

Andrei Lebedev reviews the new edition of Heraclitus by S.N.Mouraviev. This is English translation of the review (in Russian) that has been accepted for publication in *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Moscow), 2013, Nr 3.

Гераклит Эфесский. Все наследие. На языках оригинала и в русском переводе. Издание подготовил С.Н.Муравьев, изд-во Ad Marginem, Москва, 2012.

«Heraclitus of Ephesus. The complete Heritage. In the language of the original and in Russian translation. Edited by S.N. Mouraviev. «Ad marginem», Moscow, 2012», 347 pp.

The scope and diversity of Mr. Mouraviev's scholarly interests are really impressive. In the bibliography of his publications, apart from numerous volumes and articles on Heraclitus, we encounter works on historical geography, on "sindonology", on the origin of ancient Caucasian alphabets, on Russian history and genealogy etc. The unifying thread of all this is his interest in solving mysteries. S. Mouraviev has solved the mystery of the origin of the Armenian and Aluanian alphabets, of the level change of the Caspian sea in the 1st Millennium B.C., he also has solved the riddle of the Shroud of Turin, and he has discovered the «occult patterns» and «hidden harmonies» of the Heraclitean text (logos).¹ The University Sorbonne IV in 1997 accepted his doctoral thesis on this very subject, i.e. on the «poetics» and «hidden patterns» in the text of Heraclitus' fragments.²

The book under review is an abridged one-volume edition of the many-volume series that is being published since 1999.³ In the preface to his edition of Heraclitus S. Mouraviev explains the merits of his edition as follows: he is the first to have collected and edited the complete corpus of texts that constitute what he calls the «Heraclitean tradition». According to his estimate the total amount of such texts is about 1300⁴, the edition of Miroslav Marcovich (the most complete until now) contains some 700. But let us not forget the dictum οὐκ ἐν τῶι πολλῶι τὸ εὔ. In our days anyone with access to

¹ See the bibliography of Mouraviev's publications at <www.academia.edu> site.

² S.N.Mouraviev, *Poétique et philosophie chez Héraclite. Introduction à la Problématique*, thèse de doctorat préparée sous la direction du Prof. Gilbert Romeyer-Dherbey, Paris ["Myrmekia"], 1996 XXII + 516 p.

³ S.N. Mouraviev, *Heraclitea*, Academia – Sankt-Augustin, 1999 – 2012. 20 volumes advertised, 11 volumes published. The history and aims of the project are described here: S.N. Mouraviev, *Editing Heraclitus (1999-2012): Ten volumes plus one*, in: *Epoché*, vol. 17, Issue 2 (Spring 2013), p. 195 -218.

⁴ This figure is given in the Russian edition, p. 11. Surprisingly, in "Editing Heraclitus..." (see note 3 above), p. 200 he gives a different figure, 1230.

TLG is able to produce with one click a virtually complete database of ancient quotations of any early Greek philosopher from the earliest times to Neoplatonists and even the Byzantines. The virtue and expertise of an editor of the fragments of Greek authors whose original works have been lost, is not measured by the number of texts printed in the edition. Many texts found by TLG search will turn out to be rubbish. Just as in the case of collecting manuscripts for a critical edition, the wise editor of fragments will first of all eliminate worthless duplicates that depend on extant originals. Such are many quotations from Aristotle's commentators and medieval authors, like Albertus the Great, which - with very few exceptions - add nothing to the earlier texts of the same tradition. Let us also remember the dictum of Heraclitus πολυμαθίη νόον ἔχειν οὐ διδάσκει. The numerous iterations of virtually the same text only detract our attention from understanding. And without understanding, without sophisticated hermeneutical technique even the best preserved authentic fragments of Heraclitus will remain sounding brass.

The one-volume Russian edition is divided into 4 sections: biographical testimonia (M = Memoria), doxographical testimonia (D = Doxography), fragments (F = Fragmenta) and a reconstruction of Heraclitus' book (R = Refectio). It is preceded by Introduction, and followed by Notes and some Appendices.

Doxography (D) or «Placita»

The way Mr. Mouraviev quotes and arranges doxographical *testimonia* is very unusual: he is literally obsessed with a tendency to cut into small pieces and to «edit» original texts. These fragments of the fragments then reappear several times under different headings, sometimes in a shorter and longer versions. Quite often several such disjointed micro-pieces are printed continuously under the same number separated only by the sign ||. To read such artificial tangles is tiresome for the eyes and confusing for understanding.

For example, the precious evidence of Diogenes Laertius on Heraclitus' book D.L. 9,5 τὸ δὲ φερόμενον αὐτοῦ βιβλίον ἐστὶ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ συνέχοντος Περί φύσεως, διήχεται δὲ εἰς τρεῖς λόγους, εἷς τε τὸν περὶ τοῦ παντὸς καὶ πολιτικὸν καὶ θεολογικὸν κτλ. 'The book that is extant under his name by its subject matter (or "contents") is «on nature», and is divided into three chapters «On the Universe», «On politics» and «On Theology» the author cuts into two pieces (test. D1 and D4). As a result of this a syntactically defective and meaningless piece ἀπὸ τοῦ συνέχοντος περὶ φύσεως is printed separately as D1, and is mistranslated as «general theory of nature» instead of «by its subject (or contents) is about nature», whereas the other piece of the original (printed as D4), διήχεται δὲ εἰς τρεῖς λόγους is also mistranslated as «the book

has three themes» instead of «is divided into three chapters (or discourses)»; a book cannot be «divided into themes».

In the original another doxographical *testimonium* looks like this: (Dox. 1,3,11) ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος εἶναι τὸ πῦρ «fire is the beginning and the end of all things». The author cuts it into two pieces and transforms it into absurd separate pseudo-testimonium τέλος εἶναι τὸ πῦρ «fire is the end» (?). In the original the conjunction καί joins the words ἀρχή and τέλος, this is a short version of Aristotle's formula of material cause and it cannot be cut into two! Examples of this type can be multiplied. But what is most surprising and, in our view, absolutely impermissible in a scholarly edition of *testimonia*, it is the author's tendency not only to fragment further fragmental texts, but to edit the original as if it were a manuscript of modern author submitted for publication. Mr. Mouraviev does not seem to realize that in doing so he destroys the documentary value of his edition and turns into a παιδιὰ. The *oratio obliqua* in the original text of «Placita» depends on Ἡράκλειτός φησιν vel. sim. The author regularly changes *oratio obliqua* into *recta*, and in doing so he sometimes commits grammatical mistakes and makes additions of his own.

E.g. the well known Aristotle's text on the first philosophers and the discovery of the material cause in Met. 983b7 sq. in the original looks like this: τῶν δὴ πρώτων φιλοσοφησάντων οἱ πλείστοι τὰς ἐν ὕλης εἶδει μόνας ὠήθησαν ἀρχὰς εἶναι πάντων· ἐξ οὗ γὰρ ἔστιν ἅπαντα τὰ ὄντα καὶ ἐξ οὗ γίγνεται πρώτου καὶ εἰς ὃ φθίρεται τελευταῖον, τῆς μὲν οὐσίας ὑπομενούσης τοῖς δὲ πάθεσι μεταβαλλούσης, τοῦτο στοιχεῖον καὶ ταύτην ἀρχὴν φασιν εἶναι τῶν ὄντων... Aristotle presents here a general summary account of what «most of the first philosophers» thought to be the first cause; it is only further that he mentions them by name starting with Thales, and Heraclitus is mentioned only at 384b7. In Mouraviev's edition under D11 we read

τὴν ἐν ὕλης εἶδει μόνη (sic! - AL) ὠήθησεν (Ἡράκλειτος τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ) ἀρχὴν εἶναι πάντων κτλ.

Mouraviev's translation runs: «(Heraclitus's) beginning of the All (is one and) material. That, out of which all existing things consist, and what they appear from the start...»

