

Asklepios On the Move:
Health, Healing, and Cult in Classical Greece

by

Calloway B. Scott

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics

New York University

September 2017

Barbara Kowalzig

ProQuest Number:10617149

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10617149

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Dedication

To my wife and my parents

Acknowledgements

I have incurred more and deeper debts in writing this dissertation than I could have guessed when I began it. In the summer of 2016, in the push to complete a final draft of the project, I was diagnosed with cancer. This, naturally, threw up some unexpected obstacles to finishing the dissertation on time and questions about how best to move forward with the project. The whole community of the NYU Classics Department, particularly David Levene, Barbara Kowalzig, Raffaella Cribiore, and Jay Meuller will forever have my gratitude for their care, support, and encouragement. It is no exaggeration to say that, without the whole department, this dissertation would not have been possible.

Every member of the Classics Department at NYU has left his or her mark on this project, in one way or another. My interest in healing cults and medicine were sparked in my first year of graduate school, in which I wrote papers for Joan Connelly on the cult of Asklepios at Epidaurus and on Thucydides' account of the Athenian plague. In those early years, I still believed that I was going to write about Greek tragedy, until Andy Monson (and Dan Hoyer) convinced me that, at heart, I was really a historian. David Sider has always indulged my queries on matters relating to poetry and Pre-socratic philosophy over cocktails. Raffaella Cribiore pointed me to parallels in later antiquity I had never considered. So too, Joy Connolly and Mike Peachin have always been excellent sounding boards and available to talk through a conceptual problem. Thanks, too, to David Konstan and Adam Becker who have read individual chapters, always with incisive feedback. Special thanks too to Colin Webster of UC Davis who has, by this point, surely read and provided detailed comments upon far more of this dissertation than the bonds of friendship demand.

The last two years of research on this project were generously supported by two different fellowships. The New York University Center for the Humanities provided a dynamic and exciting cross-disciplinary environment which, I hope has left its mark on this work. So too, the Mellon Dissertation Fellowship allowed me the freedom to complete the remaining bulk of the writing.

This project really took its first form as a term paper for Barbara Kowalzig, my primary advisor, on the emigration of Asklepios to Athens and the work done for that paper became a core part of the dissertation's third chapter. In the intervening years since that first paper, Barbara has assiduously pushed me to broaden the scope of my thinking and see its potential relevance to other fields. She has pressed me to consider the fullest implications of whatever I happened to be arguing and to sharpen those arguments as much as possible. She has in every way made me a more versatile and careful scholar, and this dissertation would look very different, and much the poorer, without her guidance. Any short-comings and errors in the work are entirely mine, and likely because I ignored her advice.

<u>Dedication</u>	iii
<u>Acknowledgements</u>	iv
<u>List of Figures</u>	viii
<u>Introduction</u>	1
Outline and scope	5
What is health, anyway?	10
<u>Chapter One: <i>Hygieia</i> Between Body and Body-Politic</u>	17
Communities of health and illness	19
Homer, Hesiod, and the social power of <i>loimos</i>	21
Hippocratic <i>hygieia</i> and the balance of the humors	30
<i>Hygieia</i> and cult	41
<i>Paianes</i> : A sympotic song for health	46
Health, <i>charis</i> , and the exchange of pleasure	57
Healthy and wealthy in the comic city	63
Conclusion	73
<u>Chapter Two: Textual Corpora: Narratives of Care in Classical Medicine</u>	76
A systems approach to health-care	77
“Hippocratics” and the missing voice	91
Bodies and texts: reading the cure	98
Reading the body	105
The social body	121
<u>Chapter Three: The Topography of Care: Gods about the Town</u>	134

The <i>topos hygies</i> : ancient theories about healthy places	136
Sanatorium and liminality: modern approaches to cult locations	141
Maleatas and Asklepios: origins	144
Asklepios between and against: Epidauros and the Akte	153
Asklepios and the Argive response	159
Inside and outside: Asklepios at Sikyon	165
Athens: delimiting the body-politic	176
At home abroad: Asklepios in Piraeus and the Acropolis	182
Oropos: Asklepios/Amphiaraos on the front-lines	189
Conclusion	197
<u>Chapter Four: Medicine as Meeting Place</u>	201
Herodotus, Hippocrates, and medicalizing the other	204
Médecins sans frontières: a Mediterranean medical <i>koine</i> ?	219
Asklepios and Eshmun	241
Life on the edge: Apollo among the Scythians	247
Conclusion	271
<u>Conclusion(s)</u>	273
<u>Appendix: Evidence for and nature of incubatory healing</u>	278
<u>Bibliography</u>	288

List of Figures

Fig. 1. Archinos relief. National Museum, Athens 3369	114
Fig. 2. Map of the Eastern Peloponnese and Attica	146
Fig. 3. Map of the Black Sea/Cults of Apollo Ietros	252

Introduction

In the last 20-30 years classicists (not to mention historians of medicine broadly) have put great effort into understanding ancient medicinal practice as part of a broader social sphere. As a result we have seen a steady increase in the flow of conference proceedings, books, chapters, and articles focused on placing ancient medicine in its social and cultural context.¹ During this time, the investigation of “cultural” or “social” context typically connoted any attempt to step back from medical and technical writings as timeless documents of a purely intellectual endeavor that discuss transhistorically valid entities like disease, and instead aimed to historicize these writings and their subjects as products of a particular time and place. On this view, these ancient works bear the imprints of prevailing cultural and ideological projects which cannot be fully explicated by recourse to the texts themselves, and therefore require supplemental “contextualizing” of various stripes. Such scholarly works might seek, for instance, meaningful points of contact between the pathological language of the dramatic stage and emerging medical terminology or trace the methodological entanglements of medicine, ethnography, and historiography. They might interrogate the role played by constructions of gender in shaping medical practice and theory, or scrutinize the material and the embodied—highly culturally determined categories—as analogical bases for processes of intellection and theorization. Ultimately, what such wide-ranging efforts share (consciously or not) is a desire to give “emic” accounts of ancient medicine.

¹ The list is too long to catalogue here. Salient examples which have been central to ideas developed in this thesis include: Edelsteins 1945; Edelstein 1967; Lloyd 1979; 1983; 1991; 2003; Parker 1983; Porter 1985; Nutton 1992; 1995; 2013; Dean-Jones 1994; Avalos 1995; van der Eijk et al. 1995; van der Eijk 2005; King 1998; Jouanna 1999 and 2012; Thomas 2000; Kosak 2004; Cook 2005a; Horden 2008; Mitchell-Boyask 2008; Wickkiser 2008; Totelin 2009; Holmes 2010b; Israelowich 2012; Lang 2012; Petsalis-Diomidis 2012; Baker 2013; Green 2014; Thumiger 2015; Winterbottom 2016.

In other words, they attempt to take seriously ancient actors' own categories, considering any valid account of ancient medicine to rely primarily on historically relative concepts. Narratives of continuity (or rupture) between some "then" and some "now" violate this push towards historicism. The problem of this approach, however, is its tendency to move one of two ways: either it works inside out (medicine influences other spheres) or from the outside in (other spheres influence medicine). To understand the dynamics at play in the production of medical knowledge where embodied humans are active subjects and sites of cultural production all at once, one needs to capture ancient medicine not just *in* its cultural context, but as a cultural field which set parameters for the enactment of a wide variety of social relations.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the efforts to understand the apparently conflicting intersections of health, medicine, and religion during what we might call "the long Classical period." In this dissertation, I concentrate on the power and attraction of (mostly Classical) healing cults as they encapsulated the complicated web weaving together Greeks' ideas about health and healing; their individual experiences at healing shrines; the relationship between landscape, politics, and healing; and medico-religious practice as a basis of transcultural interactivity across the Mediterranean. I argue that the healing encounter—both in its "religious" and "secular" aspects—acts as a central site in the production of cultural forms and social relations adaptable to the disparate needs of individuals, polities, and peoples in the ancient world.

The principal goal of this dissertation is to look beyond the conceptual commerce between medicine and other domains of cultural praxis. Rather, I attempt to think about medicine, health, and healing as sites of social production, or, perhaps more accurately, as

frameworks from which networks of symbolic systems and social actors spring. These symbolic orders create the conditions for particular subjectivities and behaviors; they sanction social statuses and hierarchies and they beget authoritative institutions. All of this is so because bodily experiences and bodily demands are communicated through some symbolic medium or another. Whether it occurs between mortals or between man and his gods, the healing encounter is dependent upon finding mutually compatible, agreeable forms of communication (Chapters 1 and 2). So too, these processes of agreement construct histories of trust and credit, which can in turn be leveraged into forms of institutionalized power or act as the basis for further modes of communication and exchange (Chapters 3 and 4).

Indeed, these were critical insights of medical anthropologists who long ago noted that medicine creates its own cultural (indeed, even ritualized) subsystems.² These cultures inculcate certain habits which govern a huge variety of behaviors, beliefs, and dependencies which themselves underpin the dynamics of inter-physician interactions, doctor-patient relationships, and human responses to space. Of course, these medical cultures do not spring wholly formed from virgin soil, but are contoured along prevailing social and cultural landscapes. Still, “medical” cultures are themselves capable of powerfully sculpting that landscape in their turn. In fact, in many ways they are the landscape. We need only to think of the creeping power of “medicalization” (the rendering of social or behavioral deviances as medical problems with medical solutions) or socializing “cults” of fitness classes to evaluate the impact that medicalized concepts of health and fitness have on society and the cultivated self. Even in the bio-medical era, then, we can readily observe how technical and pragmatic forms of medicine exist such that

² See, most influentially, Kleinman 1980 and 1988; Good 1993. See Nijhuis 1995; King 1998; Israelowich 2012 and 2015 for attempts to incorporate medical anthropological literature (see further Chapter 2) into classics.

they might be studied as cultural systems, productive of a variety of discourses, beliefs, and disciplinary relationships between patients, experts, and authorities.

With regard to the efflorescence of “religious” medicine of Greece, we can, I think, pursue this question in a coordinate manner. In studies of Greek religion (long more tolerant of anthropological study as a primary heuristic) it is widely agreed that no such essentialist category as “the religious” existed which we might meaningfully sift out from other forms of social life or exercises of power like “the political” or “the scientific.” Rather, religion is understood to have permeated every aspect of life, subtending and making sense of very different habits and practices.³ For lack of better phraseology, “religion” existed as one of a set of interlocking symbolic orders regimenting the most private attitudes and beliefs about the body and the self, as well as relations between the individual and the family. So too, “religion” played a powerful role in articulating social and political affiliations and expressing cultural identities. We ought reasonably to expect, then, a history of ancient religious medicine to take into account this capacious ability to coordinate and enmesh all manner of social life, beyond what we might regard as the “personal” experience with illness.

Thus, while I ultimately dilate on the shape, praxis, and meanings of religious medicine, the broader intention of this study is to treat “Greek medicine” as a specific social field in which a spectrum of agents (healers and patients; gods and men; polities and cultures) were habituated to act in different ways and to different ends, guiding (and guided by) the embodied practices, spaces, and hierarchies patterning Greek cultural life broadly. In this way, I hope this dissertation may be taken both as a historically specific study of healing cult and as a widely applicable

³ Most explicitly formulated by Sourvinou-Inwood in 1990a and 1990b (both republished in 2000); see Kindt 2012 which offers a summary of the refinements made to “polis” religion since.

framework for doing anthropologically informed history of medicine in the ancient Mediterranean.

Outline and Scope

One draw-back to this kind of cultural analysis is the fact that it does not lend itself to a unified method (or rather, its aggregate approaches define the method). Consequently, this exploration of temple medicine unfolds in four different ways across four interlinked chapters, attempting as much as possible to integrate the insights and concerns of medical, religious, and cultural historians. While each chapter lays out its “local” enquiry and method, the first chapter strives to lend a “global” conceptual coherence to the whole by addressing the social and historical contingency of definitions of “health.” Using this as a groundwork, each subsequent chapter engages in some way with Greek (and some non-Greek) conceptions of health and healing as they influenced and help to explain the actions of individuals, city-states, and “cultures.”

Shortly below in this introduction, I set out in more granular detail the contemporary critical literature engaging the problem of defining “health”; that is, who counts as healthy, under what conditions, and by what authorities are they said to be so. This investigation frames the discussion of the first chapter, which argues that *hygieia*, in addition to its typical meaning of bodily integrity and well-being, possessed a twin history as a stance of ethical evaluation, one which operates as an “other-facing value.” I argue that *hygieia* was early and centrally embedded within a variety of institutions and discourses—such as civic cult, sympotic song, and the dramatic stage—as a key conceptual tool used both in visualizing interpersonal relations and enacting social cohesion (that is, it was both *discursive* and *performative*). Ultimately, then, I

attempt to highlight the degree to which this social aspect of health has long gone overlooked, and, more critically, argue that any attempt to situate the procedures of healing in the Greek world—whether it took place in temples or elsewhere—has to take into consideration these deeply ethical and social features of “health.”

In the second chapter I argue that the space of ancient Greek healing sanctuaries provided a symbolically fertile environment in which individual suppliants made the experience of sickness meaningful. More specifically, I examine the important role played by the *iamata*, the narrative records of healing miracles performed within the sanctuaries of the healing god Asklepios. These documents reveal how individuals interacted with their symbolic surroundings, imagined their personal suffering, and perceived their own bodies as objects of knowledge and care. More than this, they allow us to understand how divine epiphany helped suppliants to manage the crisis of sickness as a bodily, ethical, and social phenomenon. In the first place, the activity of reading the epiphanic records of others offered the sick narrative templates for understanding their own experiences. Moreover, the narrative strategies of these texts invited the suppliants to interpolate themselves into a community of sufferers. To that end, these tales help us to see suppliants as particular kinds of subjects defined by particular forms of agency, foregrounding not just physical aspects of recovery but the restitution of social relationships and communal identity, aligning it with the wider meanings of health as I argued in the initial chapter.

Another salient feature of this chapter is a critical reevaluation of the current historiographical consensus that primarily views temple medicine and “secular” Hippocratic medicine as complementary, non-competitive outlets of health consultation available within the

wider Greek “medical marketplace.” I question this view by calling attention to the modes of practice at work within Greek cultic medicine that operate outside formal articulations about epistemic and therapeutic methods that have typically been at the center of the history of Greek medicine. This chapter thus seeks to parse in a new way the relationship between “secular” and “temple” medicine, concentrating on the creation of differing kinds of medical subjectivity in both the temple and in “Hippocratic” encounters.

The third chapter begins with a geographical query: what drove ancient Greeks to build healing cults in the places they did? According to a religious “logic” common to Mediterranean societies, we often uncover correlations between the perceived qualities of geographical place and particular aspects of the divine. The specific aspect of a divinity worshipped in a given district not only reflected Greek impressions of landscapes and their associated qualities, but made those impressions real. Locating, founding, and worshipping at a sanctuary of the god were therefore not only means of getting in touch with the divine, but activities that concretized and projected ideology onto the landscape, transforming neutral “place” into socio-political “space.” We might reasonably then ask whether healing cults displayed geographical patterns or affinities, and, if they did, seek to determine what they might disclose about Greeks’ perceptions of the political role played by healing cults within the polis at large.

In answer to this question, I suggest that healing cults were typically located at spaces which were themselves viewed as problematic, whether because they were at “physical” territorial boundaries or at the “imaginary” boundaries of conflicting social orders like harbors, gates, or walls. I argue that, as healing sanctuaries re-orient the socially displaced body of the sick individual, so too these spaces worked to mediate the social fractures between and within

poleis. In this chapter, I chart the significance of the geographic location of Asklepios' earliest cults against the historical and political circumstances surrounding their construction (as best as can be recreated from archeological, epigraphic, mythographic, and other literary sources). What emerges are variations on a general political and topographic theme. Beginning with Epidauros' adoption of Asklepios at the close of the sixth century BCE and expanding outward among the cities of the Akte and Argolid, his cults appear to have been constructed in both urban centers and territorial peripheries. I interpret this pattern by comparison to similar local cultic geographies as they helped to organize competing interstate networks, make territorial claims, and activate communal memory. Looking north to the (very well documented) proliferation of healing cults in and around fifth and fourth century Athens, a further stress appears to have been laid on the role of healing cults in expressing civic identity and solidarity, especially as these too were utilized to reiterate strong claims about territorial control and the unity of the democratic citizen body. Here again, the social component of *hygieia* comes to the fore as healing cults—even as they ministered to the private needs of individuals—projected a sense of socio-political cohesion through features of the built landscape.

The first three chapters thus plot a course in which discourses of health and gods of healing helped relate both individuals to their wider social groups and the wider social group to itself within the boundaries of a cultural one. In the final chapter I offer a series of cases in which that frame is expanded to include medicine itself as an interface between different cultural groups. I begin by identifying the historical emergence of discourses which self-consciously treated “Greek” medicine as a form of cultural and technological practice that is somehow markedly distinct from the medicine of others. This will give us a different feel for the edges of

medicine as a socially embedded phenomenon in antiquity, as we look at how Greeks perceived (and constructed) their own world. It will also cast light upon the ways that medico-religious practices sat between cultures as meeting places for cultural interchange.

To illustrate that claim I take up three separate instances in which medicinal gods or practitioners crossed cultural “boundaries” to play key roles in facilitating wider economic, political, and social ends. This will take us far outside the previous chronological limits, back to the Bronze Age palaces of Babylon, the Levant, Egypt, and Crete, where the adaptability of medical symbolism endowed it with considerable potency in forms of interstate exchange and diplomacy. This leads us to consider two further cases in which medical cult played a role in Mediterranean transcultural relations: first the syncretism of Asklepios and the Phoenician god Eshmun in the Hellenistic period, and then the development of a “hybrid” medico-magical culture around the figure of Apollo Ietros in the Black Sea area. This investigation stands apart from other histories of medicine which, in as much as they are predominantly interested in tracing the transfer of medical knowledge-making, technology, and materials from one culture to another, are implicitly guided by whiggish concerns about intellectual primacy and progress. This final chapter, by contrast, attempts a broader synthesis of medical, religious, and cultural histories of the Mediterranean by exploring medicine not simply as a commodity of exchange—whether in the form of medical goods, ideas, or expertise—but as a locus for creative blending and hybridity in the service of various and different strategies of cross cultural communication. Ending on that note closes the circuit by returning us to the beginning, considering medicine not just in its cultural context, but as a cultural field which produced specific kinds of subjects and actors contingent upon a wide variety of social circumstances.

What is health, anyway?

As stated above, a good deal of the argument going forward concerns the mutual inflections of health and society upon one another. Before pressing on, then, it is salient to set the table and to survey briefly the contemporary scholarship which engages the interactions between the biological, social, and historical which determine what constitutes health at any given time. I do so here in order to frame (and avoid unduly cluttering up) the argument in Chapter One.

A useful “diagnostic” question is whether the concept of health can be thought about or discussed without the accessory notion of disease.⁴ Indeed, the way one answers this question generally indicates the kind of “thing” one thinks health is, and this fingers well the primary fault lines between the two major schools of thinking about health: the “naturalist” (or “objectivist”) and the “normativists” (or “constructivist”) camps.⁵ The naturalist positions (most closely allied with a western, day-to-day biomedical focus on bodily health) hold that it is a state characterized by the absence of disease, where disease is defined by the dysfunction of some “normal” biological process.⁶ Perhaps counterintuitively, naturalists find health to be an absence, defined by the lack of observed pathological agents or their effects. Its proponents therefore do not find

⁴ Here should be inserted some terminological clarification regarding “health” and “disease” as they are distinct from “well-being” and “illness.” Historically the former set is used by scholars working in the West to denote the medically defined conditions of bodily functioning and disfunction, while the latter set is generally used by anthropological and social histories of medicine to describe the non-medical beliefs about bodily states held by traditional societies.

⁵ For full surveys of the history of normativism and naturalism see Ereshefsky 2009; Boorse 2011; in addition to the extremely thorough entry in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (s.v. “Concepts of Health and Disease”) with attendant bibliography. The positions that naturalism and normativism denote are also sometimes referred to as “objectivism” and “constructivism,” but as these labels also refer to related, yet separate, positions within the philosophy and sociology of the sciences more broadly (which will receive some further attention) it is better to keep them distinct here.

⁶ Boorse 1977. This view was provocatively challenged in 1948 by the World Health Organization, which defined health as “a complete state of physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” See King 1999; 2005 for relevance to the Classical world.

“health” all that interesting a state or concept outside its bench-marking capacity. As a matter of course, this picture requires practical nuances, as what constitutes a biological “norm” is subject to change across categories or stages of life.⁷ Health, then, is quantifiable and measurable, but not materially stable: what counts as organic dysfunction in one individual with a particular constitution may be perfectly normal in another. Thus, modern day naturalists deploy statistical models to determine average “functionality” (e.g. the efficient function of the liver, kidneys, brain, or skin vis-à-vis the teleological purpose of survival and/or reproduction) with regard to some grouping (a “reference class”), say, white females ages 21-35, or African-American males over age 60. We are diseased, then, when we stray outside this statistically generated band of normality and into the territory of dysfunction and pathology.

Inter alia, the artificiality of the processes of grouping opens a window of opportunity for relativist objections.⁸ For instance, we might ask according to what criteria we are to fix the reference classes which establish medical normality. Can we do so by species? By age? Are we to assign norms according to sex, geographical location, or socio-economic class? Ultimately, we would be forced to claim that what is “normal” is so only for an individual at a specific time in a specific context. And if this is the case, it is easy to see how the model fails to provide any kind of meaningful taxonomy between sick and healthy. Still, establishing standards of health which are grounded in clinical biology and accommodate the variability of individual constitutions seems a pragmatic (and necessary) way of defining health, and so attempts to do so have remained popular and should be taken seriously. Indeed, we will see that this problem bears

⁷ Ereshefsky 2009.

⁸ Boorse 2011. There are a number of weaknesses in this picture and I will not rehearse them all here; see, e.g., Engelhardt 1976.

some resemblance to those faced by Greek medical authors who equally struggled to provide a universal account of nature—*physis*—which simultaneously accommodated local and individual variations in constitutions and disease response.

We are confronted again, then, with the difficulty of describing an essentialist account of health within objective limits, and this is the worry to which normativists most often return. Normativists point out that the language of “normality” is intrinsically ethical, and what has been called a disease by the scientific and medical communities of an era are often (if not always) understood better as individual occurrences of the interrelated exercises of power and ideology as they are written upon the body.⁹ On one end of the spectrum, as Foucault demonstrated, the designations “healthy” and “diseased” reflect those physiological and psychological states which are socially acceptable or undesirable respectively, and according to which we are acculturated to orient our behaviors and dispositions.¹⁰ Belying the “do no harm principle,” medical discourses and authority are easily transformed into instruments of discipline (as we will see in greater depth in the second chapter and third chapters). Indeed, some normativists claim that contemporary research programs, though scaffolded in the neutral language of the lab, are often implicitly oriented towards the confirmation of preexisting social attitudes and judgements.

The central problem, as one normativist thinker puts it, is that:

Disease does not reflect a natural standard or norm, because nature does nothing—
nature does not care for excellence, nor is it concerned with the fate of individuals qua

⁹ The normativist position can thus be identified as a subset of scientific constructivism generally. Constructivism, important especially for the sociology of science, insists that scientific endeavors cannot be divorced from their social, historical, and moral contexts, and that the values of a community of researchers necessarily impinges on the matter researched. This, as seen above, is especially the case with the so-called “applied-sciences” like medicine which necessarily have an explicitly social dimension. See, recently, Callard and Fitzgerald 2015.

¹⁰ Foucault 1973; 1975.

individuals...Health...must involve judgements as to what members of the species should be able to do...¹¹

“Nature,” on this view, is a construct, and the biological functionalism upon which naturalists rely is not supported by biological “realities,” in part because that reality is “always already” overwritten (or at least co-authored) by socio-culturally conditioned ways of viewing and valuing.¹² Perhaps the most frequently and potently employed example of the social character of disease is the status of homosexuality within the medical community. While up to the 1970s homosexuality had been categorized as a pathological state, the third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM III) eliminated it as a form of psycho-social deviance. No new scientific data led to this revision. Rather, this reform in the state of medical knowledge-making was part of a broader social acceptance of homosexuality which triggered a reform in medical judgement. Normativists point to this as only but a recent and highly visible example of a typical practice in which socially or ethnically marginal groups are pathologized by the normative authority inherent in forms of medical discourse.¹³

It is clear, then, that in addition to physiological etiologies, diseases also have what we may call “moral etiologies,”¹⁴ and any robust account of health and sickness must be able to house this cohabitation of the biological and the social. But this “cultural turn” approach to health as merely constructed is equally vulnerable to relativist critique.¹⁵ If “health” is simply a

¹¹ Engelhardt 1976: 266.

¹² Ereshefsky 2009; of course this view of health-and-the-body relies on forms of feminist criticism popularized by, e.g., Judith Butler (1990 and 1993).

¹³ See, e.g., Barnes 1995; Craddock 2000; Wald 2008.

¹⁴ Barnes 1995: 76.

¹⁵ See Lennox 1995 for an effort to keep biological normativism from careening into relativism by establishing “objective” (that is, biological and transhistorical) health values. Compare also Rorty 1991: 46-63 for a pragmatist defense of post-Kuhnian “relativism” in the philosophy of science more broadly.

tool for describing (and enforcing) the constellation of embodied values and behaviors which prevail at a given time, it becomes possible to claim that actually being heterosexual in 1960s America was in fact prerequisite to being “healthy” as it was then experienced.¹⁶ By these lights, we are unable to pass either ethical or scientific judgement on doctors and psychologists who labelled homosexuality a disease if that evaluation was simply a product of cultural circumstance. Critically, too, cross-cultural disagreements about medical conditions today cannot be resolved; each judgment remains valid within the boundaries of one culture or other, creating deep structural and policy related obstacles to the provision of care in a globalized world.¹⁷

Normativism has had a particularly vigorous career within those corners of the social sciences and humanities interested in medical history and public health. Scholars interested in the anthropology, history, and sociology of medicine focus on the social, economic, religious, and spatial factors at work in enculturating embodied attitudes towards health and disease.¹⁸ These disciplines have also pointed out that, like health, the related concept of the body is not a transhistorical given.¹⁹ Indeed, the once dominant model of biomedical, somatic unity is itself fragmenting. This may, in turn, have implications for how we theorize health, both biologically

¹⁶ Boorse 2011.

¹⁷ The strongest critique of normativism (see Boorse 2011) is that it lacks robust explanatory and predictive power for why some forms of deviance are labelled diseases and others are not. Alcoholism is a clear example: its status as a medical condition varies according to the person asked, typically in accord with their personal histories and values. Because normativists are committed, ultimately, to making disease a matter of socio-cultural perception, they are forced either to admit that its status changes from person to person, or to call it a disease *tout court*, as the condition is “disvalued” on the whole. But naturalists are led into similar cases of counter-intuitive classification, because any “deviant” biological function must be classed as a disease. Thus one may imagine a brain lesion which compels one to desire gourmet foods (cf. Regard and Landis 1997). All things being equal gourmands are not disvalued, and so a common sense view would hold that the individual is not suffering from a diseased brain. Nevertheless, naturalists are committed to describing this biological condition as a disease because it represents a departure from “normal” brain function.

¹⁸ E.g., Bourdieu 1976.

¹⁹ E.g., Foucault 1975; Lacquer 1990; Holmes 2010b.

and culturally as the traditional boundaries of the self and the techniques of self-care are thrown into doubt following the translation of our lives into increasingly digital and disembodied spaces.

Such a collision with a rapidly encroaching future returns us to the Classical past. The above discussion is meant to underscore the enduring potency and elasticity inherent in concepts of health and disease, and to dilate on their tendency to spill over into different spheres of life and modes of thought as well as to structure particular historical relationships between persons, institutions, and cultural protocols. Part of the hope of this investigation is to show that concepts of health—while lacking the violent and morbid fascination often characteristic of disease or the history changing impacts of plagues—provide a framework with which to approach social relationships and help us to see more keenly certain key cultural values and meanings embedded in texts and objects, bodies, and spaces.²⁰

Additionally, these considerations illustrate two important aspects of ancient Greek thinking about *hygieia*. In the first place, we will see that not all Greeks cast their ideas about *hygieia* in so strict a dichotomy as “presence” or “absence” of disease. Indeed, in the Classical period, the concept of “*hygieia*” was itself contested ground, with medical authors emphasizing the somatic dimension of well-being to the neglect of an older and more expansive tradition which foregrounded its public qualities. Secondly, this permits us to apply the observation that health and illness are not merely socially constructed, but themselves help construct the social. That is, we will examine in detail how health and sickness functioned across both descriptive and performative arenas, providing a tool both for styling and enacting the well-being of the group.

²⁰ For such “disease theories of history” see McNeil 1976; Harrison 2015.

More broadly, I hope this investigation of *hygieia* is able to spark wider conversation with significance beyond the Classical world. As we have seen, “health” appears to be equally a product of biology and culture;²¹ consequently, it rests at the contested center of a number of disciplinary attentions, including not just medicine and science, but philosophy, anthropology, sociology, linguistics and even geography. The act of defining health appears, then, to furnish an ideal map of the conflict between the sciences and humanities as the authoritative interpreters of our lives and reality. But so too, its study in the ancient world may prove relevant as the historical and intellectual conditions which have underwritten such an oppositional framework begin to fracture and gradually reorganize themselves into new alliances based on new world-views. Indeed, much of the recent debate about how one is “supposed” to define health is laden with post-Enlightenment notions about bodily, ethical, and legal forms of independence and freedom. This particular historical configuration, however, is eroding in face of new models of subjective experience which emphasize the interdependence of the human biological functioning on a range of other life-forms, from microbes to persons, and even objects. Consequently, the dichotomy between the humanistic and scientific understandings of health may be able to be re-negotiated, if not wholly reconciled. What I aim at here, then, is an exploration of how an examination of “health” and “healing,” as structuring principles of social agency and interactivity, can offer a novel framework for historical enquiry into the ancient world.

²¹ See Singer and Erikson 2011 and *infra*.

CHAPTER ONE:

Hygieia Between Body and Body-Politic

Health is not a condition that one introspectively feels in oneself. Rather it is a condition of being involved, of being in the world, of being together with one's fellow human beings, of active and rewarding engagement in one's everyday tasks.

-H.G. Gadamer¹

Ἀρμονίη ἀφανῆς φανερῆς κρείσσων.

-Heraclitus²

What do we mean when we use the words “health” and “healthy”? The answer may seem obvious enough, but what features, exactly, of an individual are we specifying when we say “she is in perfect health”? Do we simply mean that “she is not sick,” or do we aim to capture something fuller, more experientially robust? Despite our everyday, intuitive grasp of “health” and its apparent straightforwardness in regular usage, the attempt to clarify what “health” is has spawned a vast literature and interests which criss-cross various academic disciplines, public discourses, policy-making, and institutions, finding little concrete agreement. This chapter sets out to make sense of what ancient Greeks meant, or some of the things they thought they meant, when they spoke about health or ὑγεία.

In the introduction, I surveyed some contemporary attempts to define health. I did so to determine whether Greeks of the Classical world employed notions similar to our own, and, as it appears they did not, to offer a framework for reconstructing the attitudes they did entertain. The first chapter of this dissertation, then, engages Classical technical treatises, works of literature

¹ Gadamer 1996: 113.

² *DK* 22 B54. Throughout I have tried to adhere to the abbreviations of ancient authors, works, and modern collections as designated in the latest (4th) edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Where no abbreviation is suggested, full names of authors and titles of text are used. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are mine.

and song culture, as well as the cultic history of the goddess Hygieia, to provide a fuller picture of the sorts of beliefs and expectations Greeks held about health and sickness. This survey will bring us to the following conclusion: *hygieia* in the ancient world was not considered to be only, or even primarily, a somatic state. Rather, I argue that *hygieia* functioned as a conceptual tool for thinking, articulating, and enacting a variety of social relations, both emphasizing and creating the cohesion of social groupings. Of course, health registered the fitness of individual bodies; but we will discover that *hygieia* was likewise embedded in a variety discursive practices and institutions (the symposium, for instance) in which health was not only a focus of song and worship, but in which health was achieved through such collective acts. I therefore suggest that for Greeks *hygieia* was what we might term an “other-facing” or “sympathetic” value rather than an absolute or individualist one. On the one hand this is because health, as a value, already implies the existence of an individual in relation to an evaluating group of which she does (or does not) belong. But more than this, in the way that health is bonded onto a variety of social discourse, we will see that the idea of *hygieia* equally created an impulse for individuals to turn away from concerns of the self and towards those around them. Indeed, I hope to show that this social dimension of health was understood very literally as a basis for the functioning social and political body, and that discourses of health formed a means of thinking about, enacting, and even contesting group identity and solidarity. Consequently, the “healthy body politic” was far from mere metaphor or extended usage in Greek thought, but foundational to Greek conceptions of community. We will discover this not only by examining the multiple semantic uses of *hygieia* in Greek literature, but through a kind of cultural poetics of *hygieia* and some of its most frequent conceptual side-kicks.

Communities of Health and Illness

Before delving into *hygieia*'s place in the polis, it is salient to underline the role of disease in social and cultural theory. Recent scholarship has focused on the ways that microbes make communities, pointing to the way that the emergence of germ-theory inflected the thinking of early social theorists like Emile Durkheim and cultural theorists like Artaud. For these thinkers “contagion” offered an attractive model for understanding the “catching on” of ideas, images, and symbolic systems upon which the beginnings of social organization and collective identity depend.³ Similarly, Priscilla Wald has more recently drawn attention to the role performed by disease narratives in “visualizing” social networks. She points out that communicability inherently emphasizes the social quality of disease by stressing the tragic consequences of communal interdependence—the stronger a community’s bonds, the more rapid and dramatic its devastation through contagion. As disease burns through a population, then, it also brings a horrible clarity to the connections, contacts, and history of the group: “The interactions that make us sick also constitute us as a community.”⁴

A related feature of the narrative is its use as a potent tool by which communities construct their collective self-image. Contagious epidemic is often conceived of as coming from exotic and exogenous points of origin, ferried across borders by immigrants, outsiders, and other figures populating the social margins. In popular imaginings, it is often the classical Other who smuggles disease into a community, together with potentially subversive or infectious ideas.⁵ The threat of infectious disease is not simply superimposed upon groups of outsiders; the causes of

³ Wald 2008; Garner 2006.

⁴ Wald 2008: 12.

⁵ See *infra* for the Greek practice of ξενηλασία, or the purging of foreigners to keep social and cultural institutions pristine.

infection are blurred with selected social and cultural practices which are taken to be responsible for the un-hygienic conditions around the outbreak. Disease thus abets the weaponizing of culture in the fight against outsiders, and here we can pick out the role of diseases' "moral etiologies" in authorizing social and cultural prejudice.⁶ This useful confusion of disease with cultural practice marks groups off from one another and licenses particular "mythical" conceptions of the community as it is negatively defined by its own "hygienic" practices and absence of disease. More than exploiting an opportunity for communities to naturalize their own conceptions of themselves, "[o]utbreak narratives actually make the act of imagining the community a central (rather than obscured) feature of its preservation."⁷ Indeed, the processes of fighting epidemic disease played an important role in the coalescence of the modern national state just as it continues to prop up national mythologies of identity.⁸

Now, it is well known that the Graeco-Roman world lacked a conception of germ-theory or the communicability of disease.⁹ Despite Thucydides' observations that the Athenian plague was communicable, or suggestive hints found in later writers like Varro, Galen, and Vegetius, contagion in its literal sense of "touching together" never played a role in ancient thinking about the transmission or cause of sickness; this was an innovation of the 15/16th century intellectual Fracastoro, whose theories owed more to Lucretius' atomic *semina rerum* than they trumpeted the arrival of contemporary germ theory.¹⁰ Contagion narratives, then, could not have played quite the same role in Greco-Roman antiquity as they do today. Yet, in spite of the differences in

⁶ Kraut 1995; 2010.

⁷ Wald 2008: 20.

⁸ E.g. Rosen 1958; Foucault 1976; Wald 2008.

⁹ See Leven 1993; Nutton 2000 and 2013: 26 for some apparent exceptions to the rule.

¹⁰ See Nutton 1988; Grafton 1992; Jouanna 2012.

the conceptual mechanism (miasma vs. germ theory), it is worthwhile to observe that in Archaic and Classical accounts of disease, epidemic, and religious “contagion” in the form of miasmatic pollution, we can understand the powerful role of plague and sickness in projecting imagined communities, legitimizing novel social institutions, and even, perhaps, centralizing forms of authority within the polis.¹¹ While this may seem out of step with a study of *health* in the Greek world, this detour clarifies the parallel manner in which *hygieia* was employed within Greek civic and social discourses to render the group visible as a whole.

Homer, Hesiod, and the Social Power of *Loimos*

Robert Parker makes clear that “in Greek belief, there was no such thing as non-contagious religious danger.”¹² Any form of religious transgression carried with it the potential risk to spill over and visit its destruction on one’s neighbor in the form of misfortune or illness. In Homer and Hesiod’s epics, epidemic disease is powerfully presented as an exogenous force. It is rained indiscriminately down on people and driven into the world as a god-sent punishment for the sins of individuals. More than this, plagues (*loimoi*)—and the reactions they provoked—clarified (both for the Greek sufferers and for modern historians) the workings and reaffirmed the bonds of groups, whether by exposing their social architectures or mobilizing group responses in the form of myth-ritual complexes.¹³

In Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, diseases steal silently into the homes and lives of men as a marker of the insuperable gulf between mortal man and god.¹⁴ Hesiod’s image of disease as

¹¹ See Chapter Three.

¹² Parker 1983: 257.

¹³ Rutherford 2001; Kowalzig 2007.

¹⁴ ἄλλα δὲ μυρία λυγρὰ κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἀλάληται· πλείη μὲν γὰρ γαῖα κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα· νοῦσοι δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐφ' ἡμέρη, αἱ δ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ | αὐτόματοι φοιτῶσι κακὰ θνητοῖσι φέρουσαι | σιγῇ, ἐπεὶ φωνὴν ἐξείλετο μητίετα Ζεὺς. Hes. *Op.* 100-05. For full treatment of archaic concepts of disease, see Lloyd 2003.

creeping the Earth on its own accord, without giving any forewarning (αὐτόματοι φοιτῶσι...σιγῇ) captures the capricious nature of illness which demands, but is not always susceptible to, explanation.¹⁵ At the same time that Hesiod is sensitive to the human struggle to extract meaning from toil, pain, and sickness, the poet falls back on another interpretive framework which etiologizes epidemic disease within man's political environment.¹⁶ On this view, the "good king" ensures the fertility, productivity, and well-being of his people and land while the "bad king" brings only plague and famine to his.¹⁷ Indeed, this is so because the *basileus* maintains a unique relationship with the divine, and is himself "from" Zeus.¹⁸ Consequently his actions have outsized impacts upon the community and can stand in for the wider piety of the group. But because the effects of the *basileus*' rule are tangible, we find that illness is not deployed only as a "political metaphor" for the disruption of the social organism.¹⁹ It is rather conceived of by Hesiod as a serious measure of a community's political harmony, manifested in the king's respect for the divine and the seriousness with which he meets his obligations to his people. In this regard, *loimos* (and *hygieia*) are embedded within the ethical and moral structure of the community as internally apprehensible signs of its function and dysfunction. The destruction wrought by the *loimos* defines and circumscribes community belonging because it is a reminder of the group's communal dependence upon the central authority of the *basileus*, even as it

¹⁵ Cf. Edelstein 1967; Parker 1983; Scarry 1985; Kleinman 1980; Good 1994.

¹⁶ Hes. *Op.* 238-43: οἷς δ' ὕβρις τε μέμηλε κακὴ καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα | τοῖς δὲ δίκην Κρονίδης τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς... | ὅστις ἀλιτραίνῃ καὶ ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάται. | τοῖσιν δ' οὐρανόθεν μέγ' ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων, | λιμόν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμόν, ἀποφθινύθουσι δὲ λαοί·

¹⁷ Cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.109-14.

¹⁸ Hes. *Op.* 94. Cf. Bremmer 1983; Parker 1983: 266f.; Burkert 1985: 127.

¹⁹ Connection between kingship and *loimos/limos* is of course central to Soph. *OT* 1-83; compare Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.5.1. in which the Edonian king Lycurgus' transgressions against Dionysos result in famine and death at the hands of his people.

functions as a divine reproach to failed leadership. So, too, by bundling justice (δικη) and sickness together, the manner in which sickness and health are “aimed” at others becomes mutually apparent.

Famously, disease in Homeric epic is also imagined as striking the body from the outside.²⁰ It, too, is provoked by transgressions which are simultaneously political and religious and in ways that are meant to amplify the collective sentiment of the social group more broadly.²¹ Here again these arrows are poured by Apollo on the Greek host in response to the religious transgressions of the central, kingly authority.²² On the one hand, Apollo’s plague chastises Agamemnon’s impious disrespect for the god’s chosen prophet and seer, Calchas. Like Hesiod’s *basileus*, Apollo’s punishment of the whole host underlines the special moral responsibilities inherent in kingship and the potential of individual religious “pollution” to infect the group by proxy.

But *loimos* which rains destruction on the Greek host simultaneously symbolizes and catalyzes the total breakdown of the terms keeping the Greek host together. In refusing to return Chryseis to her father, Agamemnon spurns the community’s consensus in favor of his own destructively selfish ends. This refusal also sets in motion the sequence of events which will culminate in Achilles’ abdicating the battlefield, itself more destructive than the plague. Agamemnon’s misguided exercise of regnal authority ultimately endangers the well-being of the entire host and can be considered symptomatic of the social pathologies afflicting the army.

²⁰ Hom. *Il.* 1.33-108.

²¹ We will discuss further in Chapters 2 and 4 the conceptual role of Apollo and his bows as an ethical and metaphysical model of disease which circulated widely in the Mediterranean. See Faraone 1992; Lloyd 2003; Holmes 2010b.

²² Parker 1983: 265f.

Disease, then, in Homeric and Hesiodic epic, is regarded as an independent agent assailing man from the outside, for reasons both known and unguessed.

These events participate in a broader, moral lexicon used by Greeks to describe the “health” of an individual’s words and actions vis-à-vis the way he comports himself before and in response to others—whether in the context of the polis or the wartime camp on the shores of Troy. In fact, it is worth noting here that the first usage of the adjective *hygies* (the only *hyg*-stem in Homeric epic) in Greek describes not the body of a Homeric warrior, but rather the fitness of his speech. In an address to his troops before the Argive lines, at *Iliad* 8.524 Hector wishes “that this will be a ‘healthy’ command now spoken” (μῦθος δ’ ὃς μὲν νῦν ὑγιῆς εἰρημένοϛ ἔστω).²³ We can see in this instance the ethical usage of *hygieia*, in which the warrior hopes he is expressing a “sound” or “fitting” plan of attack. Hector, himself very kingly, frames his hopes for a successful *mythos* in a language of *hygieia* which is other-facing by implying the approbation of his troops. Health requires others to make evaluations (about bodies, words, political actions) and so reveals itself as a medium of relating persons, one to another or still more. Within the context of the earliest epic authors, then, we can begin to limn ways in which health and sickness were implicated in wider patterns of social and political thought which extend beyond the corporeal.

So too later Hellenic legend and historiography were littered with plagues which helped Greeks to clarify the limits of social groupings and calcify identity. Such divisions were achieved through the mobilization of collective social action or an explanation of the origins of social and religious institutions—which was another way of naturalizing particular social and cultural

²³ See Beumer 2016.

habits.²⁴ These epidemics are frequent fixtures in the mythological repertoire of the archaic Greek past, and, as in Hesiod and Homer, are frequently advanced in terms of religious transgression. The catastrophic arrival of a *loimos theopemptos*—a god-sent plague—required the consultation of an oracle or the intervention of an outsider, both of which typically functioned as mechanisms for the introduction of new sacred laws, cults, and ritual.²⁵

These experts were frequently gods or heroes. For instance, Herakles was fêted for purging Athens of plague during the Peloponnesian war and altars and shrines were erected there in his honor.²⁶ The traditions surrounding the culture heroes Musaeus and Orpheus often foreground their interventions on behalf of communities, banishing plague through the magical, ordering power of song.²⁷ But more obscure local figures were also prominent in such legends.²⁸ Epimenides of Crete was likewise held to have purified Athens of a plague, sometime either in

²⁴ Cf. Thuc. 1.144; Pl. *Prt.* 342c; *Leg.* 949e-950a; Xen. *Lac.* 14.4; Arist. *Pol.* 1272b and the danger of “contagion” of foreign customs and ideas, which require occasional ξενηλασία of foreigners from the community.

²⁵ For oracular responses to plagues see Fontenrose 1976 (only one of the more than 50 plague responses does he deem historical). Nearly all conclude in the establishment of new cultic behaviors. See, however, Fontenrose Q1 (=Paus. 5.4.6) for an interesting case in which a *loimos* engulfing all Greece is the impetus for the re-establishment of the Olympic games. Similarly Callim. fr. 194.28 Pfeiffer and Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.48 link the foundation of the oracle at Didyma-Branchidae to plague. See further Chapter 4.

²⁶ For Herakles *Alexikakos*, cf. schol. ad Ar. *Ran.* 504; Soph. *Trach.* 1012; See Ar. *Vesp.* 1043 for *alexikakos* as *kathartes*. See also *IG II²* 1582. But compare Paus. 8.1.12 for the tradition which celebrated Apollo *Alexikakos* for warding off the Peloponnesian plague. See Chapter 4 for Hellenistic and Roman traditions about Hippocrates’ role in curing the Athenian miasma through bonfires and the possible connection between the Hippocratic *Epistles* and the Delphic *Theoxenia*, in which Apollo was celebrated as *Alexikakos* (cf. Kowalzig 2007: 219f.).

²⁷ Musaeus: Ar. *Ran.* 1033 and schol. ad loc.; cf. Pl. *Resp.* 364e-365a. The Scytho-Greek seer Abaris was supposed to have saved various cities and peoples from plagues through his powerful allegiance with Apollo. See Chapter 4.

