

REMARKS ON MOSCHION'S ACCOUNT OF
PROGRESS

The problem of man's early existence and of the value of culture is discussed in one of the post-classical tragedies, and the answer given is definitely anti-primitivistic.

The longest and most remarkable of Moschion's fragments deals with man's development (fr. 6 N²/Sn., ap. Stob. 1. 8. 38) and runs to 33 well-constructed iambs containing throughout not a single resolved foot. It is uncertain whether Moschion belongs to the fourth or third century B.C.¹ Nevertheless, his account is consistent with the conscious affirmations of progress which were widely attested in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

πρῶτον δ' ἄνειμι καὶ διαπτύξω λόγῳ
 ἀρχὴν βροτείου καὶ κατὰστασιν βίου.
 ἦν γάρ ποτ' αἰὼν κείνος, ἦν ποθ' ἦνίκα
 θηροῖ<ν> διαίτας εἶχον ἐμφερεῖς βροτοί,
 ὀρειγενῇ σπήλαια καὶ δυσηλίους
 φάραγγας ἐνναίοντες· οὐδέπω γάρ ἦν
 οὔτε στεγῆρης οἶκος οὔτε λαῖνοις
 εὐρεῖα πύργοις ὠχυρωμένα πόλεις.
 οὐ μὴν ἀρότροις ἀγκύλοις ἐτέμνετο
 μέλαινα καρποῦ βώλος ὀμπνίου τροφός,
 οὐδ' ἐργάτης σίδηρος εὐνώτιδος
 θάλλοντας οἴνης ὀρχάτους ἐτημέλει,
 ἀλλ' ἦν ἀκύμων ἱκωφεύουσα ῥέουσα γῆ.
 βοραὶ δὲ σαρκοβρώτες ἀλληλοκτόνους
 παρείχον αὐτοῖς daίτας· ἦν δ' ὁ μὲν νόμος
 ταπεινός, ἡ βία δὲ σύνθρονος Διί·
 ὁ δ' ἀσθενὴς ἦν τῶν ἀμεινόνων βορά.
 ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ τίκτων πάντα καὶ τρέφων χρόνος
 τὸν θνητὸν ἡλλοίωσεν ἔμπαλιν βίον,
 εἴτ' οὖν μέριμναν τὴν Προμηθέως σπάσας
 εἴτ' οὖν ἀνάγκην εἴτε τῇ μακρᾷ τριβῇ
 αὐτὴν παρασχὼν τὴν φύσιν διδάσκαλον,
 τόθ' ἡγρέθη μὲν καρπὸς ἡμέρου τροφῆς
 Δήμητρος ἀγνῆς, ἡγρέθη δὲ Βακχίου
 γλυκεῖα πηγῇ, γαῖα δ' ἡ πρὶν ἄσπορος

¹ To the various references collected by G. Norwood, *Essays on Euripidean Drama* (London, 1954), p. 170 n. 1, we may now add the following: a third-century date was regarded as likely by: T. B. L. Webster, *Art and Literature in Fourth-Century Athens* (New York, 1969), p. xvi; A. Lesky, *Greek tragedy* (transl. by H. A. Frankfort, London, 1965), p. 202, and id., *A History of Greek Literature* (transl. by J. Willis and C. de Heer, London, 1966), pp. 632, 744; A. W. H. Pickard-Cambridge, *OCD*² v. Moschion; B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, I (Göttingen, 1971), p. vii; E. Diehl, *RE* xvi, 345; W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, III (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 61 n. 1, 81. The latter, however, admits (op. cit., pp. 81 f.) that the progress-fragment is certainly in the spirit of the late fifth or fourth century. On the other hand, a fourth-century date for Moschion was suggested by: A. E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks* (Oxford, 1896), App. 1 p. 469, who wrongly identified Moschion with a parasite ridiculed in the Middle Comedy; G. Norwood, *Greek Tragedy* (London, 1942), p. 37 n. 5; K. Ziegler, *RE*² vi A₂ (1965), n. 27. In the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse* a date c. 350 B.C. is suggested. L. Edelstein, *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity* (Baltimore, 1967), pp. 65 f., discusses briefly Moschion's passage in his survey of the idea of progress in the fourth century.

