

Legal being and its attributes in Presocratic philosophy

Existência do direito e os seus atributos na filosofia pré-socrática

Roman Grynyuk¹

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University (Ukraine)
grinuk@donnu.edu.ua

Yurii Hotsuliak²

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University (Ukraine)
y.hotsuliak@donnu.edu.ua

Resumo

O presente artigo busca traçar as características básicas da existência do direito na antiga tradição filosófica pré-socrática. Analisa-se a responsabilidade cósmica de Anaximandro. Desenvolvem-se os pensamentos de Pitágoras sobre a regulação, como a categoria separada e não como a imagem personificada. Faz -se a investigação do lugar das categorias de Fogo e Logos na existência do direito de acordo com as ideias de Heráclito. Os autores salientam a importância da ontologia de Parmênides para a formação das imaginações antigas sobre a existência do direito, bem como o valor regulatório da noção de amor e de ódio nos pensamentos de Empédocles. Este artigo analisa a noção da natureza como o critério de verdade e qualidade para as normas materiais de acordo com a doutrina do Demócrito.

Palavras-chave: Direito, Antiguidade, Pré-socráticos, Existência do direito.

Abstract

The article researches how are the main features of legal being disclosed in the ancient Presocratic teachings. In particular, it is being analyzed the

¹ Professor at the Department of Constitutional Law of Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University. Doctor of Juridical Science. Rector of Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University, st. 600-richchia, 21, Vinnytsia, 21021, Ukraine.

² Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and History of State and Law of Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University. PhD in Law, st. 600-richchia, 21, Vinnytsia, 21021, Ukraine.

cosmic liability of Anaximander. Pythagoras' ideas about regulation are considered as a separate category, not as a personified image. According to Heraclitus's teachings, it is being researched the place of the Fire and Logos categories in the legal being. The author clarifies the importance of Parmenides's ontological doctrine for the formation of ancient ideas about legal being, as well as the regulatory value of love and hate in the notions of Empedocles. The article analyzes the nature concept as a criterion of truth and quality for the material rules pursuant to the Democritus philosophical doctrine.

Keywords: Law, Antiquity, Presocratics, Legal Existence.

Introduction

We were trying to reveal the content of the legal existence through mythological personified images in previous works. That have made it possible to understand the general reflection on the legal understanding of ancient Greeks. However, it is known that Hellas did not live just by a single myth. That was the origin, which has given a jolt to much more complex philosophical constructions that have already had a concrete authorship.

The worth noting is that the process of transition to specific doctrines means the personification of separate legal provisions of individuals but not demythologization.

The question isn't either in the finishing the old or the beginning of a new one. The transition from "myth" to "logos" is that one which passes from general to individual, from simple to complex with the preservation and development of already established semantics. It will be analyzed in the future not a single time.

The law always exists on the edge of two worlds: the human and the phenomenal, moreover, this position is principling for understanding the existence of law. If we leave this phenomenon only in the metaphysical - superhuman dimension, it will be stuck in the world of theoretical and speculative structures, which obtain intellectual, but lose their social importance. If we place the law only in the human dimension, then we fall into the world of a human's changeable will, where everything is relatively and does not have stable basics, where everyone gets their own rights. That's why we are expanding not the research of principles' system in shadows of history, but of the existence of law by itself as one that gives foundation for all legal reality to exist. In this article we are revealing how the function of law can get its origin in natural environment, in universal laws and abstract notions to which the organizing force have been given. The fundamental doctrines and views of the pre-Socratic philosophers are being uncovered in this article.

Anaximander and the legal mode of philosophical cosmology

The notion of the legal existence is much wider than the notion of law. It goes far beyond essentially legal definition to search for the ground of its presence. There is only one fragment left from the philosopher Anaximander but it is possible to reveal a "legal" language even in it. "The source from which existing things derive their existence is also that to which they return at their destruction, according to necessity; they pay penalty and retribution to one another for their injustice, according to the disposition of time." (Heidegger, 1991).

This quote shows us the spheres of cosmology, the philosopher's understanding of how things are arranged in the material world, what rules are they subordinated to. Nevertheless, such words as "retribution", "penalty" (in some translations - "fine") pierce this phrase with the spirit of the law. Finally, we arrive at the conclusion that the language of law is the language of the existence by itself. All the key concepts and basics are taken not from human experience and social relations, but from the consideration about natural processes and phenomena, from getting knowledge of the existence structure. The law is not a side effect in the cosmic shadows or artificially created instrument for satisfying human's demands; it is directly commanded by the universe's logic.

