PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. VIII

GRAPTA POIKILA I

Edited by Leena Pietilä-Castrén and Marjaana Vesterinen

HELSINKI 2003

ISSN 1237-2684
ISBN 951-98806-1-5

Printed in Greece by D. Layias – E. Souvatzidakis S.A., Athens 2003

Cover: Aeschylus, *Hiketides* at the Delphic Festival in 1930.

Contents

Reading Lucian's *Περὶ ὀρχήσεως* – Attitudes and Approaches to Pantomime

Marjaana Vesterinen

Western theatre dance in the 19th and 20th centuries was, and still is to a great extent, conceived of as a particularly feminine sphere, making the male dancer's position suspicious. Dancing men were labelled effeminate, scrutinized at first by a dominantly male, and later by a dominantly female audience.[1] In Greek antiquity the situation was reversed – theatre dance was as a rule a male matter – but in spite of this the male dancers and audiences seemed to face the prejudice of effeminacy in certain cases. The main topic of my article is the educated male intellectual's view of male dancers and the attitudes that seemed to prevail in the 2nd century AD.[2] The view is directed at a dance style called pantomime, which attained great popularity in the Roman Empire and dominated the public stages along with mime performances until the 6th century. Pantomime was a dance form portraying a mythological or historical theme. It centred on a solo dance by a masked male dancer who danced all the roles, changing costume and mask during the performance. Between his acts, a choir or a solo assistant sang and told the story further.[3]

No geographical definition is given in this article, since it is question of a literary space, namely Lucian's essay *On Dancing* (*Περὶ ὀρχήσεως*, from hereon I shall use the non-standard abbreviation *OD*).[4] In spite of the fact that I began with Western theatre dance, I do not suggest that there is some sort of magical continuity in attitudes to male dancers from antiquity onwards. Western theatre dance is mentioned here partly because gender and theatre dance are studied in the field of dance research with reference to Western theatre dance, and partly because we, who are educated in the Western culture, are familiar with the notion of effeminate dancing men.

As it happens, the two complete works on dance from antiquity handle pantomime, and both from a defensive point of view: Lucian's essay, written in the 2nd

---

1 Burt 1995, 12-13.

2 From hereon, all the dates are AD, unless otherwise stated.

3 Here I shall not describe pantomime in great detail, as there are many published descriptions. See e.g. E. Wüst, Pantomimus, *RE* 18.3 (1949), 833-869; Molloy 1996, 44-50; Jory 2002, 240-241. See also bibliographies in Naerebout 1997, 144; Csapo and Slater 2001, 423. For a discussion of possible female pantomimes with further references, see Webb 2002, 286-287.

4 The following editions are used. Loeb Classical Library: Lucian vol. V (ed. and transl. A.M Harmon), London and Cambridge, Massachusetts 1936 (reprint 1972); Αρχαία Ελληνική Γραμματεία, ΚΑΚΤΟΣ: Λουκιανός, Απάντα 10; Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis: Luciani Opera vol. III (ed. M.D. Macleod), Oxonii 1980. The translations are mine, unless otherwise stated.

century,[5] and Libanios' *Oration* 64 (*Against Aristeides in Defence of Dancers*; *Πρὸς Ἀριστείδην ὑπὲρ τῶν ὀρχηστῶν*), written probably in 361.[6] Other literary sources on dance are of varying length and depth.[7] As an obvious consequence, in modern studies of ancient dance, Lucian, and to a lesser degree Libanios, are used as the central literary evidence on the subject. These works have, without doubt, influenced the view that dance in antiquity was predominantly mimetic, and they are unwisely regarded as evidence for dance earlier than from the Roman period as well.[8] Lucian, or perhaps the text itself more than its author, is regarded as an authority in matters of dance. When one considers, however, *On Dancing* in relation to Lucian's whole production, this does not seem entirely justified. Around 80 works are ascribed to Lucian,[9] and *On Dancing* is the only one where he handles dance to a great extent.[10] It is not only a question of the number of Lucian's works, but of his style. What he says, how, why, and to whom, are crucial in reading his text about dance.

This article reflects, to some degree, the general tendency outlined above, but rather than giving an account of what Lucian says about pantomime and taking it more or less for granted, I propose to ask in what light Lucian's text should be read other than allegedly stating facts, and what kind of attitudes to male dancers Lucian's essay reflects. *On Dancing* is profoundly rooted in its time of writing, and it is thus essential to consider the wider framework of the essay as well as Lucian's style and status. This will form the first part of the article. The following sections concentrate on the attitudes to male dancers in *On Dancing*. The concluding section surveys how the role of pantomime as a means of education is emphasized throughout the essay, and how it can be seen as a performance of Greekness.

---

5 Some say that *OD* was written in Antioch sometime between 162-165 on the grounds that Antioch was supposedly especially fond of pantomime, and that Lucian wrote it when Emperor Verus, a great admirer of pantomime, visited Antioch. Discussion and further references in Kokolakis 1959, 4-7. Lucian himself states that Antioch is 'naturally suited' for dance and a dance-loving city - εὐφυεστάτη πόλις καὶ ὄρχησιν μάλιστα πρεσβεύουσα (*OD* 76). This characterisation in passing, would have been a nice compliment, if the place of writing were Antioch.

6 Molloy 1996, 86.

7 Discussed in Naerebout 1997, 191-193. Most notable passages on dance in prose are by Plato, Xenophon, Plutarch, Athenaios, Pollux (Polydeukes) and Hesychios. The majority of the texts come from the 5th and 4th centuries BC, and from the 1st and 2nd centuries. There were monographs on dance in antiquity, of which we now know only the titles and names of their authors. For example, Athenaios mentions Aristokles' *Περὶ χορῶν* (*Deipnosophistai* 14.630b), and also that the famous pantomime dancer Pylades (see below, note 27) wrote a treatise on dance (1.20e).

8 Naerebout 1997, 108-109.

9 In many general descriptions of Lucian and his output, the number of his works is given as 82. According to Ms. Vaticanus 90 they amount to 81, listed in Robinson 1979, 239-242. Almost 20 of them are either certainly or possibly spurious.

10 There are some instances where Lucian mentions dance or dancers in passing, as discussed in Kokolakis 1959, 11-19.

11 Lucian is not mentioned in ancient sources until quite late (e.g. the Suda, s.v. *Λουκιανὸς Σαμοσατεύς*), and his modern biographical facts are derived from what he himself is thought of to have related, and it is not much (e.g. Luc., *On the Dream or The life of Lucian*; *Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου ἤτοι βίος Λουκιανοῦ*). For a short description of Lucian's life, see Robinson 1979, 3-4; Lightfoot 2000, 250-251. There are some attempts at a biography of Lucian, see references in Goldhill 2002, 66 n. 23. For approaches to Lucian's supposedly autobiographical passages, see Branham 1989, 28-37; Goldhill 2002, 67-82.

An Entertainer Defending Entertainment

The evidence for Lucian's biography is scanty.[11] He was probably born around 120 in Samosata, the capital of Commagene, a region in the northern part of Syria.[12] Lucian had a Greek education, which enabled him to become part of the intellectual world of the 2nd century. He made his living as a travelling *rhetor* in various parts of the Roman Empire, and is best known to us as a witty writer, a satirist.[13] He is one of the representatives of the Second Sophistic, the dominating trend of the 2nd century, which admired the classical period of Greece.[14] The main point of reference was language, namely the use of 'pure' Attic dialect. Special attention was paid to rhetoric, and the key word was tradition – simply stated, what was traditional, was good. Imitation based on the corpus of authorized Greek literary masters was one of the principles of education and in becoming a person of culture, a Greek (Ἕλλην). It is said that Lucian is, in this respect, a traditional *par excellence*, although it has to be stressed that Lucian often expresses critical views of this elite education. Throughout his production, the educational background, which he shares with his audience, becomes apparent. It is also worth emphasizing that, strictly speaking, Lucian was not a Greek to begin with, but needed the proper education, beginning with the language, to become a Greek.[15] With regard to *On Dancing*, this emerges as one of the central themes – how pantomime can educate to the tradition required by the Second Sophistic and, furthermore, to being Greek.

