

THE IMAGERY OF *LAMPADEDROMIA* IN HERACLITUS

This article is a continuation of, and a supplement to the study of Heraclitus' agonistic imagery published previously in *Phronesis*¹. In that study I have dealt mainly with the Stadion model of the cosmos; the imagery of *lampededromia* has been touched only *obiter* and without definite results². The chief purpose of the present contribution is to attempt a fresh interpretation of Heraclitus' fr. 56 ab / B 84 ab (and —on a broader scale— of the whole complex of Heraclitean quotations in Plotinus IV 8 / 6 / 1) and to explain the mysterious σκάφαι of the heavenly bodies in the light of the agonistic metaphorical code. Both the Stadion and the Lampas models of the cosmos in Heraclitus have much in common; therefore in some cases the distinction between them cannot easily be drawn (cf. Appendix I below). It is a strong conviction of the present writer, however, that Heraclitus had a *plurality* of cosmological models which he expressed by means of different metaphorical codes derived from various human τέχναι³. Consequently

1. «The Cosmos as Stadion. Agonistic metaphors in Heraclitus' cosmology», in: *Phronesis*, 1985, p. 131-150. The double numbering of Heraclitus' fragments corresponds to the editions of M. MARCOVICH, *Eraclito, Frammenti*, Firenze, 1978 and DIELS-KRANZ *VS*, respectively.

2. *The Cosmos as Stadion*, Excursus 2: «The Torch of Life», p. 145.

3. Independent imitations in PS.-HIPPOCR., *De victu*, ch. 12-24 and PS.-ARISTOT., *De mundo*, ch. 5, 396 b 7-25 = HERACL., fr. 25/B 10. Technological metaphors relating to metallurgy and metal-work («The Cosmos as Smelting-furnace» model) have been discussed in my paper «Ψῆγμα συμφυσώμενον. A new fragment of Heraclitus» in: *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, Moscow, 1979 Nr. 2, p. 3-23; 1980 Nr. p. 29-48. That Heraclitus' «cosmology» was through and through metaphorical and interspersed with analogies from human society, is confirmed by the grammarian DIODOTUS (ap. *DL IX 15*) «ὅς οὖν φησι περὶ φύσεως εἶναι τὸ σύγγραμμα, ἀλλὰ περὶ πολιτείας, τὰ δὲ περὶ φύσεως ἐν παραδείγματος εἶδει κείσθαι». This does not mean that Heraclitus' book was only a political allegory, as A. CAPIZZI, *Eraclito e la sua leggenda*, Roma, 1979, claims (though it had a political message as well). Its scope was to demonstrate an exact parallelism between the behaviour of men (exemplified by numerous τέχναι) and nature, between macro- and microcosmos, —«the same order of behaviour for all beings» «τρόπου κόσμον ἓνα τῶν ξυμπάντων» as another ancient reader put it— by discovering everywhere the same basic scheme, i.e. the interplay of opposites in an incessant process («flux», «run») of oscillation between maximum and minimum imposed by the Mediator (epistates etc.). The anecdote about Socrates the reader of Heraclitus (*DL II, 22; IX, 11*) may reflect a historical link between Heraclitus' metaphorical τέχναι and the favourite analogies with various crafts in the socratic discourses.



there is no contradiction in the assumption of two distinct agonistic models; Heraclitus may well have had even more⁴. Any attempt to conflate the Cosmostadion and the Lampas into a single model would be futile since the term τέρματα (fr. 62 / B 120) and «the way up and down» (fr. 33 / B 60) are proper to the stadium race, whereas the fr. 56 b / 84 b and the διαδοχή of the secondary sources almost certainly refer to the relay race. And again, the role played by the Sun in the two models is apparently different: the Sun as Umpire (σκοπός, βραβεύει fr. 64 / B 100) of the Cosmostadion has nothing to do with the Sun as Torch in the cosmic *lampadedromia*.

In his essay «on the descend of the soul into bodies» («περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ σώματα καθόδου τῆς ψυχῆς») Plotinus, quite surprisingly, quotes a series of Heraclitean fragments which, *prima facie*, seem to bear no relation either to one another (except the fr. 56 ab commonly, though not always, regarded as a unity) or to the subject of Plotinus' essay: *Enn.* IV 8 / 6 / 1, 11 sq. *Henry-Schwyzzer* «ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἡράκλειτος, ὃς ἡμῖν παρακελεύεται ζητεῖν τοῦτο, (1) ἀμοιβὰς τε ἀναγκαίᾳς τιθέμενος ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων, (2) ὁδὸν τε ἄνω κάτω εἰπὼν (=fr. 33 / B 60) καὶ (3) μεταβάλλον ἀναπαύεται (=fr. 56 a / 84 a) καὶ (4) κάματός ἐστι τοῖς αὐτοῖς μοχθεῖν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι (=fr. 56 b / B 84 b) εἰκάζειν ἔδωκεν ἀμελήσας σαφῇ ἡμῖν ποιῆσαι τὸν λόγον» κτλ. A close examination of the metaphorical language displayed by these four quotations will elucidate the semantical links existing between them and at once will make clear Plotinus' motives in connecting them with μετεμψύχωσις⁵. There is no need to reproduce here the doxography of modern opinions concerning the controversial fr. 56 ab / 84 ab⁶. In our first hermeneutical approach to the fragment let us start from the premiss that 56 ab belongs to the context of fr. 99 / B 20 «γενόμενοι ζῶειν ἐθέλουσι μόρους τ' ἔχειν [μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναπαύεσθαι] καὶ παῖδας καταλείπουσι μόρους γενέσθαι», i.e. relates to the succession of generations. A possible connection between the two fragments is indicated by Clement's explanatory interpolation «μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναπαύεσθαι» which may have been based on something Heraclitus said in

4. The agonistic chapter of *De victu* (I, 24) is unfortunately highly inconcrete («ἀγωνίη, παιδοτριβίη τοιόνδε»). Among other athletic contests wrestling seems to suit Heraclitus' purposes at best.

5. On Plotinus' interpretation of Heraclitus see ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ Ν. ΡΟΥΣΣΟΣ, *Ὁ Ἡράκλειτος στὶς Ἑννεάδες τοῦ Πλωτίνου*, Ἀθήνα, 1968; W. BURKERT, «Plotin, Plutarch und die Platonisierende Interpretation von Heraklit und Empedocles», in: *Kephalaion*, Assen, 1975, pp. 137-146.

6. G. S. KIRK, *Heraclitus, The Cosmic Fragments*, Cambr., 1970, pp. 250-254; MARCOVICH, *Eraclito*, pp. 213-214; E. ROUSSOS, op. cit., p. 17 sq.; CH. KAHN, *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*, Cambr., 1981, p. 169 sq.; drastic conjectures in: D. HOLWERDA, *Sprünge in die Tiefen Heraklits*, Groningen, 1978, pp. 21-23 etc.



the context, i.e., most probably, on 56 a / B 84 a⁷. It should be noted by the way that «ἐθέλουσι μόρους τ' ἔχειν» does not mean «they want to die», as the current translation has it, (for this is a plain absurdity) but «they are predisposed to death», «they tend (soon) to die» (against their own will!), for this is the meaning of the Greek idiom paralleled in Aristotle, *Hist. anim.* 575 a 28 «ἐκδόλιμόν ἐστι καὶ οὐ θέλει ζῆν» (of premature births)⁸.

One can find a clue to the agonistic interpretation of fr. 56 / B 84 in the verb μοχθεῖν, since μόχθος belongs to the semantical field of ἄθλον, ἄθλος and is often interchangeable with the latter: Hesiod., *Scut.* 305 «ἀμφὶ δ' ἀέθλω δῆριν ἔχον καὶ μόχθον» (sc. ἵππηες); Pind., *Ol.* VIII 7 «μόχθων ἀμπνοᾶ» (i.e. ἀνάπαυλα) etc. The ἄθλοι of Heracles, the patron of Greek athletics, are called μόχθοι as well (Soph., *Tr.* 1101 etc.); having done with labours he becomes ἀναπαυόμενος (cf. Baumeister, *Denkmäler des Klass. Altertums*, I, 672). The very ideal of Greek agonistic culture, the ἀρετή, is πολύμοχθος (Arist., *Carm.* fr. 4, 1 Ross). This being the metaphorical connotation of μοχθεῖν, ἄρχεσθαι can only mean «to begin»⁹ or «to start» (e.g. a new run) as opposed to τελευτᾶν which involves ἀνάπαυσιν. Hence we must take the dative τοῖς αὐτοῖς neither as a reference to mysterious «masters» (so the hermeneutical *vulgata* which depends on the Neoplatonic interpretation of ἄρχεσθαι as *servire*), nor as in πόνῳ μοχθεῖν (so e.g., Bollack-Wismann, Kahn, Holwerda), but as a *dativus incommodi* construed with ἐστὶ (not with μοχθεῖν) and referring to «mortals» metaphorically conceived as «athletes» in the *agon* of life. This makes the syntax of 56 b / B 84 b sound and —with minimal emendations of Plotinus' text (or even without them)— the connection between 56 b and 56 a perceptible:

«κάματός ἐστι τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι (sc. θνητοῖς) μοχθέειν (sc. ἀμφὶ ἄθλω sive ἀγῶνα) καὶ ἄρχεσθαι (sc. δρόμου ζωῆς)· <ἄλλος δὲ ἄλλου> μεταβάλλον ἀναπαύεται».

«It is weariness for the same (mortals or athletes) to labour (for prize in *agon*) and to start (a new race of life); so they change one another and take a rest (sc. having transmitted the torch of life to the next generation)».

The text sounds as a direct continuation of fr. 99 / B 20 («Once born for life they are liable to death, and they leave behind children in order that new death come into being») even without Clement's parenthesis μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναπαύεσθαι which we took before hand as a reminiscence of fr. 99 / B 20. The Heraclitizing context of Lucretius' simile *et quasi cursores vitae lampada*

7. On the controversy see MARCOVICH, *Eraclito*, pp. 359-360.

8. Cf. *LSJ*, s.v. ἐθέλω II, 2 and fr. 84 / B 32. I construe ζῶειν with γενόμενοι to make the antithesis more clear-cut: «born for life» — «liable to death».

