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Dedicated to my family,

with endless gratitude
πολλὰ γὰρ πονήσας, μόλις εὗρον τὸ περὶ τῶν τοῦ Θεοδοσίου ἐν βιβλίῳ παλαιὰ τῆς μονῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος τῆς ἐν ἀκρωτηρίῳ τῆς Μεσσήνης, τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην πραγματείαν ἐκείνος συνέτεμε ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης προσώπως τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Ἡρωδιανοῦ, οὐ καὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν βιβλίων εἰκοσι ὄντων ἐφύλαξεν (Constantine Lascaris, codex Matritensis 4689 (139)).
ABSTRACT

This thesis is a new edition of the Preface and Books 1-8 of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. It includes an introduction, critical apparatus, apparatus of parallel passages and notes on the text, and is intended as a contribution to modern Herodianic studies.

Most of our knowledge of Greek accentuation is due to Herodian’s lost Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. The main sources for this work, an epitome misattributed to Arcadius and another by John Philoponus, do not have modern critical editions. Lentz’s only collected edition of Herodian’s works, by Lentz (1867-70), is difficult to work with, because Lentz attempts to reconstruct Herodian’s work rather than to lay out the surviving evidence.

The new critical edition of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome is a response to the need for new and separate editions of the sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. A new edition of this text is important because the previous two editions (Barker 1820, Schmidt 1860) have many weaknesses; neither editor examined all the surviving manuscripts, and they did not read the manuscripts themselves but used copies made by other people.

My new examination of all the surviving manuscripts, excepting some very late and uncontroversially derivative manuscripts, comes to a new conclusion about their interrelations. The two manuscripts which I am the first to employ turn out to be the only non-derivative manuscripts, and therefore by far the most important. They enable us to improve the text significantly.
My introduction includes a substantial new evaluation of the interpolated or doubtful sections in the epitome, whose study is impeded by confusion as to their date and relationships to other works. It also discusses the authorship of this epitome, and its grammatical terminology and concepts.

Another innovation is the apparatus of parallel passages. The collection of other texts that have derived material from Herodian shows the extent of Herodian’s influence on later grammatical texts. The parallel passages, as witnesses to Herodian’s text in some form, often enable us to correct the text of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome.

A further contribution of my thesis consists of the commentary, which discusses corrupt passages, features of the text that have never been explained before, and places where specific details of the epitomator’s methods can be identified. The commentary also provides argumentation supporting decisions taken in editing the text, and other helpful information for the understanding of the text.
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### General Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add.</td>
<td>addidit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alt.</td>
<td>alter, -era, -erum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>confer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>codd.</td>
<td>codices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll.</td>
<td>collato, collatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coni.</td>
<td>coniecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del.</td>
<td>delevit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>editio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>em.</td>
<td>emendavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γγ</td>
<td>γράφεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.l.</td>
<td>in linea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.m.</td>
<td>in margine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. ord.</td>
<td>inverso ordine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.t.</td>
<td>in textu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. c.</td>
<td>loco citato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>nota, -ae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om.</td>
<td>omisit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob.</td>
<td>probavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch.</td>
<td>scholium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scil.</td>
<td>scilicet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.l.</td>
<td>supra lineam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editions of ancient authors and works

Notes: Except as otherwise indicated below, authors and works are abbreviated as in LSJ, and the editions used are those listed in OCD or (where no edition is listed in OCD) in the TLG. Spurious works appear under the name of the author to whom they are traditionally attributed.

A. = Aeschylus
___ Eu. = Eumenides,
___ Pr. = Prometheus Vinctus,
___ Supp. = Supplices
Achae. = Achaeus = TrGF (see below) I 20
A. D. = Apollonius Dyscolus
___ Adv. = De adverbiis,
___ Pron. = De pronominibus,
___ Synt. = De Syntaxi
Ael. Dion.
___ Ἀττ. ὀνόμ. = Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα
Aesop. = Aesopus
___ Fab. = Fabulae
Aët. = Aëtius
Medicus
Agath. = Agathias
Scholasticus
Alciphron
Alcman


Ammon.

Ammonius


Anecd. Medica


Anna Comnena

Anna Comnena Alexias


Anv. Hymnica


Anth. Gr.


Anth. Pal.


Apollodorus

Apollonius Sophista
__, Lex. = Lexicon Homericum
Apollon. Cit. = Apollonius Citiensis (Medicus)
App. = Appianus
__, Gall. = Celtica,
__, Hann. = Annibaica
__, Bell. civ. = Bellum civile
A. R. = Apollonius Rhodius
Ar. = Aristophanes
__, Av. = Aves,
__, Ec. = Ecclesiazusae,
__, Eq. = Equites,
__, Lys. = Lysistrata,
__, Pl. = Plutus,
__, Th. = Thesmophoriazusae
Ar. Byz. = Aristophanes Byzantinus
__, Epit. = Historiae animalium epitome subiunctis Aeliani Timothei aliorumque eclogis
Arist. = Aristoteles
__, HA = Historia Animalium
Ath. = Athenaeus
__, Deipnosophistae
__, Epitome

Lampros, S. P. (1885), Excerptorum Constantini de natura animalium libri duo. Aristophanis historiae animalium epitome (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca suppl. 1.1. (Berlin).
Bacchylides
__ Epinicia
Call. = Callimachus
__ Aet. = Aetia,
__ Fr. inc. sed. = Fragmenta incertae sedis,
__ Hec. = Hecale
__ Ap. = Hymnus in Apollinem,
__ Del. = Hymnus in Delum,
__ Dian. = Hymnus in Dianam,
__ Dieges. Fabul. = Diegeseseis Fabularum
Choerob. = Choeroboscus
__ De Orthogr. = De Orthographia
__ Dict. Theod. can. = Dictata in Theodosii canones
__ Ep. Ps. = Choerobosci epimerismi in Psalmos
__ in Theod. = Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione nominum et verborum
Claud. Ael. = Claudius Aelianus
__ De nat. animal. = De natura animalium


Hercher, R. (1864-6), Claudii Aelianii de natura animalium libri xvii, varia historia, epistolae, fragmenta, I-II (Leipzig; repr. 1971).
__, Var. Hist. = Varia Historia
Claud. Ptol. = Claudius Ptolemaeus
Geogr. = Geographia
Cleopatra
__, De ponder. et mensur. = De ponderibus et mensuris
__, De insid. = De insidiis
Com. = Lucius Annaeus Cornutus Philosophus
__, ND = De natura deorum
Cornel. Alex. Polyhist. = Cornelius Alexander Polyhistor
Corpus Aristotelicum, = Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta
Corpus glossariorum latinorum
D. C. = Dio Cassius
__, Hist. rom. (Xiph. epit.) = Historiae Romanae (Xiphilini
Büttner-Wobst, T. – Roos, A. G. (1906-10), Excerpta historica iussu imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta, II: excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis (I-II (Berlin)).
Lang, C. (1881), Cornuti theologiae Graecae compendium (Leipzig).
epitome) __, Jo. Ant. exc. = Historiae Romanae (Joannis Antiocheni excerpta e Dione derivata)


van Thiel, H. (2000), Scholia D in Iliadem (available on Internet only: http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/klassphil/vanthiel/index.html)

E. = Euripides
__ Cyc. = Cyclops,
__ Ion, Tr. = Troades
EM = Etymologicum Magnum
Empedocles
Ep. Hom. = Epimerismi Homerici
Ephipp. = Ephippus
__ Kyd. = Κύδων
Epiphan. = Epiphanius scriptor ecclesiasticus
__ Ancoratus
__ Panarion
__ De mensur. et ponder. (exc. Graec. 4) = De mensuris et ponderibus
__ Ind. Apostol. = Index Apostolorum (spur.)
Erotianus
__ Voc. Hippocratic.
collect. = Vocum Hippocraticarum collection
Et. Gen. = Etymologicum Genuinum
Et. Gud. = Etymologicum Gudianum
For α – βότορες:
For ἀάλιον – ζείδωρος:
For ζείδωρος – ομαί:
PCG (see below)
Hultsch, F. (1864), Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae, I (Leipzig) 259-276.
Schermann, T. (1907), Prophetarum vitae fabulosae (Leipzig).
Nachmanson, E. (ed.) (1918), Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio cum fragmentis (Göteborg).
Parvum
Etymologicum Symeonis = Etymologicum magnum auctum, I (Rome).

Euphro
PCG (see below)

Eusebius

___ Historia ecclesiastica

Eust. = Eustathius

___ D. P. = Commentarium in Dionysii Periegetae orbis descriptionem

___ Il. = Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem

Cited by volume, page and line of Van der Valk (not according to the page and line of the editio romana).1

___ Od. = Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam

Evang. Thom. = Evangelium Thomae
Klostermann, E. (1910), Apocrypha II. Evangelien (Kleine Texte 8), 2nd edn. (Bonn).

FGrHist

Flav. Arr. = Flavius Arrianus

___ Alex. anab. = Alexandri anabasis
Roos, A. G. – Wirth, G. (eds.) (1968), Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia, II (Leipzig; 1st edn. corr.).

___ Bithyn. fragm. = Bithynicorum fragmenta

___ Peripl. pont. eux. = Periplus Ponti Euxini


Gal. = Galen

1 This is more helpful for people using the TLG, and also for the sake of accuracy. This practice is also adopted by Georgios Xenis (2010).
Helmreich, G. (ed.) (1923), Galeni de alimentorum facultatibus libri iii (Corpus medicorum Graecorum 5.4.2.) (Leipzig).


Helmreich, G. (ed.) (1923), Galeni de rebus boni malique suci libellus (Corpus medicorum Graecorum 5.4.2) (Leipzig).

Lindstam, S. (1924), Georgii Lacapeni et Andronici Zaridae Epistulae XXXII cum Epimerismis Lacapeni (Collectio Scriptorum veterum Upssaliensis) (Göteborg).


A new OCT edition of this text is currently in preparation by N. G. Wilson

Müller, K. (ed.) (1855), Geographi Graeci minores, I (Paris; repr. 1965)
Descriptio Graeciae
(sub auctore
Dicaearcho vel
Athenaeo)
Hes. = Hesiodus
__ Th. = Theogonia
Hippiatr. Cant. =
Hippiatrica
Canabrigiensia
Hippol. =
Hippolytus scriptor
eclesiasticus
__ Chron. =
Chronicon
__ Refut. omn. haeres. = Refutatio omnium haeresium
Hippon. =
Hipponax
Hom. = Homer
__ II.
__ Od.
Hp. = Hippocrates
__ Aph. = Aphorismi
__ Art. = De articulis
__ Mochl. =
Μοχλίκος (Vectiarus)
__ Int. = De affectionibus interioribus
Hsch. = Hesychius

97-110.


For A – O:
For Π – Σ:
For Τ – Ω:
Ibycus


Ion

Jo. Alex. = Johannes Alexandrinus

Philoponus

__, Τον. παρ. = Τονικά

Παραγγέλματα

__, π. διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημαίν. = Περί τῶν διαφόρως τονουμένων και διάφορα σημαινόντων

Johannes Damascenus,

__, De haeres.

Jo. Laur. Lyd. = Johannes Laurentius Lydus

__, De mens. = De mensibus

__, De ostent. = De ostentis

__, De magistr. pop. Rom. = De magistratibus populi romani

Jo. Lazar. = Johannes Lazaropoulos

__, Syn. mir. s. Eug. = Synopsis miraculorum sancti Eugenii


A new Teubner edition of this text is currently in preparation by G. A. Xenis


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Orib. = Oribasius

__, Coll. Med. = Collectiones Medicae

__, Syn. = Synopsis ad Eustathium filium

Raeder, J. (1926), Oribasii synopsis ad Eustathium et libri ad Eunapium (Corpus medicorum Graecorum 6.3) (Leipzig; repr. Amsterdam 1964).

Orion

__, Etymologicum

Raeder, J. (1928-33), Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae, I-IV (Corpus medicorum Graecorum 6.1.1-6.2.2) (Leipzig).

__, Etymologicum (excerpta e cod. regio Parisin. 2630)


__, Etymologicum (excerpta e cod. Darmstadino 2773)


Orus

__, Vocum Atticarum Collectio (fragmenta ap. alios auctores et in aliiis Ori scriptis)


Pallad. = Palladius scriptor ecclesiasticus


__, Dial. vit. Chrys. = Dialogus de vita Joanni Chrysostomi


Pancrates


__, Epigramm. = Epigrammata

Weinstock, S. (1940), Codices Romani (Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 5.4) (Brussels).

Paraphr. carm. de terr. mot. = Paraphrasis carminis de terrae motibus


Paul. Med. = Paulus Medicus

__, Epit. medic. lib. sept. = Epitomae Medicae libri septem

Paul. Nic. = Paulus Nicaeensis
Lib. medic. = Liber medicus
Paus. = Pausanias
Pausianias Grammaticus (Atticus)
PCG
Periplus Maris Magni sive Stadiasmus
Periplus Ponti Euxini
Philaret. Med. = Philaretus medicus
__ = De puls. scient. = De pulsuum scientia
Philox. Gramm. = Philoxenus Grammaticus
Philum. = Philumenus Medicus
__ = Ven. = De venenatis animalibus eorumque remediis
Phot. = Photius
__ = Bibliotheca
__ = Lexicon
Phryn. = Phrynichus Atticista
__ = Ecl. = Eclogae
__ = PS = Praeparatio

For A – M:
For the rest:
De Borries, J. (ed.) (1911), Phrynichi sophistae praeparatio sophistica
Sophistica (Leipzig).

Plu. = Plutarch
__ ad II. = Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae
Ps.-Arcad. = For books 1-8:
Pseudo-Arcadius ma edition
For books 9-20:
Schmidt, M. (1860), Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς καθολικῆς προσῳδίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ (Jena).


Westerink, L. G. (ed.) (1992), Michaelis Pselli poemata (Stuttgart).


Acharnenses


Aristophanis Aves

Sch. Ar. Ec. =

Scholia in Aristophanis Ecclesiazusas

Sch. Ar. Th. =

Scholia in Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusas


Aristophanis Equites


Aristophanis Lysistratam

Sch. Ar. Pl. = Scholia in Aristophanis Plutum


Aristophanis Pacem

Sch. Ar. V. = scholia in Aristophanis Vespas


Vespas

Sch. Arat. = scholia in Aratum


in Aratum


Basilicorum libros I

Sch. Call. = scholia in Callimachum

Dieges. Fabul. =
Diegesis Fabularum
(P. Oxy. 20.2263)
__, Hymn. = Scholia in Callimachi Hymnos
Alexandr. = Scholia in Clementem Alexandrinum
Sch. D. T. = Scholia in Dionysium Thracem
Hilgard, A. (ed.) (1901), Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem grammaticam (Grammatici Graeci I.III) (Leipzig).
(Lond. = Londinensia,
Marc. = Marciana,
Vat. = Vaticana)
Sch. E. = scholia in Euripidem
(Hec. = Hecuba, Or. = Orestes, Tr. = Troades)
Sch. Hes. Th. = Di Gregorio, L. (ed.) (1975), Scholia vetera in Hesiodi theogoniam
Scholia in Hesiodi Theogoniam
Iliadem
Scholia in Hippocratem et Galenum
Sch. Luc. = Scholia in Lucianum
Sch. Lyc. = Scholia in Lycothronem
Scholia in Nicandri Alexipharmaca
Scholia in Nicandri Theriaca

Sch. Pi. = Scholia in Pindarum

Sch. Pl. = Scholia in Platonem

__, Ep. = Epistulae, 
__, Lg. = Leges


Sch. S. El. = Scholia in Sophoclis Electram

Sch. S. Tr. = Scholia in Sophoclis Trachinias

Sch. Th. = Scholia in Thucydidem

Sch. Theoc. = Scholia in Theocritum

(Bom. bes. = Βησαντίνου βωμός)

Sch. X. An. = Scholia in anabasin Cyri

Scyl. = Scylax

Sopat. = Sopater Comicus

Sophr. = Sophronius

__, Char. Theodos. = Excerpta ex Joannis Characis

commentariis in Theodosii Alexandrini canones

St. Byz. = Stephanus of Byzantium

For letters A – I (two volumes so far published):

Billerbeck, M. *et al.* (eds.) (2006–), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnika* (Corpus
Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 43/1) (Berlin).

For the rest of the work:

Str. = Strabo

Su. = Suda

Theoc. = Theocritus

Theodor. Nic. = Theodorus Nicaeensis
Kyriakopoulos, K. Th. (ed.) (1976), Αγίου Πέτρου ἐπισκόπου Ἁργοῦς βίος καὶ λόγοι Εἰσαγωγή, Κείμενον, Μετάφρασις, Σχόλια (Athens).

Theodos. = Theodosius Alexandrinus Grammaticus
Hilgard, A. (1889), Theodosii Alexandrini canones, Georgii Choerobosci scholia, Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini excerpta (Leipzig).

__,‖ Π.‖ γραμμ.‖ =‖ Περὶ‖ γραμματικῆς‖ (spur.)
Hilgard, A. (1887), Excerpta ex libris Herodiani technici (Leipzig).

__,‖ Π.‖ κλίσ.‖ ων‖ βαρυτ.‖ =‖ Περὶ‖ κλίσεως‖ τῶν‖ εἰς‖ ων‖ βαρυτόνων
For rules 1-84:
Alpers, K. (1964), Theognostos περὶ ὀρθογραφίας: Überlieferung, Quellen und Text der Kanones 1-84 (Hamburg).
For the rest:

Thphr. = Theophrastus

‒ Fr. = Fragmenta


Thucydidides


Tim. = Timaeus Sophista,
Grammaticus

‒ Lex. = Lexicon


TrGF = Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta


Trypho

‒ Fr. = Fragmenta


‒ Pass. = Περὶ παθῶν

Schneider, R. (ed.) (1895), Excerpta Περὶ παθῶν (Leipzig).

Tyrannion


X. = Xenophon

‒ An. = Anabasis


‒ Cyn. = Cynegeticus


Zonar. = Zonaras

Tittmann, J. A. H. (ed.) (1808), Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus

**Publications of Inscriptions, Ostraca, Papyri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Inscriptiones Graecae (1873-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IscM</td>
<td>Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae (inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae; Bucharest 1980–).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Jena II</td>
<td>Ast, Rodney (2010), Late antique Greek papyri in the collection of the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena (P. Jena II) (Bonn).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Papyri Greci e Latini (Florence 1912—).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics 143, 31</td>
<td>Ramsay, W. M. (1895-7), The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest, I, Parts I-II (Oxford).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten, eds. Preisigke, F. – Bilabel, F. et al. (Strasbourg; Berlin; Leipzig 1915—).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART ONE: Introduction

Aelius Herodian and his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας

1 The life and work of Aelius Herodian

Designations of praise such as μέγας (AP Cramer, IV 195, 26), σοφός (codex Matritensis 4575, Baroccius 179, Hauniensis regius 1965, and Eust. 620, 14 = II 229.9), φιλόσοφος (sch. E. Hipp. 407), and πολυμαθής (codex Matritensis 4689, Constantine Lascaris’ letter to Jacob Ximenis Muriel) are undoubtedly appropriate for the grammarian Aelius Herodian, to whom we owe most of our knowledge of ancient Greek accentuation. The details of his life are, however, as murky as his contribution to scholarship is clear.³

Herodian was Apollonius Dyscolus’ son. He was born in Alexandria and went to Rome when Marcus Aurelius⁴ (161-80 AD) was emperor. In the προοίμιον of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας Herodian dedicated his work to the emperor.

The testimonia that tradition has bequeathed to us do not agree on the reason for Herodian’s migration to Rome. Apollonius’ strictness towards his son, that Apollonius introduced a stepmother to him, and poverty⁵ are mentioned in the testimonia. It seems that the reason why Herodian’s relations with his father were considered to be strained

---

² This scholion is numbered as 407 in Schwartz’s edition, but the phrase commented on is in line 408 in Diggle’s OCT edition.
³ An extensive discussion of Herodian’s life can be found in Lentz (1867-70), VII-IX. See also the discussion in Nifadopoulos (2001), 6-8. The six surviving testimonia are edited by Lentz in GG iii.1 VI-VII.
⁴ This is the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Eusebius in his Historia ecclesiastica 4.13.1 gives us the full name of Marcus Aurelius: Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Αντωνίνος Σεβαστός and in 4.14.10 Eusebius refers to him as Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Οὐήρος, ὁ καὶ Αντωνίνος.
was their disagreement on grammatical issues, or the fact that Herodian does not mention his father very often, or even the fact that Herodian left Alexandria.

Herodian’s main work was the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, which we will deal with extensively in chapter two. With the exception of the Περὶ μονήσους λέξεως, which is the only work to survive in its entirety, all the others survive in epitomes and fragments. Herodian dedicated two works, the Περὶ Ἡλιακῆς προσῳδίας and Περὶ Ὀδυσσειακῆς προσῳδίας, to Homeric accentuation. These two works survive fragmentarily in the Homeric scholia. Other significant works are the Περὶ παθῶν, on the modification of words which survives in fragments in various sources, and the Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων, which survives mainly in fragments in Choeroboscus commentary on Theodosius’ Canones.

2 The Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας

2.1 General Account of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας

The Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας does not survive in its original form, but in epitomes and other grammatical and lexicographical works that derived material from it. This section will survey the information we have about the original, now lost work. A separate section (2.2) will be devoted to our sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

---

6 See further Dyck (1993), 774, n. 3.
7 For a much fuller discussion of Herodian’s many works see Lentz (1867-70), LXXI - CXXII and Dyck (1993), 776-94.
8 For the Iliad scholia it is preferable to consult Erbse’s edition rather than Lentz’s or Lehrs’. For critique of Lentz’s reconstruction of Herodian’s works see Part 1, section 3.
9 See Nifadopoulos (2001) and Lentz (1867-70), LXXXIII - XCVI.
The προοίμιον of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας

From the testimonium to Herodian’s life as transmitted in codex Parisinus Graecus 2603,¹⁰ we learn that after the προοίμιον, in which the grammarian dedicated his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας to the emperor Marcus Aurelius, he defined prosody (ἐν ἧ (scilicet καθολική προσῳδία) μετὰ τὸ εἰς τὸν Μάρκον προοίμιον οὖτω τὴν προσῳδίαν ὁριζέται). A short treatise entitled Πορφυρίου Περὶ προσῳδίας,¹¹ within the Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam (Scholia Vaticana, 129.9-14),¹² claims to provide us with the definition of prosody according to Herodian, but neither of the two fully-preserved epitomes of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας transmits such a definition.¹³

There is evidence in the introductions of Johannes Philoponus’ Epitome and of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome that the προοίμιον to the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας explained the difficulties of writing a treatise on accents, created by the fact that correct

---

¹⁰ This is the first Vita of Herodian edited by Lentz (1867-70), VI.
¹¹ Porphyrius should probably be identified with the important third-century author Porphyrius who, according to the Suda (π 2098), wrote grammatical works among many others: ἔγραψε βιβλία πάμπλειστα, φιλόσοφα τε καὶ ἔθθορικὰ καὶ γραμματικὰ. On the other hand, Hoerschelmann (1874), 74 rejected the view that this Porphyrius should be identified with the third-century Porphyrius, the one mentioned by the Suda, but did not provide arguments in support of his view. See also Hoerschelmann (1875), 298. Πορφυρίου Περὶ προσῳδίας is a treatise on prosody, edited as a supplement to the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax. Contrary to Götzling’s view ((1835), 11), we have almost no indication that this is an Epitome of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, apart from the mention of Herodian and the attribution to him of the definition of prosody. Πορφυρίου Περὶ προσῳδίας stands apart from all the other epitomes. In Hilgard’s edition ((1901), xxiv) of the Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam the treatise ascribed to Porphyrius is not regarded as an epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, but as a treatise on prosody.
¹² The specific part of the Scholia Vaticana in the Commentaria comes from codex Vaticanus Graecus 14, and contains a collection of scholia composed by several authors.
¹³ Cf. Lentz (1867-70), XXXVI-XXXVII.
accentuation is connected with all the other parts of grammar. The first sentence of Philoponus’ Epitome reads:

τὸ ἐκάστη λέξει τὴν δέουσαν προσῳδίαν τιθέναι συμπέρασμα σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς γραμματικῆς τυχάνει μεθόδου (‘to put the correct accent on each word is the result of almost the whole of grammatical enquiry’).  

The same thought is reflected in a sentence in the preface to Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome (1.10-3):

τὸ γὰρ ἀμα γένος εἰδος σχήμα κατάληξειν παράληξιν ἀρχὴν χρόνον στοιχείων πάθος παρατηρεῖν, καὶ ὀσα ἄλλα, ἢ τὰ πλεῖστα τούτων, χαλεπὸν καὶ δυσέφικτον (‘for to pay attention simultaneously to the gender, the derivational status, the compositional status, the ending, the penultimate syllable, the beginning, the quantities, the letters, and the transformations of form, and whatever else, or most of these, is difficult and hard to achieve’).

That the significance of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was laid out in the προοίμιον is evidenced by the following phrase in the preface to Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome (2.12-5):

εὐθὺς οὖν τὴν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ διατριβήν περιελόντες, ἐνδεικνυόμενα τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πραγματείας, καὶ τὸν πρότερον γεγραφοῦσαν τὸ ἐνδεές ἐλέγχουσαν (‘so refraining from the long-winded discussion in the introduction - laying out the size of the treatise, exposing the deficiency of those written before’)

At the same time, this phrase provides evidence that Herodian in his προοίμιον stated the deficiencies of his predecessors’ works on prosody.

---

14 See also the discussion in Lentz (1867-70), XXXVII. 
15 Translations of passages are mine, and translations of individual words given in brackets come from LSJ, unless otherwise noted. 
16 The προοιμίων referred to is that of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. See also Note 2.12 τῶν προοιμιών. 
17 Cf. the discussion of this section of Pseudo-Arcadius’ preface in Hiller (1866), 17-8 and Lentz (1867-70), XXXVII.
The arrangement of the material in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας

The Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας consisted of two parts of unequal length. The first part systematically treated the rules for the accentuation of Greek in the first nineteen books, while the second, restricted to Book 20, dealt with breathings and vowel quantities. The work also had an appendix on the accentuation of words in sentences.

Herodian arranged the material of the first part of the work following the same order for the parts of speech as the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax:19 GG i.i 23.1-2 Τοῦ δὲ λόγου μέρη ἔστιν ὁκτώ ὄνομα, ὧμα, μετοχή, ἀρθρον, ἀντωνυμία, πρόθεσις, ἐπώρημα, σύνδεσμος.20 Books 1-15 deal with nominals, 16 and 17 with verbs and participles, 18 with so-called articles,22 pronouns, and prepositions, Book 19 with adverbs and conjunctions. The prosody of nominals was divided so that the first 14 books treated the accent of the nominative singular forms according to their terminations, while Book 15 dealt with the accent of the oblique cases. Books 1-10 deal with masculine and feminine nominals ending in consonants, 11 and 12 with feminine nominals ending in vowels, 13 with neuter nominals, and 14 with monosyllabic nominals. The treatment of the accentuation of masculine and feminine nominals in Books 1-12 is arranged according to the same categorization as appears in the Τέχνη γραμματική (GG i.i 15.1 – 16.1) attributed to Dionysius Thrax, so that the first 10 books deal with masculine and feminine

---

18 For further discussion of the Appendix, sometimes referred to as Book 21, see pp. 111-2.
19 It is not the purpose of the present thesis to give an answer to the highly debated issue of the authenticity or not of this Ars Grammatica. On this issue one can consult the essays in Law V. – Sluiter I. (eds.) (1995), and the note by Wilson (2007), 69-70, where the authenticity is defended.
20 See also the discussion in Egenolff (1887), 8.
21 The modern term ‘nominal’ (or ‘nominal form’) is a cover term for both nouns and adjectives; I use it to translate the Greek term ὄνομα, which similarly covers both nouns and adjectives where no further specification is given.
22 The term ἄρθρα refers both to the article and the relative pronoun.
nominals ending in ν, ξ, η, ο, ψ, Book 11 with feminine nominals ending in α, and Book 12 with feminine nominals ending in η and ω. It is noteworthy that the terminations appear in the same order as in the Τέχνη γραμματική (GG i.i 15.1 – 16.1), with the difference that in the Τέχνη feminines with vowel terminations precede those with consonant terminations, whereas in Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome feminines ending in a consonant have already been dealt with in Books 1-10 together with masculines, and therefore only feminines ending in vowels are treated in Books 11 and 12:

Τελικά ἀρεσευκῶν ὄνομάτων + ἀνεπεκτάτων κατ’ εὐθείαν καὶ ἐνικὴν πτώσιν στοιχεῖα ἐκτείνετε: ν ξ η ο ψ, οἴον Δίων Φοίνιξ Νέστωρ Πάρις Πέλοψ. θηλυκῶν δὲ ὀκτώ: α η ω ν ξ η ο ψ, οἴον Μοῦσα Ἐλένη Κλειώ χελιδῶν ἐλιξ μήτηρ Θέτις λαίλαψ.

('the terminations of the masculine nouns that are parsyllabic in the nominative singular are five: ν ξ η ο ψ, for example Δίων Φοίνιξ Νέστωρ Πάρις Πέλοψ. And (the terminations) of the feminine nouns are eight: α η ω ν ξ η ο ψ, for example Μοῦσα Ἐλένη Κλειώ χελιδῶν ἐλιξ μήτηρ Θέτις λαίλαψ.‘)

In Book 13 the treatment of the neuter adjectives according to their formation from the corresponding masculine is followed by the treatment of the neuter nouns, again according to the classification found in the Τέχνη γραμματική (GG i.i 16.2-3 οὐδετέρων δὲ ἐξ: α ὁ η ω ν ξ η ο, οἴον ἠρμα μέλι δένδρον ὑδωρ δέπας δόρυ ('And (the terminations) of neuter nouns are six: α ὁ η ω ν ξ η ο, for example ἠρμα μέλι δένδρον ὑδωρ δέπας δόρυ'), but with the slight variation that the termination -υ is treated not at the end, but third. This minor alteration in the order is probably due to Herodian’s attempt to gather the
treatment of vowel terminations at the beginning.\textsuperscript{23} This disposition of the whole work is known to us from the Table of Contents in the preface accompanying our Epitome.\textsuperscript{24}

The length of the work has been the subject of some modern debate. The work was referred to in Antiquity and the Middle Ages as famously long. The preface of our Epitome mentions in 1.6-8 τὸ πολύυλον τῶν ὁρισμῶν ἐν πολλοῖς κανόσιν ἀθρόως κεῖμενον (‘the abundance of conditions\textsuperscript{25} that are placed all together in many rules’). Theognostus in his Prologue to the Canones sive De Orthographia 32-3 writes: οὐς (sicilicet κανόνας) δὲ ἐκ τῆς πολυύλου βιβλίου τῆς καθόλου Ἡρωδιανοῦ ἀναλεξάμενος (‘having gathered the rules from Herodian’s copious work Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας’). In his letter to Jacob Ximenes Muriel, which appears in codex Matritensis 4689 (139), Constantine Lascaris refers to the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας as τὴν μεγάλην ... προσῳδίαν and as βιβλον πολύστιχον. In Johannes Philoponus’ Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα (4.7-10) we read: ἀναγκαῖον τε πρὸς τούτοις εἰδέναι ἐκάστην λέξιν ἐπὶ ποιας συλλαβῆς τὸν τόνον ἔχει ὅπερ ἐν ἔξ μυριάσιν Ἡρωδιανῷ πεπραγμάτευται (‘and in addition one should know on which syllable each word has its accent; this has been dealt with by Herodian in sixty thousand’). The fact that the noun to be understood with ἔξ μυριάσιν is not indicated gave rise to a long-standing debate. Götting thought that the phrase ἔξ μυριάσιν indicated that Herodian dealt with the accentuation of 60,000 words.\textsuperscript{26} The implied noun could again be words, but the number of words the epitome consists of this time, not the

\textsuperscript{23} See also the discussion in Egenolff (1887), 8.

\textsuperscript{24} Where I say ‘our Epitome’, I mean the one traditionally ascribed to Arcadius.

\textsuperscript{25} For the interpretation of the term ὁρισμοὶ as conditions here see Note 1.7 ὁρισμῶν.

\textsuperscript{26} Götting (1835), 11.
number of words whose accentuation is discussed, as Göttling's view was. Ritschl, Graux, Birt, Egenolff, and more recently Wouters, on the other hand, have taken the number 60,000 to refer to the total number of lines that the work occupied. The use of the word πολύστιχος by Lascaris strengthens the view that the word implied in ἕξ μυριάσιν is στίχοι, lines and not words. Furthermore, we have no indication that the scribes ever counted the number of words they had copied or that scholars and grammarians of Philoponus' time would refer to the number of the words of a text or that it was easy and practical for them to count words. In any case, the figure 60,000 could have been exaggerated over time and Philoponus (if he was the first to give this number) might well have given a number he thought appropriate to a text known to be long.

Given, at any rate, the great length of the text, the need to create abridgements of the original work becomes quite clear. Besides, the need to make the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας, probably intended for learned people, appropriate for teaching purposes, underlined the necessity of a brief rather than of an extensive work. The reference to a second person singular in the Preface to Pseudo-Arcadius' Epitome (1.5 σκόπει, 2.18

---

27 Ritschl (1866), 83.
28 Graux (1878), 124.
29 Birt (1882), 170.
30 Egenolff (1887), 5.
31 Wouters (1975-6), 602.
32 Cf. the use of στίχοι as a means of counting and indicating the length of works in Diogenes Laertius 4.5, 4.13, 4.14, 4.24, 5.27, 5.50, 5.80.
33 On this see also Egenolff (1887), 5.
34 The assumption that the intended audience of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας were learned people, is based mainly on Pseudo-Arcadius' preface, which repeatedly mentions that the epitomator's goal is to succeed clarity as well as conciseness (1.5-6; 1.19-21; 2.16-19). This should not be taken to suggest that Herodian was an author difficult to understand, but probably that the majority of people who were not educated could not grasp the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας easily.
35 Cf. Egenolff (1887), 5.
ἐζήτησας, 2.19 ἐπικρινεῖς)\textsuperscript{36} could suggest that the audience is a pupil, if not a friend of the epitomator.\textsuperscript{37} The lemma Aristodemus (a 3915, Ἀριστόδημος) in the Suda provides evidence of the practice of writing epitomes for pupils: ἐπιτομήν τῆς καθόλου Ἡρωδιανοῦ ἐγραψε πρὸς Δαναόν.\textsuperscript{38} Later on, the transmission of the epitomes led gradually to the loss of the original work.

In order to be able to see how Herodian organized his treatise, one needs to start from the cases in which Herodian talks about his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς. From the Iliad scholion 15.338a (περὶ ὧν εἰρήσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς Περὶ <τῆς> καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς) and from several passages in the Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως where Herodian mentions his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς (iii.ii. 924.3-4 λέγεται δὲ καὶ Περὶ τούτων μοι πάντων ἐν τοῖς Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, 924.18-9 τὴν δὲ λύσιν τούτων ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς ἐποιησάμην, 926.16-7 Περὶ δὲ τούτου ἐντελῶς εἰρηται ἐν τοῖς Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, 927.2-3 πάντων δὲ λύσεις δίδωμι ἐν τῷ Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, 937.27-30 ἢ δὲ ἱστορία τῶν ὅνομάτων εἰρηται μοι ἐν δευτέρῳ Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, σημειώθηκε ἄρα τὸ ἱχώρ μόνον ὄξυρόνυμον. τὸ δὲ αὐτίον εἰρηται ἐν τῷ Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, 939.18-9 αὐτίον δὲ τὸ πάθος. ἐν τοῖς Περὶ καθολικωτέρας προσωπικῆς ἐρηται), one may conclude that the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς might deal with a point in full (ἐντελῶς), by contrast with a briefer treatment in the Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως, and that the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς might explain

\textsuperscript{36} The page and line refer to my critical edition. I cite the portion of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome which I have not edited for this thesis from the text of M. Schmidt.

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. Egenolff (1887), 5 and Note 1.5 σκόπει in the epitomator’s preface.

\textsuperscript{38} It is however possible that the dedicatee of this epitome is the grammarian Danaus (ca. 348 – ca. 390). On this view see Kaster (1983), 157; Id. (1988), 267, 385.
accentuations that could only be mentioned in the Περὶ μονήμους λέξεως (τὴν δὲ λύσιν τούτων ... ἐποιησάμην, πάντων δὲ λύσεις διδωμι, τὸ δὲ αἰτίον εἰρηται). Thus, in his other works Herodion refers the reader to the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας for a more extensive treatment of the material.

Herodion and his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας are so frequently quoted or mentioned in later works on accentuation that it is normally assumed that his works constituted the foundation for the teaching of accentuation and that all later grammarians who worked on accentuation used him and his work, directly or indirectly. There are frequent verbal similarities between later works discussing accentuation or even orthography and etymology, as well as the use of common examples due to Herodion being an ultimate source for all or most of them.

2.2 The main sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας

2.2.1 Direct sources:

The direct sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας are two epitomes, one traditionally attributed to Arcadius and the other by Johannes Philoponus of Alexandria. In the 20th century two other epitomes were discovered: a palimpsest.

---

39 See also Lentz (1867-70), LIX-LXII for discussion of the passages cited.
40 So Vendryes (1945), 11; Probert (2006), 22.
41 See also Vendryes (1945), 11. Cf. Dyck (1993), 777-8; Wouters (1975-6), 602-4. See the section on the Indirect sources pp. 130-44.
42 With the term ‘direct’ I mean sources whose goal was to create excerpts of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, i.e. the epitomes. ‘Indirect’ sources are those that derive material from the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας when they want to comment on a matter of prosody, or employ examples derived from this work for their own purposes (orthographical, etymological etc.).
43 For biographical information on Arcadius see pp. 56-63 on the authorship of our Epitome.
44 See further section 2.2.1.1 below.
45 For the purposes of a review of the extant scholarship it is worth mentioning that Göttling (1835), 11 recognized four epitomes of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας: 1. Arcadius’ epitome, 2. part of an
which contains parts of a version of books 5-7, and a fourth-century AD parchment codex containing an epitome of a portion of book 5 (P. Ant. ii. 67). The fact that there were many epitomes of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας composed as early as the fourth century (at least as far as we can say on the basis of the surviving epitomes) suggests that the transmission (and perhaps even the use, especially before the codex became standard) of the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was made difficult because of the great length of the work. This encouraged the creation of epitomes of the text relatively soon after its composition. Finally, the creation of epitomes as early as the fourth century AD and then their transmission brought to an end the transmission of the original work; although it is difficult to say when the original work ceased to be read, the process of epitomisation is probably the reason why it does not survive to this day.

2.2.1.1 Johannes Philoponus’ Epitome

The grammarian, philosopher and theologian Johannes Philoponus of Alexandria (henceforth simply ‘Philoponus’) lived in the sixth century AD. He is best known for his commentaries on Aristotle, but for our purposes his most important work was the Τουκά

epitome by Porphyrius (J. B. C. d’ Ansse de Villoison Anecdota Graeca II, p. 103, Praef. ad Theod. Alex. p. XV), 3. an epitome by Aristodemus that was lost, 4. Ἰωάννου Ἀλεξανδρέως Τουκά παραγγέλματα. For a discussion on whether Porphyrius’ text is an epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας see footnote 11 above.

46 The palimpsest is published by Hunger H. (1967), “Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολικὴ Προσῳδία Buch 5-7”, Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft, 16: 1-33. Hunger claims that this palimpsest contains books 5 to 7 of the original work Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας but see the comments in section 2.2.1.2 below.

47 See Wouters (1975-6); (1979).

48 For more biographical information and bibliography see Kaster (1988), 334-8; Dickey (2007), 81-2.
παραγγέλματα, an epitome of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. He also authored a treatise entitled Περὶ τῶν διαφόρων τονουμένων καὶ διάφορα σημαινόντων (‘On words that have a different meaning according to their different accent’). A further grammatical work Περὶ διαλέκτων is ascribed to him.

Bearing in mind that the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας has not come down to us and that we have two complete epitomes of this work, one would really like to know to what extent the two epitomes contribute to the reconstruction of the original, and which of the two follows the original more closely. Göttling judged Philoponus’ Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα to be the epitome most distant from Herodian. The comparison of the palimpsest and the parchment with the two complete epitomes reveals that both these texts are closer to our Epitome than to the one by Philoponus, and suggests that Philoponus did indeed deviate considerably from the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

In order to be able to see to what extent Philoponus’ epitome deviates from original Herodian, I have undertaken a comparison between Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome and that of Philoponus. The comparison reveals that Philoponus’ work contains general accentuation precepts and generally applicable rules, such as on when an accent will be

---

49 Philoponus’ Epitome can be consulted in the following edition: Dindorf, G. W. (1825), Ἰωάννου Ἀλεξανδρέως Τονικὰ παραγγέλματα (Leipzig). A new Teubner edition of this text is currently in preparation by Georgios A. Xenis. I am indebted to Xenis for providing me with the opportunity to cite the text of Philoponus from his edition. The numbering is still that of Dindorf’s edition. The title Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως Τονικῶν παραγγελμάτων ἐν ἐπιτόμῃ suggests that what survives today is an epitome of Philoponus’ epitome. Cf. Dickey (2007), 81. On the value of Philoponus as a source for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας see Lentz (1867-70), CXXXV-CXXXVI; Egenolff (1887), 37-9; Galland (1882a), 35-8; Kroll (1916), RE 9.2, 1784-5; Koster (1931), 138.

50 Göttling (1835), 11.

51 For a more detailed treatment of the relation of the palimpsest and the parchment to the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας and the two complete epitomes see sections 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3 below.

52 See also Galland (1882a), 38.
acute and when it will be a circumflex. As far as nominals are concerned, Philoponus is mostly interested in prescribing rules for accenting oblique cases once the accent of the base or dictionary form of a word is known, rather than for accenting the base form itself. Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome, on the contrary, is concerned with predicting which syllable of a base form will have the accent, on the basis of the word’s termination, and dedicates significantly more space to the accentuation of base forms than to that of oblique cases. As a result of this difference between the two epitomes, Pseudo-Arcadius dedicates fourteen books to the accentuation of nominals (nouns and adjectives) in the nominative according to their terminations, but there is nothing parallel in Philoponus. Both the palimpsest and the parchment codex are similar to Pseudo-Arcadius with regard to the treatment of the accentuation of nominals on the basis of their terminations. This suggests that the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας treated base forms according to their terminations, unlike Philoponus. Closest to Philoponus’ treatment of nominals is the treatment of the oblique cases in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15.53

The following may serve as examples of general accentuation rules in Philoponus’ epitome:

(1) 4.28 Ἡ ὀξεία ἣ ἐν τέλει τίθεται ἣ πρὸ μιᾶς τοῦ τέλους ἢ πρὸ δύο πρὸ τριῶν δὲ οὐκ ἐτὶ. (the acute is either placed on the final (syllable) or on the penultimate (syllable) or on the antepenultimate (syllable), but never more than three syllables from the end).

(2) 4.32-6 Ἡ περισπωμένη ἣ ἐν τέλει τίθεται ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐμῆς Ἡρακλῆς ἢ πρὸ μιᾶς τοῦ τέλους ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ κήτους, μὴ λον πρὸ δύο δὲ οὐκ ἐτὶ. οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ βραχείας τίθεται περισπωμένη οὔτε ἐπὶ θέσει μακρᾶς, ἀλλὰ μόνων τῶν φύσει μακρῶν. (the circumflex is either placed on the final syllable, as for example in Ἐμῆς Ἡρακλῆς; or

53 On the discussion of Book 15 and its content see pp. 64-102.
on the penultimate syllable, as for example on κῆτος, μῆλον; but never more than two syllables from the end. A circumflex is never placed on a short (syllable), nor on a syllable long by position, but only on one long by nature’).

(3) 5.1-6 Ἡστέον δὲ ὅτι πᾶσα βραχεία συλλαβή πρὸ βραχείας ἢ πρὸ μακρᾶς ἐφ’ ἑαυτής ἔχουσα τὸν τόνον ὀξύνεται. τοῦ μὲν προτέρου φίλος, τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου Ἑκτωρ, ἔρως. Πᾶσα συλλαβή πρὸ δύο τοῦ τέλους ἐφ’ ἑαυτής ἔχουσα τὸν τόνον ὀξύνεται Ὁμήρος, Μενέλαος. οὐδέποτε, μακρᾶς οὐσίς τῆς ἐπὶ τέλους, τρίτη ἀπὸ τέλους πίπτει ἡ ὁξεῖα (‘One must know that every short syllable, before a short (syllable) or before a long (syllable), that has the accent on itself has an acute. Every example of the former (case) is φίλος, an example of the latter is Ἑκτωρ, ἔρως. Every antepenultimate syllable that has the accent on itself has an acute: Ὁμήρος, Μενέλαος. When the last (syllable) is long there is never an acute accent on the antepenultimate syllable’).

In the Table of Contents at the beginning of Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome there is no statement that the Περὶ καθολικῆς προοοδίας contained such general accentuation precepts. It is possible that these general rules were part of the προοίμιον of Herodian’s work. Since, however, the προοίμιον does not survive, one cannot be sure whether these precepts derived from it or another part of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προοοδίας. We might also consider their coming from another source on accentuation or even belonging to Philoponus himself. In the passage of his preface to the epitome where Pseudo-Arcadius mentions the προοίμιον of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προοοδίας he does not provide any information to suggest that the προοίμιον contained any general accentuation rules. An indication that the general precepts in Philoponus’ epitome are due to Philoponus himself could be that right after these general rules and before the beginning of the accentuation rules for nominals we read:

6.34-7.3 Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰκανὰ τοῖς εἰδόσιν ἐπὶ ποῖας συλλαβῆς ἐδει <τὸν τόνον> τιθέναι. πολλῆς δὲ οὕσης <τῆς> τούτου διδασκαλίας, ἢν ἦμιν Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῇ

54 The relevant passage (2.12-5) is cited on p. 36.
The future tense παραθήσομεν suggests that Philoponus will from now on provide an epitome of Herodian’s accentuation treatise.

One of the reasons why Philoponus’ Epitome is significant is because it preserves quotations from ancient authors exemplifying the use of words listed as examples in the accentuation rules. The quotations are also preserved in the palimpsest, but omitted in Pseudo-Arcadius and the parchment.

The accentuation of nominals is followed by sections on verbs (περὶ ὑμάτων), participles (περὶ μετοχῶν), ‘articles’ 56 (περὶ ἄρθρων), pronouns (περὶ ἀντωνυμίων), prepositions (περὶ προθέσεων), adverbs (περὶ ἐπιστήμων), and conjunctions (περὶ συνδέσμων). The order in which the accentuation rules for these parts of speech appear in Philoponus’ epitome is parallel to that of Pseudo-Arcadius. 57

2.2.1.2 Palimpsest fragment from books 5-7 of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας

The palimpsest consists of ten folios of the codex Hist. gr. 10 of the National Library of Austria (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek). 58 The upper script, from the turn of

---

55 The notes in Xenis’ critical apparatus are as follows: ἔδει τελερανδον videtur; malim δὲ τὸν ὁνον add. Bloch πολλῆς Bloch: πολλὰ AV οὔσης A: οὔτα V τῆς addidi διδασκαλίας A: διδασκαλία V Ἡρωδιανός V Ἡρωδιανός A ὀλίγα V (coni. Lentz II, 7): ὀλίγα δὲ A
56 On the term ἄρθρα see footnote 22 above.
58 Hunger (1967), 1.
the 12th and 13th centuries, offers the *Vita* of John Chrysostom by Symeon Metaphrastes.\(^{59}\)

The fragments that are related to books 5-7 of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας are found in folios 1-8, 24 and 25, and are dated to the first half of the 10th century.\(^{60}\) The first quarter of folio 6 *recto* is dedicated to nominals ending in –ιος. After a gap the text resumes with nominals ending in –οος, followed by a section on numerals ending in –πλοῦς.\(^{61}\) Folio 6 *verso* contains ordinals ending in –ος and a section on words ending in –νος. The first third of folio 3 *recto* contains a section on nominals in –ωος, while folio 3 *verso* has a section about nominals in –αωος. Folio 1 *recto* and *verso* deals with nominals ending in –ακος. Folio 8 *recto* and *verso* are about nominals in –αλος, while the latter also has a section on nominals in –ελος. In folio 5 *recto* and *verso* we read about nominals ending in –ηλος, and in the latter there is also a section on nominals in –ηλος. Folio 4 *recto* and *verso* contain a part about nominals in –μος. Folios 24 *recto* and *verso*, and 2 *recto* and *verso*, deal with nominals in –νος. In folio 7 *recto* and *verso* there is a section about nominals in –ενος, while the latter contains also a section on nominals ending in –ηνος. Finally, folio 25 *recto* deals with the nominals in –αυνος, and 25 *verso* with nominals in –νος.

Hunger appears to believe that the fragments of this palimpsest are parts of the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας, not an abridgement.\(^{62}\) Despite the fact that the

\(^{59}\) Hunger (1967), 1.

\(^{60}\) Hunger (1967), 2; Gamillscheg (2009), 104.


\(^{62}\) Hunger (1967), 30.
palimpsest seems to have been more extensive than the other extant epitomes both in the number of examples cited and in the quotations of ancient authors, still some signs of shortening (e.g. καὶ ἄλλα κτλ.), and the fact that the palimpsest, in spite of its longer lists of examples, does not include all the examples provided in the various other available sources, suggest that the palimpsest cannot be the original work of Herodian. The following pairs of parallel passages illustrate that the palimpsest cites a larger number of examples than Pseudo-Arcadius, but does not contain all the examples of Pseudo-Arcadius:

(1a) Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) 6' εξής ορθέων πετ τών εις οος καθαρόν ληγόντων ύπέρ δύο συλλαβᾶς [...] ταύτα δή σύνθετα όντα πολλά εστιν παροξύτωνα, τὰ δὲ καὶ προπαροξυνόμενα ὡς ἔχει τὸ θυσσός, κεμαδοςσός, (one illegible word), κερατοξός, βοηθός, λουτροχός, οἰνοχός, τὸ δὲ (one illegible word) προπαροξύνεται, καὶ πρόχοος (προθοος Cod.), ἐπήκοος, μελανόχοος, δυσήκοος, ὀξύκοος, μελανόχοος (!), λειχόχοος καὶ ἄλλα [...] 

(1b) Ps.-Arcad. 74.7 – 75.2: Ἐξαιρέτως τὰ εἰς ΟΣ καθαρὸν υπέρ δύο συλλαβᾶς τῷ ὸ μόνῳ παραλήγοντα προπαροξυνόται. τὰ πολλὰ δὲ σύνθετα παροξύτωνα τε καὶ προπαροξύτωνα καὶ παροξύτωνα μὲν θυσσός λασσός βροτοσσός, προπαροξύτωνα δὲ πρόχοος δυσήκοος. νῦν δὲ πετί τῶν ἀπόλιν διαλήψομέθα. 

(2a) Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) 6': ἐπειδήπερ τὰ τῶν ἀριθμῶν ὀνόματα, λέγω δὲ τὰ εἰς οος ληγόντα καὶ ταξιν δηλοῦντα βαρύνεσθαι ἢθελεν ύπεσταλμένης τῆς διὰ τὸ στὸς παραγωγῆς πρώτος, δεύτερος, τρίτος, τέταρτος, πέμπτος, ἐκτος, ἐβδομος, ἐνατος, δέκατος ὁμοτόνως καὶ τὸ ὄγδος ἐξεφέρετο. ἐφυλάξατο δὲ ὁ κανών τὴν διὰ τὸ στὸς παραγωγῆς διὰ τοσαύτα: εἰκοστός, τεικοστός, τεισσεκαστός καὶ ὄσα οὕτως παρῆκαι ἐπὶ ἀριθμοῦ 

(2b) Ps.-Arcad. 75.10 – 76.3: τὸ δὲ ὄγδος εἰ καὶ ἐπιθετον προπαροξύνεται, ἐπειδὴ τὰ εἰς ΟΣ τακτικά βαρύνεται, ύπεσταλμένων τῶν εἰς ΣΤΟΣ, ἐβδομος ὄγδος ἐνατος

63 For evidence that the palimpsest is more extensive than our Epitome and other sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφησιας see Hunger (1967), 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30. 
64 Cf. Dyck (1993), 780-1. 
65 The word is not accented in Hunger. 
66 I reproduce Hunger’s exclamation mark.
dékatoς, to de eikostos triakostos kai talla oxiunetai.

(3a) Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) 6' t' eis oos lignon ta katharof upo dii syllabas paralh ygmena to o w kai i epthetika uparchoonta prooprestatai [...] lapwos, keirdos, Arphos, Laghios, talwos, Gelwos, paswos, mptrwos, patwos, Achelwos

(3b) Ps.-Arcad. 76.9 – 78.2: Ta eis OΣ katharof upo dii syllabas paralh ygmena to Ω metai I prosynezammenou prooprestatai patwos hraios Achelwos aiodos:

(4a) Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 3', l. 24 Pian eis ois lignon katharof upo dii syllabas paralh ygmenon ti ai diidhogw, ei apo dzinoumenou thelko gynoito, prooprestasthai thelei [...] arhais, prokataarchestai gar to arhchi ... koryfais, koryphi, atserepaitos, amoiwais, amereymwais (?). 'Ibukos, pompi, pompaitos, EuvitIdh Mhdeia, trpiti, trpaitos:

(4b) Ps.-Arcad. 78.6-12: Pian eis OΣ katharof upo dii syllabas ti AI diidhogw paralh ygmenon, ei apo dzinoumenon thelko gynoito, prooprestatai arhchi arhais, alki alkiwos, koryphi koryfaisos, to menoi epipsalaios ouk apo ton epipsolh parhekta, alla para to epipsolao:

In the following pair of parallels Pseudo-Arcadius provides us with more examples:

(5a) Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) 6' tauta mei efaime paroexunesthai. legw de to aplwos, diplwos, triplwos kai osa este toiauta. oti gar ouk esti syneteta, en ti eis ouz katalhzei eroumen. ta menoi kuria, ei kai stania eufethi, prooparoxunetai osper echai to Sigrwos esti de polis, ws Ekataios perigwhti Euvitph

(5b) Ps.-Arcad. 75.3-10: Ta osper entelh ton eis PIODYS lhyonton apla onta paroexunontai diplwos triplwos aplwos, to de protiplwos kai aliplwos prooparoxunetai, oti mi apla, to de athros paroexunton to ama simeinw to de proparoxwton to afwono.

Ta dia to OUS kuria proparoxunetai Sistos Peiroos Athos o kai Athos.

Coming back to the comparison of the palimpsest with the other direct sources for the Peri katholikhs prosodias, the palimpsest is closer to Pseudo-Arcadius and the parchment codex than to Philoponus, because it arranges the nominals according to their
terminations, unlike Philoponus. The palimpsest is, however, closer to Philoponus in its quotations from literature, which exemplify the use of words given as examples in the accentuation rules. These observations need to be taken into account in trying to visualise the character of the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

2.2.1.3 The Epitome of book 5 of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας in the parchment codex P. ANT. 2. 67 from Antinoopolis

This fourth-century parchment codex provides us with part of an epitome of book 5, and more specifically deals with the accentuation of words in -διος, -ωνιος, -νιος, -κιος, and -φιος. The comparison of the parchment with the Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως (GG iii.ii 18.2-17) and with other surviving sources for Herodian had suggested in the first instance that the parchment contains a fragment of book 5 of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

Wouters was right in thinking that this parchment was an abridgement of book 5 of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας and not just an epitome which shared a common source with Herodian, as Barns believed after pointing out the close relationship and correspondence of this fragment with Lentz’s edition of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, which he identified with the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. Barns presupposed that if this parchment was an epitome of the text reconstructed by Lentz, all its examples ought to have been included in Lentz’s edition.

67 See also the comparison of the parchment codex with the other three abridgements in the following section.
68 The parchment was edited by Barns – Ziliacus (1960), II and then by Wouters (1975-6), and appears also in Wouters (1979) in a briefer form.
69 See Wouters (1975-6), 609, 612; (1979), 220-1, 223.
70 Wouters (1975-6), 612; (1979), 220, 223.
71 Barns - Ziliacus (1960), II, 50-1.
But Lentz’s edition cannot be taken to equal Herodian’s original work, and thus the omission of certain examples in Lentz does not in any way demonstrate that these examples did not appear in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. Barns’ assumption that Lentz’s text equals Herodian’s work led him to form another invalid argument against considering the parchment to be an epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. Barns observed that in Lentz’s text the words in –ιος deriving from words in ξ, η, and ψ are all treated together, while in the parchment only examples deriving from words in –ξ and –η are dealt with. Even if the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας treated its material as it appears in Lentz’s text, this does not mean that the epitomator would deal with his source’s material in exactly the same way. This is also illustrated in our Epitome, where the composer deals only with the examples that derive from words ending in –ξ and –η: ὅσα ἀπὸ τοῦ Ξ ἢ Η γίνεται διὰ τοῦ Ι βραχέος (70.1). In any case the fact that the text of the parchment is interrupted soon after the treatment of the words in –ιος that are formed on the basis of words in –η, leaves open the possibility that words in –ιος deriving from words in –ψ were afterwards dealt with.

That this parchment is an abridgment of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας and not just a text which shared a common source with Herodian can be shown through the comparison of this fragment with our Epitome, with which it shares similarities in the order in which the material is presented, in wording, and in the use of the same examples. Lines 16-18 of side II of the parchment deal with the termination –διος, which appears in

---

72 It should be noted that although line 13 (side 2) announces only the treatment of words in –ιος deriving from words in –ξ, in lines 18-19 we read examples of words in –ιος that are formed on the basis of words ending in –η.
our Epitome at 68.5 - 69.2. Both texts give the same exception: in the parchment we read διὸ σημειούμεθα τὸ ἑφαρμοζός ἔξυνόμενον,73 while our Epitome has σεσημεύωται τὸ ἑφαρμοζός ἔξυνόμενον. After this, both texts deal with the termination –ωνιος, and here we find three common examples: Κιθαιρώνιος, Μαραθώνιος and Ἀπολλώνιος. Although these are not consecutive in the parchment as they are in our Epitome, they appear in the same order as in our Epitome. Despite the fact that each epitomator, having to make a selection of examples, did not always choose the same examples as other epitomators, the fact that common examples appear in the same order in the epitomes suggests that several epitomators chose to quote examples from a bigger list of examples in Herodian’s original work. The treatment of words in –ωνιος is followed in both texts by material on words ending in –νιος. In this part, both texts make special mention of the word Κλονίος, which is paroxytone as it is a proper name (parchment: Κλονίος κύριον παροξυνόμενον, side II, lines 26-7 / our Epitome: τὸ δὲ Κλονίος παροξύνεται ώς κύριον 69.7). The following two passages I will discuss have similarities both in phrasing and in use of common examples, which appear in the same order. In the parchment (side II, lines 28-31) we find:

καὶ ὅσα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ξ ηιγόντων εἰς κ74 διὰ τοῦ ιως παρῆκε, συνεκτιμένου τοῦ ι, προπαροξύνεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ κυρίου διαστολή τις γένοιτο ἐν τρισυλλάβοις τριβράχεοιν, ὡσπερ τὸ Φυγόιος καὶ Φλογίος (‘and all words in κ derived from words ending in –ξ, by means of –ιως, the ι being short, are proparoxytone except when, in the trisyllabic words with three short syllables, there is a distinction with the proper name, as in Φυγόιος and Φλογίος.’75).

73 I have normalised the orthography here.
74 The rule seems to be missing something like ἥ γατος δὲ, because among the examples we have Φυγόιος and Φλογίος.
75 The translation is that of Wouters (1975-6, 608; 1979), 219.
while in our Epitome (70.1-4) we read:

ὅσα ἀπὸ τοῦ Σ ἢ Ρ γίνεται διὰ τοῦ Ἰ βραχέος, προπαροξύνεται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ κυρίου γένοιτο ἐν τρισυλλάβοις καὶ τριβράχεσιν, ὡστέ τὸ Φρυγίος Φλογίος (‘all words derived from words ending in –ξ or –φ through short I are proparoxytone except when there is a distinction with the proper name in the trisyllabic words with three short syllables, as in Φρύγιος and Φλογίος’).

Apart from the two common examples Φρύγιος Φλογίος found in the same order in both the above passages, a few words later there are some more common examples appearing in the same order: Θρηκίος, Κιλίκιος, Φαικίος (parchment: side II, line 32; our Epitome: 70.5). Moreover, both texts draw attention to the example Ἰλλυριός as not being an exception to the rule (parchment: side II, line 34-5; our Epitome: 70.6-7). Finally, after the section just analysed, both texts deal with the ἐθνικά ἢ τοπικά that end in –ιος and are proparoxytone (parchment: side II, lines 35-6; our Epitome: 70.8-10). In this section we find the example ἐνδάπιος in both texts (parchment: side II, line 36; our Epitome: 70.10).

Wouters concludes that this fragment is an epitome, and not part of the original and full Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωρίας, on the basis of four indications. First of all, Theognostus76 often provides us with more examples than the parchment.77 This by itself is not a sufficient piece of evidence, because Theognostus might have added his own examples to those of Herodian or he might even at the same time be deriving material from other sources apart from Herodian.78 Another indication that this is an epitome is that it has no quotations from ancient authors as the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωρίας.

76 See the discussion of Theognostus pp. 136-9.
77 Wouters (1975-6), 609-12; (1979), 221, 223.
78 For a more extensive discussion see Wouters (1975-6), 612; (1979), 223.
had. The evidence we have to believe that the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας had citations from authors comes from the preserved quotations in both Philoponus’ epitome and the palimpsest of books 5-7, and from the phrase 2.7-9 ἡ τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῶν (sc. παραδειγμάτων) πολλῆ παράθεσις καταλέλειπται τῷ συγγραφεῖ (‘the many citations of their use (of the examples) has been left out by the author (of the epitome)’) in our Epitome’s preface. A third argument is the transition from the adjectives in –κιος to those in –φιος without announcement. From the surviving sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας we know that Herodian announced his transitions. To end with, the word προσεύθηκεν (‘he added’), in line 25 of side II of this fragment indicates that the parchment was an abridgement of a more extensive work. Nonetheless, the comparison of our Epitome with the parchment shows that the latter was less extensively abridged. The parchment is closer to Pseudo-Arcadius and the palimpsest than to Philoponus, in that it arranges nominals according to their terminations. In its omission of quotations from ancient authors, the parchment is closer to Pseudo-Arcadius than to the palimpsest or Philoponus.

2.2.1.4 Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome

The value of our Epitome, which is traditionally attributed to Arcadius, lies in the fact that, apart from being a witness to the now lost Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, its author retained the order of the books as this appeared in the original, and provided a preface to explain his method of excerpting Herodian. It can be inferred that the order of

79 See Hunger (1967), 1-33.
80 See Wouters (1975-6), 611, 613; (1979), 222, 224.
81 Wouters (1975-6), 613; (1979), 224
82 See also Wouters (1975-6), 610, 613; (1979), 221, 224.
the books preserves that of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας on the basis of comparison with the arrangement of the material in the palimpsest and the parchment codex. The following sections will deal with the authorship of our Epitome, its dating, interpolations or doubtful sections within it, grammatical terminology and concepts. The manuscript tradition and the previous editions of our text will be treated in Part Two of this thesis. The epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian will be dealt with in the Notes on the epitomator’s preface.

a) The authorship

In the history of ancient Greek scholarship, three grammarians have been credited with the authorship of our Epitome: Theodosius of Alexandria, Arcadius and Aristodemus. The attribution of the authorship to Theodosius and Arcadius is based on indications in the manuscripts of our Epitome, while the ascription to Aristodemus is due to an entry in the Suda.

Codices Hauniensis regius 1965 (A), Matritensis 4575 = 32 (M), and Baroccianus 179 (O) present Theodosius as the author of the Epitome. More specifically, the above manuscripts begin with the phrase Πρόλογος οίμαι Θεοδοσίου εἰς τοὺς κανόνας τῆς Καθολικῆς Προσῳδίας τοῦ σοφοῦ Ἡρωδιανοῦ (‘I think this is Theodosius’ prologue to the rules of the Καθολικῆ Προσῳδία of the learned Herodian’). The fact that the composer of the heading uses the verb οίμαι suggests that he did not really know who

83 For bibliography on these grammarians see Kaster (1988), 244, 366-7, 385; and further on Theodosius see Dickey (2007), 83-4.
84 Dyck (1993), 776 refers to this manuscript as Matritensis 38, following Iriarte (1769) 141-4. This manuscript was at some point changed to N-38 and today is Matritensis 32 = 4575 in De Andrés (1987), 55. I am indebted to Mr Nigel Wilson for unravelling the details of the changes in the shelf-marks made by the Madrid Library.
the author of this epitome was. Moreover, in the same codices, before the beginning of Book 1, we read: Κανόνες τῆς Καθολικῆς προσῳδίας τοῦ σοφωτάτου Ἡρωδιανοῦ, οὓς περιέτεμε Θεοδόσιος ὁ γραμματικὸς φιλάζας τῶν ἁριθμῶν τῶν βιβλίων (‘Rules of the Καθολικῆ προσῳδία of the most learned Herodian, which the grammarian Theodosius cut down preserving the number of the books’).

A piece of evidence from the fifteenth century, ascribing the authorship to Theodosius, comes from a statement of Constantine Lascaris surviving in codex Matritensis 4689 (139) under the title περὶ τῶν ἐπίκες τῶν ὁκτὼ μερῶν τοῦ λόγου:85 ἐπεὶ ἡ τοιαύτη πραγματεία οὐ μόνον δύσκολος τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ δυσκολότατα εύφρακτα διὰ τὰς δυστυχής τοῦ γένους. πολλὰ γὰρ πονήσας, μᾶλλος εὐρόν τὸ περὶ τῶν86 τοῦ Θεοδόσιον ἐν βιβλίῳ παλαιᾷ τῆς μονῆς τοῦ σωτήρος τῆς ἐν ἀκροτηρίῳ τῆς Μεσσήνης. τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην πραγματεῖαν ἐκείνην συνέτεμε ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης προσῳδίας τοῦ πολυμαθοῦς Ἡρωδιανοῦ, οὗ καὶ τὸν ἁριθμὸν τῶν βιβλίων εἰκοσι ὄντων ἑρύλαξεν (‘Since this treatise is both difficult and is very difficult to find because of the ill fortune of the nation (i.e. the Fall of Constantinople). After a lot of effort I only just found Theodosius’ Περὶ τῶν in an old book in the monastery of the Saviour on the promontory of Messina. And he cut down this treatise from the big prosody (i.e. the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας) of the very learned Herodian, whose number of books, being twenty, he preserved’).

This reminds us of the phrase Κανόνες τῆς Καθολικῆς προσῳδίας τοῦ σοφωτάτου Ἡρωδιανοῦ, οὓς περιέτεμε Θεοδόσιος ὁ γραμματικὸς φιλάζας τὸν

85 See also Iriarte (1769), 191; De Andrés (1987), 248.
86 Lascaris probably does not mean the work that today we call Περὶ τῶν and is attributed to Theodosius, but Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that in another passage in the manuscript Matritensis 4689 (139) he says: τὸ περὶ τῶν τὴν μεγάλην φημὶ προσῳδίαν, thus using again the phrase περὶ τῶν to indicate τὴν μεγάλην προσῳδίαν (i.e. the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας). The title Περὶ τῶν is used not to indicate a specific work, but to refer generally to a work on accentuation. Probably Lascaris felt that since the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was the most famous work of Herodian on accentuation, someone reading τὸ περὶ τῶν would immediately think of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, in its original form or as an epitome.
Lascaris writes in his letter to Jacob Ximenes, which appears in codex Matritensis 4689 (139) before the shortened Book 16 of our epitome:

καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν τῶν μεγάλην φημὶ προσωδίαν ἐκείνῳ ἐπέγραψεν (scil. Ἡροδιανός) ἐν βιβλίοις εἰκοσι, βιβλίον πολύστιχον, ἦν μετὰ ταῦτα Θεοδόσιος ἐπιτεμών τὸν τὴν ἀριθμὸν τῶν βιβλίων τὸ τε μήκος ἐφύλαξε, διὰ τὸ μὴ οἶδο τε βραχιστην ἐπιτομὴν τὴν βιβλίον δέξασθαι (‘and (Herodian) dedicated to him (i.e. Marcus Aurelius) the Περὶ τύνων, I mean the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας, in twenty books, a work consisting of many lines, of which afterwards Theodosius while epitomizing kept the number of the books and the length, because the work could not withstand very concise epitomizing’).

Lascaris thus regarded Theodosius as the author of the epitome.

Theodosius of Alexandria lived around the fourth or fifth century and he is the author of the Κανόνες εἰσαγωγικοὶ περὶ κλίσεως ὅνωμάτων καὶ ὅμημάτων (‘rules on the inflection of nouns and verbs’). He is often referred to as τεχνικός by Choeroboscus, who composed Scholia to Theodosius’ Canones. Johannes Charax also composed a commentary on Theodosius’ Canones, which today survives in an abridgement by Sophronius. Theodosius has been regarded by some scholars as the composer of our Epitome and also of a treatise Περὶ προσωδιῶν, which is edited as a supplement to the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax. Two short treatises entitled Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὄν βαρυτόνων and Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὄν δευτέρων are also attributed to Theodosius. The works Περὶ γραμματικῆς, Περὶ διαλέκτων and Περὶ τόνου are considered spurious.

Codices Parisinus Graecus 2603 (B) and Parisinus Graecus 2102 (C) attribute the authorship to Arcadius. Codex B bears the title Ἀρκαδίου γραμματική, while codex C has the inscription Ἀρκαδίου περὶ τόνου τῶν ὅκητα μερῶν τοῦ λόγου, καὶ περὶ εὐρέσεως τῶν προσωδιῶν, καὶ περὶ ἐγκλιτικῶν καὶ ἐγκλινομένων, ἐν ὦ καὶ περὶ πνευμάτων καὶ
Arcadius of Antioch lived somewhere between the second and sixth century. According to the Suda (α 3948, Αρκάδιος) he composed three works: Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας, Περὶ συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερών and Ὀνοματικὸν θαυμάσιον. The fact that Arcadius is cited in the epitome of the Ethnica of Stephanus of Byzantium provides us with a terminus ante quem of the sixth century. The fact that the two Paris manuscripts of our Epitome attribute its authorship to ArcADIUS perhaps suggests that Arcadius was known to be interested in prosody and to have lived later than Herodian.\(^8\)

According to the Suda (α 3915, Αριστόδημος) Aristodemus authored an epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας: ἐπιτομὴν τῆς καθόλου Ἡρωδιανοῦ ἐγραψε πρὸς Δαναὸν (‘he wrote an epitome of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας dedicated to Danaus’). Galland identified the epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας ascribed to Aristodemus with our Epitome.\(^8\)\(^9\) The reference to Danaus, if he is to be identified with the grammarian named Danaus (c. 348 - c. 390), could help to date Aristodemus to the second half of the fourth century.\(^9\)

Modern scholars have generally considered it unlikely that ArcADIUS is the author of our epitome, mainly because the manuscripts B and C are the least dependable of the five manuscripts. Galland found it odd that the two Paris manuscripts have Arcadius’

\(^{87}\) See also the discussion of this phrase in the section on Book 20 of our Epitome p. 108, and in the description of codex Parisinus Graecus 2102 p. 154.

\(^{88}\) Cf. Kaster (1988), 244.

\(^{89}\) Galland (1882a), 14.

\(^{90}\) On the view that Danaus could be the dedicatee of an epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας by Aristodemus see Kaster (1983), 157; Id. (1988), 267, 385.
name, given that their common source ultimately goes back to a manuscript that bears Theodosius’ name.\textsuperscript{91} The attribution of the authorship to Arcadius by the two Paris manuscripts could be, according to Galland, the result of the ill-founded suggestion by a scribe.\textsuperscript{92} Moreover, Galland\textsuperscript{93} believed that Arcadius’ name was falsely introduced to \textit{Parisinus Graecus} 2603, under the influence of what was written in \textit{Parisinus Graecus} 2102 (Ἀρκαδίου περὶ τόνου τῶν ὀκτὼ μερῶν τοῦ λόγου καὶ περὶ εὐφέσεως τῶν προοδιῶν καὶ περὶ ἐγκλητικῶν καὶ ἐγκλινομένων, ἐν ὧ καὶ περὶ πνευμάτων καὶ χρόνων). Geppert believed that the title Ἀρκαδίου γραμματικὴ contained in \textit{Parisinus Graecus} 2603 (B) could be due to a later scribe.\textsuperscript{94} Egenolff formed the hypothesis that the title in B could be specifically due to the scribe of B.\textsuperscript{95}

Against the attribution of our Epitome to Theodosius, Galland points out that if it were by Theodosius, Theodosius would have mentioned it in one of his other works, as would Choeroboscus, who studied Theodosius’ works and wrote a commentary on Theodosius’ \textit{Canones}.\textsuperscript{96} Galland also thought that the mention of Theodosius’ name in the παλαιὰ βίβλος\textsuperscript{97} might have been added by a later grammarian after the name of the real author had been omitted and Book 20 had been lost, and that the epitome was probably attributed to Theodosius by later grammarians because he was well-known for his books

\textsuperscript{91} Galland (1882\textit{a}), 14. Despite Galland’s mistaken view that the common source of B and C, \(\pi\), derives from O, \(\pi\) does indeed derive from a manuscript which attributes the authorship to Theodosius (see the chapter on the Manuscript Tradition).
\textsuperscript{92} Galland (1882\textit{c}), 30.
\textsuperscript{93} Galland (1882\textit{a}), 15.
\textsuperscript{94} Geppert (1873), 253; see also Galland (1882\textit{a}), 13 and Egenolff (1887), 6.
\textsuperscript{95} Egenolff (1887), 6.
\textsuperscript{96} Galland (1882\textit{c}), 30; see also Cohn (1895-6), 1155.
\textsuperscript{97} All the surviving manuscripts of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome ultimately go back to a παλαιὰ βίβλος. Constantine Lascaris mentioned in codex \textit{Matritensis} 4689 that this παλαιὰ βίβλος was preserved in the monastery of San Salvatore in Messina.
on grammar and accentuation.\textsuperscript{98} Preller argued that despite the fact that the attribution of the epitome to Theodosius is supported by the best manuscripts (MOA) of the epitome, the ascription to Theodosius could be due to the scribe of their common source.\textsuperscript{99} Another reason why Galland argued against Theodosius' authorship was that both the treatise \textit{Περὶ τόνου} attributed to Theodosius and Philoponus' Epitome of the \textit{Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας} begin with the treatment of the monosyllables, whereas our Epitome does not deal with them until Book 14.\textsuperscript{100} The lack of sufficient evidence in favour of Aristodemus as author of our Epitome was the reason why Egenolff, despite considering it likely that the author was Aristodemus, did not exclude the possibility that Theodosius is the author.\textsuperscript{101}

Hiller argued that the reason why two different grammarians' names appear in the manuscripts could be that Theodosius composed an epitome of the \textit{Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας} and that later Arcadius created on the basis of that an even shorter epitome, which is what survives today.\textsuperscript{102} Another explanation for the mention of two different grammarians in the manuscripts of our epitome was suggested by Geppert, who thought that Theodosius prepared an epitome of the \textit{Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας}, and that the first nineteen books of this epitome have survived, whereas Book 20 was either not excerpted or was lost.\textsuperscript{103} According to Geppert, Arcadius copied Theodosius' epitome and

\textsuperscript{98} Galland (1882a), 16.
\textsuperscript{99} Preller (1840), 13; Galland (1882a), 12.
\textsuperscript{100} Galland (1882c), 30.
\textsuperscript{101} Egenolff (1887), 5, 6.
\textsuperscript{102} Hiller (1866), 33; Galland (1882a), 20.
\textsuperscript{103} Geppert (1873), 252; see also Galland (1882a), 13.
supplied an epitome of Book 20 by some unknown author that was lost in some of the manuscripts.\textsuperscript{104}

In the face of this difficult issue M. Schmidt did not feel that he could determine authorship, and employed the neutral title Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς καθολικῆς προσωπίας Ἑρωδιανοῦ. Lentz considered best that our Epitome should be cited under Arcadius’ name and did not approve of the omission of Arcadius’ name on the title page of Schmidt’s edition.\textsuperscript{105} Göttling, on the other hand, attributed the authorship of our Epitome to Arcadius and considered Aristodemus the author of another lost epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίας.\textsuperscript{106}

In my view, the attribution of the authorship to Arcadius loses ground because of the lack of authority of the manuscripts B and C. I agree with Galland in that if the Epitome were by Theodosius, either Theodosius or Choeroboscos would have mentioned this in their works. I also share Preller’s view that the ascription of the authorship to Theodosius by the best manuscripts (MOA) is not a sufficient reason for thinking that Theodosius is the author, because they all go back to a common source which could be responsible for the attribution to Theodosius. Galland’s argument against the authorship by Theodosius on the basis of the different place of the treatment of the monosyllables in the Περὶ τόνου and Philoponus’ Epitome on the one hand, and in our Epitome on the other cannot be taken into account, because the Περὶ τόνου is today considered to be

\textsuperscript{104} Geppert 1873), 252; see also Galland (1882a), 13.
\textsuperscript{105} Lentz (1867-70), CXXXIII.
\textsuperscript{106} Göttling (1835), 11.
Hiller’s view that Arcadius created an epitome of Theodosius’ epitome and Geppert’s view that Theodosius excerpted the first nineteen books of the epitome and that Book 20 was added by Arcadius are far too speculative. There is insufficient evidence for Galland’s view that the author is Aristodemus: even though the prologue of our Epitome suggests that there is an addressee (2.17-8 ὁσπερ ἐζήτησας, 2.19 αὐτός ἐπικρίνεις), there is no inscription or mention of the name Δαναός. The authorship of our Epitome cannot be decided with certainty. Modern scholarship usually refers conventionally to the author of our Epitome with the name Pseudo-Arcadius.

b) Dating

We have no very safe indication of the date of our Epitome. It is usually dated to the fourth and fifth centuries, but this is based on the dating of the grammarians to whom the Epitome has been attributed. There are three main reasons why the dating of our Epitome is difficult: (i) The fact that authors, grammarians and other learned people in late antiquity tried to imitate the writing of classical authors complicates the dating of post-classical works. (ii) The epitomator, in abbreviating Herodian’s original, may not have added material of his own, thus preventing us from drawing any conclusions on the basis of his language. The only clear chance we get to see the epitomator’s language is his Preface, where he writes in formal Greek, although there are some awkward expressions (e.g. 2.5 μὴ ἀνεπιστήμονα ἔχειν). (iii) The fact that the text is very technical makes it difficult to distinguish any linguistic features characteristic of a certain period of time.

---

108 See also Wouters (1975-6), 602.
c) Interventions, interpolations and transpositions: doubtful sections in our Epitome

**Book 15**

There are three problems relating to Book 15. Firstly, the description of this book in the Table of Contents; secondly, the two sections on enclitics transmitted at the end of this book; and finally, the authenticity of the treatment of the oblique cases.

a) *The description in the Table of Contents:*

At the end of the treatment of the oblique cases in Book 15 of Lentz’s edition of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφίας (430.20), one reads τὰ περὶ τόνου τῶν κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμῶν ἐκλέλοιπεν. Lentz made this remark because he thought that the κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί mentioned in the description of Book 15 in the Table of Contents accompanying Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome were the numerals, but the numerals are not dealt with in Book 15 of Pseudo-Arcadius.\(^{110}\) The relevant sentence in the Table of Contents to Pseudo-Arcadius reads: τὸ δέκατον πέμπτον τὰς πλαγίας τῶν ὀνομάτων κανονίζει, καὶ τοὺς κατὰ κλίσιν ἀριθμοὺς καὶ τοὺς κατὰ θέμα εἰρημένους (3.18-20).

Scholars have disagreed about the meaning of the terms κατὰ κλίσιν ἀριθμοί and κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί. K.E.A. Schmidt,\(^{111}\) Lentz\(^{112}\) and Hiller\(^{113}\) recognized that behind the phrase τοὺς κατὰ κλίσιν ἀριθμοὺς the grammatical numbers (i.e. singular, dual, plural) were meant, but thought that the phrase τοὺς κατὰ θέμα εἰρημένους ἀριθμοὺς meant that the numerals were discussed. M. Schmidt, however, considered it incorrect to assume that there existed a discussion of numerals in Book 15.\(^{114}\)

---

110 Lentz (1863), 111.
111 Schmidt K.E.A. (1861), 323-330.
112 Lentz (1863), 111.
113 Hiller (1866), 25.
114 Schmidt M. (1860b), 513.
According to the Table of Contents, one of the things dealt with in Book 15 of the 
Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was the accentuation of the oblique cases of nouns and 
adjectives. In practice, Book 15 of the epitome also contains a treatment of the dual and 
plural nominatives and the singular, dual and plural vocatives. This is to be expected 
because a general treatise on accents such as the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας needed to 
treat all forms in the paradigm. What has been less clear is how exactly the announcement 
in the Table of Contents relates to the content of Book 15 in Pseudo-Arcadius, and 
whether some of the announced content is missing, as Lentz thought.

In considering what Herodian’s doctrine on numerals might have looked like in 
the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, Lentz cites five fragments of other Herodianic works. 
The first of these comes from Theognostus’ Canones (Cramer 1835–7, II 134.3-17), and 
names Herodian’s Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων as a source:

(1) Τὰ εἰς εἰς μονοσύλλαβα διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γραφόμενα σπάνια ἐστὶν ἐστὶν 
γὰρ τὸ δεῖς δέσυτον, ὅπερ ἄει μετὰ τῆς ὧν ἀποφάσεως, ἢ τῆς μὴ ἀπαγορεύσεως 
σύνεστιν, οὐδεὶς καὶ μηδεὶς ἐστὶν δὲ καὶ τὸ κλεῖς θηλυκόν, καὶ τὸ εἰς ἀρσενικὸν ἐπὶ 
τοῦ ἀρίθμου περισπώμενον ὕγιος· αἱ γὰρ εἰς εἰς λέξεις ὑγιόμεναι, καὶ ἔχουσαι εἰς 
ἐν οὐδέτερον μετοχαὶ εἰσιν· οἶον, τιθείς, τιθέν· νυγεῖς, νυγέν· βαρυνόμεναι δὲ 
ὄνοματα εἰσιν· οἶον, τιμήεις· ἕρωες· ἔτει οὐν τὸ εἰς εἰς οὐδέτερον τὸ ἔν, ἔχρην 
βαρύνεσθαι· ὡς ἄν δὲ τοῦτο πώς ἀν τὴν μονοσυλλαβίαν ἀναγκαῖως περιστάται, 
ὕν ἄναμει βαρύνηται ἀμέλει εἰς δισυλλαβίαν μετελθοῦν βαρύνεται ἐν τῷ 
ἁφθαλμὸς ἕν εἰς ἐπέκειτο μετώπῳ (Hesiod. Θ. 145). Ίνα τὴν ὀνοματικὴν σημασίαν 
ἀποφήγναιν· οὕτως Ἡροδιανὸς Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων. (‘The monosyllables ending in 
the sound ‘εἰς’ (i.e. [is]) that are written with the diphthong ei are rare; there is the 
oxytone δείς, which always accompanies the negation οὐ or the prohibition μη; οὐδεὶς 
and μηδείς; and there is also the feminine κλείς, and the masculine εἰς, meaning the 
numeral, which is regularly perispomenon. For words ending in εἰς that are oxytone 
and have their neuter in εν are participles, as for example τιθεῖς τιθέν, νυγεῖς νυγέν; 
and when they are recessive they are nominals, as for example τιμήεις, ἕρωες. 
Therefore since εἰς had the neuter ἔν, it should have been recessive; but I suppose this 
was not possible due to its being a monosyllable. It is necessarily perispomenon, so
that it is recessive in force. And indeed when it goes over to being disyllabic it is recessive, as in ὀφθαλμός ἔεις ἐπέκειτο μετώπω, in order to show the nominal meaning. Thus Herodian in the Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων.

The second passage comes from the *Etymologicum magnum* (91.40-55), and names Herodian’s Περὶ παθῶν as a source:

(2) Ἀμφότεροι: Ἀπὸ τοῦ δευτέρου τὸ πρῶτον διδάξω. Τι ἔστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ β τὸ α διδάξω; Ἐπειδῆ τὸ ἄμφω θέμα ἔστιν ὡς τὸ δύο διαφέρει δὲ τὸ ἄμφω τοῦ δύο, ὅτι τὸ μὲν δύο πρῶτην γνώσιν τίθησι τοῦ ἀριθμού, τὸ δὲ ἄμψω ἀναφορὰν ύπισχνεῖται διάδος· ὅστε ὅπερ ἔστιν οἱ δύο, τοῦτο ἔστιν ἄμψω. Διὰ τούτῳ τὸ δύο λαμβάνει ἄρθρον παράθεναι, οἱ δύο, τῶν δύο τὸ δὲ ἄμψω οὐ λαμβάνει οὐδὲ γὰρ λέγομεν οἱ ἄμψω· ἡ γὰρ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει. Πρῶτον οὖν ἔστι παρὰ τὸ ἄμψω ἀμφότερος· οῖον, «Ἀμφότεροι μέμασαν» «Ἀμφότεροι δ’ ἀριγητε» εἶτα δυϊκῶς ἀμφότερος· κατὰ συγκοπὴν ἄμψω, κατ’ ἐκτασιν τοῦ ο εἰς ω. Διὰ τούτῳ οὖν εἶπον, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ δευτέρου τὸ πρῶτον θέλω διδάξαι. Ἀμφότερος γὰρ εἶτα ἄμψω, κατὰ συγκοπὴν καὶ ἐκτασιν. Οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς Περὶ παθῶν. (‘Ἄμψω means ἀμφότεροι, as for example ἄμψω ὁμός φίλοι θυμώ. Ἀμφότεροι from the second (i.e. ἀμφότεροι) I will explain the first (i.e. ἄμψω). What does ‘from the second I will explain the first’ mean? Since ἄμψω is a θέμα like δύο; but ἄμψω differs from δύο because δύο introduces the first mention of the number, while ἄμψω promises reference back to a pair; thus ἄμψω is the same thing as οἱ δύο. This is why δύο can have an article added: οἱ δύο, τῶν δύο. ἄμψω does not have an article, for we do not say οἱ ἄμψω, because it already includes the notion of referring back. Thus firstly from ἄμψω comes ἀμφότερος, as for example Ἀμφότεροι μέμασαν, Ἀμφότεροι δ’ ἀριγητε. Then in the dual ἀμφότερος; and with syncope ἄμψω, with a lengthening of 0 to ω. This is why I said I wanted to explain the first from the second. For ἀμφότερος, then ἄμψω, with syncope and lengthening. Thus Herodian in the Περὶ παθῶν.’)\[15\]

In the course of a discussion of the relationship between the forms ἄμψω and ἀμφότεροι, passage (2) comments that both ἄμψω and δύο are θέματα. This point,

\[15\] As transmitted, the passage purports to derive ἄμψω from ἀμφότεροι, yet also derives ἀμφότερος, and hence ἀμφότερος, from ἄμψω (Πρῶτον οὖν ἔστι παρὰ τὸ ἄμψω ἀμφότερος). I assume that something is wrong with the expression Πρῶτον οὖν ἔστι παρὰ τὸ ἄμψω ἀμφότερος, but this is not our concern here.
which is not obviously relevant to the immediate purposes of the *Etymologicum magnum*, is likely to have featured in the source text, Herodian’s Περὶ παθῶν. The point will prove important in the following discussion.

The third passage that Lentz quoted comes from Choeroboscus’ Περὶ όρθογραφίας (Cramer 1835–7, II 266.27–267.5):

(3) Τρείς: Τὸ περισπώμενον διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου καὶ ὁφείλειν διὰ τοῦ ἰ γράφεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ τριῶν ἐστίν ή γενικὴ τῶν πληθυντικῶν, καὶ τρισίν ἢ δοτική τὰ δὲ ἐχοντα κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν καὶ δοτικήν τῶν πληθυντικῶν ἐν τῇ παραλήγουσί τοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐθείᾳ τῶν πληθυντικῶν ἔχουσι τὸ ἴ κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν οἴων, πόλις, πολίων, πόλεις· ὤφις, ὤφιον, ὤφιες· εἰ οὖν τριῶν καὶ τρισίν, δήλον ὅτι καὶ τρίες διὰ τοῦ γ′ καὶ λοιπόν κατὰ κράσιν τοῦ καὶ ε ἐις τὸ δήλον ὅτι μακρὸν τρίς διὰ τοῦ γ′ ὡσπερ πόλιες, πόλις: μάντις· μάντις· ἀλλὰ λέγει ὁ τεχνικὸς ὅτι ἕνα μὴ συνεμπέσει τὸ τρις ἐπιφορήματι, τούτου χάριν οὐκ ἐγράφῃ διὰ τοῦ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου· (‘Τρείς: The perispomenon word is written with the diphthong ei. It ought to be written with i because the genitive plural is τριῶν and the dative τρισίν; and words that have i in the penultimate syllable of their genitive and dative plurals also have i in the penultimate syllable of the nominative plural: as for example πόλις, πολίων, πόλεις; ὤφις, ὤφιων ὤφιες. So if we have τριῶν and τρισίν, it is clear that (we should also have) τριες, with i. And then with crasis of i and e into i it is clear that τρις, with a long ‘i’ sound, should be written with i: as for example πόλις, πόλις; μάντις, μάντις). But the τεχνικὸς says that it was not written with i but with the diphthong ei, to prevent it coinciding with the adverb τρις’)

In the next passage, Lentz cites an example of what he considers κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοὶ from Herodian’s Περὶ ἰλιακῆς προσωφίας (Sch. Hom. Il. 2. 557a.1 (A) = GG iii.ii 35.10-3):

(4) δυναίδεια: Πάμφυλος τρία ποιεῖ καὶ κατὰ παράθεσιν ἀναγινώσκει· ἀφορμῇ δὲ ἐχει ἢ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἀνάγνωσις τὴν ποητικὴν χρήσιν, ἢτις τὰ κατὰ παράθεσιν πολλάκις ἐνοί, ὡς τὸ πασιμέλουσα (Od. μ 70) καὶ τὰ τουαύτα. (‘δυναίδεια:

116 This section of the passage is odd, because the usual Attic forms are not πόλις and μάντις with long iota, but πόλεις and μάντεις. The problem is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis.)
Pamphilus writes this as three words and takes them to be a juxtaposition. The interpretation as a juxtaposition is based on poetic usage, which often makes a unity out of words that are juxtaposed, as in πασιμέλουσα and suchlike.

The last passage that Lentz provides us with comes from the Etymologicum magnum (346.15-35) and is a fragment from Herodian’s Περὶ παθῶν:

(5) Ἐξάκλινον, ἐξάπτουν: Αττικῶς μὲν ἔξπουν καὶ ἐξεκλινον λέγεται, ὡσπερ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐξηνυστῇ καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι τῷ κωμικῷ ἔξπουν. Φυλάττουσι γὰρ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀρίθμων ἐν τῇ συνθέσει, πεντέμηνον λέγοντες, καὶ, «ἐν πεντεσυρίγγῳ ἑξῆς» ἡμεῖς δὲ, πεντάμηνον. Ὀκτώπουν ἑκεῖνοι, καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὁκτάπουν. Εἰ οὖν ἁρὰ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀρίθμων φυλάσσουσι, ὁ δὲ ἐξ ἀρίθμων τὸ ἔξπουσος ἄρα τὸ τέλος, ἐξεκλινον λέγοντες. Αλλὰ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτι οὔδὲ μίαν λέξιν ἔχομεν εἰς διπλοῦν καταλήγουσαν, καὶ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ψυλλίσθην. Εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ ψυλλίσθησιν εἰς παραθέσειν ὅνων, «Πῦς μὲν ἐνικήσα» «Λᾶξ ποδὶ κινήσας» Εἰ οὖν ἔξπουσος ἐν συνθέσει, ὁφεῖλε τρέπεσθαι καὶ μή καταλήγειν εἰς διπλοῦν. Ἀνάλογον ὅτι πεφύλακται τὸ τέλος τοῦ ἀρίθμου ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιήτῃ ὅνω, ἐξέτης: «Ἐξέτετ’ ἄδμητῃ καὶ, «Ἐξέτετες δ’ ἠγασιν». Οὐκ ἐστιν οὖν πλευρασμός, ὡς πλανώνται τινὲς. Τὰ εἰς ΚΙΣ ἐπιφήμια ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ἀποβάλλει τὸ ΚΙΣ ὅνω, ἐπτάκις, ἐπτάμηνος: οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπτά ἀρίθμου. Τέσσαρες ὁ ἀρίθμος, τετράκις τὸ ἐπίφημον παρὰ τοῦτο τετράμηνον. Οὗτος οὖν ἔξακις, ἐξάκλινον, ἐξάπτουν. Ἡρωδιανός Περὶ παθῶν. (ἐξάκλινον, ἐξάπτουν: In Attic ἔξπουν and ἐξεκλινον are said, as also in Sophocles ἐξηνυστῇ; and in Plato the comic poet ἔξπουν occurs. For they preserve the terminations of numerals in composition, saying πεντέμηνον and ἐν πεντεσυρίγγῳ ἑξῆς. But we say πεντάμηνον. They say ὁκτώπους, and we ὁκτάπους. Since then they preserve the terminations of numerals, and the numeral ἔξης has ἔξης, they keep the termination, saying ἐξεκλινον. But it is possible to say about this, that we do not have a single word ending in a double consonant that is preserved in composition. There are some with double consonants that are preserved in juxtaposition, as for example πῦς μὲν ἐνικήσα, λᾶξ ποδὶ κινῆσας. If then ἔξπους is a compound, it ought to undergo an alteration and not have its penultimate syllable ending in a double consonant. The fact that the termination of the numeral is preserved is regular, as for example ἐξέτής in the poet: ἐξέτετ’ ἄδμητῃ and ἐξέτετες δ’ ἠγασιν. Thus there is no pleonasm, as some mistakenly believe. The adverbs ending in ΚΙΣ drop ΚΙΣ in composition, as for example ἐπτάκις, ἐπτάμηνος; for the latter does not derive from the numeral ἐπτά.)

117 I.e. a phrase that behaves like a compound (now sometimes called a Zusammenrückung), rather than a proper compound.
Σέσσαρες is the numeral, τετράκις the adverb; from this comes τετράμηνον. Thus then ἐξάκις, ἐξάκλινον, ἐξάπουν. Herodian in the Περὶ παθῶν.’)

Lentz is speculating in all the above-mentioned cases in his attempt to reconstruct how the section on the κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί in Book 15 might have looked, always considering the term ἀριθμοί to refer to numerals. There is insufficient evidence to link any of the passages (1) – (5) to Book 15 of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, for the following reasons: a) there is no mention of Book 15 or even of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς, b) the phrasing of the passages cited is not similar to the wording of Book 15 of Pseudo-Arcadius or to the treatment of the oblique cases in Philoponus’ Epitome (9.19-20.34), and c) there is no mention of κατὰ κλίσιν ἀριθμοί or κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί, although the term θέμα is used in connection with the words ἄμφω and δύω in passage (2), which names Herodian’s Περὶ παθῶν as its source.

It can, however, be shown that neither the term κατὰ κλίσιν ἀριθμοί nor κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί indicates that numerals were dealt with. Let us first focus on the terms θέμα and κατὰ θέμα. Lallot explains that ἐν θέμασιν (and the related term θεματικός) is the technical term which describes irregular inflectional phenomena (ἀνακόλουθα) characterized by variation in the stem that is not explained in terms of phonetic alteration (πάθος), something which modern scholarship calls suppletion. He notes that the typical example is that of the inflection of the personal pronouns.

---

118 This term is used in Apollonius Dyscolus: Synt. GG ii.ii 141.1, Pron. GG ii.i 11.9-10, 11.16-7, 27.6-7. Cf. also the use of the terms ἀκόλουθα in passages (6) and (8), and ἀκόλουθος in passage (8).
119 Lallot (1997), ii 45 n. 185, 417. See also the entries θέμα and θεματικός in Dickey (2007), 240 and LSJ s. v. θέμα ΙΙΙ.3, and θεματικός ΙΙ.2.
120 Lallot (1997), ii 45 n. 185.
In what follows I shall lay out further evidence for this point here, because of its importance for the meaning of κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοὶ. Passages (6) – (8) shed light on the term θεματικός in ancient grammatical thought.

Lallot’s argument about the terms ἐν θέμασιν and θεματικός can be illustrated through a passage in the Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam (sub auctore Heliodoro, GG i.iii 79.25-30)121. This passage shows us the really basic meaning of the grammatical term θεματικός, which explains its formation. The term is employed in this passage with regard to the pronouns, but nevertheless helps us to understand what the θεματικά are:

(6) Πρός δὲ τῆς κλίσεως εἰδέναι χρῆ, ὅτι τῶν μὲν ὄνομάτων καὶ τῶν ὄνομάτων ἡ κλίσις κατ’ ἀκολουθίαν φωνῆς προέρχεται, καὶ ἡ ἐτέρα ὑπὸ τῆς ἑτέρας κανονίζεται, αἱ δὲ πρωτότυποὶ ἀντωνυμίαι σημασίᾳ μόνον ποιοῦνται τὴν κλίσιν, οὐ μέντοι φωνῆς ἀκολουθίας διὸ καὶ θεματικάς αὐτὰς καλοῦμεν, ὅτι ἐκάστη φωνὴ ἑαυτῇ ἐστὶ θέμα, καὶ οὐ κανονίζεται ἡ ἑτέρα ὑπὸ τῆς ἑτέρας. (‘One should know about inflection that the inflection of nominals and verbs is derived according to analogy of form, and the rule for the one form is based on the other, but the underived pronouns (i.e. personal pronouns) form their inflection only according to their meaning, not by analogy of form. This is why we call them θεματικαί, because each word is the base form for itself, and the rule for one is not based on another.’)

It is significant for our understanding of the meaning of the term θεματικός that the term πρωτότυποι (‘not derived’) appears in connection with forms that are described as θεματικαί.

121 The phrasing of this passage is close to that of a passage from Choeroboscus’ Epimerismi in psalmos (90.18-23); cf. also 35.28-35. It is actually possible that Heliodorus derived his material from Choeroboscus’ passage (90.18-23), but I cite Heliodorus’ passage because it serves our present purposes better (on Choeroboscus’ being considered the source of Heliodorus’ commentary see GG i.iii XV, but Heliodorus’ source is not our concern here). More specifically, the wording αἱ δὲ πρωτότυποι ἀντωνυμίαι in line 3 of passage (6), rather than αἱ δὲ ἀντωνυμίαι in the corresponding passage from Choeroboscus, is useful with regard to the meaning of the term θεματικός. Cf. also EM 314.29-32.
The term θεματικός occurs in Book 15 of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome in the section where the dual nominative is dealt with. In 151.14 (Schmidt) we read τὸ δὲ ἄμφω καὶ δύο θεματικά εἰσιν (’ἄμφω and δύο are θεματικά’). Here we are not given any explanation about the content of the term θεματικά, but we get two examples, ἄμφω and δύο.

The following passage, which comes from Choeroboscus’ Commentary on Theodosius’ Canones (GG iv.i 398.5-7), not only further illustrates the meaning of θεματικά, but also links to Pseudo-Arcadius’ τὸ δὲ ἄμφω καὶ δύο θεματικά εἰσι via the shared examples ἄμφω and δύο:

(7) φησὶ δὲ ὁ τεχνικός, ὅτι τὸ ἄμφω καὶ δύο θεματικά εἰσιν, τούτεστιν οὐκ ἐγένοντο ἀπὸ ἐνικών· τὸ γάρ σημαινόμενον καλύπτει ἡ γὰρ ὁ δύο ἀριθμός δύναται <ἐν> ἐνικῷ θεωρεῖσθαι:122 (’the τεχνικός says that ἄμφω and δύο are θεματικά, that is to say they were not formed from singulars, for their meaning makes this impossible. For how can the number two be contemplated in the singular?’)

Choeroboscus’ explanation here suggests that Herodian used the term θεματικά for forms that lacked a base form that they might have been expected to have within the paradigm. In Greek grammatical texts, dual and plural nominal forms are normally considered to be formed on the basis of the corresponding singulars, but the words ἄμφω and δύο lack singular forms altogether. The identical phrasing τὸ ἄμφω καὶ δύο θεματικά εἰσιν in passage (7) and Pseudo-Arcadius (151.14 Schmidt), as well as the mention of the τεχνικός, which in this context is very likely to refer to Herodian, suggests

122 For this definition of θεματικά cf. two passages from the EM, 91.33-5 and 616.32-42, which Lentz (1867–70, III:II: 554.26–555.6) identifies as a fragment of Herodian’s Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας (555.3-5).
that Herodian was at least an intermediate stage in the discussion of the \textit{θεματικά}, from which later grammatical sources, including Choeroboscus, derived material.\footnote{The discussion of the \textit{θεματικά} already exists in Apollonius Dyscolus (see passage (8)).}

The following passage from Apollonius Dyscolus' \textit{De constructione} (GG ii.ii 139.6-140.4) employs the terms \textit{θεματικώτερον} and \textit{θεματικός} in opposition to the inflection \textit{κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῶν πτωτικῶν}:

(8) \textit{Ἐτι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τῶν πτωτικῶν ἀπ’ εὐθείας λημματιζομένης γενικῆς καὶ τὰς ὑπολοίπους πτώσεις πρὸς ἀκολουθίαν τῆς εὐθείας ἀποτελεῖ, οὐχ ὑποστελλομένου τοῦ ἁρθοῦν, εἰγε καὶ αὐτὸ ἐδείχθη ἐν τῇ δεουσῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ κεκλιμένον· αἱ δὲ προκείμεναι πρωτότυποι ἀντωνυμίᾳ \textit{θεματικώτερον} ἐκλίθησαν, οὐ δυναμένης τῆς ἐγὼ κατὰ λόγον τῶν πτωτικῶν τὴν ἐμοῦ γενικῆς παραδέξασθαι, οὐδὲ μὴν τῆς ἐμοῦ τὴν ἐμοὶ ἢ ἐμὲ, δεόντως καὶ τῶν παρεπομένων ἀριθμῶν ἐξαλλαγέντων πάλιν \textit{θεματικῶς}. ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὴν μὴ κλιθεῖσαν γενικὴν ἐς εὐθείας ἀριθμὸν ἀκόλουθον παραστῆσαι· κλιθεῖσα γὰρ συγκλίνει τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς καὶ τὰς ἐξῆς πτώσεις, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ταῖς \textit{ἐτεροκλίτοις} παραδέξασθε τις εὐθεία τῆς γενικῆς τὰ λοιπὰ σχήματα ἀποδιδούσης, οἷον ἢ μεγάλου ἐποίησε τὸ μεγάλοι, καὶ ἐκ ἁμαρτοντος τοῦ τοιούτου ἡ μεγάλος εὐθεία διασφάζεται. καὶ ὁμοιοῖς ἢ ὅπως καὶ ἐν ἡ γυναικὸς ἢ τε πολλοὶ πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ ὅπως καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο συνεπῆξαν τὸ πολλός, τὸ γυναῖκες, τὸ ὅπως. —διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ἢ ἐμοὶ οὐ κλιθεῖσα, γενομένη δὲ ἐν θέματι, καὶ τὸ ἀκόλουθον τῶν πτώσεων παραστήσατο καὶ τοὺς ἀκόλουθους ἀριθμοὺς, ἡ γοῦν ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἢ σύνεγοι κλιθεῖσαι ἐσχον καὶ τὰ συμπαρεπομένα ἀκόλουθα. ('Furthermore, the rest of the declinable words form the genitive and the rest of the cases to follow the base form consisting of the nominative. The article is no exception, since this has been shown to be declined according to the analogy it should have; and the underived pronouns (i.e. personal pronouns) that are the topic of the current discussion were declined using several different base forms, because (the pronoun) ἑγὼ could not accept the genitive ἐμοὺ according to the rules for declinable words, and nor could ἐμοὶ (accept) ἐμοῖ, ἐμὲ, with the subsequent numbers necessarily changing their base forms too. For it is impossible for a genitive that is not declined on the basis of the nominative to establish a regular (grammatical) number; for one that is declined inflects its (grammatical) numbers and oblique cases similarly. This is why as regards the ἐτεροκλίτα a (theoretical) nominative that follows the genitive is the basis for the rest of the forms. For example, μεγάλου forms μεγάλοι, and out of such a lexical form the nominative (singular) μεγάλος shows through. And
similarly the genitives ὑδατος, γυναικος and πολλοι; for (the nominatives plural are) πολλοι, ὑδατα and γυναικες, and for this reason the words πολλος, γυναικα and ὑδας also exist. For this reason ἐμοι is not inflected, but formed with its own base form and rejects regularity in the (other) cases and the subsequent (grammatical) numbers. But ἐκείνος and similar words, since they are inflected (on the basis of the nominative singular), have their oblique (cases) following regularly too.

Here θεματικα are suppletive forms and are contrasted with ordinary inflected forms. The contrast between θεματικώτερον and θεματικως, on the one hand, and κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῶν πτωτικῶν, on the other, strongly suggests that the latter is the equivalent of the term κατὰ κλίσιν that we read in Pseudo-Arcadius' Table of Contents. Moreover, the participle κλιθείσα is employed in opposition to γενομένη ἐν θέματι. The terms κλιθείσα and γενομένη ἐν θέματι correspond to the terms κατὰ κλίσιν (ἀριθμοί) and κατὰ θέμα (ἀριθμοί) which describe part of the content of Pseudo-Arcadius' Book 15.

After the treatment of the inflection of the personal pronouns, Apollonius presents the ἐτερόκλιτα (i.e. words that form different parts of their paradigms on different stems) in an analogous way to the θεματικα.124

According to passages (6) and (8), a form described as θεματικόν is one that bears its own θέμα, a word that is not formed on the basis of another base form in the paradigm. For nominals the nominative singular (or nominative singular masculine, for an adjective) is the usual base form for the rest of the paradigm, and so the term θεματικόν will normally mean that a form is not built on a nominative singular. Such words are the dualia tantum, the pluralia tantum and the ἐτερόκλιτα. An example of a duale

124 In Pseudo-Arcadius' Epitome words that are ἐτερόκλιτα, e.g. μέγας, γυνη, ὑδωρ, πολύς are not presented in relation to the θεματικα and are never called suchlike, but this may be due to the epitomator cutting down material. Nevertheless, the analogy between the ἐτερόκλιτα and the θεματικα is important for present purposes, and therefore we shall examine this analogy in Apollonius' relevant passage.
tantum is the word δύο, which is often cited as an example of a θεματικόν. How then does the meaning of θεματικός in passage (7) fit with the meaning provided by passages (6) and (8)? Is a θεματικόν a word that bears its own θέμα or a word that is not inflected from a nominative singular? One can easily see how the two explanations presented in the above passages relate to each other. Even the etymology of the word implies that a θεματικόν is a word that bears its own θέμα. It is clear, however, that a nominal form that has its own θέμα is one with a θέμα that is not simply the nominative singular in use. The θεματικά are therefore words that bear their own θέμα, either because they are based on a different stem from the usual base form (the ἔτεροκλίτα) or because the part of the paradigm that usually provides the base form does not exist at all (the dualia and pluralia tantum). Thus, the term θεματικόν refers to a form that carries its own θέμα, but for nominal forms this sometimes comes to the same thing as having no singular. This explains also the definition of the term θεματικόν that we read in the Epimerismi homerici (259,b1.):

ἄμφω: ἐστὶν εὐθεία τῶν δυϊκῶν. καὶ ἐστὶ θεματικόν, 1 τουτέστιν οὔτε ἑνικόν οὔτε πληθυντικόν ἔχει. (ἄμφω: this is the nominative dual. And it is θεματικόν, that is to say it has neither a singular nor a plural.)

Coming finally to the interpretation of the term κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί, we conclude that these are dual and plural forms – grammatical numbers – whose inflection is not based on a nominative singular form. The concept of the θεματικά in ancient grammatical thought illustrates the grammarians’ recognition that their paradigm-based model of morphology, and the concept of a leading form in the paradigm, had certain
limits, which arose due to the existence of words such as the *dualia tantum*, the *pluralia tantum* and the *ἑτερόκλιτα*.

In interpreting the content of the *θεματικά* and the *κατὰ θέμα ἀριθμοί* one should keep in mind that in the first fourteen books Herodian has been dealing with the accentuation of nominative singular forms. Book 15 is devoted to other forms in the paradigm. In general, the accentuation of these other forms is related to that of the nominative singular (or nominative singular masculine, for adjectives) in the same paradigm. But this treatment of nominative singular and non-nominative-singular forms leaves a logical gap: the dual and plural nominal forms whose accentuation cannot be predicted on the basis of a nominative singular form. Book 15 is the place where this gap would have been felt, and the logical place for it to be filled.

Even though one could argue that a treatment of the numerals would be necessary for a general and extensive treatise on accents, as the *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας* was, a counter-argument would be that Herodian operated with the same eight parts of speech as we find in the *Τέχνη γραμματική* attributed to Dionysius Thrax, and numerals are not included in this categorisation. The accent of numerals is treated, of course, here and there in our Epitome, but it seems that there was no treatment of the numerals in a separate book or section. Besides, as passage (1) implies, Herodian considered the numerals to come under ὀνόματα, and so one would precisely expect numerals to appear here and there among the ὀνόματα, not in their own section.

b) The sections on enclitics

The second problem relating to Book 15 is that after the treatment of the accentuation of the oblique cases, the manuscripts of our Epitome transmit two sections
on enclitics, whose existence is not announced in the Table of Contents. The other main
problem is that there are two sections on enclitics, and that they overlap considerably in
content. Many scholars have considered the sections on enclitics not to be an original part
of Book 15 of the Epitome.\textsuperscript{125}

One could argue that the sections on enclitics could be part of Book 15
accompanying the oblique cases, on the basis that the section on prepositions in Book 18
contains a treatment of the prepositions in anastrophe, even though this would arguably
fit better in the Appendix\textsuperscript{126} (since anastrophe of prepositions and its effect on the accent
really matters in syntax, when the preposition is combined with another word)\textsuperscript{127}. However, the two sections on enclitics deal not only with the combination of enclitics
with nouns but also with adjectives, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, and conjunctions,
suggesting that there is no special reason why the sections on enclitics should have been
part of Book 15.

A second issue that needs to be dealt with is where the sections come from, if they
do not originally belong to Book 15. The sections on enclitics could be thought to have
been originally part of the Appendix to the twenty books, which according to the Table of
Contents dealt with the accent of words in combination with other words;\textsuperscript{128} in this case

\textsuperscript{125} See M. Schmidt (1860), 159 (apparatus criticus, n. 4); K.E.A. Schmidt (1861), 351; Lentz (1863),
112, 115; Hiller (1866), 29-30; Galland (1882b), 29.
\textsuperscript{127} One could argue that anastrophe was treated both after the section on prepositions in Book 18
and in the Appendix, or that it was only dealt with in Book 18. The fact that the treatment of
anastrophe fits well after the account of the accent of prepositions leads us to believe that it was
probably not moved from the Appendix to Book 18. In any case if anastrophe was treated twice,
this should not have been really annoying for the reader in such a long text. See also the treatment
of Book 18, pp. 102-4.
\textsuperscript{128} See M. Schmidt (1860), 159 (apparatus criticus, n. 4); Lentz (1863), 112, 115.
they were later moved to the end of Book 15, probably because of an error committed by a
scribe.

An indication that the second section on enclitics in Book 15 could have been part
of the Appendix is that the phrase καὶ οἱ ἐπευχόμενος in the second section on enclitics
(163.22-3 Schmidt) appears also in the description of the Appendix in the Table of
Contents (4.12-3). Furthermore, both the Table of Contents and section one on enclitics
cite the examples Ζεύς τε (Table of Contents: 4.9, section on enclitics: 160.19 (Schmidt))
and Ζεύς δέ (δ’ elided in the Table of Contents: 4.7, section on enclitics 160.22-3
(Schmidt)).¹²⁹ Even though in the Table of Contents these examples are part of longer
phrases, their existence as single examples in section one could still testify that section one
in some way (at least as far as the common examples are concerned) goes back to
Herodian.

Even considering that dealing with enclitics would fit the Appendix, one should
still wonder why we have two separate sections on enclitics and whether both sections go
back to Herodian, whether one or both of them is further removed from Herodian than
other parts of the epitome, and which of the two, if any, was abridged by the author of
our Epitome.¹³⁰

In deciding about the authenticity of the two sections on enclitics found in Book 15
of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, one has to take into account the sections on enclitics in

¹²⁹ Cf. Lentz (1863), 115.
¹³⁰ Different scholars had various views on these points. Hiller (1866), 30 favoured the view that
Herodian’s doctrine on enclitics in the appendix was abridged more than once and in various
ways, but then finally came back to Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome. According to Lentz (1863), 115,
(1867-70), LVIII, the two sections were certainly excerpted from Herodian, because the precepts
entirely agree with those that we have transmitted in other sources deriving from Herodian.
Bekker’s *Anecdota Graeca* iii 1142-58. In Bekker there are five sections on enclitics: (1) Ἡρωδιανοῦ περὶ ἐγκλινομένων καὶ ἐγκλιτικῶν καὶ συνεγκλιτικῶν μορίων (after this section there is one entitled περὶ τοῦ ἔστιν which could either be considered independent, or belonging to this section), (2) Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Χάρακος περὶ ἐγκλινομένων, (3) περὶ ἐγκλινομένων, (4) καὶ ἄλλως περὶ ἐγκλινομένων, and (5) Αἰλίου περὶ ἐγκλινομένων λέξεων.

There are similarities in wording between all these sections and the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius, but very few similarities in wording between any of these and the first section in Pseudo-Arcadius. There are no similarities between section one in Pseudo-Arcadius and sections (4) and (5) in Bekker. On the contrary, section two in Pseudo-Arcadius has identical wording and common examples with sections (1), (4), and (5) in Bekker. One could even describe sections (4) and (5) as the same treatise on enclitics as section two in Pseudo-Arcadius, with minor changes which could be due to a scribe. It is noteworthy that sections (1) and (5) in Bekker, with which section two in Pseudo-Arcadius has many similarities, bear in their titles the name of Herodian.

There is further evidence about the publicity and circulation of the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius. Mr Nigel Wilson has located in codex *Laurentianus* Plut. 58.24 (folios 4 verso – 6 verso), dated to the 12th century, a version of the second section on enclitics. This section is incomplete owing to the loss of one or more leaves after folio 6. This version, together with the sections on enclitics in Bekker, suggests that in the late Antique and Byzantine period a group of texts on enclitics with Herodianic origins were circulating.
Before a decision is made about the sections on enclitics, we should also take into account the Herodianic doctrine on enclitics preserved fragmentarily in the scholia to the *Iliad*. There are verbal similarities and common examples between the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius and the Homeric scholia deriving from Herodian,\(^\text{131}\) but very few verbal similarities between the first section and the Homeric scholia.

\(\pi\omega\) (159.17 (Schmidt)) in the first section is said to be a conjunction, but one finds it cited in Book 19 of Pseudo-Arcadius in the section on adverbs (206.18 (Schmidt)). The contradiction with what appears to be Herodian’s doctrine adds to the impression we get from the lack of parallels with the Homeric scholia and with other texts on enclitics that this text is at best distantly related to the others, and that at least some of the content is due to a grammarian other than Herodian. The mention of \(\pi\omega\) as a conjunction in the first section could also be due to a mistake made by the epitomator or a scribe; it is not a decisive and sufficient indication of a non-Herodianic origin.\(^\text{132}\)

Another problem that remains to be examined is a passage on the enclisis of \(\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\) in Eustathius’ Commentary on the Odyssey (I 302.40 - 303.3), which indicates that the source is Charax (1151 Bekker), but in fact Eustathius’ passage (I 302.40 - 303.3) is much closer to the section on \(\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\) found in the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15 (169.9-20 Schmidt), and to the section on \(\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\) in Bekker’s Ὑμηρίανοὺς περὶ ἐγκλινομένων καὶ ἐγκλιτικῶν καὶ συνεγκλιτικῶν μορίων (1148-9).


\(^{132}\) Cf. Lentz (1863), 116-7.
Three main hypotheses can be formed to explain this problem. Firstly, it is possible that Eustathius’ statement that he derived his material from Charax should not be trusted, because Eustathius or his source had mistakenly attributed the authorship to Charax, while it is not by Charax but a source that is close to the second section on enclitics transmitted in Pseudo-Arcadius. Secondly, it is possible that the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius is a version of Charax’ treatise, and that the treatise transmitted under Charax’ name in Bekker is another version of Charax’ treatise, without one necessarily being closer to real Charax than the other; if so, Eustathius derives his material from a version of Charax similar to the one transmitted in the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius. Thirdly, it is possible that the second section on enclitics in Pseudo-Arcadius derives from Charax without much interference, and that the section attributed to Charax in Bekker’s Anecdota is not actually by Charax, or is more distantly related to the treatise he wrote.133 If the latter hypothesis is correct, the fact that the sections on enclitics are misplaced in Book 15 of Pseudo-Arcadius could be an indication that they (or at least the latter of the two) are not by Pseudo-Arcadius.

There is more work to be done on these issues but the question should not be seen as one of dividing texts into ‘Herodianic’ or ‘non-Herodianic’, but of establishing the relationships between all these texts. Most of our texts on accentuation cannot be divided straightforwardly into ‘Herodianic’ and ‘non-Herodianic’, but into texts more closely and less closely related to works of Herodian. The two sections in Book 15, being witnesses to the popularity of Herodian’s doctrine on enclitics, were probably excerpted...

133 Dr Philomen Probert is suspecting this.
independently, but a scribe incorporated both into his copy and thus they continued circulating together.

c) The authenticity of the treatment of the oblique cases

The authenticity of the whole book (i.e. of the treatment of both the oblique cases and the enclitics) was doubted by K.E.A. Schmidt and Galland, but defended by Lentz.\textsuperscript{134}

According to Galland, Book 15 as we have it today does not derive from the composer of our Epitome but from a later grammarian, who put his own book in the place of the original Book 15, either because there was no Book 15 in his copy of the Epitome or because he wanted to display his own work.\textsuperscript{135} Galland based his view on two arguments. On the one hand, the term \textit{ὄνομαστική} for nominative is employed in Book 15, but Herodian never uses this term.\textsuperscript{136} Galland did not make clear what works he considered to provide evidence for Herodian’s use of terms. Secondly, Galland argued that the two mentions of \textit{τεχνικός} in Book 15 refer to Theodosius and not to Herodian.\textsuperscript{137}

In my view the observation about the term \textit{ὀνομαστική} is not decisive with regard to the authenticity of Book 15. The epitomator could have easily replaced εὐθεία by \textit{ὀνομαστική}, even if the latter word was not found in his source. As regards Galland’s second argument we shall concentrate on one of two passages in Book 15 that refer to a \textit{τεχνικός}, the one which Galland took to show that the \textit{τεχνικός} is Theodosius:\textsuperscript{138}

\begin{enumerate}
\item 148.15-9 (Schmidt) λέγει δὲ ὁ τεχνικός, ὧν ἀι ἑπετελεσμέναι δοτικαὶ ἔχουσαι τὸ ἑποπαροξύνονται, ἔι μὴ δισυλλαβία καλύση; ὁ πολυπάταγος τοῦ πολυ-
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{134} Schmidt K.E.A. (1861), 336, 351; Lentz (1867-70), CXXXIII; Galland (1882b), 26-9.
\textsuperscript{135} Galland (1882b), 27.
\textsuperscript{136} Galland (1882b), 27.
\textsuperscript{137} Galland (1882b), 27.
\textsuperscript{138} The other passage in Book 15 that mentions a \textit{τεχνικός} is at 147.5-10 (Schmidt).
πατάγου τῷ πολυπατάγῳ καὶ κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν πολυπάταγι ἀναβιβάζει: ('The τεχνικός says that the datives formed by a change of declension and having ι are proparoxytone, unless this is prevented by the word’s having only two syllables; so ὁ πολυπάταγος τοῦ πολυπατάγου τῷ πολυπατάγῳ; and πολυπάταγι, due to a change of declension, retracts the accent').

Galland concluded that the τεχνικός mentioned is Theodosius by comparing passage (1) with following passages from Theodosius, Choeroboscus and Philoponus:

(2) Theodosius Can. GG iv.i. 37.19-21: Αἱ μεταπεπλασμέναι δοτικαὶ προπαροξύνονται, εἰ μὴ δισυλλαβία καλύσοι, διχόμην πολυπάταγι μελίκρατι ('the datives that are formed by a change of declension are proparoxytone, unless this is prevented by the word’s being disyllabic; so διχόμην πολυπάταγι μελίκρατι').

(3) Choeroboscus in Theod. GG iv.i 377.8-12: Φησὶ δὲ ὁ τεχνικός, ὅτι αἱ μεταπεπλασμέναι δοτικαὶ εἰς ἅ ἄγουσα προπαροξύνεσθαι θέλοισαι, δηλοντὶ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβαῖς οὔσαι τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ εἰσημένον αὐτῷ «εἰ μὴ δισυλλαβία καλύσῃ», οἶνον ὁ πολυπάταγος τοῦ πολυπατάγου τῷ πολυπατάγῳ παροξύτονος, καὶ γίνεται κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν τῷ πολυπάταγι προπαροξύτονος· ('The τεχνικός says that the datives that are formed by change of declension and end in ι are usually proparoxytone, that is to say if they have more than two syllables; for this is his statement: ‘unless this is prevented by the word’s being disyllabic’. For example ὁ πολυπάταγος τοῦ πολυπατάγου τῷ πολυπατάγῳ is paroxytone, and with a change of declension πολυπάταγι is proparoxytone').

(4) Philoponus 11.28: Αἱ μεταπεπλασμέναι (sc. δοτικαῖ) ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβαῖς ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν εἰς ω προπαροξύνονται, πολυπατάγῳ, πολυπάταγι [...] ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν εἰς η προσεριστῶνται ύσμιν ὑσμίνι [...] ('The datives that are formed with a change of declension and have more than two syllables, (if they are formed) from those in ω, are proparoxytone πολυπατάγῳ, πολυπάταγι [...] but (if they are formed) from those in η, they are properispomena ύσμιν ὑσμίνι [...]').

Galland assumed that the similarity in the four passages was due to the fact that 'Arcadius' (this is a convention for the author of our Epitome) had copied Choeroboscus. He then reasoned that the τεχνικός mentioned by Choeroboscus in passage (3) is Theodosius, because there is a similar passage in Theodosius (passage (2)), and because Choeroboscus’ work was a commentary on Theodosius.
In response to Galland, it should be noted that there is a chronological difficulty about ‘Arcadius’ having copied Choeroboscus, because Choeroboscus is now dated to the eighth and ninth centuries AD, while the date of the composition of our Epitome is uncertain, but most probably predates Choeroboscus. In my view, the agreement between Choeroboscus and Pseudo-Arcadius can be explained on the basis of their common Herodianic source.

K. E. A. Schmidt believed that the treatment of the accent of the oblique cases contained contradictions with Herodianic doctrine, whereas this part of the Epitome was related to Theodosius’ Canones and Choeroboscus’ commentary (GG iv.i 404.31-417.31). Specifically, the rule in passage (5), from Pseudo-Arcadius (154.2-20 Schmidt), is presented in Choeroboscus’ commentary on Theodosius’ Canones (GG iv.i 407.17-408.20) as a rule that Herodian opposed but Choeroboscus approves of (passage (6)): 

(5) ἐστὶ δὲ εἰσεῖν περὶ ὅλων τῶν σεσημειωμένων, ὅτι τὰ εἰς ΟΣ λήγοντα μονοσύλ-λαβα κατὰ τὴν γενικῆν, τὰ μὲν ὅξυτον, ἢν διὰ συμφώνων κλίνοιτο, περισσῶται κατὰ τὴν γενικῆν πληθυντικήν· σῆς σητὸς σητεῖς σητῶν, Κρής Κρητός Κρῆτες Κρητῶν. ἢν δὲ διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ΟΣ κλιθῶσι, βαρύνονται κατὰ τὴν γενικῆν πληθυντικήν· Τρῶς Τρώως Τρώες Τρώων, ὑμὸς ὑμῶς ὑμένων. τὸ δὲ τίνων εἰς διαφορὰν τῶν τυπῶν, καὶ τὸ κράτων (τῶν κεφαλῶν) εἰς διαφορὰν τῶν κρατῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ κράτους (ἡ ἄρχη). τὸ δὲ φώδων καὶ δᾶδων ἀπὸ τῶν φωδῶν καὶ δαίδων. Τὰ δὲ περισσῶμενα ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου γίνεται. ἢν μὲν διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ΟΣ κλίνοιτο, περισσῶσι τὰς γενικὰς πληθυντικὰς· μός μοῦς μεῖς μυὸν, βοῦς βοῦς βός βοῦν, δρῦς δρυῶν, σῦς συῶν. ἢν δὲ διὰ συμφώνου, βαρύνονται· παῖς παι-δὸς παιδές παιδῶν, πάντες πάντων. τὸ δὲ λαῶν ἐβαρύνθη εἰς διαφορὰν τῶν λαῶν. (It is possible to say about all the exceptions, that as regards the monosyllables ending in ος in the genitive, those that are oxytone are perispomenon in the genitive

139 See Theodoridis (1980), and Wilson (1996), 70.
140 See also the section on the dating of our Epitome, p. 63.
141 K. E. A. Schmidt (1861), 351. See also the discussion in Galland (1882b), 26-9, and Lentz (1867-70), CXXXIII.
142 See K. E. A. Schmidt (1861), 336.
plural if they are declined with consonants: σής σητός σήτες σητών, Κρής Κρητός Κρήτες Κρητών. But if they are declined with the ος preceded by a vowel, they are recessive in the genitive plural: Τῶς Τρώς Τρώες Τρῶν, δύμω δυμώδος δυμώδες δύμων. But τίνων as distinguished from τίνων, and κράτων ('of the heads') as distinguished from κρατών, from κράτος ('authority'); φωίδων and δάδων, coming from φωίδων and δάδων. The peripomena are formed in the opposite way. If they are declined with the ος preceded by a vowel they have a circumflex in the genitive plural: μύς μῦδες μῦδον, βοῦς βοῦδος βοῦδον, δύο δύον, σύς συόν. But if they are declined with a consonant they are recessive: πᾶς παῦδος παῦδες παῦδον, πάντες πάντων. Λάος is recessive to distinguish it from λαῶν.’

(6) Δοκεῖ δὲ ὁ Ἡρωδιανός λαμβάνεσθαι τούτου τοῦ κανόνος, καὶ λέγει ὅτι κακῶς λαμβάνει τὸν κανόνα πρῶτον μὲν γάρ ὅτι ἀπὸ τῶν σεσημειωμένων πλέκει τὸν κανόνα, δεύτερον δὲ ὅτι ἀντίκειται τούτῳ τὸ κίς κιός καὶ λίς λίος ταῦτα γὰρ ὄξυνονται κατὰ τὴν εὐθείαν τῶν ἑνίκων καὶ διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος κλίνονται, καὶ ὃμως οὐ βαρύνονται ἐν τῇ γενικῇ τῶν πληθυντικῶν ἀλλὰ περιστάνονται, κιόν γὰρ καὶ λίων περισταμένως. Ἐστι δὲ εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτόν ὅτι κακῶς κατατρέχεις τοῦ κανόνος τοῦ πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι, εἰ καὶ, ὡς λέγεις, ἀπὸ τῶν σεσημειωμένων πεπλέκεται διὰ καθαροῦ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανόνα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανόνα πλέκει τὸν κανόνα· καὶ σὺ γὰρ κέχρησαι διαφόροις κανόσι τοιούτοις, πλέκεις γὰρ κανόνα καὶ ἀπὸ δύο παραδειγμάτων· πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον ἀπὸ πλειόνων παραδειγμάτων πλεκόμενος ὁ κανόνας οὐδεμιὰν μέμψιν ἑαυτῷ προσφέρειν δεύτερον δὲ οὐκ, ὡς λέγεις αὐτός, ἀπὸ τῶν σεσημειωμένων πεπλέκεται ὁ κανόνας, ἀλλὰ καθόλου πάντα τὰ εἰς ὃ λήγοντα μονοσύλλαβα περιττοποιοῦσας κλινόμενα περιλαμβάνει ὁ κανόνας· εἰτε ὄξυτονα εἰσίν εἰτε περιστόμενα, ὡς ἐπί τοῦ Κρής Κρητός, σῆς σητός, δῦς δυός, μῦς μῦδος, βοῦς βοῦδος ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ εἰσίν εἰκ τῶν σεσημειωμένων. Περὶ μεντοῦ τοῦ κίς κιός καὶ λίς λίος, ὅτι λέγει ταῦτα ἀντικείσθαι τῷ κανόνι, αὐτός ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἐσημειώσατο, λέγων ἡμαρτημένα εἰσίν εἰτε κατὰ τόνον εἰτε κατὰ κλίνιν· ἡ γὰρ, φησίν, ὄξυτονα ὄψειλον διὰ συμφώνου κλινόμενα, εἰτε διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος κλινόμενα οὐκ ὄψειλον ὄξυτονεσθαι κατὰ τὴν εὐθείαν· τὰ γὰρ εἰς ὄξυτονα οὐδέποτε διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος κλίνονται, <οἴον> ἀστίς ἀστίδος, βολις βολίδος, κρήτις κρητίδος, κενής κενίδος, βασιλις βασιλίδος. Καὶ κέχρησαι τοιοῦτο παραδειγματί, ὃς πάρει Πάρις Πάριδος καὶ Θέτις Θέτιδος καὶ μήνις μήνιδος, ἐπειδὴ βαρύτονα εἰσί κατὰ τὴν εὐθείαν, γίνονται παρὰ τοῖς Ἡσιί διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος κατὰ τὴν γενικήν, οἶον Πάρις Θέτις μήνιος· ἵδιον γὰρ ἐστὶ τῶν εἰς ἑβαρυτόν τὸ διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος κλίνοντα, οἴον φόρος φόρος, μάντις μάντος, πόλις πόλιος· τὰ μέντοι εἰς ὄξυτονα, οἶον κρήτις κρητίδος, ἀστίς ἀστίδος, ὄμως ὄμως, οὐ γίνονται παρὰ τοῖς Ἡσιί διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος· τοῦτο γὰρ ἀλλότριόν ἐστι τῶν εἰς ὄξυτονα, λέγω δὴ τὸ ἔχειν <τήν> γενικήν διὰ καθαροῦ.
to ος ἐκφερομένην—οὕτω καὶ τὸ κίς καὶ τὸ λίς ὠξυνόμενα καὶ εἰς ὑπόλογα οὐκ ὠφελοῦν ἔχειν τὴν γενικὴν διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος, ἢ ἔχοντα τὴν γενικὴν διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ος οὐκ ὠφελοῦν ὀξύνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν εἴθεεν ἀλλὰ ἐνδοντὶ περιστάσσεται. Εἰ ἢ ἄρα οὐν αὐτὸς παρέθετο τὸ κίς καὶ τὸ λίς παράλογα ἢ κατὰ τόν ὑπόλογον ἢ κατὰ κλίσιν, πῶς λέγει ταῦτα ἐναντιοῦσθαι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ, φημὶ δὴ τῷ περὶ τῆς γενικῆς τῶν πληθυντικῶν; ὡστε οὖν οὐ ὑποίκως τέθεικε ταῦτα τὰ παραδείγματα ἐναντιοῦμενα τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ. 〈Herodian seems to censure this rule and he (i.e. Herodian) says that he (i.e. Herodian) finds the rule bad, first of all because he (i.e. Herodian) was arguing against) forms the rule from the exceptions and secondly because κίς κιός and λίς λιός are counterexamples to these (exceptions).143 For these words are oxytone in the nominative singular and are declined with ος preceded by a vowel, and yet are not recessive in the genitive plural but perisponomen: κιόν and λιῶν with a circumflex. One can say to him (i.e. Herodian): ‘you are wrong to inveigh against the rule; first of all because even if, as you (i.e. Herodian) say, the rule is composed from the exceptions, it is not unreasonable to compose a rule from three and even four (examples). Since you (i.e. Herodian) as well use various such rules, for you (i.e. Herodian) form a rule even from two examples. To a much greater extent, then, this rule brings no blame on itself, being formed on the basis of more examples. And secondly, the rule is not formed on the basis of the exceptions, as you (i.e. Herodian) say, but includes quite generally all the monosyllables ending in ζ, whether they are oxytone or perisponomen, that are declined imparisyllabically, as for example Κρής Κρητός, σῆς σητός, δοῦς δοῦς, μῦς μῦς, βοῦς βοῦς. These are not examples of exceptional words.’ But as regards κίς κιός and λίς λιός, as for the fact that he (i.e. Herodian) says that these are opposed to the rule, he himself (i.e. Herodian) has noted them as exceptions in other passages, saying that they are irregular regarding either their accent or their declension. For either, he (i.e. Herodian) says, these (words, i.e. κίς and λίς) ought to be declined with a consonant, being oxytone, or they ought not to be oxytone in the nominative, being declined with the ος preceded by a vowel. For the oxytone (nouns) ending in ις are never declined with an ος preceded by a vowel; thus ἀστίς ἀστίδος, βολίς βολίδος, κηρίς κηρίδος, κηρίμις κηρίμιδος, βασιλίς βασιλίδος. And he (i.e. Herodian) has used the following sort of example: just as Πάρις Πάριδος and Θέτις Θέτιδος and μήνις μήνιδος, since they are recessive in the nominative, are declined in the Ionic dialect with an ος preceded by a vowel in the genitive, as Πάριος Παρίδος μήνιος (for it is characteristic of recessive (nouns) ending in ις to be declined with the ος preceded by a vowel, as οῦς ὄς, μάντις μάντιδος, πόλις πόλιος), but oxytone (nouns) ending in ις, such as κηρίς κηρίδος, ἀστίς

143 I.e. these forms are counterexamples to the special rule for the exceptions at Pseudo-Arcadius 154.2-20 (Schmidt).
ἀσπίδος, ὀπίς ὀπίδος, are not declined with the ος preceded by a vowel in the Ionic dialect (for this is alien to the oxytone (nouns) ending in ις, I mean to have their genitive formed with the ος preceded by a vowel), so κίς and λίς too, being oxytone and ending in ις, ought not to have their genitives declined with the ος preceded by a vowel. Or, since they have their genitives (declined) with the ος preceded by a vowel, they ought not to be oxytone in the nominative but, clearly, perispomena. Since therefore he himself (i.e. Herodian) cited κίς and λίς as irregular either in their accent or their declension, how can he (i.e. Herodian) say that these contradict this rule, I mean the one on the genitive plural? Thus he (i.e. Herodian) did not rightly adduce these examples as contradicting this rule.

Before responding to K. E. A. Schmidt on passages (5) and (6) we need to clarify that whenever Choeroboscus or any other Byzantine grammarian claims to have read an ancient Greek grammarian, one always needs to ask whether he actually read this grammarian, and if so whether he read him in the original. Indeed, it is not even clear whether Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας remained available in its original form until Choerobuscus’ time. My suspicion is that it did not, since soon after the work’s composition several epitomes were created, and this must have had an effect on the transmission of the original.

Pseudo-Arcadius’ passage (5) reveals, as Choeroboscus says, that the rule on the imparisyllabic monosyllables ending in ις is formed on the basis of exceptions (ἔστι δὲ εἰπεῖν περὶ δλων τῶν σεσημειωμένων (‘it is possible to say about all the exceptions’)). These are the nine exceptions that had been cited earlier in the text (153.22-5 Schmidt), namely Τρώων, τίνων, πάντων, παίδων, θώων, κράτων, δάδων, λάων, δμώων, which are recessive rather than perispomena. The rule on the monosyllables is provided at this point to explain the accentuation of these nine exceptional genitive plurals. This is made clearer in Choeroboscus (who adds some further exceptions to these nine, which also
 appear in the passage of Theodosius he is commenting on: *in Theod. 40. 11–12*: Ἔστιν οὖν ἀπολογήσασθαι περὶ ὄλων τῶν σεσημειωμένων ὡτως (‘it is possible to defend all the exceptions thus’). There is, however, no sign in our Epitome to show that Herodian finds fault with the rule because it is formed on the basis of the exceptions. It is likely that Herodian made a comment about the rule not taking into consideration the words κίς and λίς, but that the epitomator left this out.

Choeroboscus is right in saying that the rule adduced to defend the nine exceptions in fact covers all the monosyllables in ζ declined imparisyllabically, except κίς and λίς. Choeroboscus’ claim that Herodian had noted elsewhere that the words κίς and λίς were aberrant, as regards either their accent or their declension, suggests that Herodian had explained in one of his works that κίς and λίς are exceptions. Herodian might have indeed dealt with κίς and λίς somewhere in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας or in one of his other works, but might have not recalled doing this, and thus mentioned apologetically in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας that the rule on the genitive plural of imparisyllabic monosyllables ending in ζ did not account for κίς and λίς. So when Choeroboscus says, ‘Since therefore he himself cited κίς and λίς as irregular either in their accent or their declension, how can he say that these contradict this rule...?’, he defends the correctness and validity of the rule.

It is now time to check the validity of K. E. A. Schmidt’s view as to whether Book 15 as we have it today was formed on the basis of Theodosius’ *Canones* and Choeroboscus’ commentary. To this end, I have created a table with the references to the parallel passages in Pseudo-Arcadius, Theodosius and Philoponus. I include Philoponus here because in assessing whether Pseudo-Arcadius derives Herodianic material from
Theodosius or Theodosius from Herodian in some form, one needs to take into account the other main witness to the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας as well. We shall try to work out whether the material which this part of Pseudo-Arcadius shares with Philoponus is also all in Theodosius (in which case the Herodianic material in this part of Pseudo-Arcadius could be derived from Theodosius) or whether the relationship between the three texts is something different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome</th>
<th>Theodosius’ Canones</th>
<th>Philoponus’ Epitome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146.11-147.1</td>
<td>GG iv.i 36.16-37.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.5-12</td>
<td>GG iv.i 37.4-7</td>
<td>10.20-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.15-148.8</td>
<td>GG iv.i 37.7-13</td>
<td>10.3-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.10-1</td>
<td>GG iv.i 37.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.10-150.7</td>
<td>GG iv.i 38.2-10</td>
<td>12.6-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.9-12</td>
<td>GG iv.i 38.12-3</td>
<td>13.8-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.19-151.14</td>
<td>GG iv.i 39.6-10</td>
<td>14.15-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.16-152.5</td>
<td>GG iv.i 39.12-7</td>
<td>15.1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.10-20</td>
<td>GG iv.i 39.19-40.5</td>
<td>15.22-16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.15-157.19</td>
<td>GG iv.i 40.10-41.21</td>
<td>16.23-19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.21-158.10</td>
<td>GG iv.i 41.23-42.3</td>
<td>20.5-11, 11.27-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.12-7</td>
<td>GG iv.i 42.5-8</td>
<td>20.15-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theodosius’ text is closer to our Epitome than to Philoponus. It is, however, unlikely for two reasons that Book 15 goes back to Theodosius’ Canones. Firstly, the section on the accentuation of the oblique cases is more extensive in the two epitomes than in Theodosius. Secondly, there are similarities not only between Theodosius’ text and Book 15, but also between Theodosius’ text and Philoponus’ epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

---

144 The page and line numbers in this column refer to Schmidt’s edition.
There are not so many similarities in the wording of the accentuation rules between Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus but this is due to the fact that Philoponus has deviated from Herodian’s original, as the comparison with the other main sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας has shown. There are, however, common examples between Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus that are not shared by Theodosius, something which I regard as a strong indication (and in fact stronger than the similarities in the wording of the rules) in favour of the view that the three texts share a common Herodianic source without the section in Pseudo-Arcadius having Theodosius as an intermediate source. List (1) contains the common examples between Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus that are not also in Theodosius’ section on the accentuation of the oblique cases, which follows Theodosius’ treatment of the inflection:

(1) ἀνδρός, πατρός, μητρός (Ps.-Arc. 147.6-7, Philop. 10.22); μηνός (Ps.-Arc. 147.16, Philop. 10.4); γυναῖκε (Ps.-Arc. 150.21, Philop. 14.18); Ὀμήρω (Ps.-Arc. 151.9, Philop. 14.35); καλό (Ps.-Arc. 151.10, Philop. 14.34); ἀνθρωπός ἀνθρωποί (Ps.-Arc. 152.14, Philop. 15.32-3); εὐσεβέων εὐσεβῶν (Ps.-Arc. 156.20, Philop. 16.29-30); χρυσῶν (Ps.-Arc. 157.6, Philop. 16.35), καλοί καλῶν (Ps.-Arc. 157.6, Philop. 16.34); σοφοί σοφῶν (Ps.-Arc. 157.5-6, Philop. 16.35); τάλανες ταλάνων τάλαιναι ταλαινῶν (Ps.-Arc. 155.11, Philop. 17.13-4); πόρναι πόρνων πόρνα πορνών (Ps.-Arc. 155.15-6, Philop. 17.30, 17.27); πέτραι πετρῶν (Ps.-Arc. 155.17-8, Philop. 17.27); Αὐγάντες Αὐγάντων (Ps.-Arc. 155.26 - 156.1, Philop. 19.5-6); κανών (Ps.-Arc. 157.15, Philop. 19.28); σοφοίς (Ps.-Arc. 157.23, Philop. 20.7); ταχεῖς (Ps.-Arc. 158.15, Philop. 20.17).

It should be noted that apart from above cases, there are also cases where Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus, when mentioning that the accent of a certain grammatical case is associated with the accent of another case, cite the other case as well, differently from

145 See the section on Philoponus’ Epitome (pp. 43-7), the palimpsest (pp. 47-51), and the parchment (pp. 51-5).
146 The page and line numbers of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome in this list refer to Schmidt’s edition.
147 Ὀμήρω at Dindorf 14.35 is a typographical error. The intended reading is Ὀμήρω.
Theodosius, who only mentions the case under examination. In addition to this, in some cases Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus cite both the contracted and uncontracted form of a word, while Theodosius cites only one. Examples of these two groups of cases are shown in lists (2) and (3) respectively:

(2) νύς ἕιος νύς (Ps.-Arc. 148.2\textsuperscript{148}, Philop. 10.11), ἕιος νύς (Theod. 37.9); χρυσοῦς χρυσόι (Ps.-Arc. 152.15, Philop. 15.34), χρυσόι (Theod. 40.1); φίλοι φίλων (Ps.-Arc. 157.9, Philop. 17.9), φίλων (Theod. 40.20); Αἰνείας Αἰνειῶν (Ps.-Arc. 154.24, Philop. 17.1), Αἰνειῶν (Theod. 40.13); χλούναι χλούνων (Ps.-Arc. 154.24, Philop. 17.2), χλούνων (Theod. 40.14); ἀφύαι ἀφύων (Ps.-Arc. 155.1, Philop. 17.4-5), ἀφύων (Theod. 40.15); Δημοσθένεας Δημοσθενέων (Ps.-Arc. 156.18-9, Philop. 19.15), Δημοσθενέων (Theod. 41.12).

(3) Δημοσθένεες Δημοσθενεως Δημοσθενέων (Ps.-Arc. 156.18-9 (Schmidt)), Δημοσθένες Δημοσθενέων (Philop. 19.15), Δημοσθενέων (Theod. 41.12).

There is a further argument suggesting that Theodosius’ section on the accentuation of the oblique cases and the epitomator’s section go back to Herodian independently of one another. This argument is based on a comparison of the words cited as examples in the section on inflection and the section on accentuation in Theodosius’ Canones (GG iv.i 3.2 – 36.12 and 36.14 – 42.8 respectively).

The first list (i) below shows the words that appear as examples both in the section on inflection and on accentuation, while the second (ii) the examples cited only in the section on accentuation. The comparison of the two lists shows that the majority of the words in Theodosius’ section on accentuation are not also in his section on inflection, although one would normally expect the grammarian to have used the same examples. Furthermore, the examples cited in the section on accentuation are often uncommon.

