

Andreia and Gender in the Greek Novels¹

MERIEL JONES
University of Wales, Lampeter

Introduction

Focusing on Chariton and Heliodorus, this paper analyses the Greek novels' conception of the cardinal philosophical virtue of *andreia*. It begins by identifying the prototypical spheres of *andreia* in both philosophical and more general cultural contexts, and examining the role played by gender stereotypes in the formation of ancient thought on *andreia*. It then explores the extent to which the novels advance a philosophy of *andreia*, borrowing and manipulating classical philosophical doctrine to create a complex virtue which reflects the novels' classical dramatic settings, as well as more contemporary concerns.

The early history of scholarship on the Greek novels was marked by a tendency to regard the male protagonists as somewhat passive, merely enduring the vicissitudes of separation from home and family, until they are finally restored to their rightful places in society, and reunited with the ones they love.² However, the potentially negative value-judgement inherent in reading the heroes as 'passive' has since been renegotiated, and they have instead been read as a new heroic strain, whose heroism resides in that very endurance of circumstances ultimately beyond their control, and often divinely manufactured.³ Yet the identification of the enduring male as a new heroic strain requires some qualification. The roots of this strain surely lie in Homeric epic, and particularly in the characterisation of Odysseus, fre-

¹ This piece is a much condensed version of one of the chapters of my PhD thesis. All translations from the Greek novels are taken from Reardon 1989, unless otherwise stated; all other translations are my own. Many thanks to the members of the panel of which this paper formed a part, and to the audience, for their valuable observations.

² The prime exponent of the view that the male protagonists are weakly and passive was Rohde 1914.

³ See, for example, Konstan 1994 and Haynes 2003.

quently the bearer of the epithet *πολύτλας/πολυτλήμων* ('much-enduring').⁴ Still more significant, perhaps, is Apollonius of Rhodes' Jason, the hero of an epic which Heiserman regarded as the Hellenistic precursor of Imperial novelistic sensibilities.⁵ While we might reasonably regard the protagonists' endurance as constituting heroism on an Apollonian or Odyssean model, Chariton and Heliodorus, the authors of (perhaps) the earliest and the latest extant novels, seem almost to be responding to criticisms of passivity that might be levelled against their heroes. Towards the end of their novels, both authors engage their heroes in remarkable feats of bravery, Chaereas in a martial context, and Theagenes in an athletic one.⁶ These feats of *andreia* overlay the image of the enduring hero with a more conservative conception of what it meant to be a man. Nonetheless, as this paper argues, the 'passivity' of tears, self-pity, and introspection is not intended to be erased by last-minute 'activity', but provided with a counter-weight, or complement, in the creation of a rounded adult male.

The context of andreia in ancient thought

Ἄνδρεία is often translated into English as 'courage', but the word 'courage' has manifold applications: a person can exhibit courage in a wide variety of contexts.⁷ It seems that for the Greeks, *andreia* could be just as hazy a concept as 'courage' can be for us, a fact evidenced by Plato's *Laches*. The dialogue begins with the intention of deciding the best means of instilling *aretē* in the young, but it is soon agreed that for this purpose the interlocutors must first define *aretē* itself. Hoping to simplify the issue, they decide to reduce *aretē* to one of its constituent parts, *andreia*, and attempt a definition of that.⁸ Laches' initial optimism at the prospect of defining *andreia* is soon shown to be misplaced, as what he thought would prove an easily definable term refuses to fit his suggestions.⁹ In Platonic dialogues, Socrates' *elenchos* en-

⁴ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 8,97, *Od.* 18,319, amongst many others. On Odysseus as a model for the heroes of the novels, see Lalanne 2006, 128.

⁵ Heiserman 1977, 13.

⁶ Theagenes also demonstrates his athleticism in a foot race at the Pythian Games in the fourth book, although the positioning of his bull- and giant-wrestling towards the climax of the work establishes these scenes as the most significant in terms of the construction of a 'manly' hero.

⁷ On the difficulties of defining the English word 'courage', see Walton 1986.

⁸ Pl. *La.* 190e.

⁹ *Ibid.* 194b.

courages his interlocutors to look beyond the superficial to establish more profound definitions of common concepts, for the benefit of their souls; however, the immediate and superficial responses of his fellow-speakers still hold value, for they expose the ways in which the majority define those common concepts. The conservative *stratēgos* Laches' first definition of *andreia* is valuable for precisely this reason, since it betrays the normative cultural assumption that *andreia* is primarily and fundamentally concerned with military duty: according to Laches, a man is *andreios* if he is willing to stand his ground in battle.¹⁰ The assumption of an inextricable link between *andreia* and warfare appears common in Greek ethical discourse: for Aristotle, too, the truly *andreios* man is one who confronts a noble death, while the best circumstances for such a glorious end are offered by warfare.¹¹

But it is not only warfare that allows a man to demonstrate his *andreia*. While classical figures like Laches and Aristotle might have located *andreia* on the battlefield, there is some evidence to suggest that in protracted periods of peace, athletics might serve as a simulation of warfare, providing a substitute *locus* for the display of *andreia*. So we find Imperial texts citing a man's involvement in sport as proof of his possession of *andreia*.¹² Dio Chrysostom eulogises a recently deceased boxer as follows:

One would admire Melancomas especially because, as well as being of such a kind [i.e. beautiful] in outward form, he excelled in *andreia* ... And so, understanding that, of the actions leading to *andreia*, the finest and also the most arduous is athletics, he made that his goal. For there was no opportunity for military activity, and moreover the training [for war] is easier. I would say that it is inferior in this respect also, that in military matters there is a display of courage [*eupsychia*] alone, while athletics simultaneously instils *andreia* and strength and *sōphrosynē*.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid. 190e. For the soldier as the embodiment of 'courage' in a modern context, see Walton 1986, 32 and Morgan 1994.

¹¹ Arist. *EN* 1115a30ff.

¹² See Connolly 2003, 12 on the Imperial Period as one which offered an elite male relatively few opportunities to be *andreios* in battle, and which consequently saw a migration of *andreia* from the battlefield to the stadium.

¹³ D. Chr. 29,8ff.

Through athletics, then, one may develop a wider range of virtues than through warfare, for sport generates both *andreia* and *sōphrosynē*.¹⁴ Furthermore, a little later in the oration, Dio explicitly states that athletics ranks higher than warfare in its capacity to stimulate *andreia*.¹⁵ Dio's praise of athletics as an arena for *andreia* is of course motivated by his duty as eulogist in this oration, but it is nonetheless revealing for the assumption it makes that its audience will understand a connection between warfare and athletics as the primary *loci* for *andreia*. Lucian's dialogue, *Anacharsis*, is also useful here. According to Solon, athletes are *arrenōpoi* ('manly of aspect') and they display *to andrōdes* ('manliness').¹⁶ Solon explains the relation of athletics to warfare, arguing that athletic training is a kind of 'transferable skill': athletics prepares young men for warfare and allows them to outstrip their enemies in military ability; by observing athletes in training, one may infer how they might comport themselves in battle.¹⁷ The number of inscriptions commemorating athletic victors, together with treatises and other texts on athletics,¹⁸ suggest a contemporary concern with the display of masculinity through physical endeavour in the gymnasium; this is a concern that is still relevant for Heliodorus in the third or fourth century, as we shall see. The widely held ideal of the *andreios* warrior was a role which legitimated violence;¹⁹ in peacetime athletics offered an outlet for such violence, requiring the exercise of additional virtues such as *sōphrosynē* and *karteria*.

