IFiS PAN Publishers
STUDIES
in Systematic Philosophy

WOJCIECH WROTKOWSKI

PLEASURE
New Research on Fragment B67 of Heraclitus of Ephesus

WOJCIECH WROTKOWSKI

PLEASURE
New Research on Fragment B67 of Heraclitus of Ephesus

VOL. 18

IFiS PAN Publishers

STUDIES

in Systematic Philosophy

Series Editor Seweryn Blandzi

WOJCIECH WROTKOWSKI

PLEASURE
New Research on Fragment B67 of Heraclitus of Ephesus

Translated from the Polish by Anthony Sloan
in assiduous cooperation with the author

IFiS PAN Publishers
Warsaw 2023

Recenzent
Prof. dr hab. Krzysztof Narecki

Projekt okładki
Teresa Oleszczuk

Redaktor
Elżbieta Morawska

Copyright © Wojciech Wrotkowski & Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN, 2023

ISBN 978-83-7683-201-2
ISSN 1643-6253

Wszelkie prawa zastrzeżone.
Żadna część niniejszej publikacji nie może być reprodukowana, przechowywana jako źródło danych i przekazywana w jakiejkolwiek formie zapisu bez pisemnej zgody posiadacza praw.

Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN
00-330 Warszawa, ul. Nowy Świat 72, tel. (22) 65 72 861
e-mail: publish@ifispan.edu.pl
Wydanie I

Appendix

Δὶς ἐξαμαρτεῖν ταὐτὸν οὐκ ἀνδρὸς σοφοῦ[1].

A wise man does not err in the same thing twice.

In the appendix below, I set out in chronological order the most important and best-known interpretations of our "gravissimum fragmentum", on the level of (1) the Greek text alone, if it is not accompanied by any translation (*vide* e.g. Bywater), (2) the Greek text along with a translation of it, which in some cases – with the passage of time – altered radically (*vide* e.g. Diels), or (3) a translation only, whenever there are solid reasons for holding that the author was – and often still is – perceived and cited as an Authority (*vide* e.g. Burnet).

In order to best illustrate how those interpretations have gradually evolved over the past century and a half, I keep my comments on successive "turning points" – that is, (1) editorial interventions or (2) translational innovations – to an indispensable minimum, so that each reader can discover their essence *with but little indication* (διὰ σμικρᾶς ἐνδείξεως), as Plato says[2]. I put my own διδασκάλια in footnotes, in the conviction that, seen against the arguments presented above, either (1) they will already be completely clear, making any development of them here purposeless and redundant, or (2) they will

[1] Menander, *Sententiae e codicibus Byzantinis*, 183.

[2] Plato, *Epistulae*, 341 e2–3: … τισιν ὀλίγοις ὁπόσοι δυνατοὶ ἀνευρεῖν αὐτοὶ διὰ σμικρᾶς ἐνδείξεως…

become fully understandable after reading the book, or at least those parts indicated below.

I take the liberty of expressing my hope that a careful reading of this modest appendix, which – to my knowledge – is unlike any ever prepared before, will encourage the Gracious Reader, during his or her own research, to make similar summaries, at least for personal use, of the thought of every ancient Greek philosopher – not just of one Presocratic or another – whose works have survived to our time only in fragments. May Cleve's rule: "check and doublecheck" inform and strengthen all our mental and academic habits!

Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker – the world-famous collection by Diels and Kranz – should not be taken as either "the starting point" or "the point of arrival" of honest research into early Greek philosophy, for the most noble goal of such investigations is most definitely not a consensus that assiduously aligns one's own analyses and conclusions with their German translation of a given fragment; the aim is to reach objective truth (ἀληθέα, see B112; cf. B133), that is – verifiable and reproducible results.

I. Miller, 1851

"Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη, εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν, θέρος, πόλεμος, εἰρήνη, κόρος, λιμός." Τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς. "Ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκως περ ὁκόταν συμμιγῆ θυώμασιν ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου"[3].

II. Bernays, 1854

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός – τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς – ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκως περ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ [θύωμα] θυώμασιν· ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου[4].

---

[3] Miller (1851: 283); see *supra*: 32–45. The Greek texts and all its consecutive translations are quoted here faithfully, in accordance with the different conventions of individual editors and scholars from various countries.

[4] Bernays (1854: 245; 1885: 77); see *supra*: 11–12, 45–48.

III. Duncker and Schneidewin, 1859

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός – τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς· – ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκως περ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ [θύωμα] θυώμασιν· ὀνομάζεται καθ᾽ ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Deus dies nox, hiems aestas, bellum pax, expletio fames – contraria universa: hic sensus – *mutatur autem perinde quasi commixtum sit suffimentum cum suffimentis; nominatur autem ad cuiusque libitum*[5].

IV. Mullach, 1860

86. Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός.
87. Ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώματα θυώμασι· ὀνομάζεται καθ᾽ ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

86. Deus dies, nox; hiems, aestas; bellum, pax; satietas, fames.
87. Variatur autem, ut quum odoramenta alia aliis commiscentur, appellaturque ut cuique libet[6].

---

[5] Duncker-Schneidewin (1859: 448–449); see *supra*: 49–52. To my knowledge, the last phrase after the semicolon (·) of Bernays – i.e. *nominatur autem ad cuiusque libitum* – was never, ever analysed by anyone. Moreover, it was never even cited. Anyone can easily check this today using Google or JSTOR. *Abolitio memoriae*?

Since Duncker and Schneidewin's faithful and beautiful translation reflects their respect for both (1) the semicolon (·) in the Greek text, and (2) the meaning of the word ἡδονή (*libitum*, *ut supra*), then what *crimen mortale* did they commit (unwittingly, of course)? Against the background of their correct rendering, the noticeable shortcomings of Diels' consecutive interpretations (*ut infra*) are all too visible.

