

the group employing the poems, or that terms like *νεομύσσης* point to initiation scenarios. An acknowledgement that mythic poetry uses projection and idealisation would have helped. Second, the medium of composition (high-style hexameter) is rarely brought into meaningful contact with obviously parallel texts, nor are oral-traditional poetics ever mentioned. In short, M.'s otherwise tightly argued and meticulously documented study still leaves plenty of room for deeper literary analysis.

Stanford University

RICHARD P. MARTIN
rpmartin@stanford.edu

APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS

BRANDENBURG (P.) *Apollonios Dyskolos. Über das Pronomen. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 222.) Pp. xiv + 676. Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2005. Cased, €120. ISBN: 978-3-598-77834-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06003301

Apollonius' *Pronoun* was last edited in its entirety in 1878 by Richard Schneider, and in 1902 the same scholar provided the work with its first and (until now) only commentary. Brandenburg's book, a revised version of his doctoral dissertation (Kiel, 2003), contains not only the first translation of this difficult yet seminal text but also an extensive introduction (216 pp.) and notes (25 pp.).

The Introduction contains eight chapters and a summary. Chapter 1 gives some useful generalities on author, work, etc. Chapter 8 offers a fresh account of Apollonius' theory of pronouns. Chapters 2 to 7 lay out a reconstruction of the ancient theory of the parts of speech. Unfortunately – unsurprisingly, some might say – much of it is not directly relevant to the *Pronoun*. The whole of Chapter 5, for example, on the order of the parts of speech, could have been distilled into one paragraph: Apollonius investigates the question only in the first book of his *Syntax*, and it is questionable whether that doctrine is ever needed to understand the *Pronoun*. The resulting disconnectedness is enhanced by an often infelicitous exposition and use of examples, since B. rarely chooses a passage from his own treatise to illustrate a particular notion or claim. For example, when discussing interjections and adverbs of complaint, B. might at least have mentioned a fascinating passage in the *Pronoun* where Apollonius discusses the parsing of ὤμοι (34.19–35.5), but instead the reader is referred to Demetrius, Athenaeus and Romanus (p. 89).

B.'s book will above all be acquired for, and should thus be judged upon, his translation. The presentation is straightforward. On the left, B. prints Schneider's text with a few modifications, listed in the *Index discrepantium* (pp. 665–7). Most of these are deletions proposed by other scholars, and B. himself contributes ten further deletions (none of which, however, seems persuasive). It is regrettable that B. did not indicate important changes below the text; the reader could then have seen at once that δς, for example, is only a zany emendation of Mendelssohn's for the transmitted and obviously correct θεός (*Pron.* 6.25). The translation, on the right-hand side of the page, incorporates references and short comments; why B. did not put the latter in his notes is unclear.

The treatise is more than a hundred pages long. I shall discuss the very beginning (i.e. *Pron.* 3.9–5.12). **3.10:** B. translates διεψευσμένου ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα by 'ist die

Aufgabe eines im Irrtum Befindlichen. This seems to be mistaken in both syntax and semantics; one should rather understand ‘that promise (*sc.* to discuss all appellations) belongs to one who is in error’. **3.12:** It is unclear why B. puts Aristarchus’ definition within quotation marks; Apollonius does not purport to cite Aristarchus, but to say how he defined the words in question. In the Introduction, B. starts his discussion of Aristarchus’ definition by simply asserting that the phrase is not in fact a definition (p. 166). The reader would have liked to see an argument for this claim; after all, Apollonius – our only witness – describes Aristarchus’ phrase both in the *Pronoun* and in the *Syntax* with the term ὄρος. There should be space for such things if B. finds space to *quote* half a dozen scholars on what they think σύζυγος means (*ibid.*). **3.16:** In the translation, παρανομασία is rendered as ‘Ableitung’, while in the Introduction and in the notes B. explains the term as ‘Denominativum’ (pp. 98, 572). Had Apollonius really taken the word in the latter sense, he would not have proposed his second objection. **4.1:** B. translates Tyrannio’s appellation σημείωσις by ‘Indikator’, but the verb from which Tyrannio derives it – σημειοῦσθαι – by ‘anzeigen’. To translate ὀρίζειν by ‘identifizieren’ seems rather too much of an interpretation; elsewhere B. opts for ‘determinieren’ (e.g. *Pron.* 26.10). **4.3:** B. renders τὰ παρακολουθοῦντα αὐταῖς as ‘ihre Akzidentien’ and presents Apollonius as speaking of one of the six grammatical accidents (p. 127). Surely Apollonius intended to speak of what essentially belongs to pronouns – for example, that they always signify a substance (e.g. *Pron.* 9.7). **4.5:** ἀντώνυμον as an appellation for pronouns is not known only through Apollonius, as B. claims in the Introduction (p. 98); there are at least two further occurrences in this sense (*Σ Techne* 77.21; 259.21). **4.7:** ‘Spezies’ is not to be explained as ‘das einzelne Individuum’. **4.11:** διώνυμον is presumably not used here in the sense of ‘(das) Berühmte’; in Greek grammar, proper nouns are said to be ‘dionyms’ when they signify the same person, as in the case of Πάρις and Ἀλέξανδρος (e.g. *Σ Techne* 555.16). **5.4:** Apollonius intends to say that vowel-changes occur when the word ὄνομα – and not when a noun – is compounded with another word. **5.10:** ἀπτονομασία is an inappropriate term in Apollonius’ eyes, because it is already used as the name of a figure, not because it contains a word that signifies ‘die Stellvertretung’. **5.12:** The phrase does not mean ‘was nicht der Bedeutung {von cheimásai} ermangelt’, but rather ‘what the signification {of ἀπτονομασία} does not require’. – There are thus quite a few points of detail where one might disagree with B.; in this respect the sample is not unrepresentative of the remainder of the work.

Although Saur is to be commended for having accepted the thesis in its reputable series BzA, it is deplorable that no *Lektor* seems to have examined the final product before the file was sent to the printer: one finds inaccurate and incomplete references (p. 58), references that are not listed in the bibliography (‘Nau 2001’ on p. 46), empty brackets (p. 182), brackets enclosing ‘???’ (p. 209) or ‘UBI?’ (p. 226) and far too many typographical errors – I counted 21 such mistakes in 20 pages (pp. 181–200).

Notwithstanding certain reservations, B.’s book is an important addition to the surging literature on Apollonius, and there can be no doubt that it will be essential reading in the years to come. Any scholar working on ancient grammar will need access to this book, and any decent library should obtain it.

University of Geneva

A. U. SCHMIDHAUSER
andreas.schmidhauser@lettres.unige.ch