

**Techne: A New Fragment of Chrysippus**

*Jaap Mansfeld*

Fragments I call ‘new’ when they satisfy two conditions: (1) they are not found in existing collections of fragments; (2) they are not discussed, or mentioned, in the secondary literature. The present new fragment is to be found in a passage of Olympiodorus which is the source for two well-known Stoic fragments, viz. the definitions of techne attributed to Zeno and Cleanthes, *SVF* I 73 (Zeno 12 Pearson) and I 490 (Cleanthes 5 Pearson).

Olympiodorus, interpreting Gorgias, wants to find out whether or not rhetoric is a techne; he sets out definitions of techne and looks to see if they fit rhetoric. The first definition quoted is Cleanthes¹: Κλεάνθης τούνν λέγει ὑπὸ “τέχνη ἐστὶν ἔξεις ὁδῷ πάντα ἀνύπνους.” Olympiodorus rejects this, because, so he argues, also φύσις ἔξεις τις ἐστὶν ὁδῷ πάντα πουύςα. He tells us that Chrysippus realized that Cleanthes’ definition is too wide (70.1–3 W.): ἐδεν ὁ Χρύσιππος προσβεις τὸ μετὰ φαντασμῶν ἐδεν ὑπὸ “τέχνη ἐστὶν ἔξεις ὁδῷ προιύςα μετὰ φαντασμῶν.” According to Olympiodorus, Chrysippus’ definition fits rhetoric, but there is also another one that is good, viz. Zeno’s:² Ζήνων δε φησιν ὑπὸ “τέχνη ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων συγγεγυγμαζμέων:⁴ πρὸς τι τέλος εὖχρηστον τῶν ἐν τῷ βῶ. For Chrysippus’ definition, Westerink (following Norvin) refers to *SVF* II 56, viz. to Sextus Math. 7.373, which does not quote Chrysippus’ definition in Olympiodorus, but reports Chrysippus’ argument against the view of Zeno and especially Cleanthes that “presentation” is an “impression of the soul”; if this is assumed, ἀναφέρει-

---

¹ *In Gorg.* p.69.26f Westerink = *SVF* I 490 (context omitted).
² 70.7–10 W. = *SVF* I 73 (the first text; context omitted). The many parallels for this text printed at *SVF* I 73 have been lifted whole—and even without a change of order—from A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes* (London 1891) 65f; this material is far from complete. For the late Alexandrians as sources of Stoic fragments see B. Keil, “Chrysippeum,” *Hermes* 40 (1905) 155–58.
³ -ον Olymp.; questioned by Pearson p.65, corrected by von Arnim without acknowledgment of this minor problem. The corruption occurs also in other texts containing (versions of) the definition (see e.g. *infra* n.8); Norvin and Westerink should have emended theirs accordingly. A parallel for the context in Olympiodorus and Quintilian (see *infra* 60 for the latter) is provided by Hermogenes’ elegant use of it without revealing that he does so, Περὶ τῶν στασιῶν p.28.3–6 Rabe; cf. Sopater *ad loc.*, Walz V pp.9.1f, 17.27f.
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ταί μεν μνήμη θεσαυρισμός οὐσα φαντασμῶν (cf. SVF I 64), ἀναρ- 
ρείται δὲ πάσα τέχνη σύστημα γαρ ἦν καὶ ἄθροισμα καταλήψεων . . . In other words, according to Chrysippus the presence of presen-
tations in the soul is a necessary condition for the acquisition and 
practice of techne. Chrysippus here clearly alludes to the idea of tech-
ne as a “system of comprehensions” attributed, by Olympiodorus, to 
Zeno. For his reference to soul compare the definition of techne at 
schol. Dion. Thr. p.161.28f Hilgard: σύστημα περὶ ψυχῆς γενόμενον 
ἐκ καταλήψεων κτλ., a text printed in part at SVF I 73.4

Fuller philological discussion of some of the sources in which the 
Early Stoic definitions of techne have been transmitted must be post-
poned; nor can I enter into the further interpretation of the definitions 
themselves.5 For the present, I should like to adduce a text (not in 
SVF) where the definition attributed to Chrysippus by Olympio-
dorus is quoted anonymously and in slightly different form. Here too 
the context is a discussion of the concept of techne; the different 
form in which Chrysippus’ definition is given precludes that the 
author’s source is Olympiodorus, or Olympiodorus only.6 David, Prol. 
philos. (CommAristGr XVIII.2) p.43.30–44.5 Busse:

4 Note that Hilgard, following one ms., brackets περὶ . . . γενόμενον, and that Pear-
son and von Arnim, quoting Bekker’s text, do not. I think Hilgard’s excision is wrong.
5 F. E. Sparshott, “Zeno on Art: Anatomy of a Definition,” in J. M. Rist, ed., The 
Stoics (Berkeley 1978) 273ff, is useful, but in so far as the Stoics are concerned the 
author does not stray beyond von Arnim’s texts (or von Arnim’s comments on these 
texts). The chapter on Stoicism in M. Isnardi Parente, Techne: Momenti del pensiero 
greco da Platone a Epicuro (Florence 1966) 287ff, is very informative, but Isnardi Pa-
rente too does not go beyond von Arnim.
6 Note that the (anonymous) version of Chrysippus’ definition at p.17.6f W., which 
has φαντασίας, is different both from that at 70.7f and from David’s. [Zeno’s] at 
17.20f—as at 70.7f—is without ἐμπειρία.
have been derived from Olympiodorus, *viz.* the word ἐμπειρία added after καταληψεως. Note that David does not quote Cleanthes’ definition. In other respects, the more wordy passage in the *Prol. philos.* is strictly parallel to that in *In Gorg.* Olympiodorus glosses ὅδω with τά-ξει, David with κατὰ τάξιν. David’s explanation of μετὰ φαντασίας is the same as Olympiodorus’ of μετὰ φαντασιῶν: both authors hold that this expression serves to distinguish *techne* from *physis*. Both authors finally quote the definition of *techne* as σύστημα καταληψεων κτλ. But David’s—anonymous—definition of *techne* as ἡ τῶν καθόλου γνώσις μετὰ λόγου is lacking in Olympiodorus;7 this other one is a form of Aristotle’s well-known definition of *techne* at *Eth. Nic.* VI 4 (1140a10, 20), conflated with one of *episteme* (*cf.* VI 3).

Now Aspasius, in the first pages of his commentary on the *Eth. Nic.*, explaining Aristotle’s opening words πᾶσα τέχνη καὶ πᾶσα μέθοδος (1094a1), adduces the definition from VI 4 in a more scholastic form: “τέχνη ἐστὶν ξέος μετὰ λόγου ποιητική,” omitting ἀληθοὺς before λόγου (*In Eth.Nic.* p.2.24f Heylb.). He also discusses (part of) another definition of *techne* which is a variation of the last definition adduced by Olympiodorus and David: “σύστημα ἐκ θεωρημάτων εἰς ἐν τέλος φερόντων.”8 What is more, he explains λόγος in Aristotle’s definition in the following way (p.2.25–3.1 Heylb.):

λόγον δὲ λαμβάνει οὔτε τὸν ἐπαγωγικὸν οὔτε τὸν συλλογιστικὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄπλον καὶ τεχνικὸν, ὥς χρωται οἱ δημιουργοὶ τῶν τεχνῶν ποιήματα μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀλόγων, οἷον τῶν μὲν μελεσίων τὰ κηρία, ἀραξίων δὲ τὰ ἀράχνων καλούμενα· ἀλλ’ οὖν δὲν τούτων μετὰ λόγου ποιεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὀρμὴ φυσικῆ χρωμένα τὰ ξώα.

Aspasius, like Olympiodorus, wants to distinguish *techne* from *physis*; the argument against Cleanthes’ definition attributed by Olympiodorus to Chrysippus, and used by David, may have some connection with what looks like a Peripatetic criticism of the definitions of Zeno (see *infra*) and Cleanthes. Aspasius’ testimony, in any case, is several

---

7 That is to say, it has not, as in David, been woven into the argument concerned with the Stoic definitions. But at p.70.15ff W., Olympiodorus discusses the claim of rhetoric to possession of knowledge.