As we see, the author «edits» Aristotle, changing the *pluralis* ὠήθησαν into *singularis* ὠήθησεν in order to transform the general *testimonium* into a special *testimonium* about Heraclitus only. In doing so he invents a form of aorist ὠήθησεν (instead of ὠήθη) which does not exist, and the change of pl. μόνας into sing. μόνη (instead of μόνην) results in syntactical incongruity. But this is not the whole story: he also adds to Aristotle's words in parenthesis something he composed himself (Ἡράκλειτος τὴν μίαν αὐτοῦ), but this addition does not fit Aristotle's text. By mistranslating γίγνεται πρώτου as «what they appear from the start» instead of «out of which they are generated as from the first» the author also distorts Aristotle's formula of the material cause. No

comments are required. In our view, someone who dares to edit Aristotle, should first learn elementary Greek grammar.

Here are more instances of «editing» without comments: ἡ καπνώδης ἀναθυμίασις εἶναι ὁσμή (B143 - after removal from the text of the word δοκεῖ), ἡ φύσις ἐστὶν ἀνάγκη (D168). While «editing» the famous text of Aristotle about the origin of Platonic philosophy from Heraclitus' theory of the Universal Flux, the author invents this: (D208) πάντα τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἀεὶ ρέουσι (sic -AL) καὶ ἐπιστήμη περὶ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστι. The original has πάντων τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀεὶ ρεόντων κτλ. Mr. Mouraviev does not seem to know that in classical Greek subject in plur.n. requires a verb in singular (πάντα ρεῖ !) and he even makes this mistake a norm of his own: D223 (τὰ ἐναντία) περιχωρεύουσι κ D224 συμφέρονται τὰ πάντα (in the original συμφέρεσθαι).

D222 The quotation from Plutarch *De E* 392 B has been inaptly torn out of the context with bad Greek as a result: οὐδὲν ... μένει... δυνάμενος . In the original the word δυνάμενος goes with λόγος which has been omitted by the author. In the same *testimonium* λήγει has an incorrect accent ληγῆι.

D237 ἀναθυμιάσιν ἐστι ἡ ψυχὴ. In Mr. Mouraviev's private grammar Nom. is not a required case for the subject; Acc. is fine!

The addition to Aristotle's text discussed above is nothing when compared with the text below.

D221. In Plutarch's original text we read: *De sera numinis* 559 C ἡ λήσομεν εἰς τὸν Ἡρακλείτειον (fr. B 91) ἅπαντα πράγματα ποταμὸν ἐμβalόντες, εἰς ὃν οὐ φησι δις ἐμβῆναι τῷ πάντα κινεῖν καὶ ἕτεροιοῦν τὴν φύσιν μεταβάλλουσιν. Mr. Mouraviev (on p.150) prints a different text: <ἡ πόλις ὡσπερ ἄνθρωπος ἐξίσταται αὐτοῦ ταῖς καθ' ἡλικίαν μεταβολαῖς καὶ ἕτερον ἐξ ἑτέρου γινόμενον>, ποταμῶι εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἔστι δις ἐμβῆναι, τῶι πάντα κινεῖν κτλ. The words in angle brackets are an incomplete quotation from the preceding context 559a Ἐν γάρ τι πρῶγμα καὶ συνεχὲς ἡ πόλις ὡσπερ ζῶον κτλ. This wishful cut and paste in Plutarch's text has resulted in grammatical incongruities. To begin with, πόλις in Greek is feminine, therefore ἐξίσταται αὐτοῦ should be emended to αὐτῆς, and γινόμενον to γινομένη. SM does not seem to realize that αὐτοῦ and γινόμενον in Plutarch's text depend on *neutrum* πρῶγμα, the word he has omitted! And the dative ποταμῶι still hangs in the air, because the verb ἐμβalόντες has been dropped. SM mistranslates «changes ... like river (*rekoi*) », but this is impossible meaning of ποταμῶι. This is another “russism”, i.e. confusion of the usages of Greek dative and Russian *tvoritel'nyi* case. In Russian *tech' rekoi* can mean “to flow like a river”, but in Greek ρεῖν or ἕτερον γίνεσθαι ποταμῶι is a meaningless combination of words. Normative Greek requires ρεῖν ποταμοῦ δίκην vel sim.

It is hard to see why the following authentic fragments or non-doxographical paraphrases have been included in the Doxography section: D21, D38, D110, D113,

D114, B119, B122, D129, D147, D215, D220. And it is equally hard to see why 65 doxographical *testimonia* have been included in the *Refectio* section (see below).

The same texts are often duplicated not only in different sections, but also in the same section, e.g. D 133 - D100 (scintilla), D107 = D150, D144 = D166, D49 = D212, D215 = D110 (different text of the same *testimonium!*). Examples can be multiplied, in fact the author has collected them himself in the concordances on p.273-344. We believe that such arrangement of the material does not contribute to the logical order and clarity of edition. Rather it transforms the collection into a bizarre kaleidoscope of randomly intermingled scraps of text, often the same in different combinations.

Wrong attributions. The following *testimonia* have been incorrectly ascribed to Heraclitus, either on insufficient grounds or on no grounds at all:

D23, D39, D66, D66, D71, D79 (the conception of moon as another earth is incompatible with *skaphai* and cosmic exhalations), D82 (erroneously ascribes to Heraclitus Strabo's interpretation of Arktos as «Arctic circle»), D88 (the name of Heraclitus is not mentioned in the Aristotelian passage about the river of exhalation in *Meteor.* 346b24), D93, D101, D102 (it is impossible to credit Heraclitus with the localization of mind in the brain, since the Stoics still held the archaic view), D103 (then why not to print in Doxography all Ps-Heraclitean letters?), D112, D116 (without any reason the author ascribes to Her. a piece of Christian sermon), D118, D120 (no reason) , D121, D124 (this is a parallel, not a testimonium), D127 (this is a reminiscence of the fragment about *psyche*), D128, D130, D131 , D137 (?!), D138, D139 (invention of the author), D143 (Aristotle's theory of smell), D144 (a parallel, not a testimonium), D145, D148 (requires analysis), D151, D152, D155, in D175 - D176 the author ascribes to Heraclitus logical terminology of Aristotle (!), D 191 - ἄλλο as a term for «matter» is ascribed in this text to Pythagoras, not to Heraclitus, D231 - 235 и D239 (from Albertus and Scholastics), D236 (without any reason the author ascribes to Heraclitus the Aristotelian theory and terminology of *kinesis*), D241 acribes to Heraclitus the surprising thesis κίνησις οὐκ ἔστιν which contradicts dozens of texts on Flux and motion quoted before.

Grammatical mistakes in the translation. The author mistranslates the tenses of the Greek verb. In D 49 the passive aorist ἡρμόσθαι means «(all things) are harmoniously joined together», and not «adjust themselves», in D 54 a contrary mistake, the *praesens* εἰς αὐτὸ συσπυκνόμενον (of fire) is mistranslated as «having united with itself» instead of «being condensed».

D 40 τῶι ἐναντίῳ ποιεῖται is translated as «sensations are produced by the contrary». ποιεῖσθαι is not passive here, it is a special Peripatetic usage of medium voice to denote philosophical explanations, theories etc. (cf. JSL, q.v. A V). The correct translation would be (Heraclitus) «explains the sense perception by the principle of «contrary is

cognized by the contrary». In D 157 νοητόν means «perceived by the mind, intelligible», not «conscious» (this would be νοερόν).

