

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.

Fögen has his focus on four Roman authors of different nature: Lucretius, Cicero, Quintilian, and Aulus Gellius. In addition, he makes some shorter comments on later writers such as Augustine, Jerome and Boethius. Of these, Cicero receives the most thorough analysis (77–141). Fögen has many interesting observations, and is able to open new lines of thought even if he has to use data known to most classicists. The book is generally quite enjoyable, but the extensive use of footnotes, especially concerning references to the modern linguistic literature, is slightly tiresome for the reader. One cannot avoid the feeling that there are references for the sake of references. Although central in their own field, some linguistic literature cited by Fögen has little or no use for the classicist who has to work with written data only. Even if one could try to find some positive use of this literature in analysing corpus languages, it seems to be quite useless, as theories based exclusively on speech and discussion are far from the problems faced in written corpus language. In addition, the arrangement of the bibliography is strange, as there is much duplication, which is only confusing.

*Martti Leiwo*

ESPEN KARLSEN: *The Accusativus cum infinitivo and Quod Clauses in the Revelaciones of St. Bridget of Sweden*. Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters, Band 33. Peter Lang, Bern 2001. ISBN 3-906767-34-5. 253 pp. EUR 38,20.

In ancient Latin literature the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (a.c.i.) continued to be used according to the model set by the classical authors for centuries afterwards. Therefore, the ancient authors do not, for the most part, offer suitable material for a study on syntactic variation and the competition between the a.c.i. and finite subordinate clauses which finally replaced it in the spoken registers. Mediaeval Latin, on the other hand, was characterized by a frequent use of *quod* clauses as the object of *verba sentiendi et declarandi*. Still, as Espen Karlsen notes, not much research has been done on this subject even in the field of mediaeval texts.

In the present study, Karlsen examines the use of these two constructions in one text corpus, the *Revelaciones* of St. Bridget of Sweden. The text is a translation from an Old Swedish original and although comparable syntactic variables exist in Old Swedish as well, Karlsen has found no evidence for any external influence in the language of the *Revelaciones*.

Firstly, Karlsen notes that the two groups, *verba sentiendi* and *verba declarandi*, differ from each other with regard to the most frequently used subordinate constructions. With *verba declarandi*, the *quod* clauses are used in a majority of instances (*quod* 69%, a.c.i. 27%, double accusative 4%) whereas, with *verba sentiendi*, the a.c.i. together with other non-finite constructions (the a.c.p. and double accusative) is used with more than half of the occurrences (*quod* 45.5%, a.c.i. 35%, a.c.p. 13%, double accusative 6.5%).

Karlsen shows that stylistic, syntactic and semantic factors are all relevant for the choice of construction. On the stylistic level, the choice can aim at variation and antithetic expression on the one hand and parallelism of subsequent clauses on the other. For example, *quod* clauses are preferred in enumerations, where several subordinate