Where Philosophy and Rhetoric Meet: Character Typification in the Greek Novel

KOEN DE TEMMERMAN
Stanford University/Universiteit Gent

It is commonly, and rightly, accepted that typification plays a major role in characterisation in ancient literature. Assimilation to pre-existing character types in mythology, history, or literature is one of an author's basic tools to endow his characters with meaning.[1] This holds true also for ancient Greek novelists. In scholarship on these texts, attention has been drawn to the presence and the role of character types from New Comedy and other literary genres.[2] Moreover, J. Morgan has rightly argued that character typification establishes probability and generic appropriateness, thus stimulating the reader's fictional belief: 'Kings must act like kings, slaves like slaves'.[3] Consequently, Chariton's characterisation of his protagonist Chaereas, for example, is more a matter of what he is than who he is. The ancient novelists seem hardly to have recognised the possibility that Chaereas might act as he does because he is Chaereas. They did not need individuation of character to engage readers' belief, and so their interest was concentrated more on manipulation of plot than on observation of humanity. The action of a Greek novel is not powered by the individuality of its actors. To us, they do not ring true, maybe, but there is no reason to project that feeling back on to their original audience.[4]

---

[1] Cf. *OCD* s.v. 'character': 'Strikingly absent from the ancient thought-world is the interest in unique individuality and the subjective viewpoint which figures in modern western thinking about character. What is prominent, however, in ancient literature from Homer's *Iliad* onwards is the sympathetic presentation of abnormal and problematic psychological states and ethical stances. However, this is better understood as part of the communal exploration of the nature and limits of norms of good and bad character than as anticipating the modern preoccupation with individual subjectivity.'

[2] Cf., among others, Billault 1996, 117.

[3] Morgan 1993, 228.

[4] Morgan 1993, 228.

In this article, I want to explore some specific instances of character typification in the Greek novels. My starting point is to approach character typification as an important feature in the ancient disciplines of ethical philosophy and rhetoric. Let me, first of all, underline the important role of ethical philosophy in the development of character typification. Although descriptions of character-types occasionally appear in earlier literature (e.g. Homer's description of the coward and the brave man in *Il.*13,278–86, which was, according to Eustathius, a foreshadowing of Theophrastus' treatment of the character-type of the coward),[5] the first systematic treatment of typified characters is offered by Aristotle. In his ethical philosophical works, the *Nicomachean Ethics* (*EN*), *Eudemian Ethics* (*EE*), and *Magna Moralia* (*MM*),[6] he offers an account of various human virtues and vices that is fundamental for ancient notions of character typification. He discusses thirteen virtues, each of which is defined as a mean between two vices: one of these vices represents the character state resulting from a deficiency of the particular virtue, the other the character state resulting from its excess. The virtue of courage (*andreia*), for example, is the mean between the vices of cowardice (*deilia*) and rashness (*thrasytēs*). Cowardice results from a deficiency of courage; rashness from an excess.

From Aristotle, it is a small step to his pupil and successor as head of the Lyceum, Theophrastus (371–287 B.C.). His surviving work is only a small part of his original production.[7] His concern with character and human behaviour is evident from his *Characters*, a small treatise discussing the typical behaviour of thirty socially deviant types of personality. The original purpose of Theophrastus' *Characters* has been the object of extensive debate and was probably very different from that of Aristotle's ethical philosophical works.[8] However, it is generally agreed that Aristotle's treatment of character 'provides the seed from which Theophrastus' descriptions grow'.[9] Theophrastus' character-sketches take up nine of the twenty-six vices discussed

[5] Cf. Diggle 2004, 6, Ussher 1993, 27–31.

[6] I use the Loeb editions and translations by Rackham (1962 and 1952) and Tredennick & Armstrong (1947).

[7] Diogenes Laertius (5,36–37) mentions no fewer than 225 titles.

[8] See Smeed 1985, 3–4 for an overview. On the different outlooks of Theophrastus' and Aristotle's treatments of character typification, cf. Anderson 1970, xiii. Fortenbaugh 2003, 132–141, on the other hand, lists a number of elements differentiating *EE* and *MM* from *EN*, and aligning them with Theophrastus' *Characters*. He suggests that Theophrastus' treatise was written as a collection of working sketches feeding the interest of the later Peripatus, as reflected in *EE* and *MM*.

[9] Diggle 2004, 7 lists some Theophrastan passages that take up and/or adapt Aristotelian notions. Cf. also Lombardi 1999a, 111–114, and 1999b, 209–213.

by Aristotle.[10] Among those, six Theophrastan characteristics represent what for Aristotle are deficiencies of virtue: cowardice (*deilia*), obtuseness (*anaisthēsia*), illiberality (*aneleutheria*), hypocrisy (*eirōneia*), rudeness (*agroikia*), and shamelessness (*anaischyntia*). The other three are treated by Aristotle as excesses of virtue: boastfulness (*alazoneia*), obsequiousness (*areskeia*), and flattery (*kolakeia*). As I shall demonstrate, the labels indicating these characteristics do not always cover the same semantic range in Theophrastus and in Aristotle.

Although character typification partly has its roots in ethical philosophy, the importance of ancient rhetoric for its creation and further development should not go unnoticed.[11] In ancient rhetoric too, characterisation was more a matter of conforming to (often morally significant) ready-made stock types than of psychological individuation. In the second book of *Rhetoric*, discussing the creation and display of the orator's *ēthos*, Aristotle surveys the typical characteristics of young people, old people, and people in the prime of life,[12] followed by those of noble, rich, and powerful people.[13] In rhetorical practice, the use of character typification is a logical consequence of the orator's need for a suitable construction of *ēthos*. Aristotle states explicitly how important it is for an orator to make the *ēthos* he portrays conform to a specific character type:

> Such are the characters of the young and older men. Wherefore, since all men are willing to listen to speeches which harmonise with their own character and to speakers who resemble them, it is easy to see what language we must employ so that both ourselves and our speeches may appear to be of such and such a character.[14]

The orator should also be able to construct his opponent's or other persons' *ēthos* in a credible way.[15] Assimilation to pre-existing character types is an efficient tool.[16] Many ancient rhetoricians and commentators acknowledge the importance of character typification in rhetorical practice. Rutilius Lupus, for example, gives a lengthy description of the typical behaviour of the

---

[10] Cf. Diggle 2004, 6–7.
[11] Cf. Rusten & Cunningham 2002, 18–19.
[12] Arist. *Rh.* 1389a3–1390b13.
[13] Arist. *Rh.* 1390b16–1391a29.
[14] Arist. *Rh.* 2,3,16.
[15] Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 7,2,28–35 (esp. 7,2,28). Cf. also Cic. *Inv.* 2,8,9. On the importance of *ēthos* construction in declamation, cf. Russell 1983, 87–88 and 1990b, 198.
[16] Cf. Barton 1994, 110–111.

drunkard,[17] and Quintilian discusses a series of character types from ancient comedy: 'slaves, pimps, parasites, rustics, soldiers, harlots, maidservants, old men stern and mild, youths moral or luxurious, married women, and girls'.[18] Moreover, he explicitly links the use of the 'right' character-type in oratorical practice to the creation of credibility:

> But all credibility, and it is with credibility that the great majority of arguments are concerned, turns on questions such as the following: whether it is credible that a father has been killed by a son, or that a father has committed incest with his daughter, or to take questions of an opposite character, whether it is credible that a stepmother has poisoned her stepchild, or that a man of luxurious life has committed adultery.[19]

The importance of typification in character construction is equally apparent from some rhetoricians' explanation of the terms *ēthos* or *ēthikos*. Hermogenes, for example, clarifies his use of *ēthikon prosōpon* with the mere words 'farmers, gluttons, and suchlike'.[20] Byzantine commentators on ancient rhetoricians also acknowledged the importance of character typification in the discipline that they were studying. In his discussion on *ēthopoiia*, Doxapater distinguishes between a 'simple character' and a 'compound character'. Whereas the former represents a character-type ('a farmer, an orator, a general'), the latter consists of a combination of two character-types ('what a rustic father would say when he saw his son being a philosopher').[21]

