

Serge Mouraviev, *Heraclitea* iii.1. *Recensio: Memoria. Testimonia de Vita, Morte ac Scripto (cum effigiebus)*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 2003, xxxvi + 232 pp. ISBN 3-89665-198-6; Serge Mouraviev, *Heraclitea* iii.3.A. *Recensio: Fragmenta. A. De sermone Tenebrosi praeafatio*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 2002, xxiv + 438 pp. ISBN 3-89665-197-8.

‘Une fois que les textes anciens et médiévaux qui nous renseignent sur Héraclite ont été rassemblés et édités dans *Traditio*... avec leur contexte le plus large, une fois que leur valeur et leur rôle dans la *tradition*... ont été examinés et évalués, arrive le moment où il faut en extraire, avec tout ce qui s’y rapporte, mais cette fois-ci sans aucun contexte, leur précieux contenu: *les vestiges héraclitéens*’ (*Memoria*, xi, the author’s emphasis)

Four volumes of *TRADITIO* (D’Épicharme à Philon d’Alexandrie; De Sénèque à Diogène Laërce; De Plotin à Étienne d’Alexandrie; De Maxime le Confesseur à Pétrarque) were published by the French-Russian scholar Serge Mouraviev in 1999–2003.<sup>1</sup> The two volumes under review open the next division of his comprehensive project, *RECENSIO*,<sup>2</sup> in which ‘les vestiges héraclitéens’, extracted from about 1300 texts assembled in the volumes of *TRADITIO*, are analysed from various angles. This work, in turn, prepares for the last division, *REFECTIO* — a reconstruction of Heraclitus’ book. The whole project, including the planned *PROLEGOMENA* and *INDICES*, will comprise some twenty volumes.

Let me start with a few words about the published volumes of *TRADITIO*. This is the first time that all ancient texts explicitly relating to Heraclitus have been assembled and edited in chronological order, with cross-references, *apparatus criticus*, and a French translation. The importance of this work is twofold. First, these volumes are a handy tool, offering scholars easy access to all the materials pertaining to Heraclitus. Second, it is hoped that they will also impart new impetus to Heraclitean scholarship. The classic editions of Heraclitus by Ingram Bywater<sup>3</sup> and Hermann Diels<sup>4</sup> purported to establish, with as much philological precision as possible, what in our sources is to be considered Heraclitus’ *ipsissima verba*. Since then Heraclitean editors have been mostly preoccupied with the refinement of Diels’ philological judgment while basing their restorations of Heraclitus’ teaching on his extant words. Yet as Heraclitus’ extant words are but a random collection of fragments representing *disiecta membra* of his book, so also the ideas extracted from them are *disiecta membra* of his thought. Even a glance at the *testimonia* makes it clear that the extant fragments represent but a fraction of what Heraclitus said in his book. Moreover, the understanding of Heraclitus’ message is inseparable from the understanding of his poetic language: the peculiar use of words and expressions, the implied *comparanda* of his metaphors, the range of figurative associations and paranomastic connexions, and the like. To learn these one should have the entire text; without it, the secondary evidence, reflecting the experience of the ancient reader to whom the whole book was available, proves indispensable. I hope that Mouraviev’s *TRADITIO* will prompt readers to reassess the evidential value of the Heraclitean testimonia.

As for the two volumes of *RECENSIO* under review, *Memoria*, the first (second in order of publication), comprises evidence related to Heraclitus’ life and book. The sources (section A), accompanied by French translation (but without the *apparatus*, which the reader can find in the *TRADITIO* volumes), are divided into three main sections: Life and Legend, Iconography (22 plates and a catalogue of coins bearing Heraclitus’ image), and Work. The last section includes evidence of the internal organisation, language, and circulation of Heraclitus’ book. The commen-

<sup>1</sup> Additional volumes in preparation: *Allusions et imitations, La tradition orientale et renaissante, and Commentaire*.

<sup>2</sup> Which will also include *Placita Heraclitea; Fragmenta Heracliti; Les textes pertinents; Les dossiers des fragments; Fontes Heracliti*.

<sup>3</sup> *Heracliti Ephesii reliquiae*. Recensuit I. Bywater, Oxford, 1877.

<sup>4</sup> *Heraclitos von Ephesos*. Griechisch und deutsch von Hermann Diels, Berlin: Weidmann, 1901; 2nd ed. 1909.

tary (section B) offers a thorough discussion of the material presented in Section A. The volume contains an exhaustive Bibliography and Index.

