

Maciej Kokoszko

HEROIC PORTRAITS IN THE FIFTH BOOK OF  
JOHN MALALAS' *CHRONICLE*

The greater part of the fifth book of John Malalas' *Chronicle* is devoted to the Trojan War<sup>1</sup>. It tells the story of the conflict's mythical origins, recounts the conduct of hostilities, and also describes some aspects of the return trips of the most important Greek heroes, i.e. Odysseus<sup>2</sup> and Agamemnon<sup>3</sup>.

Furthermore, the book includes a series<sup>4</sup> of portraits of eminent Greeks and Trojans, all of whom play a significant part in its narrative. Two main enumerations of these characters can be discerned. The descriptions of the Greeks open up with the portrait of Meriones and close with the depiction

<sup>1</sup> I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Mr Maciej Zakrzewski for translating the present paper into English.

<sup>2</sup> *Joannis Malalae Chronographia*. Ex recensione L. Dindorfii. Accedunt annotationes et Ric. Bentleii epistola ad Io. Millium, Bonnae 1831, (later *Malalas*), V, p. 114–122.

<sup>3</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 133. Malalas then proceeds to give a mythical report of what happened to Orestes. This „Orestiad” describes Orestes' arrival in the vicinity of Antioch, his subsequent purification, and also contains Malalas' elucidation of the meaning of a certain „Fugitive” statue in Antioch – *Malalas*, V, p. 133–142. It is apparent that the author attempted to draw a very close link between the Trojan myth and the origins of his native city.

<sup>4</sup> A similar layout is visible in the so-called „Dares” – *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae Historia*. Recensuit F. Meister, Lipsiae 1873, p. 12–13, 14–17. Many different theories have been put forward in order to explain the similarity in the sequence and contents of the „Excidio” and *Malalas' Chronicle*. Haupt assumed that the analogy did not stem from the fact that one work utilised the other, but rather from a common tradition which he associated with a certain chronicle, allegedly written by Sisyphos of Kos. Since both Dictys and Dares profited from Sisyphos' narrative, this would explain why the points of similarity between the portraits from the *Chronicle* and the *Excidio Troiae* are so marked – H. Haupt, *Dares, Malalas und Sisyphos*, „Philologus” 1881, t. 40, p. 106–121, especially p. 114; 116–119. Meister assumed that it was Homer and Dictys Cretensis who provided the author of *Excidio Troiae* with the basic material for his work – F. Meister, *Praefatio*, [in:] *Daretis Phrygii...*, p. XXI. Since Malalas used a Byzantine version of Dictys Cretensis, this would explain the similarities. Malalas' employment of Dictys cf. N. E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys*. An introduction to the *Study of Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy*, Baltimore 1907, p. 104. Griffin, however,

of Kalchas<sup>5</sup>. They are followed by the Trojans: Malalas begins with Priam and concludes with Polyxene<sup>6</sup>. The Greek list includes 6 heroes, while that of the Trojans describes 12 heroes and heroines.

The differences between the two enumerations are evident: (1) The Greek list is half as short as the Trojan one, and, (2) it only considers males. Moreover, the Greek list does not include Helen, which is hard to understand, since it was her beauty that caused the war. The depictions of other important Greeks, for instance Agamemnon, Achilles, Menelaos, are similarly absent. Consequently, one can come to the conclusion that this list needs to be supplemented.

In order to reconstruct the original number and sequence of portraits we should turn once more to Malalas himself, and to those authors who, as we know, profited from the Antiochian's narrative. Some portraits, i.e. Helen's<sup>7</sup>, and those of Diomedes<sup>8</sup>, Astynome-Chryseis<sup>9</sup>, Hippodameia-Bryse-

---

excluded Malalas' use of Dares – *ibidem*, p. 51, note 2. His view is in full agreement with that of Wagener – C. Wagener, *Beitrag zu Dares Phrygius*, „Philologus” 1879, t. 38, p. 91–125, especially p. 110–111. Wagener explained that analogies between Malalas' and Dares' portraits originated from a common pictorial and sculptural tradition – *ibidem*, p. 111.

<sup>5</sup> The sequence is as follows: Meriones, Idomeneus, Philoctet, Ajas, Pyrrhos – *Malalas*, V, p. 103–104.

<sup>6</sup> The sequence is as follows: Priam, Hector, Helenos, Troilus, Paris-Alexander, Aeneas, Glaucus, Antenor, Hecuba, Andromache, Cassandra, Polyxena – *Malalas*, V, p. 105–107.

<sup>7</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 61. This portrait may also be found in the works of later Byzantine writers, such as Kedrenos or Manasses. Kedrenos – *Compendium historiarum a mundo condito usque ad Isaacum Comnenum imperatorem a dn. Georgio Cedreno ex diversis libris collectum*, 217, *Patrologiae cursus completus... Series graeca...*, accurante J. P. Migne (later PG), t. 121, col. 252. Kedrenos, however, did not take this depiction from Malalas, but from a specific version of Dictys' work which he used. Although Kedrenos' copy of Dictys was a Byzantine version of the Greek original, it nevertheless preceded the copy which was available to Malalas (the latter included Sisyphos of Kos). It is likely that this edition was utilised by John of Antioch – Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 98, 104. Cf. also H. Hunger, *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Bd. 1, München 1978, p. 393–394. Fürst claimed that in his *Troica* Kedrenos combined Malalas' version with the *Troica* of John of Antioch – J. Fürst, *Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta*, „Philologus” 1901, Bd. 60, p. 333–335 (later Fürst I). On Constantine Manasses cf. Hunger, *op. cit.*, t. 1, p. 419. The portrait of Helen in Manasses – *Constantini Manassis compendium chronicum ab exordio mundi usque ad dominum Nicephorum Botaneiatem*, 1157–1167, PG, t. 127, col. 263. Although Constantine Manasses and Malalas belong to the same tradition, the connection between their portraits of Helen is not direct – Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 51, note 2. Patzig claimed that Manasses is linked with the *Troica* of John of Antioch – E. Patzig, *Dictys Cretensis*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1892, Bd. 1, p. 131–152, especially p. 139; *idem*, *Die Hypothesis in Dindorfs Ausgabe der Odysseescholien*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1893, Bd. 2, p. 413–440, especially p. 414. Fürst recognised the interdependence, and went on to conclude that both Manasses, and John of Antioch did not use the original Greek Dictys, but a Byzantine version that preserved a specific Byzantine and Latin vocabulary – Fürst I, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 100.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 100.

is<sup>10</sup>, Glauca<sup>11</sup>, Tecmessa<sup>12</sup>, and Troilos<sup>13</sup>, though present, can not be included in either of the abovementioned lists; we may classify them as „loose” portraits.

The list of Trojans includes a very interesting portrait, namely that of Glaucus. It is different from Malalas' other portraits due to its extraordinary brevity (four words including the name of the alleged hero) and the fact that it consists only<sup>14</sup> of epithets referring to mentality<sup>15</sup>. It has been suggested (on the basis of data provided by Isaac Porphyrogenetos) that the portrait of Glaucus is, in fact, part of the preceding description of Aeneas, which, in turn, lacks the section that was usually allotted to a hero's character traits<sup>16</sup>.

Isaac Porphyrogenetos also 'helped' us establish the original number of Malalas' Greek portraits. When one analyses the group of portraits that

<sup>10</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 101.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 99–100.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 103.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 130.

<sup>14</sup> A typical Malalean portrait consists of: (i) a section dealing with physical features/outward appearance, and (ii) a section dealing with mentality/character traits. The issue will be discussed later on in the article.

<sup>15</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 106.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 106. We can arrive at such a conclusion by comparing this fragment of the *Chronicle* with the portrait of Aeneas in Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *Peri idiotetos kai characteron ton en Troja Hellenon kai Troon*, [in:] *Polemonis Declamationes*, ed. H. Hinck, Lipsiae 1873, p. 86. Accordingly, the word *glaukos* (it also figures in Malalas' list, but as a proper name) should be treated as an epithet referring to Aeneas. Then, in Isaac's work, there appears the epithet *nuneches* (*ischyros* is the term used in Malalas' depiction of Glaucus), and this is followed by two other epithets which are analogous to the two used in Malalas' portrait of Glaucus. Cf. *Dares*, 12, note 2; J. Fürst, *Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta*, „Philologus” 1902, t. 61, p. 428–429 (later Fürst II); Wagener, *op. cit.*, p. 105, note 12. Cf. also basic information on Isaac Porphyrogenetos – H. Hunger, *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Bd. 2, München 1978, p. 58. The work of reconstructing the original number of portraits and their sequence in Malalas' *Chronicle* is greatly facilitated by his Byzantine followers and adherents, i.e. Isaac Porphyrogenetos and Joannes Tzetzes – cf. Hunger, *op. cit.*, p. 59–63. This information can be supplemented with data provided by Kedronos and Manasses. For a detailed presentation of the 'interdependence theory' with regard to John Malalas, Isaac Porphyrogenetos, and Constantine Manasses, cf. Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 104. It is Griffin's stated opinion, of which Fürst was a firm advocate (Fürst I, p. 239–241), that Isaac Porphyrogenetos drew on Malalas. A number of important researchers have, over the years, suggested that Joannes Tzetzes also compiled the material for his portraits from Malalas' *Chronicle* – Fürst I, p. 343; Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 107, note 1. Wagener's argumentation, though in essence the same, proposes that Malalas might have been just one of a numerous group of authors used by Tzetzes. Only Patzig was of the opinion that Tzetzes borrowed his Trojan material from John of Antioch – Patzig, *Dictys...*, p. 139, 144.

begins with Meriones and ends with Kalchas<sup>17</sup>, it becomes evident that Isaac copied – in part at least – Malalas' categorisation method<sup>18</sup>. The similarity is indeed striking, and lends much credibility to an important hypothesis, namely, that Malalas' influence extends far beyond this group, and that those of Isaac's portraits which precede the description of Meriones also formed a part, no longer extant, of Malalas' *Chronicle*<sup>19</sup>. In my opinion, this line of reasoning is very convincing, and may be substantiated as follows:

1) Malalas' series of portraits has an abrupt and unnatural beginning<sup>20</sup>, and is preceded by a lacuna<sup>21</sup>. This clearly suggests that an important part of the text, which must have contained the portraits of Agamemnon, Menelaos, Achilles, Patroklos, Odysseus, Diomedes, Nestor, Protesilaos, and, finally, Palamedes, is missing.