ἤδη ζυγουλκοῖς βουσὶν ἡροτρεύετο,
 ἄστη δ' ἐπυργώσαντο καὶ περισκεπεῖς
 ἔτευξαν οἴκους καὶ τὸν ἡγριωμένον
 εἰς ἡμερον δίαταν ἡγαγον βίον.
 κὰκ τοῦδε τοὺς θανόντας ὥρισεν νόμος
 τύμβοις καλύπτειν κάπμιοιρᾶσθαι κόνιν
 νεκροῖς ἀθάπτοις, μὴδ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἔαν
 τῆς πρόσθε θοίνης μνημόνευμα δυσσεβοῦς.

30

'First I will go back and unfold in speech how human life began and was established. There was once a time when the life of men resembled that of beasts, dwelling in mountain caves and dark ravines. For as yet there was no roofed house nor broad city fortified with stone towers. Nor was the black clod, nurse of abundant grain, cloven by the curved ploughs, nor did the hard-working iron tend the fruitful rows of vine, but earth was barren, senseless, and streaming down. In mutual slaughter men dined on carnivorous food. Law was humble and violence shared the throne of Zeus; and the weak was food for the stronger. But when time, begetter and nurturer of all things, changed mortal life the opposite way – whether by the solicitude of Prometheus or from necessity or by long experience, offering nature itself as teacher – then was discovered holy Demeter's grain of cultivated nourishment and the sweet fount of Bacchus. The earth, once barren, began to be ploughed by yoked oxen, towered cities arose, men built houses covered all round and turned their lives from savage ways to civilized. From this time custom ordained that they should hide the dead in tombs and give unburied bodies their portion of dust, leaving no visible reminder of their former impious feasts.'

Interlocked images, symmetrically separated in short units, contrast the two stages of primitivism and advance in both the material and moral field: from beastlike ways of living to civilized ones; from caves and ravines (vv. 5–8) to sheltering houses and fortified cities (27 f.); from the barren, uncultivated earth (9–13) to the goods of agriculture (23–6); from mutual slaughter and the sovereignty of violence (14–17) to the custom-bound society (29–33).

Moschion, like Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Critias, Lucretius,² and among prose-writers, Democritus, the Hippocratic Corpus, Isocrates, the Platonic *Protagoras*, and Diodorus³ – to limit ourselves only to some basic sources – puts forward a theory on cultural advance which is fundamentally opposed to earlier concepts of primeval perfection: the mythical Golden Race of Hesiod⁴ gradually degenerating in both the material and moral field, or the Age of Love in Empedocles, with its perfect harmony between man and nature and the lack of violence and blood shedding (frr. 128, 130

² *PV* 442–506; *Ant.* 332–75: though the primitive era is not depicted in this stasimon on human δεινότης, the praise of man's progress in all the skills of human activity presupposes the same evolution; *Supp.* 201–18; *Sisyphus* 43 F 19 Snell, op. cit.; *d. rer. nat.* 5, esp. 1105 ff.: the fullest account of prehistory preserved from antiquity.

³ Fr. 154 DK 2. 173. For Democritus' concept of progress see T. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology* (Cleveland, 1967), pp. 56–9, 106 ff., and *passim*; *VM* 3; *Paneg.* 28 ff., *Panath.* 119–48, where the theories on progress are put to a patriotic use: the Greek world owes its civilization to Athens; *Prt.* 320c–322d; *D.S.* 1. 8. 1–9. For further pieces of Kulturgeschichte in antiquity see Edelstein, op. cit., *passim*; Cole, op. cit., pp. 4 ff.

⁴ *Erg.* 106–201 on the schematic myth of Five Races. For the Golden Age in general from Hesiod onwards see: W. K. C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning* (London, 1956), ch. 4; W. C. Greene, *MOIPA* (New York, 1963), pp. 31 f. and App. 7 (with rich literature); for Hesiod's myth with parallels from oriental civilizations see M. L. West's edition, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 172–7 (with further bibliography).

DK1 362–4). Such a dream of a Golden Age, with the goodness of man matched by the abundance of nature gradually ceased to be current from the fifth century onwards.⁵

The first explicit affirmation of progress comes from Xenophanes (fr. 18 DK I 133) at the second half of the sixth century: 'the gods did not reveal all things to men from the beginning, but men through their own search find in the course of time that which is better'.⁶ For Xenophanes the creative force lies in man, and time is simply the medium in which man develops and displays his inventiveness.