²⁸ Paus. 1.14.4 holds that Thales saved Sparta from plague. The seer and hero Melampous, too, was held to heal individuals and groups in the Argolid: see Pherecydes *BNJ* 3 F33 for healing Iphicles of his impotence; Hes. frs. 37 and 131; Akous. *BNJ* 2 F28; Alex. fr. 112 Kock, for healing Proitos’s daughter(s) from a divine madness, sent either by Dionysos or Hera. However, Pherecydes *BNJ* 3 F114 (=schol. ad *Od.* 15.225) and Hdt. 9.34 report that a plague of madness had been haunting the Argive women generally, not just the Proitidai (see too Paus. 2.18.2; Gal. 5.132.12-15K he cured their “melancholy”—a collection of black bile—with *katharseis*. The whole episode recalls vividly a mass hysteria cured by *paianes* at Aristarch. fr. 117). What most of the sources agree upon (with the problematic exception of Pi. fr. 52d) however, was that Melampous demanded two thirds of the Argive land as compensation for his service (one third for himself, the other for his brother Bias). This accords with the broader pattern in which such sacred illnesses provide cover for more or less radical breaks in socio-political arrangements, here a strange three-way monarchical line.

the very beginning or the very end of the sixth century.²⁹ Both Diogenes Laertius and Plutarch pin this purification (if not explicitly of a *loimos*) to the pollution emanating from the Alcmaeonid murder of the Olympic victor Cylon. Similarly, pseudo-Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution* places this purification in the obscure context of exiling an(other) aristocratic family sometime just before the Solonian reforms. That is, both traditions concentrate upon moments of radical social change or crisis in Athenian history. As in Homer, these mythical plagues register the power of *loimos* to sculpt collective history and memory. These narratives re-write social or political crises and their resolutions as natural events, and in so doing avoid rehashing potentially fraught histories and normalize the conventional features of day-to-day life.³⁰

In addition to these quasi-mythical purifications made by itinerant *kathartai* like Epimenides, the collective performance of ritual song was another important means of warding away the devastating effects of plague. A widely reported response to epidemic disease from antiquity well into Renaissance Europe was the organization of religious processions in

²⁹ Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 1; Plut. *Sol.* 12; Diog. Laert. 1.110 (ordered by Delphi, associated with anonymous altars around Attica); Paus. 1.14.1 (associated with Triptolemos) Max. Tyre. *Diss.* 38 p.308 Trapp (=BNJ 457 T4); Strabo 10.4.14 as composer of *Katharmoi*; Pl. *Leg.* 642d as *nomothetes*; Demoulin 1979: 131-3, suggests the oracles of Epimenides may have been among those collated by the Peisistratids for political reasons. Cf., West 1983: 39-61; Parker 1983: 211; Lloyd 2003: 22-3.

³⁰ The number of plagues involved in the foundation of religious and ritual institutions of a community is too large to catalogue here: for a sample of divine plagues as cause of social/ethnic change see, e.g., Pl. *Leg.* 709b where *loimoi* are responsible for *καινοτομεῖν*—"political innovation"; Callim. fr. 194. 28-31 and Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.4 for the foundation of Branchus/Didyma at Miletus (Parke 1985); Diod. Sic. 40.3 records a "divine" plague sent to separate Egyptians and Jews, as the foundation of the Jewish *politeia*; Aeschin. [*Ep.*] 1.2 associates a *nosos loimodes* and Delian festivities; Thuc. 3.104.2 for the reinstatement of the *Delia*; cf. schol. ad Ar. *Ach.* 243 for the plague which triggered the institution of the Athenian *Dionysia*; Suda s.v. *arkteia*, Eust. *Il.* 2.772, for the *loimos* which established the *Brauronia*; at Hdt. 7.171 plague wipes out the population of Crete after Trojan War, clearing space for new populations and social customs; Diod. Sic. 15.24. *nosos theopemptos* as the cause of civil strife in Carthage; Paus. 8.27.7 for *nosos* and annual sacrifice to dead children; Paus. 1.43.7-8 *nosos* and foundation of Messene; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 12.9.1 reports a festival in honor of Apollo, Leto, Artemis, Herakles, Hermes and Poseidon in response to a plague at Rome; compare Liv. 4.25.3-4 for introduction of Apollo Medicus and social crisis. See also Petridou 2015b: 172-5 for plagues sent specifically by Apollo. For parallels from the Hebraic Near East, see Grottanelli 1983.

conjunction with the performance of chants and songs.³¹ Religious processions were powerful antidotes for a number of interlocking reasons.³² On the visceral level, these holy movements activated the profound sense of *communitas* which shared religious obligations can engender. More abstracted but just as central, they likewise helped to make the community's members visible to one another, uniting them as a group in a joint effort to ward off crisis. For instance, Philodamos' paean to Dionysos, sung at the Delphic Theoxenia, repeatedly invokes the god as *soter* (savior) within a wider hymnic structure that names the city-states participating in the festival; the imprecation for salvation and the articulation of a closed group identity are thus enmeshed in one and the same prayer.³³

These performances likewise drew on the power invested in communal spaces in the fight against disease by visiting significant religious sites.³⁴ Whether by processing through an established itinerary of sacred places or by joining center and periphery in sacred mobility, these movements reasserted the traditional connections people maintained with place in the face of catastrophe, and so equally helped to "map out" through ritual the community's spatial identity.³⁵ Finally, this sacred and unified movement of the citizen body was reinforced by the ordering power of the healing *paian* song to banish plague (more on which below). The religious procession thus placated the wrath of the offended divine, and by mobilizing an array of symbolic and performative techniques for enacting social order, it combated the inherent

³¹ For religious processions as a response to plague in later antiquity up to the Renaissance, see, e.g., Proc. *Goth.* 2.22-33; Gregory of Tours *History of the Gauls* 5; John the Deacon *History of the Lombards*; Boccaccio *Dec.* 1. Cf. Gentilecore 2004; Horden 2008.

³² Burkert 1985: 99f.

³³ Theoxenia, see *infra*.

³⁴ Mostly famously in the procession of the *Molpoi* between Miletus and Didyma: see Parke 1985; Burkert 1985.

³⁵ See esp. Horden 2008.

disruption which came with illness. Epidemic disease, while destructive and, especially in literature, a potent topos for social dissolution, was also a powerful stimulus towards the generation of *communitas* precisely because it called for the conservative energies of ritual.³⁶

The warding away of plagues by such ritual means aligned it closely with the processes and purposes of scapegoating: the katharsis of the community by the expulsion of a polluting *pharmakos*.³⁷ Scapegoating, while employed for the “protection” of the community generally, was often performed in defense against epidemic illness, either prophylactically or *in medias res*. While including many of the same ritual features, scapegoating differed from the performance of the apotropaic *paean* in the way that it “negatively” defined the community for itself.³⁸ The whole populace (notionally) gathered to witness the expurgation of the “polluting” individual, whereby the rest of the community would be saved. At the same time, it was not always a wretch who was scapegoated. Mythological accounts often portray this “marginal” figure equally as a royal personage willingly sacrificing him or herself for the salvation of the community.³⁹ Similar to other instances in which cataclysmic plague threatened, such “royal” scapegoats tended to usher in new forms of cultic life or resolve an acute political crisis.

The common thread is that scapegoating rests upon a metonymic, *pars pro toto* logic in which the selection of a victim on society’s margins reaffirms a sense of natural belonging among the remaining participants. While we possess scant information regarding the precise ritual choreography of scapegoating itself, what we do know suggests that it took place at a site

³⁶ Cf. *Erythraean Paian*=PMG 934; Thaleatas of Gortyn’s paean averting a plague at Sparta Plut. [*De Mus*]; Aristoxenos for a plague of mania (fr. 117); similarly, Iambl. *VP*. 25; see Rutherford 2001: 36-8.

³⁷ See Bremmer 1983; Burkert 1985: 82-84; Graf 2008: 77-8.

³⁸ Callim. fr. 90 Pfeiffer. Cf. [*Lys.*] 6.53.

³⁹ Most notably at Hdt. 7.197.3, but see also Sen. *Ag.* 163; Neanthes *FGrH* 84 F16; Bremmer 1983; Parker 1983.

of central, communal significance (the city hearth); involved widely collective action (procession, aischrology, or feasting); and was mythologically chartered by a crisis which threatened the community as a whole.⁴⁰ The frequency, then, in which sickness—real or imagined—is targeted as the “object” of scapegoating, is duly emblematic of plague’s conceptual role in binding a group together through the (re)creative forces of danger.

This cluster of “traditional” responses to epidemic illness invites comparison with Thucydides’ rationalizing description of the plague which ravaged Athens in 430/29. Thucydides’ account is famous as an early model of ostensibly “objective” description of bodily, social, and religious cataclysm. Yet the force of Thucydides’ narrative rests upon plague’s power to perfectly invert social values and hierarchies. As we noted above, he is typically credited with observing the communicability of the disease by stressing that those who fell ill visited most frequently their suffering relations.⁴¹ This observation, however, is not offered in empirical or pragmatic terms of fighting or avoiding infection. Rather it underscores the plagues’ thematic insistence on the closeness of people, their shared spaces, their collective habits, and relations as a direct rebuke to Athens as it had just been valorized by Perikles in his Funeral Oration, where he had praised Athenian attitudes to the freedom of association and international commerce.⁴² Thus the overall moral thrust of Thucydides’ account emphasizes the contingency of social norms and the abandonment of religious custom in the face of staggering and wanton destruction. Thucydides’ conceptions of the etiology of the plague are therefore at once differentiated from Homer, Hesiod, and the tragedians. Nevertheless he is himself part of a tradition which used the physical

⁴⁰ See Hipponax 5-11 Merkelbach-West for the earliest testimonium for the *pharmakos* (together with the cautions of Bremmer 1983).

⁴¹ It is also to be pointed out that he observed, for the first time, the phenomenon of acquired immunity.

⁴² Thuc. 2.42-6.

and psychic consequences of illness to stage a wider-ranging interrogation of the nature and texture of the social life of man.⁴³ Just as myth-ritual narratives of plague were useful for a community's self-characterization, so too in Thucydides' dramatic juxtaposition of the Athenian plague with the Funeral Oration we feel that illness played a powerful role in characterizing Athens as a political and social "actor."

Hippocratic *Hygieia* and Balance of the Humors

We have, then, traced out some of the ways that the ancient outbreak narrative offered social and conceptual tools for Greeks to define and visualize the community. We turn, now, to the Hippocratic theories of health and sickness.⁴⁴ Much of what follows is not new, but is rather a survey of well known observations on what we know of medical thought in the Classical period; like the foregoing section, such a survey is necessary, in order to underscore just how radical a break so-called "Hippocratic" conceptions were in terms of their consistently somatic theorizing about health.

Jacques Jouanna has counted a total of some 700 uses of *hyg*-roots across the Hippocratic corpus.⁴⁵ Despite this concentration of *hygieia* vocabulary, however, there are few explicit attempts to define it. Given their "technical," pragmatic nature, the authors of medical texts are much more interested in theorizing and treating abnormality than examining the healthy individual, and so well-being fades into the background as the implicit goal of therapeutic intervention. Indeed Hippocratic authors seem to assume that their audience knows what health

⁴³ Percy 1992.

⁴⁴ At least in their theoretical expressions; in practice it was often difficult to distinguish certain "medical" methods from the "magical" or "religious." See Lloyd 1979 and 1983; Parker 1983: 231f. for Hippocratic "borrowings" and reconfigurations of traditional purifying methods, like "wiping" down (see also Chapter 2).

⁴⁵ Jouanna 1999: 321.

is.⁴⁶ We must be mindful that there is no single such intellectual tradition as “Hippocratic theory,” and that the disparate ideas expressed in medical texts might not even always correspond precisely with the realities of practice.⁴⁷ The Hippocratic corpus is complexly allusive, yet there were many discrepancies among writers about what stuffs and qualities comprised the body and under what circumstances they triggered disease.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, despite the multiplicity of ideas concerning the number and kind of material stuffs that engender health and harm, the formal, mechanical principles which grounded these ideas are remarkably similar. Thus we can trace the emergence of general themes and assumptions which confer coherence to the medical program we call “Hippocratism,” and to the project of sketching *hygieia*.⁴⁹

One of the central physiological assumptions governing the practices of observation and inference was the importance of balance or harmony as critical for maintaining *hygieia*. Galen, writing in the second century AD, claimed that, in nearly all his predecessors, this balance was a result of proportionality (*summetrios*) and good mixture (*eukrasia*) of bodily fluids.⁵⁰ Whatever the multiplicity of stuffs believed to make up the *soma*, it was essential that no single one of these elements gained mastery over the others. Indeed, Alkmaeon of Croton, active sometime around the close of the sixth or beginning of the fifth century BCE, was the first writer we know of to define *hygieia* and *nosos* explicitly in the terms reflected in the later writings of Galen.⁵¹ Diogenes Laertius quotes him as saying that *hygieia* is an *ισονομία* of a given number of

⁴⁶ For issues of Hippocratic audience, see Schiefsky 2006: 35f; Nutton 2013.

⁴⁷ See van der Eijk 2016: 17-48.

⁴⁸ Cf. Nutton 2013; Craik 2015.

⁴⁹ Jouanna 1999.

⁵⁰ Gal. *De san. tuen.* 1.4 (6. 3-5 K).

⁵¹ For dating, see Longrigg 1993: 51; Jouanna 1999: 262; Nutton 2013: 47.

governing forces (δύναμις) which operated within and upon the body. Conversely, the body falls into disease when one of these *dunameis* gains the upper hand and “rules” the others in a “monarchy” (μοναρχία).⁵² This passage is much discussed and difficult not least because of its fragmentary nature and doxographical source, and the wording may not be entirely authentic.⁵³ Assuming that the origins of the political metaphor are genuine however, we find later in this same passage that Alkmaeon describes this “democratic” health as an “equal blending” (κρῆσις σύμμετρος). Alkmaeon proceeds, then, from Pre-Socratic, presumably Empedoclean, premises which understand the body to be a “blend” of different material stuffs, configured in various proportions appropriate to their form and function. Alkmaeon’s innovation lies thus not only in the assertion that health is an equal distribution of forces, but upon the framing of this equality in a strikingly political metaphor.⁵⁴

⁵² DK B4 24 (=Diog. Laert. 8.83): τῆς μὲν ὑγείας εἶναι συνεκτικὴν τὴν ἰσονομίαν τῶν δυνάμεων, ὑγροῦ, ξηροῦ, ψυχροῦ, θερμοῦ, πικροῦ, γλυκέος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, τὴν δ’ ἐν αὐτοῖς μοναρχίαν νόσου ποιητικὴν· φθοροποιὸν γὰρ ἑκατέρου μοναρχίαν. καὶ νόσον συμπίπτειν ὡς μὲν ὑφ’ οὗ ὑπερβολῆι θερμότητος ἢ ψυχρότητος, ὡς δὲ ἐξ οὗ διὰ πλῆθος τροφῆς ἢ ἐνδείαν, ὡς δ’ ἐν οἷς ἢ αἷμα ἢ μυελὸν ἢ ἐγκέφαλον. ἐγγίνεσθαι δὲ τούτοις ποτὲ κακὰ τῶν ἐξωθεν αἰτιῶν, ὑδάτων ποιωῶν ἢ χώρας ἢ κόπων ἢ ἀνάγκης ἢ τῶν τούτοις παραπλησίων. τὴν δὲ ὑγίαν τὴν σύμμετρον τῶν ποιωῶν κρᾶσιν.

The essence of health is the *isonomia* of the qualities, of the wet and dry, of the cold and hot, of the acrid and sweet, and of all the rest, while a monarchy of them creates disease, for a monarchy of any one is harmful. Disease befalls on the one hand when there is an abundance of hot or cold, and on the other through both an excess or lack of nourishment. It arises in the blood or the marrow or brain, but stems for some from external causes, such as waters (rain?), or the land, fatigue, stress or similar matters. But health is the measured blending of such factors.

⁵³ See Nutton 2013: 47-8; 80.

⁵⁴ Compare the similar political metaphor for unbalanced humors and sickness used at *Anon. Lond.* 19.18-29 Manetti, purporting to record the physiology of Menecrates of Syracuse (fl. 350’s):

συνεστάναι γ[ἀρ]
λέγει τὰ σώματα ἐκ τ(ῶν) τεσσάρων
θερμῶν μ(ὲν) αἵματος χολῆς, ψυχρῶν
δὲ πνεύματος [καὶ] φλέγματος.
τούτ(ων) μ(ὲν) δὴ μὴ στασιαζόντ(ων), ἃ εὐκρά-
τως διακειμέν(ων), ὑγιαίνει τὸ ζῶιον,
δυσκράτως δὲ ἐχόντων νο[σεῖ].

[Menekrates] says that the body is composed of four components: those which are warm are blood and bile, while air and phlegm are cold. When these are not opposed, but are under good control, the animal is healthy; but it is sick when they are poorly controlled.

By Alkmaeon's time, *isonomia* had become the watchword for consensual democratic self-regulation under the law, contrasted with the excesses of *monarchia*.⁵⁵ This appears, then, to be an early instance of the *reversal* of the body politic metaphor, in which the workings of the body were explained through the emergent discourse of democratic egalitarianism.⁵⁶ So, even as this passage advances an individualist theory of health as a balance of corporeal and environmental forces, it pays homage to the social field in which conceptions of health and sickness had grown up. As we will see, choosing to convey a philosophy about unseen forces through a potent experiential metaphor is not unusual. But we should perhaps seek to explain the origins of Alkmaeon's choice of images beyond the democratic sloganeering of the fifth century. Rather, I propose we situate it within a long-standing tradition in which the experience and texture of health and sickness were invested with greater social significance.

Alkmaeon's political metaphor anticipates, but remains distinct from, the more starkly mechanistic and processual accounts of health which characterize the thinkers of the Hippocratic Corpus. In one of the few passages that explicitly defines *hygieia* within the corpus, the author of the short treatise *Nature of Man* (*De natura hominis*) begins with an argument against contemporary material monists who hold that humans are composed wholly "of air, fire, water, earth, or any other single substance."⁵⁷ On similar grounds he extends his attack to those

⁵⁵ See, e.g., Vlastos 1966: 58-60, with comparison of Alkmaeon's corporeal *isonomia* with Anaximander's cosmological *isonomia*, as well as the environmental *isomoiria* of *Aer*: 12; see more recently Mitchell-Boyask 2008: 40.

⁵⁶ Compare Herodotus' description of Milesian *stasis* at 5.28: νοσήσασα ἐς τὰ μάλιστα στάσι; and the more elaborate, extended metaphor at Thuc. 3.83f.

⁵⁷ *Nat. Hom.* 1.3-5; 2.1-4: οὔτε γὰρ τὸ πάμπαν ἡέρα λέγω τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι, οὔτε πῦρ, οὔτε ὕδωρ, οὔτε γῆν, οὔτ' ἄλλο οὐδὲν... Γῶν δὲ ἱητρῶν οἱ μὲν τινες λέγουσιν, ὡς ἄνθρωπος αἷμα μόνον ἐστίν, οἱ δ' αὐτέων χολήν φασιν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἔνιοι δὲ τινες φλέγμα... The treatise has come to stand for humoral theory, and Hippocratic theory more generally, but at *HA* 415b Aristotle seems to attribute this work to Polybus, Hippocrates son-in-law and disciple. See also the so-called Menonia of *Anon. Lond.*, which attributes the monist *pneumatic* theory of *Flat.* to Hippocrates (see, now, Prince 2016: 101f).

philosophically influenced doctors who claim that the body is made up only of blood, bile, or phlegm (medical monists, like the author of *Breaths*). Rather, he claims, in order for the phenomenon of pain even to exist, the body has to be made up of multiple substances subject to multiple forces through which it can register change (*Nat. Hom.* 2) :

Τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔχει ἐν ἑωυτῷ αἷμα καὶ φλέγμα καὶ χολήν ξανθὴν τε καὶ μέλαιναν, καὶ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν αὐτέω ἢ φύσις τοῦ σώματος, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἀλγέει καὶ ὑγιαίνει. Ὑγιαίνει μὲν οὖν μάλιστα, ὁκόταν μετρίως ἔχη ταῦτα τῆς πρὸς ἄλληλα κρήσιος καὶ δυνάμιος καὶ τοῦ πλήθεος, καὶ μάλιστα μεμιγμένα ἢ· ἀλγέει δὲ ὁκόταν τι τουτέων ἔλασσον ἢ πλέον ἢ ἢ χωρισθῆ ἐν τῷ σώματι καὶ μὴ κεκρημένον ἢ τοῖσι ξύμπασιν. Ἀνάγκη γὰρ, ὁκόταν τι τουτέων χωρισθῆ καὶ ἐφ' ἑωυτοῦ στή, οὐ μόνον τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον, ἔνθεν ἐξέστη, ἐπίνοσον γίνεσθαι...

Man's body has within it blood, phlegm, both yellow bile and black, and these are in itself the nature of the body, and it is through these that it feels pain and is healthy. For the body is healthy whenever it contains these substances proportionally with regard to their blending, their *dunamis* and amounts, especially if they are perfectly mixed. But it is in pain whenever one of these grows lesser or greater, or separated within the body and not mixed together with all the rest. For it is natural, whenever one of these substances is separate and isolated, that not only that place become diseased...

Health thus consists of the stable balance of four humors.⁵⁸ When one of these four gains an undue influence or is isolated through a fractious “separation” from the others, this destabilization creates pain in whatever place the offending humor collects (the *locus affectus*). Dis-equilibrium is, then, the origin of disease in the body. The author of *Ancient Medicine*, who is similarly distrustful of philosophers—but also casts suspicions upon the pat numerical scheme of the humors advanced by the *Nature of Man* author—nevertheless emphasizes a remarkably similar case for blending and good measure as the (implicit) requisites for health (*VM* 14):

Ἐνὶ γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ πικρὸν καὶ ἀλμυρὸν, καὶ γλυκὺ καὶ ὄξυ, καὶ στρυφνὸν καὶ πλα-

⁵⁸ See also, e.g., *Hum.* 1; *Morb.* 4.1; *Genit.* 3 (the latter two texts possibly sharing an author, see Lonie 1983); see further Craik 2015: xxiv-xxxv.

δαρὸν, καὶ ἄλλα μυρία, παντοίας δυνάμιας ἔχοντα, πλῆθός τε καὶ ἰσχύν. Ταῦτα μὲν μεμιγμένα καὶ κεκρημένα ἀλλήλοισιν οὔτε φανερά ἐστιν, οὔτε λυπέει τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ὅταν δέ τι τουτέων ἀποκριθῆ, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐφ' ἑωυτοῦ γένηται, τότε καὶ φανερόν ἐστι καὶ λυπέει τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

For there is in man the bitter and the salty, the sweet and the acid, the sour and insipid, and countless other [qualities], holding all kinds of *dunameis* both in quantity and strength. These, when they are mixed and blended with one another are not apparent, and do not pain man. But whenever some one of them is separated off, and stands alone, then it is apparent and harms us.

If pain and sickness are, essentially, a change within the body, it naturally follows that *hygieia* is the homeostatic continuity of bodily states within a band of acceptable fluctuation.⁵⁹ Again, in these two passages—although especially in the later—we find that the definition of *hygieia* resembles the naturalist definition of health described at the beginning of the chapter. Health, for the author of *Ancient Medicine*, is really the absence of pain (οὔτε φανερά ἐστιν, οὔτε λυπέει τὸν ἄνθρωπον) and, consequently, is not something that manifests itself to us.⁶⁰ The healthy body is a body invisible to self-perception. As was the case with the Homeric or Hesiodic community, the healthy individual is only given shape and quality by the disruptive experience of pain impinging on the normally balanced mixing of stuffs.

Despite the commonality of the general principle of blending, there is a potentially meaningful discrepancy, both phenomenologically and ontologically, between the two accounts of pain's intrusion into the body. Returning now to the *Nature of Man* passage, we find the suffering individual as the subject of feeling and experience (τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου...διὰ

⁵⁹ Cf. *Reg.* 1.3; *Flat.* 1; *Aph.* 1.3 (athletes); *Aph.* 1.4-10 for variability of individual constitutions in disease; *Loc.* 1.1. takes an especially interesting view of this, in which there is no *arche* (“beginning”) of the body, but all its parts are implicated in the maintenance of the whole; consequently, all parts are subject to disease when it strikes, according to the viscosity of disease.

⁶⁰ Compare *Reg.* 1.2. in which the author defines sickness as whatever causes the body pain. On this wide view, then, even hunger is a kind of *nosos*.

ταῦτα ἀλγέει καὶ ὑγιαίνει). The humors, as constituent parts of the body, are the material that bear responsibility for pain but are also indistinguishable from the individual as the agent of perception; the stuff that pains us is also the medium through which we experience pain. We are our disease, in a way that is important and foreign to Homer and Hesiod. The author of *Ancient Medicine*, however, isolates the sudden sublimation (ἀποκριθῆ) of a single element as a pathological agent differentiated and existing apart from the sensing body of man.⁶¹ In the separation that renders this imbalance visible (φανερὸν ἐστὶ), the pathogenic agent is linguistically presented as a new, distinct entity which acts upon its victim (λυπέει τὸν ἄνθρωπον) rather than an inherent bodily process. Indeed, the diseases enumerated in the first “section” of the text *Diseases 2* cohere to a similar model of externality: here we encounter disease as the Other.⁶² Significantly such passages point to the possibility of alternative models for narrating and imagining pain and well-being, even when health is predicated on the balance of interior stuffs. Comparison of the two underscores the conceptual (and linguistic) difficulty of depriving illness its own forms of agency, whether moral, social or otherwise, even for naturalist thinkers within the Corpus.

It is well known that the medical writers were similarly interested in the connections that man maintained with the world outside the body. These authors also describe the relational qualities that obtain between humans and their physical environments. As with Alkmaeon, a concept fundamental to many medical authors was *dunamis* or *physis*—the characteristics or

⁶¹ Cf. Padel 1992: 54 who takes this to be the nosological model of all Hippocratic thinkers, as is certainly the case in, e.g., *Morb.* 1 and 2. For the *Nat. Hom.* author, among others, disease does not come from matter *ta esionta exothen*, rather it is an emergent property of the interaction of a complex system of materials and qualities at the interface of which stands the physical body. Diseases like dropsy (ὑδρωψ) are illustrative in the way they are clearly triggered somewhere within the body’s fluid balance, rather than as the result of some external shock (see, e.g., *Int.* 23-6; *Flat.* 12; *Hum.* 8; *Prog.* 8.1-8; *Coac.* 443).

⁶² *Morb.* 2.1-11. See Craik 2015 for the division of the text.

capacity for action inherent in and definitive of any given material.⁶³ These qualities provide the means by which the interior stuffs of the body are affected by invisible yet perceptible forces outside of it—like winds, temperature, and humidity—or any sudden changes in those factors, whether triggered by atmospheric or behavioral (eating, drinking, sex) causes. That is, *dunameis* form the interface between the humors inside the body and the environmental conditions without, providing the links by which the microcosm of the body’s cavity correlates to the macrocosm of the observable world and beyond. As the author of *Affections* explains, for instance (*Aff.* 1):⁶⁴

νουσήματα τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισι γίνεται ἅπαντα ὑπὸ χολῆς καὶ φλέγματος· ἡ δὲ χολὴ καὶ τὸ φλέγμα τὰς νόσους παρέχει, ὅταν ἐντῷ σώματι ἢ ὑπερξηραίνηται, ἢ ὑπερυγραίνηται, ἢ ὑπερθερμαίνηται, ἢ ὑπερψύχηται. Πάσχει δὲ ταῦτα τὸ φλέγμα καὶ ἡ χολὴ καὶ ἀπὸ σιτίων καὶ ποτῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ πόνων καὶ τραυμάτων, καὶ ἀπὸ ὀσμῆς καὶ ἀκοῆς καὶ ὄψιος καὶ λαγνείης, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θερμοῦ τε καὶ ψυχροῦ· πάσχει δὲ, ὅταν τούτων ἕκαστα τῶν εἰρημένων ἢ μὴ ἐν τῷ δέοντι προσφέρηται τῷ σώματι, ἢ μὴ τὰ εἰωθότα, ἢ πλείω τε καὶ ἰσχυρότερα, ἢ ἐλάσσω τε καὶ ἀσθενέστερα. Τὰ μὲν οὖν νοσήματα γίνεται τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισιν ἅπαντα ἀπὸ τουτέων.

All diseases originate for man from bile and phlegm. Bile and phlegm engender disease whenever it grows too dry, or too wet, or too warm or cold within the body. These substances are exacerbated as well by foods and drinks, by labors and injury, by smells and sounds and sights and touch and hot and cold. There is suffering whenever any one of the things mentioned is applied to a body which does not need it, or in an unaccustomed manner, whether too much and vigorously, or too little and weakly. All diseases are generated for men in this way.

Health is not, then, for the *Affections* author, among others, conceived in strict terms of personal autonomy or protection from hostile exterior forces (whether thought of daemonically or pathogenically) as in Homer and Hesiod.⁶⁵ Although the body remains a distinct object, it is one

⁶³ See van der Eijk 1990; Jouanna 1999; Nutton 2013.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Morb* 1.2.

⁶⁵ Holmes 2010b *passim*.

implicated in a wide field of powers with which it shares natures and capacities.⁶⁶ This is precisely why analogies drawn from the natural, observable world are potent models for interpreting bodily symptoms as indicators of invisible processes.⁶⁷

In fact, many Hippocratic authors show an interest in describing the origins of disease as the mutual interaction of body and environment through the logic of *physis*. This causal link is given its clearest exposition in *Airs, Waters, Places*, but it provides the theoretical underpinnings for the observations made in the most famously “clinical” treatises, the *Epidemics*, as well as *Regimen 2, Aphorisms*, and many others.⁶⁸ In *Epidemics One*, the author details the wide scope of interrelated phenomena the *iatros* must observe in order to successfully diagnose a patient and render illness most visible.⁶⁹ Heading the impressive battery of symptoms is the “constitution” (*katastasis*) of the seasons, a description of the year’s prevailing weather patterns and their effects upon the bodies of the local populace. The theory that the origins of all disease can be traced to the air we breathe can also be found in the treatise *Breaths*. Now, these texts are interesting because they directly confront the problem of epidemic illness and its causes. For both these authors, any instance of a *nosos demosios* or *koinos* must be sourced back to that material element which men share most in common—the quality of the air.⁷⁰ Particular qualities

⁶⁶ Holmes 2010b. See further Chapter Two.

⁶⁷ See, e.g., some of the (many) technical and natural analogies drawn at Emp. DK 31 B100 *Reg.* 1.11; *Aer.* 10-12; *Morb.* 4 *passim*. See Lloyd 1966 and 1991; Holmes 2010b: especially chapters 2 and 3. Like Alkmaeon, the *Reg.* author is particularly given to drawing his physiological analogies from the social and professional worlds, rather than from purely physical phenomena.

⁶⁸ Cf. *Reg.* 2.1-2; *Aph.* 3.1-17; see further Chapter 4.

⁶⁹ *Epid.* 1.3.1-16. Compare also *Epid.* 4.43 and 4.46; *Aer.* 1; *Reg.* 1.2; *Flat.* 2-3; *Morb.* 1.2.

⁷⁰ *Aer.* 2; *Flat.* 6; *Nat. hom.* 9. See Jouanna 2012: 127 for a distinction between the causal views expressed in *Aer.* and *Nat. hom./Flat.* Both rely on “natural” mechanisms, however.

of the air trigger changes (*metabolai*) within the body, causing all inhabitants of a given area to succumb to illness, regardless of individual constitution or regimen.⁷¹

I would add that this particular model of epidemic sickness does not just diverge from those discussed in the previous section in its essential materialism and naturalism.⁷² For the authors of *Breaths; Airs, Waters, Places*; or the *Epidemics*, epidemic sickness “diagnoses” nothing about the social character or history of the community. They are, simply put, byproducts of the interaction of a polis’s orientation and environmental factors like winds, rains, and heat. Such “common” illnesses are narratologically and socially inert. Sickness for these authors spreads neither by direct person-to-person contact nor through the interventions of the divine in human affairs. Blame is not shared, and consequently, there exists no moral imperative for the community to act in unison. Human behavior as a vector for such widespread illnesses fades from view entirely. The most one can do is recommend therapies targeted to classes of physical constitutions (i.e. heavy or shallow breathers).⁷³

Ultimately, then, when we say that Hippocratic theories of health and disease are a matter of balance, we appear to mean that they are conceptualized in primarily “processual” terms as the continuous impression of forces on a regulated system which always threatens breakdown.⁷⁴ The language of processes, widely used in the accounts of ancient medicine, captures the homeostatic essence of the body well. But such scholarly descriptions also provoke mechanical associations which tend to mask the other facet inherent in the medical thought of the Classical period: the

⁷¹ Cf. *Morb. sacr.* 13.

⁷² Cf. Jouanna 2012: 125.

⁷³ *Nat. Hom.* 9.

⁷⁴ E.g., *Reg.* 1.2; *Aph.* 1.3.

treatment of the body as a set of relations, relations which are measurable in quantity and quality and must be tended to in order to preserve a fragile equality. Health, for the naturalist physician, emerges from the careful surveillance of the body's nature and its sympathies with the "exterior world." If one assiduously observes changes in her environment, and takes the appropriate actions to counterbalance their negative effects, *hygieia* may be maintained.⁷⁵

As Brooke Holmes has argued, and as we will see further next chapter, this material body became available for conceptualization as an individual object of care within a network of impersonal forces, replacing the ethical relationships one maintained with a different network of divine and imperceptible powers which stalked the world. Even, then, as Hippocratic authors sought to fence daemonic or ethical networks of social associations from their materializing accounts of health and sickness, these texts point up the ways in which the body (and the mind) became the center of a wholly new constellation of "relations."⁷⁶ The body thus became the locus of a rather different form of ethics and self-fashioning, one which would powerfully impact later philosophical traditions. But it was also one in which the communal aspects implied in the discourses of health fade from view, displaced by the importance of reasoned self-discipline and control over the body. As we will see in the following sections, this particular social and ethical tradition of *hygieia* continued to play an important, and heretofore unnoticed, role within the imagining of the communities of the Classical period. More specifically, we will find that, if *loimos* was invested with the power of negatively defining the community during times of crisis, *hygieia* was possessed of a positive corollary power. That is, *hygieia* was widely socially

⁷⁵ Holmes 2010b.

⁷⁶ Holmes 2010b.

embedded in domains like cult, song, and the symposium, where it joined with other values to help articulate the vigor of the community, the competitive pleasures of the drinking party, and the reciprocity and trust which underpinned long term social relationships. Indeed, far from entailing bodily health only, we will see the way *hygieia*, in its other-facing dimension, emerged from a host of mutual interactions.

Hygieia and Cult

Health's wide conceptual remit is perhaps most visible in its existence as a personified figure of worship which was invariably associated with healing deities like Asklepios. Indeed, Hygieia's role at the side of Asklepios will play a significant part in the following two chapters, but an analysis of her cultural signification requires some attention to her "solo career" as well. Sometime towards the close of the sixth century BCE, Hygieia emerged as a full blown deity and object of independent worship, likely somewhere in the Peloponnese.⁷⁷ Very often, she was represented with a snake, the avatar of Asklepios, whose daughter she was typically regarded as being (although the later *Orphic Hymn to Asklepios* shows she was sometimes his consort.)⁷⁸ Nevertheless, Asklepios did not maintain exclusive rights on the snake as his divine incarnation. Zeus, when he was considered in his chthonic form—i.e., when he was not worshipped as the ruler of Olympos, but celebrated as a god of the Earth and its abundance—was typically represented as a rampant serpent.⁷⁹ Indeed, this serpentine Zeus was most widely known under the *epikleseis* Zeus Chthonios, Zeus Meilichios, or Zeus Ktesios, god of the store-room.⁸⁰ There

⁷⁷ For the iconographic history of Hygieia as a deity and figure of cult, see Kutsch 1913; Croissant 1990; Shapiro 1994; Stafford 2000 and 2005; Verbanck-Piérard 2000; Leventi 2003; Riethmüller 2005; Kranz 2010; Smith 2011; Beumer 2016. Hygieia in Peloponnese, Paus. 5.26.2 (Olympia c.460); 2.11.6 (Titane, for which see Chapter 3).

⁷⁸ *Hymn. Orph.* 85.7.

⁷⁹ See Chapter Three for possible connections between Hygieia, Asklepios, and Zeus Meilichios at Athens.

⁸⁰ For contacts between Ktesios and Hygieia, see further below.

is thus a powerful visual and ritual connection which obtained between Zeus as the protector of the family and its goods, and his connection with the gods who are most exclusively associated with health and healing. On the one hand this can clearly be explained by the link of nourishing abundance and good health. At the same time, the appearance of Hygieia in ritual contexts which enmesh the individual and the social groups which helped to define his or her identity, suggest that the connection was a more textured and interactive one.

This is especially evident in Hygieia's relatively early inclusion within the Athenian civic pantheon.⁸¹ It is here that we find some early traces of a framework for understanding health within a polis context. Plutarch's *Life of Perikles* is of special interest; here the biographer records for us a miraculous event meant to demonstrate Athena's eager and active participation in the rebuilding of the Acropolis.⁸² During the construction of the Propylaia—the massive gateway which still marks one's transition into the sacred space of the sanctuary complex—the most dedicated and active of the workmen fell from a great height and was crippled. Despite doctors' ministrations, the man did not recover and his life was despaired of. However, Athena, appearing to Perikles in a dream, gave the statesman instructions for the man's care, and following the regimen outlined by the god, the man quickly recovered. In thanks, Perikles dedicated a bronze

⁸¹ See, e.g., Garland 1992: 132; Parker 1996: 175; Wickkiser 2008: 51; 53.

⁸² Plut. *Per.* 13.12-13: Τὰ δὲ Προπύλαια τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐξεργάσθη μὲν ἐν πενταετία Μνησικλέους ἀρχιτεκτονοῦντος, τύχη δὲ θαυμαστὴ συμβᾶσα περὶ τὴν οἰκοδομίαν ἐμήνυσε τὴν θεὸν οὐκ ἀποστατοῦσαν, ἀλλὰ συνεφαπτομένην τοῦ ἔργου καὶ συνεπιτελοῦσαν. ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργότατος καὶ προθυμότητος τῶν τεχνιτῶν ἀποσφαλῆς ἐξ ὕψους ἔπεσε καὶ διέκειτο μοχθηρῶς, ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν ἀπεγνωσμένος. ἀθυμοῦντος δὲ τοῦ Περικλέους, ἡ θεὸς ὄναρ φανείσα συνέταξε θεραπείαν, ἣ χρώμενος ὁ Περικλῆς ταχὺ καὶ ῥαδίως ἰάσατο τὸν ἄνθρωπον. ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ καὶ τὸ χαλκοῦν ἄγαλμα τῆς Ὑγείας Ἀθηνᾶς ἀνέστησεν ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν βωμόν ὃς καὶ πρότερον ἦν ὡς λέγουσιν.

The Propylaia of the acropolis was constructed over five years by the architect Mnesikles, and an amazing event occurred concerning its construction which showed that the goddess was not averse, but rather lent her hand in aid of the work's completion. For the most energetic and enthusiastic of the workmen slipped and, falling from its height, was so badly injured that he was despaired of by the physicians. But the goddess appeared in a dream to Perikles, who had become despondent, and taught him the cure, which when he used it quickly and easily healed the man. In thanks for this, he erected a bronze statue of Athena Hygieia on the acropolis besides the altar which they say was already there.

statue to Athena Hygieia to stand next to an altar which had existed at an earlier date on the Acropolis.

There is much to say about this as a cult foundation myth.⁸³ On the one hand it follows a standard motif in which social crises require the installation of new cults through the transformative power of ritual. In this case, the fate of a single man stands for the fate of the whole city. As the most zealous of the workmen he embodies the energies of the community to restore itself in the long-smoldering aftermath of the Persian catastrophe. In this way he functions almost as an inversion of the scapegoat as discussed above. Just as the man can only be saved and cured through the healing instructions disclosed to Perikles by the goddess, so too the city's efforts to rebuild its cultic center, its defining core as a religious and civic community, are only to be secured through the re-foundation of Athena Hygieia's shrine on the Acropolis.

However apocryphal Plutarch's story appears, archaeological evidence confirms Athena Hygieia's Acropolis shrine from at least the beginning of the fifth century.⁸⁴ An inscription dedicated by the painter Euphronius, likely dating to the first quarter of the fifth century and the discovery of the statue base *in situ*, dated sometime in the late 430s, confirm the cults' origins and its likely re-foundation.⁸⁵ So while the details concerning the workman and Perikles' dream were likely conjured to emphasize the significance of Athena Hygieia's return to the Acropolis, the archaeological finds tend to corroborate Plutarch's chronological sequence: cult had been given to an Athena Hygieia some time in the earlier part of the fifth century and Perikles probably cast renewed attention on it. As more than one recent commentator has pointed out, we

⁸³ Stafford 2005.

⁸⁴ See Parker 1996; Stafford 2005.

⁸⁵ *IG* I³ 824; statue base I³ 506; see also a krater-cum-grafto of the painter Kallis. See Stafford 2000; 2005.

can, then, consider Hygieia as meaningfully related to Athena as state-goddess. In fact, Iphigenia Leventi has recently sought to identify the cult statue with the Hope Athena, whose iconographic attributes echo powerfully those of the famous Athena Polias/Parthenos cult statue housed within the Parthenon nearby.⁸⁶ Their visual interrelation, then, is interpretable under Athena's protective capacity, as the tutelary goddess who ensures the well-being of her city and wards off the maladies which threaten her beloved citizens.

More than this, the choice of Athena Hygieia's location is noteworthy. This is because the Athenian acropolis was not simply the epicenter of Athenian religious life. It is widely understood that under Perikles' rebuilding of the Acropolis, its architectural, iconographic, and ritual elements constituted a political and imperial "text."⁸⁷ The deliberate selection of mythological and historical motifs emphasized the imposition or creation of order through collective action—and this is especially vivid in the relief-sculpture on the temple of Athena Nike, which featured Greeks triumphing over barbarian Persians. This iconographic assemblage encoded pointed messages about the commitment to an ensemble of civic virtues as the hallmark of politico-cultural identity. So, too, it offered a set of visual arguments justifying Athens' role as an expansionist power, slowly but surely attempting to integrate the cities of the Aegean into its tentacular political economy.⁸⁸

Ritual and religious festivals—most notably the Panatheneia in which Athens' allies were "invited" to participate and which terminated at the Acropolis—were a principal mechanism of

⁸⁶ Leventi 2003: 3; see also Shapiro 1993; Smith 2011.

⁸⁷ See, e.g., Hurwitt 1999. For the significance of Asklepios' (and so, also, Hygieia's) proximity, see Parker 1996; Wickkiser 2008: 76f.

⁸⁸ See further Chapter Three.

this unification.⁸⁹ It is apparent, then, that under the Periklean reorganization and codification of the democratic and imperial Athenian ideology, that Hygieia was not only invested with striking iconographic valences. The renewal of Athena Hygieia's shrine within such a carefully orchestrated and politically potent sanctuary cannot be an accident. She was granted an important place hard by the entrance of a deeply layered space, seemingly structuring the collective ritual activities which took place there under a rubric of health.⁹⁰ And, although Athena Hygieia seems ultimately to have stopped receiving dedications by the end of the fifth century, this corresponds with the introduction of Asklepios and Hygieia's cult on the South Slope of the Acropolis in 420 BCE, in conjunction with another important cult, that of Dionysos Eleutherios, in whose theater the city's dramatic productions took place.⁹¹ Hygieia was thus consciously, and densely, woven into the civic symbolism of the urban center.⁹²

For scholars studying Hygieia's gradual and complex intervention into Athenian iconography and cult, her coupling with Athena on the Acropolis has suggested *hygieia's* emergence as a "civic virtue" within the context of fifth century democracy.⁹³ Indeed, for Amy Smith, Hygieia became the goddess "charged with the responsibility for civic health."⁹⁴ These scholars assume, rightly, the civic importance of Hygieia, yet at the same limit the scope of her

⁸⁹ For drama, see Seaford 1994; Goldhill 1990; Zeitlin 1996. See Scullion 2002 *pace*.

⁹⁰ Her shrine was also situated right next to the urban sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia, whose cult was instituted to ward off a plague roused by her ire (for the apotropaic dimension of the *Brauronia*, see Faraone 2003). Athena Hygieia's shrine was therefore also spatially connected with an important Athenian cult whose installation was motivated by concerns about the well-being of the citizenry and which, at the same time, served to unify the wider Attic territory by linking center and periphery (see Polignac 1994a and 1994b; Pedley 2005; although Faraone 2003 expresses reservations).

⁹¹ Parker 2005: 181.

⁹² See further Wickkiser 2008 and Chapter Three.

⁹³ Leventi 2003; Shaprio 1993: 128f; Smith 2011:53-55; see also Rosenzweig 2004. The appearance of Hygieia on a number of Attic hydria, together with Athenian tribal heroes and other abstracted virtues (Eudaimonia and Paidia, for instance) have been the principal grounds for civic interpretations.

⁹⁴ Smith 2011: 54.

responsibility to the bodily well-being of the citizenry. Her emphatic inclusion in a central space for the *performance* of Athenian collective identity has until now gone overlooked. In the examples which follow, we will see that celebrations of Health were not limited to wishes for bodily well-being or its conscious articulation as a civic virtue; rather, the articulation of such wishes constitute a powerful species of “doing things with words,” where the “thing done” is the enactment of group solidarity.

Paianes: A Symptic Song for Health

In his survey of Hippocratic ideas about health and disease, Jacques Jouanna identified the idea of *krasis* as the unique contribution of the emergent medical discipline and proposed that “if one were to look for an analogical model implicit in the new concept [*krasis*], it would be in the banquet—the archetypical image of wine mixed with water that was offered in libation to the gods before drinking.”⁹⁵ While Jouanna was gesturing vaguely at the possibility that the central Hippocratic notion of “mixture” was derived or borrowed from a separate sphere of social life, he does not track out the interesting implications of this suggestion. In fact, we will discover concerns for health were implicated in sympotic activities, and so the following sections drill more deeply into the complex ways *hygieia* intruded into this culturally significant space by looking principally at the performance of *paianes* and rituals which were associated with health. Examining *hygieia*’s performative role within the symposium as a microcosm of the sorts of relationships which obtained in the polis at-large will also clarify Hygieia’s worship on the Athenian acropolis as a divinity who organized ideas about civic solidarity, and help us to unpack both the descriptive and the performative registers of health.

