

Y.L. 1473
6.1. 51.15

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

HELD AT PHILADELPHIA
FOR PROMOTING USEFUL KNOWLEDGE

NEW SERIES—VOLUME 59, PART 5
1969

PHYSIOGNOMICS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

ELIZABETH C. EVANS

Professor of Classics, Connecticut College

5092 P22
EVANS, E.C.
1969

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
INDEPENDENCE SQUARE
PHILADELPHIA

August, 1969

692

~~095~~
Evans, Elizabeth C.

Physiognomics in the ancient world

Transactions of the American Philosophical
Society, 59 part 5 - 1969 - p.

5092

EVANS, E.C.

1969



Physiognomics in the Ancient World

Author(s): Elizabeth C. Evans

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, Vol. 59, No. 5 (1969), pp. 1-101

Published by: [American Philosophical Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1006011>

Accessed: 26/03/2012 05:16

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Philosophical Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

HELD AT PHILADELPHIA
FOR PROMOTING USEFUL KNOWLEDGE

NEW SERIES—VOLUME 59, PART 5
1969

PHYSIOGNOMICS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

ELIZABETH C. EVANS
Professor of Classics, Connecticut College

THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
INDEPENDENCE SQUARE
PHILADELPHIA

August, 1969

To the memory of
Dean Clifford Herschel Moore
and
Professor George Lincoln Hendrickson

Copyright © 1969 by The American Philosophical Society

Library of Congress Catalog
Card Number 73-85468

PREFACE

The dedication tells the history of this book. It was the late Dean Clifford Herschel Moore of Harvard who suggested to me a study of physiognomics in the ancient world, and who, with friendly counsel, guided my first work in the field. The late Professor G. L. Hendrickson of Yale, in the years subsequent to Professor Moore's death, with equally warmhearted interest, encouraged me to pursue the subject further, and to put the material I had gathered into some sort of book form. To those former and present members of the Harvard Classical Department, some of whom were my teachers, and to other members of the University, who, as friends, have followed the work in more recent years, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for many helpful suggestions and kind aid. Among them I may mention the late Professor Werner Jaeger, the late Professor Arthur Darby Nock, Professor Herbert Bloch, and Professor G. M. A. Hanfmann. To Professor J. P. Elder I am especially grateful for reading the manuscript in its early stages with a sharp and highly critical eye. It gives

me pleasure also to record here my debt to Dean Wilma Kerby-Miller of Radcliffe for a thoughtful appraisal of the manuscript. My brother, John Draper Evans, has done much to remove awkwardness and ambiguity of expression in the English text. But they are not, of course, in any way responsible for the errors which remain.

To the Trustees of Connecticut College and its former President, Miss Rosemary Park, I wish to acknowledge with particular gratitude a year's leave from teaching duties in 1960–1961. To the American Association of University Women I render very sincere thanks for the award of a Shirley Farr Fellowship in 1960–1961, and to the American Philosophical Society for a grant from the Penrose Fund in support of the preparation of this volume. The generosity of Radcliffe College made possible the privilege of living in the Graduate Center as a Research Fellow during that happy year of work in Widener Library.

E. C. E.

PHYSIOGNOMICS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

ELIZABETH C. EVANS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	5
I. The Treatises	6
II. Philosophy and medicine	17
III. Drama	28
IV. Papyri; rhetorical theory and practice	39
V. History and biography	46
VI. Epic	58
VII. Physiognomics in varied literary forms	67
I. Iambic, elegiac, and lyric poetry	67
II. Satire, epigram, and fiction; technical writings ...	71
VIII. Physiognomics in the fourth century A.D.	74
Abbreviations	84
Appendices	89
Index	98

INTRODUCTION

The study of the relation of the features of a man to his inner character is no modern development; for in Greece and Rome there existed, at least during certain periods of their literary history, a definite interest in the subject, comparable to the vogue associated with the name of Lavater (the Swiss physiognomist and friend of Goethe) in the eighteenth century. This interest had gained considerable impetus through the influence of the Peripatetic and Stoic schools of philosophy, and embraced a careful study of the significance of the various aspects of the body and a comparison of men and animals in the matter of physique and nature.

This present study is centered on the place in antiquity of natural physiognomy, or the art of interpreting character from the physique. It is clear that the technical handbooks on physiognomy enjoyed a far greater popularity among Greek and Roman writers, especially those of the later Greek society and Roman Empire, than has generally been supposed. As a quasi-science, it always bore a close relationship to the science of medicine; as an art, to the practice of rhetoric. It has also an obvious kinship with the field of ancient portraiture.

It is because of the many ramifications of this general subject and the discernible interest in it of many writers of antiquity that I have been encouraged to undertake a wider consideration than has been previously attempted of the awareness, either implied or expressed, of a connection between a man's appearance and his inner character as it is revealed in Greek and Latin literature from the time of Homer to the end of the fourth century after Christ, a century which marks the end of the classical era, and the beginning of the barbarian invasions; or, to put it another way, of the descriptions of personal appear-

ance as an aspect of characterization in classical writers. These descriptions are, therefore, illuminating and significant in the interpretation of the classics, and of help in the study of personality in antiquity. The important technical handbooks extant are:

1. The Pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*, third century B.C.
2. The work of Polemo Rhetor of Laodicea, *de Physiognomonía*, second century A.D.
3. The *Physiognomonica* of Adamantius the sophist, fourth century A.D.
4. An anonymous Latin handbook *de Physiognomonía*, probably of the fourth century A.D.

We may recall that Pythagoras, the Greek philosopher, of the sixth century B.C., is credited with "inventing" the science, but that Galen regards "the divine Hippocrates" as its originator. Later Greek philosophers have much to say on the subject, among them Plato and Aristotle, as well as the Stoics and Epicureans in both Greece and Rome. The first systematic treatment of such material that has come down to us is the little book ascribed to Aristotle. The work is usually divided into two parts, each probably composed by a writer in the school of Aristotle, or by an author very strongly under his influence. At the beginning of the first part of the Pseudo-Aristotle is a clear statement of the principle on which the study rests, namely "that dispositions follow bodily characteristics," and that, in turn, "the body suffers with the affections of the soul." The Pseudo-Aristotelian manual begins by discussing the methods that may be employed in treating the subject, what each part of the body may reveal as to character, and what comparisons may be made between men and animals in this regard, especially in the case of the lion and the panther. The interest in the "science" was especially widespread at certain periods: (1) that period lasting from the third through the first centuries B.C. (commonly known as the Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman era); (2) the second century A.D. (when the popularity of the subject was at its height); (3) the fourth century A.D. (a time of marked revival of interest). But the "physiognomic consciousness" of classical authors begins far earlier, i.e., with Homer, and from there on, both in poetry and prose of classical literature, whenever personal characterization is involved, plays a definite and significant role, varying in importance according to the interests and purposes of authors. The Pseudo-Aristotelian manual analyzes three methods applied to the study of physiognomics. The first method concentrates upon physiognomical inferences from a parallelism in physique and nature between

men and animals of various kinds. The second, the ethnological method, divides "men into races, in so far as they differ in appearance and in character" (e.g., Egyptians, Thracians, and Scythians). The third method takes account of the varying facial expressions and "the dispositions which follow each," such as that of anger or fear. The present volume includes a study of the theory and practice of the first two methods, i.e., the formal side of physiognomy, and, to a lesser extent, of the third method, which might be described as reflecting the "physiognomic consciousness" of ancient authors, representing such diverse literary forms as epic, elegy and lyric, history and biography, drama, philosophy, satire and fiction.

This study was started many years ago as a doctoral dissertation, and published in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 46 (1935) under the title "Descriptions of Personal Appearance in Roman History and Biography." Since that time I have carried forward various parts of the investigation, and I have collected a much larger body of material. The study is not, of course, exhaustive. It is designed simply to draw the attention of readers of classical literature to the idea of using descriptions of physique as an aid in the analysis of character. I propose to trace in main outlines the significant developments in these techniques in the ancient world. I have confined myself to the literary evidence. I have not attempted more than a cursory examination of astrological physiognomy. As for the interest of the Church Fathers in this field of physiognomics, while I have noted significant observations made by them on the subject, especially by the writers of the fourth century A.D., I have preferred for the most part to remain within the limits of pagan literature. If these omissions and inclusions seem arbitrary, they are nonetheless dictated by my desire to provide a concise account of physiognomical theory and practice. Appendices have been added for various authors when they contain noteworthy examples not taken up in the text.

If, from the foregoing discussion of the general body of material bearing on the subject of physiognomics in the ancient world, it should at this point be assumed by the reader that there is to be found consistency of statement on the *formal*—I emphasize the word *formal*—aspects of physiognomy in the major classical authors, that impression should be corrected in the light of the significant fact that the theorists in the field of classical physiognomy come relatively late in date, beginning in the period of Aristotle and the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*. It is these theorists who set down in orderly fashion what had long been informally observed and practiced. Consequently a survey of Förster's edition of the *loci physiognomnici* will disclose little from Homer, almost nothing from Aeschylus and Sophocles, and a relatively small interest in Euripides and Aristophanes. Herodotus and Thucydides as well as the Attic orators

are likewise silent on the subject. Plato, on the other hand, is filled with relevant observations, as is, of course, Aristotle. On the Latin side Cicero and Seneca, for example, have many comments, but Lucretius and Virgil almost none. Catullus and Horace (save for the latter's self-portrait) appear little influenced by the physiognomical traditions, while Plautus, Ovid, Martial, Juvenal, and Apuleius are clearly familiar with them. The same familiarity with physiognomical traditions appears in the biographers, both Greek and Roman, and, to a considerable extent, among the Roman historians, especially in Ammianus Marcellinus.

While the writers I have mentioned do not reflect the more formal tenets of the physiognomists, yet we might say that "physiognomic consciousness" in the descriptions of momentary physical appearance abounds in many of these writers, and serves to illumine the effect of physiognomic thinking upon the art of characterization. These descriptions, therefore, deserve to be examined along with the more strictly systematic aspects of this quasi-science, and constitute a part of it.

Further, the study of the "physiognomic consciousness" in classical writers involves an analysis of the ways used to describe physique. First, we may note the method by which the body is described in general terms, in expressions like *forma eximia*, *corpus ingens*, which are a commonplace in literature, and in general consist of descriptions, laudatory or otherwise, of the permanent appearance of a man. Secondly, we find the type in which the emotion of the individual registered on the body or countenance is indicated by such phrases as *laeto vultu*, *truci vultu*. The second type occurs especially in panegyrics in which the dignity of the appearance and the nobility of the eyes are lauded, or in vituperative attacks on enemies or opponents, and in expressions by which the momentary appearance of a man is depicted, i.e., in phrases which suggest the reaction of a person to some event or speech as it is reflected for a brief space upon the countenance. Thirdly, we meet the type in which the whole body is photographically described, as in the *Lives* of Suetonius. In connection with this third type (often called iconistic) we may consider physiognomy proper, that is, the formal principles of physiognomy which are discussed by the theorists, and we may then go on to determine to what extent the ideas contained in these books were influential on the classical authors.

I. THE TREATISES

As early as the Periclean Age a certain Zopyrus¹ was claiming to be proficient in the field of physiognomy. But it is not until the time of Aristotle that we hear a great deal of the technical aspects of the subject. Aristotle has much to say on the theories of

¹ Cic. *Fat.* 5; Scholia in Pers. 5, 23–24.

physiognomy, especially in the *Analytica Priora*, *De Anima*, *Historia Animalium*, and *De Partibus Animalium*. In the *De Generatione Animalium*² he mentions without name one physiognomist, who, in his lectures, reduced all faces to two or three animal types—unhappily not named. This fact bears witness to the existence of some formulated study of physiognomy in Aristotle's time, and to the acceptance of its tenets.

A passage which from the point of view of logical inference is of great importance for our study in the *Analytica Priora*³ supplies a basis for Aristotle's physiognomical theory.

It is possible to infer character from the physique (*τὸ δὲ φυσιογνωμονεῖν δυνατόν ἐστιν*) if it is granted, [says Aristotle,] that body and soul change together in all natural affections . . . (I mean such affections as fits of anger or desires among natural excitements). Supposing, then, this is granted, and also that there is one sign of one affection, and that we can recognize the affection (*πάθος*) and sign (*σημεῖον*) proper to each class of creatures, we shall be able to judge character from physical appearance. For if a peculiar affection applies to any individual class, e.g., courage to lions, there must be some corresponding sign for it; for it has been assumed that body and soul are affected together. Let this be "having large extremities." This may apply to other classes, but not as wholes; for a sign is peculiar in the sense that the affection is peculiar to the class as a whole, and not to it alone, as we are accustomed to use the term. Thus the same affection will be found in another class also, and man or some other animal will be brave. Therefore he will have the sign; for *ex hypothesi* there is one sign of one affection. If, then, this is so, and we can collate signs of this kind in the case of animals which have only one peculiar affection, and if each affection has a sign, since it necessarily has only one sign, we shall be able to judge character by their appearance. But if the genus as a whole has two peculiar affections, e.g., if lions have courage and a readiness to share, how shall we decide which sign of those which are peculiarly associated with the genus belongs to which affection? Probably if both affections are found in some other class not as a whole, that is, when of the classes in which each of them is found, certain members possess one but not the other [affection]. For if a man is brave but not generous, and exhibits one of the two signs, clearly this will be the sign of courage in the lion as well.

In analyzing this passage, W. D. Ross suggests that Aristotle never expressly states that he means⁴ "the inferring of mental characteristics in *men* from the presence in *men* of physical characteristics." The implication that *men* is intended seems clear, however, at the end of the passage (e.g., "and man or some other animal will be brave") and is sustained in the Pseudo-

Aristotelian *Physiognomonica* I, to which Ross draws attention. This discussion of *φυσιογνωμονεῖν* (to judge men's character from their physical appearance) for Aristotle serves essentially as an illustration of the "conclusion" from an enthymeme *ἐκ σημεῖων* (from signs) which infers causes from effects, not effects from causes.⁵

The little book, ascribed to Aristotle,⁶ *Φυσιογνωμονικά* (Physiognomica), is the first systematic treatment of such material that has come down to us. It⁷ comprises six major sections which are usually subdivided into two parts. These two divisions were probably composed by writers either belonging to the Peripatetic School or at any rate strongly under its influence. The two parts were apparently united to form a single book because of the subject matter.⁸ The work begins by describing the ways in which the study of physiognomy should be treated. The parts of the body which reveal character, the physical appearance proper to each state of mind (such as bravery, cowardice, wrath or prudence, or their opposites), the physical appearance of the male and female, the minute comparisons that may be made between the physique and behavior of the male and female, and the physique and behavior of many kinds of animals, especially the lion and the panther, and the aspects of character which can be observed from the form of the face, the separate parts of the body, the voice, the color, are all systematically treated.

At the beginning of this tract is a clear statement of the basis on which the "science" of physiognomy rests⁹: "Dispositions follow bodily characteristics and are not in themselves unaffected by bodily impulses. Conversely, that the body suffers sympathetically with affections of the soul is evident in love, fear, grief, and pleasure." "For no animal has ever existed such that it has the form of one animal and the disposition of another, but the body and soul of the same creature are always such that a given disposition must necessarily follow a given form." This premise serves as a preamble to Chapters I through III.¹⁰ At Chapter IV the writer of the second half of the treatise starts afresh¹¹: "It seems to me," he says, "that

⁵ W. D. Ross, *Aristotle* 5th ed., (London, 1956), p. 41. An enthymeme is described as a rhetorical syllogism (a syllogism which orators tend to use) starting from probabilities (*ἐκ εἰκότων*) or from signs (*ἐκ σημεῖων*) Pseud.-Arist. (805a; 807a; 810a).

⁶ Edited by R. Förster, *SP* 1: pp. 1-91.

⁷ For the unknown authorship of this work see Förster, *SP* 1: prolegomena, pp. xviii-xxi. Also V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudopigraphus* (Leipzig, 1863), p. 697.

⁸ R. Förster, *De Aristotelis quae feruntur Physiognomicorum Indole ac Condicione in Philologische Abhandlungen* . . . Martin Hertz (Berlin, 1888), p. 284. Förster presents full documentation for this view.

⁹ 805a (trans. W. S. Hett throughout, LCL).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 808b.

¹¹ *SP* 1, prolegomena, p. xx. This Rose denies, *De Aristotelis Librorum Ordine et Auctoritate Commentatio* (Berlin, 1854), p. 222, but he gives no reasons for his opinions. That the sections were

² Arist. *Gen. An.* 5, 3, 769 b. Cf. *Rh.* 1, 1430b.

³ *An. Pr.* 2, 27, 70b, 6-39. Trans. H. Tredennick, LCL.

⁴ That Aristotle means to imply *men* is evident in certain passages of Pseud.-Arist. 805a. On methods assayed in the study of physiognomy: "the first method takes as its basis for physiognomical inferences the various genera of animals, positing for each genus a peculiar animal form, and consequently upon this a peculiar mental character, and then assuming that if a man resembles such and such a genus in form he will resemble it also in soul" (trans. Tredennick). Cf. also 807a; 810a.

soul and body react on each other; when the character of the soul changes, it also changes the form of the body, and, conversely, when the form of the body changes, it changes the character of the soul." Interaction is, therefore, inevitable.

The methods used in this handbook are purely empirical, and there is an imprecise mixture of deduction and induction throughout. The author of the first section, having stated his premise, describes the methods used in the past: the zoological, the ethnological, and the analysis of characteristic facial expressions which are observed in varying conditions of mind. He admits that all these methods are possible, but insists that the last method is defective in that a man changes his facial expression from time to time, from cheerfulness to grief, for example, and that the inferences that can be drawn from such expressions are relatively few. Inferences drawn from animals are also subject to serious limitations, because common mental characteristics provide the physiognomists with no convincing evidence. Courage is not limited to the lion, for example. What is necessary is to collect all brave animals and then ask what sort of affections belong to all of them and not to other animals. It is important that the animals selected be very large in number and that they do not possess any mental characteristic in common other than the one whose signs are being investigated.¹²

Physiognomy, according to the author of this, the first part of the work, "has for its province, as the name implies, all such natural affections of mental content, as modify the external signs the physiognomists interpret." Having determined the special province of physiognomy, he then goes on to examine the sources of its data, and to give a detailed account of its more significant conclusions. The sources from which physiognomic signs are drawn are¹³: movements and gestures of the body, color, characteristic facial expressions, growth of hair, smoothness of the skin, the voice, the condition of the flesh, the parts of the body, the build of the body as a whole. A more extended discussion¹⁴ follows of inferences from complexion, hair, flesh, movement, voice, gesture, and expression. Then in the remaining paragraphs of the first section the author reverses his analytical approach, and considers signs of courage, cowardice, good disposition, dullness of sense, shamelessness,

put together at a later date may be inferred from the fact that Polemo of Laodicea knew a fuller version of the two tracts united in a single book and makes use of both parts. Cf. also examples given by Förster, *De Arist. quae feruntur Physiog. Ind. ac Condic.*, pp. 294-298.

¹² *Ibid.*, 805b-806a.

¹³ *Ibid.* After W. S. Hett and T. Loveday and E. S. Förster throughout.

¹⁴ 806b-808b. The observations are for the most part disconnected and haphazard in arrangement. The asyndetic manner of presentation seems to be characteristic of all the handbooks we possess. Probably the authors are compiling their work from several sources and pay little heed to formal organization of material.

well-ordered behavior, high spirits, low spirits, the effeminate nature, harshness, hot temper, the gentle disposition, dissembling, meanness of spirit, gambling instincts, abusiveness, compassion, gluttony, lasciviousness, somnolence, and good memory. The inferences here are for the most part drawn from observation of human behavior rather than from comparison with animal action. The treatment of courage gives a fair example of the way in which the writer handles the analysis¹⁵: The signs include coarse hair, an upright carriage of the body, size and strength in the bones, sides, and extremities, a stomach broad and flat, a sturdy, not overly fleshy neck, a chest that is broad and fleshy, calves of the legs that are broad low down, a gleaming eye, neither too wide nor too closed, a rather dry skin, a sharp forehead, straight and not large, neither very smooth nor very wrinkled.

The author of this part of the work concedes that another approach to physiognomical interpretation is quite possible. For example, suppose a man quick to anger, hard to please, and small minded, is, by these signs, jealous. It might be permissible for the physiognomist to identify the jealous man from other qualities. This is a method proper to those who are philosophically trained,¹⁶ since they, when they are given certain premises, know how to recognize the right conclusion in the face of given data. This would indeed be the method suggested in the *Analytica Priora*. It is best, the author adds, to make no positive assertions where signs are inconsistent and contrary to each other in detail; and above all to base statements on species instead of entire genera, since the species more closely resembles the individual and it is with individuals that physiognomy is primarily concerned, and not with the whole human race.

While the writer has ranged over the science of physiognomics, he has not drawn his illustrations from specific races, save in the case of the inhabitants of the north, who are brave and stiff-haired, and those in the south, who are cowardly and soft-haired.¹⁷ Nor does he include specific individuals except for the otherwise unidentified Dionysius, the sophist.¹⁸ The small-minded have small limbs, small delicate bodies, small eyes and small faces, like a Corinthian or a Leucadian,¹⁹ but the reason for the characterization of these particular Greeks is not indicated.

At Chapter IV, as we have pointed out, the manual begins anew. Since soul and body are sympathetically affected by each other, changes in both can be brought about simultaneously, as in the case of madness,²⁰ which doctors can cure in some circumstances by administering drugs and courses of diet, and thus

¹⁵ 807a-b.

¹⁶ 807a.

¹⁷ 806b.

¹⁸ 808a. Cf. Förster, however, *ibid.*, p. 302.

¹⁹ 808a.

²⁰ 808b.

treating both body and soul. The parallelism which exists between human behavior and that of animals is of great importance in deducing the inward nature from outer appearance. In all such cases the deductive method²¹ is vital to proper procedure. The whole animal kingdom may be divided for physiognomical purposes into two physical types, the male and the female.²² In all animals the female is tamer and gentler, less powerful, more easily trained, and more manageable, perhaps thereby less spirited, but more mischievous, and, though feebler, more reckless. The head of the female is smaller, her face narrower, her neck thinner, her chest weaker, her sides smaller; while hips and thighs are fuller, she is knock-kneed, thinlegged and more delicate of foot. The proportion of her body is pleasing rather than imposing, she is less strong, and—here is a hint of the theory of the humors—of a moister tissue. The males are the opposite of all this. They are braver and more upright, while the female is more cowardly and deceitful.

At the end of the short tract²³ the writer remarks that in every selection of signs some merit more careful consideration than others. The clearest signs are in the so-called major parts of the body. The principal place, however, is the area around the eyes and forehead, head and face. The next most important is the part around the chest and shoulders. Following in importance is the part around the legs and feet, least in importance that around the belly. It is obvious that those principal parts give the clearest evidence of the existence of intelligence.

In the light of the foregoing it may be interesting to observe the way in which the lion is described²⁴ as exhibiting the male type in its most perfect form: good-sized mouth, square face not too bony, nose rather thick, gleaming eyes deeply set, of moderate size, neither too round nor too long, a brow of the right size, the forehead square, and somewhat hollowed from the center, and hanging as a kind of cloud over the eyebrows and nostrils beneath the forehead, a head of moderate size, a neck of good length and broad, a tawny mane neither too stiff nor too curly. Around the collar bone he is loosely rather than tightly built, his shoulders are strong and his chest powerful, his trunk broad and well articulated. There is no superfluous flesh on the haunches or sides, his legs are strong and sinewy, and his whole frame well knit and taut, neither too hard nor too moist. He walks slowly, moving in a majestic way, and rolling his shoulders. Such is his physical appearance, and in soul he is generous and liberal, noble, and a lover of victory, yet gentle and just and affectionate toward those with whom he is associated.

Of the animals which appear to be brave, the panther is, except in the matter of the formation of its legs, the most feminine. With these legs, however, it accomplishes feats of bravery. It has a small face, a large mouth, small, rather light eyes, hollow, yet also flat. Its forehead is long, curved rather than flat around the ears; it has a very long and thin neck, a narrow chest, and a long back, loins and hips thick and fleshy, while the parts around the ribs and the belly are flat; it has a mottled complexion, and a body as a whole ill-articulated and ill-proportioned. This is the form of the body, and in soul it is small and furtive, and, in general, tricky.

The treatise goes on to discuss those signs which, though primarily associated with animals, become of importance for the study of physiognomics. The signs accepted for human characterization follow: "Now the selection of signs as far as human beings is concerned, is made as follows," a statement which suggests the existence of a well-established position for physiognomical manuals which are concerned with the new science of physiognomics based on semeiotics, or inference of character from outward signs.

The discussion²⁵ then turns to specific parts of the body,²⁶ which could be checked by anyone consulting various sections for reference: feet, ankles, lower leg, knee, thighs, buttocks, waist, belly, back, sides, chest, shoulders, collar bone, neck, lips, nose, face, eyes, forehead, head as a whole, ears. Treatment of color, hairiness, steps, gesture, mobility of eyes, voice, and stature follows. Above all the greatest significance is attributed to right proportions in the human body.²⁷ An ill-proportioned body (*σῶμα ἀσύμμετρον*) indicates a rogue, while a well-proportioned frame is characteristic of upright and brave men. Many of the characteristics listed and analyzed are referred to the male and female types dealt with at the beginning. Parallelisms with animals are made far more frequently than in the first part of the tract. The intermediate size, shape, or color is emphasized, as in the example of the color of skin. Too swarthy a hue marks a coward, as in the case of the Egyptians and Ethiopians.²⁸ Very woolly hair (again with reference to the Ethiopians) indicates cowardice. The remarks which have to do with the proper gesture for the hand, elbow, and arm suggest the importance of this subject in the art of rhetoric. Those with stiff and straight shoulders, who swing from side to side, are blusterers inviting comparison with horses. Those who stoop forward and at the same time roll the shoulders are

²¹ 809a.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ 814a.

²⁴ 809b–813b.

²⁵ Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 107. Miss Misener points out that the *Characters* of Theophrastus, the Peripatetic literary biography, and the physiognomical handbooks are, in great part, "the applied ethics and psychology of the master."

²⁶ 810a–813b.

²⁷ 814a.

²⁸ 812a-b. These are the only two peoples the author undertakes in connection with an analogy for races rather than individuals.

great-minded like lions. To keep turning the body, and bending it, is a sign of obsequiousness, for it is the bearing of the flatterer.

The section on stature shows the obvious influence of the humoral theories of the Hippocratic school and the ideas expressed by Aristotle in the *De Partibus Animalium*. Men of normally small height are quick, because the flow of blood²⁹ must cover a small area, and because it moves rapidly to the seat of the intelligence, i.e., the heart. Small men with dry tissues do not have persistence. This also is true of those of the color that heat produces in the body, since the effect of the blood flowing within a limited space and rapidly is to prevent them from keeping their thoughts on a single topic, and to force them to go on to something new. Big men, with moist tissue and a complexion derived from cold, lack persistence, since their blood flows slowly and the body is itself cold, so that the blood does not reach the seat of the intelligence. Small men, however, with moist tissue, and a color resulting from cold tend to carry out their purposes. For movement is within a small area, and the difficulty of movement serves to accomplish the initial intent. Large men with dry flesh and a complexion produced by heat accomplish their purpose and are keen of sense. For warmth of flesh and of color counterbalance the excess of size so that these men achieve the proportion necessary to the completion of their purpose. Again it is the intermediate in stature that is best, because it assures the capacity of a man to finish what he has set out to do, and is identified with the sense of perception, for the reason that the movement of the blood, since it does not have to travel far to reach the seat of intelligence, and is not confined to too small a space and does not pass beyond it. "In a word," concludes the handbook, "these regions supply the clearest signs in which there is the greatest evidence of intelligence."³⁰

The "science" of physiognomy becomes established in this fashion, therefore, in the period of Aristotle and his immediate successors, and assumes thereafter a vigorous role in the study of personality and the art of characterization in ancient literature.

Included among the epigrams ascribed to Theocritus³¹ is an epitaph of a certain Eusthenes, "skilled to infer the character of the mind from the eye."

Εὐσθένης τὸ μῆμα. φυσιγνώμων. ὁ σοφιστῆς
δεινὸς ἀπ' ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ τὸ νόημα μαθεῖν.

²⁹ 813a. In the first section of the treatise (806b) the writer suggests that gesture and varieties of expression are considered according to their relation to a given state of mind.

³⁰ 814b.

³¹ See A. S. T. Gow, *Theocritus* (2v., Cambridge, 1952), 11 *ad loc.* for text, translation and comment. This epigram he believes is quite possibly by Theocritus, though it also occurs under the name of Leonidas of Tarentum in the *Anthologia Palatina* 7, 661. See Förster, *SP* 2, pp. 316-317.

Eusthenes was a σοφιστής in this skill, a professional physiognomist, and not a philosopher or rhetor concerned theoretically with the tenets of the subject. He was clearly an expert—δεινός—and may well have plied his art for payment. The important point about this epitaph is the fact that it undoubtedly belongs to the third century B.C. and reflects in its own way the professional status of these studies. Apart from Zopyrus, who is said to have physiognomized Socrates, he is the first figure recorded by name as having received formal recognition for proficiency in the field. If it is true, and I believe it is, that the Peripatetic manual ascribed to Aristotle is to be assigned to the third century B.C., it becomes clear that the popularity of the science increased markedly in the course of the Hellenistic Age. It was surely a period rich and diverse in literary activity, and the science of physiognomy began to come into its own. Furthermore, the figure of Loxus, a professional writer on physiognomics, may be assigned to this period.

Our knowledge of Loxus is derived chiefly from his physiognomical writings quoted in the anonymous Latin tract of the fourth century A.D. The Latin writer has for the most part followed Polemo (employing, however, a shorter version of Polemo's tract than the one we now possess) and the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise.

The date of Loxus has been analyzed by Geneva Misener³² in an article in which she discusses at length the place of Loxus in the science of physiognomy. In her view it seems clear that Loxus is committed to Empedocles' earlier idea that the blood is the seat of the soul. It is the middle *krasis* or "mixture" of the blood that constitutes the best blended soul of intelligence and courage. In this respect she believes that he is halfway between Empedocles and Aristotle, in that he considers both physical and mental aspects of the movement of the blood, but does not advance beyond the early fifth-century idea that there is no psychic center in a specific organ, but rather that consciousness is diffused through the body by blood. She argues, therefore, that it is impossible to date him, as Förster does, as a physician of the third century B.C. Loxus' approach to the subject involving the consideration of physiology as well as from the observation of animals, she concludes, precedes Aristotle. In his theory of the "perfect temperament" and in the differentiation of sex he comes before the psychological thinking of Aristotle, and anticipates the Pseudo-Aristotelian tract, which borrows from Aristotle and accepts a theory of temperaments belonging to a much later period. His influence on later physiognomical writers can be discerned in the study of the hair in the late Latin handbook, and in the description of certain typical characters. The accumulated

³² G. Misener, "Loxus, Physician and Physiognomist," *CP* 18 (1923): pp. 1-22.

evidence seems to point, according to Miss Misener, to the late fifth or early fourth century as a date for this figure. Her arguments should be examined in the light of the Aristotelian treatment of the subject (discussed in the next chapter), and related more fully to the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook.

The correctness of Förster's dating the Latin work in the third century B.C. is, I believe, strongly supported by certain clues within the work itself. First of all, there is the strong Stoic interest in the subject of physiognomy, which accounts for its popularity in the later Greek world. Cleanthes, successor to Zeno (330–231 B.C.), is reported by Diogenes Laertius³³ to have detected a cinaedus by his sudden sneezing. This anecdote is referred to briefly by the Latin compiler³⁴ without name as "alius sternutamento subito virum se esse non confessus est," and is assigned to the Loxus source of the handbook by Förster, since it occurs immediately before the mention of Loxus' name. Another point which would link the thinking of Loxus³⁵ with that of Cleanthes is the statement that from the appearance of the body the quality of the soul may be changed, just as a breath infused into a pipe, or a flute or a trumpet. For while breath blown into the pipe or the flute or the trumpet is uniform, yet the pipe or the flute or the trumpet gives forth diverse sounds. In Seneca³⁶ the same idea is referred to Cleanthes in allusion to the approaches to philosophy. "As our breath produces a louder sound when it passes through the long and narrow opening of the trumpet and escapes by a hole which widens at the end, even so the fettering rules of poetry clarify our meaning."

Important, too, for our consideration is the statement that Loxus believes that the blood is the seat of the soul. While Miss Misener clearly associates this view with Empedocles, and believes that Loxus, if dated later, would be out of line with contemporary thought, she does not take into account the fact that the Stoic Diogenes the Babylonian (ca. 240–152 B.C.), pupil of Chrysippus and successor to Zeno of Tarsus as head of the school, held much the same view. The soul was regarded by the Stoics either as fire, or as warm breath, diffused throughout the body, just as the soul of the world is spread through the cosmos. The warm breath was connected with the blood, and Galen is our authority for Diogenes' view that the soul was fed by the vapors of the blood, as the stars are fed by vapors from the earth. The seat of the soul was in the breast, not the brain, according to Diogenes.³⁷

Finally, Loxus substitutes Celts for Scythians in his ethnological physiognomy. Where Pseudo-Aristotle³⁸ speaks of three groups of Egyptians, Thracians, and Scythians, Loxus in a corresponding discussion mentions Egyptians, Celts, and Thracians. Scythians are regularly cited in the Greek authors³⁹ of the fifth and fourth centuries, and the Celts seem to be substituted at a later date and taken over by the physiognomists. The impact of the invasion of Greece by the Celts in 280 B.C. may suggest why Loxus made this substitution. If, then, we accept the third-century date for Loxus, we must remove him from the discussion of the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century, and place him properly in the Hellenistic Age when we find an enormous interest in the formal aspects of physiognomy.

With the second century A.D. we come, so far as the classical world is concerned, to a climax of demonstrable popularity of the subject of physiognomics. Because of his great importance in the history of this field we must first consider Polemo of Laodicea. This man was probably born in the year 88 A.D. at Laodicea in Asia Minor and died about 145 A.D. While still a youth he went to Smyrna to study rhetoric—the teaching of which he later took up as his profession—and became the distinguished *declamator* of Smyrna. Of the men under whom he studied, Philostratus⁴⁰ mentions Timocrates, Euphrates, Scopelian, and Dio Chrysostom. He was a contemporary of Herodes Atticus, a bitter enemy of Favorinus, and he numbered among his own pupils the Greek orator Aristides. So esteemed was he by the citizens of Smyrna that he quickly achieved high honors there. It was about the year 113 A.D. that he was sent, so Philostratus tells us,⁴¹ in place of Scopelian as ambassador to Rome to the Emperor Trajan, from whom he obtained the right to travel free of expense by land and sea.⁴² During the reign of Hadrian he achieved his greatest triumphs. Of his friendship with the emperor we have some information from the Arabic version of his work on physiognomy, in which he describes a journey⁴³ which he took with Hadrian in

³⁸ 805a.

³⁹ Herod. 4, 1; Hipp. *Airs, Waters, and Places* 6, 91; 94; 113; Plato, *Rep.* 4, 436; Arist. *Gen. An.* 5, 3; Strabo 1, 33; 11, 507.

⁴⁰ For a careful study of his life and career see H. Jüttner, "De Polemonis rhetoris vita operibus arte," in *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen* 8, heft 1 (1902): pp. 1–116. Cf. *VS* 1, 536; 539. The principal ancient source for Polemo's life in this work.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 1, 521.

⁴² *Ibid.* 1, 532.

⁴³ Förster, *SP* 1: p. 138 (translated from the Arabic by G. Hoffman): "etenim aliquando regem maximum comitabar. dum igitur cum eo ex Brâqa in Asiam proficiscimur, comitantibus regem exercitibus et navibus vir iste se iis adiunxit. praeteriimus autem multa oppida donec ad mare pervenimus. tum ille in Bûn et Alsrûs et regiones Lydiae et Phrygiae et multa loca vectus est. deinde in Asiam revertimur per fretum in mari et ad Rûkhs adpulit. deinde navigiis in Anis profectus est et in hoc itinere naves maritimae regi obviam venire coeperunt. itaque cum in Asiam pervenissemus ad illum virum deverti." He describes the

³³ 7, 123.

³⁴ 2, 20, 8.

³⁵ 2, 4–5.

³⁶ *Ep.* 108, 10 (trans. R. M. Gummere, LCL).

³⁷ See R. Förster, "De Loxi Physiognomonía," *Rh M* 43, (1888), N.F.: pp. 505–511. Förster, *De Polemonis Physiognomicis* (Kiel, 1886), *passim*, especially page 6 and note 1 for references.

the East in 123 A.D. It is not strange, therefore, to find that, when Hadrian came to Athens and dedicated the great temple of Olympian Zeus, Polemo⁴⁴ delivered the oration. Through Polemo's friendship with the emperor, furthermore, the city of Smyrna received many gifts and special attentions from Hadrian.⁴⁵ Under Antoninus Pius we hear less of his activities.⁴⁶ But in A.D. 143 he came to Italy, where, in the presence of Marcus Aurelius, he delivered a number of orations.⁴⁷ Though Jüttner⁴⁸ states that he was considered "sophistarum Asianorum quasi princeps," we do not know a great deal of his own school of rhetoric. Of his book on physiognomy, written in Greek, which Jüttner regards as his most important work, we have the Arabic translation mentioned above, the Greek paraphrase of Adamantius of Alexandria, and a later anonymous Latin version. To both parts of the little tract attributed to Aristotle Polemo was much indebted. He especially followed the lead of Aristotle in showing close parallelisms between men and animals. The significance of each part of the body he treated with rather greater elaborateness than did the authors of the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual. At least one-third of his work is devoted to the subject of the eyes. His importance in the field of physiognomy is clear from the fact that in treatises of later periods his name occurs repeatedly.⁴⁹ From his rhetorical work, unfortunately, only two speeches remain and they give no adequate indication of the high regard in which he was held in his own day as one of the distinguished leaders of the New Sophistic. While Polemo in his handbook on physiognomy was largely indebted to the earlier Pseudo-Aristotelian tract, he also achieved considerable reputation for his own contribution to this field of study. One of the striking features of the work is the use of examples chosen to illustrate the theories set forth, drawn from his personal observation of people of his own day. Mesk's⁵⁰ careful study of these illustrations reveals

their considerable value as a source of information about Polemo's contemporaries. Under the topic of the eyes he cites examples from the past only twice. The rest come from the study of unnamed contemporaries such as a man from Cyrene, two from Lydia, one from Corinth, and indeed from people all over the eastern Mediterranean basin. In a similar fashion Polemo provides observations for other parts of the body. Though Polemo devotes a great deal of attention to the eyes, he by no means ignores other parts of the body. After full consideration of the importance of the eyes, he moves in ascending order from signs of the nails and the feet to the head, then to those of color and complexion, hair over the whole body, movement of limbs and mode of walking, to a brief discussion of breathing and the use of the voice. Nor does he neglect that branch of the study by which various races are distinguished through differences of appearance and character. It is quite clear, likewise, that he could make use of physiognomy for the purpose of encomium and invective. His laudatory description of the Emperor Hadrian appears under the topic of the eyes. "For eyes," he says,⁵¹ "that are clear and shining are good, unless other signs corrupt them. . . . Of this type surely are the eyes of the Emperor Hadrian, . . . gleaming, moist, keen, large, full of light."

At the same time one reads his caustic description of the eyes of Favorinus of Arles, an intimate friend of Plutarch, and a sophist who likewise enjoyed the powerful patronage of Hadrian. This man came to Rome fairly early in his career, but he spent many years in Asia Minor. There a bitter quarrel arose between him and Polemo in Ionia, because the people of Ephesus favored Favorinus, and those of Smyrna, Polemo.⁵² Polemo, therefore, describes with utter contempt the physical weaknesses of a man who was from the land of the Celts.⁵³ He was lustful, says Polemo, and dissolute beyond all measure. His eyes belonged to the type found in the basest men, for when the eye is open, and possesses a brilliance such as that of marble, and when the vision is sharp, these signs, he declares, bespeak much shamelessness.⁵⁴ He

eyes of the Emperor Hadrian (Förster *SP* 1: p. 148): "sunt certe oculi Hadriani imperatoris huius generis nisi quod luminis pulchri pleni sunt atque charopī acres obtutu, cum inter homines visus non sit quisquam luminosiore praeditus oculo." See note 51, below.

⁴⁴ Philostr. *ibid.* 1, 533.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 1, 531.

⁴⁶ Despite the fact that Philostratus tells us that Polemo once turned the future emperor, at that time proconsul of all Asia, out of his house, Antoninus Pius apparently did not bear it against him. 1, 534.

⁴⁷ Fronto, *Ep.* 2, 5.

⁴⁸ Jüttner, p. 20.

⁴⁹ See the article by Josef Mesk, "Die Beispiele in Polemons Physiognomonik," in *Wiener Studien* 50 (1932): pp. 51-67.

⁵⁰ Mesk, "Die Beispiele in Polemons Physiognomonik," pp. 51-67. Among unnamed contemporaries the man from Qwrnyn (Pol. 138) is probably to be identified as Lusius Quietus, one of the consulars who plotted against Hadrian. See A. Von Premerstein, "Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian im Jahre 118 n. Chr.," *Klio Beiheft* 8 (1908): pp. 46-71; cf. a note by J. Carcopino, "Lusius Quietus l'homme de Qwrnyn," *Istros* 1 (1934): pp. 5-9,

to the effect that Qwrnyn is to be identified with either Cyrene or Cerne.

⁵¹ Pol. 148. The anonymous Latin handbook on physiognomy found in this statement in Förster *SP* 1; pp. 51-52: "unde intellegendum est optimos esse contrarios id est perlucidos oculos, si nullum extat aliud indicium quod impugnet. tales Palemon auctor refert fuisse oculos Hadriani imperatoris: χαροποιός, humidus, acres, magnos, luminis plenos." See note 43, above.

⁵² Philostr. *VS* 1, 8, 490. This quarrel continued in Rome.

⁵³ Pol. 160-162. The name of Favorinus is not mentioned, but he can be identified from Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 57-58: "oculi. . . a Palemone quidem auctore referuntur, qui eunuchum sui temporis fuisse hunc hominem descripsit. nomen quidem non posuit, intelligitur autem de Favorino eum dicere."

⁵⁴ Pol. 160: "ubi oculus apertus est habetque coruscationem qualem marmor habet, acie acuta, parum pudicitiae indicat."

then proceeds to attribute to Favorinus the pitiful physical characteristics of a eunuch.⁵⁵

Maximus of Tyre, one of the popular lecturers of the second century, reflects the general interest of the rhetorical and sophistic writers of this period in the subject of physiognomy, when he discusses the proper delivery of an oration:

But from the screeching of the eagle, or the roaring of the lion, though painful to the hearing, one may recognize the strength of that which produces the sound. If, therefore, the sound of a man may not prove to be more insignificant and weaker than the roaring of a lion and the screech of the eagle, will it not be worth while to hunt out by the hearing whether the sound comes from a nightingale, whose tongue is fragile and whose tone is ephemeral, or from an eagle, or some other animal, masculine and full of power? Zopyrus skilled in recognizing the character from what met the eyes when he surveyed the parts of the body, was able to prophesy from what was seen the nature of the soul, although by an obscure kind of foretelling, —yet the condition of the soul may be divined, [and] we must track out by hearing the character of the soul.⁵⁶

This passage, when considered in conjunction with the later descriptions of the sophists' appearance while speaking before the public, throws a good deal of light on the use of the principles of physiognomy in this group. Both Cicero and Quintilian saw an important connection between the idea that the countenance is the image of the mind and the proper training of the orator in *actio* and *pronuntiatio*.⁵⁷ Philostratus, whose *Vitae Sophistarum* was written in the early decades of the third century, devoted himself conscientiously to the great figures immediately preceding his generation, especially the contemporaries, Herodes Atticus and Polemo.⁵⁸ Of the latter he writes:

the scenic effects which he employed in his declamations we may learn from Herodes, since they are described in one of the letters that he wrote to Varus, and I will relate them from that source. He would come forward to declaim with a countenance serene and full of confidence. His utterance was clear and incisive, and there was a fine ringing sound in the tones of his voice.

Herodes says also that he used to rise to such a pitch of excitement that he would jump up from his chair when he came to the most striking part of his argument, and whenever he rounded off a period he would utter the final clause with a smile (*ὁν μειδιάματι*), as though to show clearly that he could deliver it without effort, and at certain places in the argument he would stamp the ground just like the horse in Homer.

⁵⁵ Lucian presents a similar description of this sophist in less caustic terms. *Demon.* 12–13; *Eun.* 7. Cf. Philostr. *VS* 1, 8, 489.

⁵⁶ 25.3 (ed. H. Hobein). It is of significance to note that Maximus of Tyre is probably to be identified with Cassius Maximus, the friend of Artemidorus, to whom he dedicated the first three books of the *Oneirocriticus*. See C. Blum, *Studies in the Dream-book of Artemidorus* (Upsala, 1936), p. 23, and cf. below pp. 73–74.

⁵⁷ Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 40–42.

⁵⁸ *VS* 1, 25, 37 (trans. W. C. Wright, throughout LCL). Cf. *Hom. Il.* 6, 507.

Polemo⁵⁹ contracted "his proud and haughty temper,"⁶⁰ we are told, from Timocrates, the philosopher, with whom he was associated for four years in Ionia, and whom he called "the father of my eloquence."⁶¹ That association may well have had an influence on Polemo's later physiognomical studies, as Timocrates early "devoted himself to the study of writings on medicine and was well versed in the theories of Hippocrates."⁶² Galen,⁶³ the great medical writer, is quoted as the main source of our knowledge that Hippocrates was regarded as the founder of the science of physiognomy.

Another reason for Polemo's interest in the field of physiognomy was surely Dio Chrysostom's avowed belief in the validity of its principles. Dio, the beloved teacher of Polemo, likewise enjoyed the devoted patronage of Hadrian. Of the various passages⁶⁴ that

⁵⁹ For other sophists contemporary with Polemo see the description of Favorinus while speaking. Philostr. *VS* 1, 8, 491. "When he delivered discourses in Rome, the interest in them was universally so much so that even those in his audience who did not understand the Greek language, shared in the pleasure that he gave; for he fascinated them by the tones of his voice, by his expressive glance and the rhythm of his speech." Cf. also *VS* 1, 25, 542. There is a brief description of Herodes Atticus *VS* 2, 1, 504. Scopelian, another teacher of Polemo, is skillfully delineated in Philostr. *VS* 1, 21, 519. This tendency to describe the appearance in public of sophists of this period is to be observed further: Marcus of Byzantium (Philostr. *VS* 1, 24, 528); Aristocles of Pergamum (*VS* 2, 3, 567); Varus of Perge (*VS* 2, 6, 576); Philagrus of Cilicia (*VS* 2, 8, 580 ff.); Adrian the Phoenician of Tyre (*VS* 2, 10, 587); Alexander of Seleucia (*VS* 2, 5, 570).

⁶⁰ Philostr. *VS* 1, 25, 535.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, *VS* 1, 25, 536.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Anim. Mor. Corp. Temp.* Kühn 4, 797–798. But see later p. 24.

⁶⁴ Passages in Dio suggesting the influence of physiognomy are: 7, 33; 8, 30; 30, 4; 31, 162; 32, 29; 32, 54; 32, 74; 33, 17; 49, 12; 62, 6; 63, 4. In the famous debate by Prodicus on Heracles at the Crossroads the description of Basileia and Tyrannis in Dio 1, 69–84 and the description of Virtue and Pleasure in Maximus of Tyre 14, 1 bespeak an interest in physical appearance as related to character. More important for our purpose is the fairly often quoted passage on certain citizens of Tarsus in Dio's First Tarsic Oration (33, 53) which obviously shows familiarity with the doctrines of the physiognomists and which is followed by the story of a man "who had made it his special business to recognize instantly the character of each individual and to be able to describe his qualities, and had never failed with any person" (trans. H. Lamar Crosby throughout, LCL). The account of the recognition of a cinaedus which directly follows this statement is also told in Diogenes Laertius, 7, 173, of Cleanthes, the Stoic philosopher, who was skilled in the art of physiognomy. Dio Chrysostom undoubtedly took his story from some Stoic source. Cf. also 33, 49–51. Finally we may mention Dio's portrait of himself (12, 15). In this great Olympic oration, dealing with man's first conception of God, Dio refers to himself as follows: "But notwithstanding I declare to you . . . great as is your number you have been eager to hear a man who is neither handsome in appearance nor strong, and in age is already past his prime, one who has no disciple . . . but who simply wears his hair long" (trans. J. W. Cohoon throughout, LCL). Cf. *Orationes* 35, 2 and 72, 2, where Dio refers in derisive tones to long hair as the mark of the philosopher. In connection with 35, 3 Dio declares: "However, I fear that fools get no good from their

might be cited from Dio's speeches that are pertinent to the subject, I should like to call attention to one in particular. In the fourth oration⁶⁵ on Kingship, Alexander the Great is represented as conversing with Diogenes on the subject of the real king and the cleverness of artists in depicting their subjects. Dio continues: "Let us then show ourselves to be no whit worse or less competent in the field of discourse than they (the artists) in their several arts, as we mould and depict the characters of the three spirits of the three lives," namely the three prevailing types of lives which the majority adopt (the first, luxurious and self-indulgent; the second, acquisitive and avaricious; the third, conspicuous and disordered, loving honor and glory)—

therein displaying an accomplishment the reverse of and complementary to the skill and prophetic art of the physiognomists, as they call them, these men who can determine and announce a man's character from his shape and appearance; while we propose to draw from a man's habits and acts, a type and shape, that will match the physiognomists' work.

Polemo seems to have eclipsed in reputation Loxus and all other ancient authorities on the subject save Aristotle, and to have received the highest acclaim among later writers. Unfortunately none of our manuals on physiognomy is completely preserved. A brief summary of the topics treated in Polemo's seventy chapters follows:

The first chapter deals with physiognomy and the signs of the eyes (Förster *SP* 1, 107–170). Chapter II discusses the likenesses which exist between man and other animals, four-footed creatures, birds, and those that creep on the ground, and in what respect there is distinction between the male and female. It is not possible to see any human being, for whom there is not a likeness in nature to a beast. He deals with some ninety-two animals, including the horse, the ass, the ox, the deer, the lion, the dog, the monkey, the goose, the wolf, the tortoise, the snake, the owl, the peacock, and the cock, and their characteristics (*SP* 170–198). Chapters III–XXX considers the physiognomical significance of III, the signs of the nails; IV, the fingers; V, the feet; VI, the signs between the ankles and the shins; VII, the signs of the shins; VIII, the knees; IX, the signs of the loins and thighs; X, the signs of the hip-bones; XI, the signs of the back; XII, the signs of the bending of the back; XIII, the signs of the sides; XIV, the stomach;

long hair, not even if they get shaggy to the very heart—as in the case of Aristomenes, the Messenian, who caused a great deal of trouble for the Spartans, and who, though taken captive many times, always managed to escape from them—he, we are told, when at last he met his death, was found to be in that condition" (trans. H. Lamar Crosby throughout, LCL). The physiognomical interpretation of the hairy heart is to be found in Pliny the Elder, *HN* 11, 184–185, where it is stated that such people are exceptionally brave and resolute, and the same story is told of Aristomenes.

⁶⁵ 4, 87–88.

XV, the signs of the space between the navel and the chest; XVI, the signs of the chest; XVII, the breasts; XVIII, the space between the shoulder blades and shoulders; XIX, the signs of the space between the collar bone, and the chest; XX, the signs of the shoulder blades; XXI, the signs of the upper arm and the forearm; XXII, the signs of the hands; XXIII, the neck; XXIV, the chin; XXV, the mouth and lips; XXVI, the nose; XXVII, the signs of the space between the eyes; XXVIII, the signs of the face and forehead; XXIX, the ears; XXX, the head (*SP* 198–236). At Chapter XXX, the treatment shifts to: XXXI, the nations of the world; XXXII, the appearance of northern people; XXXIII, the southern people; XXXIV, the eastern and western people; XXXV, the "pure" Greek race (*SP* 236–244).

At Chapter XXXVI Polemo turns to the color of the whole body and continues with the subject of color through Chapter XXXIX (*SP* 244–248), including XXXVII, the color of the chest and its signs; XXXVIII, the color of the face and its signs; XXXIX, the color of the pupil and its signs. At Chapter XL, he takes up hair and its signs; XLI, the color of hair and its signs; XLII, the amount of hair on the shins; XLIII, the signs of hair on the hips and the thighs; XLIV, hair on the chest and the stomach; XLV, hair on the shoulders and the parts in between; XLVI, hair on the body; XLVII, the amount of hair from neck to head; XLVIII, hair on the eyebrows (*SP* 248–256). At Chapter XLIX he treats briefly the signs of the movements of individual limbs; L, walking, pace, and gesticulation; LI, breathing; LII, the voice (*SP* 248–268). The rest of the treatise (Chapters LIII–LXX: *SP* 268–292) is concerned with the signs of various types of men; LIII, a robust, daring man; LIV, a timid man; LV, a man devoted to literature and philosophy; LVI, a man lacking zeal and curiosity; LVII, a shameless man; LVIII, a man delighting in apparel and head dress; LIX, a judicious and prudent man; LX, a man very sad and downcast; LXI, an androgynous and effeminate man; LXII, a modest man, LXIII, a jeering man; LXIV, a man loving to collect money; LXV, a spiteful and foolish man; LXVI, a man of bitter mind; LXVII, a man close to the end of life without apparent disease; LXVIII, the sign of a man over whom evil and calamity unexpectedly hang; LXIX, the mark of women toward any man who is alien to love; LXX, the sign of a man pretending great calamities before any of them have touched him.

Chapter XXXV dealing with the Greeks and their "pure" race is characteristic of Polemo's discussion of ethnographical physiognomy. No other "race" is mixed with them. The "pure" Greek is of moderate and erect stature, of fair face with light complexion mixed with red; he is lean with hands and elbows of moderate size, watchful, quick to learn, with medium-sized head, with thickness and strength in the neck,

soft reddish hair, not only curly, but combed and straight, with a square countenance, thin lips, a moderate straight nose, moist, shining eyes, which move quickly and contain much light. Likewise the man devoted to literature and philosophy (Chapter LV) has much in common with the pure, idealized Greek. He is of moderate and erect stature, of fair complexion mixed with red, his hair verging on yellow, neither curly nor shaggy, his build compact, with neither too much nor too little flesh, strong calves, thighs, and shins, full arms, strong and long and well-spaced fingers, a large face not, however, thin, with tightly drawn skin and with moist and shining eyes, filled with joy. Such then is the range of Polemo's handbook.

In the fourth century we find a marked renewal of interest in the field. While the subject may not have enjoyed the popularity in this century that it attained in the second century A.D., there are clear indications that it was received with more widespread attention then in the third. The growing concern with the subject may be correlated with, and, to a certain extent, explained by trends and development of the period. In the first place, there was the appearance of a new handbook and technical treatises (including medical treatises to be handled in Chapter VIII) on the subject. In the second place, we find certain historians such as Ammianus Marcellinus taking a decided interest in the principles of physiognomy and making use of them in their writings. Curiously enough, the Emperor Julian, who is the subject of physiognomical interpretation by Ammianus, used certain descriptive procedures in his own compositions. And finally, there was the growing attention given to physiognomics by the Church Fathers.

Among the authors of technical handbooks the first to concern us is a certain Adamantius whose treatise, *Physiognomonica*, purports to be derived in part from the Peripatetic manual, but is rather more a paraphrase in popular style of Polemo's tract of the second century. Who this Adamantius was, and what were his exact dates we have no way of knowing for certain. He has been identified as a Jewish physician and sophist, mentioned by Socrates⁶⁶ in his *Ecclesiastical History*, in which he is described as having fled from Alexandria, during the conflict in that city between Christians and Jews, and then, after professing Christianity, returning to Alexandria and residing there. Libanius in his extensive correspondence addresses a number of letters to a certain Adamantius.

There were several individuals bearing this name who have been identified by Seeck,⁶⁷ but no one of these people can be reasonably identified with the physiognomist nor does he seem to be the Adamantius, addressed by Gregory of Nazianzus, who appears to have been a teacher in Athens.⁶⁸ Förster⁶⁹ has supplied us with certain essential information about this man. The first fact is that he is a pagan,⁷⁰ and probably the author of a work on winds,⁷¹ which shows the influence of Peripatetic meteorology, in addition to his above-mentioned work on physiognomy. The second fact brought out by Förster is that, since Oribasius, Julian's physician, cites him several times in his medical encyclopaedia (which incidentally is our second major source for formal physiognomical material in this period), the person referred to in the dedication of the Adamantius handbook as "beloved Constantius" probably lived in the first half of the fourth century. He has been taken to be Constantius II, emperor from 337 to 361, but Förster argues⁷² that it is not the emperor to whom Adamantius addresses his little work, pointing out that so familiar a dedication would not be appropriate. Förster proposes instead that it might be a friend, such as the "most dear of my friends" in the *De Ventis*. There is general agreement that the handbook belongs in the fourth century.

The tract of Adamantius is divided into two books, the first of which deals exclusively with the eyes, the second with various parts of the body, and then with the shapes (*εἶδη*) of different types of men. Adamantius states at the outset that he is following the method employed by Aristotle and is paraphrasing the book of Polemo. Actually the work is an epitome of Polemo's treatment, not a paraphrase, and the characteristic Aristotelian use of comparison between men and animals in the matter of physique and nature is mentioned but not developed. Adamantius points out the importance in physiognomy of regional differences and the need of considering the changes attributable to age and the nature of the locality.

He emphasizes also at the outset that the most effective method of analysis comes from a study of a mixture of signs. The basic signs, such, for example, as those marking the angry man, even if they are not always apparent, nevertheless designate him as "passionate."⁷³ Above all, the eyes are important.⁷⁴ In this emphasis he follows Polemo. His introductory

⁶⁶ For two important recent studies on the fourth century A.D. see E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (Cambridge, 1965), Wiles Lectures given at the Queen's University, Belfast, in 1963; essays edited by Arnaldo Momigliano, entitled *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1963), delivered at the Warburg Institute in 1958-1959. Cf. Socrates 7, 13. Migne PG 67, 760-765. See Förster, SP 1, prolegomena, p. c. This event presumably took place in A.D. 415 under the patriarch Cyril.

⁶⁷ O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius* (Leipzig, 1906), esp. p. 48.

⁶⁸ Ep. 235. Migne PG 37, 377.

⁶⁹ Förster, SP 1: prolegomena, pp. c-cix.

⁷⁰ Adamantius, Förster, SP 1: p. 297. The title of the physiognomical tract indicates clearly the author as Adamantius Sophistes.

⁷¹ V. Rose, *Anecdota Graeca et Graeco-latina* (Berlin, 1864-1870) pp. 25-48.

⁷² Förster, 1: prolegomena, p. ciii.

⁷³ Förster, 1: pp. 301-303.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

statement on eyes that are moist and shining, as drops of water, which indicate upright character, stems directly from Polemo's familiar description of Hadrian's eyes.⁷⁵ He proceeds from eyes that are moist to those that are mobile and suggestive of treachery, to those of varied colors such as gray or shining, and to eyes that are hollow set or protruding, blinking, winking, laughing or straining, glistening and sharp. In one respect Adamantius' treatment of this topic differs quite noticeably from that of Polemo. Except for his mention of Alexander the Great,⁷⁶ or Socrates, there is complete omission of examples drawn from the past. In other words, we do not find immediate practical application for these physiognomical observations. Another fact to be observed is the absence of the reasons⁷⁷ why the characteristics, which Adamantius carefully lists, are indicative of certain types of character.

The second book of Adamantius treats in detail the parts of the body and their significance, dwells on the "Hellenic form," and then turns to the physique of the brave, the timid, the shameless, the gentle, the greedy, the devotee of dice, the foolishly malicious, and various other types. The treatise provides, in short, a kind of checklist of familiar types, and again in the second part shows no effort to relate the material to the contemporary scene. References to animal parallelisms occur, especially in the proemium to the book. In the same introduction Adamantius mentions the forehead, the nose, the mouth, the cheeks, and the head itself as being near the eyes, and therefore highly significant physiognomically. Next in importance are the signs which are found on the neck and chest. Following these, in declining importance, are the signs to be found on the shoulders, hand, legs and feet. Least in importance are those to be found around the stomach. Under the topic of color and hair he deals briefly with regional differences in which he follows Polemo closely. In his chapter on the Greek people he states that those who preserve most closely the Hellenic and Ionic features are tall men, broad, upright, well built, of rather light complexion, tinged with red, moderately fleshy, straight-legged, with well-formed extremities. The head is of moderate size and flexible, the neck powerful, hair yellow and soft, slightly curly, the face square, the lips thin, the nose straight, eyes moist and gleaming with much light in them. For among all people the Greeks have the best eyes. In short, they represent the leonine type of man, which according to the Aristotelian manual is the best type of all. If we do not find in the fourth century the repeated use of the comparison between men and animals so characteristic of the earlier handbook, at least we find in this ethnic description of the Greek

race the lineal descendant of the Aristotelian leonine man.⁷⁸

The second formal treatise of this period dealing with the ideas of the physiognomists is an anonymous *Physiognomonica Latina*,⁷⁹ attributed for many years to Apuleius.⁸⁰ But the tract belongs probably to a later period, possibly to the latter part of the third, or more likely, to the fourth century after Christ,⁸¹ and is the compilation of an unknown author. The writer states at the outset that he has derived his material from three predecessors Loxus, Aristotle, and Polemo⁸²: "ex tribus auctoribus quorum libros prae manu habui, Loxi medici, Aristotelis philosophi, Polemonis declamatoris, qui de physiognomonica scripserunt, ea elegi quae ad primam institutionem huius rei pertinent et quae facilius intelligantur." Actually, as Förster has demonstrated, the work depends principally on Polemo and on Loxus, and draws to a much less extent on the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook. The anonymous author points out that all the material concerning the many signs drawn from the head, and including an analysis of complexion, approximately one-half of the work, together with the treatment of various types of men, from the *vir fortis* to the fool, is derived from the sophist. This version of Polemo, though briefer, agrees in the main with that of the Arabic translator and with that of Adamantius.⁸³ His indebtedness to Polemo is revealed in the particular attention paid to the eyes, in which, he says, *summa omnis physiognomoniae constituta est*. His analysis of types of men includes the familiar timid creature, the *vir ingeniosus*, the fellow without sense, the shameless type, the temperate and moderate *vir*, the *homo securus*, the *homo tristis*, the androgynous, the bitter and litigious, the gentle nature, the ironic character, the greedy, the lustful and the man inclined to pantomimes and gaming. It is obvious that the compilation contains certain repetitions of types along with details not included in the first analysis, as in the case of the *ingenium mansuetum*. The writer, furthermore, has put his material together in a hasty fashion, and has not given it a final revision.⁸⁴ In the types of characters the collator has drawn from Aristotle as well as Polemo, and appears to have had access to a fuller version of the two Pseudo-Aristotelian tractates than

⁷⁸ 809b.

⁷⁹ Förster, *SP* 2: pp. 1-145, and 1: prolegomena, pp. cxxxi-xclv.

⁸⁰ *De Anim.* 1, 203: "et tales referuntur ab Apuleio fuisse oculi Socratis quem Apollo prudentissimum pronuntiavit," quoting a passage from 2, 49, 32: "tales existimantur oculi Socratis philosophi fuisse, quem Apollo Pythius prudentissimum pronuntiavit."

⁸¹ Förster, *op. cit.* 1: pp. cxl-cxlv. Cf. E. Kelter, *Apulei quae fertur physiognomonica quando composita sit* (Kiel, 1880), *passim*.

⁸² Förster, *SP* 2: pp. 3, 1.

⁸³ Misener, "Loxus," pp. 1-22, esp. 3.

⁸⁴ See Förster *SP* 1: pp. cxxxii-cxxxiii for a full discussion of the matter.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 328. Socrates, 327.

⁷⁷ A fact which Galen deplored, *Mixt.* 2, 6 (Kühn 1, 624).

are now extant.⁸⁵ The *Physiognomonica Latina*⁸⁶ has three main sections for the study of physiognomy: the first is concerned with an analysis of the masculine and feminine types; the second has to do with ethnological physiognomy, and the third takes up the Aristotelian parallelisms of men and animals. The author does not include contemporary examples as illustrations of his points, save to quote Polemo's *exempla*,⁸⁷ or to mention such important figures as Alexander.⁸⁸ Like Adamantius he follows⁸⁹ a plan of dealing with the most significant signs physiognomically located in the head, then those in the rest of the body, the stomach being least important.

The plan which the author has pursued is this⁹⁰: "Nunc repetenda ut supra proposuimus, quae proprie Loxus seu Aristoteles posuerunt vel aliter interpretati sunt, quamvis etiam locis suis aliqua adiunximus. Quae enim Palemon (*sic*) dixit et consentanea sunt reliquis auctoribus, propemodum prosecuti sumus." When this work draws upon the Aristotelian handbook it does so in terms of paraphrase rather than direct quotation, but its importance "lies in the fact that it was the only form in which any portion of Aristotelian or Pseudo-Aristotelian biology was available to the readers of Latin texts before the translation of Gerald of Cremona in the twelfth century."⁹¹ The largest section derived from Loxus comprises a discussion of zoological physiognomy,⁹² wherein men show likenesses to animals in appearance and behavior. It is not our intention to discuss the Loxian theories of physiognomy here, since they have been treated under material belonging to the third century B.C., but it is important to observe that, apart from one mention of his name in Origen,⁹³ the inclusion of substantial excerpts from Loxus in this late Latin treatise is our only notable source for his work. It is the Latin compiler who makes it clear that Loxus stands apart from the other physiognomists in his consideration of the seat of the soul. The attempt of the "Latin collator to fuse three books into one does not lead to a precise reconstruction of the work of Loxus,"⁹⁴ but it is helpful to some understanding of his views.

⁸⁵ Misener, *ibid.*, p. 3.

⁸⁶ Förster, *ibid.* 2: pp. 5–15.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 2: pp. 43, 50, 52, 57–58, 145.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 2: p. 50.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 2: pp. 61–63.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 2: p. 108. 2: pp. 111–118, 83–88. It is a kind of summary of points chosen at random from Pseudo-Aristotle to fill out the statements drawn from Polemo.

⁹¹ S. D. Wingate, *The Mediaeval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus, with special reference to the biological works* (London, 1931), p. 8.

⁹² 2: pp. 137–143, 118–131.

⁹³ *Contra Celsum* 1, 33.

⁹⁴ Misener, "Loxus," p. 22.

II. PHILOSOPHY AND MEDICINE

In this second chapter we propose to consider the extent of the importance attached by the philosophers and writers on medicine to the general subject of physiognomics and to demonstrate as far as possible the reasons for their special interest in the subject.

Closely associated with the general field of physiognomy and explanatory of many of its principles is the theory of the humors.¹ This theory is concerned, of course, with the relation of the physique of a man to his character and temperament. The humors² constitute the fluids of body, blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile. The ideal situation exists when a proper *krasis* or blending of these humors and a right balance of the fluids are maintained. If one predominates, then the man is regarded as sanguine (blood dominant) or phlegmatic (yellow bile dominant), and specific physical and mental characteristics become assigned to each mixture, and good health (*εὐκρασία*) is determined by the right *krasis* or, as the Romans translated the word mixture, *temperamentum*.³ The fluids able to produce the desired balance were thought of also as composed of four primary qualities, combined in pairs, such as warm, cold, dry, and moist. Thus blood was hot and moist, phlegm cold and moist, yellow bile warm and dry, black bile cold and dry. To Alcmaeon of Croton (*ca.* 500 B.C.), the distinguished physician associated with the Pythagorean School, is ascribed the beginning of this theory of the humors, in that he seems to have been the first man to apply the term to the idea of a blending in the body. Health, he maintained, was the equality (*ισονομία*) of such combinations as wet-dry, cold-hot, but the single rule (*μοναρχία*) or predominance of one among them caused disease⁴: "Health is the harmonious mixture of the qualities." From the period of Alcmaeon and Hippocrates to the

¹ See the recent article by G. E. Lloyd, "The Hot and the Cold, the Dry and the Wet in Greek Philosophy," *JHS* 84 (1964): pp. 92–106.

² See J. Van Wageningen, "De Quattuor Temperamentis," *Mnemos*, N.S., 46 (1918): pp. 374–382. Cf. H. Diels-Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (3 v., 6th ed., Berlin, 1951–52), *passim*. The recent distinguished work of Raymond Klibansky, Erwin Panofsky, and Fritz Saxl on *Saturn and Melancholy* (New York, 1964) discusses the notion of melancholy and its historical development in Chapter I (pp. 3–66) in the physiological literature of the ancients, with specific reference to melancholy as an illness and melancholy in the system of the four temperaments. The authors take issue with the theory of Van Wageningen as to the formulation of the "character types" in the work of Honorius of Autun (i.e. William of Conches), and believe that they were already "firmly established among the ninth-century Arabic astrologers" (see pp. 18–19 of this chapter). Cf. also Hellmut Flashar, *Melancholie und Melancholiker* (Berlin, 1966) on the medical theories of the ancients.

³ Col. 3, 12: "opus est, inquit, inter has tam diversas inaequalitates magno temperamento, quod in corporibus quoque nostris desideratur, quorum bona valetudo calidi et frigidi, umidi et aridi, densi et rari certo et quasi examinato malo continetur."

⁴ Diels, *ibid.* 1, 4 (trans. K. Freeman).

time of Adamantius of Alexandria and Oribasius, Julian's physician, in the fourth century of our era, the names of the great doctors of antiquity are repeatedly associated with the theories of physiognomy, of which humoral psychology is an important part. Parmenides⁵ adopted the ideas of Alcmaeon on health and transferred them to the condition of mind by declaring that the keenness of the mind consisted in a certain mixture of warm and cold: "For according as the hot or the cold predominates does the understanding vary, there being a better and purer understanding derived from the hot."

