

A. A. LONG, Liverpool

HERACLITUS AND STOICISM*

As a young man, Zeno of Citium is said to have consulted an oracle about what he should do to live best: the god told him «to be in close contact with the dead» (εἰ συγχρωτίζοιτο τοῖς νεκροῖς) and Zeno understood this discouraging advice to mean 'read the works of the ancients' (Diog. Laert. 7,2)¹. We are not told who the ancients were whom Zeno read, but apart from Homer and Hesiod it is tempting to see an allusion to Heraclitus in the anecdote². To the best of my knowledge there is only one piece of evidence which associates Zeno, as distinct from other Stoics or the Stoics in general, with Heraclitus explicitly³. Indeed, evidence which enables us to distinguish Zeno's ideas from those of later Stoics is regrettably slight. But if some uncertainty attaches to Zeno's indebtedness to Heraclitus we reach firmer ground with his successor, Cleanthes. Cleanthes was well acquainted with Heraclitus and reflects his influence both in thought and in language. The importance of Heraclitus to the later Stoics is evident most plainly in Marcus Aurelius (see p. 153), and while this may reflect both the personal interest of the emperor and the general philosophical taste of the early Christian period, there is no reason to regard Marcus' predilection for Heraclitus as unusual in a later Stoic. The influence of Heraclitus on

* This article is based upon the text of a lecture which I was privileged to give at the Research Center for Greek Philosophy at the Academy of Athens on March 30, 1976. It is a pleasure to express my thanks to Professor J.N. Theodorakopoulos, Dr. L. Benakis and Dr. M. Dragona-Monachou for their kindness in arranging the lecture and for offering to publish it in «Φιλοσοφία».

1. On the oracle cf. K. von Fritz, *RE* Suppl. 10 s.v. *Zenon von Kitium*, cols. 85-86.

2. Zeno wrote 5 books of *Προβλήματα Ὀμηρικά*, Diog. Laert. 7,4, and his interest in Hesiod is attested in *SVF* 1,103-105.

3. Numenius ap. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 14,5,11 (*SVF* 1,11), after citing Xenocrates, Polemo and Crates as philosophers with whom Zeno associated, proceeds: νυνὶ δὲ αὐτῷ λελογίσθω ὅτι καὶ Στίλπωνός τε μετέσχε καὶ τῶν λόγων τῶν Ἡρακλειτείων. He then remarks that Zeno took Heraclitus, along with Stilpo and Crates, as an ally in his controversy with Arcesilaus. Whether these remarks have any biographical value, independently of learned inference from Stoic doctrine, is difficult to say. But the report scarcely entitles R.D. Hicks to speak of 'strong and explicit testimony that Zeno [and Cleanthes] studied Heraclitus', *Stoic and Epicurean* (London 1910) p. 10; similarly, E.V. Arnold *Roman Stoicism* (London 1911) p. 70.



Stoicism is a commonplace of ancient philosophical commentators and epitomists.

But what did that influence really amount to? There seems to be no general agreement among those who have discussed the subject during the last hundred and fifty years. Already in 1911 R.D. Hicks drew attention to exponents of the two extreme positions —minimal influence, on the one hand, and on the other hand, Stoicism as diluted and distorted Heracliteanism—and adopted a middle course himself⁴. Until recently, perhaps, it might be said that Hicks' standpoint, which allowed Stoicism to differ substantially from Heraclitus, while granting important conceptual affinities between both philosophies, was accepted by the most reliable interpreters of the Stoics⁵. But at the present time there is a clear tendency among scholars to return to the view that Heraclitus' impact upon the early Stoics was relatively insignificant. The reasons for this are closely bound up with the long overdue recognition that Stoicism was not an ad hoc and retrogressive system of dogmatic postulates but an important new development in Greek philosophy. It is now generally accepted that the early Stoics were strongly influenced by the Academy and also by the Lyceum, whether directly from the writings of Aristotle, or through the work of Theophrastus and other Peripatetics. Add to this the well known indebtedness of Zeno to the Cynics and to the Megarians, and it becomes clear that the Stoa was founded by a man deeply familiar with the main currents of thought in his time.

As the sphere of influence on early Stoicism has been enlarged so the interest of scholars in Heraclitus' imprint appears to have declined. The case against Heraclitus was briefly stated by Friedrich Solmsen in 1961 who asked: *Are contemporary scholars, who treat the Stoic exegesis of Homer and Hesiod with a smile or a shrug of the shoulders, well advised if they accept the Stoic interest in Heraclitus as basis for their own appraisal of Stoicism and its place in the history of Greek thought?*⁶ Solmsen argues

4. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (New York 1911¹¹) vol. 25, cols. 944-5. Hicks' examples for the two extremes were H. Siebeck, *Untersuchungen zur Philos. d. Griechen* (Halle 1873) who minimised Heraclitus' influence and F. Lassalle, *Die Philosophie Herakleitos des Dunklen von Ephesos* (Berlin 1858) who exaggerated it. The latter position goes back to Hegel, cf. *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie* (Frankfurt 1971) 19, 2, pp. 263, 266.

5. Cf. especially M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (Göttingen 1959²) 1, pp. 23, 34f., 68, 160 and E. Bréhier, *Chrysippe et l'ancien Stoïcisme* (Paris 1951²) pp. 141-51, 176-7.

6. *Cleanthes or Posidonius? The Basis of Stoic Physics*, «Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen», Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, 1961, cited here from p. 456 of the author's *Kleine Schriften* (Hildesheim 1968).

that the Stoics' fundamental debts in cosmology were to Plato, Aristotle and medical writers such as Diocles and Praxagoras. A complementary study of the four-element theory in Stoicism, based on Solmsen's assumptions, has been made by J. Longrigg in a recent article⁷. Such positive arguments against Heraclitus are supported in a negative way by some recent books on Stoicism which allude to him merely *en passant* and omit any reference to his general influence⁸.

We have reached a curious position, which would have amused Hegel. Having been frequently regarded as the decisive influence on the early development of Stoic cosmology Heraclitus is now being pushed into the background or quietly allowed to drop out of the discussion. Solmsen himself admits that *the early Stoics recognized Heraclitus as their ἀρχηγέτης and made the most strenuous efforts to find their doctrines... anticipated in his utterances* (loc. cit). But he recommends modern historians not to take their efforts very seriously. This is an odd prescription, especially when Solmsen offers no clear reasons for the Stoics' attribution to Heraclitus of ideas which, he thinks, were rooted in contemporary physics. His valuable work of tracing Stoic indebtedness to those ideas does not in the least rule out a serious historical link between Heraclitus and the Stoics. It is merely an accident that the thesis of Heraclitus' dominating influence was often accompanied in the past with a failure to locate Stoicism adequately within its contemporary intellectual milieu. The Stoics' importance as philosophers is not diminished if they were strongly influenced by Heraclitus *as well as* by the Academy and the Lyceum.

The purpose of this paper is to reconsider and to illustrate Heraclitus' influence on the Stoics, especially Cleanthes. It is a large subject and I make no claim to treat it exhaustively here. But I hope to prove that the present tendency to reduce Heraclitus' influence on early Stoicism is not well grounded. It should be emphasized that I do not intend my thesis to cast doubt upon the Stoics' close attention to positions taken up by other philosophers in their own time. I shall not suggest that Heraclitus was their starting-point in cosmology. But his importance, especially to Cleanthes, so I shall argue,

7. *Elementary Physics in the Lyceum and Stoa*, «Isis» 66 (1975) 211-229.

8. J.M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge 1969); Andreas Graeser, *Zenon von Kitium, Positionen und Probleme* (Berlin/New York 1975); F.H. Sandbach, *The Stoics* (Cambridge 1975). See also however, Gerard Watson, *The Stoic Theory of Knowledge* (Belfast 1966) pp. 10f., 82 and A.A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy* (London 1974) pp. 131, 145f.

was fundamental. In attempting to demonstrate this, one is faced with a series of questions, all of which seem to be interesting and worth posing for their own sake. What knowledge of Heraclitus did the early Stoics possess? Was their method of interpretation their own or did it derive from the work of others, especially Aristotle and Theophrastus? Did the Stoics merely twist Heraclitus' views to suit their preconceived needs, or has their interpretation, in some cases, a valid basis in Heraclitus' thought? Above all, why did they take an interest in this remote and extraordinarily difficult thinker?

