The Stoics on Identity and Individuation

ERIC LEWIS

Gisela Striker opens her artful "Antipater, or the art of living" with the statement that "In reading the doxographical reports on Stoic philosophy, one gets the impression that the Stoics had a singular, and often irritating, predilection for identity statements."[1] She goes on to claim "that some of the arguments that have been handed down to us from the second-century controversy about the Stoic definitions of the goal of life depend on the improper use of identity-statements, which however the Stoics, by their predilection for such propositions, seem practically to invite."[2] I agree with her that much confusion arises due to statements by Stoics which look like (and may in fact be) identity statements. Yet (and here we may differ) I do not think this is a manifestation of sloppiness, sophistry, or perversity on the part of the Stoics. Such statements, for the most part, follow from a detailed and sophisticated investigation into the nature of identity which has far-flung implications for almost all parts of Stoic philosophy.

Here I shall sketch some of the more important and interesting aspects of this Stoic investigation. In particular, I hope to accomplish two things: first, to suggest that the criterion of identity for ensouled individuals is persistence of soul. Second, to discuss the vexing question of how many distinct bodies populate the Stoic universe. These are, I will show, not wholly distinct issues. An investigation into both will unveil much of the Stoic theory of identity. In particular, I will demonstrate that the Stoics advocated a version of materialism which recognized many of the problems such theories must face in the light of the acceptance of some sort of soul/body identity.[3]

Before one can be convinced of this conclusion, some of Stoic metaphysics must be reconstructed. In particular, we face three main tasks. First,

[1] In, *The Norms of Nature*, M. Schofield and G. Striker (eds), CUP 1986, p. 185.
[2] Ibid, p. 186.
[3] Precisely what sort of soul/body identity the Stoics endorsed will be discussed below.

Phronesis 1995. Vol XL/1 (Accepted April 1994)

to establish that the Stoics do advocate some sort of materialism. Second, to show that they ground the identity of individuals in the persistence of qualities (in the case of ensouled entities, the persistence of soul *as* quality), qualities which, given their materialism, are somehow identified with matter. Third, and most difficult, is to show both that they recognize many of the problems which such an account raises, and that they address these problems (problems involving the precise nature of the identity of mind with body, or, more generally, the relationship of qualities, states and the like, to matter and its configurations) in an interesting, and not implausible way. I will then show how these issues affect the answer to the "how many bodies in the Stoic universe" question.

One might think that the first of these tasks is the simplest – that the Stoics are clearly materialists, and naive ones at that, since they conceive of everything (with four exceptions) as a body.[4] They are corporealists. Yet, as I shall argue, the Stoics do not conceive of everything which exists (*huparchein*) in their universe as a separable independently existing body. Their materialism is not so naive. According to the Stoics' to take an example, we are not a set of nested bodies, like so many coextensive billiard balls. I shall argue that due to a misinterpretation of the Stoic theory of identity, they have been viewed, since antiquity, as advocating a perhaps paradoxical version of corporealism. In particular, commentators, both ancient and modern, have been far too quick to assume that when the Stoics claim that X is a body (say my body), and that Y is a body (say my soul), there are therefore *two* bodies. The story, so I shall argue, is not so simple. What we need to discover is what the Stoics take to be the relationship between the many entities said to be bodies. I will begin by discussing the criteria of identity for individuals.

*

The Stoics conceive of all proper individuals[5] as peculiarly qualified (*idios poion*). Their reasons are both epistemological and metaphysical. Although the motivation for this theory is interesting, I will mention it now only briefly. First, the epistemological motivation. In order to ensure the possibility of infallible knowledge, and so preserve the possibility of the existence of a sage, the Stoics needed to preclude the possibility of two qualitatively indistinguishable individuals. Were there to be qualitatively indis-

[4] The four exceptions being place, time, void and *lekta*.

[5] I say "proper" individuals since there are many things which are, in some sense, individuals, but which the Stoics do not conceive of as being peculiarly qualified. An example would be a ship, or any composite artifact.

tinguishable individuals, a Stoic sage, when faced with one such individual, might very well mistake it for the other. If this indiscernibility were even a possibility, the sage would have to become a model skeptic by withholding assent at all times. (See Cicero, *Acad.* 2.77-8= LS 40D). Interestingly enough, Arcesilaus, according to Cicero, seems to concede that if individuals are peculiarly qualified, and if this peculiarity is preserved by the impressions of these individuals, the possibility of sagacity is preserved. The subsequent debate between the skeptics and Stoics centers on the plausibility of such peculiar qualities, and the cogency of theories of *phantasia* which preserve these unique marks. Concerning this debate, Cicero claims "this is one controversial issue which has lasted up to the present."

The Stoics buttress their theory of unique qualities with a view concerning individuation. They claim that if there were seemingly two qualitatively indistinguishable individuals, this would in fact be a case of one peculiarly qualified individual in two substrata, something which they take to be simply an absurdity (Plut. *CC* 1077C= LS 28O). They adhere to a related principle, that there could not be two peculiarly qualified individuals in one substrate (this is the famous Dion-Theon passage preserved by Philo, *de immut. mundo* 48 II.397= LS 28P). I will return to a discussion of some of the reasons the Stoics held these principles. What does follow from this brief sketch is that the Stoics uphold a very strong version of the identity of indiscernibles. If two purportedly distinct individuals share even a restricted set of qualities, the ones said to be peculiar to either of the pair, then they are the same individual.[6]

What features must peculiar properties have? They need to have three features, each of which is related to a task which these qualities perform.

