New Classicists

Find us online at
newclassicists.com

Table of Contents

Editors' Foreword

New Classicists has had a productive 2025. We are proud to present our twelfth issue with six new articles for your reading pleasure. Our first two articles are "Chameleonic Paideia: Immigrant Experience and the "Acceptable Other" in Heliodorus' Aethiopica" by Anna Coopey and "Erotic Rational Madness in the Hippolytus and the Phaedrus" by Evangelos Katsarelis. Next are "Roman Imperialistic Strategies in North Africa: 2nd Century BC to 1st Century AD" by Christian Nana Andoh and "The Critics of Galen: Analysing Criticisms of Galen's Accounts of the Antonine Plague" by Sam Northgraves. Our twelfth issue ends with "The Structure and Distribution of Features in Hermogenes' Peri Ideon Logou" by Samuel Douglas and a review of "Elite Women in Hellenistic History, Historiography, and Reception", edited by Marc Mendoza and Borja Antela-Bernárdez with the collaboration of Eran Almagor, by Guendalina D. M. Taietti.

I would like to finally thank the authors who have submitted their work to New Classicists, both for this issue and in our upcoming issues. Your continued faith in our publication and mission means the world to us. I must also recognise New Classicists' editorial team who have volunteered their time and work diligently to keep this journal running smoothly.

I hope you enjoy our latest issue and continue to take a keen interest in New Classicists. We are already hard at work getting articles ready for the next issue.

Best regards,
Dr Guendalina D. M. Taietti & Dr. Giuseppe L. Ficocelli
Co-Editors-in-Chief

Chameleonic Paideia: Immigrant Experience and the "Acceptable Other" in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*

By Anna Coopey[1]

Abstract

Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* is a text that wrestles with cultural identity and performance in a world in which identity formation was rapidly changing and morphing in unexpected ways. The emergence of *paideia* as a form of "Greekness" that resisted this change became extremely important, and allowed those who were not "traditionally" Greek to assert their "Greekness", and, thus, to become "Greek". In Heliodorus' novel, the "Other" characters seek to perform "Greekness" through their *paideia*, but equally to perform their "acceptable" difference as foreigners for the gratification and enjoyment of the Greek "Self", too. This can be seen comparatively to chime with immigrant experience up to the modern day in the "West", and thus a continuum of immigrant experience can be seen to reach from the distant past right up to the present day.

The Second Sophistic (60-230 CE) was a particularly potent era of changing identity formations.[2] Under Roman Empire, Greek identity was destabilised, as increased migration and travel around (and beyond) the Mediterranean led to the decentralisation of Greek geographical space from Greek identity, and the traditional touchpoints of fatherland, lineage, and residence

---

[1] Anna Coopey (she/her) is a PhD student split between the School of Classics and the School of International Relations at St Andrews. Her email is ac400@st-andrews.ac.uk.

[2] On the issue of identity in the Second Sophistic, see Jones (2004), Nasrallah (2005), Goldhill (2007), Whitmarsh (2011), and Dench (2017). This elaborate renavigation of identity seems to have begun, too, in the fourth century BC (as Hall (2002) and Lape (2010) have demonstrated), and to have only been heightened under the Roman Empire.

began to give way to a cultural basis for "Greekness": *paideia*.[3] Greek learning and cultural knowledge, often displayed through literary or rhetorical means, thus came into sharper focus as an alternative locus for identification, and many "foreign" (i.e., non-Greek) authors of the period displayed their own *paideia* in their writing, "self-fashioning" their identities in order to ingratiate themselves amongst the Greek and Roman elite that made up a large part of their readership.[4] In a similar manner to the novelist Lucian's characters, these authors participate in 'the self-fashioned process of "becoming Greek" … via successful performances of *paideia*' (Derbew 2022:132).[5] This cultural phenomenon can equally be seen within the novels, as particularly-learned foreign characters perform their own *paideia* for Greek characters, so that they may productively engage with "civilised" society, rather than being rejected by that dominant culture. Within this article, building on scholarship that argues for Second Sophistic authors' "self-fashioning" in their novels, I shall explore how cultural identity is depicted in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, showing how foreigners within the text perform their *paideia* and thus are able to engage with the Greeks, and be "accepted" to some level by them. Simultaneously, though, other "Others" do not possess this *paideia* – or, at least, do not *perform* it – and so are *not* granted acceptance, and are trapped in their position as objects of an ethnographic, racialist gaze. One's position as a character – one's *positive subjectivity* – is thus dependent upon one's performance for the dominant culture, one's "self-fashioning" as an acceptable "Other". I will then examine the parallels that this has with modern immigrant experience now, through comparison with Nikesh Shukla's (2016) essay collection, *The Good Immigrant*, and particularly

---

[3] Ethnicity was certainly still important for one's identity, though, as Jones (1999) has demonstrated; it was just *less* important than it had been previously. On the connection between geographical place and identity, see Liotta (2009), Antonisch (2010), and Taylor (2010).

[4] The view of Second Sophistic authors, and especially Lucian, as "self-fashioning" (after Greenblatt (1980)) has a long legacy in Second Sophistic studies, and came to a head with Gleason (1994). For an eclectic mixture of scholarly treatments of the concept in the novels, see Whitmarsh (2001), Dobrov (2002), Eshleman (2008), Keulen (2010), Niehoff (2018), Niehoff & Levinson (2019), and Weeks (2023:93-100).

[5] Also see Goldhill (2007), 158-159.

with the essays contributed by Chimene Suleyman, Wei Ming Kam, Musa Okwonga, Darren Chetty, and Varaidzo.[6]

Before we begin delving into the novel itself, it is worth giving a brief explanation of the "Self-Other" dichotomy as I employ it in this article. By Hegel's (1807) view, in order for the "Self" to be actualised – in order for a person to conceive of themselves as existing – there must be an "Other", the opposite of the "Self", through whom the "Self" can define itself through positive differentiation.[7] A model conception of the "Self-Other" dichotomy, modelled on patriarchal, "Western" norms, may be the following:

Table One[8]

Self	Other
masculine	feminine
good	evil
white	black / non-white
strong	weak
brave	cowardly
logical	passionate
pure	impure / polluted

The conception of the "Other" has been used in a number of areas of thought, from feminist thought (de Beauvoir (1949)) to the psychology of the mind (Laing 1961), but its most extensive engagement comes in imperial and colonial thought (Said 1978, 1993). Through a colonial lens, the colonised subject constitutes the "Other" to the colonising "Self", and thus is constructed as "inferior", justifying their exploitation, subjugation, and, often, extermination. This

---

[6] This reading of foreign characters performing their identity for Greek characters (and, by extension, for the audience) can also be productively applied to Clitophon in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe & Clitophon*. Clitophon, a Phoenician character, tells his story, engaging extensively with Greek culture, literature, and philosophy (and thus showing his *paideia*), to the Greek listener, the frame narrator. On Clitophon's characterisation as a performer of Greek masculinity in particular, see Jones (2012). On the sophisticated narrative boxes in Achilles Tatius' novel, see Reardon (1994) and Whitmarsh (2003).

[7] On this philosophical conception of the "Other", see Husserl (1931) and Sartre (1943).

[8] This list is obviously not exhaustive, and many more opposing adjectives could be added to it.

construction is evident in the "Self's" artistic production, which perpetuates this "Othering", and solidifies it as an accepted fact. In the case of Heliodorus' novel, and in the case of the context of its production, the Greek is the "Self", and the non-Greek, or the βάρβαρος, is the "Other", defined precisely in the negative, by the state of <u>not being Greek</u> (or, at least, not *speaking* Greek).[9]

In response to this "Othering", the "Other" can, it seems, give one of two main responses. The first is that of assimilation, where they take on the "mask" of "Self", performing an adoption of the dominant culture in order to gain "acceptance" (Fanon 1952). The alternative, opposite response would be to reject assimilation entirely, and thus risk rejection (and, in many cases, violence) from the dominant "Self" (Arce 2023). It is not a simple choice, though: in order to successfully assimilate, one must be close enough to the dominant culture to do so successfully – i.e., one must not be *too* "Other". One particularly obvious example of this is seen in skin colour with non-white groups; generally, 'those of lighter skin are awarded social and economic privileges because of their closer phenotypic resemblance to whites and their assumed superior social value relative to their darker-skinned counterparts' (Hargrove 2020).[10] Skin colour and other physical attributes are only one aspect, and there are other aspects as well, such as religious affiliation (Kogan, Fong & Reitz 2020). It is this continuum of "Otherness", and this assimilation management, that I argue we can detect when we apply it to Heliodorus' novel.

In the *Aethiopica*, there is one primary "Greekified", *paideia*-wielding "Other": Charicleia.[11] Charicleia is almost excessively "Greek" on the surface. Raised by her adoptive father, Charicles, in Delphi, she serves as a priestess of Artemis, values her chastity to the highest degree (spurning marriage completely – until she meets Theagenes, of course), and displays her Greek socialisation

---

[9] The noun βάρβαρος in the LSJ is defined explicitly as "non-Greek, foreign, … esp. of language". Importantly, it is also used, after the Persian War, to mean "brutal", or "rude", showing a collocation of all non-Greeks with negative attributes (which the Greeks would not attribute to themselves).

[10] Also see Hunter (2007) and Dixon & Telles (2017).

[11] Charicleia has been the object of much scholarship, particularly in relation to her race. On Charicleia, see Harris (2001), Haynes (2002), de Temmerman (2014), and Papadimitropoulos (2017).

and learning throughout the text.[12] However, the novel soon reveals to us that Charicleia is *not* Greek, but rather Ethiopian; while she *appears* Greek by her behaviour, occupation, and even skin colour – she is white – she *isn't* Greek, but instead is someone who *presents* as Greek. She *passes* as Greek: but she isn't Greek in the *traditional* sense.[13] She is, then, *performing* Greekness, whether consciously or not, and she does so successfully.[14] As Lye (2016:260-261) writes: 'Charicleia … although foreign-born, … comes to embody the more positive aspects of Greek identity through her courage, stoicism, rhetorical skills, and purity. … Her success reinforces the idea of an East-West symbiosis through *paideia*, … particularly relevant to Heliodorus' world.'

Charicleia is not the only "Other" in the novel who performs "Greekness" through her *paideia*; Hydaspes, her biological father and the Ethiopian king, is also a 'Hellenised Ethiopian', 'able to apply learned standards of Greekness to his behaviour in such a seamless manner that they appear natural' (Jones 2012:151).[15] Clearly, then, it seems that *paideia* is used within the novel by non-Greek characters for the (conscious or unconscious) active performance of "Greekness", which helps these characters assimilate within the Greek cultural world, and thus gain acceptance within the elite Greek community they partake in, both outside of the text and within. Charicleia is accepted by her Greek lover, Theagenes, and by her Greek reading audience, because of her display of markers of "Greekness". Concurrently, then, it seems that *paideia* is being used just as those non-Greek authors of the Second Sophistic have been read to have used it (Derbew 2022) – and just as Heliodorus himself may have been using it too. If we believe

---

[12] The emphasis on her virginity has led many to Charicleia to the martyrs in Christian texts of the same period (Andujar 2012). For further comparisons between the novels and Christian texts, see Grottanelli (1987).

[13] cf. Stephens (2008), 101. On racial "passing" and Charicleia, see Perkins (1999).

[14] cf. Derbew (2022), 23. Lye (2016:251-253) compares Charicleia's performance of Greekness favourably to Arsace's performance in the same text, showing how, while Charicleia is able to articulate and display her "Greekness" in a "good" way, Arsace fails because of her immoderate behaviour and fundamental "Persian" nature. Clearly, then, we can see the continuum of acceptable "Otherness" on display, and, on this continuum, not everybody can assimilate.

[15] It must be noted, though, that some troubling aspects of Hydaspes' behaviour – for example, his insistence on human sacrifice towards the end of the novel – *do* have to be tactfully airbrushed out. He is not *entirely* assimilable, and sits a little closer to "Other" than his daughter does. On Hydaspes' characterisation within the text, cf. 9.26, 10.9, etc.

Heliodorus' *sphragis* at the end of the novel (10.41.4) and accept his claimed Phoenician identity, we can argue that, through writing his novel, he, a non-Greek, is performing his own *paideia*, showing himself, an "Other", performing as and thus assimilating to the "Self", to "Greekness".[16] In this light, then, just as Heliodorus uses *paideia* performance to encourage Charicleia and Hydaspes' acceptance by the Greeks *within the novel and without*, Heliodorus himself performs *paideia*, and thus ingratiates himself with his Greek audience, even as a non-Greek figure.[17]

Yet it is not simply through assimilation that this *paideia*-based identity performance shines through in the text. Alternatively, we can also see foreign figures play up to stereotypes before their internal (and external) Greek audiences, moulding themselves as viewable performance pieces for the "Self" – adopting Greek "knowledge" about non-Greeks and running with it. This is seen particularly in the character of Calasiris.[18] In Book 3, when Theagenes discovers that Calasiris is Egyptian, he is ecstatic, 'like a man who has stumbled on a hidden treasure', and jumps up, drinking to their friendship (3.11).[19] In Calasiris' own narrative, nested within the novel, Calasiris then takes advantage of the interest that his Egyptian identity generates, and indulges in 'showmanship' (3.17), playing up to Egyptian associations with magic, spells, and prophecy to interest his audience, and 'pretend[ing] that the spirit is upon him' (3.17). He even does this in front of Charicleia, as she lies bed-bound and lovesick (4.5):

> Having secured our privacy, I launched into a sort of stage performance, producing clouds of incense smoke, pursing my lips and muttering some sounds that passed for prayers, waving the laurel up and down, up and down, from Charicleia's head to her toes, and yawning blearily, for all the world like some old beldam.

Charicleia's reaction to this performance is perhaps also telling. She apparently shakes her head and smiles at Calasiris, ostensibly because she feels that he has been deceived by her own

---

[16] Much has been written on this end-of-novel ethnic identification, most recently by Whitmarsh (2022) and Repath (2022).

[17] cf. Redondo Moyano (2020), 40.

[18] For an earlier treatment of Calasiris' performance in Heliodorus, see Winkler (1982).

[19] This translation, and all others in this article, are by J. R. Morgan, accessed via Reardon (2019).

performance (she is pretending to be ill in order to hide her actual lovesickness for Theagenes), but perhaps, when we read her as a *fellow conscious performer* of ethnicity, because she recognises a kindred spirit in the man (4.11):

> I kept this up for some time, until, by the time I came to an end, I had made complete fools of both myself and the girl, who shook her head again and again and smiled wryly as if to tell me that I was on quite the wrong track.

Clearly, then, we can detect various "Others" within the novel who can be said to perform ethnicity. Charicleia – whether consciously or unconsciously – performs Greekness, overlaying her Ethiopian origins through her *paideia*, while Calasiris (consciously) performs Greek stereotypes of Egyptian identity in order to ingratiate himself with the Greeks. This ingratiation then allows Calasiris to gain the authority to further his plan for Charicleia and Theagenes, and thus stage-manage the rest of the novel. Like his characters, too, Heliodorus himself can be read to be performing his *paideia* through writing his text, and, through this, consciously seeking to ingratiate himself within the literary elite – much like the Egyptian Homer he invents in the text, too (3.14-15).[20]

By nature of this performance, Heliodorus (and his characters) can be viewed as breaking the "ethnographic present" that is so central to Greek interaction with non-Greek peoples. Clara Bosak-Schroeder (2020:3-4) defines the "ethnographic present" as follows:

---

[20] cf. Whitmarsh (2011), 114-115. For an alternative (but perhaps less intriguing) reading of Calasiris' performance, see Kim (2019). Kears (2014) argues that metics (resident foreigners) could indulge in the same kind of ethnicity performance in democratic Athens – see especially 271-281, for discussion of Demosthenes 57 through this lens.

> [The present tense] is the default in Herodotus, Diodorus, and other ethnographers, who describe many non-Greek customs as eternal, fixed at the time when the ethnographer (or an informant) observed them. … The ethnographic present constructs a moment of direct contact between ethnographer and ethnographic subject and places the reader there; this allows the pleasurable illusion of travel and increases the credibility [sic.] of the ethnographer, whose account, because timeless, never loses its authority. The ethnographic present also constructs the other person as other by forcing them to stand still and be compared to the observer.

Calasiris is a conscious performer of Greek stereotypes about Egyptians, yet it is through his performance of these stereotypes that he becomes "acceptable" to his Greek audience, whose fixed construct of "Otherness" Calasiris fits himself into in order to increase his own authority within the novel. He performs Greek knowledge in order to be accepted *as an active character in his own right*, as a *positive subject*, rather than remaining static as an object of the ethnographic gaze. Charicleia is a (conscious or unconscious) performer of "Greekness", as an Ethiopian woman deemed "acceptable" to both her own intra-novel Greek society and the external Greek reader through her socialisation as Greek. These foreign figures, then, become recognisable to the Greeks through their performance *according to the Greek gaze*. Meanwhile, Heliodorus himself, through writing his novel (a display of *paideia*), equally can be seen to perform "Greekness". Characters and author perform ethnic identity, whether "Greek" or "Other", according to Greek standards, and thus gain "acceptance" as positive subject, either through performance as a stereotyped "Other" (Calasiris) or as a "Greekified" foreigner, assimilable enough for absorption by dominant Greek culture.

Not all "Others" within the text *can* escape the ethnographic present, though. As previously mentioned, assimilation is not always possible for "Others", and acceptance by the "Self" is often contingent upon how close one sits to the "Self" on the "Self-Other" continuum. Bandits are a key feature of the Greek novels, used to 'defin[e] and affirm[...] social boundaries' (Perkins 1994:47), and they are explicitly "Othered" within Heliodorus' novel. Peculiarly connected to

their physical landscape, almost to the point of merging with it (1.6.1-2)[21], speaking a different language that is unintelligible to the Greek "Self" (1.3.2)[22], and shown as remarkably morally corrupt (by Greek standards) (1.1.8, 1.3.2-3), with a markedly different (black) skin colour (1.2.8, 1.3.1)[23], the bandits are trapped by the ethnographic present, often unable to break out of it due to their foregrounding *through* that ethnographic lens. In Heliodorus' novel, Thyamis, a bandit leader (and Calasiris' son), escapes this ethnographic lens, *yet again, this is through his "Greek" learning* – he is more assimilable than the crowd of bandits we see in the ethnographic discursion that makes up a large part of the novel's first book (1.5.2-4). As Judith Perkins (1994:60-61) writes, 'In the romance, the bandits, through their inverted social structures – leaders, religious rites, even mock cities ..., but above all with their violence – provided a foil for the normative structures of elite society'. The bandits, it seems, are *too* "Other", and so remain constructs of that "Otherness", unable to break out of their ethnographic styling through (conscious or unconscious) performance.[24] Not every "Other" in the text is able to negotiate their "Othering", to fashion themselves as more acceptable to the "Self's" gaze.

The foreign "Other" *most* able to be accepted by – or most palatable *to* – the Greek "Self" in the text seems to be the Egyptian, as with Calasiris.[25] In Greek historiography, Egyptians generally seem to be a '"near Other", both geographically, culturally, and environmentally similar to Greeks and Romans and much easier to emulate than the remote Fisheaters and

---

[21] cf. Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe & Clitophon* 3.13.2-3, 4.12.6-8.

[22] On this language difference, see Perkins (1994), 61, and Derbew (2022), 165-166.

[23] Of course, Hydaspes, Persinna, and the Ethiopians – excluding Charicleia – are also black, but their skin colour is far less marked within the text, and their blackness is only mentioned in relation to disbelief at Charicleia's paternity at the end of the novel. The bandits, however, are *emphatically* black, and thus *emphatically* "different", *emphatically* "Other".

[24] The way in which the bandits are "Othered" here is remarkably similar to the "Othering" seen in texts of the later British Empire, such as Joseph Conrad's (1899) *Heart of Darkness*. The natives in Conrad's novel are strongly associated with the landscape, and their language is disparagingly described by the narrator as 'a babble of uncouth sounds'. On this, see Raskin (1967), Singh (1978), Sullivan (1981), Hawkins (1982), Elbarbary (1993), and Bowers (2013). Also see novelist Chinua Achebe's (1988) response to Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*.

[25] Another "acceptable" "Other" in the text would be the Ethiopian (Charicleia, Hydaspes), through their morality (and even through their amethyst – cf. 5.13).

Locusteaters' (Bosak-Schroeder 2020:99).[26] Calasiris, an Egyptian, *is* an "Other", but he is not an *ultimate* "Other"; he is closer to the Greeks, and so more capable of assimilation (and thus acceptance). However, it seems too that not all Egyptians are equally assimilable, and some are more "Other" than others. Calasiris illustrates this when he explains the different types of magic that Egyptians are associated with (3.16):

> There is one kind [of Egyptian wisdom] that is of low rank and, you might say, crawls upon the earth; it waits upon ghosts and skulks around dead bodies; it is addicted to magic herbs, and spells are its stock-in-trade; no good ever comes of it; no benefit ever accrues to its practitioners; generally it brings about its own downfall, and its occasional successes are paltry and mean-spirited – the unreal made to appear real, hopes brought to nothing; it devises wickedness and panders to corrupt pleasures.
> But there is another kind, my son, true wisdom, of which the first sort is but a counterfeit that has stolen its title; true wisdom it is that we priests and members of the sacerdotal caste practice from childhood; its eyes are raised towards heaven; it keeps company with the gods and partakes of the nature of the Great Ones; it studies the movement of the stars and earthly concerns of the other kind, but all its energies are directed to what is good and beneficial to mankind.

Here, we are shown a type of Egyptian knowledge viewed as acceptable by the Greeks, as not-too-"Other", and a type that is *unacceptable*, too-"Other" – and, similarly, we are also shown within the text a type of *Egyptian* that is acceptable (Calasiris), and a type that is unacceptable. The unacceptable Egyptian in the text is the old woman from Bessa in Book 6 (6.12-15), who reanimates her dead son's corpse with magic, and is promptly killed for it (in what reads like a rather heavy-handed moral lesson).[27] It seems, then, that those "Others" capable of assimilation to the Greek "Self", then, are those who aren't *too* "Other" – those whose "Other" behaviour is comprehensible to the Greek sensibility. Because Calasiris is not *too* "Other", and because he possesses the knowledge to be able to perform his "Otherness" in a way acceptable to his Greek

---

[26] Capitalisation of 'other' my own.
[27] Necromancy was certainly popular in the ancient world, but the reanimation of the dead was particularly troubling to Greeks and Romans alike, and gave rise to various monstrous figures, including vampires, zombies, and ghosts, which haunted the popular imagination. For an overview of necromancy in the ancient world, see Ogden (2004).

audience, he is accepted as a positive subject. Once again, it is clear that the performance of ethnic identity for acceptance by the dominant "Self" is only possible for certain people – Heliodorus himself perhaps being among them.[28]

It is instructive to consider the way in which this experience of ethnic and cultural performance for acceptance and assimilation to the "Self" has parallel in the modern world, too. In Nikesh Shukla's 2017 essay collection, *The Good Immigrant*, twenty-one prominent ethnic minority authors, actors, and academics wrote on the issue of cultural performance, examining how they, as first, second, and later generation immigrants, feel the need to play the "good immigrant", the "good foreigner", in order to be accepted in modern British society.[29] Shukla (2017:17) summarises fellow contributor and friend Musa Okwonga's words to him in his preface, where he states that 'the biggest burden facing people of colour in this country is that society deems us bad immigrants – job-stealers, benefit scroungers, girlfriend-thieves, refugees – until we cross over in their consciousness, through popular culture, winning races, baking good cakes, being conscientious doctors, to become good immigrants'.[30] Varaidzo (2017:34) writes on how black people have long held the 'collective role … of the entertainer' before the Western eye, and how the only way to 'control this gaze' is to 'indulge in the role of the performer'.[31] Wei Ming Kam (2017:107) laments the need to be a 'model minority', and thus not complain about the stereotypes East Asian actors are forced into in popular media, split between 'villains a la Fu

---

[28] Stephens (2008:101) writes how Heliodorus, deploring magic here, deprives the Egyptian priests of their legitimate magic and power, turning them into 'nothing more than impotent relics of a once powerful culture' – such are the hazards of assimilation! Lye (2016:249-253) writes further of how Arsace, too "excessive" as both a Persian *and* a woman – two "Other" identities – is also unable to perform successfully, and thus be accepted as a positive subject.

[29] A second essay collection, entitled *The Good Immigrant USA*, edited by Shukla and Chimene Suleyman, was released in 2019, and reflects on similar issues in the United States of America.

[30] George Alagiah (2006:45) also writes similarly in his memoir, *A Home from Home*: 'The honorary white is like a mannequin in a shop window. People get to dress it up any way they want to – and usually it ends up looking reassuringly like themselves. No fuss, no threat.' Also see Ahmed (2017), 174-175; Godden (2017), 206; and The Mash Report's (2018) "How to Be an Immigrant British People Like".

[31] On 'the burden of "acting white"', see Ogbu (2004).

Manchu' and 'delicate women who need saving, usually by white men'.[32] Darren Chetty (2017:118-119) quotes academic Karen Sands O'Connor in his essay, inspired by his experience teaching in an ethnically-diverse primary school, on how West Indian writers in British literature had to tell their stories 'in a way acceptable to their mostly white British audience'.[33] Most strikingly, Chimene Suleyman (2017:45), writing on how she has had to change the spelling of her name since childhood *purely so that British people would pronounce it correctly*, speaks of the need for immigrants to become 'chameleons' in their new countries:

> We have learned that our ways make us homeless and fatherless, just as there is a whiteness that is fearless to the point of tenure – unmoveable and permanent. We have become chameleons navigating the land, answering to white slave names put upon black nations, searching for directions not to Coaquannock – the 'grove of tall pines' but to Philadelphia.

This essay collection demonstrates that, even as recently as 2016, immigrants in the United Kingdom have articulated a sense of the need for performance for the dominant "Self" in society – in this case, white British people – in order to gain acceptance within that society.[34] Equally, we can see that there is a continuum of "Otherness" which impinges upon that acceptance; the less "Other" you are, through performance or not, the more likely you are to be accepted by the "Self".[35] It seems, then, that Calasiris and Charicleia, within Heliodorus' narrative, and

---

[32] On the stereotyping of East Asians in popular media past and present, see Marchetti (1993), Ito (2014), and CAPE's (2021) report.

[33] cf. Sands O'Connor (2007), 140.

[34] In Shukla's collection, the issue of skin colour is central to many of the essays. However, skin colour is only one reason for discrimination and marginalisation of immigrants in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, and various other characteristics are central, including accent, qualifications (from foreign universities or institutions), language, religion, or cultural observation. As an example of this, we can take the experience of Polish immigrants in the United Kingdom, whose presence has called what Fitzgerald and Smoczynski (2015) have described as an 'anti-Polish migrant moral panic' (see Kawczynski (2008) and Rzepnikowska (2018)). Regardless as to whether the specific issue of skin colour necessarily holds within the ancient context, the framework is still useful for examining the experience of a cultural "Other" experiencing life in a land dominated by the "Self".

[35] For example, in the United Kingdom, where the dominant British "Self" is largely white, white immigrants are more likely to be accepted than non-white immigrants, as they are "closer to the Self" (Yeo 2020). Indeed, Lena Simic (2009:112), speaking on her theatrical work *medea / mothers' clothes*, noted an elision of her "Otherness" as a Croatian immigrant when she married a British man and gave birth to British children in her Liverpool community.

Heliodorus and his fellow foreign Second Sophistic authors as a whole, can be read as conducting a similar performance as "Others", tamped up or down for the wishes of the "Self", in modern Britain. Perhaps, then, Heliodorus isn't quite as distant as we may think.

