

PHILIPP BRANDENBURG: *Apollonios Dyskolos. Über das Pronomen. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*. K.G. Saur Verlag, München – Leipzig 2005. ISBN 3-598-77834-1. XIV, 676 pp. EUR 120.

This book offers a thorough discussion on Apollonius Dyscolus' treatise *On the Pronoun*. Alongside the new edition (which fills in a good number of omissions to the previous authoritative edition by Schneider), the book contains a German translation of the entire treatise, as well as a long introduction and commentary. The book amounts to over six hundred pages.

The introductory part (p. 3–213) consists of a detailed account of the ancient doctrine of the parts of speech. Some of this information is quite necessary in order to understand Apollonius' position in ancient linguistic historiography, since the definition of the pronoun is intimately associated with that of the noun in Apollonius' theory. However, B. offers a much too extensive description of the development of the parts of speech, their names and their ordering; much of this discussion is irrelevant for the present purposes, and fails to throw any new light on the subject.

B.'s bibliography covers a wide range of modern research literature, but I am critical of the way he often uses it. This is the case, for instance, when B. quite frequently leans on the authority of nineteenth century works, where more recent literature would be abundantly available. Moreover, he resorts to such early, outdated works where hardly any reference is needed at all, e.g. "Die früheste im Primärüberlieferung erhaltene Quelle ist Varro. Durch Varro erhalten wir einen Einblick in den Stand der römischen Grammatik am Ende der hellenistischen Periode" (Steinthal 1891, 219–220; Lersch 1840, 143) (B., p. 24). Surely this is common knowledge among those working on ancient linguistic historiography. Such miscalculations may result from the thesis-like nature of this book.

B. maintains the traditional dichotomy between technical and philosophical grammar, which has been – correctly, as I think – abandoned in Daniel Taylor's "new model of the history of Graeco-Roman language science" (1987:13). B. emphasizes the division between Alexandrian philology and Stoic philosophy to the extent of ignoring the influence of Stoic logic in Apollonius' grammar altogether:

"Die Trennung zwischen stoischer Philosophie und alexandrinischer Philologie begegnet bereits in antiken Texten. Diese Texte stammen stets von Gegnern der Stoa und polemisieren gegen die Stoa. Sie belegen also eine schon in der Antike empfundene inhaltliche Differenz zwischen beiden Parteien, lassen sich aber nur mit Vorsicht für eine Rekonstruktion der stoischen Lehre nutzen." (p. 24).

As a result, no question is raised as to the origin of Apollonius' philosophical terms, such as *ousia* and *poiotes*. I find their translations as 'Existenz' and 'Eigenschaft' (p. 183, 209, 239) rather than substance/subject and quality infelicitous.

It emerges, however, that B.'s knowledge of the Stoic theory of meaning is highly limited; he is content to quote the common three-fold division between a corporeal sound, meaning and the referent given by Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. math.* VIII, 11–13). This problematic passage does not reflect genuinely Stoic doctrine, as has been pointed out by Frede, Long (1971: 77 n. 11) and Luhtala (2000: 77). Sextus illustrates the Stoic theory of

meaning by an individual word, 'Dion', where a combined expression, such as 'Dion walks', is required. As Frede put it, "unfortunately 'Dion' is not an example of something which is true or false, and so it is clear that something has gone wrong with Sextus' report" (Frede 1978: 65).

These critical observations suggest that the author is less confident in the theoretical aspects of his work than in translating the text of the famous Greek grammarian. The most important contribution made by B. is the German translation of this extremely difficult text, which has never been translated into any modern language. It can be hoped, therefore, that this work will inspire further research into the linguistic theory of Apollonius Dyscolus, who is the figure most in need for a reappraisal in ancient linguistic historiography.

Frede, Michael (1978) "Principles of Stoic Grammar" in *The Stoics*, ed. by John M. Rist. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, p. 7–75.

Lersch, Laurenz (1838–40) *Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten I–II*. Bonn (ND Hildesheim 1971)

Long, Anthony (1971) "Language and Thought in Stoicism" in *Problems in Stoicism*, ed. by Anthony Long. London: the Athlone Press, p. 75–113.

Luhtala, Anneli (2000) *On the Origin of Syntactical Description in Stoic Logic*. Munster: Nodus Publikationen.

Steinthal, Heymann (1890–91) *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Logik*, 1–2. Berlin (ND Hildesheim 1961).

Taylor, Daniel J. (1987) "Rethinking the History of Language Science in Classical Antiquity" in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, ed. by Daniel J. Taylor. *Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science*, 46. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 1–16.

Anneli Luhtala

*Sortes Astrampsychi*. Vol. II. Edidit RANDALL STEWART. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus K.G. Saur, Monachii et Lipsiae 2001. ISBN 3-598-71003-8. XXIII, 127 S. EUR 42.

Astra(m)psychos war ein sagenhafter Magier aus Persien. Er galt unter anderem als Verfasser eines über die Antike hinaus weit verbreiteten, etwa um 300 n. Chr. abgefassten Orakelbuches, der *Sortes Astrampsychi*, das uns in zwei Versionen erhalten ist. Die erste Version, die *ecdosis prior*, erschien 1983 mit der Teubneriana von G.M. Browne, und mit dem hier anzuzeigenden Band legt Stewart nun die zweite *ecdosis* vor. Sie ersetzt die editio princeps von Hercher aus dem Jahre 1863. Sie ist von ausgezeichneter Qualität und kann als die abschließende Ausgabe dieser zweiten *ecdosis* bezeichnet werden. Den Kuratoren der Bibliotheca Teubneriana ist zu danken, dass sie auch solche nur selten verlegte antike Texte ins Verlagsprogramm aufnehmen. Jetzt können wir die zwei Versionen auf sichererer Grundlage miteinander vergleichen. In der ersten ist die Phraseologie des Archetyps zum großen Teil bewahrt, während die zweite die Struktur des Archetyps, wenn auch unter Preisgabe des originalen Wortlauts, getreuer beibehält (dazu s. Stewarts Beitrag in *Anthology of Ancient Greek Popular Literature* [1998] 287).

Heikki Solin