1. they must persist for as long as the individual they qualify persists (in the case of living things they must be lifelong)
2. they must be unique
3. they must be perceptible (under ideal conditions at least)

I will concentrate on the first two features. The third becomes important only with respect to the role peculiar qualities play in Stoic epistemology.[7]

[6] One should note that this principle, as it stands, is to be read both synchronically and diachronically. Since my present self shares peculiar qualities with my former self, I am the same person as my former self.

[7] That soul is perceptible follows from a number of Stoic views. Soul is pneuma disposed, which, in so far as pneuma is a body, is potentially perceptible. This psychic pneuma is said by Philo to extend right to the surface of ensouled bodies (*Questions and Answers on Genesis* 2.4, = SVF 2.802). Soul also seems to have all the properties of

The first feature is related to the peculiar qualities' role as the criterion of identity of peculiarly qualified individuals. Socrates is that which is qualified in the "Socratic" way, as all other individuals are that which is qualified in the particular peculiar manner in which in fact they are qualified. The existence of some matter qualified in a given peculiar way is both necessary and sufficient for the existence of the individual so qualified.

The second feature is related to the role of the peculiar qualities as the criterion of individuation. What distinguishes one individual from another is that each is *peculiarly* qualified. For example, it is not sufficient for being two individuals to be in two separate lumps of matter (contra Sedley[8]) since if these two lumps of matter are identically qualified, they would form a single peculiarly qualified individual in two substrata, which the Stoics think is simply metaphysically impossible (at least when viewed synchronically)[9]. It is not because the lumps of matter are distinct that they are individuated, but because distinct lumps simply cannot be qualified in the same way. It is this principle which ensures that as a matter of fact distinct lumps of matter are always the matter of distinct individuals, or parts of distinct individuals, or distinct parts of the same individual. In other words, if the Stoics were to give up their view about the impossibility of identically qualified distinct lumps of matter, they would claim that the two lumps would form *one* individual (in two substrata), not two (as one would expect if the distinctness of the lumps of matter were sufficient for individuating those things constituted by the matter), although there would be two lumps (or substrata). If distinctness of matter were sufficient for individuating individuals composed of distinct lumps of matter, then the only grounds the

"states" and "tenors", and then some. Tenors, we know from Simplicius (*in cat.* 237.25ff.), are perceptible, since sour wine, and Maltese dogs all "carry the mark" of their genus. Stobaeus tells us that many virtues are just tenors of the soul (2.73.1f.; 2.70.21f.), and so should be equally perceivable. Also the virtues, themselves dispositions of the soul, are the causes of virtuous actions. "It is impossible, when someone possesses temperance, for him not to be temperate..." (see Stob. 1.138,14f). Therefore actions of a certain sort reveal properties of the soul of the person who so acts. One can perceive the soul through its effects. Indeed, Seneca tells us (*Letters*, 120.3f.) that our concept of virtue is due to the observation of virtuous acts. He constantly tells us that we perceive someone's virtue, which just is perceiving someone's soul. Sextus makes it clear that virtues are dispositions of soul, and indeed claims that they are parts of soul (*AP* 11.22f). In effect, the Stoics think that we perceive souls by perceiving the actions of ensouled beings. Socrates, on this account, cannot but act in a "Socratic" way, and knowledge of this "Socratic" way of acting would just be knowledge which would allow one to infallibly recognize Socrates.

[8] See his magisterial "The Stoics' Criterion of Identity," *Phronesis* 27 (1982), 255-75.

[9] See Simp. *in Cat.*, 214,24f., where disjoint things are said not to be able to be qualified, since they cannot posses a single unifying pneuma, which the quality would be.

Stoics would have for denying the possibility of identically qualified lumps would be the epistemological problems this would yield for the possibility of infallible recognition. Yet they do not claim just this, they claim it would yield the metaphysical impossibility of one individual in two substrata.

The third feature, related to the peculiar qualities' role as the criterion of truth, I will not dwell upon. The peculiar qualities of anything of which one can have knowledge must be potentially discernable, since it is via recognition of these peculiar qualities that knowledge (as opposed to mere opinion) of peculiarly qualified things is obtained.

Simplicius summarizes some of these features of peculiar qualities as follows:

> ... if in the case of compound entities there exists individuated form – with reference to which the Stoics speak of something peculiarly qualified, which both is gained, and lost again, all together, and remains the same throughout the compound entity's life even though its constituent parts come to be and are destroyed at different times...
>
> *in de Anima* 217,36-218,2 = LS 28I.

This passage suggests that peculiar qualities satisfy criteria one and two, that is, that peculiar qualities are both unique and lifelong.

What I now wish to demonstrate is that souls satisfy these three criteria, and in fact are the peculiar qualities of ensouled beings. But first let me quickly survey some of the other options that have been suggested in the literature. D. Sedley, in his ground-breaking "The Stoics' Criterion of Identity,"[10] investigates what might ground the diachronic identity of individuals for the Stoics – what peculiar qualities might in fact be[11]. He claims that the Stoics might feel vindicated by the discovery of the unique nature of fingerprints, and comments that they did not consider spatial-temporal continuity as the mark of identity (both fingerprints and spatial-temporal continuity being taken as possible candidates for the sort of thing peculiar properties might be).[12] However, there are good "Stoic" reasons for rejecting both something like fingerprints and spatial-temporal continuity as playing the role of the criterion of identity.

Dexippus (*in Cat.* 30, 20-6 II.395= LS 28J) suggests that the Stoics may have thought of peculiar qualities as some sort of *sundrome*, or compound of qualities:

[10] *Phronesis* 27 (1982), 255-75.

[11] Sedley believes that the Stoics have a separate account for grounding the synchronic identity of individuals, one based on distinctness of matter, discussed above. I believe the account employing peculiar qualities, although not without problems, is intended by the Stoics to ground both diachronic and synchronic identity.

