

**(1a) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, *Grammatici Graeci* I.iii.37.10–38.14 (Σ<sup>d</sup>):**

**(a) Herodian and Apollonius investigated which of E and O was shorter:**

καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων δέ, τῶν βραχέων φημί, ὃ τε Ἡρωδιανὸς ὁ τεχνικὸς καὶ ὁ τούτου πατὴρ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐζήτησαν, τί τίνος ἐστὶ βραχύτερον.

**(b) Apollonius' argument that O is shorter:**

καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος φησὶ τὸ O εἶναι βραχύτερον τοῦ E, ἀποδείξει τοιαύτην χρώμενος· λέγει γὰρ ὅτι τὸ I ἐκατέρω αὐτῶν προσθεὶς ποιήσεις δηλονότι δύο διφθόγγους, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ μείζων ἢ τὸ E ἔχουσα, ἡ δὲ ἐλάσσων ἢ τὸ O ἔχουσα, ὡς εἶναι αὐτὴν βραχεῖαν καὶ ἐν τοῖς τόνοις, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὅμηροι Πρίαμοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις.

**(c) Herodian's argument against Apollonius:**

ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς τὸ E μᾶλλον λέγει εἶναι βραχύτερον, ἀποδεικνύς οὕτως· φησὶ γὰρ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῆ παραθέσει τοῦ I ἐξετάζειν ἐκείνων τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν ἄνευ τινὸς παραθέσεως καὶ μάλιστα τῆς τοῦ I· τοῦτο γὰρ συγγενεῖαν τινα ἔχει πρὸς τὸ E· καὶ δείκνυσιν ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ἐκφώνησιν τοῦ I εἶναι ὄνομα τοῦ E γράμματος· τῷ συγγενεῖ οὖν προστεθὲν μεγάλην τινα καὶ δυναμικωτάτην δίφθογγον ἀπετέλεσεν· τῷ δὲ O προσελθόν, ᾧ οὐκ ἔχει συγγένειαν, οὐκ ἐνεδείξατο ὄλην τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν. ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος ἀνθρωπεῖου, ἵνα καὶ μᾶλλον σαφῶς αὐτὸ νοήσωμεν, εἴ τις ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ θεάσαιτο χρεῖαν ἔχοντα βοήθειας, ὅλη τῆ ψυχῆ ὑπερασπίζει αὐτὸν καὶ συμπράττει καὶ ὑπερμαχεῖ· ἀλλ' οὖν οὐχ ὅλη τῆ ψυχῆ ὑπὲρ ξένου τοῦτο ποιήσει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἀδρανεστέρα ἢ τῶν ἀμφοτέρων δύναμις πρὸς τοὺς ἐξ ἐναντίας ὠφθη· οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ I νόησον, ὅτι οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐπεδείξατο τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τοῦ O, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ E τοῦ συγγενοῦς.

**(d) Herodian's argument for the opposite conclusion:**

διὰ τοιούτων λόγων ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἀνατρέψας τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν ἐπιφέρει τοιαύτην δικαιολογίαν, δι' ἧς δείκνυσιν τὸ E βραχύτερον τοῦ O ἐλεγχόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς κλίσεως τῶν ὀνομάτων. φησὶ δὲ ἀληθέστατον κανόνα τοιοῦτον, ὅτι πᾶσα κλητικὴ τῆς ἰδίας εὐθείας ἢ ἴση ἐστὶν ἢ ἐλάσσων, μείζων δὲ οὐδέποτε· ἢ γὰρ φυλάσσει τὸ τῆς τελευταίας συλλαβῆς φωνῆεν, καὶ δηλονότι ἴση ἐστίν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ὄξνοφῶν ὦ Ὄξνοφῶν, ἢ καλὴ ὦ καλή, τὸ παιδίον ὦ παιδίον, ἢ ἐὰν μὲν τρέπη, οὔτε εἰς ἴσον οὔτε εἰς μείζον τρέπει αὐτό, ἀλλὰ πάντως εἰς ἕλαττον, ὁ

And on the subject of these vowels—I mean the short ones—the grammarian Herodian and his father Apollonios investigated which was shorter than which.

And Apollonius says that the O is shorter than the E, with the following sort of demonstration: for he says that if you add an I to each of these you'll make two diphthongs, of which the one containing an E is longer and the one with an O shorter, so that the latter is also short for the accent, as in Ὅμηροι, Πρίαμοι, and such words.

But Herodian says that the E is shorter, and he demonstrates it as follows: he says to his father that one shouldn't calculate the value of the vowels with the addition of an I but independently, without any addition and certainly without that of an I. For this vowel has a certain relationship with E. And he shows this on the basis that the pronunciation of I is the name of E. Because being added to its relative, it produced a big and very powerful diphthong. But on coming together with O, with which it does not have any relationship, it did not display its entire power. Just as in human experience too (so that we can understand it more clearly), if someone were to see his brother in need of help, he defends him with all his might and joins with him and fights on his behalf. But he will not do this with all his might on behalf of a stranger, as a result of which the power of them both towards those on the other side was seen to be weaker. So too in the case of I, understand that it did not display its power in connection with O in the same way as it did in connection with its relative E.

Having overtuned his father's view by means of such words, Herodian brings forward the following kind of pleading, by which he shows that E is proved shorter than O by the declension of nouns. And he gives a very precise rule of the following sort: every vocative is as long as its own nominative or shorter, but never longer. Either the vocative keeps the vowel of the last syllable (of the nominative), and then it's clear that the form is equally long, as in Ὄξνοφῶν (nominative), Ὄξνοφῶν (vocative); καλή (nominative), καλή (vocative); παιδίον (nominative), παιδίον (vocative), or, if the vocative changes the vowel, it doesn't

Ὁρέστης ὡ Ὁρέστα (τὸ α τοῦ η βραχύτερον), ὁ Μέμνων ὦ Μέμνον (ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς εὐθείας τὸ ω, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κλητικῆς τὸ ο), ὁ Ἀπόλλων ὦ Ἀπολλων, ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ὦ Ἀριστόφανες· ἐπὶ τοῦ Ὅμηρος οὖν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν εἰς ΟΣ ἢ ἐφυλάξατο τὸ Ο ἢ κλητική, ἢ ἐὰν τρέπη αὐτό, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τρέπει, πάντως εἷς τι βραχύτερον τοῦ Ο τρέπει αὐτό· ἐπειδὴ οὖν εἰς Ε τρέπει αὐτό, δηλονότι τὸ Ε βραχύτερόν ἐστι τοῦ Ο, οἷον ὁ Ὅμηρος ὦ Ὅμηρε.

change it into an equally long or longer one, but in every case into a shorter one, as in Ὁρέστης (nominative), Ὁρέστα (vocative)—the A is shorter than the H—; Μέμνων (nominative), Μέμνον (vocative)—the nominative has an Ω and the vocative an Ο—; Ἀπόλλων (nominative), Ἀπολλων (vocative); Ἀριστοφάνης (nominative), Ἀριστόφανες (vocative). In the case of Ὅμηρος, then, and all words ending in -ΟΣ the vocative has either kept the Ο or, if it changes it—which it does here—, it in every case changes it into something shorter than an Ο. So given that it changes an Ο into an Ε here, it's clear that Ε is shorter than Ο, as in Ὅμηρος (nominative), Ὅμηρε (vocative).

### (1β) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, *Grammatici Graeci* I.iii.498.3–35 (Σ<sup>1</sup>):

#### (a) Herodian and Apollonius investigated which of Ε and Ο was shorter:

ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων Ἡρωδιανὸς καὶ ὁ μὲν τούτου πατήρ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐζήτησαν, τί τίνος βραχύτερον·

#### (b) Apollonius' argument that Ο is shorter:

καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος φησὶ τὸ Ο· λέγει γὰρ ὅτι τὸ Ι ἐκατέρω αὐτῶν προσθεῖς ποιήσεις δύο διφθόγγους· καὶ ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ μείζων ἢ τὸ Ε ἔχουσα, ἡ δὲ ἐλάσσων ἢ τὸ Ο ἔχουσα, ὡς εἶναι αὐτὴν καὶ βραχεῖαν ἐν τοῖς τόνοις, οἷον Ὅμηροι.

#### (c) Herodian's argument against Apollonius:

ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς μᾶλλον λέγει τὸ Ε βραχύτερον· φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῆ παραθέσει τοῦ Ι ἐξετάζειν ἐκείνων τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν ἄνευ τινὸς παραθέσεως καὶ μάλιστα τῆς τοῦ Ι· τοῦτο γὰρ συγγένειαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ Ε· καὶ δείκνυσιν ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ἐκφώνησιν τοῦ Ι εἶναι ὄνομα τοῦ Ε γράμματος· τῷ συγγενεῖ οὖν προστεθὲν μεγάλην τὴν δίφθογγον ἀπετέλεσεν, τῷ δὲ Ο προσελθὸν τὸ Ι, ὦ οὐκ ἔχει συγγένειαν, οὐκ ἐνεδείξατο ὅλην τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν· ὡς ἐπὶ παραδείγματος ἀνθρωπείου, εἴ τις ἀδελφὸν ἑαυτοῦ θεάσαιτο χρεῖαν ἔχοντα βοήθειας, ὅλη ψυχῆ ὑπερασπίζει αὐτοῦ, εἰ δὲ ξένον, εἰ καὶ συμμαχεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅλω τῷ λογισμῷ· οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ι νόησον, ὅτι οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐπεδείξατο τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν <ἐπὶ τοῦ Ο>, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ε τοῦ συγγενοῦς.

#### (d) Herodian's argument for the opposite conclusion:

διὰ τοιούτων λόγων ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἀποστρέψας τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν ἐπιφέρει τοιαύτην δικαιολογίαν, δείκνυς τὸ Ε βραχύτερον· λέγει δὲ τοιοῦτον κανόνα, ὅτι πᾶσα κλητικὴ τὸν ἴσον χρόνον θέλει ἔχειν τῆς ἰδίας εὐθείας ἢ

And on the subject of these vowels Herodian and his father Apollonios investigated which was shorter than which.

And Apollonius says the Ο (is shorter). For he says that if you add an Ι to each of them you'll make two diphthongs, of which the one containing an Ε is longer and the one with an Ο shorter, so that the latter is also short for the accent, as in Ὅμηροι.

