

Part of the above reasoning may remind us that the omission of lines is a not infrequent error of the scribes. In most MSS. of Sophocles some lines have been omitted by the first hand. These have generally, but not always, been supplied in the margin either by the *διορθωτής* of the MS. or by some corrector. In the O. T. and O. C. for example, the following lines are found in L only in the *margin*:— O. T. 62 (C¹), 141 (C²), 641 (C^{1 or 2}), 800 (C⁷); O. C. 69 (C²), 899 (C²), 1105 (C²), 1256 (C²), 1375 (C²). Similarly, O. T. 46 is found on the margin of A, O. C. 99–101 on the margin of V³, Ant. 400 on the margin of L², El. 33 on the margin of Pal., etc. Ant. 942 is wholly omitted in Vat. b, Ant. 1167 is omitted, I believe, in all the MSS., but is twice quoted with its context by Athenaeus. If these facts are fairly considered, we shall hardly be accused of doing violence to probability, if in dealing with two passages which seem otherwise intractable, viz. O. T. 623–5, Phil. 1251–8, we have recourse to the hypothesis of a lost line.

The transposition of lines is a less frequent error. In the Laurentian MS., it occurs twice in the Antigone, viz. in ll. 482, 3, 897–9; but in both instances the scribe has rectified his own error with $\beta' a'$ (2, 1) and $\beta' \gamma' a'$ (2, 3, 1) placed in the margin. In some later MSS. long passages are occasionally transposed, e.g. in Ricc. 34 (followed in this and other respects by the Middlehill MS. 310), Ant. ll. 477–584 come after l. 691. But no inference can be fairly drawn from fourteenth century errors to changes which are to be supposed antecedent to L.

The separate editions of these four plays by Mr. Blaydes, and those of the Ajax and Electra by Mr. Jebb, are also referred to from time to time. Some hints have been derived from Wecklein, chiefly on the Electra, and from Cavallin on the Philoctetes.

It would be tedious and profitless to specify the help derived from earlier editions, etc. But I may mention that