

ALEXANDRA BEKIARI¹, KONSTANTINOS FAMISSIS¹, ALEXANDROS KRITIKOS¹,
NIKITAS NIKITARAS², THANOS KRIEMADIS³

¹ Department of Physical Education and Sports Science, University of Thessaly, Greece

² Department of Physical Education and Sports Science, Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

³ Department of Sport Management, University of Peloponnese, Greece

THE BODY AND THE SOUL IN HOMER, THE ORPHICS, HERACLITUS, PYTHAGORAS AND SOCRATES FROM THE CRITICAL STANDPOINT OF PHILOSOPHY AND SPORTS PEDAGOGY

Key words: Homer, Orphics, Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Socrates, body culture, soul, sports education.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is the study of text excerpts making a reference to the philosophical views on the human body and soul of Homer, the Orphics, Heraclitus, Pythagoras and Socrates as well as a comparison of the differences between them. The results of the study indicate that the Homeric philosophy is not preoccupied by the soul but by the body. The soul is not attributed immortality and divine origin. The physical hypostasis is the most important thing in earthly life. On the contrary, the Orphics and the Pythagoreans despise the human personality, and human care as a total revolves and is concentrated around the human soul – which includes whatever divine there is in man – is immortal, survives after the death of the body and comes back to life by entering other bodies. The human body in Heraclitus represents the outside, the tangible pole of men's unity. It is the source of relationships and senses, such as hearing, sight, smell, speech and learning. The body guides common speech and constitutes truth, prudence and wisdom. The soul has to do with the inside and man's speech and thought. The soul in Heraclitus' philosophy discovers man's basic discrimination, man's best and wisdom, which, as self-knowledge, is an utmost virtue because in this way man gets to know himself and common speech; he actually gets to know it theoretically and practically. Thus the discrimination concerns ontology and cosmology, but because research moves rebelliously towards anthropology and self-knowledge, which it regards as the source of cosmogony. For Socrates the soul is composed of the spirit and the moral speech and is the source of all human values. Man's material dimension, that is, his bodily aspect, is spiritualised, and like the soul itself becomes nature. The human hypostasis is not broken to pieces but becomes unified. Finally, by means of this research, it was discovered that the aforementioned philosophers made a real discrimination between the body and the soul; this discrimination is a very important issue in sports pedagogy, because it lays the foundations of man's viewing as a whole, on the basis of the theory of speech, which becomes the centre of this discussion, as a source of movement and an anthropological motive power.

INTRODUCTION

Everybody accepts that mankind owes the honour of the principle of philosophy to ancient Greeks [67], [7]. Moreover, "in philosophy, as well

as in many fields, we are forced every now and then to come back to this small people's achievements, whose all-embracing talents and activities secured a place for them in the history of mankind's evolution that no other people can claim" [11].

Nietzsche, while making a reference to the Greek philosophers, said that “I have never met anybody who has inspired so much respect as the Greek philosophers” [41]. Every philosopher has his own belief on the work of philosophy and defines it according to his own perception [65]. In Pythagoras, all philosophers are “της αλήθειας θηραταί”, i.e. “hunters” of the truth [31]. According to Heraclitus, “χρη γαρ εν μάλλα πολλών ιστορας φιλοσόφους άνδρας είναι”, i.e. philosophers must be connoisseurs of many things [16]. Plato [12] was the first to characterise a philosopher as the one who dealt with the essence of things. He equaled the thirst for learning with philosophy because, according to him, philosophy was the acquisition of knowledge [62] and a philosopher is the one who aims at the truth, the “wisdom” of which is the gods’ privilege [45]. Aristotle defined philosophy in a different way; according to him, it is research “of the final reasons and every scientific research and knowledge” [1]. Philosophy is “to be on the way towards truth and not to possess it” [15]. Finally, philosophy as a spiritual manifestation was accepted by Epicurus [64], [6], [72] and Marx [36]. Marx’s opinion is that “the objective of philosophy is not only to interpret the world but also to change it”, by bringing theory and practice closer [43]. According to Socrates, the real philosopher constantly controls himself, his acts, his life, other people’s lives, because, in this way, he will be able to take the way that will lead him to the acquisition of virtue, justice and truth.

Philosophy helps the formation of a solid character and a strong personality, which does not desert and does not lose heart when faced with big problems or adverse circumstances. Moreover, it helps man subordinate the instinct to the will and create a scale of moral values, which for many people have been devitalised and no longer have an influence. It also helps man take a responsible position with regard to the big problems concerning not only himself but also society as a whole [39].

The Greek philosophy begins with the pre-Socratic philosophy. Socrates separates the Greeks’ early archaic thought from classical philosophy. Nevertheless, no matter how important Plato’ and Aristotle’ classical Greek philosophy is, it cannot be totally understood without an essential reference to the issues and ideas that preoccupied the pre-Socratic philosophers. The main questions and issues that preoccupy Plato and Aristotle, such as the concept of the being, beginning, essence,

change (of the existence), infinity, contrariety, similarity, unity, movement, multiplicity, had been posed and up to a certain point discussed, during the pre-Socratic period. The issues regarding the structure of the world, man’s cognitive powers, essence, soul, body and spirit, the human social moral life, virtue, learning, teaching, etc. had been posed by pre-Socratic philosophers. It is obvious that these questions preoccupied the philosophers of the classical period of Greek philosophy and still preoccupy contemporary man. Thus, all these who call the pre-Socratic philosophers giants (B. Russel and K. Popper) are right; more precisely, they call them giants who struggle with problems, particularly with the problem of the being [68].

In ancient Greece, the early religious views, as they were finalised by Homer, Hesiodus and the Orphics, included opinions and issues of social, political and philosophical importance. More precisely, this research makes a reference to Homer, Hesiodus, Heraclitus, the Orphics, Pythagoras and Socrates (who, as mentioned previously, separates the Greeks’ early archaic thought from classical philosophy) and will investigate their views on the human soul and the body.

