Kurt Lampe clkwl@bristol.ac.uk

I. Introduction

My topic for today is "Julia Kristeva, the Stoics, and the True Life of Interpretations*."* I have taken the phrase "true life of interpretations" from Kristeva's article "Psychoanalysis and the Polis,"[1] where its meaning will become clear in the course of this paper. My reason for doing so is that it simultaneously points toward the heart of Kristeva's critical disagreement with Stoicism and indicates the relevance of that disagreement for this conference on "ethics of self-cultivation." In Hellenistic ethics, the end toward which all aspiration and effort are oriented is a certain sort of life*.* Exercises of self-cultivation aim to realize or sustain this sort of life, usually via the intermediaries of virtue and wisdom. This is true for Kristeva as well: as both a psychoanalyst and a cultural critic she has a consistent vision of an ideal sort of life, or at least the moral psychological core of any such life, and of the exercises of self-cultivation by which that life must be constituted and nourished.[2] Furthermore, by making "interpretation" one of her master terms for this life, she encourages us to consider how our philosophical activities, including the activity we are engaged in *at this very instant*, are already a sort of self-cultivation – whether constitutive of virtue and happiness or vice and misery remains to be considered.

My agenda in this paper is twofold. First, I would like to explain what Kristeva says about Stoicism, which is one of her fixed points of reference. It thus receives mention in many of her works,[3] but for reasons of space, my analysis will revolve around her article "Psychoanalysis and the Polis." Her claims there are difficult to understand, both because they require familiarity with the seminal and audacious scholarship of Émile Bréhier and Victor

Goldschmidt, and because she deliberately eschews dispassionate rigor and clarity in favor of affective involvement with the topic and the situation in which she writes.[4] In other words, she *performs* her ethics of interpretation. Working through these challenges in order to understand her suggestions will shed new light on a rich tradition that begins with Henri Bergson, to whose chair at the Sorbonne Bréhier succeeded, and encompasses the amazingly erudite and ambitious work of Bréhier's student Goldschmidt, Deleuze's *Logic of Sense*, and ongoing work today.[5]

My second objective is to sketch a critical response to Kristeva's presentation of Stoicism. The point is not to praise or condemn her accuracy, but rather to develop and test a new perspective on the "existential option"[6] that is the Stoic life of interpretations. In other words, I think that Kristeva, like Deleuze, Foucault, and many other European philosophers, can help us to appreciate aspects of Stoicism that the Greek and Roman Stoics could not articulate.

II. Kristeva on the Stoic "Life of Interpretations"

In "Psychoanalysis and the Polis," Kristeva writes, "I would say that interpretation as an epistemological and ethical attitude began with the Stoics. . . . Man, says Epictetus, is 'born to contemplate God and his works, and not only to contemplate them but also to interpret them . . . .' 'To interpret' in this context, and I think always, means 'to make a connection.' Thus the birth of interpretation is considered the birth of semiology, since the semiological sciences relate a sign (an event-sign) to a signified in order to act accordingly, consistently, consequently."[7] This quotation makes clear the importance Kristeva attributes to Stoicism as the originary and preeminent example of a

certain interpretive model. I will not address her assertion about the Stoics' chronological priority. What interests me is instead her claim that the Stoics' "epistemological and ethical attitude," which is revealed in their interpretive activity, can be encapsulated by the term "semiology," i.e. "making a connection" among three elements: a sign, a signified, and an action. What does that mean?

Before attempting to clarify this, it is best to complete the list of elements connected, according to Kristeva, in Stoic semiology. In her article "From One Identity to Another" she argues that "every language theory is predicated upon a conception of the subject that it explicitly posits, implies, or tries to deny."[8] There she mentions Stoic language theory only in passing, saying that she will not "refer back to the stoic sage, who guaranteed both the sign's triad and the inductive conditional clause."[9] In this compressed reference the phrase "inductive conditional clause" refers to the connections we have just seen among sign, signified, and action. I will explain this more thoroughly in a moment. We might think of this as the secondary level in Stoic semiology. But the term "sign's triad" introduces something new: namely, the connections of signifying word to signified concept, and of both to the external referent. We might call this the primary level of Stoic semiology. Kristeva believes that Stoic semiology is an "epistemological and ethical attitude" of the accomplished philosopher who, as she says here, "guarantees" both the primary and the secondary connections.

In order to understand this network of connectivity we need to detour via Kristeva's Stoics' beliefs about language. For Kristeva, language ought to be the last in a series of mechanisms for mediating and managing the

intensity of our needs, joys, and frustrations vis-à-vis other people.[10] She expresses this by saying that the engine of language is "primal want"[11] or the archaic, sexual "Thing."[12] To put it another way, the Thing represents our unnameable and overwhelming fascination, love, frustration and hatred toward other people, which is fundamental to the human experience. Our first, infantile way of relating to the Thing is via kinetic and sensorial rhythms and patterns, which Kristeva calls "the semiotic." These are experienced as an immediate relation to the maternal body as possessor of the Thing. But in the normative sequence of development, the child "abjects" this relation to the maternal body and invests its loves and hatreds in paternal signifiers instead – the "big Other" in place of the "(m)other." Kristeva calls this the "thetic break"; like Lacan, she designates the ensuing domain of signification "the symbolic." But unlike Lacan, Kristeva places great emphasis on the enduring importance of both semiotic patterns and "imaginary" polysemy within language, both of which she sees as supplements and potential rivals to signification as a means of expressing our relation to the Thing.[13]

Let us look more closely at Kristeva's theory of thetic signification. All thetic acts simultaneously posit something about external referents and represent the "subject of enunciation" in her mediated interaction with the Thing. For example, if I say, "The Stoics are brilliant," on the one hand I am picking out a referent, which I designate with the signifier "Stoics," and connecting it with an evaluative concept represented by the signifier "brilliant." But on the other hand, I am also positioning *myself*, the subject of enunciation, vis-à-vis the symbolic Other, of whom *you* are the present representatives. I am struggling to say what I can never articulate, but which

we might gloss as, "you frustrate me," "I hate you," "I love you," "please satisfy me," and so on. To put it another way, beneath every illocutionary function, such as explaining, persuading, and so on, the foundational and unachievable illocutionary aim is to occupy a satisfying position vis-à-vis the Thing.[14]

Let us now return to Kristeva's claim that the Stoic sage guarantees the connections among signifier, signified, and referent. In Text 3 Kristeva writes, "There is no sign that is not thetic and every sign is already the germ of a 'sentence' . . . . Stoic semiology, which was the first to formulate the matrix of the sign, had already established this complicity between sign and sentence, making them proofs of each other."[15] Why does Kristeva say that "every sign is already the germ of a 'sentence?'" Because even if a child says "woof-woof," she is really saying "*this is* a woof-woof"; it is in predication that subject of enunciation appears. The child is enunciating this proposition *for* her caretaker in the hope of eliciting a response. "Yes," the father might say adoringly, "that *is* a woof-woof."[16] Thus it is the "primal want" behind predicating enunciation that creates the "complicity between sign and sentence."