[12] Fingerprints, p. 266, spatial-temporal continuity, p. 262.

> But if form is that which is predicated in the category of essence of a plurality of numerically different things, in what does single individual differ from single individual, seeing that each is numerically single? Those who solve this difficulty on the basis of the peculiarly qualified – that one individual is distinguished, say, by hookedness of the nose, by blondness, or by some other combination of qualities, another by snubness, baldness, or grayness of the eyes, and again another by other qualities – do not seem to me to solve it well.

It seems clear that this list of examples of what might enter into the compound of peculiar qualities is problematic. One's hair color, shape of nose, eye color, let alone whether or not one has hair, are precisely the sorts of qualities which can change while leaving the identity of the individual unchanged. Is anyone really essentially bald? And, even if someone is essentially bald, why think that only *they* could be essentially bald, since their baldness would have to be their, and only their, essential property[13]. Worse yet, on some plausible ways of unpacking the Stoic theory no one else could even be bald at all[14]. Fingerprints seem to suffer from the same sort of problem. We may all have unique fingerprints, yet this seems to be an incidental feature of our individuality. Cut off my fingers, and I plausibly still remain me. Moving to some sort of counterfactual modal to ground my identity ("Eric is the person who *would* have these fingerprints *were* he to have fingers") is extremely problematic, question begging, and certainly unable to play the role of the criterion of truth. (One cannot say, 'I know *that* is Eric, because I know that he is the person who *would* have these fingerprints *were* he to have fingers'. You could only know this if you already knew that this was Eric.)

Let me say a bit more about the problems with the *sundrome* view of peculiar qualities. One might think, "What's wrong with this view – why cannot some list of my qualities be sufficient for distinguishing me from all other individuals?" Following Dexippus, one might suggest that some list of *common qualities*, say, having a hooked nose and blond hair, might serve as the qualities that individuate me from all others[15]. Would not a long enough

[13] Does it make sense to talk about being *totally* bald this way as opposed to that?

[14] This would follow from any model which has it that if x is a quality of Y, x cannot also be a peculiar quality of Z.

[15] It is more difficult than it may appear to formally distinguish common from particular qualities. A common quality is a quality which could be shared by more than one individual. This notion is intended to be prior to any account of the ontology of such qualities, or how different individuals can 'partake' in them. Intuitively, one talks of common qualities in the following way: "Socrates is hook nosed" (so might be Callias), as opposed to "Socrates has *this* hook nose", or "Socrates is hooknosed in *this* way", which may (but need not, for surely both of these latter locutions are true regardless of one's view concerning particular qualities) indicate ontological commitment on the part

list of all the common qualities of all individuals yield distinct lists? If so, might not a *sundrome* of common qualities be sufficient for grounding the identity and individuation of individuals?

There are problems. It may be true, as a matter of fact, that the world is a complex enough place that all individuals are commonly-qualified differently. Yet the Stoics seem to need this to be a matter of necessity, and not merely contingency. Of course, they may think that necessarily all individuals are commonly qualified in different ways (this seems to have been Leibniz's view), yet there would still be problems. First, such a view may allow us to individuate one individual from another, but such lists of common qualities are ill-suited to play the role of the criterion of identity. Surely I could lose some of my (common) qualities, and remain me. Which ones? Wouldn't these privileged qualities (those I cannot lose and remain me) be in fact *my* peculiar qualities? Yet why couldn't another individual share these qualities, since they do not exhaust the list of my common qualities (given the hypothesis under consideration we know that the *complete* list of common qualities of any two individuals may differ, but subsets of them could, and will, be the same)?

This, in turn, suggests a further problem. How could one come to know, and in fact infallibly come to know, that some number of common qualities are the peculiar qualities of an individual? Socrates today shares many, but not all, common qualities with Socrates tomorrow. How could a sage know that the *right ones* are shared, so that it is Socrates in both cases? In fact, consider a sage who met Socrates as a young man. Many years later how would the sage be able to *re*cognize the now older Socrates? It may very well be the case that the young Socrates shares more common qualities with other youths of the next generation, than his latter self does with his younger self[16]. No, common qualities will not do.

This suggests moving from common qualities to particular qualities. As I will argue, the Stoics do ground identity in peculiar qualities – the soul as a peculiar quality. Yet we must be careful concerning the individuation of these qualities. One might try something like the following, "Surely no one can have my skin color other than me. This individual quality is mine and only mine." One might mean two things by this. One might mean that this skin color is individuated by being *my* skin color. If this is what one meant, one would be clearly begging the question concerning identity, for one

of the speaker to a realist conception of particular qualities. It is only with particular qualities that one need consider the second-order identity question, "what grounds the identity through time of this particular quality?"

[16] Of course it is not the number of shared common qualities that is at issue, yet the point should still be clear.

would be attempting to ground the identity of an individual in the persistence of a quality whose very identity is itself grounded in being the quality *of* the very individual whose identity it grounds. (As an example, it would be question begging to claim that Eric's identity is grounded by the persistence of a particular skin color, namely Eric's skin color.)

It might be more plausible to move to the view that qualities are 'trope-like', meaning that quality tokens have their own identity apart from simply being the quality of some individual or other[17]. This is, in fact, the Stoic view, yet now the *sundrome* view, at least as presented by Dexippus, stumbles for another reason. The reason has already been given, the examples he gives simply cannot play such a role. I cannot be whatever individual has this particularly hooked nose, for surely I could lose my nose and remain me. It seems that what one needs is a "special" quality, which is both individual and peculiar.