2) It is undeniable that Malalas was also an important source for Tzetzes, a Greek writer and portraitist who composed his works independently of Isaac. When one modifies the list of Malalas' portraits in accordance with (1) above, they display a close resemblance – both in number and character – to those of Tzetzes<sup>22</sup>.

Having thus expanded the group of Malalas' portraits, we can come to the conclusion that:

1) The list of Greek heroes has been extended, and now includes Agamemnon, Menelaos, Achilles, Patroklos, Odysseus, Diomedes, Nestor, Protesilaos, Palamedes, Meriones, Idomeneos, Philoktetes, Aias, Pyrrhos-Neoptolemos, and Kalchas.

<sup>17</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 83–84; his sequence is as follows: Meriones, Idomeneus, Philoktet, Aias, Pyrrhos, and Calchas. Malalas' is the same: Meriones, Idomeneus, Philoktet, Aias, Pyrrhos, and Calchas – *Malalas*, V, p. 103–105.

<sup>18</sup> Isaac used the *Chronicle* directly – Fürst I, p. 240.

<sup>19</sup> Such a suggestion can be found in Meister's commentary on Dares – *Dares*, 12, p. 14, note 2. The matter was discussed extensively by Fürst I, p. 239–241.

<sup>20</sup> It lacks an introduction, which is – for example – present in Isaac's work. Cf. *Malalas*, V, p. 103; Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

<sup>21</sup> Fürst I, p. 239. The Oxford manuscript of Malalas' *Chronicle* is incomplete. For its state cf. – *ibidem*, p. 242; J. Bury, *Johannes Malalas: the Text of the Codex Baroccianus*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1897, Bd. 6, p. 219–230; L. Jeep, *Die Lücken in der Chronik des Malalas*, „Rheinisches Museum für Philologie” 1881, Bd. 36, p. 351–361; E. M. Jeffreys, *Portraits*, [in:] *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott, Sydney 1990 (later *Studies*), p. 231.

<sup>22</sup> Jeannes Tzetzes – cf. Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 104. Cf. also Agamemnon – Joannes Tzetzes, *Posthomerica*, 654–655, [in:] *Joannis Tzetzae antehomerica, homerica et posthomerica*. Ex recensione I. Bekkeri. Accedunt excerpta ex chrestomathia Procli, Berolini 1816, p. 163; Menelaos – *ibidem*, 656–659, p. 163; Patroklos – *ibidem*, 475–476, p. 141; Odysseus – *ibidem*, 672–673, p. 164–165; Diomedes – *ibidem*, 668–669, p. 164; Nestor – *ibidem*, 658–659, p. 16; Protesilaos – *idem*, *Antehomerica*, 223–225, [in:] *Joannis Tzetzae...*, p. 33; Palamedes – *ibidem*, 398–399, p. 54.

2) The list of Trojans has undergone a similar development, and now comprises Priam, Deiphobos, Helenos, Paris-Alexander, Aeneas, Antenor, Hecuba, Andromache, Cassandra, Polyxena, and Hector.

The portraits of the Greek and Trojan heroes and heroines display a certain degree of uniformity. They consist of three parts: the first gives the name of the personage, the second depicts his/her outward appearance, while the third describes character traits and also enumerates some of the character's more important skills.

A typical portrayal of the outward appearance/physique normally contains information on facial features (the colour of the hair, skin, the shape of the nose) and height, while details concerning clothing are so few that it may be said they do not exist at all. There are certain differences between the two lists and the group of „loose” portraits. The descriptions that precede those of the Greeks and Trojans lack sections describing mentality, but contain additional information on the age of each woman.

On the average, male depictions prevail. This is especially true for the Greek list, which includes only one female portrait, that of Helen. Women are more numerous amongst the Trojans, and make up a significant part of the relevant list.

An analysis of the method according to which portraits were inserted and distributed within the fifth book of Malalas' *Chronicle* may help in reconstructing his main source and the original disposition of portraits therein. Firstly, it is characteristic that portraits start to appear in the fifth book, then quite abruptly vanish, only to resurface in the ninth book of the *Chronicle*<sup>23</sup>.

This problem may be resolved by means of the following hypothesis: Malalas took the Greek and Trojan portraits from the narrative of one source, while the information for his imperial and other descriptions came from another, completely independent, work. This would explain why there are no portraits in books 1-4 and 6-8. Moreover, it is highly probable that the source for Malalas' heroic portraiture was mentioned by the Antiochian himself. This source – or rather two sources<sup>24</sup> – is Dictys of Crete<sup>25</sup> and Sisypchos of Kos<sup>26</sup>. Modern historians tend to agree that

<sup>23</sup> *Malalas*, IX, p. 225. The portraiture that appears hereafter is no longer 'mythical' but 'imperial'.

<sup>24</sup> Hunger referred to *communis opinio* and claimed that the two were Dictys and Dares – *op. cit.*, t. 1, p. 332. We are, however, inclined to accept Griffin's view that Dares should be excluded.

<sup>25</sup> The Byzantine mentioned him in several places – *Malalas* V, p. 107, 119, 122, 132, 135; X, p. 250.

<sup>26</sup> Malalas mentioned him in the following fragments of the *Chronicle* – *Malalas*, V, p. 117, 119, 132.

Dictys<sup>27</sup> was Malalas' main source for the *Troica*, although their views are still divided as far as the role of Sisyphos of Kos is concerned<sup>28</sup>.

The authenticity of the first source had for a long time been questioned<sup>29</sup>. The problem lies in the fact that the original Greek version of Dictys' work is, with the exception of a few fragments<sup>30</sup>, no longer extant. What

<sup>27</sup> An enumeration of Fürst's and Griffin's most important opinions – Fürst I, p. 237–244; Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 45–81. Only Bourrier considered Domninos as a source of portraits – P. H. Bourrier, *Über Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Joannes Malalas*. Erster Teil. Programm des kgl. humanistischen Gymnasium St. Stephen in Augsburg zum Schlusse des Schuljahres 1898/99, Augsburg 1899, p. 24, note 1; *idem*, *Über Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Johannes Malalas*, Zweiter Teil, Programm des kgl. humanistischen Gymnasium St. Stephen in Augsburg zum Schlusse des Schuljahres 1899/1900, Augsburg 1900, p. 22–24.

<sup>28</sup> Byzantine sources support the existence of Sisyphos – *Joannis Tzetzae exegesis in Homeri Iliadem*, [in:] *Draconis Stratonicensis liber de metris poeticis. Ioannis Tzetzae exegesis in Homeri Iliadem*. Primum edidit et indices addidit G. Hermannus, Lipsiae 1812, p. 20, 21, 25, 27. Modern scholars either negate or affirm his existence. Noack, for example, denied that Sisyphos ever existed. He claimed that Malalas, after borrowing and then interweaving certain elements from Dictys' work, invented the person of Sisyphos in order to conceal his reworking – F. Noack, *Der griechische Diktys*, „Philologus” 1891/93, Supplementband 6, p. 439–441. Noack maintained that Sisyphos does not have an identity of his own: he is indistinguishable from Dictys, together with whom he is always mentioned – *ibidem*, p. 440–441. Other researchers considered Sisyphos as a shadowy writer whose time is difficult to pinpoint, and whose name has been traditionally linked with that of Dictys ever since he wrote another version of the Trojan story – Fürst I, p. 249–251; Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 80, 98. The most extreme views were expressed by Haupt and Patzig. The former asserted that Dictys plagiarised Sisyphos' work – Haupt, *Dares...*, p. 117–119. Patzig first arrived at a similar conclusion, i.e. that Dictys drew on the alleged chronicle of Sisyphos. He based his opinion on two facts: (i) the Chronicle's narrative always gives priority to Sisyphos, and (ii) Malalas made an unequivocal statement (*Malalas*, V, 55d–e, p. 132–133) to the effect that Sisyphos was the first author of the Trojan story; his version was subsequently discovered by Homer – Patzig, *Dictys...*, p. 143. He subsequently changed his mind, and acknowledge that it was Sisyphos who had made use of Dictys. This did not prevent him, however, from considering Sisyphos as an independent author of a work written to commemorate Teucros, the legendary founder of Salamis in Cyprus. Consequently, Sisyphos was an author connected with Cypriot Greek culture, and most probably an inhabitant of the island – *idem*, *Das Trojabuch des Sisyphos von Kos*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1903, Bd. 12, p. 231–257, especially, p. 257. Cf. also E. Jeffreys, *Malalas' sources*, [in:] *Studies*, p. 192.

<sup>29</sup> For a cautious approach see T. Mommsen, *Zu Dictys*, „Hermes” 1876, t. 10, p. 383.

