ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	XLVIII.	2012.	pp. 59–68.

OMNIS ARS NATURAE IMITATIO EST. SENECA AND THE FINE ARTS

BY CSILLA SZEKERES

Abstract: The highly influential idea that the artist's task is to represent and copy nature as closely as possible became well-known in Seneca's wording (*omnis ars naturae imitatio est*). By investigating this formula, the present study aims to find answers to the question whether it was really this idea that Seneca regarded as the purpose and essence of a work of art. Comparing Seneca's texts with other Stoic sources, the paper gives an analysis of the meanings of the concepts *techne*/*ars*, including the fine arts as we know them today, and *mimesis*/*imitatio*. Seneca's negative value-judgement of the fine arts is relativized by being embedded in the interrelationships in his philosophy; nor can *imitatio* be interpreted in the fields of sculpture and painting as the passive reflection of reality, as mere copying.

Keywords: *techne*, *ars*, *natura*, *mimesis*, *imitatio*, Stoics, Seneca, fine arts.

The notion – *ars naturae imitatio est* –, which became an integral part of European thinking in Seneca's words[1], served as the theoretical underpinning for lifelike portrayal for a number of centuries. According to this, the artists's task is to represent: imitate, copy and reflect nature as close as possible.[2] But is this really what Seneca regarded as the essence of fine arts as we know them today, and above all, of sculpture and painting? This is a group of issues encompassing several problems which largely derive from the fact that the terms making up the apparently clear and unambiguous definitions carry highly complex meanings depending not only on the philosophical context (Platonist, Aristotelian, Stoic) but even within the philosophy of Stoicism, too.

The first, most obvious task is to investigate those places in Seneca's works where the Stoic philosopher defines his position on the function and value of arts and on the place they occupy in human life. We need to see that the question which is so important to us had marginal importance for Seneca, as did for other philosophers in Antiquity. Art belongs in the extremely broad category of

[1] Sen., *Ep.* 65,3. On the Platonic and Aristotelian roots of topos, see Solmsen 1963; Close 1971, 163-175; Büttner 2006, 62; Inwood 2007, 139.

[2] Cf. Büttner 2006,11ff.

ars, which, like Greek *techne,* encompasses all kinds of theoretical and practical abilities, skills, and knowledge. It seems that Seneca does not mark out the exact place of the fine arts in the system of *artes*. In Letter 88 (§§ 21-22), quoting Posidonius, he divides them into four groups (*artes vulgares et sordidae, ludicrae, pueriles and liberales),* however, fine arts are not represented among the concrete examples. [3]

It is certain that he excludes them from among the *artes liberales* [4] thus they are most likely to be grouped among the *artes ludicrae.*[5] Their value, or rather their lack of value, is basically determined by the fact that, according to the teaching of the philosophy of Stoicism, all the goods lying between the final good (virtue) and its opposite are indifferent. Nevertheless, within the *artes* belonging to the indifferent things *artes liberales* should be preferred, which, even though they do not belong to virtue, assist the man who wants to reach the final good as a propedeutic.[6] However, sculpture and painting as *luxuriae ministri* definitely cannot be classified among these. The stance of Seneca the philosopher on judging arts, thus seems definite and clear: as servants of luxury and pleasure, they are not only useless and superfluous but unabiguously harmful, too.[7] The question is, on the one hand, whether this value judgement is in agreement with the Stoic outlook, and on the other hand, whether it can be brought into connection with the manner of the creation of works of art designated by the term *ars naturae imitatio est.*

Contrary to the above, *ars* (*techne*), comprising also fine arts and the craftsman (*artifex, technites*) are concepts of central significance both generally in the philosophy of Stoicism and for Seneca, too. This is not merely about the

---

[3] In *Consolatio ad Marciam* (18,7) he distinguishes three groups of *artes*: quae vitam instruant, quae ornent, quae regant.

[4] *Ep.* 88,18 non enim adducor, ut in numerum liberalium artium pictores recipiam, non magis quam statuarios aut marmorarios aut ceteros luxuriae ministros.

