

Hubert Wolanin

Διάθεις in the "Τέχνη γραμματική" attributed to Dionysios Thrax and in the "Περὶ συντάξεως" by Apollonios Dyskolos : a comparative analysis

Scripta Classica 6, 51-68

2009

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach
dozwolonego użytku.

Hubert Wolanin
Jagiellonian University, Kraków

Διάθεις in the Τέχνη γραμματική
Attributed to Dionysios Thrax
and in the Περί συντάξεως
by Apollonios Dyskolos
A Comparative Analysis

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to attempt at conducting analysis of the meaning given to the word διάθεις in two most important grammatical texts written in ancient Greece, i.e. in the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysios Thrax and in the treaty Περί συντάξεως by Apollonios Dyskolos. The study leads to the conclusion that the meaning of that term occurring in both texts is quite difficult to find. Its ambiguity undoubtedly stems, at least to some extent, from real complexity of the matter it refers to. Apart from that, its vagueness results, on the one hand, from not sufficiently precise description of the criteria identifying the concepts related to that term, and from multitude and incoherence of those criteria, on the other. Due to those shortcomings, the designatum of that term, although close to the notion of the grammatical category of voice, is not quite equivalent to it. However, it reflects undoubtedly the way Alexandrian grammarians perceived the effects of the existence of that category in the grammatical system of the Greek language.

Key words: Dionysios Thrax, Apollonios Dyskolos, ancient grammar, diathesis

The term διάθεις in the Greek grammar tradition refers most frequently to the formal and functional verb variance, which is linked to the inflectional category of voice. However, the exact identification of that term meaning, as used by Greek grammarians, brings about a number of difficulties. They are caused mainly by the unclear and diverse way ancient grammarians characterised the concept denoted with this term in particular texts, which results, in turn, from a sig-

nificant complication of the way in which the category of voice functioned in the grammatical system of ancient Greek. In this article, we will attempt at conducting analysis of the range of meanings given to the word διάθεσις in two most important grammatical texts written in ancient Greece, i.e. in the Τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysios Thrax and in the treaty Περί συντάξεως by Apollonios Dyskolos.

The text of the Τέχνη constitutes the final codification of the Greek word science. The conceptual and terminological apparatus included there exerted a huge influence upon the development of modern grammar in the area of morphology, and especially the theory of inflection. Irrespective of doubts as to the possibility of attributing the Τέχνη to Dionysios Thrax (170—90)¹, the studies performed in recent years have shown that the text of that treaty reflects the grammatical knowledge which was shaped in the circle of Hellenistic philologists already in 2nd — 1st centuries before Christ². The term διάθεσις appears in the Τέχνη first of all in the context of the verb characteristics (ῥήμα)³. We encounter it already in the definition of that part of speech, reading as follows:

¹ Cf. e.g. V. Di Benedetto: “Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita”. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 1958, No 27, pp. 169—210; 1959, No 28, pp. 87—118; Idem: “La Techne spuria”. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*. 1973, No. 3, pp. 797—814; Idem: “At the Origins of Greek Grammar”. *Glotta* 1990, No 68, pp. 19—39; J. Pinborg: “Classical Antiquity: Greece”. In: *Current Trends in Linguistic Theory*. Ed. T.A. Sebeok. Vol. 13. The Hague—Paris 1975, pp. 69—126; A. Wouters: *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the ‘Ars Grammatica’ in Antiquity*. Brussel 1979; W. Ax: *Laut, Stimme und Sprache. Studien zu drei Grundbegriffen der antiken Sprachtheorie*. (Hypomnemata, Heft 84). Göttingen 1986; D.J. Taylor: “Rethinking the History of Language Science in Classical Antiquity”. In: *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*. Ed. D.J. Taylor. Amsterdam 1987, pp. 1—16; *Dionysius Thrax and the Techne Grammatike*. Eds. V. Law, I. Sluiter. Münster 1995; P. Swiggers, A. Wouters: *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity: Introduction*. In: *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*. Eds. P. Swiggers, A. Wouters. Leuven 2002, pp. 9—20.

² Cf. W. Ax: „Aristarch und die »Grammatik«“. *Glotta* 1982, No 60, pp. 96—109; Idem: „Aristophanes von Byzanz als Analogist. Zu Fragment 374 Slater (= Varro, de lingua Latina 9,12)“. *Glotta* 1990, No 68, pp. 4—18; Idem: „Sprache als Gegenstand der alexandrinischen und pergamenischen Philologie“. In: *Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike*. Hrsg. P. Schmitter. Tübingen 1991, pp. 275—301; H. Erbse: „Zur normativen Grammatik der Alexandriner“. *Glotta* 1980, No 58, pp. 236—258; S. Matthaios: *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*. Göttingen 1999; Idem: *Neue Perspektiven für Historiographie der antiken Grammatik: Das Wortartensystem der Alexandriner*. In: *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*. Eds. P. Swiggers, A. Wouters. Leuven 2002, pp. 161—220; E. Siebenborn: *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*. Amsterdam 1976; Ch.K. Callanan: *Die Sprachbeschreibung bei Aristophanes von Byzanz*. Göttingen 1987.

³ Apart from that, it occurs also in the chapter concerning ὄνομα (46, 1—2 – see below, note 4), where it denotes a specific semantic feature of a certain groups of nouns. However, that feature is of lexical and not grammatical nature, and therefore its description goes beyond the topical scope of this study.

46, 4 — 47, 2⁴: Ῥῆμά ἐστι λέξις ἄπτωτος, ἐπιδεκτικὴ χρόνων τε καὶ προσώπων καὶ ἀριθμῶν, ἐνέργειαν ἢ πάθος παριστάσα. Παρέπεται δὲ τῷ ῥήματι ὀκτώ. ἐγκλίσεις, διαθέσεις, εἶδη, σχήματα, ἀριθμοί, πρόσωπα, χρόνοι, συζυγίαι.

A verb is a word deprived of cases, capable of expressing tenses, as well as persons and numbers, denoting action or experience. Eight [properties — H.W.] accompany the verb: moods, diatheses, figures, schemas, numbers, persons, tenses, and groupings.

Thus, we can see that διαθέσεις ('diatheses') have been shown here as one of characteristic features (παρεπόμενα) of the verb, which, apart from others, such as, *inter alia*, moods, numbers, persons or tenses, constitutes an obligatory attribute of that class of words. Further on in the treaty, that feature is described in the following way.

48, 1—49, 3: Διαθέσεις εἰσὶ τρεῖς, ἐνέργεια, πάθος, μεσότης· ἐνέργεια μὲν οἶον τύπτω, πάθος δὲ οἶον τύπτομαι, μεσότης δὲ ἢ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτὲ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα, οἶον πέπηγα διέφθορα ἐποιησάμην ἐγραψάμην.

There are three diatheses: ἐνέργεια, πάθος, μεσότης: ἐνέργεια, as e.g. 'I hit', πάθος, as e.g. 'I am hit', μεσότης, which sometimes expresses action and sometimes experience, as e.g. 'I am stuck', 'I have gone mad', 'I have done for myself', 'I have enrolled'.