But this does not explain why Kristeva claims that the Stoics themselves "had already established this complicity between sign and sentence." In order to reconstruct her sequence of thought, we must first recall that (loosely speaking) the triad of signifier, signified, and referent goes back to the Stoa. For the Stoics written or spoken words do not designate bodies, which are the only beings recognized in their ontology.[17] Rather, a written or spoken signifier (*to sēmainōn*) designates an incorporeal signified (*to sēmainomenon*), which expresses an impression made upon the speaker's

soul by the bodily "bearer" (*to tunkhanon*) of this signification.[18] The incorporeal signified may be thought of as an "event" (*sumbama*[19] or *pragma*[20]) or an "effect,"[21] which the speaker understands and asserts as a true or false "sayable" (*lekton*) about the underlying bodily cause. Because they are incorporeal, these "sayable events" do not "exist" (*einai*); they are not "beings" (*onta*). Rather, they are "somethings" (*tina*), which "subsist" (*huphistasthai*).[22]

Second, we must follow up Kristeva's vague reference to Émile Bréhier's pioneering study, *La théorie des incorporels dans l'ancien stoïcisme*.[23] According to Bréhier, Stoic metaphysics of language "radically separates . . . two planes of being: on the one hand, deep and real being, force; on the other, the plane of facts, which play on the surface of being, and which constitute a multiplicity without connection or end."[24] Later Bréhier speaks of reason's "spontaneity" as the "active cause" which "constructs" rational significations.[25] It is Bréhier's reading of the evidence that allows Kristeva to assimilate the primary level of Stoic semiology to her own theory of language: namely, that the world of "facts" about external referents is fabricated by the signifying subject along with signs and sentences.

We are now in a position to return to the secondary level of Stoic semiology and the Stoic sage's "guarantee" of the "inductive conditional clause," i.e. the connections among sign, signified, and action. Here again we must follow up a vague citation in Kristeva's footnotes, this time to Victor Goldschmidt's *Le système stoïcien et l'idée de temps*.[26] One of the key passages for Goldschmidt is section eight of Epictetus' *Enkhiridion*: "Don't search for events to happen as you want, but want events to happen as they

do."[27] At the point where he introduces this quotation, Goldschmidt also quotes the passage of Epictetus included by Kristeva in Text 1. It is worth quoting Goldschmidt at some length, since his exact wording informs Kristeva's meaning. This is Text 4 on your handout: "In order to "want events as they happen," we must know and understand them, we must *interpret* them. Man, says Epictetus, is born 'to contemplate god and his works, and not only to contemplate them, but also to interpret them.' 'Interpret' means 'make a connection.'"[28] Recall now what Kristeva writes in Text 1: "Man, says Epictetus, is 'born to contemplate God and his works, and not only to contemplate them but also to interpret them. 'To interpret' in this context, and I think always, means 'to make a connection.'" It is clear that Kristeva had Goldschmidt's book open to this page as she was writing. Understanding what Goldschmidt means by "making a connection," and what it has to do with "wanting events as they happen," will turn out to be essential for appreciating Kristeva's claims.

For Goldschmidt, the phrase "want what happens" encapsulates the fundamental aspiration of the Stoic life of interpretations, which is to align your volition with the reason of god, whose providential law is also the universal causal nexus of destiny. In other words, god's benevolent and rational plan determines absolutely every sayable event in the Stoic universe. Goldschmidt distinguishes two planes of interpretation in Stoic philosophy, which are two pathways toward cognitive and affective alignment with god. In the first (this is Text 5) "the two terms, when we're dealing with events, are separated in time: one, the event-sign, which we must 'interpret,' is given to us in the present." Note here the term "event-sign," which Kristeva has picked up in Text 1. "The

semiological sciences," she says, "relate a sign (an event-sign) to a signified in order to act accordingly." In this pathway the interpreter attempts to align her volition with god's by inferring, through her grasp of theology and physics, which event will follow from the present even-sign. She then desires that divinely ordained event. But Goldschmidt believes that the emphasis in Stoicism falls instead on the second pathway. This is what Epictetus calls the "use of impressions," i.e., the cautious scrutiny of our thoughts about whatever is presently happening. In this pathway we do not connect a present event-sign to a future one, since this is often beyond our capacity. Instead, acknowledging our cognitive limitations, we connect a present event-sign to an appropriate reaction on our part. As Goldschmidt says, "The use of impressions brings us already to action. Understanding an impression consists in knowing 'which virtue we should use in connection with the object that has produced it.'"[29]

Let me illustrate this in terms of Stoic logic and moral psychology. As an example of an "event-sign," I will adapt an example from the Roman Stoic Musonius Rufus: I am at dinner, and the host serves me bread and butter.[30] Now, for this example let us also imagine that I already have in my soul some Stoic beliefs, like that intemperate behavior is vicious, and vice is to be avoided. What, in this case, is the "inductive conditional clause" to which Kristeva refers, which connects an event-sign to a signified and consequently an action? It is something like this: "If I use too much butter, or eat more than my share of bread, or get food on my clothes, this is intemperate. If this is intemperate, it is to-be-avoided." Now, according to Stoic psychology, if I assent to the proposition "it is to be avoided," action follows immediately. Thus

in this example I have connected an event-sign, namely "I am eating bread and butter" to a complex signified, namely "using too much butter, eating more than my share, and eating messily are to-be-avoided." Furthermore, I have connected this signified to action: by assenting to this signified, I immediately put myself on guard against indecorous eating![31]

Now that we understand how Kristeva reads the Stoic model of interpretation, we are ready to appreciate her critical response. This comes across most clearly in text 6: "the person through whom knowledge comes about is not mad, but (as the Stoics have indicated) he is (subject to) death. The time of accurate interpretation, that is, an interpretation in accordance with destiny (or the Other's Phallus), is a moment that includes and completes eternity; interpretation is consequently both happiness and death of time and of the subject: suicide. The transformation of sexual desire into the desire to know an object deprives the subject of this desire and abandons him or reveals him as subject to death. Interpretation, in its felicitous accuracy, expurgating passion and desire, reveals the interpreter as master of his will but at the same time as slave of death. Stoicism is . . . the last great pagan ideology, tributary of nature as mother, raised to the phallic rank of Destiny to be interpreted."[32]

I will not attempt to address every facet of this dense, poetic passage. Rather, I will focus on three claims it advances about the Stoic model of interpretation. First, Stoic intepretation "includes and completes eternity." Second, it is a sort of "suicide" or death. These first two claims take their inspiration from Goldschmidt, but substantially transform the significance of his reading. Third, Stoic interpretation is an ideology. This claim moves

beyond the "epistemological and ethical attitude" of Stoicism in order to encompass its political implications.

It is best to deal with the first two claims together. The first, that Stoic interpretation "includes and completes eternity," rests on Goldschmidt's analysis of the interplay of the two pathways of Stoic interpretation. As we have just seen, for Goldschmidt it is because I know my limits that I do not attempt to understand the providential nexus of destiny, but rather focus on aligning my volition with god's within my immediate circumstances. Thus I put all my energy into buttering that bread as beautifully and virtuously as I can, for example.[33] Yet in "wanting what happens" in this limited way, I nevertheless integrate myself into the entire series of divinely willed events: the divine law that I obey in consuming dinner virtuously is the same law that governs nature.[34] In fact I am not other than god, for god pervades the entire universe as its active principle,[35] and is particularly concentrated in rational souls.[36] This is the key to understanding Stoic compatibilism: insofar as I manage to think and act in accord with nature, divinely determined events become my freely chosen actions. Thus, in a sense, the eternity of providence is telescoped into my action.

