

Hubert Wolanin   
Jagiellonian University, Kraków

## **Byzantine Scholiasts on the Description of the Grammatical Category of the Noun Number in Τέχνη γραμματική Attributed to Dionysius Thrax**

**ABSTRACT:** The article cites passages from Τέχνη γραμματική which characterise the grammatical category of the noun number (ἀριθμοὶ ὀνομάτων) and define two classes of nouns, i.e. collective nouns (ὀνόματα περιληπτικά) and distributive (pro)nouns (ὀνόματα ἐπιμεριζόμενα), which are closely related to the category of the number. Subsequently, the passages are confronted with the comments of Byzantine scholiasts on them, quoted from A. Hilgard's scholia edition. Familiarisation with and interpretation of the analysed scholia made it possible to demonstrate the way in which the model description of the grammatical noun number as well as the characteristics of collective nouns and distributive pronouns, contained in the textbook, were received in the circle of Byzantine grammarians. In particular, focus was put on the scholiasts' choice in regard to which of the passages required further explanation or complement, and what explanations or complements thereof were formulated in the scholia, as well as which statements were met with objections or criticism from Byzantine commentators, what were the reasons behind those, and what were the suggested corrections. The analyses conducted, though limited to selected issues, allow for at least a partial understanding of the specificity of the grammatical education in the Byzantine Empire and the nature of the Byzantine discourse on the content of Τέχνη.

**KEYWORDS:** Greek grammarians, Dionysius Thrax, *Techne grammatike*, *scholia*, *grammatical number*

## Preliminary remarks

It is commonly known that the rather short textbook of Greek grammar titled *Τέχνη γραμματική*, preserved until today and attributed to Dionysius Thrax (170–90 BC), had a tremendous impact on the development of modern grammar, even though its connection to the Alexandrian philologist has long been questioned.<sup>1</sup> The work constitutes a unique summary of the Greek studies of words, and its content consists mainly of the description of eight word classes (parts of speech), which includes their semantic characterisation, and in the case of declinable words, also a characterisation of their morphological, i.e. inflectional and formative, features. The starting point for this article is the textbook's description of the grammatical (inflectional) category of the number of a noun (ὄνομα), and the description of collective nouns (πηριληπτικὰ ὀνόματα) and distributive pronouns (ἐπιμεριζόμενα ὀνόματα), directly related to the grammatical category of the number. However, the primary subject of analyses will be the way in which these descriptions were commented upon in Byzantine scholia to the *Τέχνη* textbook. This will provide us with a closer look at the canonical to Greek doctrine model of the grammatical characterisation of the noun number, the collectives and the distributives, as well as will allow us to present the

---

<sup>1</sup> His authorship of *Τέχνη γραμματική* was doubted even among the Byzantine scholars, and in the last century the attribution of the textbook was yet again questioned by V. Di Benedetto in a two-part article (Di Benedetto 1958; Di Benedetto 1959), where the preserved text was deemed to be a compilation created circa 3<sup>rd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> century AD. The Italian scholar reiterated his theses in several later publications and recapitulated them in Di Benedetto 2000. Discussions on the issue continue among scholars; the prevailing view is that *Τέχνη* mostly reflects the knowledge which Greek grammarians reached in the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup> century BC and developed in the first centuries AD, and that the content of the textbook itself that was penned by Dionysius (if it truly was), a student of Aristarchus, definitely underwent multiple modifications and many extensions were made in the following decades and centuries. For more on this subject, see Wolanin 2004: 241–247; Pagani 2011: 30–64; Callipo 2011: 9–13, 26–34; Woodard 2023: 139–142.

later reception of this model in the community of grammarians of the Greek Middle Ages.

The scholia to Τέχνη, compiled and published in 1901 by Alfred Hilgard in the monumental *Grammatici Graeci* series,<sup>2</sup> are a collection of 7 Byzantine commentaries on this textbook. Some of them (4) are in themselves the compilations of comments to specific paragraphs of Τέχνη; the authorship of these comments as well as the identity of the collections' compilers are difficult to establish. In other cases, we deal with a commentary of one author who is still either difficult to identify (*commentariolus Byzantinus*) or otherwise remains unknown (*commentarius Melampodis vel Diomedis, commentarius Heliodori*). Regardless, these texts, composed for the purposes of school or academic grammar education and hence documenting the methods used by the teachers of Constantinople during lectures to explain the content of Τέχνη to the students,<sup>3</sup> provide us with a certain idea of the grammatical doctrine of the age of Byzantium, from which these explanations originate. Bearing in mind the topic of the article, the subject of our analysis will therefore be the content of remarks contained in the scholia, commenting upon the Τέχνη's passages on the grammatical category of the noun number as well as on collective and distributive pronouns. In particular, we will attempt to present which of these passages were deemed as requiring an explanation or an addition, and what explanations or additions were formulated accordingly, as well as which elements of the characteristics of the inflectional category of the noun number raised objections or critical remarks from commentators, what were the reasons for this criticism, and what amendments were proposed. The information obtained, though limited in thematic scope, will nevertheless provide at least some insight into the nature and level of the grammatical discourse conducted on the content of Τέχνη by

<sup>2</sup> An overview and description of scholia was also done by G. Uhlig in the introduction to his edition of Τέχνη, which is a part of the same publishing series and still retains the reference character. cf. Uhlig 1883: XXXIV–XL. Basic information on Τέχνη, its supplements and commentaries to it, as well as scholarly studies on the subject, can be found in Dickey 2007: 77–80.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hilgard 1901: V: 'Ex quibus [scil. commentariis] id imprimis elucet, qua ratione in litterarum universitate Constantinopolitana doctores publici scholis, quas de grammaticis rebus habebant, compendium Dionysianum explanaverint.'

Byzantine scholars, who greatly respected the work and referred to it as a major source of knowledge about the classical Greek grammar as well as a standard by which to teach it.<sup>4</sup> This is made evident by, among other things, the volume of scholia preserved to our times, which in the aforementioned edition by A. Hilgard covers nearly 600 densely printed pages.

All fragments of Τέχνη are quoted in the article according to the edition of G. Uhlig<sup>5</sup> with page and line indications, and all translations are by A. Kemp.<sup>6</sup>

The quoted excerpts from scholia are taken from the edition of A. Hilgard<sup>7</sup> and are accompanied by numbers denoting pages and lines as well as an abbreviation referring to the relevant collection or specific commentary<sup>8</sup>; the author of the quoted statement is also indicated – if identified and included by the editor.<sup>9</sup> Words in angle brackets < > are the editor's conjectures or additions to the text based on its attestation in another collection (codex). The translations of the quoted passages from scholia are from the author of the paper. The quotations from Homer are in A. T. Murray's translation.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Robins 1993: 44: 'The *Techne* in its present form, with its extensive commentaries, was the foundation and a major authority for teaching and researching the Greek language and its grammar in the Byzantine Empire.'

<sup>5</sup> Uhlig 1883.

<sup>6</sup> Kemp 1986.

<sup>7</sup> Hilgard 1901.

<sup>8</sup> *Heliod.* = *commentarius Heliodori*, *Vat.* = *scholiorum collectio Vaticana*, *Marc.* = *scholiorum collectio Marciana*, *Lond.* = *scholiorum collectio Londinensis*, *Byz.* = *commentariolus Byzantinus*.

<sup>9</sup> This is mainly the case when the compiler included in his collection an utterance also attested in another, non-anonymous collection or manuscript, as a result of which its authorship is identifiable. In our case, this applies to Stephanos' explanations contained in the Vatican collection, and to the comments of Heliodorus placed in various collections and extracted from his commentary of which *commentarius Heliodori* is a part.

<sup>10</sup> Murray 1919; Murray 1924.

## 1. The grammatical category of the noun number in the *Τέχνη γραμματική* textbook

The category of the noun number is first mentioned in *Τέχνη* as part of a general characterisation of ὄνομα as a word class (part of speech) and this characterisation is as follows:

Ὅνομά ἐστι μέρος λόγου πτωτικόν, σῶμα ἢ πρᾶγμα σημαῖνον, σῶμα μὲν οἷον λίθος, πρᾶγμα δὲ οἷον παιδεία, κοινῶς τε καὶ ἰδίως λεγόμενον, κοινῶς μὲν οἷον ἄνθρωπος ἵππος, ἰδίως δὲ οἷον Σωκράτης. Παρέπεται δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι πέντε· γένη, εἶδη, σχήματα, ἀριθμοί, πτώσεις (24, 3–7).

A noun is a part of the sentence<sup>11</sup> which is subject to case inflection, and signifies something corporeal or non-corporeal; by corporeal I mean something like ‘a stone’, and by non-corporeal something like ‘education’; it can be used in a general way, as in ‘man’, ‘horse’, and in a specific way, as in ‘Socrates’. The noun has five types of attributes: genders, species, shapes, numbers, cases.

According to this characterisation, numbers (ἀριθμοί) are one of the five attributes that accompany the noun (παρέπεται τῷ ὀνόματι). In the later part of the textbook, the numbers were described in the following manner:

Ἀριθμοὶ τρεῖς· ἐνικός, δυϊκός, πληθυντικός· ἐνικός μὲν ὁ Ὅμηρος, δυϊκός δὲ τῷ Ὁμήρῳ, πληθυντικός δὲ οἱ Ὀμηροί. Εἰσὶ δὲ τινες ἐνικοί χαρακτῆρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι, οἷον δῆμος χορός ὄχλος· καὶ πληθυντικοὶ κατὰ ἐνικῶν τε καὶ δυϊκῶν, ἐνικῶν μὲν ὡς Ἀθηναί Θῆβαι, δυϊκῶν δὲ ὡς ἀμφοτέροι (30, 5–31, 4).

<sup>11</sup> The word classes described which are, in fact, the parts of speech, have been identified with the parts of a sentence in the textbook; cf. 22, 4–23, 2: Λέξις ἐστὶ μέρος ἐλάχιστον τοῦ κατὰ σύνταξιν λόγου. Λόγος δὲ ἐστὶ πεζῆς λέξεως σύνθεσις διάνοιαν αὐτοτελῆ δηλοῦσα. Τοῦ δὲ λόγου μέρη ἐστὶν ὀκτώ· ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, μετοχή, ἄρθρον, ἀντωνυμία, πρόθεσις, ἐπίρρημα, σύνδεσμος. – ‘A word is the smallest part of a properly constructed sentence. A sentence is a combination of words in prose conveying a meaning which is complete in itself. There are eight parts of sentence: noun, verb, participle, article, pronoun, preposition, adverb, conjunction.’