If imitation was the foundation of a good literary production, innovation or imagination was still welcomed.[16] In Lucian's case, this shows in his use of dialogue, which was connected fundamentally with philosophical prose. Lucian's talent and strength appear especially in his cutting humour, inspired by the Cynic Menippos of Gadara "whose bark is bad and bite worse... He smiles as he sinks his teeth in"[17]. Lucian can be described, in short, as a witty, intellectual entertainer seeking admiration from persons who share the same educational background and who could thus appreciate his humour; he is a *spoudogeloios*, a serious jester. Most probably, the texts were meant for public recitation, the exact style of which is not known, but which is hinted at in *On*

---

[12] In 72 Vespasian incorporated Commagene in Syria, but it remained a separate federation (κοινόν) in the province of Syria.

[13] Goldhill's characterization of Lucian goes to the very core of our factual knowledge of the author (Goldhill 2002, 66): "... a snidey intellectual from Syria, writing in the later half of the second century CE, in Greek, for a Roman audience, at least in part."

[14] For a short description of the era, and for the position of a Greek-based education in Roman Empire, see Robinson 1979, 1-3; Lightfoot 2000, 239-244 and 247-250; Goldhill 2002, 62-63 and 74-75.

[15] Goldhill (2002, 60-107) discusses how well Lucian succeeds in this respect by analysing Lucian's self-image and self-references detected from his works. It is worth noting that terms, such as Syrian, barbarian or Greek (Ἕλλην) are often used simply to emphasize the education or position a person had. This is exactly what Lucian does in many instances, for example in *Twice Accused* (*Δὶς κατηγορούμενος*), where a Syrian is accused of neglect and abuse by Rhetoric and Dialogue, discussed briefly in the concluding section of this article.

[16] This had a foundation in the writings of sophists, e.g Isokrates, *Paneg.* (*Πανηγυρικός*) 8: "... καὶ τά τε παλαιὰ καινῶς διελθεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν νεωστὶ γεγενημένων ἀρχαίως εἰπεῖν, οὐκέτι φευκτέον ταῦτ' ἐστί, περὶ ὧν ἕτεροι πρότερον εἰρήκασιν, ἀλλ' ἄμεινον ἐκείνων εἰπεῖν πειρατέον." ('One should not avoid the subjects of which others have spoken before one; one should try to do better than they did.')

[17] Luc., *Twice Accused* 33. No works of Menippos survive, but his name lives on in the style called Menippean satire, of which Lucian is a prime example.

Dancing. Given that, as Lucian insists, pantomime and rhetoric share the same technique to a degree, the anecdotes of successful or unsuccessful dancers shed light also on the demands on a good orator.[18]

Lucian's production is varied in form and themes, and also in the extent of the satirical touch.[19] *On Dancing* is not regarded as one of Lucian's masterpieces and certainly not as one presenting Lucian's wit; in general studies of Lucian, it is usually just mentioned in passing. *On Dancing* is also one of the works whose authorship has been disputed,[20] but it is, however, systematically referred to as Lucian's work in modern research. Even if it were not a genuine Lucianic text, it resembles his literary style and subject matter well enough to be called Lucianic, and can be studied and discussed in the context of Lucian's whole output. In this article, I refer to the author of *On Dancing* as Lucian. Despite the somewhat indifferent attitude to the essay among scholars, it is, however, a skilful work, in which Lucian uses devices typical of him to good effect.[21] We may also be missing a crucial satirical point. Aristeides (Publius Aelius Aristides), a well-known Greek *rhetor* and contemporary of Lucian's, had written a speech against pantomime. The contents of the speech are known only through Libanios, who much later (in the 4th century) wrote against Aristeides in defence of pantomime (*Or.* 64).[22] It has been suggested, that Aristeides wrote his criticism before Lucian wrote *On Dancing* and, if so, Lucian certainly knew of this speech.[23] Knowing Lucian's style, it would be hard to think that he would not have taken the opportunity to satirize Aristeides' speech, especially since Aristeides was considered a sober speaker, and thus a suitable target for a writer like Lucian. Further, Lucian may have have been provoked by Aristeides, who, according to Libanios, writes that ἐπεὶ δὲ ὅλως τὸ πρᾶγμα κακίζει καὶ νόσον ὀνομάζει καὶ φθορὰν τῶν θεομένων καὶ προστίθησι τῇ βλασφημίᾳ Σύρους... (*Or.* 64,9).[24] Perhaps this remark reminded Lucian of his Syrian background.

On Dancing begins with a dialogue between Lykinos, the defender of pantomime, and Kraton, the accuser, a Cynic philosopher. The dialogue recalls Kraton's accusation, and gives the reason for the defence. Finally, Kraton becomes so provoked that he allows Lykinos to give his speech in defence of dance (*OD* 6). Lykinos' speech takes up most of the essay, until the final moment when Kraton has the last word. What comes as no surprise is that Kraton is converted from a fierce enemy of dance to its devote advocate (*OD* 85).

---

18 Branham 1989, 18-19.

19 There are several ways of classifying Lucian's works, e.g. grouped by function, by form, by content. See the discussion in Robinson 1979, 13-20. Robinson himself finds the best way to group the texts is by their main effects, i.e. ingenuity and humour (Robinson 1979, 20).

20 For an overview of the debate with references, see Naerebout 1997, 190 n. 412.

21 Robinson (1979, 20) groups *On Dancing* with those works whose main effect is ingenuity, not humour, and describes it further as an exercise "in the skilful combination of a number of traditional forms".

22 As there is a gap of 200 years between Aristeides' lost speech and Libanios' *Or.* 64, a direct response to Aristeides by Libanios is impossible. A reconstruction of Aristeides' speech has nevertheless been attempted. It is very probable that Libanios had Lucian's' text at hand, and it is also suggested that Libanios copied his idea of a reply to Aristeides from Lucian. For a discussion of the relationship between these three writers with further references, see e.g. Molloy 1996, 87-89.

23 Molloy 1996, 88.

24 "[Aristeides] calls it [i.e. pantomime] a disease and ruination of the spectators, and he attaches Syrians to his slander as well..." (Translation from Molloy 1996, 144.) Libanios continues that he could not remain silent at this 'accusation', being a Syrian himself – like Lucian. It has been suggested that Aristeides' accusation is found in Kraton's opinions (Kokolakis 1959, 10).