The process by which Heraclitus' words were transmitted to the fourth century is an unsolved problem. But it is reasonable to assume that the early Stoics had access to a series of texts, known as Heraclitus' book, which gave them as authoritative a record of his work as the sources available to Aristotle and Theophrastus. This point has to be stressed since some scholars argue that the Stoic interpretation of Heraclitus was heavily dependent on Theophrastus. I shall consider this point in some detail shortly, but even if it is true, it does not prove that the Stoics derived their knowledge of Heraclitus from Theophrastus. G.S. Kirk has drawn attention to the fact that Theophrastus' enormous list of writings includes no specific work on Heraclitus⁹. He suggests that Theophrastus' interpretation of Heraclitus, so important to the later doxographical tradition, was close to Aristotle's and may have been based not on Heraclitus' so-called book but on a *mechanically - arranged selection of the odder sayings*¹⁰. It does not seem to me necessary to suppose that the Peripatetic interpretation of Heraclitus rested on such inadequate source material. Aristotle and Theophrastus depreciated and misunderstood Heraclitus, and they had their own reasons for doing so¹¹. In any case, it is inconceivable that the very close

9. CQ 49 (1955) 37. Theophrastus' *Φυσικῶν δόξαι* of course included an account of Heraclitus (cf. H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p.163) but he also devoted separate works to many early Greek philosophers—Anaxagoras, Anaximenes, Archelaus, Democritus, Empedocles (Diog. Laert. 5,42-49).

10. Loc. cit. Kirk's conjecture in *Heraclitus. The Cosmic Fragments* (Cambridge 1954) p. 7, expressed more guardedly in the 1962 reprint of his book, that Heraclitus 'wrote no book, in our sense of the word', has not won general acceptance, cf. M. Marcovich, *RE* suppl. X s.v. *Herakleitos*, col. 257, R. Mondolfo, *Eraclito. Testimonianze e Imitazioni* (Florence 1972) p. xxxiv.

11. Cf. especially, Harold Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy* (Baltimore 1935) passim and John B. McDiarmid, *Theophrastus on the Presocratic Causes*, *HSPH.* 61 (1953) 93-96.

links between Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* and Heraclitus were mediated to the Stoic through the *Φυσικῶν Δόξαι* of Theophrastus (see below).

But one of Aristotle's own Academic contemporaries, with a strong interest in the Presocratics, did write at length on Heraclitus. This was Heraclides of Pontus who is said to have written four books of «commentary» (ἐξηγήσεις) on him¹². It is possible that Heraclides, who was an independent-minded thinker, played a key part both in disseminating knowledge of Heraclitus' recorded sayings and in giving them philosophical respectability. He may also have initiated methods of interpretation which attracted the Stoic interest in Heraclitus. We can only speculate about Heraclides' sources but there is no reason to think that any later figure was in a better position to read Heraclitus' own words¹³.

At some point in his career Cleanthes imitated Heraclides in writing his own *Τῶν Ἡρακλείτου ἐξηγήσεων τέσσαρα* (Diog. Laert. 7,174 = *SVF* 1,481). The number four is an interesting coincidence and tempts me to conjecture that Cleanthes took Heraclides' work as his own basis, amplifying and amending it in accordance with Stoic doctrine. However that may be, the early Stoic interest in Heraclitus is strongly confirmed by the record of Sphaerus' writings which includes *Περὶ Ἡρακλείτου πέντε διατριβῶν* (*SVF* 1,620). Sphaerus, who was subordinate to Cleanthes in the Stoic hierarchy, may be presumed to have had his attention to Heraclitus stimulated by Cleanthes if not already by Zeno¹⁴.

It cannot be proved that the early Stoics were in a better position to read Heraclitus than were the Peripatetics; indeed this seems unlikely. Members of both schools in all probability had independent access to copies of his book, or collections of his sayings, which included most of the extant fragments and some other texts that are now lost. Heraclides' work shows

12. Diog. Laert. 5,88 (= fr. 39 Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* VII), probably confirmed by Athenaeus 4, 134b (=fr. 10 Wehrli) which implies some notoriety for his commentary.

13. If Diog. Laert. 9,15 is to be trusted, Heraclides' work was preceded by commentary on Heraclitus' σύγγραμμα by Antisthenes. Not much should be built upon a bald notice of this kind but the links between Antisthenes and Zeno of Citium are sufficiently strong (cf. K. von Fritz, cited in n. 1, cols. 93-5) to suggest him as a further possible link between Heraclitus and the Stoics.

14. The Aristo whose work *Περὶ Ἡρακλείτου* is quoted by Diog. Laert. 9,5 has been identified with the Peripatetic philosopher of that name and not the dissident Stoic (Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* VI², s.v. *Ariston von Keos*, fr. 28) but this is far from certain. The work is not included in the Stoic's list of writings at Diog. Laert. 7,163 but that does not disprove his authorship.

that the Stoics were not the first philosophers to attempt detailed interpretation of Heraclitus; and we may presume that when they were developing their own ideas they were in a position to supplement their reading of Heraclitean texts with the interpretation of Heracleides (and Antisthenes, cf. n. 13) as well as Theophrastus. We may now look rather more closely at Theophrastus' interpretation.

Simplicius gives us this report on Heraclitus which he drew from Theophrastus¹⁵:

Ἴππασος δὲ ὁ Μεταποντῖνος καὶ Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Ἐφέσιος ἔν καὶ οὗτοι καὶ κινούμενον καὶ πεπερασμένον, ἀλλὰ πῦρ ἐποίησαν τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ ἐκ πυρὸς ποιοῦσι τὰ ὄντα πυκνῶσει καὶ μανώσει καὶ διαλύουσι πάλιν εἰς πῦρ, ὥς ταύτης μιᾶς οὔσης φύσεως τῆς ὑποκειμένης· πυρὸς γὰρ ἀμοιβὴν εἶναί φησιν Ἡράκλειτος πάντα. Ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ τάξιν τινὰ καὶ χρόνον ὀρισμένον τῆς τοῦ κόσμου μεταβολῆς κατὰ τινὰ εἰμαρμένην ἀνάγκην. The principal points to notice in this account are first, that fire is treated as an Aristotelian substrate, the material cause of all change; secondly, that the method of generating other things out of fire is condensation and rarefaction; thirdly, that the universe itself is regarded as subject to regular change, beginning as fire and ceasing as fire¹⁶.

It is improbable that Heraclitus would have accepted any of these three points though the third —the periodic dissolution of everything into fire, called ἐκπύρωσις by the Stoics— has been regarded as his own view by many scholars¹⁷. But this Theophrastean interpretation largely determined the representation of Heraclitus by the doxographers¹⁸. Diels conclusively proved the dependence of Diogenes Laertius' detailed summary of Heraclitus' doctrine (9,8-11) on Theophrastus, and the same holds good for Aëtius and others¹⁹.

15. *Phys.* 23, 33 (=VS 22 A5).

16. For a full discussion cf. Kirk, *Heraclitus* pp. 303, 318f., 327 and also McDiarmid, cited in n. 11 above, with whom I am inclined to agree (against Kirk, p. 304) that κατὰ τινὰ εἰμαρμένην ἀνάγκην reflects Stoic influence on the doxography. But Mondolfo (cited in n. 10 above) defends the substance, if not the terminology, of the doxographical tradition on Heraclitus.

17. The most recent defender is R. Mondolfo, «Phronesis» 4 (1958) 75-82 answered by Kirk in «Phronesis» 5 (1959) 73-6, with further comments by Mondolfo in *Eraclito* pp. clxxx - xciii. For Mondolfo's predecessors and arguments against them cf. John Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* (London 1930⁴) pp. 158-63.

18. Whether Aristotle attributed the concept expressed by ἐκπύρωσις to Heraclitus is too large a question to be discussed briefly. Cherniss (cited in n. 11), p. 29 n. 108, argues that he did not, but cf. Kirk, *Heraclitus* pp. 319-22.

19. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* ad loc. Cf. K. Deichgräber, *Bemerkungen zu Dioge-*

But what does this tell us about early Stoic interpretation? Julia Kerschenshteiner asserted that the Stoics did not go back to the original Heraclitus but rather took over and developed the picture presented by Theophrastus²⁰. Kirk adopted a similar view and offered more evidence to support it than Kerschenshteiner²¹. His main argument is a summary of Zeno's cosmogony by Arius Didymus (*SVF* 1,102). Kirk rightly sees a connexion between Zeno's doctrine, as reported here, and Heraclitus fr. 31. But he thinks that the Stoic use of this fragment has been strongly influenced by Theophrastus' misinterpretation which is the source of Diogenes Laertius 9,8-9.

Heraclitus fr. 31 runs as follows: πυρὸς τροπαί· πρῶτον θάλασσα, θάλασσης δὲ τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ γῆ, τὸ δὲ ἥμισυ πρηστήρ. Some comments by Clement of Alexandria, the source of the fragment (2,396 Stählin), separate this part of it from the next: <γῆ> θάλασσα διαχέεται, καὶ μετρέεται εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον, ὁκοῖος πρόσθεν ἦν ἢ γενέσθαι γῆ. Clement concludes by saying: παραπλήσια τούτῳ καὶ οἱ ἐλλογιμώτατοι τῶν Στωικῶν δογματίζουν περὶ τε ἐκπυρώσεως διαλαμβάνοντες καὶ κόσμου διοικήσεως.