D161 τῶν ἐναντίων ἢ φύσις γλίχεται is mistranslated as «nature enjoys the opposites» (?), instead of «clings to opposites». Unintelligible is the translation of D 142 «the attention has continuation through the eyeholes». The author does not understand the difference between the Russian verbs *vialit'* «to sun dry» (e.g. fish) and *valiat'* «to felt» (wool). As a result of this in D66 πηλίματτα πυρός is incorrectly translated as «sun dried (*vialennyie*) clots of fire» instead of «felted (*svaliavshiesia*)». The correctness of the lemma of this placitum has been with good reason doubted by Diels, Marcovich and others. Πίλησις is Anaximenes' metaphorical term for condensation. The translation of ὑπόκυρτον in D 77 as «sub-convex» («*podvypuklyi*») is surprising, because such word does not exist in Russian and is meaningless. Mr. Mouraviev does not seem to know that in classical Greek the prefix ὑπο- besides the spatial meaning «under» can also denote small degree of the quality expressed by the basic adjective to which it is attached. E.g. ὑπαφρονέστερος (Her. 4,9) does not mean «underfoolish», but «a bit foolish» («a bit» is here *litotes*, Herodotus means that Thracians who had deified the quack Zalmoxis are **absolute idiots**). By the same token ὑπόκυρτος means «slightly convex», which means that the «basins» (*skaphai*) of the heavenly bodies are shallow.

Unnecessary or unacceptable emendations of the Greek text are also found in D103, D105 (in the text of «Placita» the copula εἶναι is often omitted in oratio obliqua, because it is easily supplied as subunderstood from preceding lemmata), D110, D129, D136.

Fragments: sections F (Fragmenta) and Refectio

Now let us pass from the edition of doxography to the edition of fragments. The reader is surprised to find not one, but two editions of fragments by the same author under the same cover. The first is titled just «Fragments» (pp. 155 - 182), and the second «Refectio» or «Reconstruction» (pp. 184 - 211). In the first the Book of Heraclitus has no title at all, in the second it has two at once: Μοῦσαι ἢ περὶ φύσεως. The numeration and the order of fragments are different: the first follows DK. In the 1st edition the fragments have index F, in the second none. The number of fragments is different, too: 156 in the first, 248 in the second. In the «Reconstruction» some thematic headings are added to the groups of fragments. To our surprise these headings are added not only to the translation (that would be fine), but to the Greek text as well, i.e. they are first composed by the author in Russian and then translated into Greek, and printed together with the Greek text of the fragments somehow pretending to be a part of the lost original of Heraclitus's book. The Greek text of the fragments (leaving aside the «patches» added in R) is usually the same, the translation sometimes is different. E.g. *logos* is translated in F as *glagol*, and in R as *rechenie*. Both are archaic Church Slavonic words whose meaning

for the modern Russian reader is opaque; worst of all, *glagol* in modern Russian is exclusively used as a grammatical term for «verb». In his preface the author explains that his «Reconstruction» is a «bonus», i.e. a generous gift of the author to Russian readers, «a kind of compensation to the reader who is aggrieved by the absence in this book of our own exposition of the Ephesian's teaching». «Its purpose is to present to the reader both the book and the virtually contained in it the teaching (of Heraclitus) at once». One may wonder how the author can know in advance that his readers will be «aggrieved» by such omission?

We take into account both the fragments included in “Reconstruction” and in F, but follow the numbers of R, because it contains all the fragments of in F plus much more, whereas section (F) contains only 22 fragments that are not included in (R).

Let us begin with the alleged title of Heraclitus' book Μοῦσαι ἢ περὶ φύσεως . It seems that Heraclitus, according to Mr. Mouraviev, could not decide about the title himself and so left it to the reader. Interesting hypothesis, but we would like to see a single parallel to such book title from the late archaic period. Similar titles - Μοῦσαι and Βάκχαι - have been attached to Herodotus' «Histories» and Philolaus' «*Peri physeos*» respectively in Hellenistic times only. And in these cases there was at least a rationale - the number of books, 9 and 3, corresponding to the number of Muses and group of Bacchantes. But Heraclitus' *syngramma* consisted of a single book only divided into three discourses. In our view such title is impossible not only on formal, but also on philosophical grounds. Heraclitus despised Homer and considered the poets liars. His book was about truth opposed to the poetic fiction inspired by Muses. Heraclitus' philosophical Muse was the Logos of the Universe that reveals the true objective «nature» (*physis*) of the world. So how he could give such a contradictory and self-refuting title to his book? There can be little doubt that by those who «give» to Heraclitus' book the title of Μοῦσαι Diogenes or his source meant Plato who refers in the «Sophist» 242d to Heraclitus as «Ἰάδεις Μοῦσαι» and to Empedocles as Σικελικαὶ Μοῦσαι. It would be precarious on the ground of this Platonic joke to print the fragments of Empedocles' poem under the title Περὶ φύσεως ἢ Μοῦσαι.

Diogenes Laertius in his biography of Heraclitus (9.12) gives a list of different titles by which Heraclitus' book was cited in various sources. One of them is γνώμην ἠθῶν, τρόπου κόσμον ἑνὸς τῶν ξυμπάντων. Mr. Mouraviev already in his first article on Heraclitus published in VDI 1970 Nr.3, p. 113 sq. «discovered» in this title a neglected fragment of Heraclitus, allegedly the *incipit* of Heraclitus' book. The «Reconstruction» now begins with this very text, heavily disformed by author's wishful «emendations» and put into question form (p. 184):

Γνώμη ἦτι θεῶν <κάν>νθρώπων κτλ. The translation runs: «will there be any knowledge about gods and men, about the single order of all?»

Such reading and interpretation are impossible for the following reasons.

- 1) Untrustworthy attribution. It comes from the list of four different titles, of which only one is attested from the 4th century B.C., one derives from Platonic joke, and one was invented by Diodotus.
- 2) Impossible as *incipit*. Both Sextus and Aristotle (two independent sources) testify that Heraclitus' book began with fr. B1. But Mr. Mouraviev knows better. He places 9 other fragments in the beginning, and only after them the fragment B1.
- 3) Impossible text and translation. There are traces of the original wording in the 4th title. Ἡθος is associated with γνώμας in B78. This prohibits the change of ἠθῶν to θεῶν. According to Sextus VII,7 some interpreters of Heraclitus proposed to class him with ἠθικοί rather than φυσικοί philosophers. The fourth title in Diogenes list, like the title of Diodotus (which also contains traces of Heraclitus original terms - οἰάκισμα), was intended to emphasize the ethical content of Heraclitus' book, and this again confirms the authenticity of ἠθῶν. The unwarranted change of τρόπου το ἀνθρώπων seems to be based on the school pronunciation of Θ as T. But τρόπου κόσμον "the order of behavior" fits the context and does not require emendation. Γνώμη ἤ θεῶν with alleged *conj. dubitationis* is bad Greek. And γνώμη θεῶν cannot mean «knowledge about gods» because γνώμη never means «knowledge». Even if such phrase were attested, it would mean something like «the mind of gods» or «the will of gods», but not «knowledge about gods».

According to our estimate 47 out of 248 fragments printed in the «Reconstruction», i.e. about 20%, are neither Heraclitean quotations from ancient authors, no doxographical testimonia about Heraclitus' doctrines, but texts which for the most part entirely (or in some cases, partially), have been invented and composed by Mouraviev himself, usually in bad Greek; in few cases they are wishful attributions to Heraclitus of texts ascribed in our sources to other philosophers like Chrysippus. These pseudo-fragments are listed below (the numbers are those of the «Reconstruction»):

1, 7, 13 (by form), 20, 22 (except the word ἀχιβασίη), 23 (a historical novel about Homer and Archilochus composed by SM), 27 (quotation from Chrysippus), 28 (continuation of the historical novel), 38 (by form), 42 (another quotation from Chrysippus), 43 (by form), 45 (the novel continued), 59, 62 (wishful conflation of two different versions of the same fragment), 72 (the words in angle brackets), 75, 76 (the words in angle brackets), 79 (the words in angle brackets), 81 (pure fiction), 86 (by form), 92, 93 (a free translation of the soul/spider analogy from Latin into bad Greek), 94 (the words in angle brackets), 99 (the words in angle brackets), 115 (the words in angle brackets), after 117 - two fictitious «fragments» in angle brackets, before 124 (the words in angle brackets), 125 (translation from Latin), 126 - a hybrid of doxography and invention, before 135 (the words in angle brackets), 136-137, 139, 141 (by form), 143

(words in angle brackets), 144, 150 (invented everything except the word ἄκεια), 159 (words in angle brackets), 161 (everything except the word χρησιμοσύνη), 163 (here the author indulges in unrestricted confabulation), 165 (everything except the word κόρος), 176, 177, 187, 188, 189, 214.