I regard Theophrastus' *Characters* as a work reflecting the interest in character typification common to ethical philosophy and rhetoric. Connections between Theophrastus' treatise and ancient rhetoric are numerous.[22] In fact, we owe the very preservation of Theophrastus' *Characters* to its insertion into a corpus of rhetorical texts mainly covering Hermogenes and Aphthonius.[23] Some scholars argue, as the Byzantines did, that Theophrastus' treatise was actually written as a handbook to provide the orator with ready-

---

[17] Rut. Lup. *De figuris sententiarum* 2,7 Halm.
[18] Quint. *Inst.* 11,3,74.
[19] Quint. *Inst.* 5,10,19.
[20] Hermog. *Stat.* 134,4–5 Spengel II. In his scholion on this passage, Syrianus lists 'farmers, misers, and gluttons' as *prosōpa ēthika* (Walz IV,100); cf. also Mathaeus Camariotes (Walz VI,603), who mentions the farmer and the dissolute man in a similar context.
[21] Walz II, 500.
[22] Fortenbaugh 1994, 18–22 and 2003, 227.
[23] Cf. Rusten & Cunningham 2002, 29.

made character depictions.[24] This view has been contested, both by scholars believing that the *Characters* had an ethical, philosophical purpose, and by those believing that it was written as an illustrative appendix to a work on the writing of comedy.[25] Whatever the intended function of the *Characters*, there is no doubt that it was used for rhetorical purposes relatively soon after its creation,[26] and it is certain that at least some of Theophrastus' character-types found their way into rhetorical education from the Roman period onwards.[27] Matelli underlines the mutual connections between rhetoric and ethics in ancient education, and emphasises that the purpose of the treatise's use in rhetorical education was possibly partly moral and ethical.[28] The development of character-sketches for the teaching of character depiction was an important part of the rhetorical curriculum, and a number of rhetoricians discuss character-types reminiscent of Theophrastus' sketches. Quintilian, for example, identifies the representation of 'rustics, superstitious people, misers, and cowards' as a school exercise.[29] It is no coincidence that these four character-types are all dealt with by Theophrastus: the rustic, the superstitious man, and the coward feature in his sketches of the *agroikos*, the *deisidaimōn*, and the *deilos*,[30] while the figure of the miser is spread over three sketches, the *mikrologos* ('skinflint'), the *aneleutheros* ('the mean man'), and the *aischrokerdēs* ('the avaricious man').[31] Parallels are found in Hermogenes, Cicero, and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.[32] It can hardly be

[24] Cf. Immisch 1898, 204, Furley 1953. On the usefulness of Theophrastus' sketches for practical oratory, see Fortenbaugh 2003, 234–237.

[25] For the first view, cf. Hoffman 1920; for the second Vellacott 1967, 9, Ussher 1993, 5–6 and 11–12.

[26] Rusten & Cunningham 2002, 22.

[27] Cf. Diggle 2004, 11–12.

[28] Matelli 1989, 384–386; cf. also Smeed 1985, 7.

[29] Quint. *Inst.* 6,2,17.

[30] Thphr. *Char.* 4, 16, and 25 respectively.

[31] Thphr. *Char.* 10, 22, and 30; cf. Matelli 1989, 382–383.

[32] Hermog. *Id.* 2,2,17 refers to 'gluttons, cowards, or misers, or suchlike', of which only the glutton is not dealt with by Theophrastus. Cicero (*Top.* 83) refers to types 'like the miser, or the flatterer, and others of that kind'; the 'flatterer' *(adsentator*) recalls Theophrastus' *kolax* and *areskos*. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4,63) defines characterisation (*notatio*) as 'describing a person's character by the definite signs which, like distinctive marks, are attributes of that character', and illustrates this with an elaborate description of a man who wants to appear richer than he actually is. As Smeed 1985, 7–8 observes, this is similar to Theophrastus' sketches in that both list typical actions to illustrate the characteristic under consideration; he also points to parallels of detail between the *Rhetorica*'s sketch and Theophrastus' treatment of the man of petty ambition (*mikrophilotimos*, 21) and the boaster (*alazōn*, 23).

doubted that Theophrastus provided a decisive impulse for character typification in rhetoric.[33]

The direct tradition of Theophrastus' treatise provides a good indication of its early circulation. Before the *Characters*' appearance in Byzantine manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries, three papyri preserve some parts of the work. Fragments of *Char.* 7 and 8 are preserved on a papyrus of the 1st century B.C., and a section of *Char.* 5 on a papyrus from Herculaneum; finally, an Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the 3rd century contains the end of *Char.* 25 and the beginning of 26.[34] Theophrastus' influence on Latin and Greek writers is abundant until the end of antiquity. He was well known to numerous rhetoricians and writers, some of whom were contemporary with the novelists.[35] The *Characters* in particular were imitated by Ariston of Ceos (3rd century B.C.), while Philodemus (1st century B.C.) cites *Char.* 5 and the definition to *Char.* 2. In New Comedy, of which Theophrastus' pupil Menander is the best known representative, Theophrastan character types flourish, but the question of whether Theophrastus influenced New Comedy, or vice versa, is debated.[36] There is evidence that both Libanius and Jerome knew Theophrastus' *Characters*.[37] Finally, some scholars have argued that the *Characters* are imitated by Lucian and Petronius, but in neither case is the evidence very strong, and it may be that both writers share a source with Theophrastus rather than being directly influenced by him.[38]

I now turn to the Greek novels. In the light of the foregoing discussion, the question of whether it is possible that their writers and readers were acquainted with Theophrastan character typification must, I think, be answered positively. It is likely that, in view of their direct transmission and their sur-

---

[33] See further Ussher 1993, 9–10, Smeed 1985, 7, Boyce 1947, 23.

[34] P. Hamb. 143; Matelli 1989, 336–337, Diggle 2004, 25–26.

[35] Cf. Fortenbaugh, Huby, Sharples & Gutas 1992. Schmidt 1971, 252 cites awareness of Theophrastus in Macrobius, Martianus Capella, Boethius, Proclus, Ioannes Philoponus, Simplicius, Olympiodorus, and Priscianus Lydus. Quintilian (*Inst.* 10,1,83) underlines the aptness of Theophrastus' name, and Cicero (*Ac*. 1,33, *Brut.* 121) praises his 'sweetness'; he is said to have called Theophrastus his 'own delight' (Plu. *Cic.* 24,6). The lost rhetorical theses with which Theophrastus probably trained his students, are mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (4,27) and Athenaeus (4,5,130d).

[36] As Diggle 2004, 8 notes, five Theophrastan character types (*agroikos*, *apistos*, *deisidaimōn*, *kolax*, *mempsimoiros*) are also names of comedies. Ussher 1977 defends the first option. For a recent account of the utility of Theophrastus for theorising about comic character, see Fortenbaugh 2003, 295–306.

[37] Fortenbaugh 2003, 228 and 233–234.

