

Quotes from Karl Krohn's dissertation "Der Epikureer Hermarchos"

Post by "Martin" of May 15, 2023 at 10:31 AM

The text was downloaded from:

[Der Epikureer Hermarchos \[microform\] : Krohn, Karl, 1895- : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive](#)

Greek texts with commentary in German and notes in Latin
archive.org

I corrected numerous failures of the OCR where they were obvious. Some breaks in the text indicate that a bit of the content may have been lost in the generation of the electronic document. The dissertation appears to be short by today's customs.

Although parts of Karl Krohn's work have probably become obsolete because of later findings, I listed everything which appeared interesting for our forum or myself. I can add surrounding text of some quotes upon request.

Accents above Greek letters are lost in my quotes. I rendered lower German quotation marks as upper ones.

Page	Quote in German original	English translation by Google corrected by Martin	Martin's Comments
9	Von den fünf Schriften Hermarchs, deren Titel uns überliefert werden (Epistolika über Empedokles, Über die Wissenschaften, Gegen Plato, Gegen Aristoteles, Briefe, fr. 20), sind uns die beiden gegen Plato und Aristoteles ihrem Inhalt nach gänzlich unbekannt.	Of the five writings of Hermarchus whose titles have come down to us (Epistolica on Empedocles, On the Sciences, Against Plato, Against Aristotle, Letters, fr. 20), the content of the two against Plato and Aristotle is completely unknown to us.	

9	<p>Porphyry bezeichnet in seinem Werke über den Vorzug der vegetarischen Lebensweise die Ausmalung der Urzustände der Menschheit und ihrer allmählichen Entwicklung (I 7-12) allgemein als aus epikureischer Quelle stammend (...). Ein Vergleich der diesen 6 Kapiteln vorangehenden und nachfolgenden Quellenangaben, die chiastisch einander gegenübergestellt sind (...) ergibt einwandfrei den Hermarchischen Ursprung der von Porphyry geschilderten menschlichen Urgeschichte (fr. 24), wie Jacob Bernays (Theophrastos Schrift über die Frömmigkeit Berlin 1866) erwiesen hat.</p>	<p>In his work on the preference of the vegetarian way of life, Porphyry describes the depiction of the original state of mankind and its gradual development (I 7-12) as generally coming from an Epicurean source (...). A comparison of the sources preceding and following these 6 chapters, which are chiastically juxtaposed (...) unequivocally shows the Hermarchic origin of the human prehistory described by Porphyry (fr. 24), as Jacob Bernays (Theophrastos writing about devotion Berlin 1866) has proved.</p>
---	--	---

Den Zusammenhang der Menschheitsgenealogie bei Porphyry (I 7-12) mit Epikurs Κυριαί δοξαί 31-40 (Diog. L. X 150 ff.) hat schon Usener (Ep. S. 397/8) erkannt. Er und Bernays nahmen an, daß Hermarch bei Abfassung seines Werkes über Empedokles die uns vorliegenden Sentenzen des Meisters in ihrer Form etwas abänderte und sie in seinen uns wörtlich von Porphyry überlieferten Text hineinflickte. Neuerdings hat nun Diels (a. a. O. S. 50) die Behauptung aufgestellt, jene zehn Sentenzen seien Exzerpte des Originaltextes der Schrift über Empedokles. Da die wörtliche Wiedergabe der Genealogie durch Porphyry oben widerlegt ist, handelt es sich jetzt darum, zu entscheiden, ob Epikur der Verfasser jener 10 Sentenzen ist, die Hermarch dann in sein Werk aufgenommen haben müßte und über die uns Porphyry ein Referat gäbe, oder ob ein jüngerer Epikureer, der als Redakteur sämtlicher 40 Sentenzen anzusehen wäre (Us. Ep. S. 11/12 XLVI) die 30 ursprünglichen "Grundansichten" durch einen Zusatz von 10 aus Hermarch entnommenen vermehrt hat. Nun zeigt sich zwar, daß die Gedanken der Sentenzen 31, 33-35 über Existenz eines natürlichen Rechts (31. 33. = Epikur Us. fr. 593. 524. 529. 597. 531. 551 - Hermarch K. 7 und 8) und Abschreckung als Wesen der Strafe (34. 95. = Epikur Us. fr. 531. 532. 534. 535. 582. 18. 397 - Hermarch K. 7 und 8) sowohl bei Epikur als auch bei Hermarch vorkommen. Aber der Inhalt der Sentenzen 32, 36-40 hat keine Parallele bei Epikur. Gedanken wie Unmöglichkeit eines friedlichen Bündnisses mit Tieren (32 = Hermarch K. 12), Unterschied von