The gendering of andreia

Philosophical and quasi-philosophical texts thus reveal two basic prototypes of *andreia*, the soldier and the athlete. *Andreia*, then, is a virtue belonging to men, and one which is performed publicly; indeed, its very etymology makes it a particularly masculine virtue, so that it has the sense not just of 'cour-

¹⁴ An Imperial Greek inscription from Smyrna honours a pancratiast for his ἀνδρεία τε καὶ σοφροσύνη; see van Nijf 2003, 263ff.; I shall return later to the connection between *andreia* and *sōphrosynē*.

¹⁵ D. Chr. 29,15ff.

¹⁶ Lucian *Anach.* 25.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 36.

¹⁸ Of which Dio's Melancomas orations are just two; see also Philostratus' *Gymnasticus*. König 2005 is the most important recent treatment of the phenomenon, but see also van Nijf 2003 and 2004.

¹⁹ See Alston 1998 on the status of the Roman *vir* as a wielder of legitimate power through military service.

age', but also of 'manliness'. But this does not automatically exclude women from the exhibition of *andreia*. It does seem, however, that female *andreia* was perceived as intrinsically different from male *andreia*, and far narrower in its scope. Aristotle understands male and female virtues in terms of dominance and submissiveness respectively, so that *sōphrosynē*, *dikaiosynē*, and *andreia* are virtues of command when possessed by men, but of subordination when possessed by women.²⁰ For him, male and female *andreia* are not simply qualitatively different, but also quantitatively so: for example, if a man had only the amount of *andreia* possessed by a particularly brave woman, he would be thought a coward.²¹ Classical texts imply that the female exhibition of *andreia* – and certainly any involvement in the traditional arenas of *andreia* – was considered to some degree unnatural. Involving themselves in the civil war, Thucydides' Corcyraean women are said to throw tiles at the enemy and to withstand the din of the fighting in a manner that is *para physin* ('beyond their nature').²² The word ἀνδρεία itself does not appear in this passage, yet the women's involvement in warfare suggests that they are partaking to a certain extent in *andreia*, with the corollary implication that it is in some way unnatural, despite the women's positive intent. We find a reflection of this attitude in a very similar scene in Heliodorus. Here, after the pseudo-kidnap of Charicleia from Delphi, the Delphian women assist in the expedition to recover her:

Many women thought in a way more manly than their nature [ἀνδρεϊότερον τῆς φύσεως]; they seized whatever came to hand as a weapon and ran after the men, but to no avail, for they could not keep up and had to admit the inherent weakness of the female sex.²³

It is therefore possible for women to display a certain amount of *andreia*, but, as we have seen from Aristotle, it will never equal that possessed by men. Like that of the Corcyraean women, the behaviour of the Delphian women is anomalous: they are attempting to engage in warfare, a traditionally male sphere of activity, and are thus laying claim to an *andreia* that is out of keeping with female *physis*; small wonder, then, that the masculinity they have appropriated is temporary and cannot be maintained.

²⁰ Arist. *Pol.* 1260a21ff.

²¹ Ibid. 1277b20ff.

²² Th. 3,74.

²³ Hld. 4,21,3; trans. modified.

What kind of *andreia* can women reasonably show? We have already noted Aristotle's contention that female *andreia* is shown through subordination, rendering it distinct from male *andreia*. The first-century Stoic Musonius Rufus also establishes a particularly female version of *andreia*. He states categorically that *andreia* is not fitting for men alone,²⁴ and that the educated woman (*pepaideumenē*) possesses more *andreia* than the uneducated.²⁵ The latter argument serves to detach *andreia* from physical strength, and to cement its relationship to the mental faculties, suggesting that it is at least in part a product of *paideia*.²⁶ Musonius makes the seemingly radical recommendation that women ought *andrizesthai* ('to show courage', 'to show *andreia*').²⁷ However, the suggestion that women partake in an element of masculinity is directed toward a very particular goal, the protection of chastity: to Musonius' mind, the best kind of woman will show *andreia*, which in turn will provide the *sōphrosynē* needed to prevent her from being persuaded or forced into bed.²⁸ Just such a form of *andreia* is displayed by Xenophon of Ephesus' Anthia. In Xenophon's third book, Anthia is on the point of being forced into marriage to Perilaus. Deciding that death is her only hope of preserving her chastity, she steels herself to drink a supposed draught of poison, which is in fact a sleeping drug:

Will you wrong Habrocomes, your husband, your beloved, the one who died for you? I am not so cowardly [*anandros*] or wretched [*deilē*] in times of trouble. Let this be decided: let me drink the draught; Habrocomes alone must be my husband; I want him, even dead.²⁹

Anthia's *andreia* is the quality that enables her to maintain her chastity and her fidelity to Habrocomes, by giving her the courage to face death.³⁰ In the fourth book she takes a rather less self-sacrificing stance in the preservation

²⁴ Muson. 4 (Lutz).

²⁵ Ibid. 3.

²⁶ Cf. Xenophon's Socrates, who marvels at a female acrobat leaping amongst swords 'even though she is a woman'. He adduces the spectacle as evidence that *andreia* may be learned (*Smp.* 2,12), and implies that, as a woman, the acrobat cannot possess *andreia* by nature. On the Socratic and early Stoic understanding of *andreia* as knowledge, see further Cullyer 2003. I shall return later to distinctions between natural and learned *andreia*.

²⁷ Muson. 4.

²⁸ Ibid. 3. On Musonius' conception of *andreia* here, see Goldhill 1995, 137–143, and Whitmarsh 2001, 112–113.

²⁹ X. Eph. 3,6,3; trans. mine.

³⁰ Konstan (forthcoming) also notes this instance of *andreia* directed towards the preservation of chastity.

of her chastity. While held by Hippothous' gang, she is the victim of an attempted sexual assault by one of the robbers, Anchialus, and is forced to turn a bandit sword upon him, killing him: 'And she, being in a desperate state, snatched a sword that was lying beside her and struck Anchialus'.³¹ Although Xenophon does not explicitly refer to this incident as an example of *andreia*, Anthia's earlier use of the adjective *anandros* in the context of the protection of chastity suggests that the concept of *andreia* is implicit here too: she temporarily assumes a masculine role in a battle to protect her chastity – a battle of which Musonius would doubtless have approved. While we might read this assumption of masculinity as a transgression of the boundaries of Anthia's 'natural' state, her action in fact serves to reinforce her status and to underscore her obligation, as the wife of Habrocomes, to protect her chastity. Furthermore, the scene is reminiscent of the examples we have seen in Thucydides and Heliodorus, where the Corcyraean and Delphian women seize whatever comes to hand to use as weapons: as in those scenes, Anthia's *andreia* is not calculated, but reactive and the product of desperation (ἡ δὲ ἐν ἀμηχανῷ κακῷ γενομένη), while the weapon she uses just happens to be lying beside her (τὸ παρακείμενον ξίφος). After the killing she reverts to her 'natural' state, becoming fearful and contemplating suicide or flight. Concluding that she cannot run away for want of someone to lead her, she decides to wait and see what fortune brings: having done its job of protecting her chastity, Anthia's *andreia* appears to have deserted her. One might argue that from the perspective of male writers, the purpose of a woman paradoxically assuming the masculine quality of *andreia* is merely to reinforce the socially normative functions the reader expects of her.