[38] On Lucian: Macleod 1974, Baldwin 1977. On Petronius: Rosenblüth 1909, 56–62; Raith 1963, 20–27; Walsh 1970, 133–134; Leão 1997, 147–167. Against Diggle 2004, 26; Sullivan 1968, 138–139.

vival in rhetorical education and other authors, Theophrastus' character types were part of the common knowledge of literarily and rhetorically trained people in the first centuries A.D. It is recognised that the Greek novelists draw heavily on common rhetorical training.[39] Among the nine characteristics dealt with by both Theophrastus and Aristotle, eight appear in the Greek novels (*deilia*, *alazoneia*, *anaisthēsia*, *eirōneia*, *agroikia*, *anaischyntia*, *areskeia*, *kolakeia*).[40] We may assume, I think, that these characteristics will indeed have been recognised by the ancient readers as markers establishing, or at least evoking, character typification. The questions that I will set out to answer in this article are three:

(1) Can we discern Theophrastan and/or Aristotelian echoes in the novelists' engagement with these eight character-types?
(2) If so, do they allow us to postulate any direct influence from Theophrastus and/or Aristotle? In others words, do the novels provide us with indications that their writers had direct knowledge of Theophrastus' and/or Aristotle's notions about these eight character-types? I will try to answer both questions by adding a third question:
(3) In which thematic areas do these eight character-types appear? Answering this question will shed light on the particular way in which the novelists engage with these character-types.

Occasional character typification in a variety of contexts

As a first observation, I want to point out that the novels' engagement with our eight character-types is heterogeneous. They appear in a variety of novelistic contexts. Occasionally, minor characters are assimilated to character-types in specific situations. We shall see that Aristotelian and/or Theophrastan ideas can be discerned in these passages. In Heliodorus, for example, Cnemon is assimilated to the character-type of the ***deilos*** ('coward') in two instances. After having overheard part of a woman's soliloquy in Nausicles' house at night, he incorrectly identifies her as Thisbe, whom he had believed to be dead. He almost faints on the spot and, fearing that someone might see him there, he takes to his heels.[41] A little later, a crocodile crosses the path of Cnemon and his companions. While his companions remain undisturbed by

[39] Cf., for example, Hock 1997 and 2005.
[40] *Aneleutheria* does not appear in the Greek novels.
[41] Hld. 5,3,2.

this familiar sight, Cnemon is much perturbed and almost runs away.[42] In an ironical comment, Calasiris explicitly labels both incidents as manifestations of Cnemon's cowardice:

> I thought it was only at night that you suffered from a faint heart, and that your attacks of timidity (*deilia*) were confined to the hours of darkness. But it seems your courage was just as heroic in the daytime all along.[43]

Both passages recall two notions of *deilia* prominent in the discussions of Aristotle and Theophrastus. First, the idea that cowardice is generated by fear is well attested in both authors. Aristotle explicitly links cowardice to an exaggerated development of fear,[44] while Theophrastus' entire sketch portrays the coward affected by fear in different situations (the term appears explicitly in *Char.* 25.7). Second, flight is often the typical manifestation of *deilia*. Since Aristotle discusses cowardice primarily in a military context (see below), he associates cowardice with throwing away one's arms[45] and/or deserting or fleeing.[46] Like Aristotle's, Theophrastus' *deilos* also flees from battle.[47]

Achilles Tatius and Chariton describe minor characters affected by cowardice in a similar context. These passages likewise feature the connection between cowardice, flight, and fear. When Sosthenes, Thersander's slave in Achilles Tatius, is informed that he is being traced by the Ephesian tribunal, he is seized by fear and flees immediately.[48] The narrator labels this behaviour explicitly as *deilia*. In Chariton's novel, Theron's characterisation of one of his companions as *deilos* similarly enacts the connection of cowardice, fear, and flight.[49] When the robber enters the tomb in which Callirhoe has just been buried alive, she throws herself at his feet in an attempt to save her life. The robber, frightened, jumps out of the tomb, and trembles as he

---

[42] Hld. 6,1,2.
[43] Hld. 6,1,3.
[44] Arist. *EN* 1103b18, 1104a22, 1115b24, 1149a8–9; *EE* 1228a33–34, 1228b5–6, 1228b24, 1229b23–24; *MM* 1185b23–26.
[45] *EN* 1119a29–30, 1130a18.
[46] *EN* 1104a21, 1116b16, 1130a30–31, 1137a21–22.
[47] Thphr. *Char.* 25,4.
[48] Ach. Tat. 7,10,4–5: 'he was filled with fear … he mounted a horse and rode with all haste …'
[49] In an earlier passage (1,7,2), Theron characterises two of his companions as *deiloi*, but we are not provided with any further detail.

urges his companions to flee.[50] In some cases, the display of *deilia* is subject to social sanctions by other characters: Theron laughs at the cowardly robber and reproaches him for being *deilos*; Cnemon is ridiculed by Nausicles for his fear of the crocodile.[51] The social regulation of cowardly behaviour also surfaces in Aristotle, who mentions the reproaches directed at cowardice and the honours awarded to bravery.[52]

Some novelistic uses of the concepts of ***kolakeia*** ('flattery') and ***areskeia*** ('obsequiousness') equally recall Aristotelian notions of these vices. In Aristotle's view, both vices are excesses of the same virtue, namely friendliness (*philia*): both the *areskos* and the *kolax* try to generate pleasure in their interlocutors by agreeing with what they say, without ever raising objections. The only passage in a Greek novel to feature *areskeia* echoes this view. Towards the end of Heliodorus' novel, the Ethiopian king Hydaspes is sceptical of Sisimithres' explanation of how he has a grown-up daughter whom he did not know about. He reproaches Sisimithres for not being an independent judge, but rather a passionate advocate of the girl.[53] Sisimithres replies that the king should regard him as his own advocate (since he will prove that he is the girl's father). At the same time, however, he characterises himself as an advocate of justice, and immediately adds that he is only concerned with perfect virtue, and not with *areskeia*.[54] Sisimithres wants to avert the suspicion of *areskeia* that might arise from his explicit alignment with the king's interests. Since the addressee of Sisimithres' speech is the Ethiopian king, who holds the highest position on the social ladder, this episode echoes the Aristotelian idea of the *areskos* assuming a position of inferiority towards others.[55]

In Aristotle's view, the difference between the *areskos* and the *kolax* lies in their ultimate goal: whereas the obsequious person tries to please others for no ulterior reason, the flatterer does so for financial or material gain.[56]

---

[50] Chariton 1,9,4.

[51] Chariton 1,9,5; Hld. 6,1,3.

[52] Arist. *EN* 1116a20.

[53] Hld. 10,14,5.

[54] Hld. 10,14,6–7.

[55] Cf. Arist. *EE* 1233b37–38 ('he who regards another in everything and is inferior to everybody is *areskos*'); *EN* 1125a2–3 ('all *kolakes* are servile, and people lacking in self-respect are *kolakes*'); 1159a15–17 ('the *kolax* is a friend in an inferior position, or pretends to be such and to love more than he is loved').

[56] Cf. Arist. *NE* 1126b12–15 ('some men are thought to be *areskoi*, viz. those who to give pleasure praise everything and never oppose but think it their way to give no pain to the people they meet'); 1127a7–10 ('of those who contribute pleasure, the man who aims at being pleasant with no ulterior object is *areskos,* but the man who does so in order that he

This notion too is echoed by some novelistic passages. Theron, for example, speaks like a *kolax* in one of his speeches to Callirhoe.[57] Before showing Callirhoe to her future buyer Leonas, he addresses her as his daughter and promises that he will eventually bring her back to Syracuse. As both the reader and Callirhoe realise, this is not true: Theron's speech aims only at facilitating Callirhoe's sale by playing on her hopes for a happy life in Syracuse. The fact that he is motivated by the financial profit that will result from Callirhoe's sale aligns him with the *kolax* as discussed by Aristotle. In Heliodorus, Cybele flatters Arsace by praising her beauty.[58] Cybele's *kolakeia* again is externally motivated, albeit not by financial profit but by the wish to know with whom Arsace is in love. The difference in social status of the subject (Cybele, servant) and the object (Arsace, mistress) of the flattery reflects Aristotle's idea that *kolakeia* is servile. In Chariton, this idea is even made explicit: the women from the countryside flatter Callirhoe 'as if she was their mistress'.[59]

A final example of occasional character typification is provided by the use of ***eirōneia*** ('hypocrisy') in two novelistic passages. First, Plangon feigns (*kateirōneusato*) to approve Callirhoe's refusal to marry Dionysius and proposes to abort the heroine's pregnancy.[60] Unlike Callirhoe, the reader knows that Plangon's only goal is to persuade Callirhoe to keep the child and marry Dionysius. Second, a case of alleged hypocrisy appears in Heliodorus. After Cnemon has been falsely and secretly accused by his stepmother of maltreatment, her husband Aristippus punishes his son by flogging. When Cnemon enquires about the reason for his punishment, Aristippus regards this question as a manifestation of Cnemon's hypocrisy (*eirōneias*).[61] Both passages evoke the Theophrastan rather than the Aristotelian sense of *eirōneia*. According to Aristotle, *eirōneia* is the opposite of boastfulness (*alazoneia*) in that both vices are deviations from the same virtue, namely truthfulness (*alētheia*). Whereas *alazoneia* is the pretension to creditable qualities that one does not possess, *eirōneia* is self-deprecation: the *eirōn* 'disclaims or disparages good qualities that he *does* possess'.[62] Although Theophrastan *eirōneia* likwise implies an inconsistency between truth on the one hand and

---

may get some advantage in the direction of money or of the things that money buys is a *kolax*').

