

XENOPHANES, AESCHYLUS, AND THE DOCTRINE OF PRIMEVAL BRUTISHNESS

The belief that primitive men lived like beasts and that civilisation developed out of these brutal origins is found in numerous ancient authors, both Greek and Latin.¹ It forms part of certain theories about the beginnings of culture current in late antiquity. These are notoriously difficult to trace to their sources, but they already existed in some form in the fifth century B.C.² One idea common to these theories is that of progress, and for this reason a fragment of Xenophanes is sometimes cited as their remote prototype: 'The gods did not reveal all things to men from the beginning; instead, by seeking, men discover what is better in time'.³ Mainly on the strength of this fragment, Ludwig Edelstein devoted the first chapter of his book *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity* to Xenophanes, and W. K. C. Guthrie has even declared that there is good reason to attribute to him a fuller account of progress, one that would include details found in later authors who speak of the early life of mankind. One of these details is the statement that the life of primitive men was 'brutal' or 'beastlike' (θηριώδης).⁴ In these authors the implication of that term varies from 'unschooled in the basic crafts' to 'inhumanly violent and bloodthirsty'. In one sense or the other it is repeatedly encountered in ancient references to this subject. Accounts of primitive brutishness which make use of the word θηριώδης (or θηριωδῶς) can be found in the *Suppliants* of Euripides, in the Hippocratic treatise *On Ancient Medicine*, in three passages of Diodorus, one of which is thought by some to contain Democritean doctrine, in four passages of Isocrates, in a fragment from a satyr-play *Sisyphus* which the ancient sources attribute variously to Euripides and to Critias, in a fragment of Athenion, in a second-century inscription, in Plutarch, in Tatian, in Themistius, and in a scholion to Euripides. Occasionally we find it said that early men

¹ The following works are referred to by author alone, or by author and short title: Ludwig Edelstein, *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity* (Baltimore, 1967); Thomas Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology* (Western Reserve Univ. Press, 1967); W. K. C. Guthrie, *History of Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1962–81) i (1962), iii (1969); E. A. Havelock, *The Liberal Temper in Greek Politics* (New Haven and London, 1957); F. Heinemann, *Nomos und Physis* (Basel, 1945); Michael J. O'Brien, *The Socratic Paradoxes and the Greek Mind* (Chapel Hill, 1967); L. E. Woodbury, rev. of Guthrie iii, cited above, in *Phoenix* 24 (1970), 348–56; Dieter op de Hipt, *Adjektive auf -ώδης im Corpus Hippocraticum* (Hamburg, 1972); Woldemar Graf Uxkull-Gyllenband, *Griechische Kultur-Entstehungslehren* (Berlin, 1924).

² See Cole, 10 ff., and other works there cited. Cole's theory that Democritus is the central figure in the development of these theories revives a thesis of Karl Reinhardt. Even in the cautious form in which Cole restates this it remains very controversial. See, e.g., F. Solmsen's review in *Phoenix* 23 (1969), 399–402. I discussed these fifth-century theories of progress in another context in *The Socratic Paradoxes*, 56–82.

³ *Vorsokr.* 21 B 18.

⁴ Guthrie, *HGP* i. 400–1, iii. 62–3 and the notes to 80–2. Havelock, 106–7, had already put forward similar speculations about the lost anthropological doctrines of Xenophanes. Their influence can be seen in the discussion of Ionian contributions to the history of civilisation found in Joseph P. Maguire, 'Protagoras... or Plato? II. The *Protagoras*', *Phronesis* 22 (1977), 114. Contrast the more cautious statements of Edelstein, 10 n. 20, and 24 n. 7. Guthrie's argument is much more tentatively expressed in his later volume (where Xenophanes is 'possibly' the common source [62]), but it is here that he makes the point that θηριώδης, though excluded from the hexameter, would have been metrically possible in Xenophanes' iambic or mixed poetry (63 n. 2).

lived like beasts (*θήρες*), but the distinctive adjective is absent. This group of passages includes the Homeric *Hymn to Hephaestus*, two tragic fragments, one anonymous, the other attributed to Moschion, and a fragment of Berosus. Less commonly, primitive life is described as 'wild' (*ἄγριος*).⁵

Although none of these explicit statements can be probably dated earlier than the late fifth century, the assumption is often encountered in scholarly writing that at least as early as the first half of that century, and possibly earlier, theories of progress had come to include references to mankind's primeval brutishness. The sparse evidence has always seemed to leave that possibility open, but it has commonly been stated as a probability or even as a fact, particularly in discussions of Aeschylean thought.⁶ Guthrie's sponsorship of this view in his *History of Greek Philosophy* marked its appearance in a widely used and justly respected standard account.⁷ Its attachment there to a named source, Xenophanes, also brought to it an advantage in clarity and definition. This aspect of his argument and another about to be mentioned combine to make it a good point of departure for anyone who may wish to throw further light on the problem. In speaking of the dependence of these later passages on Xenophanes, Guthrie makes two distinct proposals, which are closely related but require separate judgement on separate grounds. These are: (1) that in tracing the origin of the doctrine of primitive human brutishness we should consider Xenophanes a likely source, and (2) that a lost Xenophanean passage expounding this doctrine may have contained the term *θηριώδης*, a fact which would account for the later close association of the term with the doctrine. The first proposal might be true and the second false, but Guthrie's view that the source of the doctrine is also the source of the language in which it came to be customarily expressed is at least more economical than its alternative. It is suggested to him by the way in which the term *θηριώδης* is 'repeated

⁵ The passages mentioned that contain *θηριώδης* (or *θηριώδως*) are Eur. *Supp.* 202; Critias 88 B 25 (*Vorsokr.*) = 43 F 19 (*TrGF*) = Eur. frag. [894A] (see H. J. Mette, 'Euripides 1976/77 Erster Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke', *Lustrum* 19 [1976], 67–70, and note 54 *infra*); Diod. 1.8.1 (see Democr. 68 B 5 [*Vorsokr.*]), 1.90.1, and 3.56; Hippoc. *V.M.* 3 and 7 (1.576 and 585 Littré); Isoc. *Paneg.* 28, *Antid.* 254, *Nic.* 6, *Bus.* 25; Athenion, frag. 1 (Kock); *SIG* 704 E 11; Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 13 (356a); Tatian, *Orat. ad Graecos* 39.2; Themistius, *Orat.* 30.349b; schol. Eur. *Or.* 1646. The other references are Hom. *Hymn. Vulc.* 4; *trag. adesp.* 470 (*TGF*² and *TrGF*); Moschion, frag. 6, line 4 (*TGF*² and *TrGF*); *FGrHist* 680.3; Diod. 5.66.4, 13.26; schol. Hom. *Od.* 3.441. Some of these, along with examples in Latin, are discussed in W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur, und Götter* (Basel, 1959), 152–6. See also Guthrie, *HGP* iii. 80 n. 2; B. Gatz, *Weltalter, goldene Zeit, und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen* (Hildesheim, 1967), 230–1.

