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The Verbalisation of Non-Verbal Communication in Classical Greek Texts

My Ph.D. thesis constitutes an investigation into the ways in which non-verbal communication (NVC) is represented and relayed by ancient authors through the use of the written word. This written expression of NVC can be represented in conjunction with oral communication, or independently of it, offering intentionally chosen insight into particular perspectives, concepts or situations. The reasons why a specific author, or authors, chose to include certain non-verbal details are considered, as is the cultural, symbolic, and literary significance of each example. The thesis approaches the subject from historical, anthropological, sociological and philosophical perspectives, while retaining an appreciation of the chronological and methodological limitations of studying the behaviour of a society which cannot be directly experienced.

My thesis is intended to fill a gap in the historical scholarship of classical Athens as, with a few notable exceptions, the study of NVC remains virtually ignored by ancient historians and classicists. Indeed, most of the research in this area belongs to the discipline of art history and does not include a thorough consideration of the subject through the use of literary and historical sources. My research of NVC includes the study of gesture and body language, as well as investigations into kinesics, manipulable elements of appearance, autonomic nervous system responses, haptics, posture, gait, and mobility. Within these areas of inquiry there exist sub-divisions that must also be taken into consideration, e.g., gender, age, socio-economic status, and race. Furthermore, the symbolism and meaning of any element of NVC do not remain static, and the changes and alterations occurring within the means of communication of the society under investigation are critical to any attempt at understanding the role of NVC in that community.

The point of departure for my research is the Attic orators. However, the scope of my work is by no means limited to oratory. Descriptions of NVC are used throughout Greek prose and verse, allowing a web of comparable and conflicting usage to be unravelled. Of particular interest to my work is the influence of early physiognomics and physiognomical thought on the textual usage of the body. In order to establish continuity or change in the attitudes and understanding of NVC in antiquity, the texts I consider are not restricted to the classical period, but spread into adjacent centuries.

For methodological reasons, I have divided this dissertation according to body part or function, and have chosen particular aspects of NVC for detailed analysis, both on a practical and on a theoretical level. While each body movement represents a certain emotion or symbolises a particular response or message, bodily traits and actions need also be considered within the wider context of Greek thought. Bodily movement and expression are evaluated in relation to basic Greek concepts such as the ψυχή, the body, σχήμα, beauty, civic ideals and values, etc. My thesis deals with NVC both as an expression of the ideal and as a possible reflection of reality, taking into consideration its role both as a means to fantasise and as a tool of criticism.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The study of the mentioned non-verbal communication in classical texts offers a new means of evaluating well-known sources. Traditionally, attention has been given in the study of textual sources to the verbalisation of thoughts and speech, while the significance of body language and bodily movement has remained largely neglected. By focusing on the non-verbal, this study will bring to light new dimensions to familiar questions as well as highlight behaviour, and the reactions to that behaviour, which have not before been considered in depth.

Non-verbal communication is a broad and flexible term that has been used to describe a vast array of categories of human behaviour. In order to examine constructively the non-verbal communication of fifth- and fourth-century Athens it is critical to set the boundaries and limitations of this fluid term. For the purpose of this work, non-verbal communication includes those behaviours, be they conscious or unconscious, intentional or unintentional, whose meanings are recognisable within the specific social community. Non-verbal communication consists of a message sent by the encoder, and understood by the decoder, within the cultural context within which they exist. Even when those participating in the communicative exchange are unaware of the non-verbal behaviour they are using to communicate, the non-verbal expressions are by no means random. Random movements or actions and indistinguishable bodily signs are not included in this definition; they have no place within the lexicon of non-verbal communication which is restricted by the premise of a societal agreement of acceptance of meaning.

The study of non-verbal communication in general has gained in prominence as it infiltrates the research of scholars of the humanities and social sciences alike. With the publication of Charles Darwin’s *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* in 1872 and Marcel Mauss’ *Notion de technique du*
corps in 1935, the study of non-verbal communication has increasingly gained attention from social anthropologists, social psychologists, ethologists and other students of human behaviour. The middle of the twentieth century saw the beginning of an intensification of research in this field, with a real increase in publications on the subject in the nineteen-sixties and -seventies. Works by Efron (1941), Ekman (1957, 1972, 1977, 1979), Goffman (1963, 1971), Birdwhistell (1970), Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1970), Kendon (1973), and Argyle (1975) were at the forefront of this new discipline. Non-verbal communication has remained a topic of importance as questions, such as those surrounding the debates on universality versus cultural relativity and biological versus social influences, continue to interest observers of human behaviour. However, despite the acknowledged relevance and importance of non-verbal communication in understanding human interaction, with a few notable exceptions (e.g. Sittl (1890), Bremmer (1991), Lateiner (1987, 1995, 1998), Newbold (1986, 1992, 1997), and Vermeer (1992)), this area of study remains virtually ignored by ancient historians and classicists. Most of the existing research in this area belongs to the discipline of art history (e.g., Fehr (1979), Neumann (1965)) and does not include a thorough consideration of the subject through the use of literary and historical sources.

The textual foundation of the arguments introduced here are Greek texts from the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, with particular attention being paid to the Attic orations. Relevant examples are also taken from sources outside this time-frame; due to the nature of the topic under investigation, flexible chronological boundaries provide for a more complex and interesting reading of classical non-verbal communication. The texts considered allow for fruitful speculation on how

---

2 The modern theorising on non-verbal behaviour has its foundations in the ancient study of physiognomies, whose principles began to resurface in the seventeenth century. By the nineteenth century the study and use of physiognomics were widespread in the intellectual communities of Europe. For an example of an eighteenth-century consideration of physiognomies see Lavater (1800?). For a detailed study of nineteenth-century works on physiognomics see Wechsler (1982); Rivers (1994).
3 See also Scherer and Ekman (1982: 1-44), Harper, Wiens and Matarazzo (1978), Brannigan and Humphries (1972); Ekman and Friesen (1969b).
descriptions of non-verbal communication were used by authors within their respective genres, be it poetry, oratory, philosophy or other forms of Greek prose. The interaction between different types of literature is also considered, as behavioural types and traits appear throughout the Greek sources, in both verse and prose. It must be noted that this study is concerned with the textual representation of non-verbal communication and makes no pretence at representing the behaviour of the average citizen in daily life. While meaning can be projected from literature to reality, when considering a society which cannot be observed, this sort of theorising can never leave the purely speculative stage of analysis (art objects offer interesting additional information, but these too cannot be used as definitive examples of ‘real life’ non-verbal behaviour).

It is the seemingly culturally ingrained reactions to bodily form and movement assumed by the orators that lay the basis for the more philosophic works which addressed these issues, as the stereotypes and prejudices reinforced themselves. The sources are indicative of the flow of ideas from the realm of the orators to that of the intellectual, whereby the content of the orations indirectly draws treatment and commentary from the philosophers. Interpretations of non-verbal communication found in the orations undoubtedly influenced the thinkers of the period, as can be seen through the examples found in texts aimed at less popular audiences. Examples of non-verbal communication in drama also add an additional perspective, as the unique circumstances of the theatre bring forth particular forms of expression. The static mask necessitates the usage by the actor of non-verbal behaviour in order to communicate effectively. The mask itself offers a surface on which to project physiognomic facial types, and the costumes could be used as a means of depicting certain physicalities or physical traits associated with recognisable characteristics. The examples of non-verbal communication which are referred to textually in dramatic poetry are only a fraction of what must have been an extremely rich display of bodily movement. Despite their relatively small number, however, these references are very
important in expanding the scope of argument in favour of the significance of the usage of recognisable non-verbal behaviour.

The study of the non-verbal communication referred to in Greek literature opens up an important perspective on the construction of the citizen ideal and the physical behaviour that accompanies it. The body and its movements are scrutinised within the complex guidelines of acceptable behaviour and categorised to correspond with apparently rigid social norms. Just as a man’s behaviour was judged in the light of a civic ideal, so too was his physicality. The body is an expression of a man’s nature, which in turn is a reflection of the society to which he belongs. The characteristics which form the ideal citizen are expected to be manifested not only in his soul, but in his physical appearance. Furthermore, consideration of the relationship between the physical and the spiritual demands that the role of physiognomics be addressed. Even when the pseudo-science of physiognomics is not applied directly, as is often the case in the fifth- and fourth-century texts (as opposed to the physiognomic treatises of later periods), there is still a strong link between physical appearance and behaviour that is at the foundation of Greek thought on the soul, the body, beauty and nature.

In order to attempt to understand how non-verbal communication can be perceived as an expression of ethical values, it is necessary to consider how the description of the physical was manipulated in both the public and private spheres. The speeches of the Attic orators, which are freckled with references to non-verbal communication and behaviour, provide some insight into the rhetorical usage of the body. Indeed, the use of descriptions of bodily traits and movements to enhance and supplement rhetorical arguments was an identifiable topos. It is these examples, alongside corresponding descriptions in other forms of Greek literature, that allow for speculation on how the physicality of the ideal Athenian citizen was relevant to presentation and self-presentation, and to what degree this fantasy of the ideal man was ingrained in the collective consciousness of the citizen body. Social success depended on a citizen’s ability to project the
acceptable image, constructing the necessary physical behaviour. The non-verbal communication of the καλός κάγαθός, the good and beautiful man, is the standard against which citizens are judged, the individual's physical state being a statement of his nature and conditioning. The Greek ideal of the καλός κάγαθός binds the body and the soul together; this ideal citizen sets the standard of both behaviour and appearance against which all others are judged. Deviations from either the physical or the spiritual beauty or goodness are unacceptable, and neither the ugly nor the evil man can be a καλός κάγαθός. The examples found in the extant sources are presumably reliable indicators of public reaction to non-verbal behaviour, or at least that of the demographic segment which formed the jury, the Assembly, the theatrical audience or the intellectual community. Of particular prevalence in these texts is the notion of the idealised body and bodily movements, which is the standard to which all others are held, and it is the discrepancies from, as well as the similarities to, this physical form which leave a partial sketch of how elements of non-verbal communication were viewed.

Within the study of non-verbal communication there exist sub-divisions, such as gender, age, socio-economic status, race, etc., that must also be taken into consideration. While a recognisable system of non-verbal communication exists within a culture, this does not mean that this code of non-verbal conduct is applied identically to all members of that society, nor that the meaning of a particular aspect of the system remains the same regardless of the identity of the encoder or decoder. Context is paramount to understanding the messages being communicated by non-verbal behaviour and, as a result, the significance of a particular gesture might change, e.g., a kiss could be an indication of affection, of submission, or of aggression. The nuances of non-verbal expression can be extremely subtle, but their detection is essential for a successful interpretation.

Human interaction relies on non-verbal communication not only to supplement the verbal, but to relay information and reflect emotions that are independent of the spoken word. Non-verbal communication is an expression of both intentional and unintentional decisions to communicate a particular message, or messages, that might be either in agreement with, contradictory to, or independent of what is being said orally. Furthermore, while speech can be easily manipulated by the speaker, body language is more difficult to choreograph and falsify convincingly. Indeed, the role that the body plays in communicating is often forgotten or overlooked by those directly involved in the exchange, in particular by the communicator, and it is, therefore, left to express itself in a less contrived manner. The individual acts and reacts non-verbally using all the information that s/he is receiving, consciously or unconsciously, to understand and respond to the ‘whole’ interactive dialogue, not simply to the words being spoken.

The use of a description of any non-verbal behaviour incorporates, either consciously or unconsciously, the interpretative ‘baggage’ connected to the movement under consideration. Hence the significance of the intentional manipulation of body language and movement: in any society self-presentation is germane to social success and even survival, and deviations from the norm can be very damaging to an individual’s reception within that society. Individuals, therefore, try to control and alter their non-verbal behaviour in order to communicate a desired image of themselves, or to achieve results that depend on this being seen in a certain way. However, simply because an individual desires to present him/herself in a certain way does not mean that s/he will be successful, as there are numerous constraints on the use of non-verbal behaviour for self-presentation. Factors such as emotion, individual characteristics, motivation and societal restraints affect the result of an attempt to manipulate non-verbal

---

6 For an example of modern social science research on self-presentation see DePaulo (1991).
behaviour. Human beings are not fully in control of their bodily functions and actions, and the body often communicates messages that are unintended by the sender yet plainly obvious to the receiver. Nonetheless, manipulation of the body is often attempted, with varying degrees of success. The deceitful individual may alter his/her ways but a keen observer will ultimately see his/her true nature. In the classical period, as in the nineteenth-century, movement was believed to have a natural expression and tampering with this balance was thought to cause falsity and reveal an attempt at deceit. In his *Théorie de la démarche*, first published in 1833, Honoré de Balzac states that “tout mouvement a une expression qui lui est propre et qui vient de l’âme. Les mouvements faux tiennent essentiellement à la nature du caractère; les mouvements gauches viennent des habitudes.”

Bad movements are learnt behaviour and reflect a bad character, one which attempts to go against the nature of the body. Manipulation of the natural cannot be sustained, and the body eventually reveals itself.

Furthermore, the study of non-verbal communication foregrounds the question of how a specific cultural grouping sees ‘the body’ and what role ‘the body’ is allotted within its defined area of communication. A society’s use and perception of the body in communication are an indication of the nature of that culture. How the body is portrayed in literature, art, myths and cosmogonies represents society’s impression of itself, appearing as a metaphor in the means of expression of that culture. The body can be seen to represent the society itself, and its cultural treatment can prove to be very telling. Non-verbal behaviour is a culturally motivated means of communication that dictates the accepted forms of movement and alteration that the body can, and should, undergo to express different emotions, ideas and sentiments.

---

8 Balzac 1938: 639.
9 Bentall and Polhemus 1975: 10.
When investigating the non-verbal communication of a society that cannot be witnessed, the observer is left to rely solely on whatever sources have been preserved. This means, obviously, that there is only a partial, contrived description available that can in no way illustrate the full array of non-verbal communication. This does not, however, mean that nothing can be gained or understood from the limited extant and accessible information. In fact, much can be learnt by trying to understand why certain elements of body language and gesture were preserved in a literary description, or used specifically to portray a sentiment, emotion or atmosphere in the extant written texts. That specific aspects of non-verbal communication were related by ancient authors to the audience for which they were writing is indicative both of the existence of a culturally recognisable non-verbal code and of the importance of this code as an addition to spoken and written narrative. Furthermore, because of the constantly changing nature of non-verbal communication, in regard to the cues themselves as well as to the specific cultural meaning of those cues, historical perspective is a necessary addition to a synchronic understanding of non-verbal behaviour.10 However, one cannot assume that classical Greek non-verbal communication carried the same messages as modern non-verbal communication (or of any other time or place), and it is dangerous to attempt to project anachronistic interpretations of non-verbal communication onto fifth- and fourth-century Athens. Nonetheless, one can hope to uncover sufficient references to, and illustrations of, non-verbal communication in order to try to construct some form of classical model that would allow for a satisfactory understanding of textually represented ancient non-verbal communication. This does not mean, however, that interpretation and representation remain static, and within the wider context of antiquity there are changes in what are perceived as ideal movements and physical traits. This premise is even more relevant when discussing larger

10 Poyatos 1983: 46.
historical periods and, while some similarities have survived, efforts aimed at identifying continuity through to modernity are misguided.

The study of non-verbal communication is an essential component in any attempt to reconstruct, understand and interpret the systems of inter-personal communication at work in a particular society, be it modern or ancient. A society’s self-presentation, as well as its representation of others, through its description of the non-verbal, can be very instructive. The perception and interpretation of the non-verbal communication of others within the same society, of individuals belonging to separate cultural groups or to whole distinct cultures, provide interesting information on how a society sees itself, how it sees others and how it attempts to comprehend the intentions and behaviour of those both known and foreign to it.

The Greek texts referred to in this work were taken from the Oxford Classical Texts series and, where no OCT edition was available, from the Teubner series. All exceptions are indicated. Titles of primary sources are according to the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and the Oxford Classical Dictionary (Third Edition) listings.
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2. THE FACE

Facial expression is a topic which has received considerable attention since the physiognomic revival in the seventeenth-century. Indeed, as scientists and social scientists of all disciplines grapple with attempts to explain social behaviour and human physicality, the face remains central. While Charles Darwin was not the first to consider facial expressions, his work is unquestionably the most important of the modern groundbreaking forays into this area of study of human behaviour. Darwin’s *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* is of particular interest and, due to Darwin’s fame from his previously published work on evolution, it became a best-seller when published. Nonetheless, despite its large readership, this book made virtually no impact on the scientific community at the time of publication and it is only with the renewed interest in non-verbal behaviour that its value has been recognised.

While the methodology used by Darwin, and the conclusions derived from it, are the subject of dispute, the work is fundamental to the study and understanding of facial expressions.

With the increased interest in the study of non-verbal communication, the topic of facial expressions has become a central concern for modern ethologists, anthropologists and sociologists. The questions asked by modern scholars of facial expressions can also be applied to the study of non-verbal behaviour in antiquity. Of particular interest is whether facial expressions are universal, i.e., whether an expression can communicate a particular message which transcends all cultural boundaries. If universality is accepted, and by no means should

---

11 See Lavater (1800?), Duchenne (1862), Bell (1877). For a survey of the works which preceded and influenced Charles Darwin’s *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, see Darwin (1965: introduction).
this be taken as a given, can we then apply modern results of the study of facial expression to ancient Greece? It would appear that many of the facial expressions of emotions, such as fear or happiness, are not culturally specific (whereas the expressions might have elements of universality, the emotions themselves are culturally relative). Indeed, there seems to be consistency between the facial expressions used in classical Athens and modern understanding and recognition of these expressions. However, whereas there are many similarities in the meanings of facial expressions, there are some discrepancies in description: e.g. in the Acharnenses, Aristophanes describes eyebrows being raised in anger, whereas the modern, occidental inclination would be to say eyebrows furrow in anger and rise in surprise. Of course, accompanying facial actions are extremely important in interpreting the meaning of an expression. What appear to be identical expressions might change fundamentally when considered in the context of the whole face (and body). Furthermore, the verbalisations of the expressions might change fundamentally when considered in the context of the whole face (and body).
be at the root of apparent differences in interpretation, rather than the actual expressions themselves. Indeed, the assumption that the Greek terminology for emotions and expressions corresponds directly with an English equivalent is in itself flawed.\textsuperscript{19} How the nuances of the expression are described, how much of the total expression is observed, and who is witnessing it are all fundamental problems in making an accurate description of non-verbal behaviour. Even when universality can be argued, the reaction and cultural classification of expressions are very much culturally specific. Context, as well, plays a critical role in deciphering the meaning of an expression. With these limitations in mind, and after considering the facial expressions described in the extant Greek texts, it can be asserted that there appear to be no indications of any major difference in meaning of recognisable expressions.

The question remains, however, of how the Greeks of the fifth and fourth centuries viewed the face and what it represented for them. While modern scholarship offers interesting insights into the causes and occurrences of facial expressions, these do not necessarily correspond with how the Greeks understood their faces, and how and why they moved and reacted as they did. There is no doubt that the face was significantly more than simply another body part. In fact, the very word for face, πρόσωπον, implies a distinction between that which can be seen, the face, and that which is covered, presumably the rest of the body (the hands, another particularly expressive part of the body, also usually remain uncovered).\textsuperscript{20} The face is a combination of traits, such as the eyes, nose, mouth, etc., which together form an expressive entity. The combination of the various features of the face makes it the most expressive grouping of body parts. How this entity, the πρόσωπον, is utilised by ancient authors, if and when it appears in texts, reveals something of how this part of the body was seen to communicate. Both the direct consideration of the face itself, as well as the descriptions of facial

\textsuperscript{19} Russell 1997: 305.
\textsuperscript{20} Frontisi-Ducroux 1995: 19.
expressions which can be found throughout Greek literature, shed some light on how the face and its expressions might have been understood.

The face is the most conspicuous of body parts, and of the face it is the eyes which are held to be the most prominent feature. While each body part is unique, it is only the face which so easily allows for the recognition of an individual, and which is, in most cases, exposed. While it can be argued that an individual can be recognised by other physical traits, e.g., the feet or hands, no other part of the body is so readily available for close scrutiny. Of course, close proximity to the subject is essential for an evaluation of the face.

Perhaps most interesting in the study of the use in classical Greek texts of facial expressions is the relative lack of evidence. The modern reader assumes that the face is of central importance in any physical description, whereas the classical sources offer very few examples of descriptions of an individual’s face. Socrates, who is notably ugly, is the obvious exception. How many other personalities from the classical period have had their faces described in text, of whom a reconstruction, however contrived, can be made of their face? Details regarding specific expressions are preserved much more regularly, although these offer little insight into the actual appearance of an individual. The modern concept of the face being the most identifiable and individual of the physical features appears to receive little textual expression by the classical authors. Even when the face is described, it is often in correlation with details about the body and/or the στενύματα. There are also many descriptions that simply do not include the face, relying on the body alone to portray the individual.

21 Of the physiognomic writers, Polemo Rhetor (second century CE) pays particular attention to the eyes, which he claims are the foundation of the pseudo-science; approximately one third of his Physiognomonía focuses on the eyes. Cicero also refers to the eyes, e.g., De legibus 1.27; De oratore III.221-222. See also Pliny, Naturalis historia XI.143-145. See Frontisi-Ducroux (1995: 25-26); Evans (1969: 12, 15-16).

22 See chapter 6.

23 Examples of such ‘faceless’ descriptions can be found throughout this study. See, for example, Timarchus’ comportment in Aeschines I, 25 (page 80); Nicobulus in Demosthenes XXXVII (page 120); Socrates in Xenophon’s Apologia Socratis XXVII (the eyes, not the face, are beaming. Page 210); and numerous descriptions in the Aristotelian Physiognomonica.
explanation for the relatively sparse use of facial descriptions is that, unlike in modern society, there was no reliance on any technology which projected, preserved or popularised on a grand scale the image of public figures. The politician of the classical period would not necessarily be recognised by the details of his face, but he might have a demeanour or mien which would be identifiable to those attending the Assembly or serving on juries. The details of the face could be fully appreciated only in intimate encounters, and, at least from the textual evidence, do not appear to have the same importance for individual identification as they do in the present century.

The relatively small number of references to the face that do exist are not, however, without significance. Indeed, because these are few in number, their inclusion in the texts is even more interesting to the student of non-verbal behaviour. The face is undoubtedly an important means of communication in Greek text, serving as a medium in the relationship between individuals.\(^\text{24}\) When the face is used by an author, it is to communicate beyond what is being said with words, to depict emotions and meanings which are in need of a physical expression. While examples of facial expressions might not appear very regularly in the texts, the occurrences that do exist are enough to illustrate the potential of the face as a vehicle for symbolism.

### 2.1 Rhetorical usage

Within the orations there exist examples of how one’s physical demeanour and presentation are used to attempt to prejudice the voting citizen. Desirable and undesirable behaviour and appearance are described either to condemn or to praise an individual, with a view to painting an image in the mind of the juror or Assembly member of a certain character or nature that must inevitably

---

\(^{24}\) Frontisi-Ducroux 1995: 22.
accompany specific physical traits. The face figures in a handful of these examples.

While most of these physical descriptions pertain to the prosecutor, the accused or their associates, in [Demosthenes] XXV, *In Aristogeitonem* I, it is the physicality of the jury which comes into play. In [Demosthenes] XXV the orator reminds his jury that the bystanders, both Athenian citizens and others, will know how they voted by the looks on their faces when they leave the court, they will be exposed to those judging their character by physical features. The speaker warns them that their faces will reveal whether they are betraying the law, and asks how they will be able to look the crowd in the face? ἔξιτʼ αὐτίκα δὴ μᾶλʾ ἐκ τοῦ δικαστηρίου, θεωρήσουσι δʼ ὑμᾶς οἱ περιεστηκότες καὶ ξένοι καὶ πολίται, καὶ κατʼ ἀνδρ’ εἰς ἐκαστὸν τὸν παρίωντα βλέψουσαι καὶ φυσιογνωμονήσουσι τοὺς ἀπεψιφισμένους. τί οὖν ἔρεῖτ’, ὁ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, εἰ προέμενοι τοὺς νόμους ἔξιτε; ποίοις προσώποις ἢ τίσιν ὀφθαλμοῖς πρὸς ἐκαστὸν τούτων ἀντιβλέψεσθε;25 Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this passage is the use of the verb φυσιογνωμονέω, one of the first extant examples of this term.26 Undoubtedly, this usage is a reflection of a growing interest in, and possibly adherence to, physiognomic ideas, and the orator’s use of the term implies that he thought to capitalise on a popular trend. While the Demosthenic Corpus has numerous passages which appeal to the principles of physiognomics, this is the one oration which actually calls this practice by name through the use of the verb φυσιογνωμονέω.

The topos of asking the jury how they will be perceived or how they will face bystanders and fellow citizens is common enough27, yet this appears to be the only example where they are threatened that their physiognomy will disclose how

26 The date of this oration is sometime between 338-324; its authorship is considered spurious. See Vince (1935: 515) for a brief discussion.
they voted. The man who votes for acquittal, which the speaker implies is the morally wrong thing to do, does so because of his unjust nature, which will be expressed physically through his bodily traits. Does this, then, mean that the results of the individual’s behaviour can be foretold; that the just man and the unjust man can be recognised by their physiognomy? Alternatively, does just or unjust behaviour alter the physical state, creating the facial expression which is a reflection of the character responsible for a particular action? Perhaps a jury member who has voted unjustly cannot meet the eyes of his fellow citizens as his face will betray the shame and consciousness of his wrong-doing. In the case of [Demosthenes] XXV, the speaker is using physiognomy as a rhetorical threat to try to pressure the jury into voting his way by warning its members that they cannot hide their actions. The orator is clearly manipulating the principles of physiognomy, hoping to take advantage of the popular questioning of how and whether the body reflects the soul.\textsuperscript{28} There can be little doubt that physiognomies had entered the public consciousness. Indeed, for the threat of discovery through physiognomic means to be at all successful, the jurors had to believe, at least to a certain degree, that their character would be expressed physically. It is unlikely that the orator would incorporate physiognomies into his argument if he thought he would be considered ridiculous or if it were a marginal phenomenon. There seems to exist a tension between the belief that man’s nature is expressed physically and the idea that, nonetheless, men can be persuaded to change this behaviour through competent and convincing oratory. An easy solution to this perceived tension is the argument that whatever action is finally taken is, indeed, the expression of the individual’s nature. At this point in the development of physiognomics, the second half of the fourth century, this pseudo-science had not yet developed rigid boundaries. The rhetorical use of physiognomic principles would have been relatively unproblematic from the

\textsuperscript{28} See section 2.5.
perspective of methodology, allowing the orator flexibility in incorporating expressions, traits and characteristics of the face. With the passage of time and the institutionalisation of physiognomics through the writing of physiognomic handbooks, the rules of usage and interpretation would become more rigid.

Another example of a Demosthenic rhetorical use of facial expression is found in *De false legatione*, where the orator describes the life and character of the (allegedly) arrogant, vain, corrupt and treasonous Aeschines. The description of his deeds is not enough, and Demosthenes adds a physical description, including that of his facial expression, ‘puffing his jaw out’, τὰς γνάθους φυσών... Aeschines’ gait, manner of dress and facial expression are held to be proof of his nature, and they are moreover a statement of his friendship with Philip. The orator uses physical description to portray his adversary in the light he wishes the audience to see him, using the physical to conjure up a mental image in the minds of his audience.

The awareness of orators of the influence of physiognomics, or at least the principles which underlie physiognomics, on popular beliefs is also expressed through attempts to negate the impression caused by an undesirable physical appearance. As in the case of other parts of the body and movements of the body, facial expressions and features are subject to evaluation and are considered in relation to the culturally established ideal. Isocrates tells his audience in *Evagoras* that dignity is seen through behaviour, not facial expressions, σεμνὸς

---

29 Perhaps the earliest physiognomically based work is the Hippocratic *Epidemiae* II, 5-6. After this work, the main extant physiognomic texts are [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* from the third century BCE, Polemo, *Physiognomonia*, from the second century CE, Adamantius, *Physiognomonia*, from the fourth century CE, and the anonymous *Physiognomonia Latina*, also of the fourth century CE. The Pseudo-Aristotle refers to the methodology of earlier physiognomists, and it can be inferred from this that there were additional, earlier physiognomic works. Polemo and the later authors also refer to earlier works. The anonymous *Latina*, for example, mentions the physiognomies of Loxus, a Hellenistic physician of the third century BCE. (See Misener (1923)). The fourth century CE sees additional physiognomic writers, including the Emperor Julian, his physician Oribasius, the historian Ammianus Marcellinus, and numerous Church Fathers, such as Gregory Nazianzenus. See Evans (1969); Barton (1994: 95-131); Gleason (1995: 55-81).

30 Demosthenes XIX, *De false legatione*, 314. See page 125 below for further discussion on this passage in relation to Aeschines’ walk.
While this statement might suggest that Isocrates appears to be unconvinced by physiognomies, apparently his audience needs to be instructed to separate appearance from action. The orator is instructing his listeners to judge a man by his actions not by his face, thus emphasising his awareness of what must have been a societal inclination to judge a man by his looks (hardly unique to classical Athens).

There exists within oratory and rhetoric a deep awareness of the influence and impact of bodily appearance and movement. As befits the discipline, the philosophical angle in various orations on the connection between body and nature depends on the physicality of the individuals for whom the speech was written and against whom it was directed. Not only do orators need to consider the bodies of those they represent and against whom they are arguing. The orator must also be acutely aware of his own appearance and movements. In the *Rhetorica* Aristotle instructs the orator to use emotion by describing in full what is said and known, adding personal details to represent the character of both himself and his adversary. He gives the example of the facial expression of looking up angrily from under the brows and instances Aeschines’ accusation against Cratylus that he hissed and shook his fist violently. These are persuasive, as they are what the hearer knows, and become signs of what he does not know.

"Ετι ἐκ τῶν παθητικῶν λέγε δηγούμενος [καὶ] τὰ ἐπόμενα καὶ ἂ ἰσασι, καὶ τὰ ἱδία ἡ σεαυτῷ ἡ ἐκείνῃ προσόντα: "ὁ δ’ ἤφητο με ὑποβλέψας." καὶ ὡς περὶ Κρατύλου Ἀισχίνης, ὅτι διασίζων, τοῦν χειροῖν διασειών· πιθανά γάρ, διότι σύμβολα γίγνεται ταῦτα ἂ ἰσασιν ἐκείνων ὦν οὐκ ἰσασιν. The speaker should at once introduce himself and his opponent as being of a certain nature, so they will see them as such; but do it in such a way that it escapes notice. καὶ εὐθὺς εἰσάγε καὶ σεαυτόν ποιῶν τινα, ἵνα ὦς τολούτον θεωρῶσιν, καὶ τὸν

31 Isocrates IX, *Evagoras*, 44.
While this statement might suggest that Isocrates appears to be unconvinced by physiognomies, apparently his audience needs to be instructed to separate appearance from action. The orator is instructing his listeners to judge a man by his actions not by his face, thus emphasising his awareness of what must have been a societal inclination to judge a man by his looks (hardly unique to classical Athens).

There exists within oratory and rhetoric a deep awareness of the influence and impact of bodily appearance and movement. As befits the discipline, the philosophical angle in various orations on the connection between body and nature depends on the physicality of the individuals for whom the speech was written and against whom it was directed. Not only do orators need to consider the bodies of those they represent and against whom they are arguing. The orator must also be acutely aware of his own appearance and movements. In the *Rhetorica* Aristotle instructs the orator to use emotion by describing in full what is said and known, adding personal details to represent the character of both himself and his adversary. He gives the example of the facial expression of looking up angrily from under the brows and instances Aeschines’ accusation against Cratylus that he hissed and shook his fist violently. These are persuasive, as they are what the hearer knows, and become signs of what he does not know.

The speaker should at once introduce himself and his opponent as being of a certain nature, so they will see them as such; but do it in such a way that it escapes notice. καὶ εἰθὺς εἰσάγει καὶ σεαυτὸν πολὺν τινα, ἵνα ὡς τολούθον θεωρῶσιν, καὶ τὸν

---

31 Isocrates IX, *Evagoras*, 44.
Aristotle recognises the value of physical description as a means of classification and evaluation in the minds of the audience, since it gives them a sign by which they can characterise the litigant or politician. The successful speaker, however, manages to manipulate these type-castings, having enough subtlety to convince the audience of someone’s nature without allowing them to perceive what he is doing. From this passage it becomes apparent that the inclusion of descriptions of non-verbal behaviour was a rhetorical topos.

2.2 Beauty, virtue, nature

In any consideration of the face the topic of beauty inevitably comes to the fore. The face is the most recognisable and easiest to identify of human body parts and is quickly, and perhaps unintentionally, classified according to its beauty, or lack of it. This leads to questions regarding the nature of beauty and what it represents. Is beauty purely physical or does it run deeper than the flesh? Does external physical beauty represent internal beauty, or goodness, or does spiritual goodness surmount the physical? Here the Athenian aristocratic ideal of the καλός κάγαθός comes into play, as beauty and goodness define a man’s nature. The role of beauty, physical and otherwise, is a fundamental question in classical Greek thought. The ambiguity of the term ‘beauty’ is critical, as there is no straightforward division between the beauty of the body and the beauty of the soul.

33 Aristotle, Rhetorica 1417b7-8.
34 This is made even clearer in the works of later rhetoricians. Cicero, for example, regularly made mention of facial expressions and physical characteristics in his work: for instance, in Pro Roscio comoedo VII.20 he calls for comparison between the faces of Roscius and Chaeura in order to establish their characters and proceeds to describe some of Chaeura’s facial traits; in In Verrem II.i.108 there is another example of a description of facial expressions, here with a reference to Claudius, whose delicate curls, dark complexion and self-defined sharp expression make his evil nature transparent. Polemo, the renowned sophist, also used physical descriptions and relied heavily on physiognomies. In his Institutio oratoria XLiii.69-129, Quintilian instructs his pupils on what bodily behaviour and facial expressions to employ while speaking (so as not to appear effeminate and un-Roman). These include a head held straight, no melting glances, eyebrows which are neither too rigid nor too active, etc.
The Demosthenic Corpus’ most vivid example of the impact of beauty can be found in the *Eroticus*, where the orator praises the physical perfection of the youth and claims that this is a reflection of his pure soul and nature. This link between an individual’s physical appearance and his character continues along the lines of the physiognomic principles discussed above in connection with [Demosthenes] XXV. Like [Demosthenes] XXV, this Demosthenic essay is believed to be spurious and its dating is uncertain. The essay, which is unlike an oration in that it does not abide by the rules of forensic argumentation but aims simply to convince the reader of the beauty of its subject, seems to suggest that a youth of such bodily beauty cannot be anything other than noble and honourable.

The young subject of the essay is praised for not suffering from want of rhythm in manner or form, which would mar the magnificence of his body, ἢ γὰρ δι’ ἀρρυθμίαν τοῦ σχήματος ἁπασαν συνετάραξαν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν εὐπρέπειαν, ἢ δι’ ἀτύχημα τι καὶ τὰ καλῶς πεφυκότα συνδιέβαλον αὐτῷ.35 The youth’s beauty is not only in his perfectly formed physique and the elegance of his movements, but also in his face. It is in the face, and the eyes in particular, that the favour of the gods is witnessed. The gods have given this beautiful youth not simply eyes that function, but ones which reveal through their expression his noble, manly character, καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ τῶν ὀρωμένων ἔπιφανεστάτου μὲν ὄντος τοῦ προσώπου, τούτου δ’ αὐτοῦ τῶν ὀμμάτων, ἔτι μάλλον ἐν τούτοις ἐπεδείξατο τὴν εὐνοίαν ἢν εἶχεν εἰς σὲ τὸ δαιμόνιον. οὐ γὰρ μόνον πρὸς τὸ τὰ κατεπείγονθ’ ὀράν αὐτάρκη παρέσχηται, ἀλλ’ ἐνίων οὐδ’ ἐκ τῶν πραττομένων γιγνωσκομένης τῆς ἀρετῆς, σοῦ διὰ τῶν τῆς ὄψεως σημείων τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἡθῶν ἐνεφάνισεν, πρᾶσον μὲν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον τοῖς ὀρόσιν, μεγαλοπρεπὴ δὲ καὶ σεμνὸν τοῖς ὁμιλοῦσιν, ἀνδρείαν δὲ καὶ σῶφρονα πάσιν ἐπιδείξας.36 Although it is not always possible to tell a man’s nature from his actions, in this instance the youth’s beauty is a reflection of the ideal nature; he is

gentle and humane to those who look at him, he is magnificent and revered by those who speak with him, and he is manly and sound of mind to all men. This perfect young man embodies the face, body and nature of the ideal Athenian citizen male. In fact, this Demosthenic description is far from original, as it builds upon the established model for the characteristics, both physical and spiritual, of the καλὸς κάγαθὸς. In this instance the physical requires added weight and depth; the beautiful physique is not enough to be worthy of such praise and love — it must be accompanied by the beautiful nature. Internal as well as external beauty is required.

Non-verbal behaviour, and facial expressions in particular, are utilised throughout Greek prose as an essential narrative tool. Plato’s work is a fine example of how an author can use the body to symbolise human characteristics, capitalising on the societal agreement on the meaning of particular symbols in order to create the desired atmosphere surrounding his subjects. In regard to facial expression, Plato’s Phaedo provides a good example. Here the author uses the face to project the unique nature of Socrates’ character, that of a man who faces death unshaken. Καὶ ὁς λαβὼν καὶ μᾶλα ἰλεως, ὁ Ἐχέκρατες, οὐδὲν τρέσας οὐδὲ διαφθείρας οὔτε τοῦ χρώματος οὔτε τοῦ προσώπου, ἀλλ’ ὀσπερ εἰσὶ θει ταυρηδόν ὑποβλέψας πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπον... Socrates’ strength and resolve are represented by his untainted complexion and face, by his customary expression, looking up from beneath his eyes like a bull, remaining calm despite the strenuous circumstances. In the description, Socrates’ face serves as the symbol of his inner strength and resolve. In his noble and brave reaction to death the philosopher expresses his belief in the immortality of the soul which leaves

---

37 Kahn (1996: 9-12) writes that the historical Phaedo composed a Socratic dialogue entitled Zopyrus in which the oriental physiognomist reads Socrates’ face, claiming him to be dull, stupid and a womaniser. While Socrates’ disciples considered the physiognomist to have made a mistake, Socrates states that Zopyrus is correct and that he has managed to overcome his natural characteristics only through rational training.

38 Plato, Phaedo 117b. Compare this with the unchanging complexion of the brave Homeric hero in the Ilias, XIII.278-286.
behind the prison of flesh which is the body.\textsuperscript{39} As the subject of the discussion is Socrates, there is obviously no question of physical beauty (see below for more on the ugliness of Socrates), but nonetheless the virtue and nobility of character come to reflect an inner beauty which transcends physical limitations.

Descriptions of the face are used in the literature of those desiring to portray a certain nature or character of an individual. Not surprisingly, facial expressions are often attributed to great men and to men in defining situations. It seems as though physical description was a successful means by which to enhance the portrayal of the character being projected. In Xenophon's \textit{Hellenica}, for example, Agesilaus is described as having a very bright (beaming) face, \textit{μάλα φανερωμένη τῷ προσώπῳ}, a means by which the author further demonstrates the confidence of the king.\textsuperscript{40} Agesilaus knew that the arrogant Tissaphernes had broken his oath and angered the gods, who would then turn against him and support the Greeks in battle. The imagery evoked by physical description creates an impact on the reader that could not be achieved otherwise, the beaming face of confidence 'speaking' volumes. Whether Agesilaus is beautiful or not is not stated, but his facial expression certainly implies the noble character of a successful king. According to Plutarch, who could only be reconstructing the physical appearance of Agesilaus through tales which filtered down through the generations, the king both was lame, \textit{τὴν δὲ τοῦ σκέλους πήροσ}, and was reported to be short and despicable in appearance, \textit{λέγεται δὲ μικρός τε γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν ὄψιν έυκαταφρόνητος}.\textsuperscript{41} Plutarch explains away his deformities, saying that they enhanced his ambition and that his personality transcended his physical defects.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{39} Loraux 1982: 34. See page 210 for Xenophon's 'beaming' Socrates (this description includes the eyes but not the face).

\textsuperscript{40} Xenophon, \textit{Hellenica} III.iv.11. The same description is found in \textit{Agesilaus} I.13. Interestingly, Xenophon uses in both these descriptions of Agesilaus and in that of Socrates in his \textit{Apologia Socratis} XXVII.1-3 (see page 210) the word \textit{φανερός} to describe these men who are reported to be physically unattractive, yet have noble natures.

\textsuperscript{41} Plutarch, \textit{Agesilaus}, II.2.

\textsuperscript{42} See section 4.4 on deformity.
much of this account is based on reality. Indeed both Xenophon and Plutarch claim that Agesilaus forbade any likeness of himself to be made, thus ruling out even the contrived portrait of a statue as a means of appraising the king’s physicality. The physical appearance of Agesilaus seems to have belied his goodness of nature.

2.3 Beauty and ugliness

Xenophon was not unique in allowing for a discrepancy between the interior and exterior of a man. In his speech in Plato’s Symposium, Socrates expatiates on the wisdom of Diotima, his instructress on love, recalling what she said on the subject of beauty and the appreciation of the highest beauty which goes beyond the physical characteristics of the face or the body. The absolute beauty described is beyond physical manifestation, and it is this absolute beauty which will be the end result of a man’s toil for love, when he sees the τὴν φύσιν καλὸν of this love. …πρῶτον μὲν ἂν ὁν καὶ οὔτε γιγνόμενον οὔτε ἀπολλύμενον, οὔτε αὐξανόμενον οὔτε φθίνουν, ἔπειτα οὐ τῇ μὲν καλὸν, τῇ δ’ αἰσχρόν, οὗδὲ τοτὲ μὲν, τοτὲ δὲ οὗ, οὐδὲ πρὸς μὲν τὸ καλὸν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ αἰσχρὸν, οὔδ’ ἔνθα μὲν καλὸν, ἔνθα δὲ αἰσχρόν, ὡς τις μὲν οὖν καλὸν, τις δὲ αἰσχρόν οὖδ’ αὖ φαντασθῆται αὐτῷ τὸ καλὸν οἷον πρόσωπον τι οὐδὲ χεῖρες οὐδὲ ἄλλο οὖδὲν ὅν σῶμα μετέχει, οὔδὲ τις λόγος οὖδὲ τις ἔπιστήμη, οὐδὲ ποὺ οὖν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τινί, οἷον ἠν τζῶ ἢ ἐν γῇ ἢ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἢ ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ μεθ’ αὐτοῦ μονοειδὲς ἂεὶ ὅν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα καλὰ ἐκείνου μετέχονται τρόπον τινὰ τοιοῦτον, οἷον γιγνόμενον τε τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ἀπολλυμένων μηθὲν ἐκείνον μήτε τι πλέον μήτε ἐλάττων γίγνεσθαι μηδὲ πάσχειν μηδέν. This absolute love is not diluted by the physical, it is immortal.

43 Xenophon, Agesilaus XI.7; Plutarch, Agesilaus II.2. For Xenophon on the importance of a commander’s physical appearance see Cyropaedia VI.iv.20. See page 202 for more on this passage.
44 Plato, Symposium 210e6-211b5. See page 67 on the Symposium 211a5-7.
in its freedom from the encasement by flesh or colour or other tangible restrictions (211e).

This Platonic speech by Socrates fits into the dialogue just before Alcibiades enters the scene and makes his drunken declaration of love for the philosopher. Plato places Socrates, who is renowned for his ugliness, side-by-side with Alcibiades, whose beauty was admired throughout Athens, as if to make the very point that the physical need not be in correspondence with character. Nonetheless, when considering the accepted mythology surrounding these two individuals, one can speculate on how their physical beauty, or lack of it, affected public response. On the one hand, the beautiful Alcibiades was adored before his downfall, and even after betraying his city he was called back in a desperate attempt at salvation. Socrates, on the other hand, is condemned by his fellow citizens and executed. Unlike Alcibiades, Socrates did not have the physical beauty with which to dazzle the public and with which to influence others. The physical ugliness of Socrates was probably an affront to his fellow citizens, just as his actions were. Still, the beautiful Alcibiades is in love with the ugly Socrates who, a master of self-control, withstands the younger man’s charms. Socrates does not fall for the superficial beauty of the body. Indeed, he represents the goodness and absolute beauty that goes beyond the physical. Ultimately, it is the inner beauty of Socrates which perseveres, as history ultimately condemns Alcibiades, whose physical beauty, like all physical beauty, faded and withered with death. Socrates, however, whom the citizenry mocked and rejected while living, is preserved in the most complimentary style by his disciples, friends and

45 For some examples of the physical descriptions of the ugly Socrates see Aristophanes, Aves 1281ff., on the long hair, half-starved, unwashed and Socratified appearance of his supporters; Xenophon, Symposium IV.19 as an ugly satyr; Xenophon Symposium V.5 for slanting (bulging) eyes; Plato Theaetetus 143e, not handsome, with snub nose and bulging eyes, also 209b; Plato, Meno 80a, like the flat torpedo fish of the sea; Plato, Symposium 215b, 216c-d, 221d-e, 222d, Silenus-like figure or satyr. See Evans (1969: 46); Misener (1924: 106). On the portrayal of Socrates in Greek and Roman art, see Zanker (1995: 32ff.) for a detailed discussion.
later authors. Diotima’s account of the love of true beauty which is beyond the physical corresponds with the Platonic rehabilitation of Socrates. The contrast in the *Symposium* between the beautiful and the ugly, the decadent and the virtuous, Alcibiades and Socrates, elevates the inner beauty over the external and rejects the notion that the exterior is necessarily a direct reflection of the internal.

What does it mean to the theory of beauty and goodness that Socrates was ugly? Alcibiades beautiful? Is Plato offering an explanation of beauty which incorporates both the physical and the inner goodness? Indeed, according to Diotima’s instruction, all beauty is the same (210a-b), which suggests that the physical beauty of Alcibiades and the spiritual beauty of Socrates are at the very least related. That one is physically attractive and the other unattractive should be irrelevant, as the love of a particular individual is a point from which one must depart in the quest for love. The love of the particular example of beauty, e.g. of a man or a boy, is beneath the love of beauty itself, which incorporates the whole (210c-d). There should be no place in love for subjectivity or change. Absolute beauty is complete and unchanging, and it is towards this beauty that men must strive to direct their love. The love of absolute beauty is achieved through the ascent from the love of physical beauty to the love of beauty itself (211b).

According to Diotima, the matters of love should be approached by always rising, from one to two beautiful bodies, from two to all beautiful bodies, from beautiful bodies to beautiful practice, from practice to beautiful knowledge, from specific knowledge to complete knowledge, concerned with nothing other than the beautiful knowledge, in order to know, ultimately, the complete beauty. 

---

47 See Nehamas 1998.
It would appear that the tensions between the physicalities of Socrates and Alcibiades are brought out by the staging of this dialogue on Eros and complement the concepts of love and beauty as presented by Diotima’s arguments. Absolute beauty is true love, it is the expression of goodness that transcends the physical. The beauty of the soul is more honourable than the beauty of the body, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὸ ἐν ταῖς φυσιαῖς κάλλος τιμωτέρον ἡγήσατο, τοῦ ἐν τῷ σῶματι... Socrates is the embodiment of this principle, and Alcibiades, who is renowned for his physical beauty, recognises this goodness and loves Socrates for it. Nonetheless, this love is a particular love of one man, not the absolute love that transcends the physical as advocated by Diotima and Socrates. Socrates, who has ascended above the desires inspired by bodily beauty, does not reciprocate the erotic passion of Alcibiades and remains detached from his claims of lust and love. The physical beauty of the one man is beneath the love of him who loves absolute beauty.

It appears that there are a considerable number of instances where the topic of beauty arises in the presence of Socrates, or at least the topic arises in the dialogue constructed by Plato in which Socrates is inevitably the central character. Considering Socrates’ reputed ugliness, he is an appropriate presenter for the argument which subordinates physical beauty to the absolute. Plato seems to use the ugliness of Socrates’ face to make his point of how exterior beauty is not a reflection of the inner nature or worth. Socrates is the living paradigm of the

---

51 Plato, Symposium 211b7-c9.
52 Plato, Symposium 210b6-7
53 It is interesting to note that Alcibiades, who desires to be Socrates’ lover but who is rejected, is assassinated before his beauty fades; thus, by dying, he saves his vain self from the inevitable physical deterioration of old age.
54 Nussbaum 1986: 185.
Platonic belief that things are not defined by their physical manifestation, that the truth is not in appearance, but elsewhere. Indeed, Socrates is the prime Platonic example of beauty which far surpasses the temporary aesthetic value of the physical. In the fifth- and fourth-century works which describe his appearance and recount his actions, the physicality of Socrates does not define his nature; the physiognomic principles which inter-link internal and external, nature and body, do not dominate these literary physical descriptions. This is not to say that they were not influential, but the physical portrait was not automatically taken as a character description. Socrates was described as unattractive yet noble in character, but it seems that his appearance needed nonetheless to be justified or explained; Socrates was, by classical standards, ugly, yet he was beautiful in nature. His lack of physical beauty did not prevent his being admired by his followers and students, as is seen through Alcibiades, the beautiful in body, love and desire for him. Indeed, he tells of Socrates’ response to his declaration of love and desire to satisfy him. Socrates, putting on his habitual expression of feigned innocence (another facial expression used to portray a character and set the tone of the exchange) tells Alcibiades that he is not being common, that if he sees what he claims to see in Socrates, then he must see in him an extraordinary beauty that greatly surpasses his beauty of form. Καὶ οὗτος ἀκούσας μάλα ἐιρωνικῶς καὶ σφόδρα ἑαυτῷ τε καὶ εἰσθότως ἐλέεσθαι ὁ Φίλε Ἀλκιβιάδη, κινδυνεύεις τῷ ὃντι οὐ φαύλον εἶναι... ἀμήχανον τοῖς κάλλοις ὀρῶσις δὲν ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τῆς παρὰ σοὶ εὑμορφίας πάμπολο διαφέρων.

The Symposium is not the only Platonic dialogue which deals with questions relating to love, beauty and the absolute. In Cratylus, Plato presents Socrates and Cratylus discussing how things might be learned, whether by their

55 Frontisi-Ducroux 1995: 53. See page 209 on the bodily ‘mask’ that Socrates uses to disguise his true nature.
56 Evans 1969: 46; On iconic portrayals see Misener (1924).
57 Plato, Symposium 215a-222b.
58 Plato, Symposium 218d6-e3.
names or through themselves, and whether absolute beauty of goodness exists, πότερον φῶμεν τι εἶναι αὐτὸ καλὸν καὶ ἄγαθον καὶ ἔν ἐκαστον τῶν οὐτῶν οὕτω, ἤ μή. Socrates announces that they will look carefully at absolute beauty, not facial beauty and other such things, and whether it is in flux. Αὐτὸ τοῖνυν ἐκείνο σκεψώμεθα, μὴ εἰ πρόσωπον τί ἐστὶ καλὸν ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων, καὶ δοκεῖ ταῦτα πάντα ἰσθ' ἀλλ' αὐτὸ, φῶμεν, τὸ καλὸν οὐ τοιούτον ἀδεὶ ἐστὶν οἶν ἐστὶν. The implication of this statement is that human physical beauty, and that of the face in particular, constantly changes and is not absolute. Things that are in flux cannot be known only through themselves, and as things are known through naming, then without constants nothing can be known (440a). Knowledge is saved, however, if the dream of the existence of absolute goodness and absolute beauty is true. To call a physical trait beautiful is not to know beauty; the face of an individual is not where true beauty lies. Beauty can be known only through the absolute, which is beyond physical characteristics.

Not only does physical beauty alter (and eventually fade) with the changes to the body or face, but physical beauty is a subjective quality that cannot be absolute. Even within the restrictive boundaries of the ideal physicality of an Athenian citizen or citizen’s woman (mother, wife or daughter) there exists enough room for personal taste and dispute over who is considered the most beautiful. Not only is physical beauty subject to some subjectivity, but the rules of behaviour and demeanour also alter. Physical appearance is more than the sum total of the bodily characteristics in their static form, but includes how the body is moved and held, how one presents and holds oneself. As has been seen above from the Demosthenic reference to facial expressions, the manipulation of the body can be as important as the physical features (e.g., is the fact that the

59 Plato, *Cratylus* 439c7-d1.
60 Plato, *Cratylus* 439d3-6.
62 For example, Homeric non-verbal communication is based on a heroic ideal, which demands physical behaviour different from that of the democratic ideal. See Bremmer (1991).
mouth is smiling less important than the thickness of the lips?). Indeed, references to the face in classical Greek texts most often describe facial expression, not the appearance of particular characteristics. The physical is constantly changing, never reaching the static condition necessary for achieving an absolute state, the absolute goodness and beauty referred to by Socrates in the Platonic dialogues; the absolute is removed from the restrictions of the physical.

Not all descriptions of Socrates were accompanied by a complimentary presentation of his character. Most notable is Aristophanes’ portrayal of him in the *Nubes*. Presumably, Aristophanes was expressing a disdain for Socrates that would find a sympathetic response from his audience. The mask of the character of Socrates would need to be identifiable to the audience while also being comic. Presumably the mask for the actor playing Socrates was a gross caricature of the ugly features attributed to him.63 While the masks of Old Comedy often characterised specific individuals, in New Comedy masks increasingly used physiognomic features which portrayed standard stereotypical characters.64 In tragedy, too, there were mask types, as the types of characters each had an identifiable mask which demonstrated its age, nature and role through expected and easily identifiable physical traits. The face of the character, Socrates in the case of the *Nubes*, was used by the poet for dramatic effect in the form of a mask. In Aristophanes’ mockery and condemnation of Socrates, he ridicules not only his behaviour but his ugly appearance.

The attitudes of the ancient Greeks towards ugliness were to a great extent similar to their treatment of the disabled. Ugliness became a form of disability as, due to societal rejection, it hindered the citizen in his duty to the city. Just as physical handicaps are the butt of comic poetry, so too is ugliness.65 The ugly are a deviation from the ideal citizen norm of physical soundness and beauty and

63 Fergusson 1940: 108. A short review of the facial expressions of masks, primarily as reported by Pollux, is found in this article. See also Frontisi-Ducroux (1995); Misener (1924: 105); Pickard-Cambridge (1988: 218-231); Wiles (1991: 24-26, 70-71).
64 Evans 1969: 33-38.
were, therefore, rejected. Plato’s detailed dialogues on the subject of beauty and his treatment of the physical appearance of Socrates seem to illustrate this point. The ugly Socrates is once again disrupting the normative state, not only through his words and thoughts, but also through his face. Socrates’ face, with its uncitizen-like characteristics, could not have been anything other than offensive to a public which was already hostile to his influence and behaviour. If Socrates were to be analysed from a physiognomical perspective, there would be no question but that he would be seen to have the traits of a man with an evil nature; the Aristotelian Physiognomonica claims the snub-nosed are salacious, like the deer, and that bulging eyes are a sign of stupidity, as in the ass.

In Plato’s Symposium, Socrates recounts Diotima’s explanation of why Beauty is loved, this love being really a desire to reproduce, both in body and soul, with the beautiful rather than simply the love for beauty itself. Diotima continues by explaining that men desire to bring forth children and they can desire to do so only with the beautiful, and not with the ugly or shameful. Childbirth requires a divine act which puts the immortal into a mortal being, and for this the ugly are unsuitable. Birth requires beauty, whereas if it encounters ugliness it rejects it with a look of anger and distress, it coils up, turns away and shrinks back, not giving birth but holding back the foetus.

\[\text{κυωύσι γάρ, ἐφη, ὁ Σώκρατες, πάντες ἀνθρωποὶ καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἐν τινὶ ἡλικίᾳ γένωνται, τίκτειν ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡμῶν ἢ φύσις. τίκτειν δὲ ἐν μὲν αἰσχρῷ οὐ δύναται, ἐν δὲ τῷ καλῷ. ἡ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικῶς συνοφθαλμία τόκος ἐστίν. ἐστὶ δὲ τοῦτο θεῖον τὸ πράγμα, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν θυμῷ ὀντὶ τῷ ζῷῳ ἀθάνατον ἐνεσθείν, ἡ κύησις καὶ ἡ γέννησις. τὰ δ’ ἐν τῷ ἀναμμόστῳ ἀδύνατον γενέσθαι. ἀνάμμοστον δ’ ἐστὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν παντὶ τῷ θείῳ, τὸ δὲ καλὸν ἁρμόστον. Μοῖρα οὖν καὶ Εἰλείθυια ἡ Καλλονή ἐστὶ τῇ.}\]

---

66 Zanker 1995: 32-34. Zanker also discusses the transformation of the image of Socrates in later periods.
Ugliness, due to its incompatibility with the divine, is rejected by those desiring to bring forth children. In effect, the ugly cannot be the object of physical love. Only when love goes beyond the physical can beauty be internal, detached from the individual. This absolute beauty, however, is not the object of a love which will lead to reproduction, which necessitates a physical expression of the act of love.

2.4 The Soul

The relationship between body and soul is a topic of much consideration in classical philosophy (as well as of non-classical philosophical thinking), and the face plays a key role in this discourse. The face is part of the mortal, tangible physical packaging of man, while it can also be understood as the organ of the soul, through the eyes and facial expressions. In Plato’s *Alcibiades* I, Socrates and Alcibiades are discussing how the soul is man, and how when two people are conversing it is not a discussion between faces but between souls. ΣΩ. Τοῦτ’ ἄρα ἢν ὁ καὶ ὅλῳς ἐμπροσθεν εἶπομεν, ὅτι Σωκράτης Ἀλκαβιάδη διαλέγεται λόγῳ χρώμενος, οὐ πρὸς τὸ σῶν πρόσωπον, ὡς ἐοίκεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἀλκαβιάδην ποιούμενος τοὺς λόγους· τοῦτο δὲ ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή. The face (body) is not the man, it is his soul which defines his being. The dialogue continues with a discussion on how to know the body is not to know the man, a principle which can be reconciled with the above discussion on absolute beauty. Here too it is not the physical, but that which is beyond it, which is significant.

---

69 Plato, *Alcibiades* I 130e2-6.
In the *Timaeus*, which puts forth the idea of the head being the house of reason, Plato states that the head has been given a body to transport this divine dwelling of the *ψυχή*. On the head there is the face, thus making the front of the body dissimilar and more dignified than the back. The face is said to be bound to the organs which act as the forethought of the soul, διὸ πρῶτον μὲν περὶ τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς κύτως, ὑποθέντες αὐτόσε τὸ πρόσωπον, ὄργανα ἐνέδησαν τούτων πάση τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς προνοίᾳ, καὶ διέταξαντο τὸ μετέχον ἡγεμονίας τούτ' εἶναι, τὸ κατὰ φύσιν πρόσθεν. The face is thus linked to the soul through the sensory organs, opening the door for the interpretation of facial expression as a reflection of the soul.

The explanation of the human body found in *Timaeus* 44-45 depends on a comparison drawn with the structure of the universe. As in the universe, the divine is housed in a sphere which controls the rest of the body (44d). Later in the text, Plato gives a more detailed description of the structure of the body and its functions. In addition to the immortal soul which is found in the head, the mortal parts of the soul are housed in the body, divided between the more noble upper parts (heart and lungs), the base lower parts (stomach, liver, spleen) and the rest of the body, i.e. those parts which are even below the lowest of the mortal soul and which perform the purely physical function of serving man’s appetite and gluttony (72d-73a). Plato gives detailed explanations in the *Timaeus* of the construction of the human body, which is unquestionably the vessel and vehicle of the soul, both mortal and immortal.

The type of division of the body into more and less noble parts as seen in the *Timaeus* can also be found in Aristotle’s *De partibus animalium*, where it is stated that things which are considered high are placed high, in the front and to

---

70 See pages 164ff. for more on the *Timaeus*.
71 Plato, *Timaeus* 45a6-b2.
72 Cornford 1937: 150-151.
the right. Things that are base would appear low, in the back and to the left. The example of the heart is given: it is placed higher rather than lower, forward and not in the back, thus showing how nature places the noble in the most noble of places. If this argument can then be applied to the head and the face, it would appear that the head, which is the highest part of the body, would house the noble soul, and the face, which is to the front of the head, would be the expression of this soul.