[57] Chariton 1,13,7: κολακεύειν ἤρξατο.

[58] Hld. 7,10,1: κολακείας.

[59] Chariton 2,2,1.

[60] Chariton 2,10,6.

[61] Hld. 1,11,2.

[62] Arist. *EN* 1127a23–24.

representation on the part of the character-type on the other, it is not restricted to pretending absence of merits or qualities. Theophrastus' *eirōn* is a dissembler or hypocrite in general. Our two novelistic passages feature the broader, Theophrastan, idea.

Character typification in a military context

There are three contexts where we find a particularly significant deployment of character-types in the novels. The first of these is the military context. It is here that ***deilia*** most frequently occurs in the novels, and thus the character-type conforms closely to Aristotelian and Theophrastan models. For Aristotle and Theophrastus also the military setting is pre-eminently the background against which cowardice is displayed. After mentioning cowardice in dangerous situations in general,[63] Aristotle surveys the circumstances that make soldiers act in a cowardly fashion.[64] Cowardly behaviour in the same context is taken up by Theophrastus, who, after devoting one paragraph to the description of the coward's behaviour at sea, devotes five to the depiction of his behaviour in war.[65] Novelistic instances of *deilia* in a military context also recall Aristotle and/or Theophrastus on a more detailed level. In Achilles Tatius, for example, Cleitophon concludes his narration of the battle between the Boukoloi and the Egyptian army by claiming that Egyptians are characterised alternately by cowardice (*to deilon*) and belligerence (*to machimon*).[66] He argues that this is why the Boukoloi believe that they owe their victory to courage (*andreia*), and not, as he suspects, to deceit. The opposition between cowardice and courage recalls Aristotle's definition of courage as the mean between two vices, of which cowardice is one.[67] Cleitophon specifies that an Egyptian is struck by cowardice 'in times of fear', thus recalling the traditional connection between cowardice and fear. Heliodorus too stages cowardice in a military context. Theagenes considers himself a coward (*deilos*) for having fled from battle, and calls his flight *anandros* ('unmanly'), recalling the same opposition between *andreia* and *deilia*.[68] Another example of cowardly fleeing from battle occurs towards the end of the novel. During the battle between the Persian satrap Oroondates

[63] Arist. *EN* 1103b17 and 1104b8.
[64] Arist. *EN* 1116b15–17.
[65] Thphr. *Char.* 25,2 and 25,5–8 respectively.
[66] Ach. Tat. 4,14,9.
[67] Arist. *EN* 1107b1–4; *EE* 1220b40; *MM* 1186b7–18.
[68] Hld. 2,1,2; on this scene see also Jones (this volume).

and the Ethiopian king Hydaspes, the army of the former flees.[69] The narrator emphasises that Oroondates' behaviour is the most shameful of all: he immediately abandons his chariot to ride away on a horse. He is not explicitly characterised as *deilos*, but his flight and the narrator's comment on it clearly enough depict him as such. The issue of *deilia* is taken up again after he has been taken prisoner by Hydaspes. When Hydaspes asks why he undertook the reckless attack on the Ethiopians, Oroondates answers that his king 'punishes any who show themselves *deiloi* in war more than he honours the *andreioi*'.[70] This answer implies that his king would have considered him a coward if he had not engaged in battle. So again cowardice is explicitly located in a military context and opposed to courage.

A second character-type featuring in military contexts is the ***alazōn*** ('boaster'). In Chariton, Chaereas addresses his three hundred Greek soldiers before their attack on Tyre.[71] To underscore his belief in victory, he assimilates the Tyrians to the Persians who were defeated by three hundred Spartans at Thermopylae, and then contrasts the two groups, asserting that the Tyrians are not as numerous as the Persians, and that they 'combine disdain with boastfulness' (*alazoneia*). What makes the Tyrians boastful is their belief that they are militarily superior to their enemies. Heliodorus too mentions *alazoneia* in connection with military victory. In a letter to the Gymnosophists announcing his victory over the Persians, Hydaspes explains that he does not report his victory to boast (*alazoneuomenos*) about his military triumph, but to show respect to the Gymnosophists' powers of prophecy.[72] Common to both passages is an idea that goes back to Aristotle, who treats boastfulness as the excess of the virtue called truthfulness (*alētheia*)[73] and defines the *alazōn* as someone who 'pretends to creditable qualities that he does not possess, or possesses them in a lesser degree than he professes'.[74] This notion is echoed in Theophrastus' treatment of *alazoneia*.[75] His *alazōn* boasts, among other things, about inner qualities: his knowledge about the world, his generosity, and his hospitality. In the passages in Chariton and Heliodorus, *alazoneia* does indeed refer to the pretension to inner qualities, but situated exclusively on the military level.

---

[69] Hld. 9,19,1.
[70] Hld. 9,21,4.
[71] Chariton 7,3,8–10.
[72] Hld. 10,2,1–2.
[73] Arist. *EN* 1108a21–23, *EE* 1221a6, *MM* 1193a27–33.
[74] Arist. *EN* 1127a22–23. Cf. also *EN* 1127b9–10, *EE* 1234a1–2.
[75] Thphr. *Char.* 23.

A similar, martial, context might be echoed in the use of ***eirōneia*** at Heliodorus 10,31,4. When Theagenes is about to fight the Ethiopian giant, the primary narrator tells us that the latter 'glared at him and smirked; he shook his head ironically (*eirōnikois tois neumasin*) to make clear his contempt for his opponent'. Since the Ethiopian is explicitly said to appear to be contemptuous of his opponent, and since *eirōneia* by definition implies displaying the opposite of what is actually meant, we may assume that the Ethiopian, who is confident of victory, uses his 'ironic nods' to pretend to be afraid of Theagenes, thus ridiculing his opponent. This passage echoes the Aristotelian notion of self-deprecation. The *eirōn* assumes a feigned position of inferiority to another character, but in this case, this self-portrayal is deliberately enacted so as to be recognised as fake by the public watching the fight.

Erotic character typification

It is not surprising that in the Greek *scriptores erotici* erotic contexts contain by far the most examples of Aristotelian and/or Theophrastan character typecasting. Among the eight character types dealt with by both Aristotle and Theophrastus, six on occasion transfer their meaning to an erotic level in the novels: *deilia* ('cowardice'), *alazoneia* ('boastfulness'), *anaisthēsia* ('insensitivity'), *agroikia* ('rusticity'), *anaischyntia* ('shamelessness') and *kolakeia* ('flattery').