As can be easily seen, this description causes big difficulties with interpretation. These are related to the exact identification of the meanings of the terms which co-create the characteristics of the verb's διαθέσεις presented here. In this respect, we should note, first of all, that two of those terms, namely, ἐνέργεια and πάθος, appear also in the definition of ῥῆμα quoted above: ῥῆμά ἐστι λέξις [...] ἐνέργειαν ἢ πάθος παριστάσα. In this definition, they refer undoubtedly to the semantic features of the verb and they denote action and experience, respectively, as properties of the semantic characteristics of the words of this class. In other words, a definitional feature of verbs is that each of them expresses either action or experience. On the other hand, in passage 48, 1—49, 3 under consideration, those terms identify specific διαθέσεις of the verb, being some of its παρεπόμενα. The problem is, however, that the author of the Τέχνη distinguished not two but three διαθέσεις, i.e. apart from ἐνέργεια and πάθος, there is still μεσότης. Thus, the terms ἐνέργεια and πάθος (and μεσότης), as terminological exponents of (three) different διαθέσεις ῥήματος, can no longer refer straightforwardly (and exclusively) to the verb semantics; if it were so, the meaning of the term μεσότης, being

⁴ All quotations from the Τέχνη according to the following edition: *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica (Τέχνη γραμματική)*. Ed. G. Uhlig (Grammatici Graeci I 1). Lipsiae 1883 (reprint: Hildesheim 1965).

the third element of the functional opposition, together with ἐνέργεια and πάθος, would have to be interpreted in the same semantic categories, i.e. it would have to be identified with some meaning of the verb being neither action nor experience. However, several circumstances weigh against such a solution.

First of all, the adoption of such a solution would require distinguishing the same kind of meaning of a verb (i.e. neither action nor experience) in the very definition of ῥήμα as well. Yet, as we have observed before, this definition shows that verbs express only action or experience and there is nothing about expressing anything else but action or experience. Besides, μεσότης has been characterised as the notion which, in the semantic aspect, is also related only either to action or experience: μεσότης δὲ ἢ ποτέ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτέ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα. Therefore, μεσότης is not any special kind (type) of the meaning of the verb, other than action or experience. In other words, it is not something that could be expressed by the verb, as a specific meaning, since the verb representing μεσότης as one of διαθέσεις expresses also (exclusively) either action or experience⁵. So, we should assume that the terms ἐνέργεια and πάθος are used in the Τέχνη in two different meanings. The first of the two is ‘action’ and ‘experience,’ respectively, as properties of the verb semantics. In this meaning, those terms were used in the definition of ῥήμα and in the phrase: ποτέ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτέ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα, which characterises μεσότης. The other meaning relates to the use of those terms, alongside the term μεσότης, in the function of the terminological exponents of particular διαθέσεις ῥήματος (διαθέσεις εἰσὶ τρεῖς, ἐνέργεια, πάθος, μεσότης). When interpreting the meaning of ἐνέργεια, πάθος and μεσότης in this very function, i.e. in the function of the terminological exponents of three different διαθέσεις ῥήματος (and, at the same time, when interpreting the notion διαθέσεις as such), the identification of the semantic range of the term μεσότης plays obviously a key role. In this context, it seems especially important to obtain the answer to two fundamental questions: the first one: how should we understand the word ποτέ in the expression: ποτέ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτέ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα, and the other one: what is the difference, on the one hand, between μεσότης (ποτέ) ἐνέργειαν παριστάσα and ἐνέργεια as a kind of διάθεσις, and between μεσότης (ποτέ) πάθος παριστάσα and πάθος as a kind of διάθεσις, on the other?

Due to the lack of any explanations regarding the topics under discussion, the answers to the above questions can be found only in the interpretation of the attached exemplification material. And so, ἐνέργεια as the first of διαθέσεις ῥήματος being distinguished was illustrated by means of an active form in the present tense,

⁵ See also R. Popowski: „Passivum w antycznej teorii helleńskiej”. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 1982, nr 30 (3), (pp. 35—64), p. 41: „[Medium — H.W.] z semantycznego punktu widzenia oznacza bądź to spełnianie czynności, bądź doznawanie czynności”; M. Bednarski: „Kategoria strony u gramatyków starożytnych”. *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ. Prace językoznawcze*. Z. 681. Kraków 1984 (pp. 103—123), p. 105: „[Według gramatyków starożytnych — H.W.] jakiegoś szczególnego, różnego od activum czy passivum, znaczenia medium nie posiada.”

i.e. τύπτω ‘I hit’. An example of πάθος as another διάθεσις ῥήματος is an analogical medial / passive form, i.e. τύπτομαι ‘I am hit’. Finally, μεσότης as the last of the διαθέσεις ῥήματος was illustrated with the following examples: πέπηγα, διέφθορα, ἐποησάμην and ἐγραψάμην. The first example, namely, πέπηγα, is an active perfect of the verb which can convey both transitive (τήγνυμι ‘I stick (sth) in’ / πήγνυμαι ‘I am being stuck’) and intransitive (πήγνυμαι ‘I am stuck’, ‘I become numb’) meaning; the perfect form πέπηγα itself can also assume both kinds of meanings, and thus it can mean both ‘I have stuck (sth) in’ and ‘I was stuck’, ‘I became numb’. The other example, διέφθορα, represents the same perfective formation of a verb which can also have a transitive (διέφθειρω ‘I destroy’, ‘I ruin’ / διαφθείρομαι ‘I am destroyed’, ‘I am ruined’) and intransitive (διαφθείρομαι ‘I am losing my mind’, ‘I am going mad’) meaning; and similarly, the perfect form διέφθορα can mean both ‘I have destroyed’, ‘I have ruined’ and ‘I have lost my mind’, ‘I have gone mad’. The forms ἐποησάμην and ἐγραψάμην, in turn, are medial aorists of transitive verbs: ποιέω ‘I am doing’ and γράφω ‘I am writing’; those aorists have reflexive or indirectly reflexive meanings, thus: ‘I have done for myself’, ‘I have achieved (something)’ and ‘I have enrolled’, ‘I have written down (something) for myself’, respectively.

As it seems, this whole exemplification material permits, in general, double interpretation of the meaning of the terms ἐνέργεια, πάθος and μεσότης used as terminological exponents of three different verb διαθέσεις, and thus it enables two different answers to the questions posed above. On the one hand, one can assume that the said ποτέ in the phrase characterising μεσότης (ποτέ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτέ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα) refers to verb forms representing μεσότης in the sense that each of them can mean both action and experience, depending on the context (*scil.* in different contexts). This would also constitute the essence of the difference between this διάθεσις and the other two, out of which one, *scil.* ἐνέργεια, would constitute the attribute of forms expressing only action, whereas the other one, i.e. πάθος, would refer to the forms denoting exclusively experience. In this way, the phrase μεσότης (ποτέ) ἐνέργειαν παριστάσα would characterise μεσότης by showing action as one of two possible functional options realised by the verb form representing this διάθεσις, whereas with the notion ἐνέργεια as a separate διάθεσις standing in opposition to μεσότης would be linked, in turn, the action as the only obligatory semantic function realised by verb forms representing this διάθεσις. The same, *mutatis mutandis*, should be said about the relation between the sense of the phrase characterising μεσότης as διάθεσις (ποτέ) πάθος παριστάσα and the meaning of the term πάθος as the kind of διάθεσις. The notion διάθεσις itself would be based — within the scope of this interpretation — only on the semantic capacity of a given verb form, which could be expressed in the scale with the values: action/experience/action and experience.

The drawback of the above interpretation is, however, the fact that although to each of the two perfect forms, mentioned as the examples of verb formations representing μεσότης, we can really attribute meanings of which one could be

qualified as ἐνέργεια (i.e. ‘I have stuck (sth) in’ and ‘I have destroyed’, respectively), and the other as πάθος (i.e. ‘I was stuck’ and ‘I have gone mad’), it is more difficult to state the same with regards to aoristic forms presented as the examples of μεσότης. The point is that as far as the verbs ποιέω and χράφω are concerned, meanings identifiable unambiguously with πάθος are updated in the aorist by passive formations, i.e. ἐποιήθην ‘I have been made (created)’ and ἐγράφηθην ‘I have been enrolled’, whereas the meanings of the forms ἐποίησάμην and ἐγραψάμην, i.e. ‘I have done for myself’, ‘I have achieved (something)’ and ‘I have enrolled’, ‘I have written down (something) for myself’, respectively, seem to constitute concepts that, within the opposition ἐνέργεια/πάθος, are placed exclusively on the side of ἐνέργεια (‘action’).

