

TERMS FOR HOMELAND IN THE WRITINGS OF THE EMPEROR JULIAN AND IN THE *AETHIOPICA* OF HELIODORUS¹

J Hilton (University of the Free State)

In his writings the emperor Julian states that he has three homelands: Constantinople, Athens and Rome, and yet he refers to his youthful relegation to Macellum as an exile and he more than once approvingly deploys the sayings of the Cynic philosopher, Diogenes, that he was without a home and that he was a citizen of the universe. At the same time, Julian believed that human salvation was possible and that the soul could escape this world and ascend to heaven. Similarly, in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus, all the major characters (apart from the Ethiopians Hydaspes and Persinna) experience exile from their earthly homelands. Yet here too the possibility of a return to a remote, otherworldly home is suggested. Heliodorus enigmatically makes use of an allusive neologism (ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα, or ‘motherland’), in contrast with the traditional term ἡ πατρίς (‘fatherland’), to refer to a philosophical ‘place of birth’, particularly in the case of the main characters, Theagenes and Chariclea.

Keywords: Julian; Heliodorus; Neoplatonism; homeland; exile; birth.

The importance of the theme of homelessness, alienation, exile and returning home in the *Aethiopica* has long been recognized, and has been extensively discussed.² Ideas of a home, a homeland, a fatherland, a motherland, a native country, the land of one’s birth, land of one’s ancestors, are central to human identity, but they are complex concepts whose meaning is often contested, particularly in times of displacement and change. The terms are often used in nationalist propaganda or in philosophical / religious ideology,³ and vary from culture to culture. For example, while the national socialists in Germany during WWII preferred the term ‘fatherland’, Russians talked of their ‘motherland’ and ‘Mother Russia’, and, while in ancient Greece the Athenians talked of ἡ πατρίς (‘fatherland’, Xen. *An.* 3.1.20, Plat. *Crit.* 51a), the Cretans preferred ἡ μητρὶς (‘motherland’, Plato *Resp.* 575d,

¹ This article was first presented to the 33rd Biennial Conference of the Classical Association of South Africa, held at the Stellenbosch Institute for Advanced Study in November of 2019 and a revised version was read at the 41st meeting of the Australasian Society for Classical Studies in January 2020. I am grateful to the participants at both conferences for their insightful comments and questions.

² For the theme in general, see Montiglio 2005 (the ancient novels on pp. 221–261, Heliodorus on pp. 235–242); Whitmarsh 1998; Leontis 1995. For the journey home of epic heroes, see Alexopoulou 2009.

³ Tucker 1994.

Plut. *Mor.* 792c, Ael. *Nat. Anim.* 17.35, Syn. *Ep.* 94.10). In addition, in the fourth century of our era many inhabitants of the Roman Empire transferred their allegiance to a heavenly homeland.⁴

Attitudes to citizenship in the Roman world changed over time, initially as a consequence of the political unification of Italy, and became additive rather than exclusive: Cicero viewed himself as Roman but also as Tusculan, and Ennius famously had *tria corda* (Greek, Latin, and Oscan, Gell. *NA* 17.71.1). Cicero made a distinction between two fatherlands, one local and one legal, one the place of one's birth, the other the state into which one was received.⁵ The extension of Roman citizenship under the Severi, culminating in the *Constitutio Antoniana* of Caracalla in 212, in terms of which all inhabitants of the Roman Empire became Roman citizens, took this process further.⁶ In Cicero, Rome already had the title of the 'universal state' (*nomen universae civitatis*, *Leg.* 2.2.5) and the second century sophist Aelius Aristides affirmed that Rome was the common native land of all the peoples of the world (*On Rome* 60).⁷

These ideas concerning political identity in the Roman world were felt strongly in the fourth century. Their effect can be seen both in the writings of the emperor Julian and in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus. These two writers shared a close relationship as has already been demonstrated and this article will argue that Julian's thoughts on his political and personal allegiances can be matched, with minor differences, in Heliodorus' use of terms for homeland.⁸

Julian's fatherlands

The emperor on different occasions expressed his loyalty to three different cities: Constantinople, Athens, and Rome. He was born in Constantinople, lived many years in that city, and he was later laid to rest there, so naturally he felt a strong bond with it. In one of his letters (*Ep.* 59)⁹ he writes that Constantine had intended

⁴ The development of the idea of heaven at this time is a vast topic in itself that will not be investigated in this article.

⁵ See Sherwin-White 1973:134–135.

⁶ *Ibid.* 220–227; *P Giessen* 40; *Dig.* 1.5.17; *Dio* 77.9.

⁷ Sherwin-White 1973:261.

⁸ For the relationship between Julian and Heliodorus, see Hilton 2021.

⁹ I refer to the works of Julian in this article by means of the following abbreviations (the numbering is that of the Budé edition [Bidez 1932–1964], whose text I use): *Const.* = 1. *Encomium on the emperor Constantius*; *Ep.* = *Epistles*; *Eus.* = 2. *Encomium on the empress Eusebia*; *King.* = 3. *On the deeds of the emperor, or On kingship*; *Mother* = 8. *On the mother of the gods*; *Her.* = 7. *To the Cynic Heraclius*; *Them.* = 6. *To the philosopher Themistius*; *Cyn.* = 9. *Against the uneducated Cynics*; *Caes.* = 10. *Symposium or Kronia*.

to transport an obelisk ‘to Constantinople, my fatherland’ (εις τὴν ἐμὴν πατρίδα Κωνσταντίνου πόλιν), but that nothing had been done about this. The city was now (363 CE) demanding the monument from Julian (ἡ πόλις ἀπαιτεῖ παρ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ἀνάθημα), and he felt an obligation to comply with the request because Constantinople was his fatherland that belonged to him more than to Constantine, for while Constantine loved the city as a sister (since they had grown up together), Julian loved it as his mother, because he had been born there (πατρὶς οὐσά μου καὶ προσήκουσα πλέον ἤπερ ἐκείνῳ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴν ὡς ἀδελφὴν, ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς μητέρα φιλω̄). This strong attachment to the motherland is apparent in *King.* 29, 89a, where he states that the true king looks upon his fatherland (the terms ‘motherland’ and ‘fatherland’ are conflated here) as the ‘true hearth and mother of all, older and more respected than parents, and more precious than brothers or friends or comrades’ (ὕπολαμβάνει ... εἶναι τὴν πατρίδα κοινὴν ἐστίαν καὶ μητέρα, πρεσβυτέραν μὲν καὶ σεμινοτέραν τῶν πατέρων, φιλτέραν δὲ ἀδελφῶν καὶ ξένων καὶ φίλων). The good king is a ‘saviour and protector’ to his city, not tolerating profligacy or violations of the law, for the law is the child of justice (ὁ νόμος ἔγγονος τῆς δίκης).¹⁰

Julian also claimed to have Athens as his ‘true’ fatherland. At least, in the course of his discourse in honour of the empress Eusebia, he states that she and the emperor, Constantius, had made it possible for him to see his true fatherland and the one that he yearned for and loved (μοι τὴν ἀληθινὴν ποθοῦντι καὶ ἀγαπῶντι πατρίδα παρέσχον ἰδεῖν, *Eus.* 12, 118d),¹¹ although, of course, this statement must be taken in context — Julian was on this occasion defending himself against the suspicion that he resented the execution of his stepbrother Gallus and so was eager to represent himself as a mere scholar with no political ambitions (*Eus.* 12, 118d).¹² Indeed, in his *Letter to Themistius* Julian ironically notes that, when he left the court of Constantius and arrived in Athens, everyone thought he was going into exile (με φεύγειν ἐνόμιζον πάντες), but he regarded the move as a celebration of a major festival, and likened the change of domicile to Glaucus’ exchange of his golden armour for the bronze armour of Diomedes (*Il.* 6.236). He also wrote that, when called on by Constantius to leave Athens and to travel to Gaul, he had thought at the time that it would have been better had he died there (*Ath.* 5, 275a). So although Julian did not spend a long time in Athens, he writes of the city in very positive terms, since it was of course the home of the great writers of the glorious Hellenic past that he defended throughout his life.