⁶ Examples (aside from those in n. 4 *supra*) can be found in A. Kleingünther, *Πρώτος Εὐπετής* (Leipzig, 1933) = *Philologus* Suppl. 26, Heft 1, 72; F. Lämmli, *Vom Chaos zum Kosmos* (Basel, 1962), 69; D. Lanza, *Anassagora, Testimonianze e Frammenti* (Florence, 1966), 251; R. Müller, 'Die "Kulturgeschichte" in Aischylos' "Prometheus"', in *Aischylos und Pindar*, hrsg. E. G. Schmidt (Berlin, 1981), 230–1, 235; J. de Romilly, 'Thucydide et l'Idée de Progrès', *ASNP* 35 (1966), 148; and R. Cantarella, 'L'Incivilimento umano, dal "Prometeo" all' "Antigone"', *RAL* 22 (1967), 153, 163. The evidence, as it affects Aeschylus, consists of *P.V.* 447 ff. and *trag. adesp.* 470 (*TGF*² and *TrGF*), both of which are discussed in the text *infra*.

⁷ Guthrie's proposal has already been questioned in Woodbury's review. I am in debt to this piece for several important observations and will refer to it further in the course of the argument. See especially notes 39 and 49. The other implications of Xenophanes B 18 have long been the subject of controversy. Interpreters have often been charged with importing into it anachronistic or otherwise alien ideas. See P. Shorey, 'Note on Xenophanes fr. 18 (Diels) and Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 32', *CP* 6 (1911), 88–9; H. Cherniss, 'The History of Ideas and Ancient Greek Philosophy', in *Estudios de Historia de la Filosofía en Homenaje al Prof. R. Mondolfo*, Fasc. 1 (Tucuman, 1957), 96; W. J. Verdenius, 'Xenophanes Frag. 18', *Mnem.* Ser. IV, 8 (1955), 221; H. Schwabl, 'Die Eleaten', *AAW* 10 (1957), cols. 206–7.

almost like an echo' in one author after another when the subject of primitive life is raised.⁸ Since the first proposal is logically independent of the second, I will take them up separately, dealing first with the terminology and then with the doctrine itself. My argument will then run as follows:

1. The repetitions of the term *θηριώδης* in the sense 'beastlike' are probably not echoes of Xenophanes or of anyone else writing in his time, since on linguistic grounds that meaning of the word is unlikely to have appeared so early.
2. The positive evidence for tracing the doctrine of primitive human brutishness to Xenophanes or to any other author writing before the middle of the fifth century is far too slight and dubious to command our assent. In particular, there is reason to question the common assumption that it is already found in Aeschylus, an author who is sometimes said to have been open to Xenophanean influence.⁹

These two parts of the argument are meant to establish on separate grounds two distinct points, one about the development of the Greek language, the other about the history of ideas. Combined, they open the way to a hypothesis different from Guthrie's but equally economical, that the doctrine of the *θηριώδης βίος* of primitive man was first propounded at about the time when that phrase itself could first have been considered acceptable Greek, most probably in the third quarter of the fifth century. Some positive grounds for this hypothesis will be mentioned.

Could an author as early as Xenophanes have used *θηριώδης* in the sense 'beastlike'? The word is not found in any extant writer earlier than Herodotus, where it always occurs with the meaning 'full of wild beasts' or 'full of savage fish'. It would be wrong to assume out of hand that it did not exist before then, and I rely on no such claim. I propose instead to examine the development of meanings in the whole class of words to which it belongs and to show by analogy that even if it was known to Xenophanes it is unlikely at that time to have had the meaning 'beastlike'. *θηριώδης* is one of a large class of adjectives in *-ώδης*, a word-end originally referring to smell whose meaning was extended to express, among other things, content, quality, and resemblance.¹⁰ So used, *-ώδης* was characteristic of scientific and philosophical prose, and after the middle of the fifth century the class of words formed upon it grew

⁸ W. K. C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning* (London, 1957), 95, and *HGP* iii. 63 n. 2. His own list of these 'echoes' is incomplete, as are all others that I have seen. So too, no doubt, is mine (see text and n. 5 supra).

⁹ See n. 6 supra. Possible Xenophanean influence on Aeschylus is seen by Uxkull-Gyllenband, 4; Müller (supra, n. 6), 230–7; D. J. Conacher, 'Prometheus as Founder of the Arts', *GRBS* 18 (1977), 205 (repeated in *Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound* [Toronto, 1980], 96). Contrast W. Rösler, *Reflexe vorsokratischen Denkens bei Aischylos* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1970), 10 n. 25.

¹⁰ For this aspect of the problem the most useful general studies and compendia are: Carl D. Buck and Walter Peterson, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago, 1948); P. Chantraine, *La Formation des Noms en Grec Ancien* (Paris, 1933), 429 ff.; A. Debrunner, *Grechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg, 1917), 194–6; Paul Kretschmer and Ernst Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, 2. Aufl. (Göttingen, 1963), with a supplement by Georg Kisser; and Jacob Wackernagel, *Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita* (Basel, 1889), reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen, 1955), 2. Halbband, no. 51. There exist as well two monographs on the subject, each of which prints lists of words in *-ώδης* from early authors which are meant to be illustrative rather than complete: P. Droste, *De Adjectivorum in -ειδής et in -ώδης Desinentium apud Platonem Usu* (Marburg, 1886); and Dieter op de Hipt, *Adjektive auf -ώδης*.

I have listed *δυσώδης* (text infra) as a compound of the earliest period on the basis of Epicharmus 61 (Kaibel) as emended by Casaubon.

immensely. Their number, however, remained very small until then, and the rather smaller number whose occurrence in any extended sense is attested before that terminus does not, to my knowledge, include any word used to express likeness or analogy. Setting aside those few attested for this period that clearly refer to smell (δυσώδης, εὐώδης, θυώδης, κηώδης), I find the following examples:

αἰνιγματώδης, 'riddling', Aesch. *Supp.* 464. G. Italie, *Index Aeschyleus*, translates this 'aenigmati similis', but what has been said is a riddle.¹¹ **ἀνθεμώδης**, 'blooming', Sappho 96.14 (PLF), Bacchyl. 19.39 (Snell–Maehler), [?Aesch.] *P.V.* 455. **ἄσώδης**, 'slimy', Aesch. *Supp.* 31. **δονακώδης**, 'reedy', Bacchyl. 30 (Snell–Maehler). **ἐριθακώδης**, 'full of soft meat', Epicharmus 61 (Kaibel). **καματώδης**, 'toilsome', Hesiod, *Op.* 584, 664; Pindar, *Nem.* 3.17, frag. 124.5 (Snell–Maehler). **λυσσώδης**, 'full of rage', *Il.* 13.53. *LSJ* translates 'like one raging, frantic', but no comparison need be assumed. **λυσσώδης** in this passage is clearly the adjectival version of *κρατερή δέ ἐ λύσσα δέδυκεν* at *Il.* 9.239. Both passages refer to Hector. **ὄφιώδης**, 'snake-clad', Pindar, *Ol.* 13.63 (but 'snake-like' in a fourth-century prose passage, Arist. *P.A.* 696b23). **πηλώδης**, 'muddy', Parmenides 28 B 20 (*Vorsokr.*). (But the ascription is doubtful.) **πιτυλώδης**, 'abounding in pines', Alcman 157 (*PMG*), Bacchyl. 12.39 (Snell–Maehler). **σπερματώδης**, 'germinant', attributed to Charondas, but actually appearing in Stobaeus in a doctrinal summary of suspect origin.¹² **ὑπομελανδρυώδης**, the final word in Epicharmus, frag. 102 (Kaibel), *ποτιφόρμιον τὸ τέμαχος ἧς, ὑπομελανδρυώδες*, is not easy to explain. The definition in *LSJ*, 'somewhat like the μελάνδρυον', would lead us to assume that another, similar fish is being described. But the short fragment mentions none, nor does the context in Athenaeus 3.121b encourage that supposition. Better to translate 'the slice [of tunny] was edible, with a bit of tunny flavour', a line whose tone would not be out of place in comedy. **ψαμαθώδης**, 'sandy', *Hom. Hym. Merc.* 75, 347, 350.

