

We are apprehensive, that although Mr Butler's edition is, on the whole, the best which has yet appeared, the adoption of so depraved a text will for ever prevent it from being useful in any other way than as a book of reference. At the same time, we are rather inclined to believe, that critical scholars will consult it with more advantage in its present state, than they would have done if the editor had been permitted to employ his own judgment in the formation of his text. It is with the edition of Stanley; or with that of Pauw which is reprinted from it, with no intentional alterations of the text, that manuscripts have been most usually compared. So far, therefore, as any inference can be drawn from the silence of the collator, we are justified in supposing, that, in those passages which he passes over without notice, the readings of the manuscript agree with the text of Stanley. In consequence of this circumstance, an editor of Aeschylus, who makes use of former collations, which all editors who attend to various readings are compelled to do, will find that the greatest care and vigilance will not prevent him from frequently misleading his readers, and sometimes himself, unless he either adopts the text of Stanley, or exhibits it distinctly in his notes, as the standard with which his various readings are to be compared. The truth of this observation will perhaps be rendered more conspicuous by an example. In the 235th verse of the play before us, Mr Blomfield has printed ἐξερουσάμην, in his text, with the following note—'ἐξελυσάμην, Rob.' The obvious interpretation of these words is, that both manuscripts and editions, for 214 the most part, read ἐξερουσάμην; and the other reading depends principally upon the authority of the edition of Robortellus. The fact, however, is otherwise. The editions of Stephanus and Stanley agree with that of Robortellus; and we have little doubt that a great majority of the manuscripts concur in the same lection. It is from the circumstance of Stanley's having ἐξελυσάμην, that the collators are silent as to that reading, and specify those manuscripts alone which have ἐξερουσάμην. We observe, for instance, that Vauvilliers gives ἐξερουσάμην as the reading of two of the five manuscripts of the Prometheus, the collation of which he has published in the first and fourth volumes of the *Notices des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque du Roi*. As he does not state the reading of the remaining three, we may fairly conclude that they retain ἐξελυσάμην; especially as Vauvilliers has extracted, out of each of the five manuscripts, a various reading of another word in the same line. We will add Mr Butler's note on this passage, which will betray the reader into no error from which Mr Butler is himself exempt. 'ΕΞΕΛΥΣΑΜΗΝ. Ἐξερουσάμην Ask. A. C. Ven. 1. 2. Ox. In Ask. B. quoque ἐξερουσάμην, sed ibi supra—