The Cynic Kraton is depicted as a serious man with a thick beard and grey hair, whom Lykinos supposes (*OD* 1, 5) to have led a dry (αὐχμηρός) life, and for whom only hard things are good, following the Cynic philosophy. Lykinos is one of the characters whom Lucian uses as his mouthpiece or alter ego.[25] It is not a matter of chance that Lucian chooses to use Lykinos in his texts.[26] In this case, the *prosopon* / *prosopeion* of Lykinos is quite effective, alluding to the Syrian background of the 'real' Lucian: as the story went in antiquity, two men, Pylades of Cilicia and Bathyllos of Alexandria, both of 'suspicious' Oriental origin, were the inventors of pantomime.[27] Thus, Lykinos / Lucian is a good advocate of a dance form, the roots of which lie in the Orient. This could also be seen as a deficiency if Lykinos were not also an educated man, a thoroughly Hellenized Lucian - a Greek, as the name implies. Lykinos' cultural status is expressed clearly when Kraton says that Lykinos has 'our education' and has studied philosophy as much as is needed: Ἀνὴρ δὲ τίς ὤν, ὦ λῷστε[28] καὶ ταῦτα παιδεῖᾳ σύντροφος καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ τὰ μέτρια ὡμιληκώς, ἀφέμενος, ὦ Λύκινε, τοῦ περὶ τὰ βελτίω σπουδάζειν καὶ τοῖς παλαιοῖς συνεῖναι... (*OD* 2). Kraton continues, however, by warning Lykinos that he may become "some Lydian woman or a bacchant" from the educated person he is (πρὸς δ' οὖν τούτοις ὅρα ὅπως μὴ λάθῃς ἡμῖν ἐξ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ πάλαι Λυδή τις ἢ Βάκχη γενόμενος... *OD* 3), referring thus to the allegedly effeminate and 'barbarian' Orient, which was Lucian's country of origin. Kraton's remark is a double-play, where Lucian's Hellenized identity (Lykinos) is warned of becoming the person Lucian was before his education. This background serves as an effective starting point for a defence of dance – the accuser and the defender share the same culture, and now it is only the skill of the defender (*rhetor*) which allows pantomime to emerge as victor in the battle.

---

[25] Other works where Lykinos appears: *Hermotimos*, (*Ἑρμότιμος ἢ περὶ αἱρήσεων*), *The Eunuch* (*Εὐνοῦχος*), *Symposion* (*Συμπόσιον ἢ Λαπίθαι*), *The Ship* (*Πλοῖον ἢ εὐχαί*), *Essays in Portraiture* (*Εἰκόνες*), *A Conversation with Hesiod* (*Διάλογος πρὸς Ἡσίοδον*), *Affairs of the Heart* (*Ἐρωτες*; Ps.-Lucian), *The Cynic* (*Κυνικός*; Ps.-Lucian).

[26] As Goldhill (2002, 66) points out that "scholars have often wanted to cut through all of Lucian's playing with the dressing-box, and declare dismissively that Lucian sometimes calls himself 'Lykinus' ... And not ask why." For a discussion of roles and masks (πρόσωπα, προσωπεῖα) in Lucian, see the concluding section of this article.

[27] The traditional year was 23/22 BC. Athenaios, roughly contemporary with Lucian, characterizes Pylades' dancing as solemn, expressing passion and variety of character, whereas Bathyllos' dancing is more jolly (*Deipnosophistai* 1.20d-e). For the traditional date of origin, see Jory 1981, esp.148 and 157. The terminology was not very clear-cut: usually the Greek sources speak of ὀρχησταί (a general term for dancers), and only sometimes of παντόμιμοι (a term used more in Latin, *pantomimi*). The dancer was also called τραγικῆς ἐνρύθμου κινήσεως ὑποκριτής, and in Latin *histrio* (Robert 1930, 111; Jory 1996, 2 n. 2). This resulted in confusion, for example between mimes and pantomimes. According to Jory (1996, 26-27), pantomime evolved from mime; pantomimes were soloists without support from other actors (besides the chorus), dancing all the roles of the dramatic piece, hence the name 'pantomime' i.e. 'mime of everything' (*OD* 67). Mime performances were usually short plays on everyday themes, in which the performers (mimes) spoke, danced, sang and played various instruments, generally without masks. Mime was criticized more often than pantomime for immorality and coarseness. For a short overview of pantomime and mime, with references to ancient texts, see Csapo and Slater 2001, 369-389; also Molloy 1996, 81-85; Roueché 1993, 23-27. In this light we can say that the said inventors of pantomime, Pylades (which was also a very popular stage name in pantomimes, see Robert 1930, 112) and Bathyllos, were virtuosi who made the already existing dance form more widely known and elaborated it further.

[28] The reading ...ὤν, ὦ λῷστε, a very classical phrase, is used in the Oxford edition by Macleod. In the Loeb edition the reading ...ὢν ὅλως... is used.

The Educated Attitudes to Pantomime: The Power of Dance

Pantomime caught the critical attention of intellectuals, whose mouthpiece is Kraton.[29] While Lykinos defends dance in general, and pantomime and the male dancers in particular, he is a part of the same world as the educated, sharing their attitudes. It is thus not only Kraton's direct accusation, but also Lykinos' defence, which gives an insight into the educated view of male dancers. What is not said aloud is as important as what is said and how it is said. The attitudes to male dancers can be grouped under two headings. First, they are participating in a performance, which as a genre is morally questionable and against the values of the Second Sophistic, and this holds true also with regard to the audience. Second, as dancers they represent an inappropriate image of men for men. It is a question of the proper masculine image of body (*soma*) and soul (*psyche*).[30]

It is obvious that in dance, and especially when performed on stage before an audience, the attention is attracted to the body of the dancer. In dance, the body serves as the central mode of communication, with other modes such as rhythm, melody, lyrics, costumes, etc., being present and inseparable from the moving body or dance itself.[31] The communication or meaning in dance does not lie in the movements as such – "a left leg raised is a left leg raised"[32] – but in dance as a whole in its context. In order to grasp the meaning, familiarity with the particular, culture-specific movement system and the culture are essential. That is, one has to know the code in order to decode.[33] As the body is central in dance, it is powerful, through the moving body, in conveying notions of gender: who dances in what way, in what context, for whom, since "... it is through our bodies that we are allocated our gender."[34]

In the case of ancient dance, understanding meanings through a detailed account of the movements of a particular dance is not possible, since the ancient dances as such

---

[29] For the attitudes expressed by Roman authors, see Williams 1999, 139-141.

[30] Burt 1995, 73: "In theatre dance, the acceptable male dancer is ... one who, when looked at by the audience, proves that he measures up to the supposedly unproblematic male ideals." Lykinos takes up the *psyche* and *soma* of a good dancer in *OD* 74-75.

[31] There has been some discussion in the field of dance studies about dance as nonverbal communication, notably as a response to Judith Lynne Hanna's model of dance communication (Judith Lynne Hanna, *To Dance is Human: A Theory of Nonverbal Communication*, Austin 1979). For Hanna, dance is first and foremost communication, where movements make meaning. A synopsis of her theory is presented in e.g. Hanna 1988, 13-19. The theory has been criticized for its aim to cross-culturally validate notions and interpretations of dance, for example by Sally Ann Ness, Observing the Evidence Fail: Difference Arising from Objectification in Cross-cultural Studies of Dance, in Gay Morris (ed.), *Moving Words. Re-writing Dance*, London and New York 1996, 253-258. For a general overview of dance, especially in antiquity, anthropology and communicative approach, see Naerebout 1997, 312-316. As such, I see no objection of perceiving dance, as any other human action, as communicative in its own cultural context. Burt (1995, 7) does not even discuss whether dance is or is not communicative: "First the body is the primary mode of communication in dance."

[32] Naerebout 1997, 392. Of course there are movements which have relatively obvious references or meanings, but even so a single movement, as such, needs a context. For example, when the hand is placed on the heart, the facial expression, music or movement of the torso, etc. indicates what is expressed (happiness, sorrow, love, etc.).

[33] Naerbout 1997, 391-394 (communication in and interpretation of dance). As a simple example, if someone who has never seen Western ballet before, sees men dancing in *Swan Lake* 'as ballerinas', in the roles of swans, he might miss the point.

[34] Burt 1995, 7. Also Hanna 1988, 3.

are lost.[35] Meanings can be studied, however, on a more general level by looking at the way that dance is discussed or depicted in antiquity, by whom, and for what purpose. For this, the context of both the described dance performance and the description itself must be focused on. Kraton characterizes pantomime as a spectacle dominated by the overly effeminate dancer. For him, the effeminacy is revealed in soft clothes (ἐσθῆτες μαλακαί), licentious songs, and the roles of the dancer. The danger in watching pantomime is in the harmful influences – you become what you look at, an effeminate male, who crosses the line to the female gender. (*OD* 2.)[36] Lykinos, in his part, subscribes to the effect of dance on the audience in many instances, but stresses the positive effects.

