

linken Flügel), nachdem der rechte Flügel vorgerückt war. Diese Stelle bei Aischylos bestärkt auch die Auffassung von $\acute{\omicron} \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ Persae 339f. als eine nicht mathematisch genaue Gesamtzahl der griechischen Schiffe, sondern als „Gros, Hauptmasse“, worauf ich anderen Orts zurückkommen werde.

Auf Grund dieses Befundes darf man also sagen, daß der Ausdruck $\tau\eta\nu \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu \sigma\tau\alpha\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ bei Thuc. 7, 43,2 „den Hauptteil des Heeres, der zu dieser Expedition notwendig und bestimmt war“, bedeutet. Diese Auffassung von $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu$ paßt nicht nur gut in den Zusammenhang¹⁸⁾, sondern bestätigt auch die gute Überlieferung.

Notes on Phrynichus' Ἐκλογία

By JOHN J. KEANEY, Princeton University

In an article published posthumously¹⁾, R. Schöll was the first to impose some semblance of order on the confused text-tradition of the *Ἐκλογία*. In particular, he pointed to the importance of S (Vaticanus Gr. 2226) which had been unknown to editors and showed that it was intermediate between a (lost) ms. used by Nuñez²⁾ and a class of mss. used by Lobeck and Rutherford. Schöll (p. 510) said of S that „in einer ganzen Reihe von Fällen hat er allein das Richtige bewahrt.“ I print below four such cases which seem of special interest³⁾.

(1) *Ἀνταύλης* (p. 167 Lobeck) $\mu\eta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon$, ἀλλὰ $\psi\iota\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \alpha\delta\lambda\eta\tau\eta\acute{\varsigma}$, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἕτερος κύκλιος $\alpha\delta\lambda\eta\tau\eta\acute{\varsigma}$. *ἀνταύλης*, attested only in this passage, is wrong. The correct form is *Πυθαύλης*⁴⁾, as is clear from S (*Πυθαύλης*

¹⁸⁾ Poppo und Steup hatten also den Sinn der Stelle erkannt, glaubten aber, diesen Sinn im Text nur durch die Konjektur in *πολλήν* bzw. *πλειστην* herstellen zu können.

¹⁾ Sitzungsber. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1893, II, 493–540. Cf. also D. Strout and R. French, RE 20, 923.

²⁾ Barcelona, 1586 (Nunnesius Valentinus). There is also an epitome of this recension in Laur. 91, sup. 10, published by Schöll, 524–540. The epitome is only useful for the first item discussed in the text.

³⁾ The conjecture of Hartung (*ῥαλιον*) in Corinna, F 36 PMG, is the reading of S: cf. Schöll, 521 (where correct *παδαθήσεις* to *παῖδα θήσεις*).

⁴⁾ The letter *Π* is in the hand of the rubricator. Faulty rubrication is the source of the reading *ἀνθαύλης* in Pal. Gr. 243 and Vat. Gr. 1377 and 1410; this reading may have given rise to *ἀνταύλης*.

μη λέγε κτλ.) and from the Laurentian epitome (ἀδλητῆς μη Πυθαγόλης). Πυθαγόλης is not cited before Roman times (LSJ) and this is presumably why Phrynichus condemned it.

(2) *Λίβανον* (p. 187 Lobeck) . . . *Μένανδρος ἐν τῇ Σαμίᾳ* (F 1 Körte)
φέρει τὴν λιβανωτὸν· σὺ δ' ἐπίθεις τὸ πῦρ, Τρόφῃ.

The quotation is likely to be a confused reminiscence⁵⁾ of *Samia* 158:

σπείσας τε και λιβανωτὸν ἐπιθεις [

The feminine gender of *λιβανωτός* goes back to Nuñez' edition and is attested only here. S, with the other mss. I have checked, reads *τόν* and I suspect that *τήν* is nothing more than a typographical error.

(3) *Ἐπιχειμάζεις σαυτὸν* (p. 387 Lobeck), *Μένανδρος* (F 845) *εἴρηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ λυπεῖν και Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ὁμοίως. πειστέον δὲ τοῖς δοκίμοις, τοῖς μηδ' εἰδόσι τοῦνομα. ἐπιχειμάζειν* is not otherwise attested and Meineke thought the reference the same as in Ammonius, *de adf. vocab. diff.* 511 Nickau: *χειμάζειν οὐ μόνον τὸ παραχειμάζειν ἀλλὰ και τὸ ἐνοχλεῖν, ὡς Μένανδρος ἐν Ἡνιόχῳ* (F 184). Meineke's suggestion is supported by the reading of S⁶⁾: *τί χειμάζεις αὐτὸν*. Since *χειμάζειν* is elsewhere used by Menander with a reflexive force (F 335, P. Oxy. 2654, line 6), the true reading is likely to be *τί χειμάζεις σαυτὸν* (σ:ε:αυτὸν Snell).

(4) In his article⁷⁾ on (the unlikely named) *Γαγιανὸς ὁ Σμυρναῖος* (s.v. *Σύσσημον*, p. 418 Lobeck), W. Schmid suggested that the true reading might be *Γαιανός*. This is the reading of S and is doubtless correct, although Gaianus cannot be further identified.

A new Approach to Greek Prosody

By M. L. WEST, Oxford

My aim is to formulate boldly and severely something that professional metricians already know: that the conventional classification of syllables as long or short is too crude for the detailed understanding of Greek metre. I shall argue that it is necessary to distinguish at least seven different syllabic quantities.

⁵⁾ This was suggested by R. Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XXV, 65.

⁶⁾ Again, the letter *T* is in the hand of the rubricator.

⁷⁾ RE 7, 467.