

P. BRANDENBURG, *Apollonios Dyskolos. Über das Pronomen. Einführung. Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*, München-Leipzig: Saur, 2005, 676 pp., ISBN 3-598-77834-1.

Apollonius Dyscolus, who lived in Alexandria in the first half of the IInd cent. A.D., was without any doubt the most competent Greek grammarian in Antiquity. Through Priscian (VIth cent. A.D.), who in his works on Latin grammar took over many of his theoretical views, he strongly influenced the later European linguistic tradition. We know the titles of about 30 of Apollonius' treatises, but for most of them only fragments have been preserved. Fortunately we do have the full text of his master piece, *On syntax*, as well as three complete (or almost complete) minor treatises, on the pronoun (*De pron.*), on the conjunction (*De con.*; only half of the text preserved) and on the adverb (*De adv.*), respectively.

While most of the 19th century linguists still were able to read and study Apollonius in the original language, the declining knowledge of ancient Greek in the 20th century entailed the need for reliable, and, if possible, commented translations. That this need was first of all fulfilled for the work *On syntax*, is not a surprise. In 1981 Fred W. Householder published an English annotated translation. Then followed a Spanish one in 1987 by Vicente Bécars Botas and finally, in 1997, came the opus magnum of Jean Lallot, *Apollonius Dyscole. De la construction. Texte grec accompagné de notes critiques, introduction, traduction, notes exégétiques*, in 2 volumes (303; 477 pp.). Former students of Jean Lallot at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris decided to take care of some of Apollonius' *scripta minora*. Catherine Dalimier's volume on *De con.* appeared already in 2001; Sylvain Brocquet is working on the *De adv.*

For the *De pron.* an English translation (in fact Edition, with introduction, translation, and commentary) has been announced for some time by Andreas Schmidhauser of the University of

Geneva. He has been preceded by Philipp Brandenburg (= B.) who now presents a revised form of the dissertation which he submitted in 2003 at the Philosophische Fakultät of the Christian Albrechts Universität in Kiel.

By making Apollonius' treatise accessible to modern linguists B. wants to reduce the gap between classical philology and general linguistics. His monograph has three parts: (1) an extensive introduction, (2) the Greek text with the German translation on facing pages, and (3) notes.

The (obvious) task of the introduction is to present a bio-bibliography of Apollonius, to describe the transmission of the *De pron.*, to indicate the content and the general characteristics of the treatise and to situate Apollonius' study of the pronoun within the tradition of the Alexandrine research on the parts of speech. In fact this first part of the monograph, with no less than eight chapters, occupying all together 216 pages, contains all this, but also much more, so that it offers a broad history of the *Sprachwissenschaft* in Greco-Roman Antiquity. Without denying the possible utility of such a historical survey for students just entering the field, I think that this part of the book is simply too extensive. Especially the information on the Latin grammarians is not really necessary to understand Apollonius' treatise. There are, however, parts which I could appreciate, e.g. the chapter 8, with a general presentation of Apollonius' treatment of pronouns, both in his *De pron.* and in the IInd book of his *Syntax*. It contains among other things a clarifying discussion (pp. 182-188) of what Apollonius considers to be the essential functions of the pronoun, viz. *deixis* and *anaphora* (= a kind of 'mental' *deixis*), and a nice survey of the ways in which the distinction between those has been understood by modern linguists. I also like the synthetic presentation (pp. 27-30) of the authenticity problem linked with the *Technê grammatikê* of Dionysius Thrax and B.'s judgment that it contains a lot of old material, next to more recent texts parts. And finally I refer to his useful discussion (pp. 62-79) of the ancient (Greek and Latin) histories of the genesis of the parts-of-speech system. These 'doxographies' constitute a subgenre of ancient grammaticography which did not yet get the scientific attention it merits. B. argues (pp. 69-75) that Varro's distinction, in his *De lingua latina*,

of four word classes is a doxography. I find it rather difficult to recognize any ambition of Varro as an historiographer of linguistics in the passages where he defends a(n indeed original) classification, at least of the declinable words.