The second claim, that Stoic interpretation is somehow suicidal, emerges from the same trend in Goldschmidt's thinking. According to the Stoics in text 7, "living in accordance with nature comes to be the end, . . . engaging in no activity typically forbidden by the universal law, which is the right reason pervading everything and identical to Zeus, who is the director of the administration of existing things."[37] Furthermore, they insist that this end, which can also be called "happiness," can be completed in an instant.[38]

Goldschmidt explains that on the one hand, this is the instant in which the Stoic sage connects the event-sign with an action that is natural, reasonable, and in alignment with the "universal law" of Zeus. The concordance of sage and god in this instant is perfect; it cannot be improved by temporal extension. On the other hand, because the moral agent's initiative is integrated into god's enduring providence, this instant expands throughout time. Thus the moment of virtue satisfies our "desire for eternity," and leaves nothing lacking from our happiness. As Goldschmidt perorates, "The instant . . . is able to contain and encompass the centuries of cosmic cycles. Thus the instant extends throughout the [eternal] present of Zeus, like a drop of wine, according to Chrysippus, extends to the dimensions of the ocean and penetrates its entirety."[39]

Goldschmidt's tone is rhapsodic, but Kristeva's appropriation of his reading transforms it into a pointed critique. For Kristeva, the eternity completed by the Stoic would be what she calls "time as project, teleology, linear and prospective unfolding; . . . time as history."[40] The teleological project here is that of god, whose purpose has determined once and for all what is good and choiceworthy or bad and avoidance-worthy. In effect, God's volition hypostasizes the symbolic values established for the speaking subject by the thetic break. In other words, divine law and reason are names given to the big Other of signifiers, in which the speaking subject has invested her drive energy at the moment of surrendering the narcissistic jouissance of the mother-child union. Kristeva believes this thetic break is experienced as a sacrifice or loss, which reiterates and exacerbates the "primal want" underlying all interpersonal relations.[41] When symbolic value is fixed once and

for all, this loss becomes irremediable. This is why Kristeva calls the totalizing instant of Stoic interpretation a kind of suicide or death. "Time . . . in Western philosophy always refers to the time of *death*," she writes.[42] The results for the subject of this totalization of value and time vary, but might include absence of affect, evacuation of meaning from the world, or compensatory, violent acting-out.[43]

The alternative for Kristeva is to avoid temporal finalization and evaluative totalization. She believes this is possible because, as I emphasized earlier, symbolic signification continues to be underpinned by semiotic articulation and imaginary polysemy, both of which go back to our non-linguistic relations to our primary caregivers. These a-signifying modes of relating, emoting, and enjoying combine with thetic signification in "vital" and "creative" speech, which Kristeva calls *signifiance*. Examples in Kristeva's work include the speech of poets and literary authors in general, which Kristeva calls "a kind of second birth";[44] the discourse of literary appreciation, through which we participate in the "sharable singularity" of creative "genius";[45] the speech of psychoanalysts, who avoid "playing dead and adopting a stoic apathy"[46] in order to make each analysis a "work of art,"[47] combining thetic reason with countertransferential jouissance;[48] the masochistic sublimation of Christian mystics;[49] and—most controversially—the speech of maternal passion.[50] All of these modes of interpretation, i.e., of "making a connection," encourage the creativity and vitality supposedly choked off by Stoic totalization. In other words, they make it possible to initiate genuinely new beginnings, breaking the linear teleology of historical time; and

they facilitate the sublimation of drive in language, imbuing it with affect and meaningfulness.

Kristeva's third claim is simply the politicized consequence of the first two, as her commentary on Zeno's *Republic* in her book *Strangers to Ourselves* exemplifies. Given the totalization of symbolic value and exclusion of semiotic and imaginary interventions, Kristeva suggests that Stoic politics can only oscillate between two undesirable tendencies: on the one hand, the anomia of each individual's obedience to divine volition, which replaces positive law. This is how Kristeva interprets the testimony that Zeno permitted cannibalism and incest in his ideal city.[51] On the other, institutionalizing values attributed to divine volition could lead to totalitarianism.[52] To both of these Kristeva prefers a middle way, in which citizens preserve the creativity and vitality of desire and jouissance, which singularize them, but use their shared investment in symbolic signification to collaborate in constructing narratives and making decisions.[53] "The living political bond," she writes in text 8, "understood and practiced as a sharing of creativity, calls upon the singularity of each person: had 'one' forgotten this?"[54]

III. Response to Kristeva

I have now completed parts one and two of this paper, namely a clarification of Kristeva's reading of Stoicism and explanation of her critical response. To recapitulate briefly, she claims that the Stoic sage makes herself the "guarantor" of both the first level of semiological connections, namely those in the triad of signifier, signified, and referent, and of the second level of connections, namely from the sign generated by the initial triad to another sign, which leads directly to action. In so doing, the sage absolutizes thetic

values and exacerbates the feeling of loss generated by the thetic break. The result is mortification of the psyche, truncation of creativity, and poisoning of political agency. Obviously this is not the model of self-cultivation and political participation Kristeva advocates. Rather, she emphasizes the need to remain open to non-signifying semiotic and imaginary sources of renewal, both in ourselves and in others.

In the remaining few minutes of this talk I'd like to initiate a discussion about the merits of Kristeva's understanding and criticism of Stoicism. In other words, I want to consider its importance for those of us interested in Stoicism not only as an intriguing historical phenomenon, but as a source of inspiration for self-cultivation and philosophical living today. This is a big question, and I want to emphasize that my answers are merely intended as starting points.

With this in mind, I will first suggest that Kristeva's analysis sheds considerable light on *some* aspects of *some* Stoic texts. Let me begin with a general point of doctrine. One could plausibly argue that Stoic moral psychology revolves around a fundamental and non-rational drive, which is called *oikeiōsis*. No single word in English effectively translates of this word, though "appropriation" serves best.[55] What it connotes is each organism's impulse to preserve and perfect what belongs to it: in Greek its *sustasis*, in Latin its *constitutio*, in English its "constitution."[56] Seneca defines a constitution as "the hegemonic part of the soul disposed in a certain way toward the body."[57] This definition implies ontological technicalities that I cannot go into here,[58] but suffice to say that the disposition of the hegemonic part of the soul toward the body is the sustaining principle of an animal's vital unity.[59] Every animal is "pleased with," "loves," "yearns for" and "thinks well" of

this vital unity, which is itself.[60] The character of this vital unity develops over time, so that a human infant, for example, appropriates a different character than she will as an adolescent, an adult, and so on.[61] Up to a certain stage this happens without cognitive mediation, just as other animals are (supposedly) impelled to preserve their own constitutions. But at a certain stage something changes in human beings. As Diogenes writes in text 9, "since reason . . . has been bestowed on rational beings, to live correctly in accordance with reason comes to be natural for them. For reason supervenes as the craftsman of impulse."[62] Two discrete positions are compressed in this testimonium. First, whereas animals are automatically impelled toward what will preserve their constitutions, in humans reason, or *logos*, should come to supervise impulses. Second, precisely this use of reason, since it is "natural" for mature human beings, becomes the central feature in their constitution.[63] The right and legitimate use of reason is to align our volition that of Zeus, who, as we saw in text 7, is identical with "right reason" (*ho orthos logos*). Thus appropriation is designed to culminate with the coincidence of autonomy and theonomy in human happiness.