⁹⁵ Jouanna 1999: 328.

Athenaios' *Deipnosophistai*, a second century AD repository of classical Greek culture, frames itself as a symposium attended by men steeped in Greek learning. As the party winds down, the participants join in singing a *paian* suited for the closing of the symposium. According to Athenaios, the hymn was widely known as the *paian* to Hygieia, composed by the Sikyonian poet Ariphron,⁹⁶ and which, as Lucian noted, “was very well known and on the lips of all.”⁹⁷ The hymn is not only found within the works of the cultural encyclopedists Athenaios and Lucian; we have discovered the same text inscribed in two different locations.⁹⁸ One was discovered in Athens, inscribed on the so-called Kassel stone together with several other *paianes*, and the other in Epidauros, as one among a small corpus of hymns composed in honor of other deities, including Magna Mater and Pan.⁹⁹ This wide geographic circulation and long life—well more than 600 years by Athenaios' time—of Ariphron's song demonstrates not only its popularity as a hymn; it discloses the hymn's use in a multiplicity of social, ritual, and perhaps geographic contexts. For instance, the Epidaurian hymns were discovered arranged in such a way as to suggest that they provided a “liturgical” program of songs to be chanted during set hours of the

⁹⁶ *IG* IV² 1, 132 and Ath. 15.701f-2b (τὸν εἰς Ὑγίαιαν παιᾶνα ἤσας τὸν ποιηθέντα ὑπὸ Ἀρίφρονος τοῦ Σικυωνίου τόνδε)=*PMG* 813. See Furley and Bremmer 2001 vols. 1 and 2 for full text and commentary. Both Ariphron and the poem's dates are disputed. An Attic inscription of c.400 BC, *IG* II² 3092 (*TrGF* I 193 no. 53) mentions an Ariphron *didaskalos*, and we will see the sentiments contained within the poem have strong classical parallels. But Furley and Bremmer 2001 (vol 2: 224f.) argue for a Hellenistic date based on a unique emphasis given to kingly power within the hymn. See also LeVen 2014: 177f.; Breumer 2016.

⁹⁷ Lucian *Pro lapsu* 6: τὸ γνωριμώτατον ἐκεῖνο καὶ πᾶσι διὰ στόματος.

⁹⁸ See also Plut. *Mor.* 450b and 479a; Max. Tyr. *Diss.* 7.1; Sext. Emp. *Math.* 11. 49.

⁹⁹ Kassel = *IG* II² 4533. See Rutherford 2001: 42, for the extremely interesting (although probably late) *paian* to Telesphorus. Compare also *IG* II² 4473, Makedonios' hymn to Apollo and Asklepios, which was likely modeled on the Erythraean hymn (see further below).

day.¹⁰⁰ According to this hypothesis the positioning of the texts indicates that Ariphton's *paian* would have initiated the day's ritual service at Asklepios' cult there, which accords well with the *paian*'s possible role as a song of "opening" and "closing," as we find it in Ariphton. Indeed, a fragment of Alkman indicates that it was "fitting to strike up the *paian* among dinner guests."¹⁰¹

This fluidity in what were apparently appropriate, yet clearly disparate, performance contexts and occasions, has dogged scholars attempting to find underlying criteria for defining a *paian*.¹⁰² At the least, we can say from the beginning the *paian* maintained connections with health and healing. Indeed, the very first *paianes* we find in Greek literature are employed in an apotropaic way, danced by Homer's Achaians to avert the plague inflicted on them by Apollo discussed above.¹⁰³ Beyond its immediate healing power, a consensus has emerged that the performance of the *paian* was fundamentally an expression of the solidarity of the male citizenry, both as it enacted and embodied the durability and strength of the polis community.¹⁰⁴ Ian

¹⁰⁰ Furley and Bremmer 2001: 224-5; Rutherford 2001: 54 includes these among *paianes* to be sung at dawn or the beginning of the day; e.g., Eur. *Ion* 128f.; Porph. *VP*. 32. 34. 6-13. More broadly, there are hinted connections between Apollo and the Horai, both as "hours" and "seasons" in the context of *paianes* (cf. Pi. fr. 52a.5-6: ἡ ἡ, νῦν ὁ παντελής Ἐνιαυτός | Ὡρα[ί] τε Θεμίγονοι (cf. also fr. 52e and 128c.1-2). The *paian*'s regulatory function makes a good fit with the rhythms of the seasons. Indeed, thereafter *Paian* is praised as "wreathing the offspring of the people in the blossoms of lawful order," thus bridging "natural" and "conventional" ideas about harmonious order. For other associations between Apollo and the Horai, *PMG* 933 (ritual instructions prefacing the Erythraean *paian*): χοροί, μάκαιρα, Παιᾶν Ἀπόλλων... Ὡρα... ἡ ἡ Παιᾶν...; *IG* XII.5 893.3 where Apollo is saluted as ὠρομέδων. See further Rutherford 2001: 292-3.

¹⁰¹ Alc. (fr. 98): θοίναις δὲ καὶ ἐν θιάσοισιν ἀνδρείων παρὰ δαιτυμόνεσσι πρέπει παιᾶνα κατάρχην. This "opening" feature compliments the hymn's closural function within the "program" of Athenaios' symposium. See Rutherford 2001: 51-2; Ford 2002: 32; LeVen 2014.

¹⁰² For the most recent diachronic surveys of the genre, performance context, origins, and its transformations, see Käppel 1992; Furley and Bremmer 2001; Rutherford 2001; Ford 2002; 2006; 2011; Faraone 2006; LeVen 2014.

¹⁰³ Hom. *Il.* 1.471: οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῆ θεὸν ἰλάσκοντο | καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν | μέλποντες ἐκάεργον· ὃ δὲ φρένα τέρπετ' ἀκούων. See also, Aesch. *Ag.* 98-99 παιῶν τε γενοῦ τῆσδε μερίμνης; Aristoxenos *fr.* 117) relates a tale in which the singing of the *paian* is prescribed by the Delphic oracle as a cure for a strange bout of madness which caused the women of Italy to flee their cities: ἐκστάσεις γὰρ γίνεσθαι τοιαύτας, ὥστε ἐνίοτε καθημένας καὶ δειπνοῦσας ὡς καλοῦντός τινος ὑπακούειν, εἶτα ἐκπηδᾶν ἀκατασχέτους γιγνομένας καὶ τρέχειν ἐκτὸς τῆς πόλεως. μαντευομένοις δὲ τοῖς Λοκροῖς καὶ Ῥηγίνοις περὶ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ πάθους εἰπεῖν τὸν θεὸν παιᾶνας ἄιδειν ἔαρῖνοῦς δωδεκάτης ἡμέρας ξ'.... Compare Apollonius' report at *Mir.* 49.1-3 that Theophrastus (fr. 726a-c Fortenbaugh) says music cures illness of body and soul.

¹⁰⁴ See Bremmer and Furley 2001; Rutherford 2001; Ford 2006. *Pace* Käppel 1992.

Rutherford claims the *paian* “represents the organization and exhibition of the collective strength of the adult males...presenting them in such a way as to emphasize their relationship with the deity Paian/Apollo...Such performances were perceived as promoting the safety and stability of the polis...”.¹⁰⁵ Andrew Ford adds that the *paian* song, like the cry *ie ie Paian!* whence it takes its name, displays this fluid adaptability precisely because its conservative form was deployed in order to “master a new situation.”¹⁰⁶ Thus, the *paian* can be generally characterized by its role in bringing a wide variety of circumstances under control through appeals to the divinities who guaranteed the order, organization, and stability of the social and political body.¹⁰⁷

Accordingly then, Apollo was the typical recipient of a *paian*, although Rutherford observes that there was a decline in the composition of “communal, Apolline” *paianes* by the turn of the fifth century. Such a decline in the *paian*’s perception as an appropriate mode of communal song entailed the inclusion of deities other than those with “obvious” links to Apollo as potential subjects.¹⁰⁸ In addition to a specific form of song and dance, the *παιῶν\παιῶν* denoted a healing or a cure and so it is not surprising that as the healing cult of Asklepios gained in popularity he took on the additional *epiklesis* Asklepios Paian, and that Hygieia was likewise folded into the set of deities appropriately addressed as such. Even if these songs do not appear in the classic context of the civic chorus, we will see that these *paianes* continue to emphasize collective action, particularly as it was galvanized by wishes for good health.

¹⁰⁵ Rutherford 2001: 86. E.g., *PMG* 707 (=Pl. *Ion* 534d) a *paian* “sung by all,” (ὄν πάντες αἰδοῦσιν).

¹⁰⁶ Ford 2006: 295.

¹⁰⁷ For the importance of chorality for the integrative stability of the polity, see e.g., Calame 1977; Rutherford 2001; 2004; Kowalzig 2007; 2013.

¹⁰⁸ Rutherford 2001: 126. It should be noted, however, that this “decline” registers a reduction in the *textual* sources for large scale collective *paianes* commensurate with the overall evaporation of the “textualization” of lyric. Whether an independent culture of performance persisted which was never copied down remains a problem for literary historians.

Indeed, foremost among these innovative songs is the well-known *Paian to Dionysos* by Philodamos, another inscribed *paian* of the late Classical period.¹⁰⁹ This song, composed in 340/39 BCE, in honor of the newly renovated temple of Apollo at Delphi, is novel in its extension of the title *Paian* to Dionysos.¹¹⁰ Celebrating Dionysos' importance at Delphi would not have been at all out of place, for he sublet the oracular seat during the winter months while Apollo visited with the Hyperboreans. In fact, we have already noted the way that this hymn encircles and draws closer the Delphic worshipping community during the celebration of the Theoxenia.¹¹¹ At the same time, commentators have been struck by the alignment of Dionysos with the steadying and healing powers traditionally apportioned to Apollo/Asklepios.¹¹² Indeed, the final lines, addressing Dionysos as “lord of health” (ἄναξ ὑγείας) offer a bold and wholly new appellation for the god more typically associated with ecstatic frenzy.

Dionysos was not, however, totally ignorant of the healing arts.¹¹³ Indeed, we find the god of the vine's association with healing corroborated by a certain fourth century medical writer Mnesitheos who mentions a Dionysos *Hygiates* and *iatros*, although Emma Stafford points out that there is no evidence beyond this that confirms Dionysos was known by such epithets in cult

¹⁰⁹ *BCH* 19 393=SEG 3. 401. The *paian* to Telesphorus (again, probably 3rd century AD) invokes Dionysos as well at its close (*IG* II² 4533. 42).

¹¹⁰ See LeVen 2014: 306-17.

¹¹¹ See also Pi. fr. 52f. 61-2 for the Theoxenia as a Panhellenic event. This compares favorably with fr. 52e, where we find Athens (probably) celebrating its Ionian colonial history which portrays Euboea, the Cyclades, and Delos consolidated as a unified worshipping community led by Attica (see Rutherford 2001: 297).

¹¹² For dithyrambs in honor of Dionysos at Delphi during the winter see Bacchyl. 16.5-12 and Plut. *De Pyth. or.* 388e-f.; Käppel 1992; Schröder 1999; and Furley and Bremmer 2001, vol 1: 127f; LeVen 2014: 306f. As these authors note, another striking novelty of Philodamos' *paian* is its extension of equal honors to both Dionysos and Apollo.

¹¹³ E.g. Pi. fr. 52d. 25-6.

worship.¹¹⁴ Of course, wine was and continues to figure as an anesthetic, both physical and emotional.¹¹⁵ But it was also a central ingredient in many *pharmaka*—just as beer formed an important substrate for Babylonian remedies—and so the connection between Dionysos and *iatrike* supplies itself easily enough.¹¹⁶ Indeed, in a fragment of Euboulos, the comedian has Dionysos himself say “I mix three kraters only for the wise: one for health, which they drink first, the second for sweet love, and the third for sleep, which, having drunk down the wise are called off home to bed...”¹¹⁷ We will return to this fragment below as it relates to important aspects in the production of sympotic poetry as an ethical exercise. For now, it is worth noting a curious anecdote in Pausanias which records that the Amphikleans in Phokis—close by to Delphi, where again Philodamos’ *paeon* was performed at the festival of the Theoxenia—worshipped Dionysos as a healer in a way that echoes strongly both Apolline prophecy and Asklepieian incubation.¹¹⁸ While we do not have evidence for when, exactly, this Amphikleian cult took root we find in it, together with the references above, evidence that there is more in the connection of Dionysos and Hygieia than the mere pharmacological significance of wine.

It is not surprising then that Dionysos and *hygieia* are most blended together in the context of the symposium. Again, Emma Stafford has pointed to the general existence of

¹¹⁴ See Athen. 2.56a-b; cf. Stafford 2000; 2005: 133. See van Straten 1992 and Nutton 2013 for the possibility that the same Mnesitheos is depicted on a 4th century Athenian votive relief dedicated to Asklepios (*IG II² 4359* but, for which, see also Chapter Two).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 280-81, 772; Xen. *Symp.* 2.24; *Anth. Pal.* 4.339.8. See Gerber 1988 for fuller treatment.

¹¹⁶ See above for the possible Orphic connections between healing and the involvement of Dionysos. So too, Chapter Four discusses the relationship between Dionysos and so-called Orphic fragments from Olbia-Berezan which seem to assume an important link between Dionysos and the care of the body and soul both before and after death.

¹¹⁷ Euboulos fr. 94 1-6 : τρεῖς γὰρ μόνους κρατῆρας ἐγκεραννύω | τοῖς εὔ φρονούσι· τὸν μὲν ὑγείας ἕνα, | ὃν πρῶτον ἐκπίνουσι, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον | ἔρωτος ἡδονῆς τε, τὸν τρίτον δ' ὕπνου | ὃν ἐκπιόντες οἱ σοφοὶ κεκλημένοι | οἴκαδε βαδίζουσ'...Compare very similar sentiments (especially regarding the third krater) at Euenus fr. 2 West.

¹¹⁸ Paus. 10.3.3.

symptotic accoutrement associated with *hygieia*, but has not theorized its wider relationship to that institution, especially as it materializes ritual activity.¹¹⁹ It is probably no coincidence that in Philetairos’ comedy *Asklepios* we find a symptotic *kylix* (a drinking cup) called the *μετανιπτρίς*, which one was supposed to “brandish, full of equal parts water and wine, and say over it the name of Health.”¹²⁰ So too Athenaios quotes a clutch of further authors of old and middle Comedy who name this cup the *metaniptris Hygieias*—“the libating cup of health”—and connect it with the symposium.¹²¹ Much later, Pollux describes the *metaniptris Hygieias* as a *kylix* used at symposia “which they take up after washing” and which is sacred to *Hygieia*, much like the third krater of the feast was for *Zeus Soter*.¹²²

Sadly, no *metaniptris* has come down to us. Nevertheless, a red figure krater from Boeotia, currently housed in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, is suggestive: in two opposing panels, the vessel depicts *Hygieia* and *Asklepios* (or possibly *Amphiaraios*) dining, reposed on couches in a manner familiar from images of the “banqueting hero.” Quite unlike the generalized figurative short hand used for the heroic scenes, this one specifically locates the goddess within a healing sanctuary through the clear inclusion of hanging anatomical votives. So too, *Asklepios/Amphiaraios* appears to offer a huge rampant serpent wine from a *kylix*—another image with powerful associations to the healing sanctuary. The two panels thus bring out the relationship of health and healing as it could have been imagined within the space of the

¹¹⁹ Stafford 2000; 2005.

¹²⁰ Philetairos fr. 1 K-A: ἐνέσεισε μεστήν ἴσον ἴσῳ μετανιπτρίδα | μεγάλην ὑπειπὼν τῆς Ὑγιείας τοῦνομα. Such a formulation resonates with Alkmaeon’s emphasis on health as a matter of *isonomia* and a proportional blending.

¹²¹ Ath. 486e-7b contains the relevant fragments: Kallias *Kyk.* fr. 3; Nicostratus fr. 3; Antiphanes fr. 149; for a link with the *metaniptris* and *Zeus Soter*, see *Diphilos* 69; cf. Philoxenos. *Deip.* fr. c for the connection between the symptotic *metaniptris* and *Bacchus/Bromius* (with LeVen 2014: 159-61). See further Stafford 2005: 135f.

¹²² Pollux 6. 100. 6: ἡ δὲ μετανιπτρίς κύλιξ ἐστίν, ἣν μετὰ τὸ ἀπονίψασθαι ἐλάμβανον. τὸ δ’ ὄνομα οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἔκπομα σχήματος ἀλλὰ τῆς τάξεως. ἦν δὲ Ὑγιείας ἱερά...Cf. Hsch. s.v. μετάνιπτρον.

symptotic drinking party. The cup of health, then, was some ritual drinking vessel, over which one was supposed to utter the word “*hygieia*” after the important purificatory moment of washing up. Such a cup, I suggest, offers a hint of the wider socio-cultural importance of symptotic festivity in drawing together the apparently distinct roles of Dionysos, Hygieia, and *paianes*. We can imagine, then, a symposium “framed by health,” initiated by a *paian*, followed by toasts and libations for health, and brought to a close with a final *paian* for *hygieia*. Hygieia was thus insinuated into a kinesthetic choreography of gesture, taste, sound, and images which place the divinity front and center of the assembled group, encoding health as a performative aspect of the symptotic party itself.

As Catherine Bell has pointed out, one important function of ritual practice is to create a confusion between ends and means.¹²³ Over and above the goal, then, of averting hostile and threatening divine forces, the performance of the *paian* for health may have functioned precisely as a means of establishing health through the (re)assertion of social and symbolic order by means of ritual action. As Mary Douglas famously argued, impurity—and so, by extension pollution and disease—is “matter out of place,” and part of the symbolic power of the sacred is aimed at the re-ordering of such matter.¹²⁴ The use of the *metaniptris Hygieas* in ritual conjunction with the *paian* creates a series of symbolic actions which restore “matter” back to its place, where the matter here can be considered the protocols of daily life. Such a ritual frame is invoked to “master” the extravagances of symptotic ecstasy, (re)arranging the situation in a way that emphasizes the restoration of social order after its temporary relaxation. Such an ordering is

¹²³ Bell 1997: 82.

¹²⁴ Douglas 1968; see also Smith 1978: 136f.

possible because these behaviors are predicated on “long-standing” ritual codes familiar from other modes of public life (e.g., libation, sacrifice, chorality). Imprecations to the divine Hygieia through song and formal action may therefore be seen as in fact being the very ends it purports to be a mechanism for achieving: the production of health. Communal well-being is ensured precisely because this form of well-being is generated through repeated and orderly action. Further, this participatory generation of *hygieia* helps bring together the multiple contexts in which we have found Ariphron’s *paian* with which we began.

Focusing on Ariphron’s hymn and its place within the symposium, one of the key arenas of cultural mediation and reflection within the Greek *imaginaire*, permits a more nuanced theorization of *hygieia*.¹²⁵ Wecowski assumes that the sympotic context throws *hygieia* into sharp and antithetical relief with the dangerous, fractious forces which are characterized by the Dionysiac.¹²⁶ Euboulos’ fragment, however, suggests that the pairing of the two divinities might involve a crucial symbiosis, one underpinned by the careful self-control imperative for the successful symposium. The first krater may be drunk for *hygieia*, yet Euboulos’ Dionysos describes the fourth krater not as his own, but as that of *hybris*, the fifth of violence, the sixth of komastic exuberance, and the seventh of black eyes; those beyond are of vomit, destruction, and madness.¹²⁷ Dionysos tries to distance and disavow these violent associations by identifying himself with the symposium of controlled release.

Euboulos’ purpose is likely derisive, meant to needle at the academic pretensions of symposiasts who would specify each krater of wine and their effects, exemplified by the

¹²⁵ See Murray 2009; Corner 2010; Hobden 2013: 15.

¹²⁶ Wecowski 2014: 39. He suggests the performance of the *paian* within the symposium also takes on its more ancient, apotropaic function of protecting the symposiasts from the hubristic peril of excessive intoxication.

¹²⁷ Euboulos fr. 94. 6-11.

symptotic confections of Theognis, Euenus, and Panyassis.¹²⁸ Still, despite the comedic exaggeration, we are left with the impression that Dionysos' role (the ecstatic transcendence of wine) is part of the "healthy" symptotic process. Moreover, this form of health is contingent upon negotiating agreement about certain forms of self-discipline and control as part of the "symptotic game." That is, by inventorying the consequences of each krater of wine, Dionysos charts a spectrum of acceptable behaviors, employing a familiar kind of symptotic discourse in which the participants constantly put their values on display through set speeches or poetic improvisation. Singing and drinking to health in this context is thus not a simple proclamation of values, but helps participants to scrutinize themselves within particular formal limits.¹²⁹

Moreover, Dionysos' list is evidently something of a riff on another common symptotic, poetic practice with similar ends. Namely, it was a *topos* of such poetry to rank the goods which were best for man, of which a *scholion* attributed either to Simonides (or Epicharmos) is representative (*PMG* 146):¹³⁰

ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστον ἀνδρὶ θνατῶι
δεύτερον δὲ φῦαν καλὸν γενέσθαι
τὸ τρίτον δὲ πλουτεῖν ἀδόλως,
καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἡβᾶν μετὰ τῶν φίλων.

Best of all for mortal man is to be healthy,
second is to have a handsome appearance,
third to possess wealth without trickery,
and fourth, to enjoy youth with friends.

¹²⁸ E.g. Thgn. 489-91West; Euenus fr. 1-2 West; Panyassis fr. 13 Bernabé.

¹²⁹ Ford 2002; Hobden 2013.

¹³⁰ *PMG* 146 = Pl. *Grg.* 451b; schol. Aristot. *Rhet.* 1394b13; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 4.5.23. Anaxandr. fr. 18KA finds a comic revision of the poem. See also *PMG* 604; 890; Anac. fr. 59 (= *PMG* 404); Thgn. 254-56; *PMG* 882; Philemon fr. 163. Compare also two Hippocratic texts, *Aff.* 1 and *Salub.* 9, in which the man with understanding (*sunetos*) knows that "health is the most worthy of consideration," (ὅστις ἐστὶ συνετός, λογισάμενον ὅτι τοῖσιν ἀνθρώποισι πλείστου ἄξιόν ἐστιν ἢ ὑγίειν).

Like Dionysos' first krater for health, ὑγιαίνειν sits at the head of the catalogue as mortal man's greatest good. If it is true that Hygieia's cup and hymn were a part of the symbolic/discursive system whereby the ecstatic energies of the symposium were reined in and made "healthy," the ordering of health in a list of virtues is further telling about its place in the sympotic thought-world. Simonides' *scholion* is only one of a large collection of other sympotic poems in which the singer/participants of the drinking party consider what is "best" (*kalliston* or *ariston*).¹³¹ Indeed, the act of evaluative ranking fits into the wider intellectual agonism and ethical disclosure which typified the *symposium* as a social and cultural practice. Elegiac compositions such as Simonides' (or as it was mocked by Euboulos) carried with it the implicit challenge to create a new poem which commented upon or transformed the particular value claims of the preceding one.¹³² As Andrew Ford notes, this activity was conceived of as a primary means of revealing one's inner character and qualities—so hard to know from the visible surface—to the rest of the group.¹³³ Such poetic and performative practices thus make health a *locus* of friendly competition and a centerpiece of the collective activities of the symposium. So too, they underscore its role within an ethical framework whereby symposiasts reflected upon the virtues and values which bound themselves to the group. Hygieia was coopted in a dialectical play which both generated consensus and reinforced particular codes of behavior, thickening the sense

¹³¹ See, e.g., Ford 2002: 32f.; 2011: 161.

¹³² Ford 2011. E.g., Sext. Emp. *Math.* 11.52f. in which Ploutos, Hygieia, and Andreia are all successively crowned victors in a competition over which is the "greatest good."

¹³³ See, e.g., Alc. 333: οἶνος γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ δίοπτρον; 366: οἶνος, ὃ φίλε παῖ, καὶ ἀλάθεια.

of communal identity.¹³⁴ The symposium thus powerfully discloses *hygieia*'s normative role both in defining bodily health and in embodying correct social attitudes among its members.¹³⁵

We have seen already how the narrative structure and experience of epidemic illness helped fashion collective identities and visualize group relations, whether through the introduction of new cult institutions or the collective performance of apotropaic rituals. In the context of the symposium, then, we can make out a parallel function of health, for *hygieia* was equally and variously embedded into the discursive and imaginative practices of the group's cohesion. That is, if the public *paian* circumscribed the group in times of catastrophe, the interlocking rituals and friendly contests of health were equally employed to reinforce the communal bonds in times of pleasure and play. So too, *hygieia* sat at the center of the kinds of collective—even if at times “healthily” competitive—behavior which reinforced sentiments of belonging and integration upon which the wider political group depended.¹³⁶

Health, *Charis*, and the Exchange of Pleasure

I return now to Ariphron's (and other) hymn(s) to Hygieia to discuss the association of *charis* (the conceptual definition of which we will tease out below) with *hygieia* as a means of maintaining the sorts of sympotic (and other) social relations just witnessed. That is, these poems illustrate the manner in which health, when paired with *charis*, forms the *sine qua non* of a wide variety of social relationships. As we will see, this is because health guarantees the reciprocal

¹³⁴ See LeVen 2014: 274f. for similar comments on the social and ethical importance of *hygieia* as a “shared” value within the poetic repertoire in the symposium.

¹³⁵ Cf. Critias fr. 6.14-21 in which Spartan sympotic drinking leads young men to philosophical self control and measured laughter. Such drinking, Critias continues, is beneficial for the body and for “Hygieia who is most pleasurable of the gods for mortal man.” Compare also the first two books of Plato's *Leges*, in which sympotic drinking is a crucial means of social education, especially through the regulation of an elderly “Chorus of Dionysos.” Cf. Murray 2013; LeVen 2014.

¹³⁶ For the symposium as the “microcosm of the polis,” see Corner 2010; Hobden 2013. *Pace* LeVen 2014 who understands the celebration of *hygieia* within the symposium to be the exclusive practice of elites.

nature of *charis*, which itself secures the foundations upon which joint and useful action takes place (*PMG* 813):¹³⁷

Ἵγίεια βροτοῖσι πρεσβίστα μακάρων, μετὰ σεῦ
ναίοιμι τὸ λειπόμενον βιοτᾶς, σὺ δέ μοι πρόφρων ξυνείης·
εἰ γάρ τις ἢ πλούτου χάρις ἢ τεκέων
ἢ τᾶς ἰσοδαίμονος ἀνθρώποις βασιληίδος ἀρχᾶς ἢ πόθων
οὓς κρυφίοις Ἀφροδίτας ἔρκεσιν θηρεύομεν,
ἢ εἴ τις ἄλλα θεόθεν ἀνθρώποισι τέρψις ἢ πόνων
ἀμυνοῦ πέφανται,
μετὰ σεῖο, μάκαιρ' Ἵγίεια,
τέθαλε καὶ λάμπει Χαρίτων δάροις·
σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὔτις εὐδαίμων ἔφν.

Hygieia, for men most reverend of blessed immortals, with you may I live the rest of my days and foremost in your thoughts. For if there is any *charis* in wealth, or children, or in the godlike reign of kings over men, or in the desires we hunt with the stealthy nets of Aphrodite or, if man has any other heaven sent joy or reprieve from labors, with you, blessed Hygieia, it blossoms and shines in the songs of the Graces. Without you, no man is happy.

As Bremmer and Furley have noted, the formal features of the hymn are traditional even as its content is atypical.¹³⁸ Hygieia's characterization as an individual is limited to πρεσβίστα; she is eldest or, more likely, “most august” of gods for mortals in as much as the benefits she confers are wholly positive, seemingly removed from the ambiguous and fickle potential of most deities to help or harm as they are inclined.¹³⁹ Incidentally, this opening invites comparison with a

¹³⁷ See *supra* for sources.

¹³⁸ Bremmer and Furley 2001; see LeVen 2014: 277 for responses to those who reject the poem as a *paian*.

¹³⁹ Compare this with the first strophe of the Erythraean *Paian* ὃς μέγα χάρμα βροτοῖσιν ἐγείνατο... This is reduplicated in the *Hom. Hymn Asklepios* 16.4 χάρμα μέγ' ἀνθρώποισι and as the first words of an Delphic oracle (re)cited at Pausanias 2.26.7: ὦ μέγα χάρμα βροτοῖς.

contemporary, dithyrambic invocation to Hygieia, penned by Ariphron's possibly older contemporary Likymnios:¹⁴⁰

λιπαρόμματε μᾶτερ ὑψίστα θρόνων
σεμνῶν Ἀπόλλωνος βασίλεια ποθεινὰ
πραῦγελως Ὑγίεια.

Shinning eyed, loftiest mother, longed for
queen of Apollo's reverend throne,
gently laughing Health.

These are fascinating characteristics which we find nowhere else (indeed we encounter two *hapax legomena*),¹⁴¹ perhaps calling to mind Aphrodite, with its echoes of desire and beguiling laughter. Indeed, the connection between sexual vigor and health are pronounced in Ariphron and the iconographic record.¹⁴² Sadly, however, we know little more of this intriguing hymn to Health, but its clear resonance with Ariphron's more fully preserved version is striking and suggests a wider popularity of such songs than is known to us now.

In eschewing typical descriptions of favored places and famous deeds, Ariphron instead develops as the core of the poem the themes of *charis* and *terpsis*¹⁴³—the joys and pleasure

¹⁴⁰ *PMG* 769=Sext. *Emp. Adv. math.* 11.49. See Ford 2013. The chronological relationship between Ariphron and Likymnios is unclear. Biographical sources suggest that Likymnios was Ariphron's elder (fl. 420's?), while Ariphron is typically dated to the early fourth century (see below). Sextus' quotation of Likymnios "proemion," however, contains a truncated selection of lines found in the inscriptions of Ariphron's poem, suggesting to me a later contamination.

¹⁴¹ The *Orphic Hymn to Hygieia* (*Hymn* 68) appears actually to be something of a pastiche of all the poems in honor of Hygieia surveyed here, and is surely later (c. 1-fourth centuries AD; see Athanassakis 2013).

¹⁴² Cf. Sapph. fr. 1.1 Lobel-Page for Aphrodite and thrones; *OH* 68 deploys a similar series of erotic epithets; *OF* fr. 262 Bernabé represents Hygieia as the daughter of Eros and Peitho. For Hygieia's associations with Aphrodite on a series of fifth century vases, see Shapiro 1994; Verbanck-Piérard 2000; Stafford 2005; Rosenzweig 2011.

¹⁴³ For strikingly similar language compare also Macedonios. fr. 1: [θ]άλλειν ἐν βιοτῇ σὺν τερπνοτάτῃ Ὑγείᾳ and Critias fr. 6 in which Hygieia is τερπνοτάτην τε θεῶν θνητοῖς. This seems further to support a possibly oral tradition of such *paianes* for health (cf. Sineux 2000; LeVen 2014).

which Hygieia makes possible in life.¹⁴⁴ *Charis*, in the sense of “pleasing gratification,” underlies the functional success of a hymn to any god and therefore is the lynchpin in establishing reciprocity between divinity and suppliant.¹⁴⁵ The suppliant seeks to win the divinity’s favor by means of a charming song, with the hope that this favor will be returned in granting the suppliant’s petition. Often in Greek hymns *charis* is expressed through a verbal formula which figures the god or the suppliant, or both, as “rejoicing.”¹⁴⁶ For instance, in a similar hymn celebrating both Asklepios and Hygieia from the fourth century, the Erythraean *Paian*, we find (PMG 943):¹⁴⁷

χαῖρε μοι, Ἰλαος δ' ἐπίνισεο
τὰν ἐμὴν πόλιν εὐρύχορον
ἰὲ Παιάν, δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ὄρᾶν φάος
ἀελίου σὺν ἀγακλυτῷ εὐαγεῖ Ὑγείᾳ.

Rejoice with me, and propitiously come to my city with its wide dancing spaces! Ie Paian! Grant that I may joyously behold the sun’s rays with famous holy Hygieia.

Here, we find the traditional imperative that the god take delight (χαῖρε) in the song, and, in exchange, that Asklepios (Paian) bestow joy on both the city and the petitioners themselves. Notably, we again discover Hygieia invoked in a community’s description of itself (“my city

¹⁴⁴ Furley and Bremmer (2001: 58-60) anatomize the potential parts of a hymn into the following features: “predication” of powers, “anaphoric” address, *hypomneseis* of earlier good deeds, *ekphraseis* of the god’s haunts, and “narratives” (this list can naturally be subdivided and expanded, particularly with regard to gnomic statements). Of this list of potential components then, we find that the *Hymn to Hygieia* contains very few (only the first two) and in relatively compacted form.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Race 1982; MacLachlan 1993; Bremmer and Furley 2001.

¹⁴⁶ Furley and Bremmer 2001: 62-3.

¹⁴⁷ The Erythraean *paian* (PMG 943-4) like Ariphron’s *Hymn*, is found inscribed in multiple locations across the Greek world (Erythrae, Athens, Macedonian Dion, and Roman Ptolemais, all with important localizing variations. Cf. LeVen 2014: 286f.). Wilamowitz dated the Erythraean (likely the original) text to 380-360BCE, and so it may very well be contemporaneous to Ariphron’s composition. For the relevant bibliography, see Käppel 1992; Furley and Bremmer vol. 2: 161. The head of the inscription includes instructions to dance around the altar of Apollo while performing the *paean* in prayer that he might spare the *kouroi* of the city. Thus, the performance context shows also a strong apotropaic dimension, see Faraone 1992 and 2003.

with its broad dancing spaces”) and uniting the chorus together in joyous song.¹⁴⁸ Indeed, the emotional valence of song for generating delight or adoration is the typical action of *charis*, which describes equally the psychological frame of both *laudans* and *laudandus*, and thereby creates a space mutually inhabitable by both gods and men. It is surprising, then, that Aripbron’s hymn departs from this traditional framing: *charis* remains the primary target of the hymn, but in a manner that subtly reworks the dynamics of rejoicing and pleasure.

Aripbron instead makes the rather wider claim that Hygieia guarantees a *charis* which inheres in all of life’s good things (εἰ γὰρ τις χάρις...μετὰ σεῖο). Thus we find a movement away from *charis* as a form of gratitude shared between humans and gods. In fact, the hymn itself contains no instructions that the goddess should herself be delighted, substituting her rather as the very source of delight. That is, Aripbron concentrates on Hygieia as instrumentally responsible for the enjoyment one takes in a specific nexus of goods—a nexus of goods which has strong echoes in the hierarchical game of sympotic elegy witnessed above—wealth, sex, and youth. *Charis*, here, is not simply the joy taken in song which ensures the *do ut des* of religious commerce, but the socio-political pragmatism of human commerce as it is vouchsafed by the gods’ vigilance. Indeed, such an aspect of the divine *Charites* is mentioned by Aripbron’s near contemporary, Aristotle. In a passage of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the philosopher explains that it is upon bonds of reciprocity that the polis stands firm, and for this reason temples of the Charities are erected in public places.¹⁴⁹ Aripbron’s hymn thus captures this dynamic which relates the affective states of thanks and grace to processes and histories of mutual exchange. He

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Macedonius fr. 1. 28-9: σφύοις δ’ Ἀτθίδα Κεκροπίαν πόλιν | αἰὲν ἐπερχόμ[εν]ος.

¹⁴⁹ Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1132b-33a.

does so by emphasizing the way that health and *charis* animate the “on behalf of which” these particular states occur. Health, through *charis*, thus expresses the causal aspect of reciprocity as the force which keeps individuals—as well as divinities—bound to one another through time and across space. The hymn suggests, then, that the *charis* which is derived from *hygieia* forms a primary mechanism of sociality by perpetuating and renewing the foundations of the community, through the exchange of money, the birth of children, the congress of sex, and the exercises of political power.

In Ariphron’s hymn we therefore encounter the fully ethical dimension of *hygieia* as a virtue which is other-facing, as it invests value and meaning in the active engagement with and commitments to others, mortal and immortal alike. Ariphron is far from unique in this regard. Among those poets who sang the praises of health, we again encounter Simonides, who was reputed to have said that “unless someone has holy health, there is no *charis* in/from noble wisdom” (μηδὲ καλὰς σοφίας εἶναι χάριν, εἰ μὴ τις ἔχοι σεμνὴν ὑγείαν).¹⁵⁰ So, too, in a longer fragment, Simonides describes the “healthy man” (ἄνηρ ὑγίης) as the “active man who knows how to be of profit to his polis.”¹⁵¹ Again, these recall Homer’s earlier ethical use of *hygies*, and in them we reencounter health’s instrumental insinuation with *charis* and profit. It is evident, then, that within the poetic traditions which spanned the symposium and choral performance,

¹⁵⁰ Sext. Emp. (*Adv. Math.* 11.49). A little later in this passage Sextus informs us that the important Alexandrian physician Herophilos (3rd century BC) said in his *Dietetics* that “where health is absent, wisdom cannot be shown, skill is invisible, strength is uncontested, wealth is without use, and reason is impossible” (σοφίαν φησὶν ἀνεπίδεικτον καὶ τέχνην ἄδηλον καὶ ἰσχὺν ἀναγώνιστον καὶ πλοῦτον ἀχρεῖον καὶ λόγον ἀδύνατον ὑγείας ἀπούσης) Cf. von Staden 1989: 81; 407. Simonides’ sentiment has clearly been adapted to fit the medical profession, but even while lacking the language of *charis* here, the parallelism of thought is evident. For the same thought, expressed in reverse, *OH* 68. 8-9: σοῦ γὰρ ἄτερ πάντ’ ἐστὶν ἀνωφελῆ ἀνθρώποισιν· | οὔτε γὰρ ὀλβοδότης πλοῦτος γλυκερὸς θαλίησιν.

¹⁵¹ *PMG* 542. 34-6: ὃς ἂν μὴ κακὸς ᾖ] μὴδ’ ἄγαν ἀπάλαμνος εἰδ|ὼς γ’ ὄνησίπολιν δίκαν,| ὑγίης ἀνὴρ. For similarly “ethical” uses of *hygies* in the fifth century: Aesch. *Eum.* 534-6; Soph. *Phil.* 1006; Eur. *Andr.* 448; *Bacch.* 948; Thuc. 4.22. But see *supra* for this usage already in Homer and *infra* for an extended meditation on its place in Aristophanes’ *Ploutos*.

Hygieia, whether conceptualized as a divinity or an animator of social life was quite capable of being imagined outside the realm of bodily health.

Healthy and Wealthy in the Comic City

In addition to elevating *hygieia* as a locus of group solidarity there was a line of Greek thinking which tethered health with wealth. Indeed, this was conspicuously the case in Aiphron (and Simonides) where, given *hygieia*'s pairing with *charis* as a principle of exchange, this made good sense. More widely, one not only needs health to enjoy wealth, but if health is itself imagined as central to stabilizing long-term aspects of exchange, for which the “proper” use of money in the Greek world was ostensibly aimed, then the pairing of health and wealth itself takes on a much more significant social texture.¹⁵² In Old Comedy this particular pairing is extruded into the broader concerns of the political body. Wealth and health are coupled as a compound (*plouthugia*) always in situations that appeal to the universal well-being of the body politic, not to the acquisitive urges of the individual. *Plouthugia* in these passages is imagined as the bedrock upon which new cities are founded and as a public good which poliadic deities bestow.¹⁵³ To have health and wealth on the Aristophanic stage, much as in other contexts, is not only important for being an engaged citizen, but guarantees the long-term viability of the political community.¹⁵⁴

Ritual connections between health and wealth can also create a part of the community or group's festival calendar. A tantalizing passage of Plutarch's *Moralia* describes a Chaeronean

¹⁵² Money and long-term exchange, Parry and Bloch 1989. For money within the social *imaginaire* of the Greek world see, e.g., Kurke 1999; von Reden 1995; Seaford 2004; Tordoff 2012.

¹⁵³ Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 677; *Eq.* 1091; *Av.* 731; Suda s.v. *πλουθυγία* for the intergenerational nature of the concept as it was additionally networked with a host of other goods like eudaimonia, peace, and, suggestively chorality.

¹⁵⁴ Compare also Xen. *Oec.* 11.8.8.

ritual called the *Boulimos exelasis* or “Driving Out of Hunger.”¹⁵⁵ This traditional sacrifice involved multiple ritual layers, in which public and private spheres reduplicated one another as if to make as vivid as possible the overlapping of *oikos* and *polis* through the nexus of health and wealth. While the *archon* made an (unspecified) sacrifice at the *polis*’ central hearth (*koine hestia*), private citizens made similar offerings in their households, after which they chased a designated servant out of the house, flogging him or her with branches of *agnus castus* (chase-tree) and crying “Out with Hunger, in with Wealth and Health!” Thus, in the annual sacrifice, the city and household are interwoven and integrated into a single organic entity, cleansed and renewed by jointly summoning Wealth and Health.¹⁵⁶ Again, here the structural parallel between the *pharmakos* ritual and the performance of communal identity in times of crisis is evident, only with the additional element of Health and Wealth being brought in.

Similarly, in a passage of a court speech composed by the fourth century orator Isaeus an unnamed inheritance claimant talks about sacrificing to household gods in his grandfather’s home. The speaker recalls his participation in the sacrifice to Zeus Ktesios, Zeus of Household Possessions (whose visual points of contact with Hygieia we saw too).¹⁵⁷ At this celebration of Ktesios, the speaker and his grandfather “laid [their] hands together on the sacrificial objects and together placed the offerings side by side and arranged all other matters, together. He (the

¹⁵⁵ Plut. *Mor* 693e-f: Θυσία τις ἔστι πάτριος, ἣν ὁ μὲν ἄρχων ἐπὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐστίας δρᾷ τῶν δ’ ἄλλων ἕκαστος ἐπ’ οἴκου· καλεῖται δὲ ‘βουλίμου ἐξέλασις’· καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἕνα τύπτοντες ἀγνίνας ῥάβδοις διὰ θυρῶν ἐξελαύνουσιν, ἐπιλέγοντες ‘ἔξω Βούλιμον ἔσω δὲ Πλοῦτον καὶ Ὑγίειαν.’

There is a certain traditional rite, which the *archon* performs at the common hearth while everyone else does it at home and it is called the “expulsion of hunger.” The drive one of the servants through the doors of the house while striking him or her with switches of *agnus castus*, chanting at him “out with Hunger and in with Wealth and Health!”

¹⁵⁶ See *supra* for points of connection with scapegoating, as well as Bremmer 1983; Parker 1983; see also Burkert 1985: 100 for a Samian festival in which Wealth is told “to come in,” cf. Diehls *Carmina Popularia* 1.

¹⁵⁷ Ogden 2010 and *supra*. See further Chapter Three.

grandfather) prayed for our health and for our good wealth.”¹⁵⁸ For the speaker, this was an important moment principally because his grandfather (whose relationship to the speaker is here the precise matter of legal dispute) only ever included the members of his immediate family: no slaves or unrelated freemen were permitted access to the ritual—celebration of Zeus Ktesios was not only about the propagation and continuity of the household’s well-being through the conjunction of abundance and health, but about the procedures of that household’s definition, configuration, and self-representation as a social unit.¹⁵⁹

We are well used, by now, to this manner in which *hygieia* was insinuated into activities like choruses, symposia, and sacrifices which, through their festal visibility, not only establish health as a public benefit and shared interest, but translate this concept of common health into the forms of ritual practice by which the community articulates and projects an image of itself. The introduction of wealth, not in the quasi-daemonic form of *olbia* or *eudaimonia*, but in its material form available for exchange expands this idea. Health and wealth do not just ensure the physical vigor of the community. As Richard Seaford points out, wealth in the form of currency is useful because it materializes (and helps to fulfill) interpersonal obligations and because it reifies the histories of social relations upon which social capital (i.e. credit and trust) is built.¹⁶⁰ Money is never simply a vehicle for the exchange of goods and services, but is always

¹⁵⁸ Is. *De Circone* 16: τῷ Δί τε θύων τῷ Κτησίῳ, περὶ ἣν μάλιστ' ἐκεῖνος θυσίαν ἐσπούδαζε καὶ οὔτε δούλους προσῆγεν οὔτε ἐλευθέρους ὀθνεῖους, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ πάντ' ἐποίηι, ταύτης ἡμεῖς ἐκοινωνοῦμεν καὶ τὰ ἱερά συνειργουροῦμεν καὶ συνεπετίθεμεν καὶ τᾶλλα συνεποιοῦμεν, καὶ ἠύχετο ἡμῖν ὑγίαιαν διδόναι καὶ κτηῖσιν ἀγαθήν.

Sacrificing to Zeus Ktesios, concerning which sacrifice he was very serious, he included neither slaves nor unrelated freemen. But he arranged it all himself, of which we had a common part and together we took in hand the sacrificial objects and together we arranged them and together we saw to the other affairs, he he prayed for our health and good wealth.

¹⁵⁹ See Faraone 2008; Boedeker 2008.

¹⁶⁰ Seaford 2004.

implicated in particular social arrangements, and, ideally, works to entrench them. As we shall see further, the ethical use of *hygieia*, particularly in its adjectival form *hygies*, was capable also of expressing this sense of credit and trust for which wealth (notionally) was a useful sign.

Aristophanes' *Ploutos* finds *hygieia* used over and over in its most expressly ethical sense. In fact, the *Ploutos*, the last of Aristophanes' performed comedies,¹⁶¹ musters nearly all of *hygieia*'s most social associations sketched above. Indeed, if his earlier works hint at a general civic significance for health, the *Ploutos* demonstrates for us more clearly *hygieia*'s points of contact with the Dionysiac, public performance, and various forms of exchange.¹⁶² As we will see, the *Ploutos* effectively stages this ethical, interactive dimension of *hygieia* by consciously employing it to plot the economic problems which bedevil the Athenian political body, problems which are characterized by a breakdown of social capital and trust. Ultimately, we find that "health" becomes the comedy's byword for the sound moral and economic relations which undergird a stable community.

¹⁶¹ Performed c. 388 BC. See Sommerstein 2001 for performance dates/circumstances. It is unknown whether the *Ploutos* was staged as part of the City Dionysia or the Lenaia.

¹⁶² The politics of the *Ploutos* are difficult to interpret along neat ideological lines, as it seems to invite and complicate reception from a variety of vantage points, particularly in the baldly utopian way it imagines the "fixes" for contemporary Athenian society. See Dillon and Konstan 1981; Zumbrunnen 2006; Tordoff 2012 for historiographical summaries of the scholarship which has tried to explain away the various tensions within the text, particularly through the lens of "irony" (Tordoff 2012: 260).

