

entierungspunkte im Kosmos seines Epigrammcorpus dar. Die Feinheiten der vielschichtigen Beziehungsgeflechte hat die Forschung erst in den vergangenen Jahren intensiver in den Horizont ihrer Interpretationen einbezogen. Stärker und länger als die Vergil- und Ovidphilologie stand die Martialforschung nämlich im Bann einerseits eher werkimmanenter und andererseits eher außerliterarischer Fragestellungen."

The use of endnotes (pp. 139–59) instead of footnotes, an annoying feature of many publications deriving from presses based in the English-speaking world, makes the book cumbersome to read, at least for the more advanced scholar who will usually prefer to have references to secondary literature and other details on the very same page. The final section comprises a short bibliography (pp. 161–67), which also includes some non-English scholarship, but lacks a number of important works.⁶ There is an *index locorum* and a general index (pp. 169–74).

Thorsten Fögen & Keiran Carson

JOHN SKYLITZES: *A Synopsis of Byzantine History 811–1057*. Translation by JOHN WORTLEY, with Introduction by JEAN-CLAUDE CHEYNET and BERNARD FLUSIN and Notes by JEAN-CLAUDE CHEYNET. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2010. ISBN 978-0-521-76705-7. XXXIII, 491 pp. GBP 90, USD 140.

This book is a welcome addition to the translations of mid-Byzantine histories, especially as it is one of our principal sources for the era it covers – from the death of Nikephoros I (811 CE) to the abdication of Michael VI (1057 CE). Skylitzes elaborates in his own *prooemion* that his attempt was to follow the works of George Synkellos and Theophanes the Confessor, whose works he greatly admired, but unlike the works of his predecessors, which were composed as chronicles, Skylitzes instead chose to form his own work along the lines of regular history, although he does provide a plethora of precise dates and different calendar era years for major events. His work was divided into chapters, each covering individual reigns, and the focus of his interest was primarily on the imperial administration. Rather than being a work of a more original nature, the work, as its name (*Synopsis*) implies, was a compilation or a digest of previous works, many of which have not survived to the present day. It is in fact from the work of Skylitzes that we know of many of these Byzantine

⁶ For reasons of space, the following alphabetical list is limited to monographs: G. L. Fain, *Writing Epigrams. The Art of Composition in Catullus, Callimachus and Martial*, Bruxelles 2008; N. Johannsen, *Dichter über ihre Gedichte. Die Prosavorreden in den "Epigrammaton libri" Martials und in den "Silvae" des Statius*, Göttingen 2006; M. Neger, *Martials Dichtergedichte. Das Epigramm als Medium der poetischen Selbstreflexion*, Tübingen 2012; H. P. Obermayer, *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche 'Homosexualität' in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen 1998; M. Salanitro, *L'arguzia di Marziale*, Urbino 2012; J. Scherf, *Untersuchungen zur Buchgestaltung Martials*, München – Leipzig 2001; E. Siedschlag, *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen*, Berlin 1977; D. Vallat, *Onomastique, culture et société dans les Épigrammes de Martial*, Bruxelles 2008; É. Wolff, *Martial ou l'apogée de l'épigramme*, Rennes 2008.

historians and the relative scope of their works, which makes it also extremely important for the study of historiography in the middle Byzantine period.

This translation began as a group effort, with John Wortley translating the text into English, Bernard Flusin translating it into French, and Jean-Claude Cheynet providing the editorial notes to both translations. The introduction (pp. VII–XXXIII) provides essential information on the life of Skylitzes (or at least on the little we know about him), his self-proclaimed intentions, the sources he used, his adopted narrative method, and also on the manuscript tradition. The translation itself is highly readable, while not deviating from the original Greek, a feat that is laudable in itself. The text follows the chapter divisions of the Greek edition, while the page numbers of Thurn's edition have also been provided within square brackets. The subnotes are plentiful and full of essential information for the understanding of the events that are being described by Skylitzes. One can only conclude by observing that this translation is a superb work, and that it will be a great asset to anyone studying either the history or historiography of the middle Byzantine era.

Kai Juntunen

Rudimenta linguae Fennicae breviter delineata: Suomen kielen varhaiskielioppi ja sen tausta. Edited by PETRI LAUERMA. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki 2012. ISBN 978-952-222-375-3. 110 pp. EUR 34.40.

The discovery of the anonymous *Rudimenta linguae Fennicae breviter delineata* in 2008 proved a sensation for the study of Finnish literature. The previously unknown and unpublished text turned up in a small booklet auctioned at Sotheby's as part of the Macclesfield library, bound between two published 17th-century works: *Linguae Fennicae brevis institutio* (1642) by Bishop Aeschillus Petraeus and *Synopsis Chronologiae Fennicae* (1671) by Laurentius Petri. The compilation had presumably been made on the basis of its subject matter, and the *Rudimenta's* companions are pioneering works in their own right: Petraeus's *Institutio* is the first published Finnish grammar, whereas Petri's brief *Synopsis* is the earliest extant Finnish-language text on the history of Finland. Although the provenance and authorship of the *Rudimenta* remain shrouded in mystery, it has emerged that it may, in fact, be the very earliest grammar of the Finnish language. This edition, with its thorough discussion of codicological, palaeographical, grammatical and linguistic aspects of the manuscript reads like a mystery novel: how did this text, with its 16th-century content, written on mid-17th-century paper and bound around 1700, come about and why has it previously been unknown?

As the authors¹ of the articles in this volume point out, the writer can hardly have been any of the early Finnish authors known to us: he was obviously unacquainted with the early grammars of Petraeus and Matthias Martinius (1689), and the absence of the "Melanchthonian" features of

¹ Ilkka Paatero and Sirkka Havu on the most recent history of the manuscript and its acquisition (pp. 9–11), Tuomas Heikkilä on codicological issues (pp. 12–14); Anneli Mäkelä-Ahitalo on the dating of the manuscript's handwriting (pp. 15–16), Pirkko Kuutti on the earliest Finnish and Estonian grammars (pp. 17–23), Suvi Randén on the Latinity of the *Rudimenta* and its relationship to Latin grammars (pp. 24–37) and Riitta Palkki on its Finnish (pp. 39–48).