

COMMENTATIONES AD LITTERAS GRAECAS SPECTANTES

KATARZYNA FRĄCKIEWICZ

Katedra Filologii Klasycznej Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach
pl. Sejmu Śląskiego 1, 40-032 Katowice
Polska – Poland

THE CONTRACTED FORMS IN THE PRESENT INDICATIVE MIDDLE AND PASSIVE OF ATHEMATIC VERBS IN POETRY OF ANCIENT GREECE OF ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL PERIOD

ABSTRACT. Frąckiewicz Katarzyna, The contracted forms in the Present Indicative Middle and Passive of Athematic Verbs in Poetry of Ancient Greece of Archaic and Classical Period.

The aim of the paper is an attempt at analysing the contracted forms of the second-person singular of athematic verbs in Greek poetry. Verbs such as δύνομαι and ἐπίσταμαι have forms with -σαι and -ηι, -αι in the present indicative middle and passive. Contemporary scholars express different views on where the contracted forms appear. The paper presents the opinions of ancient grammarians and modern linguists on the mentioned subject. The critical analysis of these opinions has been contrasted with the forms present in the poetry of archaic and classical period.

Key words: -ηι ending, -αι ending, athematic verbs, Greek poetry.

In Greek language spirant σ remained unchanged, disappeared or was transformed depending on its position. Sigma between vowels behaved in very different ways. In Indo-European languages intervocalic consonants tended to become weakened. This resulted in their voicing, spirantisation or disappearance. Sigma tends to disappear, and in the transition phase it is weakened and becomes *h*. The transition phase is evident in the Laconian, Argolic and Elean dialects. *s remained unchanged when it occurred after *-η and *-ι (δασύς < *dns, θρασύς < *dhrsū), when it originated from gemination -σσ- (ποσί, hom. ποσσί < *pod-si) and from -τσ- (Ἄτλας < *atlants). In many cases the spirant was reintroduced by analogy: in sigmatic aorist, in dative plural with -σι and in athematic verb forms.¹

¹ See also: Frąckiewicz 2012: 9–15. The problem itself is similar to that of the so-called ‚Attic Rückverwandlung‘ (cf. Szemerényi 1991: 1338–1356; Palmer 1986: 293).

According to the general theory, in the Attic dialect in the forms of second-person singular of the present indicative middle and passive of verbs with athematic conjugation σ was restored by way of analogy to forms of perfect indicative and pluperfect middle and passive (thus τίθεσαι, ἴστασαι). Some contemporary linguists are uncertain whether σ was always restored. They believe that in Attic dialect and in other dialects there are also forms where the intervocalic σ disappears without contraction and the forms contracted (δύναι, δύνῃ and δύνασαι; ἐπίσται, ἐπίστῃ and ἐπίστασαι). It is hence problematic to which dialect forms ending in -αι and -ῃ belong to and what is the type of contraction.

THE OPINIONS OF MODERN LINGUISTS

Goodwin believes that the forms contracted in -αι occur “occasionally”.² Smyth is more precise and claims that these forms are poetic, dialectic or late.³ Schwyzer provides the forms and the place where they have occurred (dialects, works or authors): ἐπίσται – appears in Attic tragedy and in Pindar, ἐπίστῃ in Theognis, δύναι – Aeolic and Doric form, δύνῃ in Eurypides and on Ptolemaic papyrus, δύνασαι in Homer.⁴ Brugmann also found forms with -αι in tragedians, but he does not specify the place of their occurrence.⁵ Jurewicz mentions the δύνῃ form. He only observes that in present both forms are used: δύνῃ and δύνασαι.⁶ Moreover, Smyth in his *The sounds and inflections of the Greek dialects: Ionic dialect* states that the ἐπίστῃ form in Theognis is the result of the contraction of -ε and -αι: -α(σ)αι > -ε(σ)αι > -ῃ.⁷ The ἐπίσται (-αι < -ασαι) and the ἐπίστασαι form (characteristic of the Attic dialect) occur in Doric dialect of Pindar and in Aeschylus. According to Smyth, the δύνασαι form appears in Homer, in Pindar and in Attic prose, but Attic poetry notes the occurrence of δύναι. The δύναι form is also characteristic of Doric dialect. δύνῃ is the form resulting from Ionic δύνεαι, δύνασαι occurs in Attic dialect.⁸ Adrados believes that the δύνῃ form can be Attic or old Attic and that this form is based on Ionic

²Goodwin 1900: 144.

