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1. INTRODUCTION

During the Roman Empire, no one doubted that scars or even disabilities due to war wounds were the sign of a soldier’s or a king’s military value. As Plutarch put it, “You can tell a man fit for war (polemikos) by his body being covered in wounds”.¹

No one dared to suggest that wounds might induce a possible weakness of the commander’s body, due to the various assaults on his physical integrity and their possible influence on his military or political decision-making. There are no texts that indicate any relationship between a disabled commander and a defeat. But the Greek world had for centuries maintained the tradition of the ‘perfect body’ and what it considered the ‘heroic’ state of mind. In the Homeric conception, which lasted a long time, a good warrior stays free of injury or dies on the battlefield; and in any case, this happens with the agreement of the gods. But time, and various wars, passed. The fourth century BC is, from this perspective, the turning point in how physical marks were regarded. The frequency of wars at this time meant that a considerable number of men had been wounded and suffered from mobility problems or other disabilities. Scars from arrow wounds or other injuries were plentiful and visible. It is also well known that during the last three centuries before Christ, the people of the Hellenistic states not only lost their reluctance to represent old, sick or mutilated bodies, but even considered the portrayal of distorted bodies an aesthetic challenge, as we can see from statues large and small, paintings, or art works in general. This development also helped to change people’s views of veterans and wounded soldiers.

¹ I thank my colleague, Dr. S. Baddeley, as well as Christopher Goodey, for their help turning this text into a more fluent English paper.

¹ Plutarch, De fortuna Alexandri 339c: ἀνήρ πολεμικὸς καὶ τραυμάτων τὸ σώμα μεστὸς ὀφθείς.
My aim, therefore, in discussing disability and disparate bodies, is to examine the moment of change between the two opposing visions of the mutilated body in the Graeco-Roman world. The Macedonian king Philip II is a perfect example, both chronologically and in literary terms, of the evolution from the Archaic and Classical mind-set to the Hellenistic one. Before re-examining Philip's injuries, however, and considering how far this model influenced other portrayals of kings in which physical marks did not diminish the leader's courage but became indicators of it, I must very briefly hark back to the heroic model of the *Iliad*.

2. Menelaus, King of Sparta

It is well known that there are no lame heroes in the poem. The warriors either die immediately or return to combat within a few hours or days, after a period of rest. Hermann Frölich, who carefully counted all the injuries (147) and published his findings in 1879, which are still referred to by nearly all scholars on that topic, stated unsurprisingly that most of the wounds to the head or upper body, and especially to the heart, the liver or the belly, were deadly. Warriors often survived wounds to the hands, arms and legs. But we must not forget that wounding in the *Iliad* has above all a literary purpose: despite the truly astonishing details that led Frölich to consider Homer to be simply a military surgeon, their aim is to keep the audience in suspense, to make some striking comparison, or to vary the rhythm of the poem.

2.1. The Symbolism of Wounds

As a single example of the importance of symbols, note the graze to Menelaus' belly, from an arrow that had been deflected by his belt (*Iliad* 4, 139–149). Many of the details emphasise the symbolic importance of this wound; however I will restrict myself to four points.

First, Menelaus is the first Greek hero to be hit by the Trojans, probably because he is at the origin of the war. Secondly, the wound was inflicted by an arrow, and in the hierarchy of arms the bow is considered the weapon of cowards and the weak, who shoot from far away. So the wounding itself is far from noble, as would have been fitting for a king—one who was moreover brother of the commander-in-chief. Thirdly, the arrow is said (by

---

2 Frölich (1879); Samama (forthcoming).
3 Friedrich (1956).
Agamemnon) to have been shot merely by ‘someone’ (τις), so that Menelaus is even deprived of a named enemy. The audience, however, has learnt just previously that the anonymous hero is the Trojan Pandaros, son of Lycaon, who, with Apollo’s help, shot the mortal arrow that was deflected just in time by Athena. Lastly, the simple graze bleeds abundantly, impressing both the victim and Agamemnon, who nearly faints. This leads to the urgent intervention of Machaon, son of the hero-surgeon Asclepius. The wound turns out to be harmless. The emphasis here, however, is on the precise part of Menelaus’ body aimed at: the arrow just misses his lower belly, where his virility might have been affected. Pandaros is acting as the substitute for Paris-Alexandros, striking a physical blow at Menelaus’ sexual power.

What must be kept in mind is that in the *Iliad*, being wounded is a form of punishment and has a strong symbolic value. Most of the warriors therefore try as much as they can to hide their injuries, both out of shame and to avoid giving the enemy any reason to celebrate. This way of looking at the wounded or diminished body retains a firm place in the classical tradition; we know of similar anecdotes from Sparta.