When we compare Arius Didymus' text with the Theophrastean treatment, it seems to me far from clear that Zeno's cosmogony, as described by Arius, is developed out of Theophrastus' extension of Heraclitus fr. 31²²: The Stoic text says this: τοιαύτην δὲ δεήσει εἶναι ἐν περιόδῳ τὴν τοῦ ὅλου διακόσμησιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, ὅταν ἐκ πυρὸς τροπὴ εἰς ὕδωρ δι' αἰθέρος γένηται, τὸ μὲν τι ὑφίστασθαι καὶ γῆν συνίστασθαι, ἐκ τοῦ λοιποῦ δὲ τὸ μὲν διαμένειν ὕδωρ, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἀτμιζομένου αἶρα γίνεσθαι, ἐκ τινὸς δὲ τοῦ αἰθέρος πῦρ ἐξάπτεσθαι, τὴν δὲ κρᾶσιν γίνεσθαι τῇ εἰς ἄλληλα τῶν στοιχείων μεταβολῇ, σώματος ὅλου δι' ὅλου τινὸς ἑτέρου διερχομένου. Compare with this the relevant part of the Theophrastean account: γεννᾶσθαι τε αὐτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ πάλιν ἐκπυροῦσθαι κατὰ τινος περιόδου ἐναλλάξ τὸν σύμπαντα αἰῶνα... πυκνούμενον γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ἐξυγραίνεσθαι, συνιστάμενόν τε γίνεσθαι ὕδωρ, πηγνύμενον δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς γῆν τρέπεσθαι· καὶ ταύτην ὁδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ κάτω εἶναι, πάλιν τε αὖ τὴν γῆν χεῖσθαι, ἐξ ἧς τὸ ὕδωρ γίνεσθαι, ἐκ δὲ τούτου τὰ λοιπά (Diog. Laert. 9,8-9). As Kirk notes, the Stoic text differs from Heraclitus, and Theophrastus, in introducing air,

nes' Bericht über Heraklit, «Philologus» 93 (1938-9) 12-30, J. Kerschenshteiner, *Der Bericht des Theophrast über Heraklit*, «Hermes» 83 (1955) 385-411, both of whom find Theophrastus more influential on Diog. Laert. 9,7 than did Diels.

20. Cited in n. 19, p. 411.

21. *Heraclitus* pp. 327-9, cf. 318-9.

22. Kirk p. 328, who concedes that 'there were, of course, some non-Heraclitean elements in Stoic cosmogony'.

and there are other differences he does not discuss. The Stoic text, unlike Theophrastus (ap. Diog. Laert.), does not incorporate anything corresponding clearly to the second part of the fragment (cf. however *SVF* 2,413), but it is closer than Theophrastus to the first half. Heraclitus' noun τροπή is used, and the Stoic text reflects his ἥμισυ in its use of τὸ μὲν and τὸ λοιπόν. These points are indications that Zeno, or whoever it is that Arius records, had a text of fr. 31 available to him. Whether condensation (πύκνωσις) and rarefaction (ἀραίωσις) are implied by συνίστασθαι and ἀτμιζομένου I am not sure; but these concepts are certainly not made fully explicit as they are in the Theophrastean interpretation of Heraclitus (Diog. Laert. 9,8)²³. I conclude that Theophrastus is at most one possible intermediary between Heraclitus and the passage from Arius Didymus, the beginning and end of which have no connexion with Theophrastus. How far Arius Didymus represents a valid account of Zeno's cosmogony need not concern us here, though it is worth noting that his passage needs to be considered alongside other accounts of Stoic cosmogony²⁴.

This becomes particularly clear when Arius Didymus' evidence for Zeno is compared with that which he gives for Cleanthes (*SVF* 1,497, see further p. 149). Theophrastus, as we have seen, regarded Heraclitus' fire as a material substrate whose changes of density account for water and earth. In Cleanthes' cosmogony as described by Arius, where the links with Heraclitus are quite unmistakable, fire is presented not only as the material starting-point of cosmogony but also as the organising agent of the universe (ἄρχεσθαι διακοσμεῖν τὸ ὅλον). That point is not made plain in the Zenonian account, but there is every reason to regard it as the orthodox early Stoic view. The early Stoics distinguished between fire, the eternal active principle (πῦρ τεχνικόν), and πῦρ ἄτεχνον, which is one of the four elements generated by the creative fire in its association with the eternal passive principle (ὕλη)²⁵. It is highly probable that they thought Heraclitus supported this distinction, and virtually certain that they did not interpret his fire simply as a material substrate along the lines of Theophrastus²⁶.

23. They do occur unambiguously in some accounts of Stoic cosmogony, cf. Diog. Laert. 7,142, Plut. *De stoic. rep.* 1053A(=*SVF* 2,579): but in as much as these are interpretations of Heraclitus they need not derive exclusively, or even partially, from Thpt. Mondolfo (cited in n. 10) pp. 36-7 defends Theophrastus' historicity in attributing to Heraclitus processes which may be described as condensation and rarefaction.

24. Cf. Michael Lapidge, *Ἀρχαί and στοιχεῖα: A Problem in Stoic Cosmology*, «Phronesis» 18 (1973) 265-7.

25. Cf. *SVF* 1,120, 504, with discussion by Lapidge (cited in n. 24) pp. 267-73.

26. The Stoic distinction between an eternal κόσμος and a perishable κόσμος (*SVF*

Why then did Kirk find it so obvious, on the basis of this text, that *the Stoics accepted Theophrastus' extension of Heraclitus fr. 31 as a legitimate one, and developed out of it their own cosmogony* (Heraclitus p. 328)? It is due to the fact that they, like Theophrastus, interpreted fr. 31 as referring to stages of world-formation—the «turnings of fire», repeated in regular cycles following the absorption of each world into fire. Kirk regards this interpretation of the fragment as demonstrably false since it refers, in his view, not to cosmogony but to changes which go on continuously within an eternal world-order. There can be little doubt that Kirk is right about this; successive worlds periodically created and destroyed were probably not part of Heraclitus' philosophy, but it does not follow from this that the Stoics misunderstood their predecessor as a result of reading Theophrastus. Many modern scholars have followed their lead, and it may well have been Aristotle's view too. It has taken a very large amount of scholarly discussion to establish the radical nature of Heraclitus' cosmology, and agreement on many issues has not been reached. Neither the misattribution of ἐκπύρωσις to Heraclitus—if such it is by Theophrastus and the Stoics—nor other details of Stoic cosmogony suffice to show that the Stoics' interpretation of Heraclitus was largely based on Theophrastus.

The later doxographical tradition incorporates Stoic features into the Theophrastean interpretation. This seems to have led some scholars into thinking that the early Stoics merely added to or modified his views. But this is unlikely in principle and not demonstrable in fact. Stoic elements in the doxography of Heraclitus are due to the general influence which Stoicism exercised on the later philosophical tradition and to the specific interest of the Stoics in Heraclitus. They are not the best evidence for telling us what Cleanthes and other early Stoics thought about Heraclitus. Modern research has concentrated on disentangling Heraclitus' ideas from the views of later philosophers. In this process Stoic approaches to Heraclitus have too readily been regarded as only a link in the chain of Theophrastus' influence on the doxographical tradition.

2,526-29), well explained by Kirk (*Heraclitus*, pp. 307-10) in relation to Heraclitus fr. 30, is closely related to the distinction between two kinds of fire, and both could be partly inspired by the difficulty of reconciling πῦρ αἰεζῶν with ἀπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεννύμενον μέτρα. Clement of Alexandria, the source of Heraclitus fr. 31, gravely misrepresents the Stoic position by treating fire as material organised ὑπὸ τοῦ διοικοῦντος λόγου καὶ θεοῦ. For Theophrastus' distinction between two kinds of fire, and its possible influence on the Stoics, cf. Longrigg pp. 219-22 cited in n. 7 above. Mondolfo thinks that Plato *Tht.* 153a attributes a directive function to «fuoco eracliteo», *Eraclito*, p. cxxvii.

My paper up to this point has been largely concerned with clearing the ground in order to examine some aspects of the Stoics' relationship with Heraclitus. I turn now to consider these in more detail.

From Zeno onwards the Stoics denied the eternity of the phenomenal world. That thesis, so dear to the Peripatetics, seemed to them inconsistent with the empirical evidence of natural change (cf. *SVF* 1,106) and in place of it they adopted a belief in a regular and ceaseless succession of similar worlds. Unlike Plato and Aristotle they confined existence to bodies, but they agreed with these philosophers that the orderliness of nature points to the existence of a source of motion which is eternal and rational. Cosmogony, change within the world, orderliness and rationality, and materialism, were all accounted for in Stoicism by the postulation of a πρώτη οὐσία or πρώτη ὕλη with active and passive aspects or ἀρχαί. Often called θεός the active principle of eternal substance in early Stoicism is a πῦρ τεχνικόν, corporeal, rational and self-moving²⁷. The early Stoics' choice of fire as their eternal, active principle which persists throughout the succession of worlds was influenced by a variety of considerations. Chief among these were the associations between fire and the life-force of living things, the fiery nature of the heavenly bodies and the creative power of fire in technology²⁸. The early Stoics could have no better candidate than fire if they were to posit a single material principle as the active power in the universe.

