

## Do the Emotions have a History?

Fredric Jameson, in his principal theoretical work, The Political Unconscious (1981) p. 62, remarks: "That the structure of the psyche is historical, and has a history, is, however, as difficult for us to grasp as that the senses are not themselves natural organs but rather the results of a long process of differentiation even within human history." In the reference to the evolution of the senses we may detect an allusion to the young Marx, who wrote in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts: "the *forming of the five senses* is a labor of the entire history of the world down to the present."<sup>1</sup> And indeed, it is only recently that people have begun to take seriously the idea that the emotions too have a history, and that they are not necessarily the same in all times and places.

Now, given that I have recently written a book on the emotions of the ancient Greeks, in which I highlight the differences between their conception of the emotions and that which prevails today, at least among speakers of English, I naturally hold the view that the emotions do vary from one culture to another. By this I mean that emotions that the Greeks define or describe in action, taken individually, may differ from the basic emotions recognized today -- their "anger," for example, does not map precisely onto our notion of

"anger" -- and also that the very idea of what counts as an emotion, that is, the concept of emotion itself, is not precisely the same. I will draw upon some of this research to illustrate how an ancient Greek emotion, or the Greek idea of emotion, may diverge from our own, but today I do not plan to enter too much into concrete cases or examples. Rather, I wish to investigate in more depth than I have done so far what it means to say that emotions have a history, that is, what is at stake in making such a claim. In so doing, I hope to shed some useful light on the way emotions are conceived today, and also on what it is to undertake cultural history.

Let me set the stage by outlining the lineaments of the debate over the variability of the emotions as it continues to this day. On one side are those who maintain that the emotions are innate and universal across the human species (and extend to some non-human animals as well), or, in current parlance, that they are "hard-wired" into our physiology. This school of thought derives ultimately from Darwin, and in particular his last book, The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals, published in 1872. Darwin related the expressions he examined to a large number of emotions, including suffering, anxiety, grief, dejection and despair, as well as joy, love and devotion, meditation, sulkiness and determination, hatred and anger, disdain, contempt, disgust, guilt, patience, surprise, fear and

horror, shame, shyness, and modesty. Darwin's modern disciple, Paul Ekman, has continued Darwin's research on expression. Indeed, Ekman's Darwin and Facial Expression: A Century of Research in Review (1973) was published to coincide with the centennial of Darwin's Expression, and Ekman has recently (1998) re-edited and brought up to date Darwin's original work. In his own research, Ekman has reduced Darwin's large range of emotions to a few basic ones which can be readily discriminated: his primary categories are anger, disgust, sadness, enjoyment, fear and surprise (the two last sometimes conflated into one), although he suggests that contempt and perhaps the complex of shame and guilt may also have universally recognized expressions (Ekman 1998: 390-91). As Craig Smith and Heather Scott cautiously formulate the central idea (Smith and Scott 1997: 229): "There is considerable evidence indicating distinct, prototypical facial signals that across a variety of cultures can be reliably recognized as corresponding to at least six different emotions (happiness, sadness, surprise, disgust, anger, and fear), and possibly others, including interest, shame, and contempt" (for a summary of the debate over facial expression as a sign of emotion, see Parkinson 1995: 121-38). Still in the tradition of Darwin, the recent quasi-discipline of evolutionary psychology has sought to give functional explanations of the emotions and the ostensible advantages they

provide for the survival of the species (or, alternatively, and far more dubiously, for the exact reproduction of gene types); it is assumed that a specific set of discrete emotions will have been selected for in the prehistory of the race, and are thus common to all human cultures.

The opposite view is that emotions are highly dependent on culture, and that what we perceive as anger, for example, may correspond to no particular emotion among the array of sentiments that are identified and experienced in another society. Of course, members of any society are likely, when asked to identify extreme facial expressions in photographs, to apply basic emotion terms in their vocabulary (I leave aside methodological problems inherent in Ekman's research program, for example that when photographs are accompanied by narrative captions it is the narrative that determines the response, and that responses to videos as opposed to still photographs are far less consistent). But the question is whether these terms mean the same things as those that we or others might employ in response to the same image. In order to determine this, we need to know a great deal about meanings of given emotion terms in the particular culture under consideration. Thus, an ancient Greek might conceivably respond to an image of wide open eyes and intense sneering expression on the lips as being a sign of orgê, the term that is most often rendered in English as