8 Aspas. p.2.19 Heylb. Occasionally the [Stoic] definition is quoted with θεωρημάτων in place of καταληψεων, e.g. *SVF* III 214. Ps.-Gal. *Def.med.* XIX p.350.8–10 K. (*SVF* II 93) provides the following addition to a version of *SVF* I 73: ἦν οὔτως τέχνη ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐκ καταληψεων συγγεγραμμεσμένων [sic: read -ων, *cf.* supra n.3; no correction in von Arnim] ἐφ’ ἐν τέλος τῶν ἀνάφορων ἐγώντων. Isnardi Parente (supra n.5) 295f argues that Galen [sic: in fact Ps.-Gal.] introduces a Platonizing element, after *Phlb.* 15D–16C. The parallel in Aspasius shows that this form of the [Stoic] definition contains a Peripatetic element; the idea derives from the introductory pages of the *Eth.Nic.*
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centuries earlier than Olympiodorus', and already found in a scholastic setting.9

Cleanthes’ definition is also quoted by Quintilian (2.17.41), printed at SVF I 490 in the following form: nam sive, ut Cleanthes voluit, ars est potestas10 viam, id est ordinem efficiens. But we should follow the recent editions of Quintilian in reading via (δδω) and ordine (ταξιν).11 Furthermore, the words id est ordine are clearly intended as an explanation of via: compare Olympiodorus and David, who gloss δδω with ταξιν and κατα ταξιν. The context in Quintilian, who speaks of the status of rhetoric as a techne, is the same as in Olympiodorus. Unlike Olympiodorus, Quintilian accepts Cleanthes’ definition, but his reason for accepting it is the same as Olympiodorus’ more explicitly formulated reason for accepting Chrysippus’ definition: Quintilian continued (omitted by von Arnim), esse certe viam et ordinem in bene dicendo nemo dubitaverit, compare Olymp. In Gorg. p.70.3–7 W.:

η τοινν ῥητορική ὑποπίπτει τῷ ὅρῳ τούτῳ [sc. Chrysippus’], ἐξις γὰρ ἐστιν ἄδω καὶ ταξιν προϊστασι σφόν γούν ὁ ῥήτωρ προομίσος πρότερον κέρχηται, εἶτα προκαταστάσει καὶ καταστάσει καὶ τοῖς ἐξίς ταξιν ἀσπαζόμενος.

Finally, in Quintilian exactly as in Olympiodorus, the definition of techne as a σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων then follows:12

sive ille ab omnibus fere probatus finis observatur, artem constare ex perceptionibus consentientibus [= σύστημα] et coexercitatis ad finem utilem vitae, iam ostendemus nihil horum non in rhetorice inesse.

This definition is also approved as pertinent to rhetoric by Olympiodorus, In Gorg. p.70.9 W.

These samples (Quintilian’s text being the earliest) suffice to show that the context in which these definitions were cited is traditional, viz. a discussion of techne in general in relation to a specific discipline (Aspasius’ exposition is clearly dependent on discussions of this sort). It is also clear that these definitions tend to appear in clusters. This is not the case, however, for another definition of techne, attributed to Zeno in a prolegomenon to the Ars attributed to Dionysius Thrax, which does not appear in such a cluster and is not found in a discussion of techne in general. Rather, it appears in a discussion of the

9 Aspasius is also dependent on Stoic sources, cf. Philo De animal. 77–78 (SVF II 731–32) and 92 (730).
10 The substitution of potestas (δύναμις) for habitus (ἐξις) will be due to the fact that Quintilian knew the definition by heart.
11 Cf. also Pearson (supra n.2) 239.
12 Printed, without sive and observatur, up to iam, at SVF I 73.
concept of ‘definition’ associated with that of the definition of [a] techne (schol. Vat. in Dion. Thr. p.118.14–16 Hilg.): the proximate genus should appear in a definition, ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ Ζήνων, λέγων “τέχνη ἕστιν έξες ὀδοποιητική,” τοπίτεστι δε’ ὄδοι καὶ μεθόδου ποι­οῦσα τι. Pearson and von Arnim were unwilling to accept this attribution, because the text itself (so they believed) inclusive of the attribution occurs only once and because a very similar definition is attributed to Cleanthes (the one cited supra). Instead they preferred to accept Olympiodorus’ attribution to Zeno of the σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων definition; that this attribution, of a very familiar text, itself occurs only once apparently did not trouble them. Max Pohlenz, however, adducing Cicero Nat.D. 2.57 (SVF I 171) — Zeno . . . naturam ita definit, ut eam dicat ignem esse artificiosum ad gignendum progredientem via—argued that this safe parallel proves von Arnim [and Pearson] wrong. We know now, moreover, that a quite similar definition was attributed not to Cleanthes only, but to Chrysippus as well.