[5] *Ep.* 88,21vulgares (sc. artes) opificum, quae manu constant et ad instruendam vitam occupatae sunt, in quibus nulla decoris, nulla honesti simulatio est. ludicrae sunt, quae ad voluptatem oculorum atque aurium tendunt. For the latter, however, he does not bring works of fine art as examples, rather, structures whose functioning arouses admiration in the ignorant, the incompetent. Cf. Democritus' distinction between *techne* stemming from needs and unnecessry: DK 68 B 144 (Philodemus, *De mus*. 108,29ff. Kemke).

[6] *Ep.* 88,20 (sc. artes liberales) animum ad accipiendam virtutem praeparant. Cf. *Ep*. 62,1 on the value of *studia liberalia*: mentiuntur, qui sibi obstare ad studia liberalia turbam negotiorum videri volunt: simulant occupationes et augent et ipsi se occupant; *Nat.* VII 32 quis philosophiam aut ullum liberale respicit studium, nisi cum ludi intercalantur, cum aliquis pluvius intervenit dies, quem perdere libet. Cf. Costa 1992, 190ff.

[7] Also in Letter 88.,Seneca draws a comparison between the exaggerated cultivation and the senseless collection, hoarding of valuable, otherwise useless things (most likely art treasures) of *artes liberales* (§§36-37).

artist analogy considered a topos in Stoic texts as well, used to elucidate the most diverse philosophical theories.[8]

In Stoic physics, one aspect of god defined in several ways is the craftsman, who forms *kosmos* from matter (*hyle)*.[9] Zeno called god „a designing fire which methodically proceeds towards the creation of the world".[10] In the process of creation the god creates its creation, that is, nature, with which it is identified[11] as reason (*logos*).[12] According to Cicero, there is no substancial, only quantitative difference, between the craftsman-like fire, that is, nature and human *artes*: the former's activity is „much more artistic", this is how it can be the master of all other crafts. [13] There are, however, other limitations to the parallel between god as *artifex* and human creation. Greek philosophy, starting with Xenophanes to the contemporary Epicureans unanimously rejected the thought of divine action involving effort,[14] thus, in the continuation of the above Cicero text, Balbus stresses that effort is alien to god, as is Epicurean idleness.[15] In addition, the immanent divine craftsman works away on natural things not from the outside and superficially but from the inside, totally pervading them.[16] Unlike the human craftsman, he cannot create something such that in the meantime he „copies" it onto some external object as if looking at a model: he cannot pay attention to anybody else but himself in the same way as creator and creation are the same: nature/god is simultaneously *natura naturans* and *natura naturata*.[17]

The valuelessness of fine arts was contradicted by the fact that *technai* appeared rather intriguing to the Stoics, of whom Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysip-

---

[8] Cf. SVF III 301 (Phidias' art exemplifies the unity of *sophia* and *techne*); SVF II 1132 (nature strives for profit, advantage and delight, as is clear from human craft), SVF III 311 (the analogy of dynamis pervading hyle and the bronze sculptor). Wildberger 2006 I, 15-16.

[9] LS 44 B.

[10] LS 46 A (= SVF II 1027), SVF II 1133, 1134, cf. SVF II 423, LS 46 D (= SVF I 120).

[11] Stoic God is present in his own creation, cf. SVF II 323, 1044, 1135; Wildberger II 482-3, note 104.

[12] Cf. SVF I 530, 532, II 1025.

[13] Cic., *N. D.* II 57 Zeno igitur naturam ita definit, ut eam dicat ignem esse artificiosum, ad gignendum progredientem via. Censet enim artis maxume proprium esse creare et gignere; quodque in operibus nostrarum artium manus efficiat, id multo artificiosius naturam efficere, id est, ut dixi, ignem artificiosum, magistrum artium reliquarum. (58) natura non artificiosa solum, sed plane artifex ab eodem Zenone dicitur.; Cic., *Leg.* I 26 (SVF II 1162).

[14] Not even movement befits (*epiprepei*) the god of Xenophanes: DK 21 B 26; Epikuros: KD 1.

[15] Cic., *N. D.* II 59 appareat multitudo nec cessantium deorum nec ea, quae agant, molientium cum labore operoso ac molesto.

[16] SVF II 1044, 323, 1135; cf. Nesselrath 1985, 203-204;Wildberger 2006, II 482-3, note 104; Bénatouïl 2009, 25-26.