We find further examples of female *andreia* in Heliodorus. In the first, Charicleia faces an unwanted marriage to the pirate Trachinus, but Calasiris has a plan to avoid it. He encourages Theagenes and Charicleia to confront the danger they face, so that they will either escape or die courageously (*andreiōs*) and in chaste condition (*sōphronōs*).³² The reference to a chaste death can at this point only be directed at Charicleia: although Theagenes is later called upon to preserve his own chastity against the advances of Arsace, as yet the only chastity under threat is Charicleia's; her courageous death would therefore serve to protect what we have been told by Persinna's embroidered band is the single identifying mark of female *aretē*.³³ However, the nature of Calasiris' plan seems to grant a broader scope to Charicleia's *an-*

³¹ X. Eph. 4,5,5ff.; trans. mine.

³² Hld. 5,29,6.

³³ Ibid. 4,8,7.

dreia than merely the Musonius-style protection of her chastity: escape entails her assumption of the manly task of battle with the pirates, and Heliodorus tells us that when the fight breaks out, neither Theagenes nor Charicleia holds back from it.³⁴ But Charicleia's manner of fighting differs significantly from Theagenes': while he fights with a sword in hand-to-hand combat, she fires arrows from a hidden position on the ship.³⁵ Literary sources reveal a tension in the way archery was construed. Fighting with arrows from a distance – although a regular part of Greek warfare – was frequently represented as less than *andreios*: in its use of cunning and concealment, it might be thought a method of fighting particularly suited to women.³⁶ So, Homer's Diomedes famously likens Paris to a woman or a child for wounding him with an arrow from a hidden position, and Euripides' Lycus claims that Heracles lacks *eupsychia* because he fights with bow and arrow, rather than sword and shield.³⁷ Paradoxically, however, it was also thought a more intelligent (and so potentially more masculine?) way of fighting: Heracles' father Amphitryon asserts that the bow and arrow are the weapons of the wise, allowing the archer to inflict wounds while preserving his own life,³⁸ and when Dio's Achilles complains to Cheiron that archery is cowardly and beneath him, Cheiron retorts with a warning which draws a distinction between Iliadic brute force and a more sophisticated style of combat which relies on intelligence:

... but those who are like you – *andreios* and mindless – you will kill easily; but you will die at the hand of a man who is intelligent [*phronimos*] and warlike [*polemikos*], without even seeing him.³⁹

³⁴ Ibid. 5,32,3.

³⁵ Ibid. 5,32,4.

³⁶ See McInerney 2003, 233ff. on Plutarch's presentation of female *andreia* as ambiguous and not 'in the open' like traditional male *andreia*.

³⁷ Hom. *Il.* 11,384ff.; E. *HF* 162–164.

³⁸ E. *HF* 198ff.

³⁹ D. Chr. 58,6, trans. modified. Cheiron also asks Achilles if he finds women more courageous (*andreioteras*) because they fight at close quarters; the proposition that women might possess more *andreia* than men is so preposterous that it serves as proof that close-quarters combat is not the sole or even the primary *locus* of *andreia*. See also Ach. Tat. 2,22,1ff., which plays metaphorically with 'gendered' styles of fighting and the ambiguity of archery: in the fable of the lion and the gnat, the gnat questions in what the lion believes his *alkē* resides, since the lion fights by scratching and biting like a woman; the gnat, by contrast, has superior *alkē*, because he can attack like bow and arrow, without being seen; he is, however, bested by the greater cunning of the spider.

Charicleia's archery thus carries the double and paradoxical connotation of womanly cunning and manly intelligence, and serves as a complement to Theagenes' physical strength.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, an educated contemporary reader would be hard-pressed to read it without consciousness of its ambiguities. Ultimately, Charicleia's access to manliness is limited: she must stop firing arrows lest she hit Theagenes, and it falls to him to finish the fight by traditional one-on-one combat, spurred on by Charicleia's cries of 'Ἀνδρίζου, φύλαττε' ('Be brave, my love').

There is clearly a difficulty associated with ascribing to a woman a virtue that is so tightly connected to masculinity: Charicleia may exhibit her *andreia* in battle, but in a very specific and curtailed manner, which is geared to the protection of chastity. However, of all novel heroines she is the one to whom *andreia* is most accessible, and her status as a princess may be the reason for this. She is, we remember, no run-of-the-mill elite girl, but heiress to a throne, a factor underlined by her father Hydaspes as he is on the point of sacrificing her: he instructs her to display her 'brave and royal mind',⁴¹ apparently relating *andreia* to royalty and to the intellect. It is of course a philosophical commonplace that kings, more than anyone else, should possess *andreia*;⁴² thus perhaps we can see why a king's daughter might be the bravest of heroines.⁴³ In the philosophical tradition *andreia* is activated and enhanced by means of one's intellect,⁴⁴ and we observed above that Musonius' philosophically trained *pepaideumenē* has more *andreia* than her uneducated counterpart. So we can see philosophical presences in Hydaspes' reference to Charicleia's 'brave and royal mind'. But Heliodorus is

⁴⁰ We shall see shortly that Theagenes himself is skilled in intelligent combat.

⁴¹ Hld. 10,16,9; trans. mine: ... τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ... φρόνημα καὶ βασιλείον ... Hydaspes' use of the verb ἐπιδείκνυμι emphasises the public and epideictic nature of *andreia*: it is a virtue to be exhibited before an audience.

⁴² E.g. Muson. 8; D. Chr. 62,4. That both men make this point is no surprise, given that Musonius is likely to have been Dio's teacher, and both are influenced by Hellenistic kingship ideals.

⁴³ The anonymous tract, *Γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταῖ καὶ ἀνδρείαι* (*Women Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare*), also appears to relate *andreia* to royalty: the text enumerates women – and specifically queens – who have distinguished themselves in war. Its air of paradoxography implies that the women are unusual in their involvement in war, and overall the text suggests that the application of ἀνδρεία and its cognates to women was somewhat unsettling: with the exception of the title, the word features only three times in the whole text, used of Artemisia, Atossa and Rhodogyne (see Gera 1997). Plutarch is similarly uneasy with ascribing *andreia* to women in his *Virtues of Women* (Gera 1997, McInerney 2003), and Hobbs 2000, 71 notes that women's involvement in *andreia* is always marked as unusual, even when it is given approval.

⁴⁴ E.g. Arist. *EN* 1144b1ff.

not concerned here with the philosophical ideal of female *andreia* directed towards the protection of chastity; instead *andreia* is tied to what is perceived as Charicleia's duty to her native land: to give up her life as a sacrifice. The influence here is tragic more than it is philosophical: we might think of the perception of Iphigenia's sacrifice as a noble act on behalf of her homeland.⁴⁵ When Charicleia has been exempted from sacrifice by the will of the Ethiopian populace, Hydaspes remains resolved to sacrifice Theagenes. Charicleia asks her father:

... bid me slay the victim with my own hand; bid me take the sword in my hand as a treasure beyond price and earn undying renown among the Ethiopians for my courage [*andreia*]!⁴⁶

Charicleia's words evoke those of Electra to Chrysothemis: Electra refers to the *andreia* for which she and her sister will be praised if they kill Aegisthus and avenge their father.⁴⁷ Bassi observes the ambiguity in the *Electra* scene, as Chrysothemis responds by advising Electra to remember her sex: *andreia* is something a woman may not lay claim to lightly.⁴⁸ There is a similar difficulty in Heliodorus' scene, as Charicleia's precise intentions are ambiguous, and Hydaspes cannot see how her sacrifice of Theagenes could possibly be *andreios*.⁴⁹ Her request has been interpreted as a means of acquiring a sword in order to commit suicide.⁵⁰ This would seem to contradict the Aristotelian notion of *andreia*, which denies that suicide for love can constitute an act of *andreia*.⁵¹ If Charicleia's aim is suicide, it appears that she is advancing death for the sake of love as a new and very un-Aristotelian form of *andreia*. Indeed, she seems almost conscious of her status as romantic heroine: for the heroes and heroines of the novels, *not* to seek suicide after the death of or separation from one's beloved is tantamount to *deilia* – a neat reversal of the Aristotelian view.⁵² Chaereas, for instance, curses himself as *deilos* for not

⁴⁵ E. *IA* 1419ff., 1557ff. In reporting Iphigenia's steadfastness in the face of imminent death, Euripides' messenger refers to her *eupsychia* and *aretē* (1561–1562).

