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(1α) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, Grammatici Graeci I.iii.37.10–38.14 (Σd):

(a) Herodian and Apollonius investigated which of E and O was shorter:
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δὲ, τῶν βραχέων φημι, ὁ τε Ἡρωδιανός ὁ τεχνικὸς καὶ ὁ τοῦτού πατήρ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐξήγησαν, τί τίνος ἐστὶ βραχύτερον.

(b) Apollonius’ argument that O is shorter:
καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων δέ, τῶν βραχέων φημί, ὅ τε Ἡρωδιανὸς ὁ τεχνικὸς καὶ ὁ τούτου πατὴρ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐζήτησαν, τί τίνος ἐστὶ βραχύτερον.

And Apollonius says that the Ο is shorter than the Ε, 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 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 calculation 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 Ῥωμούς (nominative), Ῥωμοῦ (vocative); καλῆ (nominative), καλῆ (vocative); παιδίον (nominative), παιδίον (vocative), or, if the vocative changes the vowel, it doesn’t
Ὀρέστης ὦ Ὀρέστης (τὸ α τοῦ ἐκ τῆς βραχύτερου), ὁ Μέμνων ὦ Μέμνων (ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς εὐθείας τὸ ω, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κλητικῆς τὸ ο), ὁ Απόλλων ὦ Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ὦ Ἀριστοφάνες· ἐπὶ τὸ Ὅμηρος οὖν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν εἰς ὍΣ ἐφυλάξατο τὸ Ο ἢ κλητική, ἢ ἐὰν τρέπῃ αὐτό, ὡστε οὖν καὶ τρέπει, πάντως εἰς τι βραχύτερον τοῦ Ο τρέπει αὐτό· ἐπειδὴ οὖν εἰς Ε τρέπει αὐτό, δῆλον ὅτι τὸ Ε βραχύτερόν ἐστι τοῦ Ο, οἷον ὁ Ὅμηρος ὦ Ὅμηρε.

(1β) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, Grammatici Graeci I.iii.498.3–35 (Σ).

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

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

(b) Apollonius’ argument that O is shorter:

And Apollonius says the O (is shorter). For he says that if you add an I to each of them 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 Ὅμηρος.

(c) Herodian’s argument against Apollonius:

But Herodian rather says that the E is shorter. For he says that one must not 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 relationship with E. And he shows this on the basis that the pronunciation of I is the name of the letter E. Being added to its relative, then, it produced a big diphthong. But on coming together with O, the I (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 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.

(d) Herodian’s argument for the opposite conclusion:

Having rejected his father’s view by means of such words, Herodian brings forward the following kind of pleading, showing that E 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 αὐτῷ εἰς Ε. πότε ἵσοχρονεῖ τῇ εὐθείᾳ ή κλητικῇ, καὶ πότε οὐ; ἡνίκα ή εὐθεία οὐ μεταβάλλει τὸ φωνῆν αὐτῆς, ἵσοχρονεῖ τῇ κλητικῇ, ἡνίκα μεταβάλλει, ἐλάττονα χρόνον <ἔχει ἡ κλητική>. ἐπεὶ οὖν εὐρίσκεται ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ τρεπόμενον τὸ τελικὸν τῆς εὐθείας εἰς Ε, βραχύτερον ἦστι τὸ Ο τὸ Ε. (e) An additional argument for the same conclusion (not attributed to anyone in particular):

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ διαλέκτων· ἡ γὰρ Αἰολὶς διάλεκτος διπλασιάζουσα τὰ σύμφωνα τὰ προκείμενα φωνῆνα συστέλλει εἰς ἥσσονα· τὸ πενθήσεις πενθέσ<σ>εις φησίν· εἰ οὖν τὸ τοσοῦτον λέγει τεσ<σ>οῦτον, δήλον ὅτι ως ἐκ μείζονος εἰς ἐλάττονα συστολὴν ποιεῖται. ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ ἑνικαὶ γενικαὶ μείζονα τέλη ἔχουσι τῶν πληθυντικῶν εὐθειῶν, οἷον Ῥοδίου Ῥόδιοι, λιθίνης λίθιναι· εἴπερ οὖν ἐξελέξατο ή μὲν ἑνική γενική τὸ Ο, ἡ δὲ πληθυντικὴ εὐθεία τὸ Ε, ως ἐν τῷ Αἴαντος Αἴαντες, δήλον ώς ἐλάττον καὶ <μᾶλλον> συνεσταλμένον ἐστὶ τὸ Ε τοῦ Ο.