In making the above list, I have aimed at completeness but have interpreted the chronological limit as one that excludes Herodotus, Sophoclean fragments and, in general, material which cannot be securely dated with respect to that limit. This omission does not involve any example of a word ending in *-ώδης* used to express similarity. There are seven apparent exceptions which deserve to be set down:

ἀνδρώδης, 'manly, masculine', Empedocles 31 B 67 (*Vorsokr.*). The phrase is *ἀνδρωδέστεροι ἄνδρες*. Resemblance is not part of the meaning, as would be the case if the noun were *παῖδες* or *γυναῖκες*. Rather: 'men who are more truly men'. In any case, the manuscript reading is suspect.¹³ **κογχυλιώδης**, 'shell-like' and **κτενώδης**, 'comblake'. Attributed by *LSJ* to the historian Xanthus (*FGH Hist* 765.12), these words are actually part of a paraphrase and have little claim to be used as linguistic evidence.¹⁴ **πυργώδης**, found at Soph. *Trach.* 273, where Heracles is said to have

¹¹ That expression is not too harsh for tragedy. Cf. [?Aesch.] *P.V.* 610, Soph. *O.T.* 439, and Eur. *El.* 946.

¹² See F. E. Adcock, 'Literary Tradition and Early Greek Code Makers', *Cambridge Historical Journal* 2 (1927), 95–109.

¹³ Diels–Kranz, *Vorsokr.*, print *ἀδρομελέστεροι ἄνδρες*, an emendation proposed by Karsten and later corroborated by the Arabic version, as noted by Deichgräber in *Gnomon* 6 (1930), 375 ff. So does M. R. Wright, *Empedocles: the Extant Fragments* (New Haven and London, 1981), 118, 220. But the manuscript reading is defended by Jean Bollack, *Empédocle*, iii. *Les Origines*, *Commentaire* 2 (Paris, 1969), 545 n. 3, and by D. O'Brien, *Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle* (Cambridge, 1969), 285 n. 2. Antonio Traglia, *Studi sulla Lingua di Empedocle* (Bari, 1952), 72, observes that similar apparent tautologies are tolerated at Aesch. *Persae* 986 and at *P.V.* 585.

¹⁴ See Hans Herter, 'Xanthos der Lyder', *RE* 2.18 (1967), 1365.

hurled Iphitus ἀπ' ἄκρας πυργώδους πλακός. The definition in *LSJ* is ' = πυργοειδής, towering', and its translation of the phrase is 'from the flat top of the towering [i.e. tower-like] hill' (s.v. πλάξ). This is essentially the scholiast's interpretation. If it were correct, Sophocles' version of the story would differ from that found elsewhere in the mythographic tradition, where Iphitus is hurled from a tower or from the walls. But the phrase most probably means 'from the flat top of a tower'.¹⁵ σισυρνώδης, found in Soph. frag. 407a (*TrGF*) in the phrase σισυρνώδη στολήν. 'Consisting of a skin or fur' (Hesychius) or 'scorteus' (C. Janowski, reported in *TrGF ad loc.*) makes better sense than 'like a skin or fur' (*LSJ*). τροχώδης, 'wheel-like', and χυτρώδης, 'pot-like'. These two terms were printed in A. S. Hunt's text of the *Ichneutae* at line 295, the first as a marginal variant of the second. χυτρώδης does not otherwise occur in Greek literature; τροχώδης occurs elsewhere first in Apollonius Sophista. The papyrus readings are χυτροειδής and τροχοειδής(s). Vollgraff argued that it was more sensible to accept the readings as contractions of χυτροειδής and τροχοειδής than to assume a double error in transcription. His arguments are now rightly accepted in Radt's edition of the Sophocles fragments in *TrGF*, which also offers parallels.¹⁶

In all the authentic examples of early usage on the above list the force of -ώδης is limited to one of these: (1) 'smelling of' or 'tasting of', (2) 'full of' or 'accompanied by', (3) 'consisting of' or 'truly being'. Though some extension of the original meaning is already evident, there is no parallel to the sense of θηριώδης as it is used in later passages referring to the state of primitive man, of which the earliest may be the one in Euripides' *Suppliants*, a play of the 420s.¹⁷ The expressions used in these passages include θηριώδης βίος (or βίотος,¹⁸ or δίαίτα) and θηριωδώς ζῆν (or διακεῖσθαι). The force of θηριώδης here ('beastlike') is shown by other passages which express the same idea but avoid the word itself. In these the substituted phrases are βίον... πεφυρμένον θηρσίν θ' ὅμοιον (*TGF*² *adespoton* 470), θηρσίν διαίτας εἶχον ἐμφερεῖς βροτοί (Moschion 97.6 [*TrGF*]), and ἄντροις ναιετάασκον ἐν οὐρεσιν, ἥύτε θήρες (Homeric *Hymn to Hephaestus*, 4). So used, -ώδης approximates to -ειδής in meaning, and the influence of the latter is sometimes seen in the development of the former.¹⁹ No evidence in our literary texts encourages the assumption that this development had occurred before the middle of the fifth century. Nor was its acceptance immediate or universal even then. In Sophocles there are twelve -ώδης

¹⁵ I follow the interpretation of J. C. Kamerbeek, *Trachiniae* (Leiden, 1959), *ad loc.*, which is apparently also that of A. Dain, P. Mazon, *Sophocle*, i. *Les Trachiniennes, Antigone* (Paris, 1955) ('du haut d'un terrasse des remparts') and of *LSJ*, 7th ed. (*sic*), s.v. πλάξ ('from the top storey of a tower'). Other ancient versions of the incident are listed by Kamerbeek and by R. C. Jebb, *Trachiniae* (Cambridge, 1892), *ad loc.* The latest commentary leaves the question open (P. E. Easterling, *Sophocles, Trachiniae* [Cambridge, 1982], 114).

¹⁶ See A. S. Hunt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea Nuper Reperta* (Oxford, 1912) (cf. *POxy*, ix. pp. 55, 80); W. Vollgraff, 'Ad Sophoclis Indagatores', *Mnem.* N.S. 42 (1914), 173-4; *TrGF* IV, p. 295. No consensus exists about the date of *Ichneutae*. See A. Lesky, *Die Tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, 3. Aufl. (Göttingen, 1972), 258.

¹⁷ The date of *Supp.* is discussed by G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester, 1955), 89. Hippoc. *V.M.*, which also uses the term in a similar way (see n. 5 *supra*), may be slightly earlier than *Supp.* Cantarella (*supra* n. 6), 172, argues that the medical writer has directly influenced the tragedian, but his case is weak, and the exact date of *V.M.* remains obscure. A consensus places it near the end of the fifth century. Bibliography in M. J. O'Brien 66 n. 23, and Cantarella, 172 n. 46.