Perhaps it should come as no surprise that a play whose most significant episode involves curing the god Wealth of blindness should be rich in the language of *hygieia*.¹⁶³ In fact, the *Ploutos* features by far the most health language of Aristophanes' extant works, yet of the many instances in which a *hyg*-stem is used, none describes a bodily condition.¹⁶⁴ Rather, *hygieia* emerges as a central term in the play's ethical world, where it is used repeatedly to specify morally upright and socially conscious behavior (or its opposite). Indeed, this use of *hygieia* frames the world of the play from the very outset, helping to precipitate its major dramatic action. In the opening scene, we encounter the protagonist Chremylus who reports that he has just visited the oracle at Delphi. He was there, he says, enquiring whether his son ought to change his ways and become a scoundrel, unjust, and in no way *hygies*, in order to live a more prosperous and comfortable life than his trustworthy, but poor, father.¹⁶⁵ Chremylus' slave, Carion, confirms that this seems to be the general run of things these days, adding that it is considerably more lucrative to practice "nothing *hygies*."¹⁶⁶ We are thrust from the first into that world in which the just suffer ignobly, while the dastardly and criminal get rich with impunity. As we come to learn, this is so because the god Wealth has been blinded by Zeus, out of his

¹⁶³ In literary and cult traditions there are at least two, seemingly distinct images of *Ploutos* as a daimon, see Bowie 1996: 269-271; Sommerstein 2001: 5-8. The first, and, likely, older of the mythological traditions holds that *Ploutos* was the son of Demeter and Iason, sown into a "thrice-turned fallow field" and so "grounding" his associations with agricultural abundance and wealth (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 969-973; Hom. *Od.* 5.125-8; Hsch. ad *Hom. Hymn. Dem.* 486-9). Because of this close association with Demeter, *Ploutos* was more widely known not as the blind god of Aristophanes' comedy and Hipponax's (fr. 37) lyric, but as a young boy who, as an agent of fertility, ensured a good crop and a robust agricultural year. More crucial still for an Athenian audience was *Ploutos*' role in the Eleusinian Mysteries. Indeed, it is believed that the birth of *Ploutos* formed part of the climax of the *dromena* performed at the Mysteries of Eleusis, and so may have been central to a popular strain of soteriological ritual as well (Bowie 2009: 270; see Smith 2011 for iconography). This would create an especially interesting link between the politically salvific character of Asklepios in this play, with whom Demeter and Kore were much associated in Athens (see Chapter 3).

¹⁶⁴ The *Ploutos* contains 11 of the 23 *hyg*-roots in the corpus (see Dunbar 1883) *ad*: 37, 50, 274, 355, 356, 362, 364, 507, 870, 1060, 1066.

¹⁶⁵ *Pl.* 37: εἶναι πανοῦργον, ἄδικον, ὑγιᾶς μηδὲ ἔν.

¹⁶⁶ *Pl.* 54-55: ὡς σφόδρ' ἐστὶ συμφέρον | τὸ μηδὲν ἀσκεῖν ὑγιᾶς ἐν τῷ νῦν γένει.

typical hatred for man, so that Wealth can no longer distinguish good from bad (διαγγνώσκειν).¹⁶⁷ The action of the play then, is directed towards the restoration of Wealth's eyesight so that the distribution of wealth will once again favor the just and good. Put in another way, the characters pine for a world in which wealth is a proper sign of a man's trustworthiness and moral fortitude.

Now, Aristophanes, like his tragic counterparts Sophocles and, especially, Euripides, seems to have been consistently attracted to abnormal psychological and somatic states as a matter of craft.¹⁶⁸ Despite Aristophanes' interest in medical ideas and models, in the world of the *Ploutos*, Athens was a city barren of physicians as its coffers were empty. Indeed, we learn that, where money is lacking, so too was the medical art.¹⁶⁹ Carion's observation concerning the absence of anything *hygies* from the country at this time (or perhaps age) is connected too with this noticeable absence of *iatroi* in the city. The joke at the healer's expense turns on a deeper thematic meditation on the community's dependence on actors political, economic, and social who ensure its continued well-being. At Athens there is no moral coherency with which to draw the community together, her citizenry is fractured by conflicting, individual and acquisitive desires. Nor, of course, is wealth a positive indication of one's moral standing. Consequently,

¹⁶⁷ *Pl.* 91. The medical connotations of the word should, of course, not be overlooked.

¹⁶⁸ The literatures on medical language and the body in comedy and tragedy are now vast: see, for only a sample, Page 1953; Parry 1969; Macleod 1983; Padel 1992; Worman 2000; Brock 2002; Lloyd 2003; Kosak 2004; Mitchell-Boyask 2008; Holmes 2010b.

¹⁶⁹ *Pl.* 406-07: τίς δῆτ' ἰατρός ἐστι νῦν ἐν τῇ πόλει; | οὔτε γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς οὐδέν ἐστ' οὔθ' ἡ τέχνη.

hygieia becomes the byword against which the utopian planning of the plot takes its shape. When Wealth regains his sight, it is implied, so too will the city be healed and made whole.¹⁷⁰

Just as *hygieia* framed the moral outlook of the play's beginning, so too the central passage in which Chremylus discloses to his friend Blepsidemos his discovery of Wealth, the god's blindness, and his ultimate intention to restore his vision, is thick with *hygieia* language.¹⁷¹ The exchange between the two characters again shows that none of the *hyg*-roots are used with reference to Wealth. Rather in describing Wealth's intended cure the characters repeatedly employ variations on formulae like βλέψαι [σε] ποιεῖν, or πάλιν ἀναβλέψαι, which underline the god's reliance on sight and reinforce the thesis that moral virtue ought to be visually apparent by the possession of wealth.¹⁷² Again, not only are *hygieia* words not attached to the god, they are not used at all to designate physical or corporeal ailments. Instead we discover over and over an emphasis on thoughts or actions which are "not healthy," οὐκ ὑγίης; rather than physical conditions, characters diagnose social postures, which do not "appear to be healthy" (οὐκ δοκεῖς ὑγιαίνειν), reactivating the importance of moral inference (δοκεῖς) in social exchange.¹⁷³

The conversation between Chremylus and Blepsidemos exemplifies this use of the expression. Blepsidemos, who has heard suspicious rumors coming through the gossip mill about Chremylus' sudden financial turn (here, already the avenues through and by which information is

¹⁷⁰ The utopianism assumed by the play's protagonists is not necessarily shared by the playwright. As Konstan 1991 shows, the moral and economic coherence of the play fragments in its closing moments, as wealth is apparently distributed to *everyone*, rather than simply the just. The attempt to create an ethical semiotics with *ploutos* as the primary referent thus breaks down.

¹⁷¹ *Pl.* 335-414.

¹⁷² E.g. *Pl.* 85, 117, 126, 328, 738, 746, 866, 968, 1113, 1173.

¹⁷³ See *Pl.* 364, 1060, 1066.

spread appear infected themselves) confronts his friend with (misguided) accusations about theft or robbery:

Bl. Τουτὶ πονηρὸν φαίνεται τὸ φορτίον
καὶ μ' οὐκ ἀρέσκει. Τό τε γὰρ ἐξαίφνης ἄγαν
οὕτως ὑπερπλουτεῖν τό τ' αὖ δεδοικέναι
πρὸς ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲν ὑγιές ἐστ' εἰργασμένου. 355
Chr. Πῶς οὐδὲν ὑγιές;

Bl. This seems to me like shady business, and it doesn't sit well with me.
To get super-rich like this, suddenly, and to be afraid as well? These
are the marks of a man who's up to nothing *hygies*.
Chr. How do you mean, not *hygies*?

And shortly after, with the source of the wealth still producing confusion between them:

Bl. Φεῦ,
ὡς οὐδὲν ἀτεχνῶς ὑγιές ἐστὶν οὐδενός, 362
ἀλλ' εἰσὶ τοῦ κέρδους ἅπαντες ἤττονες.
Chr. Οὐ τοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ' ὑγιαίνειν μοι δοκεῖς.

Bl. Alas! How true that there are none left truly *hygies*!
But all are bested now by love of gain.
Chr. By Demeter it's *you* that doesn't seem to be *hygies*!

In this passage in particular, Blepsidemos advances a set of values which mixes health in with an anxiety towards the ambiguous transparency of economic exchange and the damaging social consequences that mercenary motives have on the well-being of the social group (again, exemplified by instant circulation of rumors of questionable accuracy).

To that end, as Rob Tordoff has demonstrated, the *Wealth* displays an abiding focus on the distinction drawn in Athenian society between *ousia phaneron* and *ousia aphanes*: that is visible and non-visible riches.¹⁷⁴ The former was the more generally acceptable form, principally

¹⁷⁴ Tordoff 2012: 276. He does not, however, connect the broader concerns about ethical use of money and the ethical usage of *hygieia*.

because it was notionally available to fill financial obligations between individuals and to the state. Conversely, there existed a suspicion that wealth (in the mobile and concealable form of coinage) was being hoarded by an elite hostile to subordinating personal desires for status to the communitarian demands of the city. Blepsidemos' language distills into a crystalline form precisely this mixture of anxieties about appearance and trust (φαίνεται), hyper-wealth (ὑπερπλουτεῖν), commercial exchange of goods (φορτίον), and the bad citizen (πονηρὸν) as an intrinsically untrustworthy financial actor.¹⁷⁵ That this nexus of disapproval can be embodied by the simple formula οὐδὲν ὑγιές is a powerful index of health's ethical dimensions. Moreover, in its constant negation (οὐδὲν/οὐκ ὑγιές) *hygieia* here does the work literally which terms like *nosos*, *nosema*, *loimos* and other terms designating sickness and plague do “figuratively” in tragedy, epic, and historiography: portray the collapse of community's norms. Rather than the tragic figure of the diseased city (*polis nosoussa*), we find the comic city in which nothing is *hygies*.¹⁷⁶

Tordoff takes this thematic play of sight and blindness to trace an economic narrative in which the ignorance of economic agents operating in a market economy is generally resolved through the healing of *Wealth* and the restitution of traditional, long term and largely symbolic modes of social reciprocity.¹⁷⁷ With the restoration of *Wealth's* sight comes the revelation/renovation of markers by which people may “diagnose” those who are “credible” partners with

¹⁷⁵ For the *poneros* as a self-interested economic actor, see Ober 1989: 127. Blepsidemos' very name seems to indicate a concern about the social body's ability to see (βλέπω+δῆμος).

¹⁷⁶ For the “sick city,” see Brock 2002.

¹⁷⁷ It is not, in fact, at all clear that this is the case. The various confrontations which follow *Wealth's* visit to Asklepios share a common complaint that the terms of reciprocation upon which they had relied have broken down. The attitude towards these interruptions in reciprocity, as Bowie (1996: 275) points out, is not singular, nor do I think that Aristophanes' play valorizes the return of “embedded forms” of exchange any more than he does unbounded wealth.

whom they can establish lasting foundations of exchange.¹⁷⁸ So, as health is the appropriate term for describing the moral disposition necessary for creating interpersonal, social relations in the Aristophanic polis, this ethical conception of health powerfully recalls the interactive connection between *hygieia* and *charis* in securing a variety of reciprocal, other-facing relations as it manifested in sympotic poetry.

Within the *Ploutos*, *hygies* carries a pronounced social orientation, signifying an obedience to the norms which define and make visible the *chrestos* and *dikaios* man.¹⁷⁹ This moral lexicon of *hygieia*, amplified by the ritual visit to the city Asklepieion to cure Wealth, thrusts health into a broader dialectical play questioning what the best arrangement ought to be between social trust and the economic exchange in the democratic polis. That a language and imagery of health is so tightly bonded onto the anarchic avenues of this dispute shows well how indissoluble the concept of *hygieia* was from thinking about the common good. Moreover, Asklepios' central intervention into the ideological *agon* of the Aristophanic polis makes vividly important the availability and utility of this god for ensuring that public good, particularly in the absence, or, cast in another way, in the potentially conflicted economic interests of the *iatroi*.¹⁸⁰ The pointedly ritual structure of this therapeutic encounter—doubled by the collective ritual which celebrates the city's "healing" at the drama's close¹⁸¹—evinces and corroborates this chapter's primary claim: that *hygieia* itself was not exclusively conceived of in terms of the functioning or ailing body of an individual, and that its ethical applications disclose much more

¹⁷⁸ Language of *diagnosis* as moral evaluation: *Pl.* 91, 578, 579.

¹⁷⁹ *Pl.* 88.

¹⁸⁰ Indeed, at *Pl.* 726 he is called a φιλόπολις (city-loving) god. See further Chapter Three.

¹⁸¹ Indeed, the ritual restoration of Wealth's sight and his festival procession to the Acropolis—joined by all the newly wealthy members of the Athenian polis—nicely calls upon the wider ritual tradition which saw Health and Wealth paired in central acts of establishing group solidarity. Cf. *Pl.* 1171f.

than mere extended usage from the experience of the body to the world of the social. *Hygieia* is one of many virtues, like “good” wealth, which are conceptually underpinned by their potential for positive social use.

Conclusion

We have now surveyed a wide set of literatures and materials into which health and sickness made an appearance in order to sketch the horizons of health as they were thought and experienced alongside the expert medical discourses which emerged over the course of the fifth century BCE. I want to anticipate one possible objection to the above, as a way of framing this chapter’s conclusion: namely that these non-physiological uses of *hygieia* represent metaphorical extensions of the word’s primary meaning of bodily proper functioning. I have tried to show in a number of different ways why this objection falls flat. First, the conceptual object “body” is not itself a biological, historical, or a linguistic given. It is a discursive one that is historically situated and socio-culturally contingent. Attitudes about its “health” will be an entanglement of empirical and cultural ways of seeing and valuing. Consequently, suggesting that *hygieia*’s ethical and social dimensions are metaphorical extensions assumes already a particular suite of facts about a Greek “body” which may not hold up. Moreover, linguists and philosophers like Lakoff and Johnson or Paul Ricoeur have problematized the hierarchical arrangement of “literal” and “metaphorical” meanings of words and figures of speech.¹⁸² G.E.R. Lloyd, within the context of classical languages specifically, has recently questioned the traditional analytical power of metaphor, and prefers to regard all words as possessing greater and lesser degrees of “semantic stretch.” This conception of language dissolves the boundary between primary,

¹⁸² Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Ricoeur 1981. See also Gadamer 1996 for the specific question of the “metaphorical” nature of health.

“literal” uses and secondary “deviant” or creative ones, and so reframes the approach to different levels of signification just described.¹⁸³

On this view, analogies are in fact central for the processes of intellection. That is, they form an essential—some argue *the essential*—mode of framing, recognizing, and interpreting the phenomena of our social and physical environments. In other words, it is “semantic stretch” that allows us to create categories in the first place by identifying and relating qualities. We ought not, then, hastily dismiss the significance of metaphorical relationships for building authoritative symbolic systems which anchor larger scale cultural ones. Approaching the question in this way, it would be mistaken to attempt to discriminate primary from secondary or tertiary levels of signification for any specific word, especially one like *hygieia* which so easily transited physiological, religious, literary, and material domains.

The somatic orientation of health which dominates our own thought worlds, I hope it is clear, is a function of modern medicalizing trends and a drift in the West toward scientism generally. We have observed how *hygieia* infiltrates a specifically social mind set in the context of Classical Greece, which points up the wide cultural gap in our thinking about “health” primarily as a state cultivated by and for one’s-self. In the Greek polis, the collective desire for *hygieia* erupted across a variety of discourses. What began in Homer as a particularly ethical usage of *hygieia* as a means of evaluating thought and speech, emerges as a tool of the social imagination connecting people through a constellation of institutions and practices. “Health,” for the Greeks, was not only about the self, but was sympathetic and other-facing, a quality which

¹⁸³ Lloyd 1987: 172-214; 2003: 8-9 “[Metaphor] is unhelpful because it sets up a rigid dichotomy between a supposed primary, literal use and other deviant ones. Over and over again the key terms used in relation to health and disease pose sever problems for anyone who seeks an original “literal” sphere of application. I accordingly prefer to think of all the terms we shall be considering as possessing what I call “semantic stretch.” Indeed in my view all language exhibits greater or less semantic stretch.”

helped dispose the individual towards the community good. Consequently, *hygieia* was simultaneously discursive and performative. It offered a linguistic tool to describe the unity of the body politic by emphasizing the quality of its interdependencies, as well as a means of enacting that cohesion through various forms of collective action, like choral song, commensality, prayer, and even public theater. What happens, then, when the sick body falls out of this healthy network of relations and social belonging, is the question we must address in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO:

Textual Corpora: Narratives of Care in Classical Medicine

In this chapter, I argue that the space of ancient Greek healing sanctuaries provided a symbolically fertile environment through which suppliants could interpret their experience of illness. More specifically, I examine the important role played by the *iamata*, the narrative records of healing miracles performed within the sanctuaries of the healing god Asklepios. These documents reveal how individuals interacted with their symbolic surroundings, imagined their personal suffering, and perceived their own bodies as objects of knowledge and care. More than this, they help us to understand divine epiphany as it helped suppliants to manage the crisis of sickness as a bodily, social, and ethical phenomenon. In the first place, the activity of reading the epiphanic records of others offered the sick narrative templates for understanding their own experiences and that narrative strategies of these texts invited the suppliants to interpolate themselves into a community of sufferers. To that end, these tales emphasize suppliants as social agents, foregrounding not just physical aspects of recovery but the restitution of social relationships and communal identity, aligning it with the wider cultural uses of health as I argued last chapter. This chapter therefore offers new light on the current historiographical consensus that views temple medicine and “secular” Hippocratic medicine as complementary, non-competitive outlets of health consultation available within the wider Greek “medical marketplace.”¹ I question this view by calling attention to the modes of practice at work within Greek cultic medicine that operate outside formal articulations about epistemic method that have

¹ See Nutton 1992; 1995 and *infra*.

typically formed the subject of the history of Greek science and medicine. This chapter not only explores the thick semantic network generated within healing sanctuaries, but it also seeks to parse in a more granular way the relationship between “secular” and “temple” medicine as it unfolded in practice as opposed to theory.

A Systems Approach to Health-Care

As theorized by the medical anthropologist Arthur Kleinman, the “health-care system” is a “cultural system” that furnishes a “map for and of” different kinds of behavior and decision making.² Accordingly, medical encounters must be thought about holistically in a way that captures the predispositions of both patients and practitioners as they are influenced by a range of socio-cultural factors. We must think therefore of the “health-care system” as the totality of a given culture’s beliefs and responses to illness and how they relate to one another across different health-care “sectors.” As Kleinman (1980: 24) explains:

In every culture, illness, the responses to it, individuals experiencing it and treating it, and the social institutions relating to it are all systematically interconnected. The totality of these interrelationships is the health-care system...the health-care system, like other cultural systems, integrates the health-related components of society.

The two primary components of this system are patients and healers, who are “thus embedded in specific configurations of cultural meanings and social relations.”³ This processual account helps unpack how an individual’s interactions with certain cultural institutions shape her experience with sickness and its cure. What adopting an anthropological approach of this sort affords us, then, is a means of describing the tensions between individual choices and institutions and the

² Kleinman 1980: 20 and 1988 *passim*. This is an extension of a symbolist anthropology more widely associated with Clifford Geertz.

³ Kleinman 1980: 25.

(unconscious) means of behavioral guidance built into institutional structures. This approach stands in marked contrast to the attention that is often laid more heavily on the practitioner, particularly on the ancient “Hippocratics” whose textual output dominates the historical record, even as increasing attention is paid to medical practice in its socio-cultural context.⁴ Of course, because we lack direct accounts from the patients of the past, these tensions are notoriously difficult to articulate. Examining the interactions within a healing sanctuary opens a view onto the differently documented world of Greek “individual religion,” whence we can extract a more informative picture of how suppliants navigated experiences of disease and their relationships with institutions of care.⁵

Rather than a top-down vision of health-care provision, then, it is useful to view healing as “the condition of experiencing a fit between socially identified forms of illness and care, within the cultural framework of the health-care system.”⁶ Not only are there multiple sectors of care, with a plurality of healers occupying positions within sectors, but healing also unfolds on “physiological, psychological, social, and cultural strata.”⁷ Any given sector needs to be effective

⁴ See Chapter 1. For ancient medicine in its socio-cultural context, see the contributions in van der Eijk et al. 1995 and van der Eijk 2005. For the application of the “systems approach” to medical encounters in antiquity see Nijhuis 1995, who employs this model to describe and explain hostile Roman reactions to the Greek medical tradition, and Israelowich 2012 and 2015. Israelowich 2012: 36-54 gives a general picture of the interrelatedness of medical culture to the intellectual milieu of Aelius Aristides. Both are valuable contributions to the field for their clarity on what medical anthropology can offer students of Greek and Roman medicine, but neither brings the model wholly to bear in examining the traditional split between Classical Greek “religious” and “rational” medicine. Indeed Israelowich 2015: 67 goes too far in suggesting that the medical system of antiquity was “essentially unaware of such a dichotomy.” For further attention to the role of the individual in ancient medicine, see now the collection of essays edited by Petridou and Thumiger 2015.

⁵ For individual religion in antiquity see, e.g., the contributions in Rüpke 2013.

⁶ Kleinman 1980: 360; this corresponds with Porter 1985 which famously called for medical history conducted “from below”—that is with attention paid as much to clients as healers.

⁷ Nijhuis 1995: 55.

on at least one level, and it has been observed that patients will mix and match providers, using all available sources of therapy to address a crisis at hand in a form of medical *bricolage*.⁸

As a number of scholars have seen, the case of the second century CE orator Aelius Aristides vividly illustrates the fluid and “noncontradictory” movements patients made between forms of care in the ancient world.⁹ Despite the chronological gap of some 600 years between this Imperial-Greek author and the main time period under consideration, Aristides gives us good conceptual purchase on how ritual therapy could distinguish itself “on the ground,” even when it may have formally resembled other kinds of medicine. Aristides wrote a collection of biographical essays known as the *hieroi logoi*, or “The Sacred Tales,” which document his years long, on-and-off-again convalescence at the famous temple of Asklepios in Pergamum. These accounts describe Aristides’ initial troubles with illness, the failure of mortal physicians to cure him, the god’s epiphanic invitation to seek aid in his sanctuary, and the sorts of remedies Asklepios consequently prescribed Aristides once in residence. What has attracted attention most recently, however, is less Aelius’ very intimate and personal experiences with the god—and his imaginative interpretations of those experiences—than the fact that he retained a cadre of doctors as well during this period, who appear to come and go from the temple.¹⁰ In fact, one of the marked features of Aristides’ clinical histories is the constant comparison of iatric advice with

⁸ See Kleinman 1980 *passim*; Good 1993; van der Geest 1991; King 1998: 106.

⁹ See Lloyd 1979: 40-6; Percy 1988; 1992; King 2002; Petsalis-Diomidis 2005; 2007; 2010; Holmes 2009; Israelowich 2012 and 2015.

¹⁰ This resulted in his characterization until recently as a hopeless hypochondriac. For Aelius Aristides’ typically negative reception by scholars and critics, see Percy 1988; King 2002; Petsalis-Diomidis 2010; Israelowich 2012.

that given to him by the god Asklepios.¹¹ For many, cases like Aristides’ prove that both temple and human medicine “were operating within the same health-care system with a shared language and this included healers both human and divine...[N]o evidence shows that patients viewed any distinction between religious healing and medicine, except that of the title and the locus in which health-care was administered.”¹²

Arguments like this one are salutary in their willingness to give serious consideration to the perceptions of the patient and intellectual scope to the role of the religious in offering care in antiquity. Yet the attention devoted to the overlap between secular and religious healers—especially as they converge on the level of apparent method—obscures or misses some of the important ways in which temple cures could and did differ.¹³ Title, and especially *locus*, are significant factors in differentiating the qualities of care. Time and again Aristides selects the more extreme and “counter-intuitive” therapeutic course (often confounding the advice and reasoning of his mortal physicians). Aristides plunges himself into cold rivers in the middle of winter, undergoes shipwreck, and runs wind sprints up hills when he was otherwise bedridden, all at the urging of his god.¹⁴

¹¹ A fragment of Aelian (fr. 100) demonstrates that such comparisons may have been common-place and an annoyance to certain mortal physicians: ὀφθαλμῶ γάρ τις ἐνόσει. εἶτα [Ἀσκληπίος] ἐπιστὰς ὃ δὲ λέγει ὄζει λύσαντα κάπρου πιμελὴν κᾶτα ὑπαλείψασθαι. ὃ δὲ κοινοῦται τῷ συνήθει ἰατρῷ. ὃ δὲ ἐπειράτο τὰς αἰτίας λέγειν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ συστέλλειν τὸ οἰδήμα τῇ δριμύτητι, τὸ δὲ ἐπιλιπαίνειν καὶ ἡσυχῇ ὑποτρέφειν ὁ εἴρων ἔλεγε.

A certain man had an eye disease. The god appeared and told him to apply a salve of boar’s fat and vinegar. The man then met his usual doctor who tried to explain the remedy. He sardonically offered that the one reduced the swelling by astringency while the other made it sleek and nourished it to some extent.

¹² Israelowich 2015: 51; however, see the distinction drawn by Lloyd 1979: 45.

¹³ See King 1998: 128-9 and 2002 for Aristides’ cures as an inherently narrative response to the mind-body problems of “chronic pain.”

¹⁴ See, for instance, Aristid. *Or.* 47. 16, 59, 65; *Or.* 48. 19, 54-55.

An important feature of his course of therapy is its public, interactive nature. Aristides is constantly explaining his bodily distresses, narrating his dreams, or revealing the god's instructions to his companions to their distress, amazement, delight, and incredulity.¹⁵ Many of these instructions bear similarities to medical "regimen," especially with their focus on bathing and diet. But they exaggerate considerably the physiological principles of balance, flux, and fixation upon which such recommendations as walking or running, taking hot baths or eating certain foods were typically based.¹⁶ In an especially revealing response to a throat ailment, however, Asklepios commands Aristides to compose and recite poems and speeches which honored the god.¹⁷ So too, a central panel of the fourth *hieros logos* describes how the god instructed Aristides to practice declamation—despite its seemingly insurmountable physical demands—as the primary element of his therapy. Though despairing his physical frailty, Aristides finds his powers at their peak, and declaims for a small crowd within the sanctuary, inspired by the power of the god, and reclaiming his stature as an orator.¹⁸

Ultimately, these sorts of experiences led Aristides to the remarkable claim that he considered his illness to be a benefit and joy greater than the camaraderie felt among fellow sailors, those performing together in a chorus, even initiates within sacred mysteries—palmary

¹⁵ Cf. Aristid. *Or.* 47.10, 63-66; 48. 12, 14-15, 41, 51, 71, 82; 49. 45, 50; 50. 16 (mutual enquiry by suppliants concerning regimen)

¹⁶ For comparison of Hippocratic and religious forms of katharsis, see Lloyd 1979: 44-5, 55; Parker 1983: 213f; Jouanna 2012: 122.

¹⁷ Aristid. *Or.* 47. 19, 73; 48. 2-3; 49. 4 (where Aristides dreams his verses are known by school children); 50.31 and 38-9, 42 (lyric poetry/paianes), 45 (elegiacs). Such practice is confirmed by Galen at *De san. tuen.* 1.8.19, where he explains that Asklepios often prescribes poetic composition to those whose spirits are low. Compare, also, the proemium of Macedonicus' *paian* (*CA* 138=*IG* II² 4473) to Apollo and Asklepios, who claims he wrote it at the god's instructions.

¹⁸ Aristid. *Or.* 50. 17-31 for an extended account Asklepios' instructions on rhetorical performance and Aristides' reclamation of his lost oratorical prowess.

instances of socially unifying activities in the Greek world.¹⁹ Aristides' account evinces that illness is not simply a matter of individual suffering and recovery, but one whose dimensions are filtered and configured through the social and cultural. In fact, these and other therapies narrated in the *hieroi logoi* make clear that the Asklepieion helped Aristides—a member of the Greek literary elite—frame his physical suffering as ineluctably bound up with his social identity as it was informed by a constellation of disciplines related to rhetorical practice and literary production.²⁰ The *post eventum* act of composing the work itself therefore illuminates the enduring power of cultic therapy as a means of ordering and interpreting the embodied experience of illness through the familiar practices which gave structure and meaning to his world.²¹ These narratives are valuable because they lay bare the cultic-semantic network which enabled Aristides to translate his bodily suffering into socially and culturally significant experiences; the text thus offers a hermeneutic bridge interlinking the physical, subjective, and social through cult.²² Within that interpretive process, the ethical activity of evaluation through the comparison of divine and mortal forms of advice and care occupies a central place which highlights the collaborative, participatory, and social aspects of care as they were experienced by a patient. Aristides may not, ultimately, have perceived any contradiction in seeking care from

¹⁹ Aristid. *Or.* 23.16; cf. 48. 59; 50. 27

²⁰ The whole of the *hieroi logoi* is marked by intense allusion and quotation, principally of Classical Attic writers (as well as heavy Homeric borrowings). But the following make more or less explicit connection between his experience with illness and his learned persona: Aristid. *Or.* 47.42, 49, 60, 64; *Or.* 48. 24, 40-3 (extensive comparison with Odysseus' sufferings); *Or.* 49. 30-31. Again, almost the whole of the fourth *hieros logos* is devoted to the role declamation and composition played in resuscitating his physical wellbeing as it was attached to his acclaim and renown as a rhetorician and *litterateur*.

²¹ See Petsalis-Diomidis 2010 *supra*.

²² Cf. Perkins 1994 for the religious meaning of pain and suffering in early Christian thought.

both mortal physicians and Asklepios.²³ But formulating the question in terms of “contradictions” tends to miss the ways in which different forms of medical care are enmeshed with, and are instrumental to, the creation and management of relations within ones’ wider social and cultural worlds.

This alternative way of looking at the clinical encounter deemphasizes epistemology as the dominant heuristic for approaching ancient medicine and skirts the reef of personal “belief” that stems from particular Enlightenment histories and projects. “Religious beliefs” did not necessarily motivate Greeks to seek miracle cures. Moreover, an excessive focus on beliefs—whatever that entails—occludes the examination of “religious” therapies as a form of social agency guided by the familiar protocols of cultic relations.²⁴

As an alternative to such belief-based models of ancient health-care and its provision, Classicists have recently turned to the concept of Explanatory Models (hereafter EMs).²⁵ EMs are supposed to capture ideas about etiologies (what causes a certain condition), the timing and onset of symptoms, physiological pathology (the process by which the body is affected), the natural history and severity of a condition, and beliefs about appropriate treatments.²⁶ Illness and disease are, on this view, explanatory models in themselves, since they function to present the different frameworks laypersons and professionals respectively employ when confronting

²³ Indeed, at *Or.* 42.4 Aristides claims that he submitted to Asklepios *as if to a doctor*: ταῦτ’ οὖν ἐνθυμούμενος ἐγνώκειν παρέχειν ὡς ἀληθῶς ὡσπερ ἰατρῶ τῷ θεῷ σιγῆ ποιεῖν ὃ τι βούλεται. But already this gestures at the ways that *iatroi* exerted forms of authority and expertise over their patients. Compare Israelowich 2015: 67.

²⁴ The question of belief relative to ritual activity in Greek religion is itself too vast and intractable a problem to treat here; see, e.g., Parker 2011: 31-4 for summary and further bibliography.

²⁵ Sickness being the “neutral” term to designate the abstracted phenomenon of bodily dysfunction *before* it is mediated by either the individual sufferer or the healer. See Nijhuis 1995; King 1998; 2002; Israelowich 2012; 2015.

²⁶ See Kleinman 1980: 83-118; Gesler and Kearns 2000: 30-1.

sickness. EMs are generated at different sites within a cultural system and are therefore situationally contingent. Individuals hold specific EMs within the contextual boundaries of a sickness event, but their personal knowledge communities will shape their ideas concerning particular diagnoses. EMs are also closely tied to the general ideas and expectations about illness that operate intramurally within a sector of care. The general features of an EM within subsystems are termed the “semantic illness network,” that is, the “configuration of concepts, symbols and experiences, firmly embedded in culture, the meaning of which becomes clear in the processes of interaction.”²⁷

This is all to say that illness, as a phenomenon, does not exist independently of narrative frameworks, without actors and agents, sets of motivations, without timelines, or denouement. All of which, importantly, are engaged by the individuals on either side of the medical encounter. The psychiatrist and anthropologist Byron Good explains that within the clinical context “narrative, the imaginative linking of experience and events into a meaningful story or plot, is one of the primary reciprocal processes of both personal and social efforts to counter dissolution and to reconstitute the world.”²⁸ Put differently, when the individual invokes an explanatory model, it is the “semantic illness network”—the kinds of relations that exist between symbols and govern their employment—that clarifies the meaning a sick person or her caregiver gives to a disease and frames the story she tells.

EMs can vary wildly, reflecting the diffusion of religious ideas as well as popular medical knowledge, and due to their very nature, they may or may not be explicitly articulated. Rather,

²⁷ Nijhuis 1995: 54.

²⁸ Good 1993: 118.

they tend to underpin the kinds of information shared and the manner of its expression between patient and healer. The healing encounter, then, is structured by a process of mutual evaluation and interpretation of the stories exchanged in the attempt to negotiate (or mediate) an agreed nosological or pathological reality—much as we saw with Aristides.

At the same time, this produces tremendous potential for *conflicting* EMs in the course of the clinical encounter. The different epistemic frameworks inherent in EMs may view given “facts” in entirely different ways, resulting in miscommunication or misinterpretation and so the failure of healing.²⁹ It is precisely this possibility that the narratives developed on both sides of the sickness episode may completely miss each other that I suspect accounts for some of the most interesting features of healing cults that we encounter below, and it helps to explain their recurrent utilization of stimuli intended to provoke explanatory responses, or narrative impulses, within the suppliant.

At the same time, I want to push back against the rigid images of “EM’s,” “systems,” and “subsystems,” or, rather, clarify what I perceive as their limits as descriptive tools. The implication carried in “semantic networks” and “cultural subsystems” is that health-care is simultaneously tidy and organized as well as creative and open, determined by the structures of some broader cultural logic. Pain and illness are messier and more elusive than the systems devised for their management. We saw last chapter how Aristophanes’ *Wealth* points to the fundamentally excessive nature of bodies and their aversion to totalizing discursive regimes which categorize, inscribe, and regiment.³⁰ Comedy’s ludic nature exploited this excess and

²⁹ Kirmayer 1990.

³⁰ See, e.g., Butler 1993.

utilized it to explore the semantic capaciousness of “health,” as it commutes from bodily to civic comportment.

The “health-care” system, and its “semantic illness network” is therefore not restricted to the communicative exchange of the clinical encounter. Ideas and language about health and the body are extremely mobile and range across cultural domains and performance contexts. As it is, the health-care system can be too abstracted from the roles bodies themselves play in the generation of meaning and sympathetic affect. At the healing shrine, bodies are not seen exclusively as “texts” or “sites” upon which culture is inscribed or constituted, although this is a prominent phenomenon. Their presence, in the flesh, as (re)presentations in ritual and text, in terracotta and stone precipitate whole worlds. They provoke social and moral engagements. That is, bodies are productive of culture in an elementary way that is nonetheless easy to overlook when we are too committed to organizational language like “networks”, “systems,” and “sectors.” As we will see, it is precisely the semantic interactivity and its impulse to a social imagination around the suffering body that characterized the potency of the cults of Asklepios as therapeutic spaces.

As we have just witnessed in the case of Aristides, it is now widely held among scholars of Graeco-Roman science and religion that temple and naturalist medicine were fundamentally intertwined—or, at any rate, “noncontradictory”—means of providing care to the sick. Well past are the days in which Classicists dismissively regarded the cures of the temple as “irrational” or “superstitious” excrescences upon the arm of “rational” Greek medicine.³¹ In fact, over the last several decades historians of various stripes have mustered a body of evidence persuasively

³¹ E.g. Dodds 1951.

showing that Hippocratic medicine and popular healing cults—phenomena whose origins both date to the middle of the fifth century BC—constituted cooperative and collaborative forms of medicine, rather than starkly opposed “religious” and “rational” alternatives.³² Broadly, these scholars point to the overlaps in instruments,³³ recipes,³⁴ regimen,³⁵ the willingness of mortal physicians to work under the name of healing divinities such as *Asklepiadai* (the sons of

³² See, e.g., Lloyd 1979: 40-45; Jouanna 1989; van der Eijk 1990: 63-4; Horstmanshoff 2004; Gorrini 2005; Wickkiser 2008; Nutton 2013: 112; Israelowich 2012 and 2015.

³³ Medical instruments were frequently dedicated in thanksgiving at cults of Asklepios. See *IG II² 47*, *IG II² 1532-7*, *I.Or.* 324 with van Straten 1981: 105-25; Aleshire 1989 and 1991; and Petrakos 1968 and 1996; Bliquez 2014: 25f. So too a number of votive reliefs show medical instruments, mostly cupping glasses, hanging or arranged within the god’s sanctuaries (cf. *NM* 1378; van Straten 2000: 203). From the fourth century on, cupping glasses featured on the reverse of Epidaurian coinage (see Herzog 1931). In Aristophanes’ *Ploutos*, the god is portrayed using the doctor’s pestle, mortar, and medicine chest (see Wickkiser 2008: 49). In the many votive reliefs in which Asklepios is depicted, however, he is never shown using any instrument other than his healing hand. So too, one of the *iamata* (C5) features Asklepios’ unsolicited intervention stopping a man from being cauterized by his doctors and commanding him to sleep in the Epidaurian sanctuary.

³⁴ These include the use of drugs, purgatives, and plasters, the ingredients of some of which appear also in Hippocratic recipe lists (see Totelin 2009, however, for the multivalent and “traditional” nature of such ingredients). The regulations stipulated by the *leges sacrae* include bathing and fasting and so appear to resemble Hippocratic regimen (see Ginouvès 1961; Lloyd 1979; Parker 1983; Gorrini 2005; Israelowich 2015: 53). Asklepios, too, seems to use “surgical” procedures in some of his cures within the Epidaurian *iamata* (*IG IV² 1*, 121-4) and elsewhere (e.g. *ICr.* 1.xvii.8). Nowhere, however, do doctors appear providing cures in Asklepieia (Gorrini 2005). Nor does comparison of the recipes show any exact replication indicative of a transmission of knowledge or care from one sector to another. Likewise, within Near-Eastern literary and medical texts, deities are shown with medical instruments without parallel traditions of “secular” healers (see Böck 2012). What we are observing, then, is a very *general* similarity of meta-features within medical practice (which were more widely shared among Mediterranean traditions: see Chapter 4).

³⁵ E.g. the *hieroi logoi* broadly. For a similar account from the Epidaurian sanctuary of the 2nd century CE, see *IG IV² 1*, 126, which shows clear signs of medical language (αἰῶραι for passive exercises). Nevertheless, the use of regimen is incorporated as *part* of ritual, culminating in sacred and mysterious rites. Compare the more “miraculous” late healing at *IG IV² 1*, 127.

Asklepios), their participation in religious cult,³⁶ and an overall unwillingness in Hippocratic texts to reject the “divine” as an efficacious force in the world.³⁷

Hippocratic and temple medicine thus emerged as non-exclusive, but unique, practices which tended to wrest medical authority away from a disparate set of traditional practitioners like seers, purifiers, and wisemen, some of whom boasted individual, “magical” powers over forces both natural and divine.³⁸ Moreover, medical authors utilized popular rhetorical techniques to exploit institutionalized forms of competition which worked to centralize their own medical authority. Thus, Hippocratic authors attacked and rejected the practice of those who claimed to be able to control *daemoniac* attacks as impious,³⁹ while, at the same time, temples of Asklepios offered cures to the community in civically sanctioned ways which protected the lines of communication between the human and divine.⁴⁰ Hippocratics, confronted by their self-interested and self-imposed limits over the physical, were consequently constrained in the *sorts*

³⁶ See Edelsteins 1945: 251f. for medical professional groups under the name of Asklepiadaí, the “children of Asklepios” (but n.b. Smith 1990:14 *pace* a medical *koinon* at Kos under that title). A number of inscriptions (all from the Hellenistic period or later) document honors paid to physicians in sanctuaries of Asklepios: *IG II² 483* (304 BC) honors a physician named Pheidias (the son of Apollonius of Rhodes?) at the city Asklepieion; *IG II² 772* (251/50 BC) instructs the “public” physicians to sacrifice at the city Asklepieion on behalf of the city and their patients twice annually. *IG II² 4359=NM 1841* (c.350 BC) is a votive relief depicting Asklepios and the Eleusinian deities receiving five individuals honored by the city who are often assumed to be physicians based on the names Mnesitheus and Dieuchos, known Athenian physicians (e.g., van Straten 2000; Klöckner 2010; Nutton 2013: 112). However, given the presence of Demeter-Kore, and the close civic connections of these two cults at Athens, it seems likely that this has more to do with services to the state than medical ones (see Chapter Three). See also *Inscr. di Kos* ED 132 and 267 (both 3rd century BC) where foreign city states honor Koan doctors within the Asklepieion at Kos; *IG V, 1 1145* (where the Spartan physician Damiadas self describes as Ἀσκληπιοῦ ὑπουργός, but not necessarily within the Asklepieion); *IGBulg.* 315 praises the doctor Glaukias with a dedication in a sanctuary of Apollo Iatros and Asklepios. See, too, *I.Vel* 1.21-24 for the problematic nature of a family of physician/priests in 1st century CE Velia (see Chapter Four). It is not until the second century CE that we find explicit reference to physicians and temple priests working together. Cf. *IG II² 3798/3799*. See especially Cohn-Haft 1954; Samama 2003 for exhaustive inscriptional evidence of doctors in the ancient world; also Nutton 1988; Gorrini 2005; Israelowich 2015.

³⁷ For the relationship between Hippocratic authors and the conception of the “divine” (τὸ θεῖον) see, e.g., Edelstein 1967; Lloyd 1979; van der Eijk 1990 and 1991; Hankinson 1998; Wickkiser 2008; Nutton 2013.

³⁸ See, for instance, the powers claimed by the author/reciter of the Getty Hexameters 1.1-5. See Obbink and Faraone 2013.

³⁹ Locus classicus at *Morb. Sacr.* 1.1-14; 1.39f; see van der Eijk 1990; see Hankinson 1998: 6-7 for that text’s sorting of “religion” and “magic.”

⁴⁰ Nutton 2013: 115.

of cases they could reasonably take on.⁴¹ In order to maintain their reputations and cultivate a clientele in the days before licensure or certification existed, it behooved these practitioners to refuse “impossible” or “incurable” cases.⁴² Thus, where mortal ability failed, patients who could not find treatments among local physicians had resort to the unbounded and unfailing powers of the god.⁴³ More than just taking those patients Hippocratics could or would not treat, however, scholars have suggested that temple medicine assumed particular methodological configurations which aped therapeutic developments in Hippocratic medicine and that this accounts for much of the temple’s success.⁴⁴ Even if it seems difficult to prove that Hippocratic physicians served as healers within temples, it nonetheless appears that temples took note of the value placed by the sick on Hippocratic methods and responded accordingly, just as Hippocratic practitioners were happy to enlist the divine in their own efforts. The boundaries between the domains of care were porous and the demands and expectations of those seeking care played a significant role in forming the landscape of medical practice.

This view has much to recommend it. Yet, even when they are careful to acknowledge that we should not underestimate the perceived efficacy of miracle cures or the reasons individuals had to seek divine care,⁴⁵ it is indicative of a residual bias in favor of Hippocratic medicine that scholars continue to assign separate domains of expertise for each kind of healing,

⁴¹ Cf. *Art.* 8; 14; *Morb.* 1.6; *Morb.* 2.48. But compare *Morb. Sacr.* 2.3 for a more positivist assertion about medicine’s progress. For a full catalogue and treatment of the vocabulary of those cases deemed “incurable,” see von Staden 1990.

⁴² Cf. von Staden 1990; Rosen and Horstmanshoff 2003; King 1998: 102-13 and 2002 (chronic pain); Gorrini 2005 (divine responses to plague); Wickkiser 2008; Nutton 2013: 109 (chronic pain).

⁴³ Cf. *Anth. Pal.* 6.330. 1-2. θνητῶν μὲν τέχνηαις ἀπορούμενος, εἰς δὲ τὸ θεῖον | ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν ἔχων. So, too, Hippys of Rhegium *BNJ* 554 F2 (=Ael. *NA* 9.33); Diod. Sic. 1.25.4-5 for comparative claims about Isis. See further below.

⁴⁴ See Parker 1996; Nutton 2013; Petridou 2015.

⁴⁵ E.g., Nutton 2013: 109; Petridou 2015: 193-4. Vikela 2006: 56 comes very close to the mark when she claims “in most cases, healing consisted not in practical action but in symbolic support” but ventures no further.

referring (or deferring) to the “religious” only those cases in which naturalistic medicine was not up to the job. No real evidence suggests that such strict partitioning took place. The *iamata* do show a proclivity towards physical disability, but this is hardly exclusive of other illnesses which occur in the Hippocratic corpus, like “dropsy,” head pains, kidney stones, and flesh wounds. So too, the widely practiced dedication of anatomical votives, which are typically taken to commemorate the body part that a god had healed, suggest a very wide range of ailments and tend to cut across the notion of “specialized” medicine.⁴⁶ If sanctuaries did actually see an inordinate number of cases treating disability, we may equally well explain this through the fit between healing and the social construction of illness within the space of the temple as by the “professional” strategies employed by Hippocratic healers.

Just as Hippocratics and Asklepios appear to employ overlapping ingredients, instruments, and, perhaps, even procedures, so too they may have tended to similar sorts of patients.⁴⁷ The significance of vocabulary, instruments, and methods could be sorted according to the context and manner in which the materials were brought to bear in the eyes of the patient, who could construct or extract meaning from an interaction quite independently of a doctors’ authoritative diagnosis. Like the rituals performed at Asklepieia, the “semantic network” of ancient mortal medicine lacked fixity beyond its broadest accountings of health and sickness seen last chapter. Rather, the process of signification was generated through the interplay of social context, time, space, and bodies themselves; it was controlled by the shared assumptions and learned roles of patient and healer. What remains, then, is a comparative analysis of the

⁴⁶ See further below for the “representative” nature of *ex votos*. van Straten 1981: 150 tentatively suggests that different cult *locales* showed particular specialities, which is taken up fully in Oberhelman 2014.