9. So KAHN, *The Art and thought of Heraclitus*, Cambridge 1981, 170.



tradunt (II, 79, cf. *fluere omnia* v. 69) explains itself now¹⁰. Μεταβάλλων refers to διαδοχή of runners in a relay race¹¹; as construed above with *gen.* it means properly «comes in exchange for» or «instead of»: *LSJ*, q.v. III, citing Eurip., *Troad.* 1118 «καιναὶ καινῶν μεταβάλλουσαι... συντυχίαι». My additions are *exempli gratia*: one might suppose «ἄλλος ἐξ ἄλλου»¹² as well: Aesch., *Ag.* 324 «τοιοῖδε μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι», Plato, *Legg.* 776 b 2 «ἄλλοις ἐξ ἄλλων» or else — taking the *partic.* as absolute — «μεταβάλλων <δέ τις> ἀναπαύεται» «everybody, in turn, takes a rest»¹³. In his *RE*-article on *lampadedromia* Jüthner, quite unaware of the fact, gives a suitable comment on the meaning of κάματος in 56b: «So löst den *ermüdeten* Läufer immer ein frischer ab: *Auct. ad Herenn.* IV 46 defatigatus cursor integro facem... tradit»¹⁴. The fragment displays an exquisite ambiguity: the words are chosen so as to cover both the run / rest and life / death oppositions. For the latter cf. the «ὦδε ἀναπαύεται formula of epitaphs and the instances collected in *LSJ*, s.v. ἀναπαύω II, 2 c (of dead); Peck, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, Nr. 274, 1 «καμάτων ἀνάπαυμα», v. 5 «πόνων μόχθων τε πέπαιται». As a metaphorical model the Stadion with its recurrent *dolichodromia* is more suitable for the eternal cosmic cycle; the relay race with its *short* distances between stations¹⁵ provides an equally apt symbolical language for the ἐφήμερος motif¹⁶. In this way *lampas* as a symbol of *short* life is contrasted with the *dolichos* of the old age in a Greek epitaph Nr. 157 Peck (Chios, 2nd c. B.C.; a young dead of 17 years old speaks) v. 3-4. 8:

«λαμπάδα γὰρ ζωᾶς με δραμεῖν μόνον ἤθελε δαίμων,
τὸν δὲ μακρὸν γήρως οὐκ ἐτίθει δόλιχον...
τέρμα γὰρ εἰς με βίου Μοῖρ' ἐπέκρανε τόδε».

10. The evidence of Lucretius on Heraclitus is discussed by W. RÖSLER, «Lukrez und die Vorsokratiker», *Hermes*, Bd. 101 (1973), pp. 48-57; UBALDO PISANI, «Valore documentario della testimonianza Lucreziana su Eraclito», *Atti del Symposium Heracliteum* 1981, Roma, 1983, p. 459-475.

11. On «διαδοχή» see JÜTHNER, *RE*, XII/1, s.v. *Lampadedromia*, col. 575, 5. sq. with references. Cf. Idem, *Die athletischen Leibes-übungen der Griechen*, Bd. II/1, Wien, 1968, S. 144-145. *LSJ* omits agonistic usage.

12. Or «ἕτερος ἑτέρου», cf. the opposotion «τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι / ἕτερα» in fr. 40 / B 12.

13. Instances of absolute usage (usually part. aor., but also part. praes. PLATO, *Thaet.* 166d) are collected in *LSJ*, q. v., A III, 2. KIRK, *Heraclitus. The Cosmic Fragments*, 252, suggests a τι subunderstood.

14. *RE*, XII / 1, col. 575, 47 (italics added).

15. c. 100 m according to O. GOTTWALD ap. W. RUDOLPH, «Antike Sportgeräte», *Klio*, Bd. 48 (1967), S. 86.

16. H. FRÄNKEL, «Ἐφήμερος als Kennwort für die menschliche Natur», in: *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, München, 1968, S. 23-39.



It is not clear whether Heraclitus deliberately contrasted the quasi-circular paths of the immortal Cosmostadion with the straight and interrupted paths of the human *lampas* in a way Alcmaeo, presumably, did by opposing the infinite *dolichos* of the immortals to the finite *stadiodromia* of the mortals (cf. Appendix 2 below). Something of the kind is indicated in Placit. I. 23, 7 (Plut.) = 22 A 6 DK. «Ἡ ἡρεμίαν μὲν καὶ στάσιν ἐκ τῶν ὅλων ἀνήρει· ἔστι γὰρ τοῦτο τῶν νεκρῶν· κίνησιν δὲ πᾶσιν ἀπεδίδου, αἰδίων μὲν τοῖς αἰδίοις, φθαρτὴν δὲ τοῖς φθαρτοῖς». It is a common practice to relate this *placitum* to the theory of Flux and, consequently, to dismiss it as a worthless paraphrase of the river fragment (so Diels-Kranz, Marcovich, *Eraclito* p. 146 *alii*). But there is not a word about «flux» in this text and, on the other hand, it has been demonstrated that the compiler of *Placita* possessed a certain knowledge of Heraclitus' racing imagery¹⁷. Replace doxographer's κίνησιν with ροὴν and you will have a meaningless opposition between an eternal and a transitory river. But replace it with δρόμον and you will get a sensible contrast between an endless and interrupted run. What is more, «rest» as a property of «dead» is precisely what fr. 56 / B 84 states¹⁸. Aristotle will teach us how to translate racing metaphors into abstract Peripatetic terms for motion. In the discussion of the continuous (συνεχῆς) and the conterminous (ἐχομένη, τῷ ἐφεξῆς), i.e. broken, motion (κίνησις) Aristotle adduces the relay race as an instance of the latter: *Phys.* V 4. 228 a 28 «καὶ οἷον ἡ λαμπὰς ἐκ διαδοχῆς φορὰ ἐχομένη, συνεχῆς δ' οὐ· «κεῖται γὰρ τὸ συνεχὲς ὧν τὰ ἔσχατα ἓν» (cf. δραμῶν a 28). Themist., *ad loc.*: «οὐ γὰρ γίνεται ἓν τὸ ἔσχατον τῶν δρόμων, ἀλλ' ἐκάστου τῶν τρεχόντων οἰκεῖον τι τοῦ δρόμου πέρας ἔστιν». It is the circular motion which is συνεχῆς and hence αἰδῖος, because its extremities «are one», whereas any rectilinear or semicircular motion implies στάσις and hence is φθαρτή: cf. *Phys.* VIII 8. 264 b 24 «ὥστ' οὐδ' ἐν ἡμικυκλίῳ οὐδ' ἐν ἄλλῃ περιφερεία οὐδεμιᾷ ἐνδέχεται συνεχῶς κινεῖσθαι· πολλάκις γὰρ ἀνάγκη ταῦτα κινεῖσθαι καὶ τὰς ἐναντίας μεταβάλλειν μεταβολάς (NB)· οὐ γὰρ συνάπτει

17. *The Cosmos as Stadion*, p. 135; on the confusion of «flux» and «running» see *ibid.*, Excursus 1. It should be added that the «οὐχ ἑστάναι» formula (HIPPOL., *Ref.* I, 4, 2; Max. Tyr. I, 2 g = test. 33 d⁴ Mch; cf. also «ἐμπεδον οὐδὲν» LUCIAN., *Vit. auct.* 14; test. 40 c⁹ Mch; DK I, 171, note 9) suits sometimes better to «πάντα θεῖ» than to «πάντα ρεῖ». Hippolytus' text (*loc. cit.*) is corrupt: «ἐμφέρεσθαι τε πάντα ἀλλήλοις καὶ οὐχ ἑστάναι». Roëper' «συμφέρεσθαι» (accepted by DIELS, *Dox. Gr.*, p. 559 and MARCOVICH, *Eraclito*, p. 146) cannot be accepted: what we expect is not fr. 27 / B 51, but a «πάντα ρεῖ» or «πάντα θεῖ» thesis of which «οὐχ ἑστάναι» is a negative counterpart. Ἀλλήλοις, however, precludes «flux». The correct reading seems to be «ἀντιφέρεσθαι ἀλλήλοις» «run in opposite directions» which, in turn, may be Hippolytus' substitute for a more concrete expression like «ἐναντιοδρομεῖν ἀλλήλοις».

18. Consequently, the text of *Placita* must be added to the *testimonia* of fr. 56 / B 84.

τῇ ἀρχῇ τὸ πέρας· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κύκλου συνάπτει, καὶ ἔστι μόνῃ τέλειος». 265 a 25 «τὴν μὲν οὖν κύκλῳ ἐνδέχεται αἰδίων εἶναι, τῶν δ' ἄλλων... οὐδεμίαν· στάσιν γὰρ δεῖ γενέσθαι, εἰ δὲ στάσις, ἔφθαρται ἢ κίνησις», a 21 «μὴ ἀνακάμπτουσα... φθαρτή». M. Timpanaro Cardini¹⁹ regards the words οὐ γὰρ συνάπτει... as a quotation of Alcmaeo's fr. B 2 DK. That may be so; Aristotle, however, certainly has Heraclitus in mind in the above passage as well, for he resumes: 265 a 2 «δῆλον οὖν ἐκ τούτων ὅτι οὐδ' οἱ φυσιολόγοι καλῶς λέγουσι οἱ τὰ πάντα τὰ αἰσθητὰ κινεῖσθαι φάσκοντες αἰεὶ... ρεῖν γὰρ φασιν αἰεὶ καὶ φθίνειν» κτλ.²⁰ The motion to and fro, according to Aristotle, cannot be regarded as continuous, endless and eternal since it is interrupted by στάσις at the ἔσχατα. As is often the case in Aristotle, behind the abstract terminology a concrete image from the common experience is hidden, this time — the scenery of the Greek stadium (on the «up and down» running in *diaulos* and *dolichos* see Appendix 1). Note that the phrase «τὰς ἐναντίας μεταβάλλειν μεταβολὰς» echoes the «ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω» and «μεταβάλλον ἀναπαύεται» at once.

There is no need to read the *lampadedromia* into fr. 48 / B 26 taking, e.g., «ζῶν δὲ ἄπτεται (sc. φάος) τεθνεῶτος» as «the alive kindles his torch from the dead», i.e. διαδέχεται the dead in the sequence of existence, just as «the awake kindles his torch from the sleeping». This interpretation will not resolve all the textual problems of the fragment, and —what seems to be the main obstacle— one should kindle his torch *from another*, not from himself as the awake does. At best we have a «resonance» (to use Ch. Kahn's term) between 48 / B 26 and 56 / B 84; *lampas* was usually held «ἐν εὐφρόνῃ», and the «ἄπτεσθαι/ἀποσβέννυσθαι» phraseology occurs frequently in the descriptions of the event: *Schol. Plat. Phaedr.* 231 e «ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ ἀψάμενοι οἱ ἔφηβοι τὰς λαμπάδας ἔθεον» κτλ. *Paus.* I, 30, 2 ἀποσβεσθείσης (sc. λαμπάδος) etc. In both fragments life is light, death is night; in 56 / B 84 the opposition life/death besides that is metaphorized as run/rest.

We have related the Stadion to the cosmos and the Lampas to the succession of human generations following the evidence of the extant fragments. This evidence, however, may be incomplete. It must be conceded that judged by itself the image of *lampadedromia* can be interpreted as a wide-range symbolical model of being with cosmological relevance as well as anthropological. The Universe of Heraclitus is through and through animistic; his «elements» are living beings sharing in «life» and «death» with

19. PITAGORICI, *Testimonianze e frammenti*, fasc. I, Firenze, 1969, p. 150.

20. Cf. H. CHERNISS, *Aristotle's criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, N.-Y., 1971, p. 162, n. 80.

men. Modern distinctions between «animate and inanimate», «cosmic and anthropocentric» are quite irrelevant to this type of *Weltanschauung*: anything can be transformed into anything else thanks to the «common» divine substrate bearing the name of πῦρ αείζων: even the dividing line between «mortals and immortals» is explicitly and outright denied (fr. 47 / B 76). If the neutrum μεταβάλλον in Plotinus is genuine, it might point to a more wide scope of the simile (but this is uncertain). In a sense, *Lampas* is a short encyclopaedia of Heraclitus' philosophy, for it unites in a single image: 1) the πάντα θεῖ thesis²¹; 2) the opposites (*agon*); 3) the fire (torch) and 4) the law of amoebaeal alternations (διαδοχή) (in the Stadion model «fire» is present on the referential level only, not on the metaphorical). It would be rather wasteful even for Heraclitus to profit by such a luxurious trouvaille only once.