Aristotle had a different view of the soul from that of Plato. Aristotle himself writes in *De anima* that previous thinkers treated the soul as an independent entity, not explaining its connection to the body, συνάπτουσι γὰρ καὶ πιθέασιν εἰς σώμα τὴν ψυχήν, οὐθὲν προσδιορίσαντες διὰ τῶν αἰτίαν καὶ πῶς ἔχουσιν τοῦ σώματος. καίτοι δοξεῖν ἄν τοῦτ’ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι. διὰ γὰρ τὴν κοινωνίαν τὸ μὲν ποιεῖ τὸ δὲ πάσχει καὶ τὸ μὲν κινεῖται τὸ δὲ κινεῖ, τούτων δ’ οὐθέν ὑπάρχει πρὸς ἀλληλα τοῖς τυχόσυν, οἱ δὲ μόνον ἐπιχειροῦσι λέγειν ποιῶν τι ἡ ψυχή, περὶ δὲ τοῦ δεξιούμου σώματος οὐθέν ἐτι προσδιορίζουσιν, ὡσπερ ἐνδεχόμενον κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγόρεικος μῦθους τὴν τυχόσων ψυχὴν εἰς τὸ τυχόν ἐνυφάσθαι σώμα: δοκεῖ γὰρ ἐκαστὸν ἴδιον ἐχεῖν εἴδος καὶ μορφήν. Aristotle, unlike Plato, believed in the primacy of particular material objects rather than universals, and identified these materials with substance. The material objects are concrete and individual, more than simply matter. In comparison to the postulates of Platonic universalism, which

75 Aristotle, *De partibus animalium* 665a18-22. See section 3.3 for a more detailed discussion on opposites, right/left in particular. In *Historia animalium* 493b16-20, Aristotle addresses the subject of the left and right sides of the body. Here he states that the right and left are nearly alike in all their parts, except that the left side is weaker. Ἐχει δ’ ὁ ἀνθρώπος καὶ τὸ ἄνω καὶ τὸ κάτω, καὶ τὰ ἐμπρόσθεν καὶ τὰ ὀπίσθεν, καὶ δεξιὰ καὶ ἀριστερὰ. τὰ μὲν οὖν δεξιὰ καὶ ἀριστερὰ ὄμως σχεδὸν ἐν τὰς μέρες καὶ ταύτα πάντα, πλὴν ἀναβείνει τὰ ἀριστερὰ. The implications of this argument for the perception of the role of the heart are interesting. See *De partibus animalium* 666b1-11, where Aristotle does not deny the heart its fundamental role of being the source of life, he simply redistributes it from the left side to the centre of the body, placing it in the upper, as opposed to the lower, half, and closer to the front than to the back. Aristotle acknowledges that the heart is towards the left, offering explanations as to why this highly important organ is on this side. See also *Historia animalium* 496a, 507a. Lloyd 1962: 62-63.
77 Hartman 1977: 4-5.
does not require a physical manifestation of Goodness and Beauty, Aristotle held that beauty cannot exist without an individual material object. Aristotle gave individual substances priority over universals.78 Whereas Platonic thinking suggests that the soul is a substance independent from the body, Aristotle argues that the soul is the form of the body and that when the soul leaves the body at death the body (corpse) is then simply matter which has only an accidental similarity to the soul.79 The soul is the individualisation and continuity of the body; so long as the soul exists in the body then the person exists, and continues to exist, as that individual.80 The soul is the nature of living things, and is, therefore, its form. Both body and soul together form the unity which is the living organism, the soul being the substance to the matter which is the body, ἀναγκαῖον ἀρα τὴν ψυχὴν οὕσιαν εἶναι ως εἴδος σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζωῆς ἕχοντος.81

Aristotle also states that the physical endowments of men are the result of man’s form, i.e., that any animal is given the organs and physical traits which it can use; for example, man is given hands since he has the intelligence to use them.82 The face as an organ of expression can be understood according to this principle. In the Historia animalium the face is explained within the context of the traits of man and animals. It is stated here that man is the only animal to have a face.83 Τὸ δ’ ὑπὸ τὸ κρανίον ὀνομάζεται πρόσωπον ἐπὶ μόνοι τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων ἀνθρώπου ἱχθύος γὰρ καὶ βοῦς οὐ λέγεται πρόσωπον.84 If humans are unique in having a face then, according to Aristotle, it is because only they have the capacity to use such an organ. Nature does not do things which are without

80 Hartman 1997: 103-104.
81 Aristotle, De anima 412a19-20. Lear 1988: 96-98. On the connection between body and soul, see also De anima 412b6-13; 413a2-6; 414a19-28.
82 Lear 1988: 49. Aristotle, De partibus animalium 687a2-13. This passage is dealt with in more detail in relation to hands on page 69.
83 Peck (1965: 38) notes that “[n]evertheless, there is mention of the face of a baboon at 502a20, and of the face of a chamaeleon (compared to that of a pig-faced baboon) at 503a18.”
84 Aristotle, Historia animalium 491b9-11.
reason nor make things which are superfluous, διὰ τὸ μὴ δεῖν μάτην ποιεῖν τὴν φύσιν μηδὲ περίεργον.\(^{85}\)

A possible explanation for why Aristotle claims that only humans have faces is to be found in the Aristotelian *De partibus animalium*. The author is explaining the parts of the body that are associated with the head, including the face. The face, he writes, is called πρόσωπον because it is called by name after the action it represents, man’s unique ability to stand straight up and transmit his voice forwards. Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων μορίων τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σχεδὸν εἶρηται, τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων καλεῖται τὸ μεταξὺ τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ τοῦ αὐχένος πρόσωπον, ἀπὸ τῆς πράξεως αὐτῆς ὀνομασθέν, ὡς ἐοικεν: διὰ γὰρ τὸ μόνον ὄρθων εἶναι τῶν ᾱφων μόνων πρόσωπον ὀπωσε καὶ τὴν φωνὴν εἰς τὸ πρόσω πλατεῖμε.\(^{86}\) It follows, then, that if humans alone can speak and stand upright, they too are unique in their ability to use the face as a means of communication.

The idea that the soul is reflected in the face is also expressed in Xenophon’s *Memorabilia*, where Socrates and the painter Parrhasiis discuss whether the character of the soul can be imitated. The discussion begins with the painter claiming that it is not possible to imitate the soul as it has no tangible characteristics such as shape or colour. Socrates then asks whether man expresses his feelings through his eyes, his face, and his body, to which the answer is positive. Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς τῶν φίλων ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς κακοῖς ὁμοίως σοι δοκοῦσιν ἔχειν τὰ πρόσωπα οἳ τε φροντίζουσι καὶ οἳ μη: Μᾶ Δι’ οὐ δήτα, ἐφη: ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς φαινομένοι, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς κακοῖς σκυθρωποὶ γίγνονται. Οὕκοιν, ἐφη, καὶ ταῦτα δυνατόν ἀπεικάζειν; Καὶ μάλα, ἐφη. Ἄλλα μὴν καὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς τε καὶ ἑλευθέριον καὶ τὸ ταπεινὸν τε καὶ ἀνελεύθερον καὶ τὸ σῳδορικὸν τε καὶ φρύνιμον καὶ τὸ ὑβριστικὸν τε καὶ ἀπειρόκαλον καὶ διὰ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ διὰ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ ἐστῶτων καὶ

\(^{85}\) Aristotle, *De partibus animalium* 661b24-25.

\(^{86}\) Aristotle, *De partibus animalium* 662b17-22.
κινοῦμένων ἀνθρώπων διαφαίνει. Ἀλήθη λέγεις, ἔφη. 87 Socrates continues, having Parrhasius agree that the physical characteristics which represent noble characters are more honoured than those representing the ugly, base and hateful. Πότερον οὖν, ἔφη, νομίζεις ἢδιον ὅραν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἢν τὰ καλὰ τε κάγαθα καὶ ἀγαπητὰ ἡθὶ φαίνεται ἢ δὲ ἢν τὰ αἰσχρὰ τε καὶ πονηρὰ καὶ μισητὰ; Πολὺ νὴ δὲ, ἔφη, διαφέρει, ὅ Σώκρατες. 88 This discussion between the philosopher and the painter leads to the acknowledgement of the role of the ethical in artistic representation of the physical form. 89

The face is clearly of interest to Aristotle, who links it to the soul in various instances. In De generatione animalium he states that you cannot have a face (or flesh) without a soul and that, while the name for face might remain the same after death, it is like stone or wood. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ πρόσωπον μὴ ἔχον ψυχὴν οὐδὲ σάρξ, ἀλλὰ φθαρέντα ὁμωθύμως λειχθῆσεται τὸ μὲν εἶναι πρόσωπον τὸ δὲ σάρξ, ὥσπερ κἂν εἴ ἐν γίγνετο λίθυνα ἢ ξύλυνα. 90 Clearly the face is more than the sum of its anatomical parts but is a vehicle of expression for the soul, which is its defining element. In 741a the connection between body and soul is again made, it being stated that neither face nor hand nor flesh can exist without the sense-perceiving soul, and that to be without it is to be like a dead body or inanimate object, ἀδύνατον δὲ πρόσωπον ἢ χεῖρα ἢ σάρκα εἶναι ἢ ἄλλο τι μόριον μὴ ἐνοῦσης αἰσθητικῆς ψυχῆς ἢ ἐνεργείᾳ ἢ δυνάμει καὶ ἢ πη ἢ ἀπλῶς γὰρ ὁδὸν νεκρὸς ἢ νεκροῦ μόριον. 91 The link between body and soul is what gives life to the form; without the soul, the form is nothing.

87 Xenophon, Memorabilia III.x.4-5. See page 223 for the reference in this passage to the σχῆμα.
88 Xenophon, Memorabilia III.x.5.
90 Aristotle, Generatione animalium 734b24-27.
2.5 Physiognomics

When dealing with the relationship between soul and body, and the expression of the soul through the body, physiognomics comes to the forefront. The main physiognomic text of interest here is the Pseudo-Aristotelian Physiognomonica, which is one of the earliest of the extant physiognomic works. While this text is dated to the third century BCE, the principles it incorporates can be found in texts from the fifth and fourth century, including genuine works by Aristotle. While this does not mean that physiognomics as a ‘science’ was accepted and adhered to by classical authors, the textual evidence does suggest that physiognomics were at least in the public consciousness and the that link between the physical and the spiritual, the external and the internal, was considered established. The face, and facial expressions, play central roles in the classical consideration of the body and the soul, as well as in the development of the theories of physiognomics.

The study of the physiognomy of the face raises complex questions for the physiognomist. Not only is the physical appearance of the face important, but so are the expressions produced by the face. It is the physiognomist’s job to decipher an individual’s true nature from the combination of the manipulable and the permanent. Facial expressions, which are obviously manipulable and temporary, are included by the physiognomists as a means of telling a man’s character. While a facial expression is an impermanent sign, during its existence it reveals the man’s nature. Indeed, facial expressions can accompany physical characteristics in a physiognomical description, e.g., thin and thick eyebrows can both produce a scowl; protruding and thin lips are both capable of a grimace. This does not mean that there is not a problem with the physiognomic

---

92 As will be shown throughout this study, many fifth- and fourth-century authors have elements of physiognomy in their descriptions of the physical. Evans (1969: 5) writes in her introduction on physiognomics in post-classical antiquity that “[...] the “physiognomic consciousness” of classical authors begins far earlier [than the third century], i.e., with Homer, and from there on, both in poetry and prose of classical literature, whenever personal characterisation is involved, plays a definite and significant role, varying in importance according to the interests and purposes of authors.” See Currie (1985: 360-361) on physiognomy in Aristotle.
interpretation of facial expression, and the physiognomists themselves recognise this. Pseudo-Aristotle writes that a low-spirited man can experience happiness and assume the appropriate facial expression and a high-spirited man can experience grief and have the corresponding facial expression, yet these occasional uncharacteristic expressions do not change the nature of their character. Οἱ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὰ ἡθη τὸν φυσιογνωμονοῦντες ἀμαρτάνουσιν, πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἐνιοὶ οὐχ οἱ αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὰ ἑπὶ τῶν προσώπων ἡθη τὰ αὐτὰ ἐχουσιν, οἶον ὃ τε ἀνδρείος καὶ ὁ ἀναιδής τὰ αὐτὰ ἐχουσι, τὰς διανοίας πολὺ κεχωρισμένοι, δεύτερον δὲ ὅτι κατὰ χρόνους τιμᾶς τὰ ἡθη οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ἀλλ’ ἐτέρων ἐχουσιν: δυσανίοις τε γὰρ οὕσιν ἐνίστε συνέβη τὴν ἡμέραν ἡδέως διαγαγείν καὶ τὸ ἰθός λαβείν τὸ τοῦ εὐθύμου, καὶ τούναυτίον εὐθυμον λυπηθῆναι, ὡστε τὸ ἰθός τὸ ἑπὶ τοῦ προσώπου μεταβαλεῖν. For the advocate of physiognomies, the key rests in the proper ‘reading’ of the physical signs, seeing through any contrived behaviour to reveal the true nature.

The Aristotelian Physiognomonica is a detailed study of the bodily characteristics and traits of humans as well as animals, the premise of which is that physiognomies lie at the foundation of human behaviour. This text has numerous references to facial expression. Indeed, many of the descriptions of the physical traits which accompany specific natures there appears to be at least one reference to the face of the character being discussed. An explanation for this is given at the very end of the work, where it is stated that the parts most favourable for examination are the eyes, forehead, head and face, ἐν ἀπάσῃ δὲ τῇ τῶν σημείων ἐκλογῇ ἐτέρων σημεῖα μᾶλλον δηλοῦσιν ἐναργῶς τὸ ύποκείμενον. ἐναργέστερα δὲ τὰ ἐν ἐπικαιροτάτῳς τόποις ἐγγινόμενα. ἐπικαιρότατος δὲ τόπος ὁ περὶ τὰ ὁμοιατα τε καὶ τὸ μέτωπον καὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ πρόσωπον...

93 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 805a33-b9. The principles of physiognomics continue to appear in modern discussions of facial expressions. For example, Argyle (1988: 136-138) suggests that personality can be decoded from facial expressions, both manipulable and non-manipulable.

94 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 814b.
Although Pseudo-Aristotle’s *Physiognomonica* is the text which deals with facial expression in the most detail, it is clearly based on earlier Aristotelian texts which assert similar links between physical expression and character traits. For example, in the *Historia animalium* the face is explained within the context of the traits of man and animals, using physiognomic descriptions of human characteristics according to the type of forehead a person has. προσώπου δὲ τὸ μὲν ὑπὸ τὸ βρέγμα μεταξὺ τῶν ὀμμάτων μέτωπον. τούτο δ’ οἶς μὲν μέγα, βραδύτεροι, οἶς δὲ μικρόν, εὐκίνητοι καὶ οἶς μὲν πλατύ, ἐκστατικοί, οἶς δὲ περιφερέσει, εὐθυκοί.95

In *Problemata*, also Pseudo-Aristotelian, the topic is again addressed, here in regard to how the different appearances of men are the result of their having different types of faces, handsome, ugly or a mixture. It is claimed that men whose faces are made up of an unnaturally excessive mixture are melancholic or of an uncommon nature. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ εἴδος ἑτεροί γίνονται οὐ τῷ πρόσωπον ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ποιόν τι τὸ πρόσωπον, οἱ μὲν καλόν, οἱ δὲ αἰσχρόν, οἱ δὲ μηθέν ἑχόντες περιττόν, οὕτως δὲ μέσον τὴν φύσιν, οὕτω καὶ οἱ μὲν μικρὰ μετέχοντες τῆς ταιωνίας κράσεως μέσα εἰσίν, οἱ δὲ πλήθους ἣδη ἀνόμους τοῖς πολλοῖς. ἐὰν μὲν γὰρ σφόδρα κατακορῆς ᾧ ἡ ἐξίς, μελαγχολικοὶ εἰσὶ λίαν, ἐὰν δὲ πόσο κραθῶσι, περιττοί.96 A man’s facial characteristics need to constitute a natural, middle ground in order for him to fit in with the majority of the public; any extreme characteristics will be rejected as unnatural. A man with an unnatural face would be expected to have a corresponding unnatural nature, the face mirroring the soul.

96 [Aristotle], *Problemata* 954b21-28.
2.6 Specific examples

To illustrate the use of specific examples of facial expression in Greek texts, three examples will be explored further. Of course, there are countless references in Greek literature to a multitude of facial expressions which cannot all be discussed here. These three examples represent different types of expressions: the eyebrows are a manipulable, possibly habitual expression; the blush is an autonomic nervous system response; looking angry is a general description of the face which does not give particulars of the musculatory movement. These categories are not exhaustive, but should present a varied view on facial expression as a means of non-verbal communication in text.

2.6.1 Eyebrows

In Memorabilia, as an example of the forethought in designing man, Xenophon explains the function of eyebrows, stating that they serve the purpose of keeping sweat out of the eyes.97 Similarly, in the De partibus animalium Aristotle writes simply that they are there for the protection of the eyes.98 These are the ancient justifications and explanations for the physical existence of the eyebrows, yet the significance of this body part goes much farther than the functional. The eyebrows are a central feature in any facial expression and they serve as an invaluable means of communication. As a result, references to this seemingly inauspicious part of the face are relatively plentiful.

The eyebrow appears in many descriptions of facial expression in Greek text, it being used to portray a range of emotions and reactions. This is not surprising, as the eyebrow is clearly one of the fundamental facial characteristics whose manipulation is basic to differences in facial expression. The textual usage of this trait for descriptive purposes attests to its centrality in ‘reading’ the face

97 Xenophon, Memorabilia I.iv.6.
98 Aristotle, De partibus animalium 658b14-19.
and in projecting a certain emotion. While the eyes are unquestionably important, the eyebrows also occupy a fundamental position in the descriptions of the face, much more so than might be expected by a modern reader.  

2.6.1.1 Types of eyebrows (physiognomies)

In the Aristotelian *Physiognomonica* the author treats the subject of eyebrows, giving a detailed explanation of what the eyebrows express about an individual’s nature. The examples found in this text are mostly descriptions of the eyebrows of animals, yet these are to be understood as personifications of human characteristics. Comparison between men and animals is one of the primary physiognomic methodologies used by the author(s) of the *Physiognomonica*.  

In his discussion on the physical (and moral) superiority of the male over the female, the lion, the ideal male type, is described in detail, including a reference to his square forehead which overhangs his large eyebrows.  

\[ \text{τούτων οὖτως ἐχόντων, φαίνεται τῶν ζῴων ἀπάντων λέων τελεώτατα μεταληφέναι τῆς τοῦ ἄρρενος ἱδέας... ὁφρὺν εὐμεγέθη, μέτωπον τετράγωνον, ἐκ μέσου ὑποκολότερον, πρὸς δὲ τὰς ὁφρὺς καὶ τὴν ῥίνη ὑπὸ τοῦ μετώπου οὖν νέφος ἔπανεστηκός...} \]

The *Physiognomonica* does not restrict its evaluation of eyebrows to those of the animal kingdom. Two physiognomic descriptions of eyebrows are given in 812b; those with eyebrows that meet are gloomy and those with eyebrows that go down towards the nose and up at the temples are stupid, like the pig,  

\[ \text{οὶ δὲ τὰς ὁφρὺς κατεσπασμένοι πρὸς τῆς ῥίνος, ἀνεσπασμένοι δὲ πρὸς τὸν κρόταφον εὐθέσις· ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τοὺς σῶς.} \]

Both these examples of physiognomic interpretations of eyebrows refer to specific types of eyebrows and not to the
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99 For examples of modern scholarship on the eyebrow see Blurton Jones and Konner (1971); Ekman (1979).

100 [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 805a19-34.

101 [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 809b14-22.

expression they are making. The precedent for this pseudo-Aristotelian
description can be found in *História animalium*, where Aristotle writes that
straight eyebrows are a sign of a soft disposition, if they are bent towards the nose
they signal harshness, and if towards the temples, mocking and dissembling. ὑπὸ
dὲ τῷ μετώπῳ ὀφρὺς διφυεῖς. ὅν αἱ μὲν εὐθείαι μαλακοὶ ἔθεις σημεῖον, αἱ
dὲ πρὸς τὴν ῥίνα τὴν καμπυλότητα ‘ἔχουσαι στρυφνοῦ, αἱ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς
κροτάφους μικροὺ καὶ εἰρωνεῖς.\(^{103}\)

Similarly, in Xenophon’s *Symposium* Socrates lists the loves of those
present and, when he gets to Hermogenes, attests to his love for nobility of
class. To impress this point on his listeners (or readers) a physical description
is added, οὐχ ὅρατε ως σπουδαῖα μὲν αὐτοῦ αἱ ὀφρύες, ἀτρεμεῖς δὲ τὸ ὀμία,
μέτριοὶ δὲ οἱ λόγοι, πραεῖα δὲ ἡ φωνή, ἱλαροὶ δὲ τὸ ἔθος.\(^{104}\) The noble man
has serious and earnest brows, a gaze which does not tremble, moderate words, a
gentle voice and a cheerful disposition. While Xenophon might not be directly
interested in physiognomical description, he, nonetheless, uses this methodology
to describe his noble man. Presumably his readers can imagine what such brows
look like, inferring that there exists a typical expression which represents
seriousness.

### 2.6.1.2 Drawn up or raised eyebrows

Demosthenes XIX, *De falsō legatione*, adds insight into the oratorical use
of non-verbal behaviour, in this case with an eyebrow movement. As stated
above, Aeschines’ physical behaviour is described in order to add weight to the
orator’s point that he is a haughty man with affectations calculated to belie his
humble beginnings. Here his facial expression is described as having τὰς ὀφρῦς
ἀνέστακε, literally meaning to have (violently) drawn up his eyebrows, i.e.,

\(^{103}\) Aristotle, *História animalium* 491b14-17.

\(^{104}\) Xenophon, *Symposium* VIII.3.
having “assumed an air of great dignity and importance.” Indeed, within the context of this passage, the meaning of the facial expression is not in doubt. Apparently, drawn-up eyebrows are a sign of self-importance, thus this facial expression is assumed by Aeschines or, at least, attributed to him by Demosthenes in his damning description. The scholion 561 asserts just that, stating that τὰς ὀφρύς ἀνέστηκεν ἣνα μὴ αὐτομάτως ἐκ φύσεως γένηται, αὐτὸς ἀναστῇ, φησὶ, πρὸς τοὺς καρποὺς σχήματιζόμενος.

There appear to be numerous comic references to this facial expression. Apparently, the comic poets favoured the description of raised eyebrows for their portrayals of self-important men. In instances when such a character would appear on stage it is probable that the mask worn had this facial expression, which would be recognised by the audience as a symbol for this character stereotype. In a fragment of the Old Comedy poet Eupolis there is an example of such a character. The man described here has excited eyebrows and thinks himself a worthy speaker. ΧΩ, τὰς ὀφρύς ἣδη ἔστηκε κάξοι δημηγορεῖν/ χθὲς δὲ καὶ πρῶην παρ’ ἡμῖν φρατέρων ἐρημος ἤπν,/ κοῦδ’ ἄν ἦπτικεν εἰ μὴ τοῦς φίλους ἡσσάνετο/ τῶν ἀπαγγέλων γε πόρνων κοῦχι τῶν σεμνῶν τις ὅν/... Apparently, expressive eyebrows were associated with the demagogue, as this despicable character is portrayed as trying to mimic physical characteristics of a speaker without having any of the required skill. The individual in question is described as a man with no standing who could not even speak proper Attic Greek. Another fragment from Old Comedy, this time from Cratinus, supports this interpretation of drawn up eyebrows whereby someone, probably Pericles, is described as ἀνελκταῖς ὀφρύσι σεμνῶν.

105 Demosthenes XIX, De falsa legatione, 314. Heslop 1872: 205. Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1975: 468) states that eyebrow raising can be a sign of arrogance, it being the result of the ritualisation of the reaction to unpleasant surprise, becoming a “gesture of social rejection”.

106 Scholia in orationem de falsa legatione 561.

107 Sittl (1890: 93) actually attributes the origin of this interpretation of the expression to Attic comedy and comic masks. See Aristophanes, Ranae 924.

108 Eupolis, Fragmenta 110 B (Edmonds).

109 Cratinus, Fragmenta 348 (Kassel-Austin).
In a fragment of Alexis, a Middle Comedy poet, eyebrows are once again used to describe the haughty and self-important. In this passage, the comedian condemns the raised eyebrows of the arrogant generals but, nonetheless, acknowledges that it is not surprising considering their position and their demeanour, тοὺς μὲν στρατηγοὺς τὰς ὁφρύς ἐπὰν ἵδω/ ἀνεσπακότας, δεινοῦν μὲν ἡγούμαι ποεῖν,/ οὐ πάνω τι θαμμάζω δὲ προτετιμημένους/ ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως μείζον τι τῶν ἄλλων φρονεῖν.\footnote{Alexis, Fragmenta 16, 1-4 (Kassel-Austin).} However, when a fishmonger raises his eyebrows so far that they are above his head, he chokes,

\[\text{Menander, Fragmenta 37 (Kassel-Austin).}\]

Nowhere in this passage is there a direct reference to haughtiness, self-importance, or any other explanation of the eyebrow references. Rather, it is the description of the physical which gives the context in which the behaviour of the generals and fishmongers is recounted.

The use of drawn-up brows to portray an air of (self-)importance can be seen to be the result of the expression that is the result of concentration and deep thinking, in which important men are presumed to be engaged. Indeed, eyebrow-raising is associated with the behaviour of the philosopher, the ‘high-browed’ thinker. Menander actually refers to philosophers as ‘the raisers of eyebrows’. Obviously, for the comedy to be at all effective, there needed to be societal understanding and agreement on who was intended by this physical description. Indeed, there is no doubt that it is philosophers who claim that solitude makes for invention, εὐρητικὸν εἶναι φασὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν/ οἱ τὰς ὁφρύς αἴροντες.\footnote{Menander, Fragmenta 349, 1-2 (Kassel-Austin).} Menander again describes (foolish) thinkers by their eyebrows, οἱ τὰς ὁφρύς αἴροντες ὡς ἀβέλτεροι/ καὶ “σκέψωμαι” λέγοντες.\footnote{Menander, Fragmenta 349, 1-2 (Kassel-Austin).} Menander, Fragmenta 349, 1-2. In the Deipnosophistae IV.162a4, Athenaeus refers to the epigram recalled by Hegesander of Delphi in book six of his Commentaries which calls philosophers, among other insulting things, ὁφρονασπασίδα, the sons of eyebrow raisers. This association between raised eyebrows and haughtiness or self-
this time the symbolism of the raised eyebrows was deeply embedded and easily recognisable.

Further consideration of references to raised eyebrows makes it apparent that there is more than one way in which eyebrows can be raised and, as a result, more than one emotion that can be projected. Despite the limitations of language, the raising of the eyebrows, when considered in more detail, is a rather complex action which is subject to a multitude of manipulations. The air of haughtiness described above seems to suggest that the entire eyebrow was raised, as might be done today when trying to imitate the facial expression of a self-important individual (eyebrows raised, chin up, mouth perked and a downward glance from the eyes, which are partially covered by taut eyelids). However, raising the inner ends of the eyebrow represents a completely different emotion. In Darwin’s *The Expression of the Emotions of Man and Animals* he deals with “oblique eyebrows”, of which he says that “[d]uring several years no expression seemed to me so utterly perplexing...” He interprets the oblique eyebrow facial expression, with the inner ends raised (which creates “peculiarly-formed wrinkles on the forehead, which are different form those of a simple frown...” as a result of “low spirits, anxiety, grief, dejection, and despair.” In Aristophanes’ *Acharnenses*, the messenger who comes to fetch Dicaeopolis for supper is described by the chorus as having τὰ ὀφρῶα ὀψίατάκτως. A scholion on this line states that it means he is ἐκυθρωπακτως, that he looks sullen or angry. Clearly the action of drawing the eyebrows together is somewhat ambiguous and depending on context can be interpreted differently. This is the nature of non-verbal communication of any sort and explains why a contextual reading is

---

114 Ekman (1982: 83-86) lists how the brow raise is described in the fourteen measurement techniques he addresses. These examples illustrate the subjectivity, difficulties and limitations of describing facial expressions, whose every nuance can never be fully captured by the observer.

115 Darwin 1965: 186.


118 Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 1069. See section 2.6.3 on the expression of this emotion.

119 Scholia in *Acharnenses* 1069 (Wilson).
crucial. While there might be a primary understanding of a physical symbol, its meaning can easily be altered with even the most subtle of changes. In this instance, the messenger can be both haughty and full of self-importance, considering the weight of his mission, or sullen due to the content of the message and the role he has in bearing it.

Raised eyebrows are associated with the expression of anger, a connection which probably seems unnatural to the modern occidental reader, who is accustomed to descriptions of eyebrows being raised in surprise.120 Charles Bell, whose work *The Anatomy and Philosophy of Expression* (first published in 1806), had a significant influence on Charles Darwin, implies that rage did result in raised eyebrows, stating in his description of the facial expression of rage that the forehead is alternatively knotted and raised in furrows as a result of the eyebrows.121 This early nineteenth-century observation does not seem to correspond with the results of twentieth-century social science research. According to Ekman (1979) there are seven visibly different eyebrow actions, five of which are used to express emotion. Raising eyebrows in anger (or rage), however, is not one of them.122 This leads to questions as to whether there have been significant changes in the facial reactions to emotions or whether the literary sources are using a physical description to symbolise an emotion which does not correspond to reality. If the facial expressions are indeed different, then universality of the expression of emotions cannot be claimed. If the verbal expressions are the cause of the discrepancy, then the focus shifts to the written transmission of emotional responses rather than on the facial expressions themselves.

---

120 Darwin (1965: 280-281) discusses the evolutionary reasoning behind such facial expressions. "As surprise is excited by something unexpected or unknown, we naturally desire, when startled, to perceive the cause as quickly as possible; and we consequently open our eyes fully, so that the field of vision may be increased, and the eyeballs moved easily in any direction...". See also Ekman (1977: 66; 1979: 194ff.)
121 Bell 1877: 159.
Raising is not the only eyebrow movement associated with anger or sullen behaviour; as will be discussed below, "knitting" or drawing together of the eyebrows is also used for this purpose. This description of angered, furrowed eyebrows does correspond with modern understanding of eyebrow expressions. Perhaps the differentiation between the two actions, i.e., raising and drawing together, is blurred by descriptions of these non-verbal behaviours which do not necessarily correspond with the physical act, thus explaining the connection between raised eyebrows and anger. The distinction between the physical expressions might be inconsequential, the details of the face being subordinate to the desire to communicate the emotion. Whether the brow is raised or brought together might be unimportant so long as the anger is projected successfully. In a society which appeared not to focus on facial appearance, perhaps the distinctions in the form of the expression become vague. Alternatively, we can see in this classical example an argument for cultural relativism in all facial expressions, be they voluntary or involuntary.

2.6.1.3 Bringing together

As stated above, the (modern, Western) interpretation of brows which have been brought together is that the individual is expressing anger. The appearance of anger is conveyed when “[t]he eyebrows are lowered and drawn together, the eyelids are tensed, and the eye appears to stare in a had fashion. The lips are either tightly pressed together or parted in a square shape.”123 The association between bringing the eyebrows together and anger or sullenness is not unfamiliar to the reader of classical literature, and Greek drama has numerous such descriptions. There are numerous examples in Aristophanes’ plays where eyebrows are used in such a way to express anger, for example in Nubes 582, Ranae 823, and Plutus 756. It would appear that the comic use of eyebrow

123 Ekman and Friesen (1975).
descriptions is related to the wearing of masks by the actors. It would be impossible to describe a look in someone’s eye and expect it to be registered by the audience, yet eyebrows could be prominently displayed on a mask. Aristophanes is not the only comedian to refer to eyebrows when describing his angered characters; the middle comedian Antiphanes also makes mention of them in his description of the facial expression of the arrogant and insulting fishmonger who brings his eyebrows together in an angry and sullen expression, oi δεινόν ἐστι προσφάτους μὲν ἀν τύχη/ πωλῶν τις ἱχθύς, συναγαγόντα τὰς ὄφρισ/ τοῦτον σκυθρωπάζουτά θ’ ἵμμιν προσλαλεῖν... Interestingly, this expression seems to be restricted to comedy. It would appear that the description of eyebrows in general is found more often in verse than in prose. Again, this can be attributed to the relationship between the description and the mask, where eyebrows can be a highly visible means by which to express a facial expression or an emotion. The lack of additional references to this expression can be understood, perhaps, as support for the argument that facial appearance and expression did not receive a large amount of textual attention. Outside comedy and without the mask and the potential for hyperbolic eyebrows, this facial expression appears to be insufficient to communicate anger effectively.

### 2.6.2 Blushing

Blushing is an autonomic nervous system response, used in literary description as it is the ideal means by which to portray human embarrassment, shame and bashfulness. In Darwin’s *The Expression of the Emotions of Man and
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125 Antiphanes, *Fragmenta* 217, 1-3 (Kassel-Austin).
126 See Sittl (1890: 201) who attributes eyebrows which converge in the middle to the mask of the First Slave. The mask of the Old Man had two eyebrows, furiously raised. The Old Man could also have had a mask with one eyebrow raised and the other is lowered, thus allowing him to change expression simply by turning around. See also Pickard-Cambridge (1988: 223-224).
Animals, this “most peculiar and most human of expressions” receives a seemingly disproportionate amount of attention in comparison with other facial expressions.  

Not surprisingly, Darwin’s explanation of blushing corresponds neatly with its usage in Greek literature. The Greek blush represents these emotions and is used generously, in both complimentary and damning descriptions. It is an expression which is particularly gender- and age-specific and which is not easily manipulable. Blushing cannot be caused by any physical action, only by the mind; not only is it involuntary, but conscious attempts to repress it in general result in the blush deepening. The meaning of a blush in Greek literature does not differ from modern understanding of this action. One blushes when one is ashamed or nervous whereas one reddens with anger. While the meaning of the blushes found in Greek texts is not unique, its usage is nonetheless important. That an author thought it necessary to add a physical description is indicative of the power of non-verbal communication, which succeeds in giving a fuller feeling to the emotion being projected. The “blushing boy” is a stronger image than the “embarrassed boy”.

The orators use descriptions of blushing, or rather descriptions of the lack of blushing, to portray shameful behaviour by their opponents. Both Aeschines and Demosthenes use the lack of blushing by an individual to communicate his evil nature and disregard for proper citizen behaviour. In In Timarchum Aeschines claims that Timarchus, who has none of the established ties of a honest citizen, is such a disgrace that he does not even blush in shame, despite his despicable behaviour, ἀλλὰ τούτω ἀντὶ τῶν πατρώων περίεστι βδελυρία, συκοφαντία, θράσος, τρυφή, δειλία, ἀναίδεια, τό μὴ ἐπίστασθαι ἐρυθρίαν ἐπὶ τῶς αἰσχροίς: ἐξ ὧν ἂν ὁ κάκιστος καὶ ἀλυσιτελέστατος πολίτης γένοιτο.  

129 Darwin 1965: 310.  
130 Lateiner (1998: 171) writes that “[l]ike the hiccoughs of the Symposium, blushes supply non-verbal dramatic evidence of psycho-physiological distress.” See section 5.1 for more on hiccoughs.  
131 Aeschines I, In Timarchum, 105.
Demosthenes, describing his enemy in *De corona*, also uses the lack of blushing to demonstrate the truly uncultured, pretentious and disgusting nature of the low-born Aeschines. Demosthenes claims that no educated man could describe himself in the terms that Aeschines uses for his self-promotion, and that any cultured man would blush to hear it from others, which Aeschines would never do, that is blush or hear it from others. "ɪς τῶν μὲν ὡς ἀληθῶς τετυχηκότων οὐδ' ἄν εἶς εἴποι περὶ αὐτοῦ τολούτων οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ κἂν ἑτέρου λέγοντος ἐπερυθριάσει, τοῖς δ' ἀπολειφθείσι μὲν, ὡσπέρ σὺ, προσποιομένους δ' ὑπ' ἀναισθησίας τὸ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖν ὅταν λέγοισιν, οὐ τὸ δοκεῖν τολούτοις εἶναι περίεστιν."

Blushing is obviously the accepted sign of shame or embarrassment and, in both these cases, the individual guilty of unacceptable behaviour is described in terms which specifically state that this reaction was not forthcoming in a situation where an honourable person would necessarily blush. Facial expressions such as blushing are difficult both to repress and to emulate, and the appearance or lack of this reaction seems to have been understood as a sure sign of the moral character of the person in question.

Whereas any respectable person is expected to blush in embarrassing situations, it appears that the blushing of young men was a particularly favourable description of their innocence, modesty and honesty. If the young man happened to be beautiful, even better. Platonic dialogue is particularly full of such description, often when the older, wiser (and uglier) Socrates asks a question to a promising young male beauty (of mind and body). *Charmides* 158c is just such an example. Socrates tells of Charmides’ lineage and says that with such parents the son must have soundness of mind, σωφροσύνη, and other natural qualities. He asks Charmides directly if he does or does not have enough moderation, and the modest young man blushes before he answers. "Ἀνερυθριάσας οὖν ὁ Χαρμίδης πρῶτον μὲν ἐτὶ καλλίων ἐφάνη — καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀίσχυντηλόν αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ"

---

132 Demosthenes XVIII, *De corona*, 128.
Demosthenes, describing his enemy in *De corona*, also uses the lack of blushing to demonstrate the truly uncultured, pretentious and disgusting nature of the low-born Aeschines. Demosthenes claims that no educated man could describe himself in the terms that Aeschines uses for his self-promotion, and that any cultured man would blush to hear it from others, which Aeschines would never do, that is blush or hear it from others. \( \text{ἡς τῶν μὲν ὡς ἀληθῶς τετυχηκότων οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς εἰπαὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοιούτων οὐδὲν, ἀλλὰ κἂν ἐτέρου λέγοντος ἐπερχεῖσθαι, τοῖς δ’ ἀπολειφθεῖσι μὲν, ὡσπέρ σὺ, προσποιομένοις δ’ ὑπ’ ἀναισθησίας τὸ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἀλλείποντας ἀλγεῖν πολεῖν διὰν λέγωσιν, οὐ τὸ δοκεῖν τοιούτως εἶναι περιεστίν. }^{132} \) Blushing is obviously the accepted sign of shame or embarrassment and, in both these cases, the individual guilty of unacceptable behaviour is described in terms which specifically state that this reaction was not forthcoming in a situation where an honourable person would necessarily blush. Facial expressions such as blushing are difficult both to repress and to emulate, and the appearance or lack of this reaction seems to have been understood as a sure sign of the moral character of the person in question.

Whereas any respectable person is expected to blush in embarrassing situations, it appears that the blushing of young men was a particularly favourable description of their innocence, modesty and honesty. If the young man happened to be beautiful, even better. Platonic dialogue is particularly full of such description, often when the older, wiser (and uglier) Socrates asks a question to a promising young male beauty (of mind and body). *Charmides* 158c is just such an example. Socrates tells of Charmides’ lineage and says that with such parents the son must have soundness of mind, σωφροσύνη, and other natural qualities. He asks Charmides directly if he does or does not have enough moderation, and the modest young man blushes before he answers. \( \text{Ἀνερυθριάσας οὖν ὁ Χαρμίδης πρῶτων μὲν ἔτι καλλίων ἐφάνη — καὶ γὰρ τὸ αἰσχυντηλὸν αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ} \)
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132 Demosthenes XVIII, *De corona*, 128.
Demosthenes, describing his enemy in *De corona*, also uses the lack of blushing to demonstrate the truly uncultured, pretentious and disgusting nature of the low-born Aeschines. Demosthenes claims that no educated man could describe himself in the terms that Aeschines uses for his self-promotion, and that any cultured man would blush to hear it from others, which Aeschines would never do, that is blush or hear it from others. ἃς τῶν μὲν ὡς ἀληθῶς τετυχηκότων οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς εἶποι περὶ αὐτοῦ τοιούτου οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ κἂν ἐτέρου λέγοντος ἐπερυθράσει, τὰς δ’ ἀπολειφθεῖσα μὲν, ὡσπερ σὺ, προσποιομένοις δ’ ὑπ’ ἀνασθήσας τὸ τοὺς ἀκώντας ἀλγείν ποιεῖν ὅταν λέγωσιν, οὔ τὸ δοκεῖν τοιούτως εἶναι περίεστιν.132 Blushing is obviously the accepted sign of shame or embarrassment and, in both these cases, the individual guilty of unacceptable behaviour is described in terms which specifically state that this reaction was not forthcoming in a situation where an honourable person would necessarily blush. Facial expressions such as blushing are difficult both to repress and to emulate, and the appearance or lack of this reaction seems to have been understood as a sure sign of the moral character of the person in question.

Whereas any respectable person is expected to blush in embarrassing situations, it appears that the blushing of young men was a particularly favourable description of their innocence, modesty and honesty. If the young man happened to be beautiful, even better. Platonic dialogue is particularly full of such description, often when the older, wiser (and uglier) Socrates asks a question to a promising young male beauty (of mind and body). *Charmides* 158c is just such an example. Socrates tells of Charmides’ lineage and says that with such parents the son must have soundness of mind, σοφροσύνη, and other natural qualities. He asks Charmides directly if he does or does not have enough moderation, and the modest young man blushes before he answers. Ἀνερυθράσας οὖν ὁ Χαρμίδης πρῶτος μὲν ἔτι καλλίων ἔφαν — καὶ γὰρ τὸ αἰσχυντηλὸν αὐτοῦ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ

132 Demosthenes XVIII, *De corona*, 128.
The image of a young man blushing at the direct question by Socrates regarding his nature is a flattering one, as the youth demonstrates the expected modesty and humility in the presence of his learned elders. The blush is the physical manifestation of the σωφροσύνη. Furthermore, there is a direct reference to the physical beauty of the boy, which is only further enhanced by this natural, and correct, response.

A further aspect of the treatment of blushing can be seen in the statement that this response is appropriate to a youth’s years. Age is often a factor when considering non-verbal behaviour, and blushing is no exception. The blushing of a young man is considered beautiful because of his youth, which implies a bright complexion and the lack of heavy facial hair. The innocent modesty of Charmides is appropriate behaviour, and the blush, therefore, is endearing and flattering to the elder men who surround him. A similar example is found in Plato’s Lysis, where the young Hippothales blushes at being asked by Socrates whom he desires. Ctesippus remarks that the way Hippothales blushes at the question and hesitates to answer is quite pretty and elegant. Καὶ ὁς ἐρωτηθεὶς ἡμυθρίασε... Καὶ ὁς ἄκούσας πολὺ ἐτι μάλλον ἡμυθρίασεν. ὁ οὖν Κτήσιππος, Ἀστείον γε, ἢ δ’ ὦς, ὅτι ἡμυθρίας, ὥ Ίπποθάλες, καὶ ὅκνείς εἰπεῖν Σωκράτει τοῦνομα. Hippothales’ blush is his response, his face communicating instead of words. While in this instance Hippothales is blushing in modesty, later in the dialogue his complexion turns every colour in delight, ὅ δὲ Ἰπποθάλης ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς παντοδατὰ ἡφίει χρώματα. The emotion which causes the reaction in the youth’s face is different in each case, and so too is the description. Indeed, the fact that Plato does not use the verb ἐρυθριάω in the second description implies a desire to differentiate between the meanings of the two reactions.

133 Plato, Charmides 158c5-7
134 Plato, Lysis 204b5-c5.
135 Plato, Lysis 222b2.
Xenophon also has his blushing young man, Autolycus, son of Lycon, who charms those assembled at the symposium. When asked whether he is proud of having won a prize, he blushes, then replies that it is his father who makes him proud. Not only is the blush appropriate and endearing, but Xenophon tells how the men assembled were pleased to hear him speak. Οὐτὸς γε μὴν, ἔφη τις, δὴ λοι ὅτι ἐπὶ τῷ νυκτήρῳ εἶναι. καὶ ὁ Ἀὐτόλυκος ἄνεμοπλιάσας εἶπε· Μὰ Δί οὐκ ἔγνω. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπαντῆς ἡσύχης ὅτι ἦκουσαν αὐτοῦ φωνήσαντος προσέβλεψαν, ἤρετο τίς αὐτῶν· Ἄλλη ἐπὶ τῷ μὴν, ὁ Ἀὐτόλυκε· ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἐπὶ τῷ πατρί, καὶ ἀμα ἐνεκλίθη αὐτῷ.136 Obviously, he is of the age where he was not expected to join the verbal exchange as an equal partner, so that when he does speak they are enchanted not only by his answer but by his appropriately placed modesty and innocence, as communicated through his blushing.

It is improbable that an older man would be considered beautiful when he blushed, as that would contradict the norms of behaviour expected of a man of a more advanced age and maturity, a leader in society rather than a newcomer who is still learning. The act of blushing denotes a sort of subordination, as the youth is unaccustomed to being questioned and to being an active participant in the discussions of men. A fully matured man should be comfortable in this milieu, and a blush would indicate otherwise. The young and inexperienced can blush beautifully whereas grown men would do so inappropriately.

In the Aristotelian Corpus there are various references to blushing, the most useful of which can be found in Ethica Nicomachea in a discussion on modesty. It is of no surprise that blushing is connected with modesty, which, because of its bodily manifestation, is here defined more as an emotion than a virtue. Περὶ δὲ αἰδοῦς ὃς τινος ἄρετῆς οὗ προσήκει λέγειν· πάθει γὰρ μᾶλλον ἔοικεν ἢ ἔξει. ὃρίζεται γοῦν φόβος τίς ἀδοξίας, καί ἀποτελεῖται τῷ περὶ τὰ δεινὰ φόβῳ παραπλησίου· ἐμφαίνονται γὰρ οἱ αἰσχυνόμενοι, οἱ δὲ

136 Xenophon, Symposium III.12-13.
Aristotle continues with a statement regarding the suitability of modesty only for the young, who need to be modest, whereas no older man can be praised for being ashamed, as he ought to know better than to do things of which he needs to be ashamed, ὑπὲρ δοκεῖ πάθους μᾶλλον ἢ ἔξεσθω εἶναι. Aristotle continues with a list of various physiognomic explanations of redness and blushing. Red skin is a sign of sharpness or keenness, οἷς τὸ χρῶμα ἐρυθρῶν, ὃξεῖς, ὃτι πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸ

Physiognomic descriptions of blushing take account of both the physical trait, i.e., a reddish skin tone, and the facial expression of blushing. In the Categoriae, Aristotle differentiates between the natural skin colour and the temporary reddening due to shame (or pallor due to fear); these conditions are affectations, not qualities. οὕτω γὰρ ἐρυθρῶν διὰ τὸ αἰσχυνθῆναι ἐρυθρίας λέγεται, οὕτως ὁ χρωμάς διὰ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι χρωμάς, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον πεπονθέναι τὸ ὡστε πάθη μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγεται, ποιῶτητες δὲ οὖ.

As for the Aristotelian Physiognomonica, there are numerous references to complexion, for example, a ruddy (or bright) complexion is considered a sign of the criminal, Οἱ πυρροὶ ἀγαν πανούργοι ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τὰς ἀλώπεκας. The text continues with a list of various physiognomic explanations of redness and blushing.

---

137 Aristotle, Ethica Nicomachea 1128b10-15. There are numerous examples in Problematum where Pseudo-Aristotle attributes blushing to nervousness and shame, e.g. 903a2-3, 905a7-8, 960b1-2; for reddening of the ears (which are considered here to be a part of the face), 957b10-11, 957b14-15, 960a36-37, 960b5-7, 961a31-34. In 889a15-23 the blushing is attributed to anger which causes the face to redden when the body heats up.


139 Aristotle, Categoriae 9b30-33. See page 225 for the four categories of qualities as delineated in this text.

140 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 812a16-17.
It is also a sign of madness, as that is the result of excessive body heat, οἷς δὲ τὸ χρῶμα φλογοειδὲς, μανικοῖ, ὅτι τὰ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα σφόδρα ἐκθερμανθέντα φλογοειδῆ χρολὴν ἔσχεν. Pseudo-Aristotle also attributes blushing to shyness, οἷς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐπιφοινίσσον ἔστίν, αἰσχυντηλοὶ εἶσαι· ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶθος, ὅτι τοῖς αἰσχυνομένοις ἐπιφοινίσσεται τὸ πρόσωπον.

An example of a fully matured man blushing is found in Plato’s *Respublica*. Socrates states that, as a result of being intellectually outmanoeuvred, Thrasymachus, a known sophist and rhetorician, blushed. Not only is this the first time Socrates sees such a response from this man, but it accompanies other behaviour which is associated with discomfort, nervousness and embarrassment. ‘Ὁ δὴ Θρασύμαχος ὑμολόγησε μὲν πάντα ταύτα, οὐχ ώς ἐγὼ νῦν ρξιῶς λέγω, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκκόμενος καὶ μόγις, μετὰ ἱδρῶτος θαυμαστοῦ ὅσου, ἀτε καὶ θέρος ὄντος — τότε καὶ ἔδορ ἐγὼ, πρότερον δὲ οὕτω, Θρασύμαχον ἐρυθρῶντα. — Thrasymachus’ inability to stand up to Socrates’ questions is understood not only from the content of the dialogue itself, but from the narrative description of his blatantly clear non-verbal behaviour. The seasoned sophist is reduced to reacting like an inexperienced youth in the face of Socrates’ logic, a state that not even Socrates had seen before. Another example of a blushing sophist is found in Plato’s *Euthydemus*, when Dionysodorus blushes at Euthydemus’ reprimand for ruining the argument as he gets caught up in Socrates’ logic, καὶ ὁ Διονυσόδωρος ἔρυθρασεν. Blushing was obviously not a regular nor an admired response from a man of this stature and reputation. Furthermore, it appears to be a tool used by Plato in his portrayals of the intellectually inadequate sophists. Indeed, the very suggestion that one might

141 [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 812a21-22.  
142 [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 812a22-24.  
143 [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 812a30-33.  
144 Plato, *Respublica* 350c12-d3.  
Plato’s Protagoras. Socrates asks Hippocrates what he hopes to become by going to Protagoras the sophist, at which point Hippocrates blushes, as it is clear the answer is to become a sophist. “Αὐτὸς δὲ δὴ ὡς τίς γενησόμενος ἐρχῇ παρὰ τῶν Πρωταγόραν;” — Καὶ ὅσ εἶπεν ἐρυθρῶσας — ἢδη γὰρ ὑπέφανεν τι ἡμέρας, ὡστε καταφανὴ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι — Εἶ μὲν τί τοῖς ἐμπροσθέν ἔοικε, δῆλον ὅτι σοφιστὴς γενησόμενος. — Σῦ δὲ, ἤπι δ’ ἐγὼ, πρὸς θεών, οὐκ ἃν αἰσχύνοι εἰς τοὺς “Ελληνας σαυτὸν σοφιστὴν παρέχων.146

Another, similar means of discriminating non-verbal behaviour is by gender. There are few references to women blushing in Greek texts, but it can be inferred from the general norms of comportment that women, like young men, can blush without censure.147 The light complexion and delicate disposition that were desired from women are natural companions to the blush. Charles Bell writes that blushing “adds perfection to the features of beauty... The colour caused by blushing gives brilliancy and interest to the expression of the face... It is becoming in youth, it is seemly in more advanced years in women. Blushing assorts well with youthful and effeminate features...”148 It would appear that this English Victorian appraisal of the blush would be as acceptable in Greek antiquity as in British society of the late nineteenth century. In Xenophon’s Oeconomicus Ischomachus tells of his young blushing wife, who reddens in frustration at not being able to find what her husband requests. Ναὶ μὰ Δί’, ἐφὶ ὁ Ἰσχόμαχος, καὶ δηθεῖσάν γε σίδα αὐτὴν καὶ ἐρυθρώσασαν σφόδρα ὅτι τῶν εἰσενεχθέντων τι αἰτήσαντος ἐμὸν οὐκ εἶξε μοι δοῦναι.149 Women of all ages are presumed to act by feeling and emotion rather than reason and logic and, therefore, they will undoubtedly make errors of judgement and have the occasion to be ashamed. If

146 Plato, Protagoras 312a1-6.
147 Darwin (1965: 310) states that both the young and women blush more easily. He also claims that it is rare to see an old man blush. It would appear that these observations (which are unquestionably influenced by societal norms) are not far from the Greek attitudes on blushing. See Lateiner (1998: 168-169) on gender- and age-appropriate blushing in Greek novels.
148 Bell 1877: 89.
149 Xenophon, Oeconomicus VIII.1.
one abides by Aristotle’s description of modesty as found in *Ethica Nicomachea*, the women, like young men, need modesty in order to keep their behaviour in check. Contrary to the norms applied to adult males, the female nature makes it acceptable for women to blush.

2.6.3 σκυθρωπός: Looking angry or sullen

Of the numerous facial expressions associated with particular emotions that can be found in Greek texts, angry or sullen expressions will be the example considered here. As mentioned above, this example does not give specific details of how the face is communicating this emotion, it simply states that it is there. Through looking at the usage of this particular expression, the importance of descriptions of non-verbal communication of the face can be grasped. Indeed, anger is one of the basic expressions of the face and is recognised as such by classical authors. As already discussed above, in *Memorabilia*, Xenophon recognises that emotions and feelings are expressed in the face, and the two primary emotions that he uses to demonstrate this are joy and anger, ἔπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς φαίνεται, ἔπὶ δὲ τοῖς κακοῖς σκυθρωποί γίγνονται. Similarly,

---

151 Darwin describes the facial expressions associated with anger. These include the reddening of the face or, alternatively, if the anger be so intense and the heart is impeded by the rage, the face turning pale. His description of the facial expression of anger is “[t]he mouth is generally closed with firmness, showing fixed determination, and the teeth are clenched or ground together...trembling is a frequent consequence of extreme rage. The paralysed lips then refuse to obey the will...If there be much and rapid speaking, the mouth froths. The hair sometimes bristles. There is in most cases a strongly-marked frown on the forehead...But sometimes the brow, instead of being much contracted and lowered, remains smooth, with the glaring eyes kept widely open. The eyes are always bright, or may, as Homer expresses it, glisten with fire. They are sometimes bloodshot, and are said to protrude from their sockets...The lips are sometimes protruding during rage in a manner...The lips, however, are much more commonly retracted, the grinning or clenched teeth being thus exposed...” Darwin (1965: 238-242). Darwin states that there are no marked differences between the facial expressions of rage and those of anger or indignation; the states of mind differ only in degree. Darwin (1965: 244).
152 The modern students (experimental psychologists) of facial expressions have devised similar lists of primary emotional categories which are expressed through the face. Ekman, Friesen and Ellsworth (1972) list at least seven categories: happiness, surprise, fear, anger, sadness, disgust/contempt, and interest. Izard (1971) adds shame and distress. (These results were derived from using posed facial expressions.) See Emde, Kligman, Reich and Wade (1978: 127); Argyle (1988: 121-138).
153 See page 35.
154 Xenophon, *Memorabilia* III.x.4. Xenophon uses the facial expression of anger throughout his
in Pseudo-Aristotle’s *Physiognomonica*, anger and joy are used to describe how the face reflects the soul, ἔπειδὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ ψυχῆς τὸ ἀνιάσθαι τε καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι, καταφανεῖς ὃτι οἱ ἀνιώμενοι σκυνθρώποτεροί εἰσι καὶ οἱ εὐφραίνόμενοι ἠλατοί.\(^{155}\)

For an orator the description of an angry (or sullen) look was often a crucial component in a well-structured character portrayal which relied on this expression for a complete and successful communication of the rhetorical image being drawn. Reference to facial expressions, such as that of anger, is a means by which the orator seeks to reach his ends, i.e., to convince the jury or Assembly of the mood of the individual being described.

In the works of Aeschines there are a few notable examples of angry faces. In *In Timarchum* he tells of Autolycus, a man who was noble and good and who was unaware of the reputed behaviour of Timarchus, whose remarks in front of the Assembly caused a crude reaction by those who were aware. Autolycus’ innocence kept him oblivious to why he was receiving such a reaction, ἀγνοήσας δὲ ὑμῶν τὸν θόρυβον ὁ Ἀὐτόλυκος, μάλα σκυνθρωπάσας καὶ διαλιπῶν εἶπεν.\(^{156}\)

This reaction is the natural one of the noble citizen in face of what he perceives as unjust and crude treatment of another citizen by those assembled. He is ignorant of the reputation of Timarchus and, therefore, reacts with a physical expression of anger. Whereas Timarchus uses his body for lewd and crude activities, the noble Autolycus’ physical reaction is based on purity of thought and purpose. These descriptions of physicality are a useful comparison for the orator who needs to paint Timarchus in the most damning light. Although the comparative method is indirect and more subtle than can be found elsewhere, it unquestionably serves Aeschines well in polarising noble and base behaviours.

---

\(^{155}\) [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 808b14-16.

\(^{156}\) Aeschines I, *In Timarchum*, 83.
In In Ctesiphontem, Aeschines appears to utilise a stereotype of the men sitting in the Areopagus, portraying them as a noble, elite group detached from the common citizenry in their behaviour and their awareness of the behaviour of others. In this oration, Aeschines is giving details of the auditing of those holding public office, who must by law enter into the public record their finances which will be examined and brought under the public’s decree. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὴν βουλὴν τὴν ἐν Ἄρειῳ πάγῳ ἐγγράφειν πρὸς τοὺς λογιστὰς ὁ νόμος κελεύει λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας διδόναι, καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ σκυθρωπὸν καὶ τῶν μεγίστων κυρίον ἅγει ὑπὸ τὴν ὑμετέραν ψήφου.157 The members of the Areopagus are described by Aeschines as having sullen (or angry) faces and the greatest authority, an image which is probably a reflection of the impressions and the prejudices of his audience.

In Aeschines’ De false legatione the use of facial expression is once again found to be a rhetorical instrument in the political struggle between the orator and Demosthenes. Aeschines here describes how Demosthenes, whose reputation as a speaker is well-known, collapsed when trying to deliver his speech to Philip, was unable to regain his composure, and failed to complete what he intended to say. Aeschines claims that Demosthenes, with an extremely angry look on his face, then blamed Aeschines for ruining any chance for peace and antagonising Philip.

"Ἐπείδὴ δὲ ἔφι ἡμῶν αὐτῶν [οἱ συμπρέσβεις] ἐγενόμεθα, σφόδρα πάνυ σκυθρωπάσας ὁ χριστὸς ὡτοσὶ Δημοσθένης, ἀπολωλεκέναι με ἐφι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους.158 Aeschines continues, stating that he and his fellow-ambassadors were amazed by this accusation, and describing Demosthenes as a ridiculous failure and an embarrassment before Philip. Aeschines depicts Demosthenes not only as an incompetent fool, but as a malicious, angry man who blames others in the face of his own failure. The fact that Demosthenes addressed Aeschines with a look of intense (violent) anger on his face is taken as proof of

158 Aeschines II, De false legatione, 36.
his sinister nature and his inability to accept his own shortcomings and mistakes. Aeschines’ Demosthenes not only fails Athens when she most needs him, but refuses to recognise the worth of him who does serve the city. The description of Demosthenes’ face is intended to tell more than the account of the verbal exchange; it is meant to reveal the true, horrid nature of the man.

Demosthenes also uses angry looks in his descriptions of non-verbal communication. In In Stephanum I, the antagonist’s physical deportment is related in detail. Here the jury is told how Stephanus, already portrayed by the orator as a dubious and base character, is also guilty of misanthropy. The orator ‘proves’ this by describing how Stephanus adopts an angry look and keeps his eyes lowered so as not to have to interact with his fellow citizens who might be drawn to him. Οὐ τοίνυν οὐδ’ ἂ πέπλασται οὗτος καὶ βαδίζει παρὰ τοὺς τοίχους οὗτος ἐσκυθρωπακὼς, σωφροσύνης ἄν τις ἤγησαι’ εἰκότως εἶναι σημεία, ἀλλὰ μισανθρωπίας. ἐγὼ γὰρ, ὅστις αὐτῷ μηδὲνος συμβεβηκότος δεινοῦ, μηδὲ τῶν ἀναγκαίων σπανίζων, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σχέσει διάγει τὸν βίον, τούτον ἡγούμαι συνεργακέναι καὶ λελογίσθαι παρ’ αὐτῷ, ὅτι τοῖς μὲν ἀπλῶς, ώς πεφύκας, βαδίζουσι καὶ φαινοῦσι καὶ προσέλθοι τις ἄν καὶ δεηθεὶ καὶ ἐπαγγείλειν οὐδὲν ὁκνών, τοῖς δὲ πεπλασμένοις καὶ σκυθρωπαῖς ὁκνήσει εἰς ἄν προσέλθειν πρῶτον.159 The angry-looking individual repels others and ensures that an evil character such as Stephanus is not approached by peers in need. A despicable man such as Stephanus is exactly the type to employ such tactics for his selfish ends. Such an individual is prepared to adopt an unattractive, repellent facial expression, regardless of what his true feelings are, simply to avoid his responsibilities as a member of society.