The depiction of cultural identity and "Otherness" in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* is strongly bound up with performance. Heliodorus, in his act of writing (and performance of *paideia* through that writing), presents cultural "Greekness" to ingratiate himself with his dominant, "Greek" audience, and thus to gain favour and acceptance. Within his novel, Charicleia, the perfect picture of a "Greek" woman despite her Ethiopian origin, is acceptable to Greeks both within *and* outwith the text – the Greeks within the plot and the Greeks reading the novel – through her performance of "Greek" identity (whether this is conscious or not). Calasiris, on the other hand, *consciously* performs those aspects of his Egyptian identity (magic and prophecy) which the Greeks find entertaining, performing as the "acceptable" "Other". These successful performers are contrasted with those who cannot perform so well – the bandits (or Boukoloi), Arsace, and the woman from Bessa, for example – showing just how difficult it is for the "Other" to navigate cultural acceptance by the elite Greek "Self". This experience of performance is resonant with immigrant experience in the modern day, too, and hints to a continuing experience of immigrant performativity before the dominant culture. As Salena Godden (2017:206) writes:

> You earn time to chameleon, to camouflage, to make your shade darker or lighter. To morph into what is required or expected. Whatever it takes to survive, whatever it takes to be heard, whatever it takes to get the job. Whatever armour you must wear that day. It's all positive discrimination. Right? No. Wrong. Very. Wrong.

Bibliography

Achebe, C. (1977; reprint 2016): "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness'" (pp. 14-27) from *The Massachusetts Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Massachusetts Review, Inc.)

Achilles Tatius (trans. S. Gaselee) (1969): *Leucippe & Clitophon* (Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press)

Ahmed, R. (2017): "Airports and Auditions" (pp. 172-181) from Shukla, N. (2017): *The Good Immigrant* (Unbound)

Alagiah, G. (2006): *A Home from Home: From Immigrant Boy to English Man* (Abacus Press)

Andujar, R. M. (2012): "Charicleia the Martyr: Heliodorus and Early Christian Narrative" (pp. 139-152) from Futre Pinheiro, M. P.; Perkins, J. & Pervo, R. (2012): *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections* (Barkhuis)

Antonisch, M. (2010): "Meanings of Place and Aspects of the Self: An Interdisciplinary and Empirical Account" (pp. 119-132) from *GeoJournal*, Vol. 75 (Springer)

Arce, J. (2023): *You Sound Like a White Girl: The Case for Rejecting Assimilation* (Flatiron Books)

Bosak-Schroeder, C. (2020): *Other Natures: Environmental Encounters with Ancient Greek Ethnography* (University of California Press)

Bowers, T. N. (2013): "Paradise Lost: Reading the Earth in Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness'" (pp. 93-124) from *Conradiana*, Vol. 45 (Texas Tech University Press)

Chetty, D. (2017): "You Can't Say That! Stories Have To Be About White People" (pp. 96-107) from Shukla, N. (2017): *The Good Immigrant* (Unbound)

Conrad, J. (1899): *Heart of Darkness and Other Tales* (Oxford University Press)

de Beauvoir, S. (1949): *The Second Sex* (Gallimard)

de Temmerman, K. (2014): *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Oxford University Press)

Dench, E. (2017): "Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity" (pp. 99-114) from Richter, D. S. & Johnson, W. A. (2017): *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic* (Oxford University Press)

Derbew, S. F. (2022): *Untangling Blackness in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge University Press)

Dixon, A. R. & Telles, E. E. (2017): "Skin Colour and Colourism: Global Research, Concepts, and Measurement" (pp. 405-424) from *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 43 (Annual Reviews)

Dobrov, G. W. (2002): "The Sophist on His Craft: Art, Text, and Self-Construction in Lucian" (pp. 173-192) from *Helios*, Vol. 29 (Texas Tech University Press)

Elbarbary, S. (1993): "*Heart of Darkness* and Late-Victorian Fascination with the Primitive and the Double" (pp. 113-128) from *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 39 (Duke University Press)

Eshleman, K. (2008): "Defining The Circle of Sophists: Philostratus and the Construction of the Second Sophistic" (pp. 395-413) from *Classical Philology*, Vol. 103 (University of Chicago Press)

Fanon, F. (1952): *Black Skin, White Masks* (Grove Press)

Fitzgerald, I. & Smoczynski, R. (2015): "Anti-Polish Migrant Moral Panic in the UK: A Response" (pp. 380-386) from *Czech Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Actavia)

Gleason, M. W. (1994): *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (De Gruyter)

Godden, S. (2017): "Shade" (pp. 194-209) from Shukla, N. (2017): *The Good Immigrant* (Unbound)

Goldhill, S. (2007): *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, The Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire* (Cambridge University Press)

Greenblatt, S. (1980): *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (University Chicago Press)

Grottanelli, C. (1987): "The Ancient Novel and Biblical Narrative" (pp. 7-34) from *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, Vol. 27 (Fabrizio Serra Editore)

Hall, J. M. (2002): *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (University of Chicago Press)

Hargrove, T. W. (2020): "Light Privilege? Skin Tone Stratification in Health among African Americans" (pp. 370-387) from *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, Vol. 5, Issue 3 (Sage Journals)

Harris, M. (2001): "Not Black and/or White: Reading Racial Difference in Heliodorus' Ethiopica and Pauline Hopkins' Of One Blood" (pp. 375-390) from *African American Review*, Vol. 35 (Indiana State University)

Hawkins, H. (1982): "The Issue of Racism in 'Heart of Darkness'" (pp. 163-171) from *Conradiana*, Vol. 14 (Texas Tech University Press)

Haynes, K. (2002): "Heroines: Negotiating the Theoretical Minefield" (pp. 44-80) from Haynes, K. (2002): *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel* (Routledge)

Hegel, G. W. F. (1807): *Herrschaft und Knechtschaft* (Brill)

Hunter, M. (2007): "The Persistent Problem of Colourism: Skin Tone, Status, and Inequality" (pp. 237-254) from *Sociology Compass*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Wiley)

Husserl, E. (1931): *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology* (Armand Collin)

Ito, R. B. (2014): "'A Certain Slant': A Brief History of Hollywood Yellowface" from *Bright Lights Film Journal* – https://brightlightsfilm.com/certain-slant-brief-history-hollywood-yellowface/ (accessed 03-03-2024, 17:54)

Jones, C. P. (1999): *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Harvard University Press)

Jones, C. P. (2004): "Multiple Identity in the Age of the Second Sophistic" (pp. 13-22) from Borg, B. E. (2004): *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic* (De Gruyter)

Jones, M. (2012): *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Oxford University Press)

Kawczynski, D. (2008): "Daniel Kawczynski: Poles in the UK are under attack. It's got to stop." from *The Independent* – https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/daniel-kawczynski-poles-in-the-uk-are-under-attack-it-s-got-to-stop-815370.html (accessed 08-01-2025, 12:21)

Kears, M. J. (2014): *Metics and Identity in Democratic Athens* (PhD Theses, University of Birmingham)

Keulen, W. (2010): "Different Drinking Habits: Satirical Strategies of Self-Fashioning in Antonine Ego-Narrative" (pp. 85-113) from *Ancient Narrative*, Vol. 8 (University of Groningen Press)

Kim, L. (2019): "The Trouble with Calasiris: Duplicity and Autobiographical Narrative in Heliodorus and Galen" (pp. 229-249) from *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 72 (Brill)

Kogan, I.; Fong, E. & Reitz, J. G. (2020): "Religion and Integration among Immigrant and Minority Youth" (pp. 3543-3558) from *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 46, No. 17 (Routledge)

Laing, R. D. (1961): *Self and Others* (Penguin)

Lape, S. (2010): *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge University Press)

Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. (1843): "βάρβαρος" from *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford University Press), accessed via Perseus Tufts – https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph?|=βαρβαρος&la=greek#lexicon (accessed 07-01-2025, 21:00)

Liotta, E. (2009): *On Soul and Earth: The Psychic Value of Place* (Routledge)

Lye, S. (2016): "Gender and Ethnicity in Heliodorus' 'Aithiopika'" (pp. 235-262) from *The Classical World*, Vol. 109, Special Issue: Gender, East, and West in Classical Antiquity (The Johns Hopkins University Press, on behalf of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States)

Marchetti, G. (1993): *Romance and the "Yellow Peril": Race, Sex, and Discursive Strategies in Hollywood Fiction* (University of California Press)

Nasrallah, L. (2005): "Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic" (pp. 283-314) from *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 98 (Cambridge University Press, on behalf of the Harvard Divinity School)

Niehoff, M. R. (2018): "Philo's Self-Fashioning in the Historical Writings" (pp. 25-46) from Niehoff, M. R. & Collins, J. J. (2018): *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford University Press)

Niehoff, M. R. & Levinson, J. (2019): *Self, Self-Fashioning, and Individuality in Late Antiquity* (Mohr Siebeck)

Ogbu, J. U. (2004): "Collective Identity and the Burden of 'Acting White' in Black History, Community, and Education" (pp. 1-35) from *The Urban Review*, Vol. 36 (Springer)

Ogden, D. (2004): *Greek and Roman Necromancy* (Princeton University Press)

Papadimitropoulos, L. (2017): "Charicleia's Identity and the Structure of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*" (pp. 209-223) from *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 109 (Department of the Classics, Harvard University)

Perkins, J. (1994): *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in Early Christianity* (Routledge)

Perkins, J. (1999): "An Ancient 'Passing' Novel: Heliodorus' Aithiopika" (pp. 197-214) from *Arethusa*, Vol. 32 (The Johns Hopkins University Press)

Raskin, J. (1967): "Imperialism: Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*" (pp. 113-131) from *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Literature and Society (SAGE)

Reardon, B. P. (1994): "Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative" (pp. 80-96) from Morgan, J. R. & Stoneman, R. (1994): *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (Routledge)

Reardon, B. P. (2019): *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (California University Press)

Redondo Moyano, E. (2012): "Space and Gender in the Ancient Greek Novel" (pp. 29-48) from Futre Pinheiro, M. P.; Skinner, M. B. & Zeitlin, F. I. (2012): *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel* (De Gruyter)

Repath, I. (2022): "Sphragis 2: The Limits of Reality and the End of the Novel (10.41.3-4)" (pp. 256-270) from Repath, I. & Whitmarsh, T. (2022): *Reading Heliodorus' Aethiopica* (Oxford University Press)

Rzepnikowska, A. (2018): "Racism and Xenophobia Experience by Polish Migrants in the UK Before and After Brexit Vote" (pp. 61-77) from *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 45 (Taylor & Francis)

Said, E. (1978): *Orientalism* (Pantheon Books)

Said, E. (1993): *Culture and Imperialism* (Chatto & Windus)

Sands O'Connor, K. (2007): *Soon Come Home to This Island: West Indians in British Children's Literature* (Routledge)

Sartre, J-P. (1943): *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology* (Gallimard)

Shukla, N. (2017): *The Good Immigrant* (Unbound)

Shukla, N. & Suleyman, C. (2019): *The Good Immigrant USA* (Dialogue Books)

Simic, L. (2009): "on medea / mothers' clothes: a 'foreigner' re-figuring medea and motherhood" (pp. 109-115) from *The Feminist Review*, No. 93, birth (Sage Journals)

Singh, F. B. (1978): "The Colonialistic Bias of 'Heart of Darkness'" (pp. 41-54) from *Conradiana*, Vol. 10 (Texas Tech University Press)

Stephens, S. A. (2008): "Cultural Identity" (pp. 56-71) from Whitmarsh, T. (2008): *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge University Press)

Sullivan, Z. T. (1981): "Enclosure, Darkness, and the Body: Conrad's Landscape" (pp. 59-79) from *The Centennial Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Michigan University Press)

Taylor, S. (2010): *Narratives of Identity and Place* (Routledge)

Varaidzo (2017): "A Guide to Being Black" (pp. 10-21) from Shukla, N. (2017): *The Good Immigrant* (Unbound)

Weeks, K. H. (2023): *A Latin Second Sophistic* (Durham Theses, Durham University)

Whitmarsh, T. (2001): *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford University Press)

Whitmarsh, T. (2003): "Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Erotics in Achilles Tatius" (pp. 191-205) from Panavotakis, S.; Zimmerman, M. & Keulen, W. (2003): *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Brill)

Whitmarsh, T. (2011): *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Cambridge University Press)

Whitmarsh, T. (2022): "Sphragis 1: To Infinity and Beyond (10.41.4)" (pp. 246-255) from Repath, I. & Whitmarsh, T. (2022): *Reading Heliodorus' Aethiopica* (Oxford University Press)

Winkler, J. J. (1982): "The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*" (pp. 93-158) from *Later Greek Literature*, Yale Classical Studies 27 (Cambridge University Press)

Yeo, C. (2020): "Race, Racism and Immigration in the United Kingdom: Black Lives Matter" from *Free Movement* – https://freemovement.org.uk/black-lives-matter/ (accessed 11-11-2023, 16:48)

CAPE (2021): *I Am Not a Fetish or Model Minority: Redefining What It Means to Be API in the Entertainment Industry* (CAPE)

The Mash Report (2018): "How to Be an Immigrant British People Like | The Mash Report – BBC" (YouTube) – https://youtu.be/rqOIky0bIVs (accessed 08-11-2023, 08:50)

Erotic Rational Madness in the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*

By Evangelos Katsarelis

Abstract

In this article, I suggest that both the *Phaedrus* and the *Hippolytus* explore the idea that erotic madness encompasses an element of rationality. This concept of rational erotic madness gained prominence after the Platonic dialogue, the *Phaedrus*, where Socrates posits that humans might attain the greatest fortune by allowing the rational part of the soul to guide them even in a state of madness. I contend that this idea is also evident in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, where Phaedra confronts her passions and descends into madness, yet still strives to address her dilemmas with wisdom.

Keywords: erotic madness, rational madness, moral theory of eros, Euripides and Plato, Phaedra's erotic passion, Platonic eros.

-.-

In both Platonic philosophy and Euripidean tragedy, the concept of erotic madness is closely related to human erotic passion. Eros is linked to passion because it represents an excessive and intense emotion that encompasses more than just love. Erotic passion represents a state where one cannot fully act rationally, as the desires stemming from passion may override the dictates of reason. Madness, in this context, denotes a lack of control by reason, making it an inherent aspect of eros, which is inherently beyond complete human control. Plato and Euripides underscore an initially paradoxical aspect of erotic madness that actually illuminates the complexity of the erotic experience in the human soul: rational madness. This notion suggests that within the chaotic insanity of the erotic soul, there can still be an active and significant role for rationality.

There was a widespread belief, which is evident in the works of both Euripides and Plato, that eros is tied to madness and thus considered a form of disease.[1] The term *νόσος* often refers to madness

---

[1] E.g., Sophocles, *Antigone*, 781; Gorgias, *Encomium on Helen*, 19; Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1.2.5.

as a mental illness.[2] Poets describe eros using metaphors of disease and madness, portraying it as a force that invades human life with destructive effects, leading to both physical and mental turmoil, all under the premise that this power is insurmountable.[3] As we will explore, both Euripides and Plato often depict eros as a disease and as madness, with the terms frequently used interchangeably. This duality exists because madness is medically viewed as a disease, and having a disease can indeed provoke madness.

To truly comprehend human nature, it is essential to examine its irrational components. In doing so, we discover that elements of rationality are often entwined within these irrational aspects. Nietzsche aptly noted in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, "There is always some madness in love. But there is always some reason in madness".[4] Rationality, being grounded in reason, contrasts with irrationality, which deviates from rational norms and is dominated by the pursuit of pleasures. A rational individual experiences desires but maintains them within moderate limits. Self-control, as a virtue, enables a wise person to manage irrational passions and align them with rationality. Having these in mind, I will explore instances in the works of Euripides and Plato that demonstrate what I term "erotic rational madness", suggesting the presence of a rational component within the realm of erotic madness.

In this paper, we will examine how the concept of erotic rational madness is explicitly presented by Plato in the *Phaedrus*. Here, Socrates discusses eros, asserting that within the state of madness, humans may achieve the greatest fortune (245b) through the guidance of the rational part of the soul toward true knowledge (247c). I will argue that earlier traces of this concept can be found in Euripides' portrayal of Phaedra's eros for Hippolytus. If this is the case, it is noteworthy that Plato's seemingly innovative idea of erotic rational madness may be comparable to themes developed by Euripides in his tragic poetry half a century earlier. This comparison highlights the continuity and evolution of ideas in ancient Greek thought, showcasing the impact of Euripides' tragic poetry on Plato's philosophy. It also demonstrates their shared interest in understanding human nature and the

---

[2] Padel (1995), 158.
[3] Cyrino (2018), 231; Calame (1999), 193.
[4] Nietzsche (1954), 153.

transformative power of eros, as well as how different genres might shape the presentation and reception of an idea.

The *Hippolytus* provides a rich context to establish this correlation with Platonic philosophy, as the play focuses on Phaedra's intense erotic passion and includes extensive references to how humans grapple with both their own desires and external forces influencing the erotic experience. In both the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*, the lover appears to be divinely inspired, but the capabilities differ: Phaedra is depicted as out of her wits (237-8), while in the *Phaedrus*, the lover regains their intellectual "wings" (251b-c). Both works highlight a divinely inspired eros associated with madness and an effort by the rational part of the self to overcome irrational desires. However, they reach different conclusions regarding the potential of the human soul. Through this study, I aim to demonstrate that the notion of erotic rational madness predates Plato's *Phaedrus* and can be identified in instances where the human mind struggles to fully control the soul, such as in the case of Phaedra.

Euripides and Plato

There have been a few comparative studies examining Euripides' poetry alongside Plato's philosophy, and even more that explore the connections between Euripides and Socrates (see Wildberg, 2005; Sansone, 1996; Nussbaum, 1986; Irwin, 1983; Claus, 1972; Dodds, 1945). In particular, David Sansone's influential 1996 article examined Plato's deep engagement with Euripides' texts, yet subsequent research on this topic, especially regarding concepts of madness in both tragedy and Plato's works, remains scarce. Given the significant attention to madness in tragedy, this lack of exploration appears notable. Additionally, no studies have clearly suggested that within the moral theory of eros, similar perceptions of rational madness exist. Claus's article "Phaedra and the Socratic Paradox" (1972) offers a useful foundation for this argument. Claus analyzes lines 380-90 from the *Hippolytus*, interpreting Phaedra's moral character in Socratic terms and highlighting the struggle between reason and passion.[5] I aim to extend this idea further by suggesting that we do

---

[5] See also Cairns (2020).

not only meet an interrelation of reason and passion in Phaedra but in the erotic experience of both the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*, we meet a sort of rational madness.

In Euripides' time, there was no clear distinction between philosophical and literary discussions of human practical problems, with tragic drama serving as the moral philosophy of fifth-century Athens, thoroughly exploring ethical issues.[6] Plato's ambivalent attitude toward tragedy is well documented;[7] despite condemning its imitative nature, he adopts many of its characteristics and techniques in his philosophical writings. Sansone has posited that Euripides may have influenced the intellectual development of the young Plato. Diogenes Laertius even quotes Dicaearchus, who claimed that Plato wrote poetry, including tragedy, before meeting Socrates and practicing philosophy (*Lives of Eminent Philosophers* III, 4-5). Later, Diogenes mentions that Euripides accompanied Plato on his journey to Egypt (*Lives of Eminent Philosophers* III, 6). Although the authenticity of this information is debated,[8] it is significant that stories emerged shortly after Plato's time –only a few decades in the case of Dicaearchus– attempting to explain the thin line between tragedy and Platonic dialogues. This complex relationship between Plato and tragedy has led some to speculate that Plato saw himself as a continuator of the tragic tradition.[9]

Both Euripides in the *Hippolytus* and Plato in the *Phaedrus* explore the deep understanding of human character and the essence of eros by examining how individuals deal with their passions. While a full-length tragic drama may be more adept at depicting the complexity and multifaceted nature of erotic desire than a structured philosophical discourse, deciphering Plato's intent is often more straightforward than understanding Euripides. Plato directs the reader's attention to specific

---

[6] Gregory (ed.) (2010), 112; Dover (1974), 17; Havelock (1934), 283. In tragedy, this exploration unfolds through dramatic staging, interaction among characters, debates featuring assertions and counterarguments, and a sequence of questions and answers. Billings (2021), 8.

[7] See, for example, *Republic,* 607b-c.

[8] Sansone (1996), 56.

[9] Ibid., 58.

points,[10] whereas Euripides embeds his key messages within the intricacies of the plot, sometimes leaving the central message ambiguous.

In the *Phaedrus*, as well as in the preceding *Symposium*, Plato illustrates how erotic desire can be the catalyst for a philosophical life. Although eros in the *Hippolytus* does not lead to a philosophical life, it suggests that the human mind can maintain rationality amidst erotic passion. It is not surprising that both Euripides and Plato, products of classical Athens' "Enlightenment" period –a time deeply invested in the pursuit of reason– examine an inherently irrational passion's potential for rationality.[11] During this era, human behavior was often interpreted through the lens of rational self-interest, and virtue was seen as practicing a rational way of living despite life's complexities. Both Euripides and Plato employ metaphysical, mythical, or religious concepts to discuss forces beyond human control and, in our case, the divine power of eros. The distinction lies in Plato's approach, as he preferred to "transpose his religious beliefs from the mythical to the philosophical level, thus transforming them into truths of reason".[12]

While the Hippolytus and the Phaedrus share several common elements, such as common imagery[13] and scenes depicting intense mental suffering,[14] the primary aim of this article is to

---

[10] Socrates' conclusion in his second speech in the Phaedrus (257a-b) clearly indicates that he aims to direct readers' focus to this speech about eros, rather than to the preceding arguments found in Lysias' speech and his own initial discourse.

[11] Dodds (1951) 188-9. The Greek Enlightenment of the fifth century BCE is linked to a period marked by progressive or revolutionary ideas and a critical re-evaluation of traditional beliefs and values. Solmsen (2015), 3; Cf. Billings (2021), 4-5.

[12] Dodds (1945), 24. Euripides' plays deeply explores the theme of personal responsibility within the context of divine determinism, examining the complex interplay between human agency and the will of the gods. In some of these narratives, gods seem to reside within the tragic hero (e.g., Phaedra) on a symbolic level, representing internal conflicts. Rivier (1960) 46-7. This is how battling an emotion can equate to battling a god, leading to destruction. In stark contrast, Plato's perspective on the gods differs significantly. He rejected the idea, common in tragedy, that gods experience emotions like anger, spite, and envy, as for Plato, the gods are perfectly good and serve as ethical exemplars for human behavior. Nightingale (2021), 12; Santas (1988), 66. Within this framework, Plato introduced a new conception of human beings and their relationship to the divine, integrating the gods, the cosmos, and the Forms into a unified system. Nightingale (2021), 31, 39.

[13] For instance, in the *Hippolytus* (1272-3), eros is depicted as soaring over the earth and sea, while in the *Phaedrus* (246b-250c), the image of the chariot of the soul is used.

[14] Both works emphasize psychological suffering rather than physical pain, as vividly illustrated on stage in Euripides' Hippolytus (248-9, 349, 433-42, 570, 596-7) and within Plato's moral philosophy in the *Phaedrus* (251c-251e, 254a-254e).

concentrate on the theme of rational madness as the connecting thread between the two works. This analysis is even more focused, honing in on particular sections of each text. In the *Hippolytus*, the spotlight will be on Phaedra's erotic desire and her experience of passion. In the *Phaedrus*, the emphasis will be placed on Socrates' first and second speeches.

Eros and Madness

In both the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*, eros is depicted as a form of sexual desire manifesting as intense passion, intimately linked with madness, often resulting in a loss of self-control and disorder.[15] Most argued that madness is inherent in tragedy and actually, we do not just have madness in tragedy but the madness of tragedy, which implies that this is a certain sort of madness and it has a fundamental role in the tragedy, as "in a certain sense, a scene of madness is the very essence of Greek tragedy", while in some cases it is not easy to separate madness and tragedy.[16] According to Padel, plays a pivotal role in tragedy as it reveals the fragile nature of the human mind and body.[17] This madness shapes the tragic hero, making the association of eros with madness crucial to the narrative, often driving the tragic outcomes of characters like Phaedra. Thumiger's chapter "Mad Erôs and Eroticized Madness in Tragedy" in *Erôs in Ancient Greece* (2013) explores the interrelation of these two notions in tragedy, concluding that when eros has a central role in the plot, it is negative and can lead only to misfortune due to its very element of madness. This does not suggest that eros in tragedy is always associated with madness, nor that madness is invariably linked to eros. Rather, it indicates that madness is a common aspect of erotic desire in tragedy. Let us explore how this interconnection of eros and madness applies in the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*.

In the *Hippolytus*, eros is repeatedly portrayed as a destructive force. The play portrays the suffering of three mortals (Hippolytus, Theseus, Phaedra, 1404) inflicted by Aphrodite and highlighting how humans struggle with the passions induced by superior forces, while those who are

---

[15] Aristotle compares the persons under the influence of passion to men asleep, insane, or drunk (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1147a).
[16] Most (2013), 397-8.
[17] Padel (1981), 118.

ignorant and disrespectful to these forces face destruction. Everyone in the play admits the destructive role that eros has on humans. The wording in the very beginning of the play makes this clear when Aphrodite refers to Phaedra as "a poor woman, groaning and made distraught by the goad of love, means to die in silence, and none of her household knows of her malady (*νόσον*)"[18] (38-40). The Nurse considers Phaedra's words as an irrational outburst, devoid of meaning (214), and Phaedra later acknowledges her madness, confessing that she has strayed from good sense (240-1). Aphrodite's eros wounds Phaedra like a spear (392), breaking her *φρένες* down with a terrible disease, an unholy passion (765).[19] Also, the Nurse defines eros as "great pleasure and great pain", with Phaedra responding that on her end "it will be the second" (347-7), and later Phaedra again defines her erotic passion as "troubles" (*συμφορὰς*) and "malady" (*νόσον*) (596-7). The Chorus echoes this, referring to Phaedra's passion as "troubles" (*πόνοι*, 367) sent by Aphrodite (372), and characterizing eros as the "mankind's despot" (538-9) who "ruins mortals and causes them every kind of disaster" (541). The Chorus later says that Phaedra is wrenched by an unholy passion sent from Aphrodite (764-7). Hippolytus admits that Aphrodite is the power that destroyed him (1400). Artemis, at the end of the play, remarks that "when the gods so ordain it is to be expected that men will make disastrous mistakes" (1433-4), underscoring how passion and its resulting madness provoked by a superior force can lead humans to destruction. Theseus, in his last words, attributes to Aphrodite the woes that he endured (1461).

Phaedra is possessed by a god and as a result, she is out of her wits. Aphrodite, instills erotic passion within in Phaedra's soul, who in turn works on her erotic passion through her inner material (349, 570). Thereby, Euripides intertwines external (divine) compulsion with internal culpability in the causal chain of dramatizing actions. Phaedra's affliction combines exogenous and endogenous factors, as the external divine force permeates her thoughts and personal traits. Within this framework, the Chorus ponders whether Phaedra is possessed by a god or simply manifesting a common madness seen in women (141-7, 159-61). All these perspectives of the different voices in

---

[18] For the passage from the *Hippolytus* in quotation marks, I referred to Kovacs' translation (2005).
[19] The term "broken down" (*κατεκλάσθη*, 766) is a term used by the Hippocratics to describe the body being "reduced" or "broken" by fever. Padel (1995), 159.

the *Hippolytus* show that eros is a force beyond human control, imposed by a goddess, and with profound destructive consequences. In general, it comes as no surprise that eros is closely associated with disease and madness in tragedy since in all tragic plays human irrationality and the struggle of man against his passions are fundamental elements of the plot.

For Plato, rationality is a principal virtue for philosophical life and true knowledge, while the understanding of the foundational principles of existence comes through reason rather than the senses.[20] However, Socrates declares in the palinode, his second speech in the *Phaedrus*, that madness is not merely evil but can be the source of birth for the best things when it is a gift by a god (244a). Before the palinode, Socrates advocates for rationality over lack of self-restraint (241c) but then he rejects pure rationality as disrespectful (245b), positing that irrational erotics can lead the human mind and the rest of parts of the soul to the true world (248b-c). This transformation in the conception of madness in the *Phaedrus* shows that until that point of the palinode madness in Platonic philosophy was viewed negatively, a state where non-intellectual elements dominate the soul.[21] Even in Diotima's speech in the *Symposium*, erotic madness is not explicitly mentioned; instead, the focus is on self-sufficiency.[22] Therefore, it is intriguing that Plato in the *Phaedrus* closely associates eros to madness, whereas in the *Symposium*, eros is portrayed in strictly rational terms and in the *Republic*, madness is considered evil (400b). Santas, in his effort to explain this, comes to the assumption that Plato in the *Phaedrus* "is trying to remedy a defect of his own theory of eros in the *Symposium*" aiming to bring in that stage of his philosophy of eros the intensity and passion of sexual pleasures that he lacked in the *Symposium*.[23] Thus, by incorporating more aspects of sexuality into this philosophical theory, Plato seems to give a more realistic account of passionate love.

