

tebetalende, stemmeberettigede gårdbrukere. Det jeg imidlertid savner i denne oppsummeringen er en diskusjon av makt som et motiv for en integrering. Hvem innordnet seg etter hvem, og hvem presset seg frem på bekostning av hvem. For å komme tilbake til en egen kjepphest – hvem ble dannet av hvem til et politisk individ?

Trond Bjerås sin avhandling er et viktig bidrag, og kan sees i sammenheng med den etter hvert store forskningsproduksjonen på folkelig offentlig deltakelse i dens mange former i perioden rundt 1814, som belyser denne delen av norsk historie. Den føyer seg også fint inn i en nordisk forskningstradisjon, hvor vekten har vært i Sverige. Han utfordrer også hegemonimodellen som har dominert synet på enevoldsstaten under 1700-tallet, men er kanskje mer nyansert enn andre har vært den senere tiden. Han viser i sin avhandling viktigheten av at den normative makten må sees i sammenheng med den normative praksisen – og vice versa – for å få forståelse for maktens forutsetninger og bruk.

*Marthe Hommerstad*

Elena Dahlberg, *The Voice of a Waning Empire: Selected Latin Poetry of Magnus Rönnow from the Great Northern War. Edited, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary, by Elena Dahlberg*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Latina Upsaliensia 34 (Uppsala: Department of Linguistics and Philology, 2014). 385 pp.

What do we mean by “Swedish literature”? Do we mean literature written in Swedish or literature written by Swedes? The answer that we give to that question has a huge impact on the extent of our national literature, since a considerable part of the literature written by Swedes was, as late as the middle of the eighteenth century, written not in Swed-

ish but in Latin. There is a close connection between Sweden’s short but intense period as a Great Power and Swedish Neo-Latin literature, which often aimed at praising the sovereign. Even if the chain of causes and events in the gradual disappearance of Latin as a living means of expression has never been thoroughly explored, it is clear that there was by the end of the Great Power period also an end of the popularity of propaganda literature written in Latin. When ideas and ideals changed, Swedish Latin literature was regarded as obsolete, still later it became literally incomprehensible, and authors who had expressed themselves mainly in Latin gradually sunk into oblivion. One example of such an author was Magnus Rönnow. It was not until the end of the twentieth century, with the wave of scholars interested in Neo-Latin, that these forgotten authors slowly started to emerge into the light again. There is still much to be done in this field, and Elena Dahlberg’s doctoral thesis on Magnus Rönnow is a very welcome contribution.

Who was Magnus Rönnow? He was the son of a clergyman in Åhus in Scania, born in 1665, died in 1735. Thanks to generous royal grants (his father seems to have done Charles XI a favour), he got a very thorough education and could make extensive travels to Germany and the Netherlands. Rönnow became a renowned Hebraist and obtained the position as royal translator, *Translator regni*. He later worked as a secretary of protocols in Charles XII’s chancellery in Lund, but saw himself forced to leave the post, probably because of low or non-existent wages. Disappointed and disillusioned, shortly after the death of Charles XII he left Sweden for England, where he spent the rest of his life. Rönnow was held in great esteem as a Latin poet by his contemporaries, and as late as in 1768 Samuel Älf, a keen collector of Swedish Latin poetry, planned to make an edition of his works (see Dahlberg 2014 p. 25). Times had changed, however, and general interest in Swedish Latin poetry was

waning and Rönnow's poems, as we can see, had to wait until 2014 to be made available to a greater public.

Elena Dahlberg's doctoral thesis consists of two major and almost equally long parts. The first one is a detailed introduction to Magnus Rönnow and his works and to Neo-Latin poetry of the times of the Great Northern War in general. In the second part, Dahlberg gives us editions of 11 of Rönnow's poems (he wrote around 190) together with translations into English and detailed commentaries on the content of each poem. The book also contains indices. Dahlberg writes in her "Aim" that her purpose, apart from offering a critical edition of 11 of Rönnow's poems, is to "give a picture of Rönnow's poetry in a broad comparative perspective" (Dahlberg 2014 p. 17). Let us state already here that Dahlberg fulfils every promise given in the "Aim" and more than that. Dahlberg's thesis is a very thorough study, and her extensive reading in Swedish, Danish and Russian Neo-Latin literature makes it possible for her to put Rönnow's poetry in its proper context in a way that very few, if any, other scholars could have done. As in every scholarly work, there are a (very) few things that could have been handled differently (and we will look at them briefly further on), but these are only details. The thesis as a whole is solid, learned and in many ways groundbreaking.