First, what does Lykinos have to say about the power of dance in conveying meaning? Lykinos discusses the power of dance by comparing it with the theatre performances Kraton considers as more acceptable pursuits for a cultured person, namely tragedy, comedy, performers who sing and play *kithara* and *aulos*-players who accompany the cyclic choruses, κύκλιοι αὐληταί (*OD* 2). Dance is multi-sensory occupying the ears as well as the eyes (*OD* 3-4).[37] Dance is powerful as it gives both pleasure and benefit to the spectator as well as to the dancer (*OD* 71). Most importantly, dance is powerful, because it occupies both the body and the mind, which for Kraton is a frightful image, for Lykinos the culmination of the superiority of dance. The frightfulness lies in the idea, that if (as Kraton says) dance is essentially shameful, and if (as Lykinos says) it masters the matters of body and soul alike, it indeed is harmful because it incorporates the whole human being. Regarding the matters of the mind Lykinos mentions philosophy, the Muses and, most importantly, rhetoric.[38] Dance is "a science of imitation and portrayal, revealing what is in the mind and making intelligible what is obscure" (*OD* 36, transl. by A.M. Harmon in Loeb). It is not at all a matter of chance that Lykinos brings up philosophy and rhetoric, the important elements of the Greek education, which both Lykinos and Kraton share: the similarity of technique and aim of pantomime with rhetoric and its connection with philosophy[39] should be enough for Kraton to accept pantomime.

Dance is a *techne* comparable to rhetoric at least in two points. It requires a good knowledge of the accepted corpus of mythology and history, "beginning from the Chaos

---

[35] Naerebout 1997, 234-240 in discussing the use of iconographic sources, and 315-316 about various approaches to the study of ancient dance.

[36] On the harmful effects of dance on the spectators, also Lib., *Or.* 64.59-61. For a discussion of the dangers of male audience seeing female performers on stage, see Webb 2002, 296-297.

[37] Kraton refers to the spell of Sirens in Homer, which one can escape with the help of wax. In dance, the spell works also through eyes. Lykinos subscribes to this view only to the extent that in dance the spell is not harmful but makes the spectator wiser than before. Multi-sensory, esp. the eyes: *OD* 5 (eyes wide open, seeing and hearing), 6 (music and rhythm), 68 (the dancer has all the means: musical instruments, actor's voice, singers), (eyes and ears), 85 (dance charms the eyes and makes them wide awake; Kraton has eager eyes and ears to attend a dance performance).

[38] *OD* 35 (physics, ethics, rhetoric, painting, sculpture), 36 (Mnemosyne, Polymnia). An epigram (*Ant.Pal.* 9.505) describes the Muse Polymnia, identified with dance and especially with pantomime: "I, Polymnia, am silent, but speak through the entrancing motions of my hands, conveying by my gestures a speaking silence." (Translated by W.R. Paton, The Greek Anthology, Loeb, vol. III.) References to the iconography of Polymnia in Jory 1996, 12-13.

[39] Lykinos mentions Plato and Aristotle (*OD* 70) showing that he has not forgotten 'our philosophy' as Kraton claimed at the beginning .

... until to the Egyptian Cleopatra" (*OD* 37). Lykinos gives a wearisome list of the themes a good dancer has to know (*OD* 37-61), and thus makes sure that the dancers' vast store of knowledge is not overlooked. Lykinos also reminds us of his own learnedness, when he criticizes other writers' accounts of dance as being basically only detailed lists of various dances. These omissions on Lykinos' part are not made because of the lack of learning (ἀμαθία), but because he thinks that such information is tasteless and pedantic (ἀπειρόκαλος, ὀψιμαθής). (*OD* 33)

The other point in common with rhetoric and dance is the technique with the requirement of utmost clarity.[40] A major difference was of course the muteness of the dancer, although according to Lykinos (*OD* 30), initially, the dancers had sung, but as the panting of the dancers disturbed the singing, it seemed better to have others sing. Every movement in dance, says Lykinos, has to be so clear that no interpretation is needed (*OD* 36, 62, 65). This is a very mechanistic way of looking at dance, and counterarguments are easily found. What point is there in dancing, if you can say the same thing in words?[41] The clever Lykinos tells an appropriate story about a barbarian from Pontos and a famous dancer in the time of the Emperor Nero. When the barbarian went to Rome for some business, he saw the dancer performing so vividly that although the barbarian could not understand what was being sung, because he was only 'half-Hellenized' (ἡμιέλλην), he understood the meaning of the movements. Later, when he was about to return home, Nero wanted to give him a present, and the barbarian requested the dancer. Nero enquired the reason, which in all its simplicity was to use the dancer as an interpreter: the man from Pontos had barbarian neighbours, and it was difficult to find interpreters for that language; this dancer could, however, interpret everything in signs". (*OD* 64) One may argue that the result of the story is a far cry from dance or it is not dance at all. The story is not, however, about the 'artistic' quality of dance, but about the suitability of dance technique for communication.[42]

Imitation, the catchword of the Second Sophistic, is central in Lykinos' defence of pantomime, and it seems to have been the norm for good dances. There were, however, dances that lacked in their imitative quality, and obviously pantomime was accused of its non-imitative nature. This can be detected when Lykinos tells another story of a very skilful dancer. There was a Cynic, Demetrios, who denounced pantomime, like Kraton, on the grounds that "the dancer was a mere adjunct to the *aulos* and pipes and the stamping, himself contributing nothing to the presentation but making absolutely meaningless, idle movements with no sense in them at all." It goes without saying that the dancer was able to convert Demetrios to a friend of pantomime by dancing without any music or lyrics, just by himself, mute. At the end Demetrios shouted: "I hear, what you are acting, my man – I do not just see it, you seem to me to be talking with your very hands!" (63, transl. by A.M. Harmon in Loeb, with some modifications.)

---

[40] For the use and abuse of acting skills in oration, see Fantham 2002, 362-376, esp. 371-372.

[41] According to many scholars or dancers, this is just why people dance. A famous remark by Isadora Duncan gets to the core of this argument: "If I could tell you in what it meant, there would be no point in dancing it." Cited in A.P. Royce, *The Anthropology of Dance*, Bloomington 1980, 15 (she refers to T. Comstock (ed.), *New Dimensions in Dance Research: Anthropology and Dance*, New York 1974, 226).

[42] The story has counterparts in more recent times: dance can be effectively used as a means of conveying 'practical' knowledge, e.g. in anti-AIDS –campaigns in various countries in Africa.

Pantomime as a Show of Effeminacy

Second, what has Lykinos to say about the effeminacy of the dancers, the central accusation of Kraton against the dancers? Being a male performing on stage was not, as such, a reason for being criticized of effeminacy. When Kraton criticizes Lykinos sitting in theatres watching pantomime, he wonders on the contrary why, if one really has to go the theatre at all, such an educated man as Lykinos does not attend proper and serious performances (*OD* 2). He is referring to the classical repertoire of tragedies and comedies, which are an accepted part of a Greek contest (ἀγών). It is not by chance that Kraton takes up classical drama in this discussion, since pantomime shared quite a lot with its theatrical ancestors, from the themes (e.g. mythology) and elements of the performance (e.g. a singing chorus) to the accessories of the performers, of which the mask was perhaps the most notable. The special characteristic of the mask was that its mouth was closed (*OD* 29),[43] a further indicator that the dancer himself did not use words at all. Lykinos, when replying to Kraton about attending accepted drama, pictures it in a belittling tone, while stressing at the same time that the themes of tragedy and pantomime are common to both (*OD* 27-29).[44] Thus Kraton's point about the female roles in pantomime being unacceptable should, according to Lykinos, apply equally to tragedy and comedy, and Lykinos continues that, in fact, in tragedy and comedy the female roles outnumber those of male (*OD* 28-29). Here Kraton speaks of quality, "love-stricken and the most lustful women of old stories" (*OD* 2), and Lykinos just of quantity – on quality he is silent, although later on, after having listed a vast number of themes in pantomime derived from mythology, Lykinos admits that it is most important for a dancer to know the love stories of the gods (*OD* 59-60).