⁴⁷ For “symbolic” overlap see Parker 1996: 185; overlap of methods and procedures, Wickkiser 2008; Totelin 2009; Nutton 2013; Rosen 2011; Israelowich 2012 and 2015.

interactive processes of how temple and secular forms of healing constructed patients as objects of knowledge and care, constraining or inviting particular expressions of subjectivity, according to the needs of each branch of care. So, too, we will have to situate these considerations with the important social dimension of health and sickness we observed last chapter in order to fully flesh out the patient's experience in the ancient healing sanctuary.

Hippocratics and the Missing Voice

Much of the social context of ancient medicine is irrevocably lost, and this makes recovering the "patient's perspective" inherently problematic and challenging. The larger part of Hippocratic medicine, by contrast, was conspicuous by design, and so we can speculate more readily on its social and ethical effects within Greek life.⁴⁸ Indeed, Brooke Holmes has argued persuasively that one of the principal consequences of the emergence of Hippocratic, naturalist medicine was the formulation of the body (*soma*) as a conceptual object of ethical discipline and care.⁴⁹ Hippocratic materialist theorizing about causes and effects resulted in the advent of a different mode of thinking about ethical responsibility vis-à-vis health and illness. This in turn inaugurated a transformation of "the field of social and ethical relations in which a person is embedded and, indeed, the very identity of the person as a social, ethical agent."⁵⁰ On this view, Hippocratic medicine had a radical impact on the way in which medical care as a form of social action was imagined both within the overall "system" of healing and Greek ethical thinking more broadly.

⁴⁸ See Chapter 1 for the public, declamatory performance of medicine (also, e.g., Lloyd 1979; Laskaris 2002; Schiefsky 2005; Asper 2007; Mann 2012.)

⁴⁹ Holmes 2010b: 10.

⁵⁰ Holmes 2010b: 15.

When naturalist medicine decoupled sickness and disease from the inscrutable metaphysical and “ethical” field of *daemonic* forces and agencies, it did so for the purpose of offering clear and intelligible accounts of the sequences of causality when body and environment interact. When disease could be understood so too could it be protected against by various forms of care. But within this accounting of bodily stuffs surfaced a gap between the corporeal body and the mind or soul as both an agent of care and seat of personal responsibility. As opposed to archaic imaginings of the self, the Classical period saw an assimilation of the ethical subject—the “person”—with that subject’s capacity for conscious mastery over the physical “body.”⁵¹ In short, the reformation of medical ideas about the body ushered in a redefinition of the ethical relationship between individual persons and their *somata*. Illness, then, was no longer formulated in terms of religious transgression or as the exogenous assaults of a mysterious and opaque divine.⁵² Rather, sickness was to be understood as an insufficient and potentially blameworthy care of the self.⁵³

At the same time that Hippocratic concepts of the body generated a culturally compelling model of ethical subjectivity, an extended focus on some of the practical consequences of clinical experience and what we might call the “diagnostic narratives” typical of the Hippocratic corpus cuts across this picture. Anthropologists and sociologists of medicine and science alike have been interested in how communities of medical practitioners construct their “subjects/objects of

⁵¹ Holmes is quick and right to emphasize that the “mind” within the medical writings is, too, conceived of as physical, and that mind—body is not imagined as a Cartesian ontological duality but as opposing poles along a material spectrum (2010b: 118-19).

⁵² Cf. Gorrini 2005 for the effects on temple medicine.

⁵³ Holmes 2010b: 175.

knowledge.”⁵⁴ Classical scholars, including Holmes and Petsalis-Diomidis, have similarly called attention to the ways in which ancient medical texts represent and configure their patients as embodied actors, with the goal of understanding how “rational” medicine produced the objects of its knowledge and authority.⁵⁵ Rather than focusing wholly on traditional Hippocratic regimen—with its elaborate prescriptions regarding food, drink, and exercise—as promoting a sense of agency in the patient, this work highlights the ways in which Hippocratic empiricism tends to totalize the patient *qua* site of signification. If the theoretical foundation of Hippocratic medicine rested on the premise that bodies were composed of plural materials, then the methods of diagnosis—and the social function of prognosis—tended to overlook the reality of patients as ethical subjects struggling equally to make sense of their own embodied experiences with pain and illness. That is to say, even as medical theorizing contributed substantively to Greek conceptions about personal responsibility, once a person fell ill, it was very possible that she was no longer treated as an active kind of ethical subject, but was transformed into a medicalized object.

Within the records of the Hippocratic texts we find again and again that the patient was cast as the passive object of the doctor’s penetrating gaze instead of as an active participant in the interpretive process of the clinical encounter. As one scholar has described, within the clinical interaction, “viewing resembled the practice of dissection in the dynamics of power; [physicians]

⁵⁴ Cf. Good 1993; similarly, see Daston and Galison 2009, who describe the process by which the creation of an “object” of inquiry reciprocally creates particular forms of “subjective” inquirer.

⁵⁵ Holmes 2010b; for the contrasting *disembodiedness* of the practitioner compared with the totalizing corporeality of the patient see Holmes 2013. The patient as passive “object” of the gaze is more widely acknowledged in studies of late Roman medical practice, with its more familiar culture of socio-political subordination in contrast to the sovereign and “democratic” body of Classical Athens. Nevertheless, the authority structures of high medicine of the Empire did not deviate all that widely from the Hippocratic foundations upon which it was laid. See esp. Barton 1994; Petsalis-Diomidis 2010; Nutton 2013; Israelowich 2012; see now Thumiger 2015.

fundamentally visually penetrated the body of the patient who remained passive throughout the process...the patient never returns the physician's gaze."⁵⁶ This is especially so within the *Epidemics* where the patient is almost universally reduced to an *ensemble* of signs and symptoms.⁵⁷ Though often given a name and a hometown, the quality which separates individuals as such tends to be the anomalous nature of their condition.⁵⁸ The disruptive course of disease manifested in these symptoms determines the text's "narrative arc"—which, often terminates in the death of the patient—more than any actions or agency of the sick. While the *Epidemics* were probably meant to function as an aid to practitioners in the processes of diagnosis and prognosis—that is, not meant for "public" dissemination or consumption—these texts offer an impressive catalogue of the labelling procedures available to the Hippocratic practitioner in confronting the sick body.⁵⁹

Such labelling procedures evince the sorts of authority-building practices the *iatros* cultivated and their potential for constraining the patient's subjective experience. This is especially powerful where the patient's voice is concerned.⁶⁰ In an article on "voice pathologies" in the Hippocratic Corpus, Colin Webster shows that Hippocratic physicians relied on patient

⁵⁶ Petsalis-Diomidis 2012: 72. See also Perkins 1994; Barton 1994; Hughes 2008.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Aff.*, *Int. Aff.*, *Morb.* 1 and 2, where it is precisely the *nosos* which is targeted, and not the person.

⁵⁸ See Wee 2015 for case histories as *deviations* from the normal course of disease, meant to aid the physician in assimilating the unexpected to the repertoire of known disease.

⁵⁹ See Craik 2014 for the various texts which comprise the *Epidemics*.

⁶⁰ For a (varyingly successful) attempt to recuperate the voices of the marginalized patient, see Thumiger 2015.

voices to reveal the status of their interior states and their experiences with illness.⁶¹ Indeed, the “Hippocratic triangle” purports that the three elements of the art “are the disease, diseased, and physician,” implying that the patient played an “equal” role in disclosing information and combatting disease.⁶² At the same time, physicians attempted to play down this reliance a good deal, showing that, in reality, the “triangle” was far from proportional.⁶³ One way doctors did so was by generating and utilizing a raft of prescribed external signs to glean information and circumvent the need for direct enquiry.⁶⁴ Where these signs were insufficient to make a complete diagnosis or prognosis, subsequent inquiry was recommended. But this was narrowly framed (e.g., whether the bowel movements have been loose, whether the patient has been hungry) and invariably expected a “yes” or “no” answer. This interrogative format was successful because it

⁶¹ *Epid.* 5 and 7 are the most attentive to “subjective” or interior sensations. This is most obviously the case with (non physician-induced) pain (see *Epid.* 5.92=7.100, but compare 2.2.10). But there are a variety of other phenomena which appear to be self-reported: e.g., *Epid.* 5.22 a description of “feeling healthy” (ἔδοκει ὑγιής εἶναι αὐτῷ; cf. 7.2); 5.50 depression (κατεφέρετο; cf. 5.84); 5.63 a patient describes a “gathering” around the heart (κατὰ τὴν καρδίην ἔφη τι ξυλλέγεσθαι; cf. 7.11); 5.81 fears of flute girls, fears of bridges (φόβος τῆς αὐλητρίδος; cf. 5.82); 5.83 flashes of light around the eyes (τὰ πολλὰ ὡσπερ ἀστραπὴν ἐδόκεεν ἐκλάμπειν. cf. 7. 45, 7.88); 7.1 general lapses or alterations of perception (ἀναίσθητος; cf. 7.84); 7.25 internal sensation of “heaviness of the right side, as if from the womb” (ὡς ἀπὸ ὑστερέων βάρους); 5.72 (=7.69) reports of sexual activity (ἀφροδισιάσαντι, ἐξηράνθη πάντα; cf. 6.3.5); 7.84 vertigo (σκοτόδινος; cf. *VM* 10; cf. *Coac.* 157.2; *Morb* 2.4, where it is lumped with externally observed syndromes, however). Books 2, 4, and 6 of the *Epidemics*, by contrast are aphoristic in style and generalized in content; when they do describe case histories, the symptoms are limited almost entirely to those which are observable to the physician or provokable by external stimulus. It is thus not surprising that the methodological section at *Epid* 4.43 and 4.46 elides the patient as a source of information almost entirely.

⁶² Cf. *Epid.* 1.5: Ἡ τέχνη διὰ τριῶν, τὸ νοῦσημα, ὁ νοσέων, καὶ ὁ ἰητρὸς. This has led scholars to ponder the nature of the “conversations” which must have occurred between physician and patient in curing disease, and the degree to which these, rather than or in addition to, observable symptoms, speculative schemes, and cultural predispositions, grounded diagnosis and therapy. See, for instance, Gourevitch 1984; Jouanna 1999; Nutton 2013; and Holmes 2010b: 169 who takes something of a middle path: “Both physician and patient can gather somatic data and both can make inferences, but the doctor has the upper-hand.”

⁶³ Webster 2015. See, also, Letts 2015 for the first century AD physician Rufus of Ephesus’ emphatic recommendation *to question* the patient about her experience. The explicit nature of such encouragement suggests that it was not widely practiced, or at least its practical benefits were not unconditionally accepted.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Prog.* 3 (posture); *Prog.* 5 (rapid breathing); *Prog.* 10 (sleep patterns). Webster 2015: 169-71.

controlled and “stabilized” the relevant data at the same time as it enhanced the physician’s claims to expertise.⁶⁵

A parallel strategy was to devalue the voice as a vehicle of personal information or subjective expression. In part, this was useful because the patient was felt to be an unreliable narrator of her own bodily states.⁶⁶ More broadly, however, the voice was translated into a panoply of presenting symptoms and syndromes, conceptually assimilated with other bodily discharges—pus, piss, phlegm, bile, and other excreta—by which the healer gained entry into the obscured interior of the patient’s body.⁶⁷ The voice was treated qualitatively—for instance, rough,⁶⁸ heavy,⁶⁹ slurred,⁷⁰ or lisping⁷¹—as a means of informing the physician’s diagnosis and prognosis.⁷² It was taxonomized and categorized as a form of “sonic effluvia” and the mouth, in

⁶⁵ Webster 2015. *Aff.* 37 seemingly begins with a strong endorsement of questioning patients: “Ὅταν δὲ ἐπὶ νοσέοντα ἀφίκη, ἐπανερωτῶν χρηὴ ἂ πάσχει... (“whenever you visit a patient, it is necessary to ask what they suffer...”). But it quickly resolves into this binary “yes”/“no” form. See, e.g., *Prog.* 2; *Prog.* 23; *Prorrh.* 2.41. Meanwhile, at *Int. Aff.* 1 the author criticizes those who ask patients about their illness as amateurish, since the *iatros* ought to know well in advance what ails the patient (*προκαταμάθειν*), before they say anything at all.

⁶⁶ *Art.* 2 laments that patients’ accounts of internal ailments are skewed by guesses, rather than sure knowledge of disease (*δοξάντες μᾶλλον ἢ εἰδότες ἀπαγγέλλουσιν*). Indeed, the ignorance of the lay person is a common theme in *Art.* Cf. *Epid.* 5.26. for hidden status of the body (*ἢ σχήσις τοῦ σώματος παρέλαθεν*) and *VM* 2 which concedes that it is a difficult matter for lay persons (*δημότας ἔοντας οὐ ῥηίδιον*) fully to learn and understand their own diseases (hence the need for a medical *technē*). See also *Flat.* 1; *Mul.* 1.62, in which women’s inexperience with their own bodies and sexual health creates unnecessary complications. Although see *Praec.* 2 for an endorsement of asking questions among regular folk in the case of *therapies* (but not in the course of diagnosis).

⁶⁷ See, most explicitly, the methodological statement concerning what phenomena a physician needs to attend to at *Epid.* 6.8.7; implicitly at, e.g., *Epid.* 2.18; 5.10; 5.26; 5.74; 7.3; 7.5; 7.18; 7.21-22; 7.25; 7.46; 7.53. Again, the willingness to include the absence of voice (*ἀφωνία*) as a symptom marks *Epid.* 5 and 7 off from the other books in that collection.

⁶⁸ E.g. *Art.* 12; *Epid.* 1.1; *Epid.* 2.1.8; *Epid.* 7.7; *Morb.* 2.50; cf. *Aer.* 6.

⁶⁹ E.g. *Morb.* 2.48; *Morb.* 3.16.

⁷⁰ *Epid.* 5.74=7.36.

⁷¹ *Epid.* 1.2; *Epid.* 7.22.

⁷² Webster 2015: 180-86 for the full battery of sonic qualities.

turn, was treated as “another orifice secreting verbal discharges,” and so became only another tool in the *iatros*’ arsenal to combat disease and death.⁷³

Again, these practices helped to create and reinforce the impression of technical expertise and know-how.⁷⁴ But more than this, even where case histories betray signs of incorporating self-reported information, these moments never resolve into the patient’s broader narrative accounting of her illness. The voice in Hippocratic texts did not simply betray its owner in being reduced to a diagnostic function. In creating and using their unique forms of power—i.e. fashioning themselves *as* physicians—Hippocratics erased the role of the patient’s voice as an instrument of subjective and ethical expression. The individual patient, his or her story, and its explanatory framework were suppressed and reworked into the doctor’s struggle against disease.⁷⁵ It was therefore only the physician—or a patient who had “learned” to evaluate their own sensations in the position of the physician—who enjoyed authority over the suffering body.⁷⁶ This culminates the wider picture in which the patient’s body formed the passive object (conceptually and practically) of the physician’s gaze and touch. The exclusion of the patient’s voice as an active means of making meaning of her illness therefore encapsulates the broader social asymmetry of the Hippocratic medical encounter.

We can now turn to the complementary semantic network at work within the world of the healing temple and communicative operations in place there. In contrast to the shifts in ethics

⁷³ Webster 2015: 166.

⁷⁴ Especially in the case of gynecological texts. See, e.g., Lloyd 1983; Dean-Jones 1994; Flemming 2013.

⁷⁵ Cf. *Prog.* 1 the physician alone “struggles against” (ἀνταγωνίσασθαι) disease. For military metaphors used to structure the physician’s struggle with disease see Rosen and Horstmanshoff 2003. Contrast, however, *Epid.* 6.5.1 (νούσων φύσεις ἰητροί) for more ostensibly minimalist conceptions of the physician’s role in advancing the medical art: one is simply supposed to observe and help nature along.

⁷⁶ See Holmes 2010b: 167f.; Webster 2015: 174. n. 27.

inaugurated by Hippocratic materialism, temple medicine is perhaps most striking for its indifference to etiological principles. Instead, the cures recorded at healing cults focus on just that: the structured activity of healing. Diagnosis is almost entirely absent, exchanged for the power of immanence, miraculous epiphany, and the therapeutic touch of the god. The collection of cures, as we have it, demonstrates very clearly that, despite the religious context in which medical consultation was sought, no divine *origin* for illness was looked for. This stands in surprising contrast with other Mediterranean concepts of sickness and disease.⁷⁷ While we will turn to the wider Mediterranean medical ecology in the final chapter, it is worth noting for now that the general diagnostic pattern there was to catalogue carefully symptoms as a means of discovering the divine force responsible for specific illnesses. Thus, religious transgression or impropriety was generally considered to be at the root of any given illness episode.⁷⁸

Bodies and Texts: Reading the Cure

I have suggested that, although Hippocratic and temple medicine overlapped in some formal ways, the patient's role in interpreting the meaning of illness, treatment, and cure may have differed substantially according to context of care. To examine how the patient experienced and narrated her own illness within the bounds of Classical and Hellenistic healing cults, we rely principally on the *iamata*, the inscribed "records" of Asklepios' cures performed at Epidauros.⁷⁹ Moving forward, these ritual narratives reveal two important and interrelated facts: first, the act

⁷⁷ See the contributions in Horstmanshoff and Stol 2004 for a survey of Mediterranean and Near-Eastern beliefs about disease and illness.

⁷⁸ See Chaniotis 1995 for the continuity of religious transgression or "sin" in sickness in later Cilicia. See Avalos 1995 for a comparative survey of temple medicine in Greek, Mesopotamian, and early Judaic cultures.

⁷⁹ In discussing the *iamata* I follow the alpha-numeric ordination developed in LiDonnici 1995, (e.g., A1=the first tale of the first stele; B1 the first tale of the second stele etc...) rather than the wholly sequential numbering of other editors (e.g., Herzog 1931, which was followed by the Edelsteins). I do so not only because it is her text that I use (with some reservations and modifications) but because this preserves better the architecture of the text, and helps better to bring out the way themes, patterns, and idiosyncrasies develop within particular *stèle*.

of reading these narratives offered a bounded but flexible framework for the interpretation of illness episodes; and second, these narratives tended to reassert the importance of the sick as social agents, acting in wider social networks. In the first case, we will see that the *iamata* repeatedly gesture to their own status as texts which, due to the divine nature of the cures they relate, evaded definitive readings, and offered multiple subject positions. This narrative strategy in turn created space for the reader to interpolate herself into an imagined community of the sick. Further, the *iamata* repeatedly collapse the distinction between reader and protagonist of these tales, representing the ailing body as an object demanding interpretation and the protagonists as interpreters of their own ailments—as well as those of others—creating complex relationships between the texts, persons, and bodies. Ultimately, unlike the deliberately limiting interrogative schemes of Hippocratic medicine, ritual contact with the divine offered the suppliant a fixed but flexible symbolic field by which to explain, communicate, and memorialize the experience of sickness.

The confrontation with the narratives of others means also that the process of ritual healing was bound up in comparative evaluation, as the suppliant was invited to imagine the sufferings of others to create rubrics of meaning for their own pain and illness. This underscores in a basic way that ritual healing at sanctuaries offered platforms for subjective expression, but was also inherently other-facing (in the sense discussed in the previous chapter) in as much as healing was predicated upon the imaginative relation of the self to others, both divine and human. Indeed, the *iamata* routinely emphasize the enmeshment of the body and the social, particularly as healthy and sick alike are figured as social and ethical agents, interacting with others according to particular codes of behavior. These tales thus map the contours of medical

subjectivity within the context of the temple, as it formed a social vision of health and healing targeted to aiding individuals reclaim their social status as healthy and reinforcing the wider forms of sociality into which *hygieia* was woven.

The *iamata* themselves were collected and displayed within Asklepios' sanctuary outside the city of Epidauros and record the epiphanic appearance of the god to the sick *hiketai* (suppliants) who came seeking his aid.⁸⁰ These stories were almost certainly collated by temple priests sometime in the 4th century BCE from a hodgepodge of material sources around the sanctuary, which likely stretch back to the beginning of Asklepios' presence there at the turn of the fifth.⁸¹ The stories are copied on four stone *stelai* (although Pausanias tells us that in his day there were six, which itself was only a portion of their ancient total) discovered by Panayotis Kavvadias during his excavations of the Epidaurian Asklepieion in the late nineteenth century.⁸² Sadly, of the four *stelai*, only the first two still possess substantive amounts of legible text, while

⁸⁰ Later authors like Pliny (*HN* 29.14), Pausanias (2.26.8), and Strabo (8.6.15) inform us that corpora of miracle cures were inscribed at the other major sanctuaries of Asklepios at Kos, Trikka, and Pergamon, none of which has subsequently been discovered (see also Paus. 3.26.9). However, there exists a very small handful of 2nd century BC fragments from the Lebena Asklepieion on Crete which record similar sorts of stories (*JCr* I.xvii.8-10 with LiDonnici 1995: 46-7 for their provisionally early nature). According to Pausanias (*supra*), this sanctuary was founded indirectly from the Epidaurian metropole through Balagrai in Cyrene. So, too, as a "class" or "genre" of inscription, the *iamata* appear to have been widely known and influenced the literary production of at least one author. The Hellenistic poet and philosopher Posidippus penned a collection of epigrams which were clearly inspired by the documents at the temples of Asklepios (see Bing 2004 and Wickkiser 2013 on the relation of Posidippus' *Iamatika* to the Epidaurian *Iamata*). See too *Anth. Pal.* 6. 330 for the Attic orator Aischines' poetic composition modeled upon the healing narratives, possibly originally inscribed at Epidauros; Callim. (*Anth. Pal.* 6.147) for a "pinax" meant to remind Asklepios of a vow which has been fulfilled.

⁸¹ E.g., *IG* IV² 1, 136 and 142, both of which date to c.500 BCE. From some point in the early archaic period the sanctuary had been dedicated to Apollo Maleatas. Maleatas continued to receive cult on the nearby mountain, as Asklepios' cult expanded in the plain below, see Labrinoudakis 1980 and 2002; for the sanctuary development and layout, see Tomlinson 1983; for the sanctuary as the primary apparatus of Epidaurian state religion and state formation, see Polignac 1995: 45-46; Lambrinoudakis 1980. For a history of the expansion of the cult in the Argolid, see Chapter 3.

⁸² Paus. 2.27.2. These were likely located on the eastern face of the *abaton*, where four wall grooves fit the dimensions of extant *stelai*. See LiDonnici 1995; Martzavou 2012.

the third and fourth remain badly fragmented.⁸³ The approximately fifty fully remaining stories (and impressionistic fragments of another twenty) narrate a fascinatingly wide range of feats demonstrating the god's power and goodwill. They are thus typically understood to belong to the genre of *aretology*, the purpose of which was to advertise the god's might and promote the importance of the sanctuary.⁸⁴ While this is no doubt true, they also formed an important part of the overall ritual choreography of incubatory healing. Because my focus here is trained upon suppliant interaction with the *iamata* as texts, I postpone discussion of the evidence for incubation as a form of ritual praxis in antiquity to an appendix.⁸⁵ But it is important to be clear that the suppliant's engagement with the *iamata* was only one of the final elements in a lengthy preparatory process comprising sacred travel, abstinences from sex and certain foods, ritual bathing and other purifications, certain forms of dress, and an increasingly involved sequence of sacrificial offerings before bedding down in the sanctuary *abaton* or *enkoimeterion*, where only incubants were permitted access.⁸⁶ These ritual actions were part of an important symbolic repertoire in the management of illness and pain, and it is only for the sake of space and not a reflection on their significance that they do not feature prominently here.

Most of the *iamata* stories are relatively simple and formulaic, yet they contain too a level of narrative and organizational sophistication which belies their folklorish surface. In fact,

⁸³ The Edelsteins (1945), in their still indispensable collection of the literary and (some) inscriptional testimony for the cult of Asklepios do not include the fragmentary remnants of the C and D *stelai*. While the C stele is overall in bad shape, it nevertheless contains legible materials, for which, see LiDonnici 1995: 117-31.

⁸⁴ Edelsteins 1945; Dillon 1994 and 1997; Naiden 2005.

⁸⁵ Excluding the *iamata*, the most important inscribed documents concerning incubation are: *I.Or.* 277+8(=*LSCG* 69 = *IG* VII 235); *I.Erythrai* 205. 25f.; *NGSL* 13 (in Lupu 2004); *IG* II² 4962(=*LSCG* 21); *SEG* 11. 419(=*LSS* 22); *IvP* III 161A/B; and Müller 2010(=*SEG* 60. 1332) for a newly discovered Hellenistic inscription from Yüntag Turkey. See Erhenheim 2016.

⁸⁶ For suppliants as readers of the *iamata*, see A3, A4, B16. For the issue of literacy, see Harris 1989; Thomas 1992; the contributions in Yunis 2007 (especially Heinrichs 2007: 38-58). For literacy within healing cult specifically, LiDonnici 1995; Naiden 2005. Martzavou 2012 apparently takes suppliant literacy for granted.

recently several scholars have assessed the content of the *iamata* following various lines of discourse analysis, tracing their compositional formulae or their deployment of didactic and legalistic conventions to gather and convey authority.⁸⁷ One scholar has even successfully explored the narrative corpus as a deliberate unity, drawing attention to its careful manipulation of the suppliant's emotional states.⁸⁸ These studies are significant in that they all abandon the project of determining whether these events *actually* happened.⁸⁹ Indeed, in an appropriately historicist mood, Georgia Petridou has recently observed about the phenomenon of epiphany in the Greek world generally, it is of less significance whether a particular epiphany “really” occurred than that it was perceived to have done so. She adds, “what I consider important is the very *explanatory quality* of epiphany: the fact that every culture provides...models by which an individual or group can make intelligible a potentially incoherent perception of reality.”⁹⁰ Picking up from Petridou, then, we will explore in greater depth the sort of medico-religious explanatory model the corpus of the *iamata* and the god's epiphanic interventions offered its readership of the sick.

While we cannot say for certain, it has been suggested that the very earliest compositional layer of the *iamata* was the textualization of oral stories circulating around the sanctuary as they were transmitted and adapted over time.⁹¹ Amidst such circulations, the objects

⁸⁷ For the didactic approach see Dillon 1994; legalistic Naiden 2005. See also Prêtre and Charlier 2009 for an interesting attempt at retrospective diagnosis of the “cases” within the *iamata*.

⁸⁸ Martzavou 2012.

⁸⁹ This was the primary concern of early commentators on the miracle cures (e.g. Wilamowitz). See Edelsteins 1945 which attempts to save the *iamata* from Enlightenment assaults against these narratives as religious huxterism.

⁹⁰ Petridou 2015: 108. Emphasis mine.

⁹¹ LiDonnici 1995: 50-59, who suspects some form of oral tradition lies behind (and possibly continues beside) at least A1-3, A15-17 (n.b. all stem from stele A, suggesting it as the repository of the oldest and most venerated source material).

and features of the sanctuary itself would have played a role.⁹² Stories would have been attached to or inspired by particular geographical features or votive objects which lacked inscriptions and so invited aitiological speculation.⁹³ So too, the inscription-less (or, inscription-minimal) anatomical votives which adorned the sanctuary were equally a provocation to narrative and imagination.⁹⁴ This suggests that, outside the evidence of the *iamata* themselves, we ought to imagine the healing sanctuary as a place rich in the performance and exchange of stories—both of pilgrims’ own and the retelling of others’—as they furnished relevant opportunities for patients to make sense of themselves as sick, as suppliants, and hopefully as healthy again.⁹⁵

As with any text, the number of reading scenarios available in interacting with the *iamata* are innumerable.⁹⁶ Again, recent studies have focused on a number of possible “reading programs,” none of which are mutually exclusive. Fred Naiden, in particular, notes the way that being a *hiketes* inherently casts the individual as a protagonist in her own quest for healing.⁹⁷ At the same time he identifies an inherent tension, for within the *iamata* it is the god who exerts agency, either granting or withholding his aid, while the suppliant must submit to Asklepios’ whims.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, this overlooks the important activities of reading and interpretation brought to bear by the suppliant in the engagement with the *iamata* as part of ritual. While the sick ultimately must submit to the gods in the midst of epiphany, the penultimate process of

⁹² See A1 (reflexive inclusion of votive material); A15 complex reference to an externally existing votive (*IG IV² 1, 954*).

⁹³ See LiDonnici 1995: 62-5 for series of stories inspired by “stock-types” of votive imagery (e.g., naked men B8/9).

⁹⁴ See van Straten 1995 and 2000; Forsén 1996; Hughes 2008.

⁹⁵ E.g., A3/4. LiDonnici 1995: 52.

⁹⁶ See Petsalis-Diomidis 2005: 186; Platt 2012: 44-46 for similar observations regarding the symbolic openness of the visual representations of healing on votive reliefs (more on which below).

⁹⁷ Naiden 2005: 74.

⁹⁸ Naiden 2005: 79.

reading the *iamata*—or having them read to one—proves to be a creative and expressive one. My argument underscores the undetermined nature of the text and I suggest that if there is a unified “purpose” it is the creation of a regulated but open field of signification to which suppliants could fruitfully correlate their individual experience.

Part of that regulation is provided by the embodied ritual of which they form a part, another through a grammar of narrative formulae. This grammar generates order by which expectations can be structured and the suppliant may “learn” what to do and what outcomes she might expect.⁹⁹ These are most obvious in the phrases which bookend the appearance of the god to the sleeping suppliant¹⁰⁰ and the conclusion of their cures with the assurance, “when day came, s/he left healthy.”¹⁰¹ At the same time, the contents (and, therefore, symbolic system) of the narratives are ample and protean, undermining expectations even as they are erected through formulaic repetition.¹⁰² This is because epiphanic experience, like that of illness itself, is precisely unpredictable, ineffable, and exceeds the limits of the communicable. The god, as we shall see, is defined by his ability to “amaze” and inspire “awe.”¹⁰³ Thus, the tension created between the formal regulation of the narrative and the unpredictable, adaptive nature of the divine creates interpretive space for the suppliant to read her own, individual and subjective

⁹⁹ Dillon 1994.

¹⁰⁰ Usually the phrase (or some close variation upon) ἐγκαθεύδων δὲ ὄψιν/ένύπνιον εἶδε· ἐδόκει... (“incubating s/he saw a dream. It seemed that the god...”). So at A2, A3, A4, A6, A7, A8, A9, A13, A14, A18, B1, B3, B4, B7, B8, B9, B10, B11, B12, B14(?), B15(?), B17, B18, B19, B20, B21, B22, C3, C20, C21, C22, C23.

¹⁰¹ A3, A4, A5, A8, A9, A11, A12-14 (all three with variations); A16, A18, A19, B2, B3, B6, B7 (with variation); B8, B9, B10, B12, B15, B16, B18, B20, B23, C1(?), C2, C5, C19, C21-23.

¹⁰² Pace Petsalis-Diomidis 2005 and 2010. See n. 96 *supra*.

¹⁰³ See Platt 2012: 46f. Pace Klöckner 2010, for whom Asklepios is defined—visually as well as ontologically—by his similarity to human man.

experience of the sick body and encourages interpretive agency as a driver of the therapeutic process.

Reading the Body

Scholars have routinely missed the way the *iamata* conspicuously flag themselves as texts and suppliants as readers: what we might, for want of something better, term their “metapoetic” character. Indeed, the doublet of the first two narratives of the first *stèle* offers a neat example of the indeterminacy which characterizes the corpus.¹⁰⁴ The first *iama* (A1) does so by quoting the metrical dedication from which the tale was originally extracted, transforming it into a programmatic statement about the stories to follow.¹⁰⁵ After suffering an extraordinary five year pregnancy, a certain woman, named Kleo, incubates and delivers a healthy, five year old boy outside the *temenos*. *Iama* A1 continues that:

τυχοῦσα δὲ τούτων ἐπὶ τὸ ἄνθεμα ἐπεγράψατο· οὐ μέγε[θο]ς πίνακος θαυμαστέον, ἀλλὰ
τὸ θεῖον, | πένθ’ ἔτη ὡς ἐκύησε ἐγ γαστρὶ Κλεῶ βάρως, ἔστε | ἐγκατεκοιμάθη καὶ μιν
ἔθηκε ὑγιῆ.

Having obtained these things she inscribed upon her votive, “It is not the size of the pinax that is marvelous, but the divine, since Kleo carried her pregnancy for five years, until she incubated and the god made her healthy.”

This, significantly, is the only formally “embedded” inscription within the *iamata*, citing itself precisely as a written record (note, too, that it retains its hexametric rhythm, and so was likely inspired by an actual votive which had been dedicated in the sanctuary).¹⁰⁶ More importantly, however, the inscription gives the reader instructions. One must not marvel (θαυμαστέον) at the

¹⁰⁴ See, again, LiDonnici 1995 for the ordering of the *stelai*. We know the A *stèle* was the initial stone as it begins with a double header reading: ΘΕΟΣ ΤΥΧΑ ΑΓΑΘΑ | ΙΑΜΑΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΣΚΛΑΠΙΟΥ (God Good Fortune | the cures of Apollo and Asklepios). For the role of Apollo in the sanctuary, see the following chapter, but only Asklepios is specified within the *iamata* narratives themselves (only, however, at A2 and A10).

¹⁰⁵ See n. 79 regarding LiDonnici’s numbering system.

¹⁰⁶ LiDonnici 1995: 24-5.

size (μέγεθος) of the plaque (πίναξ), but at the magnitude of the numinous (τὸ θεῖον). Of course, within the context of a single votive inscription, this could read as a self-effacing apology for the inequality of exchange—a small inscribed votive in thanks for miraculous healing seems like a bad deal for the god.

However, because of the organization of the *stèle*, this “inscription” functions also as the *clausula* of the first in a long series of tales inscribed on an actually monumental *pinax*, and so the command has another meaning with a wider scope of reference, one that highlights the marvelous aspect of the divine epiphanies to follow. As the suppliant reads on, the divine will be characterized by its ability to surprise and to operate beyond comprehension, even as the process of reading and exchanging stories necessarily creates and shapes its own sets of narrative rhythms and expectations. Indeed, it is perhaps not wholly idle to note here that, within the Hippocratic corpus, *thauma* is only used in negative constructions to convey a sequence following logic and the inferential expectations of the author, (i.e. it is “no marvel” that x phenomenon follows y, given that z).¹⁰⁷ Against the mechanical order assumed and imposed by Hippocratic scopic regimes upon the material body, the *iamata* begin by highlighting the surprising and unpredictable forms of Asklepios’ interventions.

This is borne out by the following three tales A2-A4. A2 shows what LiDonnici terms an “amplification”—reduplication of previous material with elaboration—of A1.¹⁰⁸ Like the first tale, we find Asklepios curing a woman who had endured another multi-year pregnancy (A2):

¹⁰⁷ See *Coac.* 80.2; *Genit.* 11.6; 44.19; 47.1; *Cord.* 6. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 589f-92e for the retelling of “*thaumasia*” seen in the Trophonion at Lebadeia (for which, see Appendix *infra*).

¹⁰⁸ LiDonnici 1995: 57.

Ἰθμονίκα Πελλανίς ἀφίκετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ὑπὲρ γενεᾶς. ἐγ[κατακοι]μαθεῖσα δὲ ὄψιν εἶδε· ἐδόκει αἰτεῖσθαι τὸν θεὸν κυῆσαι κό[ραν]. τὸν δ' Ἀσκλαπιὸν φάμεν ἔγκυον ἐσσεῖσθαι νιν, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο α[ἰτ]οῖτο, καὶ τοῦτό οἱ ἐπιτελεῖν, αὐτὰ δ' οὐθενὸς φάμεν ἔτι ποιδε[ῖ]σθαι. ἔγκυος δὲ γενομένα ἐγ γαστρὶ ἐφόρει τρία ἔτη, ἔστε παρέβαλε ποὶ τὸν θεὸν ἰκέτις ὑπὲρ τοῦ τόκου· ἐγκατακοιμαθεῖσα δὲ ὄψ[ι]ν εἶδε· ἐδόκει ἐπερωτῆν νιν τὸν θεόν, εἰ οὐ γένοιτο αὐτᾶι πάντα ὅσσα αἰτήσαιτο καὶ ἔγκυος εἴη· ὑπὲρ δὲ τόκου ποιθέμεν νιν οὐθέν, καὶ ταῦτα πυνθανομένου αὐτοῦ, εἴ τις καὶ ἄλλου δέοιτο λέγειν, ὡς ποησοῦντος καὶ τοῦτο. ἐπεὶ δὲ νῦν ὑπὲρ τούτου παρείη ποτ' αὐτὸν ἰκέτις, καὶ τοῦτό οἱ φάμεν ἐπιτελεῖν. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο σπουδᾶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀβάτου ἐξελθοῦσα, ὡς ἔξω τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἦς, ἔτεκε κόραν.

Ithmonika of Pella arrived at the sanctuary in hopes of a family. Incubating, she saw a dream. She seemed to ask the god to have a girl. Asklepios said he would make her pregnant, and if there was anything else she wanted, he would accomplish this too, but she said she needed nothing else. She became pregnant and bore the child in her belly for three years, until she returned to the god a suppliant on behalf of child-birth. Incubating, she saw a dream. The god seemed to enquire whether she had not got all she asked and if she were pregnant. She had added nothing about *birth* when he had asked her to say whether she was in need of something else and that he would do it. As she was then present for that purpose as a suppliant, he said he would also do this. After the dream she quit the sanctuary with haste and, once outside, she gave birth to a girl.

Ithmonika, the suppliant in question, initially sought Asklepios' aid in conceiving as well as his help in delivering her child. After initially giving his assent, Asklepios enquires if there is anything else she desires. What ensues is perhaps a humorous, “careful what you wish for” conclusion in which Ithmonika does not think to ask to be delivered of her child. Wrongly, she had assumed that delivery was included in the deal, and so we meet her, having endured a three year pregnancy before returning to the *temenos* and incubating to come to term.¹⁰⁹

The cumulative effect of the two stories is telling. The first emphasizes the marvelous and unexpected nature of the divine, τὸ θεῖον. Yet it is followed by a story which neatly mirrors it, and therefore cannot be unexpected and so seems to diminish the marvelous. At the same time, however, the second story deviates from the details of the first in important ways. Not only does

¹⁰⁹ See, e.g., Martzavou 2012: 185 for the clarifying purpose of this tale.

it add the initial difficulty of conceiving, this difficulty foregrounds the fact that certain details or intentions are always left out in communicative interchange. There exists the expectation that the other party can and will supply or infer what one means from context and the information presented. The episode thus dramatizes the obstacles inherent in language as the (necessary) medium of conveying interior, subjective states and desires. The first two *iamata*, then, are not only a “reduplication” of the same source material. They are densely allusive and interactive, simultaneously confirming the regularity of Asklepios’ powers (he heals both, after all) and problematizing the formal means of representation (both verbal and textual). The *iamata* thus dramatize the mutually collaborative and interpretive aspects of the clinical encounter as discussed above. Ithmonika, and therefore the suppliant reader, is urged to be precise in formulating her requests about her body and desires. Implicitly this caution functions as a reflexive impulse for the reader to consider closely her own body and how best to express her own relationship to it.

Even as the *iamata* highlight their textual nature in this way, they also present the internal suppliants as readers, which has the complex effect of collapsing distinctions between the *iamata* and the bodies of their protagonists as objects to be read. Take, for instance, A3 and A4, another thematic pair. These are interesting because they focus upon two suppliants who dismiss or scorn what they read in the *iamata*. In the first we meet an unnamed man whose hand is severely crippled, with the exception of a single finger (A3):

ἀνήρ τοὺς τᾶς χηρὸς δακτύλους ἀκρατεῖς ἔχων πλὴν ἑνὸς ἀφίκετο ποῖ τὸν θεὸν ἰκέτας·
θεωρῶν δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἱαρωῖ πίνακας ἀπίσκει τοῖς ἰάμασιν καὶ ὑποδιέσυρε τὰ ἐπιγράμματα·
ἐγκαθεύδων δὲ ὄψιν εἶδε· ἐδόκει ὑπὸ τῷ ναῶι ἀστραγαλίζον[τ]ος αὐτοῦ καὶ
μέλλοντος βάλλειν τῷ ἀστραγάλωι, ἐπιφανέντα [τ]ὸν θεὸν ἐφαλέσθαι ἐπὶ τὰν χῆρα καὶ
ἐκτεῖναί οὐ τοὺς δακτύλλους· ὥς δ’ ἀποβαίη, δοκεῖν συγκάμψας τὰν χῆρα καθ’ ἕνα

ἐκτείνειν τῶν δακτύλων· ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντας ἐξευθύναι, ἐπερωτῆν νιν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἔτι ἀπιστησοῖ τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν πινάκων τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν, αὐτὸς δ' οὐ φάμεν. "ὅτι τοίνυν ἔμπροσθεν ἀπίστεις αὐτο[ῖ]ς οὐκ ἐοῦσιν ἀπίστοις, τὸ λοιπὸν ἔστω τοι," φάμεν, "Ἄπιστος ὄν[ομα]". ἀμέρας δὲ γενομένης ὑγιῆς ἐξῆλθε.

A man arrived as a suppliant to the god with a crippled hand, except one finger. Seeing the inscriptions (*pinakes*) within the sanctuary he did not believe in the cures and derided what was written. But, having fallen asleep, he saw a dream: he seemed to be casting knucklebones below the temple and, as he was about to throw the bones, the god appeared and grasped his hand, stretching out his fingers. When the god left, the man seemed to bend his hand and stretch out his fingers one by one. When all were straightened, the god asked him if he still disbelieved the things inscribed around the sanctuary, and he said "no." The god responded, "Since before you discredited the things which are not incredible, *you* will henceforth be known as Incredible!" When it became day he left healthy.

The illness is relatively unremarkable and, like A2, the story's purpose seems clearly a cautionary one.¹¹⁰ The man does not wholly trust what he reads, and so derides the efficacy of the cures. Asklepios heals him, but renames the man "Untrustworthy" as a punishment. Thus, the man is cured but chastened for his transgressions all the same. The following story (A4) adheres to much the same pattern. It too features a doubter who is reprovved for sneering at the *iamata* as "incredible and impossible" (ἀπίθανα καὶ ἀδύνατα), yet who is ultimately healed. There the suppliant is required to dedicate a silver pig as a "memorial of her ignorance" (ὑπόμνημα τῆς ἀμαθίας). This second "pairing" may therefore be interpreted as an anticipatory response to the extraordinary *thaumata* of multi-year pregnancies with which the *iamata* began and, indeed, the

¹¹⁰ The *iamata* are shot through with cases of disability, many much more severe: for blindness see A4, A9, A11, A18, A20, B2, B12, C22, D3 (likely); paralysis A15, A16, A17 (partial), B16, B17, C21 (legs); dumbness A5, C1, C14(?).

third and fourth tales have been read as a check on any incredulity caused by the miraculous nature of the first two.¹¹¹

Attention to A3's narrative gaps and symbolic repertoire, however, reveals a set of more nuanced and sophisticated operations at work which again recruit the suppliant reader into the activity of *making sense*, and which extend beyond the primary level of apprehending plot. Take the details of the dream itself. In the first place, the dream is notable for the way it reworks the suppliant's crippled hand and elevates it into the primary register of its imagery and meaning. The playing of 'knucklebones' (ἀστραγαλίζω), for instance, has a clear symbolic significance for a man whose hand is paralyzed.

The act of casting knucklebones, moreover, is richly layered and culturally patterned. *Astragaloi* have been used as popular burial goods and game-pieces across almost all cultures, from Bronze Age Near-Eastern societies to the indigenous North American cultures of this millennium.¹¹² The Greeks often depicted knucklebones on vases, both in the context of the games played by heroic figures like Achilles and Ajax, as well as in post-kill sacrificial contexts.¹¹³ Indeed, the many finds of *astragaloi* in Greek sanctuaries¹¹⁴ confirm the ritual utility

¹¹¹ Dillon 1994; Naiden 2005; Martzavou 2012. All authors, in some fashion or another, assume an authorial function behind the composition of the text together and sets of aims for individual tales (see esp. Martzavou 2012: 178). My argument underscores the undetermined nature of the text and I suggest that if there is a unified "purpose" it is rather the creation of a regulated but open field of signification to which suppliants could fruitfully correlate their individual experience.

¹¹² Gilmour 1997.

¹¹³ Bundrick 2014.

¹¹⁴ Cf. *astragaloi* at the oracle of Didyma and the huge (nearly 200 kg) bronze *astragaloi* discovered at Susa, which were probably originally also from Didyma (Parke 1985; Greaves 2012), and at Kition on Cyprus. Gilmour 1997 lists the sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania in the Athenian Agora and on Delos; Bundrick 2014: 682 n. 131 mentions finds at the sanctuary of Demeter-Kore on Acrocorinth and Isthmia, of Artemis Orthia at Sparta, of Apollo at Halieis, Artemis at Ephesos, and thousands of *astragaloi* discovered in the Korykeion cave at Delphi. For *astragaloi* used by merchants within small shrines outside the agora in later antiquity, see Graf 2005. That knucklebones were widely used within the confines of sanctuaries is thus clear, but whether they were always, or even mostly, used in *astragolomanteia* we cannot be sure.

of these bones in practicing a form of *cleromancy*—a method of divination whereby decisions about the future were made by consulting the complex arrangement or ‘allotment’ (κλήροϛ) of knucklebones rolled like dice.¹¹⁵

The semantic potential of the dream’s images ramifies into a rich cluster of possible narratives. One sees a man simply passing the time with a game of knucklebones, the sort of activity which recalls the daily rhythms and bored interludes which are the privilege of the healthy. Alternatively, we find an epic figure, drawn from the games’ visual-mythic associations. Within such a scenario, the suppliant is invited to compare the man with the heroic figures of the epic past. As a historical touchstone, this reading might endow the suppliant’s own suffering with an exaggerated or outsized significance, refashioning pain and illness as a conduit to meaningful collective memory. A simple game of knucklebones thus summons a history of heroic pain and endurance. Such mythological assimilation is potent because the aitiological frameworks of such tales were familiar and ready to hand. That is, heroic suffering occurred for specific, established, and widely understood reasons and so offered a baseline for the interpretation of pain and illness which seems to hold no cause or purpose within the moment of its striking.¹¹⁶

Or perhaps the story shows the man, who had derided the *iamata* accounts, dreaming of a different mode of medical consultation altogether. This is an especially tantalizing possibility, for it transforms the content of the dream itself into a thickly layered interrogation of the process of divine signification and its relation to the sick body. Cleromancy, as recent studies have shown, was not necessarily limited to strict “yes” and “no” responses to a suppliant’s enquiry (unlike

¹¹⁵ For *astragaloι* in divination see Neils 1992; Graf 2005; Eidinow 2007; Greaves 2012; Parker 2015.