⁴⁶ Hld. 10,20,2.

⁴⁷ S. *El.* 975ff.

⁴⁸ Bassi 2003, 42; S. *El.* 992ff.

⁴⁹ Hld. 10,21,1–2.

⁵⁰ Morgan 1978, 405. I would suggest that Charicleia's use of the neuter τὸ θῦμα is deliberately vague: we cannot be sure who exactly she means to sacrifice.

⁵¹ Arist. *EN* 1116a11ff. See Garrison 1991, 18–20.

⁵² On the numerous suicide attempts in the Greek novels, see MacAlister 1996.

taking his own life when separated from Callirhoe,⁵³ and, as we have seen, Anthia decides that she is not so *anandros* or *deilē* that she would choose life over fidelity to Habrocomes. It is rather unclear why specifically Charicleia feels her suicide would be considered an act of *andreia* by the Ethiopians, but the answer may be easier to fathom if we suppose that she expects her death to act as a substitute for Theagenes'. Her death in her beloved's stead would assume an Alcestis-like tone, making a statement which the hellenised Ethiopian spectators would doubtless apprehend as an *andreios* one. The female *andreia* of the entire sacrifice scene evokes the female role of sacrificial victim familiar from Greek tragedy, and thus particularly appropriate to the novel's classical setting.

From the few examples of the application of *andreia* and its cognates to women, and from those scenes where *andreia* is implicit, we have seen that the concept tends to be employed in a gender-specific manner, which reinforces normative gender roles and socio-cultural beliefs concerning the nature of women. Anthia's intermittent *andreia* is directed towards the preservation of her chastity, and abandons her once the immediate threat has been tackled. Charicleia's *andreia* is rather more abundant and complex, as we might expect from a later and more sophisticated author, yet it retains many normative assumptions. The *andreia* she is encouraged to display is that of noble (self-)sacrifice and the protection of her chastity. Like Musonius' *pepaideumenē*, the supremely educated Charicleia has more access to *andreia* than other women. Her intelligence and prudence mark her out as exceptional among heroines, and her 'thinking' *andreia* distinguishes her from Anthia and from the Delphian women, who grab whatever weapon comes to hand; it is what commands her to use bow and arrow – the weapons of the wise – to attack her enemies from a hidden position; it is also a facet that makes her compatible with Theagenes, as we shall observe in our consideration of his exploits in the tenth book. Let us turn, then, to an examination of *andreia* as it is applied to the male characters of the novels.

⁵³ Chariton 5,2,5. If suicide for love is *andreios*, Cleitophon's pervasive *deilia* is made all the more apparent by his decision to stall suicide and wait for what he thinks are two approaching brigands to do the deed for him (Ach. Tat. 3,17,1); the irony of the scene is compounded by his use of Aristotelian language: when Satyrus and Menelaus try to take his sword, he implores them to allow him his *kalos thanatos* (3,17,3).

Male andreia

We noted earlier that Chariton and Heliodorus both involve their heroes in public displays of bravery at the end of their novels, suggesting that they view a traditional military or athletic *andreia* as indispensable in the construction of their male characters. We have also observed that education and wisdom play a part in the development of *andreia* even in women, and we can see the same thing in the case of male *andreia* in the novels. Much of Chariton's novel concentrates quite markedly on Dionysius' *paideia*, and Chariton's first use of *andreia* is in relation to his *pepaideumenos* Dionysius. The Persian king has postponed the trial to decide whether Chaereas or Dionysius is Callirhoe's legitimate husband, and Chariton tells us how Dionysius copes with the delay:

Dionysius tried to bear the situation nobly through his steadfastness of nature [φύσεως εὐστάθειαν] and care for *paideia* [παιδείας ἐπιμέλειαν], yet the unexpectedness of the blow had the power to drive even the most courageous man [τὸν ἀνδρειότατον] off course.⁵⁴

This passage contains two important points. Firstly, *andreia* appears to play a role in the endurance of circumstances, a role that is already evident in Plato and Aristotle: Laches declares that *andreia* is *karteria* of the soul, while Aristotle states that *karteria* is an element of *andreia*.⁵⁵ Secondly, the passage suggests an interplay between *paideia* and *andreia* in matters of self-comportment: the two play a synergistic role in dealing with personal difficulties, together providing *karteria*. There does seem to be some agreement in philosophical and ethical works on the importance of *paideia* to the development of *andreia*. Cebes' *Tabula* states that true *paideia* opens the door to *karteria* and *andreia*.⁵⁶ Similarly, Xenophon refers to Socrates' belief that *andreia* is a blend of nature and culture: some men by nature possess more *andreia* than others, but education or training can increase one's share.⁵⁷ This idea is implicit in Plato's *Laches*, which functions on the premise that *andreia* may be taught: it can form part of a man's *paideia*. Looking again to Aristotle, we find reference to the various virtues, including *an-*

⁵⁴ Chariton 5,9,8; trans. mine.

⁵⁵ Pl. *La.* 192b, with Socrates' response at 194a; Arist. *VV* 1250a44ff. We have remarked that endurance is also part of Odysseus' manliness, although the specific language of *andreia* is post-Homeric (see Bassi 2003).

⁵⁶ Ceb. 16 and 20. On the *Tabula* see Trapp (this volume).

⁵⁷ X. *Mem.* 3,9,1.

dreia, being a natural part of human beings from the moment of birth, but also being potentially harmful without the application of careful thought, *phronēsis*.⁵⁸ So, while *andreia* is conceived as natural to mankind, as an essential quality of the human species, it is also envisaged as responsive to *paideia*, and as entailing an internal dialogue between instinct and intellect. Schmid notes that ‘the model of courage as involving a struggle and dialogue between soul or mind and heart already had its classic expression in Homer.’⁵⁹ Both he and Smoes consider Odysseus to be the archetypal purveyor of this ‘thinking man’s *andreia*’.⁶⁰ In him we find a courage which replaces the unmeasured violence of Achilles:

Un autre modèle exemplaire de courage se met en place; il s’agit désormais d’un courage intérieur, d’un courage “moral”, différent du courage “physique” et militaire, et qui consiste à résister à un “ennemi” interne: passions, souffrances, malchance.⁶¹

Andreia thus becomes the ability to negotiate and endure one’s situation intellectually, morally, and with oneself alone. Of course, this does not abrogate *andreia*’s position as a virtue equated with battle and athletics; rather it bestows upon it an additional moral and internal dimension, and fuses it still further with other virtues, and especially with *paideia*.

