Isis, who was only a town deity.

In a sane and balanced epilogue P. restates the problem — why were men apparently more numerous than women; the answer she rightly says is complex, and it may have varied from society to society. And ‘to compose a polemic against the men . . . is not the proper objective of a historian’. Z. please note.

Despite the mistakes, P’s book deserves a place in the library of students of society; Z’s is best left on the coffee-table for its visual impact.

W.K. Lacey


Professor Long’s comprehensive survey of Hellenistic philosophy will be a welcome addition to the bookshelves of a wide variety of readers. Not only the professional ‘Stoic’ or ‘Epicurean’ will find good reading but the historian of philosophy and the general classicist will discover much that interests them. After a short introduction Professor Long has three major sections, on the Epicureans, the Sceptics and the Stoics. There then follow two chapters on the influence of the Hellenistic philosophies down to the present day. It is particularly pleasing to find a section on the Sceptics. The teacher faced with the task of expounding one of Cicero’s philosophic texts has for too long been unable to refer to any concise work of reference a student interested in the philosophic position of such important but neglected figures as Arcesilaus or Carneades. Professor Long’s section which brings together and evaluates the evidence of Cicero, Sextus Empiricus and Diogenes Laertius fills the gap admirably.

In a work intended for the general reader, one is particularly impressed with the author’s documentation. This is not needless pedantry, for Long is well aware of the results of that approach. ‘Considerable care must be taken over comparing and assessing different sources, and this preparatory work, if it is allowed too much room in the presentation and analysis of the subject-matter, can easily make Hellenistic Philosophy seem tedious, inaccessible and lacking in conceptual interest. This is a false impression.’ Yet the plain and praiseworthy fact is that while avoiding the tedium Professor Long does not fall into the trap of unsupported generalisations. There are extremely few statements without an appropriate reference.

It is also good to find an assessment of the place of the Hellenistic philosophies in the development of philosophy itself. Where a knowledge of Plato and Aristotle is necessary for our understanding, the background is deftly sketched in, while the author is equally at home looking forward and showing the similarities between, say, the Stoic logos and Spinoza’s God. This
understanding of the history of philosophy enables Long to reach a sane estimate of the extent to which Epicureanism is a reaction against Platonism and the teaching of Aristotle. Briefly, Long sees Epicurus’ concern with the objects of sensation and his rejection of the divine management of the universe as very much directed against the systems of Plato and Aristotle, but does not see a political motivation for such a rejection, as ascribed by Farrington.

In a work such as this one would not expect to find material that has not appeared elsewhere. Long has already made substantial contributions to new knowledge of the subject in other places. It is true to say that there would be few scholars who could rival his knowledge of recent research in the field, and he has ably distilled the major achievements for the enlightenment of the less specialised reader. Professor Long has always been careful to attribute new discoveries to their author.

Most of us will find here material that is new to ourselves. For example many of us expounding Lucretius will have explained Epicurean theology in blissful ignorance of a fragment of Philodemus which seems to suggest ‘that the gods’ own excellence and powers of reason secure them from the destructive forces of the environment.’ De Witt, anxious to describe the Epicurean gods in this fashion did not make use of this piece of evidence. Another area of Epicureanism where Long’s treatment is stimulating is the area of canonic, where the chief centre of interest lies in the meaning and application of the phrase επιβολή της διανοίας. Here the author suggests, in opposition to those who see Epicurus as an ‘intuitionist’ in much of his work, that the phrase means no more than ‘concentration or attention’.

A further aspect of the work which deserves commendation is the interest shown in the problems of philosophy per se, which enables the author to appreciate how difficult to solve were some of the problems which the ancients faced. The criticism that the Stoics, by their thoroughly deterministic view of the processes of the universe, including human action, had robbed the human mind of its free will, goes back as far as Carneades, and in many discussions of Stoicism the problem of the validity or otherwise of ethical judgements in a pre-determined cosmos is raised. In dealing with this problem Long distinguishes between the interpretation of free will as ‘freedom to act otherwise now’ and freedom to act in a way ‘not referable to anything outside ourselves’. By reference to a text of Aulus Gellius (S. V. F. ii, 1000) he shows that the Stoics defined freedom of will in the latter way – like both Aristotle and Spinoza – and that although all things were determined by the universal logos nevertheless that part of the logos lodged in man was responsible for his reaction to any set of external stimuli. Because this logos is the man’s essential self he can be given a measure of self-determination. This lucid exposition should save many a discussion of Stoicism from a lengthy side-track.
In commending this work, I do not wish to suggest that the reader will agree with Long’s argument at every point. For example one may wonder if Long has given sufficient weight to those Lucretian texts where *animi iactus liber* is used as the equivalent of ἐπιβολή τῆς διανοίας; for if the free projection of the mind seeks to explore by reasoning the workings of the remote parts of the universe, this does seem to give a certain weight to Bailey’s view that ‘in Epicurus’ view the concepts of science are built up step by step by the juxtaposition of previous concepts, each in their turn grasped as clear or self-evident by the immediate apprehension of the mind.’ At one point the author’s phraseology could create a misleading impression. In the section on the sources of Stoicism it would be possible to draw the conclusion that Cicero drew on Arius Didymus, a most unlikely suggestion considering that the latter was domestic philosopher in the household of Augustus in 9 B.C. It should be pointed out that this is the only slip of this nature I have been able to detect in a work where precision is the norm.

In brief I have no hesitation in commending this thoroughly readable and worthwhile work which will not only serve as a valuable introduction to the beginner but will also provide healthy stimulus to the researcher.

*C.E. Manning*


Ramsay MacMullen is well known for his *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963) and for other writings on aspects of society in the Roman world. In his latest book his concern is more general: ‘the feelings that governed the behavior of broad social groups or conditions’ (Preface). He sets himself certain limits, making his vast topic smaller but more difficult. His main interest is in the lower classes — shepherds, tenant farmers, artisans. The more familiar world of the literary and the rich takes second place. In space and time too, there are limits. Because of the dearth of evidence from the west of the empire, i.e. Mauretania and the provinces west of the Alps, MacMullen excludes these areas from his study. The book’s title marks out boundaries of time, but these are not strictly observed, especially the later terminus. But perhaps the most demanding limitation is MacMullen’s desire to find the typical, the general truth.