¹¹⁶ For the relation between medicine and heroic suffering: Worman 2000; Kosak 2004. Sophocles’ *Philoctetes* offers the paradigmatic example of the social exile of pain and sickness and the difficulties of social reintegration.

Hippocratic interrogation!). Rather, through sophisticated combinatorial readings based on the values given to the sides of the *astragalos*—much like numbering on modern dice—cleromantic exegesis could yield solutions and answers to a complex and wide-ranging body of concerns.¹¹⁷

Interestingly, there is no evidence that cleromancy was practiced at Asklepieia. While Asklepios occasionally gave quasi-oracular responses, the dreams and narrative therapies performed there focus more prominently upon action in the present.¹¹⁸ Further, despite its clear magico-religious allegiances, mantic activity could seem to resemble Hippocratic prognosis in its methods and claims.¹¹⁹ Both relied on the careful and learned interpretation of various classes of signs in order to make authoritative claims about future events. Indeed, self-described practitioners of *iatrike* were often on the defensive about their apparent similarity. These authors were quick to distinguish their methods, aims, and the reproducibility of their results from that of the seer or *mantis*.¹²⁰

Regardless of whether this was meant as an implicit critique of alternative methods of health-care consultation, the reflexive quality of the scenario is again significant. The man in A3

¹¹⁷ Paus. 7.25.10 describes the practice at an Achaean shrine of Herakles Bouraikos. After the enquirer cast the *astragaloi*, he or she interpreted their roll by means of an nearby *pinax* which explained the meanings of all the possible configurations of the dice. This meant that it was not only the total numerical value which carried meaning, but the precise combination of values represented on each *astragalos*. See also Artem. *Oneir.* 2.69 and Cic. *De div.* 2.85 for disparaging elite attitudes towards lot oracles as forms of “false” divination.

¹¹⁸ Cf. B4 and C3, but neither case addresses an illness. See the Appendix for the complicated question of healing and oracular consultation at other cults.

¹¹⁹ Cf. the claim in *Epid.* 1.5 and *Prog.* 1, that the doctor should “say what has happened before, know what is occurring now, and give an account before hand of what is to come” (λέγειν τὰ προγεγόμενα· γιγνώσκειν τὰ παρεόντα· προλέγειν τὰ ἐσόμενα·). Compare, too the statement at [Hipp.] *Ep.* 15.32 that *iatrike* and *mantike* are related arts, as they are both the offspring of Apollo, followed by a paraphrase of the Hippocratic line just quoted.

¹²⁰ E.g. *Acut.* 9; *Aff.* 1 and 3; *Prorrh.* 2.1. But see *Vict.* 1.12 for a more lenient approach and 4.2 where the author proclaims that certain *mantic* practices are valid in the realm of dream interpretation. These dream signs are unlike the *iamata* in that they operate with a strict and narrow symbolic logic (i.e. if you see x, y will happen) which can be apprehended and taught as a *techne*. Literature on the relationship between medical prognosis and divination is, by now, ample, especially within the Near Eastern context in which the overlap is considerably more extensive—see chap. 4. See also Edelstein 1967; van der Eijk 2004; Flower 2008; Nutton 2013: 114.

is presented as a reader in multiple ways: First as a reader of the *iamata* themselves, which he dismisses, but also as a reader of the *astragaloι*. Both present him in the attempt to discover some meaning for his illness. More than this, he is the protagonist of a dream cure which is itself symbolically open and subject to multiple interpretative schemes applied by the exterior, suppliant reader. Even as the “cautionary” message of the *iama* is clear—one should take seriously the gods’ power—the *iama* simultaneously deploys a strategy of subjective multiplicity to confront the problem that the variety of individual experience might exert on finding meaning for one’s own suffering within the experiences of others.

A17 presents another complex case which, like A2 and A3 forecloses a singular and direct explanation of events as a way of productively commenting upon experiential variety. In this instance, a man with a suppurating toe nods off on a temple bench and is healed by one of Asklepios’ sacred snakes (A17):¹²¹

ἀνήρ δάκτυλον ἰάθη ὑπὸ ὄφιοσ· οὗτος τὸν τοῦ ποδὸς δάκτυλον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγρίου ἔλκεος δεινῶς διακείμενος μεθήμερα ὑπὸ τῶν θεραπόντων ἐξενειχθεὶς ἐπὶ ἐδράματός τινος καθίζε· ὕπνου δέ νιν λαβόντος ἐν τούτῳ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ ἀβάτου ἐξελθὼν τὸν δάκτυλον ἰάσατο τᾷ γλώσσῃ καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσας εἰς τὸ ἄβατον ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν· ἐξεγερθεὶς δὲ ὡς ἦς ὑγίης, ἔφα ὅψιν ἰδεῖν, δοκεῖν νεανίσκον εὐπρεπῆ τὰμ μορφὰν ἐπὶ τὸν δάκτυλον ἐπιπῆν φάρμακον.

A man’s toe was healed by a snake. A man suffering terribly from a savage abscess on his toe, was borne out (of the abaton) during the day by attendants and sat on a bench. While a dream overtook him, a snake crawled out from the *abaton* and healed his toe with its tongue. Having done that, it slithered back into the abaton. Waking from this healthy, he said that he had a dream and it seemed a handsome young man had rubbed a drug on his toe.

This story is striking not least because it copies, in textual form, almost exactly the visual “narrative” of an early fourth century votive-relief discovered in the sanctuary of Amphiaraos at

¹²¹ One thinks again of Sophocles’ *Philoctetes*, with the hero’s crippling foot wound, his daytime paroxysms of pain leading to sleep, the important role played by snakes, and the ultimate cure by the young sons of Asklepios.



Fig. 1. Archinos relief. National Museum, Athens 3369 (=IG II² 4394).

Oropos (fig. 1).¹²² This, the well-known Archinos relief, likewise depicts a double-epiphanic cure. On the right side of the votive, in low relief, the dedicant Archinos appears to incubate while a snake gently bites or licks his shoulder clean. The left side of the relief shows Archinos standing while the hero Amphiaraios (visually identical to Asklepios here) tends to the same shoulder. The use of relief to organize the levels of representation pushes the “real” cure—the incubation, which can be observed and confirmed by others—to the back of the scene while foregrounding the private experience of the god’s intervention as the more immediate and “truer”

¹²² See van Straten 1981: 124; 1995: 124-5 with bibliography; 2000: 200; Bravo 2004; Platt 2012: 44f.

experience. At the same time, the theriomorphic cure seems the more fantastical one and so is worthy of remembrance with a handsome votive dedication. As Verity Platt notes, there is a complex play of representational levels here, designed to trouble the ontological and phenomenological relationship of epiphanic healing.¹²³ The *iama* not only tells the same story, it simulates this effect and the “confusion” it provokes almost exactly. There the man’s “real-life” cure is achieved in an awesome way by Asklepios’ theriomorphic avatar, but within the waking world of the sanctuary and is apparently “seen” by the narrator of the *iama*. Meanwhile within the oneiric epiphany the god simply applies a salve (*pharmakon*), as any mortal physician might, and just as Amphiaraos touches Archinos’ shoulder in the relief. Like the previous narratives we have encountered, this seemingly straightforward *iama* subtly worries at the limits of representation by rebuffing a single definitive account of events.¹²⁴ Both votive relief and *iama* confront the viewer with a symbolically excessive epiphany that emphasizes the multiplicity of subject positions within the single framework of the divine cure.

The second *stèle* features fewer such cases, but they occupy programmatic positions where they occur. B1 features a young dropsical girl who is too sick to travel, and so her mother makes the journey from Lacedaimonia to incubate on her daughter’s behalf. After a gruesome dream of decapitation by which Asklepios “drains” the girl of her excess fluids, the mother

¹²³ Platt 2012: 45-6 (and her n. 42 for recognition of the similarity with *iama* A17). We might add still a third representational level by including the depiction of a *pinax* in the furthest background, as well as the pair of eyes which surmount the votive’s outer frame. This creates an emphasis on the visual relationship between the viewer and the divine (whose eyes, exactly, do they represent?) while simultaneously conceding the materiality of the whole representation through the inclusion of the blank *pinax* in the background (*pace* van Straten 2000, for whom the depiction of votives within a votive is not reflexive, but simply “sets the scene” as in the healing sanctuary).

¹²⁴ See *NM* 3526 (= *IG* II² 4387) for the Lysimachides votive, which likewise bears a complex relationship between the event it commemorates and the visual “fidelity” of that event’s representation. See van Straten 1981: 113 and 2000: 203.

returns home, only to find that her daughter had experienced the exact same dream.¹²⁵ Like A17, there is a false simplicity which implicates differences of perspective, interpretation, and agency. The *iama* tells us that the young girl Arata “saw the very same dream” (τὸ αὐτὸ ἐνύπνιον ὠρακῦϊαν), yet the dream as it is told is that of the mother’s perspective. Logically, this implies either that Arata dreamt the same *events*, but from her own perspective—with the rather more terrifying, additional element of *being* decapitated—or that she experienced the dream “outside” her own body watching it as an object of the god’s attention, just as a reader might. The *iama* thus invites us to imagine Arata as *she* experienced the dream, as if she, like the suppliant reader, were inserting herself into the collection of narratives. These indeterminacies are significant because they are precisely the entry points that invite the reader in.

Moreover, Arata’s story develops important themes which are echoed and reconfigured in later stories. Shortly thereafter, in B3, we meet Aristagora, who undergoes a similar decapitation and then appears to walk about the day-time sanctuary headless, again (re)confusing the boundaries between waking world and dream epiphany.¹²⁶ Indeed, these surgical interventions are regular, as in A13 (the only surgery in the *A stele*), B3, B5, and B7, all of which are affiliated by affinities of pathology, style, and language.¹²⁷ We even encounter another (fragmentary) affliction of dropsy.¹²⁸ Finally, the story establishes an interest in the theme of travel and

¹²⁵ See Wickkiser 2008: 47 for the assertion that this *iama* is influenced by humoral theory. In a forthcoming article I argue that it is not influenced *directly* by humoral theory, so much as by a cultural substratum shared by both forms of medical practice which saw women’s bodies as moister than men’s.

¹²⁶ This particular *iama* has, evidently, a complex history, as Aelian reports the fifth century historiographer Hippys of Rhegium told a nearly identical story (Ael. *NA* 9. 33=*BNJ* 554 F2). Whether this evinces a layer of widely circulated folk-traditions which underlay both “lay” and “temple” recordings is still a matter of dispute. See Longo 1991; LiDonnici 1995: 72-76.

¹²⁷ So A13 τὰ στέρνα μαχαίραι ἀνσχίσαντα τὰς δεμελέας ἐξελεῖν...συνράψαι; B3 ἀνσχίσσας τὰς κοιλίαν τὴν αὐτᾶς ἐξελεῖν...συρρῦσαι; B5 τὰς κοιλίαν αὐτᾶς ἀνσχίσσας ἐξαίρει...συνράψας; B7 Ἀσκληπιὸν ἀνσχίσαντα τὰς κοιλίαν ἐκταμῖν τὸ ἔλκος καὶ συρράψαι. Thus the principal verbs of surgical resection and repair are nearly identical.

¹²⁸ C6 (interestingly, another young girl).

importance of sacred mobility in the process of healing, reduplicated at B4, B5, B13, C2, C3, C4, C10(?), C11(?), C13(?), C18, and C20. Indeed, while the C *stèle* is in bad shape on the whole, what comes through with startling clarity is the importance of maritime travel in creating a thematic thread for these later tales.¹²⁹ Yet, despite the lattice work of internal allusion, formulaic scenarios, and language, like the troubled status of the man's daytime cure and Arata's own dream, none of these are precise and reliable copies. They create models and *topoi* only to undermine or abandon them, creating space for the god's interventions to surprise and the suppliant imaginatively to insert their own bodies into the composition of the text.

If the act of reading the *iamata* implicates both the "real" suppliants and the narrative protagonists in the act of reading the body for clues about their states, certain of these tales go still further in representing the "sick" body itself literally as a textual object with social meanings encoded directly upon it. Such cases bring us nearer to understanding the way in which health and healing were socially and culturally constituted within the space of the healing sanctuary (and without). Indeed, at A6 and A7 we find cases which are not "physical" pathologies at all, but foreground skin and flesh as textual surfaces. A6 tells the story of a Thessalian named Pandaros, who approaches Asklepios in order to rid himself of tattoos (*στίγματα*) which disfigure his face and very likely identify him as a slave.¹³⁰ Indeed, as a rule in the Graeco-Roman world, tattooing was a sign of "social degradation," used almost exclusively to mark or punish slaves.¹³¹

¹²⁹ While the A and B *stelai* record suppliants from all over the Greek world, the C *stèle* may thus correspond to a more active period of overseas "colonization" during the fourth century (cf. *I.Cr.* I.xvii.8.7 and I.xvii.10.3-8 for what is probably a maritime *ktistis* narrative in the nature of B13; see further Chapter Three).

¹³⁰ For Pandaros' history, see Perdrizet 1911; LiDonnici 1995. For the full survey of *stigmata* as tattoos (especially associated with tattooing the faces of slaves) in antiquity, see Jones 1987; see also Holmes 2010a. For Asklepieia as popular locations of manumission in later antiquity, see Wickkiser 2010.

¹³¹ Jones 1987: 143-6. Although in later antiquity pilgrims of Isis also tattooed themselves, a practice which continued well through the Christian Middle Ages and beyond.

The body in this *iama* is thus explicitly one upon which Greek cultural codes and relations of power have been written (inscribed) directly. As a slave, Pandaros' alienation from his own body has been rendered symptomatic by the appearance of his face. That he could be "healed" of these *stigmata* is in itself extremely revealing about the way that healing was socially constructed in the Greek world, but in so doing also reveals the extent to which the sick and healthy body bore particular meanings correlated to social status. Indeed, just as Homeric epic reviles the bodily and verbal disfigurement of the lowly Thersites, so too Pandaros' tattoos offer a ready made if crude marker of his "slavishness," and both flag the ways in which culture and ideology can settle upon the skin.¹³²

The Hippocratic physician and Pandaros' tattoos therefore share the notion that the body conveyed information which correlated social status and ethical behavior. At the cult of Asklepios, however, there exists the promise that this inscribed body can be wiped clean and reconstituted through proper ritual mechanisms.¹³³ In an act that seems again calculated to exploit the ambiguous symbolism of oneiric epiphany, Asklepios uses *ταινία*, which indicates either the "sacred fillet" typically worn by priests, suppliants, and athletic victors;¹³⁴ or a medical bandage¹³⁵ used to wrap Pandaros' forehead.¹³⁶ The god then instructs him not to remove the

¹³² See the pseudo-Aristotelian work *Physiognomics* (and Holmes 2010a) for an attempt to work out in an empirically predictive way the correspondences between bodily signs and ethical character.

¹³³ Herein, I suspect, lies the popularity of Asklepieia as sites of manumission during the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. Wickkiser 2010 also ties the two to changes in status, from sickness to health and slavery to freedom.

¹³⁴ LiDonnici 1995: 91.

¹³⁵ Edelsteins 1945. I would suggest we are encouraged to see it as both. When wrapped around Pandaros' forehead the usage resembles the "medical." By dedicating the *tainia* within the sanctuary after his cure the cloth is transformed into its "sacred" form. This also helps us to see the complications inherent in regarding "medical materials" dedicated within sanctuaries as evidence for the presence of doctors. See above.

¹³⁶ Jones 1987 collects the later Roman recipes for the removal of tattoos: these often involved astringents applied by a bandage.

bands until he has left the temple. On leaving, Pandaros unwraps the bandages to discover that the marks—now described as letters, *grammata*,—have come away from his forehead and have been transferred onto the cloth instead. Pandaros dedicates the *tainia* to the god and quits the temple precinct.

If the impulse of a certain class of Greeks was to codify a reliable moral semiotics onto the body, Pandaros' *stigmata* constitute a point of resistance to just such a somatization of ideology.¹³⁷ Ritual cleanses the physical signs of Pandaros' social marginality and he exits the sanctuary with a redefined role bearing with it new possibilities of social agency. If we understand the phenomena of health and illness to correlate bodily states to degrees of social inclusion, the message of A6 is clear: ritual healing is as much about the “normalization” of the socially marginalized body as about its physiological health.¹³⁸ And again, A6's linguistic choices gesture beyond the boundaries of the stone inscription to an external audience of readers. The suppliant readers thus encounter Pandaros' body as doubly inscribed, both *with* and *as* text. Moreover, the transformation of the signs from *stigmata* to written *grammata*, when transferred from the medium of the body to the medium of the cloth registers the mobility of bodily signification. These lexical transformations highlight the interpretive activities that the suppliant is already engaged in, reading about the experiences which befall other bodies and the ways in which those experiences define them as persons.

¹³⁷ Cf. Holmes 2010a for the practical difficulties in moving from the level of theory to practice in inscribing ideology on the body.

¹³⁸ See Edwards 1997 for “role functionality” and disability in antiquity.

In fact, this is not the last we hear of these roving and unfixed *stigmata/grammata*. Reading on we find that these marks commute to the next tale.¹³⁹ In A7 Echedoros, to whom Pandaros had entrusted dedicatory money for Asklepios and Athena, attempts to cheat the gods their due.¹⁴⁰ On arriving in Epidauros, Echedoros incubates and is confronted by Asklepios. The god enquires whether Echedoros has brought anything for him from Pandaros, which Echedoros denies, adding that, if the god heals him, he will himself dedicate an “inscribed image” (ἀνθησεῖν οἱ εἰκόνα γραψάμενος). The lie is obvious to the god, however, and Asklepios punishes Echedoros in a way that plays both on his physical condition and the semantics of his promise. Asklepios again appears to tie a bandage around Echedoros’ forehead. But this turns out to be Pandaros’ old head-dressings, which in fact transfer onto Echedoros’ face Pandaros’ tattoos. In a final ironic reversal Echedoros thus winds up “dedicating” an inscribed image. Only, instead of inscribing an image like an anatomical votive or plaque, it is his own body, now doubly inscribed (γραψάμενος), that is “dedicated” as a memorial of his encounter with the god. As Echedoros failed to live up to his first promise, Asklepios ensures that he will fulfill the second, even if it

¹³⁹ LiDonnici 1995: 26 points out that this “pair” may originally have been a single story, elaborated over the course of time in the sanctuary. Among other reasons for thinking so, there is no *vacat* separating the two, as in earlier narratives.

¹⁴⁰ A7: Ἐχέδωρος τὰ Πανδά[ρου στίγματα ἔλ]αβε ποῖ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν. οὗτος λαβὼν παρ [Πανδάρου χρήματα], ὥστ’ ἀνθέμεν τῷ θεῷ εἰς Ἐπίδαυρον ὑπὲρ αὐ[τοῦ], [οὐκ] ἀπεδίδου ταῦτα· ἐγκαθεύδων δὲ ὄψιν εἶδε· ἐδόκει οἱ ὁ θε[ὸς] ἐπιστάς ἐπερωτῆν νιν, εἰ ἔχει τινὰ χρήματα παρ Πανδάρου εἰς Ἀθηνῶν ἄνθεμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· αὐτὸς δ’ οὐ φάμεν λελαβήκειν οὐθε[ν] τοιοῦτον παρ’ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ’ αἶ κα ὑγιῆ νιν ποιῆσαι, ἀνθησεῖν οἱ εἰκόνα γραψάμενος· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸν θεὸν τὰν τοῦ Πανδάρου ταινίαν περιδῆσαι περὶ τὰ στίγματά οὐ καὶ κέλεσθαί νιν, ἐπεὶ κα ἐξέλεθι ἐκ τοῦ ἀβάτου, ἀφελόμενον τὰν ταινίαν ἀπονίψασθαι τὸ πρόσωπον ἀπὸ τῆς κράνας καὶ ἐγκατοπτρίζασθαι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ· ἀμέρας δὲ γενομένης ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἀβάτου τὰν ταινίαν ἀφήλετο, τὰ γράμματα οὐκ ἔχουσαν· ἐγκαθιδὼν δὲ εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ ἑώρη τὸ αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον ποῖ τοῖς ἰδίοις στίγμασιν καὶ τὰ τοῦ Πανδ<ά>ρου γράμματα λελαβηκός.

Echedoros got the tattoos of Pandaros in addition to the ones he already had. He took money from Pandaros to dedicate for him to Asklepios in Epidauros, but he did not do it. Incubating he saw a dream. The god seemed to appear to him and ask whether he had monies from Pandaros as dedications for Athena in the sanctuary. He said he’d taken no such thing from him, but if the god should make him healthy, he would dedicate to him an inscribed image. After this the god wrapped his tattoos with Pandaros’ *tainia*, instructing him to take off the bandage when he left the sanctuary and to wash his face in the spring and peer into the water. When it became day he left the *abaton* and removed the *tainia* which had no marks. Looking down into the water he saw on his face both his original tattoos and the “letters” of Pandaros.

means in ways the man did not intend. Ultimately, then, if A6 emphasized the way ritual healing could erase and renew the “text” of the body, A7 underscores the importance of proper ethical comportment to achieve that renewal as well as the embodied nature of social relations more widely.

The Social Body

Yet it is not these cases alone that situate the body amidst social and ethical considerations. Of all the *iamata*, it is perhaps those concentrating on women who incubate for the sake of childbirth that implicate bodily health in social relations most vividly and totally. On the one hand, this is clear as the issue of childbirth places the body at the center of a domestic and familial structure. But on another level, this is because the correspondence between the physiological “problem” of infertility and the related question of personal responsibility is created by socio-cultural norms. In this case the Greeks avoided identifying men as the responsible party in issues of pregnancy more widely, and so, as I have discussed elsewhere, it is exclusively women who enter the temple seeking help for childlessness.¹⁴¹ To that end, the *iamata* in fact overwhelmingly present women either as potential mothers seeking to fulfill their socially teleological role of giving birth to (male) children or focus on the womb/belly as the obscure and difficult source of female ailments.¹⁴² Indeed, those women supplicating the god for childbirth make up the slim majority of female worshippers (A1, A2, B11, B14, B19, B21, B22) within the first two *stelai*, and display a marked narrative homogeneity by comparison to other

¹⁴¹ Flemming 2013: 517f. For cases which focus on women’s interiors, see B1 (Arata above), B3, B5, B21, C6. Of the first two *stelai*, only A4 (Ambrosia) does not suffer from an internal ailment.

¹⁴² For the womb’s role in women’s illnesses, principally as a physiological “solution” to their moister and looser flesh, see, e.g., *Mul.* 1 (8. 1 Li.); Dean Jones 1994: 69-77; King 1998.

tales.¹⁴³ Women’s illnesses, therefore, tend to focus upon their agency in the generation of the next line of family members or group of citizens, as well as male anxieties around this fact. Ultimately, healing—becoming pregnant—means the reclamation of this important social position and a “return” to socially expected roles.

The *iamata* are not limited to gender partitions in portraying their subjects as social agents. The protagonists appear in other ways which suggest that their cures are coterminous with the restitution of social interaction, sometimes as it fits into the immediate structure of the family unit—but not exclusively. For instance, B4 describes a lost boy and his father’s efforts to find him by enlisting the god’s aid. In this somewhat obscure tale, it seems the boy has swum into a cave from which he can find no escape.¹⁴⁴ After days of fruitless searching, his father incubates and, learning from Asklepios where his son is, tunnels into the cave to rescue the boy. In that tale the “healing” consists entirely in the making whole of a fragmented family, and so perhaps recalls something of Arata and her mother’s experiences.¹⁴⁵ At the same time, we can perhaps see in it a powerful metaphor for the experience of illness in its isolation, loneliness, and fear. The joy of the cure is the joy of rejoining one’s family and friends. So too A5 tells another

¹⁴³ The C *stèle* appears to break this pattern, however, as it begins with two female suppliants who suffer from disabilities (a mute girl and an apparently cancerous tumor, respectively), but given the fragmentary nature of the following tales it is difficult to say anything definitive.

¹⁴⁴ B4: ὕπ[ὸ π]έτραι παῖς Ἀριστόκριτος Ἀλικός· οὗτος ἀποκολυμ[βάσ]ας εἰς τὰν θά[λασ]σαν ἔπειτα δενδρύων εἰς τόπον ἀφίκετο ξηρόν, κύκ[λωι] πέτραις περ[ιεχό]μενον, καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἔξοδον οὐδεμίαν εὐρεῖν. [με]τὰ δὲ τοῦτο ὁ πατ[ὴρ α]ὐτοῦ, ὡς οὐθαμεί περιετόγγανε μαστεύων, παρ’ [Ἀ]σκλαπιῶι ἐν τῷ ἀ[βάτ]ωι ἐνεκάθευδε περὶ τοῦ παιδὸς καὶ ἐνύπνιον εἶ[λ]δε· ἐδόκει αὐτὸν ὁ θε[ὸς] ἄγειν εἰς τινα χώραν καὶ δεῖξαι οἱ, δ[ι]ότι τουτ[ε]ῖ ἐστι ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. ἐξε[λθὼ]ν δ’ ἐκ τοῦ ἀβάτου καὶ λατομήσας τὰ[ν] πέτραν ἀ[ν]ηῦρε τὸμ παιῖδα ἐβδεμα[ῖ]ον.

Aristokritos a boy from Halieis, under a rock. The boy dove away into the ocean and staying under-water then arrived in a dry place completely surrounded by rocks and could find no exit. After this, his father, since he searched and could not find him anywhere, incubated before Asklepios in the abaton concerning his son and saw a dream. It seemed that the god lead him to some place and showed him where his son was. Leaving the abaton he bore through the rock and found his son on the seventh day.

¹⁴⁵ Compare C3 and C20 both of which focus on finding misplaced objects.

story about a young mute boy accompanied to the temple by his father.¹⁴⁶ As the temple attendant instructed the father to pay the temple fees within a year in the event of a successful cure, the boy spontaneously responds “I promise” (ὑποδέκομαι). In his astonishment, the father asks the boy to repeat himself and thereafter he is said to be healthy. More than even Pandaros and Echedoros’ tales, the act of entering into a mutual obligation with the god constitutes the cure itself. So in A8 another young boy suffering kidney stones is asked by the god what he will give in exchange for healing.¹⁴⁷ The young boy responds that he will give him ten *astragaloi* (recalling A3). Laughing, the god accepts the boy’s earnest offer, and says he will cure him. No description of the physical healing is offered, presenting the establishment of boy’s relationship with the god as the important and efficacious moment.

The significance of exchange as a marker of the return to normal forms of social relationships recurs again and again within the *iamata*. This is especially notable in those instances in which the god gives something to the suppliant, usually the object or source of their suffering. A12-14 (and, similarly, B10) presents a triad of such tales, in which the god removes various foreign objects—here a spearhead, leeches, and another kidney stone—and returns them

¹⁴⁶ A5: παῖς ἄφωνος. [οὗτος ἀφί]κετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ὑπὲρ φωνᾶς· ὡς δὲ προεθύσατο καὶ [ἐπόησε τὰ] νομιζόμενα, μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ παῖς ὁ τῷ θεῷ πυρφορῶν [ἐκέλετο, π]οι τὸμ πατέρα τὸν τοῦ παιδὸς ποτιβλέψας, ὑποδέκεσ[θαι αὐτὸν ἐ]νιαυτοῦ, τυχόντα ἐφ’ ἃ πάρεστι, ἀποθυσεῖν τὰ ἴατρα. [ὁ δὲ παῖς ἐξ]απίνας "ὑποδέκομαι", ἔφα· ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἐκπλαγεὶς πάλιν [ἐκέλετο αὐ]τὸν εἰπεῖν· ὁ δ’ ἔλεγε πάλιν· καὶ ἐκ τούτου ὑγιῆς ἐγένετο.

A mute boy. He arrived in the sanctuary for his voice. When he had made the preliminary sacrifices and done the accustomed things, the torchbearer for the god, looking at the boy’s father, bid him promise that if he got what he had come for, to pay the fee within a year. All of a sudden the boy said “I promise.” His father, astonished, bid him repeat himself, so he said it again. From this the boy was healthy.

¹⁴⁷ A8: Εὐφάνης Ἐπιδάυριος παῖς. οὗτος λιθιῶν ἐνε[κά]θευδε· ἔδοξε δὴ αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐπιστὰς εἰπεῖν· "τί μοι δωσεῖς, αἱ τῦκα ὑγιῆ ποιήσω;" αὐτὸς δὲ φάμεν "δέκ’ ἀστραγάλους". τὸν δὲ θεὸν γελάσαντα φάμεν νιν παυσεῖν· ἀμέρας δὲ γενομένης ὑγιῆς ἐξῆλθε.

Euphanes, an Epidaurian boy. Suffering from stone he incubated here. The god seemed to him to stand over him and say, “What will you give me if I should heal you?” The boy responded, “Ten dice.” The god, laughing, said he would make him stop (hurting). When it became day, the boy left healthy.

as mementos of the miraculous cure. Yet these tokens memorialize more than the awesome event of healing itself: like Aristides' literary (re)production of his sufferings, these objects materialize the relationship between suppliant and divinity, creating a touchstone transforming the experience of illness and pain into a meaningful one. The latter two tales in fact draw special attention to interpersonal interactions as they frame illness and cure. In the case of the kidney stone, the sufferer expels it during the climax of an oneiric sexual encounter with a handsome boy (which itself redeploys a frequent topos of the infertility cures).¹⁴⁸ The man afflicted by “leeches” is a somewhat more textured case.¹⁴⁹ After the god surgically removes the creatures from the man's chest and sows him back up, we are informed that they were secretly slipped into his drink by his stepmother.¹⁵⁰ Again, the leeches grossly commemorate the man's restoration to health through his relationship with the god. At the same time, this episode relies on widespread cultural associations around the homicidal tendencies of stepmothers towards their stepsons.¹⁵¹ The fascinating postscript thus suggests the way that sickness and health are (re)read through the

¹⁴⁸ A14: ἀνὴρ ἐν αἰδοίοι λίθον. οὗτος ἐνύπνιον εἶδε· ἐδόκει παιδί καλῶι συγγίνεσθαι, ἐξονειρώσσω δὲ τὸν λίθον ἐγβάλλει καὶ ἀνελόμενος ἐξῆλθε ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἔχων.

A man with kidney stone. He saw a dream. He seemed to be having sex with a handsome boy, and as he had an orgasm in his sleep he expelled it. Picking it up, he left holding it in his hands.

¹⁴⁹ A13: ἀνὴρ Τορωναῖος δεμελέας. οὗτος ἐγκαθεύδων ἐνύπνιον εἶδε· ἔδοξε οἱ τὸν θεὸν τὰ στέρνα μαχαίραι ἀνσχίσσαντα τὰς δεμελέας ἐξελεῖν καὶ δόμεν οἱ ἐς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συνράψαι τὰ στήθη· ἀμέρας δὲ γενομένης ἐξῆλθε τὰ θηρία ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἔχων καὶ ὑγιῆς ἐγένετο· κατέπιε δ' αὐτὰ δολωθεὶς ὑπὸ ματρυνῆς ἐγ κυκᾶνι ἐμβεβλημένας ἐκπιών.

A man from Torone, leeches. He incubated and saw a dream. It seemed to him that the god cut open his chest with a knife, removed the leeches, gave them into the man's hands, and sewed his chest together. When it was day, the man left holding the creatures in his hands and was healthy. He drunk them down, deceived by his stepmother who had slipped them into his potion.

¹⁵⁰ The word δεμελέας is attested only at Hsch. s.v. δεμελεῖς, which he reports as meaning βδέλλα, leeches or lamprey. Cf. Hdt. 2.68 for the exact phrase καταπίνειν τὰς βδέλλας, describing birds cleaning the mouths of crocodiles. See LiDonnici 1995: 95 n. 27 for the suggestion that δεμελεῖς is a dialectal form βδέλλας.

¹⁵¹ See Watson 1995: 20f. for the place of the wicked stepmother in Greek myth generally, and 1995: 56-7 for this *iama* in particular. Watson is more occupied with the historicity of the episode, namely whether the man was in fact poisoned by his stepmother, or simply blamed her after the fact, and not on its generic place within the corpus of cures.

lens of particular social arrangements in the aftermath of the episode itself. More broadly, the above cases illustrate the way that healing is marked by the return of forms of social agency and the restoration of the healed into normal modes of sociality.

In the end, however, we find that the social and ethical quality of healing is most vividly captured by those very stories which highlight their own narrativity and textuality. Again, I suggest that this is part of the ethically reflexive nature of reading the *iamata* as a suppliant. Recall again the punitive ending of A3, where the *hiketes* was renamed “Untrustworthy” or “Incredible” as a consequence of his own deep skepticism. There as well the conclusion suggests that “health” is not coextensive with the remedying of the man’s hand. Rather, the drama implies that therapy is deeply enmeshed in the bio-social.¹⁵² The man entered as one person and left, fundamentally, as another, a shift registered in the naming practices of the world outside the temple. In another ironic mirroring of events, it was the man, and not the *iamata*, who ended up literally lacking in credibility. Framed in this way, we can read Untrustworthy’s story as more than a simple folk-tale reversal of his suspicions towards the corpus of miracle cures: the man leaves the sanctuary sound of body, but this corporeal integrity comes at the price of his ability to move and act within the world outside the sanctuary. Like Ambrosia’s derisive laughter or Echedoros’ doubly tattooed face, Untrustworthy’s new name signals what kind of person he is. Though he exits the sanctuary in a state of health (ὄγυις ἐξῆλθε), this is a vision of *hygieia* which ironically cuts across that terms’ broader power to denote the vitality of a community’s

¹⁵² It has been variously acknowledged that ritual healing at Asklepieia involved social transition or transformation. This premise has either simply gone unchallenged, without pausing to question *how* ritual unifies the social and biological experience of healing (Wickkiser 2008; 2010) or has been unsatisfactorily interpreted through the overly-broad paradigms of, e.g. “rites du passage” (cf. Graf 1993) or “high intensity” rites (Ehrenheim 2011).

interpersonal unity and interdependence.¹⁵³ “Untrustworthy” can only be said to be healthy according to his corporeal wellbeing. The ending ultimately licenses us to read in this narrative a false certainty surrounding (Hippocratic) myths of corporeal sovereignty and individual *krateia*. The man, identified originally as *akrates*—that is, without power or mastery—leaves with that physical mastery restored. Yet because he refused to rely upon the collective testimony of a community of other sufferers his new name severs him from the possibility of communal relations within which that species of *krateia* possesses any ethical valence or value.

Similar punishments can be found strewn throughout the *iamata*, mostly as a consequence of transgressing sanctuary rules or mocking the god’s cures. As in A7, A11, B2 or B16, disciplinary action tends to be applied to the body in disabling ways, by blinding, tattooing or crippling. On the one hand, blinding and crippling offer powerful physiological insight to the ethical and social character of the suppliants in question. They are unable to control themselves (*akrates*) or are “blind” to the collective power of ritual and the immanence of the divine. C4 modifies this theme at some length, and though it is badly fragmented, it links the idea that the relationship with the god is represented through exchange and the notion that the body is an object of public scrutiny and evaluation in interesting ways. In this story we read about a fishmonger named Amphimnastos who boasted that he would tithe to Asklepios, but fails to

¹⁵³ See Chap. 1.

fulfill his promise.¹⁵⁴ In reprisal Asklepios either incinerates his fish with lightning or causes an animal to gnaw upon his body (either the fish themselves or mosquitos).¹⁵⁵ Whatever the form of the actual penalty, Amphimnastos is compelled to “confess” his mendacity in the crowded Tegean marketplace and is restored (again, either in body or fish). Strikingly, to this crowd Amphimnastos’ punishment appears as a spectacle, a *theoria* (ὄχλου δὲ πολλοῦ περιστάντος εἰς τὰν θεωρίαν).¹⁵⁶ This probably puns on the contested, dual etymologies of the word, indicating both a “sight to be seen” (from θεωρεῖν) but also a “watching of the divine” (θεὸς+ὄραν).¹⁵⁷

More than this, the burning up of the fish throws emphasis on the commercial, transactional nature of Amphimnastos’ relationship with Asklepios together with the forms of mutual trust and credibility that this implies. Amphimnastos’ mendacity becomes the object of a shared, public spectacle in which the Tegeans witness not only the marvel of the god, but the fishmonger’s “true” character—a deceitful business partner.¹⁵⁸ The cure thus places the body at

¹⁵⁴ I print here LiDonnici’s text of C4 (following Peek 1962, rather than Herzog 1931):

ἰχθυοφόρος Ἀμφίμναστος. οὗτος ἰχθυοφορῶν εἰς Ἀρκαδίαν εὐξάμενος τὰν δεκάταν ἀνθησεῖν τῷ Ἀσκλαπιῶι τᾶς ἐμπολᾶς τῶν ἰχθύων οὐκ ἐπετέ[λει ταύταν ὡ]ς ἔοικ· ἐν τᾷ ἀγορᾷ οὖν ἐν Τεγέαι ἐξαπίνας οἱ ἰχθύες κε[ραυ]νῶ[ι πλα]γέντες περιπλέκοντο τὸ σῶμα· ὄχλου δὲ πολλοῦ περιστάντος εἰ[ς] τὰν θεωρίαν ὁ Ἀμφίμναστος δηλοῖ τὰν ἐξαπάταν ἀπασα[ν]τ[ῆ]μ[ι] περι τὸν Ἀσκλαπιὸν γεγενημέναν· ἐξικετεύσαντος δ’ αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν βιοτ[ε]ύοντες πάλ[ι]ν ἰχθύες ἔφανε, καὶ ὁ Ἀμφίμναστος ἀνέθηκ[ε] [τ]ὰν [δεκάτα]ν τῷ Ἀσκλαπιῶι.

Amphimnastos, a fish monger. Bringing his fish into Arcadia he prayed and vowed a tenth of his sales to Asklepios, but he did not do this as was proper. In the agora at Tegea suddenly his fish were struck by lightning and burned all over their bodies. Since a large crowd gathered around the spectacle, Amphimnastos made clear his deception in connection to Asklepios. After imploring the god, the fish appeared to come back to life, and Amphimnastos dedicated a tenth to Asklepios.

¹⁵⁵ Peek 1962 and Robert 1964 both read περιπλέκοντο implying that the fish are “burnt up” by Asklepios’ thunderbolt (while disputing whether the fish were alive prior). Herzog 1931 interprets the scenario as the *fish* biting Amphimnastos (ἀπεβιβρώσκοντο), while Horsely 1982 reads κωνόπια...ἐτίτρωσκον —mosquitos or gnats instead of the fish biting him.

¹⁵⁶ This reading is secure and accepted by all the editors of the C stele.

¹⁵⁷ See Rutherford 2013b: 4; 145 for the contested origins of the word *theoria*.

¹⁵⁸ Naiden 2005 points out that this is the only use of the word *theoria* in the *iamata*, which is surprising given the importance of the sanctuary as an international destination, not just of individual *hiketai*, but also of state delegations (see Perlman 2000 and the following chapter). But it is also worth noting that θεωρεῖν is to be found in A3—the very first “disciplinary” tale of the *iamata*.

the center of a social and visual drama. This *iamata* reminds the reader that the body is not neutral, but sits at the center of a web of relations and is under constant evaluation by others. Readers of the *iamata* are readers of bodies, but this particular cure serves as reminder that this is equally the case outside the sanctuary space. So, while C4 cure appears generally to promote the god's power and "forgiveness," its complex visual and social staging reinforce the impression that cures are fundamentally socio-somatic.

B13 takes an entirely novel tack to narrate the recovery process as a social integration. There, the suppliant Thersander incubates because of a wasting disease (φθίσις), but gets no clear vision of the god or of healing.¹⁵⁹ Having failed in his quest for a cure, he is borne back on a cart to his hometown of Halieis.¹⁶⁰ Unbeknownst to the suppliant however, one of the temple serpents entwines itself under the carriage for a ride back with him, where, like A17 or B22, the snake heals him.¹⁶¹ This miraculous event lays the groundwork for the introduction of Asklepios' cult to Halieis, by way of a consultation at Delphi. Consequently, individual anguish precipitates collective religious action, both in the enquiry at Delphi and the ultimate establishment of the town's newest cult. Thersander's healing sees him move from passive sufferer to main protagonist in a different kind of religious chronicle, reworking the significance of his individual pain into a matter of community welfare that resonates with the widely known patterns of mythic foundational narratives (thus blurring the line between "individual" and "civic" religion).

Finally, perhaps the most sustained meditation on the social integrity of the "healthy" body is at A10. Although we have seen instances which blur the line between physical and social

¹⁵⁹ Cf. B3 and B5. See Martzavou 2012 for the suppliant's potential anxiety over not seeing a dream.

¹⁶⁰ See Chapter Three for more on the importance of Halies, and similar narratives of cult foundation after healing.

¹⁶¹ For a parallel account of healing "on the road," see B5 and (possibly) C2.

pathology, this story, known within the corpus as “the Cup,” is remarkable for not treating a “person” at all:¹⁶²

κώθων. ν σκευοφόρος εἰ[ς τὸ] ἱαρ[ὸν] ἔρπων, ἐπεὶ ἐγένετο περὶ τὸ δεκαστάδιον, κατέπετε· [ὡς δὲ] ἀνέστα, ἀνῶϊξε τὸν γυλιὸν κα[ὶ ἐ]πεσκόπει τὰ συντετριμμένα σκ[ε]ύη· ὡς δ' εἶδε τὸν κώθωνα κατε[αγ]ότα, ἐξ οὗ ὁ δεσπότης εἶθιστο [π]ίνειν, ἐλυπεῖτο καὶ συντείθει [τὰ] ὄστρακα καθιζόμενος. ὁδο[ι]πόρος οὖν τις ἰδὼν αὐτόν· "τί, ὦ ἄθλιε," [ἔ]φα, "συντίθησι τὸν κώθωνα [μά]ταν; τοῦτον γὰρ οὐδέ κα ὁ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ Ἀσκλαπιὸς ὑγιῆ ποιῆσαι δύναται." ἀκούσας ταῦτα ὁ παῖς συνθείς τὰ ὄστρακα εἰς τὸν γυλιὸν ἤρπε εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· ἐπεὶ δ' ἀφίκετο, ἀνῶϊξε τὸν γυλιὸν καὶ ἐξαιρεῖ ὑγιῆ τὸν κώθωνα γεγενημένον καὶ τῷ δεσπότηι ἠρμάνευσε τὰ πραχθέντα καὶ λεχθέντα· ὡς δὲ ἄκουσ', ἀνέθηκε τῷ θεῷ τὸν κώθωνα.

The Cup. A baggage carrier was coming to the sanctuary, but when he was about ten stades away he fell down. Standing up, he opened his purse and examined the shattered things within. But when he saw that the cup from which his master was accustomed to drink was smashed to pieces, he was pained and sat down, trying to reassemble it. Just then a traveller saw him and said “Why, wretch, are you vainly reassembling that cup? Not even Asklepios of Epidauros would be able to do that.” Hearing this, the boy gathered up the sherds into his purse and came to the sanctuary. When he arrived, he opened his bag and extracted the cup which had been made “healthy.” He then told his master what had been done and said. When the master heard, he dedicated the cup to the god.

It has been recognized that to be “healthy” in this tale is to be whole.¹⁶³ The shattering of the cup extends the bodily fragmentation of the other stories in the corpus in order to underscore the power of the therapeutic process to “make whole.”¹⁶⁴ Jessica Hughes’ recent study of anatomical

¹⁶² The κώθων was a small drinking cup, which Critias (DK 88 B34) reports as especially fitted for military campaigns because it could be kept in a γυλιὸν, a small wallet or pouch (and precisely what the *pais* uses to carry his belongings in the *iama*). They are frequent dedicatory objects, known from the Athenian Asklepieion (*IG* II² 47.6 and 12) and Oropos (*I.Or.* 319) among other sanctuaries.

¹⁶³ cf. Rynearson 2008; Hughes 2008; Martzavou 2012.

¹⁶⁴ See Goldhill 2002 for the ways in which jars and cups are themselves “anatomized,” with lips, bodies, and ears. So, too, the rituals for Zeus Ktesios (see last chapter) revolved around an anthropomorphized jar standing for the health and wellbeing of the household. In some dedication inventories we find broken or defunct votive objects catalogued as οὐκ ὑγιές (cf. *IG* II² 1544.53).

ex-votos¹⁶⁵ dedicated at healing sanctuaries and shrines clarifies the way these votives offer a powerful metaphor for the experience of bodily fragmentation.¹⁶⁶ She shows persuasively that the presence of ex-votos positioned throughout the sanctuary and temple indicate a cultural experience of pain and illness as a dissolving into parts.¹⁶⁷ So too we find again and again the *iamata* fixating upon broken bodies taken apart and reassembled. We have encountered the surgical openings of the body to extract leeches while others excise painful abscesses.¹⁶⁸ So, too, we have witnessed the detachment of Arata's head from her body and her ultimate "recapitulation."¹⁶⁹ We have observed, then, the fact that therapy at the sanctuary was, sometimes quite literally, viewed as a socio-somatic process of reintegrating fractured personal integrity.¹⁷⁰

Yet, understanding the case of the Cup (or these other tales) as a simple metaphorical extension of health from the corporeal to the inanimate overlooks its level of anxiety over social

¹⁶⁵ The dedication of anatomical votives by healed suppliants in sacred contexts is another nearly global phenomenon, spanning continents and eras (Weinryb 2015; Schörner 2015; Draycott 2017). In ancient Greece they were not limited to healing sanctuaries, but it is in that context where we find them in the most significant numbers (van Straten 1981; 2000). These votives could represent nearly any part of the body: heads, torsos, breasts, arms, legs, and genitals have all been found in large numbers. The practice of dedicating these ex-votos has, generally, been understood as deictic, pointing to the sick body part for which healing was sought (cf. Roebuck 1951: 117). While it is likely true that votives did fulfill this function, an exclusively representational relationship between votives and a *locus affectus* has been productively challenged (esp. Rynearson 2003; Hughes 2008: 222). As we have seen, attempts to ascribe and stabilize meaning on bodies and body parts is difficult in practice. Bodily members—especially in cultic contexts—are inherently polysemous, "excessive." A hand, an eye, a leg, torsos, or breasts may well call attention to an illness. But an ear or eye may equally capture the sense in which the devout attempt to portray the god as seeing or "giving ear to" (ἐπήκοος) the suppliant. Similarly, a hand may greet the epiphanic appearance of the god. Terra-cotta breasts can betoken a mammary tumor as easily as they can express hopes for successful childbirth and nursing.