Chariton shows an awareness of the importance of right thinking and self-control as a complement to the physical side of *andreia*. When Chaereas joins the Egyptian army, the pharaoh, significantly, recognises that he has *paideia*.⁶² Chaereas then storms the city of Tyre, demonstrating his capacity for *andreia* in a traditional context, but also employing intelligence in order to inveigle his way into the city.⁶³ Chariton remarks quite pointedly that Chaereas is the only man able to show self-control (*sōphrosynē*) in the thick of the fighting,⁶⁴ and after this incredible military success he is considered by his men to be ‘the bravest and finest man’.⁶⁵ So to be truly *andreios*, a man must demonstrate a fusion of physical strength and intellectual capacity, with self-control. This is evident in the case of Theagenes too, in his wres-

⁵⁸ Arist. *EN* 1144b1ff.

⁵⁹ Schmid 1992, 108.

⁶⁰ Though we have noted that the term ἀνδρεία is post-Homeric.

⁶¹ Smoes 1995, 65.

⁶² Chariton 7,2,5.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 7,4,5ff.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 7,4,9.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 7,5,11: ... τὸν ἀνδρειότατον καὶ κάλλιστον ...

ting bout with the Ethiopian giant. The latter is said to be unrivalled both on the battlefield and in wrestling and boxing,⁶⁶ enabling us to read the scene as a conflation of warfare and athletics, the two prototypical arenas of *andreia*.⁶⁷ The elevation of the status of athletics that we noted in Dio and Lucian might help us to interpret Theagenes' exploits: while open battle is rare in the novels, and the chances to display a Homeric-style military *aretē* are concomitantly scarce, athletics can be understood as a substitute arena in which a hero is able to prove his *andreia*. After an initial skirmish, Theagenes assesses the situation and decides that cunning will serve him better than outright physical *andreia*: Heliodorus says that he resolves to use skill to get the better of (κατασοφίσασθαι) brute strength.⁶⁸ Here we might think of Dio's dialogue between Achilles and Cheiron, in which Achilles is warned that his brawn will be defeated by wisdom.⁶⁹ Heliodorus contrasts the giant's might – said to be *agroikos* ('crude', 'rustic') – with Theagenes' combination of strength and careful thought: while Theagenes is frequently equated with Achilles, he is clearly not the unthinking Achilles of Dio's dialogue, or the efficient but rash warrior of the *Iliad*. Indeed, we should not forget that he is also equated with Odysseus,⁷⁰ known of course not only for his endurance but also for his cunning. Theagenes' triumph in the wrestling match is thus the result of a combination of Achillean strength and Odyssean cunning and endurance. Heliodorus is at pains to demonstrate that his hero can be more than the extremes of passive and active: he is capable of combining a traditional physical *andreia* with intelligence and foresight, to win a victory that implies his possession of many different virtues, rather like the Melancomas of Dio's orations.⁷¹

Heliodorus' conception of *andreia* is also illustrated in the figure of Hydaspes during his siege and conquest of Syene, and in his reaction to the news that Charicleia is his daughter. In these two episodes we see *andreia* presented as an attribute that functions both publicly and privately, and we may also observe some engagement with the question of the extent to which *andreia* is natural or the product of culture. During his siege of Syene, Hy-

⁶⁶ Hld. 10,24,3.

⁶⁷ We might see a similar conflation in the *hoplitodromos* in which Theagenes triumphs in the fourth book.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 10,31,5.

⁶⁹ Here, though, we have a clever reversal, as it is Theagenes, the Achilles-figure, who will defeat brawn with wisdom.

⁷⁰ Hld. 5,5,2.

⁷¹ König 2005, 132 remarks that athletic success was often taken as a metaphor for the possession of other virtues.

daspes demonstrates both his military abilities and his intelligence, which are then marked out as discrete entities, and yet at the same time related to each other:

Hydaspes ... has the capacity [οἶδε] to destroy his enemies utterly but is naturally [πέφουκε] inclined to take pity on suppliants. While he adjudges the former course a mark of strength befitting the act of a soldier [τὸ μὲν ἀνδρείον ... καὶ τὸ μὲν χειρὸς εἶναι στρατιωτικῆς], he considers the latter to show a love of humanity germane to his own character [τὸ δὲ φιλόανθρωπον ... καὶ τὸ δὲ ἴδιον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης].⁷²

This seems to make two distinctions, the first between brute force and considered reaction, and the second between learned behaviour and nature, but it is no simple matter to untangle the passage. On the one hand, destroying one's enemies utterly is associated with *andreia*, and on the other, being lenient towards a conquered people is a mark of *philanthrōpia*. The latter is said to be Hydaspes' natural response, dictated by his own intellect, which in turn suggests that *andreia*, by contrast, is learned behaviour, and therefore not natural.⁷³ But this presents us with a paradox, since brute force and rational thought are usually equated to nature and culture respectively, while here the equation is reversed. The force of *andreia* is something that Hydaspes has learned to exhibit as a warrior, but as a good king and responsible man he holds it in check with wise thought: a real man does not act on his impulses simply because he can. Heliodorus makes much of the Greekness of his Ethiopians, and Hydaspes' hellenisation may be significant here: as a hellenised Ethiopian, he is able to apply learned standards of Greekness to his behaviour in such a seamless manner that they appear natural; he has learned so well how to make wise decisions that the application of that cultured, wise decision-making to learned *andreia* assumes the appearance of

⁷² Hld. 9,6,2; the Ethiopians go on to state that Hydaspes does not behave like a tyrant in times of victory, and Hydaspes himself later advises the captive Oroondates on the contrast between true kingship and tyranny (9,21,3). Hydaspes' characterisation in these scenes is foreshadowed by Thyamis' words to Arsace at 8,4, concerning her intention to treat Theagenes and Charicleia as prisoners of war: 'And while it is in the nature of war to make slaves, it is in the nature of peace to set them free; the former act is a tyrant's whim [βούλημα τυραννικόν]; the latter shows the judgment of a true king [δῶγμα βασιλικόν]. The true distinction between peace and war resides less in the inherent meaning of the words than in the deportment of the agents concerned'.

⁷³ Indeed, the use of οἶδε, while denoting ability, also suggests acquired knowledge (thanks to Ken Dowden for alerting me to this).

the natural. When Charicleia's identity is revealed, we again encounter the nature/culture dichotomy. Hydaspes is torn between his newfound role as father, and his decision, as king, to sacrifice his daughter. We are told that his interior conflict is one of 'fatherly love and manly resolve [ἀνδρείῳ τῷ λήματι]', and that when he submits to those fatherly feelings, he is submitting to nature.⁷⁴ The scene thus establishes an opposition between private paternal feelings and the public duties of an *andreios* man, nature's victory implying that paternal feelings are more natural and stronger than the responsibilities of *andreia*. However, although Hydaspes acknowledges his paternity, he is committed to those responsibilities, which include the sacrifice of Charicleia. Yet we soon learn that his address to the Ethiopian populace is cleverly designed to cause the people to oppose his apparent will:⁷⁵ his rhetorical skill (his culturally-acquired *paideia*) therefore enables him to maintain his reputation for *andreia*, an *andreia* which partially consists in his fulfilment of his duties to his people.

Consistently with Hydaspes we find *andreia* presented as a virtue that is more acquired than naturally-occurring, and the same appears true in the case of Theagenes. In the runaway bull scene, Heliodorus states that he is unsure whether Theagenes' bold action in capturing the bull is due to divine inspiration or to his own (*oikothēn*) *andreion lēma*.⁷⁶ While we might think that the use of *oikothēn* implies a natural quality, the equation drawn between Theagenes and Hydaspes through the repetition of the phrase *andreion lēma* suggests that, as with Hydaspes, we are dealing with an *andreia* that is learned.⁷⁷ *Oikothēn* is simply intended to contrast with the possibility that Theagenes' exploits might be divinely-inspired: he is acting either because of an external impetus, or because of a learned *andreia* that has become an internal part of him. In fact, this learned *andreia* is so much a part of Theagenes' make-up that it is visible to onlookers: at the very beginning of the novel, when he is lying wounded on the beach, the watching bandits are able to see his *andreios* beauty; in the highly visual context of the Delphic procession, the spectators figuratively award him the prize for *andreia*; and finally, when Theagenes is captured by the pirates, Trachinus states that he can see that he is full of *andreia*.⁷⁸ Heliodorus' repeated return to Theagenes' visible masculinity is clearly rooted in the pseudo-science of

⁷⁴ Hld. 10,16,2.