It would be a waste of time to analyze in detail every piece of Mr. Mouraviev' historical fiction. All these fictitious fragments are not only worthless, but in a sense dangerous for non-specialists who may be duped into believing that these free compositions of the author (often written in awkward Greek with grammatical mistakes) represent genuine quotations from Heraclitus. Nevertheless we discuss some samples below.

The following 65 texts are not fragments (quotations) from Heraclitus' book, but either doxographical testimonia or free paraphrases, imitations and ancient interpretations of Heraclitus: 8 (the words of Hippolytus in angle brackets), 87-90, 94-95, 113-115, 118-119, 121, 131, 157, 160, 169-174, 180, 184-186, 191-205, 212, 215-218, 220-229, 232, 235, 237, 240 (the imitation of Scythinus), 242-243, 245-248. It is worth noting that all these texts are also included in the D (Doxography) section of the edition. It becomes clear that the book under review contains not only two editions of fragments that duplicate each other to a large degree, but also two duplicating each other editions of doxography, of which the first quotes the same texts with a wider context.

The F section contains 22 additional "fragments" (i.e. not included in R) ⁵, of which only one (104A) is a part of a genuine fragment, the rest is a strange mixture of *Zweifelhafte, Falsche und Gefälschte Fragmente* in DK, fragments of Heraclides Ponticus, astrological treatise (F 139), a biographical anecdote from DL (F 140) and even a well known fragment of Epicharmus (F 156)!

Now if we subtract from the general number of fragments in both sections (248 + 21 = 269) the compositions of Mr. Mouraviev (47), doxographica (65) and *spuria* in "F" (21), the remaining number will be 136 which is close to Diels-Kranz (139 including *dubia* and *spuria*, 125 authentic) and other recent editions: 125 Marcovich, 125 Kahn, 136 Conche. In other words the edition under review does not contain really new, unknown fragments of Heraclitus (except the Derveni and the Oxyrrh. Fragments). All that is new, unfortunately, is either invented or wrongly attributed to Heraclitus. But the remaining genuine fragments, recognized by professional scholars, quite often appear in a strange, sometimes unrecognizable form. Because they also, like doxography, have been submitted to a wishful «editing», unnecessary rewriting and, worst of all, to a merciless mutilation by bizarre and wild «emendations» of what is usually absolutely sound Greek text. The examples adduced below show how Mr. Mouraviev systematically

⁵ F 4B, F 104A, F 126, F 131, F 135A, F 138, F 139, F 140, F 141, F 142, F 143-150, F 151, F 154-155, F 156.

transforms textually impeccable, grammatically sound and philosophically meaningful fragments into textually strange, grammatically perverse and philosophically absurd or trivial texts.

Now let us have a look at fragments with unnecessary or impossible «emendations» (or both) and supplements by the author. The fragment numbers are those of the «Reconstruction» /DK respectively.

2 /B 23: SM reads Δίκης ἄνομοι οὐκ ἂν ἔδησαν instead of Δίκης ὄνομα οὐκ ἂν ἤιδεσαν κτλ. «they (ho polloi) would not have known the name of justice, if such things (i.e. crimes) did not exist» accepted by DK and most scholars. In order to preserve the impossible MSS. reading ἔδησαν SM changes the MSS. ὄνομα to ἄνομοι and translates «the lawless people would not need justice etc». But this translation does not correspond to the Greek text. It is based on the confusion of two distinct verbs (LSJ, q.v. I «to bind» and II «to be in need»). The aorist from δέω II is ἐδέησαν, not ἔδησαν which is a form of δέω I «to bind». But even ἐδέησαν would not do as the original of SM's translation, for the latter requires ἐδεήθησαν. Another unwarranted mutilation of Heraclitus's text which destroys a precious piece of evidence of Heraclitus theory of names, as well as on his theory of the relativity of human values, including the concept of Justice, and transforms the paradoxical philosophical dictum into a clumsy platitude. We perceive this as an act of intellectual vandalism.

4 untrustworthy reconstruction of the Heraclitus quotation in *Pap. Derveni*. The text as a whole is barbaric Greek with unwarranted supplements. By sun's «measures» Heraclitus first of all meant «turning points» «limits» of the year and Grand year cycles (τροπαί, τέρματα, οὔρος, προσήκοντας ὄρους). Therefore the supplement εὐ]ρους is unlikely, read οὐ]ρους.

8/ B50 SM ascribes to Heraclitus (as verbatim quotation!) Hippolytus' christological context εἶναι τὸ πᾶν διαρετὸν ἀδιαίρετον ... δίκαιον, to which he adds a figment of his own written in barbaric Greek. Λόγου in B50 is Bernays' emendation of the MSS. δόγματος accepted by all scholars. Mr. Mouraviev has his own «private understanding» (ιδίη φρόνησις) of the rules of textual criticism. He prints in his text both the emendation and the emended word, i.e. both λόγου and δόγματος as Heraclitean!

9/ B 41 the form ὅτεηι does not exist and cannot exist in normal Greek.

11/ B 34 unwarranted punctuation ἀξύνετοι· ἀκούσαντες

12 / B 19 confusion of Russian and Greek forms of address. In Russian you can say *Неверные!* – «you, unfaithful», but in Greek a free address⁶ normally requires the particle ὦ, i.e. in this case ὦ ἄπιστοι! Besides that, addresses to *hoi polloi* or Ephesians in

⁶ Eleanor Dickey, *Greek forms of address*, Oxf. 1996. p. 24.

the second person occur in Pseudo-Heraclitean letters only, not in the authentic fragments. And the authenticity of the word ἄπιστοι has to be proved.

13 / B 72 unwarranted «ionization» of Marcus' paraphrase (which is not a verbatim fragment!) with linguistically impossible change of normal ὦ...λόγωι to abnormal ὄσωι... λόγωι.

16 / B 73 + B 47 : wishful conflation of two distinct fragments paraphrased by Marcus Aurelius: the one on «sleepers» (B 73) is a paraphrase of B 1 DK, the other (B 74) is a proverbial phrase «children of their own parents». The text of Marcus' second paraphrase is absolutely clear and sound: we should not act and speak like «children of our parents», i.e. «as we have received it from the tradition» (καθότι παρειλήφραμεν), which means we should not believe old fables about gods etc. told by the poets, but we should believe our eyes rather than ears, i.e. our personal experience and the logos of the Universe. Mr. Mouraviev, surprisingly, inserts in the Greek text the word ὑλακτεῖν «to bark» and translates «nor should we bark like children of our fathers»! What does it mean? How can children «bark»? As a result of such wild distortion of the MSS. text the fragment loses not only its philosophical (epistemological) meaning (personal experience versus oral tradition), but becomes a plain absurdity.