\textsuperscript{148} The page and line numbers of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome in this list refer to Schmidt’s edition.
Examples such as ῥαος, χλούνων, αὐθάρακι, αὔλιμολα, πολυσαταγι, μελίκρατι μελικράτι, ἀβλήτος ἀβλήτα, λίν, θέου, εἰνατερ, δαύρον, κάνεον (κανοῦν), κάνεα (κανά), θώων, χλούνων, αὐθάρακι are not words of everyday vocabulary. This observation suggests that Theodosius did not cite the above examples from memory. If it can be proved that the same set of examples is employed by other Herodianic sources, this will strengthen the likelihood that Theodosius does not cite these examples from memory, and will suggest that Theodosius derives the material on the accentuation of the oblique cases from a Herodianic source.

(i) Αἰαντος 3.4, 3.6, 3.8 / 36.19; ἔρωτος 3.8, 6.5, 15.16 / 36.19, 37.16; ταχέος 32.16, 32.17 / 36.20, 42.6; κρέατος 35.9, 35.11 / 36.21; Αδωνίδος 9.14 / 37.1; μάντεως 10.9 / 37.3; μάντιος 10.8 / 37.3, 38.4; μιτέρος 29.20, 29.21 / 37.4; θυγατέρος 29.21 / 37.5; πατέρος 23.23 / 37.5; γυναικός 26.15 / 37.6; θυγατρός 29.22 / 37.6; κέαρος 34.15, 34.19 / 37.9; εάρος 34.19 / 37.9; ἅρωτ 3.8 / 37.16; Δημήτερος 29.21 / 38.4; καλόν καλόν 32.15-6 / 38.4; Αιαντος 3.10, 3.12 / 38.13; εὐγενές 32.16 / 38.13; ἀνερ 18.3 / 38.15; πάτερ 18.3 / 38.15; σώτερ 18.3 / 38.15; δάερ 18.3 / 38.15; Αἰαντες 4.1, 4.5 / 39.8; Πέρσος 5.11 / 39.10; τειχοῖν 35.28 / 39.16; Αιαντες 4.7 / 39.20; Πέρσος 5.19 / 40.2; τείχεα 36.1, 36.3 / 40.7; φῶτα 36.11, 36.12 / 40.7, 41.19; ὡτα 36.11, 36.12 / 40.7, 41.19; μουσῶν 26.6 / 40.15; Δημοσθενέων 8.1 / 41.12; ὡτα ὡτῶν 36.11 / 41.19; φῶτα φῶτων 36.11 / 41.19; τειχέων 36.1 / 41.20; πατράσι 30.5 / 42.2; θυγατράσι 30.5 / 42.2; βέλεα 33.9 / 42.7; μοῦσας 5.19, 26.10 / 42.7;

(ii) χάριτος 36.19; ἄνερος 36.19, 37.6; Αχιλλέος 36.20; εὐγενέος 36.21; φιλήματος 36.23; Ὠμῆρος 37.1, 38.5; πόλεως 37.3; πολίος 37.3; μᾶς 37.6; ῥαος 37.8, 37.16; γραώς 37.8, 37.16; λάος 37.8; νόοι ἐκ τῆς νοος 37.9; κήρος 37.9; ῥος 37.9; Θόνος Θόνος 37.10; Ὠπος 37.10; χρινί 37.16; γραφέος 37.16; Τυνδάρεως Τυνδάρεως Τυνδάρεως 37.18-9; νήροεινι 37.20; πολυπάταγι 37.20-1; μελικρατι, μελικράτι 37.21; αβλήτος αβλήτα 38.3; λίμενος λιμένα 38.3-4; Δημήτερα 38.4; Διομήδεος Διομήδεα 38.4; μάντιν 38.5; Ὠμήρον 38.5; ὑγατερα 38.6; γυναικα 38.7; χρινί 38.7; παιδα 38.8; τίνα 38.8; κλείν 38.9; λίν 38.9; μύν 38.9; σύν 38.10; ζών 38.10; θεύν 38.10; Αχιλλευ 38.13; καλέ 38.13; λειώδες 38.14; ποιητά 38.14; δέσποτα 38.14; μητίται 38.14; ἀκάκιτα 38.15; εὐψότα 38.15; Διομήδες 38.17; Αριστόφανες 38.17; εὐμηκές 38.18; κακοκήθες 38.18; αὐθάδες 38.19; αὐταρκὲς 38.19; κάταντες 38.19; Δήμητερ 38.20; ὑγατερ θάνε 38.20; εἰνατερ 38.20; Αγαμέμνον 39.2;
A great number of the examples that are cited in Theodosius’ section on accentuation but not on inflection are included in Philoponus’ Epitome:

άνέρος (10.26), εὐγενεῖς (6.20), Ὄμηρος (5.9), πόλεως (5.11), μιᾶς (10.31), ίας (10.33), χηνός (10.4), λάος (10.5), κήρος (10.5), ἤρος (10.5), Θόνος (10.6), Θωνίος (10.7), Ὡπος (10.9), χηνί (4.11), διχόμενη (11.30-1), πολυτάτατη (11.30), Ὄμηρον (5.8), γυναίκα (12.12), κλεῖν (12.22), μῦν (12.22), καλέ (13.10), λειώδες (13.19), ποιήτη (13.20), δέσποτα (13.22), μητία (13.23), ἀσάκητα (13.23), Διώμηδες (13.31), αὐτάρκες (13.35), αὐθαίδες (13.35), Δήμητρα (14.4-5), θύγατερ (14.14), εἰνατερ (14.4), δαύδον (14.13), Λακεδαίμον (14.14), ἀμφότεροι (15.9), ἀμφοῖ (15.9), δυοίν (15.9), πάντων (15.14), παίδων (15.13-4), χρυσοί (15.34), ἡμεραί (17.25), ἡμερείς (16.7, 16.33, 17.26), κάνεν Κανον (9.11), κανά (19.27), μηνών (18.15), τίνων (11.9), πάντων (18.29), Τρώων (18.19), δύο (18.19), παιδών (18.23), θωϊν (18.22), δάδων (18.34), λάων (19.1), Αἰνείων (17.1), χλωύων (17.2), χρήστων (17.3), ἐτησίων (17.3), ἀφών (17.3), φίλων (17.9, 17.10), ταχεία ταχείων (17.15), πόροι πόρων (17.30), πόροι πορνών (17.27), πετρων (17.27), Δαναΐδες Δαναίδων (18.10), Δαναίδε Δαναίδων (18.10-1), δυσώδων (19.15), πόλεως (19.21), κουφών (39.8), ὡστά ὡστην (19.28), βελέων (19.32), μηνί μηνί (10.36), καλοίς (9.21), πάσι (11.4), ἄστρασι (12.5), πρόβασι (12.5), ἔγκασι (12.5), ταχέας (20.22).
The fact that Philoponus is later than Theodosius should not lead one to think that Philoponus derives material from Theodosius. Since Philoponus is writing an epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, it is more likely that Theodosius derived material from Herodian, the authority on accentuation, in some form when he was composing the section on the accentuation of the oblique cases.

It is remarkable that almost every example which is not quoted in Theodosius’ treatment of inflection, but is cited in his section on accentuation, appears in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome. This observation strengthens the likelihood that the material found in Theodosius’ section on accentuation goes back to Herodian, and that Theodosius derived the material either from the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας or from an epitome, which seems to have been close to ours. The following table contains the words that are not cited by Theodosius as examples of the inflection of nouns, but only in the section on the accentuation of the oblique cases, and which are almost always included in Book 15 of our Epitome:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theodosius: section on the accentuation</th>
<th>Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 36.20 ἀχιλλέος</td>
<td>146.16 ἀχιλλέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 36.23 φιλήματος, 40.8 φιλήματα</td>
<td>146.20, 153.12 φιλήματος; 153.13 φιλήματα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.1, 38.5 Ὥμηρον, 38.5 Ὥμηρον</td>
<td>146.21, 149.15, 151.9 Ὥμηρον, 167.18 Ὥμηρον 149.15 Ὥμηρον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.3 πόλιος, 37.3 πόλεως, 41.14 πόλεων, 37.17 πόλει, 39.8 πόλει</td>
<td>151.3 πόλεως, 151.3 πόλει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.6 μιάς</td>
<td>147.11 μιάς, 147.13 μιά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.7 ἢς</td>
<td>147.11 ἢς, 147.12 ἢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.8, 37.16 χηνός, 40.11 χηνῶν, 37.16 χηνί, 38.7 χῆνα</td>
<td>153.17 χηνῶν, 153.16 χῆνες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.8, 37.16 γραιός</td>
<td>147.16 γραιός, 150.6 γραῦν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.1 37.20 διχόμην</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149 The page and line numbers in this column refer to Schmidt’s edition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GG iv.i 37.20 πολυπάταγι</th>
<th>148.18-9 πολυπάταγι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG iv.i 37.21 μελικράτι, 37.21 μελικράς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GG iv.i 38.3 ἀβλήτος, 26.11 ἀβλής, 38.3 ἀβλήτα, 39.20 ἀβλήτες | 149.12 ἀβλήτος, 149.12, 150.20 ἀβλήτα, 150.20 ἀβλήτε 
| GG iv.i 38.4 Διομήδεος, 38.4 Διομήδεα, 38.17 Διομήδες | 149.12-3, 199.18 Διομήδεος, 199.18 Διομήδεα, 149.13 Διομήδεα |
| GG iv.i 38.8 τίνα | 149.21, 163.1 τίνα |
| GG iv.i 38.9 κλεῖν | 150.7 κλεῖν |
| GG iv.i 38.9 λίν | 150.6 λίν |
| GG iv.i 38.10 σῦν | 150.5 σῦν, 154.17 σὺς σὺών |
| GG iv.i 38.9 ζών | |
| GG iv.i 38.14 ποιητῆς ποιητα | 151.18 ποιητά ποιηταῖν |
| GG iv.i 39.10 ἁμέρω, δύω | 151.14 ἄμερω, δύο |
| GG iv.i 40.1 πλησίοι | 152.12 πλησίοι |
| GG iv.i 40.3 ἡμεραί, 40.4 ἡμεραι | 153.1 ἡμεροί, ἡμεραί |
| GG iv.i 40.8 κέρατα | 157.17 κέρατα |
| GG iv.i 40.11 μηνῶν, 41.24 μηνή, μησί | 147.16 μηνῶς, 150.2 μῆνα, 153.17 μήνες μηνῶν |
| GG iv.i 38.8 τίνα | 149.21 τίνα, 153.22-3 τίνες τίνων |
| GG iv.i 40.11 πάντων | 152.4, 153.23, 154.19 πάντων |
| GG iv.i 40.11 Τρώων | 153.22, 154.9 Τρώων |
| GG iv.i 40.12 δίων | 153.25, 154.9 δίων |
| GG iv.i 40.12 παίδων | 152.5, 153.23, 154.18 παίδων |
| GG iv.i 40.12 θώων | 153.24 θώων |
| GG iv.i 40.12 κράτων | 153.24 κράτων |
| GG iv.i 40.12 δάδων | 153.24 δάδων |
| GG iv.i 40.12 Λάων | 153.25 Λάων |
| GG iv.i 40.13 τοξότων, but in the section on declension: 5.17 τοξότα, 6.19 toξότα | 154.23 τοξότα τοξότων, 152.17-8 τοξότης τοξότα |
| GG iv.i 40.13 Αἰνεῖων, but in the section on declension: 4.21 Αἰνεία | 154.24 Αἰνεῖα, 151.17 Αἰνεία Αἰνείαιν |
| GG iv.i 40.14 χλούνων | 154.24 χλούναι χλούνων; also in other sections apart from Book 15: 45.13 χλούνης |
| GG iv.i 40.14 χρήστων | 154.25 χρήστων |
| GG iv.i 40.14 ἐτησίων | 154.25 ἐτησίων |
| GG iv.i 40.15 ἄελλων, 39.10 ἄελλης ἄελλα, 40.2 ἄελλα, but in the section on declension: 25.7 ἄελλα ἄελλης | 154.27 ἄελλαι ἄελλων, 147.1 ἄελλαι, 151.9 ἄελλης ἄελλα, 152.18 ἄελλα ἄελλα, 157.23-4 ἄελλα ἄελλαι, also in other sections apart from Book 15: 110.11 ἄελλα |
| GG iv.i 40.15 ἄφυων | 155.1 ἄφυων |
| GG iv.i 40.18 Ροδίων (masculine and feminine genitive plural) | 155.4 Ροδίων (masculine and feminine genitive plural) |
| GG iv.i 40.19, 41.18 δούλων | 157.3 δούλων |
The above pieces of evidence lead us to three main conclusions. Firstly, the fact that all three texts have a common core suggests that they all derive ultimately from a Herodianic source. Furthermore, the fact that not all the examples cited in the three texts are shared, but each of the texts provides examples which do not appear in any of the other two, suggests that the three texts had as their source a text which was richer in examples, either the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικῆς or a more extensive epitome, and that in picking randomly from a large list the three authors ended up not always including the same examples. It is normally assumed that the epitomators had in their hands original Herodian, but nothing excludes the possibility that not even they had the original. Secondly, the fact that Philoponus and Pseudo-Arcadius’ sections share some material which is not also shared by Theodosius speaks against the derivation of the section in Pseudo-Arcadius from Theodosius, i.e. against Theodosius’ being an
intermediate source for the transmission of Herodianic material to Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15. Thirdly, the closeness of Theodosius’ section to the section in Pseudo-Arcadius is more likely to be due to Theodosius’ source being an epitome similar to Pseudo-Arcadius’, not necessarily identical with it. This point is strengthened by the fact that nearly all the examples appearing in Theodosius’ section on the accentuation of the oblique cases, and not in his section on the inflection, are shared by Pseudo-Arcadius.

We will now move on to examine the relationship between Book 15 of our Epitome and Choeroboscus’ commentary on Theodosius’ Canones, in order to check the second leg of K. E. A. Schmidt’s view, that is to say the idea that Book 15 was formed on the basis of Choeroboscus’ commentary on Theodosius’ Canones. The table below contains the citations of passages with similarities in wording and use of common examples between Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, Theodosius’ Canones, and Choeroboscus’ scholia to Theodosius Canones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome¹⁵⁰</th>
<th>Theodosius’ Canones</th>
<th>Choeroboscus’ scholia to Theodosius’ Canones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146.11 - 148.8</td>
<td>GG iv.i 36.16 - 37.4, 37.7-13</td>
<td>GG 362.3 - 363.19, 364.1-8, 364.26 - 365.8, 365.24-30, 367.25-37, 371.11 - 371.34, 373.4 - 373.19, 374.3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.10 - 149.8</td>
<td>GG iv.i 37.15-22</td>
<td>375.23-9, 376.7-15, 377.8-30, 378.3-12, 378.17-22, 379.1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.10 - 150.7</td>
<td>GG iv.i 38.2-10</td>
<td>379.15 - 380.3, 380.4-24, 381.20 - 382.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.9-17</td>
<td>GG iv.i 38.12-3</td>
<td>384.8-17, 385.7-8, 385.19-23, 386.29-34, 387.14-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.19-151.3, 151.4-6, 151.7-14</td>
<td>GG iv.i 39.6-10</td>
<td>396.16-8, 396.35 - 397.3, 397.3-7, 397.13-20, 398.5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 151.16-9, 151.20-5, 152.1-5 | GG iv.i 39.12-7      | 398.22-5, 399.27 - 400.3, 400.13-

¹⁵⁰ The page and line numbers in this column refer to Schmidt’s edition.
There are examples in common between Choeroboscus and Pseudo-Arcadius which are not found in Theodosius’ section on the accentuation of the oblique cases. Such is the case of the dative singular: the examples καλῶ, φωτί, μητρί, τινί are common to Pseudo-Arcadius (148.11, 148.11, 148.12, and 148.12 respectively)\(^{151}\) and Choeroboscus (375.25, 375.26, 375.26, 375.27) but are not in Theodosius. This suggests that Choeroboscus had consulted a source other than Theodosius, and that this source and Book 15 of our epitome share a common origin. The fact that Theodosius often does not cite examples that are common to Pseudo-Arcadius and Choeroboscus reinforces our earlier conclusion that Theodosius could not have been the source of Book 15 of our epitome. In the cases where common examples in Pseudo-Arcadius and Choeroboscus are missing from Theodosius, the latter cannot even be an intermediate stage in the transmission of Herodianic material to Choeroboscus.

In what follows, I will argue against the derivation of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15 from Choeroboscus on the basis of four arguments. Firstly, there are examples which Pseudo-Arcadius and another Herodianic source, Philoponus, share, but which is not also shared by Choeroboscus. These common examples provide the best evidence against the

---

\(^{151}\) The page and line numbers in the brackets refer to Schmidt’s edition.
derivation of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15 from Choerobuscus, but it is difficult to know whether they are enough to establish the point, and thus further evidence is needed. However, it should be noted that the absence of more than a few similarities between Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus, not shared by Choerobuscus, is to a large extent due to Philoponus’ very different arrangement of the material he took over from Herodian (in line with his very different arrangement of the material in other parts of his work).\textsuperscript{152} The list below shows the examples that are common to the sections on the accentuation of the oblique cases in Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus, which are not cited by Choerobuscus:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{τάλανες} & \quad \text{ταλάνων} \quad \text{ταλαινών} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} 155.11 \ (\text{Schmidt}), \ \text{Philop.} \ 17.13-4); \\
\text{λουτρόν} & \quad \text{λουτρά} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} 153.10-1 \ (\text{Schmidt}), \ \text{λουτρόν} \ \text{λουτροῦ} \ \text{λουτρῶν} \ (\text{Philop.} \ 16.26)
\end{align*}\]

Secondly, Choerobuscus, Philoponus and Pseudo-Arcadius share a substantial common core of examples, something which suggests that the three texts go back to a common Herodianic source:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{μηνός} & \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 147.16 \ (\text{Schmidt})\textsuperscript{153}, \ \text{Philop.} \ 10.4, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 126.36); \ \text{λάαος, κήρος,} \ \text{ήρος, ύτος, Θόνος} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 147.19-148.5, \ \text{Philop.} \ 10.5-11, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 372.2-23); \ \text{στάσι} \ \text{δούσι} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 158.2, \ \text{Philop.} \ 11.3, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 414.5); \ \text{αὐταρκεῖς, αὐθαδές} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 135.16-7, \ \text{Philop.} \ 13.35, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 394.4); \ \text{χειρόν} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 152.4-5, \ \text{Philop.} \ 15.11, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 321.23, \ 400.18); \ \text{εὐσεβῶν} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 156.20, \ \text{Philop.} \ 16.30, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 411.18-9); \ \text{εὐσεβέων} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 156.20, \ \text{Philop.} \ 19.6, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 411.19); \ \text{θυγατρῶν} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 156.2-3, \ \text{Philop.} \ 19.12, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 410.36-7); \ \text{κανῶν} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 157.15, \ \text{Philop.} \ 19.28, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 413.9); \ \text{φώτων} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 152.3, \ \text{Philop.} \ 19.30, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 361.16-7, \ 413.12, \ 413.29); \ \text{ταχεῖς} \ (\text{Ps.-Arc.} \ 158.15, \ \text{Philop.} \ 20.17, \ \text{Choerob.} \ 416.14, \ 416.20, \ 416.35)
\end{align*}\]

Thirdly, there are substantial similarities between Choerobuscus and Philoponus which are not also in Pseudo-Arcadius, to the extent that, if one is assuming that the

\textsuperscript{152} See the section on Philoponus’ Epitome pp. 43-7. \\
\textsuperscript{153} Pseudo-Arcadius’ page and line numbers in this list refer to Schmidt’s edition.
similarities between Pseudo-Arcadius and Choeroboscus are due to the fact that book 15 is formed on the basis of Choeroboscus, one would also have to assume that Choeroboscus is the basis for Philoponus (which cannot be true because Philoponus is earlier; but even if Philoponus was not earlier, one would not expect him to derive material from another work apart from the Περὶ καθολικῆς προοδής, which he is empirotomising in some form) or that Philoponus or something similar to Philoponus was the basis for Choeroboscus. This points in the direction of Choeroboscus’ deriving material from Herodian in some form. This view is reinforced by the fact that often the similarities between Choeroboscus and Philoponus are not in Theodosius, or at least are not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation.  

The list below includes the similarities between Philoponus and Choeroboscus:

λεώ, νεώ (Philop. 9.27, Choerob. 253.22, 374.21; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Μενέλεως, τοῦ Μενέλεω, τῶ Μενέλεω, τῶν Μενέλεων (Philop. 9.30, Choerob. 253.16-7; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Ζηνός (Philop. 10.4, Choerob. 261.25; not in Theodosius); Σιμούντος (Philop. 10.20, Choerob. 121.19-20; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Δημοσθένεος Ζωκράτεος (Philop. 10.16, Choerob. 374.29-30; Δημοσθένος only in Theodosius’ section on inflection, Ζωκράτεος not in Theodosius); Πάριδος (Philop. 10.16, Choerob. 368.14; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); εἰνάτερος (Philop. 10.25; Choerob. 262.18, 368.15, 389.16; εἰνάτερος not attested in Theodosius); στάντι (Philop. 11.3, Choerob. 378.26; not in Theodosius); ἦρι κήρι (Philop. 11.2, Choerob. 375.27, 378.6; not in Theodosius); δόντι (Philop. 11.3, Choerob. 378.23, 378.26; not in Theodosius); ἐφοσ (Philop. 11.16, Choerob. 326.32; not in Theodosius); ἀβλήτε, εὑσβεβεί (Philop. 11.18, Choerob. 375.27-8; not in Theodosius); Ξενοφῶντι (Philop. 11.19-20, Choerob. 375.28; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); στέσσοι γλαυφοῖσιν (quotation; Philop. 11.21, Choerob. 414.7; not in Theodosius); θηρεσί, κύνεσσοι (Philop. 11.24, Choerob. 414.22, 28; not in Theodosius); ποσί (Philop. 11.25, Choerob. 325.20; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation);  

154 In fact sometimes the examples are in Theodosius’ section on inflection, but I think that in the sections where Choeroboscus is commenting on the accentuation, one would expect him to derive material from Theodosius’ section on accentuation.
be complete convergence between the several epitomes of the cases in Choeroboscus. These examples, although not attested in any of the other epitomes; not in Theodosius; Πνευμάτων (Philop. 12.10, Choerob. 322.10; not in Theodosius); Αδώνιδα (Philop. 12.10, Choerob. 379.30-1; not in Theodosius); νοῦν (Philop. 12.22, Choerob. 379.26; not in Theodosius); χοῦν (Philop. 12.22, Choerob. 129.11, 238.1; not in Theodosius); βοῦν (Philop. 12.22, Choerob. 379.26, 383.4; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Ατρειδής Ατρειδήν (Philop. 12.25, Choerob. 383.2; not in Theodosius); ἴχθυν (Philop. 12.26, Choerob. 305.38, 383.5; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); ἦδω, αἰδῶ, ἦδα, αἰδὰ (Philop. 12.31-2, Choerob. 312.4; not in Theodosius); τὴν Κλείω (Philop. 12.33, Choerob. 383.25; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Λητόα (Philop. 12.35, Choerob. 308.24, 311.23; not in Theodosius); Απόλλων Ποσείδώ (Philop. 12.29-30 (Ἀπολλώ in Dindorf is a mistake), Choerob. 383.19-20; not in Theodosius); κυκέω (Philop. 12.30, Choerob. 284.33, 338.19-20; not in Theodosius); οἱ ἴχθυς τοὺς ἴχθυς (Philop. 13.4, Choerob. 417.1; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Δημόσθενες (Philop. 13.31, Choerob. 392.28-9; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Ἑκτορ, Νέστορ (Philop. 14.1, Choerob. 394.22; Ἑκτορ not in Theodosius; Νέστορ not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); Ἐμιτῆς Ἐμμά (Philop. 14.28, Choerob. 398.3; not in Theodosius); Απελλά (Philop. 14.28, Choerob. 399.9; not in Theodosius); Παρίδου (Philop. 15.18, Choerob. 400.25; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); γυναικοί (Philop. 15.20, Choerob. 400.19; not in Theodosius); θυγατροί (Philop. 15.20, Choerob. 400.20; not in Theodosius); Πάριδες (Philop. 15.25, Choerob. 234.26; not in Theodosius’ section on accentuation); βιοπλανές (Philop. 15.26, Choerob. 401.33; not in Theodosius); βιοπλανές ἄγρον ἀπ’ ἄγρου (quotation; Philop. 15.27, Choerob. 401.34; not in Theodosius); ποιούσαι (Philop. 17.18, Choerob. 403.8, 409.24); πεδῶν (Philop. 18.24, Choerob. 405.18; not in Theodosius); μάντεων (Philop. 19.8, Choerob. 412.18, 412.26; not in Theodosius); σφυρα σφυρών (Philop. 19.27, Choerob. 413.7-8; not in Theodosius); βελάων (Philop. 19.32-3, Choerob. 413.22); συκαὶ συκάς (Philop. 20.26, Choerob. 417.17; not in Theodosius).

In addition, there are two examples in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15 which are not cited in Choeroboscus. These examples, although not attested in any of the other epitomes of the Περι καθολικής προσωπίας, contradict the view that the section on the oblique cases in Book 15 was derived from Choeroboscus. One should not expect that there will be complete convergence between the several epitomes of the Περι καθολικής προσωπίας as regards the citation of examples. It should be kept in mind that the epitomators are selecting examples from large lists, and that the similarities between the
epitomes are the result of the epitomators’ random selection of common examples. It is also not surprising that there are only two examples which are in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15 but not in Choeroboscus, because Choeroboscus is writing an extensive commentary, and the great number of examples contained in his work suggests that he made an effort to collect as many examples as possible. The following are the examples that are in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 15 but not in Choeroboscus:

παχεί (148.13 Schmidt155); ἄγια (153.7).

In conclusion, the similarities between Choeroboscus and Pseudo-Arcadius, Pseudo-Arcadius and Philoponus, Philoponus and Choeroboscus, and the common core between all three, are all explained with the single and economical assumption that they all derive material from Herodian independently of one another. This explains why none of the three texts under examination includes all the examples of the other two texts.

Who is then the τεχνικός mentioned by both Pseudo-Arcadius and Choeroboscus? Is he Theodosius, as one would straightaway assume when reading Choeroboscus’ commentary on the Canones? The τεχνικός mentioned in Book 15 of our Epitome may be taken to be Herodian, not Theodosius. It is significant that the τεχνικός is mentioned in connection with πολυπάταγος and its change of declension in the dative; this example is missing from Theodosius. The fact that Choeroboscus did not name Herodian may be explained on the basis that Herodian was an authority on accentuation and was often cited as τεχνικός in grammatical works. Choeroboscus might have thought

155 All page and line numbers in this list refer to Schmidt’s edition.
that Herodian would be easily understood behind τεχνικός, although he uses the term τεχνικός for Theodosius in other instances.

In conclusion, on the basis of all the above evidence I take Pseudo-Arcadius’ section on the accentuation of the oblique cases to have belonged to the epitome from the beginning.

**Book 17**

According to the Table of Contents of our Epitome, Book 17 deals with the accent of compound verbs and participles. Towards the end of the section on verbs we read two interpolated sections. These two sections take up pages 199.4-200.20 in Schmidt’s edition. The first contains five general precepts on the accentuation of syllables and words (not verbs), and one rule on the transformation of unaspirated consonants to aspirated ones when an aspirated vowel follows. This section is clearly out of place in Book 17, and it is very difficult to know where it came from and why or how it was placed here. The second interpolated section, entitled ἔτι περὶ συνθέτων ὀνόματων (‘further on compound verbs’), contains a clumsy repetition of the accentuation rules on compound verbs which preceded, and could be the work of another epitomator or of a scribe.

**Book 18**

Book 18 deals with the accentuation of ‘articles’ (i.e. the article in our sense, and the relative pronoun) and prepositions. After the section on articles and prepositions, there is a section on the accentuation of prepositions in anastrophe. This last section was

---

156 On the discussion of the interpolated sections in Book 17 see also Galland (1882b), 29-30.
regarded by Galland as spurious. Lentz observed that the doctrine on anastrophe in Philoponus’ Epitome (26.13 – 28.19), which appears in the section on prepositions, accords with the doctrine on anastrophe which found its way from the Περὶ Ἡλιακῆς προσῳδίας to the Iliad scholia. Lentz considered it doubtful whether the doctrine on anastrophe found in Philoponus was originally in the section on prepositions or in the Appendix, but the coherence of the section on anastrophe with the rest of the section on prepositions did not suggest that the section on anastrophe had been relocated from elsewhere. Finally, Lentz considered it likely that anastrophe was dealt with twice in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, once in the section on prepositions and once in the Appendix, and thought that this would not have been annoying for the reader in such an extensive work, especially because Herodian would have added something new in the second treatment.

One could expect anastrophe of prepositions to be dealt with in the Appendix which treats the accentuation of words in sentences, since anastrophe involves a special accent for a special word order. Nevertheless, the fact that anastrophe of prepositions is also dealt with in the section on prepositions in Philoponus’ Epitome makes it quite likely that this was the original position of the corresponding section in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome. It is true, as Galland points out, that the arrangement of the material is not the same in the two epitomes, but the fact that anastrophe is dealt with in both epitomes

157 Galland (1882b), 30.
158 Lentz (1863), 113.
159 Lentz (1863), 113.
160 Lentz (1863), 113.
should not be overlooked. The difference between the two epitomes in the arrangement of the material reveals that at least one of the two epitomators deviates considerably from his source, but still it is significant that the layout of the section on prepositions (with the treatment of anastrophe in a self-contained section at the end) remains the same in both epitomes. Furthermore, nothing excludes the possibility that anastrophe of prepositions was dealt with twice in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας, both in the book on prepositions and in the Appendix, since it is related both to the accentuation of prepositions and to the accentuation of words in connected speech.

Book 19

Book 19 contains two separate sections on adverbs, but not all manuscripts transmit both. Manuscripts M, A, and C have both sections, while O and B have only the first one. O and B have the reading λείπει in the margin, at the point where the first section ends, and just before the second section in the other manuscripts, while M and A include the second section but have λείπει in the margin, at the point where the first section ends. In M λείπει (more specifically λεί) was subsequently deleted. The different and faint ink colour with which λείπει is deleted in M could suggest that λείπει was not deleted soon after being written, but possibly when the second section was added.

In addition to the above problem, another one arises from the fact that M has the following phrase between the two sections on adverbs: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ Θεοδοσίου, τὰ δὲ Ἡρωδιανοῦ οὖτως (‘and the above was by Theodosius, while Herodian’s work is as

161 For the counter-argument and the view that the section on the anastrophe of the prepositions should be attributed to some other grammarian see Galland (1882b), 30.

162 See also the argument in Lentz (1863), 113.
follows’), but this phrase is not found in A. It is easy to imagine that the scribe of A had seen this phrase and omitted it, realising that it would confuse a reader. Another problem with the manuscript tradition as regards this book is that although B and C are codices gemelli, they present this book in different ways. B has λείπει in the margin and omits the second section, while the exact opposite happens in C. One has to assume that either the second section was omitted in π, the common source of B and C, and λείπει was written in the margin and thus B reproduced it, while C added the second section from another source and thus did not write λείπει in the margin, or that π was like C, while the scribe of B omitted the second section and wrote λείπει, because he thought that the second section interrupted the first and did not belong to the text. The first hypothesis is more likely both because the picture in B is parallel to that in O, and because the scribe of C, Jacob Diassorinus, was a known forger of his time and could be thought to have added the second section in order to make his copy look more complete.\textsuperscript{163} Diassorinus’ intention to present a fuller copy than his source, without revealing any doubt as to the status of the second section, is also suggested by the fact that he does not write λείπει, unlike O, B, and more importantly A, which although based on a source with both sections, nevertheless has λείπει in the margin like its source, M.

The question that arises is whether both sections on adverbs go back to Herodian or just one of them. If we compare the two sections we observe that some of the adverbs they deal with are common to both, but these are grouped differently and the reason given for their accentuation differs (e.g. the examples δίς, τρίς 206.11, 207.18 and the

\textsuperscript{163} Cohn (1888), 141-3; see also Galland (1882a), 17.
In general, one would have to forgive repetitions in such a large work as the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσδίας. However, repetitions of this kind within the same section and with the features described above suggest that the two parts have an independent history. Galland’s comparison of the sections on adverbs in this Epitome with the corresponding portion in Philoponus’ Epitome (28.20 – 39.28) reveals that the arrangement of the material in the first section of our Epitome is similar to that of Philoponus, but this is not true for the second section in our Epitome.

For example, the order in which the following groups of adverbs appear is the same in the first section in Pseudo-Arcadius and in Philoponus: the monosyllabic adverbs, the πυσματικά, the monosyllabic adverbs with a δίχρονον, the monosyllables with η, and the adverbs with ω.

A possible explanation for the existence of the two sections could be that the second portion came from another source (another epitome?) and was incorporated into our Epitome, probably by a scribe who saw λείπει in the margin of his source and tried to fill the gap by adding a section on adverbs which he thought went back to Herodian. We cannot know with certainty at what stage this addition was made. The phrase καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ Θεοδοσίου, τὰ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸν οὕτως in M might prove crucial to our understanding. Lascaris, the scribe of M, probably wanted to indicate that the epitome he was copying from and which was attributed to Theodosius, was interrupted at the end of the first section on adverbs (207.7 Schmidt). Lascaris could have found λείπει in the margin of his source but wished to complete the text by adding material from a work that

164 The page and line numbers in brackets refer to Schmidt’s edition.
165 For a more detailed treatment of this argument see Galland (1882b), 32.
went back to Herodian, or at least a work that he thought went back to Herodian. This could also explain why we find λείπει deleted in M: Lascaris could have deleted λείπει after adding the second section.

In the face of these problems (but without access to M) Schmidt printed both sections, while Lentz at this point took as his basis the section on adverbs from the corresponding section in Philoponus’ Epitome. When I eventually edit Book 19 I plan to write λείπει at the end of section one and to print the second section as an appendix, since I consider that the παλαιὰ βίβλος, to which ultimately all the extant manuscripts go back, did not have the second section, and because the second section, unlike the first, cannot be considered parallel to the section on adverbs in Philoponus’ Epitome.

**Book 20**

Book 20 of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας presents two main problems. First of all it is found only in our Epitome and secondly it survives only in the manuscript Parisinus Graecus 2102 (C). Book 20 as transmitted in C contains four sections: (i) περὶ τῆς τῶν τόνων εὑρέσεως, καὶ τῶν σχημάτων αὐτῶν, καὶ περὶ χρόνων καὶ πνευμάτων (‘on the invention of the accents, on their forms, and on (vowel) quantities and breathings’, 211.5 – 216.2 Schmidt), (ii) περὶ προσῳδίων (‘on prosodies’, 216.3 – 217.11 Schmidt), (iii) περὶ χρόνων (‘on vowel quantities’, 217.12 – 222.10 Schmidt), and (iv) περὶ πνευμάτων (‘on breathings’, 222.11 – 227.6 Schmidt).

---

166 See also the argument in Galland (1882b), 33.
167 See footnote 97 above.
168 See also the discussion in Dyck (1993), 778. Previous scholars have argued that Book 20 is interpolated: Geppert (1873), 252; Galland (1882a), 17-8; Egenolff (1887), 6.
The scribe of C is Jacob Diassorinus, who must have noticed the absence of this book in his source and wanted to fill the gap.\textsuperscript{169} It is possible that he compiled the Book 20 we have himself or that he found it somewhere.\textsuperscript{170} It is unlikely that Diassorinus had found Book 20 in his source for the Epitome because, as will be shown in the chapter on the Manuscript Tradition, manuscript C is a codex \textit{gemellus} with \textit{Parisinus Graecus} 2603 (B), and the common source of B and C, π, goes back to a source, codex \textit{Matritensis} 4575 (M), which did not include Book 20. An indication in favour of this view is that there is no description of Book 20 in the Table of Contents of the epitome in C.\textsuperscript{171} Although Book 20 is not commemorated in the Table of Contents of C, something which suggests that its source did not have it, the scribe of C wrote the following heading before the Preface to the Epitome with Book 20 as well as Books 1-19 in mind:\textsuperscript{172}

\begin{quote}
Ἀρκαδίου περὶ τὸν υἱὸν τῶν ὁκτώ μερῶν τοῦ λόγου καὶ περὶ εὐφέσεως τῶν προσωπικῶν καὶ περὶ ἐγκλιτικῶν καὶ ἐγκλινομένων, ἐν ὧν καὶ περὶ πνευμάτων καὶ χρόνων\textsuperscript{173}
\end{quote}

A short passage in C, transmitted between the end of Book 19 and the beginning of Book 20, seems to be a join between material from two different sources, and therefore supports the point that the Book 20 we have did not originally belong with the rest of the Epitome:\textsuperscript{174}

\begin{quote}
καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῶν, διεξοδικῶς μὲν, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον ὦ γὰρ ἄλλως κατ’ ἐμὲ ὃν τ’ ἦν ὑπενθεόθαι τῷ τῷ μῆκος τῆς Ἡρώδιανοῦ πραγματείας ἐκφυγεῖν
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{169} Galland (1882a), 17; cf. Cohn (1888), 141-3.
\textsuperscript{170} See also Cohn (1888), 142-3.
\textsuperscript{171} Cf. Galland (1882a), 17-8 and Egenolff (1887), 6. See p. 108.
\textsuperscript{172} Cf. the discussion in Galland (1882a), 18.
\textsuperscript{173} See also the discussion of this phrase in the section on the authorship, pp. 58-9 and on the description of codex \textit{Parisinus Graecus} 2102, p. 154.
\textsuperscript{174} Cf. the discussion in Galland (1882a), 17-8.
βουλομένων 

A question that arises is whether the Book 20 contained in C was composed by Diassorinus or whether this scribe had another source apart from π.175

The section Περὶ προοδωμῶν is essentially the same text as we find in the Supplementa artis Dionysianae vetusta edited by Uhlig (GG i.i. 105-114).176 Lentz argued that the section Περὶ προοδωμῶν should not be considered a work of Herodian, because the author of this small treatise includes the πάθη in the prosodies, while Herodian did not.177

The extract entitled Περὶ πνευμάτων in Book 20 is a version of the treatise περὶ πνευμάτων which occurs in manuscripts Vaticanus Graecus 1370 (fol. 138-40), Palatinus Graecus 70 (fol. 249 verso - 251 verso)178, Marcianus Graecus 652 (fol. 170 verso – 172 verso), Baroccius 116 (fol. 50), Monacensis 284 (fol. 60 recto – 62 verso)179, and Coislinianus 176 (fol. 27 verso – 28 verso), as a supplement to the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius

---

175 For the view that Diassorinus composed Book twenty, the possibility that Diassorinus worked with Constantine Paleokappa on it or that the creator of Book twenty was Angelus Vergecius see Cohn (1888), 142-3.
176 See also the discussion on the interpolations in Book 20 by Hiller (1866), 29.
178 See also IRHT, but Uhlig (1883), LV-LVI mentions folios 247 recto – 248 recto.
179 As opposed to the catalogue of the library, the IRHT gives fol. 10-54, but I have not been able to examine the manuscript by autopsy.
Thrax.\(^\text{180}\) Closest to *Parisinus* 2102 are *Coislinianus* 176 and *Monacensis* 284.\(^\text{181}\) Furthermore, words whose breathings are commented on in the extract Περὶ πνευμάτων again occur as lemmata in a section of the so-called Λεξικόν τῆς γραμματικής published by Bachmann in his *Anecdota Graeca* (I 443.18 – 446.25).\(^\text{182}\) The section at 225.26 – 226.16 (Schmidt) is found in none of the above manuscripts, and the part from 226.24 (Schmidt) to the end is also completely different from anything found in the other manuscripts,\(^\text{183}\) but this does not include the lemmata of the Λεξικόν τῆς γραμματικής.

The Περὶ χρόνων is related to a section of the so-called Λεξικόν τῆς γραμματικής, published in Bachmann’s *Anecdota Graeca* (I 446.26 – 450.14).\(^\text{184}\) Certain examples whose vowel quantity is commented on in the Περὶ χρόνων appear as lemmata in the Λεξικόν τῆς γραμματικής, suggesting some relationship between the Περὶ χρόνων and the grammatical treatise which was the basis for the Λεξικόν τῆς γραμματικής.

Given the relationships between the sections of the Book 20 we have and other known treatises, Book 20 was certainly not composed by Diassorinus from scratch. He either took them over more or less as he found them in one or more sources apart from π, or he made his own compilation. But it would be wrong to treat the sections of Book 20 as having no history before Diassorinus.

---

\(^{180}\) For more details of the manuscripts see Uhlig (1883), LV-LVI, and for a discussion see Galland (1882c), 30-1; Egenolff (1887), 8-9.

\(^{181}\) Egenolff (1887), 9.

\(^{182}\) See Galland (1882c), 27.

\(^{183}\) Egenolff (1887), 9.

\(^{184}\) See Galland (1882c), 27.
Diassorinu may be thought to have added Book 20 in his copy in order to make it seem more complete. There are other indications in C which suggest that Diassorinus struggled to present his copy as fully as and close to the classical style as possible, and therefore the addition of Book 20 should not surprise us. Diassorinus almost always adds οἷον before the examples for the rules, and creates hyperbata in his attempt to imitate a classical style. When I edit the remaining books of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome I plan to print Book 20 as transmitted in C as an appendix.

The Appendix

The Appendix is not transmitted by any of the manuscripts. All the evidence we have for its existence is the Table of Contents preceding our Epitome. We are not even sure whether this was originally another book, standing alongside the other twenty comprising the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, or whether it was an appendix with some sort of special status, accompanying the twenty books. The way this section is presented in the Table of Contents suggests that it was probably an appendix, both because it is not named Book 21, and because its description –in a separate paragraph– follows the Table listing the other twenty books. For the purposes of this thesis, I will call this section ‘Appendix’, except when mentioning another scholar’s view that this section was Book 21. A general treatise on accents, as the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας is, would have been incomplete without this section that was dedicated to the accentuation of words in sentences.185

185 Cf. Lentz (1867-70), LVIII.
The Appendix dealt with the forms of words in connected speech. To this end, this section treated διαστολή and συναλοιφή and ‘all the other things that accompany reading’ (περὶ ... τῶν ἄλλων τῶν παρακολουθοῦντων τῇ ἀναγνώσει). In this context διαστολή indicates: (i) punctuation (see sch. Hom. II. 1.62-3a), (ii) word division (e.g. whether to read δι’ ἀσπίδεος or διὰ σπίδεος, see sch. Hom. II. 11.754a, 11.754b), and (iii) the separation of words which belong closely together in meaning but are not real compounds, a synonym for διάλυσις and παράθεσις (e.g. sch. Hom. II. 10.109 δουρὶ κλυτός).\(^{186}\) συναλοιφή is the connection between words which go together syntactically (e.g. sch. Hom. II. 12.446-7a2 πρυμνὸς παχύς).\(^{187}\) κράσις, ύφεν, and ἐκθλιψις are types of συναλοιφή.

In a part with this content it would be normal to expect a treatment of enclisis and anastrophe. I have dealt with the view that two sections on enclitics which are transmitted at the end of Book 15 could have been part of the Appendix in my treatment of ‘The sections on enclitics’ in the framework of Book 15, and with the possibility that the Appendix contained a treatment of prepositions in anastrophe in my treatment of Book 18.

d) Pseudo-Arcadius’ method of excerpting Herodian

In the preface to our epitome we learn why the epitomator created an abridgement of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας and how he excerpted Herodian. For discussion of these two issues see the Notes on the epitomator’s preface.

\(^{186}\) For a further discussion of the meaning of the word διαστολή see Lentz (1863), 113-4, from whom I have derived the examples in brackets.

\(^{187}\) For a further discussion of the meaning of the word συναλοιφή and examples see Lentz (1863), 114.
e) Grammatical terminology and concepts

This section will discuss the evidence for the range of meanings with which several terms are used in the Epitome. The treatment of the Terminology relating to syllables and concepts of syllable division (2) is discussed for the first time, while in my discussion of the terms βαρύτονος (1), προσηγορικόν (4), κύριον (5), ἐθνικά (6), and in my section entitled Indication of the genders a word has as a way of distinguishing between nouns, proper names, and adjectives (3), I will clarify how certain terms are used and how specific concepts are understood in the Epitome.

1. ‘Barytone’ and ‘Recessive’ words

The term βαρύτονος ‘barytone’ refers to words with no accent on the final syllable. Within this group of words there is a significant subset: words whose accent is as far from the end of the word as allowed by the limits on the position of the Greek accent, called ‘recessive’ in modern terminology. The term βαρύνειν / βαρύνεσθαι (βαρύτονος etc.; henceforth simply ‘βαρύτονος’) is used in our Epitome to refer both more broadly to words with no accent on the final syllable and more narrowly to recessive words. When βαρύτονος is used in its wider sense it is a cover term for different groups of non-final-syllable accented words: paroxytone, proparoxytone, and properispomenon. βαρύτονος as a cover term for the above groups does not coincide with our notion of recessiveness.

The following list shows cases where the term βαρύτονος is used as a cover term for non-final-syllable accented words: (1) 49.6-8 ποίησις, γνώσις, πράξις, φάνσις, μίανσις; (2) 117.16-7 βλέννος, θύννος, Κύννος, Δάτυννος, Ἀργυννος, τύραννος; (3)

188 See further Probert (forthcoming).
A glance at Pseudo-Arcadius makes it clear that βαρύτονος is more often used with reference to recessive words, but this first impression can be made more precise. In what follows I shall examine the extent to which the term βαρύτονος is reserved for recessive words in the Epitome, and the extent to which the Epitome provides evidence for a clear conception of the category ‘recessive’. I have done a TLG search of the terms βαρύτονος, προπαροξύτονος, παροξύτονος, προπερισπώμενος in the Epitome and have organised the collected material in four tables: (i) proparoxytone words with a light final syllable called βαρύτονος in the first column, and called προπαροξύτονος in the second column, (ii)
paroxytonte and properispomenon words of more than two syllables with a light final syllable called βαρύτονος in the first column, and called παροξύτονος / προπερισπώμενος in the second column, (iii) disyllabic words with the accent on the first syllable called βαρύτονος in the first column, and called παροξύτονος / προπερισπώμενος in the second column, and (iv) polysyllabic words with heavy final syllable and accent on the penultimate called βαρύτονος in the first column, and called παροξύτονος in the second column. Since the number of words exemplifying the several accentuation rules in the Epitome is random, I count the occurrences of the terms that are used with reference to the above-mentioned groups of words, not the number of examples with which each of the terms is exemplified.

The table below (i) shows how frequently words that have at least three syllables and a light final syllable are called ‘βαρύτονος’ in the first column, and ‘προπαροξύτονος’ in the second column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proparoxytone words with a light final syllable called ‘βαρύτονος’ etc.</th>
<th>Proparoxytone words with a light final syllable called ‘προπαροξύτονος’ etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (i) shows that proparoxytone words with a light final syllable are more often called προπαροξύτονος than βαρύτονος. Moreover, a comparison of the first column of this table with the list of cases where the term βαρύτονος is used as a cover term (for words not accented on the final syllable) shows that the term βαρύτονος is more often used to describe recessive words than as a cover term, something which suggests a notion of recessiveness. On the other hand none of the other terms (προπαροξύτονος, παροξύτονος etc.) is usable in relation to such lists of words. It would be premature to
conclude that βαρύτονος is the preferred term here because the instances covered are all recessive; a further comparison is needed.

In table (ii) below I have collected the occurrences of βαρύτονος and παροξύτονος / προπερισπώμενος with reference to non-recessive words of more than two syllables with the accent on the penultimate and a light final syllable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paroxytone and Properispomenon words of more than two syllables with a light final syllable called 'βαρύτονος' etc.</th>
<th>Paroxytone and Properispomenon words of more than two syllables with a light final syllable called 'παροξύτονος' or 'προπερισπώμενος' etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is striking that paroxytone and properispomenon words of more than two syllables with a light final syllable are almost never called βαρύτονος. Could it be the facts of the Greek language, rather than any ancient conception of recessiveness, which make βαρύτονος especially useful in relation to lists of recessive words? In order to answer this question we need to have more evidence.

Table (iii) below shows that disyllabic words with the accent on the first syllable are most frequently referred to with the term βαρύτονος. This suggests that βαρύτονος is used in its narrower sense, i.e. recessive, and that there is a tendency not to use παροξύτονος/προπερισπώμενος when βαρύτονος is sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disyllabic words with the accent on the first syllable called 'βαρύτονος' etc.</th>
<th>Disyllabic words with the accent on the first syllable called 'παροξύτονος' or 'προπερισπώμενος' etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indications for a notion of recessiveness in the use of the term βαρύτονος in the Epitome are reinforced by the greater frequency of the use of the term βαρύτονος
than παροξύτονος when referring to polysyllabic words with heavy final syllable and
accent on the penultimate, as illustrated in table (iv) below:\textsuperscript{189}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polysyllabic words with heavy final syllable and accent on the penultimate called βαρύτονος</th>
<th>Polysyllabic words with heavy final syllable and accent on the penultimate called παροξύτονος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further evidence that the term βαρύτονος is mostly used with a notion of
recessiveness derives from the passage below. The phrase βαρύνονται ὡς δισύλλαβα
with reference to disyllabic words with the accent on the first syllable differently from
proparoxytone words with three syllables almost suggests that disyllabic words are not
long enough to be proparoxytone, but since their accent is as far from the end of the word
they are recessive.

196.20-2 (Schmidt) Τὰ εἰς Αἱ ὑπερδισύλλαβα προστακτικὰ προπαροξύνονται ποίη-
σαι ἀσπασαι, τὸ δὲ λούσαι καὶ δέξαι καὶ κτῆσαι βαρύνονται ὡς δισύλλαβα.

The term βαρύτονος is also used in the Epitome for an oxytone word whose
accent has been turned into a grave in connected speech. This use only occurs in the two
sections on enclitics that are transmitted at the end of Book 15.\textsuperscript{190}

167.12-4 (Schmidt) Ἐπὶ καὶ αἱ ὄξυνόμεναι λέξεις, βαρυνόμεναι δὲ διὰ τὴν
συνέπειαν, ἐγκλιτικοῦ ἐπιφερομένου τὴν βαρείαν ἐγείρουσιν αὐτός, αὐτός μοι.

160.20-3 (Schmidt) πάσα λέξις ὀξύτονος πολλάκις ἐν τῇ συνθέσει κομίζει τὴν
ὀξείαν εἰς βαρείαν, χωρὶς τοῦ τίς, οἶον Ζεὺς Ζεὺς δὲ· καλὸς καλὸς ἀνθρώπος·
σοφὸς σοφὸς ἀνήρ.

The above observations lead us to conclude that the term βαρύτονος in the
Epitome, in addition to being usable in its wide sense ‘having no accent on the final

\textsuperscript{189} All page and line numbers in this table refer to Schmidt’s edition.

\textsuperscript{190} See the discussion of Book 15, pp. 64-102.
syllable' is also employed to refer to a subset of barytone words whose accent is as far from the end of the word as allowed by the limits on the position of the Greek accent, i.e. to recessive words. However, despite this awareness of the category of recessives, the lack of a special term to refer to recessive words exclusively suggests that the category 'recessive' was conceived less clearly than it is today.

2. Terminology relating to syllables and concepts of syllable division

Syllables in ancient grammar are grouped into three categories: (i) long by nature (φύσει μακρά): a syllable containing a long vowel or a diphthong, (ii) long by position (θέσει μακρά): a syllable containing a vowel (most often a short vowel) in a closed syllable (i.e. the vowel is followed by a consonant belonging to the same syllable), and (iii) short (βραχεία): a syllable containing a short vowel in an open syllable (i.e. the vowel is not followed by a consonant belonging to the same syllable). Modern linguistic terminology uses the terms long and short with reference to vowel lengths, and names syllables light and heavy. A syllable is light if it contains a short vowel and is an open syllable. A syllable is heavy if its vowel is long, or if it is a closed syllable (either a long or short vowel followed by a consonant belonging to the same syllable), or both.

Usually in our Epitome a distinction is made between vowels that are long by nature and those that are long by position, with the use of the terms φύσει and ἐκτεινόμενοι (ἐκτείνον) or θέσει respectively. It is noteworthy that the general term μακράν is used in 74.1, 90.5, 100.6, 101.7, 104.6, 106.8, 132.4, 110.2 (Schmidt), 125.1 (Schmidt), 221.17 (Schmidt) to refer both to ('naturally') long vowels (e.g. Μούλιος) and to short vowels in closed syllables (e.g. Σέργιος, Βάκχιος). When a long vowel appears in
a closed syllable there are no indications in the Epitome that a vowel could be considered long both by nature and by position.

Syllable division as taught by ancient grammarians is linked to the written language, while modern linguistic views on syllable division are related to the rhythm of the language and are heavily based on evidence from metre. An ancient grammarian would say that two consecutive consonants in the middle of a word belong to the second syllable if this cluster could be word-initial. Otherwise the two consonants belong to two different syllables. From a modern point of view, two consonants in the middle of a word are divided between syllables in all cases where the syllable containing the preceding vowel scans as a heavy syllable.

Our Epitome employs the terms ἐπιπλοκή, σύλληψις and διάστασις to indicate consonant clusters. ἐπιπλοκή and σύλληψις are used to refer to consonant clusters that belong to the same syllable, while διάστασις is used to refer to consonant clusters that do not belong to the same syllable in syllable division. For example, at 105.11-106.6 we read:

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὩΛΟΣ μονογενὴ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς προσαροζύνεται, εἰ μὴ Ἥχου πρὸ τοῦ Ὡ δύο σύμφωνα κατ’ ἐπιπλοκήν, ἀν τὸ δεύτερον ἔστι Τ, οίον [...] Καστολός δὲ οξύνεται ἢχον δύο σύμφωνα, ἰν τὸ ἐν Τ ἔστι. τὸ μέντοι Σπάρτωλος βαρύνεται τὰ γὰρ δύο σύμφωνα οὐκ εἰσίν ἐν συλλήψει, ἄλλ᾽ ἐν διαστάσει.

The consonant cluster στ in Καστολός belongs to the same syllable (κατ’ ἐπιπλοκήν) because it is a possible word-initial cluster (although from a modern point of

---

191 See further Morpurgo Davies (1987), 92-3, 100. For an account of the ancient grammarians’ views on syllable division see Hermann (1978), 123-132. For a modern discussion of syllabification of ancient Greek see Malikouti-Drachman (2007), 537-41.

192 See further Morpurgo Davies (1987), 92-3.
view the cluster is divided between syllables). The two consecutive consonants ρτ in Σπάρτωλος do not belong to the same syllable (they are ἐν διαστάσει), because the cluster ρτ is not word-initial.

The terminology on syllable division becomes obscure at times, when it is used in conjunction with specifications as to the place of the consonant cluster within a word. The passage below presents a number of problems which make its understanding difficult. The first problem is that the phrase μὴ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ δύο σύμφωνα κατὰ διάστασιν corresponds neither to αἴτιος nor to ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκιος, ἀρτιος, and ἀντίος. αἴτιος does not have a consonant cluster, while ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκιος, ἀρτιος, and ἀντίος have two consonants κατὰ διάστασιν (‘in separation’). The other problem is the inaccuracy of the phrase ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ. We shall deal with this problem here, while the first problem will be dealt with in the Notes.

In the passage above, it is clear that the consonant clusters ρμ, ρκ, and ρτ, in the words ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκιος, and ἀρτιος respectively, are said to be κατὰ διάστασιν (ἀρ-μό-δι-ος, ἀρ-κι-ος, ἀρ-τι-ος). The rule mentions that the two consonants κατὰ διάστασιν are in the third syllable (ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ). The phrase ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ is not an accurate description of the place of the two consonants within the word, since ρ is in the fourth syllable from the end, or the first from the beginning, in the case of ἀρμόδιος, and in the third syllable from the end, or the first from the beginning, in the cases of ἀρκιος and

On the consonant cluster στ see further Morpurgo Davies (1987), 100, 102.

On the rest of the problems occurring in this passage see note 72.1-5.
ἄρτιος, while the μ in ἄρ-μό-δι-ος is in the third syllable from the end or the second from the beginning, and the κ or τ in ἄρ-κι-ος and ἄρ-τι-ος respectively is in the second syllable, counting from either end. Thus, ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ does not strictly mean in the third syllable (counting from either direction) but at the boundary either between the fourth and third syllables, or between the second and third syllables, counting from the end of the word.

The following passage provides another example of obscurity about the place of a consonant cluster within a word:

90.12-5 Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἔχοντα κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν δύο σύμφωνα μή ὄντα ἐπιθετικὰ προπαροξύνοντας Ἐρύμανθος λαβύρινθος Μέλανθος ὀλυνθος (τὸ μὴ πέπειου).

In the words cited as examples of this accentuation rule (Ἐρύμανθος λαβύρινθος Μέλανθος ὀλυνθος) the two consonants, i.e. -νθ-, are separated by a syllable boundary, so that ν is in the penultimate and θ in the final syllable (Ἐ-φύ-μαν-θος, λα-βύ-ὁ-νος, Μέ-λαν-θος, ὀ-λυ-ν-θος). Thus, the condition which prescribes that there should be two consonants in the penultimate syllable is not precise, because, in fact, the two consonants straddle the boundary between the penultimate and final syllable.

3. Indication of the genders that a word has as a way of distinguishing between nouns, proper names, and adjectives

Three-termination adjectives are indicated in the following ways: ἔχοντα θηλυκά / θηλυκά ἔχοντα (95.16-7, 102.5, 118.1, 147.8-9); ἔχοντα θηλυκά τριγενή (136.9); ἔχοντα θηλυκών γένος (115.4); εἰ παρασχηματίζοιτο εἰς διάφορα γένη (148.4-5); τριγενές / τριγενή (81.10, 88.1, 89.9, 89.13, 90.4, 91.13, 92.1, 96.7 (τριγενεία), 97.4, 98.17, 100.15, 106.6,
108.19, 109.2, 117.6, 120.5, 120.11, 121.12, 131.23, 133.6, 136.9, 137.5, 138.2, 138.8, 138.10, 138.22, 143.9, 146.3, 147.2, 151.6; ἐχοντα κατ’ ἰδιαν θηλυκά (133.14-5). In exclusions of three-termination adjectives from accentuation rules one can read ei μὴ ἐπιθετικά εἴη ἐχοντα θηλυκόν (147.8-9), or μὴ ἐχοντα κατ’ ἰδιαν θηλυκά (95.13), or μὴ ἐχοντα ἰδια θηλυκά (117.10).

Two-termination adjectives are described as ἐπιθετικά μὴ ἐχοντα κατ’ ἰδιαν θηλυκά (133.10-1). Two-termination adjectives and common nouns are described together as μὴ ἐχοντα ἰδια θηλυκά (101.13-102.1).

Masculine common nouns and proper names are described as follows: μὴ παρασχηματιζόμενα εἰς θηλυκόν γένος (91.7-8); ἀπαρασχηματιστά ὄντα θηλυκῶ γένει (117.15-6); μὴ ἐχοντα θηλυκά (137.2). One would have liked to know whether these descriptions would exclude a noun like θεός which has a feminine counterpart θεά, but the Epitome does not allow us to draw any conclusions.

Words that have only one grammatical form for the nominative singular (one ‘termination’) are referred to as μονογενη. This may apply to: (i) proper names (e.g. 90.18 Φῶκος, 90.18 Σῶκος, 91.21 Πλάκος, 97.1 Ἄλος, 101.2 Σθένελος, 106.1 Κίμωλος, 108.18 Σάμος, Ἀμος, 116.9 Κόθνος, 116.10 Πέφνος, Σίφνος, 117.6 Τύμνος, 120.4 Αὐαίνος, Κόλαινος, 130.1-2 Δώρος, Βάρος, Χλώρος, 138.5 Άνδρος, Κόδρος, Φαιδρός, 140.5 Ἰσος, Κίσος, Κρίσος, 143.8 Μέλισσος, 146.5 Στράτος, 147.16 Σηστός, 150.16-7 Ἁριτος, Λάμιτος, Μέλιτος), or (ii) common nouns (89.6-8 πτόρθος, γόνθος, γρόνθος, σμίνθος, 90.2-3 ψάμαθος, κύθνος, κάλαθος, λάπαθος, 90.19 ταύκος, 91.21 πόκος, τύκος, 97.2 πίλος, μύλος, στύλος, γρύλος, 97.15 αὐλός, δαυλός, καυλός, 101.2-3 ἄμπελος, πύελος,
κύψελος, ἀσφόδελος, 106.2 φάσκωλος, 108.18 γάμος, 116.9 ὄκνος, κύκνος, 116.10 ὑπνος, 117.6 ύμνος, σκύμνος, 120.4-5 αίνος, οίνος, σχοίνος, 120.8-10 καυνός, γλαυνός, βαυνός, κρουνός, βουνός, κεραυνός, 131.16 κόμαρος, 138.1-2 φάγρος, πάγρος, γόγγρος, 143.7 κυπάρισσος, νάρκισσος, 146.2 βάτος, λάτος, βρότος, 146.3-4 πότος, πάτος, 147.16-7 ἱστός, πιστός, μαστός, ξυστός, 150.17-8 βύνητος, τρύγητος, 151.2 ἄμητος). μονογενής cannot designate an adjective, unless the adjective is only used in a single grammatical gender (e.g. βροτολοιγός)\textsuperscript{195}. At 83.10 the term μονογενής is used to distinguish the noun θάμβος from the adjective θαμβός. The reference to ἁρμόδιος, ἄρκιος, ἄρτιος, and ἀντίος (72.1-5) as μονογενή is made difficult by the occurrence of a series of textual problems,\textsuperscript{196} but a possible explanation is that these words could be used as nouns, and this use is here being distinguished from their more obvious usage as adjectives.

A nominal form that has only one grammatical form (one termination) but is used in more than one gender, is called κοινὸν τῷ γένει.\textsuperscript{197} For example στρουθός in the following passage (88.4-89.3) indicates both the male sparrow (grammatically masculine) and the female sparrow (grammatically feminine):

Τὰ ἐἰς ἩΘΟΣ μονογενὴς δισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ παραλήγοντα μή κοινὰ κατὰ γένος βαρύνεται. μύδα τὸ γένος σήμου κόως Ζήθος Ζεύτος (τὸ κύριον). τὸ δὲ στρουθός κοινὸν τῷ γένει.

\textsuperscript{195} See also the note 85.9-13 ἀρσενικὰ ... βροτολοιγός.
\textsuperscript{196} See the note 72.1-5 Ὄσα ... σεσημεῖοται.
\textsuperscript{197} On the meaning of κοινὸς cf. the individual discussion of κοινός, κοινῶς p. 130 below.
Thus, although στρουθός has one grammatical form in the nominative singular, i.e. it is μονογενές, and is cited in a rule on μονογενη, it is also κοινὸν κατὰ γένος, because the single grammatical form indicates both the male and female sparrow.

4. προσηγορικόν

The term προσηγορικόν is usually used to refer to common nouns in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, but there are some cases where προσηγορικόν is used more loosely with the meaning ‘nominal’, in other words covering adjectives as well. The passages below illustrate this wider sense of the term προσηγορικόν.

If the term προσηγορικά were used to refer only to common nouns in passage (1) below, the comment μὴ ἔχοντα κατ’ ἱδίαν θηλυκά (‘that do not have a separate feminine form’) would make no sense. The point of the comment would seem to be to exclude three-termination adjectives but not two-termination adjectives; but the exclusion of three-termination adjectives would be unnecessary if adjectives were already excluded by the specification κύρια ἡ προσηγορικά. What reinforces this view are the words Λιβυκός θηλυκός and ἁλυκός, three-termination adjectives given as examples of words not fulfilling the condition μὴ ἔχοντα κατ’ ἱδίαν θηλυκά.

(1) 95.12-7 Τὰ εἰς ΥΚΩΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα κύρια ἡ προσηγορικά μὴ ἔχοντα κατ’ ἱδίαν θηλυκά κτητικῆς ἐννοίας ἐχόμενα βαρόνεται: Ἡβυκός Ἀμυκός κώρυκος Ἰνυκός. τὸ δὲ Λιβυκός καὶ θηλυκός καὶ ἁλυκός ὀξύνεται θηλυκά ἔχοντα. (‘Proper names or προσηγορικά in -υκός that do not have a separate feminine form and do not have a possessive sense are recessive: Ἡβυκός Ἀμυκός κώρυκος Ἰνυκός. But Λιβυκός and θηλυκός and ἁλυκός are oxytone because they have separate feminine forms’)

Passage (2) reinforces the above argument. If the term προσηγορικόν did not include adjectives, the comment μὴ ἔχοντα ἱδια θηλυκά (‘that do not have a separate
feminine form’) would be left unexplained. The mention of the adjective ἐρεμινός not being proparoxytone because it has the feminine form ἐρεμινή, without any earlier mention that the rule applies to adjectives but with the previous mention of προσηγορικά, strongly suggests that adjectives are here considered a sub-group within the larger set of προσηγορικά (‘nominals’).

(2) 117.9-14 Τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα κύρια ἢ προσηγορικά μὴ ἔχοντα ίδια θηλυκά, προσαρασχηματισμένα: Λάτυμνος Λύκαμνος Ἐπίδαμνος Αἴσυμνος. τὸ μέντοι ἐρεμινός ἔχει θηλυκόν τὸ ἐρεμινῆ, ὀσπερ καὶ τὸ ἐρυμινός (ὁ κεκαλυμμένος). (‘Proper names and προσηγορικά with more than two syllables in –νος, that do not have a separate feminine form are proparoxytone: Λάτυμνος Λύκαμνος Ἐπίδαμνος Αἴσυμνος. But ἐρεμινός has the feminine form ἐρεμινή, just like ἐρυμινός (‘covered’).’)

The same conclusion about the wide sense of προσηγορικόν as ‘nominal’ can be derived from passage (3), where the remark μὴ παρασχηματισμένα εἰς θηλυκόν γένος (‘if they do not undergo a transformation of form for the feminine’) following προσηγορικόν would be unnecessary if προσηγορικόν simply meant ‘common noun’.

(3) 91.7-11 Τὰ εἰς ΚΟΣ δισύλλαβα προσηγορικά μὴ παρασχηματισμένα εἰς θηλυκόν γένος, εἰ ἔχω τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς σύμφωνον καταλήγουσαν, πλὴν τοῦ Λ, βαρύνεται: λάκκος κόκκος ἀρκος κέρκος ὄρκος. (‘Disyllabic προσηγορικά in –κος that do not undergo a transformation in form for the feminine, if their penultimate syllable ends in a consonant, except for λ, are recessive: λάκκος κόκκος ἀρκος κέρκος ὄρκος.’)

In passage (4) the adjective κορωνός is called προσηγορικόν:

(4) 125.3-4 τὸ δὲ Κόρωνος κύριον, τὸ δὲ κορονός προσηγορικὸν. (‘Κόρωνος is a proper name, but κορωνός is a προσηγορικόν’)

In passage (5) the term προσηγορικόν is used to refer to deverbal adjectives (on the problem with βρυτός (ὁ βρύων) see Note 147.4):

(5) 147.3-5 Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα παρασχηματισμένα τῷ Υ προσηγορικά ὀξύνεται: βρυτός (ὁ βρύων) χυτός ὄντος λυτός κλυτός. (‘Disyllabic προσηγορικά in –τος that
have a in their penultimate syllable are oxytone: βρυτός (’the one who is full’) χυτός ὁυτός λυτός κυτός.

5. κύριον

Several categories of proper names are described as κύρια in the Epitome, but they all fall into two large groups: (a) personal names and (b) place names.

The term κύριον used to refer to place names contains several sub-groups: (i) city names (28.8 Αστήρ, 50.4 Αδάμας, 87.15 Άθικος, 112.8 Πέργαμος, 117.12 Έπιδαμνος, 118.7 Τάνος, 123.14 Εσχίνος, 127.5 Ωρωπός, 136.13 Αψώρος, 155.2 Πάφος, 119.14 (Schmidt) Βοίβη, 119.22 (Schmidt) Βέργη, 119.22 (Schmidt) Σέληνη, 119.22 (Schmidt) Πέργη, 121.7 (Schmidt) Νέδη, 122.16 (Schmidt) Αρτάκη, 122.16 (Schmidt) Σκυλάκη, 129.16 (Schmidt) Δωδώνη, 132.10 (Schmidt) Σπάρτη, 132.18 (Schmidt) Τράβη, 137.19 (Schmidt) Ίλιον, 137.19 (Schmidt) Ρήγιον, 139.7 (Schmidt) Βούδειον; (ii) island names (8.5, 52.27 Σαλαμίς, 55.6 Μάκρις, 83.9 Λέσβος, 85.13 Αμοργος, 97.7 Μήλος, 97.8 Δήλος, 119.2 Τήνος, 127.16 Πάφος, 129.15 Σκύρος, 122.16 (Schmidt) Θάκη, 124.10 (Schmidt) Θεύλη, 133.4 (Schmidt) Ανάψη, 139.7 (Schmidt) Σύροιον); (iii) mountain names (75.10 Αθοος, 117.11 Λάτυμνος, 132.10 (Schmidt) Δίκτη); (iv) river names (80.13 Πηνειός, 80.21 Όλμειός, 81.1 Σπερχείως, 112.2 Πύραμος, 115.7 Κύδνος, 119.2 Ρήνος, 127.4 Ίασπός, 127.5 Ασωτός, 127.16 Σάρος, 127.20 Σήλος, 128.7 Πίρος, 128.7 Τίρος, 139.12 Χάραδρος, 145.9 Κλήτος, 150.16 Λάμπτος).

Such place names are sometimes cited with an indication of the exact group of proper name to which they belong: e.g. island names (111.12-3 (Schmidt) Πεννούσα

198 But see Note on 147.4 βρυτός.
Ῥοδούσσα (ὀνόματα νήσων)), names of δήμου (‘subdivisions of a πόλις’ 113.5-6 (Schmidt) τὸ δὲ Κηφισιά καὶ ῶσιά καὶ Λουσιά ὀνόματα δήμων, 125.17-8 (Schmidt) τὸ μέντοι Αγκυλή καὶ Αγρυλή ὀνόματα δήμων ὄξυνονται, 131.1-2 (Schmidt) ὄξυνονται καὶ τὰ τῶν δήμων ὀνόματα Βησσή καὶ Περγασή), names of regions (113.17-8 (Schmidt) ὀνόματα χωρῶν· Ὀιχαλία Θεσσαλία).

Two passages, furthermore, suggest that the term κύριον as a cover term for proper nouns is not considered to identify a word as a specific type of proper noun, especially when it is a place name. At 91.22-3 Φάκος δὲ τὸ κύριον ὄνομα ὅρους τὸ κύριον is completed by the information that Φάκος is the name of a mountain. At 81.4-7 πλείω ὀνόματα ποταμῶν is added to the term κύρια in order to specify to which kind of proper noun the majority of examples belong:

81.4-7 Τὰ εἰς ΕΙΟΣ τρισύλλαβα κύρια καὶ τὰ πλείω ὀνόματα ποταμῶν ὄξυνονται· Σπερχείος Αλφείος Πηνειός Κητείος Ἐπειός. τὸ δὲ Ἀρνείος καὶ Δαρείος προπερισπώνται.

6. Are ἔθνικά included among the adjectives or proper names?

The passages below help to show that ethnic designations are not considered a category of proper names:

(1) 68.5-8 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΔΙΟΣ προπαροξύνονται, εἰ μὴ τρισύλλαβα ὄντα τριβράχεα εὐφρεθοί, καὶ παροξύνονται πρὸς διαστολὴν κυρίων καὶ ἐπιθέτων, ὅσπερ ἔχει τὸ Ῥοδίσ καὶ Σχεδίος. (‘Words ending in –διος are proparoxytone, unless, being trisyllabic, they have three short syllables, and they are paroxytone so that there is a distinction between proper names and adjectives, as in Ῥοδίσ and Σχεδίος.’)

(2) 144.12-145.7 Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΥ ἢ ΟΙ ἢ ΑΙ διφθόγγω, μή τῇ ΕΙ, ἀρσενικά ὄντα μὴ ἐπιθετικά βαριόνεται, εἰ μὴ μέρος σώματος σημαινον πλοῦτος οἴτος κοίτος Προίτος γοῖτος (ὁ ὦπος) Λαῖτος βρούτος. τὸ δὲ Κλειτός ἔχει τὴν ΕΙ καὶ τὸ γλουτὸς μέρος σώματος δηλοῦ καὶ τὸ Βουτός θηλυκον (κωμή
Αἰγύπτου) καὶ τὸ Παιτός ἑθνικόν. (‘Disyllabic words in –τος that have the diphthong ΟΥ or ΟΙ or ΑΙ in their penultimate syllable, but not (the diphthong) ΕΙ, if they are masculine and are not adjectives, are recessive, unless they indicate a part of the body: πλοῦτος οίτος κοίτος Προίτος γοῖτος (‘dirt’). But Κλειτός has (the diphthong) ΕΙ, and γλαυτός indicates a part of the body; and Βουτός is feminine (a village in Egypt) and Παιτός is an ethnic designation’).

(3) 119.8-10 Τὰ εἰς ᾝΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα, εἰ μὴ κύρια εἴη, δέχόνται Ὁθύνος ξυνός γρυνός (ἡ ἑίσα τῶν ξύλων ἡ ἔσα καὶ παχεῖα) πλυνός. (‘Disyllabic words in ᾝΝΟΣ, if they are not proper names, are oxytone: Ὁθύνος ξυνός γρυνός (the dry and thick root of woods) πλυνός.’)

(4) 138.14-8 Τὰ εἰς ΚΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἁρχόμενα δέχόνται μακρός μικρός πικρός νεκρός Λοκρός Τευκρός (τὸ εἶθνικόν, Τεύκρος δὲ τὸ κύριον). Τὸ δὲ ἀκρός καὶ ἦγος βαρύνεται. (‘Disyllabic words in ΚΡΟΣ that begin with a consonant are oxytone: μακρός μικρός πικρός νεκρός Λοκρός Τευκρός (the ethnic designation, Τεύκρος is a proper name). ἀκρός and ἦγος are recessive.’)

(5) 123.11-6 Τὰ εἰς ᾝΝΟΣ τὸ I μακρὸν ἔχοντα κύρια ἢ ἑθνικά ἢ ἐτιθετικά ἢ ύπο-

κοριστικῶν ἔννοιαν ἔχοντα προπεριστάνται: Φίλινος Κρατίνος Ἐχίνος (τὸ κύριον)

Δατίνος Λεοντίνος Ρηγίνος Μαμερτίνος. τὸ δὲ λαρινός ὄξυται. (‘Words in –ΙΝΟΣ that have a long I, being proper names or ethnic designations or adjectives or having a diminutive sense, are properisdomena: Φίλινος Κρατίνος Ἐχίνος (the proper name) Δατίνος Λεοντίνος Ρηγίνος Μαμερτίνος. Λαρινός is oxytone.’)

(6) 81.10-4 Τὰ εἰς ΕΙΟΣ τριγενὴ μὴ ἑθνικὰ προπαροξύνεται, εἰ ἀπὸ χαλικοῦ ἁρ-

χοιτοφρότειον τέλειον φλόγειον λύκειον βόειος, τὸ δὲ Ἐπειός κύριον. τὸ δὲ φατειύς κατὰ παλαιοσμόν ἐσχε τὴν δῖθωγμον. (‘Three-termination (adjectives) in ΕΙΟΣ, with the exception of ethnic designations, are proparoxytone, if they begin with a short (syllable): βρότειος τέλειος φλόγειον λύκειον βοειος. But Ἐπειός is a proper name. Αἰγύπτου had the diphthong because of pleonasm.’)

In passage (1) the accentuation of the personal names Ρόδιος and Σχεδίος is contrasted with that of the adjectives Ρόδιος and σχεδίος, but it is noteworthy that Ρόδιος (‘Rhodian’) is an ethnic designation. The implied status of Ρόδιος as adjective suggests that ethnic designations are a kind of adjective. The accentuation rule on masculines in –ουτος, –οίτος, and –αυτος in passage (2) prescribes recessive accentuation
and excludes adjectives and parts of the body. After a list of recessive examples we get some examples of words which are not recessive because they do not fulfil the conditions for the rule. Here we read γλουτός, a part of the body, the feminine Βουτός, and finally the ethnic designation Παιτός. The phrasing of the accentuation rule made no mention of ethnic designations being exempted from recessive accentuation, and at the same time we observe that no ἐπιθετικόν is cited as an example. Thus, the ethnic designation Παιτός is cited as an adjective. In passage (3) Θυνός, an ethnic designation for a person from Θυνία (see also the note on Θυνός), is cited as an example of an oxytone disyllabic word in –υνος. The exemption of proper names from oxytone accentuation suggests that ethnic designations are not classified as proper names. In passage (4) the ethnic designation Τευκρός is contrasted with the proper name (more specifically personal name) Τευκρος. In passage (5) the ethnic designations are announced separately from proper names in the phrasing of the accentuation rule. The rule in passage (6) prescribes proparoxytone accentuation for words in –ειος that are τριγενή, that is to say, three-termination adjectives, but not ἐθνικά. If ethnic designations were not considered to be a group of adjectives there would be no reason to exclude ethnic designations from the category of adjectives. The fact that Herodian or the epitomator felt the need to specify that ethnic designations are not proparoxytone, although three-termination adjectives in –ειος generally are, suggests that ethnic designations are regarded as adjectives. The same rule might be thought to provide evidence that ethnic designations are also treated as a category of personal names, since Ἐπειός is cited as an example of a non-proparoxytone word with the justification that this is a proper name, and Ἐπειός can generally be either a personal name (LGPN IIIA) or an ethnic designation (St. Byz. ε 90). However, it is
unlikely that the ethnic designation is intended here, and that ethnic designations are therefore treated as a category of proper names, because one would have to assume that the epitomator or even Herodian was inconsistent when referring to ethnic designations, sometimes calling them adjectives and sometimes proper names, even within the same rule.

7. κοινός, κοινῶς

The term κοινός is used in four different senses in the Epitome: (i) to refer to the agreement (common form) of the greatest part of the dialects (115.1, 149.2, 155.3, 99.25 (Schmidt), 106.16 (Schmidt), 146.23 (Schmidt), 150.16 (Schmidt), 170.5 (Schmidt), 190.1 (Schmidt), 190.6 (Schmidt));299 (ii) to refer to colloquial or non-literary Greek (98.15); (iii) to refer to common gender (47.9, 89.1, 89.3): this usage is dealt with in sub-section 3; (iv) to refer to a vowel capable of being long or short (147.2 (Schmidt), 152.20 (Schmidt)).

2.2.2 Indirect sources

The Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was not only consulted and cited as an authority on accentuation, but also employed as a reference work for its large lists of examples arranged according to their termination. The encyclopaedic content of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, with long lists of examples accompanied by their meanings and passages illustrating their use, despite encouraging the creation of epitomes and finally bringing to an end the transmission of the original work, remained attractive to later

299 On this use of the term κοινός cf. Stephan (1889) and Consani (1991), 27-33. See further Probert (2004), 277-91, who argues that when Herodian says κοινόν or κοινῶς he probably means that it is the usual Greek form, but on matters of accentuation Herodian’s knowledge of what is ‘normal’ comes from the koiné.
scholarship, which employed and perceived the material from various perspectives. Among these later texts are: Stephanus of Byzantium, Choeroboscus, Theognostus, the *Etymologicum genuinum*, the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, the *Etymologicum magnum*, and the *Epimerismi homericī*.

These late antique and Byzantine works have either a) incorporated or b) adjusted the accentuation rules of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας to their needs, sometimes selecting the bits that serve their aims and describing only the part of a rule which they need to explain a word’s accent, or c) have transformed them so as to fulfil their goals relating to matters other than accentuation (e.g. to create orthographical or declensional rules). This indicates the large influence of Herodian and specifically of his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας on later grammatical and lexicographical tradition.

To the extent that these later sources derive material from Herodian’s work, and therefore provide us with evidence for the work, they may be employed as indirect sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. These later works, being indirect witnesses, often help us to reconstruct the text of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome. In my reconstruction of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome I have often taken into account readings transmitted in the indirect sources for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

The comparison of certain passages from our Epitome with the indirect sources not only reveals that the latter go back to Herodian, but close verbal similarities and the use of common examples, often in the same order, suggest that these Byzantine sources

---

202 For my editorial principle on the employment of the Indirect Sources see pp. 179-80.
did not possess a copy of Herodian’s original work, but an epitome that was actually close to ours. One should keep in mind that it remains an unanswered question how long anybody was using original Herodian. Nevertheless, the use of Herodian by later authors, working either from his original work or from epitomes, proves the significance and the great influence of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας not only on later works on prosody, but also on the later grammatical and lexicographical tradition in general.

2.2.2.1 Stephanus of Byzantium (6th century AD)

Stephanus of Byzantium was a grammarian of the sixth century AD. He is very well known for his Ethnica, an extensive geographical lexicon providing geographical, linguistic, historical and mythological information about place names and their corresponding ethnic adjectives. The work survives mainly in an epitome. Stephanus of Byzantium derives material from Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. Herodian is very often mentioned by name. Stephanus’ main interest is in geography, ethnic designations and place names, but he incorporates parts of Herodian’s accentuation rules into numerous entries of his work. Unlike some of the other scholars and scholarship we will look at, Stephanus does not transform Herodian’s rules, but just incorporates sections of them. Stephanus’ citations of specific books of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας are accurate and reliable, as far as one may conclude on the basis of words cited from a

---

203 For further information and bibliography on Stephanus Byzantius and his work see Dickey (2007), 101.
204 On the value of Stephanus of Byzantium as a source for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας see Lentz (1867-70), CXXXVI-CLXXX; Honigmann (1929), RE 3A, 2380; Tolkiehn (1925), RE 12, 2469-70 s. v. Lexikographie. For the view that Lentz exaggerated the dependence of Stephanus on Herodian see Hiller (1871), 530; Egenolff (1887), 42; Lasserre (1969), 85-6. In defence of Lentz see Buehler (1973), 49-91, esp. 89.
specific book of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας and actually found in the corresponding book of Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome. To illustrate this point, I quote below all the passages in which examples cited by Stephanus with reference to a specific book of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας survive in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome in the book mentioned by Stephanus. The passages quoted from Stephanus below are not only important because they are parallel to passages from Pseudo-ArcADIUS’ Epitome, but also because they reinforce the view that Pseudo-Arcadius maintained the arrangement of the material in certain books as in the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.12-5 Τὰ εἰς ΑΝΙΣ θηλικά ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς ὑμνεῖται Μελεανίς Ξειανίς Στεφανίς, τὸ δὲ νεάνις προπερισπᾶται καὶ τὸ Αδανίς προσπαρασχίζονται καὶ τὸ Θῆβανις.</td>
<td>α 55.11-3 Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῇ τοῦ καθολοῦ, τὸ Αδανίς καὶ Θῆβανις θηλικόν τὸν Ἁελίδος ἐν ἐν τούνον.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.19-22 Τὰ εἰς ΛΙΣ παράληγον τῷ Ὑ ἡ διφθόγγῳ παραληγόμενα ὑμνεῖται. Πακτωλίς Αἰτωλίς Ιουλίς, τὸ Ἀδουλίς προσπαρασχίζονται καὶ τὸ ἀρτόπωλις.</td>
<td>α 59.1-3 Ἀδουλίς πόλεις Αἰθιόπων. οἱ δὲ Πανός νήσον αὐτήν καλοῦσιν. καὶ τάμου ββιλια Ἀδουλί δίχα του κ. σφάλμα δὲ ἐστίν. Ἀδουλίς γὰρ ὀφείλει, ὡς Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τοῖς εἰς λίς τῶν ὑς διφθόγγῳ.205 παραληγομένοις.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3-8 Τὰ εἰς ΗΝ λήγοντα ἐχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Ὑ τὸ Σ. ἡ διπλῶν σύμφωνον μὴ παραληγόμενα206 τῇ ὙΤ διφθόγγῳ ὑμνεῖσθαι θέλει, εἰ μὴ παρασχηματικῶς οὐδετέρῳ γένει, οἷον ἐστὶν καμαμῆν (ὁ ἰχθὺς) νασῆν τερσῆν Ἀἰτωλίς αὕτην αὕτην.</td>
<td>α 72.2-5 οἱ πολῖται Λακάντα, τὸ θηλικὸν Ἀκάντας. Ἡρωδιανὸς διὰ τῆς αἰ ἐν α &lt;τῆς&gt; καθολοῦ λέγων „Αἰτωλίς Ταντάλου παῖς, ἀφ' οὗ ἐν Φυργία πόλεις Αἰτωλοί“.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.10-50.5 Τὰ εἰς ΒΙΣ ύπερφύλλαβα ὑμνεῖται</td>
<td>α 79.1-2 Ἀθάρραβις πόλεις Αἰγύπτου, ὡς καὶ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205 Billerbeck correctly completes the lacuna which one may still find in Meineke’s edition. It is noteworthy that the passage of our Epitome helps to emend the text of the epitome of the Ethnica by adding the phrase ἡ διφθόγγῳ. Meineke’s text (26, 18-22) is as follows: Λ δούλις, πόλεις Αἰθιώπων. οἱ δὲ Πανός νήσον αὐτήν καλοῦσιν. καὶ τάμου ββιλια Ἀδουλί δίχα του κ. σφάλμα δὲ ἐστίν. Ἀδουλίς γὰρ ὀφείλει, ὡς Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τοῖς εἰς λίς τῶν ὑς ... παραληγομένως. (‘Ἀδουλίς, city of the Ethiopians. Others call it the island of Pan. And my books (call it) Ἀδουλί without the ν. This is a mistake. It ought to be Ἀδουλίς, as Herodian says (in the section) on the (nouns ending) in ὑς that have ὕ or ... in their penultimate syllable.’).

206 παραληγομένα scripsi: παραληγομένου codd.
The Herodianic material that Stephanus has incorporated in his work, and which renders him an indirect source for the Περί καθολικής προσωπιάς, may be employed effectively for the reconstruction of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome and ultimately the Περί καθολικής προσωπιάς. For examples of the employment of Stephanus of Byzantium for the reconstruction of Pseudo-Arcadius see the notes on Ἡιών, Λυχνιτός (ἡ πόλις), and Λωμεντός.

2.2.2.2 Georgius Choeroboscus (8th/9th century AD)

Georgius Choeroboscus was a Byzantine teacher of the eighth and ninth centuries AD who composed a number of grammatical treatises. Choeroboscus’ works consist mainly of his teaching notes and are intended for students.208 His writings, especially the Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione nominum et verborum, the De Orthographia and the Epimerismi in Psalmos, often take the form of question and answer. Choeroboscus used the Περί καθολικής προσωπιάς (in some form)

---

207 καλλαβίς ΜΑΟΒC: κάνναβις Lobeck PSGP 288, n. 5.
208 See also Dickey (2007), 80.
as a source not only on accentuation but also on declensional and orthographical issues. There are similarities in wording and common examples between Choeroboscus and Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome. These similarities suggest that Choeroboscus’ source, if not Herodian’s original work, was close to our Epitome. The parallel passages from Choeroboscus are noted in the apparatus of parallel passages, and the Notes on the text contain discussion of certain passages in Choeroboscus.

The parallel passages in the table below include common examples, and the two texts almost seem to paraphrase one another in the wording introducing the examples. This list is not meant to be exhaustive; for the rest of the parallels one may consult the apparatus of parallel passages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome</th>
<th>Georgius Choeroboscus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154.7-10 Τὰ εἰς ΣΤΟΣ υπερθεύλαβα παραληγόμενα ὅ ἐπὶ ποσότητος τασσόμενα ὃς ἔσται παλλοστός εἰκοστός τριακοστός πεντηκοστός.</td>
<td>Ep. Ps. 133.3-6 Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ λήγοντα ὑπὲρ δὸς συλλαβάς ἐξοῦντα πρὸ τοῦ Τ τὸ Σ καὶ τὴν γενικὴν περατομένην εἰς ΟΥ, ἐπὶ ποσότητος τασσόμενα, ὃς ἔσται, οἶον παλλοστός, ὀλιγοστός, εἰκοστός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.6-9 Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ΑΙ διθόγγῳ, εἰ μὲν κύρια εἰμὶ, βαρύνεται: Σφαιρὸς Σκαῖρος· εἰ δὲ μὴ οὕτως, ὃς ἔσται καίρος. τὸ δάιρος διτισφηται (ὅτι ο ὀ καυστικός).</td>
<td>Ep. Ps. 46.35 – 47.3 Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ καθαρὰ δισύλλαβα τῇ ΑΙ διθόγγῳ παραληγόμενα, εἰ μὲν εἰς κύρια, βαρύνοντα, οἶον σφαιρός, καίρος210, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὃς ἔσται, οἶον καίρος, θαιρός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.1-5 Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ υπὲρ δὸς συλλαβᾶς παραληγόμενα τῇ ΕΙ διθόγγῳ ἢ μόνῳ τῷ Π ἐκτεταμένῳ βαρύνεται Κάμειρος ὃνειρος πέπειρος μάγειρος Στάλιρος Σίσιρος.</td>
<td>De Orthogr. 245.7-9 Ὀνειρος: Τὰ διὰ τοῦ εἰρε διπαραστοῦνα διὰ τῆς εἰ διθόγγου γράφεται οἶον, ὃνειρος: μάγειρος:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

209 On Choeroboscus as a source of evidence for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας see Lentz (1867-70), CLXXV-CXC.
210 It is possible that the correct reading is σκάιρος, which comes after Σφαίρος in Pseudo-Arcadius’ passage, but the scribe omitted the σ- at the beginning because the previous word ends in –ς. It is noteworthy that the example preceding and the one following καίρος are the same as those of Pseudo-Arcadius’ passage and it would have been too much of a coincidence that this was different. Since the edition of Choeroboscus’ Epimerismoi in Psalmo does not contain an apparatus criticus, we do not know if there is any varia lectio.
2.2.2.3 Theognostus (9th century AD)

From Theognostus a work on orthography entitled Περὶ ορθογραφίας or Κανόνες has come down to us. Theognostus mentions in the preface of his work that he has gathered the rules from Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας: οὐς (sc. κανόνας) δὲ ἐκ τῆς πολυῦλου βιβλίου τῆς καθόλου Ηρωδιανοῦ ἀναλεξάμενος, καὶ λέξει λέξιν τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπισυνάψας (32-4) (‘having gathered the rules from Herodian’s copious work Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας and attaching to every word the appropriate word’).\(^{211}\) Theognostus is writing a work on orthography and yet he recognizes that the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας is his foundation. Of course one might want to treat with caution Theognostus’ statement that he employed original Herodian, because Theognostus lived about seven centuries after Herodian and it is uncertain whether Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας had survived in its entirety until the time of Theognostus. The view that Herodian’s work had not come down to such a late period as

\(^{211}\) On the transformation of Herodian’s accentuation rules into orthographical ones see also Galland (1882a), 33. On the value of Theognostus’ Περὶ ορθογραφίας as a source of evidence for the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας see Lentz (1867-70); CLXXX-CLXXXIV; Galland (1882a), 33-5; Krumbacher (1897), 585-6; Wendel (1934), 1987; Alpers (1964), 27-8.
Theognostus’ time is based on the idea that the creation of epitomes as early as the fourth century AD is likely to have discontinued the transmission of the original work.\footnote{212 See also the argument in Wouters (1975-6), 602.}

A large number of passages in Theognostus are parallel to passages of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, as illustrated in the apparatus of parallel passages of my edition. The similar wording and the employment of common examples suggest that Theognostus’ source was close to our Epitome, and perhaps was another epitome which has not survived. The fact that usually we find more examples in Theognostus than in our Epitome is not sufficient evidence to conclude that Theognostus had in his hands the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. He could have consulted an epitome that was more extensive than ours, or he could even be deriving material from an epitome without many more examples than our Epitome. In the latter case he may as well have added examples of his own.

It is noteworthy that Theognostus deals with the orthography of words on the basis of their terminations as Herodian did in his Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, and that Theognostus follows the exact arrangement of the endings as this appears in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome. One can trace the correspondence in the arrangement of the material, and common word lists with the words often in the same order, between Pseudo-Arcadius’ Book 1 to 8 and rules 143 to 430 in Theognostus (II 26.24 - 77.11). After this very close correspondence the two texts continue to have similarities in the arrangement of the material, but the correspondence is less close. It is significant, nevertheless, that the treatment of neuters in Theognostus follows the classification of neuters found in the...
Σέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax, with the slight variation that we have observed in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, i.e. the arrangement of the terminations is α ι υ ν θ ς as in Pseudo-Arcadius, not α ι υ θ ς ν as in the Σέχνη γραμματική. This correspondence between Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome and Theognostus is significant, given the differences between Philoponus and Pseudo-Arcadius in the arrangement of the material, since it suggests that the material of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας was arranged as in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome.

In Theognostus there are numerous examples of the transformation of Herodian’s accentuation rules into orthographical ones. Theognostus derives material from Herodian’s work, but since his goal is to prescribe rules on orthography, facts about accentuation are presented as conditions for orthographical rules, whereas for Herodian orthography provides conditions for accentuation rules. The following pairs of parallel passages illustrate how this transformation is made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ps.-Arcad.</th>
<th>Theognost.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

213 Πάταικος em. Schmidt ex Theognosto 326.2-3: πάγαικος ΜΑΟΒC
214 Φάλαικος em. Schmidt ex Theognosto 326.2: φίλαικος ΜΑΟΒC
215 Ἰνωπός Schmidt ex Theognosto 380.3: οἰνωπός ΜΑΟΒC et Göttling 219
2.2.2.4 The Etymological Lexica

The Etymological Lexica derive lists of examples from the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδιας, even though the point of interest might be one of declension or orthography rather than accentuation. The lexica that provide the greatest number of parallel passages are the Etymologicum genuinum (9th century AD), the Etymologicum Gudianum (11th century AD).

---

216 Δάριτος em. Schmidt ex Theognosto 417.3: δάμητος MAOBC
217 Ἀδήριτος scripsi ex Theognost. Can. 419: δήριτος MAOB; δάριτος C_e; fortasse δάριτος C_e; Νήριτος Lobeck PSGP 379; fortasse etiam Οὐρίτος ex Theognost. Can. 419.4
218 ὄνυτος corr. Schmidt ex Theognosto 420.3: ὄνυτος MAOBC
219 Μοιλότος corr. Schmidt ex Theognost. Can. 420.3: μοιλότος MAOBC
221 ύφος add. Lentz 145.12 monente Lobeck PGSE' 441, n. 9; cf. Theognost. Can. 295.2
AD), the *Etymologicum magnum* (12th century AD). The table below shows some examples of parallel passages between Pseudo-Arcadius, the *Etymologicum genuinum*, the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, and the *Etymologicum magnum*; further parallels are recorded in the apparatus of parallel passages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ps.-Arcad.</th>
<th>Et Gen.</th>
<th>Et. Gud.</th>
<th>EM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.4-9 Τὰ εἰς ΙΣ ἐσχήματισμένα ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων μελλόντων ἢ δευτέρου προσώπου του παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου βαρύνοντα ποίησις, γνώσις γνώσις, πρᾶξις πράξεις, πέφανσις φάνσις, μεμιᾶναι μίανσι, τὸ δὲ ἀφίς σεσήμευται μακρὸν ἔχον τὸ Ι.</td>
<td>α 1537.16-7 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἢ ἀπλὰ ἐκτείνοντα τὸ Ι. ἑπτά τόλους ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον, ὁποῖον κηνὴς ψήφις σφραγίς κρητίςς οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἀφίς</td>
<td>κ 317.14-7 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἡ θηλυκὰ ἡ ὑπέρ μιὰν συλλαβήν κοινολεκτούμενα, ἀποστρέφονται τὴν εἰ διάθεγγον οἶον, ἀπικεφαλεῖται, βολίς, κρητίςς, ψηφίς, κηνήμις οὕτως οὖν καὶ κεφαλίς</td>
<td>184.4-7 Τὰ γὰρ εἰς ΙΣ ἡ ὑπέρ μιὰν συλλαβήν ἀπλὰ ἐκτείνοντα τὸ Ι. ἑπτά τόλους ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον οἶον, κηνήμις, κρητίςς, σφραγίς οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἀφίς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 76.9-78.5 Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ καθαρὸν ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς παραληγόμενα τῷ Ω μετὰ Ι προσγεγραμμένον προπεριπτάται πατρώς ἡρῴς Ἀχελώνισιν ἀδίδος τὸ δὲ κολωὸς οὔνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ κολωὸς τὸ μέντοι λαγώδος καὶ πατρώς οὔνομαν, διότι οὐκ ἔχουσι τὸ Ι προσγεγραμμένον. | α 149.11-5 προπεριπτάται δὲ τὸ άθροίς διὰ τὸν χαρακτήρα τούτον, τὰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ῥῶς ἔχοντα τὸ Ι. ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς προπεριπτάσται χωρίς τοῦ κολωὸς, δὲ σημαίνει τὸν τόροφον Ἀκόλουθος αἰδός ἡρῴς ὁ ὄνως οὖν καὶ άθροίς. προσκείται «ἔχοντα τὸ Ι.» διὰ τὸ λαγώδος καὶ πατρώς: α 150.4-8 Τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ὡς διὰ τοῦ ῥῶς παράγωγα σὺν τῷ ἐγγέγραφα καὶ προπεριπτάσται τοῦ οὖν Μίνως Μινώος, α 34.2-5 τὰ εἰς ὡς οὖν μιὰν συλλαβάς τῇ φωναὶ παραληγόμενα προπεριπτάσται, χωρίς τοῦ κολωὸς, δὲ σημαίνει τὸν θόρυβον Κώς, Μινώος, πατρώς, μητρώς, τοῦτος συνενεργουθῇ διὰ καὶ ἢρώς ἔχει δὲ τὸ τὰ ἐκ παραδόσεως | α 34.2-5 τὰ εἰς ὡς οὖν μιὰν συλλαβάς τῇ φωναὶ παραληγόμενα προπεριπτάσται, χωρίς τοῦ κολωὸς, δὲ σημαίνει τὸν θόρυβον οἶον, Ἀχελώος, αἰδός, ἠρώς, οὕτως καὶ άθροίς. προσκείται «ἔχοντα τὸ Ι.» διὰ τὸ λαγώδος καὶ πατρώς: 26.31-5 τὰ διὰ τὸν ΩΙΟΣ ἔχοντα τὸ Ι. υπέρ β' συλλαβάς προπεριπτάσται χωρίς τοῦ κολωὸς, [ὁ] σημαίνει τὸν θόρυβον οἶον, Ἀχέλωος, αἰδός, ἠρώς, οὕτως καὶ άθροίς. προσκείται «ἔχοντα τὸ Ι.» διὰ τὸ λαγώδος καὶ πατρώς: 26.41-7 Τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΩΙΣ διὰ τὸν ΩΙΟΣ παράγωγα σὺν τῷ ἐγγέγραφα καὶ προπεριπτάσται οἶον, Μινώος Μινώος, πατρώς πατρώς, μητρώς, μητρώς, ἢρως ἢρως. οὕτως
2.2.2.5 The Epimerismi Homerici (9th century AD)

This text contains basic grammatical explanations of specific lemmata and was probably intended for pupils. Dealing with a lemma usually involved categorizing the word among the parts of speech according to the categories given in the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax, indicating the base form of the word, and discussing the derivation of the lemma from the θέμα.222 The Epimerismi Homerici are divided into two groups: a) those that are arranged according to the book and line of the Iliad, and b) the alphabetical epimerismi. The information we have about the dating of this work to the ninth century derives from the references to Choeroboscus, which render him

222 On this see Dyck (1983), 4.
a terminus post quem, and the fact that the Etymologicum genuinum uses it as a source, and is thus a terminus ante quem.223

The Epimerismi Homerici often derive material from Herodian. Despite the fact that the Epimerismi Homerici are transmitted anonymously, the use of the first person in passages where the material goes back to Herodian has created to some extent the impression that Herodian is the author of the Epimerismi Homerici.224 Nevertheless, the first person sometimes refers to Choeroboscus, and in fact it seems more likely that he is the author, both because of the didactic nature of the work and because of the quotation of authors and works later than Herodian.225 It should nonetheless be noted that the author of the Epimerismi Homerici sometimes favours Herodian’s view against Choeroboscus and vice versa.226 The author of the Epimerismi Homerici seems to presuppose that his readers are familiar with the Epimerismi in Psalmos,227 as is suggested by comparison of Epimerismi Homerici, 173a1 with Epimerismi in Psalmos, 81.32 – 82.6. The former passage mentions that the word θυμός has five meanings ὡς πολλάκις εἴρηται, but in fact nowhere in the Epimerismi Homerici are these mentioned, while the passage of the Epimerismi in Psalmos provides them.

The epimerist derives grammatical, etymological, orthographical and semasiological material mainly from the D-Scholia.228 Herodian is the grammarian most often quoted by name in the Epimerismi Homerici. Lentz’s view that references to earlier

223 Dyck (1983), 7.
224 For a further discussion see Dyck (1983), 5.
225 For a more detailed treatment of this issue see Dyck (1983), 5-6. For the view that the author is not Choerobocus see Reitzenstein (1897), 205-6.
226 For more details on this see Dyck (1983), 6-7.
227 For a further discussion see Dyck (1983), 7.
228 For a further analysis of the material drawn from the D-scholia see Dyck (1983), 27-8.
grammarians included in the *Epimerismi Homerici* are drawn from Herodian is confirmed by Dyck as regards Tyrannio and Trypho, while, according to Dyck, the citations of Philoxenus mainly go back to the *Etymologicum Orisonis*, which the epimerist must have used for etymologies.²²⁹ Lentz was eager to assign to Herodian much of the anonymously transmitted material in the *Epimerismi Homerici*, whereas Dyck is more cautious.²³⁰ Cohn showed that three passages of the *Epimerismi Homerici*, whose material Lentz attributed to Herodian, should be ascribed rather to Heraclides of Miletus.²³¹

The similarities in wording and common examples between Pseudo-Arcadius’ *Epitome* and the *Epimerismi Homerici* have been noted in the apparatus of parallel passages. In the following table we lay out only a small sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.22-15.5 Τὰ εἰς ΛΩΝ λήγοντα ύπερ δύο συλλαβῶν βαρύνεται, μη ὁντα περιεκτικά· Ἀπόλλων Κεφάλαιν, τὸ δὲ ἀμπελὼν καὶ καμηλῶν ὡς περιεκτικά ὀδύνεται τὸ Βαβυλών ἄρσενικός, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἡ πόλις, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ μιμάλλων θηλυκόν, (ἤτα μαίνας).</td>
<td>21,b2a.1-5 τὰ εἰς λος ύπερ δύο συλλαβῶν βαρύνεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ὦ κλίνεται, ὥς Ἀσκάλων Ἀσκάλων, Ἀπόλλων Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Βαβυλών· βαρύνεται τὰ εἰς λος λήγοντα ύπερ δύο συλλαβῶν· βαρύνεται τὸ πόλλων ἄρσενικός, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἡ πόλις, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ μιμάλλων θηλυκόν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7-12 Πάν ὅνωμα εἰς Ξ λήγον ύπερ μίαν συλλαβήν βαρύνεται, χωρίς εἰ μη παρὰ ὤμα εἰὶ συντεθείμένον καὶ μίαν συλλαβὴν φυλάττει του όμηματος, καὶ ἐπιθετικῶν ὑπάρχοι, μη ἐθνικῶν· Φαίαξ ἡ περί τοῦ σφάξα, ἀναξ κλίμαξ ἀυλάξ· τὸ διάφορα ἀπὸ όμηματος ἀπὸ του σφάξας ὁμίλεται.</td>
<td>7,b. 4-7 Πάν εἰς αξ λήγον ὅνωμα ύπερ μίαν συλλαβήν· βαρύνεται θέλει, χωρίς εἰ μη παρὰ ὤμα εἰὶ συντεθείμένον καὶ μίαν συλλαβὴν· φυλάττει του όμηματος· Φαίαξ, θωραξ· ἀναξ, κοράξ· τὸ δὲ διὰ σφάξα, ἀποκοτάξ (Nic. Ther. 521) ἀπὸ όμηματος.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 62.6-63.2 Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ καθαρὸν δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Ἰ μακρῷ ὁμοιότερο ἀπὸ ένός ἦ· | 7, d1.2-6 τὰ εἰς ας λήγοντα καθαρὸ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ ἰ ἐκτεταμένων, ἐι ἄρχεται

---

²²⁹ Lentz (1867-70), CCVII; Dyck (1983), 28, 30-1.
²³¹ Cohn (1884), 622.
3 Lentz’s edition of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφίας

Lentz’s collected edition of Herodian’s works (1867-70) is the only one to have been attempted and constitutes one of the foundations of modern Herodianic studies. Nevertheless it is difficult to work with, because Lentz attempts to reconstruct Herodian’s work by mixing material derived from the two epitomes with that of other sources and even by inventing his own rules (and adding his own examples), rather than to lay out the surviving evidence. In his reconstruction of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφίας Lentz not only combined small rules into larger ones, but sought to bring together material from all the surviving sources which he thought went back to Herodian’s work.

When Lentz takes material from other sources, the attribution of this material to Herodian is sometimes very secure but sometimes not. When using Lentz’s edition one needs to consult the apparatus constantly to see what sources Lentz is using, to the extent that it is preferable to avoid Lentz’s edition when one can consult his sources directly.

232 See Dyck (1993), 775.
233 See Dyck (1993), 777–8, where he mentions the several other sources: Ἰλιακὴ προσωφία and Οὐσιασιακὴ προσωφία preserved in the Homeric scholia; Stephanus of Byzantium; Ἰωάννου Φιλοπόνου Περὶ τῶν διαφόρως τοιναμένων καὶ διάφορα σημαινόντων; the section of Theodosius’ Canons entitled Περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς πεῖσις τόνων; the corresponding material in Choeroboscus’ σχόλια, Theognostus’ Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας; the Epimerismi Homerici; Choeroboscus’ Epimerismi in Psalmos; the etymologica.
234 See Dyck (1993), 775–8; Dickey (2007), 76.
235 Galland (1882a), 31.
236 For a critique of Lentz’s edition see also Chandler (1881), XX; Dyck (1993), 775–8; Dickey (2007), 76.
The need for a new edition of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was already expressed a few years after Lentz’s edition, by Egenolff,237 but such an endeavour has never been accomplished. What makes Lentz’s reconstruction even harder to consult is that the existing editions of many of the sources he employed rest on an insufficient manuscript basis.238

Another disadvantage of Lentz’s edition is that it is outdated. Lentz based his reconstruction of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας primarily on the two direct sources, the two epitomes, one misattributed to Arcadius and the other by Philoponus239. The palimpsest240 which contains sections of Books 5-7 and the fourth-century parchment containing a portion of book 5 (P. Ant. ii. 67)241, two fragmentary epitomes, were both unknown to Lentz.

In spite of all these disadvantages, Lentz’s edition is also valuable and helpful, because it provides a very useful collection of ancient discussions of accentuation, including plentiful parallel passages in different works likely to contain Herodianic material. Another very valuable contribution is the extensive introduction, which contains detailed treatments of numerous issues related to Herodian and his works, and the late antique and Byzantine sources that derived material from Herodian.

In reconstructing the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας Lentz arranged the material in the several books as it is arranged in Pseudo-Arcadius. With regard to the first fourteen

237 Egenolff (1887), 42; Wouters (1975-6), 604.
238 On this see Egenolff (1900), 238-9; Alpers (2004), 1-2.
239 On Philoponus’ epitome see pp. 43-7.
240 On the palimpsest see pp. 47-51.
241 On the parchment see pp. 51-5.
books, where the accent of the nominative singular of nominals is treated according to their termination, he usually started with the rules as they appear in Pseudo-Arcadius, and then added sections from other sources at points where he thought they best fitted.

On the other hand Lentz kept closer to Philoponus than Pseudo-Arcadius in that he included quotations of ancient authors. The author of our Epitome explains in his preface that for the sake of brevity he has left out the χρήσεις (‘examples of usage, i.e. passages cited’).242

In deriving material from Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome Lentz was very bold in adopting emendations suggested by Schmidt in his apparatus (e.g. 8.2 περπέρην πέρρην MSS, 11.1 ή] και MSS, 17.13 Κραννών] καρνών MSS, 19.8 ή ἐθνικα add., 25.1 ή E add., 62.5 οὐκ add.), as well as emendations of other scholars (e.g. 89.11 όθος add. Lentz monente Lobeck PGSE 1441, n. 9), but he also emended the text himself in many cases (e.g. 10.1-2 Φλέγων. τὸ δὲ φηγών καὶ ἀγών: τὸ δὲ φλεγών καὶ ἀγών MSS, 12.12 καὶ] ή MSS, 17.10 μὴ del., 17.13 Ἀγνών] Ἀγνών MSS, 19.3 πόλει add. ante ὁμώνυμα).

242 See also Note 2.5-9 ἀλλὰ ... συγγραφεῖ.
PART TWO

CRITICAL EDITION OF THE PREFACE AND BOOKS 1-8 OF PSEUDO-ARCADIUS’ EPITOME

1 The manuscript tradition

Our Epitome survives in five main manuscripts:243 a) Codex Matritensis 4575 = 32244 (M) (15th, c. 1482), b) Codex Baroccianus 179 (O) (1495), c) Codex Hauniensis regius 1965 (A) (end of 15th cent.), d) Codex Parisinus Graecus 2603 (B) (16th cent.), and e) Codex Parisinus Graecus 2102 (C) (16th cent.). I have studied and collated the above manuscripts in full, although I am editing only part of the text for this thesis.

The manuscripts O.10.14 (1466; 16-17th cent.) in Trinity College, Cambridge, and 171 (445; 17th cent.) in the Bibliothèque Municipale, Caen, have been left out of this study of the Manuscript Tradition because they have been proved to be copies of codex Baroccianus 179.245

Codex Vindobonensis theol. gr. 287 (16th cent.) contains only the second section on adverbs in Book 19.246 I have examined this manuscript in photocopies. My collation has revealed that it shares errors with codex Parisinus Graecus 2102, but both manuscripts

243 I have retained the symbols ABC employed in Schmidt’s edition for codex Hauniensis regius 1965, codex Parisinus Graecus 2603, and codex Parisinus Graecus 2102 respectively. I have followed Dyck (1993) in using the symbols M and O for the manuscripts codex Matritensis 4575 = 32 and codex Baroccianus 179 respectively.

244 See footnote 84.

245 Catalogues of manuscripts indicate that they are copies of Baroccianus 179. I have verified that manuscript O.10.14 (1466) in Trinity College, Cambridge is indeed a copy of Baroccianus 179 by examining the manuscript by autopsy and in digital images.

246 On the problem with the two sections on adverbs in Book 19 see the discussion of Book 19, pp. 104-7.
have separative errors. This observation, together with the above analysis of the problem about the two sections on adverbs in Book 19, suggests that the two manuscripts derived the material from the same source. Since codex *Vindobonensis* shares the same source with C, and C is ultimately derived from another extant manuscript, M, and since it offers no good readings that are not already in the five manuscripts that preserve the Epitome in its entirety, we will not consider it further, either in this chapter or in the reconstruction of the text.

Manuscript Royal 16 D XIV (16th cent.) in the British Library preserves part of the first section on enclitics and part of the section *περὶ πνευμάτων* in Book 20. With regard to the section on enclitics this manuscript shares just a few errors with the five manuscripts we will be dealing with in this section, and in fact these mistakes could have been committed independently. Thus it is not possible to know the relationship of this manuscript to the rest of the tradition.

We now come back to the five main manuscripts we shall be looking at in more detail:

a) Codex *Matritensis* 32 (M): 247 Madrid, *Biblioteca Nacional de España*. The manuscript is made of paper, 280x205mm, and consists of 83 folios. It was written by Constantine Lascaris in Messina, copied from a *παλαιὰ βίβλος*, as he himself says in *Matritensis* 4689 (139): μόλις εὕρον τὸ *περὶ τῶν* τοῦ Θεοδοσίου ἐν βίβλῳ παλαιᾷ τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Σωτήρος τῆς ἐν ἀκρωτηρίῳ τῆς Μεσσήνης. It is dated to the 15th century,

---

247 For more information see De Andrés (1987), 55-6 and Iriarte (1769), 141-4.
most likely no later than 1482, as Galland argues,\(^{248}\) because in 1482 Lascaris had excerpted the sixteenth book of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας for the use of Jacob Ximenes.\(^{249}\) Therefore, according to Galland’s argument, Lascaris must have already copied Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, before excerpting the sixteenth book, since he must have had in his possession a copy of the epitome before he excerpted the specific book. The possible counter-argument, namely that Lascaris could have had in his hands a copy of Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome, from which he first excerpted the sixteenth book and then copied the whole epitome, is weak if one takes into consideration Lascaris’ statement ἐπεὶ ἡ τοιαύτη πραγματεία […] δυσκολώτατα εὑρίσκεται διὰ τὰς δυστυχίας τοῦ γένους. πολλὰ γὰρ ποιήσας, μόλις εὗρον τὸ περὶ τόνων […] (‘since this treatise is very difficult to find because of the ill fortune of our nation (i.e. the Fall of Constantinople). For with much effort I just found Theodosius’ Περὶ τόνων […]’, codex Matri tensis 4689 (139)). This suggests that the Byzantine teacher, being aware of the difficulty of finding the treatise, is most likely to have copied it as soon as he found it.

In the first four folios there is a treatise on accents with the title περὶ προσῳδιῶν γενικῶς. In folio 5 there is a preface and a Table of Contents. The main text of our Epitome is in folios 6-54v and begins with the title κανόνες τῆς καθολικῆς προσῳδίας τοῦ σοφωτάτου Ἡρωδιανοῦ οὗς περιέτεμε Θεοδόσιος ό γραμματικὸς φυλάξας τῶν ἀριθμῶν τῶν βιβλίων. Folios 55-83 are blank.

\(^{248}\) Galland (1882a), 7-8.

\(^{249}\) This excerpted sixteenth book is an abridgement of the sixteenth book of Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome and is contained, together with the letter addressed to Jacob Ximenes, in codex Matri tensis 4689.
The handwriting is hasty, cursive, angular, not very clear, and leans towards the right. Middle points are usually used as dividers between the words quoted to exemplify the accentuation rules. Lascaris systematically employs accents, breathings and the iota subscript, but these are not always clear because they are small or because the ductus is thin.

The manuscript passed around 1494 to the cathedral of Messina, around 1690 to the Duke de Uceda and in 1712 to the Biblioteca Nacional de España.

This manuscript was examined in photocopies, CD-rom, and by autopsy.

b) Codex Baroccianus 179 (O): Oxford, Bodleian Library. The manuscript is made of paper and consists of 61 folios. It was written by Leon Chalkiopoulos (Λέων Χαλκιόπουλος) from Crete, in Messina in 1495. Although Galland mentions that Leon was a pupil of Constantine Lascaris, Martínez Manzano argues that there is no manuscript that confirms any collaboration between the two men. In my view, Leon’s scribal activity in Messina in the last decade of the 15th century does not exclude the possibility of a cooperation with Lascaris. The name of the scribe and the date are mentioned in the colophon which is written in Byzantine dodecasyllable verses:

\[ \text{ἡ βίβλος αὕτη, δευτέρα σχούσα τέλος | δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ελαφρίναι (sic) τοῦ πόνου (κόπου Οα. | ἐις τάς δύο δὲ μηνὸς τοῦ φλεβαρίου (ἰαννουρίου Οα.| ἱνδικτιῶν δωδεκάτης ἐούσης | Λέων γὰρ ὁ γράφας τε τὴν βίβλον ταύτην | κρίτηθεν ἐν} \]

250 For further comments on Lascaris’ handwriting see Fernández Pomar (1966), 235; Martínez Manzano (1994), 307.
251 See also RGK I 223.
252 My description of the manuscript is not intended to be exhaustive. For further information about the manuscript see Coxe (1969), 298-9.
253 For further information on this scribe and his characteristics see Gamillscheg – Harlfinger – Hunger (1981), I 237 (from now on I will refer to this work as RGK).
Messēniē te γέγραφε ταύτην (supra ταύτην habet δὲ νιν O\(^1\)) οί ἀναγινώσκοντες εὑχεσθε πάντες | ἐτῶν δὲ τρεχουσῶν\(^{255}\) ἐν οἷς ἔγραφη | ἐπτὰ χιλιάδων τε καὶ τριῶν ἑτὶ | δόξα τῷ παρέχοντι ἀρχήν καὶ τέμια | παμμεδέοντι Πατρὶ σὺν Υιὲι, Πνεύματι δόξα. (“This book, coming to an end in second place,”\(^{256}\) allowed us to be relieved of the labour on the second of February (of January O\(^{ac}\) of the twelfth indiction. Leon from Crete is the one who wrote this book, and he has written it in Messina. Let all those who read (this book) pray, seven thousand and three years having passed (scil. from the creation of the world, i.e. 5508 BC) when it was written. May there be glory to the greatest guardian Father who provides beginning and end together with his Son and the Holy Spirit”).

In folios 1-4 there are small treatises on accents and breathings: περὶ προσῳδιῶν γενικῶς (‘on prosodies in general’) (fol. 1), κανόνες καθολικοί τῶν τόνων (‘general accentuation rules’) (fol. 3), περὶ πνευμάτων πότε τὰ φωνηέντα ψιλούνται ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντα λέξεων καὶ πότε δασύνεται, ἐντευθὲν γνωστέον ἄν εἰς συντόμως (‘on breathings: when vowels have a smooth breathing at the beginning of words and when they have rough breathing should be known briefly from here’) (fol. 3b), περὶ τῶν δασυνομένων φωνηέντων (‘on vowels with a rough breathing’) (fol. 4). In fol. 5 there is a prologue to the rules of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, attributed to Theodosius. Our Epitome starts in folio 6 with the title: κανόνες τῆς καθολικῆς προσῳδίας τοῦ σοφιστάτου Ἡροδιανοῦ οὕς περιέτεμε Θεοδόσιος ὁ γραμματικὸς φυλάξας τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν βιβλίων (‘rules of the prosody in general of the very wise Herodian, which the grammarian Theodosius cut down preserving the number of the books’). As it is noted in the top margin of the last page of the epitome, Book 20 is missing; λείπει τὸ εἰκοστὸν τὸ περὶ χρόνων τῶν φωνηέντων καὶ πνευμάτων.

\(^{255}\) There is no grammatical agreement of the participle τρεχουσῶν with its subject ἑτῶν.

\(^{256}\) We know of a total of two manuscripts written by this scribe, the first (Lond. Harl. 5662) in 1493 in Messina and the second, this one in 1495.
The manuscript is preserved in good condition, despite many worm holes, especially in the margins of the paper. The handwriting is quite clear. Leon systematically writes accents, breathings and the iota subscript. He usually employs middle points as dividers between the words cited as examples of the accentuation rules.

The manuscript was acquired by the Bodleian Library, Oxford in 1629, when William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and Chancellor of the University of Oxford bought the Barocci collection for the University.²⁵⁷

This manuscript was examined by autopsy.

c) Codex *Hauniensis regius* 1965 (A):²⁵⁸ Copenhagen, *Det Kongelige Bibliotek, Nationalbibliotek, Københavns Universitetsbibliotek*. The manuscript is made of paper, 250x213mm, and consists of 910 pages. Smith identified Urbano Valeriano²⁵⁹ as the scribe of this manuscript.²⁶⁰ Urbano was a pupil of Constantine Lascaris, the scribe of *Matritensis 4575 = 32 (M)*; with Lascaris Urbano improved his knowledge of Greek.²⁶¹

The manuscript contains various grammatical treatises and is dated to the end of the 15th century. A preface²⁶² is found on pages 41-2 and the Table of Contents (πίναξ τοῦ ὅλου βιβλίου τοῦ περὶ τῶν) of the whole book on the rest of page 42 and on page 43. The main body of this epitome of Herodian’s *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας* begins with the title κανόνες τῆς καθολικῆς προσῳδίας τοῦ σοφωτάτου Ἡρωδιανοῦ οὗς περιέτεμε

²⁵⁷ For further information see Macray (1984), 68-74.
²⁵⁸ For information not included in my description of this manuscript see Schartau (1994), 168-77.
²⁵⁹ This scribe is also called Urbano Bolzanio, or Bellunese or Urbano da Belluno. On this see Adler (1938), 77; Martínez Manzano (1994), 25, n. 85.
²⁶⁰ Smith (1978), 58-9; see also Schartau (1994), 175.
²⁶² See also the section on the authorship, pp. 56-63.
Theodosios ὁ γραμματικὸς φυλάξ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν βιβλίων and occupies pages 44-186.

This manuscript is preserved in very good condition, although there are minor worm holes.263 The red ink is, however, quite faded almost everywhere.264 The handwriting is clear. The scribe systematically writes accents, breathings and the iota subscript, and he sometimes uses abbreviations (κυρ for κύριον, πόλις for πόλις). He usually employs middle points to separate the words cited as examples of the accentuation rules. The scribe is generally careful, although he makes some errors.

After the death of Urbano Valeriano (1524), the manuscript passed to the convent S. Niccolò in Venice. Afterwards Frederik Rostgaard (1671-1745) acquired it in Venice in 1699, and then the nobleman Christian Danneschiold-Samsøe (1700-1728) bought the manuscript in 1726.265 Since 1732 the manuscript has been in the Royal Library in Copenhagen.266

This manuscript was examined in photocopies and CD-rom.

d) Codex Parisinus Graecus 2603 (B).267 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France. This manuscript is made of paper and consists of 81 folios. It is dated to the 16th century. The manuscript contains the ‘grammaticae institutiones’ of Theodosius of Alexandria in folios 1-16. Our Epitome is found in folios 17-64 and bears the title Ἀρκαδίου γραμματική, and

263 Schartau (1994), 175.
264 Schartau (1994), 175.
265 Graux (1879), 50; Schartau (1994), 176.
266 Graux (1879), 50; Schartau (1994), 176.
267 See also Omont (1888-98), III, 12.
is succeeded by a treatise on breathings by Theodoretus or by Georgius Choeroboscus starting on folio 65. In folio 73 there is a small work on grammar by Theodosius.

This manuscript was examined in photocopies and by autopsy.

e) Codex *Parisinus Graecus* 2102 (C): Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*. It is made of paper and consists of 244 folios. It is dated to the 16th century and was written by Jacob Diassorinus. It contains the ‘logica’ of Nicephorus Blemmydes in folios 1-86 *recto*. From 86 *verso* we read the Egyptian, Roman, Greek, Athenian and Hebrew months. Our Epitome starts on folio 88 and occupies the rest of the manuscript. This is the only manuscript in which the Table of Contents of the epitome precedes the prologue. Moreover, this manuscript differs from all the others in that it provides Book 20. Nevertheless, the Table of Contents in this manuscript does not contain any description of Book 20. Between the Table of Contents and the prologue there is the phrase Ἀρκαδίου περὶ τόνου τῶν ὁκτώ μερῶν τοῦ λόγου καὶ περὶ εὐφέσεως τῶν προσῳδίων καὶ περὶ ἐγκλιτικῶν καὶ ἐγκλινομένων, ἐν ὦ καὶ περὶ πνευμάτων καὶ χρόνων (‘Arcadius’ (treatise) on the accent of the eight parts of speech and on the invention of prosodies and on enclitics and enclinomena, and also on breathings and quantities’), which attributes the authorship of our Epitome to Arcadius. C in general tends to add οἶνον before the

---

268 See also Omont (1886-98), I-II, 194.
269 On this see Galland (1882a), 14, who mentions Pulch’s remark that C is written in the same hand as Pseudo-Dracon and Pseudo-Philemon, i.e. Jacob Diassorinus; see also Cohn (1888), 141-3; Hunger (1978), 12.
270 For a discussion of the history of Book 20 as transmitted by C see my discussion in the Introduction.
271 See also the discussion of this phrase in the section on the authorship of our Epitome, pp. 58-9 and in the discussion of Book 20, p. 154.
words cited as examples for the accentuation rules, and creates *hyperbata* probably in an attempt to imitate a classical style.

This manuscript was examined in photocopies and by autopsy.

**Families of manuscripts**

The first scholar to work on the affiliations between the five main manuscripts of our Epitome was Galland.\(^{272}\) The stemma he provided was as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Βίβλος παλαιά]}
\\
\mid
\\
M
\\
\mid
\\
O^{273}
\\
A \quad [π]
\\
B \quad C
\end{array}
\]

Galland had correctly deduced that B and C are *codices gemelli*.\(^{274}\) These two manuscripts share common errors which are found in no other manuscript, and each of the two has some separative errors. The three lists below show, for the Preface and Books

---

\(^{272}\) Galland (1882a), 4-15.

\(^{273}\) Galland uses the name *Bodleianus* for *Baroccianus* 179 (O).

\(^{274}\) Cf. Egenolff (1887), 6, who says that B and C must share a common source.
1–8: (i) the common errors in B and C, (ii) the errors of B alone, and (iii) the errors of C alone:


275 In all the lists that follow, in cases where I do not give the symbol of a manuscript after a reading, it should be taken as the reading of every manuscript. Although I have collated the manuscripts in full, in this chapter I cite only the readings occurring in the Preface and Books 1-8. However, I mention readings occurring in the rest of the work where they affect the argument. I do not list the instances of omission of the iota subscript. I have also left out instances of errors that are not separative and/or could have been committed independently.

276 The omission of τ of the article τὰ at the beginning of rules occurs another 48 times. This error is due to the fact that the scribe wanted to write τ with red ink later but in the end he forgot to write it. Cf. the omission of ε in ἐτι (see footnote 277 below).

277 The omission of ε of the word ἐτι at the beginning of rules occurs another 6 times. This error is due to the fact that the scribe wanted to write ε with red ink later but in the end he forgot to write it. Cf. the omission of τ in τὰ (see footnote 276 above).
The same kind of error occurs another 226 times.

The same kind of error occurs another 18 times.
(iii) 1.13 ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ; ἑφεκάστω C; 1.19 συναγόμενον τε] συναγόμενον τε C; 1.19 κατά μέρος[ καταμέρος C; 1.20 ἄλλα] τάλλα C; 2.22 ὄντα om. C; 2.24 Τό] ὃ C; 2.26 τὴν om. C; 2.26 καταλήγων τα; 2.27 τῆν τά C; 2.28 Τό] ὃ C; 3.1 Τό] ὃ C; 3.1 ΜΟΣ] κος C; 3.14-5 περι ... διέξεις] περιέχει περι οὐδετέρων ὄνομάτων C; 3.21-2 τά ... πρόοσων[ πάν ὁμια καὶ πάσαν μετοχήν C; 3.23-4 πάν ... μετοχήν] πάν ὁμια τῶν εἰς μι καὶ περὶ συνθέτων ὄνομάτων C; 5.3 ὅς οὖν οὐδεσθαί] ὅς οὐδεσθαί sine accentu C; 6.13 σύμφωνον σύγχρονον C; 39.2 κατ' ἐπιπλοκήν] καταπλοκήν C; 39.2-3 ἡ τι] εἰ δὲ τι εἰ τι C; 39.14 λιμήν τις C; 39.19 τὸ τὸ ἐ C; 39.20 πλήρης om. C; 40.6 ΕΑΣ] ἂ C; 41.8 Μηριόνης] μυριόνης C; 42.7 Μενοίτης] μενοίτης C; 42.10 Ἑλεάτης] Ἑλεάτης C; 42.11 πειρατής C; 43.3-5 δεσμώτης ... ἐπιθετικά] C; 44.5 ὅς οὖν] C; 45.1 εἰς (alt.) om. C; 45.5 προτοτύπων] προτοτύπων C; 45.5-46.1 τάσιν] τάσιν C; 47.2-4 βραδυτής ... κούφωτη om. C; 48.5 μὲν om. C; 48.12 ὑποκοριστικά] ὑποκοριστικά (sic) C; 50.6 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 50.9 γέγγως] τέγγως C; 51.2-3 τὸ τὸ ... παλλακίς om. C; 51.13 ὑποκοριστικά] ὑποκοριστικά C; 51.14 ὑποκοριστικόν] ὑποκοριστικόν C; 51.27 μὲν om. C; 52.21 Ἀδούλις] Ἀγούλις C; 54.5 τρόπις] βότις C; 54.6 φωνηντός] φωνηντός C; 57.5 ὅς τε] ὅς τε C; 57.11 κιστίς] κιστίς duobus accentibus C; 58.4 παλόω] παλό C; 59.6 ὤθελχις] ὤθελχις C; 59.7 ἐπὶ τέλους] ἐπιτέλους C; 64.3 ἐός] ἐός C; 64.13 σύμφωνον] σύμφωνον C; 66.2 ἤχον] ἤχον C; 67.3 τροπὴν] τροπὴ C; 69.7 παροξυνέναι] προπαροξυνέναι C; 71.3 δὲ τὸ om. C; 71.5 Τά] τά C; 71.7 τρισύλλαβα τρισύλλαβον C; 71.19 ὄργεαν] ὀργεαν C; 74.5 κωβίος] κυβίος C; 74.10 παροξυνόν τα] παροξυνόν τα C; 76.3 τάλλα] τάλλα C; 79.5 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν om. C; 79.5 ὅς οὖν om. C; 80.3 χύδην] χύδην C; 81.12 τέλειος] τέλειος C; 82.14 καθαρόν] καθαρόν C; 83.4 Ἀρεούς] Ἀρεοῦς C; 83.11-2 ὅτα ... κύριον om. C; 84.3 πρὸ τέλους] προτέλους C; 84.7 ἰχθὺς] ἰχθὺς C; 84.7 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 84.10 ἐννοια τις] ἐννοια τις C; 86.4 οποδός] υποδός C; 87.11 σύμφωνον] σύμφωνον C; 90.7 προπαροξυνέναι] προπαροξυνέναι sine accentu C; 90.16 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 90.17 δισύλλαβα δισύλλαβα C; 91.3-4 πρὸ τέλους] προτέλους C; 91.21 πόκος] πόκος C; 92.5 παραλληγομενα] παραλληγομενα C; 93.2 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 93.8 προπαροξυνόμενα] προπαροξυνόμενα C; 93.9 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 94.1 ΚΟΣ] ὃς C; 94.9 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν om. C; 95.5 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 95.10 ἠλίκιος] ἠλίκιος C; 95.16 ἠλίκιος] ἠλίκιος C; 98.8 Τέλλα] Τέλλα C; 98.8 χύδη] χύδη C; 100.17 καὶ ... Ταβάλος] ταβάλος C; 101.5 ὅς οὖν] ὅς οὖν C; 101.6 προτελετικά] προτελετικά C; 101.10 σύνθετα] συνθετα C; 102.1 ἱδια] ἱδια C; 103.8 συνάθροισι C; 103.10 ἀπλα] ἀπλά C; 104.7 αἰμύλος] 280 The same error occurs another three times.
The common source of B and C must have been a now lost manuscript, to which Galland gives the symbol π. Dyck, while sharing the view that B and C are codices gemelli, takes their common source to be a bad copy of A. There are indeed a few mistakes shared by A, B, and C, but at least some of them could have easily been committed independently, while the rest can be otherwise explained, as will be shown later. On the other hand, there are some separative errors in A which are not reproduced by either B or C. Furthermore, the case of the error 18.2 κανών A: καμών MOBC leads me to believe that A cannot be the source of B and C, since B and C reproduce the error of the whole manuscript tradition, καμών, which A corrects into κανών. Galland listed a number of examples which, according to him, showed the agreement of A and B, C (from now on I will employ the symbol π when B and C agree) against M, but in fact only one of them is

281 Dyck (1993), 777.
282 Galland (1882a), 9. The page and line numbers in Galland’s list refer to Schmidt’s edition.
correct, 107.25 (Schmidt) Τὰ εἰς ψ Απ: περὶ τῶν εἰς ψ. Τὰ εἰς ψ Μ. I will now cite Galland’s incorrect examples, giving them first as they appear in his dissertation and then explaining why they are incorrect: 37.18 ὅτι τῷ ο παραλήγει Μ ὅτι τὸ ο παραλήγει Απ. This is not true, because only A and C have τό, while B has τῷ (sic); 136.14 Ἰσόδωρος Μ Ἰσόδωρος Απ. This is wrong because only C has Ἰσόδωρος, while A and B have Ἰσίδωρος; 121.6 (Schmidt; wrongly cited as 121.16 by Galland) σημαίνη (sic i omisso) Μ σημαίνει Απ. B has the reading σημαίνη, not σημαίνει like C, and in any case M has σημαίνει, not σημαίνη; 146.14 (Schmidt) Αἰας Αἰαντος Μ Αἰαντος ἐκ τοῦ Αἰας Απ. This is a mistake, since only C has Αἰαντος ἐκ τοῦ Αἰας, whereas A and B agree with M; 210.5 (Schmidt) Οἰ εἰς ζ Μ Αἰ εἰς ζ (scil. σύνδεσμοι) male Απ. Here again only C has the mistake Αἰ; B and A have οἰ in agreement with M.

Galland also refers to some readings in M recorded in Iriarte’s catalogue, arguing that these readings do not agree with A, B, and C. But M does not in fact disagree with A, B, and C; Iriarte reports M’s readings wrongly: 2.24 τὸ δεύτερον Μ τὸ δὲ δεύτερον Απ. This is an error because all four manuscripts have τὸ δὲ δεύτερον; 2.29 ἀρχόμενον Μ ἀρξάμενον Απ. All four manuscripts have the reading ἀρξάμενον; 60.4-5 Βενδίς Μολίς Ἀταργατίς Μ Βενδίς Μολίς Τοτίς Ἀταργατίς Απ (Ἀτεργατίς π.). This is wrong because M has the reading Τοτίς (Iriarte omits it). It is also a mistake to cite Ἀτεργατίς as the reading of π, that is of both B and C, since only C has Ἀτεργατίς; 83.6 μέχρι τῶν εἰς λος Μ μέχρι τῶν εἰς μος Απ. This information is incorrect, since M too has μέχρι τῶν εἰς μος; 133.19 (Schmidt)283 θεανῶ add. Απ. All four manuscripts have the reading θεανῶ.

283 Galland gave the wrong citation 133.18.
not only ABC as Galland says (Iriarte omits θεανσ); 202.20 (Schmidt) ἀκων Μ ἀέκων Απ. M indeed has the word ἀκων in the line of the text, but adds an ε above the line, thus correcting ἀκων to ἀέκων. Three cases of common errors (8.6 χυσωκτιν, 24.14 μοτιων, 50.20 ταμίθις) in A, B, and C can be explained otherwise, as will be shown below, and two (49.8 ἀψίς, 93.2 τῶ) could easily have been committed independently. The fact that A has separative errors not reproduced by B or C and the fact that A, B, and C have common mistakes suggest that A and π are codices gemelli. The lists below show, for the Preface and Books 1–8: (i) the errors of A alone, and (ii) the common errors of A, B, and C, which, as it will be argued later, do not support the derivation of B and C from A:

There was a native speaker of Greek and since χρυσάκτιν is preceded by ευάκτιν.

According to Galland’s stemma, A and π derive from O. We have, however, no evidence to support the derivation of A and π from O, and indeed Galland later retracted his view that A was derived from O, concluding instead that it was derived directly from M. Galland believed that π went back to O because B as well as O ends with the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου τέτυμαι τύμμα. This argument is
insufficient for two reasons: firstly because the same phrase exists in M, and so provides no reason to believe that \(\pi\) is derived from O, and secondly because, in fact, the last word in B and M is \(\tau\upsilon\psi\zeta\) and not \(\tau\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\), something which would encourage us to support the derivation of \(\pi\) from M, rather than from O. Galland in 1882 also argued for the derivation of both A and \(\pi\) from O on the basis of the comparison of M with *Matritensis* 139 = 4689. This manuscript was written by Constantine Lascaris, like M, and contains an abridged version of the sixteenth book of Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome. Galland observed that there are three cases in *Matritensis* 139 = 4689 (concerning rules found at Pseudo-Arcadius 179.1-5, 179.21-180.5, and 183.22-5) where Lascaris provides more examples than those appearing in A and \(\pi\). He then assumed, incorrectly, that those additional examples appear also in M. Finally, he reached the conclusion that A and \(\pi\) are derived from O, considering on the basis of invalid evidence that the omission of the extra examples by A, \(\pi\) and O indicated their closer affinity in opposition to M, and the derivation of A and \(\pi\) from O. The further examples found in *Matritensis* 139 = 4689 were, according to Galland, due to Lascaris’ fuller source. However, if Lascaris had had in his possession either the original work or another, more extensive epitome than Pseudo-Arcadius’, then he would have either copied that or he would have included those extra examples in M. In my view, the additional examples which appear in *Matritensis* 139 = 4689 should be attributed to Lascaris and are not part of Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome. Lascaris was very well aware of the difficulty of finding Pseudo-Arcadius’ epitome as he

---

286 Galland (1882a), 6-7, is ignorant of the existence of the specific phrase also in M.
287 Galland (1882a), 10-11.
288 The page and line numbers refer to Schmidt’s edition.
himself mentions in Matritensis 139 = 4689 (ἐπεὶ ἡ τοιαύτη πραγματεία [...] δυσκολώτατα εὐρίσκεται διὰ τὰς δυστυχίας τοῦ γένους, πολλὰ γάρ πονίζοια, μόλις εὑρὼν τὸ περὶ τόνων [...]), and he must have tried hard to preserve it as intact as possible. The extra examples could easily have been added by a native speaker and teacher of Greek, as Lascaris was.289

There are certainly common errors in O, B and C, but these are shared by M and A, and do not suggest a closer affinity between O, B, and C. Two common errors in OBC which are not in MA (63.4 βραχὺ om., 102.2 κάτηλος) can be otherwise explained as will be shown later, while two (41.1 τι πρὸ ἐτί, 122.6 Ὄρμενος) could have been committed independently. This, together with the fact that not all of O’s mistakes are included in B and C, and the fact that there are common errors in A, B, and C not shared by O suggest that O and the source of A and π were codices gemelli. The list below shows, for the Preface and Books 1–8, the errors of O alone:


289 Cf. the discussion on pp. 149, 170.
βαθυφοίτης] βαθυφείτης ὥ; 43.12 αὐτοσφαγής] αὐτοσφαής ὥ; 48.9 τύπον] τότον ὥ; 49.8 μεμίαιοι] μεμίαιον ὥ; 50.4-5 Ἀθαράμβις κάνναβις] ἀθαράμβις καναβις ὥ; 50.8 βαρύννεται] βαρυννεῖ] βαρυννεῖ ὥ; 51.8 κερδίς] κερδίς ὥ; 51.23 καὶ ὑλὶς (ἤ ὑλὰ)] καὶ τὸ ὑλὶς ἢ ὑλὲς ὥ; 51.23 αὐλίς] αὐλίς ὥ; 51.24 ἢ πόλις om. ὥ; 51.26 προπαραλήγοντα] παραλήγοντα ὥ; 52.8 ἐπήλ] ἐπήλ] ἐπῆλ ὥ; 52.13 μοιχαλίς] μοιχαλίς ὥ; 52.13 θυμαλίς] θυμαλίς ὥ; 52.17-21 τῷ - ἐκούς ὥ; 52.24 σημαί] σημαί] σημαί ὥ; 53.19 ξίσ] ἐ ὥ; 53.20 ψύξω ψύξις] τὺψω τὺψις ὥ; 54.1 ἀμαξα ἀμαξίς] ἀμαξα ἀμαξίς ὥ; 54.5 λεπίς om. ὥ; 55.1 Αἰθιοπικὰ] ἀθιοπίκα ὥ; 55.5 ΚΩΣ] κῳ ὥ; 55.5 μὲν om. ὥ; 57.4 τὰ μὲν om. ὥ; 58.10 Μέμψις] μέμψις ὥ; 59.7 ἀ] τ om. in spatio vacuo ὥ; 60.10 παῖς] παῖς ὥ; 61.9 κόπτου] κόπλου ὥ; 61.9 κλοῖς] κλοίος κλοῖος ὥ; 63.4 τὸ om. ὥ; 64.15 τρισύλλαβα ἀπλά] ἀπλὰ τρισύλλαβα ἀπλά ὥ; 65.1 κτιτακα] κτιτακά ὥ; 65.1 σημαίνοντα] σημαίνονται ὥ; 66.6 δαιδάλεος om. ὥ; 68.3 γεγονὸς] γεγονὸς ὥ; 71.15 ἐνάλος om. ὥ; 73.8 ὄφιος]] ὄφιος ὥ; 73.9 ἀει] ἀεὶ ὥ; 73.9 ἀειδος] ἀειδίῳ ὥ; 73.10 ὑπίδιος] ὑπίδιος ὥ; 82.7 ταῦτα εἰσι] ταῦτα εἰσι ὥ; 82.8 ἀκατείος] ἀκατείος ὥ; 84.13 ἔργον] ἔργον ὥ; 85.8 θηνός] θηνός ὥ; 86.1 μέντοι] μέντο ὥ; 87.3 νάρδος] νάρδος ὥ; 90.7-8 ei de τί καὶ ὀξύνεται om. ὥ; 90.19 ταῦκος] ταῦκο ὥ; 91.16-9 δύσκο — βαρύννεται om. ὥ; 95.15 κόρυκος om. ὥ; 96.1 ΣΚΟΣ] κος ὥ; 96.6 ἐνεκα] ἐνεκ ὥ; 97.2 πύλος om. ὥ; 97.2 μύλος ὥ; 98.1 Σαύλος] σαύλος ὥ; 98.15 Ἐβεσίος] ἐβεσίος ὥ; 99.11 κρύσταλλος] κρύσταλλος ὥ; 99.15 ἐκφερόμενα] ἐκφερόμενα ὥ; 99.20 κορυδάλλος] κορυδάλλος ὥ; 100.3 ὄπτιλλο] ὄπτιλλο ὥ; 100.7 ἵξαλος δαιδάλος] δαιδαλὸν ὥ; 104.8 ἀγκύλος] ἀγκύλος ὥ; 104.15 Χαρμύλας] χαρμύλος ὥ; 104.17 Ὀξύλος] ὀξύος ὥ; 104.19 τριβφάχεα] τρισύλλαβα ὥ; 106.1 ἄστι] ἄστι ὥ; 106.3 ἅστι] ἅστι ὥ; 106.10 ἐξαλο] ἐξαλο ὥ; 106.14 ὑπουλο] ὑπουλο (sic) ὥ; 107.4 το ὥ; 107.6 Τρακμός] τρακτρός ὥ; 107.13 βρυσμό] βρυσμός ὥ; 107.18 ὅν ὥ; ὅ de ὥ; 108.1 τυλιός] τυλιός ὥ; 108.7 τριβω τριμιός] τριβω τριμιόν ὥ; 108.19 θριγνέ] θριγνεῖνε [sic] ὥ; 109.2 ἀρχόμενα] ἀρχόμενα ὥ; 109.8 ἢ ἢ] ἢ ὥ; 111.2 Δείμος] δέμος ὥ; 113.1 Ἐχεμοῖ om. ὥ; 113.13 ἐβδομο] ἐβδομο ὥ; 113.14 ἐγγροκόμος] ἐγγροκόμος ὥ; 114.2 ἐτυμο] ἐτυμο ὥ; 115.2 ἀλύδομος] ἀλύδομος ὥ; 117.7 ὃ σκληρός om. ὥ; 117.16 θύνος om. ὥ; 118.1 ἐραννό] ἐρανό ὥ; 118.3 παραξύνεται] δέξινεται ὥ; 119.7 μόνον] μακρόν ὥ; 122.5 παθὸν] παθὸ ὥ; 122.13 ἄβυθνός] ἄβυθνός ὥ; 126.20 ὅλυμπος] ὅλυπος ὥ; 126.20 Ἰἀροτο] Ἰάροτο ὥ; 128.9 ὃ (pr.) ὥ; 129.1 ἔ ἔ] ἔ ὥ; 130.12 κακὸς] κακό ὥ; 131.1 σταυρός] σταυρό ὥ; 131.13 οἰκοῦρος] νικοῦρῷ ὥ.
Galland was right in observing that the manuscripts A, B and C go back to M.290 But I will argue that A and π go back to M directly; as mentioned above, Galland himself reached this conclusion in 1886 (Galland (1886), 293), in the case of A. The direct or indirect derivation of A from M could also be supported historically, if one thinks that Urbano Valeriano, the scribe of A, was a pupil of Constantine Lascaris. Leon Chalkiopoulos, the scribe of O, copied his manuscript in Messina, where Lascaris was a renowned teacher of Greek,291 and an acquaintance between the two men is possible;292 but the fact that O has some good readings that are not in M, and which should be considered inherited from O’s source rather than being Leon’s conjectures, suggest that O’s main source was not M. The good readings in O should be attributed to its source because Leon is very often careless and makes orthographical errors that one would not expect from a native speaker of Greek, something which suggests that Leon should not be expected to have corrected any errors in his source.293 It seems necessary to assume that O was copied from the παλαιὰ βίβλος, the same source which Lascaris employed to create his own copy.294 However, some readings given in the margins of O, which agree with M, suggest that Leon consulted M after copying from the παλαιὰ βίβλος. The three lists below show mainly for the Preface and Books 1-8, but also from the rest of the Epitome: (i) the good readings in O alone, (ii) the mistakes of M which came down to ABC, (iii) the good readings in M alone, and (iv) the errors in which M is alone but which do not speak

290 Galland (1882a), 12.
291 For further information on this see Martínez Manzano (1994), 21-3.
292 On the relation of the two scribes with Lascaris see also Martínez Manzano (1994), 25 (Urbano), 301 (Leon), RGK, and Foti (1989), 124 (Urbano), 127 (Leon). For the assumption that Urbano’s manuscript derives from that of Lascaris see also Pellegrini (2001), 178.
293 Cf. Schneider (1887), 41-2.
294 Cf. Schneider (1887), 41-2.
against the derivation of A, B, and C from M because the scribes could have corrected.

