

na, och i ordningsmaktens och rättsväsendets organisation, ger samtidigt användbara insikter i dåtidens samhälle. Tesen om moderniseringsprocessen är hårt driven och innebär vissa risktaganden, men framstår i grund och botten som bärkraftig.

*Mathias Cederholm*

Josef Eskhult, *Andreas Norrelius' Latin Translation of Johan Kemper's Hebrew Commentary on Matthew: Edited with Introduction and Philological Commentary*, Studia Latina Upsaliensia 32 (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2007). 568 pp.

This dissertation is a polyglot's dream. Written in English by a Swedish doctoral student, it is a philological study of a Latin translation of a commentary on Matthew that was originally written in Hebrew by an ex-rabbi who used the Syriac version (the Peshitta) of the Greek Gospel as the basis for his commentary.

Johan Christian Jacob Kemper (1670–1716) was born Moses Aaron to Jewish parents in the city of Kraków. As a young man he received a thorough training in Talmudic studies and went on to become a rabbi. His disappointment following a failed prophecy that the Messiah would arrive on earth in 1695 led to a spiritual crisis for the young rabbi and a year later he converted to Lutheranism, was baptised, and renamed. For a short time thereafter he taught at the University of Altdorf in Bavaria where he came into contact with students from Sweden. He eventually moved there and in 1701 began to teach Hebrew at Uppsala University. Much of Kemper's scholarship centered around the Kabbalah and he wrote several commentaries on the Zohar. In 1702 he produced a Hebrew translation of Matthew, the synoptic Gospel with the most references to the Old Testament, along with a commen-

tary a year later entitled *Me'irat 'Enayim* ('Enlightenment of the Eyes').

Eskult's dissertation makes a strong case that this last work deserves to be set in a number of larger contexts such as post-Reformation rabbinical studies, the history of the Kabbalah, Pietistic interest in the conversion of the Jews, 'philosemitism' in the Baroque period, and the rich tradition of Hebrew philology at Lutheran universities. It is a fascinating work. Kemper combines traditional Jewish exegetical techniques such as *gematria* and *notarikon* with the traditional Kabbalistic emphasis on levels of meaning and Christological hermeneutical principles. Along with Abraham Calov, for example, Kemper interprets many of the Psalms, including Psalm 72, as direct and literal Messianic prophecies *sine typo*, that is to say, without allegory and without any more immediate historical application (p. 79–80). Of special interest are his frequent references to the Targumim, Jewish prayer books, and the Talmud to illustrate Judaic elements in the Gospel of Matthew such as the parables and proverbs.

Kemper's commentary was translated into Latin as *Illuminatio oculorum* by one of his students, Andreas Norrelius (1679–1749). Norrelius grew up in the parish of Norrby (the origin of his Latinised surname), where his father, Olof Kråke, was a Lutheran clergyman. He enrolled at the University of Uppsala where he studied Latin, Greek, and Hebrew and wrote a dissertation on early Jewish schools. After graduating with a Master's degree in 1710 and pursuing further studies in the Netherlands, Norrelius returned to Uppsala to teach in the Faculty of Philosophy. In the following years, he applied several times without success for a professorship at the same university, and was finally appointed chief librarian in 1735. Sometime after 1747 the now elderly Norrelius completed his Latin version of his late teacher's unusual scholarly undertaking. Whether his translation of a Hebrew commen-

tary on Matthew merits a dissertation of this size and scope, or whether this is an exercise in what Ludwig Hatvany has dismissively described as 'Die Wissenschaft des nicht Wissenswertes', is a judgment that will depend to some extent on the reader's inherent interest in Neo-Latin philology.

For of all of the languages mentioned in the first paragraph of this review, it is Latin, to be precise, Neo-Latin, that is this dissertation's real subject. Once Renaissance humanists began to return *ad fontes*, that is to say to the great wellsprings of Latinity (Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Quintilian, et al.), they began to distinguish their own Latin prose and verse from the kind of Latin that had characterised the preceding centuries (variously described as 'vulgar', 'medieval', or 'ecclesiastical'). The result was a new kind of Latin, classical in its clarity and succinctness but adapted for modern use. Well into the eighteenth century, Neo-Latin continued to prove its utility for serious international communication. For scholars, theologians, and scientists from countries like Sweden and others whose vernacular languages were not widely known outside national boundaries, Neo-Latin proved to be especially valuable.

Unlike the Ciceronian purists of the Renaissance for whom the great Roman orator was not just a *lumen* (light) but a *numen* (divinity), Norrelius followed the lead of patristic Latin authors like Lactantius and Augustine who appreciated the lofty achievements of classical Latinity but were unafraid to adopt neologisms as needed (p. 181). Norrelius uses the technical word *concionator*, for instance, in his translation of Matthew's description of John the Baptist's ministry in the wilderness: *Vox concionatoris est in deserto*. In ancient Latin usage the word appears only rarely (Cicero uses it to refer to a demagogue), but the word's semantic range was extended during the medieval period and by the sixteenth century it began to be used almost exclusively to refer to the

office and function of the Protestant preacher (p. 445).