Empedocles,⁶ accepting the proposition of the four elements or primary substances, earth, air, fire, and water, set forth his theory of mixture more fully than his predecessors, believing that the seat of the brain and of the soul was in the blood. If the elements were more loosely connected, the nature of man became slow and inclined to sloth, if more dense, then the motion became more rapid and the action increased.

We are indebted to Theophrastus' *De Sensibus* for an analysis of Empedocles' theory as it applies to both sense perception and thought. Empedocles argues that in so far as the *krasis* in a given part lies in even balance, then the person is skilled in that area. For this reason some are clever speakers, others fine artisans, according as the proper mixture lies in the tongue or in the hands. And this obtains for other capacities as well. Theophrastus, however, is inclined to deny the truth of this proposition, maintaining that the tongue is merely the instrument and not the basis of eloquence and the hands, the instrument, are not the basis of craftsmanship. It is the person himself, asserts Theophrastus, who controls the tongue or the hands, and is the source of human genius. People are not mechanically intelligent merely because the mingled elements of the blood are of the same amount, neither too widely separated nor too small nor too large. Yet this view is essential to Empedocles' theory that we "think chiefly with the blood, since in it the elements are best mixed together."

The Hippocratic School⁷ accepted the idea that the

⁵ Diels, *ibid.* 1, 226, 3; Theophrastus *De Sensibus* 3-4.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1, 201, 22; Theophr. 10-13; See G. M. Stratton, *Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle* (London, 1917), pp. 66-151, for text and translation and commentary on this work.

⁷ *Nat. Hom.* 4. I use the name of Hippocrates in referring to the corpus of the Hippocratic School. For recent discussions of Greek medicine see Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture* (New York, 1944), translated by G. Highet, 3: pp. 3-35, esp. p. 32. "Greek Medicine and Paideia"; Charles Singer, "Medicine" in the *Legacy of Greece*, ed. by R. W. Livingstone (Oxford, 1928), pp. 201-248. The most important recent work on the Hippocratic corpus is that of Ludwig Edelstein, *Περὶ Ἀέρων und Die Sammlung der Hippokratischen Schriften, Problemata*, Heft 4 (Berlin, 1931); *ibid.*, "The Genuine Works of Hippocrates"; *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 7, 1 (1939): pp. 236-248. *The Nature of Man* is of vital importance in the Hippocratic corpus since it was ascribed to Polybus, son-in-law and successor of Hippocrates. It is the only systematic work in

body contains four humors and that the presence of good health or disease depends on the way they are mixed. While the Hippocratics hold that the condition of the mind is connected with the state of the body, they are not the first to postulate the four-fold division of the humors with their accompanying names. Aristotle⁸ is said to have been the first to advance this proposition and to have done so in order to explain the melancholy man. Galen,⁹ the physician of the second century A.D., worked out in further detail the scheme of temperaments determined by the humors, save for phlegm, "which," he believes, "does not contribute to the formation of character."

The terms *melancholici*, *phlegmatici*, *choleric*, and *sanguinei* were applied in the ninth century to the types of men produced by the humors of the body. This use of the terms appears in the writings of Johannitius (Honein ibn Ishak), the great Arab physician, who translated the works of Galen into Arabic. A man generally referred to as Honorius of Autun is said by Van Wageningen to have transferred the names introduced by Johannitius to descriptions of human character. Van Wageningen cites in this connection a passage from Honorius, *De philosophia mundi*:

Verbi gratia, homo naturaliter calidus et humidus, et inter quattuor qualitates temperatus, sed quia corrumpitur natura, contingit illas in illo intendi et remitti. si vero in aliquo intendatur calor et remittatur humiditas, dicitur *cholericus*, id est calidus et siccus, non est sine humiditate tamen. sin vero in aliquo intensus sit humor, calor vero remissus, dicitur *phlegmaticus*. sin autem intensa sit siccitas, remissus calor, *melancholicus*. sin vero aequaliter insunt, dicitur *sanguineus*—sed quia hoc a Johannitio in Isagogis satis dictum est.¹⁰

the corpus to deal with the theory of the humors. The treatise may be in part the work of Polybus, though as a whole it lacks unity. The section dealing with the humors presents the theory that the blood is not the only constituent element in the body, but rather four items, blood, phlegm, yellow bile, black bile. A state of health is a state of salubrious balance among these items, and any deviation from this balance inevitably causes pain and disease. The writer—Polybus—believes that while proper mixture ("krasis") is essential to health, these elements are susceptible of change and imbalance according to the seasons. This view, of course, directly relates to the work on *Airs, Waters, and Places*, which is concerned not so much with the temperament or mixture at certain seasons as with the nature of climate and the seasons to be found within the several climates.

⁸ Cf. T. C. Allbutt, *Greek Medicine in Rome* (London, 1921), p. 296. But see especially the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* 30, 1, 953a-955a.

⁹ *Nat. Fac.* 2, 9 (cf. Kühn 15, 325) and K. Freeman, *Companion to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers* (Cambridge [Mass.], 1959), p. 372 and note 1 (trans. Freeman). See Klibansky, Panofsky, and Saxl, *Saturn and Melancholy*. pp. 57-66, especially 58 on this point, and the text of Galen in Förster *SP* 2: pp. 283-299.

¹⁰ 4, 20 (Migne, *PL* 172, 93). The passage continues: "Choleric namque longi et graciles, longi ex calore et graciles ex siccitate. sanguinei vero propter calorem longi, pingues propter humiditatem. phlegmatici vero propter frigiditatem parvi, propter humiditatem grossi. melancholici autem propter siccitatem graciles, propter frigiditatem breves. istae naturales proprietates saepe variantur ex accidente. nam choleric et melan-

The *De philosophia mundi*, however, is generally accepted as the work of William of Conches,¹¹ of the School of Chartres, teacher of John of Salisbury and one of the "most accomplished scholars of the twelfth century." This idea of the identification of men by their specific dominant humors is included by Johannitius in his *Isagoge ad parvam artem Galeni*, and perhaps reached the hands of William of Conches through such a Latin translation as that of Constantinus Africanus,¹² the first great translator from Arabic into Latin.

As we have said, Galen is our principal authority for the fact that the divine Hippocrates really established the study of physiognomy as a science. He¹³ is purported to have quoted Hippocrates, saying that "in those who practice medicine without a knowledge of the science of physiognomy, the judgment goes to seed, wallowing in darkness." In his quotation from Hippocrates, however, it is in ethnological physiognomy that Galen shows his predominant interest. He is, for instance, strongly influenced by what is the earliest known treatise on the subject, the essay on *Airs, Waters, and Places*,¹⁴ a work which appeared about 400 B.C., and is concerned with the influence of physical environment on health, disease, and temperament.

The author of this essay divides his work into two parts. The first eleven chapters deal with the relation of climate to health, the second part with the influence of climate upon character. Attention is called, for instance, to the effect of hot and cold winds upon the inhabitants of cities lying towards the rising of the sun. This is a highly important circumstance in view of the fact that such people are likely to be healthier than those facing the north winds.¹⁵ They are of a better complexion and more "blooming" (*ἀνθηρά*) unless illness, as is generally the case, prevents this; they are also "clear-voiced," and endowed with better temper and intelligence than people living in the north.

cholici vel ex otio, vel comestione sunt pingues; sanguinei et phlegmatici ex abstinencia, vel labore graciles."

¹¹ M. Manitius, P. Lehmann, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1911-1931) 3, 2: pp. 216-217. Nevertheless in Honorius' work, *De imagine mundi*, a passage relevant to the present discussion occurs: 2, 59 (De homine microcosmo). For this reference I am indebted to the late Professor Eva M. Sanford of Sweet Briar College.

¹² Cf. C. H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (2nd ed., Cambridge [Mass.] 1927), p. 39; Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, (8 v., New York 1923-1958) 1: pp. 742-759 on Constantinus Africanus (ca. 1015-1087). In Max Meyerhof's analysis of Honein's translations from Greek into Syriac and Arabic is listed the translation of *De temperamentis* and *Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur*; "New Light on Hunain Ibn Ishaq and his Period," *Isis* 8 (1926): pp. 685-724, esp. p. 701.

¹³ In a work wrongly attributed to Galen, *Prognost. de Decubitu* (Kühn 19, 530).

¹⁴ See H. O. Taylor, *Greek Biology and Medicine* (Boston, 1922), pp. 25-26.

¹⁵ *Aër*. 5 (trans. W. R. S. Jones throughout, LCL).

Hippocrates' work deals not only with the effect upon a community of the kinds of winds that blow upon it but also with the way different peoples, living in different areas, are diversely affected by the changes in seasons or climate; and how the peoples of Europe and Asia differ from each other, those in Europe producing warlike and fierce inhabitants. "Asia differs very widely from Europe in the nature of its inhabitants and all its vegetation. Whereas everything in Asia grows to far greater beauty and size, and one region is less wild than the other, the character of its inhabitants is milder and more gentle."¹⁶ The cause of this is the *krasis* or blending of the seasons. With regard to the lack of spirit and of courage among the inhabitants, the chief reason why Asiatics are less warlike and more gentle in character than Europeans is the uniformity of the seasons, which show no violent changes either toward heat or toward cold, but are equable.

"Inhabitants of a region which is mountainous, rugged, high, and (not) well watered, where the changes of seasons exhibit sharp contrasts," maintains Hippocrates,¹⁷

are likely to be of big physique, with a nature well adapted for endurance and courage, and such possess not a little wildness and ferocity. The inhabitants of hollow regions that are meadowy, stifling, with more hot than cold winds, and where the water is hot, will be neither tall nor well made, but inclined to be broad, fleshy, and dark-haired; they are dark rather than fair, less subject to phlegm than to bile. Similarly bravery and endurance are not by nature part of their character, but the imposition of law can produce them artificially. . . . You will discover in general assimilated to the nature of the land both the physique and characteristics of the inhabitants.

Thus, where

the land is bare,¹⁸ waterless, rough, oppressed by the winter's storms and burnt by the sun, there you will see men who are hard, lean, well articulated, well braced and hairy. Such natures will be found energetic, vigilant, stubborn, and independent in character and temper, wild rather than tame, of more than average sharpness and intelligence in the arts, and in war of more than average courage.

These observations from the Hippocratic corpus coincide in date with the end of the fifth century, and mark the climax of a magnificent epoch in medicine.¹⁹

¹⁶ 12. Cf. 16.

¹⁷ 2, 24.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ See F. B. Lund, *Greek Medicine* (New York, 1936), pp. 1-8. In philosophical works other than the *De Legibus* (see pp. 42-43) Cicero treats the subject of physiognomics in the light of the "milieu" theory or, in other words, from the strictly ethnological point of view important in the examination of various societies. His views (*Div.* 1, 36, 79; 2, 16, 42; 2, 46, 96; *Nat. Deor.* 2, 16, 17; *Fat.* 4, 7; 5, 9. See A. S. Pease, Cicero, *De Divinatione* [Urbana, 1920] note ad 1, 36, 79.) embracing the proposition that some areas are healthful, and some pestilential for inhabitants are essentially those of the Hippocratic corpus and Greek philosophy represented in particular by Plato (*Div.* 2, 42, 98; 2, 45, 89). It is climate, rather than the aspect of the

It has been objected that the conclusions presented in *Airs, Waters, and Places* are somewhat dogmatic in nature and are not supported by the evidence on which they are supposed to be based. While this may be true in detail, there is the overall value of the principle that "geographical conditions and climate influence health"²⁰ and human nature and appearance in the history of ethnographical physiognomy.

As for Plato, while he believes that good health depends on the humors and their proper mixture, he does not attempt to attribute the character of a man to these elements. In the *Timaeus*²¹ he expresses his con-

moon and the stars, that is the vital factor, according to the Hippocratic and related schools of thought, in explaining why the Indians and Persians differ in appearance from the Aethiopians and the Syrians.

While the influence of the moon and the stars in this connection was not uncommonly proclaimed in astrology (to which we shall return later) the contention of the astrologically minded Chaldaeans that the characteristics and appearance of children are determined not by heredity but by the phases of the moon seems to Cicero incredible insanity. Writing in a similar vein only a few years after Cicero, Vitruvius (*De Arch.* 6, 1, 3; 6, 1, 6 [after F. Granger throughout, LCL]) architect of Rome under Augustus, follows closely the familiar theories of the *De Divinatione* in the analysis of types of people according to regions and climates, and the consequent rich content of the blood. Thus those of the north possess large stature, light complexion, straight red hair, blue eyes, and are full of blood, by reason of the moisture and the coldness of their country. Those near the equator are short, dark-complexioned, curly-haired, black-eyed, with weak legs and a deficiency of blood. The lack of blood makes them timid in battle, but able to endure excessive heat without fear, whereas the northerners are fearful of contracting fevers, but because of their abundance of blood are undaunted in battle. By reason of the clarity of atmosphere (*ibid.* 6, 1, 9-12) and intense heat the southern people are readier and quicker in expedients, but the opposite holds true for the north men, oppressed by a heavy atmosphere and cold moist air, and they are of duller intellect. The Roman people, being placed by nature in the center of Italy, and thus in the middle of the earth, not subject to sharp variations of climate, excel in strength of body and mental vigor. And for this reason they have been able to repress the inroads of the barbarians by astuteness, and the strategies of the southern nations they have overcome by strength. (This view is comparable to one expressed by Aristotle with reference to Greece.) By the divine will of nature, Vitruvius goes on to say, Rome has been given the right to command the whole world through the excellence of her location. In conclusion Vitruvius reverts to the subject of the climate prevailing in different countries and to the effect of the climate on the physical stature and mental characteristics of the inhabitants. The determinative influence of climates was of natural interest to Vitruvius as an architect as affecting men's dwelling places and the arrangement of buildings suitable to proper living.

²⁰ Hippocrates 1, 66, LCL. See Edelstein, "Genuine books of Hippocrates" for the authorship of the Hippocratic corpus. No Hippocratic works can be regarded as "genuine." Other passages from the Hippocratic collection deal with specific physiognomic signs: *Epidem.* 2, 5, 1; 5, 16; 5, 23; 2, 6, 1; 6.4, 19; 6, 14. See also Förster, *SP* 2: pp. 246-249. *The Nature of Man* is likewise dated around 400 B.C. and mentioned by Aristotle in the *Historia Animalium* 3, 3, 512b. See G. Sarton, *A History of Science* (Cambridge [Mass.], 1952) 1: p. 368. Cf. especially chapters 4 and 5 of this treatise.

²¹ 86a (trans. B. Jowett throughout).

viction that the humors are important for the equilibrium of the body:

Where the acid and briny phlegm and other bitter and bilious humors wander over the body and find no exit or escape, but are pent up within and mingle their own vapours with the motions of the soul and are blended with them, they produce all sorts of diseases, more or fewer, and in every degree of intensity, and being carried to the three places of the soul, whichever they severally assail, they create infinite varieties of ill temper and melancholy, of rashness and cowardice, and also of forgetfulness and stupidity.

While this humoral theory is, of course, fully accepted by Aristotle and later writers, Plato here does not go beyond the earlier notions of Alcmaeon and Parmenides. Eryximachus in the *Symposium*²² speaks of the elements of hot and cold, moist and dry, "if they retain the temperate love of one another and blend in chastened harmony, they bring to men and animals and plants health and plenty and do them no harm." Similarly the familiar ideas of the Hippocratic *Airs, Waters, and Places* are reflected in the *Laws*.²³

We must not fail to observe that there is a difference in places, and that some beget better men and others worse; and we must legislate accordingly. Some places are subject to strong and fatal influences by reason of diverse winds, or again, from the character of the food given by the earth, which not only affects the bodies of men for good or evil, but produces similar results in their souls.

Among the Scythians one man becomes a philosopher, at Athens many are such. Among the Abderites are many stupid people, but few at Athens.

Ethnographical physiognomy, which emphasizes the close dependence of human beings on environment and the seasons, finds expression likewise in the *Republic*; the quality of passion or spirit is to be attributed to the Thracians and Scythians, and in general to the northern nations, whereas a love of knowledge is a peculiar characteristic of the area of Athens, just as the love of money is a mark of the Phoenicians and Egyptians. Critias in the *Timaeus*²⁴ attributes to Athena the choice of Athens for her land, because she saw "that the happy temperament in the land would produce the wisest of men, and settled the spot most likely to produce men like herself, a lover of war and wisdom."

Individual portraiture plays as significant a part in Plato as humoral and ethnographical principles. In Xenophon's *Symposium* the iconistic delineation was an inherent part of the characterization of Socrates. So, too, in Plato, especially in the *Symposium*,²⁵ where Alcibiades eloquently praises the satyrlike nature and appearance of his teacher Socrates, a veritable Silenus. In Athens, Socrates²⁶ stalks about like a pelican and,

²² 188a; cf. *Politicus* 308a (*σβγκρασις*) and Xenophon, *Mem.* 1, 4, 8.

²³ 5, 747d.

²⁴ 24c (after Jowett); cf. *Critias* 109c-d.

²⁵ 215b.

²⁶ 221 b and d.

rolling his eyes, calmly contemplates his enemies as well as his friends. In the *Theaetetus*²⁷ Socrates, in characterizing himself, adds the familiar element of the snub nose and protruding eyes. He speaks of his own short stature in the *Phaedo*,²⁸ while Meno²⁹ says directly to Socrates that in appearance and power over others Socrates is very much like a flat torpedo fish which torpifies all those who come near him. The portrait is clearly suggestive of an ethical type, in which the individual features described through several dialogues do not, however, lend themselves to direct physiognomical analysis. On the other hand Plato's description of the charioteer and the two horses in the famous myth of the *Phaedrus*,³⁰ marking the noble and ignoble aspects of the soul, is likewise ethical in its purpose. But the iconistic description is far more concrete and closely knit in contrasting outline, and is akin to Xenophon's representations of Virtue and Vice appearing to Heracles at the crossroads (see Chapter V). The form of the description is that commonly used in later physiognomical handbooks. "At the beginning of this tale," he says,

I divided each soul into three parts, two having the form of horses, and the third being like a charioteer. The division may remain. . . . The righthand horse is upright and cleanly made (*ὀρθὸς καὶ διηρθρωμένος*), he has a lofty neck (*ὑψαύχην*) and an aquiline nose (*ἐπίγρυπος*); his color is white (*λευκός*) and his eyes dark (*μελανόμματος*); he is one who loves honor with modesty and temperance, and the follower of true opinion; he needs no touch of the whip, but is guided by word and admonition only. The other is a crooked (*σκολιός, πολύς, εἰκῇ συμπεφορημένος*), lumbering animal, put together anyhow; he has a short, thick neck (*κρατεράύχην, βραχυτράχηλος*), he is flat faced (*σιμοπρόσωπος*) and of dark color (*μελάγχρως*), with gray eyes (*γλανκόμματος*) and hot-blooded complexion (*ὑφαιμος*), the mate of insolence and pride, shag-eared and deaf, hardly yielding to whip and spur.

The most important points to note are these: a horse upright and cleanly made is, according to Pseudo-Aristotle,³¹ courageous and spirited and strong; a lofty neck³² conversely, indicates a self-willed creature, unmanageable and arrogant. But Xenophon³³ sees it as the mark of a good horse; an aquiline nose³⁴ is a kingly feature and belongs to the great-souled; very black eyes³⁵ are a sign of cowardice, yet when they verge on yellow they belong to the brave; on the other hand a crooked, lumbering animal is shameless³⁶; bloodshot eyes belong to a hot temperament, shown by *ὀξεῖαι χροαί*. *Πολύς*³⁷ related to *πολυσαρκία* is characteristic of

an insensible creature; *κρατεράύχην*³⁸ differs, but is found in the brave; *βραχυτράχηλος* is a sign of the treacherous and *σιμοπρόσωπος* has an ugly connotation on the stage and belongs to the *λάγνοι*; *μελάγχρως*³⁹ is a mark of cowardice and likewise *γλανκόμματος*⁴⁰; so, too, the shaggy-eared.⁴¹ No description is accorded the charioteer.

Like Xenophon, Plato sees the kinship between the so-called virtues of the soul and bodily qualities, though he admits that if these virtues are not originally innate they can be implanted later by habit and exercise. . . . "Did you not observe," he asks,⁴² "the narrow intelligence flashing out from the keen eye of a clever rogue?" In the *Republic*,⁴³ in another passage which bears on this point and anticipates a comparable statement in Lucretius, Book IV, and in Horace's *Satires*, Socrates asks,

Is not this a way you have with the fair; one has a snub nose, and you praise his charming face; the hooked nose of another has the grace of regularity; the dark visage is manly, the fair are children of the gods; and as to the "honey pale," as they are called, what is the very name but the invention of a lover who talks in diminutives, and is not averse to paleness, if appearing on the cheek of youth?

The satiric tenets of the physiognomists are there, though in outline, and it remains for the Peripatetics to analyze in formal fashion the specific signs attached to each physical feature.

It is in Plato, too, that we encounter another aspect of the science of physiognomy which is of paramount importance in foreshadowing the later views of Aristotle. This is to be found in the *Phaedo*⁴⁴ and might be called the zoological approach. Socrates and Cebes in debating the ultimate destiny of souls after death suggest that the souls of the evil are compelled to wander uneasily, always craving for their corporeal form until they are imprisoned in another body. "And," says Socrates, "they may be supposed to find their prison in natures of the same character as they had cultivated in their former lives." Thus men who have followed after gluttony and wantonness and drunkenness would pass into asses and animals of that sort; and "those who have chosen the portion of injustice and tyranny will pass into wolves, or into hawks and kites. Where else can we suppose them to go?" This view has attracted wide attention on the part of later writers, and has been accepted or vigorously denied. At the end of the fourth century A.D. Nemesius of Emesa⁴⁵ (physician and writer on the *Nature of Man*) interprets this Platonic passage in a discussion of transmigration

²⁷ 143e; 209b.

²⁸ 103a.

²⁹ *Meno* 80a.

³⁰ 253 c-e.

³¹ 807a; 808a; see Misener for further references, "Iconistic Portraits," pp. 106-107.

³² Adamant. 399. 11 and 15; 400.5.

³³ *Ecl.* 8; cf. Verg. *G.* 3, 79; Philostr. *Gym.* c. 35.

³⁴ Plato, *Rep.* 5, 474d; see below; cf. Pseud.-Arist. 811a.

³⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; but cf. Adamant. 390, 4 and 11.

³⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 807b.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 807a.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 811a.

³⁹ Pollux. 4, 151; Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Adamant. 376, 5 and 14.

⁴⁰ Adamant. 386, 9-10.

⁴¹ Pseud.-Arist. 812b.

⁴² *Rep.* 6, 518d-519a.

⁴³ 5, 19, 474d. cf. Lucr. 4, 1160-1169; Hor. *Sat.* 1, 3, 48-54.

⁴⁴ 81 e-f.

⁴⁵ *De Nat. Hom.* 18 (50). Trans. W. Telfer.

of souls by suggesting the division of the Platonists on the meaning of the exchange of form. In satire of the second century A.D., on the other hand, in the *Fisherman* or *The Dead Come to Life*, where the dead who have come to life are the ancient philosophers, Lucian⁴⁶ complains bitterly to Philosophy in the guise of Frankness on the representatives of the major schools.

They (the specious creatures) teach these very doctrines for pay, and worship the rich, and are agog after money; they are more quick tempered than curs, more cowardly than hares, more servile than apes, more lustful than jackasses, more thievish than cats, more quarrelsome than gamecocks.

Tertullian,⁴⁷ the Church Father of the same period, inveighs in the *De Anima* against Empedocles' development of *metempsychosis*, the adaptation of some other body, or the posthumous change by men into various animals:

for although some men are compared to beasts because of their character, disposition, and pursuits (since, as God says, "man is like the beasts that perish" *Ps.* 49.20) it does not on this account follow that rapacious persons become kites, lewd persons dogs, ill tempered ones panthers, good men sheep, talkative ones swallows, and chaste men doves, as if the self-same substance of the soul everywhere repeated its own nature in the properties of animals into which it passed. Besides, a substance is one thing, and the nature of that substance is another thing; inasmuch as the substance is the special property of one given thing, whereas the nature thereof may possibly belong to many things.

If such statements reflect the great diversity of opinion regarding the validity of Plato's views while at the same time showing the keen general interest in the topic the significant fact for us to keep in mind is that Plato conceived this relationship between men and animals in nature and disposition. Here again his remarks anticipate the later physiognomical handbooks, which obviously draw on a long-standing tradition of earlier observation. A treacherous disposition is the mark of a wolf⁴⁸ in Pseudo-Aristotle, folly as well as insolence and dullness of sense the mark of an ass,⁴⁹ whereas rapacity belongs to the hawk.⁵⁰

Of the several passages in Plato⁵¹ which deal with the theory of transmigration the most important physiognomically in relation to that of the *Phaedo* is the myth of Er at the end of the *Republic*.⁵² The patterns of future lives, both of men and of animals, are laid on the ground for spirits to choose in a new incarnation. Plato is clear that the "soul when choosing

a new life must of necessity become different." Thus the hero Ajax chooses the life of a lion,⁵³ the boldest and most perfect physical male type among animals; Agamemnon that of an eagle,⁵⁴ a kingly bird and proud-souled; Thersites, puts on the form of a monkey,⁵⁵ small-souled and villainous.

In sum, in the not inconsiderable body of material which we have found in Plato that bears upon the science of physiognomy, we may observe that he by his imaginative depiction of the soul through analogous animal types foreshadows the future asyndetic outline of the handbooks. In general it can be said that in one place or another all aspects of the "science" are indeed touched upon, though not extensively. It remains for later thinkers to develop to the full the humoral and ethnographic, the zoological and iconistic, as well as the ethical types of portraiture.

With Aristotle we come to the first analytical treatment of physiognomics preserved in Greek literature. In the *Rhetoric*,⁵⁶ Aristotle declares that even in his day instructions with regard to delivery⁵⁷ (*pronuntiatio* or *actio*) had not been treated. Delivery was essentially a matter of the right management of the voice to express various emotions, by speaking loudly or softly. No systematic treatise on the rules of delivery⁵⁸ had yet been composed, but an inward frame of mind was thought to be reflected in outward appearance.

Similarly in the *Nicomachean Ethics*⁵⁹ *μεγαλοψυχία* (greatness of soul) implies great physical stature, as beauty implies a good-sized body. Little people may be neat and well proportioned, but cannot be beautiful. Just as bodies are judged by their movements, so are characters. The great souled man is slow of step, possesses a deep voice, and a deliberate form of speech. For a rapid gait and a shrill voice bespeak an intense and nervous person, who ponders nothing fundamentally great.

In the political realm the same kind of thinking prevails. A government⁶⁰ in which the offices are given according to stature (as is said to be the case in Ethiopia), or according to beauty, would be an oligarchy, for the number of tall or fine-looking men is small, and *μεγαλοψυχία* would therefore be lacking. Ethnological physiognomy applied to citizens in the ideal state, of the type found in the Hippocratic treatise *Airs, Waters, and Places*, appears in the *Politics*.⁶¹ Those who live in a cold climate and in Europe are full of spirit, but lacking in intelligence and skill. They retain a measure of freedom, but have no political

⁴⁶ *Pisc.* 34 (trans. Harmon, LCL).

⁴⁷ *De Anima* 32, 8. Trans. P. Holmes. See Förster, *SP* 2: pp. 253-256 for other passages. The fullest annotation is to be found in J. H. Waszink, *Tertullianus, De Anima* (Amsterdam, 1947) ad 32, 8.

⁴⁸ 811a.

⁴⁹ 811a; 812a; 813a.

⁵⁰ 813a.

⁵¹ See, for example, *Timaeus* 91d; also *ibid.*, 41e-42d; *Phaedrus* 249b for a statement on metempsychosis.

⁵² 618a-620c.

⁵³ 809a; 812b.

⁵⁴ 811a-b.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Arist. Gen. An.* 4, 3, 769b. Cf. *Rh.* 3, 1, 1430b.

⁵⁷ 3, 1, 1430b.

⁵⁸ 3, 1, 1404a; Quint. *Inst.* 3, 3, 4; cf. *Arist. Poet.* 1456b, 19.

⁵⁹ *Eth. Nic.* 4, 3, 1123b, 7 sq.; *ibid.* 4, 8, 1128a, 8-13.

⁶⁰ *Pol.* 7, 7, 1327b, 23 sq.; cf. *Pol.* 3, 14, 1255a, 19 sq. (after H. Rackham, LCL).

⁶¹ *Pol.* 4, 4, 1290b, 3-7.

organization, and are unable to rule over others. Whereas the natives of Asia are intelligent, but lack spirit, and are always ruled over and in slavery. The Hellenic race, on the other hand, is situated between these areas, and shares in their characteristics; for it is high-spirited and likewise intelligent. Therefore it continues free, and is the best governed, and, were it one state, would be able to rule over all.

While Aristotle maintains in the *Analytica Priora* that it is logically possible to infer character in men from their features, it is in his biological works on animals that he deals most fully with the subject. In general he concentrates upon the appearance and behavior of animals themselves with an occasional attempt at comparison with human beings. Only later in the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual is there a developed treatment of the parallelism between men and animals that has been adumbrated in the *Analytica Priora*. In the *De Partibus Animalium* a consideration of the blood and its effect on men's behavior and appearance is of special interest to the student of physiognomy. In the Aristotelian view of anatomy⁶² and physiology, it is not the brain as we know it, but the heart that is the seat of intelligence. The heart is the source of blood, which contains also the innate heat of life. The blood flows out of the heart, and back to it with the spirit (*πνέυμα*) or organic life. The activities of the soul have their basis in the blood. Consequently it is the nature of the blood that determines the strength and courage of the individual. Galen, in this respect, follows Aristotle in the belief that the faculties of the soul depend on the *krasis* of the mother's blood from which our own arises. The passage in the *De Partibus Animalium*,⁶³ mentioned above, states that

the thicker and hotter the blood is, the more it makes for strength, if it tends to be thin and cold it is conducive to sensation and intelligence. . . . Best of all (animals) are those whose blood is hot, and at the same time thin and clear; they stand well both for courage and intelligence.

Blood is conceived of as hot or cold, thick or thin, moist or dry, swift or slow. These qualities in the blood characterize the physiology of the soul and its activities. Such activities in turn affect the behavior of man and his outward appearance.

In creatures whose heart contains a predominantly watery (i.e., thin) blood, the way is prepared for a timorous disposition. In addition there are solid earthy fibres in the thick blood which produce a passionate temperament and make it liable to outbursts of passion. For example, passion (*δρῶν*) produces heat, and solids which are heated give off more heat. Fibres are solid and, when inside the blood, cause it to boil up, if fits of passion come on. Thus bulls and boars are liable to fits of passion, because their blood is fibrous.

⁶² Cf. article in *OCD* s. v. Anatomy and Physiology, by C. Singer, and references in bibliography.

⁶³ *Part. Anim.* 2, 2, 648a (trans. A. L. Peck, LCL); Galen, *Anim. Mor. Corp. Temp.* (Kühn 4, 796); cf. *Part. Anim.* 24, 650b (after Peck).

Furthermore Aristotle argues that there are differences to be considered in the size of the heart and in its hardness or softness. These elements, too, tend to influence a creature's temperament and nature. Animals whose power of perception is small have hard and dense hearts, those whose sensations are sharp have softer hearts, while those with large hearts are cowardly, and those with small or medium-sized hearts are full of courage. Animals with large hearts, like the hare, the deer, the ass, or the mouse, are timid and betray their knavish behavior. This results from the fact that the size of the heart is out of proportion to the size of the animal, and this makes the blood colder.⁶⁴

In the *Historia Animalium* Aristotle moves from the area of physiognomy dealing with animals to the study of human appearance and behavior. In the genuine books, moreover, he puts forward statements which closely resemble those found in the later Peripatetic handbook that bears his name (the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*).

That part of the *Historia*⁶⁵ which has to do with physiognomy concerns itself with specific physiognomical signs, regularly involving a comparison with animals. They differ from one another in character, for example, as follows⁶⁶: "Some are good-tempered, sluggish, and little given to ferocity, as the ox"; some, like the wild boar, are quick-tempered and ferocious; the stag and the hare are intelligent but timid; the snake is mean and treacherous; the lion noble, courageous, and highbred; whereas the wolf is wild and sneaking, the fox mischievous, the dog spirited, affectionate, and fawning, the goose cautious and watchful, the peacock jealous and conceited. These combinations of characteristics which are quite familiar in connection with the interpretation of animal behavior are explained by Aristotle on the basis of his psychological views of the component parts of the blood and the presence of *pneuma* in the physique. He then passes on to the signs of particular parts of the body, where he draws his examples from men but does not extend his comments to parallelisms between men and animals.⁶⁷ "When men have high foreheads, they are slow to move, when they have broad ones they are apt to be distraught. With rounded or bulging foreheads

⁶⁴ *Part. Anim.* 3, 4, 667a (after Peck); cf. Pliny *HN* 11, 183. Cf. also the example of the hare, *Gen. An.* 4, 5, 774a, whose hairiness is compared to that of man, and its implication for lustfulness. Likewise *ibid.* 5, 5, 786 on the deep voice, which appears to be the mark of a nobler nature, and the reasons for this kind of voice (not necessarily true); in *Gen. An.* 4, 3, 769b Aristotle discusses monstrosities that arise not from a defect of growth but from people joking on a man ill endowed with looks as a "goat breathing fire" or a "ram butting."

⁶⁵ Of the *Historia Animalium* Bks. 10, and perhaps 7, 8, 21–30, and 9 are not genuine, and probably belong to the third century B.C. See *OCD* s.v. Aristotle.

⁶⁶ *HA* 1, 1, 488b (trans. D. W. Thompson throughout).

⁶⁷ *HA* 1, 8, 491b. See Galen, *Anim. Mor. Corp. Temp.* (Kühn 4, 796). See also *De Anima* 2, 9, 421a: Men whose flesh is hard are ill endowed by nature, men with soft flesh, well endowed.

they are quick tempered. . . .” Of the eye the white is pretty much the same in all creatures; what is called black differs in various animals. For some the eye is black, for others gray or shining, which is a sign of an excellent disposition. The eyes are of primary importance. Some are large, some small, some medium-sized. Of these the medium-sized are best. Moreover, eyes sometimes protrude, sometimes recede, sometimes do neither. Of these the receding eyes are in all animals the most acute, but the ones that do neither are a sign of the best disposition. Again eyes are sometimes inclined to blink under observation, sometimes to remain open and staring, and sometimes are disposed neither to wink nor stare. The last kind is the sign of the best nature, and of the other two, the first indicates indecision, and the second impudence. On the subject of ears Aristotle applies the principle of excellence to those of medium size and medium position, as large and outstanding ears indicate a tendency to irrelevant talk and chattering. This concept of the middle area of excellence between extremes pervades all Aristotelian thinking, of course, and is present in the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual on physiognomy.

We have already observed that, at the end of the second book of the *Analytica Priora*, Aristotle, through a discussion of inference by signs, suggested the possibility of a science of physiognomics, that is, the inferring of character from physical features. It is not, however, until the time of Galen that we encounter a sustained effort to study the relationship of a man's physique to his character, and to define in detail why certain physical and mental characteristics occur in animals and human beings.

Galen's study of this aspect of medicine is set forth in a number of essays in the great corpus of his medical writings, one of which seems to bring together his most important ideas on the relation of man's character and his physical appearance. During the first half of the second century Polemo of Laodicea had composed his handbook on the subject of physiognomics as a guide for professors of rhetoric. It was in the latter half of the century that Galen was teaching its doctrines as an important part of the physician's training. Galen was born at Pergamum, probably in A.D. 129,⁶⁸ the son of an architect Nikon. Within Nikon's lifetime Galen had already become acquainted with the ideas of the main philosophical schools, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, Epicurean; and his training in philosophy took a fundamental place in his later thinking. He early started the study of medicine at Pergamum in the Temple of Aesculapius and continued that training at Smyrna under the physician Pelops. The rhetorical school of Smyrna had just lost several of its most outstanding teachers, Scopelian, Timocrates, and above all, the leader of the New Sophistic, Polemo, whose

pupil, Aristides, was then at the height of his fame.⁶⁹ “All Ionia,” remarks Philostratus, “is like a college of learned men, but Smyrna holds the highest place, like the bridge upon the cithara.”⁷⁰ It was inevitable that the influence of the teachers of medicine should leave its mark on Galen's youthful mind, just as there can be little doubt that he was made aware of the high regard in which Polemo was held by the city. It is also highly probable that, though Galen does not specifically refer to Polemo's little handbook on physiognomy, he became familiar with it during his stay in Smyrna. It is hard for us to believe that a work so repeatedly quoted in ancient times could have escaped his notice. Indeed, a direct reference to Polemo occurs in Galen's account of his own residence in Rome,⁷¹ in which he quotes Polemo as saying that Rome was the epitome of the inhabited world. Galen's use of the term *physiognomountes*⁷² likewise may be interpreted as referring to the active practitioners of the art, among whom surely Polemo was the outstanding figure of the day.

The special contribution of Galen to our field of study is that he applied to it the doctrine of the humors. We have already noticed earlier that his physiognomical material comprised in part quotations from his “master” Hippocrates, as well as quotations from Plato and Aristotle, and in part his own observations in the medical field.⁷³ It is at the same time to be regretted that we do not find in Galen's writings, as we find in the work of Polemo, a substantial number of case histories of men whom he had studied from a physiognomical point of view. It must always be remembered that he was primarily a physician, and that his case-records deal with medical diagnosis, which must not be confused with what appears as closely allied physiognomical material. In the *Arts Medica*,⁷⁴ for example, he discusses physical warmth of heart as marked by certain inseparable and particular signs, the depth of respiration, pulse, its speed and frequency, daring and restlessness for action. “For,” he says,

if very much heat dominates, straightway there is bitter anger and madness and rashness. In such people the thorax is shaggy, and especially the chest and the parts near the praecordia. In general, even the whole body becomes warm when the heart is warm, unless the liver is strongly opposed to it.

Here, obviously, there is an amalgamation of medical diagnostic material and physiognomical ideas. The difficulty we encounter in attempting to separate the

⁶⁸ J. Walsh, “Galen's Writings and Influences Inspiring Them,” *Annals of Medical History*, N.S., 6 (1934): p. 144.

⁶⁹ Philostr. *VS* 1, 21.56 (Scopelian); trans. by J. Walsh.

⁷⁰ *Hippoc. de artic. lib. et Gal. in eum comm.* 1, 22 (Kühn 18, 1, 347).

⁷¹ *Mixt.* 2.6 (Kühn 1, 624); also ed. by G. Helmreich (Leipzig, 1904).

⁷² *TAPA* 72 (1941): pp. 107–108.

⁷³ 10 (Kühn 1, 332–334).

⁶⁸ Cf. W. Christ, W. Schmid, O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (6th ed. rev., Munich, 1924) 2, 2: p. 912.

two elements⁷⁵ may be attributed to the fact that in Galen's conception of the nature of the human being the two are not separable.

Galen judiciously observes that the physiognomists are always ready to pronounce on the character of a man from his outward appearance. "When they say that he has a chest like a lion and is therefore spirited, but legs like a goat, and is lascivious, they describe what they have observed, but they have omitted the reason for these characteristics."⁷⁶ Thus he strikes at the weakness of the physiognomical handbooks we possess. The Pseudo-Aristotelian tract states at the outset that "dispositions follow bodily characteristics and are not themselves unaffected by bodily impulses,"⁷⁷ but it probes no deeper. Polemo's handbook is a practical guide to the recognition of certain types and characteristics, yet there is no attempt to suggest the reasons why such traits occur. In Galen,⁷⁸ therefore, we find a significant effort to study the relation of the physique of a man to his character, an effort to relate the humors of the body to the temperament. Ultimately the relationship rests on the proper *krasis* or blending of the humors.

The work of Galen that may be described as a kind of small handbook on the theories of the physiognomists is one that was translated into Arabic in the ninth century: Γαλήνου βιβλίον ὅτι ταῖς τοῦ σώματος κράσεσιν αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις ἐπὶονται,⁷⁹ "that the faculties of the mind follow the mixtures or temperaments of the body." The discussion is based on a selection of a number of points of view. From experience, he assures us, he has frequently observed that the powers of the mind are closely connected with the temperaments of the body. This opinion was not his own, but was reached after careful inquiry by teachers and philosophers. Children show this diversity of mind and body, as some are stupid, some timid, some generous, some greedy. The faculties of the soul are located in the liver, the heart, and the brain. Since such philosophers as Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics appear to have attached much importance to the presence of heat, cold, wet, and dry in the human being, he reviews the ideas of these philosophers on the nature and the immortality of the soul. Wherefore, asks Galen, is dryness the cause of wisdom, and moistness of madness? The influence of the *krasis* of the body in bringing about mental illnesses is discussed, and it is

declared that the mind is damaged by such bodily afflictions as injured humors. Galen draws widely on earlier writers and so presents a neat compendium of points to be observed in studying the principles of physiognomy. Taking Plato's *Timaeus*⁸⁰ as his authority for the importance of the humors in the equilibrium of the body, he follows Aristotle in the belief that the "faculties of the soul" depend upon the *krasis* of the mother's blood, from which our own is derived. He cites as evidence a passage from the second book of the *De Partibus Animalium*.⁸¹ With extensive quotation from Aristotle on the nature of the blood and its relation to the disposition of the individual, Galen proceeds to an account of the familiar doctrine of Aristotle that the conformation of the whole body in each kind of animal becomes peculiar to the character and faculties of the soul. According to the physiognomists, moreover, certain things represent the *krasis* of soul and body, especially what is to be observed from color, hair, voice, and the action of certain parts. This remark leads him to a series of observations which are practically identical with and certainly derived from statements made by Aristotle in his *Historia Animalium*. They deal with specific physiognomical signs based on parallelisms with animals.⁸² As in the case of Polemo and the other physiognomists, the eyes are of primary importance. So with Aristotle he declares that some are large, some small, some medium-sized; of these the medium-sized are best; moreover eyes sometimes protrude, sometimes recede, sometimes neither; of these the receding eyes are in all animals the most acute; but the last kind is the sign of the best disposition. He ends his discussion of Aristotle's analysis of physiognomical signs with the remark that he might add much more of this nature did he not wish to set down the ideas of the founder of this "science," his master, "the divine Hippocrates." The quotations and comments which follow lie mainly in the field of ethnological physiognomy. He obviously derives much of his material from the essay on *Airs, Waters, and Places*. He reminds us once more that Hippocrates is a most reliable witness of the close dependence of human nature on environment and the seasons.⁸³ At this point he comes back to Plato, this time to the *Laws*, a passage which we have cited earlier.⁸⁴

This work of Galen, characterized by his insistence on the doctrine of the humors, his ready acceptance of parallelisms in the nature and physique of men and animals, in his ethnological side of the science, represents his most important contribution. He is strongly

⁷⁵ Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York, 1923-1958) 1, p. 176 points out this fact.

⁷⁶ *Mixt.* 2, 6 (Kühn 1, 624).

⁷⁷ 805a. Cf. also 808b.

⁷⁸ See Christ, Schmid, Stählin, *ibid.* 2, 2, p. 915, note 8, for a discussion of sources of the work, in *Hippoc. lib. de humor. comm.*, in Galen's corpus.

⁷⁹ Ed. by I. Müller in *Scripta Minora* of Galen (Leipzig, 1891) 2: pp. 32-79. In Kühn's edition, which has been regularly cited for other works of Galen in this article, the title is (4, 767-822): Γαλήνου ὅτι τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἦθη ταῖς τοῦ σώματος κράσεσιν ἐπεταί. The Latin title is: *Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur*.

⁸⁰ 86e-87a (trans. by B. Jowett).

⁸¹ 2.2, 648a (trans. by W. Ogle). Cf. Galen, *ibid.*, 7 (Kühn 4, 791), already cited.

⁸² I, 8, 491b (trans. by D. W. Thompson). See pp. 64-68 already cited; cf. Galen, 7 (Kühn 9, 796).

⁸³ Galen, *ibid.*, 8 (Kühn 4, 805).

⁸⁴ 5, 747d.

Aristotelian in his belief that the best-tempered (or blended) person is one who represents the absolute mean between extremes, thinness and fatness, softness and hardness, warmth and cold.⁸⁵ So also in the soul the middle state between rashness and cowardice, slowness and recklessness, pity and envy is best. The man possessing this quality must of necessity be kind, affectionate, humane, and prudent. He has all physical and spiritual virtues. He is always of a good color, breathing easily; he exists in an intermediate condition between sleepiness and wakefulness, between a smooth and hairy skin, between a dark and light complexion. Elsewhere, Galen follows Stoic sources. Rightly, he concludes, does Posidonius connect with this discussion those things which appear in physiognomy.⁸⁶

Thus Galen comes to a final unified view of the relation of man to his environment and of the humors affected by that environment, which in turn react on his appearance and nature. So much of what has been quoted above has a familiar ring that it is essential always to keep in mind the fact that it is Galen who first of all skillfully combined the Aristotelian parallelisms of men and animals in the study of physiognomy with the theory of the humors circulating in the body, and thus laid the foundations for what have become commonplaces through the centuries in the interpretation of the character of a man from his physique. It remains for us to observe in the final chapter of this volume how Oribasius, Julian's physician, records his debt to Galen in the fourth century A.D.

Thus far in this chapter we have discussed those writers who were more or less under the influence of the Aristotelian School. We now turn to the Stoics and Epicureans. The Stoics, especially Zeno, not only showed considerable familiarity with physiognomical principles but gave them a certain amount of practical application.⁸⁷ The Epicurean doctrine of the physical nature of the atomic soul, moreover, received dramatic treatment in Lucretius. If Seneca in the *De Ira*,⁸⁸ following an earlier Stoic source, explained the varieties of human nature that come from a mixture of the elements, Lucretius, following the views of his master Epicurus, brilliantly analyzed the elements of the soul that appear in the outward nature of man.⁸⁹ Thus

⁸⁵ *Mixt.* 2, 1 (Kühn 1, 576).

⁸⁶ See p. 27.

⁸⁷ *Diog. L.* 7, 173. Cf. *Dio Chrys. Or.* 33 (*Or. Tars. Prior*), 52.

⁸⁸ 2, 19. As there are four elements of fire, water, air, and earth, so there are related properties of hot, cold, dry, and moist. Accordingly, the differences of regions, animals, characters, and substances are caused by the varieties of mixture of these elements. Each man's character is determined by the element dominant in him. A fiery constitution will make angry men (fire is active and stubborn); a mixture of cold makes men timid (cold is sluggish and shrunken). The only reason why the angriest men are *flavi rubentesque* is that they have by nature a color, which they assume in anger; their blood is always active and stirred up.

⁸⁹ 3, 288-295: "est etenim calor ille animo, quem sumit, in ira/cum fervescit et ex oculis micat acrius aura./ est et frigida multa comes formidinis aura/ quae ciet horrorem membris et concitat

Lucretius describes the nature of the soul as consisting of breath, heat, air, and a fourth nameless substance. Heat flares up in anger, air in repose. The *animus* possesses that *calor* when it boils up in rage (*ira*) and fire (*ardor*) and flashes more sharply from the eyes. Cold breath (*aura frigida*) goes along with fear, and produces a shuddering in the limbs and shakes the frame. Then, too, there is the air of the peaceful state, which is uppermost when the heart is tranquil and the face serene. Those creatures⁹⁰ have more *calor* whose hearts boil readily in fury, and whose minds seethe with anger, as in the lion. The deer possesses the cold wind of fear, the oxen the calm air of repose.

Epicurus, however, speaks of the soul atoms as resembling wind and heat, and to these he adds a third unnamed substance, which is even finer. This is, as Bailey⁹¹ puts it, in accordance with Epicurean doctrine in general, but appears to be a "rough statement elsewhere elaborated." Thus Lucretius' view is supported in other Epicurean sources,⁹² and is very likely the one originally held by the school. It represents a modification of the theory of the Hippocratic four humors.

The Stoics, on the other hand, obviously were concerned with physiognomics from the time of their founder Zeno, of whom it was said by Cleanthes that he made it his particular business to recognize character from physique. Indeed the story is told of Cleanthes in *Diogenes Laertius*⁹³ that certain ingenious youths brought before him a rough fellow, a *cinaedus* (lecher), from the fields and asked him to divine his character. Cleanthes appeared at a loss and bade the man go away. As he did so, the fellow sneezed; whereupon Cleanthes said: "He is soft." A fuller version of the anecdote is given by *Dio Chrysostom*,⁹⁴ but without the name of Cleanthes attached to it. Why the sneeze is identified as characteristic of the *cinaedus* is not explained, but it was clearly understood as a physiognomical sign. "You see," remarks *Dio*⁹⁵ "the sneeze revealed the character of the man, and in the face of all his other traits was sufficient to prevent his eluding detection."

Inasmuch as excellence (*ἀρετή*), or that which participates in *arete*, is for the Stoics⁹⁶ the sole excellence, physical beauty has value only when it occurs in connection with virtue; thus the excellent man is tall, and sturdy, and commanding, and strong; but physical

artus./ est etiam quoque pacati status aeris ille,/ pectore tranquillo qui fit vultuque sereno./ sed calidi plus est illis quibus acria corda/ iracundaque mens facile effervescit in ira."

⁹⁰ 3, 296: "quo genere in primis vis est violenta leonum . . ."; 299: "at ventosa magis cervorum frigida mens est . . ."; 300: "at natura boum placido magis aere vivit . . ."

⁹¹ Cyril Bailey, *Epicurus* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 225-226.

⁹² *Plutarch, Adv. Coloten* 20; *Aet.* 43.

⁹³ 1, 173.

⁹⁴ 33, 55.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes* (London, 1891), p. 148.

excellence must be associated with the wise man, since no excellence can be granted to the common man.⁹⁷

Zeno thought it fitting to represent or describe the image of the ideal youth (*νεανίας*) from a physiognomical standpoint. The account of this portrayal occurs in a work of Clement of Alexandria,⁹⁸ in which Zeno describes the statue of a youth which accords with the concept of the virtuous man:

Let the face be open, the eyebrows neither drooping, nor the eyelids wide apart nor turned back. The neck should not be stretched up stiffly, nor the parts of the body be loosely jointed together. Let the limbs be held by a proper tautness. The mind should be keen and well keyed for discussion, and in firm possession of what has been said. Let the gestures and movements give no hope to the intemperate, but rather let modesty rest upon the countenance, and firmness be evident in the face.

It has been suggested⁹⁹ that this fragment comes from Zeno's tract on the *Art of Love*, dealing with the behavior suitable for young men. It is clearly reminiscent of the account of such behavior in the *Clouds* presented to the Athenian audience by the Just Logic in favor of the men of Marathon and the good old days of rigorous Greek training for strong character.

Like the Epicureans, the Stoics adhered to the idea of an analogy between disease of the soul and the illness of the body.¹⁰⁰ Zeno maintained that the "good mixture" of the hot, the cold, the moist, and the dry in the body constituted health, and Seneca¹⁰¹ in the *De Ira*, following an earlier Stoic source, probably Posidonius, explained the varieties of human types that come from a mixture of the elements. Galen,¹⁰² while discussing the middle state of the soul as between rashness and cowardice, slowness and recklessness, pity and envy, turns to Posidonius (135-ca. 50 B.C.) for support in those things which appear in physiognomy.

For of animals and men, as many as are broad-chested and warm-blooded are by nature in every way more given to anger; as many as are flat-hipped and cold-blooded are more cowardly. And, according to the variety of regions, the character of men differs with reference to cowardice and courage or love of pleasure and love of toil, as the motions of the soul follow the disposition of the body, which from atmospheric conditions is affected not a little. This is evident, since blood differs in animals by reason of heat and cold, thickness and thinness, and in not a few other respects, as Aristotle has written fully.

⁹⁷ Pearson, *ibid.*, 155; cf. Cicero, *Mur.* 61; *Fin.* 3, 75.

⁹⁸ *Paedag.* 3, 11, 74, restored by C. G. Cobet, *Mnemos.* 6. (1878): p. 339. An *ἄνθρωπος ἀναπεπταμένον* would be barefaced and impudent, if we compare Xen. *Mem.* 2, 1, 22, for the description of vice in the allegory of Prodicus. An *ἄνθρωπος διακεκλασμένον* belongs to a soft and shameless man.

⁹⁹ Pearson, *ibid.*, 207.

¹⁰⁰ F. Von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1921) 1, 37, 3 (Zeno); 3, 68, 27; 3, 121, 19; 3, 122, 19 (Chrysippus).

¹⁰¹ 2.19. This mixture of the elements causes differences of region, animals, physique and character.

¹⁰² *De Plac. Hippoc. et Plat.* (Kühn 5, 463-464) also edited by I. Müller (Leipzig, 1874); *FHG* 2, A. 202.

With this theory Posidonius¹⁰³ attempts to resolve the difficulties with which the earlier Stoics, among them Chrysippus, had been confronted, and had been unable to work out satisfactorily in the analogy of the disease of the soul and the disease of the body. He follows the Hippocratic essay on *Airs, Waters, and Places* on the nature of man as it is influenced by regions and countries, and brings to the later Graeco-Roman period the heritage of earlier classical thinking with relation to man's environment and behavior. In Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*¹⁰⁴ he is represented as stressing the effect of "mixture" on cultural development in the area of the Mediterranean.

Marcus Aurelius likewise reflects the earlier Stoic traditions and the interest in physiognomy current in his own day. To him also the ideas of Galen in this realm must have become familiar during their association, while the Greek physician was resident in Rome.¹⁰⁵

How rotten and crafty is the man who says: "I have made up my mind to deal plainly with you! What are you about, my friend? This preface is not necessary. The intention will reveal itself; it ought to be graven on the forehead; the tone of the voice should give that sound at once; the intention should shine out in the eyes at once, as the beloved at once reads the whole in the glances of lovers."

Since the subject of physiognomics attracted such widespread popularity in the second century, it is not surprising that there should have been some interest in this period in the origin of the "science." While we know from several accounts¹⁰⁶ of Pythagoras' life that he was considered the founder of the study of physi-

¹⁰³ See L. Edelstein, "The Philosophical System of Posidonius," *AJP* 57 (1936): pp. 286-325, especially 307-308 and note 87. Edelstein points out that Posidonius does not compare the disease of the soul with the disease of the body. See also Strabo 2, 3, 7, who uses Posidonius as a source.

¹⁰⁴ 2, 42.

¹⁰⁵ *Ἰὼν εἰς Ἐναιόν* 11, 15 (trans. A. S. L. Farquarson throughout) cf. 1, 15, 2; 4, 3; 6, 30, 2; 7, 24; 7, 31; 7, 37; 7, 60. Similarly Arrian in reporting in the second century A.D. the *Discourses of Epictetus* reflects the same point of view: 1, 24, 8-9; 1, 25, 31; 2, 8, 24-28 (steadfastness in behavior and countenance); 2, 13, 13; 3, 1, 8-9, 3, 1, 24; 3, 1, 42; 3, 2, 11; 3, 5, 9; 3, 22, 88; 4, 1; 145; 4, 8, 6; 4, 8, 12; 4, 10, 36; 4, 11, 19; 4, 11, 22; 4, 11, 27; *Encheiridion* 22, 33, 15.

¹⁰⁶ Hippol. *Haer.* 1, 2; Porph. *VP* 13; Iamb. *VP* 17. Cf. *HSCP* 46 (1935): p. 47 and note 3. Other versions of Pythagoras' practice occur in Porphyrio and Iamblichus. According to E. Rohde, *Der Griechische Roman*³, p. 273; *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1901) 2, 137, the account in Porphyrio may be referred to Antonius Diogenes, that in Iamblichus to Apollonius of Tyana. See Förster, *SP* 1: p. xiii, note 3. Förster believes that Nicomachus Gerasenus was probably less accurately used by Porphyrio than by Iamblichus and perhaps by Aulus Gellius (*SP* 1: pp. xiii-xiv). Cf. also Aulus Gellius 4, 11. See A. DeLatte, *Essai sur la Politique Pythagoricienne* (Liège, Paris, 1922) on "La Société Pythagoricienne," pp. 8-10, 25, for Timaeus and Aristoxenus as sources for this aspect of the life of the Pythagorean group under discussion. For a very recent analysis of the sources (especially Dicaearchus, Aristoxenus, and Timaeus) used for the history of the Pythagoreans see Kurt von Fritz, *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy* (New York, 1940).

ognomy, there is also the familiar statement of Galen¹⁰⁷ that the "divine" Hippocrates was responsible for the beginnings of the science. Among those who obviously regard Pythagoras as the founder is the writer of the second century A.D., Aulus Gellius,¹⁰⁸ who describes the admission requirements (based on an earlier source) for the school of Pythagoras:

It is said that the order and method followed by Pythagoras, and afterwards by his school and his successors in admitting and training their pupils were as follows: At the very outset he "physiognomized" the young men who presented themselves for instruction. That word means to inquire into the character and dispositions of men by an inference drawn from their facial appearance and expression, and from the form and bearing of their whole body. Then, when he had thus examined a man and found him suitable, he at once gave orders that he should be admitted to the school and should keep silence for a fixed period of time; this was not the same for all, but differed according to his estimate of the man's capacity for learning quickly. But the one who kept silent listened to what was said by others; he was, however, religiously forbidden to ask questions, if he had not fully understood, or to remark upon what he had heard. Now no one kept silence for less than two years. . . . But when they had learned what is of all things the most difficult, to keep quiet and listen . . . they were then allowed to speak, to ask questions, and to write down what they had heard, and to express their own opinions.

Unfortunately we are not told what was the nature of their facial expression or bearing at the end of this trial period.

III. DRAMA

Seneca, the Roman Stoic and tutor of the Emperor Nero, manifests his interest in descriptions of personal appearance not only in his philosophical essays, but also in his tragedies. His use of portraiture seems to stem specifically from a strong Stoic interest in the relation of the features of a man to his inner nature; an interest which is also common to the Peripatetic school, and is directly connected with the study of the principles of physiognomy. In Seneca's essays and letters extensive comments on the subject appear, ranging from the definition of rhetorical terms which are used for descriptions of personal appearance to an analysis of different physical types of men. The descriptions of various types of people in the dramas, both permanent, detailed portraits, and brief delineations of momentary inner feeling, reflected on the countenance, are, I believe, related in part to the Stoic interest in the theories of the physiognomists, as well as of the definite concern in this period with related rhetorical and stylistic devices, such as *characterismos* and *eikonismos*.

¹⁰⁷ *Anim. Mor. Corp. Temp.* (Kühn 4, 797-798).

¹⁰⁸ 1, 9 (trans. J. C. Rolfe, LCL). Cf. R. A. Pack, "Physiognomical Entrance Examinations," *CJ* 31 (1935): pp. 42-43. He shows the debt of Robert Burton in his Latin play, the *Philophastr* (Act 1, sc. 6), to this passage.

For this reason, I shall begin the discussion of portraiture in ancient drama with Seneca, who, in point of time, is the last writer in this genre we perhaps should consider. Yet in his adherence to Stoic philosophy he belongs properly at the beginning of this chapter since he forms a connecting link with the treatment of the views of the Stoics on physiognomics which we included at the end of Chapter II. After an analysis of Seneca's use of descriptions of physique we must look back briefly to the nature of such descriptions in Greek classical tragedy and comedy, and then explore the material available from the Hellenistic Age, which contributes markedly to the development of such descriptions in Seneca's tragedies.

Perhaps the most significant remark we can make about Seneca at this point is that he did not confine himself to any one particular type of description. In his treatment of *Medea* and *Phaedra*, for instance, we have a good example of the description of the second type: registering reaction as an aspect of characterization in Roman tragedy, used repeatedly to suggest the nature of an individual in the light of personal appearance, i.e., "physiognomic consciousness." But Seneca does not by any means limit himself to this particular type of description. Instead we find, as we not infrequently find in epic, a combination of this with the more general type of description. And even iconistic portraiture sometimes appears.

First of all, he analyzes in some detail the rhetorical terms used for iconistic and physiognomical descriptions.¹ *Characterismos* is a description of behavior and sometimes equated with *eikonismos*, wherein only the physique of people is delineated. He seems, however, to consider the two terms interchangeable and quotes the Stoic Posidonius as his authority in the matter²: "It will be useful," he says,

to illustrate each particular virtue; this science Posidonius calls ethology (*ethologia*), while others call it characterization (*characterismos*). It gives the "signs and marks" of each virtue and vice, so that distinctions may be understood between similar things. These illustrations, or to use a commercial term (i.e., of the *publicani*) *eikonismos*, I confess have a certain utility; just put them up for exhibition well recommended, and you will find men to copy them.

He cites as an example Virgil's iconistic description of a highbred horse³: "ardua cervix, argutum caput, brevis alvus, obesa terga, toris animosum pectus [high neck, graceful head, short belly, plump back, and a proud chest bristling with muscles]," and makes this comment that Virgil's description,

though referring to something else, might perfectly well be the portrayal of a brave man; at any rate I myself should select no other simile for a hero. If I had to describe Cato,

¹ *Ep.* 95, 65-69 (trans. R. M. Gummere throughout, LCL).

² See G. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," pp. 97-99.

³ Virgil, *G.* 3, 75-85.

who was unterrified amid the din of civil war . . . this is exactly the sort of expression and attitude which I should give him ("non alium vultum, non alium habitum").

In the second place, if we examine the *Epistulae Morales* rather closely, we shall observe that Seneca not only discusses the principles of physiognomy, but applies them effectively in his own writings in which he describes certain types of men. The letter to Lucilius,⁴ on the choosing of teachers, indicates, for instance, how the lecherous man is revealed by his gait, by the touching of his head with a finger, by the shifting of his gaze; the scamp is marked by his laugh, the madman⁵ by his face and general appearance. In another letter to Lucilius Seneca reports a conversation with Claranus, his former schoolmate, on various aspects of virtue.⁶ There are, he maintains, three kinds of goods⁷: those which are primary, such as joy or peace; those which are secondary, such as endurance of suffering; and a third variety, such as a modest gait, a calm and honest countenance, and a bearing that suits the man of wisdom: "tamquam modestus incessus et compositus ac probus vultus et conveniens prudenti viro gestus." "Nature," Seneca asserts, "produces certain men, who, though hampered in their bodies, nonetheless break through the obstruction." Thus the assumption is clearly maintained that a relation exists between the inner and the outward appearance, and that *incessus*, *vultus*, and *gestus* reflect the true character of the soul, or might ideally be said to do so in the man of wisdom.

For another kind of illustration of types we may turn to the *De Ira*, in which the angry man is elaborately described.⁸ With the portrait is combined the

⁴ *Ep.* 52, 12. Cf. 11, 107; 30, 3; 56, 4-5; 62, 31; 83, 21; 95, 65-73; 103, 2; 104, 28; 106, 5-7; 108, 6-7; 114, 3-4; 20-21; 115, 3-4; *De Ira* 1, 1, 3-4; 1, 18, 2; 1, 19, 2; 2, 3, 2-4; 2, 5, 3; 2, 19; 2, 35-36; 1-3; 3, 4; 3, 13, 1-3; cf. also *Constant.* 16, 3-18, 1; *Ben.* 1, 1, 5; 1, 3, 6; 2, 2; *Clem.* 1, 13, 4; 1, 19, 2-3; 2, 5, 5; *Consol. ad Polyb.* 5, 5-6, 1-2; *Tranq.* 4, 6-7. See Förster, *SP* 2: pp. 326-372, 352.

⁵ See also *De Ira* 1, 13-15. Signs of the angry man: "flagrant ac micant oculi, mutus ore toto rubor, exasestuant ab imis praecordiis sanguine, labra quantuntur, dentes comprimuntur, horrent ac surriguntur capilli, spiritus coactus ac stridens, articularum se ipsos torquentium sonus, gemitus mugitusque et parum explanatis vocibus sermo praeuptus et conplosae saepius manus et pulsata humus pedibus et totum concitum corpus magnasque irae minas agens . . ."; cf. 2, 35, 3-5 and 3, 4, 1-5 for similar discussions of the hideous appearance of anger.

⁶ *Ep.* 56, 1-5.

⁷ Actually here, as Gummere points out, he is speaking of "three sorts of circumstances under which the good can manifest itself" (*Ep.* 56, 5-6, note *ad loc.*). Elsewhere (56, 36) he declares only the first two classes are real goods: "Certain goods are indifferent: these are no more according to nature than contrary to nature, as, for example, a discreet gait and a sedate posture in a chair" ("tamquam prudentes ambulare, composite sedere"). Trans. Gummere.

⁸ See note 2 and *De Ira* 1, 1, 3. For a recent study of anger in Juvenal and Seneca see W. S. Anderson, "Anger in Juvenal and Seneca," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 19, 3 (1964): pp. 127-196. Mr. Anderson, however, is not concerned with the iconistic portrait of the angry man.

fearful picture of the madman: "audax et minax, vultus, tristis frons, torva facies, citatus gradus, inquietae manus, color versus, crebra et vehementius acta suspiria [bold and threatening mien, a gloomy forehead, a fierce countenance, a hurried step, restless hands, changing color, rapid and violently drawn breath]." If we look in Seneca for a concrete description of such a madman, a remarkable example is to be found in the philosopher's bitter diatribe on the ugliness of the Emperor Caligula⁹:

He himself was a most fruitful source of ridicule, such was the ugliness of his pale face bespeaking his madness, such the wildness of his eyes lurking beneath the brow of an old hag; such the hideousness of his bald head with its sprinkling of beggarly hairs. And he had, besides, a neck overgrown with bristles, spindle shanks, and enormous feet.

Every detail of this picture is in exact accord with the photographic description of the hated Emperor in the *Lives* of Suetonius. The physiognomical significance of these features¹⁰ I shall deal with elsewhere.

Seneca's general acceptance of the ideas of the physiognomists manifests itself in the tragedies in a different fashion.¹¹ These plays, though based directly on Greek dramas, are by and large more concerned with the use of facial and bodily expression, and the material found here would conform most closely to the third method of studying physiognomy discussed in the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook, i.e., characteristic facial expressions that follow different dispositions of mind.

In an article which appeared some years ago, Professor Berthe Marti¹² suggested that the order of

⁹ *Constant.* 18, 1 (trans. J. W. Basore throughout, LCL). Cf. *De Ira* 1, 20, 8-9; 3, 19, 1-2.

¹⁰ *HSCP* 46, (1935): pp. 67-68. Cf. pp. 54-55.

¹¹ While the discussion of the angry man is an example of Seneca's interest in certain physiognomical types, it is important to notice that the physical appearance of such a man is combined with a discussion of similar characteristics in animals. In other words this particular example might be said to illustrate the first method of studying the principles of physiognomy, analyzed in the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook. The doctrine of the humors finds expression likewise in the *De Ira* 2, 19, where Seneca, following an earlier Stoic source, undoubtedly Posidonius, discusses the mixture of the elements which causes differences of regions, animals, physique, and character. Cf. Galen, who quotes Posidonius on this subject, *De Plac. Hipp. et Plat.* 5, 5 (Kühn 5, 463-464). This would be associated with the second method of studying physiognomy described in the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook. The Greek tragedians, as we have already indicated, are not concerned with bodily or facial expression to a marked degree. Euripides, who is more partial to such delineation, uses it to describe effectively Medea and Phaedra, and likewise devotes himself from time to time to momentary descriptions of incisive power. See appendix C for examples, which, in proportion, are less frequent than in Seneca.

¹² Berthe Marti, "Seneca's Tragedies. A New Interpretation," *TAPA* 76 (1945): pp. 216-245, esp. pp. 230-234. While recognizing the importance of Miss Marti's thesis, Professor Norman T. Pratt, Jr. ("The Stoic Base of Senecan Drama," *TAPA* 79 [1948]: pp. 1-11, esp. pp. 1-2) has been inclined to dissent from her interpretation in some respects. "Beyond the mechanical difficulty involved in attaching such exact significance to manu-

the plays of Seneca preserved in manuscript *E* (Codex Etruscus, Laurentianus 37, 13) was planned by the Roman playwright to illustrate certain Stoic ideas closely related to the philosophical concepts found in his essays and letters. She argues, for example, that Seneca's characterizations of Medea and Phaedra, when viewed in connection with the *De Ira*, point to concrete examples of one of the harmful passions deplored by the Stoic philosophers. She maintains, furthermore, that the physical descriptions of the heroines of these two tragedies, presented in some detail, are closely related to Seneca's purpose in writing his dramas, that of presenting a sequence of themes allied to the ideas discussed in his philosophical works. While I believe that there is great significance in Miss Marti's interpretation of the relationship of the thought of the essays and the plays, I think that she has not taken account of all of the factors involved.

She contends¹³ that "Seneca did not intend to write plays after the manner of the Greek dramatists, but that he adapted the technique of drama to the teaching of philosophy." The two figures of Medea and Phaedra,¹⁴ she suggests, "illustrate the most significant contribution of the Stoics to psychology, the analysis of the effect of emotional impulses upon the struggle between vice and virtue. They provide *exempla* for a "Treatise of the Passions." I should submit that "they had become *exempla* of the most annihilating effects of anger" through a specific Stoic interest on the part of Seneca in the ideas of the physiognomists. They represent, furthermore, an attempt to relate physiognomical theory to rhetorical devices such as *characterismos*, popular in his day, and to certain techniques in drama. Thus the *Medea*, as a play steeped in the fury and revenge of the heroine, provides an excellent example of the detailed physical description of intense anger. This kind of description, however, is clearly of the second type, the indication of the momentary expression upon the physique or countenance. It does not attempt the iconistic portrait found in the likeness of Caligula, or the concentrated description of the angry man in the *De Ira*. The cumulative effect, however,

script sequence," he says, "... there seems to be some lack of clarity in the sequence of the themes which she finds in the plays." He believes that Stoicism, and by this he means neo-Stoicism, "shaped the nature of this drama both in superficial and in fundamental ways. The influence of philosophy is much deeper than any simple correspondence between the themes of the two genres" (10-11). See also the recent article of Norman T. Pratt, "Major Systems of Figurative Language in Senecan Melodrama," *TAPA* 94 (1963): pp. 199-234. Professor Pratt argues (199) that "we now recognize that Seneca's plays must be judged not as poor 'Greek' tragedy but as a different type of ancient drama—with its orientation and points of strength and weakness coming essentially from the fusion of rhetoric and Stoicism."

