

ON HERACLITUS FRAGMENT 62 (D—K)⁶ ONCE MORE

In this review (XII 1962, pp. 51—56) the Yugoslav Mr. M. Markovich of the University of Merida in Venezuela, well-known from his research into Heraclitus, has published a worthwhile, methodical and conclusive criticism of a small article which I published in the same periodical (XI, 1961, p. 66) under the title „Der Heraklitische Satz: 'Anthropos theos' (Frg. 62 D—K)“.

Concerning what Mr. Markovich has already said I would like to reply briefly because I believe that general discussion and dialogue provide research and restore the meaning of Truth as far as possible, since it is only through dialogue and discussion that it is possible for: „τὸ ἐξαίφνης οἶον ἀπὸ πυρὸς πηδῆσαντος ἐξαφθὲν φῶς“ to come out, but this „φῶς, . . . ἐκ πολλῆς συνουσίας γιγνομένης περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα“¹⁾ will result.

First that small article is limited just to the probable expression of Heraclitus „ἄνθρωπος Θεός“ as is declared by its title which is an expression that Hippolytus has saved for us (*Refut.* IX, 10, 6 p. 243 Wendland) therefore the interpretation of the aforesaid fragment will be limited only to the spirit of Hippolytus, the other twelve ancient free translations mentioned by Mr. Markovich (see. p. 51 and elsewhere) being in our opinion irrelevant to the discussion at present since their several meanings, I think, do not interpret the spirit of Hippolytus, because the object of that notice was the spirit of Hippolytus as far as the interpretation of Heraclitus was concerned and not the spirit of other authors; this is the point at which Mr. Markovich begins misunderstanding and from this came the criticism regarding the reference to the other free translations. Probably Mr. Markovich will say, however, that Hippolytus is not interpreting the spirit of Heraclitus; but this would not be Mr. Markovich's own opinion but the general opinion of all researchers into Heraclitus; on the other hand the majority of authors interpret Heraclitus falsely, most often the Fathers of the Church, who succeeded in baptising the spirit of the Ephesian in Christ; (but this is again a subject on which I hope to announce certain conclusions at some future philosophical or philological congress).

The fate of all lost works saved in fragmentary form, one can say, is usually very severe, since we know that often the one who has saved

¹⁾ Plat., VII, *Epist.*, 341 C.

the fragments reacts unjustly to the spirit of the author, because he obviously refers to other topics. But despite this, we do use the fragment as an authentic source.

In addition to this, with regard to lost works the content of which is now known, we must accept three possibilities; that the later authors transferred the text with the same words as the original or that he transferred the text by means of other words taking care voluntarily that these do not differ from the spirit of the original or they may have altered them to fit their own point of view as happened with the fragments 63—66 of Heraclitus saved for us by Hippolytus²⁾ (*Refut.* IX, 10).

Therefore the spirit of that article is Heraclitus through Hippolytus, as drawn by Hippolytus in the 62nd fragment of the Ephesian.

And now, for the interpretation which I have given of the aforesaid fragment of the Ephesian: following our opinion that the Pythagorean interpretation was the most suitable to serve in some measure the spirit of Hippolytus, as far as Heraclitus is concerned, we must not forget that the Pythagorean teaching on the soul influenced Plato³⁾ and the latter, of course, was the main influence on the Church Fathers. It is also known that Pythagoras was known to Heraclitus (Fragm. 40, 129) and that „billige“ interpretation of fragment 62 was quite as suitable even for fragment 26 which was saved for us by Clemens of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV 143/II 210, 21 Stählin), exactly the same reasons are active here, that is to say through that interpretation the spirit of Clemens Alexandrinus was being served.

But as far the critical comments are concerned to which I refer, in relation to the critical resettlement of the text and which are obviously not favoured by Markovich, I consider them as personal opinions. If, for example, Markovich does not favour the exobelism of „ἀποσβεσθεεις ὄψεις“⁴⁾ and he favours the exobelism of the participle „ἀποθανών“, while I believe the exact opposite i. e. that the participle „ἀποθανών“ should be kept entirely, because the contrary of it „ζῶν“ exists there.