¹⁰ For a different metaphor, that of the king as competitor in the Olympic games striving to do his best for his fatherland, see *Them.* 9, 263b.

¹¹ Athanassiadi 1992:46, 51, 143.

¹² On the importance of not taking Julian at face value, see Rebenich and Wiemer 2020:10–11, 29.

His later works, as would be expected of a reigning emperor, strike a more universal, Roman note. In his prayer at the conclusion of his *Hymn to the mother of the gods* Julian asks the goddess to grant to the Roman people (τῷ Ῥωμαίων δήμῳ) that they should purify themselves from the stain of impiety, and to grant them a ‘kindly fate’ (τὴν τύχην εὐμενῆ) that would guide their Empire together with them for many thousands of years (συνδιακυβερνώσαν αὐτῷ τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς πολλὰς χιλιάδας ἐτῶν, *Mother* 20, 179b). Rome was the city which had established the best constitution of all (*Hel.* 39, 152d–153a); it was the queen of cities (*Const.* 4, 5c, 8, 8c; *Hel.* 3, 131d) and Rome was the centre of Julian’s Neoplatonic vision of the universal management of the world under the care of the gods.¹³ This patriotic sentiment was sincere; Julian attacked the Cynic Heraclius for abandoning the fatherland, just as those whom the Christians called ‘reserves’ (ἀποτακτίτας τινὰς ὀνομάζουσιν οἱ δυσσεβεῖς Γαλιλαῖοι, *Her.* 18, 224b) did when they retreated into the Anatolian wilderness.¹⁴ People like Heraclius Julian viewed as troublemakers who wandered the world to disrupt the established order.¹⁵

At this point Julian’s words on the subject of Constantius’ fatherland should be recalled. In his encomium in honour of Constantius, Julian affirms that he will follow the rules of panegyric by mentioning his subject’s homeland, but professes to be at a loss to say which city this might be, since many had for some time been claiming him as their own (*Const.* 4, 5c). Rome, for example, the city that rules over all the others, did so, since it was his ‘mother and nurse’ and had delivered power to him. Rome, he continues, was not Constantius’ city in the same way as it was for others, who had adopted her constitution, laws, and customs (especially after citizenship had been granted to all the inhabitants of the Empire by Caracalla in 212, as noted above), but much more directly, since Rome had been where his mother Fausta had been born. Also, ‘the city of the Bosporus, which carried the name of the whole family of Constantius’, *i.e.*, Constantinople, would claim to be Constantius’ adopted land (but not the land of his birth) by the act of Constantine in founding it. But in addition to these two, Julian goes on, the Illyrians would put in a claim, since Constantius had been born in Sirmium, in the diocese of Lower Pannonia, not to mention some of the Eastern provinces, which had provided Constantius’ grandmother, Eutropia, who came from Syria. Julian concludes that he would go along with Constantius’ own choice in the matter, and that he would praise them all, especially Rome, which Constantius had declared to be the teacher

¹³ Athanassiadi 1992:84–85.

¹⁴ Calder 1923:86 identifies the ἀποτακτίται as a heretical sect.

¹⁵ In the same vein, Julian has Alexander criticise Julius Caesar for being prepared to attack his own fatherland (*Caes.* 25, 323d).

of virtue. Overall, Julian does not endorse Constantius' position as the ruler of the Roman Empire unambiguously.

Julian as an 'exile'

Orphaned of both parents by the age of five, Julian also suffered numerous separations from relatives, teachers, mentors, and friends during his life. He felt his separation from his mother's tutor Mardonius and his relegation to Macellum particularly acutely¹⁶ and later, after being declared Augustus in 361, when he could speak freely, he characterized it as an exile:

This was the song they sang to us when we had been imprisoned in a certain farm in Cappadocia, and they allowed no one to come near us after they had summoned him [his stepbrother, Gallus] from exile and had abducted me from the schools, though I was just a lad. How shall I speak about the six years we spent on someone else's property? We were like those among the Persians who are guarded in their castles, since no other person came to see us and not one of our old friends was allowed to visit us; so that we were raised shut off from all serious study and from all free intercourse, in a glittering servitude, and practising rhetorical exercises together with our own slaves as though they were comrades. For no companion of our own age ever came near us nor was allowed to do so (*Ath.* 3, 271b Bidez, trans. Wright 1913–1923 modified).

Immediately before this passage (3, 270d) Julian had stated that Constantius had imposed a sentence of exile on both Gallus and himself (τέλος δὲ ἐπιβαλὼν φυγῆν), and that, while he had been allowed to return, Gallus had been put to death contrary to the law.¹⁷ His own rustication 'on someone else's property' (ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ κτήματι) in Cappadocia, he views as imprisonment in a foreign land, similar to that experienced by captives in Persia.¹⁸ He would nevertheless have been treated as royalty in his detention, hence his bitter but memorable term for his confinement as a 'glittering servitude' (ἐν ταῖς λαμπραῖς οἰκετεῖαις).

¹⁶ For the influence of Mardonius on Julian, especially with regard to his Homeric conception of the world, see Athanassiadi 1992:14–22.

¹⁷ Ammianus Marcellinus 14.11.19–23 describes the movements of Gallus from Constantinople to Pola in Istria, where he was executed. See *PLRE* s.v. 'Flavius Claudius Constantius Gallus 4'. In 326. Crispus, the son of Constantine I by his first wife, was also executed or committed suicide at Pola.

¹⁸ Julian may have been thinking of the captive Christians in Persia during the reign of Constantine, for which see Smith 2019. Procopius later describes Persian garrisons as 'castles of oblivion' (ἐν φρουρίῳ ... τῆς Λήθης, *Pers.* 1.5.7), and being incarcerated in them was tantamount to the death penalty. See Athanassiadi 1992:21–23.

The idea of a universal homeland in Julian

Another separation, which Julian compares with his loss of Mardonius as his mentor (καθηγεμόν, *Sal.* 2, 241c), occurred when his close friend Sallust was recalled from Gaul by Constantius II. As often, Julian cites a quotation from Homer (*Il.* 11.401 ‘Odysseus was left alone’) to reflect his feelings of isolation at this point.¹⁹ Julian composed his *consolatio* to himself on the departure of his philosophical ally²⁰ when Constantius was still in power. In this work, Julian compares his relationship with Sallust with other famous friendships, such as that between Scipio Africanus and Laelius, and Pericles and Anaxagoras. He composes a lengthy speech (*Sal.* 5, 246b–248c) which he puts in the mouth of Pericles when the Athenian leader had been ordered to undertake a military campaign against Samos:

The whole world is my city and fatherland (Ἐμοὶ πόλις μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ πατρις ὁ κόσμος), and the dear gods and the δαίμονες and all good men whoever and wherever they may be. Yet we must honour the land of our birth (οὗ γηγόναμεν),²¹ since this is the divine law, and to obey all her commands and not to violate them, ‘or, as the proverb says, “kick against the pricks”’. For inexorable, as the saying goes, is the yoke of necessity.²² But we must not complain or lament when her commands are rather harsh, but rather consider the matter itself (*Sal.* 5, 246c, trans. Wright 1913–1923, modified).

This remarkable passage imagines Pericles anticipating the words of Diogenes, the fourth century BCE Cynic philosopher, who famously stated that he was a ‘citizen of the universe’, before going on to affirm the claim of ‘the land where I was born’, and to submit to its commands. The introductory words (‘you must understand what follows as the very words of Pericles’) may be an allusion to Plato’s *Menexenus*, in which Plato puts the funeral speech on the Athenian dead in the Peloponnesian War, supposedly written by Aspasia, into the mouth of Socrates.

¹⁹ For a discussion, see Athanassiadi 1992:20.

²⁰ Sallust was the author of a Neoplatonic treatise *On the gods and the world* and Julian dedicated his *Hymn to Helios* to him.

²¹ It is interesting that Julian does not use the term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα, which Heliodorus uses often, here (see the discussion below), but the idea behind the expression he uses (οὗ γηγόναμεν) is similar.

