

suicide is instead credited three times to Vitellius. Thus, the more advanced students of the subject matter are advised to always examine the Greek original before making any judgments about Petrus' work.

In addition to these minor mistakes in translation, there are a few emendations to Petrus' text that, if taken as such, would affect our understanding of the quality of the lost *History*, and also of Petrus himself as a historian. As an example, in fragment 51 (p. 52–53) the well-known sayings of Agrippina are indicated to have been stated by Octavia by adding Octavia's name in square brackets to the text. If Petrus truly had meant that these statements were spoken by Octavia, then that would testify either to the poor quality of Petrus as a historian if he had misunderstood his source (Cassius Dio) so badly, or, that he had altered the original text on purpose for some unknown reason. As the Greek text remains today, this emendation follows a strict grammatical indication, but more likely Agrippina had been introduced as the main character of the incident just prior to the selected elements in the excerpt, which makes this emendation rather misleading.

In addition to the bibliography (p. 151–161), the end of the book contains very helpful indexes (p. 162–185) of referred literary sources, people, gods and places mentioned, and correlations of fragment numbering with Müller's edition (*FHG*). All in all, this is a very welcome book, enabling a wider readership to gain easy familiarity with Petrus' work. This is by no means a minor feat, bearing in mind the fragmentary nature of the original Greek and the still ongoing debate regarding Petrus' merits as a historian.

Kai Juntunen
University of Helsinki

ARSENII VETUSHKO-KALEVICH: *Compilation and Translation: Johannes Widekindi and the Origins of his Work on a Swedish-Russian War*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia* 26. Lund University, Lund 2019. ISBN 978-91-88899-69-9; ISBN (e-book) 978-91-88899-70-5. 219 pp. EUR 0.

The works of Johannes Widekindi (ca. 1620–1678), a historiographer of the Swedish Realm, have drawn much less scholarly attention than those of some more famous seventeenth-century royal historiographers, such as Johannes Loccenius and Samuel Pufendorf. Widekindi's literary production is typical of a learned writer of his time, including historiographical works, genealogies, letters, panegyrics, orations and poems, both in Latin and in the vernacular. Among his historiographical writings there are histories of King Gustavus I Vasa (now lost) and King Gustavus II Adolphus. Arsenii Vetushko-Kalevich's doctoral dissertation studies Widekindi's work dealing with Swedish

military campaigns in Russia at the beginning of the seventeenth century, a period of political crisis in Russia known as the Time of Troubles. The work is an important source on the Ingrian War fought between Russia and Sweden in 1610–1617. As a result of the Treaty of Stolbovo (1617), which ended the war, Sweden considerably increased its power in the Baltic Sea region. It gained the provinces of Kexholm and Ingria in the treaty and became one of the largest European empires, thus taking an important step on its way to the Age of Greatness.

Widekindi's work first appeared in Swedish as *Thet Swenska i Ryssland Tijo åhrs Krijgz-Historie* (1671) and then in Latin under the title *Historia Belli Sveco-Moscovitici Decennalis* (1672). In his book, Vetushko-Kalevich shows that the Swedish version was translated from an earlier draft written in Latin, which has not been preserved. The aim of his study is twofold: to investigate Widekindi's sources and his working process as a historiographer and translator. Widekindi's own comments on the working process conveyed in some of his letters add an interesting layer to the analysis. Based on close reading and a rigorous comparison between Widekindi's Latin and Swedish texts and the literary and documentary sources, Vetushko-Kalevich's study not only gives a full account of the sources utilized for *Historia Belli Sveco-Moscovitici*, but also investigates how these sources were used and in that way sheds light on the complicated working process. Moreover, it interestingly illustrates how contemporary learned writers managed their source material, illustrating literary practices such as quoting, copying, rewriting and compiling. The Polish historian Stanisław Kobierzycki, whose work *Historia Vladislai* also deals with the Russian Time of Troubles, turns out to be Widekindi's principal literary source. Most of the other literary sources could be found in the library of the Chancellor of Sweden, Axel Oxenstierna, where Widekindi worked at an earlier stage of his career. As a royal historiographer Widekindi had the documents of the National Archive of Sweden at his disposal; his work contains information on some lost archive materials, which makes the work valuable for modern historians. Even more important for Widekindi's work was the archive of the De la Gardie family, particularly Jacob De la Gardie's reports from Russia. The sources of specific passages of Widekindi's work are thoroughly presented in Appendix 2.

The linguistic analysis carried out with the help of some quantitative indicators (based on TRIX – a translation index method developed by Lars Wollin, 2017) shows that there are many similarities between the Swedish translation of Widekindi's work and other contemporary translations from Latin into Swedish. By analysing the translation technique, Vetushko-Kalevich proves that Widekindi had at least one assistant helping him with the Swedish translation, just as he himself claims in one of his letters. In the literary analysis of the Latin and Swedish versions, Vetushko-Kalevich pays attention to the ideological expressions and textual omissions and transpositions. The study of stylistic differences between versions is particularly illustrative. Not surprisingly, the Latin version is more polished and has more rhetorical embellishment and references to classical Antiquity

than the Swedish one. Widekindi himself commented on this disparity, stating that “the Swedish tongue will lose all the grace of simple and ingenuous sincerity if too much attention is given to its decoration” (Widekindi’s letter to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, translated by Vetushko-Kalevich). More formalistic and more pedagogical, the Swedish version served a purpose that was slightly different from that of the Latin version.

Vetushko-Kalevich has chosen an interesting topic for his research. By examining Widekindi’s Latin and Swedish versions, his work illuminates the coexistence and interaction of Latin and the vernacular in seventeenth-century Sweden. Moreover, his work contributes to the discussion of the relationship between Neo-Latin and vernaculars in the early modern period, an area that has recently gained much attention within Neo-Latin studies. Vetushko-Kalevich’s meticulous analysis of Widekindi’s working process illustrates how translating worked in practice, that is, how knowledge and ideas were transmitted and exchanged between early modern reading communities.

Raija Sarasti-Wilenius
University of Helsinki

Word, phrase, and sentence in relation: Ancient grammars and contexts. Edited by PAOLA COTTICELLI-KURRAS. Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 99. De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2020. ISBN 978-3-11-068796-5; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-11-068804-7. XI, 217 pp. EUR 99.95.

The volume consists of six substantial studies based on the papers given in a workshop at the University of Verona in 2016. It opens with two contributions focusing especially but not solely on Aristotle. The comprehensive article by Paola Cotticelli-Kurras scrutinizes two Aristotelian expressions, *leksis eiromene* and *leksis katestrammene*, occurring in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, 3.9, and used by Aristotle to define two different rhetorical styles. It is her intention to explore to what extent this discussion involves understanding of such syntactic phenomena known to us as coordination and subordination. For this purpose, Cotticelli-Kurras analyses the development of syntactic relations in ancient rhetoric and grammar, tracing the metalanguage arising in these contexts until the times of the Latin rhetoricians Cicero, Quintilian and Aquila. She found no conceptual correspondence between the modern notion of subordination and the ancient use of *hypotaxis*, concluding that “the history of the development of the grammatical and of the rhetorical sphere have gone separate ways with respect to the question of the syntactic structures, even if the former could have had a possible start in the Aristotelian theory of the composition” (p. vi).