The Greek for Cicero’s Latin survives in at least five places, viz. Diog. Laert. 7.156 (SVF I 171), Ps.-Gal. Def. med. XIX p.371.4 K. (SVF II 1133), Clem. Al. Strom. 5.14.99.4 (SVF II 1134), Aet. 1.7.33, and Athenag. Leg. 6 (SVF II 1027): φύσις is a πῦρ τεχνικὸν ὄδοι βαδίζων εἰς γένεσιν. What is in Cicero and these Greek parallels recalls the objection to Cleanthes’ definition, which was the justification for Chrysippus’ rider found in Olympiodorus and David: Chrysippus added μετὰ φαντασιῶν (or -ας) in order to distinguish techne from physis; others, it seems, had failed to do this. Furthermore, David, as we have seen, quoted Chrysippus’ definition not, as did Olympiodorus, with προίοντα, but with βαδίζων, the word found in the Greek parallels to Cicero just cited. Cicero’s progredientem via, on the other hand, is closer to Olympiodorus’ Chrysippian όδῳ προ­­ιοῦσα than to the όδῳ βαδίζων of the Greek parallels printed in SVF.

13 = SVF I 72. Von Arnim quotes this text from Bekker’s edition, through Pearson, although he knew Hilgard’s, cf. SVF II 226. The same work is thus cited under different headings in Adler’s Index.
14 Pearson (supra n.2) 67, von Arnim ad SVF I 72. Cf. also N. Festa, I frammenti degli Stoichi antichi I (Bari 1932) 41; Isnardi Parente (supra n.5) 288.
15 See however schol. Dion. Thr. p.2.22f, anonymous quotation; 108.29–31 = 157.18f, where a modified form of the definition is attributed to Aristotle.
16 Unfortunately he hid this observation in a footnote, Die Stoa II (Gottingen 1947, 1972) 36, and added to the camouflage by failing to detect a typographical error: SVF I 62 for 72 (not corrected in the new Stellenverzeichnis 248).
17 At SVF II p.328.20 the words καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐνεργητικὸς κυνούμενον, added by Chartier on his own authority, must be deleted; see J. Kollesch, Untersuchungen zu den pseudogalenischen Definitiones medicæ (Berlin 1973) 96 n.94.
The word ὀδόποιητικός, found in Zeno’s definition (τέχνη ἐστὶν ἔξις ὀδόποιητική, SVF I 72), is very late Greek; the instance I have found and those cited in LSJ s.v. are all concerned with this definition. Festa, arguing from the explanation of the definition in schol. Dion. Thr. (cited above), guessed that ὄδῳ ποιητική should be read. Although Hilgard’s text should not, I believe, be emended, I think that Festa must be right in so far as the definition itself is concerned. I hope to return to the schol. Dion. Thr. on another occasion, and so restrict the present argument to the parallels in Cicero and in the definitions of Cleanthes and Chrysippus. Cicero’s via translates Zeno’s ὄδῳ, just as Quintilian’s via translated Cleanthes’ ὄδῳ. Zeno defined τεχνή as follows: τέχνη ἐστὶν ἔξις ὀδῷ ποιητική. Cleanthes altered ποιητική to the more grandiloquent πάντα ἀνύονοσ. Chrysippus, presumably because he wanted to avoid a confusion with nature and had moreover a strict rule for definitions (that the ἰδιων of a thing should be properly expressed: Diog. Laert. 7.60 = SVF II 226), changed ποιητική to προιόντα μετὰ φαντασίων. What happened here also happened in other cases. According to Arius Didymus apud Stobaeus, Zeno defined the τέλος as ὁμολογομένους ζήν (SVF I 179), Cleanthes as ὁμολογομένους τῇ φύσει ζήν (SVF I 552), whereas Chrysippus, σαφέστερου βουλόμενος ποιήσας, changed the definition to ζήν κατ’ ἐμπειρίας τῶν φύσεων συμβαίνοντων (SVF III 12 and 4).