³Smyth 1956: 154.

⁴Schwyzer 1939: 668.

⁵Brugmann 1913: 405.

⁶Jurewicz 1992: 217.

⁷Smyth here pays attention to the opinion of Herodian that -εαι ending from -ασαι is characteristic of Ionic dialect (see below); according to him, to regard δύνασαι and ἐπίστασαι forms as Ionic is not correct, that Choitoboskos citing Herodian has to do (Smyth 1894: 502).

⁸Smyth gives information on the exact place of occurrence: ἐπίστῃ (Thgn. 1085), ἐπίσται (Pind. *Pyth.* III 80), ἐπίστασαι (Pind. *Pyth.* VIII 7), δύνῃ (fr. anacr. 29, 11), δύνασαι (Hp. IX 342) (Smyth 1894: 502–503).

form without contraction.⁹ He shares the same opinion with Schwyzer, who regarded the δύναι form to be Aeolic and Doric.¹⁰

THE OPINIONS OF ANCIENT GRAMMARIANS

The ancient grammarian Herodian who lived in the 2nd century AD¹¹ also studies δύνηι and ἐπίστηι forms sometimes not analyzed by contemporary scholars. He observed, so as Smyth, that these forms are poetic.¹² Herodian adds that these forms rarely occur in Attic dialect:

Πόθεν τὸ δύνηι καὶ ἐπίστηι; ἀπὸ τοῦ δύνασαι καὶ ἐπίστασαι κατὰ πάθος Ἰάδος διαλέκτου γέγονεν ἐνδεία τοῦ σ καὶ τροπῇ τοῦ α εἰς ε δύνεαι καὶ ἐπίστεαι, καὶ κράσει τοῦ ε καὶ α εἰς η φυλαττομένου καὶ τοῦ ι δύνηι καὶ ἐπίστηι. αὕτη δὲ ἡ χρῆσις παρὰ μὲν τοῖς ποιηταῖς μάλλόν ἐστι, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ἀττικίζουσι σπανίως.¹³

Why δύνηι and ἐπίστηι? In the Ionic dialect the forms δύνασαι and ἐπίστασαι gave way to δύνεαι and ἐπίστεαι with the disappearance of σ and with a changing α into ε and (forms) δύνηι and ἐπίστηι with the contraction of ε and α into η and with a retaining ι. This use is more frequent in poetry, in Attic dialect it is rare.

τὸ δ δύνηι καὶ ἐπίστηι κατὰ πάθος λέγουσιν, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ δύνασαι καὶ ἐπίστασαι, δύναι ἐπίστααι καὶ Ἰωνικῶς δύνεαι καὶ ἐπίστεαι, καὶ κατὰ κράσιν τοῦ ε καὶ α εἰς η δύνηι καὶ ἐπίστηι, καὶ μένει τὸ ι προσγεγραμμένον.¹⁴

As for δύνηι and ἐπίστηι one say that from δύνασαι and ἐπίστασαι (is) δύναι, ἐπίστααι, and in Ionic dialect δύνεαι and ἐπίστεαι and after the contraction ε and α into η δύνηι and ἐπίστηι (forms appear) and ι is added.

According to Herodian, δύνηι form originated from: δύνασαι > δύναι > δύνεαι > δύνηι. The changing α into ε is characteristic of the Ionic dialect, thus, according to him, the forms ending in -ηι are Ionic.

The Theodosius presents a completely different view of the way of contraction. According to him, δύνηι and ἐπίστηι forms are the result of the contraction of two α:

τὸ δύνασαι καὶ ἐπίστασαι κατὰ ἀποβολὴν τοῦ σ ἐκφέρουσι δύναι καὶ ἐπίστααι, κατὰ δὲ συναίρεσιν τῶν δύο αα δύνηι καὶ ἐπίστηι, προσγεγραφομένου τοῦ ι.¹⁵

⁹Adrados 1953: 126–127; Adrados 1999: 102.