### 2.2. Early Developments in the Classical Period

By the end of the fifth century and following the numerous conflicts of the Peloponnesian war, direct battle wounds and consequences of the war such as famines or epidemics, which tremenously increased the number of casualties, had affected so many cities and families that mentalities had changed. From the last third of the fifth century onwards, staying alive becomes progressively more valuable than the *kleos aphthiton* or ‘imperishable glory’ of death in action. The years of incessant war doubtless set a higher price on life. This became even truer for generals than for ordinary citizen-soldiers. A remark attributed to Timotheos, the Athenian general, shows that up to a certain point, the wise general (or king) was not supposed to risk his life more than necessary:

> This is why Timotheus was right saying to Chares, who showed the Athenians the scars on his body and his shield penetrated by a spear. ‘As for myself, I felt very ashamed when during the siege of Samos a spear landed next to me, because in exposing myself as I did, I behaved more like a youngster than as a general and commander of such a great army.”

---

4 *Iliad* 4, 190–219. Machaon himself is wounded later in *Iliad* 11, so Menelaus turns out to have been his only patient.

5 Plutarch, *Vita Pelopidae* 2, 6: Διό καλῶς ὁ Τιμύθεος, ἐπιδεικνυμένου ποτὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τοῦ Χάρητος ὑπειλάς τινας ἐν τῷ σώματι καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα λόγγχη διακεκομμένην Ἑγὼ δ’ εἴπεν, ὡς λίαν
We can already see here emerging, during the fourth century, a notable difference: the indicative role of the commander, whose disappearance from battle due to injury or death leads to inevitable defeat. The increasing personalisation of leadership gives the general a vital prominence. The fundamental need for a good general to have *mens sana in corpore sano* appears even more striking in kingdoms such as Macedonia.

3. Philip II, King of the Macedonians

Philip, born in 382, was the third son of Amyntas III and one of his wives, Eurydike. On the death of his father in 370, his two elder brothers succeeded Amyntas to the throne, but both died within a few years. When the second son, Perdiccas, perished with 4,000 of his men in the summer of 360 during the war against the Illyrian king, Bardylis, his son Amyntas was too young to reign. Although Philip, the boy’s uncle, was chosen as *epitropos* or “regent”, he managed to get himself acclaimed by the army as “king of the Macedonians”. He quickly became famous for consolidating his authority over the Macedonian State and within two decades had transformed the Argead territory into a powerful kingdom, discouraging any attacks on its borders.

In his political behaviour he demonstrated an exceptional will, together with an unusual physical strength that encouraged his fellow men, frightened the Athenians and has fascinated some recent biographers—a fascination only surpassed by that for his son Alexander. The main interest is in politics and the relationship between the kingdom of Macedonia and the Greek cities. After Arnaldo Momigliano’s biography, first published in 1934, other scholars followed. Most of them, for instance Ian Worthington, see Philip “as a great man”, according to Diodorus Siculus’ formula, “the greatest of
the Kings in Europe”. That word ‘king’ relates to his duties both as army commander and as statesman.

All these accounts mention Philip’s strategic and political efficiency, underlining the fact that Alexander’s conquest was made possible by his father’s achievements in Greece. But although most of Philip’s life is chronologically documented, far less interest has been displayed in his physical aptitudes. He surely would have had to excel in combat and horsemanship. When, in 336, the king of the Macedonians was killed by one of his bodyguards at the age of 46, he still was a strong warrior and could have expected to live at least another twenty years. Let us now turn to Philip’s body.¹³

3.1. Injuries in General

From the few indications given by his contemporaries, especially the Athenians of course, it appears that the king had been injured several times. In his second Letter to Philip, written during the summer of 344, Isocrates prompts the king to be more cautious. The Alexandrian scholar Didymus Chalcenterus (first century BCE), commenting this speech, explains the circumstances: Philip had been wounded, along with 150 of his hetairoi, during the military campaign against the Illyrian king in spring 344. News of the injury caused a stir in the Greek cities, particularly in Athens, where his opponents were hoping the king would die. In pseudo-Demosthenes’ Oratio 11, 22 (Answer to a Letter sent by Philip to the Athenians) we learn only that he had again received several injuries, to the extent that the whole of his body had been wounded. This text supposedly dates from 339.

---

¹² Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca 16, 95.
¹³ Complementing the interesting article by Swift Riginos (1994), who provides ample bibliography on the subject.
¹⁴ Chronologically, the testimonia are following: Isocrates, Epistula 2, Demosthenes, De corona 67, with the commentaries (Scholia in Demosthenis De corona 67 ed. Dilts) and Didymus (col. 12, 1, 63).
¹⁵ Isocrates, Epistula 2, 3, 7 and 10.
¹⁶ His name is Pleuratos (Didymus) or Pleurias (Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca 16, 93, 6).
¹⁷ The same hope was raised in 331 (Demosthenes, Philippica 1, 10–11) and again in 342 (Demosthenes, De Chersoneso 35–36).
¹⁸ Both the letter and the answer were probably written by Anaximenes during the last years of the fourth century (cf. M. Croiset, Démosthène Harangues, vol. 2, Paris: Les belles Lettres (CUF), 1946, 142–146).
¹⁹ Κατατετράσθαι πάν τὸ σῶμα. So Seneca Rhetor, Controversiae 10, 5, 6: crure debili, oculo effuso, iugulo fracto.
The list of Philip's injuries comes in Demosthenes' speech of 330, *On the Crown*:

Philip himself, against whom we were fighting, had, for the sake of empire and supremacy, endured the loss of his eye, the fracture of his collar-bone, the mutilation of his hand and his leg, and was ready to sacrifice to the fortune of war any and every part of his body, if only he could live with the remnant: a life of honour and fame.\(^2^0\)

From this cataloguing of his various wounds, the audience might have imagined that they had been incurred during the same day or the same campaign. The aim is evidently political: we would not expect a medical report.

