

Någon utpräglad ortodox teolog var Tengström dock inte, varken vid denna tid eller senare. Han påverkades tidigt av samtidens neologi och intog under hela livet en förmedlande ståndpunkt mellan gammalt och nytt. Tengström menade att arvsyndsläran borde avskaffas, men var som predikant föga kontroversiell. Han undvek helt enkelt att predika över vad han betraktade som överspelade eller mindre viktiga ämnen, såsom arvsyndsläran och underberättelserna. Även sakramenten hörde till de ämnen Tengström sällan berörde.

Betecknande för Tengström är även att han såg fursten, och inte, som normalt inom svenska kyrkan, ärkebiskopen, som kyrkans överhuvud. Prästen var för Tengström i tidstypisk anda i första hand en ämbetsman med statens bästa för ögonen. På vårvintern 1803 utnämnde Gustav IV Adolf Tengström till biskop i Åbo. En tid av praktisk och reforminriktad verksamhet vidtog nu för Tengströms del. Han lade ned åtskillig tid på förslagen till ny psalmbok och kyrkohandbok, och reformerade präst- och lärarutbildningen. Från och med 1808 bedömde Tengström skilsmässan mellan den västra och den östra riksdelen som ett politiskt faktum, och inledde, för att göra det bästa av situationen för sin egen, den evangelisk-lutherska kyrkans och Finlands del, ett samarbete med den ryska ockupationsmakten, som kom att ge honom ett avgörande politiskt inflytande under de följande decennierna.

Inom idé- och lärdomshistorisk forskning brukar man av ålder tala om de vetenskapliga dygderna *lärdom och inlevelse*. Även om Gustav Björkstrand själv inte är idéhistoriker är hans Tengström-biografi skriven i denna tradition och baserad på ett digert empiriskt material. Varken på Björkstrands lärdom eller hans inlevelseförmåga finns det något att anmärka. Läsaren anar att det finns en valfrändskap mellan författaren och hans forskningsobjekt. Det faktum att de båda varit verksamma och gjort karriär inom samma områden: kyrkan, universitetet och politiken, förstärker sannolikt

detta drag. Ibland skulle jag önska ett litet mer kritiskt och distanserat förhållningssätt till föremålet för biografien från författarens sida. Sammanfattningsvis vill jag dock framhålla att Gustav Björkstrand kröner sin mångåriga bekantskap med biskops- och professorskollegan Tengström med ett imponerande verk.

Anna Lindén

Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal & Charles Fantazzi (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, vol. I: *Macropaedia* and vol. II: *Micropaedia* (Leiden: Brill, 2014). xliii + xv + 1,245 pp.

Neo-Latin Studies, or studies of the Latin language as it was used from the Renaissance onwards, has established itself as a vibrant sub-discipline of Classical Philology. Whereas most Latin language courses still focus on Cicero, Caesar, Virgil, Horace and their contemporaries, especially over the last half-century an increasing amount of research has been directed towards later periods, where the supply of un- (or at least under-)explored texts, themes and authors is still abundant. Neo-Latin scholars would initially fish in the very earliest early modern period, where great masters like Petrarch, Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus of Rotterdam yielded – and indeed still yield – massive ‘catches’. In recent decades, however, the net has been cast far wider, both chronologically and in terms of genres.

What, then, is the scope of Brill's new *Encyclopaedia*? In essence, it aims to cover no less than the state-of-the-art of the entire field of Neo-Latin studies, as seen through the lenses of eighty individual scholars. Whereas the *Macropaedia* treats broader questions in depth (60 entries, 940 pages in total), the *Micropaedia* (145 entries, 326 pages) provides dense information on more limited subject matters such as individual authors, countries or gen-

res. The editors have no doubt had their hands full. In the introduction, they compare their own enterprise with the essentially one-man achievement by Jozef IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (1st edn 1977, 2nd edn in two vols, 1990–98, vol. 2 co-authored with Dirk Sacré). Since then, the field has expanded so much that ‘it became impossible for one person – any one person – really to master the entire field’, the editors argue (p. xix). Likewise, no single reviewer can do justice to Brill’s entire *Encyclopaedia*, not even a reviewer who wishes to narrow his scope to articles dealing with the eighteenth century alone. What follows can only be a patchy sketch.

Throughout the Early Modern period, the various branches of the sciences developed specialized terminology *in tandem* with the use of innovations such as the *telescopium* (c. 1610), *microscopium* (c. 1625), *barometrum* (c. 1660) and so forth. Hans Helander describes this development in his survey of Neologisms in Neo-Latin. The only thing I miss in his article are translations of his – often lengthy – quotations, a service provided by most of the book’s contributors. Use of Latin was of course never limited to science and technology alone, as Jennifer Morrish shows in another magisterial survey, of Neo-Latin Fiction. It is reassuring to see that *Nicolai Klimii iter subterraneum* (1741) receives ample treatment, although when Morrish asks for more critical editions of Neo-Latin novels (who could disagree?), the recent online edition by Karen Skovgaard-Petersen *et al.* should at least have been mentioned. Since women as a rule were not allowed at universities and elite schools, they were not supposed to know Latin either, a circumstance which probably helped render Erotic and Pornographic Literature a particularly thriving Neo-Latin subgenre, as described in an entry by Karl Enenkel. In the aftermath of the Age of Discoveries, the Neo-Latin world expanded to Asia (which has a special article by Zweder von Martels) and North America (Ann Blair). Far earlier, of course, it