⁷⁵ Ibid. 10,17,1. On the design of this address, see Morgan 2006.

⁷⁶ Ibid. 10,28,4.

⁷⁷ Lalanne 2006, 187 rightly suggests that Hydaspes' *andreia* acts as a model for Theagenes, who will succeed him to the Ethiopian throne.

⁷⁸ Hld. 1,2,3; 3,3,8; 5,26,4.

physiognomy, which enjoyed particular popularity in the first few centuries after Christ, and was especially concerned with the detection of manliness and unmanliness through the observation of external appearance.⁷⁹

While Heliodorus clearly considers it important to demonstrate his hero's *andreia*, at no point does he involve Theagenes in full-scale warfare; in fact, with the exception of his battle with the pirates, Theagenes is consistently kept away from warfare, and his *andreia* is most explicitly and dramatically exhibited in athletic rather than military contexts, as we have seen. But long before involving Theagenes in athletics, Heliodorus begins to engage with the discourse of *andreia* by ironically removing his hero from the usual arenas of *andreia*, and by appealing to the classic opposition of *andreia* and *deilia*. This opposition is prominent in philosophy and ethics, where those with knowledge of how to respond in the face of danger possess *andreia*, while those who do not possess *deilia*.⁸⁰ In Heliodorus' second book, the bandits' island is attacked; Theagenes and Cnemon flee, although Heliodorus remarks that '... their withdrawal was not entirely due to fear'.⁸¹ Believing Charicleia dead, Theagenes criticises his own retreat from the fighting:

Charicleia is dead, and Theagenes is no more. Fate is against me. I became the coward [δειλὸς ἐγενόμην], but in vain. In vain did I endure unmanly flight [δρασμὸν ὑπέστην ἀνανδρῶν], trying to save my life for your sake, my love.⁸²

One cannot escape the playful flavour of this scene: it is rather as though Theagenes has suddenly realised how his flight might appear to another man, and is attempting to account for the conspicuous absence of *andreia* in his behaviour. He says he 'became' (ἐγενόμην) the coward, as if to emphasise that this is contrary to his usual behaviour, and that 'unmanly flight'

⁷⁹ The first overtly physiognomic passage is Calasiris' description of Theagenes at 2,35,1, where the set of his nose is an indication of his *thymos*; that passage has a considerable amount of vocabulary in common with both Adamantius' synopsis of Polemon's *Physiognomy* and the physiognomical tract of pseudo-Aristotle (see Jones 2007, Chapter 3). For an overview of the significance of physiognomy at this period, see Barton (1995, 95–131); for exhaustive studies, see Evans 1935 and 1969, Gleason 1990 and 1995, and now Swain 2007.

⁸⁰ X. *Mem.* 4,6,11; see also Arist. *Rh.* 1366b11–13, where *andreia* equates roughly to noble behaviour in dangerous circumstances, and *deilia* is the opposite

⁸¹ Hld. 1,31,4; this of course implies that fear was at least a partial cause of their retreat.

⁸² Hld. 2,1,2; trans. modified.

(δρασμὸν ἄνδρον) is merely a temporary and calculated deviation from the norm. He is eager to stress that the only reason he fled was to preserve himself for Charicleia: he sacrificed his *andreia* solely for her. From this we understand that to flee from battle is to be *anandros*, but that love might require a man of *andreia* to assume the appearance of *deilia*, and to flee in a manner contrary to his beliefs. But there is perhaps a twist here, if we think of *andreia* in Socratic and early Stoic terms, as knowledge of how to react to danger, and knowledge of those things to be and not to be endured.⁸³ Theagenes has clearly decided that the battle is something that is not to be endured, while ‘unmanly flight’ for Charicleia’s sake is something to be endured; one could therefore argue that he has exercised his *andreia* precisely by fleeing: ironically, his *andreia* is demonstrated through a flight which he perceives as *anandros*, and which he presents as a performance of *deilia* done for altruistic reasons, and belying his true character.

Heliodorus establishes Theagenes’ *andreia* very cleverly, by using Cnemon as a foil: he places the two men in an isolated position, away from the fighting, and implies Theagenes’ *andreia* simply by reference to its opposite, Cnemon’s *deilia*.⁸⁴ Following the discovery of the dead Thisbe, Theagenes teases Cnemon for his reaction to the body:

... it is time for you to be reminded of your own remarkable display of bravery [τῆς ἄγαν ἀνδρείας]: ... though you were armed and had a sword in your hand, you fled from a woman, and a dead one at that! The intrepid Athenian warrior [ὁ γενναῖος καὶ Ἀττικὸς πεζομάχος] turned tail and ran!⁸⁵

Theagenes here stresses the difference between appearing to be *andreios* and truly possessing *andreia*: though Cnemon looks the part of the *andreios* Athenian footsoldier, he is unable to play it convincingly.⁸⁶ While we noted that Theagenes’ flight from battle belied his *andreia*, here Cnemon’s macho

⁸³ See Cullyer 2003, 216ff. on Chrysippus’ definition of *andreia*. Perkins 1995, 77ff. has shown that Stoic motifs are common in the novels; see also Doulamis (this volume).

⁸⁴ On the *deilos* as character type, see De Temmerman (this volume).

⁸⁵ Ibid. 2,7,3.

⁸⁶ Despite Athens’ fame for maritime warfare, the Athenian hoplite was an enduring symbol of *andreia* (Von Reden & Goldhill 1999, 268); Heliodorus toys with the reader’s expectation that an Athenian will possess *andreia* by creating a character entirely devoid of it. For a similar contrast between *looking* manly and *being* manly, see Hom. *Il.* 3,39–45, where Hector rebukes Paris for the contrast between his external appearance and his behaviour (see Duncan 2006, 8).

garb belies the coward within: not only has he run away from the fighting outside the cave, but he has even fled from a dead woman.⁸⁷ Cnemon goes on to express his suspicion of Thisbe, despite her death, and Theagenes retorts with the sarcastic remark, ‘Won’t you stop being so manly?’ (‘Ὁὐ πάύση ... ἄγαν ἀνδριζόμενος ...’).⁸⁸ This series of applications of *andreia* and its cognates forms a prelude to the appearance of the Egyptian bandit Thermouthis, in a scene which confirms the reader’s doubts about Cnemon’s *andreia*, and reaffirms his faith in Theagenes’. Here Charicleia retreats deeper into the cave, partly as a precautionary measure, but mostly because she feels modesty at the sight of a naked man. Cnemon, we are told, ‘subtly made off too’ (ἡρέμα καὶ ὑπεδίδρασκε),⁸⁹ recognising Thermouthis and expecting him to launch an attack. Theagenes, by contrast, is not at all perturbed, and threatens the bandit with his sword, quite prepared to kill him if he makes a wrong move.⁹⁰ Heliodorus cleverly constructs this scene to present the reader with a three-tier hierarchy of *andreia*, at the bottom of which stands Cnemon. By describing Cnemon’s retreat after Charicleia’s, Heliodorus forces the reader to align Cnemon with a woman, implicitly casting aspersions on his *andreia*. But Charicleia is said to retreat more because of modesty than caution: her behaviour is thus appropriate for a woman, and is therefore laudable. Cnemon’s retreat, by contrast, is governed by fear that Thermouthis will attack: he is less manly than Charicleia is womanly. Theagenes, on the other hand, is prepared to display his *andreia* in the prototypical context of hand-to-hand combat, placing him at the top of this hierarchy of *andreia*. While the reader is undoubtedly amused at the characterisation of Cnemon in this scene, he has been prepared for it by the recurrence of the discourse of *andreia* up to this point. The simultaneous alignment and differentiation made between Cnemon and Charicleia might remind us of Aristotle’s remark that ‘a man would be thought a coward if he were only as

⁸⁷ Cnemon is the butt of this joke again later, when he is frightened at the sight of a crocodile; Calasiris teases him for his *deilia* at this, as well as at the name of the dead Thisbe: he is afraid not of a man of *andreia*, but of a dead woman (6,1,4).