It seems that only the eye and thigh wounds had any impact on Philip's appearance, as the first left him with a scar through the right part of his face where his eyeball had been removed, and he limped from the other one. Neither his wound in the right collar bone sustained in Illyria in 344, nor the one he received in the hand in 339, during the fight against the Triballoi, an independent Thracian tribe, seem to have left any visible after-effects. Let us look now at the testimonies on these two major wounds—albeit briefly, since they have already been thoroughly studied by Alice Swift Rigonos and are not our major concern here.

### 3.2. Eye Injury

The king of Macedonia lost his eye during the siege of the small Greek city of Methôn\(^2^1\) on the gulf of Therma, during the spring of 354. Authors' accounts of the projectile vary, but they agree that Philip lost his right eye.\(^2^2\) Didymus’ commentary on Demosthenes, recording earlier sources such as

\(^{20}\) [...] ἑώρων δ’ αὐτὸν τὸν Φιλίππον, πρὸς δὲν ἦν ύμιν ὁ ἀγών, ὑπὲρ ἀρχῆς καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ὀφθαλμὸν ἐκκεκομένον, τὴν κλείνα κατασχάτα, τὴν χεῖρα, τὸ σκέλος πεπερωμένον, πᾶν δ’ τι βουληθεὶς μέρος ἢ τύχη τοῦ σώματος παρελάβει, τούτο προέμενον, ὡστε τῷ λοιπῷ μετὰ τιμῆς καὶ δόξης ζῆν. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, 2, 27 comments on Demosthenes’ portrayal of Philip in parallel with Sallust’s portrayal of Sertorius (*Historiae* 1, 88).

\(^{21}\) Strabo, *Geographica* 8, 6, 15, speaking of the small town of Methane between Epidaurus and Troezenae, mentions that the name was sometimes also written Methôn, like the 'name of the Macedonian city where Philip lost an eye because of an arrow (ἐν Ἡ Φιλίππως ἐξεκόπη τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ πολιορκῶν)'. But in 7a, 1, 22 [fr. 25], he writes that while Philip, son of Amyntas, was besieging the city of Methôn, his right eye was blinded by a catapult: ἐν δὲ τῷ πρὸ τῆς Μεθώνος πεδίῳ γενέσθαι συνέβη Φιλίππῳ τῷ Ἀμύντῳ τὴν ἐκκοπὴν τοῦ δεξίου ὀφθαλμοῦ καταπελτηκή βέλει κατὰ τὴν πολιορκίαν τῆς πόλεως. About Methôn, cf. Hatzopoulos-Knoepfler (1990) 661–665. Lucian, *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit* 38 is the only author to say that it happened in Olynthos.

\(^{22}\) Esser (1931).
Theopompos, Marsyas and Douris, adds some details. Citing Theopompos, he explains, for instance, that Philip was shot from the city wall during his inspection tour and not in a fight. Later authors who mention the episode generally agree with this version, which had probably been officially validated by the Macedonian court circles. The eye injury is also briefly reported by Diodorus Siculus, no doubt after Ephorus, as well as twice by Strabo and a bit later by Justin. During the fourth century CE, the Antiochean orator Libanius repeated Demosthenes’ words. Most of the reports use nouns or verbal forms of κόπτω, ‘to smite, cut off, strike,’ illustrating the violence of the event.

Over the years, the story was somehow amplified. Pliny the Elder adds a doctor’s name, Critoboulos. Others, such as Lucian of Samosate, give the name of the archer, Aster, or even report how he threatened the king before striking him with an arrow. This is surely fiction. Some sources report that the king’s behaviour did not change after the accident; others state that