Moreover, this extract tells that there must be a higher power or a norm that gives to the things either start or completion. As we can see, this discourse sets the regulation's basics by themselves. The systematicity of law means the order and hierarchy where the Constitution must be the highest regulation and from its context the detalization to the particular branches and institutions is happening. Thus, the most basic principle of the legal existence's architecture is its comparison with the highest principle. The escalation of the higher standard in social relations is the reason of such a phenomenon's origin as a "legal field". It has bounders, forms social cohabitation, creates "the rules of game", and it is forbidden for players to go beyond these bounders, in other case this "field" will punish them (will be returned to the limits of law), or as Anaximander wrote - they return at their destruction.

Interdisciplinarity is another important point of view that comes from the philosopher's quote. Right, psychology and morality were inseparable disciplines and had their authenticity. That is why we can't see a separate legal standpoint. The philosopher's outlook is also the lawyer's, physicist's and moralist's view. Heidegger (1991) was quite fair on this issue:

the prejudiced image that in those times morality and law were considered on the basis of special disciplines' representations, ethics or jurisprudence must become insolvent ... disputing of strict boundaries here states by no means that the early times didn't know the law or morality. However, if turns from the use of those specialties are irrelevant for us here, then there where are no boundaries of the specialties, there is no possibility for breaking those boundaries and to unjustifiably transfer ideas from one area to another.

The usage of legal terminology in the cosmic processes' interpretation tells about the missing of strict interdisciplinary boundaries, that the law was not considered as something that exists only inside itself and has its exclusively separated function from other natural processes. Perhaps this is exact deficiency of the modern legal science, namely, to go beyond its own subject' frames in searching of archeology and synergy with other social bases. The law is rarely considered as an "inception", the revelation of its content is usually straitened to the fact that it is an "instrument" of regulation. However, there is a question about the origin of this instrument due to the ancient state that "nothing comes from nowhere". A human is not an absolute and he is not able to create "from nothing", therefore, the anthropological genesis of law can not be satisfied, and in our opinion, all the jurisprudence's artificiality is synthesized from its naturalness.

All key and normalization principles are taken from cosmic processes because human is a part of them. As we see, the interdisciplinarity of Greeks is not just esthetics, it is a peculiarity of a worldview that starts any particular discourse with the general principles of existence. On the other hand, this exact ontological "amnesia" generates a devaluation of legislative provisions and principles - legal nihilism.

To sum up the analysis of Anaximander's expression it is worth saying about the specific content of the legal terms which the philosopher operates by, namely, that the things pay a fine for their outrage. "They have to pay a penalty - interprets Nietzsche," they pay a fine "translates Dils, - for his injustice" (Eberhard, 2001, p. 57). Reading Anaximander, the existence has been already organized in that way that it penalizes for improper behavior, as a result, the legal liability is the emanation (Latin emanation - "leak, propagation") of space responsibility. Thus, the law is only anthropological shadow of ontological processes, it is a human dimension of orderly processes in nature. It's not about the fact that a person does not affect the legal things, but about that, it may recedes from the given basics, and then the problems, the crisis always begin. The task of a man as a "legal creature" is to preserve the consciousness through the intention for the legal existence hierarchy and not to try to be separated from the already predetermined coordinate system. That's why, according to the Anaximander's law - there will be always the retribution for all our violence. All attempts to create artificial inception for the law, departing from the natural (for example - totalitarian systems) always bring forth destructive processes, which, in the end, they have been subjected to.

The force of the number ordering or "mathematics of law" by Pythagoras

The search for legal existence means searching for the legal function of ordering, therefore, in our opinion, the ordering processes begin with the archeology of law, the desire to transfer from the condition of entropy to the one of the essence organization. The pre-Socratic philosophers singled out a specific ordering force that may have a different form, but it always stands as the basis of the cosmic system. So, first of all, it will be about Pythagoras. It is important to understand that the number is both thought, reality, and the strength of the structure.

This confirms the thesis that the law must always be in the human and in the superhuman dimensions: "From the Monad and the undefined Dyad spring numbers; from numbers point; from points, lines; from line plane figures; from plane figures, solid figures; from solid figures, sensible bodies, the elements which are four, fire, water, earth and air; these elements interchange and turn into one another completely, and combine to create a universe animate, intelligent, spherical" (Diogenes Laertius, 1925). As you can see, the number has a streamlined ontological force and provides the basis for things and processes to be. Thus, the Pythagorean doctrine is based on the condition that the order content is not established by a man, but he must reveal, understand and follow it. In return, deviations from the predetermined organization can not have a natural origin. And so they are artificially anthropological, and this requires the adding of artificial instruments to prevent them.

