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/53.1.92 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chapter 12 and summarized on p. 171: the 'be'+ dative construction, for example, survives longest when the possession is abstract and/or indefinite) might have been more interestingly analysed if some account had been taken of contemporary work in the semantics and pragmatics of existential, locative, and possessive constructions, which in fact have a great deal in common. But perhaps the most serious problem, given the importance of such distinctions to the overall analysis, is that of determining which examples of ἔχω mean 'have' and which mean things like 'keep'/'hold' or even 'get'. No very clear methodology is proposed, and even the general rules of thumb are not necessarily decisive; thus (p. 31) while we may agree that if 'hand(s)' is used as an instrument the meaning is not 'have', it is not so obvious that locative 'in one's hand(s)' forces the same conclusion ('has/holds X in his hands' both seem fine).

Ultimately, then, the strength of this book lies in the provision of detailed statistical information about the types of possessor and possession (defined in terms of notions such as concreteness, animacy, and definiteness) used in the two constructions in a range of texts and authors representing a period of development from the late Bronze Age down to the fourth century B.C. Classicists will surely find this an invaluable store of data, even if the precise basis for the choice between ἔχω and ἐστί μοι in any given case in any given period still remains, at least in part, to be determined.

St John's College, Cambridge GEOFFREY HORROCKS

LATIN LOANWORDS IN GREEK

I.-M. Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, J. Diethart (edd.): *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in den griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens, mit Berücksichtigung koptischer Quellen. Faszikel II (Beta–Delta)*. (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer XXVII/2.) Pp. 142. Purkersdorf: Verlag Brüder Hollinek, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 3-85119-279-6.

The second fascicle (β–δ) of a lexicon of Latin loanwords in Greek documentary texts from Egypt comes four years after the first (reviewed in *CR* 48 [1998], 217–18). A third fascicle (ε–κ) is promised, but, as I am told, the funding for the project has run out. The *Lexikon* has been a standard work of reference for the last few years; it would be a pity if this important undertaking were to be abandoned.

This fascicle too follows the paths trodden in the first one. There is the same overabundance of information, a display of learnedness mixed with pedantry, a union of the relevant to the trivial; but notwithstanding its ocean of references, the *Lexikon* is easy to use. The only significant departure from earlier practices concerns the accentuation of Latin loanwords, where the editors generally follow the suggestions of J. Kramer, *ZPE* 123 (1998), 129–34.

A few additional examples have accrued since the publication of the *Lexikon*, cf. the on-line wordlists at http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/fak8/papyWL/WL.pdf. One may also notice a recent publication on the issue, G. Menci, *PLup* 9 (2000), 279–95.

I append some notes on a few entries that attracted my interest. It is curious that certain Latin loanwords, such as βούλλα (or σιγίλλιον), are first attested in papyri of the early Islamic period. But this does not apply to βερεδάριος, whose instances should

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.92 Published online by Cambridge University Press