In the fifth century the climate of opinion was more favourable to the idea of a progressive rise from primitive beginnings to civilization than it had been in Xenophanes' time; and in the fourth century the idea of a continuous advance in every field of man's activities became a firmly established conviction.⁷

In the anthropological accounts which reject primitivism and accept progressivism the author of the progress from the primitive to the civilized era varies remarkably: divine ordinance, human intellect, or natural necessity.

Affirmation of divine providence in man's cultural advance occurs in Aeschylus, Euripides and Plato's *Protagoras*,⁸ while in Sophocles cultural achievements are not represented as a providential endowment but as the result of man's own efforts and ceaseless questing.⁹

Moschion's account reads like a summary of the various anti-primitivistic views of progress held from the Pre-Socratic philosophers onwards. His well written verses seem to be a blend of the traditional and the new. They point, as will be shown, both backwards to the mythical tradition and forward to the rationalistic concepts of historical development.

The poet – or more exactly the speaker of the fragment – explicitly names time as the force creating cultural advance, and in Stobaeus the passage is quoted in the discussion of Time. Already in archaic literary sources, in Orphic cosmogonies (frr. 54, 60, 64, 65 Kern) and Pherecydes of Syros (ap. Dam. *pr.* 124b, D.L. 1. 119), time is declared to be the first principle of the creation of the Universe;¹⁰ and in the fifth

⁵ Further references to the Golden Age and to praises of primitive man from the fifth century onwards (Attic Comedy, Cynics, Dicaearchus, Theophrastus, and Aratus) are cited by Edelstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 42 f., 58 ff., 134 f., 139; see also Guthrie, *HGP* III, 79 ff., E. R. Dodds, *The Ancient Concept of Progress and other Essays on Greek Literature and Belief* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 16 f.

⁶ For Xenophanes' affirmation of progress as anticipating the later expositions of the kind see Edelstein's extensive discussion, *op. cit.*, p. 3 ff.; Guthrie, *HGP* III, pp. 62 f.; Dodds, *op. cit.*, pp. 4, 6.

⁷ Expressions of progressivism in the oratory, historiography, philosophy and art of the fourth century are discussed by Edelstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 ff.

⁸ For Aeschylus' concept of progress divine providence and human intelligence, the latter having Prometheus as a symbol, can coexist: see Dodds, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff. In Euripides' *Supplikes* Theseus interprets human progress as a result of the beneficence of an unnamed god; but doubts have often been expressed as to whether Euripides himself entirely shared such a view; cf. for instance Guthrie, *HGP* III, p. 63, Dodds, *op. cit.*, p. 7, and in particular D. J. Conacher, *TAPA* 87 (1956), 8–26, esp. pp. 20 f. and *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto, 1967), pp. 97 ff. In the Platonic *Protagoras* the credit for human progress is transferred from the unnamed gods to an omnipotent Zeus named explicitly. Zeus himself granted *aidōs* and *dike* to men, which guarantee political order. But serious difficulties are involved in distinguishing the views of Protagoras, who is said to be a religious agnostic (cf. fr. 4 DK II 265 and Pl. *Th.* 162d–e), from those of Plato. For different opinions on the Platonic Protagoras' attitude to the gods see Guthrie, *HGP* III, pp. 64 f., *In the Beginning*, pp. 84 ff.; Dodds, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 f.; H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Justice of Zeus* (London, 1971), pp. 130 f.

⁹ Though the poet stresses the possible destructive effects of *δεινότης*. For *δεινότης* in Sophocles see D. Butaye, *LEC* 34 (1966), 111 ff.

¹⁰ cf. Guthrie, *In the Beginning* pp. 85–9, J. Romilly, *Le Temps dans la Tragédie grecque* (Paris, 1971), pp. 36 f.

century it is widely regarded as a prime creative power: *Pi. O.* 2. 17; *Bacch.* 7. 1; *S. OC* 618; *E. Supp.* 787 f., *Heracl.* 900. Like Xenophanes Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle agree that the progress of civilization is slow and gradual, it comes about “κατὰ μικρόν”, ‘little by little’ (*Lg.* 3. 678 b; *Paneg.* 32; *Metaph. A*, 2, 982 b 13–15). As for the accessory of time, Moschion offers three alternative agents that may be at work in the rise of civilization, of which none is especially favoured: Prometheus’ care, and its non-mythological equivalences, necessity, and nature itself through man’s long experience. However, the poet seems either uncertain or indifferent as to the exact character of the civilizing agent, for all these powers are only helpmates of time.