What is a finish for one runner, is a start for another; the death of an x is the birth of an y: this *Denkform* reminds us immediately of fr. 66 / B 36 «ψυχῇσι θάνατος ὕδωρ γενέσθαι, ὕδατι δὲ θάνατος γῆν γενέσθαι, ἐκ γῆς δὲ ὕδωρ γίνεται, ἐξ ὕδατος δὲ ψυχὴ». In secondary sources it is in fact connected with the notion of διαδοχή, and, as Jüthner remarks, «Das Übergeben und Übernehmen (διαδοχή) der Fackel ist das charakteristische Merkmal (sc. of torch race) und wird daher öfters hervorgehoben»²². The fragment as it stands, displays no agonistic (or any other) metaphors; but we do not know its original context, whereas ancient readers knew it, and so there is at least a certain possibility that they have read the διαδοχή out of, not into this passage of Heraclitus' book. Suppose for example, the above quoted fragment was followed by something like «τὸ οἱ δρομῆς ποιοῦσι· ὁ μὲν ἄρχεται, ὁ δὲ τελευτᾷ» or by «κάματός ἐστι τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι μοχθεῖν» κτλ. (on the juxtaposition of fr. 66 / B 76 and 56 a / B 84 a in Max. Tyr. see below). It has been argued²³ *in extenso* that ψυχὴ in fr. 66-67 (B 36, B 45 DK) is an archaic word for «air» comparable with *anima* in old Latin (cf. Hesych. «ψυχὴ· πνεῦμα» and «ψυχὰς· πνεύματα»; ψυχῇσι in fr. 66 / B 36 is *pluralis poëticus* correctly understood by Philo, *De aetern. Mundi* 111). Thus we have in fr. 66 / B 36 a «κύκλος γενέσεως» of the three elements: air, water and earth. The absence of fire is an aenigma, perhaps a deliberate aenigma offered by the Ephesian himself. The notion of διαδοχή will resolve the riddle in a most simple way. Fire is excluded from the cycle of births and

21. Curiously enough, the words «πάντα θεῖ» are attested in the Greek proverb «πάντα θεῖ κάλαύνεται» (PHOT., *Lex.*), though in a different sense («ἐπὶ τῶν εὐπόρων»).

22. *RE*, XII/1, col. 575, 5.

23. «Ψυχῆς πειρατά», in: *Structura texta*, Moscow, 1980, p. 118-147.



deaths because it is that immortal substance of which the three mortal elements consist and which they transmit to one another (Übergeben) in death and receive (Übernehmen) in birth. In other words fire is the «torch» carried by the participants of the cosmic *lampadedromia*: air, water and earth. The participants of a relay race now run now stop (= now live now die). Every runner runs as long as he carries the torch and stops running as soon as the torch is transmitted to the next runner. On the referential level this means that a thing exists as long as it is in possession of fire, and dies as soon as fire is transmitted to another thing. But the torch itself is «running» always and so does fire (cf. «οὐδέποτε ἀτρεμίζον» *De victu* I, 10); therefore it is ἀείζων. This is, at any rate, one of the ancient interpretations of fr. 66 / B 36 since it is in quoting this fragment that Philo (test. 66 b Mch) makes use of several metaphors from racing including «ἀλλήλας ἀντιπαραδεχόμεναι» i.e. διαδεχόμεναι (of seasons as compared with the elements). The term διαδοχή twice occurs in Maximus Tyrius (41, 4 i = test. 33 d⁴ Mch) in a passage which combines fr. 66 / B 76 with the «way up and down» and «the immortals are mortals» (47 / B 62) fragments: «διαδοχή τῶν μελλόντων» (opposed to «ἡ τῶν ἀπιόντων ὁδός», i.e. «the way up») and «διαδοχὴν ὁρᾶς βίου καὶ μεταβολὴν σωμάτων». The word μεταβολή should be taken as in μεταβολή ἱματίων: the «change of bodies» (not alteration), i.e. life is transmitted from one body to another as a torch in a relay race. Note that the first «μεταβολή σωμάτων» is quoted as a Heraclitean saying together with «ἀλλαγὴν ὁδῶν ἄνω κάτω»; hence it may represent a reminiscence of μεταβάλλον fr. 56 a / B 84 a.

Another instance of διαδοχή occurs in test. 56 a³ Mch (Aeneas of Gaza) «διαδοχὴν ἀναγκαίαν τιθέμενος» which is a quotation from Plotinus with διαδοχὴν instead of ἀμοιβάς. To appreciate this rendering one has to explain the meaning of ἀμοιβαί in Plotinus. It is not necessary to take Plotinus' «ἀμοιβαί ἀναγκαῖαι ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων» as a reminiscence of fr. 54 / B 90²⁴. The law of amoebaeal alternations in time, or the law of pendulum, is one of the fundamentals in Heraclitus' philosophy, and he may have used different (verbal as well as nominal) derivatives from the same root in several passages of his book. For instance, the participle ἀμειβόμενα (ἀμείβοντα) is attested by three independant writers²⁵, thrice in connection with «ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω» i.e. in agonistic contexts. Its meaning is «alternating», «in turns»; it is

24. *Contra* HENRY-SCHWUZER in the OCT-edition, ad loc., but cf. ed. major; MARCOVICH, *Eraclito*, p. 206; E. ROUSSOS, op. cit., p. 31. Cilento (ap. Henry-Schwyzzer) attributed the phrase to Heraclitus.

25. *De victu*, I, 5 = DK I, 182, 13; LUCIAN., *Vit. auct.*, 14 = DK I, 190, 21, PHILO, *De aetern. mundi*, 109 = test. 66 b Mch.

semantically connected with, and yet not reducible to ἀνταμοιβή of fr. 54 / B 90 which is a metaphor from the lend/borrow code. And here is the order of quotations in Plotinus IV 8 / 6 / 1, 12 H.-S. (a) «ἀμοιβάς τε ἀναγκαίως τιθέμενος ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων» (b) «ὁδόν τε ἄνω κάτω εἰπὼν καὶ» (c) «μεταβάλλον ἀναπαύεται» κτλ. As E. Roussos has pointed out²⁶, Plotinus' «ἀμοιβαὶ ἀναγκαῖαι ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων» must be understood in the light of «ἀμοιβαὶ βίων» *Enn.* II 9 / 33 / 9, 24 H.-S. (an unusual phrase for metempsychosis). Thus Aeneas' rendering of ἀμοιβαὶ as διαδοχή becomes intelligible: metempsychosis means «the change of bodies», and «the transmission of the soul» may be modelled on *lampadedromia* as easily as the ordinary succession of generations. It turns out that despite his complaints about Heraclitus' ἀσάφεια Plotinus had an insight into Ephesian's metaphorical language: all quotations (a, b, c) belong to the same, i.e. the agonistic metaphorical code.

The consensus of *De victu*, Lucianus, Philo and Plotinus makes it almost certain that the term ἀμοιβή or ἀμειδόμενα (or both) occurred in the agonistic contexts of Heraclitus' book as well, and that it should be distinguished from the economic metaphor ἀνταμοιβή of fr. 54 / B 90. Whether it was applied to the «alternation» of runners in the relay race or to the «change of paths» (i.e. the change from the ἄνω to the κάτω ὁδός) by the same runner (or to both) is not quite clear. The «change of paths» seems to suit best the context in *De victu*, Philo and Plotinus; «ἀμοιβαὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων» presumably means «changes to the contrary direction» (in a *diaulos* or *dolichos*) cf. the ἐναντιοδρομία Placit. I, 7, 22.

As βασιλεὺς Heraclitus may have been an ἐπιστάτης of «λαμπαδοῦχος ἄγων» at certain religious festivals himself; this was, at any rate, the peculiar duty of βασιλεὺς in Athens: Arist., *Ath. Pol.*, ch. 57, 1²⁷. And besides that, the torch was a sacral symbol of primary importance in the «τὰ ἱερὰ τῆς Ἐλευσινίας Δήμητρος» (22 A 2 DK) with which he had been charged before his «retirement»²⁸. At Didyma *lampas* was associated with Apollo, the divine teacher of Heraclitus; in the agonistic inscriptions are mentioned «λαμπὰς ἡ πρὸς βωμόν» and «λαμπὰς ἡ ἀπὸ βωμοῦ», a kind of «ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω». The

26. E. ROUSSOS, op. cit., p. 32.

27. Basileus awaiting the winner by the altar is a *topos* in vase painting: JÜTHNER, *Die athletischen Leibesübungen*, II / 1, S. 143-145 and Tafel 37 a, 40 a. Cf. PS.-HERACLIT., *Epist. IV* p. 315, l. 5 MONDOLFO-TARÁN «τῷ βωμῷ ὃ ἐφέστηκα» (Bernays, «οὐ ἐπέστησα» codd., «ὄν ἐπ.» Tarán).

28. ANTISTHENES RHODIUS ap. *DL IX* 6; MARCOVICH, *RE*, Suppl. X., s.v. HERAKLEITOS, col. 250.



ritual itself was pregnant with a philosophy of «πῦρ αείζων» its purpose being the replacement of old and impure fire by a new one lit on the altar of a fire god²⁹. It is this altar that was the goal of the relay race: «ἐν τούτοις γὰρ ἐκπύρῳσιν αἰνίττεται Ἡράκλειτος καὶ κάθαρσιν τῶν κακῶς δεδιωκότων» might have written an ancient commentator.

With regard to the cycle of the «ἄπτεσθαι / ἀποσθέννυσθαι» alternation the referential meaning of «altar» and «kindling a new fire» is apparently not so menacing. Following the above reconstruction it is natural to suppose that the everyday relay race of the three elements —air, water, and earth— results in kindling a new torch of the Sun from the Altar of Heavens (or a new altar fire with the torch of the swiftest element, *psyche*): «ἥλιος νέος ἐφ' ἡμέρη (fr. 58 / B 6), λαμπὰς ἢ πρὸς βωμόν» covering probably the time from midnight to midday and «λαμπὰς ἢ ἀπὸ βωμοῦ», i.e. the «παλίντροπος κέλευθος», that from midday to midnight; in this particular case the «way up and down» thus regains its proper meaning as well³⁰. In favour of this hypothesis speak: 1) «torch» as a current metaphor for Sun in Greek poets on the one hand³¹; 2) the celestial σκάφαι in the doxography of Diogenes Laërtius (the so called «Theophrastus») and *Placita* (fr. 61 Mch) on the other³². As expounded by the doxographers the theory of «bowls» looks as a

29. L. DEUBNER, *Attische Feste*, B., 1966, S. 211.

30. TH. WIEGEND, *Didyma*, I, B., 1941, p. 141 interprets the race «πρὸς βωμόν» and «ἀπὸ βωμοῦ» as two stages of a δίαυλος; other scholars regard them as separate events: L. MORETTI, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, Roma, 1953, p. 148; JÜTHNER, *Die athl. Leibesübungen*, II / 1, p. 143, n. 326. The controversy is not of crucial importance for us since the cosmic *lampadedromia* cannot represent a minute copy of the real event.

