



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Aorist Passive Stems with Middle Endings: Do They Really Exist

Worp, K.A.

### Citation

Worp, K. A. (2006). Aorist Passive Stems with Middle Endings: Do They Really Exist. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, 156, 183-184. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10153>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10153>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## AORIST PASSIVE STEMS WITH MIDDLE ENDINGS: DO THEY REALLY EXIST?

Some well-known Greek grammars of post-classical Greek present the observation that in later Greek a remarkable hybrid form is found consisting of an aorist passive stem provided with middle endings. First of all, E. Mayser<sup>1</sup> states: "An den passiven Aoriststamm treten mediale Endungen: im erotischen Fragment [P.]Grenf. I 1 col. 1, 22 (II<sup>a</sup>) ἀναμνησθῶμ(αι) und col. 2.11 ὄπρασθῶμεθα", with a remark in a footnote [1] that "Andere Erklärungsversuche sind wenig überzeugend, z.B. die Teilung ὄπρασθῶμεθα v. O. Crusius, Philol. 55, 374. Vgl. H. Ehrlich, K.Z. 38, 57." Mayser goes on to observe that "Die mißbräuchliche Verwendung medialer Formen ist auch sonst in der damaligen Volkssprache nicht selten (vgl. 80, 1b [Medium statt Aktivum] und Bd. II[.1] 112ff.) und bildet eine Stütze für die genannten Formen". Furthermore, F.Th. Gignac<sup>2</sup> observes that the phenomenon occurring in the two examples from the Ptolemaic papyri cited by Mayser, *loc.cit.*, is found in ἐκληρόθημαι, SB I 4755.1 (Byz.).

From the outside, these observations made by two authorities in the field look convincing enough.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, there is in my view reason to be cautious. As to the two Ptolemaic attestations of the hybrid form given by Mayser it may be remarked that in the latest reedition of *P.Grenf. I 1*, by K. Vandorpe as *P.Dryton 50*, both readings of the *ed. princ.* have now disappeared, i.e. the first (abbreviated) form ἀναμνησθῶμ(αι) is replaced by ἀναμ[νή]σωμ' (while Vandorpe notes: "ω in ἀναμ[νή]σωμ' corr. ex θ Crusius (Philol. 55, 1896, 354-383)"), the second case ὄπρασθῶμεθα ἐμῶν by Vandorpe's new reading ὄπ[ ]ασθω με βλέπων. Secondly, C. Wessely's reading of SB I 4755 cited by Gignac is at least doubtful. In fact, my colleague J.-L. Fournet (Paris) communicated to me his finding, made on the original already several years ago, that ἐκληρόθημαι should be corrected to ἐκληρόθη (ἐκληρώθη) καί.<sup>4</sup>

So much for the discussion of the phenomenon in various authoritative grammars: it might seem now that, after all, clear-cut attestations of an aorist passive stem provided with middle endings simply do not exist.

This, however, is not the end of the story. A search for -θήμεθα in the *DDBDP* produced an attestation of ἐξωδιασθήμ(εθα) in P.Berl. Frisk I' col. ix.20; there is, however, in this case no obstacle against resolving the abbreviation more regularly as ἐξωδιάσθημ(εν) = 1. ps. pl. ind. aor. pass. of the verb ἐξωδιάζω.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, a search for -θημαι in the *DDBDP* produced a form κατεσχέθημαι in *P.Oxy. LVI 3859.8 (IV<sup>p</sup>)*. In this case the editor notes in the critical apparatus that one should read κατεσχέθην and states in the note ad loc. that "late examples of the hybrid verbal forms (she refers to *P.Grenf. I 1*.i.22, ii.11 and SB I 4755) look more like confusion of the aorist and perfect passive". While in itself the idea about such a confusion may be correct, there is now no longer any support to be found in the 'parallels' of *P.Grenf. I 1* and SB I 4755. Only so much is certain that in the Oxyrhynchus

<sup>1</sup> *Grammatik der Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I<sup>2</sup> 2 (Berlin-Leipzig 1938) 163.