However, on the other hand, we can assume that the terms ἐνέργεια, πάθος and μεσότης, as terminological exponents of the three διαθέσεις ῥήματος, and the term διάθεσις itself, should be connected not just with the meaning of the verb as such, but rather with the relation between the meaning and the form of the verb. Along this interpretation line, the term ἐνέργεια would refer to the situation in which a verb in the form (perceived as) suitable (from the system point of view) to express action, expresses action indeed, as e.g. τύπτω ‘I hit’. We would have to do with πάθος, in turn, in the situation when a verb, which has a form (regarded as) suitable to express experience, expresses experience indeed, as e.g. τύπτρομαι ‘I am hit’. And finally, we would have to do with μεσότης in the situation, when a verb which has the form (identified as) suitable to express action, expresses experience, as e.g. πέπηγα ‘I got stuck’ or διέφθορα ‘I went mad’, or when a verb having the form (identifiable as) suitable to express experience, expresses action, as e.g. ἐποίησάμην ‘I have done for myself’ or ἐγραψάμην ‘I have enrolled’⁶. And thus, the notion μεσότης would refer to the situation in which the meaning of the verb does not correspond, in a way, to its form or even stands in opposition to it⁷. At the same time, it would imply that the author of the Τέχνη, when pointing to πέπηγα and διέφθορα as the examples of forms representing μεσότης refers exclusively to their intransitive meanings, interpreted as experience (πάθος). Let’s add that such interpretation of those meanings is additionally grounded in the fact that the meaning of ‘I got stuck’ can be understood as including the effect of the fact that ‘I was stuck’, similarly to the meaning of ‘I went mad’, which can be perceived as embodying the result of the fact that ‘I was destroyed (mentally)’. We have already mentioned earlier the meaning of the forms ἐποίησάμην and ἐγραψάμην as concepts identifiable with ἐνέργεια.

⁶ Cf. N.E. Collinge: “The Greek Use of the Term ‘Middle’ in Linguistic Analysis”. *Word* 1963, No 19, (pp. 231—241), p. 236: “The Greek choice of the adjective μέση rests on the basis of a combination of features different *inter se* and respectively shared by the ‘middle’ with each of the polar terms in the voice system, but not exhausting the range of features of any one voice”.

⁷ Also P.K. Andersen: “Remarks on Dionysios Thrax’s concept of ‘Diáthesis’”. *Historiographia Linguistica* 1994, No 21 (1—2), pp. 1—37 strongly favours such interpretation.

Adoption of this interpretation implies obviously also the assumption that certain formal features of verbs (endings) were perceived as suitable, from the system point of view, to express meanings qualified as ἐνέργεια, whereas others were perceived as suitable for meanings constituting πάθος. The legitimacy of such assumption seems not to raise any controversies, especially that in the text of the Τέχνη we encounter a similar case of showing specific formal structures as particularly suitable to express specific contents. We mean here the case when the number category (ἀριθμός) of names (ὀνόματα) is presented⁸. In the respective passage one can find the terms ἐνικοί χαρακτήρες and πληθυντικοί [χαρακτήρες — H.W.], which identify just nominal formal structures (perceived as) predisposed — evidently due to specific endings — to express singularity and plurality, respectively; and, what is more, the context in which those terms appear attests to similar — as assumed in the interpretation of the notion μεσότης under discussion — awareness of the cases of incompliance between contents systemically connoted by those structures and contents really expressed by some noun forms representing those structures (cf. ἐνικοί χαρακτήρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι and πληθυντικοί [χαρακτήρες — H.W.] κατὰ ἐνικῶν τε καὶ δυϊκῶν [λεγόμενοι — H.W.]). The forms δῆμος, χορός and ὄχλος as well as Ἀθῆναι, Θῆβαι and ἀμφότεροι, listed in the above-mentioned passage as the examples illustrating that incompliance, would thus exemplify *sui generis* μεσότης within the number category.

Within the frameworks of this interpretation, ποτέ in the characteristics of μεσότης (ποτέ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτέ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα) would thus mean not that each formation representing this διάθεσις expresses — depending on the context — action or experience, but that that διάθεσις relates sometimes to the expression of action (by verb formations predisposed formally to express experience), and sometimes to the expression of experience (by verb formations predisposed formally to express action). In this way, μεσότης (ποτέ) ἐνέργειαν παριστάσα would be different from ἐνέργεια (as another type of διάθεσις) in terms of the formal shape (and not the meaning) of word formations representing each of the two διαθέσεις in question; analogous — *mutatis mutandis* — would be the nature of the difference between μεσότης (ποτέ) πάθος παριστάσα and πάθος as a kind of διάθεσις. The concept διάθεσις itself would thus be of relational nature, based on the relation between the meaning and the form of the verb. The general sense of the word διάθεσις i.e. ‘setting’, ‘arrangement’, ‘order’, in the technical application

⁸ 30, 5—31, 4: Ἀριθμοὶ τρεῖς· ἐνικός, δυϊκός, πληθυντικός· ἐνικός μὲν ὁ Ὅμηρος, δυϊκὸς δὲ τῷ Ὁμήρῳ, πληθυντικὸς δὲ οἱ Ὅμηροι. Εἰσὶ δὲ τινες ἐνικοί χαρακτήρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι, οἷον δῆμος χορός· ὄχλος καὶ πληθυντικοὶ κατὰ ἐνικῶν τε καὶ δυϊκῶν, ἐνικῶν μὲν ὡς Ἀθῆναι Θῆβαι, δυϊκῶν δὲ ὡς ἀμφότεροι. — “There are three numbers: singular, dual, plural; singular: *Homer*, dual: *two Homers*, and plural: *Homers*. However, there are certain singular forms that are also used in reference to multiple [objects], for example, *people*, *choir*, *crowd*, and plural forms that are used in reference to singular or dual [objects]; the example for singular could be *Athens* or *Thebes*, and *both* is an example of dual”.

of that word as a grammatical term, would thus refer to those very elements, i.e. the meaning and the form of a verb, as entities constituting that particular arrangement or order.

It is difficult to decide in a definite way which of the two presented interpretations corresponds more strictly to the concept of διάθεσις (especially μεσότης) which was intended by the author of the Τέχνη and reflected in such a laconic, or even ascetic, way in the text of the treaty. Unfortunately, the scholia do not offer much help in this case, since in this matter, even the same authors often present various opinions, some of them being close to the first of the presented interpretations⁹, whereas others are closer to the other one¹⁰, still other opinions are slightly different from both of them¹¹, and yet there are also scholiasts who present their own, individual opinions about this matter, which are totally different from the systematics presented in the Τέχνη¹². All that proves obviously that those issues