The crucial point is *agon*. An acceptable male body was a product of the *gymnasion*. There the youths could be modelled into ideal citizens under the gaze of adult males. The moving male body was admired, watched and accepted in contexts requiring physical strength and competition.[45] The agonistic festivals were fundamentally situations where the Greek *paideia*, based on literature and sports, was on show.[46] As

---

[43] It should be remembered, that the masks were made of linen and no originals have been preserved; we only have representations of them. Jory (1996, 6-11 and 19) notes that female masks identifiable with pantomime outnumber those of male, which may indicate the popularity of female roles. See also Jory 2002, 241-253.

[44] This is one instance, where the reader should be aware that Lykinos', or rather Lucian's anecdotes have an objective in mind. That is, in order to defend the case (i.e. pantomime) successfully, the opposing side (i.e. classical drama) is belittled. Lykinos stresses that the themes of pantomime are more varied (*OD* 31). This is understandable because more literary tales for the themes of dances were available, such as those derived from novels.

[45] Lykinos definitely wants to underline the vigorous nature of the movements in pantomime, which are ideal for training a good, male body (*OD* 71): "[Dance is] the most excellent and well-balanced gymnastic exercise", which makes the body soft and supple as well as strong. This refers to the classical past recalling Socrates' opinion, according to Xenophon, of dance as good exercise for a healthy body, as discussed later. Lykinos notes also that dancing is much more pleasurable (ἥδιον) to watch than youths boxing, covered in blood, or wrestling in the dust.

[46] The agonistic festivals held an important place in the Roman Empire as well. Every self-respecting city had the buildings (theatre, *stadion*, *gymnasion*) required to facilitate Greek culture. See Onno van Nijf, Local Heroes: Athletics, Festivals and Elite Self-fashioning in the Roman East, in Simon Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge 2001, 307-312; Roueché 1993, 2-3.

Kraton seems to think, the fact that classical drama was one of the original agonistic performances sufficed for traditional drama to be accepted, in spite of men performing as women: "[you i.e. Kraton] call these [tragedy, comedy, etc.] competitive and therefore grand" (*OD* 26). Pantomime was naturally a newcomer to the agonistic sphere, as compared to the classical repertoire. Quite early on, however, it was incorporated into the programme of agonistic festivals, although at first as an entertaining interlude (ἐπί-δειξις). In the 2nd century, pantomime dancers were already competing even in the most respected international festivals.[47] This means that at the time of Lucian writing his essay, pantomime was an agonistic event. Why then do both Lykinos and Kraton speak as if it were not? In fact, Lykinos states directly that pantomime is not an agonistic event for the reason that the *agonothetai* consider it too grand and important for competition (*OD* 32). Kraton may intentionally confuse mime and pantomime, as sometimes happened,[48] but Lykinos would surely not. I would suggest that it is rather a question of Lykinos and Kraton speaking in terms of the original, and thus ideal, agonistic programme, when pantomime as a genre did not yet exist in the form it had in the 2nd century. Even more important is that it is one thing to perform in a play in a speaking role and quite another to dance – the attention is directed to words and body, respectively. This is exactly what Lykinos and Kraton both underline: pantomime is for the eyes and ears, drama just for the ears. Equally notable is a solo performance, where the attention is drawn to only one moving body, and not to a dancing chorus. The chorus and its dance expressed communality in quite another way than a solo performance could, as the chorus was originally composed of Athenian citizen laymen.[49] Naturally the situation had changed from 5th century BC Athens – dance in the theatres became a matter for professionals – but the reference point of, for example, a tragedy's chorus, can be fixed to the classical past on an ideological level. This is supported by the lack of discussion of, and attention to the chorus of pantomime, as it was obviously professional from the outset, and had thus no reference to a particular place, which would have enhanced communality.

It is made clear that pantomime is a recent dance genre and thus in opposition with the ideal fixed point in past. Even though the traditional time of origin of pantomime was almost two hundred years before Lucian's essay, this was still too young.[50] While subscribing to this statement,[51] Lykinos handles the problem of the date masterfully, by rooting pantomime in the ideal past (*OD* 25).[52] He points to the well-known passage in the history of ancient Greek dance, in Xenophon's *Symposion* (9), where a male and a female dancer present the love affair of Ariadne and Dionysos. Just previously, Lykinos has stated that Socrates was a true devotee of dance, who even wanted to learn the art

---

47 Roueché 1993, 23-25. Mimes appear competing from the later 2nd century.

48 See above, note 27.

49 Jory (1996, 23-24) states that solo performance denoted professionalism, which alone was despicable in intellectual circles. Besides, in choral performances the dancers sang as well, and the movements were perceived as emphasizing the words.

50 Robinson 1979, 5: "For if some sophists were accused of modernism, this seems to have meant no more than that, instead of the standard models, they imitated Alexandrian and even occasionally later literature."

51 Lykinos 'dates' the origin of pantomime to the Augustan period (*OD* 34).

52 Lykinos has previously discussed at length the origins of dance in general, and about dance among Greeks and other peoples in particular (*OD* 7-24).

(τέχνη) himself.[53] If Socrates admires a dance genre, which was then only budding and not yet even in its full beauty, are we in a position to condemn it, since: "If he [Socrates] could see those who now have advanced it to the utmost, that man, I am sure, dropping everything else, would have given his attention to this spectacle alone; and he would not have his young friends learn anything else in preference to it" (*OD* 25).[54]

Lykinos emphasizes the perfect body of a good dancer and does not consider of what the body is the instrument. True to his education he refers to Polykleitos' *kanon*[55], continuing that "[the body of the dancer] should not be very tall and lanky beyond the moderate, nor should it be too short and dwarfish[56], but just the right measure; nor should the body be fat – impossible even – neither excessively thin, which has a skeletal and dead look" (*OD* 74).[57] To this model are compared the unfortunate dancers, whom Lykinos takes as examples of how important a role the body plays in dance. The scene is Antioch, whose inhabitants are experts in matters of dance according to Lykinos; hence, their views are important. When a small-sized dancer was about to dance the part of Hector, the audience shouted in one voice: "Oh, Astyanax, where is Hector?" To a fat dancer trying to make great leaps they commented: "We beg you, spare the stage." For a very thin dancer the audience wished good health, as if he were ill. (*OD* 76) Lykinos is very careful not to mention any instances where the body could have been called effeminate, and in fact he is misleading Kraton by stressing the masculine body of a

---

[53] He does not mention the scene of Ariadne and Dionysos directly. Since this is the only imitative dance performance (thus recalling pantomime) described in Xenophon's *Symposion*, which Lucian has clearly in mind, the reference must be to this passage. Xenophon writes about Socrates admiring dance in *Symposion* 2.15-19.

[54] In antiquity the Dancing Socrates seems to have been a concept. There are six references, Lucian of course among them, to the Dancing Socrates (and to Xenophon's *Symposion*) from the 2nd to the 4th centuries (Huss 1999, 383-385). According to Huss (387-389) Socrates never danced; Xenophon meant the passage as a joke.