But Herodian rather says that the Ε is shorter. For he says that one must not calculate the value of the vowels with the addition of an Ι but independently, without any addition and certainly without that of an Ι. For this vowel has a relationship with Ε. And he shows this on the basis that the pronunciation of Ι is the name of the letter Ε. Being added to its relative, then, it produced a big diphthong. But on coming together with Ο, the Ι (to which it does not have any relationship) did not display its entire power. Just as in human experience, if someone were to see his brother in need of help, he defends him with all his might, but if a stranger, even if he fights with him, he does not do so with all his power of reasoning. So too in the case of Ι, understand that it did not display its power <in connection with Ο> in the same way as it did in connection with its relative Ε.

Having rejected his father's view by means of such words, Herodian brings forward the following kind of pleading, showing that Ε is shorter. And he gives a rule of the following sort: that every vocative likes to have the same quantity as its own nominative or a shorter one, but never a longer one. And in the case of a

ἐλάττονα, οὐδέποτε δὲ μείζονα· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς εἰς ΟΣ τρέπει αὐτὸ εἰς Ε. πότε ἰσοχρονεῖ τῆ εὐθείᾳ ἢ κλητική, καὶ πότε οὐ; ἠνίκα ἢ εὐθεῖα οὐ μεταβάλλει τὸ φωνῆεν αὐτῆς, ἰσοχρονεῖ τῆ κλητικῆ, ἠνίκα δὲ μεταβάλλει, ἐλάττονα χρόνον <ἔχει ἢ κλητική>. ἐπεὶ οὖν εὐρίσκεται ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ τρεπόμενον τὸ τελικὸν τῆς εὐθείας εἰς Ε, βραχύτερον ἐστὶ τοῦ Ο τὸ Ε.

**(e) An additional argument for the same conclusion (not attributed to anyone in particular):**

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ διαλέκτων· ἡ γὰρ Αἰολίς διάλεκτος διπλασιάζουσα τὰ σύμφωνα τὰ προκείμενα φωνήεντα συστέλλει εἰς ἥσσονα· τὸ πενθήσεις πενθέσ<σ>εις φησίν· εἰ οὖν τὸ τοσοῦτον λέγει τεσ<σ>οῦτον, δηλον ὅτι ὡς ἐκ μείζονος εἰς ἐλάττονα συστολὴν ποιεῖται. ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ ἐνικαὶ γενικαὶ μείζονα τέλη ἔχουσι τῶν πληθυντικῶν εὐθειῶν, οἷον Ῥοδίου Ῥόδιοι, λιθίνης λίθινοι· εἶπερ οὖν ἐξελέξατο ἢ μὲν ἐνικὴ γενικὴ τὸ Ο, ἢ δὲ πληθυντικὴ εὐθεῖα τὸ Ε, ὡς ἐν τῷ Αἴαντος Αἴαντες, δηλον ὡς ἔλαττον καὶ <μᾶλλον> συνεσταλμένον ἐστὶ τὸ Ε τοῦ Ο.

**(1γ) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, *Grammatici Graeci* I.iii.199.15–34 (Σ<sup>v</sup>):**

**(a) Apollonius argues that O is shorter than E:**

πάλιν τῶν δύο βραχέων βραχύτερον μὲν κατὰ Ἀπολλώνιον τὸ Ο· φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ Ε καὶ τὸ Ο, εἰ προσθήσεις [ἐν] ἑκατέρω αὐτῶν τὸ Ι, ποιήσεις δηλονότι δύο διφθόγγους, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ μακροτέρα ἢ τὸ Ε ἔχουσα· ἐν τέλει γὰρ λέξεως εὐρισκομένη ἢ ΟΙ διφθόγγος διηνεκῶς συστέλλεται, ἢ δὲ ΕΙ οὐδέποτε.

**(b) Herodian objects to Apollonius' argument:**

πρὸς ὃν φησιν Ἡρωδιανός, ὅτι [ὥσπερ] οὐ δεῖ τῆ παραθέσει τοῦ Ι τὴν τοῦ Ε καὶ Ο δύναμιν ἐξετάζεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστον αὐτῶν.

**(c) Apollonius invites Herodian to lay out why:**

ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλώνιος πρὸς αὐτόν· ὦ τέκνον, τί νι λόγῳ;

**(d) Herodian's argument against Apollonius (continued):**

καὶ φησιν ὅτι πᾶν στοιχεῖον ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἄρχεται, τὸ δὲ Ι οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ε, ὥστε συγγενὲς αὐτῷ ἐστὶ· τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς τὸ ἴδιον προσλαμβάνον, μεγαλικωτάτην τινὰ δίφθογγον ἀποτελεῖ, πρὸς ὃ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει συγγένειαν προσλαμβάνον, τὸ Ο οὐχ οὕτως ἐπιβοηθεῖται, ὥστε μεγάλην ἀποτελέσει δίφθογγον. διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δεῖ τῆ παραθέσει τοῦ Ι ταῦτα ἐξετάζεσθαι.

nominative in -ΟΣ it turns it into E. When does the vocative have the same quantity as the nominative, and when not? The nominative has the same quantity as the vocative when it does not change its vowel; and when it changes it, <the vocative> has a shorter quantity. Since, then, in the case of words in ΟΣ the last vowel of the nominative is found being turned into E, E is shorter than O.

But (one can see that an E is shorter than an O) on the basis of the dialects as well. When the Aeolic dialect doubles consonants it makes the preceding vowels shorter: for Aeolic says πενθέσ<σ>εις for πενθήσεις. And so given that it says τεσ<σ>οῦτον for τοσοῦτον, it's clear that the dialect effects a shortening, as from something longer to something shorter. Moreover, genitive singulars have longer terminations than nominative plurals, as in Ῥοδίου Ῥόδιοι, λιθίνης λίθινοι. So given that the genitive singular has decided to have an O and the nominative plural an E, as in Αἴαντος Αἴαντες, it's clear that E is shorter and more <shortened> than O.

And then of the two short vowels, the shorter according to Apollonius is O. For he says that when it comes to E and O, if you add I to each of them you'll obviously make two diphthongs, and the one with an E is the longer. For when it's found at the end of a word, the diphthong OI is invariably treated as short, but the EI never.

To him Herodian says that one must not investigate the power of E and O through the addition of I, but (one must investigate) each of them by itself.

And Apollonius says to him: 'Oh child, on what basis?'

And he (Herodian) says that every letter begins with itself (i.e. the letter-name begins with its own sound value), but I does not begin with itself but with E, so that it is related to it. And that which is related, on taking in its own, produces a really big diphthong. But on taking in that to which it has no relationship, the O is not helped in such a way that it produces a big diphthong. For this reason, one must not investigate these things through the addition of I.

**(e) Herodian’s argument for the opposite conclusion:**

καὶ λοιπὸν ἀποδείκνυσιν Ἡρωδιανὸς τὸ Ε βραχύτερον οὕτως, λέγων ὅτι πᾶσα κλητικὴ ἢ τὸν ἴσον χρόνον θέλει ἔχειν τῆς ἰδίας εὐθείας ἢ ἐλάττονα. οὐδέποτε δὲ μείζονα· ἐπεὶ δὲ εὐρίσκεται τὸ <Ο> τῆς εὐθείας τελικὸν φωνῆεν, ὡς ἐν τῷ κύριος, τρεπόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς κλητικῆς εἰς Ε, βραχύτερον ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ Ε τοῦ Ο.

**(f) Afterthought (which clarifies Herodian’s argument):**

καὶ πότε ἰσοχρονεῖ ἡ κλητικὴ τῇ εὐθείᾳ, καὶ πότε βραχύτερον ἔχει χρόνον; ἡνίκα μὲν ἡ κλητικὴ οὐ μεταβάλλει τὸ φωνῆεν τῆς εὐθείας, ἰσοχρονεῖ αὐτῇ, ἡνίκα δὲ μεταβάλλει, ἐλάττονα ἔχει χρόνον.

And finally Herodian demonstrates that E is shorter as follows: by saying that every vocative likes to have either the same quantity (of vowel) as its own nominative or a shorter one, but never a longer one. And since the O that is the last vowel of a nominative, as in κύριος, is found to be turned into an E in the vocative, E is therefore shorter than O.

And when does the vocative have the same quantity as the nominative and when does it have a shorter quantity? When the vocative does not change the vowel of the nominative it has the same quantity as it; and when it changes it, it has a shorter quantity.

**(2) Choeroboscus’ commentary on Theodosius’ Κανόνες, *Grammatici Graeci* IV.ii.149.34–151.25:**

**(a) A general rule—verbs with a recessive accent in the present have the same number of syllables in the future, unless they have a single Λ:**

ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ μὲν βαρυτόνων θεμάτων ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ ὁ μέλλων τῷ ἐνεστώτι, οἷον τύπτω τύψω—τὸ γὰρ παρ’ Ἀριστοφάνει τυπτήσω ἐν Πλούτῳ (‘οὐ γὰρ με τυπτήσεις στέφανον ἔχοντά γε’ (Ar. *Plut.* 21)) ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων ἐστὶν—λέγω λέξω, πλέκω πλέξω, γράφω γράψω, πείθω πείσω, ἀκούω ἀκούσω, βαδίζω βαδίσω, κείρω κερῶ, φθείρω φθερῶ, μαιίνω μιανῶ. δεῖ προσθεῖναι ‘χωρὶς τῶν ἐχόντων ἐν Λ’ ἐπὶ τούτων γὰρ μιᾷ συλλαβῇ περιττεύει ὁ μέλλων τοῦ ἐνεστώτος, οἷον θέλω θελήσω, μέλω μελήσω, ὡς τὸ ‘μελήσουσιν δέ μοι ἵπποι’ (//.5.228; // 10.481), ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω·

**(b) And verbs with a circumflex on the final syllable of the present have a syllable more in the future (and so do those with one Λ, even without having a circumflex):**

ἀπὸ δὲ περισπωμένων μιᾷ συλλαβῇ περιττεύει ὁ μέλλων τοῦ ἐνεστώτος, οἷον ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω, γελῶ γελάσω, περῶ περάσω, στεφανῶ στεφανώσω, γυψῶ γυψώσω. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων δὲ ἐὰν λάβῃ τις τὴν ἐντέλειαν, εὐρίσκει τὸν μέλλοντα ἰσοσυλλαβὸν τῷ ἐνεστώτι, οἷον ποιέω ποιήσω, βοάω βοήσω, χρυσόω χρυσώσω· ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν ὁ ἐνεστώτης συναιρούμενος ἔνδειαν πάσχει συλλαβῆς, οἷον ποιέω ποιῶ, βοάω βοῶ, χρυσόω χρυσῶ, καὶ τούτου χάριν εὐρίσκεται ὁ μέλλων μιᾷ συλλαβῇ περιττεύων τοῦ ἐνεστώτος· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐχόντων τὸ ἐν Λ, ὡς εἴρηται ἤδη, μιᾷ συλλαβῇ περιττεύει ὁ μέλλων τοῦ ἐνεστώτος, οἷον θέλω θελήσω, ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω.