⁹ Cf. e.g. Heliodorus (*Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*. Ed. A. Hilgard (Grammatici Graeci I 3. Lipsiae 1901, pp. 401, 20—23): Μέση δὲ καλεῖται διάθεσις, ὅταν ἡ αὐτὴ φωνὴ χωρῆ εἰς τε ἐνέργειαν καὶ [εἰς — H.W.] πάθος ὡς τὸ βιάζομαι· αὕτη γὰρ ἡ φωνὴ χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἐνέργειαν καὶ [εἰς — H.W.] πάθος, οἷον ἐὰν εἴπω βιάζομαι σε καὶ βιάζομαι ὑπὸ σοῦ. Similarly, Sophronius (*Grammatici Graeci IV 2*. Ed. A. Hilgard. Lipsiae 1894, pp. 411, 34—36): μεσότης δὲ ἡ τοῖς αὐτοῖς χαρακτηρῶσι ποτὲ μὲν δρᾶσιν ποτὲ δὲ πάθουσιν σημαίνουσα, οἷον πέπηγα διέφθορα ἐποιήαμην ἐγραψάμην.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Heliodorus (*Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem...*, pp. 401, 29—34 – with reference to the characteristics of μεσότης: ἢ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτὲ δὲ πάθος παριστάσα): Προστιθέναι δεῖ ἐνταῦθα τὸ «ἐν φωνῇ ἐνεργητικῇ» καὶ «ἐν φωνῇ παθητικῇ», ἵν' ἡ ὁ νοῦς οὕτως «ἢ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ἐν φωνῇ παθητικῇ, ποτὲ δὲ πάθος ἐν φωνῇ ἐνεργητικῇ»· τὸ μὲν πέπηγα ἐν φωνῇ ἐνεργητικῇ πάθος δηλοῖ, ἴσον γὰρ ἔστι τῷ πέπηγμαί, τὸ δὲ ἐποιήαμην ἐν φωνῇ παθητικῇ ἐνέργειαν σημαίνει, ἴσον γὰρ ἔστι τῷ ἐποίησα.

¹¹ Cf. e.g. Choeroboscos (*Grammatici Graeci IV 2*, pp. 9, 5—15): μεσότης δέ, ἥτις ποτὲ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτὲ δὲ πάθος παρίστησιν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ τέτυπα καὶ τέτηκα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τέτυπα ἐνέργειαν δηλοῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτυπα, τὸ δὲ τέτηκα πάθος, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐτάκη καὶ πάλιν ἐγραψάμην καὶ ἐλουσάμην· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐγραψάμην ἐνέργειαν δηλοῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔγραψα, τὸ δὲ ἐλουσάμην πάθος παρίστησιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐλούσθημ. Καὶ ἀποροῦσί τινες λέγοντες, διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν [ταῦτα — H.W.], φημί δὴ τὰ λεγόμενα μέσα, μὴ ἐκ τοῦ σημαυμένου ἐκλήθησαν, ἵνα ὅταν μὲν σημαίνωσιν ἐνέργειαν λέγωνται ἐνεργητικά, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ τέτυπα καὶ ἐγραψάμην, ὅταν δὲ σημαίνωσι πάθος λέγωνται παθητικά, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ τέτηκα καὶ ἐλουσάμην. Ἔστιν οὖν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ χαρακτήρ, ἥγουν ὁ τύπος, τῆς φωνῆς ἐπεκράτησεν ἐπὶ τούτων. An interpretation of μεσότης, similar to the one presented by Choeroboskos, however, limited to the formation of medial aorist, was also presented by Heliodorus (*Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem...*, pp. 401, 23—28): Ἡ πάλιν μέση ἔστι διάθεσις, ὅταν τῷ αὐτῷ ῥήματι τυπῶ μόνον πάθος καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ῥήματι τυπῶ μόνον ἐνέργειαν, ὡς ὁ εἰς μὴν τύπος· μέσος γὰρ ἔστι μόνων παθητικῶν καὶ πάλιν μόνων ἐνεργητικῶν· καὶ ἐνεργητικῶν μὲν μόνων ἐγραψάμην ἐφάμην, παθητικῶν δὲ μόνων ἐτριψάμην ἠλείψαμην ἴσην γὰρ ἔχουσι δύναμιν κατὰ σημασίαν τῷ ἐτρίφθη καὶ ἠλείφθη παθητικῷ τύπῳ.

¹² What we have in mind here are, first of all, the views of the authors which distinguish a higher number of διαθέσεις, as e.g. the author of Vatican Scholia, who states that, to be exact (κατὰ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν), there are five different διαθέσεις — cf. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem...*, pp. 246, 7—8: Διαθέσεις δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν πέντε εἰσίν, ἐνεργητικῆ, παθητικῆ, οὐδέτερα, μέση, ἐμπερικτικῆ. It is worth adding here that only in the above quoted conception such διαθέσεις

caused a lot of difficulties to ancient Greeks. However, it seems that, with a high dose of likelihood, we can regard the second of the presented interpretations as the one closer to the intention of the author of the Τέχνη¹³, first of all, due to the fact that some of the attached exemplification material (*scil.* ἐποιησάμην and ἐγραψάμην) does not correspond well to the first interpretation. Apart from that, the second interpretation, discerning the essence of ἐνέργεια, πάθος and μεσότης (as three different διαθέσεις) in the specific relations between the meaning of the word and its form, gives, at the same time, the notion διάθεσις itself (as one of παρεπόμενα ῥήματος) the status of a concept being in a closer relation with the voice as the inflectional category of the verb. It does not obviously mean that thereby the grammatical category of the verb voice was analysed and described accurately in the Τέχνη. Such a description was impossible since the grammarians tried to explain the very phenomenon, named by them διάθεσις and strictly related to the verbal voice, referring exclusively to the semantic categories of action and

is distinguished which is linked with a meaning different than action or experience (ἐνέργεια or πάθος). And this is not διάθεσις μέση, but οὐδέτερα: οὐδέτερα δὲ ἢ μήτε ἐνέργειαν μήτε πάθος σημαίνουσα, οἷον ζῶ πλουτῶ δύναιμαι βούλομαι (Ibidem, 3—5). And thus, this διάθεσις is characterised by the fact that the verb does not express neither action nor experience, e.g. “I live”, “I am rich”, “I can”, “I want”. On the other hand, διάθεσις μέση still relates exclusively to the meaning of action or experience: μέση δὲ ἢ πῆ μὲν ἐνέργειαν πῆ δὲ πάθος δηλοῦσα (Ibidem, 5). However, the comment accompanying the characteristics of διάθεσις μέση is quite surprising: τὸ γὰρ ἐποιησάμην δηλοῖ, ὅτι ἑμαυτῷ ἐποίησά τι, τὸ δὲ ἐποίηθην, ὅτι δι’ ἑμαυτοῦ ἐποιήθη (Ibidem, 5—6). Generally, about διάθεσις in Dionysios Thrax and his later commentators see: A. Rijksbaron: “The Treatment of the Greek Middle Voice by the Ancient Grammarians”. In: *Philosophie du langage et grammaire dans l’antiquité*. Ed. H. Joly. Bruxelles—Grenoble 1986, pp. 427—444; M. Iwanek: “Kategoria strony w różnoantycznych scholiach do *TEXNH ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗ* Dionizjosa Traka”. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 1997, nr 45 (3), pp. 43—55.

¹³ A similar position is taken by A. Rijksbaron (“The Treatment of the Greek Middle Voice...”, p. 428): „Dionysius’ formulation of the ‘middle’ as the διάθεσις ‘which sometimes signifies activity and sometimes affectedness’ is ambiguous and has been a constant source of confusion, for this definition makes not clear whether the ‘middle’ diathesis consists of verbs whose morphology is not in accordance with their meaning — i.e. verbs that have active forms but passive meaning and vice versa — or verbs that individually have forms that may have active as well as passive meaning. In the first case the term ‘middle’ relates to the anomalous behaviour of certain verbal *endings*, in the second, to that of certain *verbs*. To all appearance Dionysius takes μεσότης in the first sense: πέπηγα and διέφθορα are perfects with active endings — nowadays sometimes called secondary perfects — with passive meaning, from πήγνυμαι and διαφθείρομαι, respectively; by the same token ἐποιησάμην and ἐγραψάμην must be considered as having active meaning.” However, that scholar identifies (not rightly, in our opinion) the meanings constituting πάθος with “passive meaning,” which leads him to the conclusion that Greek grammarians were not aware of the existence of the intransitive meaning of such verbs as πήγνυμαι and διαφθείρομαι (and such forms, respectively, as πέπηγα and διέφθορα): “Observe, in this connection, that the *intransitive* use of πέπηγα and διέφθορα (and also πήγνυμαι and διαφθείρομαι, for that matter) is not mentioned. It is, in fact, one of the striking features of the Greek grammarians’ treatment of voice that the important group of intransitive ‘middle’ verbs that correspond to active so-called causative verbs (e.g. διαφθείρω: διαφθείρομαι, ἴστημι : ἴσταμαι) is not recognized as a separate group” (Ibidem).

experience, which obviously excludes a possibility of adequate presentation of the essence of the voice as a grammatical category.