There are also problems with the Stoics holding to a theory of identity grounded in spatial-temporal continuity. In a nut shell, the problem is that individuals are *not* spatial-temporally continuous for the Stoics. This follows both from their theory of infinite recurrence, and from their theory of mixture. The precise nature of infinite recurrence for the Stoics is hotly debated.[18] However, if they postulate linear time together with the recurrence of at least the same individuals in each world order (if not also indistinguishable/identical events) the spatial-temporal discontinuity of all individuals other than Zeus (who exists at all times through a cycle) is guaranteed. I will not exist for that temporal interval from my death in this cycle until my birth in the next cycle. If it is *me* in the next cycle, and these cycles can be distinguished by their occupation of distinct temporal intervals, then I am temporally discontinuous.

[17] This is not to say that a trope-like quality can exist not as the quality of some individual or other. No 'strong' separation claim is implied. One only need claim that the identity of some quality-trope is not contingent upon it being a quality of this or that individual. It may even be the case that as a matter of fact a given quality trope will never exist other than as the quality of a particular individual (consider, say, psychic qualities), or, stronger still, once being the quality of a given individual it could not be the quality of any other. Given this stronger formulation the quality-trope's identity is not contingent on the individual it is a quality of only in the sense that prior to it being the quality of this individual it could have been the quality of, or qualified, some other individual. This is an alternative formulation, since this is certainly not true of individual qualities conceived of as, say, Eric's skin color. For there seems to be no sense in which Eric's skin color could have been the skin color of someone other than Eric.

[18] For two recent opposed views see: A.A. Long, "The Stoics on world-conflagration and everlasting recurrence," *Southern Journal of Philosophy*. vol 23 supp., ed. R. Epp, 1985, and, R. Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion*, Duckworth, 1988, ch 10.

The Stoic theory of mixture (often both maligned and misunderstood) also demands the spatial-temporal discontinuity of individuals, at least those which can enter into mixtures. The Stoics believe that mixtures involve the destruction of those things mixed. Unlike for Aristotle, constituents in mixtures do not exist in potentiality, they do not exist at all. The Stoics are, however, committed to the claim that the very same individual constituents that were mixed can be extracted from mixtures. If so, then the spatial-temporal discontinuity of individuals again arises, since constituents of mixtures will exist before they were mixed, and after their extraction, but not while they constitute the mixture.[19]

*

Let me now turn to the Stoic account of the soul, to see if it can play the role of the peculiar quality of ensouled beings. First, is the soul lifelong, i.e., does one have the same soul as long as one lives? This seems clear, even if no text explicitly states it. We have no text which claims that we have numerically the same soul throughout our lives, yet it would be a uniquely bizarre thesis to believe otherwise[20].

It is even clearer that the death of ensouled things is the separation of the soul from the body (Sextus *AP* 7.234= LS 53F, Calcidius 220 = LS 53G, Nemesius 78,7-79,2 = LS 45D). But if the soul is the criterion of identity of a given individual person, and separation of soul and body is not both the destruction of soul and the destruction of body, a problem arises. Persistence of soul after death must entail persistence of the person after death. Indeed, the Stoics do hold to such a view, in at least two different contexts. The first is straightforward:

> [The Stoics] say that the soul is subject to generation and destruction. When separated from the body, however, it does not perish at once but survives on its own for certain times, the soul of the virtuous up to the dissolution of everything into fire, that of fools only for certain definite times. *By the survival of souls they mean that we ourselves survive as souls separated from bodies and changed into the lesser substance of the soul*, while the souls of non-rational animals perish along with their bodies. (My emphasis.)
>
> Eusebius *Evang. prep.* 15.20.6f= LS 53W

[19] See my "Diogenes Laertius VII.151 and the Stoic Theory of Mixture", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 1988.

[20] Some formulations of occasionalism have it that there is no numerical identity between entities considered at more than one time, yet surely the Stoics are not occasionalists.

We continue to exist as individual persons after the death of the composite soul/body. This also gives us a reason not to fear death, a notion found in both Seneca and Marcus Aurelius.

This notion of the persistence of a peculiarly qualified ensouled individual grounded in the persistence of soul apart from body also is found in an interesting theological context:

> At least Chrysippus says that Zeus and the world are like a man and providence like his soul, so that when the conflagration comes Zeus, being the only imperishable one among the Gods, withdraws into providence, whereupon both, having come together, continue to occupy the single substance of aether.
>
> Plut., *CC* 1077E= LS 28O

The context here is that the whole world is thought to be a peculiarly qualified individual, somehow "equated" with God, where the body of the world is said to be matter, and providence is said to be its soul, and so also the soul of Zeus. Although the details of this are sketchy, what this passage suggests is that Zeus exists during conflagration *as his soul.* This view is confirmed by two passages from Plutarch, both direct quotes from Chrysippus:

> In *On Providence* Book 1 [Chrysippus] says that Zeus continues to grow until he has used up everything on himself: 'For since death is the separation of soul from the body, and the soul of the world is not separated but grows continuously until it has completely used up its matter on itself, the world must not be said to die....
>
> Plut. *SC* 1052C-D= LS 46E.

Here the context is an explanation as to why the world (*to holon*) does not strictly speaking die, although it is a living, peculiarly qualified individual. The world's body does not separate from the world's soul, the body is merely used up, leaving the world periodically in a state where only its soul exists. Since no separating takes place, no dying takes place, and so the world exists (for a time) as its soul only. The second passage reads as follows:

> In his *On providence* Book I he says: 'When the world is fiery through and through, *it is directly both its own soul and commanding faculty* (*euthus kai psukhê estin heautou kai hegemonikon*). But when, having changed into moisture and the soul which remains therein, it has in a way changed into body and soul so as to be compounded out of these, it has got a different principle.
>
> *SC* 1053B = LS 46F (my emphasis)

Here the equation is made explicitly.