Usener (Ep. p. 397/8) already recognized the connection between the human genealogy in Porphyry (I 7-12) and Epicurus Κυριαί δοξαί 31-40 (Diog. L. X 150 ff.). He and Bernays assumed that Hermarchus, in composing his work on Empedocles, somewhat modified the form of the sentences of the master that are available to us, and patched them into his text, which has come down to us verbatim from Porphyry. Recently, Diels (ibid., p. 50) has asserted that those ten sentences are excerpts from the original text of the writing on Empedocles. Since the literal rendering of the genealogy by Porphyry has been refuted above, the issue now is to decide whether Epicurus is the author of those 10 sentences which Hermarchus would then have to have included in his work and on which Porphyry would give us a report, or whether a younger Epicurean, who should be regarded as the editor of all 40 Sentences (Us. Ep. p. XLVI), has augmented the 30 original "fundamental doctrines" by adding 10 taken from Hermarchus. Now it turns out that the thoughts of Sentences 31, 33-35 about the existence of a natural right (31. 33. = Epicurus Us. fr. 593. 524. 529. 597. 531. 551 - Hermarchus K. 7 and 8) and deterrence as the essence of punishment (34. 95. = Epicurus Us. fr. 531. 532. 534. 535. 582. 18. 397 - Hermarchus K. 7 and 8) occur both in Epicurus and in Hermarchus. But the content

13

Die Vermutung liegt nahe, daß Epikur seine Auffassung u. a. auch Protagoras entlehnt hat. Wenn andererseits nun auch Hermarch mit den beiden Vorsokratikern Berührungspunkte zeigen sollte - und man kann als solche die Verteidigung des Fleischessens und Tiertötens (Demokrit, Diels Vorsokr. fr. 251-260; Hermarch K. 10) und Erörterung des unvorsätzlichen Mordes (Protagoras, Diels A 10; Hermarch K. 9) auffassen -, so liegt durchaus nicht die Notwendigkeit vor, hier in Epikur den Vermittler zwischen Protagoras und Demokrit einerseits und Hermarch andererseits zu sehen und daraus zu folgern, daß Hermarch etwa jene beiden Stellen Epikurs Schriften entnommen habe; nichts spricht dagegen anzunehmen, daß er beide Vorsokratiker unabhängig von Epikur hätte benutzen können. Die Selbständigkeit der Schilderung Hermarchs und ihre, wenn auch nicht allzu erhebliche Abweichung von der seines Meisters kann also auch für den Fall der Gemeinsamkeit der Gewährsmänner Protagoras und Demokrit aufrechterhalten bleiben.

It is reasonable to assume that Epicurus based his opinion on Protagoras among others. If, on the other hand, Hermarchus should also show points of contact with the two pre-Socratics - and one can as such see the defense of eating meat and killing animals (Democritus, Diels Vorsokr. fr. 251-260; Hermarchus K. 10) and the discussion of unintentional murder (Protagoras, Diels A 10; Hermarchus K. 9) - then there is absolutely no need to see Epicurus as the mediator between Protagoras and Democritus on the one hand and Hermarchus on the other and to conclude from this that Hermarchus took those two passages from Epicurus's writings; nothing speaks against assuming that he could have used both pre-Socratics independently of Epicurus. The independence of Hermarchus description and its, albeit not too significant, deviation from that of his master can therefore also be maintained for the case of commonality between the references Protagoras and Democritus.

Murder is by definition intentional, at least for the German word used by Krohn.