Neither the early Stoics' basic assumptions about the universe, nor their choice of fire as the active principle, are likely to have been derived directly from Heraclitus. I agree with Zeller that the Stoics' (he says Zeno's) Weltanschauung was the ground of their Heracliteanism, not the consequence of it²⁹. The general basis of Stoic cosmology is best explained as a critical reaction to the Academy and the Lyceum³⁰. But something of profound im-

27. For the evidence and an excellent discussion cf. Lapidge as cited in n.25. In Chrysippus' cosmology, as Lapidge demonstrates (pp. 267-78), πνεῦμα replaces πῦρ as the active ἀρχή, with important consequences for the earlier Stoic distinction between fire as an eternal ἀρχή and fire as one of the four derived στοιχεῖα. When referring to the 'early Stoics' over the next few pages I do not include Chrysippus.

28. On the first two points, with arguments that develop from biology to cosmology, cf. Cic. *Nat. deor.* 2,23-28, who drew them from Cleanthes. Cf. Solmsen (see n. 6) pp. 436-45. On fire as a craftsman, cf. its description as τεχνικόν or *artificialis* *SVF* 1,171, 2,422, 1133-4, and Zeno's allegorical explanation of Vulcan (i.e. Hephaestus) as fire, *SVF* 1,169.

29. *Die Philosophie der Griechen* 3,1 (Leipzig 1909⁴) pp. 126f., 'seine eigentümliche Weltanschauung war nicht die Folge, sondern der Grund seines Heraklitismus'.

30. As is well shown by Solmsen and Longrigg, cited in notes 6 and 7.

portance to the Stoics influenced their attitude to contemporary philosophical positions and stimulated their interest in Heraclitus. What was this?

The goal of Stoicism was to create a picture of the world which would be completely coherent. They wanted to explain natural events, human conduct and the apprehension and description of reality (physics, ethics and logic) as manifestations of an all-pervading rationality or *λόγος*. At bottom the Stoics, for all their distinction between two basic principles, were monists. «The universe is one», said Zeno (*SVF* 1,97) and it was a desire to maintain unity at all costs which helps to explain many features of Stoicism—their restriction of existence to body, their refusal to accept an irrational faculty in man alongside his *λόγος*, their denial of Plato's degrees of reality or of Aristotle's distinction between celestial movements and the sublunar sphere, their strict determinism. Of course the early Stoics admitted the existence of plurality and diversity within the world, but they explained the multiplicity of things as impermanent transformations and products of their eternal rational principle or creative fire.

No doubt this sketch of Stoic aspirations is oversimplified. But I would maintain that it is essentially correct. In the interests of explaining all experience and providing men with an attitude to the world which was proof against all circumstances, the Stoics claimed that the rational principle in man, his *λόγος*, is part of the rational principle which governs the world at large. Thus man and nature are fundamentally at one, or should be. The Stoics recognized that men can and do fail to accord with their own rationality and that of the world. But by expedients which are ingenious rather than convincing they maintained that such failures are compatible with and even necessary to the good order of the universe as a whole³¹.

Unity within apparent diversity, unity in change, a controlling *λόγος* manifested in fire, and common to men as well as the universe, exhortations to follow this wise directive power, in Heraclitus the Stoics could find these and other ideas related to their own basic assumptions; which is not to say that they formulated all their own conceptions independently of him. We simply cannot relate the formative stages of Stoicism to their interest in Heraclitus. But we can see that in Cleanthes the links between Stoicism and Heraclitus had definitely been forged. His use of Heraclitus, I shall suggest, shows a much deeper understanding of the other philosopher's work than we find in Plato, Aristotle or Theophrastus.

Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* falls into three main sections³²: lines 1-14

31. For the evidence cf. n. 43 below.

32. Stobaeus *Ecl.* 1,1,12 (= *SVF* 1,537). The text of the *Hymn to Zeus* is notoriously

praise Zeus for the power which he exercises throughout all nature, animate and inanimate alike; lines 15-31 describe human folly and mistaken conceptions of the good life and also assert Zeus' capacity to unite good with bad in a harmonious unity; lines 32-39 are a prayer to Zeus to rescue men from their lack of insight into the true nature of things which he directs by reason, justice and law. The tone and style of the poem owe much to the epic tradition but to understand its individual ideas and total effect we have to consider it in relation to Heraclitus³³.

In the first section verbal echoes are prominent: Cleanthes addresses Κύδιστ' ἀθανάτων, πολυώνυμε, παγκρατὲς αἰεὶ, Ζεῦ, φύσεως ἀρχηγέ, νόμου μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν (1-2). The whole universe obeys Zeus willingly. In his hands he holds an ἀμφήκη, πυρόεντα, ἀειζῶντα κεραυνόν (10), at whose stroke (πληγῇ) all the works of nature are accomplished. It is the instrument by means of which he directs κοινὸς λόγος that passes through everything (12-13). For Heraclitus ἐν τὸ σοφὸν μούνον λέγεσθαι οὐκ ἐθέλει καὶ ἐθέλει Ζηνὸς ὄνομα (fr. 32). This may be reflected in Cleanthes' πολυώνυμε (line 1) but more significant is the fact that Cleanthes incorporates two statements by Heraclitus about the instrument of Zeus' power, the thunderbolt (κεραυνός): τὰ δὲ πάντα οἰακίζει κεραυνός (fr. 64) and πᾶν γὰρ ἔρπετον πληγῇ νέμεται (fr. 11). In Heraclitus the cosmic role assigned to fire or thunderbolt cannot be separated from the functions he attributes to λόγος, νόμος, τὸ σοφόν, and τὸ θεῖον³⁴. All of these are used to describe different aspects of cosmic order and its directing power. So it is with Cleanthes. As Heraclitus speak of a λόγος which is κοινός and a single divine law which fosters all human laws (fr. 114), so Cleanthes stresses the obedience of nature to Zeus, writes of a κοινὸς νόμος and treats the thunderbolt as the means by which Zeus directs κοινὸς λόγος that penetrates everything³⁵.

difficult, but my interpretation here does not turn upon any controversial passages. For a recent discussion cf. M. Dragona-Monachou, 'Ὁ «Ὑμνος στὸ Δία» καὶ τὰ «Χρυσᾶ Ἐπη», «Φιλοσοφία» 1 (1971) 329-76 and the works cited by her in n. 36 p. 349.

33. This is well appreciated by J.D. Meerwaldt, *Cleanthes I and II*, «Mnemosyne» 4 (1951) 38-66 and 5 (1952) 1-12, who observes, p. 46, that the 'Hymnus in Iovem singulis paene versibus vestigia exhibet Heraclitea', and cf. the (incomplete) list of parallels cited by M. Marcovich, *Heraclitus* (Merida 1967) p. 637 and G. Zuntz, *Zum Kleanthes Hymnus*, HSPh. 63 (1958) 290-28 discussed below. Most studies, where one would expect the close connexion to be noted, are either completely reticent, e.g. M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* and G. Verbeke, *Kleanthes van Assos* (Brussels 1949) or misleadingly selective, e.g. A.C. Pearson, *Zeno and Cleanthes* (London 1891).

34. Cf. Kirk, *Heraclitus*, pp. 402f.; W.K.C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy I* (Cambridge 1962) p. 434.

35. Lines 2, 7-8, 12-13, 39.

Heraclitus, for his part, refers to γνώμη, ὅτῃ κυβερνᾶται πάντα διὰ πάντων (fr. 41)³⁶.

So much for the first section of the poem. In the second part Cleanthes asserts that nothing is done in the world apart from Zeus :

πλὴν ὅποσα ῥέζουσι κακοὶ σφετέραισιν ἀνοίαις·
ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ τὰ περισσὰ ἐπίστασαι ἄρτια θεῖναι,
καὶ κοσμεῖν τᾴκοσμα καὶ οὐ φίλα σοὶ φίλα ἐστίν.
ᾧδε γὰρ εἰς ἓν πάντα συνήρמוκας ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν,
ᾧσθ' ἓνα γίγνεσθαι πάντων λόγον αἰὲν ἐόντα,
ὃν φεύγοντες ἐῷσιν ὅσοι θνητῶν κακοὶ εἰσι (17-22).

Cleanthes then analyses the failure of the bad to observe or listen to the divine κοινὸς νόμος. Obedience to this is the formula for a good life, but men, lacking such insight, pursue various bad goals, honour, wealth, and pleasure, in particular (23-31).