(1γ) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, Grammatici Graeci I.iii.199.15–34 (Σ’):

(a) Apollonius argues that Ο is shorter than Ε:
πάλιν τῶν δύο βραχέων βραχύτερον μὲν κατὰ Απολλώνιον τὸ Ο· φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ Ε καὶ τὸ Ο, εἰ προσθήσεις [ἐν] ἑκατέρῳ αὐτῶν τὸ Ι, ποιήσεις δηλονότι δύο διφθόγγους, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἐστι μακροτέρα ἡ τὸ Ε ἔχουσα· ἐν τέλει γὰρ λέξεως εὑρισκομένη ἡ ΟΙ διφθογγος διηνεκῶς συστέλλεται, ἡ δὲ ΕΙ οὐδέποτε.

(b) Herodian objects to Apollonius’ argument:

καί φησιν ὅτι πᾶν στοιχεῖον ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἄρχεται, τὸ δὲ Ι οὐκ ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ε, ὥστε συγγενὲς αὐτῷ ἐστι· τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς τὸ ἴδιον προσλαμβάνον, μεγαλικωτάτην τινὰ δίφθογγον ἀποτελεῖ, πρὸς δὲ οὐκ ἐχει συγγένειαν προσλαμβάνον, τὸ Ο οὐχ οὕτως ἐπιβοηθεῖται, ὦς μεγάλην ἀποτελέσα τοις δίφθογγοι. διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δεὶ τῇ παραθέσει τοῦ Ι ταῦτα ἔξετάσεσθαι.

And then of the two short vowels, the shorter according to Apollonius is Ο. For he says that when it comes to Ε and Ο, if you add I to each of them you’ll obviously make two diphthongs, but the EI never.

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

(1γ) Commentaries on (Ps.)-Dionysius Thrax, Grammatici Graeci I.iii.199.15–34 (Σ’):

(a) Apollonius argues that Ο is shorter than Ε:
πάλιν τῶν δύο βραχέων βραχύτερον μὲν κατὰ Απολλώνιον τὸ Ο· φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ Ε καὶ τὸ Ο, εἰ προσθήσεις [ἐν] ἑκατέρῳ αὐτῶν τὸ Ι, ποιήσεις δηλονότι δύο διφθόγγους, καὶ ἡ μὲν ἐστι μακροτέρα ἡ τὸ Ε ἔχουσα· ἐν τέλει γὰρ λέξεως εὑρισκομένη ἡ ΟΙ διφθογγος διηνεκῶς συστέλλεται, ἡ δὲ ΕΙ οὐδέποτε.

(b) Herodian objects to Apollonius’ argument:

καί φησιν ὅτι πᾶν στοιχεῖον ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἄρχεται, τὸ δὲ Ι οὐκ ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ε, ὥστε συγγενές αὐτῷ ἐστι· τὸ δὲ συγγενές τὸ ἴδιον προσλαμβάνον, μεγαλικωτάτην τινὰ δίφθογγον ἀποτελεῖ, πρὸς δὲ οὐκ ἐχει συγγένειαν προσλαμβάνον, τὸ Ο οὐχ οὕτως ἐπιβοηθεῖται, ὦς μεγάλην ἀποτελέσα τοις δίφθογγοι. διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δεὶ τῇ παραθέσει τοῦ Ι ταῦτα ἔξετάσεσθαι.

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 Ε, 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 οὑτωσί, λέγων ὅτι πᾶσα κλητικὴ ἢ τὸν ἴσον χρόνον θέλει ἔχειν τῆς ἰδίας εὐθείας ἢ έλαττόνα. οὐδέποτε δὲ μείζονα ἐπειδὲ διευρύσκεται τὸ <Ο> τῆς εὐθείας τελικὸν φωνῆεν, ως ἐν τῷ κύριος, τρεπόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς κλητικῆς εἰς Ε, βραχύτερον ἀρα ἐστὶ τὸ Ε τοῦ Ο.