This is not the only example found in the Demosthenic Corpus of a deceitful use of an angry or sullen facial expression. In In Cononem the orator describes Diotimus, Archebiades and Chaeretimus as feigning Spartan austerity,

159 Demosthenes XLV, In Stephanum I, 68. See page 38 for a parallel in [Aristotle]’s Physiognomonica. See page 147 for additional discussion on this passage.
including an angry, sullen facial expression by day, while by night engaging in all means of indecent and shameful behaviour, ἀλλ’ ἵσασιν ύμῶν, ὡς ἔγω νομίζω, πολλοὶ καὶ τὸν Διότιμον καὶ τὸν Ἀρχεβιάδην καὶ τὸν Χαρήτιον τὸν ἐπιπόλιον τουτοῦ, οἱ μεθ’ ἡμέραν μὲν ἐσκυθρωπάκασιν καὶ λακωνίζειν φασὶ καὶ τρίβωνας ἔχουσιν καὶ ἀπλὰς ὑποδέεσθαι, ἐπειδὰν δὲ συλλεγώσων καὶ μετ’ ἄλληλων γένονται, κακῶν καὶ αἰσχρῶν οὐδὲν ἐλλείπουσι.\textsuperscript{160} The austere lifestyle, behaviour and dress of the Spartans were adopted by some Athenians in response to what they saw as the declining morality of their polis. These three men, however, are accused by Demosthenes of simply putting on appearances by day while behaving in a morally corrupt fashion after hours. The implication seems to be that the greater the show of moral severity the deeper the evil and corruption in actions. Spartan clothes and facial expressions are not enough to deceive the orator into believing that these men actually lived by the standard whose outer trappings they have adopted.

Xenophon offers a contrast to such manipulative and deceitful behaviour in his description of Spartan reaction to the death of family members who fell in battle. The austere and courageous Spartans desire the glorious death in warfare above the indignity of surviving one’s fellow warriors. Indeed, in \textit{Hellenica} Xenophon recounts that the (especially female) relatives of the few soldiers who were not killed in battle looked angry and downcast, whereas the families of those killed were bright and beaming with joy. τῇ δ’ ὑστεραίᾳ ἦν ὃραν, ὃν μὲν ἐτέθνασαν οἱ προσήκοντες, λυπαροὺς καὶ φαιδροὺς ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἀναστρεφομένους, ὃν δὲ ζῴντες ἠγγελέμενοι ἦσαν, ὀλίγους ἄν εἶδες, τοῦτον δὲ σκυθρωποῦς καὶ ταπεινοῦς περιώντας.\textsuperscript{161} This portrayal of selfless patriotism is what those Athenians who adopt a Laconian appearance are trying to project and which, at least in the example raised by Demosthenes in \textit{In Cononem}, they fail to achieve.

\textsuperscript{160} Demosthenes L.IV, \textit{In Cononem}, 34.

\textsuperscript{161} Xenophon, \textit{Hellenica} VI.iv.16.
An angry or sullen expression inevitably projects a negative impression, one that does not suit a responsible active citizen with good intentions and soundness of mind. Isocrates, in Ad Demonicum, is discussing appropriate citizen behaviour, including what is an appropriate facial expression, i.e., thoughtfulness not anger. The passage continues with the reasons why; anger projects selfishness and presumption, but thoughtfulness wisdom and sensibility. Modesty, justice and moderation are traits which should be clearly seen and it is these virtues which rule the young. ἃ ποιεῖν αἰσχρὸν, ταύτα νόμιζε μηδὲ λέγειν εἶναι καλὸν. ἐθικὲ σεαυτὸν εἶναι μὴ σιωπώσων ἀλλὰ σύννουν· δι’ ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ αὐθάδης, διὰ δὲ τοῦτο φρόνιμος εἶναι δόξεις. ἡγοῦ μάλιστα σεαυτῶ πρέπειν [κόσμον] αἰσχύνην, δικαιοσύνην, σωφροσύνην· τούτος γὰρ ἀπαι δοκεῖ κοσμεῖσθαι τὸ τῶν νεωτέρων ἂθος.162 A distinction is clearly being made between the contrived, negative facial expression of anger or sullenness and the natural, positive expression of thoughtfulness. From this passage it can be seen that there is keen awareness of facial expression and the image it projects. An individual who intentionally adopts a facial expression is conscious of the persona s/he is trying to project, and thus accepts the accompanying implications for the perception of their character. The angry-looking man is selfish, disdainful, and immoderate, regardless whether his expression is a genuine or a fabricated reaction.

In Plato’s Alcibiades II, Socrates confronts Alcibiades for having an angry or sullen look on his face while heading off to pray. From this exchange between the two men, it would appear that Alcibiades is not even aware of his facial expression, while Socrates notices it and confronts his friend in an attempt to discern the reason why. The combination of an angry expression and looking down at the ground makes Socrates ask what Alcibiades is pondering, ΣΩ. Φαίνη γέ τοι ἐσκυθρωπάκεναι τε καὶ εἰς γῆν βλέπειν, ὡς τι συννοούμενος. ΑΛ.

162 Isocrates I, Ad Demonicum, 15.
Καὶ τί ἂν τις συννοϊτο, ὦ Σωκράτες;¹⁶³ Alcibiades’ only response is to ask what there might be to ponder, obviously unaware of the impact of his facial expression and non-verbal behaviour on those who see him. The ever-perceptive Socrates, however, requires Alcibiades to give an explanation for his angry face and down-cast eyes. This facial expression is not acceptable as a natural state, and its cause needs to be explained and rectified.

¹⁶³ Plato, Alcibiades II, 138a4-6.
Alcibiades’ only response is to ask what there might be to ponder, obviously unaware of the impact of his facial expression and non-verbal behaviour on those who see him. The ever-perceptive Socrates, however, requires Alcibiades to give an explanation for his angry face and down-cast eyes. This facial expression is not acceptable as a natural state, and its cause needs to be explained and rectified.

3. THE HANDS

Given the attention paid to hand movement and gestures in modern life and scholarship, the expectation is that there will be a huge amount of references to such forms of non-verbal communication in classical texts. Indeed, one need not look at modern concerns to come to such a conclusion, as any consideration of Greek art will suggest that the hands were a central means of communication. However, whereas there are numerous textual references to hands and the movements they make, they seem to evoke only a small amount of theoretical consideration by the thinkers of the period. This leads to the question of why there is such an obvious concentration on the hands as a means of communication in art, but not in texts? Furthermore, what does this tell the observer about the balance of power between words and actions? Does the ancient author or orator feel that the words he speaks/writes do not need to be accompanied by a description of the accompanying hand gestures, while the artist uses hands to speak for the words that cannot be communicated by his medium (with the exception of short dedications)? Or did the ancient Greeks simply use their hands less than we might today, thus accounting for the relative lack of attention they receive in Greek texts? Alternatively, the Greeks might have gesticulated profusely, but simply did not think gesticulation important enough to mention explicitly in texts. Perhaps the limited number of direct references to hand gestures is not a judgement on the importance of this part of the body but a reflection of authors’ judgement on the value of using such descriptions in their works. The very nature of hand gestures as a means of communication is that they do not need to be consciously noted by the participants in a communicative act in order to express effectively. Indeed, hand gestures are so much a part of

164 Dohrn (1955); Neumann (1965); Fehr (1979); Durand (1984).
human interaction that they mostly go unnoticed, or at least do not appear to seem deserving of special mention by an author.165

Whatever the reasons behind the phenomenon, there is not a large number of references to hand gestures in most of the extant Classical Greek texts. This does not, of course, mean that hand gestures were not being enacted in the streets, the courts, the Assembly, or on stage, simply that they were not being discussed in the accompanying text. It may be the case that rather than practical or routine hand movements, only obviously identifiable iconic and emblematic gestures, and not even all of those, were recorded textually.166 Non-verbal communication does not serve the same role as verbal communication, and it is, therefore, not surprising that the gestures that the audience witnessed were often not discussed verbally. Hand gestures communicate by using space in a way that speech does not,167 making their means and methods different from, and inaccessible to, the verbal sphere and, therefore, not ordinarily accompanied by a verbal description. While the function of the non-verbal is different from that of the verbal, it is no less important for the success of human communication. Indeed, non-verbal behaviour is the main means of expressing emotions and interpersonal attitudes and is critical for the existence and development of interpersonal relationships.168 Hand movements, whether dependent on speech or independent of it, communicate to the observer, and, even if they are not referred to explicitly or implicitly in the text, could not have been absent from an attempt at an honest portrayal of human behaviour.

There is, however, one notable exception to the general scarcity of references to hand gestures in Greek literature: this is tragedy, and Euripidean

166 Kendon (1991: 71) suggests that ‘gesture’ is “behaviour that is treated as intentionally communicative by coparticipants and that such behavior has certain features that are immediately recognizable.” Kendon (1991) is an example of modern social scientific experiments and theories on audience recognition and registration of both ‘significant’ and ‘ordinary’ movements.
168 Feyereisen and de Lannoy 1991: 49. For a description of experiments to test the assumption that non-verbal communication is more expressive of emotion and inter-personal attitudes, see Feyereisen and de Lannoy (1991: 62).
tragedy in particular, which makes relatively ample textual reference to particular hand gestures.\(^{169}\) Perhaps the restriction on emotional facial expression caused by a fixed mask necessitates the (hyperbolic) usage of hand gestures. Greek drama is full of emotions which need to be expressed, and gestures (and other non-verbal communication) are one of the means by which this is achieved. In fact, bodily movements and hand gestures are useful in trying to conceal the emotionally static mask, thus limiting the dramatic ambiguity that might be perceived by the audience.\(^{170}\) The examples of hand gestures which are evident in the tragic texts are fairly predictable, describing actions which were immediately recognisable as established ritualised behaviour. Indeed, most of the hand gestures found in the Greek literature of the fifth and fourth centuries fall into specific, easily identifiable groups. Ritual gestures of supplication and friendship are the most common, wherein the hands are used as a symbol embodying the relationship in question. The examples of hand gestures are unambiguous symbols for the audience, communicating through signs which have a societal agreement as to their meaning; they exist as clear cues to the social interaction being placed before the reader or audience.

3.1 *Plato's communicating hands*

The relationship between the verbal and the non-verbal is complex, with non-verbal behaviour taking on numerous roles as it supplements, enhances and contradicts the words spoken. While not a central topic of debate, communication by the hands is not without consideration in Greek thought. In a discussion in *Cratylus* on the nature of the names of things, Plato has Socrates refer to hands and their gestures, defining the hands as the means by which one can

\(^{169}\) Taplin (1971: 25) writes that "...the small stage actions—arrival, departure, embracing, separating, handing over objects—slight deeds like these take on, in their context, greatly magnified significance, and become the embodiments of tragedy." These "small actions" also include hand gestures.

communicate which are independent of the vocal. Socrates asks whether, if we had no voice or tongue, we would not sign with our hands like the deaf and mute, using our hands, head and other parts of the body, ἐὰν φωνὴν μὴ εἴχομεν μηδὲ γλῶτταν, ἐβουλομένας δὲ δηλοῦν ἄλλοις τὰ πράγματα, ἀρ’ οὐχ ἂν, ὡσπερ νῦν οἱ ἑνείοι, ἐπεξεργάζομεν ἀν σημαίνειν τὰς χεριὰς καὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ σώματι.171 Essentially, Plato is making Socrates articulate the idea that the body, and hands in particular, are a recognisable means of communication and that, if deprived of the power of speech, man would use his body to ‘speak’ for him. This Platonic discussion of non-verbal communication is describing what modern sociologists refer to as emblems (culturally specific simple messages which can be translated into a word or simple phrase), illustrators (movements which follow the rhythm of speech and emphasise certain verbal units), and regulators or adaptors (gestures which guide the interaction of the participants in the conversation), i.e., the various categories into which hand gestures can be broken down in order the better to understand the multiple ways in which they can be used as communicators.172 In the dialogue, Socrates continues, describing how we make our bodies and demeanour as similar as possible to the thing we are trying to imitate, be it a light, up-high thing by raising hands towards heaven, a heavy, below thing by putting our hands towards earth, or a running horse. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ οἷμαι τὸ ἄνω καὶ τὸ κοῦφον ἐβουλομένας δηλοῦν, ἠρομεν ἂν πρὸς τῶν σύραιν τὴν χείρα, μμεόμενοι αὐτὴν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ πράγματος· εἰ δὲ τὰ κάτω καὶ τὰ βαρέα, πρὸς τὴν γῆν· καὶ εἰ ἐπον θέοντα ἢ τι ἄλλο τῶν ζῴων ἐβουλομένας δηλοῦν, οἶσθα ὡς ὁμολότατ’ ἂν τὰ ἡμέτερα αὐτῶν σώματα καὶ σχῆματα ἐπολούμεν ἔκεινος.173 According to this dialogue, bodily imitation can express anything, using one non-verbal technique or another. Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν οἷμαι δήλωμι τοῦ τῶν σώματι ἐγγίνετο, μιμησαμένου, ὡς ἔσκε, τοῦ σώματος

171 Plato, Cratylus 422e2-5.
173 Plato, Cratylus 423a1-6. See page 211 on the σχῆμα in relation to this passage.
These arguments are set forth by Socrates within the context of a discussion on the origin of language and the naming of things. The comparison to body language is made in order to explain how the earliest names are representative of the nature of the thing they are naming, just as the hand gesture symbolises the nature of the thing it is imitating. Clearly, Plato has demonstrated the existence of an awareness, even if only his own, of the practical function of hand gestures, as well as their relationship with speech.

As with the face, the hands are visible, identifiable and highly personal. When assessing a person’s beauty, the hands are a part of the body which is exposed for examination. Plato, however, rejects the physical as the embodiment of absolute beauty, having Socrates explain in the Symposium Diotima’s theory of absolute beauty, which cannot appear in the faces, the hands or any other part of the body, as he explains in the Symposium. This does not imply, however, a Platonic rejection of the centrality of the hands (and face) in self-presentation and recognition. In the Leges, Plato declares that the punishment for a slave or foreigner for robbing a temple is being branded on the face and hands, flogged according to the jurors’ judgement and cast out naked from the boundaries of the country.

This mutilation of the hands (and face) forces the culprit to be recognised by these signs which dominate the most obvious means of identification. Like the free citizen, the slave and the foreigner are identified by the physical traits of the hands and face; they simply cannot be hidden without raising the question why, making this punishment one without respite. As with the face, the hands provide

---

174 Plato, Cratylus 423a8-b2.
175 See Feyereisen and de Lannoy (1991); Leroi-Gourhan (1964).
176 Plato, Symposium 211a5-7. See page 23 for a discussion of this passage in relation to the face.
177 Plato, Leges 854d1-4.
These arguments are set forth by Socrates within the context of a discussion on the origin of language and the naming of things. The comparison to body language is made in order to explain how the earliest names are representative of the nature of the thing they are naming, just as the hand gesture symbolizes the nature of the thing it is imitating. Clearly, Plato has demonstrated the existence of an awareness, even if only his own, of the practical function of hand gestures, as well as their relationship with speech.

As with the face, the hands are visible, identifiable and highly personal. When assessing a person’s beauty, the hands are a part of the body which is exposed for examination. Plato, however, rejects the physical as the embodiment of absolute beauty, having Socrates explain in the Symposium Diotima’s theory of absolute beauty, which cannot appear in the faces, the hands or any other part of the body, 

\[ \text{ouδ' αὐτῷ φαντασθήσεται α primaryStage} \] 

\[ \text{τὸ καλὸν οἷον πρόσωπον τι οὐδὲ χεῖρες οὐδὲ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ὃν σῶμα μετέχει.} \]

This does not imply, however, a Platonic rejection of the centrality of the hands (and face) in self-presentation and recognition. In the Leges, Plato declares that the punishment for a slave or foreigner for robbing a temple is being branded on the face and hands, flogged according to the jurors’ judgement and cast out naked from the boundaries of the country.

\[ \text{"Ος δ' ἀν ἱερουσιλὼν ληφθῇ, ἐὰν μὲν ἦ δοῦλος ἦ ξένος, ἐν τῷ πρόσωπῳ καὶ ταῖς χερσὶ γραφεῖς τὴν συμφοράν, καὶ μαστιγωθεῖς ὀπόσας ἄν δοξὴ τοῖς δικαισταῖς, ἐκτὸς τῶν ὄρων τῆς χώρας γυμνὸς ἐκβληθήτω.} \]

This mutilation of the hands (and face) forces the culprit to be recognised by these signs which dominate the most obvious means of identification. Like the free citizen, the slave and the foreigner are identified by the physical traits of the hands and face; they simply cannot be hidden without raising the question why, making this punishment one without respite. As with the face, the hands provide

174 Plato, Cratylus 423a8-b2.
175 See Feyereisen and de Lannoy (1991); Leroi-Gourhan (1964).
176 Plato, Symposium 211a5-7. See page 23 for a discussion of this passage in relation to the face.
177 Plato, Leges 854d1-4.
an initial indication of a person’s nature; they are a part of the body which communicates and interacts.

In the *Protagoras* Plato uses the hands as a metaphor for thoughts; Socrates states that just as a man’s health and bodily actions can be discovered by looking at the face and the hands, leading to a desire to see the chest and back and to study him well, so too does he yearn to know more about Protagoras’ thoughts. ώσπερ εἰ τις ἀνθρώπων σκοπῶν ἐκ τοῦ εἰδοὺς ἢ πρὸς ὑγίειαν ἢ πρὸς ἀλλο τι τῶν τοῦ σώματος ἐργῶν, ἰδὼν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἄκρας εἶποι. "Ἰθι δὴ μοι ἀποκαλύψας καὶ τὰ στήθη καὶ τὸ μετάφρευν ἐπίθεσις, ἵνα ἐπισκέψωμαι σαφέστερον," καὶ ἐγὼ τοιοῦτον τι ποθῶ πρὸς τὴν σκέψιν.178

Just as the thinker is titillated by the prospect of knowing more about the workings of the mind, so too does he who observes the hands and face desire to know the rest of the man (or not know him, should the hands and face convey an unfavourable impression). The hands and face offer insight into the nature of the rest of the man, the exposed parts reflecting that which remains hidden.

**3.2 The soul, the body and the hand**

As with other forms of classical non-verbal communication, the tie between the soul and the body is of paramount importance when considering the hands. How the ancient Greeks saw their bodies, and specific parts of their bodies, in relation to their ψυχή is a familiar theme; how this relates specifically to the hands is of interest here. In the *Tetralogia III*, Antiphon explains how the hands carry out the intentions of each of us, εἰ γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες ἀ διανοοῦμεθα ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ὑπουργοῦσιν, that he who strikes another is responsible for the action of the blow, while he who uses his hands to kill is guilty of murder.179 A man’s hands are his most useful instrument for physical action. In effect, the

---

178 Plato, *Protagoras* 352a2-6.
179 Antiphon IV, *Tetralogy III*, III.4
hands are the tools of the ἰν, doing and acting according to the commands of the soul. While this might appear obvious, it is interesting to note that, formally at least in this instance, a separation between the body and the soul is presented.

Man’s ability to use his hands to communicate is considered unique amongst animals. Xenophon writes in Memorabilia that, according to Socrates, man is the only animal which stands up straight, enabling him to look from above, to escape suffering, and to produce sight, hearing and speech; furthermore, whereas creeping quadrupeds were given feet which only enable them to move, man has been given hands, which cultivate the greatest happiness. οἱ [sc. θεοί] πρῶτοι μὲν μόνον τῶν ζώων ἀνθρώπων ὁρθῶν ἀνέστησαν· ἢ δὲ ὀρθότης καὶ προοραῖ πλέον πολεῖ δύνασθαι καὶ τὰ ὑπερθέν μᾶλλον θέασθαι καὶ ἱπτον κακοπαθεῖν καὶ ὁψιν καὶ ἀκοὴν καὶ στόμα ἐνεποίησαν· ἐπείτα τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἐρπετοῖς πόδας ἔδωκαν, οἱ τὸ πορεύεσθαι μόνον παρέχουσιν, ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ καὶ χεῖρας προσέθεσαν, οἳ τὰ πλεῖστα ὅς εὐδαιμονέστεροι ἔκειν ἐσμὲν ἐξεργάζονται. Socrates continues, asking whether it is not obvious that compared to other animals men live like gods, superior in nature, body and soul. He states that with the body of an ox the mind of a man will not accomplish what man wishes, nor will having hands without sense make things complete. οὐ γὰρ πάντως οὐκ ἐν κατάθλαιν ὂτι παρὰ τὰλλα ζῷα ὅσπιρ θεοὶ ἀνθρώπων βιοτεύουσιν, φύσει καὶ τῇ σώματι καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ κρατιστεύουσες; οὔτε γὰρ βοῦς ἐν χῶν σώμα, ἀνθρώπου δὲ γνώμην ἐδύνατ' αὐν πράττειν ἀ ἐβούλετο, οὐθ' ὡσα χεῖρας ἔχει, ἄφρονα δ' ἑστί, πλέον οὐδὲν ἔχει. Man deserves his hands, needing them in order to take full advantage of his cognitive abilities as the most developed animal.

Aristotle tells his reader that man possesses hands because he is the most intelligent animal. He writes in De partibus animalium that while some animals

180 Xenophon, Memorabilia I.iv.11. See page 35 for an Aristotelian view of humans as being the only animals to stand up straight.
have two feet, others many feet and still others no feet, that whereas some are plants and others animals, man alone of the animals stands upright, and has no need for fore-legs, but has been given arms and hands by nature. He then states that Anaxagoras claims that because man has hands he is the wisest of animals, whereas Aristotle counters that it is reasonable to state that it is because he is the wisest of animals that man has hands. Aristotle continues, stating that hands are an instrument, and that nature, like a wise being, distributes each instrument according to ability, as it is more fitting to give flutes to the flautist rather than to give flute-playing to him who has the flutes. δι' ἢν μὲν οὖν αἰτίαν τὰ μὲν δύοπόδα τὰ δὲ πολύποδα τὰ δ' ἀπόδοτα τῶν ζῴων ἐστί, καὶ διὰ τίν' αἰτίαν τὰ μὲν φυτὰ τὰ δὲ ζώα γέγονεν, εἰρήται, καὶ διότι μόνον ὁρθῶν ἐστὶ τῶν ζῴων ὁ ἄνθρωπος· ὁρθῶ δ' ὁντι τὴν φύσιν οὐδεμία χρεία σκελῶν τῶν ἐμπροσθίων, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τούτων βραχίων καὶ χείρας ἀποδέδωκεν ἢ φύσις. 'Αναξαγόρας μὲν οὖν φησὶ διὰ τὸ χείρας ἕχειν φρονιμώτατον εἶναι τῶν ζῴων ἄνθρωπον· εὐλογον δὲ διὰ τὸ φρονιμώτατον εἶναι χείρας λαμβάνειν. αἱ μὲν γὰρ χεῖρας ὄργανόν εἶσιν, ἢ δὲ φύσις ἄει διανέμει, καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος φρονίμος, ἐκαστον τῷ δυναμένῳ χρήσθαι. προσήκει γάρ τῷ ὁντι αὐλητῇ δούναι μᾶλλον αὐλοῖς ἢ τῷ αὐλοῖς ἑχουτι προσθείναι αὐλητικὴν. If this is the better way, and one accepts that nature does the best, then man is not the wisest animal because he has hands, but he has hands because he is the wisest animal. Furthermore, the wisest animal would have the best instruments, and the hand is not one instrument but many; one instrument but with the capacity to be like many instruments. Nature has given the instrument with the most uses, hands, to him who is able to perform the most skills, εἰ οὖν οὕτως βέλτιον, ἢ δὲ φύσις ἐκ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ποιεῖ τὸ βέλτιστον, οὐ διὰ τὰς χεῖράς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος φρονιμώτατος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ φρονιμώτατον εἶναι τῶν ζῴων ἔχει χείρας. ὁ γὰρ φρονιμώτατος πλείστος ἃν ὀργάνοις ἐχρήσατο καλῶς, ἢ δὲ χεῖρ ἑοκεν εἶναι

182 Aristotle, De partibus animalium 687a2-14.
Whereas Plato discusses the utility of the hands as a means of communication that can replace (or supplement) the verbal, he appears to do so in a very practical fashion, as is seen by his chosen example of the signing of the deaf and mute (see section 3.1). Aristotle’s treatment of hand gestures, however, is somewhat different, bringing them directly into the discussions on the connection between form and nature, body and soul. Plato’s consideration of the hands does not depend on interpreting the body as an expression of the soul, whereas Aristotle’s links the soul to the body, making the latter dependent on the former. Aristotle’s soul is the first actuality (or form) of a living body; the animal/human is the composite of the soul with the body. Hands are not really hands without the soul to give form to the physical matter of flesh, bones and muscles.

In De generatione animalium, Aristotle writes that a hand is not a hand without the soul, that a hand (or any other body part) without soul is only the same in name, οὕχ ἐν ὀργανον ἀλλὰ πολλά· ἐστὶ γὰρ ὡσπερ εἰ ὀργανον πρὸ ὀργάνων. τῷ οὖν πλείστας δυνάμειν δέξασθαι τέχνας τὸ ἐπὶ πλείστου τῶν ὀργάνων χρήσιμον τὴν χεῖρα ἀποδέδωκεν ἡ φύσις. 183

Similarly, in Meteorologica, he writes that the body of a dead man is only a man in name, and the hand of a dead man is only a hand in name, μᾶλλον γὰρ δῆλον ὁ νεκρὸς ἀνθρώπος ὀμοιόμοιος. οὕτω τοῖνυν καὶ χεῖρ τελευτήσαντος ὀμοιόμοιος, καθάπερ καὶ αὐτοί λίθων λεχθεῖσαν ἀν. 187 The hand, like the flute, is an instrument whose essence is more than simply its form. Without the

---

184 See pages 33ff. for more on the relationship between body and soul in Aristotle.
186 Aristotle, De generationes animalium 726b22-24.
187 Aristotle, Meteorologica 389b31-390a2 (Lee). See also De partibus animalium 640b, where Aristotle challenges Democritus’ claim that a man is known by his shape and colour, stating that a corpse has the same shape and colour as a living man yet is not a man; Politica 1253a, where he writes that a thing which is defined by a function that it can no longer perform exists only as that thing in name.
ψυχή to direct and use the physical instruments available to it, they are nothing more than shallow replicas of the real thing. Aristotle continues, stating that everything has a ‘final cause’,188 that the hand and the face are determined by their function, and if they cannot perform their functions they can exist in name only, like one who is dead or made of stone, τοῦτων δ’ ἐτὶ μᾶλλον πρόσωπον καὶ χεῖρ. ἀπαντά δ’ ἐστὶν ψυχήμενα τῷ ἐργῷ. τὰ μὲν γὰρ δυνάμενα ποιεῖν τό αὐτῶν ἐργον ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν ἐκαστον, οἷον ὀφθαλμὸς εἰ ὀρᾶ, τὸ δὲ μὴ δυνάμενον ὁμοιόμοιος, οἷον ὁ τεθνεός ἢ ὁ λίθινος.189 It is for the sake of the soul that the body exists, without which it has no reason for its existence.190

Pseudo-Aristotle offers an additional interpretation of this concept in Problemata, asking if man has been endowed with two internal instruments with which to manipulate external instruments, the hands employed for the body and the mind for the soul? ἢ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὄργανα ἐν ἐαυτοῖς ἡμῖν δέδωκε δύο, ἐν οἷς χρησάμεθα τοῖς ἐκτός ὄργανοις, σώματι μὲν χεῖρα, ψυχή δὲ νοῦν.191 The author continues, stating that the use of the hands and the mind are perfected with time, the manual instrument developing before the mental one. The instrument of the mind is knowledge, for it is useful, as the flute is to the flautist, and the natural qualities of the hand are many, nature being before knowledge, as are those things made by it (hands before mind), ἐστὶ γὰρ νοῦ μὲν ὄργανον ἐπιστήμη (τοῦτω γὰρ ἐστὶ χρήσιμος, καθάπερ αὐλοί αὐλητή), χειρῶν δὲ πολλὰ τῶν φύσει ὀντων. ἢ δὲ φύσις αὐτή γε ἐπιστήμης πρότερον, καὶ τὰ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς γενόμενα.192 Both the hands and the mind develop with time, the latter taking longer than the former, reaching maturity only in old age. This idea of a physical and mental development is found earlier in Problemata, where Pseudo-Aristotle asks in regards to stuttering whether it is the same as when boys have less control

---

188 Aristotle’s ‘final cause’ is nature, which is made up of two parts; the form, which is the end, and the matter, which exists for its sake. See also De partibus animalium 639b16ff. See Lear (1988: 35).
189 Aristotle, Meteorologica 390a9-13 (Lee).
190 Sorabji 1979: 55.
191 [Aristotle], Problemata 955b23-25.
192 [Aristotle], Problemata 955b36-39.
over their hands and feet than men do, unable to control their limbs as they are unable to control their tongue. Ἡ ὀσπερ καὶ τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τῶν ποδῶν ἀεὶ ἴττουν κρατοῦσι παιδες δύνεσ, καὶ ὁσι έλαττον οὐ δύναται βαδίζειν, ὡμοίως καὶ τῆς γλώττης οἱ νεωτεροι οὐ δύνανται;¹⁹³ The hands, like the mind, need time to develop as effective instruments, yet the physical tool does not have the complexity (and superiority) of the mental one as the former is mastered quicker than the latter.

The connection between the hand and the soul is illustrated in Aristotle’s De anima. In an explanation of the function of the soul, it is compared to the hand, an instrument which uses other instruments, just as the mind is a form which uses forms, and the senses use the perception of senses. ὁστε ἡ ψυχή ὀσπερ ἢ χειρ ἐστιν· καὶ γάρ ἡ χειρ ὁργανόν ἐστιν ὁργάνων, καὶ ὁ νοῦς εἴδος εἴδων καὶ ἡ αἰσθήσεως εἴδος αἰσθητῶν.¹⁹⁴ Man’s functionality is expressed both through his mind and through his hands, instruments which are testimony to his mental and physical sophistication. These instruments use other tools to achieve what is desired and needed. In De generatione animalium, Aristotle, using the example of carpentry, states that it is the soul, which has the required form and knowledge, which sets in motion the hands, or another part of the body, having them move in a certain way, the hands moving the instrument and the instrument the wood, καὶ ἡ μὲν ψυχὴ ἐν ἡ το εἴδος καὶ ἡ ἐπιστήμη κινοῦσι τὰς χειρὰς ἡ τι μόριου ἔτερου ποιὰν τινα κίνησιν, ἐτέραν μὲν ἄφ’ ὄν τὸ γεγυμόμενον ἔτερου, τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ ἄφ’ ὄν τὸ αὐτό, αἱ δὲ χεῖρες τὰ ὀργανα, τὰ δ’ ὀργανα τὴν ὅλην.¹⁹⁵ Human sophistication is expressed through this ability to use its natural instruments which can also manipulate other tools for its purposes. According to Aristotle, the hands are ἀνομοιομερῆς, they are not homogeneous, they consist of unlike parts, i.e., instrumental parts, which are composed of

¹⁹³ [Aristotle], Problematia 902b17-19.
¹⁹⁴ Aristotle, De anima 432a1-3.
¹⁹⁵ Aristotle, De generatione animalium 730b15-19 (This example serves as a parallel to nature’s use of semen, which is the instrument which causes generation.)
uniform parts, such as flesh, bones and muscles.\textsuperscript{196} Aristotle defends the form of man, claiming that the hand is as good as any tool or instrument, be it the talon or the sword, as it can grasp, and change, the weapon it chooses. Nature has made the hand so that it can be separated and split into many pieces or come together as one, ή γάρ χείρ καὶ ὄνυξ καὶ χηλή καὶ κέρας γίνεται καὶ δόρυ καὶ ξίφος καὶ ἀλλο ὀποιονδήποτε ὄπλον καὶ ὄργανον· πάντα γάρ ἐσται ταύτα διὰ τὸ πάντα δύνασθαι λαμβάνειν καὶ ἔχειν· ταύτη δὲ συμμεμηχανήσθαι καὶ τὸ εἰδός [καὶ] τῇ φύσει τῆς χειρός. διαιρετή γάρ καὶ πολυσχιδής· ἐν γάρ ἐν τῷ διαιρετήν εἶναι καὶ συνθετὴν εἶναι, ἐν τούτῳ δ’ ἐκεῖνο ὦκ ἐστιν.\textsuperscript{197}

Despite the centrality of the hand for human action, it is only one part of the body, and ultimately it exists to serve that body. Indeed, the hand’s relationship with the body can be understood as a metaphor for man’s relationship with his polis. As with man, the hand must have a reason for existing which goes beyond its immediate goals and needs. In the \textit{Ethica Nicomachea}, Aristotle asks whether the eye, hand, foot, and each individual part of the body does not have a function of its own, and whether the body as a whole does not have a function that goes beyond the function of its parts, ή καθάπερ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ χειρός καὶ ποδός καὶ ὀλώς ἐκάστου τῶν μορίων φαίνεται τι ἔργον, οὕτω καὶ ἀνθρώπου παρά πάντα ταύτα θεία τις ἄν ἔργον τι;\textsuperscript{198} In the \textit{Politica}, Aristotle writes that the whole must precede the part; as the polis is logically prior to the oikos or the individual, so too does the body precede the hand or the foot. καὶ πρῶτον δὴ τῇ φύσει πόλις ἡ οἰκία καὶ ἐκάστος ἡμῶν ἐστιν. τὸ γάρ ὀλὸν πρῶτον ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τοῦ μέρους· ἀναρρομένου γὰρ τοῦ ὀλοῦ ὦκ ἐσται ποὺς οὐδὲ χείρ, εἰ μὴ ὁμονύμως, ὄσπερ εἰ τὶς λέγω τὴν λιθίνην (διαφθαρεῖσα γὰρ ἐσται τοιαύτη), πάντα δὲ τῷ ἔργῳ ὑπροστεί καὶ τῇ δυνάμει, ὡστε μηκέτι

\textsuperscript{196} Aristotle, \textit{Historia Animalium} 486a7; \textit{De generatione animalium} 722a20, 722b31; \textit{De generatione et corruptione} 321b28; \textit{Meteorologica} 388a18.
\textsuperscript{197} Aristotle, \textit{De partibus animalium} 687b2-9.
\textsuperscript{198} Aristotle, \textit{Ethica Nicomachea} 1097b30-33.
Here too, Aristotle states that a thing lacking the ability to perform its potential function exists in name only. A man who does not perform his duties as a citizen of the polis is a citizen only in name, just as the hand which cannot function is a hand only in name.

3.3 Right hand, left hand

The opposition between right and left is a common theme in Greek literature and culture. The right is symbolic of the positive, the good and the lucky, while the left symbolises the antitheses of these. While this opposition is not always related specifically to hands in the textual examples, the principle behind it remains applicable. It is with these oppositions in mind that the hands, both right and left, must be considered. The right hand is used for sacred rituals, such as in the purification of unclean hands, and it is the right hand which is grasped in greeting and as a pledge. Plato refers to right and left in Book VII of the Leges, whereby the Athenian Stranger questions the common belief that by nature right and left hands differ in their ability to perform certain tasks, while

200 Aristotle, for example, addresses the Pythagorean opposites, of which right and left are one pairing. For example, in Aristotle's De caelo 271a26-28, the reader is told that ‘opposed places’ are top and bottom, front and back, and right and left, eisó de tópos enantiótites tó ánno kai kátw kai tó prósókh kai ópishen kai tó dezíon kai áristeron. In De caelo 284b30-34, Aristotle writes that these three pairs are not in all bodies, but only in those in whom there is the origin of motion and who have life, for in an inanimate thing one can see no origin of motion, diá kai oúk en ãpantí sóyma tó ánno kai kátw kai tó dezíon kai áristeron. Like the world, man needs to be considered in light of these opposing pairs. See also De partibus animalium 648a, 665a, and De motu animalium 704b19-705a2 for oppositions in animals.

201 See Lloyd (1962). See section 5.1 on hiccoughs and sneezing for a discussion on how omens to the right are positive, those to the left negative.

202 See Parker (1983: 370-374, Appendix 6: The Ritual of Purification from Homicide). A ritual purification is referred to in Euripides’ Heraclis 926-927, 928-929. This purification ritual includes a basket being circled around the altar, én kúlloj ón én kánovn/ eîlêktó boîmou, and the carrying of a torch in the right hand to dip into a basin of water, méllon de dalôn xeiří deziâ fêrein/ é̇ xêrîvâ, ós bâfêiein... In 939-941, Heracles claims that the flame of purification will cleanse his hands after he brings back the head of Eurystheus, and orders that the water be spilled out and the baskets thrown away, ótan ð' ènêyko déôro krâtê Euîrîstheos/ épî tòsui wòn x̱ainôvnon ágniov xêrâs/ êkçeîte pîpâs, ðîptîteê êk xeiříwv kavnâ.
there is no such difference between the right and left legs or the lower limbs. He blames the imbalance on the folly of nurses and mothers, claiming that by nature both limbs are nearly equally matched, but because of the customary attitudes they are not used properly and people become ‘lame’. 'Ος ἄρα τὰ δεξία καὶ τὰ ἀριστερὰ διαφέροντα ἐσθ’ ἠμῶν φύσει πρὸς τὰς χρείας εἰς ἔκαστας τῶν πράξεων τὰ περὶ τὰς χεῖρας, ἐπεὶ τὰ γε περὶ πόδας τε καὶ τὰ κάτω τῶν μελῶν οὐδὲν διαφέροντα εἰς τοὺς πόνους φαίνεται· τὰ δὲ κατὰ χείρας ἀνοίᾳ τροφῶν καὶ μητέρων οἷον χωλοὶ γεγόναμεν ἐκαστοί. τῆς φύσεως γὰρ ἐκατέρω τῶν μελῶν σχεδὸν ἰσορροπούσης, αὐτοὶ διὰ τὰ ἐθνὶ διάφορα αὐτὰ πεποιήκαμεν οὐκ ὀρθὸς χρώμενοι. Plato’s ability to recognise the influence of custom, as opposed to the necessity of nature, for the hegemony of the right hand puts his understanding of the opposition between right and left in contrast with a popular belief in the physiological reasons for this asymmetry. Indeed, if the regime of ambidextrous training promoted by Plato were adopted, it is fair to suggest that humans could develop equal skills in both hands. Yet, according to modern research, children appear initially to use both hands, oscillating back and forth as to which one dominates, with right-handedness being the overwhelming result. Whether the dominance of the right is a result primarily of nature or of cultural construction, albeit a prominent and enduring one, remains to be established. The Leges continues with a description of how those who are ambidextrous are superior, and the Athenian Stranger concludes with a statement on how children should be even of both foot and hand in every way, and how their nature should not be destroyed by custom, ὃπως ἄρτιποδὲς τε καὶ ἄρτιχειρες πάντες τε καὶ πᾶσαι γιγνόμενοι, μηδὲν τοῖς ἐθεσιν

---

203 Schuhl (1948: 174) writes that on the subject of right and left in Leges 794d ff. Plato had ventured “...proposer une innovation véritablement révolutionnaire, qui va dans le sens où mène la distinction sophistique.”
204 Plato, Leges 794d5-e4.
205 Hertz 1909: 553-557.
206 Hertz 1909: 556-557.
207 Morris 1977: 284.
208 See Needham (1973) for multi- and cross-cultural considerations of the right and left.
Aristotle refers to this passage of the *Leges* in the *Politica*, where he states that this ambidextrous ‘law’ is particular to Plato, who would require military training to be practised in such a way as to make men ambidextrous, as in war it is not good to have one useless hand, καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἀσκησιν ὅπως ἀμφιδέξιοι γίνωνται κατά τὴν μελέτην, ὡς δέον μὴ τὴν μὲν χρήσιμον εἶναι τοῖς χερσίν τὴν δὲ ἀχρηστον. Aristotle does not appear to adopt Plato’s view on inherent ambidexterity, as he asserts that asymmetry to the right was the result of nature.

In his discussion in the *Ethica Nicomachea* of the types of justice, both natural and conventional, Aristotle makes a comparison with a consideration of the nature of right and left, stating that, although the right hand is naturally stronger, it is possible to become ambidextrous, φύσει γὰρ ἡ δεξιὰ κρείττων, καὶ τὸν ἐνδέχεται πάντας ἀμφιδέξιοις γενέσθαι. This analogy with types of justice reappears in the *Magna moralia*, where Aristotle writes that while the reality of nature might partake in change, as when everyone practises always throwing with their left hand thus making them ambidextrous, yet the left is by nature weaker, and the right better than the left, no matter whether the left is made to be like the right. Undergoing change does not make a thing’s nature, and if most of the time the left perseveres as the left is and the right as the right is, then that is the nature, καὶ γὰρ τὰ φύσει ὅντα μεταλαμβάνουσι μεταβολῆς. λέγω δ’ ὅλον εἰ τῇ ἀριστερᾷ μελετῷμεν πάντες ἄντι βάλλειν, γνωσταὶ δὲν ἀμφιδέξιοι· ἀλλὰ φύσει γε ἀριστερὰ ἐστίν, καὶ τὰ δεξιὰ οὐδὲν ἤπειρον φύσει βελτίω ἐστὶ τῆς ἀριστερᾶς, κἂν πάντα πολὺς τῇ ἀριστερᾷ καθάπερ τῇ δεξιᾷ. οὕτ’ ὅτι μεταπίπτουσι, διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐστὶν φύσει· ἀλλ’ εἰ ὃς ἑπὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ τὸν πλεῖον χρόνον οὕτω διαμένει ἡ ἀριστερὰ οὐσὰ ἀριστερὰ καὶ ἡ δεξιὰ δεξιά, τοῦτο φύσει ἐστίν. Indeed, in the *Historia animalium*, Aristotle writes that man is the only

animal that can become ambidextrous, μόνον δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδέξιον γίγνεται τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἀνθρώπος.213 This ambidexterity is not the result of nature, however, but of nurture.

The natural superiority of the right is again argued in *De motu animalium*, where Aristotle states that the origin of movement is in the right side, one expression of this being man’s use of the right limb for his defence. ὅτι δ’ ἐκ τῶν δεξιῶν ἢ ἄρχη τῆς κυνήσεως ἐστι... καὶ ἀμύνονται τοῖς δεξιοῖς.214 He continues, stating that man, more than any other animal, has a ruined left (hand) because he is the most according to nature, and the right is by nature better than the left and separated from it. Wherefore, the right is the most right in humans, ἀπολελυμένα δ’ ἔχουσι τὰ ἁριστερά τῶν ζώων μάλιστα ἀνθρώποι διὰ τὸ κατὰ φόσιν ἔχειν μάλιστα τῶν ζώων· φόσει δὲ βέλτιον τε τὸ δεξιὸν τοῦ ἁριστεροῦ κεχωρισμένον. διὸ καὶ τὰ δεξιὰ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μάλιστα δεξιὰ ἐστι.215 Here Aristotle uses the human weakness of the left hand as proof of the right’s natural superiority.

In the Aristotelian *Problemata*, the author briefly considers the differences between right and left hands. Interestingly, the issue is considered in comparisons with other bodily pairs, specifically the eyes and ears: why, the author asks, do they not differ according to right or left, whereas the hands and feet do? Is it because pure elements have no differences, but what is made out of the elements is different, so that these senses are made out of elements, vision from fire and hearing from air? Διὰ τί χεῖρ μὲν καὶ ποὺς διαφορὰν ἔχει πρὸς [τὰ] δεξιὰ «καὶ» τὰ ἁριστερά, ὡμμα δὲ καὶ ἀκοή οὔ; ἢ ὅτι τὰ στοιχεῖα τὰ εἰλικρινῆ ἀδιάφορα, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων ἢ διαφορά; αὕτη δὲ αἱ αἰσθήσεις
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213 Aristotle, *Historia animalium* 497b30-31. This is an interesting comment considering Aristotle infers that man is the only animal which has hands (by virtue of being the most intelligent).
214 Aristotle, *De motu animalium* 705b30-706a9.
215 Aristotle, *De motu animalium* 706a18-22. In *De partibus animalium* 671b28-34, Aristotle also states that movement originates in the right, and that parts on that side will be stronger and make their way upwards quicker than those on the left, thus explaining why the right kidney is higher up than the left one. He applies this same logic to why people raise the right eyebrow more than the left one.
Earlier in this Aristotelian work, it is asked why the senses have no differences according to right and left, as the right is in all other ways more powerful: is it due to custom, since both sides are used in the same way to perceive sense? Is it by custom that the right seems different, since one can become accustomed to being ambidextrous? Διὰ τί οὖ διαφέρουσιν αἱ αἰσθήσεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς τῶν ἀριστερῶν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πάσι κρείττω τὰ δεξιά; πότερον διὰ τὸ ἐθος, ὅτι εὐθὺς ὁμοίως ἁμφοῖν ἑβυζόμεθα αἰσθάνεσθαι; τὰ δὲ δεξιὰ τῷ ἔθει δοκεῖ διαφέρειν, ἐπεὶ ἐξονθείσιν ἁμφιδέξιοι γίνονται. According to Pseudo-Aristotle, not all bodily pairs are subject to the asymmetry of right and left, thus leaving room for the possibility of ambidexterity.

3.4 Oratory and rhetoric

The question of how hand gestures were incorporated into classical oratory is a difficult one, which leads to conflicting responses. While it is impossible to imagine an effective speaking style which is devoid of all or most gestures, it appears that the controlled and measured ideal physical behaviour of the Athenian citizen was also expected when public speaking. The total lack of expressive hand movements is even more difficult to accept if the link between theatre and oratory is examined, whereby the speaker, like the actor, is expected to communicate effectively with his audience through convincing performance. Nonetheless, if Aeschines is to be believed, the ideal Athenian adopts a speaking style which does not include gesticulation, or at least nothing more than can be performed by having one hand outside the cloak. While Aeschines admits in In
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216 [Aristotle], Problemata 960a29-34.
217 [Aristotle], Problemata 958b16-20.
218 See Schmitt (1990: Chapter I) for an overview of ancient gestures, particularly in relation to oratory, as a foundation for later, medieval usage. See also Schmitt (1989) for a discussion on the ethics of gestures from the Roman to the Medieval periods.
*Timarchum* that speakers now have one hand exposed, he is, nonetheless, disapproving of this freedom, claiming that it would have been unacceptable to the civilised Athenian speakers of a bygone age who possessed the perfect decorum and who were cautious in their actions. καὶ οὖτως ἦσαν σωφρόνες οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐκεῖνοι ρήτορες, οἱ Περικλῆς καὶ οἱ Θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ οἱ Ἀριστείδης (ὁ τὴν ἀνάμοιλον ἔχων ἐπονυμιάν Τιμάρχῳ τούτῳ, ἵνα δίκαιος ἐπικαλούμενος) ὠστε οὐκ ἐπάντες ἐν ἐθεὶ πράττομεν, τὸ τὴν χείρα ἔξω ἔχοντες λέγειν, τότε τούτο θρασύ τι ἐδῶκει εἶναι καὶ εὐλαβοῦντο αὐτὸ πράττειν.\(^{220}\) Aeschines chastises Timarchus for speaking with his cloak thrown back, which would leave his hands exposed and free to gesticulate madly. Through the description of hand gestures, the orator uses the rhetorical topos of depicting his adversary as the antithesis of the idealised ancestors, trying to capitalise on his audience’s desire to preserve the physical embodiment of the nature which represents the glory of Athens’ past.\(^ {221}\)

The description of Cleon in the Aristotelian *Αθηναίων πολιτεία* corroborates the impression presented by Aeschines that, while there might have been speakers who adopted a physically active style, this was, nonetheless, condemned by those seeking to preserve the Athenian ideal. After listing the rulers of Athens, the author writes that Cleon was the worst corrupter of the people with his violent impulses, that he was the first to raise his voice and to abuse while on the bema and to pull up his cloak when speaking in the Assembly; all other orators spoke in an orderly fashion, τοῦ δὲ δήμου Κλέων ὁ Κλεανέτου, ὦς δοκεῖ μάλιστα διαφθείραι τῶν δήμων ταῖς ὀρμαῖς, καὶ πρῶτος ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀνέκραγε καὶ ἐλοιπονήσατο καὶ περιζωσάμενος ἐδημηγόρησε, τῶν ἄλλων ἐν κόσμῳ λεγόντων.\(^ {222}\)

\(^{220}\) Aeschines 1, *In Timarchum*, 25. See page 202 for further consideration of this passage.

\(^{221}\) Nouhaud 1982: 67-68, 175-177.

\(^{222}\) [Aristotle], *Αθηναίων πολιτεία* XXVIII.3.
Aeschines’ reprimand of Timarchus for gesticulating and exposing his body is just one of a collection of criticisms about his physical state and behaviour.\(^{223}\) It can be assumed that, at least as an ideal, any comportment attributed by Aeschines to Timarchus would be represented as a deviation from the accepted norm. Aeschines contrasts Timarchus’ gesticulation with a statue of Solon on Salamis which depicts the statesman with his arms inside his cloak, reproducing Solon’s demeanour and illustrating the appropriate manner in which to speak to the people of Athens, εὖ γὰρ οἶδ' ὃτι πάντες ἐκπεπλεύκατε εἰς Σαλαμίνα καὶ τεθεωρήκατε τὴν Σόλωνος εἰκόνα, καὶ αὐτοὶ μαρτυρήσαι τ’ αὖ ὃτι ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ τῇ Σαλαμινίῳ ἀνάκειται ὁ Σόλων ἐντὸς τὴν χεῖρα ἐξων. τοῦτο δ’ ἐστίν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὑπόμνημα καὶ μίμημα τοῦ Σόλωνος σχήματος, ὅν τρόπον ἐξων αὐτὸς διελέγετο τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων.\(^{224}\) Aeschines continues along this line, again describing Timarchus’ speaking style and contrasting it to that of the idealised citizens of yesteryear. Timarchus is different from these men mentioned before; they are too modest to speak with their hands outside their cloaks whereas Timarchus, not long ago, threw his cloak away and gesticulated violently like a pancratist in the Assembly, showing his body in a state of evil and ugliness from drunkenness and indecent conduct, so that the wise hid their faces, ashamed for the city who had this man as counsel.

Σκέψασθε δὴ, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὅσον διαφέρει ὁ Σόλων Τιμάρχου καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνοι ὃν ὅλιγο πρότερον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ εμνήσθην. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γε

\(^{223}\) See, for example, page 49 for his immodest lack of blushing; page 130 his jumping around the Assembly.

\(^{224}\) Aeschines I, In Timarchum, 25. See Cicero, Pro Caelio V, where “keeping arms inside the cloak” meant a probation period for young rhetoricians who were not yet allowed to gesture when speaking. For a discussion of the physical portrayal of the Attic orators in post-classical Greek and Roman sculptures see Zanker (1995). Zanker (1995: 46, figure 26) shows an Augustan copy of a fourth-century statue that has the orator’s arms wrapped inside his cloak, corresponding with the textual evidence on his avoidance of gesticulation, as well as in the pose of the honoured ancestors. Zanker (1995: 44, figure 25) also shows a Roman copy of a fourth-century statue, portraying Sophocles in a nearly identical pose. Both statues depict the subject in the idealised stance of the καλὸς κόγαθος, whose physicality is controlled and moderated. Zanker (1995: 84, figure 48), a Roman copy of a third-century honorific statue, shows Demosthenes with his hands outside his cloak, but clasped together. This pose still projects an image of the measured orator with a controlled physicality.
Controlled, temperate behaviour was the ideal, and deviations from it, whether real or projected, were condemned.

Interestingly, this composed and modest behaviour of keeping hands encased in the cloak appears in Xenophon’s *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*, where the body language of young men is described. Xenophon recounts that Lycurgus, wishing to instil a strong sense of modesty in the youths and in their manner, ordered that they keep their hands inside their cloaks, walk in silence, gaze at nothing, and keep their eyes looking at their feet. *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τὸ αἰδεῖοθαί ἰσχυρῶς ἐμφυσά βουλόμενοι αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐπέταξεν ἐντὸς μὲν τοῦ ἱματίου τῷ χείρῳ ἔχειν, σιγῇ δὲ πορεύεσθαι, περιβλέπειν δὲ μηδαμοί, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὅραν.*226 The modesty required of the Spartan youths in this description evokes the image of young, virginal maidens (παρθένοι), to whom Xenophon compares them. This level of modesty is undoubtedly an extreme behavioural requirement for young men. Indeed, there are strong tensions in this description by Xenophon, which was written, at least partly, for an Athenian audience. Using the highest Athenian standard of moderation and control, Xenophon praises the Spartans, yet from the beginning of the text he explicitly draws attention to the fact that Spartan customs were utterly different from those of all other Greeks. The behaviour exhibited is commendable, yet it remains outside the scope of Athenian male comportment by its very comparison to παρθένοι. The similarities (and differences) between the physical behaviour of the idealised Athenian statesman and that of Spartan youths are but one example of the internal conflict that exists between condemning and
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applauding (envying?) the regimented and disciplined Lacedonian comportment. While a comparison to female behaviour in Athenian terms would be an unequivocal criticism, in this instance it is an hyperbolic means by which to emphasise the depth of Spartan self-control as well to acknowledge the cultural gulf that makes Sparta totally unique.

In De falsa legatione, Demosthenes defends his ally Timarchus, directly referring to this attack by Aeschines on his behaviour and demeanour. According to Demosthenes, who uses as his source people from Salamis, the statue of Solon, which Aeschines uses as an example of the restrained orators with their hands inside the thrown back cloaks and as a means of chastising and abusing the reckless ways of Timarchus, was less than fifty years old, making it more than two hundred years after the time of Solon, meaning that not only the creator of the form of the body did not live at the time of his subject, but neither even did his grandfather. 

If Demosthenes is to be believed, the idealisation of the non-verbal behaviour of Solon and his peers was a (possible) construction of later generations. Their ideal physicality was projected onto the revered historical figures such as Pericles and Solon.

If Demosthenes is to be believed, the idealisation of the non-verbal behaviour of Solon and his peers was a (possible) construction of later generations. Their ideal physicality was projected onto the revered historical figures such as Pericles and Solon.

It would appear that Aeschines himself spoke according to the rules of decorum he demanded of Timarchus, addressing the Assembly with hands concealed inside his cloak. Considering Aeschines’ past experience as a tragic

227 Demosthenes XIX, De falsa legatione, 251. See page 203.
actor, this extreme restraint he appears to have when speaking might appear as over-compensation for his dramatic training. Indeed, Aeschines might be over-emphasising the stylistic ideals of oratory. In *De falsa legatione*, Demosthenes tells Aeschines that the polis does not need oratory with concealed hands, but negotiations with hands kept within. "Où λέγειν εἰς ὄν τὴν χεῖρ' ἔχοντ', Αἰσχίνη, δεῖ, οὐ, ἀλλὰ πρεσβεύειν εἰς ὄν τὴν χεῖρ' ἔχοντα." Demosthenes accuses Aeschines of subordinating himself before Philip, stretching out his hands and dishonouring his countrymen. 229 Demosthenes might also be suggesting by this description that the contemptible Aeschines is stretching out his hands in order to accept bribes. The affectation of adopting the speaking style of Solon is worth nothing if, as an ambassador for the Athenians, he shames them. The hands are the ideal metaphor for this contrast; both the oratorical style and the act of supplication (and/or of accepting bribes) are illustrated and performed with hand gestures. The same hands that remain inside the cloak while within the safety of the Assembly become stretched out and turned up in supplication (and corruption) in the presence of the state’s enemy.

The fact that Aeschines compares Timarchus to a statue of Solon is evidence of how this form of artistic representation was accepted, or at least presented, as a true depiction of the individual in question. Indeed, a statue is supposed to embody in a static pose the essence of its subject, which offers insight not only into the personality of the individual, but into the accepted norms of bodily comportment that are specific to a time and place. Statues must be considered in context, i.e., their placement is paramount to the presentation of subject. For example, the statue in the agora differs from that in a private space. 230 Since it is only the constructed oratorical texts and the idealised
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228 Demosthenes XIX, *De falsa legatione*, 255.
229 For hands outstretched and turned up in supplication see page 105.
230 Statues of public figures, orators and politicians in particular, offer a specific perspective on how these individuals were perceived. The context in which the statue is placed is also of the utmost relevance, as the demeanour and gesture will be appropriate to the venue. Furthermore, the shifting ideal of physical deportment is influential, e.g., the classical politician does not have the same comportment as the Hellenistic orator. The physical ideal changes, and so too does the
physical representation of statues which are attested, the oratorical gesticulation of classical Athens is impossible to reproduce. It can be safely asserted that, as far as an ideal speaking style was concerned, hand movements were not an acceptable part of Attic oratory (this is not true of Roman oratory). Considering the apparent taboo on gesticulation, it is interesting to consider how the orators did in fact speak. Did they keep their arms inside their cloak at all times? Were hand gestures never used, or used only by the uncouth? It is virtually impossible for humans to communicate using only the verbal, so it is probable that some hand movement occurred even with the most polished of speakers. It is not, however, unlikely that the orators did try to refrain from using their hands as much as possible, practising in order to be able to suppress the desire to enhance their words with the language of the body.

3.5 Grasping hands: Greeting, friendship and loyalty

The act of grasping hands encompasses numerous sentiments and performs a variety of roles as a gesture of greeting, as a symbol of friendship and alliance, and as a formalised act which accompanies a pledge are all interdependent, the significance of each one lending meaning to the others. For any one role to be understood, it is imperative to consider the additional symbolic

artistic depictions of these ideals. Whereas the classical citizen is expected to have a strong, controlled, measured physicality, the Hellenistic pupil is so concerned with his intellectual preoccupations that he forgets his body, which can then slump and relax accordingly. The cerebral man of the third century is concerned only with his thoughts and, unlike the citizen of the fourth century, seems to be free from a physical ideal which is based on strength, control and composure. The fourth-century man needs to be both intellectually and physically strong, a well-rounded citizen who could not only participate in public debate, but go to war for his polis when the need arises. The third-century thinker seems to be a true intellectual, with no expectations regarding his physical state. The differences in general bodily comportment must be considered when looking at the hand gestures of statues and trying to decipher what they might mean. In the Anthologia Graeca, Christodorus of Thebes (fifth century CE) in Egypt gives a description of the statues found in the public gymnasium called Zeuxippos. While this source does not date from the period in question, it nonetheless offers descriptions of statues of personalities from the classical period. For example, the deep-thinking Aristotle is described as having clasped hands (II.17-18); Clytius' clasped hands are interpreted as predicting hidden troubles (II. 254-255). Zanker 1995: 90-92.
baggage that accompanies the gesture. Context is paramount to understanding the intention of the hand clasp.

The act of greeting is a complex ritual, its meaning dependent on many different factors: gender, age, status, intimacy, circumstance and personality among them. The physical expression of greeting is related to all these conditions, and it is with this in mind that the handshake needs to be considered. Even a specific gesture, such as the handshake, is subject to semantic variation; e.g., a two-handed grasp implies more intimacy while a single handed grasp is more formal. Furthermore, a brief clasp communicates a different message than a prolonged, pumping clasp. Unfortunately, most of the references in Greek literature do not describe the details of the clasp, they only mention that it occurs. In addition, other forms of non-verbal behaviour which accompany the handshake also communicate about the relationship of those involved in the greeting and the participants’ reaction to the interaction, e.g., a rigid carriage implies discomfort or formality whereas a broad smile can indicate great warmth.\(^{231}\) The possibilities of meaning, and interpretation, are endless.

Within the vast array of hand gestures, that of individuals clasping hands is of central importance and is common to many cultures, including that of the ancient Athenians. Hands are clasped for numerous reasons — in greeting between acquaintances and strangers, as a sign of friendship and loyalty, and as a pledge between men.\(^{232}\) The act, which consists of each man putting forward his right hand and taking the hand of the other, is a symbol of equality, although it is not performed only by social equals.\(^{233}\) In the case of such a handshake, neither

\(^{231}\) Morris 1977: 93. See also Riggio, Friedman and DiMatteo (1981), for an example of the social scientific methodology for analysing non-verbal greetings. This study takes into consideration many of the external influences, such as gender or social skills, which are equally relevant in considering the non-verbal communication of antiquity. These scholars, however, have the advantage of such tools as (hidden) video recorders and players in order to record and analyse their subjects.

\(^{232}\) For a symbolic depiction of this gesture of friendship and loyalty, see Herman (1987: 134, figure 12), which depicts the Athenian marble decree relief of the goddesses Athena and Hera, the patron goddesses of the respective cities, shaking hands, and the inscription recording the treaty between Athens and Samos in 405 (Inscriptiones Graecae 13 127).