One example of erotic character typification, found in Achilles Tatius, nicely bridges erotic and military contexts When Satyrus gives Cleitophon some advice on how to persuade Leucippe to have sex with him, Cleitophon confesses that he fears that he will prove to be too *atolmos* ('timid') and *deilos*.[76] The latter term is echoed when Satyrus answers that Eros does not tolerate any *deilia*, and when Cleitophon, shortly afterwards, addresses himself as *anandre* ('unmanly') and calls himself a 'cowardly (*deilos*) soldier of a manly (*andreiou*) god'.[77] Not only does this passage feature the familiar contrast between courage and cowardice, but the metaphorical description of the lover as a soldier also associates military *deilia*, pre-eminent both in Aristotle and Theophrastus, with the erotic sphere.

[76] Ach. Tat. 2,4,4.
[77] Ach. Tat. 2,5,1.

Interestingly, the meaning of different eroticised character-types converges into a limited number of semantic patterns. First of all, several characteristics deal with a character's refusal to submit to Eros, the rejection of sexual advances, and insensitivity to sexual pleasure or physical beauty. The concept of ***anaisthēsia*** is a case in point. According to Aristotle, it generally refers to insensitivity to pleasure or desire.[78] In the novels, *anaisthēsia* is mentioned explicitly only three times. Apart from Chariton 5,10,3, where the term denotes insensitivity to someone else's misfortunes, it is used in an erotic context. In the first case, it applies to Cleitophon's insensitivity to sexual pleasure. At 5,22,5, Melite complains that Cleitophon does not want to have sex with her, although they have been married shortly before. She reproaches him for being 'as deaf to my demands as iron, wood or some other inanimate object (*ti tōn anaisthētōn*)'. Similarly, Aristotle compares the *anaisthētos* not to iron or wood, but to stone.[79] In the second case, the term denounces insensitivity to physical beauty. In Achilles Tatius, Cleinias reproaches the horse which has killed his boyfriend Charicles in an accident for having been 'insensitive (*anaisthēte*) to the boy's beauty'.[80] Here the idea of *anaisthēsia* is very close to the use of ***agroikia*** in a passage in Heliodorus. In Cybele's speech to her mistress Arsace, the *agroikos* functions as a paradigm of someone who is insensitive to beauty.[81] This passage also recalls Aristotle's discussion, according to which insensitivity (sc. to pleasure) is a characteristic shared by the *anaisthētos* and the *agroikos*.[82]

However, the novelists also apply other characteristics to the general field of erotic insensitivity. In Xenophon of Ephesus, for example, ***deilia*** occurs in a similar context. Anthia reproaches her husband during their wed-

---

[78] Cf. Arist. *EN* 1104a23–25, 1107b6–8 ('deficient with regard to the pleasures'), 1119a6–7 ('people who fall short with regard to pleasures and delight in them less than they should'); *EE* 1230b13–21 ('those who from insensibility [*di' anaisthēsian*] are unmoved by these same pleasures, some call them insensible [*anaisthētous*], while others describe them as such by other names … who keep aloof from even moderate and necessary pleasures'), 1231a27–29 ('the man so constituted as to be deficient in the pleasures in which all must in general partake and rejoice is insensible [*anaisthētos*]'); *MM* 1191b10–12 ('the man who is such as not to be affected by any of these sorts of pleasures'). *EE* 1221a21–23 ('he who is deficient and does not feel desire even so far as is good for him and in accordance with nature, but is as much without feeling as a stone, is insensible [*anaisthētos*]').

[79] Arist. *EE* 1221a22.

[80] Ach. Tat. 1,14,2.

[81] Hld. 7,10,3.

[82] Arist. *EN* 1104a14–25: 'he who shuns all pleasure, as boors [*agroikoi*] do, is insensible [*anaisthētos*]'.

ding night for being *anandros* and *deilos* in delaying and neglecting his love.[83] This refers to Habrocomes' contempt for Eros in the beginning of the novel and his claim that he does not want to submit to the god of love.[84] This use of *deilia* closely resembles the novels' use of ***hyperēphania*** ('arrogance'), which is discussed in Theophrastus (*Char*. 24) but not in Aristotle's ethical writings. Of the thirteen appearances of *hyperēphania* in the novels, eleven occur in an erotic context.[85] To start with Xenophon of Ephesus, all instances of *hyperēphania* apply to the male protagonist Habrocomes. It surfaces for the first time in a *sententia* at the very beginning of the novel: '[Eros] is a contentious god and implacable to the arrogant (*hyperēphanois*)';[86] the arrogance here is Habrocomes' contempt for Eros. Apparently, the heroine too is aware of Habrocomes' reputation: she labels him *hyperēphanos* for the very same reason: 'I am madly in love with Habrocomes; he is handsome but he is arrogant (*hyperēphanōi*) … this man I love is disdainful (*sobaros*)'.[87] When Habrocomes mentions his own *hyperēphania*, the term again refers to his refusal to submit to Eros. Once he is in love with Anthia and experiences the power of Eros, he condemns his former arrogance (*hyperēphanoun*) towards the god and blames it on his ignorance.[88] Later, he recalls this attitude, regarding his captivity as Eros' punishment for his arrogance (*hyperēphanias*).[89] Finally, *hyperēphania* is attributed to Habrocomes by two characters trying to persuade him to have sex with someone other than his wife Anthia: in both cases, the characterisation refers to his refusal. Euxeinus, who acts as a go-between for Corymbus, points out that Habrocomes is in the hands of bandits in a foreign country, and that there is 'no escape from vengeance if you arrogantly reject (*hyperēphanēsanti*) Corymbus'.[90] Manto threatens to punish Habrocomes and 'the accomplices who advised you in your arrogant action (*hyperēphanias*)' if he does not

[83] X. Eph. 1,9,4.
[84] 1,1,5–6: 'when he heard a boy or girl praised for their good looks, he laughed at the people making such claims for not knowing that only he himself was handsome. He did not even recognise Eros as a god … saying that no one would ever fall in love or submit to the god except of his own accord. And whenever he saw a temple or statue of Eros, he used to laugh';
[85] The only two cases in which *hyperēphania* is used outside this context are in Longus (3,30,5; 4,19,5).
[86] X. Eph. 1,2,1.
[87] 1,4,6–7.
[88] 1,4,5.
[89] 2,1,2.
[90] 1,16,5.

comply with her request.[91] This attribution of *hyperēphania* is recalled when Manto is informed about Habrocomes' negative answer: 'how to take revenge on the man who was turning her down (*hyperēphanounta*)'.[92] In short, Habrocomes' *hyperēphania* consistently refers to his refusal to submit to Eros or to have sex with anyone other than his wife Anthia. This recalls a specific characteristic discussed in Theophrastus' account of the *hyperēphanos*: Theophrastus repeatedly depicts this character type as someone who refuses to comply with the requests of others and does not want to come into contact with others.[93] In Xenophon of Ephesus, both notions surface, albeit exclusively on the erotic level.

In Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus too, *hyperēphania* is used exclusively in this context. Interestingly, it again applies only to the male protagonist. Cleitophon is characterized as *hyperēphanos* by two other characters, Satyrus and Melite. This refers to his rejection of Melite's request to marry her and, subsequently, to his refusal to have sex with her after their marriage.[94] Similarly, Heliodorus' hero Theagenes is twice said to be *hyperēphanos,* by Achaemenes and Arsace, because he refuses to submit to Arsace's demands for sex.[95]

Finally, the idea of ***alazoneia*** can also sometimes refer to an unwillingness to respond to the sexual passion of the opposite sex. It appears only in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus and again applies only to the male protagonist. In Achilles Tatius, Cleitophon, who has consistently been declining Melite's proposal of marriage, is told by Cleinias that 'Eros hates those who give themselves airs (*alazonas*)'.[96] In Heliodorus, the term is used by Arsace's servant Cybele, who asks her mistress to reveal to her the object of her love. She explicitly clarifies her use of the term *alazōn* with the following words:

---

[91] 2,5,2.

[92] 2,5,5.