I would like to cautiously suggest a limited comparison between this developmental psychology and that of Kristeva. Granted, it there is a striking difference between Kristeva's fundamental drive toward the archaic Thing and the Stoics' fundamental drive toward self-preservation and self-perfection. Nevertheless, there is a thought-provoking resemblance between the key moments in the two developmental theories, namely the Stoic appropriation of reason and what Kristeva calls the thetic break. The thetic break marks the epochal shift of libidinal investment from parental bodies or associated

sensations to symbolic signifiers. In a similar way, one could argue that in the Stoic account, appropriation of reason shifts the fundamental impetus from things to reasoning about things.

Let me exemplify. A child is immediately concerned with her own mental and bodily integrity,[64] and even adults may be immediately concerned with the well-being of their children,[65] friends,[66] or spouses.[67] But in order for reason to fulfill its role as the "craftsman of impulse," we should not desire the well-being of our own bodies or those of our children, friends, or spouses for their own sakes. Rather, we should wish to act in conformity with universal law and right reason, and perceive that it is legitimate and reasonable (in most circumstances) to cherish our bodies, children, friends and spouses. Thus reason would intervene as the primary object of appropriative feelings, in a sense estranging us from prior intimacies.

If there is anything to this suggestion, it could be taken to embed deep in Stoic theory some of the weaknesses criticized by Kristeva. But even if this comparison at the level of theory turns out to be indefensible, at the level of practice it is hard to deny that Stoics sometimes adopt the role of ideology police, or what Kristeva in Text 10 calls "wardens of repression and rationalizers of the social contract."[68] There are innumerable examples of this, but for reasons of time I will provide just one.

In text 11a Hierocles writes that "we should guard the laws of our fatherland as if they were second gods of a kind, and live by their guidance."[69] In fact "second gods" is a favorite simile for Hierocles, who also says we should treat our fatherland itself and our parents "like second gods."[70] This is more than a simile, of course: it points toward divine law and reason as the

preeminent elements in our own constitution. But for Kristeva, Stoic god is merely a hypostasis of repressive symbolic values. Thus it should come as no surprise when Hierocles writes, "I for my part welcome Zaleucus, the [legendary] lawgiver of the Locrians, who made it law that anyone who proposed a new law should do it with a noose around his throat, so that he should be instantly strangled and die, unless he rearranged the original constitution of the state in a way that was most emphatically profitable to the community."[71] And it is not only the laws that must be treated as second gods. Hierocles adds that "No less than the laws, customs must also be guarded, those that are truly ancestral. . . . Custom aims to be a kind of unwritten law, which has enrolled as its noble lawgiver the satisfaction of all those who make use of it."

From a Kristevan perspective one might make two observations about this passage. First, Hierocles is indeed operating as a "warden of repression and rationalizer of the social contract": in effect, he makes the symbolic values enshrined in civic law and social custom unbreakable parameters for choice and action. Under the regime of Zaleucus, there is precious little room for creative renewal through a life-giving return to pre-rational jouissance and imagination. Who would risk democratic innovation, if the cost of any mistake were "that he should be instantly strangled and die?" Second, one might detect in this fantasy of violent reprisal, which is authorized by the legendary paternal lawgiver, the return of what has been repressed by Stoic rationalism. In other words, the energies excluded by the rigidification of symbolic value return as violent acting-out, even if only at the level of rhetoric.

These considerations lead me to suspect that Kristeva has identified a dangerous temptation within Stoicism, something excluded from the Greek and Roman Stoics' own self-understanding. However, in other ways I think that Kristeva's reading is very one-sided. These all come back to a fundamental error, namely her consistent reading of Stoic doctrines about virtue as straightforward descriptions of the lived experience of Stoicism.[72] In fact the ideal of virtue, which is embodied in the sage, operates rather as an organizing fantasy. Commentators in general pay too little attention to a fundamental contradiction within Stoicism: on the one hand, by explicit doctrine virtue can be achieved; on the other, by unbreakable convention no practitioner can claim that she or any other Stoic has achieved virtue.[73] For this reason I think we should view Stoic virtue roughly as Jonathan Lear suggests we view Aristotelian contemplation. "Any form of life," Lear writes, "will tend to generate a fantasy of what it is to get outside of that life. This is because life is experienced, consciously and unconsciously, as being lived under pressure—and it is correlative to that experience that there is a fantasy of release."[74] Like Aristotle's fantasy of self-sufficient contemplation, the Stoic fantasy needs to be theoretically achievable in order to make life meaningful. In Kristeva's terms, this allows it to harness drive energy to symbolic significations. Yet it also needs to be practically unachievable, or else it would implode and give way to a new fantasy.

This insight has both general and specific consequences. The general consequence is that we should acknowledge how much creative improvisation is involved in the Stoic effort to live in harmony with divine volition. Although Stoics sometimes come across as vindictive agents of symbolic law, they also

place a great deal of emphasis on circumstantial complexity. An infinite distance separates fidelity to general ethical guidelines from perception of the virtuous thing to do in any particular situation. This is why Stoics insist that all errors are equal:[75] you're either with god or you're against him. This leaves a lot of room for creative initiative in the performance of virtue. Such creativity is emblematized by the unorthodox Stoic Aristo, who entirely rejects ethical guidelines, focusing exclusively on the sage's "adventitous capacity" (*epeleustikē dunamis*) to respond to "opportunity" (*kairos*) and "circumstance" (*peristasis*).[76] But even within orthodox Stoicism, which aims to strike a balance between extemporaneity and principled foresight, the upshot is that *every* Stoic decision can in principle make room for creative interventions.

More specific consequences reveal themselves in those passages of Stoic texts in which the yearning to understand and imitate god becomes explicitly thematized. It is here more than anywhere that we might glimpse something like a relation to the archaic Thing, at the boundaries where a penumbra of drive energy suffuses thetic reasoning. I will offer just two examples.

The first comes from Musonius Rufus, who is perhaps the Stoic author most given to ideological policing. As I discuss in a forthcoming article, Musonius' handling of sex, eating, and grooming is astoundingly sanctimonious and repressive.[77] Yet Musonius is also unusually given to fantasies about divine volition. Again, I have elsewhere discussed the masochistic jubilation in his discourse *Whether We Should Always Obey Our Parents*, which hinges on a complex interplay between an actual Roman father, who prohibits his son from philosophizing, and the cosmic father, who

positively commands it. I will not reduplicate that analysis here.[78] Instead I want to focus on his discourse *Concerning Nourishment.*

In this discourse Musonius encourages his listeners to restrict their diet to uncooked vegetables and dairy products, but above all he exhorts them to avoid meat. "Nourishment from the plants of the earth," he claims, "is naturally suited to us. . . . So is nourishment from animals that are not harmed, especially domestic animals. . . . like ripe fruit, some vegetables, milk, cheese, and honeycombs."[79] By contrast, "He used to say[80] that [nourishment by meat] was heavier and somehow impeded thought and cognition, because the rising vapors from it were muddier and darkened the soul. So people who eat a lot of meat appear to be slower of mind." Here we can see the beginnings of a rational justification for avoiding meat, which is grounded in physiology: when meat is digested, it produces "rising vapors" (*anathumiasis*) that impede cognition. From this perspective, Musonius is sketching an enthymeme grounded in symbolic values. This allows him to understand the world, and through that understanding to achieve satisfaction.[81] Yet we should also notice the prevalence of images of heaviness, slowness, muddiness, and darkness. Added to the reminiscences of ripe fruit, vegetables, milk, cheese, and honeycombs, this creates a rich sensual landscape. From this perspective, Musonius is discharging drive energy through a phantasmagoria of images that underpins or bypasses rational argumentation.