Specifically ὀξύνεται instead of M's ὀξύλεται would have been an easy correction, and M's μονοψι could have been easily corrected to μονώψ within a list of words ending in –ωψ.

(i) 18.16-7 Ἐμικροίων Ο: ἐμικροίων MC: ἐμικροίων AB; 22.2 Ω: o MABC; 50.11 ἄλουργίς Ο: ἄλουργίς AB: ἄλουργίς spiritu incerto M: ἄλουργίς (sic) C; 57.2 νυκτίς Ο: νυκτίς MABC; 57.4 βαρύνεται Β: βαρύνονται MABC; 58.3 πολῖτις Ο: πολῖτις/πολῖτις duobus accentibus M: πολῖτις BC: πολῖτις sine accentu A; 66.3 σμερδάλεος Ο: σμερδάλεος MA; 66.7 ἐγένοντο Ο: ἐγένετο MABC; 68.5 προπαροξύνεται Ο: προπαροξύνεται MABC; 77.1 παραληγόμενα ... προσγεγραμμένον Ο: παραληγόμενα τῷ ὤ μετὰ το προσγεγραμμένον M: παραληγόμενα τῷ ὤ μετὰ το προσγεγραμμένον (A:προσγεγραμμένον A) A: παραληγόμενα τῷ ὤ μετὰ το προσγεγραμμένον B: τῇ ὤ διφθόγγῳ καταχρηστική παραληγόμενα C; 79.12 ἐν ἀρχῇ Ο: ἐν ἀρχῇ MAB: ἐναρχῇ C; 104.7 πράσος Ο: πράσος MABC; 104.19 ἔχοι Ο: ἔχει MAB: τι ἔχοι C; 131.4 στάνια...βαρύνονται O: γραφεῖται) στάνια, βαρύτονα MABC: στάνια βαρύτονα MABC; 136.2 κατάκορος Ο: κατάκορος MABC; 144.1 τῷ Ο: τῷ MABC; 148.9 λύστος ὀξύτος Ο: λύστος ὀξύτος MABC: λύστος ὀξύτος Α.


(iii) 4.11 οἱ Μ: οἱ Ο: οἱ ΟΒ; 27.9 κυμοπλήξ Μ: κυμοπλήξ Α: κυμοπλήξ O: κυμοπλήξ Π; 52.19 τῷ Μ: τῷ Π: τῷ Π; 55.15 ἄγριος MAB: ἄγριος ΟC.

In these instances A, π, and Ο make mistakes independently of one another.

(iv) 99.20 ὀξύνεται] ὀξύλεται (sic) M; 108.14 (Schmidt) μονώψ] μονοψι M.
My examination of the manuscripts has shown, in contrast to the views of most earlier scholars, that A and π are derived from M directly.\textsuperscript{295} An indication of the direct and independent derivation of A and π from M is the fact that in cases where certain readings in M are ambiguous, because a letter of a word is not clear and thus there are two possible readings, at times A agrees with π, but at other times A and π provide the two possible ways of reading M’s ambiguity. This observation helps us to explain the random agreement of the following groups of manuscripts in certain readings: 1. M with B and C; 2. M with A, 3. A with B and C. The place of certain phrases in the text or in the margin may be also employed as evidence for the derivation of A and π from M. The examples of errors in the manuscripts which indicate that A and π are directly derived from M, together with my explanations for these errors, have been divided into three groups.

The first category of evidence consists of ambiguities in M that pass on to the other manuscripts either as one or the other possibility:

2.1 κρατυνομένων MC: κρατενομένων AB. The letter υ in M looks like an ε. π must have copied ε, which then B copied but C corrected to υ; 5.6 Δωριάν Lobeck: δωρέαν MBC: δηρεάν A. Here the letter ω in M looks like η; 7.8 μελείρην M\textsuperscript{a-c}: μελείρην M\textsuperscript{a-c}:ABC. The second λ is placed below the line rather awkwardly and unusually (since one normally expects the corrections to appear above the line) and thus ABC omit one λ; 18.3 πλατανών MA: πλαταύων BC; 18.14 ἁβρων MA: ἁβρων B: ἁβρων C. The letter φ is not clearly formed and gives the impression of a β; 20.1 Κράτων MOBC: κρώτων A. The shape of α in M looks like ω; 24.14 μωτίων M: μωτίων ABC. The letter φ in M looks like τ; 27.10 ὑπαίθρης MBC: ὑπάθρης A. In M σ in the ligature στ is squeezed, and since it is not clearly formed, A omits it; 27.10 ἀντίπης Schmidt: ἀντίσπης MBC: ἀντίπης A. Here again σ is squeezed before π and A omits it as it is not clearly visible; 28.7 ἐξαύτης] ἐξάντης A. A provides the reading ἐξάντης, because

\textsuperscript{295} The only scholar who argued this was Schneider (1887), 41-2.
υ in M is quite angular at its base; 36.2 ἐφύλαξε B: ἐφύλαξεν C: ἐφύλαξαν MA. In this case the α in M’s ending looks like an ε; 50.20 Ταμίαθίς] ταμίσθίς M: ταμίθίς A BC: fortasse ταμίθίς A BC. In the ligature σθ the letter σ is squeezed and not clearly visible; 52.3 πενταλίς MBC: πρυταλίς A. The ligature εν in M looks very close to the ligature υν and thus A has πρυταλίς instead of πενταλίς; 52.12 κορυδαλίς MB: κορυδαλίς AB. The first λ in M is rather small and invisible and therefore A and B leave out one λ; 61.4-5 ναύος αύος] νάνος ἄνος A: ναύος αύος MB: ναύος αύος C. The shape of ν in these words looks like ν, since the base is pointed rather than circular; 86.11 μανδός BC: μανδός vel μανδός M: μανδός A. The shape of the third letter in M is between ν and ν; 102.1 κάτηλος MA: κατηλός BC. The shape of the π looks like a τ because the two vertical lines of π are right next to each other, so that they give the impression of being only one thick vertical line; 106.21 Ἡγίμος MBC: Ἡγίμος MA: Ἡγίμος. The error in B and C is due to the fact that the shape of the rough breathing above ο and before ι, which has been omitted and later placed above the line in M, creates the impression of the diphthong οι; 106.25 κύδος MB: κύδος A. The shape of the letter after δ is between μ and ν; 137.12 νοθούρος Lobeck: νοθούρος MA: νοθούρος B: νοθούρος C. The shape of the ι in M is ambiguous and looks like an ι; 103.2-3 (Schmidt) τεθρατολόγος MBC: τεθρατολόγος BC: fortasse τεθρατολόγος MBC: om. A. M probably wrote τεθρατολόγος by mistake and then wishing to cross out the iota, drew a vertical line above the iota. So finally the shape of the iota together with the vertical line gave the impression of the letter theta (θ), something which caused the mistake in BC. However, the way M usually forms a theta is not the same as the shape the erased iota eventually takes; 103.23 (Schmidt) ἕχος MA: ἕχος B: ἕχος C. The first letter in M looks like both η and ε, something that causes A to write ἕχος, while B has ἕχος.

The second group of indications consists of double readings in M that are either reproduced by the rest of the manuscripts or for which the scribes choose one of the two randomly:

51.15 πρόλος MAB: προλός MAB: προλός MAB. B reproduces the two readings provided by M in the same position (i.e. the word that is in the line in M is also in B and the one above the line in M is also in B). This suggests that π copied both M’s readings, something which B followed, but C did not copy the reading above the line. A copies only the reading of the main text; 108.15 λίπος A: λίπος/ λίπος duobus accentibus M: λίπος BC. M has both an acute and a circumflex on the word λίπος/ λίπος; A chooses the acute, while π (BC) chooses the circumflex.
The third type of evidence is linked with the place of certain words in M. In the example 79.8-9 both M and A provide the words ἀραιός ὁ τῆς ἀρᾶς ἀραιός ὁ μὴ πυκνός in the margin of the same line in the text, although A reverses the word order in the following way: ἀραιός ὁ μὴ πυκνός (sic) ἀραιός ὁ τῆς ἀρᾶς. In 111.3 M omits βαρύνεται in the line of the text and adds it later above καὶ οἶμος (spiritu incerto M). A places βαρύνεται before καὶ οἶμος because the place where βαρύνεται is written in M suggests that βαρύνεται was intended to be before καὶ οἶμος. Although βαρύνεται is written above the line even in B, the latter correctly presents βαρύνεται after καὶ οἶμος, together with C.

The ambiguities in M should not, in my view, be attributed to Lascaris. Lascaris was a teacher of Greek, and he should not be expected to have been careless when forming letter shapes. Furthermore, his awareness of the significance of our text and of the difficulties of finding it, as well as his wish to preserve the text as intact as possible – laid out in his letter to Jacob Ximenes – lead me to think that Lascaris, being perhaps uncertain in some cases about what was written in his source, reproduced ambiguities found in the παλαιὰ βιβλία. The attribution of M’s ambiguities to the παλαιὰ βιβλία explains two common errors in OBC. In 63.4 M has δίχρονον βραχύ but δίχρονον is added above the line. OBC have only δίχρονον. It is possible that δίχρονον was above the line in the παλαιὰ βιβλία and that Lascaris reproduced it, while O and τ thought that δίχρονον was intended to replace βραχύ. In 102.2 M has the ambiguous reading κάτηλος/κάτηλος (i.e. the third letter could be either τ or τ). A has κάτηλος while OBC

296 Cf. p. 149.
have κάτηλος. If the ambiguous letter was in the παλαιὰ βίβλος and M reproduced it while O wrote clearly τ, and then the common source for B and C read τ in M, the common error in OBC can be explained without having to assume a closer connection between O and π. Two further common mistakes in Oπ could easily have been committed independently. In 41.1 Oπ omit the ε of ἔτι, but this is due to the fact that the scribes intended to write the ε with red ink but in the end they forgot to write it. At 122.6 Oπ write Ὄρμενος with rough breathing while MA have Ὄρμενος with smooth breathing but this is probably accidental. The attribution of M’s ambiguities to the παλαιὰ βίβλος explains the error in A and O before correction at 60.4 Τοτὶς MBπC: τοτὶς A: τοπὶς (πὶς expunctum) O: τότὶς Bπc. M at the specific point has the reading τοτὶς but the shape of τι looks like a π. This is in accordance with my view laid out above, that Lascaris reproduced ambiguities in the παλαιὰ βίβλος. τοτὶς could have been written in the παλαιὰ βίβλος, but τι could have looked like a π. The scribe of O may have first read τοπὶς, but expecting that the examples should have had the ending –ις, wrote τοπὶς, but then realized that what he had earlier read as π was the ligature τι, so deleted τοπὶς and wrote τοτὶς. The same could have happened independently to A by looking at M.

Returning now to the agreement of A and O in error against the rest of the manuscript tradition, two of these errors (14.1 φυλάττων] φυλάττων AO, 93.9 εἰς om. AO, 106.10 ἐωλὸς] ἐωλὸς AO) may have well been committed by more than one scribe independently. At the time that these manuscripts are written, there had long ago ceased to be any distinction in length between ς and ω, hence the error φυλάττων instead of
Moreover, the scribes could have been influenced by the reading Ἰπποθῶν, whose accent is commented on at that point (13.10-14.1 τὸ δὲ Ἰπποθῶν περισπάται φυλάττων [...]). The omission of εὶς at 93.9 could be due to the fact that εἰς is preceded by διὰ τοῦ in the manuscript tradition. διὰ τοῦ is a phrase which, like εἰς, can be used to denote the ending of a word. The scribes, seeing that εἰς came after διὰ τοῦ, could have thought that εἰς was redundant, and that it was perhaps incorporated into their source as a gloss for διὰ τοῦ, and left it out of their texts on purpose. The writing of the word ἐ̣ωλος with a smooth breathing at 106.10 (ἐ̣ωλος) could very easily have been committed independently by the scribes of A and O; at their time the rough breathing had, of course, long since ceased to be pronounced.

It is difficult, nevertheless, to consider mistakes 116.5 χαίνειν MBC: χαίρειν AO, 152.5 (Schmidt) καὶ χεροῖν om. AO, and 157.15 (Schmidt) κανὰ τῶν κανῶν] κακὰ τῶν κακῶν AO, as the outcomes of coincidence. These are suggestive of a closer affinity between the two manuscripts, but Galland’s theory of the derivation of A from O should be excluded on the basis of the mistakes in O which are not inherited by A.

Taking into account: (i) the evidence for the direct derivation of A from M, (ii) the fact that O is copied from the παλαιὰ βίβλος but is also looking at M, and (iii) the small number of common errors between A and O, one has to accept that A is also looking either at O, or at the παλαιὰ βίβλος. Historical and practical reasons as well as two other pieces of evidence suggest that A is looking at the παλαιὰ βίβλος rather than O. The

297 The lack of distinction between ω and ὃ also accounts for another two common errors in A and O: 164.7 (Schmidt) ἐγκλίνονται] ἐγκλίνονται ΑΟ, 164.14 (Schmidt) ἐγκλίνονται] ἐγκλίνονται ΑΟ.
παλαιὰ βίβλος was in the possession of the monastery where Lascaris was teaching and where Urbano copied A. It is very likely that Lascaris enabled Urbano to have access both to his own copy and to the one from which he copied M. Leon provides a parallel for the possibility for a scribe copying in that monastery to gain access to both the παλαιὰ βίβλος and M. This view is reinforced by the case of the error at 204.7 (Schmidt) where the readings of O and A coincide both before and after the correction. The scribe of O had firstly written κλητικαί but then replaced λ with τ. A began to write κλητικαί, but realizing that this was a mistake cancelled κλ and wrote κτητικαί. If A was only looking at M, there would be no reason for A’s starting to write κλητικαί, because M clearly has κτητικαί. Furthermore, if A was also looking at O, there would be no explanation for A’s starting to write κλητικαί, since O clearly corrects to κτητικαί. I take κλητικαί to be a mistake in the παλαιὰ βίβλος, corrected straightaway by Lascaris but by A (looking here later at M) and by O only after first copying the mistake from the παλαιὰ βίβλος.

Finally, a last detail of the relationship between the manuscripts concerns the fact that C, differently from B, preserves both sections on adverbs in Book 19. C must have derived the second section on adverbs from another source, probably M or A. I am not in favour of the view that the second section was in π but B omitted it, because the παλαιὰ βίβλος must have had some blank space after the end of section one on adverbs. This thought is based on four pieces of evidence: (i) O has some blank space between the end of the first section and the beginning of the section on conjunctions. (ii) M must have also initially left some blank space after the end of the first section on adverbs, since towards the end of the second section on adverbs the letters in M become smaller and are squeezed in order to fit in the space before the beginning of the section on conjunctions.
(iii) The fact that B has some blank space after the end of the first section on adverbs suggests that π also left some space. (iv) The space that O leaves between the end of the first section on adverbs and the beginning of the section on conjunctions is roughly the same as the space that the second section on adverbs takes up in M (and roughly the same as the blank space in B). The scribe of C must have tried to present his copy as complete as possible. This is the reason why he supplied Book 20, which was not in his source.

Taking into consideration all the above observations, I conclude that the stemma of the manuscript tradition of our text is the following:

```
  Βίβλος παλαιά
      /     \
     M       O
   /     \      |
A      π     |
  |      /   |
  |
B      C
```

My stemma is closer to that of Schneider, but his study has the following flaws:

(i) Some of the readings of manuscripts he recorded, and on the basis of which he concluded the relationships between the manuscripts, are wrong. (ii) He left open the possibility that O was copied directly from M. (iii) He did not observe the common errors between O and A which lead us to assume that A as well as O consulted another source. (iv) He did not point out that the fact that C transmits the second section on adverbs, differently from B, strongly suggest that C consulted another source apart from π.

---

298 See also the sections on Book 19 (pp. 104-7, esp. 105) and Book 20 (pp. 107-111, esp. 111).
299 See also the section on Book 20 (pp. 107-111).
300 Schneider (1887), 42.
2 Previous editions of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome

Barker’s Edition

E. H. Barker’s editio princeps of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωμίας was published in 1820. Barker based his edition almost entirely on a transcript of the worst manuscript, codex Parisinus Graecus 2102 (C), prepared by Gregorius Georgiades Zalykius of Thessaloniki in 1816. Georgiades noted the variant readings from codex Parisinus Graecus 2603 (B) in the lower margin of his copy of C. The notes below Barker’s text belong to Zalykius, but were translated from French into Latin by Gottfried Hermann Schaefer. Georgiades’ copy contains some mistakes. It sometimes attributes to B and C readings which are not in the manuscripts, and it often fails to note the variant readings of B.

The main disadvantage of this edition lies in the fact that the two manuscripts employed are the worst and most recent. Both these manuscripts contain errors and omissions, not only of single words but of whole accentuation rules. These omissions are due to saut du même au même.

Barker’s edition is not a real critical edition, but mainly a transcription of C’s text, with some variants from B. Barker often allows in his text readings that are obvious mistakes.

301 Barker, E. H. (1820), Άρκαδίου περὶ τῶν τῶν (Leipzig).
302 Barker (1820), V.
303 Barker (1820), 2.
Schmidt’s Edition

Fourty years after the editio princeps, in 1860, M. Schmidt prepared a new edition of the Epitome. Schmidt employed, apart from manuscripts B and C, the manuscript Hauniensis regius 1965 (A). In fact, Schmidt did not examine the manuscript himself, but employed the variant readings of A which Bloch had noted and which W. Dindorf published in the first volume of his book Grammatici Graeci (1823, p. 48-70). A has some good readings that are not in B and C, so the use of A resulted in some improvement of the text. Nevertheless, since Bloch’s variant readings were sometimes untrue, some errors have passed into Schmidt’s text.

Another flaw of this edition is that it inherits some of the mistakes of the previous edition, since it derives the readings of B and C from Barker’s edition. Schmidt identified Barker’s edition with the text of C and took the variant readings of B from Barker’s apparatus, but where there was no note with a variant reading of B, Schmidt assumed that B’s text was identical to the text of C. I have noted Schmidt’s wrong manuscript readings in an appendix. Another disadvantage of Schmidt’s edition is that he trusts readings of C in preference to readings of A and B, in cases where C makes changes in the text in order to make it look either more complete (e.g. the frequent addition of οἷον before lists of examples) or closer to the classical style (e.g. use of hyperbata; In 21.6 he printed the reading of C, πιτύρισμα. The prefixed ἀποπιτύρισμα might have been thought later than πιτύρισμα, and therefore the scribe of C preferred πιτύρισμα.).

305 Schmidt M. (1860a), V.
306 See also Galland (1882a), 4. In 1881 Egenolff published an article ‘In Herodianum technicum critica’, in which he provides the results of his new collation of A and corrects Bloch’s errors.
Apart from the employment of good readings in A, Schmidt’s important contribution to the reconstruction of the text of our Epitome lies in the fact that he provided a critical apparatus, that he made significant conjectures of his own and adopted many good conjectures by other scholars, such as C. A. Lobeck and K. Lehrs, and that in certain cases he noted parallel passages from later grammatical and lexicographical texts which could help in restoring the text. Taking these into consideration, I consider Schmidt’s edition the first critical edition of the text.

The present edition

The need for a new edition of Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome arises from the many weaknesses of the previous two editions. These are mainly due to the fact that neither of the two editors examined all the surviving manuscripts, and that they did not read the manuscripts themselves but used copies made by other people.

For the purposes of my edition I have fully collated the five manuscripts that preserve my text in its entirety. The significance of the collation of all the surviving manuscripts lies not only in the fact that I have been able to examine all the witnesses to my text, but in that the two manuscripts which I am the first to employ, Matritensis 4575 and Baroccianus 179, enable us to improve the text to a considerable degree. This is especially important to the extent that some voces nihili (ghost words) and scribal errors in A, B, and C, printed by Barker and Schmidt, can now be replaced by good readings. As shown in the chapter on the Manuscript Tradition, the new examination of the manuscripts I have undertaken comes to a new conclusion about their interrelations, which substantially affects decisions on the text.
Another innovation of my edition is that it contains an apparatus of parallel passages, to help show where other texts have derived material from Herodian, and to contribute to a better understanding of Herodian’s influence on later grammatical texts. The parallel passages, as witnesses to Herodian’s text in some form, often enable us to correct points in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome.

A further contribution of my thesis consists of the Notes on the text, which discuss corrupt passages, problems, and features of the text that have never been explained before, other points of interest such as rare words, and places where specific details of the epitomator’s methods can be identified. The Notes also provide argumentation supporting decisions taken in editing the text (e.g. why a certain reading has been chosen), and other helpful information for the understanding of the text.

**Editorial Principles:**

I keep what is in the manuscript tradition, unless it does not make sense. Words transmitted in the manuscripts but nowhere else attested sometimes raised the question whether they should be regarded as *hapax legomena* or scribal errors, and it was often very difficult to draw the line between the two possibilities. If there is a word which is attested only in Pseudo-Arcadius, and about which we are not sure if this is a *hapax* or a scribal error, I put a question mark in brackets (?) after it. This practice is also employed by Schmidt and Lentz. If a word is definitely corrupt but there is more than one equally possible solution, I print the transmitted reading with an *obelus*, and I list all the sensible suggestions in the critical apparatus.
In general, in dealing with an epitome it is difficult to find the right balance between what is necessary for the meaning and thus needs to be in the text, and what could be easily inferred and might therefore have been omitted by the epitomator for the sake of brevity. Furthermore, two specific features of the epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian also affect decisions taken in the text: (i) his tendency not to mention all the conditions for a rule in the initial statement of the rule, but to leave some for the later point when an exception is cited, and (ii) his tendency not to mention the reason why something is an exception.307

Exceptions to rules are sometimes justified with reference to facts that a modern scholar would say are associated at best accidentally with forms accented in a certain way, and the accentuation of the same form is sometimes justified in different ways in different rules. These features are typical of ancient grammatical theory: taken by themselves, I do not consider them reasons for emending the text.

In editing the text I have given special thought to postclassical features that occur in the Epitome, for example the fact that with neuter plural subjects the verb can be either singular or plural. Since the singular and plural vary freely in postclassical texts, including grammatical texts, I print each time the reading of the manuscript tradition.

In my edition I sometimes employ the indirect sources for the reconstruction of Pseudo-Arcadius. It is true that the corruption may occur in both the direct and indirect sources, but if these are examined in parallel a conclusion can often be reached. In the

---

307 See the discussion of these two characteristics of the epitomator’s method in Notes 1.17-21 δεί ... ὑπάρχη, 1.21 συντομίας ... 2.1 κρατυνομένων.
cases where I reconstruct Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome on the basis of a later indirect source, I have done so with the following principle: if Pseudo-Arcadius’ manuscripts transmit a scribal error, either a vox nihili or a word which does not make sense at the place where we read it, and if a palaeographically similar word can be found in a parallel passage in, at least, one of the late antique and Byzantine indirect sources, and this reading would be suitable for the place in Pseudo-Arcadius, then this reading can replace the error in the Epitome.
PART THREE: Text
(1.) Τούς ἐφικέσθαι τῆς ἐν προσωδίας καθολικής ἀναλογίας ποθοῦντας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ μήκος τῆς Ἡρωδιανοῦ πραγματείας ἀπαγορεύοντας, ἢ δι’ ἐπιτομῆς παράδοσις ὄνησε πρὸς τὸ βουλήμα. Σκόπει οὖν εἰ τι καὶ ἦν ἄτοιχον χρήσιμον εἰς συντομίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς σαφήνειαν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὸ πολύπλοκον τῶν ὁρισμῶν ἐν πολλοῖς κανόνοις αὐθέντως κείμενον δύσληπτον ἦν, καταδιηρέθη τούτο, ἵν’ εὐλήπτα γένηται διαφερέντα <τά> ύφ᾽ ἐν κείμενα τῷ Ἡρωδιανῷ τὸ γὰρ ἀμα γένος εἰδὸς σχῆμα κατάληξεν παράληξιν ἀρχὴν χρόνον στοιχείον πάθος παρατηρεῖν, καὶ όσα ἄλλα, ἢ τὰ πλείον τούτων, χαλεπὸν καὶ δυσέφικτον. ἐφ᾽ ἐκάστῳ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων ὁρισμῶν (2.) ἢ μὴ ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ἁμα [διὰ] τῶν παραδειγμάτων εὐθὺς παράθεσις ἀπαγορεύει διάνοιαν, ὡστε ὅδον τοῖς ἀλλοίς ἀκολουθεῖν. δεὶ δὲ τὸν ἐφ᾽ ἐκάστῳ κανόνος περιτέμινας λόγων οὕτως ἐχει αὐτόν ἐντελῆ συναγόμενον τε ἐκ τῶν κατὰ μέρος, ἴνα μὴ συντομία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφήνεια τοῖς ἐντευθέμενοις ὑπάρχῃ. συντομίας δὲ χάριν παρεῖται τὸ διὰ ζητήσεως κανονίζειν τῶν μὲν

---

ἀνατρεπομένων τῶν λόγων, τῶν δὲ κρατυνομένων ἵκανόν γὰρ τὸ κρατοῦντι λόγῳ πειθεθαί περὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς προσωπίας, ὡστε τῆς ὀρθότητος τοῦ ἐλληνικοῦ μὴ διαμαρτάνειν, καὶ τοῦ ταύτην συνιστάντος λόγου μὴ ἀνεπιστήμονα ἔχειν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πολὺ πλῆθος τῶν παραδειγμάτων, καὶ ἡ περὶ τῶν ἀγνοουμένων ἐν αὐτοὶς ἐξήγησις, καὶ ἡ τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῶν πολλὴ παράθεσις καταλέξει-πται τῷ συγγραφεῖ κάκειθεν αὐτὰ λήψεται ὁ μὴ μόνον τὴν τῶν προσωπίων ὀρθότητα ζητῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ταῖς δυνάμεις καὶ χρήσεως φιλομαθῶν. εὐθὺς οὖν τὴν ἐν τῷ προομιω διατριβή περιελοivorτες, ἐνδεικνυμένην τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πραγματείας, καὶ τῶν πρότερον γεγραφότων τὸ ἐνδέξεις ἐλέγχουσαι, ἐπ’ αὐτὰ ἠξομεν τὰ πρὸς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀναλογίας κατεπείγοντα. εἰ δὲ τι συντομώτερον τοῦ πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπειγομένου πεποίηκαμεν, ὡσπερ ἐξήγησας, μετὰ τοῦ σαφεστέρου καὶ εὐσυνόπτου τοὺς πολλοῖς, αὐτὸς ἐπικρίνεις.

(3.) Πίναξ τοῦ ὅλου βιβλίου τοῦ περὶ τόνων.
Τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον βιβλίον περιέχει τὰ εἰς Ν λήγοντα ὅνοματα ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβήν ὄντα ἀρσενικά καὶ θηλυκά.
Τὸ δὲ δεύτερον περιέχει τὰ εἰς Σ καὶ εἰς Ρ καὶ τὰ εἰς ΑΣ.
Τὸ δὲ τρίτον τὴν εἰς ΗΣ κατάληξιν.
Τὸ δὲ τέταρτον τὴν εἰς ΙΣ.
Τὸ δὲ πέμπτον τὰ εἰς ΟΣ λήγοντα καθαρά.
Τὸ δὲ ἐκτὸς ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΒΟΣ συμπληροῖ τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ κατὰ γὰρ τὴν τάξιν τῶν στοιχείων ἡ παράθεσις <ὡς> καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς ὩΝ λήγοντων.

---

Τὸ δὲ ἐβδομὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΜΟΣ μέχρι τῶν εἰς ΠΟΣ.
Τὸ δὲ ὄγδοον ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΡΟΣ μέχρι καὶ ΨΟΣ καὶ ἔτι περὶ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ οὐδετέρων.
Τὸ δὲ ἐννατον περὶ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ συνθέτων.
(4.) Τὸ δὲ δέκατον περιέχει τὰ εἰς ΥΣ ἀρσενικά καὶ θηλυκά καὶ τὰ ἐχοντα διφθόγγους πρὸ τοῦ Σ· ἐτὶ τὰ εἰς ΩΣ καὶ Ψ.
Τὸ ἐνδεκάτον περιέχει τὰ εἰς Δ Λήγοντα θηλυκά.
Τὸ δώδεκατον τὴν εἰς Η κατάληξιν τῶν θηλυκῶν κατὰ τὴν τῶν συμφώνων πάλιν τάξιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς Ω.
Τὸ τρισκαίδεκατον περὶ οὐδετέρων ὄνομάτων διέξεις.
Τὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατον περιέχει πάν μονοσύλλαβον ὄνομα.
Τὸ δέκατον πέμπτον τὰς πλαγίας τῶν ὄνομάτων κανονίζει, καὶ τοὺς κατὰ κλίσιν ἀριθμοὺς καὶ τοὺς κατὰ θέμα εἰρημένους.
Τὸ ἐκκαίδεκατον περιέχει τὰ εἰς Ω καὶ εἰς ΜΙ ὄμητα κατὰ πάν πρόσωπον.
Τὸ δέκατον ἐβδομὸν περιέχει πάν ὄμη καὶ πάσαν μετοχήν.
Τὸ δέκατον ὄγδοον ἄρθρα ἀντωνυμίας καὶ προθέσεις.
Τὸ δέκατον ἐννατον περιέχει ἐπιρρήματα καὶ συνδέσμους.
Τὸ εἰκοστὸν περὶ χρόνων τῶν ἐν φωνήσει καὶ πνευμάτων.
(5.) Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς εἰκοσιν ἐν ἀλλῳ βιβλίῳ τὸ ἀνα

γνωστικὸν εἶδος κατὰ τὴν σύνταξιν τῶν λέξεων παραδίδοται, ἀκολούθως μετὰ τὴν δήλωσιν τῆς καθ’ ἐκάστην προσωπικὰς γινομένης διδασκαλίας περί διαστολῶν καὶ συναλοιφῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν παρακολουθούντων τῇ ἀναγνώσει, οὖν ὅτε τὸ Ζεὺς ἄνυνόμενον οὐκ ἔχει τὴν ὅξειαν ὑπονυμένην, ἐν τῷ Ζεὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ ὅν Τρώας, ἀλλ’ ἕγκλινομένην διὰ τὴν ἐπιφορὰν τοῦ δὲ συνδέσμου. ἐν γοῦν τῷ Ζεὺς τε καταχθόνιος ὑώνυμαι διὰ τὴν ἐπιφορὰν τοῦ τε. ἢ δὲ οἱ ἀντωνυμία περισσωμένη ἐν τῷ οἱ αὐτῷ θάνατον, οὐκ ἐφύλαξε τὴν περισσωμένην ἐν τῷ καὶ οἱ ἐπευχόμενος, τῆς συντάξεως τοῦτο ἀπαιτούσῃ τοῦ σημαινομένου. οὕτως ἔχει καὶ τὸ μάχη ἐνι κυδιανείρη, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα.

3 γινομένης διδασκαλίας Schmidt: γινομένην διδασκαλίαν
(6.) Περὶ τῶν εἰς Ν.
Τὰ εἰς ΑΝ λῆγοντα ἀπλὰ ὅνωματα ὀξύνεσθαι θέλει, εἴπ’ εὐθείας πτώσεως μὴ τροπὴν ἀναδεξάμενα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΗΝ βαρύτων, οἰον· παῖαν Ἰάν Δωριὰν Αλκμάν τιτάν πελεκάν.
Τὰ εἰς ΑΝ σύνθετα ἀπὸ ἀπλῶν ὑγίων πάντα βαρύνονται, οἰον’ Ἁγίαταν Ἐρμόπαν αἰνοτίταν. τὸ δὲ καρβὰν ὀξύνεται, καὶ ὡσ μὴ ἀπὸ ἀπλῶν ὑγίων.
Τὰ εἰς ΗΝ λῆγοντα μὴ συντεθειμένα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΗΝ ὑγίων, εἰ ἔχοι πρὸ τοῦ ΗΝ δασὺ σύμφωνον ἢ ψιλὸν, ὀξύνεσθαι θέλει, οἰον’ Ἀρχὴν λειχήν αὐχήν κηφήν Ὀρφήν.
Τὰ εἰς ΗΝ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβῆ τὸ Α ἤτο μόνον, ἢ καὶ σὺν ἑτέρῳ φωνημένῳ δισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἔχοι οὐδετέρου παρασχημα-

---

3 Τὰ…10 ὑγίων: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 261.5-10 Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὰ εἰς ἅν λῆγοντα εἰ μὲν ὡσιν ἀπλὰ ὀξύνονται, οἰον Αλκμὰν παῖαν Τιτάν, εἰ δὲ ἂν σύνθετα βαρύνονται, τουτέστι παροξύνονται, οἰον’ Ἐρμόπαν Ἁγίαταν Τιμανόπαν: μόνον δὲ τὸ καρβὰν (σημαίνει δὲ τὸν βάρβαρον) οὔτε ἀπλοῖν ἐστιν οὔτε σύνθετον ἀλλὰ παρασύνθετον καὶ ὀξύνεται

τισμόν, οίνον· Ἀγήν αὐχήν ἀτμήν ἀπτήν Ἄιζην ἀδην ἤ νόσος).

(7.) Τά εἰς ΗΝ λήγοντα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Η ἢ τὸ Σ ἢ διπλοῦν συμφωνον, μή παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΥ διφθόγγῳ, οἶνον ὑπευθύνεται, εἰ μή παρασχηματιζοιτο ὄνοχον γένει, οίνον ἐσσήν καμασήν (ο ἵχθυς) νασσήν (?) ἔρσην (?) Ἄιζην αὔχήν ἀψήν.

Τά εἰς ΗΝ λήγοντα ὀξύνεται βαλλήν Τελλήν ἀλήν σωλήν κωλήν σιπελή(?). σεσημεωτά τό Ἑλλην μαρφύμενον.

Τά εἰς ΗΝ ἀπλά ἔχοντα δεδυλασσαμένον συμφωνον ὀξύνεται ἐσσήν ὀσσήν Τελλήν βαλλήν πλήν τοῦ Ἑλλην. τό δέ ἄρθην ἀτηκός από τοῦ ἄρθην γέγονεν.

Τά εἰς ΗΝ κατ’ ἐπιπλοκήν δύο συμφώνων ὀξύνεται πυθμήν Κεβρήν, πλήν τοῦ Ἐγκτην.

Τά εἰς ΗΝ ἔχοντα τί τῶν μέσων πρὸ τοῦ Η ὀξύνεται, ὀπότε διχόνων παραλήγωτο, ἢ φύσει

---

2 Αἰζήν ἀδην (littera ζ in Αἰζήν tamquam τ apparatus in M (de ambiguitate formae litterarum in codice M vide caput huius dissertationis de codicum traditione); ἀδην spiritu incerto M) Μ. αἰζήν αὐτήν O; ἀκτήν (app. crit.) ἀδην Schmidt 6.17 4 μη perperam Schneider (1887), 37 codicem O omittere notavit paralēghōmena scripsi: paralēghōmenon MΟ τή O; τή M 6 καμασην...7 ἵχθυς Lobeck: καμασην οἰχθην MΟ; tamquam lemma notavit TGL V 1842D sine adnotatione 7 νασην MΟ hæsitans retinui; Δαμασην vel Βλισην vel Δισην Lobeck; possis etiam conicere Ναυσην, Μνασην ἐρην MO; fortasse Θερην vel Χερην Αἰζην] αὐχην spiritu incerto M 8 αψην Schmidt: αψην spiritu incerto M: αψην O 10 ἀλήν Lobeck: ἀλήν ΜΟ κωλην Lobeck: κελην MO; Κωλην etiam Lobeck στελην MΟ; στελην Hdn. π.μ.Α. GG iii.ii 923.8; Πελλην Schmidt; στυλην pro ethnico nomine στυληνος? 15 γέγονεν] γέγονεν O 17 Κεβρην Schmidt: κεβρην MΟ 18 Εγκτην M: ἔκτην O
μακρὰ: Ωγὴν ἀδὴν ταγὴν ἀτταγὴν τριβήν (ὁ τρίτος).
Τὰ εἰς ΗΝ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς χαίρουσι τῇ ὀξείᾳ ἀτταγῆν κορδυλὴν μαραθὴν δοθήν, πλὴν τοῦ περιπέρην.
Τὰ εἰς ΗΝ ἀπὸ όριων ἢτοι διαλεγομένων τῶν εἰς (8.) ΗΝ βαρύνεται Ἑλην ϕιλέλλην, εἰρήν μελείρην, ποιμήν ἀρχιπόιμην.
Τὰ εἰς ΜΗΝ ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ σύνθετα ἀπὸ ἀπλῶν εἰ ὑπὸ τῶν εἰς ΜΗΝ: Δαμὴν λιμήν ὑμὴν ποιμήν.
Τὰ εἰς ΠΗΝ καθαρὸν μὴ ἑχοντα πρὸ τέλους συλλαβῆν εἰς τὸ Ε φονῆν καταλήγουσαν ὀξύνεται: Σειρήν Πειρήν ἠδεπηρήν, πλὴν τοῦ εἰρῆν.
Τὰ εἰς ΠΗΝ καθαρὸν τῷ Ε παραλήγοντα

9 Τὰ...11 ποιμῆν: cf. Ῥδων. π.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 937.20-2 Δαμήν τὰ εἰς μὴν λήγοντα ὀξύτοναι ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβήν ἐπὶ γενικῇ τῷ η ἐς τρέπεται, ποιμένος, λιμένος, πυθμένος, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῇ Δαμήν ἐφύλαξε τῇ Ἑθόπομ. in Theod. 264.7-9 Τὰ δὲ ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβήν εἰς τὴν ὀξύτονα ἐὰν μὲν ἑχοσά τὸ μ., τρέποντα τῷ η ἐς τὸ ἐ ἐν τῇ γενικῇ, ὀἶνον ποιμῆν ποιμένος, λιμήν λιμένος, ὑμὴν ὑμένος, πυθμῆν πυθμένος

παροξύνεται γέρην τέρην Θέρην (ποταμός) τέρην.
Τά εἰς ΝΗ δικατάληκτα ἀπλὰ μὲν ὀξύνεται δελφίν καὶ δελφίς, Τελχίν καὶ Τελχίς, Σαλαμίν καὶ Σαλαμίς, ἀκτίν καὶ ἀκτῖς, σύνθετα δὲ βαρύνεται εὐάκτιν ἱχνισάκτιν.
Τά εἰς ΥΝ λήγοντα βαρύνεται ἐξαιρέτως παρά

3 Τά...6 χρυσάκτιν: cf. Sophr. Char. Theodos. 395.26-7 καὶ ἀπλὰ μὲν ὀξύνεται, δελφίν ἀκτίν ὄν, σύνθετα δὲ βαρύνεται, τριγλώκχυν χρυσάκτιν. Τά...5 ἀκτίς: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 193.7-10 τά εἰς τά διά τού νού κλινόμενα ἀπαντα δικατάληκτα εἰσίν, οὐκιν ἀκτίνος ἀκτίν, δελφίς δελφίνος δελφίν, Σαλαμίς Σαλαμίνος Σαλαμίν, Ελευσίς Ελευσίνος Ελευσίν, Τελχίς Τελχίνος Τελχίν (Τελχίνες δὲ εἰς δαίμονες οἰκήσαντες τήν Ρόδον); 267.3-6 Ἰστέον ὅτι τά εἰς τού μακρόν ἔχουσι τά, καὶ εἰ μὲν εἰσιν ἀπλὰ ὀξύνονται, εἶτε ἀργετερία εἰσιν εἰτε θηλικα, οὐκιν Σαλαμίν Ελευσίν ἀκτίν δελφίν Τελχίν (Τελχίνες δὲ εἰς φθόνοςοι δαίμονες οἱ οἰκήσαντες τήν Ρόδον); De Orthogr. 167.16-7 πάντα γὰρ τά δικατάληκτα διά τού τού μακρόν γράφεται οὐκιν, δελφίς, δελφίν Ελευσίς, Ελευσίν γλωσίς, γλωσίς Τελχίς Τελχίν; 192.11-2 Δελφίς: τά γὰρ δικατάληκτα πάντα διά τού τού γράφεται οὐκιν, Τελχίς, καὶ τά ὀμοία; Et. Gud. α 77.4-5 πάντα δὲ τά εἰς τά δικατάληκτα διά τού τού γράφεται, οὐκιν δελφίς δελφίν, Ελευσίς Ελευσίν, γλωσίς γλωσίς, Τελχίς Τελχίν 5 σύνθετα...6 χρυσάκτιν: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 267.19-20 εἰ δὲ εἰσιν σύνθετα τά εἰς τού βαρύνονται, οὐκιν δελφίκτιν εὐάκτιν τριγλώκχυν

7 Τά...9.2 τέκτων: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 270.8-10 Ἰστέον ὅτι τά εἰς τού λήγοντα προσθέτει τοῦ οὐ ποιοῦσι τήν γενεκήν, οὐκιν Γόρτυν Γόρτυνος (ἔστι δὲ ὀνομα πόλεως Κρήτης), μόσυν μόσυνος (σημαίνει δὲ τού ξυλικον πύργον), Φόρκινος Φόρκινος; 270.20-2 Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι πάντα τά εἰς τού βαρύνονται, οὐκιν μόσυν Φόρκινος Γόρτυν, ἑπεδίῳ τά πολλά παρά τοῖς Αἰολεύσιν εὐφωλίονες, καὶ λοιπόν ὡς δοκοῦντα εἶναι Αἰολικὰ εὐλόγος βαρύνονται; Theognost.

1 παροξύνεται Lobeck: ὀξύνεται ΜΟ γέρην...2 τέρην (γέρην Schmidt 8.9 app. crit. e Hesychio γ 423 et Choerobosco in Theod. 265.16-24; τέρην Schmidt coll. Choerob. in Theod. 265.16-24; Θέρην Schmidt; pro τέρην lectionem perpέρην dubianter Schmidt 8.9 (app. crit.) et postea Lentz 17.14): ἔρην, τέρην, τέρην ποταμός, πέρην ΜΟ 5 ἀκτίς] ἀκτίς ὄν καὶ ὄς Ο 6 χρυσάκτιν Ο: χρυσάκτιν Μ
τοῖς Αἰολεύσις Φόρκυς Πόλτυν Γόρτυν μόσυν τέκτυν (ό τέκτων).

Τὰ εἰς ΒΩΝ δισυλλαβὰ ἀρσενικὰ βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ μέρος σώματος δηλοὶ ΢τίβων τρίβων ΢τράβων ἀμβών.

(9.) Τὰ εἰς ΒΩΝ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἡξῖνεται Ἀλαβῶν ἀρραβῶν. τὸ δὲ Χαρναβῶν περισπάται.

Τὰ εἰς ΓΩΝ δισύλλαβὰ ἀρσενικὰ, ὅποτε μὴ περιεκτικὴν ἣχοι δύναν ἣ διὰ τοῦ Ὀ κλίνοιτο κατὰ τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβῆν, βαρύνεται Πύρ-

Can. II 27.16-7 (= 147.1-2) Τὰ εἰς ν ἐπ’ εὐθείας ἐνικὴς οὐκ οἶδε τὴν οἱ διφθογγον’ Φόρκυν Πόλτυν Κόλυν’ Κάπτων’ Γόρτυν ὄνομα ἡμῶς; Et. Gial. κ 322.17-20 ἱστέων, ὅτι τὰ εἰς ν Ἰῃγοντα προσθέσει τοῦ σος ποιεῖ τὴν γενικήν, οἶον, Γόρτυν Γόρτυνος, ἑστὶ δὲ ὅνομα πόλεως, μόσυν μόσυνος, σημαίνει δὲ τὸν ἑξιόν πύργον, Φόρκυν Φόρκυνος 3 Τὰ...8 περισπάται: cf. Theognost. Can. II 30.29 - 31.3 (= 169.1 - 170.3) Τὰ εἰς βὼν λήγοντα καθαροῦ, εἶτε δισύλλαβα, εἶτε ὑπέρ δυὸ συλλαβᾶς, εἶτε βαρύτωνα, εἴτε ὄξυτωνα, διὰ τοῦ ω κλίνεται οἶον, Σκρίβων Σκρίβωνος· Ὁ τρήβων Ὁ τρήβωνος· Κίκων Κίκωνος· στίβων στίβωνος· Ἀλαβῶν Ἀλαβῶνος· ἀρραβῶν ἀρραβῶνος· στυγμαίται τὸ Χαρναβῶν περιστράμεθον, διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνομεν καὶ φυλάττων τὸ ὅ. Τὰ εἰς βὼν δισύλλαβα καθάρα τὴν παραλήγουσαν γράφει διὰ τοῦ ντ, ή τοῦ ντ, ή τοῦ ζ βόον, Σκρίβων τρίβων το τερεβῶν καὶ ἡξῖνεται, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ε γράφεται. Τὰ...5 ἀμβῶν· cf. Sophr. Char. Theodios. 397.28 Τὰ εἰς βὼν ἀπαντὰ διὰ τοῦ ω, τρίβων τρίβωνος, ἀμβῶν ἀμβῶνος; Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν βαρυτ. 18.4-5 Τὰ εἰς βὼν λήγοντα βαρύτωνα τὸ ω φυλάττουσα, Ἱτίβων Ἱτίβωνος, Ἱστράβων Ἱστράβωνος, τρίβων τρίβωνος (ἀρχαῖον διδασκάλων ἱματισμός), ἀμβῶν ἀμβῶνος. 6 Τὰ...8 περισπάται: cf. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν ὄξυτ. 22.25-6 Τὰ εἰς βὼν ἀρσενικὰ ὄξυτονα διὰ τοῦ Ὀ κλίνονται, βούβων βούβωνος, ἀρραβῶν ἀρραβῶνος, Ἀλαβῶν Ἀλαβῶνος (ἐστὶ δὲ ὅνομα ποταμοῦ).

4 ΢τίβων Schmidt: στίβων ΜΟ; στίβων Λοβέκκ S. Aj. 137, n. 1 (ed. alt. 166, n. 4) et Choerob. Onomat. I, 74.26 (Gaisford)
10 ἑξιο Schmidt 9.4: ἑξιο ΜΟ ἡ add. Schmidt 9.4 11 Πύργων MO: πύργων Schmidt 9.5 et Choerob. Onomat. I, 74.28 (Gaisford)
γων Αίγων Μέγων Φλέγων. τὸ δὲ φηγών καὶ ἀγών δεῦρεται.
Τὰ εἰς ΓΩΝ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβάς δεῦρεται καὶ βαρύνεται. καὶ βαρύνεται μὲν, ὡς φιλάττει τὸ Ω

3 Τὰ...11.9 ἀγκύλων: cf. sch. Hom. II. 21.141.13-7 τὰ δὲ ἄλλως κλιθέντα βαρύνεται, „Οὐκαλέγων” (Γ 148), „Πελάγων” (Ε 695), Σαλάγγων, „μέσφα Σαλάγγωνος ποταμοῦ” (Αρ. Ρh. 4, 337). τὸ δὲ καταπύγων βαρυνόμενον καὶ διὰ τοῦ ὁ κλιθέν εἶχεν ἀφορμήν ὁ τὸ βαρυνόμενον παρόνυμον εἶναι τοῦ κατάπυγος, ὡς καὶ τοῦ ἀπείρου τὸ „απέιρον” (Ω 545. 776); Theodos. Π. κλισ. ὁν βαρυτ. 18.9-17 Τὰ εἰς γων λήγοντα βαρύτονα ὑπερβαλλαβα ἀπλὰ διὰ τοῦ ὁ κλιθεῖται, Ἐρίγων Ἐρίγωνος, Σαλάγγων Σαλάγγωνος (ἐστὶ ποταμός), ἀρίγων ἀρίγωνος (ἐστὶ δὲ εἶδος δόρατος). Τὸ Πελάγων Πελάγωνος καὶ τὸ Ἀρσάγων Ἀρσάγωνος τὸ λόγῳ τῶν μετοχικῶν διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνονται καὶ τὸ <Γ> Οὐκαλέγων τε καὶ Ἀντήνωρ· καὶ τὸ Εὐάγων Εὐάγωνος ὡς μετοχή ὧκ ἀντίκειται τῷ κανόνι, ἐπειδὴ σύνθετον ἐστὶ. Πρόσκειται ἐν τῷ κανόνι «ἀπλά» διὰ τὰ σύνθετα: τὸ γὰρ προάγων προάγων τοῦ <ἀγών> αὐγών ἐφύλαξε τὴν κλίσιν τὸ καταπύγων καταπύγωνος διὰ τοῦ ὁ κλιθέν ὧκ ἀντίκειται ἡμῖν, ἐπειδὴ παρασύνθετον ἐστὶ, παρὰ γὰρ τὸ κατάπυγος σύνθετον γενόμενον, ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κόμα ἐγκύμονος ἐγκύμονος ἐγκύμονος καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴμα ἀνείμονος ἀναίμονος καὶ πεῖρα ἀπείρως ἀπείρως ἀπείρως; Theognost. Can. Π. 31.12-23 (= 174) Τὰ εἰς γων ύπέρ δύο συλλαβάς ἀπλὰ βαρύτονα, μὴ ὅταν μετοχικά, διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνεται, καὶ τρέπει τὸ ὁ, καὶ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου γράφεται τὴν παραλήγουσαν οἰον. Σταλάγγωνος ὅνοιμα ποταμοῦ· αὐγών αὐγώνος, εἶδος δόρατος· Ἐρίγων Ἐρίγωνος, ὅνοιμα κόμιν· τὸ Οὐκαλέγωνος Ἀρσάγωνος μετοχικά τὸ προάγωνος σύνθετον ὅν τοῦ ἀπλοῦ τὴν κλίσιν ἐφύλαξεν· τὸ καταπύγων καταπύγωνος, καὶ ἐγκύμων ἐγκύμων, καὶ ἐσχήμων ἐσχήμων, καὶ εἰτὶ τοῦτος ὁμοῖον τρέποντα τὸ ὁ ὡκ ἀντίκειται, παρασύνθετα γὰρ καὶ κοινά τῷ γένει κατάπυγος γὰρ καὶ καταπύγων καὶ οὕθες ὁ καταπύγων καὶ ἡ καταπύγων κόμα ἐγκύμως, ὁ ἐγκύμων ἢ ἐγκύμων.

1 Αἴγων] Αἴγων Ο  Φλέγων...2 ἀγών Lentz 23.16: τὸ δὲ φλέγων (φλέγων Bv3) καὶ ἀγών MO; Schmidt 9.6 (app. crit.) φηγών πρὸ φλέγων vel Φλέγων. τὸ δὲ ἀγών scribere proposuit 4 φιλάττει] φιλάτ Ο
κατά τὴν γενικὴν, ἢ διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλίνεται· τέλεγων Ἐνάγων προάγων Σαλάγγων Ἑρίγων. οὔπωνται δὲ τὰ διὰ τοῦ Ο κλινόμενα, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ συνθέτου [τοῦ] < eid> ΟΣ παρώνωσμα υπάρχοι, οἴον· Παφλαγών Λαιστρυγών ἁριγών (ὁ σύμμαχος), πλὴν τοῦ καταπύγων· τὰ γὰρ ἀπὸ συνθέτων εἰς ΟΣ παραχθέντα κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σημανομένου βαρύνεται· ἀπειρὸς ἀπειρόν, ἄναιμος ἀναίμων, ἀγκύλος ἀγκύλων.

Tac eis ΔΩΝ δισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται καὶ βαρύνεται. βαρύνεται μὲν, ὥσα ἐστὶν ἀρσενικὰ διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενα ἢ φυλάττοντα τὸ Ω κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν, χωρὶς τῶν συνεπιπτόντων πόλει, οἴον· κῶδων Φαίδων Φείδων κλύδων κνώδων. τὸ δὲ

6...9 ἀγκύλων: cf. Sophr. Char. Theod. 396.12-4 ὡς εἰ μὲν εἰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς συνθέτων, διὰ τοῦ Ο κλίνεται, οἴον αἴμα ἀναιμος ἀναιμόν ἀναιμόνως, ἀπειρος ἀπειρόν ἀπειρόνως
10 Τὰ...14 κνώδων: cf. Theod. Π. κλίσ. ὄν βαρυτ. 18.18-20. Τὰ εἰς διὸν λήγοντα βαρύνοντα δισύλλαβα διὰ τοῦ Ω κλίνονται, εἰ μὴ μετοχικὴν κλίσιν ἀναδέχοντα, οἴον κωδων κωδόνως, Φαίδων Φαίδωνος, χλίδων χλίδωνος (σημαίνει δὲ τὸν περὶ τούς βραχύνονας κείμενον κόσμον)

---

Σιδών πόλις. (10.) ὀξύνεται δὲ τὰ διὰ τοῦ Ὁ μόνου κλίνόμενα, οἶον Μυγδών Σαρδῶν σινδών.
Τὰ εἰς ΔΩΝ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, εἰ παραλήγοιτο τῷ Ὁ ἢ Ἄ ἢ Ἄ, βαρύνεται ἀνόδων Κινάδων Κορύδων.
Τὰ εἰς ΔΩΝ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται, παραλήγοντα τῷ Ἄ ἢ Ἄ, ὀνόματα ὄντα πόλεων ἢ ἑθνικά: Ἀμυδών Καλυδών Ἀπιδών χελιδών.
Τὰ εἰς ΔΩΝ θηλυκά ὀξύνεται λήθεδων τηκεδών σημεδών ἁπδών.
Τὰ εἰς ΖΩΝ λήγοντα ἀρσενικά βαρύνεται, ὡς μή εἰ ὑπερδισύλλαβα καὶ πρὸ τέλους ἔχοι μακρὸν τῷ Ἄ ἢ πόλει ὄρμωνει, οἶον μείζων Ρίζων Ὀξων <…..> ὄλιζων. τὸ δὲ ἀλαζών (ὁ ὑπερήφανος) ὀξύνεται. τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ ἑθνος φυλάττει τὸ Ω ἐν ταῖς πλαγίαις.
Τὰ εἰς ΗΩΝ βαρύνεται παἰήων ξυνήων.
Τὰ εἰς ΘΩΝ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικά βαρύνεται, ὡς μή ἑθνικά εἰ ἢ περιεκτικὰ μόθων

---

18 Τὰ...13.2 Αἰθών: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 274.2-6 τὸ μὲν αἰθών αἰθέων, ὡς τὰ εἰς ὀν δισύλλαβα βαρύτονα ἑχοντα δασυ σύμφωνον φυλάττουσι τὸ ω ἐν τῇ γενικῇ, οἶον Ρίνθων Ρίνθωνος (ἔστι δὲ ὅνομα κύριον), μόθων μόθωνος (ὁ κακούργος· ὑστὸ δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὸν οἰκογενῆ δοῦλον καλούσιν, οἱ δὲ Αθηναίοι οἰκότριβα φασί
Τά...14.2 κλινομένων: Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν βαρυτ. 19.30-2 Τά δὲ ὑπερφυσιλαβὰ μετοχία μὲν όντα διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνεται, Φαεθῶν Φαεθώντος, Πυριφλεγέθων Πυριφλεγέθωντος, Πολυπεράκος Πολυπεράκοντος: παρόννυμα δὲ όντα διὰ τοῦ ω, Ἀγάθων Ἀγάθωνος, Κιναίθων Κιναίθωνος τὸ εὐσιχῆν διὰ τοῦ τού κληθὲν τοῦ ἀπλοῦ τὴν κλίσιν ἐφύλαξεν. 9 τὸ... 14.2 κλινομένων: cf. EM 513.29-31 ότι τὸ Κιθαιρῶν δείκνυται, τοπικὴν ἔχον ἐννοιαν ὁμοίως και Μαραθῶν, καὶ τὸ Αργανθῶν: τὸ μέντοι Ἰπποθῶν περιποίηται, διαφέρεται γὰρ Ἰπποθῶν

1 τῶν MO; κόθων Lrobeck SA 137, n. 1 (ed. alt. 166, n. 4), cf. Choe rob. in Theod. 274.2-7; possis etiam όφθων, cf. Theognost. Can. II 33.28 (= 184.2) 

9 Πυριφλεγέθωνος om. M Κιναίθων M: Κιναίθων sine accentu Θρευμ.: κινεθῶν (expunctum) Θρευμ.: 10 Αργανθῶν Lobeck S. Aj. 137, n. 1 (ed. alt.) et postea Schmidt 10.5: ἀργανθῶν MO
Ἰπποθῶν περισσάται φυλάττων καὶ τὸ Ω μέγα καὶ διὰ τοῦ NT κλινόμενον.

Τὰ εἰς ΚΩΝ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικά, ὅποτε μὴ εἰπὶ περιεκτικά, ἡ μέρος σώματος σημαινοῦ, βαρύνεται Χάλκων Δράκων Κίκων Λάκων. τὸ δὲ κροκὼν πεικὼν χαλκῶν ὡς περιεκτικὰ ὀξύνεται, καὶ τὸ ἀγκὼν μέρος σώματος, καὶ τὸ Ἀγκών πόλις ὡς θηλυκόν, καὶ τὸ ε ἐκὼν.

Τὰ εἰς ΚΩΝ ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς ὀξύνεται καὶ βαρύνεται καὶ περισσάται. τὰ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ NT κλινόμενα καὶ Ο παραληγόμενα περισσάται Ἰπποκών Λακών. τὰ μέντοι μὴ οὕτως καὶ παραληγόμενα τῷ Α ὀξύνεται, εἰ ἐστὶ τοπικότερα, οἷον χαρακών ἀνθρακών φαρμακῶν (τὸ βαφεῖον) τοιοῦτο καὶ τὸ γυναικών Ἑλικών ὡς τοπικών τὸ μέντοι Τριάκων σαλάκων καὶ Αἰολοσίκων ύγιῶς βαρύνονται οὐ γὰρ εἰς τοπικά.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΩΝ δισύλλαβα βαρύνονται μὴ ὃντα τοπικά, οἷον ὀδών Φίλων Γέλων. τὸ δὲ αὐλών καὶ μυλών ὡς τοπικά ὀξύνονται.

(12.) Τὰ εἰς ΛΩΝ λήγοντα ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς

---

22 Τὰ...15.5 μανᾶς; cf. Theognost. Can. II 36.3-9 (= 196.1-7) Τά εἰς λῶν λήγοντα ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς ἀρσενικά ὀξύτονα τε καὶ βαρύτονα φυλάττει τό ω ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς οἶον, Ἀπόλλωνος Αἰσχάλωνος, αὖ οὖ καὶ ἡ πόλις Κεφάλωνος· Νασάκλωνος οὖν ὁ πόλεως Βαρυλώνος· ἀμπελώνος· καπηλώνος τὸ μυθικὸν μυθικόν θηλυκόν ὁν καὶ ὀξύτονον διὰ τοῦ ο κλίνομενον οὔ μαχεῖται ἐφυλάξατο γάρ αὐτὸ ὁ κανὼν· δηλοὶ δὲ τὰς μαναδᾶς· Ep. Hom. 21,β2α.1-5 τά εἰς λῶν ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς βαρύνεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ω κλίνεται, οἷον Αἰσχάλων Αἰσχάλωνος, Ἀπόλλων Αἰσχάλωνος.

---

βαρύνονται, μή ὄντα περιεκτικά. Απόλλων Ἐφάλων. τὸ ἅμπελών καὶ καμηλών ὡς περιεκτικά οξύνεται τὸ Βαβυλών ἄρσενικός, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἡ πόλις, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ μιμαλλόν θηλυκόν, (ήτω μενανάς).

Τὰ εἰς ΜΩΝ διούλλαβα μή ὄντα τοπικά, [ἡ ἐπὶ καιροῦ λαμβάνοιτο, ἢ ἔχοι πρὸ τοῦ τέλους τὸ Υ ἐκτεταμένον,] βαρύνεται Ἑρμών Ἐρμών Τίμων Σίμων. τὰ μέντοι οξυνόμενα τοπικά


---

ἔστιν, ἡ ἐπὶ καροῦ λαμβάνεται, ἡ ἔχει τὸ Υ ἐκτεταμένον καὶ τὸ κρεμὸν ὑζύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΩΝ ύπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, εἰ παραληγοιτο φύτει ἡ θέσῃ μακρά, βαρύνεται ἀρμύμων ἐγκύμων Ἡγήμων Φιλήμων. 5

Τὰ εἰς ΜΩΝ ύπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς παραληγόμενα Α βραχεί καὶ μὴ κλινόμενα διὰ ΝΤ ὑζύνεται· εἰ δέ τι εξάφυτη, ὡς κύριον. καὶ ὑζύνα μὲν Τελαμών (καὶ τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ προσηγορικὸν), καλαμῶν πλαταμῶν κεραμῶν περικτικῶν· Κεράμων δὲ τὸ κύριον, ὡς τὸ Ποτάμων ἡσσάμων. τὸ δὲ τεράμων βαρύνεται ὡς διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενον.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΩΝ ύπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς ἐχοντα τὴν

6 Τὰ...13 κλινόμενον: cf. Theodos. Π. κλίστ. ὁν βαρυτ. 21.9-14
Τὰ εἰς μονο λήγοντα ύπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς ἐχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς τὴν συνεσταλμένον [κατὰ τὴν παραληγοῦσαν] βαρύτον ὡντα φυλάττουσι τὸ ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γενικής, Ποτάμων Ποτάμονος, Νασάμων Νασάμονος (ἐστι δὲ ὀνομα ἐθνικόν καὶ κύριον). Κεράμων Κεράμονος· τούτοις ἠκολούθησαν τὸ Φοιβάμων Φοιβάμωνος κατὰ γενικήν καὶ διὰ τῶν δύο μη γραφέν· τεράμων τεράμωνος· σημηνεύει δὲ ἡ χρῆσις παρὰ Πλάτων ἐν Σοφιστῇ τῷ διαλόγῳ ὁ γὰρ Ἀνακρέων ὡς μεταχείρον τεράμωνος ἐκλινεν· σημαίνει δὲ τῶν κάλαμον. 14 Τὰ...17.7 ἐδονος: cf. Theodos. Π. κλίστ. ὅν βαρυτ. 21.7-8 Τὰ εἰς μονο λήγοντα ύπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς βαρύτον βραχεί παραληγόμενα διὰ τὸ ὁ κλίνοντα, Ἀρτέμων Ἀρτέμονος, Πολέμων Πολέμονος, Διδύμων Διδύμονος; Theognost. Can. II 35.23-7 (= 194.1-5) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἐμον ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς βαρυτον διὰ το το ὑπολογεῖ τὴν παραλήγουσαν, καὶ φυλάττει τὸ ὁ σιω, Ἀρτέμων Ἀρτέμονος· Πολέμων Πολέμονος· τὸ κρεμών καὶ ἀκρομῶν ὑζύνομεν ἐναλλάξαντα τὰ περὶ τόνον, παραληγάζει καὶ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν· τρέπει γὰρ τὸ ὁ εἰς ο; II 37.9-12 (= 200.1-4)

1 ἡ π; cf. Schmidt 12.10: λαμβάνεται
πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν βραχείαν, ὑπεσταλμένης τῆς εἰς τὸ Α (13.) παραλήξεως, εἰ μὲν κλίνοιτο διὰ τοῦ ΝΟΣ, τῆς πρὸ τέλους οὕσης διὰ τοῦ Ω, ὀξύνε-
ται εἰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Ω, βαρύνεται, οἶον ἐπὶ τῶν βαρύ-
tόνων Αρτέμιων Πολέμων Διδύμων. τῶν δὲ ὀξυτόνων τὸ δαίτυμων ἱτυμων κηδεμῶν ἀκρεμων ἐθνυμων (τὸ ἔθνος).
Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΙΜΩΝ βαρύνεται δαίμων αἵ-
μων ἀναίμων.
Τὰ εἰς ΝΩΝ [μή] ἐχοντα ἐν ἐπιπλοκή σύμφω-
νον, ἡ κατὰ διάστασιν, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πόλεων εἰς ἡ περιεκτικά βαρύνεται: Μέμνων Δάρφων Ἀγνων. τὸ Κραννών ὡς ἐπὶ πόλεως ὀξύνεται, καὶ τὸ δαφνών ὡς περιεκτικῶν.
Τὰ εἰς ΝΩΝ ἐχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους εἰς φω-
νήν ἡ φωνήντα λήγουσαν, εἰ μὴ τοπικά εἰς,

---

βαρύνεται <....> καὶ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τοῖς διὰ τοῦ ὩΝΟΣ: Κόνων Σίνων. τὸ δὲ κανών ὀξύνεται, καὶ πλατανών καὶ ἔνων.

Τὰ εἰς ἩΝ, ὅπως μὴ εἰς ἐπίθετα, δυνάμενα καὶ ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ τίθεσθαι, βαρύνονται ἄξων Πράξων. τὸ μέντοι δραξών ὀξύνεται ὡς ἐπιθετικὸν.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΩΝ μὴ ὄντα περιεκτικὰ βαρύνεται Λάμπων δράπων (ὁ δραπέτης) Δούπων ἦπιπών τὸ (14.) κύριον, ἵππων περιεκτικόν, πέπων τὸ πεπών, πε πών τὸ περιεκτικόν.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΩΝ μετ’ ἐπιπλοκῆς συμφώνου, εἰ μὴ εἰς περιεκτικά, ἢ ἐπὶ πόλεων, ἢ διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενα, βαρύνονται ἄφρων πρόφρων Μάκρων. τὸ μέντοι Αντερών λουτρών ἀνδρών ὡς περιεκτικὰ ὀξύνεται. τὸ δὲ Δεξικρῶν καὶ Ερμοκρῶν ὡς διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενα περισπάται.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΩΝ μὴ παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΙ ἢ ΑΙ διφθόγγω, εἰ μὴ τοπικὰ εἰς ἡ πόλει ὁμονυμεῖ, βαρύνονται Θήρων Νέρων γέρων τήρων.

---

1 καὶ scrips: ἡ ΜΟ ὀξύνεται Ο: εἰσοδυναμεὶ (sic) Μ
2 κανών Α: κανών ΜΟ 5 ἄξων/ ἄξων Ο 6 Πράξων]
3 Πράξων haesitanter Schmidt 13.19-20 (app. crit.) coll. Choerob. Onomat. I, 76.25 (Gaisford); cf. etiam Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων
4 βαρυντ. 19.9 Πράξων Πράξων, Λέων Λέωνος 8 βαρύνεται]
5 βαρύνονται Ο 10 κύριον] κυνοί Μ ἵππων περιεκτικών Μ3Ο: om. Μ1.
6 11 πεπώνοι] πεπῶν ΜΟ: πεπαινόμενον Lentz
7 34.17-8: ἐν πεπάννει οὐν Schmidt 14.1 (app. crit.)
8 13 κλινόμενα...14 βαρύνεται Βπ-Cp: κλινεῖται βαρύνεται Μ: κλινονται βαρύνονται Ο 14 ἄβρων Μ: ἄβρων Ο
9 16 ὀξύνεται] ὀξύνονται Ο Δεξικρῶν Schmidt 14.7 e π.μ.λ. GG
10 ii.ii 915.9 et Choerob. in Theod. 283.4, 283.34, 284.26: ἐξικρῶν
11 ΜΟ Ἕμικροφων Ο: Ἕμικροφων Μ 17 περισπάται Schmidt 14.8: ὀξύνεται ΜΟ 20 τήρων ΜΟ: τήρων (cf. Choerob. 298.34, 299.34) vel Τήρων (cf. Su. τ 456; TGL VII 2153C-D, 1929D) vel Ἡρων dubitanter Schmidt 14.11 (app. crit.)
τὸ δὲ οἰρών καὶ τοχαιρών διὰ τὰς διφθόγγους, καὶ τὸ προθυρών θυρών ἀχυρὼν Πλευρών ὡς τοπικὰ ἡ ὁμώνυμα.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΩΝ ἀρσενικά, εἰ μὴ ἐθνικὰ ἢ περιεκτικὰ εἰς, βαρύνονται Παύσων Θράσῳ Αἰσχρόν. τὸ δὲ Ὀλοσσών πόλις <.....> καὶ τὸ κιστῶν ὡς περιεκτικῶν.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΩΝ μη περιεκτικὰ <ἡ ἐθνικὰ> διὰ τοῦ Ὀκλινόμενα, βαρύνεται: εἰ δὲ τι ὁξυνθῆ, τούτῳ διαστολήν (15) ἀνεδέξατο βαρυνομένου Πλού-

8 Τὰ...20.4 ὀξύνεται: cf. St. Byz. β 106.1-8 Βιστονία πόλις Θράκης, ἀπὸ Βιστονίας <φού> Ἀρες καὶ Καλλιρρόης τῆς Νέστου. ἀδελφὸς δὲ ἦν Ὁδόμαντος καὶ Ἡδονόν. ἔνιοι δὲ Παῦνος τοῦ Ἀρες παιδός. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Βιστῶν, τῶν εἰς τῶν δισελαβῶν βαρυνομένων, οἷον Πλάτων Κρίτων, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ γένοσι σημαίνομενι χιτῶν γάρ πρὸς διαστολήν ὀξύνεται τοῦ κυρια καὶ ποταμοῦ, καὶ τὸ κροτῶν τὸ ζωόφυον πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ὄνοματος; ἡ περιεκτικῶν διὰ τὸ κοιτῶν ἑστῶν ἢ ἐθνικῶν διὰ τοῦ οἰκινόμενον, ὡς τὸ Βιστόνος, τὸ θηλυκὸν Βιστονίας.

1 οἰρών] οἰρόν Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν ὀξύν. 23.15-6, Theognost. Can. II 38.31-2 (= 208.3-4); Hsch. o 389 οἰρόν; Su. o 97 Οἰρόνος τοχαιρόν] fortasse σφαιρῶν (coni. L. Dindorf TGL. VII 1643B; vide Lentz 35.15) vel Χαϊρών (cf. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν ὀξύν. 23.16 and Theognost. Can. II 38.32 (= 208.4)); Schmidt 14.12: 'deest cautio de Χαϊρών'

των Πλάτων Κράτων Χίτων ποταμός, χιτών δὲ το ιμάτιον, το Αρίστων Ἐκάτων Χαρίτων βαρύνονται το δε κοιτῶν ἑστῶν προβατῶν ὡς περιεκτικὰ ὑζύνεται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὩΝ ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς καὶ βαρύνεται καὶ ὑζύνεται. καὶ βαρύνεται μὲν, ὅσα κλίνεται διὰ τοῦ Ω, μὴ συνεμπίπτοντα πόλειν, ὡς ἔχει Αμφιτρύων Ἡλεκτρύων. τὸ δὲ σικυών ὑζύνεται. τὰ μέντοι κατὰ γενικὴν τρέποντα τὸ Ω εἰς Ο ὑζύνονται ἀλεκτρυών Γηρυῶν Κερκυῶν ἀμφικτυών.

Τὰ εἰς ΦΩΝ ἀρσενικὰ σύνθετα διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενα περιστάται Ἀγλαοφών Ξενοφών Ἀντιφών Δημοφών. τὸ μέντοι κολοφών καὶ κατηφών ὑζύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΧΩΝ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικὰ βαρύνονται μὴ ὅντα μηνῶν ὀνόματα: Βρύχων Τύχων

1 Χίτων... 2 ἱμάτιον: cf. Jo. Alex. περὶ διαφ. τον. Διαφ. σημ. α. χ. Χίτων πάλις, χιτών (scrib. χιτών): τὸ ἑνύμα; b χ 3; c χ 3; d χ 7; e χ 9. 5 Τὰ... Ἡλεκτρύων: cf. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν ὑζυτ. 21.31 τὰ εἰς ὁν ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς βαρύνοντα τον παραληγόμενα οὐ κλίνονται διὰ τοῦ ντ, οἰον Ἡλεκτρύων Ἡλεκτρύων, Αμφιτρύων Ἀμφικτυών 9 τὰ... ἀμφικτυών: cf. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν ὑζυτ. 22.19-20 ταῦτα γὰρ τρέπουσι τὸ ὦ εἰς ο ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς, περικτικῶν περικτικῶν, Γηρυῶν Γηρυόνος, Κερκυῶν Κερκυόνος; Choerob. in Theod. 281.9-12 τὰ εἰς ὁν καθαρον ὑζύνοντα βραχίνα διχρόνη παραληγόμενα, τουτέστι συνεσταλμένα, τρέπουσι τὸ ὦ εἰς τὸ ἠ ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς, οἰον περικτικῶν περικτικῶν, ἀλεκτρυῶν ἀλεκτρύων, ἀμφικτυῶν ἀμφικτυών (ἐστὶ δὲ ἑθνὸς) 12 Τὰ... Ἀμφικτυών: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 272.1-4 Τὰ δὲ εἰς ὁν περιπαθεῦναι πάντα φυλάττουσι τὸ ὦ ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς καὶ οὐδὲπότε τρέπουσι αὐτὸ, κλίνουσι δὲ καὶ ἀταῦσα διὰ τοῦ ντ, οἰον Ξενοφῶν Ξενοφόντος, Ἀγλαοφῶν Ἀγλαοφόντος, Δημοφῶν Δημοφόντος 14 τὸ... ὑζύνεται: cf. EM 513.31-2 Τὸ Κολοφῶν καὶ κατηφῶν ὑζύνεται ὡς ἰθυλικά.

1 Κράτων ΜΟ; Κράτων St. Byz. β 106.4. 5 post Τὰ Barker 15.22 et Schmidt 15.5 δὲ habent, quod nullus codex praebet. 14 κολοφῶν BC: κολοφῶν ΜΟ καὶ... 15 κατηφῶν Schmidt 15.13-4: καὶ κατηφῶν Μ: καὶ κατηφῶν Ο 17 Τύχων Schmidt 15.16 e Choerob. in Theod. 274.7-8: τύχων ΜΟ
Σπέρχων. τὸ δὲ γλήχων ἀϕειλε βαρύνεσθαι. 
καὶ διὰ τοῦ Β, δεξύνεται. τὸ δὲ Παρ-
χών ὑψύνεται ὄνομα μηνὸς παρ’ Αἰγυπτίος ὅν. τὸ
δὲ Πολυσπέρχων διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενον περι-
σπάσθη.

Τὰ εἰς ΩΝ ἐν τέλει ἔχοντα τὸν τόνον καὶ κλι-
νόμενα διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ περιστάται Ξενοφών Ἡπ-
ποκών. (16.) σημείεται τὸ Ποσειδών καὶ 
ταῦτα τυφών περιστώμενα μὲν, οὐ μέντοι 
διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενα.

6 Τὰ…10 κλινόμενα: cf. Jo. Alex. Τον. παρ. 8.8-14 (26) Τὸν δὲ 
ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβήν ἐν μὲν τοῖς εἰς ν λήγουσιν ἀρσενικοῖς 
τὰ εἰς ὁν ἐπὶ τέλει τὸν τόνον ἔχοντα, εἰ διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνοιτο, 
περιστάται, εἰ δὲ μή, οὐκ ἔτι, πλὴν μόνον τοῦ Ποσειδών.
τούτῳ γὰρ περιστασάθη συνηρημένον ἐκ τοῦ Ποσείδων. τῶν 
δὲ περιστασάτων ὑποδείγματα, Δημοφών, ἄμφος, Ἀντιφών καὶ 
εἰ τι τοιούτον; Chorob. in Theod. 272.1-6 Τὰ δὲ εἰς ὁν 
περιστώμενα πάντα φυλάττουσι τὸ ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς καὶ 
οὐδέποτε τρέπουσιν αὐτὸ, κλίνονται δὲ καὶ ᾧτα διὰ τοῦ 
ντ, οἶον Ξενοφῶν Ξενοφώντος, Ἀγλαοφών Ἀγλαοφώντος, 
Δημοφῶν Δημοφώντος· μόνον τὸ Ποσειδῶν καὶ Τυφῶν καὶ 
ταῦτα φυλάττουσι μὲν τὸ ω ἐν τῇ γενικῇ καὶ οὐ κλίνονται διὰ 
τοῦ ντ Τὰ…8 Ἡπποκών: cf. Chorob. in Theod. 282.4-7 Ἰστέον 
ὅτι τὰ εἰς ὁν περιστώμενα διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνονται καὶ 
φυλάττουσι τὸ ὁ ἐν τῇ γενικῇ καὶ εἰς τοῦ μόνον ἀρσενικοῦ 
γένους, οἶον ὁ Θᾶν τοῦ Θάντος (ἐστι δὲ ὄνομα κύριον), ὁ 
Ξενοφῶν τοῦ Ξενοφώντος, ὁ Ἀγλαοφῶν τοῦ Ἀγλαοφώντος, ὁ 
Ἰπποκὼν τοῦ Ἱπποκόκων 
8 σημείεται…10 κλινόμενα: cf. Chorob. in Theod. 282.14-7 πάντα 
τὰ εἰς ὁν περιστώμενα διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνονται, χώρις δηλοῖτο 
τοῦ Ποσειδῶν Ποσειδῶν καὶ ταῦτα 
ταῦτα 
ταῦτα 
Τυφῶν: ταῦτα γὰρ οὐ κλίνονται διὰ τοῦ ντ, ἀλλὰ 
προσθέει τοῦ ὑποτεύξει τῆς γενικῆς καὶ φυλάττου 
τὸ ὁ; τῇ 284.8-10 Ἡπποκών 
Ταύτα δὲ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὴν αὐτὴν κλίσιν, Τυφῶν 
μὲν 
γὰρ 
Τυφῶν καὶ 
8 σημείεται…10 κλινόμενα: cf. Chorob. in Theod. 282.14-7 πάντα 
τὰ εἰς ὁν περιστώμενα διὰ τοῦ ντ κλίνονται, χώρις δηλοῖ 
τοῦ Ποσειδῶν Ποσειδῶ 
ταῦτα 
ταῦτα 
Τυφῶν 
8 σημείεται…10 κλι

1 γλήχων Schmidt 15.17: γλίχων ΜΟ; Γλίχων G. Dindorf TGL 
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Τά εἰς ΩΝ θηλυκά μη ἐπὶ πόλεων κατηγοροῦμενα ὀδύνεται, ὅποτε μὴ διὰ τοῦ Ω κλίνεται χιών λαγών τρυγῶν σταγών γοργῶν. τὸ δὲ τρήσων μήκων γλήχων βαρύνονται ὡς φυλάττοντα τὸ Ω ἐπὶ τῆς γενικῆς.


2 Ω: ο Μ 5 Ω] ω μέγα ΜΟ
Τὰ εἰς ὩΝ δισύλλαβα ἐπὶ πόλεων ὀξύνονται· εἰ δὲ τι βαρυνθῇ, ἐτέρῳ χαρακτῆρι, ἡ διαστολὴ σημαίνομενον Ηἰῶν Πλευρῶν Πυθῶν Σιδών. τὸ Ἐτῶν βαρύνεται, ὡς [ἐν] ἐτέρῳ χαρακτῆρι ὑποτεσσαρόν (καθόλου γὰρ τὰ εἰς ΤΩΝ δισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ παραληγέμενα βαρύνεται μὴ ὅντα τοπικά, διὰ τὸ κοιτῶν. τὰ δὲ βαρύτονα· Πλούτων γειτῶν Τρίτων) <.....> Σούλμων πόλεως Σικελίας, πλὴν τοῦ κροτὸν.

Τὰ εἰς ὩΝ ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς ἐπὶ πόλεων ὀξύνεσθαι θέλει, εἰ μὴ εἰς ΛΩΝ λήγοι ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους Α, ἡ ἐννοιαν συνθέσεως· Ἐλεών Μεδεῶν Σικυών Βαψυλών. σεσημεύω τὸ Ἀσκάλων καὶ τὰ Ἀθηναῖον.

Τὰ εἰς ὩΝ σύνθετα ἀπὸ ἀπλῶν, συντεθειμένα ὡς τὰ ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων βαρύνονται· Ανακρέων Χάθι. ἡ αἰ λέων. τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ περισσομένων περίσσοντα φίλοι εὐνοφόν φιλοκτησιφόν· καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ ὀξυτόνων φυλάττε τὴν ὀξείαν· φιλομακεδόν ἱππαλκτρων.

Τὰ εἰς ὩΝ ὀξύτονα δισύλλαβα καὶ μονοσύλλαβα ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ἀναβιβάζουσι τὸν τόνον,

1 Ἐκδ. τὰ...9 κροτῶν: cf. St. Byz. a 144.8-12 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ὁν δισύλλαβα ἐπὶ πόλεων ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴν ἔχοι σημαίνομενον, ὡς τὸ Κροτὸν βαρύνεται (ὀξυνόμενον γὰρ δηλοὶ εὐφόρῳ· ἡ χαρακτῆρι ὑπάγοιτο, ὡς τὸ Ἐτῶν συναπενεχθέν τῷ Τρίτῳ Γίτων Βίτων, οἰον Ἡλίων Κραννίων Γυρτῶν Νεών. σεσημεύω τὸ Σούλμων. ἐστὶ πόλεις Ιταλίας.

όπως μή σχέσει τοπική ἤνωται, ὡς ἔχει τὸ κατὰ συνήθειαν προκοιτών προσωπικῶν προθυρών. τὰ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἀναβιβάζουσι τὸν ἔον, οἶον· βαθυλείμα πρὸ ἁτίων αὐτόχθων.

Αἱ εἰς ὈΝ θηγούσαι δισύλλαβοι μετοχαὶ ὁδυ- τονοῦμεν, ὡς ὁνόματα κλινόμενα μετατίθεσι τὸν ἔον, οἶον· Ἀμφίων Υπερίων. Καὶ το- σαῦτα περὶ τῶν εἰς Ν ληγόντων ἀρσενικῶν καὶ θηλυκῶν.

Τὰ εἰς ὈΝ τοὺς τρεῖς ἐπιδέχεται τόνως· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐξόντα, ὡς αἰών, τὰ δὲ βαρύνεται, ὡς Πλάτων, τὰ δὲ περιστάται, ὡς Ξενοφών.

Τὰ εἰς ὈΝ συγκριτικά καὶ ὑποκοριστικά βαρύ- νεται ... Ατρείων Κρονίων μωρίων Ἡφαι- στίων.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὈΝ ἀρσενικά δισύλλαβα παραλη-

---

1 τοπική] Lobeck PGG 201.15: τονική (τονική B) ΜΟ 3 τόνως] τοῦ Μ 6 ὡς Schmidt 17.11: καὶ ΜΟ 7 Καὶ...9 θηλυκῶν] in fine huius libri transponenda sunt 10 ἔοι ...13 συγκριτικά...ὑποκοριστικά] debemus addere καὶ πατρωνυμικά vel scribere πατρωνυμικά πρὸ συγκριτικά συγκριτικὰ Μπο-Ο: γνησιωτικά Μη-η, ut videtur ὑποκοριστικά ὑποκοριστικά Ο βαρύνεται βαρύνονται Ο 16 ΟΝ Schmidt 17.19: αὐν ΜΟ παραληγόμενα...25.1 Ε[] παραληγόμενα haesitans βραχεὶ Schmidt 17.19 (app. crit.)
γόμενα ἂν βραχεῖ ἢ Ἐ> βαρύνεται, μὴ ὄντα περιεκτικὰ. Φάνων Κάων Κρέων λέων Νέων, νεὼν δὲ ὡς περιεκτικόν.

(18.) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἜΩΝ βραχεῖ παραληγόμενα βαρύνεται Ἡμαθίων Ἐνδυμίων.

Ἐτὶ καὶ τὰ ἔχοντα τὸ Εἰκονικὸν κύριον προῖν Ἐχίων Δηήων Αμφίων βραχίων.

Ἐτὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἜΩΝ· Μαχάων Αρετάων Ποσειδάων.

Τὰ εἰς ΌΝ ὅνωματα μηνῶν ἢ χρόνων ἰδύνεται· Ποσειδέων Ἐλαφηβολίων. καὶ τὰ τοπικὰ περιεκτικὰ ἀγῶν ἰπτῶν ἀνδρῶν.

6 Ἐτὶ...7 βραχίων: cf. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. οἱν βαρυτ. 16.21-5 Τὰ εἰς ὁν καθαρὰ βαρύτων διχόνων παραληγόμενα εἰ μὲν ἐκτείνουσι τὸ δίχρονον, τρέπουσι τὸ ῥ εἰς ὁ, εἰ δὲ συστέλλουσιν αὐτό, φυλάττουσι τὸ ῥ, οἰνον ... κύριον κίονος, πιὼν πίνονς, προῖν προῖος; Et. Λα. πε. 468.35-7 τὰ εἰς ὁν δισύλλαβα τῷ ἐν παραληγόμενα μὴ ὄντα κύρια, ἐκτείνει αὐτό, οἰνον, κύριον προῖος οὕτως οὐν καὶ πιὼν; EM 674.6-9 τὰ εἰς ἜΩΝ δισύλλαβα τῷ ἐν παραληγόμενα, μὴ ὄντα κύρια, ἐκτείνει αὐτόν, οἰνον, κίονος, προῖος οὕτως οὐν καὶ πιὼν; Choerob. in Theod. 272.25-9 Τὰ εἰς ὁν καθαρὸν βαρύτων ἰδύοντα δίχρονον ἐν τῇ παραληγοῦσῃ, εἰ μὲν ἐκτείνουσι τὸ δίχρονον, τρέπουσι τὸ ῥ εἰς τὸ ῥ ἐν τῇ γενικῇ, οἰνον ... Αμφίων Αμφίων, Ἐπερίων Ἐπερίων, Κ 480> Ἐπερίων Ἑλίοιο, Ἐχίων Ἐχίων

8 Ἐτὶ...9 Ποσειδάων: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 272.25-7 Τὰ εἰς ὁν καθαρὸν βαρύτων ἰδψοντα δίχρονον ἐν τῇ παραληγοῦσῃ, εἰ μὲν ἐκτείνουσι τὸ δίχρονον, τρέπουσι τὸ ῥ εἰς τὸ ῥ ἐν τῇ γενικῇ, οἰνον Μαχάων Μαχάων, Ἐκτάων Ἐκτάων, Ἀρετάων Ἀρετάων; Sophr. Χιλ. Theodos. 397.19-21 Τὰ εἰς ὁν καθαρὰ βαρύτων διχόνων μακρο παραληγόμενα διὰ τοῦ ὁ κλίνεται, Ἐκτάων Ἐκτάων, Μαχάων Μαχάων, Ἀρετάων Ἀρετάων Ποσειδαὸν Ποσειδαὸν

11 καὶ...12 ἀνδρῶν: cf. Theognost. Can. II 29.19-20 (= 159.1-2) Τὰ εἰς ὁν περιεκτικὰ, φυλάττει τὸ ῥ καὶ ἐπὶ γενικῆς; ... ἀνδρῶν λείμαν χειμῶν ἀγῶν

1 Α Μπο: τ Μπο, ut videtur ἢ Ἐ> add. Lentz 18.22 (proposuit ian Schmidt 17.21 (app. crit.)) βαρύνεται Μ: βαρύνεται Ο
2 Κάων Μβ: κάκων ΜΟ; Κάων Theodos. Π. κλίσ. οἱν βαρυτ. 16.31, Theognost. Can. II 30.11 (= 164.2); Choerob. Onomat. I, 71.19-20 (Gaisford)

4 Τὰ διὰ τὰ δ τὰ Ο

10 Τὰ] τὰ Ο

11 Ελαφηβολίων] Ἐλεαφηβολίων Ο
Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΙΩΝ ὑπερδισύλλαβα, εἰ μὴ εἰς ὀνόματα μηνῶν ἢ ποταμῶν, βαρύνονται Ἑν-φραίων Ακταίων εὐαίων.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς Ξ καὶ εἰς Ρ καὶ εἰς ΑΣ λήγοντων ὀνομάτων.

Βιβλίον β’

Πάν ὀνομα εἰς Ξ λήγον ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν βαρύνεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ παρὰ ὁμᾶ εἰς συντεθεῖμέ-νον καὶ μίαν συλλαβὴν φυλάττει τοῦ ὁμήματος, καὶ ἐπιθετικὸν ὑπάρχου, μὴ ἑθυκὸν Φαίας, θώραξ ἀναξ κλιμαξ αὐλαξ· τὸ διασφάξ <ἀπὸ ὁμήματος> ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ σφάξ ὀξυτόνου, τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ ὁμήματος συγκείμενα βλεφαροστάξ καὶ λι-
τροβαστάξ καὶ νεκροβαστάξ, τὸ δὲ Ασφαξ βαρύνεται ὡς ἐθνικόν.

(19.) Τὰ εἰς ΕΣ καὶ ΙΣ καὶ ΟΣ καὶ ΥΣ πάντα βαρύνεται Άελεξ πέρδιξ Καππάδοξ κήροξ.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ μὴ ὄντα σύνθετα ἐπιθετικὰ βαρύνεται μῦριςεις σκῶλης ἀλώπης.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ σύνθετα παρὰ ὠμα ὀξύνεται, εἰ ἐπιθετικά εἰς βουπλης κυμοπλης μεθυπλης. τὸ δὲ υσπλης καὶ ἀντιπης βαρύνεται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιθετικά, τὸ δὲ χηναλὼπης καὶ αὐτὸ βαρύνεται, ὡς τὸ χαμαισκόλης λεοντομύρμης.

Τὰ εἰς ΩΣ ὀξύνεται, ὡς μίαν συλλαβήν ἔχει ἐπί τέλους ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ἀπορρωξ κυμοτρωξ θυλακοτρωξ κυμορρωξ τὸ δὲ θηροδίωξ καὶ αἰγοδίωξ βαρύνεται, ὡς δύο φυλάξαντα συλλαβάς ἐν τῇ συνθέσει.

Τὰ εἰς Ρ.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΡ ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβήν εἴτε ἄρσενικά εἴτε θηλυκά εἴτε οὐδέτερα βαρύνεται μάκαρ δάμαρ ὁναρ οὐθαρ.


玘ινα ης άνων κέλως ἀπωρος;

illos μάρτυς Κέρκυρ Ίλλυρ Λίγυρ.

ἲ αἰς ΗΡ ἐξύνεται καὶ βαρύνεται. καὶ ἐξύνεται (20.) μὲν ἀπλὰ ὠντα ἀρσενικά. ὁ δὲ λόγος του Π προηγουμένου του Η-στατήρ καμπτήρ ἐλατήρι ἐξαυστηρ. Ἐξαύτηρ δὲ κύριον, ἀπερ τό ἀμάτηρ καὶ ἀντηρ καὶ Ἀστηρ κύριον. ἀρσε—

2 Ἑτι...3 Λίγυρ: cf. Theognost. Can. II 41.21-2 (= 224.1-2) Ηα εἰς νη λήγοντα διά τού του ψυλο γράφεται μάρτυς ψυρί Κέρκυρ Ίλλυρ Φίλυρ Άσυρ. 4 Τα...30.3 βαρύνεται: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 297.31-298.3 Τα δὲ ὑπέρ μιν συλλαβὴν εἰς νη λήγοντα δέχεται εἰς ἔχουσι το ντ, φυλαττουσι το εν τη γενική, οἷον λοιπὴ λοιπῆ, σωτήρ σωτῆρ, καμπήρ καμπήριος, ὀλετήρ αἰλετήρ, ἐφιστήρ ἐφιστήρ, γενετηρ γενετητερ, ἐλατηρ ἐλατηρίος (ἐστι δὲ εἴδος πλακωνυτς σημανει δὲ καὶ τον ἤνιοχον παρά το ελαίνεται) δει προσθεινα «χωρὶς το πιτήρ πατέρος καὶ ἀστήρ αστέρος» ταυτα γάρ ἔχεται το τρεπεται το εἰς το ε ἐν τη γενικη τα δε μή ἔχεται το τρεπεται το εἰς το ε ἐν τη γενική, οἷον αἰθήρ αἰθήρ, ἀνήρ ἀνήρ, δαίρη δαίρη (ὁ ἀνδραδελφος), ἀνήρ ἀνήρ, χωρὶς το σπανθήρ σπανθήρ καὶ Ἐλευθήρ Ἐλευθήρος (Ἐλευθήρ δὲ ἐστιν ὄνομα κύριον) ταυτα γάρ μή ἔχεται το ε ἐφιλαξαν το ε ἐν τη γενική. 8 Ἀστηρ κύριον: cf. Jo. Alex. περὶ διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. α 9 Ἀστηρ: ἡ πόλις παραζύνεται, ἀστήρ: το προσηγορικόν ἐξύνεται; ε 9 Ἀστηρ: ἡ πόλις παραζύνεται, ἀστήρ: ὁ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, το προσηγορικόν ἐξύνεται; δ 9 Ἀστηρ: ὁ κατ’ οὐρανόν,

1 Ἑτι...3 Λίγυρ post Εἰρ 31.4 transposuit Schmidt κέλως Schmidt: κάλλως ΜΟ ἀπωρ haestians retinui; fortasse πέλως coll. π.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 937.26; αλλις αλλα: ἀκτωρ vel πάτωρ malit Schmidt 19.18 (app. crit.); ἄχωρ Lobbeck PGG 219.22-3 (sed ἄχωρ in 31.6-7 cum explicatione citatur; vide etiam annotationem de ἄτηρος); ἄτωρ Hesychius α 8213 2 Ἑτι[τι (e om. in spatio vacuo) Ο 4 ἐξύνεται] ἐξύνεται (sic) O 5 ὡντα Μπ: μὴ ἡντα Μπ. του Τ] s.l. scribitur in O 7 ἐξαυστηρ ἐξαυστηρ Μπ: ἐξαυστηρ Μπ: ἐξαυστηρ Μπ: ἐξαυστηρ[ Ἔφωντη Choerob. in Theod. 297.33, 298.25 Ἐξαυστηρ] ἐξαυστηρ Μπ: ἐξαυστηρ Μπ: ἐξαυστηρ De Orthogr. 250.16, vide etiam AO II 250, 16; fortasse εὐπατήρ ἀστηρ: ὡς scripsent Schmidt 20.3 et Barker 19.22 8 Ἀστηρ] fortasse Πάντηρ (LGPN II) καὶ Ἀστηρ καὶ Ἀστηρ καὶ Ἀστηρ Ο κύριον] καὶ Μ
νικά δὲ εἶπε διὰ τὰ θηλυκά. καὶ γὰρ τὰ εἰς ἩΡ θηλυκά μὴ μετατιθέμενα κατὰ τι ἔθος ποιητοῦ εἰς διάφορον γένος βαρύνεται: μῆτηρ θυγάτηρ Δημήτρι. τὸ δὲ γαστήρ ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ἩΡ εὐνικά ἢ κύρια, μὴ συνεμπίπτοντα προσηγορικοῖς, βαρύνονται: Ἰβηρ Ἀννίβηρ Δόβηρ Πήρ, τὸ μέντοι Ἐλευθήρ ὀξύνεται, ὡς τὸ Ἀστήρ.

Ἀστήρ· ἡ πόλις; ε ἡ 44 Ἀστήρ· ὁ λαμπὼν, Ἀστήρ δὲ πόλις; Eust. Od. II 330.33 καὶ Λατήριος μὲν πόλις, Ἀστήρ δὲ ὁ κατ' οὐρανόν 1 καὶ ... 4 Δημήτριος cf. Hdn. p.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 922.27-35 Γαστήρ. τὰ εἰς τὴν ἀνέγειτα ὑπὲρ μιᾶς συλλαβῆς θηλυκά ὀντα βαρύνεσθαι θέλει, μῆτηρ, θυγάτηρ, εὐνάτηρ, Δημήτριος, οὐδὲν δὲ θελεί ὀξύνεσθαι. σημειωθῆς ἡ γαστήρ ὀξύνομενη, καὶ γὰρ ἄλλως τὰ εἰς τὴν ὀξύνομα ἀρσενικά, ὥσποτε μὴ κατὰ μεταβολὴν γένους εἰς, Ἀστήρ, προσηγήρ, καυστήρ, πληκτήρ, ἀλκτήρ. προσέθηκα δὲ ὅποτε μὴ κατὰ μεταβολὴν γένους διὰ τὸ ἁυστήρα κρατητήν (Σ 477), ἔλθην στεγαστήρα. τοιαύτα γὰρ ἐστιν ὅποιον ἡ αἰθήρ, ἢ ἁθήρ;

Choerob. in Theod. 322.6-13 Τὸ ἁυστήρ σωτήρ ἁθήρ καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα ἀρσενικά ὀντα πολλάκις οἱ ποιηταί μεταφέρουσιν εἰς θηλυκὸν γένος, οἶνον τὸν ἁυστήρα τὴν ἁυστήρα, οἶνον <Σ 477> ἁυστήρα κρατητήν (ἀντὶ τοῦ σφώναν, καὶ ἐστι παρὰ τὸ όνομα τὸ φθεῖρα), τὸν ἀέα τὴν ἀέα, τὸν σωτήρα τὴν σωτήρα· ταύτα δὲ οὐκ ἀντίκειται ἣμιν ὅστε κατὰ τὸν τόνον οὔτε κατὰ τὴν κλίσιν, ἐπεὶ διὰ κατὰ ποιητικὴν ἑξουσίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρσενικοῦ γένους μετηνέχθησαν εἰς θηλυκὸν γένος, καὶ λοιπὸν τὴν κλίσιν καὶ τὸν τόνον τὸν ἀρσενικοῦ γένους ἐφύλαξαν.

1 εἶπε Ο: εἶπεν M καὶ ... 4 Δημήτριος] Schmidt 20.6 (app. crit.): ἐκ διαφόρον γένους, nisi forte marius ἀρσενικὰ δὲ εἶπε διὰ τὰ θηλυκά καὶ τὰ μετατιθέμενα κατὰ τι ἔθος ποιητικὸς εἰς διάφορον γένος. Τὰ δὲ εἰς ἩΡ θηλυκὰ βαρύνεται 2 κατὰ τί Schmidt 20.6: κατὰ τί M 3 θυγάτηρ] θυγάτηρ O 5 συνεμπίπτοντα O: συνεμπίπτοντα M 6 Ἄννίβηρ ΜΟ; Ἰλλίβηρ (v. Tzschucke (1806), IIii. 408) vel Keltibēr Lobeck PGG 211 n. 5; compositum ex Ancas (fluvio) et Ἰβηρ Schmidtio 20.10 (app. crit.) videtur 7 Δόβηρ Lobeck PGG 211, n. 5: δόμηρ ΜΟ.
Τὰ εἰς ἙΠ [άπλα] μὴ ὀντα σύνθετα, μηδὲ ἑθικά, οὐκ ἔχειναι ἀνίχνη ἀθὴν σπίνθηρ. τὸ μέντοι ἐφὶς ὡς σύνθετον βαρύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ἙΠ ὀξύτονα φυλάττοντα τὸ Ἑ κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν φυλάττει καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐν τῇ συνθέσει, οἰον ἐπὶ ἀμαλλοδετήρ, στατήρ ὁ βολοστάτηρ. τὸ μέντοι ἀνίχνη λιπᾶνη, δαίρῃ πολυδάρη, πάτηρ αἷνοπάτηρ ὡς μὴ φυλάττοντα τὸ Ἑ βαρύνεται. καὶ τὸ πάνθηρ καὶ σατυρόφημο ἀπὸ μονοσύλλαβον.

(21.) Τὰ εἰς ΕἸΡ ύπέρ μιᾶς συλλαβῆς ἄσυνήθη

---

2 Τὰ…10 μονοσύλλαβον: cf. Sophr. Char. Theod. 401.24-6 Ταύτα δὲ ἐν συνθέσει διὰ τοῦ ἡ κλίνομενα φυλάττει τὴν ὀξείαν, ἀμαλλοδετήρ ὁ βολοστάτηρ, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ε βαρύνεται, πολυδάρη τὸ πάνθηρ <πάνθηρος> ὡς μονοσύλλαβον. ΙΙ 11 Τὰ…31.4 Εἰρ: cf. St. Byz. β 82 Βέκχειρ ἑθνος Σκαθικον, ὡς Σάπτει, ἠ μετὰ τοῦ σ Σάσπειρ, Ἐλέαςιρ, ὁνόματα βαρβάρων. Λέγειν ποταμὸς περὶ Γαλατίων, χρυσόθεος παρ’ Ἀχιλλοῦ ἐν Ἰοβάκχος, ᾧς ἅπα άποκέκοπται τού χρυσόθεου, ἐκατόγχει τὸ σύνθετον; Theognost. Can. II 41.23-6 (= 225.1-4) Τὰ εἰς Εἰρ λίγοντα, καὶ σπάνια καὶ αἰσθηθὴ τῇ κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ, καὶ σχέδον ἐν σημειώσει ὀιον, τὸ Βέκχειρ ὁνόμα ἑθνος Σάπτειρ ὁμοίως Αλάξειρ ὁ νόμο κύριον Λέγειν ὁνόμα ποταμοῦ Ἐλάςειρ ὁμοίως Choerob. in Theod. 321.6-9 (Τὰ addendum) Εἰρ εἰς διὰ τῆς τοῦ διεύθυνγον ἔχουσαν μονοσύλλαβα ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἡθικοῖς τὸ χεῖρ, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀρσενικοῖς τὸ φθειρ καὶ τὸ Εἰρ (Εἰρ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁνόμα ποταμοῦ) ύπέρ μιᾶς δὲ συλλαβῆς εὐρίσκομεν τὸ ἀντίχειρ καὶ τὸ Βέκχειρ (ἔστι δὲ ἑθνος) καὶ τὸ Σάπτειρ (ὁμοίως ἑθνος); Ep. Ps. 4.6-12 τὰ εἰς ἙΠ ἐπὶ παντὸς γένους διὰ τοῦ Ἑ γράφεται, πλὴν τοῦ χεῖρ, φθείρ, Εἰρ (ὁνόμα ποταμοῦ), Βέκχειρ (ἑθνοὺς ὁνόμα), Σάφειρ (ὁνόμα ἑθνος Ποντικοῦ), ἔθειρ, Ἐλάςειρ (ποταμὸς Κηλτικοῦ), Λέγειν (ποταμὸς περὶ Πλαταίαν), εινάιειρ, Ἐλάςειρ (βασιλείς Λιβανῖν), καὶ μόρκιο καὶ Φθείρ, (νίος Ἐνεμίμωνος) καὶ γράφεται διὰ τοῦ τὸν I; De Orthogr. 273.33-274.4 ἀστείον δὲ ότι εἰς εἰρ μονοσύλλαβα διὰ τῆς τοῦ διεύθυνγον

---

1 μηδὲ B: μὴ δὲ MO 7 λιπάνηρ Lobeck PGG 215.24-6: διπάνηρ MO 9 σατυρόφημο[σ] σατυρόφημο O
μὲν, τὰ δὲ εὑρεθέντα βαρύνεται Βέχειῳ Σάπειῳ Ἐλεάζειῳ Λίγειῳ Ἐλάτειῳ ἐκατοντάχειῳ ἀντίχειῳ. ἔτι καὶ τὰ μονοσύλλαβα χεῖρι φθείρι Εἰρ.

Τὰ εἰς ὩΡ πάντα βαρύνονται Νέστωρ Ἐκτωρ Κάστωρ ἀχωρ (τὸ ἀποστίτυσιμα τῆς κεφαλῆς). τὸ μέντοι ἰχώρ ὀξύνεται.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς ΑΣ.

1 Βέχειῳ Schmidt: βλέχειῳ ΜΟ Σάπειῳ ΜΟ (cf. etiam Choerob. in Theod. 321.9; EM 195.43, 708.16); Σάπειῳ ΜΟ Στ. Βυζ. β 82 et EM 195.44; Σάφειῳ Choerob. Ep. Ps. 4.8 et EM 107.37 2 Ἐλεάζειῳ ΜΟ et St. Βυζ. β 82.1-2, Choerob. Ep. Ps. 4.10-1, Theodos. Π. γραμμ. 103.30, EM 107.38: Ἀλάζειῳ Lobeck PGG 209.2-5 et Schneidewin (1848), 384 ἐκατοντάχειῳ] Εκατογχεῖῳ Στ. Βυζ. β 82 3 ἀντίχειῳ...4 εἰρ Μ4: om. Μ5 6 ἀποστίτυσιμα...7 κεφαλῆς ΜΟ; verbum ἀποστίτυσιμα in Psellus citatur (vide Boissonade Anecdota Graeca, III, Psellus, p. 216, l. 297)
Τὰ εἰς ΑΣ πολυσύλλαβα ἑκτεταμένον ἔχοντα

1 Τὰ…33.10 Α: cf. Ιο. Αλεξ. Τον. παρ. 8.14-24 Πάντα τὰ εἰς ἃς μακροκατάληκτα ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τὸν τόνον ἔχοντα ἃν ἡ κλίσις ἡ κατ’ ἀποβολήν τοῦ ε ἡ διὰ τοῦ ντ’ Μητρᾶς Μητρᾶ, Ζηρᾶς Ζηρᾶ, Γλυκὰς Γλυκάντος, πελεκάς πελεκάντος, ἄλλας ἄλλας καὶ εἰ τοιοῦτον. Ἰονικῶς παραλόγως <τα> διὰ τοῦ δ’ κεκλημένα γὰρ τὸ α’ μακρόν: σφῆς σφῆδας, ἰττας ἰττάδος, τὰ δὲ παρὰ παρακειμένου συντεθέντα, οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ χαλκοκρᾶς, νεοκρᾶς, οὐκ ἀντικεῖται ὃδε ὡς γὰρ μόνον τοῦ τ’ κλίνεται. σεσμεύεται τὸ ἵμας καὶ ἀνάρχαις ὃδε ὡς γὰρ καί ἀνάρχαις, ἄτερ παρ’ Ἀττικοῖς περιστάται; Choerob. in Theod. 385.14-6: ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν εἰς αἱ περιστομένων ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν οὕτω (scil. αἱ γενικαὶ) ἑκτεταμένον ἔχουσι τὸ α’, οὕτως φύει μακρόν, οἷον ἅλλας ἄλλας, πελεκάς πελεκάντος; EM 470*.233-44 Τὰ (a addidit: τ’ editio) εἰς ΑΣ ὅνοματα ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν (μακρόν) ἔχοντα τὸ α’, ἢ βαρύνονται, ὡς Αίας Θάς, ἢ περιστάνται (περιστὰντα editio) ὡς βορᾶς ἅλλας (εἴδος δὲ ἐστὶ πλακοῦντος, (ἐξ οὗ) καὶ ἄλλαντωπλῆς,) καὶ πελεκάς τὸ δ’ ἵμας καὶ ἄνδριας, ὡς διαλλάξαντα κατὰ τὸν χρόνον πρὸς τὰ ἅλλα, ἤγουν τοῦ άρχας (scribendum θάρας), διήλθαται καὶ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα (τὴν κλίσιν) ἐπὶ μέντοι τῆς γενικῆς ἵμαντος οἱ μὲν Αττικοὶ τὸν χρόνον τῆς εὐθείας ἀκολουθοῦντες προπαραδόνοντο τὴν γενικήν· ἢ δὲ κοινὴ συνήθεια τούτῳ οὐ παρέλαβεν, διὰ τὸ κλ. (τὸν κανόνα) πάντα διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλ. (κλανομένα). Ἐπάνω θέσει μακρᾶς περιστομένη οὐ τίθεται; 101.42-4 Ἀνδρίας: Ζητεῖται, εἰ πάντα τὰ εἰς ΑΣ μακρόν καταλήγοντα, ἢ βαρύνοντα, ἢ περιστώνται. Τὸ δ’ ἄνδρας καὶ ἵμας σεσμεύονται. Τὰ… 33.6 ὃδειλομένα: cf. Hdn. π.μ.Α. ΓΓ iii.ii 939.20-5 τὰ εἰς ἃς λήγοντα καθαρὸν, ἑκτεταμένον ἔχοντα τὸ α’, εἰ ἔχοι πρὸ τέλους φωνῆσαι ἢ φωνήσαι, βαρύστηθαί θέλει, [...] σημειώσεις ὅρα τὸ ἄνδρας ὃδειλομένον. οὐκ ἄγνως δὲ ὅτι Ἡλιόδωρος ἐβουλεύτο αὐτῷ περιστὰν ὀμοίως δὲ καί τὸ ἵμας; Sophr. Char. Theodot. 381.5-7 Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι πάν ὁμοία εἰς ἃς βαρύτονον μακροκατάληκτον ἐστι, πλὴν τοῦ μέγας καὶ λάς· καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου τὸ δέντονον βραχικατάληκτα, πλὴν τοῦ ἢµας καὶ ἄνδριας. Τὰ… 33.2 Θάς: cf. Choerob. in Thed. 122.5-6 Δεί δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι καθόλου τὰ εἰς ἃς ὅνοματα βαρύτονον ἀρχειακὰ μακρόν ἔχουσι τὸ α’, ὡς Ἰωάκ Θάς Δρύας Αίας. Τὰ… 33.1 περιστάται: cf. Et. Gud. i 277.50-2 τὰ εἰς ἃς ὅνοματα ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν μακρόν ἔχοντα τὸ α’, ἢ βαρύνεται, ἢ περιστάται.
τὸ Α βαρύνεται ἡ περισσάται, καὶ βαρύνεται μὲν Ἀτας Θόδας· περισσάται δὲ ἀλλὰς πελεκάς.

ωδέποτε δὲ ὃς ἡμικοκρατός, καὶ τὸ χαλκοκράτος καὶ γαλακτοκράτος ὡς ἀπὸ παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου. βαρύνεται δὲ τὰ εἰς ΑΣ καθαρὸν· Ἀρχίας Λο-ξίας Γοργίας. τὸ μέντοι τριὰς θηλυκὸν καὶ συστελλόμενον ἔχει τὸ Α.

3 ωδέποτε...7 παρακειμένου: cf. Chorob. in Theod. 324.28-32

Δεὶ προσθείειν ἐν τῷ κανόνι «χωρίς τῶν ἀπὸ παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου συντεθέντων»· εἰκείνα γὰρ καὶ μακρὸν ἔχουσι τὸ α καὶ δὶα καθαροῦ τοῦ τοῦ κλίνουται, οἶνον κέκραμαι χαλκοκράτος (ὁ χαλκώ κεκραμένου), γαλακτοκράτος γαλακτοκράτος (ὁ γάλακτε κεκραμένος) ωδέποτε...6 ὃς ἡμικοκρατός, cf. Chorob. in Theod. 125.28-30

Τά εἰς ΒΑΣ βαρύνονται βίβαζ Φόρβας Αββας (ποταμός). τὸ δὲ ἀκριβὰς περισσάται.

(22.) Τά εἰς ΓΑΣ πάντα βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ σκώμματος εἰς, ὅπερ ἔχει τὸ φαγάς· γίγας μέγας· τὸ μέντοι φυγάς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ Α ἐκτεταμένον. σεσμείωστοι τά ἀτταγάς περισσώμενον, ὅπερ καὶ ἀττας γῆ τον λέγεται.

Τά εἰς ΔΑΣ βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ ΔΟΣ κλίνοντο ἡ συναλημμένα εἰς ἡ ὑποκοινιστικά· Ἰδας Βρασίδας· τὸ μέντοι Θενδάς περισσάται, ὡς Μητρᾶς Ζηνάς Πυθάς· τὸ δὲ Κερκιδᾶς ἀπὸ συναλοψῆς.

Τά εἰς ΑΣ ἐκτεταμένον ἔχοντά τι πρὸ τοῦ α· τῶν διπλῶν βαρύνονται· Βύζας· Ἐλίξας· ἀλείψας· τὸ μέντοι Υψάς περισσάται, καὶ τὸ ἐξας ἐπὶ ποσότητος ὅν.

Τά εἰς ΛΑΣ δι’ ἐνός Λ βαρύνονται, εἰ μὴ ἐκ

8 Τά...12 συναλοψῆς: cf. Jo. Alex. Τον. παρ. 8.14-8 (27) Πάντα τά εἰς ας μακροκαταλήκτα ἐπί τῷ τέλει τόν τόν ἔχοντα ὧν ἡ κλίσις ἡ κατ’ αποβάλην τοῦ ε’ ἡ διά τοῦ ντ Μητρᾶς Μητρᾶ, Ζηνᾶς Ζηνα, Γλυσᾶς Γλυσάντος, πελεκᾶς πελεκάντος, ἀλλᾶς ἀλλᾶντος καὶ εἰ τι τουίτον.

συναλοφής εἰς Γέλας Ὄλας μέλας. τὸ µέντοι ἰλάς περισσάται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰλάς.
Τὰ εἰς δύο ΛΔ ἀλλὰς Πάλλας Βάλλας χωρίς εἰ µὴ ἐπὶ σκώµµατος εἰη, ἢ ἔχοι τι ἐντέλεστερον. τὸ µέντοι πελλάς (ὁ γέρων) περισσάται ἐπὶ σκώµµατος ὁν, καὶ τὸ ἀλλὰς καὶ βιλλάς.
Τὰ εἰς ΜΑΣ βαρύνεται Τόλμας ἀδάµας, εἰ (23.) µὴ κατὰ τροπὴν εἰη Δωρικὴν, ὡς τὸ Ἐρµᾶς καὶ τὸ Αρτεµᾶς ὑποκοριστικόν. σεσηµεώται τὸ ἴμας.
Τὰ εἰς ΝΑΣ ὀµοίως. εἰ µὴ εἰη ὑποκοριστικά, ἢ ἐπὶ σκώµµατος ἀρτύνας Ξένας. Μηνᾶς µέντοι καὶ Ζηνᾶς ὑποκοριστικά. τὸ ἀ δακνάς περισσάται, ὃτι ἐπὶ σκώµµατος τάσσεται.
Ἐτὶ τὰ εἰς ΡΑΣ µὴ ὀντα ὑποκοριστικά, ἢ συναληµµένα, ἢ νόµισµα δηλοῦντα Θῆρας Αὐθύρας Πυθαγόρας ὑπερτρός Μητρᾶς Ἡρᾶς τετράς βορρᾶς περισσάται. τὸ ἀ τετράς τεταύδος συστέλλεται.
Τὰ εἰς ΛΣ σύνθετα πάντα βαρύνεται παιδοπίπας εὐφαρέτρας. Τὸ µέντοι χαλκοκρᾶς ὀξύνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ παθητικοῦ παρακειµένου συντε-
θέν. τὸ δὲ φιλοπελλᾶς καὶ φιλοβορρᾶς τὸν τῶν ἀπλῶν ἐφύλαξε τόνων.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΣ συνεσταλμένον ἀρσενικά καὶ θηλυκὰ οξύνεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ΔΟΣ κλίνεται ὁ φυ-γάς καὶ ἢ (24.) φυγάς, ὁ Αρκάς καὶ ἢ Αρκάς, δυάς τριάς. τὸ μέντοι μέγας καὶ λάς ὡς συντελλοντα <τό α> βαρύνονται.

Πάν ὦνδετερον εἰς ΑΣ βαρύνεται γέφας γῆρας δέπας δέμας σέβας.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς ΗΣ ληγόντων

Βιβλίον γ’

Πάν όνομα δισύλλαβον ἀπλούν εἰς ΗΣ καθαρέον ἀσυνάλειπτον βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἔχοι πρὸ τέλους μόνον τὸ Υ. Ναίης Δάης Κλεύης Βρύης. τὸ δὲ Ἑς περισσάτα ἔχων τὸ Υ, ὠσπερ καὶ τὸ Θυνῆς Κυνῆς ἱσοσύλλαβως κλινόμενα. τὰ δὲ περιττοσύλλαβως κλινόμενα βαρύνονται λύτης Λύετος, ἀπὸ τοῦ λυήσεως. καὶ τὸ ζάης ὡς σύνθετον οξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΒΗΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα φίλη-

8 Πάν...9 σέβας; cf. Theognost. Cm. II 80.14-8 (= 448) Τὰ εἰς αὐτό ἐνδείκνυσι δισύλλαβα, τὸ ε παραλήγηται ὁ οῦν, δέπας· κέρας· δέμας· πέρας· τέρας· βρέτας· λέπας· κρέας· τοῦτο μονήρες εἰς ας καθαρόν τὸ ε παραληγόμενον· σκέτας· κνέφας· σέβας· γέφας· σέλας· ψέφας· σουμεωτα τὸ γῆρας διὰ τοῦ ἡ γραφόμενον.

1 φιλοπελλᾶς...φιλοβορρᾶς] φιλαπελλᾶς (i. q. φιλαπελλῆς Ps.-Arcad. p. 29.21-2) καὶ φιλοκυρραθός Lobeck PGSE 168, n. 30 τὸν Μεξ ο. τὴν Μεξ 2 ἐφύλαξε ο. ἐφύλαξαν Μ 6 λάς Schmidt: λάς ΜΟ ὡς...7 βαρύνονται] fortas excidit άλλα (vel καί) μή διὰ τοῦ δος κλινόμενα vel aliquid simile; ἐπειδὴ οὐ διὰ τοῦ δος κλίνονται βαρύνοντα add. Lentz 59.11 7 <το α> add. Schmidt 24.2 (app. crit.) 8 οὐδέτερον] οὐδὲνον Μ 11 γ’] τρίτον Ο 14 ποστὸ τῇ] lacunam statuit Schmidt 24.8 (app. crit.): sensus esset καὶ ἱσοσύλλαβος κλινοῖν ὡς σύνθετα εἰς; ἐπειδὴ παραστάτη μετ’ ἕναν τῇ Κλεύης TGL IV, 1624 D, s. v. Κλέυας; cf. Choerob. in Theod. 123.17, Et. Gud. κ 326.30, EM 498.33: κλείες MO 17 βαρύνονται...19 οξύνεται] fallitur Lobeck PGG 158.20-4 de mutatione accentuum praecepti tonici post βαρύνονται fortasse aliquid excipit 18 λύτης Λυέτος] <τὸ δὲ> λύτης Λυέτος vel δυῆς δυήτους Schmidt 24.11-2 (app. crit.)
εντι βαρύνεται λέβης Κέβης Χάβης Θίβης. τὸ δὲ κυβῆς περισσάται ἀπὸ τοῦ καβέας.

Τὰ εἰς ΓΗΣ δισύλλαβα βαρύνονται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ τι ἐκ συνθέτου καταλελειμμένον εἶπ, ἢ παρώνυμον ἐπιθετικόν, τότε γὰρ περισσάται, ὅτε συναλλήληται, ἢ βαχαεία παραλίγιοι καὶ ἰσοσυλλάβως κλίνοιτο. καὶ τὰ μὲν (25) βαρύτονα· Μέγης Γύγης Γάγγης Μόργης. τὸ μέντοι ἀργῆς ἐπιθετικόν, ὄσπερ καὶ τὸ ἀγῆς ἀπὸ συνθέτου τοῦ ἀγης (ὅ μὴ κλώμενος). τὸ δὲ μοιγῆς καὶ δρογῆς ἰσοσυλλάβως κλίνομενα περισσάται καὶ τὸ φθογγῆς ἐκ τοῦ φθογγήεις καὶ τὸ Αὐγῆς ἐκ τοῦ Αὐγήες.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΗΣ δισύλλαβα μὴ διὰ τοῦ ΟΥΣ κλίνομενα βαρύνονται· Πῦδης ἄδης Γράδης Μένδης. τὸ μέντοι ψευδῆς καὶ φραδῆς ἐπιθέτικα, καὶ τὸ Ποδῆς καὶ ἱοδῆς περισσασθῇ, ὅτι τῷ Ὀ παραλίγει.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ ἀποσυλλέπτα βαρύνονται· Ἀνθῆς Σκύθης Σεύθης Λάχης Πάχης. τὸ μέντοι

---

14 Τὰ...16 Μένδης: cf. EM 818.18-9 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ΔΗΣ δισύλλαβα μὴ κλίνομενα εἰς ΟΥΣ βαρύνεται οἷον, μένδης, γράδης, ἄδης.

1 ἀναπαράτου: ἀναπαράτου λέβης ... (Χάβης Schmidt 24.14 ε sch. Ar. V. 234a): (κάβης expunctum ante λέβης Μ) λέβης, κέβης, κάβης ΜΟ; λάβης pro λέβης dubitantes Schmidt 24.14 (app. crit.) Θίβης St. Byz. Θ 45.4; θίβης Unger (1839), 73.32-6; θήβης ΜΟ 4 τι ἐκ om. O e ek...καταλελειμμένου] ἀπὸ συνθέτου τοῦ καταλελειμμένου ΜΟ 5 συναλλήληπται Schmidt 24.18: συναλλέλειπται ΜΟ 6 βραχεία Βραχεία Μ 8 Γάγγης L. Dindorf TGL VII 14A-B et Lobeck PGSE2 51, n. 3; Τάγης vel Δάγγης etiam Lobeck PGSE2 51, n. 3; σάγης ΜΟ 9 ἀγής ΜΟ e: ἀργής O e ἀπὸ συνθέτου Lentz 61.24: συνθέτον ἀπὸ ΜΟ; ἀπὸ συνθέτου καταλελειμμένου Lentz 61.24 τοῦ...10 ἀγῆς Lentz 61.24: τῆς γῆς ΜΟ; τῆς ἀγῆς Schmidt 25.3; vide etiam Lobeck PGSE2 51.12-5; τοῦ εὐαγής ἢ παραγής Bekker AG I 337.13-4 11 κλίνομενα] ἢ τὸ παραλήγομεν add. Lentz 61.28-9 15 ἄδης C: ἔδης ΜΟ 16 Μένδης Lentz 62.4 e St. Byz. 444.17-9 et EM 818.18-9: μένδης ΜΟ 20 τὸ...38.1 ἀείνυνται] κριτῆς ἀείνυτον, καὶ τὸ παλτῆς ᾤ de Lehrs (1857), 142, n. 16
κριτής <...> και ψαλτής ἀττικῶς ὀδύνεται καὶ τὸ ληστής καὶ ληστής, τὸ δὲ πότης ἄρσενικόν, τὸ δὲ ποτής θηλυκόν.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ διευλαβάμη μὴ ὄντα τοπικὰ ἢ συναληλιμμένα βαρύνονται ἐχοντα πρὸ τοῦ ΗΣ ἢ ΞΞ Ἐρέξης Χρύσης κάσης. τὸ μέντοι κασῆς (τὸ πιλωτῶν ἱμάτιον) περισσάται. τὸ δὲ Κισσής ὀδύνεται ὡς ἐπίθετον.

---

1 καὶ [...2 ληστής: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 187.15-20 vide adnotationem de 38.1 <...> in apparatu critico ψαλτής... ὀδύνεται: cf. Hdn. π.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 946.5-6 τὸ δὲ ψαλτής ἀττικῶν ἐστίν ὀδυνόμενων, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἀπολλόδωρος; sch. S. El. 70 παρὰ δὲ Ἀττικοῖς ὀδύνεται τὸ τε καθαρτὴς καὶ ἀμυντικὴς ἐπὶ τοῦ βοηθοῦ, φαιδρυντῆς, ποικιλῆς, ψαλτῆς, πραιτῆς: Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημαιν. a ψ.2.2, c ψ 5.1, d ψ 2.1, e ψ 2.2; Sii. ψ 16.4-6 παρὰ δὲ Ἀττικοῖς ὀδύνονται καθαρτῆς, ἀμυντικῆς, ἐπὶ τοῦ βοηθοῦ, φαιδρυντῆς, ποικιλῆς, ψαλτῆς, πραιτῆς.

Τὰ εἰς ΝΗΣ καὶ ΡΗΣ δισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ μὴ ἔχοντα κατ’ ἐπιπλοκὴν συμφώνουν βαρύνεται εἰ δὲ τι περισσαθῆ, τούτῳ κατά συναλοιφῆν ἐγένετο, ἢ ἰαμβικὸν ἐστὶ (26.) καὶ ἰσοσύλλαβον. ὅσα δὲ ἤξυνεται, εἰς ΟΥΣ ἔχει τὴν γενικὴν ἢ εἰς ΤΟΣ. τὰ βαρύτονα πένης πλάνης Μύνης χλούνς Φάνης. τὸ μέντοι σθενῆς τεχνῆς λαχνῆς ζαχρῆς ἀπὸ συναλοιφῆς γίνονται καὶ τὸ Φανῆς ἰαμβικὸν ἰσοσύλλαβον.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Ἀμετάβολον μετ’ ἐπιπλοκῆς συμφώνου ἐτέρου κύρια ὅντα ἢ προσηγορικὰ βαρύνεται: Μέσθλης μᾶς-θλῆς Μάγνης Πίγρης Ὄπλης Πέτρης (λιμὴν τις). εἰ δὲ τι περισσαθῆ, κατὰ πάθος γέγονε, τὸ μέντοι γυμνῆς ἀβλῆς προβλῆς ἐπιθετικά ὅντα ἤξυνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ ἐπιθετικὰ δισύλλαβα εἰς ΟΥΣ τὴν γενικὴν ποιοῦντα καὶ μὴ παθόντα συγκοπῆν ἤξυνεται φευδῆς πρηνῆς ζαίης ἀλῆς. τὸ πλήρης βαρύνεται (πλήρης γάρ), ὡς ξιφήρης ὀλιγήρης. καὶ τὸ Ἅρης κύριον.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια ἔχοντα Υ ἐν τῇ παραληγούσῃ περισσάται Μυῆς Θυῆς Κυῆς. βαρύνεται δὲ τὸ Βρῦς Κυῆς περιττοσύλλαβα. γὺς δὲ οὐ κύριον.

19 τὸ...21 ὀλιγήρης: cf. Ps-Arc. 135.3-6 Ἀἰὸ ἐν οὗ διὰ τοῦ ΗΡΗΣ ἔχει προπειρασμένα ὀλιγήρης ὀλιγήρης, θυμήρες θυμήρες (τὸ δὲ θυμήρες ἀπὸ τοῦ θυμήρας γέγονε), ξιφήρης ξιφήρης, πλήρης πλήρης.

13 Πίγρης Schmidt 26.9: πήγης ΜΟ; ex Μ πνίγης dedit Galland (1886), 296 14 δὲ τὶ scripsi: τὶ δὲ ΜΟ κατὰ [κ Ἡ]
23 Κυῆς] Κυῆς Nonn. D. XXXII 236 (Κυῆς Hdt. IV 97) 25 κύριον ] κύο Μ
Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ κύρια ἀπὸ ἐντελεστέρου περισπάται Ἐρμής Θαλῆς Πυλῆς Ποδής.
Τὰ παρὰ τὸ κλέος ἐπίθετα μὲν ὅντα ὀξύνεται εὐκλείας ἀκλείας κύρια δὲ ὅντα ἐν μὲν τῇ ἐντελείᾳ (27.) βαρύνεται, ἐν δὲ τῇ συναιρέσει περισπάται Ἵρακλέης Ἡρακλῆς καὶ τὰ εἰς ΕΑΣ· Αρτεμέας Αρτέμης.
Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΗΕΙΣ περισπώνται τιμῆς τεχνῆς δαφνῆς.
Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ πατρωνυμικά ἢ ὡς πατρωνυμικά βαρύνονται Πηλείδης Ατρείδης Κρονίδης Εὐριπίδης Ἐουκυδίδης.

1 Τὰ...9 δαφνῆς: cf. Jo. Alex. Τον. παρ. 8.24-32 (28) Πάντα τὰ εἰς ἡς ἐπὶ τῆς τελευταίας ἔχοντα τὸν τόνον, εἰ παρὰ τὸ κλέος εἰς συνεθεῖται, περισπάται, οἶον Ἡρακλῆς, Σοφοκλῆς. καὶ ὅσα εἰς ὥς ἔχει τὴν γενικὴν χώρας τοῦ σ’ Ἐρμῆς Ἐρμῶν, Θαλῆς Θαλῶν, Ὁσιῆς Ὁσίων, ἐκ τῶν Ἐρμεάς, Θελέας, Σωφιᾶς πάλιν συνηθισμένα. καὶ ὅσα διὰ τὸν νεότητος τιμῆς τηρήτος, φθογγώς φθογγιότος, ἀ καὶ αὐτὰ συνήρχεται ἐκ τοῦ τιμημέας, φθογγοῖς, τὰ δὲ παρὰ ταῦτα ὀξύνεται ψευδῆς, σαφῆς, ἀληθίας, καὶ τὰ λοιπά.
3 Τὰ...6 Ἡρακλῆς: cf. Sophr. Char. Theodos. 385.25-7 τὰ δὲ παρὰ τὸ κλέος ἐντελῆ μὲν ὅντα βαρύνεται, Ἡρακλῆς, συναιρέτεσθαι δὲ περισπάται, Δημοκλῆς, Λαυκικῆς ἐπίθετα δὲ ὅντα ὀξύνεται
4 κύρια...6 Ἡρακλῆς: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 185.3-7 τὰ γὰρ παρὰ τὸ κλέος συνθεῖται κύρια διὰ τοῦτο συναιρύονται κατά τὴν εὐθείαν, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ ἐντελείᾳ βαρύνονται, οἶον Ἡρακλῆς Σοφοκλῆς Περικλῆς, καὶ λοιπῶν συναιρύοντα, οἶον Ἡρακλῆς Σοφοκλῆς Περικλῆς.
10 Τὰ...12 Ἐουκυδίδης: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 156.5-10 καθόλου γὰρ τὰ εἰς δὴς πατρωνυμικά ἢ τύπου πατρωνυμικοῦ ὅντα εἰς τὴν ς διφθογγον ἔχουσι τὴν γενικὴν, πατρωνυμικὰ μὲν, οἶον Ατρείδης Ατρείδου, Αἰακίδης Αἰακίδου, Πηλείδης Πηλείδου, Πηριμίδης Πηριμίδου, Λαυτιάδης Λαυτιάδου, τύπου δὲ πατρωνυμικοῦ, οἶον Εὐρυπίδης Εὐρυπίδου, Ἐουκυδίδης Ἐουκυδίδου; Ep. Hom. 1,11.7-9 Πηλείδης· τὰ εἰς δὴς πατρωνυμικὰ ἢ ὡς πατρωνυμικὰ βαρύνεσθαι θέλει, ἃν καὶ ἡ γενικὴ ἀπρόσλητος τοῦ σ’, Κρονίδης, Πηλείδης, Κλυτίδης, Ατρείδης. Ἐουκυδίδης
4 τῇ...5 ἐντελείᾳ Ο: τῇ ἐντελείᾳ Μ καὶ ὡς propositus Schmidt 27.2 (app. crit.) εἰς] ἐκ τοῦ δυβιταντερ Schmidt
Ἐτὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΩΔΗΣ εὐώδης πετρώδης δυσώδης.

Ἐτὶ τὰ πολυσύλλαβα παρώνυμα εὐπατρί-ΔΗΣ ἐπιταπόδης, τὸ δὲ ἑθελοντῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑθέλοντος, καὶ ἐκοντῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκόντος γενικῆς μετοχῆς.

Ἐτὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΟΛΗΣ καὶ ΟΝΗΣ Ὀζόλης Μηριόνης, τὸ μέντοι ἀκλίνης ἐπίθετον καὶ εἰς ΟΥΣ ἔχον τὴν γενικὴν.

Ἐτὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΝΗΣ κύρια Ἀριστοφάνης Θεοφάνης, τὸ δὲ ἐπίθετον θεοφάνης ὄξυνεται καὶ τὰ εἰς ΗΣ Περσικά πάντα: Ἀρταφέρνης.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΤΗΣ πολυσύλλαβα ὄξυνεται τευχη-στῆς ὀρχηστῆς ἀλῆστῆς.

Ἐτὶ τὰ εἰς ΑΡΗΣ, εἰ μὴ ἐπίθεται εἰς Κυαξάρης Παντάρης Σωκάρης.

Ἐτὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΗΡΗΣ: χαλκήρης χρυσήρης θυμήρης φρενήρης τριῆρης.

(28) Ἐτὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΩΡΗΣ: Διώρης Ἀυκώρης, ὁ Καλλίμαχος ὄξυνε.

Τὰ εἰς ΘΗΣ ἀπλά ἀρσενικά βραχεία παραλη-

---

1 ΄Ετι...2 δυσώδης: cf. Choerob. De Orthogr. 197.7-9 Δυσώδης: διὰ τοῦ ω μεγάλου γράφεται καὶ πάντα τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὀδη-οιον, εὐώδης; πετρώδης: δυσώδης καὶ τὰ όμοια. 4 τὸ...6 μετοχῆς: cf. sch. S. El. 70 τὸ δὲ ἐκοντῆς καὶ ἑθελοντῆς μετοχικά; Su. ψ 16.4 τὸ δὲ ἐκοντῆς καὶ ἑθελοντῆς μετοχικά; EM 436.4 τὸ δὲ ἐκοντῆς, ἑθελοντῆς, μετοχικά. 21 Τὰ... 42.2 ὄξυνεται: cf. Choerob. in Thedl. GG ivii 202.7-9 ὄθεν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὁματικὸν τὸ εὑριστής διὰ τοῦ [[ε ἐστιν]], ὅπερ καὶ κατὰ τὸν τόνον ἡμαρτηταὶ ὄξυνομενον; EM 436.8-12 Τὰ γὰρ εἰς ΘΗΣ λήγοντα ἀρσενικά, καθαρὸν ἔχοντα τὸ τ.
γόμενα βαρύνεται οἰκέτης ὀφειλέτης ἐργάτης. τὸ εὐφετής δὲ ὄντει, καὶ τὸ ἀθλητὴς μαθητής ποιήτης, ὅτι ἔχουσι τὴν παραλήγουσαν μακράν. τὸ δὲ προποτής ἀκρατής τριετής σύνθετα.

Τὰ εἰς ΟἸΘΗΣ ἱσοῦλλαβα βαρύνεται Δαμοίτης Μενοίτης Ὑμοίτης.

Ἐπὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἈΤΗΣ τὸ Α μακρὸν ἔχοντα, μὴ ὄντα ὑμματικὰ: Τεγεάτης Γενεάτης Σπαρτιάτης Ἐλεάτης. Τὸ δὲ θεατὴς καὶ πειρατὴς ὑμματικά ὄντα ὄξυνεται.

Ἐπὶ τὰ εἰς ΠΗΤΗΣ τοῦ I μακροῦ ὄντος καὶ ΕἸΘΗΣ· πολίτης τεμενίτης εὐφείτης βαθυρείτης, καὶ ὅσα παρόνυμα τὸ Y μακρὸν ἔχοντα πρεσβύτης Αρχύτης Πιδύτης. τὸ μέντοι

βραχεία παραλήγομενα ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβῶν, βαρύνεται καὶ ἀπλὰ ὄντα ὀίου, Ἡβάτης, ἐρέτης, ἐργάτης. Σεσημεῖον τὸ εὐφετής. 6 Τὰ...7 Θυμοίτης: cf. Theognost. Can. II 46.1-3 (= 249.1-3) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ οἰτῆς βαρύτου, μὴ ὄντα παρόνυμα, διὰ τῆς τῶν διηθόγγου γράφοντα Δαμοίτης Ἀγροίτης Φυλοῖτης Μενοίτης Ατοίτης Θαμοίτης (scrib. Θυμοίτης) 10 Τὸ...11 ὄξυνεται: cf. sch. Hom. II. 13.382b1.3-5 τὰ εἰς τῆς ὑμματικά ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβῶν, ψύνεται μακρὰ παραλήγομενα, ὑμύνεσθαι θέλει, αὐλητής πειρατής 12 Ἐτι...14 βαθυρείτης: cf. Theognost. Can. II 45.5-8 (= 247.1-4) Τὰ διὰ τῆς παρόνυμα μὴ ὄντα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς εὐς, μήτε ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ηθῆναν διὰ τοῦ ἡ γράφει τὴν παραλήγουσαν ὀίου, Ξενύτης στυλητῆς τεμενίτης ἐράτης Θεοτήτις πολίτης: II 45.13-6 (= 247.9-12) δεί προσθέτει καὶ εἶπε παρὰ τὸ δέω όμω παριχθεῖ, καὶ ταύτα γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἡ διηθόγγου γράφεται ὀίου, εὐφείτης, ὁ καλῶς δέων· βαθυρείτης, ὁ εἰς βαθῶς δέων 14 καὶ 43.2 παρόνυμα: cf. Theognost. Can. II 44.21-3 (= 244.1-3) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὑπῆς ὄξυτον καὶ βαρύτον διὰ τοῦ ψιλοῦ γράφεται πρεσβύτης· εὐδήτης· βασανύτης· μεγύτης· Αρχύτης· πιδύτης· ἀλκυνύτης· κωλύτης· μυνύτης (scribendum κωλύτης· μυνύτης); 249.4-7 τὸ πρεσβύτης· εὐδήτης· μεγύτης· βασανύτης· Αρχύτης· πιδύτης· ἀλκυνύτης· σεσημεῖον ὑπὲρ παρόνυμα διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ γράφοντα τὴν παραλήγουσαν.

4 προποτής ΜΟΘΕ: προτερπτής ΟΕ 9 Τεγεάτης Γενεάτης scrp: τεγεάτης Μ: γενεάτης Ο 13 βαθυρείτης] βαθυρείτης Ο
κωλυτής μηνυτής ὁμοιατικά καὶ οὐ παρόνυμα.

‘Ετι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὩΤΗΣ μὴ ὁμοιατικά· δεσμώτης στρατιώτης.

‘Ετι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἙΣΤΗΣ μὴ ὁντα ὑπεθετικά· Ὀρέστης Ὑφέστης Ἀκέστης, τὸ μέντοι κηδεστής ἀργεστής ἑπιθετικά.

(29.) ‘Ετι βαρύνονται τὰ παρὰ τὸ ὅλω· πανώλης ἐξώλης προώλης.

Τὰ εἰς ἩΣ ἑπίθετα παρὰ ὁμια σύνθετα εἰς ὸΥΣ ποιοῦντα τὴν γενικὴν ἐξύνεται εὐσεβῆς ἀσεβῆς εὐλαβῆς θεοφιλῆς αὐτοσφαγῆς πολυδεύκης. Πολυδεύκης δὲ τὸ κύριον βαρύνεται. τὸ μέντοι φιλαλήθης καὶ μισαλήθης καὶ εὐθὲς καὶ κακοκήθης παρ’ ὄνομα εἰσὶ οὖν παρὰ ὁμια.

5 ‘Ετι...7 ὑπεθετικά· cf. Eust. II. Π 176.5-10 Τὰ εἰς στής τῷ εἰς παραθηγόμενα, ἀπὸ ὄνομάτων ὁντα ὃτι παρόνυμα, ἐξύνεται μὲν ὑπεθετικώτερα ὁντα, βαρύνεται δὲ ὁὐχ’ ὡς ἔχουν, ὅν ἀργοὺς ἀργεστῆς ἁνεμοὺς, κηδεστής τὸ Ὀρεστῆς, εἰ καὶ παράνυμοι παρὰ τὸ ὀφέλος, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἑπίθετον, κύριον δὲ. διὸ οὐδὲ ἐξύνεται, ἀλλὰ βαρύνεται ώς κύριον. ὡσπερτάς καὶ Ὀρέστης παρὰ τὸ ὄρος; EM 509.57-510.2 Τὸ δὲ Κηδεστής, τὸ κύριον ὄνομα, βαρύνεται, ώς θύσες, θεότης· ὅρος, Ὀρέστης· τὸ δὲ κηδεστής, ἐξύνεται ώς προσθηγομένων. 14 τὸ...16 ὁμια· cf. Chorob. in Theod. 187.27-30 Τὸ δὲ ἀληθῆς διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ σύνθεσι βαρύνεται, οἶον φιλαλήθης μισαλήθης, ἐπείδη τὰ διὰ τοῦ θής σύνθετα ἀπ’ ὄνοματος βαρύνεσθαι θέλουσι, οἶον ἡθος εὐθῆς συνήθης κακοκήθης· οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἀληθῆς φιλαλήθης μισαλήθης· EM 435.53-6 Τὸ δὲ ἀληθῆς, ἀνεβήσατο τὸν τόνον ἐν τῇ σύνθεσι· ἐπείδη τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΘΗΘΣ σύνθετα ὄνομα βαρύνεται· οἶον, ἡθος, εὐθῆς, συνήθης, κακοκήθης.

7 ἀργεστῆς] ἀρχεστῆς ΜΟ 9 ὁλῳ Schmidt 29.1: ἀλλῳ ΜΟ (cf. Ep. Hom. 2.α.2.1; Lobeck RVGNVT 113) 10 ἩΣ om. O
d 12 αὐτοσφαγῆς] αὐτοσφαγῆς Ο 13 κύριον O: κυρὶ M
Τὰ εἰς ἩΣ κύρια ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ οὐδετέρων σύνθετα βαρῶνται Δημοσθένης Διογένης, καὶ τὰ <ἐπίθετα> ἐχοντα Ἡ ἐν τῇ παραληγούσῃ ἀπὸ δισυλλάβους συνήθης κακοἴθης. τὰ δὲ μὴ τοιαῦτα ἐπίθετα ὠδύνεται εὐγενῆς ἁγενῆς εὐμενῆς εὐτειχῆς.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΗΣ παρὰ τὸ ἐτος καὶ ἔργον ὠδύνεται διετῆς τριετῆς καὶ λεπτουργῆς ναξιουργῆς.

1 Τὰ...6 εὐτειχῆς: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 165.13-5 τὰ εἰς ἒς παρ᾽ ὀυδετέρων συντεθείμενα εἰς οὐς ἔχονται τὴν γενικήν, οἷον σθένος Δημοσθένης Δημοσθένους, γένος Διογένης Διογένους; 167.15-7 τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ὀυδετέρων εἰς ης γινόμενα σύνθετα τότε βαρύνονται ὅταν ὁς κύρια, οἷον σθένος Δημοσθένης, γένος Διογένης; 167.20-9 καὶ ὅταν ἀπὸ δισυλλάβου ὀυδετέρου ὃς σύνθετα ἐχοντος ἐν τῇ παραληγούσῃ τὸ ἐπιφερομένον ἀφόνου, οἷον κῆτος μεγακίθης, ἢθος κακοἴθης, μήκος ἐπιμήκης ταῦτα γὰρ ἀπὸ δισυλλάβου ὀυδετέρου εἰς σύνθετα ἐχοντος κατὰ τὴν παραληγούσαι τὸ ἐπιφερομένον ἀφόνου. Εάν δὲ μηδὲν ἐκ τούτων τῶν τριῶν ἔχωσι, τούτοισι μήτε κύρια ὃς μήτε ἀπὸ τρισυλλάβου ὀυδετέρου σύνθετα μήτε ἀπὸ δισυλλάβου ὀυδετέρου παραληγομένου τὸ ἐπιφερομένου ἀφόνου, ὠδύνεται θέλουσιν, οἷον μένος εὐμενῆς, γένος εὐγενῆς, εἰδος ὑστειδῆς, κλέος ὑστελεις, τείχος εὐτειχῆς ἐχει μὲν γὰρ τούτο ἀφόνων ἐπιφερόμενον, φημι δὴ τὸ χ. ἀλλ᾽ οὐ παραληγεῖται τῷ ἐν; 189.16-20 τὰ εἰς ἒς παρ´ ὀυδετέρων συντεθείμενα δηλονότι κατὰ τὸ τέλος εἰς οὔς ἔχουσι τὴν γενικήν, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ χαρακτῆρ καλύπτει, οἷον σθένος Δημοσθένης Δημοσθένους, γένος Διογένης Διογένους, νείκος Πολυνείκης Πολυνείκους, ἢθος κακοἴθης κακοἴθους.