¹³ Marti, *ibid.*, 219.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 222, 229. In this discussion the title *Hippolytus* is used instead of *Phaedra*.

of these momentary descriptions is to be found in Seneca's words.¹⁵ "Ut scias autem non esse sanos quos ira possedit, ipsum illorum habitum intueri. [So that you may know however that they are not sane, whom anger possesses, look at their demeanor.]" Thus Creon immediately recognizes the lurking menace inherent in Medea's expressive face, as he watches her approach¹⁶:

Fert gradum contra ferox
minaxque nostros propius affatus petit.

Two words, *ferox* and *minax*, suffice to give us the complete picture of Medea's state of mind. A similar awareness comes to the nurse as she observes Medea hurrying from the house distraught, bent on brutal vengeance because of the desertion of Jason. As Medea draws near, the nurse prays that she may curb her wild passion. "As a maenad . . . she runs, now here, now there, marks of distracted passion in her face" ["furoris ore signa lymphati gerens"]. "Her cheeks aflame, she pants with deep sobs for breath, shouts aloud, weeps floods of tears, beams with joy; she assumes the proof of every passion" (. . . vultum furoris cerno. di fallant metum). Jason, suffering from a kind of amazed and dull misapprehension, is anxious in his turn to soften her anger with prayers, but at her entrance exclaims "and see, at the sight of me she starts up, bursts into passion, displays her hate; all her anguish is in her face" (totus in vultu est dolor). Still another picture of Medea's anguish and desperation is presented by the chorus, who observes her as the children bear the fatal gifts to the palace of the bride and Medea moves in the opposite direction:

Where is this blood-stained maenad borne headlong by mad passion? What crime with reckless fury is she preparing? Her distraught face is hard set with anger:

vultus citatus ira
rigit . . .

Her cheeks blaze red, pallor puts red to flight; no color in her changing aspect does she keep long.

In order to understand the extent to which Seneca concentrates on *ira*, we may turn to Euripides' *Medea*¹⁷ for purposes of comparison. Much the same type of delineation is to be found, but with a different emphasis. Certainly in Euripides our attention is not directed constantly to the expression of anger. The nurse, first of all, tells of Medea's utter despair¹⁸:

¹⁵ *De Ira* 1, 1, 3. See pp. 29-30.

¹⁶ 186-187; 380-396; 445-446; 849-861, *passim* (trans. F. J. Miller throughout, LCL). Cf. 675-676.

¹⁷ See pp. 30-31.

¹⁸ 24-33, esp. 27-28 (trans. E. P. Coleridge throughout). *Medea* 516-519 (trans. E. P. Coleridge throughout). Compare Theognis 119-120 and 128. The whole quotation from Theognis is admired by Clement of Alexandria (*Str.* 6, 18, 6) who excerpts the first six verses. Arist. *Eth. Eudem.* 7, 2, 1237b makes use of lines 7-8, and Euripides adapts the whole passage in Medea's speech. See Förster *SP* 2: pp. 337-338 for the complete collection of references.

"never lifting her eye nor raising her face from off the ground." Then almost immediately the intensity of her angry brooding is reflected in the nurse's comment to the children's attendant: "For ere this have I seen her eyeing them (the children) savagely (*εἶδον ὄμμα νιν ταυρωμένην τοῖσδ'*), as though she were minded to do them some hurt" (92-93). At the begging of the chorus the nurse agrees to bring Medea outside, "although she glares upon her servants" (*ἀποταυροῦνται*) as "with the look of a lioness with cubs" (187-189). When Creon confronts her, he bids her take her sullen face out of the land (*τὴν σκυθρωπὸν*, 271). Yet when Jason faces her, there is no reference to her angry bearing; we hear only her cruel taunts on his dastardliness: "O Zeus, why hast thou granted unto man clear signs to know the sham in gold, while on man's brow no brand is stamped whereby to gauge the villain's heart?" *οὐδείς χαρακτήρ ἐμπέφυκε σώματι* (516-519).

Aegeus sees a downcast eye and wasted cheek, not anger on the face (689), and Jason,¹⁹ in his second encounter, perceives only fresh tears and a wan cheek as she dissembles her true plans. Finally her soliloquy as she steels herself for the murder of her sons is poignant with anguish, not anger or revenge, at the sight of the laughing eyes of her children. Seneca, we must remind ourselves, emphasizes, too, the turmoil of soul in this scene:

variamque nunc huc ira, nunc illuc amor
diducit (938-939);

but he directs our attention to Medea's fury, as he has throughout the play, and in this passage *ira* is the keynote word.

In the *Hippolytus* the concentration of Seneca on physique is again apparent in the description of the heroine, Phaedra, but the handling of this description is somewhat different. Through the eyes of the nurse the total physical effect of her disordered mind is vividly presented to the chorus. It is a matter of some significance that this is the only important passage devoted to the description of Phaedra.

The imagery of counterfeit gold and silver which we have noted in Theognis appears in drama, for example, in Euripides. Much of the same imagery is used in a modified form in the *Hippolytus* (922-928, particularly 922-923) with reference to men's voices, the one the voice of honesty, the other that of expediency. Hippolytus has come to commiserate with his father at Phaedra's death, only to be met with a savage attack for his apparent hypocrisy and faithlessness: "Alas," cries Theseus, "man needs should have some certain test set up to try his friends, some touchstone of their hearts, to know each friend whether he is true or false; all men should have two voices, one the voice of honesty, expediency's the other, so would honesty confute its knavish opposite, and then we could not be deceived." This line of thought recalls that used in the *Medea*, but the effectiveness of the figure in the *Hippolytus* lies in man's capacity for speech and the integrity of his nature revealed by the utterance of honest intent.

¹⁹ 922-923; cf. 1012. See also 1038-1043; 1071-1075.

Though she is possessed by a *tacito aestu*,²⁰ an inner consuming fire betrays itself in her eyes, and her weary face turns from the light. Her pain twists her in constantly shifting ways; she trails through the palace with faltering steps, like one dying, and barely holds her head erect upon her bending neck. She longs for rest, but struggles through the night with incessant moaning, and has no power for sleep. Her strength is gone, and all the former brightness of her face. Her steps are aimless, and the tender grace of her once lovely form has disappeared. Her eyes, that once shone like the torches of Phoebus, are dulled, and tears fall endlessly from them.

This is portraiture of the utmost detail. Every aspect of her afflicted body and soul, and the lost beauty of once brilliant eyes are limned in full. Yet in Seneca's essays we can find no description exactly paralleling or corresponding to the type of the love-maddened woman, as we can for the angry man, or the man possessed by madness. Miss Marti²¹ maintains that the physical description of Phaedra as well as of Medea fits the concrete descriptions of the symptoms of the harmful passion of anger in Seneca's treatise, *De Ira*, and that Phaedra shows all these "conventional symptoms of a mind disordered by passion" in the passage just cited. That may well be. But surely Seneca's sources might be found also in Sappho's description²² (see Chapter VII) of her feelings in the presence of a beloved girl, also, so far as the physical description of the heroine is concerned, in Euripides, in Apollonius Rhodius, and in Virgil.

Actually it is Apollonius who provides the closest parallel to the love story of Medea and Jason (see Chapter VI). Yet here, too, there is a difference, for the epic poet, in the manner of conventional Alex-

²⁰ 362-383 *passim*:

"torretur aestu tacito et inclusus quoque,
quamvis tegatur, proditur vultu furor;
erumpit oculis ignis et lassae genae
lucem recusant, nil idem dubiae placet
artusque varie iactat incertus dolor
nunc ut soluto labitur moriens gradu
et vix labante sustinet collar caput,
nunc se quieti reddit et, somni immemor,
noctem querelis ducit;
. vadit incerto pede,
iam viribus defecta. non idem vigor,
non ora tinguens nitida purpureus rubor;
populatur artus cura, iam gressus tremunt
tenerque nitidi corporis cecidit decor.
et qui ferebant signa Phoebeae facis
oculi nihil gentile nec patrium micant,
lacrimae cadunt per ora et assiduo genae
rore irrigantur"

Twice later we are reminded by the nurse and by Theseus of her fainting body, and deathlike pallor, of her disheveled hair, and *lacerae comae*, and tears (731-734; 886-887), but, the rest of the play, so far as physical description is concerned, is directed to Hippolytus and Theseus.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 233.

²² For Sappho see C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, p. 213, and note 5, 128-130.

andrian love poetry, is concerned with the development of Medea's passion for Jason, every phase of which he records in terms of the momentary expression of the face, whereas Seneca concentrates on the total effect of all phases of this love madness as it finally possesses the queen. Virgil's description of Dido is concerned with the catastrophe which follows on the destruction of her love for Aeneas, and the agony wrought by his desertion. In the telling of the growth of her passion there is, as we have pointed out, almost no attention directed to momentary facial expression, for Virgil, so far as portraiture is concerned, is primarily centered on her disillusionment and the *lacrimae inanes* of anguish.²³ At the same time it is to be expected that Euripides would contribute to Seneca's portrait a direct basis on which the Roman playwright's far more elaborate description is built. Beyond implied description of facial expression, however, Euripides does not go into detail. It is clear that the lavishness of Seneca's portrait is not part of Euripides' technique in the delineation of Phaedra,²⁴ but rather the contribution of an age given to rhetorical *eikonismos*.

Another interesting aspect of Seneca's dramatic technique, a type of description which is not immediately connected with *characterismos* and *eikonismos*, is to be found in his portrait of Hector and Theseus. The description of Hector is achieved by calling attention to the likeness between Astyanax and Hector. This device, which might be called "the device of resemblance," is used with singular effectiveness by Homer, especially in his portrait of Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, where there are repeated instances of a comparison of Telemachus with his father, and vice versa (see Chapter VI). In the *Troades* of Seneca Astyanax brings to Andromache too poignant a reminder of Hector. In the child she sees his father, the same features, the same bearing, the same commanding expression²⁵:

Nimumque patri similis; hos vultus meus
habebat Hector, talis incesso fuit
habituque talis sic tulit fortes manus,
sic celsus umeris, fronte sic torva minax
cervice fusam dissipans iacta comam.

Exactly this same method is employed in the *Hippolytus*. The sight of Hippolytus brings back to the queen the recollection of Theseus as a youth when he killed the Minotaur.

We must emphasize the fact that whereas in Seneca's *Medea* those passages which describe the bearing and facial expression of the heroine focus our

attention on *ira*, in his *Hippolytus* our interest is directed to other emotions. While the nurse describes minutely the physical manifestations of Phaedra's torture of love, it is the queen herself who sees in Hippolytus the features of Theseus as a young man ("genitor in te totus"), the same modesty, the same erect head.²⁶

Hippolyte, sic est: Thesei vultus amo

quis tum ille fulsit! presserant vittae comam
et ora flavus tenera tinguebat pudor;
inerant lacertis mollibus fortes tori;
tuaque Phoebes vultus aut Phoebi mei
tuusque potius . . . sic tulit celsum caput.
in te magis refulget incompertus decor;
est genitor in te totus et torvae tamen
pars aliqua matris miscet ex aequo decus;
in ore Graio Scythicus apparet rigor.

The concentration on Hippolytus is deliberate, for our concern with the physical suffering of the queen is thereby enhanced as she sees in her stepson the ideal likeness of her husband, Theseus, a likeness that has awakened in her these desperate pangs of love.

As is also true in the plays of Sophocles, the arrival of a character on the scene calls for a brief account of his physical appearance. Megara, in the *Hercules Furens*, watches the approach of Lycus, bearing the sceptre of Creon, whose throne he has usurped²⁷:

Sed ecce saevus ac minas vultu gerens
et qualis animo est talis incesso venit.

Andromache in the *Troades*²⁸ catches sight of Odysseus close at hand, *et quidem dubio gradu vultuque*, and knows only too well from his facial expression that he is weaving some crafty scheme. In the *Hercules Oetaeus* the appearance of the distraught Deianira is reflected in the question of the chorus who, at the sight of the woman, driven like a maddened Bacchante, ask²⁹: "sed quid pavido territa vultu/. . . fertur dubio regina gradu?"

It is often in the speech of the messenger that we get a strikingly vivid description of the momentary reaction of an individual to some crisis or situation. In the case of Oedipus the messenger reports the reaction of the king to the discovery that he has been guilty of both murder and incest.³⁰ In the *Hercules Oetaeus* facial expression is set forth in detail far beyond what is to be found in Sophocles, in a characterization of a king, impetuous and uncontrolled, driven on unceasingly by the consciousness of his guilt and impending doom.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 646-660, esp. 658. Cf. Theseus' lament over his son's death, 1269-1270.

²⁷ 329-330.

²⁸ 522-523. Cf. Hecuba in the same play, watching the approach of Pyrrhus, 999-1000.

²⁹ 700-702. Cf. Deianira observing her son Hyllus "hurrying with face of fear," 740-741, and Octavia, 436-437 (arrival of Nero).

³⁰ *Oed.* 919-926. Oedipus continues, 957-961. Cf. Atreus at altar, *Thyestes* 706.

²³ Her servants support her fainting form and lay her on the couch, exhausted from her aimless wanderings. She is weary of looking at the sky. At night her pain redoubles, and she finds no rest from torment. *Aen.* 4, 391-392; 450-455; 529-532.

²⁴ Cf. also 586-588; 788-789.

²⁵ *Tro.* 464-468; cf. Homer, *Il.* 22, 401-403 (Hector in the dust) and Seneca, *Tro.* 448-450, when Hector bids Andromache wake from sleep to save Astyanax.

As over the fields a Libyan lion rages, with threatening front and shaking his tawny mane; so he, his face fierce with passion, with eyes wild staring ("vultus furore torvus atque oculi truces") with groans and deep mutterings, limbs with cold sweat streaming, froths and threatens, and his mighty, deep buried anguish overflows. He, raging in soul, plans some monstrous deed to match his destiny.

In the *Troades*³¹ the main interest of the play lies in the scene in which the death of Polyxena and Astyanax is described. Polyxena, brave and fearless as she goes to her death, displays, we are told by the messenger, a radiant face and a beauty heightened at the moment of sacrifice, yet she moves with a countenance cast down in modesty ("deiectos gerit/vultus pudore"), though "the dying splendour of her beauty shines beyond its wont" ("fulgent genae/. . . splendet extremus decor").

Finally the end of the *Hercules Oetaeus* presents a picture of the physical appearance of the tortured Hercules at the moment of death, which in its quality of exaltation is comparable in mood to that of Oedipus at the conclusion of Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*. His suffering, so intense that control is beyond endurance, gives way to cries to the chorus as he is borne to Oeta³²: "My face, before unmoved ('invictus olim vultus'), and never wont to express its woes in tears, at last (Oh shame!) has learned to weep." His comment on his own countenance continues:

durior saxo horrido
et chalybe vultus et vaga Symplegade
rictus meos infregit et lacrimam expulit.

Yet, when Philoctetes returns from Oeta, bearing on his shoulders the bow and arrows of Hercules, the chorus bids him tell with what countenance the hero bore his death. His answer, containing the characteristic elements of a messenger's speech, conveys the happiness of apotheosis finally gained³³: "His gaze was of one who seeks the stars, not fires of earth" ("vultus petentis astra, non ignes erat"). The climax of the play, involving death by fire and ultimate purification, finds expression in absolute calmness of face and majesty and triumph, an emphasis in description completely absent from Sophocles' *Trachiniae*³⁴: "But Hercules midst roaring flames upstarting, . . . gazed dauntless round" ("intrepidum tuens"). The crowd is speechless,³⁵ "tam placida frons est, tanta maiestas viro." The play offers, Miss Marti believes, dramatic interpretation of the most profound Stoic convictions, and is, as it were, an epitome of the Stoics' creed. It is furthermore marked, I should maintain, at its climax by a remarkable

richness in the use of momentary facial expression introduced to intensify the glorious triumph of man, the *vir bonus*, over the struggles of life and death.

It is not without significance, perhaps, that just as Seneca presents thus the dauntless courage of the Stoic hero, Hercules, at the moment of death in terms of his appearance, he should likewise comment in his definition of *characterismos* and *eikonismos* on the possession of a very similar courage by the great Republican Stoic, Cato, *inter fragores bellorum civilium impavidus*, who is compared, as we have seen,³⁶ in physique and nature to Virgil's high-bred horse.

It is quite natural that Seneca's technique of personal description, while, of course, strongly influenced by the handbooks and theories of the physiognomists, should be also colored by his own philosophical ideas and adapted to meet the interests of the day. The great concern of his contemporaries in the study of rhetoric is reflected in all his literary work and he is constantly employing the accepted rhetorical devices. Extensive delineation of bodily or facial expression, permanent or momentary, achieved a strong emotional effect in such rhetorical writing, and was closely linked to the increasing interest, apparent in Stoic thought, in the physiognomical analysis of the relation of temperament to outward appearance, an interest observable in the first century, which was to increase decidedly in the second century³⁷ and gradually to leave a definite imprint on Roman literature as a whole.

To return now to the Greek tragic drama of the fifth century, the masks worn conveyed to the Athenian audience only the typical appearance of the leading characters, as, for example, those suggested in Quintilian's *atrox Medea*, *attonitus Ajax*, *truculentus Hercules*.³⁸ In Old Comedy the masks were caricatures of contemporary figures, easily to be recognized by the audience. In the *Knights* Aristophanes³⁹ explains that no mask has been made for Cleon for fear that he might resent such ridicule and take vengeful action. With New Comedy, masks are used for stock characters, and Pollux⁴⁰ in the second century A.D. describes forty-four for that period. Even in the time of Euripides the use of the realistic mask had become

³⁶ See Misener, *ibid.*, p. 98. Surely his comment on Cato in this passage links the two heroes together: "It will be helpful not only to state what is the usual quality of good men ('boni viri') and to outline their figures and lineaments ('formamque eorum et lineamenta'), but also to relate and set forth what men there have been of this kind" (*Ep.* 95, 72). Compare also in *Ep.* 30, 3 the manner in which Seneca describes how Aufidius Bassus, the Epicurean Roman historian, faces death with the boon of philosophy: "Hoc facit, Bassus noster et eo animo vultuque finem suum spectat, quo alienum spectare nimis securi putares."

³⁷ See Chapter V.

³⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 1, 3, 65ff; cf. R. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama* (Chicago, 1918), pp. 212-213, 222-224.

³⁹ 230-232.

⁴⁰ Poll. *Onom.* 4, 13.

³¹ 1137-1139.

³² 1266-1267; 1272-1274.

³³ 1645-1647. Cf. 1684-1685. See also description of Philoctetes' face (*laeto venit ecce vultu*, as he returns from Oeta, 1603-1604). See Marti, *ibid.*, pp. 241-245.

³⁴ 1736-1737.

³⁵ 1946. Cf. 1753-1755.

increasingly important.⁴¹ Earlier the mask types must have represented heroic figures not individualized.⁴² Pollux has listed twenty-eight such masks for tragedy. To the masks we shall return shortly.

If, there is one figure in Greek literature of whom the reader might desire a full-length portrait, surely it is Helen of Troy. And yet she, who is the outstanding example of the Greek concept of *κάλλος* [beauty], never is depicted in detail. Rather it is the very absence of detail in any description of her that marks her portrait in classical Greek drama. The Argive chorus in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus voices the sum of her exquisite charms⁴³: "at first . . . there came to Ilium the spirit of unruffled calm, a delicate ornament of wealth, a darter of soft glances from the eyes" (*μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος*).

To this picture of intangible allure Euripides adds various allusions which reinforce and increase our grasp of her wondrous beauty. But his treatment of Helen in several plays is wholly that of a general characterization of her beauty. In the *Electra*⁴⁴ it is Electra herself who upbraids Clytemnestra in a bitter comparison of her mother with Helen in terms of *εἶδος*. Hecuba, at the sacrifice of Polyxena, utters the wish to see Helen reduced to the same plight, for it is Helen's bright eyes⁴⁵ (*καλὰ ὄμματα*) that have caused the shameful downfall of Troy. A somber and understandable bitterness pervades Hecuba's warning to Menelaus in the *Trojan Women*,⁴⁶ and in the same

play Andromache, speaking to Astyanax, expresses her fury at the Spartan queen for her very lovely eyes (*κάλλιστα ὄμματα*) that have blasted Troy to the ground.⁴⁷ Helen herself in the play⁴⁸ named after her, voicing the same despair that was hers in the third book of the *Iliad*, cries out in self-defense to the chorus of Greek women:

Would God I could rub my beauty out like a picture, and assume hereafter in its stead a form less comely (*αἴσχιον εἶδος*). . . . I am plunged so deep in misery, for that beauty (*τὸ κάλλος*) which to other women is a boon, to me has been a bane.

The total impression of Helen's overwhelming beauty is conveyed by Euripides in the simplest fashion, by allusion to her *εἶδος*, her *κάλλος*, her *καλὰ ὄμματα*, for the dramatist, like Homer, knows no detailed likeness could ever be drawn. The dramatists are not alone in this opinion of her elusive beauty. The encomium of Helen by Gorgias (*ca.* 483–376 B.C.) again sums up the powers of her loveliness:

That in nature and nurture the lady was the fairest flower of men and women is not unknown . . . she was endowed with god-like beauty, expressed not suppressed, which inspired in many men many mad moods of love, and she, one lovely person, assembled many personalities of proud ambition.

The praise of beauty is included here as a requisite part of the person lauded. The composition of Gorgias⁴⁹ was, however, a "show piece" in the tradition of the rhetorical schools which endeavored to defend the conduct of this glorious woman, who had been bitterly condemned by the poets (Aesch. *Ag.* 689–690) as the source of infinite woes. Isocrates⁵⁰ undertook a true encomium of her godlike beauty, a vindication of her good name, not a plea in her defense, as Gorgias had done. "To her," he says, "he (Zeus) gave the gift of beauty (*κάλλος*) which by its nature brings even strength itself into subjection to it." Whereas to Hercules, his son, Zeus gave a life of labors,⁵¹ "to Helen he granted the gift of nature which drew the admiration of all beholders and which in all men inspired contention." As for the Trojan War, not only did the Greeks and barbarians participate in it, but the gods themselves encouraged their own children to share in the struggle⁵²: "With good reason in truth they came to this decision, and I, for my part, am justified in employing extravagant language

⁴¹ Eur. *Or.* 1317–1320. Electra speaks to the chorus on the death of Helen and the situation of her brother, and tells them to keep faces and eyes composed while she will wear a look of despair which she had displayed in her mask all along.

⁴² Flickinger, *Greek Theater*, fig. 66.

⁴³ *Ag.* 742. The *Prometheus* of Aeschylus (*PV* 1001–1005, trans. H. W. Smyth, LCL) contains an interesting example, in a famous passage, of a principle of physiognomics treated later in the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook. The creator and benefactor of man, Prometheus, bound on a rock in the Caucasus, hurls defiance at Hermes, the lackey of Zeus: "Never think that, through terror at the will of Zeus, I shall become womanish and with hands upturned, aping woman's ways, shall importune my greatly hated foe to release me from these bonds. I am far, far from that." The contempt expressed by Prometheus for such servility is consistent with the observations made in the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual (808a) that the pathic man carries his hands upturned and flabbily, and the effeminate man is described in the Anonymous Latin handbook on physiognomy (Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 98, 123) as one "qui resupinatas plerumque manus praemovet." Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 33, 52. Trans. J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby, and note *ad loc.*, in which the editors seem to have missed the physiognomical implications of the upturned hand) in his Tarsic oration, referred to above, similarly inveighs against certain citizens who reveal their true character and disposition by their voice, their glance, their posture, and still other presumably insignificant details such as "the elevation of the eye, the inclination of the neck, the trick of conversing with upturned palms."

⁴⁴ 1061–1064. Cf. *Andromache* (426 B.C.), which presents an impression of her power, 628–631, a passage in which Peleus berates Menelaus for succumbing to Helen's loveliness at the sight of her breasts.

⁴⁵ *Hec.* 441–443.

⁴⁶ 891–893.

⁴⁷ 772–773.

⁴⁸ 260–266; 304. Cf. 160–163. The stark tragedy caused by Helen's beauty is summed up by Iphigeneia at the moment of her own sacrifice (*IA* 1417–1418).

⁴⁹ *Isocrates* (Cambridge, 1945) 3, 54–57 (trans. La Rue Van Hook, LCL). For a recent discussion of the encomium see George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963) "Epidictic Oratory," pp. 152–203, esp. 168–169 and 186–188.

⁵⁰ *Id.* 58–59.

⁵¹ *Helen* 10, 16–17.

⁵² *Id.* 54.

in speaking of Helen: for beauty she possessed in the highest degree, and beauty is of all things the most venerated, the most precious, the most divine." "The greatest proof of my statements," continues Isocrates,⁵³ "is this: we shall find that more mortals have been made immortal because of their beauty ($\tau\omicron$ κάλλος) than for all other excellences. All these personages Helen surpassed in proportion as she excelled them in the beauty of her person." Such then was the rhetorical tradition of Greece.

Sophocles, like Aeschylus and Euripides,⁵⁴ rarely presents the iconistic description of an individual, but rather the description of the momentary appearance.⁵⁵ So slight, however, is the use of physical description, even of this sort, that it never is a prominent feature of his technique of characterization. He does, however, not infrequently give a brief but significant sketch of the appearance of a new arrival.⁵⁶ Moreover, in two plays, the *Oedipus Coloneus* and the *Philoctetes*, blindness and lameness, physical afflictions indissolubly bound up with the plot, are, as we should expect, the aspects of the physique emphasized in the heroes to the exclusion of all other physical qualities or facial expressions, except such as may be supplementary to the one feature that is dominant.⁵⁷ One noteworthy description, in which Sophocles uses the same device which Homer had emphasized in his delineation of Odysseus, occurs in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (see Chapter VI). Jocasta is ironically likening in detail the appearance of Laius to Oedipus⁵⁸: "Tell me of Laius—how did he look? How old or young was he?" Jocasta: "He was a tall man and his hair was grizzled already—nearly white—and in his form not unlike you."

When we come to Aristophanes we encounter the use of detailed portraiture as a comic device, though not employed with great frequency. The iconistic picture of Plutus⁵⁹ is an example of the satiric use as a means of identification of the god of wealth: old and

squalid, toothless, wrinkled, bent. A more elaborate likeness occurs in the *Thesmophoriazousae*, when Euripides explains to Agathon why it is better that the latter attend the festival in his place: "I'm gray and bearded, but you are fair of face, with light complexion and shaven, and high-pitched voice, and soft and pretty to look upon." The balance of the two figures is deliberate, and the physiognomical implications of the cinaedus, Agathon, obvious. In the *Clouds* a similar balance is maintained. There Just Logic lists the physical effects of following its precepts in education⁶⁰: an ivory chest, a clear skin, huge shoulders, and a small tongue . . . ; and the physical hazards of succumbing to the fashions of the day under the guidance of the Unjust Logic: pale complexion, small shoulders, a narrow chest, and a vast tongue . . . in which a derogatory physiognomical interpretation of the cinaedus is obviously used for purposes of satiric characterization.

In addition to the very occasional iconistic picture in Old Comedy, the description of momentary facial expression is introduced by Aristophanes in a variety of occasions,⁶¹ the appearance of Hercules in the underworld,⁶² the arrival of a new character, a messenger,⁶³ which calls for comment in the *Birds* by Peisthetaerus,⁶⁴ parody of such a type of description, which is part of the comic poet's technique,⁶⁵ even remarks of the chorus on the poet himself.⁶⁶

When we turn to the field of Hellenistic drama we find that Menander, as a poet of New Comedy, is primarily concerned with the life and mores of his own day. Out of one hundred comedies, of which few survive, no one reveals any marked interest in descriptions of physique. As in the *Characters* of Theophrastus this device is almost wholly absent.⁶⁷ It is in Roman comedy and its adaptations of earlier Greek comedy that we can discern the comic effect of such descriptions.

Emphasis on one physical feature, such as magnificent strength or beauty, for the sake of comic characterization, is as much a part of Plautus' technique of physical description as is the iconistic portrait used for the purpose of identification. To the latter type we shall come back directly. In the meantime it is pertinent to inquire how in Roman drama, where detailed portraiture is an integral part of the dramatist's art, but where both types of description appear, the enlargement of the soldier's ego as is

⁵³ *Id.* 60–61.

⁵⁴ An exception in Aeschylus might be Atossa's dream and her description of the two women appearing to her (*Pers.* 169–170); in Euripides the messenger's description of the mad Heracles (*HF* 931–935) and the Lydian stranger in the *Bacchae* (233–236; 452–456) verge on the iconistic type. For references *passim* to examples of "physiognomic consciousness" in Euripides, see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Euripides' Herakles* (2 v., Berlin, 1889), especially vol. 2 devoted to the text and commentary on this play.

⁵⁵ *Cf.* the innuendo in *Ant.* 526–530; 690–691; *OT* 447–448; 528–529; 532–534.

⁵⁶ *Cf.* *OT* 80–81; *OC* 319–321; *Trach.* 869–870; see also *Aes. Ag.* 638–640.

⁵⁷ *E.g.* *OC* 1; 21; 73; 146–148; 552–553; 555–556; 576–578; 1099–1101; 1256–1261; 1378–1379; 1639–1640; (all of the first type).

⁵⁸ *OT* 740–743 (trans. D. Grene).

⁵⁹ *Plut.* 265–267; *Thesm.* 189–192 (trans. Anon.). See Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," pp. 109–110, and note 1 for the physiognomical interpretation of the Pseud.-Arist. 808a; Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 134, 11.

⁶⁰ 1009–1023.

⁶¹ *Ach.* 253–254; *Ran.* 561–562.

⁶² *Ran.* 593–595.

⁶³ *Lys.* 6–8; *cf.* 706–707.

⁶⁴ 1168–1169; *cf.* *Plut.* 332–334.

⁶⁵ *Ach.* 1069–1070.

⁶⁶ *Equit.* 547–550; *Vesp.* 1032–1035. For discussion of the use of masks in Greek drama see pp. 37–38.

⁶⁷ A few examples include descriptions of momentary expressions: *Dys.* 150–155; 423; *Epit.* 18–19; 656–666; *Sam.* 404–405.

illustrated in the case of a comic figure like the Miles Gloriosus is handled by emphasis on one physical feature. The braggart soldier is, of course, a familiar figure in ancient comedy, Plautus' treatment being undoubtedly the best known. His pomposity and stupidity delight the reader, and his grandeur, self-conceived, knows no bounds.

One might expect that every aspect of the soldier's physique would command Plautus' attention, and a photographic likeness, similar to that of Thersites in the *Iliad*, would leave us with an indelible impression of his bold appearance. But the striking fact remains that exactly the opposite treatment of his person is the means by which Plautus builds our concept of the figure. The key to this difference in treatment lies undoubtedly in Plautus' use of detailed description primarily for identification. Thus in the *Captivi*⁶⁸ the exchange of roles by Philocrates and Tyndarus is revealed by Aristophontes' description of Philocrates to Hegio: "macilento ore, naso acuto, corpore albo, oculis nigris, subrufus aliquantum, crispus, concinnatus." But the Miles needs no identification, and his physical impressiveness is the one element Plautus must develop.

Artotrogus, the parasite, sets the tone for the braggart⁶⁹: "Why should I tell you, sir, what the whole world knows—that you are the one and only Pyrgopolynceus on earth, virtute et forma et factis invictissimum."

When Palaestrio, slave of the young Pleusicles, but now in the power of Pyrgopolynceus, produces Periplectomenus' ring, presumably as a token of affection from the lady next door, he presents it to the soldier as an admirer,⁷⁰ "quae te amat tuamque expetessit pulchram pulchritudinem." Milphidippa, the serving maid of this lady, Acroteleutium the courtesan, continues in the same manner⁷¹ to admire the braggart, and Palaestrio instructs Acroteleutium, the supposed wife of the man next door, on how to dupe the Miles⁷²: "I want you to scorn your own beauty beside his, and praise to the skies at the same time his *formam*, *amoenitatem*. . . . *faciem*, *pulchritudinem*." Acroteleutium (while the soldier overhears) pretends⁷³ as eagerly her fear that the braggart may change his mind, once he sees her, so magnificent is he. To

Milphidippa she persistently declares a passionate devotion to him,⁷⁴ "si amavit umquam aut si parem sapientiam hic habet ac *formam*." Finally, in the scene where Philocomasium leaves the soldier's house, Palaestrio ostensibly consoles her for the sadness she feels at the thought of parting from the braggart, and prepares to weep, too,⁷⁵ "I don't wonder at all that you loved to live with him, si *forma* huius, mores, virtus, animum attinere hic tuom." Not a single minor detail is included, but there is a recurring suggestion of magnificence, implied in the constant repetition of the word *forma*, coupled with either *pulcher* or *pulchritudo* (once *facies*), introduced by all the people involved in deceiving the braggart to the full. This technique of description and characterization becomes all the more significant when we remember the extensive use made by Plautus on occasion of detailed iconistic portraits for the sake of identification. By inference the reader here imagines every needed detail.

In Roman comedy the iconistic description used for the purpose of identification as part of the plot is a more marked feature of portraiture. Examples can be cited from both Plautus and Terence, and surely reflect a similar technique found in early Greek New Comedy.

In the *Asinaria*,⁷⁶ where impersonation provides the basis for a description similar to that in the *Captivi*, the old man Libanius describes Saurea to the ass trader: thin jaws, rather red-haired, pot-bellied, savage eyes, medium height, a scowling expression. In the *Mercator*⁷⁷ Eutychus identifies for Charinus the

⁷⁴ 1251; cf. 1270–1271.

⁷⁵ 1326–1328. Another kind of description found in Plautus, and allied to the type just discussed, is that implied in situations of mistaken identity. In contrast to the lavish detail of the iconistic portrait intended for identification, the descriptions never actually occur, but are suggested regularly by reference to the identity of appearance. Sosia in the *Amphitryo*, reflecting on the impersonation of himself by Mercury, says (600; cf. 441–442) "tū formam una abstulit cum nomine." Always a stated comparison is the basis of portraiture for the likeness between people. Sosia continued (443–445; cf. Mercury 266–267): "He is as like me, as I am myself. Same leg, foot, height, haircut, eyes, nose, lips, even jaw, chin, beard, neck, everything." The end of the *Menaechmi* (1062–1063) provides exactly the same kind of comparison between the twins, where Messenio in startled amazement exclaims to Menaechmus of Syracuse: "Your mirror . . . He's the very image of you! He's as like you as can be. . . ."

⁷⁶ 1218–1220: "Macilentis malis, refulus aliquantum, ventri osus, truculentis oculis, commoda statura, tristi fronte."

⁷⁷ 639–640: "canum varum, ventriosum, bacculentum, breviculum, subnigris oculis, oblongis malis, pansum aliquantum." Cf. G. Misener "Iconistic Portraits," pp. 112–113 for this and the other passages included here. Cf. Poll. *Onom* 14, 143: *θεράπων ἡγεμόν* has a coil of red hair on the forehead, his eyebrows are raised, his brow contracted. See A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford, 1953), p. 206. Similarly Pollux, *ibid.*, on the *ὄδλος νεανίσκος* who is young, ruddy, with curly hair, raised eyebrows, and a wrinkle across the forehead. The description would apply to Tyndarus (above) in the *Captivi*. See also the iconistic description of the supposed servant, Syrus, as the slave dealer, Harpax, in the *Pseudolus*, 1218–1220; "Rufus

⁶⁸ 647–648.

⁶⁹ 55–59 (trans. P. Nixon throughout, LCL). Cf. his hair (64; 923), his own self appraisal that his "forma" excels that of Alexander (777) and that he is one "qui formast ferox" (1388–92), and appears as well as "fortem, fortunatum et forma regia" (10). Likewise the Miles' complaint "hic astabo tantisper cum hac forma et factis frustra" (1021), Palaestrio's advice: "conlaudato *formam* et *faciem* et virtutes commemorato" (1027). See J. A. Hanson, "The Glorious Military," pp. 51–85, esp. pp. 58–59, in *Roman Drama*, edited by T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley (London, 1965) for a discussion of this material.

⁷⁰ 959. Cf. 967.

⁷¹ 1041–1042; cf. 1045; 1086–1087.

⁷² 1170–1172; cf. 1211–1212.

⁷³ 1233–1235.

slave dealer who purchased Pasicompsa: a gray-haired fellow, bandy-legged, with a huge paunch, and puffy cheeks, rather stocky, darkish eyes, and a lantern jaw, and splay feet. In the *Poenulus*⁷⁸ Milphio tells Hanno what the girls' nurse looked like: not very tall, dark and graceful, with piercing black eyes. Similarly in Terence, Clitopho says to his father, Chremes, in the *Heauton Timoroumenos*⁷⁹ with reference to a proposed bride: that girl, red-headed, green-eyed, huge-mouthed, and hooked-nose, never! The purpose of identification in these descriptions is clear from Pamphilus' direction to Parmeno with reference to a foreigner he is being sent to meet in the *Hecyra*⁸⁰: "[He is] a big fellow, ruddy complexioned, curly-haired, heavy-set, gray-eyed, with the face of a dead man."

The use of description for the purpose of identification is illustrated in three examples in the *Rudens*, but in each example there is included a further detail of characterization to describe the inner nature of the man. Trachalio⁸¹ talking to the fishermen says: "Have you seen a young fellow come along, husky, with a tanned look, and a lively face. . . . or an old bald Silenus, well set up but pot-bellied, bushy eyebrows, and a tight expression on the face, a real swindler, and hated by gods and men." Plesidippus⁸² asks Daemones whether he had laid eyes on a curly-haired fellow, quite gray, a real rascal and leering, and very smooth. Sceparnio,⁸³ on catching sight of Ampelisca, exclaims: "A very image of Venus, what brightness and gaiety in the eyes, a real vulture-like appearance, I mean a brunette, but what breasts and what an invitation in that kissable mouth."

In other words, these examples show a tendency to characterize the individual by a suggestion of the inner reaction as expressed on the face or on the body.⁸⁴ In this respect these descriptions differ from those found in the examples in the papyri collected

quidam, ventriosus, crassis suris, subniger/magno capite, actis oculis, ore rubicundo, admodum/magnis pedibus."

⁷⁸ 1111-1113: "statura hau magna, corpore aquilost/specie venusta, ore atque oculis pernigris."

⁷⁹ 1061: "Rufam illam/virginem caesiam, sparso ore, adunco naso."

⁸⁰ 440-441: "magnus, rubicundus, crispus, crassus caesius/cadaverosa facie."

⁸¹ 312-313: "adulescentem . . . strenua facie rubicundum fortem; 316-319: ecquem/recalvom ac Silanum, senem statutum, ventriosum/tortis superciliis, contracta fronte/fraudulentum, deorum odium atque hominum. Cf. Pickard-Cambridge, *ibid.*, pp. 203-204 and Pollux on the *πορνοβόσκος* who has a slight grin on his lips, whose brows are contracted, and whose head is usually bald; also Plesidippus as the *πάγχρηστος νεανίσκος* "the perfect young man of sunburnt complexion, light hair, a few wrinkles on the forehead, and his eyebrows raised."

⁸² 125-126: "ecquem . . . hominem crispum, incanum/ . . . malum, periurum, palpatorem."

⁸³ 420-423: "Veneris effigia haec quidem est ut in ocellis. . . . hilaritudo est . . . corpus cuius modi, subvoluturum . . . illud quidem subaquilum volui dicere/vel papillae cuius modi, tum quae indoles in saviost."

⁸⁴ See above, pp. 6-7.

by Fürst (see Chapter IV) where marks of identification (*οὐλή*) are emphasized, and no attempt is made to delineate the inner nature of a person. The kinship with legal forms of identification is obvious, but, in addition, the association of the details of physical features with qualities of character becomes apparent in many instances. In Roman comedy,⁸⁵ especially in Plautus, as in tragedy, new arrivals are designated by their appearance, and the ominous or dangerous ones are frequently marked by two signs: a slow step, a gloomy expression. In Terence the turning point of the *Adelphi* is marked by the effective use of description of momentary expression on the face of Aeschinus⁸⁶: "erubuit: salva res est."

As the new comedy of manners reflects the social outlook of the Hellenistic Age, and includes iconistic descriptions for the purpose of identification, the lists of masks in Julius Pollux, which we have mentioned above, may well supplement our knowledge of that physical portraiture which we associate with drama in this period.

The sources of our knowledge of these masks are varied. Actually the main evidence for this Hellenistic practice is archaeological, as T. B. L. Webster and others⁸⁷ have pointed out. Upon what Julius Pollux drew his information it is difficult to say. He may have been indebted to Aristophanes *On Masks* or Eratosthenes, or to some common source, such as the records of theatrical performances of the third century B.C. What is listed in Pollux includes "color of hair, kind of hair, *onkos*, beard, cheeks, brows, complexion, sometimes expression," occasionally some general characteristic. Much of the material contains the suggestion of a physiognomical approach or awareness of physiognomical principles, particularly in the list of twenty-eight tragic masks, six of old men, eight of young men, eight of women, and six of servants. Of the middle-aged men, the *μέλας ἀνὴρ* mentions dark complexion and probably dark hair, a curly beard, and a harsh expression (*τραχύς*). Among the *νεανίσκοι* the curly-haired youth has raised eyebrows and is stern in expression (*βλυσυρός*), whereas the delicate youth has a pale complexion and a bright look (*φαιδρός*). The squalid youth (*πιναρός*) has a downcast expression (*κατηφής*). Of the slaves the oldest (*διφθερίας*) "leather-clad," has a pale face, and a sneer, with forehead drawn up and his eyes gloomy (*σκυθρωπός*). The slave with a wedge-shaped beard has a ruddy and stern face, proper to a messenger. Among the women, the free-born old woman has gray hair and by her expression "suggests disaster." The long-haired pale girl wears a look of pain or "grievance"

⁸⁵ *Merc.* 599-600; *Epid.* 608-609; cf. a madman, *Men.* 829-830; see also Ter. *Ad.* 642; *And.* 118-120.

⁸⁶ *Ad.* 643.

⁸⁷ See A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals*, chap. IV on masks, pp. 177-212, and the bibliography cited therein; T. B. L. Webster, "Notes on Pollux' List of Tragic Masks," *Festschrift für Andreas Rumpf* (Cologne, 1952), pp. 141-150.

(βλέμμα λυπηρόν). Assignments of these masks to stated roles is, of course, conjectural but Webster⁸⁸ believes that they are to be dated in the late fourth and early third centuries, that beneath the list of Pollux' masks lies the practice of the fifth-century drama, and that many of them could have been used for the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides in the revivals of the fourth century. The forty-four masks which are identified with comedy in Pollux' list include the first old man (πάρρας πρῶτος) whose eyebrows signify gentleness, ἡμερώτατος τὰς ὀφρύς, and who has thin cheeks, and a "downcast expression" (τὴν ὀψιν κατηφής) but a rather "cheerful forehead" (τὸ μέτωπον ὑποφαιδρός). The second old man is thinner with a more intense and grieved look (ἐντονώτερος τὸ βλέμμα καὶ λυπηρός) and the ἡγέμων πρεσβύτης possesses a "hooked nose,⁸⁹ a flat face, and the right eyebrow is raised." The elderly man (πρεσβύτης) with the long wavy beard⁹⁰ does not have the eyebrow raised, but appears "lethargic"⁹¹; the Hermonian old man⁹² possesses raised eyebrows and "a piercing look" (τὸ βλέμμα δριμύς). The old man with a wedge-shaped beard and raised eyebrows is obstinate in expression (ὑποδύστροπος); the Lycomedian has both curly hair and a long beard, one eyebrow raised, and the look of a meddler (πολυπράγμων). The slave dealer (πορνοδόσκος) shows "a slight grin"⁹³ (τὰ χεῖλη ὑποσέσηρε), but "his brows are contracted."

Of the younger men we have already noted the "perfect young man" (πάγχρηστος νεανίσκος)⁹⁴ in connection with Plesidippus in the *Rudens*. Other youths show variations on this type. The rustic is dark⁹⁵ with "broad lips" and snub nose. The braggart soldier, the flatterer, and the parasite are of dark

complexion.⁹⁶ The latter two have hooked noses⁹⁷ and a "good physique" (εὐπαθεῖς). The flatterer has raised malicious-looking eyebrows,⁹⁸ the parasite is the more cheerful (φαιδρότερος). Of the seven masks for slaves, mention has been made of the leading slave in the *Asinaria*⁹⁹ and other slaves have "curly red hair, a red complexion, sometimes a squint," and are often bald. The female masks of old women show the wolfish character in the face, withered, with a long countenance, many wrinkles, a yellowish complexion and a squinting, roving eye.¹⁰⁰ Other female masks suggest little of physiognomical importance from among the young girls, the hetaerae, or the maid servants.

The work of Robert, Pickard-Cambridge, and the more recent work of Webster all suggest that in the Hellenistic age there was a growing awareness, especially in the field of drama, of the relation of character types and physical appearance. The area of application is limited, yet it is clear that in this era these character types, inherited from an earlier period of drama, both tragedy and comedy, are brought down to the level of everyday life and were familiar and common in the urban society of the Greek world. For that reason Theophrastus in his *Characters* presents us with ordinary people as well known to the streets of Athens as Horace's bore. In literary characterology, or character writing as it occurs in the Hellenistic age, Theophrastus develops in an extraordinary way the brilliant treatments of familiar human types that are designated as characterology proper by Allport.¹⁰¹

How, then, do Theophrastus and the Hellenistic biographers (to be treated in Chapter V) pursue their study of the ethical characterization of the individual? Misch,¹⁰² in discussing Aristotle and the shaping of biography, points out that in part the form of the biography was determined by his conception of "energy," that is, action as opposed to mere potentiality, by a man's way of living in action. Thus was the individual life to be portrayed "not by an enumera-

⁸⁸ Webster, *ibid.*, has suggested many points in common with the physiognomical tract attributed to Aristotle, primarily for the comic masks. But it is important to note the many hints of characterization by expression on the face that are to be found in the tragic masks. For comedy see Pickard-Cambridge, *ibid.*, pp. 177-212. See the recent work of T. B. L. Webster, *Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (New York, 1964). Cf. also his studies published by the Institute of Classical Studies, University of London: *Bulletin Supplement*, no. 9 (1960) "Monuments Illustrating Old and New Comedy"; no. 11 (1961) "Monuments Illustrating New Comedy"; no. 14 (1962) "Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play."

⁸⁹ A hooked nose is a sign of either shamelessness or greatness of soul. Pseud.-Arist. 811a.

⁹⁰ A man of fierce temper has a great beard and a heavy growth of hair. Pseud.-Arist. 808a.

⁹¹ Lethargy shows a certain softness of character. Pseud.-Arist. 806b.

⁹² Hermonian is derived from Hermon, a comic actor, probably going back to Aristophanes' *Peace*.

⁹³ A sly grin is characteristic of a silly disposition. Pseud.-Arist. 808.

⁹⁴ The *πάγχρηστος νεανίσκος* has a reddish complexion, a sign of good disposition as well as haste. Pseud.-Arist. 806b; 808a; 812a. A somewhat wrinkled forehead suggests courage. Pseud.-Arist. 807b.

⁹⁵ The *ἀγροῖκος* with a snub nose, flat lips, and dark complexion and heavy hair is cowardly and sensuous. Pseud.-Arist. 811b; 812a-b.

⁹⁶ All are marked by cowardice. The braggart soldier may have either dark or yellow hair, thereby being cowardly or courageous on occasions. Pseud.-Arist. 812a.

⁹⁷ See above, note 89.

⁹⁸ Raised eyebrows are a sign of conceit. Pseud.-Arist. 811b.

⁹⁹ The leading slave with a coil of red hair is hasty and shameless. Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 808a; 812a.

¹⁰⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 808a says signs of sulkiness include withered skin, and a wrinkled, gaunt face.

¹⁰¹ In Gordon Allport's *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (New York, 1937) three aspects of the study of personality are described as having had their sources in the ancient world. These aspects are: literary characterology, humoral psychology, and physiognomy proper. Literary characterology is to be found in Theophrastus, humoral psychology in Empedocles, the Hippocratic corpus, and Galen. Physiognomy proper is set forth in the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica*, the work of Polemo and of Adamantius.

¹⁰² Georg Misch, *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, translated E. W. Dicks, (2 v., Cambridge [Mass.], 1951) 1, part 2, chap. 2: pp. 287-338, especially p. 292 and following.

tion of characteristics, but the man's acts were to be placed on record so that his character and nature were revealed by them." Surely the *Characters* of Theophrastus belong in this category. The thirty sketches are a lively treatment of typical characters, such as the ironic man, the flatterer, the garrulous man; in other words, a book of manners of various kinds of men, both good and bad, their way of life, their modes of behavior. If, as the apocryphal preface states, the purpose of these sketches is highly moral in so far as the writer says in the dedication to Polycles that he believed that their sons would be better men if they were left with such remainders to imitate in choosing more wisely friendships and associations, then it is of considerable importance to note that Theophrastus uses almost no physical descriptions to make his points. Actually no passages of strict physiognomical significance occur.

In addition we know that Theophrastus composed an essay on Flattery (*περί κολακείας*), but we have no hint as to whether the character study, like the second portrait in his *Characters*, was devoid of physical description, or whether it contained, perhaps, material of a physiognomical nature. On the other hand, it is Theophrastus who preserves for us in his work *De Sensibus*¹⁰³ the theory of Empedocles that the seat of the brain and the soul was in the blood, and that by a particular mixture of the four elements the nature of man became more inclined to sloth or rapid action. Throughout the *Characters* there are, to be sure, places where the attempted application of physiognomical ideas might be inferred, but the application of these principles plays no real part in the characterization. The *Characters* are somewhat like "Marks of Quality."¹⁰⁴ The portraits may be classified under personal appearance, religion, life at home, life in the marketplace, visiting and entertaining friends, and public life.¹⁰⁵ Under personal appearance, clothes are uppermost in importance, haircuts, nails, and voice also are included,¹⁰⁶ but these, with the exception of the voice, are the outward marks of a man, and not concerned with his inward nature in the strict sense of physiognomical interpretation. The kind of sketch that occurs in Theophrastus finds its sources in the ethical discourses of Aristotle, as we have already noted, and likewise in several literary areas, such as Old Comedy, but above all in the dramatic dialogues of Plato. In character portrayal Plato,¹⁰⁷ as a successor to Epicharmus and Sophron, dramatically in-

troduces characters in what are essentially philosophical mimes. Within this dramatic portrayal there is also description of certain types of characters, descriptions which are the forerunners of Theophrastus, such as the short, bald coppersmith,¹⁰⁸ who gains his freedom, makes a little money, and marries the orphaned daughter, now left without means, of the former master.

If the *Characters* are to be dated around 319 B.C., it seems clear that these sketches of late Greek life are not much concerned with the principles of the physiognomists. The kind of physical appearance analyzed in the handbooks, based in part on close observation of familiar figures in an urban society, belongs probably to a slightly later period; or else Theophrastus is purposely refraining from all documentation of the physique in his stated form of characterization.

IV. PAPYRI: RHETORICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

In view of Seneca's definitions of rhetorical terms used for iconistic and physiognomical descriptions (treated in the previous chapter), we must now ask what relation the descriptions of physique found in the papyri (i.e., the use by the *publicani* mentioned by Seneca), as well as the *exempla* occurring in rhetorical theory and practice, bear to the kinds of portraiture appearing in the literature of the Graeco-Roman world and in the Roman Empire through the third century A.D.

The descriptions of physique recovered from papyri include, first of all, not only the collection made by Fürst but that of other more recently published papyri¹ which is considerable and contains iconistic portraits of the utmost detail. These descriptions occur in Egyptian-Greek legal forms, where they are used for the purpose of identification of the recruits in military enrollment, in proclamations for the capture of runaway slaves, in such private documents as wills, sale of land or of a house, resignations of claims to an estate, or a loan or a mortgage. The phrases *εὐμεγέθης* [or good height] and *μέσος μεγέθει* [of medium height] and identification such as an *οὐλή* or scar are emphasized. A typical description employed in connection with the sale of land in 107 B.C.² by Taous, daughter

¹⁰³ See Chap. II, p. 18.

¹⁰⁴ T. B. L. Webster, *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens* (London, 1956), p. 128. See the new edition of *The Characters of Theophrastus*, ed. by R. G. Ussher (London, 1960).

¹⁰⁵ Ussher, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* See 2 (Flattery) 3; 4 (Boorishness) 1; 8 (Newsmaking) 2; cf. Pseud.-Arist. 806b; 19 (Nastiness); 24 (Arrogance) 8.

¹⁰⁷ See John M. S. McDonald, *Character Portraiture in Epicharmus, Sophron and Plato* (Sewanee, 1931) "Plato's Psychology of Character-type," chap. XV, pp. 365-379.

¹⁰⁸ See McDonald, p. 362, and *Rep.* 6.495e.

¹ Cf. L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde*, (3v., Leipzig, 1912); Johannes Hasebroek, *Das Signalement in den Papyrskunden* (Leipzig, 1921); Francis Smolka, "De Ratione Personarum Describendarum in Papyrorum Actis adhibita" in *Eos* 27 (1924): pp. 75-88; F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrurkunden*, (2v., Heidelberg, 1924); Fürst, *ibid.*, pp. 597-614 for a collection of examples drawn from various periods. A more recent collection occurs in *Select Papyri* translated by A. D. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, (2v., London, 1932-1934, LCL). See for example, *Sel. Pap.* 1, 28, 29, 32, 37, 54, 58, 63, 76; 2, 234, 253.

² *Sel. Pap.* 1, 27, trans. A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar.

of Harpos, "is aged about 48 years, of medium height, fair-skinned, round-faced, straight-nosed, with a scar on her forehead." Senesis is "about 42 years, of medium height, fair-skinned, straight-nosed, with a scar on her forehead," and Siephmous "aged about 20 years, fair-skinned, round-faced, straight-nosed, without distinctive mark." Peteharsemtheus, the purchaser, is in turn "about 36 years, of medium height, fair-skinned, rather curly-haired, long-faced, straight-nosed."

Secondly, rhetorical theory ("ars rhetorica") and practice (e.g., Cicero's speeches), is of paramount significance for a study of physiognomics. The *Auctor ad Herennium*,³ (dealing with the *ars rhetorica*) defines *characterismos* ("effictio") "as representing the bodily form of some person as follows: I mean him, men of the jury, the ruddy, short bent man, with white rather than curly hair; blue-gray eyes, and a huge scar on his chin, if perhaps you can recall him from memory ('hunc, iudices, dico, rubrum, brevem, incurvum, canum, subcrispum, caesium, cui sane maior est in mento cicatrix, si quo modo potest vobis in memoriam redire')," and goes on to remark that "this figure is not only serviceable, if you wish to designate some person, but also graceful, if fashioned with brevity and clarity."

It is appropriate to review here the rhetorical terms applied to descriptions of physique as classified by Greek rhetoricians.⁴ *Ekphrasis*⁵ is a description, clear and concise, of *pragmata* or *prosopa*. *Eikonismos*⁶ is closely associated with *ekphrasis*, with this distinction, that under the term *eikonismos* only people properly may be described. *Charakterismos*⁷ is sometimes equated with *eikonismos*, and sometimes separated as a description simply of character or behavior. *Charakterismos*⁸ is defined as a "terse, asyndetic description of personal appearance, designed either as a means of legal identification or as an ornament of style." In Greek rhetorical technique it is recognized as a *schema* or *tropos* closely parallel to *charakterismos*. In the rhetorical definitions the descriptions of Thersites in the *Iliad*⁹ are frequently cited, and under *charakterismos* usually that of Eurybates in the *Odyssey*¹⁰ (sometimes Thersites as well). Another rhetorical term, *eikon*,¹¹ is a description of appearance achieved by comparison of one figure with another,

³ 4, 49, 3. Trans. H. Caplan, LCL throughout.

⁴ See the excellent discussion of these rhetorical terms in G. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits" *CP* 19 (1924): pp. 97-123, especially pp. 97-99.

⁵ *Ekphrasis*: L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, (3v., Leipzig, 1856-1885), especially 2, 16 (Hermogenes); 2, 46 (Aphthonius); 2, 118 (Theon); 3, 251 (Georgius Choeroboscus).

⁶ *Eikonismos*: Spengel, *ibid.*, 3, 108 (Polybius Sardinianus).

⁷ *Charakterismos*: Spengel, *ibid.*, 3, 108 (Polybius Sardinianus); 3, 201 (Trypho); 3, 241 (Concondrius).

⁸ See p. 40, note 3.

⁹ 2, 216-219.

¹⁰ 19, 246.

¹¹ Spengel, *ibid.*, 3, 108 (Herodian, Polybius Sardinianus).

either as a whole or part by part. Thus the wise Penelope is likened to Artemis, and Agamemnon¹² is compared in part to Zeus, in part to Ares, and in part to Poseidon.

The *Auctor ad Herennium* (first century B.C.) translated the terms *ekphrasis* and *eikonismos* by *effictio*, and *charakterismos* by *notatio*. Seneca's¹³ definition of *eikonismos* has been discussed in Chapter III. In the encomium those who compose panegyrics must treat "qualities of character and physical attributes" in three parts¹⁴: the matters concerning the soul and the character, the matters relating to the body, and thirdly, "external circumstances." The factors relating to the body are health, beauty, and quick sensibility. The *Auctor ad Herennium* adds¹⁵: "corporis sunt ea quae natura corpori attribuit commoda aut incommoda: velocitas, vires, dignitas, valetudo, et quae contraria sunt."

The development of rhetorical theory on the nature of *pronuntiatio*, or the delivery of an oration, and the importance of the countenance as the image of the mind are analyzed in the *Auctor ad Herennium*, Cicero, and Quintilian. The practical application of these theories in turn may be observed in Cicero's *Brutus*, in his orations, and in the panegyrics composed in the Roman empire.

Pronuntiatio is concerned with the suitable expression on the face, the proper use of voice and gestures. It formed one of the five main divisions of rhetorical training, on which the Auctor remarks¹⁶:

Many have said that the faculty of greatest use to the speaker and most valuable for persuasion is delivery. . . . Therefore because no one has written carefully on this subject—all have thought it scarcely possible for voice, mien, and gesture to be lucidly described as appertaining to our sense experience—and because the mastery of delivery is a very important requisite for speaking, the whole subject, as I believe, deserves serious consideration.

He outlines gestures suited to each occasion, and concludes with the statement that¹⁷ "this, nevertheless, one must remember: good delivery ensures that what the orator is saying seems to come from his heart."

By the time of Cicero careful training was required in the *ars rhetorica* for *pronuntiatio* or *actio* [hypocrisis]. But Aristotle in the fourth century declared that even in his day instructions with regard to *hypocrisis* had long been neglected, and that Thrasy-

¹² *Il.* 2, 478-479.

¹³ *Ep.* 95, 65. He quotes from Virgil's *G.* 3, 75-78, a passage describing both behavior and appearance. See p. 33 for further discussion.

¹⁴ Spengel, *ibid.*, 2, 109. Cf. T. C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 2 (1902): pp. 120-121, where he diagrams the *schema* of Aphthonius.

¹⁵ 3, 10. "Physical attributes are merits or defects bestowed on the body by nature: agility, strength, beauty, health, and their contraries."

¹⁶ 3, 19.

¹⁷ 3, 27.

machus¹⁸ had held that a good delivery depended on nature, not on art. We are told that Theophrastus in the third century was the first to treat the subject carefully. The fact may serve to explain in part why we note an almost complete absence of description of facial expression or gesture in the Attic orators, whereas Cicero introduced descriptions frequently into his speeches.

Such types of portraiture continue throughout the literature of the classical period. The kinship between the type of portraiture used in oratory and that appearing in papyri is evident, just as there is an obvious connection between the descriptions used by the *Auctor ad Herennium* and the descriptions in Roman comedy.

The *Auctor ad Herennium*, a treatise addressed to a certain Gaius Herennius, and the oldest tract on the *ars rhetorica* preserved in Latin literature, is to be dated about 86-82 B.C.,¹⁹ and is thoroughly Greek in its point of view. The line of thought pursued in the section on *pronuntiatio* (delivery) suggests that it is probably subsequent in origin to that of Theophrastus.²⁰ We may observe²¹ that the author believes completely that a good delivery proceeds directly from the state of mind. The "voice quality"²² he treats first in a considerable detail, pointing out the need for flexibility required for conversation, debate, or exhortation, and the pathetic appeal to be achieved by physical movement. *Gestus corporis* and *vultus moderatio* make more plausible what is delivered.²³ The facial expression must show modesty and keenness but should never suggest the actor or the laborer. The gestures²⁴ must correspond to the tone of voice, and the speaker, using a dignified conversational style, should stand upright, barely moving the right hand, and adopting an expression of gaiety or sadness suited to the subject matter. In the conduct of debate he must employ a rapid movement of the arm, a readily changeable expression on the face, and a sharp look. This can be varied by walking back and forth, stamping the right foot from time to time, and

maintaining a fierce, fixed expression. In exhortation a slower form of gesture is required, but the expression may remain approximately the same. In the "amplification" of pathos, it is customary to slap the thigh,²⁵ beat one's head, and from time to time assume a sad and anxious look. All of these suggestions, set down to ensure that the speaker is saying exactly what is in his heart, reflect the "physiognomic consciousness" of the later Greek world, wherein the physical appearance deliberately displays the inner emotions of the mind. These ideas are consonant with Roman rhetorical practice, and Cicero himself pursues the subject at some length. He introduces his discussion of delivery by a statement²⁶ that orators have left unconsidered this art, when they are in reality the *veritatis ipsius actores*, while *actores*, who are the *imitatores veritatis*, have taken it over. Nature, he maintains, has given to every *motus animi* a particular expression of face, tone of voice and bearing, for the whole body as well as the countenance and the voice are like the strings of the lyre, and are struck by each emotion of the mind. Everything rests with the face,²⁷ and the face in turn is under the power of the eyes. All delivery belongs to the mind, the countenance is the image of the mind, and the eyes are the index of the emotions: "nam haec est ima pars corporis quae quot animi motus sunt tot significationes et commutationes possit efficere." No one can achieve the same end with the eyes closed. There should be constant control of the eyes, since the total expression of the face should not be altered too much for fear of

¹⁸ *Rh.* 3, 1, 1403b; 1404a; Quint. *Inst.* 3, 3, 4.

¹⁹ See H. Caplan, (*Cicero ad Herennium*, LCL. Introduction, p. vii; also p. 174, note a, on the Platonic and Aristotelian form of classification to be found in epideictic causes, including praise or censure: "iam igitur potest esse rerum externarum, corporis, animi.")

²⁰ *Ibid.*, xvi.

²¹ See Quintilian, p. 42.

²² 3, 20-25. (After H. Caplan, LCL throughout.)

²³ 3, 26-27.

²⁴ See the article on gestures in *OCD* for a brief summary of the subject. For oratory and actors the essential material is to be found in Quint. *Inst.* 11, 2, 65-68, and is so designated by Förster *SP* 2: pp. 328-330, as related to physiognomical theory. H. J. Rose lists in *OCD* natural signs of emotions in classical authors, e.g., jumping (literally) at good news (Q. Cicero *Fam.* 16, 16, 1); anger marked by biting nails or fingers (Hor. *Epod.* 5, 48; Persius 5, 162); bad news evident in smiting thighs (Achilles in *Il.* 16, 125, and others after him); scratching of ear or cheek to indicate anger or perplexity (Apul. *Met.* 6, 9).

²⁵ See H. Caplan, *ibid.*, p. 204, note a. Slapping the thigh was apparently introduced into Athens by Cleon. It is often a sign of indignation. See also Quintilian, *Inst.* 11, 3, 123. Cf. H. M. Hubbell, "The Rhetorica of Philodemus," *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences* 23 (1920): pp. 243-382, esp. 310 (1, 195, col. 14a, 8; 1, 198, col. 15a). Philodemus, an older contemporary of Cicero, whose friend and patron, Piso, was the bitter enemy of Cicero, and was attacked by him in the *In Pisonem* (68-72). He was a poet and scholar whose *Rhetorica*, recovered from Herculaneum, deals briefly with the art of delivery along the lines of the *Auctor ad Herennium*. "Much of delivery is the natural and unconscious bodily expression of the emotions." 1, 196 (ed. Sudhaus). Cf. Caplan, *op. cit.*, note ad 3, 11, 191. See Robert P. Sonkowsky, "An Aspect of Delivery in Ancient Rhetorical Theory," *TAPA* 90 (1959): pp. 256-274, for a study of the importance of delivery in ancient rhetorical theory from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to the *Auctor ad Herennium*, including an analysis of the manner in which "the theory of delivery suffered from the absence of the way of studying the emotions," to a revival of interest in the subject in the *Auctor ad Herennium*. It was Cicero who restored "the study of the emotions and gave new life to the theory of delivery," particularly the "genera vocis," while Quintilian confirmed in his *Institutio Oratoria* the Ciceronian conclusions.

²⁶ *De Or.* 3, 216: "Omnis enim animi suum quandam a natura habet vultum et sonum et gestum; corpusque totum hominis et eius omnis vultus omnesque voces ut nervi in fidibus, ita sonant ut motu animi quoque sunt pulsae . . . sed in ore sunt omnia, in eo autem ipso dominatus est omnis oculorum . . . animi est enim omnis actio et imago animi vultus, indices oculi . . ." (Dedicated to Quintus, 55 B. C.).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 221-222.

unfortunate distortion, but the eyes can be used to indicate the *motus animi*, in accordance with the character of the speech, by assuming an intense expression, or a mild gaze, or a sharp or cheerful look. Nature has given man eyes,²⁸ while on the horse and the lion she has bestowed a mane, a tail, and ears, to mark the feelings of the mind. Thus in delivery the face is second only to the voice, and is governed by the eyes. It is the voice, in turn, that has the powerful part in *pronuntiatio*. It is to be prayed for as a gift, and it is to be cared for as it is given.

Quintilian writing at the end of the first century A.D. develops this idea even more fully in dealing with *gestus*. The most complete treatment of the subject in ancient rhetoric is to be found in the *Institutio Oratoria*.²⁹ The importance of gesture, he submits, is "clear from the fact that there are many things which it can express with the assistance of words." The disposition of the mind can be inferred from the countenance and the manner of walking, and even animals without the power of speech as such display anger, joy, or fawning by means of the eyes and certain other signs. The angle of the head is of paramount importance in delivery.³⁰ A *caput rectum* is *secundum naturam*; a *caput deiectum* indicates humility; a head held stiffly and rigidly suggests *barbaria mentis*. The head can also be used effectively to express modesty, uncertainty, admiration or indignation, by movements which are familiar to all. A frequent nodding of the head, accompanied by a rolling and tossing of the hair, is the mark of a fanatic. Quintilian agrees with the earlier remarks of the *Auctor ad Herennium* and with Cicero that the eyes dominate the face,³¹ and that, by means of them, we most easily express our entreaties, our threats, our flattery, or sorrow, our joy, our expectations or our resignation. It is "for this reason that on the stage masks seek to enhance in tragedy the anger of Medea or the savagery of Hercules, and in comedy, for example, the essential role of the father, who is 'alternately excited and gentle,' by representing his countenance with one eyebrow raised and the other in its usual position." Quintilian explains this oddity of expression by the fact that it was customary for actors to turn that side of the face to the audience which best agreed with the emotions of the character at the moment. In other words, we have evidence from the theater to show that there was a calculated and definite concern with not only the static portraiture of a stock figure, but also with the depiction of emotion or character through the momentary appearance or expression. Eyes are all important as revealing the nature of the mind at a given instance, through a gleam of delight or the shadow of grief. By their movement they become intent, languid, haughty,

fierce, gentle, or cruel. Eye-brows,³² too, show grief or pleasure by their motion and support the expression of the eyes.

The only other factor of greater importance is the blood,³³ which flows in accordance with the *habitu mentis*, when bashfulness transforms the cheek into blushing red, or when, by reason of fear, all the blood retreats and leaves the face in cold pallor. When the circulation of the blood is moderate, a serene expression is produced. Here the Aristotelian doctrine of humoral psychology becomes applicable and once more it is the "middle situation" that constitutes the best-blended personality. Since the shoulders,³⁴ as well as other parts of the body, are indicative of the inner nature, a mean and servile and fraudulent person may be suggested by the shortening of the neck through the contraction of the shoulders, thus producing the effect of flattery, admiration, or fear.

Because his orations represent the practical application of his views on delivery, Cicero puts into effect many of the theories on physiognomy which he sets forth in the art of rhetoric. His personal convictions with regard to the matter are summed up in a passage from the *Laws*, one of his later works, probably published after his death. He remarks in the first book³⁵ that

nature has likewise not only equipped man himself with nimbleness of thought, but also has given him the senses, to be, as it were, his attendants and messengers. . . . She has granted us a bodily form which is convenient and well suited to the human mind. . . . In addition, she has so formed his features as to portray therein the character that lies hidden deep within him; for not only do the eyes declare with exceeding clarity the innermost feelings of our hearts, but also the countenance ("vultus") as we Romans call it, which can be found in no other living being, save man, reveals the character.

In Chapter I we dealt briefly with the first professional physiognomist, Zopyrus. The account of his meeting with Socrates occurs in many later classical writers whose versions are the source of the material Förster³⁶ includes in his discussion of Zopyrus. Of special interest to us is Cicero's use of the incident to which he makes reference in two different works,³⁷

²⁸ *Ibid.* 11, 3, 79.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 11, 3, 83.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 11, 3, 78-79.

³¹ *Leg.* 1, 9, 26. Trans. C. W. Keyes, LCL. See note *ad loc.* "The Greeks are familiar with the meaning which the word 'countenance' conveys, though they have no name for it." It has been pointed out that Cicero is thinking of facial expression as "a mirror of momentary appearance," and of the "vultus" (countenance) as "an index of character."

³² *SP* 1: pp. vii-xi. *Fat.* 5, 10. Cf. scholiast on Persius 4, 24.