[55] The ideal male body was indeed represented in Polykleitos' sculpture, of which the "*canonized*" example is his *Doryphoros* (*Spear carrier*) known from many Roman copies. The original was in bronze and made ca. 440 BC, presenting a nude, muscular and well-proportioned male. Polykleitos' lost treatise (*Kanon*) handled probably from a technical point of view *symmetria*, the proportionate harmony of a depicted body. The terms *kanon* and *symmetria* are not entirely clear. See J.J. Pollitt, The *Canon* of Polykleitos and Other Canons, in Warren G. Moon (ed.), *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros and Tradition*, Madison, Wisconsin 1995, 2-24 (esp. 21).

[56] Some terracotta statuettes depicting dwarfs indicate pantomime. Jory (1996, 14-15, figs. 12 and 13) notes that performing dwarfs were usually jesters, thus more easily connected e.g. with mime, but that their relation with pantomime needs further study. Attitudes to dwarfs worsened considerably in the Hellenistic and Roman eras as compared to earlier periods in Greece and Egypt. They were often depicted as grotesque and many earned their living as entertainers (Veronique Dasen, *Dwarfs in ancient Egypt and Greece*, Oxford 1993, 247-248).

[57] The Greek authors often contrasted the Greek ideal body with that of other cultures. For example, Diodoros of Sicily (1.81-82) was confused as to the manner in which the Egyptians reacted to the body: there was no physical exercise in their upbringing as there was in Greece, and the well-being of one's body included fasting and vomiting (i.e. cleansing of the body). This view must have been quite peculiar to someone with a Greek education, since the ideal body was not muscular and athletic. According to Xenophon (*Symp.* 2), Socrates thought dance a perfect exercise for achieving and maintaining an ideal body: dancing makes the body evenly proportioned so that no part of it was 'overdeveloped' as e.g. in long distance running (shoulders underdeveloped) or boxing (feet underdeveloped). Libanios, *Or.* 64.103 mentions that when a boy is applying for dance training, the physical qualities should be observed carefully: his growth in height is estimated as average, the neck should be straight and eyes lively, the fingers shapely, and in general the boy should be pleasing to look at. Molloy (1996, 67) notes how these qualities coincide with the requirements of a boy who seeks a career in the army.

dancer, since the body was covered in notably feminine and foreign clothes. They were soft, floating and luxurious, made preferably of silk. In the iconographic depictions of pantomimes, the garments indicate delicate, even transparent, or heavy embroidered fabrics, which are usually long.[58] A highly skilful dancer did not even change his dress between roles, but could indicate the changing role by cleverly using his mantle (χλαῖνα, *pallium*), as mentioned by Fronto, *de Or.* 4 (also 2nd century): "...pantomimes when they dance in the *pallium* indicate the tail of the swan, the hair of Venus, and the whip of Fury with the same *pallium*." For Fronto, this was not, however, a compliment directed at dancers, but a derogatory example of how bad writers do the same thing as these dancers: they repeat the same idea, in disguise, over and over again.

Lykinos (*OD* 71) describes the dance style of pantomime as "energetic, including twists, turns, leaps and back-flung poses,"[59] which seems to be far from the solemn style approved of by intellectuals. An oft-cited notion, also by Lykinos (*OD* 34), of grouping dances comes from Plato, who says that there are two movement styles: the movement of beautiful bodies imitating solemnity, and the movement of ugly bodies imitating ignobility. Furthermore, the solemn movements are reflections of either courageousness or self-restraint of the soul; they are then movements either relating to war or peace, and the dances are called *pyrriche* and *emmeleia*, respectively. Since the exaggerated movements of Bacchic dances and the like are not in accordance with these requirements, imitating drunken behaviour, they are inappropriate to citizens, men and women alike. Any kind of excess in the movements of dances is questionable, because movement reflects the person's state of mind. In addition, Plato leaves the dances of comedy to slaves and foreigners who perform for money; a free citizen should not be caught learning them.[60] There are several references to Bacchic dances in both Lykinos' and Kraton's statements. As already mentioned, Kraton is afraid of Lykinos becoming a bacchant by following pantomime, and he in fact thinks that Lykinos is already filled with Bacchic frenzy (ἐκβεβαχευμένος). Lykinos responds by using the same notions as Plato in the case of accepted dances, namely taking up how pantomime is good and harmonious for the body and soul alike (*OD* 6, 74-75). When Lykinos chooses to handle Dionysiac and Bacchic dances, he mentions all the dances of drama, *kordax* (comedy), *sikinnis* (Satyr play) and *emmeleia* (tragedy), and further relates that in fact Dionysos

---

[58] Discussion in Jory 1996, 5, 19. Lykinos mentions silk clothing (ἐσθῆτι στρωτῇ) of the dancer (*OD* 63).

[59] Once again Lykinos chooses to point out masculinity, as if these movements of the beautiful body would be enough to bring pantomime and masculinity, i.e. acceptance, together. The use of hand gestures, *cheironomia*, was central to pantomime. The importance of the hands can be detected in Lykinos' story about the Cynic Demetrios, cited above, where Demetrios admires the 'talking hands' of the dancer (*OD* 63). For Lib., see above note 57. No details are known of *cheironomia*: we do not know whether the hand gestures were given a precise meaning to the extent that the dancer could produce entire sentences by using these gestures, or whether these were more 'decorative' in nature. Often the ancient *cheironomia* is compared with Indian *hastas* and *mudras* (Lillian B. Lawler, *The dance in ancient Greece*, London 1964, 12; Steven H. Lonsdale, *Dance and ritual play in Greek religion*, Baltimore 1993, 30). They are said to have developed to the extent that a dancer can translate speech into signs very accurately (A. Iyer, Hand gesture in Indian dance, *Dance studies* 18 (1994) 51-95, esp. 55). For the difficulty of interpeting ancient finger-gestures, see a short discussion by Richard Green, Towards a reconstruction of performance style, in Easterling and Hall 2002, 115.

[60] *Laws* (*Νόμοι*) 814e-816e. Also Ath., *Deipnos.* 14.628c: "The school of Damon of Athens puts it well, that a certain kind of motion of the soul is expressed in song and dance: free and beautiful souls produce beautiful music and dance, whereas the opposite kind of souls produce the opposite kind of music and dance."

subdued the warlike people of Tyrrhenia, India and Lydia by dancing. Hence, the Bacchic dances – and pantomime, when classified as Bacchic in nature, as it is a dramatic art form – can also be warlike and thus appropriate (*OD* 22). This is a good example of the importance of the dance context, which Lykinos wants to ignore by speaking more generally. It suffices for his line of argument that the dance style was in the mythological past a medium of warfare, and this story should convince people of the dance's suitability. For Lykinos there are other inappropriate dances performed in a state of drunkenness, such as the Phrygian ones, which he omits from the discussion, as they have no relation to pantomime (*OD* 34).

There was in any case a certain amount of excess found in pantomime – this is what Lykinos himself has described, and what comes up in the connection made with pantomime and Bacchic dances by Kraton. Excess alone could be seen as a feminine trait,[61] and in the case of pantomime was one of the signs of effeminacy. Lykinos admits excess, with reservations, in case of some dancers. There are bad dancers, too, who because of a lack of education (ἀμαθία) do not deliberate over their movements, but present illogical myths and historical stories, and go to extremes in their expressions. For example, when they should express something soft (ἁπαλός), they exaggerate it by being overly feminine. As a counterpart, they can carry masculinity to the point of savagery and bestiality.[62] (*OD* 80-82) Excess was also apparent in the reactions of the spectators, in clapping their hands and shouting praise to the dancer (*OD* 5), and was realized in the whole musical accompaniment, which was much more than in other performances.