This interplay of reasoning and fantasy climaxes in an exhortation to imitate the celestial gods. "Since human beings are the most akin of earthly organisms to the gods," Musonius says, "we should also be nourished in a manner most similar to them. Now, the exhalations (*atmous*) of earth and

water carried up to them are enough for the gods, so that if we took the lightest and purest nourishment, he said, we would take the most similar nourishment to the gods."

Let us pause and give this strangely literal comparison of human and divine nourishment due consideration. Like the preceding, it is structured by an enthymeme grounded in theoretical commitments. The Stoics certainly believe that humans are the earthly organisms most akin to the gods. Moreover, they believe that the foundation of this kinship is our shared rationality.[82] Even the physiology of our rational souls is similar: both are constituted by "breath" (*pneuma*), which is a compound of compacting moisture and expansive fire.[83] This helps to explain the role of "rising vapors" and "exhalations" in Musonius' comparison. Within this breath the compacting moisture is responsible for inward tension, which stabilizes organic forms.[84] The expansive fire is the intelligent, directive element; thus Zeno calls the sun a "fiery kindling from the vaporous rising of the sea,"[85] and Zeus himself is defined as "intelligent, designing fire which methodically proceeds toward the creation of the world."[86] This helps to explain why Musonius counsels avoidance of "dark" and "heavy" meat. It is on the basis of these elemental homologies between human and celestial souls that Musonius infers we should prefer light, pure nourishment.

On the other hand, we should also acknowledge how semiotic investments may underpin this line of reasoning. In making vital heat and breath the signifiers of human kinship with the gods, Stoic theory already makes respiratory and circulatory rhythms a domain in which semiotic and symbolic investments can easily converge. In focusing particularly on

nourishment, Musonius accentuates this convergence. Henceforth when I eat my rustic cheese and honey, I can think and feel that I am ingesting the rationality of the gods. To put it in psychoanalytic terms, this is an example of oral introjection: beyond my rational alignment with god, I will be replaying a primal bodily relation to and identification with him. Perhaps some of the strangeness of Musonius' argument comes from the way in which this drive facilitation and imaginary fantasy combine with its implicit argumentative structure.[87]

I turn now to my final example, which comes from Cornutus' *Survey of Greek Theology*, a text which has not yet been adequately edited, much less translated into English.[88] Cornutus addresses this text to an unnamed "boy," with whom he is discussing the allegorical meanings of Greek religious traditions.[89] This text belongs to a domain of Stoic literature that scholars have found enigmatic. Why, they wonder, are Stoics so interested in the myths, iconography, and even rituals of the Olympian pantheon, which rational theology could conceivably render superfluous?[90]

Kristeva's work points toward a new way of resolving this enigma. For Kristeva allegory is a paradigmatic example of how "the imaginary" operates "Like a tense link between Thing and Meaning, the unnameable and the proliferation of signs, the silent affect and the ideality that designates and goes beyond it."[91] In other words, imaginative constructions are halfway between symbolic signification and delirious proximity to the archaic Thing. For example, the allegorical imagination both "disowns" the surface meaning, thus clinging to the archaic Thing, and makes associative leaps to symbolism

via acoustic and visual images, thus generating new quasi-meanings – meanings in which we only halfway believe.[92]

Take Cornutus' discussion of the god Hermes. This discussion extends over six pages of the Greek text,[93] encompassing etymology of his name and epithets, exegesis of his literary and statuary images, and observations about some aspects of his cult. What binds this discussion together is Cornutus' initial assertion that Hermes represents *logos*: "Hermes happens to be *logos*, which the gods sent to us from heaven, making humans alone of earthly animals rational, which is the best thing the gods themselves possess."[94] This assertion is justified by the etymological derivation of the name *Hermēs* from the phrase *erein mēsasthai*, meaning "contrive to speak."[95] This inaugural assertion grounds the entire fantasy that follows, which we might call an imaginary celebration of rationality.

I will pick out just three moments in this sublime fiction. The first is Cornutus' explanation of the epithet "Hermes of the golden rod." "Of the golden rod (*khrusorrhapis*)," Cornutus writes, "because a beating (*rhapismos*) from him is very precious, since timely admonitions and the attention of those who listen is worth a great deal."[96] In other words, verbal castigation is like being beaten with a golden rod! Hermes' rod (*rhabdos*) returns later in the discussion, "'with which," as Homer writes, "he soothes the eyes of whomever he wishes,' i.e. the eyes of the mind, 'and arouses those who are dreaming'[97] – for he's easily able both to encourage those who are slack and to sedate those who are excited. For the same reason people believed he sent dreams and was a prophet, turning impressions whichever way he wanted."[98] In other words, Hermes' rod represents the power of the words to magically stimulate,

sedate, or generally lead listeners wherever the speaker wishes. If we permit ourselves to suspect this is slightly phallic, Cornutus will reward our audacity: "The ancients made older, bearded statues of Hermes with erect genitals, but younger, smooth-cheeked statues with flaccid ones, letting it be surmised that in those of advanced age reason is generative and complete, but fruitless and incomplete in immature men."[99] In other words, mature reason is like an *erect penis*; rational admonition is like a "very precious" beating with an erect golden penis; with this erect penis you can guide your listeners wherever you wish. None of this adds anything to the symbolic signification of *logos*, but it certainly enriches its *signifiance*. In other words, it doesn't change the meaning of rationality, but it makes it more meaning*ful*, whether you find it enjoyable, amusing, or repulsive. For these are all metastases of jouissance.

IV. Conclusions

By way of conclusion, I want to return to the question of the "true life of interpretations." For Kristeva, as we have seen, this is a life in which each individual's rational commitments are always amenable to revision from two directions: first, by engagement with the a-signifying internal forces of imaginary and semiotic jouissance; and second, by engagement with other people, including those people's imaginary and semiotic fantasies and compulsions. That is why Kristeva insists that the "interpretations" involved must be in the plural: she believes that healthy ethics and politics require a combination of shared reason and openness to unreasonable singularities.