---

23 For the following lines, see Swift-Riginos (1994). Didymus col. 12, 43 (in FGrHist 2b, 115 F frag. 52 ad Theopompos of Chios): περὶ μὲν γὰρ τὴν Μεθώνης πολιορκίαν τὸν δεξίων ὀφθαλμὸν ἐξεκόπη τοξεύματι πληγεῖς, ἐν δὲ τὰ μηχανώματα καὶ τὰς χωστρίδας λεγομένας ἐφεώρα, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ 5 τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστοριῶν ἀφηγείται Θεόπτωμος· οἷς καὶ Μαρσίας ὁ Μακεδών ὁμολογεῖ. 24 Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca 16, 34, 5: Ἔν δὲ τῇ πολιορκίᾳ ταύτῃ συνέβη τὸν Φίλιππον εἰς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν πληγεῖσα τοξεύματι διαφαράγνῃ τὴν δρασίν. (“During the siege, it happened that Philippos, hit in the eye by some arrow, lost his sight.”) 25 Strabo, Geographica 6, 6, 15 and 7a 1, 22 [fr. 25] (cf. supra note 21). 26 Justin, Historiarum epitome 7, 6: in praetereuntem, de muris sagitta iacta, dextrum oculum regis effudit. 27 Libanius, Progymnasmata 12: τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἐκεκομμένος. End of the second century CE, Clemens of Alexandria had also repeated the list in Protrepticus 4, 54, 5. 28 ἐξεκόπη (Strabo and Didymus), τὴν ἐκκεπήν (Strabo), ἐκεκομμένος (Demosthenes and Libanius). 29 The Hippocratic treaty, Epidemiae 5, 49 reports a similar accident, but the patient’s eye was not lost: ὁ δὲ ἐς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν πληγεῖς ἐπλήγη μὲν κατὰ τὸ βλεφάρον, ἐξὸ δὲ ἀδήμος ἀπερείχε. Τυπτόντος τὸ βλεφάρον, ἠρήντα πάντα· οὐδὲν φαίνον ὁ γαρ ὀφθαλμὸς δείχνειν· καὶ ὑγείας ἐγένετο ἐξωτής: αἵμα δὲ ἔρρηκε λάβρον, ἰκανὸν τῷ πλήθει. 30 Pliny, Naturalis historia 7, 124: Magna et Crito bulo fama est extracta Philippi regis oculo sagitta et citra deformitatem oris curata orbitate luminis: ‘Great is also Critoboulos’ fame, for he had extracted an arrow from the eye of Philip, the king, and healed the eyeball without deforming his face.’ 31 Lucian, Quomodo historia conscribenda sit 38. 32 Plutarch, Parallela graeco-romana 307d, probably after Duris of Samos, in FGrHist 76 F 36. The projectile is generally said to be an arrow, Strabo alone mentions a missile launched by catapult. 33 “Philip accepted his injury without any negative effects on his bravery and ability in war; nor was he vengeful, showing clemency to the besieged when they surrendered”, Lascaratos (2004). 34 Pseudo-Demetrius, De elocutione 293.
Philip lost his temper every time somebody mentioned the words ‘eye’ or ‘Kuklôps’ in his presence, since it had most probably become a nickname for the king. Whatever the case, Philip survived, thanks to his physician or rather to his solid constitution.

Fortunately, archeologists have provided us with some artefacts. The well-known archeological discoveries by Manolis Andronikos and his colleagues in various tombs at Vergina (Aigai) in 1977 gave us, among other beautiful objects, a small ivory head and some remains of a skeleton. Although the body had been cremated, forensic surgeons about twenty years ago were able to analyse the skull. There was some debate about its identification, but this is not the point here. A reconstruction of Philip’s head has been attempted, showing a scar across the right eyebrow and a missing eyeball.

### 3.3. Thigh Injury

Thirteen years after the loss of his right eye, in 341, Philip was again wounded seriously, during an engagement on the Thracian border. He was hit by a spear that went through his thigh, but neither Demosthenes, Justin nor Plutarch say which. The wound was bad, and his troops thought the

---

35 Critoboulos (rather than Critodemos) had a high social position, as we can suppose, from the trierarchy he was in charge of in 326. Concerning the two different names for the doctor (Critoboulos, Critodemos), Heckel (1981) states that Arrian (Anabasis Alexandri 6, 11, 1) is wrong, and that the name is Critoboulos (the same physician who healed Philip) also cured Alexander and became a trierarch in Nearch’s fleet.

36 His illness a few months later, which was so severe that he was reported dead (Demosthenes, Olynthiaca 3, 5), is a possible consequence of his wound: see Esser (1931), 252.


38 Philip’s wound is also depicted in other representations. The Head of Copenhagen, a realistic marble copy of a prototype from the fourth century AD, made in the age of Trajan, also clearly shows a distinct nick in the upper corner of the right eyebrow and the characteristic raising of its corners. A coin (ca. 354–350 BCE) found in the Greek town of Capsa, depicting Philip in right profile, presents a scar like a crescent moon between the lower and upper eyelids, near the external canthus, supposed to be the engraver’s deliberate indication of the injury (cf. Lascaratos 2004).


40 Swift-Riginos (1994) provides a complete presentation of the debates, notes 1, 2 and 3, 103–104.


42 The battle followed a quarrell with the Triballoi.

43 Plutarch, De fortuna Alexandri 331c: Φιλιππου λόγχα τὸν μηρὸν ἐν Τριβαλλοῖς διαπαρέντος.

44 Demosthenes, De corona 67. Only Didymus (loc. cit.) reports the right leg to be hurt.

45 Justin, Historiarum epitome 9, 3, 2: [...] et max proelium in quo ita in femore vulneratus est Philippus, ut per corpus eius equeus interficeretur.

46 Plutarch, De fortuna Alexandri 331c.
king had died. Philip was lucky again: his wound healed, but left him lame. As commander of the cavalry he was vulnerable to such injuries, since his legs were exposed to the spears and swords of infantrymen. The wound probably gave Philip a shortened thigh muscle or a contraction of the sciatic nerve. The medical texts from the Corpus Hippocraticum, for instance the Prorrheticum II, written by a Coan doctor during the second half of the fifth century BCE, warn the physician—and the patient—that ‘major wounds which have completely severed the nerves (tendons) [...] evidently leave the patient lame’.

