

Kultes in Germanien an und kann seinen Anfang um ca. 50 Jahre vorrücken. I. Huld-Zetsche berichtet über Neufunde bezüglich des Mithraskultes in Germanien und deren Implikationen für die Rekonstruktion und Neuinterpretation von Kultbildern und -stätten. Im letzten Beitrag beschäftigt sich W. Boppert mit der Ausbreitung des Christentums in Obergermanien und insbesondere in Mogontiacum. Aufgrund der dürftigen Quellenlage muss man sich jedoch auf die Gesamtsituation in vor- und nachkonstantinischer Zeit sowie v.a. einige frühmittelalterliche Dokumente beschränken. Einige burgundische Grabsteine in dem Gebiet zeigen jedoch, dass das Christentum auch bei einsickernden Germanen Eingang fand.

Die Indices hier wie auch im ersten besprochenen Band helfen des weiteren zur Erschließung des Inhalts. Beide Bände geben sicher neue Anregungen und Erkenntnisse für eine vertiefte Auseinandersetzung mit römischer provinzieller Religion.

Uta-Maria Liertz

KARIN KULNEFF-ERIKSSON: *On 'have' in Ancient Greek. An investigation on ἔχω and the construction εἶναι with a dative as expressions for 'have'*. Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 7. Lund University Press, Lund 1999. ISBN 91-7966-564-0. 192 pp. SEK 207.

This book, a published doctoral dissertation from the University of Lund, is an analysis of the use of ἔχω and ἔστι μοι in the meaning of "have" in linear B texts from Pylos and Knossos, Iliad 1, 3, 4, 20, and 24, Odyssey 1, 9, 10, 11, and 12, Herodotus 4, and 8, Euripides' *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae*, Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, and Isocrates' *Helen*, *Against the Sophists*, *Panegyricus*, *To Philip*, and *Panathenaicus* (22). The choice of data is representative as regards chronology and genre. The aim of the book is to accomplish a semantic analysis of the expressions of possession in Greek, but the linguistic motivation for this kind of study seems to remain slightly obscure. The semantics of ἔχω and other expressions denoting "have" receive the greatest emphasis, but the pragmatics of sentences with "have" expressions are studied to some extent (18–20). This is good, but there could have been even more discussion on pragmatic aspects. The analysis and discussion are usually well presented and argued, and generally Kulneff-Eriksson has a good knowledge of her subject.

However, the book is slightly cumbersome. If it had been thoroughly re-written after having been presented as a dissertation, it would have gained both with regard to its quite formal and mechanical contents and subtlety of argument. The schematic form impacts negatively on a few interesting results K.-E. sometimes presents, for example, on the differences of "have" constructions between the Iliad and the Odyssey. A thorough discussion would have given more weight to the conclusions which now remain banal: "the difference is more likely to be explained for example by a chronological distance between the poems or by the fact that two different poets have been at work (66)."

Sometimes K.-E. gets caught up in conceptual difficulties. On p. 15 the discussion of the dative is somewhat misleading, since from the native speaker's point of view the dative always has a clear grammatical use. For the native speaker a dative is

never *possessivus*, *commodi*, *incommodi* or *iudicantis* as defined in traditional grammars. It is the case which is used to express something which typically is expressed with that specific case. A native speaker usually has more than one grammatical construction to choose from for a given expression. The use of a case is strongly connected with the verb whose complement the given noun is. The verb's lexical meaning is important, largely governing the possible cases a nominal argument can have, e.g. the dative constructions. It is problematic to assume that a normally used ἔχω had different lexical meanings in the native speaker's mind (cf. 'hold' and 'have' in English with respect to ἔχω, 30–31). Rather we could assume that the same meaning was extended to different usages depending on sentential semantics. A lexeme's semantic and pragmatic function as well as its lexical meaning all play a role in a linguistic analysis. In that respect, the discussion would have been improved if syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic analysis had been applied more carefully than has been done.

Some chapters are not very illuminating (e.g. ἔχω as an auxiliary, 36–39, linear B, 50–64). One also wonders why the etymology chapter (25–29) has been included, as it does not serve well for the understanding of Greek ἔχω, a fact which the author is ready to admit herself (29). All in all, a more strict editing would have increased the usefulness of this book, which, however, still has some solid analysis concerning individual texts.

*Martti Leiwo*

THORSTEN FÖGEN: *Patrii sermonis egestas. Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache. Ein Beitrag zum Sprachbewußtsein in der römischen Antike. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, Band 150.* K. G. Saur, München – Leipzig 2000. ISBN 3-598-77699-3. 279 pp. EUR 80.

General linguistic research has several branches which are sometimes very far from each other as regards methodology, sources and objectives. Traditionally, classicists have little to do with this research, even if some knowledge of it would not do harm to anyone. A branch which has, however, received some attention during the last three decades is sociolinguistics with its many subcategories. Research on language contacts, language attitudes and language awareness has been very active among linguists in general. Even many classicists have concentrated lately on studies of identity, ethnicity and the like in different fields of ancient studies. Quite frequently these studies have drawn methodological help or support from other subjects, for example cultural anthropology and sociology.

Thorsten Fögen has set out to study the attitudes of Roman authors towards their own native language by using as methodological help sociolinguistic research on language awareness and attitudes of speakers of modern languages. This cross-methodological approach has without any doubts been very fruitful as it has uncovered even more than before the fact that Roman writers were just ordinary language users and Latin was just a normal language like any other language in the world with different language registers and linguistic variation, of which the good writers were very aware.