<sup>30</sup> Some fragments of the original Greek Dictys were found quite recently – E. Patzig, *Das griechische Dictysfragment*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1908, Bd. 17, p. 383–388; W. Eisenhut, *Zum neuen Diktys-Papyrus*, „Rheinisches Museum für Philologie” 1969, Bd. 112, p. 114–119; H. Ihm, *Der griechische und lateinische Dictys*, „Hermes” 1909, t. 44, p. 1–22. *Papyrus ad Tebtunim inventa, Papyrus ad Oxyrynchum inventa*, [in:] *Dictys creatensis. Ephemeridos belli troiani libri a Lucio Septimio ex graeco in latinum sermonem translati. Accedunt papyri Dictys graeci in Aegypto inventae*, ed. W. Eisenhut, Leipzig 1973, p. 134–140. Once published, these fragments finally proved the existence of the Greek Dictys.

we possess today is a Latin reworking<sup>31</sup> of the original, the so-called *Ephemeris belli troiani*, often referred to as the *Septimius*<sup>32</sup>, composed during the fourth century AD<sup>33</sup>. The term 'reworking' means that the alleged translator, Lucius Septimius<sup>34</sup>, did not preserve the original in extenso, but compressed the contents of a few books<sup>35</sup> of the Greek edition<sup>36</sup> into the sixth book of his own work. What is more important still, his rendition, which is provided with an epistle dedicated to Quintus Aradius<sup>37</sup> and a prologue describing how Dictys' memoirs were unearthed<sup>38</sup>, does not contain literary portraits.

Today, after prolonged and extensive studies, historians agree that the original Greek version must have been written two or possibly three centuries before the translation. The latest research dates it back to the seventh decade of the first century AD<sup>39</sup>, although in earlier times the period 150–200 AD was more widely accepted<sup>40</sup>. Its place of origin is, however, impossible to pinpoint. Fürst suggested Egypt<sup>41</sup>, but his theory is dubious.

It is even more difficult to say anything definite about Sisyphos of Kos. According to tradition, he was a scribe of Teucros, and accompanied him to Troy. Having returned home, he started to work on his memoirs, or maybe reworked those of Teucros<sup>42</sup> – we cannot be certain, for all the data is founded in legend. Nowadays it is generally accepted that Sisyphos was the author of a work on the Trojan War<sup>43</sup>, most probably a Cypriot<sup>44</sup>, and

<sup>31</sup> S. Timpanaro, *Sulla composizione e la tecnica narrativa dell' Ephemeris di Ditti-Settimio*, [in:] *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte*, t. 1, Urbino 1987, p. 169–215.

<sup>32</sup> *Dictys cretensis*. Cf. Gelzer's opinion on the importance of Dictys – H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, Teil 1: *Die Chronographie des Julius Africanus*, Leipzig 1880, p. 229.

<sup>33</sup> Fürst II, p. 380, note 19; Havet, *op. cit.*, p. 239; Noack, *op. cit.*, p. 405, 428, 478; the entry „Diktys”, in: *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung begonnen von G. Wissowa, Unter Mitwirkung zahlreichen Fachgenossen, hrsg. von W. Kroll, K. Witte, Zweite Reihe, Viertes Halbband (II, A, 2), Bd. V, Stuttgart 1923, col. 590, (later RE).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the entry „Septimius” in: RE, Bd. V, col. 1562; Havet, *Sur la date...*, p. 238–240.

<sup>35</sup> It is generally held that the exact number of books is five – the entry „Dictys”, in: RE, Bd. V, col. 589.

<sup>36</sup> *L. Septimii epistula*, [in:] *Dictys cretensis*, p. 2.

<sup>37</sup> Havet *op. cit.*, p. 238.

<sup>38</sup> L. Havet, *Sur les préfaces du Dictys-Septimius*, „Revue de Philologie” 1879, t. 3, p. 81–88.

<sup>39</sup> „Dictym Graecum septimo decennio saeculi primi post Christum natum compositum esse certum habeo...” – *Dictys cretensis...*, p. VIII; Eisenhut, *Zum neuen...*, p. 119. Cf. also Patzig, *Die griechische...*, p. 382.

<sup>40</sup> Fürst summed up the opinions of other historians – Fürst II, p. 380, note 19.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 380; 405.

<sup>42</sup> Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

<sup>43</sup> Fürst I, p. 249–250.

<sup>44</sup> Patzig, *Das Trojabuch...*, p. 257.

his book might have been incorporated into a version of Dictys which was written before the time of Malalas<sup>45</sup>.

What is reasonably certain is that the works of both Sisyphos of Kos, and Dictys belong to the group of alternative representations of the Trojan War, and also to a wider body of literary frauds, so typical of antiquity<sup>46</sup>. It is also undeniable that the works of „Dictys” and „Dares”<sup>47</sup> were extremely popular with many writers, both contemporary and later, who wrote on the topic of Troy and the Trojan War<sup>48</sup>.

Having thus pinpointed a version of the Greek „Dictys”<sup>49</sup> as the source for Malalas’ portraits, we can now attempt to explain why there are no

<sup>45</sup> Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

<sup>46</sup> A. Gudeman, *Literary Frauds among the Romans*, „Transactions of the American Philological Assosiations” 1894, t. 25, p. 140–164.

<sup>47</sup> The work was provided with a letter written by Cornelius Nepos to Sallustius Crispus, in which he recounted how he had found the *Excidio* in a library in Athens and then translated it from Greek into Latin. The author of this work, a certain Dares of Phrygia, claimed that his was an eyewitness account of the Trojan War – *Epistula Cornelii Nepotis*, [in:] *Daretis Phrygii...*, p. 1. The *Excidio* we possess today is an original version, and fully disproves Cornelius’ statement regarding the existence of a Greek original. It was written in the 6th century in barbarous Latin, and consists of forty-four chapters – Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 5. The narrative begins with the Argonautic expedition and breaks with the fall of Troy. Its sources are extremely difficult to pinpoint, though most researchers agree that the *Excidio* is very Homeric and in character with Hyginus’ fable, Dracontius, *ibidem*, p. 5, note 3; Wagener, *op. cit.*, p. 95–125. Dares’ work contains an interesting list of portraits – Dares 12–13, p. 14–17. It was noticed that the portraits in the *Excidio* bear a close resemblance, both in their order of appearance and contents, to those in Malalas’ *Chronicle*. This can be explained either by the existence of set rules governing the pictorial and sculptural representation of Greek and Trojan heroes (cf. Wagener, *op. cit.*, p. 111), or by the fact that both Dares and Dictys belonged to the same cultural circle (Fürst II, p. 596–597). Although an exhaustive elucidation has not yet been put forward, one interesting hypothesis attempted to explain the existing similarities by means of a common source, i.e. the chronicle written by Sisyphos of Kos, which was used by both Dictys Cretensis (Malalas’ source) and Dares. Consequently, the series of descriptions would have been composed by Sisyphos – Haupt, *op. cit.*, *passim*, especially p. 114–119. Cf. also F. Bornmann, *Note su Daretis Frigo*, [in:] *Filologia...*, p. 391–395.

<sup>48</sup> The epistle added to the *Excidio* openly belittles Homer. He is depicted as a liar, while Dares is represented as the author of the only extant, true work on the Trojan War – *Epistula Cornelli Nepotis*, p. 1. Malalas’ approach was much the same. Sisyphos of Kos is portrayed as an eyewitness of the Trojan War, prior to both Homer and Dictys, whose work was subsequently discovered and reworked into a myth by a liar, i.e. Homer – Malalas, V, p. 132–133; Fürst I, p. 245. Septimius also claimed that Dictys was prior to Homer – *L. Septimii epistula*, [in:] *Dictys cretensis...*, p. 1. He supports his view by stating in the prologue that Dictys was a companion of Idomeneus and an eyewitness of the Trojan War – *Prologus*, [in:] *Dictys cretensis...*, p. 2; cf. also Fürst I, p. 229.

<sup>49</sup> I would like to return to the aforementioned ‘interdependence’ of Byzantine authors. According to Fürst, the Byzantine *Troica*, Sisyphos’ chronicle, and the original Greek Dictys, all originated in the Trojan tradition. Dares’ *Excidio* may also be added to this group. Fürst



descriptions in the „Septimius”. A decisive conclusion can not be reached. The statement that the extant Latin version of Dictys does not contain any literary portraits is basically, with one sole exception – the portrait of Achilles<sup>50</sup>, which has most probably retained the place it occupied in the Greek „Dictys”. It is highly likely that the original distribution of portraits in the Greek version was the same as that of the „loose” depictions in Malalas’ Chronicle. Dictys’ descriptions were introduced whenever a given hero or heroine appeared in the narrative for the first time<sup>51</sup>. However, the origin of the two lists has not been explained. It is possible that the portraits were grouped in such a manner by a Byzantine editor of the original Dictys. The lack of portraits in the Latin *Ephemeris* may be explained by the fact that the Romans held personal appearance to be of little importance<sup>52</sup>. Unfortunately, the line of reasoning presented above is poorly substantiated and may be easily questioned. However, when one takes into consideration the present state of research and the fragmented sources which are at our disposal, it becomes clear that a comprehensive and satisfactory elucidation will not be put forward in the near future.

was of the opinion that Malalas drew on both Sisypheos, and a slightly altered, Byzantine version of Dictys. The latter was subsequently employed by Joannes Antiochenus, and his work, in turn, was used by Manasses. Joannes Nikiu, Joannes Tzetzes, and Isaac Porphyrogenetos all drew on Malalas’ Chronicle, and not on Dictys, while Georgios Kedrenos obtained his source material for the *Troica* from Malalas and Joannes Antiochenus – Fürst I, p. 256. Griffin’s interpretation is somewhat different, although he agrees with Fürst insofar as the origination of the Greek Dictys is concerned. This was translated into Latin by Septimius, while the Greek version constituted the foundation of the first Byzantine edition. Another, extensively reworked version, was used by Malalas. His copy, in turn, was employed by Joannes Nikiu, Isaac Porphyrogenetos, and Joannes Tzetzes. The first Byzantine version of the Greek Dictys was subsequently used by Joannes Antiochenus, while his work was utilised by Suidas. Kedrenos drew on another version of the first Byzantine edition of Dictys, which differed from the one used by Malalas – Griffin, *op. cit.*, p. 104. Although Fürst and Griffin arrived at divergent conclusions, they agree that Malalas did not make use of the original Dictys. It is generally held that the Greek Dictys did contain portraits. Patzig’s statement that Malalas created his own portraits is, in my opinion, unconvincing – E. Patzig, *The review of P.H. Bourier, Über die Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Jo. Malalas. Zweiter Teil, Augsburg 1900*, „Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 1901, Bd. 10, p. 609.