Doubtless Philip was still able to ride, and he was certainly more at ease on his horse than walking with pain. His limping leg did not affect his ability to command, and it is interesting to note that no historian writing about the various battles he fought ever mentioned a physical weakness. Nor did anyone suspect Philip of having changed his tactical habits because of his disability. So clearly Philip kept his complete authority not only over the troops but also over the hetairoi and other influential members of the court circle. This brings us therefore to the question: is a disabled king still a good king? Can he be accepted as a competent leader, and what is his own attitude and that of others towards his shattered body?

4. Is a Disabled King Still a Good King?

4.1. The Classical View

To understand more clearly the difference in the view of physical disabilities between the beginning and the end of the fourth century BCE, we can contrast Philip with another lame king, whose reign began about forty years earlier, in 398: Agesilaus II, king of Sparta. Shortly after his death, Xenophon, a friend and admirer, wrote an encomium praising the Spartan king’s virtues. Nowhere in this text does he mention that Agesilaus had poor health and was disabled (χωλός). The one mention of some glorious war wounds is immediately followed by one about his piety; referring to the Spartan victory against a Greek coalition at the battle of Coroneai in 394, he writes: ‘Though

---

47 So Justin, Historiarum epitome 9, 3: Cum omnes occisum putarent [...].
48 Hippocrates, Prorrheticum 2, 15 (9, 40–43 Littré): Τὰ δὲ τρόμματα τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἄρθροις μεγάλα μὲν ἄντα καὶ τελέως ἀποκόπτοντα τὰ νεῦρα τὰ συνήχοτα, εὐθηλὸν ὅτι χωλοῦς ἀποδείξεις.
49 Thus Plutarch, Vita Agesilae 3, 4.
50 The episode is also described in Xenophon, Hellenica 4, 3, 15–23.
wounded in every part of his body with every sort of weapon, he did not forget his duties towards the god.\textsuperscript{51} Knowing Xenophon as a very religious man,\textsuperscript{52} we may interpret the sentence in two complementary ways. Since any man suffering from a number of wounds might think first only of his pain, Xenophon underlines the political and religious conscience of the king who, in spite of it, immediately thanked the divinities for the victory. But a second reading might be that although Agesilaus had to some extent been abandoned by the gods, because he had been injured, he nevertheless carried out his religious duties. However, we do not learn anything else about his wounds or their consequences in this biography. Following the tradition of classical authors, Xenophon does not dwell on injuries, as if they still involved a sort of shame. Apparently, however, Agesilaus was never defeated\textsuperscript{53} and continued the struggle to maintain Sparta's influence in Greece.

Even Plutarch's \textit{Life of Agesilaus} states that the king tried to hide his lameness\textsuperscript{54} and never used it as a pretext for withdrawal from any task.\textsuperscript{55} The reason for this discretion may lie both in the importance which the Spartans' religious beliefs attached to physical integrity, especially regarding their kings,\textsuperscript{56} and in the heroic state of mind that was still important in Laconia. Nevertheless, Agesilaus reigned for forty years (from ca. 398 to 359/8), had power and authority, and was held in great respect. Although his disability was not the consequence of a war wound,\textsuperscript{57} this did not undermine his ability to reign, as long as it did not prevent him from leading the army.\textsuperscript{58} But his attempts to hide his lameness surely show that he still acted according to the traditions of the classical period.

\textsuperscript{51} Xenophon, \textit{Agesilaus}, 2, 13: ‘Ο δὲ καίπερ πολλά τραύματα ἔχων πάντοσε καὶ παντοτίος ὅπλος ἄμως σώκ ἐπελάθετο τοῦ θείου. The exact phrase again in Xenophon, \textit{Hellenica}, 4, 3, 20. Also \textit{Agesilaus}, 6, 2: σαφῆ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς σημεία ἀπενεγκάμενος τοῦ θυμό μάχεσθαι, “bearing in his own body visible tokens of the fury in his fighting”. Xenophon continues: “so that not by hearsay but by the evidence of their own eyes men could judge what manner of man he was”.

\textsuperscript{52} Xenophon, \textit{Hellenica} 4, 3, 21: he also consacrated a magnificent gift to Apollo in Delphi.

\textsuperscript{53} So Plutarch, \textit{Vita Pompei} 84, 1 (comparison between Agesilaus and Pompeius).

\textsuperscript{54} Plutarch, \textit{Vita Agisaelae} 2, 3: τὴν δὲ τοῦ σκέλους πηρωσίν ἢ τε ὁρα τοῦ σώματος ᾕντος ἐπέχρυσε.

\textsuperscript{55} Plutarch, \textit{Vita Agisaelae}, 2, 3: Πρὸς μηδὲνα πόνον μηδὲ πράξιν ἀπαγορεύνοντος διὰ τὴν χωλότητα.

\textsuperscript{56} An oracle warned against a lame kingship (Plutarch, \textit{Vita Agisaelae} 30, 1, cf. Parker (1996), 277). The necessity of physical integrity to honour the gods is far more important in the Roman tradition, cf. Baroin (2009), and Baroin (2002).