¹⁶⁶ Hughes 2008. She adduces (2008: 227) to my mind, the most convincing material evidence that Greeks figured pain and illness as an undoing and fragmenting. A 4th century votive offering from the Athenian Asklepieion (currently housed in the Österreichische Archäologisches Institut; but see van Straten 1981, fig. 50 for image) shows a suppliant kneeling before Asklepios and Hygieia. Directly behind her are suspended anatomical ex-votos—head, torso, arms and legs, which are arranged to mirror the suppliants' own body in pieces.

¹⁶⁷ Hughes 2008 and 2016.

¹⁶⁸ A13; B5; B7.

¹⁶⁹ B1.

¹⁷⁰ Hughes 2008: 231.

status and identity as built into the social experience of health.¹⁷¹ Rather, the cup's shattering actually causes the boy emotional pain and worry (ἐλυπέϊτο) and so its breaking is not only a conceptual extension of sickness as a sensation of bodily disaggregation. The object's physical disintegration creates social anguish and displacement because it reifies the boy's social "function" as a porter of his master's belongings. Consequently its shattering represents something of a confusion—are we to understand this as a healing narrative about a non-human actor, or is the cup's breaking simply meant to touch off a social crisis which must be put to order by the god's intervention? Either way, this narrative plots a fascinating expansion of the individual and his relations to other persons as negotiated, mediated, and modified by things. The cup, far from being a mere passive, inert object, embodies and, in particular circumstances, regulates the boy's social relations.¹⁷² The cup ties him to his *despotes*, and so exerts a kind of social agency in its own right. If A4 ended with the healing of the body at the expense of future social relations, then A10 thus stands as a "positive" corollary: the reintegration of the physical clears the way for the reconstitution of the social.

More than this, we should take note that the story's epilogue integrates the two interpretive strands of the "textual" and the "social" (as they have been artificially segregated here). Instead of simply leaving the sanctuary with his "healthy" cup, the *iama* hints at another story—an embedded recasting of its own narrative form—as a kind of "verbalized" parallel to the close of A1. The slave boy returns to his master to report the whole, miraculous, affair: τῷ δεσπότηι ἠρμάνευσε τὰ πραχθέντα καὶ λεχθέντα. The phrase ἠρμάνευσε τὰ πραχθέντα καὶ

¹⁷¹ See Chapter 1.

¹⁷² See, e.g. Cohen 2015, for the agency of objects.

λεχθέντα could mean simply that he “reported the things which had happened” (what was “done and said”). At the same time, the phrasing draws a close parallel with the traditional antithesis of myth and ritual as matters being said and done: τὸ λεγόμενον καὶ δρῶμενον, and can thus be understood as the boy “interpreted for his master the myth and ritual” which took place there.¹⁷³ We find in the finale of the tale not simply a “report” of what had occurred within the sanctuary but the representation of the boy’s experience as a powerful enactment of myth and ritual. Again, like the encoded instructions at the close of A1, this tale suggests itself as a model for collapsing myth (the thing read) and ritual (the sequence of actions) as one seamless and significant experience. So too, like Thersander and the snake, in choosing to foreground events as τὰ πραχθέντα καὶ λεχθέντα, the boy models this experience according to the collective memory embodied in the grand mythic traditions and the ritual activities which translated them into the present.

This *iama* draws attention to the way the slave boy utilizes myth and ritual to transform the chance events which had befallen him into a meaningful story that dramatizes his fear, his sense of exclusion, and, above all, the pain he felt over a broken cup. Like so many of the *iamata*, in doing so, this story alerts its readers to its therapeutic operations *qua* narrative. So too, the boy’s return and retelling of his experience hints at the continuous nature of that story telling. Like the boy, the suppliant will (ideally) return to friends or family to tell and retell her saga. The meaning of pain and suffering for the suppliant flowed from a framework of ritual performance, part of which was a formative confrontation with the narratives of others, which had been codified into quasi-mythical status as holy stories. Yet as the variation within the *iamata* disclose,

¹⁷³ For myth-ritual as “things being done and said” (τὰ δρῶμενα καὶ λεγόμενα), see, e.g., Burkert 1985: 4; Parker 1996: 54-5; Heinrichs 2007; Kowalzig 2007.

this narrative form was open to adaptation and exegesis following the semantic excesses of both divine epiphany and embodied experience alike. By contrast, Hippocratic medical practice aimed at stabilizing and controlling the body's semiotic abundance. This was achieved in part by limiting the role of the patient's voice, whereas within the context of the sanctuary we see that the place of subjective expression and agency was deeply intertwined with the restoration of social relations. The *iamata* insist on their own status as textual, representational objects and suppliants as a community of interpreters. This creates a framework for engaging sickness as an experience always mediated by the social and symbolic. Ultimately, the *iamata*'s "metapoetics"—their recurrent concern for their own status as unbounded and under-determined texts vis-à-vis the suppliant reader's own "textual" body—frames the sick body as a social object. Thus the "textual body" and the "social body" are not differentiated aspects of the *iamata* corpus, but are powerfully allied in the processes of ritual healing. In this way, the healing which was offered at the sanctuaries of Asklepios was contiguous with wider cultural attitudes which saw health as a fundamental means of social unity and belonging. By consistently foregrounding epiphanic healing as a means of expressing subjective meanings as a way of reclaiming personal agency in the wider context of social relations, the cults of Asklepios offered a bridge between individual cures and communal connections. The next chapter looks, then, beyond the role of the cults in mediating between the individual and the group, to the role they played in and between those communities themselves.

CHAPTER THREE

The Topography of Care: Gods about the Town

“Any general theory which seeks to account for phenomena previously considered separately runs the risk of producing an interpretative model which is too rigid and which treats in an over-schematic way the reality which is rather more variable and nuanced than the explanations proposed for it.”¹

“Classification is important in order to understand why [healing deities’] sanctuaries vary so much and why they are so numerous. It also reveals the multiform conception of health that was current in the Greek world and the many sided role of the healing gods in their cultural areas...”²

Moving from the individual’s healing encounter as a social experience, this chapter theorizes the relationship between health, space, and public religion in the Classical period. Specifically, I attempt to give an account of the factors which influenced poleis in selecting specific locations for the earliest healing cults of Asklepios and related healer gods. Indeed, as Vikela says so succinctly, we will find a great deal of variation within the topological distribution of healing cults.³ This, as she acknowledges, correlates with the amoebic nature of *hygieia* in civic and social discourse, its “multiform conception,” which we have explored in depth. This variability is also tethered to the historical fact that regionalism was an important force in the world of Greek cult, even as Panhellenism seemed to cohere around and through “global” figures like Asklepios.⁴ This creates for us an apparent paradox in accounting for the diffusion of Asklepios’ cult: In one way, the god’s very popularity appears symptomatic of widely shared

¹ Polignac 1994(b): 3.

² Vikela 2006: 44-45.

³ See, however, Melfi 2007 for the architectural uniformity of Asklepieia. Admittedly, Vikela concentrates only on Attic healing sanctuaries, not all of which were dedicated to Asklepios.

⁴ See further Chapter 4.

processes of social and cultural change sweeping across and defining the Greek world in the fifth and fourth centuries. At the same time, as I will argue, the very beginnings of this cult ought to be situated within the pressure-cooker of the fifth century Argolid where competing claims made through myth, ritual, and cult were powerful instruments in managing interstate power-relations.

This chapter comprises three major parts. The first constitutes a précis and critique of the prior attempts to theorize the placement of healing cults, both ancient and modern. We will see that these theories are based on unreliable or incomplete evidence. Moreover, these general theories are motivated by a conception of health and healing that is narrowly focused on the private individual and do not take into consideration the nexus relating the embodied individual to the social groups which erected these cult places and for whom these spaces would form part of their collective identity. The second part thus goes beyond these prior theories by focusing upon the history of cults of Asklepios in the Akte (the peninsular arm of the Peloponnese to the east of Argos) and the Argolid. I assess these cults, not only as they began and radiated outwards from the metropole of Epidauros, but as they attracted to themselves telling links within local polytheistic systems. I argue these mythographic traces disclose to us the baldly “political” substrate of the early cult which frames its adoption by later poleis (this also cuts vividly across the highly personal nature of the cures and demonstrates how deeply the spheres “public and private” or “individual and civic” were imbricated with one another through the discourse of health). Finally, after considering Asklepios’ history in the Argolid, we will “zoom out” to target the territorial development of the cult in response to the demands of democratic Athens.

Ultimately, these early histories help to clarify the interrelation of healing, space, and political history as they were manipulated at the regional level, showing again how the various city states of the Akte, the Argolid, and Attica adapted features and histories of the same cult according to their “strategic” ends. We will see that these cults followed no fixed rules of geography or demography in the typical sense. Instead Asklepios’ cult could be employed along acropoleis and agoras, city gates or harbors, mountain vales and agricultural borderlands. The feature tying these spaces together is their interstitial and marginal character, and the fact that such marginal spaces were felt to require mechanisms of arbitration, mediation, or integration. Put differently, the provision of ritual healing which saw the social reintegration of the individual body permeated healing cult’s wider collective function, as it “healed” social fractures and integrated the body politic. The best “generalization” we can make regarding healing and landscape, then, is that these cults helped to define, shape, and mediate the tensions which accrue at boundaries, “inside” and “out.”

The *Topos Hygies*: Ancient Theories about Healthy Places

The question of Asklepios’ wide appeal in the ancient world has not been the exclusive prerogative of modern historians. It vexed and exercised the attentions of the Roman architect Vitruvius and Greek polymath Plutarch alike. Both authors wrote about the sorts of places that cults of Asklepios should be located vis-à-vis the landscape as it was perceived to exist in relation to the city and its territorial hinterland. At the close of his discussion on the nature of *decor* (a kind of harmonious correspondence between structural forms, materials, conventions, and function) Vitruvius (*De arch.* 1.2.7.) states that:

Naturalis autem decor sic erit, si primum omnibus templis saluberrimae regiones aquarumque fontes in eis locis idonei eligentur, in quibus fana constituentur, deinde maxime Aesculapio, Saluti, ut eorum deorum, quorum plurimi medicinis aegri curari videntur. cum enim ex pestilenti in salubrem locum corpora aegra translata fuerint et e fontibus salubribus aquarum usus subministrabuntur, celerius convalescent. ita efficietur, uti ex natura loci maiores auctasque cum dignitate divinitas excipiat opiniones. item naturae decor erit, si cubiculis et bibliothecis ab oriente lumina capiuntur, balneis et hibernaculis ab occidente, hiberno pinacothecis et quibus certis luminibus opus est partibus, a septentrione, quod ea caeli regio neque exclaratur neque obscuratur solis cursu sed est certa inmutabilis die perpetuo.

Finally, there will be achieved a natural *decor*, first if we select the most healthful locations with fonts of water in the places where the shrines are to be erected. This is especially so for Aesculapius and Health, gods by whose medicines very many of the sick appear to be cured. Indeed, when sickened bodies are moved from pestilential places into healthy ones and aided by the use of waters from healthy sources, all the more quickly do they recover. Thus the result will be that the divinity wins a greater reputation and increases its dignity from the nature of the place. Indeed, there will be a *decor naturae*, if the living quarters and libraries are situated to the east, while baths and winter quarters face west, a northerly situation for picture galleries and those rooms in need of steady light, because that area of the sky is neither excessively illuminated nor dimmed by the sun's course; rather it maintains its brightness all the day.

Vitruvius' passage is especially notable for the way it advances a continuum of nature and convention, artifice and landscape, as part of a self-reinforcing ecosystem which is central to the wellbeing of man and divine potency. The typical fissure between *physis* and *nomos* so characteristic of Classical Greek texts has here been resolved in favor of the mutually interdependent and complementary notion of a *naturalis decor*. As a theory of the quality of place, it implies that the natural is not marred by intrusions or interference of man and *techne*. Rather, the landscape and the *maiestas* of the divine are elevated by the application of technical mastery: *natura* enhanced by *ratio* rather than contrary to it. As a corollary, nature has an important role to play in maximizing the qualities and functionality of man-made structures;

there exist certain conventional spaces, activities, and behaviors which are improved or benefitted by the rhythms of the natural.

Vitruvius thus silently advances a cluster of interdependent connections between space, landscape, structure, divinity, and man. If Vitruvius is exuberant about the beneficial qualities of landscape, the passage nevertheless raises difficult questions concerning what he thought about the nature of the healing activities which occurred at healing sanctuaries. Indeed, the language and syntax betray a guarded skepticism about the sorts of therapies on offer there. The phrase *quorum plurimi medicinis curari videntur* signals that the many only *appear* to be healed by the medicaments of Aesculapius and Salus, and that he may be distancing himself from the reality of the matter. Instead, we are left to appreciate the natural qualities of the land, particularly its hydrology, complemented by a removal from those “pestilential” environments which contribute most to the recovery of the suppliant.

Important for our purposes is that behind this nexus of qualities is a set of assumptions concerning what constitutes a *saluber regio*, and how it affects the bodies of men. While the importance of water at healing sanctuaries is somewhat of a *topos* itself, what else Vitruvius supposed was essential to a healthy landscape remains unexpressed.⁵ What, for Augustan age authors, was a healthy region? Was it defined by the presence of positive qualities, such as the provision of shade and quiet, fresh water and sweet breezes? Or was it characterized by the absence of negative aspects, as in the distance from malarial swamps and pestilential forests?⁶ Or

⁵ Cf. Ginouvès 1962; Jost 1985; Cole 1988; Riethmüller 2005. See the Appendix for bathing installations at healing cults.

⁶ See Schiedel 2001; Sallares 2002; Sallares et al. 2004 for the ancient spread of malaria into Southern Italy, probably through commercial contacts with Africa. See also Green 2014 for the possibility of a sylvatic reservoir of plague in Northern Italy from as early as the Antonine plague of the 2nd century AD.

was a healthy place simply anywhere outside the corrupting penumbra of urban life? In this way the question, “what constitutes a healthy place” reframes and extends the question “how do we define health,” provoking hermeneutic obstacles similar to those we encountered in the introduction and first chapter, only now adding the difficulty of accounting for the constructedness of space. *Saluber regio* is therefore not simply a descriptive phrase, but an evaluative one mobilizing a cluster of pre-existing and thoroughly Roman oppositions between city and country, order and disorder, normative and aberrant. While Vitruvius presents us with opportunities to uncover the cultural and ideological operations at work behind the common-sense notions of space and health in the context of Augustan Rome, ultimately I am not convinced that this passage stands as especially helpful testimony for understanding why classical Greeks situated cults of Asklepios in one place rather than another.

In Plutarch, we discover a more focused attempt to formulate the relationship between healing cults and their location which fills some of the Vitruvian gaps. Although Plutarch is considering specifically why the cult of Aesculapius on the *insula Tiberina* was established “outside” the city, this offers a chance to speculate broadly about the god’s attraction to such peripheral locales (*Aet. Rom.* 94, 286D):

Διὰ τί τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τὸ ἱερόν ἔξω πόλεώς ἐστι; πότερον ὅτι τὰς ἔξω διατριβὰς ὑγιεινότερας ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τῶν ἐν ἄστει; καὶ γὰρ Ἕλληνες ἐν τόποις καθαροῖς καὶ ὑψηλοῖς ἐπιεικῶς ἰδρυμένα τὰ Ἀσκληπιεῖα ἔχουσιν. ἢ ὅτι τὸν θεὸν ἐξ Ἐπιδάουρου μετάπεμpton ἦκειν νομίζουσιν; Ἐπιδουρίοις δ’ οὐ κατὰ πόλιν ἀλλὰ πόρρω τὸ Ἀσκληπιεῖον ἐστίν. ἢ ὅτι τοῦ δράκοντος ἐκ τῆς τριήρους κατὰ τὴν νῆσον ἀποβάντος καὶ ἀφανισθέντος αὐτὸν ᾤοντο τὴν ἰδρυσιν ὑφηγεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν;

Why is the sanctuary of Asklepios located outside the city? Is it because they believe that spending time outside the city is healthier than that spent within? In fact, the Greeks hold that Asklepieia are properly situated in places which are clean and lofty. Is it

because they believe the god came from Epidauros when called, and the Epidaurians' Asklepieion is not within the city, but outside of it. Or is it because, when [Asklepios'] snake disembarked from the trireme onto the [Tiber] island and disappeared there, they believed the god indicated his cult site?

Plutarch seems to provide more clarity, even as he invokes divergent *aitia* for the cult's location. Like Vitruvius, Plutarch puts to work un-interrogated assumptions about what kinds of places are "healthier." Only here he relies on the explicit *topos* which contrasts the "healthy" country-side to the unhealthy city. Still, rather than relying exclusively on that distinction, he offers a set of competing—but not mutually exclusive—theories about why the Roman cult was founded "outside the city." In addition to the "healthier" climes outside the urban center, the ur-cult of Asklepios was famously at a remove of some five miles from the main settlement of Epidauros. Plutarch is also citing a long-standing Roman tradition which held that the Tiber cult was imported directly from Epidauros.⁷ Further, a passage of Pausanias makes clear that in Plutarch's time it was a well established commonplace that a majority of Asklepios' cults had similarly been founded from the Epidaurian metropole.⁸ In honoring the origin of the cult, these cities followed in Epidauros' footsteps and located their sanctuaries somewhere outside the walls of the city. In so far as this history points to the gods' proclivity for the urban periphery, Plutarch's second explanation for the Tiber cult does not displace or substitute the first, but complements it. Asklepios at Epidauros was honored outside the city and so it follows that the god's serpentine avatar would seek similar accommodations in the Tiber island "outside" the city. Plutarch's purpose is to address a specifically *Roman* inquiry within the framework of that city's legacy of

⁷ Cf. Livy 29.11.1; Ovid *Met.* 15. 622-744 and *Fast.* 1.290-94; Val. Max. 1.8.2. For Asklepios received by the Romans outside the city see Pliny *HN* 29.1.16. For Asklepios' foundation of new cults in the guise of a snake, see *infra*.

⁸ E.g., Paus. 2.26.8.

cultural engagement with, and manipulation of, Greek mythological and historical episodes. In doing so he provides a coherent account which registers cultural common places that pattern Graeco-Roman elite thinking about place (that is, imperial Greeks, like Romans, conceived of places outside the city as healthier than places inside of it) while implicating Greek and Roman religious history—a subtle acknowledgement of the historiographical tradition of power shifting from the Greek east to the Roman west in terms of migrant divinities. By these lights, and without extending the discussion unduly, it is important then to understand the agendas lurking behind Plutarch and Vitruvius’ spatio-religious theorizing. While these passages are of interest for what they disclose of their own cultural and historical situations, they are not, I submit, especially robust pieces of evidence for what we might call the “topographical question.”

Sanatorium and Liminality: Modern Approaches to Cult Locations

The case for skepticism regarding the ancient sources is not an idle matter of hair-splitting. This is because these passages form, implicitly or explicitly, the foundations for one of the two current hypotheses on this “topographical question.” This first we might call the “sanatorium” hypothesis, which takes Vitruvius and Plutarch at face value and stipulates that Asklepieia were situated in places conducive to recovery.⁹ Thus, removal from the city to “healthier” places would have offered the necessary respite from the hurly-burly of the city.¹⁰ Moreover, the theory goes, distance from crowded urban centers would have had quarantining effects, isolating the infected from the healthy and thus providing a modicum of protection from

⁹ E.g., Jost 1985; Riethmüller 2005; Rosen 2011; Baker 2013.

¹⁰ Still others (Nutton 2013; Cilliers and Retief 2013: 71) propose that these healing cults were located away from “the main religious areas” of cities because of Asklepios’ latecomer status among the “old Olympian” deities. Beyond the categorical problem of identifying and describing what the “main religious area” of the *polis* might be, this statement overlooks the many cases, to be explored below, in which healing cults were deliberately, even ostentatiously, integrated into spaces which created significant continuity with older and politically powerful cults.

contagious diseases.¹¹ So too, access to clean water was important for more than just the ritual purifications which were a central part of incubation; as Vitruvius acknowledges, clean, fresh water was as central to pragmatic therapies and the pharmacology of the ancient world as it is to the modern one. This picture thus casts healing cults as prototypes to the sanatorium or health spa of 19th and 20th century.¹²

The sanatorium hypothesis falls apart in at least two ways. The first and major obstacle is that healing cults were not always established in locations that were manifestly clean or “hygienic” (in our sense). The *insula Tiberina*, to take an example we are familiar with already, was located in the center of the swampy, malarial urban river.¹³ The same can be said for Asklepieia in the presumably turbulent urban districts of Piraeus, Corinth, Argos, Sparta, or Messene, to name only a few of the sanctuaries inside urban centers.¹⁴ In fact, a joint survey of literary and archaeological sources destabilizes the unqualified assertion that Asklepieia were located outside of cities or that even a simple majority of them were appreciably removed from urban populations.¹⁵

If the archaeological evidence speaks generally against the sanatorium hypothesis’ historicity, the conceptual evidence speaks against it equally loudly. As we saw in Chapter One,

¹¹ See Riethmüller 2005: 362.

¹² See Cilliers and Retief 2013: 70 for a qualified rejection of that view.

¹³ Cf. Edelsteins 1945. Much modern work takes into account this fact, yet still falls back on the chestnuts contained in Vitruvius and Plutarch.

¹⁴ A more complete list of intramural sanctuaries would include (at least): Athens (multiple), Piraeus; Corinth; Argos; Leuktra; Sparta (?); Patrae; Mantinaea (temple of Asklepios, Apollo, and Artemis); Megalopolis; Tegea; Pharsalos; Pherai; Ambrakia; Butrint (but only late evidence); Corcyra; Amphipolis; Pella; Thasos; Keos; Paros; Mytilene (?); Cyrene; and Syracuse. See Riethmüller 2005 vol. 1: 360 and corresponding entries in vol. 2. See further below.

¹⁵ Cf. Edelsteins 1945; Cilliers and Retief 2013; *pace* Riethmüller 2005: 360-2. Riethmüller, utilizing his staggering quantity of archaeological data, supports the generalization that the overall majority of the Asklepieia were situated in extra-urban areas. This, nevertheless, relies on a synchronic view which counts *all* Asklepieia of the ancient world as well as a relatively undefined account of what constitutes an “extra-urban” cult.

ancient Greek medicine, both in its Hippocratic and folk sectors, never developed a true disease theory of contagion. Nor did the phenomenon of “religious contagion” follow contemporary models of interpersonal contact as the primary mechanism of spreading “pollution.” Rather, we can say that contagion “handed over” moral responsibility, driving a social synecdoche in which the individual stands for the whole, thereby reinforcing the community’s interdependence through the individual's relations with its gods. Social propinquity and not physical contact was thus its principal agent.¹⁶

But more than this, the major extra-urban Asklepieia, viz., those at Epidauros, Kos, and Pergamum, would hardly have been peaceful and isolated. These were bustling international centers which would have thronged year round with all manner of administrators, inn-keepers, merchants, and vendors to meet the basic hieratic needs of their many suppliant and “tourists.” During festivals, they would have resembled small cities more than bucolic and remote retreats.¹⁷ We cannot, therefore, say *tout court* that Asklepieia were removed places relying on tranquility and fresh air for the restoration of the sick and protection of the healthy.

Looking principally at the evidence in Pausanias, the Edelsteins realized that healing cults were extremely variable in their geographical proclivities.¹⁸ Fritz Graf added to this the observation that, seemingly, for every “major” healing cult located outside the city, there were sanctuaries located within the urban center, and so formulated the second explanation to the topographic question. That is, Graf sought to explain the geographical puzzle in terms of a

¹⁶ See Parker 1983.

¹⁷ For instance, the theater at Epidauros, in its earliest Hellenistic form, would have been able to seat upwards of 6000 while the theater as known today is capable of accommodating many more.

¹⁸ Edelsteins 1945: 240f.

“Doppelheit” effect, emphasizing the cult’s essential “liminality.”¹⁹ For him, these cults were located either in a geographical or “imaginary” *limes*—an urban yet liminal space—which inverted normal order enough to “get in touch” with a god who was more appropriately “of the wild.”²⁰ Athens’ two major cults of Asklepios on the Acropolis and in Piraeus typify this geographical duplication, but also point up some of the short-comings of the theory of liminality as Graf articulated it. As we shall see further below, these Athenian cults foreground the significant political dimension of the god’s topographic inclusion in ways that elude broadly conceived, structuralist oppositions of interior space as civilized and exterior space as wild.²¹

At any rate, I argue that Graf’s liminal hypothesis is not wrong in its broadest strokes. Asklepios’ cult was attracted to places along the margins, but with the important caveats that “margins” exist *wherever* social spaces are constructed; that the meanings and power of those social spaces are responsive to socio-historical changes; and that the multiple appearance of cults within the city and country-scape therefore require more historically inflected explanations. What these places have in common is that they mark transitions into spaces with require different behavioral and social regulations, yet what these spaces “mean” are subject to change according to circumstance.

Maleatas and Asklepios: Origins

¹⁹ Graf 1992.

²⁰ Graf 1992. For Graf this helps explain why Asklepios is often paired with Artemis, another liminal figure *par excellence*.

²¹ See Riethmüller 2005: 361 for a more thorough critique of Graf’s liminality, especially as it relates to Asklepios as fundamentally a “god of the wood.” At the same time, Riethmüller is too reductive in attempting to accommodate the doubling (or tripling!) of cults by reference to the wider Greek practice of simply matching an important extra-urban cult with a small sanctuary in the city center.

It remains unlikely that we will ever have a really firm understanding of why Asklepios took root on the Epidaurian periphery in the latter part of the sixth century, as he had hitherto been a marginal figure in myth.²² Nevertheless, I suggest that a key may lay in the figure of the sanctuary's co-habitant, Apollo Maleatas. This section will thus contextualize the healing god's rise within the wider significance of Apolline cults in the region, and paying particular attention to the entanglements of Apollo Maleatas and Pythaeus. Doing so we will observe how these cults established frameworks for various collective memories of arbitration and conflict, and so shine important light on Asklepios' earliest history as it set the mold for the future spread of his cult.

The origins of Asklepios' cult in the sanctuary 9km outside of the town Epidaurus remain shrouded in obscurity, in both literary and archaeological accounts. At some point in the very late sixth century he appears to have joined his father Apollo there. Prior to his son's arrival, Apollo had been worshipped on the nearby slope of Mt. Kynortion where, from some undetermined time he was known under the epiklesis "Maleatas." Asklepios' cult in the valley just below began as a

²² I will not address at any length the controversy regarding the cult's origin in Thessalian Triikka. While Homer (*Il.* 2. 729-31; *Hom. Hymn. Ask.*) and Hes. (*Cat. fr.* 60 West) knew Asklepios as Thessalian in origin, we hear of no cult with claims to primacy there until an oblique reference to Triikkan Maleatas in Isyllos. Strabo (8.6.15) throws more light on the issue by explaining that the cult's oldest seat was there, but this is rejected by Pausanias (2.26.8) who favors Epidaurus' claims to primacy. Despite long fostered hopes that archaeological finds will clarify the matter, as of yet no one has ever been able firmly to identify the cult there. A building complex complete with Roman baths looks like a good candidate, yet has betrayed no pre-Hellenistic finds and cannot be definitively linked with Asklepios (Mili 2015: 145). Riethmüller 2005 has argued zealously for the Thessalian origins of the cult, but there are no firm physical findings to support his claims, which stem from the mythological orientation towards Thessaly (see especially Renberg 2006/7), for the cities of which Asklepios acted as an important ethnic hero. In fact, Riethmüller's Thessalian agenda often threatens the quality and reliability of the work overall. However, Papakonstantinou (2012) has excavated a cult at Daphnous, which, she argues, dates as far back as the 6th century. While epigraphic evidence can only secure Asklepios' activity there in the fourth century, this site may reignite the old debate about Asklepios' Thessalian heritage. Nevertheless, as Mili 2015, following Melfi 2007, points out, even if Asklepios had old ties to Thessaly, the bulk of the cultic evidence shows Thessalian *poleis* installing cults sometime in the late fifth, fourth, and third centuries. That is, his cultic popularity in Thessaly is contemporaneous with its proliferation in the wider Greek world, and so probably belongs to the *same phenomenon* to be distinguished from earlier strands of ethnic mythography.



Fig. 2. Map of the Peloponnese and Attica

humble handful of buildings, but it underwent a rapid transformation. Several phases are recognizable before it settled into the arrangement it (more or less) preserves today in the middle of the fourth century.²³ The first buildings included an incubation chamber and a separate structure serving as *hestiatorion*.²⁴ This suggests not only that Apollo and Asklepios held equal shares of the cult, but that a shared emphasis was placed on the needs of individual healing as well as communal, collective worship: the private and the public dimensions of this cult were neither ritually nor conceptually separated. Indeed, Apollo was never entirely eclipsed by his son

²³ See especially Tomlinson 1983; Riethmüller 2005.

²⁴ See Burford 1969; Tomlinson 1983; and Lambrinouidakis 2002. The early incubatory chamber is under the present day *abaton* stoa, possibly connected to a bath (*loutron*) by a shared well which was built into the *abaton*'s eastern wall. The earliest structure, however, was an open altar framed by an "L" shaped, double stoa with shrine. Eventually this evolved into a small complex (Building E), likely an early banquet hall used for communal meals, which function was later translated to the massive *hestiatorion* (still labelled the "Gymnasium" on guidebooks: see Lambrinouidakis 2002).

there, and continued to be worshipped on both levels of the sanctuary until its destruction in the fifth century AD.²⁵

This may have been due in part to the extreme antiquity of cult activity on Kynortion. Excavations conducted by Papadimitriou in the 1940s-50s, renewed under Lambrinoudakis in the 1980s and 1990s, revealed extensive votive deposits indicating that the site had been in use for the entire Mycenaean period.²⁶ If cult activity in fact ever completely lapsed on the mountain, it resumed again early in the Geometric period and continued well into the Hellenistic and Roman ones.²⁷ The demonstrably early and important nature of Apollo cult consequently led François de Polignac to include it in his influential work as an example of an extra-urban sanctuary which delimited the outer point of the ‘bipolar axis’ of archaic Epidauros.²⁸ In this he was in fact following Lambrinoudakis, who had earlier argued that the sanctuary of Maleatas/Asklepios functioned as the premier “state-cult” of Epidauros, and advocated for its official role in consolidating Epidaurian identity and meeting many of the city’s domestic and international needs.²⁹ While the strictly schematic nature of Polignac’s work has been much revised over the last three decades, it is still widely accepted that Apollo Maleatas’ shrine on Kynortion offers an

²⁵ See Martin and Metzger 1976: 93-109. Apollo was shortly joined by Artemis, who received a number of votives on Mt. Kynortion and maintained her own temple directly south of Asklepios’ temple in the *temenos*. It appears that her small temple, allied with Asklepios’ through architectural elements, most notably its lion-head *sima*, was built over older cult buildings, possibly older *thesauroi* or priestly *oikoi*. For the link between Asklepios and Artemis, see Graf 1992: 185, who adduces connections at Messene, Sikyon, Pergamum, Sparta, and Mantinea.

²⁶ E.g., Lambrinoudakis 1981; Wright 1994: 65-8.

²⁷ See Lambrinoudakis 1980; 2002. In the Middle Geometric period an open-air altar and terrace were built directly overtop of the Mycenaean foundations. Even if this does not prove continuity, it signals the importance of the place in “Epidaurian” collective memory (Polignac 1994b: 9 and 1994a; Lambrinoudakis 2002: 214).

²⁸ Polignac 1994a: 28-30, 34 n.2, 37.

²⁹ Lambrinoudakis 1981. This is certainly confirmed for the late Classical and Hellenistic period by the large number of extant decrees regulating or arbitrating interstate disputes and borders. The interstate character of these decrees, separate from the theoretic inscriptions pertaining to the *Epidauria* (for which, see Perlman 2000), also signal the appropriateness of the cult for these city states, all with Asklepieia of their own, to conduct territorial negotiations, for which see further below.

early and clear view of the processes whereby extra-urban cults delimit the reaches of state influence and consolidate civic identity.

In the meantime, the precise relationship between Maleatas and Apollo has still never been fully explicated. We remain unsure whether a “Malos” (or some such figure) existed as an independent hero upon whom Apollo was later grafted or whether Maleatas had always signified some aspect (perhaps geographic?) of Apollo.³⁰ Whatever the case, given the proximity of the Geometric cult foundations to its Mycenaean predecessor and the regularity with which Apollo on Kynortion was identified with Maleatas in later antique sources, it has consistently been assumed that Maleatas’ worship there was ancient.³¹ However, closer scrutiny of the evidence for the Maleatas cult outside Epidauros—especially in its relationship to the “Argive” cult of Apollo Pythaeus—wins some purchase on the historical context from which the Epidaurian Asklepios emerged. We must quickly, then, set the table by summarizing Apollo’s role in the wider reaches of the Argeia and the northeastern Peloponnesian peninsula known as the Akte to appreciate Asklepios’ eventual emergence in the region.

Apollo was in fact an extremely important deity within this area, possessing cults in all of its urban centers: Argos, Asine, Mazes, Halieis, Hermione, Troizen, and Epidauros.³² Importantly, only some of these were ethnically Dorian cities: Argos, Epidauros, and Troizen.³³

³⁰ Farnell 1907: 235f.; Bernal 1985: 465 attempts to etymologize Maleatas from the Egyptian *mrt*, “disease”; for Maleatas as a local figure assimilated to Apollo, see, e.g. Bremmer and Furley 2001(2): 187. McInerney 2014 asserts that Maleatas is derived from the Peloponnesian Cape Malea, the southeastern-most promontory of the peninsula, and that he is therefore simply Apollo of Malea. However, I know of no evidence of Apollo Maleatas’ cult from the Cape area.

³¹ E.g., Marinatos 1993; Wright 1994; Antonaccio 1994: 88; Wells 1998.

³² Kowalzig 2007: 146, especially with map of Apollo’s worship in the area and further bibliography.

³³ Although the latter two somewhat problematically. Cf. Paus. 2.26.1 and 2.30.5 for the respective non-Dorian origins of the Epidaurians and Troizenians.

The remaining small, coastal cities formed a proud ethnic minority known as Dryopians. Now, at the end of the 8th century, Argos famously invaded the principal Dryopian city of Asine, flattening the town and leaving only the temple of the Dryopian's central god standing: Apollo Pythaeus. Argos thus seized administrative control of the sanctuary and absorbed the Pythaeus cult into her own her urban center, as if to erase the violent destruction of its neighbor.³⁴ Thereafter this cult had a long and involved history, one too involved to delve into here. Broadly, however, within the fifth century this sanctuary sat at the center of an Aktean cultic network, configuring interstate social relations and obligations as a para-political mechanism, possibly for the more targeted purpose of ritual regulation of borderlands and pasturages.³⁵ Crucially, however, Argos was never completely able to leverage her administration of this cultic center into a wider regional hegemony—either politically or militarily—as she had with the “Argive” Heraion during the later fifth century. In fact, at that same time the cities of the Akte were principally the staunch allies of Sparta and not Argos. Nonetheless, her control over this important cult afforded her prestige, influence, and power in a region characterized by conflict and tension, especially in and around its borderlands.

Given Pythaeus' importance in the area it is not surprising that we find Apollo celebrated as such in Maleatas' Epidaurian sanctuary as well.³⁶ However, McInerney has recently observed that the earliest material evidence for Maleatas' worship on Kynortion surprisingly dates only to early fourth century Athens, where a *lex sacra* regulating Asklepios' new cult at Piraeus

³⁴ See Hall 1994; 1997.

³⁵ Kowalzig 2007: 146-48. Polignac 1994a: 52 regards Apollo Pythaeus as inherently a god of “thresholds and boundaries.” Such a role seems corroborated as well, by the existence of an Apollo “Horios” at Hermione (Paus. 2.35.2); see also McInerney 2006 and below for the role of extra-urban sanctuaries as centers of arbitration at territorial interstices. For the economic importance of pasturage in the Akte generally, see Jameson et al. 1994: 604f.

³⁶ E.g., *SEG* 26 449, for which see further below.

commands that *prothumata* be given to Maleatas and Apollo.³⁷ Assuming that this regulation reflects ritual practice as it was first established with the cults' introduction in the final quarter of the fifth century (more on which below), this allows us to push Maleatas' Epidaurian presence back sometime into, say, the middle of the fifth century. The earliest direct literary evidence for Apollo Maleatas in Epidauros dates only to the late fourth century poet Isyllos, whose inscribed paean to Asklepios cites an Epidaurian "Malos" as Asklepios' maternal grandfather.

As numerous critics have observed, the principal purpose of Isyllos' hymn is a full throated expression of Epidaurian claims on Asklepios' cult against the traditional Thessalian ones. This hymn indigenizes Asklepios through genealogical links to a legendary Malos, clearly a backformation from the epithet Maleatas, who was "the first" to erect an altar for Apollo.³⁸ Within this poem there exists, too, a strongly aristocratic and pro-Spartan flavor, hinting at Epidauros' ties to Lacedaemon.³⁹ The earliest dedicatory evidence placing Maleatas in Epidauros does not actually appear to predate the 3rd century BC, when we begin to find honorary and interstate decrees set up "in the *hieron* of Apollo Maleatas and Asklepios."⁴⁰ Thus, despite the great antiquity and the (reasonably) well documented nature of both the upper and lower sanctuaries, the absence of evidence placing Maleatas at Epidauros before the fifth century is something of a puzzle. Absence of evidence is of course not evidence of absence nor does it

³⁷ *IG* II² 4962. See Chapter 2 Appendix and *infra*. See McInerney 2014: 14. He further notes that here we find Maleatas and Apollo treated as two *separate* divinities.

³⁸ *IG* IV² 1 128. 27-31f.: πρώτος Μᾶλος ἔτευξεν Ἀπόλλωνος Μαλεάτα βωμὸν καὶ θυσίαις ἠγλάϊσεν τέμενος· οὐδέ κε Θεσσαλίας ἐν Τρίκκηι πειραθείης εἰς ἄδυτον καταβάς Ἀσκληπιοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἀφ' ἀγνοῦ πρώτον Ἀπόλλωνος βωμοῦ θύσαις Μαλεάτα. (Malos first built the altar of Apollo Maleatas and honored his temenos with sacrifices. For even in Thessalian Triikka you would not dare descend into Asklepios' adyton without first sacrificing on the holy altar of Apollo Maleatas). For the poetry, political, and historical context of Isyllos' *paeon*, see Edelsteins 1945; Stehle 1997; Sineux 1999; Bremmer and Furley 2001; Kolde 2003; McInerney 2014.

³⁹ Stehle 1997.

⁴⁰ See, for instance, *IG* IV² 1, 61; 65 and 66 (first century BC); 127 (224 AD).

necessitate a Classical date for the origins of his cult there. Yet it does open the door to the suggestion that Maleatas might have been a rather later arrival than is typically supposed.

A quick glance around the Peloponnese, moreover, reveals that Maleatas' cult is attested quite early outside of the Epidauria. At Kosmas in Kynouria—the peninsula's eastern coastal plain, lying at the center of a string of important sixth century conflicts between Sparta and Argos—several dedications to Maleatas date to the mid sixth century, while excavations reveal that cult activity dates as far back as the eighth.⁴¹ So too, games called the *Maleateia*, known from the fifth century “Damonon Inscription,” were very likely conducted at this sanctuary.⁴² Startlingly, perhaps, Apollo appears to have been worshipped at this Kosmas sanctuary also as Pythaeus.⁴³ This is interesting not least because Apollo Pythaeus was venerated in the Spartan agora as the principal deity presiding over the Gymnopaidia.⁴⁴ This was an important Spartan “peace-time” festival, which later sources connected very closely with the Spartan victory over the Argives at Thyreas—very close to Kosmas—sometime around 546 BC in the so-called “Battle of Champions.”⁴⁵ Indeed, one of the bronze figurines dedicated to Maleatas discovered at Kosmas appears to be sporting the “Thyreatic” crown worn by the celebrants of the Gymnopaidia, thereby suggesting a link between the two festivals and the earlier battle.⁴⁶

⁴¹ For Maleatas, see *IG V*, 1 927 (=Jeffery *LSAG* p. 200. 37); 929; and 929c. Intriguingly, *IG V* 1, 929a/b are dedications in honor of Asklepios and Machaon—but they are undated and I have been unable to determine their context. For eighth century cult, see Phaklares 1990; Cartledge 2002. See also *IG XII* 3, 372 for Maleatas on fourth century BC Thera, an important Spartan colony.

⁴² *IG V*, 1 123, for the Damonon victory list. For the games, see Hodkinson 1999; Shipley 2004; Makres 2009.

⁴³ For Apollo Pythaeus at Kosmas, see *SEG* 11 890 (=Jeffery *LSAG* 199. 14).

⁴⁴ E.g., Paus. 3.11.9.

⁴⁵ Athen. 15.22.21. For the Battle of Champions, see Hdt. 1.81; Thuc. 5.42; Paus. 2.20.7. See also Hall 1995; Cartledge 2002; Kowalzig 2007; Bershadsky 2012 and 2013.

⁴⁶ E.g., Sosibios *BNJ* 595 F4. The festival of the Parparonia, also known from the Damonon inscription, was likewise celebrated in honor of a Spartan victory over the Argives in Thyreas. See Bershadsky 2012: 67.

In light of such evidence, McInerney has hypothesized that the sanctuary of Maleatas at Kosmas—and the “war games” of the *Maleateia*—helped to mark Spartan dominion over this problematical stretch of territory buffering Lacedaemonia from the Argeia.⁴⁷ If such was the case, I believe we can add that Sparta’s “appropriation” of the Pythaeus cult after the battle for Thyreas would not only commemorate the annexation of a borderland over which Argos had earlier some influence. It would preserve the memory of that conflict precisely by incorporating the “Argive” figure of Pythaeus within the Spartan agora, much as the memory of the near-contemporary Spartano-Tegean conflict was preserved in Sparta’s theft and display of Orestes’ bones from the neighboring Tegeans.⁴⁸ The Argives certainly seemed to remember it this way, as Bacchylides’ paeon fr. 4 suggests.⁴⁹ In this song, which contains precisely the aition of Pythaeus’ cultic foundation at Asine, Pythaeus emerges as an Argive figure who “symbolizes victory over the Spartans.”⁵⁰ Pythaeus thus functioned as a potent figure for both sides in summoning histories of mutual animosity, even as his respective celebrations embody the calm of peace. The pairing of Pythaeus-Maleatas at Kosmas, then, may have formed a ritual framework for the *Gymnopaidia*/*Maleateia*, both of which recalled mythic battles along the Thyreatic plain which were central to the Spartan territorial and historical imaginary.⁵¹ Such a history would implicitly

⁴⁷ McInerney 2014. See, also, Bershadsky 2012 for the suggestion that the quasi-mythical “Battle of Champions” formed the *aition* of the *Gymnopaidia* itself, and that Thyreas had early on been the location of “ritual battles” over the territory, which only became “real” in the middle of the 6th century, whereupon the ritual celebration was relocated to the Spartan agora as a commemoration of the victory.

⁴⁸ Hdt. 1.65-8; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 292b; Arist. fr. 592 Rose. See further Cartledge 2002: 119-20. Unlike the Thyreatic plain which appears to have been under Spartan control, Tegea became an important Spartan ally and was not directly subjugated.

⁴⁹ Bacchyl. fr. 4.56-80.

⁵⁰ Kowalzig 2007: 159.

⁵¹ Bershadsky 2013.

remember Maleatas as an *anti*-Argive figure, such that his worship constantly enacts histories of Spartan victory and Argive defeat.⁵²

This throws an interesting light on the dynamic of Apollo Maleatas/Pythaeus within the context of the northern Akte. If we suspect Maleatas' arrival in Epidauros was later than is typically assumed, this would suggest that Maleatas' role within Epidauros' extra-urban cult was part of an anti-Argive provocation.⁵³ That is to say, borrowing a figure who symbolized Spartan victories created the tantalizing possibility of imagining alternative cultic frameworks for regional memory and social interaction, in which Argos' control of Asine was neither absolute nor essential. Despite Asklepios' reputation as an international and equanimous healer, I am inclined to understand his associations with Maleatas as a part of this scum between Argive and Aktean communities. That is, it may have been precisely because Asklepios lacked a robust mythical background in that region that he represented such an appealing complement to Maleatas. If Maleatas represented a rebuke to Argos in general, Asklepios entered as a fundamentally "neutral" figure in whom it was possible to anchor a new regional worshipping community.

Asklepios Between and Against: Epidauros and the Akte

Like Sparta and Argos, a low-boil animosity typified Argive-Epidaurian relations across the fifth century. Here I argue that Argos attempted to co-opt something Asklepiadic from Epidauros, by instituting her own Asklepieia which were freighted with local political

⁵² Spartano-Argive antagonism around Pythaeus-Maleatas had a long history: we see it in the sequel to Argos' conquest of Asine. That is, after the Argives had driven the Asineans out of their polis, it was the Spartans who allegedly resettled the exiles in "Messenian" Asine. It perhaps not surprising that a newly published inscription from there confirms a Hellenistic priesthood of Apollo Maleatas, likely connected with ephebic service, possibly along the lines of the *Gymnopaidia* (see Makres 2009; *SEG* 48. 514). At any rate, it would appear that these Asineans took up the Laconian Apollo most hostile to the cult stolen from their ancestral forebears.

⁵³ Cf. McInerney 2014.

significance, and again flag the boundary between the Argolid and the Epidauria as historically troublesome. Ultimately, I believe this points up a further political role of Asklepios' earliest sanctuary on the borders of the Argeia and the Epidauria, underlining its place in mediating interstate frictions.