In the treaty *On Syntax* (Περὶ συντάξεως) by the most distinguished Greek grammarian Apollonios Dyskolos (2nd century after Christ)¹⁴, the term διάθεσις also denotes a property of the verb, which is close to the inflectional category of voice and which is — similarly to the Τέχνη — related to the expression of action and experience as well. Among other verb features, it occupies a privileged position; the grammarian treats it as a “special verb property”:

Καὶ τοῦ ῥήματος δὲ ἀναγκαίως πρόκειται τὸ ὄνομα, ἐπεὶ τὸ διατιθέναι καὶ τὸ διατιθεσθαι σώματος ἴδιον, τοῖς δὲ σώμασιν ἐπίκειται ἡ θέσις τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἐξ ὧν ἡ ιδιότης τοῦ ῥήματος, λέγω τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ τὸ πάθος¹⁵.

The noun necessarily precedes the verb, since influencing and being influenced are properties of physical things, and things are what nouns apply to, and to things belong the special features of verbs, namely doing and experiencing” (I, 16)¹⁶.

In the Apollonios’s opinion, the privileged position of διάθεσις in the verbal system manifests itself also by the fact that — apart from expressing of time — it characterises all verb forms, including infinitives¹⁷.

And finally, also in Apollonios’s text, just as in the Τέχνη, the term διάθεσις refers to a property which, at the level of particular verb forms, is displayed in different ways, which leads to distinguishing various types of διάθεσις standing in

¹⁴ Extensive studies concerning that grammarian were presented by: M. Bednarski: *Studia nad grecką terminologią gramatyczną Apolloniosa Dyskolosa*. Kraków 1994; Idem: *Apollonios Dyskolos: O składni*. Przekład, interpretacja, wstęp M. Bednarski. Kraków 2000; M. Bednarski: *Apollonios Dyskolos i jego gramatyka*. Kraków 2000; D.L. Blank: *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar. The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Chico, California, 1982; I. Sluiter: *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*. Amsterdam 1990.

¹⁵ The text of the treaty is quoted according to the following edition: *Apollonii Dyscoli Περὶ συντάξεως*. Rec. G. Uhlig (Grammatici Graeci II 2). Lipsiae 1910. All translations of the quoted passages come from: *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Translation and commentary F.W. Householder. Amsterdam 1981.

¹⁶ Cf. J.M. van Ophuijsen: “The Semantics of a Syntactician. Things meant by verbs according to Apollonius Dyscolus Περὶ συντάξεως”. In: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Band 34/1. Berlin—New York 1993, p. 741; E.A. Hahn: “Apollonius Dyscolus on Mood”. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 1951, No 82, p. 36.

¹⁷ Cf. III, 147: Ἀκολουθὸν ἐστὶ διαλαβεῖν καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐγγινομένης διαθέσεως καθ’ ἐκάστην ἐγκλισιν, ἥς οὐδὲ τὰ ἀπαρέμφοτα ἐκτὸς ἐγένετο διὰ τὸ κατηναγκασμένον τοῦ συνέπεσθαι ἅπασιν τοῖς χρόνοις ἢ ἐνεργητικῶς ἢ παθητικῶς ἢ μέσως — “We must now discuss the category of voice which is present in every mood, not even excluding the infinitives, because of the logical necessity for all tenses to be marked as either active or passive or middle”.

opposition to one another. However, the principles of their identification adopted by Apollonios are not easy to grasp; therefore, we will quote a longer fragment of the *Syntax*, where the grammarian discusses the issues interesting to us, and next we will try to draw some conclusions in this matters:

III, 148: Οὐκ εἶ τι ῥῆμα ὀριστικόν ἐστίν ἢ τινος ἄλλης ἐγκλίσεως, τοῦτο πάντως ἐν διαθέσει καταγίνεται τῇ ἐνεργητικῇ. χρῆ γὰρ νοεῖν ὅτι ἡ ἐνέργεια ὡς πρὸς ὑποκειμένον τι διαβιβάζεται, ὡς τὸ *τέμνει, τύπτει*, τὰ τούτοις παραπλήσια· ἥς καὶ τὸ παθητικὸν ἐκ προϋφεστῶσης ἐνεργητικῆς διαθέσεως ἀνάγεται, *δέρεται, τύπτεται*. οὐ δὴ τούτοις ὁμοιά ἐστίν τὸ *ὑπάρχω*, τὸ *ζῶ*, τὸ *εἰμί*, τὸ *πνέω*, τὸ *φρονῶ*, τὰ ὅμοια.

III, 149: τῶν δὴ τοιούτων ἀναλόγως ἡ παθητικὴ ἐγκλίσις ὑποσταλήσεται, ὅτι μὴδὲ διὰ τῆς ἐνεργητικῆς ἐγκλίσεως τὰ ἐνεργούμενα πρόσωπα παρέστησαν, ἃ πάντως διατεθέντα τὸ παθεῖν ὁμολογήει. εἰ γοῦν τὸ *φρονῶ* ἐν συνθέσει γένοιτο *καταφρονῶ*, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ *φρονεῖν* διάθεσιν μεταβίβασαν ἐπὶ τι ὑποκειμένον ἐν τῷ *καταφρονῶ σου*, ἀκώλυτον ἔξει τὴν ἀντιπαρακειμένην παθητικὴν διάθεσιν, *καταφρονῶμαι ὑπὸ σοῦ*. ὡς οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα ῥήματα κλίνοντες καὶ εἰς παθητικὰς ἐκφορὰς ὁμολογοῖ εἰσι μελετήματα φωνῆς παραλαμβάνοντες, οὐ μὴν φυσικὴν κλίσιν οὐδὲ συστατὴν.

III, 150: Ἔστιν ἃ καὶ ψυχικὴν ἢ σωματικὴν διάθεσιν σημαίνει, οἷς οὐ προσγίνεται πάλιν ἡ παθητικὴ κλίσις διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ προσούσῃ καταλήξει τὸ πάθος ὑπαγορευέσθαι [...], τὸ *καπιῶ* ἢ τὸ *ὀφθαλμιῶ*· τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα τῶν ῥημάτων ἐν αὐτοπαθείᾳ ἔχει τὸν ὀρισμόν. καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ διατίθεσθαι ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς εὐκταίοις γίνεται ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ οὕτως ἔχουσιν, ὁμολογον ὅτι οὐ συστήσεται παθητικὰ τοῦ *πάσχω, χαίρω, ἐρυθριῶ, θνήσκω, γηρῶ, θάλλω, οὐρητιῶ, γαυριῶ*. τοιοῦτον γὰρ τι παρακολουθήσει, ὡς εἰ καὶ ἀρσενικοῦ ὀνόματος ἀρσενικὸν τις ζητήσκειν ἢ θηλυκοῦ θηλυκόν· οὐ δὴ οὖν παθητικοῦ ὄντος παθητικὸν τις ζητήσκει.