[6] Mullach (1860: 327); see *supra*: 52–56. Here I draw attention to only three, cardinal issues: (1) between θυώμασι and ὀνομάζεται Mullach kept Bernays' semicolon (·); (2) the singular *appellaturque* tells us unequivocally that Mullach referred ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός; (3) unlike the vast majority of 20th-century scholars, with Diels, Kirk and Marcovich at the forefront (*ut infra*), Mullach did not distort the sense of the noun ἡδονή.

V. Cruice, 1860

« Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμέρη, εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν, θέρος, πόλεμος, εἰρήνη, κόρος, λιμός. » Τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς. « Ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκως περ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ [θύωμα] θυώμασιν· [ὃ] ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου. »

« Deus est, ait, dies, nox, hyems, aestas, bellum, pax, expletio, esuries, » omnia inter se pugnantia. Hic est sensus: « Immutatur vero, veluti quum thuribus thus commiscetur; nuncupatur secundum libidinem uniuscujusque »[7].

VI. Bywater, 1877

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ <θύωμα> θυώμασι· ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου[8].

VII. Burnet, 1892

God is day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, satiety and hunger; but he takes various shapes, just as fire, when it is mingled with different incenses, is named according to the savour of each[9].

---

[7] Cruice (1860: 432–433); see *supra*: 57–61.

[8] Bywater (1877: 15); see *supra*: 62–69. Let me repeat: the most important point is not the conjecture <θύωμα>, but the semicolon (·) placed perfectly after θυώμασι and before ὀνομάζεται.

[9] Burnet (1965: 136 = [1]1892: 136). Burnet's translation exhibits two important instances of negligence, and two crucial errors, whose lineage is as follows: (1) Burnet's note after the above translation – "R. P. 31*b*" – refers to the seventh edition of Ritter and Preller's work ([7]1888: 32), in which there is a semicolon (·) after θυώμασι and before ὀνομάζεται, not – as in Burnet (*ut supra*) – a comma. Rather than respecting that semicolon and referring ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός in accordance with the rules of Greek grammar, Burnet inserted a comma after "incenses", but provided no argumentation whatsoever in support of that radical change. (2) To lend credibility to having referred ὀνομάζεται to "fire", Burnet distorted the sense of the noun ἡδονή, most probably under the influence of Zeller ([4]1876: 602–603, n. 2): "Geruch"; cf.

VIII. Fairbanks, 1898

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ <θύωμα> θυώμασι· ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου[10].

God is day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, satiety and hunger; but he assumes different forms, just as when incense is mingled with incense; every one gives him the name he pleases[11].

IX. Diels, 1901, 1903

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός (τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς), ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὁπόταν συμμιγῆι θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου[12].

Alleyne (1881: 38, n. 1): "[…] it (the air mixed with perfumes) is named according to the smell […] of any one of these perfumes". Burnet mentioned Zeller's work *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, firstly in his "Abbreviations" ([1]1892: VIII) and many times thereafter in the pages of his book; he forgot about Zeller, though, as regards the above incorrect translation. In other words, Burnet glossed over the fact that to translate ἡδονή as "savour" was not his own idea, but Zeller's; see *supra*: 50–52.

[10] Fairbanks (1898: 32). Fairbanks stated clearly (1898: VI): "The Greek text of Herakleitos is based on the edition of Bywater"; see *supra*: 62–69.

[11] Fairbanks (1898: 33). (1) After both θυώμασι and "incense" we see the semicolon (·) proposed by Bernays (*ut supra*), not – as in Burnet (*ut supra*) and later Diels (*ut infra*) – a comma. (2) Fairbanks recognized ὁ Θεός as the subject of ὀνομάζεται; the unambiguous proof of this is the "him" that appears in the last part of his free translation. (3) In clear opposition to Zeller and Burnet (*ut supra*), Fairbanks tried to respect the meaning of the word ἡδονή ("he pleases", *ut supra*). (4) Since Fairbanks well knew and often cited the works of the two scholars mentioned above, I am inclined to think that Fairbanks overlooked their incorrect interpretation of the last phrase – as a result of referring ὀνομάζεται to "fire" and distorting the sense of ἡδονή ("Geruch" / "smell", "savour") – out of courtesy.

[12] Diels ([1]1901: 16). The identical Greek text – with the same punctuation – was printed, not just in the second edition of Diels' *Herakleitos*, but in all editions of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* as well; see *supra*: 11. Diels never respected either (1)

Gott ist Tag Nacht, Winter Sommer, Krieg Frieden, Überfluss und Hunger. Er wandelt sich aber wie das Feuer, das, wenn es mit Räucherwerk vermengt wird, nach eines jeglichen Wohlgefallen so oder so benannt wird[13].

X. Diels, 1906, 1909

[…] Er wandelt sich aber wie das Feuer, das, wenn es mit Räucherwerk vermengt wird, nach eines jeglichen Wohlempfindung *so oder so* benannt wird[14].

XI. Diels, 1912, 1922

[…] Er wandelt sich aber wie das Feuer, das, wenn es mit Räucherwerk vermengt wird, nach dem Duft, den ein jegliches *ausströmt*, benannt wird[15].

Miller's emendation: ὀκόταν, or (2) Bernays' semicolon (·) after θυώμασι and before ὀνομάζεται.

[13] Diels ([1]1901: 17; [1]1903: 76). Diels' translation here is the best of all those he proposed, but is not free from errors: (1) his "das" after "das Feuer" and his referring ὀνομάζεται to "das Feuer", not to "Gott", is unjustifiable, for in the Greek text there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6. (2) I consider "Wohlgefallen" the best equivalent of ἡδονή; what a shame that three short years later Diels changed his mind…

[14] (1) Diels' German translation from the second edition of *Die Fragmente* ([2]1906: 71) differs from his rendering from the second edition of his *Herakleitos* ([2]1909: 33) only in that the words: "so oder so" were printed in italics in *Die Fragmente* (*ut supra*), which suggests a translator's addition, but in Roman type in *Herakleitos* – misleadingly suggesting that it is the equivalent of some element of the original. (2) The above "das" after "das Feuer", and referring ὀνομάζεται to "das Feuer" instead of to "Gott", are still unjustifiable. (3) "Wohlempfindung" is a far worse proposal than the earlier – exemplary! – "Wohlgefallen".

