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 Cleanthes':[1] Κλεάνθης τοίνυν λέγει ὅτι "τέχνη ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδῷ πάντα ἀνύουσα." Olympiodorus rejects this, because, so he argues, also φύσις ἕξις τις ἐστὶν ὁδῷ πάντα ποιοῦσα. He tells us that Chrysippus realized that Cleanthes' definition is too wide (70.1–3 W.): ὅθεν ὁ Χρύσιππος προσθεὶς τὸ "μετὰ φαντασιῶν" εἶπεν ὅτι "τέχνη ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδῷ προϊοῦσα μετὰ φαντασιῶν." According to Olympiodorus, Chrysippus' definition fits rhetoric, but there is also another one that is good, *viz.* Zeno's:[2] Ζήνων δέ φησιν ὅτι "τέχνη ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων συγγεγυμνασμένων[3] πρός τι τέλος εὔχρηστον τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ." 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, ἀναιρεῖ-

---

[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 acknowledgement 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 στάσεων p.28.3–6 Rabe; *cf.* Sopater *ad loc.*, Walz V pp.9.1f, 17.27f.

ται μὲν μνήμη θησαυρισμὸς οὖσα φαντασιῶν (*cf. SVF* I 64), ἀναι-
ρεῖται δὲ πᾶσα τέχνη· σύστημα γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἄθροισμα καταλήψεων
... In other words, according to Chrysippus the presence of presenta-
tions 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 ψυχὴν 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 defini-
tions 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:

> τέχνη δέ ἐστιν ἡ τῶν καθόλου γνῶσις μετὰ λόγου, ἢ "τέχνη
> ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδῷ βαδίζουσα μετὰ φαντασίας"· καὶ γὰρ ἡ τέχνη ἕξις
> τις καὶ γνῶσίς ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁδῷ βαδίζει· πάντα γὰρ κατὰ τάξιν
> ποιεῖ. "μετὰ φαντασίας" δὲ πρόσκειται διὰ τὴν φύσιν· καὶ γὰρ ἡ
> φύσις ἕξις ἐστίν (ἔχει γὰρ τὸ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς ἔχουσιν αὐτήν, οἷον ἐν
> ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐν λίθῳ, ἐν ξύλῳ) καὶ ὁδῷ βαδίζει (κατὰ γὰρ τάξιν
> προέρχεται), ἀλλ' οὐ μετὰ φαντασίας ὥσπερ ἡ τέχνη· καὶ γὰρ ὁ
> τεχνίτης κεχρημένος τῷ λόγῳ, ἡνίκα βούλεταί τι ποιῆσαι, πρό-
> τερον διατυποῖ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὃ βούλεται ποιῆσαι καὶ εἶθ' οὕτως ἀπο-
> τελεῖ αὐτό, ἡ δὲ φύσις οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ποιεῖ· οὐδὲ γὰρ προδιατυποῖ
> ἐν ἑαυτῇ ὃ βούλεται κατασκευάσαι.

Next (44.5f Busse) David quotes—anonymously—the definition Olym-
piodorus attributed to Zeno, with an important variation that cannot

---

[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 καταλήψεων. 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 ὁδῷ with τάξει, 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 καταλήψεων κτλ. But David's—anonymous—definition of *techne* as ἡ τῶν καθόλου γνῶσις 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 ἕξις μετὰ λόγου ποιητική," omitting ἀληθοῦς before λόγου (*In Eth.Nic.* p.2.24f Heylbut). 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 ἓν 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 συλλογιστικόν,
> ἀλλὰ τὸν ἁπλοῦν καὶ τεχνικόν, ᾧ χρῶνται οἱ δημιουργοὶ τῶν
> τεχνῶν· ποιήματα μὲν γάρ ἐστι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀλόγων, οἷον τῶν μὲν
> μελισσῶν τὰ κηρία, ἀραχνῶν δὲ τὰ ἀράχνια καλούμενα· ἀλλ' οὐ-
> δὲν τούτων μετὰ λόγου ποιεῖ, ἀλλ' ὁρμῇ φυσικῇ χρώμενα τὰ ζῷα.

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 καταλήψεων, *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: ἡ οὕτως· τέχνη ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐκ καταλήψεων συγγεγυμνασμένον [*sic*: read -ων, *cf. supra* n.3; no correction in von Arnim] ἐφ' ἓν τέλος τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἐχόντων. 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.*

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 potestas*[10] *viam, id est ordinem efficiens*. But we should follow the recent editions of Quintilian in reading *via* (ὁδῷ) and *ordine* (τάξει).[11] Furthermore, the words *id est ordine* are clearly intended as an explanation of *via*: compare Olympiodorus and David, who *gloss* ὁδῷ with τάξει and κατὰ τάξιν. 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.:

ἡ τοίνυν ῥητορικὴ ὑποπίπτει τῷ ὅρῳ τούτῳ [*sc.* Chrysippus'], ἕξις γάρ ἐστιν ὁδῷ καὶ τάξει προϊοῦσα· οὕτω γοῦν ὁ ῥήτωρ προοιμίοις πρότερον κέχρηται, εἶτα προκαταστάσει καὶ καταστάσει καὶ τοῖς ἑξῆς τάξιν 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* (ἕξις) 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 ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδοποιητική," τουτέστι δι' ὁδοῦ καὶ μεθόδου ποιοῦσά τι.[13] Pearson and von Arnim were unwilling to accept this attribution,[14] because the text itself (so they believed)[15] 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[16] 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),[17] 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 ὁδῷ βαδίζον 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 προϊοῦσα, but with βαδίζον, the word found in the Greek parallels to Cicero just cited. Cicero's *progredientem via*, on the other hand, is closer to Olympiodorus' Chrysippean ὁδῷ προϊοῦσα than to the ὁδῷ βαδίζον 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, ⁴1972) 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 ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἐνεργητικῶς κινούμενον, added by Chartier on his own authority, must be deleted; see J. Kollesch, *Untersuchungen zu den pseudogalenischen Definitiones medicae* (Berlin 1973) 96 n.94.