31. PARMENID. B. 10, 3 DK; SOPH., *Ant.* 879; THEODECT. 10 (*TGF*, p. 805 Nauck) «λαμπάδ' εἰλίσσων φλογὸς ἥλιε» EURIP., *Med.* 352 «ἢ πιούσα λαμπάδα θεοῦ» (of the next day) and *Iph. Aul.* 1506 «λαμπαδοῦχος ἄμέρα Διός» (in the last two passages the διαδοχὴ of light «from day to day» is probably meant). In a multi-level metaphorical construction by AESCHULUS, *Agam.*, 284-314 a comparison is drawn between the fire-telegraph transmitting beacon light from Ida to Argos, and a relay race (quoted above); the fast-moving torch («λαμπάς, φανός») is in turn, compared with the Sun (v. 288) and the Moon (v. 298) flying over sea and earth. ALEXIS COM., fr. 87 KOCK «ποῖος φανὸς τοιοῦτος οἶος ὁ ἥλιος». Cf. also the Sun as «δαδοῦχος» in the mysteries of the Cosmos: CLEANTH. *SVF*. I, Nr. 538.

32. On various attempts in handling the *skaphai* see R. MONDOLFO e L. TARÁN, *Eraclito, Testimonianze e imitazioni*, Firenze, 1972, pp. 46-47; MARCOVICH, *Eraclito*, p. 234; *RE*, Suppl. X, col. 298 sq.; KIRK, *HCF*, 269 sq.; D. P. TAORMINA, «Eraclito e la meteorologia prearistotelica», in: *Atti del Symp. Heracl.* 1981, p. 310 sq.; recent scepticism by KAHN, *Art and Thought*, 292. I have discussed the possibility of technological interpretation («smelting-pot», «washing-pan» etc.) in: *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, 1980, Nr. 1, pp. 29-32 (Engl. summary p. 47): the pure gold of fire is «smelted out» of sea the ore (cf. «θάλασσα διαχέεται») in the cosmic furnace by the agency of «smiths bellows» (πρηστήρ) and is collected in the celestial «smelting-pots». This interpretation explains better the term ἀθροίζεσθαι which does not fit the



sample of πολυμαθία and ιστορία showing no sign of Heraclitus' σοφία; at the same time it cannot be dismissed as a doxographic fancy because of its unique character. Most probably we are facing a piece of a metaphorical model of the cosmos torn out of its context and with pedantic littoralism recast into scientifically-minded «φυσικαὶ δόξαι» «about the shape of the sun», «about the eclipse of the sun» etc., i.e. about topics on which there were no explicit statements in Heraclitus' book. Most revealing is the doxographer's remark «οὐδὲν ἀποφαίνεται... περὶ τῶν σκαφῶν (sc. ποῖαι τινὲς εἰσιν)» (DK I, 142, 10-12): *nothing* on the nature of «bowls», the key-stone of elaborate system of astrophysics! And again, there is a certain discrepancy in doxographer's speaking about the *skaphai*; at first they are introduced not as separate entities, but rather as circular holes in the heavenly vault (τὸ περιέχον): DK I, 141, 32 «εἶναι μέντοι ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. τῷ περιέχοντι) σκάφας ἐπεστραμμένας κατὰ κοῖλον πρὸς ἡμᾶς», i.e. the stars themselves are not *skaphai*, but flames inside of them: «ἐν αἷς... φλόγας ἃς εἶναι τὰ ἄστρα» (ib. 1. 33). In the subsequent explanation of eclipses and the phases of the moon, however, (DK I, 142, 2-3; cf. Placit. II, 24, 3; 29, 3) we are told of *skaphai* «turning» upsidedown and this makes them solid «bowls» and a constituent part of the stars. One can only guess which of the two descriptions is more adequate. The first would square better with a circular hole of a fire altar; here the agonistic code «meets» with the sacral one employed in fr. 77 / B 67 (to be discussed separately). It is a merit of M.L. West to fix the connection on a different occasion with no relation to Heraclitus' agonistic imagery³³. It is not necessary, however, to think at present of a *Zoroastrian* fire altar. Greek altars, especially those of the ἐσχάρα -type, are also provided with «holes» and the term κοῖλον, κοίλωμα occurs in the descriptions of them³⁴.

torch image. In view of the plurality of metaphorical models in Heraclitus one must take into account the possibility of contamination of heterogeneous images in the doxography: the transposition of the same basic idea from one metaphorical key into another is a rule, not an exception, in Heraclitus.

33. M. L. WEST, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*, Oxf., 1971, pp. 175-176 and Plate VIII.

34. PHOT., *Lex.*, s.v. ἐσχάρα (στογγυλοειδής, κοίλη), s.v. ἐσχάριον· θυμιατήριον κοῖλον, also applied to βωμοί: Schol. EURIP., *Phoen.* 274 «νῦν οὖν βώμοι ἐσχάραι τὰ κοιλώματα τῶν βωμῶν. Cf. P. STENGEL, *Griechische Kultusaltertümer*, München, 1920³, p. 15; G. G. YAVIS, *Greek Altars*, Saint Louis, 1949, §§35, 50, 65, p. 72 (of incense altars) «some examples also have a round depression on the top to receive coals». Cf. in this connection the embers simile in SEXT. EMP. VII, 130 = A 16 DK (MOND.-TARÁN, p. 156; MARCOVICH, *Eracl.*, p. 400); SENECA NQ II, 56, 1 incipienets ignes = ἀνθρακες ἀναζωπυρούμενοι (*Vestnik Drevnej Istoria*, Moscow, 1979, Nr. 2, p. 18, note 82) which, if genuine, derives rather from the technological code.

The second description of the *skaphai* («bowls») fits even more precisely a torch and just the type employed in relay race, the so called «Bündel-Fackel» (Nr. 4 of Mau's typology)³⁵.



(a)



(b)

Race torches with protecting bowls: Baumeister, *Denk. Klass. Alt.*, I, 522, Abb. 562 from a vase-painting (a); a coin from Amphipolis, *Brit. Mus. Cat., Coins, Macedonia*, 43 (b).

Mau's description of the type is worth quoting: «Das kurze Bündel steht in einem Halter, bestehend aus einer runden, nach oben offenen *Schale*, der Form nach aus Metall, die unten mit einem Handgriff versehen ist; und es ist wohl so zu verstehen, dass dieser hohl und in ihn das Bündel hineingesteckt ist» (loc. cit.). The Greek name of the protecting «bowl» is not well attested. Böttlicher's attempt to identify it as *χύτρα* on the ground of Aristoph., *Lys.* 308 has been rightly refuted by Mau (ib.). The proper name of the holder as a whole seems to be *λαμπαδεῖον* «torch-holder», *LSJ*, q.v. (inscription from

35. MAU, *RE* VI/2, s.v. «Fackeln», col. 1947, 57 sq.; W. RUDOLPH, *Antike Sportgeräte*, *Klio*, 1967, p. 85; JÜTHNER, *Die athl. Leibesübungen*, II/1, p. 139 sq.

Eleusis, 4 c. B. C.), cf. λαμπάδια «bowl of a lamp» in Septuaginta (*Exod.* 16, 38; *Zach.* 4, 2). German scholars (Baumeister, Mau, Jüthner alii) call the device «Schale» («Schutzteller» Rudolph); it is not easy to find a more exact Greek equivalent than «σκάφη, σκαφοειδής» to describe the *shape* of the protecting device, and this is what a collector of *Placita* needs for his entry «On the shape of the Sun» etc.³⁶. The «bowls» are sometimes of impressive size (as in Amphipolis coin above), so that when a celestial *skaphe* «is turned towards us with its concavity», the torch fire is visible, but «when a bowl is turned upwards», the light will be screened³⁷. Needless to say that Heraclitus never held such a «theory» of eclipses himself; we are facing a doxographic «reconstruction» of a physical opinion «hinted» by αἰνικτῆς in the Torch of the Sun image but not stated explicitly: DK I, 141, 18 «σαφῶς δὲ οὐδὲν ἐκτίθεται». If this explanation is correct, the very term σκάφη should be regarded as doxographic rather than Heraclitean (note that in DK I, 142, 7 σκάφη has been replaced by κύκλος; while *Placita* have only the unmistakably late σκαφοειδής). The remarkable frequency of «λάμπω / λαμπρὸς» terms in the doxographic text points to the original λαμπὰς or the like: DK, 141, 31 «λαμπροτάτην... τοῦ ἡλίου φλόγα», 1.33 λάμπειν, cf. «λαμπρὰ ἀναθυμίασις» 141, 30. 31. 33; 142, 6. 8 and φωτίζειν 142, 2.

The compiler of *Placita* probably took the polished metallic torch bowl as a kind of reflector and ascribed to Heraclitus the ἀνταύγεια theory: (*Plac.* II, 28, 6) «σκαφοειδεῖς... τοὺς ἀστέρας, δεχομένους τὰς αὐγὰς, φωτίζεσθαι πρὸς φαντασίαν, λαμπρότερον μὲν τὸν ἥλιον» κτλ.

Starting from the same (or similar, but distinct?) image and making the Sun a «torch-bearer» in the Great Mysteries of Nature Cleanthes attained at a symbolical model of the cosmos much more congenial to the spirit and aims of Heraclitus' book (cf. note 31); Heraclitus, by the way, was δαδουῆχος himself.

From what has been said above it follows that the «ἄπτεσθαι/ἀποσθένυσθαι» formula applied to the Heraclitean Sun first in Plat., *Resp.* 497 e (= test. 58 c Mch; cf. test. b¹, b², b³ and 61 a² Mch from Theo) does not necessarily represent a reminiscence of fr. 53 / B 30, but either derives from Heraclitus' text or is a development from the torch image³⁸.

One can only guess whether the «bowl» of the Moon is a doxographic

36. For further pictorial evidence on the torch «bowls» see DAREMBERG - SAGLIO, *Dict. des Ant.*, v. III/2, s.v. *Lampadedromia*, pp. 910-911, fig. 4328-4331; Excellent selection in JÜTHNER, *Die athl. Leibesübungen*, II/1, Abb. 31-32 on p. 138 and TAFEL 37 ab, 38, 40-41.

37. Cf. «λαμπτήρ ἀντιπεφραγμένος» *Philistus Hist.*, fr. 15 MÜLLER.

38. Cf. KIRK, *HCF*, 279; MARCOVICH, *Eraclito*, p. 223; F. LASSERRE, «Un fragment d'Héraclite oublié», *Antiquité Classique*, v. 39 (1970), p. 35 sq.

extension or a similar development from the original metaphor applied by Heraclitus to the Moon as well, in other words, whether the Moon has to do something with the cosmic *lampadedromia*? The remarkable text of *De victu*, I, 5 = DK I, 183, 1-2 «φάος Ζηνί, σκότος Ἀΐδη, φάος Ἀΐδη, σκότος Ζηνί· φοιτᾷ κείνα ὧδε καὶ τάδε κείσε» κτλ. (i.e. are running to and fro in opposite directions simultaneously, cf. «ἅμα πρόσσεισι καὶ ἄπεισι» B 91 DK = 40 c³ Mch)³⁹ comes immediately after the agonistic passage «χωρεῖ δὲ πάντα» which correlates Day = Fire = the Sun on the one hand, and Night = Water = the Moon on the other as manifestations of two rival forces in the cosmic *Agon* advancing and retreating alternately within fixed terms of «maximum and minimum». These antagonist forces apparently correspond with the «bright» and «dark» exhalations in the doxography of Diogenes Laërtius, the cause of Day and Night, Summer and Winter. If Zeus stands for «upper heaven» (the Sun region) and Hades for «lower air» (the Moon region and the sublunar world)⁴⁰, the interchange of light and darkness between them can be interpreted as a *διαδοχή* of torch: the ἄψις of the Sun is the σθέσις of the Moon *et vice versa*. Otherwise one might think of two altars as *termata* of the cosmic *lampas*⁴¹: the high Olympic βωμός of the Sun and the low chthonic ἐσχάρα of the Moon. (At this point we are facing the problem of differentiation between the agonistic and the sacral metaphorical codes).