There are three numbers – singular, dual, and plural. The singular is *ho Homēros* (Homer), the dual *tō Homērō* (the two Homers), and the plural *hoi Homēroi* (the Homers). There are some singular forms which are applied to a plurality, such as *dēmos* (people), *choros* (chorus), *okhlos* (crowd); and some plural forms which are applied to single or dual referents, for example, *Athēnai* (Athens), *Thēbai* (Thebes) of single referents, and *amphoterōi* (both) of dual referents.

It is easy to see that two distinct parts can be distinguished in the above section containing the description of the noun number. Since both were commented on by scholiasts quite extensively, we will first discuss comments on the first of them.

## 2a. The first part of the section on the noun number

Ἄριθμοι τρεῖς· ἐνικός, δυϊκός, πληθυντικός· ἐνικός μὲν ὁ Ὅμηρος, δυϊκὸς δὲ τὸ Ὀμήρω, πληθυντικὸς δὲ οἱ Ὀμηροὶ (30, 5–31, 1).

There are three numbers – singular, dual, and plural. The singular is *ho Homēros* (Homer), the dual *tō Homērō* (the two Homers), and the plural *hoi Homēroi* (the Homers).

So, in the first part of the section three values of the grammatical category of the noun number were indicated and exemplified. In reference to this, scholia contain explanations on the semantics of this category, in particular on the semantics of each of its values and the relationships between them, alongside comments on the formal structure of the terms used to name these values. For instance, in the London collection of scholia we can read the following explanation:

Ἄριθμός ἐστι χαρακτήρ λέξεως δυνάμενος διάκρισιν ποσοῦ ἀναδέξασθαι,<sup>12</sup> ἢ χαρακτήρ σημαίνων <ποσότητα> μετὰ ἀκολουθίας. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐνικός καὶ δυϊκὸς ὠρισμένοι εἰσίν, ὁ δὲ πληθυντικός

<sup>12</sup> This definition is also cited by Pecorella 1962: 134 who suggests that its author may have been Apollonius Dyscolus, as its exact match can be found in Priscianus; cf.

ἀόριστος· ἐὰν γὰρ εἴπω φίλος, ἕνα δηλῶ, ἐὰν δὲ φίλω, δύο, ἐὰν δὲ φίλοι, οὐ μόνον τρεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλούς. Διὰ τί δὲ ὡσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἷς ἑνός γίνεται ἐνικός τροπή τοῦ ος εἰς ι καὶ πλεονασμῶ τῆς κος, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο δυϊκός, οὐχὶ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρεῖς γίνεται τρεϊκός; Ἐπειδὴ ὁ τρεῖς ἀρχὴ πλήθους ἐστίν, τὸ δὲ πλήθος οὐ τρεῖς σημαίνει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δ' καὶ ε' καὶ ι' καὶ ρ', τοῦτου χάριν ἐκ τῆς σημασίας ἔλαβε τὴν ὀνομασίαν· εἰ γὰρ γέγονε παρὰ τὸ τρεῖς τρεϊκός, οὐκ ἤμελλεν ἀρμόζειν τοῖς τρισὶν ἢ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τρισὶ μόνοις (*Lond.* 545, 7–17).

The number is the form of the word that can assume (the function) of differentiating quantity, or the form expressing a quantity in order. It is important to know that the singular number and the dual number are definite, whereas the plural – indefinite. For if I say φίλος, I am referring to one, if φίλω – to two, but if I say φίλοι, I refer not only to three, but also to many. Why is it that, like ἐνικός is formed based on εἷς ἑνός by the transformation of ος into ι and addition of κος, and like δυϊκός is formed based on δύο, there is no τρεϊκός as well, formed based on τρεῖς? As three is the beginning of plurality, and plurality means not just three, but also four, and five, and ten, and hundred, it was named in accordance with its meaning, for if alongside τρεῖς the τρεϊκός would have been formed, it would not be appropriate for either three or four, but for three only.

There are several interesting points in this comment. The first one is the addition of the grammatical number definition, absent in the Τέχνη passage commented upon.<sup>13</sup> In this definition, the category is identified with the form of the word (χαρακτήρ λέξεως) as an exponent of a specific semantic function, i.e. expressing a quantity.<sup>14</sup> In Τέχνη, the reference to the word form, made by means of the same term, but in the plural, i.e. χαρακτηῆρες, appears – in a specific context – only in the

*Inst. Gram.* 5, 46 (= Hertz 1885: 172): *Numerus est dictionis forma, quae discretionem quantitatis facere potest.*

<sup>13</sup> Nb. the other inflectional categories of the noun, i.e. gender and case, are also not defined in the textbook.

<sup>14</sup> See also *Marc.* <Heliodorus> 380, 34–38: Ἀριθμὸς ἐστὶ κατὰ μὲν ἀριθμητικούς σωρεῖα μονάδων ἤγουν σύνθεσις, κατὰ δὲ γραμματικούς χαρακτήρ λέξεως δυνάμενος διάκρισιν ποσοῦ ἀναδέξασθαι, ἢ χαρακτήρ σημαίων ποσότητα μετὰ ἀκολουθίας διὰ τοῦς ἀριθμούς· δύο γὰρ καὶ τρεῖς καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἐν ἀκολουθίᾳ δηλοῦσι ποσότητα.

second part of the section on the number (and will be discussed below). In the first part, there is no reference to the word form, and the semantics of this category and its values were characterised only indirectly by listing terms (with distinct meanings) which identify each value, and by exemplifying them.

This shortcoming of Τέχνη, i.e. a lack of a direct characterisation of the semantics of the grammatical number, was a catalyst for approaching this topic as well in the commented *scholion*; the meticulousness with which it is discussed is the second thing, which attracts our attention. Emphasis is, first and foremost, put on the difference between the semantic definiteness of the first two values of this category, and the indefiniteness of the third, alongside on an explanation of what the indefiniteness and definiteness consist in. In this respect, particularly striking is the effort put into characterising the plural and the role ascribed to the number three in its characterisation. This likely stems from the structure of the grammatical category of the number in Greek, wherein plural is its third value, following the singular, denoting one object, and the dual, denoting two objects, which naturally raises the question of the relationship between the third value and the denotation of three objects. Hence why, while characterising the indefiniteness of the plural, the scholiast directly refers to the three objects denoted by it, emphasizing in the same time the inclusive nature of the said value: ‘if I say φίλοι, I refer not only to three, but also to many’.

The relationship between the number three and the semantics of the third value of the grammatical number is also discussed in the context of the term used to name this value, i.e. in regard to the question about the reason for the absence of the name (ἀριθμὸς) τρεῖκός, whose hypothetical presence emerges from the analogy to ἐνικός and δυϊκός. In response, the scholiast concludes that the absence of such name results from the fact that ‘three is the beginning of plurality’ (ὁ τρεῖς ἀρχὴ πλῆθους ἐστίν), ‘and plurality means not just three, but also four, and five, and ten, and hundred’ (τὸ δὲ πλῆθος οὐ τρεῖς σημαίνει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δ’ καὶ ε’ καὶ ἰ’ καὶ ρ’). Thus, the number three is assigned a special status, which makes it distinct from the numbers one and two. Specifically, this number does not indicate just itself but also implies a broader sense of plurality, which includes the number (three)



as well. Due to the said implication, this grammatical value of the category of the number, which may refer to three designated objects, at the same time expresses a plurality of objects as such, which in itself determines its actual meaning. And it is from this plurality, i.e. from its actual meaning, that the value takes its name, as another name would not reflect the real, i.e. numerically indefinite, nature of its referent. It is worth noting, however, that the literal message here is about why the act of referring to three – rather than to many – objects was given this name: Ἐπειδὴ ὁ τρεῖς ἀρχὴ πλῆθους ἐστίν, [...] τούτου χάριν ἐκ τῆς σημασίας ἔλαβε τὴν ὀνομασίαν (‘As three is the beginning of plurality, [...] it was named in accordance with its meaning’).

Let us add that the special status of the number three in the context of plurality and the grammatical plural is also emphasised by other scholiasts, who cite their own unique reasoning. For example, the following comment of the scholiast Stephanos can be found in the Vatican collection:

Τὸν τρίτον ἀριθμὸν πληθυντικὸν ὀνομάζομεν, ἐπεὶ ὁ τρεῖς ἀριθμὸς ἀρχὴ πλῆθους ἐστίν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ παροιμίᾳ «τρεῖς πολλοί»· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ παλαιοὶ πολλὰ βουλόμενοι σημαίνειν τρεῖς λέγουσιν, ὡς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς <ε 306> τρίς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις, ἀντὶ τοῦ πολλάκις (*Vat. <Stephani> 229, 32–230, 2*).

We call the third number plural because number three is the beginning of plurality, as the adage also indicates: «three is many».<sup>15</sup> This is why also the ancient, when referring to multitude, say ‘three’, as the poet also does: (ε 306): *thrice blessed those Danaans, aye, four times blessed*, instead of *many times*.

The scholiasts’ interest in the formal structure of words naming particular values of the number category may also be striking. In the aforementioned *scholion* from the London collection, one’s attention is drawn to the meticulousness and manner in which the scholiast describes the derivation mechanism standing behind the formation of the term ἐνικός. Although the scholiast correctly perceives the stem of the

<sup>15</sup> Comp. Lat. *Tres faciunt collegium*.

oblique cases – the genitive singular, to be exact – of the word εἶς to be the derivational base of the said term, the following description of the derivative process (ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶς ἑνός γίνεται ἐνικός τροπή τοῦ ος εἰς ι καὶ πλεονασμῶ τῆς κος) reveals a lack of proper understanding of the actual morphological structure of the interpreted words, which is generally a well-known shortcoming of ancient Greek grammar. The meticulousness of the description contrasts with the general nature of the statements about the origin of the name of the dual number (ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο δυϊκός) and the hypothetical triple number (Διὰ τί [...] οὐχὶ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρεῖς γίνεται τρεϊκός;), derivational bases of which would have to be presented in a manner different from that of the singular number name.

