

bourg, 1786) changed all this by calling attention to the comparative excellence and antiquity of Paris A.

Thus, after some wanderings, the text reverted, so far as MS. authority was concerned, to a form approaching that of the first printed edition. Brunck also deserves the credit of many successful emendations, and of having first collected and edited the Fragments,—no mean task.

A new point of departure was gained by Elmsley, who collated L. This MS. had been mentioned by Montfaucon as of the tenth century, but modern scholars before Elmsley had not had access to it, and its character was but vaguely appreciated. Elmsley's collation was printed partly in his third edition of the O. T. (1825) and in that of the Oed. Col. and partly in Gaisford's (Oxon. 1826) edition of the seven plays. His transcript of the Scholia (printed in 1825) still exists in his handwriting in the Bodleian Library. The relative values of L, A, and T, were known to Hermann, for whose edition (1839), V² and V³ (while still at Paris) were also partially collated; but the application of the principles which he acknowledged has been gradual. One consequence of the reaction against T, which has influenced succeeding editions, excepting that of Blaydes, has been retained, though not without a sense of inconsistency, by the present editor. The Triclinian readings, although appearing in MSS. of the fourteenth century, are classed amongst conjectural emendations.

Subsequently Sophoclean criticism has been further modified by the assertion of Cobet and Dindorf, that L is the archetype of all existing MSS. This assumption has been examined at some length in my Preface to Vol. I. It has done great good by concentrating the attention of scholars on L, which is now pretty thoroughly known; but, as I have tried to show, it has led to an undue depreciation of the so-called 'apographa.'

In accordance with the considerations urged in Vol. I.