔξαφῆκ’

In all, that makes 55 emendations accepted by the editors of the OCT, 38 found in their apparatus, and 42 that appear in neither. By citing these figures I do not mean to imply that the Oxford editors’ assessment of each conjecture is necessarily the correct one. But the figures do provide a rough guide to the significance of this discovery. Markland’s name has hitherto barely featured in the apparatus of critical editions of Sophocles. Now he stands revealed as one of the most prolific and successful emenders of his text. Taken with the recent haul of unpublished scholarship on Sophocles by (among others) Valckenaer and Pierson, Markland’s conjectures mean that the contribution of the eighteenth century to the purification of Sophocles’ text is now far greater than had been imagined. This has considerable implications for our understanding of the history of classical scholarship on Greek dramatic texts.
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9 I am grateful to *GRBS*’s anonymous referee for helpful comments.