

and art around him,—but with free exercise of the mind and taste, thinking only of the drama itself, and of its qualities as such. Surely that is, above all things, what is to be desired by us just now in regard to all the worthiest literature of the world—that people should know some part of it (the quantity matters much less) *at first hand*,—not merely through manuals of literary history or magazine articles. Summaries, when the work of scholars, may be valuable as introductions and as retrospects; but only the breath of the great literature itself can make the dry bones live. Any one who had read thoroughly and intelligently a single play such as the *Oedipus Tyrannus* would have derived far more intellectual advantage from Greek literature, and would comprehend far better what it has signified in the spiritual history of mankind, than if he had committed to memory the names, dates, and abridged contents of a hundred Greek books ranging over half-a-dozen centuries.

‘Explanatory notes ought to be written in one’s own ‘language, critical in the Latin.’...‘The traditionary Latin of ‘scholars’ has ‘created in a manner a vocabulary of its own.’ This is the principle laid down by Shilleto in the preface to his edition of Demosthenes *On the Embassy*, and it could not have been better exemplified than by his own practice in that celebrated book. He felt, as everyone must, the occasional difficulty of drawing the line between ‘critical’ and ‘explanatory.’ But the fact is that the difficulty becomes serious only if we try to make the line a hard-and-fast one. Practically, it can nearly always be solved by a little exercise of discretion. When both sets of notes are on the same page, no real inconvenience can arise in cases where either department slightly overlaps the other.

In a later part of this edition, when dealing in short essays with other matters of general interest in relation to Sophocles,