Another comment on the formal aspect of the terms designating the three values of the number category can be found in the so-called *collectio Marciana*, i.e. in the collection of scholia taken from the manuscript kept in *Biblioteca Marciana* in Venice. The comment comes from the scholiast Heliodorus, at times identified with Choiroboskos.<sup>16</sup> The

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps we should consider the commentator of Τέχνη, who is referred to as Heliodorus in A. Hilgard's edition of scholia, to be Choiroboskos, a Byzantine teacher and author of a plethora of works on grammar, who lived in the 8<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. His most important works include an extensive commentary on Theodosius' (4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century) Κανόνες εισαγωγικοί περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων, i.e. a list of rules and paradigms of declension and conjugation (cf. Hilgard 1889; Hilgard 1894), and a commentary on Περί προσφιδίων, an anonymous collection of rules concerning accent, vowel length, aspiration and pauses, published by G. Uhlig alongside Τέχνη γραμματική as one of its supplements. The aforementioned commentary of Choiroboskos on Περί προσφιδίων, preserved partly under his own name, and partly in an extended version under the name of Porphyry, was published by A. Hilgard in his edition of scholia to Τέχνη (Hilgard 1901: 124–150). *Commentarius Heliodori*, published in the same scholia edition (Hilgard 1901: 67–106), is also sometimes combined with Choiroboskos; it includes comments on the passages of Τέχνη following those on the noun number, but most of the missing part of the commentary has been preserved and identified by the editor in the form of excerpts housed in other scholia collections. The editor himself does not exclude the authorship of Choiroboskos, but seems rather inclined to the view that we are not dealing with Choiroboskos' original commentary but supplemented by the scholiast Heliodorus' own remarks; nb. the scholiast Heliodorus is not identifiable with any person of that name known to us (cf. Hilgard 1901: XIV–XVIII). In this article, we retain the adopted, in the Hilgard's edition, attribution of quotes from this commentary, i.e. we attribute them to Heliodorus. For more on this topic and on Choiroboskos in general, see also: Dickey 2007: 80–81, Pontani 2020: 92–95.

author characterises the relations linking the names of each value of the number category with their derivation bases in the following manner:

Τὸ ἐνικός κτητικοῦ εἶδους ἐστίν· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πλάτων Πλάτωνος λέγομεν Πλατωνικός, οὕτω καὶ <ἀπὸ τοῦ> εἰς ἑνός λέγομεν <ἐνικός, καί> δηλοῖ ὁ τοῦ ἑνός χαρακτήρ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο δυϊκός, καὶ δηλοῖ ὁ τῶν δύο χαρακτήρ. Ἄλλ' οὐκέτι ἀπὸ τρεῖς τρεϊκός φαμεν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐνικός καὶ δυϊκός χαρακτήρ ἰδιάζοντα καὶ φανερόν ἔχει ἀριθμὸν καὶ τύπον, ὁ δὲ τρεῖς ἀριθμὸς ἀρχὴν σημασίας πλήθους λαμβάνων κατὰ τὸν τύπον οὐ λέγεται κατὰ παραγωγὴν τρεϊκός, ἀλλὰ πληθυντικός· τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ τύπῳ κεχρήμεθα καὶ ἐπὶ τριῶν καὶ τεσσάρων καὶ πέντε (*Marc. <Heliiodori> 381, 21–29*).

The name ἐνικός ('singular') is possessive in nature; as based on Πλάτων Πλάτωνος we say: Πλατωνικός, so based on εἰς ἑνός we say ἐνικός, and the form (of the word) εἰς (ἑνός) is evident (there); and (similarly), based on δύο (we say) δυϊκός, and the form (of the word) δύο is evident (there). However, we do not say τρεϊκός based on τρεῖς, as both the form ἐνικός and form δυϊκός are characterized by their own distinctive number and shape, while number three, which constitutes the beginning of the concept of plurality, in regard to the shape (of the word conveying it) is not via derivation assigned the name of 'triple' (τρεϊκός), but 'plural' (πληθυντικός), as we use the same form to refer to three, to four, and to five.

So, Heliiodorus primarily attributes the terminology commented upon to a specified, more general word-formation class, i.e. possessive nouns (κτητικά), indicating an analogy with Πλατωνικός. He does this directly in reference to the name ἐνικός (Τὸ ἐνικός κτητικοῦ εἶδους ἐστίν), but later in the quote this status is ascribed implicitly to the other discussed terms as well. Unlike the author of the London scholia fragment discussed above, Heliiodorus does not focus on the formal differences between the terms derived and their derivational bases, but – on the contrary – he points to the similarities between them. He emphasises the obvious presence of derivational bases in the derivatives constituting the name of the singular number (ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰς ἑνός λέγομεν ἐνικός,

καὶ δηλοῖ ὁ τοῦ ἐνὸς χαρακτήρ) and the name of the dual number (ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο δυϊκός, καὶ δηλοῖ ὁ τῶν δύο χαρακτήρ), which provides the derived names with semantic clarity, i.e. the relationship between the name ἐνικός and the number one, and between the name δυϊκός and the number two. At the same time, the aforementioned possessive nature of these names is reflected in this semantic relationship. Heliodorus also highlights the consistency of the formal structure of the described names with their semantics, as is evidenced by the emphasis put on the distinctness of their meaning and form. In this regard, the scholiast explicitly states that the distinctness of meaning of the first two names goes hand in hand with the distinctness of their form (ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐνικός καὶ δυϊκός χαρακτήρ ἰδιάζοντα καὶ φανερόν ἔχει ἀριθμὸν καὶ τύπον). However, in the case of the third name, proving the adequacy of its form in relation to its meaning required more arguments. First and foremost, a justification of the choice of the derivation base was necessary, i.e. an explanation of why it is not the word that means three. And here again we have to do with a reference to the status of the number three as the beginning of a plurality and to the functional distribution of the name in question, which is used in the same form in reference to three, to four, and to five (objects). Therefore, the commentary is yet again conducted from the perspective of the form of the word referring (primarily) to the number of three (objects): ὁ δὲ τρεῖς ἀριθμὸς [...] κατὰ τὸν τύπον [...] λέγεται [...] πληθυντικός.

The very same *collectio Marciana* includes also a rather unique comment of Heliodorus on the derivation base of the name of the singular number ([ἀριθμὸς] ἐνικός) – the numeral εἷς (‘one’). The scholiast draws attention to the fact that its formal structure in the nominative case corresponds to noun forms in plural. Even so, he immediately rejects any connection between the numeral and plurality, arguing that the numeral is an original, unmotivated form, i.e. not derived inflectionally from any form in the singular number. The irregular ending -εἷς in the singular form becomes thereby an argument for the lack of regular, derived forms of the plural of this numeral. It seems that the commentary also specifically demonstrates sensitivity to the formal features of the terms in question and the need to clarify any interpretive doubts that may arise about them. Here are Heliodorus’ words:

Τὸ εἷς δοκεῖ σημειῶδες εἶναι· τὰ γὰρ εἰς εἰς περισπώμενα εὐθείαι πληθυντικά εἰσιν, <οἶον> οἱ εὐγενεῖς, οἱ εὐσεβεῖς· ἀλλὰ φαμεν τεθεματίσθαι· ὅθεν οὐδὲ πληθυντικὸν <τὸ εἷς ἐπιδέχεται> (*Marc.* <Heliodori> 380, 38–381, 4).

The word εἷς ('one') appears to be special; perispomena that end in -εις in the nominative case are plural, as, for example, οἱ εὐγενεῖς ('the noble people'), οἱ εὐσεβεῖς ('the pious people'); however, (in this case) we say it is a non-derived form<sup>17</sup>; thus, the word εἷς does not additionally take a plural form.

With regard to the formal shape of terms associated with the number category, let us also quote one of anonymous commentaries of this collection:

Ἀναγκαίως τὸ ὄνομα καὶ ἀριθμὸν ἐπιδέχεται, ἐπειδὴ συμβαίνει καὶ ἓνα καὶ δύο καὶ τρεῖς πολλακίς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματος μετέχειν. Καὶ ἔστιν ἐνικός, ὅταν ἓνα σημαίνει, καὶ δυϊκός, ὅτε δύο· οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τὸ τρεῖς τριτυντικὸν ἢ τρεῖκὸν ὀνομάζομεν, ἀλλὰ πληθυντικόν, ἐπεὶ ὁ τρεῖς ἀριθμὸς ἀρχὴ πλήθους ἐστίν (*Marc.* 381, 10–15).

It is necessary for the noun to inflect also for number, as sometimes one, two, or often even three (referents) fall within (the meaning of) the same noun. And it is singular if it refers to one, dual – if it refers to two; but that which refers to three is not called the triple or threefold number, but plural, as three is the beginning of plurality.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> As it seems, the term τεθεματίσθαι should be understood here as the creation of a form on the basis of its own stem, i.e. establishing a non-derived form. We can encounter the adjective θεματικός ('thematic') and the adverb θεματικῶς ('[created] thematically') used in a similar sense in section 18 of the second book of Apollonius Dyscolus's treatise *On syntax* (Uhlig 1910: 139–140) in regard to the suppletive forms of the oblique cases and plural forms of the personal pronouns, i.e. ἐμοῦ, ἐμοί, ἡμεῖς, etc. as not formally derived from ἐγώ and constituting their own stem. See also: Bednarski 2000: 101, n. 60; Bécares Botas 1985: 205–207 (s.v. θέμα, θεματίζω, θεματικός).

<sup>18</sup> In the later part of the scholion we can find the comment of Stephanos quoted above (*Vat.* <*Stephani*> 229, 32–230, 2), which justifies the thesis of the number three being the beginning of plurality.

Here we see that the scholiast (more likely to be a compiler in this case), referring to the semantics of the noun, justifies the very necessity of taking into account the number category, and writing about the absence of a hypothetical triple number, he uses not only the term *τρεῖκόν*, already cited above, but in addition a second, rather amusing, neologism, i.e. *τριτυντικόν*.

## 2b. The second part of the section on the noun number

Εἰσὶ δὲ τινες ἐνικοί χαρακτῆρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι, οἷον *δήμος* *χορός* *ὄχλος*· καὶ *πληθυντικοὶ* κατὰ ἐνικῶν τε καὶ δυϊκῶν, ἐνικῶν μὲν ὡς *Ἀθῆναι* *Θῆβαι*, δυϊκῶν δὲ ὡς *ἀμφοτέροι* (31, 1–4).

There are some singular forms which are applied to a plurality, such as *dēmos* (people), *choros* (chorus), *okhlos* (crowd); and some plural forms which are applied to single or dual referents, for example *Athēnai* (Athens), *Thēbai* (Thebes) of single referents, and *amphoterōi* (both) of dual referents.