And one should know that from recessively accented base forms, the future has the same number of syllables as the present, as in τύπτω τύψω (for the form τυπτήσω in Aristophanes’ *Plutus*—οὐ γὰρ με τυπτήσεις στέφανον ἔχοντά γε—is like those from perispomenon base forms), λέγω λέξω, πλέκω πλέξω, γράφω γράψω, πείθω πείσω, ἀκούω ἀκούσω, βαδίζω βαδίσω, κείρω κερῶ, φθείρω φθερῶ, μαιίνω μιανῶ. One must add ‘apart from those with one Λ’, for in these the future has one syllable more than the present, as in θέλω θελήσω, μέλω μελήσω (μελήσουσιν δέ μοι ἵπποι), ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω.

But from perispomenon base forms, the future is one syllable longer than the present, as in ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω, γελῶ γελάσω, περῶ περάσω, στεφανῶ στεφανώσω, γυψῶ γυψώσω. But even in the case of these verbs, if someone takes the full form he will find the future equal in number of syllables to the present, as in ποιέω ποιήσω, βοάω βοήσω, χρυσόω χρυσώσω. But then the present gets contracted and undergoes the loss of a syllable, as in ποιέω ποιῶ, βοάω βοῶ, χρυσόω χρυσῶ, and for this reason the future is found to have a syllable more than the present. And likewise in the case of verbs with one Λ too, as has already been said, the future is a syllable longer than the present, as in θέλω θελήσω, ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω.

**(c) A question—why do verbs with one Λ have a syllable more in the future?**

καὶ ἄξιόν ἐστι ζητῆσαι, διατὶ τὰ δι' ἐνός Λ ἐκφερόμενα περιπτοσυλλάβους ἔχουσι τοὺς μέλλοντας, οἷον θέλω θελήσω, μέλω (τὸ ἐν φροντίδι εἰμί) μελήσω, ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω· ἐμάθομεν γὰρ <ὄτι> ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων θεμάτων ὑπάρχων ὁ μέλλων ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ τῷ ἐνεστῶτι, οἷον τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω.

**(d) Apollonius' solution:**

καὶ λέγει ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν, ὅτι πολλὰ εἰσι ῥήματα καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων καὶ <ὡς> ἀπὸ περισπωμένων ποιοῦντα τὴν κλίσιν, οἷον τύπτω τύψω καὶ τυπτῶ τυπτῆσω, οἷον 'οὐ γὰρ με τυπτῆσεις στέφανον ἔχοντά γε' (Ar. *Plut.* 21) φησὶν Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Πλούτῳ, εἶδω εἶσω, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ 'εἶσομαι εἶ κε μ' ὁ Τυδείδης κρατερὸς Διομήδης' (*Il.* 8.532), καὶ εἰδῶ εἰδήσω, ἐξ οὗ τὸ 'εἰδήσεις δὲ καὶ αὐτός' (*Od.* 7.327), ῥίπτω ἔρριπτον καὶ ῥιπτῶ ἐρρίπτουν, ὡς παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ 'ἀνερρίπτουν' (*Od.* 13.78), κύω ἔκυον καὶ κυῶ ἐκύουν, οἷον 'ἦ δ' ἐκύει φίλον υἰόν' (*Il.* 19.117), γράφω γράψω καὶ γραφῶ γραφήσω, ἐξ οὗ ὁ γεγράφηκα παρακείμενος· οὕτως οὖν καὶ τὰ ἔχοντα ἐν Λ ἕως μὲν τοῦ παρατατικοῦ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν, <οἷον θέλω ἔθελον, μέλω ἔμελον, ὀφείλω ὠφείλον, μετὰ δὲ τὸν παρατατικὸν ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς χρόνοις ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν>, οἷον θελῶ θελήσω τεθέληκα ἐθέλησα, μελῶ μελήσω μεμέληκα ἐμέλησα, ὀφειλῶ ὀφειλήσω ὠφείληκα ὠφείλησα, ὡσπερ νοῶ νοήσω νενόηκα ἐνόησα. ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος.

**(e) Herodian's refutation:**

ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς ἀνατρέπει αὐτὸν λέγων, ὅτι κακῶς λέγεις· τὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων ποιοῦντα τὴν κλίσιν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν, οἷον τύπτω τύψω <καὶ> τυπτῶ τυπτῆσω, ῥίπτω ἔρριπτον καὶ ῥιπτῶ ἐρρίπτουν, εἶδω εἶσω καὶ εἰδῶ εἰδήσω· τὰ δὲ ἔχοντα ἐν Λ οὐ ποιοῦνται κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων θεμάτων καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων τὴν κλίσιν· ἀλλ' ἕως μὲν τοῦ παρατατικοῦ, ὡς εἴρηται, <ὡς> ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων θεμάτων ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν, οὐδέποτε δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων.

And it's worth asking why those verbs produced with one Λ have an additional syllable in their futures, as in θέλω θελήσω, μέλω ('I am in someone's thoughts') μελήσω, ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω. For we've learnt <that> if it is from a recessive base form the future has the same number of syllables as the present, as in τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω.

And Apollonius gives the following reason, that there are many verbs which make their inflection both as from recessive base forms and as from perispomenon ones, like τύπτω τύψω and τυπτῶ τυπτῆσω (in the way that Aristophanes says οὐ γὰρ με τυπτῆσεις στέφανον ἔχοντά γε in the *Plutus*), εἶδω εἶσω (from which comes also εἶσομαι εἶ κε μ' ὁ Τυδείδης κρατερὸς Διομήδης) and εἰδῶ εἰδήσω (whence εἰδῆς δὲ καὶ αὐτός), ῥίπτω ἔρριπτον and ῥιπτῶ ἐρρίπτουν (as in ἀνερρίπτουν in the poet), κύω ἔκυον and κυῶ ἐκύουν (as in ἦ δ' ἐκύει φίλον υἰόν), γράφω γράψω and γραφῶ γραφήσω, whence the perfect γεγράφηκα. In this way, then, those verbs with one Λ also inflect as from recessive base forms up to the imperfect, <as in θέλω ἔθελον, μέλω ἔμελον, ὀφείλω ὠφείλον, but after the imperfect they make their inflection as from perispomenon base forms in the tenses that follow>, as in θελῶ θελήσω τεθέληκα ἐθέλησα, μελῶ μελήσω μεμέληκα ἐμέλησα, ὀφειλῶ ὀφειλήσω ὠφείληκα ὠφείλησα, like νοῶ νοήσω νενόηκα ἐνόησα. This then is what Apollonius says.

But Herodian refutes him, saying, 'You speak badly! For the verbs which make their inflection both as from recessive base forms and as from perispomenon ones do so in both these ways in the same tense, as in τύπτω τύψω <and> τυπτῶ τυπτῆσω, ῥίπτω ἔρριπτον and ῥιπτῶ ἐρρίπτουν, εἶδω εἶσω and εἰδῶ εἰδήσω. But those with one Λ do not inflect as from recessive base forms and as from perispomenon ones in the same tense. But up to the imperfect they make their inflection as from recessive base forms, as has been said, and never as from perispomenon ones.

**(f) Herodian's contrary solution:**

κρεῖττον οὖν ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, φησὶν, τὴν ἀπολογίαν ταύτην· ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασι τὸ Σ καὶ τὸ Λ πεφύκασι διπλασιάζεσθαι, οἷον πλήσσω τινάσσω πάλλω τίλλω· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἔχοντα δύο ΣΣ ἢ δύο ΛΛ χαίρουσι τῇ βαρείᾳ τάσει, οἷον νύσσω πλήσσω τινάσσω ὀρύσσω τίλλω ποικίλλω στέλλω σφάλλω, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἔχωσιν ὀνόματα προϋποκείμενα· ἐκεῖνα γὰρ περισπῶνται, οἷον κύκλος κυκλῶ, ἄμιλλα ἀμιλλῶ (ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἀμιλλῶμαι), λύσσα λυσσῶ· τὸ γὰρ νύσσω οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ νύσσα ἐστίν, ἐπεὶ εἶχε περισπᾶσθαι, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον, νύσσα γὰρ λέγεται ὁ καμπτήρ παρὰ τὸ νύσσεσθαι τοὺς τρέχοντας· τὰ δὲ ἔχοντα ἐν Σ ἢ ἐν Λ χαίρουσι τῇ περισπωμένῃ τάσει, οἷον φυσῶ νοσῶ χρυσῶ γελῶ λαλῶ ἐλῶ (σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἐλαύνω) ὠφελῶ πωλῶ ἀμελῶ. ταῦτα οὖν τὰ ἔχοντα ἐν Λ καὶ μὴ περισπασθέντα, λέγω δὴ τὸ μέλω καὶ θέλω καὶ ὀφείλω, ἀνεμερίσαντο τὴν κλίσιν, καὶ ἕως μὲν τοῦ παρατατικοῦ, ὡς εἴρηται, <ὡς> ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων κλίνονται, μετὰ δὲ τὸν παρατατικὸν ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς χρόνοις ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν περισπωμένων ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν. τούτου οὖν χάριν τὰ δι' ἐνὸς Λ ἐκφερόμενα ἔχουσι τὸν μέλλοντα μιᾶ συλλαβῇ περιτεύοντα τοῦ ἐνεστώτος, οἷον <θέλω θελήσω, μέλω μελήσω, ὡσπερ> ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω. ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τούτοις.