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Schon im Altertum hat es nicht an Leuten gefehlt, die einige der Grundansichten (Κυριαί δοξαί) Epikur aberkannten (vgl. fr. 28).</p> | <p>Already in antiquity there was no lack of people who rejected Epicurus' authorship of some of the Principal Doctrines (Κυριαί δοξαί) (cf. fr. 28).</p> | <p>Google translated this wrongly as: "Even in antiquity there was no lack of people who rejected some of the basic views (Κυριαί δοξαί) of Epicurus (cf. fr. 28)."</p> |
| 15 | <p>Man entdeckt vor allem in fr. 29 und 31 einen Kritiker, der ein Wahrzeichen rednerisch-dialektischer Vorbildung, wie sie Hermarch besaß, an sich trägt: die spitzfindige Wort- und Begriffsklauberei.</p> | <p>One discovers above all in fr. 29 and 31 a critic who bears a mark of oratorical-dialectical training, such as Hermarchus possessed: the subtle quibble about words and concepts.</p> | |
| 15 | <p>Nicht erst seit Kant weiß man, daß das Unsterblichkeitsproblem mit dem Gottesproblem eng verbunden ist. Und der abstrakte Gottesbegriff des Empedokles (Diels fr. 134) hat sicher des Epikureers Spott und Disputierlust herausgefordert.</p> | <p>Not only since Kant has it been known that the problem of immortality is closely connected with the problem of God. And Empedocles' abstract concept of God (Diels fr. 134) certainly provoked ridicule and lust for debate on the part of the Epicureans.</p> | |

49

- Inhaltsübersicht.
- A. Bericht über Leben und Schriften.
 - I. Leben.
 - II. Schriften.
 - a) Die Epistolika.
 - b) Über die Wissenschaften.
 - c) Briefe.
- B. Fragmente und Zeugnisse.
 - I. Über das Leben (fr. 1-19).
 - II. Über die Schriften (fr. 20-57).
 - 1. Epistolika (fr. 20-39).
 - 2. Über die Wissenschaften (fr. 40-44).
 - 3. Briefe (fr. 45-51).
 - III. Zweifelhafte (fr. 58).
- Nachtrag.
- Autorenverzeichnis.

- Table of Contents.
- A. Account of Life and Writings.
 - I Life.
 - II. Writings.
 - a) The Epistolika.
 - b) About the sciences.
 - c) Letters.
- B. Fragments and Testimonies.
 - I. About life (fr. 1-19).
 - II. About the scriptures (fr. 20-57).
 - 1. Epistolika (fr. 20-39).
 - 2. About the sciences (fr. 40-44).
 - 3. Epistles (fr. 45-51).
 - III. Doubtful (fr. 58).
- Addendum.
- Index of authors.

Post by “Cassius” of May 15, 2023 at 11:44 AM

Thank you Martin!

Do we know who is referred to here as challenging the authorship?

Already in antiquity there was no lack of people who rejected Epicurus' authorship of some of the Principal Doctrines (Κυριαί δοξαι) (cf. fr. 28).

Post by “Don” of May 15, 2023 at 1:11 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)



Thank you Martin!

Do we know who is referred to here as challenging the authorship?

Already in antiquity there was no lack of people who rejected Epicurus' authorship of some of the Principal Doctrines (Κυριαὶ δοξαί) (cf. fr. 28).

It looks like fragment 28 is on pages 27-29 of the book, noting Diogenes Laertius and Philodemus, and refers, after a section in Greek, to [PD31](#) to [PD40](#).

I can try to tackle the Greek later.



Post by "Godfrey" of May 16, 2023 at 1:24 AM

Interesting that the PDs are referred to as "sentences." In the Saint-Andre translation I quickly counted only 5 as having more than one sentence. This may help to explain, at least to a degree, how they were divided into the current 40 PDs: the original groupings may have simply been separated into sentences.

Somewhere I read, although I can't remember where, that the authorship of the PDs was in question. Wherever I read it, I think a footnote connected the idea to an Italian source. Tantalizing, but not much help!

Post by "Don" of May 16, 2023 at 6:54 AM

Referring back to fr.28 referred to in post # 3 above, out doesn't seem to say what Krohn implies that it says. The first citation on p.28 is to Philodemus, pherc.1005, column 8, lines 18-19.

The book states :

εξέλεξεν και δε εκ των επιγεγραμμενων Κύριων δοκῶν ενιας

"And so chose some from the writings of the [Principal Doctrines](#) (Κύριων δοκῶν)

I don't see any references to the PDs in the actual papyrus.