From this perspective Kristeva criticizes the Stoic life as one that totalizes interpretation, thus impeding creative renewal, tolerance, and cooperation. In response I have suggested that Kristeva is partly right: Stoics

do sometimes display a proclivity toward ideological rigidity. But at the same time, parts of their "ideology" build in the sort of stimulation for creativity that Kristeva demands. For example, they aspire to alignment with god's volition, which is not even in theory knowable. Furthermore, even the partial alignment represented by virtue, which is in theory achievable, is in practice a receding goalpost. Thus it should come as no surprise that creative improvisation appears in many corners of Stoic literature. (And I have not even mentioned Cleanthes' "Hymn to Zeus," the astrological poetry of Aratus and Cleomedes, or the tragedies of Seneca!)

I have one final suggestion to leave you with. If these conjectures are at all sound, might it follow that divine volition is far more essential to the Stoic life of interpretations than modern interpreters sometimes believe? Might the so-called "return to religion" in modern European philosophy draw inspiration from Stoic theology?[100] Moreover, could this trend in modern philosophy generate creative new readings of Stoic philosophy?[101] I look forward to hearing your interpretation of this and the other suggestions I have made.

Bibliography

Algra, Kempe. 2009. "Stoic Philosophical Theology and Graeco-Roman Religion." In *God and Cosmos in Stoicism*, ed. R. Salles, 224-51. Oxford.

Arius Didymus. 1999. *Epitome of Stoic Ethics.* Ed. and trans. Arthur J. Pomeroy. Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature.

Bénatouïl, Thomas. 2005. *Faire usage: La pratique du stoïcisme.* Paris: Vrin.

Boys-Stones, George. 2003. "The Stoics' Two Types of Allegory." In *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, ed. G. Boys-Stones, 189-216. Oxford.

------. 1996. The ἐπελευστικὴ δύναμις in Aristo's Psychology of Action." *Phronesis* 41: 75–94.

Bréhier, Émile. 1962. *La théorie des incorporels dans l'ancien stoïcisme.* 3rd ed. Paris: Vrin. [1st ed. 1908, Librairie Alphonse Picard & Fils]

Brennan, Tad. 2005. *The Stoic Life: Emotions, Duties, and Fate.* Oxford.

Brittain, Charles. 2005. "Common Sense: concepts, definitions and meanings in and out of the Stoa." In *Language and Learning*, ed. D. Frede and B. Inwood, 164-209. Cambridge.

Cornutus, 1881. *Cornuti Theologiae Graecae Compendium.* Ed. Carl Lang. Leipzig: Teubner.

Dyson, Henry. 2009. *Prolepsis and Ennoia in the Early Stoa.* Berlin: De Gruyter.
Goldschmidt, Victor. 1972. "ὑπάρχαιν et ὑφιστάναι dans la philosophie stoïcienne." *Revue des études grecques* 85.406-8: 331-344.
------. 1953. *Le systeme stoïcien et l'idée de temps.* Paris: Vrin.
Hadot, Pierre. 2005. *What Is Ancient Philosophy?* Trans. M. Chase. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap.
------. 1969. "Zur Vorgeschichte des Begriffs 'Existenz': ΥΠΑΡΧΕΙΝ bei den Stoikern." *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 13.2: 115-27.
Hierocles. 2009. *Hierocles the Stoic: Elements of Ethics, Fragments, and Excerpts.* Ed. and comm. Ilaria Ramelli, trans. David Konstan. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
Kristeva, Julia. 2009. *This Incredible Need to Believe.* Trans. Beverley Bie Brahic. New York: Columbia.
------. 2001. *Hannah Arendt: Life is a Narrative.* Trans. Frank Collins. Toronto: University of Toronto.
------. 1991. *Strangers to Ourselves.* Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
------. 1989. *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia.* Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia.
------. 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. trans. M. Waller. New York: Columbia.
------. 1982a. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection.* trans. L. S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia.
------. 1982b. "Psychoanalysis and the Polis." Trans. M. Waller. *Critical Inquiry* 9.1: 77-92.
------. 1981. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art.* Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. Oxford: Blackwell.
Lachs, John. 2012. *Stoic Pragmatism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Lampe, Kurt. forthcoming. "Sex and Philosophy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Philosophy*, ed. W. Shearin and R. Fletcher. Oxford.
------. 2013. "Obeying Your Father: Stoic Theology between Myth and Masochism." In *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self*, ed. V. Zajko and E. O'Gorman, 183-98. Oxford.
Lear, Jonathan. 2000. *Happiness, Death, and the Remainder of Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.
Long, A. A. 1996. "Hierocles on *oikeiōsis* and self-perception." In *Stoic Studies*, 250-63. Berkeley.
------. 1992. "Stoic Readings of Homer." In *Homer's Ancient Readers*, ed. R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney, 41-66. Princeton.
McAfee, Noëlle. 2004. *Julia Kristeva.* London: Routledge.
Most, Glenn. 1989. "Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis: A Preliminary Report," *ANRW* II 36.3: 2014-2065.
Musonius Rufus. 1905. *Reliquiae*. Ed. O. Hense. Leipzig: Teubner.
Oliver, Kelly. 1993. *Reading Kristeva: Unraveling the Double-Bind.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Reydams-Schils, Gretchen. 2005. *The Roman Stoics. Self, Responsibility, and Affection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Schofield, Malcolm. 1999. *The Stoic Idea of the City*, with a new foreward by Martha Nussbaum. Chicago.
Voelke, André-Jean. 1961. *Les rapports avec autrui dans la philosophie grecque d'Aristote a Panétius.* Paris: Vrin.
Vogt, Katja M. 2008. *Law, Reason, and the Cosmic City: Political Philosophy in the Early Stoa.* Oxford University Press.

[1] Kristeva 1982b: 87.
[2] Kristeva comes very close to explicitly positing her aim as "cultivation of the soul" throughout 1995, e.g. in speaking of "a secret garden, an intimate quarter, or more simply and ambitiously, a psychic life" (27).
[3] The following is far from an exhaustive catalogue: 1981a: 24, 125; 1982b: 79-80, 83, 92; 1984: 40, 44; 1991: 56-63; 1995: 73, 82, 88. I would also take the "sad philosopher" of 2009: 41 to be a Stoic sage.
[4] This is true of most of her works, but see the conclusion of "Psychoanalysis and the Polis": "I would like the above remarks to be taken both as a 'free association' and as the consequence of a certain position. I would want them to be considered not only an epistemological discussion but also a personal involvement (need I say one of desire?) in the dramas of thought, personality, and contemporary politics" (1982b: 92).
[5] For this way of looking at French reception history I am indebted to correspondence with Thomas Bénatouïl, who locates his own book in this broad tradition (Bénatouïl 2005).
[6] I allude to what Hadot calls an "existential choice" (2005: 102) or "fundamental choice" (2005: 114-15, 126-28), though I an uneasy about Hadot's effort to articulate these choices in a few paragraphs. I would say instead that existential options are complex affective-cognitive-practical gestalts.
[7] Kristeva probably derives this quotation from Goldschmidt 1953: 79. Regarding Kristeva's reliance on Goldschmidt, see further below.
[8] 1981a: 124.
[9] 1981a: 125.
[10] Kristeva never (to my knowledge) offers a sustained overview of her theory of language, which she elaborates piecemeal throughout her works. But see especially 1984: 25-30, 43-51; 1989: 40-42. McAfee 2004: 13-27 provides a usefully concise overview; Oliver 1993 remains the best introduction to Kristeva, but does not address language acquisition as an independent topic.
[11] 1982a: 5, 35.
[12] 1989: 12-20; 2009: 28.
[13] Although Kristeva was profoundly influenced by Lacan, it is important to keep in mind that her metapsychology is in many ways innovative. In particular, note that her "imaginary" is very different from "the imaginary" of Lacan (*pace* McAfee 2004: 32-3).
[14] See especially Kristeva 1984: 52-56.
[15] 1984: 44.
[16] Kristeva 1984: 43-4.
[17] To be more precise, complete sayables (e.g., propositions) do not designate bodies. However, nouns and pronouns designate qualities, which are bodily (LS 33M).
[18] See LS [Long and Sedley 1986] §33, from whom I take the translation "name-bearer" for *to tunkhanon*. The position of the Stoic theory of "sayables" (*lekta*) within Stoic physics and metaphysics remains one on which no scholarly consensus has been reached.
[19] See especially LS 33q, which is included in volume 2 (Greek and Latin texts) but not in volume 1 (translations): ἂν μὲν οὖν ὀνόματος τι κατηγορηθὲν ἀπόφανσιν ποιῇ, κατηγόρημα καὶ σύμβαμα παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ὀνομάζεται, . . . οἷον