[15] Diels ([3]1912: 90–91 = [4]1922: 90–91). Diels' translation from 1912 – reprinted in identical form in the fourth, last edition of *Die Fragmente* during his lifetime – is in every way the worst of all of his translations of B67. This is not just a "turning point" in research on the thought of Heraclitus. Against the background of (1) earlier, correct renderings that respected Bernays' semicolon (·) and the true meaning of ἡδονή, and, additionally, (2) the earlier, much better proposals of Diels himself,

XII. Wendland, 1916

»ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός« – τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς· – »ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ> ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου«[16].

---

the above interpretation by the German philologist was a true "earthquake" of catastrophic consequences. If memory serves, all later editors of the Heraclitean fragments reprinted the Greek text of B67 with Diels' comma – or in some other, arbitrary form (e.g. divided into lines, *ut infra*) – so as not to put Bernays' semicolon (·) before ὀνομάζεται and not to refer ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός. Thus was held, in great quiet and quite unnoticed, the funeral of Heraclitus' idea of God's πολυωνυμία ('multitude of names', LSJ, s.v.).

However, if we look attentively at this depressing fact from the perspective of the last eleven decades (*ut infra*), we promptly see that it was exactly because atheists and materialists rejoiced and exulted so intrusively and so obstreperously – let me recall their motto: *écrasez l'infâme*! – that, in the aftermath, (1) no one dared cite Duncker and Schneidewin's exemplary translation (*nominatur autem ad cuiusque libitum*, *ut supra*); (2) in connection with B67, no one analysed why Bywater had accepted Bernays' semicolon (·) and rejected Cruice and Wordsworth's conjectures; see *supra*: 65–66; (3) no one pointed out that, in Diels' translation, his placing "das" after "das Feuer" and referring ὀνομάζεται to "das Feuer" rather than to "Gott" were unjustifiable, since in the Greek text there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6. It was only Marcovich who "managed" this problem by placing <ὃ> just after <πῦρ> so as to bolster Diels' faulty interpretation (*ut infra*); (4) no one adduced any names for fire that depend on the spices with which it is mixed; see *supra*: 117–124; (5) almost nobody bothered about the fact that ἡδονή certainly does not mean "Duft". Materialisten und Atheisten aller Länder, vereinigt euch! – is this the "unwritten law" of research into the thought of Heraclitus? Cf. *supra*: 135, n. 9.

[16] Wendland (1916: 244). (1) Miller's punctuation in the first part of the aphorism (a comma after each predicate noun) was rejected in order to form pairs of opposites; see *supra*: 37–40. (2) The better, Ionian form ὁκόταν replaced ὁπόταν, but Miller was passed over as the initiator of that emendation, as a result of which the reader could suppose it was introduced by Wendland himself; see *supra*: 32–33. (3) Between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται a comma was inserted in place of the semicolon (·). In the critical apparatus on page 244, Bernays' name appears six times. On this basis, I wager that Wendland scrutinised Bernays' research on Heraclitus very carefully, and must have noticed the semicolon. I expect that Wendland replaced Bernays' semicolon (·) with a comma under the influence of Diels, *ut supra*, *passim*.

XIII. Snell, [1]1926, [2]1940, [14]2007

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <ἔλαιον>, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ᾽ ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Gott ist Tag Nacht, Winter Sommer, Krieg Frieden, Sattheit Hunger; er wandelt sich wie Öl (?): mischt sich dies mit Duftstoffen, so heißt es nach dem jeweiligen Geruch[17].

XIV. Jones, [1]1931, 1959 (LCL)

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ πῦρ, ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασι, ὀνομάζεται καθ᾽ ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

---

[17] Snell ([14]2007: 22–23). In the "edition" of Snell, which I have before me ([14]2007), below the Greek text there is no critical apparatus, and below the German translation there are no footnotes; in the books of German scholars, these are usually much more comprehensive than the main argument; see e.g. Zeller ([5]1892: 623–750, *passim*); cf. Grafton (1999: 118–121). This publication can satisfy only those researchers of the thought of Heraclitus who are interested in knowing how Snell himself translated into German what he drew on from Diels' edition of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* and then reissued, with very few changes and without any mention whatsoever of *what* was modified – or *why* or *when* or *what for*. It must be clearly emphasized that the value of Snell's book should by no means be measured by his fame, for it cannot satisfy anyone who – rightly – ranks sources over anthologies.

(1) In place of the <πῦρ> in Diels, Snell – after Fränkel (1938, *passim*, *ut infra*) – proposed <ἔλαιον>; this conjecture seems no better than others after the acceptance of Bernays' semicolon (·) before ὀνομάζεται; see *supra*: 45–48 and 81–86. (2) Snell did not improve the form of ὁπόταν to ὁκόταν ('whenever'), nor did he reflect this word in his translation; I would propose: "wann immer" etc.; see *supra*: 32–33, 45. (3) Between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται, we see in Snell – just as in Diels (*ut supra*) – a comma, not a semicolon (·) and Snell provided no arguments against the semicolon. (4) Having used a comma, Snell deemed the subject of ὀνομάζεται to be "Öl", not – ὁ Θεός. (5) In Snell, "Geruch" is not an equivalent of ἡδονή; it is merely (a) a synonym of Diels' "Duft", one intended to create an impression of originality, or simply (b) a "borrowing" from Zeller, about which Snell made no mention; see *supra*: 50–52 and 140–141. (6) Snell probably didn't notice that propositions of the type: … *Duft*stoffen … *Geruch*… are a kind of *idem per idem*.

God is day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, surfeit and hunger. But he undergoes transformations, just as fire, when it is mixed with spices, is named after the savour of each[18].