In a short review it is impossible to cover all the issues Mouraviev's comprehensive discussion raises. I confine myself here to two topics: the dates of Heraclitus' birth and death and the nature of Heraclitus' fame, whether posthumous or not.

Apollodorus (*ap.* DL ix.1; cf. Suda, *s.v.* Ἡράκλειτος) dates Heraclitus' *akmê* to the 69th Olympiad (504/3-501/0 BCE), which places his birth between 544 and 540 BCE. Diogenes Laertius (viii 52 = Arist. fr. 71 Rose = Apollod. fr. 87 Müller) reports that Heraclitus died at the age of 60;<sup>5</sup> this puts his death between 484 and 480 BCE. Mouraviev argues (110-129) that the date of Heraclitus' *akmê* in Eusebius (*ap.* Hieronym. *Chron.*, s. Ol. 80 [460/56 BCE]) is actually the date of his death.<sup>6</sup> The dates he thus proposes are: b. 520 — *akmê* 500 — d. 460. According to the author's hypothesis, Apollodorus synchronised Heraclitus' *akmê* not with his age (40), but with his resignation from the honorary position of king-priest when he became 20.

In my view, this hypothesis is problematic. Apart from the unparalleled assigning of *akmê* to the age of 20, I fail to see why Apollodorus should have attached so great an importance to Heraclitus' resignation (greater than to the writing of the book for which Heraclitus became widely renowned, conventionally at the age of 40). Moreover, both the biographical legends and the pseudepigraphical correspondence between King Darius and Heraclitus assume that Heraclitus was a mature man around 500 BCE.<sup>7</sup> The contradictory information in certain late sources, including Eusebius, reflect a progressive deterioration of the tradition, a conclusion that an independent examination of these sources would support.

As to the question of the supposed posthumous recognition of Heraclitus, Diogenes (ix 6=DK A 1) reports that his book 'won so great a fame that there arose devotees of his called "Heracliteans"'. On the strength of this comment George Thomson<sup>8</sup> concluded that Heraclitus' writings were 'probably designed in the first instance as discourse for his disciples, the Herakleiteioi, who no doubt were organized, like the Pythagoreans... as a religious society'. Indeed, there is no suggestion in Diogenes' words that recognition was posthumous,<sup>9</sup> and there seems no reason to assume that, unlike the term 'Pythagoreans', the term 'Heracliteans' did not designate a circle of disciples. Mouraviev, for his part, comments on the Diogenes passage in a more traditional vein: 'Selon le texte de base de Diogène Laërce... les [disciples] ainsi dits 'Héraclitéens' anonymes... ne sont apparus que grâce au succès du livre d'Héraclite (peut-être même seulement après sa mort)' (153). Since Mouraviev is acquainted with the paper (it appears in his Bibliography), he apparently rejects Thomson's inferences from Diogenes; one wonders why.

<sup>5</sup> If one retains, together with Müller, Mouraviev and some other scholars, the MSS reading Ἡράκλειτον, emended by Sturz to Ἡρακλείδης.

<sup>6</sup> This view, as Mouraviev reports (124, n. 46), was defended by Vallars (1846) and C.F. Hermann (1849).

<sup>7</sup> According to one story (the Syriac text of Themist. *De virtute*, 40), when the Persians besieged Ephesus, apparently in the course of the Ionian revolt (499-94 BCE), Heraclitus advised his fellow citizens (the story must be imaginary, for no such siege is known nor indeed even possible, because Ephesus did not join the revolt). The story takes it for granted that in the years of the revolt Heraclitus was in a position to dispense public advice, which is unlikely for a person in his early twenties. Again, in Darius' pseudepigraphical letter (D.L. ix 13) Heraclitus is referred to as σοφὸς ἀνὴρ Ἐφέσιος the author of the λόγος Περὶ φύσεως. The writer of the letter evidently believed that Heraclitus was already famous for his book during Darius' reign (521-486 BCE).

<sup>8</sup> G. Thomson, 'From Religion to Philosophy', *JHS* 73 (1953), 81.

<sup>9</sup> ὡς καὶ αἰρετιστὰς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι τοὺς κληθέντας Ἡρακλειτείους. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Ἡρακλείτου) is common as a reference to followers, αἰρετισταί, of a founder of a philosophical school. The sense 'founder of a philosophical school', which according to LSJ is the sense of αἰρετιστής here, is otherwise unattested (the reference to *Vita Philonidis* is a misprint corrected in the Revised Supplement) and evidently originates from the belief that Heraclitus won no recognition in his lifetime.