'It's better, then, to give the following account,' he says. 'In verbs, Σ and Λ have a natural inclination to be doubled, as in πλήσσω, τινάσσω, πάλλω, τίλλω. And those verbs with two Σ's or two Λ's like to have a recessive accent, as in νύσσω, πλήσσω, τινάσσω, ὀρύσσω, τίλλω, ποικίλλω, στέλλω, σφάλλω, unless they have nouns underlying them—for those verbs are perispomenon, as in ἄμιλλα ἀμιλλῶ (whence ἀμιλλῶμαι), λύσσα λυσσῶ. (For νύσσω is not derived from νύσσα, since it would have had to be perispomenon, but the other way around, for the turning point is called νύσσα from the fact that the runners νύσσονται "are goaded".) But those with one Σ or one Λ like to have perispomenon accentuation, like φυσῶ, νοσῶ, χρυσῶ, γελῶ, λαλῶ, ἐλῶ (meaning ἐλαύνω "drive"), ὠφελῶ, πωλῶ, ἀμελῶ. So those which have one Λ and are not perispomenon, I mean μέλω, θέλω, and ὀφείλω, have divided up their inflection, and up to the imperfect they inflect <as> from recessive base forms, as has been said, but after the imperfect they make their inflection as from perispomenon base forms in the tenses that follow. For this reason, then, the verbs produced with one Λ have their futures a syllable longer than the present, as in <θέλω θελήσω, μέλω μελήσω, like> ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω.' So much, then, for these things.

**(3) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, *Grammatici Graeci* I.iii.222.4–21 (Σ'):**

**(a) Rules for deriving feminine patronymics from masculines in -δης, according to Apollonius and associates:**

τὰ εἰς ΔΗΣ ἀποβάλλοντα τὸ ΔΗ ποιεῖ θηλυκόν, Τανταλίδης Τανταλῆς, Πηλιάδης Πηλιᾶς, Αἰνειάδης Αἰνειᾶς· καὶ ἔδει ἐπιγράφειν Αἰνειάδος, οὐκ Αἰνεῖδος· καὶ τὸ μὲν Χρυσῆς καὶ Νηρηῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ Χρύσης <καὶ> Νηρεύς, Βασιλεύς Βασιλῆς καὶ ἐνδεία τοῦ Η Βασιλῆς· τὸ δὲ Εὐξαντίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐξάντιος, τὸ δὲ Εὐξαντίδος παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ (*Aetia* 67.7) ὕφεσιν ἔχει τοῦ Α. τὸ <δὲ> Ἐλικωνιάς πλεονάζει. οὕτως ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΔΗΣ ἀρσενικῶν σχηματίζουσι τὰ θηλυκὰ πατρωνυμικὰ οἱ περὶ Ἀπολλώνιον.

**(b) Herodian argues against their derivation:**

Ἡρωδιανῶ δὲ τοῦτο οὐ δοκεῖ, φάσκοντι μὴ δύνασθαι τοιοῦτον παρασχηματισμὸν εἶναι διὰ τὴν κατάληξιν, διὰ τὸν χρόνον, διὰ τὴν γένεσιν· τὰ γὰρ παρεσχηματισμένα ἀρσενικοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς γενικῆς κανονίζεται, ἐκ μὲν <γὰρ>

Words in -ΔΗΣ make a feminine by removing the -ΔΗ-: Τανταλίδης Τανταλῆς, Πηλιάδης Πηλιᾶς, Αἰνειάδης Αἰνειᾶς. And the (genitive of the) book title should have been Αἰνειάδος, not Αἰνεῖδος. (And Χρυσῆς and Νηρηῆς are derived from Χρύσης and Νηρεύς, Βασιλεύς gives rise to Βασιλῆς, and by deletion of the Η Βασιλῆς. And Εὐξαντίας is derived from Εὐξάντιος, and Εὐξαντίδος in Callimachus has a deletion of the Α, and Ἐλικωνιάς has an addition.) This is how Apollonius' circle form feminine patronymics from masculine patronymics in ΔΗΣ.

But this does not seem correct to Herodian, who says that this sort of change of form cannot take place because of the termination, the quantity, and the origin. For words that are derived by a change of form from masculines have their formation based on the genitive. For from a form with a long final vowel

μακροκαταλήκτου γίνεται μακροκατάληκτον, οἷον φίλου φίλη, ἐκ δὲ βραχυκαταλήκτου ὁμοίως <βραχυκατάληκτον>, οἷον μέλανος μέλαινα· εἰ οὖν <ἐκ τοῦ> Πριαμίδου, πῶς μὴ εἰς Η τὸ θηλυκόν; οὐ γὰρ καθαρὸν ἢ τὸ Ρ ἔχει, ὡς τὸ Ῥοδιά φοβερὰ· πῶς καὶ εἰς ΙΣ καὶ βραχύ; πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ νοητὸν ἔχει; Πριαμὶς γὰρ οὐχ ἢ τοῦ Πριαμίδου, ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ Πριάμου.

**(c) Brief statement of an alternative view (also attributed to Herodian?)**

οὐκοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γενικῆς τοῦ πρωτοτύπου καὶ τὸ Πριαμίδης καὶ τὸ Πριαμὶς <καὶ τὸ Θησείδης> καὶ τὸ Θησηῖς (ἢ Θησέως θυγάτηρ).

**(4) Choeroboscus' commentary on Theodosius' Κανόνες, *Grammatici Graeci* IV.ii.30. 33–33.14:**

**(a) Why are there no first-person duals corresponding to plurals with μ in the last syllable? The solution according to Apollonius:**

ἔστιν οὖν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἀσυνταξίαν ἐπιλιμπάνει ἐνταῦθα τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν· ἀσυνταξίαν γὰρ λέγομεν τὸ μὴ ἔχειν χαρακτήρα Ἑλληνικόν· ἔστι γὰρ κανὼν τοιοῦτος· πᾶν δυϊκὸν ῥῆμα θέλει χαρακτηρίζεσθαι ἢ διὰ τοῦ Τ ἢ διὰ τοῦ Θ, οἷον τύπτετον τυπτόμεθον· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος κανὼν λέγων, ὅτι πᾶν μέρος λόγου ἐπιδεχόμενον ἀριθμούς θέλει χαρακτηρίζεσθαι δι' ἐκείνου τοῦ στοιχείου ἐν τοῖς δυϊκοῖς, δι' οὗ καὶ τὸ πληθυντικὸν χαρακτηρίζεται, χωρὶς τῶν πρωτοτύπων ἀντωνυμιῶν· αὗται γὰρ θεματικαὶ εἰσι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀκολουθίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλας· ἔστι γὰρ ἡμεῖς τὸ πληθυντικὸν διὰ τοῦ Μ, καὶ τὸ δυϊκὸν νῶϊ, καὶ οὐκ ἔχει τὸ Μ. ἔστωσαν δὲ παραδείγματα τοῦ κανόνος ταῦτα· τὸ Αἴαντες ἔχει τὸ Ν καὶ τὸ Τ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ Αἴαντε ἔχει τὸ ΝΤ· τὸ Πάριδες ἔχει τὸ Δ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ Πάριδε ἔχει τὸ Δ· πάλιν ἐν τῷ γυναῖκες καὶ ἐν τῷ γυναῖκε ἐφυλάχθη τὸ Κ, καὶ ἐν τῷ μεγάλοι καὶ ἐν τῷ μεγάλω τὸ Λ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὕδατα καὶ τὸ ὕδατε τὸ αὐτὸ Τ ἐφύλαξαν· διὰ τοῦτο οἱ Δωριεῖς ἀναλογώτεροί εἰσι τὰ πληθυντικὰ ἄρθρα λέγοντες μετὰ τοῦ Τ, οἷον τοῖ ποιμένες καὶ ταῖ Μοῦσαι, ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φυλαχθῇ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πληθυντικοῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς δυϊκοῖς· τὰ γὰρ δυϊκὰ τῷ καὶ τὰ, οἷον τῷ Αἴαντε, τὰ Μούσα· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασι τυπτόμεθα ἔστι τὸ πληθυντικὸν διὰ τοῦ Θ, καὶ τυπτόμεθον τὸ δυϊκὸν διὰ τοῦ Θ. ἔχομεν οὖν τοὺς δύο κανόνας· ἔχομεν γὰρ ὅτι τὸ δυϊκὸν ῥῆμα ἢ διὰ τοῦ Τ χαρακτηρίζεται ἢ διὰ τοῦ Θ, καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἐν τοῖς πληθυντικοῖς σύμφωνον φυλάττεσθαι θέλει καὶ ἐν τοῖς δυϊκοῖς·

comes a form with a long final vowel, as in φίλου φίλη. And similarly from a form with a short final vowel (comes) one with a short final vowel, as in μέλανος μέλαινα. If then the feminine patronymic is derived from Πριαμίδου, why does the feminine not end in -η? (For the stem does not end in a vowel or P, as it does in Ῥοδιά, φοβερὰ.) Why does it both end in -ΙΣ and have a short vowel? And how does its meaning come about? For Πριαμὶς is the daughter not of Πριαμίδης but of Πριάμος.

Therefore Πριαμίδης and Πριαμὶς are based on the genitive of the underived word, and similarly Θησείδης and Θησηῖς (the daughter of Theseus).

It's possible to say, then, that the first person of the duals is lacking here because it cannot be put together (ἀσυνταξία). For we call not having a Greek shape ἀσυνταξία. For there is a rule of the following sort: every dual verb form likes to be formed either by means of Τ or by means of Θ, as in τύπτετον τυπτόμεθον. But there is also another rule, saying that every part of speech admitting of numbers likes to be formed in the dual by means of the same letter by which the plural is also formed, apart from the underived pronouns. (For those are primary formations, and do not follow from one another. For there is the plural ἡμεῖς, with Μ, and the dual νῶϊ, and it doesn't have Μ.) And let the following be examples of the rule. The form Αἴαντες has Ν and Τ, and Αἴαντε too has ΝΤ. The form Πάριδες has Δ, and Πάριδε too has Δ. And again, in γυναῖκες and γυναῖκε the Κ persists, and the Λ in μεγάλοι and μεγάλω, and ὕδατα and ὕδατε have likewise kept the same Τ. For this reason the Dorians apply more regularity in saying plural articles with a Τ, as in τοῖ ποιμένες and ταῖ Μοῦσαι, so that the same consonant is kept in both plural and dual forms. For the duals are τῷ and τὰ, as in τῷ Αἴαντε, τὰ Μούσα. And similarly in verbs too, τυπτόμεθα is the plural with a Θ, and τυπτόμεθον is the dual with a Θ. So we have the two rules. For we have the rule that dual verb forms are formed either by means of Τ or by means of Θ, and the rule that the consonant in the plural likes to be kept in the duals too.