The distinction between self-control and madness is established in the two first speeches about eros in the dialogue. The progression from Lysias' speech to Socrates' first speech and then second

---

[20] Dodds (1945), 16.

[21] Madness in the *Republic* is presented among the species of evils (400b). For more references to madness in the dialogues prior to the *Phaedrus*, see Nussbaum (1986), 204.

[22] The only irrational aspects of eros in the *Symposium* could be traced in Alcibiades' speech, who among others speaks about philosophy as a form of madness (218b).

[23] Santas (1982), 108.

speech looks like an initiation of the reader of the dialogue, which Plato seems to build gradually before reaching the peak of his philosophical theory about eros in this dialogue. In the first level, with Lysias' speech, we start with the basic concept that lovers are sick rather than sane (*νοσεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ σωφρονεῖν*) and know that they are not thinking straight (*κακῶς φρονοῦσιν*) but they are unable to exercise self-control (231d). As Harris suggests here we encounter for the first time in the dialogue the metaphor of eros as sickness, and of course, Plato is not the first to use this idea but it seems that he takes "full advantage of its implications by availing himself of an aspect of popular thought in which Eros and/or Aphrodite could, for example, be regarded as an illness or even as madness, both of which may deprive us of our reason".[24] This suggests that the concept of eros as a disease exists beyond tragedy as well.[25] Therefore, if being lovesick is the state of being out of self-control, Lysias' speech implies the opposite, which is that reason is a necessary condition for mental health.[26] Later, Socrates in his first speech introduces in the conversation the two kinds of desire; the innate desire for pleasure and the acquired judgment that pursues what is best (237d). Then, he describes how they affect our lives in a manner foreshadowing his later palinode. More specifically, in the first speech he argues that when human judgment guides humans by reason (*λόγῳ*) toward what is best, it leads to self-control (*σωφροσύνη*) but when desire draws us irrationally (*ἀλόγως*) to pleasures, it is called outrageousness (*ὕβρις*) (237e-238a). And then, a few lines later, while defining eros, he shows that eros is inherently irrational (*ἄνευ λόγου*) (238b-c). So, Socrates in his first speech contrasts self-control in love with the madness of love (241a), laying the groundwork for his second speech where he presents eros as the highest form of madness (249e).

The two speeches before the palinode made a distinction between evil madness and good *σωφροσύνη*, while Socrates' recantation elucidates how these two properties can be reconciled.[27] Through his allegory, Socrates proposes a novel model of the soul, where reason and passionate desires coexist as two of its three parts (253d-254a). He emphasizes on how reason –the rational

---

[24] Harris (2006), 390.

[25] Cf. Phaedra's definition of her erotic passion as *νόσον* at 596-7, as mentioned above.

[26] Harris (2006), 392.

[27] Harris argues that Socrates' second speech is not a complete reversal of his views about madness in his first speech, describing the second speech "more emendation than recantation". Ibid., 388.

charioteer– can work along with the spirited part –the noble white horse– and the passionate appetite –the irrational black horse– to reach their destination beyond the heavens (247c). The second speech is very rich in content because, as Santas argued, Socrates "weaves into it religion, myth, phantasy, metaphor, simile, allegory, the immortality and tripartite division of the soul, and even the theory of Forms – a formidable mixture in which it is difficult to discern structure, coherence, and sense, not to speak of philosophic substance and truth".[28] By introducing the fundamental principle that anything divine cannot be evil (242e), Socrates makes a crucial distinction between human and divine madness.[29] This redefines erotic madness, elevating it from a lack of self-control and lovesickness to a state that offers significant benefits to humans (244a, 245b). Thus, the second speech clarifies that the identification of madness with ὕβρις in the first speech mostly pertains to human madness, while divine madness is characterized as beneficial.[30]

In the *Phaedrus*, as Vlastos argued, eros is not just described but defined as a form of madness closely related to philosophy.[31] In Socrates' first speech, eros displays characteristics of a disease (238a) and madness (241a), and the lover is depicted as being afflicted because he has lost his mind (241b). However, at the beginning of his second speech, eros is introduced as a type of divine madness, asserting that madness is not inherently simple or bad because it can lead to the best things (244a). The madness of eros redirects the erotic drive from physical beauty toward the recollected ideal Form of Beauty, and thereby, toward the philosophical life, which is considered for Plato the ultimate good (256a). This madness, according to Socrates (245b), is given by the gods to attain the greatest fortune, which is the reconnection with the world of Forms, enabling the control of bodily pleasures (256c). Thus, although erotic desire begins as an irrational passion, it has the potential to be transformed into a divine madness that propels individuals towards union with the Forms, making erotic madness positive and beneficial to both lover and beloved (256a-b).

---

[28] Santas (1982), 108.
[29] Harris (2006), 398.
[30] Santas (1982), 108-9.
[31] Vlastos (1973), 27.

In Euripides and Plato, we find two distinct manifestations of madness, which can either lead to destruction or serve to "heal" the soul. Madness can be seen either as a disease or a mark of excellence, and can be perceived as either a divine punishment or a pathway to connect with the divine realm.[32] In both cases though, namely in Phaedra's passion and Socrates' second speech, erotic madness is considered as engoddedness (ἐνθουσιασμός) and this is a crucial point for both authors. As we saw, Euripides in the *Hippolytus* attributes Phaedra's erotic passion and subsequent madness to Aphrodite, thus demonstrating how gods intervene in human lives and incite their passions. On the other hand, Plato attributes the divine origin of madness to a higher purpose, connecting his moral theory about the human soul to the eternal, immutable knowledge of the Platonic Forms.[33] Unlike the divine origin of eros in tragedy which results from the gods of Greek mythology, Plato, although incorporating these gods into his philosophical framework (246e-247a), suggests that eros originates not from these deities but from the ultimate pursuit of the true world of Forms, a quest even the gods themselves undertake (247b-c). This connection between erotic madness and the divine world is emphasized repeatedly at the start of Socrates' second speech (244a, 244b, 244c, 244d, 244e, 245a, 245b, 245c), underscoring its significance in Plato's philosophical account in the palinode. By framing erotic madness as a divine gift, Plato resolves the paradox that within the state of madness, reason can guide the soul, leading to what I call rational madness, suggesting that madness can encompass rationality. The next section will delve deeper into this concept.

Erotic Rational Madness

To the extent that erotic madness can be deep-reaching, we meet erotic rational madness because the state of madness does not necessarily entail a complete loss of reality. The control of desire and the pursuit of goals beyond sensory experiences result from the exercise of reason within erotic madness. Through the combination of rational discourse and the effects of irrational passion, the

---

[32] In the *Hippolytus*, madness appears not as the punishment itself but as the tool used to execute the punishment, as the god seeks to induce a particular mental state in humans to reprimand offenses against the divine. Padel (1981), 110. Padel's hypothesis "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad" is applicable in this context.
[33] Santas (1982), 109.

erotic experience evolves into rational madness. I will first examine how this concept is illustrated in the *Phaedrus*, before examining its application in the *Hippolytus* to argue that the notion of rational madness is present there as well.

In Socrates' second speech in the *Phaedrus*, where eros is seen as irrational desire, we encounter a type of rational madness in which the rational part of the soul can dominate the irrational parts (254e). Lovers need to continually struggle against distortion to attain what is good for the soul. The contrast between madness and σωφροσύνη is a contrast between the irrational, passion-driven aspects of the soul and its intellectual states, allowing it to reconnect with the transcendent world of Forms. According to Ustinova, "this characteristically Platonic leap from madness to revelation and back to reason makes erotic rapture a way to attain transcendent reality".[34] Erotic rational madness occurs through the interplay of different parts of the soul, where both rational and irrational elements are stimulated by the sight of beauty. The irrational element sparks by bodily beauty (250e) while the rational one is caused by the recollection of the true Form of Beauty and of the realm beyond the heavens (254b). Thus, creative thinking is influenced by both internal and external factors. Beauty inflames madness in the soul, which seethes and throbs in that condition and feels anguish and helpless raving (251b-d). It is then up to the rational part of the self to take control and guide the soul toward true knowledge.

Socrates argues that "the greatest things we have come from madness when it is given as a gift of the god" (244a). This statement appears paradoxical due to the inherent contradiction between the greatest human achievements and madness.[35] The paradox deepens when Socrates claims that when the rational part of the soul prevails amid madness, the soul fulfills its ultimate purpose: to reconnect with the world of Forms through the process of recollection (249c) and live philosophically (256a). This represents a rationalization of madness. It is unsurprising that Plato, a rationalist philosopher, incorporates madness into his discussion of eros in such a way that even within this state, the rational part of the soul plays a crucial role. The positive aspect of this madness lies in its nature as a divine

---

[34] Ustinova (2018), 296.
[35] See Mackenzie (1982), 64-72.

gift (244a), placing the soul in contact with the supernatural world, which endows it with awe and powers beyond the common limits of the human soul (252c-253b).

The price for achieving erotic rational madness is the suppression of erotic desire and sexual pleasure (254e), which can obstruct the soul's connection to the world of Forms. Passions can disrupt and distort judgment (254c-e). Therefore, restricting the self and suppressing certain parts can lead to rational control. However, even the non-rational parts of the soul play a crucial role in motivating the pursuit of true knowledge and philosophy (256a) by driving the soul intellectually. These irrational parts contribute significantly to the soul's cognitive efforts. The actions inspired by erotic passion are essential for the soul's ascent to the world of Forms through recollection. Nonetheless, it would be incorrect to claim that in Plato, all actions resulting from madness are intrinsically good; rather, they can be instrumentally beneficial.[36]

Nevertheless, there are also those types of souls which during the circular motion did not see reality and remained uninitiated (248b) resulting in their rational parts failing to prevail during erotic desire due to the incompetence of their drivers. Consequently, they miss the opportunity to reconnect with the real world. The soul may act wrongly if it does not succeed in bringing irrational erotic desire under the control of reason. As Santas argues, the worst kind of lover in the *Phaedrus* is very close to what Socrates described in his first speech as human madness, namely the lover whose reason fails to prevail over his passion, but even this lover is reframed after the palinode in a new perspective that includes immortality of the soul, the tripartite division, and the recollection of the Forms.[37] That is to say that even this "bad" lover still processes recollection of divine beauty, while he sees bodily beauty, though his connection to divine beauty is weak, leading him to indulge in bodily pleasure instead. Reason is essential for mental health in all three speeches about eros (the one of Lysias and the two of Socrates), even though human reason alone, without divine madness, is insufficient, as highlighted in Socrates' palinode. After Socrates' second speech, the contrast between

---

[36] Nussbaum (1986), 219.
[37] Santas (1982), 111.

madness and self-control is radically re-evaluated through the lens of human versus divine madness (265a).

In tragedy, we observe an important and profound insight about humanity: individuals possess some freedom to transcend passion and act creatively, although this often comes at a cost. Humans in tragedy are free to choose but lack omniscience about their lives and cannot rely solely on their individual strengths. Thus, the greatness of the tragic hero can be diminished at any moment due to divine intervention. Phaedra acknowledges that she is a victim of irrationality and superior forces (240-1), refusing responsibility for her passion and focusing instead on hiding her disease rather than overcoming it, but she also dares to confront forces that surpass her (475). The symptoms of her erotic disease result from both Aphrodite's influence and Phaedra's resistance to her passion.[38] Phaedra attempts to overcome her erotic madness using pure reason but ultimately fails to conquer Aphrodite (398-402). Nevertheless, it would be excessive to argue that Aphrodite bears full responsibility for the mortal characters' wrongdoings because if Phaedra did not bear any responsibility for the tragic outcome, her heroic status would be nullified.[39]

So far, we have seen, through various references to the *Hippolytus*, how erotic passion can be likened to disease and madness and, thereby, become destructive for the tragic hero. However, as Thumiger argued in her discussion of madness in tragedy, "the implications of madness are not only negative but can also be enriching and empowering",[40] which is a perspective that helps to bridge the approaches of Euripides and Plato regarding eros. In other words, as we will see, even Phaedra who is initially portrayed as being overwhelmed by a destructive divine madness, especially during the first episode of the play, is later, in the rest of the play, empowered to attempt to manage her passion with rationality in the best way she sees fit. This shows the reversals to which human life is subject and that humans can still be upright in disaster.

---

[38] Mueller (2016), 165. If the gods were removed from the plot, there would not be sufficient human malefaction to result in tragedy because the gods bestow on mortals to make disastrous mistakes when they so ordain (1433-4). Hathorn (1957), 211.
[39] Mueller (2016), 165.
[40] Thumiger (2013), 29.

Rivier described eros in Euripides as both human and divine, and therefore, daemonic, as Diotima would put it.[41] From the outset of the play, Aphrodite reveals her plan, indicating that the ensuing troubles are part of her divine scheme. Aphrodite admits that Phaedra's terrible desire is her own doing (28). She further reveals that her plan goes beyond Phaedra's demise; she aims to expose this erotic longing in a way that leads Theseus to kill his son Hippolytus, thereby punishing him for his disrespect (41-6). If we deal with eros as divine intervention, one interpretation of the play might criticize Hippolytus for his lack of respect toward Aphrodite, which triggered the plot's misfortunes. However, when non-human forces influence human judgment, it becomes unclear, unlike in Platonic philosophy, how to assign moral responsibility. In this context, Phaedra attempts to resist the passion inflicted upon her by Aphrodite. She tries to excuse her moral shortcomings by claiming that humans are defenseless against the internal struggle between reason and passion (398-9). She confesses her moral failure (248) but attributes it (725-7) to her erotic passion for Hippolytus, fully understanding that her eros for him is forbidden. Thus, it becomes evident that although Phaedra is aware of what is right, she still succumbs to ruin because she cannot control her passion with reason. In her case, there is no excusable ignorance; she knowingly commits a wrongful act, fully aware that her nature is influenced by overpowering forces that hinder wise action.[42]

The Nurse attributes a lack of self-control to Phaedra (493-6) and, based on this, she urges Phaedra to surrender to her passion. Phaedra, a few lines later, admits that her passion has overtaken her (504-5) and subsequently portrays herself as a victim of this detested passion (727). Describing her passion as hateful is crucial, as it indicates that her mind rejected this passion from the start, driven only by her desires. The Chorus later echoes this sentiment, suggesting that Phaedra's mind was twisted by her passion sent from Aphrodite (764-6). While this does not suggest that Phaedra possesses rationality within her passion, it underscores her internal conflict between mind and passion. In Phaedra's case, the forces of Aphrodite (passionate desire) and of Phaedra herself (modesty) coexist.[43]

---

[41] Rivier (1960).
[42] Barrett (1964).
[43] Holmes (2010), 255.

Phaedra appears to use her rational part in her effort to cope with her malady. She recognizes that maintaining a sound mind while grappling with madness is an immensely challenging task (247-8). At one point, she realizes that due to her moral character, she is not strong enough to fully resist the desires stirred by her passion (380-3). Therefore, she contemplates how best to endure it (392-3). Initially, she considers hiding her malady in silence (393-4) and then clearly expresses her intention to conquer her passion through self-control (398-9). This indicates that she is aware of her condition and desires to regulate her passion with reason. This self-awareness is crucial for examining Phaedra's moral character and assessing whether the concept of erotic rational madness predated Plato's *Phaedrus*. It is evident that Phaedra wishes to achieve rationality over her irrational passion. However, she eventually realizes that she cannot confront Aphrodite, the divine force behind her passion, and thus considers death to be her only escape (400-2). She believes that death will provide relief from her troubles (599-600). Later, Artemis acknowledges Phaedra's determination to "conquer" Aphrodite using her intelligence but she was ultimately undone by the Nurse's scheming (1304).

Another indication of Phaedra's use of rationality in her madness is her concern for her name and reputation, striving to appear virtuous. Although this focus makes her seem unsympathetic and not genuinely virtuous, it suggests her ability to think and plan for self-preservation. At the beginning of her speech, Phaedra expresses shame over her words (244). After discovering that the Nurse has disclosed her desire to Hippolytus, Phaedra worries that she will no longer die with honor and quickly devises a new plan to safeguard her reputation (687-90). Phaedra pursues her own moral objectives, even if these objectives are morally ambiguous. As a result, she does not seem entirely or literally mad. However, she was undoubtedly affected by possession and illness. She was cognizant of her passion and made a destructive choice, fully aware of its consequences but prioritizing her reputation above all else (716-21).

The play explores the ethics of honor and shame, particularly illustrated in Phaedra's monologue in the first episode (373-90), reflecting the contemporary debates initiated by Socrates during Euripides' era. Contrasting with Socratic thought –that no one willingly does wrong because virtue

is the knowledge that it is always good for us to be good and thus the right kind of thinking requires the right kind of action (Plato, *Protagoras*, 352b-358a.)– is Phaedra's view (377-86) that appearing virtuous is beneficial even if actual goodness is not essential.[44] Through Phaedra, Euripides acknowledges incontinence as a factor in human behavior, demonstrating that individuals can know what is good yet act contrary to that knowledge.

Knowing that what she does is not morally proper, Phaedra tries to partially control her erotic passion by not externalizing it directly toward the object of her desire. However, she fails to fully contain her erotic madness, ultimately causing harm to herself.[45] For Phaedra, it is preferable to perish unconscious rather than endure the unbearable pain of being rational while possessed by irrational evil (247-9). Therefore, throughout her ordeal, Phaedra uses her intellect and demonstrates wisdom amidst her erotic passion. This aligns with Nussbaum's observation that deeply held beliefs about goodness can persist even when individuals are unable to fully control themselves.[46] Thus, the critical point in this story is not whether Phaedra manages to conquer her passion with her mind but that she continues to use her rational faculties to contend with it. Phaedra only partially controls her passion for Hippolytus but even this is a significant achievement for her moral character given her circumstances. Later, she accuses Hippolytus of lacking moderation (730-1), which results from self-control, hoping that her suffering will teach him σωφρονεῖν. This could indicate her respect for the virtue of σωφροσύνη. For Hippolytus, σωφροσύνη is to be chaste, and sexually proper, while Phaedra uses the term σωφροσύνη to refer to the ability of self-control, the control of reason over passion.[47]

Phaedra seems to claim that she possesses good sense (εὖ φρονεῖν) and that to fare badly should not be an indication of nature with bad sense (377-9). She differentiates between wise understanding and acting accordingly, implying that the former reflects the nature of one's intellect, while the latter

---

[44] Liatsi (ed.) (2020), 120; Lesky (2010), 93; Dillon (2004), 71-2; Halleran (2001), 180. However, according to Claus, Phaedra is "incapable of a meaningful dialogue with Socrates" because Euripides places this view about human morality in the traditional context. Claus (1972), 237.

[45] According to Segal, by sacrificing Hippolytus, Phaedra gets a greater μίασμα than the one she feared in 317. Segal (1970), 293.

[46] Nussbaum (1986), 25.

[47] Powell (1990), 81.

might be influenced by external factors beyond one's nature. Phaedra as a woman of great intelligence and admirable principles who nonetheless meets a tragic end.[48] Even Phaedra acknowledges that a good and just mind is as valuable as life itself (426-7). She seems to appreciate contemplation (375-6) and values the ability to think, despite her lack of complete self-control. Phaedra fought hard to avoid the crime of which she was accused, indicating that even within the condition of madness, one can retain comprehension of their experiences. This is evident in Phaedra's case; despite her loss of self-control, she has not lost self-awareness. This is not to suggest that Phaedra is equally rational and irrational, but rather that her madness and passion involve varying degrees of rationality. Therefore, Phaedra's eros should not be seen solely as madness, given that she retains some rational capacities. In this context, we witness a form of rationality within the condition of erotic madness.

In the dialogue that the Nurse has with Phaedra, we see the Nurse suggesting that Phaedra has the skill of good sense by nature, although this would not be enough to save her from her passion. Even if mindful humans (σώφρονες) do not want to, they might end up being in love with disaster (358-9). Therefore, from her view too, being mindful does not ensure the ability to be *compos mentis*. The Nurse further cites Phaedra's intense desire to conceal her erotic passion to protect her reputation as a mark of wisdom, claiming that hiding dishonorable deeds is among the wise practices of mortals (ἐν σοφοῖσι γὰρ τάδ' ἐστὶ θνητῶν, 465-6). Hippolytus also recognizes Phaedra's cleverness, remarking that he does not wish for an overly intelligent woman in his home because Aphrodite stirs more trouble in the clever ones (640-3). Hippolytus suggests here that erotic passion combined with cleverness can lead to greater destruction, acknowledging that Phaedra is not entirely mindless. Before discovering Phaedra's false accusations, Hippolytus notes that "she showed chastity, though she could not be chaste" (ἐσωφρόνησε δ' οὐκ ἔχουσα σωφρονεῖν, 1034) indicating that she displayed some rationality amidst her overwhelming erotic desire.

Tragedy often portrays individual emotions as being shaped by external factors imposed by the environment. Within this framework, Phaedra aims to maintain a reputation for virtue. It is not surprising that Euripides depicts eros as a primarily destructive force, unlike Plato, because tragedy

---

[48] Winnington (1960), 173; Hathorn (1957), 214.

emphasizes the downfall of human character. In this context, eros's role as a force of intensification is significant. I concur with Thumiger's assertion that "a focus on an eros which ends positively would contradict the dramatic requirement of tragedy itself".[49] Eros in tragedy is characterized by exclusivity and individuality, reinforcing that the essence of eros is the inner struggle between reason and passion. Despite her failure to be virtuous, Phaedra remains a woman with some moral standards as she attempts to manage her passion according to principles of prudence and reputation.[50] Her inner goodness starkly contrasts with the harm she inflicts on Hippolytus.[51] When she realizes her inability to conquer her erotic passion, she resolves to overcome it through death rather than succumb to dishonor.[52]

Conclusions

In both the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*, the soul is depicted as a battleground for competing forces, specifically the conflict between reason and desires. In both cases, the virtue of reason is an innate capacity of the self, while desire is stimulated by external factors and stimuli, such as a god or the sexual attraction to bodily beauty. This innate otherness within the self complicates the idea of a unified, self-contained identity. Consequently, the soul is naturally divided and eros can be the reason for the disorder of harmony among the parts of the self. If eros can lead even the righteous into misdeeds (*Hippolytus*, 358-9), then this capacity "is not truly part of the self", since it is not "within man's conscious control".[53] This implies that in tragedy, eros has its own energy that can force the human soul to act contrary to its nature, as seen in Phaedra's case. Conversely, in the *Phaedrus*, the ability of the soul to manage its passions depends on its innate qualities and skills from its prenatal past (250a-b). Although Phaedra's madness does not exhibit any clear signs of divine inspiration or

---

[49] Thumiger (2013), 39.

[50] Lesky (2010), 91-2.

[51] Phaedra's initial goal is to transform a great disgrace (αἰσχρῶν, 331) into something fine (ἐσθλὰ, 331) but ultimately, her actions prove to be a bane (κακόν, 728)) to Hippolytus as she strives to maintain the appearance of goodness.

[52] She no longer embodies the wholly wicked woman depicted in the earlier version of the *Hippolytus*. In the revised version, Euripides safeguards Phaedra's character by presenting her as a woman struggling to suppress her shameful passion. Easterling (ed.) (1997), 201-2.

[53] Dodds (1951), 41.

special insights, unlike the divinely inspired madness experienced by the lover in the Phaedrus, her irrational erotic passion is still inflicted by a divine power. Despite this, she retains rational elements to manage her passion. This is what makes erotic madness in the Phaedrus comparable to erotic madness in Hippolytus.

As Claus suggested, given that Phaedra understands her passion and its destructive impact, one might expect, according to Socrates, that she would prevent her passion.[54] However, this is not how moral character functions in tragedy. Instead, Phaedra admits no guilt and is more concerned about her reputation. For her, appearing virtuous equates to being virtuous.[55] She believes she has adhered to her moral imperatives, primarily driven by a concern for honor (εὔκλεια, 489). Similarly, Plato in the *Phaedrus* acknowledges that a sense of shame can prevent people from pursuing sexual pleasure and surrendering to erotic desire (254a).

There is a significant contrast between the erotic passion described in the palinode in the *Phaedrus* and Phaedra's passion. On one hand, Socrates in the allegory suggests that the rational part of the soul can prevail and control passion, leading to right action. On the other hand, in the case of Phaedra, her θυμός and her βουλεύματα are interrelated without her rational part fully controlling them. However, Plato's allegory also includes instances where reason fails to completely control passions, noting that some souls struggle intensely because they have not trained the bad horse properly (247b, 248b). But it would be wrong to say, using the Platonic terms, that Phaedra has failed to "train her bad horse" to follow the order of her reason because Phaedra is subject to divine infliction and, eventually, her erotic passion does not take full control of her mind.

As previously discussed, the *Phaedrus* suggests a distinction between divine and human madness with the former implying that reason manages to prevail over passion and the latter that reason fails to control erotic passion. In my interpretation, Phaedra, who attempts to manage her passion rationally but fails because she is influenced by Aphrodite, does not fit neatly into either category. As

---

[54] Claus (1972), 235-6.
[55] Reputation was a fundamental factor in ancient Greece, usually associated with κλέος, honor, and shame. See Cairns (1993); Kovacs (1980); Solmsen (1973); Dodds (1925).

demonstrated, Phaedra does not lack self-control; however, her capacity for self-control is insufficient to overcome her passion entirely. Nonetheless, I consider Phaedra's situation to be an instance of erotic rational madness, not exactly as presented in the *Phaedrus*, but in a similar context where rationality and irrationality coexist within the erotic experience. This suggests that in Plato's time, there were already instances of rationality within erotic madness, as seen in the *Hippolytus*.

In both Euripides and Plato, eros comprises both rational and irrational elements. These elements intertwine during the erotic experience. Rationality does not eliminate irrational passion but controls it. Therefore, a rational person is not devoid of passions but is someone who can manage them to some extent. The interplay of these elements forms what I call erotic rational madness. The difference between Euripides and Plato lies in the degree of prominence given to rational decision-making.

Unlike Platonic moral philosophy, tragedy does not present a binary, black-and-white morality. These two works invite exploration of the self and its moral complexities. In tragedy, good people might face ruin due to factors beyond their control. Euripides illustrates that reasonable prudence and self-control can be overridden by irrational passion, emphasizing that successful resistance to passion cannot depend solely on the power of reason.[56] Conversely, Plato provides clearer solutions to this moral deadlock and is more explicit about what constitutes good and bad morality. Plato's innovation is presenting the self as a continuous psychological entity capable of managing the interplay of reason and passion, thereby being responsible for controlling emotions and passions. In this sense, Plato, in the *Phaedrus*, moves erotic rational madness a crucial step further from what we saw in the *Hippolytus*.

One might wonder why Plato, a rationalist, emphasizes that gods bestow humans with a divinely given madness and asserts that the greatest benefits to humans come from this madness (244a). I believe Plato takes the concept of erotic madness from tragedy and integrates it into his philosophical framework, stripping away its destructive aspects and infusing it with positive meaning. Just as

---

[56] Thornton (1998), 245; Markantonatos (ed.) (2020), 967-8.

Socrates' second speech in the *Phaedrus* transforms the negative effects of erotic madness into positive ones, this shift mirrors the transition from eros in Euripides to eros in Plato.