7 Τὰ...9 ναξιουργῆς: cf. Sophr. Char. Theodos. 385.37-386.3 Τὰ παρὰ τὸ ἐτος κοινώς μὲν ὠδύνεται, διετῆς τριετῆς, ἀπτικώς δὲ βαρύνεται, κατὰ πλάνην ἀκολουθοῦτα τῷ χαρακτῆρι τῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ ἀπλῶν, οἷον φυλῆς γενετῆς, ἁτινα βαρύνεται, πλὴν τοῦ εὐτειχῆς:

Τὰ εἰς ΗΣ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΥΣ δὲνοντος μὲν ὑνον -

1 Τὰ... 4 τεταρτητής: cf. Theagost. Can. II 47.6-8 (= 257.1-3) Τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ἴς ἐρυμενα φυλάττει τὴν τοῦ πρωτοτύπου γραφῆς κατὰ τὴν παραλήγοντος οἷον, ἴνας ἀριθμής: βραδύς ἐμβριθής 5 Τὰ... 46.6 ὑποκρίνομαι: cf. Chorob. in Theod. 186.27-35 τὰ εἰς ἔργον αὐτὰ μὲν συλλαβηθεὶς φυλάττουσιν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τὴν τάσιν τοῦ ἀπολογίας, οἷον ἐρανιστής ἀρχερανιστής, δανειστής μισοδανειστής, εύφρετος εὐφρετίς, λήστης ἀρχιλήστης, Ἀρσίνης φυλαχρόνης τοῦτον οὕν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ Ἰσακλήπης ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκλήπης Ἰσακλήπης ὀφειλείν εἶναι δὲνοντος. Δεῖ προσθέσειν εἴ τι πανός «χωρὶς τοῦ κρίτης καὶ ἀληθῆς», ταῦτα γὰρ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει βαρυνόμενα, οἷον δικακρίτης ὀνειροκρίτης ὑνον -

2 ἐμβριθής Οὐ: ἐμβριθής Οὐ 3 βαρυνόμενα] βαρύνομεν Ο τριτῆς τεταρτητής Barker 27.26: τριτῆς τεταρτητῆς ΜΟ βαρύνομεν] βαρύνομεν Ο 5 τάσιν... 46.1 φυλάττει Μὐ (φυλάττει Μὐ, ut videtur): τάσιν φυλάσσει Ο
σιν φιλάττει ἐρανιστής ἀρχερασιστής, δανειστής μισοδανειστής, ληστής ἀρχιληστής, Ἀπελλῆς φιλαπελλῆς. σεσημεῖωται ἀληθῆς φιλαλήθης, κριτής δικαιοκρίτης. τὸ δὲ ύποκρίτης οὔ παρὰ τὸ κριτής, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ ύποκρίνομαι.

(30.) Τὰ εἰς ΤΗΣ πολυσύλλαβα θηλυκά βαρύ-


dikaiokrítēs ὀνειτοκρίτης: τὸ γὰρ ύποκρίτης οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ τὸ κριτής, ἐπεὶ ύποκρίτης εἶχεν εἶναι βαρυτόνως, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ ύποκρίνομαι ἔστι. Τὸ δὲ ἀληθῆς διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ συνθέσει βαρύνεται, οἰον φιλαλήθης μισαλήθης, ἐπειδὴ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ηῆς συνθέτα ἀπ’ ὀνόματος βαρύνεσθαι θέλουσιν, οἰον ἢς εὐθῆς συνήθης κακοφθῆς: οὕτως οὖν καὶ αληθῆς φιλαλήθης μισαλήθης: πρὸςκεῖται «συνθέτα ἀπὸ ὀνόματος» διὰ τὸ ἀλήθης; Et. Gud. 1281.43-7 τὰ εἰς τῆς ύπερ μίαν συλλαβήν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τοῦ ἀπλοῦ φιλάττουσι τὸν τόνον. οἰον, ληστής ἀρχηγότης, μισοδανειστής, ἐρανιστής, ἀρχερασιστής. χωρίς τοῦ κριτῆς καὶ ἀληθῆς, καὶ δικαιοκρίτης, φιλαλήθης; EM 435.26-31 τὰ εἰς ΗΣ ὀνόματα ύπερ μίαν συλλαβήν ἀδαιρεῖται ἐν τῇ συνθέσει φιλάττει τὸν τόνον τοῦ ἀπλοῦ οἰον, ληστῆς, ἀρχηγοτής: δανειστής, μισοδανειστής: εὐφῆς, ἐφευρέτης: χωρίς τοῦ κριτῆς, καὶ ἀληθῆς: ταῦτα γὰρ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει ἀναβιβάζουσι τὸν τόνον: οἰον ὀνειτοκρίτης, φιλαλήθης; 474.27-9 Ἐπειδὴ τὰ εἰς ΗΣ ύπερ μίαν συλλαβήν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τοῦ ἀπλοῦ φιλάσει τὸν τόνον, ἐρανιστῆς, ἀρχερασιστῆς. 7 Τὰ...47.5 ἐπιθέτον: cf. Choeorb. in Theod. 162.16-23 τὰ γὰρ εἰς Ἑθηλικὰ μονογενῆ διὰ τοῦ τος κλίνονται, οἰον ἑσθῆς ἐσθήτος, ποτῆς ποτήτος, <Δ 780> ἐδητός ἢ ἐδοιτότο (σημαίνει δὲ τὴν πόσιν), ποιήτης ποιτήτος, φιλήτος φιλότιτος, κακότης κακότιτος: οὕτως οὖν καὶ Μένδης Μένδητος καὶ Πάρνης Πάρνητος καὶ Πάρνηθος κατὰ μετάθεσιν του 7 εἰς 7. Πρόσκειται «μονογενῆ» διὰ τὸ νηστήρης νησημεροῦς: τοῦτο γὰρ ὡς ἔχον οὐδετέρον εἰς ες, ἠγουν τὸ νηστήρης, εἰς οὐς ἔχει τὴν γενικήν: 326.8-21 ἤσαν δὲ ὅτι οὰ εἰς τῆς λήγοντα ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς μόνως θηλικά βαρύνεσθαι θέλουσιν, οἰν λογίτης ποιότης λευκότης φιλότης κακότης καμίωτης δασφίτης δραμήτης γλυκύτης, σεσημειώμενον τεσσάρων τινῶν ὀξυωμένων· εἰσὶ δὲ ταῦτα, ταυτίζει βραδυτήν ἀνδρότητι δημότη: καὶ τὸ τραχύτης καὶ κουφότης οἰ Ἀθηναῖοι ὀξύνουσι τραχυτῆς καὶ κουφότης

2 ἀρχηγοτής Ψ: αρχηγοτής Μ 5 παρὰ τὸ M: O: om. Μ:
νονταῖ λογιότης λευκότης ποιότης. σεσημείωται ταχυτῆς βραδυτῆς ἀδροτῆς καὶ τὰ παρὰ Ἀθηναίου ὄξυτονα τραχυτῆς κουφοτῆς τὸ μέντοι ποτῆς καὶ <.....> ἐσθῆς δισυλλαβα. τὸ ἄντε ἐπιθυμητῆς ἐπιθετον.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς ἩΣ ὀνομάτων.

Βιβλίον ὅ.’

Τὰ εἰς ἩΣ συνεσταλμένοι ἀρσενικὰ καὶ θηλυκὰ καὶ κοινὰ βαρύνεται ὁφις ὀῖς παις μαντις.

Τὰ εἰς ἩΣ βαρύτονα καὶ ἐν τῇ συνθέσει βαρύ-
νονται μήτες πολύμητες, ἵδις αἰδρίς, πόλεις φιλόπολες, χάρις εὐχαρίς.

Τὰ εἰς ἹΣ οὗτον πῇ μὲν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει φυλάττουσι τὸν αὐτὸν τόνον πῇ δὲ βαρύνονται. καὶ φυλάττουσι μὲν τὰ φιλάττουσα τὸ θηλυκὸν γένος: σκελεῖς περισκελίς, νυχίς παννυχίς. τὰ δὲ κοινωνοῦντα ἄρσενικῶ γένει μετατιθέασιν ἐλπίς εὐελπίς, ἀστῆς λευκασπίς.

Τὰ εἰς ἹΣ πατρωνυμικὰ ἣ τύπον ἔχοντα πατρωνυμικῶν ὤξυνονται Πριαμίς Τανταλίς Τυνδαις.

(31.) Τὰ εἰς ἹΣ ὑποκοριστικὰ ἔχοντα ἐν ἴσαις

αἰτίς, καὶ ὁ χρυσάκτις ἡλιός· κνημίς εὐκνήμις, κληίς πολυκλῆς· εἴ δὲ βραχύ αὐτὸ ἔχουσι προσπαράγονται· οἶον, πατρίς εὐπάτρις λυπόπατρις· ἀστῆς ὀψίστης; EM 333.22-30 Ιστόν ὅτι τὰ εἰς ἹΣ θηλυκά διασύλλαβα, εἰ μὲν βαρύνεται, ἐν τῇ συνθέσει αναβαίνει τὸν τόνον· οἶον, πόλεις, ἀκρόπολις· μήτες, πολυμήτες. Εἰ δὲ ὀξυνεῖται, εἰ μὲν θηλυκὰ μονογενῆ ἄσις, φιλάσσουσι τὸν τόνον· οἶον, νυχίς, παννυχίς· αἰγίς, καταγίς. Εἰ δὲ εναλάνει τὸ γένος, εἰ μὲν ἐκτίνουσα τὸ, πρὸ μᾶς ἔχει τὸν τόνον· οἶον, αἰτίς, χρυσάκτις ἡλιός· κνημίς, εὐκνήμις εἴ τι εὐκνήμιδες. Εἰ δὲ συστέλλει τὸ, προσπαράγονται οἶον, πατρίς, εὐπατρίς· ἀστῆς, ὀψίστης; 518.33-43 Τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἹΣ θηλυκά [... καὶ] εἰ μὲν βαρύνεται, ἐν τῇ συνθέσει προσπαράγονται, οἶον πόλεις, ἀκρόπολις· μήτες, πολυμήτες, καὶ ἀγκυλομήτες· εἰ δὲ ὀξυνεῖται, εἰ μὲν τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους ἄσις, τὸν αὐτὸν φιλάττει τὸν τόνον· οἶον, αἰγίς, καταγίς· νυχίς, παννυχίς· αἰγίς, περισκελίς· εἰ δὲ ἄρσενικῷ γένεις ὄσιν, εἰ μὲν ἐκτίνουσα τὸ δίχοον ἐν τῇ συνθέσει, παραδέχονται· οἶον αἰτίς, χρυσάκτις ἡλιός· κνημίς, εὐκνήμις· κληίς, πολυκληίς· εἰ δὲ βραχύ αὐτὸ ἔχει, προσπαράγονται ἐν τῇ συνθέσει· οἶον πατρίς, εὐπατρίς καὶ λευκόπατρις· ἀστῆς, ὀψίστης. 3 Τὰ... 8 λευκαστικά: cf. Eust. II. I 43.18-23 τὰ εἰς ἹΣ θηλυκά ὀξύτονα εἰ μὲν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει φιλάσσει τὸ θηλυκὸν μόνον γένος καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόνον φιλάσσει, οἶον· σκελεῖς, περισκελίς· εἰ δὲ μεταληπτικὰ γίνονται καὶ ἄρσενικον γένος, μεθύσσεται εἰς βαρείαν τάσιν, οἶον· ἐλπίς, δύσελπις. τοῦτο γὰρ κοινὸν ἔστι τῷ γένει ταύτῃ τοῦ καὶ τὸ καταγίς μὲν ὄξυνεται εἰς μονογενές, τὸ δὲ μελαναίας βαρύνεται.

3 τῇ scripsi: τῇ ΜΟ; τῇ Schmidt 30.14 4 τῇ A: τῇ ΜΟ 7 ἄρσενικῷ Ο: ἄρσενικῷ Μ 9 Τὰ τὰ τέως in spatio vacuo Ο τύπον] τόπον Ο
συλλαβαίς τὴν παραγωγὴν ὁδύνεται θεραπαίνιος ἑταῖρις λυρίς. τὸ δὲ Ἡφις ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱπτυγμονον βαρύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ἍΣ ἐσχηματισμένα ἀπὸ βαρυτόνον μελλόντων ἡ δευτέρα προσώπου τοῦ παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου βαρύνονται ποιήσις, γνώσις γνώσις, πράξει πράξεις, πέφαναι φάνσις, μεμίαναι μίανσις. τὸ δὲ Ἦφις σεσημεῖωται μακρὸν ἔχον τὸ Ι.

Τὰ εἰς ΒΙΣ ὑπερδυσταλαβά ὁδύνεται ἡ

4 Τά...9 I: cf. Choeob. De Orthogr. 172.5-11 Ἦφις: Διὰ τοῦ γ' τὰ εἰς ἢ ἀπὸ μελλόντων γινόμενα, βαρύνεται καὶ συστέλλει τὸ γ' ὡς τὸ πράξει, πράξεις λέξεως, λέξεως Ἦφις, Ἦφις ἡ γὰρ Ἦφις συνημμένη ἐστὶ καὶ διὰ τοῦ γ' ἐκτείνει καὶ ὁδύνεται τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἢ ἀπὸ ἐκτείνεται τὸ γ' ἔτος ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον οἶνον, κνημίς κρητὶς ψῆφις οὕτως καὶ Ἦφις τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἢ ὁδύνοντα ὑπὲρ μᾶν συλλαβὴν ἀποστρέφονται τὴν εἰ διθογγον, χωρὶς τοῦ κλείς καὶ ἀντηρεῖς; Sophr. Char. Theodos. 405.15.7 Τὰ εἰς ἢ παρὰ μέλλοντα βαρύνοντα διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ ὡς, λέξεις λέξεως, ὄψις ὄψεως τὸ Ἦφις ἀφίδος παραλλαξαί τὸν χρόνων καὶ τὸν τόνον, παρειλλαξαί καὶ τὴν κατίσιαν; Ep. Hom. 317.2-3 πλείστα γαρ ὅνομα ἀπὸ μελλόντων γίνεται, οἶνον ἄψυ Ἦφις, λέξῃς λέξεως, ποιήσιν ποιήσις; El. Gen. π' 1537.11.7 ὠφειλεν δὲ βαρύνεσθαι τὸ Ἦφις καὶ συστέλλειν τὸ γ', τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἢ ὅνομα ἀπὸ μελλόντων γινόμενα καὶ βαρύνεται καὶ συστέλλει τὸ γ', οἶνον μέμψις μέμψις, ἐξο ἐξεις, λέξεως λέξεως οὕτως οὖν καὶ Ἦφις Ἦφις ὠφειλέν εἶναι, ὅθεν Ἦσθος ἀναλογίσεθον εἶπεν Ἦφις βαρύνον αὐτὸ. ἔστιν οὖν εἰπέκει, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ τὸ Ἦφις ἐκτείνει τὸ γ', τοῦτον χαίρει καὶ ὁδύνεται, τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἢ ἀπὸ ἐκτείνεται τὸ γ' ἕτος ἔχουσιν τὸν τόνον, οἶνον κνημίς ψῆφις σφαγίς κρητὶς οὕτως οὖν καὶ Ἦφις Ἦφις ὠφειλέν εἶναι. vide etiam El. Sym. π' 367.28-31; EM 183.40-184.2 ὠφειλε δὲ βαρύνεσθαι καὶ συστέλλειν τὸ ἔστα τὰ γὰρ εἰς ΊΣ ὅνομα ἀπὸ μελλόντων γινόμενα καὶ βαρύνεται καὶ συστέλλει τὸ γ', μέμψις, μέμψις ἐξο, ἐξεις λέξεως, λέξεως οὕτως καὶ Ἦφις Ἦφις ὠφειλεν εἶναι.

2 Ἡφις...[cf.] Schmidt 31.3: Ἡφις... Ἡφις ΜΟ 3 γενόμενον Schmidt 31.3: γενόμενον ΜΟ 5 postmelollontov] addit καὶ συστέλλει τὸ EM 183.41 (haut recte Schmidt 31.5 app. crit. verba καὶ συστέλλειν τὸ 1 post παρακειμένου scripta esse in EM annotavit) δευτέρου τοῦ δευτέρου Ο προσώπου] προσώπου Μ 6 παρακειμένου Ο: πτ Μ 8 μεμίαναται] μεμίανες (sic) Ο
<προ>παραδύνεται, ὃδενται τά παρώνυμα καὶ ἐπιθετικά Νιοβὶς Λυκαμβὶς Περσαβὶς, σεσημεώται τὸ καλλαβίς. τά δὲ κύρια ἢ προσηγορικὰ βαρύνεται Ἀθάραβις κάνναβις. σημεύσει τὸ κολλαβίς.

Τά εἰς ΠΣ διούντλαβα ὃδενεται, εἰ μὴ ἄρχοιντο ἀπὸ τοῦ Γ· αἰγὶς μαγὶς σφραγῖς, τὸ μέντοι Γέργις βαρύνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Γ γάρ, ὦσπερ καὶ τὸ γέλγις γέγγις.

Ὡς τά εἰς ΠΣ πολυσύλλαβα, στρατηγίς ἀλουργίς, τὸ δὲ ἀμοργίς (ἡ ύποστάθμη) βαρύνεται.

Τά εἰς ΘΙΣ διούντλαβα, εἰ μὴ μετάληψιν ἔχοι εἰς ἀρσενικὸν γένος, ὃδενεται πληθις(?) Αἴθης τηθίς (32.) (ἡ <πατρός ἡ μητρός> ἀδελφῆ). σεσημεώται τὸ αἴθις κόρθις καὶ Κράθις.

Ὡς τά εἰς ΘΙΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα ὃδενεται μὴ ὡντα ὀνόματα πόλεων Αἴγυπτων· ἀκανθίς κολοκυνθίς, τὸ δὲ Ταμιάθις καὶ Μένουθις καὶ Τερένουθις βαρύνεται.

---

Τὰ εἰς ΚΙΣ δισύλλαβα ὃξύνονται Φωκίς κερκίς χαλκίς, τὸ δὲ φίκις (?) βαρύνεται ἐτί καὶ τὰ τρισύλλαβα παλακίς πινακίς φαρμακίς.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΙΣ ἀπλὰ ἔχοντα σύμφωνον κατ' ἐπιπλοκήν ἢ διπλασιασμὸν τοῦ Λ ὃξύνεται, εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ Θ κλίνοιτο ἢ πόλιν σημαινόντος φυλλίς κιγκλίς θυλλίς (ὁ θύλακος), τὸ δὲ Τράλλις πόλις καὶ τὸ δέλλις (τὸ μικρόν σφηκίον) διὰ τοῦ Θ. καὶ τὸ βάλλις δὲ βαρύνεται (εἶδος ἀνθῆς ὄν, ὁ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἀναζήν τὸν νεκρόν).

Τὰ εἰς ΛΙΣ βραχὺ δισύλλαβα, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Π ἀρχοιτο μήτε ύποκοριστικά εἰς, ὃξυνεται βολίς φολίς σελίς ψαλίς πυλίς (ὕποκοριστικόν). τὸ δὲ πρῴ 33.λίς βαρύνεται (ἡ ἐνοσπλος ὀρχήσις), ὥσπερ καὶ ἢ πόλις ἀπὸ τοῦ Π ἀρχομένην.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΙΣ δισύλλαβα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα, εἰ παραλήγοιτο φύσει μακρὰ χωρίς Α μακρόν, ὃξυνεται μηλίς ἢ μηλέα δουλίς Δανάλις ἐναντιοῦται τὸ μαύλις ἢ μάχαμα καὶ τὸ τῆλις τὸ δὲ τάλις ἢ μελλόγαιμος μακρὸν τὸ Α ἔχει. ἔτι βαρύνεται καὶ τὸ Ζάλις καὶ μᾶλις καὶ τὸ Ἁλις καὶ ώλις ἢ υλία καὶ αὐλίς ἢ ἐπαυλίς, Αὐλίς δὲ ἢ πόλις ὃξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΙΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα εἰς Α βραχὺ προπαραλήγοντα ὃ ὃξυνεται βαρύνετα, καὶ ὃξυνονται μὲν, ὅσα τυγχάνει ἐπιθετικότερα, ἢ ἔχει τὴν πρώτην συλλαβήν καταλήγοντα εἰς Ν

---

άφωνον ἐπιφερομένου Τανταλίς Πανθαλίς (ἡ θεράπαινα Ἕλενης) ἀγκαλίς (τὸ γάρ Γ ἐκ τοῦ Ν) τπενταλίς. τά μέντοι προσηγορικά ἢ κύρια προσπαροξύνονται βούβαλις δάμαλις βαύκαλις.

Τά εἰς ΛΙΣ υπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα Ἡ βαρύνεται κάτηλις κύβηλις (ό πέλυξ) ἔπηλις (τό πώμα τῆς λάφνακος) τρόπηλις (ἡ δέσμι τῶν σκορόδων), πλὴν τοῦ Φασηλίς.

Τά εἰς δύο ΛΑ υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀδύνηται, εἰ μὴ ἐπιθετικά παρώνυμα τῆς γενόμενα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΗΣ (34.) κορυδαλλίς ἀναβαλλίς (ἡ σφαῖρα) συκαλλίς μοιχαλλίς θρυαλλίς, τό μέντοι κάβαλλις βαρύνεται.

Τά εἰς ΛΙΣ υπερδισύλλαβα, εἰ ἔχου ἐν τῖ τῶν φύσει βραχέων ἢ Ι βραχυ, ἀδύνηται κυψελίς βασιλίς Αἰολίς. τό μέντοι Αἰλίς τό ΖΙ μακρὸν ἔχει.

Τά εἰς ΛΙΣ παρώνυμα τῷ Ω ἢ διφθόγγω παραληγόμενα ἀδύνηται Πακτωλίς Αἰτωλίς Ιουλίς. τό Αδουλίς προσπαροξύνεται καὶ τό ἀρτόπωλη.

Τά εἰς ΜΙΣ προσηγορικά υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀδύνηται πυραμίς σησαμίς καλαμίς πλοκαμίς κεραμίς. τὸ δὲ Αρτεμίς Σεμίραμις Χρυσόθεμις, κύρια. καὶ τὸ Σαλαμίς κύριον ὀν ἀδύνηται.

Τά εἰς ΝΙΣ διβράξεαι προσηγορικά ἀδύνηται, κατ᾿ οὐσίας κείμενα Α ἢ Ο παραληγόντα ράνις χλανίς σανίς όνις κονίς (τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς

---

κεφαλής) κόνις δὲ τὸ χῶμα, σπάνις δὲ καὶ φρόνις οὐκ ἐπὶ οὐσίας, τὸ δὲ ύνις βαρύνεται τὸ Υ ἔχον, ὡσπερ τὸ Κρύνις.

Τὰ εἰς ΝΙΣ δυσύλλαβα παραλήγομενα φωνῆνετι μακρῶ ἢ ἐκτεινομένω βαρύνεται μῆ ὑποκοριστικά ὅντα: όρνες Θώνις μήνις νήνις. τὸ μέντοι φωνεῖς ὑποκοριστικὸν ἔστι. 35

Τὰ εἰς ΝΙΣ θηλυκὰ διφθόγγω παραλήγοντα ὄξυνεται: μαινίς δανίνις ἐπίγουνις θεραπαινίς λεαινίς. τὸ μέντοι εὕνις βαρύνεται καὶ βοῦνις καὶ χλούνις.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΝΙΣ θηλυκὰ ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβᾶς ὄξυνεται: Ωκεανίς Τιτανίς στεφανίς. τὸ δὲ νεάνις προσεριστάται καὶ τὸ Ἀδανίς προσπαχοῦεται καὶ τὸ Θήβανις.

Τὰ εἰς ΕΝΙΣ καὶ ΟΝΙΣ ὑπερδυσύλλαβα ὄξυνεται εὐμενίς εὐγενίς Λυκαονίς Ἀμαζόνις.

Τὰ εἰς ΞΙΣ ἀπὸ μελλόντων ἐσχηματισμένα βαρύνονται ἔξω ἔξις, λέξω λεξίς, ψύξω ψύξις. σεσημειώται ἀψίς ὄξυνόμενον. τὰ μέντοι

19 Τὰ...54.2 ὄξις: cf. sch. Hom. II. 1.317b.6-8 πλείστα γὰρ ὀνόματα ἀπὸ μελλόντων γέγονεν, οίον ἄψις, λέξις, δόξα, ἄξις καὶ ἄμαξα, οὕτως οὖν καὶ κνίσω κνίσα; Et. Sym. Π 367.28-31 καὶ αὐτὸ παρὰ τὸ ἁπτὸ βαρύνεσθαι καὶ συστέλλειν τὸ ἑ τὰ γὰρ εἰς ὀπὸ μελλόντων γενόμενα καὶ βαρύνονται καὶ συστέλλοντες τὸ ἑ πράξει πράξεις, λέξω λέξις. εἰ οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁπτό μελλόντος, ὡσει βαρύνεσθαι καὶ συστέλλειν τὸ ἑ; sch. D. T. Març. 353.1 Εἰρηθηὶ δὲ λέξις ἀπὸ μελλόντος τοῦ λέξι, ὡς ἔξις; cf. etiam Vit. 212.7; Chorob. De Orthogr. 172.5-11; Ep. Hom. 317,a.2-3; Et. Gen. α 1537.11-7; EM 481.30-1; Zonar. i 1139.12-4

1 κόνις ΜOε:έ; κάνις Οε:ε 5 μῆ...6 ὅντα add. Ms. 6 ὄρνες Θώνις Schmidt dubitant: ὀρθώνις MO νήνις Schmidt: νήνις MO; alli alia: ἵνα νεὶ ἧνις 8 θηλυκὰ Ms. διφθόγγω Θ: διφθόγγο Μ 11 βοῦνις Ο: βοῦνις Μ 15 Θήβανις[ θήβανις sine accentu Ο 16 ΟΝΙΣ Schmidt: ὄνις MO 17 Λυκαονίς...18 Ἀμαζόνις L. Dindorf: λυκαονίς ἀμαζόνις MO 19 ΞΙΣ] ε Ὀ 20 ψύξω ψύξις[ τύψω τύψις Ο
παρόνυμα οξύνεται ἁμαξα ἀμαξίς, πῦξος πῦξις, ὅδε ὁξίς.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΙΣ διβράχεια ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἢ συμφώνων ἀρχόμενα οξύνεται πραπίς κοπίς λεπίς, σεσημεῖωται τὸ τρόπις, τὸ δὲ ὅπις ἀπὸ φωνήντος ἄρχεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΙΣ δισύλλαβα θέσει μακρὰ παραλιγγόμενα, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἄρχοιτο, βαρύνεται μὴ ὑντα ὑποκοριστικά, εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ φωνήντος, οξύνεται. βαρύνεται δὲ ταύτα τράμπις Σάλπις (πόλις) κάλπις θέςπις πόρτις. οξύνεται δὲ ταύτα μὴ πληθ(36)θυντικῶς λεγόμενα: ἐλπίς ἀσπίς ἐμπίς. τὸ δὲ Αλπίς βαρύνεται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὌΠΙΣ πολυσύλλαβα μὴ ἔχοντα ἐννοιαν συνθέσεως οξύνεται Κεκροπίς

7 Τὰ...14 βαρύνεται: cf. Choerob. Ep. Ps. 150.29-33 Τὰ εἰς ΠΙΣ θηλικὰ δισύλλαβα, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἄρχοιτο, βαρύνεται, οἷον τράμπις τράμπιδος, (ἐστὶ δὲ εἰδὸς ὄπλον βαρβαρικοῦ), κάλπις κάλπιδος: εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ συμφώνον (scirb. εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ συμφώνου νελ εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ φωνήντος), οξύνεται, οἷον ἀσπίς, ἐλπίς, ἐμπίς: Et. Gud. a 216.11-4 τὰ εἰς πὶς θηλικὰ δισύλλαβα, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἄρχοιται, βαρύνεται, οἷον τράμπις τράμπιδος (ἐστὶ δὲ βαρβαρικὸν πλοῖον), θέςπις θέςπιδος, κάλπις κάλπιδος: εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ φωνήντος, οξύνεται, οἷον ἀσπίς ἐλπίς ἐμπίς: σημαινεῖ δὲ τὸν κόσμον; β 258.39-44 τὰ εἰς πὶς θῆματα δισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ παραλιγγόμενα, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἄρχοιται, βαρύνεται. οἷον, τράμπις, ἐστὶ δὲ βαρβαρικὴ ναῖς, κάλπις κάλπιδος, θέςπις θέςπιδος, εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ φωνήντος ἄρχοιται, οξύνεται, ἐλπίς ἐλπίδος, ἐμπίς, ὁ κόμνος, ἐμπίδος, ἀσπίς ἀσπίδος, καὶ εἰ τι όμοιον; EM 157.23-5 Τὰ εἰς ΠΙΣ θηλικὰ δισύλλαβα, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἄρχοιται, βαρύνεται, θέςπις, τράμπις: ἐστὶ δὲ βαρβαρικὸν ὄπλον: εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ φωνήντος, οξύνεται, ἀσπίς, ἐλπίς, ἐμπίς, εἰδὸς κόσμος.

1 ἁμαξα ἁμαξεὶς ἁμαξις (sic) O 5 λεπίς om. O
11 Σάλπις πόλις Θλάστις Schmidt 35.21 (app. crit.); Σάλπις (πόλις) malit Göttling 12 μὴ...13 λεγόμενα] μὴ ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα Göttling; cf. Choerob. Ep. Ps. 150.32-3; fortasse etiam μὴ ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα (vel ἀπὸ φωνήντος ἀρχόμενα) καὶ μὴ πληθυντικῶς λεγόμενα
Δρυσίς Αἰθιοπίς· τὸ φύλος τὸ προπαρασκέυηται.
Τὰ εἰς ΡΙΣ δισύλλαβα ύποκοριστικὰ <...> ἐννοίας ἔχομενα ὑζύνεσχεν Τευκρίς χειρίς.
Τὰ εἰς ΚΡΙΣ κύρια μὲν ὄντα βαρύνονται 5 Μάκρις Πρόκρις Ακρίς· τὰ δὲ μὴ οὕτως ὑζύνεσχεν ἀκρίς Λοκρίς.
Τὰ εἰς ΡΙΣ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Ρ ἐν τὶ τῶν φυλῶν ὑζύνεσχεν παλαιστρῖς αὐληστρῖς ἐπακτρίς.
Τὰ εἰς ΡΙΣ μετ᾽ ἐπιπλοκῆς μέσου ἢ δασεός ἢ τοῦ Π βαρύνεσχεν εἰ δὲ μὴ οὕτως, ὑζύνεσχεν, χιώτες εἰ μὴ σύμφωνον εἰ ὑζηπλασιοσμένον ὑβρίς Κύπρις· ὑζύνεσχεν δὲ τὸ νεβρίς κεδρίς, τὸ δὲ ἀγγίς ὑζηπλασισται.
Τὰ εἰς ΡΙΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα παραλήγομενα τὸ 10 Α βαρύνεσχεν κήθαρις εὐμαρίς Σύβαρις κάππαρις, εἰ μὴ εἰ ὡς ύποκοριστικὰ ἢ πατρωνυμικὰ, ἢ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ Ε ἔχοντα, τότε γὰρ ὑζύνεσχεν Μεγαρίς βλεφαρίς θεωρίς ἐαρίς.
Τὰ εἰς ΕΡΙΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς θηλικὰ ὑζύνεσχεν Αστερίς νυκτερίς, τὸ δὲ Πάστερις καὶ Κελένδερις βαρύνεσχεν.
(37.) Τὰ εἰς ΥΡΙΣ μὴ κατὰ τροπὴν γενόμενα ὑζύνεσχεν ἀλμυρὰς πορφυρίς ἀργυρίς Ιλαυρίς· τὸ δὲ Θάμυρις προπαρασκέυηται, τὸ δὲ ἀγγυρίς κατὰ τροπὴν ἐγένετο.

Τά εἰς ΡΙΣ Αιγύπτια προσπαθεύνεται Βούσιρις Ὁσιρις Ψένυρις.
Τά εἰς ΣΙΣ ἀπὸ μέλλοντος γινόμενα ἢ ἀπὸ δευτέρου προσώπου του παθητικοῦ παρακειμένου βαρύνονται ποιήσεις, λύσω λύσις, κέκρισαι κρίσιςς. τά μέντοι παρώνιμα χαίρουσι τῇ ὀξειᾳ Χρύσῃς Χρυσίς, νήσος νησίς. σεσημειώται τὸ ἀσίς ὁ ὅψος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀση γεγονός.
Τά εἰς ΤΙΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὸ Ὀ μικρὸν <...> ἢ Ω μέγα πρὸ τοῦ ΤΙΣ <μή ὄντα> ἐπιθετικά, εἰ μή παράκειται ἀρσενικῷ τῷ εἰς ΘΗΣ, οἰνεῦται φορτίς φροντίς νοτὶς οὐτίς Δωτίς ἀντίς. τὸ δὲ πόρτις ἀπὸ τοῦ πόρις. <.....>
Τά εἰς ΤΙΣ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ψιλὸν ἔχοντα <...>
βαρύνεται κλέπτες ἱκτις (ζῶν) λάκτις (ή τορύνη). τά δὲ οὖνεται νυκτις πηκτις.

Τά εἰς ΤΠΣ πρὸ τοῦ ΤΠΣ Υ ἐχοντα σπάνια ὅντα 
(38.) τά μὲν βαρύνεται Σύρτις, τά δὲ οὖνεται ὄντις κυρτις.

Τά εἰς δύο ΤΤ σπάνια ὅντα τά μὲν βαρύνεται, 
οἰον παιτέττις, τά δὲ οὖνεται τριοττις νεοττις.

Τά εἰς ΤΠΣ δισύλλαβα βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ὑποκοριστικώτερα εἰς πίστις μνήστις. τὸ 
μέντοι κιστις οὖνεται ὡς ὑποκοριστικῶν.

Έτι τά εἰς ΤΠΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς, εἰ μὴ 
ἐπίθετα εἰς, προσπαροξύνεται βούβρωστις ἀγροστις. οὖνεται τὸ Κεραστὶς Λιγνιτὶς 
Λιβιστὶς ὡς ἐπιθετικά.

Τά εἰς ΤΠΣ πολυσύλλαβα Ν πρὸ τοῦ Τ ἐχοντα 
μὴ παρακειμένα τοῖς εἰς ΤΗΣ οὖνεται 
Προσποντὶς Θηλησποντὶς. <...> αὐθεντις.

Τά εἰς ΣΣ θηλικὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΗΣ ἀρσενικῶν

19 Τά...58.5 λαχανόπολις: cf. sch. Hom. II. 9.571d 
<ηροφοίτις>: τά εἰς ἡ παρώνυμα θηλικα, παρακειμένα 
τοῖς εἰς τὴν ἀρσενικὸς βαρυνόμενος, προπερισπᾶται, εἰ 
φύσει μακρὰ παραλήγοντο, πρωθήκεις πολυτής ἀλείτις 
πλανήτες προσβότις. οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἀρχοφόιτις. δότα δὲ 
παρὰ τὸ παλέον ἐστιν, ἀνεβίβασε τὸν τόνον, ἀρτοπωλίς 
ἀλφιτοσώλις, ἀλλ' οὖν καὶ ὅτα παρὰ τὸ κοίτος, „παράκοιτις” 
(Α 60 αλ.), „άκοιτις“ (Γ 138 αλ.), τὸ μέντοι „δολόμητις“ (γ 250 
al.) οὐκ ἐστὶ θηλικὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρσενικὸν καὶ ἴσως τὸ μῆτις 
έγκειται ὡς τὸ „πολύμητις“ (Α 318 αλ.), „δολόμητις“. καὶ ἐστὶ 
σύνθετον; Chorob. in Theod. 329.14-22 Καὶ τά εἰς τὴ θηλικὰ 
γινόμενα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρσενικῶν, τουτέστι κατὰ τροπὴν 
τοῦ ἡ εἰς τὸ Ι, δίᾳ τοῦ δος κλίνονται, οἰον ὁ τοξότης τοῦ

1 ζῶον Ο: ζῶον Μ 2 τορύνη L. Dindorf TGL V 59B: τρυγών 
ΜΟ νυκτις Ο: νυκτις Μ: ἐπινυκτις Schmidt 37.20 (app. crit.) 
3 Υ Ω: om. Ω 4 τά μὲν om. Ο: βαρύνεται Ο: βαρύνεται 
Μ 7 παιτέττις Αττίς coni. Götting 10 ὑποκοριστικώτερα C: 
ὑποκοριστικώτερα Μ: ὑποκοριστικῶν Ο 13 βούβρωστις Μ: 
βούβρωστις ΜΟ 14 Λιγνιτὶς L. Dindorf: λογιςτὶς ΜΟ 
15 Λιβιστὶς ΒC: λυπιςτὶς ΜΟ 18 αὐθεντις Αβαντὶς vel 
Αβαντὶς Lobeck PGG 443; Schmidt 38.14 (app. crit.): ‘Sectio haec 
lacunosa videtur’
πεννόμενα πρὸ μᾶς ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον· ὁ κυνηγέτης ἡ κυνηγέτης, ὁ δραστές ἡ δραστές, ὁ πολίτης ἡ πολίτης, χωρίς τῶν ἁπὸ τῆς κοίτης καὶ πωλῶν ταῦτα γὰρ προπαροδούνται ἀκοιτίς παράκοιτις ἀρτόπωλις λαχανόπωλις. τὸ Σκυθίς δισυλλαβοῦν ἴδονται, ὡς τὸ Περσίς.

Τὰ εἰς ΦΙΣ διβράχεα ἴδονται ἁρφίς γλυφίς σταφίς. εἰ δὲ ἡ παραλήγουσα εἰς φύσει ἡ θέσει μακρὰ ἐν δισυλλάβοις βαρύνεται Ἰφις Μέμφις. τὸ δὲ Κηφίς ὡς ἐθνικὸν ἴδονται, ὡς καὶ Δελφίς.

(39.) Τὰ εἰς ΦΙΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς ἴδονται,

tοοτὸν καὶ ἡ τοξοτὶς τῆς τοξοτίδος, ὁ πολῖτης τοῦ πολίτου καὶ ἡ πολίτης τῆς πολίτιδος, ὁ δραστές τοῦ δραστίου καὶ ἡ δραστές τῆς δραστίδος, ὁ κυνηγέτης τοῦ κυνηγέτου καὶ ἡ κυνηγέτης τῆς κυνηγέτηδος, ὁ παρακοίτης τοῦ παρακοίτου καὶ ἡ παράκοιτης τῆς παρακοίτιδος, ὁ ἀρτόπωλης τοῦ ἀρτόπωλου καὶ ἡ ἀρτόπωλης τῆς ἀρτόπωλιδος, ὁ δεσπότης τοῦ δεσπότου καὶ ἡ δεσπότης τῆς δεσπότιδος. 329.28-330.3 Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι πάντα ταῦτα τὰ εἰς ἡθυλικὰ τὰ γινόμενα ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ἡθυλικῶν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς ὄντα πρὸ μᾶς ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον, οἷον ὁ κυνηγέτης καὶ ἡ κυνηγέτης, ὁ δεσπότης καὶ ἡ δεσπότης, ὁ τοξοτής καὶ ἡ τοξοτής, ὁ πολῖτης καὶ ἡ πολίτης, ὁ δραστές καὶ ἡ δραστές· σεσημεύονται ἐν τῷ κανόνι τὰ παρὰ τὸ κοῖτι καὶ τὰ παρὰ τὸ πωλῶν ταῦτα γὰρ προπαροδοῦνται ἐν τοῖς θηλυκοῖς, οἷον ἀκοιτίς παρακοίτης πορφυρόπωλις ἀρτόπωλης λαχανόπωλις. Πρόσκειται ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς ὄντα· διὰ τὸ ὁ Σκυθῆς καὶ ἡ Σκυθῆς, ὁ Πέρσης καὶ ἡ Πέρσης γνησίῳ ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐν τοῖς θηλυκοῖς πρὸ μᾶς τὸν τόνον, ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰσίν υπέρ δύο συλλαβάς.

---

1 γενόμενα Schmidt 38.16: γενόμενα ΜΟ
2 πολίτης/πολίτης duobus accentibus M 7 ἴδονται] ἴδονται O
3 πολίτης Ο: πολίτης/πολίτης dubitans Schmidt 38.23 (app. crit.) 9 βαρύνεται scrispi: παραδοῦνται M: προπαροδοῦνται O; παραδοῦνται ἡ προπαροδοτᾶται Lentz 106.34 Ἰφίς Schmidt 38.24: Ἰφίς ΜΟ 10 Μέμφις] μέμψις Ο ὡς ἐθνικὸν] Schmidt 38.25 (app. crit.): 'deebat ἐπὶ ἐθνικοῦ; aliud enim significat Κηφίς Δελφίς'
εἰ μή κύρια εἰς ἀσταφίς κροταφίς ἐλαφίς.
τὸ δὲ Ἰερόφις ὡς κύριον προσπαροξύνεται.
Τὰ εἰς ΧΙΣ ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ ὀνόματα πόλεων ἢ
νήσων εἰς Ὀ λιχίς Ἀντιοχίς παννυχίς. τὸ
δὲ ἄξις σεσμεῖωται. τὸ μέντοι Ἀταρβηχίς
Ὑδελχίς ἐπὶ πόλεως καὶ νῆσων.
Τὰ εἰς ἩΣ θηλυκὰ ἐπὶ τέλους ἔχοντα τὸν τόνον

7 Τὰ...60.2 ἀψὶς; cf. Chorob. in Theod. 327.5-20 ἱστέον ὅτι τὰ
eἰς ἡ λήγοντα ὄξυτονα ἡθλονότι ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν πάντα
dιὰ τοῦ δος κλίνονται, εἶτε ἐκτείνουσι τὸ ἵ, ὡς τὸ κνημίς
κνημίδος, κρηπίς κρηπιδός, σφραγίς σφραγίδος, ἀψὶς ἀψιδος,
eἶτε συστέλλουσι τὸ ι, ὡς τὸ ἀστίς ἀστίδος, ὄνις ὄνιδος,
βολίς βολίδος, σανίς σανίδος, σησμειωμένον τοῦ ἄγλις
ἀγλίθος; τοῦτο γὰρ οὐ κλίνεται διὰ τοῦ δος ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θος,
ἐχει δὲ μακρὸν τὸ ἵ κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν καὶ σημαίνει τὴν
κεφαλὴν τοῦ σκορδοῦ. Πρόσκειται «ὁθλονότι ὑπὲρ μίαν
συλλαβὴν» διὰ τὸ κις κιος (σημαίνει δὲ τὸν σκώλημα) καὶ λίς
λίς (σημαίνει δὲ τὸν Λέντα). ἔχον ἄνα ποσὸν τὸ ἵ κατὰ
tὴν γενικὴν ταῦτα γὰρ διὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ οὐ κλίνονται καὶ οὐ
dιὰ τοῦ δος, ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰσὶν ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν. Τὸ ἀκτίς
ἄκτινος διὰ τοῦ νος κλινόμενον οὐκ ἀντίκειται ἡμῖν, ἐπεὶδὴ
dικατάληκτον ἕστιν, ἀκτίν τό γὰρ καὶ ἀκτίς, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν
φύτει εἰς ζ ἀλλ’ εἰς ν, καὶ τρόπη παρηκολούθησε τοῦ ν εἰς τὸ ζ, ὡς
ἐν τῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ διάσκελις μεμιαθήκαμεν. Ταῦτα δὲ τὰ εἰς
τὰ ὄξυτονα εἰς ν μόνως ἔχουσι τὴν αὐτοτικὴν, οἴον κρηπίδα
ἀστίδα ἀψίδα ψφήδα βολίδα ἄνιδα; De Orthogr. 172.8-11 τὰ
γάρ εἰς ἄ απλὰ ἐκτείνουσι τὸ ι ἐπὶ τέλους ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον
οίον, κνημίς κρηπίς ψφήδης ἀστίς καὶ ἀψίς· τὰ γάρ εἰς τὰ
ὄξυτονα ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν ἀποστρέφονται τὴν εἰ
διήθογγον, χωρὶς τοῦ κλεῖς καὶ ἀντηρεῖς; Et. Gen. a 1537.16-7 τὰ
γάρ εἰς ἄ απλὰ ἐκτείνοντα τὸ ι ἐπὶ τέλους ἔχουσιν τὸν
tόνον, οίον κνημίς ψφήδης σφραγίς κρηπίς· οὕτως οἶν καὶ
ἀψίς; Et. Gad. κ 171.14-7 τὰ γάρ εἰς ἡθλικὰ ὄξυτονα ὑπέρ
μίαν συλλαβὴν κοινολεκτούμενα, ἀποστρέφονται τὴν εἰ
dιήθογγον· οἴον, ἀστίς, ἀψίς, βολίς, κρηπίς, ψφήδης.
κνημίς· οὕτως οἶν καὶ κεραμίς; Et. Syn. Π 366.34-368.4 ἐστὶν οὖν
εἰς τοῦ ἐπεὶ, ἐπεὶ τὸν τόνον, σφραγίς κνημίς ψφήδης κρηπίς·
οὕτως οἶν καὶ ἀψίς, γράφεται δὲ διὰ τοῦ ι τὰ γάρ εἰς τὰ
ὄξυτονα θηλυκὰ ὑπέρ μίαν συλλαβὴν κοινολεκτούμενα

2 Ἰερόσσφις ΜΩ: Ιερόσσφις Barker; fortasse Ὀνουφίς (493.19) vel
Μωμεμόφις (466.12) vel Πάρμεμφίς (503.16) e St. Byz. 7 Τὰ] ἀ (τ
om. in spatio vacuo) Ο
καὶ εἰς Αρχαιά τὴν αἰτιατικὴν ὁδύνην ἀσπίδας ἐπικατεῖ πνημίας ἀψίς.

Εἰ δὲ εἰς ΙΝ ἔχουσι τὴν αἰτιατικὴν, περισσοτέρας Βενδίς Μολίς Τοτίς Ἀτάργατις.

Περὶ τοῦ τόνου τῶν εἰς ΟΣ ὅνομάτων. 

Βιβλίων ἑ’.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ καθαρὰ διαύλλαβα τῷ Α μακρῷ παραλιγόμενα ὁλίγα εἰσί, καὶ ὁδύνεται μὲν, ὡσα ὡς κύρια μὴ δὲ ἐπιθετικά παῖς καὶ πηγῆς, ναὸς καὶ νηῆς, λαὸς καὶ λῃχῆς. τὸ Δάος ὡς κύριον βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ πράγμας δὲ ἐπίθετον. τὸ μέντοι ταὸς παρ’ Ἀλεξάνδρεύσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ταῶς σεσκεμεῖται. τὸ δὲ Λάος παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἀπὸ γενικῆς εἰς εὐθείαις μετεποιῆθη.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΙΟΣ διαύλλαβα, εἰ μὴ εἰς κύρια,
όξυ(40)νεται λαιός σκαιός τὸ ἐπίθετον. Σκαῖος δὲ τὸ κύριον, ὡς Βαίος Γραίος Παῖος.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΥΟΣ δισύλλαβα βαρύνεται ναῦος 

τὰ εἰς ΟΙΟΣ δισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ εἰ ἡ κύρια καὶ πυσματικά, καὶ τὸ Ὁ πλεονάζει ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ σμοίος ἐπίθετον, σκλοίος (ὁ σκόλιος) δοῖος γλοῖος (ἐπὶ κόπρου) Βοῖος κλοῖος, τὸ ποῖος τοῖος οἶος (ὁ μόνος) βαρύνεται, ὡς πυσματικά, καὶ τὰ κύρια δὲ ὀμοίως. Σμοῖος

EM 417.26-8 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΙΟΣ δισύλλαβα ὀξύτονα τριγενή δἰα τῆς ΑΙ διθόγχον γράφεται: οἶον, σκαῖος, λαῖος, φαῖος.

4 Τὰ...5 τρισύλλαβον: cf. sch. Hom. ll. 12.137b [βόας] ἀ νάς: βαρύτυπον οἱ πλείοις. Νυκίας (fr. 15 B) δὲ ὀξύτει διὰ τὸ μεταφραζόμενον, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ ἔρημος ὀξύνεται. εἰρήτι δὲ περὶ τῶν τουούν ὅτι οὐ δὲ πρὸς μεταφραζόμενα τὰς λέξεις τοιούτης. ὥ δὲ Ἀσκαλονίτης (p. 52 Β) βαρύνει χρῆ μέντοι γινώσκειν ὅτι μονήρης ἐστὶν ἡ λέξεις σιδῆν γὰρ εἰς ὁ λήγον καθαρίν δισύλλαβον, τῇ οὐ διθόγχῳ κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον παραληγομένον, τριγενές ἐστὶν δὲ οὐδὲ ἀντιπαραθέσιν ἐσχέν. ιόως δὲ βεβαρύνηται, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ ναῦος ἐβαρύνετο καὶ τὸ Τραίος κύριον καὶ τὸ „φαῖος“ παρ’ Ἀλκμάιν (fr. 147 Ρ).

6 Τὰ...62.2 ὀξύνεται: cf. Theognost. Can. II 49.21-9 (≈ 268) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ οἰος δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικά, εἰτε κύρια, εἰτέ προσηγορικά, εἰτέ προτεριστώμενα, εἰτέ ὀξύτονα, εἰτέ πυσματικά, εἰτέ αναφορικά, δἰα τῆς οἱ διθόγχον γράφονται οἶον, σμοῖος τὸ ἐπιθετικόν σκοῖος ὁ σκολίος· δοῖος· μνοῖος ὁ ἤπνος· γλοῖος ἡ κόπρος· Βοῖος τὸ ἔδρος· δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ ὀνοίμα κύριον φλοῖος· κλοῖος ὁ καὶ κλοῖος λέγεται τοῖος· ποῖος· τὸ τε προτεριστώμενον τὸ τε ὀξύτονον· τὸ τε ψυλλόμενον καὶ τὸ δασυνόμενον κοῖος· ποῖος· ὁ τὸ τε ὀξύτονον· δηλοὶ δὲ δήμον Αττικοῦ καὶ πόλιν Κρητικῆς, καὶ ὀνομα λιμένος καὶ ὀειθρόν.

2 Βαίος Schmidt 40.2: μαῖος ΜΟ 4 ΑΥΟΣ Schmidt 40.3: αὐος vel ανος Μ: ανος Ο βαρύνεται scrispi: ὀξύνεται ΜΟ ναῦος... 5 αὐος Schmidt 40.3-4: ναῦος αὐος ΜΟ; perperam Galland (1886), 297 codicem Μ ναῦος ἀνος habere notavit 8 σκλοῖος...σκοῖος] σκοῖος ὁ σκότος hesistanter Schmidt 40.7 (app. crit.) 9 κόπρου Μ: κόπλου Ο κλοῖος Μ: κλοῖος κλοῖος (sic) Ο 11 Σμοῖος scrispi ex Ar. Ec. 846: μοῖος ΜΟ
Βοῖος Κοῖος. Οἰῶς δὲ (ὁ δήμος τῆς Αττικῆς) ὄδυνται.

Τὰ ἐἰς ΕΙΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἐπιθετικά βαρύνται: λείος μείος Κεῖος θεῖος πλεῖος. τὸ δὲ νεῖός <お願> ἀρσενικόν καὶ μονογενές.

Τὰ ἐἰς ΟΣ καθαρὸν δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα

---

1 Οἰῶς...2 ὄδυνται: cf. Jo. Alex. p. διάφ. τον. διάφ. σημαιν. recensio a o 4.3 Οἰῶς: ὁ δήμος Αττικῆς ὄδυνται; recensio b o 5.2 Οἰῶς: ὁ δήμος τῆς Αττικῆς ὄδυνται; recensio c e 6.3; recensio d o 7.2; recensio e o 2.3; Eust. ΙΙ 142.10 Τὸ Οἰῶς – δήμος δὲ ἔστιν Αττικῆς.


5 <ヲκ> add. Lentz 110.7 (iam Schmidt 40.12 in apparatus critico) e Theognost. Can. ΙΙ 48.18 (= 263.4), cf. Choerob. De Orthogr. 271.1-7, (iam proposuit Schmidt 40.13 (app. crit.))
τῷ I μακρῷ ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ ἐνός ἡ δύο συμφώνων βαρύνεται πίος Χίος δίος Θρίος Φθίος. τὸ κριός σεσημεῖωται.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ τὸ δίχρονον βραχύ ἔχοντα βαρύνεται (41.) σάος Ἰος Τίος Ἰος (ὁ μόνος) βιός (ἡ ἲση). βιός δὲ (τὸ τόξον). τὸ δὲ νυός (ἡ νυφή) ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΟΟΣ καὶ ΕΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἀπὸ δὲ καὶ τὸν μόνον. Τίος ὄνομα πόλεως. Χίος ὄνομα νήσου. Κιός ὄνομα ποταμοῦ καὶ ἐθνοῦς. βιός ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερῆς. ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ βέλους ὀξύνεται, ὅτι διὰ βραχεῖος τοῦ ἱ γράφεται; Ἐλ. Γεωλ. κ. 346.48-53 τὰ γὰρ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικά, ἀποστρέφει τὴν διὰ τῆς εἰ διεθνόγγον γραφῇν· οῖος, βιός, Χίος, ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Χίου, δίος ὁ ἐνδοξός, Θρίος ὄνομα τόπου, Κιός κύριον, Τίος κύριον, ἱος ὁ μόνος, ἱος τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὸ βέλος. Πιός κύριον, κριός· ὥστε οὖν καὶ Κρίος. Ῥά...63.3 σεσημεῖωται cf. Ἐρ. Ἑμ. Ημ. 7, d1.2-6 τὰ εἰς οἱ λήγοντα καθαρὰ δισύλλαβα παρελθόντοι τὸν ἓκτεταμένον, εἰ ἀρχεῖαι ἀπὸ συμφώνου, βαρύνεσθαι θέλει, ὑπέτειστο προπεσπαύστων, οἰον Πιός ὄνομα κύριον, Χίος, δίος, Ἐρίος, Κρίος, Φθιός. σεσημεῖωται τὸ κριός ὀξύνομεν καὶ τὸ ιὸς, ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ φανεροῦ ἀρχεῖαι; ἘΜ 539.23-7 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικά τὴν Εὐ διεθνόγγον ἀποστρέφεται, βιός, δίος· Χίος, ὁ πολίτης τῆς Χίου· Θρίος, ὄνομα ποταμοῦ· Κιός, ὄνομα κύριον· Πιός, ὄνομα κύριον· Τίος, ὄνομα κύριον. ὅντως οὖν καὶ Κρίος. 8 Τὰ...64.4 μόνον: cf. Χεροβ. in Thed. 240.35-241.1 ἐπειδὴ τῶν διὰ τοῦ ὅσοι δισύλλαβοι πάντας βαρυμένους, οἰον πλοῦς ρόος κρός νῦς, τὸ ἁθὸς μένον ὀξύνεται, εἰκότως ἃς παραλλάξαν κατὰ τὸν πόλον παραλλάξαν κατὰ τὴν κράσιν; 241.3-10 Πάλιν αἰών ἐστὶ ζητήσαν, εἰ ἄρα τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὅσοι δισύλλαβα πάντα βαρύνεται, οἱ οἱν πλοῦς νῦς ὀξὺς κρός ὅρος, διότι τὸ ἁθὸς μένον ὀξύνεται πρὸςκεῖται διὰ τὸ ὅλος ὀξύνομεν. ἔτην οὖν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι μόνον τὸ ἁθὸς ἐκ πάντων τῶν δισύλλαβῶν τῶν διὰ τοῦ ὅσοι ἀπὸ μόνον τοῦ θ <ἀράξαμενον—τὸ γὰρ ἁθὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θ> ἀράξαμενον οὐκ ἀπὸ μόνον τοῦ θ> ἡχᾶτο, ἀλλ' ἕχει τὸ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ θ—εἰκότως ἃς παραλλάξαν κατὰ τὴν ἄρχουσαν.

1 μακρῷ Schmidt: μακρὸν MΟ 4 ΟΣ Schmidt: ῬΙ ΜΟ; Schmidt 40.19 (app. crit.) verba ΟΣ καθαρὸν δισύλλαβα excidisse censuit τὸ om. O διχρόνον βραχύ (διχρόνον add. M41) Μρς: διχρόνον οἱ βραχύ M4ς; Schmidt 40.19 (app. crit.) βραχύ excidisse indicavit, sed codices MA βραχύ praebent
παρήλθε καὶ κατὰ τὸν τόν όνον; ΕΜ 446.34-7 τὰ εἰς ΩΣ καθαρὸν λήγοντα, παραληγόμενα τῷ ἐ ἡ τῷ Ω, ἄρχομένα απὸ συμφώνου μὴ τοῦ Θ, βαρύνεται, πλῦσι, νόσος, γόνο. Τὸ θρόων οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ Θ. Θοὺς δὲ καὶ θεὸς ὀξύνεται. 10 Τὰ…14 γέγονεν: cf. Ἔτ. Γεν. κ 316.4-7 τὰ εἰς όνον λήγοντα καθαρὰ τρισύλλαβα τῷ ἀ μόνῳ παραληγόμενα ὀξύνεται, οἶνον, Δαναός, ἀλαός, ἐξ οὐ καὶ ἀλασκοπία, ἀγαλάσ. 15 Τὰ…65.5 κτισμα: cf. Θεογν. Καν. II 50.1-10 (= 270.1-10) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ λεοῦ τρισύλλαβα ὀξύνον μονογενὴ ἀπλὰ διὰ τοῦ ἐ πυλοῦ γραφέται οἶνον, Ἀλεός ὀνομα κύριον· εἰλέος ἡ νόσος· παλέος ὁ σκότης τίθεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ άφρονος γαλεός τῷ άιόν καὶ ἀνέπειρος γένος· Κελεός· καλεός· μαλέος· πελεός· ειλέος· τὸ το κύριον καὶ τὸ σημαίνον τὸν ἐλεεινόν, ἦν τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑλεοῦς συναπτηκέθη δ᾿ αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν εἰ καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὸν τὸν, τὸ μέλεος, προσπαράκτωνον, σύνθετον ὁν παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔλεειν ἢ παρὰ τὸ μὴ λῶ, ὁ δὴλοι τὸ θέλω· τὸ γὰρ τέλεος.
όντα κτητικά, ἢ διάφορον τόνω σημαίνοντα
ιλεός (ἤ κατάδυσις) φωλεός κολεός μαλεός. Ελεός τὸ κῦ(42).ριον, ἕλεος δὲ τὸ προστήριον. τὸ δὲ τέλεος καὶ τέλεος κτητικά.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΕΟΣ παροξύνεται εἰ <μὴ> κτητικά εἰμ., ὑπητέος πρακτέος ἁθροιστέος. τὸ δὲ ἐτεός ὁξύνεται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΛΕΟΣ παράγωγα ὑπὲρ τρεῖς

κηλεός ὁ καυστικός, κατὰ πάθος, ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλεος· κηλεος, κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ. 2 ἑλεός...κατάδυσις: cf. Hsch. e 865 ἑλεός· ἢ τοῦ ἡρωικοῦ κατάδυσας καὶ στρόφος; Phot. i 104 ἑλεός· κατάδυσας ἡρώιον; e 220 ἑλεός· ὀφείως κατάδυσας; Choeob. De Orthogr. 247.21 ἑλεός, σημαίνει δὲ τὴν κατάδυσας. Et. Gud. i 276.48 ἑλεός, ἢ κατάδυσας; Su. ei 110.2 ἑλεός, ἢ κατάδυσας; i 305 ἑλεός· ἢ κατάδυσας τοῦ ὀφείως; Zonar. i 1103.5 ἑλεός· ὁ φωλεός· ἢ κατάδυσας τοῦ ὀφείως. 9 Τὰ...66.9 χρόνος; cf. sch. D. T. Lond. 542.8-12 Ο διὰ τοῦ ἀλεος, παροξύνεται καὶ δύο συλλαβαίς τοῦ πρωτοτύπου πλεονάζει, ὕμαλεός δειμαλεός· τὸ δαιδάλεος κονισάλεος αἰθάλεος ἐνδέαν ἔχει τοῦ τοι κτητικά ὄντα· τὸ νηφάλιος προτέλιος Αἰσχυλήν ἔχει τὴν τροτὴν τοῦ ε. καὶ τῶν τοῦ; Theognost. Cam. II 51.8-14 (= 274.1-7) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἀλεος παροξύνοντα παράγωγα διὰ τοῦ ε ὕλον γράφονται ὄνιον, νηφαλεός· ὕμαλεός· ὤπταλεός· σμερδαλεός· κηλαλεός· κερδαλεός· καρφαλεός· ψηφικαλεός· ἁρταλεός· τὸ δαιδάλεος· κονισάλεος· αἰθάλεος· ἀπασθάλεος, κοινωνησάντα τῇ γραφῇ τὸν τόνον διήλλαξαν, ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιδάλεος· κονισάλεος· αἰθάλεος, γεγονότα κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ ε., καὶ τὸ ἀπασθάλεος κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ ε.; Choeob. De Orthogr. 195.21-5 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἀλεος

1 κτητικά] κτητικά Ο τόνω Schmidt 41.17: τόνον ΜΟ σημαίνοντα Μ: σημαίνοντα Ο 3 μαλεός] γαλεός Αλεός Hdn. π.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 909.12; Αλεός St. Byz. α 199.2 (Meinecke St. Byz. 70.2 (app. crit.) lectionem μαλεός in Ps.-Arcadii epitomam corruptam indicat); Αλεός etiam Götting (1835), 167 έλεος...έλεος (έλεος Götting (1835), 168); ἐλεός (τὸ ἐπίδθετον καὶ ἡ μαγειρικὴ τράπεζα καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς) ἔλεος δὲ τὸ κῦρον καὶ τὸ προστηρικὸν Schmidt 41.18 (app. crit.), cf. Theognost. Cam. II 5.25 (= 11.6), II 50.5 (= 270.5): ἐλεός ... ἐλεός ΜΟ 6 ΕΟΣ] ΤΕΟΣ haesitans Schmidt 42.3 (app. crit.) παροξύνεται Μ: παροξύνονται Ο <μη> add. Schmidt 42.3 (app. crit.), nisi plura desunt cf. II. Pros. 18.410
συλλαβάς ἐστι καὶ παροξύνεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἐνδεικνύει ἡχὴ τοῦ Ι ἀπὸ κτητικοῦ ὀνόματος, ὁιόν νηφαλέος αὐαλέος σμερδαλέος θαρσαλέος. πρόσκειται "εἰ μὴ ἡχή ἐνδεικνύει τοῦ Ι ἀπὸ κτητικοῦ ὀνόματος" διὰ τὸ δαιδάλεος δαιδάλεος, κοινισάλεος κοινισάλεος. ὅσα δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κτητικῶν ἐγένοντο κατ’ ἐνδεικνύει τοῦ Ι καὶ προπαροξύνεται Αγαμεμνόνεος Ἐκτόρεος Νεπτύρεος τέλεος χάλκεος χρύσεος.


υπὲρ τρεῖς συλλαβάς πρὸ μιᾶς τὸν τόνον ἔχουσιν ὁιόν, ἀγαλέος σμερδαλέος δειμαλέος νηφαλέος πλήν τεσσάρων δαιδάλεος κοβάλεος ἀτασθάλεος αἰθάλεος τὸ δὲ αἰθάλεος διφορεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴθου γὰρ ὑπάρχει ἀὕστερο καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νήφω, νηφαλέος. Etr. Parn. κ 31.2-6 ὁ διὰ τοῦ ΛΕΟΣ υπὲρ τρεῖς συλλαβάς πρὸ μιᾶς ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον γηραλέος κερδάλεος, αργαλέος πλήν τοῦ κοινισάλεος, δαιδάλεος; EM 261.50-262.2 τὸ ἀντὶ τοῦ ΑΛΕΟΣ υπὲρ τρεῖς συλλαβάς πρὸ μιᾶς τὸν τόνον ἔχουσιν ὁιόν αργαλέος νηφαλέος. Σεσημεωμένα δὲ εἰσὶ τέσσαρα ταῦτα δαιδάλεος, ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιδάλεος ἐστὶ καὶ κοινισάλεος κοινισάλεον δύφος, ὡς παρὰ Αντιμάχῳ, ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινισάλεος, ἀποβολῇ τοῦ ἐ ἀτασθάλεος, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀτασθάλεος, πλεονασμῷ τοῦ τοῦ ε ἔγονεν, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀτασθάλεος αἰθάλεος τοῦτο δὲ διφορεῖται, καὶ πρὸ μιᾶς ἔχει τὸν τόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴθου γὰρ ὑπάρχει, ὡς νήφω, νηφαλέος; Zonar. δ 474.16-24 τὸ ἀντὶ τοῦ αἴθου ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, πρὸ μιᾶς τὸν τόνον ἔχουσιν, ὁιόν ἀγαλέος νηφαλέος. Σεσημεωμένα δαιδάλεος απὸ τοῦ δαιδάλεος κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ ε κοινισάλεος ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινισάλεος κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ ἔστι αἰθάλεος τούτο διφορεῖται, πρὸ μιᾶς γὰρ ἔχει τὸν τόνον καὶ πρὸ δύο πρὸ μιᾶς γὰρ ὑπάρχει ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴθου, ὡς νήφω, νηφαλέος 1

1 παροξύνεται Schmdit 42.7 (app. crit.): προπαροξύνεται MO 2 τοῦ I Schmidt 42.8: inv. ord. MO 3 νηφαλέος αὐαλέος Schmidt 42.8: νηφαλέος αὐαλέος O: σμερδαλέος Μ 4 θαρσαλέος: θαρσάλεος MO 5 δαιδάλεος Schmidt 42.10-1: δαιδάλεος Μ: om. O κοινισάλεος Schmidt 42.11: κοινισάλεος MO ἐγένοντο Ο: ἐγένετο Μ
Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς <....> τῷ Η παραληγόμενα <, τὸ αἰ'η'ὸς ἐστὶν ὁδυνόμενον. τὸ γὰρ παληὰς καὶ ἀρχ'ὸς κατὰ τροπὴν τῆς AI

1 Τὰ…68.4 γὰρ: cf. Theognost. Can. II 51.15-21 (= 275.1-7) Τὰ εἰς ος λήγοντα καθαρὸν ἀπλά κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον τὸ (scrib. τῷ) η παραληγόμενα οὐκ ἐστὶν εὑρεῖν, εἰ μὴ τὸ αἰ'η'ὸς, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐκ πάθους, καὶ τὸ πηρὸς ὁ συγγενῆς πρόσκειται κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον ἐπεὶ τὸ παληὰς ἀρχ'ὸς Αχὴὸς Βοιώτα ἐστὶν κατὰ τροπὴν τῆς αἰ διφθόγγον εἰς η ὡς καὶ τὸ ὄρης Λύκης, Λακωνικὰ πρόσκειται ἀπλὰ διά τὸ πολυνής· εχένης σύνθετα παρὰ γὰρ τὸ ναῦς νης συνετέθη; Et. Gen. α 185.11-7 τὰ εἰς ος λήγοντα καθαρὸν ἀπλά κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον τῷ η παραληγόμενα οὐκ ἐστὶν εὑρεῖν, εἰ μὴ τὸ αἰ'η'ὸς καὶ πηρὸς, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐκ πάθους. πρόσκειται «κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον», ἐπεὶ τὸ παληὰς ἀρχ'ὸς Βοιώτα εἰσ τὰ τροπὴν τῆς εἰ διφθόγγον εἰς η, ως τὸ ὄρης καὶ Λυκης Λακωνικὰ πρόσκειται «ἀπλά» διὰ τὸ Πολυνής (θ 114) Ἐχένης (η 155) παρὰ γὰρ τὸ νης συνετέθησαν; EM 32.3-11 τὰ εἰς ΟΣ λήγοντα καθαρὸν ἀπλά κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον τῷ ἦτα παραληγόμενα οὐκ ἐστὶν εὑρεῖν, εἰ μὴ τὸ αἰ'η'ὸς, καὶ πηρὸς καὶ αὐτὸ ἐκ πάθους. πρόσκειται, «κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον,» ἐπεὶ τὸ παληὰς, ἀρχ'ὸς, [καὶ] Αχὴὸς, Βοιώτα εἰσ, κατὰ τροπὴν τῆς Εἰ διφθόγγον εἰς ἦτα, ως τὸ ὄρης καὶ Λυκης, Λακωνικὰ. Πρόσκειται ἀπλὰ, διὰ τὸ πολυνής, εὑρεῖς, εχένης παρὰ γὰρ τὸ νης συνετέθησαν; Et. Sym. Ι 133.9-134.7 γράφεται δὲ τὸ αἰ'η'ὸς κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν διὰ τοῦ ἦτα ἐπειδὴ τὰ εἰς ος λήγοντα καθαρὸν ἀπλὰ παραληγόμενα οὐκ ἐστὶν πηρὸς, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐκ πάθους τὸ παληὰς ἀρχ'ὸς Αχὴὸς Βοιώτα εἰσ Λακωνικὰ. πρόσκειται «ἀπλὰ» διὰ τὸ Πολυνής (θ 114) Εὐνής (Η 468) Ἐχένης (η 155) θεμιὸν εἶναι. Τὰ…2 ὁδυνόμενον: cf. EM 32.3-5 τὰ εἰς ΟΣ λήγοντα καθαρὸν ἀπλὰ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον τῷ ἦτα παραλήγουσαν οὐκ ἐστὶν εὑρεῖν, εἰ μὴ τὸ αἰ'η'ὸς

---

1 <] Schmidt 42.15 (app. crit.) verba καθαρὰ ἀπλὰ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον excedisse statuit 2 ὁδυνόμενον MO: m: 3 δέσενομεν Ο: ο: τὸ…ἀρχ'ὸς] Schmidt 42.16-7: ‘ἐμο τὸ γὰρ ἀρχ'ὸς καὶ παληὰς καὶ ἀρχ'ὸς’ παληὰς Schmidt 42.16-7: παληὰς MO ἀρχ'ὸς Schmidt 42.17: ἀρχ'ὸς MO
διφθόγγου ἐγένετο [καὶ προπαραξύνεται]. τὸ δὲ ὀρίσσος καὶ αὐτὸ προπαραξύνεται κατὰ τροπὴν τῆς Εἰ διφθόγγου γεγονός. τὸ δὲ Ἐξένησος καὶ πολύνησος προπαραξύνεται σύνθετα γάρ.

(43.) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΔΙΟΣ προπαραξύνονται, εἰ μὴ τρισύλλαβα ὅντα τριβράχεα εὑρεθῶσι, καὶ παροξύνονται πρὸς διαστολὴν κυριῶν καὶ ἐπιθέτων, ὥσπερ ἔχει τὸ Ρόδιος καὶ Σχεδίος. τὰ δὲ προπαραξύνοντα ταύτα ἰδίος ἰδίος μαψίδος παυρίδος ἀρμόδιος

---

5 Τὰ...69.2 ὁμορρέας: Theognost. Can. II 54.20-30 (=297.1-11)

---

1 καὶ προπαραξύνεται del. Schmidt 42.18: προπερισσάται καὶ ὀξίνεται haestanter Schmidt 42.18 (app. crit.) τὸ...2 προπαραξύνεται] Schmidt 42.18-9 (app. crit.) ὀμιδος καὶ Ἀρκαίος προπαραξύνεται malit; cf. Theognost. Can. II 51.20 (= 275.6) 2 ὀρίσσος πι. ὀμιδος MO 3 Eί Schmidt 42.19: αἱ MO γεγονός Mπς: γεγονός MςςΟ Ἐξένησος Schmidt 42.20: εξήκολοθησε MO 4 προπαραξύνεται Schmidt 42.20 (app. crit.): ἐξήκολοθησε τὸ δὲ πρὸς διαστολὴν Herodianum erit’ 5 προπαραξύνονται O: προπαραξύνεται Μ 7 παροξύνονται Schmidt 43.2: προπαραξύνονται MO 8 Ρόδιος Schmidt 43.3: ὀμιδος κύριος Ο: Σχεδίος Schmidt 43.4: σχέδιος ΜΟ 10 μαψίδος L. Dindorf TGL V 767C, Theognost. Can. II 54.23 (=297.4), II 58.20 (=312.5): μεμψίδος MO
νυμφίδιος. σεσημεύω το ἐρωτιός ὃνυνόμενον.

Τὰ διὰ τὸν ἘΝΙΟΣ προσπαραξύνεται Ἐλευσίνιος Σαλαμίνιος. 5
Τὰ εἰς ΝΙΟΣ καθόλου ὑπὲρ τρεῖς συλλαβὰς προσπαραξύνεται Ἐλευσίνιος Σαλαμίνιος.
τὸ δὲ Κλωνίος παραξύνεται ὡς κύριον καὶ τρισύλλαβον ὅν. καὶ τὸ μονιός ἀπέναντι τρισύλλαβον, εἰ δὲ τὸ Ἡ πλεονάση, προσπαραξύνεται μονιός γάρ.


69
Ὅσα ἀπὸ τοῦ Σ ἢ Ρ γίνεται διὰ τοῦ Ι βραχέος προσπαροξύνεται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ κυρίου γένοιτο ἐν τρισυλλάβοις καὶ [ἐν] τριβράχεσιν, ὡσπερ τὸ Φυγίος καὶ Φλογίος. προσπαροξύνεται δὲ ταῦτα Θηρίκιος Κιλίκιος Φαιάκιος μακάριος σωτήριος, τὸ δὲ Ἰλυριός οὐκ ἀντίκειται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ ἐθνικὰ ἢ τοπικὰ προσπαροξύνε(44)ται: θαλάσσιος ἐντόπιος ἐνδάπιος. τὸ δὲ Ἰλυριός ὀξύνεται καὶ θαλαμικός (ὅ κατιπλάτης).

Τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ

1 Ὅσα...7 ἀντίκειται: cf. Comp. Cath. Herod. (P. ANT. 2.67, 5.28-35) καὶ ὅσα ἀπὸ τοῦ Σ ἤ Ρ ληγόντων εἰς τὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ παρήκται, συνεσταλμένου τοῦ 1, προσπαροξύνεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἡ ἀπὸ κυρίου διαστολὴ τῆς γένοιτο ἐν τρισυλλάβοις τριβράχεσιν, ὡσπερ τὸ Φυγίος [καὶ] Φλογίος. τρίτην ἀπὸ τέλους ἔχοντα τὸν ὀξύνει θαυμάζοντα, Θηρίκιος, Κιλίκιος, Φαιάκιος, Φαιάκιος, [.....]...ος, ἀξιώζει, ἀληθικός, σωτήριος, αρ........ [±14 τὸ Ἰλυριός οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἸΟΣ παρήκται, διὸ οὐκ ἀντίκειται: Theognost. Can. II 55.29-32 (= 300.1-4) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ κιος ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς Σ ληγόντων γινόμενα, μὴ ὡς μετουσιαστικά, ἢ, μέρος σωματικόν δηλοῦντα, διά τοῦ Ι τρίτην ἔχοντα τὸν, θαυμάζοντα, Φαιάκιος, Φαιάκιος, Κιλίκιος, Κιλίκιος, Θηρίκιος, Θηρίκιος, Θηρίκιος, I 56.4-8 (= 301.1-5) Τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς Σ ληγόντων διὰ τοῦ κιος γινόμενα, διὰ τοῦ Ι τρίτην ἔχοντα τὸν, τρίτην ἀπὸ τέλους ἀπὸ τῆς παραληγούσης τῆς γενεῆς θεωροῦμενης οἰον, ὡς σωτήριος οὐκ ἀντίκειται: Choeorb. Ep. Ps. 6.2-6 τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς Σ ἢ Ρ ληγόντων συνεσταλμένου ὅτος τῶν Ι προσπαροξύνετο, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἡ ἀπὸ κυρίου διαστολὴ τῆς γένοιτο ἐν τρισυλλάβοις τριβράχεσιν, ὡς ἔχει τὸ Φυγίος καὶ Φλογίος· τὰ δὲ προσπαροξύνεται εἰς ταῦτα Θηρίκιος, Κιλίκιος, σωτήριος οὐκ ἀντίκειται. 8 Τὰ...11 κατίπλατης: cf. Comp. Cath. Herod. (P. ANT. 2.67, 5.35-6) πάντα τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ ἐθνικὰ ἢ τοπικὰ προσπαροξύνεται]. οὐς, ἐγδάπιος

3 ἐν δελεί τριβράχεσιν Lentz 118.4-5: τριβράχεσιν (τριβράχεσιν Μαθ.) ΜΟ 4 Φυγίος...Φλογίος ΜΟ; φλογίος in φλογίος Lehrs (1833), 280 n. 5 Φαιάκιος ΜΟρ.: φαιάκιος Ομ., ut videtur 10 Ἰλυριός Göttling: χιλιαίος ΜΟ; ἐλυριός haesitans Schmidt 44.1-2 (Ath. ἐλυριός habet)
προσαραθάνει συνεσταλμένον τοῦ Ι, εἰ μὴ τριβραχεά ἐπὶ κύριον εἰς πολέμιος ποτάμιος μύθοις ὑπὸ μύθοις δέσμιος. Φρυγίος δὲ τὸ κύριον παραθάνει.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΣΙΟΣ καὶ ΤΙΟΣ προσαραθάνονται, εἰ μὴ κύρια εἰς καὶ τριβραχεῖα ἀσπάσιος πρυγνήσιος Ατλάντιος θαλάττιος, τὸ δὲ πλησίος καὶ ἀντίος Τ...). Σκοτίος Κλυτίος τριβράχεα καὶ τὸ Φρισιός.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ καθαρὸν πρὸ τοῦ Ι Η ἦ Ω ἐχοντα προσαραθάνουσα νήμος δημος γηῖος λωίος πατρώιος, τὸ Ασκληπιίος ὀξύται.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΙΟΣ ὑπερτιμύλλαβα προσαραθάνει, εἰ μὴ ὄρνεν καθηγορία ἐνάλιος Δασύλλιος (ὁ Διόνυσος) θεμέλιος.

Τὸ μέντο Λαλλίος πελίος πολίος σκολιός φαλίος (ὁ λευκομέτοπος) ὡς τρισύλλαβα ὀξύται, τὸ δὲ αἰγωλίος [ἐρατίος] ἔδωλίος βαμβυλίος ὡς επί ὄρνεν καθηγοροῦμενα ὀξύται.

---

16 Τὸ...18 ὀξύται: cf. Theognost. Can. Π 57.31-2 (= 308) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ λιος τρισύλλαβα ὀξύταν διὰ τοῦ Ι ὦ γράφονται οἴον, πολίος· φαλίος· σκολιός· Λαλλίος· βαμβυλίος· πελίος.

---

3 Φρυγίος ΜΟ; Φρυγίος Schmidt 44.6 4 κύριον Ο; κύριος Μ 5 καὶ ΤΙΟΣ Μ4: ομ. Μ1. 6 καὶ τριβράχεα M4. 7 Ατλάντιος Schmidt 44.9: ταλάντιος ΜΟ; Ταυλάντιος Lentz 119.34 θαλάττιος Μ: θαλάσσιος Ο1, sed τ supra su Ο4. 8 ☞ Schmidt 44.10 (app. crit.): ‘post ἀντίος desunt nonnulla’ 10 καθαρὸν] καὶ ὡς (delete) καθαρὸν Μ 11 νήμος: νήμος Schmidt 44.13 (app. crit.) γηῖος] ἦμος vel Τήμος Lobeck PSCP 472, n. 61; ἦμος Lobeck PGSE1 449.7; Τήμος (post νήμος) Theognost. Can. Π 57.13 (= 306.7) 14 καθηγορία] καθηγορίοι τι ἐκείνως Ω 15 ενάλιος: Ω Δασύλλιος scrips: Δασύλλιος ΜΟ 16 πελίος πολίος scrips: πελίος ὁ πολίος ΜΟ 17 λευκομέτοπος] ω non liquet in Ω 18 αἰγωλίος Schmidt 44.19 (app. crit.): ἔγαλνος ΜΟ; αἰγωλίος ὁ Schmidt 44.19 (app. crit.) ἐρατίος del. Schmidt 44.19: ἐρατίος habent ΜΟ
"Όσα εἰσί μονογενή ἀπὸ ἑνεστῶτων γενόμενα εἰς (45) ΙΟΣ μὴ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ δύο σύμφωνα κατὰ διάστασιν προσαραξύνεται αἰτῶ αἰτίος, ἀρμόζω ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκῶ ἀρκίος, ἀρτῶ ἀρτίος, τὸ δὲ ἀντῶ ἀντίος σεσημεῖωται.

Ετὶ καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ μέλλοντος γινόμενα· ὀρθώσομαι ὀρθώσιος, ἀστάσομαι ἀστάσιος, φυλάξομαι φυλάξιος. τὸ μέντοι πλῆσιν πλῆσιος καὶ τὸ δέξομαι δεξιός καὶ ἐψομαι ἀνεψιός.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ τρισύλλαβα εἰ ἔχοιεν Υ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ συλλαβῇ προσαραξύνεται, εἰ μὴ τις διασυλλ. εἰς, ἡ κύριον ύπάρχοι τρίβραχον κύριος

---

1 Ὅσα...5 σεσημεῖωται: cf. El. Gad. a 197.7-10 τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὁς οὐνόματ προσαραξύνοντα παρ᾽ ἑνεστῶτα ἡ μέλλοντα παρηγμένα διὰ τοῦ ἐγράφεται, οὐν ἄω ἄγιος, ἄσω <ἀς> καὶ> ὁς, ἀρμόζω ἀρμόδιος, ἰζω ἰζιος καὶ ἀρκῶ ἀρκίος· καὶ ἐψομαι; EM 144.2-5 Τα διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ προσαραξύνοντα, παρὰ ἑνεστῶτα ἡ μέλλοντα παρηγμένα, διὰ τοῦ ἐγράφονται: ἀξω, ἄγιος· ἀρμόδιος· ἰζω, ἰδιος· καὶ ἀρκῶ, ἀρκίος.

6 Ετὶ...10 ἀνεψιος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 58.1-5 (= 310.1-5) Τα παρὰ μέλλοντα διὰ τοῦ ὁς γενόμενα διὰ τοῦ ἐγράφονται: οὐν, ἄω τὸ σέβομαι ἄσω ἁς, καὶ τροπὴ τοῦ α· εἰς ὁ ὁς· ἀστάσιος· ἀστάσιος· ἀλέξω· ἀλέξιος· κτῆσις· κτῆσιος· μνήσις· κτῆσιος· δεξίος· καὶ ἀνεψιος· κατὰ τόνον μόνον διήλθεν.

11 Τά...73.6 παροξύνοντον: cf. Theognost. Can. II 58.6-13 (= 311.1-8) Τα διὰ τοῦ ὁς τρισύλλαβα προσαραξύνοντα, ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ συλλαβῇ τὸ ν, διὰ τοῦ ἐγράφονται: οὐν· κύριος· Σύριος· Τύριος· Κύριος· νόχιος· Στύγιος· Μύσιος· Πύθιος· βρόθιος· δυϊος· κυκλίος· μύχιος· ἣ τῶν δέκα χιλιάδοις ἀπαξίθεμες· ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ ἀορίστου παραξύνεται, ὁμώος· καὶ τὸ νυμφίος· καὶ νυμφίος· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ ὀικὸν ἐν ὃ· ὁ νυμφίος· προσαραξύνεται, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νυμφίου παραξύνεται

3 προσαραξύνεται: προσαραξύνονται Ο
4 ἀρτώ Ο<α•>: ἀρτῶ δισυλλ. ακεντίσκης M: ἀρτῶ Ο<α•>
5 ἀντὸ ἀντίος] ἀρτῶ ἀρτίος MO; Schmidt 45.2 (app. crit.): 'regula nequiter corrupta'
10 ἀνεψιος Schmidt 45.8 e Theognost. Can. II 58.4 (= 310.4): ἐπὶ MO
11 ἔχειεν] ἔχειεν Ο
13 εἰς' ΜΟ<α•>: ἔχει Ο<α•>

υπάρχοις: ύπάρχοις Ο: ύπάρξαι Ο
Κύριος Τύριος Μύσιος Πύλιος Φρύγιος. τὸ δὲ Τυχίος Φφρυγίος Πλευτίος 
Κλυτίος Σκυφίος παροξύνονται ὡς κύρια. 
μύριος ὁ ἀρισμένος ἀριθμός, μυρίος ὁ ἄριστος, καὶ νυμφίος οἶκος προπαροξύνον 

νυμφίος δὲ ὁ γαμετής παροξύνον. 

Ὅσα ἀπὸ ἐπιρρημάτων παρήκαται διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ, 
προπαροξύνεται προὶ πρώιος, ὑψὲ ψυχος, 
νόσφιν νοσφίδιος, ἰφὶ ἰφίος, ἀεὶ ἀείδιος, ἕκα 
ὀηδιος. σεσημεῖωται ἄντην ἀντίος, σχεδὸν 
Σχεδίος, ὡς κύριον. 

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ τρισύλλαβα κύρια ἔχοντα τὴν

7 Ὄσα…11 κύριον: cf. Theognost. Can. II 58.16-21 (=312.1-6) Τὰ 
παρ’ ἐπιρρήσει διὰ τοῦ ἰος προπαροξύνοντα διὰ τοῦ ἰ 
γραφόντας ὀφέιν, ἵφὶ ἰφίος: προὶ πρώιος: σχεδὸν σχεδίους 
ἐκτάθην ἐκτάθιος ἀμβαδόν ἀμβαδίος: ἐταδὸν ἐταδίοις 
σταδίον σταδίῳ ὁπίθοις νοσφίδιος: ἀεὶ ἀείδιος, κατὰ 
συντολὴν τῆς ἐν διηθόγγου εἰς τὸ ὄηδιος: μαυρίδιος: τὸ 
ἀντίος μόνον κατὰ τὸν παροξύνομον: El. 
Gen. α 924.5-8 τὰ γὰρ παρ’ ἐπιρρήσια γινόμενα διὰ τοῦ ἰος 
προπαροξύνεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἰ γραφέται, ὀφέιν ἵφὶ ἰφίος, προὶ 
πρώιος, οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἄντην ἀντίος κατὰ τὸν μόνον 
ἱματητης καὶ ὡς κατὰ γραφὴν: EM 113.26-9 Τὰ παρὰ 
ἐπιρρημάτων γινομένα διὰ τοῦ ΙΟΣ προπαροξύνεται, καὶ 
διὰ τοῦ ἰ γραφέται ὀφήν, ὰφὶ ἰφίος, προὶ πρώιος, οὕτω 
καὶ ἄντην ἀντίος, ὥς ἐς ἐναντίας. 
12 Τὰ…74.2 παροξύνεται: cf. 
Theognost. Can. II 58.22-6 (=313) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἰος τρισύλλαβα 
παροξύνοντα ἀπὸ μακρὰς ἀρχόμενα διὰ τοῦ ἰ γραφέται: ὀφέιν, 
Βάκχιος: Μούλιος, οὐ τὸ σωματικὸν μέρος, ἐκεῖνο γὰρ διὰ 
tῆς ἐν διηθόγγου Αἰνιος: Φήμιος, καὶ Εὐφήμιος: Αἰδιος 
ἀγορος: Αἴλιος: μάντιος: τὸ ἐρχος: ἀντίος τὸς λοιποῖς 
ἐναντία μόνον κατὰ τὸν. 

1 Μύσιος ε Theognost. Can. II 58.8-9 (=311.3-4) (coni. Schmidt 
45.12 in apparatu critico): μύδιος ΜΟ; possis etiam Λύδιος 
4 όρισμένος Μ: ὀρισμένος O 5 νυμφίος…προπαροξύνον] 
fortasse νυμφίος ὁ νυμφικός οἶκος coll. Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον 
διάφ. σημ. recensio e, ν 4.1, EM 608.42 et Ζωναρ. ν 1408.8 
6 παροξύνοντα ΜΟρε: παροξύνεται Οας. 7 ἀπὸ ἐπιρρήματον 
ΜΟρε: ἀπὸ ὁμολόγου Οας. ἐπιρρήματον ομολόγον Οας. 
8 ψιλικος Ο 9 ἰφὶ Ο: ἰφὶ Μ ἀεὶ], ἀεὶ Ο ἀειδιος], ἀειδιος Ο 
10 οηδιος] βαδιος Ο ἄντην Schmidt 45.20: ἄντιν ΜΟ
τρίτην μακράν προπαροξύνεται Μουλίως Βάκχιος Σέργιος. τὸ δὲ Ἐρχίος παραξύνεται.

Τὰ εἶς ΙΟΣ ὑπερτρισύλλαβα ἐπὶ ἀλόγων ὑφών ὄξυν(46)νεται ἀιγυπτίος χαραδρίος ἐρωδίος. τὸ δὲ σκορπίος κοβίος παραξύνεται ὡς τρισύλλαβα.

Ἐξαιρέτως τὰ εἰς ὍΣ καθαρὸν ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς τῷ Ὅ μόνῳ παραλήγοντα προπαροξύνονται. τὰ πολλὰ δὲ σύνθετα παραξύτονα τε καὶ προπαροξύτονα. καὶ παραξύτονα μὲν θυσκός λαοσοσός


7 Ἑξαιρέτως...752 διαληψομένα: cf. Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 6' ἤξης ὁχήμαν περὶ τῶν εἰς σος καθαρὸν ληγόντων ύπέρ δύο συλλαβάς [...]. ταῦτα δὲ σύνθετα ὄντα πολλά ἐστιν παραξύτονα, τὰ δὲ καὶ προπαροξύνομενα ὡς ἔχει τὸ θυσκός, κεμαδουσσός, (einf Wort unlesbar), κερατοδός, βοηθός, λουτροχός, οἰνοχός, τὸ δὲ (ein Wort unlesbar) προπαροξύνεται, καὶ πρόχος (πρόθος Cod.), ἐπίκιος, μελανόχρος, δυσήκιος, ἐξίτικος, μελανόχρος (I), λευκόχρος καὶ ἄλλα [...].

1 τρίτην] γ’ Ὅ 3 ὑπερτρισύλλαβα] ὑπερτρισύλλαβα (sic) Μ ἀλόγων] ἄλλουν Μ ὑφών Ο: ζώων Μ 4 χαραδρίος] χαρανδρίος Ο: χαρανδρίος vel χαρανδρίος Μ 7 ante Ἑξαιρέτως (τέξαιρέτως legitur in M) habet ἐτὶ περὶ τῶν εἰς ΟΣ ΜΟ 8 τῷ τῷ Μ
βροτοσόως, προπαρωθενει τε πρόχος
δυνηκος. υν τε περι των ατλων διαληψεθα.

Τα ὠστερ ἐντελη των εις ΠΛΟΥΣ ληγοντων ἀπλα ὅντα παροξυνον τα ἀτλων τριπλων ἀτλων, το τε πρωτόπλους και ἀλιπλους προπαρωθεται, ὅτι μι ἀπλα. το τε ἄθροος παροξυνον το ἁμα σημαινε το τε προπαρωθενον το ἁφωνον.

Τα δια του ΟΟΣ κυρια προπαρωθεται Σιστους Πειροους Αθοους ο και Αθωως. το τε ὄγδους και ἐπιθετον προπαρωθεται, ἐπειδη τα εις ΟΟΣ τακτικα βαρυνεται.
υπεσταλμένων τών εἰς ΣΤΟΣ, ἐβδομος ὡγδος ἐννατος δέκατος. τὸ δὲ εἰκοστός τριακοστός καὶ τάλλα ὁξύνεται. καὶ τὸ ὅλος ὁξύνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅλω.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα Υ συνεσταλμένῳ προπαροξύνεται σίκυος Πέρυνος Φώτυνος. τὸ δὲ Τιτυνὸς ὁξύνεται καὶ τὸ Ὕ οὐκ ἔχει συνεσταλμένον.

(47.) Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ καθαρὸν ύπέρ δύο συλλαβάς

---

5 Τὰ...7 Φώτυς: cf. Theognost. Can. II 51.22-4 (= 277.1-3) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ νος καθαρὸν ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς κύρια προπαροξύνοντα διὰ τοῦ ν ψυλοῦ γράφονται οἶον, Σικυὸς Πέρυνος ὀνομα ποταμὸν Κάνδυον Αλάσυνος Φὸγυνος
7 Φώτυς: cf. Palimpsest Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 6' Φώτυς ἄρχων Ἀδωνὼν ὡς Θουκυδίδης ἐν β' 9 Τὰ...78.5 προσγεγαμμένον: cf. Palimpsest Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 3' l. 16 τὰ εἰς ως λήγοντα καθαρὸν ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενα τῷ ω καὶ ἐπιθετικὰ ύπάρχοντα προπερισσάται [...] Λατύς, κεβύς, Λαγύς, λαγύς, ταλύς, Γελύς, παστύς, μητρύς, πατρύς, Ἀχελύς, Ep. Hom. 268, b 4-7 Προπερισσάται δὲ διὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τὸν λέγοντα τὰ διὰ τοῦ ως κτητικὰ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἔχοντα τὸ 1 κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν, προπερισσάτων, οἰον Ἀχελύς, ἡρύς, ἀθύς, πατρύς, χωρίς τοῦ κολοφός (A 575), σημαίνει δὲ τὸν θόρυβον; Theognost. Can. II 49.19-20 (= 267.1-2) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ως κτητικὰ διὰ τῆς ὁ διπλογγού γράφεται οἶον, Κώςις Μινώος ἡρύς ἀνθύρις ἀστρύρις πατρύς; Chororob. Ep. Ps. 118.19-22 τὰ εἰς ΟΣ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς (τῷ Ω) παραληγόμενα περισσάτων, οἰον ἄθος μητρύς ἡρύς πατρύς, χωρίς τοῦ κώςις λώος (κολοφός), δ σημαίνει τὸν θόρυβον ἔχει δὲ τὸ 1 ἀπὸ παραδόσεως; Et. Gen. a 149.11-5 προπερισσάται δὲ τὸ ἄθος διὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦτον, τὰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ως ἔχοντα τὸ ὁ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς προπερισσάτων χωρίς τοῦ κολοφός, ὁ σημαίνει τὸν θόρυβον, οἰον πατρύς Ἀχελύς αθύς ἡρύς οὔτως οὐκ καὶ ἄθος; πρόσκειται ἔχοντα τὸ 1 διὰ τὸ λάγυς καὶ πατρύς; α 150.4-8 Τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ως διὰ τοῦ ως παράγωγα σὺν τῷ γράφονται καὶ προπερισσάτων, οἰον

2 ἐννατος Μ: ἐννατος Οἑ, ἐννατος Οξ, ut videtur 3 τάλλα Μ: τ' ἀλλὰ Ο 5 Τὰ...8 συνεσταλμένον] Schmidt 46.21 (app. crit.): 'sunt etiam plura turbata' 7 Φώτυς ΜΩ; Φὸγυνος Theognost. Can. II 51.24 (= 277.3)
παραληγόμενα τῷ Ω μετὰ Ι προσγεγραμμένου

Μίνως Μινώος, ἦρως ἤρως, πάτρως πατρός, μήτρως μητρός· οὕτως οὖν καὶ Αθώς Αθώος ὠφείλειν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν τοῦ ἀδός τοῦ ἔτη τοῦ ἄξιμον προσπαροξύνεται καὶ τὸ ι ἀποβάλλει; α 174.3-7 τά γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ως διά τοῦ ῥος παράγωγα σὺν τῷ ἃ γράφονται καὶ προσπειράστων, οἷον Μίνως Μινώος, ἦρως ἤρως, πάτρως πατρός· οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἡμῖν ἤρως καὶ αἰδώς αἰδώς καὶ κατὰ τροπὴν Βουσικήν [[τοῦ ω]] τῆς οἱ διήθουσιν ἦρως καὶ αἰδώς; α 1509.5-9 ὡς δὲ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τὸν διὰ τοῦ οὗς ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβῶς πρὸ μιᾶς τὸν τοιοῦτον ἔχοντα σὺν τῷ ἃ γράφεται, ὁμοίως ἢρως πατρός ἢρως ἀδός, οὕτως οὖν καὶ Αχέλώος· πρόσκειται «πρὸ μᾶς τὸν τοιοῦτον τοῦ τοιοῦτου» διὰ τῷ λαγὼς πρόσκειται «ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβῶς» διὰ τὸ ὁμοιότατα γὰρ οὐ γράφονται σὺν τῷ τῷ Et. Gud. a 34.2-5 τὰ εἰς ὑπόμνημα ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβῶς τὴν παραλήγομενα προσπειράστων, χωρὶς τοῦ κολώς, ὁ σημαίνει τὸν θύρωμα· Κώς, Μινώος, πατρός, μητρός. τότες συνενεκκολοθῆκε καὶ τῷ ἦρως· ἔχει δὲ τὸ ἢ ΕΚ παραδόσεως; EM 26.31-5 τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΩΙΟΣ ἔχοντα τὸ ἢ υπὲρ θ’ συλλαβῶς προσπειράστων· χωρὶς τοῦ κολώς, [ὁ] σημαίνει τὸν θύρωμα· οἴον, Αχέλώος, αἰδώς, ἦρως. οὕτως καὶ αἴδως. Πρόσκειται «ἔχοντα τὸ ἢ» διὰ τὸ λαγώς καὶ πατρός; 26.41-6 Τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΩΣ διὰ τοῦ ΩΙΟΣ παράγωγα σὺν τῷ τῷ γράφεται καὶ προσπειράζεται· οἷον, Μίνως Μινώος· πάτρως πατρός· μῆτρως μητρός· ἦρως ἢρως. οὕτως καὶ Αθώς Αθώος ὠφείλειν εἶναι ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν τοῦ ἀδός, τοῦ ἔτη τοῦ ἄξιμον, καὶ τὸ ι ἀποβάλλοι, καὶ προσπαροξύνεται; 29.28-31 ἔχει δὲ τὸ αἰδώς τοῦ τοῦ προσγεγραμμένου ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΩΣ διὰ τοῦ ΩΙΟΣ παράγωγα σὺν τῷ τῷ γράφονται καὶ περιστέρων· Μίνως, Μινώος· ἦρως, ἦρως· πάτρως, πατρός· ἦρως, ἦρως· καὶ αἴδως, αἴδως· Et. Sym. I 126.8-13 ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰδώς γίνεται αἰδώς καὶ κατὰ τροπὴν Βουσικήν τοῦ ῥως εἰς τὴν οἱ διήθουσιν αἰδώς καὶ ἢρως, ἔχει δὲ τὸ ν ἢρως ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ως διὰ τοῦ ῥος παράγωγα καὶ σὺν τῷ τῷ γράφονται καὶ προσπειράζεται· Μίνως Μινώος, ἦρως ἢρως, πατρός πατρός, ἦρως ἢρως· καὶ αἴδως αἴδως· κατὰ τροπὴν Βουσικήν τῆς ως διήθουσιν ἦρως καὶ αἴδως.

1 παραλήγομενα...προσγεγραμμένου Ω· παραλήγομενα τῷ ῥως μετὰ τοῦ προσγεγραμμένου Μ
προσεπιστάται πατρώος ἡρώως Αχελώος αἰδώς τὸ δὲ κολωὸς ὠξύνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ κολωὸς, τὸ μέντοι λαγωὺς καὶ πατρώος ὠξύνονται, διότι οὐκ ἔξουσι τὸ Ι προσγεγαμένον.

Πάν εἰς ὉΣ καθαρῶν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς τῇ ΑΠ διφθόγγῳ παραληγόμενον, εἰ ἀπὸ ὀξύνονυμένον θηλυκοῦ γένους, προσεπιστάται ἀρχή ἀρχαῖος, ἀλκή ἀλκαῖος, κορυφή κορυφαῖος, τὸ μέντοι ἐπιπόλαῖος οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιπολῆς παρῆκται, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸ ἐπιπολάζω <...> πλὴν οἱ πλείους αὐτῷ περισσώσι.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΑΙΟΣ προσεπιστάται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ γένοιτο κυρίου ἢ εἰ ἡ σύνθετον· πυγμαῖος Ρωμαίος Πτολεμαῖος Ἐρμαῖος. τὸ δὲ Ἑρμαῖος κύριον προσπαρεύνεται, καὶ τὸ φιλορωμαῖος σύνθετον οὖν τὸ δὲ Τίμαιος σεσημεῖοτα.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΙΟΣ ὑπερτρισύλλαβα προσεπιστάται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ τις εἰ ὡς, ἢ σύνθετον ὑπάρχον ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΑΙΟΣ ἈΡΧΑΙΟΙΟΣ. τὸ ἘΡΥΣΙΧΑΙΟΣ προσπαρεύνεται, τὸ δὲ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ κύριον εἰς διαστολὴν.

---

6 Πάν...13 περισσώσι: cf. Palimps. Fragn. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 3r, l. 24 Πάν εἰς ὃς λήγον καθαρῶν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενον τῇ αἱ διφθόγγῳ, εἰ ἀπὸ ὀξύνομένον θηλυκοῦ γένους, προσεπιστάται θέλει [...] ἀρχαῖος, προκατάρχει γὰρ τὸ ἀρχή ... κορυφαῖος, κορυφή, ἀστεροπαῖος, ἀμοβαῖος, ἀμεμβαίος (?) Ἰβυκος, πομπῆ, πομπαίος Εὐρυπίδης Μηδεία, τροπῆ, τροπαῖος 23 τὸ ... προσπαρεύνεται: cf. St. Byz. ε 137.3-6 τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἐρυσίχαιος, περὶ οὐ πολὺς λόγος τοῖς ἀρχαῖοις, ὁ τεχνὸς [καὶ Ἡρόδοτος] (Hdn. 2,874,9) γάρ φησιν ὅτι σεσημεῖοτα τὸ Ἐρυσίχαιος προσπαρευνόμενον ἐν τοῖς ἔθνικοις.

---

3 τὸ ...5 προσγεγαμένον om. Ο 7 διφθόγγῳ διφθόγγῳ M 15 κυρίου ἢ Lentz 133.10; ή κύριον ΜΟ 17 Πτολεμαῖος] πτολεμαίος Ο 21 προσεπιστάται Lentz 131.11: περισσάται ΜΟ
'Ετι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΔΑΙΟΣ προπερισπάται Ἰουδαίος χυδαίος Χαλδαίος.
'Ετι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΙΟΣ ἑθνικά: Ἀθηναίος Θηβαίος Ῥωμαῖος. σεσημεῖωται τὸ Ἀχαιός ὀξείνυμενον καὶ τὸ Ἐρυσίχαιος προπαραζυμνόμενον.

(48) 'Ετι τὰ τρισύλλαβα ἀπὸ Α ἡπιομένου ἀρχόμενα ἀλκαίος ἀκμαίος ἀραίος ὁ τῆς ἀράξ. ἀραίος δὲ ὁ μή πυκνός.
'Ετι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΔΑΙΟΣ υλαίος βουλαίος θηλαίος. τὸ δὲ δείλαιος καὶ φύλαιος προπαραζύμεται. ἐτὶ σημειοῦνται τὰ ἐν ἀρχῇ πρόθεσιν ἐχοντα' ἐπιπόλαιος, ἢ ἀπὸ ἐπιρρήματος, ὡσπερ τὸ παλαιός ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλαι,
καὶ τὰ κατὰ διαστολήν γινόμενα: Παλαίος τὸ κύριον, παλαίος δὲ τὸ ἑπίθετον.
Τὰ ἀπὸ ἐπιφορημάτων προπερισσῶνταί χύδην χυδαίος, ἀντὶν ἀνταιος. τὸ μέντοι μάτην μάταιος, καὶ τὸ βέβαιος παρὰ τὸ βέβηκα. τὰ δὲ παρώνυμα παρ᾽ οὐδετέρων γινόμενα οὖν δέχεται γῆς γηραιός, κράτος κραταιός, θέλει ἀραιός.
Τὰ εἰς ΕΙΟΣ καθαρὸν τρισύλλαβα ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ τριτῇ Η ἐποπαροζέυνεται θῆρειος ηλείος χήνειος κήλειος (ὁ καυστικὸς). τὸ μέντοι Ἡλείος θηείος προπερισσᾶται οὐκ ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα. τὸ δὲ Κητεῖος Πηνεῖος οὖν δέχεται ὡς κύρια καὶ τὸ Μηδεῖος κύριον προπαραζεύνεται.

(49.) Τὰ εἰς ΕΙΟΣ ἐπιθετικὰ τρισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὴν πρώτην φύσει ή θέσει μακρὰν, πλῆθος ἐκ τῶν ἐχόντων τῷ Η, περὶ ἄνε σχέσει, καὶ τῶν ἐχόντων ἐννοιάν τοπικῆν, προπαραζεύνονται γλαύκειος δούλειος χρύσειος δούρειος χοίρειος. τὸ μέντοι Ὀλμεῖος Ὀρνεῖος

---

3 Τὰ...5 βέβηκα: cf. Theognost. Can. II 53.17-20 (= 289) Τὰ παρ᾽ ἐπιφορημα διὰ τοῦ αἰών διὰ τῆς αἱ διψθόγγου γραφόμενα οἴον, πολαίοι παλαιοὶ θηραῖοι χυδαῖοι ἄγανοι ἡθαιοὶ σταδαιοὶ ἀνταιοὶ ἄγκαιος παρὰ τὸ ἀγκάς μάταιος. 5 τὸ... βέβηκα: cf. sch. Hom. II. 5.69a1.4 τὸ βεβαῖος (παρὰ γὰρ τὸ βέβηκα); 11.30a1.9 παρὰ τὸ βέβηκα ὁ βεβαῖος τὰ...8 ἀραιοὶ: cf. Theognost. Can. II 52.15-21 (= 283) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ αἰώνος δέχονται τρισύλλαβα ἀπὸ οὐδετέρων διαφόρων παραγεγένει διὰ τῆς αἱ διψθόγγου γραφόμενα οἴον, γῆς γηραῖος γέρας γεφαιοὶ βρατοῖς κράτος κραταιοὶ ἄχος ἀγαιῶς τὸ ἀραιός ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡδῶν ἰθηματος, ὁ δὴλοι τὸ φθεῖρο, γέγονεν ἦθος, καὶ ἐν πλεονασμῷ τοῦ αἱ ἀραιοί, μετελθοῦσαν τῆς δασείας τοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸ α, καθὼς καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡεῖω καὶ ἐργὸν ὀπίου Ἡρωδιεὶν ἐν τῇ καθολοῦ.

Σπερχείος Σπονδείος Δαρδανείος ως κύρια οδύνεται. τὸ δὲ παιδείος (ὁ παιδικός) προπερισπάται.

Τὰ εἰς ΕΙΟΣ τρισύλλαβα κύρια καὶ τὰ πλείω ὀνόματα ποταμῶν οὔνεται Σπερχείος Αλφείος Πηνείος Κηπείος Επείος. τὸ δὲ Αρνείος καὶ Δαρείος προπερισπώνται. ἤπροπαροξύνεται δὲ ταῦτα ἰττερείος ἀσκάτειος. ἦ τὸ δὲ Δαρτανείος οὔνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΕΙΟΣ τριγενὴ μὴ ἐθνικά προπαροξύνεται, εἰ ἀπὸ βραχείας ἄρχοις βρότειος τελειος φλόγειος λύκειος βόειος. τὸ δὲ Επείος κύριον. τὸ δὲ φατείος κατὰ πλεονασμόν ἔσχε τὴν διφθογγ. 4


Τὰ εἰς ἘΙΟΣ ύπερφροσύλλαβα μὴ πλευναούσης τῆς Ε'I διφθόγγου προπαροεύνεται Ἀιάντειος Ὀμῆρειος γαλήνειος Ἰππάρχειος. τὸ δὲ ἀδελφεῖος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφὸς πλευνάζει τῷ EI. τὰ μέντοι προπερισσῶμενα ἀπὸ τῶν Ὀμῆρου λέξεων ευθεῖαν ταῦτα εἰς πρωτανείοις ἐταιρείοις μεγαλείοις γυναικείοις ἀκατειός.

(50.) Τὰ εἰς ΟΙΟΣ ύπερφροσύλλαβα προπερισσῶνται, εἰ ἐπιθετικὰ εἰς ἡ κύρια ὀμφανοῦντα τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις ἀλλοίοις αἰδιοῖς ὁμοίοις γελοίοις παντοίοις. τὸ δὲ φλοίος δισύλλαβον καὶ τὸ κολοίος προσηγορικὸν.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ καθαρὸν ἔχοντα διφθόγγον τὴν διὰ τοῦ Υ ὑζύνεται, ἐπιθετικὰ ὑντα, οὐκ ἐθνικά.

4 τὸ...5 EI: cf. Ep. Hom. 52,6,7-8 9 Τὰ...13 προσηγορικῶν: cf. sch. D. T. Vat. 131,14-6 τὸ μὲν ὁμοίος κατὰ ἀναλογίαν ἐκφέρεται, διὸτα διὰ τοῦ οἰκός ἄπαντα προπερισσῶμεν, ἐταιρείοις γελοίοις ἀλλοίοις; Theognost. Can. II 53,32 - 54,4 (= 292) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ οἰκός υπέρ δύο συλλαβῶς προπερισσῶμενα, εἰς κύρια, εἰς προσηγορικά, διὰ τῆς οἰ διφθόγγον γράφοντα· οἰκός, ἀλλοίος αἰδιοῖς ἐταιρείοις γελοίοις: ὁρίος τῆς ὀρίους ὁμοίους· τοὺς οἱ νεώτεροι Αττικοὶ δὲ προπαραξύνουσιν; Et. Parv. o 11 Οποίος· τὸ ΠΟΙ διφθόγγον· τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΟΙΟΣ θέματα, συλλαβῆς· πρὸ μᾶς τοῦ τόνων ἔχοντα· διὰ τοῦ διφθόγγου γράφοντα· παντοίοις, ἀλλοίοις, ὁποίοις, ἐπιγραφότας· Et. Ged. γ 303,6-8 Γελοίος <8 215> ἐκ τοῦ γελοίος· τὰ διὰ τοῦ οἰκός υπέρ δύο συλλαβῶς ἄπαντα προπερισσώτατα, οἰκός παντοίος ἀλλοίος <πι 181> «ἀλλοίος μοι ἔπειν φάνης νέον ἡ τὸ παροιθέν· ἐταιρείος»· EM 224,40-3 Τὰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ΟΙΟΣ οἰκόματα υπέρ δύο συλλαβῶς ἄπαντα προπερισσώτατα· οἰκός, παντοίος, ἀλλοίος, ἐταιρείος· οἱ δὲ μεταγενέστεροι τῶν Αττικῶν τὸ γελοίος καὶ ὁμοίος προπαραξύνουσιν· οὐκ εὖ.

1 ΕΙΟΣ] ὡς Ο 5 τὸ σκηπτεῖ· τὸ ΜΟ 6 ἐπὶ ὁτ...7 εὐθεῖαν Et. Ged. 382,52 μὴ σημαίνοντα µέρος σώματος habet 7 ταῦτα εἰς C· ταῦτα εἰς M· ταῦτα εἰς O 8 μεγαλεῖοι Schmidt 49,23: μεταλείοις ΜΟ ἀκατεῖοι] ἀκατεῖοι O· Ἐκατεῖος Lobec PGG 322, n. 22 13 κολοίος Schmidt 50,4: κλοίος ΜΟ 15 ἐπιθετικά] κύρια ἡ ἐπιθετικά Schmidt 50,7 (app. crit.); κύρια ἡ ἐπιθετικά, ὁτι etiam Schmidt 50,7 (app. crit.)
ἀκουός καὶ ἐπακουός, ἀγαυός καὶ τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ἐπίθετον. πρόσκειται "εἰ μὴ ἐθνικὰ εἰπ, ἀλλὰ κύρια" ὅτι ταύτα βαρύνεται: ἀκάλαυνος Ἐφραῖνος Αρενος.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς ΒΟΣ, ΓΟΣ, καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς μέχρι τῶν εἰς ΔΟΣ.

Βιβλίον ζ’.

Τὰ εἰς ΒΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια ἢ προσηγορικὰ βαρύνεται ὁλόβος λίβος Λέσβος φλοισβὸς ὀμβος (τὸ μονογενεῖς) τάρβος. σεσημεύεται τὸ ὁλόβος παροξυνόμενον, ὅτε προσηγορικον. Ὀλβος δέ τὸ κύριον, ὄσπερ λοβός (μέρος τοῦ ἡπτατος).

Τὰ εἰς ΒΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἐπιθετικὰ δέχεται στραβός ὁμίβος (ὁ μὴ ὅρθος) καὶ βωβός.

(51.) Τὰ εἰς ΒΟΣ κύρια ἢ προσηγορικὰ υπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς προταρξύνεται ἀραβός κόναβος ἰαμβός κάραβος σάραβος ἀττέλαβος, ὅπερ οἱ Αττικοὶ παραλόγως ὀδύνουσι.

Τὰ εἰς ΒΟΣ ἐπιθετικὰ υπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς, εἰ μὴ τῷ Η παραληγοῦν ἢ σύνθετα εἰπ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΒΟΣ ληγόντων, δέχεται Ἐρέμβος κολοβός βουφορβός ἤπιοφορβός. τὸ δὲ ἐφήβος

ἀνήμος παφαλήγουσι τῷ Ἡ. τὸ δὲ φιλόκυβος σύνθετον.

Τὰ εἰς ΓΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς σύμφωνον λήγουσαν προσηγορικὰ ὄντα ἡ κύρια βαρύνεται πύργος σπόγγος φρόνγος. Γόργος τὸ κύριον, γογγός δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετον. τὸ δὲ σαργός (ὁ ἱθὺς) ὃ ἡξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΓΟΣ ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς σύμφωνον λήγουσαν ἐπιθετικὰ ὄντα, εἰ μὴ ἐννοιά τις ὑπάρχων συνθέσεως, ὃ ἡξύνεται γογγός ἀγορὸς. τὸ μέντοι γάγγος βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ μάργος σύνθετον ἀπὸ τοῦ ΜΑ στερητικοῦ καὶ τὸν ἑργον ὁ γὰρ μάργος οὐδὲν ἑργάζεται ἀγαθὸν.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΓΟΣ διβράχεα βαρύνεται λόγος μόνος ψόγος.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΓΟΣ διβράχεα ἐπιθετικὰ καὶ μῆ (52.) ἐθνικὰ ἡξύνεται φαγός κραγός (ὁ

3 Τὰ...7 ὃ ἡξύνεται: cf. Et. Gud. γ 315.5-8 Τὰ εἰς γος δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὴν [τρίτην] πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς σύμφωνον καταλήγουσαν προσηγορικὰ ὄντα ἡ κύρια βαρύνεται, οἱ πυργοὶ σπόγγος, οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἄλογος. 6 Γόργος...7 ἐπίθετον: cf. Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. recensio e, γ 9 Γόργος κύριον, γογγός δὲ ὁ ταχύς. 11 καὶ...13 ἀγαθόν: cf. Et. Gud. µ 379.49-51 Μάργος, ὁ μανώμενος, οὗ μὴ ἐστὶν ἀρωγή ἡ παρὰ τὸ ἐστερήθητα ἐργαζόμεθα ἀγαθὸν, παρὰ τὸ μὴ καὶ τὸ ἑργον καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐτύχθη. 14 Τὰ...15 ψόγος: cf. Et. Parv. λ 7 Λόγος διὰ τί βαρύνεται; τὰ εἰς ΓΟΣ δισύλλαβα διβράχεα, ἀπὸ ὁμάτων γνώμενα, βαρύνονται: ψόγος (γογγός) μόνος ὁ σημαίνει τὴν κακοπάθειν, έξ οὖ καὶ τὸ μογεῖν τὸ κακοπάθειν; Et. Gud. λ 372.34-7 Λόγος βαρύνεται. τὰ γὰρ εἰς οἱ δισύλλαβα διβράχεα, ἀπὸ ὁμάτων γνώμενα, βαρύνονται, οἷον, ψόγος, μόνος 17 κραγός...85.1 κραγαστικός: cf. sch. Αρ. Εἰ. 487α κραγόν: ἀρισταρχός δέντων, αντὶ τοῦ κραγαστικοῦ, καὶ Ἰρώδιανος ἐν Ἀττικῇ προσῳδίᾳ

1 τῷ] τῷ M, φιλόκυβος Schmidt 51.9: φιλόκυβος MO 3 τὴν M0+e: τὴν τρίτην O2+e 5 σπόγγος M5+e: σπόγγος MO+e, ut videtur 11 γάγνος M: σάγγος Ο: Αγγος Götting (1835), 216 13 ἑργον] ἑργον O 16 διβράχεα M5+e: διβραχεὰ M5+e 17 ἡξύνεται Lobeck RVGNVT 280.17, Meineke FCG IIi 544: βαρύνεται MO ὃ...85.1 τὸ2 Schmidt 52.1-2: τὸ δὲ κραγός ὁ
κραυγαστικός). τὸ δὲ Κράγος βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ Μᾶγος εὐθυκόν.

Τὰ εἰς ΓΟΣ δισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα ἡξύνεται, εἰ μὴ κύρια εἰπ’ λοιγός φηγός. τὸ δὲ Λάγος κύριον.

Τὰ εἰς ΓΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα βραχεία παραληγόμενα προπαροξύνεται πάταγος ἐλεγος (ὁ θησειος).

Τὰ εἰς ΓΟΣ τρισύλλαβα ἀρσενικὰ φύσει ἡ θέσει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα μὴ διπλασιαζομένου τοῦ Γ ἡξύνεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ κύρια εἰπ’ καὶ ἐννοιαν συνῆθεσις ἔχουν ἀργηγός πελαργός ἀμολγός βροτολογός. τὸ δὲ Αμοργος προπαροξύνον ἐπὶ τῆς νήσου οὐκ ἀρσενικόν. καὶ τὸ ὁ μαργός σύνθετον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀμοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρχός ἑστι δὲ ὄνομα κυνός.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ διβραχεὰ ἀρσενικὰ καὶ θηλυκὰ βαρύνονται εἰ δὲ τι ὀξυτονηθῆ, τοῦτο θηλυκὸν προσηγορικὸν εὐρέθη τῷ Ο παραλήγον κλάδος
ἀδὸς κάδος. τὸ μέντοι ὁδός καὶ σποδός ἀξιώνεται ὡς θηλυκά.

(53.) Ἐτι τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ δισύλλαβα <....> ἀξιώνεται ὁδός σποδός σύντος τὸ δὲ φρούδος ἀπὸ τοῦ πρόσωπος σύνθετον, καὶ τὸ Μήδος ἕθυκνον. σεσημεῖωσα τὸ σκοίδος (παρὰ Μακεδόνος ὁ οἰκονόμος) καὶ τὸ χλήδος προπερισσόμενα.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ ἀρσενικά φύσει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα βαρύνεται: Μήδος νίδος ζ.εύδος. τὸ μέντοι καυδός θηλυκόν, ὀσπερ καὶ τὸ μαυδός.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Δ σύμφωνον βαρύνεται: όγός δ' ἱάβδος ἁδός (στήλη λιθίνη).

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Δ

---

3 Ἐτι...7 προπερισσόμενα: cf. Choerob. Ep. Ps. 21.26-8
15 Τὰ...87.5 ἁφωνος: cf. sch. A. R. 284.5-7 τὸ δὲ Σίνδοι Ἡμωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ ζ. τῆς Καθάλου (I 142, Β. Λ.) βαρυτηνεῖν φης δειν τινὲς δὲ ἀντνουσιν, οὐκ εῦ; St. Byz. β 26 Βαλδός· πόλις Φανηκής. ὁ πολίτης Βαλδαιός. τὰ εἰς δος δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ δ ἁφωνον βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἐτιθετικα εἰς Ἰνδός ὁμοιον τῷ ποταμῷ, τὸ λωρός μαυδός ὁ ἁφωνος

1 ἁφωνος] Schmidt 52.17 (app. crit.): οτρομ Ciliae oppidum interlegat St. Byz. 588.21 memoratum, an ἁφωνος, ὁ σατιεταμ (EM 18.29-30) non liquit; possis etiam Παιδὸς vel παιδός; μαυδός Lobek RVGNVT 307.26; γάδος Göttling (1835), 217 μέντοι] μέντοι (sic) O 3 <>] Schmidt 53.1 (app. crit.): 'intercidentur fere haec ex τῇ πρὸ τέλους ἔχουσα Ο ἢ Η εἰ μὴ συνήθετα ύπάρχει ο ἔθνικα'; possis etiam ἐν τῇ πρὸ τέλους ἔχουσα Ο (ήτου) μόνον ἢ καὶ σὺν ἐτέρῳ φωνημέτρῳ ἢ Η εἰ μὴ συνήθετα ύπάρχει ο ἔθνικα
6 σκοίδος em. TGL IV 1705A et Meineke FCG IV 151: κοιός MO:κόδος Oμ:κόδος Oμ:κόδος Oμ:κόδος MO: Schmidt 53.4-5: χλόος MO: Schmidt 53.4 (app. crit.): 'neutra ab h.l. aliena sunt'
σύμφωνον κατὰ διάστασιν βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἐπιθετικά εἰς λίνδος Σίνδος Πίνδος νάρδος μάρδος (αὐλοῦ εἶδος), σεσημείωται τὸ Ἰννός (ποταμός καὶ τὸ ἐθνικόν). τὸ δὲ κονδός ἐπίθετον καὶ τὸ μυνδός (ο ἄφωνος).

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα βραχεία παραληγόμενα προπαροξύνεται ὁμάδος κέλαδος Τένεδος κόρυδος, ὅπερ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ὀξύνουσι.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἔχοντα κατ’ ἐπιπλοκὴν (54) σύμφωνον κύρια ἡ προσηγορικά βαρύνεται μόλυβδος σμάραγδος, τὸ δὲ ὀρυμαγδός ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα κύρια προπαροξύνεται Αβυδος Τένιδος τειχιδός. τὸ μέντοι αἱδός ἐπίθετον. τὸ δὲ κίναιδος προπαροξύνεται τῷ λόγῳ τῆς συνθέσεως.

Τὰ εἰς ΖΟΣ πάντα βαρύνεται ὄξος ὀξίζος ὀξύνεται, ἀφ’ οὗ τὸ «μυνδότεροι νεπόδον» παρὰ Καλλιμάχο. τὰ...18 συνθέσεως: cf. Ep. Hom. α 274 [...] τὰ εἰς δός καθαρὰ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀπλὰ ἐπιθετικά ὀξυνότα ὀξύνεται ὀπικός αἱδός· μὴ ὄντα δὲ ἐπιθετικά βαρύνεται Αβυδος, κίναιδος, Ὀροὶς ὁ ποταμὸς· ὁὐ μένηται Θοουκυδῆς. τὰ...88.3 πρωϊδός: cf. Ep. Hom. χ 34 [...] τὰ δὲ εἰς ὅς ἀρχοντα τριγενή πάντα ὀξύνεται πεῖζος, χθυς, πρωϊδός· τὰ δὲ μονογενὴ βαρύνεται ὄξος, ὀξίζος. σεσημεύτω τὸ μαλᾶς ὃτι μονογενὲς ὄν ὀξύνεται

2 ἐπιθετικά Meineke St. Byz. 157, n. 4 (app. crit.): ἐθνικά MO
3 νάρδος[νάρδος Ο] 4 κονδός[λοῦς malit Meineke propter St. Byz. 157.5 (vide ad n. 4 (app. crit.)) 5 ἄφωνος Ἄρεος de Mευ. n.1. 8 κορυάς] κόρυας O 13 ὀρυμαγδός Λοβέκ: ὀρυμαγδός MO; post ὀρυμαγδός add. καὶ τὸ Ἑορδὸς Meineke St. Byz. 272, n. 3 14 Τα] α οφέιτε[φυό O μακρά] μακρά M 15 Αβυδος Lobeck: ἀιδός ΜΟ 16 Τένιδος τειχισμὸς M (non ἄνδος Μ, quod Galland (1886), 297 annotavit): ἄνδος εἰπός O; Ὀροῦς (coll. AO Cramer I 56) Ἱσοῖς Lobeck PSCP 355.5-8; pro Ὀροῦς Lobeck & Eunóous (e Paus. 7.4.1) Schmidt 54.4 19 ΖΟΣ] δ (expunctum) ὦς ο O ὀξος Lobeck PSCP 361, n. 3, e Cramer AO I 143: ἢξος ΜΟ
ταύτας τρώζος. τὰ δὲ τριγενή καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ ἐπιφρομάτων ὁξύνεται: πεζὸς χθιζός πρωτζος.
Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ μονογενῆ δισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ


1 ταυτός Schmidt 54,7-8: ταυτός ΜΟ τρώζος] Τρίζος e St. Byz. 634,11, ubi Trizoi editur, Lobeck PSGP 361, n. 3; Schmidt 54,8 (app. crit.): ‘propius distant Γάζος St. Byz. g 15 et Αρτάδος Χ. An. 2,4,16; πρόζος nobis addita cautione eripitur; cf. Göttling (1835), 306’ 2 οξύνεται ι διοξυνόμενα Ο
παραλήγοντα μή κοινά κατὰ γένος βαρύνεται
μῦθος κἀθος Ζήθος Σοῦθος (τὸ κύριον). τὸ
dὲ στροφός κοινὸν τῷ γένει.

Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ δισύλλαβα μονογενῆ ἔχοντα τὴν
πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς σύμφωνον
καταλήγουσιν βαρύνεται πτόρθος γόνθος (ὁ
cόγχος) γρόνθος (τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλήσεως)
σμήνθος (ὁ μύς). τὸ δὲ ξανθὸς καὶ τυθὸς
tριγενῆ.

Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ διβράχεα βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ τόπον
dηλοῖεν νόθος πόθος ψόθος <φόθος> (ὁ
ψόφος) μῦθος, τὸ μέντοι βυθός τοπικῶν.

(55.) Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ δισύλλαβα τριγενῆ
παραληγόμενα φύει μακρά ἡ θέσει, μὴ
προηγουμένου τοῦ Σ, ὀξύνεται ἀφθός τυθὸς
ξανθὸς αἰθός (ὁ διάπυρος). τὸ δὲ λοίσθος
ἐχει τὸ Σ. σεσημεῖωται τὸ Πάρθος καὶ τὸ
νόθος.

αὐτοῦ καὶ στροφόθοι. Όφειλε βαρύνεσθαι τὰ γάρ εἰς ΘΟΣ
dισύλλαβα μονογενὴς φύει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα
βαρύνεται, Σοῦθος, κύριον μῦθος, κἀθος, Ζήθος. Ἀλλὰ τὰ
παρὰ τὸ θέω συντιθέμενα ἀπαντὰ ὀξύνεται βοηθός,
ἀγαθός. Οὕτως καὶ στροφόθος; Eust. II. I 347.18-22 ὅθεν καὶ
στροφόθος λέγεται παρὰ τὸ μετὰ ὁστρούν θέσειν. διά καὶ
ὀξύνεται ἡ λέξις κατὰ κανόνα τοιοῦτον. Τὰ εἰς θος
δισύλλαβα φύει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα, ἔχοντα τὸ θέειν
ἐγκείμενον, ὀξύνεται, οἴον βοηθός, ἀγαθός οὕτω καὶ
στροφόθος. τὰ δὲ μὴ τοιοῦτα βαρύνονται, Σοῦθος κύριον,
Ζήθος, μῦθος. 10 Τὰ...12 τοπικῶν: cf. Theognost. Can. II
54.12-4 (=295.1-3) τὰ διὰ τοῦ θοῦ δισύλλαβα διὰ τοῦ ὁ μικρὸν
gράφοντα νόθος-πόθος-φόθος-οὑθος-ψόθος-μῦθος-Κόθος-ὁνομα κύριον·

3 στροφόθοι[ In sch. Ar. Av. 877 pro u' em. C' Schmidt 54.12
(app. crit.) τῷ Μ· τὸ Ο 6 καταλήγουσαν Μπ·: καταληγοῦσαι sine accentu C 10 βαρύνεται scripsi:
ὀξύνεται MO 11 ψόθος Μβ·: ψόφος Μπ·. 〈φόθος〉] add.
Lentz 145.12, coni. iam Lobeck; cf. Theognost. Can. II 54.13 (=295.2); ante φόθος add. ἡ ἀκαθαρσία tamquam glossam ad
ψόθος Lobeck ΠΓΣΕ1 441.9 (Theognost. Can. II 54.13 (=295.2))
17 σεσημείωτα...18 νόθος] Schmidt 55.4 (app. crit.): 'intellege
ὡς κοινὰ τῷ γένει' 18 νόθος scripsi: όθος Μβ·AOB: ἠθοπ· Μβ·.
Τὰ εἰς ΑΘΟΣ μονογενῆ τρισύλλαβα ἀπὸ βραχείας ἀρχόμενα προσπαρεύεται ψάμαθος κύαθος κάλαθος καὶ λάπαθος, τὸ μέντοι ἀγαθός τριγενὲς. τὸ δὲ όρμαθος καὶ γυργαθός οὐκέτι ἀπὸ μακράς ἀρχόμενα.
Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς παραλήγοντα Ιὴ ᾨ καὶ φύσει μακρὰ προσπαρεύεται εἰ δὲ τί καὶ οὐκέτι, ἐπιθετικόν ἐστιν Λάπιθος λέκιθος ἔριθος Μίκυθος ἀκυθὸς (ἡ μὴ τίκτουσα). τὸ δὲ βοηθός καὶ κακήθος (ὁ κάκιστος) οὐκέτι.
Τὰ εἰς ΘΟΣ ὑπερδύσυλλαβα ἔχοντα κατὰ τὴν παραλήγουσαν δύο σῦμφωνα μὴ ὅντα ἐπιθετικὰ προσπαρεύονται. Ἐρυμανθὸς λαβύρινθος Μέλανθος ὀλυνθὸς (τὸ μὴ πέπειον). τὸ δὲ ὅλισθος (ὁ ὁλισθηρός) οὐκέτι ἐπίθετον ὅν.
Τὰ εἰς ΚΟΣ μονογενῆ δισύλλαβα φύσει μακρὰ παραληγόμενα βαρύνεται Φύκος Σώκους τάυκος. (56.) τὸ δὲ σηκὸς οὐκέτι. τὰ δὲ

1 Τὰ…5 ἀρχόμενα: cf. sch. Hom. II. 2.676 Κράατον [τε]: ως λάπαθον, ὡς Κράατον· καὶ γὰρ ὁ τοιοῦτος χαρακτή ὁφειλε βαρύνεσθαι ἐπί θηλυκῶν, λέγω δὲ ὅ εἰς θος λήγων ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, τῷ αὐτοληγόμενος, ἀμαθὸς (cf. E 587), «ψάμαθος» (A 385); Ep. Hom. α 271 τὰ δία του αθος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς μὴ ὅντα τριγενῆ βαρύνεται, οἰον ψάθος λάπαθος κάλαθος ἀμαθος· τὸ ἁγαθὸν τριγενὲς ὅν οὐκέτι σηκείεται τὸ ὅρμαθος.
6 Τὰ…11 οὐκέτι: cf. Theognost. Can. II 58.30-3 (= 315) Τὰ δία του ὅθος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς ἀπάλα διὰ τοῦ ἑραφοντα· οἴον, λέπιθος λέκιθος· ἔριθος; [...] Λάπιθος.
ἐπιθετικὰ ὀξύνεται γλαυκός λευκός γραικός.

Τα εἰς ΚΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια, εἰ ἔχοι τὴν πρὸ τέλους εἰς συμφωνον καταλήγουσαν βαρύνεται Μάκκος Ὄγκος (τὸ κύριον) Λύγκος Φόρκος.

Τα εἰς ΚΟΣ δισύλλαβα προσηγορικὰ μὴ παρασχηματιζόμενα εἰς θηλυκόν γένος, εἰ ἔχοι τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς συμφωνον καταλήγουσαν, πλὴν τοῦ Λ, βαρύνεται Λάκκος κόκκος ἀρκος κέρκος ὅρκος. σεσημεῖωται τὸ θρυγκός. τὸ δὲ χάλκος ἔχει Λ. καὶ τὸ φολκός ἐστι τριγενὲς ἔχον καὶ τὸ Λ.

Τα εἰς ΚΟΣ δισύλλαβα μετ’ ἐπιπλοκῆς συμφώνου του Σ ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα βαρύνεται δίσκος Φύσκος μύσκος. τὸ δὲ ἀσκος ἀπὸ φανήντος ἀρχεται.

Τα εἰς ΚΟΣ διβάσαρα μονογενῆ, εἰτε ἀρσενικά, εἰτε θηλυκά, βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ διαστολή τις σημαινομένου γένοιτο, οἶνον κύκος (?) Πλάκος πόκος τύκος. σεσημεῖωται τὸ φακός ὄξυτονον. Φάκος δὲ τὸ κύριον ὅνομα ὄρος.

Τὰ εἰς ΚΟΣ δισύλλαβα τριγενή ὀξύνεται λευκός γλαυκός πλήν τῶν παραληγόντων τῷ Ω.
Τὰ εἰς ΚΟΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς Α παραληγόμενα, οὐ προηγεῖται σύμφωνον ἢ σύμφωνα, κύρια ὃντα βα[(57)]ρύνεται Λάβδακος Πίνακος Αμάρακος Θακος. σεσημείωται τὸ Αστακός καὶ Μαλακός καὶ Καλλιάκος.

---

4 Τὰ... 93.8 σύνθετον: cf. Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 1° Θακος ... Φύλακος; sch. Hom. ll. 24.566d1 [οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀν] φυλακοῦς; Ἀρίσταρχος κατ᾽ ὀξεῖαν τάσιν προσφέρετο ὡς φρονοῦσι. ἔστι δὲ καὶ [ὅ] λόγος συναγωνιζόμενος τῇ ὀξείᾳ τάσει οὕτως ὡς τὰ εἰς κος λήγοντα ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, παραληγόμενα τῷ α, ἐπιθετικά ὃντα ὀξύνεται, «μαλακός» (τ 234), παρδακός, φαρμακός, ἀνακός, ἐνθὲν ἄνακοιν Διοςκοροῦν; Eust. ll. IV 955.7-13 φυλακτῆρες τε γάρ, ὡς πρὸ ὀλίγων, καὶ φυλακεῖς κοινῶς, καὶ ποιητικῶς φύλακαί, ὃς Ἀρίσταρχος λέγεται ὃι βαρυτόνως φυλάκους προφέρειν, ἀλλ᾽ ὀξυτόνως, καὶ κανόνα παράγειν, ὡς τὰ εἰς κος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, παραληγόμενα τῷ α, ἐπιθετικά ὃντα, ὀξύνονται μαλακός, παρδακός, φαρμακός, ἀνακός ἐδέν καὶ τὸ ἄνακοιν Διοςκοροῦν. καὶ ὃντω μὲν κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον. ἄλλως δὲ τὸ βαρυτονείσθαι τὴν λέξιν πιθανόν ἐκ τοῦ φύλας φυλακοῦς, ἔξ ὃ ὁ φύλακος, ἀναδραμοῦσθι εἰς εὐθείαν τῆς γενικῆς; EM 802.3-6 Φυλακοῦς λάθος: Ἰλαϊν ὁ. Ἀρίσταρχος ὀξύνει τὰ γὰρ εἰς ΚΟΣ λήγοντα ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, παραληγόντα τῷ α, ἐπιθετικά ὃντα, ὀξύνονται, παρδακός, φαρμακός.

---

1 ΚΟΣ Μφο: οὐς Μα. 2 τῷ τῷ Μ 5 οὐ] οὐ Ο 6 Λάβδακος Schmidt 57.1: Λάβδακος ΜΟ 7 Αμάρακος ΜΟ; Schmidt 57.1 (app. crit.): 'Μάρθακος an Αστακός scriperit non liquet, suspectum etiam eti καί' 8 Αστακός Lobeck PSGP 308.30: ἄστακος ΜΟ; Οστακός etiam coni. Lobeck PSGP 308.30; Ἀνακός Götting (1835), 221 Μαλακός Lobeck PSGP 308.35-309.1: ἄλακος ΜΟ: Ανακος etiam coni. Lobeck PSGP 308.35; φύλακος Götting (1835), 221; possis etiam ἄνακος coll. sch. Hom. ll. 24.566d1, 24.566d2, Eust. ll. IV 955.7-13 Καλλιάκος] Καυλιάκος Lobeck PSGP 309, n. 3; Παλικος St. Byz. 522.1
Τὰ εἰς ΚΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα
tῷ Ἀ προσηγορικὰ ἢ ἐπιθετικὰ ὀξύνεται
λιθακός μαλθακός ψιττακός ἀστακός
φυλακός (ὁ φυλάς, Φύλακος δὲ τὸ κύριον)
φαρμακός (ὁ ἐπὶ καθαρῷ τῆς πόλεως
τελευτῶν, φάρμακος δὲ ὁ γόης). σεσημεῖωται τὸ
θύλακος ὑσσακός αἰσθακὸς
προσαρξυνόμενα, καὶ τὸ μαίμακος σύνθετον.
Τὰ [διὰ τοῦ] εἰς ΑΚΟΣ κτητικά ὀξύνεται
Δηλιακός Φρυγιακός Ἰλιακός.
Τὰ εἰς ΕΚΟΣ ἐν ἐστιν Ἀλώπεκος ἀπὸ τῆς
gενηκῆς.
Τὰ εἰς ΟΚΟΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς
προσαρξύνονται στάνια ὄντα τοῦ Καππαδοκοῦς
Σπόρδοκος, τὸ δὲ ἐνδοκός βαρύνεται, [καὶ
tὸ αἰγοβοσκός ὀξύνεται].

---

1 Τὰ...8 σύνθετον: cf. sch. Hom. II. 24.566d2 Τὰ εἰς κος
καθαρόν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς, τῷ Ἀ προσηγορικά ἢ ἐπιθετικά ὀξύνεται, ἀνάκος φαρμακός
φυλακός τὰ γὰρ κύρια βαρύνεται, «Φύλακος» (cf. Z 35),
Τῆλακος. 5 φαρμακός...6 γόης: cf. Ammon. Diff. 494
φαρμακές ὁ φαρμακός· φαρμακός δὲ ὀξυτών ὁ ἐπὶ
καθαρω τῆς πόλεως ὑπτόμενος; Su. φ 104.1-2 Φαρμακός: ὁ
ἐπὶ καθαρῷ πόλεως ἀναφούμενος· ὅν λέγομεν καθαρμα.
gr. 10) f. IV αἰσθακός, μαίμακος 13 Τὰ...16 ὀξύνεται: cf.
Theognost. Can. II 59.17-22 (= 321) Τὰ εἰς κος λήγοντα
καθαρὸν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς τὸ Ἀ προσηγορικά στάνια
ἐστί, καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν περιλήψει ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ Καππαδόκους
λέγεται γάρ τὸ ὄνομα τρίχως· ὁ Καππαδόκος, ὁ Καππαδός, ὁ
Καππαδόκης· ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ Στάρδοκος, Θράκιον δὲ τὸ ὄνομα
διδοκός· διδοκός· Εἰνενδοκός· Δημόδοκος· ὄνομα κύριαν.

3 λιθακός] λιθακός dubitanter Lobeck PSGP 310.11 ψιττακός
Schmidt 57.6: ψιττακός ΜO 6 φαρμακός Lobeck PSGP 309:
φαρμακές ΜO; fortasse φαρμακός δὲ ὁ καὶ φαρμακεῦς ὁ
gόης 8 μαίμακος] ἐπιθέτον ἀπὸ γενικής Lobeck PSGP 315
9 διὰ τοῦ del. Schmidt 57.11 εἰς om. O 11 ἐστὶν] ἐστὶ O
15 Σπόρδοκος ΜO; Σπάρδοκος vel Σπαράδοκος Schmidt 57.16 (app. crit.) καὶ...16 ὀξύνεται del. Schmidt 57.17 et in apparatu
critico notavit: 'verba καὶ τὸ αἰγοβοσκός ὀξύνεται loco non suo
leguntur. Cf. 58.22 (Schmidt)'
Τά εἰς ΚΟΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς μακρὰ παραλιγγωντα σπάνια ὅντα βαρύνεται ἐστρήκος Μάληκος πίθηκος, τὸ δὲ Ἡωλίκος καὶ Ἀρτησκός οὐξεῖται.

(58.) Τά εἰς ΚΟΣ παραλιγγόμενα ΑΙ ἡ ΟΙ μὴ ἐπιθετικὰ προπαροξύνεται. Πάταικος Φάλακος Μίθακος σόλοικος Μόνοικος (τὸ κατὰ συναλλοφήν). τὸ Εὐβοῖκος οὐξεῖται ἐπιθετικὸν ὅν.

Τά εἰς ΚΟΣ ὑπερδιυλλαβα εἰ παραλιγγοῖτο I

5 Τά...9 ὁν.: cf. Theognost. Can. ΙΙ 60.24-7 (= 326) τά διά τοῦ αἰκος ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς, σπάνια τά δέ ὅντα, διά τῆς αἱ διδασάγουν γραφῶνται ὅνοι, Φάλακος Πάταικος· Μίθακος ὅνομα κύριον μόνον τὸ ἀλώτεκος σεσημεῖον τάδ τοῦ ε φύλου. 10 Τά...95.6 Παλικός: cf. Theognost. Can. ΙΙ 59.30 - 60.9 (= 323) Τά εἰς κος λήγοντα καθαρὸν βαρύτονα, εἴτε κύρια, εἴτε προσθετικά, μὴ κτικτικής ἐννοιας ἐχομένα, διά τοῦ ἱ γραφῶντα· καὶ ὅσα μὲν μακρὸν ἔχει τὸ ι σημειούμεθα· ὡς ἔχει τὸ λινικὸς ὅνομα ποιητῶν· Κάκικος· Τρικύκος ὅνόματα ποταμῶν· Ἑλλάνυκος· Φιλίκος ὅνομα κύριον· τὸ γὰρ κτικτικὸς οὐξεῖται, καὶ βραχὺ ἔχει τὸ τὸ καμικὸς ὅνομα ποταμοῦ· ἐν Σικελία ἐχομένον, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἱ γραφῶντα· αἱμῖφολον ἔχει τὸν χρόνον τοῦ ἑ τοιοῦτον δὲ καὶ τὸ Παλικὸς οὐξύτονον, καὶ αὐτὸ πόλεις Σικελικῆ ἐφ' ὥς ἐς ἀποθέμενες κρατήρες· τὰ δὲ ἐχοντα βραχὺ τὸ ὑ, ἐςτὶ τύτα: ἀνθέρικος· ἀνθίνηκος· Σώμοιος ὅνομα λιμένος· Ἐρικος ὅνομα κύριον· Τεμικός ὅνομα πόλεως· Κορηκῆς· Λυκάνικος ὅνομα ποταμοῦ· ἀσφαδίκος· τὸ Θεροκῆς· οἱ πλείους οὐξύνουσι· ΙI 59.7-11 (= 318)

1 μακρὰ[μακρὰ] Μ 2 βαρύνεται Ο: βαρύνεται Μ 3 ἐστρήκος Μάληκος] Theognost. Can. Ατρίκος II 59.25 (= 322.3) et μαλίκος II 59.10 (= 318.4) et μάλικος II 59.26 (322.4); Lobeck PSGP 323.3-4 Ατρήκος vel Ἐστρήκος et μαλίκος / μαλίκος suspiciosa atque ignota censuit; Nauck (1847), 147, n. 4 ἐστρήκος] ἐγορκος Ο 4 Αρτησκός scripsi e Hdt. 4.92.2: ἀρτησκός ΜΟ; Αρδησκός Lobeck PSGP 323.7-13; ἀρδησκός Theognost. Can. II 60.22 (= 325.4) 5 Al ΜΟ[ζ]: τῷ ἡ αἱ Ο[ζ].
μακρόν βαρύνεται Ἀινικός (κύριον) Κάικος Γρηγόρικος Φιλίκος. εἰ δὲ τῇ ΕΙ διφθόγγῳ, ὀξύνεται δαφεικός βοεικός Δεκελεικός Κεραμεικός. σεσημείωται τὸ Καμικός ὀξύτερον καὶ ἔχον τὸ Ι μακρόν, ὀσπερ τὸ Παλικός.