**(b) Apollonius' solution continued—the first person dual of τύπτω can't be τύπτομεν, because a rule would be violated:**

ἐπεὶ οὖν τύπτομεν τὸ πληθυντικὸν καὶ ἔχει τὸ Μ ἐν τῇ τελευταίᾳ συλλαβῇ, ἀναγκάζεται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ Μ φυλαχθῆναι καὶ ἐν τοῖς δυϊκοῖς, ἔδει γενέσθαι τύπτομον τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν τροπῆ τῆς ΜΕΝ εἰς ΜΟΝ, ὡσπερ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τυπτόμεθα γίνεται τυπτόμεθον τροπῆ τῆς ΘΑ εἰς ΘΟΝ· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἔχει τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν τῶν δυϊκῶν ῥημάτων, λέγω δὴ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο γενέσθαι τύπτομον·

**(c) Apollonius' solution continued—the form also cannot be τύπτοσθον or τύπτοτον, because a different rule would be violated:**

ἀλλ' οὔτε δὲ τύπτοσθον ἢ τύπτοτον, ἐπειδὴ οὐ φυλάττει τὸ ἐν τοῖς πληθυντικοῖς σύμφωνον, λέγω δὴ τὸ Μ· ἀναγκαζόμενον οὖν ἢ τὸ Τ φυλάττειν ἢ τὸ Θ χαρακτηριστικὸν τῶν δυϊκῶν ῥημάτων, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἐξενεχθῆναι διὰ τοῦ Μ, ἀναγκαζόμενον δὲ φυλάττειν τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν τῶν πληθυντικῶν τὸ Μ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἐξενεχθῆναι οὔτε διὰ τοῦ Θ οὔτε διὰ τοῦ Τ· τῶν οὖν δύο κανόνων μαχομένων, καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἐνός ἀπαιτοῦντος τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ χαρακτηριστικὸν τῶν δυϊκῶν ῥημάτων, τοῦ δὲ ἐτέρου ἀπαιτοῦντος τὸ Μ τὸ ἐν τοῖς πληθυντικοῖς, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐπιλιπνάνει τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν, ἠνίκα τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν πληθυντικῶν τὸ Μ ἔχει ἐν τῇ τελευταίᾳ συλλαβῇ. ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος.

**(d) Herodian's different solution—to satisfy both rules the form would have to be τύπτομθον or τύπτομτον, but these forms contain inadmissible consonant clusters:**

τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡρωδιανοῦ λεγόμενα ταῦτα, ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀναγκάζεται ἔχειν τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ, τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν τοῦ δυϊκοῦ ῥήματος, καὶ τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ, καὶ λοιπὸν ἀναγκάζεται γενέσθαι τύπτομθον ἢ τύπτομτον, ἀδύνατον δὲ τὸ Μ πρὸ <τοῦ Θ ἢ> τοῦ <Τ>· οὐ συνίσταται γὰρ οὔτε κατὰ σύλληψιν οὔτε κατὰ διάστασιν·

**(e) Herodian continued—μθ and μτ are inadmissible clusters within a syllable:**

κατὰ σύλληψιν μὲν, ὅτι τὰ ὑποτασσόμενά τι ἐν συλλήψει ἐὰν ἀντιπροηγῶνται ἐν διαστάσει ἀντιπροηγούμενα, οἷον ἐν τῷ πρῶτος τὸ Ρ ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Π κατὰ σύλληψιν, ἐὰν δὲ ἀντιπροηγήσῃται τὸ Ρ τοῦ Π, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ <ἀντι>προηγέεται, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔρω· καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ κλέος τὸ Λ ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Κ κατὰ σύλληψιν, ἀντιπροηγούμενον δὲ τὸ Λ τοῦ Κ, <ὡς> ἐν τῷ ἔλκω, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγέεται· πάλιν ἐν τῷ θνήσκω τὸ Ν ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Θ κατὰ σύλληψιν, ἀντιπροηγούμενον δὲ τὸ Ν τοῦ Θ, ὡς ἐν τῷ

Since, then, the plural is τύπτομεν and it has a Μ in its last syllable, and this Μ has to be preserved in the duals too, the first person dual should have become τύπτομον, by a change of ΜΕΝ to ΜΟΝ, just as from τυπτόμεθα comes τυπτόμεθον, by a change of ΘΑ to ΘΟΝ. But since this does not have the characteristic feature of dual verb forms, I mean a Τ or Θ, it could not become τύπτομον.

But nor can it become τύπτοσθον or τύπτοτον, since the consonant which occurs in plurals is not preserved, that is to say the Μ. So being compelled to preserve either the Τ or the Θ which is characteristic of dual verbs, it could not be produced with Μ, and being compelled to preserve the Μ which is characteristic of plurals it could not be produced either with Θ or with Τ. With the two rules conflicting, then, and the one demanding either the Τ or the Θ which is characteristic of dual verbs and the other demanding the Μ that occurs in the plurals (of the same person), of necessity the first person of the duals is wanting whenever the first person of the plurals has Μ in its last syllable. This is what Apollonius says.

But what Herodian says is the following: that the first person of the duals is here forced to have either Τ or Θ, the characteristic of dual verb forms, and the Μ of the plural, and hence it is compelled to become τύπτομθον or τύπτομτον, but it is impossible to have Μ <before Θ or Τ>. For they do not stand together either in the same syllable or across a syllable boundary.

(ΜΘ and ΜΤ do not stand together) in the same syllable, because if consonants which follow some consonant in the same syllable precede that consonant instead of following it, they do so across a syllable boundary. For example, in πρῶτος the Ρ follows the Π in the same syllable, but if the Ρ precedes the Π instead of following it, it does so across a syllable boundary, as in ἔρω. And likewise in κλέος the Λ follows the Κ in the same syllable, but when the Λ precedes the Κ instead of following it, as in ἔλκω, it does so across a syllable boundary. And likewise in θνήσκω the Ν follows the Θ in the same syllable, but



ἄνθος, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο· πάλιν ἐν τῷ γράφῳ τὸ Ρ ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Γ κατὰ σύλληψιν, ἀντιπροηγησάμενον δὲ τὸ Ρ τοῦ Γ, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἔργον, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο. ἐπειδὴ οὖν τὸ Μ ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Θ καὶ τοῦ Τ κατὰ σύλληψιν, ὡς ἐν τῷ τμήμα καὶ Ἀθμονίς (σημαίνει δὲ δῆμον Ἀττικόν), δηλονότι ἐὰν ἀντιπροηγήσῃται <τοῦ Θ ἢ> τοῦ Τ τὸ Μ, οὐ δύναται αὐτῶν ἀντιπροηγήσασθαι κατὰ σύλληψιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ διάστασιν.

**(f) Herodian continued—and the same clusters are inadmissible across a syllable boundary:**

ἀλλ’ οὔτε δὲ πάλιν κατὰ διάστασιν δύναται ἀντιπροηγήσασθαι τὸ Μ τούτων, φημί δὴ τοῦ Τ καὶ τοῦ Θ, ἐπειδὴ πᾶσα συλλαβὴ καταλήγουσα εἰς τὸ Μ θέλει ἔχειν τὴν ἐξῆς συλλαβὴν ἀρχομένην ἀπὸ τοῦ Β ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ Π ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ Φ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ψ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ Μ, οἷον σύμβουλος σύμπονος σύμφωνος σύμψηφος συμμετόχος·

**(g) Conclusion of Herodian’s argument:**

ἐπειδὴ οὖν οὔτε κατὰ σύλληψιν οὔτε κατὰ διάστασιν ἡδύνατο τὸ Μ προ<ηγήσασθαι> τοῦ Θ ἢ τοῦ Τ, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐπιλιμπάνει τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν, ἡνίκα τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν πληθυντικῶν τὸ Μ ἔχει ἐν τῇ τελευταίᾳ συλλαβῇ.

**(h) Some people attack Herodian’s argument:**

τινὲς δὲ πρὸς ταύτην τὴν ἀπολογίαν ἀντιλέγοντες, ὡς δῆθεν κακῶς εἰπόντος τοῦ Ἡρωδιανοῦ, κέχρηται τοιοῦτω λόγῳ, ὅτι εἰ θέλει ἔχειν ἐνταῦθα τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ καὶ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ τοῦ δυϊκοῦ, μὴ εἴπωμεν τύπτομον ἢ τύπτομον, ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἀσυνταξία, ἀλλ’ ὑπερβιβάσωμεν τὰ σύμφωνα, ὥστε γενέσθαι τύπτοθμον ἢ τύπτοτμον, καὶ ἔχει λοιπὸν ἢ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ τοῦ δυϊκοῦ καὶ τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀσυνταξία· εὐρίσκομεν γὰρ καὶ τὸ Τ καὶ τὸ Θ πρὸ τοῦ Μ, ὡς ἐν τῷ τμήμα καὶ Ἀθμονίς.

**(i) But Choeroboscus opposes them and defends Herodian:**

ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀντιλέγομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς κακῶς λέγοντας, καὶ ἀπολογούμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἡρωδιανοῦ καλῶς εἰρηκότος, ὅτι, ὄν τρόπον ἔχομεν γινῶναι ἐν τῷ παρακειμένῳ, ὡς τὸ κείρω γενόμενον κέκαρκα ἐφύλαξε καὶ τὸ ἀμετάβολον καὶ τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν Κ τοῦ παρακειμένου, καὶ δεύτερον ἐπέχει τὸ Κ τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν σύμφωνον, τὸ δὲ Ρ πρῶτον, τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸ τύπτοθμον ἢ τύπτοτμον οὐκ ἡδύνατο συστήναι, ἐπειδὴ τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν σύμφωνον τῶν δυϊκῶν οὐκ ἔχει τὴν δευτέραν τάξιν ἐνταῦθα, τουτέστιν ἢ τὸ Τ ἢ

when the N precedes the Θ instead of following it, as in ἄνθος, it does so across a syllable boundary. And likewise in γράφω the P follows the Γ in the same syllable, but when the P precedes the Γ instead of following it, as in ἔργον, it does so across a syllable boundary. So then, seeing that M follows Θ or T in the same syllable, as in τμήμα and Ἀθμονίς (which denotes an Attic deme), it’s clear that if M follows <a Θ or> T instead of preceding it, it cannot do so in the same syllable, but across a syllable boundary.

But M cannot precede these consonants—that is to say T and Θ—instead of following them across a syllable boundary either, because every syllable which ends in M likes to have the next syllable beginning with Β, Π, Φ, Ψ, or Μ, as in σύμβουλος, σύμπονος, σύμφωνος, σύμψηφος, συμμετόχος.

Since, then, M could not precede Θ or T instead of following it either in the same syllable or across a syllable boundary, of necessity the first person of duals is lacking when the first person of the plurals has M in its last syllable.