The other volume, *Fragmenta: A. De Sermone Tenebrosi Praefatio*, is devoted entirely to Heraclitus' language. The author rightly stresses the crucial importance of the poetic mode of Heraclitus' expression, rejecting the naive view of figurative language as an embellishment with little bearing on the message a poetic text conveys.

The first part of the volume (Σκότος — Le style et l'obscurité d'Héraclite: aperçu historique) embraces texts (with French translation and commentary) related to Heraclitus' language and mode of expression, and a monograph of more than 100 pages dedicated to Heraclitus' literary style, in which the author discusses the scholarly approaches to the theme from Schleiermacher to the present. The second part (Γλώσσα) explicates the theoretical assumptions (the difference between ordinary and poetic language) on which the analysis of the 'poetic superstructures' proceeds in the third part (Ποίησης — La dimension poétique des fragments). This is the main part ('le plat de résistance', xiii) of the volume.

The analysis starts with phonic and prosodic aspects of Heraclitus' text. The author convincingly argues for Heraclitus' use of the syllabic-accentual rhythm (isorhythmic and/or isosyllabic cola) and sporadic resort to meter ('incrustations métriques'). The investigation of the prosody is followed by an analysis of consonances (alliterations, internal rhyme, etc.) and a short discussion of some graphical aspects of the text. Next comes the 'phonosémique' level of the text produced by repetitions of morphological elements and words, a level that embraces, *inter alia*, such figures as anaphora, polyptoton, anticlasis, etc. The analysis of the 'morphosémique' level treats Heraclitus' use of chiasm and parallelism. The investigation of the poetic superstructures of the syntactic level concerns what the author considers to be the deliberate indeterminacy of Heraclitus' syntactic constructions, and in particular the figure of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. The discussion of the highest level, that of semantics, deals with Heraclitus' use of paronomasia, antithesis, oxymoron, paradox, comparison (including metaphor), image, and example.

The fourth and the last part (ἦθος — La dimension philosophique de la forme poétique) discusses the relationship between the poetic language and the philosophical content in Heraclitus. These are but 'premières approches', the main study being postponed until the examination of the individual fragments. The author discusses the pragmatic and 'macrorhetoric' functioning of Heraclitus' text; he rejects, correctly in my view, the antinomy between 'poetic artifact' and 'philosophical treatise', arguing for the referentiality of the poetic language. The last pages ponder why Heraclitus' text is so fascinating. The author's answer is that it is due to the poetic quality of Heraclitus' philosophical vision, a quality embedded in, and inseparable from, the language in which it is conveyed.

The volume includes an exhaustive bibliography, glossaries, and indices. An attached CD-ROM contains an electronic version, with corrections and additions, of the four volumes of *TRADITIO*, including some articles on Heraclitus published by the author in recent decades.

This meticulous work is the first comprehensive study of Heraclitus' poetic language. The methods employed are avowedly structuralist. The investigation is conducted in a competent and systematic way. The importance of this impressive achievement is hard to overestimate. The study brings to light aspects of Heraclitus' text which commentators have touched on only sporadically and partially. Yet the full awareness of these aspects is a prerequisite for the proper understanding of what Heraclitus tells us. Moreover, knowledge of Heraclitus' poetic usage is indispensable for an accurate discrimination between literal and non-literal citations in the ancient sources. It would be wrong, however, to consider the investigation just a preparation for interpretative work: it is an important study in its own right that establishes a new and distinctive topic of discussion for Heraclitean scholars.

I would like to add now three critical comments. The distinction the author draws (389) between the 'êthos', defined as a poetic paradigm, and the 'logos', defined as the syntagmatic manifestation of the former, suggests the langue-parole opposition, whereas the definition of the 'logos' as the philosophical meaning 'dont ces configurations [poétiques, A.F.] sont porteuses'

(*ibid.*) seems to suggest that the entire poetic language, both its expression and content planes, are regarded as the expression plane of Heraclitus' philosophical language. I find some difficulty in forming an integrative idea of these classifications.