Τὰ εἰς ΙΚΟΣ κητικὰ ἐπιθετικὰ καὶ θηλυκὸν ἔχοντα ὀξύνεται Παλατικός Ιταλικός Πυθαγορικός, τὸ δὲ ἄδικος οὐ κητικὸν. τὸ δὲ Χηλίκος καὶ πηλίκος παροξύνονται οὐ γὰρ κητικά.

Τὰ εἰς ΥΚΟΣ ύπερδιστάλλαβα κύρια ἢ προσηγορικὰ μὴ ἔχοντα κατ᾽ ἵδιαν θηλυκὰ κητικῆς ἐννοίας ἔχομενα βαρύνεται Ἰβυκός Αμυκος κώρυκος Ἰνυκος, τὸ δὲ Λιβύκος καὶ θηλυκός καὶ Ἀλυκός ὀξύνεται θηλυκά ἔχοντα.

---

Τὰ εἰς ΣΚΟΣ I ἢ Υ παραληγόμενα παροένεται σατυρισκος νεανισκος παιδίσκος. τὸ μέντοι Δαμασκός καὶ Ἀρτησικός ἀρχόμενο ἐξέστησα, σὺκ ἔχοντα Ἰ.

(59) Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ διβράχεα ἑβρύνεται. εἰ δὲ τι ἀρχόμενο, ἐνιατὸ ἐνὶ καὶ τὸ ν, καὶ παροένεται σατυρισκος παιδίσκος οὐρανισκος ἀστερισκος τὸ ἀργητικὸς σεσημείωται διὰ τοῦ η γραφόμενον καὶ ἀρχόμενον.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ μονογενή [ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς] μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χ ἀρχόμενο ἐχοντα δίχρονον ἐκτεταμένον, εἰ μὴ τις εἰς ἄστολον, ἑβρύνεται.

---

1 Τὰ...4 I: cf. Theognost. Can. II 60.19-23 (= 325) Τὰ εἰς καὶ λήγοντα υπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς, ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ κ τ σ, τὸ ν παραληγέται, ἐνιατὸ δὲ καὶ τὸ ν, καὶ παροένεται σατυρισκος παιδίσκος οὐρανισκος ἀστερισκος τὸ ἀργητικὸς σεσημείωται διὰ τοῦ η γραφόμενον καὶ ἀρχόμενον.

9 Τὰ...97.8 Σφήνος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 60.33 - 61.9 (= 328) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ υλὸς δισύλλαβα μονογενή, εἶτε κυρία, εἶτε προσηγορικὰ βαρύτονα, διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ ἵ γράφεται οἶων, Ἴλος τὸ κύριον ἐπὶ γάρ τῆς καταδύσεως τοῦ θηρίου ἀρχόμενον πῦλος κτίλος Βήλος όνομα κύριον Μύλος όνομα νήσου φίλος τοῦτο συστέλλει τὸ ν κτίλος ὁ προηγούμενος τῶν προβάτων κριός οἰς ὁμοίων τὸ ψηλὸς χελῶς εἰ καὶ περὶ τὸν τόνον διήλλαξεν τὸ δεῖλος ἀπὸ τοῦ δεός διὰ τῆς ἐς διψθόγχον γράφεται σεσημείωται τὸ Θήλος όνομα κύριον λιμένος καὶ πόλεως Μήλος ό Ζεὺς δήλος ὁ φανερός Σφήνος όνομα κύριον ἴλος τὸ δασύνομον Ἡλὸς τὸ κύριον, ὁ καὶ ψυλώται.

Τὰ...97.5 ἀρχόμενοι: cf. Theognost. Can. II 61.14-23 (= 330) Καθόλου τὰ διὰ τοῦ υλὸς δισύλλαβα τε καὶ υπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς, ἀρχόμενο τε καὶ παροένεται, πλῆρος τοῦ κυλοῦς τοῦτο γάρ διὰ τῆς ὁ δισθόγχον γράφεται, ὅτι εἰρήται καὶ ἐν διαλύει κύλον τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ ψιλοῦ γράφονται οἶων, μυλὸς (scrib. μύλος) τῦλος κτίλος γρύλος σύλως θρύλος χύλος δάκτυλος σπόνδυλος Βάκχυλος Πάπυλος Αίσιχυλος αέμυλος Ρύμυλος στώμυλος κύριολος, ὁ τῶν ἀλκυόνων ἁρήν Βετυλός ὁ λύθος ὁν ὁ Κρονός κατέπειν κρώμυλος δεύμυλος θηβύλος Σίτυλος τύτυλος νικάπυλος Ονήσυλος.

---

1 ΣΚΟΣ] καὶ Ο 4 Ἀρτησίκός ΜΟ; Ἀρθησίκος Lobeck PSGP 323.7-13 6 ἐνεκα] ἐνεκε Ο 9 υπὲρ...συλλαβᾶς del. Schmidt 59.5; δισύλλαβα Schmidt 59.5 (app. crit.)
Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια τῷ Η παραληγόμενα προσπειστάται, οἷον Μήλος Βήλος Δήλος Σφήλος.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ δισύλλαβα προσηγορικὰ ἢ ἐπιθετικὰ τῷ Η παραληγόμενα, εἰ ἔχοι ἀφόνον πρὸ τοῦ Η, ὀδύνεται πηλός βηλός (ο ὁυδός), τὸ μέντοι ἡλός καὶ ζηλός βαρύνεται οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχει ἀφόνον.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΥΛΟΣ δισύλλαβα μονογενὴ μὴ κύρια ὀδύνεται αὐλός δαυλός καυλός. τὸ δὲ

1 Ἡλός...διεστραμμένος: cf. Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. recensio e i 12 Ἡλός: κύριον, Ἰλός δὲ ὁ διεστραμμένος.
6 Τὰ...13 ἀφόνον: cf. sch. Hom. II. 15.338a (Ἅλος δὲ) Σφήλοιο: ὡς «πῦλοι» (Ε 357 al.). ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ κανὼν ὡς τὰ εἰς λος δισύλλαβα, τῷ τὴ παραληγόμενα, κύρια ὅντα βαρύνεσθαι θέλει, Τῆλος Μῆλος Βῆλος· οὕτως οὖν καὶ Σφήλος. τὰ μέντοι προσηγορικὰ ὀδύνεται τηλός χηλός, καὶ βαρύνεται, ὡς δήλος τὸ ἐπιθετικὸν καὶ ἡλός καὶ ζηλός, περὶ ὅν εἰρήσεται ἢμίν ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς προσῳδίας (1, 155, 18); Eust. II. III 738.19-22 Τὰ εἰς λος δισύλλαβα κύρια τῷ τῇ παραληγόμενα βαρύνοντας Τῆλος, Μῆλος, Βῆλος, Σφήλος, ἐπιθετικὰ δὲ ποτὲ μὲν ὀδύνονται, οἷον πηλός, χηλός, κηλός, βηλός οἴκου, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ βαρύνονται δῆλος, Δήλος, ἢ σὲ καὶ ἡλός.
9 Ἐτὶ...13 ἀφόνον: cf. Theognost. Can. II 61.10-3 (= 329) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ Ἡλός δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα εὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἀφόνον διὰ τοῦ τῇ γράφοντας χηλός βηλός, πηλός· φήλος· τοῦτος όμοιον καὶ τὸ δῆλος ἀπὸ τοῦ δέλεος γεγονός κατὰ συναίσθησιν τῶν δύο ἐπὶ εἰς τῇ.

Βραύλος Παύλος Σαῦλος κύρια. <...> καὶ τὸ ναύλος μὴ ὄν κύριον. τὸ δὲ φαύλος ἐπὶθετον.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ ἐπιθετικά ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ ΛΟΣ δι(60)φθογγον τὴν διά του Υ βαρύνεται φαύλος δουλός οὐλος. τὸ δὲ τραυλός ὀξύνεται καὶ τὸ δειλός (?)

Τὰ εἰς δύο ΛΔ κύρια ἀρσενικά βαρύνεται: Ὑλός Τέλλος Μύλλος (ποιητής κωμικός) Γάλλος Ψύλλος (τὸ κύριον). τὸ δὲ κυλός ὀξύνεται ὡς ἐπιθετικόν, καὶ τὸ Μαλλός ηθικον ὅνομα πόλεως.

Τὰ εἰς δύο ΛΔ προσηγορικὰ εἰ μὴ παραλήγουεν ἕξ ὀξύνεται: μαλλός φαλλός φελλός. τὸ σίλλος καὶ βίλλος (τὸ ἀνδρεῖον αἰδοιον, τὸ κοινώς βιλλίν παρὰ Ἐφεσίοις) βαρύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς δύο ΛΔ τριγενή εἰ μὴ παραλήγουεν Α ὀξύνεται: ψελλός ἑλλὸς κυλλός. τὸ μέντοι Γάλλος

---

17 Τὰ...99.2 ἐδνοῦς: cf. sch. Hom. Il. 16.234c.3-9 Τὰ γὰρ εἰς λος ἐτέρω λ παραληγόμενα, οὐ τὸ α μὴ προηγεῖται, ὀξύνεται κυλλός, εἰδὸς χρώματος ἐν Στεφανοπώλειον Ἑβούλου [...] κυλλός, Ἕλλος ἢ Σελλός (ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοῖ), σκελλός, φελλός τὸ προσηγορικόν. τὸ δὲ Γάλλος καὶ «ἄλλος» (A 186 al.) τὸ α ἐχει πρὸ τοῦ λ ἢ ἔτι δὲ τὸ «ἄλλος» καὶ ὡς ἐπιμετρικέμονα βαρύνεται; EM 680.44-7 Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ λήγοντα δισύλλαβα τριγενὴ ἐπίθετα, ἐτέρω λ παραληγόμενα, μὴ ἔχοντα τὸ ω, ὀξύνεται, κυλλός, ἑλλός, ψελλός. Σεσημεῖον τὸ άλλος, ὡς ἐπιμετρικέμονον

καὶ ἄλλος ἔχοντα τὸ Α βαρύνεται. σεσημειώτατο τὸ Ψύλλος τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἕθνους.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ μετ’ ἐπιτλοκῆς συμφώνον βαρύνεται. εἰ δέ τι εἰχ ὤξυτονον, ἐπιθετικὸν ὑπάρχει ὅτε ὁ λέος βύβλος βίβλος ὥρχος κόχλως πέπλος κύκλος. τὸ δὲ τυφλὸς ὀξύνεται ἐπιθετικὸν ὅν, ὄσπερ καὶ τὸ στρεβλὸς καὶ ἐσθλὸς. σεσημειώτατο τὸ μυχλὸς ὀξυνόμενον.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΛΛΟΣ τρισύλλαβα μὴ ἑθνικὰ προσαργεύνεται κρύσταλλος κάλλος ὀκταλλος (ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς παρὰ Βοϊτοῖς) τὸ δὲ Τριβαλλός ἑθνικὸν καὶ τὸ προβαλλός (ἡ ἀστίς) ὀξυνόμενον.

Τὰ υπὲρ τρεῖς συλλαβὰς ἐκφερόμενα παραλήγομεν (61) τῷ Α βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Κ ἄρχοιτον ἀρνυβαλλός (τὸ μαρσίππιον) περίαλλος (τὸ ἴσχυμα) αἰγίθαλλος. κραπαταλλός δὲ (εἶδος νομίσματος) καὶ κορυδαλλός ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΔΛΟΣ πολυσύλλαβα, ὁποῖω φωνήνετι

---

21 Τὰ...100.4 θηλυκόν: cf. Theognost. Can. II 62.10-4 (= 336) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἱλλος διωκαλαβᾶ τε καὶ υπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς διὰ τοῦ ἱ γράφονται ὁν, σύλλος Βίλλος-Στίλλος τὸ ἐθνος-Κύριλλος

παραλήγει πλήν τοῦ Α, προσπαθεῖναι Ἔνσκελλος Μάρκελλος Κύριλλος Σόφιλλος δόριλλος. τὸ δὲ ὀπτίλλος παροξύνεται καὶ τὸ νεογιλλὸς ἔχει θηλυκόν.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΛΟΣ, εἰ ἔχει τὴν τρίτην ἀπὸ τέλους μακράν, προσπαθεῖναι Κώδαλλος Τάνταλος Ἀρπαλλος ἦξαλλος δαίδαλλος. σεσημεύω τὸ ὑμιλλὸς καὶ τὸ Θεσσαλὸς.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΛΟΣ ἔχοντα τὴν τρίτην συνεσταλμένην, θηλυκῶν ἑστηκμένα, εἰ μὴ περιεκτικὴ σημασία ἔκφερθαι, προσπαθεῖναι ἐγκέφαλος πίαλλος Φίγαλλος δάμαλος. τὸ δὲ Ιταλός ὀξύνεται καὶ τὸ αἰγαλλός περιεκτικῶν.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΛΟΣ τριγενῇ ἔχοντα τὴν τρίτην βραχεῖαν ὀξύνεται ἀπαλός χθαμαλός τυχαλός Ιταλός. σεσημεύω τὸ Μέγαλος προσπαθεῖς.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΛΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα μετὰ τοῦ Α ἐκτεταμένου βαροῦνται Φάρσαλος Τάβαλος.

(62.) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΕΛΟΣ μονογενή

---


προσπαραξύνεται, ει μη πάθος τι γένοιτο, ἄμπελος Σθένελος πύελος κύψελος ἀσφόδελος (ἡ βοτάνη, ἄσφοδελος ὁ τόπος ὁ περίεχον). τὸ δειελός (τὸ δειλινὸν) οἴκυνεται, καὶ τὸ βελός καὶ μυελός.

Τα διὰ τοῦ ΕΛΟΣ ἐπιθετικά ύπερδισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὴν τρίτην μακρὰν προσπαραξύνεται ἀείδελος εἰκελος ευτράπελος πέιμπελος (ὁ παλαιὸς). εἰ δὲ τρισύλλαβα εἰπ̄ ἐπιθετικὰ μὴ ὅντα σύνθετα οἴκυνεται Σικελός στροβελός ἱκεφαλός. τὸ δὲ ζάφελος σύνθετον ὁ προσπαραξύνεται.

Τα διὰ τοῦ ΗΛΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα <....> μὴ

εχοντα ἵδια θηλυκὰ προσπαρεύνεται εὐκηλος τράχηλος κάτηλος. τὸ δὲ σιγηλὸς ἔχει θηλυκόν.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἩΛΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ ἔχοντα θηλυκὰ ἦθελεν σιγηλὸς μιμηλὸς ἀπατηλὸς ύψηλος ύδρηλος.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΔΟΣ ἁρανικὰ ύπερδισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὸ I βραχὺ παραθύεται εἰ δὲ τι προσπαρεύτον εἰπ. ἢ πάθει ἢ γένει ναυτίλος Τρώιλος Ζώιλος Πενθίλος. τὸ δὲ αἰγιλὸς θηλυκὸν προσπαρεύνεται. (63.) τὸ δὲ κοῖλος ἀπὸ

πλεονασμῷ τοῦ μ ἐργυμηλός; EM 379.20-6 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἩΛΟΣ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβᾶς προσηγορικὰ ἢ κύρια προσπαρεύνεται ἰών κάμηλος, φάσηλος. τὰ μὲντοι ἐπιθετικὰ ἦθονται, ὅτε ἔχει παραφρασημικὸν θηλυκοῦ ἰῶν, σιγηλὸς, ύψηλος· µὴ οὕτω δὲ ἔχοντα βαφύνεται, βέβηλος, κῆβηλος, κάτηλος, ἐργύμηλος. Γέγονεν παρά τὸ ἐργυόν, ἐργύμηλος τις ἀνὴν καὶ πλεονασµῷ τοῦ μ. Τὰ...102.3 θηλυκόν: cf. Theognost. Can. II 61.32-62.2 (= 333) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἱλος ύπέρ δύο συλλαβᾶς προσπαρεύτων κυρίαι τε καὶ προσηγορικὰ διὰ τοῦ ὁ γράφοντα νίον. Κάμηλος ὄνομα ὅρους τράχηλος· κάτηλος πάσηλος· φάσηλος· κάμηλος· βέβηλος. 4 Τὰ...6 ύψηλος: cf. Palimps. Fragn. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 5' σιγηλος, μιμηλος ἀπατηλος, ὀμβρηλος, ύψηλος; Theognost. Can. II 62.3-5 (= 334) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ήλος ὁδύτων ύπερ δῦο συλλαβᾶς, διὰ τοῦ ὁ γράφοντα ἰων, μιμηλος· σιγηλος· ύψηλος· χαμηλος· ἀπατηλος· ἰδηρος (scrib. ύψηλος· ὀμβρηλος· σκηνηλος. 7 Τὰ...103.2 προσπαρεύνεται: cf. Theognost. Can. II 62.6-9 (= 335) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ήλος ύπερ δυο συλλαβᾶς πρὸ τέλους ἔχοντα τὸν τόνον διὰ τοῦ ὁ γράφοντα Ζώιλος· Καβρίλος· Τρώιλος· ναυτίλος· βανδίλος· πενθίλος· όργιλος· Μυρτίλος· Χωφίλος· φυγιλος. 11 τὸ...103.1 πάθος: cf. Jo. Alex. Τον. παρ. 6.19-24 (18b) Ἀνάπταλιν δὲ ἢ βαρεῖα καὶ ἢ ὀδεῖα εἰς ὀδεῖαν συναφοῦντα, εἰ µὴ τοικὸν καλύσῃ παράγγελμα, ἰών ζωὸς ζῶσ, θεὸς θεις, Πρῶτον Πρῶτον, κόηλον κόηλον τὸ γὰρ κοῖλος κοῖλος διὰ τοικὸν παράγγελμα προσπερεσπάσθη.

τοῦ κοίλου κατὰ πάθος, καὶ τὸ μύτιλος (ὁ ἐσχατός) προσπαροξύνεται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΛΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα, εἰ ἔχοι τὸ I ἐκτεταμένον, προσπαροξύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἡ τρίτη ἔχοι τὸ A, οὐ προκατάρχει σύμφωνον στροβιλὸς (εἰδὸς ὁρχήσεως, στροβιλὸς δὲ ἡ συστροφή τοῦ ἐχῖνου) ἑσβιλὸς ὅμιλος Πάμμιλος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν συλλήψει τὰ σύμφωνα. τὸ δὲ Καδμῖλος (ὁ Ἐρμῆς) προσπεριστάται ἔχον τὸ A.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΛΟΣ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀπλὰ κύρια ἠ προσηγορικὰ προσπαροξύνονται Ας βολὸς ἀκόλος. τὸ δὲ αἰόλος, εἰτε κύριον, εἰτε ἐπίθετον, παροξύνεται, καὶ τὸ βουκόλος παροξύτων. τὸ δὲ ὁ βολὸς ἀξίνεται.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΥΛΟΣ τρισύλλαβα προσηγορικὰ ἦν

---

1 μύτιλος Mης; ο: μύτιλος Mς; cf. Hdn. π.μ.Λ. GG iii.ii 21.2
3 ἔχοι] ἔχει Ο 5 Α...σύμφωνον] Schmidt 63.5 (app. crit.): Ἰμό
A προκατάρχον συμφώνον ἐν συλλήψει ὄντων aut A ὁ
προκατάρχει συμφώνων' 7 ἑσβιλὸς] σέβιλος vel ἱστυλος
Lobeck PSGP 117.14-5; Schmidt 63.6 (app. crit.): 'Sed ἑσβιλες
(leg. ἑσβιλος) ποτηρίου εἰδὸς (παρὰ) Ταραντίνου Hesychius'
Πάμμιλος Ο: πάμμιθος M 8 Καδμῖλος] δι (expunctum)
καδμῖλος O 11 προσπαροξύνονται M: προσπαροξύνοντα (sic)
Ο

---

8 τὸ...9 A: cf. Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 5v

---

(= 330) Καθόλου τὰ διὰ τοῦ υλος δισύλλαβα τε καὶ ύπερ δύο
συλλαβὰς, ὀξύνον τε καὶ παροξύτων, πλην τοῦ κοῖλος-
τοῦτο γὰρ διὰ τῆς οἱ δυσθόγχου γράφεται, ὅτι εὑρήθη καὶ ἐν
διαλύσει κόλου τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα διὰ τοῦ υφοῦ γράφονται
όν, μυλός τύλος στυλός γρύλος σύλος θύλος χῦλος-
δάκτυλος στόνδυλος Βάκχυλος Πάπυλος Αἰσχύλος-
αἰμπολος Ρᾶμπιλος στώμπολος κῦμολος, ὁ τῶν ἀλκυόνων
ἀρχήν Βετύλος (scrib. βαύτυλος; vide etiam apparatus
criticum) ὁ λίθος ὁν ὁ Κρόνος κατέπνει κρύστυλος δείμυλος-
θηβύλος Στίπυλος τίτυλος νικάσυλος Οὐδύλος. Ῥά...
104.4 ἐστι: cf. El. Gud. α 14.4-7 τὰ διὰ τοῦ υλος ἐνσυγκατα
δύο συλλαβὰς εἰτε ὀξύνον εἰτε ἐσχάτον διὰ τοῦ υφοῦ
κύρια, εἰ ἄροις ἀπὸ φύσιν μακρᾶς, παροξύνεται κροβύλος κηρύλος Αἰσχύλος Ῥωμύλος. σεσημεῖωται τὸ βαίτυλος καὶ ὄγκυλος, τὸ δὲ αἴτυλος ἐπίθετον ἐστι.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὙΛΟΣ τρισύλλαβα ἐπιθετικά ἀπλὰ ἔχοντα τὴν τρίτην μακράν παροξύνεται στωμύλος αἴτυλος (64.) (ὁ πράος) στρογγύλος ἀγκύλος καμπύλος. τὸ δὲ αἴτυλος προπαροξύνεται ως σύνθετον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Α καὶ τοῦ συλώ, ὁ πολλὰ συλών.

Τὰ εἰς ὙΛΟΣ τρισύλλαβα κύρια ὡντα ἔχοντα τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν μηκυνομένην παρασχομένων προσηγορικά δὲ ὡντα προπαροξύνεται παροξύνεται Δερκύλος Βακχύλος Χαρμύλος. προπαροξύνεται δὲ τὸ κόνδυλος σφώνυλος δάκτυλος γόγγυλος. τὸ δὲ ΑΞυλος καὶ ΟΞυλος κύρια ὡντα τοῖς προσηγορικοῖς κατὰ τὸν τόνον ἰκολούθησαν.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὙΛΟΣ τριβράχεα, εἰ ἔχοι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ συλλαβῇ τὸ Ι εἰ μὴ εἰπὶ παρώνυμον ἐν

---


1 τίτπυλος] fortasse pítýlος, cf. Lobeck PSGP 121, n. 3, τίτπυλος vel μετίτυλος (= μέτπτυλος)
2 ἐν ΜΟ κύριον Ο: κόθ M Χρύσατος] sine accentu O
3 Λευκός] Λευκός vel Λευκός dubitant Lobeck PSGP 122
4 προσπαθεῖνται] προσπαθεῖνται Ο
5 ἔχοι[en] ἔχοιν MO
6 θηλτος] β' O: β' M
ἐστι Τ, οίον: Κύμωλος ἐνυφώσωλος φάσκολος (ὁ θύλακος) Καστωλός δὲ ὥραν ἔχει θυμίζειν, ἵνα τὸ Ἐν Τ ἐστι. τὸ μέντοι Σπάρτωλος βραχύνει τὰ γὰρ δύο σύμφωνα οὐκ ἔστω ἐν συλλήψει, ἀλλ' ἐν διαστάσει. τὸ δὲ Αἰτωλός τριγενές.

Τὰ δὲ τοῦ ὩΛΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ ὁμοιατικά ἔχοντα τὴν τρίτην μακρὰν ὧραν ἑπειδὼλος Αἰτωλός ἀμαρτωλός. τὸ μέντοι ὠλος (ὁ χθεσινὸς) προσπαροξύνει τὸς παρώνυμον, καὶ τὴν τρίτην βραχειαν ἔχει.

Τὰ εἰς ΛΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα παραληγομένα τῇ διὰ τοῦ Υ διθόνγω προσπαροξύνειν δίαυλος ἰουλος κούμουλος ὑπούλος.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς ΜΟΣ ΝΟΣ ΞΟΣ ΠΟΣ.  

Βιβλίον 2.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Μ τὸ Γ ὧραν προσηγορικὰ ὄντα: νυγιός φραγμός τιναγμός ἀλαλαγμός υλαγμός διώγμος συστηματικότερον ὣν γέμος (ἡ τάξεις) βαρυνόμενον, καὶ τὸ Ρίγμος όυ προσηγορικόν.

(66.) Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ πρὸ τοῦ ΜΔ ἔχοντα ὧραν προσηγορικὰ ὄντα, εἰ δὲ κύρια εἶπ, βαρύνει. ὧραν ἐδείκτη αἴρομος σκιαδὸς, βαρύνομεν δὲ ταῦτα: Κάδμος τό Κύνδνος.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ ΜΘ ἡ Χ ὧραν ἐδείκτη

---

βαθμός ἴσθμός ὑψημός σταθμός αὐχμός. σεσημείωται τὸ κρίθμος βαρυνόμενον.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Μ τὸ Κ σπάνια μὲν εἰσὶ καὶ βαρύνεται, οἴον Λάκμος Δέκμος. τὸ μέντοι Τρωκμός ὡξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ λήγοντα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Μ τὸ Τ βαρύνονται, οἴον πότμος Πάτμος Λάτμος. σεσημείωται τὸ ἀτμός ὡξύνομενον.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ λήγοντα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Μ τὸ Σ προσπηγορικὰ ὡντα ὡξύνεται, μὴ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβῆ τὸ Σ εἰς Ο μόνον καταλήγων, βρυσμός δεσμός δασμός θεσμός χρησμός σπασμός. πρόσκειται προσπηγορικά, ἵνα φύγωμεν τὰ βαρύτονα κύρια τὸ Κροίσμος καὶ τὸ Κάσμος. τὸ δὲ κόσμος βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ κρουσμὸς <οὐκ ἔχον τὸ Ο μόνον> ὡξύνεται, καὶ τὸ σύνδεσμος προσπαροζύνεται σύνθετον ὁν. 

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ προσπηγορικὰ ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβῆν εἰς Λ καταλήγουσαν ὡξύνεται.

ιδίωται, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ Δυκόφρονος καὶ αὐτὸ ὡξύνεται.  

όφθαλμός (67.) τιλμός ψαλμός παλμός ἴνδαλμός. τὸ δὲ ὶλμος τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ προσηγορικόν βαρύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους εἰς Μ καταλήγουσαν ἄρσενικά προσηγορικά, εἰ ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης εἰς συζυγίας, ὀξύνεται γράφῳ γραμμός τρίβω τριμός θλίβω θλιμμός. τὸ δὲ ἄμμος καὶ ψάμμος θηλυκά. ἐτὶ καὶ τὸ μνάμος (ὁ ἕκγονος) βαρύνεται ἐπιθετικόν ὅν.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ διαύλλαβα τῷ Ἡ παραληγόμενα κύρια ὄντα βαρύνεται Κνήμος Σήμος Ῥήμος. τὰ δὲ προσηγορικά ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ τις εἰς κημός (ἡ χώνη, τὸ ἐτυιθέμενον ἐπὶ τῇ ύδρα, ἐξ ἕς ἂι ψήφοι φέρονται) κνημός (ὁ τραχὺς τόπος τῶν ὄρεων) δήμος (τὸ λίπος, δήμος δὲ ὁ ὅχλος).

Τὰ εἰς ΑΜΟΣ μονογενὴ διαύλλαβα παροένεται Σάμος γάμος Ἀμος. τὸ μέντοι ἄμος (ὁ ἐμέτερος καὶ <.....> μηδαμίνος) τριγενές ὅν ὀξύνεται.

---

1 τιλμός] τολμός Ο
2 ὶλμος scripsi praeuenta Schmidt 67.1 (app. crit.): Ἀλμος cum sit in Paus. 9.34.10 videndum, ne post κύριον desint haec καὶ ὶλμος τὸ κύριον. cf. Nauck Ar. Byz. (1848), 239: Άλμος ΜΟ 7 τρίβω τριμός] τρίβον τριμόν Ο
8 μνάμος hasisanter retinui; μάμμος Nauck (1848), 157; fortasse ἄμμαιος
9 Κνήμος...Ρήμος Nauck (1855), 35: κοήμος φήμος πρόκμος ΜΟ; Κνήμος Φήμος Ῥήμος Theognost. Can. II 63.4-5 (= 339.2-3)
10 Λίπος Α: λίπος/λίπος duobus accentibus M: Αίπος Ο
11 Κνήμος...Ρήμος Nauck (1855), 35: κοήμος φήμος πρόκμος ΜΟ; Κνήμος Φήμος Ῥήμος Theognost. Can. II 63.4-5 (= 339.2-3)
12 Λίπος Α: λίπος/λίπος duobus accentibus M: Αίπος Ο
13 Σάμος...Ἀμος] σάμος γάμος ἄμος ΜΟ
14 ἐμέτερος] ἐμέτερον Μ ⇔ Schmidt 67.17 (app. crit.): 'perierunt haec τὸ τίς, ὅθεν καὶ μηδαμός καὶ'; fortasse μηδαμός ὁ τριγενεὶς τριγενενεὶς (sic) Ο
Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Ο ἢ Ε μὴ ὅντα τριγενῆ βαρύνεται, ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἢ συμφωνών βρόμος γόμος τρόμος δρόμος ὁ (68)μος (ὁ σκόληξ) τόμος (ὁ τετμημένος, τομός ὁ τέμνων).

Τὰ εἰς ΥΜΟΣ ἔχοντα τὸ Υ ἐκτεταμένον δισύλλαβα ὁδύνεται κρυμός ὁμός χυμός θυμός. θύμος δὲ τὸ κύμιον, ἢ ἢ βοτάνη, τὸ δὲ δρυμός καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ προσηγορικοῦ ὁδύνεται.

1 Τὰ...5 τέμνων: cf. Theognost. Can. Π 63.31-64.6 (= 342) καθόλου τὰ εἰς ὁς, εἶτε βαρύτωνα, εἶτε ὁδύτωνα, ἀπὸ ὁμάς τὸ ἐπαραληγόμενος γνώμενα, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ γράφονται: βρόμω βρόμως γέμω γόμως τρόμω τρόμως τέμνω τόμως: μένω μόνως φένω τὸ φονεύω φόνος: πένω πόνως: νεῖψω τὸ χονιζώ νόψος, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ γ γνόφος: τέκνος τόκως μείρω τὸ μεζίω μόρος, καὶ πλενοσμός τὸ μόρος καὶ κατα ἐναλλαγήν του ὁ μορος καὶ ἐπεὶ τὸ μ πρὸ τοῦ θ ούτε κατὰ σύλληψιν, οὕτε κατὰ διάστασιν ἐστὶν εἰρέτει, τετραπταί τὸ μ εἰς τὸ β, καὶ γένοντο βρότος οὕτως Ἡμωδανός ἐν Ἕπεμερισμῷ; Choerob. Ep. Ps. 32.8-10 Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ καθάρα δισύλλαβα ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ συμφώνου παραληγόμενα τῷ Ε ἢ τῷ Ο μὴ ὅντα τριγενή βαρύνεται, οἶον γόμως, τρόμως, βρόμως; 96.15-8 Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ καθάρα δισύλλαβα μὴ ὅντα τριγενη βαρύνεται, οἶον τρόμως, βρόμως τὸ μέντοι νομός καὶ βωμός πρὸς διάφορον σημανόμενον ὁδύνεται. 5 τόμος...τέμνων: cf. Choerob. in Theod. 236.12 τομός ὑμτόνως ὁ τέμνων καὶ τόμος βαρύτωνας ὁ τεμνόμενος


1 Τὰ] ὁ Ο 2 ἀρχόμενα] ἀρνφόμενα Ο 7 χυμός...8 θυμός Schmidt 68.4: inv. ord. ΜΟ 8 κύμιον] κὐΜ ἢ ἢ] ὢ
Τὰ εἰς ὙΜΟΣ δισύλλαβα προσηγορικά ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ συμφώνου μή τοῦ Μ, εἰ ἐπὶ οὐσίας τάττοιτο, ἐξύνεται: βωμός ψωμός ζωμός θωμός (ὁ σωφός). τὸ μέντοι κάμος (ἡ ὥδη) βαρύνεται καὶ τὸ μόμος ἀπὸ τοῦ M ἁρχεταί, καὶ τὸ Ρωμός καὶ Κρώμος κύριον βαρύνεται, ὡσπερ τὸ ὁμός.

1 Τά...7 ὁμός: cf. Theognost. Can. II 63.18-30 (= 341.1-11) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὁμοῦ δισύλλαβα δέυτερα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα, καὶ ἐπὶ οὐσίας τιθέμενα, διὰ τοῦ ὁ μεγάλου γράφονταν οἶον, μῷος (scrib. βαιμός) ξωμός· ψωμός· θωμός· ὁ σωφός· ὁς ὁμοῖοι καὶ τὸ βρῶμος ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου βαρύτον, ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ ἡχοῦ διὰ τοῦ ὁ μικροῦ βαρύτον· παρὰ γὰρ τὸ βρῶμο βρῶμος, ὡς τρέμω τρόμος· καὶ ὃτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ οὐσίας· τὸ ὁμός ἐπὶ τοῦ σκληροῦ διὰ τοῦ ὁ, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἥξεται, καὶ οὐσίαν ὑπερξηκεῖται τὸ κώμος ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενον, τὴν γραφὴν φυλάττον, τὸν τόνον καὶ τὴν σημασίαν παρήμειψεν· τὸ ὁμός ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος τὴν σημασίαν φυλάζων καὶ τὴν γραφὴν, περὶ τὸν τόνον διενήχει; Et. Gud. ψ 576.10-3 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὁμοῦ καθαρὰ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικά, δέυτερα, μὴ διεφοροῦμενα, διὰ τοῦ ὁ γράφεται, οἶον, βωμός, ζωμός, ψωμός, μὴ διεφοροῦμενα εἰπε, διὰ τὸ τομός καὶ τομός.

8 Τὰ...111.3 βαρύνεται: cf. Theognost. Can. II 64.7-12 (= 343) Τὰ εἰς μος δισύλλαβα διφθόγγον τῇ δίᾳ τοῦ 1 παραληγόμενα, σπάνια καὶ ἐν άρχομοι· ὅποιον τι ἐστὶν τὸ λοιμός ἀπὸ τοῦ λεῖπαν γεγονός κατὰ ἐναλλαγήν τοῦ π εἰς μ, καὶ τοῦ λαμός ἀπὸ τοῦ λαύκω καὶ τοῦ δειμός· ἀπὸ τοῦ δειμός· καὶ τοῦ Λίμου ἀνομα κύριον, ἄφροι καὶ Λίμου τὸ ὁρὸ ἐν Θράκῃ, καὶ οἶμος εἰπε τῆς ὄδου; Chöroeb. Ep. Ps. 27.32-28.1 Τὰ εἰς μος καθαρὰ δισύλλαβα διφθόγγον παραληγόμενα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα σπάνια εἰσὶ καὶ ἐξύνεται, οἶον λαμός, λοιμός, τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ

2 μὴ Schmidt: ᾧ ΜΟ
4 ὁ σωφός π: ὁ σωφός Μ (littera paenultima codicis M tamquam i scribitur): ὁ σωφός Ο ὁδή] ὁδή Μ
5 καὶ...6 Κρώμος] καὶ τὸ βρῶμος καὶ βρῶμος ΜΟ;
Schmidt 68.11 (app. crit.) malit: Βρῶμος καὶ Ράμος vel βρῶμος καὶ Κρώμος, nisi Βρῶμος i. q. Βρόμος; καὶ τὸ βρῶμος ὁ χόρτος καὶ Κρώμος Lentz 169.18 (app. crit.) 6 κύριον] κῦρο
ΜΟ
7 ὁμός e Theognost. Can. II 63.27-8 (= 341.10-1) et sch. Hom. ll. 3.35b1, praeeunte Schmidttio 68.12 (app. crit.), qui πρώμος an ὁμός proposuit: πώλος ΜΟ
παραλήγοντα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα οὖν καὶ λαμαρίους τῷ Δείμος καὶ οἶμος

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΜΟΣ τριβράχεα προσπαρεξύνεται, εἰ μὴ προηγεῖται τῷ Α τῷ Τ̣̩ πλοκάμος Κέραμος κάλαμος Θάλαμος κύριμος Πριάμος, τὸ μέντοι ἰταμός καὶ ποταμός οὖν καὶ διόνυσται ὡς ἔχοντα τὸ Τ̣̩ πρὸ τοῦ Α.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΜΟΣ, εἰ ἔχοι τὴν πρώτην φύσει

---

2 Δείμος Μ; δόμος Ο̣̩ καὶ...3 βαρύνεται βαρύνεται καὶ οἷμος
3 βαρύνεται Mο̣: Ι ἰταμός...ποταμός Ο̣̩: ποταμός καὶ ἰταμός Ο̣̩, sed numerus β supra ποταμός et numerus α supra ἰταμός inversam ordinem vocum indicant 9 ἔχοι] ἔχει ΜΟ̣̩ φύσει scripsi coll. sch. Hom. II. 24.228a.6-15, Eust. II. IV 893.6-7 (vide apparatus locorum similium): θέσει ΜΟ̣̩; Schmidt 68.21 (app. crit.): 'forte φύσει vel ei mi... θέσει'
μακράν, εἰ μὲν κύρια εἰη, προσπαθεύεται
Πύραμος (69.) Σήσαμος· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὄξυνται
οὐλαμὸς χρηματὸς (ἡ κατάδυσις) φωριαμός
(τὸ κιβώτιον).
Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΜΟΣ, εἰ ἀρχεῖ τὰ ἀπὸ δύο
συμφώνων, κύρια ὅντα ἤ ἐπιθετα,
προσπαθεύεται ἄρταμος (ὁ μάγευσος)
ὀρχαμος Πέργαμος ἐμπέραμος, τὸ μέντοι
σχινδαλαμὸς (ὁ σχισμὸς) ὀξύνεται
προσηγορικοὶ ὁν.
Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ὑπερδισφάλλα παραληγόμενα

tοῦ ἱππα; π 479.23-5 τὰ διὰ τοῦ αμος ὄνοματα, εἰ μὲν ἂν
κύρια, βαρύνονται, ὅνον Προμίος, Σίσαμος· εἰ δὲ μὴ ὤντος
ἐχε, ὀξύνονται, ὄιον φωριαμός, χρημάτος; EM 804.17-23 Τὰ
diὰ τοῦ ΑΜΟΣ τρισύλλαβα, ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους
συλλαβῆν φύσει μακράν, πάντα ὀξύνονται, χρημάτος,
ουλαμὸς, ὤντος ὄν καὶ φωριαμός καὶ πλεονεκιμὸν τὸ 1,
φωριαμός. θωάδος ω. Ἰορδανίδος περὶ άττικῶν προσφώνων,
τρίτη ἀπὸ τέλους ἢ ὀξεία ὄν ὡς ἀναλογοῦν, ἀλλ' ὡς
Ἀττικῶν. Ἡ μὲντοι συνήθεια ὀξυνόμενον ἔχει; 688.16-8 Τὰ διὰ
tοῦ ΑΜΟΣ ὄνοματα, εἰ μὲν ἂν κύρια, βαρύνεται, ὡς
Σίσαμος· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὀξύνεται, ὡς φωριαμός, χρημάτος; Eust. II.
IV 893.6-7 τὰ δὲ φύσει, εἰ μὲν εἰς κύρια, βαρύνεται Πύραμος,
Τεῦταμος· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὀξύνεται χρημάτος, οὐλαμός, ὄντω καὶ
φωριαμός, η κιβώτιος. 5 Τὰ... 10 ὄν: cf. sch. Hom. II.
24.228a.6-8 δεύτερον δὲ ὡς τὰ ἔχοντα τὴν ἀρχουσαν μακράν,
eἰ μὲν θέτει ὅ, βαρύνεται, «ὁρχαμος» (B 837. M 110 al.),
Τῦρταμος, «Πέργαμος» (cf. Δ 508. Z 512 al.); Eust. II. IV 893.5-6
ἐτὶ δὲ τὰ ἔχοντα τὴν ἀρχουσαν μακρᾶς θέτει βαρύνεται
ὁρχαμος, Τῦρταμος, Πέργαμος. 11 Τὰ... 113.3 ὀξύνεται: cf.
Palmes. Fragment. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 4v Περὶ τῶν εἰς
εἰμὸ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς παραληγομένων ... Τὴλεός,
Ἑχεμος, τρήγεμος (τρήγεμος?), πόλεμος, ἀνεμος, κοιλεμος,
θελεμος; Theognost. Can. II 64.13-7 (= 344.1-5) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ εἰμὸ
ἀπλὰ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς διὰ τοῦ ε ψυλον γράφονται ὁν,

2 Σήσαμος Lobbeck PSGP 156; σύσαμος MO; Κύσαμος (Nomn. D.
13.237) etiam Lobbeck PSGP 156 3 χρημάτως Bloch (in Dindorf
(1823), I 56) et Götting (1835), 194: χρημός Μφο: χρημός
Μπο, ut videtur 6 ἐπίθετα Μφο: προσηγορικά Μβο.
8 εμπέραμος Lobbeck PSGP 156: ἐμπέρας MO
9 σχινδαλαμός ... σχισμός Lobbeck PSGP 156 adiutus coniectura
Götting (1835), 194: κινδαμός ὡς ἐλεγμὸς MO
τὸ Ἐ προσπαροξύνεται Τῆλεμος Ἐχεμος πόλεμος ἀνεμος. τὸ δὲ θελεμός ἀπὸ τοῦ θελημος οὔνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ἀπλὰ τῷ Ὡ παραλήγοντα σπάνια ὀντα προσπαροξύνεται ἔρημος (ἀττικάς, ἕρημος δὲ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῷ) ἵμης. ἤτι καὶ τὰ συνθέτα Εὐθήμος εὐφήμους.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα προσπαροξύνεται ἀγώγιμος ὑψιμος πρώιμος ὠφέλιμος ἀλκίμος.

Τὰ εἰς ΟΜΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα προσπαροξύνεται κέρτομος ἀνθρομος (ὁ ἀνθρώπης) ἐβδομος θεόμος· πλὴν τοῦ καρατόμος ἁγροκομος ἀπὸ ῥημάτων συντεθέντων.
Τά εἰς ΥΜΟΣ ἔχοντα τό Υ βραχύ πρὸ τοῦ ΜΟΣ (70.) προσπαρεξύνεται ἐλυμὸς ἐτυμὸς δίδυμος Σόλυμος ἐρυμὸς. τοῦ μέντοι κωλυμὸς καὶ ὑμὸς τὸ Υ μακρὸν.
Τά εἰς ΜΟΣ τρισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΙ διφθόγγω μὴ παρεσχηματισμένα θηλυκῷ γένει ὀξύνεται κυδοιμός [ἄθροισμός ἀφλοισμός] (ἡ ταραχή). τὸ δὲ ἐτοιμὸς

1 Τά...4 μακρὸν: cf. Επ. Ημ. ν 47 τά εἰς μος λήγοντα ὀνόματα ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν τῷ ν παραληγόμενα συνεσταλμένο βαρύνεται, οἶον Ἐλυμὸς, χέλυμος, σκόλυμος (εἴδος βασάνιτς). πρόσκειται «ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν» διὰ τὸ χμός. πρόσκειται «τῷ ν συνεσταλμένῳ παραληγόμενα» διὰ τὸ ὑμός <καὶ> κωλυμός ἐκτεταμένων ἔχοντα τῷ ν; Theognost. Can. II 64.28-32 (= 346.1-5) Τά διὰ τοῦ ὑμος προσπαρεξύνεται διὰ τοῦ ν ψυλοῦ γράφονται Ἐλυμὸς· ἡδυμὸς· νήμυμος ἐτυμὸς ὁ ἀληθῆς, καὶ ἐν πλευνασμῷ τῆς τῇ συλλαβῆς ἑτυμοῦς· δίδυμος· Σόλυμος· Πόλυμος ὀνόμα κύριον σκόλυμος (scrib. σκόλυμος)· ἐρυμὸς ὁ ὑμός· ὑμὸν κατὰ γραφὴν οὐ κατὰ τόνον, ὀξύνεται γάρ; Εἰ. Συνελ. ν 407.19-23 τά εἰς μος λήγοντα ὀνόματα, ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν προσπαρεξύνεται, μὴ ὄντα σύνθετα, τῷ ν παραληγόμενα, συστέλλει τὸ ν, οἶον, ἔρυμος (scrib. ἐρυμὸς), Ἐλυμὸς, δίδυμος, ἐστυμος τὸ γὰρ πρόθυμον σύνθετον; ΕΜ 603.10-4 τά εἰς ΜΟΣ λήγοντα ὀνόματα ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν προσπαρεξύνεται, μὴ ὄντα σύνθετα, τῷ ν παραληγόμενα, συστέλλει αὐτό, ἔρυμος, Ἐλυμὸς, ἐστυμος, δίδυμος· τὸ γὰρ πρόθυμον σύνθετον. 5 Τά...115.2 προσπαρεξύνεται: cf. Theognost. Can. II 64.33-65.5 (= 347) Τά διὰ τοῦ ὑμος τρισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται μὴ παρεσχηματιστόναι εἰς θηλυκόν γένος διὰ τῆς δι διφθόγγων γράφονται· οἶον, ἀλυμός· κυδομός· ἁμομός κατὰ ἐναλλαγὴν στιχεῖων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁμομός· σπειρίζεται τό ἐτοιμος προσπαρεξύνεμον καὶ διὰ τῆς δι διφθόγγου γραφώμενον· τριγενεῖς γάρ, καὶ τὸ ἀλυμός.

1 ΥΜΟΣ| μος MO 2 ἐλυμὸς spiritu incerto O ἐτυμοῦς Ο 4 κωλυμὸς em. Lobeck PGG 423, cf. Επ. Ημ. ν 47: κωλυμὸς MO 7 ἀθροισμός...8 ἀφλοισμός del. Schmidt: ἀθροισμός ἀφλοισμός (ἀφλοισμός M) MORE: ἀθροισμός ἀφλοισμός ΩΡ.
άττικόν, τὸ δὲ ἐτοίμος κοινόν. καὶ τὸ ἀλύσιμος (ὁ ὀἰκτρός) προσπαροξύνεται.
Τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Ν ἐν τι τῶν μέσων στοιχείων, ἔχοντα θηλυκόν γένος, ὀξύνεται στεγνός στυγνός ἁγνὸς κεδνός. τὸ μέντα λάγνος βαρύνεται οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ ἰδιὸν θηλυκόν. ἀωσάκτωσ καὶ τὰ κύρια Κύννος Πῦνος Κάλυνος.
Τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ ἀπλὰ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Ν ἐν τι τῶν


ἀντιστοίχων οὔντει, ἐπιθετικὰ ὅντα καὶ μῆ ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους ΟΡ· πυκνὸς κραίπνος τερπνός στροφνὸς ἵσχυς· σεσημεώται τὸ λίχνος βαρύτονον, ὡς σύνθετον παρὰ τὸ λίγον χαίνειν. τὸ δε μόρφον (ὁ μέλας) ἔχει τὸ ΟΡ, καὶ τὸ ὅκνος προσηγορικὸν.

Τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ ἔνογγενή δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ ΝΟΣ ἐν τοῖς ἀντιστοίχων, πλήν τοῦ Α, βαρύνεται (71.) ὅκνος κύκνος Κύθνος Πέφυς ύπνος Σίφυς. τὸ δε καπνὸς οὔντει ἔχον τὸ Α.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα, εἰ παραλήγοι Α μετὰ συμφώνου, βαρύνεται θάμνος ὅμνος.

3 ἵσχυς] ἵσχος ΟV·, ut videtur 5 χαίνειν Μ: χαίγειν Ο μέλας] μέγας ΜΟ 11 οὔντει C: οὔντον ΟΟ ἔχου] ἔχον τ α ΟV·
τὸ δὲ ἀμύνος ἐξύνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Α γὰρ καὶ ἐπιθετικότερον ἀμενὸς γὰρ παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν μένος.

Τὰ εἰς ΜΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἐξοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους μὴ φύσει μακράν, μονογενὴ μὲν ὅντα βαρύνεται ὄμνος σκύμνος Τύμνος· τριγενὴ δὲ ἔξυνεται γυμνὸς σεμνὸς στυμνὸς (ὁ σκληρός).

Τὰ εἰς ΝΟΣ υπερδισύλλαβα κύρια ἡ προσηγορικά μὴ ἐξοντα ἰδία θηλυκά, προπαροῦνται Λάτυμνος Λύκαμνος Ἐπίαιμνος Αἰσυμνος. τὸ μέντοι ἐρεμνὸς ἔχει θηλυκόν τὸ ἔρεμνή, ὄσπερ καὶ τὸ ἐρυμνὸς (ὁ κεκαλυμμένος).

Τὰ εἰς δύο NN βαρύνεται ἀπαρασχημάτιστα ὅντα θηλυκῷ γένει βλέννος θύννος Κύννος Δάτυμνος Ἀργυμνὸς τύραννος. τὰ μέντα

1 τὸ...3 μένος: cf. Eust. Il. II 62.6-8 Τὸ ἀμύνος ἐξύνεται διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀντιστέφειν τὸν κανόνα. οὐ γὰρ εἰ τι ἔξυνεται, ἡδὴ καὶ τριγενές ἐστί καὶ ἀπλοῦν.

2 ἐπιθετικότερον Ο: ἐπιθετικὸν M 4 ΜΝΟΣ Schmidt: νος MO 6 Τύμνος Schmidt 71.9 (app. crit.), postea etiam Lenz 174.16: τέμνο νος MO τριγενὴς τριγενῆς Ο 7 ὅ...8 σκληρός om. Ο 11 προπαροῦνται Schmidt: παραδίδονται MO Δάτυμνος Schmidt 71.12: ἄτυμος MO; Schmidt 71.12 (app. crit.): 'Longius discendunt ἄμμον Λεπτύμνος Ἐκάτμονός Λύκαμνος] Λύκαμνος haesitanter Schmidt 71.13 (app. crit.) 12 Αἰσύμνος Schmidt: αἰσμνὸς MO 16 θηλυκῷ Ο: θηλυκῷ M θύννος om. Ο 17 Δάτυμνος θύρσις: δάθυννος MO; fortasse etiam Σίγυννος (St. Byz. 565.3), κάρυννος, κήρυννος
ἐχοντα θηλυκά ὀξύνεται ἐραννὸς (ὁ ποθεινός) ἀργεννὸς κλεεννὸς ἐρεβεννὸς.

Τὰ εἰς ΕΡΝΟΣ Ἰταλιωτικά παροεύνεται Φαλέρνος Πατέρνος.

Τὰ εἰς ΑΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια ὄντα ἀπὸ προσηγγο(72)οικά, μὴ ἔχοντα διαστολήν, βαρύνεται Τάνος Φάνος (τὸ κύριον) θράνος (ὁ διφρός). τὰ μέντοι ἐπιθετικά ἢ προσηγγορικά ἔχοντα διαστολὴν ὀξύνεται φανός. τὸ δὲ πλάνος βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ νάνος (ὁ μικρός).

Τὰ εἰς ΕΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα τινα μὲν βαρύνεται ἐνος (ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς) ἐνος· τινά δὲ ὀξύνεται κενός στενός.

---

3 Τὰ...4 Πατέρνος: cf. Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 7 Φαλέρνος, πατέρνος
7 Φάνος...9 φανός: cf. Jo. Alex. p. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. recensio a ϕ 2 Φάνος· τὸ κύριον παροεύνεται, φανός· τὸ προσηγγορικόν ὀξύνεται; cf. etiam recensio b ϕ 3, recensio c ϕ 3, recensio d ϕ 2, recensio e ϕ
8 τὰ...9 φανός: cf. Palimps. Fragm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 7 Περὶ τῶν εἰς ἀνος δισύλλαβον ἐπιθετικῶν ἢ προσηγγορικῶν ἔχονταν ἀντίδιαστολήν, φανός, πανός, δανός, τμανός, μανός, μανόστημος

---

1 ἐραννὸς] ἐρανὸς Ο 2 κλεεννὸς Schmidt 71.20: κλειεννός ΜΟ; κελαδεννός Lobeck PGSE 398, G. Dindorf TGL IV 1416D 3 Ἰταλιωτικά] Ἰταλικά Ο παροεύνεται Μ; ὀξύνεται Ο 7 Φάνος...8 διφρός] Φάνος... πάνος ὁ λύχνος Lehrs (1833), 291; βάνος το τυφλός Göttling (1835), 197 θράνος Lentz 175.31: πάνος ΜΟ 10 νάνος] νάνος ΜΟ 11 δισύλλαβα τινα] δισύλλαβα τινα Μ; δισύλλαβα τινα Ο βαρύνεται Ο: βαρύνονται Μ
Τὰ εἰς ΗΝΟΣ κύρια ἡ προσηγορικὰ βαρύνεται: Τήνος Σφήνος (ὅ τόπος) Ρήνος. τά δ’ ἐπίθετα ἐξύνεται φήνος (ὁ λαμπρός) πτηνοὶ. ἔτι καὶ τὸ λιθοὶ μή ὅν ἐπίθετον.

Τὰ εἰς ΙΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα βαρύνεται: Νίνος πίνος δίνους σχίνος. τό δὲ κλεινὸς αἰνός δεινὸς ὑπάνεται μὴ ἔχοντα τὸ I μόνον.

Τὰ εἰς ΥΝΟΣ δισύλλαβα, εἰ μὴ κύρια εἰη, ὑπάνεται Θυνὸς ἔννοις γρυνὸς (ἡ ὅικα τῶν ἕυλων ἡ ἑσοτ καὶ παχεία) πλυνὸς.

---


---

Τα εις ΩΝΟΣ βαρύνονται Πρώνος κάνος ὁ νος (ή τιμή).
Τα εις ΑΙΝΟΣ και ΟΙΝΟΣ μονογενή βαρύνεται αίνος Αδαινος Κόλαινος οίνος σχοίνος. το (73.3) μέντοι κοινός τριγενές, ὄσπερ τὸ δαφαίνος κελαινός καινός αίνος.
Τα εις ΝΟΣ διφθόγγω παραληγόμενα τῇ διὰ τοῦ Υ μονογενή ὀξύνεται καυνός γλαυνός βαυνός (διπέρ οἱ Αττικοὶ βαρύνουσι) κρουνός βουνός κεκαυνός. τὸ μέντοι χαῦνος τριγενές, τὸ δε πύραυνος (ὁ χυτρόπους) προσπαρεβοῦται.
Τα εις ΑΝΟΣ τοῦ Α βραχέος ὄντος, εἰ μή.

1 Τά...2 τιμή: cf. Theognost. Can. II 66.14-7 (= 356.1-4) τὰ διὰ τοῦ νονος διουλάλαμα μή ἀπὸ όρματος ἔχοντα τήν γένεσιν διὰ τοῦ ω μεγάλου γράφονται όνον, ὅνος ἡ τιμή Πρόνος πόλες Κρήτη: κώνος τὸ ἀποσκάσμα τῆς γῆς: στάνος χώνος ἡ χώνη φόνος ὃ μεγαλόφωνος
13 Τά...121.5 θηλυκόν: cf. Palimpsest. Fraggm. (cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10) f. 25r (in margine) Περὶ τῶν εἰς νος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς ἐχόντων πρὸ τοῦ ὃ ... στέφανος, κλίμακος, χάλας, γέμανος (κέανος cod.), ἄγκανος, λίβανος, Τιτανός, Τιανός, άναξανος,
θηλυκά ἔχοι, εἰ μὴ πρὸ τοῦ Α τὸ Δ ἢ Ε ἢ Ἰ υπάρχου, προσπαρεπιεῖται στέφανος κλίβανος λίβανος χώανος. σεσημείωται τὸ πελανός οὐρανός Σικανός. τὸ δὲ πιθανὸς ἔχει θηλυκόν. τὸ δὲ "Δ πρὸ τοῦ A" διὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ΔΑΝΟΣ, ὅτι πάντα ἀξίζεται, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ὀφθεὶ πρὸ τοῦ Δ τὸ R καταλήγουν, οἰον ἡδανός (ὁ ἡδός) οὐτιδανός ἐλλεδανός (ὁ συντρέφων) ὄιγεδανός Απιδανός. ἐφυλάζατο δὲ ὀ κανῶν "τὸ R πρὸ τοῦ Δ υπάρχον" διὰ τὸ Δάρδανος Ιόρδανος, προσπαρεῦτονα. ......

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΝΟΣ τριγενῆ ἀξίζεται στεγανός (ὁ πυκνός) πιθανός <ἀγανός> (ὁ πράος) ἰκανὸς ὀρφανός.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΜΕΝΟΣ μετοχικὰ ἀξίζουνται, εἰ μὴ


1 ἔχοι ΜΟΕ: ἔχει ΟΕ: ἦ [I] Schmidt 73.9: 'cum spectare possint ad ὀκεανός Ριανός (cf. Hdn. apud St. Byz. 577.8, 628.14) nolui Δ μετά τοῦ E ἢ Ἰ reponere' ὑπάρχοι ὑπάρχῃ ΜΟ 5 τὸ ...Δ] i. e. προσεκεῖται 11 Ιόρδανος] Schmidt 73.18 (app. crit.): 'malit Ιάρδανος' 13 <ἀγανός> additi: omissionem statuit Schmidt 73.20 (app. crit.) 14 πράος Ο: πράος Μ 15 ΜΕΝΟΣ] μένος ΟΕ:
πάθος τι γένηται παρά τήν φωνήν, τότε γὰρ προσπαρ(74).

Τά δέ ὧντονα ταῦτα· Τισσαμεὺς Ακεσαμεὺς Φαµενός Ἰαµενός Σωζοµενός. τὸ Ἰάλµενος προσπαροῦντα ἦν παθὸν, ὀσπερ καὶ τὸ Ὄρµενος Κλύµενος ἰκµενος.

Τά εἰς ἸΝΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ ἢ παρασύνθετα ὦνται, εἰ μὴ παρώνυμα εἰς κατὰ τροπὴν γένους θηλυκοῦ εἰς τήν εἰς ΟΣ κατάλειψιν γενόµενα, ἢ παρὰ γενικῆς ἀναπεµφθέντα, ἢ παρὰ Συφακουσίως παράγοιτο καθ’ ὀµοιωµατικῆς σηµασίας, ὦνται καὶ ταῦτα· Τυρηνός Ἀβυδηνός. τὸ δὲ πανσέληνος σύνθετον, ὀσπερ καὶ τὸ δύστηνος δήµηνος τρίµηνος.

Τά εἰς ἸΝΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα τὸ Ι βραχὺ

---

5 ὦντονα διὰ τοῦ ε ἱπλὸν γράφεται οἶνον, Τισσαμεὺς· Σωζοµενός· Δεξαµενός· οἰς ἀκόλουθα κατὰ τόνον τε καὶ γραφὴν καὶ τὰ τούτων θηλυκά. 7 Τά…14 τρίµηνος; cf. Theognost. Can. II 67.32-68.3 (= 367) Τά διὰ τοῦ ἤνος ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς μὴ ὀντα· μήτε ὑποκοριστικά, διὰ τοῦ 9 ὧνται τοῦ ἤνος, Ακεσαμεὺς ὀνόμα ποταµοῦ· Εὐηνός· σεληνός· ποτηρίνος· ἄγινος· ἰκέλος· γαλαθηνός· πετνὸς· ἀργηνός: τὸ δύστηνος δήµηνος· πανσέληνος· δυσχόµην σύνθετα, περὶ τόνον μόνον οὐ γραφὴν διηλλάζειν. 16 Τά…123.4 χειµερινός; cf. Theognost. Can. II 67.14-8 (= 363.1-5) τά διὰ τοῦ ἤνος ἐπί μετουσίας λαµβανόμενα, ἢ τοιαύτης ἔλης ἐχόµενα, προσπαροῦτον διὰ τού· τοῦ· γράφονται· οἶνον, ξελίνος· δρύινος· λίθινος· πέτρινος· γῆνος· δεµαντίνος· τοῦτος· ὀμοίο· τὸ κάµινος· ἱκτίνιος· κυκλάμινος· κόψινος· κόπτινος· διὰ τοῦ· τοῦ· γραφίµενα, εἰ καὶ μή μετουσίαστικα; Et. Gud. i 275.44-8 τά γάρ διά τοῦ ἤνος προσπαροῦτον, μὴ ὄντα ἀπὸ ἄπλου, ἔχοντα τήν εἰ διάθηγον, διὰ τοῦ· τοῦ· γράφεται· οἶνον, δήµηνος· δρύινος· ξελίνος· κάµινος· ἱκτίνιος· ἰκτίνος· οὐτοίς· οὐν· καὶ ἱκτίνος· EM 470.40-2 τά γάρ διὰ τοῦ· ἸΝΟΣ προσπαροῦτον, μὴ ὄντα ἀπὸ ἄπλου, ἔχοντα

---

ἐχόντα σημαίνοντα μετουσίαν προσπαθεῖνεται κρατίνος δάφνινος φήγινος πύρινος εὐλίνος λίθινος, τὰ μέντοι ἀπὸ καρφοῦ ἢ ἀπὸ ἔπηρήματος ὄξυνεται θερινὸς χειμερινός.

Τὰ εἰς ἸΝΟΣ μακρὸν τὸ Ι ἤχοντα, ὅσα ἐν ὑδατι διαιτᾶται, προπερισπόνται ἐχίνος κορακίνος φοξίνος. καρκίνος. ἐχρήν καὶ τὸ γυρίνος προπερισπᾶται (ὁ μικρὸς βάτραχος). στάναι δὲ τὰ ὄξυτονομένα ἐρινός (ὁ ἐρινεύς) καὶ τὸ χαλινός.

(75) Τὰ εἰς ἸΝΟΣ τὸ Ι μακρὸν ἤχοντα κύρια ἢ ἐδύνα ἢ ἐπιθετικā ἡ ὑποκοριστικῶν ἔννοιαν ἤχοντα προπερισπόνται Φιλίνος Κρατίνος Ἐχίνος (τὸ κύριον) Λατίνος Λεοντίνος Ρηγίνος Μαμερτίνος. τὸ δὲ λαρινός ὄξυνεται.
Τὰ εἰς ἙΙΝΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ παρώνημα οὖν τεῖται φαεινός σκοτεινός ἀλγεινός βορεινός ταπεινός (τὸ ἐπίθετον).
τὸ δὲ ἐὐ εἰεινὸς σύνθετον ὑπὸ προσπαροξύνεται.
Τὰ εἰς ΥΝΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα προποσαροξύνεται εἰ δὲ τὸ ἐξυπηρέτηθη, ἑθυκὸν εὐφρέθη κίνδυνος Πάρχυνος πίσυνος βόθυνος. τὸ μέντοι Βιθυνὸς καὶ Μαριαμνὸς ἑθυκά. τὸ μέντοι μόσυνος ἀπὸ γενικῆς μετῆχθη.
Τὰ εἰς ΩΝΟΣ ἀπλὰ ὑπερδισύλλαβα οὖν ἐντεῖται.

---

1 Τὰ...4 προσπαροξύνεται: cf. Choerob. De Orthogr. 179.23-8 τὰ γὰρ εἰς νος ἐξύτωνα παρώνημα, μὴ ἐπὶ καιρὸν λαμβανόμενα, ἀποστρέφονται τὴν διὰ τοῦ 1 κέιμον γραφῆναι ὕσιν, ὅρος, ἀρχεινός φάος, φαεινός πόθος, ποθεινός φῶς, φωτός, φωτεινός καὶ τὸ κτητικὸν ὅνομα ὁμοίως φωτεινὸς διὰ διήθηγον ἔλεος, ἔλεεινὸς βορέας, βορεινὸς σκότος, σκοτεινός καὶ αἰτίς, αἰτεινός: Et. Συμ. II 170.18-20 τὰ μέντοι εἰς νος ἐξύτωνα παρώνημα διὰ τῆς εἰ διῆχογον γραφοῦντα φάος φαεινός, ἀλγος ἀλγεινός, πόθος ποθεινός, ἔλεος ἔλεεινὸς οὕτως ἀρχος ἀρχεινός. 5 Τὰ...10 μετῆχθη: cf. St. Byz. β 98.3-6 τὰ δὲ εἰς νος καθαρὸν ὑπερδισύλλαβα τῷ ὑ παραληγόμενα προποσαροξύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἑθυκά εἰπτ. τὸ μόσυνος βαρυνόμενον σημειώσεις καὶ μακρὸν ἔχει τὸ ὑ (τὰ γὰρ ἔχοντα τὸ σ βραχυ ἔχει τὸ ὑ), καὶ τὸ γέφυρος ὁ μικρὸς βάταρχος: Theognost. Can. II 68.8-11 (= 369) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὑνος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς οὐκ οἴδε πρὸ τέλους τὴν ἡ διῆχογον ὕσιν, Πάρχυνος: Μόσυνος κίνδυνος: χέλυνος: εὐθύνος: Ρόσχυνος: Πολύνυος: Ὀρόνυος, ὅνομα ποταμοὶ: Κόρυνος. 11 Τὰ...125.4 προσπηγορικὸν: cf. Ep. Hom. 5.α.6-8 Οἰωνός οὖν ἐξύτεται τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὑνος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς ἀπλὰ ὑπερδισύλλαβα τῇ θέλει, ὅσιον οἰωνός, κοινωνός, Τιθυνός πρόσκεπται, ἀπλὰ διὰ τὸ τετράγονος, ἄφωνος, εὐθύνος; Choerob. in Theod. 373.23-9 οὐκ ἔχομεν γὰρ εὐθεῖαν εἰς νος καθαρὸν διαπλαβόνων τῷ ὑ παραληγομένην καὶ ἐξυμομένην.

---

κοινωνός οἰωνός Γελωνός, τά δὲ σύνθετα προσαρθέντα τετράγωνος εὐφώνος εὐφώνος, τὸ δὲ κόρωνος κύριον, τὸ δὲ κοινωνός προσηγορικόν.

Τὰ εἰς ἙΩΣ θηλυκὰ βαρύνονται Λῖπαξος Ἀραξος (ἀκρωτήριον) Πῦξος (ἡ πόλις καὶ τὸ φυτόν). τὸ μέντοι ιξός ὡς προσηγορικόν ὑπένεται, καὶ τὸ λοξός φοξός ὡς ἐπιθέτα, καὶ τὸ Κοραξος ὡς ἐθνικὸν.

(76.) Τὰ εἰς ΠΟΣ δισύλλαβα μὴ ὄντα ἐπιθετικὰ παραλήγοντα διχόνω ἢ μακρῷ φωνεῖ βαρύνεται ἵπτος (ἡ παγίς) ὑπὸς ὑπὸς (ὁ παντοδαπός φόρτος) κήπος.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραλήγοντα διχόνω καταλήγοντι εἰς Μ ἢ Π βαρύνεται ἵπτος

βαρυνόμενην δὲ ἔχομεν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ κόρως (σημαίνει δὲ τὸ στροβίλοιδες ἦγουν το εἰς ὀξύ λήγουν) ἄνως (σημαίνει δὲ τὴν τιμήν) τοῦτοι χάριν ύπερ ὑπερ ἐξαιρότερον πρὸςκεῖται «δισύλλαβον», ἐπειδὴ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἔχομεν εὐθείαν ὑμνομένην οἶον κοινωνός ὀιωνός Τιθωνός; Theognost. Can. Π 68.16-20 (= 371) τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἄνως ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀπλά ὑπότονα διὰ τοῦ ὁ μεγάλου γραφονταί οἴον, νάων ο ὕψων ύπερ ὑπερ οἵτως θύμος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου Τιθωνός; Θυανός; Καλανός; καλανός προετοιμήθης Πλωνός ὑμοια ἑθνούς; Ἑτεονός; Κανωνός; Καλανός; ὅρθωνός ὑμείαν ἑθνούς; Κορμός. 10 Τὰ...13 κήπος; cf. Choerob. Ep. Ps. 46.18-21 τὰ εἰς ΠΟΣ λήγοντα, ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβὴν καταλήγονταν εἰς Μ ἢ εἰς Π, βαρύνοντα, οἶον ἵπτος, κάμπος, πάπτος; μάχεται τὸ καρπὸς ὑμνόμενον ὡς γὰρ ἔχει τὸ διχόνω λήγον εἰς Μ ἢ εἰς Π.

κάμπος Λάμπος (τὸ κύριον λαμπός δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετον), τὸ δὲ καρπός ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΟΣ δισύλλαβα μὴ ἐπιθετικὰ ἔχοντα Ο ἐν τῇ παραληγοῦσι μετὰ συμφώνων ἢ συμφώνων, εἰ μὴ διαφορὰν τινὰ ποιοῦ, ὡς υποστέφει εἰς ὁμοῖα τῷ Ε παραληγόμενον, βαρύνεται τρόπος ὁ τρέπων τροπός ὁ τετραμένος, κόμπος τὸ προσηγορικὸν κομπός τὸ ἐπίθετον, τόπος κόπος κόλπος δόρπος. τὸ μέντοι σκοπός ὀξύνεται, ὡσπερ τὰ ἐπίθεται λοιπόν γρυπὸς πομπὸς χαλέπος.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΔΑΠΟΣ πάντα παρηγμένα ὀξύνονται ἡ μεδαπός ποδαπός παντοδαπός ἀλλοδαπός. ἐτὶ τὰ ἐπιθετικὰ σύνθετα τῷ Ω παραληγόμενα αἰμωπός κελαινωπός πολυπός.

Τὰ εἰς ΠΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα ἀρσενικὰ ὄντα καὶ ἐπιθετικά, εἰ μὴ παραλήγοντο τῷ Ω, προπαροξύνεται Ἀροπός Ἀναπός Ἀστέροπος ὅλυμπος Ἐύριπος Χάριπος (τὸ κύριον, χαριπός δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετος77.τον).

---


1 λαμπός...2 ἐπίθετον Mu-m. 7 κόμπος κόμπος δὲ Ὀ 13 ποδαπός π...πος Ὀ 17 Τὰ] ἄ (τ om. in spatio vacuo) Ὀ 18 ἐπιθετικά] μὴ ἐπιθετικὰ haesianter Schmidt 76.21 19 Αροπός] Ατρόπος Göttling (1835), 219 20 ὅλυμπος] ὅλυμπος Ὀ Χάριπος] χαριπός Ὀ
σεσημεώσται τὸ ἀτραπός ὄξυνόμενον. τὰ δὲ παραληγόμενα τῷ Ὑ κύρια ἡ προσηγορικά καὶ
βαρύνεται καὶ ὀξύνεται. τὰ μὲν οὖν κύρια ἀπὸ
φύτει μακράς ἀρχόμενα ὀξύνεται Ἰνωπὸς Ἀσωπὸς
Ωραπός, σημείωσα τὸ Αἰσώπος. τὸ
dὲ Κρότωπος καὶ Μελάνωπος κύρια οὖν ἀπὸ
μακράς ἀρχοντα. τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπος
προσηγορικόν προπαραδείγνεται. τὸ μὲντοι
στενώπος ὀξύνεται προσηγορικόν ὁν ἐπὶ
θηλυκοῦ μόνον. ἔτι καὶ τὸ ἀλωπός ὀξύνεται.

Περὶ τῶν εἰς ΡΩΣ ΣΟΣ ΤΟΣ ΦΟΣ καὶ τῶν
καθεξῆς.

Βιβλίον ἡ'.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΩΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Α
κύρια ὁντα ἡ προσηγορικά βαρύνεται λάρος
κάρος φάρος Σάρος (ποταμός) Πάρος. τὰ
μέντοι ἐπίθετα ὀξύνεται μιναρός (ὁ ἠδύς)
λαρὸς (ὁ γλυκύς) ψαρός βλαρός.

Τὰ εἰς ΗΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια ὁντα
βαρύνεται Σήρος Τρήρος ᾿Ηρος. τὰ δὲ
προσηγορικά, εἰ μή (78.) ἀπὸ συμφώνων ἀρχοντο,

1 τὰ...7 ἀρχοντα: cf. Theognost. Can. II 69.22-4 (= 381.1-3) Τὰ
eἰς πος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς βαρύτονα ἀπὸ βραχείας
ἀρχόμενα διὰ τοῦ ὁ μεγάλου γράφει τὴν παρατέλευτον
Κρότωπος ὁνομα κύριον Μελάνωπος: 19 Τὰ...128.11
οίκος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 69.27-34 (= 382) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ήρος
diσύλλαβα κύρια τε καὶ προσηγορικά καὶ ἐπίθετα, ὅπως ἂν
eἰς τάτες, διὰ τοῦ ὁ γράφεται οὖν, Ζήρος ὁνομα κύριον
Δήρος πόλις Κρητικῆ, ἀμφότερα βαρύνοντα: πηρός: μηρός;
κηρός: Ἱηρός: ψηρός ἡ τροφὴ τῶν θεῶν κλήρος: Λήρος:
σκληρός: νηρός σημειώσεται διὰ τοῦ ο ὁ γράφουμεν κύρια
τέσσαρα: Ἱρος: Υήρος: Κηρος: καὶ ἐπὶ προσηγορικόν
ἀξίων ὁ δύο ἀρχοντικόν κώμη.

1 οξύνομενον] θηλυκον καὶ οξυνομενον haesitanter Schmidt
77.1 (app. crit.) 2 τῶ] τῷ M 4 φύσι M4: om. M41. Ἰωστὸς
Schmidt e Theognostio 380.3: οινωπός MO et Göttling (1835),
219; Unger (1839), 368 5 Ἱωστὸς Schmidt 77.4, cf. Theognost.
Can. II 69.19 (= 380.3): ὀρφωπός ΜΟ σημειώσατα σημειώσεται Ο
7 ἀνθρώπος] ἀνος O 20 Σήρος... ᾿Ηρος] Schmidt 77.19 (app.
crit.): 'malit Βήρος Τρήρος Σήρος, quibus addendum fortasse
Δήρος' Τρήρος] τήρος MO
ἀξίνεται κηρὸς φηρός. τὸ μέντοι κλήρος
βαρύνεται ὡς ἀπὸ δύο συμφώνων ἀρέσκουν.
Τὰ εἰς ἩΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἐπιθετικὰ ὅντα μετὰ
θηλυκῶν, εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ ἡμιφάνου ἄρχοιτο, ἐξίνεται
σκληρὸς ἕηρος. τὸ δὲ λήρος μονογενές.
Τὰ εἰς ὈΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Ἐκ
κύρια ὅντα βαρύνεται Ἰρός Πύρος Τύρος
Σκύρος τὸ κύριον. εἰ μέντοι προσηγορικὰ ἢ
ἐπιθετικὰ εἰπ, ἐξίνεται ἱρός (ὁ ἱερός) λιρός
(ὁ ἀναίδης) σιρός (τὸ προσηγορικὸν, ὁ κατάγεινος
οἶκος).
Τὰ εἰς ὈΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Ἡ
βαρύνεται, ὡς τὸν γίγνεται ἀπὸ τῶν

6 Τὰ... 11 οἴκος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 69.31-4 (= 382.5-8) (vide suprā); EM 475.24-8 τὰ δίὰ τοῦ ὉΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια καὶ
βαρύνονται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἕ γράφονται, διόν, Κύρος, ὄνομα
κύριον Πύρος, ὄνομα ποταμοῦ καὶ Τύρος, ὄνομα ποταμοῦ
Μύρος, ποταμὸς Φρυγίας: σκίρος, ὁ γύψος. 12 Τὰ...129.11
deīρω: cf. Theognost. Can. II 70.14-7 (= 385) Τὰ δίὰ τοῦ ὄρος
dισύλλαβα ἀπὸ ὑμίματον γινόμενα διὰ τοῦ ὁ μύρον
gράφοντα: εἴρω τὸ συμπλέκω ὄρος: στείρω στόρος: χαίρω
χαίρω χόρος τροπῆ τοῦ ὁ εἰς σ’ οὔτως Ἡρωδανός εν τῇ
καθόλου στείρω στόρος φθεῖρο φθόρος; sch. D. T. Vat. 108.17-26
Σχηματίζεται δὲ ὄρος τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον: ἀστερὶ
ἀπὸ τοῦ στείρω γέγονε στόρος, οὔτω καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴρω
(τὸ συμπλέκω καὶ συνάπτω) γίνεται ὄρος καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὄρος
συμπλέκει καὶ συνάπτει τὸ ὀρατό τὰ ἄδικα αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ εἴρω
dε καὶ ὀρόμοι, τὸ σημαίνον τὸν περιτραχήλιον κόσμον, καὶ
γὰρ ὁ περιτραχήλιος κόσμος συμπεριέχει κόσμων τοῖς καὶ ἐκ
tοῦτον καὶ ὀρός ὁ λιμήν, περικτικός γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ λιμήν
πλήθους νεόν. Ἡρωδανός δὲ λέγει, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρου (τὸ
βλέπω) γέγονεν ὄρος καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὄρος εὐόρατα καὶ εὐόρατα
ποιεῖ ἡμῖν τᾶ ὀρειμένα. Εἰλικρίνως δὲ δασύνεται τὸ ὄρος εἰτὲ
gὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴρω γινόμενον (τὸ συμπλέκω) δασύνεται,
ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ εἴρω δασύνεται, εἰτὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρου ἀστάντως.
παραληγημένων Ε ἢ Εἱ διφθόγγῳ ὑμάτων, εἰ μὴ
tις διαστολή γένοιτο σπόρος ὦτι σπείρω,
pτόρος (ὁ πταρμός) ὦτι πτείρω, φθόρος ὦτι
φθέιρω, μόρος ὦτι κείρω, φόρος ὦτι φέρω, φορός ὀ
δέ (ὁ ἄνεμος) οὔτουνας, ὦρος, εἰρώ γάρ, ὦρος
dὲ οὔτονως (τὸ ἀρφυλιζόμενον τοῦ γάλακτος).
τὸ μέντοι βορός (ὁ πολλά ἐσθίων) καὶ τὸ χορός καὶ
σωρός (ὁ τάφος) καὶ τοῦρος οὔτουναί ὀὐ γάρ γίνονται ἀπὸ
tοιοῦτον ὥτι(79)μάτων. σεσημεῖονται τὸ δορός (ὁ
dεδαρμενός) εἰ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δείρω.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγήμενα τῷ Υ
βραχεὶ βαρύνεται Σύρος Τύρος. εἰ δὲ ἔχοι
ἐστεπάμενον, κύρια μὲν ὄντα βαρύνεται Κύρος
Σκύρος (ἡ νήσος) Σφύρος· μὴ οὕτως δὲ,
οὔτε τῷρος ὦτὸς (ὁ σύτος) τυρός Εὐρός.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ μονογενὴ δισύλλαβα

12 Ἐ...Εἰ σκρίψε: εἰ ἢ ε (αι πρὸ ποῦ dedit Galland (1886), 297) Μ: εἰ
ἡ ἢ Ο; τῇ ε ἢ ε ἢ αι (per πταίρω, sed vide annotationem de
πτείρῳ) Schmidt 78.13-4 3 πτείρῳ] πταίρῳ Schmidt 78.16
6 εἰρώ M: εἰρὼ Ο ὁρός (perperam ὁρός Galland (1886), 297)
ΜΟ 9 τοῖς] τυρός ΜΟ ὀὔτε οὔτοι Ο ΜΟρός ὀὔτουνας Ωτος:
αὐτοῦ Ο: αὐτοῦ Μ ὀὔτος Ο: ὀὔτω Schmidt 79.1: ὀὔτος ΜΟ; fallitur
Lobeck RVGNVT 279 11 δεϊκτος] δ...ρῶ Ο 13 Σύρος] accentu
incerto Ο ἐχοὶ Ο: ἐχεῖ M 14 μὲν Μαὶ: Ο: οὖτω Schmidt 79.6 (cf. Paus. II 23.4): φύρος ΜΟ
οὐτος ΜΟ: οὔτω Schmidt 79.6
παραληγόμενα τῷ Ὡ βαρύνεται Δόφος Βόρος Χλώρος (τὸ κύριον), σεσημεώται τὸ σωρός (τὸ πληθος). τὰ μέντοι ἐπιθετικά ὀξύνεται χλωρός βλωρός (ὁ ὑπόλευκος) ζωρός (ὁ ἀμικτος) μωρός καὶ μώρος ἀττικός.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ΑΙ διφθόγγῳ, εἰ μὲν κύρια εἰπ, βαρύνεται Σφαῖρος Σκαῖρος· εἰ δὲ μὴ οὕτως, ὀξύνεται καὶ ρός· τὸ δαῖρος διφορείται (ήτοι ὁ καυστικός).

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα τῇ ΑΥ διφθόγγῳ παραληγόμενα ἐπὶ ἐμψύχων τιθέμενα βαρύνεται φλαύρος σαύρος καῦρος (ὁ κακός).

dισύλλαβα, τῷ ω, παραληγόμενα, μὴ ὅντα ἐπιθετικά βαρυνεῖται. ὥρος, δόφος, χρός, φλόρος, βύρος· σεσημεώται τὸ σωρός ὀξύνεμον· τὰ δὲ ὀξύνα ἐπιθετικά εἰσιν, οἷον χλωρός, ψφόρος, μωρός· EM 742.25-31 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ΡΟΣ λήγοντα δισύλλαβα, τῷ ω παραληγόμενα, μὴ ὅντα ἐπίθετα, βαρύνεται, Ὡρος, Δόφος, Φλώρος, Βύρος· οὐδὲν ἔχομεν ὀξύνον· σεσημεώται τὸ σωρός· τὰ ὀξύνα ἐπίθετα εἰσίν, χλωρός, ψφόρος, μωρός· Πῶς οὖν ὀξύνεται τὸ σωρός· Ἡλόγητα ὅταν δισύλλαβή· τὸ πρῶτον ἁρα σωρός, ὡς ὀχέας, λοχεός; Zonar. ο 1703.20-1704.3 τὰ εἰς τοῖς ἐργά δήγοντα δισύλλαβα τῷ ω παραληγόντα, μὴ ὅντα ἐπίθετα, βαρυνείται. Ὡρος· Δόφος· Φλώρος· Βύρος· σεσημεώται τὸ Σωρός ὀξύνομενον· τὰ δὲ ὀξύνομενα ἐπιθετικά εἰσιν, χλωρός· μωρός· ψφόρος.

6 Τὰ...9 καυστικός: cf. Choerob. Ep. Ps. 46.35-47.3 Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ καθαρὰ δισύλλαβα τῇ ΑΙ διφθόγγῳ παραληγόμενα, εἰ μὲν εἰσὶν κύρια, βαρύνονται, οἷον σφαῖρος, καῦρος (scrib. Σκαῖρος), εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὀξύνονται, οἷον καῦρος, θαυμός; Theognost. Can. II 70.18-21 ( = 386) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ αἰρος δισύλλαβα στάνα καὶ ἐν ἑσπλήρωμα νεοτικόν διὰ τῆς αἱ διφθόγγῳ γράφοντα Σφαῖρος· Σκαῖρος· οὔνομα κύρια· τὸ καῦρος ὀξύνομον· τὸ γὰρ δαῖρος πεῖ τόνον διαφορεῖται (scrib. διφορείται).

10 Τὰ...131.2 γέγονε: cf. Et. Gud. γ 300.3-4 τὰ εἰς τοῖς δισύλλαβα τῇ αἱ διφθόγγῳ παραληγόμενα ἢ προσηγορικά ἢ ἐπίθετα <προ>περισσαῖα, οἷον σαύρος μαύρος ταῦρος γαύρος.

σημειώσαι τὸ σταυρὸς ἁψυχον· καὶ τὸ μαύρος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁμαύρου γέγονε.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα τῇ ΕΥ παραληγόμενα σπάνια ὅντα βαρύνονται εὗρος πλεύρος, τὸ δὲ λευρὸς ἐπιθετικόν, καὶ τὸ Νευρὸς ὄνομα ἐδύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΥ διφθογγῳ βαρύνεται, εἰ μή τι εἰς κατὰ διαστολήν (80) οὐρος (ὁ ἄνεμος, σύρος τόπος ὁ περιορίζων τὰς ναὸς) Φρούρος (τὸ κύριον, φρούρος τὸ ἐπίθετον) κούρος θούρος λούρος (πλακούντος εἶδος), τὸ δὲ κηπουρὸς καὶ οἰκούρος ὡς σύνθετα ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Α μονογενῆ ἡ κύρια προπαροξύνεται Πάνδαρος Πάνδαρος κόμαρος.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα δεδιπλασιασμένα κατ’ ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν πρώτην συλλαβήν εἰς Π καταλήγοντα προπαροξύνεται βάρβαρος Τάρταρος μάρμαρος κέραμος πέρσπερο βόρβορος.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα Α συνεσταλμένῳ ἡ ἐκτεταμένῳ τριγενῇ ὁντα ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ δεδιπλασίασται ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ χαλαρός λιπαρός χιλαρός ψαφαρός λαγαρός (ὁ ἀσθενής), τὸ μέντοι φλαρος

7 Τὰ...13 ὀξύνεται: cf. sch. Hom. ll. 2.153a.4-6 τὰ γάρ εἰς ὅς λήγοντα δισύλλαβα ἀπλά, ἔχοντα τὴν ὀν διφθογγον ἐβαφυντο, «κούρος» (Δ 321), «θούρος» (Ε 507. Ω 498), «οὐρος» (cf. Φ 405); Eust. ll. 1 298.1-3 τὰ εἰς ὅς δισύλλαβα ἀπλά ἔχοντα τὴν ὀν διφθογγον βαρύνονται, κούρος ὁ νέος, θούρος ὁ ὀρμητικός, οὐρος ὁ ἄνεμος.

1 σημειώσαι] σπασμειώσαι Ο σταυρὸς] σαυρος Ο
4 σπάνια...βαρύνονται Ο11: γρ (= γράφεται) σπάνια, βαρύτονα Ο:π: σπάνια βαρύτονα Μ πλεύρος] πλεύρος Ο:κ:
13 οἰκούρος] νικούροις Ο συνθέται] σύνθετα τρισύλλαβα haesianter Schmidt 80.4 (app. crit.) 15 προπαροξύνεται] προπαραστίσονται Ο:κ:
προπαροδούνεται ούκ ἔχον θηλυκόν, καὶ τὸ ἐγκαρός ἡ ἐγκυοτ.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΤΕΡΟΣ τρισύλλαβα, εἰ ἔχοι τὴν ἀρχοῦσαν μακράν, προπαροδούνεται φέρτερος ἑλετερος κύντερος ύστερος δεύτερος. τὸ δὲ καρτερὸς ὑζύνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατερὸς.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΤΕΡΟΣ τριβράχεα τότε βαρύνονται, ὅτε πυσματικὴν ἐννοιαν ἔχοι, ἢ ἐκ δύο προσώπων ἐν τι τὸ κατηγόρημα ποιεῖται πότερος πρότερος ἑτερος, οἷς ἤκολονθηκε καὶ τὸ ἐκάτερος.

(81.) Τὰ εἰς ΤΕΡΟΣ ὑπερτρισύλλαβα συγκριτικὰ ἢ συγκριτικῶς παραληγόμενα προπαροδούνεται ιθύντερος ἀβέλετερος

3 Τὰ...6 κρατερός: cf. sch. Hom. ll. 1.280b τὰ εἰς τερος τρισύλλαβα βαρύνεται, οἴον σφέτερος, «πρότερος» (A 548 al.), κύντερος. πῶς οὐχι καρτερός κατὰ βαρείαν λέγομεν; ὅτι τούτῳ οὐκ ἔχοι τερος, ἀλλ’ εἰς ερος τὸ γάρ τ οὐκ ἐν τῇ παραγωγῇ ἔχετε ἐν γάρ ἀπὸ τοῦ κράτος, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ βλάβου βλαβερὸς οὐ διὰ τοῦ βερος ἢ παραγωγή (ἐν γάρ πρωτοπονῶ τὸ β), οὕτως καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κράτος κρατερος διὰ τοῦ ερος ἢ παραγωγή, οὐ διὰ τοῦ τερος; Choerob. Ep. Ps. 63.9-12 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΤΕΡΟΣ τρισύλλαβα, εἰ ἔχει τὴν ἀρχοῦσαν μακρὰν, βαρύνεται, οἴον σφέτερος, βέλετερος, ἰκτερος, καὶ τὰ ὁμοια. Τὸ καρτερὸς ὑζύνεται(ὑπόνοι) οὐ μάχεται ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατερὸς γέγονε καθ’ ὑπερβιβασμὸν τοῦ P; Theognost. Cat. Π 70.22-6 (= 387) τὰ διὰ τοῦ τερος βαρύνοντα τε καὶ ὑζύνοντα διὰ τοῦ ε ψυλο υ γραφονται οἶον κρατερος ἁριστερος πειριστερος βλαττερος ὁνομα κύριον πρότερος ύστερος φέρτερος ὁ δὲ κανὼν καὶ ἐτὰ ἀντωνομών σφέτερος σφικτερος ἐμέτερος υμέτερος EM 259.18-21 Καθόλου τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΤΕΡΟΣ ὁνόματα, εἴτε ὑζύνονται, εἴτε βαρύνονται, διὰ τοῦ ε ψυλο υ γραφεται οἴον, κρατερος, σοφιστερος, ἰκτερος, ύστερος. Οὕτω καὶ δεύτερος.

μελάντερος ὀρέστερος. τοῦτοις ἥκολοῦθησε καὶ τὸ κασσίτερος εἰ καὶ προσηγορικὸν ἔστι τὸ μέντοι ἄριστερος ὁξύωνυ, ὡς διὰ ΕΡΟΣ, καὶ δεξιερός. τὸ δὲ ἀμφότερος ἐπίθετοι, τὸ δὲ Ἀμφότερος τὸ κύριον ὁξύωνυ.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΕΡΟΣ τριγενὴ ὄντα καὶ τριβάχαι ὁξύωνυ, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἔχοι τὸ Τ πρὸ τοῦ Ἐ γοαρός νοερὸς ψυχερὸς δρομερός τρυφερός.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΗΡΟΣ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν, εἰτε κύρια ἢ προσηγορικά, εἰτε ἐπίθεταν μὴ ἔχοντα κατ’ ἱδιὰν θηλυκά, προσπαρεξύωνυ ὁμηρος σιδήρους Φάληρος τρίτηρος πενταέτηρος τετραφάληρος. τὰ μέντοι διὰ τοῦ ἩΡΟΣ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν ἐπίθεταν ἔχοντα κατ’ ἱδιὰν θηλυκά ὁξύωνυ λατινήρος

4 το...5 ὁξύωνυ cf. seh. Hom. ll. 16.415a.1-3 Ἀμφότερον: εἰς διαστολὴν τὸ κύριον ὄξυωνυ ἄνεγερν ὁ ἄριστος ως ἀξείωνυ (E 393 al.) καὶ ἐπιεύθησαν οἱ γραμματικοὶ Ιο. Alex. p. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. recensio e, a 43 Ἀμφότερος· κύριον, ἀμφότερος· ἐπίθετον. 9 Τα...135.6 El: cf. EM 660.45-55 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἩΡΟΣ ύπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν ὀξύωνυ καὶ βαρύντων, μὴ ἔχοντα ἀναφαίωνυν τὸ ο, μήτε ὧμα αντιπαρακείμενον, διὰ τοῦ ἡ γράφεται Αβδήρος, τόπος· Ἀβλήρος, κύριον· φάληρος, εἰ ὡς τὸ τετραφάληρος· πενταέτηρος. Σεσημειώθηκαν δύο, Κάμυρος, Λύρος. ὁξύωνυ καυστερος· ὁτερ γίνεται κατὰ διαλέκτον διαλέκτων διαλέκτων, ἡν τὸ τέθηκα τέθισε. «Μὴ ἔχοντα ἀναφαίωνυν τὸ ο» διὰ τὸ ὅνερος· ὅνερος γὰρ λέγεται Αἰολικός. «Μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὧμα αντιπαρακείμενον» διὰ τὸ μάγειρος. Τα...13 τετραφάληρος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 71.14-8 (= 391) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἡρος ύπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν κύρια τε καὶ προσηγορικά προσπαρεξύωνυ, μὴ ἔχοντα απὸ ὅμηρος τὴν γένεσιν, διὰ τοῦ ἡ γράφονται· οἰον, Ὥμηρος· Ἀβδήρος· Ἀρης πόλεις Κρητική· Φάληρος· Ανδρόνικος· Ἰβηρία· σιδηρός· ἄσπρος· ἐρίος· Σεύρης. 13 τὰ...134.4 σημαίνει: cf. Theognost. Can. II 71.9-13 (= 390) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἡρος παράγοντα ύπέρ δύο συλλαβῶν ὀξύωνυ διὰ τοῦ ἡ γράφονται· οἰον, Ὥμηρος· μοίχηρος· καμαρικός· αἰματηρός· πονήρος· τὸ καυστερός σεσημείωται διὰ τῆς ἐν διήθεσιν γραφόμενον τροπῆς Βοιωτικῆς τοῦ ἡ εἰς τὴν εἰς δίδυμον.

5 κύριον | κυρ M 6 ΕΡΟΣ] ἔρος O 15 λατηνήρος M: λατινήρος O
άταρτηρός τυχηρός ὀλισθηρός. ἵστεον δὲ, ὅτι τὸ πόνηρος καὶ μόχθηρος οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἀντί τοῦ ὄξυνει προσπαροξύνουσιν, ὅταν τὸν ἑπίμονον καὶ ἑπίμοιχθον σημαίνη.

2 τὸ…4 σημαίνη: cf. Ptolem. De different. vocabul. 402.13-6 μόχθηρος καὶ πόνηρος προσπαροξύνουσι, μοχθήρος ὀξύνει τὰ ἡθ ὄξυνει; λέγουσι δὲ καὶ ἁπλῶς τὰ φαύλα καὶ μοχθῆρα καὶ πονηρά, ὡς Θουκυδίδης πονηρά τὰ πράγματα τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀντί τοῦ φαύλα; Herenn. Philo De divers. verb. signifcat. p 140.1-9 πόνηρον, ως ὁσόλοκον, καὶ πονηρόν, ως νοσερόν, διαφέρειν φασίν ὀμοίως μοχθήρος καὶ μοχθήρος. πονηρός μὲν γὰρ ἑστὶν ὀξυνέως ὁ κακοφθήρ, βαρυτύνως δὲ ὁ ἑπίπονος; ὥστε δὲ ὀξυνέωι ὁ λόγος ἀπαίτει ἔξοδομος σαφές. πᾶν γὰρ παρόνυμον εἰς ὃς λήγον σχηματισμένον τῶν γένεσιν ὀξυνέως ἑστίν, οἷον κάματος καματηρίου, ὀλισθῶς ὀλισθηρός, μέλι μελητήρος. εἰ καὶ πάνον καὶ μύχθος τὰ πρωτότυπα, πονηρός καὶ μοχθήρος ὀξυνέως. εἰ δ’ Ἀττικοὶ βαρυτυνούσιν, οὐ θαυμαστῶν χαίρουσι γὰρ τῇ βαρυτητῇ; Ammon. Diff. 326.1-5 μοχθήρος, μοχθήρους καὶ πόνηρος διαφέρουσι. μοχθήρος μὲν γὰρ ὀξυνέως ὁ τὰ ἡθ πονηρά· λέγουσι δὲ ἁπλῶς τὰ φαύλα καὶ μοχθῆρα πονηρά, ὡς Θουκυδίδης (cf. 7, 48, 1; 8, 24, 5) «πονηρά τὰ πράγματα τῶν Ἀθηναίων», ἀντὶ τοῦ φαύλα. μυκηθήρους δὲ ὁ ἑπίπονος, ως καὶ πόνηρος; 405.1-15 πόνηρον βαρυτυνούμενον, ως ὁσόλοκον, καὶ πονηρόν ὀξυνεώμενον, ως κυδομόν, φασὶ διαφέρειν παρὰ τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς· ὀμοίως μοχθηρὸν καὶ μοχθηρόν. πονηρός μὲν γὰρ, φασίν, ὀξυνέως ὁ κακοφθῆρ, πονηρός δὲ ὁ ἑπίπονος. — «ἀτόπως», φησὶ Τρύφων (fr. 15 Vels.) «καὶ γὰρ τὰ φαύλα μοχθήρα λέγουσιν. κατὰ δ’ ὀξύτητα», φησὶ, «καὶ ἑπ’ ἐμψύχων καὶ ἀψύχων μοχθερῶς γέ τοι τέχνης τὸ δημιουργικόν φαίμεν εἶναι. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ τύπου κέκοιμηκεν, ἀμφότερον εἰς καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τόνων μετέχειν, τότε ὀξυνέωι ἀπαίτει ὁ λόγος βία ἀνάγκης. πᾶν γὰρ παρόνυμον εἰς ὃς λήγον παρασχηματισμένον τοῖς γένεσιν ὀξύνεωιταί, οἷον κάματος, καματηρίου, ὀλισθῶς ὀλισθηρός, μέλι μελητήρος, τολμῆ τολμηρῆς, νόσος νοσηρός. εἰ δὲ πόνος καὶ μύχθος τὰ πρωτότυπα, πονηρός καὶ μοχθήρος ὑπέτειον ὀξυνεώς. εἰ δὲ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ βαρυτυνοῦσιν, οὐ θαυμαστῶν ἑστὶ χαίρουσι γὰρ τῇ βαρυτητῇ.
Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενα τῇ ΕἸ διφθόγγῳ ἢ μόνῳ τῷ ἑκτεταμένῳ βαρύνεται Κάμειρος ὄνειρος πέπειρος μάγειρος Στάλιρος (82.) Σύσιρος. τὸ καυστείρος οὐ μάχεται ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ Η ἐτράπῃ εἰς ΕἸ.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ Ο σύνθετα οντα προπαροξύνεται κατήγορος συνήγορος, περί ὅν ἐν τῷ τέλει λέξομεν· νὸν δὲ διαληψόμεθα περὶ τῶν ἐχόντων τὸν τόνον ἐν τῇ

1 Τὰ... 6 ΕἸ: cf. Theognost. Can. ΙΙ 71.19-24 (=392.1-6) τὰ διὰ τοῦ εἰρές προπαροξύνοντα ἀπὸ ὁμάτων γινόμενα διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγῳ γράφονται οἰον, μάσσω μάγειρος. Αἰολείς δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἑ πέπτω πέπειρος· ὡν τὸ ὀφελῶ ὄνειρος· ἀισχὸν αἴγειρος· ἡδῶ Ἀνδειρος ὁμοί ποταμοῦ κοινὸ Κόνειρος ὀνομα θύνυς· καίω καυστείρος· τοῦ τὴν γραφήν ἐφιλαξέν οὐ τὸν τόνον, οὐκέται γὰρ; ΙΙ 71.29-32 (=393) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἑρῷ ἐπὶ πόλεων βαρύτονα διὰ μαρκοῦ (scrib. μαρκοῦ) τοῦ ἑ γραφόνται οἰον, Κάμιρος· Στάλιρος· Κύστιρος· Δύφος· Βεθύσιος· Σίτιρος· Πύστιρος· τοῦτο καί διὰ διφθόγγου γράφεται. Choe. De Orthogr. 177.30-4 Τὰ γὰρ εἰς ρος ὁματικά τῇ εἰ διφθόγγῳ Θέλουσι παραληγόσθαι οἰον, ἀείσω αἴγειρος· μάσσω, μάγειρος· ὤν, ὄνειρος· τὸ ἐς αἱ τῆς πρῶτας συλλαβῆς γέγονεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀισχοῦ αἴγειρος, κατὰ κράσιν; 245.7-8 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ εἰρές προπαροξύνοντα διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφαται οἰον, ὄνειρος· μάγειρος; Ec. Gen. a 160.4-7 τὰ εἰς ρος ὁματικά τῇ εἰ διφθόγγῳ Θέλουσι παραληγόσθαι, οἰον μάσσω μάγειρος, πέπτω πέπειρος, ὤν ὄνειρος· (σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ὄν ὁ ὀφελῶ, πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ὄνειρον ὠφελήθησαν), ὅπως καὶ ἀισχὸν αἴγειρος; EM 488.9-16 Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΙΡΟΣ ἐπὶ πόλεως λεγόμενα καὶ μὴ οὐδέτερα διὰ τοῦ ὧ γράφεται, Πύστιρος, Στάλιρος, Κύστιρος, Δύφος, Σίτιρος. Τὸ ἥπειρος οὐκ ἀντίκειτα ήμῖν· οὐκ ἐπὶ πόλεως γὰρ, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ χαρίσι· οὕτω τὸ Στάγειρος· ἔχει γὰρ οὐδέτερον τὰ Στάγειρα. Τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα διὰ τῆς ΕΙ διφθόγγου γράφεται· χωρὶς εἰ μὴ ἄπτιν ἀπὸ δισυλλάβου, μάγειρος, καρφίος· Zonar. ο 1452.16-8 ὄνειρος. παρὰ τὸ ὄνω, τὸ ὀφελῶ, ὄνειρος· ὡς πέπτω πέπειρος, ἀισχὸν αἴγειρος, μάσσο μάγειρος.

2 τῆ| τῆ Ο 5 Σύσιρος| Σίτιρος Lentz 198.19 και Θεογνόστος Can. II 71.31 (=393.3) ετ ΕΙ 488.11; Πύστιρος Lobeck PSCP 270, n. 38 και θεογνόστος MO<sup>c</sup>: καυστειρός O<sup>c</sup>.
προπαραληγούση· ἀνορός πάπορος κατάκορος.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενα τῷ Υ κύρια ἡ προσηγορικά, μὴ περιεκτικὰ ἢ ἐπιθετικὰ ἔχοντα κατ’ ἱδιὰν θηλυκά, προπαροξύνεται πάπορος διάπορος (ὄ θερμός) μάρτυρος ἀργυρός. τὸ δὲ ἀργυρὸς (ὄ ἀργυρὸν) παρὰ Αττικοῦς ὀξύνεται ἡς περιεκτικὸν. τὰ δὲ ἔχοντα θηλυκὰ τριγενὴ ὀξύνεται λιγυρὸς καπυρὸς ἀλμυρὸς ὀχυρὸς ἐκυρὸς (ὄ πενθερός).

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΩΡΟΣ ὑπερδιßαλλα βύρια προπαξύνεται Θεόδωρος Ἀψωρος Ισιδώρος. τὰ μέντοι προσηγορικά ἡ ἐπιθετικά καὶ ὀξύνεται καὶ βαρύνεται καὶ ὀξύνονται μὲν, ὅσα ἔχει ἐννοιαν τὸν ώρῳ όχματος, θεωρὸς ύληρός ἰωρὸς (ὄ γνήσιος φύ(83)λαξ) πυλητος. τὰ δὲ ἄλλα βαρύνεται νέωρος ἀσχέδωρος μετέωρος ὅλιγωρος.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ὑπερδιßαλλα βύρια παραληγόμενα τῇ ΑΙ διθυθογγῷ προπαξύνονται, καὶ ἐπιθετικὰ ὑπάρχον ἐὐκαίρος ἀκαίρος. τὸ μέντοι ἐταίρος προπερισσᾶται.

---


---

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ υπερδιούλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ἈΥ διφθόγγω, μὴ ἔχοντα θηλυκά, προπαρεξύνεται Πίσαυρος Ἐπίδαυρος Κένταυρος Ἀναυρος. τὸ δὲ θησαυρὸς ὡς περιεκτικόν ὁμότικα ἀδυστερώντων, ἀσπερ καὶ τὰ τριγενὴ ἀμαυρός ἀφαυρός.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς παραληγόμενα <τη> ΟΥ προπαρεξύνεται ἐπίκουρος ἐπάρουρος (ὁ κηποῦρος) Ἐλουρος (ἐθνικόν) μελάνουρος παλίνουρος παλιόνουρος (τὸ φυτὸν). σεσημεώτατο νομηνουρός (ὁ τὴν νυμήν φυλάττων) καὶ ὑλοκουρός (ὁ τὴν ύλην τέμνων).

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ τρισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΥ ὁμότικα, εἰ ἔχοι τὴν ἀρχοσιαν μακάννοικουρός κηπουρός τηλουρός (ὁ μακράν ἄν). τὰ μέντοι προπερσπώμενα τρισύλλαβα ὁμότικα ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ πρὸ τοῦ ΟΥ δύο σύμφωνα ἢ καὶ πλεῖον τῶν χαρακτηριστικών τῆς δευτέρας συζυγίας τῶν βαρυτόνων ἀρκτούρος (84.) ἀγχοῦρος κλαγγούρος (ὁ κρακτικός). τὸ δὲ Λάμπουρος προπαρεξύνεται καὶ τὸ κέρκουρος εἶδος πλοίου.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα μετ’ ἐπιπλοκής συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ τῆς ΝΕ ὁμότικα νεκρός νεβρός νεφρός.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα μετ’ ἐπιπλοκής τοῦ Γ

---

1 Τὰ... ἀφαυρός: cf. sch. Hes. Th. 832.2-7 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ὄρος ὀνόματα, τῇ αὐ διθούγγῳ παραληγόμενα, ἔχοντα κατ’ ιδιάν θηλυκά ὁμότικα ὁμότικα, ὁ οἶνος ἀφαυρός καὶ τὰ ὄμωμα. τὸ δὲ ἀγαύρος ἀφαυρός, πλεονασμῷ τοῦ α ἐκ δισύλλαβον τοῦ γαύρου γνῶμενον. τὰ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντα θηλυκά προπαρεξύνεσθαι θέλει, οἶνον Ἐπίδαυρος, ὄνομα πόλεως, Ἀγαύρος, Κένταυρος, σεσημεύσεται τὸ θησαυρὸς ὁμότικα γνώμενον.

3 Πίσαυρος] ἰσαυρος dubitanter Schmidt 83.8 (app. crit.)
7 συλλαβάς] συλλαλάς (sic) O 8 <τη> addidi 10 εθνικών M<sup>m</sup> (prope Ελουρος) O: om. M<sup>+</sup> 12 νομηνουρός Lobeck PGSE<sup>1</sup> 466: νομηνουρός M: νομηνουρός O: νομηνουρός Göttling 21 κλαγγούρος M: γλαγγούρος O 24 εἰς] δάτ τοῦ νεβ (verba delete leguntur) εἰς M
βαρύνεται μονογενή ὅντα φάγροσ πάγροσ γόγροσ. τά δε τριγενή ὄξυνεται λυγρόσ ύγρόσ μεθ’ ὤν καὶ ἀγρόσ.

Τά εἰς ῬΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα Δ μονογενή βαρύνεται Ἀνδρός Κόδρος Φαίδρος (τὸ κύριον) φαιδρός δὲ (ὁ λαμπρός) ὄξυνεται, ὡς καὶ τὸ κυδρός (ὁ τίμως). σεσημείωται τὸ χονδρός ὅξυνομενον (οὗ τὸ ἐπίθετον τριγενὲς ὅν, ἀλλὰ τὸ προσηγορικόν, εἰδος ἐντέρου ὅν).

Τά εἰς ῬΟΣ δισύλλαβα τριγενή ἔχοντα δασὺ πρὸ τοῦ Ρ ὄξυνεται νωθρός σαθρός ψυχρός ἐχθρός αἰσχρός στιφρός (ὁ συνεστραμμένος). σεσημείωται τὸ γλίσχρος.

Τά εἰς ΚΡΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα ὄξυνεται μακρός μικρός πικρός νεκρός Λοκρός Τευκρός (τὸ ἐθνικόν, Τεῦκρος δὲ τὸ κύριον). Τὸ δὲ ἀκρός καὶ ἱγκρός βαρύνεται.

Τά εἰς ῬΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα Π πρὸ τοῦ Ρ μο(85)νογενή μὲν παροξύνεται κόπρος κάπρος Κύρρος Λάμπρος (τὸ κύριον, λαμπρός δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετον). τριγενὴ δὲ ὅντα ὄξυνεται σαθρός λεπρός λυπρός.

Τά εἰς ῬΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Ρ τὸ Τ μόνον ἡ μεθ’ ἐτέρου <συμφώνου> μὴ ἐπιθετικά βαρύνεται χύτρος Λεύκτρος οἶστρος βόστρος Ἰστρος. τὸ δὲ δαιτρός ὄξυνεται καὶ τὸ οἰκτρός, ἐτι καὶ τὸ φιτρός (ὁ κομμός).

Τά εἰς δύο ΡΡ ἐπιθετικά ὅντα ὄξυνεται:
στερρός πυρρός (τὸ ἐπίθετον). Πῦρρος δὲ τὸ κύριον, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ Ὄρφος.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα μετ᾽ ἐπιπλοκής συμφώνου ὀξύνεται ἐπιθετικά ὄντα· φαλακρός μολοβρός ἐρυθρός· τὰ δὲ σύνθετα τῆς κατὰ τὸ τέλος συνθέσεως ὑπερβαίνουσις μίαν συλλαβὴν βαρύνεται δείλανδρος ἀνανδρος ἕνυδρος ἀνυδρος ὑπανδρος φίλανδρος ἀϊδρος.

Τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς κύρια ὄντα μετ᾽ ἐπιπλοκῆς συμφώνου προπαροξύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἕθνικα εἰς Μινυθός Ἕρυθρος Χάραδρος (ποταμὸς) Σκάμανδρος· τὸ δὲ Οἰνωτρός κύριον, ἀφ’ οὗ τὸ ἔθνος.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ διβράχεα βαρύνεται Θάσος Κάσος δρόσος πίσος (τὸ ὅσπρον) μέσος ἰσός πόσος.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ δισύλλαβα τῷ Ὕ παραληγόμενα βαρύνεται νήσος Βήσος Μνήσως Ῥήσως.

(86) Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ θηλικὰ δισύλλαβα τῷ Ω παραληγόμενα ὀξύνεται κρωσάς (ἡ ὑδρία)

---

1 πυρρός...2 κύριον: cf. Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. recensio a π 22 Πῦρρος· τὸ κύριον παραξύνεται. πυρρός· ὁ ἕανθος ὀξύνεται; recensio b π 6 Πῦρρος· τὸ κύριον παραξύνεται, πυρρός· τὸ τριγενὲς ὀξύνεται; recensio c π 18 Πῦρρος· τὸ κύριον, πυρρός· ὁ ἕανθος καὶ ὁ σιτος· cf. recensio d π 20; recensio e π 27 Πῦρρος· κύριον, πυρρός· ὁ ἕανθος 18 Τὰ...19 Ῥήσως: cf. Theognost. Can. II 72.6-8 (= 396) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὕσος βαρύτας δισύλλαβα κύρια τῇ καὶ προσηγορικὰ διὰ τοῦ ἡ γραφότας ὄνομα, Κύριος ὅνομα ποταμοῦ· Κτήσος· Βήσος· Μνήσως· Δρήσος· νήσος· Ῥήσως.

2 κύριον] κύριον M "Τύρος" fortasse Κύριος (St. Byz. 397.11; Zonar. κ 1268.1); Lentz 204.23-4 "Τύρος retinuit et Κύριος postea addidit 3 υπερδισύλλαβα] υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς O 8 ἕνυδρος Μ. ἀνυδρος O 14 κύριον O· κύριον M 15 βαρύτας ΜΟe: τῷ ἡ παραληγόμενα (haec verba postea deleta a scriptore) βαρύτας ΜΟε: Θάσος] θάσος ΜΟ 16 Κάσος] σάκος O 18 ΣΟΣ] ος O 20 θηλικὰ M2n· O· om. M.1
Κνωσός. τὸ μέντοι Σώσος ἀπὸ τοῦ σώσω βαρύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἀρσενικὰ μονογενή παραλήγομενα διχόνω ἐκτεταμένῳ βαρύνεται Ἰσος (τὸ κύριον) Κίσος Κρίσος (τὸ κύριον) Πίσος (τὸ κύριον). τὸ δὲ Λισός οὖν ἐξεύρεται καὶ τὸ Μυσός (ἐθνικόν), ἕτε καὶ τὸ χρυσός.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα διφθόγγω ὄξυνεται, ὅτε ἐπίπεδη ἐπὶ ἁπλά πόλεων κεῖται Παισός (πόλις) Λουσός Πραισός. Ἔτι ὁξυνεῖται καὶ τὰ ἐπίθετα βλασός. τὸ μέντοι Ναίσος βαρύνεται, καὶ Βλασίσος (κύριον) καὶ τὸ γαίσος (προσηγορικόν, εἰδος δόρατος ὑπὸ).

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς ἀμετάβολον λήγουσαν βαρύνεται εἰ δὲ τι εἰσθή ὄξυνόμενον, τοῦτο ὀφθη ἐν τῇ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβῆ ἔχον Ἡ ἢ Α. καὶ βαρύνεται μὲν ταῦτα κόρσος (ὁ κρόταφος) μόλοις�  (ὁ δήμιος

---

3 Τὰ...7 χρυσός: cf. Theognost. Can. II 72.13–5 (= 398) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ισος δισύλλαβα κύρια μονογενὴ βαρύνοντα διὰ μακρὸν τοῦ τι ὁράει τὴν παραλήγουσιν ὁδὸν. Κρίσος· Ρίσος· Ἰσος· Κίσος· Πίσος, αὐ τοῦ καὶ Πίσα ἢ πόλις. 8 Τὰ...14 ὑπ.: cf. Theognost. Can. II 72.22–6 (= 400) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ισος δισύλλαβα ὅτονα διὰ τῆς αὐ τοῦ διφθόγγου χρυσίνομεν ὁδὸν. Παισός· Πραισός, ὁνομά ἐθνικοῦ· βλασός· τὸ Ναίσος ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ παισό εἰ ῥά τοῦ δόρατος, καὶ τὸ γαίσος βαρύνοντα κατὰ τὸν ὅμο ὁ βατὰ τὴν ὁράειν διήλθαν. 15 Τὰ...141.7 εἰπ.: cf. St. Byz. α 24.3–6 τὰ εἰς σος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβῶς ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους εἰς ἀμετάβολον λήγουσαν βαρύνεται, Μάγαρσος πόλεις Κυλίκις, Μαιμαρσός πόλεις Ίσμην. οὕτως Ἀγάθυρος, καὶ κύριον καὶ ἐθνικόν.

καὶ τὸ σέλινον) μόρσος χέρσος θύρσος μύρσος. σεσημεύται τὸ (87.) πυρσός ὀξυνόμενον, τὸ κιρσός καὶ τάρσος. τὰ δὲ ύπερδισύλλαβα ἔχοντα πρὸ ἀμεταβόλου τὸ Α ἐν τῇ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβή βαρύνεται Βάγαρσος Μέγαρσος. τούτος ἀκολουθεῖ καὶ τὸ Α γάθυρσος εἰτε κύριον εἰτε ἑθικόν εἰπ.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα καὶ ἔτερον Σ ὦν· κλιτικὸν ἐν τῇ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβή μὴ κατὰ πάθος ὀξύνεται Βεσσός (τὸ ἑθικόν) Ἐπισσός Ἀσσός δισσός τρισσός κισσός. <...> ὠσάως καὶ τὸ ῾Υσσός καὶ Νέσσος ἐπὶ τοῦ Κενταύρου. τὸ γὰρ γαλωσσός (ὁ λάλος) παρὰ τὸ γλώσσα γέγονε παρονύμως. τὸ δὲ κάσσος ἀπὸ τοῦ κάτος γίνεται κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ Σ· ἔστι δὲ εἶδος ἰματίου.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὸ Α συνεσταλμένον, ἐνὸς ὁντος τοῦ Σ, προσαραξύνονται κόμπασσος ἀρπασσός Δάμασσος βαύνασσος καὶ βάναυσος. σημειώσα τὸ κεφασσὸ φυτὸν ὀξυνόμενον, τὴν δὲ πόλιν βαρύνουσίν τι μέντοι τῇ γνώσασσος

---

1 θύρσος Gotting; θέρσος ΜΟ 3 κιρσός Meineke 12, n. 5: κισσός ΜΟ τάρσος ΜΟ: Τάρσος Gotting (1835), 210; ὀξύνει Meineke St. Byz. 12, n. 5 5 Βάγαρσος ... 6 Μέγαρσος fortasse Μάγαρσος Μάγαρσος (e. St. Byz. a 24.4-5); iam proposuit Schmidt 87.3 (app. crit.), sed inv. ord.; fallitur L. Dindorf TGL. II 11C, cf. Lyc. 1145 444, ARRH. ANAB. II 5.9 Βάγαρσος em. Meineke 12, n. 5: βάγαρος M: βάγαρος Ο 6 Μέγαρσος em. Meineke 12, n. 5: μέγαρος ΜΟ; Μάγαρσος Lentz 207.28-9 (app. crit.) e St. Byz. a 24.4-5, 424.6 9 ὄνσι addici 10 Βεσσός] Βυσσός malit Meineke St. Byz. 190.16 11 κισσός] Gotting (1835), 211: 'κισσός. Κίσσος δὲ τὸ κύριον παροξύνεται ὀξυνόμενο καὶ τὸ βάσιν καὶ Νέσσος ἐπὶ τοῦ Κενταύρου' 12 Νέσσος Schmidt 87.10: ἔσσος ΜΟ 15 γίνεται] γέγονε Ο 17 ΣΟΣ A: ος ΜΟ 19 προσαραξύνονται] προσαραξύνεται Ο κόμπασσος] Κάμπασσος malit Lob. Proll. 405, sed vide Diogenian. 5.46 20 βαύνασσος ... βάναυσος Μ: βάναυσος Ο καὶ] τὸ καὶ dubitanter Schmidt 87.16 (app. crit.) 22 πόλιν ΜΟβ.: πόλιν Οβ.: τῇ γνώσασσος ΜΟ; vide Lobeck PSCP 407-8 et Lehr (1857), 374
εἰκτετα(88).μένον ἔχον τὸ Α οξύνεται καὶ τὸ Παρανσος ὁ δύο ΣΣ ἔχον.
Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ τῷ Ε παραληγόμενα σπάνια ἐν Σ ἔχοντα προπαροδύνεται Ἐφεσος Ἐφεσος. τὸ μέντοι Θεοσός δύο ΣΣ ἔχον ὀξύνεται.
Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα τῷ Η παραληγόμενα ὀξύνεται εἰ δὲ τι βαρύτονον εἶπ, παρώνυμον ἄν εἰπ ἢ ἐννοιαν συνθέσεως ἔχον Ταρτησός Λυρνησός Λυκαβησός. τὸ

---

3 Τὰ…6 ὀξύνεται: cf. Theognost. Can. II 72.27-30 (= 401) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ εὐος ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς προπαροδύνεται σπάνια τὸ δ’ ὀντα διὰ τοῦ ε ψυλοῦ γράφονται οἶον, Ἐφεσος, Ἐφεσος, ὀνόματα πόλεως τὸ Εὐεσσός συστημεῖται διὰ δύο σο γραφομένου ἐστι δὲ ὀνομα πόλεως. 7 Τὰ…143.4 σύνθεται: cf. sch. Hom. II. 12.206b.10-4 τὰ εἰς σος λήγοντα ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς ὀξυνόμενα, τῷ η παραληγόμενα, ἔτερον ἔχοντα δ’, τοῦτο δὲ ἐν ἀναδεξάμενον, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ εξήλλαξαν αὐτὸ τῆς ἐκείνην τάσεως, εἰν τὸ Λυκαβησός δισον ἔχει τὸ δ’, Λυκαβησός, Ταρτησός, τὸ μέντοι Κάρησος ἐν ἔχει τὸ δ’. ἵσως όν ἄν διὰ τοῦτο ἔξηλλαγή; Theognost. Can. II 72.31 - 73.4 (= 402) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἔτος ὀξυτώνα ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς διὰ τοῦ ἦ καὶ δύο σο γράφονται οἶον, Μυκαλησός- Θεωρίας- Ταρτησός- ὀνόματα ποταμῶν Λυρνησός ὀνομα ποταμοῦ Ἐλβησός ὀνομα ποταμοῦ- Ορθησός- Μοῖρας- Σαλμυννασός τὸ Κέρης- Βολίσας δι’ ἑνὸς σ’ γραφομένα βαρύνονται τὸ Μαρτησός παρώνυμον ἀπὸ τοῦ Μαρτησώς, ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλοσα Μέλισσως; Eust. II. III 345.4-10 Τὰ εἰς σος ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς τῷ η παραληγόμενα ἔχοντα καὶ ἔτερον σ’ ὀξύνεται Αλικαρνασός, Λυκαβησός, Ταρτησός, Λυρνησός. τὸ Κάρης, μὴ διασθον ἔχον τὸ σ’, ἔξηλλαγὴ κατὰ Αρισταρχον, εἰ καὶ ὁ Τυραννιόν οὐ βουλεῖται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Καρήσου ποταμοῦ καὶ χώρα της Καρησηῆ λέγεται, ἢν ὁ ἰδιωτικός Κερασηῆ φήσει, ὁ δὲ Γεωγράφος λέγει, ὅτι Καρησηῆ ὑπονή ἀπὸ Καρήσου ποταμοῦ, ὡς νῦν, φήσει, καλεῖται Ρούτης, δοκεῖ δὲ εμβαλλείν εἰς τὸν Γράνικον.

---

5 προπαροδύνεται om. ΜΟ 6 Θεοσός [Εὐεσσός Theognost. Can. II 72.29 (= 401.3) 10 Λυκαβησός Μ-1 O-1, sed ττ supra σο ut fiat Λυκαβησός Μ-1 Ο-1]
μέντοι Κάρησος τινές βαρόνουσι βαρύνεται δὲ ταύτα Μάρτῆσος ἀπὸ τοῦ Μάρτησα. τὸ δὲ Μυόννησος Χερόνησος Προκόννησος Ἐλαφόνησος Πελοπόννησος σύνθετα.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΣΟΣ υπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους Ι εἰς Σ καταλήγον μονογενὴ ὅντα προσπαρεχόνται κυπάρισσος νάρκισσος (καὶ τὸ φυτὸν καὶ τὸ κύριον) Μέλισσος. τὸ μέντοι περισσὸς τριγενὲς, σεσημεῖται τὸ Τελμισσὸς.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΟΣ υπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τοῦ τέλους συλλαβὴν εἰς Ι ἐκτεταμένον λήγουσαν ὀδύνεται εἰ δὲ τι βεβαιώτονιται, τοῦτο παρώνυμον ὥφθη ἀπὸ θηλυκοῦ Κηφισιός Ἰλισός Κερδίσος. τὸ δὲ Ἀρκισός Ἀρκία, Λάρισες Ἀφίσα ἀπὸ θηλυκῶν.

---

5 Τὰ...10 Τελμισσός: cf. Theognost. Can. II 73.5-11 (= 403) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἱσος υπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀπλὰ μονογενὴ προσηγορικὰ προσπαρεχότονα, ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους εἰς Σ καταλήγουσαν, διὰ τοῦ τι γράφονται οἷον κυπάρισσος νάρκισσος Μέλισσος Κηφισιός Πάλισος Αρχέμισος ὀνομα ποταμὸν τὸ περισσὸς τὸν τόνον ἀμείωσαν τὴν γραφὴν εὑρίσκει τὸ Χερόνησος, Μυόννησος, οὐνόματα πάλιν ἐνικό ἀπλὰ. 11 Τὰ...16 θηλυκῶν: cf. Theognost. Can. II 73.12-8 (= 405) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἱσος υπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς βαρύτονα κύρια τα καὶ προσηγορικὰ διὰ τοῦ τι γράφονται δηλωνότι τῆς παραληγοῦσας δῆ ἐνὸς εἰκεφερομένης οἷον, Ἀρκίας ὁ ποταμὸς Κηφισιός Ἐλισός Λάνισος Νήρισος Ἀρκίας ὁ ποταμὸς Πάμισος Λάρισας Ῥήμιος ὁ ποταμὸς Σικελιάς Κριμίσος Μόμισος ὁ ποταμὸς Δίσος ὁ βιβλίος τὸ Ἀρκίας τὸν τόνον ἀμείωσαν τὴν γραφὴν εὑρίσκει.

---

(89.) Τά εἰς ΣΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα τῷ Ο παραληγόμενα ἐν διπλασιασμῷ τοῦ Σ ὀξύνεται νεοσσός κολοσσός Μολοσσός.
Τά εἰς δύο ΣΣ παραληγόμενα τῷ Υ

..............................> προπαροδύνεται μέθυσος γόγγυσος Διόνυσος.
Τά εἰς ΣΣΟΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς τῷ Ω παραληγόμενα ὀξύνεται Κερωσσός. τὸ δὲ ἀλώσος ἐν Ἔ ἔχει.

..............................>
Τά εἰς ΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῇ ΟΥ

1 Τά...3 Μολοσσός: cf. Theognost. Can. II 73.19-22 (= 405) Τά κατά διπλασιασμὸν τοῦ σ ὀξύντο τά το ο παραληγόμενα πάνω στάναι, καὶ σχεδόν ἀριστημένα· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ Μολοσσὸν ὀνόμα ἔθνους, καὶ τὸ νεοσσός· Κολοσσός καὶ μῖον. 4 Τά...7 Διόνυσος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 73.23-9 (= 406) Τά διὰ τοῦ υπος ἀπαντα, εἶτε δὴ ἕνας ἀ ἐκφέροντο, εἶτε διὰ δύο, εἴτε δισύλλαβα, εἴτε ὑπερ δύο συλλαβάς διὰ τοῦ υ ψηλοῦ γράφονται· ὀιον, βύσος· ὄνυσος· ὁ παταμῶς· μέθυσος· Διόνυσος· Βρόσος· ὁ λιμήν· ἁμυνάς· ἁμύνας· ἀγγείων πλεκτὸν στυρίδωδες· Γένυσος· ὁνάμα ποταμοῦ διὰ δύο στα Ἀμβροσίους· σεσημεῖται τὸ Κραύς διὰ τῆς οἱ διφθόγγον γραφόμενον. 8 Τά...10 ἔχει: cf. Theognost. Can. II 74.1-6 (= 408) Τά (addid) εἰς ὁς λήγοντα ύπερ δύο συλλαβάς καὶ διὰ δυστοῦ σ προσφερόμενα, καὶ το ω παραληγόμενα στάναι ἔστι· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ Βήρας διὰ δύο στα προσφερόμενον, καὶ τὸ Κερωσσός· διεξομέλεμον· ἔστι δὲ πόλεις Ἀπολλανιάδος καὶ τὸ Βλάσσος βαρυτόν παρὰ τὸν βλάσσω μέλλοντα γεγονός, καὶ δὴ ἕνας σ γραφόμενον. 12 Τά...145.7 ἐθνικόν: cf. Theognost. Can. II 74.7-13 (= 409-10) Τά διὰ τοῦ οἰστος δισύλλαβα ἄρσενικα, μὴ ἑπιτεταίρια βαρυτόνα διὰ τῆς οἱ διφθόγγον γράφονται· ὀιον, μοῖος· οἰος· κοῖοις· Προῖος· γοῖος· ὁ ψῦς· φοῖος. Τά διὰ τοῦ οἰστος δισύλλαβα βαρυτόνα, μὴ ἑπιτεταίρια, τῇ οἱ διφθόγγος παραλήγεται· ὀιον,

---

1 τῇ] τῷ Μ  2 Σ] Ὡ  5 ☀ cf. Lobeck PSGP 417  6 μέθυσος... 7 Διόνυσος] μέθυσος γόγγυσος (γόγγυσος Μἠ) διόνυσος  10 ἀλώσος Μ] ἀλώσος Ο; Βλάσσος Theognost. Can. II 74.5 (= 408.5); cf. Lobeck PSGP 418; Ἀμβροσίους Paus. 10.3.2 11 ☀ cf. Schmidt 89.11 (app. crit.): ‘exciderunt exempla in ΑΙΣΟΣ terminorum e Theognost. Can. II 73.30 St. Byz. 502.15 repetenda’
ἐ ὁ Ó τούτος, μὴ τῇ Ε, ἀρσενικά ὠντα μὴ ἐπιθετικά βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ μέρος σώματος σημαίνον πλούτος οίτος κοίτος Προίτος γοίτος (ὁ ὄψος) Λαῖτος βροῦτος. τὸ δὲ Κλείτος ἔχει τὴν Εὐ καὶ τὸ γλυτοῦς μέρος σώματος δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ Βουτός θηλυκὸν (κώμη Αἰγύπτου) καὶ τὸ Παίτος ἐθνικόν.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα ἐνὶ τῶν φύσει μακρῶν κύρια ὄντα βαρύνεται Κλήτος Δώτος Ωτος. τὸ μέντοι λωτὸς ὁ νῦν. εἰ μέντοι (90.) ἐπιθετικὰ εἰ παραληγόμενα τῷ Ἡ ἢ τῷ Ω, ὃς εἶναι, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ ἀριθμοῦ τάττουτο ὅτος πλωτός πρωτός (ὁ πεπρωμένος) πρώτος δὲ ἐπὶ ἀριθμοῦ.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ διβάραξε μονογενὴς βαρύνεται,

---

όπωτε μὴ ἔπει ἀθροίσματος ἡ κύρια εἰσίν ἀπὸ ἑπιθετικῶν: βάτος λάτος βρότος (τὸ αἴμα, βροτός δὲ ὁ φθαρτός τὸ τριγενές) πότος (τὸ συμπόσιον, ποτός δὲ τὸ πινόμενον) πάτος (ἡ ἀναστροφή) Στράτος (τὸ μὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀθροίσματος, στράτος δὲ τὸ σύναγμα). τὸ δὲ Κριτός καὶ Κλιτός ὄξυνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ διβραχέα ἑπιθετικὰ μὴ ἐπὶ ἀρίθμου ταττόμενα ὄξυνεται: βατός φατός θετὸς πλυτός, τὸ δὲ τρίτος ἐπὶ ἀρίθμου.


1 ἐπ’ Μ: ἐπὶ Ο ἴ...εἰσιν] η...εἰσιν Μ: εἰσίν Ο 4 ποτός MOs: ποτός since accentu Op.c. 10 τὸ...ἀρίθμου] βαρύνεται add iubet Lobeck PGG 351, n. 51
μακρῷ βαρύνεται σίτος Τρίτος (ό ποταμός) ὀίτος (φρέαρ), τὸ μέντοι λιτός τριγενές.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα τῷ ᾽Η τρισημοσικὰ ὀξύνεται βυτός (ό βρύον) χυτός ὄντος λυτός κλυτός.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβήν εἰς Ρ καταλήγουσαν ἡ καθ’ ὅλου εἰς ᾽Αμεταβολον βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἐπιθετικά εἰ ἔχοντα θηλυκόν φόρτος χόρτος Μύρτος (τὸ κύριον) ἀρτός μίλι(91)τος δέλτος. σεσημείωται κοντός καὶ παλτός ὀξυνόμενα, τὸ δὲ σπαρτός κυρτός καρπός τιλτός ὀξύνονται ὡς θηλυκά ἔχοντα.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΤΟΣ δισύλλαβα μονογενὴ ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ ἡ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβή ἔχοι τι τῶν φύσε βραχέων ἰστός Σηστός παστός μαστός ἐντός, τὸ Φαιόστος (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἴματος) βαρύνεται.

---

σεσημεώται τὸ βύστος καὶ Κάστος βαρύτονα. τὸ δὲ Νέστος (πόλις) καὶ κόστος καὶ νόστος βραχεὶ παραλήγουσι.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ δισυλλαβά ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Τ Σ, εἰ παρασχηματίζοιτο εἰς διάφορα γένη, ὀξύνεσθαι θέλει, εἰ μὴ ύπερθετικά εἰ, ἢ ἐκ πλειών συλλαβῶν εἰς δισυλλαβάν μεταστή πιστός ξυστός μεστός κεστός. τὸ δὲ πλείστος λέγος τὸ στος ύπερθετικά όντα βαρύνεται καὶ τὸ δύστος (ὁ δύστηνος) καὶ πόστος ἐκ τοῦ πόσατος γέγονε.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ ὤμητικα, μὴ όντα ἄρκθητικα, πρὸ τοῦ Τ τὸ Κ ἢ τὸ Π ἔχοντα ὀξύνεται πλεκτὸς ἐλκτός πνικτός θρεπτός. τὸ δὲ οίκτος βαρύνεται ὡς ὀλοκληρωτικόν καὶ κόκτος καὶ πόκτος (ὁ πόκος) καὶ τὸ κάκτος. τὸ δὲ πέμπτος ἐκτὸς τὰ τοῦ (92.) ἀριθμοῦ βαρύνεται. τὸ μέντοι πεμπτός ὀξύνεται τὸ ἐπιθετικόν, καὶ τὸ ἐκτός (ὁ ἐχόμενος) ἐκτός δὲ τὸ χωρίς ἐπίφραμα.

Τὰ εἰς διπλοῦν ΤΤ βαρύνεται, χωρὶς τῶν

---

4 Τὰ...11 γέγονεν: cf. El. Gud. χ 570.34-41 Τὰ εἰς τοὺς, εἰτε ἀπλά, εἰτε σύνθετα, διὰ τοῦ ἑπτά γράφεται, οἶον, πιστός, ἱστός, πιστός, Χριστός. ὀξύνεται, τὰ εἰς τοὺς λήγοντα ὀνόματα, ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ τ, τὸ ἕ, εἰ παρασχηματίζοιτο εἰς διάφορον (scrib. διάφορον) γένος, εἰ μὴ ύπερθετικά εἰ, ὀξύνεται οἶον, πιστός, πλείστος, ἕστοις, μεστός, σχῆμας, φραστός, κτιστός, χριστός. πρόσκειται μὴ ύπερθετικά, διὰ τὸ πλείστος, λέγος, χάστος.

1 Κάστος Schmidt 91.8: κάμπτος MO 2 Νέστος Schmidt 91.8: νέτος MO πολις Schmidt 91.8: ὁ πόλις MO 4 νόστος MO:e: νόστος βύστος καὶ (βύστος καὶ postea delevit scriptor) O:e: ei] εἰ μὴ MO; Schmidt 91.10 (app. crit.): 'quod si sī sit ei mēn scribendum huic sectioni praeceedens sectio, verbis tā ΣΤΟΣ particula δὲ inserta, adnectenda est' 9 λέγος τὸς ραφίς MO: λέγος τὸς ραφίς τὸς MO 17 τὰ...ἀριθμοῦ MO: τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ haesitanten Schmidt 91.22 18 πεμπτός MO:e: πεμπτός O:e: 19 ἐκτός...ἐχόμενος Schmidt 92.2: ἐκτός ὁ ἐχόν MO
Αττικῶν κόττος όυττος κάττος. τὰ δὲ Ἀττικὰ ὁμοτενεὶ τοὺς κοινοῖς, ἐξ ὧν γέγονεν κιττός ὃτι κισσός, τριττός ὅτι τμισσός.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΤΑΤΟΣ ὑπερθετικὰ προσπαροζένεται, καὶ ὅσα εἰς ΣΤΟΣ ὑπερθετικὰ λαμπρότατος ὁσιώτατος σεμνότατος κάλλιστος ἄριστος, ὁμοίας καὶ τὸ πλατάνιστος ἀπὸ τοῦ πλάτανος.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα κύρια ἢ προσηγορικὰ παραληγόμενα τῷ Αποστόλῳ ὑπάτῳ ἐνατος θᾶνατος Ἐρατος (τὸ κύριον, ἐρατός ὁ ἐπιθυμητικός).

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΑΤΟΣ παρηγμένα εἰ μὴ ὑμητικὰ εἰσιν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΜΙ ληγόντων, ἢ ἀπὸ δευτέρας συζυγίας τῶν περισσωμένων προσπαροζένονται μέσατος πυμάτος ὦγδόατος τρίτατος τέταρτος νέατος. τὸ μέντοι ἐρατός ἐλατός ὀξύνεται, ὕσαύτως δὲ ὀξύνεται καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας συζυγίας τῶν περισσωμένων μακρὸν ἑχοντα τῷ Αποστόλῳ θεατός ἡφαστός ἵατος.

(93.) Τὰ εἰς ΕΤΟΣ τρισύλλαβα <προ>παραληγόμενα τῷ Ε κύριῳ ὄντα καὶ

---

23 Τὰ...150.14 προσπαροζένεται: cf. Theognost. Can. ΠΙ 75.5-8 (= 416) Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ετος ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς κύρια τε καὶ προσηγορικὰ ὀξύτονα τε καὶ βαρύτονα, διὰ τοῦ ε ἕλοο γράφει τὴν παραλήγουσαν ὀνος, νυφετὸς ἀβετός τοκετὸς ἤχετος ὀνομα κύριον πυρτὸς αινετὸς τηλύγετος.

προσηγορικά προπαραθύνεται Μέγιστος Πέλετος Ἐχετος Δέρκετος Μένετος (τὸ κύριον, μενετός τὸ ἐπίθετον). τούτος ἠκολούθησε καὶ τὸ ἐμετος, ὡς ἔχον Ἐ ὀσπερ τὰ ἀνώ. τὰ δὲ ἐχοντα Α ὁμοίως ἀργετος Ἀρέτος ἀνετος (ἀνετός δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετον) πάγετος, ὁπερ ὀξύνει ἡ συνήθεια. ἐτὶ ὀξύνεται καὶ τὸ νυφετός υετός καὶ τὸ αἰετός.

Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΕΤΟΣ τρισύλλαβα προσηγορικά ἢ ἐπιθετικά ὀξύνεται, εἰ μὴ παρανύμως τετύπωσεν κοπετός πυρετός τοκετός συρφετός ἀφυσχετός (ἡ ἀκαθαρσία). τὸ μέντοι ἀσχετός ἀσπετος γνύπετος (ὁ χαύνος) προσπαραδύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ κύρια ἢ ἐπίθετα παραληγόμενα τὸ Η μονογενὴ βαρύνονται Ἀρέτος Λάμητος Μέλητος βυόντος (εἴδος ἦματον παρ’ Ἀίγυπτοις) τρύγετος (ὁ καρφὸς μονογενῶς, μονουγενῶς μεγαίνετο Nέπετος Lobeck PSGP 373; Nέπετος πέλετος malit Schmidt 93.2 (app. crit.) 3 κύριον] κυ[ρι M μενετός MO; Schmidt 93.4 (app. crit.); ‘deest cautio de ἑνετος’ 5 Ἀρέτος ὁ Mας ο: αρέτος Mας; Ἀρέτος haesitans Schmidt 93.6 (app. crit.) 6 ἀνέτος ἀνετός] λίνετος αἰετος Lobeck Proll 481 minime probabiliter ἀνετός...ἐπίθετον] ἀνετός δὲ τὸ ἐπιθετικὸν Μας. 8 νυφετός υετός] aperte corrupta secundum Schmidt 93.8 (app. crit.); ἀφετός ἀετός coni. Schmidt (l. c.), coll. Theognost. Can. II 75.7 (= 416.3), vel αἰετός καὶ αἰετός νυφετός υετός ad seq. tnema retractis secundum Schmidt (l. c.) 11 συφετός ομ. Ο 13 ἀφυσχετός...ἀκαθαρσία Mας (sine signo vel numero) Οناس. (sine signo vel numero), nisi quod pro ἀφυσχετός habent ἀσφυσχετός MO: om. Μας ονυφετός Schmidt: γνύπετος ΜΟ 16 βαρύνονται Α: β. εἰτε προπαραθύνεται ΜΟ Λάμητος em. Schmidt e Theognosto 417.3: δάμητος ΜΟ
τρυγητός δὲ τὸ τρυγώμενον, τοιούτοις καὶ τὸ ἀμήτος καὶ ἀμητός, τὸ δὲ ἐφιτὸς λαλητὸς ὀξύτων καὶ ἐπιθετικὰ καὶ τὸ ἀλαλητὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαλητὸς προσθέσει τοῦ Α.

(94.) Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενα τῷ Η ἀπλὰ τριγενῆ ὀξύτατον δωρητὸς ἀσκιτὸς κοσμητὸς ἀγαπητὸς ὡνῆτος, τὸ δὲ ἄρρητος ἀκλήτους ἀκτοῦ (ὁ ἀκατάπαυτος) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑτὸς προπαραξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ ύπερ δύο συλλαβὰς ἀρσενικὰ παραληγόμενα τῷ Ι μῆ ὀντα ἐπιθετικὰ βαρύνονται βάρβιτος Ἀδήριτος Λήτος Ἀγχιτος. τὰ δὲ θηλυκὰ ὀξύτατοι ἀμαζεῖτος ἀτραπιτός Λυχνιτός (ἡ πόλις) [δηνιτός].

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ τρισύλλαβα ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους συλλαβὴν εἰς Ο καταλήγουσαν σπάνια

---

1 τρυγώμενον em. Lobeck RVGNVT 51: τρυγώμενον MO
9 ἐτὸς Schmidt 94.4: ἑτὸς MO
12 ἀμητὸς scrispi e Theognost. Can. II 75.23 (= 419.3): ἡμήτως MO; Νήμητος Lobeck PSCP 379, postea Lentz 220.22 Λήτος Lobeck PSCP 379: δήτος M; om. O
13 Ἀγχιτος Lentz 220.23 add. e Theognost. Can. II 75.23 (= 419.3), non pro ἄρρητος; cf. Theognost. Can. II 75.21-6 (= 419.1-6): ἄρρητος MO; Οἰκριτος Theognost. II 75.24 (= 419.4): Φώκριτος Lobeck PSCP 379, postea Lentz 220.23 ἀμαζεῖτος] ἀμαζεῖτος O
14 Λυχνιτός em. Schmidt 94.9 e St. Byz. 423.15: λυχνιτός MO η πόλις om. O δηεῖτος del. Schmidt 94.10
eisín ónوتός Μολοτός. το μέντοι ἁρωτός καὶ
βίοτος προπαροξύνεται.

Τά εἰς ΤΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα Υ
βραχεί κύρια όντα βαρύνεται Ἑρωτός Ἀνυτός
Αἰπύτος Ὕρυντος. προσκείται κύρια διὰ τά
τριγενὴ ἀπλά όντα, ἀ ὀξύνεται φωρυτός
πινυτός. το ἰ ἁλυτός σύνθετον προπαροξύνεται. τά ἰ τρισύλλαβα ἐκτεταμένον
το Υ ἔχοντα ὀξύνεται Βηρυτός κωκυτός
Καρδυτός βουλυτός το ἰ Σεβένυντος
κύριον προπαροξύνεται ὑπερβαίνων τήν
τρισύλλαβαν.

(95.) Τά εἰς ΤΟΣ τρισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα

3 Τά...12 τρισυλλαβίαν: cf. Theognost. Can. II 75.30 - 76.3 (= 421) Τά διὰ τόν ὦτον ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς, εἰτε βαρύτανα, εἰτε ὀξύτανα, εἰτε κύρια, εἰτε προσηγορικά, διὰ τόν τού ψυλλοῦ γραφονταί: οἴον, Νέρυτος ὄνομα κύριον· πῖνυτός· Ἀνυτός· Μάδυτος ὣ πόλεες· Αἰπύτος· Ὅρυντος (scrib. Ὅρυντος)· Ὅμυτός· ὀξύτας· φωρυτός· ἁρυτός· Βηρυτός· κωκυτός· κορδύτος· ὑρυτός· Κολύτος· τό ἁλύτος (scrib. ἁλυτός), ὃ δηλοῖ τόν ἀδύκον καὶ μικρόν, σεστικεῖται διὰ τής οἱ διψόθγου γραφομένων. 8 τά...12 τρισυλλαβίαν: cf. St. Byz. β 88.9-12 ὀξύνεται (scil. Βηρυτός) δ’ ὧς τρισύλλαβον καὶ μικρόν ἔχει τὸν ὅ ἀδύκον καὶ μικρόν. τού τούν ἀδύκον καὶ μικρόν, σεστικεῖται διὰ τής οἱ διψόθγου γραφομένων. 13 Τά...153.8 ἀκηλίδωτος: cf. Theognost. Can. II 76.4-8 (= 422) τά διὰ τού ὦτον ὀξύτανα ἀπό τής τρίτης σεξύγως τῶν περισσαμένων γεγενημένα, εἰτε δισύλλαβα, εἰτε ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς, διὰ τοῦ ὧ μεγάλου γραφονταί: οἴον, πλωτός· στρωτός· τρωτός· πτωτός· ἁλύτος (scrib. ἁλυτός)· περυτός (scrib. περυτός)· αὐλυτός· κηρυτός· ἄδωτος.