²² For this phrase and its use in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* 218 in connection with his obligation to sacrifice his daughter Iphigeneia, see Schreckenberg 1963. The use of such quotations from Greek literature, especially Homer and the dramatists, is characteristic of both Julian and Heliodorus; while Heliodorus does not use the word ‘yoke’, he does refer to necessity in describing Hydaspes’ reluctance to submit to its laws in respect of sacrificing Chariclea (10.16.5) and Theagenes (10.32.3).

In this specific part of the speech (246c), Aspasia asks her audience to imagine that the words that follow were actually spoken by the fathers of sons being sent into battle. The words composed by Julian are thus triply fictional: a fiction within a fictional discourse by Aspasia, quoting fictional words by Athenian fathers to their sons.

Julian's discourse ends with a composite quotation from the *Odyssey* (24.402 with the addition of a line modified from 1.290 and 5.204) to make a Homeric blessing, praying that the gods might grant Sallust prosperity and allow him to return to his 'dear home and fatherland' (Οὔλέ τε καὶ μέγα χαῖρε, θεοὶ δέ τοι ὄλβια δοῖεν, / Νοστήσαι οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν). Quotations from Homer are commonplace in the writings of Julian, but this one is composed from memory.²³ Nevertheless, it makes an effective conclusion and invokes the possibility of Sallust's return to his homeland (Gaul), just as Odysseus had returned to Ithaca.²⁴

Julian refers to Diogenes' famous declaration that he did not belong to any city-state and had no home a number of times.²⁵ His fictional account of Pericles' speech to Anaxagoras on leaving for the campaign against Samos, has been mentioned above. In this speech Pericles claimed the whole world as his fatherland. Similarly, in *Cyn.* 14, 195b) Julian observed that, unlike the cynics in Antioch who were attacking him, Diogenes had striven for happiness by rejecting material possessions and the demands of the state. He had regarded himself as a man without a home, fatherland, or money: Ἄπολις, ἄοικος, πατρίδος ἐστερημένος, / Οὐκ ὀβολόν, οὐ δραχμὴν, οὐκ οἰκέτην ἔχων ('Without a city, without a home, deprived of his fatherland / having not an obol, drachma, or slave.'). This was one of Julian's favourite quotations; he also quotes this exact phrase in the accusative case in response to a letter from Themistius, exhorting him to aspire to greatness as a leader and to achieve happiness (*Them.* 256d). Julian responds modestly, deprecating his abilities and pointing out the power of fortune to prevent this. He states that rulers are not isolated from the real world nor are they like Diogenes, who was stateless and had nothing to lose.

²³ The received text of *Od.* 24.402 has μάλα for μέγα and is in fact a greeting from the old man Dolius to Odysseus and not a farewell, while the composite line recalls the words of Athena to Telemachus and Calypso's words to Odysseus.

²⁴ Bidez (*ad loc.*) comments: 'Ces souhaits de prompt retour montrent que Salluste avait la Gaule pour pays natal'. For a different take on Homeric leave-taking, see *Ep.* 35, in which Julian grants Eustathius permission to return to his fatherland.

²⁵ For Diogenes, see Dudley 1937:17–39, esp. 23–24; Navia 1996:81–118; for the theme of alienation, homelessness and the world as home in Cynic philosophy, see Montiglio 2005:180–220.

Likewise, in *Her.* 25, 238b–d, Julian noted that Diogenes had avoided initiation into the mysteries on the ground that evil people such as tax-collectors were initiates, and so were destined to enjoy happiness in the next life, whereas virtuous men such as Agesilaus and Epaminondas were not, and were thus condemned ‘to lie in the mire’ [ἐν τῷ βορβόρῳ κείσεσθαι].²⁶ Julian suggests that Diogenes made this statement because he wanted to avoid having to become an Athenian citizen, since he was not an Athenian by birth, but regarded himself as a citizen of the world (νομίζων αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου πολίτην, 238c),²⁷ and wanted to associate with all the gods who govern the universe and not those that only control part of it. According to Julian, Diogenes wanted to give a new stamp to the common currency (τό νόμιμον ... παραχαράττων) and did not want to bind himself to any one country (238d).

Julian, theurgy, and the union of the soul with the divine

Julian was critical of Christian ideas about the path to heaven but that is not to say that he did not believe in a spiritual home. On the contrary, he thought that human beings were ‘heavenly by nature’ (φύσει ... οὐρανίους) but that they had been sewn in the earth to reap virtue with piety from our constitution on earth and to strive towards our ancestral and life-producing goddess (ἀρετήν μετὰ εὐσεβείας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῇ γῆ πολιτείας ἀμνησαμένουσ παρα τὴν προγονικὴν καὶ ζωογόνον σπεύδειν θεόν, *Mother* 9, 169b). Because humans have been endowed with reason by Prometheus, those who exercise it will get to know the nature of the soul and also whatever is in them that is greater and more divine than the soul which all believe in and which they suppose is located in heaven (εἴ τι τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶ κρεῖττον καὶ θεϊότερον, ὅπερ δὴ πάντες ἀδιδάκτως πειθόμενοι θεῖόν τι εἶναι νομίζομεν, καὶ τοῦτο ἐνιδρῦσθαι πάντες οὐρανῷ κοινῶς ὑπολαμβάνομεν, *Cyn.* 4, 183b–c). Julian’s explication of the Attis myth, and especially the halting of Helios at the vernal equinox, provides evidence of the possibility of human salvation, for those who contemplate the heavens and what lies beyond the heavens can escape the cycle of generation and death and reach the gods (*Mother* 9, 168c–175d).²⁸ Julian here draws on Iamblichus’ doctrine of the ascent of the soul through theurgy:

²⁶ DL 6.39.

²⁷ Cf. 6.63, when asked where he was from Diogenes answered that he was ‘a citizen of the world’ (κοσμοπολίτης). Cf. *Luc. Vit. Auct.* 8.

²⁸ Athanassiadi 1992:145–146.

[T]hat [soul] which is present to us in an intelligible mode from the intelligible transcends the cycle of generation, and it is in virtue of it that we may attain to emancipation from fate and ascend to the intelligible gods (*Myst.* 5.26; 8.6, trans. Clarke *et al.* 2003).

On his deathbed Julian believed that he would ascend to heaven (Amm. Marc. 25.3.22).

A new term for homeland (ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα)

Given this background, it is not surprising that a new term for ‘homeland’, or ‘land of birth’ was introduced in the fourth century. Instead of the usual terms (ἡ πατρίς / ἡ μητρίς) the expression ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα began to be used (see Table 1). The phrase occurs only once before the fourth century in the *Meditations* of the Stoic philosopher Marcus Aurelius (4.48, second century CE), where the emperor exhorts himself to live life according to nature and to accept death graciously and thankfully, just as an olive does when it ripens and falls from the tree to the ground that produced it. Here the words τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν qualify an implied noun γαῖαν (‘earth’) and so can be taken to mean ‘Mother Earth’; they carry a philosophical meaning of universal application, but do not yet refer to a religious or an ideological homeland. For this reason Heliodorus’ use of the expression to mean ‘land of birth’ has been taken as evidence of his fourth century date.²⁹ The introduction of this term in addition to the traditional ones raises the question of whether it carries a special significance in the novel or not.³⁰ It is worth noting that Heliodorus rarely qualifies this expression with pronominal adjectives (‘my’, ‘your’, ‘their’ etc.) and the land denoted often needs to be inferred from other words in the sentence (see Table 2). The use of the term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα for both Theagenes and Chariclea on more than one occasion is most remarkable (2.4.1; 8.3.7), since Theagenes was not born in Ethiopia (at least not in the usual sense, see below).

²⁹ Colonna 1952:149 (Colonna’s article also discusses other characteristically fourth century terms used by Heliodorus.) See also Birchall 1996:16–27.

³⁰ Translations vary on this point. Morgan’s translation of *The Ethiopian story* (Morgan 1989a) carefully preserves the distinction between the new term (‘land of birth’) and the old one (‘home’, or ‘homeland’, and ‘fatherland’), while Lamb 1961 uses ‘native land’ for ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα and ‘country’ (derived, curiously, from Latin *contra*) or ‘fatherland’ for ἡ πατρίς. However, the older translations of Smith 1855; Underdowne 1923 (as revised by Wright) and Hadas 1957 predominantly use ‘country’, very occasionally ‘fatherland’ or ‘native land’ (Hadas oddly translates ἐνεγκοῦσα as ‘fatherland’ at 3.14.4). The French translation in the Budé edition by Maillon uses ‘patrie’ for both terms, and the Italian of Limentani 1922 has ‘patria’, and sometimes ‘paese’.