The author adopts the view, which has recently won some popularity, that many of Heraclitus' texts are deliberately fashioned to allow a multiplicity of readings — the so-called ἀπό κοινοῦ figure. According to Mouraviev, such are B 1, B 5, B 12, B 18, B 30, B 32, B 35, B 51, B 112, B 119, B 129. On close examination, however, some of these texts do not prove at all ambiguous,<sup>10</sup> whereas the alleged ambiguity of some others disappears when the poetic aspect of the expression is considered.<sup>11</sup> In the rest of the texts the ambiguity (if it is not merely due to our lack of natural feeling for the Greek) involves but trivial semantic variations, which certainly are not worth special notice.<sup>12</sup> This being so, the reading of Heraclitus' texts as deliberately ambiguous cannot be founded on philological argument; it comes perilously close to such methods of discovering a hidden meaning as an allegorical or numerological exegesis. The same can be said for the discovery of anagrams in B 22, B 30, B 52, and B 123 (292-94).

<sup>10</sup> Thus, in B 129 (Πυθαγόρης Μησάρχου... ἐκλεξάμενος ταύτας τὰς συγγραφὰς ἐποίησατο ἑαυτοῦ σοφίην, κτλ.) taking ταύτας τὰς συγγραφὰς with ἐποίησατο leaves ἐκλεξάμενος without an object (selecting, choosing for himself — what?) and yields a nonsensical reading. B 12 (ποταμοῖσι τοῖσιν αὐτοῖσιν ἐμβαίνουσιν ἕτερα καὶ ἕτερα ὕδατα ἐπυρρεῖ) contrasts the sameness of rivers to their ever-changing waters; to attach τοῖσιν αὐτοῖσιν to ἐμβαίνουσιν is to ruin the sense of the utterance.

<sup>11</sup> The question whether in B 1 (τοῦ δὲ λόγου τοῦδ' ἐόντος αἰεὶ ἀξύνετοι γίνονται ἄνθρωποι, κτλ.) αἰεὶ goes with ἐόντος or ἀξύνετοι arises only if one ignores (as most commentators unfortunately do) the fact that ἐὼν αἰεὶ is modeled after the regular epic epithet of gods αἰὲν ἐόντες (Hom. *Il.* i 290, ii 46, 186, etc., *Od.* i 263, 378, ii 143, etc.; Hes. *Theog.* 21, 33, 105, etc.) and therefore forms a single semantic unit. Aristotle's complaint (*Rhet.* 1407b13) that in Heraclitus B 1 'it is not clear to which of the two clauses the word αἰεὶ belongs' is made to support his argument that 'a written composition should be easy to read and therefore easy to deliver'. Aristotle's point is that in reading B 1 one has to decide instantly where to pause, before or after αἰεὶ, which may affect the fluency of the reading, and not that it is intrinsically difficult to decide where the αἰεὶ belongs. In fact, Hippolytus (*Ref.* ix 9.3) and Clement (*Strom.* v 111.7), who quote the fragment (in Sextus *adv. math.* vii 132 αἰεὶ is missing), Amelius (*ap. Euseb. P.E.* xi 19), who paraphrases it, and Cleanthes (*Hymn. Iov.* 21), who imitates it, do not hesitate to take αἰεὶ with ἐόντος.

Similarly, in B 30 (κόσμον τόνδε, τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπάντων, οὔτε τις θεῶν οὔτε ἀνθρώπων ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ' ἦν αἰεὶ καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ἔσται· πῦρ αἰεὶ ζῶον, κτλ.) the phrase ἦν αἰεὶ καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ἔσται, as K. Reinhardt (*Parmenides und die Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie*, Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1916, 176 n. 2; id. 'Heraklits Lehre vom Feuer', *Hermes* 58 [1923], 10-11) pointed out, is an epic formula for everlasting existence. This rules out construing it as the copula with πῦρ αἰεὶ ζῶον; one should punctuate before πῦρ, κτλ.

In the two previous cases we benefit from our knowledge of the poetic language of the epic tradition. Had we comparable knowledge of the poetic language of Heraclitus himself, many of the other apparent ambiguities would disappear. The recurrence of ἐν τὸ σοφόν in different contexts in B 32 and B 41 indicates that in Heraclitus the phrase is a single semantic unit. When this is taken into account, of the eighteen construals of B 32 considered by Mouraviev as theoretically possible (361-66), only three remain.