THE BODY AND THE SOUL IN HOMER

Homer’s works reveal a big divergence between the body and the soul. The importance and the role of the soul in Homer is different from the one defined by Plato and Christianity later on. The role of the soul here is not a leading one. The soul does not try to dominate the body and put it in the service of certain objectives because the soul has no objectives. The living people are not interested in their soul; they talk about it only when they mention dead people. Nobody is particularly interested in his soul, in order to enlighten or save it, although the big criminals’ souls, especially those criminals’ souls who were irreverent to the gods, are punished in Hades [5].

The soul has longevity, because it outlives the body, but is not attributed immortality and divine origin. No radical contrast is mentioned between the soul and the body. The spirit is not the possession of the soul and does not coincide with it. There is no reincarnation in the Homeric era. The soul does not come to the world again after man’s death, so that it can enter another body. The most melancholic note heard every now and again in the

Iliad is Achilles' complaint that he will die young. If there had been reincarnation, there would have been no reason for him to worry so much and his complaint would not have worried anyone. The fate of the soul in Hades is sad. There, it appears to be nothing more but a sad remnant of what man was once [5].

At this point we are far away from the Platonic view according to which the soul is the man. The soul for Homer is a shadow wandering in a foggy area, which is actually not an area of punishment, but its proper residence. It is totally anaemic and needs to drink some blood from the one that the living people throw to it, so that it will "come to life again" a bit and obtain some material dimension or be strengthened by something physical. Earthly life and physical hypostasis are the most important issues [5].

The Homeric heroes are alive "here and now". They know that if they die, they will be "eaten up by inky darkness" and are not interested in their soul. They enjoy life here and have no confidence in what will happen next. The only immortality that they desire is the immortality of fame and glory, achieved in the living people's world [63]. This is the reason why the Homeric hero is in a hurry to obtain glory, before he ends up being a sad shadow in Hades. The Iliad begins with the promise of glory and ends with the achievement of it. How is it possible that Plato does not "declare war" on Homer, as does not adopt any of the aforementioned views at all [5]?

In Homer, the heroes and the athletes had a strong and healthy body and that was the origin and the cause of their beauty and happiness in life. Their love for the beautiful and strong body was so big that they regarded old age as an evil not less painful than death [14]. Homer believed that death brings about the separation of the soul and the body and this is where everything ends. The body in Hades totally loses its beauty and the brilliance it had in life almost does not exist. The Homeric heroes appear posthumously either as "idols" or as "shadows". The bodies appear as idols when they have not yet crossed the gates of the Nether World, due to the non-destruction of the body, whereas the shadows appear when they have taken their place in the kingdom of Hades. Mouratidis [39] comments on the Homeric philosophy on athletics and the body and makes a reference to the theme of the Homeric epics, that is the war between the Greeks and the Trojans and the immediate consequences of

this war. The poet's theme, the Trojan War, is supported by archaeology. Moreover, he makes a reference to the athletic games that Achilles organised to honour his dead friend, Patroclus and the various sports (chariot race, boxing, wrestling, race, bayonet-fighting, throwing, archery and javelin-throwing) in which the athletes participated and competed.

The Homeric view on the body and the soul is clear. According to the poet, they constitute a unity, which ceases to exist after the death and the destruction of the body. The soul is pathetic without the body and maybe the situation cannot get any worse. The dialogue between Ulysses and Achilles when the former went down to Hades and the consolation words that Ulysses wanted to exchange with his ex-friend's shadow reveal the bad condition to which the bodies are reduced posthumously. Achilles' words are known: "Son of Laertes, do not try to explain to me what death means, I know that very well. I would rather be the last farmer on the Upper World than a king here". The Homeric heroes were aware of the fact that everything in this world was futile [39]. Man is a creature, so he has a beginning and an end. All beings have the ravage of all-healing time, the ungrateful law of oblivion and the obscurity of the human memory as an enemy. Everything goes by and only one thing is left: the glory achieved either from a war or from the games. Homer's heroes gave everything, even their life, the one and only that man has, in order to achieve this glory.

THE BODY AND THE SOUL IN THE ORPHICS

In the 7th and 6th century BC, a new Dionysiac worship spread, conventionally called "Orphism" [42]. This worship intensely projects a new view about the body and the soul and the relationships between them. According to the Orphics, the soul is the one that includes whatever divine there is in man. They do not mean of course the breath of life or the dead people's shadows or the abstract concept of life [44]. The Orphics believed that the profound secret feelings and the imagination were man's inner manifestations [5].

The Orphics were followers of an occult religious teaching, according to which the soul can survive if it is maintained pure. In the Orphics' teaching, elements that came from Apollo's

worship, who was one of the twelve gods, perceived as pure (“katharsios” Apollo “is the one that purifies from guilt and the miasma, the one with purifying qualities”), united with the Thracian beliefs about reincarnation, which probably had an Eastern or Indo-European origin. As time went by, these elements were processed, and a religious teaching was thus formed, which had a god, as a central character, who did not belong to Homer’s Pantheon [68]. This movement owes its name to Orpheus from Thrace, who, with his purity, mystic capabilities and prophetic power, combined the Apollonian elements with the Thracian religious beliefs. In this way, he became the most important figure of this religious movement.

With regard to whether the Orphic beliefs affected the thinkers and whether they contributed to the evolution of the philosophical thinking in the 6th and 5th century BC, Diels and Kranz [9] accept that they influenced the evolution of the philosophical thought, and that is why they “prefix” the Orphics in their work. This view is not easily accepted nowadays. Guthrie [14] questions whether they contributed to the evolution of the philosophical thought, and this is why he does not examine the Orphic teaching separately. Guthrie’s view is explained by the content he attributes to the term “philosophy”, which he identifies with rationality and not with the questions inherent in the Orphic mythology.

The Orphics’ beliefs, even though they are mainly religious, are related to that phase of development of thought during which philosophy is “covered” by the “garment” of myth, since the problems that bothered them had a cosmological and anthropological meaning.

