"The Stoics are famous for advancing the idea of a unitary soul in contrast to the tri- or bipartite soul of Plato and Aristotle. But that view of their psychology is oversimplified and misleading. In this paper I review the various ways in which the Stoics divided and partitioned the soul, and then zero in on a disagreement among three of them (Cleanthes, Chrysippus and Panaetius) about which functions and capacities of the soul warrant the postulation of a distinct part and which do not. I argue that Panaetius has excellent reasons to disagree with Chrysippus and that he emerges with a more interesting and more genuinely Stoic theory of the soul than he is usually credited with."