\textsuperscript{57} The king limped after an accident. Plutarch, \textit{Vita Agisaelae} 3, 8 does not come up with any circumstances, and says only that he had προσπταίασας τὸν πόδα (“was injured in the foot”).

\textsuperscript{58} At the age of 80, shattered, he still intended to start another expedition: Plutarch, \textit{Vita Agisaelae} 36: καὶ πάν ὑπὸ τραυμάτων τὸ σώμα κατακεκομμένος.
The religious conception of an exchange of gifts between men and gods may explain the sacrifice of his own body that Philip was ready to make, to compensate for the great fortune of military dominance over Greece: it expressed the fact that good luck was immediately envied by the gods and had to be balanced by some misfortune. To return to Demosthenes’ *On the Crown*, Philip's injuries come in exchange for empire (*arkhe*) and dynastic power (*dunasteia*), and for the sake of honor (*time*) and fame (*doxe*). But the important difference is that in Demosthenes' eyes, it is the political rather than the religious consequences of Philip's behaviour that matter. Was this attitude manifest in Macedonia itself at the time?

4.2. *A Trained Warrior or a Disabled Commander?*

Macedonia was a military state. Physical training was required from all men, and military exercises are known to have been part of its institutional tradition. The king's personal authority lay therefore in his ability to stand in front of his men and lead not only the war but also the kingdom, keeping an eye on the *hetairoi*. His power was reinforced by the almost permanent warfare that maintained his position. The ancient authors all praise Philip's outstanding qualities as a general, especially his quick-wittedness.

Understandably, Philip tried as hard as he could to make light of his disabilities, and to act as first among Macedonians in all circumstances. Far from expressing a religious relationship with the gods or Tyche, Philip's determination to achieve his project was even reinforced by the obstacles his disability presented, whatever it may have cost him. For Demosthenes, Philip seemed no less dangerous to the Athenians with his disabled body. Quite the contrary: it made his political will appear far stronger and more threatening. So the psychological explanation—that the sacrifices and pain reinforced Philip's determination—prevailed at that time. Demosthenes used it to convince his fellow citizens to declare war on the Macedonian king, that dangerous Barbarian.

In a famous passage, Plutarch lists four one-eyed kings or generals and forces his audience to the conclusion that they were some of the best warriors:

---

59 Thus the text of [Demosthenes’] letter in answer to Philip (22), stating that in order to increase his kingdom he had been ready to sacrifice his body: φιλοκυνδυνον δωσθ' ύπερ τού μείζων ποιήσαι την ἀρχήν κατατετρώσθαι πάν τό σώμα τοίς πολεμίοις μαχόμενον.

60 “In war, the king fought alongside his men, on horseback or on foot,” see Hammond (1989) 65.

61 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca* 16, 1, 6: ἀνδρὸν ἀρχηγικὴ.
“The generals most involved in war (πολεµικώτατοι) and those who have accomplished a great number of deeds through tricks and skill were one-eyed (ἐτερόφθαλμοι),” so Philip, Antigonos, Hannibal and [...] Sertorius.”

Philip is undoubtedly still polemikótatos and in good physical condition when at the age of 44 he beats the Greek coalition in Chaironea, in 338. We cannot know, of course, the extent of Philip’s physical engagement during this battle, but far from being adunatos or incapable, he certainly showed an intact dunamis (force, power).

Antigonos I (383–301), who was the same age as Philip, unsurprisingly reacted in a similar way. Having lost one eye, he was called Monophthalmos. How and when it happened is not clear. No historian seems to know whether it was accident or illness, and recent monographs on the self-proclaimed king emphasise his military deeds and political role, sidelining his physical appearance. The only indication that, like Philip, he wanted to hide his disability is a note by Pliny the Elder, which reminds us that Antigonos was always pictured on portraits or coins in profile, on his ‘good’ side. His epithet became his name, as is frequently the case, though he was probably also designated by the nickname of Kuklôps.

They are said ἐτερόφθαλμοι. For Esser (1934), ἐτερόφθαλμοι and μονόφθαλμοι, are perfect synonyms, but there may be a difference, μονόφθαλμος being from birth or childhood on as Pollux, Onomasticon, 61–62 explains, μονόφθαλμος is said ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν φύσεω ἐν ἐγόντων ὀφθαλμῶν, ὀιον Κυκλῶπων καὶ Ἀριμασπῶν. Herennius Philo, De diversis verborum significationibus, letter E, 62 confirms: ἐτερόφθαλμος καὶ μονόφθαλμος διαφέρει: ἐτερόφθαλμος μὲν ὁ κατὰ περίπτωσιν πηρωθεὶς τὸν ἔτερον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, μονόφθαλμος δὲ ὁ μόνον ὀφθαλμὸν ἐσχηκὼς, ὡς ὁ Κύκλωψ.

Plutarch, Vita Sertorii 1, 8: Τῶν στρατηγῶν οἱ πολεµικώτατοι καὶ πλείστα δῆλον κατεργασά- μενοι μετὰ δεινότητος ἐτερόφθαλμοι γεγόνασι, Φιλίππος, Ἀντίγονος, Ἀννακάκη καὶ ... Σερτώριας.