The Orphics’ belief on man’s creation is of particular importance. They seemed to be concerned with the question “What is man?”. Of course, they gave a mythical answer to this question, which will later be the nucleus of the so-called diarchal belief about man. Man, as Zeus’ creation from the Titans’ dust, is composed of two elements: the Divine and the Titanic. The Divine element is the soul that is a divine, Dionysiac element; and the Titanic is the body, which is a totally evil element, prison, the tomb of the soul. The objective of man’s life is to show off the divine element, until it is released from the body. The body must be purified by means of ceremonies. The soul was united with the body due to the sin committed at an earlier time, i.e. because the Titans devoured Dionysus’ body.

The body has sins and evil wishes. The Orphic poet must be an ascetic. Stoicism and purification contribute to the salvation of the soul. Purifications take place by means of rituals. Sometimes, though, more than one life cycle is needed to achieve purification [68].

According to the Orphics, the main problem is how to save the soul from the cycle of births [68]. The Orphics came to answer questions posed by people of that era, which had a philosophical character, up to one point. For them, the great events of man’s life (birth, maturation, death) and the nature surrounding them with its influence were powerful experiences leading man to the formation of questions (Aristotle, *Metaphysics* “φύση του ειδέναι, ορέγονται οι άνθρωποι”, that is men by nature wish to learn new things), which showed his spiritual puzzlement, mental dead end and admiration for the situations of life and the world generally. Questions that came up spontaneously, such as “What is life?”, “What is birth and death?”, “What is nature?”, “What is man?”, “What is soul?”, “What is body?”, “How should man live?” and “What is there first?” have the characteristics of philosophical questions because they confuse us and it is not at all easy to answer them [68].

It is not possible to characterise the answers given to them as philosophical (if philosophy is regarded as learning interwoven with speech) but as mythological. Nevertheless, they had an explanatory meaning and were used to redeem man who was possessed by spiritual questions.

All these were objectified in a particular essence that was inside man, the “soul”, which, by means of ecstasy and enthusiasm, obtained supernatural powers allowing it to connect with a superior area of the existence. As the anger in the epic united the psychic qualities and the powers of life, in the Orphics the carrier of all these profound thoughts and inner feelings was also regarded as the beginning of vitality and the reason of life. Moreover, the Orphics did not content themselves with that. The metaphysical longing for the overcoming of the fear of death led them to regard this essential part of man as immortal, a view that is, of course, related to what the beginning of life is. Therefore the concept of “soul” ended up including a superior being. It became an area of life that stands higher than the body [5].

Thus the material dimension, stripped of its initial qualities, retreated and was surrounded by negative values, mainly because, as an “earthly”

and natural essence that it was considered, it was an obstacle and a suspending factor to the tendency for secret internalisation and despiritualisation and to the ecstatic impulse [44].

The soul is imprisoned in the body. Socrates tells Kratilos that the body is the tomb of the soul [50]. People are the gods' movable fortune [54]. They set us free from the jail of life, when they decide to. This is the reason why nobody is allowed to commit suicide [55]. Only with death can the soul hope to get rid of the evils of the body. When man dies, the fate of his soul is not the one that Homer holds for the souls. It does not become an evanescent shadow in a mouldy Hades. It goes to a supersubstantial world, where it will be happy or will be punished depending on whether it was initiated to the supreme mysteries of the existence and the gods and whether it led a fair life [51]. The punishment of the soul is to go through a series of births and, if it remains pure from injustices and is set free from the material dimension, then it returns to its divine form, otherwise it is condemned to eternal punishment [46].

In the old times, the individual was merely a ring of the family chain. The children and the grandchildren had to pay for their ancestors' sins. However, time came when it was regarded as unfair to have a man pay for somebody else's mistakes and so they asked for the punishment of the one who had made the mistakes. Nobody else should pay for him. This demand is found in Solon. However, experience showed that a man often died, without having suffered the punishment he deserved for his sins. The Orphic teaching found the solution to this question. The guilty person's punishment was transferred to posthumous life [42].

Despite the fact that the Orphics' dogma concerning the soul, at least originally was not very developed, its general principles must be regarded as certain. The soul is essentially different from the body. It is pure and divine, whereas the body is corrupted and earthly. The soul is the master and the body is the slave. Man's fate on earth is miserable. People are much afflicted. They cannot predict the evils approaching and do not know how to deter them. The Orphics brought the ceremonies, the mysteries and the purifications to Greece as well, in order to help them [5].

In this way, the Orphics' religious occult movement literally reversed the preexistent order of things. Homer's doubtful, dark and insignificant became certain, bright and hopeful. And that was

certain and significant, retreated, was degraded and was once despised [44].

The reasons that caused these views and for which they were accepted are obvious enough. We are aware of the fact that life has a tendency to maintain itself at its initial composition and repels its obliteration. Socrates in the Banquet says that "η θνητή φύσις ζητεί κατά το δυνατόν αεί τε είναι και αθάνατος", i.e. the mortal nature asks as much as possible that it always exists and, consequently, that it is immortal [59]. Spinoza thinks in the same way. A first consolation for the lack of immortality is to be remembered by your children who in a way prolong your existence. When man can pursue posthumous fame, he does that [60], which is also a prolongation of himself. Therefore, since the idea of death causes terror or indignation to him, if someone assures him that death is not the last boundary, that some part of himself will survive, in some other world of course that cannot be controlled, the realist listens with disbelief but somehow consoles himself, whereas the naïve man is convinced before other people convince him.

One belief causes the other one. Since a part of Achilles survives, even a shadow, why is this shadow not something more essential? Why are the innermost thoughts and our profound feelings not the visible signs of this hypostasis, which acts within ourselves while we are alive and maintains our life? If some people end up with such views, they will easily find followers [63].