1 ὁντός em. Schmidt e Theognost 420.3: ὀντός ΜΟ
Μολοτός em. Schmidt e Theognost 420.3: μολοτός ΜΟ
Theognost. Can. II 75.28 (= 420.2): εὐροτός ΜΟ
4 βραχεὶ] βραχεὺ Θ’ Ἑρωτός] Νέρυτος (l. Τρυτός) Theognost. Can. II 75.32 (= 421.3) 10 Καρδυτός Schmidt 94.20: κανδυτός ΜΟ;
Κορδυτός Theognost. Can. II 76.1 (= 421.5); Καρδυτός Κορδυτός
hasisntanter Schmidt 94.20 (app. crit.); cf. St. Byz. β 88.9-12
Σεβένυντος] ἐβένυντο (sic) ΜΟ
τῷ Ὡ οὖνεται πτερωτός τορνωτός χρυσωτός Βοιώτος μυωτός (εἴδος χιτώνος) ἀλωτός. τὸ δορυάλωτος σύνθετον προσπαροζόντα. τὰ δὲ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Α στεφητικον προσπαροζόνταν ἀγνωτὸς ἀτρωτὸς ἀπτωτὸς· καὶ ἐτὶ τὰ σύνθετα ἀνακιδωτὸς (ἄνευ ἀκίδος) ἀπύργωτος πολύγνωτος ἀκηλίδωτος.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ ὑπερδισύλλαβος κύρια, καὶ ἔννοιαν συνθέσεως ἔχοντα, καὶ ἔτι τὴν παραλήγουσαν εἰς ἀμετάβολον καταλήγουσαν βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ διαστολὴ τις γένοιτο Ἀλίαρτος Ἀψυρτός Ἀσφαλτος Ἀμάραντος (τὸ κύριον, τὸ δὲ ἑνήκον ἔχονται). ὀξύνεται δὲ τὰ πρὸ τέλους ἘΝ ἔχοντα Λωμεντός Λαυρεντός (Σικελικαὶ πόλεις). ἐτὶ ὀξύνεται καὶ τὸ κονιορτός καὶ κολοσσυρτός σύνθετα ὄντα. τὰ μέντοι ἐπιθετικά ὀξύνεται ἱμερτός ἐγερτὸς ύφαντός.

Τὰ εἰς ΤΟΣ ἀπλὰ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἔχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Τ ψιλὸν κατ᾽ ἐπιπλοκὴν ἐπιθετικά ὄντα καὶ ὑμματικά ὀξύνεται ἐλκτός ἀμελκτός χαρακτός ὅρεκτος. τὸ μέντοι Αἰγυπτός καὶ Πάνακτος καὶ Ναύπακτος μὴ ὄντα ὑμματικά προσπαροζόναι. σεσημεῖωται τὸ δρυφακτός ὀξυνόμενον, (ὁ θύρα τοῦ δικαστηρίου ἢ καὶ κιγκλίδες καλοῦνται).

(96.) Τὰ εἰς ΣΤΟΣ κύρια ἀρσενικὰ μόνως βαρύνεται Ακαστός Ἀλαστός Ἡφαιστός. τὰ δὲ προσηγορικὰ ὀξύνεται ἀγοστὸς (ὅ ἀγκάλη) ὁίστος.

Τὰ εἰς ΣΤΟΣ ἐπιθετικὰ ἀπλὰ ὑμματικὰ ὑπὲρ

---

δύο συλλαβάς ἄνωτεροι ἐμπεριστές ὑμοιοτέρας τα δέ σύνθετα προσπαθούμενους φροντίζοντες ἀγάπην τὸν ἀλλάζοντα ἀλλακτίστας (ὁ ἀδικὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδικοῦ), ᾧ προσωπίζει καὶ τὰ ὑπερβλητικά τάχιστος ἀρίστος κάλλεστος μεθ’ ὁν καὶ ἐκαστοῦς.

Τα εἰς ΣΤΟΣ υπερδισύλλαβα παραληγόμενα Ο ἐπὶ ποσότητος ταύτον ἄρχομενοι ἀβάλλοστοι εἰκοστοῦς πριακοστοῦς πεντηκοστοῦς.

Τα εἰς ΤΟΣ υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενα τήν ΥΕΙ διφθόγγων ἀπάλα ὡντα ἄρχομενοι τορνεύτως στρατεύτως βουλευτῷ το δέ ἀστράτευτος σύνθετον.

Τα διὰ τοῦ ΟΥΤΟΣ προσπερισᾶται τηλικούτως τοιούτως τοσούτως.

Τα εἰς ΤΟΣ υπερδισύλλαβα τήν ΑΥ διφθόγγων παραληγόμενα προσπαθούμενον ἀπαντοῦσι ἀρθροστοῦ ἀκλώμενος συνημεύεται τῷ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἄξινομον.

Τα εἰς ΦΟΣ δισύλλαβα κύρια ἄ προσηγορικά

---

7 Τα…10 πεντηκοστῶς: cf. Chorob. Ep. Ps. 133.3-6 Τα εἰς ΤΟΣ λήγοντα υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἐχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Τ τὸ Σ καὶ τὴν γενικὴν περατωμένην εἰς Υ两类，ἐπὶ ποσότητος ταυτόμεναν ἄνωτεροι, όνον πολλοστὸς, ἀλγοστὸς, εἰκοστὸς; Εἰ. Patr. ε 50 Τα εἰς ΤΟΣ λήγοντα υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἐχοντα πρὸ τοῦ Τ τὸ Σ, τὴν τε γενικὴν εἰς ΟΥ τερατωμένην, ἐπὶ ποσότητος ταυτόμεναν, ἄνωτεροι, ὡν πολλοστὸς, ἀλγοστὸς, εἰκοστὸς; EM 297.40-2 Τα εἰς ΤΟΣ λήγοντα υπέρ δύο συλλαβὰς, ἐχοντα πρὸ τοῦ τὸ Σ, τὴν τε παραληγόμεναν εἰς ΟΣ περατωμένην, ἐπὶ ποσότητος ταυτόμεναν, ἄνωτεροι ἀλλοστοῦς, εἰκοστοῦς.

βαρύνεται, εἰ μὴ παραλήγοι τῷ Υ βραχεί, ἢ τῷ Λ [τοπικά]: Πάφος τάφος Σόφος (τὸ κύριον, σοφός (97.) δὲ τὸ ἐπίθετον) ὄρφος (κοινός, ὁρφός δὲ ἀττικός). τὸ δὲ κρυφός καὶ συφός ἔχει τὸ Υ βραχύ, τὸ δὲ κύφος τὸ ΚΥ μακρόν. τὸ δὲ ἀλφός (τὸ σωματικόν πάθος) καὶ πολφός (ὁφὸν τι) ἔχουσι τὸ Λ. τὰ δὲ ἐπίθετα ὀξύνεται σφόν κυφός κυφός, τὸ δὲ κουφός προπεριστάται.

Τὰ εἰς ΦΟΣ υπερδισύλλαβα ἀπλὰ μὴ δηλοῦντα ἐνέργειαν προπαροξύνεται κρόταφος ἐλαφός Ἔπαφος κόλαφος ἀσκάλαφος ἀργυφός (ὁ λευκός). τὸ δὲ ἀδελφός ὀξύνεται, καὶ τὰ ἐνέργειαν δηλοῦντα παροξύνεται πορφυρόβαφος υποδηματορφάφος καὶ ἱπποτρόφος.

κυφός; τύφος; κρύφος (scrib. κρυφός); σύφος (scrib. συφός); σκύφος; ύφος. 3 ὄρφος... 4 ἀττικός; cf. Jo. Alex. Τον. παρ. 8.35-9.4 (30) Ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς ὑπεριστάται τὰ υποκείμενα λαγός, ὄρφος, ταλώς, τὸ Μανέθως καὶ Τυφώς καὶ ταῖος καὶ περιστάται καὶ δικατάλημα ἐστὶ καὶ γὰρ <καί> εἰς ν λήγει. πάντα δὲ τὰ εἰς ὑπερισταθέντα ἄνευ λόγου περισταθήσῃ, τὸ δὲ Τηλεδώς ἐκ τοῦ Τηλεδώς συνήρηται. π. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. recensio e o 13 ὄρφος: κοινός, ὁρφός: Ἀττικός; Choerob. in Theod. 253.10-2 Σεσημεῖονται τὸ ὄρφος καὶ λαγός περισταθένα, ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ ἔφυλαξαν τὸν τόνον τῶν κοινῶν· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ὄρφος τὸ κοίνον ὄρφος ἐστὶ βαρύντων; EM 635.33-8 τὰ εἰς ΩΣ Ἀττικὰ τῆς κοινῆς εὐθείας ἔχουσι τὸν τόνον· κἂν φθάσῃ προπαρασχυθήναι ἡ εὐθεία, πάσα πτώσις προπαρασχύνεται. Σεσημεῖονται τὸ ὄρφος καὶ τὸ λαγός ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ ἔφυλαξε τὸν τόνον τῶν κοινῶν. Τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ὄρφος ὁ τόνος ὄρφος ἐστὶ, βαρύντων·

Τὰ εἰς ΧΟΣ δισύλλαβα μὴ ὄντα ἐπιθετικὰ

βαρύνεται: Κόλχος βρόγχος μῦσχος
κόγχος τρόχος (ὁ τόπος ἐν ὦ τρέχουσι,
τρόχος δὲ ὁ κύκλος) βρόγχος. σεσημεύεται τὸ
μυχὸς (ὁ ἐνδότερος τόπος). τὸ δὲ μοιχὸς
πτωχὸς ἄρχος ἐπιθετικὰ ὄντα ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΧΟΣ ὑπερδύσσαλα προπαροξύνεται:

στόμαχος βάτραχος Σωτήριχος δόλιχος
(τὸ ὀσπριον, δολιχὸς δὲ ὁ μακρός). τὸ δὲ
μοναχὸς ὀξύνεται.

Τὰ εἰς ΨΟΣ δισύλλαβα <..> ἐπιθετικὰ

βαρύνεται μύσος γύψος Τύψος θάψος
(εἶδος ἔλευσ). τὰ δὲ ἐπιθετικὰ πρὸ τοῦ Ψ ἔχοντα Μ
ἀξύνεται κομψὸς γαμψὸς.

---

1 Τὰ ...4 βρόγχος: cf. Ammon. Diff. 478.11-6 τὰ γὰρ εἰς χος
dισύλλαβα—παρατελεύτων ὄντος τοῦ ὁ—βαρυτονεῖται: οἰον
tλέχος ὁ βρόγχος κόγχος κόλχος μῦσχος, οὕτω τρόχος.
καὶ ἐτί τὰ παρὰ ὁμίατα εἰς ὦ βαρύτονα καὶ αὐτὰ
βαρυτονεῖται ἴσονς ἑλλαβοντα: οἰον πλέκω πλόκας, σπειρῶ
στόρόι, λέγω λόγος, φέρω φόρος, οὕτω καὶ τρέχω τρόχος.
8 δολίχος...9 μακρός: cf. Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημ.

11 Τὰ ...14 γαμψός: cf. Theognost. Can. II 76.30 - 77.2 (= 429)
Οὐδὲν τὸν εἰς ψος ληγόντων

12 Θάψος Schmidt 97.22: τάψος ΜΟ
(98.) Τὰ εἰς ΨΟΣ ύπερδισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται Λυκαψός κινδαψός χορδαψός.
Τὰ εἰς ΟΣ λήγοντα οὐδέτερα ὅνόματα ἄει βαρύνονται τεῖχος βέλος πάθος πέλαγος ὑψός. αἱ δὲ μετοχαὶ οὐδέτεραι ὀξύνονται τετυφός πεποιηκός γεγραφός ὅπερ καὶ αἱ ἁρσενικαί.

1 Τά...2 χορδαψός: cf. St. Byz. γ 24.3-5 τὰ δὲ εἰς ψος ύπερδισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται, σκινδαψός (ὀργάνων ὄνομα καὶ κύριον, τίθεται καὶ κατ’ οὐδένος ἡ τραγέλαφος) χορδαψός λυκαψός; Zonar. γ 415.26-8 τὰ εἰς ψος ύπερ δύο συλλαβῶν ὀξύνονται, οίον σκινδαψός [χεραψός] λυκαψός· γαληψός.

PART FOUR: Notes
1.1–4 Τοὺς...4 βούλημα: ‘Those who wish to arrive at the overall regularity in prosodies, but are defeated by the length of Herodian’s treatise, the transmission through an epitome will help towards the purpose.’

1.1–6 Τοὺς...6 σαφήνειαν: What urged the epitomator to provide an abridged version of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας was that people (perhaps students) grew weary of the great length of the text. On the addressee and the purpose of this Epitome see also Egenolff (1887), 5 and Wouters (1975-6), 602. On the length of the text see pp. 39-40 of the Introduction.

1.1 Τοὺς: I have adopted Dr Philomen Probert’s emendation of the manuscripts’ τό. The change to τό could have occurred because a scribe thought the article should go with ἐφικέσθαι.

1.1 προσῳδίαις: I translate the word προσῳδίαις with the term ‘prosodies’, not ‘accentuation’, because vowel quantities and aspiration are also included in the work.

1.2–3 ποθούντας...3 ἀπαγορεύοντας: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ ποθούντες...ἀπαγορεύοντες (1.2, 3). An accusative is needed because of ἐφικέσθαι.

1.3 ἀπαγορεύοντας: ‘are exhausted by’, LSJ s. v., II.

1.4 βούλημα: O’s βούλευμα also means ‘purpose’.
1.5 Σκόπει: The second-person singular here, as well as at 2.18 ἐξήτησας and 2.19 ἐπικρίνεις, could suggest that the addressee is a pupil or a friend of the epitomator. Cf. the discussion in the Introduction, pp. 40-1.

1.5–6 Σκόπει...6 σαφήνειαν: ‘So, consider whether something useful has been accomplished by us with regard to conciseness, but also with regard to clarity.’ The fact that the epitomator emphasises his aim of clarity (cf. also 1.19–21 ἵνα μὴ συντομία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφήνεια τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις ύπάρχῃ; 2.16–19 εἰ δὲ τὸ συντομώτερον τοῦ πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπειγομένου πεποιηκαμὲν ... μετὰ τοῦ σαφεστέρου) should not lead us to conclude that Herodian was not clear enough for his own audience. One should rather distinguish between Herodian, writing for highly educated people, and the author of our epitome, making an abridgment for pupils or less educated people. See Lentz (1867-70), LXIV.

1.6–10 ἔπει...10 Ἡσωδιανῷ: ‘Since the mass of conditions that appears all together in many rules was hard to comprehend, this has been divided, so that those that are brought under one rule by Herodian would become easy to comprehend divided’.

1.6–13 ἔπει...13 δυσεφικτον: The epitomator’s first method of excerpting Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας was the division
of the material pertaining to a single termination, which Herodian had placed in one large rule, into smaller ones, in order to make it easier to understand.

1.7 ὅρισμῶν: ὅρισμοί here are the conditions which have to be met for the rule to be valid (see Galland (1882a), 28-30, 40). Examples of conditions are given below 1.10–12 γένος ... πᾶθος.

1.9 <τὰ>: I have adopted Schmidt’s addition τὰ (1.8). This was probably omitted by a scribe under the influence of the termination -τα of the previous word (διαφέρετά).

1.10–13 τὸ...13 δυσεφικτον: ‘for to pay attention simultaneously to the gender, the derivational status, the compositional status, the termination, the penultimate (syllable), the beginning, the quantities, the letters, and the transformations of form, and whatever else, or most of these, is difficult and hard to achieve’.

1.10 γένος: ‘gender’; apart from masculine, feminine, neuter, which are evidently meant here, paying attention to gender includes, for Herodian and the epitomator, noticing whether a word has only one gender, or is a two-termination or three-termination adjective (μονογενής, διγενής, τριγενής). Cf. Lentz (1867-70), LXIII; Galland (1882a), 28.

1.10 εἶδος: ‘derivational status, i.e. underived or derived’. This term
is defined in the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax (I 25.3-5; see also Lallot (1998), 131, 149-50, 170). Cf. Lentz (1867-70), LXIII; Galland (1882a), 28; Dickey (2007), 235.

1.11 σχήμα: ‘compositional status, i.e. whether the word is simple (uncompounded), compound or parasytheton (derived from a compound)’. See D. T. I 1.29.5; Cf. Lentz (1867-70), LXIII; Galland (1882a), 28; Dickey (2007), 261.

1.11 χρόνον: ‘quantity’. This refers to the long or short quantity of the vowel in the ultimate and/or penultimate syllables. Cf. Lentz (1867-70), LXIII - LXIV; Galland (1882a), 28.

1.11–12 στοιχείον: ‘letter’. According to Lentz ((1867-70), LXIV (cf. the discussion in Galland (1882a), 28)), what is meant by στοιχείον is the presence or absence of consonant clusters, and/or the writing of a vowel sound either with a single vowel sign or as a diphthong. In my view στοιχείον just means that the presence of specific letters is important in many rules. Cf. Lallot (1997), ii 9; (1998), 95-8.

1.12 πάθος: ‘transformation/modification in the form (of the words)’.

See Dickey (2007), 250, with further literature.

1.13–17 ἔφ’ … ἄκολουθεῖν: ‘For each of these sorts of conditions the failure to cite examples immediately in many instances discourages the mind from following the other conditions easily’.
The epitomator had observed that another feature making the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφίας difficult to understand was that the examples exemplifying a specific sub-rule were not placed right after the sub-rule but at the end of the whole Herodianic rule. Therefore, in his epitome, he divided the examples that followed the whole Herodianic rule, so that each sub-rule would be followed by the examples exemplifying it.

1.14 ἐπὶ πολλοῖς: ‘in many instances’. I have not deleted this, differently from Schmidt (2.1).

1.14–15 ἄμα…15 διὰ: Schmidt’s suggestion to emend ἄμα διὰ to μὰ Δία (2.1) is weak, because an invocation to Zeus at the time when the epitome was composed would be anachronistic. Unlike Schmidt I have kept ἄμα and deleted only διὰ. It is possible that ἄμα (‘together’) is employed in order to emphasize εὐθὺς (‘directly’). διὰ could have been added by a scribe who failed to link τῶν παραδειγμάτων with παράθεσις and felt that he needed to supply διὰ to govern τῶν παραδειγμάτων.

1.15–16 ἀπαγορεύει…16 διάνοιαν: ἀπαγορεύω here means ‘exhaust, tire, make weary, discourage’; cf. sch. S. Tr. 789 ἀπηγόρευσεν ἑαυτόν.

1.17–21 δεῖ…21 υπάρχη: ‘In abbreviating the text of each rule one
should preserve it complete in this way, and gathered together from its particulars, so that there is not only brevity, but also clarity for the readers.’, (this translation is partly due to Mr Nigel Wilson). An example of this method is that often not all the conditions for the rule are mentioned at the very beginning of the rule, but later, when an exception is mentioned (e.g. 30.9–10 καὶ τὸ ... μονοσυλλάβων; 34.3–6 Τὰ ... ἐκτεταμένον; 35.19–20 τὸ ... συστέλλεται; 37.17–18 καὶ τὸ Ποδής ... παραλίγει; 80.11–13 τὸ ... ἀρχόμενα; 103.7–8 Πάμμιλος ... σύμφωνα; 107.18 τὸ ... ὁν).

1.17–18 ἐφ’ ... 18 περιτέμνοντας: The manuscripts’ περιμένοντας, referring necessarily to readers (‘those awaiting for ...’), is obscure. The epitomator refers to the readers towards the end of the sentence (τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις), and it is not clear why the readers would have had this specific expectation, i.e. that they would be awaiting for the text of each rule to be ‘complete and gathered from its particulars’. I have printed Schmidt’s emendation of περιμένοντας to περιτέμνοντας (2.3 app. crit.) so that the reference is to the task of the epitomator or, more generally, of the epitomators of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. If one ought to read (τὸν) ἀφ’ ... παραμένοντα with Göttling the meaning will be: ‘The remaining text of each rule ...’, but the text of the sentence becomes very
awkward because of ἐχειν αὐτόν. If one prints Ο’s αὐτόν to go with Göttling’s conjecture the meaning will be: ‘The remaining text of each rule must have itself in this way complete, and gathered from its particulars ...’, but again the meaning is less clear than when reading ἐφ’ ... περιτέμνοντας.

1.18 λόγον: ‘phrasing (of the rule)’. See also Galland (1882a), 30-1.

1.21–2.1 συντομίας ... 2.1 κρατυνομένων: ‘For the sake of brevity, prescribing rules through the examination of words that do not obey the rule is omitted, but through the examination of the words that confirm the rules’. Another technique of the epitomator was that, for the sake of brevity, he did not include the rationale behind the exceptions, thinking that it was enough if one knew the rationale behind the words that obey the rules. Examples of this method are: 29.4 τὸ δὲ γαστῆρ οξύνεται; 47.1–2 σεσημείωται ταχυτῆς, βραδυτῆς, ἀδροτῆς.

1.22 κανονίζειν: ‘prescribing rules’.

2.2–5 ἰκανόν ... 5 ἐχειν: ‘for it is enough to obey the rule that holds good concerning correct accentuation, so as not to go astray from correct Greek and not be ignorant of the rationale that establishes this’. The epitomator considers it enough to know the rules and their exceptions, without knowing why all the exceptions are exceptions.
2.3 ὥστε: A temporal meaning would be inappropriate here. I have therefore adopted Villoison’s emendation of the manuscripts’ ὅτε to ὥστε.

2.5–9 ἀλλὰ...9 συγγραφεῖ: ‘In addition, the great number of examples, and the explanation of the unknown (words) in these (examples), and the many citations of their use, have been left out by the author (of the epitome).’ In order to make his text brief, the author decided also to omit many of the examples, the explanations of little-known words used as examples, and the many citations of their use. The order in which the author of our epitome mentions how he dealt with the rules, the examples, their meanings, and citations of their usage in his text may give us an indication of the order in which this material appeared in the original text. The order in which the treatment of certain terminations appears in the palimpsest and the parchment fragment P. ANT. 2.67 coincides with the order in our Epitome, suggesting that our epitomator retained the overall structure of the lost original: the order of the books and of the rules within them. In this respect our Epitome is closer to the palimpsest and the parchment fragment rather than to Johannes Philoponus’ epitome (see also the discussion of the palimpsest and the parchment fragment in the Introduction, pp. 47-55).
2.9–11 κάκειθεν…11 φιλομαθῶν: ‘and the person who not only seeks correctness in accentuation but is also fond of learning the meanings of words and examples of usage (i.e. passages cited) will find these out from there (i.e. from Herodian’s original).’ Although the epitomator has cut the meanings of words and examples of usage out, he does not want to stop people from learning them, but the people who want to learn these will have to consult the Περί καθολικῆς προσῳδίας.


2.12–16 εὐθὺς…16 κατεπείγοντα: ‘So refraining from long-winded discussion in the introduction - laying out the size of the treatise, exposing the deficiency of those written before - we will reach the things that are urgent for the knowledge of regularity.’ One of the unfortunate results of our epitomator’s abridgement is that he omitted the προοίμιον of the Περί καθολικῆς προσῳδίας that was so valuable because it included Herodian’s definition of prosody, as we learn from Herodian’s Vita by Theodosius (see Lentz (1867-70), VI), and also, as we read in our Epitome’s preface, because it exposed the deficiency of those who wrote before on prosody.
2.12 τῷ προοιμίῳ: He refers to the προοίμιον of the Περὶ Καθολικῆς Προσῳδίας.

2.16–19 εἰ...19 ἐπικρίνεις: ‘And whether we have achieved (not only) greater brevity than the work that was pressing urgently in front of us, as you asked, and (i.e. but also) greater clarity and easier grasping by most people, you yourself will decide.’

On the view that this phrase suggests that our epitome was preceded by another epitome, whose abridgement our epitome is, see Egger (1876), 502. I disagree with this view for the following reasons: (i) If this were the case one would have expected this to have been mentioned more explicitly. Throughout the preface one always gets the impression that the comparison is made between Herodian’s original work and the epitome, with no hint at an intermediate stage. (ii) When the author says at the very beginning of this preface ή δὴ ἐπιτομῆς παράδοσις ὀνήσει πρὸς τὸ βούλημα (1.3–4) and σκόπει οὖν εἰ τι καὶ ἡμῖν ἴνα συμφαίναι εἰς συντομίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς σαφήνειαν (1.5–6), it is as if the author is introducing the idea and the genre of an epitome for the first time in the reception of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. It is, after all, the length of Herodian’s treatise that makes people give up in their attempt to arrive at the overall regularity in prosodies (1.2–3 πρὸς δὲ τὸ μήκος
τῆς Ἡρωδιανοῦ πραγματείας ἀπαγορεύοντας. (iii) Brevity and clarity are the epitomator’s two goals in his attempt to abridge Herodian’s original work, something which has been laid out already twice in the preface, in the framework of a comparison between the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας and this epitome: a) σκόπει οὖν εἰ τι καὶ ἡμῖν ἦνυσται χρήσιμον εἰς συντομίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς σαφήνειαν (1.5–6), b) ἵνα μὴ συντομία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφήνεια τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις ύπάρχῃ (1.19–21).

2.16 τι: Schmidt (2.21) printed C’s τό. MO’s τι makes good sense before συντομώτερον (‘somewhat briefer’). τό is an easy error before a neuter nominative or accusative.

2.17 πρὸ ἡμῶν: If ἐπειγομένου is emended to ἐπικειμένου (see the next note), one may understand πρὸ ἡμῶν to mean ‘in front of us’. With ἐπειγομένου, and the suggested by Mr Nigel Wilson προκειμένου (see the next note), the meaning is ‘before our time’.

2.17 ἐπειγομένου: If this is the correct reading here, the meaning ought to be ‘urgent’, cf. Hdt. 4.139.2. The epitomator probably implies that the addressee really seeks to receive (ἀσπερ ἐξήτησας) the Epitome of Herodian’s Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. It is possible that ἐπειγομένου is corrupt, having been influenced by κατεπειγόντα, the last word of the previous sentence. Mr Nigel
Wilson suggested to read προκειμένου (‘available’). I have thought about the possibility of emending to ἐπικειμένου (‘laid upon us’; in the sense of a duty; cf. ἀπετέρω ἔξητησας). See also the previous note.

2.28 ΟΣ: MO’s ως is clearly a mistake. Book 5 deals with the termination -ος.

2.31 <ωζ> I have added ως in order to indicate the parallelism between the alphabetical order in which the endings -βος, -γος, -δος etc. appear in book six and the alphabetical order in which the endings -βων, -γων, -δων appear in Book 1.

3.2 ΠΟΣ: MO’s ω is incorrect. Book 7 deals with the terminations -μος, -νος, -ξος, and -πος. I have thus printed -πος with Schmidt (3.14).

3.8 ΩΣ: MO’s ω is a mistake. Book 10 deals, inter alia, with the termination -ως. I have printed -ως with Schmidt (4.3).

3.12–13 κατά…13 Ω: καὶ τὴν εἰς ω μετὰ τῆς τῶν συμφώνων πάλιν τάξεως in the manuscripts’ description of Book 12 does not correspond to what one finds in the Epitome’s Book 12. Book 12 in the Epitome deals with nominals ending in -η, according to the alphabetical order of the letters preceding -η (e.g. -βη, -γη, -δη etc.) and with nominals ending in -ω. I have thus printed Schmidt’s emendation (4.6). The only possible explanation in favour of the
manuscripts’ reading is that in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίας the termination -ω might have also been dealt with according to the alphabetical order of the letters preceding it, in which case the phrase μετὰ τῆς τῶν συμφώνων πάλιν τάξεως (rather κατὰ τὴν τῶν συμφώνων πάλιν τάξιν; cf. 2.30–31 κατὰ γὰρ τὴν τάξιν τῶν στοιχείων ἡ παράθεσις; the meaning ought to be ‘according to ...’, not ‘together with ...’) referred both to the terminations -η and -ω. But if the picture of Book 12 we get from the Epitome represents the arrangement in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίας (something which is to a large extent evidenced through the correspondence with the palimpsest and the parchment in the arrangement of the material; see also the dicussion of the palimpsest, the parchment, and Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome in the Introduction pp. 47-56), then the emendation in the Table of Contents is necessary. In any case the inversion of the phrase referring to the alphabetical arrangement of the letters preceding -η, and the phrase καὶ τὴν εἰς -ω, could have easily occurred, especially if at some point the phrase was omitted by a scribe and then added above the line.

3.25 ἄθρως ἀντωνυμίας: I have inverted the order in which the two words appear in the manuscripts, so that it corresponds to the order in which the articles and pronouns are dealt with in Book 18.
3.31–4.5 Ἐπὶ...4.5 ἀναγνώσει: ‘Additionally to these twenty (books) the form to be read (in connected speech) according to the juxtaposition of words is transmitted in another book —following the exposition of the doctrine of the accentuation of individual words—, about separation of vowels and coalescence of vowels and the other things that accompany reading’.

4.3 γινομένης διδασκαλίας: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (5.4) of the manuscript’s γινομένην διδασκαλίαν. A genitive is needed after δῆλωσιν τῆς. The manuscripts’ accusative could be due to the accusative ἐκάστην.

4.11 οἱ: O’s οί is clearly wrong, since the text itself indicates that there should be a circumflex (4.10–11 ἢ δὲ οἱ ἀντωνυμία περισσωμένη ἐν τῷ ...).

4.13 ἐπευχόμενος: The scribal error ἐπευχόμενοι is due to assimilation of the termination -νος to οἱ, which a scribe might have taken to be the article. I have printed ἐπευχόμενος with Schmidt (5.12). καὶ οἱ ἐπευχόμενος occurs in the Iliad (16.829, 21.121).

4.15 ἔνι: I have emended the manuscripts’ ἔνι to ἔνι, since this is known to be Herodian’s view on the accentuation of ἔνι in this phrase (see the Herodianic scholion sch. Hom. II. 2.839b1; cf. Probert (2003), 128).
5.6 Δωριάν: This emendation suggested by Lobeck (PGG 190, n. 2) is an alternative for Δωρεύς occurring in Stephanus of Byzantium (δ 149). Lobeck’s other emendation, Δαρεύαν (PGG 190, n. 2), an alternative form for Δαρείος (cf. sch. A. Pers. 651.2 ἐσαυκε δὲ ὁ Δαρείος καὶ Δαρεύαν λέγεσθαι) is less plausible, both because Δωριάν is closer to MO’s reading δωρεάν and because Stephanus of Byzantium is known to have derived material from Herodian. For the formation of Δωριάν one may compare the ethnic designation Αἰνιάν (St. Byz. α 134), an alternative for Αἰνιός, designating a person from Αἰνία. On Αἰνιάν see also Fraser (2009), 95, 132. Cf. Ἀγριάνες, a variant for the ethnic Ἀγρία (St. Byz. α 47).

5.7 ὡητῶν: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (6.7,9,11) of the manuscripts’ ὡημάτων to ὡητῶν. Despite the fact that ὡὴμα can mean ‘word’, which is what the meaning of the sentence requires, it is not likely that a grammarian would use ὡὴμα to indicate ‘word’, due to its technical meaning ‘verb’. A scribe could easily have written ὡημάτων instead of ὡητῶν because it is much more common. I have adopted the same emendation at 5.10 and 5.12.

5.8 Αἰγίπαν: A rare name for the god Pan (see Roscher III, 1404). It occurs mainly in mythographical (e.g. Apollod. 1.42.8) and grammatical texts (e.g Choerob. in Theod. iv. 261.8).
5.8 Ἐμύόπαν: Another rare name for the god Pan (see Roscher III, 1404). It occurs mainly in grammatical texts (e.g. Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.i 261.8).

5.8–9 αἰνοτίταν: This is a hapax.

5.9 καρβάν: This rare word occurs again in Lyc. 1387; Hsch. ε 1243; sch. D. T. Lond. 540.26-7; Et. Gen. β 44.1-2; Choerob. in Theod. 261.8, 261.11; Psell. Poem. 6.424; Eust. II. I 581.26.

5.10 ὑητῶν: See note on 5.7 ὑητῶν above.

5.12 ὑητῶν: See note on 5.7 ὑητῶν above.

5.13 Ἀρχήν: A personal name (LGPN IIIA). Schmidt mentioned is his apparatus (6.12) Lobeck’s conjecture (PGG 191.21-2) ἁχήν, and did not capitalise Ἀρχήν in his text, something which suggests that he was not aware of the fact that Ἀρχήν was an attested personal name, and that he thought it was not the appropriate reading here.

5.13 λειχήν: The manuscripts’ αὐχήν is fully acceptable as an example of this rule, but in fact I consider αὐχήν to be the following example (see the next note). Lobeck’s correction (PGG 191.21-2) seems quite plausible. λειχήν serves well as an example of this rule and is also employed in the Περί μονήσους λέξεως (GG iii.ii 923.7), where it immediately precedes κηφήν and αὐχήν. If indeed λειχήν is the right reading here, this suggests that Herodian often repeated
lists of examples in his various works. The case for reading λειχήν here is strengthened by the fact that this word occurs in the vicinity of αὐχήν in some lexicographical sources thought to derive material from Herodian (Et. Gen. α 121.5-7, EM 22.40-4, Et. Sym. i 92.11-4). The scribe could have easily been influenced by the following word, thus writing that one instead of the original word (see the next note).

5.14 αὐχήν: The manuscripts’ ναυχήν is a vox nihili. Lobeck’s emendation (PGG 191.21-2) is adopted here because it is very plausible that the scribe repeated the final -ν of the previous word at the beginning of the next word, thus forming ναυχήν.

5.14 Ὀρφήν: This is a proper name (a by-form of Ὀρφῆς; cf. sch. D. T. Lond. 540.31), cf. Ibycus PMG fr. 25 = PMGF ὄνομάκλυτον Ὀρφήν, and therefore I have capitalised it, differently from Schmidt (6.13).

5.17–6.1 εἰ...παρασχηματισμόν: ‘if their form does not change for the neuter’.

6.1 Αγήν: The name of a satyr play written by the tragedian Python, but sometimes ascribed to Alexander the Great (see Snell (1964), 99-138).

6.1 ἀτμήν: This word is mainly found in grammatical and lexicographical works.

6.2 Αἰζήν: The third letter of this word in M is ambiguous between ζ,
and τ, more likely a ζ. The upper part of the letter looks more like that of a ζ, but the lower part should have been slightly more curved for a ζ. Schmidt (6.17) printed A’s αἰτήν, which is a vox nihilī. The shape of the third letter in M is probably responsible for the reading of A (αἰτήν). Many errors found in A (and in other manuscripts) are due to ambiguities in M: see also the chapter on the Manuscript Tradition. Ο’s αἰτήν αἰτήν could be thought to reflect the ambiguity in M (or in M’s source); the scribe could have been puzzled about what the third letter was and accidentally written both possible readings. Stephanus of Byzantium (α 72.3-5) mentions that the name Αἰτήν was cited in book 1 of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας and provides us with the information that Αἰτήν was a son of Tantalus (on Αἰτήν see also Et. Sym. I 92.21-2, Hdn. π.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 923.7-8 and Roscher (1884-1937), V, 77). Αἰτήν is cited again after a few lines, but this does not create any problem here. It is common in this Epitome (as it might have been in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας) for a word to be cited more than once, if it exemplifies more than one rule (e.g. ἀδήν 6.2, 7.1; ἔσσην 6.6, 6.13; εἶρην 7.7, 7.15; βαλλήν 6.9, 6.14; ποιμήν 7.8, 7.11; ἐφωδιός 69.1, 74.5).

6.2 ἀδήν...νόσος: For the word ἀδήν as referring to a νόσος see Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.i 264.34-5, cf. 264.26-7; Poll. 2.225.1-4,
4.201.5-202.1; *Et. Gen.* α 121.4; *EM.* 22.40; *Et. Sym.* I 92.11-3. Photius (α 335 = *Synagoge* Σβ α 351) provides evidence that Herodian considered the word ἀδήν to have a rough breathing and considered this to be irregular: Ἀδήν τῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι γεγενημένων ἐστι τούτο. γίνεται δὲ περὶ βουβώνας καὶ μασχάλας, καὶ ἕτε ὑπὸ τὰς σιαγόνας. ὃς ἐς ἱές καὶ δασύνεται παραλόγως, ὃς φησὶν Ἡρωδιανός (‘Ἀδήν this belongs to the things that happen in the body. And it occurs round the groins and the arm-pits and under the jaws. The word is oxytone and is irregularly aspirated, as Herodian says’). Therefore, I have employed the rough breathing and not the conventional spelling of the word.

6.4–5 μὴ...5 διφθόγγω: I could not find examples to exemplify this condition. Cf. Lentz 15.4 (app. crit.), who says that no such examples have survived.

6.5–6 εἰ...6 γένει: Cf. note on 5.17–6.1 above.

6.6–7 καμασῆ...7 ἰχθύς: The manuscripts' καμασῆν oιχθην are *voce nihil*. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation καμασῆν ὁ ἰχθύς (PGG 191.24-5). Καμασῆν is an uncommon word meaning 'fish' in Empedocles, but otherwise a special kind of fish (see LSJ s. v.). See Ath. 8.10.1-5 (= Empedocl. fr. 72.1-3); *Epit.* ii,i, 158.26-8; Hdn. π.μ.λ. *GG* iii.ii 923.11; Hsch. κ 574.
6.7 ναὸςῆν: This word is nowhere else attested and is perhaps a vox nihili. Lobeck (PGG 191.25-6) proposed the reading Δαμασῆν from Nonnus' Dionysiaca (25.453). He also suggested Βλισσῆν (on the basis of Eust. Od. I 128.15), and Διασῆν (PGG 191, n. 5). The personal names Ναοσῆ and Μνασῆ are possible but not supported by parallel passages. Naassenes, a variant name for the Ophites, a Gnostic sect of the second century (see Smith W. - Wace H. (1877-87), s. v.), is close to the transmitted reading, but it is doubtful if such a word would have been employed by Herodian as an example for his accentuation rules (see also below the note on ὀσσῆν). Another problem in associating ναὸςῆν to the above religious group is that the latter is only attested as a second-declension nominal (e.g. Ναασενοι Evang. Thom. 2, Hippol. Refut. omn. haeres. 5.pinax.2.1, 5.6.3.5, 5.9.11.5, 5.11.1.1, 10.9.1.2).

6.7 ἐφσῆν: This word is nowhere else attested. I have suggested two possible readings in the apparatus, the personal names Χεφσῆν (LGPN IIIB) and Θεφσῆν (LGPN IIIA). The first letter of a word could easily have been omitted by a scribe.

6.7 Αἰίςῆν: See the relevant note on 6.2 above.

6.7 Ἁςῆν: Both a common noun and a proper name. As a common noun this was the Phrygian word for πώγων; see Hsch. α 1451; Phot.
α 432 Ἀζήν ό πώγων κατὰ Φρύγας λέγεται. ἡ λέξις Ἀρωδιανοῦ; Synag. Σβ, α 420 Ἀζήν ό πώγων κατὰ Φρύγας λέγεται. ἡ λέξις Ἀρωδιανοῦ; cf. also Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.i 264.25-6, 264.32-4, Sophr. Char. Theodos. 395.8-9, Et. Gen. α 121.1-2, EM 22.36-7.

The proper name Ἀζήν indicates an inhabitant of Ἀζανία, a region in Arcadia (on this see Str. 8.3.1, 8.8.1, sch. A. Th. 323h.2-3, sch. E. Or. 1646.12-5, St. Byz. α 71, Eust. II. I 466.6-7 and the DGE s. v. Ἀζανία). Ἀζάνες is also the title of a tragedy by the tragic poet Achaeus (TrGF 20, fr. 2).

The fact that some of the above sources say that the word is Herodian’s (ἡ λέξις Ἀρωδιανοῦ) suggests either that our knowledge for the existence and meaning of this word is due to Herodian, or at least that later grammatical and lexicographical works derived their information on this word from Herodian.

The sources who say ἡ λέξις Ἀρωδιανοῦ might really have known which sense of the word Herodian meant, and therefore it is likely that the Phrygian word for πώγων is intended here.

6.8 ἀψη: (<α-ψην'). Lobeck PGG 192.1-2 explains that this equals ἀνεφίηστος (not ripened by caprification’, LSJ s. v.) in meaning. See LSJ s. v. ἀνεφίηστος, ψη, ψηνιζω. I have printed a smooth breathing with Schmidt (7.5).
6.9 βαλλήν: An uncommon, perhaps prehellenic word (on this see Chantraine (1968), 167) meaning ‘king’. On the spelling of this word with two and not one λ see LSJ s. v. βαλλήν. In defence of one λ see Lobeck PGG 191, n. 3.

6.9–10 Τελλήν: A personal name (LGPN IIIA, IIIB).

6.10 ωλήν: I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation of the manuscripts’ ωλλήν to ωλήν (PGG 192.5-7). ωλήν is either a common noun or a personal name (cf. Lobeck PGG 192.5-7, who hesitated whether this was a common noun or a proper name). For the latter, see e.g. Hdt. 4.35.9-15, Call. Del. 304-5, Paus. 10.5.7, 8. See also RE 17, 2432-3, s. v. Olen; DNP 8, 1161, s. v. Olen, BNP 10, 86, s. v. Olen.

6.10 κωλήν: The manuscripts’ κελήν seems to be a vox nihili. I have adopted Lobeck’s (PGG 192.7-8) emendation κωλήν. This is either a common noun (‘thigh, leg’) or a personal name (see Eust. ll. IV 824.16-825.1 and EM 550.36-8). The meaning ἐντερον provided as a synonym for κωλήν in Zonaras (κ 1273) is unparalleled. Lobeck’s Κυλλήν (PGG 192.9) is also possible but is attested only at Pausanias 8.4.5, 8.4.6, 8.17.1 and is less economical than κωλήν. κωλήν, on the other hand occurs a few times in grammatical and lexicographical works (e.g. Poll. 6.52.1, 6.52.6, 2.193.6, 5.70.1, Hsch. κ 4812, 4813, EM 550.36, 586.40).
6.10 σπελήν: This word is nowhere else attested and is probably a vox nihili. In the Περὶ μονήσους λέξεως there is a word στελήν (GG iii.ii 923.8) close to σωλήν (iii.ii 923.7) and βαλήν (iii.ii 923.8). στελήν and σπελήν seem to be corrupt forms of the genuine reading at this point. In the critical apparatus, I propose to read Σιπυλήν here, a word which is nowhere attested, but which could be an alternative form for Σιπυληνός, an inhabitant of the city Σίπυλος (the ethnic designation Σιπυληνός is attested at Stephanus of Byzantium 572.2-3). Chantraine (1968, 168) shows that names of peoples may take the termination -ην (e.g. Κηφήνες), and also that this termination is not to be separated from the ethnic designations in -ανος, -ηνος. Σιπυλήν is close to the reading provided by the manuscripts and υ could have been misread as ε. Schmidt’s Πελλήν (7.7.) is nowhere else attested as a nominative.

6.13 ὀσσην: This word occurs nowhere else. The stem of the word reminds us of the Osseni, a Jewish sect (see Smith W. - Wace H. (1877-87), s. v.), but it is questionable whether Herodian would have employed the names of Jewish religious groups to exemplify his accentuation rules. The Osseni are mentioned by Epiphanius (4th century; Panarion I 336.2, I 222.14) and Johannes Damascenus (7-8th century; De haeres. 18.1). If one could accept that Herodian quoted
such a word in his work, one would have to assume that Herodian is reconstructing the nominative singular according to the third declension, or that such a nominative singular was also in use (even if it is not otherwise attested), because the Osseni are usually declined in Greek according to the second declension (Οσσηνοί, Όσσηνοῖς, Όσσηνῶν). If indeed the word is meant to designate the Osseni, it is also possible that this word was later added by a scribe.

6.16–18 κατ’...18 Ἐγκτην: If κατ’ ἐπιπλοκήν δύο συμφώνων strictly meant a cluster of two consonants before the -HN, this would be in favour of the alternative writing of Ἐγκτην, i.e. Ἐκτην. My study of the terminology on syllable division, consonant clusters, and the indication of their place within a word, in the Introduction (the term κατ’ ἐπιπλοκήν is discussed in pp. 119ff.), has shown that sometimes the terminology is inaccurate. Thus, it is possible that δύο here means ‘at least two’. Cf. my discussion of ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ in the Introduction (pp. 120-1).

6.16 κατ’ ἐπιπλοκήν: On the term ἐπιπλοκή see the Introduction pp. 119-20.

6.17 Κεβρῆν: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (7.14) of the manuscripts’ κεφρήν to Κεβρῆν. Κεβρῆν is the name of a river (St.
Byz. 371.5) and of a city in the Troad (St. Byz. 371.4) and also of a river god (Apollod. 3.154.2-3, 3.147.6-7).

6.18 Ἐγκτῆν: or Ἐκτῆν. This is an ethnic designation (Paus. 9.5.1.1-8; Theognost. Can. II 27.12-3 (= 145.6-7); Su. ε 647; Zonar. ε 653.12; Et. Gud. (Additamenta) ε 395.21-2; EM 311.36-8; sch. Lyc. 433.19-24). There are three issues regarding the spelling and declension of this word. This word is sometimes spelled with a γ before κ and sometimes without in the various editions of works where it occurs. Secondly, it is sometimes written with a rough and sometimes with a smooth breathing. Thirdly, the nominative plural of Ἐ(γ)κτῆν is sometimes accented on the antepenultimate syllable (as implied here) and sometimes on the penultimate syllable in different editions of texts where the word occurs.

7.1 Ὕγην: An alternative form for Ὕγενος and Ὕγηνος (‘Ocean’) attested again in Hesychius (ο 19; ο 21).

7.1 ταγήν ἀτταγῆν: MO’s ἀττήν is nowhere else attested, and in any case it is incorrect here, because the rule prescribes that there should be a voiced consonant before the ending -ην. The following example, ἀτταγῆν, might have influenced a scribe who combined the beginning ἀττ- from ἀτταγῆν with the termination -ην and thus wrote ἀττήν. Ταγήν (the name of a bird: see Su. τ 10) and Ἄγην (on
this see note 6.1 above) are equally possible readings, but I print ταγήν with Lobeck (PGG 191, n. 4) because it is slightly closer to ἄτταγήν and this would facilitate the mistake (ἀττήν) that we find in the manuscripts. The stem of ταγήν is very close to that of ταγηνάριον, which according to LSJ s. v. is the diminutive of ἄτταγήν. If ταγήν is indeed the name of a bird, like ἄτταγήν, this could increase the possibility that these words were cited side by side in Herodian, because generally in the Epitome we find words that belong to the same semantic group (names of cities, rivers etc.) next to each other (e.g. names of rivers: 11.2 Σαλάγγων, Ερίγων; ethnic designations: 31.1–2 Βέχειω Σάπειω; personal names: 10.1 Αίγων Μέγων, 13.8–9 Φαέθων Φαέθοντος, Πυριφλεγέθων Πυριφλεγέθοντος, Κιναίθων, 15.1–2 Απόλλων Κεφάλων, 15.8–9 Τρυμών Σάλμων Τίμων Σίμων, 17.5 Αρτέμων Πολέμων Διδύμων, 18.2 Κόνων Σίνων; names of birds: 74.4–5 αἰγυπτίως, χαραδρίως, ἐφῳδίως).

One observes that ἄτταγήν is the only word exemplifying the specific rule that has more than two syllables. The other words are disyllabic. One could find this suspicious because the number of syllables is usually a significant factor that influences the accentuation of a word, but no condition with regard to the number
of syllables is mentioned in this rule, even though one could take as an indirect hint for the number of syllables of this rule the fact that the following rule contains the phrase 'ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβᾶς'. If the word was not intended here, it could be a faulty anticipation of the citation of the word in the following accentuation rule.

Lobeck’s emendation of ἀττην ἀτταγήν to ταγήν (ὁ ἀτταγήν) (PGG 191, n. 4) is interesting, but it is doubtful for two reasons. ἀτταγήν is not a common word and one would expect that words used to explain other words would have been easy and common. Moreover, it is suspicious that ἀτταγήν itself has a voiced consonant before the termination -ην as the rule prescribes.

7.1–2 τριβήν…2 τρίπους: For the meaning and ancient etymology of the word cf. Choerob. in Theod. 264.17-8; Eust. Od. I 309.6-7; EM 758.7-9; cf. also Orion τ 151.14-5.

7.3–4 χαίροουσι…4 ὀξεία: ‘are usually oxytone’.

7.4 κορδυλήν: This word is nowhere else attested. The stem of this word is close to that of κορδύλη (see LSJ s. v., III = σκορδύλη, a kind of fish) and κορδύλος (‘water-newt’), and perhaps there is a connection with these words (see Solmsen (1909), 143). The suffix -ην is used for the formation of the names of animals (see Chantraine (1968), 167). One may compare two uncommon names of animals
that are attested in our Epitome, namely ἄτταγήν (a kind of bird) and καμασίην (a kind of fish). κορδύλη and κορδύλος are kinds of animals, and κορδυλήν could be in some way associated with them (e.g. it could be a variant form of one of these words).

Epiphanius (Ancoratus 113.2.6) refers to the Κορδυληνοί. κορδυλήν could perhaps be a variant form for Κορδυληνός. Κορδύλη was a harbour on the coast of the Black sea (see Peripl. Pont. Eux. 36.13-5; RE 11.1386), and Κορδυληνοί were probably the inhabitants of this area.

7.4 μαραθήν: This is nowhere else attested. Solmsen (1909), 143-4 assumes that μαραθήν is derived from μάραθον = μάραθον (‘fennel’) and that it is a variant form for Μαραθών. I am inclined to assume, together with Schmidt (7.19, app. crit.), that μαραθήν is a variant form of the ethnic designation Μαραθηνός, the citizen of Μάραθος, a city in Acarnania (St. Byz. 431.18. On the relation between words ending in -ην and -ηνος see Chantraine (1968), 168).

It is possible that an ethnic designation in -ηνος had a variant form in -ήν (see also note on 6.10 σιπελήν). But we do not know whether, in the case that μαραθήν had an alternative form is -ηνος, this would have to be oxytone or recessive.

The termination -ην, although not very common, is used for the
formation of names of people, and the accentuation can be either
oxytone or recessive, e.g. Κηφήν (‘Persian’), Ἐλλην (on this see
Chantraine (1968), 168).

7.4–5 δοθήν: The manuscripts’ δοθήν is a scribal error. I have
adopted Lobeck’s emendation δοθήν (PGG 192.20-1).

7.5 περπέρην: This word is rare. Solmsen (1909), 144, saw a link
between this word and πέρπερος (‘vainglorious, braggart’). It is also
possible that περπέρην is an inhabitant of a city of Lydia and
Maeonia called Περπερη (or else Περμέρη), mentioned by Claudius
Ptolemaeus, Geographia 5.2.16.1-2. Another possibility would be that
this is the inhabitant of the village Περπερηνή, which is an
alternative name for the village in Asia called Παρπάρων,
mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium (508.10-7).

7.6 ὑπάνων: ‘words in common use’; see LSJ s. v., I.3

7.6 διαλεγομένων: ‘words used in dialects’. For this meaning of
dιαλέγομαι see LSJ s. v. διαλέγω, B.4.

7.7 εἰσην: An uncommon word used to describe ‘a Lacedaemonian
youth who had completed his twentieth year’ (LSJ, s. v.; see also
Bourguet (1927), 119; MacDowell (1986), 164-6).

There is a problem regarding the orthography of this word. In 9.85 of
Herodotus’ Histories we read ἱζέναις and ἱζένες in the critical
editions of Hude and of Rosén. In both cases this reading is an
emendation by Valckenaer, whereas the manuscripts transmit
\(\text{i} \varepsilon \dot{\varphi} \varepsilon \alpha \zeta / \dot{\varphi} \varepsilon \alpha \zeta\) and \(\text{i} \varepsilon \dot{\varphi} \varepsilon \varepsilon / \dot{\varphi} \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon\). Flower and Marincola (2002), 85-6
keep the readings \(\dot{\varphi} \varepsilon \alpha \zeta\) and \(\dot{\varphi} \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon\) (and argue for this on pages 255-6)
in their edition and commentary on Herodotus’ Book 9. I see no
reason to worry about the spelling of the word with \(\varepsilon \iota\)-, both because
the word is attested with this orthography in inscriptions (e.g. IG V, 1
279) and in grammatical and lexicographical sources (Choerob. in
513b).

Regarding the accent of this word, a passage from the \(\Lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \iota \zeta \)
\(\text{Hrōdōtou} \) (II, 465) testifies for the oxytone accentuation of this word,
but all the other evidence from grammatical works and etymological
lexica (the relevant references are cited above) supports the recessive
accent.

7.8 \(\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \iota \nu \nu\): This rare word occurs again in Plutarch (\(\text{Ly} c. 17.2.6\)),
Hesychius (\(\mu 753\)), \(\text{Glossae in Herodotum}\) (\(\varepsilon 32.4, 32.7\); but written with
one \(\lambda\)), and the \(\text{Suda}\) (\(\mu 483\); but written with one \(\lambda\)).

7.9–10 \(\varepsilon \iota\ldots 10 \text{ MHN}\): An example of this exception is \(\dot{\alpha} \chi \iota \pi \o \iota \iota \nu\),
which is cited in the preceding rule.

7.10 \(\Delta \alpha \mu \iota \iota \nu\): A personal name (\(\text{LGPN IIIA}\)).
7.14 Σειρήν: The interchange between ει and ι is a common iotacistic error in manuscripts. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation Σειρήν (8.6).

7.14 Πειρήν: The manuscripts’ πιρήν is nowhere attested. Lobeck’s (PGG 192.30) emendation Πειρήν is reinforced by a passage in the Περί μουνήρους λέξεως (GG iii.ii 923.8), where Πειρήν occurs in the vicinity of σειρήν. πιρήν is either a common noun (‘a kind of fish’) or a proper name. For mythological figures bearing this name see RE 19.1, 105-6; DNP 9, 477; BNP 10, 679-80.

7.14 Τεπορήν: This word is nowhere else attested and is probably a νοx nihili. The rule prescribes that the words end in -ην καθαρόν (‘preceded by a vowel’), and thus the word δεπορήν cannot serve as an example. The reading proposed by Lobeck, πιρήν (PGG 192.30-1), would exemplify the specific rule but is not supported by any parallel passage.

7.15 Είρην: The manuscripts’ ἄριην is inappropriate due to καθαρόν (‘preceded by a vowel’, 7.12). I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation ειρήν (8.7).

8.1 παροξύνεται: I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation παροξύνεται (PGG 192.25). Despite the fact that the transmitted
words in the list of this rule contain scribal errors (see the individual 
notes on these words), they have the accent on the penultimate.

8.1 γέφην: The manuscripts’ ἐφην is nowhere else attested. I have 
adopted the emendation γέφην that appears in Schmidt’s apparatus 
(8.9). γέφην is attested in Eustathius (II. III 903.20-1) and in 
Theodosius (Can. nom. iv.ii 18.19-20) just before the example τέφην, 
and in Choeroboscus (in Theod. 265.16-24) in the vicinity of Ἕλην 
and τέφην. τέφην and γέφην are consecutive lemmata in the Lexicon 
Artis Grammaticae, but γέφην comes after τέφην. It should be noted 
that the Lexicon Artis Grammaticae in 429.17-431.11 includes 
explanations and comments on words that are cited in books one and 
two of our Epitome, and the material of the Lexicon is arranged 
according to the terminations as in the Epitome (words that end in -ν 
as in Book 1 of the Epitome and then words with the terminations -ξ 
and -ο as the beginning of Book 2).

There is both a common and a proper name γέφην. As a common 
noun it indicates a female γέφανος (‘crane’; cf. Phot. γ 88 and Eust. II. 
I 352.2). Choeroboscus (in Theod. 265.20-1), Theognostus (Can. II 
68.5-6 (=368.2-3)) and the Lexicon Artis Grammaticae (430.2) cite Γέφην 
as a proper name. Stephanus of Byzantium (γ 59) says more 
specifically that it is the name of a city or unwalled village in Lesbos.
8.1 τέφην: I have adopted Schmidt's emendation τέφην (8.9) of the manuscripts' τέφην. The emendation is supported by the attestation of τέφην in Theodos. Can. nom. iv.ii 18.19-20, Choerob. in Theod. 265.16-24, Eust. II. III 903.20-1. See also the note on γέφην above.

8.1 Θέφην: The manuscripts' θέφην occurs nowhere else, and is in any case unsuitable here due to καθαρόν ('preceded by a vowel'; see also note on πέφην below). I have printed Θέφην with Schmidt (8.9), although no river with this name is attested. A river called Θήρην is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (5.72.4.4; cf. RE V.A. 2367, Bursian (1868-72), II 558, Fick (1905), 25), but it occurs in no other ancient source as the name of a river. Herodian's source might have contained Θέφην, which could have been a corrupt form of Θήρην (the corruption of η to ε would not have been difficult). If Θέφην is a corrupt form of Θήρην, still Θήρην will not be a proper example of the specific accentuation rule, which prescribes that there should be an ε in the penultimate syllable. It is also possible that Θέφην is an otherwise unknown river.

8.2 πέφην: The manuscripts' πέφην occurs nowhere else, and in any case it would not be a suitable example here, because the rule prescribes that the -φην should be καθαρόν ('preceded by a vowel'). Schmidt (8.9, app. crit.) suggested that the reading here should be
περιφέρην. περιφέρην could serve as an example, as it satisfies the conditions for the accentuation rule. The fact that περιφέρην has more than two syllables, differently from the other examples cited, does not seem to be a problem, because the number of syllables is not given as a condition for the specific accentuation rule. περιφέρην is also cited above on 7.5, but words are often quoted as examples of more than one rule in our Epitome, if they satisfy the rules’ conditions. On περιφέρην see above on 7.5.

8.3–5 Τά...5 Σαλαμίς: On the alternative terminations of δελφίν/δελφίς, τελχίν/τελχίς and Σαλαμίν/Σαλαμίς, cf. Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.i 267.22-4. It is noteworthy that the three examples above are cited in the same order in Choeroboscus as in our Epitome.

8.6 ευάκτιν: This rare word occurs again in Choeroboscus (in Theod. GG iv.i 267.19-21), the Etymologicum Gudianum (κ 300.16-7), and the Etymologicum Magnum (491.49-51).

8.6 χαυσακτιν: This word occurs only in our Epitome and in Sophronius’ Excerpts from Johannes Charax’ commentary on Theodosius’ Canones (395.27; see the quotation in the apparatus of parallel passages).

8.7–9.1 ἔξαιρέτως...9.1 Αἰολεῦσι: ‘characteristically in the Aeolic’.

9.1 Φόρκυν: The name of a variety of mythological figures. See RE
XX.1, 534-6, s. v. Phorkys, DNP 9, 951, s. v. Phorkys, BNP 11, 180, s. v. Phorcys.

9.1 Πόλτυν: This rare word is sometimes cited as a proper name (Theognost. Can. II 27.17 (= 147.2), II 68.10 (369.3)) or as ξυλόκαστρον (‘castle made of wood’; EM 681.20-1; Zonar. π 1560.14-6). In the Lexicon Artis Grammaticae the lemma Πόλτυνος (449.6) is given the explanation ‘name of a mountain’. If the meaning of this word is indeed ξυλόκαστρον then it is a synonym for μόσ(σ)υν. It is nevertheless possible that πόλτυν does not mean ξυλόκαστρον but that πόλτυν was confused with μόσ(σ)υν. In any case it seems suspicious that two uncommon words ending in -υν are synonyms.

9.1–2 μόσυν: This word is sometimes attested with double σσ; for double sigma cf. also X. An. 5.4.26.3; Lyc. 433, 1432; A. R. 2.381b, 2.1026; Call. Aet. fr. 43.68; sch. X. An. 5.4.2.2; sch. A. R. 159.17; D. P. Orb. descr. 766; Hsch. μ 1702, 1704; St. Byz. β 98.5, Theognost. Can. II 68.9 (= 369.2); Phot. μ 544; Su. μ 1272). Various meanings are attested for this word: wooden house (EM 591.35; Zonar. μ 1368), wooden castle (Zonar. μ 1368), wooden tower (Choerob. in Theod. 269.4-5; 270.9-10; Et. Gud. κ 322.19-20), tower (Str. 12.3.18.14-5; Eust. D. P.
765.9-10), wall (Lexic. Art. Gramm. 430.3), wooden walls (sch. Lyc. 433.3-4; cf. 433.17).

9.3–4 ει...4 δηλοί: An example of this exception would be βουβων, cf. Lentz’s reconstruction 23.1.

9.4 Στίβων: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ στείβων to Στίβων (8.18) on the basis of Su. σ 1101 and Theognost. Can. II 30.32 (= 169.4), which is a personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA). The interchange between ι and ει is a common ioticastic error in manuscripts.

9.4 τρίβων: Either a common noun (‘garment’) or a personal name (LGPN I, IIIA, VA).

9.7 Αλαβών: The name of a city in Sicily and of a river: see Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων ὁξυτ. 22.26; St. Byz. α 187; Et. Sym. I 270.14-5; D. S. 4.78.1.5-4.78.2.1.

9.7–8 τό...περισπάται: Theognostus (Can. II 30.33-4 (=169.5-6) says that the reason why Χαρναβών is an exception is because it is declined with ντ and maintains the ω in the oblique cases. Χαρναβών, mentioned in Sophocles’ Triptolemos (F 604 (547)), was a ruler of the Getae.

9.10 δύναμιν: ‘meaning’.

9.10 ἦ...κλίνοιτο: No example of this type of exception is given, but
Lentz (23.17-9) in his reconstruction cites some possible examples, e.g. πυγόν, λαγόν, σταγόν, τυγών, γοργών.

9.11–10.1 Πύγων: A personal name (see LGPN I, IIIA, IIIB).

Schmidt (9.5) printed πυγόν, which is found once in Choeroboscus’ Onomati con (I, 74.28, Gaisford). But the manuscripts’ Πύγων is suitable as an example of this accentuation rule and there is no reason why it should not be kept in the text.

10.1 Αίγων...Φλέγων: Personal names (LGPN I, II, IIIA; LGPN I, IIIA, IIIB, IV, V; LGPN IIIA, IV, V, respectively).

10.1–2 το...2 οξύνεται: φηγόν (‘oak-grove’) and ἀγών (‘assembly, course’) are exceptions because they are περιεκτικά (they denote a place in which things are situated).

10.1 φηγόν: This is very rare. φηγόν is glossed by the Latin aesculatum (‘oak-forest’) in the Corpus glossariorum latinorum II 525, 29.

11.1 ἔλεγων: The manuscripts’ ἔλεγων is nowhere else attested. Three sources, which are parallel to our Epitome, Theodosius’ Π. κλίς. ων βαρυτ. 18.9-14 (Πελάγων), Theognostus’ Can. II 31.12-23 (= 174; Οὐκαλέγων) and the Iliad scholion 21.141.13-7 deriving from Herodian (Οὐκαλέγων, Πελάγων; see the full quotations in the apparatus of parallel passages), suggest that either Πελάγων or Οὐκαλέγων should be restored here. The passage of Theodosius
points towards Πελάγων, while Theognostus (II 31.12-23 (= 174.1-7))
supports the reading Οὐκαλέγων. Οὐκαλέγων appears also in
Theodosius’ passage, but within a Homeric citation. The Homeric
scholion quotes both Οὐκαλέγων and Πελάγων, but Πελάγων is
cited just before Σαλάγγων. The text cannot be reconstructed with
certainty.

11.2 Εὐάγων: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IV). Schmidt (9.10)
printed Πελάγων (see also the previous note). But the manuscripts’
Εὐάγων satisfies the conditions for this rule, and thus there is no
reason to replace it. The order in which the examples appear in
Theodosius’ Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὁν βαρυτόνων (18.10-4; see the
quotation in the apparatus of parallel passages) strengthens the view
that the word needed here is Εὐάγων. In this passage Πελάγων,
Εὐάγων and προάγων appear in the same order as in our Epitome.

11.2 Σαλάγγων: The manuscripts’ σαλάγγων occurs nowhere else
and is probably a scribal error. Schmidt’s emendation Σαλάγγων
(9.10 e Hdn. II. pros. Φ 141 (= sch. Hom. II. 21.141.14-5)) is the name of
ων βαρυτ. 18.10. The readings Σαλγόν in Choeroboscus (Onomat. I,
74.34, Gaisford), Σταλάγων in Theognostus (Can. II 31.14-5 (=}
174.3-4)) and Φαλάγγα in Eustathius (Il. IV 474.21) all seem to be
different corrupt forms of the word Σαλάγγα.

11.2 Ἐφίγων: The name of a river (Strabo 7a.1.12.1-5; 7a.1.20.1-5;
7a.1.22.6; 7a.1.23.6; cf. also 7.7.8.49-51; Ath. 2.18.24-6; Flav. Arr. Alex.
Anab. 1.5.5.2).

11.4 του: This is redundant for the meaning. I have deleted this.

11.5–6 ἀφηγών ...σύμμαχος: The word ἀφηγών is usually
explained as βοηθός in other passages, except for sch. Hom. Il.
21.141.10 deriving from Herodian, where the synonym provided is
σύμμαχος as in our Epitome. This perhaps suggests that σύμμαχος
was particularly Herodian’s gloss for ἀφηγών. For the gloss βοηθός
see: D sch. Hom. Il. 4.7; Hsch. α 7149; Apollon. Lex. 42.4; Ep. Hom.
77,2; Et. Gud. α 192.4-5; EM 141.11; Et. Sym. II 188.25.

11.6 πλήν ...καταπύγων: καταπύγων is an exception, because it is
derived from κατάπυγος.

11.9 ἀγκύλων: This variant form of ἀγκύλος is uncommon. Given
that ἀγκύλος could be either an adjective or a personal name (see
LGPN II), it is possible that ἀγκύλων could be either of the two as
well. Theodosius (Π. κλίσ. αν βαρυτ. 20.36) cites this as a proper
name.

11.12 ἦ: I have emended the manuscripts’ καὶ to ἦ because the words
that are employed to exemplify the rule either keep the ω but do not decline with ντ in the oblique cases (e.g. κώδων, Φείδων, Φείδων, κλύδων), or decline with ντ, but do not keep the ω (e.g. κνώδων).

11.14 Φείδων: Either a personal name (see LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIB, IV, VA) or a common noun (Poll. 10.179.9-10 εἰς δ’ ἄν καὶ φείδων τι ἀγγείων ἐλαίηρόν, ἀπὸ τῶν Φειδωνείων μέτρων ωνομασμένον).

12.2 Μυγδών: A personal name (LGPN IIIA; accented Μύγδων).

12.2 Σαρδών: An alternative name for Σαρδώ, the island Sardinia (St. Byz. 556.19-557.1; Eust. D. P. 82.1-2; cf. also 458.20-1).

12.4–5 Κινάδων: A Spartan personal name (LGPN IIIA).

12.5 Κορυδών: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

12.8 Αμυδών: Name of a city (and its eponymous hero; see Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὁν ὀξυτ. 22.32, Choerob. in Theod. 280.34–5) in Paeonia (St. Byz. α 281, Eust. Il. I 565.19).

12.8 Απιδών: The manuscripts’ ἀσπιδών is nowhere else attested. I have adopted Lehrs’ emendation Απιδών, which is strengthened by the fact that Απιδών occurs in the same lemma (Ποσειδών) as Αμυδών and Καλυδών in the Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως (GG iii.ii 914.6-20), and by the fact that Απιδών is cited next to Καλυδών and Αμυδών in the treatise Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὁν ὀξυτόνων (22.31-2). The Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὁν ὀξυτόνων and the Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν
εἰς ὧν βαρυτόνων usually cite examples that are also found in our Epitome. The Περὶ κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὧν ὀξυτόνων provides us with the information that Απιδών is the name of a hero, but perhaps this is due to a confusion with Απις, the son of Phoroneus, from where the Απιδόνες were thought to have taken their name (St. Byz. α 357). Απιδόνες is a name for the Αρκάδες (St. Byz. α 357.7) as well as the people coming from Argos, since Απία was an old name for Argos (St. Byz. α 357.1-2).

12.8 χελιδών: No city with this name is attested. According to sch. Ar. Ἀν. 1680 the word χελιδών was cited in book 1 of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφορίας: [...] οὕτω δὲ αὐτῷ φησὶ βαρβάρως καὶ δυσφράστως, ὡσπερ αἱ χελιδόνες. καὶ Αἰσχύλος τὸ βαρβαριζεῖν χελιδονίζειν (φησὶ) καὶ Ἰων ἐν Ὀμφάλῃ τούς βαρβάρους, χελιδόνας ἀρσενικῶς φησιν, (ὡς Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ τῆς καθόλου φησὶν [...]). This evidence for χελιδών in book one of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφορίας encourages the thought that χελιδών is the correct reading at this point. Nevertheless, there could be something missing before χελιδών, indicating that this word too is oxytone as it has ἡ in the penultimate syllable, even though it is not the name of a city or an ethnic designation. The fact that Choeroboscus (in Theod. 317.7-9 Τὰ δὲ εἰς ὧν ὀξυτόνα θηλυκὰ μὴ
όντα ἐπὶ πόλεων τρέπουσι τὸ ω εἰς τὸ ο ἐν τῇ γενικῇ, οίον πλαγγῶν πλαγγόνος, χελιδῶν χελιδόνος), cites χελιδῶν among words that are not the name of a city, could suggest that χελιδῶν in the passage of our Epitome was intended as an exception to the accentuation rule, in the sense that it is neither the name of a city nor an ethnic designation but still it is oxytone. If this is true, then the text needs an addition, e.g. 'τὸ δὲ χελιδῶν σεσημεῖωται' or 'σεσημεῖωται τὸ χελιδῶν', and the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφωνίας might have also included an explanation similar to ἐξύτονον οὐκ ὄνομα πόλεως ἣ ἑθνικὸν ὄν'. Another explanation for the citation of χελιδῶν at this point would be that χελιδῶν could be employed catachrestically as an ethnic designation in the sense that χελιδῶν could mean βάρβαρος (sch. Ar. Λv. 1680). For χελιδῶν meaning βάρβαρος see also Hsch. χ 325 and Su. χ 187. Χελιδῶν is also attested as a personal name (LGPN IIIA, VA), but the rule makes no mention of personal names. It is, however, possible that something is missing from the conditions for the rule, e.g. something like ἡ κυψα before or after ἡ ἑθνικά'.

12.11 ἄρσενικά: It is noteworthy that ἄρσενικά here is given as one of the conditions for this accentuation rule, which makes one expect masculine nouns to be cited as examples. Nevertheless, three
adjectives (μείζων, ὀλίζων, ἀλαζῶν, the latter of which is in any case an exception) are quoted among the examples. Perhaps the use of ἀφενικός here is meant to distinguish the masculine and feminine form (which is the same for these adjectives) as opposed to neuter ones. It is also possible that one ought to add something like καὶ ἐπιθετικά after ἀφενικά. This is the only case in our Epitome where the term ἀφενικά is used with regard to adjectives, when these have the same form and accent in the masculine and feminine.

12.12 καὶ: I have adopted Lentz’s emendation since the condition regarding words with more than two syllables has to be combined with one of the two other conditions, the long α (e.g. ἀλαζῶν) or having the name of a city (e.g. the Thracian ethnic designation Ὁλιζών; on this see the following note). The abbreviation for καὶ is often confused with η in minuscule manuscripts (see also note on 18.1 καὶ).

12.13 πόλει ὑμονυμεῖ: An example of this exception could be the Thracian ethnic designation Ὁλιζών (Su. o 167), which has the same name as the city Ὁλιζών (Hsch. o 562, St. Byz. 489.14, Theognost. Can. II 38.26 (=207.9)). See also below on 12.14–15 <....> ὀξινεται.

12.14 ὘ίζων: Either the son of Cadmus (see Theodos. Π. κλίσ. εἰς ον βαρυτ. 19.8) or the name of a city (St. Byz. 545.5 and β 140.4-5; cf. Str.
7.5.7.2 who reports this word as the name of a city) and a river in
Illyria (St. Byz. 545.5 and β 140.4-5).


12.14–15 <> ... 15 ὀξυνεται: In this section there is an example of only
one of the two groups of exceptions to the general rule of the
accentuation of the words ending in -ζων, which is ἀλαζων, a word
that is oxytone because it has more than two syllables and has α in
the penultimate syllable. One would expect to get an example of the
other type of exception, which occurs when a word ending in -ζων
has more than two syllables and has the same form as the name of a
city (πολει όμωνυμει). The lacuna could be filled with the addition
of the ethnic designation ὀλιζων (see also the critical apparatus),
which has more than two syllables and has the same form as the city
name ὀλιζων (cf. Theodos. Π. κλις. ον ὀξυτ. 22.34-23.5). Ολιζωνες
are according to the Suda (ο 167) an ἔθνος Θρακικόν. It is true that
ὁλίζων is often used in grammatical texts in contrast to the city
Ὀλιζὼν with regard to its accent (cf. St. Byz. 489.14-7; Eust. II I
513.11-2). This observation probably led Lentz (28.2-4) to reconstruct
the text by making the distinction between the city Ὀλιζὼν and the
adjective ὀλιζων. Nevertheless, the city name Ὀλιζὼν is feminine
(on this see Hom. II. 2.717; Theodos. Π. κλις. ον ὀξυτ. 23.4-5; St. Byz.
489.15-6; Su. μ 501; Eust. ll. I 512.2; Zonar. o 1443.16), something
which creates problems in adding this word in this accentuation rule
which is about the ἄφοσενικά ending in ζων.

12.19 μόθων: M’s μώθων and O’s μύθων are scribal errors. I have
adopted Schmidt’s emendation μόθων (10.18).

13.1 τώθων: The manuscripts’ τόθων occurs nowhere else. Two
readings are plausible here: Lobeck’s emendation κώθων, on the
basis of a parallel passage from Choeroboscus (in Theod. 274.2-7) and
τόθων, supported by a passage from Theognostus (Can. II 33.27-31
(= 184). κώθων could be either a common noun or a personal name
(LGPN I). I consider κώθων slightly more likely than τόθων,
because in Theognostus τόθων and μόθων are not next to each
other, and the only other example common to Theognostus and our
Epitome is πίθων, while κώθων in Choeroboscus is right next to
μόθων and in vicinity of Πίνθων and αἰθων, two examples which
are also cited in the relevant accentuation rule in our Epitome. A
passage in Eustathius (Od. I 46.40-1) presents the genitives κώθωνος
μόθωνος τόθωνος in a row, but is not decisive with regard to which
of the two possible readings should be printed, partly because of its
brevity. The three passages cited above suggest that both κώθων and
were cited in the Περί καθολικῆς προσφηδίας close to μόθων.

13.1 τΜάθων...Θηβαίος: If indeed Μάθων is the right word here then one would expect that this person was sufficiently well known to be mentioned by Herodian. But we have no information about a Theban figure with this name. The LGPN IIIB has no-one of this name. Moreover, even if one assumes that there was such a personal name and that there was a person with this name who was sufficiently well known to be cited in a work, still no other name in this Epitome is given an explanatory gloss like this; we only find such glosses for common nouns and adjectives. In the critical apparatus I have suggested emending Μάθων ὁ Θηβαίος into μάλθων ὁ θηλαίος. The emendation of Μάθων into μάλθων is very tempting, both because of the parallel passage from Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων βαφυτ. 19.24-9 (quoted in the critical apparatus) and because the corruption of μάλθων to μάθων must have been easy as it involves the omission of just one letter. The correction of Μάθων to μάλθων creates problems since there needs to be correspondence between the word cited and the word that the manuscripts transmit as its explanation (i.e. Θηβαίος). The difficulty is overcome if θηβαίος is not a genuine word of the text. In passages where a
meaning is provided for the word μάλθων we find μαλακός in Theodosius Π. κλίσ. ων βαρυτ. 19.25-6 and γύνανδρος in the Suda μ 111. Neither of the two words, nevertheless, is palaeographically close to the transmitted θηβαιός, thus making it hard to assume the corruption of either μαλακός or γύνανδρος into θηβαιός. There is a possibility that the explanatory word cited after μάλθων was θηλαίος, a word that is cited in our Epitome (79.11) and is very close to θηβαιός as it involves only the change of a single letter. Even though this word is rare and is attested only in Byzantine Greek (see LBG IV s. v. θήλαιος (see the Analecta Hymnica Graeca III, 253.28); the accent of the word is different, but it is possible that both accentuations were in use), its stem is related to θήλυς θήλεια θήλυ.

The fact that the evidence for this word comes from late Byzantine texts could make one wonder about the authenticity of this reading and could point to a later addition by a scribe, but we may be dealing with an early occurrence of this word. It is reasonable that words in colloquial use might be attested particularly early in glosses, since a word used as a gloss really needs to be easily understood.

A name Μέθων is attested (see LGPN IIIB), but no famous figure with this name is known, thus making it difficult to understand why Herodian would have cited this name.
13.2 Ρίνθων: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

13.2 Αἴθων: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIB, VA).

13.3 Πυθών πόλις: Πυθών is oxytone because it is a city, but cities were not announced as exceptions to this rule. See also below on 13.3 κιθών ... ὄξυνεται.

13.3 Σιθών: This is oxytone, because it is an ethnic designation (cf. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ὄν ὄξυτ. 23.9).

13.3–4 κιθών ... 4 ὄξυνεται: In the statement of the general rule for disyllabic masculine words in -θων two types of exceptions are mentioned: ethnic designations and words denoting a place in which things are situated. κιθών is either thought of as a 'περιεκτικόν' (ὡς περιεκτικόν; cf. Choerob. in Theod. 280.3-29) because the person is situated in it, or the phrasing of another type of exception has been left out (either due to a scribal error or by the epitomator for the sake of brevity; cf. also the case of Πυθών, which is said to be oxytone because it is a city, while cities are not prescribed as exceptions to this rule), or the citation of κιθών (ὁ χιτών) here is a mistaken interpolation. Alternatively, it is possible that after a list of exceptions which are taken care of in the rule, the list went on to include some general exceptions.

13.9 Κιναίθων: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).
13.10 Ἀγγανθών: The name of a mountain in Mysia (St. Byz. α 394, Theognost. Can. II 34.2 (≈ 185.4)), and therefore as the rule allows, it is exceptionally oxytone.

14.5 Χάλκων: A personal name (LGPN I, IV).

14.5 Κίκων: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA) and an ethnic designation (RE 11.1, 381, s. v. Kikon, DNP 6, 454, s. v. Kikones, BNP 3, 327, s. v. Cicones).

14.6 κρόκων: This word occurs nowhere else. It probably means a saffron meadow (‘parterre de crocus’, DELG). It has the ending -ών, which is characteristic of περιεκτικά and it has the stem of κρόκος (‘saffron’).

14.6 πευκών: This rare word occurs again in Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων ὀξυτ. 23.11 and sch. Hom. ll. 18.576a1.4.

14.6 χαλκών: ‘forge, smithy’, see DELG s. v. χαλκός. This word occurs only in our Epitome and in Theodosius’ Π. κλίσ. ων ὀξυτ. 23.11.

14.8 Αγκών πόλις: The Greek form of the Italian city Ancona.

14.12 μὴ οὕτως: i.e. μὴ διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενα.

14.13 τοπικωτέρα: ‘rather place-like, more or less indicative of place’. It should be noted that the terms τοπικός and περιεκτικός overlap in their use. περιεκτικά denotes a subset of τοπικά,
something which, apart from being semantically sensible, is shown in our Epitome by the use of the two terms next to each other, the one referring to the other: τοπικά περιεκτικά (25.11–12) and περιεκτικήν τοπικήν ἔννοιαν δηλοῖ (113.9 Schmidt). τοπικά περιεκτικά equals περιεκτικά, as is shown in the Epitome e.g. by the fact that ἀνδρῶν is once included in a list of τοπικά περιεκτικά (25.11–12), and once in a list of περιεκτικά (18.15–16). Furthermore, τοπικά περιεκτικά may be referred to in the Epitome simply as τοπικά, or as περιεκτικά, so that in some instances the terms are interchangeable. Thus, κοιτῶν is once called τοπικῶν (23.7) and once περιεκτικῶν (20.3–4), and ἀχυρῶν is once referred to as τοπικῶν (19.2–3) and once as περιεκτικῶν (136.7–8); γυναικῶν, μυλῶν, ἀχυρῶν are called τοπικά (14.15–16, 14.21, 19.2–3 respectively), although the term περιεκτικά would also have been appropriate (cf. the use of περιεκτικῶν to describe ἀνδρῶν at 18.15–16). Conversely, τρασιά, αἵμασια, σκηνή and ἱπτῶν are called περιεκτικά in the Epitome (113.3-4 Schmidt, 113.4 Schmidt, 128.1-2 Schmidt, 17.7, respectively), although they could also have been called τοπικά.

14.14 χαρακτόν: This word is very rare: it occurs only in our Epitome and in the papyri P. Ryl. II 427, fr. 19; P. NYU II, 40v.16; SB ΧΧΙΙ 15747.3, 15750.3.
14.14 ἀνθρακών: This word is attested only in our Epitome and in an ostraca (O. Claud. IV 742.5).

14.14–15 φαμακών...15 βαφεῖον: The word φαμακών (‘dye-house’) is uncommon. Other sources also give us the synonym βαφεία (‘dyer’s house or workshop’) for φαμακώνες: sch. Hom. Il. 4.191a.2; Hsch. φ 184, α 8565; Et. Gud. φ 549.12-3; Eust. Il. I 734.21-2, IV 648.20-1, Od. I 56.27-8, 352.2-3. Cf. Poll. 7.169.6-7.

14.16 Τριάκων: A (mythological) personal name. See RE 6A 2354-5.

15.2 καμηλών: The manuscripts’ μηλὼν is not suitable at this point because the rule is about words with more than two syllables. It is significant for the history of transmission of grammatical and lexicographical works thought to derive material from Herodian that we find traces of the reading μηλὼν in the manuscript tradition of the Etymologicum Gudianum (α 174.5) and the Epimerismi Homerici (21,b2a.4). This suggests an early corruption in the common source for all these works and our Epitome. καμηλών is rare; it occurs again in Theognost. Can. II 36.6-7 (= 196.4-5), Et. Gud. (α 174.5), and Epim. Hom. (21,b2a.4).

15.3–4 τὸ...4 πόλις: Βαβυλών as founder and eponymous hero of the city is also mentioned in Stephanus of Byzantium (β 5) and in Eustathius (D. P. 1005.18-22).
15.6–8 ἦ…8 ἐκτεταμένον: This phrase does not fit grammatically, and I have deleted it with Schmidt (12.6–8), but perhaps something with this sense may be thought to have been present in the Πεφί καθολικής προσωπίδας at least, given the occurrence of ἦ ἐπὶ καμφοῦ ... ἐχει το Υ ἐκτεταμένον further on. Nevertheless, it is not unusual in our Epitome to be given more exceptions or more information on an exception, which was not anticipated at the beginning of the rule. It is reasonable that for the sake of brevity the epitomator would have often avoided repeating certain parts of rules. It is therefore possible that this phrase was added at the beginning by a scribe, on the basis of what follows.

15.8 ᾿Εμων: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, V) and also the name of a river (Zonar. ε 860.19).

15.8 Σάλμων: Probably a personal name. It is attested in the inscription SEG 2 718 (Pisidia). The genitive Ἀλμώνος mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium (α 222 Ἀλμος: πόλις Βοιωτίας, ὡς Ἐλλάνικος καὶ Σάλμων αὐτήν φησι κακῶς. τὸ ἐθνικὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλμώνος γενικῆς Ἀλμώνιος καὶ Ἀλμώνια) presupposes a nominative Ἀλμων (attested at Etymologicum Symeonis I 294.20-1). A parallel nominative Σάλμων may have existed (alongside Σάλμος
and Σαλμώνιος (see St. Byz. 551.19-20), parallel to Ἀλμος and Αλμώνιος).

15.9–16.1 τὰ…16.1 ἑστιν: λειμὼν ('meadow') and κευθμῶν ('hiding place') are included in Lentz’s reconstruction of the text (32.10) as possible examples for this part of the rule. λειμῶν and κευθμῶν are cited in grammatical and lexicographical works that are generally thought to derive material from Herodianic sources, in connection with disyllabic words in -μων that are τοπικά. λειμῶν: Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων ὁξυτ. 23.18-21, Et. Gud. κ 317.42-6, λ 364.50-2; κευθμῶν: Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων ὁξυτ. 23.18-21, Theognost. Can. Π 39.7-11 (= 210) and Et. Gud. κ 317.42-6.

16.1 ἐπὶ…λαμβάνεται: For example, χειμών. χειμών is quoted in grammatical and lexicographical sources with material thought to derive from Herodian in some form, in connection with disyllabic words in -μων that indicate time: Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων ὁξυτ. 23.18-21, Theognost. Can. Π 39.7-11 (= 210) and Et. Gud. κ 317.42-6, λ 364.50-2; see also Lentz’s reconstruction, 32.11.

16.1–2 ἔχει…ἐκτεταμένων: Στρυμών and δρυμών could have been used to exemplify this exception. This is supported by parallel passages. On Στρυμών see Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων ὁξυτ. 23.18-21, Theognost. Can. Π 39.7-11 (= 210); on δρυμών see Theodos. Π. κλίσ.
ον ὀξυτ. 23.18-21. Lentz (32.12-3) adds these words as examples of this part of the rule.

16.2 κρεμῶν: An uncommon synonym for ἀκρεμῶν ('bough, branch'). It should be noted that this word does not designate a place, and does not have long υ: it is just a genuine exception.

16.10 κεραμῶν: This rare word occurs again in Aristophanes' Lysistrata (200).

16.11 Κεράμων...Ποτάμων: Personal names: LGPN II; LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA, respectively.

16.12 τάσσαμων: The manuscripts' ἀσσάμων occurs nowhere else. A personal name Ἀσσάμων is attested (see LGPN IIIA). A possible reading might be Νασάμων, as suggested by Lobeck (PSGP 157.9), which left its traces in later texts (e.g. Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ον βαφυτ. 21.9-11, St. Byz. 470.8-9) thought to have derived material from Herodian in some form. In fact, the reading Νασάμων appears in Theodosius' Π. κλίσ. ον βαφυτ. 21.9-13 close to Ποτάμων, Κεράμων and τεράμων, suggesting that this passage and the passage from our Epitome share a common source. It is possible that the passage from Theodosius has preserved the genuine reading, Νασάμων could be either a personal name or an ethnic designation (see the sources cited above).
16.12 τεφάμων: There are two words τεφάμων. τεφάμων, -όνος means ‘becoming soft by boiling’, and τεφάμων, -όνος-οντος equals ‘κάλαμος’ in meaning. There are two pieces of evidence suggesting that the word meant here is the second one. First of all, the manuscripts transmit ‘ώς διὰ τοῦ ΝΤ κλινόμενον’. The second τεφάμων is the one that has an alternative declension with -ντ-. Secondly, Theodosius’ Περί κλίσεως τῶν εἰς ὄν βαρυτόνων 21.9-14 (see the apparatus of parallel passages) is parallel to this accentuation rule and cites Ποτάμων, Νασάμων and Κεφάμων just before τεφάμων. Theodosius tells us that Anacreon declined τεφάμων with -ντ- and that it means ‘κάλαμος’. Thus, the parallel passage from Theodosius is at least evidence for the text of our Epitome here, at an early date.

17.2 μέν κλίνοιτο: The manuscripts’ μη ἐγκλίνοιτο is inappropriate; διὰ τοῦ ΝΟΣ indicates the inflection. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation μέν κλίνοιτο (13.1).

17.5 Αρτέμων: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA). There is also a common noun ἀρτέμων, but that has its genitive in -όνος (see LSJ s. v.).

17.6 ἵππων: The manuscripts’ ἵππων is not attested anywhere else. Both suggested emendations of G. Dindorf, δαίππων and ἰππὼν (a
reconstructed variant form of Ἰτυμονεύς, on the analogy of δαυτυμονεύς, which is a variant for δαυτυμών) are reasonable. Ἰταμών, an emendation by Lehrs (see the critical apparatus) could perhaps be taken as a variant form (παρώνυμον) of ἴταμός ('headlong, hasty'). If it can be proved that δαυτυμών needs to be reconstructed here, then the emendation of the previous word written in the manuscripts, τυμών, into δαυτυμών will be affected. The reason for this is that δαυτυμών and Ἰταμών are both plausible emendations for τυμών, but I print δαυτυμών in order to keep Ἰταμών, which is transmitted after τυμών, as the following example. It is, however, possible that the right readings were Ἰταμών δαυτυμών. Nevertheless, a single emendation is more economical.

17.7 ἔθνυμών: This is a hapax. Its meaning is doubtful (DELG s. v. ἔθνος calls it enigmatic and points out that its termination reminds one of δαυτυμών). Our Epitome cites the meaning ἔθνος. The DGE s. v. gives two possible meanings: ‘member of a nation’ and ‘leader of a nation’.

17.8–9 αἵμων: Either an adjective or a personal name. If an adjective, the meaning is doubtful, perhaps ‘eager, passionate, expert, knowledgeable’. On the meanings see DGE and LSJ s. v. I have employed a rough breathing with Schmidt (13.6).
17.10–11 ἐν...11 διάστασιν: For a discussion of the terms ἐπιπλοκή and διάστασις see the Introduction pp. 119ff.

17.12 Δάφνων: The manuscripts’ Δάφνων is nowhere else attested. Lobeck’s conjecture Δάφνων (see the critical apparatus), which is very close to the transmitted reading and is a personal name (see LGPN IIIB, IV), seems very plausible.

17.13 Κραννών: The manuscripts’ καρνών occurs nowhere else. I have adopted the emendation Κραννών suggested by Schmidt (13.10) in his apparatus. The rule prescribes that there should be a consonant before the termination -νων, and therefore I print Κραννών and not Κρανών, as this city name is spelled in the manuscript traditions of some other texts.

18.1–2 Ό...2 ΩΝΟΣ: There must be a lacuna before καὶ ... ΩΝΟΣ. Lentz (33.24-34.6: Τὰ εἰς νῶν ἔχοντα τὴν πρὸ τέλους εἰς φωνήν ἢ φωνήντα λήγοντα, εἰ μὴ τοπικὰ εἰ, βαρύνεται καὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ὅνος ᾤς ἀμείνων ἀμείνων ή διὰ τοῦ ὅνος κλινόμενα ἢς ὣς ὑγιαίνων ὄνομα ἰατροῦ, Αὐξάνων κύριον ἰσοδυναμεῖ τοῖς διὰ τοῦ ὅνος οίων Κόνων, Σίνων, Ζήνων, Φαίνων, Μόνων ὡς ἐκτὸς Μακτάριον πᾶλιν Σικελίας, Σήνων ὑ κατοικῶν Σήνην πᾶλιν Κελτικήν, Φλάνων πῶλις καὶ Λιμήν πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηροτον ἑσον. Αστερίδωφος, τὸ δὲ καρνῶν ὀξύνεται,
προσέτι πλατανῶν καὶ ξενών καὶ παρθενων) reconstructed his text on the basis of a passage from Theognostus (Can. II 37.13-7 (= 201): Τὰ εἰς νων ύπέρ δύο συλλαβάς βαρύτονα, ώς ἐπὶ τὸ πλείστον μετοχικά ἐστιν, καὶ τὴν τῶν μετοχῶν κλίσιν ἀναδέχονται οἶον, Ὑγιαῖνων Ὕγιαῖνοντος ὅνομα ἑπτών: Αὐξάνων Αὐξάνοντος ὅνομα κύριον τὸ ἀμείνων ἀμείνονος οὐ μετοχικόν ἀλλὰ συγκριτικόν, καὶ τὴν τῶν συγκριτικῶν κλίσιν ἐφύλαξεν). The part missing was probably about the words in νων that are declined with ὅνος and ὅντος, as the passage from Theognostus suggests.

18.1 καὶ: I print καὶ and not ἢ, because καὶ is required to link ἰσοδυναμεί τοῖς διὰ τοῦ ὙΝΟΣ with the text of the lacuna, as this may be reconstructed on the basis of the passage from Theognostus cited in the note above. On the confusion between καὶ and ἢ in minuscule manuscripts see also note on 12.12 καὶ.

18.6 Πράξων: The manuscripts transmit the reading πράξων. This is attested as a personal name (see LGPN I, II, IIIB, IV). Theodosius' passage Π. κλίσ. νων βαρυτ. 19.9 supports Schmidt's suggestion (13.19-20, app. crit.) that the reading should be Πρήξων and not πράξων here. Theodosius presents Ἀξων right after Πρήξων, while our Epitome quotes πράξων after Ἀξων. Nevertheless, there is no reason to change Πράξων to Πρήξων, since Πράξων satisfies the
rule. Ποήξων could either be a misreading of Ποάξων or its Ionic form. If, however, the reading here ought to be Ποηξών, the corruption of ποήξων to ποάξων may be easily excused, since the two words differ only with regard to one vowel and it would have been easy for the η to become an α under the influence of the previous word, ἀξών.

18.6 δραξών: This rare word occurs again in Hesychius (Δ 2322), Sophronius (Char. Theodos. 398.11; accented δράξων), and the Etymologicum Magnum (286.33-7; accented δράξων). In the Etymologicum Magnum we find two meanings, thief and πορνοβοσκός ('brothel-keeper'). These meanings are more relevant than the one given by Hesychius (a temple in Sicily), since the rule prescribes that δραξών is oxytone because it is an adjective.

18.9 δράπων...δραπέτης: The word δράπων is rare. Our Epitome, Theognostus (Can. II 34.12 (= 186.7)), and Zonaras (Δ 570.19) provide the meaning δραπέτης ('runaway'), while the Suda (Δ 1506) cites Δράπων as a proper name. No other evidence supports the information provided by the Suda.

18.9 Δούπων: This proper name is rare. It is cited in Theognostus (Can. II 34.12-3 (= 186.7-8) and in the Suda (Δ 1427); Theodosius (Π.
κλίσ. ων βαρυτ. 20, 1) and Choeroboscus (Onomat. I, 78.23, Gaisford) tell us that this was the name of one of the centaurs.

18.11 πεπώνιον: This word probably dates back only as early as the beginning of the Byzantine period. See LBG s. v. πεπόνιον. πεπώνιον (= πεπόνιον) means ‘melon’, like πέπων, even though the former has a diminutive termination. The occurrence of this word could provide us with some evidence on the date that our Epitome was composed, but we may be dealing with an early attestation of this word here.

18.11 πεπών: This word occurs nowhere else. It denotes the place where πέπονες grow. This word, even if not otherwise attested as such, may be easily recognised as a πειρίκτικόν, as its termination follows the usual pattern of the πειρίκτικά, which end in -ών. This suffix has the descendant -ώνας in modern Greek and is easily recognisable as signifying a place where something is placed or grows.

18.12 μετ’ ἐπιπλοκῆς: On the term ἐπιπλοκή see the Introduction pp. 119ff.

18.14 Μάκρον: Either an ethnic designation (see Hecat. FGrHist fr. 206); sch. A. R. 90.7-22, 161.7-8; St. Byz. 429.5-6, 428.20-1; Su. μ 85; RE 14, 815; DNP 7, 761; BNP 8, 105), or a personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA,
IIIB, IV, VA), or an adjective ('longhead'). See also note on Μάκρος 55.6.

18.15–16 τὸ...16 ὃςύνεται: λοντρών and ἀνδρῶν are περιεκτικά, while Αντρών is the name of a city. The way this sentence is phrased suggests that Αντρών is included among the περιεκτικά. It is possible that the phrase ἐπὶ πόλεων (or a similar expression indicating that Αντρών is the name of a city) given at the beginning of the rule was not repeated afterwards, for the sake of brevity. Otherwise, one may assume that there is a lacuna here.

18.15 Αντρών: The name of a city in Thessaly: Hsch. α 5541, St. Byz. α 341 (there is evidence in α 341 and α 36 that Stephanus of Byzantium accented the word on the penultimate syllable), Et. Gen. α 939, EM 114.55, Et. Sym. II 11.7, II 86.22; cf. Harp. 41.3, Phot. α 2144, Su. α 2768.

18.16 Δεξικρών: The manuscripts' ἐξικρῶν is nowhere attested and is probably a scribal error. I have printed Schmidt's Δεξικρῶν (14.7), which is attested at the Περί μονής λέξεως in the vicinity of Ἐρμόκρῶν (GG iii.ii 915.9-10). Δεξικρῶν is a personal name (LGPN I).

18.16–17 Ἐρμόκρῶν: A personal name (LGPN I).

18.20 τήρων: This word is the Greek form either of the Roman
common noun tiro (‘recruit’, see Ps.-Macarius *Sermones* 64 50.4.12.1-3, Jo. Laur. Lyd. *De mens.* 4.157.1-3, *Su.* τ 535, Zonar. τ 1727.20; cf. *TGL* VII 2153C-D; sometimes written as τίρων, τείρων or τύρων) or of the Roman proper name Tiro (Johannes Zonaras *Epitome Historiarum* I, 390.13; I, 390.27; I, 391.4; cf. *TGL* VII 2153C-D; the personal names Τίρων (*LGPN* IIIB) and Τύρων (*LGPN* I, II, VA) are also attested); the reconstructed genitive Τήρωνος in the inscription *IG* XII, 3 656 from Thera, could provide evidence for the personal name Τήρων.

19.1 οἰσών: Hesychius (ο 389) cites the word with a rough breathing (but the reliability of the Hesychius manuscript about breathings may be doubted, given the unreliability of its accents (Latte (1953), vol. 1, XXVII)) and gives the definition οἰσών· ἡ ἐκ τῆς καταμετρήσεως τῆς γῆς εὐθυωρία (‘the straight course/direction of the measuring out of the earth’). A word οἰσών (meaning something like ‘district’) is attested on a 5th-century Cyprian inscription (the Idalion bronze = no. 217 in Masson (1983)). In the manuscripts of Theodosius (Π. κλισ. ων ὁξυτ. 23.15-6) and Theognostus (*Can.* II 38.31-2 (= 208.3-4) this word occurs as οἰοσών. These two sources provide us with the meaning ‘ἡ χάραξις τῶν ἀρότρων/τοῦ ἀρότρου’ (respectively). This word is rare and is attested only in the above-mentioned sources and in a fragment of Eratosthenes (line 1).
19.1 ἰσχαιρὼν: The manuscripts’ ἰσχαιρὼν is nowhere else attested. Two possible conjectures, ὀφαιρὼν and Χαιρὼν, are suggested in the critical apparatus. The corruption of either of the two proposed readings to the manuscripts’ reading would have been quite easy and equally possible.

19.3 Ἐλευρών: A mythological personal name (see RE 21.1 s. v.). This name is an exception to the main accentuation rule for words ending in -φων, because it has the same form as the name of a city; the rule as stated therefore allows it to be oxytone.

19.3 ὁμώνυμα: Lentz (35.20) added πόλει before ὁμώνυμα, because the beginning of the rule says ἢ πόλει ὁμώνυμεῖ, but it seems to me that the addition of πόλει is not necessary because it can be easily implied from the mention of πόλει a few lines above. Thus, the epitomator may be thought to have left πόλει out for the sake of brevity. Cf. the phrase ἀπὸ παθητικοῦ παρακεμένου (33.7), which does not repeat σύνθετα (33.4) from the phrasing at the beginning of the rule (33.3–4).

19.4 ἐθνικὰ: No example for this type of exception is cited. It is possible that there is a lacuna, as Schmidt assumed (14.16 app. crit.), and that an ethnic designation (or ethnic designations) was cited as example after Ὅλοσσών πόλις. The reason for thinking this is that
Ὁλοσσών refers back to ἀφενικά and κυσών back to περιεκτικά, and the ἔθνικά in the phrasing of the rule are preceded by the ἀφενικά and followed by the περιεκτικά. An ethnic designation that could exemplify this rule might have been Ἀυσών (see also Lentz’s reconstruction 36.5).

19.5 Ὁράσων: A personal name: LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA.

19.6 Ὁλοσσών...<: The name of the city is sometimes cited as Ὁλοσσών (Str. 9.5.19.53, Theodos. Can. GG iv.i2 28.12, Π. κλίσ. οὐν ὡς ἐκτ. 24.3, sch. Lyc. 905.5-6, Theognost. Can. II 32.6 (= 177.3), 212.7, Lex. Art. Gramm. 432.4) and sometimes as Ὁλοοσσών (Hom. II. 2.739, sch. Hom. II. 2.739c, 2.739e, Str. 9.5.19.3, Hsch. o 622, St. Byz. 490.11, Choerob. in Theod. 317.14-5, Eust. Il. I 519.18, 520.25). This is a city in Magnesia (St. Byz. 490.11) or a city in Thessaly (Hsch. o 622; cf. sch. Lyc. 905.5-6). The fact that this feminine city name (see the critical apparatus for references regarding the gender) is cited in an accentuation rule about masculines does not give cause for concern, because in any case this word is cited as an exception to the rule. In fact, there must have been a comment about the reason behind this exception (i.e. the gender of this word; see the critical apparatus, where the presumed meaning of the lacuna is given).

19.8 <ἡ ἔθνικά>: The lacuna is filled on the basis of a parallel
passage from Stephanus of Byzantium (β 106; see the full citation in
the apparatus of parallel passages).

19.8–9 ἐθνικὰ>... 9 κλινόμενα: An example of this exception would
be Βιοτῶν (see also St. Byz. β 106).

20.1 Χίτων ποταμός: Stephanus of Byzantium (β 106) mentions that
χιτῶν is oxytone so that there is a distinction between the common
noun and the homonymous river name. But with the exception of
our Epitome and Stephanus of Byzantium this river name is nowhere
else attested. Johannes Philoponus in his Περὶ τῶν διαφόρως
tονουμένων καὶ διάφορα σημαινόντων (recensio a χ 7.1, recensio b χ 3.1, recensio c χ 7.1, recensio d χ 7.1, recensio e χ 9.1) cites Χίτων as
the name of a city by contrast to the oxytone χιτῶν.

20.4 προβατῶν: This word is rare and occurs mainly in inscriptions
(ID 356bis; ID 373; ID 374; ID 403; ID 445; IG XI,2 153; IG XI,2 287,
SEG 40 655) and papyri (P. Cair. Zen. 59068.2, An. Pap. 14/15, p. 174, l. 14 (PSI X 1170 recto)).

20.8–9 τὸ... 9 ὄξυνεται: σκυῖν is oxytone because although it is
declined with ω it coincides in form with the city Sicyon.

20.14–15 τὸ... 15 ὄξυνεται: κολοφῶν and κατηφῶν are oxytone,
because they are not declined with -ντ-.

20.17 Βρύχων: This is attested as: (i) a river name (Heraclid. Perieg.
Descr. Graec. fr. 2.7.1-2, Hsch. β 1271, Theognost. Can. II 33.30 (= 184.4); Hesychius provides us with the information that the river was close to Pallene), and (ii) as a personal name (LGPN I, IIIB).


21.1–2 γλήχων…2 δέννεται: The alternative forms of γλήχων are βλήχων and βιλήχω. Our Epitome mentions that if the word γλήχων is feminine and written with a β it is oxytone. Bearing in mind that this section is about the accentuation of words ending in -χων and since there are no further comments as to the variant form of γλήχων, one would expect that the comment about the oxytone accent would be about ΒΛΗΧΩΝ. However, the word appears to be transmitted as oxytone when it has the ending without the -ν (i.e. βληχώ), otherwise normally as βλήχων (βλήχων: Trypho Pass. 2.30.2, Hsch. β 734, Su. β 338.1, Et. Gud. β 274.3, Zonar. β 392.30; βληχών: Phryn. PS 53.16; the accents here just reflect what I have found in printed texts). This suggests either that there should be a clarification that the comment about the oxytone variant is about βληχώ, or that Herodian had the view that ΒΛΗΧΩΝ as well as βληχώ should be oxytone. The statement of the rule suggests that γλήχων is masculine, while βληχώ/ΒΛΗΧΩΝ feminine. γλήχων is
De garrulit. 511C3, Gal. De compos. medicament. secund. loc. libri x
12.950.16, Ps.-Gal. De remed. parabil. 14.398.17, Orib. Syn. 5.33.5.2-6.1,
9.43.33.6, Coll. Med. 11.delta.7.4, Aët. Iatric. lib. xvi 25.11; Iatric. lib. viii
1.56.1.15, 7.3.2.37-8 (but feminine in 5.8.2.11) and Zonar. (β 391.10).
On the other hand, Hp. Int. 44.26, Dsc. 3.32.1.5, Eup. 1.116.1.6, 2.9.3.3,
Philum. Ven. 14.6.3-4, and Su. γ 287 cite this noun as feminine, and
Phryn. PS 53.16-8, says that γαληχών (Ionic form) and γαλαχών (Doric
form) are feminine. γαλήχων appears both as masculine and feminine
in ancient sources. βλήχω is always mentioned with regard to being
the feminine and Attic equivalent to γαληχώ/γαλήχων (see Theodos.
Π. κλίσ. ων βαρυτ. 19.28-9, Su. γ 287, Zonar. γ 440.8-9). These three
last passages create the impression that this noun is feminine only in
Attic, but the above-mentioned passage from Phrynichus informs us
that in Ionic and Doric too the word is feminine.

21.4 Πολυσπερχων: In the various printed editions where this name
occurs, the accent is on the penultimate syllable, cf. Paus. 5.6.1.4-5,
sch. Lyc. 801.4, 801.10, Theodos. Π. κλίσ. ων βαρυτ. 19.31, Ath.
4.42.13, Phot. Bibl. 92.72a.15-6, Su. δ 333.6, Eust. ll. III 547.6, IV 734.6,
Od. I 10.30. According to the RE 21.2 s. v. Polyperchon, the correct
form of the name is Πολυπέρχων, but the manuscripts mostly transmit the name with a σ. See also DNP 10.74-5, BNP 11.529-30.

21.8–10 σεσημείωται…10 κλινόμενα: This comment is a bit unusual. Normally we are not told that certain words follow a rule even though they should be exceptions, because clauses excepting certain groups of words from a rule do not guarantee that those words have any particular accent, they just exempt them from the main rule.

21.9 ταών: This word has the following variants: ταώς, ταώς and ταών.

22.1–2 μη…κατηγορούμενα: ‘that do not signify (names of) cities’.

This condition is given in order to exclude from the rule the feminine names of cities that end in -ων and are oxytone (e.g. Σιδών, Πυθών, Καλυδών, Ηίων, Πλευρών, Βαβυλών, Αμυδών) and are declined with ω. The feminine common nouns in -ων that are dealt with here are oxytone, but are declined with ο.

22.3 γογγών: A variant form for Γογγώ ‘the Gorgon’.

23.2–3 ει…3 σημαινομένοι: If an example is recessive, it either falls under a rule applying to a different word shape (ἐνέρχονται) or is recessive to distinguish one meaning from another (διάστολη σημαινομένον; this condition concerns words that have the same
form, but are accented differently to distinguish different meanings). An example of the first type of exception is Ἱππών, which even though it is a disyllabic name for a city ending in -ων, follows the accent rule applying to words ending in long vowel plus -των, such as Ἑλέυσσα,  γείτων, Ἱππών. Ἱππών has the i short (see LSJ s. v.). This probably causes no problem; Ἱππών falls into this group, because it has the termination -των and the same number of syllables, and does not denote a place, even if it does not have the same vowel length as the rest of the group in the penultimate syllable.

23.3 Ἱμών: The manuscripts’ ἴων is not a city name. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation Ἱμών on the basis of a passage from Stephanus of Byzantium (α 144.11).

23.8 Σοῦλμων πόλις Σικελίας seems abrupt right after the explanation of Ἱππών. It is possible that there is a lacuna before Σοῦλμων. A plausible solution would be to add ‘σεσημείωται (τὸ)’ before Σοῦλμων, on the basis of Stephanus of Byzantium α 144.8-12 (see the apparatus of parallel passages). Σοῦλμων is recessive although it does not fall into either of the two cases that are predicted to be exempted from this accentuation rule (i.e. ἑτέρον χαρακτῆρι and διαστολῆ σημαινομένου), and thus could well have been preceded by σεσημείωται. Another suggestion would be to add
something like ':both' before Σουλμων, in order to link the
barytone Σουλμων with 'το ἤτων βαρύνεται' (for this suggested
addition cf. κρημών (16.2), which is a genuine exception and is
linked with the part of the rule describing the systematically
exempted words with 'καὶ τό').

23.8–9 Σουλμων...9 Σικελίας: Σουλμων is the Greek form of the
Italian city Sulmona. The manuscripts transmit 'πόλις Σικελίας',
while Stephanus of Byzantium (α 144.11-2 σεσημεῖωται τὸ
Σουλμων. ἐστὶ πόλις Ἰταλίας) preserves the right information.
Lentz (39.17-8) as well as Schmidt (16.15) maintain the reading
Σικελίας. Lentz agrees with Meineke (St. Byz. 55.6 (app. crit.)), who
suggested that Σικελίας should not be emended to Ἰταλίας, because
Herodian appears to be using Sicily catachrestically to refer to the
lower part of Italy, as when he calls Λωμεντός and Λαυρεντός
Sicilian cities (Ps.-Arcad. 153.15).

23.9 πλήν...κροτῶν: The logic of the transition from 'Σουλμων
πόλις Σικελίας' to 'πλήν τοῦ κροτῶν' is unclear in the text as
transmitted. There is evidence from ancient sources that are known
to have derived material from Herodian (e.g. St. Byz. α 144.8-12, β
106.6-7) that κροτῶν was cited close to Κρότων, so that a distinction
is made between their different meanings. In fact, Κρότων is an
example of a city name that is excluded from the oxytone accentuation 'διαστολη σημαινομένου'. It is not accidental that in
the above-cited passages from Stephanus of Byzantium the phrasing
is similar to 'διαστολη σημαινομένου' ('ει μη διαστολην ἔχει
σημαινομένου' and 'πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολην τοῦ τῆς πόλεως
όνόματος' respectively). The above evidence suggests that Κρότων
would have been cited in the Περὶ καθολικῆς Προσῳδίας close to
κροτῶν as an example of a city name whose accent is recessive
διαστολή σημαινομένου.

23.12 Ἐλεών: The manuscripts' ἐλαιῶν ('olive-yard') is not the name
of a city. I have adopted Schmidt's emendation Ελεών (16.18). At a
time when both ε and αι were pronounced [e], such a mistake must
have been easy.

23.13 Μεδεῶν: The manuscripts' μηδεῶν is not a city name. I have
adopted Schmidt's emendation Μεδεῶν (16.18).

23.14 τάσσαλων: This reading occurs nowhere else. Two corrections
have been suggested: Νασσάλων and Καστάλων. Νασσάλων,
which is very close to the transmitted reading, is cited in the vicinity
of Ἀσκάλων and Βαβυλών in Theognostus' Canones (II 36.5-6 (=
196.3-4)), but is nowhere else attested, and we cannot be sure that
this is indeed the word intended here. Καστάλων is a reading we
find in Stephanus of Byzantium (710.8 and 366.8 (but in the latter case manuscript R has Κασταλὼν, while A has Καστάλων)) close to the ethnic designation Ἀσκαλονίτης (in 366.8-10; cf. the citation of Ἀσκάλων just before ἀσσάλων in our Epitome). Νασσάλων seems palaeographically more plausible than Καστάλων, but the text cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

23.18 φιλοξενοφῶν: This rare compound occurs again in Choeroboscus’ Dictata in Theodosii Canones (Gaisford I 74.22, but wrongly accented φιλοξενόφων).

23.18 φιλοκτησιφῶν: This compound is a hapax.

24.1–2 ως…2 συνήθειαν: ‘as happens in customary usage’.

24.2 προσπυλῶν: This compound word is very rare. It occurs again in the scholia to Aeschines (2.105.2) and in the papyrus SB XX, 14166.9-10.

24.7–9 Καὶ…9 θηλυκῶν: This sentence marks the end of book one, but instead of having it at the very end of the book, the manuscripts transmit it here, where it is followed by further treatment of masculine and feminine nominals in -ν.

24.10–12 Τὰ…12 Ξενοφῶν: One would expect to find this introductory sentence, which presents an overview of the possibilities for the accentuation of words ending in -ων, at the very
beginning of the treatment of the -ων ending, more specifically right before the termination -βων. It is difficult to know why such a transposition occurred. The place of this opening and general sentence right after the sentence which points to the end of the book on the ending -ων is in any case suspicious.

24.13–15 Τὰ...15 Ἡφαιστίων: The examples cited for this accentuation rule are patronymics (Ἄτρεῖων, Κρονίων) and hypocoristics (μωρίων, Ἡφαιστίων (on Ἡφαιστίων as hypocoristic see Eust. Od. I 375.12-4, EM 420.52-3)). No examples of comparatives (συγκριτικά) are given, while the term πατρωνυμικά is not used. Some possible explanations are (i) that there were originally examples of συγκριτικά, which the epitomator or a scribe left out despite including the term συγκριτικά, and at the same time the epitomator or scribe mistakenly left out the term πατρωνυμικά although he cited examples of πατρωνυμικά, or (ii) a scribe mistakenly wrote συγκριτικά in the place of πατρωνυμικά, and no συγκριτικά were intended at this point in original Herodian.

24.14 μωρίων: diminutive for μωρός (see sch. D. T. Vat. 227.8-9, Marc. 376.8, Lond. 539.6). Schmidt (17.18) printed the vox nihili μωτίων, which manuscripts ABC transmit due to the τ-like shape of
letter ᾲ in M, which was their source (on the ambiguous shapes of letters in M see the chapter on the Manuscript Tradition).

25.2 Κάων: MO’s κάκων is not attested. Schmidt’s emendation Κάων (17.21) is supported by a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. 164.1-3). Κάων in manuscript B, before the addition of κ supra lineam, may be thought as a felicitous error. Κάων appears close to Φάων and Κρέων in two other grammatical works (Theodos. Π. κλίσιον βαρύτητα. 16.31-2, Theognost. Can. II 30.11-2 (= 164.2-3)) that are thought to derive material from the Περί καθολικής προσῳδίας.

26.3 Ακταίων: A personal name (LGPN VA).

26.9 καὶ ὅματος: That a nominal derived from a verb maintains one syllable of the verb it is derived from, might seem somewhat self-evident from the point of view of modern scholarship. μίαν συλλαβήν should probably be taken to mean ‘at least one syllable’, not simply ‘one syllable’, on the basis of two pieces of evidence. On the one hand, the ancient grammarians’ view (see sch. D. T. Marc. 377.31-378.2, Lond. 543.7-13) that nominals derived from verbs usually maintain the last consonants (but not necessarily a whole syllable) of the verb they are derived explains why μίαν συλλαβήν here is used to indicate that at least one syllable of the verb should be maintained, as opposed to single letters. On the other hand, the fact
that μίαν συλλαβήν does not simply mean ‘one syllable’ is suggested by the fact that in this rule there are also examples that maintain two syllables of the verb (λιτροβαστάξ, νεκροβαστάξ). see also note on 26.12 τὰ ... νεκροβαστάξ below), because in this rule there are also compound words that maintain two syllables of the verb (e.g. λιτροβαστάξ, νεκροβαστάξ (βα - στά from βαστάζω)); see also note on 26.12–27.1 τὰ ... νεκροβαστάξ).

26.10 ἐπιθετικὸν...ἐθνικὸν: The second exemption from recessive accentuation of the words in -ξ with more than one syllable regards adjectives, but not ethnic designations. The fact that ethnic designations are excluded from adjectives suggests that the ethnic designations are regarded as adjectives, not proper names (see also the discussion of whether ἐθνικὰ are included among proper names or adjectives in the Introduction, pp. 127-30).

26.11 κλίμαξ αὐλαξ: The words need to have a circumflex since the α is short, and therefore I have followed Schmidt (18.19-20) in emending the manuscripts’ κλίμαξ and αὐλαξ.

26.11–12 τὸ...12 ὄξυτόνου: The fact that διασφάξ can be also derived from the oxytone σφάξ as well as from the verb διασφάζω explains why διασφάξ is mentioned separately from the other three
compound examples, βλεφαροστάξ, λιτροβαστάξ and νεκροβαστάξ, which are clearly derived from verbs.

26.11–12 <ἀπὸ ... ὑματος>: I have added this phrase on the basis of two parallel passages: *Ep. Hom.* 7,b.4-7 and *Et. Gud.* α 132.5-7 (see the apparatus of parallel passages). ἀπὸ ὑματος at the beginning of the following sentence could have facilitated the omission of this phrase here.

26.12 ἦ ... ὄξυτόνου: This phrase is absent from the previous two editions. I consider its presence here both genuine and required. It explains why δωσφάξ, which is a compound word as well as βλεφαροστάξ, λιτροβαστάξ and νεκροβαστάξ, is mentioned separately in the framework of this accentuation rule (see also the note on 26.11–12 τό ... ὄξυτόνου). The absence of this phrase from Barker’s edition is natural, because neither B nor C has it. A transmits it, but since Bloch’s collation of A (Dindorf (1823), I 51), which Schmidt employed failed to make a note of this, the phrase is also missing from Schmidt’s edition.

26.12–27.1 τὰ ... 27.1 νεκροβαστάξ: On the explanation of why the citation of λιτροβαστάξ and νεκροβαστάξ in this rule does not cause any problems, although the condition says μίαν συλλαβήν
φυλάττοι τού ὁμίμητος, see the interpretation of μίαν συλλαβήν in the note on 26.9 καὶ ... ὁμίμητος.

26.13 βλεφαροσπάξ: The manuscripts’ readings are nowhere else attested and are probably voces nihili. βλεφαροσπάξ (‘arching the eyebrows’) is a conjecture by Hermann ((1801), 434 (regul. de prosod. 63)). Even though according to MO the second constituent part of this compound word is -παέ, the fact that there are parallel passages (EM 270.30-2, Zonar. ὅ 515.1-3) where σπάξ is dealt with in the vicinity of βαστάξ and σφάξ suggests that one should reconstruct σπάξ as the second part of this word.

26.13–27.1 λιτροβαστάξ: This compound is a hapax. This could mean the person carrying, holding, or taking away (stealing) the λίτρον (measure of capacity; see LSJ s. v.) or the λίτρα (1. a silver coin of Sicily, 2. a pound (weight), 3. measure of capacity; see LSJ s. v.).

27.1 Άσφαξ: An ethnic designation (St. Byz. α 508).

27.4–5 κηρυξ: With regard to the issue of whether ΚΗΡΥΞ should be paroxytone or properispomenon, this rule is not helpful, because it is not explicitly mentioned which of the two possibilities is meant. But in the Περὶ διχόνων (GG iii.ii 9.19-27) Herodian mentions that the ν in the nominative is short. In favour of κηρυξ see also the
argumentation in Probert (2003), 84. On the paroxytone accent see the argument in West (1998), XLVIII.

27.9 βουπλης: The paroxytone adjective βουπλης is the passive counterpart of βουπλης (see sch. A. Pr. 681b.2-4 καὶ «βουπλης» ὦ τὸν βοῦν πλήσων «βουπλης» δὲ ὄ υπο τοῦ βοός πλησόμενος; Et. Ῥυθ. β 283.17-9 βουπλης καὶ βουπλης: διφορεῖται κατὰ τὴν τάσιν πρὸς διάφορον σημαίνόμενον ὀξυτόνως μὲν τὸ ἐνεργοῦν ὀργανον, βαρυτόνως δὲ τὸν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ πλησόμενον. cf. also the Et. Parv. β 15).

27.9 κυμοπλης: A variant form of κυματοπλης (‘wave-beaten’).
This variant form occurs only in our Epitome and the Anthologia Graeca (10.7.1).

27.9–10 μεθυπλης: This is a rare compound occurs again in sch.

27.10 ἀντιπης: MO’s ἀντίσπλης is nowhere else attested and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation ἀντίπης (19.7 e sch. Hom. Il. 18.413b.1).

27.12 χαμαισκωλης: ‘earthworm’. This compound is a hapax.

27.12–13 λεοντομυμης: This compound is very rare. This is the oldest attestation of this word. For its Byzantine attestation see LBG.
27.14 μίαν συλλαβήν: One should understand τοῦ ὀνόματος. Cf. note on 26.9 καὶ ... ὀνόματος.

27.16 θυλακοτρωξ: This rare compound is also attested in sch. Hom. II. 2.755b.1, Hsch. θ 850, Theognost. Can. II 41.11 (= 222.3), Sophr. Char. Theodos. 401.7. Hesychius attaches both ἐνποίς and ἀκοίς to this lemma.

27.16 κυμορρωξ: This is a hapax.

27.16–17 θηροδίως: This rare word occurs again in Choeroboscus (in Theod. 296.2) and in the Etymologicum Magnum (451.22).

27.17 αἰγοδίωξ: This rare word is attested only in our Epitome, Choeroboscus (in Theod. 296.2) and the Etymologicum Magnum (451.22).

27.19 Τὰ...𝑃: I have printed τὰ εἰς ὑ, not the manuscripts’ τὰ εἰς αὐτο, so that this sub-heading corresponds to the whole section on words ending in -ο.

27.22 οὖθαρχ: I have emended the manuscripts’ οὖθαρχ to οὖθαρχ with Schmidt (19.17).

28.1–3 Ἐτι...3 Δίγγυ: Schmidt (19.18-20 app. crit.) transposed this section after Εἰό (31.4). Schmidt’s idea is reasonable, but it is possible that a special reason resulted in the mention of this section here.

28.1 κέλωξ: MO’s κάλλωξ, is nowhere else attested, although
Κάλως is mentioned by Appian (Hann. 156.3) as a river name. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (19.19) κέλως, which is cited in the Περί μονήρους λέξεως in the vicinity of ὄθεως (GG iii.ii 937.26).

28.1 ἀπωρ: The manuscripts’ ἀπωρ is nowhere attested and is probably a vox nihili. Many conjectures are possible. I am not in favour of Lobeck’s ἀχως (see the critical apparatus), because the word ἀχως is cited a bit after this point of the text (31.6) accompanied by the meaning of the word. One would have expected the meaning of a word to be given the first time the word occurred in the text, not the second. I consider the most plausible readings here to be ἀκτωρ, suggested by Schmidt (19.18 app. crit.), and πέλως. Both these readings are transmitted in the Περί μονήρους λέξεως (GG iii.ii 937.26-7) in the vicinity of ὄθεως (and of κέλως, which we reconstructed above, on the basis of the same passage from the Περί μονήρους λέξεως). The reading ἀκτωρ can be also defended on palaeographical grounds, since the ligature κτ could give the impression of a π in minuscule. πάτωρ, also suggested by Schmidt (19.18 app. crit.), and ἀπωρ, a rare word in Hesychius (α 8213), are both very close to ἀπωρ, and are also possible.

28.3 Δίγυς: A river name and an ethnic designation (St Byz. 416.10-1, Eust. D. P. 76.16-7).
28.5 ὁ...λόγος: ‘And the reason is that Τ precedes Η’.

28.7 Ἐξαυτηθ: This word is nowhere else attested. I have kept this reading in the text with some reserve. A proper name Ἐξάπτηθ is mentioned by Choroeboscus (De Orthogr. 250.16), but is nowhere else attested. It is possible that both Ἐξαυτηθ and Ἐξάπτηθ preserve traces of the right reading. Another reading that is close to the transmitted one is ἐνπάτηθ.

28.8 ἀμάτηθ: Perhaps ‘of the same mother, brother/sister’, see DGE s. v. A dative ἀματήρεσσι is attested in Theocritus (Idyll. 7.29), but we are probably not dealing with the Doric form of ἀματηθ here. Herodian does cite words from dialects other than Attic (e.g. παιδοπίπας 35.21, εὐφαρέτωρας 35.22), but usually not when the corresponding Attic form is allowed by the conditions for the rule. παιδοπίπας and εὐφαρέτωρας, for example, were cited in their Doric forms because the accentuation rule for which they were cited dealt with compound words in -ας.

28.8 ἀντηθ: The manuscripts’ ἀντηθ is nowhere else attested. An attested name Πάντηθ (LGPN II) is very close to the manuscripts’ reading. Corruption from Πάντηθ to ἀντηθ could easily have occurred.

28.8 Αστηθ: This is the name of a city (see the apparatus of parallel
passages). A common noun ἄστη meaning ἡ φαρέτρα ἡγούν βελοθήκη is mentioned by Hesychius (α 7855), but this is not the word referred to here, because the example needs to be a proper name. See also note on 29.8 Άστη below.

29.1–3 καὶ...3 γένος: Sometimes a word is attested with a particular gender only in poetry: (1) ὑαστή is feminine in the Iliad (18.477), but it is masculine in the other sources: Pancrates Epigramm. 6.117, Apollon. Lex. 40.20, Nonn. D. 28.202, Philaret. Med. De puls. scient. 237, Eust. Il. I 181.3, II 664.12, Od. I 181.3 (but feminine in Il. IV 218.9-10), Su. ο 81.2; (2) ἄη is feminine in the Iliad (3.381, 11.752, 16.790, 17.269, 20.444, 20.446, 21.549, 21.597 and the Odyssey 7.15, 7.140); (3) άιθή is feminine in the Iliad (16.365) and the Odyssey (19.540). On the use of masculines in the feminine in poetry cf. Choerob. in Theod. 322.6-13; see the apparatus of parallel passages). This condition for the rule is intended to exclude forms that are feminine only in poetry.

29.4 τὸ...δέυνεται: An example of the epitomator’s practice not to mention explicitly the reason why a word is an exception. See the discussion of the relevant section of the epitomator’s Preface (1.21–2.1).

29.6 Ἰβην: This is cited among the examples of ethnic and proper
names that are recessive as they do not coincide with common names, but in fact ἰβης is the name of an animal (Hsch. ι 126 ἰβης· χερσαίων τι θηρίον· ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἰβης εῖ; see also LSJ s. v.). The fact that it is not taken into account that ἰβης can be a common noun as well suggests either that this word for the animal was not well known (and therefore the grammarian did not know that this word should have been registered as an exception), or even that the name of the animal is a later invention, perhaps in an attempt to provide an etymology for the name of the ethnic ἰβηςες.

29.6 Ἀννίβης: Neither the manuscripts’ Ἀννίβης nor Schmidt’s Ἀννίβης, which he thought to be a compound name from the river names Ἄνας and ἰβης (20.10 app. crit.), is anywhere else attested.

29.7 Δόβης: The manuscripts’ δόμη is nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation Δόβης (PGG 211, n. 5), which is the ethnic designation for a citizen of Δόβηςος, a city in Paeonia (St. Byz. δ 102).

29.7 Πής: The ethnic designation for the people living in Pieria and in the area around mount Olympus (see Str. 7a.1.11.7-8, 9.2.25.34-8). Choeroboscus (in Theod. 300.8) provides us only with the information that this is a proper name. The Etymologicum Gudianum (π 467.22) gives the information ἑθνικός Μακεδόνιος. This information makes
sense in the light of the fact that the Macedonians inhabited the place after the Pieres (Str. 9.2.25.34-9). The Lexicon Artis Grammaticae (431.5) says that Πίνη is the name of a mountain.

29.7–8 τὸ ... Ἀστήρ: One infers from the phrasing of the rule that the reason why Ἐλευθήρ and Ἀστήρ are exceptions is because they coincide with προσηγορικά. There is indeed a προσηγορικόν Ἐλευθήρ: Lexicon Artis Grammaticae 431.4 Ἐλευθήρ: ὁ ἀπὸ ξένης παραγεγονός ('descended from a foreign country'). The proper name Ἀστήρ coincides with the common noun meaning 'star'.

29.7 Ἐλευθήρ: This is either: (a) a city in Boeotia (sch. Hes. Th. 54b1; cf. also 54b2; EM 329.25), or (b) the name of a king, son of Apollo (sch. Hes. Th. 54b1; cf. also 54b2), or (c) the name of one of the Curetes (St. Byz. ε 46.1-2), or (d) a mountain which was named after king Ἐλευθήρ (sch. Hes. Th. 54b2).

29.8 Ἀστήρ: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IV, VA). The citation of Ἀστήρ a few lines after the city name Ἀστήρ, puzzled Schmidt (he put a question mark after Ἀστήρ in 20.4), who must have thought that there was a contradiction between the two consecutive accentuation rules. It is indeed a bit odd that no indication of the different meanings is given, and of why the city name should not be oxytone as it too coincides with a common noun. It is possible that
the Περὶ καθολικής προσωφίας included this information, but that
the material was then cut down by the epitomator, or that such an
omission was due to a scribal error. One should not be suspicious
about the accentuation of Άστη, since there are enough sources that
testify that there was a city name Άστη accented on the penultimate
syllable.

30.3 τὸ...βαρύνεται: ἔφη is compounded from ἐφι- and the root of
ήσα (see DELG s. v.).

30.6–7 ὅβολοστατής: This word occurs only in our Epitome and
Sophronius (Char. Theodos. 401.25).

30.7 λιπάνης: The manuscripts’ διπάνη occurs nowhere else.
Lobeck’s emendation λιπάνη (PGG 215.24-6) is nowhere else
attested, but one can back-form λιπάνη to e.g. λιπανδρία.
Furthermore, λιπάνη can be defended on palaeographical grounds
since the confusion of λ and δ is very common.

30.7–8 πολυδάμης: This word occurs only in our Epitome and
Sophronius (Char. Theodos. 401.25).

30.8 αἰνοπάτης: This word occurs only in our Epitome, Aeschylus’
Choephoroe 315 and the ancient scholion to this line.

30.9–10 καὶ...10 μονοσυλλάβων: It was not mentioned at the
beginning of the rule that if the second part of the compound is a
monosyllable, then the word cannot be oxytone. See the discussion of this principle in the epitomator’s Preface (1.17–21 deī ... υπάρχῃ).

30.9 σατυρόφημι: This compound is a hapax.

31.1 Βέχειο: The manuscripts’ βλέχειο occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox hilibi. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation Βέχειο (21.2), which is the name of a Scythian nation (St. Byz. β 82, EM 195.43-4, Et. Sym. II 428.21-4, Zonar. β 383.7).

31.1–2 Σάπειο: A Scythian ethnic designation (sch. A. R. 161.19; cf. also Choerob. in Theod. 321.9 who mentions only that this is an ethnic designation). Stephanus of Byzantium at 555.12-3 tells us that Σάπειοι were a nation in the interior of Pontus.

31.2 Ἐλεάζειο: All the manuscripts of this Epitome, Stephanus of Byzantium (β 82.1-2), and the Etymologicum Magnum (107.38) have the reading ἐλεάζειο, while the text of Theognostus transmits Ἀλάζειο. Herodotus (4.164.4) tells us that Ἀλάζειο was the name of a king of the Barcaeans (cf. also Theognost. Can. II 41.25 (= 225.3) who mentions that Ἀλάζειο is a proper name). According to Stephanus of Byzantium (β 82), Ἐλεάζειο is the name of a barbarian people, while in Choeroboscus’ Epimerismi in Psalms (4.10-1) we read that this was the name of a king of the Libyans. That Ἐλεάζειο indeed indicates an ethnic designation, and not the personal name mentioned by
Choeroboscus, is suggested by the fact that both in Pseudo-Arcadius and in Stephanus of Byzantium this word appears close to two other ethnic designations, Βέχιω and Σάπειω. The passage from Choeroboscus, which explains Ἐλεάζειω in a way that would suit Ἀλάζειω, suggests that there was some confusion between the words Ἐλεάζειω and Ἀλάζειω in the manuscript tradition of certain texts, as for example in Theognostus: his passage is parallel to ours and one would have thought that he derived his material from a Herodianic source, but nevertheless Ἀλάζειω appears in his text. The intermingling of the information about Ἀλάζειω and Ἐλεάζειω in Choeroboscus as well as the presence of Ἀλάζειω in Theognostus, could suggest that Ἐλεάζειω and Ἀλάζειω were mentioned side by side in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίας. The reading Ἀλάζειω, with the exception of its appearance in Theognostus’ text, does not seem to have left traces in the transmission of the grammarians and etymological lexica. Lobeck (PGG 209.2-5) proposed to read Ἀλάζειω in Theognostus (II 41.25 (= 225.3)), but Cramer did print Ἀλάζειω, and there is no indication whether the tradition actually has Ἀλάζειω or Ἐλεάζειω, as Lobeck’s proposed emendation suggests. Schneidewin’s view ((1848), 384) that Ἐλεάζειω in Choeroboscus and the Etymologicum Magnum is a scribal error for Ἀλάζειω, a king of the
Barcaeans, who is mentioned by Herodotus (4.164.4), on the basis of the thought that Christian scribes would be inclined to write Ἐλεά-ζειοπ thinking at Ἐλεάζαφ, does not seem to me sufficient and decisive for reconstructing Ἀλάζειο in Pseudo-Arcadius. Thus, the reading transmitted by the manuscripts of this text is retained here.

31.2 Λίγειο: The name of a river close to Galatia (St. Byz. β 82; cf. also Theognost. Can. II 41.25-6 (= 225.3-4), Zonar. λ 1308.2).

31.2 Ἐλάτειο: The name of a Celtic river (Choerob. Ep. Ps. 4.9; cf. also Theognost. Can. II 41.26 (= 225.4), EM 107.38).

31.3–4 ἐτι...4 Εἰγ: It would be odd if ‘ἐτι καὶ’ were used to add the list of the three monosyllables in -ειο to the list of the words in -ειο that have more than one syllable and are βαρυνόμενα. Normally ‘βαρύνεται’ refers to words not accented on the final syllable, but monosyllables are either oxytone or perispomenon (cf. Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.i 204.13-5, iv.ii 24.22-3, 283.20-1). A passage from Theognostus’ Canones (II 134.10-7 = 806.8-15; cf. also Choerob. in Theod. 204.15-20), which names Herodian’s Περί μονοσυλλαβών as a source, suggests that monosyllables that are perispomena were thought to be recessive: ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸ εἰς εἰχεν οὐδέτερον τὸ ἐν, ἡχῆξι βαρύνεσθαι οὐκ ἢν δὲ τούτῳ πῶς διὰ τὴν μονοσυλλαβίαν ἀναγκαῖος περισσάται, ἵνα δυνάμει βαρύνηται ἀμέλει εἰς
δισυλλαβίαν μετελθόν βαρύνεται ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ ἐεὶς ἐπέκειτο μετώπω (Hes. Th. 145.) ἵνα τὴν ὄνοματικὴν σημασίαν ἀποφήναι· οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς Περί μονοσυλλάβων. ('Therefore since εἰς had the neuter ἐν, it should have been recessive; but I suppose this was not possible due to its being a monosyllable. It is necessarily perispomenon, so that it is recessive in force. And indeed when it goes over to being disyllabic it is recessive, as in ὀφθαλμῷ ἐεἰς ἐπέκειτο μετώπω, in order to show the nominal meaning. Thus Herodian in the Περί μονοσυλλάβων.'). If this idea underlies here, then 'ἐτι καὶ' might have originally linked the recessive words that have more than one syllable with monosyllables that are perispomena, and therefore recessive in force. The original rule might have included perispomena monosyllables (e.g. εἰς is accented εἰς at Theognostus Can. II 133.18 (=802.6)), which the epitomator cut down, or a scribe omitted by mistake, thus leaving 'ἐτι καὶ' without any clear link with the previous sentence. If the 'ἐτι καὶ' is not meant to add the three monosyllables to the previous list of the βαρυνόμενα, then it should be taken with 'ἀσυνήθη', so that the meaning is that the monosyllabic words in -εἰς as well as the words in -εἰς that have more than one syllable are not usual (not in use).

But, of course, this would be an odd observation to make in this
work, if there is no information about the accent to go with it, and also because χείο, a very common word, is included in this list. It is possible that something, perhaps a list of oxytone words with more than one syllable, has dropped out before ‘ἐτι καὶ τὰ μονοσύλλαβα’, and ‘ἐτι καὶ’ was supposed to link the section on the monosyllables with that list. There are two oxytone words in Hesychius that end in -ειο and have more than one syllable: τοῦσοίο (τ 1211), which according to Locker’s Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache should have been τοῦσείο, and διαβουλεύειό (διαβολεύ υ Latte δ 956). τοῦσοίο (τοῦσείο) and διαβουλευείο are nowhere else attested.

31.4 Εἰο: Three meanings are provided in grammatical and lexicographical works for this word. We have the information that this is the name of a river (Choerob. in Theod. 321.7-8, Ep. Ps. 4.8, De Orthogr. 274.1; Zonar. ε 626.4, ε 627.12), or that it means λαίλαψ (‘furious storm, hurricane’; Hsch. ε 998; Σα ε 126; Phot. ε 251; Su. ει 176; Zonar. ε 626.4), or that it means λαμπηδὼν (‘lustre, brilliance’; Σα ε 126; Phot. ε 251; Su. ει 176; Zonar. ε 626.4).

31.6–7 το...7 κεφαλής: Contrary to Schmidt (21.6), I did not choose the word order of manuscript C (τῆς κεφαλῆς πιτύσιμα). The scribe of C usually alters the word order, trying to create hyperbata, in order to give the text a rather ‘classical/rhetorical’ aspect.
31.6 ἀποπτύφισμα: ‘dandruff’, see DGE, TGL I.ii 1611C and LBG. The word occurs later, in a Byzantine author (Psellus Poem. 6.301; the edition by Westerink has ἀποπτύφισμα, but Boissonade’s Anecdota Graeca (III, Psellus, p. 216, l. 297) have ἀποπτύφισμα), but it is possible that we are dealing with an early occurrence of this word. Schmidt (21.6) wrongly printed the reading of C as opposed to the reading of A.

31.7 τὸ...δεῦνεται: No reason is mentioned why ἰχώφ is exceptionally oxytone (see the discussion of the relevant section in the epitomator’s Introduction 1.21–2.1 συντομίας ... κρατυνομένων).

33.2 ἀλλάς: The manuscripts’ ἀρκὰς (which should have been ἀρκᾶς, since the α is short) is not a proper example for this section of the accentuation rule on words in -ας. A perispomenon word is needed at this point and since ἀρκᾶς is oxytone, it is not a suitable example. There are three parallels, Jo. Alex. 8.14-24, EM 470*.233-40 and Choerob. in Theod. 385.14-7 (see the apparatus of parallel passages) that support the reading ἀλλᾶς in the place of the manuscripts’ reading ἀρκᾶς. In Philoponus’ passage ἀλλᾶς comes right after πελεκᾶς, while in the other two passages the word ἀλλὰς comes immediately before πελεκᾶς. Moreover, in Philoponus’
passage, after ἄλλας we read χαλκοφάς, ἵμας and ἄνδριας, as in
Pseudo-Arcadius, while in the Etymologicum Magnum ἄλλας is
quoted after Αίας and Θόας and before ἰμας and ἄνδριας, as in
Pseudo-Arcadius. The transition from ἄλλας to ἀρκάς could easily
have occurred either at a stage of manuscript transmission (by means
of a scribe assimilating the termination of the word to the
termination of the following word πελεκάς), or even at the phase of
epitomising. The words ἄλλας and ἀρκάς are palaeographically
close to each other, especially in minuscule. There are traces of the
appearance of ἀρκάς near ἄλλας and πελεκάς in the etymological
lexica (see EM 470*. 233-40 and Et. Gud. i 277.50-6: Τὰ εἰς ἀς
όνοματα ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβήν μακρὸν ἔχοντα τὸ α, ἥ χαρύνεται, ἥ
περισσάται. οἶνον, βοναλλᾶς, ἔστι δὲ εἰδος πλακοῦντος, ἡς οὐ καὶ
βαλλαντοπῶλαι, καὶ πελεκᾶς. τὸ δὲ ἰμάς καὶ ἄνδριας, ἀς
dιαλλάξαντα κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ἕγον τοῦ ἀρκάς, διήλλαξαν καὶ
κατὰ τὴν κλίσιν.). These two passages from the etymological lexica,
which share common examples and have similar structure with our
Epitome, could suggest that ἀρκάς appeared close to ἄλλας and
πελεκάς in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφωνίας. Moreover, a passage
from Choeroboscus* in Theod. 348.24-6 τὰ γὰρ εἰς ἀς ἐξύτωνα ἐπὶ
ὀνομάτων οὐ ποιοῦσιν υδετέρου παρασχηματισμόν, οἶον Ἀρκάς
φυγάς χαλκοκράς γαλακτοκράς testifies to the appearance of Ἀρκάς close to χαλκοκράς and γαλακτοκράς, two examples that are close to ἴμας, ἀνδριάς and πελεκάς in our Epitome, and therefore reinforces the idea that Ἀρκάς was quoted near ἄλλας in a grammatical tradition that probably goes back to Herodian. It is interesting that in the passage cited from the Etymologicum Gudianum a compound of ἄλλας (i.e. βοναλλᾶς) is cited before πελεκάς and close to ἴμας and ἀνδριάς.

33.3–7 οὐδέποτε ... 7 παρακειμένου: The wording of the rule about the two types of exceptions consisting of polysyllabic oxtone words in -ας is somewhat concise and elliptical. The main rule states that polysyllabic words in -ας are never oxtone if they have long α. If a word is considered compounded from a perfect passive it is an exception: so χαλκοκράς and γαλακτοκράς. -κρας was thought by grammarians to derive from κέκραμαι as parallel passages show (see the apparatus of parallel passages). Even though ἴμας and ἀνδριάς have long α, they are not recessive or perisponemon as the rule prescribes, but oxtone. Therefore, while χαλκοκράς and γαλακτοκράς are oxtone because they have a feature that stands in the way of their following the general rule, ἴμας and ἀνδριάς, which could well have followed the general rule as they fulfil all the
conditions, are nevertheless exceptionally oxytone. Two passages from Choeroboscus (in Theod. 125.28-30, 325.5-11; see the apparatus of parallel passages) provide evidence that Herodian in the Πεφικαθολικής προσφώδιας commented on the accent of ἴμας and ἄνθρωπος and said that they are oxytone ‘παραλόγως’. Choeroboscus’ παραλόγως ὀξύνονται is equivalent to Pseudo-Arcadius’ σημειούμεθα ὀξυνόμενα. The fact that παραλόγως is rarely used in our Epitome, while σημειώνεται occurs very often, suggests either the epitomator’s or Herodian’s preference for using σημειώω instead of παράλογος/παραλόγως to express genuine exceptions (ones that cannot be brought under a sub-rule of their own).

34.1 βίβας: This word is attested in the inscription SEG 36 813, 1 from Crete (the word is capitalised in the edition, in order to indicate that a proper name is meant, but it is not accented). The edition says that Βίβας is equivalent to Βιβίας. If this is not the correct reading, then many readings are possible: e. g. Ρῆβας, Ἁβας, Χάλβας, Σάμβας, Αβίβας.

34.1 Φόρβας: The name of a hero of different mythic cycles in Thessaly, Rhodes, Elis and Argos. See RE 20.1. 527, s. v. Phorbas.

34.2 Αββας ποταμός: Ἀββας occurs again in Sophronius' Excerpts
from Johannes Charax’ commentary on Theodosius’ Canones (380.20), but no information about this word is given.

34.2 ἀκριβᾶς: This word is nowhere else attested. If it ought to be ὀκριβᾶς, which equals ἀκρίβας, as is stated in the Etymologicum Gudianum (o 424.43-6) and the Etymologicum Magnum (620.55-6), then the accentuation rule is ill formed, since it prescribes that there should be a perispomenon word at this point, or the rule contains a lacuna. No explanation is given for the fact that this word is perispomenon.

34.3–6 Τὰ...6 ἐκτεταμένον: One reads that φυγάς is oxtone although it does not have long α. That is to say, although the quantity of the α does not stand in the way of recessive accentuation, φυγάς is oxtone. This makes one understand that short α is a condition for recessive accentuation. Nevertheless, when the recessive words (γίγας, μέγας) were cited, nothing was said about their α being short. See the discussion of the relevant epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian in the epitomator’s Preface (1.17–21 δεί ... ὑπάρχη).

34.5–6 μέγας...6 ἐκτεταμένον: The α is short in μέγας, as well as in φυγάς. Later on in the Epitome we read: τὸ μέντοι μέγας καὶ λᾶς ως συστελλόμενα βαρύνονται (36.6–7). Here, the fact that the
α is short is presented as the reason why μέγας and λάας are recessive. So, the meaning of the phrase about φυγάς should be that φυγάς is oxytone although it does not have long α, not that φυγάς is oxytone because it does not have long α. This interpretation is confirmed by a passage from Choeroboscus (in Theod. 122.7-9).