\(^{233}\) Herman 1987: 37. See Wagner (1975: 51-59) for more reliefs.
individual has the advantage, both are unarmed as their right hand engages them in this physical act. Handshaking is an ‘access ritual’, with simultaneous requests for and offerings of access. The act requires that the two individuals involved be close enough to make contact, that they recognise the intention to shake hands, and that they respond and co-operate with one another in order to successfully manoeuvre this physical act. If they are incapable of co-ordinating the handshake, then it is apparent that they will find it difficult to co-operate once the formalised greeting is over and the reason for their meeting becomes apparent. The introductory gesture of greeting sets the scene for the interaction that is to follow, letting the participants assess each other’s willingness and ability to work together, or against one another, for the desired goal. While there are variations of this action, the basic meeting of right hands remains at the foundation of this gesture. The tactile expression of a bond is depicted through the emotive clasping of hands.

One important element of the handshake is that it precludes many acts of aggression. The right hand carries the sword, which is used for aggressive or defensive purposes. While there is no reason why an individual could not use his left hand or his legs to inflict pain on another man, the offering, and accepting, of the right hand communicates a willingness not to do so. The right hand is understood to represent the vehicle which holds the sword (or other weapon), the hand which is behind the acts of brutality and heroism that a sword-wielding man might perpetrate. The left hand, in contrast, carries the shield. In Euripides’ Hercules, Theseus comes to repay Heracles, who brought him out alive from the nether-world, by offering him his right hand, symbolising his sword and
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234 Herman 1987: 51, 52, fig. 5. In Cyropaedia VIII.iii.14, Xenophon describes the regal Cyrus as having his hands outside his sleeves. This description refers to the Persian custom of keeping hands inside the sleeve while in the presence of royalty (see Miller 1914: 355, fn. 1) Like the handshake, the immobilisation of the hands makes a violent attack difficult.
236 Kendon 1982: 441.
238 See Snodgrass (1967) on Greek swords and shields.
willingness to go to battle, or to become allies, τίνων δ’ ἀμοιβᾶς ὦν ὑπῆρξεν Ἡρακλῆς/ σῶσας μὲ νέρθεν ἥλθον, εἰ τι δεῖ, γέρον, ἢ χειρὸς ύμᾶς τῆς ἐμῆς ἦ συμμάχων. 239 By offering his right hand Theseus is offering to fight alongside Heracles. In Sophocles’ Philoctetes, Neoptolemus tells Philoctetes to stretch out his right hand and take possession of his weapon, ἀλλὰ δεξιάν/ πρῶτευε χεῖρα, καὶ κράτει τῶν σῶν ὀπλῶν. 240 It is specifically the right hand which will empower Philoctetes. This act of empowerment is abruptly interrupted by the intruding Odysseus, who has been waiting in ambush. Presumably the actions on stage were expressive, with Philoctetes grasping for his weapon with his right hand, only to be denied. 241

The handshake which symbolises the alliance between warriors and is based on the concept of the hand being the instrument of hostility is also the gesture of amicability. In In Ctesiphontem, Aeschines reports the clasping hands in supposed friendship and hospitality as a symbol of Taurosthenes’ hypocrisy, ὁ τ’ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Ταυροσθένης, ὁ νυνί πάντας δεξιοῦμενος καὶ προσγελῶν, τοὺς Φοκικοὺς ξένους διαμιμᾶσας, ἥλθον ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ὡς ἀναρήσοντες. 242 Taurosthenes had joined his brother Callias the Chalcidian with troops from Phocis to attack the Athenian troops when they were in danger, but is now behaving as if he is a friend. The handshake occurs after the warfare, implying an alliance that never existed. In this instance the orator himself draws attention to the symbolic nature of the clasping of hands, its representation of a bond which was symbolised by the physical act of each man’s gripping the hand of the other. The handshake is more than a social nicety, it represents the emotional depth of friendship as well as a commitment of loyalty between the participants. 243

239 Euripides, Heralcide, 1169-1171.
240 Sophocles, Philoctetes 1291-1292.
241 Taplin (1971: 32-33) focuses on the relationship and communication between Philoctetes and Neoptolemus which are illustrated by their non-verbal behaviour, their “stage actions and silences”.
242 Aeschines III, In Ctesiphontem, 87. I retain δεξιοῦμενος of the manuscript tradition contra Dilts (1997).
violation of the meaning behind the gesture is considered unacceptable, dishonourable behaviour.

Another example of the shaking of right hands as a sign of intimacy later revealed to be hypocritical can be found in Demosthenes’ *In Midiam*. Here the orator tells of the dishonourable behaviour of Meidias who remained intimate with Aristarchus, going into his home, talking things over with him, sitting very close to him and shaking hands with him the very day before he accused him in the Assembly of terrible evils (including the murder of Nicodemus). ἀλλὰ μὴν ὃς ἄληθη λέγω καὶ τῇ μὲν προτεραίᾳ ὅτε ταύτ’ ἔλεγεν, εἰσεληλύθη καὶ διελέκτ’ ἐκείνῳ, τῇ δ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἀκαθαρσίας, ἀνδρές ὧσ’ ἀκαθαρσίας, τῇ δὲ ἐπικήνου καὶ ἐφεξῆς οὕτως καθεξόμενος, τήν δεξιάν ἐμβαλὼν, παρόντων πολλῶν, μετὰ τοὺς ἐν τῇ βουλῇ τούτους λόγους, ἐν οἷς αὐτόχειρα καὶ τὰ δεινότατα εἴρηκε τόν Ἀρίσταρχον... 244 It can be understood from these examples that the handshake was taken seriously as a sign of loyalty and that the severing of the implied pledge was wholeheartedly condemned.

The overuse or misuse of a meaningful gesture can destroy its significance, cheapening it in the eyes of the society it is meant to serve. The handshake between individuals can be perceived as being contrived and false if used indiscriminately, thus losing its meaning as an expression of a real and honoured bond between two men. In the summation of the oration *De corona*, Demosthenes describes his own loyal and noble behaviour to wards of city of Athens. He uses a physical description to represent himself as the faithful servant of the polis, claiming he does not prance around the agora, stretching his hand out when he hears good news for Philip, hoping that the tidings of his behaviour will

---

244 Demosthenes XXI, *In Midiam*, 119. In the statement in 121, the witnesses declare that Meidias was friendly with Aristarchus the day before he accused him before the Council, and that after he had made his statement, he went back to Aristarchus, and took his hand, claiming he had said nothing, asking Aristarchus to reconcile him with Demosthenes, ὃς ἐπήλθεν ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς τούτους τοῖς λόγοις εἰρηκὼς, εἰσεληλύθη πάλιν ὃς Ἀρίσταρχον καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν ἐμβαλὼν καὶ ὧσ’ ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ δεξιάν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν εἰρηκών καὶ αἰτοῦντα Ἀρίσταρχον ὡς ἀν διαλλάξῃ αὐτῷ Δημοσθένην.
be sent back to Macedon, and that he (Demosthenes) does not shudder, moan and stoop like the traitors when his polis does well. οὐκ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς ἔτερων εὐτυχῆσι φαιδρὸς ἴγω καὶ γεγηθῶς κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν περιέρχομαι, τὴν δεξιὰν προτείνων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τούτοις οὕς ἀν ἐκεῖσ’ ἀπαγγέλλειν οἴωμαι, τῶν δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἀγαθῶν πεφρικῶν ἀκούω καὶ στένων καὶ κύπτων εἰς τὴν γῆν...245 This description is an obvious reference to Demosthenes’ portrayal of Aeschines’ behaviour fourteen years earlier in De falsa legatione 314, where he accuses him of acting in just such a fashion.

Examples of handshaking are not restricted to descriptions of Athenian behaviour, indicating that there was a wider recognition of this gesture within Greece and beyond.246 Xenophon describes vividly the meeting between Pharnabazus and Agesilaus, during which they discuss their relationship as enemies or potential friends. After Pharnabazus speaks, Agesilaus grasps his hand, an action that binds them together despite their two states being at war, ἀκούσας ταῦτα ὁ Ἀγγαίλαος ἐλάβετο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰπεν· Εἴθ’ ὁ λῶστε σὺ, τοιούτος ὅν φίλος ἦμιν γένοι.247 The handshake does not preclude their fighting in the future, but the words spoken indicate that this will occur only if circumstances offer no other option. In the next passage, Pharnabazus’ son by Parapita offers to make Agesilaus his ξένος, guest-friend, an offer which is accepted, Ξένον σε, ἔφη, ὁ Ἀγγαίλας, ποιοῦμαι. Ἐγὼ δὲ γε δέχομαι.248 Another non-Athenian example of handshaking being seen as a sign of friendship can be found in Cyropæedia, where Cyrus is described as stretching out his hand to friends when they pushed their way through the crowd to him, ὁπότε δὲ τις καὶ τῶν φίλων διωσάμενος τὸν ὅχλον προφανείτης, προτείνων ὁ Κύρος τὴν

245 Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 323. On a number of occasions the agora appears as the setting used by Demosthenes in depicting his opponents’ arrogant and despicable behaviour. See, for example, page 125 for Aeschines’ arrogant appearance; for Pythocles see footnote 345. See Millett (1998: 224-227).

246 See Herman (1987: 51, figure 4) for a stone relief depicting the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III shaking hands with the king of Babylon.

247 Xenophon, Hellenica IV.i.38. See page 94 for a discussion of the handshake which symbolised the truce which led to the meeting.

248 Xenophon, Hellenica IV.i.39.
Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VII.v.39.

250 Plato, *Parmenides* 126a 1-4.
The contrast between Chaerephon’s behaviour and that of the majority of those acknowledging Socrates’ unexpected return is illustrated through his non-verbal behaviour — he leaps up, runs, and grasps his hand. Through these actions he leaves the others behind, expressing his excitement physically even before he does so orally. The physical touch of the handshake adds a personal, involved dimension to a greeting.

The handshake is more than a gesture of greeting and of friendship; it is a symbol of loyalty. In the Respublica, the gesture of grasping the right hand is found in the description of honours that should be bestowed upon him who is the bravest and most honoured. Such a man will be crowned by the lads and boys who serve with him, he will be greeted with the right hand, and he will kiss and be kissed. Τὸν δὲ ἀριστεύοντα τε καὶ εὐδοκιμήσαντα οὐ πρῶτον μὲν ἐπὶ στρατιάς ὑπὸ τῶν συστρατευομένων μειρακίων τε καὶ παίδων ἐν μέρει ὑπὸ ἐκάστου δοκεῖ σοι χρήναι στεφανωθῆναι; ἥ οὐ; Ἐμοι γε. Τί δὲ; δεξιωθῆναι; Καὶ τοῦτο. 'Ἀλλὰ τῶδ' οἴμαι, ἥν δ' ἐγὼ, οὐκέτι σοι δοκεῖ. Τὸ ποῖον; Τὸ φιλῆσαι τε καὶ φιληθῆναι ὑπὸ ἐκάστου.252 The handshake is a gesture of loyalty to him who is most deserving of praise. Grasping the right hand is more than a ceremonial act, but a pledge of honour and friendship. In Xenophon’s Hellenica, just such a reaction is shown to the successful Spartan general Teleutias, as the soldiers grasped at his hand, crowned him with a garland and a head-band, and prayed for him, ἡνίκα γὰρ ἐπὶ θάλατταν κατέβαινεν ἐπὶ οἶκον ὁρμώμενος, οὐδεὶς ἐκείνων τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὅσ οὐκ ἐδεξιώσατο, καὶ ο μὲν ἐστεφάνωσε, ὁ δὲ ἐταυώσεν, οἶ δ' ὑπερήφανες ὁμοὶ καὶ ἀναγομένου ἑρμπτπον εἰς τὴν θάλατταν στεφάνους καὶ ἥχοντο αὐτῷ πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθά.253

251 Plato, Charmides 153a3-b4.
252 Plato, Respublica 468b2-11.
253 Xenophon, Hellenica V.i.3.
The contrast between Chaerephon’s behaviour and that of the majority of those acknowledging Socrates’ unexpected return is illustrated through his non-verbal behaviour — he leaps up, runs, and grasps his hand. Through these actions he leaves the others behind, expressing his excitement physically even before he does so orally. The physical touch of the handshake adds a personal, involved dimension to a greeting.

The handshake is more than a gesture of greeting and of friendship; it is a symbol of loyalty. In the *Respublica*, the gesture of grasping the right hand is found in the description of honours that should be bestowed upon him who is the bravest and most honoured. Such a man will be crowned by the lads and boys who serve with him, he will be greeted with the right hand, and he will kiss and be kissed. *Τὸν δὲ ἀριστεύσαντά τε καὶ εὐδοκιμήσαντα οὐ πρῶτον μὲν ἐπὶ στρατιὰς ὑπὸ τῶν συστρατευομένων μειρακίων τε καὶ παῖδων ἐν μέρει ὑπὸ ἐκάστου δοκεῖ σοι χρὴνας στεφανωθῆναι; ἤ οὖ; Ἕμοιγε. Τί δὲ; δεξιώθηναι; Καὶ τοῦτο. Α"λλὰ τὸδ’ οἶμαι, ἤν δ’ ἐγὼ, οὐκέτι σοι δοκεῖ. Τὸ ποῦν; Τὸ φιλῆσαι τε καὶ φιληθῆναι ὑπὸ ἐκάστου.*252 The handshake is a gesture of loyalty to him who is most deserving of praise. Grasping the right hand is more than a ceremonial act, but a pledge of honour and friendship. In Xenophon’s *Hellenica*, just such a reaction is shown to the successful Spartan general Teleutias, as the soldiers grasped at his hand, crowned him with a garland and a head-band, and prayed for him, ἡνίκα γὰρ ἐπὶ θάλατταν κατέβαινεν ἐπ’ οἴκου ὁμόμενος, οὐδεὶς ἐκείνων τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὡς οὐκ ἐδεξιώσατο, καὶ ὃ μὲν ἐστεφάνωσεν, ὃ δὲ ἐταινίωσεν, οἱ δ’ ὑπερήψαντες ὅμως καὶ ἀναγομένου ἔριπτου εἶς τὴν θάλατταν στεφάνους καὶ ἡχοῦντο αὐτῷ πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ.253 As with the

251 Plato, *Charmides* 153a3-b4.
252 Plato, *Respublica* 468b2-11.
253 Xenophon, *Hellenica* V.i.3.
honoured men in the Respublica, the grasping of the valiant general’s hand by the soldiers symbolises the respect, loyalty and friendship which the individual warrior bestows upon him.

The handshake which symbolised friendship and loyalty also developed a more formal expression of this relationship in its role in the ritual of making a pledge or taking an oath.254 The word for right hand, or handshake, ἥ δεξιά, also acquired the meaning of a pledge, the symbolism of the gesture being so apparent in ancient Greece. The gesture is one of non-aggressive, friendly greeting and of an oath of loyalty, two notions that are not unconnected.255 The handshake which represents the solemnity of a pledge of good faith, is recounted in the Aristotelian Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, where the tyrant Hippias shook right hands with Aristogeiton, who then provoked him into killing him by saying he had taken the right hand of his brother’s murderer, καὶ τέλος ὃς οὐκ ἐδύνατο πάντα πολὺν ἀποθανεῖν, ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὃς ἀλλος μηνύσων πολλοὺς καὶ πείσας αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰππίαν δοῦσαι τὴν δεξίαν πίστεως χάριν, ὡς ἔλαβεν οἰκείδισας ὅτι τῷ φοινίκι τάδελφοι τὴν δεξίαν δέδωκε οὕτω παράξυνε τὸν Ἰππίαν ὦθο’ ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς οὐ κατέσχεν ἑαυτὸν ἀλλὰ σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν διέφθειρεν αὐτὸν.256 A similarly deceitful handshake is referred to in Aeschines’ In Ctesiphontem, where the speaker reminds the jury of Demosthenes’ previous misdeeds, which include his twice torturing with his own hand Anaxinus of Oreus, to cause him to be punished with death, a man who had entertained him in Oreus, from whose table he had eaten, drunk and poured libations, with whom he had grasped right hands in friendship and hospitality (guest-friendship), a man whom he condemned to death, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίς στρεβλώσας τῇ σαυτοῦ χειρί, ἐγραφας αὐτὸν θανάτῳ ζημιώσας, καὶ παρὰ τῷ αὐτῷ ἐν Ὄρεῳ κατήγου, καὶ ὅ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς τραπέζης ἐφαγες καὶ ἐπιες καὶ ἐσπεισας, καὶ τὴν

254 Onians (1951: 97, n. 10) explains the sanctity of the right hand on the grounds of its being “the executive member representing and pledging the life soul.” See Neumann (1965: 49-59) for some artistic depictions of the handshake.

255 Herman 1987: 50.

256 [Aristotle], Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία XVIII.vi.
Aeschines uses the handshake to express the hypocrisy and disloyalty of Demosthenes, who could torture and call for the death of a man who had been his εἰνος. The implication is that a man who would do such a thing to his εἰνος could be expected to act in the same fashion regarding the polis. Such a man cannot be trusted and certainly should not be rewarded for his loyalty.

As has already been demonstrated, the shaking of hands is often connected with the cessation of violence or warfare, as a gesture of friendship or alliance between combatants. This is in keeping with the concept of the shaking of right hands as a means of disempowering the organ of aggression, i.e., the hand of the weapon. The handshake as a gesture of a formalised pledge derives from this meaning. In Xenophon’s Hellenica there are numerous examples of pledges being ratified through the shaking of right hands; under the guidance of Agesilaus, Spithridates and Otyς come to an agreement about the marriage of the former’s daughter to the latter, ἐὰν τοῦτον δεξιὰς δόντες καὶ λαβόντες ἐπὶ τοῦτος ἀπεπέμψαν τὸν ὁμίλημα.258 Apollophanes of Cyzicus obtains from Agesilaus a truce (symbolised by a solemn drink offering) and a pledge, i.e., the shaking of the right hand, in order to bring about a meeting between Pharnabazus and the Spartan king, ὡς δ’ ἠκούσεν αὐτοῦ, ἑπονῆσεν λαβὼν καὶ δεξίὰν παρὴν ἄγων τὸν Φαρναβάζων εἰς συγκείμενον χάριν...259 When the two meet, they greet each other and shake right hands, καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἀλλήλους χαίρειν προσεῖπαιν, ἐπείτα τὴν δεξίὰν προτείναντος τοῦ Φαρναβάζου ἀντιπροτείνε καὶ ὁ Ἀγησίλαος,260 thus securing the truce and pledge and allowing the discussion to begin. Like some of the earlier references taken from Xenophon, these examples are not depictions of Athenian behaviour. Nonetheless, the

257 Aeschines III, In Ctesiphontem, 224.
258 Xenophon, Hellenica IV.i.15.
259 Xenophon, Hellenica IV.i.30. See page 90 for the handshake of friendship at the meeting between Pharnabazus and Agesilaus.
260 Xenophon, Hellenica IV.i.31.
gesture appears to be the same, adding strength to the assumption that handshake was pan-Hellenic, and even part of the cultural (body) language of Persians and other non-Greeks.261

The hand gesture of grasping the right hand also appears in tragedy. Of course, the examples discussed here are only those for which there is direct textual evidence — it is impossible to know how many additional handshakes were part of the dramatic actions which were not verbalised. The handshake was a useful tool for the poet, who could be certain his audience would understand its symbolic significance. For example, in Euripides’ Iphigenia Aulidensis, the familiar rituals are performed to symbolise the pledge being taken. Agamemnon tells of the oath to defend Helen taken by her suitors as demanded by her father Tyndareus, for which they clasped right hands, offered burnt sacrifices, and poured drink-offerings, καὶ νῦν εἰσῆλθεν τάδε· ὁρκοὺς συνάψαι δεξιάς τε συμβαλεῖν/ μυπτήρας ἀλλήλους καὶ δι’ ἐμπύρων/ σπονδάς καθείναι κάπαράσασθαι τάδε.262 In this instance, the handshake represents the more formal circumstance of a binding oath rather than the less formal gesture of friendship and the ties of the guest-friend. Nonetheless, the gesture of clasping hands is an integral part of the bonding ritual. The hand clasp is the physical contact between the men which actualises the pledge and for which the sacrifices and offerings are made. The handshake is not necessarily accompanied by any other rituals or gestures, it being a strong enough symbol to be used on its own.

In Trachiniae, Sophocles describes the act of grasping right hands in the pledge between Heracles and Hyllus. ΗΡ. ἐμβάλλε χεῖρα δεξιάν πρώτιστά μοι./ ᾿ΥΛ. ως πρὸς τί πίστιν τήν’ ἀγαν ἐπιστρέφεις;/ ΗΡ. οὐ θάσσον οίσεις μηδ’

261 See Herodotus, II.lxxx for a description of the Egyptian greeting of extending the hand down (to the knees) (dissimilar to Greek gestures of greeting), ἀυτὸ ὁ λίθος προσαγησάμεν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῇ ὁμοίᾳ ἑνδολυσάμεν κατεύνες μέχρι τοῦ γούνατος τὴν χεῖρα. Herman (1987: 54) states that “[t]he ritual technique may vary from place to place, but the underlying system of beliefs is one.” Herman refers to Herodotus’ examples of Arabians (III.viii), Nasamones (IV.clxxii), and the Skythians (I.xxiv, IV.vii).

262 Euripides, Iphigenia Aulidensis 57-60. Another example of symbolic hand clasping in this play is found in lines 471-472. The gesture involves Menelaus and Agamemnon.
In *Philoctetes*, a pledge is also made when Neoptolemus shakes hands with Philoctetes, promising that he will not leave him, Φι. οὕ τινες σ’ ἑνορκόν γ’ ἀξίω θέσαι, τέκνου. Ne. ώσς οὐ θέμις γ’ ἐμοῦστι σοῦ μολεῖν ἀτερ. Φι. ἐμβάλλε χειρὸς πίστιν. Ne. ἐμβάλλω μενεῖν.

The act of pledge-making in tragedy is not exclusively male or adult. In Euripides’ *Heraclidae*, Iolaus tells the children to give their right hands to the friends and kinsmen they have found, δότ’, ὡ τέκν’, αὐτοῖς χεῖρα δεξιάν, δότε./ ὑμεῖς τε παιό, καὶ πέλας προσέλθετε. This act ensures their protection and symbolises the bond between those partaking in the gesture. Interestingly, here the gesture is performed by children without its losing its adult significance, thus demonstrating that it is not solely men who can be seen to perform this gesture. However, the children cannot participate equally in the relationship, as they cannot fulfil the requirements of friendship. As with women, the responsibility for the pledge implied with the handshake remains with the free male adult and not with the children. In Sophocles’ *Oedipus Coloneus*, Oedipus asks his friend, king Theseus, to take the ancient pledge of a handshake with his daughters, promising never to betray them willingly and always to do well by them, κάπει προσήλθεν, εἶπεν, “ὁ φίλον κάρα,/ δός μοι χειρὸς σῆς πίστιν ἀρχαίαν τέκνοις,/ ὑμεῖς τε, παίδες, τῷδε· καὶ καταίνεσον/ μήποτε προδώσειν τάσδ’ ἐκών, τελεῖν δ’ ὁσ’ ἁνε/ μέλλης φρονῶν εὖ ξυμφέρωντ’ αὐταῖς ἀεί”. The participation of a woman in the physical manifestation of the pledge, albeit under the guardianship of her father, suggests that the gender restrictions on the act were not totally inflexible and that, at the very least, exceptions did exist. That women

263 Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 1181-1184.
264 Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 811-813. Taplin (1971: 33) states that this handshake is the first occasion on which Philoctetes and Neoptolemus touch. The physical touch changes the nature of the relationship, the handshake symbolising their bond, formalising it in this ritual gesture. Later in the play, Philoctetes bewails what he perceives as Neoptolemus’ breaking of the pledge he made (927-962); this including a direct reference to the right-handed shake in 942. Another reference to the shaking of right hands in this pledge is found in 1398.
266 Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* 1631-1635.
did not normally shake hands in oath taking is, however, indicative of their unequal status with men. While free men can assume a relative equality with each other and can, therefore, shake hands with the intent to honour the pledge, to do so with a woman puts the onus on the man to honour the oath, as the woman cannot offer the same tangible manifestations of friendship and loyalty as her partner in the gesture.

Examples of a similar nature are found in the works of Euripides. In Helena, Menelaus and Helen pledge to die together, taking hold of each other's right hand to make the pledge, Me. ἐπὶ τοῖσδε τοῖνυν δεξιᾶς ἐμῆς θύγε./ El. φαύω, θανόντος σοῦ τὸδ' ἐκλείψειν φάος./ Me. κάγῳ στερηθείς σοῦ τελευτήσειν βίον. This is an additional example of a woman shaking hands to ratify a pledge. Again, while the woman can offer the sentiments behind the oath, she is not a social equal and is not, therefore, in a position to undertake the responsibilities of a pledge. Nonetheless, the very existence of such examples implies at least a symbolic recognition of a woman's abilities to be an honourable participant in an oath, even if she does not have the legal or social power for action. Of course, how much of the acceptance of such portrayals is the result of poetic license and how much can be projected on to Athenian reality can never be established.

Another example of an oath which requires the inclusion of a woman is that taken in marriage. In Euripides' Medea Jason breaks this oath to Medea, an oath taken with the right hand, in order to marry King Creon's daughter. Μῆδεια δ' ἡ δύστηνος ἡτιμασμένη/ βοᾶι μὲν ὅρκους, ἀνακαλεῖ δὲ δεξιᾶς/ πίστιν μεγίστην, καὶ θεοὺς μαρτύρεται/ οἷς ἀμοιβῆς ἐξ' ἵλσονος κυρεί. This reference to hands is highly significant, as it is Medea's hand — which had been taken in oath — that proceeds to kill their children, to become polluted by this

---

268 Euripides, Helena 838-840.
269 Euripides, Medea 20-23. Another reference to this 'right-handed' oath is found at 496. At 899, Medea tells her children to take their father's right hand, symbolising that a truce has been made.
sinister act; the physical vehicle of a marriage oath, the hand, becomes the evil instrument of murder. Unlike the usual marriage agreement conducted between groom and male guardian, it is Medea herself who must have taken on the masculine role in securing the oath with Jason. Typically, the marriage contract (the ἐγγύη) is a legal agreement between the bridegroom and the woman’s κύριος, in which the woman has no active part; the physical consummation of the union is not a legal requirement. The pledge of the ἐγγύη was sealed by the men with a handshake, and the bride did not have to be present during this transaction. Whereas the marriage contract is the legal responsibility of men, nonetheless, at least on the tragic stage, a right-handed pledge taken by the husband is seen as symbolising the union between a man and his wife, and not only with her κύριος.

The symbolism of the right-handed pledge is also used by Euripides to involve the mother in the extra-legal aspects of marriage. In Iphigenia Aulidensis, Clytemnestra demands the right hand of Achilles in order to clasp it and mark the beginning of (his and Iphigenia’s) marital bliss; Achilles’ response is that he will not put his hand in hers, that he would be ashamed to do so before Agamemnon, and that such a touch would not be proper, κλ. μείνοι — τί φεύγεις; — δεξίαν τ’ ἐμῇ χερί/ σύναιφαυν, ἀρχήν μακαρίων νυμφευμάτων./ Αχ. τί φήσις; ἐγὼ σοι δεξίαν; ἀδόμιμθ’ ἄν; ’Αγαμέμνον’, εἰ φαύλιμεν δῖν μὴ μοι θέμις. Achilles’ reaction to Clytemnestra’s request leads to the revelation that he knows nothing of the supposed betrothal, thus exposing Agamemnon’s treachery. It is before Clytemnestra discovers that there is no arranged marriage that she desires to shake

270 In Athens, pollution which resulted from homicide was referred to by the claim that the killer had ‘unclean hands’, e.g., Antiphon V, De caede Herodis, 11 and 82; Lysias XXVI, Περὶ τῆς Εἰδανόρου δοκιμασίας, 8. See Parker (1983: 104-143)
271 Graves (1990: 236ff., vol. 2) writes that Medea, having been struck by Eros’ arrow and fallen in love with Jason, offers to help him win the fleece on the sole condition that he take her as his wife. Jason swore by all the gods of Olympus to be forever faithful to her, after which she gave him the means to accomplish the task set him by her father, King Aëetes. Considering the circumstances of the marital oath, it is clear that Medea did not have a male guardian present.
272 Redfield 1982: 186-188.
274 Euripides, Iphigenia Aulidensis 831-834.
right hands with Achilles, a gesture which symbolises the oath taken by men to secure this union. The mother would not partake in the legal contract represented by this act, yet perhaps the significance here is that she still has an emotional stake in the marriage. Nonetheless, Clytemnestra’s request to take Achilles’ hand is unusual, and his reaction is that he does not even want to touch her hand, this being inappropriate behaviour between a man and woman.

3.6 Supplication

3.6.1 The Grasp

The grasping of a hand, or hands, is not only a gesture of friendship and oath, but can also be a sign of supplication; context is of the utmost importance. The same action that symbolises friendship between equals cannot have an identical meaning if it is between those of unequal social standing. In Aristophanes’ Nubes, Strepsiades asks his son, Pheidippides, to shake (right) hands and kiss him, κόσον μὲ καὶ τῆν χεῖρα δῶς τὴν δεξιὰν, and to obey him by relinquishing his passion for horses and going to study with the sophists.\(^{275}\) As this is a relationship between father and son, there cannot exist between them a situation of equality. The son is by social convention subordinate to the father, regardless of age. Therefore, this requested action of shaking hands and giving a kiss is not a gesture of friendship, but of filial loyalty and obedience to the father; Strepsiades is asking for this physical gesture in order to reinforce his son’s duty to obey the demand he is about to present to him.

Furthermore, even in a transaction between legal equals, one of the parties might choose to express his respect for the other by positioning himself in the role

\(^{275}\) Aristophanes, Nubes 81. A similar combination of acts, clasping hands and kissing (the face), is found in Sophocles’ Oedipus Coloneus 1130-1131; Oedipus wishes Theseus to stretch out his right hand so he could touch it and kiss him, καὶ μοι χέρ’, ὡναξ, δεξιὰν δρέξων, ὡς ἔπαυσε χαλῆται τ’, εἰ δέμος, τὸ σὸν κάρα. Oedipus then retracts the request as he does not wish to contaminate Theseus by touching him, thus spreading the pollution and evil which have befallen him.
of subordinate or inferior; perhaps the inequality is expressed in a way that is not related to their legal status. In Aristophanes' *Ranae* there is a comic example of hand clasping and kissing as a sign of reverence and respect. Here it is Sophocles who displays the gestures of reverence to Aeschylus, kissing him and clasping his hand, giving the tragic chair to him whom he acknowledges as the superior poet, μᾶ Δἰ' οὐκ ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' ἐκυψε μὲν Αἰσχύλου, ὡ τε δὴ κατῆλθε, κἀνέβαλε τὴν δεξιὰν, κἀκεῖνος ὑπεχώρησεν αὐτῷ τοῦ θρόνου. This passage is ambiguous as to who yielded what to whom. While it can be argued that it is Aeschylus, who died long before Sophocles, who is turning the tragic chair over to the younger poet, this reading is inconsistent with the rest of the play. However, it is difficult to understand how Sophocles could be seen to be giving a chair which he himself does not possess. The most likely reading of this passage is that which suggests that Sophocles' gesture be understood as his making no claim to the tragic chair, which he willingly admits belongs to Aeschylus. There is no question of social subordination, but a situation where an equal expresses his recognition of talent greater than his own. Of course, comedy must be considered in context, and the handshake described here is firmly set in Aristophanic parody rather than in any sense of reality.

The supplicating grasp of the hands can lead to a relationship of friendship, but the gestures cannot be mistakenly interchanged for one another. While the physical action might be identical, the context and supplementary words and actions clearly distinguish the act of supplication from the act of friendship (of course, the supplicant can become the friend, and the friend can become a suppliant). Sophocles, in *Oedipus tyrannus*, has Jocasta tell Oedipus how a slave bearing news of Laius, when he found out Oedipus was now reigning,

---

276 Aristophanes, *Ranae* 789-790. See also 754.
278 See Herman (1987: 55-56). An example given here of an act of supplication which then leads to a relationship of guest-friendship is that between Odysseus and the Egyptian king (Homer, *Odyssey* XIV.279ff.) See also Gould (1973: 78-80), where he discusses Homeric examples of the supplicant being then treated as a guest-friend, ἐκεῖνος, or friend, e.g., Odysseus' supplication to Alkinoos (*Odyssey*, VII.142ff.); and Priam's to Achilles (*Iliad*, XXIV.503ff.).
clasped her hand and supplicated her to send him to faraway fields and pastures, 

οὗ δὴ τ' ἄφ' ὅγαρ κεῖθεν ἥλθε καὶ κράτῃ/ σέ τ' εἶδ' ἐχοῦτα Λαῖών τ' ὀλολότα,/ ἐξεκέτευσε τής ἐμῆς χειρὸς θυγών/ ἁγρούς σφε πέμψαι κατ' ποιμνίων νομᾶς,/ ὅς πλείστον εἴη τοῦδ' ἀποστοὺς ἀστεώς. 279 This clasping of her hand was expressive of the slave’s subjection to Jocasta’s will, his need to supplicate before her in order to make his request. The gesture could not be the clasped hands of friendship, as the social class and the gender of the individuals involved prohibit this interpretation. Neither a slave nor a woman is in the position to offer the hand grasp of the guest-friend; neither can meet the accompanying responsibilities of such a gesture.

The grasping of hands in supplication is often combined or associated with other, similar gestures, such as throwing oneself at the feet of another and holding their knees and/or beard. 280 This expression of physical contact defines the supplication, its action delineating the time interval during which one individual has supplicated before another. 281 The action of kneeling adds to the message being communicated by the suppliant — it is a physical gesture that places the person being supplicated in the dominant role, having control over the body of the person who is vulnerably on his/her knees. By making the body small, the suppliant is putting him/herself in the submissive role. 282 Furthermore, the suppliant is forced into a physically uncomfortable position before the person s/he is supplicating.

279 Sophocles, Oedipus tyrannus 758-762.
280 These acts of supplication, i.e., grasping the hand, face, beard, or knees, are identifiable in Homer, e.g., Ilias XXIV.477-479, for knee grasping. See Gould (1973) on the gestures and physical behaviour of supplication; see also Pedrick (1982) for a response to Gould’s usage of Homeric gestures of supplication as sociological evidence. See Neumann (1965: 68-70) for knee touching. See Onians (1951: 174-186) for a discussion on the sanctity of the knees, which (he claims) is ascribed to them of being a symbol for paternity and generation. Onians (1951: 494) claims this belief in the hands and knees as the root of life to be true of the Jews as well.
281 Taplin 1978: 69. For a discussion on the Homeric reactions to supplication and the importance of the physical contact for how and when the supplication is accepted or rejected, see Gould (1973: 78-81).
282 Morris 1977: 142.
The actual gesture of supplication defines the period for which the suppliant can expect the appropriate response from, and mercy, of the person who is being supplicated, although the spirit of supplication may remain after the termination of the grasp. Nonetheless, when the actual ritual of supplication is terminated, the suppliant can no longer expect the protection offered during a formal act of supplication. Euripides writes of a suppliant grasp in the *Hippolytus*, whereby the nurse grasps her mistress’s hand and knees, Φα. τί δράς; Βιάζη, χειρός ἐξαρτωμένη. Τρ. καὶ σῶν γε γονάτων, κοῦ μεθήσομαι ποτε.283 Phaedra, referring to the grasped hand, is shamed by the suppliant gesture into granting the nurse’s request, Φα. ἀπελθεῖ πρός θεῶν δεξιάν τ’ ἐμὴν μέθες. Τρ. οὔ δὴ τ’, ἐπεί μοι δώρον οὐ δίδωσιν ἥρην. Φα. δῶσοι σέβας γὰρ χειρός αἰδοῦμαι τὸ σῶν.284 The nurse repeats this gesture with Hippolytus, kneeling before him and begging for his right hand. Hippolytus orders the nurse not to touch him with her hands, as he does not want the physical contact which will actualise her supplication to him285; she grasps his knees, another gesture of supplication, and begs that he does not destroy her, Τρ. ναὶ, πρός σε τὴνος δεξιάς εὐωλένου. Πτ. οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χειρὰ μηδ’ ἄφιη πέπλων; Τρ. ὦ πρός σε γονάτων, μηδαμῶς μ’ ἐξεργάση.286 Again, these gestures cannot be interpreted as anything other than those of supplication; the nurse is not only a woman, but a slave.

Not all such gestures, however, are the result of slaves supplicating to the free. Even when it occurs between social equals, the act of supplication evokes the physical behaviour and demeanour of social inferiors, of women and children, highlighting the real discrepancy in their honour and position.287 In *Hecuba*,

---

285 Taplin 1978: 70.
Odysseus, disguised in tattered clothes and with a wound on his face, touches the knees of Hecuba in supplication, presenting himself as her slave in order to save his life, Ek. ἡμῶ δὲ γονάτων τῶν ἐμῶν ταπεινός ὄν; Od. ὡστ’ ἐνθανεῖν γε σοὶς πέπλουσι χεῖρ’ ἐμήν./ Ek. τί δὴτ’ ἔλεξας δοῦλος ὄν ἐμὸς τότε.288 Elsewhere in the same play, the situation is reversed and it is Hecuba who supplicates Odysseus, imploring her daughter to do the same. Odysseus hides his right hand and turns his face away so as to avoid having the gestures of supplication expressed towards him by Polyxena, allowing neither his chin nor his hand to be touched by her, Πο. ὀρῶ σ’, Ὅδυσσεῦ, δεξιὰν ὑψ’ εἴματος/ κρύπτοντα χεῖρα καὶ πρόσωπον ἐμπαλν/ στρέφοντα, μή σου προσθήγω γενελάδος.289 Odysseus does not allow himself to be subjected to the physical contact and is, therefore, untouched by the worry of having rejected a supplicant. Later, Hecuba supplicates before Agamemnon’s knees, chin and right hand, Ek. ...Ἀγάμεμνον, ἰκετεύω σε τῶνδε γονάτων/ καὶ σοῦ γενείου δεξιῶς τ’ εὑδαίμονος.290 In this instance, it is Hecuba who is in the situation of being unfree. This gesture of knee grasping is used extensively by Euripides, and is a prime example of how a dramatist used non-verbal behaviour to communicate with his audience. The frequent usage of this gesture implies that it must have been recognised as an act of supplication.

Euripides has further examples of this gesture of supplication. For example, in Hercules, Heracles’ wretched son falls at the feet of his maddened father in supplication as he tries to kill him, reaching with his hands towards his chin and neck, trying to convince his father not to kill him, that he is his own son,

288 Euripides, Hecuba 245-249.
289 Euripides, Hecuba 342-344. The action of touching the chin is also a recognised gesture of supplication. For example, see Euripides’ Andromache 573-574, where Andromache falls to her knees before Peleus, trying to touch his chin with her hand. See also Euripides’ Electra 1214-1217, where Orestes tells how his mother put her hand to his chin begging him to spare her. See Onians (1951: 233) on the jaw and chin as also being seen as the source of life, as a means of generation.
290 Euripides, Hecuba 752-753. See also lines 836-840 for an additional reference to Hecuba’s supplicant knee grasp; line 851 for Agamemnon’s reference to Hecuba’s supplicant hand. See also the Supplices 272, where the women of the chorus grasp Theseus’ knees in supplication.
and not that of Eurystheus, φθάνει δ' ὁ τλήμων γόνατοι προσπεσών πατρός, / καὶ πρὸς γενείου χειρα καὶ δέρνη βαλὼν/ Ἡ Φάλτατ', αὐδαί, μή μ' ἀποκτείνης, πάτερ.291 Another example of a child supplicating a murderous father by reaching for his chin and knees is found in Iphigenia Taurica. Here Iphigenia tells how she stretched her hands towards her father’s chin and knees as he prepared to sacrifice her, (κακῶν γὰρ τῶν τότ’ οὐκ ἀμυνομένῳ)/ ὅσα γενείου χείρας ἔξηκόντισα/ γονάτων τε τοῦ τεκόντος, ἐχαρτωμένη...292 Later in this play it appears that Iphigenia uses these gestures again, this time in supplication towards the women of the chorus-leader, asking the assistance of the chorus in helping her flee. The gestures are not all directed to one person: Iphigenia begs them, grasps the right hand of one, the cheek of another, and the knees of a third, imploring them by their dear homes, their mothers, fathers, and children, by themselves, ἀλλὰ πρὸς σε δεξίας/ σὲ καὶ σ’ ἱκνοῦμαι, σὲ δὲ φίλης παρηδός/ γονάτων τε καὶ τῶν ἐν δόμωσι φιλτάτων/ μητρὸς πατρός τε καὶ τέκνων ὅτωι κυρεί].293 The supplication is manifold, Iphigenia resorting to different gestures in order to convince the women. The physical actions are central to this expression of supplication, essential for the message to be clear to the audience witnessing this interaction.

While the textual evidence for such gestures of supplication is overwhelmingly Euripidean, it is not exclusively so. In Plato’s Epistulae VII, just such an action is described when Theodotes fell at the feet in supplication and grasped the hand of the angry Dionysius, beseeching him not to harm Heracleides, προσπεσῶν δ’ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεοδότης, λαβόμενος τῆς χειρός ἐδάκρυσεν τε καὶ ικέτευεν μὴ δέν τοιοῦτον ποιεῖν.294 This dramatic description conjures up the imagery of tragedy, one man supplicating himself before another in desperation.

291 Euripides, Hercules 986-988. In line 967-969 there is a further reference to suppliant hands, as the delusional Heracles thinks that his father is Eurystheus’ father, grasping him in fear and supplication, ὃ δὲ μν Ἐυρυσθέων δοκῶν/ πατέρα προταρβοῦθ’ ἰκέσιον φαιένχειρός/ ὀθέα. 292 Euripides, Iphigenia Taurica 361-363. 293 Euripides, Iphigenia Taurica 1068-1071. 294 Plato, Epistulae 349a7-b2.
The author of this letter would have been well aware of the tragic usage of this gesture, utilising it with great effect in this correspondence.

3.6.2 Hands up-turned and outstretched

Another hand gesture which symbolises supplication, is that of extending the hands and arms, with the inner arm facing up. This gesture, which is used in supplication before gods as well as men, demonstrates to the person (or god) being supplicated that the suppliant is without weapon, that s/he is opening her/himself up to the mercy of the other. The physical position of being with open, outstretched, turned out arms is one which is difficult to defend, or from which an act of aggression would be unwise. This gesture is a physical validation of helplessness, an admission that there is no contest or claim to dominance, or even equality. Indeed, in *Prometheus vinctus*, Aeschylus defines this action as feminine, with Prometheus stating that he will never become like a woman, with hands up-turned, asking his most hated enemy to release him from his bonds, εἰσελθέτω σε μήποθ’ ώς ἐγὼ Δίος/ γνώμην φοβηθείς θηλύνους γενήσομαι,/ καὶ λιπαρήσω τὸν μέγα συνόμενον/ γυναικόμιος ὑπτιάσασιν χερῶν/ λύσαι μὲ δεσμῶν τῶν. With this action the male suppliant has, at least temporarily, surrendered his manhood.

Thucydides uses this gesture to illustrate the Plataeans surrendering to the Lacedaemonians in the year 427. He writes of the Plataeans that they present themselves to the Spartans as being in the situation of warring friends, that they should be given an amnesty, and that a decision sanctioned by divine law should be made because they give themselves up with hands held out, ὡστε καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἄδειαν ποιοῦντες ὅσια ἄν δικάζοιτε καὶ προνοοῦντες ὅτι ἐκόντας.

---

295 For a comparative study of supplication in the ancient Near East see Gruber (1980).
296 Gould 1973: 94. Onians (1951: 180-181, fn. 1) claims that this gesture, of extending upturned hands in supplication, originates as a begging gesture.
297 Aeschylus, *Prometheus vinctus* 1002-1006.

105
The Plataeans give themselves up willingly, using the description of this act of supplication, turning their arms upward and extending them forth, as an illustration of their lack of aggression, their total subordination to the Spartans. By supplicating the Spartans they hope to appease their sense of vengeance, to be granted the mercy that this action begs for. According to Thucydides, it is against the laws of the Greeks to kill such a suppliant; the Plataeans' use of this imagery is critical in their attempt at salvation.

As mentioned above, Demosthenes' *De falsa legatione* 255 not only gives a depiction of the idealised lack of gesticulation for the best oratorical style, i.e., a speaker keeping his hands inside his cloak, but also describes gestures of supplication to demonstrate how Aeschines behaved with Philip, i.e. humiliating himself and Athens. It can be safely assumed that this description is both hyperbolic and metaphoric, but it is nonetheless revealing of audience expectations. The behaviour is described explicitly, hands stretched out and turned upwards, bringing shame upon your countrymen, σὺ δ’ ἐκεῖ προτείνας καὶ ὑποσχῶν καὶ κατασχώνας τούτως ἐνθάδε σεμνολογεῖ... Whereas Aeschines disgraces Athens and makes gestures of supplication before Philip, when he returns to Athens, he speaks solemnly and seeks to behave to all outward appearances as an honourable citizen. His gestures, however, reveal him as the wicked coward that he is. Interestingly, in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*, the description of the κιναιδός includes his having poor eyesight, being knock-kneed, having his head inclined to the right, and hands which are carried with palms facing upward and slack, κιναιδόν σημεία ὅμμα κατακεκλαμένον, γονύκροτος· ἐγκλίσεις τῆς κεφαλῆς εἰς τὰ δεξιά· αἱ φοραί...

299 Thucydides, III.lviii.3.
300 See page 84.
301 Demosthenes XIX, *De falsa legatione*, 255.
It is not accidental that Demosthenes conjures up the easily recognisable image of the κιναίδος in his portrayal of Aeschines. This physical stereotype was well established already in the fourth century and is clearly incorporated into the physiognomic works of the third century. This is a clear example of how the physiognomic consciousness developed into the (pseudo-) science.

Twice in the Demosthenic corpus, oracles are recounted which describe the gesture of raising both the right and left hands in supplication. In In Midiam, Demosthenes is arguing that, because he was performing a choreic liturgy at the time, Meidias' abuse of him was more than just a personal insult, but an attack on the divine sanction of the oracles for the choruses. Demosthenes includes in his oration two oracles, one from Delphi, the other from Dodona, as proof of his position. In the description of the behaviour expected at the festivals the following are mentioned: the setting out in the streets of wine bowls and dances, the wearing of garlands like their forefathers, and the honouring of all the gods of Olympus, the lifting up of right and left hands and the offering of public thanksgiving. [Περὶ ύγιείας θεῶν καὶ εὔχεσθαι Διὶ ύπάτῳ, Ἦρακλεῖ, Ἀπόλλωνι προστατηρίῳ: περὶ τῶν ἄγαθῶν Ἀπόλλωνι ἄγιε, Λαστὶ, Ἀρτέμιδι, καὶ κατ’ ἄγνιας κρατήρας ἰστάμεν καὶ χοροὺς καὶ στεφαναφορεῖν κατὰ πάτρια θεῶς Ὀλυμπίοις πάντεσι καὶ πάσαις, τίδιας† δεξιάς καὶ ἀριστερᾶς ἀνίσχυτας, καὶ μνασιδωρεῖν.] The oracles demand supplication from the citizens. It is the raised, upturned hands which symbolise this supplication, the action defining the spirit of the gesture without need of an explanation. An almost identical recounting of the oracle is found in Contra Macartatum, in this instance in an argument over the right and duty of relatives to

302 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 808a12-14. See section 4.3 for a more detailed discussion of the physical attributes of the κιναίδος.
303 See Evans 1969.
304 Demosthenes XXI, In Midiam, 52. See page 204.
perform burial rites.\textsuperscript{305} Demosthenes appeals to the oracle from Delphi in order to 
demonstrate its similarities with the laws of Solon, requiring that rites be 
performed for relatives on the appropriate days. In the oracle’s recounting of how 
the gods are to be worshipped it includes the demand for right and left arms to be 
raised to the gods in supplication, giving thanks as is customary. The oracles 
prescribe what behaviour is expected from the Athenians, and the demand for 
supplication is made through the appropriate description of the hands.

In Aristophanes’ \textit{Aves}, Peisthetaerus comically tells how it is not the gods, 
but the birds, that will be worshipped by standing under the strawberry bushes and 
olive trees, offering barley and wheat, and stretching out their hands in prayer for a good portion, κοῦκ ἐς Δελφοὺς/ οὖδ’ εἰς “Ἄμμων’ ἔλθοντες ἐκεῖ/ θύσομεν, ἄλλ’ ἐν τὰῖς κομάροις/ καὶ ταῖς κοτίνοις στάντες ἔχουντες/ κραθάς πυροῦς εὐξόμεθ’ αὐτοῖς/ ἀνατείνουτες τῷ χείρ’ ἀγαθῶ/ διδόναι τι μέρος.\textsuperscript{306} Despite the glaring Aristophanic satire, it can be assumed that the gestures of supplication 
that are made to the birds reflect those normally done for the gods. For the 
comedy to be effective, the audience would need to recognise the actions of 
supplication in order to appreciate the swapping of birds for gods.

Not all the examples of arms being outstretched or raised in supplication 
are Athenian. In Xenophon’s fictional \textit{Cyropaedia}, when Gadates the eunuch’s 
loyalty is questioned by Cyrus, he lifts his hands to heaven as a symbol of his 
swearing that he is telling the truth and that he has not been influenced by 
Hystaspas, καὶ ὁ Γαδάτας ἀνατείνας τὰς χεῖρας πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀπώλοσεν

\textsuperscript{306} This gesture of supplication can be interpreted as implying an indication of the deified status 
of Cyrus. Like the act of proskynesis, extending the arms in supplication could be understood by 
the Greek witness as proof of a Persian’s acceptance of their king as a god. Of course, the Greek 
meaning of a gesture cannot be accepted as universal. Prostration, for example, can be understood

\textsuperscript{305} Demosthenes XLIII, \textit{Contra Macartatum}, 66. 
\textsuperscript{306} Aristophanes, \textit{Aves} 618-624. 
\textsuperscript{307} Xenophon, \textit{Cyropaedia} VI.1.3. 
\textsuperscript{308} While the gesture is
apparently similar to those made by Greeks, it should be noted that this gesture is made by a barbarian, to a barbarian. However, the tale is told by a Greek, and must be understood within the context of an external interpretation, or invention, of events occurring in a non-Hellenic culture, but being recounted for a Hellenic readership.

As in all forms of non-verbal communication, context is paramount. Indeed, the outstretched hand is not unconditionally the sign of supplication, for when it is the hands of a god which are extended, it symbolises a demand for supplication. Aristophanes tells his audience that statues of the gods stretch out their hands, held forth with hollowed palms in order to take the sacrificial offerings of those who come to pray. In the *Ecclesiazusae*, the citizen states that it is not the way of men to give, but to take, like the statues of the gods with their outstretched, upturned hands, οὐ γὰρ πάτριον τοῦτ’ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ λαμβάνειν ήμᾶς μόνον δεῖ νὴ Δία· καὶ γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ γνώσει δ’ ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν γε τῶν ἀγαλμάτων· ὅταν γὰρ εὐχώμεσθα διδόναι τάγαθα· ἐστηκεν ἐκείνοντα τὴν χεῖρ’ ὑπτίαυ· οὐχ οὐς τί δόσοντ’ ἀλλ’ ὅπως τι λήψεται. A further example of a description of the outstretched, receiving hands of the gods is found in the *Aves*, Π. ἵν’ ὅταν θύων τις ἐπειτ’ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν χεῖρ’, ὡς νόμος ἐστίν, τὰ σπλάγχνα διδῶ, τοῦ Διὸς ἀυτοὶ πρῶτεροι τὰ σπλάγχνα λάβωσιν. Both these examples are satirical: in the *Ecclesiazusae* it is the greedy behaviour of men which is mocked, in the *Aves*, it is the gods themselves who are satirised. No matter what the genre, these examples show how the same gesture can have multiple, and dissimilar, meanings depending on circumstance.

---

3.7 Tragic breast beating

Perhaps not surprisingly, it is in tragedy, and Euripides in particular, that the largest collection of references to hand gestures appears. The dramatic posturing required from the genre would have included an almost continuous display of gestures and other forms of non-verbal communication. However, this does not necessarily translate into a representation of such gestures in the wording of the play itself. No other tragic poet makes as much use of the description of gestures. (As for comedy, there is not a large number of descriptions of hand gestures, yet it is clear that comedy too could hardly do without these physical expressions.) The student of non-verbal communication, and hand gestures in particular, is lucky to have a poet such as Euripides who appears to have been particularly inclined to include such descriptions (at least far more than other dramatists). Not all gestures are deeply meaningful, yet those which are the result of conscious dramatic choreography are chosen to communicate a message, however small or mundane.311

A particularly vivid and effective example of dramatic use of gesture is that of beating the breast in grief. This was an immediately recognisable gesture, and is found in Euripides’ Alcestis, when the chorus, while trying to ascertain whether Alcestis has died, asks whether they hear the groaning, the crashing of hands within the house or the weeping as of things done, — Κλυεὶ τίς ἦ στεναγμὸν ἢ/ χειρῶν κτύπων κατὰ στέγας/ ἦ γόσον ὡς πεπραγμένων;312

Again in 104, the chorus states that there is no cut lock of hair on the porch nor women thudding their hands, — χαίτα τ’ οὕτις ἐπὶ προθύροις/ τομαῖος, τὰ δὴ νεκῶν/ πένθει πίνυει, οὐδὲ νεολαίατ/ δουπεῖ χείρ γυναικῶν, both identifiable signs of mourning.313 The performing of the gesture of breast beating would be enough for the chorus to be able to establish that a death has occurred. They do

312 Euripides, Alcestis 86-88.
313 Euripides, Alcestis 101-4. See also Supplìces 603-605.
not need to be told anything beyond this, as the gesture in itself will be sufficient to communicate the grief. Sophocles also uses this gesture as a means of communicating grief, as is seen in Oedipus Coloneus, when, upon hearing of their father’s imminent death, Oedipus’ daughters fell to their father’s knees, weeping, beating their breasts and lamenting at length, ἐς δὲ γούνατα/ πατρὸς πεσούσαι 'κλαίον οὐδ' ἀνίεσαν/ στέρνων ἀραγμοὺς οὐδὲ παμμῆκεις γόους.314

Sophocles makes further use of breast beating in Ajax, when the chorus describes how Ajax’s elderly mother will react when she hears of his plight. She will wail pitifully like a bird, her beating hands falling violently with a thud against her breast, and tearing out her white hair. ἤ ποι παλαία μὲν σὺντροφὸς ἀμέρᾳ,/ λευκῷ τε γῆρα μάτηρ μιν ὅταν νοσοῦν/- τα φρενοβόροις ἄκουσαν/ αἰλουνον αἰλινον/ οὐδ’ οἰκτρὰς γόον ὀριθος ἄποις/ σχήσει δύσμορος, ἀλλ’ ὀξυτὸνος μὲν ψάδας/ θρηνήσει, χερόπληκτας δ’/ ἐν στέρνοις πεσοῦνται/ δοὺποι καὶ πολίας ἄμυμμα χαῖτας.315 While in this instance the mourning is not described as a reaction to death, the mental sickness which afflicts Ajax will cause an equal, if not more dramatic, response. Ajax’s actions are a source of extreme humiliation and disgrace, and will necessarily result in Ajax killing himself. If Ajax had not killed himself, the shame he would bear would be worse than death, and his mother’s mourning would remain appropriate. The chorus’ description of these acts of mourning enhances the feeling of irreconcilable loss, emphasising through a description of the physical, ritualised aspects of mourning that Ajax is lost to those who love him.

Aeschylus attributes the act of breast beating to his male Persian chorus in the Persae. Evidently, the Athenian author has no problems using this gesture in his portrayal of non-Greek characters, which might suggest that, at least to an Athenian audience, this action appears to go beyond their cultural boundaries. Of

314 Sophocles, Oedipus Coloneus 1607-1609. There are additional references to hand gestures in this scene; Oedipus’ opening of his arms to his daughters in 1611; the hand clasp in 1632 (discussed above); Oedipus' putting his hands on his children in 1639; king Theseus’ shading of his eyes with his hands in 1651.
315 Sophocles, Ajax 624-633.
course, it is impossible to know if the breast-beating Persians are purely a creation of Aeschylus’ literary license. It is the vanquished Xerxes who calls on his chorus to mourn the loss of his fleet and those killed in battle, to beat their breasts and cry the Mysian wail. *Ευρισκόμενος Χερσέας*. The gestures of mourning which have been attributed to Xerxes and the other Persians are those which are restricted to females in any Greek context. The action of beating one’s breast is not in itself barbarian, it is the fact that it is men who perform it that puts it outside the limits of acceptable Athenian behaviour. The reference to Mysian wails is a blatant statement of the un-Greek nature of these acts of mourning. By having the Persian men express their grief in this way, Aeschylus is depicting them in the effeminate, elaborate manner which is expected of the barbarians.

### 3.8 Comic crudeness

Comedy is full of references to the physical, and the modern reader can only speculate on the extent to which recognisable gestures were used on stage to supplement and enhance the words being spoken by the actors. However, much can be gleaned from the rare occasions where the text does refer to the gesture. Disappointingly, there are not many such references to hand gestures. Aristophanes does, however, expose his audience to one example of what must have been a recognisable gesture of insult — σκιμαλίζειν — showing a closed fist with the middle finger pointing upward. While this term can have the

---

316 Aeschylus, *Persae* 1054.
319 Cantarella 1992: 48. Onians (1951: 478, n. 2) refers to Holma, *Die namen d. Körpert. im Ass. Bab.*, (p.123) as the source for his statement that the Babylonians also stuck up the finger as an insult. Onians (1951: 495) uses a Jewish, biblical example from Prophets, Isaiah lviii.9, “Then shalt thou call, and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry, and he shall say, Here I am. If thou take away from the midst of thee the yolk, the pointing of the finger, and the speaking of iniquity.” The raised fore-finger (as opposed to the raised middle finger) can also be seen as a gesture of aggression or threat, the finger symbolising the weapon with which an attack can be made, see Morris (1977: 61).
course, it is impossible to know if the breast-beating Persians are purely a creation of Aeschylus' literary license. It is the vanquished Xerxes who calls on his chorus to mourn the loss of his fleet and those killed in battle, to beat their breasts and cry the Mysian wail. Ξε. καὶ στέρνε ἄφανε κάπιθοα τῷ Μῦσιον. The gestures of mourning which have been attributed to Xerxes and the other Persians are those which are restricted to females in any Greek context. The action of beating one's breast is not in itself barbarian, it is the fact that it is men who perform it that puts it outside the limits of acceptable Athenian behaviour. The reference to Mysian wails is a blatant statement of the un-Greek nature of these acts of mourning. By having the Persian men express their grief in this way, Aeschylus is depicting them in the effeminate, elaborate manner which is expected of the barbarians.

3.8 Comic crudeness

Comedy is full of references to the physical, and the modern reader can only speculate on the extent to which recognisable gestures were used on stage to supplement and enhance the words being spoken by the actors. However, much can be gleaned from the rare occasions where the text does refer to the gesture. Disappointingly, there are not many such references to hand gestures. Aristophanes does, however, expose his audience to one example of what must have been a recognisable gesture of insult — σχιμαλιζειν — showing a closed fist with the middle finger pointing upward. While this term can have the

316 Aeschylus, Persae 1054.
319 Cantarella 1992: 48. Onians (1951: 478, n. 2) refers to Holma, Die Namen d. Körpert. im Ass. Bab., (p.123) as the source for his statement that the Babylonians also stuck up the finger as an insult. Onians (1951: 495) uses a Jewish, biblical example from Prophets, Isaiah lxviii.9, “Then shalt thou call, and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry, and he shall say, Here I am. If thou take away from the midst of thee the yolk, the pointing of the finger, and the speaking of iniquity.” The raised fore-finger (as opposed to the raised middle finger) can also be seen as a gesture of aggression or threat, the finger symbolising the weapon with which an attack can be made, see Morris (1977: 61).
general meaning of ‘to jeer’, the gesture of the middle finger being raised in insult cannot be separated from its original meaning. This gesture is an obscene action, used as a means of attack. While the primary meaning of this gesture implies that the recipient was a κιναιδός or a καταπυγων, it can also be understood as a general expression of disrespect and hate. The connection between the raised finger and the phallus cannot be missed. The use of the phallus as a symbol for insult is the result of human desire for dominance — the individual gesticulating to indicate that another man is a κιναιδός does so by affirming his own masculinity through a symbolic display of his erect phallus. In Acharnenses, Dicaeopolis dresses up in rags to address the chorus, stating that the spectators will know who he is, while the chorus will stand by like fools, as he shows them his finger as in insulting pet phrases, τοὺς δὲ αὖ χορευτὰς ἥλιθίους παρεστάναι,/ ὡς ἄν αὐτούς ῥηματίοις σκιμαλίσω. In the Pax, Trygaeus and Hermes recognise the trades of men by their expressions at the prospect of peace between the cities, Trygaeus (ironically) asking whether he cannot see how the armourer takes delight, showing the middle finger (jeering) at the sword-maker? Τρ. ὁ δὲ δρεπανουργὸς οὕς ὀρᾶς ὃς ἤδεται,/ καὶ τὸν δορυξὸν οἶνον ἐσκιμάλισεν. A similar obscene use of finger gestures is found in the Equites. The ever crude Sausage Seller and the respectable Demus are discussing men like the smooth-faced effeminate who partakes in politics and speaks in a ridiculous manner, and the Sausage Seller asks whether Demus is not ‘feeling with his finger’, i.e. making an obscene gesture which implies this babbling man’s effeminacy and Demus’ abhorrence of him, οὐκοῦν καταδακτυλικός σὺ τοῦ

320 Henderson 1991: 213. Scratching one’s head with a finger (perhaps the middle one?) was considered a sign of effeminacy: see Plutarch Pompeius XLVIII.12; Juvenal IX.132-133; Martial, Epigrams VI.lxx for the digitus impudicus.
322 Aristophanes, Acharnenses 443-444.
323 Aristophanes, Pax 548-549.
The individual who is at the receiving end of the gesture has been insulted and called an effeminate through this use of the hand and fingers.

