

Manuscript Version. Published version:

*Classics Ireland* 26: 163–166. doi:10.2307/26926274 [www.jstor.org/stable/26926274](http://www.jstor.org/stable/26926274)

M. HEIDEGGER, **Heraclitus. The Inception of Occidental Thinking and Logic: Heraclitus's Doctrine of the Logos**, trans. Julia Goesser Assaiante and S. Montgomery Ewegen (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018). ISBN: 978-0-8264-6241-1. STG £19.99 (Pb).

*Keith Begley (Trinity College Dublin)*

{164} This is the first complete English translation of two series of lectures given by the German philosopher Martin Heidegger (MH) at the University of Freiburg, on the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus (H). The first, 'The Inception of Occidental Thinking', was given in the summer semester of 1943 and the second, 'Heraclitus's Doctrine of the Logos', in the summer semester of 1944. They became available as Volume 55 of MH's *Gesamtausgabe* in 1979, three years after his death. This new edition retains the original pagination in square bracketing throughout the text and contains xviii + 309 pages. The print is slightly blurred and angled on a few of the recto pages in my copy.

The edition begins with a verbose table of contents in lieu of an index, followed by the translators' forward. There are eight sections in each lecture series. Each section is divided into two or more shorter sub-sections. Many of the sections end with a substantial 'review' sub-section or contain more than one such sub-section. These were originally drafted as a separate manuscript (p. 299: [403]). There is also a 'supplement' included by the original editor, which is a first draft of the continuation of material in an earlier section. This is followed by the original editor's afterword. The edition ends with two short glossaries, one German to English and the other English to German. Unfortunately, there is no Greek apparatus, which would have proved useful to some readers given that the second language of the text is not German, rather, classical Greek.

The reader should be forewarned that this is not light reading and is suitable primarily for scholars. H is called 'obscure' even by ancient commentators. If one {165} had hoped that MH would allow H's words to emerge into the light of the present day, one would be sorely disappointed. Instead, this emerging takes the form of submergence beneath the even more obscure parlance of MH's philosophy. Perhaps it would be best if the reader were to corner each of these philosophers on their own, before allowing them to converse with each other, if at all.

MH is rarely mentioned these days in the scholarly literature on H and, in these lectures, MH does not engage much with the scholarship of his day, except derisively. MH at times discusses also, among others, Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Hegel, and Nietzsche, sometimes at length. MH's ultimate aim is, in a certain sense, to take us back to what he sees as being the more authentic mode that H inhabited. Philosophy, MH thinks, took a wrong turn at its beginning, hence his attempts at the rectification of language and his idiosyncratic etymological reinterpretations of H's words. However, MH admits at one point that "A different manner of thinking may be able to illuminate the saying of Heraclitus's. It is not

being asserted that Heraclitus explicitly thought and said all of this” (p. 256: [343]). This is a consequence of what is instead MH’s projection of his ideal philosophical mode onto H, for which the latter, of course, “[...] never had the proper words or proper saying” (p. 256: [345]).

MH was of the opinion that the standard ordering of the fragments established by Hermann Diels, which remains standard today, is “rather nonsensical”. Nevertheless, “[...] from time to time in the sequence of the fragments, those which belong together also occur {166} together, since already a crude understanding of the wording of the fragments compels one to associate them” (p. 33: [43]). This strikes me as misplaced criticism. MH must not have realised that, with few exceptions, Diels arranged the fragments by alphabetical order of their quoting authors and by occurrence in those authors’ works, precisely to allay such concerns regarding ordering. Hence, it should not be surprising that associated fragments sometimes occur together if they did so already in the work of their quoting author.

MH was a member of the Nazi party and expressed anti-Semitic views, some of which have only recently come to light with the publication of his ‘Black Notebooks’. Some of these were composed in same time period as the lectures on H during the second world war. This uncomfortable context is omitted from the translators’ foreword. Perhaps the reader is thought not to deserve this particular piece of unconcealment, as it could hinder appreciation of such lines as (p. 92: [123]):

The planet is in flames. The essence of the human being is out of joint. A mindful consideration that is sufficiently world-historical can only come from the Germans, provided that they find and safeguard ‘the Germanic.’ This is not arrogance, but rather the knowledge of the necessity of bearing out an inceptual poverty.

H, however, advised quenching hubris quicker than a blazing pyre (B43).