¹⁰Adrados 1953: 126–127; Schwyzer 1939: 668.

¹¹Many works of Herodian not been preserved, however, we can find some references at later grammarians.

¹²Smyth 1956: 154.

¹³Herodianus 1863: 33, 1–4.

¹⁴Herodianus 1867: 840, 2–5.

¹⁵Theodosius 1894.

One quotes δύνασαι and ἐπίστασαι (forms) after the loss of σ: δύναι and ἐπίσται, after the contraction of two αα δύνηι and ἐπίστηι with ι added.

However, the opinion of Theodosius relates to Aeolic dialect. On the other hand, Herodian does not mention these forms in Aeolic dialect. Thus we can believe opinions of Herodian and Theodosius to be independent.

Based on the above, Herodian and Theodosius, the ancient grammarians, in contrast to modern linguists, analyse in detail the way of contraction in the forms ending in -ηι. They disagree in which dialects the contracted forms are present.

They are, as far as I know, the only sources known to us about this.

THE FORMS IN POETRY¹⁶

After discussing the ancient and contemporary grammarians' opinions on the subject, we should analyse the contracted forms in poetry of archaic and classical period. Below, for the problematic verbs I present forms found in the critical apparatus having regard to the fact that every copist and editor corrects the variants preserved in the manuscripts in order to present a coherent and standardized text.

We should pose a fundamental question in which dialects, according to the general theory, the contracted forms are present. Generally, the contraction is characteristic of the Attic dialect. However, the forms of athematic verbs ending in -σαι are exceptions. In the Attic dialect σ was reintroduced by the analogy of the verbs with stem that end with a consonant. Therefore, the ἐπίστηι, δύνηι and ἐπίσται, δύναι forms occurring in lyric poetry and in tragedy but not in early Attic prose, are probably not Attic.¹⁷ It is also problematic which is the type of contraction.

The ἐπίστηι and δύνηι forms can be found in Theognis and in Anacreontics:

Δημῶναξ, [...] οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστηι (Thgn. 1085)

ὄσον δύνηι βάθυνον (fr. anacr. 4, 6)

ἴσον γὰρ οὐ δύνηι φιλήσαι (fr. anacr. 31, 11)

In tragedy, they occur only in dialogue parts:

σὺ δ' οὐ λέγεις γε, δρᾶς δέ μ' εἰς ὄσον δύνηι (Eur. *Andr.* 239)

δρᾶς δ' οὐδὲν ἡμάς εὖ, κακῶς δ' ὄσον δύνηι (Eur. *Hec.* 253)

¹⁶Analysis based on editions such as: Aeschylus 1990; Aristophanes 1907; Aristophanes 2002; *Carmina Anacreontea* 1984; Euripides 1916; Euripides 1944; Euripides 1973; IEG 1998; Pindarus 1987; *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta* 1955; Sophocles 1970; Sophocles 1973; Theocritus 1999.

¹⁷See above. According to Herodian, an ancient grammarian, these forms are poetic. Smyth also regarded these forms to be poetic, dialectic or late.

The theory of Herodian would be attested by forms in lyric poetry but there are only two forms in Anacreontics and one in Theognis so we do not confirm that certainly these forms are Ionic, especially because they occur in tragedy as well. And the question is why the contracted forms are present in writing Ionic dialect. This problem is difficult also because the written Ionic dialect had the forms without contraction whereas the forms contracted were observed in colloquial language.¹⁸ Moreover, the Ionic forms in tragedy, in dialogue parts are difficult to explain. Considering that in Ionic dialect the forms without contraction occur more frequently, δύνητι would be an exception with contraction or variant form to the also Ionic δύνεαι form.