The word ὁδοποιητικός, found in Zeno's definition (τέχνη ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδοποιητική, *SVF* I 72), is very late Greek; the instance I have found[18] 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 ὁδῷ ποιητική should be read.[19] 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.[20] 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 ὁδῷ, just as Quintilian's *via* translated Cleanthes' ὁδῷ. Zeno *defined techne* as follows: τέχνη ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδῷ ποιητική. Cleanthes altered ποιητική to the more grandiloquent πάντα ἀνύουσα. Chrysippus, presumably because he wanted to avoid a confusion with nature and had moreover a strict rule for definitions (that the ἴδιον of a thing should be properly expressed: Diog. Laert. 7.60 = *SVF* II 226), changed ποιητική to προϊοῦσα μετὰ φαντασιῶν. What happened here also happened in other cases. According to Arius Didymus *apud* Stobaeus, Zeno defined the τέλος as ὁμολογουμένως ζῆν (*SVF* I 179), Cleanthes as ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν (*SVF* I 552), whereas Chrysippus, σαφέστερον βουλόμενος ποιῆσαι, changed the definition to ζῆν κατ' ἐμπειρίαν τῶν φύσει συμβαινόντων (*SVF* III 12 and 4).[21]

It is arguable that Zeno's definition was intended as an improvement of Aristotle's at *Eth.Nic.* VI 4, τέχνη ἕξις μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς ποιητική ἐστιν ~ Zeno, τέχνη ἐστὶν ἕξις ὁδῷ ποιητική. Zeno's ὁδῷ replaces Aristotle's μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς. Aspasius, 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 ὁδοποιεῖσθαι (but see n.20 *infra*) is found at Ps.-Andronicus Περὶ παθῶν p.243.40f Glibert/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 ὁδοποιεῖν and ὁδοποιεῖσθαι, 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 ὁδοποιεῖν at Arist. *Rh.* 1354a8, where R. Kassel, however, now accepts Bywater's conjecture ὁδῷ 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 ὁδῷ 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 ποιοῦν see Diog. Laert. 7.134 (*SVF* I 85), for God = fire as the ποιοῦν 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 ~ ὁδῷ βαδίζον εἰς γένεσιν. According to Cicero, Zeno called nature a craftsman: *plane artifex ab eodem Zenone dicitur*, the *ignem artificosum* being *magistrum artium 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 out[23] that I 73 has much in common with another description of *techne* in Aristotle (*Metaph.* 981a5f): γίγνεται δὲ τέχνη ὅταν ἐκ πολλῶν τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἐννοημάτων μία καθόλου γένηται περὶ τῶν ὁμοίων ὑπόληψις. We have seen that in the version of *SVF* I 73 found in David the word ἐμπειρίᾳ 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 Στωϊκοὶ λέγουσι 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.

[24] Schol. Dion. Thr. p.108.31–33 Hilg. V. Di Benedetto, "Dionisio Trace e la *techne* a lui attribuita," *AnnPisa* 27 (1958) 171–78. I do not agree with his analysis completely,

ker. Now in a prolegomenon to the schol. in Hermog., which is also indebted to David,[25] the definition is cited—anonymously—*with ἐμ-πειρία*; the author, however, knows that it also exists without this word: ἢ ὡς ἄλλοι ἐξηγοῦνται, ἄνευ τοῦ "ἐμπειρία" ἐκτιθέμενοι τὸν ὅρον. For ἐμπειρία in another important definition (or version of this definition), see Chrysippus' *telos*-formula, ζῆν κατ' ἐμπειρίαν τῶν φύσει συμβαινόντων (*SVF* III 12, and 4). A common Stoic definition of ἐμπειρία (Aet. 4.11 = *SVF* II 83) is ἐμπειρία ... ἐστι τὸ τῶν ὁμοειδῶν φαντασιῶν πλῆθος—which is close to Aristotle's ἐκ πολ-λῶν τῆς ἐμπειρίας ἐννοημάτων μία καθόλου ... ὑπόληψις, and re-calls Chrysippus' argument[26] against Zeno and Cleanthes about mem-ory as the θησαυρισμὸς 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 Chrysip-pus (*SVF* II 56) apparently takes this definition for granted: σύστημα γὰρ ἦν ... , *i.e.* " ... is supposed to be." Also the final clause, πρός τι τέλος εὔχρηστον τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ, can be paralleled from Aristotle: compare *Metaph.* 981b15f on the χρήσιμον[28] 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 indi-vidual 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

---

but it is in any event clear that David's version and exegesis of the anonymous defini-tion is one of the sources of the author of the prolegomenon.

[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 defini-tion (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.

[28] Aristotle distinguishes the useful aspect of the arts and sciences from the cogni-tive, 'free' aspect. The topos of the χρήσιμον dates back to Sophistic times, see F. Heinimann, "Eine vorplatonische Theorie der τέχνη," *MusHelv* 18 (1961) 105–30 [C. J. Classen, ed., *Sophistik* (Darmstadt 1976) 127–69].

[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 ποιητική, we should think of the Stoic principles, *viz.* the ποιοῦν and the πάσχον, 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.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT
December, 1982