The entry in LSJ⁹ (s.v. φέρω V ‘bring forth’, whether of the earth or trees) attributes the use of the new form ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα in the fourth century to Heliodorus (2.29.5) and Libanius (*Or.* 2.66, dated by Norman 1977 to 380/1 and so later than Heliodorus).³¹ It also notes the related middle form of the term (ἡ ἐνεγκαμένη) in a letter of Julian (*Ep.* 202) in the sense of ‘land of birth’, but this letter, addressed to ‘Arsace, the Armenian satrap’ is deemed a later forgery by Bidez and Cumont in their first edition of Julian’s letters.³² The TLG reveals two occurrences of the middle form in Gregory of Nyssa’s oration *On St. Ephraem*, both in the sense of ‘homeland’ (Migne 46.833.5, 849.12).³³ These references are notable, since Gregory of Nyssa also uses the form ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα in this sense (*Life of Gregory the wonderworker* 46.905.57 Migne, dated to 380 by Van Dam 1982).³⁴ However, Gregory (335–395) probably lived somewhat later than Heliodorus (assuming that he wrote the *Aethiopica* at some time during the short reign of Julian, 361–363, as is most likely) as most of his orations date to 379–388.³⁵ Since Gregory was strongly influenced by Neoplatonism, it is possible that he adopted this term from his reading of philosophical texts, or, conceivably, from reading Heliodorus.³⁶

It appears then that the *Aethiopica* was the first text that we know of to use this neologism and that it originally carried a philosophical meaning. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Heliodorus’ novel is certainly the first to use it more often than he does the traditional terms (see Table 1). In the *Aethiopica* both terms (ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα and ἡ πατρίς) are sometimes used to refer to homelands: Chariclea’s homeland, Ethiopia, Cnemon’s Athens, and Homer’s putative home city, but the new term occurs almost twice as frequently as ἡ πατρίς in the novel, particularly in the second half, and it is used to refer to Charicles’ Delphi, Calasiris’ Memphis, and, of course, Chariclea’s Ethiopia.³⁷

³¹ Libanius uses the phrase ἡ πατρίς far more often than he does ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα, but when he does use the new phrase it is to refer to the city in which he had been born, Antioch, or another city in the Roman Empire (*Or.* 11.272; 49.17).

³² The term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα does not otherwise occur in the writings of Julian, although the concept of the land of one’s birth is prominent.

³³ The later lexicographers (e.g., Hesychius) cite the middle form as a synonym for πατρίς (Hesychius refers to Eur. *Tro.* 825, but this may be a later gloss).

³⁴ Van Dam 1982:277.

³⁵ *Ibid.* See also Danielou 1955.

³⁶ On Gregory’s Neoplatonism, see Cherniss 1930; Meredith 1999.

³⁷ Heliodorus uses this term more than most fourth century authors (22 times), apart from Cyril of Alexandria (fifth century, 46 times in all of his works), Theodoret (19 in all works), Libanius (28 in all works). More significantly, he uses ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα almost twice as often as ἡ πατρίς (the ratio is 22:13). He is the only author besides Cyril of Alexandria to do this (Cyril’s ratio is even more marked at 10:46). Taking into account

The boukolos

The opening scenes of the *Aethiopica* take place in wild regions of the western edges of the Nile delta, where the *boukoloi* live (cattle herders living outside of the law). Heliodorus names this region Boukolia (known to Stephanus *Ethn.* as Ἡρακλειοβουκόλια) but, because of the inundations of the Nile, it is not so much a territorial region as a lake surrounded by marshland.

Heliodorus ironically describes this outlaw settlement as a kind of state (ληστρικὸν πολιτεύεται) and notes that all the outlaws born within it consider it their ‘nurse and fatherland’ (τροφὸν ... καὶ πατρίδα τὴν λίμνην ἐνόμισεν). Heliodorus’ account of this place draws on Herodotus (2.92.2; 5.16.3) and, more recently, Achilles Tatius (4.11–12),³⁸ but whereas Achilles Tatius, whose account may well have been based on personal observation, describes the huts of the inhabitants as ‘a rough and ready imitation of a city’ (αὐτοσχέδιον μεμίμηται πόλιν, 4.12.7), Heliodorus accentuates the irony of an informal settlement being likened not just to a city, but to a fatherland (πατρίδα). The use of the term πατρίς here brings out the paradox clearly.

The story of Cnemon

The young Athenian, Cnemon, tells his fellow captives, Theagenes and Chariclea, the story of his banishment from Athens as a result of a complicated intrigue initiated by his step-mother, Demaenete (1.9.1–18.1).³⁹ The narrative concerns the sexual affairs of Demaenete, aided by her servant Thisbe, that result in Cnemon being accused of assaulting her and later being duped into entering his father’s bedroom with a drawn sword under the mistaken belief that she was entertaining her lover there. As a result he was put on trial for attempted parricide and, after deliberating on various penalties, the court sentenced him to perpetual banishment and so, in his own words, ‘I was driven out from my ancestral hearth and the land where I was born’ (κἀγὼ μὲν οὕτως ἐξηλαυνόμεν ἐστίας τε πατρώας καὶ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης, 1.14.2). Here the term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα, in conjunction with the reference to his ‘ancestral hearth’, underlines the emotional trauma of his unjust exile from his home. Later in the novel, when Cnemon is asked to tell the story of his

the fact that the writings of Cyril, Theodoret, and Libanius were far more extensive than those of Heliodorus, these statistics are significant. See Table 1 below (this table gives statistics for the use of the accusative singular forms [τὴν] πατρίδα / τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν, and the genitive singular forms [τῆς] πατρίδος / τῆς ἐνεγκούσης only in order to avoid ambiguous grammatical forms). The expression ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα is used in the novel by both male and female characters, both Greeks and others.

³⁸ On the *boukoloi* in Achilles Tatius, see most recently Hilton 2020.

³⁹ For the story of Cnemon, see Morgan 1989b; Hilton 2019.

banishment to the merchant Nausicles, he repeats these words ([saying that] ‘he was exiled from the land of his birth’, φυγαδευθείη τῆς ἐνεγκούσης, 6.2.3), after identifying himself as ‘an Athenian in respect of his fatherland’ (τὴν πατρίδα ὡς Ἀθηναῖος). When asked by Calasiris whether he will accompany them in their search for Theagenes, who had been separated from them after their release from captivity in the marshlands of the outlaws, Cnemon puts on an emotional outburst, inveighing against fortune, which had deprived him of his family, his ancestral home, and the fatherland and the city of those who were dearest to him (γένους με καὶ οἰκίας πατρώας ἐστέρησας, πατρίδος καὶ πόλεως τῆς τῶν φιλτάτων ἐξένωσας, 6.7.4). He asks them to allow him to return to his fatherland and family (ἐπὶ τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὸ γένος, 6.7.6) and Nausicles assures him that he will assist him to regain his home and fatherland (οἰκόν τε καὶ πατρίδα τὴν σὴν, 6.8.1) and that he will make him rich. While the new term is used twice in Cnemon’s narrative for his homeland, most probably for emotional effect, the term πατρίς is used three times towards the end of his narrative, possibly because Cnemon’s exile was political and the result of a law trial arising from a series of sexual intrigues in Athens, which is portrayed as a worldly city. His return is facilitated by Nausicles, who promises to make him very wealthy and betroths his daughter Nausiclea to him (6.8.1). He describes his return to Athens as an act of filial loyalty arising from the need to preserve something of his family (μὴ ... ἔρημος εἰς τὸ παντελὲς διαδόχου καὶ ἄκληρος ὁ οἶκος ἀπολειφθεῖη, 6.7.6) and hopes (vainly as it turns out) to be able to leave Chariclea in good conscience after reuniting her with Theagenes (6.7.7). His return to Athens is characterized as a return to the material world.