Euripides and Plato both explore the discrepancy between the nature of human character and the extent to which individuals successfully navigate their lives. Euripides focuses on how a good character can fail, while Plato emphasizes how a character can achieve a life well-lived. In the *Hippolytus* and the *Phaedrus*, among other works, characters are depicted as being harmed or corrupted by erotic desire due to circumstances beyond their control. Despite this similarity, Euripides and Plato offer different perspectives in these narratives. Euripides examines the self's relationship to its moral struggles through human passions, whereas Plato seeks to demonstrate the path to true knowledge and ultimately, to bliss. Studying these irrational factors in behavior leads to a deeper understanding of human nature, particularly in the context of erotic experience.

Works Cited

BARRETT, W. S. (1964) *Euripides: Hippolytos.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BILLINGS, J. (2021) *The Philosophical Stage: Drama and Dialectic in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

CAIRNS, D. (1993) Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ (2020) "Phaedra's Fantasy Other: Phenomenology and the Enactive Mind in Euripides' *Hippolytus*". In: M. Liatsi (ed.) *Ethics in Ancient Greek Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp.117-28.

CALAME, C. (1999) *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

CLAUS, D. (1972) "Phaedra and the Socratic Paradox". *Yale Classical Studies*, 22, pp. 223-38.

CYRIMO, M. S. (2018) "Of Love and Bondage in Euripides' *Hippolytus*.". in M. Masterson, N. S. Rabinowitz, and J. Robson (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge, pp. 251-64.

DILLON, J. (2004) "Euripides and the Philosophy of His Time". *Classics Ireland*, 11, pp. 47-73.

DODDS, E. R. (1925) "The ΑΙΔΩΣ of Phaedra and the Meaning of the Hippolytus". *The Classical Review*, 39, pp. 102-4.

_____ (1929) "Euripides the Irrationalist". *The Classical Review*, 43, pp. 97-104.

_____ (1945) "Plato and the Irrational". *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 65, pp. 16-25.

_____ (1951) *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkely: University of California Press.

DOVER, K. J. (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

EASTERLING, P. E. (ed.) (1997) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GREGORY, J. (ed.) (2010) *Όψεις και Θέματα της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής Τραγωδίας* (*A Companion to Greek Tragedy*). M. Kayser et al. (trans.). Athens: Papadimas.

HALLERAN, M. R. (2001) *Euripides'* Hippolytus. Newburyport: Focus Publishing.

HARRIS, J. P. (2006) "Divine Madness and Human Sanity in Plato's *Phaedrus*". *Mouseion*, 6, pp. 387-406.

HATHORN, R. Y. (1957) "Rationalism and Irrationalism in Euripides' *Hippolytus*". *The Classical Journal*, 52, pp. 211-8.

HAVELOCK, E. A. (1934) "The Evidence for the Teaching of Socrates". *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 65, pp. 282-95.

HOLMES, B. (2010) *The Emergence of the Physical Body in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

IRWIN, T. H. (1983) "Euripides and Socrates". *Classical Philology*, 78, pp. 187-97.

KOVACS, D. (1980) "Shame, Pleasure, and Honor in Phaedra's Great Speech (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 375-87)". *American Journal of Philology*, 101, pp. 287-303.

_____ (ed. & trans.) (2005) *Euripides'* Children of Heracles, Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

LESKY, A. (2010) *Η Τραγική Ποίηση των Αρχαίων Ελλήνων Τόμος Β′: Ο Ευριπίδης και το τέλος του είδους* (*Die Tragishe Dichtung der Hellenen*). N. Chourmouziadis (trans.). Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation.

LIATSI, M. (ed.) (2020) *Ethics in Ancient Greek Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

MACKENZIE, M. M. (1982) "Paradox in Plato's *Phaedrus*". *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society N.S.*, 28, pp. 64-76.

MARKANTONATOS, A. (ed.) (2020) *Brill's Companion to Euripides*. Leiden: Brill.

MOST, G. W. (2013) "The Madness of Tragedy". *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition*, 38, pp. 395–410.

MUELLER, M. (2016) *Objects as Actors: Props and the Poetics of Performance in Greek Tragedy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

NEHAMAS, A. & WOODRUFF, P. (1995) *Plato:* Phaedrus. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

NIETZSCHE, F. (1954) "Thus Spoke Zarathustra". in *The Portable Nietzsche*, W. Kaufmann. (trans.) New York: Viking Press.

NIGHTINGALE, A. W. (2021) *Philosophy and Religion in Plato's Dialogues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NUSSBAUM, M. (1986) *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PADEL, R. (1981) "Madness in Fifth-Century Athenian Tragedy". in P. Heelas and A. Lock (eds.) *Indigenous Psychologies: The Anthropology of the Self*. London: Academic Press, pp.105-31.

_____ (1995) *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

POWELL, A. (ed.) (1990) *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*. London: Routledge.

RIVIER, A. (1960) "L'élément démonique chez Euripide jusqu'en 428". *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, 6, pp. 45-86.

SANSONE, D. (1996) "Plato and Euripides". *Illinois Classical Studies*, 2, pp. 35-61.

SANTAS, G. (1982) "Passionate Platonic Love in the Phaedrus". *Ancient Philosophy*, 2, pp. 105-14.

_____ (1988) *Plato and Freud: Two Theories of Love*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.

SEGAL, E. (1970) "Shame and Purity in Euripides' *Hippolytus*". *Hermes*, 98, pp. 278-99.

SOLMSEN, F. (1973) "Bad Shame and Related Problems in Phaedra's Speech (Eur. *Hipp*. 380-388)". *Hermes*, 101, pp. 420-5.

_____ (2015) *Intellectual Experiments of the Greek Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

THORNTON, B. (1998) *Έρως: Ο Μύθος της Σεξουαλικότητας στην Αρχαία Ελλάδα* (*Eros: The Myth of Ancient Greek Sexuality).* Gr. Kondylis (trans.). Athens: Oksi.

THUMIGER, C. (2013) "Mad Erôs and Eroticized Madness in Tragedy". In: E. Sanders, C. Thumiger, C. Carey, N. J. Lowe (eds.) *Erôs in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-40.

USTINOVA, Y. (2018) "Erotic Mania". In: *Divine Mania: Alteration of Consciousness in Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge, pp. 294-312.

VLASTOS, G. (1973) *Platonic Studies*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

WILDBERG, C. (2005) "Socrates and Euripides". In: *A Companion to Socrates*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 21-35.

WINNINGTON-INGRAM, R. P. (1960) "*Hippolytus*: A Study in Causation". *Entretiens sur l' Antiquité Classique*, 6, pp. 169-97.

Roman Imperialistic Strategies in North Africa: 2ⁿᵈ Century BC to 1ˢᵗ Century AD

By Christian Nana Andoh

Abstract

Existing scholarly discourses on Roman imperialism frequently analyse the underlying economic, political, military, or cultural motivations driving Rome's expansion. However, a more nuanced understanding necessitates a focused examination of the concrete strategies employed by the Romans to establish and, crucially, *maintain* their hegemony over conquered territories. This paper addresses this gap in scholarship by adopting a historical approach, utilising content analysis of primary and secondary sources to investigate the multifaceted strategies implemented by Rome in its conquest and subsequent control of North Africa from the 2ⁿᵈ century BC to the 1ˢᵗ century AD. Recognising North Africa's significant economic resources, strategic geographical location, and geopolitical importance within the Roman sphere, this study argues that Rome's enduring influence over this diverse region was not solely a consequence of military might but rather the result of a carefully orchestrated and adaptive set of imperial strategies that aimed to secure both immediate advantages and long-term stability. By bringing to bear the various interconnected strategies employed, this analysis offers a more comprehensive understanding of the operational mechanisms underpinning Roman imperialism in a region presenting unique challenges and opportunities.

1. Introduction

The study of Roman imperialism has long captivated scholars, with debates often centering on the primary drivers of Rome's relentless expansion (Mommsen, 1981; Morley, 2010; Stone, 2013). While the underlying economic aspirations for resources, the strategic imperative of controlling key territories, the political ambition of elite individuals, and the perceived cultural superiority that fueled the *mos maiorum* have all been explored, a critical area demanding more focused attention is the *how* of Roman control. This paper posits that understanding the longevity and efficacy of Roman imperialism in North Africa requires a detailed analysis of the concrete strategies Rome employed

not just in initial conquest, but more importantly, in establishing and maintaining its dominion over a vast and often recalcitrant territory.

This study aims to address a scholarly gap by dissecting the specific imperial strategies utilised by Rome in North Africa, moving beyond general motivations to identify the concrete mechanisms of control. It will analyse the adaptation and evolution of these strategies in response to the unique challenges and opportunities presented by the North African context, and evaluate their effectiveness in securing Roman interests, consolidating power, and shaping the socio-political landscape of the region. Ultimately, this research seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of Roman imperialism in North Africa that acknowledges both the exercise of power and the agency of the local populations. The article aims to achieve these objectives by examining the period from the 2nd century BC to the 1st century AD. This period witnessed the decisive subjugation of Carthage and the subsequent implementation of various control mechanisms that shaped the region for centuries. The structure of this article will proceed by first establishing the historical context and imperial motives, followed by an examination of the initial wars of conquest. It will then delve into key strategies such as divide-and-rule tactics, the manipulation of client kingship, the establishment of colonies and urbanisation, the strategic deployment of garrisons, and the nuanced application of Romen culture and citizenship policies. Finally, the paper will analyse the impacts of these strategies on North African society and conclude by reflecting on the region's significance within the broader context of Roman imperial history and suggesting avenues for future research.

2. Historical Context and Imperial Motives

North Africa, encompassing the territories roughly corresponding to modern-day Tunisia, Algeria, and parts of Libya and Morocco, held immense strategic, economic, and political significance for the burgeoning Roman Republic and subsequent Empire (Philip, 2014; Raven, 1993). This region was not a homogenous entity but rather a complex mosaic of diverse peoples, cultures, and political structures, including the powerful maritime civilisation of Carthage, the Berber kingdoms of Numidia and Mauretania, and various nomadic groups. The pre-Roman history of North Africa

was rich and complex, with indigenous Berber societies having a long history of settlement and adaptation to the region's diverse environments (Brett & Fentress, 1996). Phoenician colonisation, particularly the establishment of Carthage, had a profound impact, introducing urban centers and maritime trade networks (Markoe, 2000). Understanding this diversity is crucial for appreciating the challenges and adaptations of Roman imperial strategies in the region.

Strategically, North Africa's location along the southern Mediterranean coast provided Rome with control over vital sea lanes, facilitating trade and communication within its expanding empire and, crucially, offering a crucial buffer against potential threats from the south. Control of North Africa significantly reduced the risk of naval incursions and piracy that could disrupt Roman trade and supply lines. This strategic importance increased as Rome's power and reliance on Mediterranean trade grew. The Roman military, with its disciplined legions and effective organisation, played a crucial role in achieving these strategic objectives, securing Roman dominance over the region (Goldsworthy, 2007).

Economically, the region was a breadbasket, renowned for its fertile agricultural land producing grain, olive oil, and other essential resources that were vital for feeding the growing population of Rome, particularly the urban population of Rome itself (Tenney, 1927). North Africa's agricultural surplus played a critical role in sustaining Rome's military campaigns and its overall economic stability. Garnsey (1988) provides a detailed analysis of the Roman food supply, highlighting the importance of North African grain. Beyond agriculture, the region also offered valuable commodities such as timber from the Atlas Mountains, livestock, and mineral wealth, including valuable marble quarries. These resources further enhanced North Africa's economic importance to Rome.

Politically, control over North Africa enhanced Rome's prestige and power, demonstrating its ability to project influence and exert control over distant lands and diverse populations. This expansionist drive was intertwined with Roman elite culture, where military conquest and territorial acquisition were often seen as paths to political advancement and social status. Roman political ideology, shaped by concepts like *imperium* (the right to rule) and *dignitas* (prestige), further fueled

this expansionist ambition (Harris, 1979). Roman control over North Africa also meant control over important trade routes and the ability to extract tribute and taxes, further solidifying Rome's dominance in the Mediterranean world.

Rome's motives for expansion into North Africa were multifaceted, evolving over time but consistently driven by a confluence of factors. The Punic Wars (264-146 BC), initially sparked by competition for economic and strategic dominance in the western Mediterranean, ultimately instilled a deep-seated animosity towards Carthage and a determination to eliminate it as a rival (Scullard, 1982). This rivalry was not solely about resources but also about prestige and control over the Mediterranean trade network. Beyond the Carthaginian threat, the allure of North Africa's agricultural wealth became increasingly important as Rome's population grew, and its reliance on grain imports increased. The political ambitions of Roman elites, seeking military glory (*gloria*) and opportunities for personal enrichment through conquest and governance, also played a significant role in driving expansionist policies (Mommsen, 1981). These intertwined strategic, economic, and political imperatives provided the impetus for Rome's sustained and ultimately successful imperialistic endeavors in the region.

3. Wars of Conquest and the Fall of Carthage

The Punic Wars (264-146 BC) and the Jugurthine War (112-106 BC) stand as critical milestones in Rome's conquest of North Africa, laying the groundwork for subsequent imperial strategies and fundamentally reshaping the region (Scullard, 1982; Philip, 2014). These conflicts were not isolated events but rather part of a larger pattern of Roman expansion and consolidation of power in the Mediterranean.

The Punic Wars, a series of three major conflicts between Rome and Carthage, were pivotal in establishing Roman dominance in North Africa. The First Punic War (264-241 BC) saw Rome adapt its military organisation, rapidly developing its naval capabilities and employing innovative tactics like the *corvus* to challenge Carthage's maritime supremacy (Goldsworthy, 2000). The Second Punic War (218-201 BC), marked by Hannibal's famous invasion of Italy, tested Rome's resilience

to its limits. Rome's eventual victory, attributed to its strategic depth, logistical capabilities, and the tactical brilliance of commanders like Scipio Africanus (Penrose, 2005), had a profound impact on both Roman and Carthaginian societies. Carthage was significantly weakened economically and politically, its overseas empire dismantled, and its capacity for future aggression severely curtailed (Scullard, 1982). The Third Punic War (149-146 BC) culminated in the complete destruction of Carthage, a symbolic act of Roman power fueled by a faction within the Roman Senate and a desire to eliminate any lingering threat (Harris, 1979). Archaeologically, the remains of Carthage reveal the scale of Roman destruction and the subsequent rebuilding as a Roman city (Hurst, 2010). The annexation of the *Africa Proconsularis* province, encompassing the former Carthaginian territories, marked the formal beginning of direct Roman imperial administration in a significant portion of North Africa. The political consequences within Rome included the rise of powerful military figures and the solidification of a more aggressive expansionist policy.

The Jugurthine War (112-106 BC) further solidified Roman dominance over Numidia, a key Berber kingdom in North Africa, and revealed the complexities of Roman expansion into the interior of the region. Initially, Rome sought to manipulate Numidian politics, intervening in internal power struggles and attempting to exert influence through client kings (Sallust, *Jugurthine War*). However, Jugurtha's defiance and his successful mobilisation of Numidian resistance exposed the limitations of indirect rule in the face of strong local opposition. The war highlighted the challenges Rome faced in controlling the vast and diverse territories of North Africa, particularly the semi-nomadic Berber populations, who employed guerrilla tactics that proved difficult for the Roman legions to counter effectively (Law, 1976). The Roman response was forceful, involving a significant military commitment and the deployment of skilled commanders like Marius, whose reforms to the Roman army had significant long-term political consequences within Rome, contributing to the rise of powerful individuals and the eventual decline of the Republic (Goldsworthy, 2003). The eventual Roman victory led to a more direct assertion of Roman power in Numidia and the further integration of Numidian territories into Rome's sphere of influence, though not without continued resistance and adaptation of Roman strategies. Archaeological evidence from Numidian sites

provides insights into the nature of Numidian society and the impact of Roman interaction (Camps, 1980).

These wars of conquest were not merely about territorial acquisition; they were foundational acts of establishing Roman military superiority, demonstrating Rome's unwavering commitment to controlling the region, and providing valuable experience and knowledge that shaped the development of more nuanced strategies of long-term control. The lessons learned in these conflicts, particularly regarding the challenges of dealing with Berber resistance and the complexities of local politics, informed Rome's subsequent approach to governing North Africa.

4. Divide-and-Rule Strategy

The "divide and rule" (*divide et impera*) strategy was a cornerstone of Roman imperial control in North Africa, effectively preventing the emergence of unified and potent resistance (Posener, Speir & Vermeule, 2010). This tactic involved strategically cultivating divisions and rivalries among local powers and ethnic groups, ensuring that no single entity could amass enough strength to challenge Roman hegemony. Unlike other regions in Roman territories, North Africa presented unique challenges and opportunities for the Romans, especially from the 2nd century BC to the 1st century AD, necessitating a tailored approach to consolidating its power, and the divide-and-rule strategy was a key component of this tailored approach. This approach was not merely opportunistic; it was a deliberate and calculated policy that required a deep understanding of the complex political and social dynamics within North Africa.

Key examples of this strategy abound in North African history. During the Second Punic War, Rome skillfully fostered the rivalry between the Numidian kings Massinissa and Syphax, ultimately backing Massinissa, whose kingdom then served as a crucial ally and a check on other local ambitions (Scullard, 1982). This was a particularly effective application of the strategy because Numidia was a significant power in its own right. Massinissa's long reign and his consistent alignment with Roman interests exemplify how Rome could leverage existing power dynamics to its advantage, ensuring a local power remained invested in the Roman system and preventing the rise of a unified Numidian

threat. Rome's support for Massinissa not only provided military support but also often involved diplomatic recognition and the granting of titles and privileges, further solidifying his allegiance and creating a clear contrast with his rivals. This created a system of rewards and punishments that incentivised cooperation with Rome.

The very destruction of Carthage can also be seen through this lens, albeit in a more destructive form, eliminating a major power that could potentially unite other North African entities against Roman influence. The removal of this significant regional power created a power vacuum that Rome could then manipulate to its benefit, dealing with smaller, less formidable entities. By eliminating the dominant power, Rome disrupted pre-existing alliances and power structures, forcing other entities to re-align themselves in a new Roman-dominated order. This disruption made it much harder for any coherent opposition to emerge.

Furthermore, the Roman administration often deliberately created or exacerbated internal divisions within existing kingdoms and tribal confederations. The complexities of Berber political structures, often characterised by tribal loyalties and shifting alliances, provided fertile ground for such tactics. Berber society was often organised around semi-nomadic tribes with fluid borders and complex kinship ties. This inherent fragmentation made it easier for Rome to find factions willing to cooperate. By recognising and supporting certain factions within these groups, Rome could prevent the formation of large, cohesive Berber confederations capable of challenging Roman authority. This support could take many forms, from providing military aid to mediating disputes in a way that favored Roman allies to granting economic advantages. The fragmentation of Mauretania after the death of client kings, as mentioned in the broader historical context, further illustrates this. Rather than directly administering the entire territory immediately, Rome often allowed or even encouraged internal strife, subtly or overtly backing competing claimants to the throne, which made subsequent intervention and eventual annexation easier (Philip, 2014). This created a situation of dependency, where local rulers were forced to rely on Rome for support, thereby diminishing their independence.

By strategically playing on existing tensions and preventing the formation of cohesive alliances, Rome effectively minimised the threat of large-scale, unified resistance to its rule, a crucial element in maintaining long-term stability in a region with a history of independent and often resistant local populations. The success of this strategy highlights Rome's pragmatic and adaptable approach to imperial control in North Africa, and its willingness to exploit local conditions to its advantage.

5. Client Kingship and Indirect Rule

While direct Roman administration was established in key provinces like *Africa Proconsularis*, Rome also employed the strategy of indirect rule through client kingship to manage other parts of North Africa (Oxford Classical Dictionary, Nd). This approach involved delegating a degree of authority to local rulers who were nominally independent but ultimately loyal to Rome, thereby maintaining control without the need for extensive direct military and administrative investment. This system was a cost-effective way for Rome to govern vast territories and diverse populations, allowing them to leverage existing power structures and local knowledge. Client kings were expected to maintain order within their territories, collect taxes and tribute for Rome, and provide military support when required. In return, they received Roman recognition, protection, and often, significant wealth and prestige. This arrangement allowed Rome to project its power without overstretching its resources, particularly in regions where direct rule would have been costly or difficult to implement.

Massinissa of Numidia (c. 238 – 148 BC) serves as a prime example of a successful and long-lasting client king who significantly furthered Roman interests in the region (Scullard, 1982). His alliance with Rome during the Second Punic War was crucial in weakening Carthage and ultimately securing Roman victory. In return for his loyalty, Rome supported Massinissa in expanding his kingdom and consolidating his power over other Numidian tribes. Massinissa's long reign was characterised by his unwavering support for Rome, his adoption of some Roman customs, and his efforts to modernise Numidia along Roman lines, including the development of agriculture and infrastructure. His rule provided stability and order in the region, benefiting both Rome and

Numidia. Massinissa's success demonstrates the potential benefits of client kingship for Rome: a stable, loyal ally who could govern effectively and contribute to Roman security and economic interests. However, even with a successful client king like Massinissa, Rome had to remain vigilant. The potential for a powerful client king to become *too* powerful or to pursue his own ambitions, even at the expense of Rome, always existed. The succession struggles that followed Massinissa's death, for example, required Roman intervention to ensure continued Numidian loyalty.

Juba II of Mauretania (c. 52 BC – AD 23) represents another important example of client kingship, albeit under the later Roman Empire (Philip, 2014). The son of Juba I, who had opposed Caesar, Juba II was taken to Rome as a hostage and educated in the Roman court. This Roman upbringing shaped his worldview and ensured his loyalty to Rome. Augustus installed Juba II as king of Mauretania, a kingdom that Rome aimed to stabilise and integrate into its sphere of influence. Juba II's reign was characterised by his promotion of Roman culture and urbanisation in Mauretania, his support for Roman trade and economic interests, and his scholarly pursuits, which included writing on history and geography. His rule facilitated the spread of Roman influence in the western part of North Africa, contributing to the region's Romen culture and integration into the empire. Juba II's example illustrates how Rome could use a client king educated in Roman ways to effectively extend its cultural and political influence, even in territories that were not directly administered. However, even in Juba II's case, Rome had to carefully manage the relationship. His power was ultimately dependent on Roman support, and any perceived deviation from Roman interests could result in the loss of his throne.

Both Massinissa and Juba II demonstrate the key features of successful client kingship: loyalty to Rome, effective governance, and a willingness to promote Roman interests. However, the system of indirect rule also presented challenges for Rome. It required careful monitoring of client kings, the ability to intervene decisively when necessary, and a nuanced understanding of local politics. The success of client kingship depended on Rome's ability to balance the need for local autonomy with the maintenance of ultimate Roman authority. The Jugurthine War, for example, demonstrated the dangers of misjudging a client king and the potential for a seemingly loyal ruler to turn against Rome.

The system also required Rome to maintain a credible threat of force, as client kings were more likely to remain loyal if they knew that Rome could and would intervene militarily if necessary. Furthermore, the reliance on client kings could create resentment among local populations who might view them as Roman puppets.

6. Colonies and Urbanisation

The establishment of Roman colonies (*coloniae*) and the promotion of urbanisation were crucial and intertwined strategies for consolidating Roman power and fostering Romen culture in North Africa (Raven, 1993; Wilson, 2018). These strategies went beyond mere territorial control; they aimed to fundamentally reshape the physical, social, and cultural landscape of North Africa in the Roman image, creating a more enduring and integrated imperial system.

Roman colonies served diverse and overlapping purposes, each contributing to the multifaceted goals of Roman imperialism. *Coloniae Civium Romanorum* primarily functioned as Veteran Settlements, providing land allotments to retired Roman soldiers, thereby ensuring army loyalty by giving veterans a vested interest in Roman stability. These veteran settlers, often possessing military skills and Roman customs, acted as a stabilizing force, a garrison against local unrest, and a potent agent of Romanization, disseminating Roman values and practices into the local environment. Earlier *Coloniae Latinae* served as Strategic Outposts, strategically located to control key resources like fertile land or mines, trade routes, or borders. They functioned as military garrisons, administrative centers, and hubs for resource extraction, effectively projecting Roman power and facilitating efficient communication, logistics, and supply lines, which was essential for maintaining Roman security and economic interests. Finally, all *coloniae* were designed as centres of Roman culture, embodying Roman urban planning principles with their grid systems, monumental architecture (forums, temples, amphitheaters, baths), Roman legal institutions, and social structures. These features were powerful tools for the dissemination of Roman culture, the Latin language, and Roman customs, encouraging local populations, particularly elites, to adopt Roman ways of life and integrate into the Roman system.

The refounding of Carthage as a Roman colony (*Colonia Iulia Concordia Carthago*) under Julius Caesar and Augustus is a significant and highly symbolic example of this strategy (Hurst, 2010). The destruction of Carthage in the Punic Wars was followed by a period of deliberate neglect, a *damnatio memoriae* intended to erase the city's power and influence. Its subsequent re-establishment as a Roman city was a powerful statement of Roman dominance, a deliberate act of cultural and political supersession, and an attempt to replace the memory of Rome's great rival with a new Roman identity. Roman Carthage became a thriving urban center, attracting Roman settlers, Italian merchants, and ambitious local elites, and it played a pivotal role in the Romen culture of the region, becoming a major center of Roman culture and administration in North Africa.

Similarly, the development and embellishment of existing cities, and the creation of new ones, like Leptis Magna, particularly under the Severan dynasty (a dynasty originating from the region, showcasing the complex interplay of Roman and local identities), showcase the Roman commitment to urbanisation as a tool of imperial integration (Mattingly, 2010). These urban centers, often built or rebuilt with significant Roman investment and adorned with impressive public works, became focal points for economic activity (trade, markets), administration (government, legal proceedings), and cultural exchange (festivals, performances). Roman urban planning, characterised by the orthogonal grid system, the central forum, public baths (Thébert, 2013), amphitheaters for entertainment, and temples dedicated to Roman deities, imposed a Roman order on the landscape and encouraged the adoption of Roman social and cultural practices, shaping the daily lives of both Roman settlers and local inhabitants.

Veterans and settlers who populated these colonies, along with Roman administrators, merchants, and other immigrants, acted as direct and indirect agents of Romen culture, introducing Roman customs, the Latin language, Roman law, and Roman social structures to North Africa. However, the social dynamics within these urban centers were complex. Local elites, attracted by the opportunities for social and economic advancement within the Roman system, often embraced Roman culture, adopting Roman dress, language, and lifestyles, further accelerating the process of Romen culture. This could lead to social stratification and tensions between those who embraced

Roman ways and those who maintained indigenous traditions. The degree of Romen culture varied significantly across different social groups and regions, and local resistance and the persistence of indigenous cultures remained a factor throughout Roman rule, demonstrating the nuanced and often contested nature of cultural change under imperial rule.

7. Garrisons and Military Infrastructure

The strategic placement of Roman garrisons and the development of a robust military infrastructure were essential for maintaining order, defending Roman territories, projecting Roman power, and facilitating the long-term control of North Africa (Philip, 2014; Raven, 1993). The Roman military presence in North Africa was not a static entity but rather a dynamic and evolving instrument of imperial policy, adapting to changing circumstances and shaping the region's physical and social landscape in profound ways.

Roman legions and auxiliary units were strategically stationed in key locations, with their placement determined by a complex interplay of factors. Frontier Defense was a primary concern, with garrisons heavily concentrated along the *Limes Africanus*, a complex and evolving fortified frontier system. This "zone of control," incorporating forts, walls, watchtowers, and patrol routes, was designed to protect Roman territories from incursions by nomadic Berber tribes and other potential threats from the vast Sahara Desert and its surrounding regions. The *limes* necessitated a permanent and substantial military presence, including specialized desert warfare units, to ensure security, control trade routes, and prevent raids on Roman settlements and agricultural lands, with Hitchner (2018) specifically highlighting the need to protect valuable agricultural lands. Beyond frontier protection, military installations were also strategically located for the Control of Strategic Resources, positioned near valuable assets such as fertile agricultural areas (e.g., the *granarium Africae*), mines (for marble or minerals), or important trade routes. This placement aimed to protect these resources from local unrest, ensure their efficient exploitation for Rome's benefit, and maintain Roman control over the province's economic lifeblood. Furthermore, garrisons were situated in or near urban centers (e.g., Carthage, Leptis Magna) and other areas prone to instability or resistance

for the Maintenance of Internal Order. This role involved suppressing internal rebellions, enforcing Roman law and taxation, and maintaining control over often diverse and sometimes restive local populations, which was crucial for the smooth functioning of Roman administration and resource extraction. Finally, the strategic deployment of these units was underpinned by extensive and well-maintained military infrastructure, including roads, forts, supply depots, and signal stations, which facilitated Communication and Logistics. This infrastructure was crucial for the rapid movement of troops and supplies, ensuring Rome's ability to respond quickly and effectively to any crisis, and maintaining effective control over vast distances and diverse terrains, thereby serving as the backbone of Roman power projection and administrative efficiency.