It is immediately evident that we have further verbal indebtedness to Heraclitus in these lines. The unity of all into one and the eternal λόγος of all things call to mind his fr. 1 on λόγος and his constant stress on unity. Zeus in Cleanthes harmonises and unifies moral opposites; in Heraclitus god is a series of pairs of opposites—day night etc. (fr. 67) and τῷ μὲν θεῷ καλὰ πάντα καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ δίκαια, ἄνθρωποι δὲ ἃ μὲν ἄδικα ὑπειλήφασιν ἃ δὲ δίκαια (fr. 102). But the connexion between the two philosophers is not confined to verbal reminiscences. Cleanthes develops the moral consequences of obedience to and recognition of the common λόγος or νόμος, and can we deny that Heraclitus does so too? Fr. 2 exhorts us to *follow the common λόγος* and this is Cleanthes' constant imperative. Charles Kahn has written that Heraclitus' real subject is not the physical world but the human condition³⁷. If this over-emphasizes the moral element, consider also Kirk's observation that *Heraclitus made it far clearer than his immediate predecessors that man himself is a part of his surroundings; in him, too, the Logos is operative, and his effective functioning depends upon action in accordance with it—and so upon his understanding of it*³⁸. Heraclitus does not, in so many words, list the false goals which the unknowing aim at but

36. ὅτῃ κυβερνᾶται Deichgräber for the various transmitted corruptions. In favour of γνώμη = «divine guiding principle» cf. Marcovich, *Heraclitus* pp. 451f. with bibliography pro and contra.

37. *A New Look at Heraclitus*, «American Philosophical Quarterly» 1 (1964) 194. Cf. Marcovich, cited in n. 10 above, col. 295.

38. *Heraclitus*, p. 403.

his insistence on the need to follow the common λόγος, and his diagnosis of failure to do so in the majority of men, has probably inspired much of this section of Cleanthes' poem. Heraclitus uses the contrasts between sleeping and wakefulness, and between private and common understanding³⁹, but the implication is the same as that of Cleanthes: only a life based upon the λόγος common to all things can have a proper grounding. So far as our evidence goes, Cleanthes grasped the moral significance of Heraclitus' thought in ways which Plato, Aristotle and Theophrastus either ignored or misunderstood.

But someone could object that I have so far established no more than surface parallels between Heraclitus and Cleanthes' *Hymn*. Heraclitus' λόγος, the argument might run, was not that of the Stoics. He meant by it 'the formula which connects opposites into a unity'; they meant 'reason or rationality pervading and directing the world as a whole'. I do not myself think it is possible to characterise λόγος either in Heraclitus or in the Stoics as simply as this. But for the present let that pass, for the kind of objector I have in mind can be illustrated by some comments of Günther Zuntz on the middle section of Cleanthes' poem⁴⁰.

Zuntz thinks that Cleanthes has *unconsciously* combined here two totally irreconcilable concepts of λόγος, the Stoic and the Heraclitean. Before and after lines 18-21 we have the Stoic concept, a positive directing power present in everything, which guides things to the good; but in lines 18-21, «wie eine Bombe aus einer anderen Welt» (p. 297) the harmony of the Stoic cosmos is shattered by the Heraclitean λόγος, a *Formel des Seins*, *coniunctio oppositorum*, whereby Zeus harmonises good and bad into a unity. This, Zuntz asserts, is not a moral but a metaphysical principle, the λόγος of Heraclitus, according to which all things happen. «Wie könnte ihn einer *fliehende beiseite lassen*», asks Zuntz, as Cleanthes in line 22 says that the bad do? Zuntz means that no-one could do so, and that Cleanthes moves imperceptibly from a Heraclitean λόγος which accounts for all that happens to a Stoic λόγος which is a moral imperative that men can coherently disobey.

For Cleanthes' alleged failure to recognize this juxtaposition of incompatible λόγος concepts, Zuntz draws attention to his echo of the Heraclitean pun, ξυνός - ξὺν νόῳ (frs. 2 and 114) in the supposedly transitional lines, 24-5, κοινός - σὺν νόῳ. Zuntz is right to draw attention to the importance

39. Cf. frs. 1, 2, 17, 28, 89.

40. Article cited in n. 33, pp. 296-8.

of Heraclitus in Cleanthes' poem, but his attempt to analyse and separate the two λόγος concepts does not seem to me successful.

Let me offer three points for consideration : 1. The Stoics, like Heraclitus, held that everything in the world accords with λόγος⁴¹. 2. This applies for the Stoics to the behaviour of the bad as well as the good; from the perspective of the individual bad man such behaviour is seen as a consequence of his own λόγος being «at fault» παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον, but it is still attributable to λόγος⁴². From the perspective of cosmic λόγος or universal law, the behaviour of the bad was regarded by the Stoics as necessary to the economy of the universe as a whole : without bad good could not exist⁴³. We may well feel that this attempt to reconcile bad in the part with good and harmony in the whole is unsatisfactory, and that it raises substantial difficulties for Stoic ethics⁴⁴. But it is certain that the Stoics incorporated the co-existence of moral opposites in their concept of cosmic order and saw the good and harmony of cosmic λόγος as compatible with the existence of bad in individual men⁴⁵. If then we find difficulty in reconciling the harmony of good and bad with the imperative, «be good», that is not due to Cleanthes' lack of sensitivity to different λόγος concepts. The Stoics, as monists, required the harmony of moral opposites in order to reconcile their belief in universal providence with their knowledge of the existence of bad men. 3. It is thoroughly misleading to label Heraclitus' λόγος 'metaphysical' and that of the Stoics *moral*. In both systems λόγος is a principle of being *and* a principle of morality. Such 'naturalism' was precisely what attracted the Stoics to Heraclitus. In him, as in the Stoics, all things are determined by λόγος but the many fail to recognize this and thus seek to organise their lives on alien principles. In calling their own active power in the universe λόγος the Stoics were expressing the closest affinity with Heraclitus⁴⁶.

41. Many texts could be cited : cf. Chrysippus ap. Plut. *Stoic. rep.* 1050A (*SVF* 2, 937) οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλως τῶν κατὰ μέρος γενέσθαι οὐδὲ τοῦλάχιστον, ἢ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν φύσιν καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνης λόγον ; Chrysippus' description of ὁ τοῦ Διὸς λόγος as the same as εἰμαρμένη *ibid.* 1056C (*SVF* 2,997). For Zeno cf. *SVF* 1,160-2, and for Cleanthes, outside the *Hymn to Zeus*, *SVF* 1,531, 533.

42. *SVF* 3,445, 459, etc. Cf. J.M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge 1969) pp. 22 - 36; Josiah B. Gould, *The Philosophy of Chrysippus* (Leiden 1970) pp. 181-96; A.A. Long *Hellenistic Philosophy*, pp. 175 - 78.

43. Cf. Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1050E-1051D, *Comm. not.* 1065B - 1066 D, *SVF* 2,1168-1186.

44. Cf. my remarks in *Hellenistic Philosophy*, pp. 181-4.

45. Apart from the passages cited in n. 43 cf. Epictetus 1,12, 16.

46. Cf. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* 1, pp. 34-5.

When we translate λόγος by 'reason' we obscure this fact. If the Stoics had wanted to conceive the world as governed by reason *simpliciter* they would have followed Plato in talking about a cosmic ψυχή or νοῦς. But they used λόγος rather than νοῦς, both for its associations with rational discourse and for its link with the 'formula of being'. Aristotle could lend support to the second aspect but the Heraclitean λόγος could quite properly be interpreted as covering logical, metaphysical and moral functions.

Having said that, I do not wish to imply that the Stoic λόγος was simply adopted without change from that of Heraclitus. My point is rather that the two concepts are sufficiently close to rule out Zuntz's notion of an unrecognized juxtaposition of alien notions on Cleanthes' part. Heraclitus' concept of λόγος as the unification of opposites was used by Cleanthes to provide the orthodox Stoic reduction of «partial evil to universal good». But in these lines (18-21), which Zuntz regards as Heraclitean, the thought is Stoic and an important modification of Heraclitus. The earlier philosopher does not speak of Zeus or his cosmic principle making the crooked straight or harmonising the bad with the good such that the resulting unity is good, and obeyed by all save the bad. Cleanthes regards the λόγος as an objective power of good which, through Zeus, can accommodate those exceptionally recalcitrant parts of the cosmos which are bad. Heraclitus has a more radical and paradoxical conception. He reduces opposites to the constituents of harmony. Men distinguish good from bad, but to god all things are good (fr. 102). This is not what Cleanthes says. He recognizes objective evil in the world but asserts that Zeus can make it blend with the good. The thought of Cleanthes is closely modelled on Heraclitus; but it is not the same.