Moschion, as a historically thinking writer, seems not to stress Prometheus’ benefit to the human race,¹¹ and his scepticism becomes explicit if we accept the reading of the manuscripts *σπάσας*¹² for Nauck’s emendation *πάρα*. Moreover, the reference itself to factors such as necessity and experience is indicative of Moschion’s rationalistic approach to cultural advance.

Ἀνάγκη, ‘necessity’, was frequently declared to be a spur to the formation of civilized societies in historical anthropologies. According to Anonymus Iamblichi (89 [82] 6 (1) DK II 402) necessity forced men to combine for survival.¹³ Democritus speaks of an initial period in which necessity separated certain arts indispensable for human existence (fr. 144 DK II 170), while the author of the essay *On Ancient Medicine* (*VM* 3) asserts that sheer necessity caused men to seek and discover the art of medicine. In Diodorus’ anthropology (1. 8. 9) necessity is assisted by man’s natural endowment (*χρεία*¹⁴ stands here, as often, as an equivalent of *ἀνάγκη*) while in *Pl. Plt.* 274c it is said that in early times men were *ἀμήχανοι* and *ἄτεχνοι* because no previous necessity had driven them to invention.

Φύσις, ‘nature’, and *μακρὰ τριβή*, ‘long experience’, provide further common factors involved in the rationalistic accounts of human development. Men derived suggestions from nature which they gradually used, creating something analogous to what had been observed. Such a view traces its origin from natural philosophers. Democritus (fr. 154 DK II 173) expresses his secular outlook on progress by stating that the human race learned various skills from animals by imitation. Similarly, according to Anaxagoras (fr. 21 b DK II 43 f.), experience, memory, wisdom, and skill enable men to make use of animals and their products (honey, milk, etc.). For men like Polus and Gorgias ‘experience makes our life proceed in accordance with art, and lack of experience in accordance with chance’ (*Pl. Gorg.* 448c). Epicurus (ap. D.L. 10. 75) asserts that human nature has been taught and forced to learn many various lessons by the facts themselves, and reason subsequently develops what it has thus received. Similarly, according to Lucretius (5. 1452 f.) practice and experience kept progress steady and gradual in all the skills of civilization.

Following this rationalistic trend of thought Moschion tells how from the primitive stage when law was weak and violence supreme, man gradually achieved awareness of the natural world around him and drew out from it what he needed for his civilized way of living. Humanistic echoes, first traceable in Xenophanes, are not lacking in Moschion. Human intellect contributed to the rise of civilization: men built fortified

¹¹ For the traditional depiction of Prometheus as the benefactor of mankind cf. Hes. *Erg.* 48 ff., *Th.* 565 ff.; A. *PV* 109–11, 251–4, 443–5, 457–506; *Pl. Prt.* 321c–322, *Plt.* 274c; Sch. A.R. *Arg.* 2, 1248–50a (Wendel²).

¹² Snell, op. cit. 97 F 6 prints *σπάσας*, which is grammatically balanced with *παρασχών* (v. 22). Metaphorical *σπάω*, a stronger word than *ἐλκω*, means ‘carry away, draw aside’: *LSJ* s.v. 5; cf. *S. El.* 561, *Pl. Lg.* 1. 644e.

¹³ For the content, the authorship, and the date of this work (late fifth or early fourth century) see Guthrie, *HGP* III, pp. 71–4, 314 f.

¹⁴ On its meaning in accounts of cultural rise see Cole, op. cit., p. 41 and n. 27.

cities and homes and established burial customs as a direct result of their moral development.

Nevertheless, though divine providence is not explicitly referred to as an author of progress, Moschion has Zeus in his text and, in the traditional manner, associates Demeter and Dionysus with wheat and wine, the blessings of the earth.¹⁵ In E. *Ba.* 274–85, as in Moschion's passage, emphasis is laid on the association of the dry and wet elements in man's feeding, cereals and wine respectively, as represented by Demeter and Dionysus, the gods of cultivated food.¹⁶ Moreover, the religious connotations implied in the burial custom¹⁷ (vv. 30–3) show that the poet could hardly be regarded as a religious agnostic, like some of the adherents of the historical development of progress.¹⁸