On the adjectives mono- or heterophthalmos, see Esser (1933).

Briant (1973) writes on political history and Billows (1990) 28–29, followed by Lascaratos (1999), asserts that, according to Plutarch (Vita Alexandri 70), he had been wounded in his youth, when he fought on side of Philip II at the battle of Perinthos in 340. But this wrongly assimilates Antigonos, future king, with a certain Antigenes, who also suffered the loss of an eye, certainly a common disability among soldiers.

Pliny, Naturalis Historia 35, 90: “He also painted a portrait of King Antigonos, who was blind in one eye, and devised an original method of concealing the defect, for he did the likeness in ‘three-quarter’, so that the feature that was lacking in the subject might be thought instead to be absent in the picture; he only showed that part of the face which he was able to display as unmitigated”.

Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria 2, 13, 12: “In a painting, the whole face is shown: but Apelles painted Antigonos from the side (in profile), to hide the deformity of his lost eye”.

Aelian, Varia historia 12, 43: “The son of Philippos, Antigonos who was one-eyed, and therefore, called the Cyclop ...” follows Douris.
that he died at the battle of Ipsos during the summer of 301, at the age of 81; apparently, his missing eye had had no effect on his military and political career.\footnote{It is noticeable that no defeat was ever assigned to a commander's physical disability, except for Crassus' short sight which caused him to miss the movements of the troops and ruined his position (Plutarch, \textit{Vita Bruti} 43, 4: ἥν γάρ ἀσθενής τὴν δόξαν).}

\textbf{4.3. Wounds Exhibited as Proof of Courage}

It therefore seems that neither lameness nor loss of an eye hindered Agesilaus, Philip or Antigonos from their military and political tasks as kings. From the remaining texts, we learn that they did not pride themselves on their scars or war wounds. On the contrary, Philip grumbled about them. Thus Plutarch: ‘Philip, fighting against the Triballoi, had his thigh hit by a spear and, although he was cured, he could not bear being lame.’\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{De fortuna Alexandri} 331c: Τὸ δὲ πατέρας Φιλίππου λόγχη τὸν μιρόν ἐν Τριβαλλοῖς διαπαρέντος, καὶ τὸν μὲν κίνδυνον διαφυγόντος, ἀφομένου δὲ τῇ χωλότητι.} Antigonos insisted on hiding the fact that he was one-eyed. In this sense, they still act like men of the classical period, neither boasting about nor taking advantage of their physical scars.

However, it seems that within a single generation the view of distorted bodies had radically changed. From Alexander on, each scar is definitely understood to be proof of courage and exemplary skill, which the warrior is proud to show\footnote{Curtius Rufus, \textit{Historiae} 9, 3, 10: Intuere corpora exanguia, tot perfossa uulneribus, tot cicatricibus putria. “Look at our exausted bodies, shattered by so many injuries, distorted by so many scars”, is the request from the veterans to Alexander in 325 after so many ordeals.} because they manifest his \textit{arete}. Arrian reports how Alexander challenged his troops\footnote{Arrian, \textit{Anabasis Alexandri}, 7, 10, 1: ἄγε δὴ καὶ ὅτε τραύματα ὑμῶν ἐστὶ γυμνώσας αὐτὰ ἐπιδείξατο καὶ ἔγω τὰ ἐμὰ ἐπιδείξω ἐν μέρει: “Come now, whoever of you has wounds, let him strip and show them, and I will show mine in turn”.} in 325 by inviting them to show their scars as \textit{indicia uirtutis}:

\begin{center}
Come now, whoever of you has wounds, let him strip and show them, and I will show mine in turn; for there is no part of my body, in front at any rate, remaining free from wounds; nor is there any kind of weapon used either for close combat or for hurling at the enemy, the traces of which I do not bear on my person. For I have been wounded with the sword in close fight, I have been shot with arrows, and I have been struck with missiles projected from engines of war; and though oftentimes I have been hit with stones and bolts of wood for the sake of your lives, your glory, and your wealth, I am still leading you as conquerors over all the land and sea, all rivers, mountains, and plains.\footnote{Arrian, \textit{Anabasis Alexandri}, 7, 10, 2 quoting Alexander’s speech to his troops in 325: ἄγε}.
\end{center}
All shame has vanished. Alexander’s body becomes a visible and living emblem of his military worth and is considered an εἰκών. Plutarch summarizes: ‘He [Alexander] did not cover over nor hide his scars, but bore them with him openly as symbolic representations, graven on his body, of virtue and manly courage.’ To imitate the king, hetairoi and soldiers also compete to show their courage and accumulate injuries, sometimes even voluntarily.

And in Plutarch’s time, disablement due to war wounds is definitely considered a sign of military worth. To his father, grumbling about his pain and his limping, Alexander answers: ‘Be of good cheer, father, and go on your way rejoicing, that, at each step, you may recall your valour (arete).’