"anger." But this does not guarantee that what the Greek meant by orgê is the same as what we meant by "anger." To ascertain this, we need to investigate how the term orgê was used and defined by Greeks. As it happens, Aristotle provides a definition of this term, and also some illustrations of the conditions under which it is elicited. His definition runs: "let orgê be a desire, accompanied by pain, for a perceived revenge, on account of a perceived slight on the part of people who are not fit to slight one or one's own." Now, this does not resemble very closely the definition to be found, for example, in the Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary of English, which runs: "a strong feeling of displeasure and usually of antagonism" (<http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>, s.v.). The dictionary goes on to indicate differences among various related words in English, and notes that anger, "the most general term, names the reaction but in itself conveys nothing about intensity or justification or manifestation of the emotional state." Yet Aristotle points specifically to the cause of the response, namely a slight or insult on the part of someone not in a position to belittle you. Now, we can of course say that the difference between the two definitions is not an essential one; ancient Greek and modern English anger both refer to a painful or unpleasant response involving hostility, and Aristotle's mention of the reason for orgê, like his specification of orgê

as a desire for vengeance, simply colors in, as it were, the bare outline provided by Merriam-Webster, which corresponds to the elementary and trans-historical character of anger as such. But this is to suppose that treating anger as "a strong feeling" is somehow neutral, the universal ground of the emotion, as it were, whereas definitions that include a reference to the stimulus or intentional state are otiose or supererogatory.

Now, as it happens, the definition of anger provided by the Merriam-Webster dictionary conforms nicely to the meanings they give for the term "emotion" itself: "the affective aspect of consciousness"; "a state of feeling"; "a psychic and physical reaction (as anger or fear) subjectively experienced as strong feeling and physiologically involving changes that prepare the body for immediate vigorous action." Note the emphasis on "feeling," "affective aspect," and "psychic reaction": all concentrating on an ostensibly internal state, with no reference to the external cause of the sentiment.<sup>2</sup> Here, to be sure, Merriam-Webster adds a comment on physiological changes, which are assigned the function of enabling "vigorous action." One wonders just what action is enabled by such emotions as shame, or pity, or -- another good Aristotelian emotion -- gratitude. No doubt, some behavioral response is associated with each of these latter sentiments, but would we normally be inclined to characterize it as "vigorous"? Merriam-Webster evidently have

in mind an impulse to flee or react aggressively, that is, a transient but powerful state of readiness, not the long-term and settled intention to respond in accord with a sentiment elicited by another person's condition or treatment of us. The latter view corresponds better to Aristotle's conception of anger as a desire for revenge, which might take various forms and indeed bide its time (compare the Spanish proverb that revenge is a dish best eaten cold).

What is more, Aristotle's picture of orgê conforms as well to the definition he provides of emotion in general, or rather, to use his own term, pathos: "Let the emotions be all those things on account of which people change their minds and differ in regard to their judgments, and upon which attend pain and pleasure, for example anger, pity, fear, and all other such things and their opposites." Note how there is no mention of feeling here, no reference to action readiness or physiological states, not to mention facial expressions specific to each emotion; Aristotle's sole criteria for something being an emotion is that it affect one's judgment or discrimination, along with the requirement that it be accompanied by pleasure and pain. Stripping the idea of anger to a mere feeling, in accord with the definition in Merriam-Webster, is not so much to get down to basics in respect to the nature of emotion but rather to deprive orgê of what it takes to qualify as an

emotion, or more strictly a pathos, as Aristotle conceives of it. Before we affirm that Aristotle's orgê is more or less equivalent to our "anger," it is necessary to be sure that our sense of emotion itself is not specific to our own culture and hence relative rather than universal.

For Aristotle, a desire for revenge provoked by a slight will naturally affect how we judge the person or action that caused the offense, and so it clearly qualifies as a pathos. But there is more: by placing the emphasis on the cause of the passion, rather than on the resultant feeling (however it is determined) and expression, Aristotle is plainly opening the way to a great deal of cultural variation in the constitution of anger-like and other sentiments. Thus, orgê, as Aristotle understands it, is produced by a slight and nothing but a slight. This is a far more restricted range of causes than those commonly associated with anger today. For one thing, if we take Aristotle at his word, his definition excludes the possibility of being angry at an inanimate object, or indeed at anything that is by nature incapable of insulting us; I cannot plausibly be angry at a dog that bites me, for instance, unless I believe that it did so with the intention of putting me down. Simply to indicate how peculiar Aristotle's account of orgê is when compared to modern ideas of anger, I cite two claims that he makes about it. First, Aristotle says that we cannot become

angry -- that is, feel orgê -- with people who fear us. The reason is that their fear demonstrates their respect for us, and thus they are not in a position to slight us. And second, we cannot return anger for anger. The point here is that someone who angry at me is responding to my disdain for him or her, and so is in no position to offend me by a gesture of contempt. A slight is not simply a private matter but rather a social act that affects our public image. If we are to turn the tables on the offender and put him down in turn, we must first restore the original equilibrium by getting even -- that is precisely why Aristotle defines anger as a desire for revenge.