Presocratic parallels for relay race imagery in cosmology are scanty. The most interesting instance (and a probable reflex of Heraclitus' *Lampas* model) is offered by Ps.-Hippocr., *De hebdomadibus* 2, 2, l. 1-2 West⁴² «τῆς τῶν ὡρέων ἐκδοχῆς» (= *διαδοχῆς*, cf. Aesch., *Ag.* 299); the Latin translation (*Ambros.* and *Paris.*) has *tradendorum*. The imagery of *lampadedromia* seems to be carried on in the enigmatic words c. 2 2 1.7 W. «ὥστε μὴ

39. Note that after this agonistic phrase PLUTARCH, *De E*, 392 c quotes fr. 66 / B 76 «πυρὸς θάνατος ἀέρι γένεσις» and cf. the racing term «περιελαυνομένης» *ibid.* 392 d., The Cosmos as Stadion, Excursus I. As I see now, ἄπιτον ARISTOPH., *Equ.* 1161 has been interpreted as a real starting-command already by E. N. GARDINER, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, 1910, 273 (accepted by B. SCHRÖDER, *Der Sport im Altertum*, 1927, p. 106). JÜTHNER, *Die athl. Leibesübungen*, II / 1, p. 90 and note 175 objects this interpretation on the ground that the proper command comes next («θέοιτ' ἄν»). But Jüthner has missed the comic point of the passage: Cleon and the Sausage-Seller only *pretend to run*, but in fact stand still. Hence ἄπιτον is the proper command, and the subsequent θέοιτ' ἄν is only an encouragement: «Well, why are you not running?» (suggested orally by ALEX. K. GAVRILOV.). Cf. also εἰσιέναι and ἐξιέναι as agonistic terms SOPH., *El.* 685 sq.

40. Cf. M. L. WEST, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*, Oxford 1971, pp. 138, 188.

41. JÜTHNER, *Die Athl. Leibesübungen*, II / 1, p. 142 «Der Altar als Ausgang und Ziel».

42. M. L. WEST, «The Cosmology of Hippocrates» *De Hebdomadibus*, CQ, vol. 21 (1971) Nr. 2, pp. 365-388.

τὴν αὐτὴν στάσιν ἔχειν ὁδοῦ τὰ ἄστρα». Themistius' comment on Aristotle's reference to λαμπὰς (cited above) offers a plausible solution of the conundrum: «οὐ γὰρ γίνεται ἐν τὸ ἔσχατον τοῦ δρόμου, ἀλλ' ἐκάστου τῶν τρεχόντων οἰκειὸν τι τοῦ δρόμου πέρας ἐστίν». The heavenly stars (the season-markers) in their risings and settings «succeed» or «follow» one another (cf. ἀκολουθίη) within the year cycle like the runners in διαδοχὴ race; what is στάσις for one season, is ἄφεςις for another. Hence «each has a στάσις of its own». The writer has agonistic imagery in mind from the very beginning: Mansfeld⁴³ has correctly interpreted ἀνιούσης in I, 2, 1. 4-5 «σελήνης ἀνιούσης καὶ τελειούσης» as «returning» by comparing Philo, *De opific. mundi*, 101 (τῆς σελήνης) «κατὰ μείωσιν ἀνακαμπτούσης... πλησιφαῆς γίνεται καὶ πάλιν ὑποστρέφει διανλοδρομοῦσα τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν» κτλ. Cf. also 2, 1, 1. 3 W. αὐτόδρομος.

The words «ἐν ἀλλήλοισι ζῶντα καὶ δι' ἀλλήλων διόντα» 2, 1, 1. 12-13 W. call for special attention since the reference is to the sublunar μοῖραι, i.e. to air, water and earth, the triad of mortal elements of Heraclitus' fr. 66 / B 36. «Ἐν ἀλλήλοισι ζῶντα» presumably means «they live at the cost of one another»⁴⁴, i.e. the birth of air is the death of water etc. «Δι' ἀλλήλων διόντα» paralleled in Empedocles B 17, 34 = B 21, 13 «δι' ἀλλήλων θέοντα» (of elements), can hardly mean «they pass through one another», for this interpretation does not suit the context (moreover, there is no mention of κρᾶσις in the ch. 1-12 at all)⁴⁵. A more suitable rendering of διόντα would be «go to and fro» (*LSJ*, s.v. δῖμι I, 1) or «go through», i.e. «traverse a certain distance from the beginning to the end» (*LSJ*, q.v., II a, citing Plato, *Axiach.* 370 e «δῖμι τὸν θεῖον δρόμον», cf. also the meaning of «διατρέχω, διαθέω, διαδρομή» *LSJ*, q.v.v.)⁴⁶. I take δι' ἀλλήλων as adverbial phrase semantically related to διάλληλος and meaning «interchangeably»: the start of air is the finish of water etc. Thus we attain at an exact parallelism between «ἐν ἀλλήλοισι ζῶντα» and «δι' ἀλλήλων διόντα»: the interchange of life and

43. J. MANSFELD, *The Pseudo-Hippocratic tract περὶ ἑβδομάδων* ch. 1-11 and *Greek Philosophy*, Assen, 1971, p. 51.

44. The quasi-litteral translation «they live within one another» does not seem to make any sense and is quite unsuitable even for the alleged «Posidonian vitalism», *Contra* MANSFELD, op. cit., p. 78; Mansfeld is accurate enough to cite as parallels Heraclitus' fr. 66 / B 36 and the Empedoclean passages (op. cit., p. 59, note 26) which alone would make his claims unfounded. Another exact parallel is *Lucret.*, II, 76 *et interse mortales mutua vivunt* followed by the *lampedromia simile* (v. 79).

45. *Contra* MANSFELD, op. cit., p. 79 sq.

46. Cf. the meaning of «ἡλίου δίοδος» *Hebd.* I, 2, 1, 4 West «the orbit» or, perhaps, «the region» (*spatium*) of the Sun: the basic concept of δια- in δίοδος is that of «passing through», i.e. *completely* a certain distance, not of «penetrating into».

death between the three sublunar elements (contrasted as a whole with the deathless upper μοῖραι) is compared with *lampadedromia*, the symbol of ephemeral existence.

The case of Empedocles is somewhat more ambiguous. The current interpretation takes «δι' ἀλλήλων θέοντα» as «traversing one another» and relates it to the κραῖσις of elements. Κρησις indeed is mentioned in B 21, 14 and *prima facie* seems to confirm this interpretation. And yet the expression «running (?) through one another» remains cumbrous; «running interchangeably», i.e. «transmitting the torch of life to one another» would do more justice to the metaphor θέοντα and would fit perfectly the context of B (and B 26, 1-3) which reaffirms the same thought in the terms of a political metaphorical code: «ἐν δὲ μέρει κρατέουσι» (B 17, 29) and refers to the ἐφήμερος motif (B 17, 11 «οὐ σφισι ἔμπεδος αἰών»).

I will conclude with what seems to be a neglected Pre-Plotinian reminiscence of Heraclitus' fr. 56 / B 84 (note the cosmological application of the image): Philo Alex., *De Cherubim* (commenting on «σάββατον· ἐρμηνεύεται δ' ἀνάπαυσις» ch. 87), 88 «καὶ τοῦ καμάτου μαρτύριον ἐναργέστατον αἱ ἐτήσιοι ὥραι...» 89 «ἐπεὶ τὸ συνεκτικώτατον μεταβολῆς αἴτιον κάματος...» 90 «ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τὰ μὲν τρεπόμενα καμάτῳ πέφυκε μεταβάλλειν» κτλ.

Appendix I: The controversy about Greek δίαυλος and its relation to the interpretation of Heraclitus' agonistic fragments.

There is a controversy among the historians of Greek athletics concerning the «turning» after the first stadion-distance in δίαυλος and δόλιχος, a controversy which is important for the precise understanding of Heraclitus' agonistic imagery. Dörpfeld held that in Olympia the runners, after passing the first stadion-length, turned round pillar and went back by a parallel path; according to Hauser, there was no change of paths, but only that of the direction (*Pendellauf*); i.e. the runners ran up and down the same path making a short stop at the end in order to reverse their course. Jüthner admits that «in the absence of unambiguous, clear evidence the riddle still remains unsolved»⁴⁷. Therefore in interpreting the Heraclitean fragments

47. JÜTHNER, *Die athl. Leibesübungen*, II / 1, p. 105; on the controversy see *ibid.*, p. 103 sq., p. 111 sq. Prof. Paul Mylonas thinks there is no riddle at all since only the *Pendellauf* conforms to archaeological evidence, whereas the other view results from a confusion with horse-race (oral communication). See also Π. Μ. ΜΥΛΩΝΑΣ, *Στάδια*, Ἀθήναι 1952, pp. 20 sq., 35 sq.

relating to the Stadion image one must take into account both possibilities. In reconstructing the Cosmostadion I have *tacite* followed Dörpfeld's view. It must be conceded, however, that Hauser's view fits better Heraclitus' fr. 33 / B 60 «ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω μία καὶ ὡυτή» «the way to and fro is *one and the same*». A historian of Greek athletics might refer to this fragment as an early evidence in favour of *Pendellauf*. And this being so, it would be inaccurate to regard δολιχοδρομία as a model of circular movement in the proper sense (though Greek writers incidentally do so: cf. *Anthol. Pal.* IX, 342, 2 «πόλλ' ἀνακυκλοῦται δόλιχος δρόμος» and Laur. Lyd., *De mens.* III 4 quoted in Appendix 2 below). Aristotle's contrast between circular motion and «ἐναντίας μεταβάλλειν μεταβολὰς» in the supposed polemics against Heraclitus (cited above) would be more intelligible on the assumption of Hauser's view, too. Jüthner cites as an evidence on *Pendellauf* a letter by Isidorus of Pelusium (c. 450 A.D.) to a certain hypodiaton Palladius. The letter exhibits a detailed agonistic simile intended to be a moral parabel. Late as it is, the text is worth quoting *in extenso* because of its verbal coincidences with Heraclitus' fr. 56 / B 84: S. Isidori Pelusiotae *Epist.* III, 144; *PG* v. 78, p. 840 B «οὐκ ἔστι μικρὸν τὸ μικρὸν εἶναι δοκοῦν, τὸ μὴ προστιθέναι ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέγιστον. Ὅδὸς γὰρ ἔστι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρίστην φέρουσα μεταβολήν. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ ῥεῦμα τῆς κακίας, τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπώλειαν τρέχον, ἡρεμήσειεν, ἀρχὴν λήψεται ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν κίνησις. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἢ ἐν τοῖς σταδίοις στάσις καὶ ἐπηρέμησις τὴν ἐναντίαν τίκει κίνησιν (εἰ μὴ γὰρ σταίη, οὐκ ἂν εἰς τοῦναντίον χωρήσειεν), οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κακίας, εἰ μὴ παύσοιτο, οὐκ ἂν τῇ ἀρετῇ χώραν δοίη». One should only replace the «virtue and vice» of the Saint Father with «evening and morning» or the opposite seasons (elements) to make of this text a suitable commentary on Heraclitus' Cosmostadion. And μεταβολή suggests an alternative agonistic interpretation of fr. 56 a / B 84 a «μεταβάλλον ἀναπαύεται» «it rests by changing (or «turning») to the contrary»⁴⁸, i.e. «everything dies by passing into its contrary»: the death of night (winter) is the birth of day (summer) etc. What mortals erroneously call «death» is in fact only a momentary stop in the *Pendellauf* of the incessant cosmic process, a boundary line between two forms of existence «running in opposite directions». The death of a mortal (man) is the birth of an immortal (god) because it is one and the same runner («the immortals are mortals» fr. 47 / B 62), i.e. the soul or δαίμων, who runs up and down the same path of the cosmic Stadium and reappears alternately now under the name of «immortal» (running ἄνω) now under

