

consideration, that scholiasts in perplexity could not possibly suppose ἔνδικος (v. 329) to be a neuter substantive, or παροῦσαν (v. 695) to signify *past*. The first hypothesis would have seemed to them perfectly natural; and the second would have passed at once with a tacit ἀντὶ τοῦ παριοῦσαν καὶ παρελθοῦσαν.

It is perhaps worth while also to remark, since inaccurate language is sometimes used on the subject, that in strictness a *scholium* proves no more than that the reading, to which it refers, was propounded or assumed by some interpreter. Whether the reading was anywhere found we cannot tell, much less infer it to be older or otherwise better certified than that existing in the ms. Sometimes indeed we can assert the contrary. For instance in *Cho.* 216 the text has an impossible ἐκπαγλουμένης, while the *scholium* assumes ἐκπαγλουμένην. Not only however is the accusative in itself unacceptable, but it does not account for the existing genitive, and never was (we may be sure) in any ms. from which M is descended. It is merely a superficial conjecture, if indeed it is not a blunder. I take this opportunity of mentioning this *scholium* (ἐκπάγλως θαυμάζουσαν), because in the note to the passage it has been unintentionally omitted.