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.

(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, έλαττόνα ἔχει χρόνον.

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:

ιστέον δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ μὲν βαρυτόνων θεμάτων ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ ὁ μέλλων τῷ ἐνεστῶτι, ὥσπερ τύπτω τύψω—τὸ γὰρ παρ’ Ἀριστοφάνει τυπτήσω ἐν Πλούτῳ (‘οὐ γάρ με τυπτήσεις στέφανον ἔχοντά γε’ (Αr. Plut. 21)) ως ἀπὸ περισπωμένων εἰστὶ—

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 γάρ 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, μιαίνω 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.

(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 μιὰ συλλαβῆ περιττεύει ὁ μέλλων τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος, ὥσπερ ποιῶ ποιήσω, νοῶ νοήσω, γελῶ γελάσω, περῶ περάσω, στεφανῶ στεφανώσω, γυψῶ γυψώσω. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων δὲ ἐὰν λάβῃ τὴν ἐντέλειαν, εὑρίσκεται τὸ μέλλοντα ἰσοσύλλαβον τῷ ἐνεστῶτι, ὥσπερ ποιέω ποιήσω, βοάω βοήσω, χρυσόω χρυσώσω· ἀλλὰ λοιπὸν ὁ ἐνεστὼς συναιρούμεν ἔνδειαν συλλαβῆ, καὶ κεφαλής μὲν ὁ μέλλων μιὰ συλλαβῆ περιττεύει τὸν ἐνεστῶτος’ ὥσπερος δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐχόντων τὸ ἐν Λ, ως εὑρίσκεται ἡ ἡμέρα, μιὰ συλλαβῆ περιττεύει ὁ μέλλων τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος, ὥσπερ θέλω θελήσω, ὀφείλω ὀφειλήσω.

And one should know that 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 ποιῶ ποιήσω, βοάω βοήσω, χρυσόω χρυσώσω. But then the present gets contracted and undergoes the loss of a syllable, as in ποιῶ ποιήσω, βοάω βοήσω, χρυσόω χρυσώσω, 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.
A question—why do verbs with one Λ have a syllable more in the future?

και ἄξιον ἄτι ζητήσας, διατὶ τὰ δι’ ἑνὸς Λ ἐκφερόμενα περιστουλλάβουσ...

καὶ λέγει ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν, ὅτι πολλὰ εἰσὶ ρήματα καὶ ως ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων καὶ <ώς> ἀπὸ περισπωμένων ποιοῦντα τὴν κλίσιν, οἱνό τῷ παρατατικῷ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων καὶ <ώς> ἀπὸ περισπωμένων ποιοῦντα τὴν κλίσιν, ὡς ἀπὸ περισπωμένων καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων ποιοῦντα τὴν κλίσιν· ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὡς μὲ τὸν παρατατικὸ, ὡς εὑρίσκεται, <ώς> ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων θεμάτων ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν, οὐδέποτε δὲ 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, οφείλω οφειλήσω. 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.
Herodian’s contrary solution:

‘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, τίλλω, στέλλω, σφάλλω, unless they have nouns underlying them—for those verbs are perispomenon, as in ἁμιλλῶ (whence ἁμιλλῶμαι), 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 are not perispomenon, I mean μέλω, θέλω, and ὀφείλω, have divided up their inflection, and up to 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.

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

(a) Rules for deriving feminine patronyms from masculines in -ΔΗΣ, according to Apollonius and associates:

Words in -ΔΗΣ make a feminine by removing the -ΔΗ-: Τανταλίδης Τανταλίς, Πηλιάδης Πηλιάς, Αἰνειάδης Αἰνειάς. And the (genitive of the) book title should have been Αἰνειάδος, not Αἰνεΐδος. (And Χρυσηΐς and Νηρηΐς are derived from Χρύσης and Νηρεύς, Βασιλεύς gives rise to Βασιληΐς, and by deletion of the Η Βασιλίς. And Εὐξαντιάς is derived from Εὐξάντιος, and Εὐξαντίδος in Callimachus has a deletion of the A, and Ἑλικωνιάς has an addition.) This is how Apollonius’ circle form feminine patronyms from masculine patronyms in -ΔΗΣ.