had taken root in northernmost Europe as well. Minna Skafte Jensen has written the entry on Neo-Latin literature in the Nordic countries. She begins by defining the area as ‘Denmark with Norway and Iceland under its sway, and Sweden with Finland’ (p. 1,098). While her presentation is succinct and informative, she could have included such parts of the Baltics and northern Germany as were ruled from Copenhagen or Stockholm, at least the Latinate environments at the Universities of Kiel and Greifswald. A similar article by Nikolaus Thurn on The German Regions wisely neglects political borders when encompassing German minorities in *inter alia* post-Ottoman regions (Transylvania) and Russia (Saint Petersburg). Harder to fathom is that author’s choice in setting the chronological end of his survey to the year 1700. If there was one cultural area in Europe where Latin did not lose its relevance with the advent of the century of Enlightenment, it would be the Germanic world. Thurn’s dividing line becomes even more puzzling when considering that France, where the decline of Latin took place far earlier, has been allotted not only one, but *two* separate entries dealing with The Seventeenth Century and Later Periods (by Ingrid De Smet and Jon Balsarak respectively). One may also ask how it came to pass that Emanuel Swedenborg is the only Nordic Neo-Latin author with an entry of his own, whereas the internationally renowned Carolus Linnaeus and Ludovicus Holberg receive no separate treatment. Such inconsistencies are obviously unavoidable in a multi-authored project like this. A sympathetic reader will always rejoice over the subject matters that are actually included, rather than deploring those that have been left out.

Historians tend to think of Diderot and D’Alembert whenever they reflect on the genre that has now found recent success in the form of Wikipedia and similar free-to-use services on the web. The enlightened *philosophes* assembled new and innovative knowledge in a format that was, if not new, then at least forcefully

employed. An entry by John Considine, on Encyclopaedias and Dictionaries, reminds us of the Jesuit Maichael Pexenfelder, whose *Apparatus eruditionis* was first published in 1670 and subsequently reprinted throughout the eighteenth century. Even Leibniz envisioned a grand Encyclopaedia project – in Latin. Similarly, Johan Ihre, Johan Öhrling and other lexicographers used Latin when editing their Swedish and Sami dictionaries. Latin and the Enlightenment is the subject of a particularly compelling discussion by Yashmin Haskell, who effectively reassesses notions of Latin as a dead language of no relevance to progressive thinkers at the dawn of modernity. Although Haskell's examples are all from non-Nordic countries, their relevance appears self-evident. Other contributions that deconstruct the dead-language metaphor are entries on Conversational Latin: 1650 to the Present (by Milena Minkova); Latin Words to Music (Rudolf Rasch); Neo-Latin Drama (Jan Bloemendal); Pronunciation (Dirk Sacré); Diplomacy and Court Culture (Erik De Bom), *et cetera*.

The above-mentioned Hans Helander of Uppsala University has been influential in the Nordic countries, with his plea for the study of learned texts from the Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment periods, as a supplement to the widespread focus on imaginative literature (cf. his 'Neo-Latin studies: Significance and prospects', *Symbolae Osloenses*, vol. 76, 2001). Indeed, the vast amount of academic dissertations, pamphlets and journal articles that were produced in Latin during a time that most readers of this Yearbook will be familiar with, deserve better than being shaken off our common stock of sources by the tag 'latinlærdóm' (i.e. not-worth-reading). Nowadays, you no longer need to be a giant of Holberg's stature in order to have your Latin *opuscula* placed under scrutiny (although it helps, as witness the Holberg Project); also, less epitomized men such as the historian of the Viking World Tormod Torfæus (1636–1719), the Orientalist Andreas Nor-

relius (1679–1750) or the Finnish humanist Henrik Gabriel Porthan (1739–1804), to name only three examples, have attracted considerable interest from Neo-Latin scholars in recent years. You need not even be a man in order to be remembered for your Latin writings, as Jane Stevenson's seminal study on *Women Latin Poets* (Oxford, 2005) proves. Stevenson, moreover, is the author of several gender-problematizing entries in the book under review.

Becoming a Neo-Latin scholar is no easy task. With reference to the late Philip Ford, it requires 'a thorough grounding, both linguistic and literary, in classical literature, while at the same time being well versed in the vernacular literature and contemporary history of the countries on whose authors [one is] working' (Demmy Verbeke's entry on the 'History of Neo-Latin Studies', p. 917). Those patient enough to build the necessary skills, however, will have plenty of materials to explore and contexts to restore. *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World* is both an excellent guide for further research and an imposing statement of what has so far been achieved.

Per Pippin Aspaas

Guðrún Ása Grímsdóttir (ed.), *Ættartölusafnrit séra Þórðar Jónssonar í Hítardal I–II*. Ritröð Stofnunar Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum 70 (Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum, 2008). 1,012 pp.

Genealogy is an ancient pursuit. In the most basic terms it revolves around human relationships and how people relate to one another, in the past and present. Its relevance to human society has been ever-changing, as it has journeyed from antiquity towards present times. In the not so distant past, genealogy could attach a man to heavy burdens and obligations. For instance, the duty of vengeance; or