

in editing the Fragments, I have availed myself of Mr. R. Ellis' acute remarks on them in the Cambridge Journal of Philology, Vol. IV, and that I am largely indebted, as every editor must now be, to the edition of the Tragic Fragments by A. Nauck, Leipzig, 1856.

I had once hoped, as indicated in a former writing, to give here some general account of previous editions of Sophocles. Further reflection has induced me to relinquish that project. To have executed it on any considerable scale would have unduly burdened a work which is already sufficiently loaded.

To assign to Aldus, Canter, Turnebus, Camerarius, H. Stephanus, Capperonier, Vauvillers, Brunck, Musgrave, Erfurdt, Hermann, Elmsley, Schneidewin, and a host of names only less distinguished than these, each his own proper share of merit and of blame, would be, indeed, a work demanding high qualities, and not unworthy of any scholar's ambition. But for myself, I feel compelled to decline it.

It may be well, however, to indicate once more in outline the history of the text.

Aldus (Venice, 1502) seems to have depended on the Venetian MSS.<sup>1</sup>, the most legible of which, 467 (V<sup>3</sup>), is very closely akin to Paris A.

The first Juntine edition (Florence, 1522, editor Antonius Francinus) follows closely on the Aldine traces; but the editor of the second Juntine, who is said to have been Victorius, appears to have had access to L; and the Roman edition of the Scholia (A. D. 1618) was taken either from this or a kindred MS.

The next important edition, that of Turnebus (Paris, 155<sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub>), is memorable for the importance attributed by its editor to Paris T, the Parisian copy of the recension of Triclinius, with his Scholia on the metres, etc. This new influence continued through Stephanus (1568), Canter (1579), Capperonier and Vauvillers, and the London editions, until Brunck (Stras-

<sup>1</sup> See in O. C. 110.