It is arguable that Zeno’s definition was intended as an improvement of Aristotle’s at Eth.Nic. VI 4, τέχνη ἔξις μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς ποιητική ἐστιν ~ Zeno, τέχνη ἐστὶν ἔξις ὀδῷ ποιητική. Zeno’s ὀδῷ replaces Aristotle’s μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς. Aspasiaus, as we have seen, omitted Aristotle’s ἀληθοῦς and hastened to add that logos should not be taken in a scientific sense. To Zeno, μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς must have been unacceptable, for truth is only granted the Sage (cf.

18 Schol. Dion. Thr. p.2.23 Hilg. The verb ὀδόποιησθαι (but see n.20 infra) is found at Ps.-Andronicus Περὶ μαθών p.243.40f Gilbert/Thierry = SVF III 267 (p.65.29f), in a definition of human πρόνοια.

19 Festa (supra n.14) II 110. Cf. also the definition of virtue, SVF III 66.

20 Isnardi Parente (supra n.5) 288 n.2 argued against Festa, adducing parallels from Aristotle with ὀδόποιειν and ὀδόποιησθαι, but these verbs (apart from not being, in a strict sense, parallels for the adjective) mean something other than what would be needed here. The only seemingly valid parallel for the required sense is the verb ὀδόποιειν at Arist. Rh. 1354a8, where R. Kassel, however, now accepts Bywater’s conjecture ὄδῳ ποιεῖν: Der Text der aristotelischen Rhetorik (Berlin/New York 1971) 117f, where, apparently unaware that Festa anticipated him, he also proposed to correct the text of SVF I 72. For parallels to ὀδῷ see Cope’s note ad loc. and Pease’s ad Cic. Nat.D. 2.57.

21 Many other Stoics produced their own version of the telos-formula, see Clem. Al. Strom. 2.21.129.1-5, conveniently printed at Posidonius fr.186 E.-K.
SVF I 52, 216), not always the craftsman or professional. On the other hand, the idea expressed by the word ποιητική must have been fully acceptable to Zeno, who said that nature is a craftsman, that nature is a fire, and that this divine craftsmanlike fire is the active, or creative, principle: for God as the ποιων see Diog. Laert. 7.134 (SVF I 85), for God = fire as the ποιων see Aristocles apud Eus. in SVF I 98. What holds for the divine fire holds for techne: according to Cicero Nat.D. 2.57ff (SVF I 171f), and the Greek parallels (SVF I 171, II 1027, 1133f), nature creates in the manner of art, ad gignendum progredientem via ~ ὀδῷ βαδίζουν εἰς γένεσιν. According to Cicero, Zeno called nature a craftsman: plane artifex ab eodem Zenone dicitur, the ignem artificosum being magistrum arium reliquarum. The operational parallel between nature and art is, of course, familiar from Aristotle;22 but Aristotle always (e.g. already Protr. fr.11 Ross) distinguished art from nature, whereas Zeno said that nature itself is a craftsman. We have already noticed that Chrysippus is said to have objected to this identification in so far as art is concerned; consequently his argument, as cited by Olympiodorus, is as pertinent to Zeno’s definition (SVF I 72, not cited by Olympiodorus) as it is to Cleanthes’. The fact that Chrysippus criticized and amended the definitions printed as SVF I 72 and 490, but did not criticize that at SVF I 73, helps explain why the σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων definition became the authoritative one, why the other three survived only marginally, and why Zeno’s even came to be attributed to Aristotle.