(b) Herodian argues against their derivation:

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
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 M, and the dual νῶϊ, and it doesn't have M.) 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 a Δ, and Πάριδε too has a 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 τοὶ ποιμένες and ταὶ Μοῦσαι, so that the same consonant is kept in both plural and dual forms. For the duals are τῶ and τά, as in τῶ Αἴαντε, τὰ Μοῦσαι. 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.
Apollonius’ solution continued—the first person dual of τύπτω can’t be τύπτομεν, because a rule would be violated:

Since, then, the plural is τύπτομεν and it has a M in its last syllable, and this M has to be preserved in the duals too, the first person dual should have become τύπτομον, by a change of MEN to MON, 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 T 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 M. So being compelled to preserve either the T or the Θ which is characteristic of dual verbs, it could not be produced with M, and being compelled to preserve the M which is characteristic of plurals it could not be produced either with Θ or with T. With the two rules conflicting, then, and the one demanding either the T or the Θ which is characteristic of dual verbs and the other demanding the M 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 M in its last syllable. This is what Apollonius says.

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

But what Herodian says is the following: that the first person of the duals is here forced to have either T or Θ, the characteristic of dual verb forms, and the M of the plural, and hence it is compelled to become τύπτομθον or τύπτομτον, but it is impossible to have M <before Θ or T>. For they do not stand together either in the same syllable or across a syllable boundary. (ΜΘ and MT 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 P follows the Π in the same syllable, but if the P precedes the Π instead of following it, it does so across a syllable boundary, as in ἐρπω. 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 ἡλκω, it does so across a syllable boundary. And likewise in θήσωκ the N follows the Θ in the same syllable, but
ἄνθος, κατά διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο· πάλιν ἐν τῷ γράφῳ τὸ Ρ ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Γ κατά συλλήψιν, ἀντιπροηγησάμενον δὲ τὸ Ρ τοῦ Γ, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐργόν, κατά διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο. ἐπειδὴ οὖν τὸ Μ ὑποτέτακται τοῦ Θ κατὰ σύλληψιν, ἀντιπροηγήσαμεν δὲ τὸ Ρ τοῦ Γ, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐργόν, ἀντιπροηγήσατο· πάλιν ἐν τῷ γράφῳ τὸ Ρ τοῦ Γ, οὐ δύναται αὐτῶν ἀντιπροηγήσασθαι κατά συλλήψιν, ἀλλὰ κατά διάστασιν.

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

ἀλλ’ οὔτε δὲ πάλιν κατὰ διάστασιν δύναται ἀντιπροηγήσασθαι τὸ Μ τοῦτων, φημὶ δὲ τοῦ Τ καὶ τοῦ Θ, ἐπειδὴ πᾶσαι συλλαβάς καταλήγουσας εἰς τὸ Μ θέλει ἔχειν τὴν ἑξῆς συλλαβήν ἄρχομενην ἀπὸ τοῦ Β ή ἀπὸ τοῦ Π ή ἀπὸ τοῦ Φ ή ἀπὸ τοῦ Ψ ή ἀπὸ τοῦ Μ, οἷον σύμβουλος σύμπονος σύμψηφος συμμέτοχος.

(g) Conclusion of Herodian’s argument:

ἐπειδὴ οὖν οὔτε κατὰ σύλληψιν οὔτε κατὰ διάστασιν ἠδύνατο 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 ἐχεῖ ἐν τῇ τελευταίᾳ συλλαβῇ.