³³ *Tusc.* 4, 37, 80; "Ut Socrates dicitur, cum multa in conventu conlegisset in eum Zopyrus, qui se naturam cuiusque ex forma perspicere profitebatur, derisus est a ceteris, qui illa in Socrate vitia non agnosceret, ab ipso autem Socrate sublevatus, cum illa sibi insita, sed ratione a se delecta diceret." Cf. *Off.* 1, 36 for suitable outward appearance, gait and conversation, in which Cicero writing to his son on duty, is undoubtedly indebted for the thought of the passage to Panaetius. I have

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 223; cf. *Or.* 55-56; 59; 60; *Brut.* 110; *Pis.* 1.

²⁹ *Inst.* 11, 3, 65-68 (trans. H. E. Butler, LCL throughout).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 11, 3, 69.

³¹ *Ibid.* 11, 3, 72; 3, 75.

the *De Fato* and the *Tusculan Disputations*. In the *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero observes that Socrates admitted that the characteristics which Zopyrus had recognized were part of his natural endowment but had been overcome by philosophy (a version which is followed by Alexander of Aphrodisias in the second century A.D.). Whatever may have been Cicero's interpretation of this remark of Socrates, there is no doubt that the orator uses the device of physiognomical interpretation in his orations with telling effect.

An excellent example of Cicero's adroitness in this area is to be found in his oration *Pro Quinto Roscio*. The orator, it may be recalled, is inveighing against Fannius Chaerea, who had declared that the actor Roscius had defrauded him in the case of a slave who had been killed. Cicero implores the court to consider the lives and countenances of both men³⁸:

Do not the head itself, and those clean shaven eyebrows seem to reek of malice and proclaim craftiness aloud? If one can make a guess from the silent form of a man's body, does not Fannius seem to be composed entirely of fraud, trickery, and lies from the tips of his fingers to the top of his head? He always has his head and eyebrows shaved, that he may not be accused of having a single hair of an honorable man on him. Roscius has constantly portrayed him brilliantly on the stage—and yet he is not adequately rewarded with gratitude in return for his kindness.

Or to take an example of similar oratorical vituperation, Cicero scornfully attacks the new fashion prevailing among candidates for office³⁹—that all visit the homes of all citizens, and let the voters conclude from the faces of the candidates what courage and capacity each possesses: "Did you see him, wrapped in gloom, head hanging down? He's down, he's given up, he's thrown away his weapons."

It is indeed part of Cicero's technique to depict with vividness the physique and faces of those whose characters he wishes to attack. He pays particular attention not merely to description of expressions which are of a permanent cast, but even more of those which change frequently, so that he may hold up for ridicule the men whom he is opposing in court. He begins, for example, his attack on Calpurnius Piso in the first oration which he delivered in the Senate on his return from exile (57 B.C.)⁴⁰: "He (Piso) succeeded in hoodwinking you and the Roman people, not by these well-worn instruments of deception, wisdom, and eloquence, but by a knitted forehead, and a disdainful air, but me he could not hoodwink." When Caesar had departed for Gaul in 58 B.C., he had left Clodius and Piso, consul for 58, and his son-in-law, to ensure Cicero's banishment. Piso and Gabinius had aided

Clodius in securing this exile, and Piso was given the province of Macedonia as a reward, while Gabinius received Syria. When Cicero came back to Rome in 57 his speech *De Provinciis Consularibus* (delivered 56 B.C. and reminiscent of his first speech on his return) expressed his thanks to the triumvirs, and at the same time bitterly attacked both Piso and Gabinius for mismanagement of their provinces.⁴¹ "I make no comment on his pride, his insolence, his cruelty. Close hidden be all those deeds of lust and darkness, which he sought to conceal by a stern and lofty look, not by modesty and self-control ('fronte et supercilio, non pudore et temperantia')." In the *Pro Sestio*, even earlier in that year (56 B.C.) he had lampooned Piso and Gabinius. At Piso he thunders⁴²: "quam taeter incedebat; quam truculentus! quam terribilis aspectu!" "You⁴³ would have thought you saw one of our bearded ancestors, a perfect specimen of the old regime, a mirror of antiquity, a pillar of the State." . . . What am I to say of his eyebrow (supercilium) which then did not seem to men to be a *supercilium*⁴⁴ (sternness and authority) but a guarantee (pignus) for the State? "There was such a solemnity in his eye, there were such wrinkles in his forehead, that this eyebrow seemed to be sponsor of the year's security" ("tanta erat gravitas in oculo, tanta contractio frontis, ut illo supercilio annus ille niti tanquam vade videretur"). Yet the height of scurrility in personal attack comes in the *In Pisonem* of 55. In the opening paragraphs, in answer to Piso's earlier attack on him in the senate, Cicero refutes in the language of insult the claim that he had deprived Piso of his rightful office in the province of Macedonia⁴⁵:

Do you begin to see, monster, do you begin to realize how men loathe your impudence? . . . We were not deceived by your slavish complexion, your hairy cheeks, and your discolored teeth; it was your eyes, eyebrows, forehead, in a word your whole countenance, which is a kind of dumb interpreter of the mind, which pushed your fellow-men into delusion.

This theme of hate and contempt continues⁴⁶: "Nor was I so craven, after guiding the ship of state through dread wave and whirlwind and anchoring her safe in port, as to flinch before the cloudlet of your frown or your colleague's tainted breath." As a youth Piso presented such an aspect of severity in his forehead and eyebrow that he seemed angry not only to men but to the gods themselves. Cicero remarks that Philodemus,⁴⁷ so far from being intimidated by Piso's scowling countenance, sought his friendship. And yet with reference to Piso's pretence and villainy

discussed Cicero's statements more fully, in Chapter VIII in connection with St. Ambrose, *De Officiis Ministrorum*, and the pagan and Christian view of man's physique and behavior; *Fat.* 6.

³⁸ *QRosc.* 7, 20 (trans. J. H. Freese, LCL).

³⁹ *Mur.* 21, 44–45 (trans. L. E. Lord, LCL).

⁴⁰ *Post Red. in Sen.* 6, 15–16 (trans. N. H. Watts, LCL).

⁴¹ *Prov. Cons.* 4, 8 (trans. R. Gardner, LCL).

⁴² *Sest.* 8, 19–20.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 19 (trans. R. Gardner throughout, LCL).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Pis.* 1. N. H. Watts throughout, LCL. Cf. edition by R. G. M. Nisbet, *Cicero in Pisonem* (Oxford, 1961).

⁴⁶ 9, 20.

⁴⁷ 5, 11. Cf. 11, 25, and the end of the speech.

Cicero⁴⁸ adds: "And this I hardly dare mention. I fear there may be some one who as yet fails to discern the monstrous villainy that yonder solemn brow envelopes in its folds." When two days later Piso was introduced to a public assembly by Gabinius, with whom he shared the consulship, and was asked about Cicero's consulship,⁴⁹ he replied with one eyebrow raised in scorn to his forehead, the other lowered to his chin, that cruelty did not please him. "Never," concludes Cicero,⁵⁰ "have I thirsted for your blood, . . . but to see you abject, despised, scorned by your fellows, a thing—that peers into every corner and quakes at every whisper, that lives mistrustful of itself . . . a shivering, trembling, fawning wretch—this have I desired to see you; and my desire has been gratified" ("horrentem, trementem, adulantem omnis videre te volui: vidi"). This is the Piso "who to public view seemed all eyebrows and antique gravity."⁵¹

The acerbity of Cicero's power of personal invective so forcefully displayed in the case of Piso is directed against many other figures as well. Catiline⁵² was possessed of a countenance that was so full of madness, his eyes of crime, his speech of arrogance, "sic ut ei iam exploratus et domi conditus consulatus videretur." Of the conspirators with Catiline,⁵³ and finally of the confession of each man—"still their pallor, their eyes, their looks, their silence seemed much more certain proof." Against Clodius, against Antony, against Verres, comparable invectives are hurled.⁵⁴ While descriptions of personal appearance in Cicero's orations are often identified with passages of vituperation and invective, personal description is sometimes employed for purposes of praise and eulogy. When Cicero⁵⁵ in the *Pro Deiotaro* speaks of Caesar (45 B.C.), he says "in tuis oculis, in tuo ore vultuque acquiesco." Or when he speaks of Marius, to whom he refers in eulogistic terms:

If the countenance of Marius, if his voice, if the flash of his commanding glance ("si ille imperatorius ardor oculorum"),⁵⁶ if his recent triumphs, if the sight of his bodily presence, had such power, let his authority, let his achievements, let our memory of him, let the everlasting name of that most courageous and most illustrious hero have the same power now.

Personal descriptions of a favorable or eulogistic content are to be found also in the *Brutus* in connection with Cicero's portrayal of the great orators of Rome. Here the principles of oratorical appearance set forth in the *Orator* and the *De Oratore* are given specific application and contribute to the general picture of

Roman excellence in this field. Gnaeus Pompey,⁵⁷ the triumvir, possessed "in voce magnum splendorem," and in bearing "summam dignitatem." Crassus⁵⁸ displayed no violent "movements of the body, no sudden variation of the voice, no walking up and down, no frequent stamping of the foot." Cicero's appraisal of the effectiveness of his contemporaries' delivery brings us back, by way of a full circle, so to speak, to the type of description occurring in the ninth book of the *Iliad*,⁵⁹ when Odysseus on getting up to speak appears as a man of no understanding.

Pliny the Younger in the panegyric on Trajan *inter alia* commends the strength and stature of the emperor's body, the distinction of his head, the dignity of his countenance and his humanity, his hair arranged for the enlarging of his majesty, the nobility of his person made even more manifest by the descriptions of those whom he succeeded.⁶⁰ Yet Domitian,⁶¹ in the *Agricola* of Tacitus, is terrifying in face, in the haughtiness of his forehead, in the anger of his eyes, in the effeminate pallor of his body, and in the shamelessness of his suffused countenance. The rhetorical tradition of panegyric⁶² continues in the same manner in the third and fourth centuries, when the view holds that the nature of the mind can be gathered from the face and grace of a man's appearance, so far as a divine spirit has entered into the body as a dweller.⁶³ The signs of ill-concealed grief go out through the eyes ("per vultus indices") and the face, which is the betrayer, reveals the most intimate condition of the mind, so that the "imago animorum" stands out "in speculo frontium." The laudations of Constantine⁶⁴ are most frequent: he is praised for his likeness to his father, and the writer cherishes the same gravity of the forehead, the same tranquility in the eyes and face, the same blush of modesty.

What, furthermore, is the connection of physiognomics with the imaginary portraits of heroes, the practice of rhetorical description and the art of painting in general? These latter subjects are among those treated in the various works of the family known as the Philostrati. It is in the *Heroicus*, which is concerned with the cult of Protesilaus, that we find such fictitious descriptions. In this work Philostratus

⁴⁸ *Brut.* 68, 239 (trans. G. L. Hendrickson, LCL).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 48, 148.

⁵⁰ 3, 217.

⁵¹ 48, 4.

⁵² *Agr.* 45: "cum denotandis tot hominum palloribus sufficeret saevus ille vultus et rubor quo se contra pudorem muniebat."

⁵³ 67, 1; cf. 73, 4. When Trajan, in contrast, speaks to a crowd, there is gravity of thought and expression, earnestness in his voice, power in his utterance, as there is good faith in his eyes, his bearing, his gestures, and indeed in his whole body.

⁵⁴ *Incert. Auct. Paneg. Constantino Aug. Dict.* 6, 17, 3 (ed. E. Baehrens, *XII Panegyrici Latini* Leipzig, 1911). Nazarus, *ibid.*, *Paneg. Constantino Aug. Dict.* 4, 13, 1. Pacatus Drepanus, *Paneg. Theodosio Aug. Dict.* 2, 37, 3. See appendix D for other references.

⁵⁵ *Incert. Auct. Paneg. Constantino Aug. Dict.* 6, 4, 2.

⁴⁸ 6, 12.

⁴⁹ 6, 14 (presumably an ocular defect).

⁵⁰ 41, 99. Cf. 41, 98.

⁵¹ R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), p. 149.

⁵² *Mur.* 24, 49 (trans. L. E. Lord, LCL).

⁵³ *Cat.* 3, 5, 13 (trans. L. E. Lord, LCL).

⁵⁴ See appendix D.

⁵⁵ *Deiot.* 2, 5 (trans. N. H. Watts, LCL).

⁵⁶ *Balb.* 21, 49 (trans. R. Gardner, LCL).

includes descriptions of Greek heroes, ghosts of the Trojan war, in an extraordinary account purportedly given to an old farmer by the ghost of Protestilaus.⁶⁵ These "forged" descriptions are not strictly identificatory, but are rhetorically elaborated after the style of an *ekphrasis*, a much practiced exercise in the new sophistic tradition,⁶⁶ though the "fictitious portrait" goes back to Dicaearchus' and Hieronymus' of Rhodes description of Heracles. Of the four members of the Lemnian family carrying the name of Philostratus, Verus, the oldest, has left no surviving works. Flavius, son of Verus, born about 170 A.D., and working under the patronage of Julia Domna, wrote not only the *Lives of the Sophists*, to which we have referred, but also the *Heroicus*. The Philostratus portraits belong, of course, in the tradition of Dares, *Historia de Excidio Troiae*, an imaginary account of the war from the Trojan point of view. The form used in the descriptions adds a note of authenticity to the identification of such heroes as Diomedes and Sthenelus. "And Protesilaus saw the shapes of both Diomedes and Sthenelus. The latter was tall and erect, with blue eyes and a hooked nose, thick hair, a tawny complexion rather ruddy, the former steady and alert appearing, dark complexioned, with a straight nose and curly, dry hair." Achilles is compared to the lion type, possessing such attributes as heavy hair more shining than gold and well arranged, a nose not yet hooked, but destined to be, the eyebrows arched, and such fury evident in the shining eyes as to put off any attack.

A figure of prime importance in the history of ancient painting is the Elder Philostratus, son-in-law of Flavius and grandson of Verus, who wrote the earlier *Imagines*, descriptions of paintings located perhaps in some Neapolitan collection, and brilliantly discussed by Karl Lehmann-Hartleben.⁶⁷ This work, perhaps to be dated in the second quarter of the third century A.D., "aims to create standards for the oratorical interpretation of painting,"⁶⁸ and includes many descriptions of momentary appearance of physique. The commitment of both the Elder and the Younger Philostratus to physiognomical principles in their rhetorical *ekphraseis* is clear. For our purposes the comment of the Elder Philostratus on the portrait of Pantheia⁶⁹ is perhaps the more significant:

The character of Pantheia the beautiful has been described by Xenophon,⁷⁰ how she disdained Araspas and would not

yield to Cyrus and wished the same earth to cover her and Abradates in the grave; but what her hair was like, what the breadth of her brow, what her glance and expression of her mouth Xenophon did not describe, though he was particularly clever at telling such things; but a man not good at writing though very clever at painting, who, though he had never seen Pantheia herself, was nevertheless well acquainted with Xenophon, and here paints Pantheia as from her soul he divined her to be.

He had earlier maintained that poets and painters⁷¹ make equal contributions to our knowledge of the deeds and the looks (*εἶδη*) of heroes. Philostratus the Younger (grandson of the Elder) expresses the same ideas in the prooemium of his *Imagines*⁷²:

For he who is to be a true master of the art (of painting) must have a good knowledge of human nature, he must be able to discern the signs of men's character, even when they are silent, and what is revealed in the state of the cheeks and the expression of the eyes, and the character of the eyebrows, and, to put the matter briefly, whatever has to do with the mind.

Here, we might say, the theoretical principles of physiognomy and the practice of rhetorical description ("ekphrasis") meet in the realm of art. If we accept Lehmann-Hartleben's thesis that these paintings are real, and the Philostratus "happened to be in Naples in the villa of a friend whose rooms were decorated with extensive groups of paintings and that he from time to time lectured on them," we may see that his interest was directed to the task of "giving oratorical expression to the impressions gained from the pictures."⁷³ Flavius Philostratus, author of the life of Apollonius of Tyana, depicts the philosophizing mystic of the first century A.D. as discussing painting with Damis in much the same phraseology.⁷⁴ In the course of this work the King of India expounds the philosophical training of Indian youths who wish to

⁷¹ 1, 1. For momentary descriptions see: 1, 3 (Aesop); 1, 4 (Menoeus, son of Creon); 1, 6 (Cupids); 1, 7 (Memnon); 1, 8 (Poseidon); 1, 9 (Cupids riding swans); 1, 11 (daughters of Helios); 1, 14 (Bronte and Astrape); 1, 15 (Theseus and Ariadne); 1, 16 (Daedalus and Pasiphae); 1, 17 (Oenomaus); 1, 18 (Dionysus); 1, 20 (satyrs); 1, 21 (Olympus); 1, 22 (Midas and satyrs); 1, 23 (Narcissus); 1, 24 (Apollo); 1, 26 (Apollo); 1, 27 (Amphiaras); 1, 28 (hunters); 1, 29 (Perseus and Andromeda); 1, 30 (Pelops); 2, 2 (Achilles); 2, 8 (Critheis); 2, 9 (Pantheia); 2, 10 (Clytemnestra and Cassandra); 2, 12 (Pan); 2, 15 (Lynceus at the sight of Glaucus Pontius); 2, 18 (Cyclops and Galatea); 2, 19 (Apollo); 2, 21 (Heracles and Antaeus). Similarly for Philostratus the Younger, *Imagines* 1 (Achilles on Scyros) and (Pyrrhus of Scyros); 2 (Marsyas and Apollo); 4 (Deianira); 5 (Amphitryon); 6 (Orpheus); 7 (Medea and Jason); 8 (Eros and Ganymede); 9 (Pelops and Hippodameia); 10 (Pyrrhus and Eurypylus); 11 (Argonauts and Medea); 13 (Sophocles); 14 (Apollo and Hyacinthus); 15 (Meleager); 16 (Heracles); 17 (Philoctetes). For Callistratus the same technique holds: 1. Satyr; 3. Eros; 4. Indian; 5. Narcissus; 7. Orpheus; 8. Dionysus; 10. Paeon; 11. Youth; 12. Centaur; 13. Medea; 14. Athamas.

⁷² Trans. A. Fairbanks throughout, LCL. Cf. Callistratus 5 (Narcissus) on the same point.

⁷³ "The *Imagines* of the Elder Philostratus", p. 41.

⁷⁴ 2, 22; cf. *ibid.*, 6, 4, the description of the statue of Memnon in iconistic style, and 6, 10 for the appearance of Virtue and Vice before Hercules.

⁶⁵ Diomedes and Sthenelus (ed. Kayser) 170, 27; 171, 2; Nestor 167, 5; Palamedes 183, 4-19; Aeneas 190, 22; Alexander (Paris) 191, 22; Achilles 200, 4-16; Patroclus 203, 30; 204, 5; cf. Protesilaus himself 141, 24; 142, 9 and Hector 151, 24-29, as well as Odysseus 185, 19-22.

⁶⁶ G. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits"; p. 121.

⁶⁷ "The *Imagines* of the Elder Philostratus" *A Bull* 23 (1941): pp. 16-44.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁶⁹ 2, 9 (trans. A. Fairbanks throughout, LCL).

⁷⁰ *Cyr.* 6, 1, 31; 5, 1, 6; 6, 4, 6.

become students and must be inspected.⁷⁵ The process is not unlike that allegedly followed by Pythagoras and recorded in Aulus Gellius.⁷⁶

But the particulars of the youths themselves are duly learnt by inspection of them. For in many cases a man's eyes reveal the secrets of his character, and in many cases there is material for forming a judgment, and appraising his value in his eyebrows and cheeks, for from these features the dispositions of people can be detected by wise and scientific men, as images are seen in a looking glass.⁷⁷

V. HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

We have already observed that the Greek historians in general make slight use—Thucydides none at all—of the descriptions of personal appearance as a device of characterization. Herodotus does, however, introduce random observations on the physical features of different peoples,¹ and on the relation of these features to the physical environment.

In the final chapter of his history Herodotus indicates familiarity with the ideas found in the Hippocratic work *Airs, Waters, and Places*. When the Persians are preparing to leave their rugged land after the downfall of Astyages, the Median king, and to occupy more fertile territory, Cyrus listens to them and then speaks a word of admonition²: "Do you go, but if you do, make ready to be no longer rulers, but subjects. Soft lands breed soft men; wondrous fruits of the earth and valiant warriors grow not from the same soil." The historian obviously assumes a relationship between climate, appearance, and character, and this remark of Cyrus is used at the conclusion of his history to remind his readers that the Persians, like the Greeks, were once great warriors, and to warn his victorious countrymen in moralistic terms of the possibility of future disaster to themselves. This passage is, of course, an example of humoral physiognomy, intended to show that the faculties of the soul follow the mixtures of the body, and that they, in turn, are affected by the climate in which people live.

Xenophon,³ on the other hand, as one under the influence of Socratic ethics, draws attention to the relation of character to the physique. He,⁴ with Aristophanes and Plato, delineates in considerable detail the familiar features of Socrates and his satyr-

⁷⁵ 2, 30.

⁷⁶ 1, 9.

⁷⁷ 2, 30 (trans. F. C. Conybeare throughout, LCL). Cf. other descriptions in *VA* 4, 9; 4, 16; 4, 20; 4, 27; 5, 9; 5, 35; 6, 30; 7, 27–28; 7, 31; 7, 42; 8, 7; 6–7; 8, 26; 8, 29.

¹ See Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 104.

² 9, 122 (trans. A. D. Godley, LCL). See Howe and Wells, *Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912) and note *ad loc.*, in which the editors point out that Herodotus ascribes to Cyrus the teaching of Hippocrates, *Aër*. 24. The place of Hippocrates in the history of physiognomical theory we discussed in Chapter II.

³ *Mem.* 3, 10, 4–5; cf. *Symp.* 1, 10; *Symp.* 5, 6 (on himself).

⁴ Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 106. *Symp.* 4, 19, 5. Cf. *Arist. Neph.* 223; *Plato Theaet.* 143e; 209b; *Meno* 80a; *Symp.* 215b; *Phaed.* 103a; *Rep.* 513a.

like inner nature—snub-nosed, bulging eyes, wide-spread nostrils, and thick lips. He, furthermore, represents Socrates as conversing with Parrhasius, the painter, on the proper methods of representing a subject's features so as to reveal his inner nature through the medium of art.

The choice of Heracles at the crossroads, as described by Xenophon, reflects the same kind of physiognomical thinking⁵:

And there appeared two women of great stature making towards him. The one was fair to see and of high bearing; and her limbs were adorned with purity, her eyes with modesty; sober was her figure, and her robe was white. The other was plump and soft with high feeding. Her face was made up to heighten its natural white and pink, her figure to exaggerate her height. Open-eyed was she, and dressed so as to disclose her charms. Now she eyed herself; anon looked to see whether any noticed her; and often she stole a glance at her own shadow.

The first description of Virtue is entirely that of static appearance, interpreted in ethical terms; the second, of Vice, is iconistic description, of which two features have physiognomical significance. Πολυσαρκία [plumpness] is a sign of the senseless and ὄμματα ἀναπεπταμένα [open eyes] of the shameless.⁶ The debate between these two women,⁷ allegorical in character, has a long and changing history, starting from Prodicus and finding expression in the fourth century A.D. in Gregory of Nazianzus' description of the strife of the Soul and the Flesh. The presence of iconistic physical portraiture in this debate varies with the purpose and period of those who imitate Xenophon's⁸ version of Prodicus' story, and it is important to observe how these descriptions change under the influence of physiognomical trends in different eras. But the burden of this section comes from a historian writing as a philosopher.

In the historical writing of the fourth and third centuries B.C. little or no importance was attached to descriptions of personal appearance. Similarly it may be said of the Attic orators of the same period that there is virtually no concern with the eulogy of the appearance, permanent or momentary, of an individual, or for attack by the vituperative description of opponents. That clearly becomes part of the rhetorical technique of historiography and oratory at a later period. Only in the prose work of Polybius on universal history (his life spans the second century

⁵ *Mem.* 2, 1, 22 (trans. E. C. Marchant, LCL).

⁶ Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 106. For πολυσαρκία see *Pseud.-Arist.* 807b; *Adamant.* 362, 8 and 16; *Plato, Rep.* 556D. For ὄμματα ἀναπεπταμένα see *Pseud.-Arist.* 807b; *Adam.* 317, 6; 336, 1.

⁷ For a study of this debate in classical literature see M. C. Waites, "The Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature," *HSCP* 23 (1912): esp. pp. 9–19. Cf., too, Philo Judaeus, *De Sacr. Abelis et Caini*, 20; *Sil.* 15, 18–31, *Philostratus VA* 6, 10.

⁸ For other passages in Xenophon dealing with physical descriptions, permanent or momentary, see *Ap.* 27; *Cyr.* 4, 4, 3; 5, 1, 5; 8, 4, 21; *Symp.* 1, 10; 4, 19; 5, 5; 8, 3. Also *An.* 2, 6, 8–9; *Ages.* 11, 2.

B.C.) do we find the question raised as to the relationship between "man, his character and his actions on the one hand, and his material environment on the other."⁹ Polybius, writing on the subject of music in Arcadia,¹⁰ accepts the principles of the Hippocratic essay on *Airs, Waters, and Places*. He remarks that the practice followed by the ancient Arcadians of introducing music training into their way of life was not for the purpose of luxury. These people devote themselves to hard labor in a cold and gloomy climate, and their character is by nature austere. He suggests that human beings yield easily to the influence of climate and that this serves as a strong formative element in the development of distinctive qualities of character, physical appearance and complexion, as well as in habits. Consequently music became obligatory with most of the Arcadians. Boys were trained to sing hymns and paeans, they danced at the Dionysia, they shared in singing at banquets, they marched in military formation to music. Thus they endeavored to soften and humanize the harshness of their environment, while the people of Cynaetha, alone in Arcadia, neglected such things entirely, although they needed these elements in their lives more than anybody in Arcadia, since their climate and countryside were the most unfavorable. Consequently in the struggles of the Achaean league in 220 B.C. they suffered severely because they did not take part in these Arcadian festivities, and so had become accustomed to crime. This view of Polybius¹¹ with respect to the effect of climate on man's appearance and behavior is of course to be found in Plato and Aristotle, and it is likely that Polybius shared with Posidonius much the same ideas as were held by the Stoics.¹² The Pseudo-Aristotelian author of the *Problemata*¹³ raises the question as to why the inhabitants of very hot or very cold regions are like beasts in appearance and nature, and believes that "moral energy is correlated with animal warmth." Megasthenes,¹⁴ the Hellenistic writer on the history of India, remarks that the intelligence of the Indians is due to their clear climate and pure water, and its effect on their physique and nature.

Among the earliest descriptions of physique in the

historical records and historical literature of Rome are those appearing in the epitaphs of the Scipios. That, for example, of Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, consul 298 B.C. (the inscription is before 200 B.C.) is of the first type,¹⁵ defined in the introduction;

Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus
Gnaivod patre prognatus fortis vir sapiensque
quoius forma virtutei parisuma fuit. . . .

Or a similar example is to be found almost a hundred and fifty years later in the epitaph of Claudia, *ca.* 133-122 B.C.¹⁶

Hospes quod deico paullum est: asta ac pellege.
heic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrae feminae.
nomen parentes nominaverunt Claudiam
.....
sermone lepido, tam autem incessu commodo.
domum servavit, lanam fecit. dixi. abei.

Or, to take another example from early Latin literature, there is the epigram of Quintus Catulus (consul 102 B.C.) on the famous actor Roscius:

Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans
cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.
pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra,
mortalis visust pulchrior esse deo.

Cicero, who quotes the lines in the *De Natura Deorum* (I, 28, 70) remarks, "Ah, yes, Roscius, more beautiful than a god, but then, as indeed in our own day, he was endowed with *perversissimis oculis* ("a villainous squint," Mayor). Yet to Catulus he seemed *salsus et venustus*. Such expressions are part and parcel of Roman historical writing. The description is of the simplest sort, yet briefly suggests the unchanging excellence of body and character in each instance.

In comparison with Tacitus or Ammianus Marcellinus, Livy uses with relative infrequency the description of personal appearance for the purpose of characterization.¹⁷ We have an excellent estimate of Scipio Africanus. The descriptions are of the second type, for Livy prefers to show the power exerted over the minds of his soldiers and over those of his enemies by the authority and dignity evident in Scipio's appearance. During the height of a mutinous uprising at Sucro (206 B.C.), when the leaders of the rebellion were assembled before Scipio, his very face created terror¹⁸:

¹⁵ CIL 12 6, 7 (date of the inscription about one hundred years later than the elogium).

¹⁶ CIL 12, 1211.

¹⁷ In order to avoid unnecessary repetition I am including in appendix D a classified list of the more important descriptions of the first and second type that have come to my attention from the Roman historians. I shall discuss here only a few examples from Livy, Tacitus, and in Chapter VIII, Ammianus Marcellinus.

¹⁸ 28, 26. Cf. 28, 27 (trans. F. G. Moore, LCL): "Tum omnis ferocia concidit, et ut postea fatebantur, nihil aequae eos terruit quam praeter spem robur et color imperatoris, quem adfectum visuros crediderant, vultusque qualem ne in acie quidem aiebant meminisse. sedit tacitus paulisper, donec nuntiatum est deductos in forum auctores seditionis et parata omnia esse."

⁹ F. W. Walbank, "The Geography of Polybius," *Cl Med* 9 (1948): pp. 155-182, especially p. 179.

¹⁰ 4, 21, 9. See note *ad loc.* in F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 465-466.

¹¹ Walbank (note 9, above) *ibid.*, 180-181.

¹² *Ibid.*, 180, n. 5. Instances of the use of descriptions of physique for characterization can also be found in Polybius, e.g. 8, 19; 10, 19; 11, 39, 9; 16, 34, 6-7; 18, 6, 5; 21, 9, 2; 24, 11; 27, 12; 30, 3, 7-8; 31, 23, 8; 33, 4; 26, 15; 38, 8.

¹³ 14, 1, 909a. Cf. Walbank, *ibid.*, 179.

¹⁴ *FGH* 2, 402 (Diodorus Siculus 2.36). For the "milieu" theory see K. Trudinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der Griechisch-römischen Ethnographie* (Basel, 1918). I am indebted to Walbank for this reference. Posidonius plays a prominent role in the development of this idea, and its last notable example in antiquity is to be found in the physiognomist Adamantius in the fourth century A.D.

When all their fierceness failed them, and, as they afterwards admitted, nothing alarmed them so much as the unexpected strength and healthy color of the general whom they believed they would see as an invalid, also an expression on his face such as, they said, they never remembered even in battle. He sat in silence for a moment, until the report reached him that the promoters of the mutiny had been brought into the open space and that everything was ready.

Then after describing the suppression of the rebellion Livy continues¹⁹:

Scipio by his conscientiousness in paying all his men, guilty and innocent alike, and more by his countenance and speech showing no resentment against any one, easily won the hearts of his soldiers.

Again at Zama, when Scipio addressed the Roman troops before they went into battle against Hannibal's forces,²⁰ we see the remarkable effect of this man's presence and appearance before his auditors: "celsus haec corpore voltuque ita laeto, ut vicisse iam crederes, dicebat." When he received Masinissa for the first time, the effect which his appearance produced on the Numidian was overpowering²¹:

The Numidian had already been filled with admiration for the man in consequence of his reported achievements, and had conjured up in mind an ideal figure, tall and stately. But greater still was the reverence that possessed him for the man in his presence; and while Scipio had great natural dignity, long hair added charm, as did a general appearance not due to studied elegance, but truly masculine and soldierly; and his age was exactly at the height of physical strength, amplified and made more dazzling by the youthful bloom which appeared to have been renewed after his illness.

The characterization of a man through the effect of his presence and personality upon others is nowhere more dramatically illustrated than in the case of Hannibal²²: Hannibal was sent to Spain, where he had no sooner arrived than he was the favorite of the entire army. The old soldiers thought that Hamilcar was restored to them as he had been in his youth; they beheld the same lively expression and piercing eyes, the same cast of countenance and features. No toil could

¹⁹ 28, 32: "Scipio cum fide solvendi pariter omnibus noxiis innoxisque stipendii tum vultu ac sermone in omnes placato facile reconciliatis militum animis, priusquam castra ab Carthagine moveret, contione advocata, multis verbis in perfidiam rebellantium regulorum invectus."

²⁰ 30, 32.

²¹ 28, 35: "Ceperat iam ante Numidam ex fama rerum gestarum admiratio viri, substitueratque animo speciem quoque corporis amplam ac magnificam; ceterum maior praesentis veneratio cepit; et, praeterquam quod suapte natura multa maiestas inerat, adornabat promissa caesaries habitusque corporis non cultus munditiis, sed virilis vere ac militaris, et aetas erat in medio virium robore quod plenius nitidiusque ex morbo velut renovatus flos inventae faciebat."

²² 21, 4. cf. 33, 9 (trans. B. O. Foster, LCL). "Missus Hannibal in Hipaniam primo statim adventu omnem exercitum in se convertit Hamilcarem iuvenem redditum sibi veteres milites credere; eandem vigorem in vultu vimque in oculis, habitum oris lineamenta que intueri . . . nullo labore aut corpus fatigari aut animus vinci poterat. Caloris et frigoris patientia par."

exhaust his body or overcome his spirit. Of heat and cold he was equally tolerant. The terror he created in his soldiers, the tragic look of the man conquered by Scipio Africanus,²³ as he was observed laughing in the Curia of Carthage, when he himself was the cause of tears, brought this sardonic comment: "If the mind within us could be seen, just as the expression of the face is seen by our eyes, it would be readily clear to you that this laughter which you upbraid is not that of a happy spirit but of one almost beside itself through misfortunes."

The appearance of the Gauls²⁴—"procera corpora, promissae et rutilae comae, vista scuta, praelongi gladii"—is described more than once, and their huge and terrifying size constantly brought the Roman forces to the brink of panic, only to be stopped by the exhortation of their commanders. The same type of portrait appears in the *Germania* of Tacitus. The Germans are depicted as having²⁵ "truces et caerulei oculi, rutilae comae, magna corpora et tantum ad impetum valida; laboris atque operum non eadem patientia." And most frequently these hulks of barbarians bring complete consternation to the Roman soldiers, who in turn are exhorted by their officers to face them without fear.²⁶

In Tacitus we may observe that the description of physique has an even more significant place in the narrative. For the most part the descriptions occur in the brief analysis of an individual's vices or virtues, as in the case of Domitius Corbulo²⁷: "corpore ingens, verbis magnificis et super experientiam sapientiamque etiam specie inanium validus," or Lateranus²⁸: "animi validus et corpore ingens," or Sejanus²⁹: "corpus illi laborum tolerans, animus audax; sui obtegens, in alios criminator . . ." Descriptions are also inserted in the narrative, as the occasion demands, to suggest or emphasize some momentary state of the mind. Tacitus declares that his purpose in writing the *Annals* is to show outstanding examples of political vice or virtue for posterity to condemn or admire.³⁰ In such a history delineation of character, analysis of motives, is fundamental. How, for example, could the historian

²³ 30, 44 (trans. F. G. Moore, LCL).

²⁴ 5, 44; 38, 17; cf. likewise 10, 28; 27, 48; 34, 47; 38, 21. For Tacitus' technique of character portrayal, apart from the descriptions of personal appearance dealt with in this section, see Stephen G. Daitz, "Tacitus' Technique of Character Portrayal," *AJP* 81 (1960): pp. 30-52, where the important evidence gathered is discussed.

²⁵ *Germ.* 4; cf. 30.

²⁶ *Ann.* 2, 14 (Germanicus to his army); cf. Also *Agr.* 2; *Ann.* 2, 21; *Hist.* 5, 14; 5, 18.

²⁷ *Ann.* 13, 8.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 15, 53.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 4, I (first type). Cf. *ibid.* 2, 72 (Tacitus' description of Germanicus as he was dying): "tanta illi comitas in socios, mansuetudo in hostes, visuque et auditu iuxta venerabilis (second type), cum magnitudinem et gravitatem summae fortunae retineret, invidiam, et adrogantiam effugerat." Cf. *ibid.* 2, 73.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 3, 65.

better impress on his reader's consciousness the way in which the bitterness and hypocrisy of the Emperor Tiberius affected those with whom he was associated and, in turn, the way in which the emperor was affected by those around him, than by a brief description of their visible reactions to significant events? The picture of the emperor is far from pleasant; Tacitus leaves us a vivid account of the tragic ugliness of his later years, when his appearance was by no means inconsistent with the reputed faults of his character at that period³¹:

This description, almost verging on the third or Suetonian type, may be compared with Tacitus's famous analysis of his life at the end of the sixth book. Tiberius' *mores* varied with his fortune³²:

There were those who believed that in his old age he had become sensitive also to his outward appearance. For he possessed a tall, round shouldered, and abnormally slender figure, a head without a trace of hair, and an ulcerous face generally variegated with plasters.

Rather different is the emphasis in the picture of Tiberius in Tacitus from that in Suetonius. The latter tends to balance the good and bad in his life, both of character and physique. Tacitus is impressed by the effect that the austere tragedy of his last years produced in his physical appearance. Briefer, momentary glimpses of the emperor appear throughout the *Annals*. "Neque vultu mutato"³³ he is described when the revolt of the Treviri and the Aedui and sixty-four Gallic states was announced to him. To such a point was he able to conceal his anger against Libo Drusus (reported to him as one engaged in a conspiracy against the state) that³⁴ "atque interim Libonem ornat praetura, convictibus adhibet, non vultu alienatus, non verbis commotior," but before he read the accusation and named the accusers against Libo, the defendant³⁵ "manus ac supplices voces ad Tiberium tendens immoto eius vultu excipitur." When Germanicus dies, Tiberius and Livia remain aloof from public lamentation³⁶: "inferius maiestate sua rati, si palam lamentarentur, an ne omnium oculis vultum eorum scrutantibus falsi intellegerentur." Tacitus

compares that unfortunate man with Tiberius³⁷: "nam iuveni civile ingenium, mira comitas et diversa ab Tiberio sermone, vultu, adrogantibus et obscuris." Against the son of Germanicus, Nero, he was strongly prejudiced, owing to the influence of Sejanus³⁸: "enimvero Tiberius torvus aut falsum renidens vultu: seu loqueretur, seu taceret iuvenis, crimen ex silentio, ex voce. . . ." Even on the deathbed of the Emperor, Tacitus concludes³⁹:

By now his constitution and strength were failing Tiberius, but not yet his powers of dissimulation. The unbending mind remained; still energetic in word and look, he strove every now and then to cover the manifest breaking-up by a forced sociability.

In contrast with the gloomy description of the Emperor Tiberius is the picture of Agricola, in whom Tacitus, following the convention of the encomium, praises the excellence of the body in a description which is purely of the second type⁴⁰:

³¹ 1, 33.

³² 4, 60. Cf. 4, 15.

³³ 6, 50. (Cf. 4, 34.) *Ann.* 6, 50, trans. J. Jackson, LCL: "Iam Tiberium corpus, iam vires, nondum dissimulatio deserebat; idem animi rigor; sermone ac vultu intentus, quaesita interdum comitate quamvis manifestam defectionem tegebat."

⁴⁰ *Agr.* 44. (trans. M. Hutton, LCL): "Quod si habitum quoque eius posteri noscere velint, decentior quam sublimior fuit: nihil impetus et metus in vultu; gratia oris supererat; bonum virum facile crederes, magnum libenter." In appendix D I have included examples of similar descriptions from Pliny's panegyric on Trajan and from the later writers of panegyrics.

In Cornelius Nepos' lives of illustrious men descriptions of physique and countenance are commonly appended to the brief analysis of character as habitually displayed on many occasions, especially in the encomia of military leaders in battle (Atticus excepted). These descriptions are for the most part of the first type, such as occur in the eulogy of Scipio and Claudia. In the case of Macrochir (21.1): "praecipuam habet laudem amplissimae pulcherrimaeque corporis formae quam incredibili ornavit virtute belli"; or of the second type in which the nature of the mind is imprinted on the body and the face, as in the later *laudationes*: Dion (4.1) "autem praeter nobilem propinquitatem generosamque maiorum famam multa alia ab natura habuit bona, in his ingenium docile, come, aptum ad artes optimas, *magnam corporis dignitatem*, quae non minimum commendat" In these lines there are surely to be seen the literary beginnings of the encomia of which the panegyric of Trajan by Pliny the Younger, is a conspicuous example, embracing such qualities as dignity of physique, tranquility of face, nobility of countenance and the like. The earliest biographies in Latin literature are, like Plutarch's marked by the Peripatetic ethical aim and are completely simple in character. The description of Atticus (1.1) provides us with an interesting example: "Erat autem in puero praeter docilitatem ingenii, summa suavitas oris ac vocis." Sallust, too, like Nepos, is concerned with the general appraisal of excellencies and faults of mind and body. Jugurtha (*Jug.* 6) was one "qui ubi primum adolevit, pollens viribus decora facie, sed multo maxime ingenio validus, non se luxui neque inertiae corrumpendum dedit" But the most striking portrait is iconistic, that of Catiline presented by Sallust in his account of the conspiracy. This portrait is, like those found in the orations of Cicero (e.g., Piso), a bitter appraisal of the man's physique and nature: *Cat.* 15: (cf. *Cat.* 31: "sed ubi ille adsedit Catilina, ut erat paratus ad dissimulanda omnia, *demisso vultu*, voce supplici postulare a partibus coepit, nequid de se temere crederent"; and earlier *Cat.* 5: "nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis,

³¹ *Ibid.* 6, 51. Cf. Pseud-Arist. 807b, and Tacitus, *Ann.* 4, 57 (trans. J. Jackson, LCL): "Egregiumque vita famaue quoad privatus vel in imperiis sub Augusto fuit; occultum ac subdolum fingendis virtutibus, donec Germanicus ac Drusus superfuere; idem inter bona malaque mixtus incolumni matre, instabilis saevitia, sed obiectis libidinibus dum Seianum dilexit timuit, postremo in scelera simul ac dedecora prorupit, postquam remoto pudore et metu suo tantum ingenio utebatur."

³² *Ibid.* 4, 57. "Erant qui crederent in senectute corporis quoque habitum pudori fuisse; quippe illi praegracilis et incurva proceritas, nudus capillo vertex, ulcerosa facies, ac plerumque medicaminibus interstincta."

³³ 3, 44.

³⁴ 3, 28.

³⁵ 3, 29. Cf. 2, 34 (L. Piso affair); 3, 67 (trial of Silanus); 4, 34 (trial of Cremutius Cordus).

³⁶ 3, 3.

Should posterity desire to learn his mere appearance, he was well-proportioned rather than imposing. There was no irritability in his face; its dominant expression was benign. You could easily credit him with goodness, and be glad to think him great.

The doctrines of the Peripatetics bearing on physiognomy find a place among Latin writers of the first century after Christ in Pliny's *Natural History*,⁴¹ in which he comments on Aristotle's theories of physical signs for determining duration of life. He himself has no confidence in such physical symptoms, considering them utterly futile; but, because Aristotle did not treat the subject with contempt, he feels bound to set down some remarks upon it. The indications of a short life are few teeth, very long fingers, a muddy complexion, and numerous lines in the palm of the hand. He looks upon the following as signs of a long life: stooping in the shoulders, one or two unbroken lines in the hand, more than thirty-two teeth, and large ears. Pliny continues, "among ourselves Trogus"—and here he refers, of course, to Pompeius Trogus, the Augustan historian—

sed ingenio malo pravoque . . . corporis patiens inediae, aliorum, vigiliae supraquam cuiquam credibile est. Animus audax subdolos variis cuius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator.") "Ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat. Igitur color ei exsanguis, foedi oculi, citus modo, modo tardus incessus; prorsus in facie vultuque vecordia inerat." Momentary descriptions are likewise part of Sallust's incisive biographical art, as at the moment of death, when Catiline (61) lay far apart from his own supporters, overcome in battle, "paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi, quam habuerat vivus, in vultu retinens."

In Quintus Curtius Rufus, Velleius Paterculus, and Valerius Maximus descriptions of physique play a relatively small part in the narrative as a whole, and likewise in Florus, Justinus, Aurelius Victor and Eutropius. (See appendix D for references.) The *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* occasionally show a tendency to general description, but often it is encomiastic, as in the case of Marcus Aurelius (Julius Capitolinus, *Vita Marci Antonini* 16. Cf. the same ideas in Eutropius 8, 11, *Epit. de Caes.* 16, 7. The descriptions surely come from the same source. Cf. J. Schwendemann, *Der historische Wert der Marci bei Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Heidelberg, 1923), p. 197. See on this subject *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, essays edited by Arnaldo Momigliano esp. Chapter IV, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century," pp. 79-99. See full bibliography, Chap. VIII): "Erat tantae tranquillitatis ut vultum numquam mutaverat maerore vel gaudio, philosophiae deditus Stoeicae, quam et per optimos quoque magistratus acceperat et undique ipse collegerat." But these writers (see the important article by J. Cousin, "Rhétorique et psychologie chez Tacite" *REL* 29 [1951]: pp. 228-247) also follow the Suetonian tradition of iconistic description such as we have seen in Nepos' portrait of Catiline. In Pliny's Letters, as in Cicero's, descriptions occur, but they are few and not conspicuous. Voconius Romanus (2, 13, 6) displays "mira in sermone, mira etiam in ore ipso vultuque suavitas, ad hoc ingenium excelsum, subtile . . . dulce facile eruditum in causis agendo . . ." Euphrates (1, 10, 6 sq.; cf. Calpurnius Piso, 5.17, 3) the philosopher is marked by "proceritas corporis, decora facies, densissimus capillus, ingens et cana barba; quae licet fortuita et inania putentur, illi tamen plurimum venerationis adquirunt . . . vitae santitas summa, comitas par."

⁴¹ *HN* 11, 274 (trans. H. L. Rackham throughout, LCL).

in a similar manner has added some outward signs of character which I will append in his own words⁴²: "When the forehead is large, it indicates that the mind beneath it is sluggish; people with a small forehead have a nimble mind, those with a round forehead an irascible mind—as if this were a visible indication of a swollen temper! When men's eyebrows are level, this signifies that they are gentle, when they are curved at the side of the nose, that they are stern, when bent down at the temples, that they are mockers, when extremely drooping, that they are malevolent and spiteful. If peoples' eyes are narrow on both sides, this shows them to be malicious in character; eyes that have fleshy corners on the side of the nostrils show a mark of maliciousness, when the white part of the eye is extensive, it conveys an indication of impudence; eyes that have a habit of repeatedly closing indicate unreliability. Large ears are a sign of talkativeness and silliness." Thus far Trogus.⁴³

Pliny describes the eyes of the Roman emperors with some care, in terms which are akin to those found in Suetonius⁴⁴:

Blue-gray eyes see more clearly in the dark. It is stated that Tiberius Caesar alone of all mankind was so constituted that if he woke up in the night for a short time, he could see everything just as in bright daylight, although darkness gradually closed over him. The late lamented Augustus had gray eyes like those of horses, the whites being larger than usual in a human being, on account of which he used to become angry if people watched his eyes too closely; Claudius Caesar's eyes were frequently bloodshot and had a fleshy gleam at the corners; the Emperor Gaius had staring eyes; Nero's eyes were dull of sight except that he screwed them up to look at objects brought close to them.

And he concludes this passage with these very significant words⁴⁵:

No other part of the body supplies greater indications of the mind—this is so with all animals alike, but especially with man—that is, indications of self-restraint, mercy, pity, hatred, love, sorrow, joy. The eyes are also varied in their look—fierce, stern, sparkling, sedate, leering, askance, downcast, kindly; in fact, the eyes are the abode of the mind ("profecto in oculis animus habitat").

One of the most important literary developments of the Hellenistic period is to be found in the field of biography, which in this era falls into two general categories. The first type is directed toward the gathering and conveying of information of a detailed nature, which finds further expression in the *schemata* used by Suetonius in the *Lives of the Caesars*, by the writers of the *Historia Augusta*, and by Ammianus Marcellinus. The description of personal appearance

⁴² *HN* 11, 274 (cf. Arist. *HA* 1, 9, 491b).

⁴³ *HN* 11, 141-145. Cf. 11, 138; 11, 185; 11, 200 (Arist. *Part. Anim.* 3, 14, 675b); 11, 158; 11, 138: "The brow is an indication of sorrow and gaiety, mercy and severity. . . . With them [eyebrows] we indicate assent and dissent, they are our chief means of displaying contempt; pride has its place of generation elsewhere, but here it has its abode; it is born in the heart, but it rises to the eyebrows and hangs suspended there ('superbia . . . hic sedem habet')."

⁴⁴ *HN* 11, 141-145.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

is an essential feature of such biography. The other type, following the ethical aim of the Peripatetic school of biography, culminates in the work of Plutarch in the second century A.D.

Photographic descriptions contained in Peripatetic biography are rarely preserved. That found in Cyril of Alexandria, taken from the life of Socrates by Aristoxenus,⁴⁶ reports what Spintharos stated, namely that he himself could not have met with any more persuasive figure [than Socrates], such was his voice and lips, and the character evident in them, in addition to what was said of the particular nature of his appearance. Dicaearchus, pupil of Aristotle and contemporary of Theophrastus, and Hieronymus of Rhodes in the early second century B.C. give in much the same fashion an imaginary portrait of Heracles, preserved in Clement of Alexandria⁴⁷: "Homer then knew Heracles as a mortal man; Hieronymus the philosopher describes the configuration of his body as small, bristling-haired, powerful, Dicaearchus as athletic, sinewy, black, hooked-nosed, with a fierce look, smooth haired." Miss Misener adds "that the descriptive terms are those in the Peripatetic manuals on physiognomy and the contemporary Egyptian papyri."⁴⁸ Even more significant is the account derived from Dicaearchus⁴⁹ wherein Pythagoras is described as endowed by nature with physical gifts of a high order: he was tall and gracious, as well as possessing a pleasant voice and disposition. In like manner Hermippus,⁵⁰ following in the tradition of the Peripatetic School in the third century B.C., records the elegance of the appearance of Theophrastus at his lectures and his very extensive use of gestures to enliven his discourses.

Although from the period beginning with Dicaearchus and running up to the first century B.C. few fragments have reached us, the few citations preserved from writers of the period would indicate that these descriptions continued. For instance, Plutarch and Dionysius of Halicarnassus state that Demetrius of Phalerum (350 B.C.) is the source of our information about Demosthenes, that he was afflicted with indistinctness and a lisping quality in his speech and bodily blemishes. Satyrus, one of the founders of Peripatetic biography, has left a portrait of the handsome Alcibiades, for which the source is Antisthenes the Cynic.⁵¹ From the same period comes the description of Zeno by Apollonius of Tyre, probably based on writings of the Stoic School, preserved in Diogenes Laertius⁵²: He was lean, fairly tall, dark-complexioned,

with thick legs, not firmly set, and delicate. Furthermore from Timotheus of Athens are derived the descriptions of Zeno⁵³: bending his neck to one side or the other; of Speusippus⁵⁴ that he was loosely jointed: τὸ σῶμα διακεχυμένος; of Aristotle⁵⁵ that he spoke with a lisp (τραυλός), that his calves were thin, his eyes small, and that he was conspicuous by his attire and his hair; and of Plato⁵⁶ that he was thin-voiced (ισχνόφωνος). Plutarch's preoccupation with physiological theories has been noted above and to this subject we shall return.

Such then is the setting for a study of the descriptions in the biographies of Suetonius, who as a faithful follower of Alexandrian tradition records all the known facts about the lives of the emperors. Suetonius⁵⁷ as "magister epistularum" from 119 A.D. until the year 121 was associated with Hadrian and his court in considerable intimacy, in a post requiring discretion and circumspection. Pliny the Younger, his close friend, described him in a letter to Trajan as "probus, honestissimus, eruditissimus virum." During his tenure of office he must have had ready access to the imperial archives, from which he gleaned much of the material presented in the *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, published as early as 122 A.D. We must remember that just before this period Polemo of Laodicea, a contemporary of Suetonius, had been sent from Smyrna to Rome to the Emperor Trajan, and that shortly afterwards he was closely associated with the Emperor Hadrian. Certainly the name of Polemo, if not the man himself, must have been known to Suetonius.

A regular feature of the *schemata* used by Suetonius in the *De Vita Caesarum*, by the writers of the *Historia Augusta*, and by Ammianus Marcellinus is the description of personal appearance. Leo⁵⁸ contended more than sixty years ago that Suetonius, following Varro, adopted the form of biography used by the learned Alexandrian writers—with this difference, that he transferred the form from the field of literary biography to the historical-political type. From this contention Professor Stuart⁵⁹ recently has been in-

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ 4, 1.

⁵⁵ 5, 1.

⁵⁶ 3, 5.

⁵⁷ *Ep.* 10, 94. Suetonius was dismissed from his secretaryship for a breach of court etiquette. See J. Cousin, "Suetone Physiognomiste dans les vies des XII Césars" *REL* 31 (1953): pp. 234–256, who covers much of the same material, and the comment of R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958) 2: p. 502: "Suetonius estimated correctly the taste and market of the times. Readers were drawn to the personal items that formal history disdained. There was room for a rival or supplement to the *Annales*—and the chronicle of ancient folly and depravity, compiled by a government official, carried no political danger."

⁵⁸ F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (Leipzig, 1901), pp. 141; 315–323.

⁵⁹ Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, pp. 186, 226–253.

⁴⁶ See Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, pp. 132, 138.

⁴⁷ *Protrep.* 2, 30.

⁴⁸ Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 108.

⁴⁹ *FHG* 2, 244, frg. 29; cf. Stuart, *ibid.*, pp. 174–176, especially 175.

⁵⁰ *FHG* 3, 46, frg. 43. Cf. Stuart, *ibid.*, 176 for other examples.

⁵¹ *FHG* 3, 160.

⁵² 7, 1.

clined to dissent in his *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*. A number of scholars, including Fürst and Misener,⁶⁰ have studied the problem of the origin of the descriptions of physique in the Latin biographers. It is not necessary to review their work here, save to state that Fürst, in a study of the *Ephemeris* of Dictys of Crete, traced the material of the photographic description of personal appearance in the Egyptian papyri and in Greek and Roman literature, and came to the conclusion that the iconistic portrait was for the most part alien to classical Greek literature, but was a native Egyptian official method of identification adopted by the Greek conquerors. Miss Misener believes that, through want of positive evidence to substantiate it, Fürst's theory is untenable, though she recognizes the importance of this type of description in the Egyptian-Greek legal forms, where it was used for the purpose of identification in military enrollment, and for a similar purpose in proclamations for the capture of runaway slaves and in such private documents as wills.

In the descriptions of the Roman emperors, Suetonius relates how the imperial family sought the

advice of a *metoposcopus* [forehead inspector] to determine the future of the young Britannicus.⁶¹

"At that time, so they say, a physiognomist was brought in by Narcissus, the freedman of Claudius, to examine Britannicus and declared most positively that he would never become emperor; but that Titus, who was standing by at the same time, would surely rule." Tiberius, the biographer says,⁶² walked with his neck stiff and upright, generally with a frowning countenance, being for the most part silent. When he spoke to those about him it was very slowly, and usually with a slight gesticulation of his fingers, "quae omnia ingrata atque adrogantiae plena et animadvertit Augustus in eo et excusare temptavit saepe apud senatum ac populum professus naturae vitia esse, non animi." Similarly of Domitian Suetonius writes⁶³: "commendari se verecundia oris adeo sentiebat, ut apud senatum sic quondam iactaverit: usque adhuc certe et animum meum probastis et vultum." And of Otho⁶⁴: "tanto Othonis animo nequaquam corpus aut habitus competit. fuisse enim et modicae staturae et male pedatus scambusque traditur." Suetonius' lost work, *De Vitiis Corporalibus*, dealing descriptively with both the parts of the body and its defects, would explain why he was so often inclined to record the physical weaknesses of the imperial family. But much stronger evidence of his interest in physiognomy comes from the fragments of an epitome of his lost *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* (*Concerning Terms of Abuse in Greek*), which Miller has published.⁶⁵ Several terms are defined from a physiognomical point of view. The most significant fragment, apparently derived from the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook, reads as follows⁶⁶: *βυσσάχην* [short-necked: the crafty man], for in the

⁶⁰ Fürst, *Lit. Porträt.*, pp. 374-440; 593-622. G. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," pp. 97-123. Attention is called to the articles by H. V. Canter, "Personal Appearance in the Biography of the Roman Emperors," in *Studies in Philology* (University of North Carolina Press) 25 (1928): pp. 385-399; M. E. Deutsch, "Concerning Caesar's Appearance," *CJ* 12 (1917): pp. 247-253; E. K. Rand, "On the History of the De Vita Caesarum of Suetonius in the Early Middle Ages," in *HSCP* 37 (1926): pp. 1-48, especially 40-48. *Latin Biography* ed. by T. A. Dorey (London, 1967), published in the *Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence*, contains a chapter on "Suetonius and his Influence" by G. B. Townend (IV, pp. 79-111), which, while useful, adds little that is pertinent to the present study save in his remarks on Einhard's imitation of Suetonius' methods of the description of Charlemagne's appearance (pp. 102-103). Chapter V (pp. 113-138) on "The Augustan History" by A. R. Birley sets forth the problems of the Augustan History in a succinct fashion, and indicates that the work of six biographers is some kind of forgery, but he does not go as far as Sir Ronald Syme, who argues brilliantly that "the *Historia Augusta* is one of the great hoaxes of all time," the work of an impostor, to be dated perhaps about A.D. 395, which reflects the writing of the historian Ammianus Marcellinus (*Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*, Oxford, 1968). Professor Syme includes a complete bibliography on the nature and composition of these imperial biographies, which he summarizes trenchantly as a "morass." For an earlier summary of the problem see the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* ed. with an English translation by David Magie (LCL), vols. 1-3, especially 2, pp. vii-xxxvi. Magie gives also in the introduction of vols. 2 and 3 a full bibliography of the work done on these imperial biographies through the year 1932.

The article by Alan Cameron, "Descriptions of Personal Appearance in Plutarch and Suetonius: The Use of Statues as Evidence," *CQ* 61 (1967): pp. 414-422, points out the importance of portrait sculpture in the discussion of personal appearance, but fails, it seems to me, to take adequate account of the place of the physiognomical handbooks in descriptions of physique in Suetonius and Plutarch. See also *Latin Biography*, chap. III (pp. 45-77), on "Plutarch" by A. J. Gossage, especially pp. 53-55, for Plutarch's "general interest in statuary and portraiture."

⁶¹ *Tib.* 2 (trans. J. C. Rolfe throughout, LCL). "Educatus in aula cum Britannico simul ac paribus disciplinis et apud eosdem magistros institutus. quo quidem tempore aiunt metoposcopus a Narcisso Claudii liberto adhibitum, ut Britannicum inspiceret, constantissime affinis illum quidem nullo modo, ceterum Titum qui tunc prope astabat, utique imperatorem."

⁶² *Tib.* 68. "All of these mannerisms of his, which were disagreeable and signs of arrogance, were remarked by Augustus, who often tried to excuse them to the senate and people by declaring that they were natural failings, and not intentional."

⁶³ *Dom.* 18. "He was so conscious that the modesty of his expression was in his favor, that he once made this boast in the senate: 'So far, at any rate, you have approved my heart and my countenance.'"

⁶⁴ *Otho* 12. "Neither Otho's person nor his bearing suggested such great courage. He is said to have been of moderate height, splay-footed and bandy legged."

⁶⁵ M. E. Miller, *Mélanges de Littérature grecque* (Paris, 1868), pp. 415-452. Cf. Förster, *SP* 2: pp. 278-279. In this epitome occur such expressions as (p. 415) λευκόπυγος [white-rumped]; the coward and again μελάμπυγος [black-rumped]; the courageous (p. 421); λειψός [drivelling]; the thoughtless and snotty.

⁶⁶ Miller, *ibid.*, 418. Philemon Holland, whose translation of Suetonius appeared in 1606, annotates the description of Tiberius (68) thus: *cervice obstipa*, "Such be termed in Greeke βυσσάχηνες. And if we may believe the Physiognomie delivered by Aristotle they be by nature deceitful and wilie, given to circumvent, entrap and supplant others."

handbook we find⁶⁷: Those who have too short a neck are crafty. Pollux, for whom Suetonius is an important source, may well have derived directly from him the passage which he cites in his *Onomasticon* under the name of Aristotle⁶⁸: A short-necked man is he who draws up his shoulders, and contracts his neck, a man whom Aristotle judges by his looks as crafty. It is a fair conjecture that Suetonius, like Polemo, was familiar with the fuller version of the Peripatetic manual on physiognomy. We cannot assume, of course, that Suetonius had any personal connection with Polemo, for not only is the date of composition of the latter's handbook not known, but there is no direct evidence that Suetonius had actually read the book. But the striking parallelism of the ideas and expressions in Suetonius and those in the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual as well as those in Polemo is of no little importance. With the evidence of *Concerning Terms of Abuse* as a point of departure, I have attempted to show how Suetonius' descriptions of personal appearance correspond to the principles laid down in the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook and in the work of Polemo, by placing the related passages side by side.

I do not mean to imply that Suetonius in the *Lives* of the emperors made unflinching use of physiognomical tags in his descriptions of personal appearance. In many instances it is impossible to find exact parallels in the two handbooks. In the first place, our manuals have not come down to us entire. Portrait sculpture undoubtedly contributed to iconography in literature,⁶⁹ and I should never hesitate to grant that the *testimonia* of identification drawn from the papyri provided—through Alexandrian biographers—another source for interest in *eikonismos*. My purpose is rather to bring the little handbooks on physiognomy to the attention of the readers of Suetonius and Ammianus Marcellinus. Suetonius takes especial interest in the use of phrases relating to the good proportions of the human body, as when he describes Tiberius as⁷⁰ "latus ab umeris et pectore, ceteris quoque membris usque ad imos pedes aequalis et congruens," or Augustus, who had⁷¹ "staturam brevem quam tamen Iulius Marathus libertus etiam memoriam eius quinque pedum et dodrantis fuisse tradit . . . sed quae commoditate et aequitate membrorum occuleretur," or Domitian, who was⁷² "praeterea pulcher et decens, maxime in iuventa et quidem toto corpore exceptis pedibus, quorum digitos restrictiores habebat." In

the descriptions collected from the papyri by Fürst and in the more recently published papyri referred to above,⁷³ the phrases *εὐμεγέθης* [of good size] and *μέσος μεγέθει* [of moderate stature] occur over and over again, but the spirit of the descriptions is far different from that in Suetonius. Marks of identification are emphasized—a scar—*οὐλή*; interest in good proportions does not seem to appear there. But the physiognomists attribute the greatest significance to right proportions in the human body. An ill-proportioned body⁷⁴ indicates a rogue, says the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual, while a well-proportioned frame is characteristic of upright men and brave. Thus Caligula, the description of whose cruel and vicious nature is a vivid picture on the pages of Suetonius, was⁷⁵ "statura eminenti . . . corpore enormi, gracilitate maxima cervicis et crurum"; and Nero was⁷⁶ "statura prope iusta . . . cervice obesa, ventre proiecto, gracillimis cruribus."

When we study the *imagines* of the emperors in detail, Augustus, as described by Suetonius, we can most easily associate with the lion.⁷⁷

⁷² *Dom.* 18. Cf. also *Vesp.* 20: "statura fuit quadrata compactis firmisque membris."

⁷³ See Chapter IV, pp. 39–40.

⁷⁴ Pseud-Arist. 814a.

⁷⁵ *Calig.* 50.

⁷⁶ *Nero* 51. Cf. the description of Otho, whose physical appearance in no way compared with his mind (*Otho* 12). Domitian as a young man displayed excellent proportions in his body, but this was marred in later life (*Dom.* 18). Titus as a youth displayed outstanding qualities both of appearance and of character and possessed "forma egregia et cui non minus auctoritatis inesset quam gratiae" (*Tit.* 3). This last description betrays a distinctly encomiastic touch, reminiscent of the descriptions of beauty in the romances, and likewise such phrases as "forma fuit eximia" (*Aug.* 79), or "auctoritas dignitasque formae non defuit ei" (*Claud.* 30). Similar expressions are found in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* and Ammianus Marcellinus (see appendix E). But the phrases referring directly to a *σῶμα σύμμετρον* [well-proportioned body] may in turn be referred to the physiognomical manuals.

⁷⁷ *Aug.* 79: "forma fuit eximia et per omnes aetatis gradus venustissima, quamquam et omnis lenocinii neglegens . . . vultu erat vel in sermone vel tacitus adeo tranquillo serenoque . . . oculos habuit claros ac nitidos, quibus etiam existimari volebat inesse quiddam divini vigoris, gaudebatque, si qui sibi acrius contuenti quasi ad fulgorem solis vultum submitteret; sed in senecta sinistro minus vidit; dentes raros et exiguos et scabros; capillum leviter inflexum et subflavum; supercilia coniuncta; mediocres aures, nasum et a summo eminentiorem et abs imo deductiorem; colorem inter aquilum candidumque; staturam brevem quam tamen Iulius Marathus libertus etiam memoriam eius, quinque pedum et dodrantis fuisse tradit, sed quae commoditate et aequitate membrorum occuleretur, ut non nisi ex comparatione astantis alicuius procerioris intelligi posset."

"He was unusually handsome and exceedingly graceful at all periods of his life, though he cared nothing for personal adornment. His expression, whether in conversation or when he was silent, was so calm and mild. He had clear, bright eyes, in which he liked to have it thought that there was a kind of divine power, and it greatly pleased him, whenever he looked keenly at anyone, if he let his face fall as if before the radiance of the sun; but in his old age he could not see very well with his left eye. His teeth were wide apart, small, and ill-kept; his hair was slightly

⁶⁷ 811a. Cf. A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900; Bibliothèque des écoles française d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 82), pp. 267–269; 417–418.

⁶⁸ 2, 135. Förster, *SP* 1, proleg. p. xx, believes this to be the case. Cf. in this connection Eustath, ad *Il.* 2, 159; Quintil. *Inst.* 2, 3, 83.

⁶⁹ See J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie*, 1–4, especially 2, 1–3.

⁷⁰ *Tib.* 68.

⁷¹ *Aug.* 79.

Augustus, Suetonius says, possessed:

- (1) eyes that were bright and piercing in which Augustus wished it believed there was a certain divine vigor
- (2) hair a little curly
- (3) and inclined to a yellow color, and
- (4) stature which was low but was concealed by the good proportion of his limbs.

The lion, according to the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual,⁷⁸ possessed:

- (1) gleaming eyes
- (2) a neck of due length with a tawny mane on it, which is not
- (3) too closely curled and
- (4) a body well knit, neither stiff or too soft and of moderate stature.

In Polemo the picture of the man who is devoted to the study of the liberal arts is closely akin in appearance to that of a lion⁷⁹: "sit moderata statura et erecta, albi coloris rubro mixti, capillo simplice ad flavum vergente, demisso nec tamen crispo aut horrido capillo . . . oculis humidis et charopis et laetitia perfusis"; and Suetonius tells us that Augustus from his early youth devoted himself eagerly and with the utmost diligence to eloquence and other liberal studies.⁸⁰ In regard to other aspects of the physique of Augustus capable of physiognomical interpretation, as listed by Suetonius, we may gather that the biographer was disposed to consider Augustus' character as excellent, judging from the external signs of his person. He possessed:

- (1) "oculos [noted above] claros ac nitidos quibus etiam existimari volebat inesse quiddam divini vigoris, gaudebatque si quis sibi acrius contuenti quasi ad fulgorem solis vultum summitteret."
- (2) "capillum leviter inflexum et subflavum," which is a sign of stoutness of heart⁸¹
- (3) "supercilia coniuncta," which are generally a sign of beauty⁸²
- (4) "mediocres aures," which show great vigilance in the performance of duty⁸³

curly and inclined to golden; his eyebrows met. His ears were of moderate size, and his nose projected a little at the top and than bent slightly forward. His complexion was between dark and fair. He was short of stature (although Julius Marathus, his freedman and keeper of his records, says that he was five feet and nine inches in height), but this was concealed by the fine proportion and symmetry of his figure, and was noticeable only by comparison with some taller person standing beside him."

⁷⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 809b. Cf. 813b; 814a.

⁷⁹ Pol. 272.

⁸⁰ Aug. 84.

⁸¹ Pseud.-Arist. 809b; 812b; Pol. 248; 250; 272; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 22-23; 2, 24; 2, 92; 2, 120.

⁸² Fürst, *op. cit.*, p. 387; Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 29.

⁸³ Pol. 234. Cf. Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Adamant. 380; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 65.

- (5) "nasum a summo eminentiorem et ab imo deductiorem," which signifies a noble-souled man⁸⁴

- (6) "colorem inter aquilum candidumque," which is a sign of strong character.⁸⁵

Suetonius' description of the emperor's life and character is in general laudatory.

He exercised the most severe discipline in military affairs.⁸⁶ He administered justice with the utmost diligence and leniency.⁸⁷ As patron and master his behavior was mild and conciliating, but, when the occasion required it, he could be severe.⁸⁸ Of his clemency there are numerous examples.⁸⁹ He did not readily make friends but he clung to them with the utmost constancy.⁹⁰ He was most temperate in the other details of his living.⁹¹

If we turn to Caligula, we again find a remarkable correspondence between Suetonius' estimate of the Emperor's character and the principles of the physiognomists, for his physical appearance is especially associated with the disagreeable features of the panther and the goat.

Caligula was endowed with⁹²:

- (1) "oculis et temporibus concavis"⁹³
- (2) "corpore enormi, gracilitate maxima cervicis et crurum"⁹⁴
- (3) "capillo raro et circa verticem nullo, hirsutus cetera. quare transeunte eo prospicere ex superiore parte aut omnino quacumque de causa capram nominare criminisum et exitiale habebatur"
- (4) "colore expallido"
- (5) "fronte lata et torva"

⁸⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 811a; Pol. 228; 244; Adamant. 376; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 71; 2, 140.

⁸⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106; 120.

⁸⁶ Aug. 21.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁹² Calig. 50: "statura fuit eminenti, colore expallido, corpore enormi, gracilitate maxima cervicis et crurum, oculis et temporibus concavis, fronte lata et torva, capillo raro et circa verticem nullo, hirsutus cetera. quare transeunte eo prospicere ex superiore parte, aut omnino quacumque de causa capram nominare, criminisum et exitiale habebatur. vultum vero natura horridum ac taetrum etiam ex industria efferabat, componens ad speculum in omnem terrorem ac formidinem."