Now, if we adopt, for a moment, Aristotle's criteria for emotion, perhaps we can make some plausible comparisons between ancient Greek orgê and modern anger, of the sort that are difficult to draw so long as one conceives of anger principally as a feeling -- for how are we to evaluate how an ancient Greek felt, or for that matter how we ourselves do from one episode of an emotion to another? On Aristotle's description, we can say, for example, that Greeks seem to have been particularly sensitive to challenges to their public esteem or status, and that Aristotle accordingly deemed it reasonable to single out offenses of just this type as elicitors of a basic emotional response. Anger, in Aristotle's sense, was a reaction to what today is colloquially called "dissing," that is, "disrespecting"

or manifesting disdain by a word or gesture toward another. Today, questions of honor, in this sense, are not so central, perhaps, to social life, and accordingly our conception of anger has modulated, and now consists in a response to a broader range of stimuli. Can we say, then, that the core emotion of anger has remained the same, and what has changed is the kind of behavior or event that elicits it?

Such a view would meet the preconditions for there being a history of anger. For in order that a subject have a history, it must change in some respects -- what remains wholly self-identical has simply a timeless definition, like the proposition that two plus two equals four, rather than a history in the proper sense -- but it must also exhibit a certain continuity, for otherwise we have, not a history of a single subject, but rather a sequence of subjects, for example, orgê in Aristotle's time and "anger" in ours. And yet, I am not sure that we can simply produce a history of anger, or anger-like emotions, by assuming that the response, whether as feeling or as facial expression, is uniform, and it is only the cause that changes. Let us consider for a moment the case of fear. We might suppose that we can readily identify items that typically induce fear in some groups but not in others: dogs, say, or certain insects, or snakes. I know people who have an intense fear of flying, something I imagine was not common in classical antiquity,

outside perhaps the immediate circle of Icarus. The history of fear, then, becomes the story of things that are feared. Insofar as such objects of fear are random, however, they would seem not to be proper subjects of a history, for they lack the continuity that we have said is essential to a historical treatment. Listing everything that people have feared would be like writing a history of the color green by itemizing all the things that have been painted green over the ages: we would have said nothing about the history of the color green itself, treating it as though it were changeless -- something that in fact is not the case. To write a history of fear, we want rather to know how fear itself has changed. And indeed, there is reason to think that it may have. Let me again take Aristotle as a point of departure. Aristotle defines phobos, commonly translated as "fear," as follows: "let fear be a kind of pain or disturbance deriving from an impression of a future evil that is destructive or painful." This may seem an uncontroversial description, but it is less innocent than may appear. To fear something, you must understand that it is productive of harm; that is, you must infer from a present impression the harm that it portends at some later time. The function of inference is central to Aristotle's account. As William Fortenbaugh, who has contributed importantly to our understanding of Aristotle's conception of the emotions, rightly

observes (2002, p. 94): "Humans have the capacity to think and therefore can believe that an insult has occurred and that some danger threatens. Animals lack this cognitive capacity and therefore cannot experience emotions as analyzed by Aristotle" -- that is, they cannot experience anger or fear. We see, then, that it is not just the objects of fear that differ in respect to Aristotle's conception and ours, but fear itself. Like orgê, fear, or rather phobos, is an essentially cognitive phenomenon, and stands in a different relation to its object -- whatever that object may be -- than fear does, insofar as fear is understood as a "state of feeling."