The δύνητι form occurs also in comedy but only once¹⁹ and as opposed to the forms in tragedy, it is a subjunctive with a regular contraction.²⁰

It also raises many doubts that δύνητι form, noted by manuscripts, in tragedy, following Porson, is changed to δύναι form (Soph. *Ph.* 798; Eur. *Hec.* 253). Porson believes this form to be more Attic. δύνητι form is relatively frequent in later texts, also in prose. In Menander (Men. *Dys.* 808), Crates (Crates *SH* fr. 363, 2), Pseudo-Pythagoras (*Carm. Aur.* 8, 19), in Ionic prose (Hp. *VC* 14, 36 Littré), in mature Attic prose (Plat. *Phaedo* 58d, 8; Isoc. I 21) and in late prose (Plb. VII 12, 5). However, it is usually subjunctive (Crates *SH* fr. 363, 2; Men. *Dys.* 808; Plat. *Phaedo* 58d, 8; Isoc. I 21; Hp. *VC* 14, 36).

The ἐπίσται form appears in tragedy and in Pindar²¹:

εἰ δ' λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, ἴερων, / ὀρθὸν ἐπίσται (Pind. *Pyth.* III 80)
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπίσται, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἀμελεῖν μάθε (Aesch. *Eum.* 86)
 [...] σὺ δ' εἴσαγε / ὄπως <τῶ> ἐπίσται τήνδε κύρωσον δίκην (Aesch. *Eum.* 581)

δύναι occurs in Alcaeus and in Theocritus:

αἶ τι δύναι κατεχ[.....]ο (Alc. fr. 119, 8)
 οὔτε τὸν ὄγμον ἄγειν ὀρθὸν δύναι, ὡς τὸ πρὶν ἄγεις (Theoc. X 2)

This form can be found in Sophocles, in a choral part and in dialogue parts:

οὔτω κατ' ἡμᾶρ οὐ δύναι μολεῖν ποτε (Soph. *Ph.* 798)
 Ἄλλ' ὅ τι δύναι μάκιστον (Soph. *Ph.* 849)

Based on the above, the forms in -αι occur in Pindar, Alcaeus, Theocritus and in tragedy. They are, as far as I know, all attested forms. In the light of the facts mentioned it is difficult to draw any specific conclusions. Lyric and tragedy

¹⁸ Marchewka 2002: 82; West 1982: 12.

¹⁹ Aristoph. *Eq.* 491.

²⁰ Fiderer 1920: 99.

²¹ Schwyzer 1939: 668.

contain the many words and forms which are not really Doric or Aeolic. The language of poetry is different from ‘normal Doric’ and ‘normal Aeolic’. The poets use an artificial language, some elements of a heightened style which were regular in poetry.

The form in Alcaeus would be Aeolic, in Pindar would be Aeolic or Doric, in Theocritus Doric. Whereas in tragedy, we cannot establish which dialect those forms belong to. According to Porson, those forms are more Attic. According to scholars the Doric forms in the dialogue of tragedy, can also be explained.²² Buttmann states that scholars express divergent views on forms with -αι. Some (as Porson) believe that they are Attic, some (as Schol. Victor.) that they are Doric. He claims that Atticists reject δύνῃ Indicative (originating from Ionic δύνεαι). However, the forms in -ῃ not only appear in Theognis (1043 Br. = 1085 *IEG*) and in *Carmen Aureum*, but also in Sophocles (*Ph.* 798) and in Euripides (*Hec.* 253). According to him δύνῃ Ionic form occurs also not infrequently in Attic writers, therefore it can be found as used by later authors. Consequently, he regarded the forms with -σαι to be characteristic of the older Attic prose only whereas the forms with -ῃ to be in poetry and in later works.²³

The five other forms of Present Indicative Middle and Passive raise doubts. It is difficult to establish whether they originate from thematic verb or athematic verb. πέτομαι / πέταμαι verb has both forms, thematic and athematic. *LSJ* note: “The only pres. in Hom. and Att. Prose is πέτομαι; πέταμαι is used by Sapph. *Supp.* 10.8, Simon. 30, Pi. *P.* 8.90, *N.* 6.48, *E. Ion* 90 (anap.), *API* 1.208 (Lucill.), and in later Prose.”²⁴ No information is available on this verb in comedy. However, the contracted forms πέτει and πέτη occur in Euripides and Aristophanes:

νῦν γὰρ πέτη τε καὶ φρονῶν οὐδὲν φρονεῖς (Eur. *Ba.* 332)

Τί πέτει [...] (Aristoph. *Pax* 95)

Αὐτῆ σὺ, ποῖ ποῖ ποῖ πέτει [...] (Aristoph. *Av.* 1199)

[...] ὁπόθεν ποτ' εἶ (codd. πέτη) (Aristoph. *Av.* 1201)

Κἄπειτα δῆθ' οὕτω σιωπῆ διαπέτει (Aristoph. *Av.* 1217)

These forms may be considered thematic. According to this interpretation πέτει would be the variant form to πέτη from *πέτεσαι, where ε is the thematic

²² See: Kaczko 2008: 254–258; Pickard Cambridge 1997: 417–418; Marchewka 2005: 129.

²³ „Secundum Porsonum [...] magis attica forma foret δύναι. Alii dicunt doricam ut Schol. Victor. ad II. ξ, 199 (ap. Heyn.) ubi recte legitur ἐπιστᾶι, δύναι. [...] ἐπιστη est in Theogn. 1043 Br. (1085 Bekk.): δύνῃ in Aur. Carm. 8 et 19 quod factum ex ionico δύνεαι docet [...]. Certum est, δύνῃ indicativum reici ab Atticistis [...] et occurrere tamen, inter antiquiores auctores, Sophoclis hoc nostro loco, Euripidis *Hec.* 253. [...] in verbo δύναι saltem ionicum δύνῃ apud atticos quoque scriptores invaluisse videtur; unde recentiores crebrius eo usi sunt: atticistarum autem regula eo restringenda ut in attica prosa antiquiori solum δύναι obtinuerit, apud poetas autem et recentiores scriptores etiam δύνῃ” (Sophocles 1822: 135).

²⁴ *LSJ* s. v. πέτομαι

vowel. Thus in the codes: *πέτη* (*Av.* 1201).²⁵ Smyth claims that the forms with *-η* occur in tragedy, while forms in *-ει* are characteristic of prose and comedy.²⁶ The forms with *-ει* would show pass of *μι*-verb into the *ω* inflection. The *πέτη* form may originate from athematic verb *πέταμαι*. *πέτη* would be the result of the contraction: *πέτασαι* > *πέται* > *πέται* > *πέτη*. In view of this type of contraction *πέτη* may be Ionic form. The form of three manuscripts with *πέτη* is not supported by any editor.

ἐφίη is a contracted form of Present Indicative occurring in a choral part, which is noted only by Brugmann²⁷ and Schwyzer²⁸: *τί μοι τῶν δυσφόρων ἐφίη* (*Soph. El.* 143). Probably, this form originates from *ἐφίεσαι*. This form is interesting, because the forms with *-η* often appear in the second-person singular of Indicative Middle and Passive of the *ω* inflection and linguists note the contracted forms of the Indicative of athematic conjugation only among deponent verbs. And Jebb notes the *ἐφίει* form.²⁹ However, the forms with *-ει* suffix are believed to be later. *-ει* was written in the fourth or third century B.C.,³⁰ thus this form seems unlikely in tragedy.

To conclude, the forms of indicative in *-η* and *-αι* appear in lyric poetry (*ἐπίστη*, *δύνη*, *ἐπίσται*, *δύναι*), in tragedy (*δύνη*, *δύναι*) and in comedy (*δύνη*), while they do not occur in epic poetry. There are nine³¹ forms ending in *-η*, and seven³² in *-αι*. Most probably, I analysed all the places of occurrence of forms with *-αι*. In Pindar and Alcaeus there are two forms in *-αι*, one in Theocritus, four in tragedy, one of which is noted after Porson. The form in Alcaeus can be Eolic, in Pindar Aeolic or Doric, in Theocritus Doric. In tragedy, it is not possible to establish which dialects the contracted forms belong to. Thus, we must agree with Schwyzer that the forms with *-αι* ending are characteristic of Aeolic and Doric dialect and they also occur in tragedy. The analysis of the opinions of ancient grammarians shows that the forms with *-η* are not unknown to them. Most probably, in my view, the forms in *-η* occurring in Theognis and in Anacreontics are Ionic. It is supported by the type of contraction and dialectal features of works. In tragedy there are only two forms with this contraction, while *δύνη* (*Eur. Hec.* 253) is changed to *δύναι* form after Porson. Modern linguists believe that forms

²⁵Aristophanes 2002: 84.