But let us go back to the beginning of the thesis. Dahlberg gives a description of Rönnow's life (the description is short, since the sources are few) and the very little scholarly research that has been done on him before. After Samuel Älf's aborted editorial project, Rönnow seems to have been entirely forgotten until Kurt Johannesson mentioned him in his *I polstjärnans tecken: Studier i svensk barock* (1968), where he referred to him as the most outstanding poet of his time (Dahlberg 2014 p. 25). Although Rönnow has not been absent from the general surveys of Swedish Neo-Latin literature that have been written since then,

Dahlberg's thesis is the first extensive study and modern edition of Rönnow's work. Here, as elsewhere in the thesis, Dahlberg shows that she is well read in the relevant secondary literature.

Dahlberg has found some 190 poems that can be attributed to Rönnow (in some cases, the attribution to Rönnow is not absolutely clear). Out of these, 170 (printed and unprinted) make up part of Samuel Älf's collection, today kept at the Linköping Diocesan Library. Älf had originally planned to edit not only Rönnow's oeuvre, but also works by many other today forgotten Swedish Latin poets. Dahlberg provides no list of the titles of all of Rönnow's 190 poems in her thesis (as she could, perhaps, have done), but she gives a brief overview of their major themes. As the time of the Great Nordic War seems to have been Rönnow's most prolific period, it is quite natural that Dahlberg, aiming at giving a representative selection, has chosen the 11 poems in her edition from this period. On pp. 30–34 in her thesis, she offers a very useful table of the 11 poems, showing for each one of them the title, year of composition, metre, number of verses, libraries and archives where it can be found and attribution. It would, however, have been very helpful if this table had also contained information on where the poems (i.e. the poems that do not only exist in manuscript) were printed. Generally speaking, one could have wished for more practical information on the printing: who the printers were, who financed the printing etc., and also on how Rönnow's and his contemporary colleagues' poetry was financed and how the poems spread. The lack of information is, however, most certainly due to the fact that we simply cannot know.

The following sections, which treat the historical background of the poems and the role of the Latin propaganda literature during the Great Nordic War, are doubtlessly some of the most interesting and important in the

book. Dahlberg stresses the importance of the often overlooked Latin literature within the national literatures during this period. Dividing the Latin propaganda literature into official polemical documents and occasional literature (fictive letters, allegories and orations and poems), she emphasizes the connection between the occasional literature, often eulogizing the sovereign, and the times of autocracy. A modern scholar may sometimes wonder if these glorifying and stylistically very complicated poems actually had any readers even in the seventeenth century. Dahlberg shows that they certainly had and that these poems played a most important role in the political debate of the time. Rönnow's poem *Hercules Genuinus* (no. 7 in Dahlberg's edition) made the Danish authorities so enraged that it was used as one of the reasons (or rather pretexts) for declaring war against Sweden in 1709 (Dahlberg 2014 pp. 47 and 268–279). One of the great strengths of Dahlberg's text here is that she does not only discuss the Swedish propaganda literature in Latin, but also the Latin propaganda literature written by representatives of the other side, i.e. by Russians and Danes. There have been studies before comparing Swedish and Danish Latin propaganda, but as far as I know Dahlberg is the first scholar ever to compare Latin propaganda literature written by Swedes and Russians.

From the historical and political context, Dahlberg moves on to the question of ideas and sources for this kind of literature. She discusses the roles played by ancient topoi, princely virtues, Christian motifs and Gothic references. While it is quite natural that Antiquity was a constant place of reference, it is very interesting that the Neo-Latin authors – as shown by Dahlberg – made a point of making their contemporary heroes surpass the old ones and antiquity itself. This is clearly seen in Rönnow's poem on Charles XII as the new Hercules that was mentioned above. In this section as well as in all the others, Dahlberg

uses numerous examples not only from Rönnow but also from his contemporaries. The lack of secondary literature makes it crucial to go directly to the sources, and that is exactly what Dahlberg does.

In the excellent section on princely virtues, Dahlberg's text causes a small confusion concerning the use of the word "Reformed". Dahlberg compares Humanist mirrors of princes (for example Erasmus' *Institutio principis Christiani*) with what she calls "Reformed" ones. The context makes it more likely that she rather means "Protestant".

