

SOURCES ON LATER STOICISM

INWOOD (B.) *Later Stoicism 155 BC to AD 200. An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Pp. xii + 584. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Cased, £130, US\$170. ISBN: 978-1-107-02979-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23000744

I.'s impressive volume is welcomed with a sigh of relief. This is the third instalment in the Cambridge source books on post-Hellenistic philosophy, and one that is long overdue given the ever-growing interest in ancient Stoicism. The first two brilliant volumes of the series were dedicated to Peripatetic philosophy by R.W. Sharples (2010) and Platonist philosophy by G. Boys-Stones (2018), respectively. Here, the mapping out of a colossal body of evidence according to the standard divisions of philosophy (logic, physics, ethics) for each thinker – I.'s editorial choice – will prove vastly useful to all students of Stoicism and scholars across disciplines as it makes it much more convenient for readers to look up a particular area of thought and assess the thinker's contribution to it, or what philosophical preoccupations loomed large. Crucially, such a layout enables readers to identify the differences of opinions within a school where disagreement was rife, unsurprisingly for a philosophical movement that lasted over 500 years.

Although 'late Stoicism' is typically located towards the end of the Hellenistic era with a focus on the Roman Stoics and the Stoicism of the Roman Imperial period (31 BCE–300 CE) – a thoroughly modern periodisation of the school –, I. argues in the introduction for an earlier start, the middle of the second century BCE. More specifically, it is the intellectual dispute between the head of the school, Antipater of Tarsus, and the Academic Carneades, a philosopher-prodigy from North Africa, that proved a turning point for Stoicism, driving its leader to engage with Plato and Aristotle extensively – a move quite unprecedented for the Stoics at the time.

Some indication in the introduction about a potential re-periodisation of the school's evolution regarding its earlier periods would have been helpful now that the old division of the school into early, middle and late Stoicism is being entirely revised. Scholars had previously questioned the modern division of the school's history by referring to intellectual and socio-cultural shifts taking place well before the end of Ptolemaic Egypt (31 BCE) and the rise of Roman supremacy in the Mediterranean basin. But none pushed as far back as I.'s starting date of the mid-second century BCE for later Stoicism.

As I. puts it, the aim of the book is to present readers with 'a representative selection of the evidence we have for Stoicism in its later phases' (p. 1). This is no small task to begin with, but in merging the middle phase of Stoicism, traditionally represented by Panaetius and Posidonius, with its later phase, inevitably dominated by the Roman Stoics (Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius), I.'s redefinition of 'later Stoicism' offers a more wide-ranging survey of how Stoic thought developed before it moved to Rome, and beyond ethics where the focus could have been if the book had concentrated exclusively on the Stoicism of the Roman imperial period.

Six chapters follow. Each chapter contains a general section and is then divided into three parts: 'Part A: Logic', 'Part B: Physics', 'Part C: Ethics', each sectioned into specific categories on issues with which the school concerned itself. Sources are grouped into a small number with an introductory paragraph at regular intervals offering detailed context and explanatory notes helping to navigate the content. Cross-referencing throughout is particularly useful in cutting through the mass of sources and finding what one is looking for.

Apart from the first and last chapters that cover ‘The First Hundred Years’ and ‘The Second Century CE’, respectively, each intervening chapter is dedicated to a specific thinker: Chapter 2 ‘Posidonius’; Chapter 3 ‘From Posidonius to Seneca’; Chapter 4 ‘Seneca the Younger’; Chapter 5 ‘Epictetus’.

In Chapter 1 the emphasis is on the school’s conservatism in Stoic orthodoxy despite having different strands of Stoicism named after particular leaders of the school (e.g. Diogeneans, Antipatreans, Panaetians). Archedemus of Tarsus, known to Seneca the Younger (cf. *Epist.* 121.1–3), is put on a par with Panaetius and Posidonius, in terms of innovative thinking. Antipater, the one who most extensively engaged with Carneades’ criticism, emerges as a ubiquitous voice in Stoic debates across all areas, especially on epistemology, the nature of the cosmos and the soul. There is also a fair amount of practical advice on marriage strongly driven by socio-cultural ideas about gender roles, class and status; it is worth noting that Antipater’s views on gender role distribution are not shared by later Stoics. Antipater is thus framed as one of the earliest Stoics who cared for and wrote about the practical applications of Stoic philosophy ahead of Panaetius. In ethics, the focus is mainly on second-hand knowledge of Panaetius’ lost work *On Appropriate Actions* and its reception in Cicero’s *On Duties*. This corner of the book sheds some light on how aspects of Stoicism relate to or compare with Platonist and Peripatetic thought.