XV. Fränkel, 1938

Ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός – τἀναντία ἅπαντα (οὗτος ὁ νοῦς), ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ, ὅκωσπερ … ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

God is day night, winter summer, war peace, plenty hunger – all the contraries, this is what is meant, and He undergoes changes – as … (lacuna) when blended with θυώματα, receives different names according to the scent of each single one[19].

---

[18] W. H. S. Jones (1959: 482–483). Jones: (1) omitted the angle brackets around πῦρ; (2) in place of Bernays' semicolon (·) he inserted a comma; (3) even though in the Greek text there is no relative ὅ before ὀνομάζεται, Jones referred ὀνομάζεται to πῦρ, not to ὁ Θεός; (4) incorrectly – following Burnet – translated ἡδονή; see *supra*: 165, n. 45.

[19] Fränkel (1938: 230–231). Fränkel cited the Greek text of B67 from the fifth edition of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1935), on which Kranz worked after Diels' death.

What is vital for our enquiry is that: (1) Fränkel did not respect Bernays' semicolon (·), though he certainly perceived it (at least in Bywater's edition), and never explained why he preferred Diels' comma to the semicolon (*ut supra*). (2) As a result of this, Fränkel referred ὀνομάζεται to his own conjecture <ἔλαιον> ('olive-oil'; LSJ, s.v.), not to ὁ Θεός. (3) In his own translation, Fränkel distorted the sense of ἡδονή ("the scent", *ut supra*). (4) In the erroneous conviction that ἡδονή is "scent", Fränkel put forward a false interpretation of other researchers' thinking. In fact, their conclusions would have protected him from his own errors had he (a) thought things through in accordance with Greek grammar and (b) respected the true sense of ἡδονή (1938: 234, n. 10):

> The assumption (R. Scott, Bernays, Bywater) that Heraclitus speaks of a mixture of different incenses puts God on the same level with the phenomena, and the last part of the fragment indicates that in each case only one θύωμα, with its one specific ἡδονή, is involved.

In order to validate and extol his own argumentation and the conjecture <ἔλαιον>, Fränkel strove to topple a supposed "assumption" of Scott, Bernays and Bywater

XVI. Walzer, 1939

Ὁ θεός· ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός, ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυμώασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Il dio : giorno-notte, inverno-estate, guerra-pace, sazietà-fame; come il fuoco si tramuta quando ad aromi si mescola, prende nome secondo l'olezzo d'ognun d'essi[20].

XVII. Kirk, [1]1954, [2]1962

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός, – τἀναντία ἅπαντα, οὗτος ὁ νοῦς – **ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ> ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.**

God is day night, winter summer, war peace, satiety hunger, – *all the opposites, this is the meaning* – and undergoes alteration in the way

---

(*ut supra*), which those researchers never *de facto* formulated, for (1) respecting the semicolon (·), (2) understanding the proper sense of ἡδονή, and (3) referring ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός does not imply – as Fränkel mistakenly imagined – that God should be placed "on the same level" as "a mixture of different incenses", but that God can be named according to one's own pleasure, *ergo* – his multiple names (πολυωνυμία, 'multitude of names'; LSJ, s.v.). Fränkel did not analyse this type of reasoning at all – and it cannot be ruled out that he didn't even suspect it – since he did not refer ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός. It must be emphasised, therefore, that, contrary to what Fränkel erroneously suggests, no θύωμα ('that which is burnt as incense', pl., 'spices'; LSJ, s.v.) has any "specific ἡδονή" (*ut supra*), because ἡδονή means: 'pleasure', 'enjoyment' (*ut supra*, *passim*), not – as Fränkel *aliique permulti* would have it – "scent".

[20] Walzer (1939: 106). (1) After θεός we have a punctuation mark we have encountered before; see *supra*: 41–45; here it functions as a colon. (2) The word θυμώασιν is a misprint; it should be θυώμασιν. (3) Before ὀνομάζεται Walzer placed a comma, not – like Bernays and Bywater – a semicolon (·); he offered no arguments in favour of the comma. (4) Walzer referred ὀνομάζεται to "il fuoco", though in the Greek text there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6. (5) Walzer did not make the sense of ἡδονή visible.

that fire, when it is mixed with spices, is named according to the scent of each of them[21].

XVIII. Diels and Kranz, [9]1960

Gott ist Tag Nacht, Winter Sommer, Krieg Frieden, Sattheit Hunger. Er wandelt sich aber gerade wie das Feuer, das, wenn es mit Räucherwerk vermengt wird, nach dem Duft eines jeglichen heißt[22].

XIX. Cleve, [1]1965, [2]1969

Day (and) night, winter (and) summer, war (and) peace, satiety (and) hunger – (all this together) is the god. But he (just) changes like fire when mingled with perfumes: it is (then) called (so or so) according to the pleasant sensation due to each (sc., of the various fragrant stuffs).

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός. … ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ> ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν· ὀνομάζεται καθ’ ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου (sc. θυώματος)[23].

---

[21] Kirk ([2]1962: 184); see *supra*: 35–36, n. 12; 40, n. 23; 44, n. 33; 71–72, n. 7; 82–83; 86; 133–138; 145–146, n. 22. Between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται – that is, in the most important place in B67 – Kirk opted for no punctuation. Marcovich, Kahn and Pradeau will do likewise, *ut infra*.

[22] DK ([9]1960, Vol. I: 165); see *supra*: 12, 20–22, 51–52, 61, 66–69, 77–79. In the last translation of B67 authored by Diels (*ut supra*), Kranz corrected not a single error. (1) In place of “Überfluß” Kranz put “Sattheit” and omitted “und”; (2) at his own accord he added “gerade”; (3) and he modified Diels’ final version: “[…] nach dem Duft, den ein jegliches *ausströmt*, benannt wird” as: “[…] nach dem Duft eines jeglichen heißt”.

[23] Cleve ([2]1969: 57); see *supra*: 94, n. 5.