(h) Some people attack Herodian’s argument:

τινὲς δὲ πρὸς ταύτην τὴν ἀπολογίαν ἀντιλέγοντες, ὡς δῆθεν κακῶς εἰπόντος τοῦ Ἡρωδιανοῦ, κέχρηνται τοιούτῳ λόγῳ, ὅτι εἰ θέλει ἔχειν ἐν τῷ παρακειμένῳ τὸ πρῶτον πρόσωπον τῶν δυϊκῶν τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ καὶ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ τοῦ δυϊκοῦ, μὴ εἴπωμεν τύπτομθον ἢ τύπτομτον, ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἀσυνταξία, ἀλ’ ὑπερβιβάσωμεν τὰ σύμφωνα, ὥστε γενέσθαι τύπτοθμον ἢ τύπτοτμον, καὶ ἔχει λοιπὸν ἢ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ ἢ τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀσυνταξία· εὑρίσκομεν γὰρ καὶ τὸ Τ καὶ τὸ Θ πρὸ τοῦ Μ, ὡς ἐν τῷ τμῆμα 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, ὡς ἔχει τὸν τρόπον ἔχεται κατὰ διάστασιν, καὶ τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν Κ τοῦ παρακειμένου, καὶ δεύτερον ἐπέχει τὸ Κ τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν σύμφωνον, τὸ δὲ Ρ πρῶτον, τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ὃς τῆς συλλήψεως ὄψεις ἄνθος, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο, ἐπειδή τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν σύμφωνον τῶν δυϊκῶν ὄψεις ἄνθος, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο, ἐπειδή τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν σύμφωνον τῶν δυϊκῶν ὄψεις ἄνθος, κατὰ διάστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντιπροηγήσατο.
τὸ Θ, ἀλλὰ τὸ Μ ὑπὸ τῆς δευτέρας τάξεως, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐνομίζετο τοῦτο τὸ Μ χαρακτηριστικὸν εἶναι τοῦ δυϊκοῦ ρήματος, καὶ οὐκέτι τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ᾽ ὡστε οὐν οὐ δύνανται ὑπερβιβασθῆναι τὰ σύμφωνα ἑπὶ τούτων καὶ γενεσθαι τύπτομον ἢ τύπτομον, ἀλλ᾽ εἰ ὅλως ἀναγκαζομεθα φυλάττει τὰ δύο, τουτέστι καὶ τὸ Μ τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ καὶ τὸ Τ ἢ τὸ Θ τοῦ δυϊκοῦ, ἀναγκαζομεθα φυλάττει τὸ χαρακτηριστικὸν τοῦ δυϊκοῦ δευτέραν ἑπέχον 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.

(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 μ-verbs ἱστέον ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ τέθειμαι παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου γίνεται τὸ ὑποτακτικὸ τροπῇ τῆς παραληγούσης εἰς Ω ἐὰν τεθῶμαι.

(b) Apollonius’ different view:

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

(c) Herodian’s refutation:

ἐλέγχει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς λέγων, ὅτι οὐ καλῶς δοξάζει· οὐδὲ γάρ, φησίν, εὑρηται παντελῶς ἐν χρήσει τὸ ἐὰν τεθείκωμαι καὶ ἐὰν δεδώκωμαι, ἀλλὰ 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 ὑποτακτικοῦ τοῦ παρακειμένου καὶ ὑπερσυντελίκου ἐγίνετο τὸ ὑποτακτικὸ παθητικὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου προσθέτει τῆς ΜΑΙ, ὡφείλεται ἐὰν τετύφωμαι εἶναι, καὶ μὴ ἀναπληροῦσθαι διὰ μετοχῆς διὰ τὸ τὸν τέτυμμαι παθητικὸν παρακειμένον ἐχει πρὸ τοῦ Μ σύμφωνον, καὶ πάλιν ἐὰν μεμνήκωμαι ὥστε φησίν ἐὰν μεμνήσθωμαι, καὶ οὐχ ἐὰν μεμνήσθωμαι ἐὰν μεμνήσθωμαι ἐὰν μεμνῆσθωμαι ὧν μεμνήσθωμαι, καὶ οὐχ ἐὰν μεμνήσθωμαι ἐὰν μεμνήσθωμαι.
(6) Choeroboscus’ commentary on Theodosius’ Kanōnec, 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, ώς οὐδέποτε εὑρίσκεται δεύτερος μέλλων ἕνεργητικὸς ὁριστικὸς <ἐν χρήσει· ἃς> γάρ, φησιν, παρέθετο χρήσις ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος, ὥς πεπλασμέναι αὐτῷ εἰσίν, ώς τὸ φυγῶ δραμῶ τυπῶ, οὐ δεύτεροι γὰρ μέλλοντες· «οὐδεὶς γάρ τῶν παλαιῶν», φησίν, τούτοις ἔχρησις· ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῷ ‘ἐγὼ δέ κ´ ἀγω Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρῃον’ (II.1.184) ἐνεστώς ἐστίν ἀντὶ μελλόντος τοῦ ἅξω·