<sup>50</sup> „...in primis adulescentiae annis, procerus, decora facie, studio rerum publicarum omnes iam tum virtute atque gloria superabat, neque tamen aberat ab eo vis quaedam inconsulta et effera morum impatientia”. – *Dictys cretensis...*, 1, 14, p. 12. This vestige of the original portrait is important, for its structure closely resembles Malalas’ portraits; it consists of two parts – the first depicts Achilles’ outward appearance, while the second describes his character traits. Accordingly, we can assume that portraits in the original Dictys were similarly constructed. Our inference is further supported by the fact that Isaac’s portrait of Achilles is fundamentally the same – Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

<sup>51</sup> Fürst II, p. 595.

<sup>52</sup> The issue was discussed by Fürst II, p. 438–439.

Three different hypotheses were put forward in order to explain the origins of heroic portraits in the Chronicle. The first maintains that Malalas' method of depicting his characters was a typically Byzantine innovation, and as such was much in agreement with contemporary literary fashion<sup>53</sup>.

This theory could be accepted, but only if no similar portraiture had appeared before the Chronicle was composed. However, even a brief look at Greek historiography written before Malalas' time reveals an abundance of literary portraits which are extremely similar to his. This argument completely refutes the theory.

The second and third hypotheses are based on the assumption that the origins of Malalas' heroic portraiture are to be found in his sources, i.e. in the work of Dictys; this means that we should concentrate our efforts on elucidating the origins of the latter's descriptions. The second theory stresses that the aforementioned technique evolved solely within the Grecian cultural context. Misener<sup>54</sup>, its chief exponent, traced the evolution of the „iconistic” physical description from Homer<sup>55</sup> right up to twelfth century Byzantium<sup>56</sup>. Her research was subsequently supplemented by Evans<sup>57</sup>.

The third hypothesis, which I shall discuss in greater detail, maintains that descriptions of the DICTEAN type originated in a mixture of Egyptian and Greek influences, and tries to trace the inception of this specific descriptive pattern to private and public Egyptian documents<sup>58</sup>, and also to Egyptian painting. According to Fürst, the chief exponent of this hypothesis, the most important characteristic feature of Dictys' portraits (which he calls „Signalements”<sup>59</sup>) is their construction – they are nothing more than monotonous lists of completely disjointed<sup>60</sup> adjectives. While Fürst admitted that Dictys' depictions differed from<sup>61</sup> those present in the Egyptian papyri, he maintained that this dissimilarity only concerned the subjects: in other words, Dictys' depictions were figments of the author's imagination, while

<sup>53</sup> F. Rohde, *Die griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig 1914, p. 151. This method was compared with physiognomy, and a conclusion was reached that Malalas' portraiture is 'unphysiognomical'.

<sup>54</sup> G. Misener, *Iconistic Portraits*, „Classical Philology” 1924, t. 19, p. 97–123, *passim*.

<sup>55</sup> Rohde claimed that Homer refrained from iconistic portraits – Rohde, *op. cit.*, p. 160, note 1.

<sup>56</sup> The last part of Misener's work deals with Byzantium – Misener, *op. cit.*, p. 123, note 3.

<sup>57</sup> Evans' main achievement was the elucidation of the role played by physiognomy in antiquity. Her most important work is – *Physiognomics in the Ancient World*, „Transactions of the American Philosophical Association” 1969, t. 59, p. 1–101.

<sup>58</sup> Fürst II, p. 377.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 379.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 376.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. E., M. Jeffreys, *Portraits*, p. 241–242.

the Egyptian ones referred to real persons. Fürst then went on to describe their common features. Egyptian portraits did not render full and perfect likenesses of the described and were just as formulaic as Dictys<sup>62</sup>. The latter point served as the foundation of Fürst's assertive statement that Dictys most probably wrote his work in Egypt<sup>63</sup>, and that portaiture was peculiar to two nations – the Egyptians and the Greeks. In the former, pictorial representation climaxed in portrait painting, the finest examples of which are the sepulchral portraits from Faium. Both these depictions, and the aforementioned documentary data are characterised by an extremely faithful representation of the subject's physique (including birthmarks, scars, disfigurements, etc.) and by the extensive use of formulae. Portraits were made in order to preserve the image, and thereby the identity, for either religious (in the case of sepulchral paintings) or legal (in the case of documents) purposes<sup>64</sup>.

Fürst's chronology is as follows: a direct result of Alexander the Great's conquest of Egypt was the introduction of certain typically Grecian ideas concerning the depiction of humans<sup>65</sup> and their surroundings (e.g. ecphrasis) into Egyptian portaiture. The two different „concepts” or „approaches” interwove, until finally there emerged a new, Hellenistic – i.e. Dictean – technique, which was from then on evolved and perfected by consecutive generations of writers. The coming of the Romans, who were signally uninterested in literary portraits<sup>66</sup>, seems to have had an adverse influence on their further development and use.

According to Fürst's research, the first papyrus containing „Signalments” (i.e. portraits) – a testament<sup>67</sup> – was written in the year 240 BC<sup>68</sup>. From then on the number of such documents grew steadily and only came to an end in 263 AD<sup>69</sup>.

He divided these „Signalments” into two different categories. Those in the first were characterised by the enumeration of epithets referring to outward appearance only – a feature which is worth underlining – and predominated from the third century BC to the first decade of the first century AD. Those in the second are referred to as „ule-asemos”, since they portray only specific physical features, such as birthmarks, scars, disfigurements, etc., and are very frequent in documents which were written

<sup>62</sup> Fürst II, p. 379.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 382.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 398–399.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 382.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 438.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 399.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 403.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 403.

from the end of the first decade of the first century AD onwards. Portraits died out altogether in the third century AD, following the introduction of certain legal modifications by the Egyptian administration<sup>70</sup>.

Summing up, we may state that the evidence presented by Fürst, together with his interpretation, lead to the following conclusion: Dictys' technique originated from the formulaic language of Egyptian documents, it was firmly rooted in the Hellenistic-Egyptian tradition, and gained great popularity due to the cultural influence of Alexandria<sup>71</sup>; it follows therefore that the beginnings of this technique had nothing in common with Byzantium or its culture.

Though coherent, interesting, and well substantiated, Fürst's argumentation does, none the less, have a number of weaknesses, to which I shall now turn.

Firstly, Fürst placed too much emphasis on the formal similarities between the portraits of Dictys and Malalas, and the Egyptian documentary material. A close analysis of the texts contradicts his view, for while the Egyptian descriptions enumerate physical features at length, they contain information pertaining to character traits<sup>72</sup>. Dictys'

<sup>70</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 403.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 405.

<sup>72</sup> This is easy to notice following an examination of the papyri included in Fürst's dissertation – *Anhang I*, in: Fürst II, p. 597–614. His attention was exclusively concentrated on the analogies between Dictys' and the papyri's approach to physical descriptions. This problem seems to be fundamental to the discussion, for Fürst apparently took no notice of the context in which literary portraits were composed. The vast majority of physical descriptions were component parts – together with sections enumerating character traits – of fuller, more complete characterisations. This is illustrated by a whole range of depictions, starting with Plato's picture of the horses, and ending with portraits composed in late Byzantine times. I would like to give a few examples, since a more detailed look at the problem might prove instructive. For Evans' extensive treatment of the issue cf. Evans, *Physiognomics*, p. 1–101, *passim*. Let us choose three instances and see whether they really form parts of a full – i.e. physical and mental – characterisation. We shall start with the horses depicted in Plato's *Phaedrus* – Plato, *Phaedrus*, 253c-e, [in:] Plato. With an English Translation by H. N. Fowler, t. 1: *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedrus*, Cambridge–Massachusetts–London 1960, p. 494. The portrait begins with a long list of terms referring to the outward appearance of the creatures, and ends with a few words describing their mental features. The section allotted to the first animal says that it loves honour, modesty, and temperance, follows only true opinions, and does not need to be controlled with a whip, but is guided by the admonitions of its master. The fragment which depicts the other creature concludes with the following statements: the horse is insolent and excessively proud, and hardly ever yields to either whip or spur. As we can see, mental qualities appear alongside physical features. Now let us turn to a portrait taken from Malalas' Greek list, for instance that of Meriones – *Malalas*, V, p. 103. It finishes with three adjectives which describe the hero as fierce, magnanimous, and bellicose. One can, of course, state that some of Malalas' portraits, for example those belonging to the „loose” group, are similar to the Egyptian ones. However, a detailed analysis of the fragmentary portraits which are present in the Latin *Ephemeris* and in the works of Malalas' followers, clearly indicates that a typical, 'model'

portraits are, on the other hand, concerned with both mental and physical qualities<sup>73</sup>.

Secondly, the time interval between the appearance of the last Egyptian description and the composition of Dictys' work is, in my opinion, long enough to undermine the concept of 'chronological evolution' expounded in Fürst's theory. One should keep in mind that, according to the German historian, „Signalments” of the first type finally disappeared in the first decade of the first century AD, while the Greek original of Dictys' work was written sometime between 150 and 200 AD<sup>74</sup>. Eisenhut shifted the composition of the latter work to the seventh decade of the first century<sup>75</sup>, thereby shortening the gap to just over fifty years. Whatever the final result of these calculations may turn out to be, we would still have to take it for granted – as Fürst apparently did – that Dictys had an intimate knowledge of Egyptian legal practices.