The final short section of the *Hymn*, with its prayer to Zeus to enlighten men, is not directly modelled on Heraclitus. But the content of the prayer keeps him closely before our minds. In the epithets of Zeus which Cleanthes uses, the thunderbolt is repeated (line 32) and when in the next line Cleanthes begs Zeus to rescue men from grievous ἀπειροσύνη—lack of insight—he echoes Heraclitus fr. 1, γινομένων γὰρ πάντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τόνδε ἀπείροισιν ἐοίκασι. Cleanthes asks Zeus: δὸς δὲ κυρῆσαι γνώμης ἢ πίστευος σὺ δίκης μέτα πάντα κυβερνᾷς (34-5). This is a clear reminiscence of Heraclitus fr. 41 : εἶναι γὰρ ἐν τὸ σοφόν, ἐπίστασθαι γνώμην, ὅτ' ἐκ κυβερνᾶται πάντα διὰ πάντων (cf. n. 36). Κοινὸς νόμος and δίκη are repeated in Cleanthes' last line. Heraclitus' conception of justice as strife is not of course what Cleanthes means. This was an element of Heraclitus which the Stoics had good reasons for eliminating.

Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* is not a summary of Stoic thought nor do its very strong links with Heraclitus constitute a comprehensive interpretation

of that philosopher. What we have here is a remarkably interesting example of the constructive use of one thinker's work by another where the borrower, as I have tried to show, proves to have a deep understanding of his creditor's ideas without being slavishly bound by them. One would give much to have Heraclitus' own verdict on Cleanthes' hymn. If its teleology, piety and moral emphases are thoroughly Stoic it is also true that Cleanthes' insight into Heraclitus' own thought is closer to the historical views of modern critics than it is to the ancient doxographical tradition.

There is further evidence which confirms Cleanthes' close reading and positive use of Heraclitus. Arius Didymus' report of his cosmogony (Stobaeus *Ecl.* 1,17,3 = *SVF* 1,497) includes three items which are particularly noteworthy. First, the earliest clear reference by a Stoic to *τόνος*, 'tension', which 'does not cease in the substance of the universe' as fire continuously goes about its periodic constitution of the cosmos⁴⁷. It has often been suggested that the Stoics found support for their *τόνος* and *τονική κίνησις* in Heraclitus' 'back-turning' or 'back-stretched harmony' (*παλίντροπος* or *παλίντονος ἁρμονίη*, fr. 51), and that Cleanthes was the first Stoic to develop the concept in detail⁴⁸. The context of this passage tends to confirm both suggestions, for it includes two further unmistakable echoes of Heraclitus.

Cleanthes proceeds to illustrate the periodic growth and decline of the universe, under the direction of fire and its persistent «tension», by analogy with organic parts, which come together in a seed and are subsequently separated from it: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐνός τινος τὰ μέρη πάντα φύεται ἐκ σπερμάτων ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ ὅλου τὰ μέρη, ὧν καὶ τὰ ζῷα καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ὄντα τυγχάνει, ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις φύεται. καὶ ὥσπερ τινὲς λόγοι τῶν μερῶν εἰς σπέρμα συνιόντες μίγνυνται καὶ αὖθις διακρίνονται γινομένων τῶν μερῶν, οὕτως ἐξ ἐνός τε πάντα γίνεσθαι καὶ ἐκ πάντων ἐν συγκρίνεσθαι, ὁδῶ καὶ συμφώνως διεξιούσης τῆς περιόδου. Cleanthes' expression ὥσπερ τινὲς λόγοι τῶν μερῶν seems to use *logos* in the Heraclitean sense of «measure» or «proportion»; and the cosmic truth which the

47. Καὶ τοιαύτην περίοδον αἰεὶ καὶ διακόσμησιν ποιούμενου (sc. πυρός) τὸν ἐν τῇ τῶν ὅλων οὐσίᾳ τόνον μὴ παύεσθαι. For discussion of the whole passage cf. R. Hirzel, *Untersuchungen zu Cicero's philosophischen Schriften* 2,1 (Leipzig 1882) pp. 128-31, H. von Arnim, *RE* 11.1 s.v. *Kleanthes*, cols. 563-4, J.D. Meerwaldt, «Mnemosyne» 4 (1951) 44-53.

48. Cf. Hirzel (cited in n. 47) pp. 158-9, Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* I, p. 74, Marcovich, *RE* suppl. 10 s.v. *Herakleitos* col.315. Both Marcovich, *Heraclitus* pp. 125f., and Kirk, *Heraclitus* pp. 211-15, prefer *παλίντονος* to *παλίντροπος*. But even the latter reading does not preclude a connexion, in Stoic eyes, with *τόνος*.

analogy exemplifies is a version of Heraclitus' own words, ἐκ πάντων ἐν καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντα (fr. 10), though in Heraclitus these words refer probably to the permanent condition of things in the world rather than to the periodic succession of worlds.

As in the *Hymn to Zeus* Cleanthes' use of Heraclitus here is neither mere imitation nor wilful misinterpretation. Heraclitus may not have likened the universe to a living thing, as Cleanthes does, and «tension» is too important a concept in Stoicism to be derived from misreading Heraclitus. Tension is a property of the divine fire or fiery breath which is also the λόγος pervading and maintaining the universe. But accounts of τονικὴ κίνησις as simultaneous motion in contrary directions (*SVF* 2,451), or alternation of two opposite movements (*SVF* 2,450, 458), show why the Stoics found it proper to associate their concept with Heraclitus. He had repeatedly stressed that harmony is of opposites and this seems to be implicit in the Stoics' doctrine that the stability of the universe is constituted by the tension of the active principle —its contrary movements which unite the centre of the cosmic sphere with the circumference⁴⁹. By calling «tension» a πληγὴ πυρός (*SVF* 1,563) Cleanthes may be presumed to have deliberately echoed Heraclitus' fire whose balanced changes maintain order in the universe⁵⁰.

Heraclitus' psychology and its connexions with fire and λόγος also influenced the Stoics, but that subject is much too large to pursue in detail now. Instead we may conclude this treatment of Cleanthes' relationship to Heraclitus by glancing at a most interesting and controversial text. Once again it comes to us from Arius Didymus⁵¹: περὶ δὲ ψυχῆς Κλεάνθης μὲν τὰ Ζήνωνος δόγματα παρατιθέμενος πρὸς σύγκρισιν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους φυσικοὺς φησιν, ὅτι Ζήνων τὴν ψυχὴν λέγει αἰσθητικὴν ἀναθυμίασιν, καθάπερ Ἡράκλειτος. βουλόμενος γὰρ ἐμφανίσαι, ὅτι αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀναθυμιῶμεναι νοεραὶ αἰεὶ γίνονται, εἵκασεν αὐτὰς τοῖς ποταμοῖς λέγων οὕτως «ποταμοῖσι τοῖσιν αὐτοῖσιν ἐμβαίνουσιν ἕτερα καὶ ἕτερα ὕδατα ἐπιρρέει» καὶ «ψυχαὶ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑγρῶν ἀναθυμιῶνται». ἀναθυμίασιν μὲν οὖν ὁμοίως τῷ Ἡρακλείτῳ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀποφαίνει Ζήνων.

This text provides us with most valuable information about Cleanthes'

49. Cf. my remarks in *Hellenistic Philosophy* pp. 156 -7. In the Stoic evidence referred to above, it is the τόνος of πνεῦμα and not just that of πῦρ. This reflects Chrysippus' doctrine, whereas Cleanthes speaks explicitly of πῦρ, cf. ἀντιτυπήσαντος (as well as τόνος) in Arius Didymus above, perhaps reflecting πληγὴ in Heraclitus (fr. 11).

50. The context of *SVF* 1,563 is ethical, but its description of τόνος is quite consistent with Arius Didymus' evidence.

51. Apud Eusebium *Praep. evang.* 15,20 = *SVF* 1,519.

methodology. As Kirk says (*Heraclitus*, p. 367), *it is almost certainly Cleanthes and not Zeno who quotes from Heraclitus*. Cleanthes, we may infer, looked for views similar to Zeno's in other thinkers and found them in Heraclitus. While Arius speaks here specifically of Zeno's psychology it is highly likely that Cleanthes cited parallels from Heraclitus in his other comments on Zeno's philosophy. This passage supports the idea that Cleanthes went to Heraclitus in particular for strengthening the foundations of Zeno's philosophy (cf. Kirk ad loc.); and such a motive helps to explain both his interest in Heraclitus and innovations in Stoicism which Heraclitus may partly have inspired.

The validity of Cleanthes' interpretation of the river and the soul is controversial. As a severe sceptic Kirk may be cited⁵². He argues that Heraclitus used the river to illustrate the stability in change of *all* things and therefore its restriction in this case to an image of psychology is mistaken. He suggests that Cleanthes was misled by his source —a superficial arrangement of Heraclitus' sayings in which the river was wrongly juxtaposed to a statement giving the gist of our fr. 36, to the effect that the source of souls is the moist. But one is reluctant to posit an inadequate source for Cleanthes. Why should he not have had access to a version of Heraclitus' book which was generally authoritative? Since Kirk, several scholars have defended the main lines of Cleanthes' quotation⁵³. Heraclitus may have used the river image in more than one context, and he certainly held that the dry, fiery substance of souls at their best is a transformation of moisture (cf. fr. 36). Probably he did not use the word ἀναθυμίασις but there are good reasons for thinking that it represents his belief⁵⁴. Thus the continuity of the river by the flow of different waters would be like the soul which owes its continuing (or renewed) existence to the flow of vaporising moisture.