III, 151: Τὰ γοῦν διὰ τοῦ μέσου ἐνεστῶτος ἐν τύπῳ παθητικῶ ἐνέργειαν σημαίνοντα ἀπαράδεκτον ἔχει τὴν διὰ τοῦ ω κατάλεξιν, ἐνεργητικὴν οὖσαν, ἐπεὶ τὸ ταύτης εὐχρηστον διὰ τοῦ προειρημένου μέσου ἐνεστῶτος κατείληπτο, ὡς ἔχει τὸ *βιάζομαι σε, μάχομαι σοι, χρωμαι σοι* καὶ ἄλλα πλείστα. σαφὲς οὖν ὅτι παντὸς παθητικοῦ εἰς *μαι* λήγοντος ἐνεργητικὸν ἔστιν παραδέξασθαι, ἐὰν μετὰ τῆς καταλήξεως συντρέχη καὶ τὰ τῆς συντάξεως, *ἴσταμαι ὑπὸ σοῦ — ἴστημι σέ, δέρομαι ὑπὸ σοῦ — δέρω σέ, ἔλκομαι ὑπὸ σοῦ — ἔλκω σέ*· οὐχὶ τὸ *πέταμαι ὑπὸ σοῦ*, διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ τὸ *πέτημι σέ*. ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ *ἄγαμαι, δύναμαι, ἔραμαι*.

III, 152: Ἔστι ἃ καὶ διάθεσιν σημαίνει ἐνεργητικὴν, οὐ μὴν ἔχει ἀντιπαρακειμένην παθητικὴν ἐκφορὰν, καθὸ τὰ διατιθέμενα ἄψυχα καθεστῶτα οὐ κηδύνατο ὁμολογήσαι τὸ παθεῖν, εἰ μὴ τὸν αὐτῶν τις λόγον διαθεῖτο, ὡς ἔχει τὸ *περιπατῶ*. τούτου γὰρ οὐ συστατὸν τὸ *περιπατοῦμαι* οὐδὲ τὸ *περιπατῆ*, καθὸ οὐδὲ πρὸς τὰ ἄψυχα αἱ ἀποφάσεις τῶν λόγων,

οὐδέ ἐξ ἀψύχων αἰ ἀποφάσεις γίνονται, περί γε μὴν αὐτῶν, περιπατεῖ ἡ ὁδός, οἰκεῖται ἡ γῆ. ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ἐπὶ τοῦ πλέω, τρέχω καὶ ἀπάντων τῶν τοιούτων.

III, 148: Just because a verb occurs in the indicative (or in any other mood) it does not necessarily follow that it will have a true active voice. For you must consider that activity is something that passes over to some object, as in verbs like *temnei* ('he cuts'), *tuptei* ('he beats'), and similar verbs, and from these basic actives is derived the passive voice *deretai* ('he is skinned'), *tuptetai* ('he is being beaten'). But there are quite different verbs such as *huparchō* ('I exist'), *zō* ('I live'), *eimi* ('I am'), *pneō* ('I am breathing'), *phronō* ('I am sensible') etc.

III, 149: The passive inflection of such verbs is regularly lacking, because there are no persons acted upon in the active voice, so there can be no persons affected in such a way as to need to show passivity. Of course if you put a prefix on *phronō* ('I am sensible') and make *kataphronō* ('I scorn, have contempt for'), then there is a passing over of action or attitude of mind to some object as in *kataphronō sou* ('I look down on you'), and so there is nothing to prevent passivization, *kataphronoumai hupo sou* ('I am scored by you'). So anybody who makes up passive forms for such verbs [i.e. 'be', 'live', etc. — H.W.] is obviously just making them up as examples, since they have no such inflection naturally or grammatically.

III, 150: Some verbs signify a mental or physical disposition, which cannot take the passive inflection because the passivity is already present even with the active endings [...], like *kopiō* ('I'm getting tired') or *ophthalmiō* ('I have got eye trouble'): for such verbs involve self-suffering. And since this passive experience may belong either to the class of desirables or those which are not so, it's generally agreed that there are no passives for *paschō* ('I experience (something)'), 'I have (something) done to me', happen to me'), *chairō* ('I rejoice'), *eruthriō* ('I blush'), *thnēiskō* ('I die'), *gērō* ('I grow old'), *thallō* ('I flourish'), *ourētiō* ('I have to urinate'), *gauriō* ('I exult'). Trying to passivize these would be like adding a masculine suffix to masculine nouns or a feminine suffix to feminine nouns. You cannot make something passive if it already is passive.

III, 151: Verbs with 'middle' present form, formally like the passive, but signifying an activity, are incapable of taking the *-ō* endings of the active because the possibility of using it is destroyed by the aforesaid present 'middle', as for instance *biazomai* ('I force you'), *machomai soi* ('I'm fighting you'), *chrōmai soi* ('I use you') and many, many more. It is clear that every passive form in *-mai* etc. has a corresponding active, provided that the syntax-and-semantics agree [in passivity — H.W.] with the form: *histamai hupo sou* ('I am stood up by you'), *histēmi se* ('I stand you up'), *deromai hupo sou* ('I am skinned by you'), *derō se* ('I skin you'), *helkomai hupo sou* ('I am drawn by you'), *helkō se* ('I draw you'), but not **petamai hupo sou* ('*I fly by you'), hence

not **petēmi se* (? ‘I cause you to fly’): the same holds good for *agamai* (‘I admire...’), *dunamai* (‘I can...’, ‘I am able...’), *eramai* (‘I’m in love with...’).

III, 152: Some other verbs signify an activity, yet have no corresponding passive paradigm because the inanimate objects affected by these verbs cannot be considered to experience or feel anything, unless someone makes up a speech as if spoken by them: so *peripatō* (‘I walk’). You cannot make a **peripatoumai* (‘I am being walked’) or a **peripatēi* (‘You are walked’) since we do not address speech to inanimates [for the second person — H.W.] and inanimates cannot make assertions [to use the first person form], but we do talk about them, and can say *peripateitai hē hodos* (‘The road is being walked’), *oikeitai hē gē* (‘The land is inhabited’). The same account works for *pleō* (‘I sail’), *trechō* (‘I run’) and all of that sort.

It results from the above-quoted text that Apollonios made an attempt at distinguishing three different language plans, i.e. formal, semantic and grammatical one. This distinction manifests itself in applying such terms as *ἐνεργητική/παθητική ἔγκλισις* (ἐκφορά, κλίσις, τύπος) with reference to the formal shape of the word, such expressions as *ἐνέργεια/πάθος* with reference to the word meaning, and such terms as *ἐνεργητική/παθητική διάθεσις* with reference to its grammatical characteristics, related to the specific syntactic properties (σύνταξις). And so, *ἐνεργητική διάθεσις* is characterised with the fact that a respective *παθητική διάθεσις* is derived from it and that it is manifested only by verb forms which have *ἐνεργητική ἔγκλισις* and express *ἐνέργεια* “transferred from the nominative of the subject to the accusative of the object”. In this way, *ἐνεργητική διάθεσις* is identified here with transitivity. In turn, *παθητική διάθεσις* is a feature only of those verbs which are characterised by *παθητική ἔγκλισις*, which express *πάθος*, connote a suitable syntax with a (noun in) genitive preceded by a pronoun *ὑπό* and which have formal/functional (inflectional) equivalents characterised by *ἐνεργητική διάθεσις*. All other verb forms, which do not meet those criteria, are outside the strict opposition *ἐνεργητική διάθεσις/παθητική διάθεσις*. Apollonios distinguishes four groups of such verbs¹⁸.