Thirdly, the German historian diminished the role played by one other – vital – factor, namely „scientific”<sup>76</sup> and „popular” physiognomy. The very fact that this art appeared at least 150/200 years before the first Egyptian documents were written gives it – and also Greek literary portraiture (which

---

portrait consisted of two sections – one dealing with the physique, the other with mentality. We are thus in a position to state that the structure of Malalas' depictions differed from that of the Egyptian ones. Finally, I would like to suggest how a typical 'physiognomic' portrait was constructed. One of its component sections contained a list of specific parts of the physique (i.e. hair, feet, legs, etc.), which were appropriately interpreted, and then paired with a given mental type. The other section gathered the physical features of a given mental type, for instance those of the brave, the cowardly; etc. [cf. for example, *Polemonis de physiognomonia*, liber 42, 55, [in:] *Scriptores physiognomonici graeci et latini*. Recensuit R. Foerster, t. 1, Lipsiae 1893, p. 252, 272 (later SP)], and then processed them into a coherent and complete description. As we can see, the 'end product' consisted of two complementary parts, the physical and mental. It is strange that Fürst failed to appreciate this. His omission directed him into an inconsequential analysis of formal similarities, while an examination of the analogies between Dictys' portraits and physiognomy would, in my opinion, be much more relevant and appropriate.

<sup>73</sup> The works of Lucius Septimius, Malalas, Isaac Porphyrogenetos, and Joannes Tzetzes all abound with portraits possessing this type of structure. The „loose” portraits in the *Chronicle* differ, but such irregularities either: (i) resulted from errors committed by subsequent editors of the original *Ephemeris*, (ii) originated in the faulty state of the Barocianus, or (iii) were caused by certain faults in the reworked edition of „Dictys” used by Malalas.

<sup>74</sup> Fürst II, p. 380, note 19. It is worth mentioning that this epoch witnesses a surge of interest in physiognomy.

<sup>75</sup> Eisenhut, *Zum neuen...*, p. 119.

<sup>76</sup> Fürst (cf. Fürst II, p. 384, 430) failed to appreciate the fact that it was during the fourth century BC (therefore one full century before the appearance of the first Egyptian documentary portraits) that *scientific* physiognomy, developed by Plato, Aristotle, and the Peripatetic School, first found employment in biography.

originated with Homer<sup>77</sup>) in its entirety<sup>78</sup> – chronological precedence<sup>79</sup>, and naturally points to the predominant role played by Greek culture (this refers to physiognomy<sup>80</sup> and certain other elements in the creation of the

<sup>77</sup> Although Fürst acknowledged the significance of Homer, he simply stated that Dictys' descriptions were not taken from Homer's works, and did not research the matter further – *ibid.*, p. 382. His concluding remark is only partly true, for Homer's writings were the foundation of the Grecian educational system, and every Greek, irrespective of where he lived, was in some way influenced by this common heritage. An example of its longevity is the epithet *korythaiolos*, taken from the portrait of Hector – *Homeri Ilias*. Edidit G. Dindorf. Editio quinta correctior quam curavit C. Heintze, pars 1: *Iliadis*, I–XII, Lipsiae 1888, 2, 816, p. 47; Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

<sup>78</sup> Though Fürst recognised the importance of Greece, he concentrated his research on formal similarities between the Egyptian and DICTEAN portraits. I think that a closer look at Philostratan descriptions, which have been discussed by numerous historians, might prove conducive to a satisfactory assessment of Fürst's line of reasoning. Like Dictys, Philostratos the Younger composed 'bipartite' portraits of heroes and heroines who took part in the Trojan War. This analogy, according to Fürst, may be explained by the fact that Philostratos' style closely resembled that of the Alexandrian Sophists. Alexandria, in turn, was an important cultural centre which diffused the native, Egyptian style of portraiture – Fürst II, p. 405. This was how the Egyptian tradition 'met' the Second Sophists – cf. *ibidem*, p. 406. This conclusion, seemingly correct, is in fact wrong, for the German historian completely neglected another, much more plausible, chain of interdependence: (i) the technique originated with the Greeks, (ii) it spread to Alexandria, (iii) and, via the Alexandrian School of Sophists, entered into Philostratos' portraits. Fürst could reject this interpretation out of hand for a very simple (and expedient) reason – his literary studies did not encompass the period that came before the third century BC. As a result, his research always substantiated the 'precedence' of Egyptian influence. My line of reasoning, which I hold to be fundamentally correct, leads to the inescapable conclusion that Peripatetic biography and physiognomy (the two were closely connected) preceded the Egyptian descriptive technique. Finally, should we continue our analysis of Fürst's approach to physiognomy and then apply it to Philostratos' portraits, numerous other weaknesses crop up in the German's method. For example: Fürst was adamant that a direct link between physiognomy and Philostratos can not be established, yet went on to state that the latter's descriptions contain elements of zoological physiognomy – *ibidem*, p. 431. It is, I think, quite obvious that the theory developed by me offers an explanation which is much more rational and credible than Fürst's apparently self-contradictory conclusion, since it assumes that physiognomy played an integral, not auxiliary, role in Philostratos' portraiture (cf. the chain of interdependence put forward in the present note). One last point – all of my inferences were based on the data compiled by Fürst. Cf. also Ihm on Philostratos – Ihm, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. suggestions made by Jeffreys – *Portraits*, p. 242.

<sup>80</sup> Every conceivable piece of evidence indicates that physiognomy formed the foundation of the DICTEAN technique: (1) It preceded Dictys chronologically. (2) It constituted a popular, important, and influential part of the Greek cultural heritage, being present in philosophy, rhetoric, medicine, popular literature (romance), etc. (3) It suited the innate sensitivity (underlined by Fürst) of the Greeks, (4) Its 'operational' form had crystallised long before Dictys' time. The 'operational' value of physiognomy was twofold: (a) it possessed a reliable *scientific* methodological apparatus, (b) it already formed a standard, one might even say indispensable, part of biographical studies. Dictys' work includes many biographical elements,

Dictean technique. Indeed, one may be justified in assuming that the Egyptian descriptions were nothing more than a branch of a Greek literary form.

An analysis of Dictean and Malalean portraits reveals that, for the most part, they consist of two main sections: the first is concerned with the physique, the second with mentality. Each part tends to supplement the other, and this – apart from their contents – clearly indicates that these descriptions were constructed in strict adherence to physiognomical schemata. Any constructional irregularities are either errors committed by subsequent editors of the original *Ephemeris*, or originate in the faulty state of the Baroccianus<sup>81</sup>.

Let us now turn our attention to the following selection of portraits. The ones from Agamemnon to Palamedes are taken from Isaac Porphyrogenetos' *Peri idiotetes*, while all the others come from John Malalas' *Chronicle*.

#### THE PORTRAIT OF AGAMEMNON<sup>82</sup>

He is described as a „big” man with limbs „of considerable size”<sup>83</sup>; these features are characteristic of the heroic male/leonine type. His complexion is, in conformity with the Greek ideal of beauty<sup>84</sup>, white; excessive whiteness, i.e. pallor, denotes pusillanimity<sup>85</sup>, but if the white complexion is paired with yellowish hair, or if we assume that the adjective „white” is synonymous with „yellowish-white”, then his white complexion would indicate strength and courage<sup>86</sup>. Should we accept the fundamental

while the author of *Ephemeris* used physiognomy to supplement and/or reconstruct the physiques of traditional, Homeric characters (cf. Misener's treatment of this aspect – Misener, *op. cit.*, p. 108) (5) Physiognomy represented the main current of Greek culture, while the Egyptian documents, for all their purported research value, were nothing more than peripheral developments.

<sup>81</sup> Any subsequent reworking must clearly have facilitated the introduction of certain alterations and modifications. For example, when Isaac Porphyrogenetos and Joannes Tzetzes utilised Malalas' data, they introduced a number of minor modifications. The Baroccianus, in turn, can not be treated as a faithful copy of the original, for some passages have been compressed.

<sup>82</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

<sup>83</sup> *Anonymi de physiognomonia liber*, 122, [in:] SP, t. 2 (later Anonymus), p. 138–139; *Pseudoaristotelis physiognomonica*, 10, [in:] *ibidem*, t. 1, (later Ps. Aristotle), p. 22.

<sup>84</sup> *Adamantii physiognomonica*, B 32, [in:] SP, t. 1, (later Admantios), p. 385.

<sup>85</sup> Ps. Aristotle, 67, p. 72; Anonymus, 91, p. 120.

<sup>86</sup> Admantios, B 33, p. 386; *Pseudopolemonis physiognomomma*, 6 (later Ps. Polemo), [in:] SP, t. 1, p. 386.

physiognomical rule, which states that „good” physical qualities mirror „good” character traits<sup>87</sup>, then Agamemnon’s „good” nose can only be classified as a positive feature. The king’s bushy beard is an unmistakable sign of passion and a volatile temper<sup>88</sup>, while his dark hair may denote harshness<sup>89</sup> (it appears that this interpretation is supported by Homer). The Greek concept of beauty preferred a touch of ruddiness, but dark hair was also perfectly acceptable<sup>90</sup>. Agamemnon’s „big” eyes most probably do not denote mental retardation, for they are neither bulgy, nor disproportionately „big”. Moreover, since „big” eyes were also characteristic of bulls<sup>91</sup>, we would be inclined to interpret them as signs of the king’s innate strength and fierceness<sup>92</sup>, rather than morosity. Courage<sup>93</sup> is another typically masculine feature, as are nobleness and magnanimity<sup>94</sup>.