(1) To my knowledge, Cleve was the only 20th-century researcher of the thought of Heraclitus who – either after Bernays or at his own initiative – placed a semicolon (·) after θυώμασιν, *ut supra*. But can we be sure Cleve understood that punctuation mark as a semicolon, that is, in the same way as, e.g. Duncker and Schneidewin had (*ut supra*)? Let us recall: “The colon and semicolon are indicated by the same mark, a point above the line”; see *supra*: 41–45. All doubts are dispelled by the colon in his translation: Cleve treated the Greek punctuation mark – which can be used as either (a) a colon, or (b) a semicolon – as a colon (:), not a semicolon (;).

XX. Marcovich, 1967

ὁ θεὸς
ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος,
πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός
(τἀναντία ἅπαντα, οὗτος ὁ νοῦς)·
ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>,
<ὃ> ὁκόταν συμμιγῆι θυώμασιν
ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

God is
day and night, winter and summer;
war and peace, satiety and hunger;
and he takes various shapes (or *undergoes alteration*)
/ *just as fire does,*
which, when it is mingled with spices,
is named according to the scent of each of them[24].

---

(2) As a result of this, Cleve wrongly determined that the subject of ὀνομάζεται was <πῦρ>, not ὁ Θεός, even though in the Greek text there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6. This is clear from the last part of his translation, where we see: (a) "it", not "He", and (b) the misleading addition: "(sc. θυώματος)"; see *supra*: 172.

(3) It is undeniably worth remembering and appreciating that Cleve did not try to give the word ἡδονή a meaning it does not possess (e.g. "scent" / "Duft", *ut supra*, *passim*). Nevertheless, it should be noted that his proposal of "the pleasant sensation" can be considered an echo of the "Wohlempfindung" in Diels' second edition of *Die Fragmente*, not an equivalent of the "Wohlgefallen" in the first edition, *ut supra*; see *supra*: 24–25, 140–141.

(4) I couldn't recommend the unconventional way in which Cleve cited sources: first his own translation, and only then the original text, *ut supra*. The source is always higher up in the hierarchy than the translation, and the translation should never impose an interpretation on the reader *a priori*.

[24] Marcovich ([1]1967 = [2]2001: 413, 415); see *supra*: 12–13, 18–20 and 111–116.

(1) It is easy to see that the nonsensical division of our "gravissimum fragmentum" into pseudo-poetic lines of verse was subordinated to a single idea that Marcovich accepted *a priori*. Having acknowledged – after Diels and Kirk, among others (*ut supra*) – that ὀνομάζεται should be associated solely with <πῦρ>, and not – heaven forbid! – with ὁ Θεός, Marcovich put Cruice's conjecture <ὃ> before ὁκόταν along with the note "addidi" (*ibidem*: 414), though he knew perfectly well – and

XXI. Bollack and Wismann, 1972

ὁ θεός· ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

---

scrupulously inscribed it in his own critical apparatus – that the conjecture <ὁ> before ὀνομάζεται had been proposed by Cruice, but rejected by Bywater, and for good reason (see *supra*: 65–66). In my view, since Marcovich wanted to refer ὀνομάζεται to <πῦρ>, he should have made it clear that he was indebted to Cruice for the idea of introducing the conjecture <ὁ>. That way, on the strictly grammatical level, he could justify connecting ὀνομάζεται not with ὁ Θεός, but with a conjecture – in fact, with any conjecture (in Cruice: [θύωμα], *ut supra*; in Marcovich: <πῦρ>). In other words, Marcovich's note "addidi" is misleading, for, strictly speaking, it was not Marcovich who "added" the conjecture <ὁ> to the Greek text, but Cruice; Marcovich only placed <ὁ> immediately after <πῦρ>. The fruit of Marcovich's silence over this fact was that those researchers whose exegeses or translations of the aphorisms of Heraclitus relied on Marcovich's edition mostly cited the Greek text in the conviction that the conjecture <ὁ> – which is superfluous! – was introduced by the Serbian philologist, not the Catholic priest. I don't know whether Marcovich hoped to increase his citation rate this way, but I wouldn't rule it out, since such a result wasn't hard to foresee.

(2) That Marcovich had to be aware of the existence of a semicolon (·) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται is clear from the bibliographic information he included in his own critical apparatus *à propos* Bernays' conjecture <θύωμα> before θυώμασιν (*ut supra*). But to make sure no one inadvertently reminded themselves that, once upon a time, someone had placed a semicolon (·) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται, and as a result – without distorting the sense of the word ἡδονή – had referred ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός, Marcovich erased all traces of this, removing the punctuation after θυώμασιν (*ut supra*), and in his exegesis of B67 (= 77 M) he made no mention at all of the existence of a semicolon (·) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται in Bernays' article or the editions of Duncker and Schneidewin, Mullach, Cruice or Bywater (*ut supra*).

(3) This begs the question: did Marcovich really believe his readers would never check all these bits of information, make connections between them, and then reflect on them? After all, on their basis – in light of the facts and truth – anyone can objectively and fairly evaluate and give a name to what Marcovich perpetrated. Or perhaps because of his scientific achievements and world renown, Marcovich assumed that no one would dare criticise his analyses and translations? See e.g. Litwa (2016: IX, XXIX–XXXI, *ut infra*). Everything indicates that Marcovich gave all this little, if any, thought: something in the atheistic and materialistic "paradigm" of Diels and Kirk must have been much more important and attractive for him. The cup of bitterness overflowed with the falsification of the meaning of the noun ἡδονή ("*scent*", *ut supra*)… Cf. *supra*: 135, n. 9.

Dieu : jour nuit, hiver été, guerre paix, satiété faim; mais il change justement comme, mêlé aux fumées, il reçoit un nom suivant le goût de chacun[25].

XXII. Kahn, 1979

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός. ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

The god: day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, satiety and hunger. It alters, as when mingled with perfumes, it gets named according to the pleasure of each one[26].

XXIII. Colli, 1980

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός, ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκως πῦρ, ὁκόταν συμμιγῆι θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Il dio è giorno notte, inverno estate, guerra pace, sazietà fame, e si altera nel modo in cui il fuoco – ogni volta che divampi mescolato a spezie – riceve nomi secondo il piacere di ciascuno[27].