[17] Cf. Solmsen 1963, 496; Zagdoun 2000, 11.

pus wrote books with the same title.[18] According to Nesselrath, it was the Stoa itself that systematised the concept of *techne* – vis-a-vis that of Aristotle – into an improved system, thereby giving it the form which made it decisive for the entire later Antiquity.[19] In Stoic philosophy, *techne,* with an extended content,[20] includes virtue (*arete*) and the individual types of virtue, *episteme*, and philosophy itself (*techne peri ton bion*). Its value is unambiguously marked by the fact that it was ranked among the things to be preferred (*proegmena*), due to its usefulness (*chreia)*.[21]

The concept of *techne* is closely linked with the theory of *oikeiosis*, the pillar of Stoic ethics. In accordance with this, nature endows living beings with *artes* itself: this is why the spider, for example, is able to make a web.[22] Nature provides for people in a different way: it teaches them such that *ratio* should invent *artes,* and, together with them, invents things necessary for life, imitating nature.[23] From all this it does not follow, however, that usefulness would be the exclusive criterion of *artes*, nor is it the only criterion for the divine creator: the only function of the tail of a peacock, the feathers of a bird or the beard of men can be beauty.[24] By the same analogy, an instance of delighting can be equally regarded as the purpose of human creation. If the divine master can portray something merely for its beauty, then why should we reject the same thing in the case of the human master as an utterly useless thing?

Seneca gives a detailed account of the essence of *artes* and its place in human life in his letter 90., written to and polemizing with Posidonius.[25] Contesting the views of the Rhodes philosopher about the origin and development of culture, Seneca expresses strikingly opposing views on *artes*, too. While according to Posidonius, *artes* were invented by wise people (*sapientes*), Seneca keeps *artes* employed in everyday life definitely distinct from philosophy,[26]

---

[18] Cf. SVF I 41, 481, II 16, 17.

[19] Nesselrath 1985, 138.

[20] For a definition see. SVF I 490, 73.

[21] SVF III 127, 136, 516, 189 (=Cic., *Fin.* III 18 artes etiam ipsas propter se assumendas putamus, cum quia sit in iis aliquid dignum assumptione, tum quod constent ex cognitionibus et contineant quiddam in se ratione constitutum et via.). Cf. Nesselrath 1985, 142, 183.

[22] Sen., *Ep.* 121, 22.

[23] SVF II 1162 (Cic., *Leg.* I 26 Artes vero innumerabiles repertae sunt, docente natura. Quam imitata ratio res ad vitam necessarias sollerter consecuta est.

[24] SVF II 1165 (Cic., *N. D.* I 47) , SVF II 1166 (Cic., *Fin.* III 18), SVF II 1167 (Lact., *Inst. div*. II 10).

[25] Cf. Pfligersdorffer 1982; Costa 1992, 203-213; Szekeres 1995,58-78.

[26] *Ep.* 90,7 artes quidem a philosophia inventas quibus in cotidiano vita utitur non concesserim.; cf. §11.

linking them to *luxuria*.[27] *Artes* attributable to human ingenuity (*sagacitas*), like inventions, create goods which are considered indifferent (*adiaphora*) as they have nothing to do with the final good realized in virtue, the ultimate purpose of human life (*telos*). All *artes* are concerned with the body which was once the servant of them, however, by now the body has become their lord, their master (§19.). The goods attributable to the crafts (*artes)* do not cater for real human needs, are thus entirely unnecessary and only serve meaningless luxury.[28] He supports his argumentation with this obviously Epicurean notion: real needs are taken care of by nature itself.[29] Nature, one of whose aspects is providence (*pronoia*) in Stoic philosophy, does not expect man, like any other living beings, to make great effort to sustain life.[30] *Ars* being a synonym of *luxuria* in Seneca's terminology and *luxuria* being the opposite of *natura*, it seems self-evident to him to strikingly oppose nature *artes*.[31] We need to stress that all this applies to the crafts serving the body, whereas the letter reaches its climax in its portrayal of the *ars* whose value is undeniable and which leads to virtue.[32] The real *artifex* is *sapientia*, as life's creator or craftsman (*artifex vitae*),[33] which is served by all *artes*.