The design and function of Roman military infrastructure in North Africa were sophisticated and adapted to the specific challenges and opportunities presented by the region. Forts and fortresses (*castella* and *castra*) ranged from small *castella* for auxiliary units to large *castra* accommodating legions, serving as major administrative and logistical centres. These fortifications, often built with durable stone, incorporated sophisticated defensive features like thick walls, towers, ditches, and strategically placed gates, with their design evolving to reflect changes in military tactics and threats, as evidenced by archaeological insights from sites like Lambaesis. Crucially, the construction of an extensive and strategically planned network of roads (*Viae Militaris*) was a hallmark of Roman military engineering, vital not only for military mobility but also for trade, communication, and provincial integration. These high-standard roads facilitated rapid troop deployment, efficient supply transport, and the movement of merchants and administrators, connecting and integrating various parts of the region into the wider Roman world. Furthermore, supply depots (*Horrea*) were strategically established to store essential provisions like food, weapons, and other supplies, ensuring troops were well-equipped even in remote areas, with their efficient management being critical for successful military operations and the maintenance of Roman power. Lastly, a network of watchtowers and signal stations was often built along frontiers, roads, and strategic locations to provide early warning of threats, facilitate communication between military installations, and enhance Roman surveillance and control, playing a vital role in intelligence gathering and rapid response capabilities.

The Roman military presence profoundly and multifacetedly impacted North African society, extending far beyond its primary function of defense and control. It significantly stimulated and integrated local economies by creating a substantial and sustained demand for goods and services, fostering trade, and creating dependencies on the Roman military economy as local suppliers and artisans provided necessities to Roman troops. This prolonged interaction between diverse Roman soldiers and local populations also led to complex cultural exchange and blending, with soldiers often forming relationships with local women, contributing to the mixing of cultures and the transmission of Roman customs and values, though this exchange was not always harmonious and could involve tensions. Furthermore, the Roman army acted as a powerful agent of Romanization and urban development, introducing Roman customs, technology, and social practices. Military camps (*canabae*) frequently attracted civilian settlements of merchants and artisans, which could evolve into towns and cities, further spreading Roman influence and transforming the urban landscape. For some North Africans, recruitment into the Roman army, especially auxiliary units, offered avenues for social mobility and integration, enabling them to gain Roman citizenship, learn Latin, and participate in the Roman system, though this mobility was often limited and the army also utilized forced conscription. Conversely, the Roman military presence also engendered resistance and conflict, with local populations resenting its demands for resources and its role in enforcing Roman rule, leading to prolonged conflicts, particularly with Berber tribes, and necessitating a substantial Roman military presence.

8. Roman Culture and Citizenship

The implementation of Romen culture and policies and the granting of Roman citizenship, albeit selectively, were crucial and intertwined strategies for integrating North African elites and fostering a sense of belonging (or at least acquiescence) within the Roman imperial framework (Revell, 2009; Quinn, 2003). These strategies went beyond mere political control; they aimed to fundamentally reshape North African society and culture, drawing local elites into the Roman system and creating a more stable and enduring imperial order.

The extension of varying degrees of Roman citizenship, such as *civitas sine suffragio* (citizenship without the right to vote), to certain individuals and communities was a powerful and effective tool for co-opting local leaders and encouraging their cooperation with Roman rule. This was a calculated policy, not a universal gesture. Rome used citizenship as a reward and an incentive, offering significant advantages to those who collaborated. Examples of citizenship grants can be found throughout North Africa. As Britannica notes, many communities advanced in wealth and standing to rival the Roman colonies, acquiring the grant of Roman citizenship, which put the seal of imperial approval on the prosperity, stability, and cultural evolution of developing communities. Leptis Magna and Hadrumetum received Roman citizenship and the status of a colony from Trajan.

By granting citizenship, Rome offered local elites significant advantages. These included enhanced legal status and rights under Roman law, providing protections and privileges such as property and inheritance rights, and access to legal recourse in Roman courts, which non-citizens lacked. Roman citizenship also conferred considerable social prestige, elevating the social standing of recipients and signifying their inclusion in the Roman world, thereby opening doors to further social advancement. While *civitas sine suffragio* (citizenship without the right to vote in Rome) did not grant direct voting rights in Rome itself, it could still provide opportunities for political influence within local administration and politics, as these often mirrored Roman models. Furthermore, Roman citizens generally enjoyed greater access to economic opportunities and trade networks throughout the vast Roman Empire. This created a vested interest among the elite in maintaining the Roman order, as it often brought them substantial social and economic advantages. They became stakeholders in the Roman system, less likely to rebel and more likely to actively support Roman rule.

The Severan dynasty, originating from Leptis Magna, provides a compelling and vivid illustration of the transformative impact of Romen culture and citizenship policies. The rise of Septimius Severus to the imperial throne and the subsequent prominence of other North Africans within the Roman administration demonstrate the remarkable potential for integration and advancement within the Roman system for those North Africans who fully embraced Roman

culture and law. This example was powerful propaganda for Rome, showcasing the benefits of assimilation.

The transformation of Leptis Magna into a magnificent Roman city under Severus further underscores the profound and lasting impact of Roman influence on North African urban centers. As discussed in the Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History, the Severan forum in Leptis Magna stands as a testament to the revolutionary technical solutions adopted by Roman architects. Severus's building projects were not just about aesthetics; they were about demonstrating Roman power, wealth, and culture. They served to Romanise the city and its inhabitants.

Beyond formal citizenship grants, the broader process of cultural integration, or Romanization, operated through various channels. The adoption of language, specifically Latin (the language of Roman administration, law, and culture) was a key aspect, particularly among urbanised and elite populations, with Latin inscriptions serving as a crucial source of evidence for its spread and associated cultural practices. The implementation of law also played a significant role, as Roman law, even in localized forms, standardized legal practices and introduced Roman concepts of justice and governance, contributing to a more uniform administrative system. In terms of religion, while local religions endured, the adoption of elements of Roman religion, such as the worship of Roman deities or participation in imperial cults, fostered a degree of Roman identity, especially in urban areas, with building inscriptions often documenting the construction of religious edifices related to the imperial cult (ResearchGate). Finally, the adoption of Roman Lifestyle, including customs, dress, entertainment (e.g., gladiatorial games, theater), and social practices, further contributed to the Romanization of North African society, particularly among the elite who sought to emulate Roman ways; archaeological evidence from sites like Carthage demonstrates this through the standardized Roman urban model and its public buildings (Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History).Archaeological and epigraphic evidence, such as the prevalence of Latin inscriptions, the construction of Roman architectural styles (e.g., forums, baths, amphitheaters), and the adoption of Roman material culture, attests to this complex and multifaceted cultural blending (Wilson, 2018; Thébert, 2013; Yamauchi, 2001). However, it is crucial to remember that Romen culture was not a

uniform or complete process. Indigenous cultures and identities persisted alongside Roman influences, creating a complex tapestry of cultural interaction. Furthermore, Roman society, including in North Africa, was highly stratified. As Wikipedia details, status was determined by ancestry, census rank based on wealth, gender, and citizenship. Social class significantly impacted access to power and resources.

9. Impacts of Roman Imperialism

The implementation of these multifaceted Roman imperialistic strategies had profound and lasting impacts on the socio-political and economic landscape of North Africa. Roman rule instigated significant transformations, leaving an indelible mark on the region for centuries to come, but these transformations were complex and uneven.

9.1 Economic Transformation and Exploitation

Economically, Roman administration spurred considerable development. The construction of an extensive network of roads (*viae publicae*), such as those connecting major urban centers and the frontier regions, facilitated trade and communication, fostering economic integration across the vast territories (Raven, 1993). These roads were not merely paths but engineered structures that enabled the efficient movement of goods and people. Aqueducts and irrigation systems, often impressive feats of engineering, were built to enhance agricultural productivity, supporting the growth of urban populations and the export of agricultural surplus, particularly grain (*annona*) and olive oil, which were vital to the Roman metropole (Tenney, 1927). North Africa became a crucial supplier of these commodities, earning the moniker "the breadbasket of Rome." However, this economic growth was often accompanied by exploitation and inequality, as Roman economic policies frequently prioritized the needs of the empire and Roman citizens, sometimes at the expense of local populations. Taxation, both in cash and in kind, could be a heavy burden on local communities, leading to indebtedness and land alienation as small farmers struggled to meet their obligations. The establishment of Roman colonies often involved land confiscation from indigenous populations, displacing people and disrupting traditional agricultural practices. Despite some local elites profiting

from trade and collaboration with the Romans, the unequal distribution of wealth meant the majority of the population likely experienced limited benefits from economic growth, with wealth concentrated in the hands of Roman settlers and a small number of Romanized locals. Finally, the Romans actively engaged in resource extraction of North Africa's natural resources, including timber, minerals, and wild animals, which sometimes resulted in environmental degradation and the disruption of local economies.

9.2 Political Restructuring and Local Administration

Politically, Roman rule brought a degree of centralised administration and legal order, albeit under foreign domination. The establishment of provincial structures, with Roman governors and officials, replaced pre-existing political systems, creating a hierarchical structure with Rome at its apex. North Africa was divided into provinces, each governed by a Roman official responsible for maintaining order, administering justice, and collecting taxes, thereby eroding local autonomy and traditional forms of governance. Roman law, while occasionally adapted to local customs, became the overarching legal framework, influencing property rights, inheritance, and dispute resolution; this imposed a degree of uniformity but could disrupt traditional legal practices. The Romans actively promoted urbanisation, establishing new cities and granting municipal status to existing settlements, which led to the spread of Roman urban planning, architecture, and institutions, though it also contributed to the decline of traditional rural communities. In some areas, Rome initially relied on client kingdoms to administer territory, but these kingdoms were ultimately incorporated into the Roman provincial system. While this imposed stability could be beneficial in reducing inter-tribal conflicts, it also meant the suppression of local political autonomy and the subjugation of indigenous populations to Roman authority.

9.3 Resistance and the Persistence of Identity

Yet, Roman imperialism also engendered persistent resistance and the resilience of indigenous identities (Revell, 2009). Berber communities, a significant portion of the North African population, often maintained their distinct languages, customs, social structures (tribal

organization), and religious beliefs, resisting complete assimilation into Roman culture. Resistance to Roman rule took many forms, ranging from passive resistance, such as maintaining traditional practices and languages, to active armed conflict. Berber warfare was frequently characterised by its mobility and adaptation to the local environment, making control of the hinterland difficult for the Romans. Major revolts, such as the revolt of Tacfarinas in the early 1st century AD (Tacitus, *Annales*), posed significant challenges to Roman authority and demonstrated the limits of Roman power, often fueled by grievances over taxation, land confiscation, and Roman encroachment on Berber territory. Despite Roman influence, the persistence of Berber identity remained strong in many areas, particularly in rural and mountainous regions, evidenced by the survival of Berber languages, cultural practices, and social structures.

9.4 Cultural Blending and Syncretism

Archaeological and epigraphic evidence reveals a complex and nuanced picture of cultural blending, or creolization, rather than simple assimilation (Yamauchi, 2001). The adoption of Roman elements, such as Latin language (evidenced in inscriptions), Roman architectural styles (in urban centres and villas), and Roman material culture (pottery, tools), often existed alongside the continuation of indigenous traditions and beliefs. This blending is seen in religious syncretism, where local deities might be syncretized with Roman gods, creating hybrid forms of worship, such as local Berber gods being identified with Roman deities. In architectural blending, indigenous architectural motifs might be incorporated into Roman designs, or Roman building techniques adapted to local conditions (Wilson, 2018; Thébert, 2013). Similarly, artistic fusion occurred as Roman art styles blended with local artistic traditions, creating unique forms of expression. Regarding language contact, while Latin became the language of administration and the elite, Berber and Punic languages continued to be spoken in many areas. The construction of Roman villas in rural areas further suggests a degree of cultural adaptation and interaction between Roman landowners and local populations, pointing to a dynamic process of cultural exchange where both Roman and indigenous cultures influenced each other, rather than a one-way imposition of Roman identity.

9.5 Social Transformations and Stratification

Roman rule also had significant impacts on social structures and stratification within North African society. Local elites often adopted Roman customs, language, and lifestyles to maintain their status and power, potentially widening the gap between them and the rest of the population. Urbanisation and social change brought new social roles, occupations, and increased social mobility for some, but also created new forms of social inequality. Slavery, a widespread institution in Roman society, was prevalent in North Africa, with slaves drawn from various sources including war captives and local populations. The highly stratified Roman society, with citizenship, wealth, and social status determining rights and privileges, imposed its social hierarchy on existing North African structures, creating a complex system of social relations. The impacts of Roman imperialism in North Africa were thus a complex interplay of transformation, adaptation, and resistance. While Roman rule brought infrastructure development, economic changes, and a new political order, it also faced persistent opposition and resulted in a multifaceted cultural and social landscape where Roman and indigenous elements coexisted and interacted in various ways. The legacy of this period continues to shape the cultural and historical identity of modern North African nations.

10. Conclusion

The enduring Roman hegemony over North Africa was not a mere consequence of military ambition but rather the result of a carefully calculated and adaptive set of imperial strategies. From the initial wars of conquest that established Roman dominance and secured vital resources, to the nuanced application of divide-and-rule tactics that exploited regional divisions and rivalries, the strategic manipulation of client kings to govern territories indirectly, the establishment of colonies as centers of Roman culture and administration, the deployment of military infrastructure to maintain control, and the selective extension of Romen culture and citizenship to integrate local populations, Rome employed a diverse toolkit to secure its interests and maintain control over this vital region.

The interconnectedness of these strategies, each reinforcing the others, highlights the sophisticated nature of Roman imperialism.

The history of Roman imperialism in North Africa underscores the significance of this region within the broader narrative of Roman expansion and governance. It demonstrates Rome's capacity to adapt its imperial strategies to the specific challenges and opportunities presented by different territories. Further research could explore the regional variations in the implementation and impact of these strategies, as well as the long-term legacies of Roman rule on North African societies and identities beyond the period under study. Examining the perspectives of the indigenous populations and their agency in navigating Roman imperialism also remains a crucial avenue for future scholarly inquiry.

Bibliography

Primary Evidence

Augustus. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti,* (Bushnell, T. 1998 Trans). Cambridge, The Internet Classics Archive, http://classics.mit.edu /Augustus /deeds. 1b.txt.

Livy. *The History of Rome* (Trans. Rev. Canon Roberts, 1905), J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.

Livy. *Periochae*. (Chaplin, J.D., 2007. Trans). Oxford University Press.

Pliny the Elder., *The Natural Histories*. (Bostock, J., Trans, 1855). London.

Sallust. *Jugurthine War and Conspiracy of Catiline*. (Trans: S.A. Hanford, 1963) Penguin Books Ltd.

Suetonius., *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. (Trans. J. Gavorse, 1957). Modern Library.

Secondary Evidence

Akaah- Ennin, J.A. et-al (2005). *The Rise of Rome from City-State to Imperial State*, Nyankod Printing and Publications Co. Ltd.

Akinboye G. (2014). *Africa and The West: An Economic History of The Roman Imperialism in Africa*, Alpha Crowns Publishers.

Annandale, R. (2001). *Historiography, Post-Colonial Theory, and Roman North Africa, a Study of the Impact of Cultural Beliefs on Historical Knowledge.* University of Manitoba.

Baronowski, D.W. (2011). *Polybius and Roman Imperialism*. Bristol Classical Press.

Boak, A.E.R. & Sinnigen, G.W. (1968). *A History of Rome to A.D. 565.* Macmillan Company.

Burton, P. (2019) *Roman Imperialism. Brill Research Perspectives in Ancient History. 2* (2).

Burton, P.J. (2019*). Roman Imperialism.* Brill

Braund, D. (2022) *Rome and Friendly King: The Character of the Client Kinship*. Routledge.

Campbell, B. (2002). *Warfare and Society in Imperial Rome, C .31B.C – 280 A.D*. Routledge.

Carry, M. & Scullard, H.H (1979). *A History of Rome Down to the Reign of Constantine*. Macmillan, London.

Cornwell, H. (2019). *Roman Attitudes to Imperialism: the view from History*. Cambridge University Press.

Champion, C.B. (2004). *Roman Imperialism*. Blackwell.

Cilliers, L. (2007). *Some Thoughts on the Demise of Roman influence in North Africa.* The University of Free State.

Cilliers, L. (2019). *Roman North Africa: Environment, Society and Medical contribution*. Amsterdam University Press.

Davies, E. (2009). *North Africa: The Roman Coast*. The Bradt Travel Guide.

De Blois, L. (2018). *Image and reality of Roman Imperial power in The Third Century AD: the impact of war*. Routledge.

Dufton, J.A. & Fentress, E. (2022). *Roman North African Urbanism.* Wiley Online Library.

Dsanic, D. (2015). "The Military and Colonial Destruction of Roman Landscape of North Africa." *Modern and Contemporary Forms, 23* (3).

Edwell, P. M. (2013). Definitions of Roman imperialism. In *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*. Brill.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, (2015). On *Roman Formation of Colonies*.

Encyclopedia Britannica (2018). http://www.britanica.com/place/Africa-Roman-territory.

Erdkamp, P. (2005). *The Grain Market in the Roman Empire: A Social, Political, and Economic Study.* Cambridge University Press.

Erskine, A. (2010). *Roman Imperialism*. Edinburgh University Press.

Evans, M. (2014). North Africa, Roman. *Encyclopaedia of Global Archaeology*.

Flower, H.I. (2014). *The Roman Republic*. (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press.

Franco, C. (2024). "Transisioni imperfette. Studi classici e scorie coloniali." *FuturoClassico FCl*, (10), 287-313.

Grant, P. (2010). "The Navy in Rome's Rise to Empire: 264-146 B.C." Lambert Academic Publishing.

Gruen, E.S. (1970). *Imperialism in the Roman Republic*. Rinehart and Winston.

Hers, P. (1994). "Dieter Flach, Römische Agrargeschichte." *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 586-594.

Hobson, M. (2020). *Regional Urban Systems in the Roman World, 150 BC -250 CE*. Brill.

Hosawi, B.S.M. (2018). "Diplomatic Relations of Rome with Local Forces in North Africa 202 BC -284 AD." *International Journal of Science and Research 7*, 332-342.

Hoyos, D. (2011) *A Companion to Punic Wars*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Knighton, A. (2016). *Reasons Romans went to War*. War History Online.

Lepelley, C. (1981). *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire/2 Notices d'histoire municipale*. Études augustiennes.

Lintott, A. (1993). *Imperium Ramanum: Politics and administration*. Routledge.

Mattingly, D.J. & Hitchner, R. B. (1995). "Roman Africa: An Archaeological Review." *Journal of Roman Studies,* 85, 165-213.

Mattingly, D.J., (2011). *Imperialism, Power and Identity*. Princeton University Press.

Mattingly, D.J. (2023) *Between Sahara and Sea: Africa in the Roman Empire*. Michigan University Press.

Maransana, P. & McDonald, B. (2022). *Sustainable Urbanism in the Roman World.* Cambridge University Press.

Momigliano, A. (1981). "The Origins of Rome", in: F.W. Walbank and others ed., *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 7*.

Mommsen, T. (1981). *Theories of Imperialism*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Morley, N. (2010). *The Roman Empire: Roots of Imperialism.* Pluto Press.

Oxford Classical Dictionary, (Nd). (3rd ed). *Client Kings*. Oxford University Press.

Philip, C.N. (2014). *Rome and North Africa*. University of Texas Press.

Posener, E.A., Speir, K.E. & Vermeule, A. (2010). "Divide And Conquer." *Journal of Legal Analysis.*

Quinn, J.C. (2003). *Roman Africa?* Oxford University Press Research Archives.

Raven, S. (1993*). Rome in Africa*. Routledge.

Revell, L. (2009). *Roman Imperialism and Local Identities*. Cambridge University Press.

Scullard, H.H, (1982). *From Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome from 133 BC to AD 68*. Routledge.

Stone, M., (2013). "The Genesis of Roman Imperialism." In *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*. Brill.

Tenney, F (1927). *An Economic History of Rome.* John Hopkins University Press\.

Thébert, Y. (2013). *Thermes romains d'Afrique du Nord et leur contexte méditerranéen*. Publications de l'École française de Rome.

Todd, J.M. (2018). *Foundation of Rome: Myth and History*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Wilson, R.J.A. (2018). *The Roman Villa in the Mediterranean Basin, Late Republic to Late Antiquity.* Cambridge University Press.

Yamauchi, E. M. (Ed.). (2001). *Africa and Africans in antiquity*. MSU Press.

The Critics of Galen: Analysing Criticisms of Galen's Accounts of the Antonine Plague

By Sam Northgraves

The influence of Galen on medicine survives well into the 19th century and beyond (Jackson, 2011:21, Mattern, 2011:478). Known as the "Prince of Physicians", his connection to the Antonine Plague in his time and our reliance on him as a source has led to the Plague often being referred to as the Galenic or Galen's Plague (Jackson, 2011:21). While Galen was not without his flaws, such as his disparaging of rival physicians in pursuit of his own legacy, his observational skills, experience, methodical practices, anatomical discoveries and contributions to medicine cannot be overlooked (Nutton, 2020:124, Mattern, 2011:478). It is these factors and his presence in Rome during the outbreak which have led to him becoming a central source for the Antonine Plague.

This article will explore the modern criticisms of Galen's accounts of the Antonine plague, chiefly in his *Method of Medicine* (5.12) in which he discusses his attempts to treat the plague and the symptoms of the disease. This is described by some modern historians as providing inaccurate, disappointing and partial descriptions of the plague. This analysis will explore what Galen covers of the disease, the biases of retrospective diagnosis and how this has influenced the reception of Galen's medical accounts, his motives and his importance as a medical source in light of other surviving evidence. Additionally, this analysis proposes more constructive criticisms of Galen. Under the aim of examining Galen's reception as a prominent medical source in the study of the ancient diseases, this article intends to advocate for the practical use of primary accounts in consideration of their context and to review scholarly criticisms of the primary evidence.

The biases of smallpox

Many historians have made the informed assumption that the Antonine plague was smallpox (Haesar, 1882:32, Hirsch, 1883:126, Jackson, 1988:157, Duncan-Jones, 1996:116, Nutton, 2024:224). While other possible diseases have been considered, from typhus to the bubonic plague to measles and rubella, this conclusion of smallpox has led to many issues in objectively discussing

Galen's evidence (Gourevitch, 2013:66, Littman et al, 1973:245). Zinsser (1960:101) makes the further suggestion that this was not one singular infection but an attack from multiple diseases, though he too agrees that the major contributor was likely related to smallpox. A strong emphasis has been placed on Galen's failure to deliver a full account of the symptoms of the plague, deemed unsatisfactory to a modern medical and historical audience (McNeill, 1977:132). This seems partially spurred by the nonconformity to the symptoms of smallpox. This is equally relevant when referring to his suspected inaccuracies. The dismissal of these symptoms is an example of the problematic practice of thinking backwards, starting at a conclusion and dismissing any evidence which does not conform to this belief. While there is value in criticising sources, criticising the limits of an experienced physician's accounts only to rely on them so heavily in making a modern diagnosis leads to the conclusion of smallpox appearing rather dubious or hasty at a minimum.

A frequently cited advocate for the diagnosis of smallpox is Littman (et al, 1973). While Littman (et al, 1973:245) agrees that Galen's symptomatology is "sketchy", there is enough to "make a firm diagnosis". Littman's (et al, 1973:250-251) discussion of Galen's symptoms frequently connects back to the smallpox diagnosis, leading to the dismissal of symptoms that fall outside of this range and limiting the analysis of the disease. However, Littman (et al, 1973:251) does discuss possibilities beyond smallpox and why these do not align with Galen's recorded symptoms, such as typhus. Yet, Littman (et al, 1973:251) then reaffirms the smallpox diagnosis, as "no plague disease other than smallpox is known to produce an exanthem such as Galen describes". Though, in a footnote, Littman admits that Galen does not reference the characteristic scarring left behind by smallpox. Littman (et al, 1973:251-252) attributes this to Galen's partial descriptions, and motives in treatment over diagnosis. Like other advocates of this diagnosis, Littman takes the absence of symptoms such as scarring as an omission by Galen, such is their conviction over the smallpox diagnosis. Littman further argues such symptoms appear after the disease concludes its course, though an absence of symptoms does not necessarily correlate to omission on Galen's part. Flemming (2019:233), however, criticises these explanations as "vague and unsatisfactory". Being such a characteristic symptom of smallpox, it is concerning that no mention has been made by Galen or any other sources

of this lasting impact of the disease. A more convincing possibility Flemming (2019:233) presents is the variability of the smallpox virus and how differences in the population and environment of Rome may have led to less scarring. While Gourevitch (2005:65) seconds the smallpox diagnosis, she does counter Littman's (et al 1973:251) insistence that this was an omission evidencing the modern omissions of the scarring in Rooyen (et al, 1948:286). Gourevitch (2005:65) argues that in other accounts of smallpox such descriptions were not omitted, such as in Balzac's *Le Curé de village*. Equally, there are ancient accounts which have been speculated to be of pockmarks and similar scarring beyond the Antonine Plague, thus not explaining why Galen wouldn't record such symptoms (for example Pliny *NH* 26.1–11). Rhazes (*KJH* 11), who is discussed later, crucially mentions treatments to remove the lasting marks of jadari, believed to be smallpox. However, a flaw in this comparison is that Rhazes was practising significantly later, around 900 AD. There are no surviving contemporary accounts mentioning the lasting scarring of smallpox from the Antonine plague, weakening the diagnosis and thus this reproof of Galen.

It is these flaws in the modern smallpox diagnosis which lead the criticisms of inaccuracies and omissions in Galen's account to be scrutinised. Furthermore, it reflects the biases which come with placing modern medical expectations onto ancient accounts. Flemming (2019:232) equally criticises Littman's conclusion, presenting Littman's omissions of Galen's recorded symptoms of memory loss and the confusion which Littman fails to explain in relation to the proposed diagnosis. Flemming (2019:232) equally acknowledges that smallpox is exclusively human, which does not align with the accounts of animal deaths (*Herodian* 1.12.1-2, Aristid. *Or*.48.38). Flemming's criticisms of Galen's accounts are certainly fairer than Jackson's, which is discussed later. While Flemming (2019:226) does explore the modern diagnosis of smallpox, her sceptical analysis and critiques of the diagnosis clearly imply her scepticism as to the belief. Flemming's (2019:226) critiques seem to not be with Galen only, unlike Jackson's, but with the use of Galen's account by historians. Galen's symptoms are certainly specific, in both their descriptions and their duration (*MM* 5.12). Yet, his focus on individuals rather than the general populace has certainly limited our understanding of the disease. These issues are not wholly with Galen and his accounts, but with the

limits in using his accounts as the basis for a robust diagnosis. Galen's symptoms are indeed scattered throughout his works and Flemming's further criticisms of Galen himself are reasonable. A prominent limit in the use of Galen's accounts in the present day is his lack of "sustained analysis" (Flemming, 2019:225-226). For example, while his comments on the healing properties of "astringent milk" (*MM* 5.12) are extremely interesting, they have no modern value within medicine due to a lack of analysis as to precisely how this milk cured the individual. This is likely not due to omission, instead to the fact that Galen did not know in a precise, medical sense why the milk worked. It is placing modern expectations and values onto these ancient sources which culminate in unfair objections and the dismissal of limited and valuable evidence.