It is very easy to consider „ἀποσβεσθεεις ὄψεις“ as an explanation of „ἀποθανών“ and to place that under Clemens, or under any one else who has elaborated Clemens text, therefore, in our opinion the above explanation is to be rejected.

Markovich's stand-point is that the aforementioned explanation „ἀποσβεσθεεις ὄψεις“ must be kept and is against the removal of the participle „ἀποθανών“ since the majority of researchers from Wilamowitz (adnot. crit. in ed. Stähl., 1906) to Clémence Ramnoux (*Héraclite* etc. Paris 1959 p. 42) are of the opinion that the interpretation must be retained and the participle ἀποθανών removed. I, personally,

²⁾ See A. N. Zoumpos, *Heraclitea*, München 1953.

³⁾ See Plat., *Ps.-Axiochos* 365 E. ψυχῆ, ζῶον ἀθάνατον ἐν θνητῷ καθειργμένον φρουρίῳ.

⁴⁾ See. A. N. Zoumpos, *Interprétation philosophique du vingt-sixième fragment d'Héraclite*: Revue des Études Grecques 59—60 (1946—47) p. 2—4.

despite all the respect and estimation I feel for all these people, never rely on personal conviction for proving the means of „Consensus gentium“, which was very desirable to Stoics and Neopythagoreans, but it does not, however, serve the concept of Truth.

What Markovich criticises us for not mentioning the old theory of the Viennese professor Theodor Gomperz (SB. Wiener Akademie 113, 1886, 1010f. 1041f.) as well as of some others (see. Markovich p. 52. „Es ist erstaunlich, daß der Verf. die klassische Deutung von Theodor Gomperz, in SB Wiener Akademie etc. nicht mal erwähnt“) does not show ignorance (see. A. N. Zoumpos Βιβλιογραφικά περί Ἡρακλείτου: Πλάτων, 9, 1957, p. 69—87) but simply that they are irrelevant to the question under discussion.

Then Markovich criticises us (p. 53, 3) because we use sources which do not correspond to the pure spirit of Heraclitus („Der Verf. bedient sich solcher Quellen, welche mit Heraklits echtem Denken nichts zu tun haben“) and he refers to this passage of Aristotle (*De caelo* I 298b 30), which refers to the flowing of beings⁵). It is a certainty that this passage is purely Aristotelian, but that it does not express the concepts of Heraclitus is well-nigh amazing. Then Aristotle (*Met.* 6) writes: „Ἐκ νέου τε γὰρ συνήθης γενόμενος τῷ Κρατύλῳ καὶ ταῖς Ἡρακλειτείαις δόξαις, ὡς ἀπάντων τῶν αἰσθητῶν αἰεὶ βρόντων καὶ ἐπιστήμης περὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ οὐσης“. In this passage of Aristotle, they speak about the philosophy of Plato and Plato was a student of Cratylos who in his turn a student of Heraclitus, and he was initiated in Heraclitus, on the other hand it is impossible that Cratylos should not have known those passages referred to (see fragm. 49a, 91). Therefore the theory of Heraclitus reached Aristotle via Cratylos and Plato and he, writing about the Ephesian (*De caelo* I 298b 30), expressed his spirit exactly. Then again we have the expressed opinion of Kirk that the passage belongs to Aristotle⁶), but the Aristotelian origin characterised exactly the thoughts of Heraclitus.

I do not intend to deal with the further comments of Markovich, since they do not bear, directly, at least, on the spirit of my article. It is well-known that there are many interpretations regarding the 62nd fragment of Heraclitus, that means that the essence of contraries (mortal — immortal) which it probably refers to, is that the mortal, if he wishes to leave the mortal life and to live immortally, must die. There is another interpretation where Heroes are understood, who mortal in life are immortal after their deaths, but there is also the possibility of a close relationship existing between the fragment mentioned and fragment 76 (fire lives the death of earth, and air lives the death of fire, water lives the death of air, earth of the water: ζῆ πῦρ τὸν γῆς θάνατον καὶ ἀήρ ζῆ τὸν πυρὸς θάνατον, ὕδωρ ζῆ τὸν ἀέρος θάνατον, γῆ τὸν

⁵) τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα γίνεσθαι τέ φασι καὶ βεῖν, εἶναι δὲ παγίως οὐδέν.