Let me pause to indicate one consequence of this difference between Aristotle's conception of fear and the modern idea. The Merriam-Webster dictionary explains that, among its various synonyms such as anxiety, dread, terror, and so forth, "fear is the most general term and implies anxiety and usually loss of courage." Aristotle, on the contrary, affirms (Nicomachean Ethics 1115b23-28) that, far from being courageous, a person who does not experience fear at all (he uses the word aphobia) "would be either mad or insensible to pain." So too Socrates, according to Xenophon (Memorabilia 4.6.10), concludes that "those who are not afraid of [terrible] things because they do not know what they are are not courageous at all," to which his interlocutor responds: "Right, for on that basis, many madmen

and cowards would be deemed courageous." Far from being a mere state of anxiety, "fear," Aristotle tells us, "makes people deliberative" (Rhetoric 2.5, 1382a5). A history of fear would have to take account of this different sense of the relationship between fear and courage, or fear and calculation.

Now, one might note here that the conception of emotion as raw feeling, as it is represented by the Merriam-Webster dictionary, is no longer the prevailing one in modern psychology and philosophy, and has given way to more cognitively based interpretations.<sup>3</sup> Such is the case, for example, with so-called appraisal theory, which holds that "emotions are elicited by evaluations ... of events and situations" (Roseman and Smith 2001: 3). Indeed, Richard Lazarus, one of the founders of modern appraisal theory, observes (2001, p. 40) that "those who favor a cognitive-mediational approach must also recognize that Aristotle's Rhetoric more than two thousand years ago applied this kind of approach to a number of emotions in terms that seem remarkably modern." Might we not say, then, that the radical opposition between emotion and reason that has been characteristic of popular and scientific thought for several centuries or even millennia represents an error in the history of psychology, comparable, say, to the doctrine of four elements -- earth, air, fire, and water -- as the basic constituents of matter, and that in fact Aristotle was simply right, and

Merriam-Webster is wrong? In this case, there is no evolution or transformation to be traced from ancient Greek ideas of pathos to modern notions of "emotion," since nothing has changed: there is no history here. At best, we could observe that the cognitive conditions for the emotions have changed, in accord with the values prevailing in ancient versus modern society. Sights were a more important stimulus to anger then, less so now; so too, the threat of death in warfare was more general, at least among the adult male citizens of Athens, which was almost continually at war, whereas fear today takes greater account of a vague sense of dread or anxiety. Such an approach has the advantage, moreover, of relating the emotions -- whether anger, fear, or others such as shame or pity -- to the conditions of social life; the history of the emotions becomes, in turn, an aspect of the history of cultures as a whole.

This is an attractive proposal, but not, I think, the whole story. A history of the emotions ought not simply to bracket a conception of the emotions that has been dominant for hundreds or thousands of years as a mistake, and go on with business as usual. For the interpretation of emotions as "states of feelings," as the Merriam-Webster dictionary has it, is not just a matter of theory; the emotions have been, and continue to be, experienced in just this way, and not as cognitive phenomena or appraisals. A history should be able to describe and account

for this phenomenon. What is more, it is not just a matter of tracing anger-like or fear-like sentiments across cultures, taking account of the different circumstances in which they are elicited and acknowledging that in some periods these emotions are perceived more as interior states, whereas in others a description of the eliciting conditions forms part of their definition or essence. For the range and variety of sentiments that count as emotions is itself subject to change. In the second book of the Rhetoric, which is where Aristotle investigates the emotions in greatest detail (and that this should occur precisely in a treatise on rhetoric as opposed, say, to that on the soul is itself significant), Aristotle elects to discuss anger and the allaying of anger, which he seems to treat as a separate emotion; love and hatred or hostility; fear and its opposite, confidence or elation; shame and shamelessness; gratitude; pity and its opposite, indignation; envy; emulousness or rivalry, which he regards as a positive counterpart to envy, in which one is motivated to achieve what one's equals possess rather than feeling perturbed simply at the thought that one's peers are well off; and, finally, the opposite of emulousness, namely contempt. It is not clear that all these kinds of pathos, to use Aristotle's term, would qualify as emotions in a modern inventory. I have noticed that pity is almost never included in such lists today,