<sup>2</sup> *Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, II: *Morphology* (Milano 1981) 357.

<sup>3</sup> Remarkably enough, I have not found any discussion of such hybrid forms in the thorough study of verbs in later Greek by B.G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens 1973). I cannot tell whether this means that Mandilaras does not accept them. Likewise, the phenomenon is apparently not discussed by S. Kapsomenos, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit*, München 1938; L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, Tübingen 1925<sup>2</sup>; F. Blass - A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des N.T. Griechisch*, 1965<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> I am most grateful to Dr. Fournet for acquainting me with his finding.

<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the editor of *CPR X 107a (396<sup>p</sup>)*, proposed to correct in the subscription to this contract the 1st ps. sg. Aor. pass. ind. συνηλλάγην to συνηλλάγημεθα, as the syntax demanded a plural rather than a singular form; after all, however, one should correct the 1st ps. sg. Aor. pass. ind. into συνηλλάγημην.

papyrus the reading of the verbal ending in -σχεθήμαι is correct,<sup>6</sup> while it would seem to me that one should not separate -μαι from the preceding, as if a spelling error for με (acc. sg. of ἐγώ) were to be reckoned with. Furthermore, *P.Col. IV 103.9-11 (III<sup>a</sup>)* also comes to the rescue of the defendants of the hybrid form by providing us with a phrase φρόντισον ἵνα οικονομηθώμεθα (one would expect a form οικονομηθώμεν); for this, the editor in his note refers to E. Mayser, *Grammatik*, I<sup>2</sup> 2 163. Now, while on this point Mayser's authority was questioned above, there is, again, no possibility to change the texts' reading itself or its interpretation.<sup>7</sup>

At the same time, however, it would seem to me that these and other such exceptional forms are idiosyncracies, rather than that we should regard the phenomenon under discussion as an aorist form resulting from a more or less regular development of later Greek. Perhaps<sup>8</sup> one may regard the form in *P.Col. IV 103.10-11* as an idiosyncratic spelling error for οικονομησώμεθα (= 1. ps. pl. Aor. Med.; the translation in the ed.princ.: "consider how we are to arrange matters" hardly needs to be adapted)? Likewise, one could argue that the form κατεσχέθημαι contains a spelling error for κατεσχέθημεν, i.e. -μαι would stand for -με, while the final ν was omitted because of its weak position in pronunciation (cf. F.Th. Gignac, *Grammar*, I 111-12).

Papyrological Institute, University of Leiden

Klaas A. Worp<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See the photo of the papyrus available through the website "<http://163.1.169.40/gsd/collect/POxy/index/assoc/HASH0a1c/4fdc312c.dir/POxy.v0056.n3859.a.01.hires.jpg>". I cannot refrain from stating my doubts about the reading of the verb's beginning, κκτ-. While kappa seems damaged beyond the point of clear recognition, I cannot read hereafter both an alpha and a tau.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. by separating οικονομηθώ from a following μεθ' ἃ; there is no lacuna hereafter as appears from the photo on the website "[http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/ldpd/app/apis/search?mode=search&pubnum\\_coll=P.Col.&pubnum\\_vol=4&pubnum\\_page=103&sort=date&resPerPage=25&action=search&p=1](http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/ldpd/app/apis/search?mode=search&pubnum_coll=P.Col.&pubnum_vol=4&pubnum_page=103&sort=date&resPerPage=25&action=search&p=1)".

<sup>8</sup> I owe the following suggestion to the acumen of my colleague Ms F.A.J. Hoogendijk (Leiden).

<sup>9</sup> I am grateful to Dr. F. Waanders (Amsterdam) who in a private discussion raised with me a question that inspired me to the writing of this note.