Cleanthes at least found sufficient resemblance between this doctrine and Zeno's psychology to claim that they agreed in calling the soul an αἰσθητική ἀναθυμίασις. Zeno probably held that the soul as πνεῦμα is principally nurtured from the blood and his use of ἀναθυμίασις to describe the process of vaporisation may well owe more to Aristotle and medical theory

52. *Heraclitus*, pp. 367-80.

53. Cf. Gregory Vlastos, *On Heraclitus*, *AJPh* 76 (1955) 338 ff., especially n. 2 p.338, W.K.C. Guthrie (cited in n. 34 above) pp. 491-2, Charles Kahn (cited in n. 37 above) p. 199. J.D. Meerwaldt's emendation of νοεραὶ to νεαραὶ in the fifth line of Arius Didymus' citation, printed above, strengthens an authentic link with Heraclitus' own thought («*Mnemosyne*» 4 [1951] 53-4).

54. Cf. Kirk, *Heraclitus*, pp. 273, 334, 368, Guthrie and Kahn, cited in previous note.

than to Heraclitus⁵⁵. We may accept that Cleanthes is responsible for linking Zeno with Heraclitus, but if his interpretation of the latter is defensible his attempts to identify the views of Zeno and Heraclitus are less plausible. In this case Cleanthes helped to promote misinterpretation of Heraclitus by trying to associate him with Stoicism.

Cleanthes' understanding and utilization of Heraclitus raise many problems. He was not a historian of philosophy and his own preconceptions affected his reading of his predecessor's work. In cosmogony and psychology he certainly read into Heraclitus unwarranted anticipations of Stoicism, but when due allowance is taken of these points we are still left with general conceptual affinities which are of great importance to both systems. The Stoic cosmos of Cleanthes has far more in common with Heraclitus than it shares with other systems. Hirzel in 1879 argued that Cleanthes was chiefly responsible for the Heraclitean features of Stoicism, and this seems to be correct⁵⁶. It gains probability if we assume that Zeno did not argue in detail for many of his views and that Cleanthes sought to give them further support by linking them to the most appropriate philosopher of earlier times. Nor should we overlook the possibility that Cleanthes' interest in Heraclitus and other past writers was stimulated by the need to protect Stoicism against attack from the Academic sceptics. By associating Heraclitus with his own views he could present a more united front against scepticism.

Cleanthes' influence on the development of Stoicism was most conspicuous in physics and theology. He elaborated Zeno's doctrines here and established an orthodoxy for Chrysippus and later Stoics, which is not to say that they agreed with him on everything. His interest in Heraclitus, probably stimulated by Zeno, was so strongly imprinted in what he wrote that later Stoics inevitably accepted Heraclitus as a precursor of comparable stature to Diogenes of Sinope. Thus the Stoics themselves helped to propagate that confused amalgam of Stoic and Heraclitean notions which permeates the later Greek tradition of the history of philosophy. Chrysippus may have contributed to this, but it does not seem that he shared Clean-

55. *SVF* 1,135, 139, 140, cf. Solmsen (cited in n. 6) pp. 452-3.

56. *Untersuchungen* (cited in n. 47) pp. 115-82, unreasonably criticized by Pearson, *Zeno and Cleanthes* p.22, though Hirzel overstated his argument. His work still deserves consultation, especially for links between Cleanthes' astronomy and Heraclitus. Kirk gives a well-balanced account of Cleanthes' relation to Heraclitus, *Heraclitus*, pp. 367-8, and considers many aspects of the Stoic interpretation which I have not attempted to deal with here.

thes' special regard for Heraclitus. In developing Stoic logic and ethics, as he did with such success, Chrysippus looked to the Academy and Lyceum rather than to Heraclitus.

There is, however, a later Stoic on whose writings Heraclitus has left a remarkable impression—Marcus Aurelius. In conclusion, it is appropriate to mention some features of his indebtedness⁵⁷.

Marcus Aurelius refers to Diogenes, Heraclitus and Socrates as models of enlightenment and contrasts them with Alexander, Gaius and Pompey (8.3). He regards Heraclitus as one of the great sages, and in an interesting passage exhorts himself to remember Heraclitus' maxims, four of which he then quotes (4.46). But his implicit references to Heraclitus are much more numerous. He repeatedly uses the 'river' as an image of universal flux and also the cycle 'up and down' (e.g. 2.17, 4.43, 5.23, 6.17, 9.28). He reflects Heraclitus' emphasis on the relativity of human judgements (6.57) and observes that 'nothing is bad for things which are in process of change, as nothing is good for things which exist in consequence of change' (4.42). Like Heraclitus, he dwells on the hidden nature of things (5.10, 10.26) and on the reciprocal process of change which absorbs a thing's parts and then redistributes them (4.36, 5.13). Even when he is not apparently alluding to Heraclitus, he uses word-play which Heraclitus would have approved (e.g. 5.36-7, 7.27).

Like Cleanthes, Marcus Aurelius reflects Heraclitus at many points. In this paper I have concentrated on the earlier Stoic, for when considering Marcus we enter a quite different period by which time Heraclitus' influence has become diversified through Hippocratic writings, apocryphal letters and the revival of Pyrrhonian scepticism. The whole question of Heraclitus' role in Stoicism remains open for discussion. But can we deny that it was of decisive importance both in its acknowledged influence and in its formative effect?

57. For further details cf. Farquahrson's commentary. The importance of Heraclitus in Marcus' *Meditations* is not adequately covered in standard books on Stoicism and deserves detailed study. Cf. M. Dragona-Monachou, *The Stoic Arguments for the Existence and the Providence of the Gods* (Athens 1976) p. 241.

Ο ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΣΤΩΪΚΟΙ

Περίληψη.

Τὴν τελευταία εἰκοσαετία παρατηρεῖται ἀναβίωση τοῦ ἐνδιαφέροντος γιὰ τὴν ἐλληνιστικὴ φιλοσοφία καὶ ἰδιαίτερα γιὰ τὴ φιλοσοφία τῆς Στοᾶς καὶ τοῦ Ἐπικούρου. Μία ἀπὸ τὶς συνέπειες τῆς ἀναζωπύρωσης τοῦ ἐνδιαφέροντος αὐτοῦ ὑπῆρξε ἡ ἀπόρριψη τῆς θέσης, ποὺ πρῶτος ὑποστήριξε ὁ Hegel καὶ εὐρύτερα διέδωσε ὁ Zeller, ὅτι ὁ Ζήνων καὶ ὁ Ἐπίκουρος δὲν ἦταν πρωτότυποι ἀλλὰ ὀπισθοβατικοὶ στοχαστές, ποὺ ξαναγύρισαν στοὺς Προσωκρατικοὺς — τὸν Ἡράκλειτο καὶ τὸν Δημόκριτο ἀντίστοιχα — ἀγνοώντας σὲ μεγάλη ἔκταση τὴν Ἀκαδημία καὶ τὸν Περίπατο. Οἱ νεώτεροι ἐρευνητὲς παρατήρησαν (καὶ σωστά), πὼς σημαντικὴ ἐπίδραση θετικὴ καὶ ἀρνητικὴ ἄσκησε στὸν Ζήωνα καὶ στὸν Ἐπίκουρο ἡ ἀττικὴ φιλοσοφία τῆς ἐποχῆς τους. Στὴν ἐπανεκτίμηση ὅμως αὐτὴ τῶν ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν πηγῶν τῆς στωικῆς φιλοσοφίας ὁ Ἡράκλειτος ἐπισκιάσθηκε περίεργα καὶ ἄδικα. Στὶς πρόσφατες ἐργασίες τῶν Solmsen, Rist, Sandbach καὶ Graeser ἡ σημασία τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου γιὰ τὴν Ἀρχαία Στοὰ ἀγνοήθηκε σχεδὸν τελείως. Ἡ διαπίστωση ὅμως ὅτι οἱ ἀρχαῖοι Στωικοί, παράλληλα μὲ τὴν ἐπήρεια τοῦ Πλάτωνος, τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ ἄλλων, ὑπέστησαν ἰσχυρὴ τὴν ἐπίδραση τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου μπορεῖ νὰ ἀνταποκρίνεται περισσότερο στὴν ἀλήθεια.