Yet, to develop this hypothesis, Thucydides' accounts of the Athenian Plague have equally been considered to be smallpox, along with many other diseases (Morgan, 1994:197, Littman, 2009:460). While Thucydides' (2.47-55) accounts show striking similarities to Galen's, such as a rash, coughing up of blood and vomiting (Thuc.2.49, *MM* 5.12), there are some crucial differences such as an insatiable thirst noted by Thucydides. While their accounts of their respective plagues are frequently compared, Littman and other supporters of the Antonine smallpox hypothesis fail to explain the absence of the loss of sight which was prominently noted by Thucydides but not Galen (Thuc.2.49, Flemming, 2019:229). Carrying the risk of loss of sight, this could advocate for a stronger possibility of smallpox for the Athenian plague than that of the Antonine (Crosby et al, 1993:1009). Though the absence of scarring and the addition of animal deaths makes the possibility that the Athenian plague was smallpox significantly less likely, this therefore brings into question, should the Athenian and Antonine plague have both been smallpox, why Galen did not encounter or mention a loss of sight in his patients (Duncan-Jones, 1996:109, Thuc.2.50).

Beyond such diagnoses, many historians seem to agree on the limits of Galen's accounts. However, Flemming's stance respects the nuances of the evidence, commenting on its limits within modern medical diagnoses. The argument of other historians such as Littman, that Galen's accounts are inaccurate or partial, appears to be heavily influenced by the widespread, accepted belief that he was recording the symptoms of smallpox. Excluding this smallpox bias, it would be challenging to

criticise Galen as inaccurate or omitting elements due to our limited comparable accounts. It appears that only under this smallpox assumption can Galen be criticised in such a way.

What does Galen provide?

Even beyond a medical context, Galen is critical for understanding the social and cultural elements of Roman life during his period (Jackson, 2011:28). Most significantly, he presents a valuable insight into Roman imperial physicians, both in their practices and education. But Galen's importance is paramount in considering the lack of comparable sources for the Antonine plague and its symptoms. A more productive stance than the criticisms of what Galen possibly omits or his alleged inaccuracies is what Galen does provide in his accounts. Jackson's (1988:174) criticism quotes Gilliam's (1961:227) comment, in which Gilliam praises Galen for his influence but maintains that his references to the plague "are scattered and brief". Jackson (1988:174) adds his own interpretation of Galen's account as "disappointingly uninformative". This interpretation, while understandable from a medical standpoint, fails to recognise that the symptoms provided by Galen are apparently enough for some historians to reconstruct a medical diagnosis. At minimum, Galen's accounts do provide some understanding of the disease.

Galen's symptoms have allowed historians to conclude possible diseases as unlikely, such as typhus and the bubonic plague (Flemming, 2019:232). The absence of symptoms, though believed to be due to omissions or inaccurate by some, could equally be used in an attempted diagnosis. If taken as the full truth, Galen's accounts could be essential to a diagnosis if all present and excluded symptoms corresponded to a disease. It is the lack of such a perfect match which appears to have led to some criticisms. Mattern (2008:150) praises Galen's approach to his patients, both his skills as a physician and his documenting of symptoms. Galen's symptoms, though brief within his volume of works, are relatively detailed when not contrasted to modern medicine. In his *Method of Medicine* (5.12) Galen discusses in succession his attempt to treat the afflicted and the methods he took in examining the patient, but crucially the symptoms of coughing, a sore trachea, catarrh, the coughing up of hot but not very fresh blood, internal ulcerations, the expelling of a piece of the lining of the

trachea, subsequent damage to the patient's voice, changing of appetite, vomiting in some, a stomach disturbance in all, exanthemata, the combination of exanthemata and bodily purging occurring in those who would survive, fever, dry sores, scabbing resembling ash which fall away to reveal healthy skin which scars over within days in those with ulcerations, those without ulcerations had itchy, rough scabbing which fell like scales instead, similar to "lepra", presumably leprosy, and the duration of some symptoms. Gourevitch (2013:58) adds that in his *De atra bile* (4.1-12), Galen discusses the state of the patient's excrement. While he specifies that the excrement was black, he further details the timings, indications of impending mortality and the varied occurrences of pain or smell. This could be evidence of gastrointestinal bleeding or internal haemorrhaging (Gourevitch, 2013:58).

Beyond the plague, Galen was sensitive to his patient's body temperatures (for example *Feb. Diff*.1.3, 2.7, *MM* 10.3) pulse (for example *Feb. Diff*.2.7, *MM* 10.3, see his works on the pulse *Diff.Puls., Dig.Puls., Caus.Puls., Praes.Puls.)*, humoral imbalances (for example *Temp*.2.6), expressions, skin pallor and focused on his patients' own wording of their ailments (for example *MM* 5.12), with his description of the Antonine plague remaining just as systematic in its coverage of the symptoms (Mattern, 2011:479, Flemming, 2019:227). While criticised for incorrect beliefs in humours, this should rather be a criticism of the time and context of his work than of his conclusions (Jackson, 1988:174). Even with Galen's "systematic coverage" of the Antonine plague symptoms, Littman (et al, 1973:249-252) finds a criticism in Galen's failure to mention whether these were raised or flat exanthemata, even after describing Galen's description of the exanthem as excellent (Flemming, 2019:227). However, this is again only in relation to the pursuit of a modern diagnosis. Approaching these symptoms from a non-medical perspective, without the expectations of conclusive symptoms and its biases, Galen's accounts are incredibly valuable.

What was Galen trying to accomplish?

Galen's primary interest, according to Littman (et al, 1973:245,251), was the treatment, diagnosis and effects of the plague. Jackson (1988:174) criticises Galen's focus on the humoral symptoms, alleging the other symptoms of fever and pustules took "secondary importance". If the

humoral symptoms were clearly his primary focus, it is unreasonable to criticise Galen's secondary focus on the symptoms for not taking primary importance. Galen's focus was evidently not the detailing of symptoms for future generations, unlike Thucydides', hence we should not hold his work to this standard (Littman et al, 1973:244, Gilliam, 1961:227). Holding this expectation that a modern audience will find a detailed list of symptoms that were preserved under the attempt to inform a modern audience of the disease is unreasonable if this was not Galen's intentions. A more useful criticism to make of Galen's work is whether he accomplished what he intended to in his writings. Galen's approach to diagnosis was rigorous and evidently effective even without the use of a modern, medical setting (Mattern, 2011:479). But for example, one could argue that Galen's accounts, such as his lack of explanation concerning the exact qualities of the curative milk (*MM* 5.12), has hindered future readers in attempting to understand his cure and replicate its benefits. But if this was not Galen's intention it is unfair to criticise his accounts solely on this basis. His alleged omissions could be for a multitude of reasons. In the case of the milk, it may be a lack of insight into its exact medicinal properties. But equally, it may be down to his audience.

Galen was not writing for the average population, of his time or of a modern context (Littman et al, 1973:244, Gilliam, 1961:227). Galen's readership was his contemporaries, his friends and colleagues who knew him personally, equally elite, literate and educated members of Roman society (Nutton, 2020:98,124). These were evidently individuals who held Galen in high regard, but crucially these were individuals who also lived through the plague (Nutton, 2020:124). The absence in Galen's writings of a complete description of the disease likely stems from the fact that his readership was well informed on the plague, both its symptoms and societal effects, having lived through it alongside Galen. Equally, their degree of medical understanding, even if only through knowing of Galen and his achievements, could lead to many elements being omitted. It is equally possible that this lack of a complete description was not due to omissions but Galen himself. Galen may not have understood the full impact of the disease, nor have encountered every symptom of it. While this would be very unusual considering his standing, his extensive writings and his prolificity as an imperial physician, the insinuation that his descriptions are partial suggests he deliberately

omitted elements. Due to the scarcity of comparable accounts, it is not conclusive that he did. Yet, it is highly probable that these omissions were down to his knowledge of his readership.

Galen's motive in writing his accounts may have been tied to his interest in epidemics, as well as demonstrating his capabilities as an imperial physician (Jackson, 1988:173). His *Method of Medicine* was not intended as a collection of detailed nosological records but as a collection of accounts on the methods of treating injuries and diseases, as explained in the title of the work: *methodus medendi*. It is evident, as will be discussed later, that Galen is flawed in his presentations of himself within his works. Galen's tendency to boast over his accomplishments strengthens his unreliability as an unbiased narrator of his accomplishments and so his accounts. Galen's almost fantastical diagnoses of tumours and miscarriages on pulse alone may be a demonstration of his skill as a physician but, considering his bias as the narrator, it is possible these accounts were exaggerated to serve his personal goal of inflating his accomplishments (Mattern, 2008:151, Flemming, 2019:220). In Galen's accounts of his life, he makes mention of divine visits (Nutton:2024:217). As a public figure within Rome, his accounts are biased considering his motive of aiding his self-image, such as his claims of Alexandria as unsatisfactory for his education even with its reputation within education, though he remained for many years (Matter, 2011:478, Nutton, 2024:217). Galen was evidently a competent physician, treating the likes of Marcus Aurelius, his son and household (Mattern, 2011:478). While Galen did treat patients of all ages, sexes and social classes, the majority of his writings were on patients of similar social standings to himself and his audience (Mattern 2011:479). Another crucial nuance is the possible influence of Galen's superiors, such as his return to Rome on the instruction of the emperor (Gourevitch, 2005:60).

Galen's intentions in his works are not specifically expressed, but it is evident he is not detailing a completely unbiased account of his endeavours. While this is a valid criticism of his reliability, this must also be accounted for in the context of his motives. Galen's motive was not to document the entirety of the symptoms for future generations, but likely instead to present his own reports of the plague to those equally familiar with its effects. It is therefore unreasonable to criticise Galen's accounts as not satisfying a modern medical audience. Galen's audience were his peers, who were

aware of Galen's work and the lived experience of this plague. While it is reasonable to be disappointed in Galen's seemingly limited descriptions, it is unfair to criticise the limits of his accounts if this is not what he set out to achieve.

Additional sources for the Antonine plague

The dismissal of Galen's accounts and the criticisms of his alleged inaccuracies is hindered by the lack of comparable contemporary sources. There is the frequent argument that Galen's descriptions of the disease are not detailed, however this criticism must be put into the context of the other available sources. Jackson (1988:174) criticises Galen's accounts as "sparing and disappointingly uninformative", "scattered and brief" and lacking precision in relation to the attempts at modern diagnosis, taking the unfairly personal but debatable stance that Galen has concentrated on the wrong symptoms. However, Flemming (2019:221) argues that all the surviving texts discussing the Antonine plague are "patchy and programmatic", the majority dating to centuries after the plague.

Beyond the medical context there are additional textual sources which discuss the impact of the plague, both later such as Ammianus Marcellinus (23.6.24) and contemporary such as Lucian (*Alexander* 36, Gilliam, 1961:231-232). But many of these sources are limited to a few lines and do not go into extensive detail, each supplemented by the author's own bias and motives. Eutropius' (*Breviarium* 8.12) account is in relation to the impact on the army, while Dio (*Epit*.71.2.4, 73.14.3-4, 73.15.1) mentions the extent of the plague and his estimated mortality rates. However, the work's genre as historical and its motives and biases are evident in Dio's discussion of the plague primarily in relation to emperors and political conspiracies, and the conspiracies of deliberate poisonings during the outbreak. Herodian (1.12.1-2) details the severity of the plague and the response of doctors, who recommended individuals use perfumes, incenses and herbs to prevent the inhalation of polluted air, though this is equally brief. Orosius' (7.15.5, 7.27.7) account is more extensive, though certainly exaggerated, detailing complete devastation across Italy and the armies of the frontiers with "nothing remained but ruins and forests". This exaggeration may come from Orosius' bias as a Christian, exaggerating this "pagan catastrophe" (Jackson, 1988:174, Gilliam, 1961:233). It

is the limits of these alternative sources which lead to a debatable reliability, but crucially none of these references the symptoms of the plague.

Aristides (*Or*.48.38-45) details his personal experience with the Antonine plague, including his symptoms of an extreme burning sensation and a long recovery period. Crucially, Aristides does discuss the lasting symptoms of the plague, something absent from Galen's accounts, of a sore pharynx and pain swallowing (*Or*.51.9). It is possible to interpret additional symptoms from his accounts, including delirium, dreams and restlessness (Gourevitch, 2013:64). Though initially presenting himself as selfless in his primary focus on the welfare of others, his focus shifts to a narrative with a clear personal motive. He details how, while afflicted with the disease, his mind remained firm compared to others (*Or*.48.39). Quoting the *Iliad*, comparing himself to the Homeric hero Eurypylus, Aristides' accounts are subject to his own bias and ego (*Or*.48.39). Furthermore, Aristides' (*Or*.48.40-42) accounts are questionably dramatized, such as his divine visit by Athena. While his documenting of his own symptoms is nonetheless beneficial to the modern historian, his dramatization introduces and air of unreliability to his account, though his lived experience is nonetheless valuable beyond a medical sense.

By comparing Galen's accounts of the plague to fellow physicians, it may be determined whether Galen was truly lacking in his documentation. A credible comparison could be Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakarīyā al-Rāzī, latinised to Rhazes (Flemming, 2019:236). Rhazes, in the latter part of 900 AD, discusses his treatment of the diseases jadari and hasbah, believed to be smallpox and measles (Flemming, 2019:236-237). Though writing significantly later, Rhazes' (*KJH*) discussion is more detailed. However, this could be a result of motives and audience, as discussed before in relation to Galen. The diagnosis of smallpox is stronger within Rhazes accounts, with the additional evidence of pockmarks which was crucially missing for Thucydides and Galen (Rhazes, *KJH* 11). Rhazes defends Galen from those criticising him for not mentioning the affliction of jadari, his praise of Galen appearing foremost in his work (*KJH* 1.1-2). The criticism that Galen's accounts pale in comparison to Rhazes' lengthy description is flawed. These were two different physicians from widely different contexts. While Rhazes praises Galen for his work, this does not inevitably correlate

Rhazes' jadari to Galen's undetermined plague. Should the Antonine plague be confirmed as smallpox, the works of Rhazes could certainly be used in addition to Galen to build a greater understanding of smallpox in the ancient world. Crucially there was a notable pause in documentary evidence during the epidemic, hence Galen's significance, seen in diplomata, (fig.6, fig.7 in Duncan-Jones, 1996:124-125) inscriptions, (fig.8, fig.9, fig.10, fig.11 in Duncan-Jones, 1996:126-127) and coin minting (fig.16, fig.17, fig.18 in Duncan-Jones, 1996:132-133). The documentation which remained included inscriptions, oracles, Egyptian taxation documents detailing population drops, and Egyptian administrative reports referring directly to the plague and its impact (Gilliam, 1961:234-235, 240, Duncan-Jones, 1996:119).

These documents and texts are valuable as a collective for the understanding of the plague and its impacts on Roman life. However, on an individual basis, these documentations hold limited evidence. The knowledge of these additional sources' flaws and biases allows for criticism of Galen's critics. These alternative texts provide little as regards the symptoms of the Antonine plague, leaving the primary, contemporary source of the plague's symptomology being Galen. Without his accounts, the modern understanding of the plague's symptomology would be severely lacking. Flemming (2019:225-226) explains that all literary engagements with illnesses, such as the Antonine plague, are subject to the narrator's own terms. These accounts are shaped by their private interests and biases. The critiques of Galen's accounts can be ascribed to many of these additional sources and frequently weaken under the understanding of the limits of the alternative evidence. Equally, the understanding that these complaints can be applied to these alternative sources suggest a ubiquitous issue in documentation in antiquity than simply Galen alone.

The flaws in Galen

A more robust criticism of Galen is not his alleged inaccuracies or partial descriptions, but his evident biases as discussed prior. An apparent bias is a constant within medical accounts of antiquity, in which a greater focus is put on the treatment of individuals than the documentation of the population (Flemming, 2019:230). This is the case within Galen's accounts of the Antonine plague.

This leaves historians reliant on singular cases, often of elite men, to understand the symptoms of the disease which may well present with minute differences in different individuals. Galen does not mention falling ill (Flemming, 2019:231). Unlike Aristides, Galen presents himself as having the authority of other classical physicians through his alleged immunity and endurance in comparison to his patients. Furthermore, for such a seemingly deadly disease, Galen mentions no deaths under his care (Gourevitch, 2013:59). This could be down to a bias in what he records, perhaps in relation to his motives or audience. Galen is equally selective in his accounts beyond the Antonine plague, primarily documenting patients of similar social standings, distinguished patients and intriguing cases (Nutton, 2024:228). In many cases, these seem to be used to demonstrate Galen's abilities as a physician, seemingly "bent on singing his own praises", linking his achievements to the great names of the past (Gourevitch, 2013:60, Nutton, 2024:227). His mentioning of divine interactions sows equal doubt as to his reliability, either through dramatization or delusion (Nutton:2024:217). However, as demonstrated previously, the other sources of the plague are equally as flawed.

Gilliam (1961:249) explains how accounts of pestilence encourage their writers to display their talents, crafting "highly coloured and extravagant" dramatized accounts. This is not a uniquely ancient problem, but merely a human flaw. A criticism of his reliability, founded in Galen's own biases, is much more constructive than simply questioning his symptoms. This allows for critical engagement with his accounts and use of him as a source for the Antonine plague, while remaining wary of the flaws in his works.

Conclusion

The criticisms of Galen's accounts seem heavily rooted in the smallpox assumption and modern historians' failures to diagnose the Antonine plague accurately. To critique these descriptions as inaccurate or partial is not productive when accounting for the limited alternatives. The nuances of Galen's motives and intended audience must be considered in utilising his accounts and the understanding of the limited additional evidence further grounds Galen's value as a source. Galen was evidently a skilled physician, but nonetheless he was not immune to the human flaws of bias,

boasting and unreliability. Understanding and examining these nuances, rather than dismissing them, provides a more constructive scholarly practice. All accounts of the Antonine plague must be treated with scrutiny, but to allege Galen to be "disappointingly uninformative" is limiting (Jackson, 1988:174). If we broach his accounts with no preconceptions, and with the understanding of these nuances, Galen's medical accounts are invaluable.

Primary Bibliography

Abú Becr Mohammed ibn Zacaríyá ar-Rází, *A treatise on the small-pox and measles*, 1848, Greenhill, W. A., England, Sydenham Society.

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Ammianus Marcellinus,* 1935, Rolfe. J. C., London, Cambridge.

Aristides, Aelius, *Orations*, 1968, Behr, C. A., 1968, Aelius Aristides and the sacred tales, A.M. Hakkert, Amsterdam.

Dio, Cassius, *Roman History,* 1955, Cary, E., Vol. 9, William Heinemann LTD, London.

Eutropius, *Breviarium,* 1886, Watson, J. S., London, George Bell and Sons.

Galen, *De Atra Bile*, 1937, de Boer, W., Galeni de propriorum animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione / de animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione / de atra bile, Leipzig, Teubner.

Galen, *De febrium differentiis*, 2004, Wernhard, M., uber die arten der fieber in der arabischen version des ounain ibn Ishaq, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München.

Galen, *De pulsuum differentiis*, 2024, Johnston, I., Papavramidou, N., Galen on the Pulses, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston.

Galen, *De dignoscendis pulsibus*, 2024, Johnston, I., Papavramidou, N., Galen on the Pulses, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston.

Galen, *De causis pulsuum*, 2024, Johnston, I., Papavramidou, N., Galen on the Pulses, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston.

Galen, *De praesagitione ex pulsibus*, 2024, Johnston, I., Papavramidou, N., Galen on the Pulses, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston.

Galen, *Method of medicine*, 2011, Johnston, I., Horsley, G. H. R., Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Galen, *On temperaments*, 2020, Johnston, I., Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Herodian, *History of the empire Herodian*, 1969, Whittaker, C. R., Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Orosius, *Seven books of history against the pagans: the apology of Paulus Orosius*, 1936, Raymond, I. W., Columbia University Press.

Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History*, 1855, John Bostock, London. Taylor and Francis, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street. 1855.

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 1843, Hobbes, T., Molesworth, W., The English works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, London, J. Bohn.

Secondary bibliography

Crosby, A. W., Kiple, K. F., 1993, 'Smallpox', *The Cambridge World History of Human Disease*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1008–1013.

Duncan-Jones, R. P., 1996, 'The impact of the Antonine plague', *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 9, pp. 108–136.

Flemming. R., 2018, 'Galen and the Plague', *Galen's Treatise Περὶ Ἀλυπίας (De indolentia) in Context*, Brill, pp. 219-244.

Gilliam, J. F., 1961, 'The Plague under Marcus Aurelius', *American journal of philology*, 82(3), pp. 225–251.

Gourevitch, D., 2005, 'The Galenic Plague: a Breakdown of the Imperial Pathocoenosis: Pathocoenosis and Longue Durée', *History and philosophy of the life sciences*, 27(1), pp. 57–69.

Gourevitch, D., 2013, *Limos kai loimos. A study of the galenic plague*, Paris, éd. De Boccard, Histoire des sciences médicales.

Haeser, H., 1882, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medicin: und der epidemischen Krankheiten/ von Heinrich Haeser: 3*, Germany, Hermann Dufft, 1875-1882.

Hirsch, A., 1883, *Handbook of geographical and historical pathology,* London, New Sydenham Society.

Hopkins, D. R., 1983, *Princes and peasants: smallpox in history*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Jackson, R., 1988, *Doctors and diseases in the Roman Empire*, British Museum Publications.

Jackson, M., 2011, *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Medicine*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Littman, R. J., Littman, M. L., 1973, 'Galen and the Antonine Plague', *American journal of philology,* 94(3), pp. 243–255.

Littman, R. J., 2009, 'The Plague of Athens: Epidemiology and Paleopathology', *The Mount Sinai journal of medicine*, 76(5), pp. 456–467.

Mattern, S. P., 2008, *Galen and the rhetoric of healing*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mattern, S., 2011, 'The art of medicine: Galen and his patients', *The Lancet (British edition)*, 378(9790), pp. 478–479.

McNeill, W. H., 1977, *Plagues and peoples*, 1st edition, Oxford, B. Blackwell.

Morgan, T. E., 1994, 'Plague or Poetry? Thucydides on the Epidemic at Athens', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974), 124, pp. 197–209.

Nutton, V., 2020, *Galen: A Thinking Doctor in Imperial Rome*, 1st edition. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Nutton, V., 2024, 'The Life and Career of Galen', *Ancient Medicine*, 3rd edition, United Kingdom: Routledge, pp. 174–184.

Van Rooyen, C. E., 1948, *Virus diseases of man*, New York, T. Nelson.

Zinsser, H., 1935, *Rats, Lice and History*, Bantam Books, New York.

The Structure and Distribution of Features in Hermogenes' *Peri Ideon Logou*

By Samuel Douglas

Abstract:

Hermogenes' *Peri Ideon Logou,* "On the Essential Qualities of Speech" has been both incredibly influential and remarkably hard to interpret. It lays out seven main stylistic concepts (*Ideai*) that can comprise up to twenty different conceptual categories, each with their own characteristic features. The categories are, however, heterogenous, and it is not easy to reconcile concepts such as Rapidity (γοργότης) and Truth (ἀλήθεια) as belonging to a consistent analytical system. Furthermore, the groupings of the *Ideai* can be difficult to parse, with types such as Grandeur (μέγεθος) and Character (ἦθος) encompassing large and disparate groups.

The categories are defined by characteristic features: Thoughts, Approaches, Word choice, Figures, Clause Types, and various rhythmical considerations. By mapping the relationships between these features this paper seeks to understand the stylistic connections between the *Ideai* through comparison of their features and establish two main facts. First, that thoughts are the predominant features by which the *Ideai* are grouped, representing strategic ideals rather than stylistic categories. Second, that this distinction reveals a three-part division in Hermogenes' categories that may help to explain the occasional incongruities in his statements about the *Ideai* and help better explain the usefulness of his text to ancient readers.

Introduction – A Basic Overview of the *Ideai*

The most influential of Hermogenes' surviving texts, *On the Essential Qualities of Speech* (Περὶ ἰδεῶν λόγου), attempts to classify the ideal qualities that a writer or speaker should aim at.[1] In practice,

---

this becomes a list of between seven and twenty types that typify the style of Demosthenes. However, the categories are heterogenous: Clarity (σαφήνεια), Purity (καθαρότης), Distinctness (εὐκρίνεια), Greatness (μέγεθος), Dignity (σεμνότης), Roughness (τραχυτής), Vehemence (σφοδρότης), Brilliance (λαμπρότης), Climax (ἀκμή), Expansiveness (περιβολή), Beauty through deliberate arrangement (ἐπιμέλεια/κάλλος), Rapidity (γοργότης), Character (ἦθος), Simplicity (ἀφέλεια), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), Bitterness (δριμύτης), Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια), Truth (ἀλήθεια), Disgruntlement (βαρύτης), and Shrewdness (δεινότης).[2] Some of the terms would seem at first glance to refer to the speech itself (Distictness, Beauty, Rapidity), others to the speaker (Dignity, Disgruntlement, Shrewdness), others to forms of argumentation (Character). In particular, Climax seems to apply to a very particular part of the speech. In the early sections of the treatise, Hermogenes gives a list as follows:

> Φημὶ τοίνυν, ὅτι τὸν Δημοσθενικὸν λόγον τὰ ποιοῦντά ἐστιν, εἰ μέλλοι τις ὡς ἓν ἅπαντα ἀκούσεσθαι, τάδε· σαφήνεια, μέγεθος, κάλλος, γοργότης, ἦθος, ἀλήθεία, δεινότης· λέγω δὲ ὡς ἓν ταῦτα πάντα οἱονεὶ συμπεπλεγμένα καὶ δι᾿ ἀλλήλων ἥκοντα· τοιοῦτος γὰρ ὁ λόγος ὁ Δημοσθενικός. τούτων δὲ τῶν Ἰδεῶν αἳ μὲν ἐφ᾿ ἑαυτῶν εἰσι καὶ καθ᾿ ἑαυτὰς συνιστάμεναι, αἳ δὲ ἔχουσιν ὑφ᾿ ἑαυτάς τινας ἄλλας ἰδέας ὑποβεβηκυίας, δι᾿ ὧν δὴ γίνονται, αἳ δὲ κοινωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλαις μέρει τινὶ ἢ καὶ μέρεσιν·
>
> I say then that the speech typical of Demosthenes, if one is inclined to listen to it in its entirety is made up of these: Clarity, Greatness, Beauty, Rapidity, Character, Truth, Shrewdness. I say this as all of these exist as if intertwined and coming through one another, for such is the speech of Demosthenes. For of these Ideai, some are on their own and grouped together, others have beneath themselves other *Ideai* subordinated to them, through which they are manifested. Some share with others a certain part or parts.

---

[2] Just as the definitions of each term have been the subject of much debate, with the most recent English standard translations being those in Wooten (1987) and Rutherford (1998) 8, the exact translations have been equally contested. Here I have aimed for terms with broader or more neutral English resonance, hence, for example, "Truth" over Wooten's "Sincerity" or Rutherford's "Veracity" for ἀλήθεια. For βαρύτης (literally 'heaviness') Wooten (1987) uses the translation 'Indignation'; followed by Heath (1995) 88; Heath (1995) 261; Du Toit (2014). Dilts and Kennedy (1997) 81 suggest that in Aspines it refers to speech compelled by circumstance, which does correspond to some aspects of this but more so to Reasonableness with which it shares many features. The precise translation of δεινότης varies in scholarship: Wooten uses 'Force', Rutherford 'Power', Patterson (2015) 6–7, 44–68 'Gravity' (Following Scaliger), Conley (1987) 432 advocates for Johannes Sturm's 'Decorum'. For translations in earlier scholarship, see Lindberg (1977) 10–12.