A lot of people dream of happiness, without, however, being able to taste even a small part of it in the end. On the other hand, though, the saddest rule involves the most miserable people's triumph and happiness and their death without having being punished (the insignificant ones are usually punished). The people who are messed up by injustice and "thirsty" for happiness think in a naïve way that they themselves will be happy sometime, either because they did not do harm to anybody or because they themselves finally deserve a bit of happiness. They also think spontaneously, but always in a naïve way, that the punishment will finally sometime be imposed on the villains, be it so on their children or their descendants, who continue in a way the existence of these scoundrels who died without having being punished [5].

Nevertheless, if it happens that the dead people have their own world, which is somehow significant, then why can somebody not be happy in such a world, since he did not achieve this here? Or

why won't he experience greater happiness, since he did not do harm to anybody? And if evil is punished only randomly here, why won't there be absolute justice there? So, if somebody assures us of the fair man's future happiness and the unfair one's punishment, no prod will be inside us so that we will reject this view [63].

Thus, the associations, but mainly the powerful inner prods were not absent from any stage of the progressive idealisation of the initial shadow, the ghost that ended up becoming the main element of the human hypostasis, the carrier of thought. This tendency offered humanity not a verified piece of knowledge, like the pieces of knowledge sought by Aristotle, but a paramount consolation to the man who is "thirsty" for happiness, harassed by injustice and scared of death.

Consequently, according to the Orphics, the main problem is how to save the soul from the cycle of births. This view exists in the Indian religious tradition (Yedas) and in Buddhism, but in Greece it takes a special form as it is combined with the journey of the soul towards Hades, its total behaviour during life and with its presence in front of the deities of Hades. These views that the Orphics had, which were connected with religious occult ceremonies, were widely afloat and had influenced a great number of eminent Greeks. During this early period, we have important renowned representatives of the Orphic beliefs who were distinguished for their personality, e.g. Museos Athineos, who came from Eleusis and was regarded as a poet and interpreter of the oracles; Epimenides Kris, known as the person purging the cities, the one who purged the city of Athens from the so-called "Kilon's Agos" ("Kilon's Miasma"); Akusilaos Argios; Theagenes Riginos; Ferekides and Hesiodus.

THE SOUL AND THE BODY IN HERACLITUS

Heraclitus rose to prominence as an "ingenious" philosopher. According to Laetius, Heraclitus regarded fire as the beginning of the world [4]. He is the first one to pinpoint the contrasts in social life and the tangible things which constantly change [52].

That is to say, we can observe constant creation and destruction taking place periodically in

the world. The contrasts between things are regarded as the reason for this flow, i.e. the change of things, but not what many people claim, that "this change producing things from the initial fire is followed by discord or war" [40].

On the contrary, it is discord or war that makes things move: "πόλεμος πατήρ πάντων ἐστί, πάντων δὲ βασιλεύς, καὶ τοὺς μὲν θεοὺς ἔδειξε τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους, τοὺς μὲν δούλους ἐποίησε τοὺς δὲ ἐλεύθερους" [19], i.e. war is the creator and king of everything. War usually shows off ones as gods and others as simple people, and it usually makes ones slaves and others free people. A spot-on remark can be made that the war, i.e. contrasts between things, is the cause and not the result. Heraclitus, like the other Ionian natural philosophers, first expresses the thought that movement and life are qualities of the matter [43]. This new belief about the world and life away from myths was born from the new economic and social conditions. To a great extent, this is due to the fact that the Ionian philosophers are democratic and feel that it is their debt to dissolve the clouds of the myth they inherited from the aristocracy [18].

In order to make the problem of Heraclian concepts of the body and the soul understandable, we should show that it is related to two central points of Heraclitus' teaching: one concerning the relationships of the dialectic polarity of the world, i.e. overt and covert harmony; and the other concerning the dialectic polarity of man as a cosmic and reasonable being [13]. According to Heraclitus, the oppositions "overt-covert harmony" and "body-soul" in man are fundamental in the horizon of dialectic polarity. With regard to the "overt-covert harmony" opposition, the term "overt" refers to the tangible world, the world here and now, the outside world. With regard to the covert harmony pole, the term "covert" refers to common speech, the speech as man's thought and soul, the meaning of the world and man's meaning. The "body-soul" opposition is related and parallel to the "overt-covert" opposition, i.e. it is an anthropological discrimination and concerns man's dialectic polarity as the body and the soul.

The term "body" is not found in Heraclitus. Instead there is the whole semantic horizon, which concerns the human body and deals with the overt, the outside, the tangible pole of man's unity [13]. The term "soul" is often found in Heraclitus in various excerpts and concerns the other pole of man's dialectic polarity: the inside, man's speech

and thought. Heraclitus' teaching on the body is mentioned in various excerpts [17].

According to these texts, man as a body is a biological "being" (animal) and a cosmic "being". Man "talks" with the body, co-exists and communicates with the material world. This coexistence with the outside world is mentioned in Heraclitus under the term "egiria" ("coincidence"). However, man differentiates and "distinguishes himself" from the world with which he co-exists, according to the principle "εν διαφερόμενον εαυτώ", i.e. the one being in constant opposition with itself. The human body in the aforementioned horizon is a source of relationships and senses described by Heraclitus as hearing, sight, smell [28], speech and learning [27]. Heraclitus regards the eyes rather than the ears as more accurate witnesses, i.e. the sight rather than the hearing, like all ancient Greek philosophers [21]. According to Heraclitus, the sense senses and when it senses, it learns and when it learns, it leads towards speech. When it does not do it, it is a "bad" witness for reality and concerns sensory organs "βαρβάρους ψυχάς έχοντας", i.e. characterised by a barbaric soul [22]. Consequently, according to the physical anthropological discrimination and procedure, the meaning of the body appears to live, feel and guide common speech. This constitutes the truth, prudence and wisdom of the body. The opposite of that leads to ill-considered, barbarity and the irrational.

