LETTER TO EDITOR

Mental Health Care in the Roman Empire: Early Approaches to Madness

Jaikumar Velayudham (M.D.)[1]

1- Government Vellore Medical College, Vellore, Tamilnadu, India

Correspondence:
Jaikumar Velayudham
Government Vellore Medical College, Vellore, Tamilnadu, India

e-mail: maildrjai@rediffmail.com

Citation:
Jaikumar Velayudham, I., LastName, I., LastName, I., 2026. Mental Health Care in the Roman Empire: Early Approaches to Madness. *Res Hist Med*, 15(4), pp. 407-410. doi: 10.30476/rhm.2026.108702.1364.

Dear Editor,

The Roman Empire is remembered for its engineering achievements, legal institutions, and military expansion. Less frequently discussed is its approach to mental illness, which reflected the interaction of religious beliefs, medical theories, family responsibilities, and legal provisions. Although Rome did not establish a system of dedicated psychiatric hospitals comparable to modern institutions, its responses to mental disturbance offer valuable insights into the historical evolution of psychiatric care.

Religious explanations remained influential in Roman society. Mental disturbances could be interpreted as manifestations of divine displeasure or

supernatural influence. Healing sanctuaries associated with Asclepius, the Greek god of medicine incorporated into Roman religious practice, offered ritual healing and opportunities for seeking divine intervention. However, the extent to which these sanctuaries provided care specifically for people with mental illness remains uncertain and should not be equated with the establishment of psychiatric institutions (Edelstein, and Edelstein, 1998).

Alongside religious interpretations, Greco-Roman physicians developed naturalistic explanations for mental disturbances. Galen (129–c. 216 CE) drew upon humoral theory, which associated health and disease with the balance of bodily humours. Melancholia was linked to black bile, while mania was explained through disturbances in bodily processes and humoral balance (Nutton, 2013). Treatments included dietary regulation, bathing, exercise, and medicinal preparations, reflecting the therapeutic principles of ancient medicine (Nutton, 2013; Jackson, 1988). Although these explanations and interventions differ substantially from contemporary psychiatric knowledge, they illustrate attempts to understand mental disturbance through systematic medical reasoning.

A particularly revealing account appears in the writings of Aulus Cornelius Celsus, a Roman encyclopaedist whose De Medicina discussed the recognition and management of mental disturbance. Celsus described different presentations of insanity and emphasized that management should be adapted to individual responses. He observed that, in some circumstances, "*the patient is to be agreed with rather than opposed*," with the mind gradually redirected towards more rational thoughts (Scarborough, 1969). This passage illustrates an early recognition of the potential value of a calm, individualized therapeutic approach. Nevertheless, Celsus also described restrictive practices, including restraint and coercive interventions, particularly when a person was considered dangerous. His account therefore reflects both therapeutic observation and the limitations of ancient approaches to humane care.

Formal institutional psychiatric care was largely absent, and families played a central role in managing mental disturbance. Access to physicians and other remedies varied according to social status and economic resources. (Jackson, 1988; Gardner, and Wiedemann, 1991). Roman law also recognized the consequences of severe mental incapacity. The category furiosus was associated with limitations on certain legal acts, while cura furiosi provided a framework for managing the affairs of individuals considered incapable of exercising independent legal judgment. Such arrangements could protect property and facilitate family responsibility, although they also restricted



autonomy (Temkin, 1991).

The evidence suggests that Roman society negotiated a continuing tension between care, protection, and social control. Some medical writers advocated approaches tailored to the individual's condition, while ancient medical texts also documented physical restraint and other coercive measures. The extent and frequency of these practices are difficult to establish, and claims about specific places of confinement should be treated cautiously when direct evidence is lacking.

The historical significance of Roman mental health care lies not in a direct progression towards modern psychiatry but in the coexistence of religious, medical, familial, and legal responses to mental disturbance. These approaches demonstrate that mental illness was understood through several overlapping frameworks rather than a single explanatory model. Similar tensions between therapeutic care, individual autonomy, family responsibility, and public safety continue to inform contemporary mental health practice, although modern psychiatry rests on substantially different scientific and ethical foundations.

In conclusion, Roman approaches to mental disturbance provide a valuable perspective on the historical development of psychiatric thought. Their medical writings, religious traditions, and legal arrangements reveal early attempts to interpret and manage mental illness within the social and intellectual context of their time. Studying these traditions helps illuminate the complex historical relationship between culture, law, and the care of people experiencing mental distress.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

Edelstein, E.J., and Edelstein, L., 1998. *Asclepius: Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gardner, J.F., and Wiedemann, T., 1991. *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, R., 1988. *Doctors and Diseases in the Roman Empire*. London: British Museum Press.

Nutton, V., 2013. *Ancient Medicine*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Scarborough, J., 1969. *Roman Medicine*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Temkin, O., 1991. *Soranus' Gynecology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Received: 12 Sep 2025; Accepted: 11 Oct 2026; Online published: 1 Nov 2026
Research on History of Medicine/ 2026 Nov; 15(4): 407-410.