Hermogenes *Peri Ideon Logou* 218[3]

The types are variously interrelated, with some being derivative of others, some being *sui generis.* Seven types are listed above, and these are typically considered primary in some sense, although how these relate is not universally agreed upon even among commentators of late antiquity.[4] It is clear from the outset that the longer list of *Ideai* contains some ideas that are component parts or subordinate elements of the *Ideai* on the shorter list.[5] It is also clear from its treatment that Shrewdness (δεινότης) is a radically distinct concept, and that it predominantly concerns itself with the proper application of other *Ideai.* For this reason it will not be part of this study.

What do the Ideai, then, represent? Hermogenes must have a firm idea of what the *Ideai* are, and it must be reasonably consistent. He states that the categories are clear.[6] Are these *Ideai*, then, primarily stylistic categories?[7] This has been the general assumption of recent scholarship on the topic, and not without reason. The *Ideai* are generally described as being made up of features that are primarily concerned with style rather than, for example, argumentation. But, as we will see, the connections between the grouped *Ideai* are far from obvious to the modern reader, both in respect to the top-level aesthetic concepts and to their specified ornamental components.

---

[3] Please note that the reference numbers refer to Rabe's Teubner edition.

[4] Syrianus (5th C.), for example, in his commentary understands the quality Truth (ἀλήθεια) to be both primary and indivisible. Michael Psellos (11th C.) in the *Synopsis of Hermogenes* regards Truth to be a subset of Character alongside Disgruntlement, (*Synopsis of Hermogenes* 378–79) for which see Walker (2001), but a different structure would seem to be presented in his epistolatory *Synopsis of the Rhetorical Forms* which also takes Truth to be indivisible (156), for which see Papaioannou (2017). The confusion persists in more recent scholarship, for which see Lindberg (1977) 17–18; 81–82; Patillon (1997) 112–14. For discussions of the concept of divisibility in Hermogenes and Syrianus, see Stavelas (2014) 11–15.

[5] This paper will focus on the potential groupings according to features which do not always correspond to the implicit or explicit subordination in Hermogenes' text. For a list of the *Ideai* and the explicit groupings of them as subordinate see the list of the *Ideai* and their characteristic thoughts below.

[6] See, for example, statements such as *Peri Ideon* 216 οἶμαι γὰρ θαυμάσεσθαι ἂν εἰκότως μᾶλλόν τινας ἡμᾶς διὰ ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέγιστον ἐπ' εὐκρινείᾳ ἤ τινος ἐπιτιμήσεως ἕνεκα τούτων ἀξίους νομιεῖν, μόνον εἰ προσέχειν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς ἐθελήσαιεν. "For I think that you will therefore rather admire [my work], and most of all admire it on account of its clarity, rather than consider it deserving of censure on account of this, if only you are willing to pay attention to each and every detail."

[7] Style is a remarkably imprecise term in English, as it can in reference to public speaking refer to anything from pronunciation of a phoneme to the speaker's overall philosophy of aesthetics. While I will try to use more precise terms, this will in general refer to *how a thing is written* in contrast to *what is being said*.

Hermogenes' Ideai are comprised of a hierarchical distribution of features, as can be seen from early in the text:[8]

> Ἅπας τοίνυν λόγος ἔννοιάν τε ἔχει πάντως τινὰ ἢ ἐννοίας καὶ μέθοδον περὶ τὴν ἔννοιαν καὶ λέξιν, ἢ τούτοις ἐφήρμοσται. τῆς δ' αὖ λέξεως ἐχούσης πάντως τινὰ καὶ αὐτῆς ἰδιότητα πάλιν αὖ σχήματά τέ ἐστί τινα καὶ κῶλα συνθέσεις τε καὶ ἀναπαύσεις καὶ τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν τούτοιν συνιστάμενον ὁ ῥυθμός· ἡ γὰρ ποιὰ σύνθεσις τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν καὶ τὸ ὡδί πως ἀναπεπαῦσθαι τὸν λόγον ἀλλὰ μὴ ὡδὶ ποιεῖ τὸ τοιόνδε ἀλλὰ μὴ τοιόνδε εἶναι τὸν ῥυθμόν.
> Accordingly, all speech certainly has some Thought (*Ennoia*) or Thoughts, and an approach concerning the Thought, and Style (*Lexis*) which is fitting for these. Since style assuredly has certain features proper to it, there are also again Figures (*Schemata*), Clauses (*Kola*), Word Order (*Synthesis*), Clausula (*Anapauseis*), and Rhythm as composed of the previous two. For a particular arrangement of the parts of speech and how one pauses speech in one place and not another causes the rhythm to be one way and not otherwise.
> Hermogenes *Peri Ideon Logou* 218

Hermogenes observes this structure throughout, with some notable exceptions.[9] It is especially common in subtypes, that is to say those *Ideai* not among the list of primary *Ideai* (for which see the first quotation from *Peri Ideon* 218), for Hermogenes to give a general indication of certain distinguishing features, and then mention that all other features correspond to that of a larger group. For example, the chapter on Pleasantness (γλυκύτης) is predominantly filled with discussions of the characteristic Thoughts and subject matter, two distinct Figures (the use of epithets and quotations from poets), and then states that the Figures and stylistic features of Simplicity, Purity (καθαρότης) and Beauty are appropriate, along with the rhythms of Dignity (σεμνότης). These, naturally suggest a close association between these *Ideai*, but evidently the shared elements are of less importance than the stated essential features. This passage also suggests that the characteristic Thought is the primary element of the *Idea*.

---

[8] This paper, for the sake of clarity, will capitalise the terms Thought, Approach, Style, Figure, Clause, Word Order, Clausula and Rhythm when they are used as Hermogenes' concepts *Ennoia, Methodos, Lexis, Schema, Kola, Synthesis, Anapausis,* and *Rhythmos* respectively as well as the names of the *Ideai*.
[9] For the history of this hierarchy, see Patillon (1997) 114–24; Rutherford (1998) 12–16. Some comments on Hermogenes' predecessors will be given in the conclusion

That the primary consideration of the *Idea* is not the ornamental quality of its style but rather the Thought and strategic goals is preserved in Syrianus' commentary:

> ἰδέα δέ ἐστι ποιότης λόγου τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις ἁρμόδιος προσώποις τε καὶ πράγμασι κατά τε ἔννοιαν καὶ λέξιν καὶ τὴν ὅλην τῆς ἁρμονίας διαπλοκήν.
>
> An *Idea* is a quality of speech appropriate to the established character and matter at hand according to the thought and diction and whole intermixture of harmony. Syrianus *Comment. Herm.* 2.16–19.

This quote comes early in the commentary and sets the readers' expectations. The *Idea* will be concerned with style, but categorised according to character and situation. Syrianus likely has in mind the passage early in Hermogenes' *Peri Staseon* giving a similar definition before moving into organisation, Τὴν δὲ ἀμφισβήτησιν ταύτην ἀνάγκη περί τε πρόσωπα γίνεσθαι καὶ πράγματα· ("Necessity creates the matter of dispute concerning both the characters and the affair at hand" *Peri Staseon* 1.20–21), although the division by this point has become commonplace and the term πρόσωπα for a figure in a speech is part of the general vocabulary of rhetorical writing.[10] The *Idea* for Syrianus is, therefore, some quality of speech necessary for a given argumentative tactic.

Grouping the *Ideai* according to their Thoughts in the *Ideai*

The Thoughts (ἔννοία) of each *Idea* can be summarised as such with the "primary" *Idea* listed alongside the component or subordinate types where this subordination is explicit in Hermogenes' text:

Idea	Component *Idea*	Characteristic Thought
σαφήνεια	καθαρότης	Direct *Peri Ideon* 227, Childish 323
	εὐκρίνεια	Background 236, Discussion of Structure 236
μέγεθος	σεμνότης	Myth 242, Universal/Natural 244, Glorious Deeds 245–46
	τραχυτής	Reproach 255
	σφοδρότης	Reproach 260
	λαμπρότης	Confidence 264, Glorious Deeds 265

---

[10] For the earlier history of the term, see Clay (1998) 17; 36–38.

	ἀκμή	Reproach 269
	περιβολή	Generalities 278, Extraneous Detail 281
κάλλος		None[11]
γοργότης		None[12]
ἦθος	ἀφέλεια	Direct 322, Trivial 325, Analogy to Nature 325
	γλυκύτης	Description of Pleasant Things 333
	δριμύτης	Sharpness 328
	ἐπιείκεια	Lowered Expectations 345, Stating Compulsion 346
ἀλήθεια		(as ἀφέλεια, 352), Anger 353
βαρύτης		None

The crossovers between characteristic Thoughts tend to follow top-level parallels in the *Ideai*. Climax (ἀκμή), Roughness (τραχυτής) and Vehemence (σφοδρότης) all have a common theme of reproach (255–56, 260–61, 270). Roughness and Vehemence vary only in the relationship between the speaker and the target. In the case of Roughness the target is a social inferior, in Vehemence a superior.[13] Climax, can employ the characteristic thoughts of either. These three are all subtypes of Greatness (μέγεθος). Similar thoughts, although not explicitly related are employed in Truth (ἀλήθεια) and Disgruntlement (βαρύτης). Thoughts related to the mythological or the divine are used in both Dignity, and Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), although perhaps with a slightly different focus. Dignity has a focus on oaths, prayers, and statements about grand things, while Pleasantness tends to dwell on poetic themes for the sake of beauty. Truth is stated to share the characteristic Thoughts of Simplicity (ἀφέλεια).[14] And it similarly shares the approach of using oaths.

---

[11] It is explicitly stated in *Peri Ideon* 298 that Beauty has no characteristic thoughts.

[12] Hermogenes rejects the possible characteristic thoughts of Rapidity (γοργότης), in *Peri Ideon* 312.

[13] See the opening to the section on Vehemence, *Peri Ideon* 260: Ἡ δὲ σφοδρότης ἐννοίας μὲν ἔχει καὶ αὐτὴ τὰς ἐπιτιμητικὰς καὶ ἐλεγκτικὰς καθάπερ ἡ τραχύτης· ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν τραχύτης κατὰ μειζόνων προσώπων καὶ αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν δικαστῶν ἢ ἐκκλησιαστῶν γίνεται, ὡς ἐδείξαμεν,
ἡ δὲ σφοδρότης κατὰ ἐλαττόνων προσώπων, οἷον κατὰ τῶν ἀντιδίκων ἢ καθ' ὧν ἂν καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες δέξαιντο ἡδέως... ("The characteristic thoughts of Vehemence are likewise criticism and cross-examination, just as in Roughness, However, Roughness is created concerning more important people, and the members of the jury and members of the assembly, as we have shown, but Vehemence concerns less important figures, such as the opponent, or those whom the listeners might point at with pleasure...").

[14] Peri Ideon 352.

Undoubtedly, then, the Thought, as conceived of by Hermogenes relates strongly to the mode of argumentation and approach. Indeed, the thoughts as given in each section are generally relevant to content, argumentation, or character.[15] The emphasis placed on the *Ennoia* and their focus on non-stylistic aspects would seem to speak against a stylistic organisation, especially since the parallels in the specified thoughts tend to align with the overarching categories Greatness and Character (ἦθος). This alignment between top-level organisation and the Thoughts reinforces the sense that characteristic Thoughts are the primary elements for the *Ideai*.

Discontinuities Between Content Based and Stylistic groupings

The top-level organisation of the *Ideai,* then, represents categories according to content and strategy. Does this categorisation align with the stylistic elements? We can disregard Approaches, which tend not to display parallels between *Ideai*. The distinction between an Approach and a Figure is broadly predicated on the specificity of the feature: an Approach implemented through specific parts of a sentence becomes a Figure. [16] More information can be gleaned from the distribution of Figures, which are undoubtedly more aligned with ornament than content. In the Figures, the parallels and divisions suggest a radically different structure. A sharp division can be seen, firstly, in

---

[15] A non-exhaustive list. Those referring to content: Mythological material (*Peri Ideon* 219, 242); Use of extensive background (236); Themes of Natural Science (244); Moral Philosophy (245); Glorious History (246); Glorious Achievements (265); Extraneous Detail (281, which is of course related to certain stylistic effects); Trivial Themes (324); Description of Pleasant things (331); Description of Love (333). Those referring to argumentation: Explanation of structure (236); Open Reproach (255, 260, 269 which may also display character); Proof by Analogy (325); Lowering Expectations (345). Those referring to character: Confidence (264); Childish Thoughts (323); Presenting oneself as if acting under compulsion (346); Anger (353).

[16] For example, there are several Approaches that discuss sequence, as in the suggestion of the use of logical over chronological sequences or refutations in sequence in Distinctness (εὐκρίνεια *Peri Ideon* 235–38) or in the reversal of logical sequence in Expansiveness (περιβολή, 282) or the lack of sequence due to emotion in Truth (ἀλήθεια, 357). Contrast these with the Figures: use of enumeration for structure in Distinctness (238), expansion through explanation (290), aposiopesis, or the breaking of sequence in Truth (361). Figures are therefore often specific implementations of Approaches, although the distinction was clearly debated in antiquity, as, for example, Hermogenes feels the need to defend his definition of narration as an Approach (227). Other areas of overlap include the role of confidence and hesitation in the Approach of Brilliance (266), and Dignity (246), where in Truth it is part of a Figure as part of doubt (*diaporesis*, 361) and judgement (*epikresis*, 361).

the use of structure and subdivision. Straightforward grammar is specified as a feature of Purity (καθαρότης), as here:

> Σχῆμα δὲ καθαρότητος ἡ ὀρθότης· «ἐγὼ γάρ, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, προσέκρουσα ἀνθρώπῳ πονηρῷ καὶ φιλαπεχθήμονι»...
>
> εἰ γὰρ πλαγιάσαις, κἂν ἀφηγῇ, πάντως περιβαλεῖς· ἐννοίας γὰρ ἄλλας ἐφέλκονται οἱ πλαγιασμοί.
>
> Straightforward grammar is a figure of Purity, as "For I, O Athenians, was angry at an cowardly and quarrelsome man"...
>
> For if you use oblique cases, even if you clearly show your direction, you will generally amplify, since the use of the oblique cases draws with it other thoughts.
> *Peri Ideon* 229-230

The examples and further discussion throughout this chapter of the *Peri Ideon* make it very clear that this refers to the use of the noun in the nominative case with an indicative verb to create a simple statement.[17] Subordination of any kind is indicative of Expansiveness (περιβολή), conceived of as fundamentally opposed to Purity in this respect.[18] Dignity (σεμνότης) also recommends straightforward grammar, and several other *ideai* follow these two.[19] Parenthesis (or *embole*) is similarly divided. Purity, Dignity and those *Ideai* that derive their basis from them recommend against it.[20] Expansiveness and Climax employ it, as does Rapidity (γοργότης).[21] This grouping is paralleled in the use of asyndeton, used in Brilliance (λαμπρότης), Expansiveness, Climax, Rapidity and Truth.[22] We can summarise the *Ideai* that explicitly discuss either subordination or parentheses like so:

---

[17] To take one example, *Peri Ideon* 230 quotes Herodotus «Κροῖσος ἦν Λυδὸς μὲν γένος, παῖς δὲ Ἀλυάττεω, τύραννος δὲ ἐθνέων» "Croesus was a Lydian by descent, son of Alyattes, king of the people", in contrast to «Κροίσου ὄντος Λυδοῦ μὲν γένος, παιδὸς δὲ Ἀλυάττεω, τυράννου δὲ ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐντὸς Ἅλυος ποταμοῦ'» "Since Croesus was of Lydian birth, son of Alyattes, the king of the people on this side of the river Halys...".

[18] Peri Ideon 229.

[19] *Peri Ideon* 250. Those that explicitly follow Purity in this respect are Simplicity (329), Pleasantness (219, 336), and Reasonableness (352).

[20] Peri Ideon 251.

[21] *Peri Ideon* 270, 288, 314.

[22] *Peri Ideon* 267, 270, 316, 318, 354.

	Subordination	No Subordination
Parenthesis	Expansiveness (περιβολή), Climax (ἀκμή)	Rapidity (γοργότης)
No Parenthesis	Brilliance (λαμπρότης)	Dignity (σεμνότης), Simplicity (ἀφέλεια), Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια), Purity (καθαρότης), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης)

Evidently the two concepts follow one another, and since these elements are essential to Expansiveness we can see a closer relationship between Climax, Rapidity, Brilliance, and Expansiveness in their use of *Parenthesis* and subordination.[23] Structure at the level of the sentence is least coherent in Truth (ἀλήθεια), which takes an idiosyncratic approach; its Features *Aposiopesis*, breaking off a sentence part way through, and *epidiorthosis*, self-correction, go beyond the tendency for parenthesis into a complete breakdown of the structure of the passage. These elements are not shared with any other *Idea*.

A similar split can be seen in the modes of address recommended. *Apostrophe,* address by name, and *deiktikon,* address by pointing (i.e. "that man") are the two forms of address commonly recommended in the *Ideai*. Those that use *apostrophe* are Vehemence (*Peri Ideon* 262, therefore implicitly Roughness, τραχυτής also), Climax (270), Rapidity (313), Pleasantnes*s* (γλυκύτης 270, and

---

[23] This is particularly interesting in light of the discussion of Brilliance and Rapidity throughout the Peri Ideon. Lindberg (1977) 92 highlights Peri Ideon 264.1–4, but this very clearly is an opposition in respect to certain features, namely clause length, and not a general opposition. However, as she notes, the opposition of the two at 280 is as clear a statement of opposition as any in the Peri Ideon. Wooten (1989) 582 regards Rapidity and Expansiveness as antithetical based on his reading of Peri Ideon 318: Τοῦ δ' αὖ δοκοῦντος μὲν τέμνειν τὰ πράγματα, οὐ μὴν τέμνοντός γε ὡς ἀληθῶς, ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον καὶ περιβάλλοντος λόγου παράδειγμα τὸ... (Wooten's 1987 translation: "The following is an example of a passage that seems to be concise (τέμνοντός) but is not so really, but in fact is abundant, which is the opposite of concise...") This seems to me to be a misreading. Τέμνοντός is not synonymous with γοργότης, and we should read this a as a specific split according to clause length.

by extension Bitterness, δριμύτης) , and Truth (360, inherited from Vehemence).[24] Those that explicitly refuse *apostrophe* are Purity (251), Dignity (251), Simplicity (329), and Reasonableness (352). *Deiktikon* is primarily present in the more aggressive forms, Vehemence and Truth (and by extension Roughness), as follows:

No *Apostrophe*	*Apostrophe only*	*Apostrophe, Deiktikon*
Dignity (σεμνότης), Simplicity (ἀφέλεια), Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια)	Climax (ἀκμή), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), Bitterness (δριμύτης), Rapidity (γοργότης)	Roughness (τραχυτής), Vehemence (σφοδρότης), Truth (ἀλήθεια)

Expansiveness (περιβολή) and Beauty (κάλλος) do not discuss the topic. This division splits both of the larger groups, Greatness (μέγεθος) and Character (ἦθος) as such (associating, for the moment, Truth with Character) :

	Apostrophe	**No Apostrophe**
Subordinate to Greatness	Roughness (τραχυτής), Vehemence (σφοδρότης), Climax (ἀκμή)	Dignity (σεμνότης)
Subordinate to Character	Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), (Bitterness, δριμύτης), Truth (ἀλήθεια)	Simplicity (ἀφέλεια), Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια)

---

[24] In the case of Roughness and Bitterness, which have relatively few characteristic features, but which adhere closely to another type, the appropriate styles can be assumed from Vehemence and Pleasantness respectively.

Those lacking *apostrophe* are those that derive stylistically from Simplicity, a division that we shall see more as the various elements of the *Ideai* are inspected below. These two systematic divisions in the *Schema* are the clearest indications that the divisions according to Hermogenes' top-level groupings are not reflective of the stylistic divisions in the text, instead they reflect the characteristic thoughts and the strategic choices of the orator. With this in mind, it would be sensible to analyse the *Ideai* according to the structure that exists within the text. The following sections will group them by feature, using the recommendations for *Lexis, Schema, Kola,* and *Rhythmos* that are given by Hermogenes.

Grouping the *Ideai* according to their Figures (σχήματά)

There are relatively few direct and explicit parallels between the sets of Figures assigned to each *Idea,* but the Figures, by sheer extent, give a different picture of the complex relationships between *Ideai*. There are four groups that can be made, alongside three *Ideai* that are not easily placed into a group based on their Figures.[25] The first is typified by Purity, and is comprised of Purity, Dignity, Simplicity (ἀφέλεια), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), and Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια). To this may be added Distinctness (εὐκρίνεια), since the Figures of the two are of a different type and they are meant to form a complimentary group producing the *Idea* Clarity (σαφήνεια). With the exception of Pleasantnes*s* and Distinctness, these share very few Figures with other *Ideai*. Judgements are a feature of Dignity*,* and Truth, but the examples of usage for the two are explicitly different. Likewise, Distinctness shares a tendency to enumerate and clearly divide sections with Expansiveness, but since this is not a feature of Purity (καθαρότης) or the other *Ideai* in this group the overlap is minimal.[26] Simplicity is stated to use the Figures appropriate to Purity in addition to some of its own, just as it employs the same Diction (λέξις). Likewise, Pleasantness and Reasonableness use this group of

features.[27] It is likely, due to its short entry and its position in the book, that Bitterness uses the same features, and that they have been omitted to avoid a fourth repetition. Since this is the largest group, it is easiest to see the are the Figures in tabulated format, with references to the places they are discussed:[28]

	Purity	Clarity	Dignity	Expansiveness	Simplicity	Pleasantness	Bitterness	Reasonableness
Straightforward Grammar (*orthotes*)	229		250		329	219, 336		352
Enumeration		238		279, 288				
Division of whole into parts (*merismos aparithmesis*)		238		279, 288				
Repetition (*epanalepsis*)	239	239			329	336		352
Judgements (*epikresis*)			250					
Judgements with hesitation					250			
Lack of *apostrophe*	251		251		329			352
Lack of *parentheses*	251		251		329	336		352

Dignity also closely mirrors Simplicity in its preference for straightforward grammar (250), lack or parenthetical statements (251), and lack of *apostrophe* (direct address, 251). They vary in that Dignity recommends judgements (*epikresis*, 250), and Simplicity the use of repetition (*epanalepsis,* 239).[29] Hermogenes notes the similarities in several places, conflating the two as essentially a unified style with respect to their Figures and, as will be discussed below, their rhythmical tendencies. The preference for lack of parenthesis and avoidance of direct address puts Dignity at odd with the other subtypes of Greatness, which tend to employ these Figures.[30] The preference for direct grammatical

---

[27] *Peri Ideon* 329 and 352 respectively.

[28] Note that often these are wholesale adaoptions of the Figures approprate to another *Idea.*

[29] Hermogenes notes the similarities in his discussion of the differences between Dignity and Brilliance in 267–68.

[30] Direct address as *apostrophe* is a feature of Vehemence and Climax. Since this feature is explicitly a part of Vehemence it is a part of Roughness.

structures over subordination is a direct contrast between Dignity and Brilliance (λαμπρότης), and therefore by extension also Climax.[31]

The second grouping is that of Roughness and Vehemence, which are explicitly similar. Climax shares their features while also using the features of Brilliance. This interrelation speaks for the interrelation of Roughness/Vehemence and Brilliance in a broader sense.[32] Certainly, in some passages there is a greater emphasis on mixing Brilliance and the more aggressive types beyond the simple creation of Climax.[33] However, Brilliance includes aspects of Expansiveness (περιβολή), and it is this aspect that is most emphasised in the discussion of Figures. Truth takes from Vehemence the forms of address *apostrophe* and *deiktikon*.[34] Through Climax, features are shared with several different *Ideai*, predominantly Expansiveness and Rapidity, but these have a very diverse set of Figures, and the link is predominantly through Brilliance;[35] the only one shared with Roughness and Vehemence is *apostrophe,* a feature of Rapidity. Selected correspondences with references are listed in the table below:

	Roughness	Vehemence	Brilliance	Climax	Abundance	Rapidity	Truth
Commands	258						
Rhetorical question (reproach)	258						
Apostrophe with Questions		262		270		313	360
Personal address (*deiktikon*)		263					360
Direct denials (*anairesis*)			267	270			
Starting afresh (*apostaseis*)			267	270			
Asyndeton (*symplokai*)			267	270	318	316	357

[31] Peri Ideon 267–68.

[32] Lindberg argues for a sharper division between Dignity/Brilliance and Roughness/Vehemence in general (Lindberg (1977) 69–74). In the case of the Figures relevant to these, we should observe some of Hermogenes' statements on the relation of Brilliance and Roughness/Vehemence that she notes, for example the opening of the section on Brilliance, *Peri Ideon* 264. Dignity and Brilliance do not share Figures, but the distinction Lindberg notes does come out when observing the rhythm and diction of each, as will be shown below.

[33] As, for example, 242.

[34] Peri Ideon 360–61.

[35] Asyndeton (*Peri Ideon* 316, 318) and Parenthesis (288, 294 and 314) are features of these and of Climax.

Although Climax shares many Figures with the Vehemence-group, Hermogenes focuses more on its connections to Brilliance than to Vehemence, since Climax is the product of the Figures that produce Vehemence and those that produce Brilliance. The closeness of this connection in general is indicated by Hermogenes' comments on Dem. 18.48 and 18.71:

> καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ μὴ ἁπλῶς εἰς μῆκος ἀπολελύσθαι τὰ κῶλα, ἀλλ' εἶναι μὲν τὸ ὅλον ἕν, δοκεῖν δὲ διακεκόφθαι ταῖς συμπλοκαῖς καὶ γεγενῆσθαι κομματικόν, οὔτε λαμπρότητος ὂν οὔτε ἀκμῆς σφοδρότητος δὲ μᾶλλον, τῷ τὴν σφοδρότητα τῆς μὲν λαμπρότητος ἀπηλλάχθαι πάντη, τῇ δὲ ἀκμῇ κατά τι κοινωνεῖν ἀκμαιότερον μᾶλλον ἢ λαμπρότερον πεποίηκε φαίνεσθαι τὸν λόγον.
> And the clause-release is not done singly at full length, but the whole thing seems to be interspersed with interjections and made into tiny remarks, not in the manner of Brilliance, nor Climax, but Vehemence. With respect to all this, since Vehemence is quite distinct from Brilliance but shares some aspects with Climax, it makes the speech appear more Climactic than Brilliant.
> *Peri Ideon* 277

It therefore seems reasonable to consider Climax to be closely related to Brilliance with respect to the schema. Naturally the closeness of these two groups through Climax, which is inherently a hybrid construction, could lead one to group the two together.

The fourth group is between Beauty (κάλλος) and Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), which takes many of its Figures from Beauty, although it is also closely connected to Simplicity as we have seen above.[36] It is remarkable that Beauty shares so few features with other *Ideai,* although some could be seen as an extension of other features. The focus on balanced clauses and parallelism throughout Beauty is, of course, a refinement of the tendency towards μὲν / δὲ balance in Distinctness (εὐκρίνεια) and Expansiveness.[37] Likewise the use of repetition and small variations expressed in a variety of ways is reflected in the repetitions and variations of Rapidity, but in both of these cases the complexity and

---

[36] Peri Ideon 339.
[37] Distinctness (*Peri Ideon* 239), Expansiveness (290–91), Beauty (276, 291, 299–305).

nature of the extensions make it clear that these Figures are of quite a different sort.[38] Brilliance and

Climax are stated to somehow have an inherent element of Beauty, as *Peri Ideon* 302 states:

> οὐδὲν δὲ θαυμαστόν, εἴ τι καὶ λαμπρὸν ἢ ἀκμαῖον ἔχει τὸ προειρημένον παράδειγμα·
> συγγένεια γὰρ λαμπρότητι πρὸς κάλλος ἐν ἅπαντι σχεδὸν πράγματι, διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς
> ἀκμήν· τὰ γὰρ ἀκμαῖά τε καὶ ὡραῖα – καὶ σώματα καὶ ὅ τι βούλει – πάντως καὶ λαμπρὰ
> καὶ καλά, οὐ μὴν τὸ ἀνάπαλιν· καλὸν γὰρ δύναταί τι καὶ μὴ ἀκμαῖον εἶναι μηδὲ λαμπρόν.
> It is not unusual if something Brilliant or Climactic follows the aforementioned
> paradigm, since there Brilliance has a kinship towards Beauty in nearly all mattters,
> and because of this there is also a kinship with Climax. For the climactic and timely
> – the main part of the speech and whatever else – is completely brilliant and
> beautiful, but the contrary is not true; for it is possible to be beautiful and not
> climactic nor brilliant.
> *Peri Ideon* 302–303

This comes during a discussion of the Figures of Beauty. There are no features of Brilliance in

any of the categories that are also explicitly attributed to Beauty. The sole exception to this are the

shared stipulations on using long clauses which are not Figures proper.[39] Additionally, the 'beautiful'

aspects of Brilliance are explicitly not those produced by adornment, the main focus of Beauty, that

is to say adornment for its own sake rather than that inherent to beautiful ideas.[40] It seems likely that

---

[38] Both, in fact, employ polyptoton with small variations (*Peri Ideon* 306). *Rapidity's* more general repetitions (303) recall the variety of studied ways for creating balance through repetition in Beauty (303–306).