21 / B 124: bizarre «emendation» of the MSS. reading κεχυμένων to κεκυημένων with the following translation «and like meat bulked at random would be the most beautiful of the conceived ... (cosmos)». The reference is allegedly to aborted foetus. But κεκυημένος does not mean «conceived». It is attested only once in Galen (*De septimestri partu*, line 70 in TLG) as applied to ἡμέραι, i.e. days of pregnancy. The word used for βρέφος is ἀποκεκυημένος. And again, in the text «emended» by SM there is nothing that corresponds with the notion of «heap» or «bulk» in the translation. This notion is present partly in the MSS. reading κεχυμένων and especially in the emendations of σάρξ (σωρός, σάρμα etc.) both of which the author rejects! In Mr. Mouraviev' own text the verb κεκυημένων goes with ἄριστος as *gen. partitivus*, and so the adverb εἰκῆι is left hanging in the air. It seems that Mr. Mouraviev connects it with the noun σάρξ. But a phrase like σὰρξ εἰκῆι with intended meaning «randomly bulked meat», i.e. «disformed meat» is impossible in Greek or (we presume) in any I.-E. language with adverbs. Mr. Mouraviev does not seem to understand that an adverb is named so because it is applied to verbs (ad-verbium), not to nouns. Neither in classical Greek, nor in any modern European language you can say «house warmly» instead of «warm house». By the same token you cannot say «meat by chance» instead of «disformed meat». B 124 is an extremely important text not only for the reconstruction of Heraclitus' philosophy of nature, but for the history of Western philosophy in general, because it is the earliest known (attested by authentic quotation, not by doxography) instance of teleological polemics against mechanistic physics, using an «argument from design». Mr. Mouraviev

by his irresponsible and illiterate textual criticism destroys this philosophical treasure and transforms it into a nightmarish scene from abortion clinic. This is another act of true intellectual vandalism.

24 / B 80. Impossible reading εὖ δέ and ἐρεῖν instead of generally accepted εἰδέναι and ἔριν turn into nonsensical love story the most important Heraclitean fragment on cosmic strife. According to the «emended» text, Polemos falls in love with Dike! But ἐρέω «to love» is virtually non-existent (once in Archilochus), in Ionic prose (Herodotus, Hippocrates) ἐρέω always is a form of ἐρῶ «to say». Inf. ἐρεῖν = ἐρᾶν does not seem to be attested.

26/ B 53 The insertion of γάρ in the text of the Polemos fragment is unwarranted. Μὲν γάρ is a normal combination of particles, but γὰρ ... μὲν is strange and unknown to Denniston.

31 / B 20 The insertion of δὴν in the beginning is bizarre. It makes the syntax very hard and distorts Heraclitus' thought.

35 / B 136 Mr. Mouraviev who has discovered «syllabo-tonic rhythm» in Heraclitus' fragments and even «hidden patterns» invisible to professional classicists, does not recognize ordinary Greek meters. Otherwise he would not have inserted the unmetrical θανοῦσαι in the beginning of the hexameter line.

36 / B 63: Conjecture ἐν θά<πρω> is impossible. The dialect form θάπος is attested only once in Eustathius in the sense of θάμβος, not in the sense of “grave”. The use of dialect and rare words (especially of *hapax legomena*!) from lexicographers in emendations of the texts whose authors ignore such words, is a clear sign of crude and amateurish textual criticism.

39 / B 57 There is only one person on planet Earth who translates the Greek word for «merriment», εὐφροσύνη, as «night». This is Serge Mouraviev.

41 / B 99 The Ionic and Homeric word for «night» εὐφρόνη disappeared from colloquial usage by Hellenistic times, and so was doomed to be corrupted on a regular basis in medieval manuscripts as εὐφροσύνη, a word familiar to Byzantines and still used in Modern Greek. So when the common word εὐφροσύνη occurs in MSS. tradition in connection with ἡμέρα vel sim., it is with 100% certainty a corruption of an uncommon word εὐφρόνη. And if both words occur as *variae lectiones*, the reading εὐφρόνη is with 100% certainty a *lectio difficilior*. Every professional editor of Greek texts knows this elementary fact. Mr. Mouraviev ignores it. That is why he retains in all cases the corrupted εὐφροσύνη and mistranslates it as «night». But this is not enough! In the present case (B 99 DK) the MSS. tradition of Plutarch (both in «Aqua an ignis» and in «De fortuna») preserves the correct reading εὐφρόνη. But Mr. Mouraviev «emends» it to εὐφροσύνη! In doing so he commits two crude mistakes at once: he violates the basic

principles of textual criticism (because he is unable to discern *lectio difficilior* from *facilior*), he intentionally corrupts the sound MSS. text and he also mistranslates the wrong reading!

44 / B 120 The wishful change of the MSS. reading οὔρος αἰθρίου Διός to κόρος α. Δ. destroys the beautiful Heraclitean analogy of the «Cosmic stadium» and the best available exemplification of the fundamental law of *enantiodromia* of opposites (or cyclic change). οὔρος is the «turning-point» (*terma* in the stadium) of a *dolichos* race, at which every opposite reverses its course from ὁδὸς ἄνω to ὁδὸς κάτω and runs in opposite direction.⁷

46 / B 129: unwarranted insertion of <ὁ> between Pythagoras' name and patronymic.

47 / B 35: unwarranted change of pl. ἴστορας to sing. ἴστορα.

50 / B 104. No grammar, no sense. As usually in SM, mistranslation of impossible barbaric Greek. διδασκάλωι χρείων τε ὀμίλωι is unintelligible, but in any case this cannot mean «another guy vaticinates as a teacher» (?).

53 / B 29 ascribes to Heraclitus Clement's context, τοῖς αἰσχίστοις τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν is a quotation from Demosthenes, *De corona* 296.

54 / B 125A is a quotation from a Pseudo-Heraclitean letter, not a genuine fragment. In the genuine B 121 H. does not address Ephesians in second person.

55 / B 44 : implausible emendation of γινομένου to γε νομίμου. What does νόμιμος νόμος mean? SM translates «original law», but νόμιμος has no such meaning.

69 / B 86: the author erroneously ascribes to Heraclitus as a verbatim quotation Clement's idea of «Christian gnosis». As usually, mistranslation of impossible text. Διαφυγγάνει means «escapes», not «are dispelled» (?).

74 / B 101 gives a trivializing translation of ἐμεωυτόν as «by myself» instead of «myself», and so both destroys the very foundation of Heraclitus' ethics and cuts its connection with the Delphic imperative "know thyself".

75 / cf. B 92 this is not a separate fragment. Clement depends on the Plutarch's quotation about Sibyl (B 92 DK, correctly Marcovich test. 75 a 1) and says that the future (τὸ μέλλον) was revealed (πεφάνθαι) to Sibyl with the help of god. SM, implausibly, reads and translates μάλλον Σιβύλλης as «better than Sibyl» (!) and εἰμι πεφασμένος as «I have explained everything for myself» (?). Mistranslation of impossible Greek.

⁷ A.V.Lebedev, *The Cosmos as a Stadium. Agonistic metaphors in Heraclitus' Cosmology, Phronesis*, 1985.

98 / B 26. Mr. Mouraviev mercilessly «emends» sound texts, but leaves untouched one of the most corrupt fragments about parallelism of micro- and macrocosmos. Impossible Greek and no philosophical sense.

99 / B 21 On εὐφροσύνη here and in 98 / B 26 see our comments above ad fr. 44 / B 99.

100 / B 89 All editors accept the emendation of the MSS. reading ἀναστρέφεισθαι to ἀποστρέφεισθαι. The author retains the reading of MSS. and translates it as «turns away», but this is the meaning not of the MSS. reading he chooses, but of the emendation he rejects!

101 (B 2): pointless change of διό to δι' ὅ, in any case this is Sextus', not Heraclitus' word. The author mistakes Sextus' explanatory remark ξυνὸς γὰρ ὁ κοινός for Heraclitus' words, but Sextus simply «translates» the Ionic word: «for ξυνός (in Ionic) means κοινός (in ordinary usage)».

105 / B 114: the emendation of the second πόλις (of dittographic origin) into πολὺ imposes itself and is accepted by all editors. The reading πόλις spoils the syntax of the fragment and destroys the «Fraenkel's proportion» on which it is formally based.

111 / B 10. One of the most bizarre «emendations» in this edition afflicts one of the most important metaphysical fragments of Heraclitu. To begin with, the reading συλλάψεις is superior to the more trivial συνάψεις. The author prefers the inferior reading and then spoils it further it by turning it into verb συνῆψ' ἔς. Such procedure is typical for SM: first he creates bad Greek, and then he mistranslates it into unintelligible Russian. The verb συνάπτω normally means «to unite, to join», but SM translates it «she (harmony) has harnessed into curved and non-curved etc.». One usually «harnesses» a horse. In our view the combination συνάπτω + εἰς + two accusatives is both grammatically impossible and meaningless.