<sup>87</sup> The Pythagorean School was, within the sphere of Grecian culture, the first to notice that „goodness” and „beauty” are, in effect, two sides of the same coin. They followed the notion that physical beauty and moral goodness are basically one and the same thing. Cf. J. J. Politt, *The Ancient View of Greek Art. Criticism, History, and Terminology*, New Haven-London 1974, p. 20. This idea was also adopted by other philosophical schools. Plato wrote on the issue in his *Philebus*. The philosopher’s efforts were concentrated on expounding the implications inherent in the concept of „goodness”. This „goodness” embraced a mixture of thought and pleasure subject to measure (in order to avoid chaos) – Plato, *Philebus 64d-e*, [in:] *Plato. With an English Translation*, t. 3: *The Statesman. Philebus* by H. N. Fowler. *Ion* by W. R. M. Lamb, Cambridge-Massachusetts-London 1952, p. 388; 390. The aforementioned concept is inherent in the very nature of „beauty”. This results from the fact that both these ideas, i.e. „goodness” and „beauty”, can be measured and represented numerically. Measure and commensurability, Plato writes, should always be identified beauty and excellence. Cf. Plato, *Philebus*, 64e, p. 388; Politt, *op. cit.*, p. 16–17. Aristotle wrote on the subject in his *Metaphysics*. He attributed the concept to Pythagoras and maintained that it could be explained by means of the theory of numbers. Numbers formed the basis of both sensible bodies and abstractions such as justice – Aristotle, *Metaphysics*. Books I–IX. With an English Translation by H. Tredennick, London-New York 1933, 1, 5, 985b–986b, p. 30; 32; 34 cf. also J. E. Raven, *Polyclitus and Pythagoreanism*, „Classical Quarterly” 1951, t. 45, p. 147–152. Since the influence exerted by Plato and Aristotle on scientific physiognomy was considerable, adherents of the art subsequently adopted this idea.

<sup>88</sup> Ps. Polemo, 70, [in:] SP, t. 1, p. 427.

<sup>89</sup> Ps. Aristotle, 22, p. 34.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. the Greek idea of beauty – Adamantios, B 32, p. 386; Polemo, 35, p. 242; Ps. Aristotle, 68, p. 76; cf. also the concept of male beauty – „capillus crassior, rubens vel niger cum rubore” – Anonymus, 5, p. 7.

<sup>91</sup> Ps. Aristotle, 63, p. 68.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. reasons for fierceness – Aristotle, *Parts of Animals*, 2, 4, 650b – 2, 4, 651a, [in:] *Aristotle. With an English Translation* by A. L. Peck and a Foreword by F. H. A. Marshall. *Movements of Animals. Progression of Animals* by E. S. Forster, Cambridge-Massachusetts-London 1955, p. 136; 138; 140.

<sup>93</sup> Anonymus, 4, p. 7.

<sup>94</sup> Aristotle, 41, p. 50; Anonymus, 4, p. 7.



To recapitulate: both parts, i.e. physical and mental, of Agamemnon's masculine/leonine portrait enumerate features and traits traditionally befitting a hero and king, thereby constituting a typically physiognomical whole<sup>95</sup>.

#### THE PORTRAIT OF MENELAOS<sup>96</sup>

A representative of the other popular heroic type, Menelaos is somewhat shorter than Agamemnon. Short people, though energetic, tend to lack persistence<sup>97</sup>. The well-shaped chest is, of course, characteristic of the leonine/masculine type. His red complexion (similar to that of Alexander the Great<sup>98</sup>) betrays inner energy and possible irascibility, even treacherousness<sup>99</sup>. The bushy beard, „good” nose, and „good” face are to be interpreted as in the previous portrait.

To recapitulate: Menelaos, though somewhat shorter than Agamemnon, is still typically masculine/leonine, and possesses all of the features which physiognomy demanded from a Greek hero<sup>100</sup>.

#### THE PORTRAIT OF ACHILLES<sup>101</sup>

The „good” chest, muscular physique, and long limbs are in conformity with the leonine/masculine type. The last feature – typically Homeric<sup>102</sup> – also implies that he was as an excellent runner and jumper<sup>103</sup>. Achilles' sparse beard<sup>104</sup> and the wine-like colour of his eyes most probably mean

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Evans' remarks, *Literary Portraiture in Ancient Epic. A Study of the Descriptions of Physical Appearance in Classical Epic*, „Harvard Studies in Classical Philology” 1948, t. 58/59, p. 193, 216–217.

<sup>96</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 80–81.

<sup>97</sup> For a detailed explanation see – Ps. Aristotle, 72, p. 86.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Plutarch, *Alexander*, 4, [in:] *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*. Ex recensione C. Sintenis, t. 3, Lipsiae 1843, p. 139; for further information on the origins and development of this type cf. – *Ioannis Zonarae annales*. Ex recensione M. Pinderi, t. 2, Bonnae 1844, 8, 4, p. 330. This description is an excellent example of how the complexion, mentality, and inner energy interdepend.

<sup>99</sup> For further information on the feature – cf. Adamantios, B 33, p. 386–387.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. remarks concerning Agamemnon – Evans, *Literary...*, p. 193.

<sup>101</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, 1, 58, p. 3; 1, 84, p. 4, etc.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. also Euripides, *Electra*, 439, [in:] *Euripidis fabulae*, cum annotationibus L. Dindorfii, t. 2: *Andromacha. Electra. Hercules furens. Bacchae. Hecuba. Phoenissae. Orestes. Iphigeniae. Cyclops*, Lipsiae 1825, p. 64.

<sup>104</sup> Possibly denotes his age.

that he was young and inexperienced<sup>105</sup>. Polemo, however, considered this colour to be a negative feature, but gave no further explanation<sup>106</sup>. The expression of Achilles' eyes denotes one who is marvellously strong, mighty, and powerful<sup>107</sup>. His dense hair connotes a love of physical pleasure, for hairy creatures were said to be lecherous by nature<sup>108</sup>, while the melodious voice is yet another characteristically leonine feature<sup>109</sup>. His martial qualities fully conform with the leonine/masculine model. The long nose, if „crassus..., rotundus, robustus, robur et sternuitatem et magnanimitatem indicat, qualia e canum et leonum moribus sunt”<sup>110</sup>. According to another possible interpretation, a long nose denotes a birdlike person<sup>111</sup>.

To recapitulate: another typically physiognomical description corresponding with the leonine/masculine model. Its physical part is in full agreement with the mental features enumerated by Isaac Porphyrogenetos<sup>112</sup>.

#### THE PORTRAIT OF PATROKLOS<sup>113</sup>

His well-developed musculature and considerable physical strength are, as before, typically leonine/masculine features. The symmetrical build of his body is the best possible and denotes a man of sterling character<sup>114</sup>. The

<sup>105</sup> *Pseudopolemonis codicis gothani physiognomonica*, 5, [in:] SP, t. 2, p. 151.

<sup>106</sup> „Oportet autem vitare eum cuius oculus turbidus est, colorem vini meri referens, cum quo ne iungas consuetudinem, sed eum cave”. – Polemo 1, p. 116.

<sup>107</sup> Adamantios, A 16, p. 332.

<sup>108</sup> For further information on this feature see – Ps. Aristotle, 69, p. 78.

<sup>109</sup> On the voice cf. Polemo, 2, p. 196. Yet another variation of this feature appears in the portrait of Hector – *Malalas*, V, p. 105. The hero is referred to as deep voiced. This particular faculty is, according to the Pseudoaristotelian handbook, characteristic of males (the lion, cock, etc.) – Ps. Aristotle, 12, p. 24. The Pseudoaristotelian treatise maintains that a deep voice is typical of the courageous – Ps. Aristotle, 10, p. 20. Cf. Adamantios' less favourable interpretation – B 42, p. 404; cf. also his comment that a deep voice is typical of the „kosmioi” – Adamantios, B 49, p. 413.

<sup>110</sup> Polemo, 26, p. 228.

<sup>111</sup> Anonymus, 125, p. 140.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. remarks on Achilles' portrait – Evans, *Literary...*, p. 192; 216.

<sup>113</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

<sup>114</sup> On the best build, together with an interpretation of this feature – Ps. Aristotle, 24, p. 36; 72, p. 88, etc. This physiognomical tag was much used by Byzantine writers – Michael Pselios, *Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976-1077)*, 1, 35. Texte établi et traduit par É. Renaud, t. 1, Paris 1926, p. 22 (the proportions of emperor Basil II's body are frequently mentioned); the same feature is referred to by the daughter of the emperor Alexis I – *Annae Comnanae Porphyrogenitae Alexias*. Ex recensione A. Reifferscheidii, t. I, 3, 3, p. 99-100 (later *Anna Comnena*). It is interesting that Anna utilised this tag when portraying women.

somewhat tawny hair – said to be characteristic of the Greeks<sup>115</sup> – is an unmistakably leonine quality. As before, the beautiful face and eyes mirror moral goodness. The rosy complexion – literally „white-red” – is the best possible and denotes innate bravery, irascibility<sup>116</sup>, cleverness<sup>117</sup>, and nobleness<sup>118</sup>. Patroklos's honourableness, iron self-control, and exemplary martial qualities denote a typical Greek hero.

To recapitulate: yet another masculine/leonine depiction that adheres to the rules of „scientific” physiognomy.

#### THE PORTRAIT OF ODYSSEUS<sup>119</sup>

The straight hair should have no negative connotations<sup>120</sup>, while its colour – grey – denotes a man in early old age. There are, however, some features which have decidedly unfavourable connotations:

a) a protruding belly – this may denote a person who is either senseless<sup>121</sup> or wicked<sup>122</sup>; it may also mean that Odysseus' „animi mobilis defectum, ebrietatem, veneris amorem [...] Si multam carnem habet et robustus est, pravitatem agendi, simulationem, fraudem, dolum et nullam intelligentiam indicat”<sup>123</sup>;

b) a delicate complexion – since the adjective „delicate”<sup>124</sup> was usually applied to women (whose deviousness<sup>125</sup> compensated for their meagre

<sup>115</sup> Adamantios, B 32, p. 386.

