
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 provinzialer Religion.

Uta-Maria Liertz


This book, a published doctoral dissertation from the University of Lund, is an analysis of the use of €xw and €στι 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 €xw 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 ηχω had different lexical meanings in the native speaker's mind (cf. 'hold' and 'have' in English with respect to ηχω, 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. ηχω 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 ηχω, 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


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.