P.GENOVA II 52: A LINK WITH HESYCHIUS?<sup>1</sup>

*P.Genova II 52*<sup>2</sup> (= W. Clarysse a.o., *Leuven Database of Ancient Books*,<sup>3</sup> # 10035; = M. Huys a.o., *Catalogue of the Paraliterary Papyri*<sup>4</sup> # 0274) is a papyrus of unknown provenance, labelled by the first editor a 'Lista di Parole in B'. After describing the physical characteristics of the papyrus fragment and defining its palaeographical date ('early IIIp\*') she points out that the type of text encountered on the fragment definitely looks like an alphabetically ordered word list, though it is not a real glossary because there are no word explanations. Therefore, she concludes (p. 8), "... è possibile che il frammento faccia parte di un indice più ampio di vocaboli, appartenente a una singola opera oppure a opere diverse di uno o più autori", and in a footnote (n. 4) she observes: "Molti sono gli autori ai quali riconducono le parole qui elencate, da Omero a Eschilo, da Aristofane ad Aristotele, da Platone ad altri ancora, e per ognuno di essi può essere citata più di un'opera: risulta pertanto difficile - e forse inutile - cercare in questa molteplicità di fonti una risposta univoca per il nostro frammento."

These observations are, of course, correct. Our general view on this word list may be influenced by my accidental discovery that many (though not all) of the words in this text also appear in a completely or almost completely identical form as *lemmata* in the lexicon of Hesychius, our most important late antique source of Greek lexicography.<sup>5</sup> The following listing should illustrate this point ('---' indicates the absence of a corresponding entry in Hesychius):

	<i>P.Genova II 52</i> , col. i	Hesychius
1	β]ε . . . νοι	---
2	βελλερ[ο]φ[ο]ν[τη]ς	---
3	βεβηλος	cf. B 413, βέβηλος
4	βημα	cf. B 551 & 563, βῆμα
5	βησσει	cf. B 582, βήσσης
6	βηρυλ'λιοι	cf. B 578, βήρυλλος
7	βιον	cf. B 611*, βιόν
8	βιβλ[. . .]	cf. B 599, βιβλία; B 609, βίβλιος
9	βιβλαρ[ ]	---
10	βλάσταν[ ]	cf. B 685, βλάσταν
11	βλασφη[ ]	---
12	] . . . [	---

<sup>1</sup> I should like to thank Prof. Dr. K. Alpers, Prof. R.S. Bagnall, Dr. R. Criore and Ms. F.A.J. Hoogendijk for contributing various critical remarks to an earlier version of this paper; of course, I am responsible for its final form and content. I should also like to express my gratitude to Dr. B.P. Muhs for correcting my English text.

<sup>2</sup> L. Migliardi Zingale, *Papiri dell'Università di Genova*, vol. II (nos. 51-90), Firenze 1980 (= *Pap.Flor.*, 6). This text was written on the verso of a papyrus sheet; the recto is published by H. Harrauer - R. Pintaudi, *PUG II 52 recto: frammento di manuale tachygrafico*, *AnalPap.* 14-15 (2002-2003) 117-118.

<sup>3</sup> See the website '<http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/>'; hereafter = *LDAB*.

<sup>4</sup> See the website '<http://cpp.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/searchform.html>'; hereafter = *CPP*.

<sup>5</sup> On this author (*flor.* V or VIp) and his importance for Greek lexicography, see the article by R. Tosi in *Der Neue Pauly*, Bd. V 514-515. On the history and development of Greek (and Latin) lexicography in Antiquity and Byzantium general, see the excellent overview by K. Alpers, 'Lexikographie' B.I-III, in: G. Ueding (Hrsg.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, Bd. V: L-Musi (Tübingen 2001) 194-210. Actually, the two studies by M. Naoumides, "Greek Lexicography in the Papyri" (unpubl. Diss. Urbana, Illinois 1961) and "The Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri" (in: *Classical Studies presented to Ben Edwin Perry* [Urbana, Illinois, 1969; = *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, 58] 181-202) do not cover material deriving directly from ancient schools.