"He was very tall, and extremely pale, with a huge body, but very thin neck and legs. His eyes and temples were hollow, his forehead broad and grim, his hair thin and entirely gone on the top of his head, though his body was hairy. While his face was naturally forbidding and ugly, he purposely made it even more savage, practising all kinds of terrible and fearsome expressions before a mirror."

⁹³ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 136: "contra si oculum parvum et cavum vides, possessori eius dolum et insidias, invidiam et aemulationem tribuito"; 146; 152; 196; Adamant. 324; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 47-48; 2, 135; 2, 139.

⁹⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 811a; 814a; Pol. 194; 218; 220; 270; Adamant. 358; 366-367; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 58; 2, 72; 2, 120.

The panther had⁹⁵:

- (1-2) small eyes rather pale, hollow and somewhat flat, the neck is over long and light, . . . and the whole body is badly joined and ill proportioned. The goat was of this appearance⁹⁶
- (3) Creatures with hairy legs are sensual; witness goats . . . and the marks of a sensual man. He has a pale skin and is covered with black, straight hair,⁹⁷
- (4) which is a sign of cowardice,⁹⁸
- (5) which indicates stupidity and foolishness.⁹⁸

Suetonius says that even as a very young man Caligula could not control his natural cruelty and viciousness.⁹⁹ It is not long before we meet such statements in Suetonius as this: "So much for Caligula as emperor; we must now tell of his career as a monster."¹⁰⁰ "The following are special instances of his innate brutality."¹⁰¹ And finally, "I think I may fairly attribute to mental weakness the existence of two exactly opposite faults in the same person, extreme assurance, and, on the other hand, excessive timorousness."¹⁰²

It is in the description of Tiberius,¹⁰³ however, that

⁹⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 809b-810a.

⁹⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 182; "capra prudens proterva libidinosa fallaci lusui multum dedita malignitatis et palpitacionis multae"; 248; 254; Adamant. 392; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 60; 2, 92; 2, 93-94; 2, 117.

⁹⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 808b.

⁹⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 808b; 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 120; Pseud.-Arist. 812a. Cf. Pol. 230; Adamant. 377-378; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 27; 2, 29.

⁹⁹ Calig. 11.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 22.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 27. Cf. 32; 34.

¹⁰² Ibid., 51.

¹⁰³ Tib. 68: "corpore fuit amplo atque robusto, statura quae iustam excederet; latus ab umeris et pectore, ceteris quoque membris usque ad imos pedes aequalis et congruens; sinistra manu agiliore ac validiore, articulis ita firmis, ut recens et integrum malum digito terebraret, caput pueri vel etiam adulescentis talitro vulneraret. colore erat candido, capillo pone occipitium summiore ut cervicem etiam obtegeret, quod gentile in illo videbatur; facie honesta, in qua tamen crebri subiti tumores, cum praegrandibus oculis et qui, quod mirum esset, noctu etiam et in tenebris viderent, sed ad breve et cum primum e somno patuissent; deinde rursus hebescebant. incedebat cervice rigida et obstipa, adducto fere vultu, plerumque tacitus, nullo aut rarissimo etiam cum proximis sermone eoque tardissimo, nec sine molli quadam digitorum gesticulatione. quae omnia ingrata atque arrogantiae plena et animadvertit Augustus in eo et excusare temptavit saepe apud senatum ac populum, professus naturae vitia esse, non animi."

"He was large and strong of frame, and of a stature above the average; broad of shoulders and chest; well proportioned and symmetrical from head to foot. His left hand was the more nimble and stronger, and its joints were so powerful that he could bore through a fresh sound apple with his finger, and break the head of a boy, or even a young man, with a flip. He was of fair complexion. His hair was rather long at the back, so much so as even to cover the nape of his neck; which was apparently a family trait. His face was handsome, but would break out on a sudden with many pimples. His eyes were un-

we find the most striking example of the applicability of physiognomical doctrine to the portrayal of the character of an emperor, in this case the close correspondence between his physical merits and defects and the known virtues and vices of his character.

Tiberius was:

- (1) "corpore amplo atque robusto," which is a sign of courage¹⁰⁴
- (2) "ceteris quoque usque ad imos pedes aequalis et congruens," and of "statura quae iustam excederet," which is indicative of a man excellent in the performance of duty, and shows a just nature,¹⁰⁵
- (3) "latus ab umeris et pectore, and sinistra manu agiliore ac validiore, articulis ita firmis, ut recens et integrum malum digito terebraret," which shows a robust and courageous man.¹⁰⁶

Suetonius declares that he conducted his military campaigns with efficiency and success.¹⁰⁷ He required the strictest discipline among the troops,¹⁰⁸ and exercised his power "ad utilitates publicas pronomiorem."¹⁰⁹ Augustus, in considering the matter of the succession and upon weighing the "faults and merits of Tiberius" with each other, "decided that the latter preponderated," and he swore before the people that "he was adopting Tiberius for the good of the country."¹¹⁰ At first, says Suetonius, "he played an unassuming part, almost humbler than that of a private citizen."¹¹¹ "He even introduced a semblance of free government by maintaining the ancient dignity and powers of the senate and the magistrates."¹¹² While he possessed marked excellence in some aspects of his physical appearance, in others he showed weakness.

- (4) "colore erat candido," which shows a tendency to fear¹¹³

usually large and, strange to say, had the power of seeing even at night and in the dark, but only for a short time when first opened after sleep; presently they grew dim-sighted again. He strode along with his neck stiff and bent forward, usually with a stern countenance and for the most part in silence, never or very rarely conversing with his companions, and then speaking with great deliberation and with a kind of supple movement of his fingers. All these mannerisms of his, which were disagreeable and signs of arrogance, were remarked by Augustus, who often tried to excuse them to the senate and people, by declaring that they were natural failings and not intentional."

¹⁰⁴ Pol. 268; Adamant. 408-409; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 119.

¹⁰⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; 814a; Adamant. 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 131.

¹⁰⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 807a; 808a; 810b; Pol. 212; 214; 268; 272; Adamant. 362; 408-409; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 119; 2, 131-132.

¹⁰⁷ Tib. 9; 14; 16; 17; 18.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 19.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 33.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 21.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 26.

¹¹² Ibid., 30.

¹¹³ Pseud.-Arist. 812a. Cf. Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106.

- (5) "praegrandibus oculis," which are regarded by Pseudo-Aristotle and Polemo as indicative of sloth¹¹⁴; we are told, however, of the remarkable keenness of his eyes,¹¹⁵ "qui, quod mirum esset, noctu etiam et in tenebris viderent sed ad breve et cum primum e somno patuissent; deinde rursum hebescebant"; to such eyes, says Polemo, "iniustitiam adiudica,"¹¹⁶
- (6) "incedebat cervice rigida et obstipa," which betrays memoriae et scientiae defectum" and haughtiness¹¹⁷
- (7) "adducto fere vultu," which is indicative of self-will, as in the lion and the bull, and shows a morose disposition as well as perfidy,¹¹⁸ as does also
- (8) "plerumque tacitus nullo aut rarissimo etiam cum proximis sermone eoque tardissimo nec sine molli quadam digitorum gesticulatione." On the other hand, Pseudo-Aristotle states that among the signs of good moral character are a slow gait, and a slow way of talking.¹¹⁹

Suetonius' description of Tiberius' appearance does not belong to any stated period of his life. But his account of the end of the Emperor's career borders on invective. He says "he did so many other cruel and savage deeds under the guise of strictness and improvement of the public morals."¹²⁰ After his arrival at Capri he "broke out into every form of cruelty, for which he never lacked occasion."¹²¹ "Many things, too, show not only how hated and execrable he was all this time, but also that he lived a life of extreme fear and was even exposed to insult."¹²² "His cruel and cold-blooded character was not completely hidden even in his boyhood". . . . "But it grew still more noticeable after he became emperor, even at the beginning, when he was still courting popularity by a show of moderation."¹²³ Surely Suetonius' familiarity with the principles of the physiognomists may be inferred

¹¹⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 108; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 138.

¹¹⁵ Tib. 68.

¹¹⁶ Pol. 152. Cf. 156; 160; Adamant. 331-332; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 52.

¹¹⁷ Pol. 220; 234; Adamant. 368; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 75-76; 2, 99. A stiffness of the neck combined with a slow walk shows a certain haughtiness; "cervice obstipa" is not a good sign according to Polemo (222), for it shows that its possessor is not free from insanity. Pseud.-Arist. (807b) says that among the signs of the shameless are broad shoulders, hunched up, bearing not straight, but a little bent over, the chest high.

¹¹⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; 812a; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 28. Cf. Pol. 156; Adamant. 378.

¹¹⁹ Suetonius remarks (Tib. 21): "I am also aware that some have written that Augustus so openly and unreservedly disapproved of his austere manner, that he sometimes broke off his freer and lighter conversation when Tiberius appeared." Pseud.-Arist. 807b. But this aspect of the physique has to be considered in relation to others.

¹²⁰ Tib. 59.

¹²¹ Ibid., 61.

¹²² Ibid., 63; 66; 69.

¹²³ Ibid., 57.

from a number of passages in his works, but it is no more convincingly demonstrated than in these three widely differing iconistic portraits of the Roman emperors.

Plutarch,¹²⁴ the great figure in Peripatetic biography in the early second century, combines the ethical aim of this school of biography with an application of the Aristotelian doctrine of the "mind's construction in the face" in a number of striking passages.¹²⁵ A rather exceptional example occurs in the *Life of Alexander*:

It is not Histories that I am writing, but Lives; and in the most illustrious deeds there is not always a manifestation of virtue or vice, nay, a slight thing like a phrase or a jest often makes a greater revelation of character than battles where thousands fall, or the greatest armaments, or sieges of cities. Accordingly, just as painters get the likenesses in their portraits from the face and the expression of the eyes, wherein the character shows itself, but make very little account of the other parts of the body, so I must be permitted to devote myself rather to the signs of the soul in men, and by means of these to portray the life of each, leaving to others the descriptions of their great contests.¹²⁶

In the *Life of Sulla*,¹²⁷ furthermore, he relates that on the occasion of the visit of Orobazus, ambassador from the King of the Parthians to Sulla,

a certain man in the retinue of Orobazus, a Chaldaean, after looking Sulla intently in the face, and after studying carefully the movements of his mind and body, and investigating his nature according to the principles of his peculiar art, declared that this man must of necessity become the greatest in the world, and that even now the wonder was that he consented not to be first of all men.

His actual appearance as described by Plutarch does not follow the strictly iconistic form of Suetonius, for, as Miss Misener points out, "Plutarch wishes to present to his readers a fully rounded personality,"¹²⁸ in a "style of portraiture far removed from the impersonal photographs of the papyri,"¹²⁹ which served only for identification. Plutarch allows his readers to gather the size and proportions of Sulla from existing statues¹³⁰ and concentrates his attention on the color and character of his subject's eyes and face.

¹²⁴ D. R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, pp. 167-169.

¹²⁵ *HSCP* 46 (1935): pp. 57-58. To those references may be added *Amat.* 21 (see Förster, *SP* 2, p. 340); *Ad principem in-eruditum* 2; *Quomodo quis sent. prof. virt.* 15. Attention is called to an article dealing with a study of the popularity of physiognomy in Elizabethan England by Carroll Camden, "The Mind's Construction in the Face," *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig* (Palo Alto, 1941), pp. 208-220.

¹²⁶ *Alex.* 1, 3; (trans. B. Perrin, throughout, LCL). Cf. *Alcib.* 4, 1; *Anton.* 4, 1; *Pomp.* 48, 7; *Quaest. conv.* 5, 7, 3, 681d; *De Cap. ex Inim. Util.* 6, 89e.

¹²⁷ 5, 5-6.

¹²⁸ Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 110.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.* On Plutarch's attitude towards sculpture as reflecting the appearance and character of a man see *De Alex. M. Fortuna aut Virtute Or.* 2, 2.

His personal appearance, in general, is given by his statues; but the gleam of his gray eyes, which were terribly sharp and powerful, was rendered even more fearful by the complexion of his face. This was covered by coarse blotches of red, interspersed with white. For this reason, they say, his surname was given him because of his complexion, and it was in allusion to this that a scurrilous jester at Athens made the verse: "Sulla¹³¹ is a mulberry sprinkled over with meal."

It is well to remember that to the physiognomists keen and piercing eyes¹³² are a good sign of courage, though the gray eye also¹³³ means want of humanity, and an unbending nature; a white countenance¹³⁴ mixed with blotches of red indicates daring and fierce anger. And these characteristics of Sulla are readily observed in Plutarch's account of the man.¹³⁵

Now if we return at this point to the life of Alexander, it is interesting to note that the appearance with which Plutarch invests his ruler is that of a "heavenward-gazing ruler." L'Orange has demonstrated the appropriateness of this description in a masterly fashion in a volume on *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture*.¹³⁶ "Allusion," he says,

is made to Alexander's heavenward gaze in ancient literature, above all by Plutarch¹³⁷: Apelles the painter and Lysippus the sculptor also lived in the time of Alexander. . . . When Lysippus modeled his first statue of Alexander which represented him looking up with his face turned towards the heavens (as indeed Alexander often did look, with a slight inclination of his head to one side) some one engraved these verses on the statue, not without some plausibility:

Eager to speak seems the statue of bronze, up to Zeus it gazes:

Earth I have set under foot, Zeus, keep Olympus yourself.¹³⁸

Wherefore Alexander gave orders that Lysippus only should make statues of him. For Lysippus¹³⁹ was, it

¹³¹ 2. Among portraits found in Plutarch may be cited: *Ages*, 2, 2-3; *Alcib.* 1, 3-4; *Alex.* 4, 1-3; *Anton.* 4, 1-2; *Arat.* 3, 1; *Cat. Mai.* 1, 3; *Cat. Mi.* 1, 2; *Cic.* 3, 5; *Dem.* 2, 2; *Fab.* 17, 5; *Flam.* 1, 1; *Lys.* 1, 1; *Mar.* 2, 1; *Phil.* 2, 1-3; *Phoc.* 5, 1; *Per.* 3, 2-4; *Pomp.* 2, 1-2; *Pyrr.* 8, 1; *Rom.* 6, 1-2 (Rom. and Rem.), 7, 3-4; (Rem.); for the appearance of the orator while speaking see *Dem.* and *Cic.* 1, 6; *Per.* 5, 1; *TG* and *CG* 2.2-5.

¹³² A sign of *εὐφυλία*, Pseud.-Arist. 812b.

¹³³ Cf. Pol. 246. "Glaucus color" indicates "defectum humanitatis et indolis rigorem."

¹³⁴ A sign of "audacia" and "vehemens iracundia." Pol. 244.

¹³⁵ *Sull.* 6, 8; 30, 4-31.1; *Lys.* and *Sull.* *passim*.

¹³⁶ 19-28.

¹³⁷ *Alex. M. Fortuna aut Virtute Or.* 2, 2; *Alex.* 4; *Pyrrh.* 8; cf. Tsetzes, *Chil.* 11, 100.

¹³⁸ *AP* 16, 120.

¹³⁹ Cf. *Alex.* 4 "Apelles, however, in painting him as wielder of the thunderbolt, did not reproduce his complexion, but made it too dark and swarthy, whereas he was of a fair color, as they say, and his fairness passed into ruddiness on his breast particularly, and in his face." From the Pseudo-Callisthenes *Alexander Romance* (not before 300 A.D.) we learn that he resembles neither his father nor his mother. His hair "was like the mane of a lion; and his eyes differed in color, the right being black, the left light green, his teeth were long and narrow like a stag's and his face was like the roar of a lion."

seemed, the only one who revealed in bronze Alexander's character, and in molding his form portrayed also his virtues. The others wished to imitate the flexing of the neck and the melting and liquid softness of his eyes, but were unable to preserve his virile and leonine expression.

As the allusions to Alexander's appearance do not go back to Plutarch, the description which the biographer gives of him are based on the portrait tradition of Lysippus. That is not his real, but rather idealized delineation in art, with the characteristic heavenward gaze and the tilted neck, as a new ruler type. This Hellenistic concept of the ruler, formulated by Lysippus, and recorded in Plutarch, becomes prevalent in later periods. As heroic achievements of Alexander increase to the point where he becomes convinced that he is sent by God to save humanity, the heavenward look with which he is regularly identified becomes transformed into an expression of ecstasy. The moist eye and the shining, radiant glance is characteristic of the most excellent character, as the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook indicates,¹⁴⁰ and as Polemo¹⁴¹ maintains. Both Polemo and Adamantius associate this feature with Alexander, and they are quite clearly following the Hellenistic tradition.¹⁴² Pompey's imitation of Alexander in this matter is also familiar from a well-known passage from Plutarch.¹⁴³ The "transfigured Alexander" becomes an imitation of God¹⁴⁴ the "expressive reflection of the god in the ruler's own face," a concept which slowly from late Antiquity to the Middle Ages passes from being an exaltation of the outward perfection of the body to a reflection of the beauty of the soul. Another aspect of Alexander's physique is a profusion of long, flowing hair, found regularly in his portrait heads. This type dominates royal portraiture throughout the late Greek world and ultimately "invades" Rome in the republican period, being represented, for example, in the figures of heavenward-gazing Pompey and long-haired Scipio Africanus.¹⁴⁵ L'Orange remarks that the Roman portrait, however, "did not become like the Greek, a synthetic interpretation and glorification of personality, but an analytical chronicle, a historical biography." Yet this savior-type continued in the tradition, he goes on to say, modified by a striking dualism¹⁴⁶ in the imperial portraits embracing, on the one hand, the national heritage of Rome, "the constitutional representation of the statesman founded on

¹⁴⁰ 807b; 812b.

¹⁴¹ Pol. 108; 142; 148; 248. He applies this characteristic particularly to the emperor Hadrian, and also to Alexander, 144, specifically to his "magni oculi."

¹⁴² *SP* 1, p. 328.

¹⁴³ *Pomp.* 2.

¹⁴⁴ L'Orange, *ibid.*, p. 28.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 30; cf. pp. 95-98.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 31. Cf. also 31-33 for the importance of this feature in ancient life as a mark of the wise man and philosopher. See Livy 28, 35, as well as Sil. 8, 559-561. See also L'Orange, *ibid.*, "The Hellenistic Saviour-type Invades Rome," pp. 49-53; "The Imperial Saviour-Type," pp. 54-94.

republican tradition," and, on the other, the "inspired," transfigured world ruler. He cites characteristic examples from portraits of Nero, Domitian, the Antonine emperors, Septimius Severus down to Constantine, who had himself represented as a heavenward-looking, long-haired ruler in portraits dating from A.D. 334–337. Here the upward look is the physical expression of inner contact between the emperor and the heavenly powers. Under the influence of philosophy in late Antiquity, the literary portraiture begins to emphasize the spiritual goodness of man, not his outward appearance. Thus, in his polemic against symmetry, the Stoic definition of beauty, Plotinus¹⁴⁷ (A.D. 204–270) inveighs against the view, held by earlier thinkers, that "beauty in bodies consists in the symmetry and just proportions of their parts." Beauty rather consists of kinship with the soul, in which the splendor or all virtues may be seen, the greatness of character . . . the imposing countenance of valor, dignity, and modesty, and above all intelligence, resembling the divinity by its brilliant light. In the fourth century A.D. this view, as we shall see, dominates the Christian attitude toward the classical handbooks on physiognomy.¹⁴⁸

Thus the physiognomical principles which are conspicuously embodied in Plutarch's biography of Alexander, as showing the relation between a man's appearance and his inner character, become absorbed into Christian ideology, wherein a new emphasis is placed upon the appearance of a man in so far as it depicts his inner character; a gradual transformation which is brought out in later literature and portrait sculpture. The literary portraits of Alexander found in Plutarch may serve to illumine the obvious kinship which the study of ancient physiognomy enjoyed with ancient portraiture sculpture, and may suggest the further correlation which should be pursued on the evidence of both artistic and literary materials.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ *Enn.* 1, 6, 1 (trans. K. S. Guthrie); 1.6, 5; Cf. L'Orange, *ibid.*, "The Saviour-portrait in late Antiquity," pp. 95–129. Other relevant passages include 3, 1, 6; 3, 6, 3; 4, 4 (absurdity of Ptolemaic astrology); 5, 9, 12; 6, 7.

¹⁴⁸ A characteristic statement is to be found in two lines from a fifteenth-century Vatican manuscript which contains in part a Latin translation of the treatise of Adamantius. The translator is identified by Mercati as the librarian of Nicholas the fifth, Giovanni Tortelli. He pauses at the end of the section *De Colore*, with this elegiac distich:

"Qui te Christe colit sincero corde redemptor:
Seu niger, aut albus, seu ruber, ille bonus.
Deo gratias."

He died ca. 1466. The distich follows the words of Adamantius (Förster *SP* 1, p. 390. See G. Mercati, *Opere Minori* 4, 166 in *Studie Testi* 79, for the account of Vat. L 3122.

¹⁴⁹ An admirable analysis of personality in Roman portraiture is to be found in G. M. A. Hanfmann, "Observations on Roman Portraiture," *Latomus* 11, (1953): pp. 39–50.

VI. EPIC

Our attention is often called to the fact that Homer refrained from detailed portraiture of his characters. To say that he refrained from all portraiture, however, would be wholly misleading. Since the scope of the present investigation is to consider such examples of physical description as are related to the unchanging character of an individual on the one hand, and to his momentary emotional condition on the other, the question that naturally occurs to the classicist studying the portraits of Homer is how far the poet suggests the techniques of the later physiognomists.

In general it may be said that Homer pursues for the most part a middle course between that economy of detail which Dio Chrysostom,¹ writing in the second century A.D., so applauded in this epic poet as he observed that it would not have been fitting to describe Hector, save as a brave man only, when he was setting fire to the ships,² and the longer iconistic type of description in his characterization of Thersites,³ as being bandy legged, with sparse woolly hair, lame in one foot, with his head warped, and his shoulders bent down upon his chest; a description which fits readily into the conventional portraits of the *ἀναιδής* [shameless] and the *κακότης* [malicious] of the Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook.⁴

In the light of the foregoing it is appropriate to consider Homer's treatment of the fair Helen. Lessing,⁵ who maintained that poets should abstain from lavishly describing physical appearance, cited the Homeric treatment of Helen. Nowhere, in fact, does the poet enter upon a detailed description of her in the *Iliad*, though the whole poem is based on her loveliness. Homer, in his wisdom, says Lessing, left unattempted what the Greek scholar Constantinus Manasses in the twelfth century chronicled in infinite detail. One element follows another in Manasses' portrait of Helen, yet he achieved no description of physical beauty as beauty:

She was a very beautiful woman, with lovely eyebrows and complexion,
With beautiful cheeks and face, ox-eyes, snow-white skin;
Dark-(or round) eyes, tender, a grove full of charms,
White-armed, delicate breathing, beauty undisguised;
The complexion fair, the cheek rosy,
The countenance pleasing, the eye beautiful,
In artificial loveliness undyed, natural;
A rose-colored fruit tinged her whiteness,
As if one should dye ivory with splendid purple.
Long-necked, dazzling white, whence she was often called
Swan-born lovely Helen.

(In trans. of Lessing's *Laokoön*, by Sir R. Phillimore)

¹ *Or.* 21, 16–17.

² *Il.* 22, 370–371 (trans. A. T. Murray throughout, LCL).

³ *Il.* 2, 216–219.

⁴ G. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," *CP* 19 (1924): pp. 103–104.

⁵ *Laokoön*, Lessing, Herder, Goethe, *Selections*, edited by W. G. Howard (New York, Holt and Co., 1910), chap. 20 (pp. 124–126).

But if the description of Helen in Homer is generally of the simplest sort, permitting the reader's imagination to roam at will, there are many other instances of characterization in which the poet seems unconsciously or intuitively to anticipate the principles enunciated by the physiognomists at a much later date. Consider, for example, the account given in the *Iliad*⁶ by Idomeneus to Meriones of the man courageous in battle, an account very much in accord with the writings of the physiognomists. I refer to the passage in which "the Achaeans are told off beside the ships for an ambush, wherein the valor of men is best discerned."

There the coward and the brave man most plainly declare themselves: for the color of the coward changes often, and his spirit cannot abide from within him, but now he kneels on one knee, now on the other, and rests on either foot, and his heart beats noisily in his breast as he thinks of his doom, and his teeth chatter loudly. But the color of the brave man does not change, nor is he greatly afraid from the moment that he enters the ambush of heroes, but his prayer is to mingle instantly in woeful war.

Similarly, in a passage in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus replies to Euryalus, who taunts him with not having the look of an athlete. He says⁷:

So true it is that the gods do not give every gracious gift to all, neither shapeliness, nor wisdom, nor skilled speech. For one man is feebler than another in presence, yet the god crowns his words with beauty and men behold him and rejoice, and his speech runs surely on its way with a sweet modesty, and he shines forth among the gathering of his people, and as he passes through the town men gaze on him as a god. Another again is like the deathless gods for beauty, but his words have no crown of grace about them; even as thou art in comeliness preeminent, nor could a god himself fashion thee for better, but in wit thou art a weakling.

Many centuries later Galen,⁸ commenting on this passage, remarks that it is best that a young man, looking at himself in a mirror, if he be handsome, should practice making his soul as fair as possible, for it is a disgrace for a base soul to dwell in a beautiful body. But if a man should appear to be ugly of body, so much the more should he be concerned for his soul, that he may be able to quote the words of Homer, when Odysseus says angrily to Antinous: "For one man is feebler than another in presence . . . lo, now I see that thou hast not wisdom with thy beauty!"

Here, then, is the stuff out of which the beginnings of physiognomical "science" evolved. The passages quoted above reveal an early interest in the relation of man's appearance to his character. The poet's capacity to describe either appearance or character in trenchant and satiric terms (the appearance, for example, of the rebel Thersites as the "ugliest man" both in body and mind, ever to come to Ilium), or

to identify in realistic fashion the herald Eurybates⁹ as round-shouldered, black-skinned and curly-haired, becomes significant in the light of the later development of the science of physiognomy. Centuries afterward the Greek rhetoricians introduced these descriptions to illustrate their definitions, and the descriptions are a commonplace in Greek and Roman treatment of rhetorical theory and practice.

As we have said, it is not part of epic technique to describe the whole body from a "photographic point" of view. On the other hand, it is characteristic of epic to indicate in varying degree the emotion of the individual registered on the body or the countenance in such phrases as *κακ' ὀσσομένος* [evil-looking] or *laeto vultu*, *truci vultu* and to these phrases we must give our attention. This "momentary" portraiture in epic runs the gamut of human emotions in brief descriptions of physical appearance used for emphasis on heroic physique and heroic qualities of character, for delineation of love, happy or disillusioned, for expression of all the deeper moments of human experience in sorrow, in anger, or in joy. These descriptions are sometimes boldly, more often subtly, interwoven in the narrative in varying frequency with other commonly used devices of characterization.

Thus portraiture is introduced for the sake of intensifying such episodes as the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, for delineating the fierceness of the Homeric heroes on the battlefield,¹⁰ for presenting the picture of Odysseus indirectly through the eyes of others by repeated comparison with Telemachus, and comparison of the son with the father¹¹.

Agamemnon, angered at the accusations of Calchas in *Iliad*, Book I, is filled with rage in his black heart, and his eyes are like blazing fire¹²: ὅσσε δὲ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετετάωντι ἔϊκτην. His look, as he replies to Calchas' charges, bodes trouble: *κακ' ὀσσομένος*. In the quarrel which ensues between Agamemnon and Achilles, the phrase *ὑπόδρα ἰδών* [looking fiercely], which occurs repeatedly¹³ in the *Iliad* and less frequently in the *Odyssey*, is used of Achilles as he hurls the epithet *κυνώπης* [dog-faced] at the Commander-in-chief. But the son of Peleus in no wise ceases from his wrath¹⁴: "Thou wine bibber, with the eyes of a dog, but the heart of a deer" (*κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο*) is his final insult to Agamemnon, while he shouts that the Achaeans will someday futilely seek his aid.

⁹ *Od.* 19, 246 Nor are the fixed epithets such as *κυανοχαίτης* (dark-haired) or *καλλιπάρης* (fair-cheeked) necessarily the means which Homer regularly employs for individualizing his characters. With them I do not intend to deal.

¹⁰ See pp. 59-60.

¹¹ See pp. 60-61.

¹² 1, 104.

¹³ 1, 148. Compare *Il.* 2, 245; 4, 349; 5, 411; 5, 251; 5, 888; 10, 446; 12, 230; 14, 82; 17, 141; 17, 169; 18, 284; 20, 428; 22, 260; 22, 344; *Od.* 8, 165; 17, 459; 18, 14; 18, 337; 18, 388; 19, 70; 22, 34; 22, 60; 22, 320.

¹⁴ 1, 225 (after Murray throughout).

⁶ *Il.* 13, 278-286.

⁷ *Od.* 8, 167-177.

⁸ *Protrep.* 8. (Kühn 1, 17-18).

The field of battle provides similar pictures. Ajax, the bulwark of the Achaeans, stalks through the warriors, with a smile on his grim face¹⁵ (*μειδιῶν βλοσυροῖσι προσώπασιν*), valiant and tall, towering above the Argives. When forced to give way to the Trojans, sullen at heart¹⁶ Ajax is compared to a tawny lion beset by dogs, or a lazy ass cudged by boys.¹⁷ For Zeus has stirred him to flight, and he stands in a daze, and then with an anxious glance toward the crowd retreats slowly step by step.¹⁸ With the Achaeans pushed hard at the ships he ranges with long strides over the many decks, confronting Hector relentlessly.¹⁹ Hector, turning his horses this way and that, has eyes²⁰ even as those of the Gorgon, or of Ares, bane of mortals, while he ruthlessly drives the Achaeans to the ditch. With the tide of battle favoring the Trojans, Hector bursts through the gates of the Greek camp and his eyes blaze with fire²¹: *πυρὶ δ' ὅσσε δέδῃει*. Raging around the Greek ships, he displays his fierceness in eyes burning beneath his dreadful brows.²² Achilles, in turn, determined to reenter battle, likewise shows the intensity of his wrath in blazing eyes²³ (*ἐν δέ οἱ ὅσσε/δεινὸν ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ὥς εἰ σέλας ἐξεφάανθεν*) while he shouts, striding along the shore of the sea. When he is arrayed for battle there enters into his heart grief for Patroclus, but his eyes shine as a flame of fire²⁴ (*λαμπέσθην ὥς εἴ τε πυρὸς σέλας*). As he meets Aeneas standing with threatening face, he rushes at him in his fury with glaring eyes²⁵ (*γλαυκίων διδύς φέρεται μένει*) and in his final encounter with Hector he is like a snake that has fed on baleful herbs, and dread wrath has entered into him, and he glares terribly upon his quarry.²⁶

Or to take an example from the gods on Olympus, Hera, determined to pursue her own course of action in the Trojan War, adorns herself in order to beguile Zeus on Mount Ida, and, smiling, lays the zone of laughter-loving Aphrodite in her bosom.²⁷ When Zeus, deceived awakes from his sleep, *ὑπόδρα ἰδών* [looking sternly], he addresses his spouse, and the ox-eyed Hera shudders.²⁸ But Zeus, at length mollified, smiles at her submissive plea that it is Poseidon who inflicts harm upon the Trojans and upon Hector. Yet when Zeus refuses to alter his promise to Thetis, Hera goes to the assembly of the gods in anger. She

laughs with her lips, but her forehead above her dark brows does not relax²⁹ (*ἥδ' ἐγέλασσε/χείλεσιν οὐδὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι κυεανέησιν/ἰάνθη*). Helen identifies Agamemnon among the Achaean heroes on the battlefield, at the request of the elders on the walls of Troy. Here the portraiture is indirect and comparative, for the lord of men appears before our eyes in terms of the gods. His head and eyes³⁰ (*ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν*) are like those of Zeus, his waist like that of Ares, his chest equal to Poseidon's. Odysseus, in turn, is compared with Agamemnon by Priam as shorter, but broader of shoulder and of chest, like a ram in the herd. Helen identifies him for the benefit of the Trojan king, and the sage Antenor supplements the account of Laertes' son with the story of the embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy to regain Helen. Menelaus, he says, though commanding in appearance, is of few words in speech; Odysseus, the more stately while seated, gives, as he rises to speak, the impression of a man of no understanding. He would stand, looking down with his eyes fixed on the ground,³¹ (*ὑπαὶ δὲ ἰδεσκεν κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πῆξας*) holding his staff stiffly, without a trace of gesture so vital in later rhetorical practice. Yet when he begins to speak, he utters words falling like the snowflakes of winter, and all marvel at his appearance. The device of comparison employed to portray Agamemnon anticipates to a degree the method used to describe the hero of the *Odyssey*. The key to the portrait of Odysseus lies in its indirection. He is first revealed to our eyes through the appearance of his son. When Mentis (Athena) meets Telemachus, he asks directly³²: "But, come, tell me this and declare it truly, whether indeed, tall as thou art, thou art the son of Odysseus himself. Wondrously like his are thy head and beautiful eyes" (*αἰνῶς γὰρ κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὄμματα καλὰ ξοικας*). That his likeness to his father has impressed Nestor is revealed by the observation the latter makes on his speech.³³ When Helen, happily settled again in her own home in Sparta, receives Telemachus searching for the wanderer, she turns to Menelaus with the remark³⁴: "Amazement holds me as I look, as this man is like the son of great-hearted Odysseus," and Menelaus replies³⁵: Yes, that is so. "Such were his hands, and the glances of his eyes, and his head and hair above."

The first direct description of Odysseus comes in the picture of the lonely man far from Ithaca, seated on the shores of Calypso's island, straining his soul with tears, and, as he weeps, looking wistfully over the sea. From that portrait of despair he once more

¹⁵ 7, 211.

¹⁶ 11, 556.

¹⁷ 11, 556–562; 544–549. *Τρέσσε δὲ παπτήνας*.

¹⁸ 11, 544–547.

¹⁹ 15, 686.

²⁰ 13, 349. *Γοργοῦς ὄμματ' ἔχων ἥδ' ἐβροτολοιγοῦ "Ἄρης*.

²¹ 12, 466. *Cf.* 12, 463. His face was like sudden night—*νυκτὶ θοῇ ἀτάλαντος ὑπώπια*.

²² 15, 607–608. *Τῷ δὲ οἱ ὅσσε λαμπέσθην βλοσυρῆσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσιν*.

²³ 19, 16–17.

²⁴ 19, 355.

²⁵ 20, 161; 172.

²⁶ 22, 95.

²⁷ 14, 223.

²⁸ 15, 34. *Cf.* 15, 13.

²⁹ 15, 101–103.

³⁰ 2, 478–479.

³¹ 3, 217.

³² *Od.* 1, 206–209 (trans. A. T. Murray throughout, LCL).

³³ 3, 124–125.

³⁴ 4, 142–145.

³⁵ 4, 149–150.

emerges as the magnificent, commanding figure we have been led to visualize in the early books of the *Odyssey*. Shipwrecked on the coast of Phaeacia, he creeps from the thicket like a mountain-bred lion, trusting in his strength, his eyes blazing³⁶ (*ἐν δὲ οἱ ὄσσε δαίεσθαι*), terrifying the gentle and lovely Nausicaa and her companions by his appearance. The work of Athena in transforming him into a godlike figure, taller and mightier to look upon—gleaming with beauty and grace—makes him marvelous to see and in reality the kind of person imagined from the earlier references to his physique in the comparison made with Telemachus. Nor is Nausicaa the only person promptly captivated by his new appearance. On the Phaeacians, Athena³⁷ has worked a similar spell, that he may be welcomed and win respect. His build is remarked upon by Laodamas, the son of Alcinous, who urges his participation in the games. His great might, his strength of youth, are even yet apparent,³⁸ says the Phaeacian, through he has been overwhelmed by many troubles.

Once Odysseus is restored to his own Ithaca the technique of description is in a way reversed. Eumaeus, the swineherd, without recognizing his master, talks to him of the glorious form and strength of Telemachus³⁹ (*δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἀγῆτόν*), who is in no degree inferior in appearance to his father. The magnificence of Telemachus is again suggested in the description of Eumaeus' greeting to the youth, the affection with which the old man kisses his head and both his beautiful eyes.⁴⁰ Yet the resemblance of Telemachus to his father, emphasized strongly in the early books by those who knew Odysseus well, has no part in the wanderer's welcome by his wife. By the irony common to human experience he who, of all men, was closest to Penelope tells her the tale of meeting Odysseus on the island of Crete on his way to the war and is unrecognized by his own wife while

she mourns for her absent husband. But his eyes stand fixed between his lids as though they were of horn or iron, and with craft he hides his own tears.⁴¹ Then once more the device of the earlier books of the *Odyssey* appears as Eurycleia obeys Penelope's command to bathe the visitor's feet⁴²: "Never have I seen any man so like another as thou in form, and in voice, and in feet art like Odysseus." Thus the device of comparison common to the earlier portraits of the man is used directly against the man himself in the later story. When Eurycleia recognizes the scar upon his leg, joy and grief in one moment come to her, and her eyes fill with tears, and with her eyes she turns toward Penelope, anxious to show her that her husband is at home.⁴³ But Penelope cannot meet her glances⁴⁴ nor does she comprehend, for Athena has turned away her thoughts. With the fearful slaughter of the suitors accomplished, Odysseus sits in the hall by a tall pillar, looking down,⁴⁵ waiting to see whether his wife will speak to him, and she in turn sits long in silence, and astonishment comes upon her, and with her eyes she looks full in his face, but once and again she fails to know him, for, says Homer, his clothing is mean. When at last Athena transforms him and sheds abundant beauty upon him, making him taller and mightier as she had done for Nausicaa and the Phaeacians, Penelope still hesitates to identify him as her lord, beset by the doubts and uncertainties brought about by many years of separation. And the final recognition of the wanderer is achieved not by any means of physical resemblance to a man known long ago, but by the familiar story and simple device of the olive bedpost wonderfully wrought by Odysseus years before the Trojan war.

Grief and sorrow are implicit in a poem of war like the *Iliad*. Andromache smiles through her tears⁴⁶ (*δακρύνειν γελάσασα*) in her farewell to Hector. Briseis mourns gently and sadly for Patroclus, while Achilles writhes in paroxysms of grief. Hector's death leaves his wife, his mother and father prostrated with grief as the final scenes of the *Iliad* are marked by a kind of crescendo of sound and bereavement, involving both the Trojans and the Greeks. So Achilles wonders at the sight⁴⁷ of the godlike Priam as he appears at his tent. Swift to anger, he answers Priam's request for Hector's body,⁴⁸ *ὑπόδρα ἰδών*. The fierceness of his feeling is instantly revealed upon his face, but just

³⁶ 6, 131-132. But compare Athena's skill in transforming him to a shriveled old man in Ithaca, *Od.* 13, 398-403; 429-433.

³⁷ 8, 18-20.

³⁸ 8, 134-137. He is described directly by Athena as supple, fair-haired, fair-skinned, with beautiful eyes in *Od.* 13, 398-401.

³⁹ 14, 177.

⁴⁰ 16, 14-16; 17, 63. In *Od.* 18, 219-220, Penelope chides Telemachus for the treatment accorded the stranger in their halls. See also W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* (Oxford, 1954), chap. V, "The Untypical Hero," pp. 66-80, esp. pp. 66-67: "In physique he had the unusually short legs and long torso described by Antenor and Helen in *Il.* 3, 191-198," with note.

From Philostratus' *Heroicus*, Stanford, *ibid.*, chap. 12, "Ulysses and the Discrediting of Homer," pp. 146-158, esp. pp. 151-152 quotes: "You could tell the man's guilty thoughts by his downcast and concentrated expression," and "It would be absurd to suppose, for example, that goddesses like Circe and Calypso would love a man past the age for amorous delights, undersized, with a snub nose, and with shifty, wandering eyes (because of his chronic anxieties and suspicions). That look of thoughtful concentration, which he habitually wore, was far from being conducive to love affairs."

⁴¹ 19, 203-204; 211-212. He describes Odysseus' attendant, Eurybates.

⁴² 19, 380-381.

⁴³ 19, 476-477.

⁴⁴ 19, 478-479.

⁴⁵ 23, 90-95. See the interpretation of the recognition offered by Anne Amory, *Essays on the Odyssey* (Bloomington, 1963), chap. VII, "The Reunion of Odysseus and Penelope," p. 100-121.

⁴⁶ *Il.* 6, 484.

⁴⁷ 24, 483.

⁴⁸ 24, 559.

as quickly he grants the old man's wishes and bids him spend the night. They eat and Priam marvels at Achilles, how tall he is, and how handsome, like the very gods.

While the poetry of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* antedates the systematic approach to physiognomics, various instances of "physiognomic consciousness" can thus be observed as an essential part of Homer's method of characterization. We may move now to other types of epic, to consider briefly evidence of a comparable concern for physiognomics as an aspect of characterization.

With Apollonius Rhodius the technique of physical description is modified. Examples of its use, in the first place, are not common through the poem. Whatever instances occur in rapid succession are to be found concentrated in one episode of the Argonautic expedition, the story of Medea and Jason. Every phase of this affair he records with delicate innuendo in the conventional manner of erotic poetry, and this skillful type of delineation is his major contribution to the technique of portraiture in epic. It is obvious that the poet is working here less in the Homeric tradition of description than under the influence of lyric, where momentary emotion and instantaneous reaction express themselves in line after line, as in the poetry of Sappho, with direct intensity. There is also evident the influence of the drama and the obvious attempt to imitate Euripides in his portrayal of his dramatic figures and to bring psychological insight to bear on the fine art of characterization.

This particular kind of portraiture is introduced in the third book. Here every momentary development is marked by a corresponding facial expression on the part of the chief actors. The Medea romance starts, as does Dido's, in the machinations of two goddesses. Athena and Hera debate the means of furthering the exploits of Jason, their eyes fixed on the ground at their feet, plotting each in her own way⁴⁹ (καὶ ἐπ' οὐδὲος αἴ γ' ἐ ποδῶν πάρος ὄμματ' ἔπηξαν). They appeal to Cypris, who is introduced in a ridiculous scene as the mediator, and who proposes that they persuade Eros to charm Medea with love.⁵⁰ Cypris maintains that he will readily obey their command. The goddesses smile, look at each other, but at their urging, nevertheless, Aphrodite promises to coax him, and Hera, taking her hand, beams her approval.⁵¹ Eros is discovered playing dice with Ganymedes. Finishing the game with a winning hand, he stands upright, a sweet flush glowing on his cheek. His opponent sits by, silent and downcast of face. The ruthlessness of the little rogue is betrayed by the loud laughter⁵² with which he proclaims his success in this *tour de force*.

His mother questions him, amused,⁵³ bribes him with the promise of a gift, a round ball, and he complies gladly with her request. He enters the threshold of the palace, glances sharply around⁵⁴ (ὀξέα δειδίλων) and shoots his arrow at Medea. The damage is done. The scene shifts and our next descriptions are wholly concerned with the Colchian princess and Jason's task. Pierced by the arrow of Eros, Medea keeps darting sharp glances⁵⁵ (ἀμαρύγματα) at Aeson's son, and her soul is consumed in pain. In her distress her cheeks turn pale, then red. Aeetes, meanwhile, hearing of the feat proposed by Jason, and, being consequently infuriated, displays his cruelty in the fierceness of his eyes beneath his brows.⁵⁶ He tells Jason the conditions under which the fleece may be obtained, and the Argonaut stands, speechless, fixing his eyes on the ground.⁵⁷ As he prepares to meet the challenge, Medea with a stealthy glance⁵⁸ (ὄμματα κούρη· λοξά) observes Jason, magnificent in his beauty and grace. Chalciope, well aware of her sister's distraction, accosts her and inquires as to the reason. Medea's cheeks flush, she starts to speak and stops. Chalciope urges her to devise some trick to help Jason, and Medea's heart leaps with joy, her cheeks crimson, and a mist swims before her eyes.⁵⁹ Tortured with anguish by night, she resolves upon her plan. Waiting for Jason as he prepares for his task, she cannot keep her glance steadily on her attendants. Presently the hero appears before her longing eyes; they meet secretly in the shrine of Hecate. He addresses her in gentle courtesy, and she casts her eyes down with a smile as sweet as nectar⁶⁰: ὁδ' ἐγκλιδὸν ὄσσε βαλοῦσα νεκταρέον μείδῃσε. Raising her eyes she looks at him full in the face⁶¹ (ἀνέδρακεν ὄμμασιν ἄντην). Eros flashes a bright flame from the golden head of the Argonaut, and Jason captivates her radiant eyes. And now both fix their eyes on the ground in a state of confusion and then look at each other again, smiling tenderly beneath their shining brows.⁶² As they prepare to separate, she casts her eyes to her feet,⁶³ begging him to remember her name. He pledges his love, receives from her the fatal charm, and goes his way to the task imposed. Then, as time passes, Hera puts into the heart of Medea dread fear. She is haunted by the knowledge that her attendants are aware of her guilt, yet her eyes blaze with fire,⁶⁴ her ears ring in lines reminiscent of Sappho's art. When,

⁴⁹ 3, 129.

⁵⁰ 3, 281.

⁵¹ 3, 288, 290.

⁵² 3, 371 (after R. C. Seaton).

⁵³ 3, 422-423.

⁵⁴ 3, 443-445.

⁵⁵ 3, 724-725.

⁵⁶ 3, 1008-1010; cf. 3, 951-953.

⁵⁷ 3, 1018-1019.

⁵⁸ 3, 1022-1024 (after Seaton).

⁵⁹ 3, 1063-1064.

⁶⁰ 4, 16-17.

⁴⁹ 3, 22 (trans. R. C. Seaton throughout, LCL).

⁵⁰ 3, 91-93.

⁵¹ 3, 107.

⁵² 3, 124.

with her help, the task of Jason is completed, she is ready to abandon her home and family. But all too soon Medea's mood is changed. She upbraids Jason for trying to desert her, when he refuses to fight the Colchians over her brother Absyrtus.⁶⁵ Yet the terrible deed of murder is done, and the girl quickly turns her eyes away⁶⁶ (ἐμπάλιν ὀμματα' ἐνεικε), and covers them with her veil in horror. The lovers escape their pursuers in the Argo and take their homeward way. All the innuendo tends to disappear from their facial expressions, all the intensity of the emotion felt in the third book lessens, and in the final scenes little of visible emotional expression remains to move the reader. Only once again is there significant use in the narrative of the expression in Medea's eyes—this time fearful in their power—as she turns her mind to craft and with a hostile look bewitches the eyes of Talos,⁶⁷ the bronze man of Crete. For in that moment Medea becomes the sorceress of mythology rather than the Colchian princess tortured by the anguish of love.

The love story of Medea and Jason leads directly to the theme of the fourth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. In terms of portraiture there is obvious kinship, and at the same time marked differences. There are three episodes of the *Aeneid* showing wherein Virgil was indebted to his predecessors, Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes, and wherein he introduced certain nuances of his own. The first episode includes the shipwreck and the subsequent landing of Aeneas and his companions in Africa; the second episode is that of Aeneas and Dido; the third has to do with the battle scenes in the latter part of the *Aeneid* in which Turnus plays such a conspicuous part. I propose to deal here only with the second episode.

In general it may be said that Virgil follows in the epic tradition in that his descriptions belong to the momentary rather than the iconistic type, but that in the fourth book of the *Aeneid* those descriptions of momentary reaction are expanded within the limits of their own, special category to meet the needs of Virgil's descriptive technique.

As Aeneas is revealed to Dido, the queen is astonished,⁶⁸ *primo aspectu*, at the glorious appearance of the Trojan on whom his goddess mother has bestowed all the graces of Odysseus, granted by Athena, at crucial moments, while adding a sprightly luster to his eyes⁶⁹ ("laetos oculis adflarat honores"). In the telling of the story of the last night of Troy the familiar figures of the *Iliad* legend appear,⁷⁰ momentarily

described, but with the return, to the tragedy of Dido all the possibilities inherent in physical portraiture are heightened exactly as in the third book of Apollonius. The queen herself is simply⁷¹ "forma pulcherrima" at the beginning, as she reassures the Trojans quietly⁷² "vultum demissa." Once the story of Aeneas' wanderings is finished, Aeneas' face is fixed in the heart of Dido,⁷³ she recalling in mind his bearing and his bravery. The affair progresses rapidly, far more rapidly than in the *Argonautica*, and the moment of climax is reached with hardly a suggestion of momentary portraiture. Aeneas is recalled to duty. He prepares to depart, delaying his plea to the queen. She in desperate mood senses the truth, attacks him, then exhorts him, while he holds his eyes unmoved,⁷⁴ suppressing anxious care within his heart. Briefly he explains his task. She listens to his words with averted glances⁷⁵ ("aversa tuetur"), "huc illuc volvens oculos totumque pererrat,"⁷⁶ and with silent look (*luminibus tacitis*) surveys him. Scornfully she rejects his words⁷⁷: "Has he ever turned his eyes in kindness to her distress?" Not even Juno or Jupiter has regarded her with impartial eyes⁷⁸ ("oculis aequis"). In an instant she breaks off, turns away⁷⁹ ("seque ex oculis avertit"), and leaves Aeneas hesitant, distraught. In the intense scenes which ensue little actually is said of facial expression other than in reference to tears⁸⁰ ("lacrimae inanes"), futile and unavailing. The contrast to Apollonius is striking, for in Apollonius where the growing power of love between two people increases every moment in tension, detailed portraiture of the face is part of the poet's technique. But Virgil's art at this point is "the art of reticence," and all the force of the overwhelming passion of Dido and Aeneas is barely mentioned in these terms, while the height of anguish and disillusionment is limned bitterly and fully. As Dido determines on her final plan, she conceals it on her countenance⁸¹ ("consilium vultu tegit"), successfully deceives the unwitting Anna, and ultimately "sanguineam volvens aciem,"⁸² pale, resolute on death, she rushes to the pyre where she

joyously lifting his eyes to heaven for the omen of Jupiter (2, 687), Andromache telling the story of her captivity, "deiecit vultum" (3, 320).

⁷¹ 1, 496. Brooks Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 66, 80–83, 355 discusses the appearance of Dido, and Aeneas ("pulcherrimus," 4, 141). See also Viktor Pöschl, *The Art of Vergil*, trans. G. Seligson (Ann Arbor, 1962), pp. 62–91, esp. 61 and 66.

⁷² 1, 561.

⁷³ 4, 4–5 (after H. R. Fairclough throughout, LCL).

⁷⁴ 4, 331–332, "immota tenebat/lumina."

⁷⁵ 4, 362.

⁷⁶ 4, 363–364.

⁷⁷ 4, 369. "num lumina flexit?"

⁷⁸ 4, 372.

⁷⁹ 4, 389.

⁸⁰ 4, 449; 413; 439.

⁸¹ 4, 477, "ac spem fronte serenat."

⁸² 4, 643.

⁶⁵ 4, 388–390.

⁶⁶ 4, 466.

⁶⁷ 4, 1669–1670.

⁶⁸ 1, 613.

⁶⁹ 1, 591.

⁷⁰ Hector, whose "serenus vultus" (2, 285–286) is frightfully disfigured, Cassandra "tendens ardentia lumina" (2, 405) as she is dragged from the temple, Priam uttering imprecations on Pyrrhus for defiling the "patrios vultus" (2, 539), Anchises

hurls a final imprecation on Aeneas⁸³: "Let that cruel Trojan from the sea fill his eyes with these flames, and bear with him the omens of my death" ("hauriat hunc oculis ignem crudelis ab alto"). In the moment of death she seeks to lift her heavy eyes to the sky, three times she searches for the light, "oculis errantibus,"⁸⁴ and groans, having found it. In the fourth book of the *Aeneid* Virgil shifts his emphasis in portraiture from the growing power of love treated in Apollonius to the catastrophe that follows on the destruction of that love, and the havoc wrought upon its victims.

The end of the tragedy is quick, and the epilogue in the underworld reveals the same intense mood of scorn that exists at the end of the fourth book. While Aeneas seeks for the last time to plead his case to the queen,⁸⁵ "ardentem et torva tuentem," she, "aversa," holds her eyes fixed on the ground, and does not alter her looks again.⁸⁶ As in the enamorment of Medea it is the *δέσις* [binding] of the story that receives skillful portraiture, so in Dido's story it is the *λύσις* [loosing] that marks the power of the poet's handling of this aspect of characterization, for Apollonius is concerned with love,⁸⁷ and Virgil with tragedy.

In Ovid's *Metamorphoses* the use of physical description is not essentially different from that appearing in the earlier epic tradition. Because of the very nature of Ovid's scenes of transformation, we are not to expect depictions comparable with those in the fourth *Aeneid*. Instead of descriptions sustained over a long portion of the poem, we encounter the momentary suggestion of appearance, which, once presented, holds the reader's interest.

In the *Pharsalia* Lucan also makes relatively little use of physical description. Of the two principal figures⁸⁸ in the epic, Pompey, Lucan's favorite, is sympathetically drawn. On the night before the great battle the poet apostrophizes the general, as he views the plain of Pharsalia for the last time⁸⁹: "With countenance unchanged he beholds Pharsalia." After the battle the defeated general, arriving at Lesbos, is tragically disfigured with paleness,⁹⁰ his countenance overhung with white hairs, his garments squalid with

black dust. He leaves Lesbos, taking Cornelia with him, only to have her witness her husband's murder before her very eyes.⁹¹ In death he remains majestic in appearance and bearing:

permansisse decus sacrae venerabile formae
irataque deis faciem, nil ultima mortis
ex habitu vultuque viri mutasse fatentur.

Caesar, on the other hand, though hated by Lucan, dominates the scene. He inspires terror in the foe.⁹² He commands constant respect from his soldiers by his power of speech⁹³:

convocat armatos extemplo ad signa maniplos
utque satis trepidum turba coeunte tumultum
composuit vultu dextraque silentia iussit.

Completely controlled, *vultuque serenus*,⁹⁴ he grants peace to Afranius, who pleads in behalf of the Pompeians. He stands before his soldiers, intrepid in countenance ("intrepidus vultu"),⁹⁵ and harangues them from a mound of earth commanding their awe, and inspiring strength and courage in their hearts.⁹⁶ "But if I see those tokens that never play your leader false—fierce countenances and threatening eyes—then victory is yours." He is adept at feigning emotion, for while Pompey's murderers suppressed their signs and concealed their feelings by joyous features, Caesar mourned⁹⁷:

abscondunt gemitus et pectora laeta
fronte tegunt, hilaresque nefas spectare
cruentum,—
O bona libertas—cum Caesar lugeat, audent.

Lucan's contempt is never more clearly revealed than in the passage where he describes how Caesar, actually overjoyed, received the head of his rival⁹⁸:

. . . nec non his fallere vocibus audet
adquirique fidem simulati fronte doloris:

Outwardly assured⁹⁹ ("tum vultu semper celante pavorem"), though the people of Egypt are hostile to him, he comes to Alexandria and visits the temples of the gods, and the tomb of Alexander the Great, and falls wholly under the spell of Cleopatra, who, with confidence in her beauty, entreats Caesar to protect her and her brother against the power of Pothinus. Her pleas would have been in vain but for the fact that her prayers and her unchaste face plead for her¹⁰⁰:

⁸³ 4, 661–662.

⁸⁴ 4, 691.

⁸⁵ 6, 467.

⁸⁶ 6, 469–470, "illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat."

⁸⁷ Cf. Catullus, 64, in this regard. Emphasis is placed on the descriptions of Ariadne's face and eyes as she beholds Theseus, almost no attention is given to the countenance in her moments of despair, save to tears and laments. See pp. 68–69.

⁸⁸ Very little is said of Cato save when Marcia comes to him, bearing the ashes of Hortensius, and they solemnly renew their marriage vows in the presence of Brutus. 2, 333–337; 360–361; no saffron colored veil concealed the downcast features of the bride ("demissos vultus"), Cato admitted no joyousness to his rigid features 2, 373 ("nec duroque admisit gaudia vultu").

⁸⁹ 7, 682–683: "non impare vultu/aspicis Emathiam" (trans. J. D. Duff, throughout, LCL).

⁹⁰ 8, 54–61.

⁹¹ 8, 664–666; cf. 589–592.

⁹² 1, 244–246.

⁹³ 1, 296–298.

⁹⁴ 4, 363. But he is quick to anger, when the people of Mas-silia send deputies to him, deprecating civil war (3, 356–357): "cum turbato iam prodita vultu/ira ducis tandem testata est voce dolorem."

⁹⁵ 5, 316–321.

⁹⁶ 7, 290–292.

⁹⁷ 9, 1106–1108.

⁹⁸ 9, 1032–1041; 1043–1046; 1062–1063.

⁹⁹ 10, 14–15.

¹⁰⁰ 10, 82–85; 104–105.

nequiquam duras temptasset Caesaris aures:
vultus adest precibus faciesque incesta perorat.

The technique used in this historical epic resembles that used by Tacitus in the *Annals*, for while momentary descriptions are introduced with less subtle nuance than in the *Annals*, the portraits of Pompey and Caesar are similar in nature to Tacitus' portrayals of Agricola and Tiberius.

Whenever the Argonaut legend reappears after Virgil in the epic tradition of the Roman empire, the influence of Apollonius rather than that of Virgil is apparent in the portraiture of Medea and Jason, as in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*.

In the longest epic poem in Latin literature, the *Punica* of Silius Italicus, the use of descriptions of physical appearance is again limited, if the number of examples found be related directly to the length of the poem. Yet the portraits that Silius includes are essential to the narrative, and powerfully drawn. In a digression in the sixth book the story of Regulus, which really belongs to the First Punic War, introduces one of the most glorious and honorable figures of the Roman Republic. The unique character of the man comes out in the apostrophe of the general's squire, Marus, to Serranus, Regulus' son, who seeks refuge in his hut after the tragic defeat of Lake Trasumenus.¹⁰¹ "I saw you, greatest of generals, when, though you were a prisoner, your countenance terrified the citadel of Carthage." Old Marus continues¹⁰² with his account of Regulus' intrepid courage, calling attention to the calm brow which met the gaze of onlookers when he first brought the fleet under his command to the Carthaginian shore, and which was likewise to be observed, when, as a captive, he was sent to Rome to seek terms of peace, and passed through the crowd before unfriendly eyes.¹⁰³ Marus as an eyewitness watched the face of the commander as his ship glided into the Tiber—the face, remarks Silius, and the eyes that reveal the mind¹⁰⁴ ("servabam vultus ducis ac prodentia sensum/lumina"). His expression was unchanged in the midst of a thousand dangers. Such, too, was his mien in Rome and in the city of Carthage, even when he was tortured. The son listens to the old man, takes up the story, and fills in the picture of his father.¹⁰⁵ His stature was more than human, his unkempt hair fell free from his white head, and on his brow with its disordered locks sat

¹⁰¹ 6, 82–84 (trans. J. D. Duff throughout, LCL). He speaks of the fire in Regulus' eyes (6, 220): "terribilis gemino de lumine fulgurat ignis."

¹⁰² 6, 368–370:

"... fert lumina contra
pacatus frontem, qualis cum litora primum
attigit appulsa, rector Sidonia classe."

¹⁰³ 6, 367.

¹⁰⁴ 6, 384–385; 387–388.

¹⁰⁵ 6, 426–430; esp. 428–29:

"frontique coma squalente sedebat
terribilis decoratque animi venerabile pondus . . ."

diginity and authority, like nothing since—a portrait reminiscent of the same magnificent composure described in Horace's lines.¹⁰⁶

Two other portraits have a prominent place in the *Punica*. Hannibal, the Carthaginian general, displays all the characteristics of a man who will brook no opposition to his determined progress, his frown, his fierceness of countenance,¹⁰⁷ his threatening face when he turned toward Rome and prepared to march back again¹⁰⁸:

. . . torvos cum versus ad urbem
ductor Agenoreus vultus remeare parabat,

his daring which stirred equal courage in his soldiers,¹⁰⁹ and the consternation, inspired at Rome by his march, allayed by the faces of the senate.¹¹⁰ Even his address to his son bespeaks a desire to have the qualities associated with his own fierceness of expression reproduced in the face and character of his child. "I recognize my father's countenance and the defiant eyes beneath a frowning brow. I note the depth of your infant cries, and the beginnings of a fierceness like my own."¹¹¹

A quite different picture is presented by Scipio. While the latter's forehead was that of a soldier and his eyes were bright, their expression was kind and those who looked upon him felt both respect and pleasure.¹¹² When he returned to Rome in triumph, after the Battle of Zama, the stalwart bearing that marked his appearance at the beginning of the epic was magnificently displayed as he rode through the city:

ipse, adstans curru atque auro decoratus et ostro
martia praebebat spectanda Quiritibus ora.

One scene memorable in the career of Scipio is the debate between Virtue and Pleasure, whom Silius describes as appearing before him. This famous debate, stemming from Prodicus, depicts Scipio sitting like Hercules in solitude at the crossroads. He viewed the examples set before him, and showed his approval in his face.¹¹³ The decision in favor of virtue, once made, started him on his long career. It was shortly after this that he asked for the command of the army in Spain, and received it. Excitement was general. People believed that they saw his father's

¹⁰⁶ *Carm.* 3, 5, 41–44:

"fertur pudicae coniugis osculum
parvosque natos ut capitis minor
ab se removisse et virilem
torvus humi posuisse vultum."

¹⁰⁷ 11, 542–543; 2, 208–210.

¹⁰⁸ 13, 2–3.

¹⁰⁹ 12, 510.

¹¹⁰ 12, 551–552; "stat celsus et asper ab ira/ingentemque mentum torvo domat ore senatus."

¹¹¹ 3, 75–77.

¹¹² 8, 559–561:

"martia frons facilesque comae nec pone retroque
caesaries brevior: flagrabant lumina miti
aspectus gratusque inerat visentibus horror."

¹¹³ 15, 122–123; 133–134.

features in his face, and indeed recognized in Scipio the stern countenance of his uncle as a young man. The debate itself, in which Virtue and Pleasure contended for his allegiance, gave Virtue the opportunity to present arguments which encouraged him to ask for the command. Pleasure is described first, a ravishing creature¹¹⁴: "the pin in her hair gave studied beauty to her brow, and her roving wanton eyes shot forth flame after flame." The appearance of Virtue was far more in accord with Roman taste. "Her hair that sought no borrowed charm from ordered locks, grew freely about her forehead; her eyes were steady, in face and gait she was more like a man; she showed a cheerful modesty, and her tall stature was set off by the snow-white robe she wore"¹¹⁵:

. . . frons hirta neque umquam
composita mutata coma; stans vultus, et ore
incessuque viro propior, laetique pudoris.

Silius' portrait of Scipio naturally invites comparison with that of the same general in Livy. We recall that in Livy Scipio is distinguished by the authority and dignity of his appearance, his face creating terror at the height of a mutinous uprising at Sucro, the overpowering effect¹¹⁶ he produced on Masinissa when he received the Numidian for the first time. The portraiture of the earlier historian has clearly influenced Silius' concept of the Roman commander, and the descriptions in Silius as a whole are closely akin to those in Livy.

In Statius the device of physical description in the portraiture of the principal characters of the *Thebaid*, following the pattern of Homer and Virgil, is somewhat more frequently used.

Entirely different in spirit from the conventional warlike character of the heroes depicted in the *Thebaid* is the romantic and appealing portrait of the young Achilles, his mother Thetis, and the lovely Deidamia in the *Achilleid*. Achilles, now in the care of old Chiron, has not yet lost the bloom of youth and a quiet light burns in his glance and there is much of his mother in his look¹¹⁷ ("tranquillaque faces oculis et plurima vultu/mater inest"). His mother comes to visit him and is received hospitably by the centaur. Anxious for her son, she soon relaxes her countenance with a smile¹¹⁸ ("his victo risit Thetis anxia vultu") as the entertainment proceeds. She proposes to protect her son from the hazards of war by dressing him up in women's clothes to let him live among the daughters of Lycomedes. Achilles at first resists. Thetis directly questions him: "Why do you turn away? What means that glance? Are you ashamed

to soften yourself in this garb?"¹¹⁹ ("cur ora reducis?/quidve parant oculi? pudet hoc mitescere cultu?"). So Achilles complies, after they have taken leave of the centaur, who watches them depart, concealing his moist eyes¹²⁰ ("udaque celat/lumina"). When Achilles arrives at the court of Scyros, he becomes immediately fascinated by Deidamia who, with the rosy bloom of her countenance,¹²¹ outshines her sisters in his eyes. The love he suddenly feels does not stay hidden, but the flame penetrates his whole body and crimson his cheeks.¹²² His mother, unaware, hands him over to Lycomedes as Achilles' sister with the remark¹²³: "Don't you see how fierce her look is, and like her brother's?" ("nonne vides, ut torva genas aequandaque fratri"). The Scyrian princesses look upon him with shrewd glances of appraisal and note how tall he is in head and neck, how broad his chest and shoulders.¹²⁴ Deidamia becomes conscious of how closely he is watching her, and she, in turn, marvels at the deep tones of his voice and the way in which he shuns all the others and follows her with too attentive look¹²⁵ ("nimio quod lumine sese/figat"), and at all times hangs constantly on her words. When at last Achilles is emboldened to confess and pursue his love, and to admit the ignoble disguise he has been forced to endure, the princess is horror struck, although she had secretly suspected his good faith. She trembles at his presence, while his countenance is changed as he makes confession¹²⁶ ("horruit et facies multum mutata fatentis"). Meanwhile, as the affair progresses, Ulysses arrives in search of the hero, and the ruse of the shield and armor leads to the discovery of the true Achilles after he has escaped detection only by the constant resourcefulness of Deidamia. Once the youth is identified, the story follows its familiar course, Achilles reveals himself to Lycomedes as the father of Deidamia's child, and the fragmentary second book ends with his departure for Troy. Compared with the fairly conventional type of portraiture of the *Thebaid*, that of the *Achilleid* is refreshing.

The Alexandrian love poetry of Apollonius has been imposed upon the martial epic of Homer to produce in the end of the first century of the empire a poem that tells of Achilles, son of Peleus, who is involved by an over-affectionate, almost mortal mother in a kind of romantic situation and love affair, a treatment often filled with unconscious humor, that

¹¹⁹ 1, 271-272.

¹²⁰ 1, 233-234.

¹²¹ 1, 297.

¹²² 1, 304-306: "sed fax . . . /in vultus atque ora redivit lucemque genarum/tingit."

¹²³ 1, 351.

¹²⁴ 1, 366-368:

" . . . nec turba piarum
Scyriadum cessat nimio defigere visu
virginis ora novae."

¹²⁵ 1, 568-569; 584.

¹²⁶ 1, 664.

¹¹⁴ 15, 26-27: "fronte decor quaesitus acu, lascivaque crebras/ancipiti motu iaciebant lumina flammis."

¹¹⁵ 15, 28-31.

¹¹⁶ 28, 26; 32; cf. 28, 35.

¹¹⁷ *Ach.* 1, 163-164 (trans. J. H. Mozley throughout, LCL).

¹¹⁸ 1, 194.

borders closely on a drawing-room comedy of manners. But it is important to observe that much of the thread of the narrative is carried by the suggestion of facial expression on the characters in the romance.

VII. PHYSIOGNOMICS IN VARIED LITERARY FORMS

I. IAMBIC, ELEGIAC, AND LYRIC POETRY

As we proceed from Homer to those shorter and more personal poetic forms which follow the Homeric epic in the literary history of Greece, and which are traditionally classified as iambic, elegiac, and lyric, we find that it is in the area of satire that characterization in terms of physiognomics makes its first appearance. Thus Phocylides' diatribe on the nature of women¹ foreshadows the later Aristotelian doctrine that a particular animal form is to be associated with a particular mental character: "The tribes of women come of these four, the bitch, the bee, the savage-looking sow, and the long-haired mare." Only the bee is the good housewife who knows her work, and for her in wedlock a man should pray. A more fully developed example of this parallelism between physique and nature appears a century later in Semonides' familiar classification of ten classes of women. Again only the beelike creature is a worthy helpmate, while the apelike woman embodies qualities suggestive of Aristotelian physiognomical characterization²: "Foul of face, short in neck, she hardly moves, hipless, lean shanked, like an ape. She knows all arts and wiles, nor takes thought of men's laughter. Nor will she do a man any kindness." Of this type, in turn, the Pseudo-Aristotelian manual remarks³

¹ *Elegy and Iambus* 1, 3 (trans. J. M. Edmonds throughout, LCL).

² *Elegy and Iambus* 2, 7, lines 71-82.

³ 810b. The description of the stalwart general in Archilochus insists on courage and puts little emphasis on imposing appearance (*Elegy and Iambus* 2, 58): "A general who is tall pleases me not, who walks with legs apart, delights in curls and shaves the hair that grows upon his calves . . . but rather a man should be short and bow-legged to behold, set firm on his feet, full of heart (*καρδής πλέως*)." Dio Chrysostom employs a paraphrase of the last statement for the purpose of censure in his first Tarsic oration (an address delivered to the people of Tarsus on the immorality of their city in the first century A.D.): "Nay let me rather have one who is bandy-legged, stands firmly, and has hairy shins." (*Or.* 33, 17, trans. J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby, LCL.) The portrait of Archilochus' foppish general, which has an underlying satiric purpose, as does that of Thersites in the *Iliad* is the forerunner of the Miles Gloriosus of later literature, the pompous Lamachus of Aristophanes' *Acharnians*. See *Archiloque, Fragments* ed. by F. Lasserre, trans. and comment. by A. Bonnard [Paris, 1958], p. 93 ("Quant au fragment 93 rien de moins homerique que ces quatres vers." The admiration of Homer for beauty yields here "soudain la place au goût de la laideur pleine de caractère, qui s'incarnera en Esope et Socrate. La bravoure militaire, pour gagner Archiloque, doit revêtir le corps de Thersite"). The lines of Archilochus are endowed with a greater physiognomical significance by Dio: "Therefore you must not think that if Archilochus had no love for the sort of general he

that lean shanks, which look as if they had been rubbed bare, are indicative of a mischievous disposition, as in the case of apes.