Chapter 2 is extremely useful in outlining the significance of Posidonius’ impact on Stoicism, but also his sphere of influence. I. improves on H. von Arnim’s voluminous collection of fragments and *testimonia* of the earlier Stoics (*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*), which overlooks Posidonius (and Panaetius) while still referencing evidence from their contemporary Stoics. Viewed as a renegade to his school and usually lumped together with his teacher Panaetius, it is not always easy to evaluate how innovative a thinker Posidonius was. Here, I. provides us with a vast array of sources on Posidonius that help reconstruct his work and position him as the most important philosopher for Stoicism since Chrysippus, especially in physics.

Chapter 3 ‘From Posidonius to Seneca’ is an important chapter in bridging the gap between two leading figures of Stoicism. In doing so, intermediary thinkers are brought to the fore, some of whom have been recently rediscovered, such as Musonius Rufus. Some are lesser known (e.g. Chairemon and Cornutus), but their contribution can be conveniently gauged across all three areas of logic, physics and ethics.

Chapters 4 and 5 are extremely convenient in assessing how Seneca the Younger and Epictetus contributed to other areas of Stoic thought beyond ethics. Unlike Seneca, the difficulty with Epictetus is that he did not write a word, his teaching came down to us through a third party, Flavius Arrianus. And only four of the eight compiled books survive. Both Seneca and Epictetus, though traditionally studied for their views on the passions and how to live a dispassionate life, come across as fully fledged thinkers whose input touched upon all areas of philosophical thought.

The final chapter is dedicated to the Stoics of the second century CE. Here, I. presents a list of philosophers, beyond Marcus Aurelius, showing that Stoic thought still had currency and further potential for development (e.g. Euphrates, Cleomedes, Hierocles, Philopator). I. also includes thinkers who seem to have been influenced by Stoic thought such as Arrian and Dio of Prusa. A great feature of this chapter is that it allows the work of the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius, and engagement with Stoicism, to be read alongside that of his contemporary fellow Stoics.

I.’s volume will undoubtedly become a major item of reference for both students and scholars across disciplines (philosophy, Classics, intellectual history and beyond). Although it cannot replace von Arnim’s *SVF* collection, the source book is of great

assistance in gaining a quick foothold on aspects of Stoic thought, since all texts feature in translation. As such, it constitutes an ideal tool for teaching ancient Stoicism and making it a widely accessible subject.

University of Manchester

DALIDA AGRI
dalida.agri@manchester.ac.uk

READING – SILENT OR ALOUD?

HEILMANN (J.) *Lesen in Antike und frühem Christentum. Kulturgeschichtliche, philologische sowie kognitionswissenschaftliche Perspektiven und deren Bedeutung für die neutestamentliche Exegese*. Pp. 707. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, 2021. Cased, €128. ISBN: 978-3-7720-8729-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X23000033

H.'s book on reading in antiquity and early Christianity is a strong work that deserves a wide readership. It changes influential assumptions about reading in antiquity, driving home its argument with slow circumspection. The book is H.'s *Habilitationschrift*, and the author demonstrates his intimate knowledge of the field, but also his ability to use a relevant range of theoretical approaches beyond classical New Testament exegesis. In research on ancient reading it has been common knowledge that ancient literature was read aloud. This is the key idea that H. challenges in a set of convincing analyses. Moreover, and persuasively, he offers analyses of several other empirical sources that demonstrate that individual, quiet reading was much more common than previously thought.

The book is clearly structured, with an extensive introduction that first treats the state of the art in research on reading in early Christianity, especially cultic reading, performance criticism and public or communal reading, then provides an overview of the long debate on the question of loud or silent reading in antiquity and a methodological discussion of shortcomings of previous research. Finally, it presents H.'s methodological approach and terminology. The remainder of the book is divided into two major parts, 'Grundlagen' and 'Anwendung der erarbeiteten Grundlagen zur Analyse spezifischer Textcorpora'. Then follows an 'Anhang' providing helpful lists of the evidence for silent reading, terms for reading objects, Greek and Latin terms for reading, abbreviations, lists of the empirical materials and, finally, the substantive list of references and helpful indexes. The first part, 'Grundlagen', presents an overview of the multitude of reading media in antiquity, the semantics of Greek and Latin reading terms, and a stimulating discussion of the typographical qualities of *scriptio continua* up against contemporary cognitive and neuroscientific studies of reading processes. In the second part of the study, 'Anwendung', H. presents and discusses empirical case studies first from ancient Judaism (the Hebrew Bible, LXX and selected Second Temple literature such as Philo and evidence from Qumran), then from the New Testament (Paul, Mark and the Apocalypse of John are given attention), before he summarises and discusses the methodological implications for exegesis and the consequences for research on the emergence of a New Testament canon. Then, he concludes on the status of reading in early Christian groups overall.