To sum up the above: in contrast with the Stoic view somewhat generously labelled general that there is a close relationship between *techne* and *physis, techne* being useful and *techne* being teachable-learnable*,* Seneca accepts only the latter as valid for all *artes*. The *artes* linkable to the body are not useful and

---

[27] *Ep.* 90, 9 mihi crede, felix illud saeculum ante architectos fuit, ante tectores. ista nata sunt iam nascente luxuria; §19. a natura luxuria descivit, quae cotidie se ipsa incitat et tot saeculis crescit et ingenio adiuvat vitia.

[28] Cf. Sen., *Helv.* 11,4-5.

[29] *Ep.* 90, 15 posse nos habere usibus nostris necessaria si contenti fuerimus iis quae terra posuit in summo; §§16-18; cf. Sen., *Ep.* 4,10-11; 60,3; 110,10-11; *de vita beata* 8,2; Epic., *ep. Men.* 130; *KD* XV.

[30] *Ep.* 90, 18 non fuit tam inimica natura ut, cum omnibus aliis animalibus facile actum vitae daret, homo solus non posset sine tot artibus vivere (…) ad parata nati sumus (…) sufficit ad id natura quod poscit.

[31] *Ep.* 90, 16 Non desiderabis artifices: sequere naturam. In his Letter 121 discussing the theory of *oikeiosis* (*conciliatio*) (§§22-24.) Seneca distinguishes those abilities of animals with which provident nature endowed them to help their survival (*artes*) and the learned crafts of man: *nascitur ars ista, non discitur*. He considers human *artes* definitely lower than the innate *artes* of animals imposed on them by nature, with which man cannot compete*: non vides, quam nulli mortalium imitabilis illa aranei textura*? (§22.) Later Marcus Aurelius XI 10 argues, from a reverse angle, for the fact that nature cannot lag behind artistic creation.

[32] *Ep.* 90,44 Non enim dat natura virtutem: ars est bonum fieri.

[33] *Ep.* 90, 27; cf. *Ep.* 29,3; 31,6; 95,7-8; 117,12, *Vit. beat*. 8,3.

are contrary to nature. Based on Seneca's argumentation, *ars* proper, which meets every single criterion, is exclusively striving towards virtue (§44).[34]

In Seneca's works we find several texts where god is *artifex* and divine activity is *ars*.[35] The basis question, however, is *how* god carries out creation, what the object and purpose of his creation is and whether all this can be related to the activity of human craftsmen (*artifices)*?

It seems obvious to draw a comparison between the activities of the divine and human craftsman. However, in accordance with the Stoic outlook, the object of god's creative activity, as a consequence of the identity of god and nature, is itself.[36] This automatically excludes the possibility of describing the process of creation in the case of divine and human *artifex* alike as *imitatio* (*mimesis*), as was customary in antiquity, irrespective of philosophical standing.[37] *Mimesis,* however we define it, presupposes an external reality independent of the creator which he, according to the general mindset, somehow reflects in his work. Still, the concept of *imitatio* can often be found in Seneca's works, however, it is not primarily used to serve the characterization of the activity of *artifex.* With Seneca, *imitatio* is above all the *imitatio* of god: man striving towards the *perfecta virtus* intends to reach his goal "imitating", following god, competing with him.[38] God, from another aspect, nature, is rational through and through,[39] his reason is perfect at that. Reason (and far from being *perfecta ratio*) is only one part of man, but even that makes him, uniquely among all living things, capable of understanding the world and „imitating" it.[40] All this is thus made possible by the substantial relationship between god and man, the

---

[34] For the teachability of virtue, see *Ep.* 88,32; 95,56; 123,16.

[35] *Ep.* 58,28; 71,14; *Prov.* I 5,9; de *Otio* 4,3; *Nat.* II 45,1.

[36] Sen., *Ben.* IV 8,2 Quocumque te flexeris, ibi illum videbis occurrentem tibi. nihil ab illo vacat: opus suum ipse implet. Cf. Wildberger 2006 II, 482-3.

[37] From the extensive literature on *mimesis* see recently: Halliwell 2002.