Let's look at the well-known Pythagoras's definition of the justice concept as 'the equal for equal' reward (Aristotle, 1999, p. 182). Isn't it the basic principle of the sanctions' institution? Obviously, yes, how greater misconduct is, more severe penalties will be. So, as we see Pythagoras, in his teaching, does not personally regulate ideas from the myth, and on the contrary - abstracts them, which adds a clearer certainty and rationality to the legal existence. Thus, we come to the idea of law as a universal regulator which task is preserving and extension of the determined structure of existence. Moreover, the number gives accuracy and inductance to the law, which means the transfer from abstract universalistic forces to the concrete modus of their detailization. At present, we can clearly understand the urgency for

the number in law, despite of its humanitarian context. Wherever it is necessary to apply for a category of measurement and magnitude, the law appeals to mathematics; when we talk about reasonable terms, we still need a numerical word, not to mention about the concept of "sanction size".

Pythagoras points out about the necessity in clearly defined attributes of legal existence, not simply in general terms of the importance or aesthetics principles, as it was in case with myths. The law is always built on the principle of "idea to system". For example, if the idea is totalitarian, then the norms are doomed to repression, and vice versa - if the nature is democratic, then the regulator gets a chance for a humane face.

Naturalization of the legal function: Heraclitus and the Fire

As well-known, Heraclitus identified the basic natural element, which all the phenomena and processes are originated from and disappeared in. "The transformations of fire are: first sea; and of sea, half becomes earth, and half the lightning – flash." This means that the fire of ruling the universe Logos or God turns through the air into water, which is like a seed of the world, and he calls it the sea. In turn, the Earth, the sky and what is between them arise from it. And how then the world returns again to its original condition and a global fire appears, he explains in the following words: "Sea is liquefied and measured into the same proportion as it had before it became earth" (Curd, 2008, p. 171). Thus, cosmos is already arranged not by a personified god with a range of anthropomorphic defects (gods can revenge, envy, etc.), but by a special matter - the Fire, which is regulated by the law - the Logos. The ostent of the myth is primarily explained by its universality and the necessity for being understandable for everybody. Throughout time, the question of the universe's knowledge obtains more aristocratic character, and on the proscenium the characters who are able to deepen into the context more than myth appear (the shallowness of which is conditioned by availability). The same applies to the question of the legal existence disclosure; man does not generate, but creates it, he is being in it, in spite of whether it is available for understanding or not.

The fire can burn, warm, rejuvenate, and it is nothing but regulation of cosmic processes. He judges the universe: 'Fire in its advance will judge and overtake all things. All things are an exchange for fire, and fire for all things, as goods for gold and gold for goods' (Curd, 2008, p. 171).

What are the grounds for implementing such "legal authority" by the fire? The main reason is its logic; it is managed by the higher intelligence (God) - the Logos. That is exactly what the name of our work is devoted to, because the ancient philosophers (with some exceptions) open the existence of the higher intelligence in nature, by which everything is arranged, as everything has its causes and consequences in the natural processes and so it is devoided of chaos (or tends to such deprivation). Thus, unlike Pythagoras, Heraclitus's legal existence is revealed through the ontological binary: that is what regulates (the Logos is the legislator and the law), and the fact of its implementation - the Fire. Hence we come to the conclusion that this is a prototype of the legal regulation mechanism.

Heraclitus determined very clearly the genealogy of any legal system: "Those who speak with sense must rely on what is common to all, as a city must rely on its law, and with much greater reliance; for all the human laws are nourished by one divine law; for it has as much power as it wishes and is sufficient for all and is still not exhausted" (Stamatellos, 2012, p. 87). The philosopher raises the question in that way that in the positive law there is no choice, it

either responds to the highest divine laws, or is doomed to collapse (since lower one doesn't have authorities over the highest forces); the fire can't heat and burn in this case. Once again we are convinced that the "regulator" always exists on the bound of two worlds: ideas and things so that the legal processes do not break the cosmic hierarchy of values. The proof is the following words of Heraclitus: 'Immortals are mortal, mortals immortal, living the death of those, and dying the life of these. Of all those whose *logos* I have heard, no one reaches this conclusion - that the wise is separate from all things' (Guthrie, 1962, p. 464). That is why the legal existence on its content cannot rely on the separate individual's will, it is part of the world synergy: "The people should fight to defend *nomos* as their city wall" (Guthrie, 1962, p. 464). Now we start to understand the following philosopher's instructions, because the law that corresponds to the higher Logos is well-intentioned one, and to which the person aspires in the end, and therefore, he has to keep it.