According to Heraclitus, the soul can be "mortal" [25], "ipnotousa" ("asleep") [20] and "fluid" [29]. A man with a fluid soul is "ipnoton" ("asleep"), a mortal in the night and ignorance. He ignores the "body-soul" and "inside-outside" oppositions and does not care about them; he does not move and blocks the movement towards speech, consequently, he is ill-considered and irrational [13]. This is the basic reality outside the system of values and laws that regulate the world harmony. This reality is described with the words "efroni" ("night"), "sleep", "death" [13]. In the dimension of "efroni" ("night"), "discrimination" and indifference, the man, stimulated by the "one", the common speech, which is different and motivated, proceeds to a very great act, which, according to Heraclitus, is called "φαός άπτεται εαυτώ", i.e. "he lights a light to himself so that he can see" [24]. After this ignition, man starts to see, hear, really smell and think, so the soul turns from fluid to dry, "the wisest" and "the best" [23]. A token of the wisdom of the soul is that it asks to

learn, to get to know itself (self-knowledge), its boundaries and profound speech [26]. In this way the soul discovers man's basic discrimination and divine ethos [30]. This constitutes man's genius, his best and wisdom, which as self-knowledge is the utmost virtue, because in this way man gets to know himself, common speech and, as a matter of fact, he gets to know it theoretically and practically. The utmost wisdom as a virtue and prudence is that man thinks of his truth, says it, acts truly according to the human common speech; these should take place naturally and come along with real scientific knowledge.

Thus we see that the body-soul opposition in Heraclitus refers to ontology and cosmology, but as research it turns rebelliously towards anthropology and self-knowledge, regarded as the source of cosmogony. After that, man's microcosm becomes an example for the world, based on the discovery and theory of common speech [13].

Heraclitus' body-soul opposition is a major issue in sports pedagogy, because it lays the foundations of man's view as a whole on the basis of the theory of speech, which is the centre of this discussion, as a source of movement and anthropological motive power.

THE BODY AND THE SOUL IN PYTHAGORAS

The Ionian philosophers tried to give answers to the cosmological problem as they were influenced by the philosophy of the East. These Ionian philosophical thoughts appeared more intense with the Sophists' teaching, which was deeply revolutionary because it affected the establishment of the great landowners and the oligarchy, causing different reactions [65]. A philosophical school was then established in the Western Mediterranean, aimed not only "to react against every change and innovation but also to redeploy landholders on new political, social and organizational institutions" [35]. A philosophy was born and projected with a theosophical and ascetic axis that found its most important representatives among the Pythagoreans and the school of Elea.

According to tradition, Pythagoras got to know Thales', Anaximander's and Ferekides Sirios' teachings, as their student, and later on, he made long trips to Egypt and Persia, where he expanded his cognitive horizon, both with the

Egyptians' and Babylonians' mathematical and astronomical theories and their ethical-religious beliefs.

It is not easy to identify the real significance of the Orphic religious movement in Hellenism on the basis of available sources [38]. Definitely, the influence must have been highly significant, since both Pythagoras and Plato were not indifferent to the Orphics' theories.

The Orphics' main views on the soul were integrated in Pythagorism [8]. The Pythagoreans adopted the radical body-soul opposition, escorted by an apparent contempt for the body, views that do not agree with the Greeks' dominant views on the soul [32] and the body, as one can extract them from Homer's, Pindar's and Simonides' great poetry, sculptures and paintings, where the body is not only despised but is glorified.

Pythagoras' teaching is summarized mainly in the theory "about the soul" with a faith in reincarnation and mathematics. According to the theory on the soul, the cause of movement in man is the soul itself because it is immortal. According to Pythagoras, it must be perfected and purified from various sins. Nevertheless, in order for this to take place, posthumously, it is transferred to another man, animal or plant, depending on the sins that the first man, to whom God gave the soul, has committed [10]. "The helplessly unworthy souls will enter a world of happiness, where they will go on living without the presence of the body" [40]. The philosopher's interest in the soul was more religious than philosophical [33].

The reincarnation dogma presupposes that the soul survives after the death of the body and is consequently immortal [44]. This means that it is related to the divine, of which the main characteristic feature is immortality. The series of births aimed at the perfect purification of the soul from the physical dimension, that is, it had a religious-ethical objective. A particular way of life that Plato calls the Pythagorean way of life [58], a life full of bravery and virtue, secures a better fate for man even after his death [69]. The souls were connected with the body in order to be punished [70]. As in the Orphic life [53], the final objective here becomes the redemption from the cycle of births and the recovery of the lost divine blessedness. The way to salvation is the same: purification from the luscious and removal from the earthly. Of course, the relationship between early Pythagorism and Orphism and the discrimination of

the things Pythagoras said from the things taught by his immediate successors are problems for which no agreement can be reached [34]. However, there is a difference in the way of purification. The Orphic purification has basically a ritualistic character but is escorted by a system of religious and later ethical prohibitions. The purification takes a spiritual and ethical character in the Pythagoreans. It is achieved mainly by means of philosophy that allows the cultivation of the divine element inside us. Music and gymnastics are themselves means of spiritual purification. Of course, we also have the ascetic habits here, the known symbols or rumours [71], like the abstinence from meat, prohibition of broad beans and other ones.

Pythagoras was the first one to use the word "kosmos" ("order of things"/ "jewel") in order to characterise the harmony and the order that dominates the infinitude of the universe. Moreover, he believed that the soul was the harmony of the body on which it had an influence so that there would always be symmetry and balance between them [39]. The soul was always placed higher than the body that is why, the influences of the latter on the soul were not at all desirable. On the contrary, there was a pursuit for the influence of the soul on the body in order to make man harmonious and have the order dominating the universe reign inside him. According to Pythagoras, man should obtain ethos and decency, which can be obtained by means of constant practice and virtue, which he divided in three parts: justice, bravery and prudence. It is not easy for man to obtain virtue because he is imperfect by nature, this is the reason why constant effort is needed, aiming at the elimination of his natural flaws, which make him unfair, ambitious and avaricious [39].