But some, opposing this argument on the basis that Herodian spoke badly, use the following sort of argument: that if the first person of the duals likes to have the Μ of the plural here, and the Τ or the Θ of the dual, we would not say τύπτοθμον or τύπτοτμον, so that an impossible combination does not arise, but we would transpose the consonants so that it would be τύπτοθμον or τύπτοτμον. And then it has either the Τ or the Θ of the dual and the Μ of the plural, and there is no impossible combination. For we find both Τ and Θ before Μ, as in τμήμα and Ἀθμονίς.

But we argue against them, since they speak badly, and we defend Herodian, who spoke well, as follows. In the way that we can see in the perfect, that when κείρω becomes κέκαρκα it preserves both the liquid consonant and the characteristic Κ of the perfect, and the Κ which is the characteristic consonant occupies the second place, and the Ρ the first place, in the same way τύπτοθμον or τύπτοτμον could not have been formed, because the characteristic consonant of the duals—that is to say Τ or Θ—does not have the second place here, but the

τὸ Θ, ἀλλὰ τὸ Μ τὸ ἔχον τὴν δευτέραν τάξιν, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐνομίζετο τοῦτο τὸ Μ χαρακτηριστικὸν εἶναι τοῦ δυϊκοῦ ῥήματος, καὶ οὐκέτι τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ ὥστε οὖν οὐ δύνανται ὑπερβιβασθῆναι τὰ σύμφωνα ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ γενέσθαι τύπτοθμον ἢ τύπτοτμον, ἀλλ' εἰ ὅλως ἀναγκαζόμεθα φυλάττειν τὰ δύο, τουτέστι καὶ τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ καὶ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ τοῦ δυϊκοῦ, ἀναγκαζόμεθα φυλάξαι τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν τοῦ δυϊκοῦ δευτέραν ἐπέχον τάξιν, τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ, τὸ δὲ Μ πρώτην.

**(j) So much for first person dual forms:**

τοσαῦτα περὶ τοῦ πρώτου προσώπου τῶν δυϊκῶν ἔχομεν εἰπεῖν.

M which holds the second place. And then this M would be thought to be characteristic of the dual verb, and no longer the T or Θ. As a result, the consonants cannot be transposed in these forms to give τύπτοθμον or τύπτοτμον. But if we are entirely compelled to keep the two, that is to say both the M of the plural and the T or Θ of the dual, we are compelled to keep the characteristic of the dual—the T or Θ—in the second place, and the M in the first place.

This is as much as we have to say on the first person of the duals.

**(5) Choeroboscus' commentary on Theodosius' Κανόνες, *Grammatici Graeci* IV.ii.367.31–368.10:**

**(a) Choeroboscus gives a rule for forming the perf. pass. subjunctive of μι-verbs**

ἰστέον ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ τέθειμαι παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου γίνεται τὸ ὑποτακτικὸν τροπῆ τῆς παραληγούσης εἰς Ω ἐὰν τεθῶμαι.

**(b) Apollonius' different view:**

ὁ μέντοι Ἀπολλώνιος οὐχ οὕτω κανονίζει, ἀλλὰ φησὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεργητικοῦ ὑποτακτικοῦ γίνεσθαι προσθέσει τῆς ΜΑΙ, οἷον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐὰν τεθείκω ἐὰν τεθείκωμαι, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐὰν δεδώκω ἐὰν δεδώκωμαι.

**(c) Herodian's refutation:**

ἐλέγχει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς λέγων, ὅτι οὐ καλῶς δοξάζει· οὐδὲ γάρ, φησὶν, εὐρηται παντελῶς ἐν χρήσει τὸ ἐὰν τεθείκωμαι καὶ ἐὰν δεδώκωμαι, ἀλλ' ἐὰν τεθῶμαι καὶ ἐὰν δεδῶμαι.

**(d) An additional argument for Herodian's view:**

ἄλλως τε <δὲ> εἰ ὑπῆρχεν ἀληθὴς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑποτακτικῶν ἐνεργητικῶν τοῦ παρακειμένου καὶ ὑπερσυντελικοῦ ἐγένετο τὸ ὑποτακτικὸν παθητικὸν προσθέσει τῆς ΜΑΙ, ὥφειλεν ἐὰν τετύφωμαι εἶναι, καὶ μὴ ἀναπληροῦσθαι διὰ μετοχῆς διὰ τὸ τὸν τέτυμμα παθητικὸν παρακείμενον ἔχειν πρὸ τοῦ Μ σύμφωνον, καὶ πάλιν ἐὰν μεμνήκωμαι ὥφειλεν εἶναι καὶ οὐχὶ ἐὰν μεμνῶμαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μέμνημαι.

One should know that from the perfect passive (indicative) τέθειμαι, the subjunctive is derived by a change of the penultimate vowel to Ω: ἐὰν τεθῶμαι.

But Apollonius does not make this the rule, but he says that it comes from the active subjunctive by the addition of -ΜΑΙ, as in ἐὰν τεθείκωμαι from ἐὰν τεθείκω, and ἐὰν δεδώκωμαι from ἐὰν δεδώκω.

But Herodian refutes him, saying that his opinion is not correct. For, he says, ἐὰν τεθείκωμαι and ἐὰν δεδώκωμαι are not found in use at all, but ἐὰν τεθῶμαι and ἐὰν δεδῶμαι.

And anyway, if Apollonius' argument were correct, and if the passive subjunctive were derived from the active subjunctives of the perfect and pluperfect by the addition of -ΜΑΙ, then it ought to have been ἐὰν τετύφωμαι, and the form ought not to be supplied by means of a participle because of the fact that the perfect passive τέτυμμα has a consonant before the Μ. And again it should have been ἐὰν μεμνήκωμαι, not ἐὰν μεμνῶμαι from μέμνημαι.

For a more succinct statement of this difference of opinion, see Theodosius' Κανόνες, *Grammatici Graeci* IV.i.96.28–97.2: τέθειμαι τὸ ὀριστικόν, καὶ τροπῆ τῆς παραληγούσης εἰς Ω τεθῶμαι. Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ἐὰν τεθείκωμαι φησὶν αὐτὸ εἶναι ἀμαρτύρως, ὡς φησὶν Ἡρωδιανός. 'τέθειμαι is the indicative, and by a change of the penultimate to Ω (we arrive at the subjunctive) τεθῶμαι. But Apollonius says the form is (ἐὰν) τεθείκωμαι—(but) without authority, as Herodian says.'

**(6) Choeroboscus' commentary on Theodosius' Κανόνες, *Grammatici Graeci* IV.ii.168.10–169.30:**

**(a) Herodian argues against Apollonius that there are no second future active indicatives in use:**

ιστέον δὲ ὅτι λέγει ὁ Ἡρωδιανός, ὡς οὐδέποτε εὐρίσκεται δεύτερος μέλλων ἐνεργητικὸς ὀριστικὸς <ἐν χρήσει ᾗς> γάρ, φησίν, παρέθετο χρήσεις ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος, ἢ πεπλασμένα αὐτῶ εἰσιν, ὡς τὸ φυγῶ δραμῶ τυπῶ, οὐ δεύτεροι γὰρ μέλλοντες <οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν>, φησίν, τούτοις ἐχρήσατο ἢ ἐνεστῶτές εἰσιν ἀντὶ μελλόντων, ὡς τὸ 'κούρη δ' οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνωνος Ἀτρείδασ' (//.9.388), <καὶ ὡς τὸ 'πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τοὶ τελέω' (//.23.20; //.23.180)>· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ οἱ ἐνεστῶτές <εἰσιν ἀντὶ μελλόντων, ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ γαμήσω> καὶ τελέσω, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῷ 'ἐγὼ δὲ κ' ἄγω Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον' (//.1.184) ἐνεστῶς ἐστὶν ἀντὶ μέλλοντος τοῦ ἄξω·

**(b) Herodian's argument continued:**

ἄλλως τε δὲ οὐδέποτε μέλλων ὀριστικὸς διαλύεται· πῶς οὖν τὸ γαμέω καὶ τελέω, εἴ γε μέλλοντες ὑπῆρχον, ἐν διαλύσει παραλαμβάνονται; ἄρα οὖν ἐντέλεια εἰσιν ἐνεστῶτων τὸ γαμέω καὶ τελέω· πρόσκειται ὀριστικὸς, ἐπειδὴ τὸ εὐφρανεῖν ἀπαρέμφατον γίνεται κατὰ διάλυσιν εὐφρανεῖν, οἷον 'εὐφρανεῖν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἰόν' (//.5.688). σημειοῦται δὲ τὸ ἐκχεῶ δευτέρου μέλλοντος, οἷον καὶ τὸ 'κατακλιεῖ' παρ' Εὐπόλιδι ἐν Χρυσογένει, οἷον 'εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὴν κατακλιεῖ' (Eupolis, Χρυσοῦν γένος fr. 310 K.-A.)· γέγονε δὲ τὸ κατακλιεῖ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· ἔστι κλειῶ, τούτου ὁ δεύτερος ἀόριστος ἐκλιον διὰ τοῦ Ι, τῆς παραληγούσης συσταλείσης, ὥσπερ λείπω ἔλιπον, πείθω ἔπιθον, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκεῖθεν κατακλιῶ ὁ δεύτερος μέλλων καὶ κατακλιεῖ τὸ τρίτον πρόσωπον.

**(c) Some people think κρεμῶ and ἀγορῶ are futures:**

τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων ἰστέον, ὅτι τὸ κρεμῶ καὶ ἀγορῶ τινὲς λέγουσι δευτέρου μέλλοντος εἶναι·

**(d) Choeroboscus (in his own voice?) argues against these supposed examples:**

ἔστι δὲ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα οὐ δύναται οὔτε δευτέρου μέλλοντος εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὔτε πρώτου· καὶ δευτέρου μὲν γὰρ μέλλοντος οὐ δύναται εἶναι, ἐπειδὴ ὁ δεύτερος μέλλων τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς ΕΙ διφθόγγου ἔχει ἐκφερόμενον, οἷον τυπῶ τυπεῖς τυπεῖ, νυγῶ νυγεῖς νυγεῖ· ταῦτα δὲ διὰ τῆς ΑἸ διφθόγγου ἔχουσι τὸ <δευτέρου καὶ> τρίτον πρόσωπον ἐκφερόμενον, οἷον κρεμῶ κρεμᾶς κρεμᾶ, ἀγορῶ ἀγορᾶς ἀγορᾶ· πρώτου δὲ μέλλοντος οὐ δύναται εἶναι, ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ πρῶτος μέλλων τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον πρόσωπον ἔχει διὰ τῆς ΕΙ διφθόγγου ἐκφερόμενον, οἷον τύψω τύψεις τύψει, εὐφρανῶ εὐφρανεῖς εὐφρανεῖ,

One should know that Herodian says that a second future active indicative is never found <in use.> For the uses <which> Apollonius provided have either been made up by him, like φυγῶ δραμῶ τυπῶ—for these are not second futures, for <nobody among the ancients>, he says, used these—or they are presents for futures, as in κούρη δ' οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνωνος Ἀτρείδασ <and πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τοὶ τελέω>. For here the presents <stand for futures, for the forms are used instead of γαμήσω> and τελέσω, just as in ἐγὼ δὲ κ' ἄγω Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον there is a present instead of the future ἄξω.