Parmides and the existence; or the independence of mind in overseeing the legal verity

As it has been already mentioned, our discourse's aim is not the search for norms or institutions as the legal existence, the source, the presence of which gives the basis for all legal beings to exist. The phrase "legal being" that exactly tells us about the difference between the concrete and the general. Thus, it is about its integrity as a part of the common being itself. So, our journey across the function of regulatory categories can't avoid Parmenides, who eventually became the first who was talking about this concept: 'Come now, and I will tell you (and you must carry my account away with you when you have heard it) the only ways of enquiry that are to be thought of. The one, that (it) is and that it is impossible for (it) not to be, is the path of Persuasion (for she attends upon Truth); the other, that (it) is not and that it is needful that it not be, that I declare to you is an altogether indiscernible track: for you could not know what is not - that cannot be done - nor indicate it.' (Vamvakas, 2009, p. 139) We are interested in several thoughts at once. Firstly, that being is opened exclusively to the mind which is independent from experience. Of course, this attitude could be criticized, however, we are interested in the reasons and purpose for its appearing. Namely, that it is hard to come to something general behind the specific experience, and the clear understanding that if we move from the general truth and through its prism we will behold the concrete things and it will protect us from logical and semantic mistakes. Analogically, it happens with everything in the law. If its key characteristic – order – was highlighted, then where do we take its *arche* from? It can be denied that the social cohesion, its communication generates the rules of behavior in any situation. However, then what are the benchmarks for such rules? This is instability of human will and trust to the "humaneness" of the ruler. But on the other hand, we can say that the ordering comes from cosmic processes, from nature itself, which are beyond anthropological influence, and only the human is a part of it. Then the law gets the benchmarks that do not require human creativity, but only identification and recognition.

Secondly, the most interesting for us in this fragment, that being exists and nothingness doesn't. Thus, by doubting in the legal existence, we do not refute it, but only enter the path of ignorance. Thus, by substantiating the category of legal existence, we thereby strengthen the jurisprudence's permanent columns. If the legal existence is the path of truth, then this category puts the law in the same category with the vital basics. The dichotomy of the thinking and knowledge world (truth and non-truth) allows us to concretize the analogy of the legal and non-legal. Can the norm of law be non-legal? In case that such formulation does not sound

tautologically, it is possible that if we separate the law as a phenomenon beyond the state and supstate, then only norms can correspond to the specific legal categories or vice versa. By determining this measurement, we categorically set the law on a humane path, it receives a human face (but not a violent one), and it becomes an integral part of universal human spiritual powers. And the mentioned dichotomy is realized through the delimitation of "legitimacy" and "irregularity" and specifically in the legal relationship.

As we can see, there is justification in the insistence on the initial divide of the most general categories and their supremacy in jurisprudence with the following transition into the particular single whole. Law does not simply put in order social relations - it leads them to the basic social welfare; and it is presented as the intelligence (the path of knowledge and ignorance) in Parmenides teachings. Consequently, the doctrine about general being gives us the opportunity to isolate and legitimize the notion of legal being, as well as to understand the power of independent pure mind in beholding and consolidating of the legal values.

Empedocle's *Philia* and *Neikos*, or the Legal Dualism

The naturalistic approach in search of the legal existence is reduced to the fact that a particular natural element, with its exceptional features, acquired a self-regulating role, from which we receive a regulatory legal function. At the same time, we encounter the doctrine that this function of nature has much improved, and is more tangent to the modern theory of jurisprudence. We are talking about the Empedocles philosophy and the division of two powers: love (*philia*) and enmity (*neikos*) in the cosmic processes. "That, what is united with friendship, then it's again chased from each other with hostility" (Diogenes Laertius, 1925).

Thus, the *philia* is responsible for the merger processes, and the *neikos* for separation and destruction. Doesn't it lead us to the certain similarities in legal relationships? And truly: regulation (static, dynamic), protection, defense. These are the functions that are obviously deduced from the previously mentioned cosmic processes. The law can be both constructive and also can execute the destructive role, necessary at the same time. Wrongdoings are not just a side effect of human behavior, it is inevitable (due to the human imperfection - *humanum errare est*). Therefore, the legal existence is built like that the forces of consolidation and separation do not flow from each another, but they are predetermined. In case of a violation there will always be a kind of "hostility" between the law and the human. With all of that, the law as a force disagree not with a particular person (this is a matter of ethics), but with its behavior. Therefore, the *neikos* is directed towards behavior, its prevention or retribution for it.