The case for the correctness of the attribution to Zeno of the definition at SVF I 72, then, is stronger than that for the attribution to him of the canonical definition at SVF I 73. However, Pearson already pointed out23 that I 73 has much in common with another description of techne in Aristotle (Metaph. 981a5f): γίγνεται δὲ τέχνη ὅταν ἐκ πολλῶν τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἐννομάτων μία καθόλου γένηται περὶ τῶν ὀμοίων ὑπόληψις. We have seen that in the version of SVF I 73 found in David the word ἐμπειρία occurs. This fuller form of the definition is also found in another prolegomenon to the Ars of Dionysius Thrax, which Di Benedetto has proved to be dependent on David:24 οἱ δὲ Στωικοὶ λέγουσιν κτλ., printed at SVF II 94 from Bek-

22 See W. Fiedler, Analogiemodelle in Aristoteles (Stud.ant.Philos. 9 [1978]) 168ff, 260ff, and especially the excellent pages of Isnardi Parente (supra n.5) 77ff. Good remarks on the text of SVF I 171 and on the antecedents as well as the originality of Zeno’s view are made by D. E. Hahm, The Origins of Stoic Cosmology (Columbus 1977) 200ff.

23 Pearson (supra n.2) 66.
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ker. Now in a prolegomenon to the schol. in Hermog., which is also indebted to David,25 the definition is cited—anonymously—with ἐμπειρίας, the author, however, knows that it also exists without this word: ἦς ὁ ἄλλος ἐξηγούνται, ἀνεν τοῦ "ἐμπειρία" ἐκτιθέμενοι τῶν ὅρων. For ἐμπειρία in another important definition (or version of this definition), see Chrysippus’ telos-formula, ζήν κατ’ ἐμπειρίαν τῶν φύσεων συμβανόντων (SVF III 12, and 4). A common Stoic definition of ἐμπειρία (Aet. 4.11 = SVF II 83) is ἐμπειρία ... ἦστι τὸ τῶν ὀμοειδῶν φαντασίων πλήθος—which is close to Aristotle’s ἐκ πολλῶν τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἐννοημάτων μιὰ καθόλου ... ὑπόληψις, and recalls Chrysippus’ argument26 against Zeno and Cleanthes about memory as the θησαυρομοσία φαντασιῶν which, just like techne (i.e. the σύστημα ... καταλήψεων), would be destroyed if φαντασία were to be interpreted in a crudely material sense. These scraps of testimony are consistent; yet, whether or not ἐμπειρία is read in the definition at SVF I 73,27 the parallel in the Metaphysics of Aristotle shores up the likelihood of its attribution to Zeno, as does the fact that Chrysippus (SVF II 56) apparently takes this definition for granted: σύστημα γὰρ ἤν ..., i.e. “... is supposed to be.” Also the final clause, πρὸς τι τέλος ἐυχρηστοῦν τῶν ἐν τῷ βιῷ, can be paralleled from Aristotle: compare Metaph. 981b15f on the χρήσιμον28 and Eth. Nic. I 1 on the τέλος of techne.29 What the correct form of the definition at SVF I 73 should resemble I find hard to say. Presumably, the variations found in the sources represent rival versions which may derive from individual Stoics. Perhaps the version with ἐμπειρία is Chrysippus’30

I conclude with a comment on Zeno’s definition of techne as an active or creative condition. The word ποιητική does not, in Zeno, have the same significance as in the Aristotelian definition that is

---

25 Walz IV p.4.9f = Rabe 17: <Marcellini?> prologue at Prol.syll. p.262.1f. This discussion of definition, of techne, etc., owes much to David; the definition of definition (Walz p.17.14f = p.275.16–19 Rabe) is David’s (p.11.17f–Busse).
26 At Sext. Math. 7.372 (SVF II 56); see supra 57f.
27 Note that von Arnim, at SVF II 94, giving the scholium text, retains ἐμπειρία.
29 Cf. M.-P. Lerner, Recherches sur la notion de finalité chez Aristote (Paris 1969) 137ff. That a techne should be useful is, of course, also Plato’s view (e.g. Grg. 465A); see Heinimann (supra n.28) passim.
30 For ἐμπειρία in relation to τέχνη esp. in the Hellenistic period see E. Siebenborn, Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien (Stud.ant.Philos. 5 [1976]) 119ff.
repeated verbatim. It will be recalled that, to Zeno, Nature itself is a craftsman. In order to understand what he meant by τεχνη, we should think of the Stoic principles, viz. the ποιητική and the πάσχος, first formulated by Zeno (SVF I 85). Zeno’s techne is ποιητική, active or creative, in the same way that his God, or Nature, or Logos, are active or creative. Techne informs matter—it belongs with the creative logos which is part of human nature.
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