The story of Charicles

The priest of Apollo at Delphi, Charicles, was also deprived of the land of his birth. He confided in the itinerant priest of Isis, Calasiris, that after the deaths of his daughter and wife in a fire, he had resolved ‘to retire from the land of my birth, and flee the solitude of my home’ (ὕπεξάγω δὲ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης καὶ τὴν ἐρημίαν τῆς οἰκίας ἀποδιδράσκω, 2.29.5). He travelled to Egypt where he met the Ethiopian gymnosophist, Sisimithres, at whose request he adopted Persinna’s daughter, whom he named Chariclea, after promising to bring her up as a free Greek woman (2.32.1, 5). He regarded his stay in Egypt as a banishment brought about by a malevolent *daimon* (ἐμὲ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἐξήλασεν, 4.19.8), but eventually returned home, when he had overcome his grief (ἤδη γάρ μοι τῆς λῖαν ἀλγηδόνοσ τῷ χρόνῳ πεπτομένης ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐπάνοδος ἐσπουδάζετο, ‘time having truly digested my sorrow, I now longed to return to the land of my birth’, 2.30.1). The term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα here conveys the personal nature of priest’s expulsion from

his home by a supernatural agency. In addressing the people of Delphi after the abduction of Chariclea, he attempts to shame them into taking action by calling on them to avenge the honour of their homeland and its ancestral gods as a result of their outrage at the kidnapping (τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης καὶ θεῶν τῶν πατρώων ἀγανάκτησιν, 4.19.7). Charicles uses the new, more philosophical term for homeland throughout his narrative to accentuate the private and religious nature of the events he relates.

The story of Homer

In the course of a light-hearted conversation between Calasiris and Cnemon, the former mentions that Homer was an Egyptian (3.13.3, 3.14.2). When asked to explain this unusual assertion, Calasiris states that, although many cities have laid claim to Homer and although for a wise man every city is his fatherland (πατρις ἔστω τῷ σοφῷ πᾶσα πόλις, 3.14.2), he was in fact born in Egyptian Thebes, after the god Hermes had lain with his mother in a temple during a time of national celebration (3.14.2). As a mark of this Homer carried a patch of hair on his thigh and as a result he was given the name, Homer, as if from the Greek word for thigh, ὁ μηρός. Homer concealed the circumstances of his birth because, according to Calasiris, he was not accepted as an initiate when he came of age because of this physical blemish, and was deemed illegitimate, and for this reason his father had banished him (ἐδιώχθη γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, 3.14.4). Alternatively, he had hidden the truth of his birth because of his wisdom, deeming all cities his fatherland (πᾶσαν ἑαυτῷ πόλιν μνώμενος, 3.14.4).⁴⁰

Calasiris' theory of Homer's nationality is one of many that were proposed in antiquity.⁴¹ Among them is the account in the Pseudo-Plutarchan life about Homer's own question to the god, Apollo, concerning his fatherland. The response given to him stated that he did not have a fatherland, only a motherland.⁴² Calasiris' suggestion that Homer was Egyptian and that he was thought to have been illegitimate is unique among these accounts, and was probably invented to provide a doublet to the birth of Chariclea,⁴³ who was exposed by her mother out of fear that her unusual skin colour might lead to accusations of adultery by the queen. Like Homer, Chariclea carried a birthmark on her body — a ring of black on her

⁴⁰ For a discussion, see Whitmarsh 1998. The manuscripts here preserve the variant πατρίδα, which was written above the word πόλιν.

⁴¹ Cf. Paus. 10.24.3; *Certamen Hom. et Hes.* 36–40, 56–62; Philostr. *Her.* 44.1–5 [Aitken and Maclean].

⁴² For the pseudo-Plutarchan lives of Homer, see West 2003. The reference is to the first life, section 4.

⁴³ On narrative doublets in Heliodorus, see Morgan 1998, although this particular one is not discussed there.

arm that would aid her identification as the legitimate daughter of Persinna. The other suggestion that he makes — that Homer had concealed the truth about his birthplace (ἐσιώπα τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν, 3.14.4) in order to be claimed as a citizen by all cities — may have been influenced by the account of Philostratus in the *Heroicus* (44, Maclean and Aitken 2001), that all cities and all peoples ally themselves with Homer, but there were similar ideas in the writings of Julian, as noted above. This much-analysed episode provides a significant context for the other stories of alienation from a homeland in the novel. The terms used, especially πόλις and πατρίς, may have been influenced from previous treatments of this topic, although the new term is used when discussing Homer's personal reason for concealing his homeland. The discussion neatly contrasts the patriotic contest among the cities of the world claiming Homer as their own to the poet's individual desire to belong to all cities, expressed in Cnemon's use of the more philosophical term.

Chariclea's Phoenician suitor

In order to avoid a marriage between Chariclea and Charicles' nephew Alcamenes (4.13.2) Calasiris arranged for himself, Theagenes, and Chariclea to leave Delphi on a Phoenician ship bound for Carthage (4.16.6). While they were sailing, the Phoenician owner of the ship fell in love with her and approached Calasiris in order to arrange a marriage with her. He proclaimed that he is ready to marry her without a dowry, since he not only owned the ship but also much of the cargo, consisting of gold, precious stones and silk clothing. In addition, he offered to take their people and country in exchange for his own (ἔθνος δὲ καὶ πατρίδα τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀλλάξομαι, 5.19.3). This vignette satirizes the materialism and self-interest of the Phoenician, who boasts of his worldly wealth and is prepared to discard his civic identity in order to fulfil his impulsive desires. In this the Phoenician to some extent resembles Cnemon, who abandons the search for Theagenes in order to return to Athens as a wealthy man. The traditional term πατρίς is used in this passage.

The story of Calasiris

The story of Calasiris, which, like that of Charicles, is a tale of withdrawing from one's homeland for personal reasons, is closely woven into those of Theagenes and Calasiris, since he is their mentor and guide. When Cnemon tells Calasiris, who had been separated from Theagenes and Chariclea, that he knew that they were safe, Calasiris promises that if they ever were to set foot on the land of his birth (εἰ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἐπιβαίημεν), he would recompense him for information about them richly (2.23.3). He goes on to confide in Cnemon that earlier in his life

he had encountered a wealthy and beautiful courtesan, Rhodopis (2.25.1), who had visited Memphis and had overcome the sexual continence (*ἐγκράτεια*) and priestly purity (*ιερωσύνη*) that he had practised after his wife's death. Although he had not actually slept with Rhodopis, but had only gazed lustfully at her (2.25.4),⁴⁴ he nevertheless imposed the punishment of exile on himself for his sins (*ἡμαρτημένων*) and departed from the land of his birth (Egypt) as a man cursed with an evil demon (*φυγῆ κολάζω τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ὁ βαρυσταίμων ἐξήειν*, 2.25.4). He travelled to Ethiopia in search of the wisdom of the Ethiopian gymnosophists (4.12.1) and the reader must infer that he learned their sacred script there. During his time he encountered the Ethiopian queen, Persinna, who asked him to search for her daughter, Chariclea (4.12.2–3), whom she had exposed at birth on account of her alien skin colour (4.8.6). In fact, one of the Ethiopian gymnosophists, the young Sisimithres, had rescued the child and had taken her to Egypt (2.31.1). Calasiris promised to search for Chariclea (4.13.1) and so he returned to Greece where he travelled to Delphi.

