City [2008]. While J. occasionally mentions Brennan and Vogt, his arguments are primarily aimed at Inwood and do not fully engage with these later, more subtle analyses.) Since right reason also describes the nature of Zeus (D.L. 7.88), the analysis of rationality is ultimately the correct way to comprehend more fully 'the divine point of view'. Again, I would direct readers to several excellent papers on this subject in the edited volume by R. Salles, *God and Cosmos in Stoicism* (2009) [reviewed below].

University of Michigan – Ann Arbor HENRY DYSON
hdyson@umich.edu

STOIC COSMOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

SALLES (R.) (ed.) *God and Cosmos in Stoicism.* Pp. x + 274. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Cased, £45, US$85. ISBN: 978-0-19-955614-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X1200042X

This collection contains some important contributions to the study of Stoic cosmology and theology. Most of the discussion seems intended for specialists, but a few of the papers (particularly those of Salles and Bénatouïl) would be suitable for undergraduates who have recently started to study Hellenistic or Roman philosophy. The nine papers are divided into three sections: 'God, Providence, and Fate'; 'Elements, Cosmogony, and Conflagration'; 'The Ethics and Religion of Stoic Cosmo-Theology'. There is a full *index locorum*, but the *index nominum* doubles as the index of subjects, so if you want discussions of 'fire' you will have to look up, say, 'Philo Judaeus and fire'. For the most part the Editor's introduction consists of summaries of the nine chapters.

The first section opens with a paper by T. Bénatouïl on the range of god's activities in the cosmos. Bénatouïl considers five ways in which Stoics could have allowed their god a respite (for example, they could have claimed that god is inactive during the conflagration), and shows that in each case they did not. This paper frequently brings itself into dialogue with the other chapters and so is particularly well integrated into the collection. Its most natural companion is Algra's comparison of Stoic theology with contemporary religion, which is put in the third section and at the very end of the book; this is one way in which the division into sections feels artificial.

As it is, Bénatouïl's paper is followed by J.-B. Gourinat's discussion of whether the Stoics were materialists. The verdict is 'no'. Most specialists will find more rewarding the observations made along the way, as in the discussion of Stoic responses to the *Timaeus*, where it is shown that Stoics in their own cosmology emphasised a biological model of creativity and not the technological model that, together with the biological model, is offered by Plato's dialogue (pp. 50–1). (Gourinat claims on p. 50 that 'prime matter' – rather than god, as the text at Diogenes Laertius 7.136 suggests – generates the four elements, and this should have been corrected, particularly as Cooper translates the same passage accurately on p. 101.) S.S. Meyer discusses the 'chain' by which causes are connected and which is said to constitute fate. This chain, she argues, is not a matter of temporal succession; instead it must be understood as the 'sympathy' between parts of the cosmos that is shown when, for example, changes to animal life coincide with

lunar waxing and waning. Against this it can be said that the 'chain' constituting fate is a chain specifically of *causes*, whereas this example of 'sympathy' involves either two effects or one effect (changing animal life) and one cause (the moon).

J. Cooper starts the section on elements, conflagration and cosmogony. His paper is indispensable reading for future work on the Stoic elements. Cooper analyses a passage of Stobaeus (*Ecl.* 1, p. 129.1–130.20 Wachsmuth), according to which Chrysippus used the term 'element' in three ways. Cooper's main aim is to show how fire could be treated both as the origin of the elements and as an element coordinate with earth, water and air: Zeno is held responsible for the confusion, and Chrysippus is shown to have addressed it by distinguishing between fire, 'proto-fire' and 'flash', the last of which constitutes all substance when the world has been fully ignited in the conflagration. Salles then provides another contrast between early Stoics: whereas Cleanthes regarded the conflagration as the world's destruction, Chrysippus regarded all the elements as fire in various states (here we get an alternative to Cooper's reconstruction) and took this to show that the world must survive the conflagration. I. Kupreeva then looks at apparent affinities between Stoicism and some Peripatetic physics; her learned paper is primarily about the Aristotelian tradition and seems out of place in a collection on Stoicism.

The third section contains two papers on the importance of physics for ethics and one on the relationship between Stoicism and contemporary religion. M. Boeri evidently wishes to emphasise the moral importance of cosmology, but it is hard to discern precisely what Boeri thinks about the relationship between physics and ethics. B. Inwood shows the range of perspectives on the value of physics to be found in the works of Seneca, and introduces his discussion by showing that in the early Stoa too a range of perspectives was on offer. K. Algra outlines the epistemological basis of Stoic theology and then presents some refreshingly unfamiliar material on Stoic attitudes to religious cult and images. It is hard to see why two papers on physics and ethics were needed, particularly as there is not a clear contrast between them, but Algra's paper gives the collection a strong ending.

University of St Andrews ALEX LONG
agl10@st-andrews.ac.uk

HIEROCLES' ETHICS

RAMELLI (I.) *Hierocles the Stoic.* Elements of Ethics*, Fragments, and Excerpts*. Translated by David Konstan. (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 28.) Pp. xc + 179. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009. Paper, US$32.95. ISBN: 978-1-58983-418-7.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X12000431

One of the greatest challenges of Stoic scholarship has always been the uneven distribution of sources across the history of the school. While there is only fragmentary material and indirect evidence on the early and middle Stoa, the late or 'Roman' phase of the school is represented comparatively well, with extensive records of Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. However, the 'Roman' phase of the school saw many figures whose teaching is far less known than that of the three aforementioned authors. A striking example is the Stoic Hierocles. Hierocles is probably best known as the author of a famous simile which likens our relationship to our own mind, body, family, city and ultimately all mankind to a series