The preceding passages suggest that if the soul of some individual exists, then that individual exists. In other words, they present a sufficiency condition for the existence of an individual. If the soul of an individual is the

criterion of identity for that individual, then persistence of soul after death entails persistence of the individual after death. We have seen that the Stoics endorse this. Yet is there evidence that the Stoics thought that if the soul of an individual does *not* exist, the individual also does not exist? There is. This evidence concerns the Stoic account of birth. They claim that the fetus has but a *phusis*, which is hardened from a blow upon entering the outside world, "For just as *pneuma* in stones is immediately kindled by a blow, on account of the readiness for this change, so the *phusis* of a ripe embryo, once it is born, does not hesitate to *change into soul* on meeting the environment. So whatever issues forth from the womb is at once an animal." (Hierocles 4.39f.= LS 53B). If what is born is to be an animal, it must be ensouled. Prior to being ensouled no individual animal exists, since no animal exists at all.[21]

In addition, there are texts which suggest that the soul has "individuating powers". The Stoics have a tripartite theory of three sorts of entities (all being *pneuma* variously disposed) which unify bodies, and give rise to their qualities. These are *hexis*, *phusis* and *psyche* (H-P-P). Philo tells us that:

> hexis is also shared by lifeless things, stones, and logs, and our bones, which resemble stones, also participate in it. *Phusis* also extends to plants, and in us there are things like plants – nails and hair. *Phusis* is *hexis* in actual motion. *Psyche* is *phusis* which has also acquired impression and impulse.
>
> *Allegories of the laws* 2.22-3 II.458 = LS 47P

Philo also tells us that God:

> Bound some bodies by *hexis*, others by *phusis*, others by *psyche*, and others by rational *psyche*.
>
> *God's Immutability* 35-6 II.458 = LS 47Q

The difference between *hexis*, *phusis* and *psyche* seems to be degrees of tension, or activity, of the pneuma which they, in some sense, are. *Psyche* is *pneuma* disposed in a most complex way. All three members of this triad share certain roles or properties, some of which seem ideally suited for being that in virtue of which something is peculiarly qualified (or, more precisely, seem *to be* the peculiar quality of something).

Most of the reports of interest to us concern *hexis*, since reports on *phusis* or *psyche* tend to concentrate on powers these have which are not also shared by *hexis*. Yet since *phusis* is *hexis* (more precisely, *hexis* in motion), and *psyche* is *phusis* and then some, all three share a minimal set of proper-

[21] This in effect gives us a necessary condition for the existence of an individual as long as the Stoics do not countenance the possibility that an individual can exist as that very individual, being at one time plant-like (prior to ensoulment when the fetus has but a *phusis*), and later an animal.

ties. Plutarch tells us that *hexeis* sustain bodies, and are responsible for the qualities of those bodies they sustain (*SR* 1053Ff.= LS 47M). Achilles adds that bodies are called unified if "governed by" a single *hexis*, this *hexis* being the cohesive *pneuma* of the body (*Isagoge* 14, II.368). We are told a bit more about this by Nemesius, who reports that *pneuma* has two motions, an inward and an outward:

> the outward movement producing quantities and qualities, and the inward one unity and substance
>
> 70,6f= LS 47J

Plutarch adds that these pneumatic tensions give form and shape to bodies (*SR* 1053F-1054B = LS 47M). Clauses such as "productive of unity and substance", and "giving of form" virtually claim that *pneuma*, as either *hexis*, *phusis* or *psyche* individuates those things of which it is *pneuma*.

In an interesting passage, Simplicius (*in Cat.* 214,24-37 = LS 28M) informs us that all qualified things are so qualified with respect to a particular quality, which is itself a *hexis*. For example, a grammarian (someone 'qualified' by the knowledge of grammar) is a grammarian due to having the common quality 'knowledge of grammar'. It is the having of a common quality that fixes one's species membership; to be a horse, or a human, is to be commonly qualified in a horse-like or human-like way.[22] It is a small step to claiming that things are particularly qualified with respect to the particular *hexis* (or *phusis* or *psyche*) they have. Having a particular "kind" of H-P-P fixes the natural kind one is a member of (see Plutarch on iron, stone and silver (*SR* 1035Ff.), while having the particular H-P-P one has fixes *which* individual one is. Since those parts of a human which are like, or have, *phuseis* (I assume no parts of a living body are, or have, merely a *hexis*), are precisely those which could not ground the identity of an individual (hair, nails, and the like), I conclude that it is soul, or the persistence of an individual soul, which is responsible for, and *is*, the peculiar quality of ensouled beings, and in particular that it satisfies the three features peculiar qualities must have.

*

Yet there are problems here. In particular, what is the soul? Is it the right sort of thing to be a peculiar quality? Is it a quality at all? Is it a body? If so, is it itself a peculiarly qualified individual (which would threaten a vicious

[22] See DL 7.58 where, according to Diogenes of Babylon (head of Stoa mid 2nd-cent.), 'horse' and 'man' are terms which signify common qualities.

regress)? If it is not a body 'all on its own', but is somehow the body of which it is the soul, how could this body change, while the very same individual soul remains? Problems such as these move both the Stoics and 'moderns' alike to loosen the knot of identity with respect to the relationship of the soul/mind to the body.