Pythagoras perceives the universe as harmony and mathematics, claiming that numbers are the beginning or the essence of beings. He tried to explain the beginning of beings by means of numbers and mathematics. The development and the refinement of mathematics is rendered self-evident, so that they will be used for the development of a philosophical theory and thought. According to Aristotle [2], the Pythagoreans not only contributed to the development and refinement of mathematics but they also were the first ones to deal with it seriously. At the same time, they dealt with music and particularly with the harmonious theory of objects to which the separation of musical intervals belongs. The first harmonious theory is

attributed to Pythagoras himself and within its framework “the mathematical determination of the relationships of intervals” is attempted.

Man’s soul is considered by Pythagoras to be immortal; it comes from some divine group and, due to some punishment, has been obliged to exist within the human body. The Pythagorean philosophy considers the body to be different from the soul or something opposite to it. The body is a foreign environment for the soul, in which it is obliged to spend a part of its life [39]. The Pythagoreans used various exercises aimed at the purity of the body and the soul. The hardening of the body by means of exercise would make it capable of resisting the various challenges and, in this way, the purposes of the soul would be met. The Pythagoreans used various gymnastic exercises aiming at the preservation of a balanced physical condition, which they regarded as something “complimentary and beautiful” [37]. Pythagoras himself said that the virtue of the world was harmony. The good laws are the virtue of the city and the virtues of the body are health, beauty and vigor.

Finally, Pythagorism influenced the Greek thought more essentially, through the Eleatic philosophy, Plato’s philosophy, Platonism and Neoplatonism. After all, a great number of books were written from the time of Aristotle and his successors until the end of the ancient world about Pythagoras’ personality and teaching. From all these, the “Lives” written by Diogenes Laertius, Porfirios, Iamvlichos and an anonymous man have survived in one piece.

THE BODY AND THE SOUL IN SOCRATES

Socrates (470-339 BC) based his whole philosophy on self-knowledge, which for him was a source of virtue, and its beginning was doubt; his phrase “εν οίδα ότι ουδέν οίδα” [73], i.e. “I know one thing, that I know nothing” is well known. He believed that it was preferable for someone to know what he himself was instead of dealing with issues like natural phenomena. His interest was rather directed towards the “Athenians’ moral uplift” [35], as he wanted to “correct” the confusion brought about by the Sophists, who had a harmful effect on the manners, as he believed.

This new belief by Socrates inaugurates a new era of philosophy, which changes direction. His aim is not to give a solution to the cosmic

problem but the way to ameliorate life. The philosophical thought was cosmological and became anthropological and moral. This ethics demands the knowledge of moral rules and, furthermore, the knowledge of good because, according to Socrates, “knowledge and virtue coincide” [43]. This ethics by Socrates is based on reason, i.e. the wisdom from which all other virtues, such as justice, prudence, bravery and holiness [61] stem. Therefore, the beginning of his teaching was “self-knowledge” and the “moral uplift” of society.

Socrates’ philosophy concentrates on man and his problems. The object of his thought was man and the moral amelioration of his life. Cicero said that Socrates was the first one who brought philosophy from the sky onto the earth and forced it to investigate man’s life, ethics, good and evil deeds. Just like the Pythagoreans Socrates also believed that man must examine his life and judge his acts, aiming at his moral amelioration. He stressed that it is not worth leading an unexamined and uncontrolled life. He often said “ουδείς εκών κακός” meaning that man becomes evil only from ignorance, that is, he is not evil by his own free will, whereas when he gets rid of the ignorance that possesses him, he can reach virtue. Thus knowledge leads to virtue, whereas ignorance leads to wickedness. The beginning of Socrates’ philosophy is the defeat of man’s spiritual poverty; man must know himself, his spiritual power and flaws, i.e. he must obtain self-knowledge [39].

The Greek philosophy begins with the pre-Socratic philosophy. Socrates separates the Greeks’ early archaic power from classical philosophy [68]; he thought that the “salvation of the soul” was his mission. In the Apology, he appears to talk emphatically about the care and the treatment of the soul [47]. There, he advises the Athenians to follow his example and neither the old nor the young should take care of their body or care about money before they take great care of their soul, that is before they find a way to have their soul at its best as much as possible [49]. The discussion in Protagoras begins with the observation that his young friend’s soul is in danger [57]. According to Socrates, God did not attend only to the human body but “όπερ μέγιστον εστί και την ψυχήν κρατίστην του ανθρώπου ενέφυσε” [74], i.e. the most important thing is that He gave man a good soul. In these excerpts, the term “soul” is used with a particular sensitivity that we find for the first time in Greek literature and that we will find again in

Christianity and then in the later civilization [63]. The question remains then how Socrates viewed the soul? Burnet, in one of his essays, in which he traces the evolution of the views on the soul in ancient Greece, shows that the importance given by Socrates to the term “soul” coincides neither with the Homeric idol nor with the Ionian philosophers’ aeriform soul, the soul-demon of the Orphic worship or the soul of the Attic tragedy (Proc. Brit. Acad. 1915-1916, 235 and so on).

Socrates, as a historian, does not seem to have ever shared the theory of the immortality of the soul expressed in *Phaedon*, or the theory of preexistence by *Menon*, although Plato attributes them to him. Plato says in *Phaedon* that the theory of the ideas and the faith in the immortality of the soul must be regarded as interrelated [56]. So, if we accept Aristotle’s view that the theory of the ideas is not Socratic but Platonic [3], then the dogma of the immortality of the soul must belong to Plato, because the one is supported by the other. Socrates in his *Apology*, where he confronts the impending death, leaves what happens in the soul posthumously totally uncertain [48]. This uncertainty must have been his true attitude towards this issue that maybe did not aim at definitely solving it. He never talked with certainty about the form of reality that characterizes the soul and did not clearly say whether the soul could or could not be separated from the body [5]. The concept of the soul in Socrates must be composed of the spirit and ethical speech. “The only way to understand the soul, about which Socrates talks, is to regard it along with the body, as two different sides of one and only human nature [33]. In his mind, there is no difference between the psychic and the natural world; the old concept of ‘nature’, the one that comes from natural philosophy, now includes the spirit as well and the transformation of its essence. Socrates cannot claim that man has the monopoly of the spirit [75] and that nature is capable of developing spiritual powers. But exactly as man’s natural side is spiritualised, due to the coexistence of the body and the soul as distinguished parts of the single human nature, the soul at its turn takes a new and amazing reality: it transforms into a nature without being influenced by external factors”.

