

are still preserved in the various libraries of Europe. Where this 217 knowledge cannot be obtained, the critic incurs continual danger of attributing double or triple authority to the same copy, by 218 citing it under two or three different names. The investigation, indeed, is attended by much difficulty, in consequence of the carelessness or bad faith of the editors, who commonly exaggerate both the number and the value of their manuscript authorities. A single incorrect and recent copy, is sometimes styled *mirae fidei et vetustatis exemplaria*; and a printed edition is frequently quoted under the name of *alii libri*, *nonnulli codices*, etc. It is in consequence of not understanding this phraseology, which was once the common language of the profession, that the modern editors of Sophocles gravely appeal to the manuscripts of that poet, collated by Henry Stephens. We certainly impute no intentional fraud to that learned printer; but we are not the less convinced, that no grounds exist for supposing that he ever examined any copy of Sophocles, either written or printed, except the edition of Turnebus. Turnebus himself has printed a number of various readings at the end of his edition of Aeschylus, with the following title: *Τὰ ἄλλως εὐρεθέντα ἐν τισὶν ἀντιγράφοις*. Misled by the ambiguity of the expression, subsequent editors not unfrequently quote these various readings by the name of *MSS. apud Turnebum*; and we observe, that both Mr Butler and Mr Blom-

---

--21. *Codex Baroccianus num. 231 hujus quoque collationem praebe-  
runt Porsoni schedae.* As there is only one Baroccian manuscript of  
Aeschylus, it is evident that these two numbers designate the same  
copy. We presume that Mr Butler will not forget to notice, in his  
'general Preface,' the great resemblance which subsists between the  
Baroccian manuscript and his own *Venetus primus*. See particularly  
v. 182, 618, 627, 809, 870, 874, 902. Perhaps one of these copies  
is a transcript of the other. We also observe, that they are very  
nearly related to the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, and, what is of more  
importance to the critic, to the miserable copy from which Aldus  
printed the Prometheus.—22. *Emerici Bigoti codex; cujus varietates  
secum communicatas habuerat Musgravius, e cujus libro descripsit Por-  
sonus.* The manuscripts which belonged to Emeri Bigot were pur-  
chased, after his death, by the Abbé de Louvois for the Royal libra-  
ry. Of the nine copies of the Prometheus above enumerated, that  
which is numbered 2786 bears, in the catalogue, the name of *Telle-  
rianus*, and, from that circumstance, appears to be the same as that  
purchased by the Abbé de Louvois, whose surname was Le Tellier.  
This observation, if it be correct, will identify Mr Blomfield's twen-  
ty-second copy with his eighth or ninth.—23, 24. *Mosquenses duo  
apud Schutzium.*—25. *Codex Vitebergensis a Zeunio collatus.*—26, 27.  
*Lipsienses duo apud Butlerum.*—28. *Codex Guelpherbytanus, apud Schut-  
zium.*—29, 30. *Veneti duo apud Butlerum.* We will not anticipate  
Mr Butler's general Preface, by making any observations on the eight  
copies last enumerated.