¹⁸ Actually βίотον ἐκ... θηριώδους (Eur. *Supp.* 201-2). The construction is of a type found also at Soph. *Ant.* 1092-3.

¹⁹ See Buck-Peterson (*supra*, n. 10), 698.

words. None has the force of ‘-like’.²⁰ Herodotus also has twelve, eleven of them found in no previous author. The great majority are terms useful in geographical description, and among them by far the commonest is *θηριώδης*.²¹ It seems possible, though unprovable, that it was a term coined for use in geographical contexts, perhaps by Herodotus himself, and then adapted with changed meanings to suit philosophical and medical contexts.²² In any case, it belongs to a group of content-adjectives first encountered in Herodotus (*ἀκανθώδης*, *θηριώδης*, *ἰχθυώδης*, *λιθώδης*, *πωώδης*, *ψαμμώδης*), a group likely to be in some measure the result of coinage by analogous formation. There is no passage in Herodotus where *θηριώδης* or any other word of that termination is used to mark a resemblance. This omission is the more interesting because in four passages Herodotus compares the sexual practices of barbarians to those of animals. The phrases used, however, are *κατά περ τὰ ἄλλα κτήνηα* (2.64.1), *κατά περ τῶν προβάτων* (3.101.1), *κατά περ τοῖσι προβάτοισι* (1.203.2), and *κτηνηδόν* (4.180.5).

In contrast, during the last three decades of the fifth century and in the early fourth, words in which *-ώδης* has the force of ‘-like’ are not hard to find. Aristophanes has *Διπολιώδης*, ‘like the feast of Dipolia’ (*Nub.* 984); *κριμνώδης*, ‘like meal’ (*Nub.* 965); *πρινιώδης*, ‘oaklike’ (*Vesp.* 383); *σφηκώδης*, ‘wasplike’ (*Plut.* 561); *ὑποζυγιώδης* ‘like a beast of burden’ (frag. 731, Kock). Euripides has *δρακοντώδης*, ‘snakelike’ (*Or.* 524), and *θηριώδης*, ‘beastlike’ (*Supp.* 202, *Or.* 524).²³ Of the three *-ώδης* words attributed to Democritus, two fall into this category. He is said by Aelian to have used the term *τὸ τευθρηγιώδες*, ‘the honeycomb-like part’, to signify the porous section of the forehead in bulls, and he disparaged mere physical beauty without intelligence as *ζωώδης*, ‘animal-like’.²⁴ This last term is a close parallel to *θηριώδης* as used in anthropological contexts. The development of the language in the fourth century and later provides numerous further examples.²⁵

What this evidence shows is that we make a precarious assumption if we say that Xenophanes, who died a very old man about the year 470,²⁶ could have used *θηριώδης*

²⁰ *ἀνεμώδης* (frag. 553 [TrGF]), *δυσώδης* (*Phil.* 1032), *εὐρώδης* (*Ajax* 1190), *θρομβώδης* (*Trach.* 702), *λυσσώδης* (*Ajax* 452), *μιτώδης* (*Ant.* 1222), *παγετώδης* (*Phil.* 1082), *πετρώδης* (*Ant.* 774, 958), *πυργώδης* (*Trach.* 273), *σισyrνώδης* (frag. 407a [TrGF]), *στομώδης* (frag. 1098 [TrGF]), *ὕλώδης* (*Ichneutae*, frag. 314, line 221 [TrGF]). The references for the extant tragedies are those found in F. Ellendt, H. Genthe, *Lexicon Sophocleum*.

²¹ *ἀκανθώδης* (1.126.1), *ἀργιλιώδης* (2.12.3), *αὐχμώδης* (1.142.2), *δυσώδης* (2.94.2), *εὐώδης* (3.112), *θηριώδης* (1.110.1, 1.111.3, 2.32.4 [twice], 2.32.5, 2.65.2, 4.174, 4.181.1 [twice], 4.181.2, 4.191.2, 4.191.3, 6.44.3), *ἰχθυώδης* (7.109.2), *λιθώδης* (4.23.1), *πωώδης* (4.47.1), *σαρκώδης* (3.29.2), *ταραχώδης* (1.32.1), *ψαμμώδης* (2.32.6, 4.191.3). Of these, *θηριώδης* occurs thirteen times, *ψαμμώδης* twice, the rest once each. References are from J. E. Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus*.

²² Meanings of the word in medical texts are discussed by D. op de Hipt, 71–4.

²³ At *Tro.* 671 *τὸ θηριώδες* means ‘the nature of a beast’.

²⁴ Aelian, *N.A.* 12.20 = 68 A 155; 68 B 105 (*Vorsokr.*).

²⁵ Some evidence is not even approximately datable. Into this classification must fall the following terms and phrases: *τυντλώδης λόγος*, ‘muddy discourse’ (*com. adesp.* 909 [Kock]), and *ἐρεβώδης θάλασσα*, ‘a sea dark as Erebus’ (*adesp.* 999 [81] [PMG] = *TGF*² *adesp.* 377). Examples from the Hippocratic Corpus are also omitted here because there is no agreement as to when its parts were written. See G. E. R. Lloyd, ‘The Hippocratic Question’, *CQ* 25 (1975), 171–92.

²⁶ See Guthrie, *HGP* i. 363; L. E. Woodbury, ‘Apollodorus, Xenophanes, and the Foundation of Massilia’, *Phoenix* 15 (1961), 134–55; and Kurt von Fritz, ‘Xenophanes’, *RE* 2.18 (1967), 1542. Recent literature on the question of his dates is reviewed in J. Wiesner, ‘Xenophanes 1957–1969’, *AAHG* 25 (1972), 2–4.

to mean 'beastlike,' or any word in *-ῶδης* to mean '-like'.²⁷ It cannot be proved strictly impossible that he did, but in the reasonably large and varied assortment of words with that suffix cited above no parallel to such a usage can be found until several decades after his death. It hardly merits a place in a speculative reconstruction of his words.²⁸ This linguistic conclusion is of interest in its own right because it clarifies a stage in the development of Greek scientific and philosophical terminology, one not always correctly reflected in our lexicons. The effect on the main argument of this paper is to show that one of Guthrie's suggestions, that a certain word-echo in anthropological texts can plausibly be traced to Xenophanes, is ill founded. This does not prove that we must give up the hypothesis that Xenophanes is the source of the doctrine found in these texts, since he could easily have expressed it in other terms than those later used by his supposed followers.

The evidence, however, that Xenophanes taught any such doctrine as man's primeval brutishness in any terms at all is very weak. Fragment B 18 is admittedly compatible with such a doctrine, but nothing in the wording requires it, since a belief in progress can take other forms and can deal in contrasts less dramatic than brutish/civilised. Whatever the passage may have gone on to say, the two lines we possess speak of progress as a present and continuing activity and give no hint of a division of history into discrete stages.²⁹ The case for finding the doctrine implied in other early literary descriptions of progress is not much stronger, even where these speak of a primitive stage of development. A review of the evidence will show that it cannot be identified in any passage that can be securely dated before the late fifth century, and that caution should therefore be observed in speculating about any supposed earlier origin. It is even absent from two passages written later than 450 which arguably reflect earlier ideas. This conclusion will parallel that of the linguistic part of this paper, but it does not in any way depend upon it.