⁶) See. G. S. Kirk, *Heraclitus — The Cosmic Fragments*, Cambridge, 1954 17: „This is sheer Aristotelianism“.

ὑδατος), that is that fragment 62 mentions the change of the elements, as exactly as in 76, may be very possible.

And now the question arises that it is out of these various theories that one interprets the thoughts of Heraclitus with the answer always being in doubt. Personally, I believe, that by that interpretation of fragment 62, I have explained at least the spirit of Hippolytus, which as shown even by fragments 63—66 is of metaphysical content. Furthermore, I believe that Hippolytus by offering the fragment of Heraclitus in this way wished to show the Ephesian's conception of the souls of men, but there is something more, which I might add, that is that when interpreting fragments the interpreter should be reserved since a fragment is also a problem for the philologist. It is questionable whether those who have preserved the fragments, mainly the Fathers of the Church, as said before, express the factual or not. Independent of their Yes or No, these fragments are, whether we like it or not, authentic sources. On the other hand it is but right that the interpretation should be fully in agreement with the spirit of the person undertaking to preserve the fragment since the adoption of the fragment is frequently made by the writer in such a way that it favours his own theory and this I once more repeat is chiefly the case with the Church Fathers who preserved fragments which coincide with their own ideas. But that „billige“ interpretation which I first employed eighteen years ago on the 26th fragment of Heraclitus (see *Revue des Études Grecques* 59—60, 1946—47, pp. 1—7) and which I argued sufficiently, drawing upon up-to-date sources. It wasn't a „dunklere“ interpretation neither was it done with a „Willkürlichkeit“. In any case, the former Professor of the University of Paris and Academician E. Bréhier wrote in 1946 the following with reference to the interpretation of the above: „Je vous remercie bien vivement de l'envoi de votre intéressante étude; il me semble que le but d'Héraclite dans ce fragment est bien de marquer la continuité qu'il y a entre la vie et la mort. L'étude est trop spéciale“ and elsewhere he again wrote: „Votre interprétation du fragment d'Héraclite me paraît juste; vous avez bien montré la signification symbolique du fragment“.

I shall not mention here the dozens of favourable criticisms of the aforementioned interpretation, but just mention the brilliant impression made by that interpretation when in August 1953 at the XI International Philosophical Assembly in Brussels, and in the presence of the greatest philologists and historians of philosophy I interpreted some fragments of Heraclitus (see A. N. Zoumpos, *Die metaphysische Bedeutung des Wortes „Αιδης“ bei Herakleitos*: Actes du XI-ème Congrès International de Philosophie, Bruxelles 20—26 Août 1953, Vol 12, p. 54 ff.). I am very glad that what I wrote many years ago is still vital and mentioned by modern researchers or generally by all researchers. Some short time ago the French professor Jacques Chevalier, *Histoire de la Pensée*, Paris 1955, p. 613 wrote: „Tel est le sens de l'énigmatique 26 fragment d'Héraclite, dont A. N. Zoumpos a donné une excellente interprétation philosophique (R. Et. Grecques, 1946—47, p.l.s.).

I will now conclude the monologue so unwillingly begun because I think the columns of a scientific periodical are always of Corinthian rhythm and therefore somewhat short and unsuited to excessive speeches. On the contrary this present answer has been directed specifically at those criticisms which refer exclusively to the spirit of that article and no other. As far as the further comments made by Markovich are concerned, they are both wise and in any other circumstances valuable and profitable.

Closing, I always avoid in my studies as well as in my criticisms dogmatic characteristics since no opinion can be expressed dogmatically, especially in such cases where many varied opinions may coexist, without the one appearing to the other as „höchst unwahrscheinlich“.

Nevertheless, difference of opinion is nothing but τὸ ἀντίξουν συμφέρον... καὶ ἐκ τῶν διαφερόντων καλλίστην ἄρμονίαν but the καλλίστη ἄρμονία“ is always produced „κατ' ἔριν“ as the Ephesian has said⁷⁾.

Athens.

A. N. Zoumpos.

⁷⁾ Fragm. 8.