²⁶Smyth 1956: 189. According to Bellocchi, *-ει* ending of the second-person singular of middle and passive instead of *-η* < *-εαι* did not occur earlier in comedy (Bellocchi 2008: 272).

²⁷Brugmann 1913: 405.

²⁸Schwyzler 1939: 668.

²⁹See. *Soph. El.* 143 Jebb.

³⁰Auerbach-Golias 1962: 86.

³¹Thgn. 1085; fr. anacr. 4, 6; fr. anacr. 31, 11; *Eur. Andr.* 239; *Eur. Hec.* 253; *Aristoph. Eq.* 491; *Eur. Ba.* 332; *Aristoph. Av.* 1201; *Soph. El.* 143.

³²Pind. *Pyth.* III 80; *Aesch. Eum.* 86; *Aesch. Eum.* 581; *Alc.* fr. 119, 8; *Theoc.* X 2; *Soph. Ph.* 798; *Soph. Ph.* 849.

in -ηι and -αι are poetic, dialectic or late. The analysis of those forms in comedy do not reveal much as well, because there are not forms with -αι ending. There is one form in -ηι, but it is subjunctive. The analysis of other texts also does not resolve the problem. Certainly the δύνηι form can be found in poetry and in prose, but usually it is subjunctive. Based on the above, one may make a guess that the forms of indicative in -ηι are Ionic, in -αι are Doric and Aeolic, in tragedy the use may have been reasoned by the influence of the earlier literary tradition and the desire to produce a work of a heightened style. In comedy, δύνηι form would not be difficult to explain. This would be considered a regular Attic form of subjunctive. In order to draw the conclusions concerning forms ending in -ηι, the analysis of other texts, which I have not covered here, is recommended.

EDITIONS

Primary sources

- Aeschylus 1990: *Aeschyli tragoediae*, M. L. West (ed.), Leipzig 1990
- Aristophanes 1907: *Aristophanis comoediae*, F. W. Hall et W. M. Geldart (edd.), t. 1–2, Oxonii 1907
- Aristophanes 2002: Aristophanes, *Birds*, N. Dunbar (ed.), Oxford 2002 (1998)
- Carmina Anacreontea* 1984: *Carmina Anacreontea*, M. L. West (ed.), Leipzig 1984
- Euripides 1916: Euripides, *Andromache*, A. S. Way (ed.), vol. 2, London-New York 1916
- Euripides 1944: Euripides, *Bacchae*, E. R. Dodds (ed.), Oxford 1944
- Euripides 1973: Euripides, *Hecuba*, S. G. Daitz (ed.), Leipzig 1973
- Herodianus 1863: Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήματος ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ: *E Duobus Codicibus Caes. Reg. biblioth. Vindobonensis*, J. La Roche (ed.), Vienna 1863 (Jahresbericht über das königlich-kaiserliche akademische Gymnasium in Wien für das Schuljahr 1862–1863)
- Herodianus 1867: *Grammatici Graeci*, pars 3: *Herodiani technici reliquiae*, collegit, disposuit, emendavit, explicavit, praefatus est A. Lentz, vol. 2, fasc. 2 scripta de nominibus, verbis, pronominibus, adverbii et librum monadicorum continens, Lipsiae 1867
- IEG 1998: *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati I-II*, M. L. West (ed.), Oxford 1998
- Pindarus 1987: *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, post B. Snell H. Maehler (ed.), pars I: *Epinicia*, Leipzig 1987
- Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta* 1955: *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*, E. Lobel, D. Page (edd.), Oxford 1955
- Sophocles 1822: *Sophoclis Philoctetes*, P. Buttman (ed.), Berolini 1822
- Sophocles 1894: Sophocles, *The Electra*, R. C. Jebb (ed.), Cambridge 1894
- Sophocles 1970: Sophocles, *Philoctetes*, T. B. L. Webster (ed.), Cambridge 1970
- Sophocles 1973: Sophocles, *Electra*, J. H. Kells (ed.), Cambridge 1973
- Theocritus 1999: Theocritus. *A Selection: Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*, R. Hunter (ed.), Cambridge-New York 1999
- Theodosius 1894: [Theodos. Alex.] *De dialect. aeol.* 21, [in:] *Excerptum* Περί διαλέκτων, R. Schneider (ed.), Leipzig 1894 (Beigabe zu dem Jahresbericht des königlichen Gymnasiums zu Duisburg)