We had to wait for Alexander—and Plutarch—to see Philip taking pride in his wounding. His disability became so famous that, by the second century BCE, it had turned into a topic for rhetorical exercises: ‘Which of Aphrodite’s hands did Diomedes hurt?’ induced the question: ‘Which was Philip’s limping leg?’ In Plutarch’s time, recalling the lame king had evolved into a scholarly occupation, and Philip is neither suspected as δικαιολογητικος nor δικαιουμένους, but rather as a model for imitation. (Plutarch, De fortuna Alexandri 331c: οὐκ ἔγκαλυπτονο διακρυτόν τάς οὐλίας, ἀλλ’ ὅσπερ εἰκόνας ἐγκεχαραγμένας ἀρετῆς καὶ ἀνδραγαθίας περιφέροντα.]

Plutarch, De fortuna Alexandri 331c: Τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς Φίλιππος λόγῳ τὸν μηρὸν ἐν Τριβαλλίας διαπαρέντος, καὶ τὸν μὲν κίνδυνον διαφυγόντος, ἁγθομένου δὲ τῇ χυλόστητι, βάρφει, πάτερ, ἔρι, καὶ πράσινον φανερώσε τῆς ἀρετῆς κατὰ βῆμα μιμομονεύσεις.]

The anecdote of a man named Cleisophos, in Philip’s entourage, covering his eye in sympathy with the king or limping in imitation is an obvious forgery. (Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 6, 249a: “Satyrus, in his Life of Philip, says that when Philip had his eye knocked out, Cleisophus went along with him with his own eye bandaged in the same way. Again, when Philip was wounded in the leg, Cleisophus marched limping along with the king”). But what this shows is that the king’s disabilities became not only characteristic but also worthy of imitation.

Plutarch, Quaestiones convivales 739b: ἐντερομένου πατέρω σκέλει χωλᾶς ἤν Φίλιππος. The parallel between the Iliadic episode of Diomedes hurting the goddess of love and Philip’s wounding elevates the latter almost into a literary tale.
someone the gods have forsaken nor is he an exceptional figure among kings or commanders. Times had changed.

5. Conclusion

Undoubtedly the mistrust of mutilated bodies, based on the profoundly Greek idea that inner beauty is incompatible with visible decay, together with the superstitious fears involved in religious interpretations, gradually disappeared. This was especially true concerning kings and generals who, because of their military activity, were inevitably exposed to serious injuries that could alter their appearance. It seems that from Philip onwards, war injuries and scars received in formal battles were easily admitted as tokens of bravery. The implicit religious taboo fades away. As long as the king or general could stay on his horse and ride properly, he was able to fight and lead his men. This, first and foremost, was what mattered.

Following the lame god Hephaestus, myth has given any limping person a divine reference. Georges Dumézil studied, in Roman legends and German mythology, the association between the one-eyed and the lame that was embodied in various heroes, such as Horatius Cocles, putting forward the idea of a ‘paradoxically qualifying mutilation’ in Roman thought. More prosaically in the Greek world, as most non-deadly wounds injured the legs or feet, it is obvious that lame people abounded in ancient times, as did those suffering from diseases of the eye. Thus none of our kings was an exception in ancient society.

The Roman fascination with the body image of elder citizens as noble and tired, from the last years of the Republic to the first century CE, made it easier for soldiers to swagger around showing off their scars or mutilations. No doubt Plutarch, greatly influenced by his stay in Rome, adopted the new state of mind towards distorted or disabled bodies. He represents a synthesis of both traditions: on the one hand the Hellenistic need for a military leader to be the best warrior, entailing the risk of being injured and disabled; on the other hand, the Roman admiration for visible proof of arete, virtus, elevating scars into badges of courage. ‘The others, said Sertorius, do not always wear

---

80 Dumézil (1978) 275.
81 Ambulant disabilities came through the shortening of the muscles after an injury or a bad reduction of the bones in case of a fracture. In the Graeco-Roman world, the most frequent ailments concerned sight or mobility, as I have tried to show elsewhere, cf. Samama (2009) and previously Esser (1934).
the proof of their heroism: they sometimes lay down their necklaces, their spears and their crowns. But I always keep the distinctive signs of my courage: in my disability, they can see my bravery.\footnote{Plutarch, \textit{Vita Sertorii} 4, 3–4. Cf. Sallust, \textit{Historiae} 1, 88: \textit{corporis deshonestamento laetabatur} and the commentary by Gellius, \textit{Noctes Atticae} 2, 27: “Philip is not shown, like Sertorius, rejoicing in bodily disfigurement”. See Pailler (2000).}

In this interpretation Philip II, king of Macedonia, emerges as the turning point: he still belongs to the classical period, because he tried to hide his disabilities, and because in the eyes of the Athenians he seemed ready for a sort of transaction with the gods: in the tradition of δῶρον vs. ἀντιδῶρον, he offered his body in exchange for power and increasing political dominance. But at the same time, because of his scars were numerous and visible, he became a primary emblem of the wounded king. Unwittingly, he opened the way for his son Alexander, so often injured, and for those epigoni who gradually established the tradition of a king in arms whose very body was a living image of battles. For some of them, over the years, even lameness or monophthalmia came to be considered a possible source of pride.
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