in particular, thorough studies of the formal aspects of *Kathareuousa* Greek, which are still lacking. But before that comes about, the Greek-speaking reader will enjoy this rich, beautifully illustrated, and well-structured first volume on the oldest history of the Greek language.

The University of Arizona, Tucson GONDA A. H. VAN STEEN

GREEK DIALECTS

A. C. Cassio (ed.): *Katà Diálekton. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca. Napoli—Fiaiano d'Ischia, 25–29 September 1996*. (AION, Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, Sezione Filologico-Letteraria, 19.) Pp. 617. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1999. Paper.

This collection of articles, based on presentations to the Third International Colloquium on Greek Dialectology in Naples (September 1996), consists of a general introduction by the editor, followed by twenty-four original contributions (in five modern European languages) from leading practitioners in the field, and four indexes (of linguistic and dialectological issues, of inscriptions cited, of Greek words and proper names discussed, and of literary texts referred to).

Though there is no overall 'theme' beyond that of Ancient Greek dialectology, the sheer range of the material and issues discussed is impressive. Anyone wishing to know about current developments and controversies in this field will need to look here, not only for the information and analysis provided by individual authors but also for the excellent, up-to-date bibliographic references. A comprehensive account is clearly beyond the scope of a short review, but we have here: (i) analyses of specific inscriptions or collections of inscriptions, both familiar and newly published, from various times and places (Masson, Brixhe, López Eire, Bartoňek, Palumbo Stracca, Cassio, Consani, Dubois, Hodot, Lazzarini); (ii) discussion of a range of issues involving dialect contact and its impact on dialectal development (Morpurgo Davies, Santiago, Minon); (iii) an assessment of a range of phonological issues (the chronology of compensatory lengthening in Attic–Ionic [Crespo Güemes], the validity of the supposed shift of *ai* to *ei* in certain dialects [Striano], and the rationale behind different regional attempts to standardize orthography in the face of sound change [Vottéro]); and (iv) analyses of various aspects of syntactic and morphological structure and of the use of vocabulary (Dettori, Dobias-Lalou, Wachter, Méndez Dosuna, Bile, Meier-Brügger, García Ramón, del Barrio).

The quality of these contributions, in terms of factual content, presentation, and scholarly judgement, is uniformly high, and even where one might hesitate to follow all the way (e.g. is there really the evidence to take the now famous Pella *defixio* as representative of the echt 'Macedonian dialect' in its natural state in the relevant period, as Brixhe would have us believe [pp. 41–71]?), there is always the necessary raw material to hand, both data and bibliography, to assist in the construction of counterarguments.

This collection of articles will be essential reading for all those interested in Ancient Greek dialectology, whether in the 'big picture' or in the details of the usage of specific regions. Progress in this domain can only be made through the meticulous compilation and judicious analysis of the currently available data—by no means a closed set, as

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.91 Published online by Cambridge University Press

new material is constantly coming to light, and even corpora that have long been in the public domain may reveal something new when re-examined with a fresh eye. Regular updates of the quality on offer in this volume provide experts and amateurs alike with an invaluable resource.

St John's College, Cambridge GEOFFREY HORROCKS

POSSESSION IN GREEK

K. KULNEFF-ERIKSSON: *On 'Have' in Ancient Greek. An Investigation on ἔχω and the Construction εἶναι with a Dative as Expressions for 'Have'*. Pp. xxii + 192, tables. Sweden: Lund University Press, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 91-7966-564-0.

Most of the world's languages do not have a transitive verb 'have', and use a 'be' + dative construction instead. Even among the Indo-European languages, where the existence of a 'have'-verb is relatively common, it is clear from the lack of agreement among the items in question that they represent the product of a series of independent innovations. Greek shows evidence of both constructions from the earliest times, and this book, which is a revised version of the author's Lund University Ph.D. dissertation, seeks to trace the evolution of the means of expressing possession from Linear B down into prose of the fourth century. It begins with a general introduction, outlining the rationale and objectives of the enquiry, and then considers both the etymology of ἔχω and the distribution of the etymon **seg'h-* in other ancient Indo-European languages. There follow two chapters on other meanings of ἔχω and on the formation of its tense stems, and seven chapters on 'have' in various epigraphic and textual corpora (Linear B, Homer, Herodotus, Euripides, Xenophon, Plato, and Isocrates). Finally we have a chapter on the rôle of definiteness in possessive constructions, followed by a general summary and conclusion.

The author's main purpose is to show how the use of the two methods of expressing possession (i.e. ἔχω and the construction εἶναι with a dative) evolved over time: while in the earliest texts the latter is the dominant usage with non-concrete possessions, the former with concrete ones, ἔχω steadily gains ground over its 'rival' across the board, though its overall predominance remains more marked when the possession is concrete (and non-animate). Ultimately ἔχω acquires a very broad and rather non-specific range of meaning(s). This overall distribution is traced to the 'early' meanings of ἔχω ('hold', 'contain', 'have in one's power'), though it is specifically noted that the 'be' + dative construction is systematically avoided when the possessor is the focal element in a clause (i.e. the element subject to special emphasis or contrast).

As sometimes happens with work in 'classical' linguistics, the absence of references to more general studies of the relevant phenomena makes for certain weaknesses. Thus recent typological accounts of possession draw attention to the fact that instantiations of 'have' may have relatively short life cycles, a point which undercuts the assumption (pp. 1–2) that PIE must have been a 'be' language on the grounds that there is no clear evidence in the daughter languages for any particular proto-'have'-verb. Similarly, the discussion in Chapter 4 of the tense stems of ἔχω (and of the distribution of present and aorist forms of verbs meaning things like 'keep' and 'stop') suffers from a lack of appreciation of work on the interaction between grammatical aspect and lexical Aktionsart, while the rôle of the (in)definiteness of the possession (as discussed in

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.91 Published online by Cambridge University Press