*

The view I wish to advance concerning the relationship of the soul of an individual to the individual herself is that the soul is not a body other than (*heteron*) the individual. It is not, however, therefore identical with the individual (where identity is taken to be an equivalence/indiscernibility relation)[23]. The reasoning that will establish this will also demonstrate that many of the 'bodies' which inhabit the Stoic universe are not distinct bodies, not bodies *heteron* each other, and so in fact are not a plurality of bodies. If body A and body B were not bodies *heteron* each other, then, so I claim, the Stoics would not consider A and B to be *two* bodies. Stoic corporealism is itself often thought to be a strange enough view. Given the usual interpretation of that corporealism, that the many distinct bodies of the Stoic universe are coextensive, the theory may seem not only odd but also absurd. That the Stoics are corporealists is certain, that absurdities immediately threaten, I will argue, is false.

The Stoics are in fact quite sensitive to the issues surrounding the coextension of discrete bodies, and develop a theory to avoid it. This theory has two main components: a theory of parts and wholes and a particular type of entity reductionism.[24] In particular, the Stoics argue that if A is a part of B, A is not other than (*heteron*) B. They also have a complex reductionistic ontology to explain *what* the parts of wholes in fact are, if not bodies other than the whole, nor identical with them. I will now sketch both aspects of this theory, apply it to the case of souls and the individuals of which they

[23] Such a relation would be symmetric, reflexive, transitive, and satisfy the condition having it that purportedly two identical entities share in common all properties either is said to have. To deny that a given soul is identical with a given body will be to deny that whatever properties one has, the other necessarily shares them. Many modern identity theorists deny that this condition holds when considering identity *through* time.

[24] In a far-reaching and important paper, J. Barnes discusses much of Stoic logic concerning parts and wholes ("Bits and Pieces", in *Matter and Metaphysics*, J. Barnes and M. Mignucci (eds.), Bibliopolis 1988). I am basically in agreement with his reconstruction of the Stoic *heteron* relation. I will be applying many of his conclusions to argue for metaphysical and physical claims concerning the Stoics that he did not chose to investigate.

are souls, and suggest how it might be applied to other entities in the Stoic universe.

First let us look at texts concerning parts and wholes. The first text to consider is Plut. *CC* 1074B-C:

> Now *to pan* is neither a part (for nothing is greater than it), nor a whole as they themselves (the Stoics) say; for "whole" is predicated of what is ordered, whereas *to pan*, because it is infinite, is indeterminate and disorderly.

This passage establishes that wholes must be organized and that parts, in order to be parts, must have something "greater than them". This second claim is ambiguous, but it may be important, for on one reading at least, it denies that any given whole is a part of itself. If parts are, in general, not identical with the whole they are parts of (as we will see the Stoics think), then this is a desirable result, for otherwise wholes will not be identical to themselves.

The second text to examine is Sextus *M* IX 336:

> The Stoics say that a part is neither different from (*heteron*) the whole nor the same as it. For a hand is neither the same as the man (for it is not a man) nor different from the man (for the man is thought of as a man together with it).

The *heteron* relation is what needs to be interpreted. It is clear that *heteron* does not mean non-identical, since a hand is clearly not identical to the person whose hand it is, yet is not *heteron* the person whose hand it is.

The third text to examine is Stob. 1.20,7 (=Pos., fr.96= LS 28D.9f. modified)

> The peculiarly qualified thing is not the same as its constituent substance. Nor on the other hand is it different from it, *but is merely not the same*, in that the substance both is a part of it (and occupies the same place as it), whereas whatever is called different from something must be separated *in place* from it, (and not be thought of as even part of it). That what concerns the peculiarly qualified is not the same as what concerns the substance, Mnesarchus says is clear. For things which are the same should have the same properties. For if, for the sake of argument, someone were to mould a horse, squash it, then make a dog, it would be reasonable for us on seeing this to say that this previously did not exist but now does exist. So what is said when it comes to the qualified thing is different. So too in general when it comes to substance, to hold that we are the same as our substances seems unconvincing.[25]

[25] Sedley and Long (but not Barnes) drop out the "in place" in the clause which reads: "whereas whatever is called different from something must be separated *in place* from it...." I take this clause to be making a crucial theoretical claim concerning a criteria for *heteron*-ness. See now also Sorabji, *Matter, Space and Motion*, p. 87 for a correct rendering of this clause.

There is much to cull from this passage. In particular, we want to know what criteria of "*heteron*-ness" this passage establishes. A PQI is said not to be the same as its (constitutive) substance, nor other than it (*me tauton..me heteron*). This is said to be due to the following factors:

1. the substance *is a part* of the PQI[26]
2. the substance *occupies the same place* as the PQI.[27]

These two criteria rule against the substance being *heteron* the PQI. In order for two things to be *heteron* each other, they must be separated *in place*, and not thought of as in a part – whole relation. As we shall see, these two criteria, taken together, establish that if two things are separate in place, they occupy completely non-overlapping places.

In addition, in order for two things to be the same as each other, they must have (all?) the same properties. This is equivalent to claiming that sameness is an indiscernibility relation (as we think identity must be), i.e if a is the same as b then if Fa then Fb. These claims can be put as follows:

1. X is 'merely not the same' as Y iff X is a part of Y
2. X is *heteron* Y iff x is separated in place from Y and X is not (thought of as) a part of Y.
3. X is the same as Y iff X and Y have (all) the same properties.

There are a number of things to note about these claims. First, the notion of part at work here is a somewhat non-standard one. It cannot simply be the case that if A is a part of B, A exclusively occupies some spatial partition of B. Not all parts are spatial subsets of wholes. This is evident since a PQI and its substance both occupy the same place completely, yet the latter is a part of the former. But the Stoics are also concerned with more 'garden variety' parts, such as hands, viewed as proper parts of individuals. The Sextus passage concerning hands, when read together with the Stobaeus passage, suggests that hands, and in general "proper parts" of individuals (that is, spatial partitions of individuals) are "merely not the same as" the individual of which they are parts.

