my success, I can safely say that my general object has been to approximate as nearly to the external conditions of my author as the English language, viewed as a vehicle for poetry, would admit; and even in those instances (very few, I trust) where I appear to have deviated from them at all widely, to give a true impression of the thing said and the manner of saying it.

In adverting to my work as an annotator, I need only notice the two editions which have more immediately preceded mine in England, those of Mr. Peile and Mr. Paley. They happen to stand in some degree in opposition to each other, the notes of the one being written in English, and intended as a contribution to an "enlarged, practical, vivid, and therefore popular treatment of Greek literature," those of the other exhibiting a return to the old language, and as a general rule, to the old style of critical investigation. Though I cannot but respect the sagacity, terseness, and general good sense displayed by the latter, I must still consider that he, in common with others, has dwelt disproportionately on one of his predecessor's faults of execution, while so far as he differs from him in principle, he has shown a less complete view of the requirements of modern criticism. In spite of all the instances of prolixity, pseudophilosophical refinement, and unpoetical phraseology, which can be collected from Mr. Peile's book, he seems to me to have done service to his generation by departing from the dogmatic style of note-writing, which rules without giving reasons, and thus tends to isolate philology from all other branches of knowledge, and seeking to introduce discussions which may claim a place in positive philosophy as dealing with facts of human nature, and consequently of human interest. This intention has been converted into "the idea of making Æschylus popular by English notes," and as such, stigmatised as "one of the wildest chimeras which ever entered the human brain d:" but, more candidly

d Dyer's Tentamina Æschylea, p. 29.