

Olympiodorus' work, perhaps the more damning in view of Dodds's great knowledge of Neoplatonism generally. Nevertheless, I think Dodds would agree that the work is not without interest. I believe it is especially useful for a reason unknowable to Dodds some forty years ago when his book was published. That is, contemporary Plato scholarship is increasingly focused on methods of interpreting the Platonic corpus, including in Europe the so-called Tübingen school, and in North America the non-doctrinal or literary school. The current state of affairs is that there is tremendous disagreement. A careful reading of this work, dated in so many respects, can nevertheless provide a valuable perspective on some common unquestioned assumptions about how to read Plato.

Olympiodorus' commentary is really a series of fifty lectures on successive sections of the text and a proem. Each lecture discusses the *σκοπός* of the passage and then focuses on phrases or sentences with a view to their illumination within the framework of the overall interpretation. As is the case when one uses virtually any commentary on an ancient text, success in finding the help one happens to need is sporadic. If one comes to this work expecting acute analysis of argument in the fashion of contemporary Anglo-American scholarship, then surely one will be disappointed. Olympiodorus is, however, especially helpful or at least interesting on rhetoric and on the concluding myth. Above all, he is perhaps actually one of the best commentators on this work when it comes to taking the dramatic structure and personae seriously without supposing that this requires emasculating doctrinal content altogether. Indeed, Olympiodorus finds them inseparable. It is, I think, owing to his good sense and not his benighted Neoplatonism that it probably never occurred to him that serious attention to the characters meant trivializing or dismissing Plato's arguments.

The translation is generally excellent and the extensive notes are very useful for those reading this work as a guide to both Plato and later Neoplatonism. This book is a distinguished addition to Brill's series *Philosophia Antiqua*, which now contains some eighty monographs, many of which are serious studies of facets of the later period. The series deserves to be more widely known than I suspect it is. Unfortunately, the steep prices are something of a deterrent.

University of Toronto

LLOYD P. GERSON

THE INNER CITADEL

P. HADOT: *The Inner Citadel: the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*. Pp. x + 351. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998. Cased, £27.95. ISBN: 0-674-46171-1.

This volume is a translation with minimal changes of *La Citadelle intérieure: introduction aux 'Pensées' de Marc Aurèle* (Paris, 1992). That Hadot, doyen of the study of late antique philosophy, has long been working on the Stoic emperor's *Meditations* has been clear at least since the important studies published in his *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique* (Paris, 1981), of which a version with some papers added and omitted has been published in English as *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford, 1995). He has also recently published the first volume (covering Book 1) of a text and commentary that, if the fullness of coverage is sustained, will be the most substantial treatment of the author since Gataker. The present study is a synthesis, aimed at a wider public: reference to ancient sources is full and frequent, but all are translated, and Greek words are transliterated.

© Classical Association, 2001

After four introductory chapters that expertly convey a wealth of information on the career of the emperor, the problems that face the reader on first encounter with the text, the ancient tradition of self-discipline through reading and composing philosophic exercises, and the debt to Epictetus, the core of the book examines the nature of Epictetus' Stoicism and the way in which the tripartite model of spiritual self-examination which Epictetus supplies is worked out repeatedly, even incessantly, in the *Meditations*. This model involves three disciplines: that of assent (acceptance of what nature wills), that of impulse or action, and that of desire. A substantial chapter is devoted to each, showing how the apparent disorder and variety of Marcus' reflections can cohere as a fundamentally simple system of beliefs. After a short chapter on 'Virtue and Joy', the threads are drawn together in a long chapter offering an overall reading of the *Meditations* and of Marcus' outlook (pp. 243–306). Many will find this the most enjoyable part of the book. Here and elsewhere (esp. pp. 163–79), H. shows that the 'pessimistic' reading of Marcus' thought can be traced back to Renan, and that it often rests on the misreading of specific passages. In general, a picture emerges of a more positive thinker, and one closer in outlook to Epictetus and to what may be seen as 'orthodox' Stoicism: also of a writer who, despite the quasi-fragmentary state of his work, maintains and regularly asserts an impressively consistent set of doctrines.