123 / B 58: the unwarranted change of Hippolytus' γοῦν into οὐκ οὔν and the translation «(the doctors)... are by no means dissatisfied...» contradict flatly the words «they complain» (ἐπαιτιῶνται).

128 / cf. B 84: unwarranted change of the MSS. reading φυγῆι to φορῆι.

129 / B 84: unwarranted change of the MSS. reading ἄρχεσθαι to ἀρκεῖσθαι. Just as in the preceding fragment, medieval corruption is excluded and the integrity of the reading ἄρχεσθαι is guaranteed by other Neoplatonists who quote the same sayings from Plotinus.

135 / B 125: both the Greek text and the translation/interpretation of the fragment about *kykeon* are illogical. SM chooses the reading without μή and wishfully «emends» κινούμενος to κυκούμενος. Such form does not exist, the participle from κυκάω will be κυκώμενος. Like any cocktail, *kykeon* disintegrates into constituents when it is *not*

stirred, not when it is stirred. Therefore the reading μὴ κινούμενος imposes itself as the only possible.

151 / B 15: unwarranted change of μὴ to μήν and strange translation. ὅτεωι μαίνονται means «possessed by whom they become mad», not «for the sake of whom...».

153 / B 11: superfluous insertion in the text of the word οὖ which is not even placed within angle brackets.

162 / B 31: impermissible «emendation» of the MSS. reading διαχέεται into αἶα χέεται.

It is methodologically wrong to emend an authentic fragment on the basis of a doxographical paraphrase. And again, before making such conjecture one has to ask himself if this poetic word accords with Heraclitus' usage: in all other fragments he uses the prosaic γῆ. SM in his «textual criticism» does not only breaks the rules of Greek grammar and ascribes to Greek words unnatural or non-existing meanings, he invents Greek words of his own! In this particular case he has invented *ad hoc* a bizarre word πυρόθεν allegedly meaning «from fire». This word is nowhere attested and even the theoretical possibility of existence of such word is zero. Γῆθεν is a false analogy, because «earth» is also a place, so γῆθεν (opposed to οὐρανόθεν) connotes «from below», but words denoting substances do not contain connotations of place or direction, and therefore words like πυρόθεν, ὕδατόθεν, ἀερόθεν, χρυσόθεν etc. do not exist.

167 / B 64 + B 65: an unsuccessful attempt to join two distinct fragments into single text by impermissible means. SM «corrects» αὐτό (= τὸ πῦρ) into αὐτός (= Κεραυνός) and so establishes the following text: καλεῖ δὲ αὐτός (= Κεραυνός) χρησιμοσύνην καὶ κόρον. The translation of the integrated text B 64 + 65 runs: «The Pilot of All is the lightning of Zeus, and he produces («*vyzyvaet*») deficiency and abundance of fire». But the word καλεῖ belongs to Hippolytus, it is not a part of quotation. Hippolytus writes «He (i.e. Heraclitus) calls it (i.e. fire) deficiency and abundance». In any case, in Russian the verb *vyzyvat'* has two meanings: 1) to call, 2) to cause, to produce. The Greek verb καλέω has only the first meaning, but never the second.⁸ Mr. Mouraviev commits a ridiculous mistake by confusing the semantics of the Greek and Russian verbs and by mistranslating Greek καλέω as «to produce» ! As a rule, Mr. Mouraviev's mistakes of translation follow the wrong «emendations» of the Greek text and are added to them. In this case, however, the wrong emendation depends on and is generated by the mistranslation of the Greek word.

⁸ in Modern Greek προκαλώ can mean «to cause». It seems that both modern Greek προκαλώ «to cause» and Russian *vyzyvat'* «to cause» are semantic calques (loan-translations) of the French *provoquer*. from Latin *provoco* that, unlike classical Greek προκαλέω, could mean «to cause»

237 ἐναντιοτροπή is a cumbersome late doxographical word paraphrasing B 51 (παλίντροπος) and so does not qualify for a separate fragment.

To the above samples of Mr. Mouraviev's editorial art we will add his extravagant emendation of the biographical testimonium M 23. Aristotle in *De partibus anim.* 545 a 17 recounts as a parable for the students of nature a story about Heraclitus and visitors who were embarrassed when they saw the famous man «warming up by the oven»; Heraclitus encouraged them «to come in, for there are gods here, too». The transmitted text seems to be in perfect order, the point of the anecdote is clear: there are gods even in the kitchen (allusion to Heraclitus' pantheism and the divine fire). Nevertheless, Mr. Mouraviev, following an unfortunate suggestion of D.S. Robertson (ἰπνός = κοπρών)⁹, «emends» the MSS. reading θερόμενον πρὸς τῶι ἰπνῶι into θρώμενον πρὸς τῶι ἰπνῶι which he translates as «...sitting in the toilet» («vossedaia v nuzhnike») (p.23). Such reading and interpretation are impossible for the following reasons. 1) θράομαι (cf. θράνος «bench») is *hapax* attested only in Philitas (fr.14.1 Powell). It is methodologically wrong to «correct» a word that is part of Aristotle's standard vocabulary with an uncommon poetic word that is not attested in Aristotle and is virtually unknown. Aristotle would have used a common word like καθήμενον, καθεζόμενον vel sim. 2) The normal and well-attested meaning of ἰπνός is «oven» or «kitchen» (fireplace). The obscene usage (= κοπρών) occurs only once in Aristophanes (LSJ, q.v. IV). Many ordinary words with neutral meaning are used with obscene allusions in the Old Attic comedy. It would be precarious to import such comic usage into Aristotle's philosophical prose. 3) Aristotle himself was a «decent man» or «man of good manners» (χαρίεις) and it is unlikely that he would advise his young listeners or readers with such an indecent anecdote. Heraclitus sitting in the toilet and inviting embarrassed visitors «to come in»?! The story actually sounds like a προτροπή to study all animal forms without prejudice; all creations of nature have «something divine» in them. 4) Heraclitus' own pantheism did not reach to the point of coprophilia that Mr. Mouraviev's perverse taste imports into this innocent parable. «Dung» is a word of emotional disgust in Heraclitus (B 96 DK, cf. B13 = 36 Marc.), and Aristotle elsewhere (fr. 100 Rose) cites Heraclitus' moral advice: a decent man (χαρίεντα) should not βορβόρωι χαίρειν. 5) Even apart from these considerations, the coprophilistic reading is ruled out because it trivializes the meaning of the parable and destroys its philosophical meaning: «fire» is present at focal point in the «oven» image, but it is absent from the image of cesspool. As a result of such perverse reading and interpretation the connection of the story with Heraclitus' philosophy of fire and pantheism (πάντα πλήρη θεῶν) is lost. Unless Heraclitus suffered from a heavy form of

⁹ Proc. Cambr. Philol. Soc., fasc. 169-171 (1938), 10. This has been convincingly refuted by Louis Robert, *Héraclite à son fourneau*. In: *École pratique des hautes études*. 4e section, Sciences historiques et philologiques. Annuaire 1965-1966. 1965. pp. 61-73

paranoid delirium (something we seriously doubt), he could hardly hold the view that κόπρος is ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων and that dung permeates every single thing in the Universe.

The remaining fragments, i.e. those which are neither fabricated by SM himself, nor distorted by his inept «emendations» of the Greek text, unfortunately, are not safe to use, either. Spared by Mr. Mouraviev's insatiable passion to «edit and correct», they for the most part fell victims of incorrect interpretations (partly due to misunderstood grammar) and/or of mistranslations. Here are the most conspicuous cases.

Fr. 5 (B 85) ἐπτοῆσθαι φιλεῖ here means «gets excited», not «is trembling» or «scared».