⁸⁸ Ibid. 2,11,3; trans. mine. Bassi 2003, 43–44 remarks that *andreia* and its cognates are often used ironically in comedy and tragedy to imply ‘the irrevocable absence of a ‘true’ or unambiguous manliness’.

⁸⁹ Ibid. 2,13,2ff.; trans. mine.

⁹⁰ Cf. 5,24,3: when the Tyrian ship is attacked by Trachinus’ pirate gang, Charicleia and Calasiris must restrain Theagenes, who is ‘spoiling for the fight’ (ἐνθουσιῶντα πρὸς τὴν μάχην).

brave as a brave woman'. Here Theagenes and Cnemon are most explicitly contrasted, with Cnemon's *deilia* emphasising Theagenes' *andreia*.⁹¹

We meet another example of Cnemon's dearth of *andreia* when Ther-mouthis requests that Cnemon accompany him on his reconnaissance mission:

Seeing that Cnemon was flinching from this – for he was obviously distressed as he reported the Egyptian's words – Theagenes said, 'You always were the sort of person who is vigorous of mind [γνώμην], but weaker of spirit [λήμα]. I know what you're like particularly from your present behaviour. Whet your resolve [φρόνημα]! Direct your mind to the more manly course [πρὸς τὸ ἀνδρείότερον ὄρθου τὴν γνώμην]!'⁹²

We have seen that *andreia* was conceived as a fusion of wise thought and physical action, and this is precisely the conception that Theagenes enunciates here; in his combined criticism and exhortation of Cnemon, Theagenes offers a holistic definition of *andreia*, comprising *gnōmē*, *phronēma*, and *lēma*: it is all very well for Cnemon to possess the first of these qualities, but if he is unable to direct it and unwilling to act, he cannot be said to be *andreios*; he may have *gnōmē*, but even that requires channelling. The qualities mentioned correspond to those attributed to Hydaspes, Theagenes, and Charicleia. Poor Cnemon, however, is a pale imitation of these higher beings: he may have presence of mind, as his escape from Ther-mouthis will show,⁹³ but he lacks the gumption to tackle a physical threat; being truly *andreios* requires a combination of intellect and daring. Cnemon, then, has only the external appearance of *andreia*, and Heliodorus' implicit comparison of him with Theagenes informs the reader that the latter has both the appearance and the substance of *andreia*, a fact that will be demonstrated beyond doubt by his exploits in the final book.

We have seen that Chaereas exhibits a form of *sōphrosynē* in his attack on Tyre, restraining his aggression at a time when no one else is capable of

⁹¹ Thisbe and Charicleia are also frequently set up in opposition to highlight the differences between their characters; on Cnemon and Thisbe as the antitheses of Theagenes and Charicleia, see Morgan 1989.

⁹² Ibid. 2,18,3–4; trans. mine.

⁹³ Ibid. 2,19,6–7. Even the intellect Cnemon exhibits in escaping from Ther-mouthis is not without qualification: the excuse he invents of having loose bowels characterises him more as a figure from the comic stage than the epic battlefield; coming hard on the heels of a Homeric simile (2,19,5) and an epic-style time-check (2,19,6), the effect of the diarrhoea pretext is even more ironic.

self-control. We have also observed something similar in the case of Hydaspes, exercising leniency towards the people of Syene. An association between *andreia* and *sōphrosynē* is common in texts with a philosophical element. We saw, for example, that Dio praised athletics as conducive to the development of both virtues: fighting skill must be complemented by self-restraint. But self-restraint in warfare and athletics was not the only form of *sōphrosynē* that the philosophical ideal demanded in a man. In the case of women, we noted that *andreia* was very much directed towards a sexual *sōphrosynē*, and this is true also of men, in whom *andreia* plays a part in the battle against desires and pleasures.⁹⁴ This is a theme we find in Heliodorus, when Theagenes and Charicleia are alone in the Egyptian cave:

... if ever Charikleia found Theagenes becoming somewhat excited and playing the man [ἀνδριζόμενον], a reminder of his oath was enough to restrain him; and he for his part moderated his conduct without complaint and was quite content to remain within the bounds of chastity [σωφρονεῖν], for though he was weaker than love, he was stronger than pleasure.⁹⁵

While in the case of Musonius' virtuous woman, the verb *andrizomai* referred to the defence of *sōphrosynē*, the case of Theagenes is somewhat different: here, *andrizomai* obviously implies a sexual demonstration of masculinity, which must be restrained by the application of *sōphrosynē*, in much the same way as *andreia* must be controlled by *sōphrosynē* in battle and sport. Theagenes has vowed to respect Charicleia's chastity until they are married; a sexual demonstration of his *andreia* – his manliness – is thus out of the question. This scene forms a sexual parallel to that in which Theagenes fled from the fighting to preserve himself for Charicleia: there we saw a conscious decision not to show his masculinity in a military context, while here we have the exercise of *sōphrosynē* over the exhibition of masculinity in a sexual context. It is acceptable for Theagenes to be 'weaker than love', but vital by the ethics of classical masculinity that he prove himself stronger than his desire for pleasure, that he exhibit *sōphrosynē* in a situation where he has the power to indulge his desire. The decision *not* to show *andreia*, *not* to 'be brave' or 'play the man' in a sexual context, paradoxically invests him with *andreia*, with manliness. It is interesting to note that when Theagenes was asked to swear an oath to respect Charicleia's chastity, he

⁹⁴ Pl. *La.* 191d–e.

⁹⁵ Hld. 5,4,5; trans. modified.

was hurt at the prospect of later appearing to restrain himself because of fear of the consequences, rather than by the power of his own *proairesis* ('moral choice'), which he wanted the opportunity to display.⁹⁶ The presence of this Stoic watchword in a scene that distinguishes between external pressure and personal freedom of choice seems to signal strong Stoic influence.⁹⁷ The Stoic presence is later reinforced by Theagenes' refusal to yield to the sexual advances of the Persian princess Arsace. Again, by not showing *andreia* in a sexual context, he is 'more of a man than ever' (πλέον ἀνὴρ τότε),⁹⁸ and a distinction is drawn between the torments undergone by his body and his soul's striving for *sōphrosynē*. Theagenes' *andreia* is thus comprised in part of the ability to resist his own sexual drives, an ability which aligns him with Stoic philosophers, and with the Platonic Socrates, whose resistance to Alcibiades' seduction efforts is described as an example of *sōphrosynē* and *andreia*, *phronēsis* and *karteria*. Alcibiades recounts Socrates' incredible endurance at Potidaea as proof of the futility of attempts to get the better of him:⁹⁹ the possession of traditional physical *andreia* is indicative of the possession of moral *andreia*.¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

Philosophical interpretations of *andreia* seem to have had a significant influence on both Chariton and Heliodorus. Both authors demonstrate an awareness of the Aristotelian emphasis on the application of wise thought to all virtues, so that *andreia* for them is a fusion of fighting ability – whether

⁹⁶ Hld. 4,18,6.