Moving on to Rönnow's poetical models, Dahlberg claims (successfully, as I think) that his chief model among the Classical poets was Horace. The list of lines borrowed directly from Horace (p. 110) is perhaps not very impressive (it would be more surprising if there were no borrowings from this great author), but the argumentation is sound and convincing. While the connection between Rönnow and Horace is interesting, it is perhaps still more important that Rönnow's contemporaries compared him to the English Neo-Latin poet George Buchanan (1506–1582) and his Polish-Lithuanian colleague Casimir Mathias Sarbiewski (1595–1649) (Dahlberg p. 101). Very far from being unoriginal imitators of ancient authors, the Neo-Latin poets were innovative writers in their own right and regarded as such by their contemporaries.

For all its inspiration from ancient sources, Baroque literature is something very different from Horace and Vergil. Dahlberg aptly characterizes the Baroque style of writing as "full of metaphors, bombastic epithets, metonymical phrases, allegory and emblematic language, all these devices of imaginative language being borrowed from or developed from ancient literature, but enhanced and exaggerated in the typical Baroque manner" (p. 111). In describing Rönnow's style, Dahlberg concentrates on his use of allegorical language and rhetorical tropes and figures. The allegorical language in

particular is absolutely crucial for the understanding of the propaganda literature of the time. Dahlberg gives a good description of the origins and use of the well-known Swedish Lion, Russian Eagle and Danish Elephant, but she also discusses Rönnow's new (?) inventions the Russian Aurochs and the Danish Tiger. Dahlberg also uses visual arts (photos of Swedish and Russian medals from the time), and it is striking how well Rönnow's text and the images on the medals illustrate each other.

Rönnow's Latin is described in some very thorough chapters, where Dahlberg (among other things) makes lists of Neo-Latin words that are normally not found in dictionaries. These lists can be very useful for scholars who, quite excusably, do not know that *Codanus sinus* means "the Baltic Sea" and *Chanus* "Khan".

We have now arrived at the second part of the thesis, the edition of Rönnow's poems with translation and commentary. Dahlberg keeps close to the text of the original (print or autograph/manuscript copy), keeping the spelling and some of the typographical features. The only change of any importance is that she has modernized the punctuation. As all editors of Neo-Latin texts know, this is a question where there are two different policies: to modernize or not to modernize... Both policies have advantages as well as disadvantages, and as long as the editor is consistent, the one is probably as good as the other.

Through the 11 poems in the edition, we can follow the rise and fall of the reign of Charles XII. The subject of poem no. 1, *Ad Carolum XII Augustissimum*, is the failed Saxon siege of Riga in 1700. In nos. 2, *In Victoriam Narvensem* (the longest poem, 496 verses) and 3, *Ode ad Urbem Narvam*, Rönnow eulogizes the King's victory at Narva. In nos. 4–5, *De Triumpho Clitoviensi* and *Super Triumphum Clitzoviensem*, the subject is the Swedish victory over the Saxon-Polish army at Kliszow in 1701. No. 6, *In Thorunium*, is about the surrender

of Thorn (Torún) in 1703. The above-mentioned *Hercules Genuinus* (no. 7), where Charles XII is called the real Hercules (and the ancient myth is called "nothing but a fairy tale of the poets") has a subtitle where the Swedish king is called "the Emperor of Great Scandinavia": a grave provocation against the Danes. In no. 8, *Salva Scania*, the hero is not Charles XII, but his general Magnus Stenbock, who has defeated the Danes in the Battle of Helsingborg. No. 9, *In Imagines Politicas*, is a deliberately intriguing poem aimed against a Pro-Russian poet (see below). In no. 10, *In triumphum ... prope Urbem Gadebusch*, another of Stenbock's victories is eulogized. In the eleventh and last poem, *In auctos numero hostes Carolinos*, written in 1715, the poet expresses concern as he counts Charles XII's many enemies and wishes for peace.