What truly engages his emotions is the contrast between the primitive era, with the beastlike way of living,¹⁹ the barren earth, and cannibalism, and the blessings of civilization, with cultivated food linked with social order and the development of morality.²⁰ Moschion's voice is that of a highly refined society. The thought of men once having eaten 'their fellows' flesh' predominates in his imagination; and he celebrates the release from such 'impious feasts' through law and morality.²¹ Cannibalism is thought to have been the result of earth's complete barrenness (v. 13)²² in the primordial centuries. Thus Moschion denies the theory of the infinite fertility of the earth which characterised the Golden Age and has steadily declined.²³

¹⁵ Demeter and Persephone set alongside Dionysus: Hdt. 2. 123.1 (with How and Wells' note); Pi. *I.* 7. 3–5 (and Sch. ad loc.). For the association of Demeter, Kore and Dionysus in mystic worship see L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, pp. 360 ff., J. P. Guépin, *The Tragic Paradox* (Amsterdam, 1968), p. 266 ff.

¹⁶ The association recurs in D.S. 4. 3. 5, Sch. Arat. *Diosem.* 1068 (Martin). For the passage of the *Bacchae* and its earlier echoes of philosophic thought see Dodds' note ad loc.

¹⁷ See below p. 000.

¹⁸ Moschion has improperly been compared to Critias (in the fragment cited above n. 2). For such a comparison see, for instance, Guthrie, *HGP* III, p. 63. Critias, the dramatist and sophist, described with cynical frankness religious beliefs as a useful political invention to inspire a fear of the law and thus to ensure the good behaviour and subjection of all citizens. The character in Moschion's play is far from promulgating such an atheistic view. On Critias see Guthrie, *HGP* III, pp. 243 f., 298–304.

¹⁹ The animal-like life of primitive men is a stock theme in the anthropological accounts: E. *Supp.* 201 f., strongly reminiscent of the adesp. fr. 470. 2 f. N.², assigned variously to Aeschylus and to Euripides (see C. Collard's note at *Supp.* ad loc., vol. II, p. 439); Critias, *Sisyphus*, op. cit. I f., with the same pair of words (ἄτακτος καὶ θηριώδης βίος) as in D.S. I. 8. 1; *VM* 3; Isoc. *Nicochl.* 6, *Paneg.* 28, *Bus.* 25, *Antid.* 254; Dem. *Aristog.* I. 20; Ditt. *SIG*³ 704, p. 324. 12–15; Cic. *De invent.* I. 2; Lucr. 5. 932.

²⁰ ἤμερος τροφή (v. 23), 'corn-growing, cultivation of land', entails a settled form of life in communities and social order, and is thus associated with ἤμερος δίαίτα (v. 29). On the other hand, ignorance of cultivated food characterizes primitive societies: cf. D.S. I. 8. 5. The Athenians claimed to have been the originators both of corn-growing and of political order: Isoc. *Paneg.* 28 ff.; Ditt. *SIG*³ 704 (see above n. 19); D.S. 13. 26. 3; Xen. *H.G.* 6. 3. 6.

²¹ Edelstein, op. cit., pp. 65, 66, saw in Moschion's statement polemic overtones directed against the cynic contention that according to the law of nature even the eating of human flesh is not impious: see Snell, op. cit. 88 F I, 1 d, for the defence of cannibalism in Diogenes' tragedies.

²² The remaining part of the verse after ἀκύμων is usually thought to be corrupt; but none of the conjectures suggested so far (mentioned by Nauck, ad loc.) seems to be convincing: cf. O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*² (Berlin, 1963), p. 303. The verse as it stands fits the context: the earth was ἀκύμων, 'barren', κωφεύουσα, 'senseless' (not feeling, sc. the plough: cf. v. 9), and ρέουσα, 'streaming down' (probably through erosion).

²³ Hes. *Erg.* 116–20; Pl. *Plt.* 272a. Dicaearchus, ap. Porph. *de abst.* 4. 2 ff. (= fr. 49 Wehrli) is in accord with Plato when he says that in the time of Cronos everything grew of its own accord without the aid of men who had not yet learned the art of agriculture or indeed any other art at all.

The concept of mutual slaughter and cannibalism in the primitive era, which also occurs in [Pl.] *Epin.* 975a and D.S. 1. 90. 1, seems to be a direct echo of the Orphic belief expressed in fr. 292 Kern:²⁴ ἦν χρόνος, ἥνικα φῶτες ἀπ' ἀλλήλων βίον εἶχον | σαρκοδακῆ, κρείσσων δὲ τὸν ἥττονα φῶτα δάϊζεν. Orpheus is said to have restrained men from mutual slaughter (Ar. *Ra.* 1032; Hor. *A.P.* 392 f.)²⁵ and to have prohibited bloodshed from his rites of mystical initiation.²⁶ One of the things for which he was revered in his capacity as a culture-hero was that he put a stop to this savage practice.