[39] *Peri Ideon* 268, 272, 307.

[40] *Peri Ideon* 264. John Doxopatres (*Commentarium in Hermogenis librum περὶ ἰδεῶν* 275.25–30, pages from Walz 1834 v. 6) suggests a distinction in that Beauty is over-adorned and Brilliance displays beauty by nature, presumably through inherent balance in clauses, clear patterns, etc... (see also 334.26–335.6). This is not inconsistent with Hermogenes' descriptions, for example in *Peri Ideon* 234 which emphasizes the creation of beauty in Brilliance through noble thoughts,. Hagedorn argues for a division between a more dignified and sublime form of beauty –represented by Brilliance– which corresponds closely to the "high-style" *arete κάλλος,* in Dionysius, (Hagedorn 1964: 42–43) but the examples given do not support this interpretation of Hermogenes' work. For example, Dionysius' statement, which Hagedorn cites, at *Dem.* 48.40–43 ἐνθυμηθεὶς δέ, ὥσπερ ἔφην, ὡς διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων θεωρημάτων ὅ τε ἡδὺς γίνεται λόγος καὶ ὁ καλός, ἐσκόπει πάλιν, τί ποτε ἦν τὸ αἴτιον, ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ οὐ τῶν αὐτῶν ἦν ποιητικά, εὕρισκε δὴ τῶν τε μελῶν οὔσας διαφοράς ... ("Having considered, as already mentioned, that it is through these same rules that speech becomes sweet (ἡδὺς) and beautiful (καλός) [Demosthenes] was pondering again what the cause might be that the one poetic method was not like the other, and he found that their natures indeed differed with respect to tonal expression...") does not present a parallel to the use of the terms Beauty (κάλλος) and Brilliance in Hermogenes, since these *Ideai* are not comparable with respect to their stylistic features as ἡδὺς and καλός are in Dionysius. Passages such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Dem.* 49.53–58 make it clear that while Beauty may be linked to grandeur in Dionysius, the distinction between speech that is καλός and that which is ἡδὺς is quite different from that between Beauty and Brilliance in

---

Hermogenes is here mixing terminology or making a comment on the frequent use of the two styles in combination with one another and that no direct connection of the Figures of the two can be made on this basis.

The three more independent types are Truth (ἀλήθεια), Rapidity (γοργότης), and Expansiveness (περιβολή). The first of these, Truth, bears some relation with respect to the Figures to Vehemence (σφοδρότης) and Roughness, as noted in the section on these above, but in general it has more unique features than shared, and those aspects that are shared are generally part of broader divisions; it shares *apostrophe* and *deiktikon* with the Vehemence-group and *asyndeton* with the Brilliance group. These are some of the most broadly shared Figures.[41] *Diaporesis,* doubt, *aposiopesis,* breaking off a sentence, *epidiorthosis,* self-correction, and *apolytos merismos* are all unique to Truth. It is not implausible that Disgruntlement (βαρύτης) shares the Figures of Truth, but this is ambiguous. Disgruntlement makes no individual claim to Figures and does not have the clear indicators of shared features through structure or placement as Bitterness (δριμύτης). The relative independence of Expansiveness within the Greatness-group (μέγεθος) makes its uniqueness here unsurprising.[42] The *Schema* that it shares are few and have been discussed above, but its broad range of unshared Figures suggest independence. Rapidity likewise shares only Figures related to larger divisions and the aspect of rapid questioning that is also a feature of Truth.[43] Groupings can therefore be relatively easily created and summarised thus:

- Purity (καθαρότης), Dignity (σεμνότης), Simplicity (ἀφέλεια), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης), and Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια)

- Roughness (τραχυτής) and Vehemence (σφοδρότης)

Hermogenes. The similarities are mainly parallels in vocabulary and suggest that beauty is being talked about in a more general sense.

[41] For the distribution of these and the *Ideai* that use them, see above.

[42] The relative independence of this *Idea* is discussed at *Peri Ideon* 242.

[43] As noted above, *Apostrophe* (*Peri Ideon* 313), *Asyndeton* (316), and *Parenthesis* (314) are all elements of Rapidity shared with larger groups. Rapid replies to objections (*Peri Ideon* 356) are shared with Truth. Other Figures of Rapidity are not shared.

- Brilliance (λαμπρότης) and Climax (ἀκμή)

- Beauty (κάλλος) and Pleasantness (γλυκύτης)

- Expansiveness (περιβολή)

- Rapidity (γοργότης)

- Truth (ἀλήθεια, and potentially Bitterness δριμύτης)

Grouping the *Ideai* according to rhythmic characteristics

Divisions according to word order, cadence, and rhythm, which comprise the interrelated rhythmic concerns of Hermogenes' division, are relatively simple.[44] There are four groups with some few *Ideai* that cross categories. In short, these groups are: Those that follow Clarity (σαφήνεια), characterised by iambic and trochaic rhythms; those that follow Dignity, which are dactylic and anapestic with spondaic cadences; those that follow Roughness with inconsistent rhythm and clashing syllables; and finally those that follow Beauty with consistent (but unspecified) rhythm, but varied use of accentuation and an avoidance of hiatus. These groups are generally expressed through the webs of explicit references in the descriptions of the *Ideai*.

The rhythmic characteristics of each group can be summarised as follows:

Clarity (σαφήνεια)	Dignity (σεμνότης)	Roughness (τραχυτής)	Beauty (κάλλος)
Iambic/Trochaic Rhythm	Dactylic/Anapestic Rhythm		Consistent Rhythm, but unspecified
Iambic/Trochaic	Spondaic Clausulae, Avoid Catalectic	Inconsistent Clausulae, Avoids	Avoid Spondaic

[44] References for the passages that discuss these characteristics are listed below with the specific *Ideai* for each group.

Clausulae	Endings	Consistency	Clausulae
Some mixture	Relaxed/Loose Rhythm		Consistent Rhythm
		Harsh/Clashing Sounds	Avoidance of Hiatus
			Variation in accent placement

These groups are not explicitly stated by Hermogenes but tend to proceed from explicit cross-references in the text. The *Ideai* can thus be grouped as such:

- Clarity (*Peri Ideon* 232–33), both Purity and Distinctness, Rapidity (319), Simplicity (329), Reasonableness (352), Disgruntlement (368), *(Bitterness,* assumed from placement*)*

- Dignity (251), Brilliance (λαμπρότης 268), Climax (ἀκμή 272)

- Roughness (259–260), Vehemence (σφοδρότης 263), Truth (ἀλήθεια 363)

- Beauty (309), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης 339)

There are a few small overlaps, Rapidity and Bitterness (δριμύτης) both suggest avoiding hiatus. Pleasantness has many of the rhythmic features of Dignity including a specific suggestion of using the spondaic cadences and dactylic/anapestic rhythms characteristic of that type. This first aspect is in direct conflict with the advice it inherits from Beauty (κάλλος). Since however, it follows Beauty in many other respects, especially with respect to the *schema*, it seems useful to think of them as also linked here. Expansiveness lacks specific rhythmic characteristics, for which see *Peri Ideon* 295.

Grouping the *Ideai* according to Diction (λέξις) and Clause length.

There are generally fewer recommendations made with respect to Diction and clause length, but they complement the other categories well. Three groups can be usefully created from the stipulations about Diction. The first is those that follow the Diction of Clarity as laid out in *Peri Ideon* 229, that is to say Distinctness (εὐκρίνεια 240) and Simplicity (ἀφέλεια 328) which is followed generally by other Ideai of Character (ἦθος). The second is Dignity (247–49) followed by Brilliance (λαμπρότης 267). The third is Vehemence (σφοδρότης 262) followed by Climax (269), and Truth (359), and we might suppose that a similar set of stipulations applies for Roughness. With the exception of Truth these all also use metaphors, which is a hallmark of Dignity, but the use of harsh coined words is a more precise similarity. These correspond almost exactly to the groups suggested in the section on rhythmic groupings. Beauty and Rapidity also share a recommendation that short words be used, but this is not a very precise correspondence. The other *Ideai* either use unique advice with respect to Diction or do not have explicit statements on the subject.

Clause length can rather simply be summarised as being split into long, short, and unspecified clauses, the division is as follows:

Long	Short	Unspecified
Brilliance (λαμπρότης 268), Climax (ἀκμή 272), Beauty (κάλλος 307)	Clarity (229–232, 240), Dignity (σεμνότης 251), Roughness (τραχυτής 259), Vehemence (σφοδρότης 263), Simplicity (328), Pleasantness (γλυκύτης 219), Reasonableness (ἐπιείκεια 352), Truth (ἀλήθεια 363), (potentially Disgruntlement, βαρύτης and Bitterness, δριμύτης)	Expansiveness (περιβολή), Rapidity (γοργότης)

These therefore tend to form similar groups to those created by the correspondences in Figures, rather than rhythm. Comparing the groups, it is evident that the combinations formed here are an arrangement of the groupings seen in the Figures, whereas they would divide the groups based on Rhythm or Diction. The stipulations with respect to clause length and rhythm seem therefore to reveal two sets of stylistic groupings, suggesting an underlying pattern to Hermogenes' thought on the stylistic groupings of the *Ideai.*

The Overall Structure of the *Peri Ideon.*

The *Peri Ideon,* therefore, has three different main structures of features. The first is evident in the titles of the *Ideai* given in the introduction, the *ennoia*, and the *methodos*, the second in the divisions in clause length and *Schema,* the third is most evident in the rhythm and diction characteristic of the *Idea.* It seems sensible on this basis to think of the *Ideai,* with respect to their top-level categorisation, as not exactly stylistic categories but rather an integrated category making precise recommendations based on strategic decisions by the speaker, reflecting Syrianus' emphasis discussed above. The *Ideai* therefore do not map precisely onto stylistic groupings. This arrangement does however, approximate the structure given by Stavelas in his analysis of the conceptual structure of the *Ideai.* He argues for three parametrical levels one notional, one methodological, and one that follows the style as enunciated.[45] We might summarise this as follows, following his diagram on page 18:

- Thought: Thoughts

- Method: Approaches, Figures

- Convention: Diction, Clause length, Rhythm

This analysis loosely supports such a tripartite division, although stipulations of clause length would seem to be grouped in a manner that recalls the Figures rather than rhythm. Likewise, there are good arguments for seeing the Approaches as closer to Thoughts in a Hermogenean context.

---

[45] Stavelas (2014) 10–11, see also the diagram at Stavelas (2014) 18. This structure is not taken from the parallels in features but rather from the traditions and conceptual nature of the categories.

Hermogenes seems to make a distinction between Thoughts-Approaches and the remainder of the categories under the banner *Lexis* in his introduction *Peri Ideon Logou* 218 (in the second passage from 218 given above). [46] The similar treatment of them as idiosyncratic alongside the crossover between Thought and Approach discussed above would seem to support this. This problem is, however, outside of the scope of this paper, and more work is needed to establish the role of Approaches in this system. The structure as observed in this analysis according to correspondences in features may be summarised:

- Thought: Thoughts (Approaches)

- Figures: Figures, Clause Length

- Diction: Diction, Rhythm

This organisation may contribute to the enduring problems of categorising certain *Ideai* within groups. For example, Expansiveness is stated to operate independently of the other parts of Greatness (μέγεθος).[47] As we have seen there are only small areas of stylistic overlap between the *Figures* (Figures) of Expansiveness and any other *Idea,* and no overlap in diction (no recommendations are given with respect to clause length or rhythm). Therefore, its independence is in its stylistic features not in its strategic deployment, and its combination with other *Ideai* is a hybridisation. Truth likewise is sometimes regarded as independent of Character (ἦθος), sometimes a part of it. With respect to Figures and Diction it is clearly similar to Roughness or Vehemence (σφοδρότης), but the strategic goals of the two are quite different. The former two, parts of Greatness, have the aim of characterising the speaker's opponent and case the latter of characterising the speaker themselves. These could be regarded, following Hermogenes' reuse of rhetorical terminology in the names of the categories, as characteristic of Aristotle's *pathos* as opposed to *ethos*.

---

[46] See discussions of *Methodos* in Patillon (1997) 114–116; Rutherford (1998) 14–16.
[47] For example, see the discussions of its place within Greatness in *Peri Ideon* 242.

Such a structure lends support to the argument that Hermogenes' *Ideai* are closely related to Demetrius' categories of style.[48] These also display a tendency towards top-level categorisations that elide similarities in stylistic qualities. For example, hyperbole is a feature of two of the four stylistic virtues (and discussed in a third) and one of the faults in the *De Elocutione*.[49] This division would also seem to support argues the interpretation of the *Ideai* as strategic ideals for practical use rather than purely abstract units of analysis.[50] It might also suggest that the challenging diversity in category names might be purely practical, and that there is value in the use of names that reflect but do not correspond to earlier terminology. The orator who has chosen a broad strategic approach, for example a straightforward, plain-speaking Lysianic defence speech, could easily find the proper stylistic guidance from the purer and plainer styles using categories that recall adjectives used to describe Lysias' work. This might work in a manner similar to the way in which *stasis*-theory guidebooks would recommend a style of argument to the speaker based on the situation, and a comparison of these methods would be a good subject for future research. It also would suggest that the category Shrewdness (δεινότης), omitted for much of this analysis since it does not function like other *Ideai,* is not so distinct from the others as it may first appear. All the *Ideai* deal with strategy and using the right style at the right time, but Shrewdness reflects the cumulative effect of these choices throughout the speech. We are therefore left with a text whose practical value as a rhetorical aid is supported by its structure, and not undermined by its incongruity.

---

[48] A great deal of work has been done on this from other angles, for which see Patillon (1997) 105–112, 114–24. Rutherford (1998) 12–16 in particular argues for a close connection to Demetrius.

[49] Demetr. *Eloc.* 52 (elevation); 124–26 (frigidity); 161–63 (elegance); 282–86 (forcefulness).

[50] Potentially this might follow Stavelas' conception of them as "codes of signs" For example, Stavelas 2014, 16 "It would be preferable either to regard them as codes and sub-codes of an aesthetic structure, relating to the oratorical deliverance of speech, or to consider the resolved ideas as codes of signs or as stylistic figures, since they elevate the stylistic forms signified from the linguistic to the aesthetic level, and to regard the seven major ideas as constructed systems of signs."

Bibliography

Clay, D. (1998) 'The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity', *Mater. E Discuss. Anal. Dei Testi Class.* 9–40

Conley, T. (1987) 'Hermogenes' On Types of Style', *Rhetor. J. Hist. Rhetor.* 5, 431–36

Dilts, M.R. and Kennedy, G.A. (eds) (1997) *Two Greek rhetorical treatises from the Roman Empire: introduction, text, and translation of the Arts of rhetoric, attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara* (Mnemosyne Supplementum collana 168) (Leiden New York Köln)

Du Toit, A. (2014) 'Galatians and the περὶ ἰδεῶν λόγου of Hermogenes: A rhetoric of severity in Galatians 5–6', *HTS Teol. Stud. Theol. Stud.* 70, 5 pages

Heath, M. (1995) *Hermogenes On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford)

Lindberg, G. (1977) 'Studies in Hermogenes and Eustathios: the theory of ideas and its application in the commentaries of Eustathios on the epics of Homer', (Ph.D. Diss. Lund)

Papaioannou, S. (2017) 'Synopsis of the Rhetorical Forms, based on Hermogenes' On Forms', in C. Barber and S. Papaioannou (eds), *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art* (A Byzantine Perspective on Aesthetics) 20–30

Patillon, M. (1997) *L'art rhétorique : exercises préparatoires, etats de cause, invention, catégories stylistiques, méthode de l'habileté / Hermogène ; première traduction française intégrale, introduction et notes par Michel Patillon ; préface de Pierre Laurens.* (Collection Idea.) (Paris)

Patterson, A.M. (2015 reprint, original 1970) *Hermogenes and the Renaissance: Seven Ideas of Style* (Princeton)

Rutherford, I. (1998) *Canons of style in the Antonine age: idea-theory in its literary context* (Oxford classical monographs) (Oxford)

Stavelas, A.N. (2014) 'Oratorical Stylistics according to Hermogenes of Tarsus', *Aither* 6, 6–21

Walker, J. (2001) 'Michael Psellos on rhetoric: A translation and commentary on Psellos' synopsis of Hermogenes', *Rhetor. Soc. Q.* 31, 5–40

Wooten, C.W. (1987) *Hermogenes' On types of styles* (Chapel Hill)

––––– (1989). 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes on the Style of Demosthenes', *The American Journal of Philology*, 110(4), 576–588. https://doi.org/10.2307/29528

Review: "Elite Women in Hellenistic History, Historiography, and Reception"

edited by Marc Mendoza and Borja Antela-Bernárdez with the collaboration of Eran Almagor. Women of the Past: Testimonies from Archaeology and History. Brepols publishers: Turnhout, Belgium, 2024, pp. 170 ISBN 978-2-503-61106-8.

by Guendalina Daniela Maria Taietti

The volume addresses the role of royal women in the Hellenistic period, both as historical agents and as historiographical and artistic tropes. The book positions itself well within the growing body of scholarship from the last few decades, which has seen increased interest in the study of women's agency in antiquity following the seminal works of Sarah Pomeroy (*Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*, New York, 1975) and Elisabeth Carney (*Women and monarchy in Macedonia*, Norman OK, 2000). A notable recent contribution is Elisabeth Carney and Sabine Müller (eds.)'s *Routledge Companion to Women and Monarchy in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (London-New York 2021), which features interdisciplinary studies from the ancient Eastern civilizations to late antiquity and also explores some aspects of the reception of royal women in ancient and modern contexts. Regarding non-royal women, several important recent publications include Mary R. Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant (eds.)'s *Women's life in Greece and Rome: a Source Book in Translation* (Baltimore, 2005); Giampiera Arrigoni (ed.)'s *Le Donne in Grecia* (Rome-Bari 2008); Bonnie Maclachlan's *Women in Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook. Bloomsbury sources in ancient history* (London-New York, 2012); and Stephanie Lynn Budin and Jean MacIntosh Turfa (eds.)'s *Women in Antiquity: Real Women across the Ancient World* (London-New York, 2016).

Elite Women in Hellenistic History, Historiography, and Reception belongs to the new Brepols series *Women of the Past: Testimonies from Archaeology and History* and originates from a panel on royal and non-elite women held at the Celtic Classics Conference in Coimbra in 2019— although eventually several papers read at the conference did not make it into the volume. The editors acknowledge that a comprehensive and systematic study on both royal and non-royal women

throughout the Hellenistic period is still a desideratum, and this little collection surely takes a further step into that direction. It offers original contributions through an interdisciplinary approach (history, archaeology, epigraphy, numismatics, and art history) and provides a broad geographical and chronological overview of Hellenistic royal and elite women, while it also addresses some of their predecessors and forerunners in Epirus, and their reception in Gandhāran art.

The book comprises six studies:

a) 'The Power of Names, Women, and the Aeacid Dynastic Image' by Elisabeth D. Carney, in which the author reappraises naming practices under the Aeacids, drawing parallels with the Argeads and the Hellenistic dynasties. Carney convincingly demonstrates the pivotal role of royal women in shaping and sustaining the Aeacid dynastic image. Greek ruling dynasties often employed a variety of tactics to construct a compelling image that would reinforce their power within and outside their realm, and genealogies (i.e. claiming descent from a mythical or heroic figure) were widely used in the Classical and Hellenistic period. The Aeacids (fifth century BC-232 BC) claimed descent from Achilles through his son Neoptolemus and, from the outset, women played an important role in the Aeacid dynasty. Carney compares the accounts of Thucydides (I.136.1-137.2), Plutarch (*Them.* 15.1-3), Diodorus (XI.56.1-4), and Cornelius Nepos (*Them.* 8.4-5) and discusses the tale of Themistocles, who, while escaping from his pursuers, is helped by the wife of Molossian king Admetus I (c.471 BC). The queen suggests to Themistocles that he holds her son in his arms and waits for the king. Indeed, at this sight Admetus refuses to turn him over to his pursuers and help him flee to Persia. Carney aptly shows the similarities between this tale and the Homeric account of Odysseus' supplication to Arete, wife of the Phaeacian ruler Alcinous (*Od.*VII.139-206) and the supplications of baby Pyrrhus at the Illyrian king Glaukias' court, who instructs his Aeacid wife to bring Pyrrhus up (Plu. *Pyr.* 3.1-2). Thus, these variants of Themistocles' tale portray the fifth century Aeacid court as Homeric and as one where royal women exercised power and agency.

Naming someone after an ancestor was another method to construct a compelling image, as it 'is both a commemorative act (a reference to a grand past)', and 'an assertion that the newly named person embodies the qualities of their namesake' (p. 22). Although at the beginning the Aeacid did

not bear heroic names, from the reign of Alcetas I (ca. 390/85-370 BC), they began to use names related to Achilles and/or Trojan ancestors, perhaps because of the king's dealings with Dionysius I of Syracuse and the Athenians, and thus the need to construct a stronger heroic dynasty's image. Notably, the Aeacids emphasized female names, as they focussed on the heroic ancestry—rather than just giving the name of the grandmothers, the most common Greek naming practice—and inventiveness, which distinguishes them from other ruling dynasties, whose naming practices 'focused on continuity via repetition of both names and epithets' (p. 28).

b) '*Oh, Heaven is a Place on Earth*. Imperial Paradigm and Local (Female) Agency in Late Achaemenid and Early Hellenistic Bactria: A Model of Paradise Politics' by Marco Ferrario. Building on Wouter F.M. Henkelman's work on the Achaemenid administrative structure and system beyond the Iranian plateau, Ferrario examines the political strategies adopted by the Achaemenids to establish their rule over Bactria, and how the Persians' transformation of the territory actually allowed local elites to gain more power. Marriages played an important role in forming power balances and alliances between the Achaemenids and the local ruling class. Ferrario argues that that local aristocratic women, such as Rhoxane, were not passive recipients of power but actively sought strategic marriages to maintain control over estates and territory; thus, economic interests laid behind the marriages between the Macedonian generals and some daughters of the Central Asian aristocracy. While the chapter provides valuable insights on Achaemenid Bactria and its local elite, I would have appreciated a deeper focus on women's roles, to better align with the topic of the volume.

c) 'The Wives of Lysimachus. A Study of Dynastic Relations' by Branko F. van Oppen de Ruiter. This chapter explores Lysimachus' numerous marriages as diplomatic tools, and how Lysimachus' women actively took part in the political scene. It re-evaluates the chronology of events and challenges existing assumptions about Lysimachus' serial monogamy, showing that, like Philip II, Alexander III and other Hellenistic rulers, he was practicing *polygyny* (cf. Plu. *Comp. Demetr. Ant.* 4.1). van Oppen states that so far neither Lysimachus nor his wives received the scholarly attention they deserve as they lack dynastic continuity, and that the dynastic importance of his wives is stressed by the city foundations and coins minted in their name, a policy that Lysimachus did not apply for

his son Agathocles, nor for any other male family member. In the chapter, special attention is given to Amastris, the daughter of Oxyathres, a brother of Darius III. During the mass wedding at Susa, she was wed to Craterus, who, given his devotion to Macedonian tradition, allegedly repudiated her upon his return to Macedon. Following Memnon (*FGrH* 434 fr. 4.4), van Oppen suggests that, with Craterus' consent, Amastris offered herself to Dionysius of Heraclea. Amastris was a valuable wife as she was part of the Persian nobility; she received Greek education before her wedding at Susa and became acquainted with Macedonian affairs through Craterus. After Dionysius' death, she also became regent of Heraclea, a fact that gave her an even greater appeal to Lysimachus. After her return in Bithynia in 290s BC, Amestris probably ruled the Pontic area on his behalf and expanded his influence along the Black Sea.

d) 'Polygamy and Queenship under Antiochus II. The King's Wife Laodice I and the *basilissa* Title (or the Lack Thereof)' by Altay Coşkun. This chapter delves into Laodice I's marriage, her power dynamics, and the politics surrounding the use (or absence) of the *basilissa* title. This Seleucid example is paralleled by similar practices of other Hellenistic royal women and kingdoms. Coşkun has refined his views on Laodice I through several studies, and suggests that the negative literary portrayal of Laodice is modelled on Olympias, the mother of Alexander, also accused of murdering her husband in order to secure power for her son. Although Laodice I was never granted the title of *basilissa*, she held a more prominent position than Berenice, and her name was imbued with Seleucid royalty. I commend Coşkun for his command and new interpretation of a variety of Babylonian and Greek sources, such as the literary and historiographical tradition, inscriptions and papyri.

e) 'Queenship in Pergamon. Public Agency and Dynastic Image' by María Dolores Mirón Pérez. This chapter sheds light on the concept of queenship in the Attalid realm and challenges the notion that Attalid queens were passive subjects. Mirón Pérez shows how the *basilissai* Apollinis and Stratonice played a significant role in the creation of a monarchic image and propaganda as much as other Hellenistic royal women. The author also explains that peculiar traits of Attalid queenship were the centrality of motherly virtues and family harmony, together with religious euergetism—

characteristics that contributed to legitimizing the Attalid dynasty as a whole and crafting its public image.

f) 'The Dream of Queen Māyā in Gandhāran Art' by Ashwini Lakshminarayanan. This study examines the transmission of Hellenistic imagery, motifs, and royal notions in Gandhāran art, which is to be found in Buddhist monuments between the first and fourth century AD. Specifically, Lakshminarayanan shows the mutual influences between native Indian, Central-Asian, and Graeco-Roman art via the example of Queen Māyā's dream, in which she dreams of an elephant striking her with its tusk(s) and miraculously impregnating her. Māyā will then bear the Shakyamuni Buddha to the world. The author suggests that, although normally in Gandhāran art female characters have a secondary role, as the main topic is the life of Shakyamuni Buddha, in the reliefs depicting the dream, conception, and birth, Queen Māyā is the central character. She is portrayed according to popular motifs circulating in the area and blended with visual elements of the Hellenistic period, such as the 'reclining female figures' in terracotta which became popular in the East. Thus, reception and adaptation of both Hellenistic and local cultures helped the development of the Gandhāran repertoire and give prominence to the role of Queen Māyā.

Although I would have welcomed the inclusion of a female editor, the presence of three female contributors out of six reflects the editors' commitment to 'break[ing] the silence of time' around historical women from the past—and also of today. This volume wants to make a stand in giving 'the other half of humankind' the place they deserve in history, and also carries a timely and thoughtful message about the ongoing fight for women's rights of equality, dignity, respect, and safety. In their introduction, the editors also state that the volume seeks to determine whether women's increased visibility was the result of a historical change stemming from the new political and structural developments of the Hellenistic kingdoms, but they leave the question unanswered. Surely, beyond its academic value, the volume serves as both inspiration and a call for future interdisciplinary collaboration, especially in the underexplored field of non-elite women in the Hellenistic world.

Editors for Issue

The following list highlights the members of our editorial board who supervised the peer review process for the articles included in this issue.

Dr. Guendalina D. M. Taietti

Dr. Jordon Houston

Dr. Martine Diepenbroek

Lucilla Crispi

Giulia Tonon

Dr. Lucrezia Sperindio