

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
FOR GREEK PHILOSOPHY

FIRST
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON GREEK PHILOSOPHY

IONIAN PHILOSOPHY

SAMOS, 27-31 AUGUST 1988
DORYSSA BAY HOTEL - PYTHAGOREION

PROF. DAVID D. KARNOS

ON THE DOCTRINES OF THE SOUL'S BONDAGE AND RELEASE IN PYTHAGOREANISM AND JAINISM

The brotherhood of the Pythagoreans has never been the subject of considerable philosophical interest, though what has been delivered in the name of Pythagoras as a teacher of number and theory constitutes a significant contribution to the literature on the Pre-Socratics. As J.N. Theodorakopoulos has noted "It is impossible to trace the historical origins of Pythagorean philosophy, and it is a mystery how this religious and political movement started. However, we must assume that originally the philosophical sect of the Pythagoreans had practical rather than theoretical aims". Hence, the brotherhood is generally perceived as a sect organized to reform the moral and spiritual life of Ionia, and later of Magna Graecia. However, this emphasis obscures the Pythagorean quest for purification and the entire corpus of teachings on the body (Diels-Kranz, 21 B 7· Diogenes Laertius viii. 13, 19). Discussion about the fate of the soul, particularly in its successive migrations from one body to another until liberation is achieved through ascetic and philosophic *katharsis*, commands a central role in Plato's *Republic*. Discussion about the nature of the body and its relation to the soul, regrettably, seems to have disappeared with the practice of the brotherhood. Presumably, such a discussion might clarify the special role of religious belief in the development of the Pythagorean concept of philosophy as a systematic science. To entertain this approach, I would turn to those notions of the soul's imprisonment in the body such as can be found today in the ascetic self-restraint designed to liberate the *jiva* or soul from the bondage of matter. That the founder of Jainism, Mahavira (599-528 B.C.D.) was a contemporary of Pythagoras is interesting; that Mahavira, too, went against traditionally accepted notions of matter and number is more relevant. For the Jains, matter, *pudgala*, is derived from *pum*, or "coming together" and *gala*, or "coming apart". In turn, this flux momentarily constitutes the senses, mind, and speech which forms the subtle body of the soul through which experience is possible. That the soul can be liberated from this fluxing process (*karma*) is the primary concern of the Jains; that this is based on a material view of life is unique to the Indian systems of thought (most of which claim *karma* to be only a psychological or metaphysical force). A comparative approach to the problem of the body's constitution in Pythagoras and Jainism might be of some interest to those concerned with the history of ideas as well as to those who might get wonder what the brotherhood of ascetics practiced.

DR A. V. LEBEDEV

ANAXIMANDER THE ORIGINATOR OF THE *MIXIS* THEORY OF MATTER AND THE FOUNDER OF THE MECHANISTIC PHYSICS.

We have an explicit and consentient evidence of Aristotle and Theophrastus that Anaximander described the initial stage of cosmogony and his *Urstoff* as undifferentiated mixture of pre-existent elements. This evidence is commonly disregarded on the ground that $\mu\acute{\iota}\gamma\mu\alpha$ is Aristotle's false interpretation of the authentic $\tau\acute{o}$ $\delta\eta\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu$, while Theophrastus simply follows his Teacher. My main thesis states precisely the reverse. (1) $\tau\acute{o}$ $\delta\eta\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu$ (subst. neutr.) is Aristotle's own

descriptive term for Anaximander's "mixture" determined by the subject-matter of Phys. III, 4. Aristotle does not ascribe τό ἄπειρον as a specific designation of ἀρχή to Anaximander at all, for he says that πάντες (sic) ὡς ἀρχήν τινα τιθέασιν sc. τό ἄπειρον (203 a 3) and quotes Ἀναξίμανδρος καί οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν φυσιολόγων (203 b 14). The meaning is perfectly clear: τό ἄπειρον stands for "indefinite matter" in the Platonic sense, hence Aristotle's statement that Anaxagoras posits τό ἄπειρον + νοῦς, Empedocles τό ἄπειρον + φιλία/νεῖκος, and "Anaximander with most of the physiologi" — τό ἄπειρον only, i.e. matter without *movens*. In Phys. 205 b 2 Aristotle describes Anaxagoras' mixture as τό ἄπειρον and so does Plutarch (Is. 370 E νοῦν καί ἄπειρον) and Clemens, Protr. 5, 64. Most probably, Anaximander used ἄπειρος (-ov) as adjective or predicate of φύσις (among other attributes, e.g. αἰδιος καί ἀγήρω) and/or of τό περιέχον. He intended (and distinguished): (a) infinite extension of the *Urstoff*; (b) numerical infinity of heterogeneous constituents. The meaning "indefinite" is Platonic and so out of question (contra G.S. Kirk *et al.*). (2) Theophrastus depends on Aristotle only partly, since he (a) specifies Anaximander's mixture as similar to that of Anaxagoras (whereas Aristotle unites them with Empedocles) and (b) adduces a unique description of the *similar similibus* differentiation of mixture in Anaximander's cosmogony: Simpl. Ph. 27, 12 where ἐκεῖνος can only refer to Anaximander. This description (not in DK) is probably based on a genuine simile of Anaximander (and should be classed among fragments): just as in a washing-pan "gold comes to gold" and "earth to earth" because of the whirl-like (dinos!) or παλμός motion, so... Thus we have a genuine *consensus* between Aristotle and Theophrastus as independent sources. The *mixis* theory of matter is also presupposed by fr. B 1 where ἐξ ὧν and εἰς ταῦτα refer to the plurality of the original elements. This interpretation (advanced by H. Cherniss) is now confirmed by neglected paraphrases of B 1 in Heracl. Qu. Hom. 22, 10· Philo, Post. Caini, 5; Lyd., Mens. IV, 40 which preserve traces of the original wording of the first half (διακρίνεσθαι, μοῖραι) effaced in Simpl. In its original form B1 stated the principle of decomposition of all compound bodies (including the infinite worlds) into their original constituents without any diminution of the total amount ("the repayment of debt"). Thus it was Anaximander (and not Parmenides) who first formulated the most fundamental principle of Greek physics "e nihilo nihil". He denied all *genesis* and alteration and created the first consistent system of mechanistic physics of the "preformist" type. The corpuscular theory is strongly presupposed by this system. Anaxagoras' debt to Anaximander seems to be enormous: not only ἀπο-/ συν-/ διακρίνεσθαι but also such terms as μοῖραι and σπέρματα (cf. seminaliter Dox 171) quite probably derive from Anaximander. Viewed as a whole Anaxagoras' philosophy was an attempt to reconcile two antagonistic doctrines: Anaximander's mechanistic theory of matter and Heraclitus' teleological concept of the Cosmic Mind (Γνώμη). Heraclitus himself attacks Anaximander's *dinos* and "mixture" in B 124-125 DK. The teleological πάντα κυβερνᾶν and τό θεῖον (Phys. 203 b 11-13) have nothing to do with Anaximander, but are quoted by Aristotle from Diogenes of Apollonia (B 5) who is referred to (among others) by πλεῖστοι τῶν φυσιολόγων. NB: By "Theophrastus" I mean only what is nominatim quoted from Th., not the hypothetical "Th." of Diels.