even when they extend to dozens of emotions, though it is invariably found in ancient Greek and Roman treatments. Similarly, gratitude is very rare, whereas emulation, contempt, and confidence -- the opposite of fear -- seem to pertain to a different psychic sphere entirely than that of emotion. If we look to other Greek texts, moreover, beyond Aristotle's analysis in the Rhetoric, we find included under the rubric pathos a still wider range of feelings. Thus, the treatise called the Rhetoric to Alexander, now ascribed to a certain Anaximenes and dated a little earlier than Aristotle's own Rhetoric, gives as examples of pathos contempt and fear, and also feeling pleasure, pain, and desire or appetite (7.5 = 1428a36-b5). Elsewhere in this same work (7.14), the category widens so as to embrace also passionate love, anger, drunkenness, and ambition -- drunkenness surely seems out of place to us in a classification of emotions, and so too, I think, ambition. Aristotle himself sometimes employs the term pathos rather more widely than he does in the Rhetoric, including, for example, desire, joy, and longing alongside the more usual passions (NE 1105b21-23). Now, one approach to this variety of uses of the term pathos is to argue, as I myself have done, that ancient Greek did not have a term that corresponds precisely to the modern idea of emotion, and that Aristotle, in his catalogue in the Rhetoric, was in a certain sense inventing the concept precisely by delimiting its

range. Be this as it may, a history of the emotions must recognize not only that other cultures may classify as emotions, alongside fear and anger, for example, sentiments that seem foreign to our own taxonomy -- there are numerous such instances -- but also that some items that fall under what seems to be the concept most closely related to the English "emotion" pertain to a quite different category, as in the case of pain and pleasure, which Aristotle regards as sensations and includes as constituent part of a pathos, and also desire or appetite.

Indeed, if we consider the list of basic emotions that Ekman purports to have identified as correlates to discrete facial expressions, it too presents some odd members. We recall that his inventory included anger, disgust, sadness, enjoyment or happiness, fear, and surprise. Now, disgust and surprise seem like curious candidates for the status of emotion. Both appear rather low in cognitive content, for example: disgust at a foul odor seems virtually instinctive, and surprise may be nothing more than being startled at a sudden loud noise. Even if we take a less intellectual view of the emotions than Aristotle did, and virtually eliminate the element of appraisal, anger or fear appear far more responsive to argument than do disgust or surprise. We may be able to talk a person out of feeling angry or afraid, if we explain that an insult was not intended or an apparently dangerous snake is in fact tame or

just a stick. There's not much you can say about reacting to a rotten egg. What is more, happiness and sadness seem to me at least to qualify more as states or perhaps moods than as emotions; but perhaps my intuitions here are simply different from those of Ekman and his associates.

A history of the emotions, it seems to me, will have to take into consideration the kinds of psychological responses that tend to get collected under an individual rubric in a given culture, or even among subgroups within a single society. This means producing something like a map of the mind, and exhibiting the different ways in which it may be divided into zones and regions. While there are likely to be some similarities among the maps that correspond to different times and places, it may not always be possible to select an area that matches up with the modern idea of emotion. On the whole, Aristotle's examples of pathos in the Rhetoric seem to fit reasonably well with the items that might be included in a modern list, at least of the sort produced by the appraisal school of emotion theory; but then again, it is worth noting that only two of Ekman's six basic emotions turn up in Aristotle's inventory, and as many as ten or twelve of Aristotle's, depending on how one counts, fail to earn an entry in Ekman's set. To see why these registers differ as they do, one would have to undertake something like a cross-cultural study of the construction of the self.

The project of examining over several cultures the constitution of the emotional field -- where such a domain may plausibly be said to exist at all -- is an exciting one, and would clearly require a collaborative effort among specialists. But I would like to conclude this inquiry into whether there can properly be said to be a history of the emotions by taking a somewhat different perspective on the question. What I am about to say may seem like something of a retreat from the points I have made so far, since I am going to attempt to define an approach to emotion that may permit some useful comparisons across cultures, even where there is no native psychological category that quite fits the concept of emotion as I propose to characterize it. I may, then, reasonably be accused of imposing my criteria for what constitutes an emotion upon quite different conceptions, and of constructing a history on the basis of exclusions that are methodologically unjustified. I shall take the risk, nevertheless, and you must be the judges of whether the gamble has value.

Paul Griffiths, in his book, What Emotions Really Are (1998), has attempted to resolve the tension between the neo-Darwinist and cognitive approaches by separating out at least two different classes of emotions -- those analyzed in what he calls the "affect program" of Paul Ekman, and the "higher cognitive emotions such as envy, guilt, jealousy, and love" (9).