As noted previously, commentaries also exist for the above-cited second part of the Τέχνη's section on the noun numbers. What is discussed there is a certain discrepancy between the semantics attributed to specific values of the grammatical number and the quantitative aspect of the meaning of some words marked by these values. Such cases were exemplified, on the one hand, by collectives, and, on the other, by (toponymic) *pluralia tantum*. To indicate the existence of such a discrepancy, the author utilised distinct phrases that introduce a terminological distinction between the formal aspect of the words marked by the specific value of the number category, and their semantic aspect. On the one hand, we have ἐνικοί / πληθυντικοὶ χαρακτῆρες – ‘singular/plural word forms’, on the other κατὰ πολλῶν / κατὰ ἐνικῶν καὶ δυϊκῶν λεγόμενοι – lit. ‘uttered with reference to numerous / singular and dual [objects]’.<sup>19</sup> Among many issues commented upon by the scholiasts in regard to this passage, the above terminology was also deemed as

<sup>19</sup> For more on this, see also Wolanin 2004: 193–194.

requiring further explanation. In the Venice collection, famous for its manuscript kept in *Biblioteca Marciana*, one can read the following short comment on the matter:

Χαρακτήρα λέγει τὸν τύπον τῆς προφορᾶς· τὸ γὰρ δῆμος καὶ χορός καὶ ὄχλος ἐνικοῦ μὲν ἀριθμοῦ προφορὰν ἔχει, πλῆθος δὲ σημαίνει (*Marc.* 382, 11–13).

[The author of *Τέχνη*] uses the term *χαρακτήρ* to refer to a type of a (word) form, as the words *δῆμος* ('people'), *χορός* ('choir') and *ὄχλος* ('crowd'), though they have singular form, denote plurality.

As one can see, the phrase *τύπος τῆς προφορᾶς* was used to explain the term *χαρακτήρ*, while the phrase *κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι*, referring to the meaning of collectives, was replaced by a simple *πλῆθος σημαίνουσιν*. In the Vatican collection of scholia, there is, on the other hand, a remark made by Stephanos, who, by citing a formal analogy, justifies the assignment of the singular number to the collectives listed, and in the same time he explains the essence of their plural meaning:

Τὸ γὰρ χορός ὀνομά ἐστιν ἔχον χαρακτήρα ἐνικόν – ὡσπερ γὰρ καλός, οὕτω καὶ χορός – ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ σημαϊνόμενον πληθυντικόν ἐστιν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν συσταίη χορός ἐξ ἐνὸς μόνου ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλ' ἐκ πλειόνων· καὶ τὸ δῆμος δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον σημαίνει (*Vat.* <*Stephani*> 230, 6–9).

(The word) *χορός* ('choir') is a noun having a singular form – for as (the word) *καλός* ('beautiful') is formed, so is *χορός* ('choir') – but the meaning expressed by it is plural; for a choir cannot consist of only one man, but of many; and (the noun) *δῆμος* ('people') has a similar meaning.

To indicate the form – analogous to *καλός* – of the interpreted collective (*χορός*) Stephanos utilised the term *χαρακτήρ* (*ἐνικός*), also used in *Τέχνη*, but referring to its meaning he used the phrase *τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ σημαϊνόμενον* (*πληθυντικόν*). Heliodorus, in turn, portrays this discrepancy between form and meaning on a broader plane while

drawing attention to syntactical consequences that come with the use of collectives:

Ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ῥημάτων εἰσὶ φωναὶ τοῖς σημαινομένοις ἐναντία – τὸ γὰρ ὀρχοῦμαι φωνῆ μὲν ἐστὶ παθητικόν, σημαινομένῳ δὲ ἐνεργητικόν –, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων εἰσὶ φωναὶ ἐναντία τοῖς σημαινομένοις· τοῦ γὰρ δῆμος ὁ μὲν τύπος ἐνικός, τὸ δὲ σημαινόμενον πληθυντικόν· πῶς γὰρ ἂν συσταίῃ δῆμος ἄνευ πολλῶν; ὅθεν ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἐξὸν ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς τὰς φωνὰς καὶ πρὸς τὰ σημαινόμενα ὑπαντᾶν, οἷον «ὁ δῆμος ἐπολέμησεν» καὶ «ὁ δῆμος ἐπολέμησαν» (*Lond. <Heliodori>* 545, 18–25).

As in the case of verbs there are forms opposed to the things signified – for ὀρχοῦμαι ('I dance') is passive in form, and active in meaning – so also in the case of nouns there are forms opposed to the things signified; the form of the word δῆμος is singular, and the meaning plural; for how could there be a people without the many? Hence, with such words, agreement can be applied both to the form and to the meaning, as in, for instance, ὁ δῆμος ἐπολέμησεν ('the people fought (singular) a battle') and ὁ δῆμος ἐπολέμησαν ('the people fought (plural) a battle').<sup>20</sup>

The scholiast invokes here an analogy to deponent verbs, which rids collectives of their appearance of uniqueness, or even incorrectness. What is also noteworthy is the use of twofold terminology to designate the concept of the word form. On the one hand, we have the term φωνή used several times, and on the other, τύπος. However, when referring to the meaning conveyed, the author consistently uses the term τὸ σημαινόμενον. When it comes to the aforementioned syntactic consequences, the scholiast noted the possibility of combining plural verb forms with singular collectives, i.e. the possibility of applying the so-called *ad sensum* construction (σύνταξις κατὰ σύνεσιν), mentioned by other grammarians<sup>21</sup> as well. However, later in his commentary Heliiodorus raises the question of why collectives are also used in the grammatical plural:

<sup>20</sup> Likewise in *Marc.* 381, 30–382, 1.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. e.g. Apollonios Dyskolos, *Περὶ συντάξεως* 1, 67 (= Uhlig 1910: 58–59).



Ζητητέον δέ, εἰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἐνικῷ ἀριθμῷ πληθυντικὴν σημασίαν ἔχουσι, διὰ τί λέγονται πληθυντικῶς, οἷον δῆμοι. Φαμέν οὖν ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο λέγονται πληθυντικῶς, ἵνα τὴν ποσότητα τῶν συστημάτων δηλώσωσιν· ἐὰν γὰρ εἶπω δῆμος, ἐν σύστημα δηλῶ πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν περιεκτικόν, ἐὰν δὲ εἶπω δῆμοι, πολλὰ συστήματα δηλῶ (*Lond.* <*Heliodori*> 545, 30–34).

If they [*scil.* collectives] in the singular have a plural meaning, then the question must be answered as to why they are used (also) in the plural, as is with, for instance, δῆμοι ('peoples'). And we claim that they are used in the plural form to show the quantity of collectivities, for if I say δῆμος ('a people'), I show one collectivity including many people, while if I say δῆμοι ('peoples'), I show many collectivities.

Thus, in the scholiast's opinion, collectives such as δῆμος are used in the plural to 'show the quantity of collectivities'. Consistently, the meaning of the collective noun in the singular, which in the first part of the quoted paragraph was determined to be πληθυντικὴ σημασία ('a plural meaning'), later in the text was expressed as just σύστημα ('a collectivity'), and in reference to the specific word form δῆμος as σύστημα πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν περιεκτικόν ('a collectivity including many people'). Thus, πληθυντικὴ σημασία was identified with σύστημα as the meaning of the collective noun in singular. In turn, the grammatical category of the number was assigned the function of indicating 'a quantity of collectivities' (ποσότητα τῶν συστημάτων),<sup>22</sup> or more specifically: the singular number of indicating 'one collectivity' (ἐν σύστημα), and the plural – 'many collectivities' (πολλὰ συστήματα). Thus, we are dealing here with a certain terminological distinction between σύστημα as a term referring to the lexical semantics of the collectives (independent of their grammatical number), and ποσότης, ἐν, and πολλοί as terms referring to the semantics of the grammatical category of the number, both in general (ποσότης), and of its two values, i.e. singular (ἐν) and plural (πολλοί). Therefore, we can consider this a rather successful attempt to characterise the collectives, i.e. to point out the essence of grammatical plurality on the one hand, and the essence of lexical collectivity on the other, and at the same time the basis for the difference

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *supra* *Lond.* 545, 7–17.

between *pluralis* and *collectivum* – although it clearly lacks a more general conceptual and terminological apparatus that would allow for the theoretical distinction between grammatical and lexical semantics. For obvious reasons, in the above commentary Heliodorus focused on semantics, but it is also worth noting the phrases occurring there that characterise the formal status of words, namely ἐν τῷ ἐνικῷ ἀριθμῷ (‘in the singular’) and the adverbial determiner πληθυντικῶς (‘in the plural’).

However, in the discussed section (31, 1–4) from Τέχνη also another type of discrepancy between the formal shape and the meaning of the word is indicated: εἰσὶ δέ τινες [...] πληθυντικοὶ [χαρακτήρες] κατὰ ἐνικῶν τε καὶ δυϊκῶν [λεγόμενοι], ἐνικῶν μὲν ὡς Ἀθῆναι Θῆβαι, δυϊκῶν δὲ ὡς ἀμφοτέροι. ‘There are [...] some plural forms which are applied to single or dual referents, for example, *Athēnai* (Athens), *Thēbai* (Thebes) of single referents, and *amphoterōi* (both) of dual referents.’ This kind of discrepancy is the opposite of what was exemplified by collectives. And the statement about ‘anomalies’ of this type also became a matter discussed by the scholiasts. In the Vatican collection, we can find the following comment from Stephanos on this subject:

Συμβαίνει πάλιν, φησίν, ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, πληθυντικὸν ἔχειν χαρακτήρα τὸ ὄνομα, σημαίνεσθαι δὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐναντίως <ἐνικόν>. Θῆβαι γὰρ τύπος πληθυντικός, ἡ δὲ πόλις μία ἐστίν. Τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ οὕτω προφέρονται, τὰς μὲν Ἀθήνας <η 80> εὐρυάγυιαν <Ἀθήνην>, ὅτι τῆ φωνῆ μὲν πληθυντικόν ἐστιν, τῷ δὲ σημαινομένῳ ἐνικόν· τοιοῦτο δὲ καὶ τὸ Θῆβαι, ὡς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς εἶπε πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον <Ζ 416> Θῆβην ὑπίπυλον. Καὶ τὸ ἀμφοτέροι δὲ δυϊκὸν ὄν, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει, πληθυντικὸν χαρακτήρα ἔχει, σημαίνει δὲ δύο μόνους· καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ τολμήσει τις ἐπὶ πλήθους τῆ λέξει χρῆσασθαι (*Vat. <Stephani> 230, 10–19*).