---

[25] Bollack-Wismann (1972: 220); see *supra*: 151–157, *passim*.

[26] Kahn (1979: 84–85); see *supra*: 25–28, 151–166.

[27] Colli (1980: 88–91).

(1) Colli recalled that the reading ὅκως πῦρ was proposed by Davidson; see *supra*: 71. In this interpretation, the word πῦρ is not – as in *Die Fragmente* – a conjecture after ὅκωσπερ, and for this reason – I believe – Colli did not put it in angle brackets.

(2) Between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται Colli inserted a comma. Of the existence of the semicolon (·) in both Bernays and Bywater (*ut supra*) – he was no doubt aware, if this follows from the facts that (a) he included their works in his bibliography, (b) he cited them many times, and (c) he used their names in his critical apparatus in connection with the conjecture <θύωμα>, *ut supra*. Unfortunately, Colli provided no arguments whatsoever for the change in punctuation.

(3) Having done away with Bernays' semicolon, Colli referred ὀνομάζεται to πῦρ, not to ὁ Θεός, even though there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6.

XXIV. Conche, 1986

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Dieu est jour nuit, hiver été, guerre paix, satiété faim ; il se différencie comme <le feu>, quand il est mêlé d'aromates, est nommé suivant le parfum de chacun d'eux[28].

XXV. Robinson, 1987

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός [(τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς),] ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ?>, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

God <is> day <and> night, winter <and> summer, war <and> peace, satiety <and> famine, and undergoes change in the way that <fire?>, whenever it is mixed with spices, gets called by the name that accords with <the> bouquet of each <spice>[29].

---

(4) Colli was not convinced by all those interpretations of B67 in which an incorrect sense was ascribed to the word ἡδονή ("il piacere", *ut supra*).

[28] Conche ([4]1998 = [1]1986: 379).

(1) Between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται Conche placed a comma, not a semicolon (·), as Bernays had done, and Bywater after him, *ut supra*. Conche was perfectly well aware of this, since, next to the conjecture <θύωμα>, in his own critical apparatus he provided: (a) bibliographic data on Bernays' article, and (b) information that Bywater had *accepted* ("*acc*[*epit*]") Bernays' conjecture. This proves conclusively that Conche declined to use a semicolon (·) deliberately. At the same time, he made no mention of the existence of a semicolon in Bernays, and gave no reasons for the change in punctuation.

(2) As a result of this, Conche referred ὀνομάζεται to <πῦρ>, not to ὁ Θεός, and was unruffled by the fact that in the Greek text there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6. Nor did he mention that Bywater had rejected the conjectures of Cruice and Wordsworth; see *supra*: 65–69.

(3) In Conche, "le parfum" is an exquisite equivalent of Diels' "Duft", *ut supra*; the noun ἡδονή has a different sense.

[29] Robinson (2003 = [1]1987: 44–45). (1) What pleases me most in Robinson's translation is "whenever" as an equivalent of ὁπόταν, which – after Miller – Robinson

XXVI. Mouraviev, 2000

«**ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφροσύνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός**» – τἀναντία <γὰρ> ἅπαντα, οὗτος ὁ νοῦς – «**ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ, ὃ> ὁπόταν συμμιγῆι θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου**.»

*«**Dieu : jour nuit, hiver été, guerre paix, satiété disette**» – tous les contraires, voilà l'idée. – «**Mais change comme <feu qui>, mêlé à senteurs, se dénomme selon le plaisir de chacun**»*[30].

---

might have corrected to ὁκόταν; see *supra*: 32–33, 45. (2) The word ἡδονή does not mean "bouquet".

[30] Mouraviev (2000: 540–541).

(1) Mouraviev unnecessarily replaced Miller's reading εὐφρόνη with his own – flawed, in my view – proposal: εὐφροσύνη ('mirth', 'merriment'; LSJ, s.v.). Note that the first part of B67 – after ὁ Θεός – consists of four pairs of carefully selected opposites; it is not σάρμα εἰκῆ κεχυμένων (see B124). The opposite of ἡμέρη ('day'; LSJ, s.v.) is *night*, not *mirth*. The poetic word: εὐφρόνη ('the kindly time', euphem. for νύξ, 'night'; LSJ, s.v.) is deep and full of beauty; an ear sensitive to etymology (εὖ, 'well' + φρήν, 'heart'; LSJ, s.v.) hears in it much more than in the colloquial νύξ.

(2) I consider Marcovich's conjecture <γὰρ> between τἀναντία and ἅπαντα unnecessary; see Litwa, *ut infra*: 197, n. 36.

(3) I find the conjecture <ὃ> after <πῦρ> completely superfluous, nay, downright calamitous; Marcovich did not add it (as Mouraviev believed) – but he did appropriate it and make it famous; see *supra*: 188–189, n. 24.

(4) The information Mouraviev put in his critical apparatus deserves multiple, attentive readings. In connection with Bernays' conjecture <θύωμα> before θυώμασιν (*ut supra*), Mouraviev provided bibliographic data on Bernays' article, both the first edition (1854) and the reprint (1885). Thanks to this, anyone can find the semicolon (·) in Bernays between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται. Mouraviev also tells us of the existence of the proposals of Wordsworth and Cruice, but says not a word about the fact that Bywater rejected them precisely because – unlike Mouraviev – he accepted Bernays' semicolon (·) and therefore associated ὀνομάζεται with ὁ Θεός.

(5) Mouraviev not only failed to note and respect the existence of a semicolon (·) before ὀνομάζεται in Bernays, but also provided no arguments for replacing it with the comma of Burnet and Diels (*ut supra*). I believe that, where science is concerned, everyone is entitled to challenge the views of anyone else. An honest methodology, though, should be based on evidence and arguments – not omissions or concealment.