The passages of cultural history that invite inspection as possible evidence of early fifth-century doctrine form a varied assortment, and each raises its own questions.³⁰

²⁷ The evidence for non-medical authors cited by D. op de Hipt does not pretend to be complete, but the observations he bases on it are generally consistent with mine. He maintains that *-ῶδης* words bearing the sense 'Ähnlichkeit dem Wesen, dem Kern der Sache nach' are a logically late development in the history of the word-group (257, 284). (But I would not cite as an example of this sense, as he does, the doubtful reading *ἀνδρωδέστεροι* at Empedocles 31 B 67 [Vorsokr.]. See text *supra* and n. 13.) The evidence he prints would seem to warrant extending the judgement of lateness to terms expressing similarity of any kind. The only apparent impediment is the adjective in the (questionably) Parmenidean phrase *ἀτάρπιτος... πηλώδης* (28 B 20 [Vorsokr.]). This, however, does not refer to 'stoffliche Ähnlichkeit', as he says on p. 257, but rather to material.

²⁸ Robert Renehan, *Studies in Greek Texts* (Göttingen, 1976) 146, warns that in pronouncing on the currency of words we should not confuse 'earliest' with 'earliest extant'. This cautionary principle, which is true and relevant to the examples he mentions, might be thought relevant here. But it is not. I am not denying to Xenophanes an existing text of an alleged quotation with the argument that it contains a word or usage that is 'too late'. There is no existing text. If there were, the probabilities would have to be recalculated.

²⁹ Other fragments and testimonia of Xenophanes are sometimes cited as relevant to this issue (see Havelock, 106–7). In 21 B 15 (Vorsokr.) animals are imagined as making gods in their own images. Even if this willingness to compare men and animals expresses something more than satirical fantasy, the idea of a shared crudeness and savagery has still not appeared. Again, 21 B 14 refers to the invention of coinage and shows the same interest in discovery as does 21 B 18. But it brings us no closer to a brutish stage in history.

³⁰ A passage of Hesiod and one of Anaximander have also turned up in some discussions. Hes. *Op.* 276–9 contrasts men with animals on the ground that the former possess justice and the latter do not. Instead, animals eat one another. If proof were needed, this would show that

Some of them present uncertainties of date, or authorship, or of meaning. They are as follows:

- (1) Homeric *Hymn to Hephaestus*, 4 (speaking of primitive men):

ἄντροις ναιετάασκον ἐν οὐρεσιν, ἥύτε θῆρες.

The collection of *Homeric Hymns* contains poems of different periods, ranging from the archaic to the Hellenistic or beyond. The dates for some are very uncertain. Nothing in the 8-line *Hymn to Hephaestus* requires a date earlier than the late fifth century. Its association in our texts, however, with hymns of undoubted antiquity has an effect even on scholarly judgement. Theiler, though he concedes the uncertainty of date, treats the hymn as if it were evidence of an early 'popular tradition' while calling attention to line 4. It is true that the indebtedness of men to gods for the arts is an ancient view, but it cannot be assumed that the state from which they rescued men was similarly described at all periods.³¹

- (2) *Trag. Adesp.* 470 (*TGF*²):

ἐπειτα πάσης Ἑλλάδος καὶ ξυμμάχων
βίον διώκησ' ὄντα πρὶν πεφυρμένον
θηρσὶν θ' ὅμοιον. πρῶτα μὲν τὸν πάνσοφον
ἀριθμὸν ἡϋρηκ' ἔξοχον σοφισμάτων.

This fragment, which almost certainly refers to the discoveries of Palamedes, is often attributed to the *Palamedes* of Aeschylus.³² The evidence cited in favour of this attribution is far from persuasive. For example, much weight has been attached to the way in which line 4 almost duplicates *P.V.* 459. Only those who still regard Aeschylus as the certain or probable author of the *P.V.* can continue to cite this argument,³³ and even they must weigh in the balance lines 2–3, which are almost equally close in thought and turn of phrase to *Eur. Supp.* 201–2. Mette, who attributes the fragment to Aeschylus, relies partly on the echo from the *P.V.*, but he develops other arguments as well. He points out its compatibility with Aesch. *Palamedes*, frag.

'brute' had long possessed connotations of moral and social deficiency. What the passage does not say is that the moral distinction between men and animals arose in the course of time. The relation between the two takes a different form in Anaximander 12 A 30 (*Vorsokr.*), where the first men were said to have grown inside a kind of fish. Only, however, in an avowedly speculative account, such as that offered by Havelock (105), can this statement, along with others about the origin of animal life and the invention of the alphabet (12 A 30, 12 C), be taken to imply animal-like behaviour on the part of primitive men.

³¹ W. Theiler, *Zur Geschichte der teleologischen Naturbetrachtung bis auf Aristoteles* (Zürich, Leipzig, 1925), 39–40. Useful comments on the problem of dating can be found in N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974), 3; J. Humbert, *Homère: Hymnes* (Paris, 1959), 214; Klingünther (supra, n. 6), 75.

³² It is left unassigned by Nauck in *TGF*²; by F. Stoessl in 'Die Palamedes-Tragödien der drei grossen Tragiker', *WS* 79 (1966), 94 n. 5; and by M. Griffith, *Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge, 1983), 167, 169, and in 'Aeschylus, Sicily and Prometheus', *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies... Presented to Sir Denys Page...*, ed. R. D. Dawe et al. (Cambridge, 1978), 110. It is referred to the *Palamedes* of Euripides by G. Hermann, *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (Leipzig, 1852), in his note on *P.V.* 460, and also, more tentatively, by F. Jouan, *Euripide et les Légendes des Chants Cypriens* (Paris, 1966), 350 n. 2. It has been more usual to assign it to the *Palamedes* of Aeschylus. K. Wachsmuth emended the text of Stobaeus to reflect this judgement (*I. Stobaei Anthologium* [Berlin, 1884], i. 15), and an equally confident line was taken by H. J. Mette, who adopted the *adespota* as Aeschylean frag. 303 in *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin, 1959) and explained his reasons in *Der verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin, 1963), 107. Mette's judgement has recently been adopted in *TrGF* ii. 138. Nauck's suspension of judgement was better advised.

³³ See M. Griffith, *The Authenticity of the Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge, 1977), 253.