The verse ὁ δ' ἀσθενὴς ἦν τῶν ἀμεινόνων βορά (v. 17), sounding like a clumsy repetition of sentiment and language, has been regarded as spurious by some investigators.²⁷ Nevertheless, despite its prosaic style, the phrase does convey a new idea that is perfectly appropriate to those of the preceding three lines: the supremacy of the physically stronger.²⁸ Different, scientific explanations for the destruction of the weaker are given in other accounts of prehistory where mankind is depicted as feeble and unprotected, and so ravaged by the beasts (Pl. *Plt.* 274b–c, *Prt.* 322b; cf. *ibid.* 321c) or as having perished because of the cold, the lack of food (D.S. 1. 8. 6) and the improper diet (*VM* 3). The concept of injustice towards the weak and the predominance of the physically stronger has a mythical precedent, with moral implications and without cannibalism implied, in Hes. *Erg.* 192–4; in the fifth race, right will lie in might of hand, and the bad will wrong the better man.

For Moschion brute force, *Bía*, was the only law and shared the throne of Zeus. The idea is again in contrast to that of Plato and Dicaearchus²⁹ that at the beginning of human life war and contention were unknown. Though the reading *Διί* is not entirely certain and despite Lloyd-Jones' argument³⁰ that Canter's *δίκη* 'has slightly more palaeographical probability', *δίκη* has no place in a regime of mutual slaughter and cannibalism. The difference between the primitive and civilized eras is stressed by the unspoken contrast here with the traditional belief that it is not Violence, but Law or Justice which shares the throne of Zeus:³¹ Orph. fr. 160 Kern; Hes. *Erg.* 259;³² Pi. *O.* 8.21 f.; S. *O.C.* 1381 f.; Dem. *Aristog.* 1. 11; P. *Oxy.* 2256 fr. 9 (A) 10 = A. fr. 530 Mette;³³ P. Bodmer xxviii col. 1. 19 f. (published by E. G. Turner, *MH* 33

²⁴ The view was held by many scholars: cf. Kern's note ad loc.; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, 1913), p. 371 and n. 2; F. Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel, 1945), p. 151; M. Pohlenz, *Die Griechische Tragödie*² (Göttingen, 1954), Erläut. p. 192.

²⁵ For different interpretations of Horace's passage see C. O. Brink's note ad loc.

²⁶ On Orphism see, for instance: Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (London, 1952); Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley, etc. 1953), ch. 5; Guépin, op. cit., pp. 227 ff. Earlier literature is cited by Greene, op. cit., App. 9.

²⁷ C. Wachsmuth (note at Stob. 1. 8. 38) was followed by A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*² (Hildesheim, 1964), p. 815; cf. also R. Walker, *Addenda Scenica* (Paris, 1923), p. 224. Others rightly reject such a view: cf., for instance, Pohlenz, loc. cit.

²⁸ cf. D. S. 1. 90. 1... τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀλλήλους κατεσθίειν καὶ πολεμεῖν, αἰεὶ τοῦ πλέον δυναμένου τὸν ἀσθενέστερον κατισχύοντος.

²⁹ *Plt.* 271e; Dicaearchus, op. cit. (above n. 23).

³⁰ *JHS* 76 (1956), 57 n. 24.

³¹ Though the concept of Violence, *Bía*, and Power, *Kράτος*, as closely associated with Zeus is not lacking: Hes. *Th.* 385–8 (an aetiological explanation of the belief: see West's note ad loc., p. 272); A. *PV* 12 ff.; Call. *Jov.* 67. Moschion has thus parallels to draw upon for his depiction of Zeus enthroned with Violence. Critias similarly portrays primitive life as a slave of force (*Sisyphus*, vv. 1 f), and asserts that the laws prevented the open deeds of violence (v. 10), which had happened in the disordered state of life. For *δίκη* and *βία* see R. Hirzel, *Themis, Dike und Verwandtes* (Hildesheim, 1966), pp. 129 ff., and for *Δίκη* as *πάρεδρος Διός*, *ibid.*, pp. 412 ff.