And sometimes, he says, the opposite occurs: the noun has a plural form, while denoted by it is – to the contrary – singularity. For ‘Thebes’ is a plural form, but (denoted by it) the city is one. Poets also show this when (writing) about Athens: εὐρυάγυιαν <Ἀθήνην> (η 80), since formally it is plural, but semantically – singular. The same applies to Thebes, since the

poet also said in accordance with the meaning: Θήβην ὑπίπυλον (Z 416). And ἀμφοτέρω too, while expressing the dual number, as mentioned by (the author of Τέχνη) himself, has a plural form, though it points to just two (referents); and not a single person dares to use this word in reference to many of them.

As can be seen above, Stephanos mainly explains the essence of the toponymic *pluralia tantum* cited in the Τέχνη text by pointing out the contrast occurring between their form and their meaning: τύπος πληθυντικός, ἢ δὲ πόλις μία ἐστίν / τῆ φωνῇ μὲν πληθυντικὸν ἐστίν, τῷ δὲ σημασιμένῳ ἐνικόν / πληθυντικὸν χαρακτηῖρα ἔχει, σημαίνει δὲ δύο μόνους. What is noteworthy here is the use of three different expressions to refer to their formal structure, i.e. τύπος, φωνή and χαρακτηῖρ. However, the scholiast is particularly focused on the semantics of these words, i.e. on proving the singular, individual character of their referent. He does so by referring to Homer's syntagms, in which 'the poet said in accordance with the meaning' (ὁ ποιητῆς εἶπε πρὸς τὸ σημασιόμενον). The point, of course, is the use of adjectival modifiers of the discussed city names (and the names themselves) in the singular. Heliodorus, in turn, delves deeper into this question and tries to explain why singular and dual objects can be designated by plural word forms:

Ἄξιον δὲ ἐστὶ ζητῆσαι, τίνος ἔνεκεν οὕτω παρείληπται πληθυντικὸν ἀντὶ ἐνικῶν καὶ δυϊκῶν· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀμφοτέρω, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει, πληθυντικὸν ἔχει χαρακτηῖρα, σημαίνει δὲ δύο μόνους, οὔτε γὰρ τολμήσω ἐπὶ πλήθους τῆ λέξει χρῆσασθαι. Καὶ λέγομεν, διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι τὸ πληθυντικὸν καὶ ἐνικὸν καὶ δυϊκὸν σημαίνει, ἐπειδὴ ἐμπεριέχεται τῷ ἀριθμῷ καὶ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὰ δύο. Φήσειεν <ἀν> τις, «ἄρα γοῦν, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἐνικὸν ἐμπεριέχεται τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν δυϊκῶν, καὶ δυϊκὰ ἀντὶ ἐνικῶν ἔξεστι λέγειν;» Λέγομεν ὅτι οὐ· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ πληθυντικῷ ἀόριστός ἐστιν ὁ ἀριθμὸς, ἐν δὲ τῷ δυϊκῷ ὠρισμένος· πῶς οὖν τὸν ὠρισμένον κατὰ δύο μόνων ἀριθμὸν καὶ ἀντὶ ἑνὸς παραλαμβάνειν εὐλογον; Πάλιν πληθυντικὸν μὲν ἔχει τύπον προφορᾶς τὸ λέγειν Ἀθῆναι καὶ Θῆβαι· ὡς γὰρ κατὰ πολλῶν ἐστὶ λεγόμενον, μίαν δὲ σημαίνει τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ μίαν τὰς Θήβας· Ὅμηρος μέντοι ἀκριβῆς ὢν τὰ μὲν ἐνικά ἐνικῶς προηνέγκατο, οἷον <η 80> ᾤχετο δ' εἰς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγουαν Ἀθήνην, καὶ <A 366>

ῥχόμεθ' ἐς Θήβην, καὶ <Z 416> Θήβην ὑψίπυλον. Διὰ τί δὲ τὸ ἀμφοτέροι χαρακτῆρα πληθυντικὸν ἔχει; Ὅτι ὁμοίως κλίνεται τῷ πληθυντικῷ. ὡς γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν πολλῶν τοῖς πολλοῖς τοὺς πολλοὺς ᾧ πολλοί, οὕτω καὶ <οί> ἀμφοτέροι τῶν ἀμφοτέρων τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ᾧ ἀμφοτέροι (*Marc. <Heliodori> 382, 17–35*).

It should be clarified why the plural form is used in such a manner instead of the singular and dual forms, for also the (word) ἀμφοτέροι ('both'), as is said by (the author of *Τέχνη*) himself, has a plural form, while it refers to two (referents), and I dare not use that word in reference to a plurality. And we claim that this is because the plural expresses both the singular and the dual, as the number (it expresses) contains both one and two. One might say: «So, since the singular number is contained in the number expressed by the dual forms, can the dual forms also be used instead of the singular forms?» We say that they cannot, for in the (grammatical) plural the number is indefinite, and in the dual the number is definite. How, then, could it be reasonable to use the definite (grammatical) number intended for only two also instead of that intended for one? And again, the plural form of expression characterizes the word Ἀθῆναι ('Athens') and the word Θῆβαι ('Thebes'), for each is spoken as in reference to many, and means one Athens and one Thebes. Homer, however, being meticulous, expressed singular things in singular ways, as in, for instance, <η 80> ῥχετο δ' εἰς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην ('She came to Marathon and broad-wayed Athens'), and <A 366> ῥχόμεθ' ἐς Θήβην ('We went forth to Thebe'), and <Z 416> Θήβην ὑψίπυλον ('Thebe of lofty gates'). Why does the word ἀμφοτέροι ('both') have a plural form? Because it inflects like a word in the plural; since just as (we decline) οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν πολλῶν τοῖς πολλοῖς τοὺς πολλοὺς ᾧ πολλοί, so (we do in the case of) <οί> ἀμφοτέροι τῶν ἀμφοτέρων τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ᾧ ἀμφοτέροι.

Heliodorus explains then the use of the grammatical plural to express singular and dual objects on the grounds that the plurality includes both one and two, i.e. in a number which can be expressed by plural both one and two are included. Although a similar inclusion can also be applied to the relationships occurring between the dual and the

singular, the question of whether one could use the dual instead of the singular is answered in the negative. He justifies his view by referring to the already mentioned attribute of the definiteness of the dual and the singular number against the indefiniteness of the plural.<sup>23</sup> It seems that in the indefiniteness attributed to the plural one should also find an argument justifying the earlier claim that the plural also includes one and two. Thus, the *pluralis*, according to Heliodorus' reasoning, would include one and two, but – unlike the *singularis* and *dualis* – not be limited to them. Even if this were the case, it would be difficult not to notice and accuse the scholiast of inconsistency or even contradiction, having in mind the paragraph from the Venetian collection quoted above (*Marc.* 381, 21–29) in which he pointed to the number three as the beginning of the concept of plurality (ὁ δὲ τρεῖς ἀριθμὸς ἀρχὴν σημασίας πλῆθους λαμβάνων), as did, moreover, other Byzantine commentators (cf. *supra Lond.* 545, 7–17; *Vat.* <*Stephani*> 229, 32–230, 2).

Our attention is also drawn here to the use of the phrase ὡς γὰρ κατὰ πολλῶν ἐστὶ λεγόμενον in reference to the words Ἀθῆναι and Θῆβαι. An analogous formulation can be found in the paragraph of Τέχνη quoted above and commented upon by scholiasts, i.e. Εἰσὶ δὲ τινες ἐνικοί χαρακτῆρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι, οἷον δῆμος χορός ὄχλος. The phrase there, as can be seen, applies to collectives, and the term λεγόμενοι itself refers to their range of meaning: '(There are some singular forms which are) applied to (a plurality)'. In Heliodorus, the statement (Ἀθῆναι / Θῆβαι) ὡς κατὰ πολλῶν ἐστὶ λεγόμενον applies to a *plurale tantum* word, and the term λεγόμενον refers to its formal shape: 'it is spoken (= is expressed in the form) as in reference to many'. We are thus dealing here with a kind of 'reversal of the function' of the participle λεγόμενον. It is also interesting to note that the expression in question is not found in any other scholion commenting on the issue at hand.

Later in his commentary, Heliodorus, like Stephanos, recalls Homeric phrases in which the names of Athens and Thebes, as well as the adjectives describing them, are used in the singular. The scholiast attributed the presence of this linguistic device to Homer's meticulousness, who 'expressed singular things in singular ways' – τὰ μὲν ἐνικὰ

<sup>23</sup> See also *Marc.* 382, 3–10; *Lond.* 545, 25–29.

ἐνικῶς προηνέγκατο.<sup>24</sup> The adverbial ἐνικῶς, referring to the word form and thus to the use of the grammatical singular, has its parallel in the phrase (λέγονται) πληθυντικῶς – ‘(are used) in plural’, employed by Heliodorus in section *Lond.* 545, 30–34 (cited above) in reference to collective nouns while pointing to the reasons for their use in the plural as well.

In the last part of the commentary, the scholiast justifies the assignment (in the *Τέχνη* textbook) of the plural form to the word ἀμφοτέροι (‘both’) by pointing to its formal analogy to πολλοί (‘many’). The formal analogy was also invoked by Stephanos in justifying, in turn, the attribution of the singular form to the collectives (cf. *supra Vat.* 230, 6–9: Τὸ γὰρ χορός ὄνομά ἐστιν ἔχον χαρακτῆρα ἐνικόν – ὥσπερ γὰρ καλός, οὕτω καὶ χορός). However, Heliodorus, unlike Stephanos, does not limit himself to juxtaposing two analogous word forms, but speaks of an inflection being parallel to that of the word in plural (ὁμοίως κλίνεται τῷ πληθυντικῷ) and adds full paradigms of the words compared. This type of detailed enumeration seems to be quite typical of the interpreted scholia, making it clear that they were intended for a school-oriented, didactic purpose.<sup>25</sup> However, they are perhaps particularly characteristic of Heliodorus, who, for example, elsewhere details the paradigms of all personal and possessive pronouns inflected according to the person, number and case, which filled several pages of Hilgard’s edition (cf. p. 80–85), and the editor himself noted: ‘non multum abest quin nauseam nobis moveat declinatio illa pronominum et primitivorum et derivatorum per omnes personas, numeros, casus perducta’ (*praef.* XV). On the other hand, Hilgard emphasised that many elements of the scholiast’s commentary testify to the good quality of his sources<sup>26</sup> and mentioned Choiroboskos in this context, albeit without explicitly identifying him with Heliodorus.