(6) A thing in Mouraviev's translation that is priceless in itself, in my view, is that – in contrast to Zeller, Diels, Snell, Burnet, Kirk, Graham, Walzer, Marcovich,

XXVII. Pradeau, 2002

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ πῦρ, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Le dieu est le jour, la nuit, l'hiver, l'été, la guerre, la paix, la satiété, la faim, il change comme le feu qui, lorsqu'il est mêlé à des épices, est nommé selon le parfum de chacune d'elles[31].

Conche and many, many others – Mouraviev made an attempt to preserve the true sense of the noun ἡδονή ("le plaisir", *ut supra*).

[31] Pradeau (2002: 322). Pradeau: (1) did not explain why he gave up on the punctuation Miller proposed for the first part of B67 (see *supra*: 37–40), and in fact never mentioned it; (2) omitted the words between λιμός and ἀλλοιοῦται (see *supra*: 35–36) and never wrote what prompted him to do so; (3) disregarded, like, e.g., Schultz and Loew before him, the angle brackets around πῦρ; see *supra*: 89, 119, n. 7; (4) knew and cited the edition of Bywater (*ibidem*: 327; cf. 203, 212, 261, 294), and certainly had the opportunity to consider and respect Bernays' semicolon (·) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται – which Bywater accepted – yet ignored the punctuation *en bloc*; he then more easily (5) referred ὀνομάζεται to "le feu", not "le dieu", even though there is no relative pronoun ὅ in the Greek text before ὀνομάζεται; cf. *supra*: 95, n. 6; (6) distorted the sense of the noun ἡδονή ("le parfum"); (7) offered no name at all for fire.

In the conclusion of his commentary, in a manner that in no way results from the above accumulation of errors and omissions, Pradeau partially agrees with Kirk, and states (2002: 323):

> […] l'ordre immuable de la contrariété et du changement est nommé dieu par Héraclite. Les quatre couples majeurs ici énumérés désignent en effet les intervalles de changement dans lesquels toutes choses changent ; ils définissent la réalité dans son ensemble, une et éternelle. C'est cela seul qui mérite le nom de dieu.

I consider Pradeau's conclusion ("C'est cela seul qui mérite le nom de dieu") erroneous, since (1) the final phrase ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου ("he is named according to the pleasure of each"; see *supra*: 172) refers solely to ὁ Θεός, not "le feu"; (2) in my judgment, the essence of Heraclitus' thought in B67 is not what – in our opinion – "deserves" ("mérite") "the name of God" ("le nom de dieu"), or why; it is that God is named by each according to his pleasure, *ergo* – God's many names (πολυωνυμία, 'multitude of names'; LSJ, s.v.).

Pradeau certainly encountered the problem of the many names of God, since on another occasion (2002: 39) he cited the first eight verses of Cleanthes' *Hymn to*

XXVIII. Gemelli Marciano, 2007

Τὸν γὰρ ποιητὸν κόσμον αὐτὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ ποιητὴν ἑαυτοῦ γινόμενον οὕτω λέγει·

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός,

τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς, ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ

ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὁπόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Denn dass die erzeugte Welt selbst zum Demiurgen und eigenen Schöpfer geworden ist, sagt Heraklit folgendermaßen:

Der Gott: Tag, Nacht; Winter, Sommer; Krieg, Frieden; Sattheit, Hunger;

[das heißt] alles Gegensätze. Das ist die Bedeutung. Er verändert sich aber

wie Feuer, das, wenn es sich mit Räucherwerken vermischt, nach dem angenehmen Duft eines jeglichen benannt wird[32].

XXIX. Graham, 2010

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός [τἀναντία ἅπαντα· οὗτος ὁ νοῦς], **ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ, ὃ>, ὁκόταν συμμιγῆι θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου**.

Zeus, in which he recognised "vocabulaire héraclitéen" and observed: "Dans ces vers comme dans le reste du poème, les motifs héraclitéens sont nombreux" (2002: 40). I expect that, if in his own analysis of B67 Pradeau had not made the errors listed above, he would not have hesitated in seeing the first verse of Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* ("Ô, le plus noble des immortels, dont les noms sont multiples [πολυώνυμε – W.W.] et qui est pour toujours omnipotent […]") as yet another "Heraclitean motif"; see Thom (2005: 45–47).

[32] Gemelli Marciano (2007: 316–317); see *supra*: 39–40, n. 22. (1) Since in the Greek text there is no relative pronoun ὅ before ὀνομάζεται, associating ὀνομάζεται with <πῦρ> is unjustifiable from the perspective of Greek grammar. (2) The expression καθ' ἡδονὴν does not mean "nach dem angenehmen Duft".

God is day night, winter summer, war peace, satiety hunger (all the contraries, and this is mind), **and he alters just as <fire, which,> when it is mixed with spices, is named according to the aroma of each of them**[33].

XXX. Fronterotta, 2013

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός [τἀναντία ἅπαντα, οὗτος ὁ νοῦς]· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ ὃ>, ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

Il dio è giorno notte, inverno estate, guerra pace, sazietà fame; si altera come il fuoco che, mescolandosi alle spezie, viene chiamato a seconda del gusto di ciascuna[34].

---

[33] Graham (2010: 176–177). Graham (1) took Cruice's conjecture <ὃ> from Marcovich in order to associate ὀνομάζεται – like Diels *aliique permulti* – with <πῦρ>, not with ὁ Θεός, *ut supra*; (2) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται he inserted a comma, though he certainly knew Bernays' research, since in his chapter on Heraclitus he cites Bernays numerous times; (3) "the aroma" is not and never will be an equivalent of ἡδονή.

[34] Fronterotta (2013: 97). Fronterotta knew and appreciated the edition of Bywater (*ibidem*: CXXIII) and cited it many times, yet concerning our "gravissimum fragmentum" never mentioned it at all. Why not?

I think this omission by Fronterotta was deliberate. After all, even the slightest mention of (1) the semicolon (·) before ὀνομάζεται in Bywater, (2) Bywater's rejection of the proposals of both Cruice and Wordsworth (see *supra*: 65–66), and (3) referring ὀνομάζεται solely to ὁ Θεός, all undermine the conclusions of those researchers who either ignored or were unaware of these crucial facts.