<sup>116</sup> „Color pulcher albus ad rubedinem vergens audaciam et vehementem iracundiam designat” – Polemo, 36, p. 244.

<sup>117</sup> Adamantios, B 33, p. 388.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. the interpretation in the Pseudoaristotelian manual – Ps. Aristotle, 9, p. 18. Adamantios' approach was very similar – Adamantios, B 33, p. 387.

<sup>119</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

<sup>120</sup> Physiognomical manuals do mention of this feature. Cf. the analysis of different kinds of hair – Polemo, 40, p. 250; 41, p. 250.

<sup>121</sup> This trait forms of the characterisation of the *anaisthetoï* – Adamantios, B 47, p. 412.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. the location of this trait in the characterisation of the *moroponeroï* – Adamantios, B 60, p. 425.

<sup>123</sup> Polemo, 14, p. 210. According to the Pseudoaristotelian handbook, this is a typically masculine feature – Ps. Aristotle, 51, p. 56; 58.

<sup>124</sup> The Pseudoaristotelian treatise provides a few good examples of the connection – Ps. Aristotle, 20, p. 32; 45, p. 54, etc.

<sup>125</sup> The words *male* and *female* as used by physiognomists did not necessarily denote just the sex. The term *female*, for example, meant that a given animal represented the majority of features usually ascribed to the female sex. Since physiognomy incorporated Greek misogyny, those who dealt with this art would attribute positive features to the male, and negative ones to the female. The general idea that lurked, so to speak, behind the approach of physiognomists was that women were less courageous and had to make up for this

physical strength) we might be justified in stating that Odysseus was 'femininely' crafty, resourceful, and cowardly;

c) eyebrows that meet – this feature usually denoted sadness<sup>126</sup>. Fürst, however, maintained that it signified beauty<sup>127</sup>.

Odysseus' „good” nose is one of the few compensatory features.

To recapitulate: despite numerous flaws, of which craftiness seems to be the most pronounced, this is still a typically masculine/leonine portrait<sup>128</sup>.

#### THE PORTRAIT OF DIOMEDES<sup>129</sup>

Although it repeats most of the features enumerated in the previous depictions, some new elements can be found:

a) his perfectly proportioned body is discussed at the very beginning<sup>130</sup>;

b) „honey-coloured” skin and ideally fair, or even slightly tawny, hair; according to Plato, they denote masculine beauty<sup>131</sup>;

c) a somewhat upturned nose – this denotes both feminine and masculine beauty<sup>132</sup>;

d) a tawny beard – the colour is both leonine and characteristically 'Grecian'<sup>133</sup>;

e) a short neck – frequently used to denote great physical strength and cautious courage, since „brevitas et crassities colli fortitudinem corporis sed timiditatem in animo significat”<sup>134</sup>;

f) moderation/prudence – which also characterise the courageous masculine/leonine type – are mentioned alongside<sup>135</sup>.

handicap by knavery. Cf. a characterisation of the female sex preserved in a physiognomical manual – Ps. Aristotle, 42, p. 52; Anonymus, 4, p. 7.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. the Pseudoaristotelian interpretation – Ps. Aristotle, 69, p. 80.

<sup>127</sup> Fürst II, p. 387.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. remarks on the hero's portrait in the writings of Homer – Evans, *Literary...*, p. 192–216.

<sup>129</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 81–82.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. an analysis of the best build in the Pseudoaristotelian handbook – Ps. Aristotle, 72, p. 86; 88; especially, p. 90.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. remarks on Plato – *The Republic*. With an English translation by P. Shorey. In Two Volumes, t. 1, Books I–V, London–Cambridge–Massachusetts 1953, 5, 19, 47d–e, p. 512.

<sup>132</sup> Plato, *Republic*, 5, 19, 47d, p. 512.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. the Grecian idea of beauty outlined in Adamantios' treatise – Adamantios, B 32, p. 386.

<sup>134</sup> Polemo, 23, p. 220.

<sup>135</sup> These qualities were usually attributed to men – *Sylloge locorum physiognomicorum*, [in:] SP, t. 2, p. 340. The compound *modesty/prudence* is often paired with courage – Ps. Polemo, 68, p. 422–423; cf. also the depiction of the two horses, especially the positive traits of the first – Plato, *Phaedros*, 253c–e, p. 494.

THE PORTRAIT OF NESTOR<sup>136</sup>

His age is indicated by the adjective „old” and by the grey hair and beard. He is tall – a typically heroic, Grecian feature – and has a slightly hooked nose, which denotes nobleness<sup>137</sup> and outstanding intellectual faculties<sup>138</sup>. His eyes are described as „blue”; this may mean that they are either „pale blue”<sup>139</sup> (and therefore denote cowardice) or „blue, clear, and bright”<sup>140</sup> – which would signify that his character is „good” and masculine/leonine. Finally, Nestor’s long face indicates that he may be somewhat insolent<sup>141</sup>.

To recapitulate: another typically masculine/leonine portrait, with strongly emphasised intellectual faculties.

THE PORTRAIT OF PROTESILAOS<sup>142</sup>

It repeats most of the abovementioned features.

THE PORTRAIT OF PALAMEDES<sup>143</sup>

This depiction generally corresponds to the image of the „viri litterarum amanti”<sup>144</sup> and the „viri placidi”<sup>145</sup>, though it is somewhat marred by excessive talkativeness. Other features have been discussed in the previous portraits.

THE PORTRAIT OF MERIONES<sup>146</sup>

This depiction is similar to the ones presented above: the hero’s complexion is fair (but not pale), he has a bushy beard, curly and dense

<sup>136</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

<sup>137</sup> Plato, *Republic*, 5, 19, 47d, p. 512.

<sup>138</sup> „Nasus curvus multam cogitationem notat” – Polemo, 26, p. 228.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. the Pseudoaristotelian manual – Ps. Aristotle, 68, p. 76.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. the aforementioned handbook – Ps. Aristotle, 68, p. 76.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. a version of Polemo’s treatise – „qui faciem longam habet, insolens est” – Ps. Polemo, 8, p. 154.

<sup>142</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 82.

<sup>144</sup> Polemo, 55, p. 272.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 278.

<sup>146</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 103; Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

hair, an aquiline nose, is magnanimous and, finally, full of prowess. Meriones' eyes are described as „big”, which most probably means that they are of the „correct” or „appropriate” size, and thereby positive<sup>147</sup> (disproportionately large eyes usually denoted stupidity<sup>148</sup>). Their colour – a (shiny?<sup>149</sup>) black<sup>150</sup> – conforms to the Greek ideal of beauty<sup>151</sup>.

To recapitulate: another consistently heroic depiction<sup>152</sup>.

Other depictions repeat the general pattern, and introduce only a few features. Aias Locrius is „strabos”<sup>153</sup>. According to physiognomy, a squint may denote manic tendencies<sup>154</sup>. Pyrrhos<sup>155</sup> hair is red: this colour has decidedly negative connotations<sup>156</sup>. His circular face, similar to that of the emperor Justinian<sup>157</sup>, is extremely difficult to interpret, for we do not know whether it was fleshy (this feature usually signified stupidity or „invrecundiam”<sup>158</sup>) or simply more rectangular than circular, and thereby conformed to the Greek ideal of beauty<sup>159</sup>. Kalchas' portrait is also very interesting<sup>160</sup>. Malalas' description of this man appears to be somewhat incomplete. Isaac Porphyrogenetos' depiction is clearly better<sup>161</sup>, for it details Kalchas' intellectual acumen by means of his fair complexion and delicate features<sup>162</sup>. Another interesting portrait is that of Paris-Alexander<sup>163</sup>. It underlines his beauty, a classical element of the Homeric heritage. It is much more difficult, however, to locate the physiognomical representation of Alexander's

<sup>147</sup> The big, birgt eyes of emperor Hadrian were said to denote his good character – Anonymus, 34, p. 52.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. the interpretation of this feature in Polemo's physiognomical manual – Polemo, 1, p. 108.

<sup>149</sup> This quality is portrayed by the adjective *charopus* (usually used with regard to the lion) – Polemo, 2, p. 196. Cf. also Anonymus, 25, p. 40; 26, p. 40–41; 27, p. 41–42.

<sup>150</sup> Black eyes could indicate „generosum, iustum, probum, ingeniosum...” – Anonymus, 27, p. 42.

<sup>151</sup> Black eyes were perfectly acceptable, though physiognomists generally preferred blue, shiny, and clear ones.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. Evans' remarks, *Literary...*, p. 197.

<sup>153</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 104.

<sup>154</sup> *Sylloge*, p. 280.

<sup>155</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 104.

<sup>156</sup> It denotes avarice – Anonymus, 73, p. 92.

<sup>157</sup> *Malalas*, XVIII, p. 425.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. the interpretation proposed in the anonymous Latin treatise – Anonymus, 106, p. 130.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. the shapes of Greek faces – Adamantios, B 32, p. 386.

<sup>160</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 105.

<sup>161</sup> Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

<sup>162</sup> This depiction closely resembles that of the „viri litterarum amantis” – Polemo, 55, p. 272. Cf. also Evans' commentary on Hommer's literary portrait of Kalchas – Evans, *Literary...*, p. 197.