[26] This makes clear that by part the Stoics do not mean mere spatial partitions of objects, for the substance of a PQI is completely coextensive with the PQI, yet is not identical with the PQI (so the claim that the substance of something is a part of the thing does not reduce to the claim that something is a part of itself).

[27] As will become clear from what follows, this condition merely qualifies the sense in which the substance of a PQI is a part of that PQI. Two things can occupy completely the same place as each other, yet one can be a part of the other. It is the Stoic theory of parts and wholes, which, once properly unpacked, does all the work here.

The notion of "separated in place" is also ambiguous. Strictly speaking, a whole and one of its proper parts are not in the same place, since places are for the Stoics three-dimensional extensions, and wholes and any of their *proper* parts occupy distinct three-dimensional extensions.[28] The Stoics non-standard use of part, coupled with this feature of the places of parts and wholes, complicates their theory of identity. One might fail to recognize that the substance of a PQI is a part of this individual (given the non-standard Stoic concept of part, which allows parts to be completely coextensive with wholes). Alternatively, one might not think that a proper part of some individual (say a hand) is separated in place from that individual (given the Stoic concept of place), and so the "is not (thought of as) a part of" clause in (2) above. In other words, the two conditions for *heteron*-ness found in clause (2) above require that in order for two things to be *heteron* each other they must be spatially completely non-overlapping.

This suggests a two pronged test for bodies being *heteron* each other:

a. if A is a part of B, A is not *heteron* B
b. if A and B are both parts of C, A and B are *heteron* each other only if they are in completely separate places (not spatially overlapping)
c. so, from b, if A and B are not in completely separate places they are not *heteron* each other, whether or not they are parts of the same whole.

In addition, the Stoics are clear about what they mean by 'separate'. They mean separate in place. Note that this is *not* a modal claim. The claim is not that x is *heteron* y if x is separ*able* from y, but rather if it is separ*ate* from y. This is important. We have confirmation of the non-modal nature of the separation claim in Seneca:

> One thing must be *separate* from another if they are to be two.... My mind is an animal, and I am an animal. Yet we are not two. Why not? Because my mind is a part of me. Something will be counted for itself when it stands for itself; but when it is a member of something else, it cannot be thought different from it.
> *Ep* CXIII 4-5

Here my mind (something very close to my soul, a part of it in fact) is said not to be an animal *other* than me, since they are not separate. We know that they are separ*able*, since that is what death is; and so this text supports the non-modal nature of the separation claim.

Let us review what has been established. The soul of an individual persists for the life of the individual (as composite), and individuates the individual. It is the peculiar quality of the individual whose soul it is. Persistence of soul is both necessary and sufficient for persistence of the individu-

[28] In fact the two extensions stand in a part-whole relation to each other.

al. Given the role of the soul as the criterion of identity and individuation of an individual, it makes sense that the Stoics should claim that the soul is not other than the individual. Although the soul is a body, it is not a body *heteron* the individual whose soul it is. It is not the same as the individual (or, for that matter, as the individual's body), it is 'merely not the same' as the individual. A person and her soul are not *two* bodies. The relationship of a person to her soul is weaker than identity, yet still quite strong. Identity is an indiscernibility equivalence relation. The relationship of soul to body, and, so I claim, of qualities in general to that which they qualify, or of parts to wholes, is a partial indiscernibility equivalence relation.

There is a problem lurking here. By developing a 4-valued theory of identity ('same as', 'other than', 'merely not the same as', and 'not the same as' (recall *heteron* does not mean 'not the same as')[29], the Stoics are able to claim that the relationship of various entities, in particular of soul and body, is weaker than identity, yet not so weak that the two are separate distinct bodies. But this loosening up of identity leaves open another possibility. Might A and B *not* be distinct from one other, yet at the same time be bodies distinct from one other? Might not A and B be two bodies, but not two? This may sound odd, but it is a possibility which must be canvassed. Might the soul after all be a *body* distinct from the body of the individual of which it is the soul, yet not be distinct from the individual of which it is the soul? In general, could there be distinct bodies which are the bodies of things which are not *heteron* each other? I think the answer to this is no. Let me explain why.

Such a possibility would have it that there could be coextensive bodies, which, while being two bodies, would not be two things other than each other. Surely these two bodies could not themselves be peculiarly qualified individuals, for then it would be hard to see what work the *heteron* relation would be doing. Such PQIs would not be *heteron* each other, and so it seems that they could not be *two* PQIs. In any case, the *heteron* test seems to rule out having a plurality of bodies coextensive. If body A is not separate in place from body B, then body A is not other than body B.[30]

This view fits well with one candidate for what the Stoics may have taken to be a definition of body. For there to be two or more bodies present somewhere, there must be two or more resistant extensions present (on the

[29] This fourth relation, although not mentioned directly, falls out of the above theory. It is the relation which partially spatially overlapping entities have to each other. My left calf including my knee is "not the same as" my left thigh including this same knee.