⁹⁷ We might see something similar in Theagenes' bull-capturing, where we noted that Heliodorus ponders whether Theagenes is divinely inspired or acting freely. On the importance of *proairesis* in Stoicism, see Sandbach 1975, 165; on Stoic presences in X. Eph, see Doulamis (this volume).

⁹⁸ Hld. 8,6,4.

⁹⁹ Pl. *Smp.* 219dff.

¹⁰⁰ Neither of which is Cleitophon ever able to show. Achilles Tatius also uses the verb *andrizomai* in a sexual sense (2,10,1; 4,1,2), although Cleitophon's behaviour is the polar opposite of Theagenes'. While Theagenes chooses not to 'play the man' through the exercise of *sōphrosynē*, Cleitophon is prevented from doing so simply by the circumstances; never once does he apply *sōphrosynē*. His later submission to Melite, preceded by nominal resistance, bears witness to his lack of self-control. Achilles' uses of *andrizomai* appear to be part of a deliberate ploy to have Cleitophon show himself up as a man who is thoroughly (and comically) devoid of the cardinal virtues, as emphasised by his repeated pretensions to philosophy.

military or athletic – and a measured self-control. *Andreia* also has a role to play in managing difficult circumstances, so that it is in some sense *karteria*, endurance. There is no agreement in philosophical sources on the precise relationship of *andreia* to *karteria*: are the two distinct, one and the same, or is *karteria* simply a variety or off-shoot of *andreia*? The *aporia* with which Plato's *Laches* concludes is indicative of the extent of the confusion: no definition of *andreia* is achieved which will satisfy all parties, and *andreia* is never convincingly detached from its fellow virtues. Likewise, novelistic *andreia* is not easily separated from other virtues. Philosophical and ethical treatises do appear to agree that *paideia* plays a vital role in the acquisition or development of *andreia*, and this is a role we find reflected in the novels.¹⁰¹ Heliodorus seems to question the naturalness of behaviour, and to touch on the effect that *paideia* can have on it, so that, whereas in Aristotle we find the idea that practice can enhance a natural attribute, Heliodorus elaborates this concept to suggest that *paideia* can make what is actually learned behaviour *appear* natural. And while Heliodorus undoubtedly engages with classical philosophical theory, he also very much represents his own period, with its intense interest in reading internal masculinity through the lens of external appearance. The long-standing association of manliness with warfare and athletics gives *andreia* its external face: it is a virtue that is primarily displayed in very public contexts. Yet what comes through most clearly from both Chariton and Heliodorus, despite the large-scale and public demonstrations of *andreia* at the climax of their novels, is that *andreia* is not complete without internal, private deliberation.

Bibliography

- Alston, R. 1998. 'Arms and the man: soldiers, masculinity and power in Republican and Imperial Rome', in: L. Foxhall & J. Salmon (eds.), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, London: Routledge, 205–223.
- Balot, R.K. 1998. 'Foucault, Chariton, and the masculine self', *Helios* 25.2, 139–162.
- Barton, T.S. 1995. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bassi, K. 2003. 'The semantics of manliness in ancient Greece', in: R.M. Rosen & I. Sluiter (eds.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill, 25–58.
- Connolly, J. 2003. 'Like the labors of Heracles: *andreia* and *paideia* in Greek culture under Rome', in: R.M. Rosen & I. Sluiter (eds.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill, 287–317.

¹⁰¹ As is the role of *paideia* in the exhibition of *sōphrosynē* (see Balot 1998).

- Cullyer, H. 2003. 'Paradoxical *andreia*: Socratic echoes in Stoic 'manly courage'', in: R.M. Rosen & I. Sluiter (eds.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill, 213–233.
- Duncan, A. 2006. *Performance and Identity in the Classical World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, E.C. 1935. 'Roman descriptions of personal appearance in history and biography', *HSPH* 46, 43–84.
- Evans, E.C. 1969. 'Physiognomics in the ancient world', *TAPhS* 59.5, 5–101.
- Garrison, E.P. 1991. 'Attitudes toward suicide in ancient Greece', *TAPA* 121, 1–34.
- Gera, D. 1997. *Warrior Women: The Anonymous Tractatus de Mulieribus*, Leiden: Brill.
- Gleason, M.W. 1990. 'The semiotics of gender: physiognomy and self-fashioning in the second century C.E.', in: D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler & F.I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 389–415.
- Gleason, M.W. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London: Routledge.
- Heiserman, A. 1977. *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hobbs, A. 2000. *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, M. 2007. *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Greek Novel*, Diss., Swansea.
- König, J. 2005. *Athletics and Literature in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Konstan, D. Forthcoming. 'Le courage dans le roman grec: de Chariton à Xénophon d'Ephèse, avec une référence à Philon d'Alexandrie', in: B. Pouderon (ed.), *Roman IV: Vertus, passions et vices dans le roman grec*, Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen.
- Lalanne, S. 2006. *Une éducation grecque: rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*, Paris: Éditions la Découverte.
- Lutz, C.E. 1947. 'Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates"', *YCIS* 10, 3–147.
- McInerney, J. 2003. 'Plutarch's manly women', in: R.M. Rosen & I. Sluiter (eds.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill, 319–344.
- MacAlister, S. 1996. *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*, London: Routledge.
- Morgan, D.H.J. 1994. 'Theater of war: combat, the military, and masculinities', in: H. Brod & M. Kaufman (eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 165–182.
- Morgan, J.R. 1978. *A Commentary on Books 9 and 10 of Heliodorus' Aithiopia*, Diss., Oxford.
- Morgan, J.R. 1989. 'The story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopia*', *JHS* 109, 99–113.
- Morgan, J.R. 2006. 'Un discours figuré chez Héliodore: comment, en disant l'inverse de ce qu'on veut, on peut accomplir ce qu'on veut sans sembler dire l'inverse de ce qu'on veut', in: B. Pouderon & J. Peigney (eds.), *Discours et débats dans l'ancien roman*, Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, 51–62.

- Perkins, J. 1995. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*, London: Routledge.
- Reardon, B.P. (ed.). 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rohde, E. 1960. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Hildesheim: George Olms.
- Sandbach, F.H. 1975. *The Stoics*, London: Chatto & Windus.
- Schmid, W.T. 1992. *On Manly Courage: A Study of Plato's Laches*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Smoes, E. 1995. *Le courage chez les Grecs, d'Homère à Aristote*, Brussels: Ousia.
- Swain, S. (ed.). 2007. *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Nijf, O. 2003. 'Athletics, *andreia* and the *askêsis*-culture in the Roman east', in: R.M. Rosen & I. Sluiter (eds.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill, 263–286.
- Van Nijf, O. 2004. 'Athletics and *paideia*: festivals and physical education in the world of the Second Sophistic', in: B.E. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 203–228.
- Von Reden, S. & Goldhill, S. 1999. 'Plato and the performance of dialogue', in: S. Goldhill & R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 257–289.
- Walton, D.N. 1986. *Courage: A Philosophical Investigation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.