48. «Turn quickly or suddenly» is adduced in *LSJ*, q.v. as the earliest attested meaning of μεταβάλλω: HOM., *Il.* 8, 94 «μετὰ νῶτα δαλῶν» (applied to τροπή in battle) etc.

the name of «mortal» (running κάτω). The names are different, but «the referential meaning is the same» «λόγος γὰρ ὡυτός» (Clem., *Paed.* III, 1,5 = test. 47 c Mch)⁴⁹. «Χωρεῖ δὲ πάντα καὶ θεῖα καὶ ἀνθρώπινα ἄνω καὶ κάτω ἀμειδόμενα», (*De victu* I, 5). The disadvantage (if any) of this interpretation is that it would separate fr. 56 a and 56 b relating the former to the Stadion model (fr. 56 b anyhow can refer to *lampadedromia* only)⁵⁰. But there are advantages too: first, there is no need to emend or to supplement Plotinus' text; and second, the series of quotations in Plotinus acquires a unity of thought and imagery: (1) «fated changes to the contrary», (2) «the way to and fro», (3) «everything stops when reversing its course». On this assumption one is inclined to think that not only the word ἀμοιβαί, but also the whole phrase «ἀμοιβαὶ ἀναγκαῖαι ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων» may represent either a verbatim quotation from Heraclitus (and hence a separate fragment) or, at least, a close paraphrasis of a genuine saying. If authentic ἀναγκαῖαι would refer to the personal «fate» rather than to the abstract «necessity» (cf. Soph., *Ai.* 485 «ἀναγκαία τύχη» «fateful chance» etc.). Now the idea of fate is worked into the agonistic image of «running to and fro» in *De victu* I, 5 = DK I, 183, 6-7 «φοιτώντων τε ἐκείνων ὧδε τῶν δέ τε κείσε... τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἕκαστον ἐκπληροῖ...»⁵¹. The connection is so unusual that it would be hardly possible to dismiss the consensus between Plotinus and *De victu* as a mere coincidence. Cf. also 22 B 137 DK and especially *Placit.* I, 7, 22 (22 A 8 DK) «εἰμαρμένην δὲ λόγον ἐκ τῆς ἐναντιοδορομίας δημιουργὸν τῶν ὄντων».

49. I side with Gigon and Wiese (*contra* Marcovich, *ad loc.*) in taking the words «λόγος γὰρ ὡυτός» as a part of the quotation not only because of the Ionic wording, but also because of Clement's comment on them («μεσίτης γὰρ ὁ Λόγος ὁ κοινὸς» κτλ.): how could Clement comment on his own explanatory remark? (which, I dare say, explains nothing). If spurious the words must have been added by Clement's source, but those who suppose it, would bear the *onus probandi*. Note that ὁ Λόγος «The Word» in the theological sense (especially as a subject) comes more often with an article (cf. LAMPE, *Gr. Patr. Lex.*, q.v.). Clement's hermeneutical bias in substituting the Saviour for an ordinary Greek expression is obvious. I have tried to make sense of the words at question (which may have come immediately after τεθνεώτες) by taking λόγος as «subject», «thing spoken» as opposed to the names «mortals and immortals». An alternative solution would be the reading ὁδὸς γὰρ ὡυτὴ «the way (sc. up and down) is the same» which fits perfectly the imagery of *dolichodromia*. A reader like Clement who does not understand Heraclitus' metaphorical language, may have easily mistaken ΟΔΟC for an abbreviation of ΟΛΟΓΟC or even deliberately corrected the meaningless «road».

50. Fr. 56 a and 56 b were regarded as separate fragments, e.g., by I. BYWATER, *Heracliti Ephesii Reliquiae*, Oxonii, 1877, p. 34 and O. GIGON, *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit*, Lpz., 1935, p. 94.

51. Cf. PLATO, *Soph.* 242 b «παρὰ πόδα μεταβαλὼν ἑμαυτὸν ἄνω κάτω, δοκῶ γὰρ τήνδ', ὦ παῖ, τὴν ὁδὸν ἀναγκαιοτάτην ἡμῖν εἶναι τρέπεσθαι».

Appendix II: Further parallels for racing imagery in Presocratic cosmology⁵².

Hermann Diels was the first to compare Anaximander's «ἀρμάτειος τροχὸς» (12 A 21-22 DK) with the Indo-European myth of the «wheel» or «chariot» of the Sun⁵³. Mythological roots of the simile do not preclude its rational function in Anaximander. In particular, the wheel of a *racing* car hints to the *swift* motion of the Sun: in a geocentric system, and especially in that of Anaximander, the «speed» of the Sun ought to be estimated as enormous, for it runs over «the whole cosmos» in 24 hours. The «chariot wheels» of the Sun and the Moon revolve round the Earth which, in turn is compared with λίθος κίων (?) (12 A 5 DK) or, perhaps, simply κίων (λίθος being a gloss: cf. Schol. Aristoph., *Nub.* 815 with λίθους as a gloss on κίονας). Pillars were used both in Greek stadia and hippodromoi as *metae* (νύσσα, καμπτήρ); scenes of *hippikos agōn* with κίονες marking the racing-field are common in Greek vase-paintings⁵⁴. In Empedocles' B 46 (if we trust Diels' restoration) the Moon revolves round the Earth as a chariot wheel round νύσσα, i.e. a pillar. Admittedly, the «wheels» and the «pillar» in Anaximander do not fit together precisely to form a deliberately constructed cosmological hippodromus, since the Earth by its location corresponds to the axis of the wheel, not to the *meta*. And so they are either disconnected or there is a connection on the level of subconscious association.

Aristotle's etymology of αἰθήρ («ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν ἄει» *De caelo* 270 b 23, cf. *Meteor.* 339 b 25) which he ascribes to prehistoric sages may well be of Presocratic coinage. Apart from Empedocles' B 53 (note that Empedocles' word for air is αἰθήρ, not αἴηρ) one might think especially of Alcmaeo A 12 DK = Arist., *De anima* 405 a 32 «ὥς ἄει κινουμένη· κινεῖσθαι γὰρ καὶ τὰ θεῖα πάντα συνεχῶς ἄει» etc. The emphatically iterated ἄει (the key word of the argument) is almost certainly authentic. «Motion» is equally emphasized, but Alcmaeo could hardly use κινεῖσθαι; the latter term seems to be Aristotle's substitute for a more archaic expression, most probably θεῖν; cf. a similar word play in Ps.-Philol. B 21 DK «τοῦ ἄει θεόντος θείου». Both the

52. This is a supplement to «The Cosmos as Stadion», Excursus 3, where the racing imagery of Parmenides, Zeno and Empedocles has been briefly discussed.

53. H. DIELS, *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. v. W. BURKERT, p. 13, note 1.

54. DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, v. III/1, s.v. «hippodrome», p. 200, figs. 3845, 3846; GUHL UND KOHNER, *Leben der Griechen und Römer*, Berlin 1893⁶, p. 378, fig. 504. A more exact (though more remote in time) parallel to Anaximander's Earth is the cylindrical *meta* of the Circus of Maxentius in Rome, depicted, e.g., in H. A. HARRIS, *Sport in Greece and Rome*, Ithaca, N.-Y., 1976, Plate 80.

δρόμος of the stars and the τέρμα δίου were current Greek ideas which had passed into Greek language itself. It was a matter of the philosophy to clarify their relation and to put them into contrast. Alcmaeo may have contrasted the immortality of «ἀεὶ θέοντα θεῖα» with the mortality of human beings (qua σώματα) as an endless *dolichodromia* (quasi-circle) with a finite *stadiodromia* (straight). Hence «men perish because they cannot fasten the beginning and the end together» «οὐ δύνανται τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ τέλει προσάψαι» (24 B 2 DK) presumably means that «they cannot make the winning-post of life one with the starting-post» «ἰσῶσαι τὰφέσει τὰ τέρματα» (Soph., *El.* 686). This hypothesis is not capable of definite proof, yet it suits well the context of fr. B 2 in Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* XVII 3. 916 a 21 sq. «εἴπερ ἀρχὴ τίς ἐστι καὶ τέλος τοῦ παντός, καὶ ὅταν γηράσκων τίς ἐπὶ τὸ πέρας ἔλθῃ (i.e. ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα δίου) καὶ πάλιν ἐπαναστρέψῃ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν... ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐκάστου τῶν ἄστρον φορᾶ κύκλος τίς ἐστίν... ὡς πάλιν ἐπανακάμπτειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ συνεχὲς ποιεῖν καὶ ἀεὶ κατὰ ταῦτα ἔχειν. Τοὺς γὰρ ἀνθρώπους φησὶν Ἀλκμαίων διὰ τοῦτο ἀπόλλυσθαι» etc.

It is true that in the *Corpus Aristotelicum* ἀνακάμπω is a rather general term for «bending back, returning» (see Bonitz, *Ind. Arist.* q.v.), but in contexts implying «running» it displays a strong connection with «καμπτήρ» «turning-post» and is almost synonymous with δολιχεύω. If life is δρόμος, death is παῦλα. Having come to the *terma* of life man does not «ἀνακάμπει ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν» (as the immortals do), but ἀναπαύεται, i.e. stops running. And, to put it in Plato's words, «παῦλαν ἔχον κινήσεως παῦλαν ἔχει ζωῆς» (*Phaedr.* 245 c).

In the later Pythagorean tradition the stadium model is applied to the progression of numbers in counting from 1 to 10 and «turning back» to 1; accordingly, *dekas* is conceived as «turning-post». The first clear instance seems to be Philo, *De opif. mundi*, 47 «περὶ ὃν ὡς καμπτήρα εἰλοῦνται καὶ ἀνακάμπουσιν» (sc. οἱ ἀριθμοί). One cannot be sure whether the obliterated metaphor ἀναποδόω (which occurs earlier in the *Placita* 1, 3, 8 «ἐφ' ἃ ἐλθόντες πάλιν ἀναποδοῦσι ἐπὶ τὴν μονάδα» cf. *Moderat.*, ap. *Stob.* I *Coroll.* 8 «ἀναποδισμὸς εἰς μονάδα»)⁵⁵ represents a trace of the same simile. In Ioannes Lydus' excerpt from Pythagoreans both the progression of numbers and the year-cycle are modelled on *dolichodromia* with *dekas* and New Year as «turning-posts» respectively: *De mens.* III 4 (p. 38, 17 Wünsch)

55. Further references in W. BURKERT, *Lore and Science in ancient Pythagoreanism*, Cambr. (Mass.), 1972, p. 72, note 122. The Pythagorean name for 9 νύσσητας (*Theol. arith.* 58) probably derives from νύσσα and belongs to the same circle of ideas.