182 (*TGF*² = Mette 304) and urges the possibility that the two come from the same context in that play. It does seem likely enough, as he says, that the latter fragment, in which Palamedes speaks of his invention of military ranks and of having instituted the custom of taking three meals a day, followed close upon a claim to the invention of numbers, such as we find in the *adespota*.³⁴ This argument, however, is effectively nullified by Mette's citation of Plato, *Rep.* 522d, which implies that the conjunction of numbers and military formations was a feature of Palamedes' defence in *several* tragedies and not one alone. Commentators on the *Republic* have understood this.³⁵ Consequently, no certain connection based on content can be assumed to exist between the two fragments. Nor is Mette's case made stronger by his reference to the scholion attached variously to *P.V.* 457, 458, and 459 (τούτων [or ταύτην] τὴν εὕρεσιν καὶ Παλαμῆδι προσήψεν).³⁶ It is not clear to which invention(s) the author of the scholion referred, and in any case such details would have been likely to turn up in more than one Palamedes play. Alternative possibilities, therefore, must be considered, and among these Euripides cannot be ruled out. The coincidence of phrasing with his *Suppliants* will count for something. So will the fact that he is by far the commonest tragic source in Stobaeus, where the lines are quoted. There exists too a fragment from his *Palamedes* (578 *TGF*²) which appears to be taken from a speech into which the *adespota* would fit well. The truth is, however, that no decisive argument has been found for any attribution, and the uncertainty is made greater by the fact that the Palamedes legend was used as material for plays by all three major tragedians and several minor ones, using the titles *Palamedes* and *Nauplius*.³⁷ The fragment, in short, is not datable, and its author is unknown. Its existence does not affect probabilities established by other evidence.

(3) [?Aesch.] *P.V.* 452–3

κατώρυχες δ' ἔναιον ὥστ' ἀήσυροι
μύρμηκες ἄντρων ἐν μυχοῖς ἀνήλίοις.

Here again, the recently revived controversy about the authenticity of this play leaves open the possibility that this description is post-Aeschylean, but we need not rely on this argument. The lines occur in a section (442 ff.) where the condition of mankind before it received the arts from Prometheus is described in some detail. That passage is sometimes loosely said to refer to this condition as 'beastlike' on the strength of its comparison of men and ants.³⁸ But no general term such as *θήρ* is present,³⁹ and

³⁴ *Der verlorene Aischylos* (supra, n. 32), 107. The link would be the words *ἐκατοντάρχους* and *τρίτα* in the *Palamedes* fragment.

³⁵ See G. Stallbaum, *Platonis Opera Omnia* iii.1 (Gothae et Erfurdiae, 1858), 143–4; James Adam, rev. D. A. Rees, *The Republic of Plato* (Cambridge, 1963), ii. 107–8.

³⁶ See C. J. Herington, *The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound* (Leiden, 1972), *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 19, 143–4.

³⁷ See *TrGF* iv. 355, 386. R. Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* (Berlin, New York, 1974), x, has some good comments on the general issues relating to *adespota*. With particular reference to Mette, he decries the invention of 'bad arguments' to justify the attachment of authors' names to them. Jouan (supra, n. 32), n. 2, has further bibliography.

³⁸ 'Tierhafte Behausung' (U. Dierauer, *Tier und Mensch im Denken der Antike* [Amsterdam, 1977], 28 n. 17). Cf. Heinimann, 148; Griffith, *P.V.* (supra, n. 32), 166. Edelstein, 55 n. 73, says that the expression 'brutish' occurs at *P.V.* 453. This is a slip, but it may reflect what he thinks is implied. See n. 48 infra. My own wording at *Socr. Paradoxes* 68 n. 26 was inaccurate.

³⁹ A similar point has already been made by Woodbury (rev. of Guthrie, 353). Commenting on the absence of *θηριώδης* or a like term in *P.V.* 452 ff., *Protagoras* 320c ff., and *Antigone* 332 ff., he sees in it evidence of a distinction between earlier and later sophistic doctrine about human nature. Cf. Heinimann, 148. Edelstein had also concluded that for Protagoras 'the beginnings

it is hard to see why an analogy between men and ants based on a single specific resemblance should be thought to imply a general assimilation of human life to animal life. The passage instead describes these early men as mere children, moping about in confusion like figures in dreams, without the means to make houses, and so dwelling in caves. They resemble ants because they are insignificant creatures caught in a dismal environment, and the choice of the adjectives ἀήσυροι and ἀνηλίοις is designed to make this point. The picture is as specific as the bee-simile at *Il.* 2.87 ff., and it has more in common with such Homeric descriptions than with later comparisons of primitive men and θῆρες.

(4) Plato, *Prt.* 320c8–322d5 (the myth of Prometheus). A double uncertainty hangs over this passage: does it accurately reflect Protagoras' views? if it does, how early did he develop them? Even if we assume that Plato has accurately set down a Protagorean theory developed before 450, there is nothing here to upset conclusions based on other passages in this collection. Primitive men are contrasted at length with animals, whose endowments for survival are natural and against whose attacks men are at first helpless. On the other hand, the habitual injustices practised in the earliest social groups are not presented as beastlike behaviour. Protagoras does not go beyond saying ἡδίκουν ἀλλήλους (322b7).⁴⁰

(5) Soph. *Ant.* 332–75. In this first stasimon, the subject of which is man's achievement of civilisation, animals have a part in the description of civilised life, but only as the objects of prey and of domestication. The first Argument to the play implies a date in the late 440s. Once more we have to reckon with a possible reflection, or at least adaptation, of Protagorean views.⁴¹

(6) Orphic fragment 292 (Kern):

ἦν χρόνος, ἥνικα φῶτες ἀπ' ἀλλήλων βίον εἶχον
σαρκοδακῆ, κρείσσων δὲ τὸν ἥττονα φῶτα δαίζεν.

These lines are quoted by Sextus Empiricus, *Ad. Math.* 2.31 and 9.15, and attributed to Orpheus. Kern, following Maass and Norden, took them to be from an Orphic poem current in the fifth century, and he regarded the reference to primitive cannibalism as evidence of an Orphic source for the doctrine of the θηριώδης βίος of early men. The link between these two ideas is exhibited at Hesiod, *Op.* 276–9, where beasts are distinguished from men by the fact that they devour one another. Cannibalism as an aspect of mankind's primitive state is therefore quite possibly implied in the earliest references to that state as 'brutish', though in extant documents this aspect is not made

of mankind were savage rather than brutish' (24 n. 7). He evidently does not think of this, however, as a distinction between earlier and later doctrine, since he speaks of Anaxagoras as identifying 'man's first form of life with that of animals' (ibid.). This last judgement, however, appears to be reached partly by imputing to Anaxagoras some views of his pupil Archelaus found in 60 A 4 (*Vorsokr.*), and partly by assuming an implicit reference in 59 A 102 and B 21b to an animal-like stage in human history. Both passages speak of man's superiority to the animals, but neither speaks of it as the result of an historical change. In particular διὰ τὸ χεῖρας ἔχειν φρονιμώτατον εἶναι τῶν ζώων ἀνθρώπων (59 A 102 = Arist. *P.A.* 687a7) should not be paraphrased 'it is because man has hands that he becomes wiser than the brutes' (italics mine).

⁴⁰ The reliability of the passage as a source for Protagorean doctrine is discussed in M. J. O'Brien, 62–3, and Guthrie, *HGP* iii. 64 n. 1.