The editions and English translations of the poems are very solid. Anyone who has tried to translate Neo-Latin texts, especially Baroque poetry, knows that it is a most trying and time-consuming task, but Dahlberg succeeds beautifully: she makes the poems perfectly comprehensible to a modern reader, and the text never sounds far-fetched or ridiculous. The commentaries, crucial for the understanding of most of the poems, are very informative, and the argumentation is generally sound and convincing. In the commentary on the very interesting no. 9, *In Imagines politicas*, one could perhaps have wished for a deeper discussion concerning the "little book" ridiculed by Rönnow. It seems perfectly clear that its author was Feofan Prokopovich, but can we really assume with perfect certainty that his *libellus* was *De arte poetica*? This book was, as Dahlberg writes, not yet published at the time of the composition of Rönnow's poem: is it possible that Rönnow was referring to another book by Prokopovich (today unknown), a book still more provocative in Swedish eyes? This is, however, just a speculation.

Magnus Rönnow was indeed the voice of a waning empire, this empire representing both Sweden as a Great Power and the empire of Neo-Latin poetry. In Elena Dahlberg's doctoral thesis, the voice of Magnus Rönnow, long silent, can be heard again. The thesis is an excellent example of modern Neo-Latin scholarship. Let us hope that it will inspire other scholars to explore other neglected authors from the Great Power period and let the Swedish writers that did not write in Swedish once again be a part of our national literature.

Johanna Svensson

Tilda Maria Forselius, *God dag, min läsare!: bland berättare, brevskrivare, boktryckare och andra bidragsgivare i tidig svensk veckopress 1730–1773*, Eureka. Ellerströms akademiska nr. 42 (Lund: Ellerström, 2015). 327 s.

Tilda Maria Forselius arbete undersöker de mediehistoriska förutsättningarna för den framväxande periodiska pressen i Sverige under frihetstiden och tidig gustaviansk tid. Med fokus på hur brevet användes och varierades över tid i svenska tidskrifter vill Forselius ge nya perspektiv både på skrifternas och på brevformens förändringar och medialisering under 1700-talet. Boken är en omarbetad version av avhandlingen från 2014.

I centrum står ett antal svenska veckoskrifter från 1730-, 1750- och 1770-talen. De har rötterna i den så kallade Spectator-genren. Joseph Addisons och Richard Steeles nyskapande mediala form för veckoskrifter för den brittiska marknaden, där humor och moral kombinerades i en läsarvänlig och säljande form. Det svenska materialet består av nio veckoskrifter från 1730-talet, med ett särskilt fokus på Edvard och Carl Carlssons *Sedolärande Mercurius* (1730-1731) och Olof Dalins *Then Swänska Argus* (1732-1734). Därutöver behandlas Carl

Christoffer Gjörwells *Bref Om Blandade Ämnen* (1754), samt Catharina Ahlgrens *Brefwäxling* (1772-1773, tre delar).

Tidskrifterna har tidigare uppmärksamats av forskningen, men Forselius anger tre syften för sin studie som komplement till, och i flera fall med en polemisk udd mot, den tidigare forskningens slutsatser. Huvudsyftet är att placera dem i ett mediehistoriskt sammanhang, ett annat att särskilt undersöka de remediade breven i tidskrifterna. Ett tredje syfte är att se hur brevetteori och praxis skiftar över tid och hur detta återspeglas i de publicerade breven under 1750- och 1770-talen jämfört med 1730-talet.

Den centrala frågeställningen rör hur brevformen användes för olika ändamål i tidskrifterna. En teoretisk utgångspunkt finner hon i tanken om remediering: Jay David Bolter och Richard Grusins begrepp för ett mediums representation i ett annat medium, det vill säga relationen mellan ett äldre och ett nytt medium (*Remediation, Understanding New Media*, 1999). Det finns flera studier av äldre press som utgår från dessa perspektiv, men Forselius' är den första undersökning som kombinerar brevet och den periodiska pressen.

Arbetet inleds med en genomgång av Spectator-genrens uppkomst och spridning genom Europa, de svenska förhållandena, samt en läsning av förorden till *Mercurius* och *Argus*. Slutsatsen blir att tidskrifterna innehåller en ny form av tilltal, vilket anges inbjuda till dialog, men även att det finns ett exkluderande tilltal där mankön och svenskhet utgör ramen för gemenskap. I kapitel 3-6 sätts tidskrifterna in i ett mediehistoriskt sammanhang. Här flyttas uppmärksamheten från den tidigare forskningens fokus på upphovsmän till produktionen och distributionen av skrifterna, läskunnigheten, läsvanor, censursämbetet, kaffehusen, samt de samtida medier som veckoskrifterna konkurrerade med.

Kapitel 7 och 8 behandlar det andra syftet: att beskriva, tolka och diskutera brevens inne-