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Heikki Solin


The problem with women's studies (or with almost any other studies) relating to classical antiquity is that we have to gather information from very heterogenous sources. For example, statements found in works belonging to different literary genres are usually not commensurate, and even if they are, we cannot know for sure. "When dealing with antiquity scholars have always compared apples with pears and plums, because if we want to fill our basket we have to use all the fruit that is available" (p. 174).

Vidén has read through the works of Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, Seneca, Martial and Juvenal and excerpted those passages which state opinions about women, both about individuals and about the gender as such. She concludes that these authors did not primarily strive for an accurate description of historical women. The female stereotypes and the portraits of individual women were used to highlight the writers' opinions about men and about Roman society in general. Thus, any information extracted from this evidence must be handled with a certain caution. Regarding the general pattern of thought of the upper-class authors, Vidén makes some pertinent remarks, like: "a chaste woman is not necessarily a good woman, but a good woman is of necessity a chaste woman" (p. 176).

There is no reason to doubt these conclusions. It is even possible that similar
warnings have been issued before. However, it is not a bad thing that the problem has been stressed again, especially in such a systematic and judicious study. The book is clearly written and well documented.

Antti Arjava


These two important volumes constitute Gregory Vlastos' intellectual testament for future generations of scholars in Socratic and to some extent also Platonic studies. The earlier of them turned out to be the last work finished by the author himself who died shortly after the book was published. At the time of his death at the age of 84, Vlastos was, however, preparing a companion volume including revised versions of his important and influential articles on Socrates' elenctic method of argument, his disavowal of knowledge, and his relationship with the Athenian democracy. Familiarity with the theses presented in these papers, especially the one on the elenchus, is virtually presupposed from the reader of Socrates. Therefore, it is very convenient to have them now published together in a collection edited by Myles Burnyeat.

Together with G.E.L. Owen, Gregory Vlastos must be regarded as the most important contributor to the huge growth and improvement of scholarship in ancient philosophy especially in English-speaking countries during the last couple of decades. He was obviously a most stimulating teacher and it was his insistence on a thoroughgoing training both in classics and in philosophy that played an important part in revolutionizing the role of ancient philosophy in academic communities. For Vlastos it was never sufficient just to recount what ancient philosophers said; the important thing was to understand what they meant. This required interpreting ancient texts in the light of the argumentative clarity and rigor of the best analytic philosophy. Perhaps it is just his striving for clear and precise presentation that has aroused so much debate and controversy around his numerous papers on Presocratic and Socratic philosophy. Even if he has not always succeeded in convincing his readers he has very often set out a fruitful basis for future critical discussion.

These qualities of clarity and precision, but also controversiality, are very much in the foreground both in Socrates and in Socratic Studies. Vlastos' main thesis is that in his dialogues Plato attributes to Socrates two philosophies which are not only incompatible but even antithetical and irreconcilable. In the dialogues, conventionally dated as early ones, we find a Socrates who is exclusively a moral philosopher, who does