The poetry of Theognis⁴ reflects a more general awareness of the principles of physiognomical theory even without recognizing it as a formal science. He reminds young Cynrus that

the deceit of counterfeit gold or silver is easily endured, nor hard is it for a man of skill to find them out; but if the mind of a friend be false within him unbeknown, and the heart in his breast deceitful, this hath god made most counterfeit for mankind, this is the grief hard of all things to discover. For neither the mind of man nor yet of woman shalt thou know till thou hast made trial of it like a beast of burden, nor shalt thou ever guess it when thou comest to buy, because outward shapes do so often cheat the understanding.

While we might naturally expect some detailed description of physique in iambic poetry, especially in view of its identification with satiric expression, we find this type of description generally lacking in the lyric, as in the case of Alcaeus. What is more characteristic of the lyric in this regard is that type of generic term such as *εἶδος* [form] or *κάλλος* [beauty], which is employed by later Greek dramatists, principally with reference to Helen. This is a device of singular effectiveness in conveying the impression of extraordinary beauty and is found repeatedly in the Greek lyric.⁵ Related to it also is the brief delineation

has described and did not gauge the value of a general by his height or hair, he would ever have praised a city because he found in it such things as rings and baths and fountains and porticoes . . . for such things are simply like hair and ringlets on a man."

Elegy and Iambus 2, 19. See also Aristophanes, *Lys.* 802, and Blaydes' note. The scholiast on *Il.* 24, 315, speaking of Archilochus, calls the eagle "black-rumped": "Lest thou meet a black-rumped creature." Edmonds suggests this is a line which may be part of a speech of the fox to its cub. But Hesychius (in whose lexicon the fragment occurs as a kind of proverb) proposes that the expression means "lest you meet somebody brave and strong," i.e., Heracles, whose encounter with the Cercopes would imply such an interpretation. Again on the *Iliad* 3, 281, Eustathius commenting on the *γονόκροτοι* "knock-kneed" adds "but Anacreon uses the words of cowards." See H. J. Rose, *Handbook of Greek Mythology* (6th ed., London, 1958), p. 217.

⁴ *Elegy and Iambus* 1, 119-128, cf. also 535-537; cf. Euripides, *Med.* 516-519. Clement of Alexandria in his *Str.* (7, 22) remarks that the Greeks "gave their gods human passions as well as human shape; even as each race of men depict their forms so as to be like their own." "These," he says, are "in the words of Xenophanes." The fragment of Xenophanes which Clement has in mind contends that the Aethiopians believe that their gods are snub-nosed and black, while the Thracians think that theirs have gray eyes and red hair: "Even so do they represent their soul and imagined them possessed by the same emotions." Cf. Xenophanes, *Elegy and Iambus* 1, 16, 202 (Xenophanes, trans. Edmonds, LCL).

⁵ In Sappho there is either utter simplicity in a general description of beauty itself, in the gentle picture of beauty in Anactoria, in regard to whom Sappho expresses the longing for "the sweet sound of her footfall and the sight of the brightness of her beaming face rather than all the chariots and armoured footmen of Lydia." (*Lyra Graeca* 1, 38, second century papyrus, trans. J. M. Edmonds

of momentary inner emotion reflected on the face. A similar form of characterization is to be found in a description of the intensity of the reaction of the beholder to beauty, in the registration of instantaneous feeling at the sight of the beloved, as in Sappho.⁶

The pastoral *Idylls* of Theocritus employ the same device of momentary description. The poems contain many examples of this technique, as would be expected in view of the nature of his poetry, characterized as it is by miniature vignettes of pastoral song and mimes. Thus Simaetha sings of her mad love, complaining that by reason of its pangs,⁷ she has lost her beauty, while Delphis, who is soon to leave her for another, gazes on her, then with eyes fixed on the ground, is possessed by her beauty, her color, her loveliness, her bright eyes. But almost as quickly the transitory moment of infatuation is past,⁸ and Simaetha in loneliness complains bitterly to the moon of the man who is "the heartless one."

The most detailed description of this type of love madness occurs in an idyll, the Theocritean origin of which is generally denied, but considered Hellenistic in date,⁹ in which an unnamed oxherd laments the unfeeling Eunice, who stares at him in contempt from head to foot, snorting with her lips, and looking at him askance with her eyes (*ὄμμασι λοξὰ βλέπουσα*), twisting her body, and laughing him to scorn. He, in turn, replies, in a typical lover's complaint that a

throughout, LCL. For clarity and convenience of reference I use this revised edition through the chapter.) The same simplicity pervades the praise of the bride of Sappho's epithalamium and becomes a regular part of the "schemata" of later epithalamia: "Thy form (*εἶδος*) o bride, is all delight, thy eyes are of gentle hue; thy fair face is overspread with love" (*Lyra Graeca* 1, 158). Cf. Catullus 61, 6-10; 56-60; 187-191 for similar praise of the bride. In later Greek lyric the same tone prevails, but the beloved is described in detail. Cf. *Elegy and Iambus*, LCL 2, Anacreontea 16, 1-25, and the imitation of these lines in the iconistic description of Bathyllus, a boy favorite (17). The figure of Eros also is prominent in this later Greek poetry. Moschus delineates him thus I, 8-9, 12: his skin is flame colored, his eyes "keen and burning," his heart evil, but "his tongue sweet, his hair lovely, and his brow shameless" (after Lang).

The exaltation of physical prowess in Pindar likewise reflects scattered observations of the same nature. For Aristecleides of Aegina he utters words of praise. *Nem.* 3, 19-20. See *Ishm.* 7, 22-23 (for Strepsiades of Thebes, trans. J. W. Sandys, LCL): "wondrous in strength is he and yet comely to look upon, and he hath also courage no whit inferior to his frame."

⁶ *Lyra Graeca* 1, 2. See C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (2nd, revised ed., Oxford, 1961), pp. 185-189 for a full discussion of this poem and of the physical symptoms of love to be found earlier in Archilochus and in Homer. See also Denys Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 19-33 for a critical analysis of the same text. No detail of the appearance of the girl is given, but every sense is appealed to, every momentary physical aspect of the beholder is described. Thus Sappho records her own feelings: "I am tongue-tied, in a moment a delicate fire has overrun my flesh, my eyes grow dim and my ears sing, sweat runs down me and a trembling takes me altogether, till I am as green and pale as the grass."

⁷ 2, 82-84; 2, 112-114.

⁸ 2, 140-141.

⁹ 20, 12-16. See Gow *ad loc.*

sweet beauty had once bloomed in him, like ivy around a tree, that his forehead was white above his black eyebrows, his tears were brighter than those of gray-eyed Athena, and his mouth was softer than curd, and from his lips a voice flowed more sweetly than honey from the comb,¹⁰ before he was bound by love of Eunice.

Among the Roman lyric and elegiac poets, Catullus, with a lyric directness reminiscent of Sappho, first sees his "shining Lesbia"¹¹ in terms of his own reaction to her beauty in the words of the earlier poet.¹²

As the intensity of his feeling increases, however, the impression he conveys of the beauty of Lesbia, "dulce ridentem" (51,5), is in the simplest phrases. Not an extended description occurs. She is "formosa," she is "candida," she is "pulcherrima" like Dido in the *Aeneid* (1, 496), she surpasses all others in loveliness, she possesses within herself all the graces. His capacity for incisive detail in ridicule, like that of Homer in the case of Thersites, leaves no doubt as to his power for iconistic description in the portrait of Quintia¹³ or of the "amica Formiani," but his art in

¹⁰ 20, 21-26.

¹¹ 2, 5: "desiderio meo nitenti."

¹² 51, 3-12:

"qui sedens adversus identidem te
spectat et audit
dulce ridentem, misero quod omnis
eripit sensus mihi; nam simul te,
Lesbia, aspexi, nihil est super mi
vocis in ore
lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus
flamma demanat, sonitu suopte
tintinnant aures, gemina teguntur
lumina nocte."

¹³ 86, 1-4:

"Quintia formosast multis; mihi candida, longa,
rectast. haec ego sic singula confiteor,
totum illud formosa nego: nam nulla venustas
nulla in tam magnost corpore mica salis."

43, 1-5:

"Salve, nec minimo puella naso.
nec bello pede nec nigris ocellis
nec longis digitis nec ore sicco.
nec sane nimis elegante lingua
decoctoris amica Formiani."

For a recent discussion of this same material see K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations*, (London, 1963) chap. II, "The Emergence of a Form: the Latin Short Poem," pp. 59-83, esp. 66-71. Cf. R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1889), s.v. 86 and 43, and the parallels cited. It is not without significance to observe how Dracontius in the fifth century A.D., writing "de Raptu Helenae," puts into the mouth of Paris (in a plea to the "candida Helena" on the island of Cyprus) almost exactly Catullus' fundamental concept of Lesbia in his description of Helen, but with the iconistic details added that are gradually imposed on the earlier classical portrait of her beauty (516-526):

"Si talis erit quam forte merebor
uxorem, sic blanda genis sic ore modesto
sic oculis ornata suis sic pulchra decore
candida sic roseo perfundens membra rubore
sic flavis ornata comis sic longior artus
et procera regens in poplite membra venusta,
tali semper ego dignatus coniuge felix
non desim, famuler supplex et iussus adorem,

the description of Lesbia is as subtle as Homer's and as elusive and pervasive.

That he might have dwelt upon all the details of Lesbia's beauty, but does not, is suggested by the fact that, when he describes women whom he scorns, he attributes to them conventional marks of beauty, which do not, nevertheless, redeem their shortcomings. Thus Quintia may be "candida" [fair-complexioned], "longa" [tall], "recta" [well-shaped], but she is not really "formosa" because in "tam magno corpore" she possesses "nulla venustas, nulla mica salis." The "amica Formiani" does not have a small nose, a small foot, tapering fingers, dry mouth and a refined tongue, and she, too, is lacking in that intangible and indefinable "venustas," coupled with animation ("mica salis"). In fairness it must be added that Catullus¹⁴ does not concern himself in the least with "the mind's construction" in his lady's face, although, as Ellis points out, "formosa" surely implies not mere beauty of form or person, but a general charm of gesture and expression.

If Catullus employs an economy of detail when describing his Lesbia, we find a somewhat different situation when we come to Propertius. The elegist, in contrast, devotes himself wholeheartedly to depicting the momentary facial expression of Cynthia (and of himself) in the manner of Hellenistic love poetry, and of Ovid's *Heroides*. He furthermore delights in praise of all aspects of Cynthia's physique. While Catullus is almost free of such devices for Lesbia, Propertius abounds in them.

Cynthia¹⁵ first snared him with her eyes, and love forced him to abandon his proud look ("constantis . . .

conubio servus veniam sub lege mariti
nocte dieque pavens quidnam velit illa iubere
quae specie fulgente micat . . ."

See C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford, 1961), note ad 86, especially on the history of *formosus* by A. Ernout, *Rev. de Phil.* 21, (1947): p. 65.

¹⁴ Cf., however, 64, 60-62, for the disillusionment described in the desertion of Ariadne by Theseus. Catullus depicts the first glimpse the girl has of the Athenian hero and the intensity of her immediate love for him, expressed in her face, 64, 91-93: "non prius exilio flagrantia declinavit lumina." Her terror at his struggle with the Minotaur, 64, 100-102: "fulgore expalluit auri"; then her heartbreak, as she gazes tearfully at the ship receding from Naxos, leaving her utterly desolate; cf. also Aegeus, 64, 219-220, 241-242. See also poem on Attis, 63, 48-49.

¹⁵ 1, 1, 1-4.

"Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis,
contactum nullis ante cupidinibus .
tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus
et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus . . ."

He is tireless in looking upon her, 1, 3, 19-20; (after H. E. Butler throughout, LCL) cf. 1, 5, 21-22. Yet her changing color (1, 6, 5-6) keeps him from sailing the Adriatic. Cf. also 1, 15, 39-41. In despair Propertius asks himself, does he give no indication of his love by changing color (1, 18, 17-18), no evidence of faith on his countenance. His advice to the young lover is in terms of his experience with Cynthia: should the lady ask for anything do not refuse it with stern countenance (1, 10, 21-24, "ingrata fronte").

lumina fastus"). Can such a face¹⁶ dwell on this earth? Her hair is yellow, her hand slender, her figure full and tall, her walk stately. But it was not her face, fair though it is that wins his heart¹⁷ ("nec me tam facies, quamvis sit candida") nor her hair, nor her eyes, though they are twin torches and live stars. It is the matchless beauty ("forma") of Helen, come to earth a second time. As for his power to describe¹⁸ her, where else will she find anyone to sing "her face, her hands, her dark eyes, and the softness of her steps." The portrait is filled with iconistic detail, and undoubtedly real, but the total picture of Cynthia's loveliness is built around a comparison with Helen, whose beauty had defied description in the art of earlier poets. Ironically it is the very essence of that "forma" and "facies" which Propertius never quite conveys in his likeness of Cynthia. Phase after phase of the affair, imagined or real, is recorded by the suggested expression on the face, but the immediate effect which these descriptions produce is one of consuming intensity of emotion in the poet. Though he dwells on all aspects of the beauty of a mistress whose every whim he seeks to satisfy, nowhere does he achieve the incomparable impression which the appearance of Lesbia has left in the poems of Catullus by the complete absence of detail.

If we may for the moment depart from a chronological treatment of the lyric and elegiac poets, in order to bring together certain closely related aspects of our study, it might be helpful at this point to turn to Ovid and to consider how he handles examples of personal description. We have observed above that Propertius describes his beloved Cynthia through a comparison with Helen.

In the plays of Euripides, where the figure of Helen looms so large, the total impression of her renowned beauty is conveyed by allusions to her grace, her lovely eyes. Apparently the dramatist, like Homer, feels that no detailed likeness could ever be drawn. Ovid's treatment of Helen follows in part the example of Euripides, so that he often presents her through the simple medium of description by the use of "forma" or "facies" with no added detail. But Ovid gives an impression of Helen and her compelling power through another interesting device. Using a more sophisticated approach, he presents her beauty in the *Heroides*,¹⁹ in an exchange from two points of view,

¹⁶ 2, 2, 3, 5-16. "Cur haec in terris facies humana moratur?"

¹⁷ 2, 3, 9, 13-14, 32-34. Great is the beauty of Cynthia but her words are light (2, 5, 28).

¹⁸ 2, 12, 23-24; cf. 2, 3, 14, 31-32; 4, 3, 27-28; 4, 8, 53-56.

¹⁹ *Her.* 16 and 17, which I would take to be Ovid's work. For a recent discussion of this much-debated question see Pauly-Wissowa *RE* s.v. Ovidius Naso, 1925-1931, and the references cited therein, esp. S. B. Clark, "The Authorship and the Date of the Double Letters in Ovid's *Heroides*"; *HSCP* 19, (1908): pp. 121-155. It may be of some importance to note in this connection the close parallelisms in technique between the descriptions of momentary appearance in the double *Heroides* and those found in Ovid's other works. See appendix B 2.

that of Paris, and that of Helen herself.²⁰ Both views reflect the interplay of the first type or general description with the second type which "registers the reaction" of the face. During the fortuitous absence of Menelaus in Crete Paris pleads his love at Sparta²¹. He begs her to hear his plea with a face that is not hard²² ("nec vultu cetera duro"), but rather with one that suits her beauty ("formae conveniente tuae"). The emphasis on the word "forma" is maintained throughout the letter. Helen, the daughter of beautiful Leda, "more beautiful than her mother" had enthralled him with her gift of love ("pulchrior illa"). Helen's face is indeed like that of Venus on Mount Ida, and there is not a land that has not heard of her loveliness ("facies"). Her beauty ("forma") deserves a better place than Sparta, and his own beauty ("forma") will compare favorably with that of Menelaus. He can only entreat her ("formosa"). "Ah, Helen," he asks, "do you think that beauty of yours ("faciem") can be free from fault? Either you must change your beauty ("faciem"), or you must needs not be hard. Fairness and modesty are mightily at strife" ("lis est cum forma magna pudicitiae"). Adept in the practice of the art of love, Paris plays his cards adroitly and beauty ("forma, facies, vultus") is the object of his praise. Helen, in reply, is equally adept.²³ At first she indignantly reproves him for writing so passionately. Her defense of her own good name is direct: "If I do not feign a gloomy countenance ("tristis vultus") nor sit with stern brows grimly bent ("duris torva superciliis") fama tamen clara est." She doubts his good faith in his praise of her beauty, not, of course, that her beauty ("facies") is not well known to her—"aut mea sit facies non bene nota mihi." She protests "his constant secret signals" from his "almost speaking brows," and his eyes which her own can scarcely meet. Every innuendo of momentary facial reaction is in her answer, her blush at his impetuosity at dinner, her signals to him that she could not believe him. Though her "facies" is "rara," let it be another lady whom he seeks. Her beauty ("forma") is content to be approved of men, and

Menelaus is far away²⁴: "de facie metui, vitae confidit, et illum/securum probitas, *forma* timere facit." Paris may boast his courage and his deeds, but his face ("facies ista") belies his words, and Helen knows the secret of his heart—and hers. This Ovidian view of Helen, lightly held, is a masterpiece of insight into the frailties of woman's heart and woman's beauty. She, who in Homer is wondrously like to the immortal gods in beauty, has descended to the level of ordinary beings, and as Professor Rand²⁵ puts it, "Ovid is thinking out ancient history, the part the historians do not record." This setting forth in Helen's letter of every phase of Paris' infatuation for her in terms of recorded facial expression, and, in turn, her own reaction, is in the manner of Alexandrian love poetry, and forms a connecting link between the description in similar terms of Medea's love for Jason in Apollonius' epic, and the equally romantic description of momentary appearance in the story of Achilles' love for Deidamia in Statius' *Achilleid*.²⁶ It must always be remembered that no suggestion of detail or iconistic likeness ever betrays the wit of Ovid's description of Helen.

If Ovid's treatment of Helen follows the pattern of Euripides in that he presents her through the simple medium of description by the use of "forma" or "facies" with no added detail, it likewise follows the pattern of Apollonius in so far as he is concerned with recording the momentary facets of Paris' infatuation with her by letting Helen describe his constantly changing and importunate facial expression. These methods of portraiture are related to those of other lyric and elegiac poets of his period, and are to be compared with the techniques used in earlier Greek lyric.

Ovid, to be sure,²⁷ delights in depicting the beauty of womankind and, above all, Corinna, but he does not adhere to the method found in Propertius' treatment of Cynthia. As his handling of the portrait of Helen marks one characteristic way of delineating physique, e.g., of registering reaction on the face, his description of Lucretia in the *Fasti*²⁸ marks another. In this moving and most famous of his Roman stories, he paints the beauty of a faithful wife, a beauty that is not only that of body, but also of soul. Everything about Lucretia delights Tarquin, her figure, her snowy complexion, her yellow hair, her artless charm, her look, her color, her lovely face. At his importunate words Lucretia buries her face in her lap. The gesture was becoming, writes Ovid, and likewise her

²⁰ 16, 1-2 (trans. G. Showerman throughout, LCL).

²¹ 16, 299-300.

²² 16, 11-12; see 16, 85-86, 137, 142, 191-192, 205-206, 271-272, 287-290.

²³ 17, 15-17, 38, 76-78:

"noto ———
cum modo me spectas oculis, lascive, protervis,
quos vix instantes lumina nostra ferunt",
81-84:

"A, quotiens digitis, quotiens ego tecta notavi,
signa supercilio paene loquente dari!
et saepe extimui ne vir meus illa videret
non satis occultis erubique notis!"

89-90:

"Credere me tamen hoc oculo renuente negavi —
ei mihi, iam didici sic ego posse loqui!"

²⁴ 17, 93, 125-126, 173-174, 252.

²⁵ E. K. Rand, *Ovid and His Influence* (Boston, 1928), p. 32.

²⁶ See pp. 66-67. Cf. the later portrait of Helen in the Dares story of Troy, and in Malalas, J. Fürst, *Lit. Porträt*. p. 596, and Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," pp. 120-121.

²⁷ *Am.* 1, 5, 9-10, 19-22; 1, 10, 13-14, 2, 5, 15-18, 33-34, 42-44, 51; 2, 8, 15-16; 2, 17, 7-10; 3, 11, 41-44.

²⁸ 2, 761-764; 773-774 (trans. J. G. Frazer throughout, LCL). Cf. *Fast.* 2, 827-828; 845-846 (her death).

modest tears: for²⁹ "her face was worthy of its peer, her soul": "et facies animo dignaque parque fuit."

This is the essence or summation of Ovid's concept of "forma" and "facies," and he returns to the concept over and over again³⁰: "nec solam faciem, mores quoque confer et artes." One might say that this attitude is basically that of the physiognomists,³¹ such as Eusthenes,³² who was skilled in learning the spirit from the eyes. But the physiognomists insist on every kind of photographic detail to attain their goal of interpretation of character from the physique, whereas no detail of physical description is needed to impart the fundamental nature of beauty implied by the word "facies" in Ovid's description of Lucretia.

By such concentration on a simple generic word or by use of subtle implication in descriptions of momentary appearance the poets we have examined in widely diverse areas of ancient poetry convey with the utmost art an impression in characterization through description of physique, which would never be achieved by any amount of accumulated iconistic detail.

II. SATIRE, EPIGRAM, AND FICTION; TECHNICAL WRITINGS ON ASTROLOGY AND DREAM BOOKS

When we come to the general subject of satire, which covers, of course, a considerable extent of territory embracing the works not only of those authors whose writings are included in the formal category of "satura,"³³ but also of those representatives of other literary forms, whose works show a definite satiric slant or approach, we can readily see that we have here a fertile field for the conscious or unconscious application of the principles of physiognomy.

Let us glance for a moment at the *Satires* of Horace. Here is a man who brings to the medium of satire that disposition, that outlook on life,³⁴ which has become

so familiar to the world at large through many passages of self-revelation.³⁵ It is not surprising therefore that Horace's satiric expression should take the form of good-natured fun directed not only at others but also at himself. There is, for instance, the highly amusing portrait of himself in his letter to Albius³⁶:

me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises.

Then there is another, and perhaps more famous self-portrait in an *Epistle*, addressed to his book:

corporis exigui, praecanum, solibus aptum,
irasci celerem, tamen ut placibilis essem.³⁷

He describes himself at an earlier age as possessing³⁸:

nigros angusta fronte capillos.

On the other hand, as might be expected, the later satirists, adopting an approach quite in contrast to the good-natured self-appraisal of Horace, found in the principles and theories of the physiognomists an effective weapon for sharp criticism. Naturally we think of Juvenal in this connection. He puts no trust in faces, for expressions deceive, and a bold front often conceals an ugly purpose³⁹:

Frontis nulla fides; quis enim non vicus abundat
tristibus obscenis? . . .
hispidia membra quidem et durae per brachia saetae
promittunt atrocem animum.

Peribonius, however, is more genuine and open. "I hand over to the fates the man who betrays his nature in his face, and by his walk."

Juvenal is also a master of the technique of momentary characterization while at the same time borrowing many of the features of iconistic portraiture. In the case of the misery of Naevolus he asks:

Why is it, Naevolus,⁴⁰ that when I meet you, you so often look gloomy ("tristis") and your forehead is knitted like a beaten Marsyas ("fronte obducta"); you have a somber face ("vultus gravis") and a bristling forest of unkempt hair; no brightness ("nitor") on your hide.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1, 3, 44-48:

" . . . strabonem
appellat paetum pater, et pullum, male parvus
si cui filius est . . .
 . . . hunc varum, distortis cruribus, illum
balbutit scaurum pravis fultum male talis."

³⁶ *Epist.* 1, 4, 15.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 1, 20, 24-25. Cf. Suetonius, *Vita Horati*. See appendix E.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1, 7, 25.

³⁹ *Juv.* 2, 8-16; 9, 1; 9, 130-133 (trans. G. G. Ramsay, throughout, LCL). Cf. also Phaedrus, who, in his fables, subscribes to the same cynical physiognomical point of view as Juvenal (4, 2, 5-7): things are not always what they seem; the forehead first of all deceives many. See 3, 4, 3-7; 4, 16, 7-8; and the anecdote concerning Menander 5, 1, 9-16.

⁴⁰ 9, 12:

" . . . vultus gravis, horrida siccae
silva comae, nullus tota nitor in cute. . . ."

Similarly he adheres to the view that wise and prudent men may be born in heavy, thick air, in the land of muttonheads.

²⁹ 2, 755-758. Similarly on Claudia Quinta: "nec facies impar nobilitate fuit" (*Fast.* 4, 304-305). Cf. *Fast.* 4, 309-310, 317-328. Vindicated by the Mother Goddess she walked in the procession with joyful face ("laeto vultu") 4, 343-344. Cf. however, *Ars Am.* 2, 201-202, when Ovid's advice to the lover is very different in nature and didactic in tone: "imponat leges vultibus illa tuis" (cf. *Am.* 1, 11, 17-18), "Laugh when she laughs. Weep if she weeps." With kindly names, too, shortcomings may be softened (*Ars Am.* 2, 657-662, after J. H. Mozley, LCL). Even in the case of the ugliest (*Ars Am.* 1, 613-614): "nulli non sua forma placet," and of the chaste (*Ars Am.* 1, 623): "delectant etiam castas praeconia formae." Furthermore never stop praising her looks, her hair, her fingers, her tiny foot (*Ars Am.* 1, 621-622).

³⁰ *Rem Am.* 713. Cf. *Med. Fac.* 43-46; *Ars Am.* 2, 119-120.

³¹ Pseud-Arist. 805a.

³² *AP* 7, 661.

³³ *Sat.* 1, 9, 60-66, esp. 63-66:

. . . vellere coepi
et pressare manu, lentissima brachia, nutans,
distorquens oculos, ut me eriperet. male salsus
ridens dissimulare."

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 2, 5, 91-98, esp. 91-93:

. . . Davus sis comicus atque
stes capite obstipo, multum similis metuenti."

In epigram Martial also follows the iconistic tradition. Thus Zoilus, the former slave, now hated, is⁴¹:

Crine ruber, niger ore, brevis pede, lumine laesus
rem magnam praestas, Zoile, si bonus es.

Red hair, dark complexion, short foot, and bleary eyes are all details of description used for identification and for derogatory characterization. Candidus is told of the effeminate nature of his wife's lover⁴²:

Crine nitens, niger unguento, perlucidus ostro
ore tener, latus pectore, crure glaber.

Sleek, dark with ointment, shining in purple; soft-mouthed, broad in the chest, but smooth in the calf is he who often clings shamelessly to your wife as her attendant.

Physiognomical signs, as Miss Misener points out,⁴³ mark the illegitimate nature of certain children: at ille simo nare, turgidis labris . . . palaestritae . . . quartus cinaedi fronte, candido vultu . . . ex concubino Lygdo, hunc acto capite et suribus longis . . . morionis filium."

Two writers coming somewhat later in the second century, but roughly contemporary with each other, both of whom provide relevant examples of the application of physiognomical principles, are Lucian and Apuleius. In Lucian we find an instance of the skillful use of physiognomical description for purposes of amusing satire in his portrait of the professor of public speaking, possibly to be identified with Julius Pollux, the lexicographer:

If you turn to the other road, you will find many people⁴ and among them a wholly clever and wholly handsome gentleman with a mincing gait, a thin neck, a languishing eye, a honeyed voice, who distills perfume, scratches his head with the tip of his finger, and carefully dresses his hair, which is scanty now, but curly and raven black—an utterly delicate Sardanapalus, a Cinyras, a very Agathon . . . I am thus explicit that you may recognize him by those tokens, and may not overlook a creature so marvelous, and so dear to Aphrodite and the Graces. . . .

"He would address you . . . tossing back what hair is still left him, faintly smiling in that sweet and tender way which is his wont."⁴⁴ Equally biting is

⁴¹ 22, 54.

⁴² 12, 38.

⁴³ 6, 39. Cf. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 115. 8, 53; cf. 1, 64; 11, 102; 3, 42. He follows here the views of Horace and Ovid. 4, 6, 2; 4, 14, 11; 4, 35, 1; 7, 12, 1; 10, 64, 2; 6, 10, 6; 7, 87, 9; 5, 37, 1-17; 2, 11, 1-5; Miss Misener remarks (*ibid.*, p. 114 and notes *ad loc.*) in her survey of iconistic portraits that we must bear in mind their double-edged character. Epithet may be piled on epithet, and accumulation, supported by brevity, produces the trenchant effect of satire and epigram.

⁴⁴ *Rh. Pr.* 11-12 (trans. A. M. Harmon throughout, LCL). For examples of various types of portraits see *Abd.* 28 (sex differences); *Alex.* 3; *Anach.* 25 (young man in the prime of condition); *Bacch.* 2 (Dionysus and Silenus); *Bis Acc.* 28 (oratory on the Syrian); *D. Meretr.* 1; 2; 3; *D. Mort.* 1; 9; 10; 24; 25 (Thersites); *Dem. Enc.* 1 (Thersagoras); *Demon.* 18; *Deor. Conc.* 4 (Dionysus); *Ep. Sat.* 1, 24 (on the rich); *Eun.* 7; *Gall.* 14 (Simon); *JTr.* 30 (Apollo); *Nav.* 2 (young Egyptian), 6, 10;

Lucian's attack on the ignorant book collector, a Syrian,⁴⁵ and equally ludicrous are his descriptions of the parasite⁴⁶ and various types of conventional, long-bearded philosophers.⁴⁷

As for Apuleius, he was for a long time credited with the authorship of the anonymous later Latin paraphrase⁴⁸ of Polemo's handbook on physiognomy. The work, attributed to Apuleius as the result of the misinterpretation by Albertus Magnus⁴⁹ of a brief passage in the little treatise⁵⁰ has been shown to belong to the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century after Christ, the tract of an unknown author. In the genuine works of Apuleius, among passages which are pertinent to our subject, occurs one at the opening of his treatise on *Plato and his Doctrine*,⁵¹ in which he tells a dream of Socrates, in

Nec. 11 (millionaires and money-lenders); *Nigr.* 11 (actors); *Par.* 41; cf. 4; *Philops.* 5, 23, 24 (Socrates); *Pr. Im.* 1, 4; *Salt.* 74-75, 77; *Somn.* 6 (sculpture vs. education); *Timon* 16-17 (on a man taking a maid for his wife); 54 (Thrasycles); *Cat.* 16-17 (tyrant, money-lender); *VH* 2, 34 (dreams); *Vit. Auct.* 7, 10 (Cynic); 12 (Cyrenaic); 13 (Democritean, Heraclitan). Lucian does not lose sight of the importance of the orator's appearance in public speaking. Cf. *Salt.* 35; and *Rh. Pr.* 15; 16; 19; 23, and esp. 20.

⁴⁵ *Ind.* 7: "Have someone take the second book of the *Iliad* and read it to you. Do not bother about the rest of the book, for none of it applies to you; but he has a description of a man making a speech, an utterly ridiculous fellow, warped and deformed in body (*Il.* 2, 212). Now, then, if that man Thersites . . . Cf. *Ind.* 21 and esp. 23.

⁴⁶ *Par.* 41: "Pass on, and now see how the parasite looks. In the first place, is he not generous in his proportions, and pleasing in his complexion, neither dark nor fair of skin; for the one befits a woman, and the other a slave; and besides has he not a spirited look, with a fiery glance like mine, high and bloodshot? It is not becoming, you know, to go into battle with a timorous and womanish eye. Would not such a man make a fine soldier in life and a fine corpse, if he should die?"

⁴⁷ *Fug.* 4 (philosophy and sham philosophers): "There are some, Zeus, who occupy a middle ground between the multitude and the philosophers. In deportment, glance, and gait they are like us, and similarly dressed; as a matter of fact, they want to be enlisted under my command and they enroll themselves under my name, saying that they are my pupils, disciples and devotees." Cf. 19: "In irascibility, pettishness, and proneness to anger they are beyond little children; indeed, they give no little amusement to onlookers, when their blood boils up in them from some trivial reason so that they look livid in color, with a reckless, insane stare and foam (or rather venom) fills their mouths." In *Icar.* 29 (cf. 5; 10; 21) the philosophers appear thus: "Then cloaking themselves in the high-sounding name of Virtue, elevating their eyebrows, wrinkling up their foreheads and letting their beards grow long, they go about hiding loathsome habits very like actors in tragedy. For philosophers see *Cyn.* 1; 14; 17; 19; 20; *Eun.* 8; *Gall.* 10; *Herm.* 18; 19; 86; *JTr.* 16; 26; *Par.* 29; *Philops.* 29; *Pisc.* 12; 14; *Pro Merc. Cond.* 12; 25; 33; *Symp.* 7; 16; 28. Additional references include: *Cat.* 3; 22; *Eun.* 7 (Favorinus?); 8; 10; *Dom.* 17; *Hist. Conscr.* 8; 13; *Icar.* 22; *JTr.* 1; 9; 14; 45; *Lapilh.* 18; *Nigr.* 21; 26; *Par.* 48; 50; *Pereg.* 3; 6; *Philops.* 18; 34; *Rh. Pr.* 6; 9; *Symp.* 2-3; 10; *Tim.* 13; 16; 26; 27; 46; 47; *VH* 1.

⁴⁸ Förster, *SP* 1, pp. cxxxvii-cxlv.

⁴⁹ *De Anim.* 1, 2-3.

⁵⁰ Förster, *SP* 2, p. 49.

⁵¹ One might cite *Apol.* 4; 15; 16; 43; 59, as examples of descriptions in which qualities of character are connected with physical

which the philosopher thought that he beheld a cygnet flying from an altar in the Academy, sacred to Cupid, and settling in his lap. Afterwards a full-fledged swan, it winged its way to heaven, entrancing the ears of men and gods with the music of its song. When Socrates mentioned the dream to some of his friends, Ariston happened to be present for the purpose of presenting Plato for instruction. As Socrates cast his eyes on Plato and saw from his external appearance his inner disposition, he said, "This, my friends, is the swan from the altar of Cupid."

The description of Lucius in Apuleius' novel, *The Golden Ass*,⁵² is an excellent iconistic portrait, which lends itself to physiognomical interpretation. When Byrrhena, his mother's kinswoman, meets him in the market place, she observes that he is tall, but nicely proportioned, slender without being thin, his complexion is rosy but not too red, his yellow hair is simply arranged, his gray eyes are watchful and en-

appearance, though they are not always strictly physiognomical in nature. Particularly important for its physiognomical implications is *Apol.* 24. See also *Met.* 1, 6; 19; 20; 23; 5, 22; 9, 30; 10, 2; 10.

The exaltation of beauty in the hero and heroine of the Greek romances is familiar, and the idea that the eye is the mirror of the soul occurs frequently. I do not propose to discuss this aspect of portraiture. E. Rohde in *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (3rd ed. revised, Leipzig, 1914), has analyzed it in detail in Part IV, *Die einzelnen sophistischen Liebesroman*, pp. 388-554; see also K. Jax, *Die Weibliche Schönheit in der griechischen Dichtung* (Innsbruck, 1933), chap. VII, "Der Roman," pp. 160-178, and J. Fürst, *Lit. Porträt.*, pp. 431-433. The iconistic form of description is to be found also, as Miss Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," p. 122, points out. In Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* (ca. A.D. 300), for example, the portrait is both detailed and physiognomical in characterization. 1, 4: When Clitophon beholds Leucippe "she blinds his eyes by the beauty of her face. She was like that picture of Europa on the bull which I saw just now: an eye at once piercing and voluptuous; golden hair in golden curls; black eyebrows—jet black; pale cheek; the pallor shading in the centre into a ruddy hue, like that stain wherewith the Lydian women tint ivory; and a mouth that was a rose—a rosebud just beginning to uncurl its petals. Directly I saw her, I was lost; for beauty (κάλλος) wounds deeper than any arrow and strikes through the eyes into the soul: the eye is the passage for love's wound (ὀφθαλμοὺς γὰρ ὁδοῖ ἐρωτικῇ τραύματι. I admired her tall form, I was stupefied by her beauty, I showed my fear by the beating of my heart, I stared shamelessly at her, but I was ashamed to be caught doing so. Try as I would to drag my eyes away from gazing on her, they would not obey me, but remained fixed by the force of her beauty, and at length they won the day against my will" (trans. S. Gaselee throughout, LCL), cf. 1, 1; 1, 3; 1, 13; Xenophon (2nd-3d cent. A.D.) 1, 2, 5 (Antheias); cf. 2, 35; 3, 4; Heliodorus (2nd-3d cent. A.D.) 7, 10 (Theagenes); cf. 2, 35; Longus (2nd-3d cent. A.D.) 1, 13 (Daphnis); 1, 17 (Chloe); cf. 1, 20, 1 on σκυθραπαῖζειν [to be angry] = τοῖσποικεῖν τὰς ὀφθαλμοὺς [to arch the eyebrows] in Phrynichus, Förster, *SP* 1, p. 300, frg. 10, and 1, p. cxlii, addendum on 2, p. 300, 14. See also Chariton, *Chaereas and Callirrhoe* (before 150 A.D.), Bk. 6 on Callirrhoe: "But when night came, the king (Artaxerxes) was again on fire, and Love kept reminding him of those glorious eyes, and the beautiful face of Callirrhoe. He praised her hair, her walk, her voice, the way she entered the courtroom, the way she stood, the way she spoke, her very silence, her embarrassment, and her weeping" (trans. W. E. Blake).

⁵² *Met.* 2, 102.

dowed with a flashing glance just like an eagle's, his face is handsome in all its features, and he has a graceful and unaffected gait. The physiognomists emphasize good proportions⁵³ as one of the first essentials of upright character, while yellow hair⁵⁴ and a flashing glance⁵⁵ constitute the marks of intelligence and stoutness of heart. A rosy complexion⁵⁶ is auspicious and gray eyes⁵⁷ belong to a bold spirit, as in lions and eagles.

Up to this point in the present chapter we have been dealing with authors whose works contain descriptive passages illustrative of the principles of physiognomics. We turn now to certain writers on more or less technical subjects, who, while not themselves embodying the techniques of physical descriptions, attest, by means of their direct or indirect allusions, to the general contemporary interest in the "science." Included in this latter group are various lexicographers, such as Julius Pollux⁵⁸ and Phrynichus,⁵⁹ whose interest in the subject is demonstrated by a goodly number of relevant examples, some excerpted from known earlier sources and some from unknown.

Physiognomics in the classical period was mainly descriptive. In the medieval period the predictive aspect was more fully developed, and that fact involved it with the subject of astrology. It is not within the province of this study to explore in any detail the place of astrology in the history of ancient physiognomy. On the other hand, Sextus Empiricus,⁶⁰ the physician and skeptical philosopher, in his *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* attacks the subject of astrology, and at the same time approves and indicates a ready acceptance of the ideas of the physiognomists: "Seeing then that men vary so much in body . . . men also differ from one another in respect of the soul itself, for the body is a kind of expression of the soul, as in fact is proved by the science of physiognomy."

His stand against astrology is unrelenting. It is not reasonable, he argues,⁶¹ that life is ordained according to the stars. Likewise the astrologers should be put to shame when they undertake to associate the shapes and characters of men with the signs of the heavens. Astrology as a significant political force has been admirably treated in recent years by F. H. Cramer⁶² in *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*.

⁵³ Pseud.-Arist. 814a. See *HSCP* 46, (1935): p. 64.

⁵⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 809b; Pol. 250.

⁵⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 812b.

⁵⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 806b; 807b. Pol. 244; 246.

⁵⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 812b.

⁵⁸ See the passages cited by Förster, *SP* 2, pp. 281-282, esp. *Onom.* 2, 135.

⁵⁹ See Förster, *SP* 2, pp. 300-301.

⁶⁰ *Pyr.* 1, 85; cf. *Math.* 5, 95, 96, 97, 99, 101.

⁶¹ 1, 85 (trans. R. G. Bury throughout, LCL).

⁶² The best general account is *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* by F. Cumont (London and New York, 1912). Much important material has been published by O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2nd ed., Copen-

He investigates the rise and growing interest in the subject in the Latin world, after its beginnings in the Hellenistic period. He discusses the conversion of Republican Rome to the study (150–44 B.C.), even going so far as to consider the “astrologers as the powers behind the throne” from Augustus to Domitian, and analyzes the place of astrology in Rome from Nerva to the death of Severus Alexander (A.D. 96–235).

If the popularity of the subject of physiognomy is attested by the many references to it on the part of those who approve of it and accept its validity, its popularity can also be surmised from the observations of its detractors. That the doctrines of the physiognomists could be eyed with suspicion may be inferred from the writings of Artemidorus, who flourished toward the end of the second century. To be sure, Artemidorus' special field of activity lay in the interpretation of dreams, a subject highly regarded in antiquity, and his *Oneirocriticus* is the outstanding treatise on that topic. He naturally looked with ill-disguised concern on any competition that might be offered to his particular skill.

In discussing those things which are to be believed, he warns⁶³ us that whatever dreams come from the gods are reliable, next those dreams which come from priests, because they are honored among men after the gods, then after kings, rulers, parents, and teachers. Parents bring us into existence, and teachers instruct us how to live. Thirdly the seers are to be trusted, at least such as are not given to deception. But whatever the followers of Pythagoras may say, or the physiognomists, or the diviners from dice or from cheese, or by a sieve, their words are lies and unsub-

hagen, 1957). See Cramer's preface for bibliographical material. We know from Cicero (*Div.* 2, 99) that Panaetius (2nd cent. B.C.), alone among the Stoics rejected astrology as a science. Posidonius, on the other hand, born in Syria, and coming to Rome in 87 B.C., is called by St. Augustine (*C.D.* 5, 2) “fatalium siderum assertor,” and enhanced in a powerful fashion for his own day and for a century more the influence of astrology among highly educated and thoughtful people. The fatalism of its tenets fitted well the Stoic thinking on the principate, and was warmly embraced, as Cumont puts it (*ibid.*, 99–100): “The power of this sidereal theology, founded on the ancient beliefs of Chaldaean astrologers, transformed in the Hellenistic Age under the twofold influence of astronomic discoveries and Stoic thought, and promoted, after becoming a pantheistic sun-worship, to the rank of official religion of the Roman Empire, preached on the one hand by men of letters and by men of science in centres of culture, diffused on the other hand among the bulk of people by the servitors of the Semitic, Persian or Egyptian gods, it is finally patronized by the emperors who find in it at once a form of worship suitable for all their subjects and a justification of their autocratic pretensions.”

⁶³ 2, 69 cf. 1, 1. Passages pertaining to dreams about various parts of the body, e.g., 1, 17 (large head); 1, 18 (hair); 1, 20 (horse hair); 1, 23 (forehead); 1, 24 (ears); 1, 25 (eyebrows); 1, 26 (eyes); 1, 27 (nose); 1, 28 (cheeks); 1, 30 (philosopher's beard); 1, 40 (shoulders); 1, 41 (breasts) actually show little in common with the interpretations found in the physiognomical handbooks.

stantial. They bewitch and defraud those whom they chance to meet.

If the proponents of the science of physiognomy in the second century A.D., are widely represented in various types of Greek and Roman literature, we may now explore to what extent this subject enjoyed a certain popularity in the last major period under consideration, namely the fourth century of the Christian Era.

VIII. PHYSIOGNOMICS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY A.D.

The final chapter of this volume reviews the nature and place of the study of physiognomics at the end of the classical era. The discussion of the revival of interest in physiognomy in the fourth century will center around the figure of the emperor Julian (who wrote on the subject), and writers associated with him whose use of such ideas is directed often toward the praise or blame of the emperor. Such observations on physiognomy occur in the writings of the Greek sophist Adamantius, who made a paraphrase of Polemo's work (already treated in Chapter I), in Oribasius, Julian's physician, who discusses physiognomy in his medical tracts, in Gregory of Nazianzus, the Church Father, who uses it as a basis for a vituperative portrait of Julian. Ammianus Marcellinus, the historian, follows the pattern of Suetonius in his *imagines* of the later emperors, notably in his encomiastic description of Julian.

This study includes, finally and briefly, an analysis of physiognomical material found in the Church Father Ambrose (on the proper duties and bearing of a Christian), and in Nemesius of Emesa (in the *Nature of Man*, a discussion of Galen's ideas on the connection of the soul with the temperament of the body)—to name but two writers—which reflects the ideas current in the Christian as well as in the pagan thinking of the fourth century in regard to the relation of man's inner nature and outward appearance, and on the relation of man to his environment and the effect of that environment on his physique and personality.

First of all, let us consider the contribution of medical literature to the subject of physiognomics in the fourth century. The period was one of significant medical activity, and the most famous doctor of the time was Oribasius, friend and physician of the Emperor Julian. Oribasius was born in Pergamum in A.D. 325 and his time of literary activity falls in the second half of the fourth century. He compiled a vast medical encyclopedia in some seventy books, of which approximately one-third survives, called the *Iatrikai Synagogai*. In addition he wrote a summary of his work, which is also extant, as well as a volume on home remedies. These volumes have considerable historical value in that Oribasius quotes at length from previous

writers, and honors above all the work of Galen in the second century. Adamantius, whom Förster identified with the physiognomist, appears as an authority on *Weights and Measures*¹ and for medications. Oribasius also quotes Adamantius five times with reference to such ailments as scurvy, gangrene, and burns.² It is to Galen, however, that Oribasius is much more deeply indebted. He draws extensively on Galen's work on the humors in his own essay "Concerning the humors according to Hippocrates drawn from Galen." From Galen's views he excerpts observations on the presence of phlegm, which marks the disposition as³ ἀπολμόν τε καὶ δειλὸν καὶ ὀκνηρόν. He is also greatly indebted to Galen for material in connection with his analysis of that structure of the body which represents the best "krisis."⁴ This is essentially the Aristotelian point of view: namely, that "the best-blended person is between the extremes of thinness and fatness, softness and hardness, warmth and cold. In soul likewise he is midway between rashness and cowardice, slowness and recklessness, pity and envy. He is kind, affectionate, humane, and prudent."

It is evident that Oribasius has drawn on that part of Galen's essay which has to do with the influence of location and atmospheric conditions upon the character of a people. In this essay, it may be recalled, Galen pointed out that such qualities as rashness, courage, and hasty judgment, possibly exemplified in the case of the Celts and the Germans, or the Thracians and the Scythians, were related to the regions in which these people lived.⁵ Oribasius' indebtedness to Galen is again revealed in his citations from Plato's *Timaeus*⁶ that have to do with importance of the humors which circulate through the body by either preserving or upsetting the proper equilibrium of temperament, which creates such varied qualities as impatience and languor, rashness and timidity, forgetfulness and dullness. By quoting these passages from Galen, Oribasius transmits to his own day and later periods the essential views of Galen on the principles of physiognomy, especially in his emphasis on the

doctrine of the humors, and the Aristotelian concept of the well-blended man.

We have called attention to the fact that Ammianus followed the example of Tacitus in making extensive use of descriptions of the second type, i.e., where the immediate mental and emotional reaction suggested on the countenance is briefly described by the historian. We observed certain features and variations of this type of description having to do with the momentary appearance of men and women, drawn from all areas of society.

That Julian, like Scipio, created awe in the minds of the vanquished is demonstrated by the experience of Honorius,⁷ who, "summoned to a conference by the Emperor, whom he worshipped with trembling eyes, was overcome by the appearance of the victor." While, as we have said, Ammianus follows Tacitus' method in his use of examples of the second type, referred to above, we may notice, on the one hand, that the frequency of their use is not quite as great as in Tacitus, and, on the other hand, that the descriptions do not so easily fall into well-defined categories. What is rather more interesting, however, is that in a fair number of instances we find the descriptions of a man about to speak before a group or assembly. In other words we have here, *ipso facto*, the practical application of the principles of theoretical rhetorical training. This device of description (e.g., Livy, 45, 10) marks, then, a connecting link between the theoretical material on the subject of gesture and facial expression found in Cicero and Quintilian and the actual delivery as recorded by Cicero in the *Brutus* and by the historians. It is a type especially common in Tacitus.⁸ The appearance of a commander before his army, or conversely the appearance of soldiers before their general or before the enemy, often calls for this kind of description, especially in Livy, Quintus Curtius Rufus, Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus.⁹ But the reason for Ammianus' adoption of the Suetonian method of iconistic description is clear, since he was surely influenced by the doctrines of the physiognomists of his own day, as the portraits in the earlier biographies of Suetonius appear to have been. It is important, moreover, to remember that he was acquainted with the widespread belief in astrology (in connection with which he took Julian to task for too much reliance on dreams and omens)¹⁰ and that he was familiar with the physiognomical handbooks of the day, a fact which is shown by that passage wherein he describes the soldiers watching Julian as he was created Caesar by Constantius in A.D. 355.

⁷ 17, 10, 9; cf. 21, 9, 8.

⁸ *Ann.* 4, 15; 12, 18; 16, 29; *Hist.* 1, 16-17; 2, 48; 4, 40; 4, 43.

⁹ See M. L. W. Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians* (Berkeley, 1947), pp. 141-161 for a recent general discussion of Ammianus; also E. A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge, [Eng.], 1947).

¹⁰ Laistner, *ibid.*, pp. 152, 159 and notes 26 and 48 for the relevant passages in Ammianus.

¹ Orib. *Syn.* 2, 59 (*Œuvres d'Oribase*, ed. Bussemaker and Daremberg, Paris, 1851-1876) 5, p. 85. I use this edition for convenience of reference, though the more recent critical edition of Oribasius, as yet incomplete, edited by J. Raeder, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* (Leipzig, 1922-1933) should be consulted for much of this material in volume 6¹, 6², and especially 6³.

² *Syn.* 3, 24; 3, 28; 3, 29; 3, 36; 7, 6 (B. and D. 5, 109; 5, 111, 112; 5, 114; 5, 335; 6, 137).

³ *Mixt.* 2, 6 (Kühn 1, 643); Orib. 21, 6 (B. and D. 3, 18) and *Syn.* 5, 44 (B. and D. 5, 245). See *Ars Medica* 11, Kühn 1, 336.

⁴ *Mixt.* 2, 1 (Kühn 1, 576); Orib. 21, 5 (B. and D. 2, 11-12); *Syn.* 5, 43 (B. and D. 5, 241). Cf. *TAPA* 76 (1945): p. 298 for this whole passage.

⁵ *Mixt.* 2, 6 (Kühn 1, 627-628); Orib. 21, 6 (B. and D. 3, 21-22); cf. also *Mixt.* 2, 6 (Kühn 1, 625-626); Orib. 21, 6 (B. and D. 3, 16-17) and *Syn.* 5, 44 (B. and D. 5, 242-245).

⁶ 86e-87a. Galen, *Anim. Mor. Corp. Temp.* 6 (Kühn 4, 789); Orib. 54, 6 (B. and D. 3, 214) where he is dealing with the injury to the soul.

"Gazing long and earnestly on his eyes, at once terrible and full of charm, and on his face, attractive in its unusual animation, they divined what manner of man he would be, as if they had perused those ancient books, the reading of which discloses from bodily signs the inward qualities of the soul."¹¹ In Ammianus

Julian was:

- (1) "mediocris staturae," which indicates "the greatest acuity of sense, and the greatest general effectiveness, for—the movements of the blood, not having a long distance to travel, easily reach the reason—thus the greatest tenacity of purpose and the greatest acuity of sense."¹²
- (2) "ab ipso capite usque unguium summitates liniamentorum recta compage," which is a sign of a good and just character.¹³
- (3) "venustate oculorum micantium flagrans, qui mentis eius angustias indicabant," which is a sign of a "cogitator magnarum rerum."¹⁴
- (4) "ore paulo maiore labro inferiore demisso," which is like the mouth of a lion, and one must attribute to its possessor daring and all the other qualities of character associated with the lion (a protruding lower lip indicates a tendency to vanity).¹⁵
- (5) "naso erectissimo," which is a sign of much vigor and thoughtfulness¹⁶ (Adamantius also tells us that straightness of nose betrays lack of control in the tongue¹⁷ and Ammianus makes this comment on Julian¹⁸: "linguae fusioris et admodum raro silentis").

¹¹ 15, 8, 16.

¹² 25, 4, 22. "Figura tali situque membrorum. mediocris erat staturae, capillis tamquam pexis et mollibus, hirsuta barba in acutum desinente vestitus, venustate oculorum micantium flagrans, qui mentis eius argutias indicabant, superciliis decoris, et naso rectissimo, ore paulo maiore, labro inferiore demisso, opima et incurva cervice, umeris vastis et latis, ab ipso capite usque unguium summitates, liniamentorum recta compage, unde viribus valebat et cursu."

The figure and proportion of his body were as follows: He was of medium stature. His hair lay smooth as if it had been combed, his beard was shaggy and trimmed as to end in a point, his eyes were fine and full of fire, an indication of the acuteness of his mind. His eyebrows were handsome, his nose very straight, his mouth somewhat large with a pendulous lower lip. His neck was thick and somewhat bent, his shoulders large and broad. From his head to the ends of his finger-nails he was well proportioned, and as a result was strong and a good runner. (trans. J. C. Rolfe throughout, LCL). Pseud.-Arist. 813b.

¹³ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Pol. 268; Adamant. 408–409; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 119–120.

¹⁴ Pol. 148; Adamant. 328; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 50. Cf. Pseud.-Arist. 807b; Pol. 144; J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca* (codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae regiae parisiensis 4 vols., Oxford, 1839–41), p. 255; Adamant. 305.

¹⁵ Pol. 224; 226; Adamant. 374; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 67.

¹⁶ Pol. 228; Adamant. 376; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 70–71.

¹⁷ Adamant. 376.

¹⁸ 25, 4, 17.

(6) "umeris vastis et latis," which is a sign of fortitude.¹⁹

(7) "opima et incurva cervice." Although this may be regarded as indicative of affectation,²⁰ and is generally a very unfavorable sign, a thick neck also is a sign of fierce temper, as in bulls.²¹

In the light of his characteristics Julian might well, like Augustus, be compared with the lion,²² thus contradicting the impression given by Gregory²³ of a man endowed with unpleasant physical features. This whole description is linked with the enumeration of his virtues, "temperantia, prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo, felicitas, liberalitas—a vir profecto heroicis connumerandus ingeniis." Indeed Ammianus' portrait is of such an encomiastic nature—"ad laudativam paene materiam pertinebit"²⁴—that the treatment of Julian occupies a unique place in the total plan of the history. While it is clear that Ammianus followed the annalistic form of Tacitus' histories, it is equally apparent that he drew upon the literary "schema" of biography, and, trained carefully in rhetorical theory, followed also strict rules of the encomium prescribed for the speech in honor of a ruler. Praise of personal appearance is an essential "topos" in the "laudatio," and finds its place here just as it does in Claudius Mamertinus' *Gratiarum Actio Iuliano*.²⁵

¹⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 807a; 808a; 810b; Pol. 214; 268; Adamant. 364; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 78; 2, 119. Cf. Amm. Marc. 22, 14, 3: "ridebatur . . . ut homo brevis humeros extentans angustos." See Pseud.-Arist. 813a; Pol. 262; Adamant. 400; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 100.

²⁰ Pol. 258; Adamant. 367.

²¹ Pseud.-Arist. 811a; Adamant. 366; 370. Cf. Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 72.

²² Pseud.-Arist. 809b.

²³ Or. 5, 23, *S. Gregorii Theologi vulgo Nazianzeni Opera omnia*, "Opera omnia quae extant vel eius nomine circumferuntur" (Paris, Benedictines of Saint-Maur, 1778–1840), p. 161.

²⁴ 25, 4.1; 16, 1, 3. M. J. Kennedy has analyzed carefully in *The Literary Work of Ammianus* (Lancaster, Pa., 1912), p. 56 the nature of this *laudatio* as a "biography in brief, a detached passage of absolutely personal information concerning Julian, and could be removed in entirety without affecting in the slightest degree the record of historical events."

²⁵ A. Baehrens, *XII Panegyrici Latini* (Leipzig, 1911) 3, pp. 131–156, esp. c. 6. The encomiastic literature of this period lauds the dignity of the appearance, the tranquillity of the countenance, the nobility of the eyes. Julian himself in his panegyric on Constantius praises the appearance of his cousin with the statement (F. K. Hertlein, *Iuliani Imperatoris Quae Supersunt* Leipzig, 1875–1876), Or. 1, 10c, that he necessarily had to have the upbringing of a king to train his body to strength and power, health and beauty, and to prepare his soul for courage, justice, moderation, and wisdom. Cf. also his heroic deeds of Constantius (Or. 2, 101b) and his panegyric on Eusebia, first wife of Constantius (Or. 3, 109d). The life of Constantine ascribed to Eusebius (F. A. Heinichen, *Eusebii Pamphili Scripta Historica* Leipzig, 1868–1870) 2, 1, 19 praises in similar fashion the person of Constantine for grace and beauty and height; he so far surpassed his contemporaries in strength that he was a source of fear to them; cf. also his appearance at the Council of Nicaea, where his piety and fear of God was evident in his downcast eyes, the blush on his face, and his walk. He was outstanding among all those present in his height and beauty, in the dignity of his bearing,

Another literary device employed by Ammianus is the use of "exempla virtutis et vitiorum" drawn from earlier Roman history for purposes of comparison and contrast.²⁶ Thus when Julian was made Caesar by Constantius in the palace in A.D. 355, he was the object of jibes from envious courtiers who were jealous of his successes in Gaul. A "she-goat, not a man," they called him, "a hairy fellow, a monkey in purple." "But," remarks the historian, "as the greatest glory is always subjected to envy, so we read of the faults and crimes of the illustrious leaders of old, which, even if they did not exist, the malicious constantly held against them." He cites as examples Cimon, son of Miltiades, Scipio Aemilianus, and last of all, Pompey, of whom it was said by his detractors, when nothing else of blame could be uncovered against him, that he was guilty of two laughable and ridiculous habits, namely that he used to scratch his head with one finger, and that, to cover up an ulcer, he wore a white bandage around his leg. The first habit, they suggested, showed that he was dissolute and effeminate, and, the second, that he was eager to start a revolution.²⁷ Julian himself observes in his satire on the *Caesars*²⁸ that it was indeed not strange that Caesar overcame Pompey, who used to scratch his head with his finger tip and in other respects resembled more a fox than a lion.

This use of descriptions of personal appearance for purposes of blame or praise occurs repeatedly in the Emperor Julian's satires²⁹ and resembles similar iconistic portraiture in Lucian.³⁰ Such satire is especially sharp in the *Misopogon*, or *Beard Hater*, in which Julian, in attacking the luxury and excesses of the people of Antioch, ridicules his own appearance:³¹

I have [he says] many reasons for finding fault with myself, and I shall begin with my face, which nature did not make particularly handsome or shapely or radiant, and for that reason out of perversity and contrariness I

and remarkable strength and vigor, all of which revealed the excellent qualities of his mind (*ibid.* 2, 3, 10; *cf.* 2, 4, 53). This life is more in the nature of a panegyric than a piece of strict historical writing. *Cf.* also Athanasius on the Life of St. Anthony, *PG* 26, 940A. Gregory of Nyssa on St. Macrina, *PG* 46, 964 A-B; *id.* on St. Gregory Thaumaturgus *PG* 46, 934 D; also Pulcheria *PG* 46, 870 B; St. Ambrose on his brother Satyrus 1, 52; Sulpicius Severus on the Life of St. Martin 27; Jerome on the Life of St. Hilarion 4.

²⁶ Laistner, p. 147.

²⁷ 17, 11, 4. The first trick of Pompey is mentioned by Plutarch in his life of Pompey (48, 7; *cf.* also his *De Cap. ex Inim. Util.* 6, 89e). Lucian refers to it in *Rh. Pr.* 11 as a mark of effeminacy, and Seneca Rhetor in *Controv.* 7, 4, 8. Compare also Juvenal's allusion to this gesture physiognomically in 9, 130-133.

²⁸ *Caes.* 323 b. Here the remark becomes almost a proverb for effeminacy. See *The Works of the Emperor Julian* (trans. W. C. Wright throughout, LCL), *ad loc.*

²⁹ *Caes.* 308 d-309 b (Julius Caesar and Octavian); 309 c (Tiberius); 311 a (Nerva); 317 c (Marcus Aurelius). *Cf.* also St. Jerome, *Against Jovianus* 1, 34; 1, 36; 2, 21; 2, 36; the *Letters* 24; 39, 1; 40; 54, 7 and 13.

³⁰ See *TAPA* 72 (1941): pp. 101-102.

³¹ 338 b-c; 339 a-c.

have added this beard, since I am not handsome. . . . And if you wish to learn something of what is usually not mentioned, my chest is heavy and shaggy with hair, just as the breasts of lions who are rulers over the wild beasts, nor have I ever made it smooth, . . . where you are all handsome and tall and beardless.³² Furthermore I entered your city by choice with a long beard, whereas it was possible for me to come, if not a youth in years, at least a stripling in manner of softness of countenance.³³ But my nature does not permit me to cast my eyes in all directions wantonly, so that I may seem beautiful to you at least in face, if not indeed in soul.³⁴

If Julian is inclined to be somewhat ruthless in his use of physical description for satiric purpose, no less so is Gregory of Nazianzus, who attacks the Apostate in two bitter invectives. The Cappadocian Church Father (A.D. 330-390), bishop of Constantinople, eloquent preacher, prolific letter writer, and poet of considerable ability, had been a fellow student of Julian at Athens and had had an opportunity of observing him at first hand. Like Ammianus, who took part in Julian's campaign against the Persians, Gregory had studied the Emperor, and thus we have two portraits of Julian from entirely opposing points of view. Moreover, Libanius, the famous sophist of Antioch, was on the closest terms with Julian during the months when he resided in Antioch, preparing for his attack on the Persians in the winter of A.D. 362-363. For Libanius, Julian was the bright hope of the survival of Greek studies in a Christian world, and the death of the young Emperor was a hard blow to the pagan rhetorician. His funeral oration on Julian and his picture of Julian as a student must be weighed against the disparaging remarks of Gregory. Libanius describes him as a grandson of an emperor, nephew of an emperor, cousin of an emperor, neither strutting in a pompous manner, nor giving annoyance, nor expecting to receive attention by reason of the number of his attendants, but going to school in common dress, with an eyebrow not scornful of others.³⁵ At Athens he performed brilliantly as a speaker, but was modest about it all, for indeed there was no subject on which he held forth without blushing.³⁶

³² 342 c-d. For signs of lasciviousness, *cf.* Pseud.-Arist. 808b. ³³ 349c.

³⁴ 351 a; *cf.* 365 d; 367 b. The *Misopogon* describes Julian's stay of nine months at Antioch, where the inhabitants, for the most part Christian, were strongly opposed to his restoration of pagan religion.

³⁵ R. Förster, *Libanii Opera* (Leipzig, 1903-1927) 2, *Or.* 18, 11, 525.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 18, 30, 532. Libanius shows no significant use of physiognomical material save for two passages cited by Förster *SP* 2, p. 250; an excerpt from Plato, *Republic* 5, 19, 474d on the *σμός, γρηπός, μέλας* type, in a letter to Demetrius 362/363 A.D., *Epist.* 795 ed. R. Förster 2, p. 280; an excerpt from Suetonius, *Terms of Abuse in Greek* on (the snotty man) *ἀνόητος καὶ μυζώδης* in *Or.* 27 and in *Or.* 33. R. A. Pack, "Φυσιογνωμονικά in Libanius' *Antiochicus*" *AJP* 56 (1935): pp. 347-350, considers two passages overlooked by Förster in his reference to Libanius in *SP*, namely *Or.* 11, 154 (on the voice, the gait, and the manner of wearing one's clothes as of importance in ancient character analysis, and *Or.* 11, 38 (on the modulation of the voice).

We have called attention to Gregory's devastating power of invective as illustrated in his attack on Julian. It may be pertinent at this point to note that he was also the master of the "laudatio funebris," as he was "a pioneer in adapting the pagan funeral oration to Christian use."³⁷ Gregory's use of encomium on physical appearance is, as in the case of Julian's praise of Constantius,³⁸ part of the usual "schema" of the funeral speech. Thus Gregory's brother, St. Caesarius,³⁹ was notable for beauty and size, for grace in all respects, for euphony of voice. With reference to his father he writes⁴⁰ that as far as an account of the latter's country, his family, the good proportions of his body and outward splendor, and all other things are concerned, these matters he would hand over to the rules for the composition of encomia, and begin with what is of primary importance and especially appropriate. Thus, having alluded to the "topos" entitled "praise of the body," Gregory goes on to laud his father's humility, which was not apparent in his dress but represented a condition of soul. He did not achieve this, Gregory observes, by any external action or gesture, such "as a bending of the neck, or a lowering of the voice, or a downcast look or by length of beard, or a shaving of his head, or by the nature of his walk," all of which was pretense. Nor did he ever display on his person the anger he felt.⁴¹ The eulogy of physique, in short, is maintained by indirection, or rather it is a denying of the familiar outward aspects usually considered indicative of the inward state of humility.

Gregory's oration on the occasion of the funeral of Basil the Great, which likewise follows the pagan "schema" of the "laudatio funebris,"⁴² includes mention of physical endowments, such as beauty, strength, and stature, in which most men take delight.⁴³ But these matters Gregory proposes to leave to those who wish to pursue them, pointing out only that Basil, when he was young and had not yet subdued the flesh to the pursuits of philosophy, was in no way inferior to those who were absorbed constantly in the things of the body. Meanwhile Basil himself, on the other hand, in a letter to Gregory, had observed⁴⁴ that "the humble

and abject spirit is attended by a gloomy and downcast eye (*ὄμμα στυγνὸν καὶ εἰς γῆν νενευκός*), neglected appearance, unkempt hair, and dirty clothes," and that "the stride⁴⁵ should be neither sluggish, which would argue a laxity of mind, nor, on the other hand, brisk and swaggering, which would indicate that its impulses were rash." Thus, it is to be noted that Gregory by his disinclination to dwell on the physique of Basil, save for the briefest mention of it, emphasizes its extraordinary spiritual quality. In still another letter,⁴⁶ of unknown address, Basil had discussed "the perfection of the monastic life," which, Deferrari points out, Basil here identifies with the ideal Christian life.

The Christian ought not to speak in a light vein. . . . He must not talk idly, prattling of things which neither conduce to the benefit of his listeners nor to the activities that are indispensable and permitted us by God. . . . There should be no clamor or any scene or commotion wherein anger is expressed. . . . The voice should be modulated under all circumstances. . . . The Christian should neither answer anyone nor act boldly or contemptuously, but in all things should exhibit modesty and reverence toward everyone. He ought not to wink covertly or use any gesture which grieves a brother or shows contempt.

In the Longer Rules of Asceticism⁴⁷ the monk is told especially to refrain from laughter, an injunction neglected by most people.

For to be overcome by incontinent and immoderate laughter is a mark of incontinence and shows that a man has not his emotions under control, and does not suppress the frivolity of his soul by a strict rule. It is not unseemly to reveal merriment to the extent of a cheerful smile, though only so far as Scripture allows when it says⁴⁸:

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 1, 22, 132-135.

⁴⁷ *Regulae Fusius Tractatae* R. 8, 359-360 (trans. Clarke, throughout). Migne PG 31, 961. Compare in the Basilian corpus the *Sermo Asceticus* 323, Migne PG 31, 880-881, where the monk is urged to betray no sign of anger or memory of injuries received, or jealousy or contentiousness. No gesture or movement, no word or sharp glance of the eyes, or any expression of the face, or anything else that might stir a fellow monk to wrath should ever be evident. In the *De Ascetica Disciplina* 212, Migne PG 31, 649 on the topic of how a monk must be equipped, it is stated that he must think much, and speak little, that he must not be rash or arrogant in his speech, nor talk more than is right, that he must not be prone to laughter, but adorned with modesty, that "he must keep his eyes down, and his soul up." For a discussion of Basil's ascetic works see W. K. Lowther Clarke, *St. Basil the Great* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 63-106, and *id.*, *The Ascetic Works of St. Basil* (London, 1925), *passim*.

⁴⁸ R. 8, 359-360; cf. *Prov.* xv. 13. We may glance in passing at what the early Church fathers of the second century, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, have to say on the subject. Clement, for example, in discussing the conduct of the converted and the need of simplicity in the social life of the Christian deprecates unseemly laughter in the *Paedagogus*: "For the seemingly relaxation of the countenance in a harmonious manner . . . is called a smile. So also is laughter on the face of well regulated men termed. But the discordant relaxation in countenance in the case of women is called a giggle, and is meretricious laughter; in the case of men, a guffaw, and is savage and insulting laughter"

³⁷ See *Funeral Orations by St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Ambrose*, translated by L. P. McCauley, J. J. Sullivan, M. R. P. McGuire, R. J. Deferrari (New York, 1953), 22; introduction on the early Christian Funeral Oration by M. R. P. McGuire, pp. vii-xxi, esp. pp. ix-x, and pp. xvi-xviii.

³⁸ Note 25.

³⁹ *Or.* 7,5. Migne PG 35, 759-760. Likewise his sister St. Gorgonia, *Or.* 8,10 PG 35, 800-802.

⁴⁰ *Or.* 18, 5 PG 35, 990; 18, 23; PG 35, 1012 (after L. P. McCauley throughout).

⁴¹ *Or.* 18, 26 PG 35, 1016.

⁴² F. Boulenger, *Gregoire de Nazianze. Discours funebres en l'honneur de son frere Césaire et de Basile de Césarée* (Paris, 1908), pp. xxix-xxx.

⁴³ *Or.* 43, 10. Migne PG 35, 508.

⁴⁴ Trans. R. J. Deferrari throughout, LCL. *St. Basil. The Letters* 1.2, 20-21. Written to Gregory about A.D. 358 when Basil had retired to Pontus (Deferrari).

"When the heart is merry the face rejoices"; but to shout with loud laughter, and allow the body to shake involuntarily, does not befit one who has his soul under control, or is of proved virtue, or has command of himself.