The orchestra consisted usually of *aulos*, i.e. reed-blown pipe (αὐλός), pipe (σῦριγξ), *kroupezai*, i.e. wooden clappers attached to the foot of a musician (κρούπεζαι), drum (τύμπανον), cymbals (κύμβαλα), *krotala*, a sort of castanets (κρόταλα), and sometimes even *kithara*, i.e. lyre (κιθάρα).[63] The percussion instruments in particular were perceived as feminine, and men performing with these instruments were liable to be labelled as effeminate on this basis.[64] The *aulos* provoked controversial associations, being a general instrument used in every possible context, but at the same time being linked to effeminacy and foreign habits.[65] This is clearly presented in Kraton's comment, when he says that the spectator of pantomime is duped by the *auloi* (καταυλισμένος), and then compares this to the accepted performances of *auloi* accompanying cyclic choruses, and of singing accompanied by *kithara* (*OD* 2). Lykinos responds to this later on (*OD* 26), stating that, in order to show how good pantomime is, he wants to compare it with

---

[61] Williams 1999, 138-139.

[62] Interestingly enough, gladiators were also objects of disapproval, but this had more to do with the fact that they, or some of them, hired themselves out to fight as a performance. Williams 1999, 140-141.

[63] *OD* 2 (*aulos*, songs) 26 (*aulos*, *kithara*), 63 (*aulos*, *kroupezai*, human voice) 68 (*aulos*, *syrinx*, *kroupezai*, *kymbala*, human voice), 72 (*aulos*, *kymbala*, human voice, *syrinx*), 80 (string instrument), 83 (*kroupezai*). Also Molloy 1996, 74-79. For technical aspects of the instruments, see West 1992; Landels 2001.

[64] West 1992, 124. The oft-cited effeminate (μαλακός) Zenobios from Hellenistic Egypt is worth mentioning. He was hired to perform on one occasion with *tympanon*, *kymbala* and *krotala*, along with an *aulos*-player Peteous, and was even required to have the best possible clothes (P. Hib. 54, ca. 245 BC).

[65] Wilson (1999, see esp. 58-59, 72-78) has analysed the ambivalence of the *aulos*, calling it *enfant terrible* in classical Athens, which can be taken as a point of reference in this passage, as Kraton has clearly set his mind on that period. The players were often foreigners, non-Greeks, and women playing especially at the *symposia*, and often the *aulos*-players were clad in lavish robes. Aristotle (*Pol.* 1341a-1341b) is very clear in his opinions of the bad influences of the *aulos*.

tragedy and comedy, but leaving the instruments out, since both the *aulos* and the *kithara* are part of pantomime. This for Lykinos is evidence of the superiority of pantomime, as it includes all the instruments Kraton just mentioned; he does not take into account that *kyklioi auletai* are different from *auletai*. The context of the instrument conveys the meaning. Both Kraton and Lykinos connect the characteristic high-pitched sound of the *aulos* and human voices with effeminacy: Kraton, against pantomime, mentions the voice and *aulos* together (*OD* 2) and Lykinos, against tragedy, speaks about the voice of the actor (*OD* 27).

Recalling the idea that one's true nature is revealed in the style of dance, it is just a short step to effeminacy off-stage if the dance is judged as effeminate; if a man makes a show of his body on stage for money it is a short step to selling his body off-stage, too. Pantomime dancers were often equated with, or at least spoken of in the same breath as κίναιδοι, men who were noted for their effeminacy and alleged homosexuality,[66] and with prostitutes as well.[67] Lucian himself, in his other writings, hints at dancers in this way. *The Ignorant Book-collector* (*Πρὸς τὸν ἀπαίδευτον καὶ πολλὰ βιβλία ὠνούμενον*) is an attack on an uneducated (ἀπαίδευτος) and ignorant Syrian book-collector – once again an unnamed Syrian appears in the picture – whose appearance resembles that of *kinaidoi*, with a certain kind of a walk, gaze, voice and make-up evoking effeminacy, and the *kinaidoi* are mentioned as hanging around with dancers (22-23). In *The Hired Academic* (*Περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων*, 27), an essay about a Greek intellectual working in a wealthy Roman household, the intellectual is rivalled by "a *kinaidos* or a dancing-master or an Alexandrian dwarf reciting Ionics," all of whom are in the business of passion (ἐρωτικά). Thus, Lucian himself presents the typical notion of dancers being part of the sexually loaded and effeminate sphere of the culture. This image of effeminate dancers is far removed from ideal masculinity, *andreia*, which includes notions of power, and to quote from more recent times, "in order to represent masculinity, a dancer should look powerful."[68] When Lykinos notes (*OD* 81) that the spectator sees himself, his own actions and feelings, in the dancer as in a mirror, it is just what Kraton is afraid of: seeing the possible effeminacy, even *kinaidia*, which perhaps lurks in every man.[69]

The Performance of Greekness

Pantomime can bee seen as incorporating the idea that in the 2nd century, being a Greek was a performance in itself.[70] Taking up the required role and acting it out convincingly was particularly important in rhetoric, and the role-playing, trying on different masks,

---

[66] E.g. David Bain, Two Submerged Items of Greek Sexual Vocabulary from Aphrodisias, *ZPE* 117 (1997) 81-84, with some further references 81 n. 7. In recent decades, with the rise of studies on (homo)sexuality in antiquity, *kinaidoi*, lat. *cinaedi*, are suddenly a focus of attention. Here it is impossible to give a full bibliography of the subject. An elaborate study of *kinaidoi* vs. *hoplitai* is found in Winkler 1990, 45-70. With the focus on the Roman period, see e.g. Williams 1999, 160-229, both works with further references.

[67] Lib. *Or.* 64.38 and 81.

[68] Burt 1995, 51.

[69] Kraton (*OD* 5) alludes to the appearance of effeminate, *kinaidic* appearance in saying that he will not attend pantomime performances as long as he still has hair on his legs and his beard is un-plucked. The bottom line is that it is a question of self-restraint, and there seemed to be a real horror of discovering *kinaidia* in every man. Winkler 1990, 52-54 (discussing a passage in Plato, *Gorgias* 494c-e).

can be detected in Lucian's texts.[71] Pantomime as a theatrical art was naturally based on acting different roles. Lykinos relates a very telling story about the dancers' masks and roles. Once again there was a barbarian who – obviously not being well-acquainted with pantomime – noticed that there were five masks (πρόσωπα) but only one dancer. He wondered who else was going to dance and he was told that the same dancer would dance all the roles (προσωπεῖα), changing masks between acts. The barbarian commented: "I did not realize, my friend, that though you have only this one body, you have many souls." (*OD* 66, transl. by M.A. Harmon in Loeb.) One example of the masks and roles offstage comes from Lucian's essay *The Apology* (Ἀπολογία).[72] Here it is question of intellectuals and not of dancers or actors. In *The Hired Academic* Lucian had satirized intellectuals who, in order to secure material needs, take up positions in wealthy households, living in a state of 'voluntary slavery'. Lucian tells us in *The Apology* that he himself had chosen this lifestyle later in his life, and now has to defend his present status to a certain Sabinos. Right from the start the reader is dragged into the images of the theatrical world: Lucian states (2) that Sabinos is a friendly philosopher and that for Lucian, in order to succeed in his defence, it may be best to put on Sabinos' mask (τὸ σὸν πρόσωπον). If this scene is not convincing enough, it will be time for a scene change (ὥρα τοίνυν μετασκευάσαντας ἡμᾶς τὴν σκηνήν). Later on (5-6) Lucian suggests fitting comparisons for Sabinos to take up against Lucian. Lucian is like an actor who on stage is Agamemnon, but once off the stage, without the mask, is just some ordinary Aristodemos, playing his part for money. Or Lucian is like Cleopatra's monkey, that was taught to dance and was admired for its skills, but when it saw a fig (or an almond) on the ground, it stopped dancing, ate the fig, and even tore the mask up. Lucian suggests some defences, but finally comes to the conclusion that if he is condemned by the judges, his response to them is οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ, 'Hippokleides doesn't care' (15). Lucian's proverbial remark is very fitting for accusations comparing him with actors and dancers. Hippokleides was an Athenian aristocrat who had almost won as a bride the daughter of Kleisthenes of Sicyon in an *agon*. Hippokleides, however, danced in such a vulgar manner that Kleisthenes shouted 'you have danced away your marriage'. Hippokleides did not care.[73] Lucian's intellectual is like the dancer who has one body but many souls.