Fronterotta: (1) did not explain why, rather than the semicolon (·) of Bernays – which Bywater accepted – he used the comma of Burnet and Diels (*ut supra*); (2) gave no names for fire whatsoever, to which – having proposed the reading <πῦρ ὃ> ("[…] il fuoco che […]", *ut supra*) – he referred ὀνομάζεται; (3) incorrectly interpreted the meaning of the word ἡδονή (2013: 99): "[…] il «gusto», come ho reso il termine ἡδονή, rappresenta effettivamente la proprietà essenziale o specifica delle diverse spezie, ossia il loro «aroma» […]".

XXXI. Laks and Most, 2016 (LCL)

ὁ θεὸς ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν θέρος, πόλεμος εἰρήνη, κόρος λιμός· ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

God: day night, winter summer, war peace, satiety hunger. He changes just as <fire>**, when it is mixed together with incense, is named according to the scent of each one**[35]**.**

XXXII. Litwa, 2016

ὁ θεὸς
ἡμέρη εὐφρόνη,
χειμὼν θέρος,
πόλεμος εἰρήνη,
κόρος λιμός.

–τἀναντία ἅπαντα, οὗτος ὁ νοῦς·–

ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, <ὃ> ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν, ὀνομάζεται καθ' ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

God is
day night,
winter summer,
war peace,
satiety hunger.

He means that God consists of all the opposites.

---

[35] Laks-Most (2016: 160–161). (1) Between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται we have the comma of Burnet and Diels, not the semicolon (·) of Bernays and Bywater (*ut supra*, *passim*). (2) Because Laks and Most referred ὀνομάζεται to <πῦρ>, not to ὁ Θεός, they tried to give the word ἡδονή a sense it does not possess.

He is altered like fire, which, whenever it is mixed with types of incense, is named according to the aroma of each[36].

XXXIII. Mouraviev, 2017

This God: daytime nighttime,
winter summer, war peace,
abundance famine.
And it changes {yet remains sole}
like <fire which>,

[36] Litwa (2016: 638–639). Not unreasonably, Litwa expressed certain reservations about Marcovich's edition, and even issued an elegant and witty warning against it (*ibidem*: IX):

> Although Marcovich's double apparatus and indices are generous, his *libido emendationis* altered readings on almost every paragraph, making the text a minefield for scholars whose eyes are not constantly trained on the apparatus.

A bit farther on, Litwa added (*ibidem*: XXIX–XXX):

> Marcovich has been regularly and rightly taken to task for his invasive, unnecessary, and conjectural emendations to our only surviving manuscript of books 4–10. Some scholars have deemed Marcovich's edition "unusable" […]. […] a great many of Marcovich's emendations are too clever by half. They reflect the mind-set of nineteenth-century philologists who proposed emendations as trophies of erudition.

Unfortunately, in connection with our "gravissimum fragmentum" Litwa forgot about his own valuable and much needed caveats: (1) following in Marcovich's footsteps, he needlessly inserted <ὃ> between <πῦρ> and ὁκόταν; (2) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται he inserted a comma, probably after Wendland, who, influenced by Diels, replaced Bernays' semicolon (·) – accepted by Duncker and Schneidewin (*ut supra*) – with a comma; (3) as a result – and under the influence of Marcovich's translation (*ut supra*) – he distorted the sense of ἡδονή ("aroma", *ut supra*)…

If, when translating the passage above, Litwa had perused Bywater's edition – which he never cited – or that of Duncker and Schneidewin, whose readings he did cite sporadically, but only elsewhere, he would certainly have perceived: (1) the semicolon (·) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται; (2) the exemplary Latin translation of the final phrase: *nominatur autem ad cuiusque libitum*.

mingled with scents,
is named after the pleasure of each[37].

XXXIV. Wrotkowski, 2023

Ὁ Θεός· ἡμέρη, εὐφρόνη, χειμὼν, θέρος, πόλεμος, εἰρήνη, κόρος, λιμός. Ἀλλοιοῦται δὲ ὅκωσπερ <πῦρ>, ὁκόταν συμμιγῇ θυώμασιν· ὀνομάζεται καθ᾽ ἡδονὴν ἑκάστου.

God [is]: day, night, winter, summer, war, peace, satiety, hunger. But he alters himself like <fire>, whenever it mixes with spices; he is named according to the pleasure of each[38].

---

[37] Mouraviev (2017: 324–325); see *supra*: 192–193, n. 30. Mouraviev's addition: "{yet remains sole}" (*ut supra*) finds no support in the Greek text.

[38] (1) After Θεός I place a colon (·), just as was done by Walzer and, afterwards, Bollack and Wismann; see *supra*: 186 and 189. Before a colon an oxytone (Θεός) does not change its acute to the grave; see Smyth (1956: 37–38). (2) In the first part of our "gravissimum fragmentum", I preserve Miller's punctuation; see *supra*: 37–40. (3) I agree with the majority of scholars that the words between λιμός and ἀλλοιοῦται are an interpolation; see *supra*: 35–36. (4) I believe that the verb ἀλλοιοῦται is not only Heraclitean, but also brilliant; see *supra*: 39–40. (5) I accept the conjecture <πῦρ>; see *supra*: 15–16, 71–74, 81–86. (6) I consider Miller's emendation ὁκόταν to be both rational and needful; see *supra*: 32–33; its meaning ('whenever') was highlighted by, e.g., Robinson and Litwa, *ut supra*. (7) Along with Bernays, Duncker and Schneidewin, and Bywater, I place a semicolon (·) between θυώμασιν and ὀνομάζεται; see *supra*: 178–180. (8) Thanks to Bernays' semicolon (·), I refer ὀνομάζεται to ὁ Θεός, not to <πῦρ>; see *supra*: 11–13, 45–47, 49–52, 65–66. (9) The word ἡδονή has not lost for me its attested and authentic sense: 'pleasure'.