And besides, a future indicative is never resolved (i.e. uncontracted). How then are γαμέω and τελέω used with resolution, if they were futures? So γαμέω and τελέω are the unmodified forms of presents. The word 'indicative' has been included because the infinitive εὐφρανεῖν becomes εὐφρανεῖν with resolution, as in εὐφρανεῖν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἰόν. And the form ἐκχεῶ belonging to the second future is noted as an exception, as also κατακλιεῖ in Eupolis' Χρυσοῦν γένος, as in εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὴν κατακλιεῖ. And κατακλιεῖ has come about in the following way: there is κλειῶ, and the second aorist of this form is ἐκλιον, with an iota, the penultimate (syllable) having been shortened, as in λείπω ἔλιπον, πείθω ἔπιθον, and from there κατακλιῶ is the second future and κατακλιεῖ its third person.

These things being so, one should know that some say that κρεμῶ and ἀγορῶ are second futures.

But it's possible to say that these cannot belong to the second future, nor to the first. And they cannot belong to the second future because the second future has its second and third person produced with the diphthong ΕΙ, as in τυπῶ τυπεῖς τυπεῖ, νυγῶ νυγεῖς νυγεῖ. But these forms (i.e. κρεμῶ and ἀγορῶ) have their <second and> third person produced with the diphthong ΑἸ, as in κρεμῶ κρεμᾶς κρεμᾶ, ἀγορῶ ἀγορᾶς ἀγορᾶ. And they cannot belong to the first future, since first of all the first future has its second and third person produced with the diphthong ΕΙ, as in τύψω τύψεις τύψει, εὐφρανῶ εὐφρανεῖς εὐφρανεῖ—but these forms (i.e.

ταῦτα δέ, ὡς εἴρηται, ἔχουσι τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς ἌΙ διφθόγγου ἐκφερόμενον· δεύτερον δὲ πρώτου μέλλοντος <οὐ δύνανται εἶναι>, ἐπειδὴ οὐδέποτε ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς ἔχει ὁ μέλλον τοῦ ἰδίου ἐνεστώτος, ἀλλ' <ἡ> ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ αὐτῷ, οἷον τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω, ἢ περιττοσυλλαβεῖ, οἷον ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω· ἐὰν οὖν τὸ ἀγορῶ καὶ κρεμῶ δῶμεν μέλλοντας εἶναι, εὐρίσκονται ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς ἔχοντες τοῦ ἐνεστώτος, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεστώτης ἀγοράζω καὶ κρεμάζω ἐστίν, ὅπερ ἀδύνατον.

**(e) Alternative analysis of κρεμῶ and ἀγορῶ (again in Choeroboscus own voice?):**

ἀλλὰ λέγομεν, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀγοράζω καὶ κρεμάζω· <τούτων ὁ> μέλλον κρεμάσω καὶ ἀγοράσω, καὶ κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ Σ κρεμάω καὶ ἀγοράω, καὶ κατὰ κρᾶσιν τῶν φωνηέντων <τουτέστι τοῦ Α καὶ Ω> εἰς Ω γίνεται κρεμῶ καὶ ἀγορῶ, ὡσπερ βοάω βοῶ, περάω περῶ· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἔχουσι τίποτε μὴ ἀρμόζον <τῷ μέλλοντι, τουτέστιν> ἔνδειαν συλλαβῆς—τοῦτο δὲ οὐχ ἀρμόζει τῷ μέλλοντι, ὁ γὰρ μέλλον, ὡς εἴρηται, οὐ θέλει ἔχειν ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς τοῦ ἰδίου ἐνεστώτος, οἷον τύπτω τύψω, ποιῶ ποιήσω—τούτου χάριν μετῆλθον εἰς ἐνεστώτα· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀρέ<σκω καὶ μεθύσκω> γέγονεν· ἔστι γὰρ ἀρῶ ἀρέσω καὶ μεθύω μεθύσω, καὶ προσελθόντος τοῦ Κ κατὰ τὸν μέλλοντα ἀνέδραμον <ταῦτα εἰς> ἐνεστώτα, ἐπειδὴ ἐδέξαντό τίποτε μὴ ἀρμόζον τῷ μέλλοντι, φημί δὴ τὸ Κ, τὸ γὰρ Κ οὐκ ἔστι χαρακτηριστικὸν <βαρυτόνου> μέλλοντος· πρόσκειται 'βαρυτόνου μέλλοντος' διὰ τὸν <ἐπλακον> πλακῶ δεύτερον μέλλοντα.

**(7) Choeroboscus' commentary on Theodosius' Κανόνες, IV.ii.52.10–54.11:**

**(a) Why do prefixed verbs have the augment after the preverb? An account attributed to Apollonius:**

πρόθεσις γὰρ ἐστὶν ἥς οὐδὲν θέλει προτίθεσθαι· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι ἔσωθεν γίνεται ἢ κλίσις, οἷον καταγράφω κατέγραφον, ἀναγινώσκω ἀνεγίνωσκον, περιπατῶ περιεπάτου, κατορθῶ κατώρθουν. τὸ δὲ ἀληθέστερον κατὰ χρόνον γίνεται ἢ σύνθεσις· οἷον ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ χειρογραφῶ ἐχειρογράφουν καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ καλαμογραφῶ ἐκαλαμογράφουν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων συνθέτων τῶν μὴ ὄντων ἀπὸ προθέσεως κλίσις ἐγένετο συνθέσεως, μετὰ γὰρ τὴν σύνθεσιν ἐγένετο ἢ κλίσις, τουτέστι πρῶτον συνετέθησαν καὶ οὕτως ἐκλίθησαν, οἷον φιλοσοφῶ ἐφιλοσόφουν, χειροκοπῶ ἐχειροκόπουν· ἐπὶ μέντοι τῶν ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἀρχομένων τὸ ἐναντίον γίνεται, σύνθεσις γὰρ γίνεται κλίσεως, τουτέστι κατὰ χρόνον γίνεται ἢ σύνθεσις, καὶ ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι πρῶτον κλίνονται

κρεμῶ and ἀγορῶ), as has been said, have their second and third person produced with the diphthong ἌΙ. And secondly <they cannot> belong to the second future because the future never has fewer syllables than its own present: it either has the same number of syllables as it, as in τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω, or it has a larger number, as in ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω. If, then, we grant that ἀγορῶ and κρεμῶ are futures, they are found to have fewer syllables than the present (for the presents are ἀγοράζω and κρεμάζω), which is impossible.

But we say that (first of all) there is ἀγοράζω καὶ κρεμάζω. <Of these the> future is κρεμάσω and ἀγοράσω, and by loss of the Σ κρεμάω and ἀγοράω, and by contraction of the vowels, <that is to say of the Α and Ω,> into Ω arise κρεμῶ and ἀγορῶ, just as βοάω (gives) βοῶ and περάω (gives) περῶ. And since they have something not compatible <with the future, that is to say> the lack of a syllable—and this is not compatible with the future (for the future, as has been said, does not like to have fewer syllables than its own present, as in τύπτω τύψω, ποιῶ ποιήσω)—for this reason they have gone over into the present. For this is what has happened also in ἀρέ<σκω and μεθύσκω>. For there is ἀρῶ ἀρέσω and μεθύω μεθύσω, and with the Κ being added in the future these went over to the present, since they had received something not compatible with the future, I mean the Κ. For the Κ is not characteristic of a recessive future. And the words 'recessive future' have been included because of <ἐπλακον> and its second future πλακῶ.

καὶ οὕτω συντίθενται, οἷον ἀπὸ τοῦ γράφω γίνεται καταγράφω, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔγραφον κατέγραφον, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γέγραφα γίνεται κατατέγραφα, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγεγράφειν γίνεται κατεγεγράφειν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔγραψα τὸ κατέγραψα, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γράψω τὸ καταγράψω· τοῦτο δὲ γίνεται, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαμαυρωθῇ ἢ πρόθεσις ἐξωθέν τί ποτε δεχομένη· τῆς γὰρ προθέσεως, ὡς ἐμάθομεν, οὐδὲν ἐθέλει προτίθεσθαι.

**(b) Brief digression – Apollonius promises to address a related question elsewhere:**

διατί δὲ τῶν προθέσεων πασῶν τῶν εἰς φωνῆεν ληγουσῶν ἐκθλιβομένων, οἷον καταγράφω κατέγραφον, ἀνέρχομαι ἀνηρχόμην, διέλθω διήλθον, ἢ πρό και ἢ περί οὐκ ἐκθλίβονται, οἷον προέρχομαι περιέρχομαι, ἐν τῷ περί προθέσεως, εἰ θεῶ φίλον, μαθησόμεθα.

**(c) So much for Apollonius' account:**

ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἀπολλωνίος φησιν.

**(d) Herodian's refutation:**

πρὸς τοῦτον δὲ ἀντιλέγει ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς λέγων, ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν ἢ κατὰ πρόθεσις ἐν τῷ καταγράφω, ἀλλὰ μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ ῥήματος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἐγένετο ἢ σύνθεσις. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ εὐγενῆς οὐκ ἔστι τὸ εὐ ἐπίρρημα, ἀλλὰ μέρος ἐγένετο τοῦ ὀνόματος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ ἐπίρρηματος ἐγένετο ἢ σύνθεσις, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ καταγράφω οὐ λέγομεν, ὅτι πρόθεσις ἐστὶν ἢ κατὰ, ἀλλὰ μέρος τοῦ ῥήματος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἐγένετο ἢ σύνθεσις· ἄλλως τε ἰδοὺ τὸ συνήγορος ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἄρχεται, καὶ ὁμως λέγεται εὐσυνήγορος, καὶ πάλιν σύμβουλος εὐσύμβουλος, ἐπανοϊκτικῆς θυρεπανοϊκτικῆς· οὐκ ὦφειλον οὖν οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἀρχόμενα δέξασθαι ἐξωθέν τί ποτε. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἡρωδιανός.