Aristophanes also addresses the implications of this gesture for the one gesticulating. Indeed, in a society which idealises a controlled physicality, the use of such an expressive and rude display of non-verbal behaviour could not have been condoned. In the Nubes, the audience is told that persons who play with their fingers, i.e., who use such coarse gestures, are themselves considered to be skaioi, unlucky or ill-omened (literally, left), and áγρείοι, boorish, Στ. τίς ἄλλος ἀντί τουτοῦ τοῦ δακτύλου; πρὸ τοῦ μὲν, ἕτερο, ἐμὸν παιδὸς ὄντος, οὕτωσι. Σ. ἀγρείος εἶ καὶ σκαιός. Grand gestures need to be reserved for solemn occasions, not used as a means of expressing abuse and insult.

3.9 Fidgeting hands

The action of ‘fidgeting’, caused by clearly visible autonomic nervous system responses, is very communicative. What the fidgeting demonstrates is that, while there has been a reaction due to increased stress and arousal, no action has been taken to address the cause of these responses. Socrates describes such behaviour in Plato’s Philebus, where a mixture of emotions is given as the causes of men’s fidgeting. In this instance, it is excess pleasure which causes the reaction; leaping, turning all sorts of colours, different demeanours, and many breathings, expressing great consternation and causing him to shout in folly.

324 Aristophanes, Equites 1381.
325 Aristophanes, Nubes 653-655. The scholion explains that the τοῦτοῦ τοῦ δακτύλου refers to showing the membrum virile, ἡ πόθη. Scholia in Nubes 653 (Koster).
326 Morris 1977: 166.
This emotional reaction demonstrates a complete lack of physical control and moderation. It is not only pleasurable feelings, however, which cause such comportment, as fidgeting can also be the physical reaction when a person has been abused or insulted and cannot, or will not, respond with a counter-attack. This excess energy, then, is expressed as fidgeting. Such perceived physical ‘proof’ of cowardice, inactivity or anxiety, is not suitable behaviour for the Athenian citizen, and descriptions of fidgeting are used derogatorily.

In Aristophanes’ Lysistrata, the audience is given an idea of what sort of hand movements and gestures were not considered acceptable; those which expressed distress rather than a calm comportment and disposition. While Aristophanes describes such gestures within the framework of comedy, they are not inconsistent with the generally accepted principle that the Athenian citizen should have the controlled, measured comportment that his circumstances demand. In the Lysistrata, Lysistrata tells the Magistrate to listen and to keep his hands fixed and in control while she tells him how the women will save the city, to which he answers that he is unable to as he cannot restrain his anger, Λυ. ἀκροὶ δὴ/ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας πειρῷ κατέχειν. Πρ. ἄλλ’ οὖ δύναμαι· χαλέπον γὰρ/ ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτὰς ἵσχειν.328 Similarly, Pseudo-Aristotle’s Problemata describes the behaviour of an anxious man, which includes rubbing his hands, stooping, stretching, and leaping about, never keeping still, διότερ εἰκότως ἵδρουσι ταῦτα οἶς πονοῦσι καὶ τρίβουσι δὲ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συγκαθιάσι καὶ ἐκτείνονται καὶ ἐξάλλουσι καὶ οὐδέποτε ἡμεῖσιν.329 Hands are recognised for their highly expressive and communicative ability, and those which cannot be

327 Plato, Philebus 47a3-9.
328 Aristophanes, Lysistrata 503-504. A further Aristophanic description of such behaviour is found in Ranae 921-922, where Dionysus asks (the all-depraved) Aeschylus why he is fidgeting (i.e. stretching his limbs and being impatient).
329 [Aristotle], Problemata 869b10-13. For a Homeric description of a fidgeting coward, see Ilias XIII.280-283.
kept under control reveal the weak, nervous and undesirable nature of the individual.
4. WALKING

Whereas the previous two chapters have evaluated particular body parts, this chapter will focus on a particular action, walking. Walking is a fundamental part of human existence and behaviour, and the textual manipulation of this central action is of great interest. The legs in and of themselves do not attract the same amount of consideration by ancient (and modern) authors as do the face and the hands (although consideration of these is also limited), and an analysis of the legs in motion is a more interesting and productive means of approaching the study of this part of the body. Furthermore, this shift in methodology enables a more in-depth analysis of how one form of bodily movement is integrated into textual descriptions.

Walking, like other forms of non-verbal behaviour, is used by classical authors for rhetorical and descriptive purposes. An individual’s walk, i.e., his/her gait, pace and posture while in motion, can be seen as a statement about his/her nature. Walking as non-verbal communication is subject to interpretation on numerous levels that far surpass a simple acknowledgement of the act of perambulation. Of course, not every mention of, or reference to, walking is relevant to a textual analysis of non-verbal behaviour. Indeed, one important aspect of a successful interpretation of non-verbal behaviour is the need to be able to differentiate between the significant and insignificant examples of body language. While it can be argued that even the most mundane examples of non-verbal behaviour have their worth as a means of understanding the society under investigation, the focus here will be on instances where the description of walking is used as a tool to portray a certain image of an individual, to define a person’s character through his/her bodily actions.

Within the context of the study of non-verbal communication, walking occupies an interesting place. While some bodily behaviours can be easily divided into categories such as autonomic nervous system responses (e.g.,
blushing)\textsuperscript{330} or physiographic gestures (e.g., hand movements which accompany speech)\textsuperscript{331}, walking is a complex form of non-verbal behaviour which is not easily categorised. It is an action that the individual consciously partakes in, while also being one that it is difficult to do without, i.e., walking is, first and foremost, humankind’s most natural means of transportation.\textsuperscript{332} Indeed, the ability to walk on two legs is an integral part of the definition of what it is to be human (in contrast with the defining elements of other animals). However, there is much more to this form of movement than simply a means of transporting oneself, and it is here that one enters the realm of non-verbal communication. In his \textit{Théorie de la démarche}, Balzac underlines the dichotomy of the action of walking, that although it is the most natural of actions and is of central importance its study has been neglected, by asking “[n]’est-il pas réellement bien extraordinaire de voir que, depuis le temps où l’homme marche, personne ne se soit demandé pourquoi il marche, comment il marche, s’il marche, s’il peut mieux marcher, ce qu’il fait en marchant, s’il n’y aurait pas moyen d’imposer, de changer, d’analyser sa marche: questions qui tiennent à tous les systèmes philosophiques, psychologiques et politiques dont s’est occupé le monde?”\textsuperscript{333} Indeed, the very act of walking, be it to or from something or someone, before one even considers the character of the walk itself, communicates a message. Context is paramount, and actions as simple as walking out of a room can be strikingly communicative. In addition, the style of the walk itself must be considered, as well as the social and cultural interpretations applied to this bodily movement and its meaning. Again, context is critical, as many elements (e.g., gender, age, status) need to be considered when evaluating any form of non-verbal behaviour. It can be safely assumed that any person who \textit{can} walk will choose to do so and that walking is a

\textsuperscript{330} See section 2.6.2.
\textsuperscript{331} See page 66.
\textsuperscript{332} See Morris (1977: 288-293) on the various forms of human locomotion, with “walking as [humans’] dominant locomotory feature.”
\textsuperscript{333} Balzac 1938: 614.
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natural action pursued from the earliest stages of life. Perhaps it is because it is
such a necessary and universal action that it is considered in attempts to
understand the individual behind the movement. An individual's walk is used as a
tool to categorise them within society, and is susceptibl._e to all existing prejudices
and subjectivity.

4. 1 Fast walking, slow walking

Attic oratory, and the Demo sthenic corpus in. particular, offer the most
engaging examples of references to walking. The public speaker makes use of an
established topos of utilising physical descriptions to cast an individual as an
easily identifiable stereotype, thus taking advantage of his audience's prejudices.
Descriptions of walking appear to have been one means by which to do so. There
was clearly an awareness in classical Athens of the meaning and interpretation of
body language, and orators were quick to capitalise on this when projecting the
nature of either the speaker or his opponent. The orator uses descriptions of
walking to demonstrate certain characteristics -

he uses the walk to portray the

man to his audience. It is impossible to know whether the individuals described
did or did not actually walk in the manner attributed to them, the important
rhetorical strategy being simply to ensure that the audience sees them in the
desired fashion. The attitudes towards different gaits and strides must have been
well established, as the orator invokes them throughout his speeches to make
important points at crucial times. An orator may, however, try to persuade his
audience to accept his definition of normality, even if it is not universally
accepted. An unsuspecting audience can be easily manipulated to alter their
perception, even if only subtly, without even realising that they have been guided
by the cunning rhetorical tactics of the speaker. Even when attempting to
compensate for the undesirable traits of the client he is trying to defend, the orator


must contend with overcoming the popular adherence to the ideals of physical behaviour and appearance against which they judge others.

When considering the use of walking in these orations, it quickly becomes apparent that the manner, and pace, of this action are very significant. Without mechanical means of locomotion, humans walked much more in antiquity than they do in modern times. Walking is not simply putting one foot before the other, but is a means of communicating personal characteristics and traits. A man’s walk is considered to be expressively almost on a par with a man’s face, it is highly personal and is ‘read’ by those around him. Be it a verbal self-portrait or the painting of another, the verbal depiction of the walking man allows the speaker to describe the character he wants to project.

In the Demosthenic *Contra Pantaenetum*, the general attitude towards the speed at which an individual walks is revealed, at least as it is presented by the orator. In this speech, the orator has Nicobulus, for whom the speech was written, quoting Pantaenetus as saying that the claims against Nicobulus are based on the fact that the Athenians hate those who deal in usury, and that the money-lender is an odious man. He then has Pantaenetus describe him as one who walks quickly, speaks loudly and constantly carries a cane. ‘Επειδὰν τοῖνυ τις αὐτῶν ἔρηται ‘καὶ τὶ δίκαιον ἔξεις λέγειν πρὸς Νικόβουλον,’ μισοῦσι, φησίν, 'Αθηναῖοι τοὺς δανείζοντας. Νικόβουλος δ’ ἐπίφθονός ἐστι, καὶ ταχέως βαδίζει, καὶ μέγα φθέγγεται, καὶ βακτηρίαν φορεῖ: ταῦτα δ’ ἐστὶν ἄπαυτα, φησίν, πρὸς ἐμοῦ.

These grievances against Nicobulus are not violations of the law, but are transgressions of the societal norms expected of an honourable Athenian citizen. Nicobulus’ behaviour is not illegal, just despised. Demosthenes has the speaker say just that, thus forcing the jury to recognise that while fast walking, loud speaking, and cane carrying might be associated with the loathed money-lender, they are not the basis for a legal dispute. The orator presents Pantaenetus as

---

334 Demosthenes, XXXVII, *Contra Pantaenetum*, 52.
thinking that drawing attention to these negative physical traits of Nicobulus will work in his favour, that the Athenian jury will be persuaded to act against the physically despicable Nicobulus out of prejudice. By bringing this to light the speaker will, hopefully, draw the jury’s attention to this rhetorical manoeuvring and scuttle Pantaenetus’ plan. It would seem this image of the fast walking money-lender is so powerful that it is thought to be enough to ensure condemnation regardless of fact or justice. Nicobulus does not try to disassociate himself from the physical characteristics attributed to him; he simply tries to defuse their charge by separating them from the legal issue at hand.

Fast walking is considered an undesirable trait, and its connection with loud talking, not unique to this passage, serves to reinforce this negative image. A further example of this undesirable combination of physical traits can be found in Aristotle’s Ethica Nicomachea. Here he writes that slow movements, a deep voice and steady speaking are thought to be attributes of the high-souled; whereas quickness and a shrill voice are the attributes of the nervous. καὶ κίνησις δὲ βραδεία τοῦ μεγαλοφύχου δοκεῖ εἶναι, καὶ φωνὴ βαρεία, καὶ λέξις στάσιμος· οὔ γὰρ σπευστικὸς ὁ περὶ ὀλίγα στοιχάζων, οὐδὲ σύντονος ὁ μηδὲν μέγα οἰόμενος· ἐὰν δὲ ἐξηφωνία καὶ ἡ ταχυτῆς διὰ τούτων.335 This description is in clear agreement with the evidence found in the Demosthenic Corpus, thus reaffirming the existence of a societal acceptance of the meaning of these physical traits. The physical behaviours described by the orator do not need to be explained, rather they themselves are the explanation. For the negative description of the physical to be successful, the non-verbal behaviour adduced needs to be both recognisable and unambiguous. It would appear that the fast walker is the loud talker — he is uncouth, uncivilised and worthy of nothing but the jury’s or Assembly’s contempt. The association between one’s social status and one’s physical demeanour can be found also in dramatic works. In relation to

335 Aristotle, Ethica Nicomachea 1125a12-16.
a man’s walk, a fragment of the comedian Alexis clearly makes this association as
the audience is told how the manner in which one walks reflects one’s social
status, the unrhythmical walk signifying illiberal behaviour not fit for a free man
and the unpolished mannerisms of the lower classes, ἐν γὰρ νομίζω τοῦτο τῶν
ἀνελευθέρων/ εἶναι, τὸ βαδίζειν ἀρρῆθεμας ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς,/ ἐξὸν καλῶς.\footnote{336}

In Contra Pantaenetus 55, attention is again drawn to Nicobulus’ fast
walking, with Nicobulus admitting this undesirable physical trait in his own self-
description. He goes even further in allowing the audience to envisage him and
his ungainly strides by drawing a comparison with the gentle gait of his opponent,
Pantaenetus. Τοιοῦτος, ὁ Πανταίνετε, ἑγώ, ὁ ταχύ βαδίζων, καὶ τοιοῦτος σύ, ὁ ἀτρέμας. ἀλλὰ μὴν περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ γε βαδίσματος ἢ τῆς διαλέκτου, τάληθῇ πάντ’ ἐρῶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὁ ἀνδρείας δικασταῖ, μετὰ παρρησίας. ἑγώ γὰρ οὐχὶ λέληθ’ ἐμαυτόν, οὐδ’ ἀγνοο, οὐ τῶν εὗ πεφυκότων κατὰ ταύτ’ ὡν ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ τῶν λυστελουόντων ἐαυτοῖς.\footnote{337} The speaker is aware of his physical
liabilities and presents them openly. Physically, he is not graced by nature, and
there is no doubt that he is concerned that this will be held against him.\footnote{338} In
section 56 Nicobulus explains to his listeners that he thinks that physical attributes
are distributed by chance and that it is not easy to fight against what one has been
given. Indeed, if it were not for these differences men would be identical to one
another. He continues by saying that to look at what another has, and to rebuke
him for it, is easy, and this is what Pantaenetus is doing. It seems that the speaker
is seeking to occupy the higher moral ground, claiming that he has been the
victim of nature which has left him with a quick gait and a loud voice. He

\footnote{336} Alexis, Fragmenta 265, 1-3 (Kassel-Austin); Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 1.21d. At 1.21b-c, Athenaeus describes the proper way for a gentleman to wear his cloak; from left to right over the shoulders, not gathered up above the knees. It would appear that the draping of one's cloak was very significant to one's self-presentation and that Alcibiades, and those whose physicality expresses their degenerate nature, do not wear theirs appropriately. See page 80 for Aeschines' critical description of the manner in which Timarchus wears his cloak.

\footnote{337} Demosthenes XXXVII, Contra Pantaenetum, 55.

\footnote{338} One can see the general underestimation of the physical in turn-of-the-century classical scholarship from the following comment “So strong was the Greek appreciation of τὸ καλὸν that they associated moral with merely physical qualities.” [italics mine]. Paley and Sandys (1886: 133).
presents these disabilities frankly, deriding those who try to punish the physically disadvantaged by capitalising on their misfortune in not having been graced with the physical traits preferred by society. The message seems to be that one should not be punished for one’s physical imperfections but rather judged by actions and fact alone.\textsuperscript{339} Gait is a matter of φύσις and not νόμος, i.e., one cannot learn to walk otherwise than one does naturally. Temporary manipulation of traits can be achieved, but the true nature of the individual remains unaltered.\textsuperscript{340} Indeed, the topic of manipulation brings forth the issue of the role the body plays in the relationship between nature, φύσις, and custom, νόμος. The physical traits of an individual, as well as the moral implications of those traits, are the result of φύσις, yet the idealisation of these particular bodily characteristics is based in νόμος.\textsuperscript{341} The identification with the physicality which represents the ideal citizen is the result of cultural influences, whereas the actual physical body of the citizen himself is the result of nature. In this instance, while the undesirable walk is not proof of the speaker’s guilt, it is nonetheless a trait associated with a man with a dubious and dishonourable profession, usury. It would seem that in this instance the physical is not totally unrelated to the moral.

The existence of this sort of argumentation within the orations is illustration that the orator recognised the power of the physical — he knows that the speaker will be judged by his physical appearance and bodily movements, and he needs to act to counter this. It seems that the rhetorical tactics here are to make a pre-emptive strike by bringing the undesirable physical traits to the forefront, to highlight the existing stereotypes and prejudices, and, by doing so, defuse the power of these physical images and force the jury to recognise their biases and

\textsuperscript{339} See Lysias XVI, \textit{Pro Mantitheo}, 19. Here the speaker, defending himself against charges that he served in the cavalry under the Thirty Tyrants, pleads not to be judged by appearances, in this case his long hair, a fashion associated with aristocrats, but by actions. The physical appearance here is not a matter of φύσις alone, as the hairstyle itself is easily altered and is not dictated by nature (although the nature of the man clearly influences his choice of hairstyles).

\textsuperscript{340} For a discussion on nature and its classical context when explaining sexual behaviour and physical traits see Winkler (1990b: 66ff.). In particular, he discusses the Aristotelian treatment of the power of Nature and of Habit.

\textsuperscript{341} Euben 1997: 127.
look beyond them. The fast walker must be saved from his own physicality and from the power of the slow walker and his favourable impression.

In *In Stephanum I*, there is a reference, very similar to those of *Contra Pantaenetus*, to fast walking and the natural physical attributes of men. Here Apollodorus describes himself as being the unfavoured fast walking, loud talking man, while it is Phormio who is the fortunate slow walker. ἐγὼ δ', ὁ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῆς μὲν ὁδεύσι τῇ φύσει καὶ τῷ ταχέως βαδίζειν καὶ λαλεῖν μέγα, οὐ τῶν εὐτυχῶς πεφυκότων ἐμαυτὸν κρίνω· ἐφ' οίς γὰρ οὐδὲν ὕφελούμενος λυπῶ τινας, ἐλαττον ἐχω πολλαχοῦ". There is an obvious connection between these two examples, and they seem to suggest that this form of comparison, whereby the speaker presents himself as the physically inferior, was a rhetorical topos. These examples can be seen as depicting the speaker as an unpolished, untrained orator, just an average citizen taking advantage of his democratic right. Like members of the listening jury, perhaps, he has physical flaws, not conforming to the ideal body type. Nonetheless, he pursues justice and takes on his physically better endowed opponent. Despite his physical inferiority, Apollodorus is still a better citizen than Phormio. This presentation of the physically inferior as morally superior can be interpreted as a rhetorical questioning of the aristocratic καλὸς κἀγαθὸς ideal.

The character traits attributed to the different speeds at which one can walk and the length of stride taken are dealt with succinctly in the Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*. Here the long strided slow walker is fit for finishing what he takes on, a short strided slow walker does not finish what he starts, a long strided fast walker is not enterprising but finishes, and the short strided quick walker is enterprising and does not finish. Μακροβάμων καὶ βραδυβάμων εἶν ἂν νωθρεπιθέτης τελεστικός, δὴ τὸ μακρὰ βαίνειν ἀνυστικόν, τὸ βραδέως δὲ
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342 Demosthenes XLV, *In Stephanum I*, 77.
343 These two orations most probably were written by the same man, be it Demosthenes or another.
The link between an individual’s walk and his/her nature is clear according to the physiognomists’ use of body movements and traits to define character and behaviour.

4.2 Arrogance, vanity, and adultery

A vivid example of how Demosthenes makes use of a description of walking to influence his listeners can be seen in XIX, De falsa legatione. Here Demosthenes uses Aeschines’ stride and gait as one of the means of depicting his rival as an inflated, arrogant poser who sympathises with Athens’ enemy Philip. Before the orator’s description of his rival’s walk and other physical traits, the audience is given a summary of Aeschines’ development from a modest politician to an arrogant doer-of-evil. We are initially told that before Aeschines had begun his evil works against the polis he was prepared to admit to his humble beginnings as a clerk and was thankful to have been voted for — he was aware of how he was seen and behaved modestly. However, since his countless works of evil he has ‘drawn up his eyebrows’ in vain pride, he goes through the agora with his cloak completely let down to his ankles, walking in exactly the same way as Pythocles345, with his lower jaw puffed out as a symbol of vanity346. καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πορεύεται θοιμάτιον καθεὶς ἀχρὶ τῶν σφυρῶν, ἵσα βαίνων Πυθοκλεῖ, τὰς γνάθους φυσῶν, τῶν Φιλίππου ξένων καὶ φίλων εἷς οὗτος ῥῆμαν ἡδη...

344 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 813a3-9.
345 In oration XIX, De falsa legatione, 225, Demosthenes tells his audience that since his visit to Philip Pythocles avoids him, while he struts around the agora discussing plans with Aeschines.
346 In his commentary on oration XIX, De falsa legatione, 314, Weil (1883: 374) states that this expression has become proverbial, as seen in the lexicons of Harpocration, Suidas, and others. For the facial expression see pages 17 and 42.
347 Demosthenes XIX, De falsa legatione, 314.
Demosthenes’ vivid description produces a formidable impression that places his adversary in the mould of the man who characteristically perform these actions. This is how an enemy of the state would appear, and, therefore, this is how Aeschines is presented. This passage is full of physical traits which are used in order to create an image in the minds of the audience of a vain, self-inflated man who should be scorned as a friend of the enemy Philip. The image of Aeschines walking through the agora, his cloak inappropriately worn and with an expression of arrogance on his face, serves as a graphic illustration of the tale of Aeschines’ misdeeds. It is not sufficient for Demosthenes simply to tell his audience that the low-born Aeschines is arrogant and on the side of the evil Philip, he must also give a physical description to add weight to his rhetoric.

Interestingly, the type of description used by Demosthenes appears much later in Plutarch’s *Vitae Parallelae*, where he describes Alcibiades in a similar fashion, as walking with utter wantonness, trailing his long robe behind him. καὶ Ἀρχιππος τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου σκόπτων, “βαδίζει”, φησί. “διακεχλιδώς, θειμάτιον ἔλκων, ὅπως ἐμφερῆς μάλιστα τῷ πατρὶ δόξειν εἶναι, κλασαυχενεύεται τε καὶ τραυλίζεται.” Apparently, the inappropriate walk and the immodestly draped cloak depicted by Demosthenes are preserved as a fourth-century symbol representing the physicality of the vain and disgraceful citizen. With the benefit of hindsight, Plutarch gives a physical description to Alcibiades which suits his reputation as a womaniser and his political disgrace.

---

348 Shilleto’s (1894: 256) comment that “the wit of the passage is greatly increased if Aeschines was of short stature, as Ulpian says on de Coron. p.270 § 129”, draws further attention to the power of the physical description to deflate one's opponent (or inflate one's ally, as the case might be).

349 Examples such as this one which are found in the works of later authors, e.g., Plutarch and Athenaeus, can be considered, although with the required amount of hesitancy. The treatment of walking by these authors corresponds with the evidence found in the orations and other sources from the period. Physiognomies became an increasingly popular discipline and by the second-century CE was flourishing; many of the meanings attributed to physical traits, and walking in particular, were preserved through to this period. Nonetheless, it can be assumed (with caution) that the evidence presented by Plutarch and Athenaeus is based on fifth- and fourth-century sources and, while undoubtly influenced by the theories of the body of their day, is still relatively useful when considered within the appropriate context.

Despite his initial respectability, the corrupt nature of Alcibiades was always expressed through his walk and other physical attributes, and he did eventually fulfil the expectations established by his bodily appearance and behaviour.

The recognition of the physical traits of an adulterer, i.e., a man of Alcibiades’ nature, seems to have been of some interest, and concern, to Athenian citizens. In Aristotle’s *Sophistici elenchi*, it is suggested that one can know an adulterer simply by his effeminate appearance and night-time wanderings, βουλόμενοι γὰρ δεῖξαι ὅτι μοιχὸς, τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔλαβον, ὅτι καλλωπιστής ἢ ὅτι νύκτωρ ὅραται πλανώμενος. πολλοῖς δὲ ταῦτα μὲν ὑπάρχει, τὸ δὲ κατηγορούμενον οὐχ ὑπάρχει. Aristotle does not agree with these claims, but apparently recognises the influence of the physical and the danger of opinions based on appearance which can lead to deceptive conclusions, such as: if an adulterer is a dandy, then a dandy is, necessarily, an adulterer. The connection between effeminate behaviour and adultery is made again by Aristotle in *Rhetorica*, where it is used as an example of guilt by association, ἄλλος, εἰ ἄλλοι ἐμπεριλαμβάνονται οὕς ὀμολογοῦσιν μὴ ἐνόχους εἶναι τῇ διαβολῇ, οἷον εἰ, ὅτι καθάριος, ὁ δείνω μοιχὸς, καὶ ὁ δείνα ἄρα. In the *Rhetorica*, Aristotle indicates that prejudices based on appearance are equally true in the reverse circumstances, that a respectable looking individual will not be suspected of committing a crime even if indeed guilty, αὐτοὶ δ’ οἷοντα δυνατοὶ εἶναι μάλιστα ἀξίωμα ἄκειν ὁ εἰπεῖν δυνάμενοι καὶ οἱ πρακτικοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐμπειροὶ πολλῶν ἄγωνων, κἂν πολύφιλοι ἄσιν, κἂν πλούσιοι. In all three examples Aristotle is exposing the flawed common beliefs and rhetorical sophistry which appeal to physical traits to categorise behaviour. Evidently there existed a common need to believe that the physical manifestations of the adulterer, or of other social deviants, were cues by which one could recognise and safely
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categorise these transgressors of societal norms. Through Aristotle’s attempt at debunking these prejudices the social significance of physical stereotyping is affirmed, and specific behavioural traits, such as walking, serve as examples of how the non-verbal behaviour is interpreted.

For a contrasting example of what was perceived as acceptable Athenian comportment, and against which all deviations were judged, we may read how Plutarch, in the *Moralia*, describes Pericles as having adopted a calm lifestyle and mannerisms, which included walking slowly, talking softly, and keeping his hands inside his cloak. Περικλῆς δὲ καὶ περὶ τὸ σώμα καὶ τὴν δίαιταν ἐξήλλαξεν αὐτὸν ἡρέμα βαδίζειν καὶ πράως διαλέγεσθαι καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἄει συνεστηκός ἐπιδείκνυθαι καὶ τὴν χεῖρα συνέχειν ἐντὸς τῆς περιβολῆς καὶ μίαν ὀδὸν πορεύεσθαι τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα καὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον.\(^{354}\) This comportment was seen as ideal, projecting the contained modesty and self-confidence of the Athenian citizen.\(^{355}\) The controlled movements do not lack in strength or energy, yet are not quick, fidgety or overbearing.\(^{356}\) Presumably, a man who was graced with such a demeanour would be above the suspicion of the majority of Athenians despite his possible guilt.

### 4.3 Walk of the κιναιδος

Like the physically identifiable adulterer, the sexual degenerate also has a physical type by which the guilty, or presumed guilty, can be identified. In fact, the κιναιδος, or καταπύγων, has similar physical traits to those noted in the description of the vain and corrupt Alcibiades, who was also accused of being, and depicted as, sexually deviant. The walk of the κιναιδος is central to his

---


\(^{355}\) In *Pericles* V, Plutarch describes Pericles as having a solemn spirit and a gentle and composed presence. This description of the behaviour of an idealised ancestor is very similar to those already discussed in Aeschines' *In Timarchum* and [Aristotle]'s *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, see pages 80ff.

\(^{356}\) Fehr 1979: 18.
physicality, as it is the most basic of movements which allows for even the slightest deviations to be detected. A man who walks in the effeminate manner of the κίναιδος must be a κίναιδος, whether he admits it or not, to himself or others, as his true nature is expressing itself through the movements of the body. While it might be conceivable that one would try to alter one’s self-presentation to appear more acceptable, no right-minded citizen would adopt the physical trappings of a κίναιδος intentionally. The physical characteristics of a κίναιδος are inherent in his φύσις and cannot be changed through habit or custom, i.e., νόμος. Within the context of the rhetoric of the period, it is safe to say that if it moves like a κίναιδος, it is a κίναιδος. It is on this premise that, in In Timarchum, Aeschines accuses Demosthenes of being effeminate, of not being able to tell whether he is man or woman under his soft white shirts, ἔτει καὶ περὶ τῆς Δημοσθένους ἑπωνυμίας, οὐ κακῶς ὑπὸ τῆς φήμης, ἀλλ’ οὕχ ὑπὸ τῆς πίθης, Βάταλος357 προσαγορεύεται, ἐξ ἀνανδρίας καὶ κιναιδίας ἐνεγκάμενος τούνομα.358 Aeschines calls Demosthenes a sexual degenerate again in De falsa legatione, ἐν παλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ὄν ἐκλήθη δι’ αἰσχρουργίαν τινὰ καὶ κιναιδίαν Βάταλος,359 referring to the corrupted (and lewd) nickname once more. In the bitter political struggles that engulfed the orators, no ammunition was too strong for their attempts to discredit their opponents, and calling into question a rival’s sexuality, i.e., suggesting that he subjects himself habitually to the passive (feminine) role in a relationship and is, therefore, a sexual deviant, was a powerful weapon. Accusing someone of being a κίναιδος conjured up complex and detailed associations in the minds of those whom the speaker is trying to persuade.360 In

357 Cantarella (1992: 47) states that Βάταλος is a derivative of Βάτταλος, from ὁ Βάττος, the Stammerer. Βάταλος is synonymous with ὁ πρωκτός, which means ‘anus’, thus implying that Demosthenes was a passive homosexual. This is an obvious corruption of the nickname given to the orator by his nurse because of a childhood speech defect.
359 Aeschines II, De falsa legatione, 99.
360 See Fox (1998: 9ff.) on the rhetorical power of the term, particularly with regard to Socrates’ use of it in Plato’s Gorgias 494c-e.
the case of Aeschines’ smearing of Demosthenes in *In Timarchum*, the very basis of the speech is the perverse and despicable (sexual) behaviour of the self-prostituting Timarchus. The assembled jury were already poised to hear tales of debauchery and neglect, and the insinuation about Demosthenes’ sexuality could hardly have been missed.

In *In Timarchum*, Aeschines paints a verbal picture of the degenerate Timarchus’ behaviour, comparing his unsightly bodily movements and characteristics, which include jumping about the Assembly, with the controlled and revered behaviour of Solon and the men of his time. Σκέφασθε δὴ, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡςον διαφέρετι ὁ Σόλων Τιμάρχον καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνοι ὃν ὀλίγων πρότερον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ εἰμισθήσην. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γε ἃσχύνοντο ἐξω τὴν χείρα ἔχουσι λέγειν, οὔτοι δὲ οὐ πάλαι, ἀλλὰ πρῶθεν ποτε ῥίψας θεϊμάτιον γυμνὸς ἐπαγκρατίαζεν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡςον κακῶς καὶ αἰσχρῶς διακείμενος τὸ σώμα ὑπὸ μέθης καὶ βδελυρίας ὡστε τοὺς γε ἐν φρονοῦντας ἐγκαλύπτασθαι, αἰσχυνθέντας ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, εἰ τοιούτοις συμβούλιοις χρώμεθα. By Aeschines’ account, Timarchus’ body should not even be gazed upon by decent men, it being a true reflection of his corrupt and perverted nature. This is a man who prostitutes himself, engages in indecent sexual acts, and knows no moderation; his vices are not only physical but moral, as he neglects his duties as a son and as a citizen. The decrepit and weakened body is a natural reflection of the corrupt and perverted soul. This stereotype of the prostitute and sexual degenerate had already been comically depicted in Aristophanes’ *Nubes* of 423, where Right Logic is praising the values of old, listing the traits of the previous generation and contrasting them to the decadence promoted by Wrong Logic. Among other things, the Athenians of yesteryear would never strut around wantonly, prostituting themselves as they prepare for their lovers, and behaving in a way that calls for the punishment of having a radish thrust up one’s
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'fundament', i.e., as if being found guilty of the act of adultery, ὀφθαλμοὶ τῇ φωνῇ πρὸς τὸν ἐραστήν/ αὐτὸς ἐαυτὸν προαγωγεύων τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐβαδίζειν./ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐπιτυγχάνετ’ ἐξήν καὶ κεφάλαιον ὑπανίδος. In this play Aristophanes gives his audience a long and detailed description of the effeminate, weak and unheroic contemporary man whose body should be kept covered up, as should his nature.

The description of a person's stride and gait is accepted as a reflection of one's nature or personality. Indeed, walking is one example of how the body can be 'read' as a physiognomic expression of the man's mental and spiritual characteristics. In Pseudo-Aristotle's Physiognomonica, where the reader is treated to numerous explanations of the physical manifestation of the nature of the soul, most of the physical traits described are non-manipulable, i.e., they cannot be altered consciously by the individual. However, walking, which is not a static physical trait, is also addressed. In 808a, the reader is told that the κύναιδος has bad eyes and knock-knees, his head tilted to the right, with his hands upturned and limp, and he walks in one of two ways — his hips either wiggle or are held rigidly, κύναιδος σημεία ὅμμα κατακεκλαμέναι, ὑγνύκροτος· ἐγκλίσεις τὴς κεφαλῆς εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ· αἱ φοραὶ τῶν χειρῶν ὑπταί καὶ ἐκλυτοί, καὶ βαδίσεις διτταί, ἢ μὲν περιεύνωτος, ἢ δὲ κρατούντος τὴν ὀσφύν· καὶ τῶν ὄμμάτων περιβλέψεις, ὁδὸς δὲν εἰ ἔλεγχε ὁ ὅμορφος ὁ σοφιστής. Interestingly, the Physiognomonica does not describe the walk of the ideal, or even the average, citizen, but that of the social and sexual deviant. Later in the same work, the author describes the physiognomic traits of female animals, who are by their nature more evil, in comparison to those of the noble male. The female's physical characteristics correspond neatly to those of the κύναιδος. Like the effeminate

362 Aristophanes, Nubes 979-981.
363 Evans 1969. For detailed discussions of physiognomics, and the physiognomics of walking in particular, which focus on a later historical period (second-century CE), see Gleason (1990) and (1995). It should be noted that the physiognomic interpretations of walking in the classical period continue through to the second century CE and beyond. See also Barton (1994).
364 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 808a12-16. See page 106 for the up-turned hands of the κύναιδος.
male, female animals are knock-kneed, weak and fleshy, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ δῆλον, ὅτι ἐκαστὸν ἐν ἑκάστῳ γένει θῆλυ ἀρρενὸς μικροκεφαλωτέρον ἐστι καὶ στενοπροσωπότερον καὶ λεπτοτραχηλότερον, καὶ τὰ στήθη ἀσθενέστερα ἔχει, καὶ ἀπλευρότερά ἐστι, τὰ τε ἱσχία καὶ τοὺς μηροὺς περισσαρκότερα τῶν ἀρρένων, γονύκροτα δὲ καὶ τὰς κυήμας λεπτὰς ἔχοντα, τοὺς τε πόδας κομψοτέρους, τὴν τε τοῦ σώματος ὅλην μορφὴν ἥδιω μάλιστ' ἄν ἢ γενναιοτέραν, ἀνευρότερα δὲ καὶ μαλακώτερα, ὑγροτέραις σαρξικές εκχρημέναι.\[365\] This feminine body type is more shapely than the male, but is not representative of the noble character of the high born, as the male body is. In 813a, the author again refers to the walk of women and the effeminate, stating οἵ δὲ τοῖς ποσὶν ἐξεστραμμένοις πορευόμενοι καὶ ταῖς κυήμας θηλείαις· ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τὰς γυναῖκας.\[366\] Like other physical deviations attributed to the κόραιδος, being knock-kneed or having feet or legs that turn outward would affect an individual’s manner of walking, creating an impression of an unbalanced and unstable gait. The build and softness of the feminine body, as well as the feminine body-type of the κόραιδος, physiologically demand a feminine gait.

The effeminate wiggle or restrained shuffle of the κόραιδος are very far from the easy, confident stride of the Athenian citizen. A fragment of the late-fifth-century comic poet Phrynichus illustrates the direct link postulated between a subservient and subordinate nature and how a man walks, ἢ γὰρ πολίτης ἄγαθός, ὥσ εὖ οἶδ' ἐγὼ, κοὐχ ὑποταγεῖς ἐβάδιζεν, ὡσπερ Νικίας.\[367\] The reference to Nicias is appropriate considering the military disaster in Sicily, which brought defeat and humiliation to the Athenians. As in Plutarch’s description of the traitor Alcibiades, the failed general Nicias is given a dubious physical demeanour. The subordination described by Phrynichus brings forth images of
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365 [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 809b4-11.
367 Phrynichus, *Fragmenta* 62 (Kassel-Austin). This reference to Nicias corresponds with Plutarch’s description of him in his *Vitae Parallelae*, where he is referred to as ἀθαρσίας, lacking in courage (e.g. *Nicias* IV.6), and in general is depicted as being of questionable character, hiding his true nature behind the trappings of wealth and (initial) success.
the sexually submissive male whose walk is testimony to his nature, a nature which ultimately leads to a shameful end for the individual, the citizen body and the city itself.

Any physical trait associated with a κίναιδος would be reviled and mocked, and Aristophanic comedy is full of ridicule of the effeminate, sexually questionable man. The contemporary man of leisure moves accordingly, he is soft and graceful but far from embodying goodness or manhood. In the *Vespae* the comedian depicts young pretty men swaggering around with feminine gaits while others gape and are duped by their appearance, ὅταν εἰσελθὼν μειράκιῶν σοι κατάπνυον, Χαυρέου νίος, ὠδὶ διαβὰς διακινθεῖς τῷ σώματι καὶ τρυφεραθεῖς. In this instance both the κατάπνυον and those who are charmed by him are subjected to the comedian’s jests as he inflames the disdain the majority of his audience must feel for these men and their lifestyle. Aristophanic descriptions are not limited to simply calling someone a sexual degenerate, but include graphic name-calling which refers to particular physical characteristics. The link between these physical traits and the walk of a κίναιδος, as described in the *Physiognomonica*, can be easily imagined — an unusually large behind or phallus would cause the wiggle, whereas someone accused of being στενός would have a repressed gait. The comic costumes that accentuated these physical deformities, e.g., by adding extra padding behind and strapping on a large floppy phallus in front (not to mention the implications of possibly donning a light coloured mask), little doubt is left as to the physicality of

---

368 Fehr 1979: 12.
369 Aristophanes, *Vespae* 687-688; the straddling walk with legs striding far apart can also be found in Aristophanes, *Equites* 77 (where, in the next line, the play on words suggests the anus being in an infinite darkness, τοσόνδε δ' αὐτοῦ βῆμα διαβεβηκάτος / ὁ πρωκτός ἔστιν αὐτόχρημα' ἐν Χάδοι).
370 Fehr (1979: 12) suggests that the 'Leichtigkeit' of the leisure class as seen in Aristophanic comedies, which includes actors both walking and dancing, not only reflects their social standing but also is something that the audience gains pleasure from watching. He continues by acknowledging the conflict that exists between 'light movement' and the easy life it represents and the 'strong movement' of the idealised citizen. Inevitably, the former is seen as contemptuous and the conspicuous display of luxury and softness despised, while the latter is perceived as desirable.
the κίναιδος. These props undoubtedly caused the actors to wiggle when they walked, an action they might have exaggerated even further for comic effect.372

An example of Aristophanes’ mockery can be found in *Equites* where Paphlagon and the Sausage Seller have an exchange whose innuendo implies that the two are κίναιδοι, able to manipulate their sexual body parts and suffering from sexual degeneracy. Κλ. καὶ νὴ Δί’ ὑπὸ γε δεξιότητος τῆς ἐμῆς/ δύναμαι πολεῖν τὸν δῆμον εὐφύν καὶ στενὸν./ Ἀλ. χω πρωκτὸς οὐμὸς τουτογι. σοφίζεται.373

Indeed, the very ability to control the contractions or enlargement of the anus symbolises the usage of that orifice and the passive homosexuality that is implied. Certainly this physical flexibility would have altered the gait of those affected, walking in one manner while contracted, another while enlarged. Another example is found in the *Acharnenses*, where Aristophanes refers to the babbling son of Cleinias, i.e., Alcibiades, by his large anus, τοῖς νεωτι δ’ εὑρύπρωκτος καὶ λάλος χω Κλεινίου,374 not very subtly referring to his reputation as an effeminate and a κίναιδος. Again, in the debate between Wrong Logic and Right Logic in the *Nubes*, Aristophanes uses the comic description of the wide-assed to mock all of Athens, saying that counsellors, tragedians, orators, and the audience itself are children of εὐφύπρωκτοι.375 Indeed, from this comic account it would seem that all men and their offspring are guilty of giving into the pleasures of the body, thus fitting the role of the morally weak and naturally corruptible. Another such example can be found in Aristophanes’ *Vespae* where the chorus, when praising the manly manner of generations past, goes so far as to refer to the youths of the time as εὐφύπρωκτος, thus leaving no question as to their corrupt nature that leaves them open to sexual deviancy.376 An alternative term to εὐφύπρωκτος found in Aristophanic comedy to describe the disgraceful and weak male is

372 See Winkler (1990a).
374 Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 716. (See also 843.)
375 Aristophanes, *Nubes* 1090.
376 Aristophanes, *Vespae* 1070.
λακκόπρωκτος, the loose-arsed or literally the ‘cistern-arsed’, which is what Strepsiades calls his son Pheidippides in *Nubes* as he throws insults at him for hitting his father, a wholly unacceptable action by Athenian norms.\(^{377}\)

It is not only the arse which is subject to detailed description by Aristophanes, but the phallus as well.\(^{378}\) A man with a large phallus can be presumed to walk differently from one with a small one. In Right Logic’s discussion in the *Nubes* on the contrast between the noble Athenian ancestors and the morally corrupt youths of the day, the audience is given a description of the physical traits of the honourable youths of the past, which include having a small phallus, πόσθην μικράν, as opposed to the youths of the present, who are endowed with large, animalistic phalloi, κωλήν μεγάλην.\(^{379}\) The overall picture is one of fit, healthy, sexually pure ancestors as opposed to the feeble, undisciplined men of the present. The physiology of the soft, enlarged καταπύγων ορ κίναδος would necessitate a gait and pace different from the athletic, contained ideal of the Athenian male.

While comedy offers a ridiculous picture of the καταπύγων ορ κίναδος, this is still a reflection, if a distorted one, of commonplace prejudices. As illustrated above, the references to the distinctive walk of the effeminate male (as well as other types of deviations from the ideal gait and pace) are found in various sources, comic and other. A further, and later, example of the condemnation of effeminate behaviour is seen in Plutarch’s *Moralia* where he tells of the Argive king Lacydes who was slandered as being effeminate due to a hair arrangement and a too delicate walk, οἶνον Λακόδην τὸν Ἀργείων βασιλέα κόμης τις διάθεσις καὶ βάδισμα τρυφερότερον εἰς μαλακίαν διέβαλε, καὶ Πομπήιον τὸ ἐνὶ κνάσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν δακτύλῳ πορρωτάτῳ θηλύτητος καὶ ἀκολασίας.


\(^{378}\) On the comic phallus see Pickard-Cambridge (1988: 220-223); and Hawley (1998: 85-86), who suggests that the distorted costumes of comedy both alienate the (male) audience from the actors as well as unite them through the sign of the phallus.

\(^{379}\) Aristophanes, *Nubes* 1014-1018.
It is not unusual for non-Athenians, and non-Greeks, to be judged by Athenian standards and have Athenian social norms projected onto their behaviour. In this instance, however, it is not unreasonable to assume that an effeminate demeanour was also despised by the Argives. Once again, the gait which deviates from the physical ideal is condemned, and the individual guilty of it suspected of having a dubious nature.

### 4.4 Lame, limping and walking with a cane

There is an additional aspect to be considered when discussing a man’s walk, and that is whether he can do so unaided. It has already been established that the able bodied, model citizen had a slow, graceful gait and that he needed no assistance when walking. The physical ideal was based on a citizen/hoplite who could be a productive member of that society and fight for it in battle if necessary. The deformed and disabled were judged according to these societal requirements and their varying inability to meet them. Not all citizens were blessed with the good-fortune of physical fitness and inevitably there were those who were lame or crippled, who needed a crutch or a prop, or who could not walk at all. It is clear from the orations that carrying a certain type of cane, as opposed to the socially acceptable staff often seen depicted in civic scenes, was not approved of and was associated with other negative traits like fast walking and loud talking. It seems, however, that the combination of fast walking and cane carrying precludes any serious physical damage. One would have to assume that, in instances where these two traits are present, i.e., when the cane carrier is also a fast walker, the

---

380 Plutarch, *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* VI.34.
381 By contrast, the Persians, as depicted by the Greeks, seem to have been more tolerant of effeminate behaviour, or what the Greeks perceived as effeminate comportment. For example, see Hall (1989: 127, 209-210).
383 Citizens carrying staffs can be seen on Attic vases depicting civic scenes. It should be noted that there appears to be an obvious difference between the crooked canes of the aged and lame and the elegant staffs of able-bodied citizens. See, for example, Boardman (1989), Hoppins (1919), and Stewart (1997).
cane is more for cosmetic purposes than due to insurmountable physical necessity. Furthermore, the cane which receives a critical description must have been perceived as differing from the citizen’s typical staff in such a way as to provoke disapproval. Nonetheless, even when the carrying of a cane was due to physical disability, as might be the case with a significant number of returning veterans, the imperfect is still disdained. Whether acquired through injury or the result of natural causes, deviations from the ideal are subject to criticism and censure.

As mentioned above, in Contra Pantaenetum 52 the audience is told that Nicobulus carries a cane, βακτηρίαν φόρει, a description which has negative implications. Indeed, it is this type of cane, the βακτηρία, which appears in negative descriptions, as is also seen below in the portrayal of Lysias’ invalid. The derogatory meaning which is attributed to this example of cane carrying suggests that in this context the cane is a deviation from the ideal democratic behaviour. There is apparently an identifiable distinction between acceptable and unacceptable canes or staffs, those that fall into the latter category being carried by the ill, the aged, or the Spartans and philo-Laconians.384 None of these associations is complimentary; the first two are representative of weakness and frailty, whereas the third is symbolic of a lifestyle which lay in stark opposition to Athenian democratic ideals and reality. In fact, a staff could be seen as a weapon, the carrying of which was prohibited within the confines of Athens.385 An Athenian who carried such a prop could be the subject of criticism and disdain and, should he find himself involved in litigation, his opponents would no doubt try to use such a physical description to portray him in an unfavourable light. Inappropriate cane carrying can be negatively associated with the long-haired, unwashed, Socratising, Laconian-mad, as is (comically) attested in Aristophanes’

---

384 For example, the βακτηρία appears in the hands of old men in Aristophanes’ Acharnenses 682. In Thucydides VIII.Ixxiv.2, the Spartan general Astyochus raised his βακτηρία against Dorieus, who was demanding the pay due to his sailors. Smith (1935: 337) states that he carried this cane “…according to the custom of Spartan generals.”

Aves 1280-1285.\textsuperscript{386} πρὶν μὲν γὰρ οἰκίσαι σε τὴνδε τὴν πόλιν, ἔλασκωμόνων ἀπαντεῖς ἀνθρωποί τότε, ἔκόμων ἐπείνων ἑρῴπων ἐσωκράτουν σκυτάλι ἐφόρουν, νυνι δ' ὑποστρέφαντες αὐ/ ὀρνιθομανοῦσι, πάντα δ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς/ ποιοῦσιν ἄπερ ὀρνιθεὺς ἐκμυοῦμενοι.\textsuperscript{387} Hardly the idealised image of the serene, composed Athenian citizen.

In the case of the cane’s being a necessity due to a deformity or handicap, the negative reaction to physical defects remains. In a society where merely having a quick gait is derided, the prospect of a deeper and more tangible defect is abhorred. Perhaps the most notorious cripple suffering from lameness is Philoctetes, who suffers alone and in agony on the island of Lemnos. The gangrenous wound which was the result of a snake bite causes his abandonment, his complete rejection from a society which cannot bear to hear, see, or smell the diseased and deformed man. Philoctetes is the ultimate example of the marginalisation and rejection of the deformed by the physically whole. Indeed, the centrality of the issue can be seen through the fact that Sophocles wrote an entire play around this theme.

In Athens, there existed a system of state support for poor, disabled citizens. Lysias XXIV, \textit{Ὅπερ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου}, represents a claim for this public assistance and exemplifies the Athenian treatment of the physically deformed, in this instance a man who needs two canes to walk, δυνάω βακτηρίαν χρῶμαι.\textsuperscript{388} The litigation for which this oration was composed revolves around an attempt to strike the speaker from the list of those who receive the state assistance of one obol due to their disability. The Aristotelian \textit{'Αθηναίων πολιτεία} also refers to such a system, in this instance the sum received being that of two obols. Δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀδυνάτους ἢ βουλήν τὸνός γὰρ ἐστίν ὃς κελεύει τοὺς ἐιτὸς τριῶν μιᾶς κεκτημένους καὶ τὸ σῶμα πεπρωμένους ὑστε μὴ δύνασθαι

\textsuperscript{386} In Aristophanes, \textit{Ecclesiazusae} 266-279 we are given a description of the women dressing up as men, taking their husbands' Laconian shoes, etc., and leaning on sticks, mimicking the way of the country men.
\textsuperscript{387} Aristophanes, \textit{Aves} 1280-1285.
\textsuperscript{388} Lysias XXIV, \textit{Ὅπερ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου}, 12.
It should be noted that the amount given was a paltry amount which would have been much less than what a physically able man could earn from a day’s labour. Furthermore, while the practice of supporting the disabled appears progressive and liberal-minded, and indeed the speaker appears grateful for the allowance the state has given him, inclusion on the list of invalids results in political and social marginalisation, as only the physically able can hold state office. The physically disabled lose their full rights as Athenian citizens. One of the arguments used in order to keep himself on the list is that should it be decided that he is able-bodied, then he is free to run for the archonship, a concept that must have been reviled by the listening (and voting) citizens. Athens’ crippled and disabled citizens were seen, and saw themselves, as an underclass, who, due to their deviant physicalities, could not exist as equals to the physically able.

An early example of the disdain felt towards the physically deformed is found in the Ilias, where there is a physical description of Thersites, who babbled disorderly tales against kings in order to make the Argives laugh. He suffered not only from a devilish nature, but also from physical grotesqueness, ἀίσχιστος δὲ ἀνήρ ὑπὸ Ἰλιον ἦλθει: φολκὸς ἐπὶ, χωλὸς δ’ ἐτερον πόδα· τῷ δὲ ὦ ὀξὺ κυρτῷ, ἐπὶ στῆθος συνοιχωκότε· αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεί· φοξὸς ἐπὶ κεφαλῆ, ψευδή δ’ ἐπενήσθε ἡλίαν. Ironically, the lame Thersites gets hit upon the back with Agamemnon’s σκῆπτρον (staff) by the physically fit warrior Odysseus. The man who meets the ideal requirements of a heroic physicality, for whom a staff is

389 [Aristotle], 'Αθραίων πολετεία XLIX.4.
390 Garland (1995: 35-36) states that the sum paid changed, from the one obol mentioned in Lysias XXIV, to the two obols of the Aristotelian 'Αθραίων πολετεία (c. 330), and, by the time of Philochoros (third century), five obols.
391 Lysias XXIV, Ἐπέρ τοῦ ὀδηγότου, 13.
392 Homer, Ilias II. 216-219. See Goldhill (1998: 105-106) on this description of the “most shameful of the Achaens” who he compares to the Homeric descriptions of the beautiful bodied warriors such as Achilles (Ilias XXI.108), Hector (Ilias XXII.370-371) and Odysseus (Odyssea, XXIII.163).
393 Homer, Ilias II. 243-245.
a superfluous (but acceptable) prop, uses this very instrument to abuse the crippled man, who would require a crutch for the basic and necessary movements of walking.

The Athenians were very aware of an ideal physical beauty and perfection, and radical departures from these were not easily tolerated. If the merely ugly or ungraceful were persecuted, then surely the deformed suffered more severely. This being the case, a justification for the existence of physical disability needed to be found. Indeed, this type of bodily misfortune was attributed to the workings of a displeased god, the handicapped child being considered the punishment for sinful parents.394 Once deformity is placed in the hands of the divine, that society is then free to disassociate the imperfections from its own physicality. Had the parents of the unfortunate cripple not sinned, then the deformity would not have appeared. The crippled child will be excluded from productive and acceptable society, a harsh punishment for parents who transgress the norms of this society and, more importantly, disregard the will of their gods.

Physical deformity in the average citizen resulted, in most instances, in social and political marginalisation.395 Indeed, only in the most exceptional of cases could disability be successfully overcome. Demosthenes, for example, may have been such an exception, as it has been suggested that the orator himself suffered from physical deformity, in the form of birthmarks and a speech impediment.396 In certain (very rare) instances deformity could be seen as a sign of an exceptional being, as a divine sign that this individual has been marked apart from the rest. In respect to lameness, while the handicap might be the result of a lesser limb, the leg being weaker, shorter or less straight, it could also be seen as a positive sign which liberated the lame from the confines of straight, linear walking.397 For the lame use a non-linear motion as they walk, rolling their

---

396 Evans 1969: 51. See footnote 357.
deformed legs in a manner that suggests the completion of the circular form. Indeed, in the case where both legs are lame, a symmetry remains, as is the case with the Greek god Hephaestus who would have had a gait which required both legs to move in a circular motion in order to propel himself forward. While the lame are unquestionably deformed and unsightly, there exists an alternative interpretation of this physical discrepancy, should circumstances and personal initiative demand that the alternative be considered.

Perhaps the most telling instance of lameness and the duality it can represent is that of Hephaestus. It must be noted, however, that Hephaestus cannot be seen as a model by which to judge human deformity due to his being divine. Nonetheless, it can be argued that the attributing of traits of human deformity to a god is a device by which a society comes to terms with the physical imperfections that deviate from their ideal. The lame god Hephaestus, although himself the subject of mockery within the community of the gods, is still praised for his craftsmanship and proves himself a cunning diplomat. In the *Ilias*, Homer tells how he defused an argument between Hera and Zeus by interrupting to pour wine for all the gods, thus causing them to laugh at his ungraceful movements as he limped about, ἄσβεστος δ’ ἄρ’ ἐνῶρτο γέλως μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν, / ώς ἰδον Ἡφαίστον διὰ δῶματα πολλύνυμτα. Knowing that he would cause a comic diversion, the god subjects himself to this humiliation and succeeds in breaking the tension between his divine mother and Zeus. The comic image of the lame god serving wine results in a night of feasting, with Zeus and Hera later reconciled. Hephaestus suffers as a result of his deformity, but he is not left entirely without vindication. In the *Odyssea*, the lame god is shunned by Aphrodite, whom he had already won as his bride despite his physical deformity, in favour of the beautiful Ares, yet it is he who has the last word as he ensnares them while they sleep in his bed. Ζεὺ πάτερ ἦδ’ ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν

Even though he succeeds in punishing Aphrodite for her unfaithfulness, he still is aware that the gods will laugh at him and his misfortune. Nonetheless, the slow and lame manages to ensnare the beautiful, yet sinful.

In this same passage it is made clear that it is not due to Hephaestus’ deficiencies that he is lame, as in his frustration he states the generally accepted justification for a malformed child, that it is the parents who are to blame, ἀτάρ οὗ τί μοι αἰτίος ἄλλος, ἀλλὰ τοκῆ δύω, τῷ μὴ γείνασθαι ὀφελλοῦ.

Even the great goddess Hera has produced a lame offspring, who in turn proves his capabilities despite his physical handicap. Yet, despite his accomplishments, Hephaestus is, nonetheless, marginalised within his community. That a lame god even exists suggests the possibility that, while most lame men and women are shunned and rejected, there were those afflicted by lameness who would be considered exceptions, perhaps singled out by the divine.

The disallowing of disabled men from holding office appears to have been relaxed or over-ridden if circumstances demanded it. Pausanias, writing in the second-century CE, tells of how the lame Medon, the first archon, was allowed to rule Athens because of the decision by the priestess of the Delphic oracle, and despite the protests of Neileus who refused to have a cripple rule over him. Ἔτεσι δὲ οὗ πολλοῖς ὕστερον Μέδων καὶ Νειλεύς πρεσβύτατοι τῶν Κόδρου παιδῶν ἔστασίασαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἄρχης, καὶ οὐκ ἔφασκεν ὁ Νειλεύς ἀνέξοσθαι βασιλεύομενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Μέδουτος, ὡς ὁ Μέδων τὸν ἔτερον ἢν τῶν παιδῶν χωλός. δόξαν δὲ σφισάν ἀνενεγκείν ἐστὶν χρηστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, δίδωσι

400 Homer, Odyssey, VIII. 306-311.
401 See Homer, Ilias IX, 502-507 which has Prayer as lame and Sin as strong footed, the former following the latter to try to heal the hurt it has caused.
402 Homer, Odyssey, VIII. 311-312.
Of course, any testimony coming from a source as late as Pausanias cannot be accepted as an exact, or even reliable, telling of events. Nonetheless, this reference is useful in demonstrating both the negative reaction to the idea of having a lame ruler, as well as the existence of the possibility that such physical disabilities can, on extremely rare occasions, be overcome. In this instance it is by divine will that the exceptional acceptance of leadership is allowed. Another late description of a lame man overcoming his congenital handicap and obtaining political power and social acceptance is Plutarch’s account (which concurs with Xenophon’s version in *Hellenica* III.iii.3–4) of the Spartan king Agesilaus, who despite his lameness was appointed king of Sparta in the place of Leotychides, allegedly the illegitimate offspring of Alcibiades and king Agis’ wife Timaea. The prophecy that was meant to derail Agesilaus’ rise to the throne, Φράξεο δὴ Σπάρτη, καίπερ μεγάλαυχος ἐόθεα, μὴ σέθεν ἄρτιπόδος βλάστη χωλή βασιλεία. δὴρον γὰρ νοῦσοι σὲ κατασχήσουσιν ἄελπτοι/ φθερσίβροτοι τ’ ἐπὶ κύμα κυλινδόμενον πολέμου, is what in fact legitimised his reign. While the assumption was that it was Agesilaus who was the lame ruler, it is Leotychides’ accession which was the χωλή βασιλεία, he not being a direct descendant of Heracles and, therefore, unfit to be king. Indeed, we can see here how the sin of the mother, Timaea, results in the child, Leotychides, being considered lame, albeit in this instance without a physical manifestation.

Philip of Macedon is another example of a leader suffering from lameness, in this case the result of an injury in war. In *De corona* Demosthenes asks Aeschines what counsel was needed by Athens from its advisors in face of the conquering enemy Philip, who was prepared to suffer bodily mutilation in order to retain his honour and reputation, ἐώρων δ’ αὐτὸν τὸν Φιλιππον, πρὸς ὃν ἦμ
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404 Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio* VII.ii.1.
406 Plutarch, *Agesilaus*, III.7; for a similar version see Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio* III.viii.9.
407 Philip also had only one eye, see Plutarch, *Alexander*, III.1. Vlahogiannis 1998: 19, 29.
Philip's lameness, as well as his other wounds and disabilities, are not physical characteristics that have been present since birth and do not, therefore, carry the same implications as a birth defect. Nonetheless, disabilities obtained later in life can still be seen as divine punishment or identification, incurred as a result of specific actions or behaviour. In this example, Demosthenes uses Philip's disfigurements as proof of his courage and determination in battle, evidence of a leader who is prepared to sacrifice his body for the higher cause of military success and honour. Even so, the reader is made aware of the importance of physical wholeness, as its sacrifice is considered huge, if sometimes necessary for success.