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 κούρην δ’ ἀγαμέμνονος Ατρείδαο <and πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τοι τελέω>· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ οἱ ἐνεστώτες <εἰσὶν ἀντὶ μελλόντων, ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ γαμήσω> καὶ τελέσω, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῷ ‘ἐγὼ δέ κ´ ἀγω Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρῃον’ there is a present instead of the future ἅξω.

(b) Herodian’s argument continued:

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 εὐφρανέειν with resolution, as in εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν. And the form ἐκχεῶ belonging to the second future is noted as an exception, as also κατακλιεῖ in Eupolis’ Χρυσοῦν γένος, as in εἰ μή τις αὐτὴν κατακλιεῖ. And κατακλιεῖ has come about in the following way: there is κλείω, and the second aorist of this form is ἔκλιον, 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.

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

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

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

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 El, as in τυψώ τυψεῖς τυψεῖ, νυγῶ νυγεῖς νυγεῖ, ἐπιθω ἐπιθεῖς ἐπιθεῖ; 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.
ταῦτα δὲ, ώς εἴρηται, ἔχουσι τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς Ἄι διηθήνειν ἐκφερόμενον· δεύτερον δὲ πρῶτον μέλλοντος <οὐ δύνανται εἶναι>, ἐπειδή οὐδέποτε ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς ἔχει οἷον τὸ ἔχουσι τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον πρόσωπον διὰ τῆς Ἄι διηθήνειν, ἀλλ’ <ή> ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ αὐτὸν, ὅπειρ τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω, ἡ περιπτύσσει, ὅποι ποὺ ποήσῃ, νοῦς νοῆσῃ· ἐάν οὖν τὸ ἀγορᾶ καὶ κρεμᾶ δίωμεν μέλλοντας εἶναι, εὐρύσκονται ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς ἔχοντες τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος, ὁ γάρ ἐνεστῶς ἁγορᾶς καὶ κρεμαζὸς εἶστιν, ὅπερ ἄδυνον.

(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 γάρ ἔστιν ἧς οὐδὲν θέλει προτίθεσθαι· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ώς ἂν τὶς εἴποι ἐσώθηται, οἷον καταγράφω κατέγραφον, ἀναγινώσκω ἀνεγίνωσκον, περιπατῶ περιεπάτουν, κατορθῶ κατώρθουν. τὸ δὲ ἀληθέστερον κατὰ ἀρκετὸν γίνεται ἡ σύνθεσις· οἷον ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ χειρογράφῶ ἐχειρογράφουν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων συνθέτων τῶν μὴ ὁμοίων ἰδίως ἰδίως διὰ προθέσεως καὶ ἰδίως διὰ μὴ ὁμοίως διὰ προθέσεως καὶ ἰδίως διὰ μὴ ὁμοίως, μετὰ τῆς συνθέσεως εἴρηται καὶ σύνθεσις·<ή> ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ αὐτὸν, ὅπειρ τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω, ἡ περιπτύσσει, ὅποι ποὺ ποήσῃ, νοῦς νοῆσῃ· ἐάν οὖν τὸ ἀγορᾶ καὶ κρεμᾶ δίωμεν μέλλοντας εἶναι, εὐρύσκονται ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς ἔχοντες τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος, ὁ γάρ ἐνεστῶς ἁγορᾶς καὶ κρεμαζὸς εἶστιν, ὅπερ ἄδυνον.