<sup>12</sup> It is of little consequence for the general significance of Heraclitus' words whether καθαίρονται... αἵματι μαινώμενοι in B 5 is construed as 'they purify themselves staining themselves with blood' or 'they purify themselves with blood staining themselves'; whether εἰ μὴ ἔλπηται ἀνέλπιστον οὐκ ἐξευρήσει in B 18 is rendered 'if one does not expect the unexpected, one will not find it' or 'if one does not expect it, one will not find the unexpected'; whether διαφερόμενον ἑωυτῷ ὁμολογέει in B 51 is translated 'in diverging it agrees with itself' or 'in diverging from itself it agrees'. As to B 112 — σωφρονεῖν ἀρετὴ μεγίστη, καὶ σοφίη ἀληθῆα λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν κατὰ φύσιν ἐπαύουτας — the construals ἀρετὴ μεγίστη καὶ σοφίη and ἀληθῆα λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν are nothing but exercises in a mechanical reading of the Greek.

Mouraviev's association of the obscurity of Heraclitus' expression with the poetic quality of his language is hardly tenable: poetic language as such cannot be considered an obscure way of expression. Therefore the explanation for Heraclitus' obscurity is to be sought elsewhere. The author of the Derveni papyrus says that Heraclitus speaks 'like one who relates a *hieros logos*':<sup>13</sup> that is, the impression that Heraclitus' book made on the Greek reader was that of sacred discourse. Some thirty years before the publication of the transcript of the papyrus,<sup>14</sup> George Thomson<sup>15</sup> drew attention to the similarity of Heraclitus' style to the liturgical *formulae* of the mysteries and labelled it 'hieratic'. It seems that the obscurity of Heraclitus' expression is rooted in his imitation of the mode of expression of the Eleusinian λεγόμενα and the Orphic ἱεροὶ λόγοι.<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, Mouraviev ignores the testimony of the author of the Derveni papyrus; nor does he discuss the striking similarity in style and wording between the inscriptions on the fifth-century Orphic bone plates from Olbia<sup>17</sup> and Heraclitus B 62, B 67, and B 88.<sup>18</sup>

These few critical comments are but a fraction of my numerous disagreements with the author. More often, however, I do agree with his conclusions and, what is much more important, I have greatly benefited from his meticulous and nuanced discussion of the sources and his painstaking investigation of Heraclitus' poetic language. There can be little doubt that the two volumes under review will prove a permanent contribution to Heraclitean scholarship.

Aryeh Finkelberg

Tel Aviv University

*Héraclite, Fragments (Citations et témoignages)*. Traduction et présentation par Jean-François Pradeau (Paris: GF Flammarion, 2002), 374 pp. ISBN 2-08-071097-4.

Plusieurs comptes rendus ont déjà été consacrés à cet ouvrage dans diverses revues spécialisées. Le livre de P. y est examiné avant tout en tant qu'approche nouvelle des divers problèmes que pose l'interprétation (la «présentation») historico-philosophique des vestiges du philosophe d'Éphèse. Il n'y était pratiquement question ni du choix des textes, ni de leur traduction, ni de l'édition des fragments, autrement dit d'aucune des bases philologiques de toute interprétation philosophique. C'est sur cet aspect-là du travail de P. que nous voudrions faire quelques remarques.

En effet, malgré le sous-titre, il s'agit non seulement d'une traduction et présentation, mais aussi d'une édition critique nouvelle des *fragments* — au sens propre du terme (c'est-à-dire des citations textuelles), car:

- 1) le texte grec de chaque fragment est reproduit au début de chaque note, puis traduit et commenté;

<sup>13</sup> Col. iv.6: ὅσπερ ἱκελ[α ἱερο]λόγωι λέγων. ἱερο]λόγωι Sider, acc. Janko, Betegh (cf. ἱερ[ολογ]εῖται in col. vii.7): μυθο]λόγωι Tsantsanoglou, Jourdan.

<sup>14</sup> *ZPE* 47 (1982), after 300. The last edition, translation, and comprehensive discussion are in: G. Betegh, *The Derveni papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.* 79, 83.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. now the lines in the Orphic-Bacchic gold leaves which are identified by C. Riedweg ('Poésie orphique et rituel initiatique. Éléments d'un "Discourse sacré" dans les lamelles d'or', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 219 [2002], 459–81) as belonging to the ritual performance of the initiation.

<sup>17</sup> 463T-465T (Bernabé). First publication: A.S. Rusjaeva, 'Orfism i kult Dionisa v Olvii', *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 1978 i, 87-104; for the amended reading see J.G. Vinogradov, 'Zur sachlichen und geschichtlichen Deutung der Orphiker-Plättchen von Olbia', in: P. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée: en l'honneur de J. Rudhardt*, Genève: Droz, 1991, 77-86.

<sup>18</sup> On which see esp. M.L. West, 'The Orphics of Olbia', *ZPE* 45 (1982), 17-49.