The sources tend to highlight the exceptional cases of a deformed ruler achieving honour and position, thus illustrating how on rare occasions the inferior physical state is not a reflection of an underdeveloped or warped mental state. These examples seem to prove the rule, however, and the belief in the relationship between physically deformity and a deficient nature remains intact. Indeed, not all lame rulers have surmounted their handicap, their lameness being both of body and of nature. Herodotus tells of another lame man who acceded to the throne and continued his family's kingship, Battus of the Theran colony of Kyrene, δειδέξατο δὲ τὴν βασιλην τοῦ Ἀρκεσίλεων ὁ παῖς Βάττος, χωλός τε ἔων καὶ οὐκ ἀρτίπους, himself the descendant of Battus the stutterer, another physically defective leader. This lame king was less successful than his stuttering ancestor, however, and he saw the dismantling of his realm. In this instance, the physical lameness conforms to the stereotype and can be seen to be a
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408 Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 67.
409 Herodotus IV.161.1.
manifestation of an inherent weakness and a substandard nature. Not only was Battus physically unfit, he also lacked the mental and spiritual fitness to preserve his kingdom. As discussed above, physical deformities, especially those resulting in lameness, affect the manner in which one walks. Due to his physical disabilities the lame man cannot adopt the ideal gait and pace even if he were inclined to do so. The act of carrying a cane, even when it is not for purely physical reasons, changes one's walk by the very simple fact that it adds a third (artificial) leg or takes the place of a lost limb. While there are undoubtedly varying degrees of dependency on the cane, all of them would create an asymmetrical and less controlled stagger. In the event that the lame do not use any form of artificial crutch, as in the case of the god Hephaestus, there must exist a sense of balance and symmetry in the disabled walk. Still, his walk is non-standard. The image of a lame man waddling forth on deformed legs invokes an image of the same sort of swaying that is associated with the walk of the κίναδος. Like the κίναδος, the lame are marginalised within society and are believed to have a questionable nature, as is reflected in their deformed physical state.

### 4.5 Manipulation

While undesirable physical traits are attributed to the misfortune of nature, this does not mean that they are not beyond manipulation. The orator makes his audience aware of the dishonest men who try to manipulate their natural physical characteristics to suit their purposes. It is not impossible to hide one's true nature through the alteration of the physical, and those who believed in and depended on the 'science' of physiognomies or who used body language as a tool for

---

411 See Vernant (1982) for a discussion, as influenced by the structuralist myth theory of Claude Lévi-Strauss (1958), of the lameness (or deformity) of Labdacus, Laius and Oedipus, and the tyrannical offspring of the lame Labda, Cypselus and Periander. In both cases the lame accomplish the goal of obtaining power but, nonetheless, the line does not persist and ultimately the physical imperfection and, therefore, the moral defect, prevail.
classification needed to be constantly on their guard in order to sniff out impostures.\textsuperscript{412} While the physical traits can be at least temporarily altered, the nature of the individual underneath remains. In \textit{In Stephanum I}, the audience is told that Stephanus is a greedy and fickle money-lender, who kept company only with those presently enjoying good fortune and wealth. In this instance, the action used to illustrate Stephanus' behaviour as a man who ingratiates himself with those he feels he can benefit from is that of walking. \textit{σκοπείτε δὲ, τὸν βίον ὃν βεβίωκεν ἐξετάζοντες. οὕτος γὰρ, ἡνίκα μὲν συνέβαινεν εὐτυχεῖν Ἀριστολόχῳ τῷ τραπεζίτη, ἵσα βαίνων ἐβάδιζεν ὑποπεπτωκὼς ἐκεῖνῳ, καὶ ταῦτ᾽ ἵσασι πολλοὶ τῶν ἑυθάδ᾽ ὑμῶν ὑμῶν.}\textsuperscript{413} The image of a man walking alongside another, of changing his gait or pace in order to accommodate the stride of him whom he is trying to impress, is a vivid one. In this oration, Stephanus is accused of being a profiteer who will do anything to please the rich and powerful, but who leaves them if their fortunes change.\textsuperscript{414} The money-lender Stephanus will even go against his nature to satisfy the vanity of the wealthy and, more importantly, to benefit himself. We are not told here whether Aristolochus had a fast or slow gait, or whether he had a particular way of walking. However, considering the description of the usurer in \textit{Contra Pantaenetaium} 55, it seems fair to assume that the implication is that Stephanus had a similar, fast gait, whereas Aristolochus had the desired slow pace. It would seem likely that the natural walk of a money-lender was presented as being hurried and crass, in accordance with accepted popular prejudices. That Stephanus had to alter his gait in order to accommodate Aristolochus implies that a difference in gait did exist, just as there was a difference in character. Unlike Nicobulus, however, it seems that Stephanus had

\textsuperscript{412} A discussion of 'physiognomical deception' of the second-century CE can be found in Gleason (1990: 76-81). See Ekman and Friesen (1969a) on psychotherapeutic techniques for detecting "leakage and deception clues".

\textsuperscript{413} Demosthenes XLV, \textit{In Stephanum I}, 63.

\textsuperscript{414} In Plutarch, \textit{De fortuna Romanorum} III, a personification of Virtue and Fortune is found; the gait of Virtue is unhurried whereas Fortune moves hastily.
an easier time going against nature and was recognised as one who would change
his manner in order to benefit from perceived similarities. From the tone of the
oration, this chameleonic trait was not looked upon favourably. In Contra
Pantaenetum 55, the protagonist Nicobulus, trying to present himself most
positively, tells how he does not go against his nature; that he recognises that he is
unfortunate and implores his fellow citizens not to judge him on this fact, but
according to the evidence presented. In contrast, in In Stephanum I, the
antagonist is presented as a shrewd trickster who alters himself in the pursuit of
dishonourable ends.

In the earlier chapter on facial expressions, a further example of
Stephanus’ deceitful behaviour is discussed. This example is also relevant in a
consideration of the use of walking and manipulation of non-verbal behaviour in
this oration, as it is while he walks alongside the walls of the city that Stephanus
adopts the sullen facial expression. The audience is told that the image that
Stephanus hopes to project as he walks alongside the walls is that of soundness of
mind, but in reality he is guilty of misanthropy. The speaker brings to light the
root of the deception. For someone to project a sullen image despite not suffering
any misfortune or constraints is indicative of a conscious decision to do so. Où
toînuv ouô' à pêplassâi kai ñadíζei ëapà toûs toîxouûs êskûbrwmapâçôs
sôôfroouûnhûs àû tôs ègîôsâçî' eikôtôs èînai sêmêia, ãllâ miôsanôwôpîaç.416
The reason for this, the speaker claims, is that a man who walks simply and
joyously is approachable, whereas people shrink from approaching and asking
favours from a sullen or angry-looking man. Theophrastus uses just such
behaviour in his description of Ἠπερηφανία, Arrogance, in his Characteres,
whereby the arrogant man avoids interaction by walking along without chatting
with those he meets, keeping his eyes down until he has passed, καὶ ἐν ταῖς
óðoûs pôrêuômênos μῆ λαiêv tôs èntuγχâçousî, kátw kêkûfôs, ôtan dê

415 See page 59.
416 Demosthenes XLV, In Stephanum I, 68.
aὐτῷ δόξη, ἂνω πάλιν. The unsociable, and presumably arrogant, Stephanus does not contribute to the needs of the citizens of Athens, but looks for others’ misfortune by which he can ruthlessly profit. The importance of bodily movement is brought to light as the speaker warns his listeners not to be taken in by the physical manner of his opponent. There is an obvious awareness of the power of body language and an attempt to deal with it. It is again walking which is used to illustrate a deceitful and dishonest nature. The contrast between the approachable and unapproachable man is made through the comparative descriptions of sullen and joyous walking. The walk seems to be a powerful enough bodily movement to be perceived as embodying the character as a whole.

Again, we are presented with Stephanus’ ability to alter his body language and to adopt the physical appearance of the desired nature, but we are warned by Apollodorus that it is no more than a mask which is covering his true savage and cruel manner.

Manipulation of one’s physicality is not considered an honourable act, the individual attempting to hide his true bodily nature being perceived as dishonest and deceitful. Whatever the motivation, no honourable man should want, or need, to alter his physical traits. An interesting, if late, example of failed deception through physical manipulation is found in Plutarch’s *Alcibiades*, where he discusses the general’s defection to the Spartans and, among other things, his alterations to his appearance as he tries to assimilate himself into Laconian society. However, despite his attempts at manipulating his self-presentation, his true nature remains the same, 

συνεξομολογοῦσαι καὶ συνομοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι καὶ ταῖς διαίταις, ἃ ἔρθεν προσμενῳ τροπάς τοῦ χαμαλέουτος... ἐν Σπάρτῃ γυμναστικός, εὐτελής, σκυθρωπός, ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ χλιδανὸς, ἐπιτερπῆς, ῥάθυμος, ἐν Θράκῃ μεθυστικός, ἱππαστικός, Τισσαφέρη δὲ τῷ σπατρήσει συνὶν ὑπερέβαλλεν ὅγκῳ καὶ πολυτελεῖα τὴν

---

418 Sandys and Paley 1875: 96-97.
The unsociable, and presumably arrogant, Stephanus does not contribute to the needs of the citizens of Athens, but looks for others’ misfortune by which he can ruthlessly profit. The importance of bodily movement is brought to light as the speaker warns his listeners not to be taken in by the physical manner of his opponent. There is an obvious awareness of the power of body language and an attempt to deal with it. It is again walking which is used to illustrate a deceitful and dishonest nature. The contrast between the approachable and unapproachable man is made through the comparative descriptions of sullen and joyous walking. The walk seems to be a powerful enough bodily movement to be perceived as embodying the character as a whole. Again, we are presented with Stephanus’ ability to alter his body language and to adopt the physical appearance of the desired nature, but we are warned by Apollodorus that it is no more than a mask which is covering his true savage and cruel manner.

Manipulation of one’s physicality is not considered an honourable act, the individual attempting to hide his true bodily nature being perceived as dishonest and deceitful. Whatever the motivation, no honourable man should want, or need, to alter his physical traits. An interesting, if late, example of failed deception through physical manipulation is found in Plutarch’s Alcibiades, where he discusses the general’s defection to the Spartans and, among other things, his alterations to his appearance as he tries to assimilate himself into Laconian society. However, despite his attempts at manipulating his self-presentation, his true nature remains the same, συνεξομολούθαι καὶ συνομοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι καὶ ταῖς διαίταις, ὀξυτέρας τρεπομένῳ τροπᾶς τοῦ χαμαίλεοντος... ἐν Σπάρτῃ γυμναστικός, εὐτελής, σκυθρωπὸς, ἐν Ἱωνίᾳ χλάδανος, ἐπιτερπής, βάθυμος, ἐν Θράκῃ μεθυστικός, ἵππαστικός, Τισαφερήν ἐν τῷ σατράπῃ συνών ὑπερέβαλλεν ὅγκῳ καὶ πολυτελείᾳ τὴν
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The effeminate and dandified Alcibiades of Athens could not exist within the harsh Spartan ideal, and this shrewd political survivor is well practised in accommodating the tastes of his hosts. For Alcibiades to be accepted, he must alter his ways, shedding the softness and ease of his previous behaviour for a lifestyle that will be acceptable to the society which will be defining his new identity. Plutarch is clearly disdainful of these manoeuvres, warning his reader that the man underneath remains the same. The chameleon Alcibiades can alter his physical appearance but can do nothing about his true nature. Indeed, it is his corrupt nature which allows him so readily to alter his appearance to suit his needs as well as to shift his political alliances with such ease. In the various descriptions of the many changes of Alcibiades offered in this passage of Plutarch he is never presented in the guise of the honourable democratic citizen of Athens, a noble physical state which the moral degenerate must not have been able to achieve. With the benefit of hindsight, Plutarch uses the description of physical appearance and non-verbal behaviour to portray Alcibiades in the role that history ultimately prescribes to him.

419 Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, XXIII. 4-5.

420 Earlier, classical descriptions of Alcibiades are not so damning. For example, in Plato’s *Symposium* he is given a speech and is praised by Socrates. Nonetheless, even here he is depicted as drunk as well as very beautiful. Even before his failure and treason tarnished his image he was known and presented as the pretty, flirtatious party boy.
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5. BODILY FUNCTIONS

This chapter will approach the topic of non-verbal communication from a different perspective than the previous ones; rather than considering a particular body part, or even a bodily movement, the focus here will be various bodily functions. Of course, it is the verbalisation of these functions which is of interest, i.e., how an author uses a bodily function within the text and what symbolism it can be understood to represent. For the purpose of this study, three body functions will be examined: hiccupping, sneezing, and spitting. The first two will be considered jointly and within the context of their Platonic link in Symposium 189a. The third, spitting, will offer further insight into how ritualised bodily functions can be deployed in Greek texts.

A bodily function cannot be detached from its relationship to the body and to bodily action, and its symbolism is dependent on this defining aspect. Furthermore, the body itself cannot be limited to the purely physical or personal and must be seen to exist within the socially defining context of its time. The human body can be seen as a symbol of society as a whole, and its functions are an expression of both the individual and the collective bodies. To understand the ritualised role of bodily functions and fluids, they must be seen as representing more than the actions and powers of the body, but also those of society.\footnote{Douglas 1984: 116. See also Bell (1992: 179-180) for a brief discussion on Douglas' 'physical body'.} If the body is seen to incorporate a microcosm of society, then its non-verbal (and verbal) expressions must be considered in this light. The body is the means by which the individual communicates and interacts with society, and the social meaning imposed on the body and its behaviour inevitably affects the individual.\footnote{On interaction see Goffman (1963, 1971, 1983); Kendon (1973); Shilling (1993: 82-88).} A bodily function, be it conscious or unconscious, intentional or unintentional, contrived or not contrived, carries with it the weight of its cultural symbolism. The body is much more than a biological organism, but a complex
social phenomenon created by the society in which it exists. The ancient Greek portrayals of hiccoughs, sneezes and spits are more than a listing of physiological actions, they are a means to see into the society from which they were created and transcribed. Even within a certain society, the body is not limited to one interpretation, and its actions and functions can be expressions with more than one meaning.

5.1 Hiccoughs and a sneeze: Plato’s Symposium 189a

A study of classical hiccoughs and sneezing finds its natural point of departure in Plato’s Symposium 189a, where Aristophanes has his uncontrollable attack of the hiccoughs cured by the orderly sneeze, 'Εκδεξάμενον οὖν ἔφη εἰπεῖν τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη ὅτι καὶ μᾶλ' ἐπαύσατο [sc. ἦ λύγξ], οὐ μέντοι πρὶν γε τὸν πταρμόν προσενεχθήναι αὐτῇ, ὡστε με θαυμάζειν εἰ τὸ κόσμιον τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμεῖ τοιούτων ψόφων καὶ γαργαλισμῶν, οἶον καὶ ὁ πταρμός έστιν: πάντα γὰρ εὕθις ἐπαύσατο, ἐπειδὴ αὐτῷ τὸν πταρμόν προσήμεγκα. This use of non-verbal behaviour in Plato’s Symposium brings forth various questions regarding the content and context of this dialogue. Plato’s use of non-verbal behaviour, in this instance the hiccough and the sneeze, to support the arguments and ideas presented and to advance the sequence of speakers and events, should not be dismissed without consideration. The sneeze and hiccoughs are investigated here both as independent entities and as inter-dependent acts. The reason for this particular occurrence of the hiccoughs, and the subsequent sneeze, must be analysed, as must their satiric, comic and dramatic roles. The hiccough and the sneeze need to be considered both as symbols and as purely physical acts in light of the cultural and physiological understanding and theories of antiquity.

424 Plato, Symposium 189a1-6.
Both these examples of non-verbal behaviour serve their own purposes within the *Symposium* and were chosen by the author for their particular attributes. Whereas the attack of the hiccoughs seems to be accepted and treated as a relatively straightforward physical act, the sneeze introduces a more complex set of questions, both regarding its role as a successful cure of the hiccough and as a force in its own right. This bodily function is laden with symbolism, as well as being the subject of much physical theorising, both in the context of the *Symposium* and independently of it. The sneeze is more widely referred to in Greek classical texts than might be expected, and it carries with it cultural significance; it is recognised as an omen, as the expression of the ψυχή, as a variation of the nod, and as a divine sign. The existence of these numerous interpretations of the sneeze must be taken into consideration when examining Plato’s use of this potentially spontaneous and independent act (which in this case is generated by the poet himself) within the profoundly controlled and stylised dialogue. Furthermore, the physical effect that these two bodily acts have on the dialogue as a whole requires examination, as does the direct reference made by Plato to τὸ κόσμον, the orderliness, in this instance of the body. Structure and order in the *Symposium* are intentionally disrupted by these two actions and the reactions to them, and the implications of this disruption are fundamental to comprehending Plato’s usage of them, both in manner and method.

5.1.1 Context

The greater context within which 189a is spoken is that of a third-hand account of a banquet held in Athens to honour a dramatic victory by the tragic playwright Agathon in 416 BCE, in which Plato presents to his readers a discourse between various diverse characters on the subject of Eros. The seven speeches of the participants which Plato offers through Apollodorus’ narration represent different philosophical and intellectual perspectives on, and complex
understandings of, Eros, climaxing (although not ending) with Socrates' speech. The messages and ideas being communicated by Plato in the Symposium are not to be found in the reporting of words alone. Alongside the recounting of the verbal content of the speeches Plato includes in his narrative the description of gesture, proxemics, and other non-verbal behaviour. These are by no means incidental inclusions of detail, but are allotted an important role in the staging and development of the Symposium. Plato illustrates the philosophies of Eros, Virtue and Knowledge through the seven speeches as well as through the actions, gestures, emotions, and states of sobriety, or intoxication, of each member of the Symposium as each declares his idea and theory. The non-verbal behaviour is an integral element of the message Plato wishes to put forth; both words and actions are paramount to the philosophies being presented by Plato in the Symposium. Indeed, although Apollodorus is asked by his companion to relate only the speeches that were spoken at the banquet, he sees fit to dramatise his reconstruction of it by including descriptions of seating arrangements, entrances and exits, gestures, etc., which must be understood as being fundamental to the meaning of the Symposium as a whole. It is no coincidence that Plato relates the various details of Aristophanes' attack of hiccoughs, his attempts at overcoming his affliction and, finally, the unsuccessful and successful cures. The detailed description is not superfluous, but integral to the structure and understanding of the Symposium.

189a of the Symposium constitutes the opening remark made by Aristophanes as he re-enters the realm of speakers after having been overcome by an attack of hiccoughs which, subsequently, made him unable to speak when his turn arrived to present his views on Eros. By the time 189a was uttered, three speakers have already spoken: Phaedrus, Pausanias and Eryximachus. The last of
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these, Eryximachus, was a notable physician, and was initially meant to have spoken after Aristophanes. Due to the attack of hiccoughs which incapacitated the comedian, Eryximachus becomes the next speaker after Pausanias to offer a discourse on Eros and thus he serves Aristophanes in two ways; first, by offering medically weighted suggestions on how to cure the hiccoughs; second, by taking Aristophanes’ speaking place and thus allowing the discourse on Eros to continue. When Aristophanes is finally cured of his affliction he prefaces his speech by thanking Eryximachus for the remedies offered which cured him of his hiccoughs. Before Aristophanes has even begun his speech, the austere physician is quick to warn the comedian not to resort to foolishness. This must seem somewhat ironic considering the theatrics Aristophanes must have exhibited while trying to cure himself of the already humorous hiccoughs. Furthermore, the content of Aristophanes’ speech was not simply comic, but offered an insightful and fantastic analysis of the relationships between men, between women, and between men and women, while commenting on the mortal condition in love and lust—Eros.

The discussion here focuses on Plato’s use of bodily functions, i.e., the hiccough and the sneeze, in accordance with the dialogue of the Symposium. The use of the hiccough, ἡ ἀγχος, and the sneeze, ὀ πταμός, greatly affects the course of the banquet, be it the cause of physical alteration in the setting and seating or as metaphors for larger issues being discussed. The presence of these two seemingly marginal acts is indeed significant to the understanding of the dialogue.

5.1.2 The Hiccoughs

In the Symposium, it is the hiccoughs which bring about the necessity for the noises and titillations of the sneeze. One physical disorder necessitating another. The attack of the hiccoughs is not mentioned by name in 189a, but it is

clear that it is the indirect object of the sentence, the αὐτῷ, which was being controlled. Indeed, without the hiccough there would be no need for a sneeze, no need to bring Aristophanes’ physical being back to order. It is important to investigate the source of the hiccoughs themselves; whether they were a spontaneous attack with no obvious cause, or whether they came into existence as a reaction to something else. The natural assumption would be that hiccoughs at a banquet are the result of excessive drink, but this does not seem to be the case here. Early on, we are told by Pausanias that most of those present are still recovering from the previous night’s drinking. As for Socrates, who is reported never to be in an inebriated state regardless of the quantities of drink he consumes, he will be happy with any decision, be it to drink copiously or not. It is, therefore, initially decided that this will not be a night of excessive drinking, but one of moderate and pleasurable consumption. It is in this manner that the reader is informed that those who were present at the banquet from the beginning of the speeches are sober and that, therefore, the drunkenness of that evening cannot be the immediate cause of Aristophanes’ hiccoughs. However, while there is no excessive drinking at this juncture, there is the unlikely possibility that the comedian’s attack of hiccoughs was symbolising Aristophanes’ drunken debauchery of the previous night and that Plato wished to illustrate the comedian’s absurd nature by having drink affect him to such a degree that he is still affected physically the following day, while Socrates, who drinks no less, is left unaffected.

It should be noted that the state of relative sobriety at Agathon’s banquet did not persist throughout the night, as Alcibiades and a group of drunken revellers made a late entrance and led the remaining members of the banquet to intoxication. In this light, the hiccoughs of Aristophanes could be seen as

429 See page 26 for a more detailed discussion of Socrates’ Silenus-like appearance, but not behaviour.
foreshadowing the seemingly inevitable inebriation of the comedian at such an affair. Aristophanes’ hiccoughs are earned retrospectively as he joins the party in their insobriety. It is in the latter part of the Symposium, after the speeches have been made, that the drinking resumes and Aristophanes, unlike some of the other participants of the Symposium, joins in in his expected fashion.431 The admittedly light-drinking Eryximachus, Phaedrus and others leave the banquet while the more hearty, like Aristodemus, Agathon, Aristophanes and, of course, Socrates, remain for the festivities and drinking.432 The Symposium concludes with Aristodemus falling asleep while Agathon, Aristophanes and Socrates remain awake in discussion until morning, when the two poets eventually doze off and the perpetually sober philosopher finally gets up and departs, leaving behind what must be imagined as the typically dishevelled scene found the morning after a successful banquet.

The cause of Aristophanes’ hiccough attack is never definitely stated in the Symposium, the ambiguous explanation being that it was the result of ‘some other cause’, ἤ ὑπὸ πλησιμονῆς ἢ ὑπὸ τινὸς ἄλλου λύγγα ἐπιπεπτωκῆαν καὶ οὐχ οἶνον τε εἶναι λέγειν.433 Assuming that the previous night’s drinking was not the immediate cause of Aristophanes’ hiccoughs, the blame for the attack could, therefore, be either too much food consumed at the banquet or, perhaps, a reaction to poor speeches being delivered up until that point.434 The fact that Aristophanes suffers for the hiccoughs at this early stage of the banquet while Alcibiades, who arrives drunk and late and therefore misses the speeches, does not have them, is a hint that it is neither food nor drink, but bad rhetoric that has caused this negative and uncontrolled physical reaction in the comic poet.435 Furthermore, Aristophanes has his hiccoughs while he is still sober and not later when he has

431 Brochard 1954: 72.
432 Plato, Symposium 223b-c.
433 Plato, Symposium 185c6-7.
again resumed drinking, thus implying that the cause of the attack is not due to a stomach full of drink. Whatever the cause, the result remains that the comic poet cannot speak when it is his turn to do so. This in itself is ironic, as Aristophanes was hardly a man known to be unable to express what he is thinking, and here Plato has him gasping for air and incapable of articulating even a simple string of sentences. Through this one act Plato has succeeded in stripping Aristophanes of his powerful weapon: words. While Aristophanes might be the great comedian of his era, he is accustomed to making people laugh through the fantastic and ironic scenarios he creates on stage, and not directly at himself. It appears that Plato has successfully turned the tables on Aristophanes, by writing him into the part of the ridiculous looking and behaving, if not sounding, character. Indeed, while Aristophanes might appear absurd while curing his hiccoughs, his upcoming speech does not reflect the spirit of his actions; the poet himself tells Eryximachus that while he does not fear saying something laughable, γέλοιος, he will not say something absurd, κατελελαστός (always a negative quality).436

It can be suggested that this embarrassing attack of hiccoughs is Plato’s light revenge on the comedian. In the Nubes Aristophanes enjoyed a laugh at Socrates’ expense, and now, in return, Plato has Aristophanes in a very foolish predicament. It would seem, however, that Aristophanes could not have been held fully to blame by Plato for his teacher’s persecution, as the comedian’s comic attacks on the philosopher were in accordance with the trend of the time, Nubes hardly being unique in its satire of Socrates.437 Therefore, this hiccup attack can hardly be interpreted as a serious attempt at wholehearted revenge. Not only does Plato include Aristophanes in the Symposium, although not all those present at Agathon’s banquet are included in this account of the events, but he is given an unquestionably important speech.438 Nonetheless, while Aristophanes’

---
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speech might be important, it does not produce the same response of respect as does that of Socrates. Plato does not single out Aristophanes for particular abuse or humiliation, but lets him off with mild embarrassment due to being temporarily disabled by an uncontrolled physical act. While Aristophanes’ theory on Eros might be rejected by Diotima, Socrates supplants all the previous speakers and not Aristophanes exclusively, and the philosopher does nothing more vicious than perhaps suggesting in 212c that the comedian takes himself too seriously. If Plato truly held Aristophanes responsible for the death of Socrates he would not have the two of them sitting, dining and drinking together so congenially at the Symposium. Considering the circumstances, Plato seems to react indulgently towards Aristophanes. Furthermore, there are many more humiliating bodily functions which Plato could have used to incapacitate Aristophanes had he truly intended to make him appear as foolish as possible. Plato, however, does not lower himself to real vulgarity and Aristophanes’ hiccoughs is about as harsh as the criticism gets.

Whereas Plato’s attack on Aristophanes might not be vicious or forceful, ancient and modern scholars have nonetheless recognised that the comedian’s subjection to the hiccoughs was a means used by Plato of ridiculing him. Considering the obvious associations which accompany the hiccoughs, this form of mockery can be seen as Plato’s objection to Aristophanes drunken and debauched lifestyle. Olympiodorus, writing in the sixth century CE, tells how Aristophanes is satirised in the Symposium by having hiccoughs embrace him.

éκωμώδησε δὲ αὐτὸν [sc. Ἀριστοφάνη] ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ τῷ διαλόγῳ ώς κωμωδίαν ὄφελθείς· καὶ γὰρ ποιήσας αὐτὸν ὑμνοῦντα τὸν "Ερώτα εἰσάγει
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442 See Bury (1932: xxii). The sneeze can also be interpreted as a physiognomic sign which signifies a deviant lifestyle. For a late, Latin example of how the sneeze could be interpreted see Gleason (1990: 407, 1995: 77) on the story from the anonymous Physiognomonia Latina (fourth century CE) of physiognomist Kleanthes who identified the “tough-looking hirsute man with horny hands and shaggy mantle” as a κιναίδος by a revealing sneeze.
However, while it is possible that the intended comedy was to be fully at Aristophanes’ expense, it should be considered whether other speakers were also the targets of his satire. For example, it is plausible that Plato intended to present Eryximachus in the light of irony as the famous physician is called on to cure the medically mundane hiccoughs. In addition, and more obviously humorous, throughout the serious and controlled physician’s speech Aristophanes is attempting all the cures offered to rid him of his hiccoughs, creating a ridiculous auditory and visual backdrop for Eryximachus’ speech. The result is Aristophanes making a comic spectacle of himself while Eryximachus goes on dryly about things medical, leaving both men satirised by Plato. The humour that can be derived from Aristophanes’ hiccoughs is not simply that of the comedian being possessed by a bodily function beyond his control which has resulted in making him incapable of speaking. While Eryximachus has given Aristophanes serious medical advice on how to cure the hiccoughs and has agreed to speak in his turn, he has his own speech belittled by the background scene and sounds of Aristophanes’ attempt at finding a cure. Whereas Eryximachus’ speech might be intended to be serious, it is spoken during a scene which becomes unquestionably comic. The comedian Aristophanes is not disappointing his audience as here too he is offering them comedy, causing the ridicule of another while displaying buffoonery that represented a more satirical statement than might be at first perceived. Indeed, the actions of Aristophanes in trying to cure himself of his hiccoughs are not unrelated to what Eryximachus is saying,
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446 Clay (1983: 188) describes this scene with commendable vividness: “What all this means is that as Eryximachus is delivering himself of his pompous and profound description of Eros, his unfortunate neighbour is hiccoughing, gasping, gargling, wheezing, snorting and sneezing.”
447 The undermining of Eryximachus’ serious speech by the comic antics of another character is very like the technique of Aristophanic drama. In his comedies, Aristophanes parodies tragedy and reality, forcing his audience to question what they are being shown. It is very possible that Aristophanes used comic gestures and movement as comic backdrops to ‘serious’ speeches, thus increasing the intended satirisation. See Goldhill (1991: 167-222).
as the physician’s cosmic theory rests on harmony being created by the bringing together of opposites, which is a theory that is in direct contradiction with the real example of curing hiccoughs with a sneeze; where the cure of holding one’s breath (the opposite of a hiccough) is found ineffective, the sneeze, similar to the hiccough in that it too is violent physical disorder, is a successful remedy.\textsuperscript{448} Indeed, the physical actions of Aristophanes are an introduction to his words on Eros, with which he will take a view totally different from and contrary to that of Eryximachus.\textsuperscript{449}

The famous physician is not the only other guest, besides Aristophanes, who might be the object of Plato’s satirical use of the hiccoughs. It could also have been directed at Pausanias, whose dull and mundane speech seems to have been the cause of Aristophanes’ acute physical reaction.\textsuperscript{450} The hiccoughs of Aristophanes seem to have the successful role of satirising more than one of the speakers present at the banquet. While Aristophanes might be the one to suffer physically from the hiccoughs, he is not the only one to suffer from the irony and humour that they bring to light and call to question. Writing in the second century CE, Athenaeus, who specialised in the genre of sympotic literature, comments on Plato’s \textit{Symposium} stating that it is full of men who turn their noses up and mock one another, \textit{τὸ δὲ Πλάτωνος πληρές ἐστιν μικτημαστῶν ἄλληλους τοθακούντων}\textsuperscript{451} He continues, stating that he lets pass the man (Aristophanes) troubled by hiccoughs and attended by gargles of water, and still more by the suggestion of itching his nose with a dry twig to make him sneeze; he (Plato) satirises and ridicules Agathon’s balanced clauses and antitheses, and leads out Alcibiades, who claims to be in the evil plight of desire. \textit{Πλάτων δὲ — τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς λυγγὸς ὀχλούμενον καὶ θεραπευόμενον ἀνακογχυλασμὼς ὑδατος, ἔτι δὲ ταῖς ὑποθήκαις τοῦ κάρφους ὑνα τὴν ρίνα κνήσας πτάρη, παρίημι.}
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Athenaeus does not limit his interpretation of Plato’s ridicule to Aristophanes alone, whose humour seems too crass to justify investigation, but extends it to that of Agathon, Alcibiades, and others. Athenaeus further states, here in reference to 222a-b of the Symposium, that Plato mocks not only Alcibiades, but also Charmides and Euthydemus and many other young men, or μόνον δ’ Ἀλκιβιάδην διασύρει, άλλα καὶ Χαρμίδην καὶ Εὐθύδημον καὶ ἄλλους πολλοὺς τῶν νέων.453

The awkward and anaesthetic hiccoughs serve not only to emphasise the comic ludicrousness of the comedian Aristophanes, but also draw a contrast with the favourably portrayed and elegant tragedian Agathon who, due to the change in speaking order resulting from the hiccough attack, is to speak directly after the comedian.454 Plato wanted the ideas on Eros to be presented in a certain order, and, thanks to the hiccough and the sneeze, so they were. Therefore, it appears that the structural intention of the dialogue is brought to light as comic and tragic poets are brought side-by-side.455 This movement of Aristophanes towards Agathon can be seen to represent metaphorically the later discussion between Socrates, Agathon and Aristophanes on the ability, or inability, of one man to write both tragic and comic poetry. This change in speaking order brings the comedian and tragedian closer together, thus signifying the artistic connection between these dramatic disciplines. In fact, the Symposium itself can be seen as a “tragi-comedy”, transcending both genres and spreading comic and tragic elements between those present, regardless of their perceived character of serious or laughable.456 Furthermore, Plato can be seen to be commenting on the natures
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of comedy and tragedy through his treatment and representation of Aristophanes and Agathon respectively. The hiccoughs can further be interpreted as Plato’s humorous method of criticising the often vulgar contents of Aristophanes works.457 Interestingly, there are no references in Aristophanes’ extant works to the hiccough.

This physical closeness which has been contrived by Plato between the comedian and the tragedian is the consequence of the offer of Eryximachus, who had previously separated them, to take Aristophanes’ turn at speaking. The ease with which Aristophanes and Eryximachus swap places can be seen as symbolising the ease with which their roles of comedian and physician can be blurred. Indeed, the two speakers are inherently linked both by the relationship of physician and patient as well as by their having switched speaking order. Not only has their physical positioning been switched, but the context of their speeches has become somewhat ambiguous, as regards which of them is speaking from purely scientific knowledge and which from artistic. Their respective speeches can each be interpreted as belonging, at least partially, to the domain of the other.458 On the one hand, while Eryximachus retains his pedantic and scientific manner when describing his natural philosophy of opposites as the source of harmony, he does venture beyond medicine to cover the subjects of music, astronomy and religion.459 Aristophanes, on the other hand, builds his theory on Eros around the physiological unity and separation of men and women, homosexual or heterosexual. Aristophanes’ speech, however, cannot be accepted as a straightforward endorsement of physiological theory and should be understood as satirising the medical theories of his day.460 Eryximachus is rightfully aware of the potential mockery aimed at his profession and expresses
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this in his verbal exchange with Aristophanes.\textsuperscript{461} The implications of the blurring of content can be seen to signify that, while Eryximachus might take himself with the utmost seriousness and while he might be considered a medical authority, the science of medicine has more to do with the arts than might otherwise be assumed.\textsuperscript{462} Furthermore, medicine can be quite comical, as can be seen practically through Aristophanes’ attempts at curing his hiccoughs using Eryximachus’ advice. This premise of impure and overlapping disciplines can be applied equally to the fluid boundaries of comic poetry which, despite its seemingly light and ridiculous guise, can communicate influential messages and ideas.

Plato was not unique in his use of the hiccoughs, as the hiccough was not without symbolic significance nor was it without contemporary consideration in that period. The remedies for hiccoughs offered to Aristophanes by the physician e.g., holding one’s breath, gargling with water, or tickling one’s nostrils to provoke a sneeze, seem to have been typical and accepted in the ancient period.

\[\text{εάν μέν σοι ἔθελη ἀπευστι ἔχοντι πολὺν χρόνον παύσεις, ἤ λύγξ, εἴ δὲ μή, ὅθεν ἀνακογχύλισαν. εἰ δὲ ἄρα πάνιν ἵσχυρά ἐστίν, ἀναλαβὼν τι τοιοῦτον ὀξὺ κνήσας αὖ τὴν ῥήνα, πτάρε· καὶ εάν τοῦτο πολύσης ἀπαξ ἢ δίς, καὶ εἰ πάνιν ἵσχυρά ἐστι, παύσεται.}\textsuperscript{463} While the remedies suggested in the \textit{Symposium} might produce comic results, they do not seem to be unusual or novel to those witnessing their suggestion and application. Indeed, there are other ancient references which use the same, and similar, methods for curing hiccoughs. The Hippocratic \textit{Aphorismi} declares sneezes to be a cure for hiccoughs.\textsuperscript{464} The Aristotelian \textit{Problemata}, which addresses the problems of the nostrils, refers to sneezing, vinegar and holding the breath as cures for the hiccoughs, all having to do with

\textsuperscript{461} Bury 1932: xxxiii.
\textsuperscript{462} For a relevant discussion on ancient science see Lloyd (1987).
\textsuperscript{463} Plato, \textit{Symposium} 185 d6-e3.
\textsuperscript{464} Hippocrates, \textit{Aphorismi} VI, xiii (Littre).
heating the air which is constrained, causing the hiccoughs, διὸ δὲ ἐξος τε παύει λυγμὸν καὶ ἡ ἀπνευστία, ἡ ἡρμαία ἡ λύγ... ἡ οὖν ὁμιὴ ῥήγυνυ τὸ ἐγκατελημμένον πνεῦμα, δ ἑπεὶ τὸν λυγμὸν.\(^{465}\) In Problemata it is further stated that hiccoughs are attributed to the lungs and sneezing to the nose, thus associating the hiccough with the body and the sneeze with the head. It is their mutual connection to breathing which is used to explain how the latter was believed to cure the former. While the true and exact physiological reasons for the hiccoughs are unknown in the classical period,\(^{466}\) this did not prohibit speculation on both cause and cure. In addition, it is possible to apply Plato’s theory about the diaphragm and the separation of the soul to this understanding of the hiccough.\(^{467}\) According to Plato’s Timaeus there exist two types of souls, the immortal soul and the mortal one. The immortal soul exists as an independent power which resides within the head, the most divine part of the body. The mortal soul includes all of man’s vices, which include pleasure, pain, rashness, fear, foolishness, anger and hope which are then combined with lust and irrationality.\(^{468}\) The two types of souls are housed within the body, where the mortal soul is separated from the immortal one. This is the purpose of the neck, which separates the head from the chest, which is the house of the mortal soul. Within the chest itself the part of the mortal soul whose attributes include courage and spirit is separated from this base and appetitive part, and is found in the upper half of the chest, where the lungs and heart are located, and in close proximity to the head. The lower half housed the part of the soul which was ruled by bodily needs and functions.\(^{469}\) If this theory can be applied to the function of the hiccough within the body, then it would indicate that the hiccough comes from the diaphragm, which is what divides the chest into the upper and lower chambers,


\(^{466}\) According to Dorland’s Illustrated Medical Dictionary (1994) a hiccough is “an involuntary spasmodic contraction of the diaphragm, causing a beginning inspiration which is suddenly checked by closure of the glottis, causing the characteristic sound; called also singultus.”

\(^{467}\) Plochmann 1963: 10.

\(^{468}\) Plato, Timaeus 69d.

\(^{469}\) Plato, Timaeus 69e-70a.
representing attribute and vice respectively. However, while this explanation offers an interesting theory on the nature of the hiccoughs, there is no indication that Plato knew that hiccoughs originated from the diaphragm. The (flawed) speculation as to the physical origin of the hiccoughs can be seem in the Aristotelian *Problemata*; the author seems to think that the hiccoughs originated in the lung. Hiccoughs are the result of the lungs cooling and not absorbing air and moisture, ὡδὲ λυγμὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸν πνεῦμον κατάψυξις καὶ ἀπεψία πνεύματος καὶ ὑγροῦ, the hiccough occurs when the excess moisture is restrained in the lungs and the rising air is unable to escape, causing spasms, ἢ δὲ λύγξ, ὅταν ὑπὸ ὑγροῦ κατέχηται πνεῦμα περιττὸν περὶ τὸν πνευματικὸν τόπον. τοῦτο γὰρ ὄρμων καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον διακόψαι σπασμὸν ποιεῖ, ὡ δὲ σπασμὸς οὕτος καλεῖται λύγξ.

5.1.3 The Sneeze

It is the hiccoughs which prohibit Aristophanes from taking his turn to speak, but it is a sneeze which finally cures him of his affliction. In the *Symposium* it is the sneeze which is introduced as the solution to Aristophanes’ hiccoughs, which have managed to resisted all other attempts at being cured. Where the hiccough disrupts the proceedings of the banquet and the order in which those present were to speak, the sneeze is what checks the disruption and allows order to be regained, albeit somewhat altered. The hiccough causes Aristophanes to cede his turn to Eryximachus, but the sneeze occurs just in time to have the comedian again ready to speak, now positioned immediately before the tragedian Agathon.

The sneeze exists in the *Symposium*, like the hiccough, as a physical act which exists independently of the individual it affects. While the sneeze is

---

470 Onians 1951: 119.
471 [Aristotle], *Problemata* 961b11-12.
472 [Aristotle], *Problemata* 962a10-13.
provoked by Aristophanes, when it does occur it overcomes the body in a totally uncontrollable manner. Both the hiccup and the sneeze are the result of some outward provocation, but once they appear they cannot be harnessed by the conscious will of the individual. These are two independent bodily disorders which Plato uses in his manipulation of events at the banquet. Although the sneeze and the hiccoughs share a physical connection through their relationships to breathing, the symbolic interpretations of the hiccoughs and of the sneeze are different and almost antithetical. The hiccoughs are but the product of the body, which is mortal and serves as the vehicle of the head, the house of Reason. The sneeze, however, comes from the nose, i.e., the head, and is therefore linked with the domain of Reason. The location of the dominant and divine immortal soul, i.e., the ψυχή, differs depending on text and author and can be found to reside within the head, as is the case in Plato’s Timaeus. Sneezing is connected and associated with the immortal soul and is treated differently than other bodily acts associated with breathing.

While the hiccough and sneeze do not carry the same symbolic meaning, the former being little more than a physical bodily function while the latter represents omens, divine signs and the independent will of the ψυχή, they are linked physically and are considered to be similar and in harmony. The physical link between the two is explained by Pseudo-Aristotle as τὸ δὲ περὶ τῶν πταρνύμενον τόπων ἐκεῖ τῆς ῥυμὸς κοινωνίαν τῷ πνεύμῳ δηλοὶ ἢ ἀναπνοῇ κολυὴ ὀδὰ. ὡστε πτάρνυται μὲν θερμαίνομενον αὐτοῦ· τῷ δὲ συμπάσχειν ὁ κάτω τόπος, ἐν ψ χείτιν ὁ λυγμός.474 The nose, which is the place of the sneeze, is connected to the lung, breathing being common to both. One sneezes when the lung becomes hot, and the place below, where the hiccoughs come from, is also affected. The sneeze is the expression of the noble region of the head, whereas the hiccoughs come from the base region of the lower chest. Indeed, the

473 Onians 1951: 118.
474 [Aristotle], Problematia 961b16-20.
provoked by Aristophanes, when it does occur it overcomes the body in a totally uncontrollable manner. Both the hiccough and the sneeze are the result of some outward provocation, but once they appear they cannot be harnessed by the conscious will of the individual. These are two independent bodily disorders which Plato uses in his manipulation of events at the banquet. Although the sneeze and the hiccoughs share a physical connection through their relationships to breathing, the symbolic interpretations of the hiccoughs and of the sneeze are different and almost antithetical. The hiccoughs are but the product of the body, which is mortal and serves as the vehicle of the head, the house of Reason.473 The sneeze, however, comes from the nose, i.e., the head, and is therefore linked with the domain of Reason. The location of the dominant and divine immortal soul, i.e., the ψυχή, differs depending on text and author and can be found to reside within the head, as is the case in Plato’s Timaeus. Sneezing is connected and associated with the immortal soul and is treated differently than other bodily acts associated with breathing.

While the hiccough and sneeze do not carry the same symbolic meaning, the former being little more than a physical bodily function while the latter represents omens, divine signs and the independent will of the ψυχή, they are linked physically and are considered to be similar and in harmony. The physical link between the two is explained by Pseudo-Aristotle as τὸ δὲ περὶ τῶν πταρνῷμενων τόπων εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς κοινωνίαν τῷ πνεύμονα δηλοὶ ἢ ἀναπνοὴ κοινή οὖσα. ὡστε πτάρνυται μὲν θερμαινομένου αὐτοῦ· τῷ δὲ συμπάσχειν ὁ κάτω τόπος, ἐν ψ ἐστὶν ὁ λυγμός.474 The nose, which is the place of the sneeze, is connected to the lung, breathing being common to both. One sneezes when the lung becomes hot, and the place below, where the hiccoughs come from, is also affected. The sneeze is the expression of the noble region of the head, whereas the hiccoughs come from the base region of the lower chest. Indeed, the

473 Onians 1951: 118.
474 [Aristotle], Problemata 961b16-20.
 Symposium is full of such oppositions. There exist within the dialogue many oppositions within what is being said and done by the various speakers and which serve to emphasise the tension between numerous seeming antitheses; high and low, right and left, divine and human, noble and base, wisdom and ignorance, fair and ugly.475

Plato was not unique in his mention of the sneeze, which is neither an ignored physical phenomenon in classical literature, nor an unconscious bodily function without importance and meaning. Rather, it seems to have been a culturally accepted symbol in classical Athens. Indeed, the sneeze is considered to have been an omen, good or bad depending on circumstance.476 The symbolism associated with the sneeze was not restricted to the classical period. An early example of the sneeze as an omen is found in Homer’s Odyssea when Telemakhos’ sneeze is understood as a positive sign affirming Penelope’s words and desire to see the suitors dead. "Ὡς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ μέγ’ ἐπταρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δώμα/ σιμερδαλέων κονᾶβησε... οὖχ ὀράς ὃ μοι ύδως ἐπέπταρε πάσι ἐπεσει.; τῷ κε καὶ οὐκ ἀτελῆς θάνατος μυστήρα γένοιτο/ πάσι μᾶλ’, οὐδὲ κὲ τὶς θάνατον καὶ κήρας ἀλάξει.477 Through this example it can be understood that from the Homeric period the ancient Greeks recognised the sneeze as having an ominous meaning. The origin of this belief, however, cannot be ascertained.478 Another, later, example from Greek literature which reaffirms the notion of the sneeze as an omen is from Aristophanes’ Aves of 414 BCE. Here the chorus tells how birds are ‘read’ as omens, and how a sneeze (among other things) is a bird, ὀρνιν τε νομίζετε πάνθ’ ὄσαπερ περὶ μαντείας διακρίνει./ φήμῃ γ’ ύμιν ὄρνις ἐστί, πταρμών τ’ ὄρνθα καλείτε,/ ἐξύμβολον ὄρνιν, φωνῆ ὄρνιν, θεράπουτ’ ὄρνιν, δῶν μὸν ὄρνιν./ ἄρ’ οὐ φανερῶς ἡμεῖς ύμῖν ἐσμέν μαντεῖος Ἀπόλλων;479

---

476 See Pease (1911).
477 Homer, Odyssea XVII, 541-542, 545-547.
478 Pease 1911: 429.
479 Aristophanes, Aves 719-722.
Xenophon also tells of a sneeze being a good omen in *Anabasis* when a sneeze made by a soldier during a speech, just as the word ‘deliverance’ is spoken, is taken by the troops as a sign of good fortune and an affirmation of the words spoken. τοῦτο δὲ λέγοντος αὐτῶν πτάρνυται τις: ἀκούσαντες δ’ οἱ στρατιῶται πάντες μὴ ὁρμῇ προσκυνήσαν τὸν θεόν, καὶ ὁ Ἑυνοφῶν ἐίπε· Δοκεὶ μοι, ὦ ἀνδρεῖς, ἐπεὶ περὶ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν λεγόντων οἰωνὸς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἑφάνη, εὐξασθαί τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ θύσειν σωτηρία ὅπου ἂν πρῶτον εἰς φιλίαν χώραν ἀφικώμεθα, συνεπείξασθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς θύσειν κατὰ δύναμιν.\(^{480}\) There was unanimous belief in this interpretation of the omen and the necessary sacrifices ensued. Whether this tale is historically accurate or not is irrelevant, the point being that Xenophon used the symbol of the sneeze to communicate the unity and optimism of the warriors in their belief in this divine omen. Regarding the sneeze in the *Symposium*, there can be little doubt that Plato’s use of it to cure Aristophanes of his hiccoughs was intentional and that there was full awareness of the symbolic significance of this act.

In *De genio Socratis*, Plutarch has Polymnis claim that a man from the Megarian school, who heard it from Terpsion, said that the sneeze was a sign of Socrates, but that he never spoke to his companions of such a sign, saying that he was not influenced by the sneezes themselves, but by signs from heaven. ᾠλ’ ἐκείνῳ μοι δοκεῖ θαυμαστόν, εἰ πταρμῷ χρώμενος οὐ τούτῳ τοῖς ἐταῖροις ἀλλὰ δαιμόνιον εἶναι τὸ κολίδου ἢ κελεύον ἔλεγε.\(^{481}\) Polymnis also puts forth the question of how a man such as Socrates could have his behaviour dictated by a sneeze, and then immodestly justify this by calling it a sign from heaven. Furthermore, Socrates’ actions were not those of a man who relied on sneezes, but one who was led by higher authority and command to goodness, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄνδρὸς ἐκ κληρονομοῦν ἢ πταρμῶν μεταβαλλομένην ὅτε τόχοι γνώμην ἔχοντος

\(^{480}\) Xenophon, *Anabasis* III.ii.9.

\(^{481}\) Plutarch, *De genio Socratis* XI.19-21.
Pheidoloëus continues, by asking how it is that it was only for trivial and insignificant matters that sneezes were taken as omens, and that even the ignorant masses do not rely on them for important issues, and yet they claim that Socrates believed them to be divine signs. Galaxidorus answers with the explanation that while those who are ignorant might not understand the significance of this omen, for one who understands the divine a seemingly trivial sign like the sneeze can indeed offer deep insight into great things. Furthermore, he would be surprised if Socrates called the omen a sneeze and not a sign from heaven as the sneeze is but the tool used by the Heavens to send a message, for γὰρ τοῦ ὁργάνου τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ’ οὐ καὶ τὸ ὁργάνον ὑπὸ χρήται πρὸς τὸ ἔργον ὁργάνου δὲ τι καὶ τὸ σημεῖον ὑπὸ χρήται τὸ σημαίνου. It should be noted that while Plutarch was not writing as a contemporary of Socrates but in the first and second century CE, his interpretations of sneezes remain interesting and valid for consideration here.

It can be ascertained with a fair degree of certainty that Plato uses the sneeze in the Symposium while being aware of the symbolic ‘baggage’ that accompanies it. The sneeze was by no means considered to be a simple and random physical act. It was understood to be naturally connected to some form of power inside the head and is regarded as a spontaneous expression of that something, independent of the body and the conscious will. The sneeze was regarded as being a prophetic symbol, a sign from a power, the ὕψιθή, that had other knowledge beyond that of the conscious mind. Non-verbal behaviour was loaded with symbolic relevance, and its verbalisation carried with it the
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482 Plutarch, De genio Socratis XI.37-39.
483 Plutarch, De genio Socratis XII.1-8.
484 Plutarch, De genio Socratis XII.9-22.
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implicit desire of the author to harvest and use its symbolic strength in presenting a certain method or mood.

Movements of the head carry with them specific symbolic significance. The sneeze, besides being the nasal expression of the ψυχή, can also be seen as a form of nod, which was considered a deliberate affirmation by the ψυχή — the soul and physical strength — of the words just spoken. The sneeze, therefore, can represent this same concept, but in its spontaneous and unconscious form, that of the affirmation of the independent power in the head. A much later (first century CE) expression of this phenomenon can be found in Pliny’s *Naturalis historia:* the example of sneezing over a dish of food, which meant that the ψυχή has not yet been satiated by this dish despite what the body might feel, shows how the ψυχή was indeed independent of the conscious control over the body, and so acted. Furthermore, when a sneeze occurs which is deemed not to be prophetic in nature, it is seen as a disturbance of this independent power. Aristophanes’ sneeze need not be taken as conscious or intentional commentary on the speeches he just heard, but can be seen as a reaction from the independent power of his ψυχή.

More generally, in analysing the sneezes found in Greek texts and their meaning as omens, there are three primary things to be considered; 1) the position of the person who sneezes, 2) the time of the sneeze, 3) the physical condition of the person who sneezes. The first of these is connected to the ancient significance of right and left as applied to omens. Throughout classical texts, the right is considered lucky, the left unlucky; the right is considered good, is connected to masculinity and is honourable. The left, however, is associated with evil, the feminine and the dishonourable. A sneeze to the right was a good

488 Pliny, *Naturalis historia.* XXVIII.26; Onians 1951: 104.
489 Onians 1951: 225-226. See section 2.4 on the relationship between the body and the soul.
490 Onians 1951: 104.
491 Pease 1911: 431.
492 Lloyd 1962: 66. See section 3.3 for a discussion on right and left hands.
omen, to the left a bad omen.\textsuperscript{493} In his life of Themistocles, Plutarch tells how on one occasion during the fighting with the Persians, three prisoners were brought to Themistocles while he was sacrificing. At the same moment that the visionary Euphrantides saw them, there was a great flame that shot up and a sneeze gave forth its good omen to the right. The visionary demands they be sacrificed to ensure a Greek victory. Themistocles is shocked and horrified at this suggestion but could not stand up to the irrational needs of the believing mob. Plutarch, who attributes this story to the historically literate philosopher Phanias the Lesbian, understands the sneeze as being taken for a divine omen which required the sacrificing of these prisoners. τούτους ἴδων Εὐφραντίδης ὁ μάντις, ὡς ἀμα μὲν ἀνέλαμψεν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν μέγα καὶ περιφανεῖς πῦρ, ἀμα δὲ πταρμός ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐσήμινη, τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα δεξιωσάμενος ἐκέλευσε τῶν νεανίσκων κατάρδξασθαι καὶ καθιερέσαι πάντας ὑμηστῇ Διονύσῳ προσευξάμενον οὕτω γάρ ἀμα σωτηρίαν καὶ νίκην ἔσεσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν.\textsuperscript{494} There is a further reference to the importance of the direction of a sneeze in Plutarch’s \textit{Moralia}, where the reader is told how Socrates adhered to the sneeze as an omen when added to other convincing evidence. The reader is told that Socrates accepted as an omen both his sneezes and those of others and that if someone sneezed to the right, whether from behind or in front, he would continue to act, but if it was to the left he would not. ὅτι τὸ Σωκράτους δαμῶν πταρμός ἦν, ὦ τε παρ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὦ παρ’ ἄλλον. ἐτέρου μὲν γὰρ πταρώντος ἐκ δεξιῶν εἰτ’ ὁπιθεθεὶν εἰτ’ ἐμπρόσθεν ὅρμαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν, εἰ δ’ ἐξ αριστερᾶς, ἀποτρέπεσθαι.\textsuperscript{495}

\textsuperscript{493} Aristophanes parodies this belief through the use of another bodily function; in \textit{Equites} 638-639 he has the Sausage Seller claim that his thoughts were disturbed by a καταπύγων farting to the right, ταῦτα φρουτίζωται μοι ἐκ δεξιῶς ἀπέπαρσε καταπύγων ἀνήρ. Additional Aristophanic references to farting are \textit{Equites} 115 (farting and snoring); \textit{Plutus} 698-699.\textsuperscript{494} Plutarch, \textit{Themistocles}, XIII.3. See Catullus XLV.8-9 for Love’s sneezes, two to the right and one to the left. These sneezes, which originate on the right, are seen as omens of goodwill for the lovers. Love sneezes again to the left and right, these also being considered as good omens, in lines 17-18. On Catullus’ sneezes see Gratwick (1992).\textsuperscript{495} Plutarch, \textit{De genio Socratis} XI.13-17.
In the *Symposium* there is no mention of the direction of Aristophanes' sneeze, although there are other significant references in the dialogue to left and right, in particular in regards to seating and speaking order. Movement from the left to the right was acceptable and lucky and, with the exception of the temporary change in order caused by Aristophanes' hiccough attack, this is the direction the speaking order in the *Symposium* takes. It is significant to note that it is the place to the left, i.e., that which would be passed to from the right, which was considered the most honoured. At this banquet this place is initially occupied by Phaedrus, while Agathon, the host, occupies the lowest place at the table. However, upon Socrates' late arrival, he takes the seat to Agathon's right, i.e., the place of honour, thus moving Phaedrus down a seat (there is further disruption to the seating order when Alcibiades arrives). Even in the last discussion, that between Aristophanes, Agathon and Socrates, the previous rhythm was retained while drinking, the cup going from left to right.

The second condition to be considered, the time of a sneeze, is critical in understanding the nature of the omen. The sneeze was considered ominous should it occur at the beginning of an act, as it was symbolic of an end, and the act should then be abandoned. This theory is then applied to the time of day a sneeze occurs. In *Moralia*, Plutarch states that Socrates is concerned not only with the direction of the sneeze, but also its timing. Plutarch writes that if it was Socrates himself who sneezed before doing what he was about to do then it confirmed his action, whereas if he sneezed after he had already begun acting, he would stop, τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ πταρμῶν τὸν μὲν ἐτι μέλλοντος βεβαιοῦν τὸν δ' ἡδη πράσσοντος ἔπέχειν καί κολύειν τὴν ὀρμήν. Should a sneeze occur early in

496 Plato, *Symposium* 177d. See Braunlich (1936) for a discussion on whether drinking order, ἐπὶ δεξία, was clockwise or counter-clockwise. The typical dining room had seven or eleven couches which were placed around a square shaped room. For an extensive study on the numerous attributes of a symposium, see Murray (1990b).
498 Details of the changes caused by Alcibiades’ arrival are mentioned in 222e. See Bury (1932: 168); Schuhl (1948: 173).
500 Plutarch, *De genio Socratis* XI.17-19.
the day then it is considered a bad omen, as it symbolises termination of an act while the day is just beginning. The day, in effect, does not have a chance to develop before there is an omen, the sneeze, which signals to abandon it. However, should the sneeze occur late in the day, it is seen as a good omen as it is a positive affirmation of a day already ending. If, as stated above, the sneeze is a spontaneous nod and it is the ψυχή’s affirmation of what is being said or done, then it is offering unsolicited affirmation of the day just passed.\textsuperscript{501} In the Aristotelian \textit{Problematata} it is stated that sneezing between midnight and midday is not a good thing but between midday and midnight it is positive. \textit{Διὰ τί οὐ μὲν ἀπὸ μέσων νυκτῶν ἄχρι μέσης ἡμέρας οὐκ ἀγαθοὶ πταμοὶ, οὐ δὲ ἀπὸ μέσης ἡμέρας ἄχρι μέσων νυκτῶν; ἦ ὅτι ο μὲν πταμὸς μᾶλλον δοκεῖ ἐπισχεῖν τοὺς ἄρχομένους καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄρχῳ:}\textsuperscript{502} It is fair to assume that the sneeze at Agathon’s banquet occurred during the second half of the day and was, therefore, a good omen. The sneeze occurs early on in the banquet and should not be assumed to have happened after midnight. Aristophanes’ sneeze can be seen as an affirmation of Agathon’s victory for which the banquet was held as well as a general one for the group assembled that evening and the topic being discussed.