[93] Thphr. *Char.* 24,2: 'the *hyperēphanos* is one who will say, to someone who is in a hurry to speak with him, that he will see him after dinner when he takes his walk'; 24,5: 'when he is being elected to some public office he declines to stand, stating on oath that he cannot spare the time'; 24,8–9: 'if he passes you in the street he will not speak to you, but keeps his head bent down, or, when he chooses, looks up in the air. When he entertains friends he does not dine with them himself, but makes one of his servants look after them'; 24,11: 'he will allow no one to visit him while he is oiling himself, or washing, or eating'.

[94] Ach. Tat. 5,11,6; 5,22,6.

[95] Hld. 7,25,1–2.

[96] Ach. Tat. 5,12,1.

> Who could be so presumptuous or so deranged (*alazōn kai ekphrōn*) as not to capitulate before your beauty or not to consider union in love with you to be very bliss?[97]

As the reader realises, the person about whom Cybele speaks is none other than Theagenes.

A second pattern underlying erotic character typification revolves around physical beauty. The concept of ***agroikia*** is a case in point. The *agroikia* of many characters, referring as it does to their geographical provenance (the countryside as opposed to the city), manifests itself in the absence of physical beauty. This contrasts them to the protagonists of the love stories, whose origin is not the countryside but the city. This pattern features widely, especially in Longus. The narrator of this novel, who is implicitly characterised as a city man, consistently presents people from the countryside as falling short of the physical beauty that distinguishes the protagonists.[98] Immediately after the discovery of Daphnis and Chloe by the countrymen Lamon and Dryas, the narrator emphasises that their beauty is 'too fine for the countryside (*agroikias*)'.[99] This notion frequently surfaces in the remainder of the novel and is paralleled by the idea that physical beauty correlates to the socially elevated status of urban people.[100] The combination of these two ideas appears also in Chariton. When Leonas tells Dionysius that he has bought a very beautiful female slave, Dionysius maintains that a beautiful slave is a contradiction in terms. In his view, Callirhoe only seems beautiful to Leonas because he can only compare her to people from the countryside (*tais agroikois*).[101] In the novels, then, *agroikia* is primarily manifested not in the absence of wittiness, as in Aristotle, or of good manners in social interaction, as in Theophrastus,[102] but in the absence of physical beauty. The traditional connotations of the term *agroikia* have in the novels been replaced by an erotic sense, denoting a lack of beauty. Similarly, Chariton's narrator ascribes *agroikia* to people from the countryside who admire Callirhoe's beauty and recognise the inferiority of their own.[103] In Heliodorus, the pri-

---

[97] Hld. 7,9,5. The translation is Morgan's (1989).

[98] Like the Methymnaean city men, the narrator comes to the countryside to hunt; cf. Morgan 2004, 148. This attitude is part of a broader attitude of disdain towards the country adopted by the narrator; cf. Morgan 2004, 15–16.

[99] Longus 1,7,1.

[100] See for example Longus 1,28,2; 3,32,1; 4,11,2; 4,19,1; 4,20,2; 3,26,4; 4,30,4.

[101] Chariton 2,1,5.

[102] Arist. *EN* 1108a26, 1128a8–10 and Thphr. *Char.* 4.

[103] Chariton 2,2,1; 2,2,6; 2,2,8.

mary narrator invokes the Egyptian brigands' *agroikia* to explain why they regard the beautiful Charicleia as divine and think that she is a priestess or the living statue of a goddess.[104]

In two passages of Chariton, ***alazoneia*** also centres on the issue of physical beauty. Discussing the beauty of Persian and Greek women, the Persian queen Stateira calls the Greeks 'boasters (*alazones*) and beggars'.[105] This, she argues, is why they call Callirhoe beautiful. So, for the Persian queen, the boastfulness of the Greeks consists in claiming that one of them is more beautiful than she actually is. This characterisation is taken up a few paragraphs later: when Rhodogyne challenges Callirhoe in a beauty contest, her beauty makes the Persians believe that she will defeat Callirhoe. They imagine that this defeat will make the Greeks aware that they are boasters (*alazones*).[106] In both passages, *alazoneia* denotes a pretension to a greater beauty than one actually possesses. In this, it both recalls and diverges from Aristotle's and Theophrastus' discussions of the concept, which are concerned with pretension to inner qualities and material possessions.[107] As with *agroikia*, the notions traditionally underlying *alazoneia* have in these passages been displaced to the level of physical beauty.

Thirdly, the novels' use of ***anaischyntia*** ('shamelessness') is also primarily located on an erotic level. In both Aristotle and Theophrastus, shamelessness manifests itself in crossing boundaries of propriety in social interaction. Theophrastus' *anaischyntos*, for example, joins his guests from abroad who have bought theatre seats, but does not pay his part of the cost. The next day, he even brings his sons and the slave who looks after them.[108] By defining the shameless person as 'someone who speaks and acts on every occasion and to all men just as occurs to him' and as 'someone who says and does everything without regard to circumstances',[109] Aristotle also underlines the idea of transgressing social boundaries. Except in two cases (Ach. Tat. 8,9,5 and 8,10,2), this idea, crucial in the novels' depiction of *anaischyntia*, is located exclusively on an erotic level. In Achilles Tatius, rape is

[104] Hld. 1,7,2.
[105] Chariton 5,3,2.
[106] Chariton 5,3,7.
[107] On boasting about inner qualities, cf. Arist. *EN* 1127a22–23, 1127b9–10, and *EE* 1234a1–2. In two instances, Aristotle's definition leaves open the possibility of interpreting the boaster as someone who pretends to have more *material* possessions than he really has: Arist. *EE* 1221a24–25 and *MM* 1186a24–27. This idea occurs also in Theophrastus, whose boaster boasts about money (*Char.* 23,2).
[108] Thphr. *Char*. 9,5. Other examples in 9,2; 9,4; 9,6; 9,7.
[109] Arist. *MM* 1193a3–9.

twice explicitly called an act of *anaischyntia*. Leucippe uses the term of Thersander's threat to force her to have sex with him.[110] This term is repeated when Cleitophon narrates this episode to Leucippe's father Sostratus.[111] Besides the intentional rapist, the adulterer is also depicted as a shameless transgressor of social codes. In his speech before the Persian court, Dionysius, who unjustly suspects Mithridates of having attempted to seduce his wife Callirhoe, refers to his opponent as a 'shameless adulterer (*anaischyntos moichos*)'.[112] A little later, he labels the behaviour of the Persian king Artaxerxes as *anaischyntia* because he postpones the trial to keep Dionysius' wife close by for longer.[113] The same use appears in Achilles Tatius, where Tereus' adultery, depicted on the painting observed by Cleitophon and Leucippe, is referred to as 'shameless adultery (*moicheias anaischyntou*)'.[114] Similarly, Thersander's lawyer Sopater refers to Melite's behaviour as *anaischyntia* when he accuses her of adultery.[115] Finally Cleitophon narrates how he stared shamelessly (*anaischyntōs*) at the object of his love, Leucippe.[116] Here the term refers to the transgression of the boundaries of decency in the expression of erotic feelings. In all these cases, the notion of transgressing social boundaries traditionally evoked by the concept of *anaischyntia* functions exclusively on the erotic level.

Finally, a similar dynamic can be found in two passages in Chariton featuring ***kolakeia***. As already noted, Aristotle says that, unlike the *areskos*, the flattery of the *kolax* is motivated by hope of financial or material profit; Chariton connects flattery with erotic motivation. The suitors flatter (*kolakeuontes*) Callirhoe's servants because they envisage a marriage with the beautiful heroine.[117] The second case is Chaereas' flattery of Callirhoe (*kolakeuein*) soon after their marriage.[118] Here, the flatterer's aim is reconciliation after an emotional disagreement.