One night during his stay in Delphi, Calasiris experienced a vision in which Apollo and Artemis informed him that he was destined to return to the land of his birth (*ῥα σοι,* ἔλεγον, *εἰς τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐπανάκειν, οὕτω γὰρ ὁ μοιρῶν ὑπαγορεύει θεσμός,* 3.11.5). This filled Calasiris with hope that he would indeed return to his homeland (*εἰς τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐπανάξειν προσδοκῶν*, 3.15.3), but when he had learned the true story of Chariclea's birth and exposure by reading the swaddling bands (written in the secret Ethiopian script that he had evidently learnt on his earlier visit to Ethiopia) in which the child had been wrapped at the time of her exposure (4.8.1, 11.4), he was filled with trepidation at her high birth and the distance between Delphi and Chariclea's homeland, Ethiopia (*τίνων μὲν γενομένη, τίνων ἐνομίσθη, πόσῳ δὲ τῷ μεταξύ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἀπήχθη*, 4.9.2), but he nevertheless resolved to help her to elope from Delphi. Calasiris, Theagenes, and Chariclea then travelled by ship to Egypt, but were wrecked on the coast of that land in a storm (5.27.2, 27.7). They were taken prisoner by bandits; Theagenes was separated from them for a while but they were eventually reunited at Memphis, where Calasiris unexpectedly died (7.11.4).

The term used in the above narrative, as in that of Charicles, is overwhelmingly *ἐνεγκοῦσα*. As in the case of his fellow priest, the 'exile' of Calasiris is self-imposed and the result of the machinations of a malevolent supernatural power.

⁴⁴ The sentiment may reflect knowledge of the New Testament in which Jesus equates looking lustfully on women with actual adultery (Matt. 5.27–28). For Calasiris, see Winkler 1982.

Theagenes and Chariclea

Theagenes is deprived of his homeland because of his violent kidnapping of Chariclea from Delphi, but he also attributes his misfortune to a malign supernatural agency that pursues both himself and Chariclea, with whose destiny he is identified ever since their encounter at the Pythian Games. During the confusion of the battle between the *boukoloι* and the state forces he is separated from Chariclea and believes that she has been killed. Theagenes attributes this misfortune to an ‘insatiable Fury’ who had also driven them from ‘their’ homeland (τίς οὕτως ἀκόρεστος Ἐρινὺς τοῖς ἡμετέροις κακοῖς ἐνεβάκχευσε φυγὴν τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἐπιβαλοῦσα, 2.4.1). Others also assume that Theagenes and Chariclea share a common homeland. The leader of the outlaws, Thyamis, informs the Persian satrap Arsace that Theagenes and Chariclea are nobly born and that they desire to recover their people and their homeland (πάντων ἐπίπροσθεν ποιοῦνται γένος τὸ ἴδιον ἀνακομίσασθαι καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐπανήκειν, 8.3.7). However, it is Chariclea who was miraculously born in Ethiopia and who desired to return there ever since she heard the story of her birth from Calasiris. Her mother Persinna had urged Calasiris to find her daughter and to persuade her to return to her homeland (ικέτευεν ἐπιζητεῖν καὶ προτρέπειν ἥκειν εἰς τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν, 4.12.3). Although he had agreed to do so, at Delphi he is filled with doubt in view of the distance between Greece and Ethiopia (πόσῳ δὲ τῷ μεταξὺ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἀπήχθη, 4.9.2). Nevertheless, he proceeds to persuade her to recover her family, her fatherland and her parents (γένος μὲν καὶ πατρίδα καὶ τοὺς φύντας, 4.13.2) together with Theagenes, who is prepared to follow them anywhere in the world.

When Calasiris unexpectedly dies, Chariclea is thrown into despair and laments his loss, stressing that he had been her guide to the land of her birth (7.14.7). Nevertheless, she remains positive about the outcome of their wandering, even when Theagenes pessimistically interprets an oracle that he had received to mean that Ethiopia stood for the underworld of the dead and that he would be accompanied by Persephone there. Instead, she says, she would lead him to her homeland, Ethiopia (πατρίδος τῆς ἐμῆς Αἰθιοπίας, 8.11.5). Chariclea’s use of *πατρίς* here is unexpected, since the new term is otherwise used to refer to the land of her birth, but may be explained by the relatively neutral tone of this passage.

When Theagenes and Chariclea arrive in Ethiopia, and seek to be reunited with their parents, Persinna remarks on her daughter’s long separation from her homeland (τῆς ἐνεγκούσης, 10.7.8) and Hydaspes attributes it to the will of the gods (ἐξόκισαν τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἐπὶ πέρατα γῆς ἔσχατα, 10.16.6) and notes the irony that, because it was the law in Ethiopia to sacrifice captives to the gods,

he was obliged to kill his daughter, and that she would experience more suffering in her homeland than she did in foreign lands, and that although her life had been preserved abroad, she would meet her death in the land of her birth (τῆς ἐνεγκούσης, 10.16.9).⁴⁵ Still he so loved his homeland (τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν, 10.16.4) that he was prepared to give up his hopes for an heir and to obey the law of his homeland (τῷ πατρίῳ πείθεσθαι νόμῳ, τῶν ἰδίων λυσιτελῶν τὸ τῆς πατρίδος ἐπίπροσθεν ποιούμενον, 10.16.5). However, the Ethiopian people refuse to allow the sacrifice to go forward when Chariclea's identity as the daughter of the king and queen is revealed, and they are married (10.40.2) and are crowned with the white mitres of the priest of Helios and the priestess of Selene, in fulfilment of the oracle that Calasiris had received in Delphi (2.35.5; 10.41.1–3).

The term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα and Chariclea's return to Ethiopia

While both Calasiris and Chariclea use the traditional term πατρίς for her homeland Ethiopia, each on one occasion only, the new term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα predominates in the story of her journey home, especially in the final stages, and it is used exclusively in the stories of the priests, Charicles and Calasiris. These are the characters who directly assist in the rescue and return of Theagenes and Chariclea to Ethiopia. While each has a separate homeland (Delphi and Memphis), both are instrumental in securing her return to her homeland Ethiopia. Theagenes too is drawn into her dramatic return and her homeland becomes his. The lives of all are affected above all by the revelation of her supernatural birth; this miraculous event makes Ethiopia indeed the 'land of her birth' (4.8). Even Hydaspes, who, as the head of the Ethiopian state occasionally uses the term πατρίς, also uses this term to refer to Chariclea's homeland.

A second reason for the use of the new term can be found in the influence of Platonic ideas in the *Aethiopia*, especially the idea of *anamnesis* — the doctrine that the soul remembers its previous existences, which is referred to in the description of the first meeting of Theagenes and Chariclea (3.5.4–5):

He said this, and poured the libation, while Theagenes took the fire; when he did so, my dear Cnemon, we understood that the soul is divine and akin to the works of heaven (συγγενὲς ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἔργοις); for at the same time as the young couple saw each other they fell in love, as though the soul recognised something similar to it at the first encounter and ran eagerly towards a deserved home (πρὸς τὸ κατ' ἄξιαν οἰκεῖον). At first they stood as one in passionate excitement, then she slowly handed the torch to him and

⁴⁵ Hydaspes varies his expression between πατρίς and ἐνεγκοῦσα in this rhetorically elaborate antithesis.

he took it, fixing their eyes with great intensity on each other as if somehow recalling in their memories the times they had known or had seen each other before (my translation).

Here the idea that the soul is divine and ‘akin to the works of heaven’ (συγγενὲς ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἔργοις), recalls Plato’s account in the *Phaedrus* of how the soul of a man who has once seen the truth, such as a philosopher, recollects this vision when he has been incarnated:

... it takes a man to understand by the use of universals, and to collect out of the multiplicity of sense-impressions a unity arrived at by a process of reason. Such a process is simply the recollection (ἀνάμνησις) of the things which our soul once perceived when it took its journey with a god, looking down from above on the things to which we now ascribe reality (ἃ νῦν εἶναί φασιν) and gazing upwards towards what is truly real (εἰς τὸ ὄν ὄτως). That is why it is right the soul of the philosopher alone should regain its wings; for it is always dwelling in memory as best it may upon those things which a god owes his divinity to dwelling upon (*Phdr.* 249b–c, trans. Hamilton 1993).