Apart from the section 30, 5–31, 4 discussed so far, which characterises the number of the noun as one of its inflectional category

<sup>24</sup> See also *Lond.* 545, 34–546, 1.

<sup>25</sup> See also *Lond.* 546, 2–4; in reference to the entirety of the interpreted section 30, 5–31, 4 from *Τέχνη* see also *Byz.* 574, 29–575, 2.

<sup>26</sup> Hilgard 1901: XV: ‘Satis multa insunt in eo commentario, quae eius auctorem fontem haud spernendum adisse doceant.’

(παρεπόμενον), there are 2 semantic classes of nouns (εἶδη ὀνομάτων) closely related to this category, which are described in the Τέχνη textbook (together with 22 other classes) at the end of the paragraph concerned with the noun (ὄνομα). One of these classes is constituted by περιληπτικά ὀνόματα, i.e. the collective nouns, previously cited as examples in section 31, 1–31, 4, but not yet named, and the other one by ἐπιμεριζόμενα ὀνόματα, i.e. the distributive (pro)nouns. Below, therefore, we will present Τέχνη's definitions of these two classes of words and the scholiasts' comments on them.

### 3. The collective nouns

The collective noun (περιληπτικὸν ὄνομα) was defined in Τέχνη in the following way:

Περιληπτικὸν δέ ἐστὶ τὸ τῷ ἐνικῷ ἀριθμῷ πλῆθος σημαῖνον, οἷον δῆμος χορός ὄχλος (40, 4–41, 1).

A collective noun is a noun in the singular number which signifies a plurality, such as 'people, chorus, crowd'.

As can be seen, the short and simple definition is illustrated here with the same examples as in the case of ἐνικοὶ χαρακτηῖρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι in section 31, 5–31, 4. And, as with regard to that section, also commenting on this passage on collectives, the scholiasts generally focus on explaining the phenomenon of singularity of the form and plurality of the meaning of these words, additionally using examples of Homer's *ad sensum* constructions, as in, for instance, the following commentary by Stephanos:

Περιληπτικὸν ὄνομα λέγεται, ὅταν ὁ μὲν χαρακτήρ ἐνικὸς ᾗ, ἐμφαίνηται δὲ διὰ τοῦ σημαينوμένου πολὺ τι πλῆθος, οἷον στρατός χορός. Εἴρηται δὲ περιληπτικὸν παρὰ τὸ περιέχειν τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ σημαινόμενα, οἷον, ὡς ὁ τεχνικός φησι, δῆμος χορός ὄχλος· ταῦτα γὰρ ἐνικὸν μὲν ἔχει τὸν τύπον, εἰς ος γὰρ λέγει, τὸ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν σημαινόμενον πλῆθος ἐστίν· οὔτε γὰρ

ἄν δῆμος οὔτε χορός οὔτε ὄχλος ἐξ ἑνὸς προσώπου συσταίη. Ἐντεῦθεν οὖν καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ εἰδότες τὴν δύναμιν τῆς λέξεως πολλάκις πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ὑπαντῶσι καὶ ῥήματα πληθυντικοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἐπάγουσιν, οἷον <Υ 166> ἀγρόμενοι πᾶς δῆμος καὶ <Ο 305> ἡ πληθὺς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἀπονέοντο (Vat. <Stephani> 240, 34–241, 8).

A noun is referred to as collective when the form is singular, while through the meaning some numerous plurality is shown, as for instance *an army* or *a choir*. It is called περιληπτικόν because it includes the things it denotes, for instance, as the grammarian says, *the people, a choir, a crowd*. These words have a singular form, since they end in -os, but what is signified by them is a plurality, as neither the people, nor the choir, nor the crowd can consist of just one person. For that reason also poets, aware of the meaning of the word, often take into account what is meant and combine plural verbs with it, as e.g. (Υ 166) ἀγρόμενοι πᾶς δῆμος ('whole folk [...] gathered together') and (Ο 305) ἡ πληθὺς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἀπονέοντο ('the multitude [i.e. the army] fared back to the ships of the Achaeans').<sup>27</sup>

It may be somewhat surprising that in explaining the origin of the name of this class of words, the scholiast referred to the verb περιέχειν, rather than to the expected περιλαμβάνειν.<sup>28</sup> However, Heliodorus, in his commentary on this paragraph, again poses a question, and the answer to it allows him to question the definition of collectives adopted in the Τέχνη textbook:

<Ἄλλ'> οὖν εἰ λέξει τις, ὅτε πληθυντικῶς αὐτὸ λέγομεν, οὐκέτι περιληπτικόν ἐστι; Ναί, λεκτέον, καὶ ὅτε πληθυντικῶς αὐτὸ λέγομεν, <περιληπτι>κόν ἐστι. ἄλλ' οὐκ ἔδει αὐτὸν εἶπεν «τὸ δι' ἑνικῶ ἀριθμοῦ πλῆθος σημαῖνον»· οὐδὲ γὰρ μόνῳ τῷ ἑνικῶ ἀριθμῷ πλῆθος περιλαμβάνομεν· ἰδοὺ γὰρ λέγοντες οἱ δῆμοι, συνεστήκασιν ἐξ ἐκάστης διαιρέσεως τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ <πλήθ>ος περιλαμβανούσης. Καὶ μή τις ὑπολάβῃ

<sup>27</sup> See also *Marc.* 395, 24–31; *Lond.* 557, 4–10.

<sup>28</sup> A direct reference to this verb is only found in *commentariolus Byzantinus* (*Byz.* 577, 8): ταῦτα γὰρ (*scil.* περιληπτικά) πλῆθος περιλαμβάνουσι· διὰ τοῦτο περιπηπτικά λέγονται.



ξένον εἶναι τὸ λεγόμενον, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν <τοῖς> ἐπιμεριζομένοις παρὰ βραχὺ <ταῦτ>ὸν ὀρώμεν· ὡς γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἕκαστος ἐκ τῆς καθ' ἓνα τομῆς ἐπὶ πάντας γίγνεται ἡ ἀναφορά, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἕκαστοι ἐκ τῆς <κατὰ πολλοὺς το>μῆς ἐπὶ πάντας κατὰ πολλοὺς τετμημένους λέγεται ἡ ἀναφορά, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ δῆμος ἐνικῶ τύπῳ πλῆθος <περιλαμβά>νομεν, καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ δῆμοι πολλοὺς δῆμους δηλοῦμεν συνηγμένους ἐκ διαίρεσεως ἐκάστης πλῆθος <περικλειούσης> (*Heliod.* 68, 18–30).

And if someone says: when we utter this (word) in the plural, is it not then already a collective noun? But of course it is, it must be said; also when we utter it in the plural, it is a collective noun; however, (the author) should not have said that ‘by means of the singular number it signifies a plurality’, for it is not only in the singular number that we express plurality. For here are (the people) uttering the word δῆμοι (‘peoples’), (and in doing so) they put together (a collection), each component of which in itself contains a plurality. And let no one think this to be strange, since we also see almost the same thing in distributive nouns, for just as in ἕκαστος (‘every’) from the division into individuals a reference to all arises, and in ἕκαστοι (‘all belonging to each group’) from the division into many (groups) a reference to all divided into many groups is expressed, so also in δῆμος by means of the singular we express a plurality, and again in δῆμοι we express numerous peoples gathered into a whole, each component of which contains a plurality.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, this time Heliodorus is no longer asking about the rationale behind the possibility of using collectives in the plural, but about the consequences this possibility rises for the way in which this class of words should be defined. In this context, the scholiast points out that the definitional association of collectivity with the expression of plurality by a word in the grammatical singular only is inappropriate for two reasons. Firstly, because it wrongly deprives the word of collective status if it is used in the grammatical plural, and secondly, because collectives express plurality not only in the singular but also in the plural. And the greater part of the commentary, rather paradoxically, is focused precisely on proving that collective nouns convey plurality

<sup>29</sup> See also *Marc.* 395, 18–24; *Lond.* 557, 10–15.

also in the plural. This time, however, the scholiast does not resort to the phrase *πολλὰ συστήματα*, but speaks of a plurality arising from the division into parts, each of which also contains a plurality (*ἐξ ἐκάστης διαιρέσεως τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ πλῆθος περιλαμβανούσης*). It can therefore be inferred that, according to Heliodorus, one should define collectives as words that denote plurality in both the singular and plural.

Referring to the argument carried out by the scholiast, it must be said that his intuition leading him to consider also word forms in *pluralis* like *δῆμοι* as collectives is fully correct. However, what impeded him in presenting a correct line of argument was the already mentioned lack of the conceptual distinction between grammatical and lexical semantics, which prevented him from referring precisely to lexical semantics as a property that determines the collective character of a word's meaning and is actualised regardless of the value of the grammatical number in which it occurs. Connected to this, of course, is the general issue of the lack of the conceptual distinction between a lexeme (dictionary unit) and a grammatical form representing it. However, in the aforementioned attempt to prove the plural meaning of collectives in *pluralis* particularly interesting is the resort to the analogy with distributive (pro)nouns (*τὰ ἐπιμεριζόμενα*) that allowed the scholiast to present this meaning as a plurality resulting from the division (of some whole) into parts that themselves contain a plurality: *ὡς γὰρ [...] ἐν τῷ ἑκάστοι ἐκ τῆς κατὰ πολλοὺς τομῆς ἐπὶ πάντα κατὰ πολλοὺς τετμημένους λέγεται ἢ ἀναφορά, οὕτω καὶ [...] ἐν τῷ δῆμοι πολλοὺς δήμους δηλοῦμεν συνηγμένους ἐκ διαιρέσεως ἐκάστης πλῆθος περικλειούσης* – ‘for just as in *ἑκάστοι* (‘all belonging to each group’) from the division into many (groups) a reference to all divided into many groups is expressed, so in *δῆμοι* we express numerous peoples gathered into a whole, each component of which contains a plurality’. The distributive (pro)nouns in question are a type of nouns (*ὀνόματα*) distinguished in the *Τέχνη* textbook following the collective nouns. Because of the links between the distributives and the grammatical category of the number, they also remain of interest to us.