³² West, ad loc. distinguishes the instances when Dike is sent by Zeus to write a report of men's misdeeds and those where Dike's seat beside Zeus is treated as something permanent.

³³ The fragment is also quoted and discussed by Lloyd-Jones in his Appendix to the Loeb edition of Aeschylus, fr. 282, and by the same author, op. cit., pp. 59 f., and in *The Justice of Zeus*, pp. 35 n. 40, 99 f.

(1976), 1–23). Accordingly, in Moschion's account the substitution of Justice or Law for brutal Violence as enthroned with Zeus seems to be ingeniously used to emphasize the cruelty of the primitive era when νόμος was not σύνθροπος Διί but ταπεινός, abased in power (vv. 15 f.). Moreover, the universal sanction of the burial custom in the concluding verses further stresses the difference between primitive and civilized eras in terms of powerful laws ordering men's mutual respect.

The coexistence of Zeus and Violence in early time is likely to point to the belief in an evolution in the character of gods, especially of Zeus,³⁴ who may have become wiser when he was older. This seems to be an echo of the earlier Pre-Platonic³⁵ concept of deity as not changeless and eternal but developing in time and having a personal history in time. The contrast of the notions in vv. 15–17 and 29 ff. reveals Moschion's conviction that the violence and injustice which had prevailed among gods and men in the primitive era were replaced by civilized customs and law-abidingness. Such a belief recalls Aeschylus' optimistic faith as implied in the *Eumenides* and the *Prometheus Unbound*:³⁶ a faith in the re-establishment of a world founded on a new order of righteousness and peace for gods and men.

With the last four verses the account reaches the point which the poet obviously had in mind: the inculcation of the sanctity of sepulture. Moschion, with a clear aetiological perspective, referred to the history of culture to explain the custom of burying the dead. A transition is thus achieved from the wider sphere to that which is more relevant to the dramatic action.³⁷

As the material basis of human life (nourishment, residence, formation of cities) becomes stabilized and secure, there emanates from it a gradual intellectual and moral progress which characterizes ἡμερον διαίταν. The emphasis given on the burial custom at the end of this account of progress implies the conviction that mankind will be able to preserve the gifts of civilization, which it gradually obtained, as long as it abides by the customs and laws established as guarantees of social order. The idea recalls Theseus' affirmation in the *Supplices*:³⁸ man's existence is secure on the premiss that he preserves the κόσμος,³⁹ namely the moral and political order which the state ordains. Respect for the dead, manifested in the sacred burial custom, is for both Euripides and Moschion one of the fundamental moral norms on which civilization is based. In Euripides it is portrayed as an ancient ordinance of the gods which never

³⁴ A moral development – or simply a change in attitude (cf. Lloyd-Jones, *Justice of Zeus*, pp. 95–103, *JHS*, op. cit. 57, 66 f.) – on Zeus' part, especially as portrayed by Aeschylus in the Promethean trilogy, has often been suggested. To the references quoted by Lloyd-Jones, op. cit. 56 and nn. 19–21, and Dodds, *The Ancient Concept of Progress*, p. 42 n. 1, we may add: G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens* (London, 1941), pp. 338, 340; H. W. Smyth, *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Berkeley, 1924), pp. 118 ff.; Dodds, *Greeks and the Irrational*, pp. 32 f.

³⁵ For Plato's being the first in Greek thinking to conceive of an unchanging god see Dodds, *The Ancient Concept of Progress*, p. 42, with his view approved by Lloyd-Jones, op. cit. 57 f.

³⁶ Especially in the final reconciliation (predicted in *PV* 186–92) between Zeus, the supreme divinity, and Prometheus, the symbol of man's restless inventiveness. On this reconciliation in *PV* cf. Thomson, op. cit., pp. 337 f.; Lloyd-Jones, op. cit., pp. 66 f., *Justice of Zeus*, p. 97; Dodds, *The Ancient Concept of Progress*, pp. 40 f.

³⁷ See below p. 415 on the possible theme of the play. The pattern is familiar in tragedy and especially in Euripides; cf. H. Friis Johansen, *General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis* (Copenhagen, 1959), pp. 42, 49.

³⁸ Moschion's concluding verses involve remarkable parallels of language and sentiment (especially the sanction of the burial law) with Theseus' bold reply to the Theban herald who had claimed that the bodies of the Argive leaders should be left unburied: see esp. vv. 524–8, 538–40, 670–2.