A positive feature is that B. translates all the Greek (and Latin) source texts. Only rarely one can disagree with his renderings. Let me mention nevertheless one instance. On p. 154 he argues that *pra'gma* in Dionysius Thrax's definition of *o[noma* means 'action', but afterwards (pp. 155-156), when translating texts of scholiasts clearly inspired by the *Technê*, he does not accept this meaning (but prefers 'Sachen').

B. adopted the Greek text of the codex Parisinus 2548 (10th cent. A.D.) as printed in Richard Schneider's edition of 1878 (*Grammatici Graeci*, II 1), but he takes into account about 80 times (cf. the list on pp. 665-667) the corrections proposed by Schneider himself (in *Grammatici Graeci*, II 2, 1902), by P. Maas (1903) and by A Thierfelder (1935). Passages considered as interpolations are kept in the Greek text, but printed in smaller font. B.'s translation, although as literal as possible (cf. p. 8: "eine Übersetzung die dem Original sowohl inhaltlich als auch stilistisch entspricht"), reads easily. The division into a lot of sections and subsections and the titles indicating the content greatly help the understanding of a difficult treatise. Readers who do not have Greek will also appreciate the transliteration of the Greek examples.

B. did not aim at an extensive scientific commentary of the type of Dalimier's for the *De con.* or Lallot's for the *Syntax*. For the about 114 pages of Greek in the *G.G.* II 1 (or 190 pages in the lay-out of Brandenburg's volume) there only 29 pages of commentary. On the other hand the *Erläuterungen* are more elaborated than the notes (included in the translation itself) of Householder or those (in footnotes) of Bécarea Botas to the *Syntax*. Their main purpose is to clarify the argumentation of Apollonius (cf. p. 10: "Sie sollen lediglich helfen, den roten Faden trotz aller apollonianischen Detailfreude nicht zu verlieren") and so the reader is sometimes left to himself, for ex. about the passage in the *De pron.* which is most crucial in the authenticity debate of the *Technê*, viz. *καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ὁ Θραξ Διονύσιος καὶ ἄρθρα δεικτικὰ τὰς ἀντωνυμίας ἐκάλουν* (*G.G.*

II 1,5.18-19). 'Both Apollodorus of Athens and Dionysius Thrax called the pronouns also 'deictic articles'. The deictic pronoun is absent from the (preserved) *Technê* and modern scholars strongly disagree on the interpretation of Apollonius's sentence. Cf. most recently C.C. de Jonge, *Between Grammar and Rhetoric. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics, and Literature* [Ph. Leiden, 2006], pp. 118-121. Apollonius's affirmation is mentioned on p. 27 of B.'s introductory part, but receives no comment at all in the *Erläuterungen*.

B.'s bibliography (pp. 602-662) is enormous and it takes even more space than necessary because in the case of works in several volumes each separate volume gets a (superfluous) complete bibliographic description. Nevertheless there are lacunae. I missed (on p. 145, n.93) for example Jean Lallot's article *L'étymologie chez les grammairiens grecs : principes et pratique*, in *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, LXV (1991), fasc. 1 (= *Actes du Colloque de Rouen des 21 et 22 novembre 1991: Etymologie diachronique et étymologie synchronique en grec ancien*), pp. 135-148.

The monograph is not free of material errors and misprints. Let me mention only that the grammatical papyrus (p. 153 and *passim*) *P. Yale 1.25* dates from the 1st cent. A.D. (not B.C.) and that Aelius Herodianus (p. 26), in spite of his stay in Rome, is a Greek and not a Roman grammarian. Some of the misprints may cause confusion; the inventory number (p. 5) of the codex Parisinus is 2548 (and not 1548); Trannios (p. 29) is an error for Tyrannion, and instead of a[*numata* (p.179) we should read *ojnovmata*.

n index of concepts, besides the *Index locorum* (pp. 603-662), would have been very useful. In spite of the deficiencies I mentioned this is an important achievement in the Apollonius-*Forschung*.

ALFONS WOUTERS

KU Leuven

alfons.wouters@kuleuven.be