⁴¹ See H. F. Johansen, 'Sophocles 1939–1959', *Lustrum* 7 (1962), 193. Uxkull-Gyllenband, 10, sees the influence of Anaxagoras and Archelaus, citing the fragments now numbered 59 B 21b, 59 B 4, and 60 A 4 in *Vorsokr.* A fragment of Eur. *Aeolus* (no. 27, *TGF*²) also speaks of man's subjection of the animals.

explicit until the middle of the fourth century.⁴² This claim that the doctrine has an Orphic origin is often repeated, but it suffers from the same uncertainty that clouds all discussion of early Orphic beliefs. The similarities of form and thought between fragment 292 and Hesiod, *Op.* 193 and 202 ff., which Norden pointed out, are too slight a basis for an early dating. The source of the fragment, moreover, is late, and the passage at Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1030 ff., sometimes quoted as corroborative, in which Orpheus is said to have taught men *φόνων ἀπέχεσθαι*, offers no real support. Homicide is not cannibalism and, unlike the latter, does not connote a bestial way of life. In fact, much less may be implied, since the phrase is of a kind used elsewhere to decry animal sacrifice and the eating of meat.⁴³ In any case, the *Frogs* is itself too late to serve as a witness to early or mid-fifth-century Orphic teaching. Before such gaps in the evidence, a sceptical attitude to the claims made for the fragment seems justified. There are also more general grounds for caution. The freedom with which the benefits of civilised life came to be attributed in antiquity to different gods and heroes is well known. Irreconcilably comprehensive roles as benefactors of mankind were claimed on behalf of Prometheus, Palamedes, Phoroneus and, under the influence of Egyptian accounts, Isis and Osiris.⁴⁴ Orpheus had from early times been spoken of as a musician and founder of mysteries. At some stage he came to be credited with taming man's bestial nature. One cannot strictly exclude the possibility that a form of this doctrine, which is undeniably found in late antiquity,⁴⁵ had already appeared in Orphic poetry before the middle of the fifth century, in time to inspire philosophical speculation. Linforth has warned us, however, that in the give and take between

⁴² The evidence for a belief in primitive cannibalism is assembled by A. J. Festugière, 'À Propos des Arétologies d'Isis', *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 42 (1949), 215–20. He regards the date of frag. 292 as uncertain (219 n. 36). The matter is complicated by the controversy over the antiquity of the Orphic myth of the dismemberment and eating of Dionysus by the Titans. This is discussed in I. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1941), 307 ff. Contrast M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* i. Band, 3. Aufl. (Munich, 1967), 686. E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1964), 155–6, gives a clear summary. See now M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983), 140–75.

The references in the text above are to O. Kern ed., *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1922), 303; Ernst Maass, *Orpheus* (Munich, 1895), 77 n. 104; Ed. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Berlin, 1913), 371 n. 2. Others who think that Orphic doctrine affected theories of progress include Dierauer (supra, n. 38), 28; A. Graeser, rev. of Cole, in *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 12; Heinimann, 149–52; and W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (London, 1935), 24 n. 5, and 40. Heinimann relies in his argument on the reference to Orpheus in Dem. 25.11, in a context which also refers to the development of civilisation. But the reasons for mentioning Orpheus here that are proposed by Linforth, 98–100, 144–6, seem sufficient: the rhetorical effectiveness of the allusion and the availability of Orphic poetry. Nor is there any need to assume that the author would have drawn his ideas and allusions from a single source. Linforth discusses *Frogs* 1030–6 on pp. 67–71.

F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin, New York, 1974), would derive frag. 292 from a late fifth-century Eleusinian-Orphic poem, but one composed under sophistic (perhaps specifically Prodician) influence (31–39, 158–63, 176–81). M. L. West (supra, this note), though he cites with approval Graf's theory of a probable Eleusinian origin (268), seems elsewhere to imply that such a poem could have appeared no earlier than the mid-fourth century, because only then does Eleusinian poetry begin to be ascribed to Orpheus (23–4, 41, 261).

⁴³ Cf. Empedocles 31 B 136 (*Vorsokr.*).

⁴⁴ For Phoroneus see Paus. 2.15.5, 2.19.5, and Tatian, *Orat. ad Graecos* 39.2. For Isis and Osiris see *IG* XII. 5.739 (1st cent. B.C.); Diod. 1.14; Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 13 (356a); and F. Solmsen, *Isis among the Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, Mass., London, 1979), 27–47. Some nations had their civilisers too, of whom the usual formulas are used. See schol. Eur. *Or.* 1646 (Pelagus); Diod. 3.56.3 (Uranus), 5.66.4 (Kronos); Berosus, *FGrHist* 680.3–4 (Oan).

⁴⁵ Themistius *Orat.* 30.349b (= Kern, frag. 112, p. 33).

philosophers and Orphic writers the latter were almost invariably the borrowers, and that may well be the case here.⁴⁶

There is nothing in all this to encourage an assumption that the doctrine of primeval brutishness was known in the first half of the fifth century. In fact, no reference to it can be confidently placed earlier than the 420s, the commonly accepted date of Euripides' *Suppliants*.⁴⁷ At line 202 of this play, the life from which a provident god saved primitive men is called *πεφυρμένος καὶ θηριώδης*.⁴⁸ The source of Euripides' term *θηριώδης* and of the idea it represents here is obscure, and one might be justified in closing the inquiry at this point. There are, however, additional facts which suggest that the period in which the theory first becomes known to us is also the most favourable time for its emergence. Woodbury has suggested that a description of primitive life as brutish would have first been appropriate in those late fifth-century circles which accepted the antithesis of *φύσις* and *νόμος* in its radical form.⁴⁹ The aptness of this remark is easy to confirm. In its extreme form, the opposition *φύσις/νόμος* expresses the view that human nature, inherently grasping and aggressive, is held in check only by law and custom. In numerous authors it takes the form of a contrast between the licence enjoyed by beasts and the restraints imposed on men in society. In both Aristophanes and Philemon there are characters who deplore the impediments that laws place on our activities, in contrast to the freedom of animals. In Philemon, the latter are said to conform only to *φύσις*. Calicles in Plato's *Gorgias* also finds in the animal kingdom models for behaviour according to nature. Elsewhere the theme is used in order to praise law. In Lysias' *Funeral Oration* the alternative to civic life under the guidance of *νόμος* and *λόγος* is referred to as rule by violence in the fashion of wild beasts. Again, in the first speech against Aristogeiton, attributed to Demosthenes but commonly thought to be by another hand, there is an extended contrast between the influences of *φύσις* and *νόμος* in society in the course of which law is said to be that which keeps our way of life above the level of the beasts.⁵⁰ The affinity between the two doctrines is clearest when the brutishness alleged of early men is moral rather than simply a lack of human comforts and inventions.⁵¹ The most striking illustration of all is a passage from Euripides' *Orestes* in which Tyndareus

⁴⁶ Linforth (supra, n. 42), 359.

⁴⁷ See n. 17 supra.

⁴⁸ Disorder and brutishness go together in some other descriptions of primitive life too, e.g. in Diod 1.8.1. If *ἔφυρον* at *P.V.* 450 is the earliest reference to primitive disorder, it may show that this idea antedates that of primitive brutishness. The same might be said about another detail in *P.V.*, viz. cave-dwelling, which is there sufficiently accounted for as the natural recourse of men who cannot build houses. Elsewhere, e.g. in Hom. *Hymn. Vulc.* 4, it has become a sign of brutishness. Since inherited detail can acquire new significance in the context of a new theory, we are not entitled to say that in the former, and possibly earlier, account cave-dwelling already implies brutishness. See n. 38 supra.

⁴⁹ Rev. of Guthrie, 353. Antiphon the Sophist 87 B 44 (*Vorsokr.*) is an extended example of argument based on this antithesis.