---

[110] Ach. Tat. 6,22,2.
[111] Ach. Tat. 8,5,6.
[112] Chariton 5,6,10.
[113] Chariton 6,2,8.
[114] Ach. Tat. 5,4,2.
[115] Ach. Tat. 8,10,9.
[116] Ach. Tat. 2,3,3.
[117] Chariton 1,2,3.
[118] Chariton 1,3,7.

Character typification and social hierarchy

The third and final context for character typification is the social one. In his conversation with a group of strangers, for example, Calasiris suggests that it is 'vulgar and bad-mannered (*tōn agroikoterōn*)' to depart after having shared libations and food without having exchanged introductions.[119] In Theophrastus too the *agroikos* is characterised by a lack of manners: he drinks a bowl of gruel before going to the assembly and claims that garlic smells as sweetly as perfume, he talks at the top of his voice, he sits with his cloak hitched up above his knees, etc.[120]

More often, however, novelistic character typification in a social context relates to social hierarchy rather than to social interaction in general. An example from Chariton featuring ***eirōneia*** will clarify this. When the Persian eunuch suggests that Callirhoe become the Persian king's mistress, her first impulse is to scratch out his eyes. However, she manages to suppress her anger, and addresses the eunuch in an ironic way (*kateirōneusato*), arguing that as a slave of Dionysius she is not worthy to be the King's mistress.[121] Here as elsewhere *eirōneia* reflects the inconsistency between Callirhoe's innermost emotions and her public behaviour in social interaction. Although she is actually furious, she has the presence of mind to hide this emotion. More importantly, however, Aristotle's notion of self-deprecation also comes into play. Callirhoe tries to avoid the eunuch's proposal by casting herself as Dionysius' slave. In reality, however, she has come to Babylon not as Dionysius' slave but as his legally married wife. In this passage, then, the Aristotelian notion of self-deprecation is applied to social status.

The issue of social status is equally important in the novelistic development of the concept of ***alazoneia***. The novels echo Theophrastus' account of the *alazōn*, for whom social hierarchy is a primary concern. Theophrastus' boaster boasts about his extended network of relations in high society: he claims that he served in the army with Alexander, that he was on familiar terms with him, and that he has repeatedly been invited by Antipater to come to Macedonia.[122] When Chariton's Dionysius, for example, enquires about Callirhoe's origin, the heroine answers that she prefers not to reveal it because she does not want to appear boastful (*alazōn*) about her former station

---

[119] Hld. 4,16,5.
[120] Thphr. *Char.* 4,2; 4,4.
[121] Chariton 6,5,8–9.
[122] Thphr. *Char.* 23,3–4.

in life, which was more respectable than her present one.[123] The meaning of these words is obvious: she, the daughter of the great general Hermocrates, has been sold as a slave to Dionysius and thus subjected to the ultimate humiliation. The boastfulness mentioned by Callirhoe refers to the apparent pretension to a higher social status that would emerge from her account. Since her original social status was much more elevated than her present one, she would appear to be a boastful slave if she told the truth. In my second example, the Persian eunuch Artaxates believes that Callirhoe will spread the news about the King's love for her because of her 'boasting (*alazoneias*) that the King loves her'.[124] In Artaxates' view, Callirhoe's hypothetical boastfulness would originate from the awareness that her beauty provides her with access to the highest social level in the Persian Empire. A last instance of this use of *alazoneia* is found in Heliodorus 7,19,2. Here the words *to alazonikon* refer to the pompous splendour with which Arsace, the wife of the Persian satrap Oroondates, receives Theagenes in her quarters. The term denotes the display of social superiority at the Persian court towards the Greek guest. However, the splendour does not have the expected effect on Theagenes: he refuses to kneel or to perform *proskynēsis*, which outrages the court. In all three passages, the importance attached to social status by Theophrastus' boaster is echoed by a similar concern in the boasting of Callirhoe and Arsace, hypothetical or real. An amusing variant on this aspect of boastfulness may be found in Achilles Tatius. Cleitophon's servant Satyrus tells Conops, the slave of Leucippe's mother, a story about a gnat and a lion. The gnat, whom Satyrus characterises as *alazōn*, claims that the lion is no more beautiful than he, nor stronger, nor bigger, and that consequently he cannot rule (*basileuein*) over the gnat as over the other animals.[125] The term *basileuein* and the gnat's claim to be superior to the lion clearly suggest that the concept of *alazoneia* is displaced from its normal social context to that of the animal kingdom.

Conclusion

Let us return to the three questions that this article set out to answer. I started my discussion by stating that answering the third question (on the possibility of discerning thematic areas in character typification) would help us to an-

[123] Chariton 2,5,8–9.
[124] Chariton 6,6,7.
[125] Ach. Tat. 2,22,1–7.

swer the first and the second one (on the presence of Aristotelian/ Theophrastan echoes and the possibility of direct influence respectively). So let me start by taking up the answers given to this last question. Although the novelists' engagement with character typification is marked, to a certain extent, by heterogeneity, the foregoing analysis has shown that it tends to cluster around certain specific semantic areas. I have singled out three such areas as displaying a significant use of character-types: the military, the erotic, and the social contexts. Within these areas, we can, broadly speaking, distinguish two patterns of the use of character-types in the novels. First, the context in which the character-types appear echoes Aristotelian and/or Theophrastan ideas. This is the case in the appearance of the *deilos* in military contexts and of the *alazōn* in contexts enacting a concern with social status. Second, and more frequently, traditional notions evoked by the use of a character-type are displaced to another level. This is the case, for example, in the appearance of *alazoneia* and *eirōneia* in military contexts and of *eirōneia* in social contexts. This second dynamic is particularly noticeable in the use of character-types in an erotic context. Within this context, character typification is mainly situated in three semantic areas. First, several character-types relate to the refusal to submit to Eros, rejection of sexual advances, or insensitivity to sexual pleasure or physical beauty. Most of the character-types used to develop this idea (*anaisthēsia*, *agroikia*, *deilia*, *hyperēphania*, *alazoneia*) transfer their normal connotations, exemplified in Aristotle and Theophrastus, to the erotic sphere, with the result that characteristics traditionally associated with a certain character become erotically coloured. The traditional notion of insensitivity, for example, evoked by the character type of the *agroikos*, becomes insensitivity to physical beauty, and the *hyperēphanos*, traditionally characterised by an unwillingness to have social contact, is characterised in the novels by an unwillingness to have *sexual* contact. In these cases, the characteristics primarily apply to the *male* protagonists. Interestingly, many of the instances of *deilia*, *hyperēphania*, *alazoneia* and *anaisthēsia* appearing in this context go to the heart of the ancient Greek novel hero's identity. In most cases (Xenophon, Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus), they relate to the hero's rejection of sexual advances or to his insensitivity to the prospect of having sex with women other than the heroine. As indicated in the main section of this article, all these characteristics are attributed to the heroes not by the primary narrator of the story, but by other characters, who disapprove of the hero's detachment from sexual desire for other women and therefore characterise him by using negative character types. This implies an interesting inversion of the Aristotelian and

Theophrastan discussions of these characteristics: these terms, referring to vices and negative characteristics in Aristotle and Theophrastus, are taken up by characters who reject what readers and the novelists themselves consider to be one of the heroes' basic *virtues* and one of the hallmarks of the genre, namely their sexual fidelity to the heroine. Second, a number of character-types (*agroikia*, *alazoneia*) thematise the importance of physical beauty. Here again, we find the transfer of traditional notions to the erotic level. Novelistic *agroikoi* are not characterised by a lack of good manners or of wittiness, but by an absence of physical beauty. Similarly, some novelistic *alazones* do not boast about money or about social status, but about physical beauty. Third, the same dynamic applies to the novelists' engagement with *anaischyntia*, which systematically enacts the traditional notion of the transgression of social codes in an erotic context, and with *kolakeia*, which relocates the notion of profit traditionally attached to the behaviour of the *kolax* to an erotic level.