This recollection of the divine, according to the *Phaedrus*, occurs when one who has recently been initiated, and who has ‘beheld the realities’ sees an ‘image of beauty’ once he has been reincarnated (251a).⁴⁶ The idea of recognition through what is similar (τὸ ὅμοιον ἐπιγνώσεως) is prominent in the passage from the *Aethiopica*, which should be compared with Plato *Symp.* 192a, 195b, where both Aristophanes and Agathon state that love is the attraction of like to like. Even the word ὀλκότερον recalls Plato’s use of the word to describe how knowledge draws the soul towards the truth (*Rep.* 521d; 527b) and Plotinus’ description of how Love attracts the soul towards the One (*Enn.* 3.5.3).⁴⁷ But this does not exhaust the parallels between this passage and Plato. In Heliodorus, the lovers run towards what they believe to be rightly their own (πρὸς τὸ κατ’ ἀξίαν οἰκεῖον), which recalls Aristophanes’ words in the *Symposium* 193d, when he states that love brings us into what is our own in the present (ὅς ἔν τε τῷ παρόντι ἡμᾶς

⁴⁶ *Phaedrus* 251a: ‘But the newly initiated, who has had a full sight of the celestial vision, when he beholds a god-like face or a physical form which truly reflects ideal beauty, first of all shivers and experiences something of the dread which the vision itself inspired; next he gazes upon it and worships it as if it were a god’ (trans. Hamilton 1993).

⁴⁷ In the same vein, Merkelbach 1962:241 refers to the role of the Eroles, who draw souls towards their home, in the hymns of Proclus (2.5; 7.34–36) and the role of Eros in the Chaldaean oracles.

πλεῖστα ὀνίνησιν εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἄγων) and gives us hope that we will attain the blessed life in future (καὶ εἰς τὸ ἔπειτα ἐλπίδας μεγίστας παρέχεται).⁴⁸

The idea of incarnation is also found in the *Aethiopica* at a crucial point in the narrative, although this concerns the newly born Chariclea. When she is exposed, the Ethiopian gymnosophist, Sisimithres, is unable to pass her by, since the principal tenet of his order was not to neglect a soul that has been incarnated (2.31.1: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μοι θεμιτὸν ἐν κινδύνῳ ψυχὴν ἅπαξ ἐνανθρωπήσασαν παριδεῖν). This has been taken as evidence that Heliodorus was familiar with Christian ideas, but it would more probably be a Neoplatonic concept.⁴⁹

Heliodorus reserves the phrase ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα in the sense of ‘land of birth’ largely to those involved in the main plot of the novel, chiefly those who are instrumental in ‘exiling’ Chariclea from the land of her birth, and who seek to obtain her return, such as Persinna and Hydaspes, and those who protect and accompany her, such as Theagenes, Charicles, and Calasiris. The term is also used with more urgency in the closing narrative of the work and also in emotive passages that are crucial for the unfolding of the plot (see Table 2 and the use of the term ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα in the summary of the narratives of Calasiris, Charicles, and Chariclea given above).

Conclusions

This article has argued that ideas of exile, home, and homeland in the *Aethiopica* broadly reflect the thoughts of the emperor Julian on these matters. The architecture of the plot of the *Aethiopica* is one of wandering (Books 1–5) followed by progressive revelations of the destiny of the two main characters that lead them ultimately to Ethiopia (Books 6–10), which is characterized as a heavenly homeland.⁵⁰ Not only did Heliodorus employ a new term for ‘land of birth’ — a term that had its origins in philosophical, and later Neoplatonic and Christian

⁴⁸ A further parallel between the *Symposium* and the *Aethiopica* can be found at Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.6.3 when the two lovers embrace so tightly that they seem to fuse into one being, recalling the argument of Aristophanes in Plato’s dialogue that love is the attraction of two halves of a previous whole.

⁴⁹ First taken as Christian by Korais 1804–1806; cf. Rohde 1914³:462–463, but the notion of incarnation belongs more appropriately to the concatenation of ideas that Plato presents in the *Phaedrus*.

⁵⁰ In this respect the *Aethiopica* resembles the *Aeneid* of Virgil, itself conceptualized as an Odyssean time of wandering (Books 1–6), followed by an Iliadic struggle to establish a new homeland in Italy (Books 7–12). Given the prominence of Virgil’s poems in the fourth century (particularly Constantine’s Christian interpretation of *Ecl.* 4 in his *Oration to the assembly of the Saints*), it is not unlikely that both Julian and Heliodorus would have been familiar with it. For Constantine’s speech see Edwards 2003.

thinking — but he also inserts a number of references to myth as an enigmatic vehicle for the ‘deeper meaning’ of his narrative (3.5.7; 9.9.5; 10.38.3). The reader notes that this journey ‘home’ involves not only Chariclea, who is at least Ethiopian, but also Theagenes, the Thessalian (2.4.1; 8.3.7, 11.5), because his soul had encountered hers in a previous existence and was eager to travel back to what was their deserved home (3.5.4). The oracle given to Calasiris in Delphi concerning Theagenes and Chariclea, had stated that they will come to a ‘dark-coloured land’ (πρὸς χθόνα κυανέην), where they will receive the reward of a good life (ἀριστοβίων μέγ’ ἀέθλιον, 2.35.5) and it is repeated at the end of the novel (10.41.2). For Chariclea, whose name indicates her special status as the Platonic World-Soul,⁵¹ she returns to the site of her miraculous and supernatural birth (4.8). This reading of the novel is grounded in the fourth century context of the work, especially in respect of the attenuated notion of the ‘fatherland’, which had been weakened in the Hellenistic period and grew increasingly irrelevant after the extension of citizenship to all inhabitants of the Roman Empire under Caracalla, and under the existential pressure of the religious crisis following the period of persecution in the late third century. It gives the narrative a purpose and a goal and enables it to compete with rival Christian conceptions of heaven such as that of Jerusalem as a heavenly city, and the *apokatastasis* of all souls at the end of time, that were being put forward by Christian writers at this time.

⁵¹ Chariclea’s name, when the letters are counted as numbers, is 777. Macrobius (*Comm.* 1.6) gives a full discussion of the importance of this number in Neoplatonic numerology and connects it with the notion of the ‘World-Soul’ discussed by Plato in his *Timaeus*.

TABLE 1

Author	Date	[τὴν] πατ- ρίδα	[τῆς] πατ- ρίδος	Total	τὴν ἐνεγ- κοῦσαν	τῆς ἐνεγ- κούσης	Total	Diff
Chariton	1st ce	4	9	13	0	0	0	13
Polybius	2nd ce	51	67	118	0	0	0	118
Xenophon of Eph.	2nd ce	4	2	6	0	0	0	6
Achilles Tatius	2nd ce	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
Longus	2nd ce	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plutarch	2nd ce	81	170	251	0	0	0	251
Philostratus	3rd ce	3	7	10	0	0	0	10
Cassius Dio	3rd ce	48	41	89	0	0	0	89
Julian	4th ce	10	6	16	0	0	0	16
Heliodorus	4th ce	9	4	13	8	14	22	-9
Libanius	4th ce	54	73	127	15	13	28	99
Basil	4th ce	25	32	57	2	5	7	50
John Chrysostom	4th ce	171	149	320	4	4	8	312
Synesius	5th ce	4	15	19	2	5	7	12
Cyril of Alexandria	5th ce	5	5	10	24	22	46	-36
Theodoret	5th ce	29	23	52	18	1	19	33

Table 1 indicates the usage of ἡ πατρίς and ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα in selected authors (acc. sing. and gen. sing. only).

