

The first issue Scott focuses on is self-evidently of interest to any study on innatism. How should innatism be defined? What do we mean by saying that something is innate to the mind? And if an innate theory will accept some role to be played by sense-perception, how exactly will it differ from empiricism? Scott shows that even though Aristotle is an empiricist, he is a moderate one, for whom some innate dispositions like character traits and especially a desire to know fit into an otherwise empiricist theory of learning. Plato and the Stoics are innatists but of a significantly different version. For Plato, prenatal knowledge is latent in us, waiting to be revealed. The Stoics believed that rather than knowledge, humans have cognitive predispositions to form certain concepts rather than others. This, according to Scott, and the fact that the seventeenth century philosophers even used Stoic vocabulary of common notions and *prolēpseis*, makes their theory a descendant of Stoic dispositional innatism.

Scott is admirably capable of writing a philosophically interesting history of ancient views about learning and discovery, and he is sensitive to the different motivations and variations of theories. However, even though the book is explicitly *not* written to fulfill any "encyclopaedic ambitions", there are a few problems with Scott's choices. It is apparent for example that the jump from the Stoics to seventeenth-century philosophy is rather abrupt, and leaves something to be desired from a book which makes historical claims about the origin of seventeenth-century innatism. Yet regardless of this, I found the comparison illuminating.

What I find more genuinely problematic is that even though Scott is a careful and appreciative reader of Plato, the great philosopher may not have been given a fair ride for his money. Scott's view on what happens in Socrates' discussion with the slave boy in the *Meno* is far from uncontroversial, as is his reading of Plato in many places. For Scott, Plato has much to say about philosophical knowledge and ethics – about how, for instance, moral claims ought to be closely scrutinized – but next to nothing to tell about what he calls ordinary concept formation. This, I suspect, is partly due to the fact that starting from the theory of recollection, Scott has chosen to analyse the dialogues *Meno*, *Phaedo*, *Phaedrus*, and *Republic*. It would have been interesting to see what he has to say about the material, for example of the *Timaeus*. Could it have made one more inclined to see a dispositional innatist in Plato? Or at least a philosopher who is, after all, interested in learning and thought more generally?

In a sense, the weakness of the book is also its beauty: Scott has his own particular and well-argued view, and he displays it elegantly and openly.

*Pauliina Remes*

MONICA GALE: *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge UP, Cambridge 1994. ISBN 0-521-45135-3. 260 p. GBP 35 (H/b).

Lucretius' choice to write poetry instead of prose is chiefly to make Epicurus' rather rigid and epitomized doctrine of rationality more attractive to an educated Roman reader (especially Memmius, the poet's patron). The mythological element in *De rerum natura*, also, has this aim, and Gale discusses this view by extensively allegorizing the conception of myth in Lucretius' style. Myth, as rationalized and even demythologized,

becomes a philosophical example of not only entertaining but didactic value, thus leading the reader *per falsa ad vera*, and so is not in contradiction with Epicurus' rationalistic views that neither myth nor poetry were good methods of obtaining knowledge. Gale discusses this in ch. 4, too, where Epicurean epistemology and theology are compared with Lucretius' mythological imagery, and Lucretius' *lucida carmina* are paralleled with Epicurus' philosophy.

In ch. 5, these ideas are related to the myth of primitive man and *Kulturgeschichte* (as 'latent' myth). Further comes the ch. "The Deification of Epicurus", which is important, also, to understand Lucretius' deep relation with his master.

In chs. 1 and 2, we find out the basis, differences and criticisms of the conception of myth in Greek and Roman philosophical thought. In addition, Gale illuminates us on how Lucretius' target is to explain totally, not only rationalize (which seemed to have been Cicero's and Varro's aim) myths and allegories: there is nothing divine or supernatural behind them. If this is accepted, the way would be already shorter for acceptance of *vera ratio* and achievement of ἀταραξία. Especially in ch. 2, Gale writes and argues like a guest in Lucretius' near circle, and she becomes close to the 1st century BC Roman philosophical atmosphere.

In ch. 3, Gale argues that Lucretius' poem is not only a mythological/historical/encomiastic epic or simply didactic, but all this, or, as she says, 'the ultimate epic', or, in Murley's words, 'cosmic narration'. Lucretius is aware of his position as a poet after the line Homer–Empedocles–Ennius, who he proudly emulates.

In ch. 6, Gale handles the problematic Venus-proem along with the last book's description of the plague of Athens. Among other explanations, the proem seduces us to read the whole poem while the plague serves as an un-idealized exodus, bringing to mind the softness of birth and the hardness of death.

To conclude, Gale appropriately gives a new interpretation of the myth γιγαντομαχία: Epicurus the Giant, with help of Lucretius, conquers the old gods. Overall, Gale's argumentation of her subtle subject is solid and her examples are very illuminating. The text is well proofread, and the bibliography and indexes are very useful.

*Sakari Pankkonen*

CAIUS PLINIUS SECUNDUS: *Om Bildkonsten. Naturalis historia XXXIII–XXXVII*. Översättning av Bengt Ellenberger. Paul Åströms förlag, Jonsered 1997. ISBN 91–7081–130–X. 429 s. USD 47.90 (H/b).

XENOFON: *En persisk furstes uppfostran. Κύρου παιδεία*. Översättning med inledning och kommentarer av Lars Nyberg. Paul Åströms förlag, Jonsered 1998. ISBN 91–7081–055–9. 776 s. USD 35.90 (P/b).

Daß jetzt auch in Skandinavien zweisprachige Ausgaben von den als wichtig angesehenen Klassikern herausgegeben werden, soll herzlichst begrüßt werden. Nebst dem hier zu behandelnden Werk sind auf lateinisch *Epistulae ex Ponto*, *Epistulae Heroidum* und *Ibis*, *Nux* mit *Halieutica* von Ovid, *Ars poetica* von Horaz, *de reditu suo* von Rutilius Namatianus, *Elegiae* von Tibull, und eine Auswahl von Martialis publiziert worden. Zusätzlich sind noch *Pervigilium Veneris*, *Commentarii de bello civili* von Caesar und *Miles gloriosus* von Plautus in Vorbereitung.