For a preposition is something before which nothing likes to be placed. For this reason the inflection takes place on the inside, as one might say, as in καταγράφω κατέγραφον, ἀναγινώσκω ἀνεγίνωσκον, περιπατῶ περιεπάτουν, κατορθῶ κατώρθουν. But the most accurate account is that the composition happens only in due course. For example, in the case of χειρογράφω ἐχειρογράφου καὶ καλαμογράφω ἐκαλαμογράφου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συνθέτων τῶν μὴ ὁμοίων ἰδίως διὰ προθέσεως καὶ ἰδίως διὰ μὴ ὁμοίως, μετὰ τῆς συνθέσεως εἴρηται καὶ σύνθεσις·<ή> ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ αὐτὸν, ὅπειρ τύπτω τύψω, λέγω λέξω, ἡ περιπτύσσει, ὅποι ποὺ ποήσῃ, νοῦς νοῆσῃ· ἐάν οὖν τὸ ἀγορᾶ καὶ κρεμᾶ δίωμεν μέλλοντας εἶναι, εὐρύσκονται ἐλάττονας συλλαβὰς ἔχοντες τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος, ὁ γάρ ἐνεστῶς ἁγορᾶς καὶ κρεμαζὸς εἶστιν, ὅπερ ἄδυνον.

For the K is not characteristic of a recessive future. For the words 'recessive future' have been included because of ἐπειδὴ ἐδέξαντό τι ποτὲ μὴ ἁρμόζον τῷ μέλλοντι, φημὶ δὴ τὸ Κ, τὸ γὰρ Κ οὐκ ἔστι χαρακτηριστικὸν βαρυτόνου μέλλοντος. And the words 'recessive future' have been included because of ἐπειδὴ ἐδέξαντό τι ποτὲ μὴ ἁρμόζον τῷ μέλλοντι, φημὶ δὴ τὸ Κ, τὸ γὰρ Κ οὐκ ἔστι χαρακτηριστικὸν βαρυτόνου μέλλοντος. And the words 'recessive future' have been included because of ἐπειδὴ ἐδέξαντό τι ποτὲ μὴ ἁρμόζον τῷ μέλλοντι, φημὶ δὴ τὸ Κ, τὸ γὰρ Κ οὐκ ἔστι χαρακτηριστικὸν βαρυτόνου μέλλοντος.
καὶ οὕτω συντίθενται, οἷον ἀπὸ τοῦ γράφῳ γίνεται καταγράφῳ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐγραφον κατέγραφον, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γέγραφον καταγέγραφον, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γράφειν κατεγεγράφειν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γράψεως καταγράψεως. Θείας ἑλίθηται γινεται καταγράφω, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γράψα τὸ κατέγραψα, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γράψω τὸ καταγράψω. Τοῦτο δὲ γίνεται, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαμαυρωθῇ ἡ 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 διῆλθον, οἷον προέρχομαι περιέρχομαι, ἐν τῷ περὶ προθέσεως, εἰ θεῷ φίλον, μαθησόμεθα.

(c) So much for Apollonius’ account:

ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος φησιν.

(d) Herodian’s refutation:

πρὸς τοῦτο δὲ ἀντιλέγει ὁ Ἡρωδιανὸς λέγων, ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ κατά πρόθεσις ἐν τῷ καταγράφῳ, ἀλλὰ μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ ῥήματος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἐγένετο ἡ σύνθεσις. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ εὐγενής οὐκ ἔστι τὸ εὐ-ἐπίρρημα, ἀλλὰ μέρος ἐγένετο τοῦ ὀνόματος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ ἐπιρρήματος ἐγένετο ἡ σύνθεσις, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ καταγράφῳ οὐ λέγομεν, ὅτι πρόθεσίς ἐστιν ἡ κατά, ἀλλὰ μέρος τοῦ ῥήματος, εἰ καὶ ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἐγένετο ἡ σύνθεσις; ἄλλως τε ἰδοὺ τὸ συνήγορος ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἀρχεται, καὶ ὅμως λέγεται εὐσυνήγορος, καὶ πάλιν σύμβουλος εὐσύμβουλος, ἐπανοίκτης θυρεπανοίκτης. Οὐκ οὖν οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἀρχόμενα δέξασθαι ἐξωθέν τί ποτε. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἡρωδιανός.