³⁹ v. 245. G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester, 1955), pp. 7, 20 and *passim*, aptly pointed out – though contrast Conacher, *TAPA*, op. cit. 13 – that the basis of the play lies in the conception of a safeguarded world, well ordered by rational laws.

lost its validity.⁴⁰ Similarly, in Moschion's passage the speaker, by calling 'impious' (δυσσεβής) the 'primitive feasts' which have now been abolished by νόμος,⁴¹ implies that this burial custom is εὐσεβές, in accordance with religious norms.

Interestingly the same belief is expressed in a fragment from Moschion's *Pheraioi* (3. N.²/Sn., ap. Stob. 4, 57, 3):

κενὸν θανόντος ἀνδρὸς αἰκίζειν σκιάν
ζώντας κολάζειν, οὐ θανόντας εὐσεβές

and in one ascribed with strong probability to the same play⁴² (7 N.²/Sn., ap. Stob. 4 57. 14):

τί κέρδος οὐκέτ' ὄντας αἰκίζειν νεκρούς;
τί τὴν ἀναυδὸν γαῖαν ὑβρίζειν πλέον;
ἐπὶ γὰρ ἡ κρίνουσα καὶ θηδίονα
καὶ τὰνιὰρὰ φροῦδος αἰσθησις φθαρῇ,
τὸ σῶμα κωφὸν τάξιν εἰληφέν πέτρου

Apart from the strong similarities in language and imagery, the possible coincidence in the dramatic situation helps to link the two passages. Both seem to be parts of a dramatic plea for the respect due to the dead.⁴³ The coincidence of the burial motif with the closing lines of the fragment on progress suggests that this third passage may also belong to the same play and the same dramatic situation.⁴⁴ So well defined a theme at the end of a rationalistic account of man's development points to a dramatic situation concerned, as often in tragedy, with a vigorous opposition to a refusal of obsequies. And this is the certain ground for any consideration of the theme of the *Pheraioi*. It is attested that after the murder of Alexander, the notorious tyrant of Pherae, his body remained unburied and outraged.⁴⁵ The *Pheraioi* therefore is likely to have dealt with the murder of Alexander, the denial of burial rites to his body⁴⁶ (possibly by his successor to the throne), and the strong opposition (by an Athenian ?)⁴⁷ which followed such a decision. The contrast between the cruelty of the dead tyrant and the demand for the application of burial rites must have created strong dramatic effects.

Athens

G. XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS

⁴⁰ *Supp.* 563 οὐ γὰρ . . . | νόμος παλαιὸς δαιμόνων διεφθάρη. Cf. vv. 19, 301, with Collard's notes ad loc. and at v. 526.

⁴¹ Obviously not a formally enacted law but a traditional custom sanctioned by immemorial usage. Accurate definitions of the two main uses of νόμος are set forth by Guthrie, *HGP* III, pp. 56 f.

⁴² O. Ribbeck, *RhM* 30 (1875), 159; O. Ravenna, *RSA* 7 (1903), 761 ff.; J. Duchemin, *L'Agôn dans la Tragédie grecque*² (Paris, 1968), p. 106.

⁴³ cf. Duchemin, loc. cit. For the dramatic debate in the *Pheraioi* see also G. Xanthakis-Karamanos, *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979), 72 f.

⁴⁴ For the ascription of the passage on progress to the *Pheraioi* cf. Ribbeck, loc. cit., and Ravenna, loc. cit. However, such an attribution of these two unnamed fragments to the *Pheraioi* is difficult to prove in view of the very restricted knowledge concerning this poet's poetic activity: only three titles (*Themistocles*, *Telephus*, and *Pheraioi*) are preserved.

⁴⁵ See Conon, *Narrat.* 50 (*FGrHist* 26), Plut. *Pel.* 35, Sch. Hom. *Il.* 24. 428.

⁴⁶ Thus the majority of scholars: Ribbeck, op. cit. 155 ff.; F. Schramm, *Tragicorum graecorum hellenisticae quae dicitur aetatis fragmenta* (Diss. Münster, 1929), p. 68; C. del Grande, *TPAAΩIΔIA*² (Milano, 1962), pp. 188 ff.

⁴⁷ Since the burial custom is attributed to Athenians: Ael. *VH* 5. 14; cf. Paus. *I.* 32. 5, D.S. 4. 65. 9. I owe a large part of my translation to Guthrie, *HGP* III, 82.