The masks are again mentioned in *Twice Accused*, a brilliant description of Lucian's own literary style, where a Syrian is accused of neglect and abuse by Rhetoric and Dialogue. The female Rhetoric met with the young Syrian, who spoke a barbarian language and wore Ionic clothes. She educated and married him and introduced him into Greek educated circles. The Syrian, however, when he was educated enough, understood that Rhetoric behaved indecently, so he found solace in Dialogue. Since it is Lucian we are talking about, he cannot settle with Dialogue either, but creates something new. The male Dialogue then accuses the Syrian of abuse, relating first, how he (i.e. Dialogue) was

---

[70] Goldhill 2002, 89 referring to B. Cassin, *L'effet sophistique*, Paris 1995, 451 ("La seconde sophistique performe l'hellénisme.")

[71] See Goldhill 2002, 67-73, 82-89. Lucian was by no means alone with the idea of intellectuals' life as a role-play. See Catharine Edwards, Acting and self-actualisation in imperial Rome, in Easterling and Hall 2002, 377-394, esp. 378-380.

[72] See Goldhill 2002, 69-71 (about Lucian's account of himself in *The Apology*, which Goldhill characterizes as "...wittily self-conscious play with the strategies of self-justification.").

[73] Herodotos 6,127-129.

formerly extremely serious, pondering "upon the gods and nature and the universe". The Syrian, however, reduced him to the same level as the general population (πλῆθος) and changed the mask of tragedy into that of comedy. Then the Syrian "shut me (i.e. Dialogue) up with jest, iambic, Cynic, Eupolis and Aristophanes – clever (δεινός) in mocking things sacred and making fun of everything that is good. In the end, he even dragged in Menippos, one of the old Cynics..." (*Twice Accused* 26-33, the citation from 33.) In this 'autobiographical' story, however, the connection with pantomime is not masks, but education. If someone is unfortunately only half-Hellenized, such as the barbarian from Pontos, who could not understand what was being sung (*OD* 64), or even lacks a Greek education altogether, dance can step in. Dance can teach the alphabet, and further transmit the good, wholesome Greek stories to the audience. Thus the dancer's body serves as a Hellenizing instrument. It is as Rhetoric in *Twice Accused*, who educated the Syrian from barbarian to Greek. Interestingly enough, Lykinos has several anecdotes about barbarians learning and understanding Greek culture with the help of pantomime.

By linking pantomime with rhetoric, Lykinos alludes to its language-like quality, and thus also emphasizes the suitability of pantomime as an effective medium for displaying Greekness. While language is the starting point of education, at the same time it becomes the decisive element in showing one's education. In the 2nd century there were two categories of rhetoric: Attic and Asiatic, the latter having connotations of effeminacy and excess.[74] In a way, Lykinos wants to detach pantomime from this Asiatic, Orientalist rhetoric, by ignoring the effeminate traits woven into pantomime, and by stating that there are bad dancers, who should not cause the whole art of pantomime to be condemned. Pantomime is at its best Greek, its technique and style pure as Attic rhetoric. If, through language, one can both enter and display Greek culture, one can do so also through pantomime.

Lykinos and Kraton share the opinion of the limitless possibilities of dance in conveying meaning, good and bad; dance should be used carefully, like an enlightened philosopher guiding the city. The vast corpus of proper themes, and the subtlety of the dance style acquired through a demanding training, are in favour of the dancer. For Lykinos, effeminacy is just an unfortunate side effect, which can be eliminated by mastering the same education, especially rhetoric that speaks against dance. In short: "How, then, is dance not utterly harmonious, since it sharpens the soul (*psyche*), trains the body (*soma*), delights the spectators, and teaches the old stories with the help of *auloi*, *kymbala* and rhythmic melodies enchanting the eyes and ears?" (*OD* 72). It is a performance of Greekness, comprising the elements needed for the Greek education and linking the theatre culture to the classical past. By watching pantomime, Lykinos does not lose his education, nor does Lucian return to Orientalism.

Finnish Institute at Athens

[74] Goldhill 2002, 91. See also Fantham 2002, 371.

Bibliography

Burt 1995 = Ramsey Burt, *The Male Dancer – Bodies, Spectacles, Sexualities*, London and New York 1995 (reprint 1996).

Csapo and Slater 2001 = Eric Csapo and William J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama*, Ann Arbor 2001[4] (1[st] edition 1995).

Branham 1989 = R. Bracht Branham, *Unruly Eloquence. Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*, Revealing Antiquity 2, Cambridge, Massachusets and London 1989.

Easterling and Hall 2002 = Pat Easterling and Edith Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge 2002.

Fantham 2002 = Elaine Fantham, Orator and / et actor, in Easterling and Hall 2002, 362-376.

Goldhill 2002 = Simon Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*, Cambridge 2002.

Hanna 1988 = Judith Lynne Hanna, *Dance, Sex and Gender: Signs of Identity, Dominance, Defiance, and Desire*, Chicago and London 1988.

Huss 1999 = Bernhard Huss, Dancing Sokrates and laughing Xenophon, or the other *Symposium*, *AJPh* 120, n. 3 (1999) 381-409.

Jory 1981 = E.J. Jory, The literary evidence for the beginnings of imperial pantomime, *BICS* 28 (1981) 147-161.

Jory 1996 = E.J. Jory, The drama of the dance: prolegomena to the iconography of imperial pantomime, in William J. Slater (ed.), *Roman Theatre and Society*, E. Togo Salomon Papers I, Ann Arbor 1996, 1-27.

Jory 2002 = John Jory, The masks on the propylon of the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias, in Easterling and Hall 2002, 238-253.

Kokolakis 1959 = Minos Kokolakis, Pantomimus and the treatise περὶ ὀρχήσεως (*de Saltatione*), ΠΛΑΤΩΝ 11 (1959) 3-56.

Landels 2001 = John G. Landels, *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*, London & New York 2001 (1[st] edition 1999).

Lightfoot 2000 = Jane L. Lightfoot, Romanized Greeks and Hellenized Romans: later Greek literature, in Oliver Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek World*, New York 2000, 239-266.

Molloy 1996 = Margaret E. Molloy, *Libanius and the Dancers*, Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien, Band 31, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York 1996.

Naerebout 1997 = F.G. Naerebout, *Attractive Performances. Ancient Greek Dance: Three Preliminary Studies*, Amsterdam 1997.

Robert 1930 = Louis Robert, Pantomimen im griechischen Orient, *Hermes* 65 (1930) 106-122.

Robinson 1979 = Christopher Robinson, *Lucian and His Influence in Europe*, Bristol 1979.

Roueché 1993 = C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods*, JRS monographs 6, London 1993.

Webb 2002 = Ruth Webb, Female entertainers in late antiquity, in Easterling and Hall 2002, 282-303.

West 1992 = M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.

Whitmarsh 2001 = Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford 2001.

Williams 1999 = Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality. Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York, Oxford 1999.

Wilson 1999 = Peter Wilson, The *aulos* in Athens, in Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge 1999 (reprint 2001) 58-95.