As for the third consideration, the physical state of the sneezer, it is of relevance here. As a rule, the sneeze was considered a positive sign in regard to one’s health. It was believed that should ill persons sneeze, they are well enough to recover, whereas if they are too ill to sneeze, they were beyond being saved, διὸ καὶ τοὺς ἐκθυνόμενους κρίνουσιν πταμικῶς, ὥς ἐὰν μὴ τούτῳ δύνηται πάσχειν, ἀσώτους δύναται. ὡστε ὃς σημεῖον ὑγείας τοῦ ἀρίστου καὶ ἱερωτάτου τόπου προσκυνοῦσιν ὃς ἱερόν, καὶ φήμην ἀγαθήν ποιοῦσιν.\textsuperscript{503} In the Hippocratic \textit{Prognosticon} it is stated that sneezing either before or after illness is bad in the case of lung disease, κορύζως δὲ καὶ πταμοῦς ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς περὶ

\textsuperscript{501} Onians 1951: 138.
\textsuperscript{502} [Aristotle], \textit{Problematata} 962b19-22.
\textsuperscript{503} [Aristotle], \textit{Problematata} 962b4-7; Pease 1911: 434.
Pseudo-Aristotle’s *Problemata* asks why the sneeze, but not coughing or a runny nose, is considered divine. Διὰ τί τῶν μὲν πταρμῶν θεόν ἤγομεθα εἶναι, τὴν δὲ βήχα ἢ τὴν κόρυζαν οὐ;\(^{505}\) The answers tendered are that it is because the sneeze comes from the head which, due to it being the source of reason, is the most divine part of the body and that, unlike the other two symptoms mentioned, the sneeze is not the result of disease. ἢ διότι ἐκ τοῦ θειοτάτου τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς τῆς κεφαλῆς, ὡς ὁ λογισμὸς ἐστι, γίνεται; ἢ ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἀπὸ νοσουντων γίνεται, τούτῳ δὲ οὐ;\(^{506}\) Aristotle further asks why other emissions of breath such as wind and eructation are not regarded as sacred, but sneezing is. Διὰ τί τῶν μὲν ἄλλων πνευμάτων ἂν ἔξοδοι, ὧν φύσης καὶ ἐρυμοῦ, οὐχ ἵπεραι, ἢ δὲ τοῦ πταρμοῦ ἵπερα;\(^{507}\) The answer he presents is that wind is from the lower part of the stomach, eructation from the upper and sneezing is from the head; as the head is the most divine region, then the breath that comes from it is also considered divine, and that the sneeze shows that the most divine region, the head, is in good health. ἐστὶ δὲ φύσα μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς κάτω κολίας πνεῦμα, ἐρυμὸς δὲ τῆς ἄνω, ὁ δὲ πταρμὸς τῆς κεφαλῆς. Διὰ τὸ ἱερώτατον οὖν εἶναι τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐντεθεῖν ὡς ἱερὰν προσκυνοῦσιν. ἢ δὲ ἅπαντα τὰ πνεύματα σημαίνει τοὺς εἰρημένους τόπους βέλτιον ἔχειν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ;\(^{508}\)

It could be inferred from this that Aristophanes’ head was indeed in good health, even if his body was reacting to his life of hedonism and indulgence, or perhaps just to the previous night’s activities. While far less common, the sneeze could also be seen as a symptom of disease which could lead to death, although these tend to be described as exceptions. For example, in *Historiae* Thucydides lists sneezing as a symptom of one of the stages of plague, which then descends to the

---

\(^{504}\) Hippocrates, *Prognosticon* XIV. 15-19 (Littre).

\(^{505}\) Aristotle, *Problemata* 962a21-22.


\(^{507}\) Aristotle, *Problemata* 962a32-33.

\(^{508}\) Aristotle, *Problemata* 962a35-40.
chest and ends in death. In the Hippocratic Corpus the sneeze is also amongst the symptoms of various diseases but, although the sneeze can foreshadow death (as mentioned above), it is usually seen as a sign of potential good health, e.g., ἄλλ’ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις νοσήμασιν τὸν ἐναντίωδεςτάτοιον οἱ πτωμοὶ λυσιτελέουσιν. Furthermore, there existed (and still exists) a tradition to call for the health of one who sneezes. This can be seen as a call to the ψυχή as independent from the body, for the former to care for the safety of the latter. The idea that the sneeze was an indication of the possibility of restored health can be applied to Aristophanes in the Symposium. The reader is aware that the comedian is suffering from a hang-over, and the sneeze can be seen as (comically) reassuring the reader that while Aristophanes might be subdued for the moment, he is not beyond hope and will recover and regain his usual spirits soon enough. And so it turns out: Aristophanes’ physical incapacitation due to the hiccoughs is but temporary, and the comedian is quickly rehabilitated and able to recite his tale of Eros.

5.1.4 Structure and effects

After considering the hiccough and the sneeze and what both of these bodily functions symbolise and signify in Plato’s Symposium, their effect on the actual structure of the banquet should be addressed. Aristophanes’ attack of the hiccoughs must be considered in its role of causing the change in speaking order mid-dialogue. Plato constructs his Symposium in a precise and calculating manner, intentionally positioning the various speakers in their respective places and speaking orders. The final order by which the speeches are presented has nothing to do with chance or lack of intention or attention. There are seven speakers whose words are reported by Apollodorus, and these can be divided into

509 Thucydides, II.xlix.3.
510 Hippocrates, Prognosticon XIV.19-22 (Litré).
511 Onians 1951: 264.
three parts: the first five speakers; Socrates’ speech; and that of the drunken Alcibiades. This division can be justified on thematic grounds simply as the first five speakers believe that Eros is a god, who is perfect and without fault and, therefore, justifies all actions and behaviour; unlike these five, Socrates considers Eros a δεισίμων; while the speech of Alcibiades speaks not of Eros itself but of Socrates (the man) and the Eros of Socrates. Plato carefully choreographs the seating arrangement of the guests who enter prior to the discussion, as well as those who enter after the speeches have begun, each individual being placed according to the desired construction of the dialogue. The narrative links provided by Apollodorus offer detailed descriptions which allow the reader insight into the staging of the drama which was the symposium. The entrances and exits throughout the Symposium are by no means random, coincidental or marginal in importance, and their dramatic effect is central to understanding the meaning of the dialogue. Plato is fully in control of these actions and gestures, using each one to manipulate his symposium into reflecting the content of the dialogue. The final order by which the speeches are presented has nothing to do with chance or lack of intention or attention. Plato wanted the ideas on Eros to be presented in a certain order, and so they were. Even when the story of Agathon’s banquet is being told third-hand the order of speeches and the physical placement of the speakers are related in the utmost detail.

It is within this framework of precise positioning of the characters involved that one must consider Aristophanes’ hiccup attack which prohibits him from taking his ‘rightful’ turn to speak. Furthermore, Plato’s choice to change the order of the speakers once in the middle of the dialogue, rather than having written them in the desired final order to begin with, needs to be

512 See Bury (1932: lii-lxiv); Brochard (1954: 60).
513 Brochard 1954: 62-64.
516 On exits and entrances in stage drama, see Taplin (1978: 31-57).
addressed. Why does Plato choose such a way, i.e., the hiccoughs, to cause the disruption in the existing order? Indeed, it seems that Plato gave Aristophanes the hiccoughs in order to emphasise the order of his speakers. The change he made assured that the significance of the final order was not missed, nor were the implications of this alteration. The hiccoughs are by no means accidental or decorative literary padding, but are used to illustrate that what might appear to be the smallest and most insignificant of details can be intentionally used by the author to create the desired order.

5.1.5 Cosmic order

An additional aspect which will be touched on briefly is Plato’s use of the word κόσμου in 189a in relation to the hiccoughs and the sneeze and the associations this term naturally evokes. In 189a Plato has Aristophanes wonder whether the orderliness of the body, τὸ κόσμου τοῦ σώματος, desires the noises and tickling of the sneeze. He continues by stating that the hiccoughs, one bodily disorder, are stopped immediately upon the bringing on of the sneeze, another disorder, thus restoring the body to its normative orderly state. Plato’s use of the term τὸ κόσμου is not accidental and has deep implications for the understanding of this Platonic hiccough and the subsequent sneeze. Plato’s cosmology offers an explanation of the ordered universe, τοῦ κόσμου, as well as of the order of the human body. It is in this context that ὁ κόσμος is relevant here. Like the cosmos, which is composed of Necessity and Reason, man has an intelligent, immortal soul and a mortal soul; these are housed inside the body, which, despite its distractions and flaws, ultimately allows for order to prevail over disorder. Indeed, this idea can be seen expressed through Plato’s use of the hiccough and

517 Lowenstam 1986: 45.
519 On Platonic cosmology see, for example, Cornford (1937); Furley (1987; 1989).
520 Morrow 1965: 422.
the sneeze. Whereas the hiccup is a disorderly bodily function void of reason, the sneeze is an expression of the ψυχή, independent of its physical host, although still using the body, i.e., the nose, in its physical manifestation. As with the cosmic dominance of Reason over Necessity, so does the sneeze subjugate the hiccup within the body, thus restoring order from disorder. As in the order of the universe, bodily order is the result of independent powers being brought together to create a preferred physical state. Thus the disorder of the hiccoughs is exorcised through the disorder of the sneeze. To combat one disorder, another must be created and utilised in conjunction with the first, and only then is order regained.

This need for co-operation between different elements is to be understood on various levels of interpretation, including that of the universe, the body politic and the individual human body. The general cosmic order of the macrocosm, the universe, is equally relevant for the microcosm, the living being, which is included in the scope of the infinite order of the cosmos.521 The order that is desired on a universal level is also at the base of the quest for the principle of the order of man, which relies on a system of Ideas, which combine life, soul and intellect to create a form of body.522 The cosmic order and the bodily order are a result of independent powers being used in conjunction with one another to establish a harmonious existence devoid of chaos. In example of 189a, Aristophanes’ sneeze reclaims order from the disorder of his body, as well as that of the dialogue itself.

5.2 Spitting

References to spitting, πτύω (and its derivatives), in classical texts are by no means infrequent, yet the topic is highly under-investigated. Indeed, the ways

521 Plato, Timaeus 30c7-31a1.
522 Robin 1935: 165-166.
by which to analyse the phenomenon of spitting are manifold. Possible interpretations, some of which transcend cultural boundaries, may be derived from the inter-disciplinary study of this particular example of non-verbal communication. While each incident of spitting must be considered within its textual and cultural context, the more general relationship to theories of the body also needs to be considered. Spitting has to be seen within the context of the body as a whole, and from the point of view of how and why the body is being manipulated, whether intentionally or unintentionally, to communicate whatever message is intended. Bodily acts such as spitting may have religious, ritualistic, cultural, social or individual significance. Spitting is an action open to many interpretations — it may be understood as a purely natural and symbolically unencumbered function, as an intentional act of abuse and insult, or as a means of protecting oneself from evil or misfortune. Status and gender also affect the role of spitting, in particular when it is considered as a form of ritual action.

This study of ancient spitting differs from the previous section on hiccupping and sneezing in that this bodily function is a conscious act performed by the individual rather than a physical affliction over which there can be little or no control. While Aristophanes' sneeze in Symposium 189a was instigated in order to cure the hiccoughs, once it occurred it was uncontrollable. Spitting, however, is perceived as a physical act fully under the control of the one who is spitting. In order to offer a more comprehensive understanding of how spitting was understood in antiquity, this study relies on a wider range of sources than previous sections. While there is not a huge amount of textual references to spitting, those that can be gleamed from the extant sources create the impression of a bodily function which was deep in meaning and significance.

In contemporary Western society, the act of spitting is thought to be an expression of disgust or disdain. From the outset of modern scholarship on non-verbal communication, there have been negative connotations attributed to spitting. In The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals, Darwin states
that "[s]pitting seems an almost universal sign of contempt or disgust; and spitting obviously represents the rejection of anything offensive in the mouth."523 He then gives various examples, ranging from Shakespeare to the Ethiopians, to illustrate this point.524 Despite Darwin’s assumption that its meaning is "almost universal", the act of spitting must not be automatically accepted as an insult or as a negative response, and historical context must be considered when attempting to explain human behaviour. While the above explanation of spitting is indeed the most common meaning applied to πτύω,525 it is by no means exclusive, and the alternative interpretations and intentions should not be marginalised or ignored.

In order to understand the various interpretations of the act of spitting, each element of that act, both the literal and the symbolic, must be analysed. The actual act of spitting may be defined as follows: the conscious projection of spittle/saliva from the mouth/body towards/on another person or object.526 This multi-faceted definition can be understood in numerous ways, with the emphasis placed on a variety of different theoretical associations. First, the saliva can be seen as the transmitter of pollution or danger, a means by which contamination can be spread. In general, bodily fluids can be seen as sources of impurity, and saliva is no exception.527 Indeed, the spittle itself can be seen to embody the bad-feeling and insult intended by the act, it being the physical expression of these sentiments. Second, the spittle, having been created by the body, is being

525 The differences between the various compound forms of the basic term for spitting, πτύω, are not without relevance. For example, to 'spit out', ἀποπτύω or ἐκπτύω, is very different from the terms for to 'spit upon', καταπτύω, προπτύω or ἐπιπτύω. The former are used to express rejection, either literal or figurative, the latter to express an act towards another thing, be it a person or the evil-eye.
526 This study considers the spitting of saliva and not of other bodily fluids. However, it should be noted that the verb πτύω is used to describe the various forms of ejecting (or not ejecting) bodily fluids, e.g., pus and blood, from the body. Many of such examples are found in the Hippocratic corpus. While these might appear to be little more than descriptions of symptoms of various ailments, they do provide important information. The spitting of blood and/or pus is considered to be a clear indication of poor health and it is a symptom which is referred to frequently. For the different 'biles' which effect human health as well as more general discussion on Hippocratic and Greek medicine see Longrigg (1993); Phillips (1973); Temkin (1991).
527 Douglas 1984: 35.
projected outside the body. The saliva is sent out from the confines of the body, in essence, bringing an element of the body with it when it exits from the bodily confines. ‘Saliva’ becomes ‘spit’ through the action of expelling it from the mouth, and spit, having been produced by the body and excreted from a bodily orifice, succeeds in traversing the boundaries of the body. Created from within, yet transported outside the body, spittle can be a powerful substance which exists in both domains. Finally, in addition to its aggressive function, spit can also serve as a natural defence against evil and harm, a means by which to protect oneself, one’s body or another being from evil. The ancient attitude towards spit must be recognised as being multi-dimensional, incorporating both positive and negative properties, which are themselves not unrelated. Spitting can be used both to protect from evil as well as to project evil on others. Spitting is an internal spiritual power, like witchcraft or prophecy, which humans believed was able to be harnessed for both good and evil purposes. The rituals of the classical era (and those of surrounding periods) which incorporate spitting are conscious acts and expressions which deal with evil from both sides, that of projecting it and that of counteracting it.

5.2.1 Ritualised spitting

In order to understand classical spitting, it is important to consider the meaning behind the various acts with which it is associated. The textual use of spitting to convey certain sentiments or emotions does not occur randomly or in a vacuum. Rather, there is an element of ritual associated with spitting which directs its usage. This ritual, which differs depending on the context of the spit,

528 Douglas 1984: 122. Douglas (1970: 139) writes that bodily excretions such as faeces, semen and spittle are used as weapons of attack by the witch.
529 In his encyclopaedic study of man, Walker (1977: 243) writes that “[i]n occult terms, saliva is the quintessence of the bodily fluids mixed with the psychic emanations from the heart and head, and one of the most potent effluvia in the world. Depending on circumstances it has the properties of the water of life, a deadly poison, and an antidote to poisons and other evils.” See also Crombie (1891) on the saliva superstition.
finds its origin in religious belief. The origins of the Greek religious beliefs regarding spitting are not traceable, yet the religious implications and associations of this act are accepted and preserved. Like other examples of ritualised behaviour, the action often becomes distanced from the original religious context and becomes assimilated into accepted common usage, in such a way that the communicator does not necessarily consider the religious origins of the action when choosing to use it. One might know that to spit in another’s face is an insult without knowing the origin of this belief. Ritual acts are crucial for the cultural consistency of a society and are, therefore, used continuously, regardless of their proximity to religious roots. Ritual consistency serves to perpetuate and anchor the culture within which, and for which, it exists; rituals are a means by which society reaffirms itself.\textsuperscript{531} Indeed, Athenian life, public and private, incorporated ritual into many aspects of daily existence.\textsuperscript{532} Democratic ideals were tied to the ritualised traditions of Athenian society, which the citizen used in order to express his membership in this community.\textsuperscript{533} For a culture to define itself, it needs constants, and ritualised behaviour fills this role.

\subsection*{5.2.2 Metaphoric usage}

The cultural and societal use of spitting in classical Athens will be examined here through the examples found in ancient texts, both classical and other. The focus of this study is to try to construct an understanding of spitting through the use of textual examples; no pretence is being made as to the formulation of an accurate portrayal of daily Greek spitting. However, the textual examples do provide us with an indication of what spitting meant when it was specifically and intentionally noted or utilised. The ejection of saliva that occurs

\textsuperscript{531} Durkheim 1976: 387-388. See Bell (1992) for an overview of anthropological theories on ritual.
\textsuperscript{532} For a more general examination of Greek ritual, see Osborne and Hornblower (1994).
\textsuperscript{533} R. Osborne 1994: 8-9.
because one has something caught in one’s throat does not necessitate the assumption of symbolic meaning, but spitting in the face of an adversary, enemy or loathed person, or on oneself in the face of danger, is not unimportant or insignificant. That a particular author decided to verbalise a spitting incident and include it in his narrative is indicative of its symbolic force and its worth as a descriptive tool.

That spitting can be used metaphorically indicates that there is societal agreement on the meaning of this action when used in a certain fashion, e.g., it is understood that spitting on or at someone represents a harsh and negative response. While this interpretation of spitting is not exclusive, it is clearly what is presumed when used symbolically in contexts such as these. The very act of spitting upon someone has come to represent the emotions which are the motivation behind the act, thus telling the reader (or audience) how this action should be understood. For example, when in In Demosthenem Dinarchus describes Demosthenes as τὸν κατάπτωστον he is stating that Demosthenes is a despicable man.534 Dinarchus uses the term ‘one who deserves to be spat upon’ (as opposed to μαρός, μυστός or στυγνός, for example) knowing that the implied meaning is understood (it can be understood from the context that τὸν κατάπτωστον is used negatively and to insult — that to be spat upon is indeed despicable and cannot be construed as something else). There is no notion of anyone actually being spat upon, but rather that Demosthenes evokes the same sentiments as those that would inspire such an act.

Not only is Demosthenes on the receiving end of the spitting descriptions, but he uses similar language in his own orations. For example, in De corona the Thessalians are described as κατάπτωστοι, thus describing their vile nature.535 Later in the same oration, the contemptible Aeschines is described as τὸν

---

534 Dinarchus I, In Demosthenem, 15.
535 Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 43.
**5.2.3 Acts of Spitting**

**5.2.3.1 Spitting on Bosom/Spitting three times**

One of the most obvious examples of ritual spitting in Greek texts refers to what must have been a well-recognised action of spitting on one’s chest in order to keep away evil. This usage of spittle to protect the individual from evil is an illustration of how spitting need not be seen as an insult or an act of rejection. It is not a negative act towards another but a positive act for oneself. Spitting is an act which expresses a “violent repugnance” for evil, and is thought to have reviled...
the manifestations of evil such as diseases.\textsuperscript{540} Theophrastus refers to this ritual in his description of the Superstitious man, who spits on his chest in the face of madness and epilepsy, \(\text{μαυρόμενον \ δε \ ιδων \ \epsilon \ \text{επιληπτων \ \φρίξας \ εἰς \ κόλπων \ πτύσα}\).\textsuperscript{541} In his satire of the overly superstitious man, Theophrastus depicts him as practising an exaggerated number of rituals to avoid pollution and the evil-eye. That spitting on one's chest is included in this critical portrayal of the overly superstitious is an indication that this act was widely recognised as a performed ritual.\textsuperscript{542} When considering the act of spitting itself, it should be noted that one does not spit \textit{at} the diseased but \textit{upon} oneself, thus making it a defensive act as opposed to an offensive action. This suggests that the spitting is merely symbolic and that the act is not thought to be curative or even to ward off contagion, but to be an expression of superstitious beliefs that will keep the evil which is infecting the diseased at bay.\textsuperscript{543} On seeing a madman or an epileptic the superstitious man interprets the sight as foreboding that he himself will be afflicted by these diseases in the future,\textsuperscript{544} and he hopes to protect himself through the spitting. The spitting, therefore, is believed to act as a prophylactic agent, deflecting the possible danger of various evils.

Another form of ritualised spitting is that of spitting three times when faced with evil or adversity. There is an early example of the triple-spit ritual in Hipponax, whereby Encolpius spits three times when he becomes sexually impotent, \(\ldots \text{καὶ τῶι \ κυμαῖοι} \ 	ext{τῶι[δε]} \ \text{δίνα} \ \text{φολι_passwd[ς]} / \ \text{επιπτύσας} \ 	ext{τρίς} \ \text{καὶ τ[}/ \ \text{ά]} \ \text{π[]} \ \text{δὲ} \ 	ext{δὲφατ[्र} \ \text{ός}.\textsuperscript{545} One could assume that this spitting ritual is performed in

\textsuperscript{540} Jebb 1909: 147.
\textsuperscript{542} Although a much later, and non-Greek, source, Pliny refers to the powers of saliva/spitting in \textit{Naturalis historia}, XXVIII.35, \textit{despuimus comitiales morbos, hoc est contagia regerimus}. This chapter continues with references to saliva as a means of fighting witchcraft, treating boils, etc.
\textsuperscript{543} Nicolson 1897: 30-31.
\textsuperscript{544} Edmonds and Austen 1904: 95.
\textsuperscript{545} Hipponax, \textit{Fragmenta} 78.14-16. Miralles and Portulas (1988: 9) state that “[t]he most plausible and stimulating hypothesis concerning Hipponax’s fragment 78 is that it describes a man’s attempt to recover his sexual vigour, which he has temporarily lost; these attempts are set in a context, which is probably ritual, of ceremonies related to ideas of fertility and fecundity.”
order to counteract the evil which has caused the state of impotence.\textsuperscript{546} This ritualised reaction to impotence is a particularly interesting use of a spitting ritual, as in this instance the spitting is used to combat an evil already affecting the body and not something threatening it from the outside. There is further significance, as the impotence in itself represents an inability to perform a bodily function which culminates with the excretion of a bodily fluid, semen. The action which is invoked in order to rectify the impotence, i.e. spitting, is the intentional expulsion from the mouth of saliva, itself a bodily fluid. The relationship of the fluids within the body, as well as the effects their excretion has on the desired balance within, are of importance.\textsuperscript{547}

The examples of spitting three times or of spitting on one’s bosom are not limited to the classical period (or earlier), but continue to be used in Greek literature of later periods. These examples remain valuable when considering the meaning of this non-verbal behaviour in its classical context, as, while the meaning of the act may develop and change with time, it is still rooted in the earlier usage.

Perhaps the most informative instance of ritualised spitting comes from Theocritus VI, where the beautiful Damoetas tells how he spat three times on his chest, as the old woman Cotyttaris had taught him, in order not to be bewitched by the evil-eye. \textit{ως μὴ βασκαυθῶ δὲ, τρις εἰς ἑμὸν ἐπτυσα κόλπου· ταύτα γὰρ ἄ γραία με Κοτυτταρίς έξεδίδαξε.}\textsuperscript{548} This is an illustration of the belief that spitting three times could counteract evil which derived from excessive beauty, presumptuousness or immodest behaviour that might provoke the gods, and Nemesis in particular. This act of spitting can be interpreted in two ways. First, that spitting is an abusive and defiling act which will illustrate the

\textsuperscript{546} In his commentary on the fragments of Hipponax, Masson (1962: 145) states that “on sait que dans les superstitions anciennes et modernes, cracher est un acte apotropaique, surtout lorsque l’on crache trois fois...” For other remedies for impotence and ways to obtain (and retain) erections, see Winkler (1991: 220-221).

\textsuperscript{547} For a general anthropological consideration of bodily fluids, particularly blood and semen, see Héritier-Augé (1989).

\textsuperscript{548} Theocritus, \textit{Idyllia} VI, 39 (Gow).
individual's awareness of his (her) own limitations. Damoetas might be beautiful, but by spitting thrice on his own bosom he is tarnishing that physical beauty, while also conducting himself in a way which demonstrates his human capacity for base behaviour. Second, the saliva is a means for keeping evil at bay, and by spitting on himself Damoetas is creating a protecting shield against the evil that might be drawn to him by his beauty. The first interpretation is one which defines saliva and spitting as negative elements, whereas the second explanation has them acting positively as a defence against external harms.

In this passage of Theocritus VI, it should be noted that the act of spitting is not left to explain itself, but is accompanied by a statement of the reason for this behaviour. The inclusion of an explanation for the spitting, i.e., that it fends off bewitchment, leads one to question whether, by the time Theocritus was writing in the third century BCE, this ritual can no longer be assumed by the author to be self-explanatory, or whether the explanation is merely added for emphasis. Considering the existence of additional later references to the ritualised act of spitting three times on one's bosom, it would seem that the explanation of the act was not so much to facilitate contemporary understanding as for increased emphasis and poetic effect.

An additional aspect of this account needs to be considered, and that is the involvement of Cotyttaris, a woman with a non-Greek, i.e., Thracian, name. By attributing this ritualised act to a non-Greek woman, Theocritus is implying that such action should not be attributed to a Greek male. Barbarians were certainly portrayed as being highly ritualistic, and women, whether Greek or not, were considered to be more superstitious by nature. The scholia explains that spitting on one's bosom is done to ward off evil and cites the Callimachus example, thus further highlighting the importance women play in this ritual, 

549 See, for example, Lucian, Navigium 15 (second century CE).
550 Hall 1989: 17; 99-100; on barbarian religion, see 143-154.
The fact that it is women spitting is not irrelevant, as it specifically states here that the spitting is especially done by women to ward off evil, μάλιστα αἱ γυναῖκες. Callimachus, who was also writing in the third century, has the ritual act of spitting on one’s bosom performed by women. In this example there is no indication of the number of spits, δαίμων, τῇ κόλπους ἐπιπτῶσι γυναῖκες. Here too, this act is understood as a means of exorcising the goddess Nemesis. The goddess was believed to punish those who were excessively boastful, hopeful or arrogant, and spitting on one’s chest was a means to avert her wrath.

In Theocritus XX, there is a further example of spitting three times upon one’s chest, in this instance when Eunica spat upon her bosom after feeling defiled at the suggestion that she should be kissed by a rustic, ...ἀπ’ ἐμεῖ δύνῃ μή με μολύνῃς. τοιάδε μυθίζοισα τρίς εἰς ἑδὲν ἐπιτύσε κόλπον, καὶ μ’ ἀπὸ τᾶς κεφαλᾶς ποτὶ τῷ πόδε συνεχὲς εἶδεν/ χείλεσι μυχθίζοισα καὶ ὀμμασι λοξά βλέπωσι, καὶ πολὺ τὰ μορφὰ θηλύνετο, καὶ τὶ σεσαρός/ καὶ σοβαρὸν μ’ ἐγέλαξεν. The spitting ritual here represents more than one of its various meanings: first, it serves as the means by which to deflect the defilement which she feels has threatened her; second, it is an expression of her disgust at the concept of kissing such a man. The spitting is not an isolated act of rejection; she does not simply spit, but looks him over from head to toe, jeers at him, gives him an unsympathetic look, and, in a womanly way, she laughs at him in a sneering and haughty manner.

551 Scholia in Theocritum vetera VI.39a.
552 Scholia in Theocritum vetera VI.39b.
553 Callimachus, Fragmenta incertae sedis, 687 (Pfeiffer).
554 Sittl 1890: 120. Trypanis (1958: 281) explains this fragment by stating that “[w]omen exorcised Nemesis by spitting on their bosoms.”
555 Nicolson 1897: 38.
556 Theocritus, Idyllia XX, 10-15 (Gow).
When considering this bodily act, an aspect of particular interest is the longevity of this symbol, which appears throughout antiquity without obvious changes in meaning. While this is not a unique phenomenon, it is, nonetheless, an indication that certain symbols are not necessarily culturally-specific. In order to demonstrate the continuity in the perceived meaning of this act in antiquity, a late, non-Greek example will be discussed briefly; reference to spitting three times in one’s bosom is found in Pliny’s *Naturalis historia*. Within a discussion on the various properties and uses of saliva we are informed that spitting three times on one’s chest appeases the gods when one is too presumptuous, *veniam quoque a deis spei alicuius audacioris petimus in sinum spuendo, et iam eadem ratione terna despuere precatione in omni medicina mos est*... This explanation of the act is in accordance with Theocritus VI, where the spitting is performed in order to defend oneself from the evil brought on by excessive beauty. Despite the late date of the reference from *Naturalis historia*, it seems clear that this spitting ritual has retained its meaning regardless of the distance it has travelled from its primary religious source.558

5.2.3.2 Spit in the Face

The act of spitting at another person, as opposed to the evil that person might carry or represent, is undoubtedly an act of abuse or insult. To spit in another’s face, which can be seen as a prime symbol of the self,559 adds additional weight to the insult. Hyperides, in a fragment from a private abuse case, lists spitting in the face along with being slapped, being pulled by the hair, and being treated like the most dishonourable servant, 1. ...ἐπείτα ἸΠΠΟΝΙΚΟΣ ὑπ’ ΑὐΤΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ μόνον ἐρραπίσθη τῇν γνάθον· ἐγὼ δ’ ὑπὸ τοῦτον τῶν τριχῶν

558 For additional examples of continuity, a concept which should only carefully be attributed to non-verbal communication, see Sittl (1890: 118); Gow (1950: 125-126, vol. 2). For a more general argument in favour of continuity through to modernity see Boegehold (1997).
559 Synnott 1993: 2. See chapter 2 on the face in Greek thought.
elkonin, kondulovus elaion. 2. Pròs to prósomou prospotúein. 3. Eiv autò ósper to átrimótaton therápion.\textsuperscript{560} This reference leaves little doubt as to how such an act was categorised. The act of spitting in another’s face is one of hubris, at least as powerful as a verbal insult.

An example is also found in Sophocles’ Antigone. Haemon, upon finding the hanged Antigone, turns to Creon, glares at him with furious eyes, spits in his face and, not answering, draws his two-edged sword, tòv d’ ágríous ósousi pappímas ò paîs;/ ππússas prosoúpò kóudèn ánteipw, xífoùs/ élkei delpòus kínódoutas, èk d’ órmoménonou/ patrôs fugaíson ãmpak.\textsuperscript{561} There can be no question here as to the meaning of the emotions and intention of the spit. The crazed Haemon attempts to kill his father immediately after spitting at him and, when he does not succeed, kills himself with his own sword.\textsuperscript{562} Haemon is experiencing emotion of the most intense nature, strong enough to bring him to attempted patricide (and regicide), and it is expressed by the poet through a description of the look in his eyes and the act of spitting in the face of the other. This act of spitting is transgressive; it is the son and subject who projects his bodily fluid onto his father and ruler. As a form of insult, spitting offers more than spoken words as it transports a physical expression (saliva) of the hubris from the sender to the receiver. There is no need to explain the meaning of this type of spit, as it is a culturally accepted non-verbal symbol which evidently represents disdain, disgust, insult, abuse and rejection.

However, the question as to whether this spit is intended literally or metaphorically is of importance and has been the subject of scholastic debate.\textsuperscript{563}

\textsuperscript{560} Hyperides, Fragmenta 36 (Burtt).
\textsuperscript{561} Sophocles, Antigone 1231-1234.
\textsuperscript{562} Jebb (1900: 218) comments that “Haemon is momentarily insane with despair and rage: the very words autò xolarei, 1235, indicate the transport of frenzy which these verses were meant to depict.”
\textsuperscript{563} Jebb (1900: 218) writes that “Nothing could do more violence to the language, or more injury to the dramatic effect, than the Scholast’s theory that ππússas prosoúpò has a merely figurative sense, “with an expression of loathing on his face””. See Scholia in Sophoclis tragodiae vetera, Antigone 1232, ππússas prosoúpò: oíou ápósttrafíes kai akósmasas kai èk tòv prosoúpou katanemudemonos, oú kúris prosoúpías to patòr òs kai hèmès èn tì suptìa hèmèn katanéttan autòv ò èstì kataphróthasen tòv lògon autòv; oux elkein de tò xífòs kata tòu
There is no reason to think that Sophocles did not intend to express the son’s hatred for his father with this effective and unambiguous use of non-verbal behaviour. While there are many examples of metaphoric usage of spitting to express disgust and hatred this scenario suggests action and not merely words. Whereas spitting might be seen as distasteful and vulgar, within the context of this play there is no reason to assume that the explicitly abusive behaviour associated with spitting in an other’s face is not intended.

5.2.3.3 Spit on (someone)

Whereas spitting on the face constitutes the strongest insult, the act of spitting on or at any part of another person’s body was sufficiently insulting to leave no doubt as to the intended message. In *De falsa legatione*, Aeschines uses spitting to describe Demosthenes’ attitude towards his rivals and their political decisions. Demosthenes is described as himself being a bought man, while spitting on, i.e., having disdain for, those who take bribes. ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπρατον ἔχων μέρος τοῦ σώματος, [οὐδὲν τὴν φωνὴν προείπει, ὃς ὁ Ἀριστείδης ὁ τοὺς φόρους τάξας τοῖς Ἑλλησίοις ὁ δίκαιος ἐπικαλούμενος] δυσχεραίνει καὶ καταπτύει δωροδοκίας. It is in Aeschines’ interest to portray Demosthenes in the most unfavourable light possible, claiming that Demosthenes is himself corrupt yet ‘spits upon’, i.e., finds contemptible, the taking of bribes. Aeschines tells his audience that Demosthenes is annoyed, δυσχεραίνει, and that he spits upon them (his rivals), καταπτύει. It is not enough simply to state Demosthenes’ displeasure and to mock him as a hypocrite and as being like Aristeides. To say that he also spits upon his fellow ambassadors communicates through action his contempt. Aeschines’ use of non-verbal behaviour is used to

---

564 Aeschines II, *De falsa legatione*, 23.
express the true embodiment of Demosthenes' attitude in a way that verbal expression alone cannot.

There is a second example of this sort found in In Ctesiphontem. Aeschines is again presenting Demosthenes as a hypocrite, claiming that this ‘hater-of-Alexander’ and ‘hater-of Philip’ had gone, not once, but twice as an ambassador to Macedon and is now commanding the Athenians to spit upon the Macedonians, ὃ νυν κελεύων τῶν Μακεδόνων καταπτύειν. To spit on the Macedonians is unquestionably an act which indicates great contempt and disrespect, and the usage here serves to add weight to the point being put forward by Aeschines. Again, the use of non-verbal behaviour adds additional force and weight to the orator's description and argument.

Similar usage is found in De corona, where Demosthenes expresses his disdain and criticisms of Aeschines. When defending his advocacy of military resistance to the Macedonians, Demosthenes states that Aeschines never opposed this policy and that, if he had, it would have been a betrayal of Athenian heritage and forefathers. For Athens not to have attempted to resist would have been despicable, causing the orator to ask rhetorically if anyone would not have spat on Aeschines if he had suggested not striking back the enemy. εἰ γὰρ ταῦτα προείπ᾽ ἀκοινωτεί, περὶ ὧν οὐδένα κύριων ὁντιω' οὐχ ὑπεμείναν οἱ πρόγονοι, τίς οὐχὶ κατέπτυσεν ἄν σοι; μὴ γὰρ τῆς πόλεως γε, μηδ' ἐμοῦ. The rhetorical power of this passage is expressive of the Greek fear of passivity and enslavement. The hubris of enslavement is inconceivable to the Athenian citizen, and Demosthenes' suggestion that anyone opposing military action would be spat upon is undoubtedly representative of popular feeling. Literally, the term, κατὰ + πτύω, means to spit down upon someone, thus clearly expressing the notion of the superior person spitting on the inferior. In the fervour of his rhetoric this use

565 Aeschines III, In Ctesiphontem, 73.
566 Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 200.
of καταπτύω evokes a powerful picture of Aeschines, not the polis and not Demosthenes, being the target for this vivid expression of rejection and contempt. Who would not spit in Aeschines’ face for such behaviour?

In De corona Demosthenes again describes the haughty Aeschines as spitting upon others, i.e., σὺ δ’ ὁ σεμνὸς ἀνήρ καὶ διαπτύων τοῦς ἄλλους...568 That the low-born Aeschines should presume to think himself superior to the (relatively) well-bred Demosthenes is ludicrous, and Demosthenes attributes to Aeschines such base behaviour as spitting upon others as if to illustrate that, although Aeschines might try to present himself as sophisticated and genteel, his actions betray him. Within this context, spitting is an insulting, abusive, and base act.

The act of spitting on another is not restricted to oratory. Euripides uses this physical expression of disgust and contempt in the Hippolytus, to demonstrate the depth of Hippolytus’ rejection of the nurse’s proposition. His reaction is physical as well as mental, the spit symbolising how he cannot even retain such a notion within himself; he must exorcise it from his body. Ἡπ. ἀπέπτυσ' οὐδείς ἀδικός ἐστὶ μοι φίλος.569 In Ranae, Aristophanes has Euripides say to Aeschylus, in their struggle to prove their respective poetic superiority, that if there is any extra padding or if he repeats himself in the prologue then he can be spat upon. Εὐ. ἔγω φράσω./ κἀν ποὺ δίς εἴπω ταυτόν, ἢ στοιβήν ἰδης/ ἐνούσαν ἐξω τοῦ λόγου, κατάπτυσσον.570 Being spat upon is obviously a disgusting and insulting enough act for Euripides to think this sufficient punishment if he fails to produce poetic excellence. If the act were not a powerful one then it would not be a sufficiently satisfying reward for his rival if he failed. In the context of this play, for Aeschylus to spit on Euripides would undoubtedly caused the latter much humiliation and the former great satisfaction.

568 Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 258. The use of the verb διαπτύω emphasises the depth of contempt that the action is meant to represent. He thoroughly spat on others.
569 Euripides, Hippolytus 614.
570 Aristophanes, Ranae 1177-1179.
of καταπτύω evokes a powerful picture of Aeschines, not the polis and not
Demosthenes, being the target for this vivid expression of rejection and contempt.
Who would not spit in Aeschines’ face for such behaviour?

In De corona Demosthenes again describes the haughty Aeschines as
spitting upon others, i.e., σὺ δ’ ὁ σεμνὸς ἀνήρ καὶ διαπτύων τοῖς ἄλλοις...
That the low-born Aeschines should presume to think himself superior to the
(relatively) well-bred Demosthenes is ludicrous, and Demosthenes attributes to
Aeschines such base behaviour as spitting upon others as if to illustrate that,
although Aeschines might try to present himself as sophisticated and genteel, his
actions betray him. Within this context, spitting is an insulting, abusive, and base
act.

The act of spitting on another is not restricted to oratory. Euripides uses
this physical expression of disgust and contempt in the Hippolytus, to demonstrate
the depth of Hippolytus’ rejection of the nurse’s proposition. His reaction is
physical as well as mental, the spit symbolising how he cannot even retain such a
notion within himself; he must exorcise it from his body. Ἰπ. ἀπέπτυψεν οὐδὲς
ἀδικὸς ἐστὶ μοι φίλος. In Ranae, Aristophanes has Euripides say to
Aeschylus, in their struggle to prove their respective poetic superiority, that if
there is any extra padding or if he repeats himself in the prologue then he can be
spat upon. Εὐ. ἐγὼ φράσομι / καὶ ποὺ δίς εἰπὼ ταυτόν, ἢ στοιβὴν ὅσα
ἐνοῦσαν ἐξω τοῦ λόγου, κατάπτυσσον. Being spat upon is obviously a
disgusting and insulting enough act for Euripides to think this sufficient
punishment if he fails to produce poetic excellence. If the act were not a powerful
one then it would not be a sufficiently satisfying reward for his rival if he failed.
In the context of this play, for Aeschylus to spit on Euripides would undoubtedly
caused the latter much humiliation and the former great satisfaction.

568 Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 258. The use of the verb διαπτύω emphasises the depth of
contempt that the action is meant to represent. He thoroughly spat on others.
569 Euripides, Hippolytus 614.
570 Aristophanes, Ranae 1177-1179.
In Theophrastus’ *Characteres* XIX, δυσχερεία, (perhaps belonging to *Characteres* XI, obnoxiousness, βολωρία) the reader is given a description of a man who neglects his body and lives in squalor. This man keeps himself in a disgusting state and his behaviour is reproachable. Amongst his other deplorable and crass habits he is also accused of spitting across the table at the cup-bearer, καὶ ἀποπτύσαι δὲ βουλόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς τραπέζης, προσπτύσαι τῷ οἴνοχῳ. The behaviour associated with this character is obviously considered intolerable and base. That he spits at the cup-bearer expresses both his crudity of behaviour and his arrogant disregard for household servants, who were of an inferior status. His spitting could be construed as hubris, and, at the very least, was totally unacceptable. It would seem that to spit at another person, be it a poet or a cup-bearer, was deemed inappropriate and abusive.

One way of establishing the place spitting held in Greek society is to consider their reaction to cultures other than their own and how these societies were seen to have dealt with spitting. In *Cyropaedia*, I, Xenophon writes of how the Persians do not spit, blow their noses, break wind or urinate where they can be seen, as these are all considered to be breaches of decorum. αἰσχρὸν μὲν γὰρ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ Πέρσαις καὶ τὸ πτῦειν καὶ τὸ ἀπομύττεσθαι καὶ τὸ φύσες μεστῶς φαίνεσθαι, αἰσχρὸν δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ ἱόντα ποι φανερὸν γενέσθαι ἢ τοῦ οὐρήσαν ἐνεκα ἢ καὶ ἀλλο τινὸς τοιοῦτον. In *Cyropaedia*, VIII, Xenophon, while discussing the physical deterioration of the Persians, again deals with the fact that the Persians do not spit or blow their noses, although he states here that while they once did not do these things in order to harden the body, now the custom remains but the reason behind it no longer exists as the Persians no

---

571 Theophrastus, *Characteres* XIX.11.
572 On the inclusion of slaves under the law of hubris see Demosthenes XXI, *In Midiam*, 47; Fisher 1990: 123ff.; Murray 1990a: 140ff. Navarre (1924: 119) explains that “[l]a civilité grecque n’interdisait pas de cracher en public... ‘Cracher loin’ μικρὰ ττελω, était une expression proverbiale, pour symboliser l’arrogance, le mépris...L’incivilité réside ici moins dans le fait lui-même que dans les circonstances. Avec ce dernier trait, nous revenons, ce semble, au portrait du δυσχερείας.”
573 Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, I.ii.16.
longer pursue hard work as they once did. 'Ως δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν σωμάτων ἐπιμέλονται ὅπερ πρόσθεν, νῦν αὐτὸ τοῦτο διηγήσομαι. νόμιμον γὰρ δὴ ἢν αὐτῶν μήτε πτύειν μήτε ἀπομύττεσθαι. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι ταῦτα οὐ τοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ὕγρῳ φειδόμενοι ἐνόμισαν, ἀλλὰ βουλόμενοι διὰ πόνων καὶ ἱδρύτος τὰ σώματα στερεοῦσαν. νῦν δὲ τὸ μὲν μὴ πτύειν μηδὲ ἀπομύττεσθαι ἐτι διαμένει, τὸ δὲ ἐκποιεῖν οὐδαμοῦ ἐπιτηθεύεται. In a description of Persian beliefs and laws, Herodotus also tells of the religious implication of spitting in Persian rivers and the total taboo on such conduct, ἐς ποταμὸν δὲ οὐτε ἐνουρέουσι οὐτε ἐμπυτύουσι, οὐ χειρας ἐναπονίζουσι οὐδὲ ἄλλον οὐδένα περιορώση, ἀλλὰ σέβονται ποταμοῦς μάλιστα. It would seem that the Persian aversion to spitting was both religious and cultural, undoubtedly inter-dependent forces in the development of the attitudes towards spitting. Whereas the Greek authors appear not to associate the Persian habits and beliefs with their own, they nonetheless express interest in the Persians’ attitude towards spitting. Whereas the Persians are describes as not spitting at all, the Athenians appear to have done so willingly. In Memorabilia, Xenophon tells of Socrates describing Athenian behaviour of spitting out saliva as far away as possible, because it does not help but harms them, καὶ τὸ σίαλον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἀποπτύουσιν ὡς δύναται πορρωτάτῳ, διότι ὡφελεῖ μὲν οὐδέν αὐτῶν ἑνὸς, βλάπτει δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον. It would appear that for them, unlike the Persians, spitting was a relatively common means of non-verbal communication, expressing both the positive and the negative, which had been integrated into Greek culture at various levels, from the physical to the metaphoric.

574 Xenophon, Cyropaedia, VIII.viii.8.
575 Xenophon, Memorabilia I.ii.54.
5.2.3.4 ἐπιφθύζω and spitting as an expression of time

Theocritus VII, 127 offers another possible example of spitting, in this instance by an old woman, ἄμιμῳ δὲ ἀσυχία τε μέλοι, γραία τε παρείη/ ἀτις ἐπιφθύζοισα τὰ μὴ καλὰ νόσφιν ἐρύκοι.577 The scholia state that there is one view which explains this verb, ἐπιφθύζω, as spitting, which is done here by an old woman to avert evil, ἤτις ἐπιφθάζῃ περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀποδιοποιήσατο. φθύζειν δὲ τὸ πτύειν Δωρικῶς· εἰώθασι γὰρ αἱ γραίαι, δὴν ἐπιφθασαί, ἐπιπτύειν.578 However, while ἐπιφθύζω is generally accepted to mean ἐπιπτύω, alternative interpretations have been suggested. The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae writes φθύζω Susurrum edo, sicut et ἐπιφθύζω, thus defining ἐπιφθύζω as whispering and not spitting.579 Considering the context, however, this meaning is less likely than that of spitting.580 That the term ἐπιφθύζω was coined by Theocritus does not assist in deciphering the intended meaning.581

There is another possible interpretation of the use of ἐπιφθύζω in Theocritus VII which is found in the scholion, which states τινὲς δὲ ὀλίγον χρόνον συμπαροῦσα· φθύζων γὰρ τὸ ὀλγοχρόνιον κατὰ γλώσσα.582 This definition removes the meaning from spitting (or whispering) and applies it to the description of time. However, the suggestion that ἐπιφθύζοισα refers to something lasting a short time need not be unrelated to an alternative meaning which evolves from ἐπιπτύω, to spit upon. In fact, there are examples in Greek texts of spitting being used metaphorically in expressions of quickness. In Idyllia XXIX, Theocritus writes that one grows old faster than one can spit, κἂτι γηράλεοι πέλομεν πρὶν ἀπύπτυσαι/ καὶ ῥύσσοι, νεότατα δ' ἐχην

577 Theocritus, Idyllia VII, 126-127 (Gow).
578 Scholia in Theocritum vetera VII.127a-b.
579 Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, vol. 4, 738B.
580 Hatzikosta (1982: 186) states that "in view of the context, however, an old woman casting spells, the meaning of 'spit' is more appropriate here." Gow (1950: 64, vol. 1) uses the 'spitting' definition.
582 Scholia in Theocritum vetera VII.127a.
Clearly this reference to spitting is a culturally accepted and understood metaphor which, in a context such as this, represents quickness and shortness of time. Without this consensus the phrase would be ambiguous and confusing, making the author’s intention difficult to ascertain. Another example of spitting being used to denote quickness can be found in Menander’s *Perikeiromene*. Here Sosias is telling Daos about the destructive behaviour of the light-shield soldiers, saying οἱ παίδες οἱ τὰ πελτί᾽ ὀφτοὶ πρὶν πτύσαι/ διαρπάσονται πάντα, κἂν τετρωβόλους/ καλῆς. It is not the behaviour of the soldiers which is of interest here, but Menander’s metaphoric use of spitting to illustrate the speed with which they act. Spitting is, indeed, a quick and concise act, and it has seemingly been adopted as a metaphor for like behaviour.

583 Theocritus *Idyllia* XXIX, 27-29 (Gow).
Reference to non-verbal communication in classical Greek texts occurs both in descriptions of particular movements and gestures, and in the recording of more general impressions, such as that of an individual’s demeanour. While specific examples of references to non-verbal communication allow examination of how a bodily part and its movements are perceived, the more general appearance of an individual can be equally informative to the observer. This encompassing physical impression can be defined as demeanour, mien or bearing, all of which terms are relatively vague and fluid as to what physical traits they include. This chapter will consider the Greek term σχήμα as it is used in verbal portrayals of human bodily communication. The physical form which is referred to as the σχήμα does not offer a specific combination of characteristics from which it is composed. Rather, the σχήμα is used by various authors to represent the general physical impression made by an individual. The discussion of σχήμα yields information on both idealised and unacceptable comportment, examining the body as a whole in its role of revealing a person’s character or emotional state. Within the context of the consideration of the body, authors who refer to the σχήμα are using it to communicate the embodiment of the individual, the form which represents the content.

Of particular interest is the use of σχήμα in conjunction with descriptions of other forms of bodily behaviour. How the Greek authors describe their characters, and have them describe each other, is revealing of the manner in which they viewed the human body and the characteristics which were considered defining elements. Facial expressions appear in conjunction with the σχήμα in

585 Sittl (1890: 1) differentiates between the specific Greek terms for particular forms of non-verbal behaviour, e.g., νεύμα and χειροδεσία, and those terms which imply a general term such as κίνησις and σχήμα.
586 σχήμα has various meanings, including that of ‘form’ and ‘shape’, which are not applied exclusively to the body. The definition which comprises demeanour, carriage and gestures is but one usage. See Goldhill and Osborne (1999: Introduction) for a discussion on σχήμα in the context of ‘performance’. For a modern anthropological and psychological study of ‘body schema’ see Tiemersma (1989).
physical descriptions; the inclusion in textual descriptions of both the face and the σχήμα implies a recognition by the author of the communicative value of both parts of the body, as well as a distinction between the two. It would appear that the σχήμα does not automatically include facial expression in its meaning. This can be understood as recognition that, just as there can be discrepancies between what is being said orally and what is being expressed non-verbally, so too can different parts of the body be communicating conflicting messages simultaneously; for instance, while the face might be effectively controlled, the rest of the body might reveal true sentiments. The face is the part of the body which is most easily controlled and manipulated, whereas communication by the rest of the body is open to more accurate interpretation as it is more likely to ‘leak’ feelings or intentions. It should be no surprise, then, that classical authors often included more than one means of non-verbal behaviour in their descriptions. A person’s σχήμα might reveal what their words or face might not.

6.1 The form of the σχήμα

In classical Athens, education of the citizen elite, i.e., those who are most likely to be in the public eye and subject to scrutiny of their physicality, was expected to include the training of both the body and the mind, using gymnastics and philosophy respectively, through exercises and discipline. The manipulation of the σχήμα, therefore, is an established part of formal instruction. In Isocrates’ Antidosis, in which the author uses the framework of a fictitious legal defence to justify and explain himself and his work, these principles of education are discussed. Whenever they take their pupils, the gymnastics masters teach those going to school the postures devised from exercise, while those masters concerned with philosophy teach all the existing forms, going through with the pupils that which reason needs. ἐπειδὰν γὰρ λάβωσι μαθητὰς, οἱ μὲν παιδοτρίβαι τὰ σχήματα τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἁγιορείαν εὐρημένα τοὺς φοιτῶντας διδάσκοντο, οἱ δὲ

This physical and mental training is said to make the pupils better men and citizens, stronger in both mind and body. The σχήμα can be trained and moulded, becoming the reflection of the idealised physicality of the citizen. The properly educated man will have the corresponding demeanour, his body reflecting his well-trained mind and his status in society.

The Demosthenic Eroticus illustrates how the σχήμα of an individual is seen as embodying his whole physical nature, how it is bigger than the individual bodily traits which make up its parts. This essay, which is a departure in genre from the Demosthenic orations, is a celebration of the beauty of a young man. The author writes that the beauty of this youth is so great that it is not ruined by any defects that have made other beauties imperfect. He describes these imperfections, writing that a demeanour with want of rhythm, or some other misfortune which will produce the same result, comes to disturb the whole good appearance. ἤ γὰρ δι’ ἀρρυθμίαν τοῦ σχήματος ἀπασάν συνετάραξαν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν εὔπρεπειαν, ἤ δὲ ἀτύχημά τι καὶ τὰ καλῶς πεφυκότα συνδιέβαλον αὐτῷ. A man’s σχήμα is his physical totality and, although he might have a collection of independently beautiful features, if they are not combined to create an attractive σχήμα, they are fatally flawed. The whole is not simply the sum of its parts, and it is the intangible σχήμα which governs the dominant physical impression. The beautiful σχήμα can belong only to the idealised citizen male.

The man who is the product of the idealised education system will embody that society’s values. He will look, act and think accordingly. Illustrative examples of the idealised σχήμα, as well as deviations from this ideal, are found in the works of Xenophon. In the Memorabilia, he tells of Prodicus’ essay on Heracles, which uses two women as a metaphor for the choice between a young man’s path towards either virtue or vice. The metaphor includes the physical

588 Isocrates XV, Antidosis, 183.
589 [Demosthenes] LXI, Eroticus, 12.
descriptions of each of the women, which are in accordance with their attributed behaviour and characteristics. The tale relates how two tall women come towards Heracles; one is attractive to the eye and has a noble nature, her body is adorned with purity, her eyes with modesty, her demeanour with moderation, and her dress is white; the other woman has thickened into dumpiness and softness, she has beautified her complexion so it seems to enhance her true whiteness and redness, her demeanour is such that she appears to be more upright than she naturally is, she has her eyes wide open, and most of all her dress enhances her attributes. καὶ φανήναι αὐτῷ δύο γυναῖκας προσέναι μεγάλας, τὴν μὲν ἐπέραν εὔπρεπῆ τε ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐλευθέρων φύσει, κεκοσμημένην τὸ μὲν σώμα καθαρότητι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα αἴδοι, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα σωφροσύνη, ἐσθήτι δὲ λευκῇ, τὴν δ' ἐπέραν τεθραμμένην μὲν εἷς πολυσαρκίαν τε καὶ ἀπαλότητα, κεκαλλωπισμένην δὲ τὸ μὲν χρώμα ὡστε λευκοτέραν τε καὶ ἐρυθροτέραν τοῦ ὄντος δοκεῖν φαύνεσθαι, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα ὡστε δοκεῖν ὀρθοτέραν τῆς φύσεως εἶναι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα ἔχειν ἀναπεπταμένα, ἐσθήτα δὲ ἕξ ἤς ἂν μᾶλιστα ὀρὰ διαλάμποι.590 The first woman, Virtue, has the idealised bearing and appearance of a woman who embodies that trait, while the second woman, Vice, also looks the part.

Aristotle addresses the physical manifestation of virtue when he writes about the application of the term ‘good’, ἀγαθός, in the Magna moralia. According to Aristotle, Virtue is honoured, whenever someone becomes of good character because of it; for now he has acquired the σχῆμα of virtue, οὐκοῦν καὶ ἡ ἀρετή τίμιον, ὅταν γε δὴ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς σπουδαῖος τὴς γένηται: ἢδη γὰρ οὗτος εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς σχῆμα ἤκει.591 By being virtuous man (or woman) will appear virtuous, having the σχῆμα of goodness. How this σχῆμα manifests itself physically is not described, indicating that there is no need to give the details of an idealised form that enjoys societal agreement and recognition.

Another example of the use of σχῆμα as an expression of a virtuous character, in this instance in describing the behaviour of non-Greeks, is found in

590 Xenophon, Memorabilia, II.i.22.
591 Aristotle, Magna moralia 1183b24-26.
Xenophon’s (fictional) *Cyropaedia*, when Cyrus calls on his commanders to prove themselves to their men, both in deeds and in words. He tells each of his commanders to remember what he has told them, and to exhibit to their men their leadership, to demonstrate that they are worthy of command, to display general bearing in demeanour, facial expression and words that they are without fear. καὶ ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν ὑπομιμησκέτω τοὺς μεθ’ αὐτοῦ ἀπερ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐπιδεικνύτω τις τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐαυτῶν ἄξιον ἀρχῆς, ἀφοβον δεικνύς καὶ σχῆμα καὶ πρόσωπον καὶ λόγους.⁵⁹² Xenophon includes both the face and the σχῆμα, each one an independent, if connected, means of communication.

### 6.2 Rhetorical usage

In Attic oratory, the issue of an individual’s σχῆμα is addressed on numerous occasions. As has been seen in the preceding chapters, speakers made regular use of descriptions of non-verbal behaviour in their portrayals of friends and foes. In the face-to-face society of Athens, how a man appears is legitimate material for political attack (or praise).⁵⁹³ In the political battle between Aeschines and Demosthenes (and Timarchus), for example, both orators address the issue of Timarchus’ demeanour as it compares to the statue of the revered Solon on Salamis, the posture of which was that expected of the great statesman. In *In Timarchum*, Aeschines describes the statue, which has Solon’s hands modestly inside his cloak,⁵⁹⁴ a remembrance and imitation of Solon’s demeanour, evoking his manner when discoursing before the people of Athens. τούτο δ’ ἔστιν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὑπόμυημα καὶ μίμημα τοῦ Σόλωνος σχήματος, ὅν τρόπον ἔχων αὐτὸς διελέγετο τῷ δῆμῳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων.⁵⁹⁵ This statue, which Aeschines presents as an accurate depiction of Solon’s appearance, is contrasted with the crass Timarchus, whose transgressive movements and behaviour are
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⁵⁹² Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VI.iv.20.
⁵⁹³ Winkler 1990a: 29.
⁵⁹⁴ For a discussion of the hand gestures referred to in these passages by Demosthenes and Aeschines, see pages 79ff.
brutally criticised. Demosthenes, in his *De falsa legatione*, responds to the criticisms by Aeschines, defending his ally Timarchus by choosing to refer directly to Aeschines’ attack on his behaviour and demeanour and to question the legitimacy of his source for the physical ideal.\(^596\) Indeed, by using this argument, Demosthenes is recognising the topos of manipulating physicalities in order to have them coincide with civic ideals. He criticises Aeschines for merely imitating Solon’s speaking style, i.e., keeping his hands inside his cloak, rather than imitating his nature. Demosthenes continues, stating that it would have been much more profitable to have seen Solon’s psyche and intelligence, which were not imitated, and which were very much the opposite of Aeschines’. \(^597\)

Whereas Aeschines focuses on the differences in bodily behaviour between Solon and Timarchus, Demosthenes concentrates on the discrepancies between the spiritual nature and character of the noble statesman of yesteryear and those of the treacherous and despicable Aeschines.

The rhetorical topos of attacking a rival by drawing the audience’s attention to his physicality appears again in Aeschines’ *De falsa legatione*, in this instance in an attack on Demosthenes’ σχήμα. In the speaker’s account of the ambassadors’ report to the Assembly, he describes Demosthenes’ demeanour and gestures. Aeschines recounts how, after everyone else had spoken, Demosthenes rose last of all, with his customary marvellous demeanour and, rubbing his head, began to criticise the other ambassadors, εφ’ ἀπασί δ’ ἡμῖν ἀνίσταται τελευταῖος Δημοσθένης καὶ τερατευσάμενος, ὡσπερ εἶωθε, τῷ σχήματι καὶ τρίψας τὴν κεφαλὴν...\(^598\) According to Aeschines, Demosthenes said that the other ambassadors’ talk was wasteful and nonsensical, whereas his account would be brief and appropriate. In this passage, Aeschines acknowledges the impact of
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\(^{596}\) Demosthenes XIX, *De falsa legatione*, 251.
\(^{597}\) Demosthenes XIX, *De falsa legatione*, 252.
\(^{598}\) Aeschines II, *De falsa legatione*, 49.
Demosthenes’ impressive physical presence as a speaker, describing his σχήμα and the gesture of rubbing his brow, which probably symbolised his feigned confusion and disdain for what he had just witnessed. By specifically referring to Demosthenes’ demeanour the orator is trying to disarm its persuasive effect, by making the audience aware of the power of his physical presence and polished rhetorical style. Furthermore, the inclusion of these descriptions in his version of the events is itself a rhetorical device, a means of implying that Demosthenes’ bodily movements are contrived. Indeed, Aeschines claims Demosthenes’ behaviour in the Assembly contradicts his earlier praise of the ambassadors to the Council, and that his ἵθος (character) is really ἐπίβουλος καὶ ἀπιστὸν, scheming and untrustworthy.\textsuperscript{599}

Demosthenes himself describes in his orations the σχήμα of others, using a general physical impression for rhetorical purposes. In De corona, Demosthenes addresses the rhetorical tactics used by the dishonourable orator, i.e., Aeschines, which focus on petty details of particular words or gestures. He does not shrink from saying that a man who wishes to scrutinise the orator in a fair manner and not make a malicious prosecution would not prosecute him by mimicking his sayings and demeanour. Καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ τούτ’ εἰπεῖν ὁκνήσω, ὅτι ὁ τὸν ῥήτορα βουλόμενος δικαίως ἔξετάξειν καὶ μὴ συκοφαντέων οὐκ ἄν οἶα σὺ νῦν ἔλεγες, τοιαῦτα κατηγόρει, παραδείγματα πλάττων καὶ ῥήματα καὶ σχήματα μιμούμενος...\textsuperscript{600} The honest orator focuses on facts and deeds, not the superficial trappings of speaking style and bodily gestures. Aeschines is again portrayed as being concerned with the superficial aspects of oratory, whereas Demosthenes concerns himself with the substance of political activity.