#### 4. The distributive (pro)nouns

The distributive (pro)noun is accompanied in the Τέχνη textbook by the following definition:

Ἐπιμεριζόμενον δέ ἐστι τὸ ἐκ δύο ἢ καὶ πλειόνων ἐπὶ ἓν ἔχον τὴν ἀναφοράν, οἷον ἐκάτερος ἕκαστος (41, 2–3).

A distributive is a noun which, when two or more things are involved, refers to one of them, such as *hekateros* (each – of two), *hekastos* (each – of more than two).

This passus was also referred to by Heliodoros in a longer commentary:

Καὶ ὁ ὅρος τοῦ <ἐπιμεριζο>μένου καὶ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα παραδείγματα πάνυ ἐσφαλμένα ἐστίν· εἰ γὰρ τὰ ἐπιμεριζόμενα ἐκ <δύο ἢ καὶ> πλειόνων ἐπὶ ἓν ἕκαστον ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν, ἔδει εἰπεῖν ἢ ἕτερος ἢ ἄλλος, ἐπειδὴ ταῦτα ἐκ δύο <καὶ> πολλῶν ἕνα σημαίνει. Ἔστιν οὖν οὕτως ἄμεινον λέγειν· ἐπιμεριζόμενόν ἐστιν ὃ δηλοῖ ἕνα ἐκ δύο, <ἢ δύο καθ'> ἕνα, ἢ ἕνα ἐκ πολλῶν, ἢ πολλοὺς καθ' ἕνα· οἷον ἕνα μὲν ἐκ δύο, ὡς τὸ ἕτερος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, <δύο δὲ καθ'> ἕνα, ὡς τὸ ἐκάτερος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἕνα τε ἐκ πολλῶν, ὡς τὸ ἄλλος, πολλοὺς τε καθ' ἕνα, ὡς τὸ ἕκαστος. <Εἰδέναι> δὲ χρή, ὡς τινες ἐδόξασαν τὸ ἐπιμεριζόμενον τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιάν πως ἔχειν τῷ περιληπτικῷ· <εἰ γὰρ τὸ> «ἕκαστος ἐλθέτω», φασίν, ἐνικῶς πολλοὺς περιλαμβάνει, δοκεῖ πως ταῦτόν εἶναι τὸ ἐπιμεριζόμενον <καὶ τὸ περιληπτικόν, εἴ γε ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ πολλοὺς δηλοῦν ἀναφέρεται. Πρὸς οὓς δεῖ οὕτως> λέγειν· <ἀγνοεῖν μοι> δοκεῖτε, ὡς πολλή ἐστιν ἡ διαφορὰ ἐπιμεριζομένου καὶ περιληπτικοῦ, οὐκ εἰδότες, ὅτι τὸ ἐπιμεριζόμενον μὲν <ἐκ τοῦ καθ' ἕκα>στον ἐπιμερισμοῦ τὴν πρὸς πάντας ἔμφασιν ἔχει, τὸ δὲ περιληπτικόν οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιμερισμοῦ ἀλλ' αὐτόθεν <τὴν περιληψιν σημαίνει> (*Heliod.* 68, 31–69, 13).

Both the definition of a distributive noun and the examples supplied are completely wrong, for if each of the distributive nouns refers to one of two or also of many, then it should have been said, either ἕτερος ('one of

two') or ἄλλος ('another'), as they denote one of two as well as of many. So it is better to say this: a distributive is a noun that expresses one of two, or two by one, or one of many, or many by one; and so one of two, as e.g. one (ἕτερος) of the eyes; two by one, as e.g. each (ἐκάτερος) of the eyes; one of many, as e.g. another (ἄλλος); many by one, as e.g. every (ἕκαστος). It is important to know that some have considered that the distributive noun has almost the same meaning as the collective noun. For if, they say, (the expression) ἕκαστος ἐλθέτω ('let everyone come') in the singular includes the many, then it seems that the distributive noun and the collective noun are more or less the same thing, since each is assigned to denote the many. They should be answered thus: you seem to me to be unaware that there is a great difference between a distributive noun and a collective noun, as you do not know that the distributive noun from division to each individual has a meaning referring to all, while the collective noun not from division, but directly means an inclusion (of many).<sup>30</sup>

While with regard to the definition of a collective noun, the scholiast postulated only a certain correction, here we have a total criticism (Καὶ ὁ ὅρος τοῦ ἐπιμεριζομένου καὶ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα παραδείγματα πάνυ ἐσφαλμένα ἐστίν – 'Both the definition of a distributive noun and the examples supplied are completely wrong'). And it seems fair to say that this criticism is at least partially justified. If the term ἀναφορά stands for a semantic reference, then the examples given by the author of Τέχνη (ἐκάτερος, ἕκαστος) are certainly not characterised by reference to a single element (out of two or many), although this is the feature assigned to them in the definition (Ἐπιμεριζόμενον δέ ἐστι τὸ [...] ἐπὶ ἓν ἔχον τὴν ἀναφορὰν). In contrast, Heliodorus's reasoning in defining and providing examples of the distributives is clear, coherent, and logical. According to him, these words denote either one object, implying at the same time its membership in a two- (ἕτερος) or multi-element set (ἄλλος)<sup>31</sup>, or two or many objects, but – unlike collectives – in an individualising way (καθ' ἓνα), i.e. emphasising their individuality within the two- (ἐκάτερος) or multi-element (ἕκαστος) set

<sup>30</sup> See also *Lond.* 557, 17–25.

<sup>31</sup> It should be pointed out that lexemes ἕτερος and ἄλλος are currently not included in the distributive pronouns in the strict sense.

they form. Also interesting and noteworthy seems to be the final part of the commentary in question, in which the scholiast emphasised the difference between the distributive nouns expressing plurality and the collective nouns, writing that the distributive noun ‘from division to each individual has a meaning referring to all’ (ἐκ τοῦ καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐπιμερισμοῦ τὴν πρὸς πάντας ἔμφασιν ἔχει), while the collective noun ‘not from division, but directly means an inclusion (of many)’ (οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιμερισμοῦ ἀλλ’ αὐτόθεν τὴν περίληψιν σημαίνει). The difference in the way the two types of words express plurality is thus characterised by the opposition: ἐκ τοῦ καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐπιμερισμοῦ vs. αὐτόθεν, while their scope of meaning is identified by the terms τὴν πρὸς πάντας ἔμφασιν ἔχει and τὴν περίληψιν σημαίνει, respectively. In these expressions, one can also see references to the nomenclature applied to both types of nouns. In this context, aside from the phrase περίληψιν σημαίνει which characterises the meaning of collectives, it is worth noting the use of the word ἐπιμερισμός in place of τομῆ, which Heliodorus used when referring to distributive nouns in his commentary on collectives (ἐκ τῆς καθ’ ἕνα τομῆς ἐπὶ πάντα γίνεται ἡ ἀναφορά – *vide supra*, *Heliod.* 68, 18–30;).

Τέχνη’s definition of distributive nouns, which are rather challenging to approach theoretically, was also commented upon and explained by scholiasts differently and not as critically as Heliodorus did. Thus, the author of an anonymous commentary included in the Vatican collection attempts to explain how accompanying examples should be interpreted in light of this definition, while presenting an understanding of the definition itself that differs from that of Heliodorus:

Τὸ μὲν ἑκάτερος ἐκ δύο ἐπὶ ἓν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν, οἷον ὡς ὅταν εἶπω «ἑκάτερος τῶν φίλων γνήσιός ἐστιν»· οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπὶ ἓν ἔχουσι τὴν ἀναφοράν, λέγω δὴ τὴν γνησιότητα· καὶ πάλιν τὸ ἕκαστος <ἐκ πολλῶν ἐπὶ ἓν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν, οἷον ὡς ὅταν εἶπω «ἕκαστος» τῶν φίλων ἐλεύθερός ἐστιν»· οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπὶ ἓν ἔχουσι τὴν ἀναφοράν, λέγω δὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν (*Vat.* 241, 15–20).

In the case of the word ἑκάτερος (‘each of two’), of the two by one something is referred (to them), as when I say, for instance: ‘each of the two

friends is legitimately born', for to them by one something is referred, I mean legitimate birth. And again in the case of ἕκαστος ('each'), of the many by one something is referred (to them), as when I say, e.g.: 'each of the friends is free', for to them by one something is referred, I mean freedom.

If our understanding of this explanation is correct, the scholiast assigns to the expression ἐπὶ ἓν used in Τέχνη the meaning in which Heliodorus used the term καθ' ἓνα (i.e. 'by one', 'individually'),<sup>32</sup> while he gives to the term ἀναφορά a meaning closer to predication rather than reference.<sup>33</sup> In the same collection, we can also find two other attempts at describing the essence of distributive nouns. The first of these was penned by an anonymous author:

Τὸ ἐπιμεριζόμενον διὰ τὸ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ μέρος διαιρέσεως ὡς ἐπὶ πᾶν χωρεῖν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν δοκεῖ πως ἔχειν τῷ περιληπτικῷ, εἴ γε ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ πάντας δηλοῦν ἀναφέρεται (*Vat.* 241, 21–24).

The distributive noun, by the fact that it extends, in a way, from division into parts to the whole, also seems to have almost the same meaning as the collective noun, since both are attributed to denote all (elements).

As we recall, such a characterisation of distributive nouns was critically addressed by Heliodorus, who cited the second part of it almost verbatim in his commentary (cf. *supra* 68, 31–69, 13; *Heliod.*). For this reason, the compiler of the Vatican scholia added to the above passage the words of Heliodorus (with minor changes), in which he described the difference between distributive and collective nouns (cf. 241, 24–27). The second attempt at creating his own approach to the specificity of distributive nouns is attributed to Stephanos:

<sup>32</sup> Similarly to M. Callipo, who uses the phrase *uno alla volta* in her translation of the discussed Τέχνη paragraph; cf. Callipo 2011: 73: 'Il distributivo è quello che, tra due o anche più elementi, fa riferimento a uno alla volta, come ἐκάτερος (uno dei due) ἕκαστος (ciascuno).' However, it is difficult to accept the translation of ἐκάτερος as 'uno dei duo'.

<sup>33</sup> Comp. also: *Marc.* 396, 2–8.

Ἐπιμεριζόμενον ἐστὶν ὃ ποιεῖται ἀπὸ πλήθους προσώπων ἕξαναριθμησιν.<sup>34</sup> εἴρηται δὲ ἐπιμεριζόμενον, ὅτι ἀπομερίζει ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τὸ καταληπτόν, ὡς τὸ ἕκαστος καὶ τὸ ἑκάτερος (*Vat. <Stephani> 241, 10–13*).