**(e) Choeroboscus' defence of Apollonius:**

ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπολογούμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου λέγοντες, ὅτι ἄλλο λέξις καὶ ἄλλο συλλαβή. ἐὰν μὲν γὰρ λέξις προσέλθῃ μετὰ <τὴν> σύνθεσιν, φυλάττεται τὸ ἰδίωμα <τὸ> ἀρχικόν, ἐὰν δὲ συλλαβή, οὐκέτι· καὶ δῆλον ἐκ τῆς δασείας· ὥσπερ γὰρ λέγομεν, ὅτι ἡ δασεῖα φίλαρχός ἐστιν, οἷον ῥώμη ῥήτωρ εὐρον ὕβρις ὕλη, καὶ ὁμως ἐν ταῖς συνθέσεσιν φυλάττεται ἢ δασεῖα, ὡς ἐν τῷ καθίσταμαι φιλορώμμιος μισορήτωρ ἐφεῦρον, ἐπειδὴ λέξις προσήλθε, καὶ ἐφυλάχθη τὸ ἰδίωμα τὸ ἀρχικόν, ἐὰν δὲ προσέλθῃ συλλαβή, τότε ἐξαμαυροῦται κυρίως ἢ ἀρχουσα τῆς λέξεως, οἷον ἐστὶν ὀρῶ ὀρᾶς· τούτου γίνεται ὁ παρατακτικὸς ὤρων

inflected (so to speak) and in that form they are compounded. For example, from γράφω comes καταγράφω, and from ἔγραφον comes κατέγραφον, and from γέγραφα comes κατατέγραφα, and from ἐγεγράφειν comes κατεγεγράφειν, and from ἔγραψα comes κατέγραψα, and from γράψω comes καταγράψω. And this happens so that the preposition does not lose its natural character by receiving something on the outside. For nothing likes to be placed before a preposition, as we have learnt.

And if God is willing, we will learn in 'On the preposition περί' why it is that whereas all prepositions that end with a vowel undergo elision, as in καταγράφω κατέγραφον, ἀνέρχομαι ἀνηρχόμην, διέλθω διήλθον, the prepositions πρό and περί do not undergo elision, as in προέρχομαι περιέρχομαι.

These things, then, are what Apollonius says.

But Herodian argues against him, saying that to begin with κατὰ isn't a preposition in κατέγραφον but a part of the verb, even if the composition took the preposition as its starting point. For just as in εὐγενῆς the εὐ- isn't an adverb but has become part of the nominal (i.e. noun/adjective), even though the composition took the adverb as its starting point, so too in καταγράφω we don't say that the κατα- is a preposition but a part of the verb, even though the composition took the preposition as its starting point. And anyway, notice how συνήγορος begins with a preposition, and nevertheless εὐσυνήγορος is said, and likewise σύμβουλος εὐσύμβουλος, ἐπανοϊκτικῆς θυρεπανοϊκτικῆς. These words too should not have received anything on the outside (i.e. if Apollonius' argument were right), seeing as they begin with prepositions. This then is what Herodian says.

But we speak in defence of Apollonius, saying that a word is one thing and a syllable is another. For if a word is added on composition, the feature associated with the beginning of a word is kept, but if a syllable is added this no longer happens. And this is clear from the rough breathing. For just as we said that the rough breathing likes to go at the beginning, as in ῥώμη ῥήτωρ εὐρον ὕβρις ὕλη, and yet in compounds the rough breathing is preserved, as in καθίσταμαι φιλορώμμιος μισορήτωρ ἐφεῦρον, because a word has been added, and the feature associated with the beginning of a word is kept. But if a syllable is added then the initial syllable of the word properly loses its natural character, as in ὀρῶ

δασυνομένης τῆς πρώτης συλλαβῆς, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐπλεόνασε τὸ Ε καὶ ἐγένετο ἐώρων, ἅμα τῷ πλεονασμῷ παρεφθάρη καὶ ἡ ἄρχουσα· συλλαβὴ γὰρ προσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνέδραμεν ἡ δασεῖα ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας συλλαβῆς ἐπὶ τὴν πρώτην· ἔχομεν γὰρ ὅτι φίλαρχός ἐστιν ἡ δασεῖα· καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐμός σός ὅς τὸ ὅς δασύνεται· ὅταν δὲ πλεονάσῃ τὸ Ε καὶ γένηται ἐός, ἀνατρέχει ἡ δασεῖα εἰς τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν, ὡς δῆθεν διὰ τοῦ πλεονασμοῦ τῆς συλλαβῆς ἐξαμαυρωθείσης τῆς ἀρχούσης· ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνθέτοις οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον, ὡς εἴρηται, γίνεται, ἀλλὰ φυλάττεται ἡ δασεῖα, ἅτε δὴ τῆς ἀπλῆς λέξεως ἔτι ἐμφαινέουσης τὴν ἰδίαν ἄρχουσαν·

**(f) Choeroboscus' defence of Apollonius – continued:**

τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ αἱ προθέσεις, ἐὰν μὲν προσλάβωσιν ἄλλην λέξιν μετὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν, φυλάττουσι τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρχικὴν συλλαβὴν, οἷον συνήγορος εὐσυνήγορος, σύμβουλος εὐσύμβουλος, ἐὰν δὲ προσλάβωσι συλλαβὴν, ἐξαμαυροῦσι τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρχικὴν συλλαβὴν. καὶ τούτου χάριν τὸ καταγράψω οὐ δύναται γενέσθαι ἐκατάγραφον, ἐπειδὴ αἱ συλλαβαί, ὡς εἴρηται, προσερχόμεναι ταῖς λέξεσιν οὐ φυλάττουσιν αὐτῶν τὸ ἰδίωμα τὸ ἀρχικόν· ἐν οὖν τῷ συνήγορος εὐσυνήγορος καὶ ἐπανοίκτης θυρεπανοίκτης, εἰ καὶ προσέρχονται ταῖς προθέσεσιν, ἀλλ' αὐταὶ οὐκ εἰσὶ συλλαβαί ἀλλὰ λέξεις, ὥστε φυλάττεσθαι τὰ ἰδιώματα τῆς προθέσεως ἡγουν τὴν ἀρχικὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐν δὲ τῷ καταγράψω ἐὰν γένηται ἐκατάγραφον συλλαβῆς προσερχομένης καὶ οὐ λέξεως, ἐξαμαυροῦται τελείως τὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς προθέσεως θελούσης αἰεὶ <εἶναι> κατ' ἀρχὴν· οὐκέτι γὰρ φυλάττεται ἡ ἄρχουσα ἀλλ' ἐξαμαυροῦται. ἄτρεπτος οὖν τηρεῖται ἡ πρόθεσις, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἐν πλεονασμῷ εἴη, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ καθέζομαι ἐκαθεζόμεν, καθεύδω ἐκάθευδον, καμμύω ἐκάμμου, ἐνέπω ἦνεπον· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ οὐδὲν πλέον σημαίνουσιν αἱ προθέσεις· τὸ γὰρ ἔζομαι καὶ [τὸ] καθέζομαι τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνουσι, καὶ τὸ εὐδω καὶ καθεύδω, καὶ τὸ μύω καὶ καμμύω ἀπὸ τοῦ καταμύω κατὰ συγκοπὴν τοῦ α καὶ τροπὴν τοῦ Τ εἰς Μ, καὶ τὸ ἔπω <καὶ ἐνέπω>· ἔξωθεν δὲ ἐποίησαντο τὴν κλίσιν τὸ ἐκαθεζόμεν ἐκάθευδον ἐκάμμου ἦνεπον, ὡς σχεδὸν ἀπλῶν οὐσῶν τῶν λέξεων, ὥσπερ τύπτω ἔτυπτον.

ὄρᾳς. The imperfect of this becomes ὥρων, with the first syllable aspirated, and when an extra E is added and it becomes ἐώρων, the initial syllable is corrupted along with the addition. For a syllable as been added, and for this reason the rough breathing has gone up from the second syllable to the first. For we have the principle that the rough breathing likes to go at the beginning. And likewise in the case of ἐμός, σός, ὅς, the form ὅς has a rough breathing. But when an extra E is added and it becomes ἐός, the rough breathing goes up onto the first syllable, with the initial syllable evidently losing its natural character because of the addition. But in compounds nothing of the sort happens, as has been said, but the rough breathing is preserved, with the simplex word still displaying its own initial syllable.

In this way prepositions too, if they take to themselves another word on composition, they preserve their own initial syllable, as in συνήγορος εὐσυνήγορος, σύμβουλος εὐσύμβουλος, but if they take to themselves a syllable, they obscure their own first syllable. And for this reason καταγράψω cannot become ἐκατάγραφον, since syllables, as has been said, when added to words do not preserve their word-initial feature. So in συνήγορος εὐσυνήγορος and ἐπανοίκτης θυρεπανοίκτης, even if they (the εὐ- and θυρ-) come together with prepositions, these are not syllables but words, so that the characteristic features of prepositions are preserved, that is to say their capacity to go at the beginning. But in καταγράψω, if it becomes ἐκατάγραφον, with a syllable and not a word being added, the characteristic feature of a preposition—which likes always to be at the beginning—is completely obscured. For the initial syllable is no longer preserved but obscured. So the preposition is preserved unchanged, unless it is an extra element, as in καθέζομαι ἐκαθεζόμεν, καθεύδω ἐκάθευδον, καμμύω ἐκάμμου, ἐνέπω ἦνεπον. For in these instances the prepositions do not add anything to the meaning. For ἔζομαι and καθέζομαι mean the same thing, and likewise εὐδω and καθεύδω, and μύω and καμμύω (which comes from καταμύω by loss of the A and a change of T into M), and ἔπω <and ἐνέπω>. And ἐκαθεζόμεν ἐκάθευδον and ἐκάμμου ἦνεπον have made their inflection on the outside, since these words are practically simplicia, like τύπτω ἔτυπτον.

Other passages with something of the same flavour include Choeroboscus' commentary on Theodosius' Κανόνες, *Grammatici Graeci* IV.ii.237.21–238.15 (on whether perfect imperatives end in -θι or -ε); *Epimerismi Homerici, ordine alphabetico traditi* 6 Dyck and *Etymologicum Magnum* 472.10–25 (on whether ἴξον is an aorist or an imperfect).