Here's what that papyrus has :

[DCLP/Trismegistos 62437 = LDAB 3610](#)

column 11

P.Herc. 1005 col. 8th

Sketched 1803-1806 by Giuseppe Casanova

Engraved 1844-1861 by Vincenzo Corazza

[?? -ca.-? ? ? ἐρχόμενον ἀκριβεί-]

αι πρ [ς τ [τ[ν ἀνδρ[ν] ,

[πε] ρ πολλ[ν [Υ [εCSσ] θαι [τά-]

κε [[ί] νοις ἀρέ' [σ] κοντ ' , [έκ] τ[ς ά [ρ-]

5 χῆς ἰσοψία [α] ν τιν ἰσολογία ἰσοβία-
 ν [ει] ν ?? ς περί τινων ἐπι-
 στολογικῶν ἰσοκαταστάσεως [Πρρς Πυ-]
 θροκλέα περὶ μ [ε] τεώρων
 ἐπιτομῆς καὶ τοῦ Περ ἄ-
 10 ρ C [ετ] ἰσολογία, καὶ τιν εἰς Μητρό-
 δωρον ἀναφερομένων
 ἰσοθηκῶν καὶ τιν Μαρ-
 τυριῶν καὶ μλλον [δ] ??
 τοῦ Πρρς τιν Πλάτωνος
 15 Γοργίαν δευτέρου, καὶ τιν
 εἰς Πολύαινον τοῦ Πρρς
 τορς ἰήτορας καὶ κακὰ τοῦ Περ ἰ-
 σελήνης καὶ τιν εἰς ἰσορ-
 μαρχον · ἐξέλεξεν δ ?? καὶ
 20 [ἰσορμαρχίας] γεγραμένω [ν]

And here's the clunky translation I gleaned from *Les Epicuriens* in French, trying to compare with the Greek...

[11] [However, Zeno had good reason to ? consider, in connection with many [writings of our school] that a doubt hung over the opinions which were those of our great men at the origins [of the Garden] thus [he designated for Epicurus] certain letters, the summary on celestial phenomena To Pythocles (Πρρς Πυ)θροκλέα περὶ μ [ε]τεώρων ἐπιτομῆς) and On The Virtues (Περ ἄρ [ετ]ῶ ἰσολογία) (Footnote in book: These are the works of Epicurus, although his name is not mentioned and the last title is not otherwise attested.), as well as those writings attributed to Metrodorus which are The Rules of Conduct, the Testimonies and, more certainly, the second book of Against Plato's "Gorgias"; the books Against the Rhetoricians and The Moon attributed to Polyaeus, and those attributed to Hermarchus. Furthermore, he made a selection precisely [missing 1 word] [from the] writings ...

I'm still working on the second citation in the book. Stay tuned...

#Polyaeus

Post by “Don” of May 16, 2023 at 7:50 AM

The next citation is to Philodemus On Anger, pherc. 182, col. 43, lines 16-23:

[DCLP/Trismegistos 62390 = LDAB 3555](#)

..., ὥστε καὶ τοῦτον

ἀσθενῆ ποιεῖν, οὐ παρενο-

χλήσει, καθάπερ ἐν[ί]οις, οἳ

πάνδεινον ἠγήσαντο, ταῖς

20 Κυρίαῖς Δόξαις ἀντιγρά-

φοντες, εἰ τετόλμηκέ τις

ἐν ἀσθενείαι λέγειν ὀργὴν

καὶ χάριτα καὶ πᾶν τὸ τοι-

οὔτον,...

people, (sc. namely, their) putting a halt to someone's actions and getting vengeance on him—not even if we should call it [rage].²⁰²

[14] But [saying that anger is] a [weakness] and applying it to the wise man, so as to make him weak too, will not trouble us, as it does some,²⁰³ who, writing against the *Kyriai Doxai*, thought it was outrageous that someone²⁰⁴ had dared to say that "anger, gratitude, and all that sort of thing are in weakness," [25] since Alexander, by far the strongest of all, was liable to frequent fits of anger and conferred favors on countless men. For it is not the weakness opposite to the (strength) of athletes and kings that is meant²⁰⁵ in his (sc. Epicurus's) argument, but the constitution and nature that is capable of death and pains, [35] which Alexander, one would suppose, and every human being in general share,²⁰⁶ although they most of all (sc. athletes and kings)