"Σωκράτης περιπατεῖ." This is rendered into Latin as *accidens* by Seneca: Sapientiam bonum esse dicunt; sequitur ut necesse sit illam corporalem quoque dicere. At sapere non putant eiusdem condicionis esse. Incorporale est et accidens alteri, id est sapientiae" (*Ep. Mor.* 117.3).

[20] LS 33B.2-3.

[21] LS 55A-D. The Stoics have no regular word for "effect," which they usually render "that of which something is the cause" (οὗ αἴτιον).

[22] LS volume 1 p. 164. Although as recently as 1969 it was possible for Hadot to argue that the general metaphysical status of Stoic incorporeals was designated by *huparkhein*, scholarly consensus is now solidly behind Goldschmidt's 1972 rebuttal.

[23] Kristeva 1984: 243 n. 49.

[24] "sépar[e] radicalement, ce que personne n'avait fait avant eux, deux plans d'être: d'une part, l'être profond et réel, la force; d'autre part, le plan des faits, qui se jouent à la surface de l'être, et qui constituent une multiplicité sans lien et sans fin d'êtres incorporels" (Bréhier 1908: 13). Goldschmidt expands on this line of interpretation when he compares a certain trend in the thought of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius to Kantian critical idealism (1953: 119-21).

[25] Bréhier 1908: 16: "Tandis que la représentation [i.e, impression] ordinaire se produit par le contact d'un corps qui marque son empreinte dans la partie hégémonique de l'âme, au contraire, il paraît y avoir plus de spontanéité dans la représentation rationelle. C'est la pensée qui la construit, en diminuant les objets sensible qui lui sont donnés d'abord; les objets ne sont pas ici cause affective, mais c'est la raison." He is thinking in particular of concept formation and the testimony of D.L. 7.53. For recent discussions of the Stoic theory of concept formation, see Brittain 2005, Dyson 2009.

[26] Kristeva 1982b: 79 n. 1. Kristeva does not provide any page number in Goldschmidt.

[27] μὴ ζήτει τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι ὡς θέλεις, ἀλλὰ θέλε τὰ γινόμενα ὡς γίνεται καὶ εὐροήσεις. Goldschmidt reads εὐπορήσεις, but the change is immaterial; the part of the quotation to which he ceaselessly returns is simply θέλε τὰ γινόμενα ὡς γίνεται, "Vouloir les événements comme ils se produisent" (1953: 79). He relates this to M. Aur. 7.23: συμβαίνει τι μοι; δεχομαι. . ., of which he says, "Il faut donc 'accepter' l'événement et le vouloir" (1953: 100).

[28] "Pour 'vouloir les événements comme ils se produisent,' il faut les connaître et les comprendre, il faut les *interpréter.* L'homme, dit Epictète, est né 'pour contempler Dieu et ses oeuvres, et non seulement pour les contempler, mais encore pour les mettre en rapport" (1953: 79).

[29] "Aussi bien l'usage des représentations nous conduit déjà à l'action. Comprendre une représentation consiste à savoir 'de quelle vertu il faut user par rapport à l'objet qui l'a produite'" (Goldschmidt 1953: 123, citing M. Aur. 3.2.3).

[30] XVIIIB esp. p. 101.3-12 ed. Hense 1905.

[31] Strictly speaking the ensuing "impulse" will be directed at the predicate of the proposition "this is to-be-avoided [*pheukteon*]." See SVF 3.91 = LS 33J, SVF 3.89. Cf. Arius Didymus *Ep.* 6c (ed. Pomeroy).

[32] 1982b: 83.

[33] Goldschmidt 1953: 169 n. 1 aptly cites Epictetus *Diss.* 1.7.32-33, which illustrates this principle extremely well.

[34] Goldschmidt 1953: passim, especially 101, 156.
[35] LS 44B, 54A-B.
[36] LS 47O.2.
[37] DL 7.88 = LS 63C (part, translation adapted).
[38] LS 63I (and see also the other texts collected at SVF 3.54).
[39] "l'instant, comme l'avait dit Marc-Aurèle, peut contenir et comprehendre les siècles des périodes cosmiques; ainsi l'instant s'étend le long du présent du Zeus, comme la goutte de vin, d'après Chrysippe, s'étend à la dimension de l'Océan et le pénètre tout entier" (1953: 207). See further at Goldschmidt 1953: 146-51, 198-207.
[40] Kristeva 1981b: 17.
[41] This is what is usually called "castration."
[42] 2009: 44. Although she does not elaborate, I would suggest that alongside Hegel and Heidegger, she also has in mind Stoicism.
[43] Note that, a propos of "the time of history," Kristeva adds, "A psychoanalyst would call this 'obsessional time,' recognizing in the mastery of time the true structure of the slave" (1981b: 17). In other words, she directly contradicts the Stoic claim that alignment with transcendent value equals freedom! Thus she also implies that Stoicism is basically an "obsessional" cultural structure. On the relation of obsessional neurosis to the symptoms I have just described, see especially Kristeva 1995: 44-65.
[44] Kristeva 1984: 70.
[45] Kristeva 2009: 29-41.
[46] 1995: 73.
[47] 1995: 34.
[48] 1995: 3-102 passim, especially 34-5; 1982b: 81, 83-4, 86-7; 2009: 20.
[49] 2009: 47-63.
[50] 2009: 42-7.
[51] For more recent scholarship on this topic, see Schofield 1991, Vogt 2008.
[52] 1991: 57-63. Here again it is worthwhile tracing the vague references in Kristeva's footnotes (specifically, 198 n. 31): Kristeva's reading of Zeno's *Republic* and most (if not all) her exact citations of Greek and Roman texts come from Voelke 1961: 114-31, 143-5, 152-62, 185-90.
[53] 2001: 13-29, 55-72; 2009: 71-6. Kristeva makes a subtly different point in "Psychoanalysis and the Polis": there she emphasizes how effective political interpretation, like psychoanalytic interpretation, needs to harness desire rather than sticking to "objective" rationality (1982b: 86-7). She is slightly vague about how political interpretation should relate to models like psychoanalytic interpretation, which acknowledge the heterogeneity of the constituents of signifiance.
[54] 2009: 13.
[55] Latin *proprius* is reasonably close to Greek *oikeios*.
[56] The following summary presumes the continuity of what are sometimes distinguished as self-appropriation and social appropriation. In this I agree with Brennan 2005: 154-68. Key testimonia regarding appropriation include D.L. 7.85-6 = LS 57A, Cicero, *Fin.* 3.62-8 (excerpted by LS 57F), Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 121 (excerpted by LS 57B), Hierocles *Elements of Ethics* passim (excerpted by LS 57C, D, G), esp. VI-IX, and Gell. 12.5.7 = SVF 3.181.