[38] Sen., *Ep.* 95,50 Vis deos propitiare? bonus esto. satis illos coluit, quisquis imitatus est*; Ep.* 104,23 magnanimos nos natura produxit et ut quibusdam animalibus ferum dedit, quibusdam subdolum, quibusdam pavidum, ita nobis gloriosum et excelsum spiritum, quaerentem ubi honestissime, non ubi tutissime vivat, simillimum mundo, quem, quantum mortalium passibus licet, sequitur aemulaturque. According to Wildberger 2006 I, 271: "Während Seneca sehr oft davon spricht, daß man *Gott* nachahmen und sich ihm angleichen müsse (…), findet man solche Gedanken für andere Stoikern seltener belegt." At the same time the idea shows close affinity with Plato (*Theaet*. 176b). Cf. Fischer 2008,14-5., Sedley 2005, 132.

[39] Sen., *Nat.* I praef. 14.

[40] Sen., *de Ira* II 15,2 Quid est autem cur hominem ad tam infelicia exempla revoces, cum habeas mundum deumque, quem ex omnibus animalibus ut solus imitetur, solus intellegit? Cf. Cic., *Tusc.* V 70.

fact that the human soul is, in fact, an offshoot (*apospasma*) of god.[41] Thus *imitatio naturae* is identical with *imitatio dei*, of which *ratio*, is a means on the one hand,[42] and the goal on the other, since the final good – living in accordance with nature, that is, with god – is identical to perfect agreement with divine reason, to acquiring the perfected reason (*perfecta ratio)*.[43] Consequently, for Seneca *naturae imitatio* can by no means mean mere copying in the field of ethics since its condition is the *understanding* of the world (nature, god). But it cannot mean this in the realm of human crafts, – implicitly, the fine arts –, either.

Referring to Posidonius in Letter 90, Seneca gives a detailed account of the birth of the two *artes*: that of a baker's trade (§§22-3.) and of sailing (§24.). Both came into being as a result of the *imitatio* of nature, with man himself being the model in the former, more precisely, the processes of chewing and digestion, and the movement of fish in the water in the latter. *Imitatio* means the interpretation and modelling or independent *recreation* of two natural phenomena or mechanisms.[44] Maybe we are not rash in concluding from this that the likeness of a painting to the portrayed object does not necessarily mean mechanical copying, mirror-like correspondence, either.[45] In letter 9, (§7) we can read a highly interesting remark about the fact that for the painter, painting itself represents greater joy than the finished work ,[46] which conjures up in us

---

[41] Sen., *Ep.* 92,30 Quid est autem cur non existimes in eo divini aliquid exsistere, qui dei pars est? totum hoc, quo continemur, et unum est et deus: et socii sumus eius et membra. Cf. Cic., *Tusc*. V 38 humanus autem animus decerptus ex mente divina; LS 53 X; Rist 2010, 264-5.

[42] Sen., *Ep.* 66,39 bonum sine ratione nullum est: sequitur autem ratio naturam. "quid est ergo ratio?" naturae imitatio; Cf. Vitr. II 1,6; Inwood 2007, 175.

[43] Sen., *Ep.* 92,2 in hoc uno positam esse beatam vitam, ut in nobis ratio perfecta sit. On Seneca's definition on *telos* see also *Ep.* 5,4 propositum nostrum est secundum naturam vivere; *Ep.* 66,39 "quod est summum hominis bonum?" ex naturae voluntate se gerere; *Vit. beat.* 8,1 natura enim duce utendum est. hanc ratio observat, hanc consulit. Idem est ergo beate vivere et secundum naturam; *Ot. sap*. 5,1. Cf. Börger 1980, 9-15.

[44] A similar conclusion is reached by Köller 1975, 190-1., who believes that in Seneca's artistic interpretation, instead of Plato' concept of *mimesis*, its older meaning also determining the Aristotelian concept of *mimesis* ("portrayal") is reflected. According to this, "*mimesis* bedeutet nicht: illusionistisch gespiegelt, sondern in der Handlung als eine den Menschen angehende Wahrheit vergegenwärtigt." Cf. Solmsen 1963, 486ff. It should be noted that the *mimesis* = reflection theory, traditionally based on Plat., *Rep.* X 596b-598d , shold be called the theory *attributed* to Plato. On Plato's differential interpretation of *mimesis* see Halliwell 2002 *passim*, especially 58ff; 118ff.; Büttner 2006, 13ff.

[45] Sen., *Ep.* 71,2 nemo, quamvis paratos habeat colores, similitudinem reddet, nisi iam constat, quid velit pingere. Cf. Kölle 1975, 172ff.