Fr. 9 (B 41). Γνώμη here has a normal in the Ionic dialect meaning «mind», «intelligence» and refers to the Divine mind that «steers» the Universe, ἐπίστασθαι has the same meaning («to recognize») as in fr. B 57 DK. The author mistranslates γνώμη as (human) «thought», but Heraclitus could hardly believe in human ability to «steer all things», on the contrary, he says that human nature has no γνώμας at all (B 78). In fr. 19 (B 56) ἀπολείπομεν and φέρομεν denotes a paradoxical antithesis «we lose» / «we gain» (LSJ, s.v. φέρω A VI,2 «carry as a booty»), rather than «we leave behind» / «we carry». In fr. 28 (B 8) ἀντίξουν means «hostile, opposing», not «counteraction». Fr. 28 (B 105) is based on a wrong attribution. Heraclitus could not discuss astrology and alleged astrological allusions in Homer. fr. 44 (B120) τέρματα never means in Greek «boundaries between x and y», the connotation of the «end of the road» or of the «turning point» is always present, see above on the analogy of stadium. fr. 48 (B 81) «the originator of the verbal knives for sacrifice» (?) is inept translation of κοπίδων ἀρχηγός which means either «the inventor of lies» or «the leader of liars». 51 (B 39) mistranslates λόγος «esteem» (of Bias) as «what is said». 53 (B 23) In translating κλέος ἀέναον Mr. Mouraviev tries to render ἀέναον with a non-existing Russian word *vechnotechnyi* («ever-flowing») on the false analogy with poetic word *skorotechnyi* «transient» (literally «quick-flowing»), but this is unfortunate since in *skorotechnyi* the second element expresses the idea of transience, not of permanence. 65 (B 78) *sob'* is another unintelligible Russian word for the Greek ἦθος, and γνώμας is mistranslated as «knowledge» instead of «insights» or «wisdom». 68 (B 92) ἐξικνεῖται (of the voice of Sibyl) means «reaches» (the 1000 - years span), not «breaks through». 73 (B 22) translating γῆ in the parable about gold-seekers with modern geological and road-construction term *grunt* («ground, bottom soil») is both stylistically tasteless and technologically incorrect: in mining «earth» refers to the mining waste or rubbish, not ground. 105 (B 114) As Alex Mourelatos has convincingly pointed out ¹⁰, τρέφονται here is a social, not a biological metaphor. Heraclitus does not mean that the Divine law «feeds» the human laws with some kind of «food» (this is absurd), but that he is their

¹⁰ AJPh Vol. 86, No. 3 (Jul., 1965), pp. 258-266.

Supporter (τροφός), and they are his «siblings», i.e. depend on him. 106 (B32) the translation is hard to understand. It is wrong to combine in one translation different variants, the commentary is a more suitable place for this. 107 (B 67) ἡδονήν means “flavor”, not “charm” (?) 155 (B 90) The mistranslation of ἀνταμείβεται as “is transformed” destroys the important economical metaphor of exchange which is connected with the law of preservation. To translate χρήματα as *chervontsy* (Russian denomination of 10 roubles !) is both stylistically ridiculous and essentially incorrect: in Heraclitus’ analogy χρυσός corresponds to «money», and χρήματα to «things» or «property». Fr. 159 – 163 (B 31 DK) the translation of all fragments about 4 elements (*maxima membra mundi*) in Heraclitus is a grotesque heap of absurdities. The main source of confusion is the misinterpretation of πρηστήρ as “sheet lightning” or “distant lightning” (“*spoloh*”). In fact it is Heraclitus’ word for “air” that has nothing to do with the meteorological phenomenon in Aristotle and the doxography.

182 (B 59) is a futile attempt to preserve the MSS. reading γραφέων after Kirk. The reference to fullers (γναφέων) is guaranteed both by Hippolytus’ *scholion* and the parallel in *De victu*. Fr. 209 (B 45) is translated “And you will not find the limits of the soul, even if you have traversed (*proshel*) every road, so deep is its saying”. Here as elsewhere Mr. Mouraviev encounters difficulties in grasping the meaning of the tenses and aspects of the Greek verb. It is wrong to translate *praesens* ἐπιπροσέυμενος with Russian perfective aspect *proshel* “have traversed”. This translation is not only grammatically incorrect, but it also contradicts the main thesis of the fragment that you can never reach the end of *psyche*, because *proshel* means “have traversed to the end”, i.e. just the opposite of what Heraclitus means. It is also wrong to translate βαθύν λόγον as “deep saying”. Λόγος here means “measure, volume” as in B 31 (the logos of the sea), and βαθύν means “abundant”, “enormous”. 210 (B 115) ascribed in Stobaeus to “Socrates” is of Pythagorean origin and has nothing to do with Heraclitus. 211 (B 12) the famous fragment on rivers has been distorted to the point of being unrecognizable. The unwarranted insertion in the text of the word ἀναθυμῶνται (which is wishfully mistranslated as “provide food for themselves”!) destroys the original thought completely. 241 (B 52) contains yet another bizarre neologism coined by the author to render an ordinary Greek word αἰών. Presumably this neologism means “eternity”, but *Aion* in Heraclitus denotes *Lebenszeit* rather than abstract eternity.

The title of the section “Commentary and Notes” (pp. 215 – 255) does not correspond to its real content. We have not found in these pages a real systematic commentary, but rather short notes, most of them very superficial and popular. It is hard to see what kind of reader the author has in mind when he writes, e.g. “Homer: greatest Greek poet, author of the “Iliad” and “Odyssey”... (note19), “Pythagoras: ... thinker, religious and political leader (note 46) “Dionysus: god of the fertility of earth...” (note151) etc. In those few notes that attempt to explain some fundamental terms of Heraclitus like

Logos (note 8) and Aeon (note 76) instead of a clear and definitive interpretation we find elusive pseudo-methodological considerations about the supposed polysemy and ambiguity of Heraclitus' language and the divergence of modern opinion. Together with Mr. Mouraviev's inability to write a cohesive general exposition of Heraclitus' philosophy, as well as with apparent absurdity of virtually all readings and translations of separate fragments, this leads us to the conclusion that he has no clear general understanding of Heraclitus' thought. But then how does he dare to "emend" Heraclitus' texts? One cannot emend the text of ancient author (or any author) unless she/he relies on what he believes to be correct, i.e. on some established body of authentic basic doctrines. But Mr. Mouraviev explicitly denies the very existence of such body of doctrines and accuses anyone who disagrees with him of "mortal sin" of "dogmatism". He does not seem understand that ἐπιστήμη and ἀλήθεια are dogmatic by definition, but someone who rejects these ideal goals of inquiry will be inevitably left with their opposites, i.e. with relativistic δόξα and ψεῦδος.

The "poetics" of Heraclitus' style according to Serge Mouraviev

Both in the *Fragmenta* and the "Reconstruction" sections the text of the fragments is divided into "verses" of different length and arranged as *carmina figurata* of the Russian avant-gardists. A division of Heraclitus' fragments into verses was first introduced in the edition of Miroslav Marcovich in 1967. Marcovich, however, arranged these verses "stepwise", à la Mayakovsky, and not as *carmina figurata*. He also warned in the Preface that the purpose of this division was to elucidate sense bearing cola, and not metrical units of the prose rhythm. Mouraviev's "division" occasionally coincides with that of Marcovich, but often is different, the general tendency being to cut the text into smaller units, sometimes as short as a single word ὄκωσπερ (fr. 15 of the Reconstruction). Unlike Marcovich, Mouraviev regards this division as metrical; he claims to have discovered a «syllabo-tonic rhythm» in Heraclitus prose. But he does not stop here, he goes further and claims to have discovered in the sequence (or dispersion) of single letters in Heraclitus' text «hidden patterns» and «invisible harmonies», anagrams, cryptograms, palindromes etc. For example, in B 123 (= φρ. 70 of the Reconstruction) he "discovers" a cryptogram ΦΥΣΙΣ κρΥπτεισθαι Φιλεῖ, whereas in the fragment about gold-seeker (B 22 = φρ. 73), he finds a "hidden" word ΧΡΥΣΟΝ. In fact there is no χι in the MSS. text of the fragment, but Mr. Mouraviev has "solved" the problem by inserting into the text a χι of his own concoction and "emending" (or rather falsifying) the words καὶ εὐρίσκουσι into Χ' εὐρίσκουσι!

