

consistent. It is now a quarter of a century since he made the same objection<sup>1</sup>, though certainly with less of acrimony, against the edition of Schneidewin. And the quarrel is still older, for his criticism of the German editor in this respect may be viewed as a reply to Hermann's not ungracious remark, that Elmsley would have done better to adopt a less discursive method of annotation<sup>2</sup>.

I am not aware that Schneidewin ever made rejoinder. But the grounds of his procedure are evident. He was writing not for editors but for students, whose attention ought not to be unnecessarily distracted from their author at every turn to judge between the commentator and his predecessors.

The practice of minimizing such references has of course its limits.

It is at once admitted that where a *conjectural emendation* is adopted, the name of its first author should be given. Even this, however, is not always quite a simple duty. *Αικάλλουσι* for *ἐκκαλοῦσι* in O. T. 597 was conjectured independently by Musgrave and L. Dindorf with more than half a century between them. The credit of the emendation was at one time claimed for the name of Dindorf. It is now modestly ascribed to Musgrave. His words are: 'Fuit etiam cum de *αικάλλουσι* cogitarem: sed videbatur ea vox turpem potius assentationem, quam honestam petitionem significare.' A sentence which places the editor who adopts the conjecture in this dilemma: he must ascribe it to one who was not the first to think of it, or to one who has declined the honour. Again, *χρηστοῖς* has been proposed by more than one critic as a correction of *χρησθείς* in Ant. 24; but *χρηστοῖς δίκαια* is understood by one to mean 'Just meed of virtue,' by another 'What good men approve.' Here are two emendations and not one only. Suppose the sense last thought of to be

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Kennedy's review of Schneidewin's Sophocles appears in the Cambridge Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology for 1854.

<sup>2</sup> 'Si de rebus alienis in commentariis

scriptum est, non tam hi scriptoris causa facti esse, quam scriptor, ut commentarius scribi potuerit, editus videtur.' Herm. Opusc. vol. iii, p. 144, ed. Lips. 1828.