[46] Attalus philosophus dicere solebat: "iucundius esse amicum facere quam habere. quomodo artifici iucundius pingere est quam pinxisse." Illa in opere suo occupata sollicitudo ingens oblec-

the image of the industrious divine *artifex* [47] as well as that of the Stoic philosopher toiling unrelentlessly until the end of his life.[48] If the comparison holds, then, for the human *artifices* creation itself is an activity which resembles the divine activity that shapes the world and brings joy, whose valuable nature can hardly be questioned. And the much-studied Letter 65[49] reveals the fact that Seneca's interpretation of Plato also contradicts the theory of *mimesis* = mirror-like correspondence.

In the letter Seneca uses the well-known sculptor analogy to elucidate the relationship between Stoic cause (*causa*) and matter (*materia*) (65,3): *Omnis ars naturae imitatio est. itaque quod de universo dicebam, ad haec transfer, quae ab homine facienda sunt: statua et materiam habuit, quae pateretur artificem, et artificem, qui materiae daret faciem. ergo in statua materia aes fuit, causa opifex*. In the continuation, confronting Stoic theory with Aristotle's and Plato's *turba causarum* (§11.), he names *idea* (§7.) as the fifth one in the line of Plato's causes: *His quintam Plato adicit exemplar, quam ipse 'idean' vocat: hoc est enim, ad quod respiciens artifex id, quod destinabat, effecit. nihil autem ad rem pertinet, utrum foris habeat exemplar, ad quod referat oculos, an intus, quod ibi ipse concepit et posuit. haec exemplaria rerum omnium deus intra se habet numerosque universorum, quae agenda sunt, et modos mente conplexus est: plenus his figuris est, quas Plato 'ideas' appellat, inmortales, inmutabiles, infatigabiles*.[50] The text regarded as a valuable source of the early history of Middle-Platonism[51] is interesting to us for several reasons. By suggesting the possibility that ideas do not have transcendental existence only but are present in god's mind, he sheds new light on Plato's demiurge activity, too. Since he looks at ideas not as models outside themselves, the process of creation interpreted as *mimesis* cannot mean mere copying, either. On the other hand, this kind of interpretation of ideas makes it possible to draw a closer parallel between Plato's demiurge and the Stoics' immanent god.

In conclusion we can say that for Seneca in the case of *ars* belonging to the soul (*bonum fieri*) *imitatio naturae* involves striving to achieve complete ac-

---

tamentum habet in ipsa occupatione. non aeque delectatur, qui ab opere perfecto removit manum. iam fructu artis suae fruitur: ipsa fruebatur arte, cum pingeret. Cf. Kölle 1975, 157.

[47] On this question and on the issue of divine activity in *ekpyrosis* see Bénatouïl 2009.

[48] *De Otio* 1,4 certe Stoici nostri dicunt: usque ad ultimum vitae finem in actu erimus, non desinemus communi bono operam dare, adiuvare singulos, opem ferre etiam inimicis senili manu. nos sumus, qui nullis annis vacationem damus (…).

[49] Cf. Sedley 2005, 134ff. Comments on the letter and literature review, Inwood 2007, 107-111; 136-155.

[50] Cf. Cic., *Orat.* 8-10.

[51] Cf. Halliwell 2002, 316, note 6; Lowenstam 1998-1999.

cordance with nature (god). This accordance can be achieved with the help of philosophy, with the acquisition of correctly-judging perfected reason (*recta ratio*). Only the wise, the perfectly moral man (*sapiens*) possesses *recta ratio*, the ideal man who is hardly exemplified in real life. For the man who wants to achieve the greatest human good, virtue, the result of *imitatio naturae* cannot be complete likeness to nature, perfect accord with it,[52] since he *is only trying* to understand the ever-changing world governed by divine *ratio*. All other *artes* are indifferent from the point of view of the final goal, virtue. What is more, the *artes* serving the body as servers of luxury and greed are downright harmful. The reason for this, however, is not the mode of the work of art as *imitatio*, rather, the simple fact that the *artes* belong to the body in sharp contrast to the soul.[53] This way, the negative judgement of the fine arts, embedded in the interrelated system of Seneca's philosophy is merely relative, it becomes sound exclusively when contrasted with *ars,* leading to *telos,* the ultimate goal of human life. Imitation, on the other hand, serving to characterize the mode of creation is an exquisite activity, which in some sense can be likened to that of the divine creator, with *ratio* as its means.