In In Midiam, Demosthenes elucidates for his imaginary audience (it is not certain that the speech was actually delivered) the impact of non-verbal communication, acknowledging both its power and the difficulty of explaining it verbally. In this speech, which deals with a public physical assault on

\textsuperscript{599} Aeschines II, De falsa legatione, 54.  
\textsuperscript{600} Demosthenes XVIII, De corona, 232.
Demosthenes by Meidias, bodily behaviour is obviously of central importance. The orator states that there are many things that the person striking could do which the one suffering the blows would not be able to report; through demeanour, look, and tone, being as humiliating and as hateful as possible, whenever punching or slapping, πολλά γὰρ ἄν ποιῆσειν ὁ τύπτων, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὃν ὁ παθὼν ἐνὶ οὖθ ἄν ἀπαγγέλαι δύνατο ἐτέρω, τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῷ φωνῇ, ὅταν ὃς ὑβρίζων, ὅταν ὃς ἔχθρος ὑπάρχων, ὅταν κοντύλοις, ὅταν ἐπὶ κόρης.601 The physical action of hitting is not the only aspect to this insult; it is accompanied by a provocative σχήμα, as well as the manner and content of the words spoken. In this oration, the speaker is discussing the rage of a man who is struck in insolence, as Demosthenes claims he was by Meidias, and alleging that worse than the act of hitting, which being public is grievous enough, are the insult and indignity of being humiliated. It is this humiliation which is the cause of a forceful reaction. Meidias strikes Demosthenes in public, at the Great Dionysia where the orator is serving as choregus for his tribe, yet he does not strike back. Demosthenes presents himself to the jury as the champion of civilised self-restraint, who, despite Meidias’ brutal and prevocational behaviour, brings the incident to court rather than settling it with his fists. The code of behaviour for Athenian citizens required self-restraint; the offended individual should not retaliate physically, but seek to negotiate the conflict through compromise.602

In the same oration, Demosthenes includes the σχήμα in his description of the arrogant Meidias, portraying him as a despicable brute despised even by those who have no direct interaction with him. Demosthenes rhetorically asks Meidias whether he thinks that he alone of men is so great in life that he can be full of manifest arrogance towards all men, including those who have no dealings with him and yet are annoyed beholding his audacity, his tone of voice, his demeanour, his followers, his wealth and his insolence. Does he think that in judging him they

601 Demosthenes XXI, In Midiam, 72. See Fisher (1990: 130ff.).
will straightaway have pity? συ μόνος τῶν δυτῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔπι μὲν τοῦ βίου τοσαῦτης ὑπερηφανίας πλήρης ὡν [πάντων ἀνθρώπων] ἔσει φανερώτατας, ὡστε καὶ πρὸς οὓς μηδέν ἔστι σοι πράγμα, λυπεῖσθαι τὴν σὴν θρασύτητα καὶ φωνήν καὶ [τὸ] σχῆμα καὶ τοὺς σοὺς ἀκολούθους καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ ἄβρων θεωροῦντας, ἐν δὲ τῷ κρίνεσθαι παραχρῆμ' ἐλεηθήσει; 603 Meidias’ despicable behaviour is reflected in his σχῆμα, the arrogance of mind reflected in the arrogance of the body. In depicting Meidias in this way, the orator is using his skilled rhetoric to project the desired image into the minds of his listeners.

Plato also refers to the usage of non-verbal communication as a rhetorical tool, a means by which successfully to adopt the dispositions of others. In the art of mimicking, Plato writes, man uses the body as his instrument. In the Sophista, the Stranger states that when someone, using his own body, makes his σχῆμα appear in nature much like your σχῆμα, or his own voice similar to your voice, this is called the most fantastic art of mimesis. "Ὅταν οἶμαι τὸ σὸν σχῆμα τῆς τῶ ἑαυτοῦ χρώμενος σώματι προσόμολον ἢ φωνήν φωνῆ φαίνεσθαι ποιή, μήμης τοῦτο τῆς φανταστικῆς μάλατα κέκληται ποι." 604 In this passage Plato is referring to imitation through knowledge, a positive use of mimesis for the representation of acceptable characteristics. It is imitation that is not based on knowledge which is despised by the philosopher. Plato’s views on imitation are complex, and there is a distinct discussion in the Respublica regarding what sort of mimesis is acceptable in his ideal state. This reference from the Sophista should be considered within the wider Platonic discussion of mimesis, in particular in relation to poetry. As will be discussed in detail below, in the Respublica, Plato criticises the poets who use imitation which causes men to act otherwise than they would naturally, and to adopt undesirable characteristics. He does, however, seem to accept imitation, be it in oratory or poetry, if it is of

603 Demosthenes XXI, In Midiam, 195.
604 Plato, Sophista 267a6-8.
positive traits already present and idealised, of those virtues which are known to the imitators.605

Aristotle considers how non-verbal communication is an effective means of bringing a rhetorical argument to life, making it accessible, and, therefore, credible, to the audience. He states that a believable physical demeanour is essential for convincing the audience of the sincerity of feeling. In the Rhetorica, in a discussion on pity and what evokes it, Aristotle writes that when misfortune is near it appears pitiable, but those appearing to be ten-thousand years forward or back either do not cause pity at all, or not in a like manner; gestures, voice, dress and playing the dramatic part so as to seem the most pitiable, are necessary in completing the effect. ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐγγὺς φανώμενα τὰ πάθη ἐλεεινά ἐστι, τὰ δὲ μυριστὸν ἐτος γενόμενα ἢ ἐσώμενα οὔτε ἐλπίζοντες οὔτε μεμημένοι ἢ ὅλως οὐκ ἐλεούσιν ἢ οὐχ ὁμοίως, ἀνάγκη τοὺς συναπεργαζομένους σχήμασι καὶ φωναῖς καὶ ἐσόμης καὶ ὅλως ύποκρίσει ἐλεεινοτέρους εἶναι...606 The orator who brings the emotions home to his audience, making them believe that these are pressing issues and that the feeling is fresh and deep, will succeed in evoking their compassion and obtaining their support.

6.3 Deceptive Manipulation

Manipulating physical appearance and behaviour for deceptive motives is a topic which is touched upon in various considerations of non-verbal communication. Indeed, while some physical traits are not manipulable, it appears that the σχῆμα can be altered with relative ease. One’s σχῆμα is not a particular bodily characteristic nor is it restricted to one part of the body, but is the total impression made by an individual’s physicality. For that very reason, it can be manipulated. The ability to alter one’s σχῆμα does not suggest, however, that this causes a change in the inherent nature of the individual.

606 Aristotle, Rhetorica 1386a29-33.
In Plato’s *Respublica*, the manipulation of the physical for personal gain is attributed to the flatterer, a type universally condemned. Plato writes that tyrants begin by associating with flatterers, who group together and are ready to do any service for them; if they need something, the flatterers will subject themselves, undertaking all manner of services to make the relationship work, but, if the relationship comes to an end, the flatterers will give themselves over to another. The flatterer, in this way, is a type universally condemned.

Plato writes that tyrants begin by associating with flatterers, who group together and are ready to do any service for them; if they need something, the flatterers will subject themselves, undertaking all manner of services to make the relationship work, but, if the relationship comes to an end, the flatterers will give themselves over to another. Indeed, this very behaviour can be found in Demosthenes’ *In Stephanum I*, where the orator derides Stephanus for his deceitful comportment, using bodily descriptions to convey his sinister nature to the jury. Stephanus is accused of changing his behaviour in order to flatter Aristolochus the banker, abandoning Aristolochus’ son when the banker is ruined by men such as himself. According to Demosthenes, Stephanus is also guilty of adopting the facial expression and demeanour of a sullen, thoughtful man, despite having suffered no misfortune, in order to make himself unapproachable and thus avoid conversing with others. This demeanour, however, is but a screen over his character, which manifests his rude and cruel intention, open to the officers despite being dressed like her servants.

Another reference to a deceptive σχήμα is found in Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, where he describes the demeanour of Pantheia, the wife of Abradatas of Susa, who is recognised by the officers despite being dressed like her servants.
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608 Demosthenes XLV, *In Stephanum I*, 63-64. See page 146 for Stephanus’ deceptive walk.
609 For a detailed examination of the facial expressions described in *In Stephanum I*, see page 59.
610 Demosthenes XLV, *In Stephanum I*, 69.
611 A physiognomist would argue that there would be physical clues in Stephanus’ behaviour and appearance which would signal to the trained observer his deceit and true nature.
and attempting to remain anonymous. Araspas, in whose charge Cyrus had placed the women, describes how obvious the breeding of this noble woman was as she stood amongst her attendants: thus commanded to rise, the servants rose together and surrounded her; but it was clear that she was different, foremost in stature and in nobility and in decorum, although standing with a lowly demeanour. ώς δὲ ἀναστήνας αὐτὴν ἐκελεύσαμεν, συνανέστησαν μὲν αὐτῇ ἄπασαι αἱ ἀμφ' αὐτήν, διήνεγκε δ' ἐνταῦθα πρῶτον μὲν τῷ μεγέθει, ἐπειτα δὲ καὶ τῇ ἁρετῇ καὶ τῇ εὔσχημοσύνῃ, καίπερ ἐν ταπεινῷ σχήματι ἐστηκαί.612 Interestingly, in this instance her σχήμα is lowly, while her μέγεθος is noble. The posture or demeanour is the adopted, unnatural σχήμα, whereas her stature demonstrates her true nature and status.

Similarly, in Plato’s Symposium, σχήμα is used to describe a contrived demeanour which does not represent the true nature of the individual. Alcibiades is explaining his love of Socrates, depicting his behaviour and claiming he projects a demeanour which covers up his true internal self. Alcibiades instructs the members of the symposium to notice how Socrates is amorously disposed towards the beautiful and is always near them, appearing thunderstruck; that his demeanour is that of one who does not know or see anything, ὁρᾶτε γὰρ ὅτι Σωκράτης ἔρωτικός διάκειται τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀεὶ περὶ τούτους ἔστι καὶ ἐκπέπληκται, καὶ αὐτῷ ἀγνοεῖ πάντα καὶ οὐδὲν οἶδεν. ώς τὸ σχήμα αὐτοῦ τούτο οὐ συλημόδες;613 Alcibiades continues, comparing Socrates to Silenus, asking his friends at the banquet, whether if his true nature were uncovered from within, they would know how full he is of self-control, ἐνδοθεν δὲ ἀνοιχθεὶς πόσης οἴεσθε γέμει, δ' ἀνδρεῖς συμπόται, σωφροσύνης.614 The physically ugly and intellectually dominant Socrates is adopting a demeanour which does not portray his true nature, and it is only by penetrating this exterior that the true character of the man will be reached. Socrates, who drinks, but never gets drunk,

612 Xenophon, Cyropaedia, V.i.5.
613 Plato, Symposium 216d2-4.
614 Plato, Symposium 216d6-7.
is indeed the true symbol of self-control at this symposium. While other men need drink to become Silenus-like in behaviour, Socrates already has this physicality by nature and, therefore, avoids this behavioural syndrome. Nonetheless, Alcibiades insists that the seductive, love-struck behaviour of Socrates does not represent his true, sober nature. Plato’s use of σχήμα in this dialogue corresponds with the Socratic arguments on Eros already discussed in the Symposium. The liberation from the body in the search for true expressions of beauty and love has been introduced by Socrates in Diotima’s theories on Eros, which claim that true love is beyond any bodily trait, beyond the merely physical. Just as the σχήμα of Socrates does not demonstrate his true nature, so too does physical expression not represent true love and beauty.

6.4 Communication

While it appears that authors see the σχήμα as being manipulable and not necessarily representative of a person’s true nature, it can also be used effectively in various texts as a legitimate means by which to express an individual’s physical demeanour and character. Perhaps one of Xenophon’s most telling uses of the description of body language, and of one’s σχήμα in particular, is in his Apologia Socratis. Here, Xenophon includes a physical description to add force to his portrayal of Socrates’ exit after the completion of his defence at his trial. Xenophon writes that, after Socrates had finished speaking, his manner was very much in agreement with what he had been saying, since as he went away his eyes, demeanour and gait were all beaming. εἰπών δὲ ταῦτα μάλα ὁμολογομένως δὴ τοῖς εἴρημένοις ἀπῆει καὶ ὁμόμασι καὶ σχήματι καὶ βαθίσματι φαινόμενος. Socrates’ physical state communicated the same message as his words, exuding a strength and honour that challenged the charges made against him. The words themselves were not sufficient for Xenophon’s portrayal — the inclusion of a
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617 Xenophon, Apologia Socratis XXVI.1-3.
description of the accompanying non-verbal communication was also necessary in order to attempt a reconstruction, no matter how idealised, of the man and his defence.

In Plato's dialogues there are numerous references to specific types of non-verbal communication as well as to the general concept of a person's demeanour, carriage or gestures, their σχήμα. As has already been discussed in relation to hand gestures\(^6\), in the *Cratylus*, Socrates discusses the use of body language when voice is unavailable, stating that, if, for example, we wish to show a galloping horse or some other animal, we know how to make our bodies and demeanour most like theirs.

\[\text{καὶ εἰ ἦππον θέοντα ἢ τι ἄλλο τῶν ζώων ἐξουλομέθα δηλοῦν, οὐθα δεῖ ὡς ὄμιλοτατ' ἀν τὰ ἴμιετερα αὐτῶν σώματα καὶ σχήματα ἐποιοῦμεν ἐκείνοις.}\]^7 The whole body is used as a physical tool of communication, expressing concepts and feelings when words cannot. Communication through the body is not, however, restricted to when there can be no oral speech; like the voice, the σχήμα and the hands are vehicles through which the individual can 'speak'.

In the *Leges*, Plato recognises the fundamental connection between speech and bodily movement, observing how men move their bodies to varying degrees depending on emotion and training, more violent movement belonging to the more joyful, the cowardly and untrained, whereas less violent movement is that of the less joyous, the more courageous and sedate. In fact, according to Plato, it is the bodily communication of the verbal which led to the development of dancing.\(^8\) Voice and movements are rhythmically synchronised, with dance (χορεία) being the formalising of idealised verbal and non-verbal communication.\(^9\) When uttering sound, whether in song or in speech, it is not possible to make the whole body still; wherefore the imitation of spoken words by

---

\(^{6}\) See page 65.
\(^{7}\) Plato, *Cratylus* 423a4-6.
\(^{8}\) On dance see Naerebout (1997); Lonsdale (1993). For ways in which the postures of dance are held to increase the beauty of an already beautiful boy, see Xenophon's *Symposium*, II.15; II.16; II.22.
\(^{9}\) Lonsdale 1993: 30.
gestures achieves the whole art of dancing. ὅλως δὲ φθεγγόμενος, εἴτ' ἐν ὑδαῖς εἴτ' ἐν λόγοις, ἵσυχίαν οὐ πάνυ δυνατὸς τῷ σώματι παρέχεσθαι πᾶς. διὸ μίμησις τῶν λεγομένων σχήμασι γενομένη τὴν ὄρχηστικὴν ἐξηράσασθο τέχνην σύμπασαν.\(^6\) Human communication cannot be restricted to words, since the non-verbal inevitably and naturally accompanies speech. The gestures and movements can be controlled and trained, but they nonetheless remain.

### 6.5 On Poetry

Poetry was a central part of Greek culture, and the Athenians in particular were passionate about this mode of discourse. Epic and drama were both fundamental elements in Athenian society, interacting with and influencing the citizen audience. Poetry is a means by which to present scenes of acceptance and transgression of ethical values.\(^6\) The language of poetry corresponds with that of other genres, such as philosophy and oratory; the poet, like the philosopher and orator, questions social and ethical norms, challenging civic behaviour and values.\(^6\) Poetry was not seen as an art form in the modern sense, but it was accepted as occupying an educational role in the polis.\(^6\) Because of the influential role of poetry, it was the subject of much intellectual contemplation, and opposition, in the classical period.

In his Symposium, Xenophon illustrates the impact of a successful depiction by actors of the characters they are playing. Xenophon creates for his banquet a convincing theatrical display by actors playing Ariadne and Dionysus, in a representation of marital love. The beauty of this performance lay in the actors’ ability to play their parts with utter conviction, luring their audience into believing the tale they were recounting. For they looked not like those who had been artificially taught their postures, but like those able to yield to their long

---

622 Plato, Leges 816a3-6.
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awaited desires, ἐφίκεσαν γὰρ οὐ δεδιδαγμένοις τὰ σχήματα ἀλλ' ἐφειμένοις πράττειν ἢ πάλαι ἐπεθύμουν. The actors’ portrayal of the lovers touched those watching, depicting marital love in a most inspiring fashion. Thus Xenophon allows poetry to be beautiful and virtuous, inspiring genuine emotions in the audience.

In Plato’s Respublica a poet’s use of imitation for effect is problematical in a far more complex and sophisticated way. Socrates asks whether, by making himself resemble another by voice or by demeanour, he is imitating the one he is resembling. In such instances, and others like it, Homer and other poets are creating the narrative through imitation. Οὐκ οὖν τὸ γε ὀμοιοῦν έαυτόν ἀλλ’ ἢ κατὰ φωνὴν ἢ κατὰ σχήμα μιμεῖσθαι ἐστιν ἐκεῖνον ὃ ἀν τις ὀμοίω; Τί μήν; Ἑν δὴ τῷ τοιούτῳ, ὥς εἴκεν, οὖτός τε [sc. Ὁμηρος] καὶ ὦ ἀλλοι ποιηταὶ διὰ μιμήσεως τὴν διήγησιν πολύνται. It is the use of imitation to hide oneself, attempting to convince the listener that one has a different identity, which is unacceptable. This type of imitation requires the use of both voice and demeanour. Plato continues, stating that there is poetry which uses narrative only and no imitation, namely the dithyramb; that which uses narrative and imitation jointly, that is epic; and that which uses imitation exclusively, namely tragedy and comedy. Mimicry is not a desirable talent, and the poets who employ it are a danger to the health of the polis; imitative poetry encourages citizens to adopt characteristics which are other than their own. Unlike the imitation of honourable characteristics (Respublica 395c), which encourages the development of positive traits, the mimesis discussed here is that of foreign, negative qualities. The young guardians of the state need to imitate only the
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honourable traits of virtuous men, those that will contribute to both healthy minds and healthy bodies, and which are already accepted as admirable qualities in the ideal city.632 By imitating these virtues, they are mirroring themselves and their own values. The poetic art of imitation as currently practised, however, results in confusion, corruption and deceit, and should not be encouraged. Amongst the poets there are two types, those who use a minimal amount of mimicry and concentrate on narrative, and those who, being of a debased nature, will imitate anything, filling their recital with all forms of noise and gesture. Such a poet will have a speaking style which is all imitation of voice and gestures, having little narrative, καὶ ἔσται δὴ ἢ τούτων λέξεως ἀπασα διὰ μιμήσεως φωναῖς τε καὶ σχήμασιν, ἢ σμικρῶν τι δηγήσεως ἔχουσα.633 Poetry, however, is not words alone, but includes non-verbal accompaniment. Plato draws attention to the necessary roles of both voice and σχήμα in mimesis, particularly in poetic imitation, which he links unfavourably to theatrical performance.634

In the Læges, Plato again addresses the topic of education and representation in choral performances. The Athenian Stranger asks whether a man who is well trained and can use his voice and body to portray effectively both good and bad while feeling no emotion in regard to either is better educated than the man who does not have the skill to communicate with his voice and body, but differentiates between what is good and what is evil. The answer given is that it is the first man who is not properly educated. This leads to the question of when it is necessary for good demeanour and tune (lyric poetry) to be revealed; if a manly soul is in distress and a cowardly soul is in the same situation, will their demeanours and voices be the same? τί δὲ δὴ τὸ καλὸν χρῆ φαίναι σχήμα ἢ μέλος εἶναι ποτε; φέρε, ἀνδρικῆς ψυχῆς ἐν πόνοις ἔχομένης καὶ δειλῆς ἐν τοῖς αὐτό ὁ τε καὶ ἵσους ἀρ’ ὁμοία τα τε σχήματα καὶ τὰ φθέγματα

633 Plato, Respublica 397b1-2.
634 Rabel 1996: 366. Rabel (1996) argues that by σχήμα Plato is meaning to include both bodily gestures and forms of speech.
The bodily movements could not be the same. The nature of the individual in question will be reflected in his bodily behaviour and responses. The Stranger explains his use of the metaphor of music for tunes and postures, summarising his argument by stating that those having a manly (good) soul and body will have a demeanour and tune that are good, and those who are bad, the total opposite. "καὶ ἵνα δὴ μὴ μακρολογία πολλή τις γίνηται περὶ ταῦθ' ἡμῖν ἀπαντα, ἀπλῶς ἐστώ τὰ μὲν ἅρετῆς ἐχόμενα ψυχῆς ἢ σώματος, εἴτε αὐτῆς εἴτε τυχὸς εἰκόνος, σύμπαντα σχήματα τε καὶ μέλη καλά, τὰ δὲ κακίας αὖ, τούναντίον ἀπαν." Indeed, the Stranger argues that bad demeanour is a negative influence on those who witness it, calling for legislation which, like that of the Egyptians, will restrict the poet to portraying only good men. The honest law-giver will persuade, or force, the poet to make honourable poems about self-controlled, courageous and good men, using good sayings, incorporating praise in the rhythms of the gestures and in the harmonies of the tune (music). "ταύτων δὴ καὶ τὸν ποιητικὸν ὁ ὀρθὸς νομοθέτης ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ρήμασι καὶ ἐπανετοῖς πείσει τε, καὶ ἀναγκάσει μὴ πείθων, τὰ τῶν σωϕρόνων τε καὶ ἀνδρείων καὶ πάντως ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν τε ῥυθμοῖς σχήματα καὶ ἐν ἀρμονίαισιν μέλη ποιοῦντα ὀρθῶς ποιεῖν." Such a law will allow for poetry, but only that which will be deemed positive by having a beneficial influence on the polis.

While Plato obviously saw a need to control the creative forces of the poets, the Muses, in contrast, are no cause for concern. Unlike the poets, the Muses are never guilty of error, of rendering feminine gestures and tunes to words made for men, or of composing the rhythm of slaves and the unfree to tunes and gestures fit for the free, or, moreover, of constructing the rhythms and gestures of the free and allowing the tune or gesture of the opposite type rhythm. "οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἕκειναι γε ἐξαμάρτοτεν ποιεῖ τοσοῦτον ὡστε ρήματα ἄνδρῶν ποιήσασαι τὸ μὲν κακόν ποιητικὸν ὀρθῶς ποιῆσαι τὸ.
The human jumbling of tunes, rhythms, gestures and verses leads to vulgar disorder and moral degeneracy.

Aristotle, while influenced by Platonic ideas on poetry, does also diverge from them. He recognises the vulgarity of non-narrative poetry, but he does not have the same distrust of it as Plato. Aristotle develops an understanding for poetry, seeing its potential as an independent discipline with certain acceptable qualities. Taking into consideration this shift in perception from the Platonic stance, Aristotle can make suggestions for a more successful dramatic presentation. In the *Poetica*, he discusses how to create an effective portrayal on stage. The poet should keep the scene in his mind in order to detect contradictions. He should also, if he is able to, help in completing the effect by using gestures. For natural qualities are more persuasive when performed by someone actually in that condition; he who is agitated will act stormy, and he who is made violent is angry in a more truthful way. 

Dramatic representation needs gestures and body movement to remain believable, and the poet needs to envision these when constructing his play. The actors’ bodies (and voices) are the poet’s main medium for his art, and he must use them fully to establish successfully the context of his play. This passage demonstrates a recognition of the role gestures play in a

---

638 Plato, *Leges*, 669c3-8. See also *Leges* 802d8-e11. See *Leges* 797b7-c9 for the point that children who always change their games, including their bodily gestures and equipment, do not know propriety, since they are always looking for innovations, whereas the children who keep to the same game, using the same rules, leave the laws undisturbed.


641 Taplin 1978: 3.
dramatic production as well as in daily life. Whereas the conditions in which the plays were staged, and the use of masks, required conventionally recognisable gestures, their effective use as a means of communication can also be seen as a tacit acceptance of the existence and importance of the non-verbal behaviours.

Whereas Aristotle might concede that the use of gestures made drama more truthful, these bodily movements are, nonetheless, indicative of the vulgarity of the genre. In the *Poetica*, Aristotle considers whether epic or tragedy is better, the better one being that which is less vulgar. The author concludes by stating that some people claim that epic is for suitable spectators, who do not need the inclusion of improper gestures, whereas tragedy is for the common people. As it is vulgar, then it is clear that it (tragedy) is inferior. \(\text{τὴν \ μὲν \ οὐν \ πρὸς \ θεατάς} \) 
\(\text{ἐπιεικεῖς} \) 
\(\text{φασὶν} \) 
\(\text{εἶναι} \) 
\(\text{οὐδὲν} \) 
\(\text{δεόνται} \) 
\(\text{τῶν} \) 
\(\text{σχημάτων} \) 
\(\text{τὴν} \) 
\(\text{δὲ} \) 
\(\text{τραγικὴν} \) 
\(\text{πρὸς \ φαύλους} \) 
\(\text{εἰ} \) 
\(\text{οὖν} \) 
\(\text{φορτικῆ} \) 
\(\text{χεῖρων} \) 
\(\text{δῆλον} \) 
\(\text{ὅτι} \) 
\(\text{ἄν} \) 
\(\text{εἶη} \).\(^{642}\) Whereas non-verbal behaviour might improve the dramatic disciplines, it does not make them more respectable or acceptable to the cultured class.

**6.6 Dramatic \(\sigmaχήμα\)**

Drama as an art form uses the manipulations of the body, in addition to the spoken word, in order to communicate character types and their scripted roles in a theatrical presentation. The description of physical appearance is a necessary part of dramatic narrative and dialogue, yet, as has been shown in the previous chapters, is often conspicuously absent. While the gestures, movements and postures of the actors are highly communicative, they only infrequently received verbal attention.\(^{643}\) The representation of a character's demeanour is crucial for a successful, and believable, dramatic portrayal, and there are occasional examples where one's \(\sigmaχήμα\) does indeed get mentioned in the text. Interestingly, the physical details of what a particular \(\sigmaχήμα\) entails are often taken for granted and

---

\(^{642}\) Aristotle, *Poetica* 1462a2-4.

omitted from the description, whereas it is the nature that it is understood to represent that is verbalised. Indeed, there seems to exist a heavy reliance on societal agreement on what constitutes a particular type of σχήμα, be it noble or base, as well as on the universal recognition of that by the Athenian audience.

The tragic descriptions of σχήμα are applied to diverse subjects, from the strength of the warrior to the innocence of the child. Aeschylus, for example, has the Scout describe Hippomedon in Septem contra Thebas as being of great demeanour and blow, Ἰππομέδοντος σχήμα καὶ μέγας τύπος. Hippomedon is a fierce and impressive warrior whose physicality communicates this character to any witnesses to his behaviour. The fear that the poet desires to project is embodied in Hippomedon’s physicality, the total picture of his strength and aggression. In contrast, in Euripides’ Medea, Medea refers to the noble face and demeanour of her children, ...καὶ σχήμα καὶ πρόσωπον εὐγενές τέκνων. No particular characteristics are described, no definition is given of what a well-born, noble face or body looks like; there is simply the statement that these children possess such traits (as, indeed, their lineage implies). The general appearance of the children is given without any detailed description. Of course, in addition to the cultural pre-conceptions about the appearance of noble children, the audience is presented with the theatrical action taking place before them. A similar reference to noble appearance is found in Ion, when Ion describes the appearance of Creusa. Ion addresses her (without recognising who she is), stating that she has noble character, and claiming that a sign of this noble manner is her noble demeanour, γενναίότης σοι καὶ τρόπων τεκμήριον/ τὸ σχήμα ἔχεις τόδε, ἡτίς εἶ ποτ’, ὦ γυναι. Ion continues, explaining his judgement of Creusa’s appearance, saying that many things should be known about a person from his/her demeanour, that something is recognised which brings his/her noble birth to light,

644 Aeschylus, Septem contra Thebas 488.
645 Euripides, Medea 1072. See chapter 2 on the ‘noble face’.
646 Euripides, Ion 237-238.
omitted from the description, whereas it is the nature that it is understood to represent that is verbalised. Indeed, there seems to exist a heavy reliance on societal agreement on what constitutes a particular type of σχήμα, be it noble or base, as well as on the universal recognition of that by the Athenian audience.

The tragic descriptions of σχήμα are applied to diverse subjects, from the strength of the warrior to the innocence of the child. Aeschylus, for example, has the Scout describe Hippomedon in Septem contra Thebas as being of great demeanour and blow, Ἰππομέδοντος σχήμα καὶ μέγας τύπος. Hippomedon is a fierce and impressive warrior whose physicality communicates this character to any witnesses to his behaviour. The fear that the poet desires to project is embodied in Hippomedon’s physicality, the total picture of his strength and aggression. In contrast, in Euripides’ Medea, Medea refers to the noble face and demeanour of her children, ...καὶ σχήμα καὶ πρόσωπον εὐγενῆς τέκνων. No particular characteristics are described, no definition is given of what a well-born, noble face or body looks like; there is simply the statement that these children possess such traits (as, indeed, their lineage implies). The general appearance of the children is given without any detailed description. Of course, in addition to the cultural pre-conceptions about the appearance of noble children, the audience is presented with the theatrical action taking place before them. A similar reference to noble appearance is found in Ion, when Ion describes the appearance of Creusa. Ion addresses her (without recognising who she is), stating that she has noble character, and claiming that a sign of this noble manner is her noble demeanour, γενναίότης σοι καὶ τρόπων τεκμήριον/ τὸ σχήμα ἔχεις τόδ’, ἤτις εἶ ποτ’, ὡ γυναι. Ion continues, explaining his judgement of Creusa’s appearance, saying that many things should be known about a person from his/her demeanour, that something is recognised which brings his/her noble birth to light, — γνοίη δ’ ἄν ὡς τὰ πολλά γ’ ἀνθρώπου πέρι/ τὸ σχήμα’ ἰδὼν τίς εἰ πέφυκεν
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A further example of Euripides’ use of the noble σχήμα is found in Iphigenia Aulidensis, in Clytemnestra’s praise of Achilles, where she says that while her tale is pitiable, he has this (noble) demeanour, that of the good man who is of help to the unfortunate. ἀλλ’ οὖν ἔχει τι σχήμα, καὶ ἀπωθεν ἦν/ ἀνηρ ὁ χρηστός, διωστυχοῦντας ὕφελειν. Achilles’ σχήμα is that of someone who assists others, his deeds and demeanour reflecting his noble character. The nobility of the individual is in his/her σχήμα, visible for others to see and appreciate. Whereas the σχήμα can be manipulated and, therefore, deceptive, it may also be used as a tool for projecting the true nature of an individual, becoming the physical embodiment of that nature.

Using the σχήμα for purposes of identification is not restricted to individuals, but is also used for ethnic classification. In Sophocles’ Philoctetes, it is by their armament and demeanour that Philoctetes recognises the troops as Greeks, and that is agreeable to him, σχήμα μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλάδος/ στολῆς ὑπάρχει προσφιλεστάτης ἐμοί/ φωνῆς δ’ ἀκούσαι βούλομαι. Despite the physical signs of their Hellenic origin, Philoctetes nonetheless wishes to hear their voices. The suggestion made by this passage is that, in addition to their equipment, the bodily comportment of the Greeks is distinguishable from other races and that carriage and demeanour are culturally specific. It should be noted, however, that a verbal confirmation is requested by Philoctetes, as he does not trust his sense of sight alone to validate his impression. Despite the power of the non-verbal, on this occasion it is voices which are trusted most.

As in tragedy, the non-verbal communication of comedy is an important addition to the text, which is often not referred to directly. There are, however, some textual examples to be found; Aristophanes, in particular, makes good use of such descriptions. The comedian directs his satire at numerous members of contemporary society, portraying them in the desired ridiculous light. In the
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647 Euripides, Ion 239-240.
648 Euripides, Iphigenia Aulidensis 983-984.
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Acharnenses, Aristophanes has Dicaeopolis complain about the pomp and show of the ambassadors sent to Persia eleven years earlier. He is annoyed with their peacocks and pretensions, and with their general demeanour, ἀχθομαι ἵνω πρέσβεσιν καὶ τοῖς ταύσι τοῖς τι ἀλαζονεύσασιν... ἢκβάτανα τοῦ σχήματος. The trappings and stature of these men leave little doubt in the mind of the observer that they have lived an easy life of luxury at the state’s expense. The diplomats’ appearance implies ostentatious and superficial self-aggrandisement rather than thoughtful political actions carried out for the good of the polis.

Aristophanes also satirises those who try to emulate the physical ideal of the Athenian forefathers. In the Equites, the Sausage Seller describes Demus, who is seen wearing the golden cicada, the brilliance of ancient demeanour, not smelling of pigs, but making peace and anointed with myrrh, ὂς ἐκείνος ὡρᾶν τεττιγοφόρας, ἄρχαίῳ σχήματί λαμπρός, ὡς χορωμῶν δζων ἀλλὰ σπονδῶν, σμύρνη κατάλειπτος. This passage is part of an elaborate recreation of the Athenians of yesteryear, a rejuvenated Demus, symbolising the people of Athens, and being represented as wearing the trappings of the glory days of their ancestors. This new, noble Demus will right the current evils of the polis, behaving as would his honourable forefathers. The ancient σχήμα referred to is one of honour and nobility, a demeanour which is confident, embodying the ideal citizen’s characteristics.

A contrasting reference to σχήμα is found in Aristophanes’ Vespae, where the term is used to create a disparaging image. In this example, the chorus compare themselves, the noble old men of a bygone past, to the decadent youths of the day. Their customs of old age are better than the ringlets and the lewd

650 Aristophanes, Acharnenses 62-64. See Cartledge (1990: 47) on peafowl as a diplomatic gift. This passage of the Acharnenses links peafowl with embassies to Persia.
651 Aristophanes, Equites 1313-1332. In another reference to Demus’ posture and demeanour in 1354, the Sausage Seller asks him why he is bent forward and cannot stand fast in his place. ὡς ἐκείνος τι ἐκπέτεις; όψι κατὰ χῶραν μενεῖς; It is in shame for his past actions that he adopts such a posture. This is an example of how the σχήμα is affected by emotional responses to a situation.
(broad-arsed) demeanour of youths, ὃς ἐγὼ τοῦμὸν νομίζω/ γῆρας εἶναι κρεῖττον ἢ πολ-/λῶν κακίννους νεανίων καὶ σχήμα κεφυρπρωκτίαν.652 In this play, the youths are portrayed as effeminate κιναιδοι and this leaves no doubt as to what is meant by a σχήμα κεφυρπρωκτίαν, i.e., the antithesis of the strong­backed, moderate, controlled citizen. Indeed, a more detailed description of this demeanour is given by Bdelycleon and Philocleon, when the former instructs the latter to put on Laconian shoes, and to step forward lavishly, swaggering effeminately, ἀνυσόν ποθ' ὑποδυσάμενος· εἰτα πλουσίως/ ὅδι προβάς τρυφερόν τι διασαλακώνειον.653 Philocleon answers, telling him to look at his demeanour and consider the opulent men he most walks like, ἰδοὺ. θεῦ τὸ σχήμα, καὶ σκέψαι μ' ὅτω/ μάλιστ' ἐδοικα τὴν βάδισιν τῶν πλουσίων.654 While walking is one form of action, it is the whole demeanour of the individual which creates the impression of the dandy; Bdelycleon is not called on to look only at the walk, but at the whole physical impression which is manifested in the σχήμα.

The gendering of demeanour is also found in the Ecclesiazusae, where the accurate, masculine, presentation of σχήμα is very important as the women disguise themselves as men, needing to adopt not only their husbands’ clothing and walking-sticks, but also their demeanour and way of movement. The fact that these were male actors mimicking what they saw as the comportment of women, who in turn are attempting to imitate men, adds an additional layer to both comedy and stereotypical behaviour. Praxagora instructs the Second Woman on how to disguise herself as a man, how to speak well and like a man, leaning her body on her cane, ἥγε ννν ὅπως ἀνδριστῇ καὶ καλῶς ἐρεῖς· διερευσαμένῃ τὸ σχήμα τῇ βακτηρίᾳ.655 Tellingly, the bearing of a man is seen by the woman as having a slouchy posture which relies on a cane for support. The symbolism of the man who cannot stand unaided is not without significance in the political statement being made by the revolutionary ‘women’. The need for the women to

652 Aristophanes, Vespae 1068-1070. See page 133 for a discussion on the wide-assed κιναιδος.
653 Aristophanes, Vespae 1168-1169. See section 4.3 for more on the walk of the κιναιδος.
654 Aristophanes, Vespae 1170-1171.
655 Aristophanes, Ecclesiazusae 149-150.
adopt a manly σχημα, as opposed to simply a disguise, is again referred to when
the chorus moves the women along, telling them to watch well lest someone see
their σχημα (demeanour and shape) from behind, μὴ ποῦ τις ἐκ τοῦπισθεν ὅν τὸ
σχημα καταφυλάξῃ.\(^{656}\) The implication here is that the demeanour of the women
is inherently different from that of the men they are trying to imitate.
Furthermore, there is an admission of the role the σχημα plays in the
identification of an individual or, at the very least, of their gender, when the face
is not seen. The women do not need to show their faces to be discovered; it will
be enough if their true σχημα is noticed.

A final Aristophanic usage of σχημα for character portrayals is found in
the Ranae, where Dionysus ponders the correct way to knock at Pluto’s door,
showing concern for local custom, whereas Xanthias tells him to stop wasting
time, to try the door, as though he has the demeanour and resolve of Heracles, οὐ
μὴ διατρίψεις, ἀλλὰ γεύσει τῆς θύρας,/ καθ’ Ἡρακλέα τὸ σχημα καὶ τὸ λήμ’
ἐχων.\(^{657}\) The courage and strength of Heracles are mentioned directly,
presumably in comparison to the meek and terrified Dionysus who is avoiding the
task at hand. Xanthias instructs him that he need not worry about local ways, but
simply needs to present himself as would the aggressive, courageous warrior. His
physical presence will speak for him. Again, no details are given as to what this
σχημα entailed, the poet naturally assuming that the bearing of the heroic
Heracles was common knowledge to everyone in the audience.

6.7 Physiognomic types and Aristotelian σχημα

The premise which lies at the foundation of physiognomics has already
been evident throughout this chapter and remains a principal factor in the study of
the σχημα. Unlike many other forms of non-verbal behaviour, the σχημα is not
restricted to any specific part of the body, but incorporates many different aspects

\(^{656}\) Aristophanes, Ecclesiazusae 482.
\(^{657}\) Aristophanes, Ranae 462-463.
without the delimitations of a rigid definition. Modern scholars of non-verbal behaviour refer to ‘demeanour effect’, which is the bias in non-verbal expression, the ways in which one’s natural demeanour affects communication; for example, an innocent, passive-looking individual will have difficulty presenting himself as a thug. Of course, how characteristics such as ‘innocent’ are perceived is culturally specific.

In the Memorabilia, Xenophon has Socrates argue that human emotion is represented in the face and in the body, that the truly magnificent and noble, humble and servile, moderate and wise, insolent and vulgar, appear so in the face and in the σχήμα of a man, whether static or in motion. 'Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς τε καὶ ἕλευθερον καὶ τὸ ταπεινόν τε καὶ ἀνελεύθερον καὶ τὸ σωφρονικόν τε καὶ φρόνιμον καὶ υβριστικόν τε καὶ ἀπειρόκαλον καὶ διὰ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ διὰ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ ἑστίῶν καὶ κινουμένων ἀνθρώπων διαφαίνει. Both face and body are specified, in recognition of the role each of them has in expressing both positive and negative emotions.

More specifically, in his Symposium, Xenophon describes the physical effects of being in love. He outlines the bodily changes which occur to one possessed by Eros, how it is unlike the effect had by any other gods on men. Those possessed by other gods look more fierce, have a more terrible voice and are driven to more violence; those possessed by chaste Eros have more kindly eyes, make their voices more gentle, and keep the more noble of demeanours. ἄλλ’ οἱ μὲν ἔξ ἄλλων πρὸς τὸ γαργύτεροι τε ὀράσθαι καὶ φοβερώτερον φθέγγεσθαι καὶ σφυδρότεροι εἶναι φέρονται, οἱ δ’ ὑπὸ τοῦ σώφρονος ἔρωτος ἐνθεοὶ τὰ τε ὀμματα φιλοφρονεστέρως ἔχουσι καὶ τὴν φωνὴν προστέραν ποιοῦνται καὶ τὰ σχήματα εἰς τὸ ἑλευθερωτέρον ἀγούσιν. Descriptions of men in love (or men enraged) conjure up this physiognomic type, the emotion felt

659 Xenophon. Memorabilia III.x. For a more detailed discussion of this passage in reference to facial expression, see page 35.
660 Xenophon, Symposium 1.10.
being mirrored in the body. The link in human behaviour between emotional and physical feelings is recognised and explained.

Plato also uses the physical to represent the nature of types of individuals. In Plato’s *Politicus*, the Stranger offers a physical description of priests and prophets to reinforce his explanation of their behaviour and role. The demeanour of the priests and the prophets is full of great pride, and they have a revered reputation gained because of the greatness of their undertaking, τὸ γὰρ δὴ τῶν ἱερέων σχῆμα καὶ τὸ τῶν μάντεων εὐ μάλα φρονήματος πληροῦται καὶ δόξαν σεμνὴν λαμβάνει διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐγχείρημάτων... Whereas Plato generalises his application of these physical traits to a group, he nonetheless provides a justification for their adopting such a demeanour. The societal influences to which a priest or prophet is exposed contribute to the adoption of proud bearing.

In contrast, in Plato’s *Gorgias*, a description of a man’s σχῆμα appears in reference to the accomplishments of the modest sea pilot whose task it is to keep men and women safe and alive each day. After he performs his role, he that has the skill to make his way through the sea, he disembarks and walks up and down by his ship with a moderate demeanour. ...καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἔχων τὴν τέχνην καὶ ταῦτα διαπραξάμενος ἐκβας παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ναῦν περιπατεῖ ἐν μετρίῳ σχήματι. Unlike the priests and prophets, the seaman is presented as being modest in demeanour and reflective of his role in preserving the lives of those who sail with him. He does not receive accolades from members of society, his safe delivery of passengers is taken for granted despite his fundamental role in keeping the travellers safe and the vessel afloat. There is no societal influence to inflate his demeanour, allowing modesty to be expressed. One’s position in life appears to have a direct influence on one’s σχῆμα, demonstrating the role that education, self-perception and societal response have on the development of the individual’s physical bearing.

---
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The Aristotelian corpus is full of examples of the use of the term σχῆμα; only occasionally, however, is the term used in relation to the body and its demeanour. The principles of qualities which are used in the practical application of physiognomics are outlined in the Aristotelian Categoricae, where the author distinguishes between four different types of qualities. The first type is that of habits and dispositions, ἐν μὲν οὖν εἴδος ποιότητος ἔξις καὶ διάθεσις λεγέσθωσαν.663 The former, which include virtue and knowledge, are lasting while the latter, e.g., health or bodily warmth, are easily changed. The next type of qualities is that of natural abilities and disabilities, καὶ ἀπλῶς ὁσα κατὰ δύναμιν φυσικὴν ἢ ἀδύναμίαν λέγεται.664 These qualities are the result of innate ability, or lack of it, not of conditioning or training. The third type refers to qualities which are subject to circumstance and those which are passive, τρίτου δὲ γένος ποιότητος παθητικαὶ ποιότητες καὶ πάθη.665 The passive qualities are inherent and difficult to alter, whereas those which depend on circumstance are not defining elements of one’s character. The final type of quality discussed by Aristotle is that of σχῆμα, enhancing physical forms and attributes which define the nature of the subject. Aristotle writes that this fourth kind of quality is of the form and the shape of existing things, such as whether it is straightness or crookedness, and other qualities resembling them; each is called such, according as it is of a certain nature. Τέταρτον δὲ γένος ποιότητος σχῆμα τε καὶ ἡ περὶ ἐκαστον ὑπάρχουσα μορφή, ἐτὶ δὲ πρὸς τούτως εὐθύτης καὶ καμπυλότης καὶ εἰ τι τούτως δομοῦν ἔστων. καθ’ ἐκαστον γὰρ τούτων ποιὸν τι λέγεται.666 Such qualities qualify that which possess them, as the σχῆμα of an individual will define its possessor.

In the Ethica Nicomachea, Aristotle describes the actions and appearances of the vain. He gives a brief assessment of the character flaws in a vain
individual, including their ostentatious demeanour. Vain people adorn themselves in dress, demeanour and other such things. They wish their visible success to be known by others, so that they should talk about it, and through this talk they will be honoured. καὶ ἐσθήτι κοσμούνται καὶ σχήματι καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις, καὶ βούλονται τὰ εὐτυχήματα καὶ φανερὰ εἶναι αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγουσι περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς διὰ τούτων τιμηθησόμενοι. Once again, the physicality of the individual corresponds to his nature.

Not surprisingly, it is in the Physiognomonica that many of the relevant Aristotelian references to σχήμα are found. The first appearance of σχήμα in this text is in the discussion on which signs should be considered by the physiognomist, as he is not to deal with them all. The physiognomist uses signs from movement, demeanour, complexion, the customary appearance in the face, hair growth, smoothness, voice, the flesh, the parts of the body, and the general form of the whole body, ἐκ τε γὰρ τῶν κινήσεων φυσιογνωμονεῖ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν σχημάτων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν χρωμάτων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡθῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου ἐμφανισμένων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν τριχωμάτων, καὶ ἐκ τῆς λειτοτήτος, καὶ ἐκ τῆς φωνῆς, καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός, καὶ ἐκ τῶν μερῶν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τύπου ὅλου τοῦ σώματος. The methodological discussion regarding which signs are of most use in physiognomies continues, with the author of the text claiming that an overall picture is preferable to specific parts. The strongest of the signs for the parts of the body are taken from general usage, as is displayed by movement and demeanour. Generally speaking, it is simple-minded to trust one sign; whenever most are in agreement with one sign, then it is more probable to assume the sign to be true. ἵσχυρότερα δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς μέρεσι σημείων ἐστὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἡθεῖ τοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφανεῖμοις λαμβανόμενα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς κινήσεις καὶ τὰ σχήματα. ὅλως δὲ τὸ ἐνὶ μὲν πιστεύειν τῶν σημείων εὐθείᾳ, ὅταν δὲ πλείω συμφωνοῦντα καθ’ ἐνὸς λάβῃ, μᾶλλον ἡδὴ κατὰ τὸ εἶκός ἂν τις ὑπολαμβάνωι.

667 Aristotle, Ethica Nicomachea 1125a30-32.
668 [Aristotle], Physiognomonica 806a28-33.
The physiognomist prefers the combination of traits for his analysis, the general impression created by demeanour and movement being a more reliable means by which to determine nature than an isolated physical characteristic.

Based on a similar conceptional framework, the *Physiognomonica* uses σχήμα in many of its descriptions of particular characteristics. Some of the signs of bravery are hard hair growth, a straight carriage of the body, bones, ribs and extremities of the body strong and large, and a flat, tucked-in belly. Ἀνδρείου σημεία τρίχωμα σκληρόν, τὸ σχήμα τοῦ σώματος ὀρθὸν, ὡστά καὶ πλευραὶ καὶ τὰ ἀκρωτήρια τοῦ σώματος ἱσχυρά καὶ μεγάλα, καὶ κοιλία πλατεία καὶ προσεσταμένη.⁶⁷⁰ Amongst the signs of the coward is a demeanour which is tight in movement, τὸ σχήμα σώντου ἐκ ταῖς κινήσεσιν.⁶⁷¹ The insensitive man’s movements, σχήμα, disposition and face correspond to the rest of his bodily traits, fleshy, σαρκώδης, and thick, παχύς.⁶⁷² The signs of the shameless man include a carriage which is not straight, but small and drooping forward; he is sharp in movement and red in body, τῷ σχήματι μὴ ὀρθὸς ἅλλοι μικρῶς προπετέστερος, ἐν ταῖς κινήσεσιν ὄξυς, ἐπίπυρρος τὸ σῶμα.⁶⁷³ Those of cheerful spirits are slow in movements and unconstrained; in demeanour, manner and facial expression they are not so hurried but appear good, ἐν τῇ ταῖς κινήσεσι βραδύς ἐστω καὶ ἄνειμένος. τῷ σχήματι καὶ τῷ ἱθεὶ τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου μὴ ἐπισερχῆς ἅλλα ἀγαθὸς φαινέσθω.⁶⁷⁴ The faint-hearted man is dejected in demeanour and defensive in movement, ἐν τῷ σχήματι ταπεινὸς καὶ ταῖς κινήσεσιν ἀπηγορευκῶς.⁶⁷⁵ Signs of the high-spirited are a straight, broad-ribbed body, cheerful and reddish in demeanour, θυμώδους σημεία. ὀρθὸς τὸ σῶμα, τῷ σχήματι εὐπλευρός, εὐθυμός, ἐπίπυρρος.⁶⁷⁶ The gentle man has a

⁶⁶⁹ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 806b34-807a2.
⁶⁷⁰ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 807a31-34.
⁶⁷¹ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 807b10.
⁶⁷² [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 807b20-28.
⁶⁷³ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 807b31-32.
⁶⁷⁴ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 808a5-7.
⁶⁷⁵ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 808a11-12.
⁶⁷⁶ [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 808a19-20.
strong fleshy form, up-stretched in carriage. \( \text{πραέος σημεία. \ ισχυρός τὸ εἶδος, \ εὐσάρκος. \ ...ὑπτιος τὸ σχήματι.} \)

The physiognomist has a formula for every character type, each of which consists of a combination of traits that often includes the \( σχήμα. \)

\footnote{677} \footnote{678} [Aristotle], *Physiognomonica* 808a24-26.

All of these examples taken from the *Physiognomonica* come from the first half of the text; there is no mention of \( σχήμα \) at all in the second half. It has been suggested that the work was written by two authors, thus explaining the clear demarcation of the two halves, the differences in approach, and some unnecessary repetition. If this theory of dual authorship is accepted, apparently only the creator of the first half is concerned with the general impression of the \( σχήμα. \)

7. CONCLUSION

This investigation into the verbalisation of non-verbal communication in classical Greek texts offered a detailed examination of how this aspect of human comportment was integrated into the literature of ancient Greece. Textual references to non-verbal communication provide insight into how bodily movements and physical features are portrayed, and how the authors use such descriptions in their attempts to sway their audience into accepting their definition of appropriate, and inappropriate behaviour. Accepting the premise that there is a societal agreement on the meaning of these physical gestures and signs, the textual evidence is seen to reflect the ethical values imputed to different aspects of non-verbal communication. Depictions of non-verbal behaviour communicate an individual’s relationship to the ethical ideal; both the honourable citizen and the disdained deviant find their nature expressed through their respective physicalities. Whereas the textual references to non-verbal communication offer much material for critical analysis, they cannot be straightforwardly transferred to the realm of ‘reality’ — the non-verbal communication of living, breathing Athenians of the fifth and fourth centuries remains the subject of speculation.

The methodology chosen for this study has been to consider specific examples of different types of non-verbal communication, rather than to try to attempt a comprehensive listing of all identifiable examples. Through its focus on certain forms of non-verbal communication an analysis has been conducted, on which may be based an analytical model that may be applied to those gestures and physical features not considered here. Furthermore, the topics considered in this study fall into a range of classifications associated particularly with the study of modern non-verbal communication; the face and hands are both body parts which communicate through forms of behaviour belonging to diverse categories such as emblematic gestures and autonomic nervous system responses; walking, which requires movement and incorporates numerous parts of the body; bodily functions,
which can be anatomical as well as highly ritualistic; and the consideration of the σχήμα, a Greek term which incorporates the totality of the physical body as well as its spiritual essence.

The face has been the point of departure for this study of the textual representation of non-verbal communication. The face occupies a unique place in the study of the human body; it is the most exposed and scrutinised part of the body, and is the focal point of human expressiveness. The classical treatment of the face reflects its complexity as a symbol for human expression and identity, demanding consideration of its relationship with the soul. Yet, despite the apparent acknowledgement of the importance of the face, it does not receive as much textual attention as a modern reader might expect. In fact, descriptions of facial features are rare. More common is the descriptive use of facial expressions for communicative purposes — the reader might be made aware of the expression being made, while remaining totally uninformed as to the appearance of the features which form the expression. The role of facial expressions in drama, as well as the complexity of expressing emotions through a static mask, present additional matter for consideration. The face is utilised and examined also by philosophers, orators, poets and physiognomists in their representations of human behaviour.

The hands were considered next; along with the face, they are the most revealing and expressive of body parts. However, as with the face, the centrality of the hand is not reflected in a large number of references to it in Greek texts. The relative paucity of references should not be misconstrued as indicating that the hands were unimportant to the Greeks, but simply that they did not receive extensive textual attention. The small amount of textual references does not accurately reflect the amount of gesticulation being performed on the stage or bema. Of the philosophical writers, Plato acknowledged the communicative role of the hands, while Xenophon and Aristotle both recognised the hands as distinctive to humans, an indication of sophistication, complexity, and humans'
superiority over other animals. In addition, the issues of ambidexterity and the significances attributed to left and right are important in understanding ancient constructions of the human body as well as cosmic order and oppositions. Dramatic productions needed the hands, so that the actors could effectively express their characters, since the mask forced the hands and body to compensate for the impossibility of emotive facial expressions. As for oratory, even the restrained Aeschines admits to cases of speakers having one hand outside their cloaks, thus hinting at the unrepresentative nature of the Athenian ideal of speakers who kept their hands hidden and who refrained from all (immodest) gestures.

The third chapter considered a particular action, walking, rather than a specific physical feature. Whereas the face and the hands can be analysed while in a static state, the very definition of walking implies activity and movement. The textual use of walking, however, is often far more significant than an author simply relating a means of locomotion. The description of an individual’s walk can be seen to embody the essence of Athenian attitudes towards the body and bodily motion. The classical Greek sources which refer to walking project a sensitivity to the body and its movements as well as a need to see in the body an expression of man’s nature. The bodily ideal of a pleasant gait, combined with a calm demeanour and soft speaking style, represents the model citizen in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, and any deviation from this ideal needs justification and classification.

Next to be considered was the role of certain bodily functions, and hiccupping, sneezing and spitting in particular. Once again, there is a shift in methodology in order to expose another aspect of the study of non-verbal communication. Bodily functions are neither a bodily feature nor a form of movement, but a physical expression which is released from within the body. Furthermore, whereas these functions are non-verbal, they are not necessarily non-vocal. The hiccoughs and sneeze were examined as functions in their own
right, but it is as textual interruptions and additions to Plato’s *Symposium* that they are of most interest. The close reading of a particular reference in a single dialogue was designed to illustrate the complex and intriguing nature of such examples of non-verbal communication. These two physical phenomena must be seen as more than unconscious actions of the body, and need to be considered in their non-verbal context and under the weight of their symbolism. One cannot sneeze at Aristophanes’ hiccoughs nor consider the sneeze to be but a hiccough in this Platonic dialogue. As regards spitting, the various examples of this bodily function also illustrate the depth of meaning and symbolism that can be attributed to a seemingly simple physical act. The textual references to spitting suggest that there are culturally recognisable associations to this ritual act. Spitting projects much more than the saliva from the mouth; this bodily action is deeply rooted in the beliefs and superstitions of the classical period and beyond.

The concluding chapter addressed the concept of the \( \sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha \), which includes both physical features and bodily motion and yet, being more than the sum of physical parts, reflects also a person’s total being. The \( \sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha \) is used as a communicative vehicle through which authors can shape character types, using a singular concept to encompass a wide range of physical traits which are associated with a particular type. Unlike fixed physical traits, the \( \sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha \) is vulnerable to manipulation and corruption, the external appearance influencing the internal form, and vice versa. The references to the \( \sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha \) rarely offer detailed physical descriptions, but are simply attributed with identifiable virtues (or vices).

While each of the chapters in this study offered a different perspective on an aspect of non-verbal communication, there are constant themes which run throughout the entirety of the discussions. The centrality of the body within Athenian culture is implicit throughout, as the citizen attempted to achieve the — originally aristocratic — physical (and spiritual) ideal of the \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \varsigma \ \kappa \alpha \gamma \alpha \theta \delta \varsigma \). The body and its movements embody an ethical ideal, and their textual use must be
considered in light of this assumption. The examples of non-verbal communication which have been examined here are evidence of the physical embodiment of this ideal — authors use descriptions of bodily behaviour to communicate the nature of both the individual and the society to which s/he belongs. These references give the modern student of ancient non-verbal communication insight into how this aspect of human behaviour was perceived and expressed by (male) Athenian and Greek authors as they interpreted diverse aspects of their own culture, as well as how these writers interpreted the actions and rituals of non-Greeks.

The examination of non-verbal communication as an expression of societal values requires that the questions be addressed as to what influences and instigates the behaviour under consideration. This study has illustrated that non-verbal communication results from a combined influence of nature and nurture; the tension that exists in classical thought between the concepts of φόβος and νόμος is of paramount relevance to this work. The modern debate between the cultural relativism and/or the universality of non-verbal communication has led to interesting queries regarding human behaviour. While it has been argued that certain emotions elicit a universal physical response, the impetus for the emotion itself must be considered within the cultural context in which it was created. For example, whereas both moderns and ancients appear to have blushed in shame or embarrassment, the cause of these emotions cannot be accepted as universal, as each society has culturally specific values and norms of behaviour (even when these appear to transcend cultural boundaries, there are often subtle differences which might not be apparent to the ‘outside’ observer). As has been argued throughout this study, non-verbal communication is much more than simply a physiological response, but is an aspect of human behaviour which is deeply rooted in the psyche. Non-verbal communication is both universal and culturally relative, each supporting the other as a means of expression. While this is true for non-verbal communication itself, it is even more relevant to the verbalisation of
non-verbal communication, which relies on both the author’s interpretation and need to project his/her message effectively, and on the reader’s ability to recognise the symbols presented to him/her.

The physiognomic element in the discussion offers further scope for its consideration. By the fifth and fourth centuries there was an increasingly visible trend in Greek literature of using the body to portray the character of an individual. Whether consciously or not, physiognomic elements are introduced by authors of the classical period, denoting the physical types which in the third century become formalised by the ‘scientific’ physiognomists. The link between the external appearance and the internal nature appears to be ingrained in the thinking of the time, with authors making conscious efforts to withstand and counter-act this assumption. Whether it is Demosthenes describing the good character of a physically deviant citizen or Plato justifying the ugliness of Socrates despite his goodness, these textual examples are clearly written under the weight of a societal tendency to judge a person’s nature by his/her appearance. While physiognomies is not adopted out-right, the orators, philosophers and poets of the fifth and fourth centuries are experimenting in their work with these forms of physical descriptions.

The reality of classical Athens was one which saw many bodily types, forms and deviations, with precious few (if any) of its citizens (or even citizen elites) having the physical appearance which appears to have been the ‘norm’ against which all others were held. The physically perfect citizen/hoplite was a fantasy which was hardly a reflection of the citizens present in the Assembly, the law-courts, the theatre or the agora. Nonetheless, the literary evidence suggests that those in the public eye were judged according to these unattainable standards. The orator, politician or dramatic character is expected to possess physical qualities which can meet the high standards demanded by the populace, standards which the average citizen could never meet. Despite, or perhaps because of, the human reality of physical imperfections, Athenian democratic society nonetheless
clung to a bodily ideal, inflicting upon those who fell short of this ideal the penalties of marginalisation. Indeed, the physical body of the Athenian citizen is held up to the same criteria by which the polis itself is judged, the external seen as reflecting the internal substance which gives it form (just as the state reflects the nature of its citizens). Non-verbal communication is a means by which the citizen's behaviour and appearance are scrutinised and controlled, societal norms dictating acceptable, and unacceptable, citizen behaviour.

Through the examination of the verbalisation of non-verbal communication in classical Greek texts many aspects of Athenian culture have been addressed. By focusing on the actions that accompany narrative and dialogue, this study has addressed an aspect of Greek literature which has been mostly neglected. The role of non-verbal communication within the author's repertoire of literary devices is a central one, partly because of its ability to infiltrate the textual scene while remaining seemingly undetected. A reading of classical sources with a conscious awareness of the references to non-verbal communication will alter, and enhance, the understanding and appreciation of the texts.
8. BIBLIOGRAPHY


Braunlich, Alice F. 1936. “‘To the Right’ in Homer and Attic Greek,” AJPh 57: 245-60.


Lavater, J. C. 1800?. Essays on Physiognomy: For the Promotion of the Knowledge and the Love of Mankind. Translated from the German by Holcroft. London.


Onians, R. B. 1951. *The Origins of European Thought About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*. Cambridge.


[First published in 1844.]


Tate, J. 1928. “‘Imitation’ in Plato’s *Republic,*” *CQ* 22: 16-23.


Webster, T. B. L. 1939. “Greek Theories of Art and Literature Down to 400 B.C.,” *CQ* 33: 166-179.