In a similar vein St. Ambrose, addressing the Church Fathers of the west on the duties of the clergy (*De Officiis Ministrorum*), discourses at some length on the functions of modesty,⁴⁹ how "it should qualify both speech and silence, accompany chastity, commend our prayers to God, govern our bodily motions." "Modesty," he submits, "must be guarded in our very movements and gestures and gait. For the condition of the mind is often to be seen in the attitude of the body. . . . Thus the movement of the body is a sort of voice of the soul ('Est enim in ipso motu, gestu, incessu tenenda verecundia. Habitus enim mentis in corporis statu cernitur. . . . Itaque vox quaedam est animi corporis motus.')" Closely akin to Basil's statements on the monk's life is Ambrose's insistence that the clergy must not walk hurriedly except in case of real danger or necessity,⁵⁰ "for a suitable gait is that wherein there is an appearance of authority and weight and dignity and which has a calm, collected bearing." Above all "we ought to be humble, gentle, mild, serious, patient. We must keep the mean in all things, so that a calm countenance and quiet speech may show that there is no vice in our lives."⁵¹ He sternly rebukes two clerics⁵²—both of whom had left the church—on what their gait betrayed them to be, faithless in heart. One had forsaken his faith at the time of the Arian controversy, the other through love of money. "And in their gait was discernible the semblance of fickleness, the appearance, as it were, of wandering buffoons."⁵³ These injunctions are completely consistent with the scheme of behavior suitable

for the devout Christian, and are to be found again and again in various Christian tracts. Interestingly enough, Ambrose's *De Officiis* is intended as a work on the "proper conduct of a Christian gentleman," and as such is derived from Cicero's *De Officiis*, written for the instruction of a young Roman, his son, Marcus. Consequently it is Cicero's concern for appropriate appearance that constitutes the immediate pagan source for this Christian counsel. In discussing modesty Cicero exhorts his son to follow nature and to avoid what is offensive to eyes and ears⁵⁴:

So, in standing or walking, in sitting or reclining, in our expression, our eyes, or the movements of our hands, let us preserve what we have called propriety ("nos autem naturam sequamur et ab omni, quod abhorret ab oculorum auriumque approbatione, fugiamus; status, incessus, sessio, accubitus, vultus, oculi manuum motus teneat illud decorum").⁵⁵ We must be careful, too, not to fall into a habit of listless sauntering in our gait, so as to look like carriers in festal processions, or of hurrying too fast, when time presses. If we do this, it puts us out of breath, our looks are changed, our features are distorted; all this is clear evidence of lack of poise, "ex quibus magna significatio fit non adesse constantiam."

When, therefore, we examine Gregory's invectives against Julian it is not strange that we should find that he emphasized exactly those aspects of the physique which he in Christian panegyric and Basil in discussion of monasticism would deplore. If the monk should not be arrogant in speech or manner, or a chatterer, or prone to laughter or anger, but rather adorned with shame and modesty, what does Julian, according to Gregory, display in his appearance? Gregory⁵⁶ remarks that from his early contact with Julian in Athens, he had become not a bad judge of his character, though he had not as yet achieved great skill in that regard. But he had been impressed by the unevenness of Julian's behavior and his extreme excitability. Signs which boded ill, as being indicative of an unstable character, were his unsteady neck, shoulders always jerking and shrugging, an eye rolling and glancing, with a look of madness, feet unstable and teetering, a nose breathing forth scorn and contempt, ridiculous twitchings of the face, immoderate bursts of laughter, a constant nodding of the head in assent or dissent, speech broken or cut off by breathing, disordered and insistent questions with responses no better and in no way consistent or orderly.

(2, 5, 46. Clement was a student of Herodes Atticus. For Clement's interest in physiognomical theory see Förster, *SP* 2, 303–309. For Tertullian see Förster, *SP* 1, p. lxx, and 2, pp. 255, 331–332. Cf. also a similar point of view to that of Clement quoted above in *De Cult. Fem.* 13.) "A fool raises his voice in laughter" says the Scripture (Eccles. 21.23); but a clever man smiles almost imperceptibly. The clever man in this case he calls wise, inasmuch as he is differently affected from the fool." (*Paed.* 2, 5, trans. W. Wilson. For Clement's interest in physiognomical theory see Förster, *SP* 2, pp. 303–309, especially *Paed.* 2, 7; 3, 3; 3, 5; 3, 11; *Str.* 1.21; *The Newly Baptized*, passim; for Tertullian see Förster *SP* 1, pp. lxx and 2, pp. 55; 331–332. *Patientia* 15; for a point similar to that of Clement quoted above see *De Cult. Fem.* 2.1; 2.8; 2.13; *De Anim.* 5; 20; 25; 32.)

⁴⁹ 1, 18, 67, 70–71 (trans. P. Schaff and H. Wace throughout), to be found in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, X. (Reprinted: Grand Rapids, 1955).

⁵⁰ 1, 18, 75.

⁵¹ 1, 20, 89.

⁵² 1, 18, 72 (after Schaff and Wace).

⁵³ Cf. also the *Exhortatio Virginitatis* 10.64; *Hexaemeron* 6.58 on the: "corporis humani praestantia deque singulorum eius membrorum conformatione, dispositione atque officiis . . . imago quaedam animi loquitur in vultu, fidei basis in qua quotidie Domini nomen inscribitur et tenetur."

⁵⁴ 1, 35, 128 (trans. W. Miller throughout, LCL). This whole passage surely stems from Panaetius' *Περὶ τοῦ Καθῆκοντος*.

⁵⁵ 1, 36, 131: "Cavendum saltem est, ne aut tarditatis utamur in ingressu mollioribus, ut pompae ferculis similes esse videamur, aut in festinationibus suscipiamus nimias celeritates, quae cum fuerint, anhelitus moventur, voltus mutantur, ora torquentur; ex quibus magna significatio fit non adesse constantiam. sed multo etiam magis elaborandum est, ne animi motus a recedant; quod assequemur, si cavebimus, ne in perturbationes atque exanimationes incidamus, et si attentos animus ad decoris conservationem tenebimus."

⁵⁶ *Or.* 5. *Contra Iulianum* 2, 23. Migne *PG* 35, 692.

Asmus⁵⁷ has analyzed closely the physiognomical significance of the details of this portrait, demonstrating how each feature was susceptible of unfavorable interpretation. The appearance of Julian, Asmus points out, is that of a worthless person: his unsteady neck bespeaking an evil doer, his jerking shoulders, insolence and arrogance, his glancing, maddened eyes suggesting a man possessed of a demon and fraudulent in nature, his unstable feet, madness and effeminacy, his unrestrained laughter, a shameless creature. The portrait is ugly, and like that of Thersites in the *Iliad*, suggests in its physiognomical implications, the "meanest man" of the later Roman Empire.⁵⁸ That the description was to be interpreted physiognomically seems clear also from the *scholia* under the name of Basil Minimus, which comment⁵⁹ that in this passage the character of the Apostate was to be branded as wicked, turbulent, and demoniacal, a fact which a seer or a physiognomist would indeed have divined, declaring that the man was full of demons, and filled with all iniquity. Support for this point of view is to be found in Gregory's first invective against Julian,⁶⁰ wherein the latter is described as ascending from a cave, presumably Mithraic, filled with demons both in mind and in action, and indicating by the wildness of his eyes whom he had been worshiping, if indeed he had not been possessed by demons from the very day on which he had taken such nefarious thoughts into his mind. In damning Julian, Gregory has directed his satirical attack on every feature of his personal

⁵⁷ R. Asmus, "Vergessene Physiognomonika," *Philologus* 65 (1906): pp. 410-415. Gregory was a strong admirer of Polemo of Laodicea. See H. Jüttner "De Polemonis Rhetoris Vita Operibus Arte," pp. 112-113. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, Migne PL 23, 709 says of Gregory of Nazianzus: secutus est autem Polemonis dicendi charactere. Cf. Suidas s.v. Γρηγόριος Ναζιανζοῦ. (ascribed to Sophronius) *ibid.* Gregory's familiarity with Polemo's works may explain in part his interest in physiognomical material. Cf. Asmus, *ibid.*, pp. 415-421, on the physiognomical interpretation of love sickness of the prince Antiochus for his stepmother in a story told by Julian in the *Misopogon* 347a-348a, and Asmus, 421-423 for Julian's *Epist.* 79 to Photinus, written in Antioch 362-363, preserved in the Latin version of Facundus Hermianensis (ca. A.D. 546). It deals with an attack on Diodorus of Antioch, whose body had wasted away with illness, a sign not of philosophical nature, as he had wished it to seem to those deceived by his appearance. Asmus, 423-424, also calls attention to the possible physiognomical interpretation of ethnic types in Julian's treatise against the Galileans.

⁵⁸ *HSCP* 58-59 (1948): p. 197; Misener, "Iconistic Portraits": pp. 103-104.

⁵⁹ *Scholia in Or. 5. Contra Iulianum*, 2, 23. Migne PG 36, 1141B. Basil Minimus (ἐλάχιςτος) was Metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia in the tenth century.

⁶⁰ *Or. 4. Contra Iulianum*, 1, 55-56. Migne PG 35, 578-580. Gregory elsewhere inveighs fiercely against anger and its manifestation on the person: PG 37, 819-821. Cf. Seneca, *De Ira*: 1, 1, 3-5; and against indecorous behavior in women: PG 36, 291; 295; 37, 883-908; likewise John Chrysostom: PG 63, 457-460; 689-690; cf. Synesius PG 66, 1257. For similar observations on the countenance: Greg. Naz. PG 36, 18-20; 293-296; Greg. Nyss. 44, 293-294; 46, 533-534; Joh. Chrysost. 52, 412-413; 57, 19-20; 59, 156 (anger); 63, 501; 552 (the baseness of anger); 657-658; 689 (anger); 878.

appearance which would disassociate the Emperor from the Christian view of man and his ideal physique.

In short, the iconistic portraits of Julian in Ammianus and Gregory serve to illustrate the state of tension that existed in the distracted world of the middle fourth century, and to reflect in their own way the significant conflicts of this critical period. Gregory's opposition to Julian's apostasy is readily understood, but the maliciousness of his charges against him surely presents an exaggerated picture of the Emperor in whom his pagan admirer Ammianus in an equally lavish fashion could find only virtues essentially Christian. Yet in this contrast of description and physiognomical interpretation we may perceive something of the struggle between Christianity and paganism in a remarkable era. "Why, my friend," asks Julian⁶¹ of an unknown painter, "did you give me a form other than my own? Paint me exactly as you saw me."

In a century which has so lively an interest in medical handbooks, we should not fail to note the influence of Galen in another area of literature, namely the discussion of the Church Fathers on the nature of man. Before turning to one of the most important documents of the fourth century it may be well to recall the contributions made by Galen not only to medicine but also to other related fields. It was his concern as a physician and a physiognomist to relate the physique of a man to his character both in a practical fashion by a description of certain physical types and characteristics, and by an analysis of the reasons for these characteristics.

The document to which I have reference is the Christian treatise of Nemesius of Emesa on the *Nature of Man*. Nemesius was a writer with vast knowledge of Greek philosophy; he was also well informed in the field of medicine and thoroughly read in the writings of Galen, whom he quotes repeatedly. It could indeed be assumed that he may have been a practicing physician before he became bishop of Emesa.⁶² Telfer prefers to consider him not a practitioner but a "gentleman amateur,"⁶³ and cites as a comparable example in medicine, Caesarius, brother of Gregory of Nazianzus,⁶⁴ who had studied at Alexandria both mathematics and "the marvelous art of medicine which deals with constitutions and temperaments and causes of disease."⁶⁵ The primary concern of Nemesius

⁶¹ Trans. Wright, LCL 3, 302-303. Cf. T. R. Glover *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (New York, 1924), pp. 47-76, esp. 48, 52-53.

⁶² Migne PG 40, 503-818. See the recent English translation of this work by William Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa in the Library of the Christian Classics*, vol. 4 (Philadelphia, 1955), pp. 201-455.

⁶³ Telfer, *ibid.*, p. 207.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or. 7*, 10. Migne PG 35, 766-768.

⁶⁵ Migne PG 35, 761-764 (trans. L. P. McCauley). Telfer also cites the physicians Zeno of Cyprus, and his pupils Magnus, Oribasius and Ionicus as iatrosophists (*op. cit.*, p. 208, note 18).

is, as Telfer points out, with ethics and the life of virtue. But he recognizes that while soul and body may be separated by nature, in the fact of living they are united. Consequently, if we wish to discuss the composition of the soul, we must clearly understand the constitution of the body.⁶⁶ For this reason the philosopher with a concern for ethics must turn to the physician for a knowledge of the body. The "interaction of soul and body" is continual in man's life.⁶⁷ In dealing, therefore, with the corporeal nature of man he treats of the four elements, their combinations and relationships, which the physicians call the four humors circulating in the human body. Thus the views of Galen loomed large in an essay which is a Christian treatment of the nature of the soul.⁶⁸ The work was intended, it would appear, for persons outside the Church who possessed some knowledge of Christianity and the Scriptures, and who needed to be informed further on the Christian view of man.⁶⁹

Nemesius, while discussing several kinds of physical union as possible analogies for the union of the soul and body, is at pains to refute Galen's identification of the soul with "temperament," that is, the mixing of the constituent elements of the body in which the preponderance of one of the elements, or four humors, determined the physical appearance and psychological characteristics associated with that humor.⁷⁰ "The temperament of the body," he maintains, "cannot be the soul. . . . If the temperament of the body is soul, and everybody has soul, there is no inanimate body, not even a stone, a bit of wood, or iron, or anything else inanimate."⁷¹

⁶⁶ Telfer, *ibid.*, p. 210.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 212-216 for an excellent summary of the argument of Nemesius.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 212 and 227.

⁶⁹ Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (Cambridge, 1956) 1, chap. xvi, "The Mystery of the Incarnation," pp. 364-399, 407. Professor Wolfson has analyzed closely the philosophical thinking of Nemesius on the Mystery of the Incarnation, that is of two natures and one person, and has shown how Aristotle's explanation of the unity in the union of the soul and body is adapted by the Fathers after examination of the various kinds of physical union discussed by the philosophers. A number of analogies of physical union are explored by Nemesius in his treatment of the union of soul and body which he explains on the basis of the Aristotelian concept of "predominance," namely "that the unity of man consists in the soul which is the dominant element in him, by reason of its dominating the body." This idea is ultimately derived from Aristotle's view of the union of form and matter. "Soul and body are one because soul is the form of the body." See also W. W. Jaeger, *Nemesios von Emesa; Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinem Anfängen bei Poseidonios* (Berlin, 1914), *passim*, for the sources of Nemesius' material, including discussion of Galen.

⁷⁰ Telfer, p. 271, note 2, which cites B. Domanski, *Die Psychologie des Nemesios* (Münster, 1900), p. 9. Domanski has shown that Nemesius is following closely here the work of Galen "that the faculties of the mind follow the mixtures or temperaments of the body" (Kühn 4, 767-822). For the nature of the soul in relation to the humors in Galen see *TAPA* 76 (1945): pp. 291-292.

⁷¹ Migne *PG* 40, 553-556 (trans. Telfer throughout, p. 272).

There are, according to Galen, continues Nemesius, nine "kraseis" of which eight are bad, and one alone is good. Man is constituted according to a good temperament or mixture (that is, man who belongs to the "middle 'krasis'") and in varying degrees, other kinds of living creatures are constituted according to the bad temperaments. But Galen, he argues, also believes that the nine "kraseis" are found in inanimate objects. Furthermore, if the soul is a "krasis" or "temperamentum," and temperaments vary with age, season of the year, food, and the like, then the soul also changes. And if the soul changes, our soul is not always the same, but it is now the soul of a lion, and now that of a sheep, according to the state of "krasis." This, argues Nemesius,⁷² is absurd. Temperament is known to change, and it is the physicians who have the art of bringing about this change. *Εἰκασία*, the good mixing of hot and cold, dry and moist, is a state of health. The body is the instrument (*ὄργανον*) of the soul. Temperaments or the proper mixing of the humors are for the sake of the soul. Therefore, concludes Nemesius, proper care of the temperament or health is "a prime spiritual duty."⁷³

Two other passages in the *Nature of Man* reflect a knowledge of earlier material on physiognomy. These passages call for refutation by Nemesius. If Galen appears wrongly to consider the soul a quality of body, the Stoic view of the corporeal soul must be also examined and rejected. Cleanthes had stated that "when the body is sick or hurt, the soul suffers with it, and conversely, the body with the soul. For when the soul feels shame, the body blushes, and when the soul feels fear, the body blanches. Therefore the soul is corporeal."⁷⁴ Nemesius' reply to this is in the nature of a refutation of the proposition that "if the body is sick or hurt, the soul suffers with it." The question, he states, "is whether the body is the sole sufferer, deriving perception from the soul, while the soul remains itself unaffected, or whether the soul suffers together with the body. Most learned authors," he submits, "take the first alternative. But Cleanthes should base his argument on what is agreed, not what is in dispute."⁷⁵

Secondly, he discusses certain arguments from Plato's *Phaedo*⁷⁶ on the nature of the soul and idea of transmigration.

All Greeks [he argues]⁷⁷ who represent the soul as immortal agree in believing in transmigration. Where they differ is as to forms of soul. . . . The Platonists are particularly divided on this point. For Plato said that wrathful, proud, and grasping souls exchange bodies with wolves and lions, and that those who have run to excesses

⁷² *Ibid.*, 556-557 (Telfer, p. 273).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 558-560 (Telfer, pp. 273-274 and note 10).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 545-548 (Telfer, pp. 266-267). See Förster *SP* 1, p. lxx, for this passage.

⁷⁵ See Telfer's commentary on this passage, p. 268.

⁷⁶ 31. See Förster *SP* 2, p. 254 for this passage.

⁷⁷ Migne *PG* 40, 581-584 (Telfer, p. 288).

will receive the bodies of donkeys, and other animals of that sort. Some took his reference to mean literal wolves, lions, and donkeys, and others thought that they discerned that he spoke in parables, and by naming animals alluded to manners of behaving.

He continues his comment on the *Phaedo* by quoting various opinions, but agrees ultimately with Iamblichus that there is no migration of souls from men into irrational beasts, but only from one beast into another, and from one human being into another. "And, it seems to me, Iamblichus⁷⁸ both hit upon Plato's meaning and lighted on truth itself."

Thus Nemesius, writing in a Christian world of the last decade of the fourth century or thereabouts, includes in his analysis of the nature of man certain fundamental ideas of early Greek physiognomical theory, especially of Plato and the Stoics, and gives particular attention to the view of Galen, derived from Hippocrates, on the constituent elements or humors in man's physique and their effect on the behavior of man. But, in rejecting these concepts in the light of his own Christian beliefs, he interprets for his age basic physiognomical principles enunciated centuries before.

While Nemesius at the end of the fourth century discusses certain principles on the nature of man in terms of medicine and the humors, we may inquire what other views of the relation of character to the physique are to be found in Christian writers. Synesius, Bishop of Cyrene, writing at almost the same time as Nemesius, courageously addresses himself to the Emperor Arcadius on the subject of kingship. The speech, *De Regno*,⁷⁹ was delivered before the Emperor in 399. "Who is the true king?" he asks.

The true king is he who lives for his people's good, who realizes his responsibility as the representative of some sort of divine providence. But especially is the king divine because he it is who shares his virtue with whole

nations, and because many men rejoice in the good deeds of such a one. It is, moreover, in his case a necessity that his inner life should pass undisturbed and that a divine calm should extend even to his countenance. And this is a sight to inspire not fear but the deepest piety, to wit, his remaining in an unruffled state of dignity, overwhelming his friends, that is to say, good men, with admiration, his enemies and wicked men with terror.

He finds this ideal sadly wanting in the actual situation and considers the empire threatened in many directions. It was a memorable speech, destined to stir much praise, but the remedy proposed for Arcadius—to develop his soul with philosophy, and his body with military exercise—was in no way adequate for the perilous nature of the times.

In contrast to the sobering exhortations to philosophy offered to Arcadius is the *Praise of Baldness*⁸⁰ ("Encomium Calvitii"). It is trivial and witty, a rhetorical piece designed to answer Dio Chrysostom's *Praise of Hair*. Like Julian's *Misopogon* it is highly personal, and a "show essay." Whereas Dio had written, Synesius declares, so eloquent an encomium on long hair, baldness is a sad state indeed. There is, on the other hand, a great antagonism between hair and wisdom. The hairiest of all animals is the sheep, and everybody acknowledges sheep to be the stupidest of animals. The least hairy of creatures is man, and man by common consent is the wisest of animals. Thus a pagan emperor and a Christian bishop look to the absurd in physique and record in vigorous fashion their caustic observations. Julian is bitter and sardonic in addressing the people of Antioch; Synesius lively and paradoxical. Since Dio Chrysostom had regarded hair "as the seat of man's might and mind," Synesius takes the opportunity of reversing completely the proposition, and at the same time deriding, as Lucian had done two centuries before, the ostentation of the long-haired, long-bearded philosophers. He points out that Dio has emphasized how Homer considered hair of first importance, since he makes no encomium on the eyes of the heroes except in the case of Agamemnon (while he is praising the rest of his body beside), save to speak of the quick gleaming eyes, but he does extol all of them for their hair, Achilles, Menelaus, Hector, Euphorbus, Odysseus, even Zeus for his ambrosial locks. But, Synesius observes, Dio had omitted to mention that, when Athena seized the son of Peleus by his fair hair, she stood behind him, and, if Achilles had long hair, then she grasped his hair from behind, if for no other reason than that even at this moment of youth he was somewhat bald. Thus in the greatest of Greek heroes he would submit the physiognomical argument that baldness and wisdom presumably coincide.

In the conclusion of this study we could do no better than ask what was the general attitude of the late

⁷⁸ The mention of Iamblichus at this point in Nemesius is to be noted. For the purposes of this study he assumes an importance in that in his *Life of Pythagoras* (17) he sets forth, as Aulus Gellius had done in the second century, the skill of Pythagoras as a physiognomist. His discussion of the tests of Pythagorean initiation is the most extended we possess. He tells us that Pythagoras, as soon as students had entered his school, considered their laughter, their speech, their silence. He observed their stature, their gait, and the motions of their bodies. He considered the whole structure of the person physiognomically, believing that these signs were visible expression of the invisible nature of the soul. See *TAPA* 72, (1941): p. 107, note 55, for a discussion of the sources of this passage. Eunapius in the *VS* uses only occasionally descriptions of personal appearance (with a physiognomical slant), and then of men whom he admired inordinately: Maximus of Ephesus, teacher of Julian, the most famous miracle-working philosopher of the fourth century (473); Prohaeresius (487); Chrysanthius (487); Iamblichus (459).

⁷⁹ *Or. A* (ed. N. Terzaghi, *Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni et Opuscula*, Rome, 1939-1944), *passim*. Dio, too, had written on kingship, introducing physiognomical concepts into the discussion. Dio, we must remember, as the teacher of the physiognomist Polemo, wrote a speech on hair which is lost, save for what Synesius quotes from it.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, *Or. E'*, *passim*, esp. 5. This is an epideictic display of the ridiculous and the paradoxical. Cf. T. C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," pp. 89-261, esp. 157-166.

fourth century toward a physiognomical view of man. A partial, or possible representative answer, might be found in a passage from Rutilius Namatianus' *De Reditu Suo*. Namatianus, "the last of classical Latin poets," was born in Gaul in the end of the fourth century. He was a man of literary tastes, and, as a pagan, a follower of Stoic philosophy. In A.D. 416, after the devastation of Rome by Alaric, he started from Rome back to his own country, likewise overrun by barbarian invasion, and by sea made his way northward. At Pisa he stopped to visit his friend Protadius, a native of Trèves, a Roman official who had corresponded with Symmachus. Namatianus' tribute to him is characteristic of the Roman *dignitas* of the end of the Roman world. "[If] anyone," he says,

"may wish to recognize him by sure signs, [he] should think in his heart that he is looking on a model of good-

ness; no painting will ever give a truer portrait of him in color than will the image ("figura mixta de meritis") that comes from his blended excellencies. His prudence ("prudentia"), marked by a steady look ("certo vultu"), is evident to a distant eye; the expression of fairmindedness ("forma iustitiae") shines out, commanding respect. This tribute might perhaps be less were Gaul merely praising a fellow countryman; but Rome can bear witness to her prefect.⁸¹

With this encomium Rutilius reminds us of the "dignitas" of that Scipio (consul 298 B.C.) whose tomb inscription carries these words of praise for a

. . . fortis vir sapiensque
quoius forma virtutei parisuma fuit,

that constituted the essential character of the "vir bonus" of the early Roman Republic.

⁸¹ *Minor Latin Poets* (trans. J. W. Duff and J. D. Duff throughout, LCL), 546-550.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.

Titles frequently cited in the Notes

- FHG F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 2 vols. in 5 parts. (Berlin, 1923–1929; vol. 3, Leiden, 1943; Reprint: Leiden, 1954–1958, 2 vols.).
- FÜRST, J. *Die Literarische Portraitmanier im Bereich des griechisch-römischen Schrifttums* (Leipzig, 1903).
- Kühn, C. K. *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia* [Corpus Medicorum Graecorum] (Leipzig, 1821–1833, 20 vols. in 22).
- STUART, D. R. *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (Berkeley, 1928).
- FÖRSTER, R. *Scriptores Physiognomnici* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1893) will be cited as *SP*, followed in Volume 1 by page number; in Volume 2 by 2 and page number. This work contains the texts of the writers on physiognomy. The *sylloge locorum physiognomnicorum* has been indispensable for all parts of this study, and on it I have constantly drawn.
- EVANS, E. C. "Descriptions of Personal Appearance in Roman History and Biography," *HSCP* 46 (1935): pp. 43–84; also "The Study of Physiognomy in the Second Century A.D.," *TAPA* 72 (1941): pp. 96–108; "Galen the Physician as Physiognomist," *TAPA* 76 (1945): pp. 287–298; "Literary Portraiture in Ancient Epic," *HSCP* 58–59 (1948): pp. 189–217; "A Stoic Aspect of Senecan Drama: Portraiture," *TAPA* 81 (1950): pp. 169–184.
- Translations from Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiognomonica*, are from H. S. Hett, *Artistotle: Minor Works*, LCL.

B.

List of Abbreviations Used in the Notes

- AESCH. Aeschylus
 AG. Agamemnon
 CHO. Choephoroi
 PERS. Persae
 PV Prometheus Vincetus
 SEPT. Septem Contra Thebas
 SUPP. Supplices
- ALBERTUS MAGNUS
 DE ANIM. De Anima
- AJP American Journal of Philology
 AMM. MARC. Ammianus Marcellinus
 AP Anthologia Palatina
 APP. Appian
 B. CIV. Bella Civilia
 AP. RHOD. Apollonius Rhodius
 APUL. Apuleius
 APOL. Apologia
 MET. Metamorphoses
- ARIST. Aristophanes
 ACH. Acharnenses
 AV. Aves
 EQUIT. Equites
 LYS. Lysistrata
 NEPH. Nubes
 PLUT. Plutus
 RAN. Ranae
 THESM. Thesmophoriazusae
 VESP. Vespae
- ARIST. Aristotle
 AN. PR. Analytica Priora
 ETH. EUDEM. Ethica Eudemia
 ETH. NIC. Ethica Nicomachea
 GEN. AN. De Generatione Animalium
 HA Historia Animalium
 PART. ANIM. De Partibus Animalium
 POET. Poetica
 POL. Politica
 RH. Rhetorica
- ARR. Arrian
 ANAB. Anabasis
 EPICT. DISS. Epicteti Dissertationes
- A BULL. Art Bulletin
- AUGUSTINE
 C. D. De Civitate Dei
- AUR. VICT. Aurelius Victor
 DE VIR. ILL. De Viris Illustribus
- AUSON. Ausonius
 CENT. NUPT. Cento Nupialis
 EPIST. Epistulae
 EPITHAL. Epithalamium
 PAREN. Parentalia
 PROF. BURD. Commemoratio Professorum
 Burdigalensium
- ST. BASIL
 R. Regulae
- B. AFRIC. Bellum Africum
 B. ALEX. Bellum Alexandrinum
- CAES. Caesar
 B. CIV. Bellum Civile
 B. GALL. Bellum Gallicum
- CALP. Calpurnius Siculus
- CATULL. Catullus
- CIC. Cicero
 BALB. Pro Balbo
 BRUT. Brutus
 CAECIN. Pro Caecina
 CAEL. Pro Caelio
 CAT. In Catilinam
 CLU. Pro Cluentio
 DEIOT. Pro rege Deiotaro
 DE OR. De Oratore
 DIV. De Divinatione
 DIV. CAEC. Divinatio in Caecilium

- DOM. De Domo Sua
 FAM. Epistulae ad Familiares
 FAT. De Fato
 FIN. De Finibus
 HAR. RESP. De Haruspicum Responso
 LEG. AGR. De Lege Agraria
 LEG. De Legibus
 MARCELL. Pro Marcello
 MIL. Pro Milone
 MUR. Pro Murena
 NAT. DEOR. De Natura Deorum
 OFF. De Officiis
 PHIL. Orationes Philippicae
 PIS. In Pisonem
 PLANC. Pro Plancio
 PROV. CONS. De Provinciis Consularibus
 QUINCT. Pro Quinctio
 Q ROSC. Pro Roscio Comoedo
 RAB. PERD. Pro Rabirio Perduellonis Reo
 RAB. POST. Pro Rabirio Postumo
 ROSC. AM. Pro Roscio Amerino
 RED. IN SEN. Post Reditum in Senatu
 SEST. Pro Sestio
 SULL. Pro Sulla
 TUSC. Tusculanae Disputationes
 VATIN. In Vatinius
 VERR. In Verrem
 CJ Classical Journal
 CL MED Classica et Mediaevalia
 CP Classical Philology
 CQ Classical Quarterly
 CLAUD. Claudian
 BELL. GOTH. Bellum Gothicum
 CONS. STIL. De Consulatu Stilichonis
 CONTRA EUTROP. Contra Eutropium
 CONTRA GILD. Contra Gildonem
 CONTRA RUF. Contra Rufinum
 EPITHAL. Epithalamium
 GRAT. ACT. Gratiarum Actio
 PANEG. HONOR. Panegyricus De Consulatu Honorii
 PANEG. CONS. MANL. THEOD. Panegyricus Dictus Manlio Theodoro Consuli
 PANEG. PROB. AND OLYBR. Panegyricus Dictus Probino et Olybrio Dictus
 RAP. PROSERP. De Raptu Proserpinae
 CLEM. AL. Clemens Alexandrinus
 PAEDAG. Paedagogus
 STR. Stromateis
 CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
 DIO CASS. Dio Cassius
 EPIT. Epitome
 DIO CHRYS. Dio Chrysostom
 OR. Orationes
 DIOG. L. Diogenes Laertius
 DIOD. SIC. Diodorus Siculus
 Q. CURT. RUFUS Q. Curtius Rufus
 EUNAP. Eunapius
 VS. Vitae Sophistarum
 EPIT. DE CAES. Epitome de Caesaribus
 EUR. Euripides
 ALC. Alcestis
 ANDR. Andromache
 BACCH. Bacchae
 CYC. Cyclops
 EL. Electra
 HEC. Hecuba
 HEL. Helena
 HERACL. Heraclidae
 HF Hercules Furens
 HIPP. Hippolytus
 IA Iphigenia Aulidensis
 IT Iphigenia Taurica
 MED. Medea
 OR. Orestes
 PHOEN. Phoenissae
 SUPP. Supplices.
 TRO. Troades
 EUTROPIUS
 EPIT. DE CAES. Breviarium Ab Urbe Condita
 FLOR. Florus
 FRONTO
 EP. Epistulae
 GALEN
 ANIM. MOR. CORP. TEMP. *Ταῖς τοῦ σώματος κράσεσιν αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις ἐπονται* (Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur)
 DE PLAC. HIPPOC. ET PLAT. De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis
 IN HIPPOC. LIB. DE HUMOR. COMM. Hippocratis De Humoribus Liber et Galeni in eum Commentarii tres Libri
 MIXT. *Περὶ κράσεων* (De Temperamentis)
 NAT. FAC. *Περὶ φυσικῶν δυνάμεων* (De Naturalibus Facultatibus)
 PROTREP. *Προτρεπτικός* (Adhortatio ad Artes Discendas)
 PROGNOST. DE DECUBITU *Περὶ κατακλίσεως Προγνωστικὰ ἐκ τῆς Μαθηματικῆς Ἐπιστήμης* (Prognostica de Decubitu ex mathematica scientia)
 GREG. NAZ. Gregory of Nazianzus
 OR. Orationes
 GREG. NYSS. Gregory of Nyssa
 HSCP Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
 HEROT. Herodotus
 HES. Hesiod
 CAT. Catalogus
 OP. Opera et dies
 SCUT. Scutum
 TH. Theogonia
 HIPPOC. Hippocrates
 AER. Airs, Waters, Places
 DE ARTIC. LIB. ET GAL. IN EUM COMM. De Articulis reponendis Liber et Galeni in eum Commentarius.

- EPIDEM. Epidemics
 NAT. HOM. De Natura Hominis
 HIPPOL. Hippolytus
 HAER. Refutatio Omnium Haeresium
 HOM. Homer
 IL. Iliad
 OD. Odyssey
 HOR. Horace
 ARS P. Ars Poetica
 CARM. Carmina
 EPIST. Epistulae
 EPOD. Epodi
 SAT. Sermones
 HYMM. HOM. Hymnus Homericus
 AP. Hymnus Homericus ad Apollinem
 BACCH. Hymnus Homericus ad Bacchum
 CER. Hymnus Homericus ad Cererem
 MERC. Hymnus Homericus ad Mercurium
 PAN. Hymnus Homericus ad Panem
 SOL. Hymnus Homericus ad Solem
 VEN. Hymnus Homericus ad Venerem
 IAMB. Iamblichus
 VP De Vita Pythagorica
 JOH. CHRYSOST. John Chrysostom
 JOSEPH. Josephus
 AJ Antiquitates Judaicae
 BJ Bellum Judaicum
 JHS Journal of Hellenic Studies
 JULIAN
 CAES. Caesares
 EPIST. Epistulae
 OR. Orationes
 JUST. Justinus
 EPIT. Epitome
 JUV. Juvenal
 LIBANIUS
 EPIST. Epistulae
 OR. Orationes
 LCL Loeb Classical Library
 LUC. Lucan
 LUC. Lucian
 ABD. Abdicatus
 ALEX. Alexander
 ANACH. Anacharsis
 BACCH. Bacchus
 BIS. ACC. Bis Accusatus
 CAT. Catapulus
 CYN. Cynicus
 DEMON. Demonax
 DEM. ENC. Demosthenis Encomium
 DEOR. CONC. Deorum Concilium
 D. MERET. Dialogi Meretricii
 D. MORT. Dialogi Mortuorum
 DOM. De Domo
 EP. SAT. Epistulae Saturnales
 EUN. Eunuchus
 FUG. Fugitivi
 GALL. Gallus
 HERM. Hermotimus
 HIST. CONSCR. Quo Modo Historia Conscribenda Sit
 ICAR. Icaromenippus
 IND. Adversus Indoctum
 JTR. Juppiter Tragoedus
 LAPITH. Lapithae
 NAV. Navigium
 NEC. Necyomantia
 NIGR. Nigrinus
 PAR. De Parasito
 PEREG. De Morte Peregrini
 PHILOPS. Philopseudes
 PISC. Piscator
 PR. IM. Pro Imaginibus
 PRO MERC. COND. Pro Mercede Conductis
 RH. PR. Rhetorum Praeceptor
 SALT. De Saltatione
 SOMM. Somnium sive Vita Luciani
 SYMP. Symposium
 TIM. Timon
 VH Verae Historiae
 VIT. AUCT. Vitarum Auctio
 LUCR. Lucretius
 MART. Martial
 MEN. Menander
 DYS. Δύσκολος (Dycolus)
 EPIT. Ἐπιτρέποντες (Epitrepontes)
 SAM. Σαμία (Samia)
 MIGNE
 PG Patrologiae Cursus, series Graeca
 PL Patrologiae Cursus, series Latina
 MNEMOS. Mnemosyne
 NEMES. Nemesianus
 CYN. Cynegetica
 ELC. Eclogae
 NEMESIUS
 DE NAT. HOM. De Natura Hominum
 NEP. Nepos
 OCD. Oxford Classical Dictionary
 ORIB. Oribasius
 SYN. Synopsis
 ORIG. Contra Celsum Origen
 OV. Ovid
 AM. Amores
 ARS AM. Ars Amatoria
 FAST. Fasti
 HER. Heroides
 IB. Ibis
 MED. FAC. Medicamina Faciei
 MET. Metamorphoses
 PONT. Epistulae ex Ponto
 REM. AM. Remedia Amoris
 TR. Tristia
 PAN. LAT. Panegyrici Latini
 PERS. Persius

- PETR. Petronius
 SAT. Satura
 PHILO JUDAEUS
 DE SACR. ABELIS ET CAINI De Sacrificiis
 Abelis et Caini
 PHILOSTR. Philostratus
 GYM. De Gymnastica
 VA Vita Apollonii
 VS Vitae Sophistarum
 PIND. Pindar
 ISHM. Isthmian Odes
 NEM. Nemean Odes
 OL. Olympian Odes
 PYTH. Pythian Odes
 PLAT. Plato
 PHAED. Phaedo
 REP. Respublica
 SYMP. Symposium
 THEAET. Theaetetus
 PLAUT. Plautus
 AMPH. Amphitruo
 ASIN. Asinaria
 AUL. Aulularia
 BACCH. Bacchides
 CAPT. Captivi
 CAS. Casina
 CURC. Curculio
 EPID. Epidicus
 MEN. Menaechmi
 MERC. Mercator
 MIL. GL. Miles Gloriosus
 MOSTELL. Mostellaria
 PERS. Persa
 POEN. Poenulus
 STICH. Stichus
 TRIN. Trinummus
 PLIN. Pliny, The Elder
 HN Naturalis Historia
 PLIN. Pliny, The Younger
 EP. Epistulae
 PANEG. Panegyricus
 PLOTINUS
 ENN. Enneades
 PLUT. Plutarch
 ADV. COLOTEN Adversus Coloten
 AET. Aetia Romana et Graeca
 AGES. Agesilaus
 ALCIB. Alcibiades
 ALEX. Alexander
 ALEX. M. FORTUNA AUT VIRTUTE OR. De
 Alexandri Magni Fortuna Aut Virtute, Libri II.
 AMAT. Amatorius
 ANTON. Antonius
 ARAT. Aratus
 CG. Gaius Gracchus
 CAT. MAI. Cato Maior
 CAT. MI. Cato Minor
 CIC. Cicero
 DE CAP. EX INIM. UTIL. De Capienda ex
 Inimicis Utilitate
 DEM. Demosthenes
 FAB. Fabius Maximus
 FLAM. Flamininus
 LYS. Lysander
 MAR. Marius
 PER. Pericles
 PHIL. Philopoemen
 PHOC. Phocion
 POMP. Pompeius
 PYRR. Pyrrhus
 QUAEST. CONV. Quaestiones Convivales
 QUOMODO QUIS SENT. PROF. VIRT. Quo-
 modo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus
 ROM. Romulus
 SULL. Sulla
 TG Tiberius Gracchus
 POLL. Pollux
 ONOM. Onomasticon
 PORPH. Porphyry
 VP Vita Pythagorae
 PROP. Propertius
 PRUDENT. Prudentius
 PSYCHOM. Psychomachia
 QUINT. Quintilian
 INST. Institutio Oratoria
 QUINT. SMYR. Quintus Smyrnaeus
 REL. Revue Des Études Latines
 REV. DE PHIL. Revue de Philologie
 RhM. Rheinisches Museum
 SALL. Sallust
 CAT. Bellum Catilinae
 IUG. Bellum Iugurthinum
 SHA. Scriptores Historiae Augustae
 AEL. Aelius
 AUREL. Aurelian
 ANTON. CARAC. Antoninus Caracalla
 ANT. GETA Geta
 ANT. PIUS Antoninus Pius
 GORD. TRES Gordiani Tres
 MARC. ANTON. Marcus Antoninus
 MAX. ET BALB. Maximus et Balbinus
 MAXIM. DUO Maximini Duo
 OPIL. MACRIN. Opilius Macrinus
 SEV. ALEX. Severus Alexander
 TYR. TRIG. Tyranni Triginta
 VAL. DUO Valeriani Duo
 SP. Scriptores Physiognomonici; Pseud.-Arist.
 Pseudo-Aristotle; Pol. Polemo; Adamant. Ada-
 mantius; Anon. Physiog. Lat. Anonymous *de*
 Physiognomonica
 SEN. Seneca, the Elder
 CONTROV. Controversiae
 SEN. Seneca, the Younger
 APOCOL. Apocolocyntosis
 AG. Agamemnon
 BEN. De Beneficiis

- CLEM. De Clementia
 CONSOL. AD POLYB. Consolatio ad Polybium
 CONSTANT. De Constantia Sapientis
 EP. Epistulae
 HF Hercules Furens
 HIPP. Hippolytus
 HO Hercules Oetaeus
 MED. Medea
 OCT. Octavia
 OED. Oedipus
 PHOEN. Phoenissae
 TRANQ. De Tranquillitate Animi
 TRO. Troades
 SEXTUS EMPIRICUS
 MATH. Against the Schoolmasters
 PYR. Outlines of Pyrrhonism (*Πυρρώνειοι
ὑποτυπώσεις*)
 SIL. Silius Italicus
 PUN. Punica
 SOPH. Sophocles
 AJ. Ajax
 ANT. Antigone
 EL. Electra
 OC Oedipus Coloneus
 OT Oedipus Tyrannus
 PHIL. Philoctetes
 TRACH. Trachiniae
 STAT. Statius
 ACH. Achilleis
 SILV. Silvae
 THEB. Thebais
 SUET. Suetonius
 AUG. Divus Augustus
 CALIG. Gaius Caligula
 CLAUD. Divus Claudius
 DOM. Domitianus
 TIB. Tiberius
 TIT. Divus Titus
 SYN. Synesius
 OR. Orationes
 TAC. Tacitus
 AGR. Agricola
 ANN. Annales
 GERM. Germania
 HIST. Historiae
 TER. Terence
 AD. Adelphoe
 AND. Andria
 EUN. Eunuchus
 HAUT. Heautontimorumenos
 HEC. Hecyra
 PHOR. Phormio
 TERT. Tertullian
 DE ANIM. De Anima
 DE CULT. FEM. De Cultu Feminarum
 TAPA Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association
 TRANS. CONN. ACAD. ARTS AND SCIENCES
 Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences
 THEOC. Theocritus
 ID. Idyls
 TIB. Tibullus
 TSETZES
 CHIL. Historiarum Variarum Chiliades
 VAL. FLACC. Valerius Flaccus
 ARGON. Argonautica
 VAL. MAX. Valerius Maximus
 VELL. PAT. Velleius Paterculus
 VERG. Virgil
 AEN. Aeneid
 ECL. Eclogues
 G. Georgics
 VITR. Vitruvius
 DE ARCH. De Architectura
 XEN. Xenophon
 AGES. Agesilaus
 AN. Anabasis
 AP. Apologia Socratis
 CYR. Cyropaedia
 MEM. Memorabilia
 SYMP. Symposium

APPENDIX A 1

This appendix contains noteworthy examples of the descriptions of two types found in the Homeric epics, and the Hesiodic didactic epic as well as the Homeric Hymns.

1. Descriptions of the first type, showing the general characterization of the permanent appearance of an individual:

Hom. *Il.* 1, 98; 1, 113-115; 3, 44-45; 3, 156-158; 3, 224; 3, 226-227; 7, 211-212; 9, 505-506; 10, 314-316; 11, 10-11; 22, 13; 769; 18, 414-415; 22, 401-403; 23, 65-67; 24, 375-377; 24, 559.

Od. 1, 206-208; 1, 301-302; 4, 12-14; 5, 211-213; 6, 15-17; 6, 150-151; 6, 276-277; 8, 134-137; 8, 308-311; 8, 457; 8, 521-527; 9, 256-257; 10, 112-113; 10, 395-396; 11, 336-337; 11, 469-470; 11, 550-551; 14, 175-179; 15, 331-332; 16, 14-16; 16, 174-176; 17, 336-337; 18, 66-70; 18, 192-196; 18, 219-221; 18, 248-249; 19, 124-125; 20, 194; 21, 334; 22, 156-158; 24, 16-17; 24, 252-253; 24, 367-368; 24, 373-374.

Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns: first type.

Hes. *Op.* 60-68; *Scut.* 71-72.

Hymn. Hom. *Ap.* 197-199; 201-203; *Bacch.* 4-6; 14-15; *Cer.* 275-281;

Pan 37; *Ven.* 81-85; 155-157.

2. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the momentary appearance of an individual:

Hom. *Il.* 1, 102-104; 1, 148-149; 1, 199-200; 1, 206; 1, 223-225; 2, 268-270; 3, 33-37; 3, 216-219; 3, 396-397; 3, 427; 4, 356-357; 6, 471; 6, 512-514; 9, 13-16; 9, 502-504; 10, 374-375; 10, 390; 10, 400; 11, 36-37; 11, 136-137; 11, 248-250; 11, 378-379; 11, 544-547; 12, 462-466; 13, 17-20; 13, 37; 13, 184-185; 13, 404-405; 13, 434-435; 13, 473-475; 13, 503; 14, 99-101; 15, 113-114; 15, 607-608; 16, 3; 16, 10-11; 16, 610; 17, 603; 17, 674; 17, 679-680; 18, 22-27; 18, 124; 19, 16-17; 19, 284-285; 19, 365-366; 20, 161-162; 21, 408-409; 21, 491-492; 22, 94-95; 22, 274; 23, 385; 23, 784-786; 24, 358-360; 24, 483-484.

Od. 4, 114; 4, 153; 4, 609-610; 4, 661-662; 6, 131-132; 8, 85-86; 8, 326; 8, 343; 8, 521-522; 9, 371-372; 11, 42-43; 11, 526-530; 11, 538-540; 11, 606-608; 13, 287-289; 16, 354; 16, 476-477; 17, 541-543; 18, 35; 18, 111; 18, 163; 18, 320; 19, 204; 19, 471-472; 19, 476-479; 20, 268-269; 20, 301-302; 20, 345-347; 20, 358; 21, 376-377; 21, 396; 21, 431; 22, 23-24; 22, 371; 24, 315-317; 24, 450.

Hes. *Op.* 195-196; 370-371; *Th.* 820-835; 909-911; *Cat.* 98.6; *Scut.* 71-72; 115; 144-148; 159-160; 168-169; 248-252; 386-391; 426-432; 445.

Hymn. Hom. *Bacch.* 13-16; 47-48; *Cer.* 192-194; 200; 204; 213-215; *Merc.* 29; 42-45; 278-281; 414-415; *Sol.* 9-13; *Ven.* 81-83; 181-183.

APPENDIX A 2

This appendix includes noteworthy examples of the descriptions of the two types found in other Greek and Roman epic poetry (fragments of the epic poets are not included) through the fourth century A.D.

1. Descriptions of the first type, showing the general characterization of the permanent appearance of an individual.

Ap. Rhod. 1, 204-205; 1, 668-674; 1, 1229-1230; 1, 1312-1313; 2, 37; 2, 681-682; 3, 724-725; 3, 1006-1007; 3, 1262; 4, 682-683. Claud. *Rapt. Proserp.* 2, 36-38; 3, 86-92.

Luc. 1, 402; 1, 441-443; 1, 463; 2, 51; 3, 78; 5, 274-275; 10, 127-132.

Ov. *Met.* 1, 498-501; 1, 237-239; 2, 237; 5, 39-60; 7, 705; 7, 730-731; 9, 715-717; 10, 515-517; 10, 522-523; 12, 189-190; 14, 322-324.

Prudent. *Psychom.* 148-149.

Quint. Smyrn. 1, 50-51; 1, 622-623; 1, 660; 1, 673-674; 3, 557-558; 4, 129-130; 4, 218-220; 5, 530; 6, 302-303; 6, 375; 6, 382-383; 6, 385; 7, 368; 7, 690-691; 13, 501-503.

Sil. *Pun.* 2, 208-210; 2, 414-415; 2, 431; 2, 453-454; 3, 232-253; 4, 754-755; 5, 434-436; 5, 437-440; 6, 304-306; 6, 405; 6, 407-408; 7, 651-652; 8, 463-465; 12, 242-246; 13, 861; 13, 801; 14, 530-531; 15, 133-134.

Stat. *Theb.* 1, 414-417; 1, 845-846; 2, 94-97; 2, 203-204; 4, 251-253; 4, 274; 4, 731-732.

Val. Flacc. *Argon.* 4, 240-242; 5, 363-365; 5, 373-375; 8, 30-31.

Verg. *Aen.* 1, 26-28; 1, 46-49; 1, 496-497; 1, 657; 1, 683-685; 3, 489-491; 3, 590-594; 3, 631; 4, 606; 4, 141-142; 4, 181-183; 4, 328-330; 4, 556; 4, 590-591; 5, 284; 5, 345; 6, 860-862; 7, 473-474; 11, 810; 12, 64-66; 12, 101-102; 12, 154-155; 12, 220-221; 12, 597-601; 12, 665-666; 12, 670-671; (*Ciris*) 429-432; 496-497.

2. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of permanent appearance of an individual.

Claud. *Rapt. Proserp.* 1, 81-83.

Luc. 8, 155-158; 8, 664-667; 10, 104-105.

Ov. *Met.* 3, 393-394.

Quint. Smyrn. 1, 53-61.

Sil. *Pun.* 8, 559-561; 8, 609-612; 12, 227-228; 15, 26-31; 15, 357-359.

Stat. *Theb.* 4, 743-746; 5, 25-27; *Achil.* 1, 163-164; 1, 351.

Val. Flacc. *Argon.* 5, 465-466; 5, 479-480.

Verg. *Aen.* 1, 588-591; 2, 285; 2, 677-678; 5, 646-649; 7, 328-329; 8, 265-267; 8, 393; 9, 335; 9, 477-478; 9, 583; 9, 649-652; 9, 793-795; 10, 115.

3. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the momentary appearance of an individual.

Ap. Rhod. 1, 266-267; 1, 485-486; 1, 534-535; 1, 784-785; 1, 790-791; 1, 1170-1171; 1, 1296-1297; 2, 25-30; 2, 44; 2, 49; 2, 546; 2, 664-665; 3, 120-124; 3, 129; 3, 150; 3, 297-298; 3, 371; 3, 681-687; 3, 724-725; 4, 11-12; 4, 16-19; 4, 389; 4, 465-466; 4, 470; 4, 695-697; 4, 727-730; 4, 1039-1040; 4, 1279-1280; 4, 1315; 4, 1344; 4, 1543-1545; 4, 1669-1670.

Claud. *Rapt. Proserp.* 1, 272-274; 2, 312-316.

Luc. 1, 186-190; 1, 192-194; 1, 244-247; 1, 296-297; 2, 333-337; 2, 371-373; 2, 509-510; 3, 355-357; 4, 162-164; 4, 363-365; 4, 569-570; 5, 211-217; 5, 295-296; 5, 316-321; 5, 364-367; 5, 508-510; 6, 224-225; 6, 228-229; 6, 515-518; 6, 657-659; 7, 13-16; 7, 129-130; 7, 290-292; 7, 320-322; 7, 682-683; 7, 709-710; 8, 54-61; 8, 69-70; 8, 589-592; 9, 739-740; 9, 1032-1039; 9, 1043-1046; 9, 1062-1063; 9, 1106-1108; 10, 14-15; 10, 82-85.

Lucr. 1, 32-37; 1, 90-92; 3, 152-158; 3, 476-483; 4, 1137-1140; 4, 1160-1167 (*cf.* Hor. *Sat.* 1, 343-344; Ov. *Ars Am.* 2, 657-662 and the Greek source in Plato's *Rep.* 5, 474d-475a).

Ov. *Met.* 1, 237-239; 1, 498-499; 2, 178-181; 2, 447-448; 2, 470; 2, 748-751; 2, 752; 2, 857-858; 3, 99-100; 3, 187-188; 3, 273-278; 3, 418-424; 3, 577-578; 4, 346-347; 4, 464-465; 4, 682-683; 5, 92; 5, 234-235; 5, 500-501; 5, 506; 5, 569-570; 6, 34-35; 6, 165-169; 6, 303-305; 6, 620-621; 7, 84-88; 7, 496-497; 7, 862; 8, 322-323; 8, 465-470; 8, 677-678; 8, 791-808; 9, 27; 9, 111; 9, 527; 10, 359-360; 10, 609-610; 10, 661-662; 11, 395-399; 11, 417-418; 11, 464; 13, 3-4; 13, 125-127; 13, 442-444; 13, 455-456; 13, 540-542; 14, 734; 14, 839-840.

Prudent. *Psychom.* 42-45; 48; 109-114; 116; 163-166; 178-183; 194-200; 276-277; 310-315; 335-338; 452-453; 456-457; 551; 553; 572; 604; 640-641; 699-704; 823.

Quint. Smyrn. 1, 81-82; 1, 161; 1, 563-564; 1, 643; 1, 718-719; 3, 35-36; 3, 67-68; 3, 131-132; 3, 133-134; 3, 145-146; 3, 252; 3, 537-539; 4, 345-346; 4, 460; 4, 495; 5, 237; 5, 328-329; 7, 56-57; 7, 176-177; 7, 313-314; 7, 361-364; 7, 464; 7, 488; 9, 117-118; 9, 371-375; 9, 468-472; 12, 400-412; 13, 385-394; 13, 426-427; 14, 39-47; 14, 55-58; 14, 61-62; 14, 169-172; 14, 181-184; 14, 386-387; 14, 391-398.

Sil. *Pun.* 2, 154; 3, 75-77; 3, 297-298; 4, 534-540; 4, 821; 5, 275-276; 5, 673; 6, 82-84; 6, 101; 6, 220; 6, 294-295; 6, 368-370; 6, 383-388; 6, 425-430; 6, 457; 6, 698-699; 7, 75-76; 8, 656-657; 9, 65; 9, 168; 9, 412-413; 9, 460-462; 10, 263; 10, 631-633; 11, 73-74; 11, 207-209; 11, 218-219; 11, 229-230; 11, 327-328; 11, 542-543; 12, 510; 12, 551-552; 12, 734-735; 13, 2-3; 13, 696; 13, 733-734; 13, 780; 13, 782; 13, 784; 13, 822; 14, 186-188; 15, 122-123; 16, 138-139; 16, 189; 16, 192-193; 16, 233; 16, 258; 16, 281; 16, 305; 16, 580; 17, 35; 17, 184; 17, 213-214; 17, 309-310; 17, 324-334; 17, 409; 17, 629-630; 17, 645-646.

Stat. *Theb.* 1, 186-188; 1, 414-417; 1, 477; 1, 536-539; 1, 673-675; 2, 203-204; 2, 230-235; 2, 526-527; 2, 544-546; 2, 655; 3, 77-78; 3, 326-330; 3, 367; 3, 376-377; 3, 680-681; 3, 711; 4, 380-381; 4, 496-497; 4, 581; 4, 740; 4, 743-753; 4, 768; 5, 25-27; 5, 421-426; 5, 502; 5, 613; 6, 622-623; 7, 359-361; 7, 474-475; 8, 242-244; 8, 254; 9, 702-706; 10, 166-167; 10, 606-607; 10, 688-689; 10, 756-757; 10, 840; 10, 892-893; 11, 233; 11, 327; 11, 336-337; 11, 372-373; 11, 526-527; 11, 582-585; 12, 121-123; 12, 222-223; 12, 534-535; 12, 537; 12, 588; 12, 688; *Achil.* 1, 194; 1, 270-271; 1, 308; 1, 366-368; 1, 584-585; 1, 662-664; 1, 864-866; 1, 906-908.

Val. Flacc. *Argon.* 1, 79-80; 1, 132-133; 1, 229-230; 1, 291-293; 1, 296-297; 1, 722-723; 1, 802-803; 2, 462-464; 2, 535; 2, 595; 2, 608-609; 3, 178-180; 3, 337-339; 3, 576-577; 4, 1-3; 4, 19-20; 4, 39-40; 4, 189-190; 4, 232-235; 4, 323-324; 4, 359; 4, 639-640; 4, 759; 5, 85; 5, 312; 5, 519-520; 5, 570; 6, 22; 6, 578-580; 6, 584-586; 6, 604-605; 6, 657-658; 6, 661-662; 6, 758-760; 7, 32-33; 7, 78-80; 7, 103-107; 7, 115-116; 7, 121-122; 7, 128-129; 7, 153-155; 7, 190-192; 7, 214-215; 7, 244; 7, 292-294; 7, 296; 7, 305-306; 7, 334-335; 7, 368-369; 7, 407-412; 7, 431-433; 7, 436; 7, 458; 7, 461-462; 7, 511-515; 8, 9; 8, 30-31; 8, 54-55; 8, 163-165; 8, 204-205.

Verg. *Aen.* 1, 91-92; 1, 126-127; 1, 208-209; 1, 227-229; 1, 254-256; 1, 370-371; 1, 403-404; 1, 459-460; 1, 465; 1, 480-482; 1, 494-495; 1, 689-690; 1, 709-710; 1, 719-720; 2, 1; 2, 120; 2, 220-221; 2, 270; 2, 282; 2, 403-406; 2, 568-569; 2, 681; 2, 687; 2, 724; 2, 769-770; 3, 48; 3, 320; 3, 344-345; 4, 4-5; 4, 127-128; 4, 279-280; 4, 331-332; 4, 362-364; 4, 369; 4, 371-372; 4, 388-389; 4, 449; 4, 641; 4, 642-644; 4, 689; 4, 691-692; 5, 181-182; 5, 345; 5, 555; 5, 852-853; 6, 47-51; 6, 156-157; 6, 299-300; 6, 455; 6, 467-471; 6, 685-686; 7, 249-251; 7, 291; 7, 399; 7, 415-418; 7, 446; 7, 488; 8, 152-153; 8, 222-223; 8, 310-312; 8, 520; 8, 697; 8, 709; 9, 209; 9, 521; 9, 734; 9, 740; 9, 793-794; 10, 445-448; 10, 473; 10, 742; 10, 770-772; 11, 120-121; 11, 237-238; 11, 251; 11, 479; 11, 507; 11, 800-801; 12, 70; 12, 101-102; 12, 219-221; 12, 807; 12, 829; 12, 866; 12, 665-666; 12, 915; 12, 920; 12, 930; 12, 939-940; 12, 945.

(Culex): 235-236; 254-255; 268-269; 290-291; 322-327.

(Cirix): 180; 225-226; 401-402.

4. Descriptions of the third type, showing the iconistic description of an individual.

Verg. *G.* 3, 76-88; (Moretum) 31-35.

APPENDIX B 1

This appendix includes noteworthy examples of descriptions of two types found in the fragments of early Greek elegiac, iambic, and lyric poetry. Refer-

ences are to LCL for Elegy and Iambus (EI), and *Lyra Graeca* (LG).

1. Descriptions of the first type, showing general characterization of an individual.

Anacreontea: (EI 2, 1, 6-10; 17, 1-5; 9-33; Crates: (EI) 2, 7; Ion of Chios: (EI) 1, 4. Philoxenus: (LG) 3, 8; Pindar, *Ishm.* 4, 45-51; 7, 22-23; *Nem.* 3, 19-20; *Ol.* 8, 19-20; 9, 65-66; 110-111; 141; 10, 103-105; *Pyth.* 4, 79-85; Plato, epigrams: (EI) 2, 9.

Sappho: (LG) 1, 38; 1, 58; 1, 148, 5-9; 1, 158.

Solon: (EI) 1, 13.

Theognis: (EI) 1, 933-934.

Tyrtaeus: (EI) 1, 10; 27-29, 30.

2. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the permanent appearance of an individual.

Alcaeus: (LG) 1, 398; Telestes: (LG) 3, 1, 4-5; Theognis: (EI) 1, 83-86.

Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the momentary appearance of an individual.

Alcaeus: (LG) 1, 5; Anacreon: (LG) 2, 52; 2, 84; 2, 114; Anon: (LG) 3, 90.

Bacchylides: (LG) 3, 1-2; 16-20; 3, 13; 54-56; 3, 38; 15-17;

Ibycus: (LG) 2, 2.

Pindar. *Nem.* 4, 37-41; 7, 65-67; 10, 61-63; *Pyth.* 9, 38-39.

Sappho: (LG) 1, 1, 13-16; 1, 119; 1, 120; 1, 156; 1, 2, 5-15.

Simonides: (LG) 2, 27; Scolia: (LG) 3, 30.

3. Descriptions of a third type, showing the iconistic description of an individual.

Alcaeus: (LG) 1, 51; Anacreon: (LG) 2, 59; Anacreontea: (EI) 2, 16, 6-25.

APPENDIX B 2

This appendix includes noteworthy examples of the descriptions of the first and second types found in Greek (other than those listed in Appendix B 1) and in Roman lyric and elegiac and pastoral poetry, satire, and epigram, as well as several examples of the third type.

1. Descriptions of the first type, showing general characterization of an individual.

Catull. 10, 3-4; 20, 14-15; 39, 1-2; 41, 3-4; 81, 3-4; 89, 1-4; 93, 1-2.

Hor. *Carm.* 1, 5, 3-5; 1, 9, 21-22; 1, 19, 5-9; 1, 32, 11-12; 1, 36, 17-19; 2, 8, 5-8; 2, 12, 13-16; 2, 12, 21-26; 3, 2, 6-9; 4, 9, 13-16; 4, 10, 4-6; 4, 13, 9-12; *Epod.* 17, 17-18; 17, 21-24; *Sat.* 1, 2, 89; 1, 2, 92-93; 1, 2, 123-124; 1, 3, 33-34; 1, 3, 44-48; 1, 6, 30-33; 1, 8, 25-26; *Epist.* 1, 20, 24-25.

Juv. 1, 32; 10, 45-50; 10, 296-297.

Mart. 2, 33, 1-4; 3, 8; 3, 53; 6, 29, 5-6; 6, 34, 5-6; 11, 102, 1-2.

Ov. *Am.* 1, 5, 19-22; 1, 8, 24-25; 1, 8, 33; 1, 10, 13-14; 2, 10, 23-24; 3, 2, 1-2; 3, 11, 41-43; *Ars Am.* 1, 509-510; 1, 613-614; 2, 119-120; 2, 123-124; 2, 569-570; 2, 643-646; 2, 657-662; *Fast.* 3, 437-438; 4, 223-224; 4, 305-306; 4, 309-310; 4, 541-542; *Her.* 13, 109-110; 16, 137-138; 16, 141-142; 17, 125-126; 17, 173-174; *Med. Fac.* 43-46; *Pont.* 1, 4, 1-4; 1, 10, 25-26; 4, 13; 15-16; *Rem. Am.* 317-320; 327-328; 337-340.

Petr. *Sat.* 15; 27.

Prop. 2, 2, 3; 2, 2, 5-6; 2, 5, 28; 2, 7, 7-8; 2, 7, 10; 2, 12, 23-24; 4, 7, 7-8.

Stat. *Silv.* 1, 2, 271-273; 1, 2, 276-277; 2, 7, 118-119; 3, 3,

113-114; 3, 4, 31; 4, 4, 8; 5, 3, 114-115; 5, 5, 86-87.

Tib. 1, 1, 67-68; 1, 4, 3-4; 1, 5, 43-44; 2, 5, 7-8; 3, 5, 25-26.
Occasional poetry, including panegyrics.

Auson. *Parent.* 5, 3-6; 7, 11-12; *Pro. Burd.* 17, 1-3; 20, 13-14;
Epist. 22, 24-25.

Claud. *Cons. Stil.* 2, 178-181.

2. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the permanent appearance of an individual.

Juv. 11, 154; 14, 51-52.

Mart. 1, 77; 8, 46, 1-2; 9, 76, 1-3; 9, 79, 5-6; 10, 32, 5-6; 12, 64, 1-2.

Occasional poetry, including panegyrics.

Auson. *Parent.* 8, 5-6; 9, 23-24; 14, 5-8; 16, 3-5; 17, 11-15; 19, 3-4; 23, 1-6.

Claud. *Contra Eutrop.* 2, 380-381; *Epithal.* 10, 241-242; 10, 263-271; 25, 41-43; 25, 125-127; *Paneg.* 90-91; Shorter Poems: 11, 29, 44-46.

3. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the momentary appearance of an individual.

Catull. 3, 17-18; 42, 7-9; 45, 10-12; 55, 6-8; 61, 6-10; 56-60; 157-161; 213-215; 63, 48-49; 83-85; 64, 34; 60-62; 86-87; 90-92; 110-111; 219-220; 267-268; 65, 22-24; 67, 45-46; 68a, 15-16; 30-32.

Hor. *Carm.* 1, 2, 38-40; 1, 3, 17-20; 1, 13, 5-9; 1, 19, 5-8; 1, 22, 23-24; 1, 37, 25-26; 2, 2, 23-24; 2, 12, 14-17, 25-26; 2, 16, 25-27; 3, 3, 3; 3, 3, 4, 54; 3, 4, 41-44; 3, 11, 21-22; 3, 27, 25-28; 3, 27, 66-68; 4, 1, 33-36; 4, 5, 6-8.

Epod. 4, 5-6; 5, 3-4; 5, 9-11; 7, 15-16; 10, 15-16; 17; 13, 3-5.

Sat. 1, 9, 63-66; 2, 3, 9-10; 2, 3, 177-180; 2, 4, 91-93; 2, 5, 51-55; 2, 5, 103-104; 2, 8, 58-59.

Epist. 1, 6, 12-14; 1, 14, 37-38; 1, 18, 41-43; 1, 18, 94-95; 1, 19, 12-14; 1, 19, 45-47; 2, 1, 197-198; 2, 2, 92-94; *Ars P.* 93-94; 101-102; 284-285.

Juv. 3, 104-105; 3, 185; 3, 100-101; 4, 74-75; 4, 104-105; 6, 8; 6, 418; 9, 133; 10, 33-34; 10, 191-192; 11, 204-205; 13, 76-77; 13, 241-242; 14, 56-57; 14, 109-110.

Mart. 1, 24, 1-4, 11-13; 2, 24, 7-8; 2, 41, 13-14; 4, 1, 3-4; 4, 14, 10-12; 5, 2, 7-8; 5, 51, 3-5; 5, 78, 22-24; 6, 10, 5-6; 9-10, 6, 60, 3-4; 7, 5, 5-6; 7, 12, 1-3; 7, 26, 5-6; 7, 58, 7-8; 7, 84, 5-6; 8, 61, 1-2; 9, 23, 3; 9, 24, 1-3; 9, 37, 5-6; 11, 2, 1-4; 11, 39, 13-14.

Ov. *Am.* 1, 4, 15-18; 1, 8, 35-38; 1, 11, 17-18; 1, 14, 55; 2, 1, 5-6; 2, 2, 33-34; 2, 4, 9-10; 2, 5, 15-17; 2, 5, 33-36; 2, 5, 43-44; 2, 8, 15-16; 2, 17, 7-8; 3, 1, 7; 3, 1, 9-12; 3, 1, 31-34; 3, 1, 47-48; 3, 2, 5-10; 3, 2, 67-68; 3, 2, 83; 3, 9, 45-46; 3, 14, 27-28.

Ars Am. 1, 109-110; 1, 463; 1, 573-574; 1, 729-730; 2, 49-50; 2, 201-202; 2, 311-314; 2, 451-454; 2, 691-692; 3, 73-74; 3, 287-288; 3, 507-514; 3, 553-554; 3, 729-730; 3, 801-802.

Fast. 1, 3-4; 1, 17-18; 1, 69-70; 1, 145-146; 1, 373-375; 1, 418-420; 1, 553-554; 2, 355-356; 2, 489-490; 2, 613-614; 2, 755-758; 2, 773-774; 2, 827-828; 2, 845-846; 4, 29-30; 4, 161-162; 4, 317; 4, 343-344; 4, 585-586; 5, 23-24; 5, 245; 6, 19; 6, 65-66; 6, 493-494; 6, 615-616; *Her.* 4, 71-74; 4, 77-78; 6, 25-26; 6, 71-72; 6, 145-146; 7, 69-70; 7, 183; 8, 55-58; 9, 123-126; 9, 127-129; 10, 135-138; 11, 27-28; 11, 35-36; 13, 17-18; 16, 51-52; 16, 83-86; 17, 15-17; 17, 76-78; 17, 81-84; 17, 89-90; 18, 251-252; 20, 5-7; 20, 55-60; 20, 119-120; 20, 205-208; 21, 111-114.

Ib. 559-560; *Pont.* 1, 2, 91; 2, 1, 5-6; 2, 1, 21-28; 2, 63-64; 2, 2, 79-80; 2, 2, 91-92; 2, 5, 51-52; 2, 8, 21-22; 2, 8, 39-41; 2, 8, 53-54; 2, 8, 55-56; 2, 8, 73-74; 3, 1, 1-2; 3, 1, 165-166; 3, 3, 13-14; 3, 4, 27-28; 4, 1, 5-6; 4, 4, 45-46; 4, 9, 91-92; *Rem. Am.* 587-588; 713; *Tr.* 1, 3, 59-60; 1, 4, 11-12; 27-28; 1, 8, 23-24; 2, 87-88; 512-514; 526-527; 3, 5, 11-12; 3, 7, 33-35; 3, 9, 18-19; 4, 2, 29-30; 4, 3, 9-10; 4, 3, 49-50; 4, 3, 69-70; 5, 1, 39-40; 5, 7, 17-18; 5, 8, 15-18.

Pers. 3, 80-82; 5, 91-92.

Prop. 1, 1, 1-4; 1, 3, 17; 1, 3, 19-20; 1, 5, 21-22; 1, 6, 5-6; 1, 10, 31-34; 1, 15, 39-41; 1, 18, 17-18; 2, 1, 5-8; 2, 3, 9; 2, 3, 13-14; 2, 3, 32; 2, 10, 9-10; 2, 20, 1-2; 2, 22, 11-12; 2, 23, 8-9; 2, 23, 24; 2, 34, 23-24; 3, 8, 23-26; 3, 14, 31-32; 4, 3, 27-28; 4, 8, 53-55.