We are not going to discuss in detail something that apparently should be relegated to the domain of esoteric pseudo-science and *alternative philology* (or *paraphilology*). Let us

only point to the fact that Mr. Mouraviev, unknowingly, has already refuted his own “syllabo-tonic” hypothesis himself by including into the corpus of authentic fragments some late paraphrases that are not *verbatim* quotations from Heraclitus; nevertheless Mr. Mouraviev has “recognized” in them the alleged “syllabo-tonic rhythm” and has printed them in the form of *carmina figurata* !¹¹ This fact alone demonstrates that the alleged “syllabo-tonic rhythm” exists only in Mr. Mouraviev’s imagination, for, according to his method, all prose texts of Plato and Aristotle, as well as those of the Stoics and Neoplatonists pass as *carmina figurata* and should be read as a syllabo-tonic poetry like that of Byron and Pushkin.

Conclusions

If we subtract now from the general number of genuine fragments in both sections (136) those that are either distorted by impossible “emendations” (40) or seriously mistranslated (23) we are left with some 73 fragments that pass as genuine fragments of Heraclitus with more or less acceptable Greek text and translation. This is about 27 % of the total number of texts in sections F and R (excluding 134 in F common with R). We say “more or less”, because we have not counted all minor instances of “editing” (addition or deletion of articles, particles, crasis and elision of vowels etc.) that do not seriously alter the meaning of the text, but still compromise the authenticity of the fragments. This means that almost 3/4 of the whole number of fragments will seriously mislead the reader in some respect (e.g. false attribution, bad Greek, mistranslation) and not infrequently in many respects at once, e.g. a text falsely ascribed to Heraclitus may be first distorted by impossible “emendation”, and then mistranslated from bad Greek into bizarre Russian. We conclude that the edition under review is incompetent; its author does not have a professional knowledge of Greek, nay he repeatedly demonstrates his ignorance of the elementary Greek grammar. From the hermeneutical point of view, he shows a clear tendency towards turning Heraclitus’ sayings into unphilosophical platitudes or absurdities like “Heraclitus in the toilet”, “barking children” an “meat by chance”. And the collection itself demonstrates a total lack of critical judgment. Anything goes for SM as Heraclitus: astrology (F 139), skeptical epistemology (R 90), a christological text of Hippolytus (F 50), a iambic verse from Epicharmus (F 156) etc.

¹¹ See e.g. B 7 (a piece of Attic prose, not even a paraphrase, but a free interpretation of B 67); B 72 (Marcus Aurelius’ paraphrase of B1 and B17); B 82 (a piece of Platonic prose), B 102 (Pophyrius’ paraphrase or summary exposition of Heraclitus’ views on the relativity of human values, *ὑπειλήφασιν* is late) etc.

Therefore Mr. Mouraviev (who has no university education)¹² has no right to speak as a maître on behalf of classical philology and to instruct professional classicists on methodology as he does in the Appendix “Seven mortal sins of philology” on pp. 261 – 265. The worst “mortal sin” of philology is incompetence. By the same token, Mr. Mouraviev has no right to edify philosophers as he does in insulting words on pp. 264. He prohibits philosophers to read Heraclitus philosophically: instead they should first study Mr. Mouraviev’s works on “hidden patterns”, i.e. fortuitous combinations of separate letters of the Greek alphabet in the text of fragments which are often either composed or edited by Mr. Mouraviev himself! As regards Mr. Mouraviev’s methodology, we will put it *more Aristotelico*: Mr. Mouraviev’s methodology is either the basis of his research, or it is not. If it is the basis of his research, then it is wrong and should be rejected, because in 100% cases it leads to wrong results. And if it is not the basis of his research, then it should be rejected as irrelevant. In any case it should be rejected.

The edition under review is not only useless for a specialist (first of all because it is unreliable and falsifies the *fontes*), it is also dangerous for students and non-specialists who may easily mistake Mr. Mouraviev’s fiction for genuine Heraclitus. The Russian edition is especially dangerous, because it has no *apparatus criticus*¹³, and so non-specialists are not in the position to distinguish between MSS. Readings and Mr. Mouraviev’s emendations and additions. Unlike most unprofessional or esoteric writers

¹² The source of this information is Mr. Mouraviev himself who told me that he was dismissed in his youth from a pedagogical institute in Ukraine in his second year. If this information is incorrect, Mr. Mouraviev may refute it by producing his university diploma. Mr. Mouraviev admits himself that he is neither classical scholar, nor a philosopher by education: “I was neither a professional classicist, nor a professional philosopher; my background was, rather, philological and linguistic” (S.N. Mouraviev, *Editing Heraclitus (1999-2012): Ten volumes plus one*, in: in: *Epoché*, vol. 17, Issue 2 (Spring 2013), p. 195). What does it mean? He was neither a classicist, nor a philosopher, but he had rather a “philological background”? Which background? It seems that Mr. Mouraviev tries to conceal the fact that he has no university education by making enigmatic allusions to some mysterious “philological background”. I venture to guess what exactly Mr. Mouraviev means by his “philological and linguistic background”. I knew Mr. Mouraviev in Moscow in the 70-ies and 80-ies. At that time he worked for the official Soviet news agency APN as a translator from Russian into French. Among other official texts, he translated into French the “great book” of Soviet propaganda, Brezhnev’s memoirs “*Malaya Zemlya*” (he proudly showed me the manuscript of his translation), a huge lie about Brezhnev’s heroic exploits that allegedly changed the course of WW II. If this is Mr. Mouraviev’s “philological and linguistic background”, then I should note that translating Brezhnev from Russian into French and translating archaic Greek philosophers into any modern language requires a bit different qualification.

¹³ There are only testimonia in F. There is no information on Mr. Mouraviev’s readings and supplements in the “notes”, either.

on ancient philosophy, he knows how to imitate the external attributes of “serious scholarship”. His “learning and erudition”, his bibliographies and overblown critical apparatuses etc. have already duped some scholars and publishing houses into mistaking him for a real scholar. This is a review of the one volume *Editio Minor*, not of the 11 volumes of “Heraclitea” published in 1999 – 2011. However, the one volume abridgement is based on the *Editio maior*, and so with the exception of our remarks on the Russian translation, our criticism for the most part applies to the relevant volumes of “Memoria” (vol. III.1), “Placita” (vol. III.2), “Fragmenta” (vol. III.3 B/i) and “Refectio” (vol. IV A).

In our view, Mr. Mouraviev is more than *editor* of Heraclitus. Rather he is a *co-author* of the Greek texts or he invents an unknown Greek author. It would be more appropriate to call this unknown author Mouraclitus rather than Heraclitus. To be sure, Mouraviev’s edition is not an intentional hoax like the case of Alan Sokal or “The Rooter”¹⁴. But still there are some common features in all these cases: a pseudo-scientific, unprofessional and meaningless text passes as respectable scholarship thanks to its “academic” disguise and superficial imitation of external attributes of science. We do not recommend this book to academic libraries, scholars, students or general public. Its proper place is in the recycle bin.

April, 2013

Andrei Lebedev (Moscow)

¹⁴ We believe that SM acted from self-deception, i.e. that he deceived both himself and the readers. But he still produced falsified texts that are as dangerous for non-specialists as intentional falsification would be. It does not matter whether a practitioner of alternative medicine harms people by wrong treatment intentionally or because of his incompetence and self-deception. In both cases he acts as a charlatan and harms people. And in both cases he must be stopped. Although we do not support selfish gene theorists, there is something to be learned from the book of Robert Trivers, *Deceit and Self-Deception: Fooling Yourself the Better to Fool Others*, 2011.