

What Calls for Our Language? -the Case of Heraclitus-

Takashi YAMAMOTO

Philosophy is concerned with truth as a whole. However, if truth reveals itself unconditionally as a whole, our language cannot endure it, as is indicated by a simile of a bat towards the sun in Aristotle (Met. 993b9-11). We have a fragment, "the sun's size is the width of a human foot." (DK3). "The sun on the earth!" is an atomic bomb. It is because the sun is far away that we could lead our life. This is reflected upon the fact that the light of the truth is dispersed thinly throughout the world. All this suggests that our human language is too weak to express the truth in a direct way, (DK59: "the way of writing is straight and crooked").

The main interpretation of the river-fragment is that the flow of water is a necessary condition of the being of a river. But the point lies at a still deeper level. If the flow of water changes radically in a short time, it would not be the same river, but a different river. If the change happens slowly enough, it is still the same river. There is no general rule which determines between being the same river and a different river. However, there is a certain measure to fix the case in the concrete contexts. What is it that uses such a measure? It is we, humans. We measure the being of a river. Thus to be is to make-to-be (to make it to be a part of our world). The river-fragment elucidates the meaning of the concept of being within a context of humanization.

The fragment DK67 shows the mechanism of humanization and 'beyond'. Since humans need light and heat in order to be alive, the correlative distinction between day and night, winter and summer is a part of human life. But there are unlimited number of other opposites; justice and injustice, beauty and ugliness, health and disease, male and female, life and death. They are all resonant with our interest and pleasure.

It is not possible that the opposites are the case at the same time. Only day *or* night, war *or* peace. But it means that our actuality lacks the other half of the opposites. Thus our actuality as a visible fact is not the whole but a certain part. Should we not inquire into the whole?

The god: daynight, which is not day or night, not day and night either, but daynight as a whole which penetrates day and night. It indicates the prior (ante rem) dimension to the factualization of day or night in everyday life. The name of 'god' is what plays a role when we think of the whole (of the world? of myself?). And in this case the god is what makes us to investigate into the whole of daynight (symbolized as 'the ') in the actual situation of life presented as either day or night. Our thinly understood fact of day or night as well as day and night, with our life connected with it, should be thrown into a garbage disposer. Are we truly awake in daytime? Or are we sleeping as was Athens to which Socrates was attached as a gadfly (Apol. 30e)? What about war or peace? How about division (sex) of a male or a female? Only either part of the pair of opposites can be realized (*moria* > *moira*), which comes to be from the infinite abyss, and through which the should be investigated (here too there are gods).