[30] Partially overlapping entities may be distinct bodies, but not be *heteron* each other. However, this possibility does not affect in any interesting way the answer to the question: "How many distinct bodies are there in the Stoic universe?"

assumption that the Stoics define bodies as three dimensional extensions plus resistance (*to trikhê diastaton meta antitupias*)). Now grounding 'otherness' in spatial separation makes sense, for it suggests a plausible theory concerning the individuation of extensions. The theory it suggests is that one cannot have two or more coextensive extensions. There is in any region only one extension present, the very extension that defines the spatial boundaries of the given region. To think otherwise suggests questions such as, "Where are these two (or more) extensions coextensive?" or, "What is it that they share in common?". The Stoics, by downgrading the ontic standing of place (it is one of the four incorporeals), are ill equipped to answer such questions.[31]

Further evidence for this view comes from considering what the Stoics thought the soul to be. The soul is *pneuma* disposed. The following passage relates *hexis*, *phusis* and *psyche*, as we have already seen, yet goes on to claim that they are all *pneuma*:

> There are two kinds of innate *pneuma*, the physical kind and the psychic kind. Some also posit a third, the tenor (*hexis*) kind. The *pneuma* which sustains stones is of the *hexis* kind, the one which nurtures animals and plants is physical, and the psychic *pneuma* is that which, in animate beings, makes animals capable of sensation and of moving in every way.
>
> Galen, *Med. Intro*, 14 726, 7-11 = LS 47N

This is confirmed by Calcidius who claims that "the soul is found to be natural breath" (220 = LS 53G).

The general model this suggests is that the soul is *pneuma* disposed in a particular way. Yet, if *pneuma* itself is but matter disposed, there is really no other body anywhere around which one might consider the soul to be, or to have. Indeed, we know that the Stoics did not consider psychic qualities to be other than the person who has them, for virtues are said to be a part of the sage (Sextus, *AM* XI, 24), and therefore cannot be *heteron* the sage. If qualities of the soul, the soul disposed, are not *heteron* the individual whose soul it is, it seems impossible to claim that the soul is *heteron* the person whose soul it is. As for the soul and the body of a given person, these too cannot be *heteron* each other, since they are not separate in place, merely separable.

I think considerations such as these can be used to demonstrate that the

[31] If the above reconstruction of the Stoic theory of identity is correct, it is impossible to uphold the standard interpretation of the Stoic theory of mixture, which has it that the constituent bodies in a mixture are actually coextensive. I have argued elsewhere that this is in fact a terrible misreading of the Stoics' theory. See my "Diogenes Laertius VII.151 and the Stoic Theory of Mixture", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 1988. .

qualities of any individual are not other than the individual, and, more generally, that any given PQI is not a body other than its:

a. matter
b. substance
c. psychic qualities
d. other qualities
e. soul
f. body.

The Stoics conceive of the relationship of mind to body as like that of the qualities of a body to the body; they are 'all but the same', yet not the same, nor *heteron* each other. It is this theory of *heteron*-ness which is at the heart of Stoic reductionism.

I will finish with the resolution of one final, yet crucial, problem. Even if the above account is correct, one might be left with the following worry: must the Stoics simply decree that our souls are in fact peculiar, that my soul is qualitatively distinct from everyone else's? If so, are they not just grounding much of their metaphysics and epistemology on little more than a pipe dream? I think that the Stoics have good reason to claim that souls are all qualitatively distinct, and that recognition of their reasons for believing this will show just how interrelated are the principles of Stoic metaphysics that I have been discussing.

What constitutes the qualities or states of our soul? In a nutshell, all our beliefs, desires, memories, concepts and the like are our soul disposed. If two putatively distinct souls were to be indistinguishable, they would each have to each all and only indistinguishable beliefs, desires, memories, concepts, etc. But this, so I shall demonstrate, is impossible. The impossibility of this follows from the Stoic theory of impressions (*phantasia*). Our impressions, themselves mental entities, are, roughly speaking, how things appear to us, usually direct products of the employment of our sense organs. These imprints on our soul, which reveal themselves and their causes,[32] seem to be essentially first person, and so particular. Although two people may assent to what seems to be the same *lekton* when they both view a sunset, their appearances will necessarily include how the sunset appears from their necessarily distinct spatial perspectives. They may both ascribe the same content to their impressions, namely that "I am having the impression of a sunset", but the impressions themselves are not individuated by

[32] See Aetius 4.121-5 = LS 39B. In addition, for a more extensive discussion of the particular nature of impressions see LS, commentary on sections 33 and 39.

the content one happens to give them. My impression of a sunset is still just that, even if for some bizarre reason I ascribe some deviant content to it, like "There is a large apple pie before me." Since an appearance is itself a soul disposed, the two souls will be disposed differently when each receives an appearance, even if the appearance is of the same thing, say the same sunset.[33]

We are now in a position to see the Stoic's solution to our dilemma. Since the Stoics think that there cannot be two peculiarly qualified individuals in one substrate, no individual other than (*heteron*) me can have appearances indistinguishable from mine. This is because no other individual can occupy the same place as I do, and so have my perspective on things. Since our beliefs, desires, volitions, and the like are contingent on our appearances, it is very likely that these too will be distinct, from one individual to another. So the distinctiveness of our souls is guaranteed by a metaphysical principle that is both quite plausible, and independent of the epistemological considerations which power the need to have peculiar qualities in the first place. Because our perspectives on the world are necessarily ours and only ours, and by postulating a mental state which embodies this perspective (*phantasia*), the uniqueness of our souls is ensured, and so our very uniqueness.[34]

McGill University, Montreal

[33] For a similar account of the particularity of impressions see M. Frede, "Stoics and Skeptics on Clear and Distinct Impressions", in: *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, Minnesota, 1987, esp. p. 155.

[34] A version of this paper was read at Trinity College, Univ. of Toronto, and at the Fourth International Conference on Greek Philosophy, Rhodes, 1992. In particular I wish to thank B. Inwood, M. Deslauriers, S. Menn, P. Mitsis and J. Moravcsik for their comments. I benefited greatly from Bob Sharples' comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Copyright of Phronesis is the property of Brill Academic Publishers and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.