34.13–14 ἑχοντά...14 διπλῶν: I have emended the manuscripts’ ἑχοντα τι πρὸ τῶν το ἑχοντά τι πρὸ τοῦ α τῶν διπλῶν. A number of similar emendations are also possible (see the critical apparatus).

34.14 Ἐλίξας: No such common noun or proper name is anywhere else attested.

34.14–15 ἀλείψας: This word, which coincides with the aorist participle of the verb ἀλείφω, is not attested as a common noun or a proper name. Various emendations that have been suggested would have been possible (see also the critical apparatus). I have retained the manuscripts’ ἀλείψας with some reserve.

34.15–16 τὸ1...16 ὄν: The reason why Ὑψᾶς does not follow the rule is not mentioned. See the relevant discussion of the epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian (1.21–2.1 συντομίας ... κρατυνομένων).

34.15 Ὑψᾶς: This proper name is attested in Callimachus’ lambi (fr. 201, in the accusative Ὑψᾶν). The manuscripts’ Ὑψᾶς cannot be...
identified, as TGL VIII 547 D suggests, with the Greek form of the river Hypsa that is mentioned by Pliny (HN 3.8.(14).90.), because the Greek name for this river is Ὕψας (see Plb. 9.27.6.).

34.15 ἐξάς: The Greek form for the Latin coin sextans occurs again in Hesychius (ε 3613) and in the Fragmenta Varia of the Corpus Aristotelicum (8.44.510.2, 8).

35.1 Γέλας: A river name (St. Byz. γ 45.2).

35.2 ἁλάς: I have printed a rough breathing with Schmidt (22.14). This contracted form of ἁλαῖς occurs nowhere else.

35.2 ἁλαῖς: The manuscripts’ ἁλέας is not the uncontracted form of ἁλάς. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation ἁλαῖς (22.15).

35.3 ς βαρύνεται: The manuscripts’ ἐκτείνεται (ἐκτείνονται Ω) seems to be taking the place of a verb that would normally indicate the accentuation of the words listed in this rule. Even if the rule meant to comment on the lengthening of a vowel (e.g. of the α in the penultimate syllable), and therefore even if the rule ought to include the verb ἐκτείνω (in some grammatical form) we are still missing the verb that prescribes the accentuation. Schmidt indicated that there is a lacuna after ΑΛ; he did not fill it, but mentioned in his apparatus that the verb βαρύνεται must have originally prescribed the accentuation in this rule. Lentz supplied ἐκτείνόμενον ἔχοντα το α.
Although something with this meaning must have been present in this rule I have not printed Lentz’s exact addition in my text, to allow for the possibility of slight variation.

35.3 κύλλας: I have printed MO’s κύλλας. According to Hesychius (κ 4505) κύλλας is used by the Ἱλείοι for ἃκυλλαξ’. The name Κύλλας occurs very close to Πάλλας in Eustathius (ll. I 55.6), which could suggest that the two names were cited close to each other in the Περί καθολικῆς προσωφίας, but I do not consider appropriate the change of the manuscripts’ κύλλας to Κύλλας here.

35.4 Πάλλας: The name of divine and heroic figures: see RE 18.3, 234-7; DNP 9, 197-8; BNP 10, 396.

35.4 Βάλλας: A personal name (LGPN VA).

35.5 ἡ...ἐνετελέστερον: ‘if there is a more basic form, i.e. a form before πάθος’. I could not find any examples of this exception.

35.8 Τόλμας: This seems to be a proper name. It occurs only in our Epitome and Choeroboscus’ Dictata (I 37.16-7 Gaisford) with the information that it is a proper name.

35.13 ἀφτόνας: MO’s ἐφτόνας occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation ἀφτόνας (PSGP 247, n. 22). ἀφτόνας is very close to the reading transmitted by the manuscripts.
35.13 Ξένας: A personal name (LGPN I).

35.14–15 δακνάς...15 τάσσεται: The manuscripts’ δεκάς occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihili. δεκάς cannot be a corrupt form of δεκάς, because the rule prescribes a circumflex, and also because after the mention of the diminutives Μηνάς and Ζηνάς, one would expect an example of the other type of exception, i.e. something said as a σκώμμα. This leads us to the second problem about this phrase, which is that the manuscripts’ ἐπιτάσσεται does not make sense. I have adopted Schmidt's emendation of δεκάς to δακνάς (Schmidt 23.6 e Choerob. Dict. Theod. can. I 43.2), and Lobeck’s emendation of ἐπιτάσσεται to ἐπὶ σκώμματος τάσσεται (PSGP 247, n. 22). δακνάς 'biter' (DGE s. v.) occurs again in Phrynichus’ Praeparatio sophistica (64.10), where it is used as an adjective qualifying ὄνος and ἰππός, and in Choeroboscus Dictata (I 43.2 Gaisford).

35.17 Ἡμας: This personal name is attested in Herodotus (4.147.1, 3, 6, 8, 4.148.1,6).

35.17–18 Αθύμας: This is the name of: (a) a sea-port near Byzantium (St. Byz. α 84.1-2, Eust. Od. I 339.27-8, Zonar. α 58.18), (b) a river near Byzantium (St. Byz. α 84.1-2; cf. Str. 7a.1.56.21-2), (c) a gulf (St. Byz. α
84.1-2), (d) a river in Μελαντιάς, a village in Thrace (Agath. 181.21-3, Su. μ 463.1-3).

35.18 Ἡρᾶς: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IV, V).

35.19 τετράς: This rare coin name occurs again in Hesychius (τ 630).

35.19–20 τό ... συστέλλεται: We are told that τετράς is an exception because it has short α, but having long α was not mentioned earlier as a condition for the recessive accentuation. See the discussion of the relevant section on the epitomator’s methods of excerpting Herodian (1.17–21 δεῖ ... ὑπάρχη).

35.21–22 παιδοπίπας: The Doric form of παιδοπίπης. In all the other sources where this word occurs, apart from Hesychius (π 77), it has its Attic form. This suggests that this word was not mainly known in its Doric form. Thus, Herodian may be thought to have reconstructed the Doric form, in order to have it exemplify the accentuation rule for compound words in -ας, or he may have derived this example from a Doric source which does not survive today (On the use of the Doric form instead of the Attic cf. εὐφαρέτας 35.22).

35.22 εὐφαρέτας: The Doric form of εὐφαρέτης. This rare word occurs again in S Tr. 208, in sch. D. T. Vat. 148.7, Lond. 544.1, Maced. Pae. 1 = Anth. Gr. App., Epigr. exhort. et suppl. 53.1, always in the Doric
form. On the use of the Doric form instead of the Attic see also the
note on παϊδοπίπας 35.21. Herodian might have derived this word
from a source where the Doric form occurred.

35.22–36.1 Τὸ...36.1 συντεθέν: χαλκοκράς exemplifies another
accentuation rule at 33.6.

36.1 φιλοπελλᾶς: This is a hapax, probably meaning ‘lover or
admirer of old men’ (the second member of the compound being
πελλᾶς). The rule prescribes that φιλοπελλᾶς and φιλοβορρᾶς
maintain the accent of the uncompounded words, i.e. πελλᾶς and
βορρᾶς. πελλᾶς and βορρᾶς are attested earlier (35.5 and 35.19
respectively) in the text, quite close to φιλοπελλᾶς and φιλοβορρᾶς,
and the phrase τὸν τῶν ἀπλῶν ἐφύλαξε τὸνον could be seen as
referring back to the accent of the uncompounded words which have
been mentioned recently. In support of φιλοπελλᾶς Dr Probert had
the following view: ‘One might imagine that φιλαπελλᾶς and
φιλοβορρᾶς were explained as not following the rule for compounds
in -ας because they are derived via πάθη from φιλαπελλῆς and
φιλοβορφέας (the latter if -έας is allowed to count as a different
termination from -ας). However, in that case one would not expect
the sentence to end with a reference to the accent of the
uncompounded forms: the crucial data would be the πρωτότυπα,
φιλαπελλῆς and φιλοβοφέας, rather than the uncompounded forms'. Dr Somolinos from the DGE raised the issue that compounds beginning with φιλο- are not used ἐπὶ σκώμματος (as a jibe), but it seems to me that one cannot exclude the possibility that such a word could have existed and could have been used ἐπὶ σκώμματος e.g. in Attic comedy, especially since the uncompounded πελλᾶς was used ἐπὶ σκώμματος. Lobeck’s conjecture φιλαπελλᾶς as the Doric form of φιλαπελλῆς is clever, but I find no serious objection to the transmitted φιλοπελλᾶς. Ἀπελλῆς and φιλαπελλῆς appear later on (46.3).

36.1 φιλοβοφέας: This is a hapax.

36.6–7 τὸ...7 βαρύνονται: The words μέγας and λᾶας are recessive, by contrast with the words mentioned just before them, which end in -ας συνεσταλμένον and are declined with -δος, because μέγας and λᾶας only have the ας συνεσταλμένον but are not declined with -δος.

36.6 λᾶας: The manuscripts' λᾶας coincides with the proper name Λᾶας, which is a Doric name with nominative ending in -ας with long α, contracted from -αος (Choerob. in Theod. 120.31-4, 121.15-6). But the word here cannot be the proper name because the rule says that the α is short. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation λᾶας (24.2).
36.7 συστέλλοντα...α: I have adopted the addition of τὸ α suggested by Schmidt (24.2 app. crit.), because the meaning of συστέλλοντα remains incomplete. If συστέλλομενα ought to be in the place of συστέλλοντα τὸ α (this hypothesis is based on the use of the passive participle συνεσταλμένον at the beginning of the rule), then a possible omission of a phrase similar to the one cited in the critical apparatus (ἀλλὰ (vel καὶ) μὴ διὰ τοῦ δος κλινόμενα) would be easily explained as a saut du même au même (-μενα ... -μενα). Even if συστέλλοντα τὸ α is the right reading here, a phrase like the one suggested above would seem to be needed for the sense and might have originally existed in the text, but it is possible that the epitomator left it out for the sake of brevity.

36.14 τὸ Υ: Schmidt (24.8 app. crit.) thought that there was a lacuna after Υ. It is true that a complete form of the rule should have included something like καὶ ἰσοσυλλάβως κλίνοιτο ἢ σύνθετα εἶτη as Schmidt indicates, but I have treated Schmidt’s suggested addition with some reserve, given one of the features of the epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian: the reason why certain words do not satisfy a rule is not always announced at the beginning of the rule as a condition for the rule, but later when the actual exception is cited. Schmidt’s filling of the lacuna is useful in terms of the understanding
of the rule as a whole, and could even be thought to work as a
reconstruction of the original Herodianic rule.

36.14 Ναίης: A proper name (Choerob. in Theod. 160.25).

36.14 Δάης: The name of a Scythian nation (see St. Byz. δ 1).

36.14 Κλεύης: The manuscripts’ κλέης is nowhere else attested. I
have adopted TGL’s emendation Κλεύης, which is a personal name
(LGPN IIIB).

36.15 Βρύης: A personal name (LGPN II). It is cited again in 39.24.

36.15 Υής: This word is transmitted as Ὑής in the manuscript
tradition of some texts (e.g. Paus. Gr. ν 3; Eust. ll. IV 225.20-1. Some
sources provide us with the information that this was an epithet of
3.1, Phot. ν 616.11, Su. ν 82, EM 775.3, Eust. ll. IV 225.20), some others
that it was an epithet of Zeus (Hsch. ν 112, Theognost. Can. II 18.30 (=
104.8; accented Ὑής) and others that this was an invocation for
Sabazius (Paus. Gr. ν 3.4-5, Phot. ν 616.19, Eust. ll. IV 225.21). He is
sometimes regarded as a foreign god (Phot. ν 616.15, Su. ν 82.4, EM
775.6).

36.15 ἔχον ...: One should understand μόνον as indicated at 36.14.

36.17 τὰ ... βαφύνονται: The plural used in the phrase τὰ ...
κλινόμενα βαφύνονται leads one to expect more than one example,
but conceivably the epitomator maintained the phrasing of the rule in its original form (thus maintaining the plural because more than one example was cited), but kept only one example. It is also possible that Herodian used the plural because he had more than one example in mind, although he only thought it necessary to give one. Thus I do not consider Schmidt’s assumption (24.11-2 app. crit.) that there is a lacuna after βαρύνονται necessary.

37.1 Κέβης: A personal name (LGPN IIIB, VA).

37.1 Χάβης: The manuscripts’ κάβης is a vox nihili. I have chosen to read Χάβης here suggested already in Schmidt’s apparatus (24.14 e sch. Ar. V. 234a) on the basis of sch. Ar. V. 234a: Χάβης: οὔτως Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῆς Καθόλου παρατίθεται τὸ ὄνομα διὰ τοῦ β: Χάβης. The emendation involves only the alteration of a single letter. The name Κάβας occurs in Argos (LGPN IIIA), but it would be a bit odd for Herodian to have cited the name in its Attic form if this name was not found in Attic or koiné sources.

37.1 Θίβης: The manuscripts’ θῆβης, is nowhere attested as a nominative. I have printed Θίβης, attested in Stephanus of Byzantium (θ 45.4). The confusion between η and ι could be due to the similarity with the city name Θῆβαι. Moreover, the η - ι confusion is one of the common itacistic errors, and in any case, at a
time when distinction of vowel length was no longer made, such a
mistake could have easily occurred. Θιβης seems to be an alternative
form of the ethnic designation Θιβιος, referring to a person from
Θιβα (see St. Byz. θ 45.4), otherwise called Θιβαίς (see St. Byz. θ
45.1-4) near the Pontus (cf. Flav. Arr. Bithyn. fragm. 49.6-7 (=FGH 2b
156F 84.2-3); Eust. D. P. 828.6-7).

37.2 Κιβῆς: This word occurs nowhere else. A name Κιβᾶς is
attested (LGPN I, IV).

37.6 Καὶ: The manuscripts’ καὶ is required here, not the η printed by
Schmidt (24.19), because the short penultimate and the parisyllabic
decension are conditions for the circumflex that need to be satisfied
together, as in μοιῆς and δογῆς. On the contrary, the
συναληλιμένα φθογγής and Αὐγής are declined
imparisyllabically.

37.8 Γάγγης: The manuscripts’ σάγγης is nowhere else attested. A
name Σάγγας occurs in ancient sources (sch. A. R. 183.15, EM 707.20,
Zonar. σ 1625.22), but there is no evidence that Σάγγης is a variant
form of this name. I have adopted L. Dindorf’s (and later Lobeck’s;
Dindorf TGL VII 14A-B, Lobeck PGSE2 51, n. 3) emendation of
σάγγης to Γάγγης, considering this emendation as the
palaeographically closest to the transmitted reading.
37.8 Μόργης: An ethnic designation according to Choerob. in Theod.

37.9 ἀπὸ συνθέτου: The manuscripts’ συνθέτον ἀπὸ does not make sense here, because ἄγής is not a compound word. In order for the construction ἀπὸ συνθέτου to be possible here the compound word would have to come before its constituent parts (e.g. τὸ ἄγης συνθέτον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄ και ἄγης), but this possibility is less economical. Moreover, ἀπὸ συνθέτου corresponds to ἐκ συνθέτου at the beginning of the rule. Furthermore, since one set of exceptions to the rule consists of the words that are καταλελειμμένα ἐκ συνθέτου (e.g. ἄγης), one expects the interest to fall primarily on these καταλελειμμένα rather than on the compound words themselves. Lentz’s addition of καταλελειμμένον after συνθέτου has not been adopted here, since for the sake of brevity the epitomator, or perhaps even Herodian, did not always repeat words given at the beginning of the rule, if they could easily be taken as implied later on. An example of this principle is the phrase τὸ μέντοι ἄγης ἐπιθετικόν (37.8–9), which refers back to the section ἡ παρώνυμον ἐπιθετικόν (37.4–5) at the beginning of the rule and does not repeat παρώνυμον that is given at the beginning of the rule (cf. also 86.1–2 τὸ ... θηλυκά).
37.9–10 τοῦ…10 κλώμενος: I have adopted Lentz’s emendation of the manuscripts’ τῆς γῆς to τοῦ ἀγας. Schmidt’s emendation τῆς ἀγας (25.3) is inappropriate because ἀγα, differently from ἀγας, is not a compound word as the rule prescribes. Moreover, ὁ μὴ κλώμενος is a suitable gloss for ἀγας but not for ἀγα. I have also rejected the idea of emending the manuscripts’ τῆς γῆς to either τοῦ εὐαγας (‘free from pollution, pure’ or ‘καλῶς κεκλασμένος’ or ‘bright, clear’) or παναγας (‘all-hallowed’) as in Bekker’s Anecdota Graeca (I 337.13-4), because neither of these corrections would fit the meaning ὁ μὴ κλώμενος.

37.10 μογῆς: This word occurs nowhere else. It is probably an adjective derived from μογέω, equivalent to μοχθής (μοχθέω - μοχθῆς, μογέω - μογής) (see TGL V 1128A). However, the problem with this reading is that adjectives derived from adjectives in -ῆς are not known to be declined parasyllabically as would be required here (see TGL V 1128A). Schmidt’s suggestion to read Βογῆς (25.3 app. crit.) is not plausible because the name is in fact accented Βόγης at Herodotus 7.107.

37.10–11 δρογῆς: This word is nowhere else attested.

37.14–16 Τὰ…16 Μένδης: The mention of τὸ μέντοι ψευδῆς καὶ φραδῆς ἐπιθετικά (37.16–17) could suggest that this initial sentence
of the accentuation rule should have included something like κύρια ὄντα ἢ προσηγορικά after δισύλλαβα. Furthermore, the mention of the fact that Ποδής and ὅδης are perispomena because they have the o in their penultimate could suggest that the beginning of the rule should have indicated that having the o in the penultimate is an exception to recessive accentuation. But the epitomator probably omitted these conditions at the beginning of the rule considering that their mention later was sufficient (see also below the note on 37.16–17 τὸ ... ἐπιθετικά). I have therefore not considered Lentz’s addition ἢ τὸ ὁ παραληγόμενα necessary. Cf. the discussion of the epitomator’s principle 1.17–21 δεῖ ... ὑπάρχη.

37.15 Ποδής: The name of a city (St. Byz. 538.14) and a river (St. Byz. 538.14; cf. Choerob. in Theod. 157.33-4) in Pisidia.

37.15 ὅδης: I have printed C’s ὅδης. The other manuscripts’ ἐδης occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. ὅδης is reinforced by a parallel passage from the Etymologicum Magnum (see the apparatus of parallel passages).

37.15 Γράδης: This patronymic refers to the son of Γρᾶς, cf. Choerob. in Theod. 156.2-3, 156.11-3.

37.16 Μένδης: The manuscripts’ μέδης occurs nowhere else and is probably a scribal error. I have adopted Lentz’s emendation Μένδης,
which according to the testimony of Herodotus (2.46.13-4) is the word for ‘he-goat’ (τράγος) and the name of the god Pan in Egyptian. Stephanus of Byzantium (444.17-9) informs us that this was the name of a city in Egypt, near Lycopolis, where the he-goat and Pan were worshipped.

37.16–17 τὸ...17 ἐπιθετικά: Here we read that the reason why ψευδής and φοαδής are exceptions is because they are adjectives, but in fact they do not satisfy the condition for recessive accentuation, which is that the words should not be declined with -οῦς in the genitive. This suggests either that the beginning of the rule should have said μὴ ἐπιθετικὰ διὰ τοῦ ὈΥΣ κλινόμενα, in which case the presence of ἐπιθετικά here is justified, or that the beginning of the rule should have said δισύλλαβα κύρια ὁντα ἡ προσηγορικά, so that adjectives would be excluded from the recessive accentuation (this again would indirectly justify the presence of ἐπιθετικά here). In the latter case μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὈΥΣ κλινόμενα should not by itself be considered to be the reason why ψευδής and φοαδής are not recessive, but the genitive in -οῦς together with the fact that these words are adjectives, or one may even consider that μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὈΥΣ κλινόμενα was meant to exclude common and proper names that
are declined with -ους. On the fact that not all the exceptions to the rule appear at the beginning see the note on 37.14–16 Τὰ ... μένδης.

37.17–18 καὶ1 ... 18 παραλήγει: In a later accentuation rule (40.2) we find Ποδής cited in a list of examples that are proper names ending in -ης that have a more basic form (e.g. Ἐμής (Ἐμέας), Θαλῆς (Θαλέας)). Taking into consideration that both Ποδής and όδης could have exemplified this other rule, one could wonder how decisive the fact that these words have o in their penultimate syllable is with regard to their accentuation. See also the general discussion of this in the chapter ‘The present edition’.


37.17 όδης: This seems to be a personal name but it is nowhere attested (see TGL VI 2406D).

38.2–3 τὸ2 ... 3 θηλυκόν: I have adopted Lentz’s emendation (63.1-32) of the manuscripts’ δεσπότης ... δεσποτὶς to ποτὶς ... ποτὶς. Since the text deals with the accentuation of words on the basis of their terminations, there is no reason for a comment about the accent of a masculine and the corresponding feminine with a different termination. This appears to be a comment on the orthography of the two words more than on the accent, which in any
case falls on the same syllable in the masculine and feminine forms.

A parallel passage from Choeroboscus’ commentary on Theodosius’ *Canones* (187.15-23; see the apparatus of parallel passages) reinforces the emendations πότης ... ποτής. It is noteworthy that all the other examples cited and commented on in this accentuation rule of our Epitome are disyllabic, even if this is not explicitly mentioned as one of the conditions for the rule. This strengthens the thought that δεσπότης and δεσπότις are not the appropriate examples here. The manuscripts’ δεσπότης and δεσπότις may be explained palaeographically because of the δε immediately before πότης and ποτής. A scribe seeing δε ποτης could easily have thought of δεσπότης. Confusion between η (ποτης) and ι (-ποτις) would have been an easy phonetic mistake.

**38.6 κάσης:** This word is very rare. LSJ s. v. gives the meaning ἡλικιώτης on the basis of Hesychius (κ 966), where the manuscript has κασης but Latte prints κάσις. Perhaps the manuscripts’ κάσης in Pseudo-Arcadius should encourage one to read κάσης in Hesychius rather than emending to κάσις. For the meaning of κάσις as ἀδελφός see sch. A. *Th.* 674h, Phot. κ 221, *Et. Gud.* κ 302.26, *EM* 493.15, Zonar. κ 1148.13-5, *Su.* κ 456, Σα κ 91, and as ἀδελφή see sch. *E. Hec.* 943. The genitive κάσου (which is a suitable genitive for
κάσης, but not for κάσις) is explained as ἀδελφός in the
*Etymologicum Gudianum* (κ 302.3-4). The *Etymologicum Gudianum* κ 302.28 gives the meaning ἀνηλικώτης ἀδελφός to κάσις. It is interesting that this lemma combines the two pieces of information about κάσης/κάσις, the one having to do with age and the other with kinship. It is not clear whether the combination of the two explanations in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* results from some kind of contamination, or if it means to give a meaning to κάσις which distinguishes this word from κάσης. With regard to ἀνηλικώτης in the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, we observe that there is contradiction with ἡλικίωτης in Hesychius. Alternatively, Κάσης may be a personal name: the genitive Κάσου is attested in the inscriptions *OGIS* 200 and *SEG* 32 1601, from Egypt and Nubia respectively, and the accusative Κάσαν is attested in Bacchylides’ *Epinician Ode* 11.118-9.

38.6–7 κασής...7 ἰμάτιον: κασής is a rare word. Our passage informs us that this was a garment of felt. This is a variant form for κάσσος (κάσος), which is cited later on in the Epitome with the explanation ἔστι δὲ εἴδος ἰματίου (141.14–16). I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ πηλώτιον to πιλωτόν (25.18).
38.7–8 τὸ...8 ἐπίθετον: This seems to suggest that the rule excluded adjectives as well as τοπικά and the συναληλιμένα, but possibly the epitomator omitted the exclusion of adjectives from the phrasing at the beginning of the rule. Cf. the omission of certain exceptions from the beginning of the rule at 37.16–17 τὸ...ἐπιθετικά, 37.17–18 καὶ τὸ Ποδής...παραλήγει.

38.7 Κισσής: I have followed Schmidt in emending the manuscripts’ κισσής to Κισσής.

39.2 ἐπιπλοκήν: See the discussion of this grammatical term in the Introduction, pp. 119-20.

39.10–11 ἀμετάβολον: ‘liquid or nasal consonant’.

39.11 ἐπιπλοκής: See note on 39.2 ἐπιπλοκήν.

39.13 Πίγρης: The manuscripts’ πίγρης occurs nowhere else. Schmidt’s emendment Πίγρης (26.9) is a personal name (LGPN I, IV, VA).

39.13–14 Πέτρης...14 τις: A μέγας Πέτρας and a μικρός Πέτρας are mentioned by Scylax (108.5, 108.9-11 respectively). The Periplus Maris Magni (Stadiasmus) mentions a Πέτρας (30.1, 33.1, 33.3, 34.1) and a μικρός Πέτρας (40.1). Claudius Ptolemaeus’ Πέτρας μεγάλης λιμήν (4.5.3.5.) and Πέτρας μικρᾶς λιμήν (4.5.2.9) seem to be
corrupt forms of Πέτρας μέγας and Πέτρας μικρός λιμήν respectively. On this see RE 19.1181-2.

39.14–15 εἰ…γέγονε: Examples of this sub-rule could be τεχνής, λαχνής and ζαχνής, which were cited earlier under the section on words ending in -νης and -φης (39.7–8). These three examples result from a πάθος, from contraction (τεχνήεις, λαχνήεις, ζαχρηής) as was explicitly mentioned in the relevant section above. Cf. Lentz’s reconstruction (64.32-3).

39.14 δὲ τι: I have inverted the manuscripts’ τι δὲ to δὲ τι in order to restore the normal order for these two words.

39.19–20 τό…20 γὰρ: πλήρης is said to be barytone because it is subject to syncope from πληρής to πλήρης. The supposed syncope in πλήρης is justified differently in Choroboscus (in Theod. 162.10-2), Theognostus (Can. II 44.16-20 (= 243), the Etymologicum Gudianum (π 470.43-4), the Etymologicum Magnum (676.53-5) and Zonaras (π 1552.15-7).

39.21 ὀλιγήρης: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ λιγήρης to ὀλιγήρης. λιγήρης is a scribal error. ὀλιγήρης appears next to ξιφήρης in two Iliad scholia (3.316a1, 9.336c) deriving from Herodian.

39.23 Μυῆς: A personal name (LGPN IIIA, accented Μύης).
39.23 ὜φης Κυῆς: These proper names are nowhere else attested.

40.1 ἀπὸ ἐντελεστῆρον: ‘that have a more complete form’.

40.2 Πυλῆς: The contracted form (cf. 40.1 ἀπὸ ἐντελεστῆρον) of the name Πυλέας occurring at the *Etymologicum Magnum* (210.15). *LGPN* II, III, IV records a name Πυλῆς, but the inscriptions cited by *LGPN* (LGPN II: *ABV* p. 367 no. 89, for the inscription see *AIA* 1929, 363 n. 5; LGPN III: *Syll.* 419, 3; LGPN IV: *SEG* 24 579, 6) suggest that there are two different names: (i) Πύλης, -ητος (Πύλητος *Syll.* 3 419, 3) and (ii) Πυλης, -ου, which could either be Πύλης, -ου, -η or Πυλης, -ου, -η (Πυλη *SEG* 24 579, 6), but *LGPN* lists these occurrences under the entry Πυλῆς. *LGPN* IV reports wrongly that Πυλη in *SEG* 24 579, 6 is a genitive while it is a dative. The dative Πυλη would be an appropriate dative for either Πυλης, -ου or Πυλης, -ου.

40.7 Ἀρτεμῆς: A personal name (*LGPN* I, IV).

40.9 τεχνής δαφνῆς: These two words exemplify another two rules (τεχνῆς is also cited as an example at 39.7), one about words in -νης that are the result of contraction (39.1–8) and the other about words ending in ΗΣ that have a liquid or nasal consonant before the Η in combination with another consonant in the same syllable and are subject to a change (39.10–15). The phrase ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ΗΕΙΣ in this
rule corresponds to ἀπὸ συναλοιφῆς (39.8) in the first of the above-mentioned rules and to κατὰ πάθος (39.14) in the second.

40.10 ὡς πατρωνυμικά: I. e. words that have the characteristic termination of a patronymic, but are not patronymics: e.g. Εὐφιτίδης, Ἐουκυδίδης.

41.7 Οἴολης: A Locrian ethnic designation (Hsch. o 131, Choerob. in Theod. 160.8, Su. o 70, Zonar. o 1428.7).

41.8 ἀκλινής: I have kept the manuscripts’ reading despite the fact that this word does not end in -ονης or -ολης. It is possible that this accentuation rule originally dealt with words ending in -λης and -νης more generally, rather than specifically with words ending in -ολης and -ονης. An alternative solution to this problem is to assume that some material of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφίας has been cut out by the epitomator, thus resulting in the mention of ἀκλινής right after the words in -ολης and -ονης. ἀολλής, which was suggested by Göttling, is not an appropriate example of this rule as it stands, because ἀολλής has double λ. The word νεακονης would be suitable here, but is not supported by any parallel text.

41.12 Ἀρταφέρνης: M’s ἀρταφέρνης and Ο’s ἀρταφέρνης are not attested Persian names. I have adopted Lentz’s Ἀρταφέρνης (70.17).

41.13–14 τεχνηστής...14 ὁρχηστής: I have followed Schmidt
(27.19-20) in emending the manuscripts’ τευχιστής and ὀρχιστής to τευχιστής and ὀρχιστής respectively. The interchange between η and ι is a common iotacistic error.

41.15 Ἐτι... ΑΡΗΣ: Ἐτι should have been used to link the statement about the accent of the words of this sentence with that of the previous sentence so that the verb indicating the accent would not be repeated. But the previous sentence gives words that are oxytone, while this sentence gives recessive words. Thus, the sentence Ἐτι τὰ ἐἰς ΑΡΗΣ ... Σωκάρης should have been linked with the section on the words in -АНΗΣ, which in its turn is linked (with the use of Ἐτι) to the βαρύνεται of the section on the patronymics (40.10–12), as well as the three sections between them (41.1–2, 41.3–6, 41.7–9), which begin with Ἐτι. The Ἐτι at the beginning of our sentence could suggest that the section Τὰ ἐἰς ΣΤΗΣ ... ἀλφιστῆς (41.13–14) originally appeared at a different point, perhaps after Τὰ ἐἰς ΤΗΣ ἀπλὰ ἀρσενικά ... τοιετῆς σύνθετα (41.21–42.5). This view is reinforced by the fact that the treatment of the ending ΣΤΗΣ gets in the way between the sections on ΑΝΗΣ and ΑΡΗΣ and spoils the alphabetical order according to the ending.

41.19–20 Λυκώφης...20 ὀξύνει: The genitive Λυκωφέος that we find in Callimachus’ hymn to Apollo (l. 19) is based on the
nominative Λυκωφεύς, cf. Theogonist. Can. II 45.32-3 (= 248.3-4). See also Ahrens (1859), II xli-xlili.

42.9 Τεγεάτης Γενεάτης: I have printed both M's Τεγεάτης and O's Γενεάτης. It is not possible to know in which order these two words were originally written, but I consider that they were cited in our Epitome next to each other. The fact that both words end in -εάτης and their second letter is e facilitated the omission of Τεγεάτης in one and Γενεάτης in the other manuscript. Γενεάτης is rare. It occurs again in Stephanus of Byzantium (γ 47) and is the inhabitant of the Corinthian village Γενέα.

43.6–7 κηδεστής: κηδεστής (‘son-in-law, father-in-law, brother-in-law’), which could well have been called προσηγορικόν (cf. Orion κ 89 21-2, Et. Gud. κ 319.4, EM 510.1-2), since it is almost never used to qualify another noun (but see άνδρα κηδεστήν Plu. Demetr. 32.7.8, Ant. 78.2.2), is included among the adjectives in this passage. For a discussion of the term προσηγορικόν see the Introduction, pp. 124-6.

43.7 ἀφγεοτής: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (28.23) of the manuscripts’ ἀφγεοτής to ἀφγεστής. This emendation is supported by a parallel passage from Eustathius (II. II 176.5-10; see the apparatus of parallel passages).
43.9 ὀλῶ: I have followed Schmidt (29.1) in emending the manuscripts’ ὀλλω to ὀλῶ.

43.12 αὐτοσφαγῆς: This word usually occurs in tragedy.


44.3 <ἐπίθετα>: Both the fact that the examples given in the rest of rule are adjectives, and the phrase τὰ δὲ μὴ τοιαῦτα ἐπίθετα (44.4–5), suggest that ἐπίθετα should be added here.

44.6 ἐυτειχῆς: The manuscripts’ reading ἐυτυχῆς does not qualify as an example of this section of the rule. The rest of the examples are compound adjectives whose second member is based on a neuter noun ending in -ος and which do not have η in the penultimate syllable. Thus, ἐυγενῆς and ἀγενῆς are compounds of γένος and ἐυμενῆς is a compound of μένος. It seems necessary to follow Lentz (81.4) and read ἐυτειχῆς (‘well-walled’) here, in which case the second part of the compound adjective is based on τεῖχος. This emendation is supported by a passage in Choeroboscus (in Theod. 167.24–30).

44.8 καὶ λεπτοσφαγῆς: The manuscripts’ κλεπτοσφαγῆς is a vox nihili. I have adopted G. Dindorf’s emendation καὶ λεπτοσφαγῆς. The
manuscripts' κλεπτουργής is probably due to the a scribe who did not recognise the abbreviation for καί and thought it was the first letter of the word λεπτουργής that was following. The existence of καί between τμιτής and λεπτουργής makes sense because it links the two different groups of compounds, those whose second member is ἐτος and those whose second member is ἔργον.

46.3–4 σεσημείωται...4 δικαιοκρίτης: An explanation for the accent of φιλαλήθης and δικαιοκρίτης is given by Choeroboscus in his Commentary to Theodosius Canones (187.27-35, 187.23-5 respectively; see the full citations in the apparatus of parallel passages). According to him the compounds of ἀλήθης are recessive because they follow the accentuation rule which applies to words ending in -ηθης, as for example εὐήθης, συνήθης, κακοήθης (cf. EM 435.53-6). The compound words that have -κριτής as their second part are recessive, because the accent of κριτής was exceptionally oxytone and should have been recessive as a rule prescribes for masculine disyllabic words in -της (Choerob. in Theod. 187.15-6). It is possible that Herodian had included some more of the same information as Choeroboscus, and in fact Choeroboscus may well have derived some of the material from the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, given the close verbal similarities and the use of
common examples between our Epitome and this passage from Choeroboscus.

47.4 θ. Schmidt (30.5) and Lentz (83.13) thought that there must be a lacuna here (see the critical apparatus for the proposed additions). The two scholars noticed that θ was cited in a list of examples relating to an accentuation rule on words ending in -της, and thought that they should add η to make θ a gloss for η. A passage from Choeroboscus shows that θ was considered to correspond to τ: in Theod. 325.33 θ ης ης θτος (το γαρ θ δυναμει τ ης τουτεστιν αντισταξει τω τ). This passage suggests that the ending -θης was regarded as equivalent to -της and could be dealt with in the same way. The termination -θης is not dealt with separately in this book. The concept of the corresponding letter (αιστοιχον) in ancient grammar is employed (inter alia) in relation to the unaspirated consonants (π, τ, κ) and the aspirated consonants (φ, θ, χ). The two letters belonging to each of the three pairs π - φ, τ - θ, and κ - χ, are said to be αντισταξεια in the three classes of labial, dental, and palatal consonants respectively. See also sch. D. T. Vit. 117.38-9, 125.24-5, Marc. 372.33-5, 339.7-9, 407.20-1, 407.34-5, 408.5-6, A. D. Adv. 147.18-23, Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.i 295.1-3, iv.ii 75.28-9, 78.31-2, 80.4-5, 103.28-9, 146.17-8, 146.27-8, 147.32-2, 180.20-1,
The correspondence of ἐσθής to ἐστίς must have been mentioned in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας. The incoherence here is probably the fault of the transmission of the Epitome, but the possibility that it is the fault of the epitomator cannot be excluded. The sign of the lacuna in my text shows at least that in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας one ought to expect that the correspondence of ἐστίς with ἐσθής was indicated.

47.9 κοινά: This refers to words that can be both masculine and feminine according to the sex of the referent, such as ὀίς and πάϊς.

See also the discussion of the term κοινός in my Introduction, pp. 123-4, 130 and Dickey (2007), 237 s. v. ἐπίκοινος, 244 s. v. κοινός. The Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax calls this κοινόν γένος (I 25.1-2).

48.3 πῖ: I have printed the word with an iota subscript as required.

48.6 σκελῖς: Both a synonym for ἀγλῖς ('clove, head of garlic') and a later form for σχελῖς ('rib of beef').

48.6 νυχῖς: This word occurs only in our Epitome and in Et. Gud. κ 327.7-8, EM 333.26, 518.37. In all four passages it is quoted next to παννυχῖς.
48.12–49.1 Τά…49.1 ὄξυνεται: That is to say, the diminutives ending in -ις that have the same number of syllables as their base words.

49.2 λυφίς: This diminutive of λύφα occurs only in our Epitome and sch. D. T. Vat. 227.17, Marc. 376.14-5, Lond. 539.10.

49.2 Ἰφις…ἴφι: The words have a long penultimate syllable, and therefore I have followed Schmidt (31.3) in printing them with a circumflex.

49.2 Ἰφίς: A personal name (LGPN I, II, VA).

49.3 γενόμενον: I have printed Schmidt’s emendation (31.3) of the manuscripts’ γινόμενον to γενόμενον.

49.4–5 Τά…5 μελλόντων: This section of the rule appears again in 53.19–20, but with reference to the termination -ξις.

49.8–9 τό…9 Ι: ἄψις appears as an example of another accentuation rule at 59.7–60.2, and is cited again as an exception at 53.21.

50.1 προ>παροξύνεται: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ παροξύνεται to προπαροξύνεται. Later on (50.4) we read βαρύνεται before Αθάρραβις and κάνναβις.

50.2 Νιοβίς: This derivative occurs again at sch. Hom. II. 24.604a.3.

50.2 Λυκαμβίς: A word derived from the name Λυκάμβης. The majority of attestations of Λυκαμβίς occur in the phrase Λυκαμβίς
ἀφχή (Hsch. λ 1371, Phot. λ 444), a *periphrasis* which Cratinus employed in his *Νόμοι* (*PCG* fr. 138 (130)), for the ‘polemarch’ Lycambes. See also *OCD* s. v. Archilochus.

50.2 Περραμβίς: One of the possible female ethnic designations (together with Περραμβός and Περραμβή) for a person coming from Περραμβός, a city in Thessaly (St. Byz. 518.5-7).

50.3 σεσημείωσαι...καλλαβίς: καλλαβίς is an exception, because although it is neither a παρώνυμον nor an ἐπιθετικόν it is oxytone. Unlike Schmidt (31.11) I have not printed Lobeck’s emendation κάν ναβίς (*PSGP* 288). κάν ναβίς is not suitable here, because it is cited in the following sentence among the προσηγορικά that are recessive. Therefore, it is not exception and one cannot expect it to be cited as such. The appearance of σημείωσαι τὸ καλλαβίς so close to σεσημείωσαι τὸ καλλαβίς seems a bit suspicious.

50.4 Αθάραμβίς: The testimony of Stephanus of Byzantium (α 79.1-2) that Αθάραμβίς was cited in book 4 of the Περί καθολικής προσφοδίας is significant for two reasons. Firstly, because Stephanus’ text (α 79.1-2) enabled Schmidt (31.12-3) to emend the manuscripts’ ἂθαράμβις, and secondly because his testimony reveals that the form in which he consulted the Περί καθολικής προσφοδίας had the same
arrangement of the material in certain books as our Epitome. 

Ἀθάρακτις is a city in Egypt (St. Byz. α 79.1-2 and Et. Sym. I 104.18).

50.5 σημείωσαι…κολλαβίς: κολλαβίς is an exception because although it is a common noun it does not have a recessive accent. I have kept the reading of MO, although it occurs nowhere else. The meaning of κολλαβίς is doubtful; words that seem to have the same stem with κολλαβίς mean different things. In sch. Ar. Pac. 1196 κεκολλαβισμένοι is linked to κόλλαβος (‘a kind of cake or roll’).

ἐνεκολάβασε in Hesychius (ε 2884) and Eustathius (Od. II 142.3-4) is glossed by κατέπιεν (‘swallowed’). κολλαβίζοσθαι in Photius (κ 873) is a synonym for περαίνοσθαι (‘being fulfilled, accomplished’). κολλαβίζειν is explained by Pollux (9.129.1-3) as a kind of game.

50.8 Γέργις: Either the name of a city in Troy (St. Byz. γ 58.1) or the name of a Persian general in Xerxes’ army (Hdt. 7.82.6 - 83.2, 7.121.10-2).

50.9 γέγγις: This word is nowhere else attested and is perhaps a νοξ nihili. Many other conjectures can be suggested, e.g. Γίγις, Βέγγις (LGPN I), Γόγγις (LGPN II, IIIA), Σέγγις (LGPN IV, VA). Schmidt noted in his apparatus (31.17) the reading Γέτις from Stephanus of Byzantium (γ 67.2), but this could not have been cited here, because it does not end in -γις.
50.11 ἀμοργίς...ὑποστάθημι: ἀμοργίς is an uncommon word. It occurs again in Ar. Lys. 737; sch. Ar. Lys. 735.1-2; sch. Pl. Ep. 363a,ter (the gloss ὑποστάθημι is given); Hsch. β 1273; Lex. de Att. Nomin. (22; (the gloss ὑποστάθημι is given)).

50.13–14 εἰ...14 γένος: No example of this exception is provided and I have not been able to find any examples.

50.14 πληθίς: This word occurs nowhere else and is perhaps a vox nihili. I suggest πλινθίς, because of its similarity with the transmitted reading, but there are no parallel passages to support this. A scribe could easily have written πληθίς in the place of πλινθίς, under the influence of πληθύς (cf. M’s reading a.c.).

50.15 τηθίς: I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation (PENVA 134) of the manuscripts’ τιθίς to τηθίς. The interchange between η and ι is a common iotaic error.

50.15 <πατρός...μητρός:> I have added this phrase because it is required for the complete meaning of τηθίς.

50.16 αἰθίς: This word occurs nowhere else. Schmidt’s conjecture Δένθις (32.1 app. crit.) is possible, but there are no parallel passages to support it, and therefore the text cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

50.16 κόρθις: The manuscripts’ κοφίς is nowhere else attested and
is probably a scribal error for the rare κόρθις, which is attested in Hesychius (κ 3613) and Photius (κ 965.2) and is explained as σωρός, σωστροφή. I have thus followed Schmidt’s suggestion (adopted later by Lentz) to emend κρόθις to κόρθις.

50.17 Κράθις: The name of a river (Hdt. 1.145.6, Scyl. 13.26, Str. 8.7.4.32, Paus. 7.25.11.5).

50.20 Ταμίαθις: The manuscripts’ ταμίοσθις occurs nowhere else, and is probably a scribal error for Ταμίαθις, the name of a city in Egypt (St. Byz. 599.14, Choerob. in Theod. 196.12-3, 344.18, Sophr. Char. Theodos. 388.2, 405.1). I have thus printed Lobeck’s emendation Ταμίαθις (PSGP 366, n. 3).

50.20 Μένουθις: I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation of the manuscripts’ μενούθις to Μένουθις (PSGP 366, n. 3; St. Byz. ε 124.1). Μένουθις is the name of an Egyptian village close to the Canopic mouth of the Nile (St. Byz. 445.7).

50.21 Τεφένουθις: The manuscripts’ τεφενούθις is emended according to Stephanus of Byzantium (ε 124.1).

51.2 φίκις: This word occurs nowhere else. A number of emendations have been suggested (see also the critical apparatus), but none of them is supported by parallel passages. I consider it more likely that the intended reading here was Κίκις or φύκις (the
word is normally transmitted as φυκίς, but perhaps Herodian had a
different view about the accent), or that there is something missing
from the text. In the latter case, it is possible that φυκίς was included
in the list of oxytone words in -κίς, and that another word was given
as an example of a recessive word, but that a scribe accidentally
transposed φυκίς to the place where we now read φίκις. The accent
could then have been changed (perhaps even by another scribe) to fit
the verb βαφύνεται. The change of ν to ι would have been easy in
either case.

51.8 κιγκλίς: Μ's κυγκλίς and O's κυγκίς occur nowhere else. I
have adopted Schmidt's emendation κιγκλίς (32.12).

51.8 θυλλίς...θόλακος: θυλλίς is rare; it occurs also in Hesychius
(θ 855; cf. θ 853), who gives the synonym θόλακος ('sack') as in our
Epitome, but also γωρυτός ('quiver') and ἐλυτον ('covering, case').

51.9 δέλλις...σφηκίων: δέλλις occurs mainly in grammatical and
lexicographical sources. The following passages provide us with the
meaning ζώον ὅμοιον μελίσση: Hsch. δ 596, Choerob. in Theod.
224.11, 292.18, 328.30, Et. Parv. o 2.6-8, Et. Gud. o 435.46-7, EM
632.4-5, Ep. Hom. 1,α1 48, while Hsch. δ 596 gives also the synonym
σφήκες and Zonar. δ 478.22 gives the synonym σφηκίων (written
with one λ in Zonar.).
51.10—11 βάλλις... Περιφέρεια: βάλλις is a rare word that occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical sources: Theodos. Π. γραμμ. 94.17-8, Et. Gen. β 21.3, Et. Sym. II 390.21-3, EM 186.35-6. The wording of this phrase does not make it clear whether Herodian thought that βάλλις is recessive because it is declined with θ, or whether he cited this word as a genuine exception. The ancient sources provide us with the genitive βάλλιθος (EM 186.36, Theodos. Π. γραμμ. 94.17), but LSJ gives the genitive βάλλεως.

51.14 πυλίς ὑποκοριστικῶν: πυλίς is mentioned as an example even though diminutives and words that begin with π are exempted from the rule prescribing oxytone accentuation. Perhaps something has fallen out here. On the other hand, the exemption ‘unless they begin with π or are diminutives’ does not necessarily mean that words falling into these two exempted groups cannot be oxytone. Rather, the exemption indicates that the accent of the exempted words cannot be predicted by the main rule given. Thus, words that are exempted from a rule do not necessarily have a different accentuation from the words that follow the rule. Still, it seems slightly odd that after ὑποκοριστικὰ are exempted, πυλίς is then listed as an example with the specification ὑποκοριστικῶν.

51.20 μαύλις...μάχαιρα: The manuscripts’ μάλβυδις occurs
nowhere else. I have adopted TGL’s emendation μαύλις. μαύλις is uncommon, occurring mainly in grammatical and lexicographical sources. The meaning μάχαιρα is given also in sch. Nic. Ther. 706a, Hesychius μ 417, 415 (in 415 the meaning λαστομείον is given), Et. Gud. μ 380.5, EM 574.270-3, Eust. Il. II 501.7 and sch. Theoc. Bom. bes. 4a. μαύλις is also attested in Call. Aet. fr. 75.9, Nic. Ther. 706.

51.21 τάλις...μελλόγαμος: τάλις is an uncommon word occurring mainly in grammatical and lexicographical sources, which provide us with the synonyms μελλόγαμος (Poll. 3.45.5-6; Hsch. τ 85a (μελλόγαμος παρθένος); Phot. τ 567.17; Eust. Il. II 531.9 (μελλόνυμφος), III 563.4 (μελλόγαμος παρθένος)), or νύμφη (Hsch. τ 85a, sch. S. Ant. 629, Zonar. τ 1711.20), or γυνή γαμητή (Hsch. τ 85a). It also occurs in S. Ant. 629, Call. Aet. fr. 75.3, Poll. 3.45.8.

51.22–24 ἔτι...24 ἐπαυλις: The mention of the examples Βάλις, μάλις, Ἡλις, ὀλίς and αύλις in the same sentence is a bit clumsy, because Βάλις and μάλις have long α, like τάλις, and could have been mentioned in the same section as τάλις rather than in the same section as Ἡλις, ὀλίς and αύλις. The epitomator might have had second thoughts and made a clumsy addition.

51.22 Βάλις: The manuscripts of Pseudo-Arcadius and Stephanus of
Byzantium have βάλις. Meineke emended to Βᾶλις, the name of a city in Libya (St. Byz. β 28).

51.22 μάλις: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ μάλις to μάλις, an alternative form for μηλίς, -ίδος (‘a distemper of asses, prob. glanders’).

51.23 ϊλις...ϊλία: I have followed Schmidt in emending the manuscripts’ ὀλις to ὀλις. The word ὀλία cited as a synonym for ὀλις occurs nowhere else.

52.1–2 Πανθαλίς...2 Ἐλένης: I have adopted Lobeck’s addition of Ἐλένης after θεράπαινα (PSGP 97.3-5 coll. Paus. 10.25.4). Pausanias (10.25.4.5-7) mentions Πανθαλίς as one of the two handmaids of Helen of Troy (the other one is called Electra). The addition of Ἐλένης is necessary here, because the information θεράπαινα would not have been sufficient for the designation of Πανθαλίς. The fact that Homer (II. 3.144) does not cite the same names for Helen’s handmaids as Pausanias, but provides us with the names Aethra and Clymene, reinforces the idea that the addition of Ἐλένης is necessary here: if Πανθαλίς was well and generally known from being cited in Homer, one could have thought that the addition of Ἐλένης would be unnecessary.
52.2 ἀγκαλίς: The manuscripts’ ἐγκαλίς occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation ἀγκαλίς.

52.3 πενταλίς: The manuscripts’ πενταλίς is nowhere else attested. I have thought about emending to πεταλίς which is very close to the manuscripts’ πενταλίς. Although indirect sources provide no evidence for the appearance of πεταλίς in our text, it satisfies the conditions for the rule; it follows the rule prescribing oxytone accentuation because it is an adjective (‘full-grown’). The ν before the τ in the reading of the majority of the manuscripts, πενταλίς, could easily have been added by a scribe under the influence of the second of the two conditions for oxytone accentuation, ἢ ἐχει τὴν πρώτην συλλαβήν καταλήγουσαν εἰς ν ἄφώνον ἐπιφερομένου, and also under the influence of the fact that all three preceding examples have ν before the stop consonant. Furthermore, a scribe could have added ν under the influence of the numeral πέντε. Lobeck’s δενδαλίς is also possible, but it is not supported by any parallel passages.

52.5 βαύκαλις: This rare word occurs again in Sopat. fr. 24, Ath. 11.28.3 and Anth. Gr. 1.244.4. The two ancient sources that provide us with a synonym for βαύκαλις (Sopat. fr. 24, Ath. 11.28.3) give this as τετράκυκλος, which should be read τετρακότυλος, as Mau points out in the RE (3.153) lemma.
52.7 κάπηλις: In the manuscripts of some other sources (e.g. Ar. Th. 347, Pl. 435) the word is accented καπηλις in the nominative. The Scholia to Aristophanes’ Plutus (635, 1120) make a distinction between κάπηλις and καπηλις, according to which κάπηλις is a woman who sells wine, while καπηλις is the daughter of a κάπηλις.

52.7 κύβηλις…πέλυξ: Apart from the synonym πέλεκυς (Hsch. κ 4377, α 461.3, Phot. α 146.2, κ 1148, Su. κ 2595, Et. Sym. I 24.14-5, EM 543.1, Zonar. κ 1262.25), other passages provide the synonyms μάχαιρα (Hsch. κ 4376, Phot. κ 1149), ἀγγείον κεραμεύνων ὡς πυξίς (Phot. κ 1150), τυφόκυνσις (Phot. κ 1151), and ὁ πέλεκυς ὁ μαντικός (Et. Gen. α 22, EM 8.9).

52.8 ἐπηλις…λάρνακος: ἐπηλις occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical works (Ael. Dion. Αττ. ὀνόμ. ε 48, α 157; Phryn. PS fr. 249*, Hsch. ε 4560; Orus fr. 30, Phot. ε 1468, α 2407; Su. α 2646, 3155, ε 2173; Eust. Od. I 253.13-4). The meaning ‘πώμα τῆς λάρνακος’ is also cited in Aelius Dionysius (Αττ. ὀνόμ. ε 48), Hesychius, Photius (ε 1468), Eustathius.

52.8 πώμα: This emendation is written in C’s margin in pencil. This could be a rather recent emendation.

52.8–9 τρόπηλις…9 σκορόδων: Aristophanes’ τροπαλίδος (Ach. 813) suggests an oxytone nominative τροπαλίς (cf. τροπαλλίς and
τροπαλλίδος in sch. Ar. Ach. 813a). The word appears to be oxytone in the majority of the other sources (Phot. τ 606.13, Zonar. τ 1747.32, τ 1748.1, τ 1748.3; cf. Su. τ 2117, Eust. Od. I 216.4), but in the sch. Nic. Alex. 432a.3-4 and the EM (769.1) the word is recessive. The meaning δέσμη τῶν σκορόδων occurs also in the scholia to Nicander’s Alexipharmaca (432a.3-4), Photius (τ 606.13), Etymologicum Magnum (769.1), Zonaras (τ 1747.32); cf. sch. Ar. Ach. 813a.3.

52.9 Φασηλίς: The name of a harbour (Scyl. 100.12-3) and a city in Pamphylia (Su. κ 1620.5-6 (but in Su. φ 121 Φασηλίς is the name of an island), Scyl. 100.12; but accented on the antepenultimate in Hdt. 2.178.10, sch. Th. 2.69.1, Str. 14.3.9, D. S. 20.27.1.6, D. P. Orb. desc. 855, St. Byz. 660.5 and Eust. Il. II 285.10-1, cf. I 501.29-30, D. P. 855.1-2, 855.7-8 (here we are also given the information that there was also a lake with the name Φασηλίς), 855.15-6).

52.12 κορυδαλλίς: κορυδαλλίς is one of the many variant forms of this bird.

52.12 ἀναβαλλίς...σφαίρα: ἀναβαλλίς is a rare word; it occurs again in Hsch. α 4188, Phot. α 1395, EM 95.42-3, which provide us with the meanings τανία and σφαίρα.

52.13 συκαλλίς: or συκαλίς.

52.13 μοιχαλλίς: usually spelled with one λ.
52.13–14 το...14 βαρύνεται: I have printed B’s κάβαλλις. κάβαλλις is derived from a word ending in -ης (καβάλλης) and thus it is not oxytone. κάβαλλις is a *hapax*.

52.17 Ἀζίλις: The name of a city (St. Byz. α 75, sch. Call. Hymn. 2 89) or a mountain (sch. Call. Hymn. 2 89) in Libya.

52.21 Ἀδουλίς: The name of a city in Aethiopia (St. Byz. α 59, El. Sym. I 60.17). No reason for the word’s exceptional recessive accentuation is given here or in any other source.

52.24 σησαμίς: M’s σισαμίς and O’s σιγαμίς are scribal errors. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation σησαμίς (34.11), an alternative form for σησαμή.

52.26–27 καί...27 ὄξυνεται: Σαλαμίς was cited earlier under another accentuation rule (8.3–5).

52.27 Σαλαμίς: I have printed Lobeck’s emendation (PSGP 157.21-2) of the manuscripts’ σεμίς δὲ to Σαλαμίς.

52.30–53.1 κονίς...53.1 χώμα: κονῖς is used mainly in the plural. It is cited in contrast to κῶνις also in Ammonius (Diff. 280), Johannes Philoponus (π. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημαιν. ε κ 22; cf. addit. 170.3) and Sophronius (Char. Theodos. 405.5-7).

53.3 Κρίνις: MO’s reading allows us to replace A’s *vox nihili κέρνις* printed by Schmidt.
53.6 ὀρνίς Θῶνις: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (34.21 (app. crit.)) of the manuscripts’ ὀρθῶνις to ὀρνίς Θῶνις.

53.6 νῆνις: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ νίνις to νῆνις (34.21), the contracted epic and Ionic form of νεᾶνις. The interchange between ι and η is a common iotacistic error.

53.7 φωνίς: This diminutive of φωνή occurs once again in the Epimerismi Homerici (1,a1 69).

53.9 δαυνίς: This is a hapax. Its meaning is doubtful (see LSJ and DGE s. v.). Perhaps it is linked with δαυνός = δανός (see DGE s. v.).

53.10 λεανίς: This word is a hapax. It is probably a diminutive of λέανα.

53.10–11 τὸ...11 χλούνις: The reason for these exceptions is not indicated.


53.11 χλούνις: This rare word occurs again in A. Eu. 188, sch. A. Eu. 188a, 188b, 188c, Orion (exc. e cod. Darmst. 2773) χ 617.18.

53.13–14 τὸ...14 προπερισπάται: Choeroboscus (in Theod. 327.17-8) says that νεᾶνις is properispomenon because it has the α long. It is
true that Ὄκεανὸς and στεφανίς, which are oxytone, have short α, but Τιτανὸς has long α and yet is still oxytone. Moreover, ὘ῆβανὸς has short α like Ὄκεανὸς and στεφανίς, but is recessive. Therefore, the length of α does not seem to be a real condition for the oxytone accentuation of words ending in -άνις.

53.14–15 τὸ...15 Θῆβανὸς: Stephanus of Byzantium (α 55.11-3) is a witness to the citation of Άδανις and Θῆβανὸς in the fourth book of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίας.

53.14 Άδανις: The feminine ethnic for a citizen of Άδανα (St. Byz. α 55).

53.15 Θῆβανὸς: The name of a wind that took its name from Cilician (or Hypoplastician) Thebe(s), where Andromache’s father Eetion was king (St. Byz. α 55).

53.16–18 ΟΝΙΣ...18 Ἄμαζονὶς: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ ὀνὶς to ονῖς (35.9), and L. Dindorf’s emendation Λυκαῶνὶς Ἄμαζονὶς of the manuscripts’ Λυκαῶνὶς ἂμαξῶνὶς (TGL V 421D (see also lii 9D)). The interchange between ο and ω is common in manuscripts after the loss of vowel quantity distinction. The fact that Λυκάων and Ἄμαζων are written with an ω might have also contributed to the manuscripts’ error.

53.17 εὐμενὶς: This adjective is attested in the singular only in our
Epitome and sch. A. Th. 887c. The plural Ἐφενίδες always refers to the Ἐφινύες or Furies.

53.17 Ἐφενίς: An alternative feminine form of Ἐφενής. Ἐφενίς is less common than Ἐφενής.

53.17 Λυκαονίς: This word is nowhere else attested. It means ‘(of Lycaon’ (feminine) or ‘daughter of Lycaon’.

54.11 τράμπις: This uncommon word occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical works, where it is explained as 'βασιλαρυκόν πλοίον' (sch. Lyc. 97.1, 1299.1, Hsch. τ 1244, Et. Gud. α 216.12-3, θ 258.41) or 'βασιλαρυκόν ὀπλον' (Choerob. Ep. Ps. 150.31-2, EM 157.23-4).

54.11 Σάλπις: Perhaps an alternative form for Σάλπη, a city and a lake in Italy (see sch. Lyc. 1128; cf. Lyc. 1129), although a personal name Σάλπις is attested (LGPN IIIA), and there is no evidence that Σάλπις is an alternative form for Σάλπη. Stephanus of Byzantium (631.1) mentions the city name Τράμπη, but there is no evidence that this city name had the alternative form Τράμπις, in which case one could argue that one should invert τράμπις with Σάλπις and consider that πόλις was intended as a gloss for τράμπις.

54.11 πόλις: Since πόλις does not end in -πις, it is certainly not intended to be an example of this accentuation rule. I have put πόλις
in brackets, in order to indicate that this was probably meant to be an explanation for Σάλπις (see also the note above), although Σάλπις is nowhere else attested as a city name. It is also possible that another example was intended at the place where we now read πόλις.

54.12 πόρπις: This paroxytone nominative, which is an alternative for πόρπη, is a hapax. In Hesychius (α 3139) we read πορσίδα, whose nominative would be πορπίς.

54.12–13 δέχεται...13 λεγόμενα: Schmidt (35.22-36.1) thought that there was something wrong with the expression μή πληθυντικῶς λεγόμενα and agreed with Göttling’s correction of μή πληθυντικῶς λεγόμενα to μή ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα. The rule prescribes that the disyllabic words in -τις that have a 'long by position' penultimate are recessive if they begin with a consonant and oxytone if they begin with a vowel. It is often the case in the Epitome that for the sake of brevity certain conditions for a rule are not repeated at the point where exceptions due to these conditions are mentioned. It is therefore possible that the epitomator wrote βαρύνεται δὲ ταῦτα ... δέχεται δὲ ταῦτα without repeating the conditions about the word having to begin with a consonant and a vowel respectively. In the section on the words beginning with a vowel, the phrase μή πληθυντικῶς λεγόμενα is added in order to
distinguish ἐλπίς, ἀσπίς and ἐμπίς from Ἀλπίς which is mostly
used in the plural (see Eust. D. P. 294.8-9, 338.5-7, 340.26-8) and is
therefore recessive despite the fact that it begins with a vowel. If after
ὄξυνεται δὲ ταύτα the condition prescribing a word-initial vowel
was repeated either in the form μὴ ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἀρχόμενα or
ἀπὸ φωνημένος ἀρχόμενα, the omission of this part could be easily
explained because of the homoeoteleuton (ἀρχόμενα ... λεγόμενα).

55.1 Δρυσίς: An alternative form for Δρυσία and Δρυσης, the
city of the Δρύσες that is close to Trachis (St. Byz. δ 137.4-6).

55.1 φύλοπις: I have printed φύλοπις with Schmidt (36.5). The
manuscripts’ mistake φύλωπις must have been easy at a time when
both o and ο were pronounced [o].

55.3 ◐: Lentz’s addition (98.16) seems very plausible. Τευκρίς is not
a diminutive. This suggests that there is a lacuna after ὑποκοριστικά
and that the omitted part was linked to ἐννοιας. One would rather
have ἡ τύπον πατρωνυμικοῦ ὄντα or τύπον πατρωνυμικῶν/οῦ
ἐχοντα, because strictly speaking Τευκρίς does not have the
meaning of a πατρωνυμικόν, but it is formed according to the
pattern of the πατρωνυμικά. It seems, nevertheless, that the phrase ἡ
πατρωνυμικής is as likely as the other suggestions just made, and
that to a certain extent the use of ἐννοια in the text reveals that
Τευκρίς is not really considered to be a πατρωνυμικόν, because if it were the rule could have simply said ἡ πατρωνυμικά. The expression πατρωνυμική ἔννοια is rare. It occurs again in Apollonius Dyscolus (Synt. GG ii.ii. 326.4).

55.6 Μάκρις: A name for Euboea (St. Byz. ε 149.1, 428.20; Hsch. μ 131, EM 389.2). See also the note on Μάκρον (18.14).

55.6 Ακρίς: The name of a city (Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. α α 25, b α 25, c α 36, d α 20, e α 27, Eust. ll. III 398.7). A personal name is also attested (LGPN IIIA, but accented Ακρίς).

55.7 Λοκρίς: An adjective qualifying an implied noun γῆ/χώρα or γυνή (see St. Byz. 684.4-5).

55.9 παλαιστρίς: This feminine form for παλαιστής is a hapax.

55.9 αύληστρίς: A hapax variant form for αύλητρις; cf. αύληστής for αύλητής.

55.11–12 Τὰ ...12 βαρύνεται: Possible examples, especially with the rest of the voiced consonants and the aspirated consonants could have been e.g. τίγρις, ἄφρις, δίφρις, ἵδρις, ἱδρις.

55.14 ὤξυνεται ...κεδρίς: νεβρίς and κεδρίς are genuine exceptions, because although they satisfy the conditions for recessive accentuation, they are exceptionally oxytone.

55.14–15 τὸ ...15 δεδιπλασίασται: ἄγγαφος is a rare word; it occurs
again in the *Etymologicum Symeonis* (I 28.20) and the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (α 31.4), but is accented on the final syllable (ἀγγαίς), while in Zonaras (α 26.16) we read ἀγαίη. In the *Etymologicum Symeonis* and Zonaras the word is explained as ὅδυνη. It seems that both ἀγγαίη and ἀγαίη are corrupt forms of ἀγγαίης. That the word should be written with two γ is made clear through the verb δειπνάσιασται in our Epitome. The variant accent of the word in some sources could be due to scribal error.

55.17 ἑυμαρίς: sch. E. Or. 1370 testifies to the citation of this word in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίδας.

55.21 ἐαρίς: This rare word occurs only in our Epitome and Hesychius (ε 34), where ἐαρίδας is glossed by κανθαρίδας.


55.23–24 τὸ ...24 βαρύνεται: Πάστερις and Κελένδερις seem to be genuine exceptions, because although they fulfil the conditions for the accentuation rule they are not oxytone.

55.23 Πάστερις: The manuscripts’ πάτερις occurs nowhere else, and
is probably a scribal error. I have adopted Meineke’s emendation of
Stephanus’ manuscripts παστερίς to Πάστερις, which is the name of
an Egyptian city (St. Byz. 510.9). It occurs only in our Epitome and
Stephanus of Byzantium.

55.24 Κελένδερις: The manuscripts’ κέλερις occurs nowhere else,
and is probably a scribal error. Κελένδερις is the name of a city in
Cilicia Trachea (Scyl. 102.5, Str. 14.5.3, Hdn. π.μ.λ. GG iii.ii 925.7; cf.

55.27 τὸ ...προπαρφυτεῖαι: Θάμνως is a genuine exception,
because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule it is not oxytone.

55.27–28 τὸ ... ἐγένετο: The following grammatical and
lexicographical sources consider that ἄγνωσ is formed from
ἀγνωσ with a change of o to u: sch. Hom. Il. 9.647, Orion α 27.4-7,
Eust. Od. I 77.19-22, Et. Gen. α 44, α 1327.12, Et. Gud. α 221.15, EM
14.28-30, Zonar. α 315.20-1, π 1507.16-7.

56.2 Βούσιρις: The name of an Egyptian king and the city named

56.2 Ψένυρις: The name of an Egyptian village (St. Byz. 374.17,
701.9).

56.3–6 Τὰ ... κρίσεις: Cf. also the rule cited earlier in 49.9–50.4.
56.8-9 οὐσιαίωται... γεγονός: ἀσις is an exception because although it is derivative of ἀσιά, it is not oxynote.

56.8 ἀπό...ἀσια: The meaning here ought to be ‘that derives from (the noun) ἀσια’. This can be either expressed by ἀπό τοῦ ἀσια or ἀπό τῆς ἀσις (usually when the phrase ‘ἀπό τοῦ’ is followed by a feminine noun, the noun is in the nominative, otherwise we get ἀπό τῆς and the feminine noun is in the genitive). In having to decide between either changing ἀσις into ἀσια or τοῦ into τῆς I have chosen the first, with Schmidt (37.12), thinking that ἀσια was more prone to be written in the genitive (ἀσιας) in the manuscripts both under the influence of ἀπό and of the final sigma of ἀσις, whereas it would have been more difficult for τῆς to have been mistakenly written as τοῦ in front of a feminine noun.

56.10 ὧ: Among the examples cited we find οὐτίς. As the rule stands it does not include the case of οὐ- in the penultimate syllable. We therefore assume either that there is a lacuna after Ο μικρόν that could be filled with a phrase like ἦτοι μόνον ἢ σὺν ἐνέργεια φανέρεται or that οὐτίς is wrongly cited at that point (see the note on οὐτίς, where the possibility that the right reading is ὦτίς is taken into consideration). The assumption that there is a lacuna is reinforced by sch. Hom. II. 17.40b (see the apparatus of parallel passages), which
has the phrase παραληγόμενα δὲ τῷ ο ἦτοι μόνῳ ἢ σὺν ἐτέρω φωνήντες and includes οὔτις among the examples.

56.11 <μὴ ὄντα> The examples provided in this rule are all common nouns and proper names. No adjectives are cited. This makes one think that before ἐπιθετικά we are missing the words μὴ ὄντα (cf. Schmidt 37.14 app. crit.). A passage from the Iliad scholia (17.40b) deriving from Herodian, is a witness to the citation of μὴ ὄντα before ἐπιθετικά (see the apparatus of parallel passages).

56.11–12 εἰ…12 ΘΣ: Sch. Hom. ll. 17.40b exemplifies this condition with the case of πότις derived from πότης (see the apparatus of parallel passages).

56.13 οὔτις: In order for οὔτις to be able to serve as an example of this rule, we should assume that the rule as we have it is missing the phrase ἦτοι μόνον ἢ σὺν ἐτέρω φωνήντες after ὁ μικρόν (see also the critical apparatus and note on 56.10 <...>). It is also possible that the word here should have been ὁτίς, which means the same as οὔτις. If this is the case, then there is no need to assume that there is a lacuna after ὁ μικρόν. οὔτις as well as ὁτίς are rare words. The citation of οὔτις in sch. Hom. ll. 17.40b supports the assumption of οὔτις here, and the concomitant assumption of a lacuna after ὁ μικρόν (see also note on 56.10).
56.13 Δωτίς: The manuscripts’ δοτίς is a scribal error due to the loss of vowel quantity distinction. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation Δωτίς (37.16), a personal name (LGPN II).

56.14 τὸ ...πόρις: πόρις is not an exception because it derives from πόρις and therefore does not fully fall into the group of words ending in -τις. This suggests that rules apply to forms before the operation of πάθη.

56.14 <> One may assume, both on the basis of the condition εἰ μή παράκειται ἀρσενικῶ τῷ εἰς -της and of sch. Hom. Il. 17.40b (see the apparatus of parallel passages), that something was mentioned here about πότις, derived from πότης. It is possible that the example of πότις was mentioned in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας, but that the epitomator left it out for brevity’s sake. That we should not expect an extensive treatment of the exceptions in the Epitome is suggested in the epitomator’s prologue (see the discussion of 1.21–2.1 συντομίας ... κρατυνομένων).

57.1 κλέπτις: This is the feminine form of κλέπτης. It occurs again in Alciphron 2.19.2.7, Nicephorus Patriarcha (Lib. Onir. III κ 60), and in the scholia in Basilicorum libros (60.12.61.4).

57.1–2 λάκτις ...2 τορύνη: The manuscripts’ τορυγών as a gloss for λάκτις is inappropriate, and is clearly a mistake. I have adopted

57.2 νυκτίς: M’s νυκτίς is a *vox nihil*. O’s νυκτίς occurs once in Michael Psellus *Poem.* 9.1269-70 Ἡ νυκτίς ἐλκος νυκτός ἀλγύνον πλέον, φλυκταίνοιηδές, ύπερυθρον τὴν χρόαν. The definitions of ἐπινυκτίς (‘pustule which is most painful by night’) in ancient sources suggest that νυκτίς is a synonym for ἐπινυκτίς: Poll. 4.197.2-3 ἐπινυκτίς φλύκταινα ὑποπέλιδνος ύφυγρος ἐναίμος, περὶ κνήμας καὶ πόδας ἐν νυκτὶ γινομένη; Orib. *Coll. Med.* 44.17.1-3 Αἱ δ’ ἐπινυκτίδες ἐλκύδρια εἰσὶν ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου ἐξανθοῦντα, φλυκταίνοιηδῆ, ύπερυθραα ἀν ἐκρηγνυμένων ἰχώρ ὕφαιμος ἀπορρέι. ταῦτα μὲν ἡμέρας οὐ πάνυ ἐνοχλεί, νυκτὸς δ’ ἐπώδυνά ἐστιν διόπερ καὶ οὕτως ἀνομάσθη καὶ ὃδυναι μείζος ἢ κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ἐλκου; *Syn.* 7.37.1-3, cf. Paul. *Med.* *Epit. medic. lib. sept.* 4.9.1.1-4; Paul. *Nic. Lib. medic.* 119.1-5. Thus, O’s νυκτίς is sufficient here and there is no need to print ἐπινυκτίς. It should be observed in any case that all the examples cited in this accentuation rule are disyllabic, and this reinforces the point that νυκτίς is preferable to ἐπινυκτίς.

57.7 παιτέττις: This is nowhere else attested.
57.7 τοιοτίς: This rare word occurs again in sch. Hom. II. 14.183c.3, Eust. II. III 610.9.

57.8 νεοτίς: Either a diminutive of νεοσσός or the title of a fragmentary comedy by Anaxilas or Antiphanes or Eubulus.

57.10 ύποκοριστικώτερα: ‘more or less diminutive, rather diminutive’. See also note on 14.13 τοπικώτερα.

57.13 βούβωστις: MO’s βούβωστοις is a scribal error. The rule is about words ending in -στις. I have printed C’s βούβωστις.

57.14 Κεφαστίς: An adjective used of Io (A. Pr. 674, sch. A. Pr. 669a.7), or an adjective for Cyprus (Nonn. D. 5.614, 13.441, 29.372) because it has many extremities (sch. Lyc. 447.52), which ended up being employed as another name for Cyprus (St. Byz. 396.3-4, 595.8, Joh. Laur. Lyd. De magistr. pop. Rom. 126.16-8).

57.14 Διγυστίς: I have adopted L. Dindorf’s emendation (TGL V 357D (s. v. λογιστίς)) of the manuscripts’ λογιστίς. Though this is usually an alternative name for the Στοιχάδες, the three islands that are now called les Îles d’Hyères (A. R. 4.553-4, sch. A. R. 288.20-2, St. Byz. 585.19-20), it can be used as an adjective, more specifically as an ethnic designation (E. Tr. 437, cf. sch. E. Tr. 437).

57.15 Διβυστίς: MO’s λυβιστίς is a scribal error. BC preserve the
good reading Λιβυντίς, the feminine ethnic designation indicating origin from Libya (St. Byz. 415.12-9).

57.18 αὐθεντίς: The feminine form of αὐθέντης. It occurs only in our Epitome and in Photius (α 3161.3). I agree with Schmidt (38.14 app. crit.) that there must be a lacuna in this section. More specifically, I think that there is something missing before αὐθεντίς, because αὐθεντίς, derived from αὐθέντης, was probably meant to be cited as an exception to the condition ἐν παρακείμενα τοῖς εἰς ΤΗΣ.

57.19–58.1 Τὰ...58.1 τόνον: The phrasing of this rule would have been more complete if ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς (or ὑπερδισύλλαβα) was mentioned in this sentence. This is suggested by the mention of Σκυθίς and Πεσις that are disyllabic and oxytone, contrary to the examples κυνηγετίς, ἀσπότις and πολίτις that have more than two syllables and have the accent on the penultimate syllable. The mention of ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς by Choeroboscus (in Theod. 329.34-330.3; see the apparatus of parallel passages) could suggest that a phrase indicating the number of syllables was present in the Πεσι καθολικῆς προσφθίας. The epitomator, nevertheless, may well have left it out as a result of one of his general principles in
excerpting Herodian. See the discussion of the relevant section in the epitomator’s prologue (1.17–21 δε ... υπάρχη).

58.9 βαφύνεται: M’s παροξύνεται corresponds only to Μέμφις, while O’s προσπαροξύνεται cannot refer to either of the examples Ἰφις and Μέμφις. I print βαφύνεται, which is more economical than Lentz’ παροξύνεται ἡ προσπερισπάται, which is equally reasonable, and could perhaps explain O’s προσπαροξύνεται as a conflation of προ- (περισπάται) and παροξύνεται.

58.9 Ἰφις: I print the name with a circumflex as well as Schmidt (38.24), because the penultimate is long by nature and the ultimate short. Ἰφις is either a personal name (LGPN I, II, VA) or an adjective meaning ταχύς (see the Su. i 774, Zonar. i 1133.7).

58.10 Κηφίς: This ethnic designation is nowhere else attested.

59.1 κροταφίς: This rare word occurs again in Poll. 7.106.6, 10.183.3-4, 10.147.3, Hsch. κ 4206, Theognost. Can. II 21.5-6 (= 119.2-3), and Hippiatr. Cant. 93.24.3.

59.1 ἐλαφίς: This bird name occurs only in our Epitome and Dionysius Periegeta (Ixeut. s. De auc. 2.12.1-2).

59.2 Τερόοφις: This name occurs nowhere else.

59.5 Ατάρβηχις: The name of a city in the island of Prosopitis (Hdt. 2.41, St. Byz. α 513).
59.6 Υδελχις: This proper name is nowhere else attested.

60.4 Βενδις: For information on this goddess see RE 3.269-71, DNP 2.558-9, BNP 2.593-4.

60.4 Μολις: The name of a deity, which Choeroboscus and the *Epimerismi Homerici* report as Thracian (Choerob. *in Theod.* 129.39-130.3, 328.10-4, *Ep. Hom.* 1,a1.41-3), but which Nicolaus Damascenus (*FGHist* 90 (10-1) = Constantinus Porphyrogenitus *De virt. et vit.* I 331.31-332.1) mentions as the Babylonian name for Aphrodite, which is to be identified with Μύλιτα Οὐρανία in Herodotus (1.131). For more information and discussion see Tomaschek ((1980), II.1 48) and *RE* 16.7. See also the note on Τοτις below.

60.4 Τοτις: This name occurs nowhere else. Choeroboscus (*in Theod.* 328.12-3) and the *Epimerismi Homerici* (1, a1.41-3) cite Τοτις close to Βενδις, Αταργατις and Μολις, and provide us with the information that all these are names of gods worshipped by the Thracians. Tomaschek ((1980), II.1 48) points out that the designation ὀνόματα δαιμόνων τιμωμένων παρὰ Θραξίων with regard to Μολις, Τοτις, and Αταργατις is the result of scribal error. Pohlenz (1916), 584 considers Τοτις in our Epitome wrong, while he accepts Ττις. Pohlenz takes for granted that we are dealing with a Thracian god
name here, and since he would have expected the root *tit-* for Thracian god names, he takes the view that one should expect Τιτίς in Herodian. Tomaszek ((1980), II.1 48), however, on the basis of a fragment from Nicolaus Damascenus (*FGrHist* 52 (54) = Constantinus Porphyrogenitus *De insid.* 18.23) brings as a parallel for Τοτίς, the Phrygian proper name Τότης, and indicates that Τοτίς was a goddess that entered Phrygia from the Semitic east. In my view the Epitome can be taken as evidence that the right form of the word is Τοτίς.

60.5 Ἀτάργατις: The name of a Syrian goddess (see *BNP* 2.219-20, *DNP* 11.1167-8 (s. v. Syria Dea), *RE* 2.1896, but for the form Ἀταργάτις see Lightfoot (2003), 37.

60.8 μακρῷ: I have printed A’s correction of μακρόν to μακρῶ. The correction in A is easy both because of τῶ, and the frequency of παραλήγω followed by a dative in the Epitome.

60.9–10 ὅσα…10 ἐπιθετικά: It is interesting to observe the use of the two types of negation οὐ and μή in the same phrase. In postclassical Greek it is often observed that μή replaces οὐ. The fact that here we have οὐ and μή in the same phrase reveals that οὐ and μή were used in free variation.

60.11 Δᾶος: Δᾶος scans long in poetry (e.g. Men. *Pk.* 542) and
therefore the word is properispomenon, not paroxytone. I have thus printed Δάος with Schmidt.

60.12–13 τὸ²...13 ταῶς: We have no earlier sources than Herodian that testify to the use of ταῶς by the Alexandrians. Two passages, Choeroboscus’ in Theod. 284.13-22, and the Etymologicum Magnum 749.7-11, which explicitly mention that they derive their material from Herodian (Choeroboscus mentions specifically the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας, while the Etymologicum Magnum tells us that the source is Herodian) are witnesses to Herodian’s view that ταῶς was not derived from ταῶς with an Attic lengthening of ο into ω, because Herodian said in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας that the word ταῶς with the -ος was not in use in the koiné. The two above-mentioned sources do not mention that the form ταῶς was used by the Alexandrians, but they show as well as the passage from our Epitome the juxtaposition and contrast between ταῶς and ταῶς in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφοδίας. It should be noted, nevertheless, that while the two passages mentioned above indicate that the α is short in ταῶς, the accentuation rule in our Epitome presents long α as a condition for the rule.

60.13 ταῶς: This is a borrowed word (see Schwzyzer Gr. Gr. 1. 219). DELG, says that the animal came to Greece from India via Persia, and
the word is certainly a borrowing. It is not usual for Greek words to
have aspiration in the middle, but borrowed words sometimes retain
features of the source language even though they are not usual in the
borrowing language. Some grammarians and lexica seem to have
said ταῦτα had a rough breathing, at least in Attic (A. D. Synt. 2.
459.1; Trypho Fr. 5 (preserved by Ath. IX 397e); the Suda τ 98;
Seleucus, cited later in the same passage of Athenaeus; Eustathius II.
II 27.8 citing Athenaeus; Eustathius II. IV 621.4, citing both
Athenaeus and Seleucus).

60.14–15 τό…15 μετεποίηθη: A genitive λάου is attested at Oedipus
Coloneus 196.

61.2 Σκαίος: The name of many mythological heroes: see RE II, IIIA,
424-5.

61.2 Βαιός: The manuscripts’ μαῖος has been taken by the TGL V 509
B to be the month name May. In some editions of astrological texts
we find Μαῖος for Μάιος (Σφεδρακόν (e cod. Mus. Hist. Mosq. 186,
fol. 159) 12.196.24, Paraphr. carm. de terr. mot. (e cod. Vat. gr. 1753, fol.
18v) V 161.6, 161.9). This could suggest that Μαῖος was an
alternative form for the month Μάιος. But this name is usually
trisyllabic and is accented Μάιος. I have adopted Schmidt’s
emendation Βαιός, which is a personal name (LGPN IV).
61.2–3 Γραίός...3 Παίος: Personal names (LGPN IIIA and VA respectively). Γραίος is also an ethnic designation for a citizen of Γραια, a city in Eretria (St. Byz. γ 106).

61.4 ἈΥΩΣ: I have printed ἈΥΩΣ with Schmidt, since this is clearly the termination dealt with here.

61.4–5 βαρύνται...5 αὐς: The manuscripts transmit ὅξυνται, but the reading ought to be βαρύνται. This is suggested both by the fact that the examples ναῦς and αὐς are contrasted to the oxytone ἀγαυός and because the Herodianic scholion sch. Hom. ll. 12.137b says ναῦς is recessive.

61.4–5 ναῦς...5 αὐς: These words are clearly properispomena. I have thus followed Schmidt in emending the manuscripts’ ναῦς: αὐς by printing a circumflex.

61.7–8 καὶ...8 ἀρχή: An example of this could be οἰς, considered to be a variant form of ἵς ‘one’); cf. A. D. Pron. 56.4-6, Orion o 124.4-6, Et. Gud. ι 280.17-8, o 424.10-2, EM 618.44-5, Eust. II. II 392.17-8, Zonar. o 1431.5-6. See also below on 61.9–11 τὸ ... πνευματικά.

61.8 σμοιός ἐπιθέτων: The adjective σμοιός occurs only in our Epitome, in Hesychius (ο 1269), where the synonyms χαλεπός, φοβερός, στυγνός are given, and in Theognostus (Can. II 49.24 (=
268.4)), where it is accented σμοίος. A proper name Σμοίος is also attested (sch. Ar. Ec. 846 (but Σμοίος in Ar. Ec. 846), Su. σ 748), but the rule here clearly refers to the adjective.

61.8 σκλοίος...σκολιός: The variant form for σκολιός, σκλοίος, is a hapax. Lobeck (PGSE¹ 502) considers σκλοίος as a variant form of σκελλός (‘crook-legged’) on the basis of the analogy of φελλός being an alternative form for φλοιός (the analogy of φελλός with φλοιός that Lobeck discusses is at Paus. 8.12.1.7-9).

61.9 Βοιός: Probably an ethnic designation (see App. Gall. 1.3.1, St. Byz. β 115), but if so it is noteworthy that it is not considered to be a proper name. That ethnic designations are thought to be adjectives is also suggested by the following passages: τοιγενῆ μή ἔθνικά 81.10, ἐπιθετικὰ ὄντα, οὐκ ἔθνικα 82.15. See also the discussion of this issue in the Introduction, pp. 127-30. In Philoponus’ περὶ διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. recensio e β 5, βοιός is contrasted with the proper name Βοῖος (Βοῖος is also cited in our Epitome, a few lines below), but the gloss which accompanied it does not survive.

61.9–11 τὸ...11 πυσματικά: It is noteworthy that τοῖος and οἶος are called πυσματικά together with ποίος. This occurs nowhere else, and one may think that it is due here to careless abbreviation on the part of the epitomator. Alternatively, one could assume that there is
a lacuna. τοίος would normally be called ἀνταποδοτικόν (cf. A. D. Adv. 183.8; sch. D. T. Vat. 239.31-2, Marc. 394.1-2; Et. Gud. τ 531.55-6; EM 762.42-3), and οἶος is an ordinary adjective, which, in fact, is an exception because it has the o redundant at the beginning (on οἶος see also the note 61.7–8 καὶ ... ἀφχή). In my view, in this context we should expect οἶος rather than οἶος. It is true that the gloss ὁ μόνος suggests that οἶος is really meant here, but I suspect that οἶος and οἶος were both originally mentioned but have been conflated. It is possible that οἶος was cited after the recessive words τοίος and τοίος, in order to exemplify the point about words beginning with a pleonastic o-, but that at some point was transposed (with its gloss) to the place where we find it, and οἶος was omitted.

61.11 Σμοίος: The manuscripts’ μοίος occurs nowhere else. I print Σμοίος, which occurs in Aristophanes (Ec. 846; cf. also LGPN II).

62.1 Βοίος: This is mentioned as an ethnic designation in Theognostus (Can. II 49.25 (= 268.5), but otherwise as a proper name (Philoponus περὶ διάφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. recensio e β 5). The fact that Βοίος is said to be an ethnic designation in Theognostus suggests that Βοίος was confused with Βοιός, which is reported as an ethnic designation by Stephanus of Byzantium (β 115). See also the note on
61.9 Βοϊός above. It follows from the accentuation rule that Βοϊός is a proper name rather than an ethnic designation.

62.1 Κοίος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

62.4 μείος: An alternative form for μείων (see also Ps.-Arcad. 188.3 (Schmidt), Orion χ 166.8, Ep. Hom. 5.c.10, Et. Gud. τ 525.9-10, Et. Gud. (addit.) α 190.22, EM 583.13).

62.4 πλείος: The epic form for πλέως.

62.4–5 τό...5 ἀρσενικόν: The noun νειός is feminine and therefore ἀρσενικόν cannot refer to it. This points to a lacuna before ἀρσενικόν, which could possibly be filled with οὐκ. A passage from Theognostus (Can. II 48.15-20 (= 263)), which is parallel to our rule on the accentuation of disyllabic words in -ειος, confirms the assumption that the negation is required in front of ἀρσενικόν. The orthographical rule in Theognostus distinguishes the oxytone νειός from the recessive words μείος, θείος, Κείος, λείος and πλείος both because of its feminine gender and because it does not have οὐδετέρου παρασχηματισμόν (‘change of form for the neuter’). Given that the passage from Theognostus is parallel to our passage, it is possible that the information about οὐδετέρου παρασχηματισμόν was included in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας. It should be noted that the single indication of μονογενές would have exempted νειός
from the recessive accentuation, since the rule refers to adjectives, while μονογενές claims for νειός the status of a noun. Thus, as the text stands in the Epitome, it is not clear why Herodian should have indicated the word’s gender, and why he should have done it in the negative form ‘not masculine’. A parallel passage from Choeroboscus’ De Orthographia 271.1-7 elucidates the two points above (see the apparatus of parallel passages). Choeroboscus’ rule is an orthographical one but could be a transformation of a Herodianic accentuation rule. Choeroboscus’ passage suggests that in the Περί καθολικής προσωφίας νειός might have appeared in a context where a contrast was made between disyllabic words written with -ιος and -ειος, and a comment was made that the masculines are usually written with -ιος. This is, of course, primarily a matter of orthography, but orthographical issues are important and generally mentioned in connection with accentuation in the Περί καθολικής προσωφίας. The phrasing here might look a bit awkward, since νειός is removed from its wider content, but this is often the result of the act of epitomising. Choeroboscus’ passage shows that the fact that νειός is not masculine was not originally redundant.

63.1 μακρό: I have followed Schmidt (40.16) in emending μακρόν to μακρό. Cf. note on 60.8 μακρό.
63.2 πίος: Both an adjective and a personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IV, VA).

63.2–3 Φθιός…3 σεσημείωσαι: κριός is a genuine exception, because although it satisfies all the conditions for recessive accentuation, it is nevertheless oxytone.

63.4 ΟΣ: Not all the examples in this list end in -ιος. Thus, I have printed OΣ with Schmidt (40.19).

63.5 σάος: Both an adjective and a personal name (LGPN IIIA, IV).

63.5 ιος…μόνος: The manuscripts’ ιος does not mean μόνος, but ιός does (see LSJ, DELG), and in this text as well as in other sources ιός is thought to be a variant of οιός (see also above on 61.7–8 και … ἀφιή). It is possible that because of the thought that οιός was equal to ιός, Herodian thought that the accent of ιός was also ιός, thus οιός would literally equal ιός, only having the redundant ο at the beginning. The recessive accentuation of IOΣ is supported by other sources: A. D. Pron. 56.4-6, Et. Gud. 1 280.17-8, o 424.10-2, EM 618.44-5, Eust. II. II 392.17-8, Zonar. o 1431.5-6. The fact that the feminine form ἓα was recessive and much more frequent (see DELG s. v. ιός (1)) could suggest that a grammarian might have thought that the masculine was also recessive (cf. Trypho Fr. 6.9.3-4 (= A. D. Pron. GG ii.i. 56.4-6)).
63.6–7 τὸ²...7 ὀξύνεται: νῦς is oxytone even though it has short υ, and is thus a genuine exception.

64.3 ἐός: See LSJ s. v. ἐῦς.

64.5 ὍΣ: MO’s ϕός has a redundant iota subscript. The iota adscript is indicated with the phrase μετὰ προσγεγραμμένου ἰ.

64.7 Ἀφός: An inhabitant of the island Ἀφς (St. Byz. 424.3-4) or a Macedonian month name, equivalent to August (Su. λ 730).

64.12 κατὰ διάστασιν: ‘in separate syllables’. See the discussion of this term in the Introduction, pp. 119-21.

65.1 τὸνό: The manuscripts’ τὸνον is probably due to assimilation with διάφορον. The meaning ought to be ‘indicating something different with regard to their accent’, not ‘indicating a different accent’. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation τὸνό (41.17).

65.2 ἰλεός: Usually written εἰλεός in ancient sources.

65.3 μαλέός: This word occurs again in Theognostus (Can. II 50.4 (= 270.4)) right after κολέός and before Ἐλεός (with the intervention of πελεός). The Suda mentions in two passages (μ 101, φ 182) a mythological person called Μάλεος. Perhaps Herodian had the view that this name was oxytone. If μαλέός ought to be considered a scribal error one could emend to γαλέός occurring in the Περι μονήρων λέξεως (GG iii.ii 909.12).
65.3–4 Ἐλεός...4 προσηγορικόν: The proper name Ἐλεός meant here is probably the name of a river in Elis (Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. recensio a ε 13, recensio c ε 19, recensio d ε 11, recensio e ε 5). I have printed Göttling’s correction of the manuscripts’ ἔλεος to ἔλεος ('pity, mercy, compassion'). The contrast between the proper name Ἐλεός and ἔλεος in the passages from Philoponus cited above, which probably go back to a Herodianic source, increase the likelihood that the words meant to be contrasted here are the river name Ἐλεός and ἔλεος. Alternatively, one may think of the possibility that the words contrasted here are the personal name Ἐλεος (LGPN IIIB) and the common noun ἔλεος ('kitchen table') or ἔλεος ('a kind of owl'), but this possibility is less likely for three reasons: (i) since this accentuation rule is about oxytone words, one expects to get the oxytone word first and then a word of the same shape, but with a different accent, (ii) the parallel passages from Philoponus support the contrast between Ἐλεός and ἔλεος, and (iii) it is more economical to change the manuscripts’ ἔλεος to ἔλεος and keep ἔλεος at the beginning, rather than to change ἔλεος to the personal name Ἐλεος and turn ἔλεος into ἔλεως.

65.4–5 τὸ...5 κτητικά: For the concept of τέλεος/τέλειος as

65.6 <μή>: I have adopted Schmidt’s addition of μή. Although the termination -εος is reported in ancient sources as characteristic of κτητικά (despite the fact that certain words do not have an obvious meaning of possession; see note on 65.4–5 τὸ ... κτητικά), the examples ὑπετέος, πρακτέος, ἄθρωστέος are deverbal adjectives and deverbal adjectives are never referred to as κτητικά.

65.7–8 τὸ...8 ὅξυνεται: ἐτεός is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule it is not paraoxystic.

66.1–4 παροξύνεται…4 θαρσαλέος: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendations of the manuscripts’ προπαροξύνεται, νηφάλεος, αὐλεός to παροξύνεται, νηφαλέος, αὐαλέος. Despite the fact that the manuscripts (with the exception of θ which has σμερδαλέος) have the accent on the antepenultimate (a mistake that must have happened after παροξύνεται was altered to προπαροξύνεται), the words are clearly paraoxystic (νηφαλέος is sometimes accented νηφάλεος in the editions of ancient texts e.g. Zonar. ν 1398.7, 9, but the mistake might have originally occurred under the influence of νηφάλιος), and need to be considered as such in order for the rest of
the rule to make sense (the rest of the words in the rule with which
this list is contrasted are proparoxytone).

66.2 τοῦ I: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’
nonsensical ἄ τοῦ.

66.6 δαιδάλεος...κονισάλεος: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendations of the manuscripts’ δαιδαλέος and κονισαλέος to
dαιδάλεος and κονισάλεος. These words do not follow paroxytone accentuation prescribed for words in -αλεος, because their base form is in -αλεως; their form in -αλεος is thought to occur due to defectiveness of i.

66.6–9 ὅσα...9 χρύσεος: This section seems to have been transposed to here from another part of the Epitome on the κτητικά. The fact that this section does not really belong here is suggested by the following two things: (i) the words cited as examples do not end in -αλεως as the rule prescribes, and (ii) the repetition of ὅσα δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κτητικῶν ἐγένετο κατ’ ἐνδειαν τοῦ I καὶ προσαροζύνονται after the phrase εἰ μὴ ἔχῃ ἐνδειαν τοῦ I ἀπὸ κτητικοῦ ἄνόματος seems suspicious. There is no need for this phrase here; the examples Αγαμεμνόνεος ... χρύσεος could have followed κονισάλεος. The epitomator or scribe who transposed this section here created a link between the two lists of examples of κτητικά ending in -εος.
66.7 καὶ: This seems redundant.

67.1 -: Schmidt 42.15 (app. crit.) thought that there was a lacuna at this point in the text and suggested that it should be filled by the addition of καθαρὰ ἀπλὰ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον. Schmidt’s suggestion is supported by four parallel passages: Theognost. Can. II 51.15-21 (= 275), Et. Gen. α 185.11-7, EM 32.3-11 and the Et. Sym. I 133.9-134.7 (see the full citations in the apparatus of parallel passages). Schmidt’s suggestion is reasonable and possible, but in my view it probably corresponds more to the text in the original Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας. It can be argued that the similarities in wording and the use of common examples in the aforementioned four parallel passages, which are known to have derived material from Herodian, strongly suggests that these sources go back to a Herodianic source, perhaps more specifically the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας. In my view, the epitomator probably left this information out following one of his general principles in excerpting Herodian (see the relevant discussion in the epitomator’s introduction 1.17–21 δεὶ ... ὑπάρχη). It is possible that the epitomator left out, for example, the word ἀπλὰ at the beginning of the rule, considering that readers would infer ἀπλὰ as a condition for the rule when they would read the examples of the exceptions that are
compound words. For this reason I have not adopted the addition in the text, but I have signalled a lacuna in the text as a way of indicating that a section of text from the Περί καθολικής προσωπικής has probably been left out.

67.2 <>...ὦξυνόμενον: The phrase τὸ...ὦξυνόμενον is not smoothly linked with Τὰ εἰς ΩΣ...παραληγόμενα. The four passages cited in the above note (Theognost. Can. II 51.15-21 (= 275), Et. Gen. α 185 11-7, EM 32.3-11, Et. Sym. I 133.9-134.7; see the full citations in the apparatus of parallel passages) support the view that there is a lacuna at this point. I have put a dot after the lacuna sign to show that the section τὸ αἰζής ἐστίν ὦξυνόμενον does not belong with Τὰ εἰς ΩΣ...Ἡ παραληγόμενα. Three parallel passages (Theognost. II 51.8-14 (= 275.1-7), Et. Gen. α 185.11-7, EM 32.3-11; see the full citations in the apparatus of parallel passages) suggest that something similar to ὡκ ἐστιν εὐρεῖν might have originally followed παραληγόμενα.

67.3 παληώς: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ πάλης to παληώς, the Boeotian form for παλαιώς.

67.3 ἀρχηώς: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (42.17) of the manuscripts’ ἀρχης to ἀρχηώς, the Boeotian form for ἀρχαιώς.

68.1 καὶ προσαραφάνεται: παληώς and ἀρχηώς are not
proparoxytone. Thus, I have deleted καὶ προσπαροξύνεται with Schmidt. καὶ προσπαροξύνεται is probably a later addition by a scribe under the influence of καὶ ... προσπαροξύνεται which follows. Schmidt suggested in his apparatus to emend καὶ προσπαροξύνεται to προσερισπάται καὶ ὀξύνεται but there would be no correspondence between the examples and the verbs describing their accent.

68.2–3 ὀφηος...3 EI: πι corrects M's (and also O's) ὀφηος. ὀφηος is the Laconian form for ὀφειος (cf. Theognost. II 51.20 (= 275.6), Et. Gen. α 185.15, EM 32.9; see the full citations in the apparatus of parallel passages). I have thus adopted Schmidt's emendation of MO's α1 to ει. α1 might be due to α1 διφθόγγον (67.3–68.1) earlier in the same rule.

68.2 καὶ...προσπαροξύνεται: καὶ αὐτὸ creates the impression that together with ὀφηος at least another proparoxytone word must have been mentioned. Schmidt (42.18-9 (app. crit.)) would have liked to have ὀφηος καὶ Λύκης προσπαροξύνεται. The occurrence of Λύκης next to ὀφηος and in the vicinity of παλής and ἄρχης and of Ἐχένης and πολύνης is reinforced by three parallel passages (Theognost. II 51.15-21 (= 275.1-7), Et. Gen. α 185.11-7, EM 32.3-11; see the full citations in the apparatus of parallel passages).
68.3 Ἐχένης: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ ἐχήνης. Ἐχένης is the name of a hero occurring in Homer (Od. 7.155, 11.342; cf. sch. Hom. Il. 14.499a, Od. 7.155; Eust. Od. I 271.9, I 423.2).

68.7–8 παροξύνονται…8 Σχεδίος: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendations of the manuscripts’ προσπαροξύνονται, ῥόδιος, and σχέδιος to παροξύνονται, Ρόδιος, and Σχεδίος respectively. The fact that this section within the phrasing of the rule is about the paroxytone proper names and not about the proparoxytone adjectives (something which is not clarified through the ambiguity πρὸς διαστολὴν κυρίων καὶ ἐπιθέτων) is shown by the fact that the examples do not come after Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΔΙΟΣ προσπαροξύνονται … εὐφθέωσι, but after εὐφθέωσι up to κυρίων καὶ ἐπιθέτων a new section begins, and at its beginning a verb appears to indicate the accent of the section. Furthermore, this section of the rule is followed by τὰ δὲ προσπαροξύτονα ταύτα, which suggests that the section of the rule immediately preceding τὰ δὲ προσπαροξύτονα ταύτα does not consist of proparoxytone words. The personal names Ρόδιος (the LGPN I, II, III, IV, VA have Ρόδιος) and Σχεδίος are paroxytone, as contrasted with the adjectives Ρόδιος and σχέδιος.
68.10 μαψίδιος: MO’s μεμψίδιος is nowhere else attested and is probably a vox nihili. I have printed Dindorf’s emendation μαψίδιος.

69.1–2 σεσημείωται...2 ὁξινόμαινον: The accentuation of ἔρωδιός falls under another rule regarding words for irrational animals that have more than three syllables and end in -ιος (74.3–5). Theognostus (Can. II 54.27-30 (= 297.8-11)) provides us with a justification for the accentuation of ἔρωδιός.

69.1 ἔρωδιός: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation ἔρωδιός of MO’s unattested εὔωδιός. ἔρωδιός is supported by three passages: (i) in the Περί μονήρους λέξεως (GG iii 924.5-14) ἔρωδιός appears in the vicinity of Ἀχέδιος and Ποδίος, (ii) in Theognostus (Can. II 54.20-30 (= 297.1-11)) ἔρωδιός appears in the vicinity of μαψίδιος and νυμψίδιος, (iii) in the Etymologicum Magnum (380.35-40) ἔρωδιός appears in the vicinity of παυρίδιος and μαψίδιος.

69.10 μούνιος: An epic form of μονιός.

70.1–7 Ὁσα...7 ἀντίκειται: The accentuation of the words that are derived with the suffix -ιος from words ending in ξ is treated separately from that of -ιος words derived from base forms ending in ο in the parchment codex P. ANT. 2.67, differently from our Epitome. This makes one wonder whether derivatives of words ending in ξ and ο were treated together or separately in the Περί καθολικῆς
προσωδίας, given that our epitomator mentions in his introduction that he had divided larger rules into smaller ones. It seems that our epitomator made an exception in this case and did not divide the two groups of endings. A justification for the lack of separate treatment of the terminations ξ and ϑ in our Epitome could be that ξ and ϑ are not the terminations of the words that are really in question, but those of the base words from which the words in question are derived. It is less likely that our epitomator amalgamated originally separate treatments of the two groups of words.

As regards the treatment of the derivatives of the words ending in -ξ in the parchment, it should be noted that the phrasing of the condition ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς ξ ληγόντων εἰς κ does not take into consideration Φυγίος and Φλογίος. The fact that our Epitome does not have εἰς κ suggests either that this is a careless addition by the author of the parchment codex or a scribe, or that something is missing here (e.g. εἰς κ ἡ γ).

70.2–4 εἰ...4 Φλογίος: The personal names Φυγίος (the LGPN IIIA has Φυγίος) and Φλογίος (Nonn. D. 26.45, 28.261, 34.226, 39.322) are paroxytone, as contrasted with the adjectives Φυγιός and Φλόγιος.

70.3 τρισυλλάβοις...τριβράχεσιν: Although in two parallel
passages (*Comp. Cath. Herod.* (P. ANT. 2.67, 5.28-35), Choerob. *Ep. Ps.* 6.2-6) we read ἐν τρισυλλάβοις τριβφάχεσιν, I do not find any fault with keeping the conjunction καὶ between the two words here.

70.3 ἐν: I have deleted ἐν considering it a later addition and redundant for the text.

70.3 τριβφάχεσιν: I have accented the word on the antepenultimate with Lentz.

70.6–7 τὸ...7 ἀντίκειται: The parchment fragment *P. ANT* 2.67 (5.34-5) provides us with a justification for the accentuation of Ἴλυς, by saying that Ἴλυς does not derive from Ἴλυς.

70.10 τὸ...δεῦνεται: MO's χλυς is a *vex nihil*. I have adopted Göttling's emendation ((1835), 173) Ἴλυς. The ligature λλ could have been misread as χλ before or after the omission of the word's first letter. With τὸ δὲ Ἴλυς δεῦνεται one should understand 'but Ἴλυς is oxytone (although it is an ἔθνικον)'.

71.3 ὑθμιος: This uncommon variant form for ὑθμικός occurs only in our Epitome, in the *Epimerismi Homerici* α 278.62), and in the Περί ποσότητος (Cramer AO II 287.22).

71.3–4 Φυγίος...4 παροξύνεται: Φυγίος is paroxytone because it is a proper name and has three short syllables. Φυγίος satisfies the conditions for the rule and there is no reason to change the
manuscripts’ Φυγίος into Φυτίος following Schmidt. P. ANT. 2.67, and our Epitome three times (the other two occurrences are in 70.4 and 73.2) comment on the accent of this proper name, indicating that it is paroxytone.

71.7–8 τὸ...8 «: The meaning of this sentence is incomplete. One would expect at least an indication of the accentuation of πλησίος and ἀντίος. πλησίος and ἀντίος are treated as genuine exceptions because although they fulfil the conditions for the rule they are not proparoxytone.

71.8–9 Σκοτίος...9 Φρασίος: The epitomator does not repeat the word κύρια, which was one of the two parts (together with τριβράξεα) of the exception that was given at the beginning of the rule. This suggests that the epitomator, for the sake of brevity, thought it was enough to give one of the elements of a section of the rule later on, in order to signify it.

71.8 Σκοτίος: This name occurs again in the Pindaric fragment incert. 319 (282).

71.15 Δασύλλιος...Διόνυσος: The manuscripts’ δασάλιος occurs nowhere else. I have emended to Δασύλλιος, which is attested in other sources (Paus. 1.43.5.10-11, EM 248.55, Zonar. δ 465.17-8) as a name for Dionysus. It seems that δασάλιος is due to assimilation of
the termination -ωλιος to that of the previous word (ἐν-άλιος). Despite the fact that it is tempting to print Δασύλιος, since the rest of the examples in this accentuation rule are written with a single λ (see TGL II 912A), the rule does not mention any restriction as to the writing with a single λ. Furthermore, it is likely that there were originally two separate rules on words in -λιος and -λλιος, or one rule on words in -λιος (either with a single or double λ) with a substantial number of examples in -λλιος, but that the epitomator in cutting down kept only Δασύλιος. Schmidt mentions in his apparatus that the manuscript of Cyril’s lexicon preserved in Moscow transmits Δασύλιος, something which I have not been able to check this myself, but even if the information is correct I would still hesitate to print Δασύλιος. In inscriptions (ISCIII, SEG 53 720bis) Δασύλλιον is written with double λ.

71.16 πελιός...σκολιός: The manuscripts transmit πελιός ὁ πολιός, but πελιός (‘dark, dull’) is nowhere else glossed by πολιός (‘grey, grizzled, grisly’). I have printed πελιός πολιός, thinking that πολιός was not intended as a gloss for πελιός but as another example in this list of words in -λιος. It is strange in any case that a word in -λιος would need to be glossed by another word in -λιος. A parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 57.31-2 (=308); see the apparatus
of parallel passages) cites both πελιός and πολιός in the rule on
words in -λιος, suggesting that Herodian cited both words as
examples in the same list. It is possible that a gloss followed πελιός,
and that after its omission (but perhaps with the remaining article
ˈό) the next example (πολιός) was thought by a scribe to be a gloss
for πελιός.

71.17 φαλιός…λευκομέτωπος: For λευκομέτωπος as a synonym
EM 186.30 (φάλιος), Et. Svm. II 388.29-390.1 (φάλιος).

71.18 αἰγωλιός: The manuscripts' ἐγωλιός is due to the changes in
the vowel system. ω and o are both pronounced [o], with no
distinction in length, and αι like ε is pronounced [e].

71.18 ἐφωδίος: ἐφωδίος cannot serve as an example here because it
does not end in -λιος. This bird name must have been introduced
into the text by a later scribe, who probably thought of this word
when he wrote the other bird names and added it by mistake.
Schmidt (44.19 (app. crit.)) tried to maintain ἐφωδίος in the text by
suggesting the addition of the article ὦ before it, thus rendering
ἐφωδίος a synonym for αἰγωλιός. αἰγωλιός, however, is a small kind
of owl, and therefore has nothing to do with ἐφωδίος (ˈheron').

71.18 ἑδωλιός: This bird name occurs again (i) in sch. Ar. Av. (883.3),
but the genitive ἐδώλιου in the manuscripts suggests a nominative ἐδώλιος (cf. also the scribal error εἰδώλιος for ἐδώλιος in the same line of the scholion), (i) in Hesychius (ἐ 548), and (ii) in Photius (έ 145; it is accented ἐδώλιος).

72.1-5 Ὅσα...5 σεσημεῖωται: The parallel passages from the Etymologicum Gudianum and the Etymologicum Magnum (see the apparatus of parallel passages) suggest that Herodian might have treated the rule on words in -ιος deriving form present and future tenses in one rule. This, in combination with some problems in the rule as transmitted, i.e. that (i) the rule makes mention of words having two consonants, but not all examples have a consonant cluster (e.g. αἰτίος), (ii) ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκιος, and ἄρτιος are not proper examples for both μὴ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ and κατὰ διάστασιν (on the discussion of ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ as indicating the boundary between the second and third syllable (ἄρ-κι-ος, ἄρ-τι-ος) or between the third and fourth syllable (ἄρ-μό-δι-ος) see the Introduction, pp. 120-1), and (iii) αἰτίος, ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκιος, ἄρτιος, and ἄντιος are not obvious examples of μονογενή (on the discussion of this term see the Introduction, pp. 122-4), could suggest that there is a lacuna in this rule.

It is likely that after μὴ ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ δύο σύμφωνα κατὰ
διάστασιν προσαρχίζειν τα δεδομένα, there was a list of words that do not have a consonant cluster, e.g. αἰτίος (in the word list as transmitted; in fact, αἵτιος could be the remaining of this list) and words like ἀγιος (as transmitted in Et. Gud., EM; the citation of such a word could even explain the existence of μονογενής), ὄσιος, ὄσιος, ὦιος (Et. Gud.), ἴδιος (EM), and after that a list of words with a consonant cluster (ἀμμόδιος, ἀρκιος, ἄρτιος). Otherwise one needs to assume that αἰτῶ αἰτίος is a later addition. But whether we can assume that there were two groups of words with consonant clusters, those with the two consonants belonging to the same syllable and those with the two consonants belonging to different syllables is difficult because the currently cited examples ἀμμόδιος, ἀρκιος, ἄρτιος do not fulfil both the negation μὴ ἔχοντα and κατὰ διάστασιν. This ill-formed rule could be the result of either a clumsy epitomisation or of a sequence of scribal errors. I have put the sign of lacuna in the text after αἰτίος. In this way the difficulty about the citation of αἰτίος is superseded, because it allows for a list of words with no consonant clusters to follow it. At the same time, the indication of the lacuna at that point in the text allows for μὴ to remain in the text, as it would refer to a word list without consonant clusters.
72.1 μονογενή: On the use of the term μονογενής with reference to αίτιος, ἀρμόδιος, ἀρκιος see the Introduction, pp. 122-3.

72.5 τό...σεσημεῖωται: ἀντίος is a genuine exception, because although it satisfies the conditions for the rule, it is nevertheless paroxytone.

72.8 φυλάξιος: This adjective is a hapax.

72.9–10 ἐφομαι...10 ἀνεψιός: The manuscripts’ ἐψιός is nowhere else attested. A parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 58.1-5 (= 310); see the apparatus of parallel passages) suggests that ἀνεψιός should be restored here. ἀνεψιός is linked etymologically with ἐπομαι in the Etymologicum Gudianum (α 142.1-2) too.

73.1 Μύσιος: MO’s μύδιος is nowhere else attested. Schmidt printed C’s μύλιος, which is probably due to the scribe (B has μύδιος as the rest of the tradition; on changes due to the scribe of C see section on Book 20 and the description of C). I have followed Schmidt’s suggestion to emend μύδιος to Μύσιος on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 58.6-13 (= 311.1-8); see the apparatus of parallel passages), where Μύσιος appears in the vicinity of κύσιος, Κύριος, and Τύχιος. I consider Λύδιος an also possible emendation, because in three passages (Phot. ν 305.4, Σα ν 121, Ση. ν 593.2), Λύδιος appears in the vicinity of νύμφιος/νυμφίος,
Τύφιος, Φρύγιος. I consider Μύσιος more likely for two reasons: (i) the passage from Theognostus is clearly parallel to our Epitome, while the three passages which could suggest Λύδιος are not overall parallels but just include words that appear in our accentuation rule, (ii) the corruption from Μύσιος to μύδιος can be explained on palaeographical grounds; δ and σ are often confused in minuscule.

73.2–3 τό...3 κύρια: These names are paroxytone rather than proparoxytone not only because they are proper names, but also because they have three light syllables (ἡ κύριον ὑπάρχοι τρίβολας). The relevance of the three light syllables is given at the beginning of the rule and not repeated here. It seems that the epitomator thought that it was sufficient to say that these words are κύρια in order to refer back to the exception as a whole (ἡ κύριον ὑπάρχοι τρίβολας).

74.1 μακράν: One should understand both 'φύσει' and 'θέσει'. See section on syllables and concepts of syllable division in the Introduction (pp. 118–9). See also 90.5, 100.6, 101.7, 104.6, 106.8, 132.4, 110.2 (Schmidt), 125.1 (Schmidt), 221.17 (Schmidt).

74.5 κωβίος: This fish name is usually accented κωβιός in the manuscript tradition and editions of the several sources where it occurs (e.g. Aesop. Fab. 73.1, Arist. HA 508b.16, 591b.13, 598a.11, 621b.19, Ephipp. Kyd. fr. 12.8, Thphr. Fr. 171.8.6, Euphro Syn. fr. 9
(10.4, Gal. *De alim. facult.* 719.4, *De reb. boni mal. suci* 795.15, Ath. 7.62.4, 7.62.7, 7.120.19, 9.21.6, 9.67.37).

75.1 βροτοσφός: Sometimes written βροτοσφῶς (*Et. Parv.* β 12.1, 12.3) or βροτοσφός (*Et. Gud.* β 289.10, 289.12).

75.10 Σίστος: This name occurs nowhere else. It should be noted that the palimpsest preserves the reading Σίγγος close to the words ἀπλός, διπλός, τριπλός. The palimpsest informs us that Σίγγος is a city name according to Hecataeus' Περίγης Εὐρώπης. The *Etymologicum Magnum* (613.31), according to which Hecataeus' fragment 145bis b. is reconstructed, quotes the word Σίγδος next to Πείρος. Σίστος, Σίγγος and Σίγδος are very close to each other and could all be corrupt forms of the right reading, if none of them is correct here. I have retained the reading of the manuscripts with some reservation.

75.10 Πειρός: The manuscripts' πέρος occurs nowhere else. I have adopted Schmidt's emendation Πείρος, which is the name of a Homeric hero (Hom. II. 2.844, 4.525).

75.10 Αθος: A variant form for mount Αθως (St. Byz. α 85).

76.7 Πέυνος: This river name occurs again in Theognostus (*Can. II* 51.23-4 (= 277.2-3)).

76.7 Φώτυος: This accentuation rule prescribes that there should be
an µ in the penultimate syllable and therefore I print the manuscripts' reading Φώτυος, not Φώτιος with Schmidt (46.22). The reading Φώτυος (in the corrupt form φωστυος) is also attested in the palimpsest fragment together with the information that this is the name of the leader of the Χάονες who is mentioned by Thucydides in book two (2.80.5). Thucydides' manuscripts transmit Φώτυος. The name Φώτυος is attested (LGPN IIIA) independently of Φώτιος. The reading Φόγγυος in Theognostus (Can. II 51.24 (= 277.3)) must be a corrupt form of Φώτυος.

78.10–13 τὸ...13 περισπώσι: The phrase πλῆν ... περισπώσιν (‘but the majority of people write it as perispomenon’) is a bit obscure after ἐπιπόλαιος. ἐπιπόλαιος (‘superficial, shallow, on the surface’) is only attested as proparoxytone. The properispomenon Ἐπιπολαιός is the ethnic designation of a person from Ἐπιπολαί, a village close to Syracuse (St. Byz. ε 96). It is possible that before πλῆν ... περισπώσιν, something, perhaps another word ending in -αιος, has been lost or carelessly omitted by the epitomator, who failed to realise that it was essential for a coherent text. Thus, the phrase πλῆν ... περισπώσιν refers to a word that is not cited in the accentuation rule as we have it.

78.23 Ἐφυσίχαιος: The ethnic designation of an inhabitant of
79.8–9 ἄφαιος…9 πυκνός: I have transposed this phrase from the various different places where it occurs in the manuscripts (see the critical apparatus). ἄφαιος exemplifies the accentuation rule for words that have three syllables, start with α with a smooth breathing, and have the termination -αιος. ἄφαιος may be thought to have been cited next to ἄφαιος, because it makes sense to mention the exception ἄφαιος after a similar word that follows the rule. I have put a rough breathing on ἄφαιος on the basis of evidence that Herodian believed that after the addition of the α- before ὑαιός, the α took the rough breathing from ὑ (Theognost. Can. II 52.18-21 (= 283.4-7), Et. Gen. α 1117, EM 134.18-20).

79.11 θηλαῖος: The word with this accent occurs nowhere else (but see my suggested emendation of Μάθων ὁ θηβαῖος to μάλῳν ὁ θηλαῖος in note 13.1 Μάθων ὁ θηβαῖος). The LBG has the lemma θῆλαῖος. It is possible that both θηλαῖος and θῆλαῖος were in use. In any case, even if the form θῆλαῖος was more common, the citation of the word θηλαῖος in our accentuation rule shows that at least Herodian thought that the word was properispomenon. Schmidt’s suggested conjecture Αηθαῖος is inappropriate because it does not
end in -λαιος, while Βηλαιος would be suitable but is not supported by any parallel passages.

79.11 φύλαιος: This word occurs only in our Epitome and Theognostus (Can. II 52.25 (= 284.4)). The Suda (φ 831) has Φυλαιος for the person coming from Φυλή, but φύλαιος is probably linked with the common noun φυλή rather than the place name (this is suggested by the fact that in Theognostus’ rule φύλαιος is presented among other adjectives in -αιος derived from common nouns, but Theognostus’ examples also include Πέλλη Πελλαιος).

80.1–2 Παλαιος…2 κυριον: A personal name (LGPN IIIB).

80.7–8 ἄξα…8 ἀραιος: According to the testimony of Theognostus (Can. II 52.18 (= 283)) Herodian had said in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωρίας that ἀραιος derives from ὀξω (‘flow, run, stream’), while according to the Etymologicum Magnum (134.18-20), from ὀξιο (‘break, shiver, shatter’). Lobeck (PGSE1 21, n. 13) argued that ἄξα is a corrupt form of ὀξω, but the rule prescribes oxytone accentuation for words derived from neuter nouns. It is possible that Herodian mentioned an alternative etymology of ἀραιος from a verb, and that the above-mentioned sources preserved only the alternative etymology.

80.7 ἄξα: This must be the accusative plural of ἄξος (ἀξύμα,
stream’), and not the epic adverb ὑεῖα (‘easily’), because the rule prescribes that the adjective is oxytone when it is derived from a neuter noun. If ὑεῖα is to be thought of as an adverb, then ἀραίως should be thought to be exceptionally oxytone, since the rule prescribes that the adjectives that are derived from adverbs are properispomenon.

80.11–13 τὸ...13 ἀρχόμενα: The reason why these words are exceptionally properispomenon is not mentioned at the beginning of the rule as a condition. See the discussion of the epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian in the Introduction (1.17–21 δεῖ ... υπάρχη).

80.13 Κήτειος: This word is oxytone only in our Epitome. The other sources have Κήτειος. Κήτειοι were a Mysian nation (sch. Hom. Od. 11.521.1-4, Hsch. κ 2572, Apollon. Lex. 99.23, Eust. Il. I 571.2, Od. I 431.37-9). Α χειμαρρώδες ποτάμιον called Κήτειον is mentioned by Str. (13.1.70.6-7) and Eustathius (Od. I 431.39, Od. I 432.8-9). Herodian might have thought that the accent of the word was different, or something may be missing from the text.

80.17 πρώτην: first (reckoned from the beginning of the word). O’s τρίτην is equally sensible, if taken to mean third, reckoned from the end of the word.

80.20 γαλαύκειος: This adjective is uncommon. Our Epitome is the
oldest attestation of this word. It occurs again in Oribasius (Coll. Med. 48.45) and the Suda (γ 279.3).

80.21 Ὀρνεῖος: This word occurs nowhere else.

81.1 Σπονδεῖος: This proper name occurs nowhere else.

81.1 Δαρδανεῖος: The manuscripts' Δαρεῖος occurs nowhere else. I have adopted Götting's emendation (see the critical apparatus) Δαρδανεῖος, which is a river name (Et. Sym. I 361.4).


81.8–9 προπαραθύνεται...9 ἀσκάτειος: The words ἵπτερεῖος and ἀσκάτειος occur nowhere else, and are probably corrupt forms of ἐταιρεῖος and ἀκατεῖος, which appear later on (82.7–8; see also Schmidt's critical apparatus 49.11). If the right words here are ἐταιρεῖος and ἀκατεῖος, still the place where they appear in the manuscripts is not suitable, because the specific rule after which this
phrase occurs is about proper names. If one corrects ἰττέρειος and ἀσκάτειος into ἐταφεῖος and ἀκατεῖος, then one must also change προσφαροξύνεται into προσφερισπάται (see Schmidt’s critical apparatus 49.11). A more sensible place for this phrase would have been the following accentuation rule, which is about adjectives in -ειος whose first syllable is short. προσφερισπάται δὲ ταύτα· ἐταφεῖος ἀκατεῖος would fit well after the mention of the proparoxytone examples βρότειος ... βόειος. προσφαροξύνεται δὲ ταύτα creates, in any case, a contrast with what precedes. It is tempting to assume that this phrase belongs with the rule on the words in -ειος that have more than three syllables, i.e. where ἐταφεῖος and ἀκατεῖος are included among the examples (82.7, 82.8), and that its occurrence here is the result of the anticipation of this phrase. However, one would have to explain the existence of the phrase προσφερισπάται (for transmitted προσφαροξύνεται) δὲ ταύτα here, since the phrasing of the fact that these words are properispomenon is different at 82.5–8. If, nevertheless, προσφερισπάται δὲ ταύτα· ἐταφεῖος ἀκατεῖος here is due to anticipation of τὰ μέντοι ἀπὸ τῶν Ὀμήρου λέξεων εὑρεθέντα ... ἀκατεῖος this would fit with the assumption that the phrase τὸ δὲ Δαρδανεῖος ἰξύνεται must have appeared after ἀκατεῖος (see the
following note). The doubtful place of the phrase προσπαρεξύνεται δὲ ... ἀσκάτειος as well as that of τὸ δὲ Δαρδανειῶς ὀξύνεται point to their accidental omission by a scribe, who then added them in the margin. Later scribes, not knowing where these phrases belonged, would then have reinserted them randomly at the points where we read them today.

81.9 ἄπο ... ὀξύνεται: The presence of Δαρδανειῶς in this rule might be justified, although it has more than three syllables while the rule prescribes that the words should have three syllables, on the basis of other passages where words with more than three syllables come under rules about words with three syllables (e.g. βροτολογοῦς in 85.9–13, ἀφυγνετὸς in 150.9–12, ἁματροχά in 113.20-114.4 (Schmidt)). If one were to move Δαρδανειῶς next to Ἐπειῶς, one would have to explain the wording τὸ δὲ ... ὀξύνεται, which suggests that Δαρδανειῶς was cited close to another group of examples with different accentuation. It is nevertheless possible that this phrase should be transposed after ἀκατεῖος at 82.8, where the rule is about words with more than three syllables (cf. the previous note). It would make sense for τὸ δὲ Δαρδανειῶς ὀξύνεται to appear after ἀκατεῖος at 82.8. The mention of ἀσκάτειος at 81.9, probably a corrupt form of ἀκατεῖος, before τὸ δὲ Δαρδανειῶς ὀξύνεται may be
an indication that this phrase appeared originally after ἀκατεῖος (see also the previous note).

82.3 γαλήνειος: otherwise written γαλήνιος.

82.8 ἀκατεῖος: This rare word occurs again in our Epitome and in Pollux (1.91.5), where it is proparoxytone.

82.11 αἰδοίος: Both an adjective and a personal name (LGPN I). The accent of the proper name and the adjective is the same.

82.12 ὁμοίος: Both an adjective and a personal name (LGPN IV (Ὀμοίος), VA (Ὅμοιος)). The accent of the proper name and the adjective is the same.

82.12 παντοίος: Both an adjective and a personal name (LGPN II, IIIA, IIIB). The accent of the proper name and the adjective is the same.

82.14–83.4 Τὰ…83.4 Αρένος: This passage is somewhat problematic. οὐκ ἑθικά creates the impression that one should get some examples of ethnic designations that do not follow the rule, but no ethnic designation is mentioned in it. This, of course, may be due to the epitomator cutting down material. Moreover, the phrase ἀγανός καὶ τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ἐπίθετον creates the impression that something must have been said prior to this phrase regarding the κύρια. In order to overcome the problem, Lentz (138.2) changed οὐκ
ἐθνικά from our Epitome into ἡ κύρια ὀμοφωνούντα τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις
and later on εἰ μὴ ἐθνικά εἰη into εἰ μὴ ἐπιθετικά εἰη (138.3-4).
Lentz’s first change satisfies the need for κύρια in the phrasing of the
beginning of the rule, something which fits well with ἀγαυός καὶ τὸ
κύριον καὶ τὸ ἐπίθετον. The second change is a bit awkward,
because reading πρόσκειται εἰ μὴ ἐπιθετικά εἰη one would have
expected that earlier in the rule there would have been an exclusion
of adjectives from the main rule. However, this is not true, because
the rule is about adjectives. The main reason why Lentz’s
suggestions should not be followed is because πρόσκειται Χ...Υ
should mean ‘the words Χ...Υ are in the rule because...’, so the words
following πρόσκειται should be in the rule or, failing that, at least a
phrase with the same meaning. Regarding the phrase ἀλλὰ κύρια
perhaps something was mentioned earlier in the rule, but was later
omitted either by the epitomator or by a scribe. What makes the
phrase πρόσκειται εἰ μὴ ἐθνικά εἰη, ἀλλὰ κύρια even more difficult
to understand is that the three examples given are nowhere else
attested (or attested as nominatives; see the relevant notes below),
thus not enabling us to know what must have been said in the
phrasing of the rule.

83.1 ἄκουός: This word does not usually occur uncompound. The
etymological lexica (Et. Gen. α 349, EM 51.23-5, Et. Sym. I 226.23-6), in which this word is mainly attested, cite it together with a quotation from Callimachus (Fr. inc. sed. 499).

83.4 Ἄκαλαυος Ἰπείραυος: These words occur nowhere else.

83.4 Ἀρευος: No such nominative is attested. Ἀρευος, the Aeolic genitive of Ἄρης is attested in Choeroboscus (in Theod. 163.5-7, 214.20-1).

83.10 θάμβος...μονογενές: The noun, not the adjective θαμβός, -ή, -ών. The information τὸ μονογενές is, strictly speaking, redundant because the phrasing of the rule said κύριον ἡ προσηγορικά.

83.10–12 σεσημείωται...12 κύριον: ὄλβος is presented as an exception, but ὄλβος has been cited as an example of the recessive accentuation at the beginning of the rule (83.9), and in fact it is the proper name Ὀλβός which does not follow the rule prescribing recessive accentuation. Instead of being recessive, as the rule prescribes, Ὀλβός is oxytone in contrast to the common noun ὄλβος.

In my view, Herodian could have written ὄλβος in the initial list of examples, and then forgetting that he had included ὄλβος in this list, and remembering the proper name Ὀλβός, or just wishing to add this information, made this remark about the different accentuation
of Ὀλβος as a noun and as a proper name. Thus, I do not consider it necessary to obelise the first occurrence of ὀλβος.

83.12 Ὀλβος…κύριον: The proper name Ὀλβος occurs again in Philoponus’ π. διαφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. (addit.) 224.18.

83.15 βωβος: The manuscripts’ κωβος occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (50.20 app. crit.) βωβος. λωβος is also possible but βωβος is more likely because β and κ are interchangeable in minuscule.

83.18 κόναβος: The manuscripts’ κόραβος occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. κόναβος, suggested by Lobeck (PSGP 285, n. 1), occurs in the vicinity of ἀραβος also in the Etymologicum Gudianum (κ 336.41-51) and Etymologicum Magnum (528.10-8).

83.18 σάραβος: Both a common noun (‘γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον’, Hsch. σ 191, Phot. σ 500.2, Su. σ 110) and a river name (Claud. Ptol. Geogr. 7.1.29.5, 7.2.13.4). As a common noun it was mainly used by comic poets (Comica Adespota Fragm. Incert. Poet. fr. 1137; cf. Phot. σ 500.2, Su. σ 110).

83.19–20 ἀπτέλαβος…20 ὀξύνουσι: There is no other evidence for the oxytone accentuation of ἀπτέλαβος in the Attic dialect.

84.11 γάγγος: M’s γάγγος and O’s σάγγος occur nowhere else. Göttling’s correction άργος would fit well here. άργος could have been mentioned here both in order to highlight the fact that as a proper name it cannot be oxytone as the adjectives are, and to underline the fact that the homonymous words άργος and ἀργός have different accents, so that a distinction is made between their different meanings. In several ancient sources ἀργός and άργος are examined side by side (Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τον. διαφ. σημ. recensio a α 34, recensio c α 13, recensio d α 32, recensio e α 36, Et. Gud. α 187.4, EM 136.1, Eust. Od. II 145.36-8, 146.45-147.1). I consider Γόγγος equally possible. The phrase τὸ μέντοι ... βαρύνεται after a list of adjectives makes one expect either a proper name or a genuine exception.

84.17 φαγός: The word for ‘glutton’ is always φάγος in other ancient sources.

84.17–85.1 ὀ...85.1 τὸ: According to sch. Ar. Eq. 487a Aristarchus accented the word on the final syllable, as did Herodian in his Αττική προσωδία (see the apparatus of parallel passages). Thus ὀ κραυγαστικός should be a gloss for κραγός, not κράγος. I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation (52.1-2) of the manuscript’s τὸ δὲ
κράγος ὁ κραυγαστικός. τὸ δὲ τὸ (ὁ κραυγαστικός). τὸ δὲ Κράγος
βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ.

85.1 τὸ1...βαρύνεται: Κράγος is a mountain in Lycia (see Cornel. 
Alex. Polyhist. fr. 73-77.5, St. Byz. 380.16) and a cult title or a name 
for Zeus in Lycia (sch. Lyc. 542.1, 542.4, 538.20bis). Κράγος is not 
oxynote since it is not an adjective, but a proper name.

85.5 Λάγος: The majority of the ancient sources have Λάγος, not 
Λάγος (only Jo. Alex. π. διαφ. τὸν. διάφ. σημ. recensio b, λ 2, sch. 
Theoc. 17.14b.3 have Λάγος).

85.9–13 ἀρσενικά...13 βροτολογός: It is interesting that 
βροτολογός, an adjective, is given as an example of ἀρσενικά. One 
normally describes nouns as ἀρσενικά, not adjectives, which have 
more than one gender, but βροτολογός found mainly as a Homeric 
epithet of Mars, might have been thought of as a word of one gender 
because only found in the masculine.

85.10–11 μὴ...11 Γ: No examples of this type of exception are given 
in our Epitome. Σύναγγος, a Phoenician city name, which according 
to Stephanus of Byzantium (591.21-2) was cited in the sixth book of 
the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπίας, could exemplify this condition. 
Σάλαγγος, the name of an Italian and Indian nation (St. Byz.
550.10-1), could also have been mentioned here (cf. Lentz's reconstruction 141.14–5).

85.13–14 τὸ...14 ἄρσενικόν: The island name is oxytone in the majority of the ancient sources where this name occurs.

85.15 Ὅμαργος: This dog name occurs nowhere else.

85.18–19 εἰ...19 παραλήγον: The fact that feminine common nouns with o in their penultimate syllable are exempted from the oxytone accentuation, together with the fact that Κνίδος qualifies as an example of the rule (see Schmidt's view in the critical apparatus), suggested to Schmidt that something should be added after θηλυκά at the beginning of the rule (see Schmidt's suggestions in the critical apparatus). In my view, it is possible that nothing is missing after θηλυκά. Even if the ΠΕΡΙ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗΣ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΙΔΙΑΣ included some specifications after θηλυκά, the epitomator could have considered the statement that exceptions were feminine common nouns with o in the penultimate syllable sufficient: the reader can be expected to conclude that recessive accentuation applies under all other circumstances.

86.1 ἄδος: The word’s etymology might lead one to expect a rough breathing, but a smooth breathing is also found for some other words built on the same root (see DELG s. v. ἄδην).
86.1–2 τὸ...2 θηλυκά: ὀδός and σποδός are exceptions not only because they are feminine, but also because they have o in the penultimate syllable, but only the fact that they are feminine is mentioned when the two words are cited as examples. This is done for the sake of brevity. See also note on 37.9 ἀπὸ συνθέτου.

86.6 σκοίδος: The manuscripts’ κοίδος occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihil. I have adopted TGL’s emendation (IV 1705A, and later Meineke’s FCG IV 151) σκοίδος, a rare word which occurs again in Menander (Cithar. fr. al. nota 9; CAF fr. 289), Pollux (10.16.6), Hesychius (σ 1051), and Photius (σ 523.4–5).

86.7 χλήδος: The manuscripts’ χλίδος is unsuitable here, because it is neuter, while this book only deals with masculines and feminines. The writing of this word with an -t is a common iotacistic mistake. I print Schmidt’s emendation χλήδος (53.4-5).

86.9 νίδος: This word occurs nowhere else.

86.10 ζεύδος: This word occurs nowhere else.

86.10 καυδός: This word occurs nowhere else. It is possible that the word intended here is the island name Γαυδός (Apollod. Gramm. (FHG) fr. 159.55, 160c.5, Str. 1.2.37.5, 6.2.11.38-9, 7.3.6.53, Call. Fr. inc. sed. 470; sometimes written Καυδός, e.g. Et. Gud. κ 352.5).

86.11 μαυδός: This word occurs nowhere else.
86.13 ὁγδος: The spelling ὁγδος of the ordinal numeral ὁγδους is late and this raises questions about the date of composition of the Epitome. The rule is clearly about disyllabic words and therefore does not allow a correction of ὁγδος to ὁγδους.

86.13 ὀάβιδος: I have printed ὀάβιδος with Schmidt.

86.13 ἀσδος: This is a hapax.

87.2 λίνδος: Either a common noun, 'an aromatic plant' (see LSJ s. v.), or a proper name, the town of Lindos.

87.2 Σίνδος: Either an ethnic designation (Scyl. 72.1, Hsch. ο 682, St. Byz. 569.27-570.2) or a common noun (St. Byz. 569.27-570.2).

87.3 μάρδος: This is a hapax.

87.5 μυνδος...ἀφωνος: μυνδος occurs again in S. fr. 1072, Lyc. 1375, sch. Lyc. 1375.13, Hsch. μ 1871, St. Byz. β 26.3, Et. Guð. μ 400.35. It is attested with a recessive accent in Hesychius, the Etymologicum Gudianum and the Lycophron scholion.


87.11 κύρια: No proper names are cited as examples. Lentz in his reconstruction (143.10-9) includes the proper names Λίχανδος (St. Byz. 418.17), Ληψμανδος (St. Byz. 414.8), Κύλλανδος (St. Byz.
392.7), Ἀσπενδός (Scyl. 101.2, Str. 12.7.1.4, 14.4.2.8, D. P. Orb. descr.
852, St. Byz. α 484, Eust. D. P. 852.6, 852.7-8, 852.15), Ὡσινδός (St. Byz.
1 101, Theognost. Can. II 54.6-7 (= 293.2-3), Πύρινδος (St. Byz. 541.8),
Ἀρινδός (Theognost. Can. II 54.7 (= 293.3)).

87.13 ὁρυμαγδός: I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation (PGSE¹ 509)
of the manuscripts’ ὁρυμαμαδός. The rule prescribes that the
termination -δος should belong to a consonant cluster.

87.15 Ἀβυδός: The manuscripts’ ἀοδός occurs nowhere else.
Lobeck’s emendation Ἀβυδός (PSGP 355.4-5) is supported by a
parallel passage from the Epimerismi Homerici (α 274; see the
apparatus of parallel passages), where Ἀβυδός appears in the
vicinity of ἀοδός and κίναδος.

87.16 Ἕνοιδός: The manuscripts’ Ἕνοιδός occurs nowhere else. Both
suggested emendations, Ὑροιδός (Lobeck PSGP 355.5-7) and
Ἐνοῦδος (Schmidt 54.4), are equally possible here. Ὑροιδός is
supported by a parallel passage from the Epimerismi Homerici (α 274),
but Ἐνοῦδος is palaeographically closer to Ἕνοιδός. The text cannot
be reconstructed with certainty here.

87.16 Ἐκῆδός: The manuscripts’ Ἐκῆδός occurs nowhere else. The
emendation Ἐκοσῆδος suggested by Lobeck (PSGP 355.4-9) is
possible, but it is not supported by parallel passages.
87.19 ὅζος: The manuscripts’ ἶζος occurs nowhere else. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation ὅζος (PSGP 361, n. 3, e Cramer AO I 443), which is supported by a parallel passage (Ep. Hom. χ 34 = AO Cramer I 443) and requires the change of a single letter. ἶζος is an adjective, and therefore unsuitable here.

88.1 ταύζος: The manuscripts’ ταύζος occurs nowhere else. I have retained this reading (but printed a circumflex with Schmidt 54.7-8) with some reserve. It is tempting to correct ταύζος into either τρύζος (or Τρύζος, the name of a tyrant mentioned by Claudius Aelianus (Var. Hist. 14.22.1)) or τρίζος. τρύζος and τρίζος are close to the reading ταὐζος, and they occur in the vicinity of θοὶζος in the Etymologicum Gudianum (q 494.1-3) and Etymologicum Magnum (705.15-7) respectively.

88.1 τρόζος: This word occurs nowhere else. The words τρύζος and τρίζος, suggested as emendations for ταύζος in the previous note, would have been suitable here as well, but many other corrections are possible.

89.1 μὴ...γένος: ‘that do not have the same form when their gender is different’. This remark is intended to exclude cases like στρουθός, where both the male and female sparrow are indicated with the same grammatical form. Thus, although στρουθός has one grammatical
form, i.e. it is μονογενές, it is κοινὸν κατὰ γένος at the same time, because the single grammatical form indicates both the male and female sparrow.

89.2 κώθος: This uncommon word occurs again at π.μ.α. 947.21; Ath. 7.69.6, 7.83.8, 7.83.19, Epit. II.i 139.32; Hsch. κ 4789; Theognost. Can. II 54.14 (= 295.3); Su. κ 2224; Et. Gud. μ 399.19, σ 513.35; EM 730.34.

89.6 γόνθος: This is a hapax.

89.7 γρόνθος...αὐλήσεως: The meaning given for γρόνθος here reveals that γρόνθος is meant to be an alternative form for, or at least a word related to γρόνθων (‘first lessons on the flute’). In no other source is the meaning of γρόνθος linked with αὐλήσεως; γρόνθος otherwise means ‘fist’ and ‘spoke on a machine’.

89.11–12 ψόθος...12 ψόφος: Only in our Epitome and in Theognostus (Can. II 54.13 (= 295.2)) is ψόθος glossed by ψόφος. The other ancient sources provide us with the meanings ψόφα (Hsch. ψ 238) and ἀκαθαρσία (Hsch. ψ 238, Phryn. PS fr. 37*, Phot. ψ 655.16, Su. ψ 120) for ψόθος. Even if ψόφος were another meaning for ψόθος, it would be strange that Herodian should have glossed ψόθος with reference to this uncommon meaning. It seems more likely that a word meaning ‘noise’, for which ψόφος would be a
suitable gloss, has been left out between ψόθος and ψόφος. It is noteworthy that in the passage of Theognostus we read the word ὄθος before ψόθος, and ὄθος (‘rushing noise’), could in fact have been explained by ψόφος (‘noise’). Given that Theognostus derives material from Herodian, and given that the passage of Theognostus is parallel to this passage of our Epitome, it is possible that ὄθος was initially mentioned by Herodian, but was then accidentally omitted, either by the epitomator or by a scribe. Possibly the words were cited next to each other in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωπικίας as they are in Theognostus, but in the reverse order, i.e. ψόθος, ὄθος (ὁ ψόφος), and at some point the order of the words ψόθος and ὄθος was inverted. The omission of ὄθος must have occurred after the inversion of ψόθος with ὄθος. The fact that both ψόθος and ψόφος begin with ψο- might have contributed to the linking of the two words in Theognostus and in our Epitome. One may assume, on the basis of the common inversion between ψόθος and ὄθος in both our Epitome and Theognostus, that the inversion occurred at an early stage in the transmission of Herodian’s text, or at least that the two texts share a common source which already contained the inversion. I have followed Lentz (145.12; already Lobeck PGSE¹ 441, n. 9) in filling the lacuna by adding ὄθος between ψόθος and ὁ
ψόφος. I have not followed the exact addition suggested by Lobeck (see the critical apparatus), as I do not consider the addition of ή ἀκαθαρσία after ψόφος necessary.

89.12 τό … τοπικόν: Even though βυθός has two short vowels, it is oxytone because it is considered a τοπικόν.

89.15 ἀφθός: This word occurs nowhere else.

89.16 λοίσθος: The word meant here is the adjective (‘left behind, last’), not the noun (‘beam, boom’), because the rule prescribes that the words should be τριγενή.

89.17 Πάρθος: This is an exception because it is not τριγενές but κοινόν τῷ γένει (see also Schmidt’s observation in the critical apparatus).

89.18 νόθος: I have emended the manuscripts’ ὄθος to νόθος. Schmidt’s ὄνθος (55.5) is problematic for me: the rule is on τριγενή in -θος, and then we read two exceptions (‘σεσημεῖωται …’). ὄνθος is a noun, thus making it difficult to accept. The section ‘σεσημεῖωται …’ up to the end needs to contain either genuine exceptions (thus τριγενή) or words that are adjectives but not τριγενή. Πάρθος is an exception because it is not τριγενές (see also the previous note). My emendation νόθος might have been
mentioned as an exception because it can be both τριγενές (νόθος, -η, -ον) and διγενές (νόθος, -ον).

90.3 λάπαθος: The manuscripts’ λέκυθος is unsuitable here, because it does not end in -αθός as the rule prescribes. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation λάπαθος (PSGP 362), which is supported by two parallel passages (sch. Hom. Il. 2.676 and Ep. Hom. α 271; see the apparatus of parallel passages).

90.5 μακράς: See note on 74.1 μακράν.

90.7 φύσει μακρά: Schmidt 55.12 (app. crit.) provides as examples of this condition Σίμαιθος, Κόναιθος, which are both attested in Theognostus (Can. II 59.4-5 (= 317.2-3)).

90.7–8 εἰ...8 ἐστί: ‘oxytone words (of this shape) are all adjectives’.

90.8–9 Λάπιθος...9 Μίκυθος: Personal names (LGPN IIIB; LGPN I, IIIB respectively).

90.10–11 τὸ...11 δεύνεται: βοηθός and κακηθός are oxytone as they are adjectives.

90.10 κακηθός: The formation of κακηθός is peculiar. Other sources have a κάκιθος or κακιθός glossed as κάκιστος (κάκιθος: Choerob. AO II 248.26-7, EM 484.55-6, Zonar. κ 1145.20-1; κακιθός: Choerob. AO II 229.22).
90.12–13 ἔχοντα...13 σύμφωνα: See the discussion of syllable division and consonant clusters in the Introduction, pp. 118-21.

90.16 ὀλισθός...ὀλισθηρός: ὀλισθός is an uncommon synonym for ὀλισθηρός. It occurs again in Hp. Art. 29.1, Mochl. 19.1, Diocl. Fr. 163.2, Apollon. Cit. 12.34, Jo. Alex. π. διάφ. τον. διάφ. σημ. recensio e o 5.2.

90.19 ταύκος: This is nowhere else attested. Many readings are possible here (see the critical apparatus).

90.19 τὸ...ὀξύνεται: σηκός is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions mentioned in the rule, it does not follow the accentuation prescribed.

91.5 Μάκκος: This personal name is attested in the inscription SEG 43 680, 64 from Gallia Narbonensis. It is probably the name of a king at Hesychius μ 122. At EM 707.41 μάκκος is attested in a list with another three words in -κος (σάκκος, λάκκος, κόκκος).

91.5 Ὀγκος...κύμιον: This personal name is attested at sch. Lyc. 1225, St. Byz. 482.22, EM 613.43-4.

91.11–12 σεσημείωται...12 θριγκός: θριγκός is a genuine exception because, although it satisfies the conditions mentioned in the rule, is nevertheless oxytone.

