

Blomfield; and that no metaphysician or political economist whatsoever is responsible for any of the sentiments which they contain.

We presume that our readers are well aware, that we should act in a mode perfectly inconsistent with the mysteries of our profession, if we entered into any explanation as to the manner in which our review of Mr Butler's work was composed, or the persons who assisted in the composition. It is with considerable reluctance that we speak even hypothetically upon a question which we wish to involve in the most profound secrecy. We shall content ourselves, therefore, with observing, that if Mr Butler's suspicions are well founded, the appellation of *the fairest of critics* is no less due to Mr Blomfield than to the Rev. Luke Milbourn, whose remarks upon Dryden's translation of Virgil were accompanied by a specimen of a rival translation executed by himself. *

The rivalry which may be supposed to exist between the Prometheus of Mr Butler and that of Mr Blomfield, does not arise from any remarkable resemblance, either in the plan or the execution of the two works. Mr Butler's edition contains the corrupt text of Stanley; three distinct sets of Scholia; a Latin version; the commentary of Stanley; a very ample selection of various readings, and critical remarks on the text; and, lastly, an equally ample selection of explanatory notes. The quantity of matter comprized in these various articles is so great, that Mr Butler's edition of the Prometheus occupies nearly two thirds of a considerable volume in quarto. Mr Blomfield's edition, which is a pamphlet of moderate dimensions, contains a Greek text, exceedingly different from that of Stanley, under which are exhibited the most important various readings, interspersed with occasional observations, chiefly relating to points of verbal criticism. An explanatory glossary is added at the end of the volume. We shall endeavour to give our readers an account of the manner in which Mr Blomfield has executed each of the three departments of his work.

In our account of Mr Butler's edition, we lamented that he was compelled, by the stern decree of the Syndics of the University press, to adhere strictly to the text of Stanley; which, in fact, is no other than the text of Henry Stephens, with a few alterations and improvements by Canter, and by Stanley himself.

* See Pope's note on the Dunciad, book ii. v. 349. Perhaps a recent instance of a similar nature may occur to the attentive readers of the Edinburgh Review.