Ἕνας ἄλλος προσανατολισμὸς τῆς σύγχρονης ἔρευνας ἐπηρέασε ἐπίσης τὴν ἐκτίμηση τῆς σχέσης τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου καὶ τῆς Στοᾶς. Στὴν ἐπιδίωξή τους νὰ ἀποκαταστήσουν τὴ φιλοσοφία τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου τόνισαν οἱ ἐρευνητὲς τὴν ἀνάγκη νὰ γίνη διάκριση τῆς στωικῆς ἐρμηνείας καὶ παρερμηνείας τῶν ἀπόψεών του, ἀπ' ὅτι ὁ ἴδιος ὁ Ἡράκλειτος εἶχε πραγματικὰ στὸ νοῦ του. Ἦταν ὅμως ἡ στωικὴ ἐρμηνεία στὸ σύνολό της προκατειλημμένη καὶ ἀναχρονιστικὴ ; Ἄν πραγματικὰ πλανήθηκαν σχετικὰ μὲ τὴν «ἐκπύρωση» — ὅπως ἐξ ἄλλου καὶ ὁ Θεόφραστος — δὲν προκύπτει ὅτι παρερμήνευσαν τὸν Ἡράκλειτο συστηματικά. Ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόβλημα πὼς οἱ ἐπὶ μέρους Στωικοὶ καὶ ἰδιαίτερα ὁ Κλεάνθης μελέτησαν τὸν Ἡράκλειτο δὲν ἔχει ἀκόμη ἐρευνηθῇ ἀμερόληπτα καὶ σὲ βάθος. Ἐχει θεωρηθῇ ὡς δεδομένο περισσότερο, χωρὶς καὶ νὰ ἔχη ἀποδειχθῇ, ὅτι οἱ Στωικοὶ χρησιμοποίησαν ἀπλῶς τὸν Ἡράκλειτο ἀβασάνιστα γιὰ νὰ στηρίξουν τὸ δικό τους φιλοσοφικὸ σύστημα κι ἀκόμη ὅτι ἡ στάση τῶν Στωικῶν ἀπέναντι στὸν Ἐφέσιο φιλόσοφο βασιζόταν περισσότερο στὴ λανθασμένη ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Θεοφράστου. Μιὰ σύγκριση ὅμως τῶν σχετικῶν κειμένων δὲν ἐνισχύει αὐτὴ τὴν ἄποψη. Καὶ πρὶν ἀπὸ τὸν Θεόφραστο εἶχε



γράψει ὁ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικός τέσσερα βιβλία «ἐξηγήσεων» τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου. Δὲν ὑπάρχει λοιπὸν λόγος νὰ δεχθοῦμε ὅτι ἡ παρόμοια μελέτη τοῦ Κλεάνθη βρισκόταν σὲ ἀμεσώτερη ἐξάρτηση ἀπὸ τὸν Θεόφραστο παρὰ ἀπὸ κάποια παραλλαγή τοῦ ἴδιου τοῦ «βιβλίου» τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου. Πραγματικὰ διάφορες ἐκθέσεις τῆς στωικῆς κοσμογονίας εἶναι πιὸ κοντὰ στὴ γλῶσσα τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου παρὰ οἱ συνόψεις τῶν ἀπόψεων του, ποὺ προέρχονται ἀπὸ τὸν Θεόφραστο.

Ἀλλὰ γιατί ἐδειξαν τόσο μεγάλο ἐνδιαφέρον γιὰ τὸν Ἡράκλειτο οἱ Στωικοί ; Στὸ ἐρώτημα αὐτὸ μπορεῖ σχηματικὰ νὰ δοθῇ ἡ ἀκόλουθη ἀπάντηση. Στὸν Ἡράκλειτο μπορούσαν νὰ βροῦν ἓνα ἐννοιολογικὸ πλαίσιο γιὰ τὴν κατανόηση τοῦ κόσμου πολὺ πιὸ συγγενικὸ μὲ τὶς δικές τους θέσεις ἀπ' ὅ,τι τὸ πλατωνικὸ καὶ τὸ ἀριστοτελικό : ἐνότητα μέσα στὴ φαινομενικὴ ἀνομοιότητα, ἐνότητα στὴ μεταβολή, ἓνα λόγος ρυθμιστὴ ποὺ εἶναι ἐπίσης «πῦρ» καὶ εἶναι κοινὸς καὶ στοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ στὸ σύμπαν, καὶ παραινέσεις στοὺς ἀνθρώπους ν' ἀκολουθοῦν τὴ σοφὴ αὐτὴ κατευθυντήρια δύναμη. Οἱ Στωικοί ἦταν στὸ βάθος μονιστὲς καὶ ἀπέρριπταν ὅσες πλατωνικὲς καὶ ἀριστοτελικὲς ἐννοιες ἔβρισκαν ἀσυμβίβαστες μὲ τὸ «σωματικὸ» καὶ «ζωτικοκρατικὸ» μονισμό τους.

Ἡ προσεκτικὴ ὥστόσο μελέτη τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου ἀπὸ τοὺς Στωικοὺς καὶ ἡ θετικὴ χρῆση τῶν δογμάτων του ἀποδεικνύεται πειστικώτατα ἀπὸ τὸν *Ὑμνον εἰς Δία* τοῦ Κλεάνθη. Τὸ ἔργο αὐτὸ ἀποκαλύπτει τὴν βαθειὰ κατανόηση ἀπὸ ἓνα στωικὸ φιλόσοφο τοῦ ἀμαλγάματος τῆς φυσικῆς καὶ τῆς ἠθικῆς τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου, ποὺ ἀνάλογή της δὲν βρίσκομε στὸν Πλάτωνα, τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη καὶ τὸν Θεόφραστο. Ἀπὸ τὴν ἄποψη αὐτὴ μπορούμε νὰ συγκρίνωμε τὸν «Ὑμνο» τοῦ Κλεάνθη μὲ νεώτερες ἐπιστημονικὲς προσεγγίσεις τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου. Ἦταν λοιπὸν ὁ Κλεάνθης καὶ ὄχι ὁ Ζήνων — ὅσο τουλάχιστον οἱ μαρτυρίες μᾶς ἐπιτρέπουν νὰ συμπεράνωμε — ἡ μορφή ποὺ συνέδεσε τὸν Ἡράκλειτο μὲ τὸν Στωικισμό. Μπορούμε μάλιστα νὰ ὑποθέσωμε ὅτι ὁ Κλεάνθης προσπάθησε νὰ ἀναπτύξῃ καὶ νὰ στηρίξῃ φιλοσοφικὰ τὰ φυσικὰ δόγματα τοῦ Ζήνωνος γενικὰ στὴ σύγκρουσή τους μὲ τὸν Ἀκαδημαϊκὸ Σκεπτικισμό καὶ ὅτι μιὰ ἀπὸ τὶς μεθόδους ποὺ χρησιμοποίησε γιὰ τὸν σκοπὸ αὐτὸ ἦταν ἡ ἀναζήτηση παραλλήλων ἀπόψεων στοὺς προγενέστερους στοχαστές. Μερικὲς φορὲς βέβαια, ὅπως π.χ. συμβαίνει μὲ τὴν ψυχολογία, παρερμήνευσε πιθανῶς τὸν Ἡράκλειτο. Ἀλλοτε — κι οἱ περιπτώσεις αὐτὲς κυρίως μᾶς ἐνδιαφέρουν — ἀνέπτυξε θέσεις, ποὺ μαρτυροῦν στενὸ δεσμὸ μὲ τὸν Ἡράκλειτο. Κάποτε παραθέτει καὶ τὰ ἴδια τὰ κείμενά του, ποὺ προλαμβάνουν καθαρὰ μερικὰ στωικὰ δόγματα. Τέτοια δείγματα στενῆς σχέσης μὲ τὸν Ἡράκλειτο ἀποτελοῦν ὁ *Ὑμνος εἰς Δία* καὶ ἡ ἐκθεση τῆς κοσμολογίας τοῦ Κλεάνθη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀρειο Δίδυμο.

Τὸ τελικὸ ἀποτέλεσμα μᾶς δίνει ἓνα γοητευτικὸ παράδειγμα ἐποικοδομητικῆς χρήσης τῶν ἀπόψεων ἐνὸς φιλοσόφου ἀπὸ ἓνα νεώτερό του. Εἶναι δύσκολο νὰ ἀποφανθοῦμε, ἂν οἱ κατευθυντήριες γραμμὲς τῆς στωικῆς φιλοσοφίας εἶχαν τεθῇ πρὶν ὁ Ἡράκλειτος ἐπηρεάσει τὸ σύστημά της. Ἀλλ' ἂν καὶ ἡ σκέψη τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου ὑπῆρξε μία ἀπὸ τὶς πολλὰς διαπλαστικὰς ἐπιρροάς, εἶχε πάντως πρωταρχικὴ σημασία. Ὁ Χρύσιππος μὲ τὸ ἰδιαίτερο ἐνδιαφέρον του γιὰ τὴ Λογικὴ καὶ τὶς λεπτομέρειες τῆς Ἠθικῆς ἀπηχεῖ τὸν Ἡράκλειτο πολὺ λιγώτερο ἀπ' ὅ,τι ὁ Κλεάνθης. Ἀλλὰ ἡ συνέχεια τῆς ἡρακλειτικῆς ἐπίδρασης στὴ Στοὰ ἀποδεικνύεται ἀδιάκοπη στὸν Μάρκο Αὐρήλιο.

(Μετάφραση Μ. Δραγώνα - Μονάχου)