Given this dichotomy, Griffiths concludes that the "concept of emotion is unlikely to be a useful concept in psychological theory" (14), since it embraces categorically distinct items, and he proposes that the very term "'emotion' should be eliminated from our psychological vocabulary" (15). Since I do not see anger as significantly less cognitive than envy, I would not draw the line where Griffiths does. In any case, both of Griffiths' classes are too much in mold of the modern idea of emotion, at least in English, to be useful for cross-cultural comparison. Yet I think that it is possible to define a set of pre- or proto-emotional responses that may have a better claim to being innate and universal than the items that qualify as emotions, whether in modern theory or in that of Aristotle. In a way, Silvan Tompkins made an attempt at this in separating out what he called "affects" from emotions proper, though there are many problems with the way he worked out his theory, not least that he applied the same names, for example "shame," to both the affect and the emotion. But there are certain behaviors, such as the attachment to another individual that is commonly observed in infants, avoidance of large things that appear very close, responses to fondling, tendencies to hide when exposed to particular stimuli, stress signals, and the like, that appear to be common to humans everywhere, and are even shared by certain animals. These behaviors frequently have observable

physiological correlates, which have been measured in laboratories and are often taken to constitute evidence of the innateness of basic emotions. The problem, as I see it, lies in attaching the name "emotion" to these responses. In general, it seems to me that the kinds of affect that tend to be identified as emotions are more complex than these reactions, and correspondingly more variable. It is not necessary to go all the way over to an Aristotelian conception of pathos and its species, with Aristotle's strong emphasis on judgment and interpersonal relations as the locus and cause of emotional behavior, although I confess to having a personal predilection for his approach, which has something to contribute to modern theorizing. In any case, if we could isolate a reasonable repertoire of affective behaviors that are universal, it would be possible to determine the extent to which they enter into affective concepts of different cultures -- with no expectation that the same combinations would find popular labels in all times and places. One might even be able to determine which kinds of primitive responses tend to find expression in the emotional behavior of different societies, or to be recruited as preconditions or components of emotions. These correlations, provided they could be established, might in turn be brought into relation with the more cognitive dimensions of pathos or emotion, that is, with the socially conditioned values and

expectations that serve as stimuli to anger, fear, shame, and the rest -- to the extent they are named and perceived as distinct sentiments.

The project I have described is a tall order, and the research, both physiological and sociological, that could bring it to fruition is still in its infancy. But with the great strides that are being made in the understanding of the physiological bases of affective responses, both in the brain and in the body as a whole, and with the careful comparative work on the structure of the affective vocabulary in different societies that has begun to be undertaken in the last couple of decades -- and more recently still in respect to the classical world of Greece and Rome -- there is, I believe, reason to be optimistic that progress can be made. And with this, there will be the groundwork for a genuine history of the emotions, which can take account of the very different constructions of the self that emerge in different societies and yet identify and define the common and universal elements that lie at the basis of them.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> 1987: 109 = ? Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, tr. Martin Milligan (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1988) = MEW 40 (Berlin: Dietz Verlag) 541-542). Cf. David Howes, The Varieties of Sensory Experience (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991); idem, Sensual Relations: Engaging the Senses in Culture and Social Theory (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> Even where there is reference to the stimulus of an emotion, it often takes the form of a raw sensation; cf. the lines by the Australian poet, A.D. Hope, The Wandering Islands:

There is the land-locked valley and the river,  
The Western Tiers make distance an emotion,  
The gum trees roar in the gale, the poplars shiver  
At twilight, the church pines imitate an ocean.

The ancient Greeks seem to have been largely immune to this Romantic sense of natural sublimity.

<sup>3</sup> Prevailing in certain schools of thought, at least; for the cognitive view is hardly universal today. Cf. Stephen Mithen, The Singing Neanderthals: The Origins of Music, Language, Mind and Body (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2006): "Most

---

anthropologists are tempted to equate the large brain of Homo neanderthalensis with a capacity for language.... But the temptation must be resisted; the Neanderthals who inhabited Europe and south-west Asia had brains as large as those of modern humans but behaved in quite different fashion, one that indicates the absence of language.... They were 'singing Neanderthals' -- although their songs lacked any words -- and were also intensely emotional beings: happy Neanderthals, sad Neanderthals, angry Neanderthals, disgusted Neanderthals, envious Neanderthals, guilty Neanderthals, grief-stricken Neanderthals, and Neanderthals in love. Such emotions were present because their lifestyle required intelligent decision-making and extensive social cooperation" (as quoted in William H. McNeill, "Beyond Words" [review of Mithen], The New York Review of Books 53.7 [27 April 2006] 26-28; quotation on p. 27). Whereas the passionate Neanderthals are assumed to lack language, we may recall that Aristotle's discussion of the emotions is to be found in his treatise on rhetoric.