[57] "'Constitutio' inquit 'est, ut vos dicitis, principale animi quodam modo se habens erga corpus" (*Ep. Mor.* 121.10). Seneca makes it clear that this is formal definition (*finitio*). Ramelli helpfully connects this definition with Hierocles' explanation that the leading part (τὴν ἡγεμονίαν) of every organism perceives all parts of both the organism's body and its soul (2009: 55, citing Hierocles, *Elements of Ethics* IV.51-5). On this Stoic theory of "proprioception" see Long 1996.
[58] "Relative disposition" is the fourth of the so-called Stoic ontological "categories" or "genera," on which see the testimony gathered at LS 29. Note also that virtue is defined as the soul in a certain disposition: "virtus autem nihil aliud est quam animus quodammodo se habens" (Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 113.2).
[59] Compare Hierocles, *El. Eth.* IV.27-53 (p. 13 ed. Ramelli), where Hierocles connects the "tensive movement" of the soul, which is a "sustaining power," with the organism's continuous and complete self-perception, which occurs by the oscillation of this tensive movement outward from the hegemonic part to the extremities and back again.
[60] The Greek terms are εὐαρεστεῖν (Hierocles *El. Eth.* IV.40-49), φιλαυτία (ibid. V.20-25), σφοδρός ἵμερος (ibid. VII.4), εὐνοία (inferred from ibid. IX.1-5).
[61] Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 121.14-18.
[62] LS 57A.
[63] See esp. Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 121.14: "Dicitis, inquit, omne animal primum constitutioni suae conciliari, hominis autem constitutionem rationalem esse et ideo conciliari hominem sibi non tamquam animali sed tamquam rationali; ea enim parte sibi carus est homo qua homo est."
[64] LS 57A.1-3, Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 121.18-24, Hierocles *El. Eth.* VI.54-VII.50 = p. 18-21 ed. Ramelli.
[65] LS 57F.1.
[66] Hierocles *El. Eth.* 11.15-20 = p. 28-9 ed. Ramelli.
[67] See Reydams-Schils 2005: 143-76 on the treatment of marriage by Antipater, Musonius, Hierocles, and Seneca.
[68] 1981: 24.
[69] Stobaeus 3.733-34 Wachsmuth = Ramelli p. 70-3, entitled "From Hierocles' *How We Should Treat Our Country*."
[70] Stobaeus 3.730.17-731.15 Wachsmuth = p. 68-9 Ramelli; Stobaeus 4.640-44 Wachsmuth = Ramelli p. 82-3.
[71] p. 71 ed. Ramelli.
[72] She inherits this focus from the scholarship of Bréhier, Goldschmidt, and Voelke.
[73] This convention is never (that I recall) articulated, a silence that in itself deserves further analysis. The neo-Aristotelian Alexander of Aphrodisias attributes to the Stoics the claim that "there have been just one or two good men, as their fables maintain, like some absurd and unnatural creature rarer than the Ethiopian's phoenx" (LS 57N.2).
[74] Lear 2000: 48-9.
[75] Arius Did. *Ep.* 11o (ed. Pomeroy). Similarly, an infinite distance separates vice from virtue: "just as in the sea the man an arm's length from the surface is drowning no less than the one who has sunk five hundred fathoms, so even those

who are getting close to virtue are no less in a state of vice than those who are far from it" (LS 61T).

[76] Boys-Stones 1996.

[77] See Lampe (forthcoming), especially part III.

[78] Lampe 2013: 192-7.

[79] fr. XVIIIA p. 94.12-95.7 ed. Hense. All translations from Musonius are my own.

[80] Musonius, like Socrates or Epictetus, left no written texts. The texts we ascribe to him were written by an otherwise unknown "Lucius," who stands to Musonius like Xenophon to Socrates or Arrian to Epictetus.

[81] For Kristeva the object of "the need to believe" is "a truth that keeps me, makes me exist" (2009: 3); such a truth recalls the self-certainty of mother-child "oceanic feeling" or the loving support from the "imaginary father" (2009: 1-10).

[82] A claim advanced in innumerable Stoic texts, e.g. LS 57F.3, 63D-E, Epictetus *Diss.* 2.8.10-12.

[83] LS 47G-H, J, O-Q.

[84] Long and Sedley 1986: vol. 1, p. 288.

[85] SVF Zeno 121: ἄναμμα νοερὸν ἐκ τοῦ θαλάσσης <ἀναθυμιάματος>.

[86] LS 46A.1.

[87] "Uncanny strangeness" (i.e. *étrangeté inquiétante*, the French translation of Freud's *das Unheimliche*) is one of the many avatars of the archaic Thing (Kristeva 1991: 182-92, and see 214 n. 19).

[88] On the defects in Lang's 1881 Teubner edition, which I use for this paper, see Most 1989: 214-16. There appears to exist a translation and commentary by R.S. Hays, written as a PhD dissertation at the University of Texas at Austin in 1983, which has never been published.

[89] On the pedagogical aspects of the text, see Most 1989: 2029-34.

[90] See especially Long 1992, Boys-Stones 2003: esp. 209–15, Algra 2009: esp. 234–8, and Lampe 2013.

[91] 1989: 100.

[92] "By shifting back and forth from the disowned meaning, still present just the same, of the remnants of antiquity for instance (thus, *Venus* or 'the royal crown') to the *literal* meaning that the Christian spiritualist context attributes to all things, allegory is a tenseness of meanings between their depression/depreciation and their signifying exaltation (*Venus* becomes the allegory of Christian love)" (Kristeva 1989: 101-2).

[93] C. 16 p. 20-6 ed. Lang.

[94] 20.18-21 ed. Lang (reading μόνον τὸν ἄνθρωπον where Lang prints μόνον τὸν ἀνθώπων).

[95] ibid.

[96] 21.15-8 ed. Lang.

[97] Homer, *Iliad* 24.343-4.

[98] 22.10-18 ed. Lang.

[99] 23.16-22 ed. Lang.

[100] Note that Kristeva herself participates in this "return to religion." In *This Incredible Need to Believe* she asks, ""Might psychoanalysis be one of the variations of theology? Its ultimate variation, *hic et nunc*?" (2009: 70)

[101] Here engagement with Lachs' erudite and ingenious *Stoic Pragmatism* could also be useful, particularly his "ontology for Stoic pragmatism" (2012: 143-81),

which emerges from critical engagement with—as Lachs reads it—Santayana’s conflicting impulses in ontology and epistemology.