H.'s account is a powerful and well-grounded reading of the *Meditations*. It goes without saying that he presents the evidence scrupulously and is generous to opposing views. There is perhaps some tendency to pass over the odder or more individual aspects of Marcus' book, and occasionally one feels that consistency and coherence are being imposed on the author. A surprising passage in the Conclusion (p. 309) insists that we are dealing with philosophy and that we should avoid 'all the vague and imprecise implications, both social and mythical' that the word religion brings. A critic of H.'s study might press him for a fuller treatment of the more 'religious' aspects of the *Meditations*, where some have detected divergence from the path of Epictetus. The handling of the *daemon* or inner god, for example, is not as fully treated as might be hoped: H. sees no need to regard it as any more than the faculty of reasoning (pp. 123–4). Again, some passages referring to prayer and divine aid are either not discussed or reduced somewhat in significance (in particular, 9.40, alluded to only in passing). The discussion of the gods in Stoicism, pp. 147–63, is important and fascinating, but its general trend is to suggest that there is nothing out of the ordinary in Marcus' references to religion; I am not sure that this is adequate. Another chapter that seems to go without discussion is 12.5, on the afterlife.

It would be unduly self-effacing to exclude any comparison between this book and my own 1989 study, about which H. makes a number of kind comments. As one would expect from a mature scholar, his text is plainer and less cluttered with digressions and detail than mine, which still suffered from its origins as a thesis. H.'s book, despite the biographical opening, is more philosophic in its general thrust, and less concerned with the Roman context or with literary traditions outside the main line of philosophic discourse. The nature of his book excludes detailed stylistic comment (though note pp. 257–60). But on doctrinal matters and on the argumentative texture he is an incomparable guide.

H.'s detailed work on this text often enables him to improve on commonly available translations or to correct nuances. Unfortunately there is no index of passages discussed; in so long a book, this is to be regretted. More cross-referencing would also have been helpful, e.g. in the first chapter the psychohistorical reading of Dailly–van Effenterre is said to draw risky conclusions (p. 320 n. 61), but there is no forward

reference to the detailed refutation in Chapter X. Of points of detail, scholars will want to note the following: p. 68, supporting the view of Fränkel that 4.49.2–5 are a quotation from Epictetus; p. 111, criticizing the interpretation of Epict. *Ench.* 1.5 by Goldschmidt; p. 137, criticism of an influential section in Dodds's *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (Cambridge, 1965); p. 337 n. 90, deleting 'of Phaleron' in 9.29, after Schenkl.

The translation, by Michael Chase, has been very well done: only occasionally is one aware of awkwardness (but on p. 58, 'anthropomorphic' should be 'anthropocentric'; p. 132, 6 up for 'present' read 'future'; 'disaccord', p. 234, is infelicitous; 'complacently' seems wrong on p. 159.1 ['compliantly?']; and on p. 280 'like wild, androgynous beasts' misrepresents the Greek of 3.16).

The power and vigour of H.'s interpretation derive partly from his belief in the importance and continuing value of Stoic philosophy, at least broadly interpreted in terms of a Stoic outlook on life (see esp. pp. 307–12). His assertion of this value rests not on facile acceptance of an etiolated doctrine, but on a lifetime's labour to understand ancient philosophy historically and sympathetically. In this book, as in his work as a whole, he sets a demanding standard, and an example which we can all applaud.

Christ Church, Oxford

R. B. RUTHERFORD

GENESIS ELUCIDATED

L. FLADERER: *Johannes Philoponos. De opificio mundi. Spätantikes Sprachdenken und christliche Exegese*. Pp. 419. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased, DM 158. ISBN: 3-519-07684-5.

Late in his career John Philoponus (490–570 A.D.) wrote an intriguing commentary on the first book of Genesis, *De opificio mundi* (*Opif.*). By content the work belongs to the hexaemeron commentary tradition on which he freely draws, esp. Gregory of Nyssa and Basil. However, the format and argument of the work are unusual because they owe much to philosophy and the genre of the philosophical commentary. Given the fact that Philoponus wrote important and innovative commentaries on a number of Aristotle's works, this need not be surprising. Ludwig Fladerer has now produced a learned study of the 'literary universe' (p. 17) of *Opif.* A prominent position is given to sixth-century Alexandrian philosophy of language as providing the hermeneutical type on which Philoponus modelled his commentary on Genesis. F. is much indebted to the work of Clemens Scholten (*Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift De Opificio Mundi des Johannes Philoponos* [Berlin and New York, 1996]), from whom he has also adopted a very idiosyncratic set of abbreviations of ancient works. The book has a rich bibliography on the intersection of grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy of language in antiquity, and closes with brief indices of names and topics. In a work that brings together such a remarkable variety of theological, philosophical, and literary sources, the lack of an index of passages is to be deplored—together with the low quality of the printing.

In the third part of the book, which contains systematic and detailed interpretations of selected passages of *Opif.*, F. is at his best. He analyses how Philoponus employs exegetical, grammatical-rhetorical, and philosophical strategies in order to present the text of Genesis as a meaningful whole, and to attack the positions of Theodore of