Matthew's Gospel was heavily influenced by the paratactic structure of the Hebrew language, a style that is reflected in many biblical translations over the centuries, including the Vulgate. Jerome believed that even the word order of the original Scriptures was divinely inspired (p. 273). While respecting the distinctive nature of scriptural vocabulary and style, Norrelius' biblical translations, by contrast, tend to be more classicising than Jerome's. He freely disregards Hebraic word order, avoids verbal repetition, and not infrequently chooses to employ a poetic or even an archaic Latin word instead of a simpler, more common one. To analyse in detail the vocabulary, syntax, and style of this Neo-Latin work, synchronically and diachronically, is the main object and achievement of Eskhult's dissertation.

Neo-Latin is a relatively new field of research and as a discipline it continues to mature. While there has been some scholarly research into the Latin works of such well-known poets as Petrarch, Helius Eobanus Hessus, and John Milton, its sophistication and extent comes nowhere close to matching the scholarship devoted to the Latin poets of the Augustan period or even the so-called Silver Age. The voluminous Latin prose that was produced during the early modern period, much of it fairly sophisticated or even technical in nature, has been even less thoroughly studied than the poetry. The Latin works of historical celebrities from Erasmus and Martin Luther to Emanuel Swedenborg and Carl Linnaeus have attracted some scholarly attention, but there are thousands of less illustrious authors from this same period whose potentially important contributions to the European cultural tradition remain shrouded in the regrettable obscurity of the Latin language. Like Homer's 'strengthless dead', these authors and their works await the painstaking administrations

of philologists like the renowned Neo-Latin scholar Hans Helander who directed this dissertation, and dedicated graduate students like Josef Eskhult to animate them sufficiently to take their rightful place in the cultural continuum to which they belong.

Carl P. E. Springer

Andreas Hellerstedt, *Ödets teater: ödesföreställningar i Sverige vid 1700-talets början* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2009). 264 s.

Fortuna står och balanserar på ett ostadigt klot, lyckohjulet snurrar, ödet är nyckfullt och förunderligt. I Andreas Hellerstedts avhandling, framlagd våren 2009 vid avdelningen för idéhistoria vid Stockholms universitet, diskuteras och tolkas sådana föreställningar om öde, försyn och lycka i Sverige i början av 1700-talet, vilka på ett genomgripande sätt hade en stor betydelse för den tidigmoderna människans förståelse av sin tillvaro. Undersökningen avgränsas till framför allt perioden 1700–1721, tiden för Karl XII:s regering, det stora nordiska kriget och stormaktstidens sammanbrott. Det var en orolig tid brännmärkt av förödande krig, missväxt, svält, pestepidemier och ekonomisk nedgång. Men det var samtidigt också en idéhistoriskt spännande tid med förändringar i tanken, nya strömningar inom religion och filosofi, och intressanta ansatser till en naturvetenskaplig uppblomstring.

Tankar kring ödet, försynen och lyckan var centrala i tiden. Avhandlingens mål sägs delvis vara att just visa att så var fallet. Föreställningar om ödet, lyckan och försynen skapade mening, de var centrala filosofiska begrepp, ingick som en del av metafysiken, och var oundgängliga inom moralfilosofin och den politiska filosofin. Ödet diskuterades i den lärda världen, inom teologi och filosofi, men ödesföreställningar var också viktiga för den enskilda män-

niskan i hennes förståelsen av sitt eget livsöde. I inledningen skriver Hellerstedt: "Att studera begreppen försyn, öde och lycka innebär för mig att ta historien på allvar." (s. 12) Det var ämnen som betydde mycket för dåtidens människor. Hellerstedt försöker förstå varför de var betydelsefulla, vilken funktion de hade i deras samhälle, som ett led i en strävan efter att förstå en tid på dess egna villkor. Det är en sympatisk hållning som med intresse uppmärksammar vad de människor som då levde tänkte, och som inte är ute efter att pådyvla dem vår tids dom, vår tids uppfattningar.

Hellerstedts avhandling kan delvis sägas utgöra en begreppshistoria. Han studerar vilka betydelser människor har lagt i begreppen, varifrån de har hämtat dem och hur de har använt dem. Vidare undersöker han i vilka sammanhang dessa begrepp tillämpades och varför de var användbara och vanligt förekommande. De begrepp som står i fokus för Hellerstedts framställning är närmare bestämt *försyn*, *öde* och *lycka* som går tillbaka på latinets *providentia*, *fatum* och *fortuna*. Även slumpen, *casus*, tillhör denna grupp av begrepp. Med samlingsbeteckningen *ödesföreställningar* betecknar han de begrepp som används för att beskriva något som styr världen och människorna. Frågan gäller nu hur och varför dessa begrepp användes under den period som studeras. Hellerstedt försöker med andra ord förklara det tidiga 1700-talets användning av begreppen, särskilt i fråga om ödesföreställningars roll i krig, politik och samhällstänkande. Fyra frågor ställer han till materialet: huruvida ödet eller lyckan användes som en syndabock då Gud inte kunde hållas ansvarig; hur stormaktens sammanbrott hantades, förklarades och gjordes meningsfull genom föreställningar om ödet; vilka möjligheter man ansåg att den enskilda människan hade att påverka sin egen situation; och slutligen vilka ödesföreställningar som ansågs felaktiga och varför de ansågs vara det.

Om man ska försöka formulera kärnan i den problematik som Hellerstedt ger sig i kast