Bibliography

Bénatouïl 2009 = Bénatouïl, Th: How Industrious can Zeus be? The Extent and Objects of Divine Activity in Stoicism. In: Salles, R. (ed.): *God and Cosmos in Stoicism*. Oxford.

Börger 1980 = Börger, H.: *Grundzüge der Bildungstheorie L. A. Senecas*. Frankfurt am Main–Bern–Cirencester/U. K.

Büttner 2006 = Büttner, S.: *Antike Ästhetik. Eine Einführung in die Prinzipien des Schönen*. München.

Close 1971 = Close, Anthony J.: Philosophical Theories of Art and Nature in Classical Antiquity. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32, 163-184.

Costa 1992 = Costa, C. D. N.: *Seneca 17 Letters with translation and commentary* by C. D. N. Costa. Warminster (1988[1]).

Fischer 2008 = Fischer, Susanna E.: *Seneca als Theologe. Studien zum Verhältnis von Philosophie und Tragödiendichtung.* Berlin–New York (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde. Hrsg. von M. Erler, M, Gall, D., Heitsch, E., Koenen, D. L., Zinzen, C., Bd. 259)

Halliwell 2002 = Halliwell, S.: The *Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton and Oxford.

---

[52] Cf. *Ep.* 90, 27 Dis (…) immortalibus solis et virtus et beata vita contingit: nobis umbra quaedam illorum bonorum et similitudo. accedimus ad illa, non pervenimus.

[53] *Ep.* 65, 16 corpus hoc animi pondus ac poena est: premente illo urgetur, in vinculis est, nisi accessit philosophia. With this Seneca represents a view whose Platonist origin is undeniable. Cf. Lowenstam 1998-1999, 69 ff.

Inwood 2007 = Inwood, B.: *Seneca. Selected Philosophical Letters.* Translated with an Introduction and Commentary by Brad Inwood. Oxford.
Kölle 1975 = Kölle, M.: *Totum in exiguo als Lebensform und Kunstprinzip in Senecas philosophischen Schriften.* Inaugural-Diss. Heidelberg.
Lowenstam 1998-1999 = Lowenstam, S.: Seneca's Epistle Sixty-Five. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 43/44, 63-78.
Nesselrath 1985 = Nesselrath, H.-G.: *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar.* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte. Hrsg. von Bühler, W., Hermann, P., Zwierlein, O., Bd. 22) Berlin–New York.
Pfligersdorffer 1982 = Pfligersdorffer, G.: Fremdes und Eigenes in Senecas 90. Brief an Lucilius. In: Stagl, J. (Hrsg.): *Aspekte der Kultursoziologie. Aufsätze zur Soziologie, Philosophie, Anthropologie und Geschichte der Kultur. Zum 60. Geburtstag von Muhammed Rassem*. Berlin, 303-326.
Rist 2010 = Rist, J. M.: *Stoic Philosophy*. Cambridge (1969[1]).
Sedley 2005 = Sedley, D.: Stoic Metaphysics at Rome. In: Salles, R. (ed.): *Metaphysics, Soul, and Ethics in Ancient Thought. Themes from the Work of Richard Sorabji.* Oxford, 117-142.
Solmsen 1963 = Solmsen, F.: Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24, 473-96.
Szekeres 1995 = Szekeres Cs.: *Szemelvények a római levélirodalomból*. (Roman Letters - Excerpts) Debrecen, 29-153.
Wildberger 2006 = Wildberger, J.: *Seneca und die Stoa: Der Platz des Menschen in der Welt.* Bd. 1-2. (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte. Hrsg. von Lehmann, G.-A., Nesselrath, H.-G., Zwierlein, O. Bd. 84/1) Berlin–New York.
Zagdoun 2000 = Zagdoun, M.-A.: *La philosophie stoïcienne de l'art*. Paris.

Abbreviations

LS = Long, A. A., Sedley, D. N.: *The Hellenistic Philosophers 1-2*. Cambridge 1987.
SVF = Arnim, J.: *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. I-IV. Leipzig 1938, 1923, 1924.

(ISSN 0418 – 453X)