«κύκλος παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ ἐστὶν ἢ δεκάς καὶ πέρας· περὶ αὐτὴν γὰρ εἰλούμενοι καὶ κατακάμπτοντες ὥσπερ καμπτήρα δολιχεύουσι οἱ ἀριθμοί. ὅρος γὰρ ἐστὶν τῆς ἀπειρίας αὐτῶν... οὕτως ἄρα καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ φύσεως ἔστι εὐρεῖν, ὅτι συμπληρούμενος αὐθις, ὥσπερ ὁ δέκα ἀριθμός, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναστρέφει· καὶ ταύτῃ ἐνιαυτὸς ὠνομάσθη, παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κινεῖσθαι αὐτόν· κύκλος γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν εἰλούμενος». Late as it is, this text clarifies the connection between the *dolichodromia* of seasons (Heraclitus fr. 64 b 100) and the etymology of ἐνιαυτὸς in Plutarch *De def. or.* 416 A «ἐνιαυτὸς ἀρχὴν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τελευτὴν ὁμοῦ τι πάντων ὧν φέρουσι ὥραι γῆ δὲ φύει». In *De mens.* I, 17. p. 10, 15-17. Lydus applies the term καμπτήρ «turning-post» to the tropic of Capricorn as if it were a current expression: (Numa's New Year) «ὅταν Ἡλῖος τὸν Αἰγόκερων μεσάζων αὖξει τὴν ἡμέραν, ἀποστρέφων πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοτίου καμπτήρος, προστιθεὶς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡμῶριον» (not in *LSJ*). Macrobius *Sat.* I, 17, 61 sq. reports a similar construction from Cornificius' «Etyma» (the etymology of Pythius): «cum enim sol in signo Cancri aestivum solstitium facit, in quo est longissimi diei terminus, et inde retrogressum agit ad diminutionem dierum, Pythius eo tempore appellatur ὡς πύματον θεῶν, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸν τελευταῖον δρόμον τρέχων. idem ei nomen convenit et cum Capricornum rursus ingrediens ultimum brevissimi diei cursum intellegitur peregisse», etc. The model related by Lydus and Macrobius resembles that of Heraclitus fr. 62 / B 120, but since the runner is the Sun, the τέρματα of the cosmic stadium are identified with the solstices (or the tropics), not with the equinoxes.

Even Democritus' atoms are «running», though not on a stadium. In Diogenes' account of Leucippus' cosmogony (i.e. the cosmogony of *Megas Diakosmos*) we are told that atoms «συγκατατρέχει ἀλλήλοις» (DL IX 31 = DK, II, 71, 4) «run together», i.e. «flock, crowd» to form the original σύστημα of the cosmos (the explanation of συγκατατρέχω in *LSJ* is wrong). The image is not agonistic, but rather derives from a familiar scene of a Greek polis' life, i.e. that of people running down the convergent streets and crowding in *agora* or in a strait. The simile compressed by the doxographer into two words is quoted *in extenso* by Seneca *NQ* V, 2, 1 = 68 A 93 a DK = Nr. 371 Luria, this time applied to the aetiology of winds; cf. especially «ubi turba in angustum concurrat». The metaphorical variation of «flux» and «running» is at work again: «συρρεόντων ἀεὶ» (DK II, 71, 7) and ἐπέκρουσις (II, 71, 9)⁵⁶.

I append samples of late allegorical interpretations of circus and

56. Rightly defended by J. KERSCHENSTEINER, *Hermes*, Bd. 87 (1959), p. 446, note 4 with further details.

hippodromus quoted from unidentified sources by Ioannes Lydus and relating to the subject «the stadium as cosmos». They may be of little or no value for the history of Games, yet they are relevant to the history of idea which, as we have seen, is very old. Oenomaus, so we are told in *De mensibus* 1, 12 (p. 4. 5-11 Wünsch). first held a *hippikos agon* with quadriga at the vernal equinox («ὑψουμένου τοῦ Ἡλίου»); he was dressed in green and represented the Earth («ὑπὲρ τῆς Γῆς»), resp. the faction of inlanders; whereas his rival was dressed in blue and represented the Sea («ὑπὲρ τῆς Θαλάσσης»), resp. the faction of coasters. Πράσινοι and βένετοι are the factions of the Roman circus, but the remark that in the earliest period the agon was held with *biga* is confirmed by archaeological evidence⁵⁷. The mythical circus of Kirke (p. 3-7 Wünsch) is probably the most elaborate cosmological hippodromus in Greek literature: «καὶ πυραμὶς δὲ ἔστιν ἐν μέσῳ τῷ σταδίῳ, ἥ δὲ πυραμὶς Ἡλίου, ἐπεὶ ἄσκιος ἐγγὺς ὁ τοιοῦτος βωμὸς... ἐν δὲ τοῖς παρ' ἐκάτερα τέρμασι τοῦ εὐρίπου⁵⁸ τούτου ἄνωθεν μὲν τῆς πυραμίδος ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐρίπου βωμοὶ ἴδρυνται τρεῖς· Κρόνου, Διός, Ἄρεως· κάτωθεν δὲ πάλιν βωμοὶ τρεῖς, Ἀφροδίτης, Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Σελήνης· τρίποδες δύο, Ἡλίου καὶ Σελήνης, καὶ ἄγαλμα γυναικὸς φιάλην ἐπιφερομένης· ἔστι δὲ ἡ γῆ, φέρουσα τὴν θάλασσαν· σάλπιγγες δὲ ἐπὶ τέλει τῶν ἀγώνων τοὺς νικητὰς ἐπὶ τὰ γέρα καλοῦσι, δώδεκα δὲ ὕσπληγες κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν δώδεκα ζῳδίων... οὐ πλέον δὲ τῶν ἑπτὰ κύκλων... περὶ τὴν πυραμίδα, ἣν νῦν ὀδελὸν καλοῦσι, διεπληκτίζοντο οἱ ἀγωνισταὶ... διὰ τὸ τοσοῦτους εἶναι τοὺς τῶν πλανήτων πόλους... τέσσαρσι δὲ καὶ εἴκοσι βραβείοις τὸν πάντα συνετέλουν ἀγῶνα διὰ τὸν ἐν πυραμίδι λόγον... δις δὲ τὸν δώδεκα ἀριθμὸν εἰς δύο τέμνοντες τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας καιρὸν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τελοῦσι». The four chariots of different factions correspond with the four elements and planets: 1) Red = Mars = fire; 2) White = Jupiter = air; 3) Green = Venus = earth; 4) Blue = Saturnus = sea (p. 6, sq. Wünsch) or with the four seasons: «οἱ δὲ φασιν πράσινον μὲν τὸ ἔαρ, ῥούσιον δὲ τὸ θέρος, βένετον δὲ τὸ φθινόπωρον, λευκὸν δὲ τὸν χειμῶνα» (p. 90, 2-4 W., cf. a different construction p. 88, 22 sq. Wünsch). Lydus' source in *De mens.* I, 12 seems to be Charax of Pergamus: cf. 103 f 34 Jacoby and Ioann. Antioch. *FHG* IV 552, fr. 29, 31 Müller.

57. *Der Kleine Pauly*, Bd. IV, p. 279, 26.

58. Εὐρίπος as it seems, originally meant «water channel» in the middle of a racing field, but afterwards was transferred to *spina*, and the *Volksetymologie* connected it with the «up and down» motion of racing cars as similar to that of the Chalkidan Euripus: (LYDUS, *De mensibus*, ed. R. Wünsch, I, 12; p. 5, 1-3, Leipzig 1903) «ἐκ τοῦ θαλαττίου ἴσως Εὐρίπου καὶ τῆς ἐπτάκις αὐτοῦ διαυλοδρομίας, ἐπειδὴ κάκεινος ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀντιστρέφει τὴν κίνησιν».



For further inspiration one may consult Chrysippus' metaphorical construction (*SVF* II 117, Nr. 569, cf. Nr. 602) cited by Dio Chrysostomus (*Or.* XXXVI, § 42 sq.); the cosmos is conceived as *quadriga* and the 4 elements as 4 divine horses: Zeus = fire, Hera = air, Poseidon = water, Hestia = earth. Surprisingly enough, the horse of Hestia stands still at the centre while the swiftest horse of Zeus-fire «ἀεὶ περὶ τὸν ἐστῶτα ὡς νύσσαν φέρεσθαι» (§ 47).

Andrei LEBEDEV
(Moskow)

ΜΕΤΑΦΟΡΙΚΕΣ ΕΙΚΟΝΕΣ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΝ ΛΑΜΠΑΔΗΔΡΟΜΙΑ ΣΤΟΝ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟ

Περίληψη

Κατὰ τὸν συγγραφέα ὁ Ἡράκλειτος δὲν εἶχε μιὰ κανονικὴ κοσμολογία μιλησιακοῦ τύπου ἀλλὰ ἐνα πλῆθος συμβολικῶν μοντέλων τοῦ κόσμου, τὰ ὁποῖα περιέγραφε μὲ διαφόρους μεταφορικοὺς κώδικες. Ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν τῶν κωδίκων συνήθως κατάγεται ἀπὸ τὴν ὁρολογία διαφόρων «τεχνῶν». Αὐτὸ τὸ γεγονὸς, ποὺ εἶναι θεμελιακὸ γιὰ τὴν ἐρμηνευτικὴ τῶν Ἡρακλείτειων ἀποσπασμάτων, τὸ ἔχει ἤδη προσέξει ἓνας ἀρχαῖος ἀναγνώστης τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου, ὁ γραμματικὸς Διόδωτος (στὸν Διογ. Λαερτ. IX, 15), κατὰ τὸν ὁποῖον τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου δὲν εἶναι περὶ φύσεως... ἀλλὰ περὶ πολιτείας, τὰ δὲ περὶ φύσεως ἐν παραδείγματι εἶδει κείσθαι. Ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Διοδώτου δὲν σημαίνει ὅτι τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ Ἐφεσίου σοφοῦ δὲν ἦτο παρὰ ἓνα κρυπτογραφικὸ πολιτικὸ pamphlet, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὅτι τὸ βασικὸ ἐνδιαφέρον του ἀποτελοῦσαν οἱ παραδειγματικὲς σχέσεις μεταξὺ φύσεως καὶ κοινωνίας, μεταξὺ μακρο- καὶ μικροκόσμου, δηλ. ὁ «θεῖος νόμος». Ἐπομένως οἱ μεταφορικοὶ κώδικες τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου δὲν πρέπει νὰ ἐρμηνευθοῦν ὡς ἓνα καθαρῶς καλλιτεχνικὸ ἢ ρητορικὸ (ἢ κρυπτογραφικὸ) μέσον, ἀλλὰ νὰ τεθοῦν στὰ πλαίσια μιᾶς ἀρχαϊκῆς μεταφυσικῆς ποιητικοῦ χαρακτῆρος μὲ ἠθικὸ, πολιτικὸ καὶ θρησκευτικὸ σκοπὸ.