91.16 μύσκος: This word occurs again in Hesychius (μ 1952), where
it is glossed with μέσσαμι and κηδος. μύσκος (=μυσκος) is also a diminutive of μυς (TGL V 1311). There is no need to change μύσκος into Ζύσκος, as Schmidt would have preferred (56.14), but the occurrence of Ζύσκος in the vicinity of δίσκος and Φύσκος in the Περί μονήρους λέξεως (GG iii.i 947.10) could suggest that Ζύσκος was cited in the same word list in the Περί καθολικής προσφώνιας.

91.20 κύκος: The manuscripts’ κύκος occurs nowhere else. Hesychius (β 1304) has the lemma βυκός glossed by δασμοφόρος. βυκός may be wrongly accented in the Hesychius manuscript (on the lack of reliability of this manuscript on accentuation matters see also notes on 19.1 οἰρών and 114.3 ἐφυμος). A genitive βύκου in the medical text De alimentis (12.8) reinforces the above view. Βύκος is mentioned as a river name in Claudius Ptolemaeus (Geogr. 3.5.4.8). Other words, which are close to the transmitted reading (Μύκος/μύκος, λύκος, τύκος), would be possible here, but the text cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

91.21–22 σεσημείωται...22 ὀξύτονον: Even though φακός fulfils the conditions for recessive accentuation, it is oxytone because there is διαστολή τις σημαινομένου: a distinction between the common noun φακός and the proper name Φάκος.

92.2–3 πλην...3 Ω: e.g. σῶκος.
92.7 Πίνακος: A personal name attested at SEG 29 116 (Attica).

92.7 Αμάφακος: Nowhere else attested as a proper name. ἀμάφακος is a plant name and the homonymous perfume (Hsch. α 3439, Phot. α 1123).

92.8 Αστακός: The manuscripts’ ἀστακός occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation (see the critical apparatus). Αστακός is the name of a city in Bithynia (St. Byz. α 497).

92.8 Μαλακός: The manuscripts’ ἀλακός occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. I have accepted Lobeck’s emendation (see the critical apparatus). Μαλακός is a personal name (LGPN I (Μάλακος), IIIA, IIB (Μάλακος), IV (Μάλακος)).

92.8 Καλλιακός: This word occurs nowhere else.

93.3 λιθακός: A rare synonym for λίθαξ, which occurs again at P.Oxy 1087.47-8 (cf. sch. Hom. II. 7pap 6, 76.28-9), which is a fragment of Stesichorus (fr. 214 PMGF).

93.7 οὐσσακός: Ancient sources provide us with two different meanings for this word: (i) γυναικεῖον μόριον/αίδοῖον (sch. Ar. Lys. 1001, Su. ν 672, ν 683.4) and (ii) πάσσαλος (Phot. ν 634.7-8, EM 785.8, Zonar. ν 1787.9-10).

93.8 μαίμακος: This rare word occurs again in Tragica Adespota
(TrGF fr. 593) and in Photius (μ 28), who provides us with the synonyms χαλεπός and δύσμαχος and tells us that μαίμακος is a tragic word (τραγική ἢ λέξις). μαίμακος is not a compound word, and it is a bit odd that it is called a σύνθετον here, rather than παρώνυμον. Since μαίμακος is not often attested it is not possible to find out whether this view that μαίμακος is a compound was widely held. Despite the fact that ancient views on what a compound is were the same as modern views, ancient views on etymology do not always correspond with modern linguistic views. For the loose usage of the term σύνθετον for παρώνυμα (words derived from nouns) in Pseudo-Arcadius cf. μάργος (84.12–13), φρόνιμος (86.4–5), αἰσθητός (104.9–10), λίχνος (116.4–5), ἀστεροσφή (117.5-6 Schmidt), μελέτη 131.10-1 (Schmidt), which are presented as compounds.

93.11 Τὰ…ἔστιν: The text claims that there is only one word ending in -εκος, but there are also τέκος, βέκος (or βεκός), πέκος, and the personal name Νίχεκος (LGPN IV).

93.11 Αλώπεκος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

93.15 Σπόρδοκος: This word occurs nowhere else. Schmidt (57.16 app. crit.) observed that either the name Σπόρδοκος, probably an alternative form for Σπάρτοκος (for which see LGPN II, VA), or Σπαράδοκος (LGPN IV) was intended here. The α of the antepenultimate syllable could have easily become o under the influence of the following two o's.

93.15–16 καί...16 ὀξύνεται: This phrase is out of context as transmitted, because it does not concern words in -οκος. It is possible that this phrase belonged originally to the rule on words in -οκος preceded by τ and υ (96.1–4), and that αἰγοβοσκός was intended as a further example (together with Δαμασκός and Αρδησκός) of words that are oxytone because they do not have an iota in the penultimate.

94.3 Ἐστρηκος: This word occurs nowhere else. Theognostus (Can. II 59.25-6 (= 322.3-4)) cites Ἀτρικός, a Cretan city name (but such a Cretan city name is nowhere else attested), next to μάλικος, a bird name. Ἀτρικός and μάλικος are close to the readings Ἐστρηκος and Μάληκος transmitted in our text. Ἀτρικός and μάλικος occur nowhere else. It is possible that Ἀτρικός as well as Ἐστρηκος are corrupt forms of the genuine reading.

94.3 Μάληκος: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA).

94.4 Ἀρτησκός: I have emended the manuscripts' Ἀρτισκός to
Ἀρτησκός on the basis of Herodotus 4.92.2. Ἀρτησκός is the name of a tributary of the Hebrus. The existence of the river names Ἀρδησκός (sch. Hes. Th. 338.11-2) and Ἀλδησκός (Eust. Il. II 606.8, Od. II 168.21, D. P. 311.5), which are similar to Ἀρτησκός, probably influenced Schmidt into printing Ἀρδησκός in his text (57.20). On the different locations of the aforementioned rivers see RE s. v. Aldeskos, Ardeskos, Artiskos.

94.6 Πάταικος: The manuscripts' πάγακος occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. I have adopted Schmidt's emendation Πάταικος, on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (see the apparatus of parallel passages and the critical apparatus). Πάταικος is a personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA) or 'Phoenician deities of dwarfish shape, whose images formed the figure-heads of Phoenician ships' (LSJ s. v.; see Hdt. 3.37).

94.7 Φάλαικος: I have printed Schmidt's emendation of the manuscripts' φάλαικος, which occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili, to Φάλαικος, on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (see the apparatus of parallel passages and the critical apparatus). Φάλαικος is a personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB).

94.7 Μίθαικος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

94.8 Μόνοικος: This is the city name (St. Byz. 456.7), not the epithet
of Heracles in Southern Gaul, because the rule does not apply to adjectives.

95.1 Αἴνικος: The manuscripts’ ἀνίκος occurs nowhere else, and thus there is no other evidence to suggest that this is indeed a proper name. A number of possible emendations have been suggested (see the critical apparatus). Αἴνικός at Theognostus Can. II 59.33 (= 323.4) should be corrected to Αἴνικος on the basis of this accentuation rule, and Εὐνικὸς should be added before ὄνομα ποιητοῦ (on the confusion between the poet’s name Εὐνικὸς and Αἴνικος see Meineke FCG I 249), or Αἴνικός should be changed to Εὐνικὸς in order to correspond to ὄνομα ποιητοῦ. The passage from Theognostus’ Canones (see the full citation in the apparatus of parallel passages) is close to the passage in our Epitome and supports the emendation of ἀνίκος to Αἴνικος or Εὐνικὸς (cf. the above two suggested emendations of Αἴνικός), or to Ἑλλάνικος, as both these names appear in the vicinity of Κάικος, Γρηγόρικος and Φιλικός and are close to the reading transmitted by the manuscripts, but Αἴνικος is a bit more likely. Αἴνικος is palaeographically closer to the transmitted ἀνίκος than the other two suggested emendations of Αἴνικός in Theognostus, namely Εὐνικὸς and Ἑλλάνικος, and thus is more economical. Moreover, supposing that Αἴνικος is present in
Theognostus’ passage, and that Αίνικός is not simply changed to Εὐνικός there, Αίνικός is more likely than Ἐλλάνικος in Pseudo-Arcadius, because of the correspondence in the order in which the examples are cited in the two passages. Κάικος, Γρήγικος and Φίλικος appear in the same order, thus rendering Theognostus’ Αίνικός (the first suggested emendation of Αίνικός) more likely than Ἐλλάνικος, which appears after Γρήγικος in Theognostus.

95.1 Κάικος: The name of a river in Mysia (Philox. Gramm. fr. 412, sch. Hes. Th. 338.10, Ps.-Plu. Fluv. 21.1, Hsch. κ 224, Theognost. Can. II 59.33 - 60.1 (=323.4-5)).


95.2 Φίλικος: A proper name (Theognost. Can. II 60.1 (= 323.5), cf. LGPN I, II, IIIA (Φιλικός)).

95.4 Καμικός: A city in Sicily (St. Byz. 351.13) or a river name in Sicily (Theognost. Can. II 60.2-3 (=323.6-7)).

95.6 Παλικός: A city in Sicily (D. S. 1188.6.7-10, Theognost. Can. II 60.4-5 (=323.8-9)).

95.15 Άμυκος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA, IV).

95.15 κώρυκος: Either a common noun or a place name (a mountain
name: Str. 14.1.32.2, St. Byz. 401.22-3, or a promontory: Paus. Gr. κ 60.2, Phot. κ 1330.2-3, Su. κ 2299, or a city name: St. Byz. 401.18). I have not capitalised it to allow for both possibilities.

95.15 Ἰνυκος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

96.6 διαστολήν πέπονθεν: e.g. the adjectives θολός and σαλός, which are oxytone in order to contrast with the nouns θόλος and σάλος respectively. θολός and σαλός as adjectives are τριγενής and therefore exemplify also the other condition given for non-recessive accentuation.

96.8 τὸ...δέχεται: ὀλός is not subject to the rule prescribing recessive accentuation since it is τριγενής. In other sources it occurs only in the vocative (Alcman fr. 116, EM 622.45, 622.46, 622.47).

96.9 ὑπέρ...συλλαβάς: As the rule stands there are no examples of words with more than two syllables. It is possible that initially the Herodianic rule also included words with more than two syllables, which the epitomator left out for reasons of brevity, or a scribe by mistake. Thus, originally the rule might have said δισύλλαβά τε καὶ ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς, and possibly the epitomator kept this although he had not kept any examples with more than two syllables. Then, at some point in the transmission of the text δισύλλαβα might have been omitted, but ὑπέρ δύο συλλαβάς remained without being
exemplified by words with more than two syllables. A passage from Theognostus (Can. II 61.14-23 (= 330)), which is parallel to that of our Epitome (see the citation in the apparatus of parallel passages), reinforces the assumption that initially the rule included examples with more than two syllables as well as disyllables.

97.1 Ἰλος...διεστραμμένος: The word for διεστραμμένος ('distorted, perverse') is Ἰλλός, not Ἰλός as the manuscripts transmit. I have thus adopted Lehrs' emendation Ἰλλός here ((1833), 290; see also the previous note). Someone could have remembered the oxytone word Ἰλλός when he read Ἰλος (τὸ κύριον) and thus added Ἰλλός δὲ ὁ διεστραμμένος. Then, another scribe could have written Ἰλός instead of Ἰλλός, either influenced by the occurrence of one λ in Ἰλος, or because he thought that the two words needed to have exactly the same shape and be distinguished only by their accentuation.

97.2 μύλος: This word has short υ, and therefore should not have been cited here. Either one has to accept that Herodian made a mistake in including this example here, or μύλος is a later addition by a scribe and should thus be deleted.

97.8 Βήλος: A personal name (LGPN IV).

97.8 Σφήλος: The manuscripts' φήλος is a rare adjective meaning
'deceitful' (Hsch. ϕ 344, Su. ϕ 265, Et. Gen. α 1038.7-8, EM 130.51-2, 160.40), which is unsuitable here, because a proper name is required. Lobeck’s emendation Σφήλος is called κύριον ὄνομα in sch. Hom. II. 15.338a.2-3, Theognost. Can. II 61.7-8 (= 328.9-10), Eust. II. III 738.19-20, Su. σ 1738, while the Iliad (15.338) tells us more specifically that this is a personal name.

97.15 δαυλός: an alternative form for δαλός.

98.1 Βραυλός: This proper name occurs nowhere else. The personal names Πραυλός (Πραυλός; LGPN I, IIIA, IIIB, VA) and Καυλός (LGPN II) are close to the transmitted reading, but such an emendation is not supported by parallel passages.

98.5 τὸ¹...δεύνεται: τραυλός is a genuine exception because it fulfils all the conditions mentioned in the rule, but does not display recessive accentuation.

98.5-6 καὶ...δειλός: The citation of δειλός in this accentuation rule is suspect, since the rule is about adjectives in -λος that have a diphthong with υ before -λος. δειλός does not have a diphthong with υ and so should not have been mentioned. καὶ τὸ δειλός here might have been introduced in the text under the influence of the phrase καὶ τὸ δειλός δεύνεται a bit earlier in the text (97.5). It is possible that the word intended here was the noun δαυλός (not the
adjective δαυλός; on the accent of the adjective see Radt (1982), 243-4), and that the purpose of its citation was that δαυλός is not recessive, because it is not an adjective as the rule prescribes.

98.9 Ψύλλος…κύριον: A personal name (LGPN IIIA, VA).

98.17–99.1 Τά…99.1 βαρύνεται: My edition of the text presents for the first time this part of the text, which does not appear in either of the two previous editions, while Lentz added ἴλλος (from AO I 338.26-7), κιλλός (from ll. Pros. 16.234), and ἀλλος (from ll. Pros. 16.234 and Ep. Cr. I 45.32-4). Barker and Schmidt based their editions on the text of B and C, which omit this part because of the homoeoteleuton (saut du même au même) with the previous section that ends with βαρύνεται. Schmidt also used some readings from A, but since he did not see the manuscript himself, he failed to offer this part of the text, which A has.

98.18 ἴλλος: I have emended manuscripts’ σιλλός into ἴλλος. A parallel passage from the Etymologicum Magnum (680.44-6; see the apparatus of parallel passages), which presents ἴλλος right before ψελλός and in the vicinity of ἀλλος, reinforces my conjecture. σιλλός is a mistaken form for σύλλος, which could not have been cited here because as a noun it is not τριγενές, being recessive. ἴλλος could easily have become σιλλός, either under the influence of
σίλλος in the previous accentuation rule, or because a scribe duplicated the σ at the end of the previous word ψελλός.

99.1–2 σεσημείωται...2 ἐθνοῦς: In the previous editions of this Epitome the phrase σεσημείωται ... ἐθνοῦς appears right after the section on the προσηγορικά, because of the omission of the accentuation rule on the τριγενή in the manuscripts which the previous editors used (see also the above note on 98.17–99.1 Τὰ ... βαρύνεται). Ψύλλος is an ethnic designation and thus it is τριγενές, so the right place for it to appear is at the end of the accentuation rule on the τριγενή, not in the previous one on the προσηγορικά.

99.8–9 σεσημείωται...9 ὀξυνόμενον: μοχλός is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule, it does not follow the prescribed accentuation.

99.11 κίαλλος: The reading of the manuscripts occurs nowhere else.

Both suggested emendations by Lobeck are possible and there is no evidence to support one against the other. The text cannot be reconstructed with certainty here. βίαλλος, a reading which occurs only in the Etymologicum Symeonis (I 390.22-3), would also be possible here, if, of course, this is a genuine word and not a mistake in the manuscripts. It seems, at least, that the etymology given to βίαλλος in the Etymologicum Symeonis, namely ἥ βίον ἄλλον ποιοῦσα,
justifies the existence of such a word (βι - αλλο - κ). In my view βιαλλος is more likely than Lobeck’s emendations, because κ and β are often confused in minuscule. A word βιαλλίς occurs in the 
*Etymologicum Genuinum* (β 21.3) and the *Etymologicum Magnum* 
(186.35), and is explained by the phrase ἐπεί (ἐπειδὴ EM) δοκεῖ βιον ἄλλον ποιεῖν. The similar explanations provided for βιαλλος and 
βιαλλίς, as well as the fact that they only differ with regard to their 
termination, suggest that βιαλλος is a variant form for βιαλλίς. 
βιαλλίς appears in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum 
Magnum* in the lemma βάλλις, a plant which δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἀναζήν 
tοὺς τεθνεώτας. βάλλις appears earlier in our text (51.10–11), with 
the information εἶδος ἀνθους, ο δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἀναζήν τὸν νεκρὸν. 
The explanations provided for βάλλις in our Epitome on the one 
hand, and in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* and the *Etymologicum 
Magnum* on the other, are close to each other, and it seems that all 
three texts have derived the information from the same or a similar 
source, if one of the three is not the source for the other two, or, at 
least, one of the other two. This observation suggests that βιαλλος, if 
indeed a variant form for βιαλλίς, could have appeared in 
Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, as well as βάλλις, because βάλλις and 
βιαλλίς/βιαλλος are linked together in the etymological lexica, and
if Herodian quoted βάλλις, it is possible that the source where he
derived βάλλις from, contained also βίαλλος and ή βίαλλις.

99.13–14 προβαλλός...14 ἀσπίς: προβαλλός is a rare word. It
occurs again together with the gloss ἀσπίς in Hesychius (π 3334) and
Photius (π 450.1; accented on the antepenultimate).

99.18 περίαλλος...ισχίον: περίαλλος is a rare synonym for ἵσχιον,
and occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical texts. The
word occurs again together with the gloss ἵσχιον in Hesychius (π
1572), Photius (π 414.22, spelled περίαλλος), the Suda (π 1063, spelled
περίαλλος), and the Synagogē (Σα π 320, spelled περίαλλος).

99.19 κραπαταλλός...νόμισματος: Our Epitome, Pollux (9.83.1-3,
spelled κραπαταλός), Hesychius (κ 3971, spelled κραπαταλός), and
Photius (κ 1054, spelled κραπαταλός) all provide us with the
meaning νόμισμα for κραπαταλλός, while Hesychius provides us
with another two meanings, μωρός (κ 3971) and a kind of fish (κ
3970).

100.2 Μύσκελλος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA (Μύσκελός LGPN
IIIB)).

100.3 Σόφιλλος: A personal name (LGPN II, IIIB).

100.3 δύριλλος: The manuscripts' δύριλλος occurs nowhere else.
The ὅφο variation is frequent in manuscripts and this is also true of
the manuscripts of our Epitome. δόριλλος is both a common noun (an alternative form for δορίλλος, δορίςλος, δορύλλος) and a personal name (LGPN I, II). I have not capitalised it to allow for both possibilities.

100.3 ὀπτίλλος: A Doric form for ὀφθαλμός.

100.4 καὶ...θηλυκόν: This is an instance where a condition is not mentioned in the rule itself, but we only learn of it later on, when an exception is mentioned (see also note on 1.17–21 δεῖ ... ὑπάρχη). At the beginning of the rule it could have been mentioned that the rule does not apply to feminine words, or that to be subject to the rule words need to be μονογενή.

100.4 νεογιλλός: An alternative form for νεογιλός.

100.6 μακράν: See note on 74.1 μακράν.

100.6 Κώδαλος: A personal name (Hippon. fr. 118.12, *151A.1, Ath. 14.18.37, II.ii 130.12, Diogenian. 5.69.1, Hsch. κ 4776).

100.8 σεσημείωται...Θεσσαλός: Even though the antepenultimate is ‘long by position’ (there is a short vowel in a closed syllable), and thus the two words fulfil the conditions for the rule, they are nevertheless oxytone. Thus, ὀμφαλός and Θεσσαλός may be regarded as genuine exceptions.

100.12 πίαλος: This rare word occurs again in sch. Opp. H. II 10.12,
Hsch. π 2242, EM 780.7. Hesychius tells us that πίαλος means παφάλευκος.

100.12 Φίγαλος: A mythological personal name: Paus. 8.3.1.6, 8.3.2.1, 8.5.7.5, 8.39.2.2, 8.39.2.8.

100.12–13 το…13 δένεται: Ἰταλός does not follow the rule prescribing recessive accentuation because it has a distinct feminine form.

100.17 Ἰταλός: Ἰταλός has long i and cannot therefore have been cited as an example of this accentuation rule. The emendations suggested by Schmidt 61.16-9 (app. crit.) are suitable but there is no particular evidence to support either of the two. The appearance of ἴταλός here might have been influenced by the word’s appearance in the previous rule (100.13).

100.17 Μέγαλος: This is a personal name (LGPN IIIA, IIIB), and therefore it does not follow the accentuation of the τριγενή in -αλος.

101.1 ει…γένοιτο: No examples of this condition are cited.

101.2 κυψέλος: Both a common noun and a personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA).

101.4 δειπλός: MO’s mistake δειλός may be easily excused.

Manuscript A could have easily arrived at the right reading by deliberate correction or chance, especially given the occurrence of
the gloss δειλίνων (written with ει) after δειλός. δειλός is usually recessive, but Herodian prescribes oxytone accentuation here. On the accent of δειλός see the discussion in Probert (2006), 372-3.

101.7 μακράν: See note on 74.1 μακράν.

101.8 ευτράπελος: This word does not have a heavy antepenultimate syllable, but is nevertheless listed as an example of this accentuation rule. This word might have been included in Herodian’s list because it fulfils all the conditions of the rule, apart from that of the long antepenultimate, or might have been added by the epitomator or a scribe who remembered this word when he was writing the other words in this list.

101.11 στροβελος: This word occurs only in our Epitome and in Hesychius (σ 2015), where it is glossed as σοβάρως, τοφερός.

101.11 θκεφαλος: MO’s κεφαλός is not suitable here because the termination dealt with in this accentuation rule is -ελός. It is possible that κεφαλός is the corrupt form of a word that was cited, together with ζάφελος, as an example of compounds (e.g. ἐκνέφελος, ἄνεφελος, ἀστυφελος) that are proparoxytone. The text cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

101.13 ⊲ Schmidt’s suggestion that προσηγορικα ἢ κύρια is missing from the rule, on the basis of a passage from Herodian’s Περι
Ionic προσωφίας (Σ 580 = sch. Hom. II. 18.580b1), should be reconsidered. Both the Homeric scholion and a passage from Theognostus (Can. II 61.32-62.2 (= 333)) suggest that the original Herodianic rule contained some examples that were proper names. As the rule stands in our Epitome, there are no proper names. Thus, adding κύοςα would not correspond to the examples cited. It is possible that for the sake of brevity the epitomator left out the examples that were proper names, and in doing so he also left out the description κύοςα at the beginning of the rule. In this case one does not need to add κύοςα. Another possibility is that the epitomator wrote κύοςα at the beginning of the rule, but then in the process of cutting down some of the material he happened to leave out examples of proper names; later a scribe who observed that there were no proper names quoted left out κύοςα from the beginning of the rule. Both nouns and adjectives are mentioned in the rule as transmitted. Usually in the Epitome, when nouns and adjectives obey the same rule no need is felt to name both προσηγορικά and ἐπίθετα/ἐπιθετικά. The labels προσηγορικά and ἐπίθετα/ἐπιθετικά are added only if there is a distinction with regard to their accentuation (e.g. 82.9–13, 112.5–10).

101.13–102.1 μη...102.1 εὐκηλος: εὐκηλός, in fact, has a feminine
form, but what is meant by μὴ ἔχοντα ἰδια θηλυκά is ‘not having a separate form for the feminine’.

101.13–102.1 μὴ…102.1 θηλυκά: ‘if they do not have a separate feminine form, i.e. if they are two-termination adjectives.’ See the discussion in the Introduction, p. 122.

102.10 Πενθίλος: A personal name (LGPN I).

103.1–2 μύτιλος…2 ἔσχατος: μύτιλος is alternatively written μύτυλος. This rare word occurs again in Theoc. Idyll. 8.86, sch. Theoc. 8.86b, the π.μ.λ. (GG iii.ii 927.6), and Hsch. (μ 1481, μ 1991). The meaning ἔσχατος is also attested in Hesychius (μ 1991 and μ 1481), but he also has the meanings νῆπιος (μ 1991 and μ 1481) and νέος (μ 1991).

103.6 στροβιλός: This word (glossed as συστροφή τοῦ ἐχίνου) occurs nowhere else.

103.7 ἔσβιλος: This word occurs nowhere else. Schmidt’s assumption that ἔσβιλος equals ἔσβηνες is not supported by the ancient sources. Lobeck’s conjectures σέσιλος and ἵσπνιλος (sometimes spelled εἶσπνιλος or εἰσπνηλος in ancient sources) are close to the transmitted reading, but are not supported by any parallels.

103.7–8 Πάμμιλος…8 σύμφωνα: Πάμμιλος has an α in the antepenultimate syllable and before it there is a consonant, and thus
the statement of the rule would lead one to expect Πάμμιλος not to be subject to the rule prescribing proparoxytone accentuation. When we get to the point where Πάμμιλος is cited as a proparoxytone example we read ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν συλλήψει τὰ σύμφωνα (‘but the consonants are not taken together’). This condition is added in order to explain why Πάμμιλος is proparoxytone even though it falls under the exemption announced at the beginning of the rule, while Καδμίλος is an ordinary exception. So this condition limiting a set of exceptions to the rule is given not at the beginning of the rule, but at the moment when the specific example to which it refers is cited. See also the discussion of the relevant section of the epitomator’s introduction (1.17–21 δεὶ ... ὑπάρχῃ).

103.7 Πάμμιλος: In Hude’s edition of Thucydides 6.4.2 and of the scholion to 6.4.2 we read Πάμμιλον (attested in manuscript G) as in our Epitome, while Jones prints the reading of manuscripts A, B, C, E, M Πάμμιλλον.

103.8 συλλήψει: See the discussion of this grammatical term in the Introduction, p. 119.

103.8–9 Καδμίλος...9 Ἐμης: Καδμίλος is usually identified with Ἐμης in the ancient sources (e.g. sch. Lyc. 162, 219, Choerob. De Orthogr. 229.13; cf. Eust. ii. I 771.30-772.1). For the relation of
Kαδμίλος with other mythological people see RE 10.1458-60 s. v. Kadmilos, DNP 6.129 s. v. Kadmilos, BNP 2.867 s. v. Cadmilus.

103.11 Ασβόλος: For information on this mythological name see RE 2.1519.

103.13–14 βουκόλος...14 παροξύτονον: βουκόλος does not display proparoxytone accentuation, because it is a compound word.

103.14 τὸ...ὄξυνεται: ὀβόλος is a genuine exception because, although it fulfils the conditions mentioned in the rule, it is not proparoxytone.

104.2 κρωβύλος: The manuscripts’ κροκύλος is unsuitable here, because the rule prescribes that the antepenultimate vowel should be long. I have adopted TGL’s emendation to κρωβύλος, which is supported by three parallel passages (Theognost. Can. II 61.14-23 (= 330), Et. Gud. α 14.4-7, EM 11.5-6, Et. Sym. I 36.12-4; see the apparatus of parallel passages). κρωβύλος is both a common noun and a personal name (LGPN II, IIIA, VA); in order to allow for both possibilities I have not capitalised the first letter.

104.3 σεσημεύωτai...ὀγκυλος: βαίτυλος is a genuine exception because, although it fulfils the conditions for the rule, it is not paroxytone. In order for ὀγκυλος to have been a genuine exception, the rule should have read ἑπὸ φύσει ἑ θέσει μακρὰς’. One might
think that the addition of Ṯ θέσει would solve the problem here, but there is an obstacle to this solution: ὅγκυλος is attested neither as a common noun nor as a proper name; ὅγκυλον in Hesychius (ο 49) is glossed by σεμνόν and γαῦρον, which points towards an adjective. A number of emendations would have been possible here, e.g. Ἀγκυλος (LGPN II) or ᾨγυλος (St. Byz. 706.3). None of these conjectures are reinforced by parallel passages, but it should be noted that, (i) Ἀγκυλος is at least palaeographically very close to the transmitted ὅγκυλος, and that (ii) the fact that three parallel passages (Et. Gud. α 14.4-7, and EM 11.5-6, Et. Sym. I 36.12-4) cite ἀγκύλος in the vicinity of Αἰσχύλος, could suggest that Ἀγκυλος as well as ἀγκύλος were both cited in the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσῳδίας in the corresponding rule, as often in Pseudo-Arcadius, where adjectives and proper names are often presented side by side to show that the accent distinguishes their meaning (e.g. Λαμπρός - λάμπρος 138.21-22, Φρύγιος - Φρυγίος 73.2-3). It is noteworthy, nevertheless, that if Ἀγκυλος is the right reading here, one would still need to add ἦ θέσει to the condition for the rule.

104.3 βαίτυλος: The manuscripts' αἵτυλος occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihil. I have corrected the reading into βαίτυλος on the basis of a passage from Theognostus (Can. II 61.20-2 (= 330.7-9)),
which although it has Βετύλος, an incorrect spelling for βαίτυλος, quotes the meaning of the word as ὁ λίθος ὃν ὁ Κρόνος κατέπιεν, and thus shows that βαίτυλος is the word meant.

104.3 ὅγκυλος: See note on σεσημείωσαι ... ὅγκυλος above (104.3).

104.6 μακράν: See note in 74.1 μακράν.

104.14–15 Βακχύλος...15 Χαρμύλος: Personal names (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IV, VA and LGPN I, II, IIIA respectively).

104.19–105.1 εἰ...105.1 ἰσοσυλλάβοις: ‘if there is I in the antepenultimate syllable, unless a word is a derivative that has the same number of syllables as the word it is derived from’. εἰ ἐχοι ... τὸ I and εἰ μὴ ... ἰσοσυλλάβοις are two conditions for the proparoxytone accentuation of the words that have three short syllables and end in -υλος. What makes the second condition less clear is the way it is introduced. It would have been clearer if this condition was introduced by ἡ εἰή. The way εἰ μὴ εἰή follows εἰ ἐχοι it as if the second condition is dependent on the first condition, but it is not obvious why this link between the two conditions is to be made. The awkward linking of εἰ ἐχοι ... τὸ I with εἰ μὴ εἰή ... ἰσοσυλλάβοις could be due to the epitomator, but seems to be tolerable in terms of the comprehension of the rule. Schmidt (64.12) thought that there was a lacuna after τὸ I. Schmidt’s proposed
addition (64.12 app. crit.) is plausible, and corresponds to the order in which the examples appear, first the proparoxytone examples, then the paroxytone ones and then the παρώνυμον Στάφυλος, but τὰ δὲ μὴ οὔτως seems a bit unnatural at that point of the text. In the four cases where the phrase τὰ δὲ μὴ οὔτως occurs in the Epitome (55.6, 107.23-4 (Schmidt), 118.6-7 (Schmidt), 189.8-9 (Schmidt)) it appears just before the specific group of examples that do not follow the rule prescribed, not in the main phrasing of the rule. τὰ δὲ μὴ οὔτως seems redundant at the place where Schmidt suggests its addition, i.e. the kind of superfluous information that the epitomator would most probably not include in our Epitome, even if it ever existed in the original work.

105.1 τίτυλος: This word occurs only in our Epitome and Theognostus (Can. II 61.22 (= 330.9)).

105.2 Ἰτυλος: The manuscripts’ ἱστυλος occurs nowhere else. I have adopted Göttling’s emendation Ἰτυλος, which is a mythological personal name.

105.4–5 τὸ…5 σταφυλῆ: Στάφυλος is a παρώνυμον ἐν ἰσοσυλλάβοις (‘a derivative that has the same number of syllables as the noun it is derived from’), and therefore it is proparoxytone even though it does not have an I in the antepenultimate syllable.
105.5–6 καὶ...6 προσαρωξύνεται: Ἀγκυλος is proparoxytone as a proper name, differently from the paroxytone adjective ἀγκύλος. Since the phrasing of the rule does not generally exclude the κύων from proparoxytone accentuation, one would have expected the beginning of the rule to have given a condition that applies to Ἀγκυλος. On the other hand, the fact that Ἀγκυλος does not have I in the antepenultimate syllable does not justify its accent, unless Ἀγκυλος is regarded as a παρώνυμον ἐν ἴσοσυλλάβοις (Ἀγκυλος may be thought to be a παρώνυμον of ἀγκύλη, with which it has an equal number of syllables). Alternatively, the accentuation of Ἀγκυλος may be justified on the basis of its distinction from the adjective ἀγκύλος. In fact, this would explain the mention of the fact that Ἀγκυλος is a proper name, although nothing was stated at the beginning of the rule regarding words that have the same form, but are accented differently so that a distinction is made between their different meanings. See the discussion of the epitomator’s Preface where I discuss conditions that are not stated at the beginning of a rule but emerge during the course of a rule (1.17–21 δεὶ... ὑπάρχη).

105.9 ἰαμβύλος: This word occurs only in our Epitome and Hesychius (τ.45).

106.1 ἀνθυρόσωλος: The manuscripts’ ἀνθυρόσωλος occurs nowhere
else. A number of emendations have been suggested (see the critical apparatus). I am in favour of Schmidt’s emendation on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 62.28 - 63.2 (=338.1-8)).

106.3–6 τὸ ἑ… διαστάσει: For a discussion of the grammatical terms σύλληψις and διάστασις, and of their occurrence in this passage see the Introduction, pp. 119-21.

106.8 μακράν: One should understand both ‘φύσει’ and ‘θέσει’. Otherwise this will not be true for ἀμαρτωλός (this has short α but is in a closed syllable). See also note on 74.1 μακράν, and the discussion of syllables and syllable division in the Introduction, pp. 118-21.

106.14 κούμουλος: I have kept the reading of MO, differently from Schmidt, who printed Lobeck’s emendation Κάμουλος (PSGP 132). κούμουλος is the Greek form of cumulus (‘heap, pile’), borrowed from Latin. Johnson - West (1949), 289, 296 mention that κούμουλοι referred to a fee paid to the ship captains. κούμουλος occurs again in Cleopatra (De ponder. et mensur. 80.7), Epiphanius (De mensur. et ponder. (exc. Graec. 4) 87.12), and Zonaras (σ 1631.12). The word κούμουλον (‘a measure, one thirtieth of an artaba’ or a kind of ‘tax or levy’, LSJ revised supplement), which appears to have been an alternative form for κούμουλος, and thus another transliteration for
the latin *cumulus*, occurs in the papyri *P. Oxy.* 3395, l. 12 (371 AD; the papyrus actually has *κούμηλα*), *P. Oxy.* 4346, l. 8 (380 AD; *κούμουλον*), *P. Oxy.* 3481, l. 10 (442 AD; the actual reading of the papyrus is *κούμελα*), *SB* 24, 16270, l. 7 (341 AD; the papyrus in fact has *κού*), *P. Jena* II, 8, l. 14 (5th - 6th cent. AD; the papyrus’ actual reading is *κούμαλα*), *P. Vindob.* G 13933v.10 (=*ZPE* 32, 255, 4th cent. AD), *P. Flor.* 75.21 (380 AD). Johnson - West (1949), 158-9 fail to link *κούμουλοι* with *κούμουλα*, saying that ‘the *κούμουλα* are otherwise unknown but may be some form of *sportula*’. The *LBG* s. v. *κούμουλος* provides us with the meaning ‘*voll, gehäuft*’.

106.24 σκιαδιός: This word occurs nowhere else.

106.25 ἰΚύνος: MO’s reading is unsuitable here, because the rule is about words ending in -δος. A’s Κύνος is probably due to the scribe (who noticed that words in this list ought to end in -μος), but occurs nowhere else. I have conjectured Εὐκαδιός, but with some reserve. Thus, I have kept Κύνος with a *crux*.

107.2–3 σεσημείωσα...3 βαρυνόμενον: κρίθμος is an alternative spelling for κρήθμος. According to Eustathius (*ll.* II. 148.13–149.1; see the apparatus of parallel passages) Homer’s commentators said that κρήθμος was recessive, while in copies of Lycophon the word is oxytone. At Lycophon’s *Alexandra* 238 most manuscripts have
κρηθμοῖι, but two (Coislinianus 345 = Parisinus 345 (A in Kinkel’s edition, B in Mascialino’s edition) and Palatinus Graecus 218 (E in Mascialino)) have κρηθμωῖι.

107.6 Τρωκμός: Strabo (12.5.1.3, 12.5.2.1, 12.5.2.10, 12.3.39.32) and Stephanus of Byzantium (639.11-2) mention the ethnic designation Τρωκμός, which is probably intended to be the same as the reading here. Τρωκμός is only attested in our Epitome.

107.13 βροσμός: Βροσμός is the name of a King (EM 249.16-7), but is unsuitable here, because the rule is about common nouns. ὄνυσμός and βρασμός, which Schmidt conjectures (see the critical apparatus), would have been equally possible. The text cannot be reconstructed with certainty here.

107.15 ἵνα φύγωμεν: ‘in order to avoid’.

107.15 Κροίσμος: The name is attested at Iliad 15.523.

107.16 Κάσμος: This name is attested in two inscriptions from Phrygia (Alt. v. Hierapolis 291/292 and Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics 143, 31).

107.17 <οὐκ...μόνον>: This phrase is unsuitable after Κάσμος, where it is transmitted, and was probably transposed here from its original place after κρουσμός (in which case, as Schmidt points out - see the critical apparatus- one ought to read ἔχον instead of ἔχοντα).
The fact that Κροίσμος and Κάσμος are not common nouns but proper names is the reason why they are not oxytone, but recessive. The exception for words that are recessive when they have O before Σ in the penultimate syllable applies to common nouns, which would otherwise be oxytone, and does not concern proper names. In any case, the name Κάσμος does not even have an O before -σμος, and therefore it would not make sense to have the phrase οὐκ ἔχον[τα] τὸ Ο μόνον referring to it. With the citation of οὐκ ἔχον τὸ O μόνον, the meaning is that κρουσμός is oxytone, because unlike κόσμος, which has the O alone before -σμος, κρουσμός has the O together with ο, not alone. The transposition of this phrase after κρουσμός makes sense, because this condition shows why κρουσμός is oxytone although it has O in the penultimate. It is possible that the phrase οὐκ ἔχον[τα] τὸ O μόνον was later added by a scribe on the basis of the phrase μὴ ἔχοντα ... εἰς O μόνον καταλήγον at the beginning of the rule. If this assumption is correct, the phrase οὐκ ἔχονται τὸ O μόνον should be deleted.

107.18 τὸ...ὄν: The fact that σύνδεσμος is said not to be oxytone because it is a compound might suggest that the beginning of the rule should have mentioned that oxytone accentuation applies only to uncompounded words (see the note on 107.10 λήγοντα in the
critical apparatus, with Schmidt’s proposed addition of ἀπλά). Nevertheless, it is possible, as happens in other similar cases in Pseudo-Arcadius’ Epitome, that a condition for the rule is not given at the beginning, but is later stated when an exception is cited (see note on 1.17–21 δεί ... υπάρχη in the epitomator’s preface). It is likely that the epitomator did not write ἀπλά at the beginning of the rule, because he thought that readers would easily infer from what they would read later about σύνδεσμος, that the oxytone accentuation applied only to uncompounded words. However, the Περί καθολικῆς προσφοβίας might have included the word ἀπλά at the beginning of the rule, as Choroboscus does in the Epimerismi in psalmos (76.6-7; see the full citation in the apparatus of parallel passages).

108.2–3 τὸ ... βαρύνεται: The manuscripts’ ἀλμος is nowhere else attested as a recessive common noun. An oxytone noun ἀλμός, a gloss for φοίκη, is attested in the Synagoge (Σα φ 199) and the Suda (φ 713), but which on the basis of EM 800.24 should read παλμός in the Synagoge and the Suda. Since no common noun ἀλμος is attested, and since Choroboscus’ Epimerismi in Psalms (1.25-8) and the Etymologicum Magnum (817.27-30) (see the apparatus of parallel passages) mention ὀλμος (= ὀλμος) after ὑσαλμός and ἰνδαλμός, it is
possible that the right reading is Ὄλμος, not Ἀλμος. In this case the corresponding common noun which is also recessive is ὀλμος. The correspondence of Ὄλμος with ὀλμος, a word with a rough breathing, does not create any problems, because the linking is between two words that have the same form (Herodian includes breathings in the prosodies, and this could suggest that the breathing is not considered part of the word, properly speaking), and because, in any case, the word ὀλμος often occurs with a smooth breathing (ὁλμος) in the manuscripts of ancient texts, and it is possible that Herodian shared the view that the word had a smooth breathing. For the breathing of the word ὀλμος see DELG and LSJ s. v.

A scribe could easily have written Ἀλμος instead of Ὄλμος under the influence of the ending -αλμος found in the majority of the preceding examples. The manuscripts’ Ἀλμος can also be explained by the fact that Ἀλμος is a variant form for Ὄλμος (Paus. calls him Ἀλμος in 2.4.3.3, 9.34.10, but Ὄλμος in 9.24.3.6), and perhaps the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσωφίας contained an indication that the name of this mythological person had two alternative forms, but the epitomator in his attempt to cut material down kept Ἀλμος and left Ὄλμος out. Thus the recessive προσηγορικόν implied is ὀλμος, which would correspond to the proper name Ὄλμος.
Schmidt’s conjecture adding Ὄλμος (= Ὀλμος) and keeping Ἀλμος (see the critical apparatus) is plausible, and could in fact represent the text of the Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφορίας, but the phrasing τὸ δὲ ... τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ προσπιρομίκων in the Epitome suggests that only one proper name should be expected here.

108.8 μνάμος: I have retained the manuscripts’ μνάμος with some reserve. μνάμος occurs nowhere else. The word ἀμναμος could have been glossed by ἔκγονος. In other ancient sources ἀμναμος is glossed by ἔγγονος (Hsch. α 3714), νίοῦ νίός (Hsch. α 3715), and ἀπόγονος (sch. Lyc. 144.12, Et. Gen. α 659.1, Su. α 1607, EM 84.44, Et. Sym. I 410.18, Zonar. α 143.5). If ἀμναμος is the reading intended here then we need to assume that there is a lacuna before έτι καὶ τὸ, because ἀμναμος does not end in -μος.

108.11 Κνήμος: The manuscripts’ κρήμος is not otherwise known as a proper name. Κνήμος is a personal name (LPGN IIIA), and is attested in Theognostus (Can. II 63.4 (=339.2)).

108.11 Σήμος: The manuscripts’ φήμος is only attested as a proper name in Theognostus (Can. II 63.5 (= 339.3)). Nauck’s Σήμος is a personal name (LPGN I, II).

108.11 Ρήμος: The manuscripts’ πρῆμος is nowhere else attested as
a proper name. I have adopted Nauck’s Ῥῆμος, which is attested in Theognostus (Can. II 63.5 (= 339.3)).

109.4 ὄμος…σκώληξ: The word ὄμος occurs again, with the gloss σκώληξ ἐν ξύλοις in Hesychius (q 437).

109.7–8 χυμός…8 θυμός: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ θυμός χυμός to χυμός θυμός, in order to allow for θυμός and θύμος, two words of the same form but of different accent, to appear next to each other. It is common in the Epitome to have pairs of words of the same form next to each other so that a distinction is made between their different accents.

109.8 θύμος…κύριον: A personal name (LGPN IV (Θύμος)). I have not capitalised it, because the same word refers to the common noun in this passage.

109.8–10 τὸ2…10 ὀξύνεται: δρυμός is normally oxytone, because it has long ν. I have not capitalised the word because it also refers to the common noun in this passage.

110.2–3 εἰ…3 τάττοιτο: ‘If they are nouns that refer to a substance’. The distinction here seems to be between tangible and intangible nouns, but this is roughly the equivalent to what modern scholars would call concrete and abstract nouns correspondingly, though the criteria for dividing concrete from abstract may be surprising from a
modern point of view. Cf. Ps.-Arcad. 121.4-9 (Schmidt), where the phrase οὐσίαν σημαίνει is exemplified by πέδη, κνίδη and σιδη, which all refer to tangible objects, as opposed to the examples κομιδή (ἡ ἐπιμέλεια), ἀδή (ἡ ἡδονή), φραδή (ἡ βουλή), χλιδή (ὁ κόσμος).

110.4–5 τό...5 βαρύνεται: κῶμος is recessive, because it does not refer to a tangible object.

110.5–6 καὶ²...6 κύριον: The manuscripts’ Ρώμος is a personal name, while βρώμος is a common noun. Therefore, there must be something wrong with the transmitted word order in this phrase, since it does not make sense if the characterization κύριον comes after a common noun. There are three possible solutions to this problem, the first two suggested by Schmidt and the third one by me. According to Schmidt one should either invert the order of Ρώμος and βρώμος, so that κύριον comes right after Ρώμος, or replace βρώμος with the proper name Βώμος. I have replaced the manuscripts’ βρώμος with the proper name Κρώμος. This solution is based on a further suggestion of Schmidt’s (the second one reported in the critical apparatus), changing Ρώμος καὶ βρώμος to βρώμος καὶ Κρώμος. It is uneconomical to reject the manuscripts’ Ρώμος, which is in any case a proper name, so as to keep βρώμος, and then add Κρώμος, which is not attested in the manuscript tradition.
However, my proposal makes use of the suggestion that Κρῶμος is to be read where βρώμος is transmitted. This is attractive on palaeographical grounds since β and κ can interchange in minuscule.

For information on Κρῶμος see RE 11.1975.

110.6–7 ωσπευ...7 ωμος: The manuscripts’ πώλος in connection with words ending in -ωμος is unexpected, and it seems that we are dealing with a scribal error. I have adopted Schmidt’s suggested emendation ὠμος (68.12 app. crit.). Theogostus (Can. 341; see the apparatus of parallel passages) presents ὠμος in the vicinity of ψωμος, ζωμος, and θωμος. ὠμος could have been mentioned here as an example of a word which is not oxytone because it does not start with a consonant; cf. sch. Hom. II. 3.35b1, where ὠμος appears in the vicinity of μważnie. I consider Schmidt’s other suggestion, πρώμος, a bit less likely, because it is not supported by any evidence in the ancient sources, although it is slightly closer to πώλος than ὠμος.

111.2–3 τό...3 βαρύνεται: Δείμος is a genuine exception: it fulfills the conditions for the rule, but is nevertheless recessive. For οίμος one should infer from the condition ἀπὸ συμφώνου ἄρχόμενα that the reason why the word is not oxytone is because it does not start with a consonant.
111.9 φύσει: I have emended θέσει into φύσει. The first syllables (reckoned from the beginning of the word) of Πύραμος and Σήσαμος cannot be called long by position, because they are open syllables (i.e. they are not followed by a consonant). On the other hand, both words have a long first vowel, so the first syllable of each of the two words can be called φύσει μακρά. Two parallel passages (sch. Hom. Il. 24.228a.6-15, Eust. Il. IV 893.6-7; see the apparatus of parallel passages) support this emendation.

112.2 Σήσαμος: I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation of the manuscripts’ σίσαμος to Σήσαμος, which is a personal name (LGPN I, VA). Of Lobeck’s two emendations for transmitted σίσαμος I consider this one more likely than Κίσαμος, because a change of Σήσαμος to Σίσαμος would be an easy iotaistic mistake. The two parallel passages that have σίσαμος instead of Σήσαμος (Et. Gud. π 479.23-5 and EM 688.16-8) could have made the mistake either independently of or under the influence of a Herodianic source common to these texts and Pseudo-Arcadius.

112.5–6 εἰ...6 συμφώνων: The examples do not start with two consonants, so strictly speaking the condition is not met. Two parallel passages that share the examples ὄρχαμος and Πέργαμος (sch. Hom. Il. 24.228a.6-8 and Eust. Il. IV 893.5-6; see the apparatus of
parallel passages) allow us to explain the obscurity in Pseudo-Arcadius. The phrasing of the conditions of both parallel passages says τὰ ἑχοντα τὴν ἀρχουσαν μακραν (θέσει). If we try to combine the two conditions, that is to say the need for a ‘positionally long’ initial syllable as prescribed by the two parallel passages, and the need for two consonants at the beginning of the word, we get the idea that what is meant here is ‘if the first syllable (reckoned from the beginning of the word) is long by position as a result of the vowel of the first syllable being followed by two consonants’.

113.1 Ἐχεμος: A personal name (LGPN VA).

113.5–6 Ἐρημος…6 Ποιητη: For some discussion of this and related passages see Probert (2004), 283-5.

113.6 παρα…ποιητη: In Homer; see also Probert (2004), 283-5.

113.6 Ἰμος: The manuscripts’ Ἰμος is attested again at the Etymologicum Gudianum (τ 269.7), but it seems to be just an intermediate form that serves to derive ἰάλμος from ἴμιλ. λίμος in Hesychius is a hapax which is very close to the manuscripts’ Ἰμος, but there is no special reason why one should adopt this reading, and thus the text cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

113.12 Ἰνδομος: This rare word occurs again in the Etymologicum
Genuinum (a 825.3), the Etymologicum Magnum (102.44) and Zonaras (d 508.17).

113.13 ὑέμος: This is nowhere else attested, and could be a vox nihili. Dindorf’s emendation Δίομος is supported by two parallel passages (Et. Gen. a 825, EM 102.43-7), where Δίομος appears in the vicinity of ἀνθρωμός and κέρτομος. ὑέμος attested in the Suda (d 240) is closer to the manuscripts’ ὑέμος, since it requires the change of a single letter, but is not supported by any parallels.

113.14 ἁγγικόμος: M’s ἁγιονόμος and O’s ἁγιοκόμος are scribal errors. Lentz’ emendation of ἁγιονόμος to ἁγιονόμος is plausible, but I have written ἁγγικόμος, which is an emendation of O’s ἁγιοκόμος. ἁγγικόμος is more difficult and less frequent than ἁγιονόμος.

114.3 ἔφυμος: This rare word occurs again at Theognostus Can. II 64.31 (= 346.4) and the Etymologicum Magnum 603.13 (see the apparatus of parallel passages). Hesychius (e 6096) has ἔφυμος glossed by Ζεύς, ἄγυος (‘yoke, cross-bar’), and ζεύγη (‘loop attached to the yoke, yoke, cross-bar’). Theognostus presents ἔφυμος as an alternative form for ὑύμος (‘pole of a chariot or car, log, block’). ἔφυμος is probably the same as Hesychius ἔφυμος; the accentuation
of the Hesychius manuscript should not be trusted (see also note on 19.1 οἰρών).

114.4 κωλυμός: The manuscripts’ κωλυμός occurs nowhere else. I have adopted Lobeck’s emendation κωλυμός (PGG 423), which is supported by a parallel passage from the Epimerismi Homerici (v 47); see the full citation in the apparatus of parallel passages). A scribe could easily have made an orthographical error at a time when both ω and o were pronounced [o]. κωλυμός occurs again only in the Epimerismi Homerici and in Didymus Caecus’ Commentarii in Psalms 29-34 (226.2, but transmitted with the accent on the antepenultimate).

It is probably a synonym for κωλύμα and κωλύμη.

114.7–8 κυδομός...8 ταραχή: ή ταραχή is a gloss, which refers to κυδομός, and thus should have appeared right after κυδομός. There are two pieces of evidence for considering that ἀθροισμός and ἀφλοισμός are not genuine readings. Firstly, they do not end in -ομος as the rule prescribes but in -οιμος, and secondly their position which dislocates κυδομός from its gloss ή ταραχή. ἀθροισμός and ἀφλοισμός have probably been added by a scribe, and thus should be deleted. The insertion of ἀθροισμός and ἀφλοισμός must have happened in two steps: firstly a scribe might have added the two words in the margin, and then someone else
decided to incorporate them into the main text, but added them clumsily between κυδοιμός and ἡ ταραξή.

115.2 ἀλύδοιμος...οἰκτρός: ἀλύδοιμος is a rare word: it occurs again in Hesychius (α 3284) and Theognostus (Can. II 65.5 (= 347.6); see the apparatus of parallel passages). Hesychius gives πικρός as a gloss for ἀλύδοιμος, not οἰκτρός as in our Epitome. As Kaibel ((1899), 176, fr. 139) observed, in the Suda (α 1426) (and also in Zonar. α 123.15) instead of ἀλύδοιμος ὁ οἰκουρός one should probably read ἀλύδοιμος ὁ οἰκτρός, as in our Epitome.

115.5–6 τὸ...6 θηλυκόν: λάγνος is not oxytone, because it is not used of females.

115.9–116.1 τῶν...116.1 ἄντιστοιχῶν: Here this term refers to the unaspirated voiceless stops κ-π-τ and the corresponding aspirated consonants χ-φ-θ. On the term ἄντιστοιχα see also note on 47.4 <> ἐσθής.

116.5 μόρφυνος...μέλας: The meaning of the word μόρφυνος is doubtful. Several meanings are attested in ancient sources: (i) μέλας is attested at our Epitome, D sch. Hom. ll. 12.316, Eust. ll. IV 910.21, Zonar. μ 1368.6-7, μ 1371.23 (this latter passage has also the synonym σκοτεινός together with the Suda μ 1268), EM 591.20; (ii) ὁ ταχύς καὶ δυνατός καταλαβεῖν is attested at Orion μ 103.11-4 and EM
591.19-20 (in this passage we also read the synonym ὁ καταλαμβάνων); an *Iliad* scholion deriving from Herodian (sch. Hom. *Il. 24.316a1.4-5*) gives us the variation ὁ συλλαμβάνων (this scholion provides us also with the synonym ταχύς without the rest of the supplement); cf. the meanings ἄρσαξ at D sch. Hom. *Il. 24.316*, συλληπτικός τῶν διωκομένων at Eust. *Il. IV 910.22*; (iii) φόνιος is mentioned at D sch. Hom. *Il. 24.316*, Orion μ 103.11-4, Eust. *Il. IV 910.18-9, EM 591.24*; Zonaras (μ 1368.7-9) has the phrase ὁ ἐπιφέρων τοῖς ὀρνυτὶ φόνον; (iv) the meaning ‘kind of eagle’ is attested at D sch. Hom. *Il. 24.316*, Hsch. μ 1694, Σα μ 270 (lemma μορφών), Phot. μ 542, *Su. μ 1269*, and Zonar. μ 1368.4; (v) the meaning ἐφισοφός is provided by Eustathius (*Il. IV 910.20*). In addition to the uncertainty about its meaning, μόρφος is sometimes taken to be an adjective and sometimes a noun in the ancient sources. The passage of our Epitome is interesting because it shows that Herodian took the word to be an adjective. On the meaning and the status of μόρφος either as an adjective or a noun see also the notes on μόρφος in Probert (2006), 356 and 362-3.

117.2 ἐπιθετικωτέρον: ‘rather adjective-like’.

117.6 Τύμνος: The manuscripts’ τέμνος is an intermediate stage in ancient etymologies for τέμνος (see *Et. Gud. τ 525.42-3*, EM
751.42-3), but I doubt that Herodian would have cited an intermediate form as an example. I have adopted Schmidt's suggested emendation Τύμνος (71.9 app. crit.), the name of a city in Caria (St. Byz. 641.11).

117.7–8 στυμνός...8 σκληρός: στυμνός is a rare word; it occurs again in Hesychius (σ 2078, also with the gloss σκληρός is attested here as well) and in the Fragmenta Alchemica (P. Holm., fr. 107.4).

117.11 Λάτυμνος: A Laconian or Crotonian mountain (see sch. Theoc. 4.19b).

117.11 Λύκαμνος: This word is nowhere else attested. There is no evidence to support Schmidt's emendation Λύραμνος (71.13 app. crit.).

117.12 Λίσυμνος: A personal name (LGPN IV).

117.16 Κύννος: A mythological personal name: Apollod. Epit. 7.28.4 (accented Κύννος), St. Byz. 393.19.

117.17 Δάτυννος: The manuscripts' δάθυννος occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihil. I have conjectured Δάτυννος, which is a personal name (LGPN IIIB). Δάτυννος could easily have become δάθυννος under the influence of the word θύννος earlier on. A number of other emendations are possible (see the critical apparatus), but Δάτυννος is the closest to the manuscripts' reading.
118.4 Φαλέφνος Πατέφνος: The accent of these two words is
sometimes proparoxytone in other sources where it occurs (for the
proparoxytone accent of Φαλέφνος see Plb. 3.90.11.1, Str. 5.3.6.60,
5.4.3.34, App. Bell. civ. 1.6.47.1, M. Ant. 6.13.1.3, sch. Luc. 73.23.6; for
the proparoxytone accent of Πατέφνος see D. C. 72.5.2.4, Hist. rom.
magistr. pop. rom. 20.2, 74.18, Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus De
virtut. et vit. II, 375.16). It is noteworthy that the accent prescribed by
Pseudo-Arcadius is the Latin position of the accent. On the
accentuation of Latin loan words in Greek see the discussion in
Probert (2006), 132-6, where it is argued that the paroxytone accent
Pseudo-Arcadius prescribes for Φαλέφνος and Πατέφνος shows that
sometimes the Latin accent was retained when a word was borrowed
into Greek. Clarysse (1997) and Kramer (1998) have argued, against
Wackernagel (1926, 57-9) that the position of the Latin accent never
influences the accentuation of a Latin word borrowed into Greek. For
criticism of this view as too extreme see Radt (1998, 1999), and again
the discussion in Probert (2006), 132-6.

118.7 Τάνος: A city in Crete (St. Byz. 602.1).

118.7 Θανός: The manuscripts’ πάνος occurs nowhere else, and is a
falsa lectio for θανός (see LSJ s. v.).
118.9 φανός: This is an example of both groups of words that are oxymoron, since it is both an adjective ('bright') and a common noun ('torch'), whose oxymoron accent distinguishes it from the personal name Φάνος/Φάνος (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, VA).

118.9–10 τὸ...βαρύνεται: πλάνος is recessive even though it is an adjective.

118.10 καὶ...μικρός: In other sources (sch. Clem. Alexandr. 337.25, Choerob. De Orthogr. 239.21) νᾶνος is glossed by μικρός ἄνθρωπος.

119.2 Σφήνος...τόπος: The manuscripts’ Φήνος is a river name according to Theognostus (Can. II 65.31 (= 352.5)), not a place name. Theognostus (Can. II 65.28-9 (= 352.2-3)) says that Σφήνος is a place name. I have written Σφήνος, differently from Schmidt (72.9) who retained the inconsistency between Φήνος and ὁ τόπος, providing two suggestions in his apparatus. I disagree with Schmidt’s first suggestion, while I consider the second reasonable but not especially likely. Schmidt’s first suggestion is weak, because it is a lot easier to imagine that a careless scribe omitted the initial sigma of Σφήνος due to haplography (Τῆνος ends in sigma and Σφήνος begins with sigma) than that the epitomator or a scribe wrote Φήνος but then wrote ὁ τόπος instead of ὄνομα ποταμοῦ, or even that the epitomator or a scribe omitted Σφήνος between Φήνος and ὁ τόπος.
If both Φήνος and Σφήνος are to be expected in this rule, it is a bit
strange that we are given an explanation for Σφήνος but not for
Φήνος, even though both words are rather uncommon. Schmidt’s
second conjecture can be supported on the basis of Theognostus’
parallel passage (Can. II 65.27-33 (= 352); see the apparatus of parallel
passages), which presents both Φήνος and Σφήνος in the same rule
as Τήνος, Ρήνος, φηνός, πτηνός and ληνός, but the fact that the
order in which these examples appear in Theognostus is the same as
in Pseudo-Arcadius, together with the fact that Σφήνος in
Theognostus appears between Τήνος and Ρήνος (more specifically
after Τήνος Ἡνος, and right before Ρήνος), while Φήνος is cited
considerably later, suggest that one should expect Σφήνος rather
than Φήνος here. Lentz (176.5-13) in his reconstruction of Herodian’s
rule included both Φήνος ὄνομα ποταμοῦ and Σφήνος ὄνομα
τόπου, but the fact that he places Φήνος ὄνομα ποταμοῦ between
Τήνος and Ρήνος suggests to me that he considered that what
Pseudo-Arcadius had at this point was Φήνος rather than Σφήνος.
Thus, I have not entirely attributed the emendation to Lentz.

119.8 ι...είη: e.g. Κύνος

119.9 Θυνός: The ethnic designation of a person from Θυνία (St.
Byz. θ 75). The citation of Θυνός in this accentuation rule, which
exempts proper names from oxytone accentuation, is another piece of evidence for the fact that ethnic designations are not regarded as proper names but as adjectives. I have capitalised the word, differently from Schmidt.

120.1 Πηώνος: A Cretan city name (Theognost. Can. II 66.16 (= 356.3); see the apparatus of parallel passages).

120.4 Αὐαίνως: A personal or place name mainly known from the expression Αὐαίνου λίθος from Aristophanes, Frogs 194. See Radermacher (1921), 166, Dover (1993), 216-7, Sommerstein (1999), 174-5.

120.8 γλαυνός: This word occurs nowhere else. According to LSJ this is a kind of tunic in Pollux 7.48, but the edition has ἀφρανός.

121.3–4 σεσημείωται...4 Σικανός: πελανός, ὀφανός, and Σικανός are genuine exceptions, because although they fulfil the conditions for the rule, they are not proparoxytone.

121.7 ἧδανός: This word occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical works (e.g. sch. Hom. ll. 14.172a2.1, 14.172a3.1, Orion ε 57.2, ε 62.1, Et. Gud. (addit.) ε 399.20, EM 315.32, Eust. ll. III 603.4, Zonar. ε 612.16, ε 613.22).

121.11 ⇔ Schmidt (73.18) considers that there is a lacuna after προσπαρεξύνονται, because the beginning of the rule has the
condition ‘unless there is δ or ε or ι before α’, but the manuscripts provide examples only for words that have δ before α. It is, nevertheless, possible that the epitomator left out the examples of the other two groups of words for the sake of brevity, considering the citation of examples that belonged to the first group to be sufficient.

121.13–14 πιθανός…14 πράος: In the manuscripts πιθανός (‘persuasive, plausible’) is followed by the gloss πράος (‘mild, soft, gentle’) but πράος is not a proper gloss for πιθανός. Schmidt noticed this problem, and made a note of it in his critical apparatus but offered no solution. I have added ἀγανός (‘mild, gentle’), which could well have been glossed by πράος, and is suitable in this rule because it both ends in -ανός, and is τριγενές. My conjecture is reinforced by the Iliad scholion 14.172a1 deriving from Herodian, where ἀγω ἀγανός immediately precedes στέγω στεγανός, and appears in the vicinity of πιθανός and ἰκανός. Furthermore, in the Etymologicum Magnum (380.1) πείθω πιθανός immediately precede ἀγω ἀγανός.

122.8 παρασύνθετα: ‘derivatives from compounds’.

122.8–12 εἰ…12 σημασίαν: This part of the rule, which contains the three cases where the oxytone accentuation does not apply, is left without any examples. As regards masculine words in -ηνος derived
from feminine words, Lentz in his reconstruction of the Περί καθολικῆς προσωδίας (181.31-3) provides us with the examples Ὄπιηνος (Ὅπιηνη), Μυκηνος (Μυκήνη), and Κύλληνος (Κυλλήνη), on the basis of Theognostus’ Canones (II 68.6-7 (=368.3-4); ἵππην ἵππηνος should be written Ὄπιηνη Ὅπιηνος as in Lentz). As regards words whose nominative was considered to be formed on the basis of the genitive Lentz (181.34-182.5) obtains the examples Τροιζήνος (Theognostus has Τροϊζήνος at II 68.6 (= 368.3)) and Γέρηνος from Theognostus (Can. II 68.4-6 (= 368.1-3)) and Stephanus of Byzantium (Τροιζήνος: γ 58.1-2, Γέρηνος: γ 60.6-7). As regards the third case Lentz (182.6-7) derives the examples τοσσήνος (Doric for τοσσοῦτος) and τούήνος (Doric for τοιοῦτος) from Ahrens (1843), 270, n. 7) and Lobeck (PSGP 191).

123.3–4 ἰ…4 ἐπιρρήματος: e.g. προϊνός, ὀψινός, χθεσινός (cf. Lentz’s reconstruction 182.18).

123.7–8 καρκίνος…8 προπερισπάσθαι: As the text stands καρκίνος appears to stand alone, without any link with the previous or the following sentence. The previous sentence is about the words that are properispomenon, and thus καρκίνος, which is paroxytone, cannot be part of the list of properispomenon words.

Furthermore, it is difficult to link καρκίνος with the phrase ἔχοην
καὶ τὸ γυρίνος προσπερισμάσθαι (‘γυρίνος too should have been properispomenon’), in MO, because καρκίνος and γυρίνος have different accents. If the meaning was that καρκίνος should have been properispomenon like γυρίνος, in which case one ought to emend καὶ τὸ into κατὰ τὸ (this is actually the reading of BC), this is not clear for two reasons. Firstly, because καρκίνος has short i, and thus does not satisfy the conditions for the rule. Secondly, because there is no reason why the accentuation of καρκίνος should be parallel to the accentuation of γυρίνος in particular, and in any case it is not made clear in the rule why γυρίνος is treated separately from the other properispomenon words.

One would be tempted to delete καρκίνος, but a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 67.19-22 (= 364); see the apparatus of parallel passages) provides evidence for the citation of καρκίνος by Herodian in this rule.

123.7–8 τὸ…8 βάτραχος: One would have expected the meaning ὁ μικρός βάτραχος to be given right after γυρίνος, without the intervention of προσπερισμάσθαι.

123.15–16 τὸ…16 ὀξύνεται: λαρίνος is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule (it is an adjective and has long i), it is nevertheless oxytone.
124.9–10 τὸ... 10 μετήχθη: For the grammarians' general view that the genitive of μόσσων is turned into a nominative cf. sch. D. T. Lond. 549.3-5; Ep. Hom. 66,a.2-4, 66,a.6-7; St. Byz. γ 58.1-2, Choerob. in Theod. 115.29-30, 121.9-13, 270.15-7, Ep. Ps. 68.9-12, 88.11-2, De Orthogr. 168.24-5, 241.12-4; Theognost. Can. II 68.4-7 (= 368); Et. Parv. μ 27; Et. Gen. α 1209.1-5; Et. Gud. α 201.3-8, α 201.16-202.1, α 203.2-4, λ 359.21-3, μ 397.36-8, σ 512.19-21, σ 512.29-31, τ 526.3-7, τ 538.30-3, υ 537.54-5, υ 540.54-7; EΜ 146.20, 146.32-3, 242.27-30, 268.10-1, 490.18-21, 505.2-4, 514.43-5, 553.13-6, 602.25-7, 718.20-4, 752.12-4, 770.34-5, 773.33-5, 775.25-6; Et. Sym. II 216.15-7, II 318.27-9.

125.4 κορωνός προσηγορικόν: κορωνός is an adjective, but here the term προσηγορικόν is used to describe it. προσηγορικόν usually refers to common nouns, but perhaps the use of προσηγορικόν for κορωνός suggests that adjectives are not excluded from προσηγορικά and that the term προσηγορικόν is used to distinguish common nouns and adjectives on the one hand and proper names on the other.

125.5–8 θηλυκά... 8 ὀξύνεται: Given that at the beginning of the rule we read θηλυκά as a condition for recessive accentuation, and since among the examples the plant name πῦξος, a common noun, is mentioned, one would have expected to read ὃς ἀφοσιωμένων after
ιξός, not ὡς προσηγορικόν. However, it is possible that the rule initially said θηλυκά κύρια, and that the epîtomator or a scribe omitted κύρια. If this is true, then ὡς προσηγορικόν would be a satisfactory reason why ιξός is not recessive. As regards the plant name πυξός, this word is not mentioned in its own right but only as an additional meaning of Πυξός, which rightfully appears in its capacity as a proper name.

125.5 Λίπαξος: A Thracian city name (St. Byz. 418.7).

125.6 Ἀραξός ἀκρωτήριον: A cape in Eleia (Str. 8.7.5.59-60).

125.9 Κοραξός ...έθνικόν: A Colchian (St. Byz. 373.5) or Scythian (Hsch. κ 3584) ethnic designation.

126.1 Λάμπος ...κύριον: A personal name (LGPN II, IIIA, IIIB, IV).

126.2–3 λαμπός ... 2 ἐπίθετον: λαμπός is a hapax.

126.3–4 μή ... 4 συμφώνων: e.g. κομπός, πομπός (this can be used as either a noun or an adjective; as an adjective it exemplifies this condition). The phrasing of this condition suggests that the only group of adjectives that is exempted from the recessive accentuation consists of those with o in the penultimate syllable and with at least one consonant before -πος. However, the end of the rule τὸ μέντοι σκοπός ὀξύνεται, ὥσπερ τὰ ἐπίθετα ... χαλεπός suggests that the adjectives in -πος are supposed to be oxytone in general, and in any
case, this is confirmed by the examples cited (λοιπός, γρυπός, χαλεπός).

126.5 εἰ...ποιή: i. e. if the change of accent does not mark any distinction of meaning, e.g. τρόπος as opposed to τροπός.

126.5–6 ύποστρέφει...6 παραληγόμενον: ‘it goes back to a verb that has ε in the penultimate syllable’, e.g. πομπός < πέμπω.

126.16 κελαινωτός: This word is a hapax.

126.18 εἰ...Ω: This is an exception that applies only to adjectives ending in -ωπός (e.g. αἰμωπός, κελαινωτός, πολυωπός, mentioned in the previous rule); the proper names and common nouns with Ω in the penultimate syllable are dealt with separately later in this rule.

126.19 Ἀρωπός: A personal name (LGPN II).

126.20 Ἄστρωπος: A personal name; it does not occur in the nominative anywhere else, but the genitive Ἀστερόπου (sch. E. Or. 383.11) presupposes a nominative Ἀστέροπος.

127.1 σεσημείωται...δεινόμενον: ἀτραπός is feminine and therefore is not proparoxytone.

127.4 Ἰνωπός: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ οἰνωπός to Ἰνωπός, on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (see the apparatus of parallel passages and the critical apparatus).
127.5 Ἀσωπός: Αἰσωπός in Theogostus (II 69.19 (= 380.3); see the apparatus of parallel passages) should probably be emended to Ἀσωπός on the basis of our Epitome’s passage. The other possibility, to read Αἰσωπός, is less likely, because Αἰσωπός occurs later in the same rule in Theogostus.

127.5 ὑποτός: The manuscripts’ ὑποτός is a scribal error. Schmidt emended to ὑποτός, which is transmitted in a parallel passage from Theogostus (see the critical apparatus and the apparatus of parallel passages).

127.9–10 ἐπὶ...10 μόνον: ‘used only in the feminine form’. ὁ στενωπός and ἡ στενωπή are both used as common nouns, and therefore the phrase ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ μόνον does not make any sense here. In Poll. 9.38.1, Eust. Il. I 256.28, IV 756.7, Man. Phil. Carm. 2.244.15, Jo. Lazar. Syn. mir. s. Eug. 1189, the form στενωπός is feminine. Theodor. Nic. Enc. s. Petr. episc. Ar. 196 and Anna Comn. Alex. 6.14.2.5-6 could be suggesting that the gender is feminine. Despite these passages where στενωπός is feminine, in the majority of the cases it is masculine. Thus, one cannot easily understand why our text here seems to suggest that στενωπός is used only in the feminine form. There are two possible solutions to this problem: (i) either one should add a negation before the phrase ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ
μόνον, so that the meaning is that στενωπός, differently from e.g. ἀνθρωπός is oxytone because it is not only used in the masculine, but also in the feminine; (ii) alternatively, one may assume that some further information was added in connection with ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ μόνον, something that had to do with where (in which authors or works) one could find στενωπός as a feminine rather than more widely as a masculine.

127.16 φῶς: Either a common noun, φῶς, ὁ, or a proper name, the island Φῶς, ἡ. I have not capitalised the word, in order to allow for both possibilities.

127.17 μναθός: A rare word. Apart from the gloss ἡδύς given here and in some other texts (Hsch. μ 1493, Phot. μ 480, Su. μ 1146), these other sources give another three glosses: (i) μαλακός (Hsch. μ 1493, Phot. μ 480, Su. μ 1146), (ii) θυμήρης (Hsch. μ 1493), (iii) ραθύς (Phot. μ 480).

127.18 βλαφός: In the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum (II, 257) βλαφός (without accent) is glossed as insulsus (‘awkward, bungling, silly, absurd, tasteless’), βλαφόν (without accent) as inconditum (‘irregular, disordered, confused, unformed’), and βλαφοῦμαι as insulsor (this word is a hapax, and probably means ‘be βλαφός’). In the Anecdota
Medica Graeca (171, κεφ. ε’/καπ. 5) the word βλαφία is explained as ἀση (‘loathing, distress, vexation’).

127.20 Σήος: A river name (Claud. Ptol. Geogr. 7.2.10.3, 7.2.7.12).

127.20 Τρήος: A place in Thrace (St. Byz. 634.3) or a river name (Str. 5.3.9.26).

127.20 Ἡος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA (Ἑος)).

127.21 εἰ...ἀγχοιντο: ‘unless they start with more than one consonant’.

128.1 Φηος: ἤ τροφή τῶν (ἀγχαίων Hsch. φ 363) θεών’ (Theognost. Can. II 69.30-1 (= 382.4-5); Hsch. φ 363, but the lemma is φηον). This rare word occurs only in our Epitome and the two above-mentioned sources.

128.4 εἰ...ἀγχοιτο: I have adopted Lentz’s emendation of the manuscripts’ μὴ to μὲν, because both ζ and ξ, counted as ἠμίφωνα, as well as λ, otherwise it would not be necessary to explain why λῆος is not oxytone (on ἠμίφωνα see Dickey (2007), 240).

128.7 Πίος: I have retained the manuscripts’ Πίος, although a river name Πείος is mentioned by Herodotus (1.145.10) and Pausanias (7.18.1.2, 7.22.1.7). The orthography with an iota is indicated in the Epitome by the phrase παραληγόμενα τῷ I. A piece of evidence which supports the reading of our Epitome’s manuscripts is that two
parallel passages from texts which have derived material from Herodian in some form (Theognost. Can. II 69.32 (= 382.6), EM 475.26; see the apparatus of parallel passages; cf. Zonar. π 1548.12, but Πίρος ἱ 1120.3) preserve the river name Πίρος. In fact, Theognostus explicitly prescribes the orthography with an iota for the four proper names ῾Ιρος, Πίρος, Τίρος and Σκίρος. The parallel passages that mention the river name Πίρος do not indicate where this river is, and thus it is not easy to find out whether Πίρος and Πεῖρος point to the same river. I have put an acute rather than a circumflex on the iota, following the manuscript tradition of our Epitome and Theognostus (Can. 382.6), Etymologicum Magnum (475.26), and Zonaras (π 1548.12).

128.7 Τίρος: A river name (Choerob. De Orthogr. 269.6, EM 475.26-7).

128.8 Σκίρος: Either (i) a personal name (LGPN II), or (ii) a κατοικία (‘colony’) of Arcadia (St. Byz. 575.7), or (iii) an alternative name for the Σκιωφόρωμα or Σκίρα (sch. Pl. Lg. 828d.3, St. Byz. 575.15-576.1 (accented Σκίρος), Su. σ 624 (accented Σκιρος)), or (iv) the name of a Salaminian hero (Plu. Thes. 17.6.1-3, St. Byz. 575.10-1, Phot. σ 522.10-1, Su. σ 624.6-7).

129.1 Ε...ΕΙ: I have inverted the order in which ει and ε appear in the manuscripts, so that ει is next to διφθόγγω.
129.3 πτόρος: A rare word; it occurs only in our Epitome, the
_Etymologicum Magnum_ (694.51) and Zonaras (π 1590.25).

129.3 πτείρω: I have kept the reading of the manuscripts. This
present indicative is attested alongside πταίρω, and therefore there is
no need to change it as Schmidt did (78.16). Moreover, since I have
kept πτείρω, there is no need to add at the beginning of the rule,
together with Schmidt (78.14), the diphthong AI as one of the
possible penultimate vowel sounds.

129.5 φορός...ἀνέμος: φορός does not itself mean ἀνέμος, but it is
an adjective that is very often used to describe ἀνέμος.

129.6 ὄρος...γάρ: According to sch. D. T. _Vat._ 108.17-26 (see the
apparatus of parallel passages) Herodian had the view that ὄρος
derived from ὄρῳ.

129.15 Σφύρος: A mythological personal name: see _RE_ IIIA.1759-60

129.15 μὴ...δὲ: i.e. μὴ κύρια ὕντα. This phrase excepts the proper
names, not the words that do not have long ù, because the structure
of the rule suggests that τὰ εἰς ΡΟΣ ... Τύφος deals with the words in
-φος with short ù, while the rest of the rule with the words in -φος
with long ù. Thus, there seems to be a problem with the citation of
ξυφός in the specific place, because it has short υ (see also the following note).

130.2 Χλώρος…κύριον: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

130.4 βλωφός…ύπόλευκος: The word βλωφός is rare; it occurs only in our Epitome, Hesychius (β 762), who provides us with the meaning σύκου φύλλον instead of ύπόλευκος, and Theognostus (Can. 384.5; but accented βλώφος) Zonaras (β 391.20), who gives the gloss διάλευκος. It is possible that βλωφός is both an adjective, as in our Epitome, and a common noun, as in Hesychius.

130.4 ξωφός…ἄμικτος: ξωφός is nowhere else explained with the manuscripts’ ὁ μικρός. I have emended μικρός to ἄμικτος. The assimilation of the termination of ἄμικτος (-τος) to that of the words cited as examples (-φος) would not have been difficult.

130.7 Σφαίρος: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA).

130.8 Σκαίρος: This proper name occurs again in Theognostus (Can. II 70.19-20 (=386.2-3)).

130.8–9 τό…9 καυστικός: δαίφος is nowhere else attested with an alternative accentuation. Our Epitome is the only source that glosses the word with καυστικός.

130.9 διφορεῖται: ‘accented in two ways’.

131.4 πλεύφος: This word occurs nowhere else.
131.10 Φρούρος...κύριον: A personal name (LGPN II, IV).

131.12 λοῦρος...εἴδος: λοῦρος occurs nowhere else.

131.16 κόμαρος: Either a common noun or a personal name (LGPN I, IV).

132.2 ἐγκαρος...ἐγκυος: ἐγκαρος ('brain') is usually given the synonym ἐγκέφαλος in ancient sources (sch. Hom. Il. 9.378b.5-6; sch. Lyc. 1103; Porph. ad Il. 9.378.2-3; Eust. Il. II 734.24-5, II 735.1-2, II 538.20-539.2, Od. I 356.14). The word ἐγκυος does not end in -αρος, as the rule prescribes, and it seems that it was intended to be a gloss for ἐγκαρος. However, there is no evidence that ἐγκαρος means ἐγκυος ('pregnant'). It is possible that the word that should have explained ἐγκαρος is ἐγκέφαλος. Both ἐγκέφαλος and ἐγκυος begin with ἐγκ- and end in -ος, and this would have facilitated a scribal error. Schmidt (80.17) proposed with some reserve to correct ἐγκυος to ἵγκρος, but this is not very likely, because ἵγκρος is a difficult word, even more difficult and less common than ἐγκαρος, and one would have expected ἐγκαρος to be glossed by an easier word. Moreover, ἵγκρος is disyllabic, and thus its appearance as an example for this rule about words with more than two syllables would not be justified. I have conjectured καὶ ἁγκαρος, but this is not supported by any parallels, and therefore I have not adopted the
conjecture in my text. ἀγγ- could easily have become ἐγκ- under the influence of the preceding ἐγκαιρος and the abbreviation for καὶ is very often confused with η in minuscule.

132.3–6 Τὰ … ἐκκεφορός: In dealing with the witnesses to the Περί καθολικῆς προσφοδίας one is tempted to make comparisons, where possible, and try to understand the extent of proximity of each one to the original work. This accentuation rule is offered for comparison with a passage from Choeroboscus’ Epimerismi in psalmos (63.9-12; see the apparatus of parallel passages). The two passages employ exactly the same wording regarding the accentuation of trisyllabic adjectives ending in –τερος (Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ΤΕΡΟΣ τρισύλλαβα, εἰ ἔχει τὴν ἄρχουσαν μακράν), except that the Epitome uses the verb προσπαρεύνεται, whereas Choeroboscus the verb βαρύνεται; both verbs here describe the accent as being at the same place. Moreover, there is a minor piece of grammatical variation in that Pseudo-Arcadius has the optative ἔχοι, while Choeroboscus ἔχει. Both extracts have in common the examples φέρτερος and βέλτερος in the same order. It is noteworthy that these two examples are the two first from the list of examples in both texts. This observation suggests that our Epitome as well as Choeroboscus’ source go back to a common source, which provided these common examples at the
beginning. It should be noted finally that both passages give the same exception to the rule, namely the variant accentuation of καρτεφός and they provide the same justification for it. It is worthy of mention that our Epitome gives three examples more than Choeroboscus, while it leaves out only one example provided by Choeroboscus. A possible explanation of this is either that the form in which Choeroboscus had read Herodian did not have many more examples than our Epitome or, if Choeroboscus is using original Herodian or a source that was more extensive than our Epitome, he systematically decided not to cite all of his source’s examples. The latter explanation seems more likely. The words καὶ τὰ ὀμοία, in any case, show awareness that there are more examples.

132.4 μακράν: See note on 74.1 μακράν.

132.8–9 ἡ...9 ποιεῖται: ‘indicates one out of two persons (in the non-technical sense); makes reference to a single person by comparison with another person’, e.g. πρώτερος, ἔτερος, ἐκάτερος. πρώτερος denotes one entity that is before another (so one needs at least two entities before one of them can be πρώτερος, but nevertheless a singular entity is the ‘πρώτερος’ one); for the sense of comparison between two persons cf. Ptol. Ascal. Diff. voc. 405.12; Ammon. Diff. 413.1-2, 418.1-2, De impr. 19.1-2; Choerob. Ep. Ps. 2.27-8;

132.13 ἢ...παραληγόμενα: e.g. ἀβέλτερος, ὀρέστερος.

133.2–4 τὸ²...4 δεξιερός: According to the *Etymologicum magnum* (256.28-33; cf. Eust. *ll.* III 215.5-7) Herodian thought that δεξιερός was derived from δεξιός (δεξι -τ - εφός < δεξι -ός) by analogy with the formation of ἀριστερός from ἀριστος (ἀριστ -εφός < ἀριστ -ός), by contrast with Philo(n), who believed that δεξιερός was formed from δεξιός, via δεξιερός, with the addition of τ. There is no indication in the above-mentioned sources of whether the derivation of δεξιερός from δεξιός by analogy with the formation of ἀριστερός from ἀριστος is meant to explain the accent.

133.10–11 μη...11 θηλυκά: ‘that do not have a distinct grammatical form for the feminine’.

133.11 ὀμηρος: Both a common noun and a personal name. I have not capitalised the word, in order to allow for both possibilities.

133.15 λαπηρός: I have adopted the reading of M following the principle ‘lectio difficilior potior’. λαπηρός occurs only once again, in
the neuter, in Erotianus (Voc. Hippocratic. collect. 94.1), and it is given
the synonym ἑγνών. Ὁσ λυπηρός probably represents a scribal
error, the change of λα- into λυ- under the influence of the very
common word λυπηρός. A scribe probably saw λαπηρός, but did
not recognize it, since it is a rare word, and thus wrote λυπηρός
instead.

134.2–4 τὸ...4 σημαίνη: For the oxytone and proparoxytone
accentuation of πονηρός/πόνηρος and μοχθηρός/μόχθηρος
depending on the dialect and (according to some but not all
grammarians) on the meaning, compare the passages cited in the
apparatus of parallel passages, and see the notes on
πονηρός/πόνηρος and μοχθηρός/μόχθηρος in Probert (2006), 263 n.
13, 323–4, and 325.

135.3 Κάμειρος: The parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II
71.29-32 (= 393) has Κάμειρος, which is said to be a city name. Two
passages from Eustathius (Il. I 490.8-10, D. P. 504.6-8) indicate that
Κάμειρος is the Rhodian city name, while Κάμειρος is a personal
name, but, in fact, the Rhodian city name appears in the sources
written both with ει and ι. No personal name is attested apart from
the mythological name, which is linked with the city name. The
writing of the mythological name in a different way from the city name would be unexplained.

135.4 Στάλιρος: A city name (Theognost. Can. II 71.30 (= 393.2), EM 488.10).

135.5 Σύσιρος: This word occurs nowhere else. Lentz (198.19) emended to Σίτιρος on the basis of two parallel passages (Theognost. Can. II 71.31 (= 393.3), EM 488.11; see the citations in the apparatus of parallel passages).

135.9 περι...λέξομεν: συνήγορος and κατήγορος are not mentioned at the end of this book. They occur again in the following book (102.8 Schmidt), where words compounded with ἀγορὼ are dealt with.

135.9–136.1 νῦν...136.1 προσαφαληγούση: This phrase suggests that from this point onwards we will read about proparoxytone words in -ορος, but in fact the beginning of this rule was already about proparoxytone words (κατήγορος, συνήγορος).

136.1 ἀνορος: This word occurs nowhere else.

136.1 πάπορος: This word occurs nowhere else.

136.2 κατάκορος: I have printed O’s reading. κατάμορος occurs nowhere else, and is probably a corrupt form of κατάκορος.

136.13 Αψωρος: The name of a city in Illyria. Stephanus of
Byzantium (α 580), who provides us with this information, states that he got it from book 8 of Herodian's Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφώνειας.

136.16 ὀφῶ: The active present indicative of this verb occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical sources and is usually adduced to explain words in -ωφός (see LSJ s. v. ὀφέω, Corn. ND 2.1-3, Et. Gud. τ 528.35-6, EM 757.48-50).

136.17 ὑληωφός: The reading of the manuscripts ὑληωφός might result from the influence of the following word ῥοφός on this one, or may be an ioticastic error. This is an uncommon word, attested at Call. Hec. fr. 373, Anth. Gr. 9.337.3, A. R. 1.1227, sch. A. R. 111.23, Su. ν 97.

136.17 ῥοφός...φύλαξ: The Synagoge (Σ 1 153), Photius (τ 292), the Suda (τ 500), and Zonaras (τ 1138.7-8) provide us with the glosses θυρωφός and φύλαξ for ῥοφός.

136.18 νέωφος: This uncommon word is glossed as ‘νέος’ by Hesychius (ν 422) and Photius (ν 297.9). Schmidt (83.1 app. crit.) found fault with νέωφος and thought that it should perhaps be transposed considering that the second member of the word derives from ὀφῶ, but it derives from ὄνυμι. It is the second member of νεωφός that derives from ὀφῶ, -ωφός.
137.3 Πίσανφος: A city name (Procop. De bell. 7.11.32.2, Agath. 42.17).

137.4–5 τὸ...5 ὃςνεται: At the beginning of the rule it was not mentioned that περιεκτικά are excluded from proparoxytone accentuation. It was the epitomator’s method of excerpting the Περί καθολικής προσῳδίας (see the full discussion of the epitomator’s methods of excerpting Herodian) to mention certain parts of the rule only at the point where an example was mentioned, and thus not to announce them from the beginning.

137.11 παλινουρος: Either the name of a cape (Str. 6.1.1.29; D. C. 49.1.3.2-3) or an adjective. The word is only attested as an adjective in a pun in a Latin source, Martial 3.78.2.

137.12–13 νομηουρος...13 φυλαττων: νομηουρος occurs nowhere else.

137.13 υλοκουρος: A rare word; it also occurs at Lycophron 1111.

137.18–20 δύο...20 βαρυμώνων: The consonants that are characteristic of the ‘second conjugation of recessive verbs’ are κ, γ, χ, and κτ; see sch. D. T. Marc. 407.30-1; Timoth. Gramm. καν. καθολ. π. συντ. 242.31-4; Choerob. in Theod. GG iv.ii 13.38-14.7; Sophr. Char. Theodos. 415.27-8.

137.21 ἀγχούρος: A rare word; it occurs again in Hesychius (α 922).
137.21 κλαγγούρος: This word is nowhere else attested.

138.1 πάγος: A word of unclear meaning (see also LSJ).


138.18 ἵγκρος: An uncommon word glossed by ἐγκέφαλος (Hsch. i 147, Choerob. De Orthogr. 226.1, EM 587.44, Zonar. i 1084.7 (here the word is spelled ἵγγρος)).

138.25 <συμφώνων>: The phrase μόνον ἡ μεθ’ ἐτέρου is left incomplete. I have adopted Lentz’s addition of συμφώνου, as I believe that its presence here is necessary. One could argue that συμφώνου is implied, but there are two passages in our Epitome (137.22, 185.25 Schmidt), where φωνήντως, correspondingly, is explicitly mentioned after μεθ’ ἐτέρου. In other grammatical texts (e.g. sch. Hom. II. 10.134b.5-8, Theodos. Π. γραμμ. 96.27-97.2, Choerob. in Theod. 258.24-6) μεθ’ ἐτέρου is also found in this sort of context with συμφώνου/φωνήντως.

138.26 χύτρος: Either a common noun or a proper name. To allow for both possibilities, I have left it uncapitalised.

139.2 Ὕφος: This word occurs nowhere else. In the critical apparatus I have suggested the reading Κύρος, a city in Syria (see St. Byz. 397.11; Zonar. κ 1268.1), but there are no parallel passages to
support this. Lentz (204.23-4) kept Υψητς, but added Κύριος later on.

139.5–7 τὰ...7 βαρύνεται: ‘The compound words whose second part has more than one syllable are recessive’.

139.9 ἄνδρος: An uncommon variant form for ἄνδρος.

139.12 Μίνυθος: This word occurs nowhere else, but seems to be a proper name.

139.12 Ἕραθος: A mythological personal name: see RE 6.602 s. v. Erythros.

139.13–14 το...14 έθνος: Herodian tells us that both the personal name and the ethnic are oxynome. Neither the personal name nor the ethnic is otherwise attested with oxynome accentuation. Other sources (D. H. 1.11.2.7-8, 1.11.3.1, 1.11.3.5, 1.11.4.5, 1.13.1.11; Paus. 8.3.5.1, 8.3.5.7) provide us with the nominative Ὀινώτος for the personal name.

139.19 Βήςος: A historical personal name attested in the inscription IG XII,5 444. In the literary sources this name is spelled with double sigma: e.g. D. S. 17.74.1.4, 17.83.7.1, 17.83.7.5, 17.73.2.5, 17.p.1.32, 17.p.1.49; Str. 11.8.8.5; Flav. Arr. Alex. anab. 3.8.3.3, 3.21.1.5, 3.21.10.1, 3.28.8.1, 3.28.9.3, 3.30.1.5, 3.30.4.5, 3.30.5.4, 4.7.1.7, 4.7.2.7; Plu. Alex. 42.5.2; Phot. Bibl. 91, 67b.36.
139.19 Μνήσος: A mythological personal name: see RE 15.2284 s. v. Mnesos.

139.21 κρωσός: This word is usually spelled with double sigma: e.g. S. OC 478, E. Ion 1173, Cyc. 89; Lyc. 369, 1365; Theoc. Idyll. 13.46; sch. Theoc. 13.46a; Plu. Arist. 21.4.1, Alex. 20.13.1, Poll. 6.14.2, 6.23.6, 8.66.4-5, 10.30.2, Paus. Gr. κ 50; Hsch. κ 4276, τ 177, Orion κ 84.14, Theognost. Can. II 21.10 (= 119.7), Su. κ 2496, EM 541.30, Eust. II. II 193.11, II 193.13, III 609.21, Zonar. κ 1250.10.

140.1 Κωσός: Both the spellings Κωσός and Κωσσός are well attested. Debate in the grammatical tradition is attested at Theognostus Can. II 72.10 (= 397.2).

140.1 Σώσος: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA).

140.6 Πίσος...κύριον: Πίσος is a personal name (LGPN VA).

140.6 Λίσος: A personal name (LGPN VA; cf. Λισσός LGPN I, Λίσσος LGPN II, IIIA, Λίσος LGPN IV).

140.10 Παισός πόλις: See D Sch. Hom. II. 5.612 (spelled Παισσός), Str. 13.1.19.1-2; Eust. II. I 558.7-8, II 159.3. A homonymous river is mentioned by Str. 13.1.19.1-2, Hsch. π 105, Eust. II. I 558.7-8.

140.10 Λουσός: A city in Arcadia (St. Byz. 419.17), usually called Λουσσόι (St. Byz. 419.17, Paus. 8.18.8.1, 8.18.7.5, 8.18.8.6) or Λούσσοι (Call. Dion. 235, Plb. 4.25.4.5-6, 9.34.10.1). A scholion to Callimachus’
*Hymns* (3.235b) says that according to Herodian the city name is neuter and therefore the nominative is τὰ Λούσα.

140.11 Πραισός: The name of a city in Crete (St. Byz. 534.3). Theognostus (*Can.* II 72.23 (= 400.2)) tells us that Πραισός is an ethnic designation, but Stephanus of Byzantium (534.3-4) gives the ethnic designations Πραισίςς and Πραισιεύς for a person from Πραισός.

140.12 Ναίσος: A river name (*Theognost.* *Can.* II 72.24 (= 400.3); Zonar. ν 1384.7).

140.13 Βλαίσος κύριον: Βλαίσος is a personal name (*LGPN* IIIA).

140.16 ἀμετάβολον: liquid or nasal consonant.

140.19 κόρσος...κρόταφος: κόρσος is a rare word. It occurs again in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (κ 338.41, κ 348.58-9) and the *Etymologicum Magnum* (43.10), which gives the gloss κορήσικος.

140.19–141.1 μόλσος...141.1 σέλινον: μόλσος is a rare word. It occurs again twice in Hesychius (μ 1585 (μόλσον), μ 1586). In μ 1585 Hesychius gives three synonyms for μόλσον: σελίνον καυλός, ἄνθος, ὑποφυάδα. The first coincides with the second gloss given in our Epitome. In μ 1586 Hesychius informs us that μόλσος is the Aeolic word for δημός (‘fat’). We observe that there is no correspondence between the other synonym given in our Epitome, δήμιος, and Hesychius μ 1586. Either δημός or δήμιος could be a
mistake owing to the fact that both words begin with δημ-. Hoffmann (1893), II 241 is in favour of the meaning δημός, and derives μόλσος from μέλδω (‘soften by boiling’) and Chantraine (DELG s. v.) agrees with this view.

141.1 μόλσος: This word occurs nowhere else.

141.1 θύρσος: I consider the manuscripts’ θέρσος unsuitable here, because it is odd that Herodian should have employed as an example the Aeolic form of θάρσος, when θάρσος itself could well have exemplified the rule. I have adopted Göttling’s emendation ((1835), 210). Θύρσος is either a common noun or personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA). I have left it uncapitalised in order to allow for both possibilities.

141.2 μύρσος: Either a common noun or a personal name (LGPN IV, VA). The common noun is rare; it occurs again at Hsch. μ 1920, EM 595.35-6, and Zonar. μ 1375.1-2. Hesychius gives the gloss κόφινος, while the other two sources give the description πλεκτόν ἀγγείον ἐξ ἀγγοῦ.

141.2–3 σεσημείωται…3 ὀξυνόμενον: πυρσός is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule it is not recessive.

141.3 τὸ…τάρσος: κυρσός and ἄρσός (or whatever the word meant
here actually was; see the next note) are not recessive, because they have i and α respectively in their penultimate syllables.

141.3 τάρσος: This word occurs nowhere else and is probably a vox nihili. Many conjectures are possible (see the critical apparatus).

141.5 Βάγαρσος: This word occurs nowhere else.

141.9 <ού>: I have added ού before κλιτικόν because both sigmas are part of the stems of the words cited as examples: none of them is acquired in declension.

141.9 κλιτικόν: ‘pertaining to declension’.

141.10 Βεσσος...έθνικόν: Βεσσοί is an alternative ethnic designation for the Τετραχωρίται (St. Byz. 618.8).

141.10 Θυσσός: A city name (Scyl. 66.16).

141.11 Λοσσός: The name of a city in Lydia (St. Byz. α 492.1).

141.11 κισσός: Either a common noun or a personal name (LGPN I, II (Κίσσος), IIIA, IIIB (Κίσσος), IV (Κίσσος), VA (Κίσσος)).

141.11 -: I consider that there is a lacuna between κισσός and ώσαύτως. The phrase ώσαύτως καὶ τὸ after a list of oxytone words leads us to expect oxytone examples to follow, yet the examples are recessive. Thus, I assume that after κισσός some recessive examples were mentioned, and that ώσαύτως καὶ τὸ linked that phrase with the one containing Ύσσος and Νέσσος. Schmidt had not noted that
there is a lacuna here, although in his apparatus he quotes Göttling’s conjecture, which involves the addition of Κίσσος δὲ τὸ κύριον παροξύνεται after κισσός. Göttling’s emendation is reasonable, but it is not supported by any parallel passage.

141.12 Ὡσσος: I have capitalised this word, since Ὡσσος (‘javelin’) is oxytone. Ὡσσος is a place name. The ancient sources (Flav. Arr. Peripl. pont. eux. 3.1.2, 7.1.2-3, 7.1.4; Hippol. Chron. 233.3; Epiphan. Ind. Apostol. 108.10, 114.5) speak of a harbour at Ὡσσος.

141.13 γλωσσός: This word (glossed by λάλος) is a hapax.

141.14 κάσσος: A rare word; it occurs again in Hesychius (κ 985).

141.19 κόμπασσος: This word occurs nowhere else.

141.19 ἀρπάσσος: Either a common noun or the name of a river in Caria (St. Byz. α 445, Et. Gen. α 1219.1, Et. Sym. II 220.23).


141.21–22 τὴν...22 βαύνουσι: Behind the implied city name Κερασος, Κερασοὺς near Trebizond is to be understood (see RE 11.264-5).

141.22 τέγγασσός: This word occurs nowhere else, and it is
uncertain whether this is a *hapax* or a *vox nihili*. On this see also Lobeck *PSGP* 407-8 and Lehrs (1857), 374.

142.5 Ἕρεσσος: The name of a city in Lesbos and its eponymous hero (St. Byz. ε 107.1), and a mythological personal name (Paus. 10.27.3.3-5).

142.6 Ὑεσσός: The name of a city in Lydia and Pisidia (St. Byz. θ 68).

143.1 Κάρης: I have adopted Lentz’s Κάρης, not the manuscripts’ κάρης, on the basis of two parallel passages (sch. Hom. *Il.* 12.20b.14, Eust. *Il.* III 345.6; see the apparatus of parallel passages), which indicate that this name should be written with single, not double σ, and which probably derive their material from Herodian. According to Eustathius, Aristarchus’ view was that Κάρης did not follow the accent of words in -ηςος, because it was written with a single sigma. It is very likely that Herodian shared the same view. A scribe could easily have added a sigma under the influence of the rest of the words under the same rule, which are all written with double sigmas.

143.2 Μάρπης: The name of a city in the Troad (Paus. 10.12.3.9-4.3, 10.12.4.9-5.1).

143.2 Μάρπης: Either a personal name (*LGPN* IIIA), or a
mythological personal name (see RE, DNP, BNP), or a mountain in Paros (St. Byz. 434.6).

143.9–10 σεσημείωται...10 Τελμισός: Τελμισός is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule it is not proparoxytone.

143.15 Κερδισός: A city name (Su. ν 1387), which occurs only in our Epitome and the Suda.

143.15 Ἀρκισός Ἀρκίσα: Ἀρκισός and Ἀρκίσα are otherwise unattested. The parallel passage from Theognostus, Can. II 73.12-8 (= 404), mentions a river name Ἀρνισός, but this is also otherwise unattested.

143.15 Ἀρκισός: A personal name Ἀρκισός is attested (LGPN IIIB), cf. Ἀρκισός in D. C. (Jo. Ant. exc. 755.4).

143.15 Ἀρκίσα: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

144.5–6 ⊔: Some of the examples of words ending in -υσσος which could have been cited here may be recovered from a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 73.23-9 (= 406); see the apparatus of parallel passages), e.g. Γένυσος, Άμβρυσος. It is common in lacunas due to saut du même au même that the word before the omitted part coincides with the last word of the omitted part, and since usually in the accentuation rules the last word before the
examples is the verb describing the type of the accentuation, it is possible that the lacuna is due to the *homooteleuton* of προπαροξύνεται ... προπαροξύνεται. The two groups of words dealt with here (-υσος, -υσος) are both proparoxytone, and it is likely that the verb προπαροξύνεται occurred twice, once before the words in -υσος and once before those in -υσος.

144.9 Ἐλευσίνα: The name of a city in Ἀπολλωνίας according to Theognostus (*Can.* II 74.3-4 (= 408.3-4)), but on the location see also *RE* 11.328.

144.10 ἀλωσος: This word occurs nowhere else; its meaning is unclear (see also LSJ and DGE).

145.3 κοίτος: The manuscripts’ κλοίτος occurs nowhere else, apart from Theognostus (*Can.* II 74.12 (= 410.3)), where it is accented Κλοίτος. I have emended κλοίτος to κοίτος on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (*Can.* II 74.7-9 (= 409); see the apparatus of parallel passages). Lentz (214.13) includes the word κοίτος in his reconstruction of this Herodianic rule, but I have not attributed the emendation to him, because he keeps Κλοίτος where it occurs in Pseudo-Arcadius, and adds κοίτος from Theognostus later on in the rule. In Theognostus οἶτος, Προϊότος, and γοίτος appear in exactly the same order as in Pseudo-Arcadius. Προϊότος and γοίτος are next
to each other in Theognostus as in our Epitome, but while in our Epitome we read κλοίτος between οίτος and Προίτος, in Theognostus we find κοίτος. In my view, Κλοίτος in Theognostus (Can. II 74.12 (= 410.3)) does not support the retention of κλοίτος here, because instead of Κλοίτος one should read Κλείτος in Theognostus (the personal name, which is sometimes accented Κλείτος as in Pseudo-Arcadius). There are two reasons for thinking this: (i) Pseudo-Arcadius’ passage presents Κλείτος after Λαίτος, and in the vicinity of Παιτός, while in Theognostus Κλοίτος comes after Λαίτος and Παιτός, which suggests that Κλείτος was intended where we read Κλοίτος in Theognostus, and (ii) Theognostus deals with recessive words in -οίτος under rule 409 (II 74.7-9), but cites Κλοίτος under rule 410 (II 74.10-3), where he deals with recessive words in -αίτος. One would not expect Κλοίτος under that rule, because it is both spelled and accented differently from the examples cited there. Even if one were to correct Κλοίτος to Κλοίτος, it would still be difficult to justify the appearance of this word here, because it could well have been cited under the relevant rule on recessive words in -οίτος (409), and in any case Κλοίτος is attested only in Pseudo-Arcadius. Κλείτος, nevertheless, would fit well in rule 410, because it is a recessive name following the accentuation of the
words in -αιτος, although it is written with the diphthong ει. It would not be surprising if Ἐλείτος appeared under this rule, because there is no separate rule treating words ending in -ειτος. The lack of correspondence between Theognostus’ ᾿Ελείτος and Pseudo-Arcadius’ ᾿Ελειτός does not weaken the above arguments. Theognostus’ main interest is in orthography, thus he may be thought to have cited this personal name in its recessive form, which is more widely attested. It should be noted that the personal name ΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ is recessive in modern Greek, and Theognostus might have cited the recessive form of the name, because he was more familiar with it. If Κλοιτός were to be emended to Κλειτός in Theognostus, this would suggest an awkward transformation of Herodian’s accentuation rule into an orthographical one, since the linking of Κλειτός with the recessive words in -αιτος would not be efficient (on the accent of ΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ see also the note on 145.5 Κλειτός). The problem of the accent of ΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ in Theognostus does not, however, create any problems to the arguments for emending Pseudo-Arcadius’ Κλοίτος to κοίτος.

145.4 βρούτος: Either a common noun, a variant for Hesychius’ βρύτος ('fermented liquor made from barley, beer’), or the personal name (LGPN ΠΙΒ).
145.5 Κλειτός: Sch. Hom. ll. 15.445 deriving from Herodian, indicates that the adjective as well as the proper name should be oxytone, but the proper name is properispomenon in the majority of the literary sources.

145.6–7 καὶ...7 Αἰγύπτου: The information κώμη Αἰγύπτου would more suitably come before θηλυκόν (cf. the critical apparatus).

145.6 Βουτός: Editions of other ancient sources print this word with a recessive accent: Plu. De Is. et Osir. 377C.11, St. Byz. β 157.1. However, the mention of Βουτός here makes absolute sense if the word is indeed oxytone, because it follows and is linked with an oxytone word (γλουτός). Moreover, θηλυκόν should be taken as an explanation for this word’s not being recessive. Thus it seems that Herodian believed Βουτός was not recessive, but oxytone.

145.7 τὸ...ἐθνικόν: Παιτός does not follow the rule prescribing recessive accentuation because it is an ethnic designation, and ethnic designations are considered adjectives. Παιτοί in Herodotus (7.110.4) suggests a recessive nominative singular, while Theognostus (Can. Ι 74.11 (= 410.2); see the apparatus of parallel passages) has Παιτος, but the rule clearly prescribes oxytone accentuation.

146.1 ὡπότε...ἄθροισματος: e.g. στρατός.

146.1–2 κυριά...2 ἐπιθετικών: e.g. Κριτός, Κλιτός, although
second-declension names originating as oxtone adjectives are often recessive (see e.g. Probert (2003), 112–14).

147.2 ἰτος; Alternatively written ἱτπος in ancient sources (sch. Th. 2.19.2.2-3, Choerob. De Orthogr. 256.13-7, Et. Gen. α 64.10, EM 703.13-7). The orthography with ει and oxtone accentuation is ascribed to Orus, the spelling with iota and recessive accentuation to Herodian (sch. Th. 2.19.2.2-3, Choerob. De Orthogr. 256.13-7, Et. Gen. α 64.10, EM 703.13-7).

147.2 τὸ…τηγενὲς: At the beginning of the rule it is not mentioned that a condition for the recessive accentuation is that the words are μονογενὴ (or that they are not τηγενὴ), but at the point where the exception λιτὸς is mentioned, we are given the reason that it is τηγενὲς. See the discussion of the relevant section of the epitomator’s method of excerpting Herodian (1.17–21 δεὶ ... υπάρχη).

147.4 προσηγορικά: One would have rather expected ἐπίθετα/ἐπιθετικά, but since προσηγορικόν means not only common noun but also nominal, it can also include adjectives.

147.4 βουτὸς…βρύων: βουτὸς seems to be a deverbal adjective from βρύω. βουτὸς in Psellus (Poem. 6.457) and Zonaras (σ 1643.19) means πόμα. That βουτὸς is a deverbal adjective from βρύω here
and not an alternative form for βρύτος meaning ‘beer’, is suggested, apart from the explanation ὁ βρύων which accompanies it, by a parallel passage from Theognostus (II 74.30-2 (= 414); see the apparatus of parallel passages), which gives the information ἀπὸ ὑμάτων γινόμενα.

147.5 ὑπότος...κλυτός: These are adjectives, but they are included in the προσηγορικά. Usually in our Epitome the term προσηγορικόν refers to nouns, not nominals more widely. In this case one either has to accept that προσηγορικόν can be used loosely for ‘nominal’, or that perhaps the rule originally contained examples of nouns as well as adjectives, but that in the process of epitomising the nouns were left out.

147.10–11 σεσημεῖωται...11 ὄξυνόμενα: Usually with σεσημεῖωται genuine exceptions are introduced, that is to say words that fulfil the conditions for the rule but nevertheless do not follow the accentuation prescribed. κοντός should therefore be taken to be the common noun (‘pole’) here, not the adjective (‘short’). κοντός is oxytone even though it satisfies the conditions for the accentuation rule. παλτός is an adjective, and adjectives are, in any case, exempted from the prescription of recessive accentuation. Thus,
παλτός would fit better among the examples of adjectives that have a separate feminine form (τὸ δὲ σπαρτός ... θηλυκὰ ἐχόντα).

147.12 τιλτός: I have emended MO's τικτός to τιλτός. τικτός occurs nowhere else, and is probably a vox nihil. As the rule prescribes at the beginning the words under this rule have an ἀμετάβολον before -τος. κ is not an ἀμετάβολον. Thus, τικτός as well as Schmidt's θικτός are unsuitable here. τιλτός, even though not supported by any parallel passage, satisfies the conditions for the rule. The emendation to τιλτός is very economical, since it only involves the change of a single letter.

147.16 παστός: This is the common noun (‘bridal chamber, bridal bed’), not the adjective (‘salted’), because the rule gives as a condition that the words should be μονογενή.

147.17 ἔντος: This is the common noun (‘walking place, covered colonnade’), not the adjective (‘shaved, whittled’), since words that are μονογενή are required by the rule. See also the previous note.

148.1 σεσημεῖωται...βαρύτονα: βύστος and Κάστος are genuine exceptions, because although they satisfy the conditions for the rule they are recessive.

148.1 βύστος: The word that is etymologically linked with βυθός and βυσσός in lexicographical sources (Et. Gen. β 289, Et. Gud. α
74.8-9, β 291.2, EM 217.17-20, Et. Sym. II 514.24-5, Zonar. β 411.5-6) is oxytone. DGE lemmatize βύστος as an autonomous word of doubtful meaning.

148.1 Κάστος: MO's κάμπτος is unsuitable here, because the rule is about words ending in -στος. I have adopted Schmidt's emendation, which is very close to the transmitted reading, although it is not supported by any parallel passage. Κάστος is a personal name (LGPN IV, VA).

148.4–5 εἰ... 5 γένη: 'if it changes form in the various genders', that is to say if it is an adjective that has a separate form for each of the three genders. Thus, this condition excludes nouns.

148.6–7 ἐκ... 7 μεταστή: e.g. δύστος (considered to come from δύστηνως) and πόστος (considered to come from πόσατος).

148.10 δύστος: The form δύστος is nowhere else attested.

148.10–11 πόστος... 11 πόσατος: The form πόσατος occurs only in grammatical and lexicographical sources (Su. π 2119.1, EM 685.1-3, Zonar. π 1563.8-9). The EM mentions that the information is derived from the Περὶ παθῶν.

148.16 πόκτος: This alternative form for πόκος occurs once again, in the Etymologicum Magnum (679.44-5).

149.1 όυττος: This word occurs nowhere else, and is probably a νοχ
nihili. Possible emendations would be Γρύττος, Λύττος, βύττος. I am not in favour of βρύττος, because this is the Attic form of βρύσσος (‘a kind of sea-urchin’), and the rule exempts specifically Attic forms. I am also not in favour of Lentz’s λύττος (218.4-5), because although it involves the change of a single letter, this is not justified on palaeographical grounds. The personal name Γρύττος, although Attic (LGPN II), should not be treated with the same reserve as βρύττος, because the exemption should be taken to refer to Attic forms with -ττ- corresponding to koiné forms with -σσ-, not to personal names or other forms that do not have koiné equivalents with -σσ-. βύττος in Hesychius (β 1353) is also plausible here. Such a change would be very economical, since it involves the change of a single letter; moreover, β and φ are close to each other in majuscule. Taking all the above arguments into consideration, I believe that βύττος and Γρύττος are the most plausible. It should be noted that there is no parallel passage to support any of the proposed emendations, and therefore the text cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

149.1 κάττος: Since κάττος is attested and fulfils the conditions for the rule, I see no reason to change it, as suggested by Schmidt (92.5 app. crit.).
149.1–2 τὰ...2 γέγονε: The way this sentence is phrased suggests that the Attic form is based on the koine form. This is not unusual in grammatical texts. The notion of X coming from Y is essentially synchronic rather than diachronic.

149.11 Ἔλατος: A personal name (LGPN IIIA).

149.11 ὀπατος: Initially used as an adjective, but later the Greek form for the Latin consul.

149.11 ἑνατος: This is hardly a noun, and may be an intrusion from the next rule.

149.12 Ἐρατος: A personal name (LGPN I, IIIA, VA).

149.14–15 εί...15 ληγόντων: Ancient grammarians classify middle athematic verbs, such as ἐφαμα, as -μι verbs, even though an active in -μι is not in use (see A. D. Synt. II 398.5-14 and Tyrannion 1 fr. 14, l. 12-3 on δύναμαι). A passage from the Etymologicum Magnum (325.43–4), which presents the form ἐλημι as equivalent to ἐλῶ, suggests that ἑλατός can also be considered a derivative of a -μι verb.

149.19–20 τῆς...20 περισπωμένων: i.e. contracted verbs in -άω.

149.21 φρατός: A rare word; according to the Etymologicum Gudianum (φ 550.23) it means συγγενής. This reading is probably wrong here, because φρατός does not derive from a contracted verb
in -άω. Schmidt’s emendation φυσατός is sensible, but φωσατός (from φωσάω), which I suggest in the critical apparatus, is also likely.

149.24 <προ>παραληγόμενα: I have emended the manuscripts’ παραληγόμενα to προπαραληγόμενα. The comment τά δὲ ἔχοντα Α ὁμοίως (with the examples that follow), in conjunction with τούτος ἠκολούθησε καὶ τὸ ἐμετός, ὡς ἔχον Ε ὁσπερ τὰ ἄνω, suggests that an E is required in the antepenultimate as well as in the penultimate syllable of Πέλετος ... Μένετος. Lentz (218.26-219.3) in his reconstruction of this Herodianic rule wrote ἔχοντα τὸ ε ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἀπὸ τέλους, thus recognising that an E is required in the antepenultimate.

150.1 Μέγιστος: This name here is a scribal error, because it does not end in -ετος as the rule prescribes.

150.2 Πέλετος: This name occurs nowhere else.

150.2 Δέρκετος: A personal name (LGPN I, II, IIIA, VA).

150.2 Μένετος: A personal name (LGPN I, IIIA, VA).

150.5 ἄφετος: A rare word; it occurs again in Hesychius (α 7035), where we learn that this is the Cretan word for ἀφετοθὸς (‘juniper’).

150.5 Ἀρετός: A personal name (LGPN I). Thus, I have capitalised it, differently from Schmidt (93.6).
150.6 ἀνετος...ἐπίθετον: The distinction between ἀνετος and ἀνετός here suggests that ἀνετος is not an adjective, but this is not true. ἀνετός occurs nowhere else. The only obstacle to Lobeck’s emendation is that the phrase τὰ δὲ ἔχοντα Α ὀμοίως strictly speaking prescribes a single A in the antepenultimate syllable, but it is possible to accept lato sensu that the A required can be either single or as part of a diphthong.

150.13 γνύπετος: An uncommon word; it occurs mainly in grammatical and lexicographical works (Hsch. γ 734; Phot. γ 165; EM 236.40-2; Zonar. γ 443.8).

150.16 Δάμητος: I have emended the manuscripts’ δάμητος to Δάμητος, on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (see the critical apparatus and the apparatus of parallel passages). Δάμητος is the name of a river in Italy, close to Croton (St. Byz. 409.9-10).

150.17 βύνητος: This word is a hapax.

151.8–9 ἄητος...9 ἀκατάπαυστος: ἀκατάπαυστος (‘incessant’) as a gloss for ἄητος is attested only in our Epitome, but perhaps ἀκατάπαυστος is an attempt to express the notion of ἀκόρεστος (‘insatiate’; Hsch. α 1522, Su. α 667, EM 23.20, Zonar. α 57.8) and ἀπληστος (‘insatiate, greedy’; Hsch. α 1522; sch. Nic. Ther. 783b),
which we find in lexicographical works, with a single word that indicates the notion of ceaselessness that ἀκόφεστος and ἀπληστος have in common.

151.11–14 μὴ...14 πόλεις: The exemption of adjectives from recessive accentuation (μὴ ὄντα ἑπιθετικά βαρύνονται) is not followed by any clear indication of the accent of adjectives in -τος. In the section ἃ ἀ δὲ θηλυκά ὀξύνεται onwards we get three examples, ἀμαξίτος, ἀτραπιτός, and Λυχνιτός, the first of which is an adjective. The fact that these three examples are preceded by ἃ ἀ δὲ θηλυκά ὀξύνεται creates the false impression that all three words are oxotone because they are feminines. Thus, one is left to infer from μὴ ὄντα ἑπιθετικά βαρύνονται, that adjectives should be included in the oxotone words, which are dealt with later on in the rule. Alternatively, ἀμαξίτος may be listed as a feminine noun because it is sometimes used as one, owing to ellipsis of ὁδός.

151.12 Ἀδήμιτος: I have emended the manuscripts' ἰδήμιτος into Ἀδήμιτος on the basis of a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. 419; see the apparatus of parallel passages), in which Ἀδήμιτος appears in the vicinity of ἀμαξίτος and ἀτραπιτός. Ἀδήμιτος is a personal name (LGPN I). There is also an adjective ἄδήμιτος, but this accentuation rule exempts adjectives. I consider Lobeck’s Ἡφιτος...
from Stephanus of Byzantium (474.1-2) less likely, because Stephanus does not indicate that he derived this reading from Herodian, and \( \nu \) is not palaeographically close to \( \delta \).

151.13 Αγχιτος: I have adopted Lentz’s emendation Ἄγχιτος, taking into consideration a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 75.21-6 (= 419); see the apparatus of parallel passages), which presents Ἄγχιτος in the vicinity of ἀμαξιτός and ἀτραπιτός.

151.14 Λυχνιτός...πόλις: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ λαχνιτός to Λυχνιτός on the basis of Stephanus of Byzantium (423.15). According to Pseudo-Arcadius Λυχνιτός is feminine, while Stephanus of Byzantium (423.14-5) tells us that it is masculine. This conflicting information could just mean that Stephanus thought that Λυχνιτός was masculine, differently from Herodian, and does not necessarily suggest a conflict between the direct and indirect sources for Herodian. The phrase Ἡρωδιανός Λυχνιτόν αὐτόν φησι does not imply that according to Herodian Λυχνιτός is masculine. Stephanus tells us about the gender of this city name at the beginning of his entry, together with the geographical information, and at that point he is more likely to have derived his information from another source. Moreover, the
Herodianic form is different from that of Stephanus, something that
could also explain the different genders.

151.14 δηριτός: This word occurs nowhere else, and is probably a
vox nihili, due to the influence of Αδήριτος as corrupted to δήριτος.

152.1 ὁνότος: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the
manuscripts’ ὁνότος to ὁνότος, on the basis of a parallel passage
from Theognostus (II 75.29 (= 420.3); see the critical apparatus and
the apparatus of parallel passages).

152.1 Μολοτός: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the
manuscripts’ μωλοτός to Μολοτός on the basis of a parallel passage
from Theognostus (II 75.27-9 (= 420.1-3); see the apparatus of parallel
passages). Μολοτός is an alternative form for Μολοσσός (St. Byz.
455.8-10).

152.1 ἄροτος: I have adopted Meineke’s emendation of the
manuscripts’ ἐὔροτος to ἄροτος, on the basis of palaeographical
grounds, i.e. the resemblance between εὐ and α. This emendation is
reinforced by a parallel passage from Theognostus (Can. II 75.27-9 (=
420); see the critical apparatus and the apparatus of parallel
passages).

153.1 τόρνωτός: A rare word; it occurs only in our Epitome and
Eustathius (II. I 674.10).
153.2 μυωτός: This rare word occurs again in Pollux (7.60.6), Hesychius (μ 2016), and Photius (μ 640). Hesychius and Photius also provide the same gloss as Pseudo-Arcadius (Hesychius: εἰδός τι χτιόνος, Photius: χτιόνος εἰδος).

153.7 ἀνακιδωτός: This is a hapax.

153.9 κύρια: Schmidt (95.8, app. crit.) suggested the addition of καὶ προσηγορικά, in order to allow for the mention of Ἀσφαλτός. In my view the addition is not needed, because Ἀσφαλτός is a personal name (LGPN IIIA, IIIB).

153.9–10 καὶ...10 ἔχοντα: The way the rule is phrased, it is suggested that this section of the rule should refer to all proper names in -τος that have more than two syllables. Though it is obvious why some of the words in this list were taken to be compounds (e.g. Ἀσφαλτος from ἀ + σφάλλω, Ἀμάραντος from ἀ + μαραίνω), it is less clear for some others (e.g. Ἀψυρτος).

153.15–16 Λωμεντός...16 πόλεις: These cities are in Italy, not in Sicily. It would be odd for Herodian to have confused Italy and Sicily.

153.15 Λωμεντός: I have adopted Schmidt’s emendation of the manuscripts’ λομεντός to Λωμεντός on the basis of a passage from Stephanus of Byzantium (see the apparatus of parallel passages).
Λωμεντός is a city in Italy (St. Byz. 423.18), an alternative name for Νωμεντός (Nomentum), modern Mentana.

153.15 Λαυρεντός: The name suggests ancient Laurentum in Latium (not the same as Loreto). If so the text confuses Italy and Sicily.

153.16–17 ἕτη...17 ὄντα: κονιορτός and κολοσπρότος are not recessive because they are common nouns, not proper names.

153.21 ἀμελκτός: This word is a hapax.

153.24–25 σεσημείωται...25 ὀξυνόμενον: δρυφακτός is an exception because it is oxytone, even though it is neither ἐπιθετικόν nor ὀνοματικόν.

153.28 Ἀκαστός: A personal name (LGPN II, IIIA, IIIB, IV, VA).

153.28 Ἀλαστός: This name is attested in an inscription from Phrygia (MAMA 4 134).

154.13 στρατευτός: This word is a hapax.

154.19–20 σεσημείωται...20 ὀξυνόμενον: ἐνιαυτός is a genuine exception, because although it fulfils the conditions for the rule, it is nevertheless oxytone.

155.3 ὄφος: Other grammatical and lexicographical texts agree that the koiné form of this fish name is recessive, while the Attic form is perispomenon (see the apparatus of parallel passages). Interestingly enough in modern Greek this fish name although written with -ος as
the koine form, it is accented on the final syllable as the Attic form
(cf. λαγώς/λαγός in the Attic, but λαγός in modern Greek).

155.15 πορφυροβάφος: An uncommon word; it also occurs in Ion
(3b.392,F 6.26), Ar. Byz. Epit. 1.44.7, Poll. (7 169.7-170.1), Ath. (II.ii
123.31 = 13.81.30).

156.2 Κόλχος: A personal name (LGPN IIA, IV). One should not
understand the ethnic designation meaning ‘Colchian’, because
ethnic designations are considered to be ἐπιθετικά, whereas this rule
on the recessives in -χος excludes adjectives.

156.3 κόγχος: The manuscripts’ κόχλος is not suitable as example of
this accentuation rule, because it does not end in -χος. I have
followed Lentz (225.24), who printed κόγχος, adopting Schmidt’s
suggested emendation (97.14 app. crit.). A passage from Ammonius
(Diff. 478.11-6; see the apparatus of parallel passages) that is parallel
to ours presents κόγχος in the vicinity of κόλχος, μόσχος, and
τρόχος.

156.11 <>: The adjectives in -μψος are not recessive, as we learn at the
end of the rule, and in any case none of the recessive examples is an
adjective. Therefore, a negative is needed before ἐπιθετικά. Schmidt
(97.21) noted in his apparatus that μή is missing here. μή ὅντα is
another plausible emendation.
156.12 μόψος: A rare word; it occurs again in Hesychius (μ 1769) with the gloss κηλίς ἢ ἐν τοῖς ἱματίοις and the indication that this is a Cyprian word.

156.12 Τίψος: A city name (Theognost. Can. II 77.1 (= 429.6); see the apparatus of parallel passages).

157.2 Λικαψός: A village close to Lydia (St. Byz. 421.6).

157.2 κινδαψός: An alternative form for σκινδαψός.
Appendix

2.3–4 τοῦ...4 ἐλληνισμοῦ: Perperam Schmidt 2.10 (app. crit.) codices BC τὸν ἐλληνισμὸν habere notavit.
2.5 συνιστάντος: Perperam Schmidt 2.11 (app. crit.) codices BC συνιστῶντος habere notavit.
2.16 τί: Haud recte Schmidt 2.21 (app. crit.) solum codicem A τι habere notavit; codex B etiam τι habet.
2.27 τήν...ἸΣ: perperam Schmidt 3.8 (app. crit.) codicem A τῆν τὰ εἰς ΙΣ habere notavit. codex τῆν εἰς ΙΣ praebet.
5.13 λειχὴν: Schmidt 6.12 (app. crit.) haud recte codicibus B et C lectionem εὐχὴν attribuit; error debetur Barkero 8.14-5, qui in textu εὐχὴν tamquam lectionem codicum BC scripsit.
5.17–6.1 παρασχηματισμῶν: Perperam Schmidt 6.16 (app. crit.) lectionem προσχηματισμῶν codicum BC tribuit; error debetur Barkero 8.18-9, qui in editione sua προσχηματισμῶν scripsit.
6.2 ἀδήν: adı̇n spiritu incerto A; perperam Egenloff (1881), 495 codicum A spiritum asperum habere scripsit A.
6.10 σωλήν: haud recte Schmidt 7.7 (app. crit.) solum codicem A lectionem σωλήν habere notavit. codex B etiam lectionem σωλήν praebet.
7.9 μή: haud recte lectionem μὲν codices BC habere Barker 9.20 et ita Schmidt 8.3 (app. crit.) notaverunt
7.14 Σειρήν Πειρήν: perperam Schmidt 8.6-7 (app. crit.) lectionem εἰρήν codicis C etiam codici B attribuit; error debetur Barkero 9.25, qui in textu εἰρήν scripsit et variam lectionem codicis B in apparatu non notavit. Haud recte Schmidt 8.6-7 (app. crit.) codices B et C πειρήν habere notavit.
8.3 ΙΝ: haud recte lectionem ην etiam codici B Schmidt 8.10 (app. crit.) attribuit; error debetur Barkero 10.1, qui in textu ην scripsit et variam lectionem ιν codicis B non notavit.
8.4 Τελχίν...Τελχίς: Perperam voces τρεχίν καὶ τρεχίς codici C Schmidt 8.11 (app. crit.) attribuit; error debetur Barkero 10.2, qui in editione sua τρεχίν καὶ τρεχίς scripsit et in apparatu critico notavit: τελχίν καὶ τελχίς pro τρεχίν καὶ τρεχίς
11.3 τα: Schmidt 9.11 omissionem codicum B et C non emendavit.
12.2 σινδὼν: Schmidt 10.2 male σινδὼν sine accentu scripsit.
14.5 Κίκων: Post Κίκων Schmidt 11.10 Δίκωn scripsit, quod nullus codex habet; vide etiam Egenloff (1881), 495.
15.5 ήτωι μανάς: σημαινοὶ ἰδέ μανάδα C (haud recte σημαινεῖ
Schmidt 12.5 (app. crit.); error debetur Barkero 15.5, qui in textu σημαίνει de C scrispit.

18.2 Κόνων: Perperam Schmidt 13.15 (app. crit.) lectionem κώνων codicis C etiam codici B tribuit; error debetur Barkero 14.12, qui variam lectionem codicis B in apparatu non notavit.

19.6 Ὀλοσσών: Schmidt 14.16 (app. crit.) lectionem λοσσών codicis C etiam codicibus AB attribuit; error debetur Barkero 15.14, qui λοσσών tamquam lectionen codicum BC in textu scrispit.

20.1 Κράτων: Perperam Schmidt 15.1 (app. crit.) codicem A litteram o supra ω habere annotavit.

20.2 Ἀριστων: Schmidt 15.2-3 errorem ἀ ὠστὸν (sic) codicis A non notavit.

20.13 Ξενοφών: Schmidt 15.12 omissionem codicis A non notavit.

20.15 κατηφών: Perperam Schmidt 15.13 (app. crit.) codicem A η supra τ habere annotavit; Bloch (G. Dindorf (1823), I 50) η supra τ enotavit, ut lectionem codicis A corrigeret, sed codex η supra τ non habet.

21.4 κλινόμενων: Haud recte Schmidt 15.20 (app. crit.) κλινόμενα tamquam variam lectionem codicis A annotavit; error debetur Blochio (G. Dindorf (1823), I 50), qui in suo apographo hoc enotavit.


22.4 γλύχων: Perperam Schmidt 16.6 (app. crit.) lectionem γλύχων codicum BC etiam codici A attribuit.

23.12 ἐνοιαν: Schmidt 16.18 lectionem ἐνοιας codicis A et ἐνοιαν codicis B non notavit.


23.20 ἱππαλεκτρυών: Schmidt 17.3 lectionem ἱππ’ ἀλεκτρυῶν codicis A non notavit.

24.5 δισύλλαβοι μετοχαί: Schmidt 17.10 lectiones μετοχαὶ δισύλλαβοι codicis C in textu scrispit et inversum ordinem vocum in codices A et B non notavit.

24.5–6 ὄξυνομομεναι: Schmidt 17.10-1 lectionem ὄξυνομομεναι codicis A non notavit.

25.1 Α: Schmidt 17.20 omissionem codicis A non notavit.

25.8 Ἀρετάων: Schmidt 18.5-6 ordinem vocum Ποσειδάων Ἀρετάων codicis C scrispit et inversum ordinem vocum in codicibus A et B non notavit.

26.8 χωρίς εἰ: Schmidt 18.17 lectionem εἰ codicis C scrispit et lectionem χωρίς εἰ codicium A et B non notavit.
26.12 ἡ...öffenton: Schmidt 18.20 lectionem óξύνεται codicis C scripsit et variam lectionem ἡ ἀπό τοῦ σφάξ ἐῴετονου codicis A non notavit.
26.13 βλεφαροστάξ: Schmidt 18.21 lectionem βλεφαροστάξ codicis A non notavit, sed solam lectionem βλεφαροστάξ codicum ABC Herodiani Περι διχρόνων.
27.9 κυμοπληξ: Perperam Schmidt 19.6 (app. crit.) lectionem κυμοπληξ codici A attribuit; error debitur Blochio, qui κυμοπληξ tamquam lectionem codicis notavit in Dindorffii Grammatici Graeci vol. I 51.
27.10 δὲ ὕσπληξ: Schmidt 19.7 lectionem δὲ ὕσπληξ non enotavit.
27.19 Τὰ...P: Schmidt 19.15 lectionem Περι τῶν ληγόντων εἰς αὖ codicis C scripsit et variam lectionem Τὰ εἰς αὖ codicis A non enotavit.
27.21 εἶτε θηλυκά: Haud recte εἰτε θηλυκα omisit Schmidt, quamquam codex A verba εἰτε θηλυκά praebet
28.6–7 καμπτήρ ἐλατήρ: Schmidt 20.2 ordinem vocum ἐλατήρ καμπτήρ in codice C in textu scripsit et inversum ordinem vocum in codicibus A et B non enotavit.
31.1–2 Σάπεο: Schmidt 21.2 (app. crit.) haud recte lectionem Σάπεο codicibus BC attribuit (error debitur Barkero (20.16–7), qui in editione sua Σάπεο scripsit, quod Schmidt esse lectionem codicum BC credevit).
31.6 ἀποπτύρισμα: Haud recte Schmidt 21.6 (app. crit.) codicem A ἀποπτύρισμα habere enotavit.
34.4 ὁσπερ: Haud recte Schmidt 22.2 (app. crit.) lectionem ὁσπερ solo codici B attribuit; codex A etiam ὁσπερ habet.
34.9 συναληλιμμένα: Perperam Schmidt 22.7 (app. crit.) lectionem συναληλιμμένα codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit; codex A συναληλιμμένα praebet.
34.10 ὡς: Haud recte Schmidt 22.8 (app. crit.) omissionem vocis ὡς in codicipus B et C etiam codici A attribuit.
34.13 τι: Perperam Schmidt 22.10 lectionem τὸ codicis C scripsit et variam lectionem τι codicum A et B non notavit.
34.17 Τὰ: Schmidt 22.13 male τὸ scripsit.
35.2 ἰλας: Perperam Schmidt 22.14 (app. crit.) codicum A ἰλας habere scripsit; codex A ἰλας praebet.
35.2 ἰλας: Haud recte Schmidt 22.15 (app. crit.) codicum A ἰλας scribere notavit; codex A ἰλας habet.
35.10–11 σεσημεῖωται...11 ἰμας: Haud recte Schmidt 23.3 additionem vocis οξυνόμενον in codice C scripsit et absentiam vocis in codicibus A et B non enotavit.
35.17–18 Θήρας Αθύρας: Perperam Schmidt 23.9 (app. crit.) codicem B θύρας θήρας praebere indicavit; codex B Θήρας Αθύρας habet.
36.7 συστέλλοντα: Perperam Schmidt 24.2 (app. crit.) lectionem συστέλλοντα codicis B non etiam codici A attribuit.
36.18 το: Schmidt 24.12 omissionem vocis το in codice A non enotavit.
37.4 καταλελειμμένων: Schmidt 22.17 male καταλελειμμένων scripsit.
37.6 και: Perperam Schmidt 24.19 (app. crit.) codices BC vocem ή omisisse, quod codex A habet, enotavit; codex A και praebet.
37.18 το: Schmidt 25.10 male lectionem το codicum A et C scripsit.
38.3 το...θηλυκόν: Lentz 63.2: δεσπότις το B: δεσπότις το ΜΑΘ: και το δεσπότις C; perperam Schmidt 25.13 (app. crit.) etiam codici B lectionem και το δεσπότις attribuit.
38.7 πιλωτόν: Haud recte Schmidt 25.18 (app. crit.) lectionem πιλωτον codicis C etiam codicibus A et B attribuit. A et B πιλωτον habent.
38.8 ως: Schmidt 25.19 perperam codices A et B ως omisisse notavit
40.3 μεν: Haud recte Schmidt 26.23 (app. crit.) codices B et C μεν habere enotavit. Codex A μεν praebet, quod B et C omiserunt.
41.2 δυσώδης: Perperam Egenolff (1881), 496 ευόδης dedit de A.
42.10 Ἑλεάτης: Ἑλεάτης C; perperam Schmidt 28.12 (app. crit.) lectionem Ἑλεάτης etiam codici A attribuit.
42.11 πειρατής: Perperam Schmidt 28.12 (app. crit.) lectionem πειρατής etiam codici B attribuit
43.3–4 Ἐτι...4 στρατιώτης: Haud recte Schmidt 28.19-20 (app. crit.) codicum C hanc partem omisisse notavit; de omissione partis δεσμώτης ... ἑπιθετικά in codice C vide ad apparatum criticum
43.3–5 δεσμώτης...5 ἑπιθετικά: om. C; haud recte Schmidt 28.21 (app. crit.) codicum C ὑμματικά pro ἑπιθετικά habere notavit; vox ὑμματικά ante Ορέστης omissioni debetur
43.7 ἀργεστής: Schmidt 28.23 additionem verbi καὶ ante ἀργεστής in codice C in textu scrispit et in apparatu critico non enotavit.
43.7 ἑπιθετικά: Schmidt 28.23 additionem verbi ὀξύνονται post ἑπιθετικά in codice C in textu scrispit et in apparatu critico non enotavit.
43.12 ἀσεβῆς: Perperam Schmidt 29.4 (app. crit.) codices BC vocem ἀσεβῆς omississe notavit.
45.1 εἰς²: Haud recte Schmidt 29.16 (app. crit.) codices AB εἰς omississe notavit.
47.8 εἰς...συνεσταλμένον: Perperam Schmidt 30.8 (app. crit.) verba εἰς ἡ συνεσταλμένον ἄρσενικα codici A attribuit. Haud recte Schmidt 30.8 (app. crit.) codices BC εἰς ὠνόματα συνεσταλμένον τὸ ἐχοντα habere annotavit; codex B εἰς ἠ ὠνόματα (ὀνόματα deleetum legitur) habet et codex C εἰς ὠνόματα συνεσταλμένον τὸ ἐχοντα
48.11 Τυνδαρίς: Schmidt 30.21 male additionem ἢ τοῦ Τυνδάρεω post Τυνδαρίς in codice C in textu scrispit, et perperam solum codicum B voces ἢ τοῦ Τυνδάρεω non habere in apparatu critico enotavit. Codex A etiam ἢ τοῦ Τυνδάρεω non habet.
49.3 γενόμενον: Haud recte Schmidt 31.3 (app. crit.) solos codices B et C γενόμενον habere enotavit; codex A etiam γενόμενον praebet.
50.5 σημειώσαι: Haud recte Egenolff (1881), 496 codicum A σημειώσατέν habere annotavit; codex A σῇ habet.
50.7 σφαγίς: Schmidt 31.15 male σφαγίς in textu scrispit; σφαγίς lectio codicis A ante correctionem est.
50.11 ἀλουφγίς: Haud recte Schmidt 31.18-9 lectionem ἀλουφγίς etiam codici C attribuit; codex C ἀλουφγίς (sic) habet.
50.17 Κράθις: Perperam Schmidt 32.2 (app. crit.) lectionem κράθις codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit; codex A κράθις praebet.
50.20 δὲ: Perperam Egenolff (1881), 496 verbum μὲν postea deleetum in A non annotavit.
51.3 παλακίς: Haud recte Schmidt 32.9 (app. crit.) lectionem παλακίς codicibus A et B attribuit; codices A et B παλακίς habent.
51.15 ή: Perperam Schmidt 33.1 (app. crit.) lectionem ή codicibus ABC attribuit.
51.15 ἐνοπλοῖς: Haud recte Schmidt 33.1 (app. crit.) lectionem ἔν ὀπλοῖς codicibus B et C attribuit (CΔC: ἐνοπλοῖς (sic), ut videtur, scripsit).
51.18 εἰ: Schmidt 33.4 male εἰ scripsit.
51.20 μαῦλοις: Haud recte Schmidt 33.6 (app. crit.) lectionem μάλυβοῖς codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit; codex A μάλυβοῖς habet.
51.21–22 μακρόν...22 A: Haud recte Schmidt 33.7 lectionem τὸ α μακρόν codicis C in textu scripsit et variam lectionem codicum A et B μακρὸν τὸ α non enotavit.
51.27 μέν: Haud recte Schmidt 33.11 (app. crit.) omissionem codicis C etiam codici A attribuit.
52.3 πενταλίς: Perperam Schmidt 33.15 (app. crit.) lectionem πενταλίς codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit; codex A πρυνταλίς habet.
52.8 πῶμα: Haud recte Schmidt 33.20 (app. crit.) lectionem πτῶμα codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit; codex A πτῶμα habet.
52.16 ἦ I: Haud recte Schmidt 34.5 (app. crit.) lectionem τὸ ἦ codicis C etiam codici B attribuit.
52.18 ἔχει: Perperam Schmidt 34.6 (app. crit.) omissionem codicis C etiam codici B attribuit.
52.21 Ἀδουλίς: Haud recte Schmidt 34.9 (app. crit.) lectionem ἄγουλίς in codice C etiam codici B attribuit. Codex B Ἀδουλίς habet.
52.27 Σαλαμίς: Haud recte Schmidt 34.13 (app. crit.) codices ABC σεμίς habere notavit. solus codex C σεμίς praebet; codices AB σεμίς δὲ praebent.
52.28 ὀξύνεται: Haud recte Schmidt 34.14 variam lectionem ὀξύνεται codicis C in textu scripsit et lectionem ὀξύνεται aliorum codicum non enotavit.
53.1 δὲ: Perperam Schmidt 34.17 lectionem codicis A in textu non scripsit.
53.9 παραλήγοντα: Perperam Schmidt 35.1 (app. crit.) variam lectionem παραλήγοντα solo codicis B attribuit; codex A etiam παραλήγοντα habet.
54.13 ἐπίς...ἐμίς: Perperam Schmidt 36.1 (app. crit.) codicem C ἄσπις ἐπίς ἐμίς habere annotavit; codex C ἐπίς ἄσπις ἐλπίς praebet.
54.15–16 ἐχοντα...16 ἐννοοῖαν: Schmidt 36.3 inversum ordinem
vocum ἐννοιαν ἔχοντα in codice C in textu scrispit et lectionem aliorum codicum non enotavit.

55.16 ὑπερδισύλλαβα: Schmidt 36.18 lectionem ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβάς codicis C in textu scrispit et lectionem ὑπερδισύλλαβα aliorum codicum non enotavit.

55.19 E: Schmidt 36.21 verbum supervacaneum τὸ ante E addidit, et additionem non enotavit.

55.24 Κελένδερις: Schmidt 36.24-5 lectionem Κελένδερις scrispit, sed lectionem κέλερις codicum non enotavit.

56.10 O: Schmidt 37.13 (app. crit.) additionem verbi τὸ ante O in codicibus B et C in textu scrispit, sed alios codices solum O habere non enotavit.

57.4 βαρύνεται: Schmidt 38.1 lectionem βαρύνεται in textu scrispit, sed lectionem βαρύνονται codicum ABC non enotavit.

57.5 ὡτίς: Haud recte Schmidt 38.1 (app. crit.) lectionem ὡγίς codicis C etiam codici B attribuit; codex B ὡτίς praebet.

57.13 βούββωστις: Schmidt 38.9 lectionem βούββωστις in textu scrispit, et lectionem βούββωστις codicum non enotavit.

59.5 ῥάχις: Perperam Schmidt 39.6 lectionem ῥάχις codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit.

59.6 Ὑδελχις: Perperam Schmidt 39.6 (app. crit.) lectionem ὑδελχίς codicis C etiam codici B attribuit.

60.5 Αταργατίς: Perperam Schmidt 39.12 (app. crit.) lectionem ἀταργατίς codicis C etiam codici B attribuit.

60.8 μακρῶ: Perperam Schmidt 39.15 (app. crit.) lectionem μακρῶν codicum B et C etiam codici A attribuit; codex A lectionem μακρῶ praebet.

63.1 ἐνὸς...συμφώνων: Haud recte Schmidt 40.16 (app. crit.) lectionem ἐνὸς συμφώνων codicis C etiam codici A attribuit. Perperam lectionem ἐνὸς δύο συμφώνων codici B attribuit.

64.7 Δῶρος σώρος: Barker et Schmidt 41.9 inversum ordinem vocum scriserunt.

64.9 ἘΙΟΣ: Schmidt 41.11 (app. crit.) hau recte codices BC ὙΟΣ... ἕνος habere notavit; error desetur Barkero 38.10, qui ut tamquam ἕ legit et in textu scrispit.

65.2 ἵλεος: Perperam Schmidt 41.17 (app. crit.) lectionem ἵλεος codicis B non etiam codici A attribuit.

65.6 εἰ: Barker 38.21 et Schmidt 42.3 hau recte lectionem ἕ codicibus attribuerunt; error desetur Barkero, qui εἰ tamquam ἕ legit et in textu scrispit.

66.5 δαιδάλειος: Perperam Schmidt 42.10 (app. crit.) lectionem
δεδάλειος codicis C etiam codicibut A et B attribuit; error partim
debetur Barkero, qui lectionem codicis C in textu scripsit et variam
lectionem codicis B non annotavit.

66.8 προπαροξύνονται: Haud recte Schmidt 42.12-3 (app. crit.)
προπαροξύνεται in textu scripsit, quod nullus codex habet. Codices
προπαροξύνονται praebent.

68.2 προπαροξύνεται: Haud recte lectionem παροξύνεται etiam
codicibus A et B attribuit Schmidt 42.18-9

68.4 προπαροξύνεται: Perperam Schmidt 42.20 (app. crit.)
lectionem παροξύνεται codicibus A, B et C attribuit; error partim
debetur Barkero 39.13, qui παροξύνεται in textu scripsit. Codices
προπαροξύνεται habent.

68.8 Ροδίος...Σχέδιος: Haud recte Schmidt 43.3 (app. crit.)
lectionem ρόδιος καὶ σχέδιος codicis C etiam codici A attribuit.
Codex A, ut etiam codex B, ρόδιος κύριον καὶ Σχέδιος habet.

69.3 ΩΝΙΩΣ: Haud recte Schmidt 43.7 (app. crit.) lectionem codicis C
etiam codici A attribuit.

69.8 μονίωσ: Perperam Schmidt 43.12 (app. crit.) lectionem
παροξύνεται codici A attribuit; codex A οξύνεται praebet.

73.4 μύριος: Perperam Schmidt 45.14 (app. crit.) lectionem μυρίος
codicibus A, B, et C attribuit.

73.10 ἀντην: Perperam Schmidt 45.20 (app. crit.) lectionem ἀντιν
codicis C etiam codicibus A et B attribuit; A et B ἀντιν praebent.

74.5 κυβίος: Haud recte Schmidt 46.2 (app. crit.) lectionem κυβίος
codicis C etiam codici B attribuit; error debetur Barkero 42.3, qui
lectionem κυβίος codicis C in textu scripsit et variam lectionem
κυβίος codicis B non annotavit.

75.6 ἀθρόος: Haud recte Schmidt 46.12 (app. crit.) codices BC
ἀθρόως habere scripsit; error debetur Barkero 42.13, qui ἀθρόως
(tamquam lectionem codicum BC) in textu scripsit.

77.1 Ω...προσγεγραμμένου: Haud recte Schmidt 47.1 (app. crit.)
lectionem διψθόγγιο (post Ω) codicis C etiam codici B attribuit.
Perperam Schmidt 47.2 lectionem καταχρηστική codicis C in textu
scripsit, et lectiones aliorum codicem non enotavit.
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