Secondary sources

- Adrados 1953: R. Adrados, “Sobre los orígenes del vocabulario ático”, *Emerita* 21, 1953
- Adrados 1999: R. Adrados, *Historia de la lengua griega: de los orígenes a nuestros días*, Madrid 1999

- Auerbach-Golias 1962: M. Auerbach-Golias, *Gramatyka grecka*, Warszawa 1962
- Bellocchi 2008: M. Bellocchi, "Epicarmo e la comedia attica Tanica" [w:] *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*, a cura di A. Mongatti, Firenze 2008
- Brugmann 1913: K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik: Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax*, vierte vermehrte auflage bearbeitet von A. Thumb, München 1913
- Fiderer 1920: E. Fiderer, *Gramatyka języka greckiego – szkolna*, cz. 1, Lwów-Warszawa 1920
- Frąckiewicz 2012: K. Frąckiewicz, "Imperfect Indicative / Aorist and Present Imperative / Aorist Middle and Passive of Athematic Deponent Verbs in Poetry of Ancient Greece of Archaic and Classical Period", *Scripta Classica* 9, 2012
- Goodwin 1900: W. Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*, Boston 1900
- Jurewicz 1992: O. Jurewicz, *Gramatyka historyczna języka greckiego*, Warszawa 1992
- Kaczko 2008: S. Kaczko, "La tragedia" [w:] *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*, a cura di A. Mongatti, Firenze 2008
- Marchewka 2002: A. Marchewka, *Homerycki język Herodota*, Gdańsk 2002
- Marchewka 2005: A. Marchewka, *Podstawy historii i gramatyki historycznej j. greckiego*, Gdańsk 2005
- Palmer 1986: L.R. Palmer, *Die griechische Sprache*, Innsbruck 1986
- Pickard-Cambridge 1997: A. Pickard Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford 1997
- Schwyzler 1939: E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, Bd. 1: *Allegemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, 1 Bd, München 1939
- Smyth 1894: H.W. Smyth, *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects: Ionic Dialect*, Oxford 1894
- Smyth 1956: H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. by G. M. Messing, Cambridge, MA 1956
- Szemerényi 1991: O. Szemerényi, "The Attic Rückverwandlung or Atomism and Structuralism in Action", *Scripta minora* 3, 1991
- West 1982: M. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford-New York 1982

FORMAE CUM CONTRACTIONE IN INDICATIVI PRAESENTIS SECUNDA PERSONA
VERBORUM CONIUGATIONIS IN -ηι APUD QUOSDAM ANTIQUOS POETAS
GRAECOS

Argumentum

Hoc studio formae in -ηι et -αι quaeruntur atque disputatio, ubi formae cum contractione occurrant, continetur. Viri ac feminae docti in his rebus explicandis multum inter se dissentiunt. Sunt, qui putent indicativi praesentis secundam personam in -σαι semper exire. Alii tradunt post σ eiectum contractionem interdum passam esse in -ηι et -αι e. g. ἐπίστη, ἐπίσαι. Formae in -ηι ex Ionico -εαι ortae sunt, quod Herodianus testatur. Sententia Theodosii formae quaesitae ex -αι ortae sunt. In contemporanea linguarum doctrina formae in -ηι et -αι uni dialecto non attribuantur. Inter viros doctos non consensum est, ubi et quam frequenter hae formae occurrerent. Igitur formae apud quosdam antiquos poetas Graecos exhibitae cum opinionibus virorum doctorum comparatae sunt.