Μετὰ ἀπὸ τὴν ἐρευνα τεχνολογικῶν μοντέλων στὴν κοσμολογία τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου (στὸ ἄρθρο μου «Ψῆγμα συμφυσώμενον. Νέον ἀπόσπασμα τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου», *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, Μόσχα 1979, N 2, 1980 N 1, ὅπου πρόκειται γιὰ μεταφορὲς ἀπὸ τὴν μεταλλουργία καὶ χρυσοχοϊκὴ τέχνη), ἀκολούθησε μιὰ μελέτη ἀγωνιστικῶν μεταφορῶν «The Cosmos as Stadium», *Phronesis* XXX (1985) 131-150, ὅπου ἔγινε προσπάθεια ἀποκα-



ταστάσεως ενός ανεπτυγμένου κοσμολογικοῦ μοντέλου, στὰ πλαίσια τοῦ ὁποίου ὁ κόσμος εἰκονίζεται σὰν Στάδιο, οἱ ἀντίπαλες κοσμικὲς δυνάμεις (Μέρα - Νύχτα, Χειμώνας - Καλοκαίρι κτλ.) σὰν ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι ἀθλητές, ἡ κίνηση σὰν «δρόμος» ἢ ἐναντιοδρομία (A 8 DK), ἡ ἐναλλαγὴ γεννήσεως καὶ φθορᾶς, σὰν ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω (B 60), δηλ. οἱ διάδρομοι ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκκίνηση μέχρι τοῦ τέρατος καὶ ἀντίστροφα, οἱ ἰσημερίες σὰν τέρατα (B 120), ὁ ἥλιος σὰν βραβεὺς τοῦ κοσμικοῦ ἀγῶνος (B 100) κτλ.

Ἡ παροῦσα μελέτη προσπαθεῖ νὰ ἀνακαλύψει ἓνα ἄλλο ἀγωνιστικὸ μοντέλο στὸν Ἡράκλειτο, ποὺ δὲν πρέπει νὰ συγχέεται μὲ τὸ Στάδιο, τὸ μοντέλο τῆς λαμπαδηδρομίας. Τὸ βασικὸ κείμενο, στὸ ὁποῖο παρουσιάζεται ὁ ἀντίστοιχος μεταφορικὸς κώδικας, εἶναι τὸ ἀπόσπασμα B 84 ab. Τὸ συμπληρώνω καὶ τὸ ἐρμηνεύω ὡς ἑξῆς: *κάματός ἐστι τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι* (δηλ. θνητοῖς) *μοχθέειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι* (δηλ. δρόμου ζωῆς) *<ἄλλος δὲ ἄλλου>* *μεταβάλλων* (δηλ. διαδεχόμενος) *ἀναπαύεται* (*μοχθέειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι* εἶναι ὑποκείμενο, *κάματός ἐστι* - κατηγορούμενο, *τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι* - *dativus incommodi*, ποὺ συντάσσεται μὲ τὸ *κάματός ἐστι*, ὅχι μὲ τὸ *μοχθέειν*): «Εἶναι κάματος (πάντοτε) γιὰ τοὺς ἴδιους (θνητοὺς ἢ ἀγωνιστές) νὰ μοχθοῦν (στὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς ζωῆς) καὶ ν' ἀρχίζουν (δηλ. νὰ ξεκινοῦν ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκκίνηση ξανὰ καὶ ξανά). (Γι' αὐτό) διαδεχόμενοι ὁ ἓνας τὸν ἄλλον, παίρνουν ἀνάπαυση», δηλ. πεθαίνουν, ἀφοῦ ἔχουν μεταδώσει τὸν πυρσὸ τῆς ζωῆς στὴν ἐπόμενη γενεά. Ἡ περίφημη εἰκόνα, γνωστὴ ἀπὸ τὸν Πλάτωνα (Νομ. 776 b 2) καὶ τὸν Λουκρήτιο (Π, 79), λοιπόν, εἶναι Ἡρακλείτειας καταγωγῆς.

Στὴ συνέχεια ἐξετάζονται δύο δυνατότητες. Κατὰ τὴν πρώτη, τὸ ἀποσπ. B 84 ἀνήκει στὸ συμπεριεχόμενο τοῦ ἀπ. B 20 (*γενόμενοι ζῶειν ἐθέλουσι μόρους τ' ἔχειν καὶ παῖδας καταλείπουσι μόρους γενέσθαι* (παρατηρεῖται ὅτι τὸ *ἐθέλουσι* δὲν σημαίνει «θέλουν», ἀλλὰ «τείνουν πρὸς τὸν θάνατον», δηλ. γρήγορα πεθαίνουν). Σ' αὐτὴν τὴν περίπτωσι τὸ ἀπ. B 84 θὰ εἶχε καθαρῶς ἀνθρωπολογικὸ χαρακτήρα καὶ θὰ συνδεόταν μὲ τὸ ἀρχαϊκὸ μοτίβο τῆς *ἐφημέρου* ζωῆς. Κατὰ τὴν δεύτερη δυνατότητα (τὴν ὁποία μᾶλλον προτιμῶ) ἡ εἰκόνα τῆς λαμπαδηδρομίας στὸν Ἡράκλειτο λειτουργεῖ ὡς ἓνα συμβολικὸ μοντέλο τοῦ γίνεσθαι γενικὰ καὶ ἀναφέρεται ἐπίσης σὲ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον. Εἶναι μιὰ «σύντομος ἐγκυκλοπαιδεῖα» τῆς φιλοσοφίας τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου, διότι ἐκφράζει ὅλες τὶς βασικὲς τῆς ἀρχῆς· 1) τὴν θεωρίαν τοῦ «πάντα θεῖ», 2) τὰ ἀντίθετα (ἀγών), 3) τὴν φωτιὰ (ὁ πυρσός) καὶ 4) τὸν νόμον τοῦ ἐκκρεμοῦς ἢ τῆς μοιραίας ἐναλλαγῆς (διαδοχῇ). Τὸ τέρα ἐνὸς δρομέως εἶναι ἡ ἐκκίνηση ἐνὸς ἄλλου, ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Α εἶναι ἡ γέννησι τοῦ Β· ἡ ἴδια δομὴ τῆς σκέψεως μᾶς θυμίζει τὸ ἀπ. B 36 (*ψυχῇσι θάνατος ὕδωρ γενέσθαι, ὕδατι θάνατος γῆν γενέσθαι* κτλ.).

Παρ' ὅλο ποὺ τὸ κείμενο τοῦ ἀπ. B 36 δὲν περιέχει καμμία φανερὴ



ἀγωνιστική μεταφορά, είναι πιθανόν, ὅτι στὸ χαμένο συμπεριέχον του ἀπαντοῦσε μιὰ ἀντίστοιχη παραβολή (π.χ. *τὸ οἱ δρομέες ποιεῖνσι κτλ.*), διότι οἱ μεταγενέστερες παραφράσεις συνδέουν αὐτὸ τὸ ἀπόσπασμα μὲ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς *διαδοχῆς*. Ἡ ἀπήχηση τοῦ ἀπ. B 36 στὸν Ψευδο-Ἱπποκράτη, *Περὶ ἐβδομάδων*, 2,1 ἐπίσης ἀναφέρεται στὴν λαμπαδηδρομία. Ὅπως ἔχω ἀποδείξει σὲ μιὰ ἄλλη μελέτη, τὸ ἀναφερόμενο τοῦ ὄρου *ψυχῇ* στὰ ἀπ. B 36 καὶ B 45 εἶναι ὁ ἀέρας (κι ὄχι ἡ φωτιά). Στὸ ἀπ. B 36 ἀντιμετωπίζουμε λοιπὸν τὴν τριάδα τῶν «θνητῶν» στοιχείων —ἀήρ, ὕδωρ, γῆ—, πού κατὰ τὴν ὑπόθεσή μας εἰκονίζονται σὰν δρομεῖς στὴν λαμπαδηδρομία. Ἡ ἀπουσία τοῦ πυρὸς εἶναι ἓνα αἰνίγμα, πού ἀκριβῶς αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπόθεση μπορεῖ νὰ λύσει ἱκανοποιητικά· ἡ φωτιά δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ συμμετέχει στὴν κοσμικὴ λαμπαδηδρομία σὰν *δρομεύς*, διότι εἶναι ὁ ἴδιος ὁ πυρσὸς πού μεταδίδεται ἀπὸ τὸ ἓνα στοιχεῖο στὸ ἄλλο. Στὴ στιγμή τῆς *διαδοχῆς* ὁ ἓνας πεθαίνει (*σταματᾷ*), ὁ ἄλλος γεννιέται (*ξεκινᾷ*), ἐνῶ ἡ φωτιά οὔτε *σταματᾷ* οὔτε *ξεκινᾷ*, καὶ γι' αὐτὸ εἶναι ἀθάνατη (*πῦρ ἀείζων*). Τὸ τέρμα τῆς λαμπαδηδρομίας ἦταν ὁ βωμὸς στὸν ὁποῖο ὁ νικητὴς ἔπρεπε ν' ἀνάψει μιὰ *νέα φωτιά*. Ὁ βωμὸς εἶχε ἐπάνω του ἓνα στρογγυλὸ κοῖλον, δηλ. κάτι *σκαφοειδές*· τὸ *λαμπαδεῖον* ἐνὸς πυρσοῦ ἐπίσης εἶχε μιὰ *σκάφη*. Ἐχοντας ὑπ' ὄψιν τὴν γνωστὴ μεταφορὰ *ἡλίου λαμπάς*, εἶναι φυσικὸ νὰ ὑποθέσουμε ὅτι ἡ καθημερινὴ κοσμικὴ λαμπαδηδρομία τῶν στοιχείων ἔχει ὡς ἀποτέλεσμά της τὸ ἀναμμα ἐνὸς νέου ἡλίου (ἀπ. B 6) στὸ βωμὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Ἐπομένως ἡ θεωρία τῶν οὐρανίων «σκαφῶν», τὴν ὁποία οἱ δοξογράφοι ἀποδίδουν στὸν Ἡράκλειτο, δὲν εἶναι παρὰ μιὰ ψευδο-ἀποκατάσταση, βασισμένη στὴν κυριολεκτικὴ ἐκδοχὴ τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ πυρσοῦ ἢ τοῦ βωμοῦ. Δὲν ἀποκλείεται ὅτι σὰν *βασιλεὺς* ὁ Ἡράκλειτος ἦταν ὁ ἴδιος ὁ *ἐπιστάτης* τῆς λαμπαδηδρομίας· στὶς ἀγγειογραφίες βλέπουμε ἓνα βασιλέα νὰ περιμένει τὸν νικητὴ πλάι στὸ βωμό*.

Andrei LEBEDEV
(Μόσχα)

* Ἡ φιλικὴ βοήθεια καὶ ἡ γενναιοδωρία τοῦ Δρος Λίνου Μπενάκη (Ἀθήνα) καὶ τοῦ Δρος Στυλιανοῦ Λαμπάκη (Ἀθήνα) μὲ ἔχουν ἐφοδιάσει μὲ πολλὰ ἀπαραίτητα (καὶ ἄλλωστε ἀπρόσιτα σὲ μένα) βιβλία, τὰ ὁποῖα διευκόλυναν πολὺ τὶς προσωκρατικὲς μου μελέτες. Τοὺς ἐκφράζω τὴν εὐγνωμοσύνη μου.