On the whole, Socrates viewed the soul as the source of all values of human life and this is the reason why he stressed the importance of inner life, the one that characterizes the final stages of the Greek civilization.

CONCLUSIONS

- Homer supports that the living people are not interested in the soul but in the body. The soul is not attributed immortality and divine origin. Earthly life and physical hypostasis are the most important issues.
- On the contrary, the Orphics contempt human personality, and man’s care as a whole is concentrated around his soul. For them, the soul includes whatever divine there is in man. It is immortal and survives after the death of the body. It comes back to life by entering other bodies, in a better or worse state, depending on the way man acted in his previous life. Here, the physical dimension, stripped of its initial qualities, retreated and was surrounded with negative values. It was regarded as an obstacle to internalisation, ecstatic urge and despiritualisation. The body, according to the Orphics, “is the tomb of the soul” [50].
- The term “body” is not found in Heraclitus. However, we find the whole semantic horizon, which concerns the human body and deals with the overt, the outside and the tangible pole of man’s unity. The human body is the source of relationships and senses, which Heraclitus describes as hearing, sight, smell, speech and learning. Thus, according to the physical anthropological discrimination and procedure, the meaning of the body appears to live, feel and guide common speech. This constitutes the truth, prudence and wisdom of the body. The opposite of that leads to the ill-considered, barbarity and the irrational. The term “soul” is often found in Heraclitus in various excerpts and concerns the other pole of man’s dialectic polarity. It concerns the inside, man’s speech and thought. A token of the wisdom of the soul is that it asks to get to know itself (self-knowledge), its boundaries and profound speech. The soul discovers man’s basic discrimination, man’s best and wisdom, which as self-knowledge is an utmost virtue because in this way man gets to know himself, common speech and, as a matter of fact, he gets to know it theoretically and practically. We can thus see that the body-soul discrimination refers to ontology and cosmology, but it turns as research rebelliously towards anthropology and self-knowledge, which he regards as the source of cosmogony. After that, man’s microcosm

becomes an example for the world, based on the discovery and the theory of common speech.

- The Orphics' main views on the soul were integrated in Pythagorism. The Pythagoreans adopted both the radical body-soul discrimination, escorted by an apparent contempt towards the body, and the idea of reincarnation.
- Socrates thought that the salvation of the soul was his mission but the soul, as he means it, coincides neither with the Homeric idol nor with the Ionian philosophers' aeriform soul or the Orphics' soul-demon. The soul for Socrates is composed of the spirit and ethical speech and is the source of all human values. However, the great philosopher never showed his contempt for the human physical dimension. In Socrates, man's natural aspect is spiritualised, like the soul itself. The human hypostasis is not broken to pieces but becomes unified.

It can finally be stated that there is a real body-soul opposition in all the aforementioned philosophers. This discrimination can be and actually is a very important issue of sports pedagogy, because it lays the foundations of man's viewed as a whole, on the basis of the theory of speech, which becomes the centre of this discussion, as a source of movement and anthropological motive power. This anthropological motive power, when in contact with various problems, and relying on an interscientific cooperation and processing of classical excerpts to which all aforementioned philosophers make a reference, moves to a dialogue. Both this dialogue and the relationships in the context of which man is studied by many different sciences constitute the basis of sports pedagogy and philosophy of our era.

By the term "Sports Pedagogy", we mean a way of existence for man, where all his physical, psychic and spiritual powers are symmetrically developed. Sports pedagogy, sports and physical education and classical education are more generally regarded as an essential characteristic of Greek culture. Christian teachings are regarded as a continuation, culmination and completion of the ancient Greek education, physical and spiritual education and sports education. The fact that the early Christian Fatherly theology integrated ancient Greek education and physical education into the Christian educational system is a major achievement. Without this momentous integration neither Byzantine humanism nor the humanism of the

Western Renaissance, Neohumanism or various modern theories, patterns and educational systems would be understandable.

Moreover, sports pedagogy includes the theories of the beautiful and moral as well as the aesthetics of all elements that meet and are presented both by the soul and the human entity. Within the framework of this aesthetics, the dialectic entity of the "εὖ" ("good") is depicted, as no "εὖ"/ "good" exists without the beautiful and the moral; because the "εὖ"/ "good" and the "moral", on the basis of the aforementioned theory of speech as well, are the unity of the good, the fair, the true, the game, the free and the beautiful. This equality could be regarded as a centre of the speech about virtue and the virtue of the whole philosophical thought of Homer, the Orphics, Heraclitus, Pythagoras and Socrates. Because the "εὖ"/ "good" and the "moral" show moderation, harmony, symmetry, matter and form.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aristotle Athenians' Republic 1331a. 16/ Metaphysics 1004a 3-b1, 982b, 20.
- [2] Aristotle Metaphysics 985b.
- [3] Aristotle Metaphysics A6 987a 32-b9, M4 1078b 12-32, M9 1086b 2-14.
- [4] Aristotle Rhetoric 111, 1407b, 15-25.
- [5] Arvanitakis T., ed., Πλάτων, Περί κινήσεως (Plato, About the Movement), Zitros/Skepsi, Thessaloniki 1996.
- [6] Bergson H., ed., L' evolution créatrice, (The evolution of creative), Paris 1969.
- [7] Burnet J., ed., Greek Philosophie, I. Thales to Plato, Paris 1935.
- [8] Delatte A., ed., Etudes sur la littérature pythagoricienne (Studies of Pythagorism), Paris 1915.
- [9] Diels H. & Kranz W., ed., Die Fragmente der vorsokratiker (Fragments of presocratiks), Weidmann, Dublin-Zurich 1966.
- [10] Diogenes Laertius VIII.
- [11] Engels F., ed., Διαλεκτική της φύσης (Dialectics of nature), (translation E. Bitsaki), Contemporary Era, Athens 1984.
- [12] Euthydemus 288d.
- [13] Farandos G., ed., Εισαγωγή στην Ολυμπιακή Παιδεία (Introduction to the Olympic Education), S.I. Zaxaropoulos, Athens 2004.
- [14] Guthrie W., ed., The Greeks and their Gods, Boston 1967.