TABLE 2

Reference	Term	Speaker	Topic (person affected)	Homeland	inferred from?
1.6.1	πατρίδα	boukolos	marsh is a fatherland (boukolos)	marsh	ἐνόμισεν
1.14.1	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Cnemon	driven from land of birth (Cnemon)	Athens	ἐξηλαυνόμεν
2.4.1	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Theagenes	exile from land of birth (Th. & Ch.)	Ethiopia	ἡμετέροις
2.23.3	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Calasiris	return to land of birth ('our' = 'my')	Egypt	ἐπιβαίμεν
2.25.4	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Calasiris	exile from land of birth (Calasiris)	Egypt	κολάζω
2.29.5	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Charicles	exile from land of birth (Charicles)	Delphi	ὑπεξάγω
2.30.1	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Charicles	return to land of birth (Charicles)	Delphi	μοι
3.11.5	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Calasiris	return to land of birth (Calasiris)	Egypt	σοι
3.14.4	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Cnemon	conceals land of birth (Homer)	Egypt	ἐσιώπα
3.15.3	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Calasiris	return to land of birth (Calasiris)	Egypt	Ἔχαιρον
3.16.5	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Calasiris	leaves land of birth (Calasiris)	Egypt	ἐξέστην
3.16.5	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Calasiris	exile from land of birth (Calasiris)	Egypt	μοι

Reference	Term	Speaker	Topic (person affected)	Homeland	inferred from?
4.9.2	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Calasiris	Ch. far from land of birth (Ch.)	Ethiopia	ἀπήχθη
4.12.3	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Calasiris/ Persinna	Ch. must return to land of birth (Ch.)	Ethiopia	general sense
4.13.2	πατρίδα	Calasiris	Ch. should return to fatherland (Ch.)	Ethiopia	σοι
4.19.7	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Charicles	People of Delphi do not respect the land of their births (Delphians)	Delphi	ὑμῶν
4.19.8	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Charicles	driven from land of birth (Charicles)	Delphi	ἐμέ
5.19.3	πατρίδα	Phoenician	offers to change fatherland (Phoen.)	Phoenician	ἀλλάζομαι
6.2.3	τὴν πατρίδα	Cnemon	Athens is fatherland (Cnemon)	Athens	ἔλεγεν
6.2.3	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Cnemon	exile from land of birth (Cnemon)	Athens	φυγαδευθεῖη
6.7.4	πατρίδος	Cnemon	exile from fatherland (Cnemon)	Athens	με
6.7.6	τὴν πατρίδα	Cnemon	return to fatherland (Cnemon)	Athens	μνησθήσομαι
6.8.1	τὴν πατρίδα	Nausicles	Cn. will return to fatherland (Cn.)	Athens	σὴν
7.3.5	τῆς πατρίδος	Thyamis	exile from fatherland (Thyamis)	Egypt	αὐτῶ

Reference	Term	Speaker	Topic (person affected)	Homeland	inferred from?
7.14.7	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Chariclea	mourns loss of Calasiris, her guide to land of birth (our = my <i>i.e.</i> , Ch.)	Ethiopia	ἡμᾶς
8.3.7	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Thyamis	Ch. and Th. desire to return to land of birth (Ch. and Th.)	Ethiopia	ποιοῦνται
8.11.5	τῆς πατρίδος	Chariclea	Ch. = κούρη leading Th. to her fatherland	Ethiopia	πατρίδος τῆς ἐμῆς Αἰθιοπίας
10.7.8	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Persinna	Ch. exiled from land of birth (Ch.)	Ethiopia	σωθείη
10.16.4	τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν	Hydaspes	goodwill to the land of birth (Hy.)	Ethiopia	ἐγὼ ... ποιοῦμαι
10.16.5	τῆς πατρίδος	Hydaspes	must obey law of fatherland (Hy.)	Ethiopia	ἐμοί
10.16.6	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Hydaspes	gods exiled Ch. from land of birth (Ch.)	Ethiopia	ἦν = ταύτην
10.16.9	τὴν πατρίδα	Hydaspes	paradox: Ch.'s fatherland more oppressive than foreign lands (Ch.)	Ethiopia	Σύ
10.16.9	τῆς ἐνεγκούσης	Hydaspes	paradox: land of birth brings death while foreign lands brought preservation for Ch. (Ch.)	Ethiopia	Σύ

Table 2 indicates speakers and topics in passages in which the terms ἡ πατρίς and ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα are used in the *Aethiopia*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexopoulou, M 2009. *The theme of returning home in ancient Greek literature: The nostos of the epic heroes*. Lewiston / Queenston / Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Athanassiadi, P 1992² [1981]. *Julian: An intellectual biography. Classical lives*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Bidez, J, Rochefort, G & Lacombrade, C (eds.) 1932–1964. *L'Empereur Julien: Oeuvres Complètes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Birchall, J 1996. *A commentary on Book 1 of Heliodoros' Aithiopia*. PhD thesis, University of London.
- Calder, W M 1923. The epigraphy of the Anatolian heresies. In Buckler, W H & Calder, W M (eds.), *Anatolian studies presented to William Ramsay*, 59–92. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Cherniss, H F 1930. The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa. *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 11.1:1–92.
- Clarke, E C, Dillon, J M & Hershbell, J P (trr.) 2003. *Iamblichus, On the Mysteries. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 4*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Colonna, A 1952. La cronologia dei romanzi greci: Le *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro. *Il Mondo Classico* 18:143–153.
- Danielou, J 1955. La chronologie des sermons de Gregoire de Nysse. *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 29:346–72.
- Dudley, D 1937. *A history of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th century AD*. London: Methuen.
- Edwards, M J 2003. *Constantine and Christendom: The oration to the Saints, The Greek and Latin accounts of the discovery of the Cross, The edict of Constantine to Pope Silvester. Translated Texts for Historians*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Hadas, M 1957. *An Ethiopian romance*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hamilton, W (trans.) 1993. *Plato, Phaedrus and Letters VII and VIII*. Harmondsworth / London: Penguin.
- Hilton, J L 2019. Cnemon, Crispus, and the marriage legislation of Constantine I in the *Aethiopia* of Heliodorus. *GRBS* 59.3:437–459.
- 2020. The revolt of the *Boukoloi*: Class and contemporary fiction in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*. In Evans, R J & de Marre, M (eds.), *Piracy, pillage and plunder in antiquity: Appropriation and the ancient world*, 129–144. London / New York: Routledge.
- 2021. Was the emperor Julian a reader of the *Aethiopia* of Heliodorus? *TAPA* 151.2:395–417.

- Korais, A I (ed.) 1804–1806. *ΗΑΙΩΔΙΟΡΟΥ ΑΙΘΙΟΠΙΚΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΑ ΔΕΚΑ*. Paris: IM Eberarto.
- Lamb, W (trans.) 1961. *Heliodorus* Ethiopian story. London: J M Dent.
- Leontis, A 1995. *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the homeland: Myth and poetics*. Ithaca / London: Cornell University Press.
- Limentani, U 1922. *Romanzo d' Etiopia*. Roma: A F Formiggini Editore.
- Maclean, J K B & Aitken, E B 2001. *Flavius Philostratos*: Heroikos. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Meredith, A 1999. *Gregory of Nyssa. The early Church fathers*. London: Routledge.
- Merkelbach, R 1962. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. München: Beck.
- Montiglio, S 2005. *Wandering in ancient Greek culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgan, J R 1989a. Heliodorus, an Ethiopian story. In Reardon, B P (ed.), *Collected ancient Greek novels*, 349–588. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.
- 1989b. The story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*. *JHS* 109:99–113.
- 1998. Narrative doublets in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*. In Hunter, R (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, 60–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Navia, L E 1996. *Classical cynicism: A critical study*. Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Norman, A F 1977. *Libanius: Selected works, vol. 2: Selected orations*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.
- Rebenich, S & Wiemer, H-U 2020. Introduction: Approaching Julian. In Rebenich, S & Wiemer, H-U (edd.), *A companion to Julian the Apostate*, 1–37. Leiden: Brill.
- Rohde, E 1914³. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Darmstadt: Georg Olms.
- Schreckenber, H 1963. *Ananke: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Wortgebrauchs*. München: Beck.
- Sherwin-White, A N [1939] 1973². *Roman citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, K 2019. *Constantine and the captive Christians of Persia: Martyrdom and religious identity in late antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, R (trans.) 1855. *The Ethiopics or adventures of Theagenes and Chariclea*. London: Bohn.
- Tucker, A 1994. In search of home. *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 11.2:181–187.
- Underdowne, T 1923. *Heliodorus: An Aethiopian romance*. London: G. Routledge & sons.

- Van Dam, R 1982. Hagiography and history: The life of Gregory Thaumaturgus. *CA* 1.2:272–308.
- West, M L 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T 1998. The birth of a prodigy: Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism. In Hunter, R (ed.) *Studies in Heliodorus*, 93–124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winkler, J J 1982. The mendacity of Kalasiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*. *YClS* 27:93–158.
- Wright, W C 1913–1923. *The works of the emperor Julian*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.