(e) Choeroboscus’ defence of Apollonius:

ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπολογοῦμεθα 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 εὗρον ὕβρις ὕλη, καὶ ὅμως ἐν ταῖς συνθέσεσιν φυλάττεται ἡ δασεῖα, ὡς ἐν τῷ καθίσταμαι φιλοῥώμαιος μισοῥήτωρ ἐφεῦρον, ἐπειδὴ λέξις προσῆλθε, καὶ ἐφυλάθη τὸ ἰδίωμα τὸ ἀρχικόν, ἐὰν δὲ προσέλθῃ συλλαβή, τότε ἐξαμαυρωθεῖ τὸ καταγόμενον νόμισθαι, οἷον ὁρῶ ὁρᾷς· τούτου γίνεται ὁ παρατατικὸς ὥρων.

inflected (so to speak) and in that form they are compounded. For example, from γράφῳ comes καταγράφῳ, and from έγραφον comes κατέγραφον, and from γέγραφον comes καταγέγραφον, and from γράψεως comes καταγράψεως. 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 καταγράφῳ, κατέγραφον, and from γέγραφον comes καταγέγραφον, and from γράφῃ comes καταγράψῃ, and from γράφειν comes καταγράψειν, and from γράψειν comes καταγράψεις, and from γράφειν comes καταγράψεις. 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.

These things, then, are what Apollonius says.

But Herodian argues against him, saying that to begin with κατά 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 εὐγενής the εὐ- isn’t an adverb but has become part of the nominal (i.e. noun/adj), even though the composition took the adverb as its starting point, so too in καταγράφῳ 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 εὐσυνήγορος begins with a preposition, and nevertheless εὐσυνήγορος is said, and likewise εὐσύμβουλος εὐσύμβουλος, ἐπανοίκτης θυρεπανοίκτης. 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. This is clear from the rough breathing. For just as we said that the rough breathing likes to go at the beginning, as in ρῷμη ρήτωρ εὗρον ύβρις ύλη, and yet in compounds the rough breathing is preserved, as in καθύσταμαι φιλοῥώμαιος μισοῥήτωρ 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 ὠρῶ
δασυνομένης τῆς πρώτης συλλαβῆς, καί ἐπειδή ἐπλεόνασε τὸ Ε καὶ ἐγένετο ἕως, ἀμα τῷ πλεονασμῷ παρεφθάρη καί ἢ ἄρχουσα συλλαβῆ γάρ προσῆλθε, καί διὰ τοῦτο ἀνέδραμεν ἡ δασεῖα ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας συλλαβῆς ἐπὶ τῆν πρώτην ἔχομεν γάρ ὅτι φιλαρχός ἦστιν ἡ δασεία καί πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔμοι σὸς ὡς τὸ ὁ δασύνετα ὅταν δὲ πλεονάσῃ τὸ Ε καὶ γένηται ἑός, ἀνατρέχει ἡ δασεῖα εἰς τὴν πρώτην συλλαβῆ, ὡς δήθεν διὰ τοῦ πλεονασμοῦ τῆς συλλαβῆς ἐξαμαυρωθείσης τῆς ἀρχούσης ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνθέτοις οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον, ως εἰρηται, ἀλλὰ φυλάττεται ἡ δασεία ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας συλλαβῆς, ἅτε δὴ τῆς ἁπλῆς λέξεως ἐπὶ ἐμφαινούσης τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρχούσην.

(f) Choeroboscus’ defence of Apollonius—continued:

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 καταγράφω 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 καταγράφω, 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 ἐκαθεζόμην, καθεύδω ἐκάθευδον, καμμύω ἐκάμμυον, ἔπω ἤνεπον. For in these instances the prepositions do not add anything to the meaning. For ἔπω and καθεύδω mean the same thing, and likewise εὔδω and καθέζομαι mean the same thing, and likewise εὐδω καθεύδω, and μῦω καμμύω (which comes from καταμύω by loss of the Α and a change of Τ into Μ), and ἔπω <καὶ ἔννεπω>. And ἐκαθεζόμην ἐκαθεζόμην, καθεύδων ἐκάθευδον, ἔπω ἤνεπον have made their inflection on the outside, since these words are practically simplicia, like τύπτω ἔτυπτον.