One of them is made up of such verbs as *ὑπάρχω* ‘I exist’, *ζῶ* ‘I live’, *εἰμί* ‘I am’, *πνέω* ‘I breathe’, *φρονῶ* ‘I think’ etc., which have an active form (*ἐνεργητική ἔγκλισις*), but do not connote objects the activity is transferred to; therefore, they do not have their equivalents with a passive form (*παθητική ἔγκλισις*), expressing *παθητική διάθεσις*.

The second group consists of such verbs as *κοπιῶ* ‘I am tired’, *ὀφθαλμιῶ* ‘I have an eye problem,’ *πάσχω* ‘I experience something,’ *χαίρω* ‘I am happy,’ *ἐρυθριῶ* ‘I blush,’ *θνήσκω* ‘I die’, *γηρῶ* ‘I grow old’ etc., which do not have passive forms as well, since they express experience already in the active form (towards oneself).

¹⁸ Cf. M. Pantiglioni: “Il termine *διάθεσις* nella linguistica classica e Dionisio Trace”. *Athenaeum* 1998, nr 86, pp. 258—259.

Another group includes verbs which express action in a passive form, so they do not have active forms, such as e.g. βιάζομαι σε ‘I use violence towards you’, μάχομαι σοι ‘I fight with you’, χρῶμαι σοι ‘I use you’ etc.; the status of *medial praesens* (μέσου ἐνεστώτος) has been attributed to those verbs.

Finally, the last group consists of verbs in an active form, which express an activity addressed exclusively to inanimate objects, such as e.g. περιπατῶ ‘I walk’, οἰκέω ‘I live’, πλέω ‘I swim’, τρέχω ‘I run’, and therefore, they have forms of the passive voice only in the third person, and thus περιπατεῖται ἡ ὁδός ‘the road is walked on (i.e. one walks along the road)’, οἰκεῖται ἡ γῆ ‘the earth is inhabited’ etc.

Apollonios does not classify, by means of any terms, the words belonging to the above-mentioned groups. Only (transitive and intransitive) *verba deponentia* he specified as the forms of μέσου ἐνεστώτος, which may suggest their connection with μέση διάθεσις which would hence consist in expressing action by verbs having a passive form. However, it is difficult to establish in a strict and unambiguous way, what was μέση διάθεσις to our grammarian, since he expresses his opinions about it extremely rarely and in a very brief way. And so in one place he says only:

ἡ συμπαραπομένη διάθεσις, ἐνεργητικὴ οὖσα ἢ παθητικὴ, καὶ ἡ μεταξύ τούτων πεπτωκυῖα μέση, οὐ προσχωροῦσα οδετέρᾳ.

the inflection for voice, active or passive, and the middle voice which lies between these two. (III, 54).

In another place he writes as follows:

III, 30: Ἔστι καὶ ἐπὶ διαθέσεως τὸ, τοιοῦτον ἐπιδειξαι. τὰ γὰρ καλούμενα μέσα σχήματα συνέπτωσιν ἀνεξέτατο ἐνεργητικῆς καὶ παθητικῆς διαθέσεως, [...] τὸ γὰρ ἐλουσάμην καὶ ἐποιησάμην καὶ ἐτριψάμην καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια ἔχει ἐκδηλοτάτην τὴν σύνταξιν ὅτε μὲν ἐνεργητικὴν, ὅτε δὲ παθητικὴν, εἶγε τὸ ἐτριψα τοῦ ἐτριψάμην διαφέρει καὶ τὸ ἐλουσα τοῦ ἐλουσάμην, παράκειται δὲ τῷ ἐποίησα τὸ ἐποιησάμην καὶ ἔτι τῷ προήκα τὸ προηκάμην.

A similar situation can be demonstrated in respect to voice. The forms which are called ‘middle voice’ admit a neutralization (coincidence of form) of active and passive [...]. For *elousamēn* (‘I took a bath’, ‘I bathed (myself)’), *epoiēsamēn* (‘I took part in’, ‘did or made (for myself)’, ‘considered or regarded (X as Y)’), and *etripsamēn* (‘I got tired’) and similar forms are most explicitly construed in both ways, sometimes as actives, sometimes as passives, since *etripsa* (‘I crushed, wore out (something or someone)’) differs from *etripsamēn*, and *elousa* (‘I washed or bathed (someone else)’) differs from *elousamēn*, but there is no such difference between *epoiēsa* (‘I made’, ‘did’) and *epoiēsamēn* or between *proēka* (‘I sent’, ‘let go’, ‘threw’) and *proēkamēn* (‘I threw out’, ‘I threw away’).

As can be seen, Apollonios does not speak here about μέση διάθεσις, but about μέσα σχήματα ('medial forms'), which are characterised by the fact that they "admitted coincidence of active and passive diathesis" (συνέμπτωσιν ἀνεδέξατο ἐνεργητικῆς καὶ παθητικῆς διαθέσεως)¹⁹, whereas the notion of active and passive diathesis itself is combined again with the specific syntactic properties (ἔχει ἐκδηλοτάτην τὴν σύνταξιν ὅτε μὲν ἐνεργητικὴν, ὅτε δὲ παθητικὴν). In this context, the forms ἐτριψάμην and ἔλουσάμην were shown as characterised with παθητικὴ σύνταξις (διαθεσις), since they are different from ἔτριψα and ἔλουσα respectively, which in an obviously way have to represent ἐνεργητικὴ σύνταξις (διάθεσις); in turn, the forms ἐποίησάμην and προηκάμην were presented as characterised with ἐνεργητικὴ σύνταξις (διαθεσις), since they are not different from the forms ἐποίησα and προηκα, which have the same σύνταξις (διαθεσις). It leads to the conclusion that the said "coincidence of active and passive diathesis" (συνέμπτωσις ἐνεργητικῆς καὶ παθητικῆς διαθέσεως), which characterises medial forms (μέσα σχήματα), concerns a specific morphology type (here: medial aorist) and it consists in the fact that some of the formations representing this type are characterised by διάθεσις ἐνεργητικὴ (such as ἐποίησάμην and προηκάμην), whereas other ones (such as ἐτριψάμην and ἔλουσάμην) are characterised by διάθεσις παθητικὴ²⁰. Taking into account passage III, 151, one would need to add that the same status of μέσα σχήματα also characterises the forms of medial *praesens* (μέσου ἐνεστῶτος), of which some, e.g. βιάζομαι (σε) express διάθεσις ἐνεργητικὴ, whereas other ones, e.g. ἴσταμαι (ὑπὸ σοῦ), express διάθεσις παθητικὴ.

At this point, it is worth noting that Apollonios mentions in passing also "an action (διάθεσις) which relates one entity to the same entity"²¹, but it occurs while discussing pronouns with reflexive meaning and the grammarian does not refer there to any verb properties related to the voice category²².

In summary, we can state that for Apollonios the notions ἐνεργητικὴ διάθεσις and παθητικὴ διάθεσις identify transitive verb formations, which mean action and experience, respectively, and connote mutually conditioned syntactic structures: *nominativus* + *accusativus*, and *nominativus* + *ὑπό* + *genetivus*. The term μέσα refers to the morphological type (medial aorist), the representations of which (i.e. verb forms in medial aorist) are not all characterised by the same διάθεσις, but

¹⁹ Translation of F.W. Householder referring to the place seems to be not very exact.

²⁰ Cf. A. Rijksbaron: "The Treatment of the Greek Middle Voice...", pp. 433—434 (with reference to the quoted passage III, 30): "The middle forms, then, 'received a falling together of the active and the passive diathesis'. This is primarily to be taken in the sense [that] passive endings may have either active or passive meaning". However, that scholar adds (p. 434): "I think that Apollonius, too like Dionysius, considered forms... with active endings but passive meaning as 'middle' ". Cf. also M. Pantigliani: "Il termine διάθεσις nella linguistica classica...", p. 258: "I verbi con diatesi media [...] sono i verbi che mostrano una sorta di neutralizzazione delle diatesi attiva e passiva, dal momento che hanno un senso sia attivo che passivo".