⁵⁰ Ar. *Nub.* 1427 ff.; Philemon, frag. 93 (Kock); Pl. *Grg.* 483d; Lys. 2.19; Dem. 25. 15–16 and 20. The authorship of Lys. 2 and of Dem. 25 is in doubt. See Guthrie, *HGP* iii. 74–7. Max Pohlenz, 'Anonymus *περὶ νόμων*', *NGG* (1924), 19–37, maintains that the general discussion of law in the latter speech is a later addition taken from a treatise written at the end of the fifth century, one which shows Pythagorean and Orphic influence. See also D. F. Jackson and G. O. Rowe, 'Demosthenes 1915–1965', *Lustrum* 14 (1969), 74; R. Sealey, 'Pseudo-Demosthenes XIII and XXV', *REG* 80 (1967), 250–5. Similar ideas were expressed by the Epicurean Colotes. See Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1124–5.

⁵¹ See Isoc. *Paneg.* 28, and Hippoc. *V.M.* 3 and 7 for the latter reference, and Critias 88 B 25 (*Vorsokr.*) and Isoc. *Bus.* 25 for the former.

refers to man's brutishness as a continuing fact rather than as a historical phase long past. His statement takes the form of identifying the antagonist of νόμος in the struggle for public order as τὸ θηριώδες (524). Elsewhere, in a prose passage of Thucydides less influenced by strong emotion but pursuing a similar theme, we find the same agent identified in a more familiar way as ἡ ἀνθρωπεία φύσις (3.45.7). To this extent, the language of the φύσις/νόμος opposition and that of the anthropological theory are interchangeable. Using these terms and ideas, any speaker of Greek could have accomplished an effortless transition from an assessment of the basic forces at work in contemporary society to an account of mankind's ascent to civilisation.

It would be taking no more than a step beyond this to speculate that the doctrine of a self-indulgent, belligerent human nature curbed only by custom and law and imagined as an animal under restraint influenced accounts of human progress, so that these began to speak of a period of natural brutishness antedating the appearance of law. Herodotus (4.106) reported the existence of a northern tribe, the Androphagi, who observed no law and practised cannibalism, the Hesiodic mark of the beast. Such reports may have helped to reshape and darken the conception of lawless primitive existence and at the same time helped to give a radical cast to the new view of human nature. The evidence is too thin, however, to allow us to reconstruct the development of these doctrines and to say with any confidence how they came into conjunction. The sources run deep, if Kirk is right to link the φύσις/νόμος antithesis with the widespread contrast between nature and culture in myth.⁵² The name of Archelaus will claim attention in any closer inspection of this problem, since a case can be made for saying that he deserves the main place in the account. The principal evidence for his role is the version of his doctrine found in Hippolytus, in which the separation of men from animals is an event followed by the establishment of cities, laws, and arts, and the report in Diogenes Laertius and the Suda of his doctrine that the just and the shameful exist οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ νόμῳ. The value of this evidence, however, and with it Archelaus' importance in fifth-century thought, have received very different assessments by scholars. The whole issue lies beyond the scope of this paper.⁵³

The results of this inquiry which are not speculative or unduly problematical can be stated in the form of three conclusions. First, the grounds for tracing the theory of primeval brutishness to the time of Xenophanes or that of Aeschylus are very weak. Second, the theory itself is easily reconciled with the late fifth-century opposition of φύσις and νόμος, and only at this time is it quite clear that it is known. Third, not until then do phrases of the type θηριώδης βίος, which remain closely associated with

⁵² G. S. Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Cambridge, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1971), 152–3, 168. It should not be forgotten either that the man-eating savage is known to Greek poetry as early as the *Odyssey* (9.291 ff., 10.116 ff.).

⁵³ The references are 60 A 4 *ad fin.* and 60 A 1 and 2 (*Vorsokr.*). Uxkull-Gyllenband, 11 n. 21, proposes using Isoc. *Nic.* 5 ff., where a sequence of ideas similar to that in 60 A 4 occurs with the phrasing τοῦ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἀπηλλάγημεν, as a way of supplementing our knowledge of Archelaus' views. Max Pohlenz, moreover, in 'Nomos und Physis', *Hermes* 81 (1953), 423, argues that the antithesis φύσις/νόμος is discernible in Hippocratic writings that he dates to the period around 430, and that here too Archelaus is the source. The attribution to Archelaus of the antithesis in Diogenes Laertius and the Suda (60 A 1 and 2) is part of his evidence. Not to speak of the disagreements about the dates of the medical treatises (see n. 25, above), the value of what Diogenes and the Suda tell us is very differently appraised by Guthrie, who accepts it (*HGP* ii. 340, iii. 58), and by G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, M. Schofield, who are sceptical (*The Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, 2nd ed. [Cambridge, 1983], 389). Heinemann, 113–14, doubts at least the form of expression. W. Burkert cites it along with 60 A 4 as evidence of Archelaus' great importance in cultural history (rev. of Cole, in *AGPh* 51 [1969], 296). In this he agrees with Lämmli (supra, n. 6), 63–71.

the doctrine, find analogies in the usage of other words in *-ώδης*. Where the extant remains are so fragmentary, it would be incautious to state these conclusions in more positive terms. Nevertheless, taken together they leave the way open to an alternative hypothesis that clearly merits serious consideration. This is that the doctrine of primeval moral and physical brutishness was first broached within a period that approximates the third quarter of the fifth century. The original statement of this view, or an early and influential variant, used the term *θηριώδης* to characterise man's first state; at this period such usages were neologisms. The doctrine quickly enriched philosophical and literary conceptions of primitive life and of human nature, producing numerous echoes of substance and of language.⁵⁴ The identity of its author is not apparent. This is a period when more than one philosopher can be assumed to have occupied himself with the history of civilisation, and among these Archelaus and Democritus have good claims to be considered.⁵⁵ The sorting of these claims is another issue.

University of Toronto

MICHAEL J. O'BRIEN

⁵⁴ See note 5 above. The possible influence of this and related doctrines on Euripides' view of human nature is a subject worth study, particularly in *Ba.* and *Or.* (See R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus* [Cambridge, 1948], 112–13.) The clearest evidence is at *Supp.* 200–1 and *Or.* 524. To these one would have to add frag. 894A, line 2 (see Mette, n. 5 *supra*) if it were in fact from the *Sisyphus* of Euripides, a play of 415 B.C. A. Dihle's case for believing that he rather than Critias is the author is set out in 'Das Satyrspiel "Sisyphos"', *Hermes* 105 (1977), 28–42. It seems a serious objection to his theory that the fragment contains a far lower proportion of lines with resolutions than (i) Euripidean tragedies of this period and (ii) the satyr-play *Cyclops*. See Dana Sutton, 'Critias and Athens', *CQ* 31 (1981), 34 n. 9; A. M. Devine, L. D. Stephens, 'A New Aspect of the Evolution of the Trimeter in Euripides', *TAPA* 111 (1981), 44.

⁵⁵ See Democritus 68 B 144 and 154, 68 A 151, and the controversial 68 B 5 (*Vorsokr.*). The history of the dispute over the last is outlined by Cole, 11. The relevant texts for Archelaus are cited in n. 53 *supra*.