If the behavior fits the legal coordinate system, then the law creates conditions for its existence, focusing on the category of well-being. Consequently, we have a dual legal function - constructive and destructive.

In addition, from the philosopher's doctrine it is followed another important analogy: "Empedocles firstly divided "live elements" into the passive part (matter) and the active (force)" (Leonard, 1906). And yes, we do have both force and matter, which influence, and what are influenced by. Isn't it the same kind of relations between the law and society? Obviously, yes, moreover, it is integral. The society does not only need the law, it is unthinkable without it, without such a regulator, it will be simply doomed.

All these analogies are not just our intellectual speculation. Empedocles confirms them: "But the entire universal law is not divided. All the space of the ether and all immeasurable radiance..." (Leonard, 1906). The law for the Greeks firstly is not the one that is created by

people, but the natural superhuman law - the Logos, the philia, the physis etc. State law must be legitimized in cosmos. The distance from the processes of the four elements interaction and the formation of everything to the legal processes is much smaller than it can be thought, because we are inseparable from the nature and we obtain our knowledge through interaction with it. Therefore, the human law is not taken "from nothing", there is always "something" that gives the foundations to its existence.

Democritus and "artificiality" of law; the highlight of natural and state in law

Despite of the fact that our search for the law's origin occurs in natural processes, it is clear that the laws which we follow and for the breaking of which we are punished are still being created and executed with human hands, the natural law is only a good shape for contemplation without them. And Democritus makes precisely this following division into *fusis*-nature and *nomos*-law: "... "The first principles of the universe are atoms and empty space; everything else is merely thought to exist." " (Diogenes Laertius, 1925). Such nature and law identification is of fundamental importance in clarifying the difference between law and right, which can be both legal and non-legal. History shows us that the law may have a very distinct "face", and therefore there is a great demand for preserving it from its own self-worthiness.

That is why, the presence of a norm existence is not a sign of reasonableness and well-being for Democritus: "... The laws would not prevent each man from living according to his inclination.; and it is able to do so, when they themselves wish to receive benefit; for it shows to those who obey it their own particular virtue." (Nill, 1985, p. 86). The Greeks often equated the notion of law and the notion of "dike", or justice. As we see, Democritus highlighted positivist tendencies in the law, however, he did not become a positivist himself, concerning about too unstable and volatile sources of state law - the human freedom. Consequently, what contradicts nature is unfair, and therefore, untrue. Nature acts as a criterion of truth and a quality category for positive norms. Thus, we can conclude that not everything that is happening in the legal system is related to the true legal function. In our opinion, the natural-legal and positivist scientific discourses take their origin from here.

Protagoras's human measurement of the legal existence

At the same time, naturalistic naturally-legal dogmatism in antiquity also had a skeptical reaction. It is about Protagoras and Sophists in general. "Of all things the measure is Man, of the things that are, that they are, and of the things that are not, that they are not" (Schiappa, 1991, p. 117). We will not go deep into the particular content of the Sophists position, it's important that Protagoras denied non-human and supra-human entities as such for our ontologically-legal searches. The arguments in favor to this position are quite convincing, since, obviously, we can only assert our own sensory phenomenal world, all the rest is just speculation of the mind or, in general, the question of faith. Nevertheless, even the sophists did not deny the presence of nature and the law. Protagoras's intent on the legal existence can be called with using such of C.G. Jung's terminology as "introverted", that is, where the subject acts as the primary value, and not an object that is not excluded at the same time, it is merely placed into the subject's orbit and matters only in connection with it. Hence, man gives right to the law existence, as well as to the measure for all being.

The position of the Sophists has been largely disproved by Socrates, but for our study it is important that the naturally-legal dogmatic had its own critique, which only expanded the horizons of seeking for the legal existence. The relativism of the Protagoras's outlook is well described by Diogenes Laertius (1925) with a concrete example: "There is a story that one day he demanded a payout from his student, and he replied: "But I have not yet won the case at court!" Protagoras said: "If we sue and I win the case, then you will pay, because I won, if you win, you will pay because you won". From the position of a modern lawyer, of course, there is a reason to call Protagoras a wrongdoer, because he speculates on the topic of "winning the case" and there is not a single word about the possible loss. However, here it is not about profit, but about the educational process, which is in absolute. The actual state of affairs is not important, but the ability to substantiate own position.