A distributive noun is one that transforms a plurality of people into (their) enumeration; it is called distributive because it distinguishes from the plurality that which can be grasped (individually), e.g. *each, each of two*.

The clever phrases the scholiast used here, i.e. *ποιεῖται ἀπὸ πλήθους ἕξαναριθμησιν* and *ἀπομερίζει ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τὸ καταληπτόν*, serve to formulate an intelligent and rather accurate characterisation of the semantics of distributive pronouns. As was already mentioned, describing these words correctly could be difficult because of their unique meaning, on the one hand generalising and determining the plurality of the referent, but individualising on the other, which is linked to the possibility of their use in the singular grammatical number.

## 5. Conclusions

In summary of our review and the analyses conducted, we can conclude that the short section on the grammatical category of the noun number in *Τέχνη γραμματική*, as well as the even shorter sections that define collective nouns and distributive (pro)nouns, generated quite a few rather diverse explanations and comments from Byzantine scholiasts. Practically each and every one of the statements and examples was commented upon.

When it comes to the general characterisation of the grammatical category of the noun number in *Τέχνη*, the scholiasts, on the one hand, focused on the semantics of the specific values of this category, while emphasizing the definite character of the singular and dual number, which implied that a noun stands for (respectively) one or two objects, in contrast with the indefinite character of the plural number, which may refer to any number of objects, starting with three. On the

<sup>34</sup> See also *Lond. 557, 16–17*.

other hand, the subject of the scholiasts' comments concerned the relationships between the meaning contributed by specific values of the number category and the terminology adopted to name these values. In this regard, we can find statements whose authors identify the derivational bases of the terms referring to the singular and dual number, interpret the formal aspect of the manner in which they are created, and emphasise the word-formative clarity and semantic adequacy of both terms. First of all, however, they comment extensively on the lack of the term 'triple number' (ἀριθμὸς τρεῖκός / τριτυντικός) for this value of the number category, which allows the noun to designate three objects, and the use of the term 'plural number' (ἀριθμὸς πληθυντικός) to serve this function instead. Furthermore, they justify this phenomenon on the grounds that the number of three objects implied by this value is at the same time the beginning of the (indefinite) plurality that determines the actual scope of meaning of this value and the etymon of its name. In addition, they invoke a specific argument in the form of adages and quotations from Homer, in which the number three functions as a generalisation of plurality (τρεῖς πολλοί). A particular case of sensitivity to issues concerning the nomenclature used to refer to the number category is Heliodorus' comment on the apparent relationship of the formal shape of the numeral one, especially its ending -εῖς, with the grammatical plural.

Plenty of comments were made on Τέχνη's examples of words in the singular number denoting a plurality (δῆμος) and words in the plural number referring to one (Ἀθῆναι) or two objects (ἀμφοτέροι). In commenting on this contradiction between the grammatical form and the semantics, Heliodorus stands out again, reducing the appearance of uniqueness of this phenomenon by referring to deponent verbs as words characterised by a similar discrepancy between the form and the meaning as collective verbs. Responding in turn to the question of why these nouns can also be used in the grammatical plural, he made a terminological distinction between the plurality expressed by them lexically (σύστημα – 'a collectivity') and the plurality expressed grammatically (πολλὰ συστήματα – 'many collectivities'), and thus *de facto* a distinction between *collectivum* and *pluralis*. In regard to *pluralia tantum* nouns, he tried to justify the fact that they refer to only one or



two objects by referring to the indefiniteness and inclusivity of the plural as a value including the numbers one and two as well, which, however, contradicts his own identification elsewhere of the number three as ‘the beginning of plurality’. The inadmissibility of using the grammatical dual to express a single object was explained by him, in turn, by pointing to the definite nature of the *dualis*. Scholiasts in general, not just Heliodorus, also considered it necessary to justify the statement about the grammatical singularity of nouns such as δῆμος and the grammatical plurality of nouns such as Ἀθῆναι, and therefore pointed to their formal analogy with singular and plural forms (respectively) of ‘regular’ nouns. Similarly, they explained and argued the thesis of the singularity or plurality of their meaning (respectively), often using literary examples of *ad sensum* constructions.

Closely related to the grammatical category of the number are also two nominal semantic classes defined in Τέχνη, namely the collective noun (ὄνομα περιληπτικόν) and the distributive (pro)noun (ὄνομα ἐπιμεριζόμενον). In the scholia pertaining to the description of collective nouns, apart from schematic statements justifying their grammatical and semantic status, we can also find an interesting comment by Heliodorus, who considered the textbook’s definition of this word class, which connects the plurality conveyed by these words only with the grammatical singular, to be imprecise, and argued that a collective noun maintains its status as a collective noun and expresses plurality even when it occurs in plural. The plural character of its semantics, when used in the grammatical plural, is described by Heliodorus this time in terms of the division into parts that themselves contain a plurality (ἐκ διαιρέσεως ἐκάστης πλήθος περικλειούσης), and the description is accompanied by an appeal to the analogy provided by the distributive noun. And the definition of the latter noun class also came under Heliodorus’ criticism, as did the view espoused by some grammarians that the meaning of collective and distributive nouns is one and the same, since Heliodorus claimed that the distributive noun from the division to each individual has a meaning referring to all, while the collective noun means directly encompassing the many. However, in the scholia we also find commentaries that present a different from Heliodorus’ understanding of Τέχνη’s definition of a distributive noun, and even

scholiasts' own attempts to capture the essence of these words, among which Stephanos' definition stands out.

The presented overview of scholia<sup>35</sup> shows that the intellectual level of comments on the subject matter indicated in the title varied considerably. It must be remembered, however, that these commentaries had a scholarly, didactic character, as did the Τέχνη textbook itself, which was devoted to the grammar of classical Greek, as evidenced by, *inter alia*, examples drawn mainly from Homer and the poets of the classical period. That being so, we should not be unduly surprised by the overly detailed discussions on elementary and rather obvious issues, or by the attributing (*implicite*) to the dual number a status analogous to that of the singular and plural, although even at the time when Τέχνη may have been written, the *dualis* was already in a state of decline.<sup>36</sup> However, the cognitive value of the scholia remains beyond doubt, and among their authors there happen to be distinct and uncommon figures, such as Heliodorus (vel Choïroboskos). Alfred Hilgard, aware of all the shortcomings of the scholia, wrote with concern in the introduction to his edition: ‘mihi videor audire obiurgantes, quod nimis et operae et temporis profusum sit in re viliore aut nullius pretii’.<sup>37</sup> As far as I know, his concern happily remained only a concern, which gives me hope that the same will be true for this humble contribution as well.

## References

### Primary sources

- Hertz M., 1855, *Prisciani Grammatici Caesariensis Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri XVIII, vol. 2: Libros I–XII Continens*, M. Hertz (ed.), Lipsiae.
- Hilgard A., 1889, *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones de Flexione Nominum et Verborum. Georgii Choerobosci Prolegomena et Scholia in Canones de Flexione Nominum*, A. Hilgard (ed.), Lipsiae.

---

<sup>35</sup> Selected scholia to Τέχνη γραμματική are also cited, translated and commented upon by Robins 1993: 45–86; however, they do not touch the issues discussed in this article.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Horrocks 2010: 73, 102, 138.

<sup>37</sup> Hilgard 1901: VII.

- Hilgard A., 1894, *Prolegomena. Georgii Choerobosci. Prolegomena et Scholia in Canones de Flexione Verborum. Sophronii Excerpta ex Ioannis Characis Commentariis in Canones*, A. Hilgard (ed.), Lipsiae.
- Hilgard A., 1901, *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*, A. Hilgard (ed.), Lipsiae.
- Kemp A.J., 1986, 'The Tekhnē Grammatikē of Dionysius Thrax: English Translation with Introduction and Notes', [in:] *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, D.J. Taylor (ed.), Amsterdam, pp. 169–190, <https://doi.org/10.1075/sihols.46.10kem>.
- Murray A.T., 1919, *Homer; The Odyssey*, vol. 1–2, transl. A.T. Murray, London.
- Murray A.T., 1924, *Homer; The Iliad*, vol. 1–2, transl. A.T. Murray, London.
- Uhlig G., 1883, *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*, G. Uhlig (ed.), Lipsiae.
- Uhlig G., 1910, *Apollonii Dyscoli De constructione libri quattuor*, G. Uhlig (ed.), Lipsiae.

### Secondary sources

- Bécares Botas V., 1985, *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega, Salamanca*.
- Bednarski M., 2000, *Apollonios Dyskolos "O skladni". Przekład, interpretacja, wstęp*, Kraków.
- Callipo M., 2011, *Dionisio Trace e la tradizione grammaticale*, Roma.
- Di Benedetto V., 1958, 'Dionisio Trace e la 'Techne' a lui attribuita', *Annali della Scuola. Normale Superiore di Pisa* 27, pp. 169–210.
- Di Benedetto V., 1959, 'Dionisio Trace e la 'Techne' a lui attribuita', *Annali della Scuola. Normale Superiore di Pisa* 28, pp. 87–118.
- Di Benedetto V., 2000, 'Dionysius Thrax and the Tekhne Grammatike', [in:] *History of the Language Science*, vol. 1, S. Auroux et al. (eds), Berlin, pp. 394–400.
- Dickey E., 2007, *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford.
- Horrocks G., 2010, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*, Chichester.
- Pagani L., 2011, 'Pioneers of Grammar: Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language', [in:] *From Scholars to Scholia: Chapters in the History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, F. Montanari, L. Pagani (eds), Berlin–New York, pp. 17–64, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110251630.17>.
- Pecorella G.B., 1962, *Dionisio Trace, TEXNH ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗ, testo critico e commento*, Bologna.
- Pontani F., 2020, 'Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453)', [in:] *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the*

- Byzantine Age*, F. Montanari (ed.), Leiden–Boston, pp. 373–529, [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004430570\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004430570_006).
- Robins R.H., 1993, ‘The *Tekhnē Grammatikē: The Foundations*’, [in:] *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, R.H. Robins (ed.), Berlin–New York, pp. 41–86.
- Wolanin H., 2004, *Fleksja w gramatyce starożytnej Grecji*, Kraków.
- Woodard R.D., 2023, ‘Greek Linguistic Thought and Its Roman Reception’, [in:] *The Cambridge History of Linguistics*, L.R. Waugh, M. Monville-Burston, J.E. Joseph (eds), Cambridge, pp. 102–143, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9780511842788.008>.