²¹ II, 139.

²² See M. Bednarski: „Kategoria strony u gramatyków...", p. 106.

some of them by the ἐνεργητική διάθεσις, and some by the παθητική διάθεσις. Intransitive formations are outside that systematics. It is also worth mentioning that the grammarian paid attention to the relations occurring between διάθεσις and other verb properties (such as e.g. tense and mood) and verb formations (e.g. infinitive).

Another issue is the fact that Apollonios uses the term διάθεσις also in meanings which are not linked to the voice category at all²³. Some of them are of non-grammatical nature²⁴, other are close to action (expressed by a verb) as such²⁵, and still other refer to the temporal (aspectual)²⁶ or modal categories. In the latter case, that term is used with the determiner ψυχική (διάθεσις), or τῆς ψυχική (διάθεσις) and it concerns the mood category. Let us add that the application of the terms διάθεσις τῆς ψυχῆς or ψυχική διάθεσις with reference to modal verb features related to the mood was not only Apollonios's habit, but it constituted a more widely spread practice. Therefore, verb properties connected with the voice category were also referred to by means of the term σωματική διάθεσις for differentiation purposes²⁷.

When comparing the meaning of the term διάθεσις in both texts under analysis and its relation to the (present-day) concept of the grammatical voice category, we come to the conclusion that in both texts this term refers to a certain x verb property the essence of which is the relation between the form x and semantics of the verb, while the latter (i.e. semantics) is accounted for in the form of two-part opposition: action/experience (ἐνεργεια/πάθος). Since the said relation can be shaped in different ways at the level of particular verb formations, several kinds of διάθεσις were distinguished by means of specific determiners (ἐνεργητική διάθεσις/ἐνεργεια, παθητική διάθεσις/πάθος, μέση διάθεσις/μεσότης). Apart from those common

²³ What made A. Hahn ("Apollonius Dyscolus...", p. 34) state: "I doubt whether in Apollonius *diathesis* by itself ever has a technical meaning at all. It is rather a colorless word which, chameleon-like, acquires color from its surroundings."

²⁴ E.g. III, 160.

²⁵ τὰ τῆς διαθέσεως — 'actions expressed by a verb'; cf. I, 137: Αἱ πλάγιοι συντάσσονται ταῖς εὐθείαις μεταξύ πίπτοντος ῥήματος, οὗ τὰ τῆς διαθέσεως ἐπὶ τὴν πλαγίαν μέτεισιν ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας εὐθείας. [...] παραλαμβάνεται ῥῆμα τι ὑπαρξιν δηλούντων, ἴνα τὴν τοῦ δάσαντος προσώπου διάθεσιν δηλώσῃ, ἐπεὶ καὶ προσώπων ἢ μετοχῆ ἀμοιρεῖ, ὁ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑβρίσας Τρύφων ἐστίν — "The oblique [forms — H.W.] are connected with the nominative ones by means of a verb whose action passes over from the nominative to the oblique [...]. A verb is added from the class of existence verbs, in order to clarify the identity of the person acting, since participles cannot express person. *The one who injured the man is Thryphon*". See also I, 148; I, 149.

²⁶ E.g. I, 114: ἅπαντα τὰ προστακτικὰ ἐγκειμένην ἔχει τὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος διάθεσιν, προστασσόμενα ἢ εἰς παρατακτικὴν διάθεσιν ἢ εἰς συντλικὴν — "all imperatives contain an implicit future tense, whether the command is in imperfective or perfective aspect". See also III, 98; III, 102.

²⁷ Cf. Choeroboscus (Grammatici Graeci IV 2, pp. 5, 4—7): Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὰς ἐγκλίσεις οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ τὰς διαθέσεις κοινῶς ἐκάλουν διαθέσεις, καὶ λοιπὸν ὕστερον διεμέρισαν, καὶ τὰς μὲν ψυχικὰς ἐκάλεσαν ἐγκλίσεις, τὰς δὲ σωματικὰς διαθέσεις. But see also *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem...*, pp. 245, 26—27: Διάθεσις ἐστὶ δίατα ψυχῆς καὶ διοίκησις.

features, however, we note also significant differences as to the way of accounting for various details related to the issue of diathesis in both texts.

With reference to Τέχνη, one can state that the factors given above, in principle, exhaust the criteria which the classification of particular διαθέσεις (kinds of διάθεσις) was based upon. The essence of two of those διαθέσεις, i.e. ἐνεργεια and πάθος, turns out to be the compliance of formal and semantic features within a given verb form. Those types, from a terminological point of view, were identified with semantic features of verb forms, which are characterised by those kinds of διάθεσις. The basis for distinguishing the third type, i.e. μεσότης, is contradiction between formal and semantic characteristics (or, in opinion of some scholars, semantic ambivalence), manifested by specific verb forms.

In turn, in Apollonios's text, apart from those indicated above, an additional syntactic criterion was introduced, which gave a much more restrictive character to the two main and mutually conditioned types of διάθεσις distinguished there, namely, ἐνεργητική διάθεσις and παθητική διάθεσις; in this way, the distribution of those διαθέσεις was narrowed down exclusively to transitive verbs. This was accompanied by a considerable extension of the terminological apparatus, which permitted a more precise description of formal and semantic verb features, and the very features, together with that additional syntactic factor, constituted, as we have already mentioned, criteria for identifying particular διαθέσεις. As a result, determinants of one kind of diathesis, i.e. ἐνεργητική διάθεσις, became the following factors: a specific formal shape of the verb identified as ἐνεργητική ἔγκλισις, suitable meaning, i.e. ἐνεργεια, and transitivity determined by connoted syntax with a subordinate noun in the accusative. In turn, the determinants of the other type of διάθεσις, i.e. παθητική διάθεσις, became: παθητική, ἔγκλισις πάθος and the connoted syntax: ὑπό + noun in the genitive, respectively. Those specific, but very narrow criteria, did not, however, enable Apollonios to determine clearly the διάθεσις of a wide group of intransitive verbs. Although the grammarian mentions middle diathesis (διάθεσις μέση), he does not define it in any way. On the other hand, he introduces the notion of 'medial forms' (μέσα σχήματα) characterised by the fact that they "admitted the coincidence of active and passive diathesis" (συνέμπτωσιν ἀνεδέξατο ἐνεργητικῆς καὶ παθητικῆς διαθέσεως). He includes in those "medial forms" the forms of medial aorist, the specifics of which is that they may be characterised both by διαθέσεως ἐνεργητική (e.g. ποιησάμην or προηκάμην), and διάθεσις παθητική (e.g. ἐτριψάμην or ἐλουσάμην). Therefore, any separate type of diathesis relates to the phrase talking about the "coincidence of active and passive diathesis" (συνέμπτωσις ἐνεργητικῆς καὶ παθητικῆς), but only the ambivalence of diathesis (active or passive) characteristic of specific morphological type (medial aorist) at the level of particular verb forms which represent it, is pointed out.

As can be seen, then, the meaning of the term διάθεσις occurring in both texts is quite difficult to find. Its ambiguity undoubtedly stems, at least to some extent, from real complexity of the matter it refers to. Apart from that, its vagueness

results, on the one hand, from not sufficiently precise description of the criteria identifying the concepts related to that term, and from multitude and incoherence of those criteria, on the other. Due to those shortcomings, the *designatum* of that term, although close to the notion of the grammatical category of voice, is not quite equivalent to it. However, it reflects undoubtedly the way Alexandrian grammarians perceived the effects of the existence of that category in the grammatical system of the Greek language.