<sup>163</sup> *Malalas*, V, p. 105–106; Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 85–86.

cowardice in battle. We have already mentioned that a white complexion and dark, curly hair<sup>164</sup> may, when the descriptive adjectives signify an excess of a particular quality, denote pusillanimity; unfortunately, this does not apply to either Malalas' or Isaac's descriptions. In my opinion, the problem may be solved by coupling the abovementioned physical features with the bigness of Paris' mouth (typical of the „cowardly” leopardine/feminine type), for such a combination would naturally connote pusillanimity<sup>165</sup>. The Malalean portrait<sup>166</sup> of Helenos and the Homeric depiction of Thersites<sup>167</sup> have one – negative<sup>168</sup> – feature in common: both characters are bent. Hector<sup>169</sup>, on the other hand, is said to be courageous and full of energy<sup>170</sup>, though these classically masculine/leonine<sup>171</sup> features are somewhat marred by his lisp, which may indicate manic depressiveness<sup>172</sup>. Furthermore, Hector is described as *korythaiolos*<sup>173</sup>; in my opinion, the use of this epithet clearly shows that Malalas' – and therefore Dictys' – technique was to a large extent influenced by Homeric portraiture<sup>174</sup>.

We will now turn our attention to a few portraits from the „female group”. Of these, Helen's is by far the most famous: every author of note composed his own, particular version<sup>175</sup>, and all of them are in conformity with the Greek idea of feminine beauty as expounded in physiognomical manuals. Accordingly, she is of the proper height, well-built (i.e. her body is in *eukrasia*), as white as snow, has „good” breasts<sup>176</sup>, a fair complexion

<sup>164</sup> „Scias plagae meridianae incolae nigros crispis capillis [...] esse, cum promptum ingenium et memoriam et [...] voluptatem et multas cogitationes mendacium avaritiam et furtum possideant” – Polemo, 33, p. 238.

<sup>165</sup> Cf. the description of the leopard in the Pseudoaristotelian manual – Ps. Aristotle, 42, p. 52. A paragraph in the anonymous Latin treatise elucidates the link between the leopardine/female type and cowardice – Anonymous, 4, p. 7.

<sup>166</sup> Malalas, V, p. 105.

<sup>167</sup> Homer, *Iliad*, 2, 216–219, p. 28. The issue was discussed by Misener – *op. cit.*, p. 103–104.

<sup>168</sup> This interpretation was put forward by Evans – *Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography*, „Harvard Studies in Classical Philology” 1935, t. 46, p. 44; eadem, *Literary...*, p. 197.

<sup>169</sup> Malalas, V, p. 105; Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

<sup>170</sup> Like a 'burning flame' – Isaac Porphyrogenetos, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

<sup>171</sup> Isaac describes him as „lion-like” – *ibidem*, p. 87. This clearly links the hero with the physiognomical masculine/leonine type.

<sup>172</sup> *Sylloge*, p. 247.

<sup>173</sup> Homer, *Iliad*, 2, 816, p. 47, *ect.*

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Evans remarks – *Literary...*, p. 192–193.

<sup>175</sup> Malalas, V, p. 91; Georgios Kedrenos 217–219, PG 121, col. 252; Manasses, 1157–1167, PG 127, col. 263; Joannies Tzetzaes *antehomerica*, 115–120, p. 18–19. The features depicted in these portraits display a certain degree of similarity.

<sup>176</sup> A graceful chest is characteristic of the leopard – Ps. Aristotle, 42, p. 52.

(typical of the female sex<sup>177</sup>), a „good” nose, „good” eyebrows<sup>178</sup>, „good” facial features<sup>179</sup>, tawny hair, big eyes, and, finally, a pleasant voice.

Most of these features reappear in the other portraits: though Polyxene's<sup>180</sup> beauty is denoted by an upturned nose<sup>181</sup> and „good” cheeks, her complexion is also fair, while Cassandra's<sup>182</sup> hair is nearly as curly and tawny as Helen's<sup>183</sup>; gracefulness and/or delicate features<sup>184</sup> are characteristic of all the heroines. What is more, the „big” eyes or „good” eyes mentioned in the portraits of Helen, Hecuba<sup>185</sup>, Andromache<sup>186</sup>, and Polyxene<sup>187</sup> most probably constitute a direct reference to yet another ideally beautiful female – „big-eyed” Hera, thereby further intensifying the link between Malalas' (and also Dictys') portraiture and the Homeric tradition.

To recapitulate: I am quite certain that the descriptions discussed in the preceding paragraphs were greatly influenced by the Grecian canons of feminine beauty, that elements of these canons<sup>188</sup> are present in the writings of Homer, and, finally, that they were accepted in their entirety by

<sup>177</sup> Ps. Aristotle, 67, p. 72; 74.

<sup>178</sup> Ps. Aristotle, 41, p. 50; 69, p. 80. A very good interpretation of this feature was made by Psellos – *Chronographia*, 1, 35, p. 22.

<sup>179</sup> All of these features represent the classical physiognomical „good = beauty” grouping.

<sup>180</sup> A full portrait of the heroine – *Malalas*, V, p. 106.

<sup>181</sup> Plato, *Republic*, 5, 19, 47d, p. 512.

<sup>182</sup> A complete portrait of the heroine – *Malalas*, V, p. 106.

<sup>183</sup> An important element of the Greek ideal of feminine beauty.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. the range of adjectives which could, according to Adamantios' manual, be applied to women – *Adamantios*, B 2, p. 349–351.

<sup>185</sup> A full portrait of the heroine – *Malalas*, V, p. 106.

<sup>186</sup> A complete portrait of the heroine – *Malalas*, V, p. 106.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 106.

<sup>188</sup> A very similar image of the female sex was adopted by Greek romance. It is worth underlining that Achilles Tatius used physiognomical tags to portray his heroines: Europe has golden/tawny hair and a rosy complexion – *Achilles Tatius*, 1, 4, 3–4. With an English Translation by S. Gaselee, London–New York 1917, p. 14. Rhode noticed that Greek writers frequently depicted women as white-complexioned – Rhode, *op. cit.*, p. 153. Achilles Tatius' depiction of Melitte employs similar epithets: she is rosy-cheeked, and her skin has a milky smoothness – *Achilles Tatius*, 5, 13, 1, p. 262. Other writers of Greek romance had a preference for blonde-haired heroines. Cf. Anthia – *Xenophontis ephesicorum de amoribus Anthiae et Abrocomae libri quinque*, 1, 2, [in:] *Erotici scriptores. Parthenius Achilles Tatius, Longus, Xenophon Ephesius, Heliodorus, Chariton Aphrodisiensis, Antonius Diogenes*. Jamblichus ex recensione G. A. Hirschig, Eumathius ex recensione P. Le Bas. Apollonii Tyrii historia ex cod. paris. edita a J. Lapaume. Nicetas Eugenianus ex nova recensione Boissondii. Graece et latine cum indice historico, Parisiis 1885, p. 184. Fürst acknowledged that Greek romance played a role in the popularisation of physiognomy – Fürst II, p. 432; cf. also Misener, *op. cit.*, p. 122–123. Even hundreds of years later, Byzantine authors still adhered to the same ideal of feminine beauty. The *Alexiad* serves as a good example – the empress Irene is symmetrically-built and has rosy cheeks (*Anna Comnena*, 3, 3, p. 101), while the empress Maria is tall, rosy-cheeked, and her skin is snow-white (*ibidem*, 3, 2, p. 97).



physiognomy (both „popular”, as well as „scientific”) and its adherents (Malalas/Dictys).

The conclusion which I would infer from our analysis of the male and female Malalean/Dictean portraits presented above is that the technique used in their preparation originated in the influences exerted by two important sets of factors:

1. The Homeric tradition and heritage. According to Evans „portraiture in Homer is introduced [...] for delineating the fierceness of the Homeric heroes on the battlefield...”<sup>189</sup>. A logical – though tentative – interpretation of this statement would be that:

a) „physiognomical”<sup>190</sup> elements were first introduced into portraiture by Homer;

b) they then underwent a long process of development, systematisation, and augmentation at the hands of subsequent writers and physiognomists, and, finally;

c) came to influence the portraits of Malalas/Dictys.

If one accepted this line of argumentation, then the Greek origins of iconistic (i.e. physiognomically influenced) portraiture would be hard to question.

2. Physiognomical schemata, that is:

a) the ideal male, i.e. leonine, type;

b) the ideal female, i.e. leopardine, type;

c) tags and phrases that supplemented and individualised particular portraits.

The art of physiognomy supplied the portraitist/biographer with a sound methodological apparatus. Once applied to the fragmentary Homeric descriptions, this „method” made possible the translation of mental qualities (provided by the Homeric heritage) into physical features, and vice versa.

Maciej Kokoszko

#### PORTRETY HEROICZNE W PIĄTEJ KSIĘDZE *KRONIKI MALALASA*

Artykuł rekonstruuje pierwotną liczbę, kolejność i treść literackich portretów odmalowujących bohaterów greckich i trojańskich. Autor szuka genezy portretów w bizantyńskiej wersji *Ephemeris belli troiani* autorstwa Diktysa z Krety. Następnie przeprowadza polemikę z tezami Fürst'a (*Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta*, „Philologus” 1902, Bd. 61,

<sup>189</sup> Evans, *Literary...*, p. 216.

<sup>190</sup> „Portraiture [...] for delineating fierceness”.

s. 374-440), który twierdził, że kompozycja portretów Diktysa/Malalasa wywodzi się z tradycji prawnej hellenistycznego Egiptu. Autor artykułu dochodzi do wniosku, że zasady kompozycji portretów literackich Malalasa mają korzenie w greckiej tradycji literackiej, a szczególnie w dorobku Perypatu. Następnie uwypukla rolę fizjonomiki w kształtowaniu się portretów heroicznych zawartych w piątej księdze *Kroniki* Malalasa. W końcowej części pracy autor artykułu przeprowadza fizjonomiczną analizę literackich wizerunków bohaterów greckich i trojańskich. Na podstawie jej wyników dochodzi do wniosku, że zostały one oparte na schematach obrazujących kanon urody męskiej (oddawany przez symbol lwa) i kobiecej (oddawany przez symbol pantery). Oba te schematy zostały uzupełnione przez wprowadzenie do portretów elementów ideału urody greckiej oraz całego szeregu innych motywów fizjonomicznych.