

living manuscript. The orthography shows many features that are well documented in 16<sup>th</sup>-century texts (the writings of Agricola and the so-called Uppsala Gospel Book) but already absent from the 1642 Bible translation. Dialectal features suggest that the author may have been the native speaker of a dialect spoken in the vicinity of Rauma, although some of his forms have only been documented in the eastern parts of Finland Proper or the dialects of Häme. On one instance, the author offers two alternatives for the same form, giving the third person plural of the "simple perfect" as "hee Racastit", but citing "hee Racastiwat" as the form used in Häme. Apparently, the author was thoroughly acquainted with at least two, if not several, distinctive variants of spoken Finnish.

In addition to the insightful discussions of the various aspects of the *Rudimenta* and its provenance (in Finnish), the book includes a facsimile reproduction of the original manuscript, written in a beautiful seventeenth-century hand. The text is also reproduced in an edition by Suvi Randén that is faithful to the orthography of the original (although I would have considered retaining the ligature *æ*, rendered by the editor as *a* and *e*). Randén has also written a highly competent Finnish translation of the text. I must, however, disagree with one particular interpretation of the translator: the author of the *Rudimenta* states that Finnish monosyllables are pronounced *gravi tono* (p. 90). I take this to be a reference to the system of acute, circumflex and grave accents that the Latin grammarians – for better or worse – adopted from Greek prosodic theory, and probably means that monosyllables are unstressed (Randén's interpretation at p. 75 is the opposite). Whatever the author's intent was, his generalization is of course wildly inaccurate.

The edition could have benefited from a more detailed commentary of the text, possibly with an English translation. As it is, the book only contains an English version (by Titia Schuurman, at pp. 99–104) of its concluding summary by Petri Lauerma (pp. 93–98). Although it is probably fair to expect scholars of Finnish language and history to be literate in Finnish, the text is also relevant from the point of view of the history of linguistics and, all in all, of broader interest than the authors or publishers of this remarkable volume may have realized.

Seppo Heikkinen

JONAS GRETHLEIN: *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2010. XII, 350 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-11077-8. GBP 55, USD 95.

*The Greeks and Their Past* is a stimulating discussion of the representations of literary memory in fifth-century BC Greek literature. Its aim is twofold. The first goal is to "reconstruct the literary field of memory in fifth-century BCE Greece" (p. 12), the broader second goal is simply to advance our understanding of the literature of this period. Consisting of two main parts, "*Clio polytropos*: Non-historiographical Media of Memory" and "The Rise of Greek Historiography", Grethlein's book offers nuanced readings of texts from various genres, such as epinician poetry, elegy, tragedy, oratory and historiography. The first part of the book examines Pindar's *Olympian 2*, the "New Simonides", Aeschylus's *Persians*, Lysias's *Funeral Oration* and Andonices's *On the Peace* (the last two were, however, not written in the fifth century, but in the early fourth century BC), whereas the second part deals with the works of Herodotus and Thucydides. Grethlein's plan is to analyse how differ-

ent genres utilized the idea of literary memory, but I wonder if focusing on fewer genres might not have improved the coherence of the first part, even though every chapter in this part is an interesting read. I particularly enjoyed, for instance, the author's perceptive reading of the "New Simonides". Compared to the first part, the second part, in which Grethlein analyses parts of the works of Herodotus and Thucydides, gives him more space and time to develop his arguments. All in all, this is an important book, and it gives a clear overview of the employment of the idea of literary memory in fifth-century Greek literature. The editorial work by Cambridge University Press is irreproachable.

*Iiro Laukola*

GESINE MANUWALD: *Roman Republican Theatre. A History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011. ISBN 978-0-521-11016-7 (hardback). XII, 390 pp. GBP 65, USD 105.

This book is a general history of, and an introduction to, Roman theatre and drama. W. Beare's *Roman Stage* (1964), while still used and useful, is outdated concerning newer material. Manuwald's purpose is "to provide a synoptic discussion of the whole complex of dramatic works in Republican Rome". She wishes to accomplish this by combining a variety of diachronic and synchronic perspectives.

An important and valuable part of Manuwald's discussion is the placement of Republican drama in its contemporary historical, political, and social context. This is done in Part I, titled "Cultural and institutional background". The cult context of Roman drama is not as obvious as in its Greek counterpart, but this aspect should not be overlooked, and Manuwald does a good job of presenting the evidence for the various Roman festivals, their associated deities and temples, and the evolving development of the practice of offering dramatic performances on these occasions. The Romans' preference for temporary theatrical structures, together with the practical and architectural aspects of these constructions, are given due attention. The production process of the plays, the role of the impresarios responsible for this, the organization of the actors and their social status, the control the poets had (or did not have) over their texts after the first production, and financial matters (who paid whom and when) are all important topics covered in the first part. These multiple perspectives of a largely practical nature make up the most rewarding part of the book.

What perhaps cannot be avoided in a book with as broad a coverage as this one is the fact that the treatment is at places superficial, for example concerning the reception of Greek culture by the Romans, or the relationship between drama and the building of a national identity. These themes are mentioned several times throughout the book but nowhere discussed in detail.

The second part, "Dramatic poetry", is divided into three chapters: "Dramatic genres", "Dramatic poets", and "Dramatic Themes and Techniques". Manuwald presents all the essential sources and information. Concerning the fragmentary poets her discussion is thorough. It seems that the author wished to find a balance between the highly incongruous nature of the material that we have on Roman Republican drama, with most authors surviving only in fragments and only two represented by a series of entire plays. This is understandable, given the book's scope and aim: it is not a book on Plautus and Terence, and not even one on the *palliata*.