Stat. Silv. 1, 1, 15-18; 1, 1, 69-70; 1, 2, 7-8; 1, 2, 11-12; 1, 2, 167-168; 1, 2, 211-212; 2, 1, 41-44; 2, 1, 108-109; 2, 1, 168-173; 2, 2, 145-146; 2, 6, 22-23; 2, 6, 38-39; 2, 6, 40-41; 2, 6, 50-53; 3, 4, 51-52; 3, 5, 11; 4, 2, 16-17; 4, 3, 40-43; 4, 2, 52; 5, 1, 64; 5, 1, 140; 5, 1, 170-171; 5, 2, 73-74.

Tib. 1, 2, 21-22; 1, 2, 33-34; 1, 6, 1-2; 1, 6, 18-19; 1, 8, 9-12; 1, 8, 43-44; 1, 8, 67-69; 2, 1, 29-30; 2, 3, 33-34; 2, 6, 43; 3, 4, 29-32; 3, 6, 33-34. Sulpicia's Garland 3, 9. Pastoral poetry.

Nemes. *Cyn.* 80-81; 243-247; *Ecl.* 2, 78-81; 3, 21-23; 3, 33-34; 4, 17.

Calp. 4, 84-86; 5, 46-48; 5, 91-94; 6, 9-11; 6, 52-53; 7, 76-78. *Theoc. Id.* 1, 32-38; 1, 89-91; 1, 95-96; 3, 18-20; 5, 35-37; 6, 8-9; 6, 25-26; 7, 128-129; 8, 72-73; 15, 11-12; 15, 127-129; 16, 8; 20, 6; 20, 9; 20, 12-16; 20, 21-24; 23, 7-8; 23, 11-14; 24, 117-118; 25, 214-215; 25, 233-234; 27, 69-70; Bion 1, 7-11, 29; 2, 17-20; Moschus 1, 7-9; 1, 12; 2, 85-88; 4, 2-3, 108-109.

Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 27-29; 4, 60; 5, 56-57; 6, 21-23. Occasional poetry, including panegyrics.

Auson. *Cent. Nupt.* 3; 4; *Epist.* 30, 11-16; *Grat. Act.* 12; 13.

Claud. *Bell. Goth.* 356-358; 376-377; *Cons. Hon.* 154-155; 354-360; 560-564; *Cons. Manl. Theod.* 217-220; *Cons. Stil.* 1, 26-27; 1, 45-47; 2, 34-36; 2, 135-137; 2, 327-328; 2, 347-348; 2, 358-359; 3, 69-70; 3, 195-197; 3, 218-219; *Contra Eutrop.* 1, 110-111; 120-123; 252-254; 257-262; 2, 25-28; 31-32; 527-529; *Contra Gild.* 1, 21-23; 174-176; *Contra Ruf.* 1, 164-165; 1, 325-326; 2, 86; 130-132; 255-256; 400-402; 410-411; *Epithal.* 10, 7-9; 11-12; 316; 319-325; *Paneg. Honor.* (396 A. D.) 30; (398) 518-519; *Paneg. Prob. and Olybr.* 117-118; Shorter poems. 30; 121-122.

4. Descriptions of the third type, showing iconistic description of the individual.

Auson. *Epist.* 26, 7-12

Mart. 4, 42, 5-10; 10, 65, 5-15.

Petr. *Sat.* 23; 97; 126.

Sen. *Apocol.* 5 Claudius; 4 Nero; 12.

APPENDIX C

This appendix contains noteworthy examples of the descriptions of the first and second type found in the Greek and Roman dramatists. For the sake of convenience the *Octavia* is included under Seneca's dramas.

1. Descriptions of the first type, showing general characterization of an individual:

Aesch. *Pers.* 323-324; *Sept.* 488.

Soph. *El.* 1177; *OC* 1256-1261; *OT* 740-743.

Eur. *Andr.* 196-198; *Hel.* 160-161; 263-264; 304-305; 577; *Med.* 1071-1072; *Or.* 918; *Supp.* 887-889.

Sen. *HF* 626-627; *Med.* 75-76; 82-83; *OT* 775-776; *Oct.* 554-555.

Arist. *Av.* 1712-1714; *Lys.* 78-80; *Pax* 524-526; *Ran.* 411-413; *Thesm.* 31; *Vesp.* 1071-1072.

2. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the permanent appearance of an individual:

Aesch. *Ag.* 737-742.

Soph. *El.* 663-664; 684-685; *OC* 285-286; 555-556.

Eur. *Andr.* 330-332; *El.* 1062-1064; *Hec.* 379-381; *Tro.* 835-837.

Sen. *HF* 472-475; 720-727; 764-767; *HO* 391-395; *Hipp.* 646-660; 795-808.

Arist. *Ach.* 566-567; *Lys.* 809-811; *Neph.* 102-104; 1112; *Pax* 395.

3. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the momentary appearance of an individual:

Aesch. *Ag.* 239-241; 270-271; 418-419; 636-640; 788-798; 1427-1428. *Cho.* 96-99; 668-671; 736-740; *Pers.* 81-82; *PV* 358; *Sept.* 536-537; 622-623; *Supp.* 197-199; 1004-1005.

Soph. *Aj.* 462-465; 1008-1011; *Ant.* 441-442; 526-530; 690-691; 795-796; 801-805; 829-831; 1231-1232; *El.* 804-807; 1184; 1230-1231; 1285-1287; 1296-1297; 1309-1310; *OC* 244-245; 319-321; 1249-1251; 1709-1710; *OT* 80-81; 447-448; 528-529; 532-535; 1303-1304; 1371-1372; 1384-1385; *Phil.* 215-216; 225-226; 257-259; 278; 367-368; 701-702; 815; 821-822; 865-866; 934-935; *Trach.* 58; 795-797; 869-870.

Eur. *Alc.* 173-174; 183-184; 205-207; 399-400; 597-600; 763-764; 773-778; 800-801; *Andr.* 130-132; 532-534; 545-546; 629-631; 744-746; 764-767; 826-827; 880-881; 1077-1078; *Bacch.* 233-236; 453-456; 606-607; 692-693; 1122-1123; 1165-1167; *Cyc.* 73-74; 210-211; 499-502; *El.* 241; 503; 558-559; 830; 947-949; 1074-1079; 1399; *Hec.* 62-66; 342-344; 441-443; 499-500; 568-579; 807-808; 968-972; 1049-1050; *Hel.* 456; 544-545; 1419; 1537-1540; 1570-1572; *HF* 98-99; 130-132; 449-450; 867-870; 931-935; 990-992; 1199-1201; 1287-1288; *Heracl.* 381-382; 633; 684; *Hipp.* 170-175; 203-204; 245-246; 274; 279-280; 852-855; 946-947; 1151-1152; *IA* 187-188; 454-455; 581-585; 635-637; 643-644; 648; 681-684; 821-822; 851-852; 993-994; 1122-1123; 1127-1128; 1238-1239; 1417-1418; 1549-1550; 1557; 1581; *IT* 76; 264-266; 268-269; 832-833; *Ion* 237-240; 582-584; 621-623; 731-732; 925-926; 1261-1263; 1437-1438; *Med.* 24-32; 92-93; 131-136; 187-189; 271-273; 689; 860-862; 903-907; 1006-1007; 1012; 1038-1042; 1118-1120; 1146-1149; 1160-1170; 1197-1199; *Or.* 225-226; 253-254; 387; 389; 456-458; 632-633; 725-726; 893-894; 957-958; 1204-1206; 1261-1266; 1317-1320; 1456-1459; 1504-1505; *Phoen.* 127-128; 145-147; 301-306; 363-364; 452-454; 960-961; 1307-1309; 1332-1334; 1364; 1440-1441; 1486-1489; *Rhes.* 710-714; 814-815; *Supp.* 21-22; 95-96; 1056; *Tro.* 36-38; 315-316; 351-352; 654-655; 772-773; 891-893; 987-988; 1022-1024.

Sen. *Ag.* 49-50; 128; 237-238; 408-409; 586-588; 710-719; 772-774; 788-789; 922-923; 949-950; *HF* 202-205; 216-219; 329-331; 640-642; 953-955; 1022-1023; 1042-1044; 1174-1175; 1178-1179; 1228-1229; *HO* 165-170; 228-230; 240-241; 250-253; 482-483; 700-702; 740-741; 796-798; 808; 833-835; 985-986; 1265-1268; 1272-1274; 1338-1340; 1347-1348; 1603-1604; 1607-1608; 1645-1647; 1684-1685; 1693-1694; 1722-1724; 1736-1737; 1745-1746; 1753-1755; *Hipp.* 360-382; 431-433; 586-587; 731-734; 829-830; 886-887; 915-919; 989-990; 1064-1065; 1168-1169; 1262-1263; 1269-1270; *Med.* 93-94; 97-98; 186-187; 380-381; 385-389; 445-446; 675-676; 738-739; 853-865; 937-939; 1020-1021; *OT* 180-190; 202; 288-290; 480-481; 509-510; 554-555; 567-568; 647-648; 654-657; 819-821; 840-842; 839; 919-924; 952-970; 1003-1007; *Phoen.* 29-30; 473-474; *Thyestes* 330-331; 416; 421-427; 505-507; 705-706; 719; 898-900; 903-906; 935-936; *Tro.* 448-450; 457-459; 464-468; 522-523; 615-617; 631; 647-648; 897; 999-1000; 1024-1025; 1088-1090; 1112-1113; 1137-1138; 1152; *Octavia* 21-22; 73-75; 108-112; 172-173; 436-437; 690-692; 698-700; 703-706; 722-723; 778-779; 820-842.

Arist. *Ach.* 1069-1070; *Av.* 1168-1169; *Equit.* 74-75; 548-550; 631; 646-647; 1272-1273; *Lys.* 5-7; 426-427; 512-514; 706-707; 886-887; 1138-1141; 1283-1284; *Neph.* 186-187; 225; 361-363; 581-583; *Pax* 481-482; 1208-1209; *Plut.* 332-334; 368-369; 422-424; 633-636; 701-702; 735-736; 756-759; 1022; *Ran.*

307-308; 561-562; 593-595; 602-604; 804; 1090-1093; *Thesm.* 852-854; 956-958; *Vesp.* 446-447; 454-455; 655; 900-901; 1031-1035; 1170-1171.

Plaut. *Amph.* 52-53; 960; *Asin.* 784; *Aul.* 592; *Bacch.* 595-596; *Capt.* 105-106; 541-542; 557; 594-596; *Cas.* 281-282; *Curc.* 190-191; 230-233; 293-294; *Epid.* 61-62; 435; 608-609; *Men.* 178-180; 753-754; 829-830; 888; *Merc.* 182; 368; 371; 404-406; 599-600; 671; *Mil. Gl.* 201-202; 870-873; *Mostell.* 810-811; 890; *Pers.* 27; 130; 546; *Poen.* 513-514; *Pseud.* 106-107; 458; 658-659; 911; 964; *Stich.* 270-271; *Trin.* 623-624; 1168.

Ter. *Ad.* 642; 863-865; *And.* 118-120; 135-136; 856-857; 878; *Eun.* 68-69; 242; 249-250; 313-317; 472-473; 558-559; 579-580; 681; 1017-1018; *Haut.* 306-307; 372-373; 700; *Hec.* 352; *Phor.* 104-105; 211; 341-342; 890.

APPENDIX D

This appendix includes noteworthy examples of the descriptions of the first and second type found in the Greek and Roman historians and biographers. I have included in these lists citations from Cicero's orations, from Pliny's panegyric on Trajan, from the later writers of panegyrics, and from Valerius Maximus. No attempt is made to include here general descriptions of personal appearance of the first type, which are not definitely linked by the authors with qualities of character (arranged in approximate chronological order).

1. Descriptions of the first type, showing general characterization of an individual.

B. Alex. 44.
Nep. 15, 3; 17, 8; 18, 11; 21, 1; 22, 3.
Sall. Cat. 5; 15; *Iug.* 6; 28.
Cic. Caecin. 27; *Cat.* 2, 22; *Rab. Perd.* 21; *Rosc. Am.* 135; *Valim.* 4.
Diod. Sic. 1, 65; 3, 8, 2; 5, 32, 2; 8, 91, 5; 15, 39, 2; 19, 81, 4; 29, 27.
Livy. 3, 11; 4, 19; 7, 9; 7, 10; 9, 16; 28, 17; 30, 1; 42, 11.
Joseph. AJ 2, 9; 6, 158; 164; 18, 3, 4.
Q. Curt. Rufus 3, 11; 4, 13; 7, 4; 7, 9; 7, 11; 8, 13; 9, 10; 10, 3.
Vell. Pat. 2, 29; 2, 41; 2, 75; 2, 94; 2, 97; 2, 107; 2, 108; 2, 117.
Val. Max. 1, 7, Ext. 4; 5, 1, 3; 5, 4, Ext. 7; 5, 8, 5; 5, 10, 2; 6, 1, 1; 6, 9, 14; 6, 9, Ext. 4; 7, 1, 1; 7, 3, 6; 8, 3, 1; 9, 2, 2; 9, 2, Ext. 5.
Tac. Ann. 1, 10; 2, 4; 2, 21; 2, 41; 2, 73; 6, 21; 11, 16; 12, 4; 12, 44; 12, 49; 12, 64; 13, 45; 15, 48; 15, 59; 15, 72; 16, 6; 16, 15; *Hist.* 1, 7; 1, 9; 1, 53; 2, 5; 2, 30; 4, 13.
Flor. 1, 13, 4; 2, 14, 3.
Just. 1, 10, 13; 12, 8, 1-2; 12, 12, 11-12; 13, 1, 10-11; 23, 4, 14-15; 36, 2, 11; 38, 8, 9.
Aur. Vict. 17, 5; 39, 1.
Epit. de Caes. 1, 20; 10, 2; 15, 4; 40, 15; 42, 6; 44, 4.
Eutrop. 10, 7.
Arr. Anab. 5, 19, 1; 7, 28, 1-2; 8, 1, 2.
Dio Cass. 7, 30, 2; 57, 18; 62, 9, 1; 10, 1; 15, 2; 77; *Epit.* 14; 16.1; 62.2; 68.31, 3; 80.
SHA. Ael. 5; *Aurel.* 6; *Max. et Balb.* (Balbinus), 7; *Tyr. Trig.* (Celsus), 29; *Ant. Geta*, 4; *Gord. tres* (Gordian 2), 18; (Gordian 3), 31; *Maxim. duo* (Maximinus 1), 2, 6; *Ant. Pius* 2, 13; *Val. duo* (Valerian 2), 8.
Amm. Marc. 17, 13, 24; 18, 6, 7; 21, 6, 4; 27, 10, 3.

2. Descriptions of the second type, showing characterization of the permanent appearance of an individual.

- Caes. *B. Gall.* 5, 14.
 Nep. 7, 1; 10, 1; 11, 3; 25, 1; 25, 22.
 Sall. *Cat.* 15 (see reference under first type).
 Cic. *Balb.* 58; *Div. in Caecil.* 46; *Cacl.* 6; *Cat.* 1, 32; *Dom.* 3;
 101; *Marcell.* 10; *Mil.* 92; *Planc.* 34; *Vatin.* 8; *Verr. Act. prim.* 21.
 Diod. *Sic.* 5, 28, 1.
 Livy 24, 5; 39, 40.
 Vell. *Pat.* 2, 110; 2, 127.
 Val. *Max.* 2, 10, 8.
 Tac. *Ann.* 2, 13; 2, 14; 2, 72; 11, 28; 13, 19; 16, 32; *Hist.* 1,
 14; 1, 22; 1, 39; 2, 1; 4, 62; 5, 14; 5, 10; *Agr.* 11; *Germ.* 4; 30.
 Plin. *Paneg.* 4, 7; 22, 2; 24, 48, 4; 55, 11; 61, 2.
 Flor. 3, 10, 20.
 Just. 5, 2, 6.
Epit. de Caes. 3, 5; 16, 7; 18, 6; 21, 4; 45, 5; 48, 8.
 Eutrop. 8, 11; 9, 27; 10, 5.
 Arr. *Epict. Diss.* 1, 24, 8, 9; 2, 8, 24–28; 3, 1, 42.
 SHA *Serv. Alex.* 4, 14; *Marc. Anton.* 16; *Anton. Carac.* 2;
Max. et Balb. (Maximus), 6; *Opil. Macrin.* 2.
 Amm. *Marc.* 14, 6, 10; 21, 6, 9; 26, 6, 7; 27, 6, 15; 28, 1, 45;
 21, 3, 2; 30, 4, 11.
 Pan. *Lat.* 2, 6, 2; 3, 5, 3; 4, 5, 4; 4, 34, 4; 5, 9, 3; 6, 4, 2–4;
 6, 17, 1; 7, 6, 4; 7, 9, 5; 8, 19, 3; 12, 7, 5; 12, 17, 1; 12, 19, 6.

3. Descriptions of the second type showing characterization of the momentary appearance of an individual.

- Caes. *B. Gall.* 1, 39; *B. Civ.* 1, 19.
 B. *Afric.* 10.
 Nep. 14, 4.
 Sall. *Cat.* 31; 61; *Iug.* 113.
 Cic. *Brut.* 141; 158; 203; 227; 235; 238; 239; 240; 261; 265;
 272; 278; 303; *Phil.* 2, 63; 11, 7; 13, 4; *Balb.* 49; *Cacl.* 14; 49;
Cat. 1, 13; 1, 17; 2, 18; 3, 13; *Clu.* 29; 54; 72; *Deiot.* 5; *Dom.*
 26; 133; *Har. Resp.* 2; *Leg. Agr.* 2, 13; *Mil.* 33; 61; *Mur.* 44; 49;
Pis. 1; 11; 12; 14; 20; 24–25; 68; 99; *Prov. Cons.* 8; 12; *Quinct.*
 97; *Rab. Post.* 35; *Post. Red. in Sen.* 12; 13; 15; *Rosc. Com.* 20;
Sest. 19–20; 22; 28; 106; *Sull.* 15; *Verr. Act. sec.* 1, 141; 2, 108;
 3, 5; 3, 23; 4, 148; 5, 161.
 Diod. *Sic.* 3, 18, 5.
 Livy 2, 10; 2, 23; 2, 58; 2, 61; 5, 44; 5, 46; 6, 13; 7, 5; 7, 10;
 7, 33; 8, 9; 9, 2; 9, 5; 9, 6 (bis); 9, 7; 9, 8; 10, 28; 21, 2; 21, 4;
 22, 7; 22, 46; 23, 9; 27, 34; 27, 48; 29, 17; 30, 14–15; 30, 44; 33,
 48; 34, 47; 38, 21; 39, 12; 39, 34; 40, 5; 40, 8; 44, 36; 44, 45; 45,
 10; 45, 40.
 Joseph. *BJ* 4, 563; 6, 7, 2; 7, 338; 340; *AJ* 2, 55; 11, 167; 12,
 24; 12, 91; 16, 44.
 Q. Curt. *Rufus* 3, 6; 4, 6; 10; 4, 13; 5, 4; 9; 5, 11; 6, 1; 6, 5;
 6, 7; 6, 8; 6, 9; 6, 11; 7, 2; 7, 5; 7, 7; 7, 8; 7, 9; 7, 10; 7, 11; 8, 4;
 8, 6; 8, 12; 9, 3; 9, 5; 9, 7; 10, 3; 10, 5; 10, 8; 10, 9; 10, 10.
 Vell. *Pat.* 2, 27; 2, 100.
 Val. *Max.* 1, 5, 3; 1, 6, 9; 1, 8, 8; 2, 6, 14; 2, 7, 6; 3, 1, Ext. 1;
 3, 1, 2; 3, 2, 7; 3, 2, 24; 3, 3, Ext. 7; 3, 8, 6; 3, 8, Ext. 1; 4, 1, 12; 4,
 1, 13; 4, 1, Ext. 2; 4, 3, 5; 4, 6, 3; 5, 1, 1; 5, 1, Ext. 6; 5, 7, Ext.
 1; 5, 7, Ext. 2; 5, 10, 1; 5, 10, Ext. 1; 5, 10, Ext. 2; 6, 1, 7; 6, 2, 4;
 6, 2, 7; 6, 3, 10; 6, 4, 3; 6, 8, 6; 6, 9, 11; 6, 9, Ext. 1; 6, 9, Ext. 2;
 6, 9, Ext. 5; 7, 2, Ext. 1; 7, 2, Ext. 2; 7, 3, Ext. 9; 7, 8, 2; 7, 8, 9;
 8, 1, 3; 8, 2, 2; 8, 7, 1; 8, 7, Ext. 2; 8, 7, Ext. 7; 8, 8, Ext. 1;
 8, 10, Ext. 1.
 Tac. *Ann.* 1, 3; 1, 7; 1, 24; 1, 42; 2, 33; 2, 53; 3, 1; 3, 9; 3,
 16; 3, 53; 4, 28; 5, 7; 6, 24; 6, 46; 12, 18; 12, 36; 13, 16; 13, 20;
 13, 40; 14, 16; 15, 36; 15, 55; 15, 61; 15, 72; 16, 4; 16, 5; 16, 24;
 16, 29; 16, 34; *Hist.* 1, 17; 1, 45; 1, 81; 1, 82; 2, 48; 2, 52; 2, 65;
 2, 70; 2, 99; 3, 3; 3, 10; 3, 56; 3, 58; 3, 65; 3, 74; 4, 11; 4, 31; 4,
 40; 4, 43; 4, 72; 4, 81, 4, 85; *Agr.* 39, 45.
 Plin. *Paneg.* 22, 6; 41, 3; 54, 1; 67, 1; 73, 1; 73, 3–4; 75, 6.
 Flor. 4, 2, 81; 4, 12, 7.
 Just. 1, 3, 1–2; 1, 5, 3; 11, 8, 8–9; 18, 4, 9; 24, 2, 10; 44, 2, 1.
 Aur. *Vic.* 3, 10.

- De Viris Ill.* 67; 76.
Epit. de Caes. 8, 4; 12, 2; 28, 3.
 App. *B. Civ.* 2, 11, 77; 6, 5, 26; 6, 15, 97; 8, 12, 82; 8, 13, 91.
 Arr. *Anab.* 5, 2, 3; *Epict. Diss.* 3, 2, 11; 3, 5, 9; 4, 1, 145; 4,
 11, 22; frg. 9, 180. *Ench.* 22; 33, 15; 38, 8.
 Dio Cass. 3, 13, 2; 8, 6–7; 5, 1, 12; 55, 11; 62, 20, 2; 74, 13,
 1; 76, *Epit.* 8, 5; 78, 11, 1.
 SHA *Serv. Alex.* 17, 29; *Max. et Balb.* 1.
 Amm. *Marc.* 14, 5, 6; 14, 7, 13; 14, 11, 22; 15, 7, 4; 16, 10, 10;
 16, 12, 36; 17, 10, 3; 17, 13, 3; 19, 9, 9; 21, 13, 9; 26, 6, 15; 26, 9,
 5; 26, 9, 9; 28, 4, 23; 29, 2, 23; 29, 5, 15; 29, 5, 46; 30, 1, 20; 30,
 4, 13; 30, 4, 19; 30, 5, 19; 30, 8, 11; 31, 13, 4; 31, 13, 10.
 Pan. *Lat.* 2, 44, 2; 3, 6, 4; 3, 29, 2; 4, 14, 2; 4, 18, 4; 4, 22, 4;
 11, 12, 4.

APPENDIX E

This appendix includes the third or iconistic descriptions from Suetonius, the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, and Ammianus Marcellinus, together with citations in the notes from the handbooks on physiognomy significant at each point, and references in Arabic numerals to important chapters from the respective authors inserted for the purpose of comparison (marked by *cf.*). No attempt is made here to include references to relevant descriptions in authors other than those under consideration. For such references see H. V. Canter, "Personal Appearance in the Biography of the Roman Emperors," *Studies in Philology* 25 (1928): pp. 385–399. In the case of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* references to the physiognomical handbooks are included, though the parallelisms are not striking, as they are in the case of Suetonius and Ammianus Marcellinus, because of the literary nature of the *Historia Augusta* (see note 60, p. 52 for Sir Ronald Syme's views on the nature and composition of these imperial biographies). Perhaps the lack of significant parallelisms in the *Historia Augusta* with the material found in the physiognomical handbooks is an argument in itself in support of the views that these biographies are pure forgeries.

SUETONIUS

JULIUS CAESAR. 45: fuisse traditur excelsa statura,¹ colore candido,² teretibus membris,³ ore paulo plenior,⁴ nigris vegetisque oculis,⁵ valitudine prospera, nisi quod tempore extremo repente animo linqui atque etiam per somnum exterreri solebat . . .

¹ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. *Cf.* Suet. 43; 75.

² Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 10; 2, 106.

³ Pol. 216; Adamant. 361; Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 86.

⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 232; Adamant. 379; Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 69. *Cf.* Suet. 20; 76. See on this point M. E. Deutsch, "Concerning Caesar's Appearance," in *CJ* 12 (1917): p. 248, and Pseud.-Arist. 809b; Pol. 224; Adamant. 373; Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 66.

⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 812b; 813a; Pol. 116; 124; 142; 146; 148; 246; 248; Adamant. 310–311; 331; 390–391; Anon. *Physiog.* Lat. 2, 41; 2, 50. *Cf.* Suet. 43; 54; 56; 58; 63; 71; 72.

ut calvitii vero deformitatem iniquissime ferret, saepe obtrectatorum iocis obnoxiam expertus.

AUGUSTUS. See text, p. 54.

TIBERIUS. See text, pp. 54–55.

CALIGULA. See text, p. 55–56.

CLAUDIUS. 30: auctoritas dignitasque formae non defuit ei, verum stanti vel sedenti ac praecipue quiescenti, nam et prolixo nec exili corpore⁶ erat, et specie canitiaeque pulchra, opimis cervicibus⁷; ceterum et ingredientem destituebant poplites minus firmi,⁸ et remisse quid vel serio agnetem multa dehonestabant: risus indecens,⁹ ira turpior spumante rictu, umentibus naribus,¹⁰ praeterea linguae titubantia, caputque cum semper tum in quantulocumque actu vel maxime tremulum.

NERO. 51: statura fuit prope iusta,¹¹ corpore maculoso et fetido,¹² subflavo capillo,¹³ vultu pulchro magis quam venusto, oculis caesiis et hebetioribus,¹⁴ cervice obesa,¹⁵ ventre proiecto,¹⁶ gracillimis cruribus,¹⁷ valitudine prospera.

GALBA. 21: statura fuit iusta,¹⁸ capite praecalvo, oculis caeruleis,¹⁹ adunco naso,²⁰ manibus pedibusque articulari morbo distortissimis, ut neque calceum perpeti neque libellos evolvere aut tenere omnino valeret.

OTHO. 12: tanto Othonis animo nequaquam corpus aut habitus competit. fuisse enim et modicae staturae²¹ et male pedatus scambusque²² traditur, munditiarum vero paene muliebrum, vulso corpore, galericulo capiti propter raritatem capillorum adaptato et adnexo, ut nemo dinosceret.

VITELLIUS. 17: erat enim in eo enormis proceritas,²³ facies rubida plerumque ex vinulentia,²⁴ venter obesus,²⁵ alterum femur subdebile impulsu olim

⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. Cf. Suet. 15.

⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 811a; Pol. 220; Adamant. 366–367; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 72; 2, 121. Cf. Suet. 3; 4; 35; 36; 38; 39.

⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 813a; Pol. 204; Adamant. 358; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 89. Cf. Suet. 33; 34.

⁹ Pol. 148; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 52; 2, 54. Cf. Suet. 34 (above).

¹⁰ Miller, *Mélanges*, p. 421.

¹¹ Pseud.-Arist. 813b. Cf. Suet. 10; 16; 19.

¹² Pseud.-Arist. 809b–810a. Cf. Suet. 26.

¹³ Pseud.-Arist. 809b; Pol. 250; Adamant. 393; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 24; 2, 120. Cf. Suet. 22.

¹⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 808a; 812b; Pol. 122; 142; 246; 270; Adamant. 313; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 39; 2, 12. Cf. Suet. 37; 42.

¹⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 811a; Pol. 218; 220; Adamant. 366–367; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 72; 2, 121. Cf. 42.

¹⁶ Pol. 210; Adamant. 361; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 85.

¹⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 810a; Pol. 194; 270; Adamant. 358; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 120; 2, 133. Cf. Suet. 27.

¹⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 813b.

¹⁹ Pol. 112; 116; 118; Adamant. 312–313; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 39. Cf. Suet. 9; 12.

²⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 811a; Pol. 228; Adamant. 376; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 71; 2, 140. Cf. Suet. 14.

²¹ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; but cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. Cf. Suet. 8; 9.

²² Pseud.-Arist. 810a; Pol. 204; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 115.

²³ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b.

²⁴ Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 108. Cf. Suet. 4.

²⁵ Pol. 210; Adamant. 361; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 85.

quadrigae, cum auriganti Gaio ministratorem exhiberet.

VESPASIAN. 20: statura fuit quadrata, compactis firmisque membris,²⁶ veluti nitentis.

TITUS. 3: in puero statim corporis animique dotes exsplenduerunt, magisque ac magis deinceps per aetatis gradus: forma egregia et cui non minus auctoritatis inesset quam gratiae, praecipuum robur, quamquam neque procera statura et ventre paulo projectiore²⁷; memoria singularis, docilitas ad omnis fere tum belli tum pacis artes.

DOMITIAN. 18: statura fuit procera,²⁸ vultu modesto ruborisque pleno,²⁹ grandibus oculis,³⁰ verum acie hebetiore³¹; praeterea pulcher ac decens, maxime in iuventa, et quidem toto corpore, (28) exceptis pedibus, quorum digitos restrictiores (28) habebat; postea calvitio quoque deformis et obesitate ventris et crurum gracilitate,³² quae tamen ei valitudine longa remacruerant.

TERENCE. 5: fuisse dicitur mediocri statura,³³ gracili corpore,³⁴ colore fusco.³⁵

HORACE. habitu corporis fuit brevis atque obesus,³⁶ qualis et a semet ipso in saturis describitur et ab Augusto hac epistula. . . . vereri autem mihi videris ne maiores libelli tui sint, quam ipse es; sed tibi statura deest, corpusculum non deest.

SCRIPTORES HISTORIAE AUGUSTAE

Aelius Spartianus. HADRIAN. 26: statura fuit procerus,³⁷ forma comptus, flexo ad pectinem capillo, promissa barba, ut vulnera, quae in facie naturalia erant, tegetet, habitudine robusta.

Julius Capitolinus. VERUS. 10: fuit decorus corpore, vultu geniatus, barba prope barbarice demissa, procerus³⁸ et fronte in supercilia adductiore³⁹ venerabilis. dicitur sane tantam habuisse curam flaventium capillorum,⁴⁰ et capiti auri ramenta respergeret, quo magis coma inluminata flavesceret.

²⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 814a; Adamant. 408–409; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 131; Cels. 2, 1. Cf. Suet. 12; 14; 15; 16.

²⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 810b; 813b; Adamant. 361; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 85. Cf. Suet. 7; 8.

²⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 810a; 813b; 814a; Pol. 200; Adamant. 354–355; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 82; 2, 115. Cf. Suet. 8; 9; 10; 11; 14.

²⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 246; Adamant. 386–387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 108.

³⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 114; 144; Adamant. 311; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 138. Cf. Suet. 19; 22.

³¹ Pol. 136; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 121.

³² Pol. 210; Adamant. 358; 361; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 85; 2, 120; 2, 133.

³³ Pseud.-Arist. 813b.

³⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 142.

³⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386–387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106.

³⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 813b.

³⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b.

³⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b.

³⁹ Pol. 230; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 28; 2, 53.

⁴⁰ Pol. 250; Adamant. 393; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 24; 2, 120. Cf. SHA 2.

Aelius Lampridius. **COMMODUS ANTONINUS**. 17: fuit forma quidem corporis iusta, vultu insubido, ut ebriosi solent, et sermone inconditio, capillo semper fucato et auri ramentis inluminato, adurens comam et barbam timore tonsoris.

Julius Capitolinus. **PERTINAX**. 12: fuit autem senex venerabilis, inmissa barba, reflexo capillo, habitudine corporis pinguiore, ventre prominulo,⁴¹ statura imperatoria.

Aelius Spartianus. **SEVERUS**. 19: ipse decorus, ingens,⁴² promissa barba, cano capite et crispo,⁴³ vultu reverendus, canorus voce, sed Afrum quiddam usque ad senectutem sonans.

Aelius Spartianus. **PESCENNIUS NIGER**. 6: fuit statura proluxa, forma decorus⁴⁴ capillo in verticem ad gratiam reflexo, vocis canorae⁴⁵ ita ut in campo loquens per mille passus audiretur, nisi ventus adversaretur oris verecundi et semper rubidi,⁴⁶ cervice adeo nigra, ut, quemadmodum multi dicunt, ab ea Nigri nomen acceperit, cetera corporis parte candidus et magis pinguis. . . .⁴⁷

Julius Capitolinus. **CLODIUS ALBINUS**. 13: fuit statura procerus,⁴⁸ capillo renodi et crispo.⁴⁹ fronte lata,⁵⁰ candore mirabili,⁵¹ ita ut plerique putent, quod ex eo nomen acceperit, voce muliebri et prope ad eunuchorum sonum, motu facili.⁵²

Aelius Lampridius. **ANTONINUS DIADUMENUS**. 3: puer fuit omnium speciosissimus, statura longiuscula,⁵³ crine flavo,⁵⁴ nigris oculis,⁵⁵ naso deducto,⁵⁶ ad omnem decorem mento composito, ore ad oscula parato, fortis naturaliter, exercitio delicatior.

Julius Capitolinus. **GORDIAN I**. 6: et erat quidem longitudine Romana.⁵⁷ canitie decora et

pompali vultu, ruber magis quam candidus,⁵⁸ facie bene lata,⁵⁹ oculis, ore fronte verendus, corporis qualitate subcrassulus.

Trebellius Pollio. **TYRANNI TRIGINTA. ZENOBIA**. 30: fuit vultu subaquilo, fuscus coloris,⁶⁰ oculis supra modum vigentibus nigris,⁶¹ spiritus divini, venustatis incredibilis. tantus candor in dentibus ut margaritas eam plerique putarent habere non dentes, vox clara et virilis.

Trebellius Pollio. **CLAUDIUS**. 13: statura procerus,⁶² oculis ardentibus,⁶³ lato et pleno vultu,⁶⁴ digitis usque adeo fortibus,⁶⁵ ut saepe equis et mulis ictu pugni dentes excusserit.

Flavius Vopiscus. **FIRMUS**. 4: fuit tamen Firmus statura ingenti,⁶⁶ oculis foris eminentibus,⁶⁷ capillo crispo,⁶⁸ fronte vulnerata, vultu nigriore,⁶⁹ reliqua parte corporis candidus sed pilosus atque hispidus,⁷⁰ ita ut eum plerique Cyclopem vocarent.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

GALLUS. 14, 11, 28: fuit autem forma conspicuus bona, decore filo corporis membrorumque recta conpage,⁷¹ flavo capillo et molli,⁷¹ barba licet recens emergente lanugine tenera, ita tamen ut maturius auctoritas emereret, tantum a temperatis moribus Iuliani differens fratris, quantum inter Vespasiani filios fuit Domitianum et Titum.

CONSTANTIUS. 21, 16, 19: figura tali situque membrorum: subniger,⁷³ luce oculorum edita,⁷⁴ cern-

⁴¹ Pol. 210; Adamant. 361; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 85. Cf. SHA 12; 13.

⁴² Pseud.-Arist. 813b; 814a; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b.

⁴³ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 248; Adamant. 392; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 22-23; 2, 92; 2, 120.

⁴⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; 814a; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b.

⁴⁵ Pol. 266; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 120. Cf. SHA 6.

⁴⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 246; Adamant. 389; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106. Cf. SHA 1; 5.

⁴⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386-387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106. Cf. SHA 1; 5.

⁴⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 813b. Cf. SHA 5; 11.

⁴⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 248; Adamant. 392; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 22-23; 2, 92; 2, 120. Cf. SHA 13.

⁵⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 230; Adamant. 377; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 27.

⁵¹ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106.

⁵² Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Pol. 266; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 58.

⁵³ Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. Cf. Fürst, *Lit. Porträt.*, p. 432. on height as a sign of beauty.

⁵⁴ Pol. 250; Adamant. 393; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 24; 2, 120.

⁵⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 146; 148; 246; Adamant. 390; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 41.

⁵⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 811a; Adamant. 376; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 71. Cf. SHA 8.

⁵⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; 814a; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. Cf. SHA 3.

⁵⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386-387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 107.

⁵⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 232; 278; Adamant. 379; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 69. Cf. SHA 6.

⁶⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386-387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106. Cf. SHA 30.

⁶¹ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; 813a; Pol. 108; 124; 142; 148; 246; Adamant. 331; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 102.

⁶² Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. Cf. SHA 13.

⁶³ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 812b; Pol. 108; 142; 148. Adamant. 331; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 52. Cf. SHA 2.

⁶⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 232; 278; Adamant. 379; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 69.

⁶⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 807a; 808a. Cf. Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 119.

⁶⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 813b.

⁶⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 811b; Pol. 142; Adamant. 325; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 49.

⁶⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 248; Adamant. 392. Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 22-23; 2, 92.

⁶⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106.

⁷⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 254; Adamant. 392; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 93-94. Cf. SHA 2; 4.

⁷¹ Pseud.-Arist. 809b; 814a; Pol. 268; Adamant. 408-409; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 131. Cf. Amm. Marc. 14, 11, 3; 14, 11, 28.

⁷² Pseud.-Arist. 806b; Pol. 248; 250; Adamant. 393; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 23; 2, 24; 2, 120.

⁷³ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106. Cf. Amm. Marc. 21, 16, 8.

⁷⁴ Adamant. 325. Cf. Amm. Marc. 21, 16, 4.

ensque acutum⁷⁵ molli capillo,⁷⁶ rasis adsidue genis lucentibus ad decorem ad usque pubem ab ipsis colli confiniis longior, brevissimis cruribus et incurvis,⁷⁷ unde saltu valebat et cursu.

JULIAN. See text, pp. 75–76.

JOVIAN. 25, 10, 14: incedebat autem motu corporis gravi,⁷⁸ vultu laetissimo, oculis caesiis,⁷ vasta procertiate et ardua,⁸⁰ adeo ut diu nullum indumentum regium ad mensuram eius aptum inveniretur.

PROCOPIUS. 26, 9, 11: corpore non indecoro nec mediocris staturae,⁸¹ subcurvus humumque intuendo semper incedens.⁸²

VALENTINIAN. 30, 9, 6: corpus eius lacertosum et validum, capilli fulgor colorisque nitor,⁸³ cum oculis caesiis semper obliquum intuentis et torvum⁸⁴ atque pulchritudo staturae liniamentorumque recta conpage maiestatis regiae decus implebat.⁸⁵

VALENS. 31, 14, 7: cessator et piger: ignei coloris,⁸⁶ pupula oculi unius obstructa, sed ita ut non minus appareat, figura bene compacta membrorum, staturae nec procerae nec humilis,⁸⁷ incurvis cruribus⁸⁸ extanteque mediocriter ventre.⁸⁹

GAULS. 15, 12, 1: celsioris staturae et candidi paene Galli sunt omnes et rutili⁹⁰ luminumque torvitate terribiles,⁹¹ avidi iurgiorum et sublatius insolentes. nec enim eorum quemquam adhibita uxore rixantem, multo fortiore et glauca, peregrinorum ferre poterit globus, tum maxime cum illa inflata cervice suffrendens.

EGYPTIANS. 22, 16, 23: homines autem Aegyptii plerique subfuscili⁹² sunt et atrati magisque maesti-

⁷⁵ Pol. 160; Adamant. 409; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 52. Cf. Amm. Marc. 21, 16, 5.

⁷⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 806b; Pol. 248; Adamant. 393; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 22; 2, 92. Cf. Amm. Marc. 14, 5, 2.

⁷⁷ Pol. 204; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 115; 2, 140. Cf. Amm. Marc. 14, 11, 4.

⁷⁸ Pol. 22; Adamant. 399; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 99.

⁷⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 142; 246; Adamant. 312–313; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 39.

⁸⁰ Pseud.-Arist. 813a–813b.

⁸¹ Pseud.-Arist. 813b. Cf. Amm. Marc. 26, 9, 11.

⁸² Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 810b.

⁸³ Pol. 244; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106. Cf. Amm. Marc. 30, 9, 2–4.

⁸⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; 813a; Pol. 142; 246; Adamant. 312–313; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 39.

⁸⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 814a; Pol. 268; Adamant. 408–409; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 131. Cf. Amm. Marc. 30, 9, 1.

⁸⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386–387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106–107.

⁸⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 809b; 813b; 814a; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 3, 1123b; Adamant. 408–409; 411; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 131. Cf. Amm. Marc. 30, 4, 2.

⁸⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 810a; Pol. 204; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 115. Cf. Amm. Marc. 31, 14, 5.

⁸⁹ Pol. 210; Adamant. 361; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 85.

⁹⁰ Pol. 238; 244; 250; Adamant. 386–387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106.

⁹¹ Pol. 142; 148; 248; Adamant. 409; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 52–53. Cf. Amm. Marc. 15, 12, 2–3.

⁹² Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 236; 244; Adamant. 386; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 107; 2, 120.

ores, gracilenti et aridi,⁹³ ad singulos motus excandescentes, controversi et reposcenes acerrimi.

PERSIANS. 23, 6, 75: sed ne generaliter corpora describamus et mores, graciles paene sunt omnes,⁹⁴ subnigri vel livido colore pallentes⁹⁵ caprinis oculis torvi⁹⁶ et superciliis in semiorbium speciem curvatis iunctisque⁹⁷ non indecoribus barbibus capillisque promissis hirsuit, omnes tamen promisce vel inter epulas festosque dies gladiis cincti cernuntur.

HUNS. 31, 2, 2: ubi quoniam ab ipsis nascendi primitiis infantum ferro sulcantur altius genae, ut pilorum vigor tempestivus emergens conrugatis cicatricibus hebetetur, senescunt imberbes absque alla venustate, spadonibus similes, compactis omnes firmisque membris et opimis cervicibus, prodigosae formae set parvi,⁹⁸ ut bipedes existimes bestias vel quales in conmarginandis pontibus effigiati stipites dolantur incompte.

ALANI. 31, 2, 21: proceri autem Halani paene sunt omnes⁹⁹ et pulchri, crinibus mediocriter fulvis,¹⁰⁰ oculorum temperata torvitate terribiles,¹⁰¹ et armorum levitate veloces, Hunnisque per omnia suppres verum victu mitiores et cultu, latrocinando et venando ad usque Maeotica stagna et Cimmerium Bosporon, itidemque Armenios discurrentes et Mediam.

APPENDIX F

In the late nineteenth century Professor Richard Förster published a survey of the tradition of physiognomics in the ancient world in an essay entitled *Die Physiognomik der Griechen* (Kiel, 1884). This short account of natural physiognomy remains the best general treatment of the subject. Förster's edition of the *Scriptores Physiognomnici* followed a decade later (2 vols., Leipzig, 1893), and contains the texts of the major ancient physiognomical writers together with a "sylloge locorum physiognomnicorum."

For other aspects of the subject Bernouilli's *Römische Ikonographie* (Stuttgart, 1882–1884) gives the pertinent material dealing with portrait heads,

⁹³ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 142.

⁹⁴ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 142.

⁹⁵ Pseud.-Arist. 812a; Pol. 244; Adamant. 386; 387; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 106; 2, 107; 2, 120. Cf. Amm. Marc. 23, 6, 80.

⁹⁶ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Pol. 182; 248; Adamant. 409; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 102. Cf. Amm. Marc. 23, 6, 76.

⁹⁷ Pseud.-Arist. 812b; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 29. Cf. Amm. Marc. 23, 6, 80: adeo autem dissoluti sunt et artium laxitate vagoque incessu se iactantes ut effeminatos existimes. See Pseud.-Arist. 808a; Pol. 276; Adamant. 400–401.

⁹⁸ Pseud.-Arist. 807a; 813b; Pol. 220; 268; Adamant. 366–367; 408–409; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 72–73; 2, 131. Cf. 31, 2, 9; 31, 2, 11; 31, 2, 12.

⁹⁹ Pseud.-Arist. 813b; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 4, 7, 1123b. Cf. Amm. Marc. 31, 2, 22.

¹⁰⁰ Pol. 250; Adamant. 393; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 24.

¹⁰¹ Pseud.-Arist. 807b; Adamant. 409; 414; Anon. Physiog. Lat. 2, 52–53.

coins, medals, and painting. H. P. L'Orange's *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947) has demonstrated in portrait sculpture the significant relationship between art and physiognomical theory. C. Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig, 1890) has dealt in detail with gestures as such, for example, in the field of oratorical delivery. The very recent publication of Richard Brilliant's *Gesture and Rank in Roman Art* (New Haven: Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 14, 1963) is an important addition to our knowledge of the use of gestures to denote status. George Hanfmann's "Observations on Roman Portraiture" in *Latomus* 11 (1953) contains a masterly analysis of Roman portrait heads in relation to a study of the concepts of personality, and points the way to further work on this subject in art. Bouché-

Leclercq's *L'Astrologie Grecque* (Paris, 1899) and F. H. Cramer's *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia, Memoirs, 37, 1954) have provided rich sources for the predictive side of physiognomy (astrological physiognomy), a significant phase of the subject more fully developed in the Middle Ages.

Permission to use in modified form articles which I had published earlier in the *Transactions and Proceedings* of the American Philological Association and in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (cited under Abbreviations A, p. 84) has been granted by the American Philological Association and by the Harvard University Press. The Harvard University Press has also kindly granted permission to quote specific passages from certain volumes in the Loeb Classical Library.

INDEX ¹

- Abderites, 20
 Achilles, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 70, 82
 Achilles Tatius, 73
Actio, 13, 22, 40
Actores, 41
 Adamantius, the sophist, *Physiognomonica*, 5, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 38, 46, 47, 54, 55, 57, 58, 74, 75, 76, 93, 94, 95, 96
 Aeneas, 32, 63, 64
 Aeschylus, 6, 34, 35, 91, 92
 Aethiopians, 20
 Agamemnon, 22, 40, 59, 60, 82
 Agricola, 49, 65
 Ajax, 22, 60
 Albertus Magnus, 72
 Alcaeus, 90
 Alcibiades, 20, 51
 Alcmaeon of Croton, 17, 18, 20
 Alexander of Aphrodisias, 43
 Alexander the Great, 14, 16, 17, 56, 57, 58, 64
 Alexandrian Biographers, 53
 Alexandrian love poetry, 70
 Allbutt, T. C., 18
 Allport, G., 38
 Ambrose, Saint, 74, 77, 78, 79
 American Philological Association, *Transactions and Proceedings*, 97
 Ammianus Marcellinus, 6, 15, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 92, 93, 95, 96
 Amory, A., 61
 Anacreon, 90
Anacreontea, 68, 90
Analytica Priora, 7, 8, 23, 24
 Anchises, 63
 Anderson, W. S., 29
 Andromache, 32, 34, 61, 63
 Anonymous Latin handbook, *de Physiognomonica*, 5, 16, 17, 34, 35, 54, 55, 56, 72, 76, 93, 94, 95
 Antioch, 77, 82
 Antonine Emperors, 58
 Antoninus Pius, 12
 Antony, 44
 Apelles, 57
 Apollonius Rhodius, 31, 62, 63, 66, 70, 89
 Apollonius of Tyana, 45, 51
 Appian, 93
 Apuleius, 6, 16, 72, 73
 Arcadians, 47
 Arcadius, Emperor, 82
 Archilochus, 67
 Ares, 60
 Ariadne, 64, 69
 Aristides, 11, 24
 Aristophanes, 6, 33, 35, 46, 67
 Aristotelian Physiognomical Characterization, 67
 Aristotelian School, 17, 24, 26, 66, 75, 81
 Aristotle, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 38, 39, 40, 41, 47, 50, 51, 53, 91, 92, 93, 94
 Arnim, F. von, 27
 Arrian, 27, 92, 93
 Artemidorus, 13, 74
 Asiatics, 19
 Asmus, R., 80
 Athanasius, 77
 Athena, 61, 62, 63, 82
 Athens, 20
 Attic orators, 6, 41, 46
 Atticus, 49
 Auctor ad Herennium, 40, 41, 42
 Augustine, Saint, 74
 Augustus, Emperor, 20, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 74
 Aulus Gellius, 27, 28, 46, 82
 Aurelius Victor, 50, 92, 93
 Ausonius, 91
 Bacchylides, 90
 Baehrens, A., 44, 76
 Bailey, C., 26
 Basil the Great, 78, 79
 Basil Minimius, 80
 Basore, J. W., 29
 Beauty (*καλλος*), 34, 35, 67, 73
 Bellum Africum, 93
 Bellum Alexandrinum, 92
 Benedictines of Saint-Maur, 76
 Bernoulli, J. J., 53, 96
 Birley, A. R., 52
 Bonnard, A., 67
 Bouché-Leclercq, 97
 Bowra, C. M., 31, 68
 Braggart Soldier, 38
 Brilliant, R., 97
 Briseis, 61
 Britannicus, 52
 Burgess, T. C., 40, 82
 Bury, R. G., 73
 Bussemaker, U. C., 75
 Butler, H. E., 42, 69
 Byrenna, 73
 Caesar, 44, 64, 65, 93
 Caesarius, Saint, 78, 80
 Caligula, Emperor, 29, 30, 50, 53, 54, 55
 Calpurnius Siculus, 91
 Camden, C., 56
 Cameron, A., 52
 Candidus, 72
 Canter, H. V., 52, 93
 Caplan, H., 40, 41
 Carcopino, J., 12
 Cassandra, 63
 Catiline, 44, 49, 50
 Cato, 28, 33, 64
 Catullus, 6, 47, 64, 68, 69, 90, 91
 Cave, Mithraic, 80
 Celsus, 94
 Celts, 11, 12, 75
 Chaldaean Astrologers, 20, 74
Charakterismos, 28, 30, 32, 33, 40
 Chariton, 73
 Charlemagne, 52
 Chiron, 66
Cholerici, 18
 Chrysanthius, 82
 Chrysippus, 11, 27
 Church Fathers, 6, 15, 22, 78, 80
 Cicero, 6, 13, 19, 20, 27, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 50, 74, 75, 79, 92, 93
 Cinaedus (Iecher), 11, 26, 35
 Claranus, 29
 Clark, S. B., 69, 78
 Clarke, W. K. L., 78
 Claudia, 47
 Claudian, 89, 91
 Claudius, Emperor, 50, 52, 53
 Claudius Mamertinus, 76
 Cleanthes, 11, 13, 26, 81
 Clement of Alexandria, 27, 30, 51, 67, 79
 Cleopatra, 64
 Clodius, 43, 44
 Cohoon, J. W., 13, 34, 67
 Coleridge, E. P., 30
 Columella, 17
 Constantine, 44, 58, 76
 Constantinus Africanus, 19
 Constantinus Manasses, 58
 Constantius, 15, 75, 76, 77, 78
 Conybeare, F. C., 46
 Corinna, 70
Corpus ingens, 6
 Cousin, J., 50, 51
 Cramer, F. H., 73, 74, 76
 Crassus, 44
 Crates, 90
 Cremutius Cordus, 49
 Crosby, H. L., 14, 34, 67
 Cumont, F., 73, 74
 Cynthia, 69
 Cyril of Alexandria, 51
 Cyrus, 46
 Daitz, S. G., 48
 Daremberg, C., 75
 Dares, 45
 Deidamia, 66, 70
 DeLatte, A., 27
 Demetrius of Phalerum, 51
 Demosthenes, 51
 Deutsch, M. E., 52, 93
 Dicaearchus, 45, 51
 Dictys of Crete, 52
 Dido, 32, 62, 63, 64, 68
 Diels, H.-Kranz, W., 17, 18
 Dio Cassius, 92, 93

¹ This index has been prepared with the constructive and perceptive cooperation of Mrs. Helen B. Cole, of the staff of the Palmer Library, Connecticut College.

- Dio Chrysostom, 11, 13, 26, 34, 58, 67, 82
Diodorus Siculus, 92, 93
Diogenes the Babylonian, 11
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 51
Dodds, E. R., 15
Domanski, B., 81
Domitian, Emperor, 44, 52, 53, 58, 74
Domitius Corbulo, 48
Dorey, T. A., 36, 52
Dracontius, 68
Dudley, D. R., 36
Duff, J. D., 64, 65, 83
Duff, J. W., 83
- Edelstein, L., 18, 20, 27
Edgar, C. C., 39
Edmonds, J. M., 67
Effictio, 40
Egyptian, 6, 9, 11, 20, 52, 64
Egyptian-Greek legal forms, 39, 52
Eikon, 40
Eikonismos, 28, 32, 33, 40, 53
Einhard, 52
Ekphrasis, 40, 45
Elegiac poetry, 67
Ellis, R., 68, 69
Empedocles, 10, 11, 18, 22, 38, 39
Encomium Calvitii, 82
Epicurean School, 5, 24, 26, 27
Epicurus, 26
Epitome de Caesaribus, 92, 93
Equality (*ισονομία*), 17
Ernout, A., 69
Ethiopia (ns), 9, 22
Eumaeus, 61
Eunapius, 82
Eunica, 68
Euphrates, 11
Euripides, 6, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 62, 67, 69, 70, 91, 92
Europeans, 19
Eurybates, 59, 61
Eurycleia, 61
Eustathius, 53, 67
Eusthenes, 10, 71
Eutropius, 50, 92, 93
Evil-looking (*κακ' ὁσώμενος*), 59
Excellence (*ἀρετή*), 26
Eyes, beautiful (*καλὰ ὄμματα*), 34
- Facies*, 36, 69, 70, 71
Fairbanks, A., 45
Fairclough, H. R., 63
Fannius Chaerea, 43
Farquarson, A. S. L., 27
Favorinus, 11, 12, 13
Flashar, H., 17
Flavius, son of Verus (Philostratus), 45
Flickinger, R., 33, 34
Florus, 50, 92, 93
Förster, R., 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 27, 29, 30, 41, 52, 53, 58, 72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 96
Fordyce, C. J., 69
Form, (*εἶδος*), 15, 34, 45, 67
Foster, B. O., 48
Frazer, J. G., 70
Freeman, K., 18
Freese, J. H., 43
Fritz, K. von, 27
- Forma eximia*, 6, 36, 70, 71
Fürst, J., 37, 39, 52, 54, 70, 73, 95
- Gabinus, 43, 44
Galen, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 38, 59, 74, 75, 80, 81
Gardner, R., 43, 44
Gaselee, S., 73
Gauls, 48
Gerald of Cremona, 17
Germanicus, 48, 49
Germans, 48, 75
Gestus, 29, 41
Glover, T. R., 80
Gnaeus Pompey, 44
Godley, A. D., 46
Good health (*εὐκρασία*), 17, 81
Good height (*εὐμεγέθης*), 39, 53
Gorgias, 34
Gossage, A. J., 52
Gow, A. S. T., 68
Graeco-Roman period, 27, 39
Granger, F., 20
Greatness of soul (*μεγαλοψυχία*), 22
Greeks, 14, 15, 16, 46, 52
Greek classical tragedy, 28, 33
Greek comedy, 35
Greek drama, 29, 30, 33
Greek new comedy, 36
Greek tragedians, 29
Gregory of Nazianzus, 15, 46, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80
Gregory of Nyssa, 77, 80
Grene, D., 35
Gummere, R. M., 11, 28, 29
Guthrie, K. S., 58
- Hadrian, Emperor, 11, 12, 13, 16, 51, 57
Hamilcar, 48
Hanfmann, G. M. A., 58, 97
Hannibal, 48, 65
Hanson, J. A., 36
Harmon, A. M., 22, 72
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 6, 97
Hasebroek, J., 39
Haskins, C. H., 19
Hector, 32, 58, 60, 61, 63, 82
Heinichen, F. A., 76
Helen of Troy, 34, 58, 59, 60, 67, 69, 70
Hellenic race, 16, 23
Hellenistic age, 10, 28, 37, 38, 50
Hellenistic drama, 35
Hellenistic saviour-type, 57
Helmreich, G., 24
Hendrickson, G. L., 44
Hera, 60, 62
Heracles at the Crossroads, 13, 21, 46
Hercules, 33, 35, 42, 45, 51, 57, 65
Hermippus, 51
Herodes Atticus, 11, 13, 79
Herodotus, 6, 11, 46
Hertlein, F. K., 76
Hesiod, 89
Hett, W. S., 7, 8
Hieronymus of Rhodes, 51
Hippocrates, 5, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 28, 46, 75
Hippocratic corpus, 19, 22, 27
Hippocratic school, 10, 17, 18, 20
- Hippolytus, 27, 31, 32
Historia Augusta, 50, 51, 52, 93
Historical-political type (biography), 51
Holland, P., 52
Holmes, P., 22
Homer, 5, 6, 13, 32, 34, 35, 51, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 82, 89
Honorius, 75
Honorius of Autun, 17, 18, 19
Horace, 6, 21, 38, 41, 65, 71, 90, 91, 94
How, W. W., 46
Hubbell, H. M., 41
Humoral Psychology, 42
Humors, 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 29, 75, 81, 82
Hunt, A. D., 39
Hutton, M., 49
Hymni Homerici, 89
Hypocrisis, 40
- Iambic poetry, 67
Iamblichus, 27, 81
Ibicus, 90
Ill-proportioned body (*σῶμα ἀσύμμετρον*), 9
Imagines (Philostratus the Elder and the Younger), 45
Imperial saviour-type, 57
Incessus, 29
Indians, 20, 47
Instrument (*ὄργανον*) of the soul, 81
Isocrates, 34
- Jackson, J., 49
Jaeger, W. W., 18, 81
Jason, 62, 63, 65, 70
Jax, K., 73
Jerome, Saint, 77
Johannitus (Honein ibn Ishak), 18
John Chrysostom, 80
John of Salisbury, 19
Jones, W. R. S., 19
Josephus, 92, 93
Jowett, B., 20, 25
Jugurtha, 49
Julian, Emperor, 15, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82
Justinus, 50, 92, 93
Jüttner, H., 11, 12, 80
Juvenal, 6, 29, 71, 77, 90, 91
- Kelter, E., 16
Kennedy, G., 34
Kennedy, M. J., 76
Keyes, C. W., 42
Klibansky, R., 17, 18
Krasis (mixture), 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 25, 75, 81
- Laertius, Diogenes, 11, 26, 51
Laeto vultu, 6, 59
Laistner, M. L. W., 75, 77
Lateranus, 48
Laudatio funebris, 78
Lavater, J. K., 5
Lehmann, P., 19
Lehmann-Hartleben, K., 45
Leo, F., 51
Leonine man, 16
Lesbia, 68, 69
Lessing, G. E., 58

- Libanius, 15, 77
 Libo Drusus, 49
 Lion, 7, 9, 22, 25, 26, 45, 53, 54, 60, 76, 77
 Literary Biography, 51
 Livia, 49
 Livingstone, R. W., 18
 Livy, 47, 48, 57, 66, 75, 92, 93
 Lloyd, G. E., 17
 Longer rules of asceticism, 78
 Looking fiercely (*ὀρόδρα ἰδών*), 59
 L'Orange, H. P., 57, 58, 97
 Lord, L. E., 43, 44
 Loxus, 10, 14, 16, 17
 Lucan, 64
 Lucian, 13, 22, 72, 77, 82, 89
 Lucilius, 29
 Lucius, 73
 Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, 47
 Lucretia, 70, 71
 Lucretius, 21, 26, 89
 Lund, F. B., 19
 Lusius Quietus, 12
 Lyric poetry, 67
 Lysippus, 57

 McCauley, L. P., 80
 McDonald, J. M. S., 39
 Macé, A., 53
 Macrochir, 49
 Magie, D., 52
 Manilius, M., 19
 Marcia, 64
 Marcus Aurelius, Emperor, 12, 27, 50
 Marcus Cicero, 79
 Marius, 44
 Marti, B., 29, 30, 31, 33
 Martial, 6, 72, 90, 91
 Masinissa, 48, 66
 Mask Types, 34, 37, 38, 42
 Maximus of Ephesus, 82
 Maximus of Tyre, 13
 Medea, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 42, 62, 63, 64, 65, 70
 Medium height (*μέσος μεγέθει*), 39, 53
 Megasthenes, 47
Melancholici, 18
 Menander, 35, 71
 Menelaus, 60, 70, 82
 Mesk, J., 12
Metensomatosis, 22
 Meyerhof, M., 19
 Migne, PG, 15, 78, 80, 81
 Migne, PL, 18
Miles Gloriosus, 36, 67
 Miller, F. J., 30, 94
 Miller, M. E., 52
 Misch, G., 38
 Misener, G., 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21, 28, 33, 35, 36, 40, 45, 46, 51, 52, 56, 58, 72, 80
 Mitteis, L., 39
 Momigliano, A., 15, 50
 Moore, F. G., 47, 48
Motus animi, 41, 42
 Mozley, J. H., 66, 71
 Müller, I., 25, 27
 Murray, A. T., 58, 59, 60
 Myth of Er, 22

 Naevolus, 71
 Narcissus, 52

 Nemesianus, 91
 Nemesius of Emesa, 21, 74, 80, 81, 82
 Nepos, Cornelius, 49, 50, 92, 93
 Nero, Emperor, 28, 49, 50, 53, 58
 Neugebauer, O., 73
 New comedy, 33, 35
 New Sophistic, 12, 24
 Nisbet, R. G. M., 43
 Nixon, P., 36
Notatio, 40

 Odysseus, 32, 35, 44, 59, 60, 61, 63, 82
 Oedipus, 35
 Ogle, W., 25
 Old comedy, 33, 35, 39
 Oribasius, 15, 18, 26, 74, 75
 Origen, 17
 Otho, 52, 53
 Otis, B., 63
 Ovid, 6, 64, 69, 70, 71, 89, 90, 91

 Pack, R. A., 28, 77
 Page, D., 68
 Panaetius, 74
Panegyrici Latini, 93
 Panofsky, E., 17, 18
 Pantheia, 45
 Panther, 7, 9, 54, 55
 Papyri, 37, 39, 41, 53
 Paris, 70
 Parmenides, 18, 20
 Parrhasius, 46
 Passion (*δράγη*), 23
 Pearson, A. C., 26, 27
 Pease, A. S., 19
 Peck, A. L., 23
 Penelope, 61
 Peribonius, 71
 Periclean Age, 6
 Peripatetic School, 5, 7, 9, 15, 21, 28, 49, 50, 51
 Perrin, B., 56
 Persians, 20, 46, 77
 Persius, 41, 42, 91
 Petronius, 90, 91
 Phaedra, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32
 Phaedrus, 71
 Phillimore, R., 58
 Philodemus, 41, 43
 Philo Judaeus, 46
 Philostrati, 12, 13, 21, 24, 44, 45, 46, 61
 Philoxenus, 90
Phlegmatici, 18
 Phocylides, 67
 Phoenicians, 20
 Phrynichus, 73
 Physiognomic consciousness, 5, 6, 28, 41, 62
 Physiognomics (*φυσιογνωμονεῖν*), 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 46, 62, 67, 73, 74
Physiognomonica Latina, 16, 17
Physiognomontes, 24
 Pickard-Cambridge, A. W., 36, 37, 38
 Pindar, 68, 90
 Piso, C., 41, 43, 44, 49
 Plato, 5, 6, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 39, 46, 47, 51, 73, 75, 77, 81, 82, 90
 Plautus, 6, 35, 36, 37, 92
 Pliny the Elder, 14, 23, 50
 Pliny the Younger, 44, 49, 50, 51, 93

 Plotinus, 58
 Plutarch, 12, 26, 49, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 77
 Polemo of Laodicea, Rhetor, *de Physiognomonica*, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 24, 25, 38, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 74, 76, 80, 82, 93, 94, 95, 96
 Pollux, Julius, 21, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 53, 72, 73
 Polybius, 46, 47
 Polybus, 18
 Pompeius Trogus, 50
 Pompey, 44, 57, 65, 77
 Porphyrio, 27
 Pöschl, V., 63
 Posidonius, 27, 28, 47, 60, 74
 Pratt, N. T. Jr., 29, 30
 Preisigke, F., 39
 Priam, 60, 62, 63
 Prodicus, 13, 46, 65
 Prohaeresius, 82
 Prometheus, 34
Pronuntiatio, 13, 22, 40, 41, 42
 Propertius, 69, 70, 90, 91
 Protadius, 83
 Protesilaus, 45
 Prudentius, 89, 90
 Pseudo-Aristotelian handbook, *Physiognomonica*, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 34, 35, 38, 46, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 66, 73, 76, 93, 94, 95, 96
 Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata*, 18, 47
 Pseudo-Callisthenes, 57
Publicani, 28
Pulchritudo, 36
 Pythagoras, 5, 27, 28, 46, 51, 74, 82
 Pythagorean School, 17, 27, 28

 Quinn, K., 68
 Quintia, 68, 69
 Quintilian, 13, 22, 33, 40, 41, 42, 53, 75
 Quintus Catulus, 47
 Quintus Curtius Rufus, 50, 75, 92, 93
 Quintus Smyrnaeus, 89, 90

 Rackham, H. L., 22, 50
 Raeder, J., 75
 Ramsay, G. G., 71
 Rand, E. K., 52, 70
 Rhetorical theory and practice (*ars rhetorica*), 39, 40, 41, 60
 Rohde, E., 27, 73
 Rolfe, J. C., 28, 52, 76
 Roman comedy, 35, 36, 37, 41
 Roman *Dignitas*, 83
 Roman people, 20
 Roman republic, 83
 Roman tragedy, 28
 Rose, H. J., 41
 Rose, V., 7, 15
 Ross, W. D., 7
 Rutilius Namatianus, 83

 Sallust, 49, 50, 92, 93
 Sandys, J. W., 68
Sanguinei, 18
 Sappho, 31, 62, 67, 68, 90
 Sarton, G., 20
 Satire, 71
 Satyrus, 51

- Saxl, F., 17, 18
 Scar (οὐλή), 39, 53, 61
 Schaff, P., 79
Schema, 40, 78
 Schwendemann, J., 50
 Scipio Africanus, 47, 48, 57, 65, 66, 75, 83
 Scopelian, 11, 13, 24
 Scriptores Historiae Augustae, 50, 53, 92, 93, 94, 95
 Scythians, 6, 11, 20, 75
 Seaton, R. C., 62
 Sejanus, 48, 49
 Semeiotics, 9
 Semonides, 67
 Seneca, the Younger, 6, 11, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 80, 91, 92
 Seneca, Rhetor, 77
 Septimius Severus, 58
 Severus Alexander, 74
 Sextus Empiricus, 73
 Showerman, G., 70
 Silanus, 49
 Silius Italicus, 57, 65, 66, 89, 90
 Simaetha, 68
 Simonides, 90
 Singer, C., 18, 23
 Single rule (μοναρχία), 17
 Sittl, C., 97
 Smolka, F., 39
 Smyrna, 11, 12, 24, 51
 Socrates, 10, 15, 16, 20, 21, 42, 43, 46, 51, 73
 Solon, 90
 Sonkowsky, R. P., 41
 Sophocles, 6, 32, 33, 35, 38, 91, 92
 Spengel, L., 40
 Speusippus, 51
 Spirit (πνεῦμα), 23
 Stanford, W. B., 61
 Statius, 66, 89, 90, 91
 Stoic School, 5, 10, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 58, 81, 82, 83
 Strabo, 11, 27
 Stratton, G. M., 18
 Stuart, D. R., 51, 56
 Suetonius, 6, 29, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 71, 74, 75, 77, 93, 94
 Suidas, 80
 Sulla, 56, 57
 Sulpicius Severus, 77
 Syme, R., 44, 51, 52, 93
 Synesius, Bishop of Cyrene, 80, 82
 Syrians, 20
 Tacitus, 44, 47, 48, 49, 65, 75, 76, 92, 93
 Taylor, H. O., 19
 Telemachus, 32, 59, 60, 61
 Telestes, 90
 Telfer, W., 21, 80, 81
Temperamentum, 17
 Terence, 36, 37, 92, 94
 Tertullian, 22, 79
 Terzaghi, N., 82
 Theocritus, 10, 68, 91
 Theognis, 30, 67, 90
 Theophrastus, 9, 18, 35, 38, 39, 41, 51
 Thersites, 22, 36, 40, 58, 59, 67, 68, 80
 Theseus, 32, 64, 69
 Thetis, 66
 Thompson, D. W., 23, 25
 Thompson, E. A., 75
 Thracians, 6, 11, 20, 75
 Thrasymachus, 40
 Thucydides, 6, 46
 Tiberius, Emperor, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 65
 Tibullus, 91
 Timocrates, 11, 13, 24
 Timotheus of Athens, 51
 Titus, Emperor, 52, 53
 Tortelli, G., 58
 Townend, G. B., 52
 Trajan, Emperor, 11, 44, 49, 51
 Tredennick, H., 7
Tropos, 40
Truci vultu, 6, 59
 Tyrtaeus, 90
 Ussher, R. G., 39
 Valerius Flaccus, 89, 90
 Valerius Maximus, 50, 92, 93
 Van Hook, L. R., 34
 Van Wageningen, J., 17, 18
 Varro, 51
 Velleius Paterculus, 92, 93
 Verres, 44
Vir bonus, 83
 Virgil, 6, 28, 31, 32, 33, 63, 64, 65, 66, 89, 90, 91
De Viris Illustribus, 93
 Vitruvius, 20
 Von Premerstein, A., 12
Vultus, 29, 41
 Wace, H., 79
 Walbank, F. W., 47
 Walsh, J., 24
 Waszink, J. H., 22
 Watts, N. H., 43, 44
 Webster, T. B. L., 37, 38, 39
 Well proportioned body (σῶμα σὺμμετρον), 53
 Wells, J., 46
 Wilamowitz-Möellendorf, U. von, 35
 Wilcken, U., 39
 William of Conches, 19
 Wingate, S. D., 17
 Wolfson, H. A., 81
 Wright, W. C., 77, 80
 Xenophanes, 67
 Xenophon, 20, 21, 27, 45, 46
 Zeno, 11, 26, 27, 51
 Zeus, 60, 82
 Zoilus, 72
 Zopyrus, 6, 10, 13, 42, 43