- [15] Heidegger M., ed., Τι είναι φιλοσοφία (What is philosophy), (translation A. Vagena), Athens 1973.
- [16] Heraclitus B 35.
- [17] Heraclitus Fr. B5, B6, B7, B10, B20, B21, B26, B27, B17, B13, B14, B28, B34, B55, B54, B58, B62, B69, B82, B74, B96, B101, B107, B111, B123, B124 and B126.
- [18] Heraclitus Fr.49.
- [19] Heraclitus Fr.53.
- [20] Heraclitus Fr.B1 and 77.
- [21] Heraclitus Fr.B101, 107.
- [22] Heraclitus Fr.B107.
- [23] Heraclitus Fr.B118.
- [24] Heraclitus Fr.B26.
- [25] Heraclitus Fr.B36.
- [26] Heraclitus Fr.B45, 101 and 118.
- [27] Heraclitus Fr.B55, 101, 107.
- [28] Heraclitus Fr.B7.
- [29] Heraclitus Fr.B77.
- [30] Heraclitus Fr.B78 and 119.
- [31] Herodotus Fr.87/ Diogenes Laertius I 12.
- [32] Jaeger W., ed., Die Theologie der fruehen griech (Theology of ancient Greek), Denker, Stuttgart 1953.
- [33] Jaeger W., ed., Education: The Ideals of Greek Culture, London 1976.
- [34] Karenyl K., ed., Pythagoras und Orpheus, Praeludien zu einer Kuenftigen Geschichte der Orphik und des Pythagorismus (Pythagoras and Orpheas, Introduction to philosophy of Orphism and Pythagorism), Zurich 1950.
- [35] Kordatou G., ed., Ιστορία της αρχαίας ελληνικής φιλοσοφίας (History of the Ancient Greek Philosophy), 5th edition, Athens 1972.
- [36] Lucacs G., ed., Schriften zur Ideologie und Politik (Writings of Ideologe and Politik), Darmstand 1973.
- [37] MacCarthy H.S., ed., Possible Pythagorean Influences on Plato's Views of Physical Education in the Republic, *Research Quarterly*, 40, 1969.
- [38] Moulinier L., ed., Orphée et l' orphisme et l' époque classique (Orpheas and Orphism in ancient epoch), Paris 1955.
- [39] Mouratidis I., ed., Εισαγωγή στην αρχαία ελληνική φιλοσοφία. Θέματα φιλοσοφίας φυσικής αγωγής και αθλητισμού (Introduction to ancient Greek philosophy. Issues of the philosophy of Physical Education), Platon Publications, Thessaloniki 2007.
- [40] Niarchou K., ed., Εισαγωγή στην φιλοσοφία (Introductory Lessons of Philosophy), 3rd publication, Athens 1984.
- [41] Nietzsche Fr., ed., Η γέννηση της φιλοσοφίας (The birth of Philosophy), 3rd publication, Athens 1975.
- [42] Nilson M.P., ed., Ελληνική θρησκεία (Greek popular religion), (translation I. Th. Kakridi), Athens 1966.
- [43] Panagiotoopoulos D., ed., Φιλοσοφία σε ιστορικό και κοινωνικό επίπεδο (Philosophy on a historical and social level), Karanasi Publications, Athens 1985.
- [44] Pfister F., ed., Religion der Griechen und Roemern (Religion of Greek and Rome), *Jahresbericht ueber Altertums* 229, 1-162, 1930.
- [45] Phaedrus 278d.
- [46] Pindar Olympian Ode (Olimpionikus) II 57/ Plato Phaedon 81a/ Plato Republic B 363c d.
- [47] Plato Apology 29d- 30b.
- [48] Plato Apology 40c- 41c.
- [49] Plato Apology 41e.
- [50] Plato Kratilos 400c.
- [51] Plato Kratilos 400c/ Republic B 366a-b, 363c-d.
- [52] Plato Kratilos 402 A.
- [53] Plato Laws ΣΤ 782c.
- [54] Plato Phaedon 62b.
- [55] Plato Phaedon 62c.
- [56] Plato Phaedon 76e.
- [57] Plato Protagoras 313a-b.
- [58] Plato Republic I 600b.
- [59] Plato The Banquet 207d.
- [60] Plato The Banquet 208c.
- [61] Plato Theetitos 149a.
- [62] Republic 376b, 475e, 475b.
- [63] Rigas A., ed., Παιδαγωγική επιστήμη (Pedagogical Science), volume A, Athens 1993.
- [64] Sextus Empiricus "Against Mathematicians" X 1, 169.
- [65] Theodoridis X., ed., Εισαγωγή στη φιλοσοφία (Introduction to philosophy), 2nd edition, Athens 1955.
- [66] Veikos Th., ed., Προσωκρατική φιλοσοφία (Presocratic philosophy), 2nd edition, Athens 1950.
- [67] Veikos Th., ed., Εισαγωγή στη φιλοσοφία (Introduction to Philosophy), Themelio, Athens 1983.
- [68] Voudouris K., ed., Προσωκρατική φιλοσοφία (Presocratic philosophy), Athens 1991.
- [69] VS 36, B4.
- [70] VS 44, B14.
- [71] VS 58c.
- [72] Wittgenstein L., ed., Reason-Philosophical dissertation, *Tractatus*, 4, 1921.
- [73] Xenophon Memoirs A1, 16.
- [74] Xenophon Memoirs A4, 13 and A4, 9.
- [75] Xenophon Memoirs A4, 8.