From these observations it is clear that our first question (can we discern Aristotelian and/or Theophrastan ideas in the novelists' engagement with the eight character types?) should be answered positively:

First, some characteristics reflect both Aristotle and Theophrastus at the same time; these are *deilia*, *anaischyntia*, and *eirōneia*. When employed in a military context (as in Achilles and Heliodorus), *deilia* echoes three notions present in both Aristotle and Theophrastus: (1) *deilia* is generated by fear; (2) fleeing from battle is a typical act characterising the *deilos*; and (3) *deilia* is opposed to *andreia*. In other contexts too (in Heliodorus, Achilles, and Chariton), flight and fear are associated with *deilia*. Moreover, Aristotle's notion that *deilia* is subject to social sanctions is also present (in Heliodorus and Chariton). The novelists' conception of *anaischyntia* relates, in most cases, to the transgression of codes guiding social interaction (Chariton, Achilles), as in Aristotle and Theophrastus. Finally *eirōneia* in some cases (Heliodorus, Chariton) combines the Theophrastan idea of dissembling and the Aristotelian notion of self-deprecation.

Second, a number of novelistic instances of *anaisthēsia*, *agroikia*, and *kolakeia* feature Aristotelian rather than Theophrastan views of these characteristics. *Anaisthēsia* (in Achilles) denotes insensibility to sensory stimuli, as in Aristotle, rather than forgetfulness and drowsiness. One instance of *agroikia* (in Heliodorus) concerns insensitivity to physical beauty rather than bad manners. Finally *kolakeia* reflects the Aristotelian notions both of aiming at gain and of servility (Chariton, Heliodorus).

Third, and conversely, *alazoneia*, *agroikia*, *eirōneia*, and *hyperēphania* reflect ideas from Theophrastus. *Alazoneia* (Chariton, Heliodorus) denotes pretension to a higher social status than one possesses in reality. One case in Achilles offers an amusing variation on this motive. In Heliodorus, *agroikia* recalls Theophrastus' notion of bad manners. In some cases (Chariton, Heliodorus) *eirōneia* recalls Theophrastus' depiction of the dissembler. Finally, *hyperēphania* (in Xenophon, Achilles, and Heliodorus) recalls two Theophrastan notions: refusing to comply with a request, and refusing contact with others.

Our second question (do the novels show any signs of direct influence from Aristotle and/or Theophrastus?) should be answered with some caution. The novels' engagement with Aristotelian and Theophrastan character types does not offer any specific verbal resonances of either author. Rather, it offers resonances of ideas, actions, and types of behaviour present in one or both. This observation does not warrant the conclusion that the Greek novelists had direct access to Theophrastus' *Characters* or Aristotle's *EN*, *EE*, or *MM*. Instead, I judge it more likely that the character-types, along with some basic notions intrinsically connected with them, originating from Aristotle's ethical writings on virtue and vice and developed by Theophrastus, had become a part of rhetorical education by the first centuries B.C. and thus of the cultural patrimony of rhetorically and literarily educated people. In my view, the novelists' use of these character-types is an aspect of their engagement with the literary toolkit developed in rhetorical education. The novelists exploit character-types that ultimately go back to Theophrastus and Aristotle, but, as far as I can see, they do not offer us any indication that direct acquaintance is more likely than indirect influence through the rhetorical tradition that preserved and transmitted these character-types from the first centuries B.C. onwards.[126]

Bibliography

Anderson, W. 1970. *Theophrastus. The Character Sketches*. Translated with notes and introductory essays, Kent: Kent State University Press.

Baldwin B. 1977. 'Lucian and Theophrastus', *Mnemosyne* 30, 174–176.

[126] Research underlying this publication was funded by the Fund for Scientific Research – Flanders (Belgium) (F.W.O.-Vlaanderen) and the Belgian American Educational Foundation. I would like to thank Susan Stephens for her trenchant criticism and helpful comments. Any errors or oversights are entirely my own.

Barton, T.S. 1994. *Power and Knowledge. Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Billault, A. 1996. 'Characterization in the ancient novel', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 115–129.

Boyce, B. 1947. *The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642*, Cambridge, MA:
Harvard University Press.

Diggle, J. 2004. *Theophrastus. Characters*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fortenbaugh, W.W. 2003. *Theophrastan Studies*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Fortenbaugh, W.W. 1994. 'Theophrastus, the *Characters* and rhetoric', in: W.W. Fortenbaugh & D.C. Mirhady (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, New Brunswick, N. J. – London: Transaction Publ., 15–35.

Fortenbaugh, W.W., Huby, P.M., Sharples, R.W. & Gutas, D. (Ed. and transl. by) 1992. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Part Two: Psychology, Human Physiology, Living Creatures, Botany, Ethics, Religion, Politics, Rhetoric and Poetics, Music, Miscellanea*, Leiden – New York – Boston: Brill.

Furley, D.J. 1953. 'The purpose of Theophrastus' *Characters*', *SO* 30, 56–60.

Hock, R.F. 1997. 'The rhetoric of romance', in: S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*, Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 445–465.

Hock, R.F. 2005. 'The educational curriculum in Chariton's *Callirhoe*', in J.-A.A. Brant, C.W. Hedrick & C. Shea (ed.) *Ancient Fiction. The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 15–36.

Hoffman, C. 1920. *Das Zweckproblem von Theophrasts Charakteren*, Breslau (diss.).

Immisch, O. 1898. 'Ueber Theophrasts Charactere', *Philologus* 57, 193–212.

Leão, D.F. 1997. 'Trimalquião à luz dos *Caracteres* de Teofrasto', *Humanitas* 49, 147–167.

Lombardi, M. 1999a. 'Paradigmi caratteriologici ed osservazione empirica nei «Caratteri» di Teofrasto e nei « hysiognomonica» pseudoaristotelici', *RCCM* 41.1, 111–121.

Lombardi, M. 1999b. 'L'illiberalità nei Caratteri IX, X, XXII, XXX di Teofrasto tra etica aristotelica, endoxa, tipizzazione comica e realismo biotico', *RCCM* 41.2, 209–218.

Macleod, M.D. 1974. 'Lucian's knowledge of Theophrastus', *Mnemosyne* 27, 75–76.

Matelli, E. 1989. 'Libro e testo nella tradizione dei Caratteri di Teofrasto', *S&C* 13, 329–386.

Morgan, J.R. 1989. 'Heliodorus. An Ethiopian Story', in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 349–588.

Morgan, J.R. 1993. 'Make-believe and make believe: the fictionality of the Greek novels', in: C. Gill & T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 175–229.

Morgan, J.R. (With an introduction, translation and notes by) 2004. *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Aris & Phillips.

Raith, O. 1963. *Petronius ein Epikureer*, Nuremberg: Verlag Hans Carl.

Rosenblüth, M. 1909. *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren*, Berlin (diss.).

Russell, D.A. 1983. *Greek Declamation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, D.A. 1990. 'Ethos in oratory and rhetoric', in: C. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 197–212.

Rusten, J. & Cunningham, I.C. (Ed. and transl. by) 2002. *Theophrastus. Characters. Herodas. Mimes. Sophron and Other Mime Fragments*, Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press.

Schmidt, C.B. 1971. 'Theophrastus in the Middle Ages', *Viator* 2, 251–270.

Smeed, J.W. 1985. *The Theophrastan 'Character'. The History of a Literary Genre*, Oxford – New York: Clarendon Press.
Sullivan, J.P. 1968. *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study*, London: Faber.
Ussher, R.G. 1977. 'Old comedy and 'character': some comments', *G&R* 24, 71–79.
Ussher, R.G. (ed. with introduction, commentary and index) 1993. *The Characters of Theophrastus: introduction commentary and index* (rev. ed.), Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
Vellacott, P. (trans.) 1967. *Theophrastus. The Characters. Menander. Plays and Fragments*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Walsh, P.G. 1970. *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.