In this case, we can set up both existence and non-existence to all the things. The modern politically legal reality does not rarely reflect exactly this state of affairs and follows this law when one and the same act is carried out by socially different people, and differently qualified. This is a pseudo-truthful introversion, when the subjective is placed over the objective and the ontological and legal favor collapses under the feet of the legal system. We do not state that Protagoras's thoughts are unreliable; we merely ascertain the risks that these provisions hold for the legal reality. "... the state has written the laws and it forces to either command or obey in accordance with them" (Diogenes Laertius, 1925). Not surprisingly, the legal existence cannot be extended beyond the boundaries of a human and the state as a social phenomenon in the Sophists philosophy, since there is no power over the state, and only the state is legally empowered with the violence features, it is doomed to force to something without external (natural) criteria, but not to create goodness.

Conclusions

1. The existence has been already arranged by Anaximander that way, that it penalizes all beings for inappropriate behavior, so the legal liability is essentially an emanation of the cosmic responsibility. Thus, the law is only anthropological shadow of ontological processes, it is a human dimension of all the ordered processes in nature. The language of law is the language of being. An analogy with the highest beginning is one of the basic principles of the architecture of the legal existence, which we can deduce from the pre-Socratics doctrine.

2. Pythagoras does not personally regulate the ideas from the myth in his teaching, but rather abstracts them, which adds more precise certainty and rationality to the legal existence. Thus, we conclude that the law is a universal regulator which task is to preserve and extend the established structure of being.

3. According to Heraclitus, the Universe has been already arranged by not personified God with a number of anthropomorphic imperfections (gods can take revenge, envy, etc.), but a special matter - the Fire, which is governed by law - the Logos. The fire burns, smokes, rejuvenates, and it is nothing but regulation of cosmic processes. According to Heraclitus the legal existence is revealed through the ontological binary: the Logos arranges, the Fire realizes, which is a prototype of the legal regulation's mechanism.

4. According to Parmenides, the existence is opened merely for intelligence regardless of experience. If the legal existence is the path of truth, then this category puts the law into one line with the vital basis. The law gets orientation which does not require the human creation, but only identification and recognition.

5. Empedocles's doctrine states that *philia* - love is responsible for the processes of consolidation, and *neikos* - hate is in charge of separation and destruction. Legal being is created in such a way that the forces of unification and separation do not follow from each other, but they are predetermined.

6. The ontological discourse of Democritus convinces that something which contradicts to nature is unfair, and therefore not legal. The nature performs as a criterion of truth and a category for positive norms. Thus, we conclude that not everything that is happening in the legal system is related to the true legal function.

References

- ARISTOTLE. 1999. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Kitchener, Batoche Books, 182 p. <<https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/aristotle/Ethics.pdf>>. Accessed on: 08 Aug. 2019.
- CURD, P.; GRAHAM, D. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 588 p.
- DIOGENES LAËRTIUS. 1925. *Lives of the eminent philosophers*. Loeb Classical Library. Book VIII. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
<http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Diogenes_Laertius/Lives_of_the_Eminent_Philosophers/8/Pythagoras*.html>. Accessed on: 08 Aug. 2019.
- EBERHARD, J. 2001. *Justification: The heart of the Christian Faith*. London, Bloomsbury. 302 p.
- GUTHRIE, W.K.C. 1962. *A history of Greek Philosophy. The earlier Presocratics and Pythagoreans*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,. 488 p.
- HEIDEGGER, M. 1991. *Country Path Conversation*. Moskow, Progress Publisher.
<http://www.odinblago.ru/haideger_razgovor>. Accessed on: 08 Aug. 2019.
- LEONARD, W. E. 1906. *The Fragments of Empedocles*. New York, Cornell University Library, 218 p.
- NILL, M. 1985. *Morality and self-interest in Protagoras, Antiphon and Democritus*. Leiden, printed by E.J. Brill. 124 p.
- SCHIAPPA, E. 1991. *Protagoras and Logos*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 226 p.
- STAMATELLOS, G. 2012. *Introduction to Presocratics: a Thematic Approach to Early Greek Philosophy with Key Reading*. West Sussex, John Wiley & Sons, 151 p.
- VAMVAKAS, C. J. 2009. *The Founders of Western Thought: The Presocratics*. Dordrecht, Springer, 291 p.

Submetido: 25/09/2019

Aceito: 11/02/2020