Inscriptions dated to the earlier part of the fifth century demonstrate Asklepios' sanctuary outside Epidaurios as a place of political refuge for Argives on the run.⁵⁴ One in particular was dedicated by a certain Kallipos, an Argive seeking asylum there with his φοικᾶται, who was “invited by Apollo Pythios” to his sanctuary.⁵⁵ This led Lambrinouidakis to assert that Epidaurios was a natural place of refuge on the assumption that Apollo Pythaeus/Maleatas “dans la propagande religieuse de l'époque” was opposed to the Apollo Pythaeus of Argos. More than that, Lambrinouidakis supposed that “[l]e sanctuaire d'Apollo Maleatas lui-même apparaissait comme un bastion face à la menace argienne.”⁵⁶ As at Spartan Kosmas, it appears that the co-identification of Maleatas and Pythaeus on Kynortion was not just a matter of translating local Apollos, but was aimed rather at antagonizing Argos.

More tangible evidence of inter-polis hostility as it relates to Pythaeus comes to the fore in 419 BC, when Argos made good on an evidently long-considered plan to invade the Epidauria. Thucydides (5.53) reports that Argos launched her incursion: προφάσει μὲν περὶ τοῦ θύματος τοῦ Απόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθαέως, ὃ δέον ἀπαγαγεῖν οὐκ ἀπέπεμπον ὑπὲρ βοταμίων Ἐπιδαύριοι (κυριώτατοι δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἦσαν Ἀργεῖοι). That is, Epidaurios' failure to contribute specific

⁵⁴ See *IG* IV² 142 (“I am Apollo Pythios”) dated to the 6th century BC, to which we might add *IG* IV² 1 137 (between 500-450 BC) dedicated by Ἀρκείλας, who identifies as an Argive. For the Epidaurian sanctuary as a place of asylum, see Sinn 1993.

⁵⁵ *SEG* 26 449: Κάλλιπος ἰκίετας Εὐκλέος υἱοῦ τὸν Ἐπιδαύριον παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Πυθίου Ἀργεῖος ἀρχὸς καὶ φοικιάται. Cf. Lambrinouidakis 1980.

⁵⁶ Lambrinouidakis 1990: 181.

sacrificial duties which were paid “ὕπὲρ βοταμίων” to Apollo Pythaeus’ cult at Asine was taken seriously enough to constitute a *casus belli*. The ulterior motive behind this invasion was no doubt the establishment of lines of communication with Argos’ ally Athens, which lay behind similar Athenian adventures in the Akte during the first Peloponnesian War. At the same time, as Barbara Kowalzig has argued, the phrase ὕπὲρ βοταμίων can be explicated as fees paid on behalf of pasture lands whose tenure was problematical.⁵⁷ Indeed, the Akte was a mountainous place in which boundaries, particularly between grazing lands, were particularly difficult to distinguish and a constant source of legal dispute and adjudication.

Ultimately, Epidauros’ “failure” to pay the cultic fees owed to the Argive Apollo Pythaeus in the final quarter of the fifth century may well have had to do with Epidauros’ promotion of Asklepios and Maleatas at the (literal) expense of Pythaeus. It is perhaps no coincidence that at this time too the other cities of the Akte begin flocking to Epidauros and eventually incorporate their own Asklepieia.⁵⁸ Indeed, in the *iamata* we find suppliants from Halieis, Hermione, and Troizen.⁵⁹ At some point, probably early on, Asklepios became an important god at Troizen where he was housed in the major extra-urban sanctuary of Hippolytus with whom he developed strong associations in myth and ritual.⁶⁰ Hermione too imported the cult somewhere within the

⁵⁷ See Kowalzig 2007: 147 *pace* Jameson et al. 1994: 63, who understand it in a geographical sense.

⁵⁸ Although, it was just before 419 that Athens acquired its own Asklepieion, although, only within a lull in Epidaurian-Athenian hostilities. See Wickkiser 2008 below.

⁵⁹ Troizen: *iamata* B3 and C5 both reference sanctuaries of Asklepios (see LiDonnici 1995 *ad loc* for potential “rivalries” between the cults); Hermione A20; Halieis A18; B4 and B13.

⁶⁰ A context within the Hippolyteion (Paus. 2.32.1-4) is confirmed by numerous dedicatory finds in honor of Asklepios and Hygieia, but the precise location has yet to be identified. Inscriptions: *IG IV* 771; 772; 782 (fourth century). Mythological connections between Asklepios and Hippolytus’ resurrection are known already in the archaic epic *Naupactia*, and Eur. *Hipp.* 1209 (πέτρων Ἀσκληπιοῦ; cf. Mitchell-Boyask 2008: 47f.). So too Paus. 2.27.4 records a dedication made by Hippolytus in thanksgiving, and a votive relief from Epidauros (*NM* 1392 c. 400BC) depicts Hippolytus with a horse.

city-walls, possibly in relation to one of its most important gods, Demeter Chthonia,⁶¹ as did the small polis Halieis.⁶²

While we know nothing of Halieis' physical cult, *iama* B13 records Asklepios' emigration there and gives, I think, something away about the god's incorporation. This particular *iama* records how a man named Thersander came seeking Asklepios' aid, but saw nothing clear in the incubatory dream. Disappointed, Thersander began his return journey home to Halieis on a wagon. Before exiting the temenos, however, one of the sanctuary snakes slipped up under the wagon's axel and rode out the remainder of the trip as a sacred stowaway. The appearance of the snake in the town prompted the perplexed Halieisians to send to Delphi in order to discover whether they ought to return the serpent to Epidauros, or to foster it there. The Delphic response favored the latter course of action, and proclaimed that a temenos of Asklepios should be established within the town. It was presumably on this occasion that a dedicatory inscription was set up in the Epidaurian sanctuary to celebrate the ties between mother cult and its newest offshoot, and from this the tale contained in the B13 *iama* was surely derived.⁶³

Halieis is hardly the most pronounced instance of serpentine colonialism.⁶⁴ A small settlement tucked away in the southwestern corner of the Akte, it was a marginal polis from the

⁶¹ The location of the Hermione Asklepieion is most probably to be sought near the cult of Demeter Chthonia, with whom he is connected in a 3rd century votive (*IG* IV 692). See Benedum 1986:143; Riethmüller 2005: 101.

⁶² Cf. Paus. 2.36.1, abandoned in his time, but mentions reading the foundation myth on the Epidaurian *iamata*: see LiDonnici 1995; Riethmüller 2005: 99. No archaeological foundations for the cult at Halieis has as yet come to light.

⁶³ LiDonnici s.v. B13. As we will see below, the Asklepieion outside Epidauros served as the archive for many state-decrees.

⁶⁴ See, e.g., Epidauros Limera (Paus. 3.23.6-7), Lebena (*I.Cr.* I. xvii. 8), Athens (*IG* II² 4960), and Rome (*Ov. Met.* 15.531). Following the Telemachos monument, Asklepios *may* have arrived too in Athens as a *drakon* in a wagon. For the supplement δ[ρ]άκοντα (Körte 1896). Clinton (1992; 1994) however, reads δια[κόνος], claiming that Athens already "had" a sacred snake on the acropolis (followed by Wickkiser 2008). Parker 1996 reads, against the syntactical difficulties outlined by Clinton, δ[ρ]άκοντα, arguing for Asklepios' predilection for traveling as his snaky avatar, favored also by Ogden 2010. See the Cretan *iamata* *I.Cr.* I.xvii.8-10 for maritime travel. For the Athenian snake, see further below.

seventh century onwards and perhaps best known as the site to which the Tirynthians were relocated after Argos sacked that city in the fifth century.⁶⁵ Like the other cities of the Akte, a sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus was the primary civic cult upon the acropolis⁶⁶ and, again, the Halieisians are referenced explicitly in Bacchylides' paeon in connection to the god's worship at Asine.⁶⁷ Halieis was thus linked to Argos through the cultic network of Apollo Pythaeus and the domination of Tiryns in the first half of the fifth century.⁶⁸ It is easy to imagine, then, that there was little love lost between the Tirynthian populace of Halieis and Argos. Especially within the matter of territorial disputes and obligations, the Tirynthian population may have balked at Argive meddling in the Akte. While the enquiry at Delphi regarding the matter of Asklepios' snake appears at first glance to fit the Greek pattern of attempts to introduce new gods into local pantheons, it could equally reflect a desire to activate new cultic associations which pointed away from Argos and towards Epidauros.⁶⁹ Indeed, the intervention of the Delphic authority displaces the possibility of collusion between Epidauros and Halieis, which is rather made to seem deliberately selected by the god as his newest cultic branch.

I propose that all of this hints at the emerging importance of the Asklepios/Maleatas cult in contravening Argive efforts to integrate the Akte through a shared worshipping community by offering a regional alternative to the Argive controlled cult. As we have seen, Asklepios' cultic facilities grew in size and sophistication over the fifth century, emphasizing in equal measure the

⁶⁵ Cf. Hdt. 7.137. See Jameson et al. 1994: 77; Hall 1994 and 1997.

⁶⁶ See Riethmüller 2005: 98-99.

⁶⁷ Bacchyl. fr. 4.49 Snell-Maehler:]εξ ἐξ Αλικῶν τε. See Kowalzig 2007: 132-60; for Apollo's sanctuary at Halieis, see Jameson 1974 and 1982.

⁶⁸ Outside of the cultic network of Apollo, Halieis appears to have shared some political institutions with Argos, see *Nomima* I 107; Kowalzig 2007: 151.

⁶⁹ Cf. Hdt. 5.67 for the tricky matter of Sikyonian attempts to introduce anti-Argive gods into the city.

individual and collective aspects of his worship with Apollo. Its growing regional importance is visible above all in the expansion of his games, the *Asklepieia*. Known for its international efflorescence within the Hellenistic context of “new” Panhellenic festivals,⁷⁰ through Pindaric references we can date its origins to the final quarter of the sixth century.⁷¹ Pindar’s victors would situate this festival within a parochially regional circuit, drawing competitors principally from the Northern Peloponnese and Saronic gulf. By the second half the fifth century, however, its catchment area was expanding.⁷² Still, it was these cities Epidauros called upon to help finance the monumentalization of the sanctuary in the 370’s, to which they responded within their own limited means.⁷³

From the suppliant records of the *iamata* and what we know of the Games, then, we can see that over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries Asklepios’ cult formed an important meeting place for the cities of the Akte, creating yet another ritual mechanism for the regulation and configuration of regional social relations and obligations. But, just as Pythaeus’ cult never

⁷⁰ E.g., *IG IV² 1*, 94-6 with Seve 1993; Perlman 2000; Parker 2008.

⁷¹ Pi. *Nem* 3.148; *Nem* 5.97; *Isth.* 8.147-50, all for Aeginetan victors who had also won victories at Epidauros in the 470’s. Nemean 5, however, provides the *terminus post quem* for the Games as Pindar mentions that it was the *laudandus* Pytheas’ grandfather Themistios who was victorious at Epidauros, prompting Seve (1993: 305) to date that victory c.520 BC. This date would be earlier than any known dedication to Asklepios, meaning either that the festival was meant to honor, in the first place, Apollo or that Asklepios was celebrated with games that predate any material record of his worship.

⁷² See *Syll.*³ 82 (c.420) for Dorieus of Rhodes’ four victories at Epidauros; *AP* 13.19.9 (Simonides?); Plat. *Ion.* 530a.

⁷³ *IG IV² 1*, 102, 107, Halieis in fact contributed over 1200 drachmas. Other heralds are mentioned as being sent into Troizen, Hermione, Tegea and Mantinea. See Burford 1969; Tomlinson 1983; Jameson et al. 1994: 82-3. Tegea may also have possessed an early Asklepieion: cf. Paus. 8.45.1-47.1, confirmed by various votive reliefs for both Asklepios and Hygieia (e.g., Tegea Mus. Inv. 29 with Dugas 1921; Jost 1985: 381; Riethmüller 2005: 231). Like other poleis (e.g., Troizen, Hermione, Athens) Asklepios joined the central poliadic sanctuary. For the role of Athena Alea’s temple in the political organization of Tegea, see Voyatzis 1990; 1999: 143f., possibly in connection with the mobilizing power of Sparta to the south. If this is the case, we have yet another instance of Asklepios’ later involvement with a cult which played a role in the territorial and political disputes of the Peloponnese. Mantinea also possessed an Asklepieion. Paus. 8.9.1 for the well-known ναός διπλοῦς, split between Asklepios and the Letoïdai. Pausanias claims that the statue of Asklepios was a work of Alkamanes, and so dates to the late fifth century, while the group of Leto, Apollo Pythios and Artemis were works of Praxiteles. See Jost 1985: 124f.; Mitropoulou 2001: 37; Riethmüller 2005: 209-13.

fully integrated this community in political or military terms, neither did Asklepios' cult overlap fully with the multiple means of identifying on the Akte. First and foremost, his cult offered a “neutral” grounds on which one could seek healing and asylum. This appears also to have framed Asklepios and Maleatas' precinct as a space in which fractious conflict and dispute might be mediated through competitive athletic and musical display, or the settlement of interstate agreements. Epidauros' extra-urban cult thus became a central space not just for individuals but also of inter-polis communication and arbitration among the Aktean cities, especially within the Hellenistic period.⁷⁴ These arbitrations seem to concern pasturages and grazing lands—particularly for goats,⁷⁵ with which Asklepios was tightly associated in the Epidaurian tradition—as they continued to represent a matter of thorny dispute.⁷⁶ Ultimately, then, it seems as if Asklepios' regional success came with some displacement of Apollo Pythaeus' role in the religious regulation of the territorial margins.

Asklepios and the Argive Response

Argos did not take Epidaurian developments lying down. Turning away from Epidauros to Argos itself we can see more clearly how this god became embroiled within local conflicts. According to Riethmüller's catalogue of Asklepieia, Argos contained as many as *four* different

⁷⁴ Arbitration decrees concerning disputes over marginal lands between Epidauros and Hermione *IG IV² 1, 75=SEG 11. 377* (a copy set up at Hermione); Epidauros and Corinth *IG IV² 1, 71*; Epidauros and Arsinoe *IG IV² 1, 72*. By contrast the dispute between Arsinoe and Troizen *IG IV² 1, 76+77* is over more central land. See Jameson et al. 1994: 596f. for the issue of the βολεοὶ λίθων as boundary markers and the fees which are claimed against goat pasturages (recalling the importance of the ritually taxed βοτάμια of Thucydides 5.53).

⁷⁵ For the southern Akte as a rich area of pasturage, see Jameson et al. 1994: 604f. See also *SEG 26. 451* (c.350BC) for Timainetos' δεκάταν αἰγῶν “tithe of the goats” within the Asklepieion.

⁷⁶ For Asklepios' ownership of revenue bearing lands nearby one of the areas of dispute at *IG IV² 1, 75* (n.74), see the *horos* stone at *IG IV² 1, 701*, probably to be taken in conjunction with a *horos* stone for Apollo Pythaeus found nearby (Nauplion Mus. inv. no. 13 868); *pace* Riethmüller 2005: 102 who interprets both stones—in the absence of any cultic architectural remains—as the basis for a healing cult.

Asklepieia, although surely not all were creations of the fifth or fourth centuries.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, Pausanias transmits to us a raft of fascinating details about the Argive Asklepieia, all of which hint suggestively at the very deliberate manner in which Asklepios was integrated into the mythic, political, and geographic fabric of Argive society.

As we follow Pausanias' travels around the Argolid we learn that the oldest and most conspicuous (ἐπιφανέστατον) temple of Asklepios at Argos was founded by Sphyros, Asklepios' grandson by Machaon.⁷⁸ Sadly, no clear archaeological evidence for Sphyros' Asklepieion has yet come to light.⁷⁹ Nonetheless, following the Periegete's description, this cult was situated somewhere within the city's walls, probably in the north-eastern sector of the city.⁸⁰ In fact, *all* of the Argive healing cults were within the city or peri-mural. Given the cult's apparent fame and antiquity I suspect that Sphyros provides a key to the political history of the Asklepios cult at Argos and, more particularly, reveals a god caught up in the midst of the Argive machinations of the fifth century.

⁷⁷ Riethmüller 2005: 73-88.

⁷⁸ Paus 2.23.4. The epic cycle knows of a tradition which made Machaon and Podilarios sons of Poseidon, but the likelihood of his paternity here seems slight; see Davies *EGF* frs. 1 and 7 (=Paus. 3.26.9).

⁷⁹ Pausanias informs us only that Xenophanes and Straton fashioned the cult statue, whom Riethmüller (2005: 85) dates to the second or early first century BC; see *ibid* (2005: 84) for the complete absence of archaeological finds.

⁸⁰ Riethmüller 2005: 85. The second, and more securely located healing cult—originally identified as a bathing complex and/or Serapeion—was settled centrally within the agora, nestled at the foot of the theater (cf. Paus. 2.21.1; Riethmüller 2005: 73-83). Again, unfortunately, we can say little about that sanctuary's early history. Statuary, scattered inscriptions, and several anatomical votives discovered by Ginouvès (1954: 173f.) seem to guarantee that Asklepios was indeed worshipped at that site. However, the sequence of the cult's evolution from relatively humble beginnings in the Classical period into a large and impressive baths is extremely confused by multiple building phases in the Roman period (Riethmüller 2005: 77-9). In fact, it is unclear whether it ever represented an independent healing cult, or if Asklepios and Hygieia were venerated there by virtue of their later gravitation towards baths. The third confirmed shrine of Asklepieia lay just outside of the city, along the "Hollow Road," among a cluster of hero-shrines, most interesting of which was a *hieron* of Amphiaraos and his charioteer, Baton (cf. Livy 34.26 and Plut. *Pyrrh.* 32) located only some 300 steps outside the city walls. Asklepios was associated with chariots at Troizen as well through the figure of Hippolytus.

Sphyros possesses all the aura of an old, local healing deity, whose healing character was later utilized to leverage Asklepios into the city's pantheon—although auras may be meant to mislead.⁸¹ His broader significance for the Argives is registered by the phratry name *Sphyredai*, which we find a handful of times in the inscriptional record.⁸² Tellingly, however, the first we hear of this and other such phratronyms is within the fifth-century reorganization of Argive social institutions. This occurred in the wake of Argive territorial expansion and democratic reforms, which Piérart dates to 470-60BC.⁸³ That is, as Jonathan Hall observes, the phratry system was rolled out amidst a suite of social changes aimed at the organization and incorporation of new peoples and lands, surely including some along the Epidaurian and Aktean borders.⁸⁴ As best we can tell, these phratry names derive either from toponyms or figures of the heroic past, or rather, figures who were deliberately made to look as if they were.

Sphyros was either, then, an Argive healing hero of old, repurposed for the organizational ends of the newly minted Argive democracy, or a fresh recruit to the Argive roster of democratic heroes. Either possibility suggests that Asklepios was deliberately, if somewhat obliquely, affixed to the new political order of the Argive democracy. In the case of the former, Sphyros—an obscure hero with little remembered past—was ripe for rebranding with a mythic background that connected Asklepios to Argive land. In the event of the latter, one of Asklepios' kin could be seen as dragooned into the service of Epidauros' enemy. Either way would have been entirely

⁸¹ Riethmüller 2005: 85.

⁸² See Piérart 1983: 270f. and 2000 for phratry names and inscriptions; Vollgraf (1909: 271); Tomlinson 1972: 219. Piérart 1983: 272 contends the phratronym is not derived from the name σφῦρος but rather the toponym σφυρηίς. Although Tomlinson enumerates “Sphyredai” among the “mysterious” phratry names, whose connection to cult, place, or family cannot be established.

⁸³ Piérart 2000.

⁸⁴ E.g., Hall 1994 and 1997.

consistent with Argos' penchant for retrofitting myths on the fly as they suited her political needs.⁸⁵ And both produced the net result that Sphyros became emblematically a part of the Argive citizen identity, fitted into the primary mechanism of organizing familial, political, and territorial relations within the fifth century polis. Argive myth thus reveals a desire to wrest something Asklepiadic away from Epidauros, in order, perhaps, to forge powerful and authoritative genealogical fastenings to Asklepios by claiming direct ancestry for the cult, but in a way that also transfigures it through the political elevation of Argos' native son.⁸⁶ As we will see further below, this was not the only instance in which a *polis* manipulated Asklepios' mythic genealogy.

Another obscure figure of local Argive legend sheds further light on Asklepios' place in territorial dispute. Pausanias informs us that just beside Sphyros' cult of Asklepios lay a *taphos* for a woman named Hyrnetho.⁸⁷ The reader must wait, however, until the Periegete's description of the Epidauria, where she also possessed a *temenos*, to learn her story. As Matthew Clark points out, Pausanias lavishes Hyrnetho's story with uncustomary attention, signaling something unusual about its status as somewhere between obscure factoid and key information for unlocking the local past.⁸⁸ After the several chapter wait we learn that Hyrnetho was the favorite

⁸⁵ Cf. Hall 1994.

⁸⁶ That Argos sought her own connection with Asklepios is vaguely gestured at by the scholiast to Pi. *Nem* 3.147 which reports that Argos instituted its *own* games of Asklepios: τίθεται δὲ ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ ἀγῶν Ἀσκληπιῶ, τῶν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν πρώτων θέντων, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ Ἀργείων Ἀσκληπιῶ...See Edelsteins 1945; Seve 1993.

⁸⁷ Paus. 2.23.3.

⁸⁸ Clark 2012: 77.

daughter of Temenos, the first Heraclid king of Argos.⁸⁹ Temenos had given his daughter in marriage to Deïphontes—himself the grandson of Herakles and lord of Epidauros—and appeared to favor him over his own sons. Angered by their father’s slight and eager to exact revenge on Deïphontes, Hymnetho’s jealous brothers abducted her away from Epidauros. During Deïphontes’ headlong pursuit of his wife-nappers, Hymnetho and her unborn child were killed. Deïphontes chased the brothers out of Epidaurian land, thus establishing the split between the two cities and their lands. In her honor, then, the Argives erected a *taphos* next to Sphyros’ *temenos* for Asklepios, while the Epidaurians dedicated an entire olive grove to her just outside their Asklepieion, from which no branch was to be removed.

Jennifer Larson argues that the “tug of war” over Hymnetho naturally renders in myth the political tensions between rival political factions.⁹⁰ To this I would add that Hymnetho’s pregnancy, as a powerful symbol of agricultural fertility (and dynastic union) gestures at the territorial nature of these tensions, and her death on the road between the two cities localizes the dispute to the borderlands of the eastern Argolid and Epidauros, memorialized by her olive grove in the Epidauria.⁹¹ The Epidaurian association with olives and borders is strengthened by a local

⁸⁹ Cf. Paus 2.19.1; 23.3; 2.26.2; 2.28.3-7. See also Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.17.9; Nikolaos of Damaskos *FrGHist* 90 F30 (below); Steph. Byz. s.v. Ὑρνήθιον for the *temenos* of Hymnetho at Epidauros and the name as an *ethnikon*; Dioscorides (*HE* 1691-6 Gow and Page) alludes to the dramatic performance of Hymnetho’s narrative, which suggests that by the 2nd century BC the story was reasonably well known. In fact, there is evidence that Euripides treated at least some part of this narrative cycle in a suite of plays: the *Temenos*, *Temenidae*, and, perhaps, the *Kresphontes*, which may have gone up as a trilogy (Clark 2012). It has been suggested that these plays were produced sometime around 420 in response to the military hostilities between Epidauros and Argos recorded by Thucydides. As Robertson (2009: 316) notes, Athenian loyalties inclined at this point toward Argos in the conflict. Nevertheless, it was also at just this time that Athens received Asklepios into its poliadic pantheon and, as Wickkiser (2008) contends, that certain political factions within Athens were attempting to forge peaceful ties with the aristocratic elements which dominated Epidaurian society. It is difficult to determine, then, what foreign agenda Euripidean drama served in staging this particular mythic cycle, if it served any at all. However, it seems plausible that even several decades after Argive expansion and socio-political reorganization, the Hymnetho mythic cycle was still perceived as a powerful and relevant way of embodying the complicated geopolitics of the Northern Peloponnese, even for an Athenian audience.

⁹⁰ Larson 1995: 143.

⁹¹ Paus. 2.28.3.

olive tree called “Twisted” which, according to legend, Herakles bent with his bare hands to mark the border between Epidauros and the cult center at Asine.⁹² In fact, this same olive tree returns us yet again to Bacchylides fr. 4, where it likewise appears marking the Asinean border(!). What is still more, Nikolaos of Damascus, in his recital of the Hyrnetho drama, cites her death precisely as the catalyst for a Dryopian invasion of the Argeia, which was rounded up by the Epidaurian Deiphontes, confirming the possibility of Epidauros leading the charge in an anti-Argive movement.⁹³

The precise link between the Hyrnetho myth and Asklepios admittedly remains murky, but whatever the subtending logic, both hung together through the superimposition of myth on cultic space as it commemorated, negotiated, or kept alive the broader disputes which existed between Argos, Epidauros, and the other cities of the Akte. Hyrnetho and Asklepios were thus coupled into the geographical system of Epidaurian border markers which could be seen also as a rallying point for the Dryopian cities to confederate with the quasi-Doric Epidaurians both in myth and in cult. Meanwhile at Argos she not only had a grave, but her name served as the basis for the fourth, non-Dorian tribe, the Hyrnathioi, redeploying the same mechanism of Sphyros’ inclusion in, and organization of, Argive society.⁹⁴ While we may not be able to recover precisely the symbolic significance of Hyrnetho among the four tribal groups which organized the Argive

⁹² Paus. 2.28.2.

⁹³ Nikolaos of Damaskos *FrGHist* 90 F30: Δηιφόντης πρῶτον μὲν ὑποπέμψας πρέσβεις κρύφα Τροϊζηνίους καὶ Ἀσιναίους καὶ Ἑρμιονεῖς καὶ πάντας ὅσοι τῆδε Δρύοπες ὄκουν. Asine, naturally, has not yet been destroyed by the Argives.

⁹⁴ Cf. *IG* IV 600 (ἀ φυλὰ τῶν [Υ]ρναθίων); *IG* IV 488 (Υλλέων... Πανφυλᾶ[v], Ὑρναθίων); See Piérart 2000. Robertson (2009: 217) claims this ethnic eponym could only have been Dryopian in nature, and so is part of the Argive campaign for political unification with the Akte. As we have seen Hyrnetho was genealogically a Heraklid whose associations with Dryopians were forged posthumously in a military campaign *against* Argive aggressions. If this is the case then the phyletic name Hyrnethoi preserves the memory of difference and conflict even as it appropriates that conflict as a strand of Argive collective identity.

demos, it is clear that she serves to demarcate political groupings within the Argive community in the same way that she served to create and to fix spatial relationships within the Epidaurian one. At the same time that the cities used her to wrestle over authoritative versions of history and leadership, they also did so to make particular claims about social space in the midst of the convulsive second half of the fifth century.

That both these Hyrnetho and Sphyros emerge from the shadows in the fifth century to organize and articulate Argive political identity is an important piece of evidence in the complicated tangling of Argive-Epidaurian relations, one that happens also to drag the newly emergent and popular cult of Asklepios into the political mix. Against this background, the fact that Argos possessed four urban cults of Asklepios—at least two of which were very probably Classical—appears all the more striking. I suggest that the manner in which Hyrnetho embraces political and territorial conflict in relation to Asklepios is neither idle nor accidental, but is instead importantly revealing about the early origins of Asklepios and the dynamism of his cult in its earliest cultic context at Epidauros. So too, this helps us to see that the geographical situation of Asklepieia were not generically determined by concerns for healthy places, but were bound up in the specific processes and histories of social and political change.

Inside and Outside: Asklepios At Sikyon

Argos was not the only early adopter of Asklepios' cult in the area. The nearby Sikyonians maintained two Asklepieia—one urban and one extra-urban—which, as we will find, were implicated as well within the political and territorial excitements of the fifth century. Thanks to the destruction and relocation of Sikyon's acropolis by Demetrios Poliorketes at the

close of the fourth century BC, the archaeology of the pre-Hellenistic city is rather a mess.⁹⁵ Consequently for Asklepios' urban cult we are reliant mostly upon Pausanias who reports that, in his day, the healing sanctuary was located not far outside the agora, nearby the gymnasium, and that Asklepios' cult-statue there was a chryselephantine one crafted by Kalamis, a well-known artisan of the fifth century.⁹⁶ This report, along with several anatomical ex votos and relief sculpture dated to the late fifth and fourth centuries on display at the Sikyon Archaeological Museum permit us to situate the cult's foundation some time in the final quarter of the fifth century at the very earliest, likely after his arrival in nearby Argos and Corinth.⁹⁷ Again, we cannot know for certain, but given the distribution of finds related to the god within the Hellenistic city, it is likely that his Classical cult was also urban and re-located within an analogous place in the post-Poliorketes layout.⁹⁸ Pausanias is somewhat more forthcoming about the circumstances surrounding Asklepios' arrival at Sikyon, where he tells us that (2.10.3):

φασὶ δὲ σφισιν ἐξ Ἐπιδαύρου κομισθῆναι τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ ζεύγους ἡμιόνων δράκοντι εἰκασμένον, τὴν δὲ ἀγαγοῦσαν Νικαγόραν εἶναι Σικυωνίαν Ἀγασικλέους μητέρα, γυναῖκα δὲ Εἰχέτιμου. ἐνταῦθα ἀγάλματα ἐστὶν οὐ μεγάλα ἀπηρτημένα τοῦ ὀρόφου. τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ δράκοντι Ἀριστοδάμαν Ἀρατοῦ μητέρα εἶναι λέγουσι καὶ Ἄρατον Ἀσκληπιοῦ παῖδα εἶναι νομίζουσιν.

They say that the god was carried to them upon a mule-drawn wagon in the likeness of a snake and that Nikagora of Sikyon brought him, who was the mother of Agasikles and wife of Echetimos. Here there are statues, not large, hanging from the roof. They say the one riding upon the snake is Aristodema, mother of Aratos and believe that Aratos was a son of Asklepios.

⁹⁵ Cf. Griffin 1982; Riethmüller 2005; Lolos 2005 and 2011.

⁹⁶ Paus. 2.10.1.

⁹⁷ For the votive reliefs, see Riethmüller 2005: 66. See also the statue base for Asklepios *IG IV 431=SEG 11. 251*. Several examples of Roman era statues for Asklepios within the Hellenistic city have come to light, one of which was discovered in the bathing complex which now houses the Sikyon Museum (cf. *BCH* 1989: 598). See further below for Corinth.

⁹⁸ Cf. Riethmüller 2005: 66-7.

There are a number of elements within this foundation narrative which deserve our attention. First, as with other cults we have seen and will continue to see, is the baldly political connection between Asklepios and Aratos, the most important Sikyonian in Hellenistic history. That Aratos was considered Asklepios' son gestures at the civic importance of this cult. Secondly, we note the cult was imported direct from the metropole. Like Epidauros, Sikyon historically had a fraught relationship with Argos.⁹⁹ While their relations fluctuated in the Archaic period, by the Classical era Sikyon had pivoted away from Argos and Corinth and towards Spartan hegemony (indeed, Sikyon would offer Sparta a key strategic corridor for northern campaigns through the fifth and fourth centuries) thus aligning her wider strategic interests with that of Epidauros and the poleis of the Akte.¹⁰⁰ Sikyon's introduction of Asklepios' cult may thus have been part of a wider anti-Argive policy by fostering pro-Epidaurian links in the late fifth century.

The myth of Asklepios' arrival likewise warrants attention as it recalls Halieis' own foundational myth. Sikyonian-Halieisian interaction too shows that Sikyon had at least some military involvement around the Akte in the middle of the fifth century when, with the Epidaurians and Corinthians, they aided in the expulsion of an Athenian landing party in 460.¹⁰¹ While the details are shady, it seems that this invasion was motivated by Athenian desires to secure communications with Argos—precisely the Argive motivation in attacking Epidauros later

⁹⁹ Hdt. 5.67-9. Herodotus tells us the Sikyonian tyrant Kleisthenes changed the Dorian tribal names in the mid 6th century in order to stir anti-Argive sentiment, but that by the end of that century, those names had been reverted to their traditional forms. So, too, he stopped Sikyonian rhapsodic competitions held at Argos. See Kowalzig 2007: 129, 152 for the ethnic and political tensions between Sikyon and Argos played out in song. See Lolos 2011: 62-63. For Argive-Sikyon tensions, see further Griffin 1982; Parker 1994; Hall 2007.

¹⁰⁰ Hdt. 6. 86. In 494 BC Argos levied a fine against Sikyon (as well as Aegina) for supporting the Lacedaemonians in an invasion of Argive territory. See Lolos 2011: 61-66.

¹⁰¹ Cf. *IG I³* 1147; *SEG* 31. 369; Thuc. 1.105.1; Diod. Sic. 11. 78. See Griffin 1982; Lolos 2011. According to Jameson et al. (1994: 76 n. 20) the evidence confirming Sikyonian involvement is a greave dedicated at Olympia. For Halieisian history, see Jameson 1969; Jameson et al. 1994: 72f.; Kowalzig 2007: 157.

in 419.¹⁰² Proximity to Epidauros and joint enmity towards Argos makes the narrative parallelism of Asklepios' fifth century arrival and establishment at both of those city states all the more striking. This is especially so given that the narratives, as they stand, mask active involvement of Epidauros in "spreading" the cult; they seem, rather, to reflect local interests in acquiring the power of the god close to home, or perhaps, in reinforcing friendly relations with Epidauros.

Pausanias informs us that there existed still another healing sanctuary in the country-side (χώριον) of Titane, a small settlement which straddles the borderlands of the Sikyonia and Phliousian territory to the south. At Sikyon, then, there appears to have existed the classic dual model of a central urban cult and extra-urban one. Indeed, this cultic complex was developed well away from the main settlement of Sikyon. A Roman inscription for Asklepios positively identifies the cultic area as the hill of the church Agios Tryphon, where it seems to have provided a model too of Vitruvian planning. As Pausanias describes it and modern topography confirms, the sanctuary was perched near the top of a rising saddle (λόφος) overlooking the sprawling plain below. So too it seems that the cult was reasonably well watered by springs and a Roman aqueduct nearby.¹⁰³ That this Asklepieion fits the urban/extra-urban model has not before been recognized, as most commentators have regarded Titane as a city-state or an "acropolis" in its

¹⁰² Hdt. 7.137.2-3 reports Halieis' capture by enterprising Spartans sometime before 446, suggesting, perhaps, that Athens had successfully brought Halieis under her sway by other means. Again, it appears they secured an agreement with Halieis to garrison the city and use her harbor by 424/3. Cf. *IG* I³ 75; Jameson 1969: 314; Jameson et al. 1994 77f.

¹⁰³ Martha 1879; Riethmüller 2005: 68-71; Lolos 2011: 389-98. Cf. *IG* IV 436, discovered built into the church. The hill slopes gently to the northwest where it creates an extensive terrace, supported on its north side by a long retaining wall, which Lolos (2011: 391) identifies as the Asklepieion peribolos wall. Within the peribolos, a bath complex has been identified, fed by underground Roman aqueducts. This would seem to suggest also the appropriate locale of an Asklepieion. Riethmüller (2005: 70-1) however, supports identifying the Asklepieion with a building on the eastern terrace below the hill of Agios Tryphon, some 200m away.

own right.¹⁰⁴ However, Yannis Lolos has convincingly demonstrated that Titane was not a politically independent entity with an un-determined relationship to Sikyon at all, but a fortified religious center lying on the Sikyonian periphery.¹⁰⁵ Part of the confusion surrounding the Titane sanctuary stems from the large area enclosed by the fortification walls, which gives the impression of a town. Pausanias, however, transmits a clutch of interesting details that throw clarifying light upon the site (2.11.5-8):

ὕστερον δὲ Ἀλεξάνωρ ὁ Μαχάονος τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ παραγενόμενος ἐς Σικυωνίαν ἐν Τιτάνῃ τὸ Ἀσκληπιεῖον ἐποίησε. [6] περιοικοῦσι μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλοι καὶ τὸ πολὺ οἰκέται τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κυπαρίσσων ἐστὶν ἐντὸς τοῦ περιβόλου δένδρα ἀρχαῖα: τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα οὔτε ὁποίου ξύλου γέγονεν ἢ μετάλλου μαθεῖν ἔστιν οὔτε τὸν ποιήσαντα ἴσασι, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τις ἄρα ἐς αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀλεξάνωρα ἀναφέρει. φαίνεται δὲ τοῦ ἀγάλματος πρόσωπον μόνον καὶ ἄκραι χεῖρες καὶ πόδες: χιτῶν γάρ οἱ λευκὸς ἐρεοῦς καὶ ἱμάτιον ἐπιβέβληται. καὶ Ὑγείας δ' ἔστι κατὰ ταῦτὸν ἄγαλμα: οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἴδοις ῥαδίως, οὕτω περιέχουσιν αὐτὸ κόμαι τε γυναικῶν αἱ κείρονται τῇ θεῷ καὶ ἐσθῆτος Βαβυλωνίας τελαμῶνες. ᾧ δ' ἂν ἐνταῦθα τούτων ἰλάσασθαι θελήσῃ τις, ἀποδέδεικται οἱ τὸ αὐτὸ σέβεσθαι τοῦτο ὃ δὴ καὶ Ὑγείαν καλοῦσι...[8] [ἀγάλμα] λίθου δὲ Ἀσκληπιος ἐπίκλησιν Γορτύνιος....

Later, Alexanor, son of Machaon, son of Asklepios, was born in the Sikyonia and built a sanctuary for Asklepios in Titane. [6] While some others live nearby, the greater part are servants of the god; within the peribolos there is also an ancient glade of cypress trees. It is not possible to learn of what sort of wood or metal the cult statue was made, nor to know who did so, although some report Alexanor himself made it. The face of statue and its fingers alone are discernible, for a chiton of white wool and a himation cover it. There is a similar statue of Health which you cannot easily see, so thoroughly is it covered by the hair of women who cut off their locks and, together with strips of Babylonian garb, dedicate them to the goddess. By whatever of these one desires to propitiate the gods,

¹⁰⁴ Riethmüller 2005: 68-9 acknowledges it as within the *chora* of Titane, but treats it as an independent “miniature-town” (Bergstädtchen) with its own acropolis. For the relationship between the Titane cult complex and the Sikyonian center, see Lolos 2005 and 2011: 396-7.

¹⁰⁵ Lolos 2011: 218f.

they receive the same instruction to worship this which they call “Health”...And there is a stone statue of Asklepios known by the epiklesis Gortynios¹⁰⁶...

Several points of interest immediately stand out from this fascinating if strange report. The first is Pausanias’ clear statement that those who live in the surrounds are mostly servants of the god. On this rests Lolos’ assertion that this was not an independent political entity, but a cultic center within the wider reach of the Sikyonia. Second is the striking age of the cult. From its foundation by one of Asklepios’ immediate descendants to the venerably archaic images of Asklepios and Hygieia, combined with the otherwise inexplicable place of the “Babylonian” offerings in the midst of the bare country, the impression is one of hoary antiquity.¹⁰⁷ Indeed, field surveys show continuous usage of the site from the Geometric period onward, indicating that this had long been an important site within Sikyon’s religious landscape.¹⁰⁸ Asklepios and Hygieia, however, were not likely to have come to Titane any earlier than the fifth century, so we must look further back in time for its original inhabitants.

Pausanias tells us too of an (apparently shared) sanctuary of Athena and Asklepios’ mother Coronis, where both had old wooden cult icons (*xoana*), which surmounted the sanctuary hill and were flanked by a stoa displaying images of Dionysos, Hecate, Aphrodite, the Mother of

¹⁰⁶ The epiklesis Gortynios is important, and there is sadly no space here to delve more deeply. The Arkadian town of Gortyn is (now) known to have possessed two cults of Asklepios, one just outside of the city and the other abutting the walls of the Acropolis (see Martin and Metzger 1941; Melfi and Alevridis 2005; Riethmüller 2005 s.v. Gortys). Martin and Metzger pointed out early on the non-coincidental connection between the sanctuary’s layout and that of Epidauros. Moreover, this cult is no later than the early fourth century BC. Like Sikyon, then, Gortys was an early adopter of the cult and very consciously paraded its Epidaurian origins through spatial organization. Melfi and Alevridis (2005) assess the Asklepieion at Alipheira—which was also an urban cult built into the acropolis walls—and find the same conscious orientation towards the Epidaurian model. This helps confirm Melfi’s (2007) thesis that the cult played an early and important role in Arkadia. What is more, Gortys, Alipheira, and Tegea—where there is another early and important cult of Asklepios (Paus. 8.46.1; 8.54.5)—are all Arkadian “border” towns. Their adoption of the cult based closely on Epidauros’ model thus adds weight to that cult’s character as a frontier one.

¹⁰⁷ Nilsson 1906: 410-11.

¹⁰⁸ Lolos 2005; 2011: 398, notes the “exceptional quality of the material,” which included imported Attic ceramics and sculptural fragments.

the gods, and Tuche.¹⁰⁹ Settled just below the sanctuary hill, Pausanias describes an altar to the winds (βωμός ἀνέμων) and an installation of four *bothroi* where a priest also performed yearly secret rites (ἀπόρρητα), muttering the spells of Medea to tame the winds as they blasted down from the Peloponnesian highlands.¹¹⁰ In these evocative snatches of detail, one detects the unmistakable flavor of an ancient healing cult, its earlier apotropaic essence probably still evinced in the wind magic performed at the nearby altar.¹¹¹ This magical connection between winds and the figure of Medea may have been motivated by Sikyon’s maritime interests and, hence, her need for favorable winds. Indeed, the connections between wind magic and human sacrifice, especially child sacrifice—with which Medea was widely associated—maintained an exuberant hold on the Greek mind.¹¹² But so too wind magic held strong links with the chthonic, and there might have been an agricultural logic behind the ritual as well.¹¹³ At any rate, the ties between Medea’s charms and her mastery of healing/harming *pharmaka* are clear and made all the more evident by the proximity of the altar to the later healing cult complex.¹¹⁴ In light of the old, weird wind magic performed next to the archaic, wooden images of Coronis and Athena and their unique moirocaustic sacrifices, we are probably dealing with a very old healing cult.

¹⁰⁹ Paus. 2.11.7-8. These are also wooden statues, except the one of Asklepios Gortynios.

¹¹⁰ This should probably be identified with the building on the lower terrace east of the Agios Tryphon hill (Lolos 2011: 395, *pace* Riethmüller 2005: 70). However, the absence of any pre-Roman cultic material in the area is puzzling.

¹¹¹ This recalls similar wind rites at, e.g. Keos on the rising of Sirius, or the Spartan paean to Euros (*PMG* 858) cf. Burkert 1985: 175.

¹¹² See Scullion 1994; Collins 2008: 57f.

¹¹³ For wind magic and cult, cf. Burkert 1985: 175; Scullion 1994: 111 (with reference to Titane); Lolos 2005: 292; Blakley 2006: 152-154.

¹¹⁴ Here, too, the connection with Helios is obvious, as well, perhaps as the pretense of “Titan,” from whom the sanctuary takes its name. Medea, often genealogically connected with Helios in myth, is here paired with the solar power Helios, joining the sun to the winds in what recalls a kind of agricultural weather magic, which can also be “maritime in its iconology” (Blakley 2006: 152).

More striking than the archaic origins of the healing cult are the implications lurking behind the tradition of its founder, the Sikyonian Alexanor. Now, Machaon was a popular healing divinity especially in the Peloponnese, but like Sphyros, Alexanor presents a mostly obscure figure who appears to have received cult only in Sikyon.¹¹⁵ Alexanor was likely, then, originally a healing hero eventually displaced by Asklepios, yet still saluted in Sikyonian traditions concerning the old site at Titane. It is unclear whether this event preceded the incorporation of Asklepios in the urban area, with its direct connection to Epidauros. More importantly, the myth which held that Alexanor was a grandson of Asklepios by Machaon directly compares with Argos' own foundation myth concerning Sphyros, *also* a son of Machaon. As we saw in the case of the urban Asklepieion, Sikyon embraced her cultic links with Epidauros at a time when the Epidaurian sanctuary was posturing itself against Argive interests. If Argos had appropriated Asklepiadic elements for her new political topography in a manner aimed at denying Epidaurian claims, it seems that Sikyon meant to bolster the authority of her own cults through the dual appeals of importation and genealogical connection to the Epidaurian metropole. Evidently, Asklepios' role in articulating wider interstate policy did not terminate at the border of the Argeia and Epidauria.

The geographical situation of this Asklepieion offers meaningful parallels with the Epidaurian sanctuary as well. As we noted above, Lolos has argued that Titane was not an

¹¹⁵ Another of Machaon's sons, and brother of Alexanor, Polemocrates, was the prominent healer in the border land district of Thyreatis (Paus. 2.38.6). The name Polemocrates chimes *particularly* loudly given the importance of Thyreatis in the border disputes between Argos and Sparta discussed above. See also Riethmüller 2005: 92f. For Machaon's popularity in the Peloponnese cf. Paus 3.26.9; 4.3.2; 4.30.3. For Asklepios taking the place of Alexanor, Lolos 2005; 2011.

independent “town” at all, but a religious outpost on the farthest reaches of Sikyonian territory.¹¹⁶ More specifically, he claims that Titane was perhaps the most important religious site outside of the Sikyonian city-center. In addition to the rich pottery finds there, the significance of the site is indicated by the network of clearly constructed and well travelled roads linking Titane to Sikyon and major neighboring *poleis* as well.¹¹⁷ Calling upon Polignac’s center-periphery model, Lolos suggests that the cult was situated there to define Sikyon’s wider territory through sacred procession. In particular, he suggests that the fortified cult site secured the pasture lands shared by the neighboring *polis* Phlious¹¹⁸—a polis of growing importance as an agricultural and strategic seat in the fifth century—and a sometime ally of Argos.¹¹⁹ Securing this border would thus have been a priority of the Sikyonians during the Classical period, but the presence of an early Asklepieion in pasture lands is again evocative.

The role we have seen the Epidaurian Asklepieion play in mitigating border conflicts helps us to refine Lolos’ point. As Jeremy McInerney, among others, points out, the spatial binary “city” and “country” on which Polignac’s center-periphery model rests is in many ways problematic; if there was a “deeply rooted opposition at play in the topographic imagination of

¹¹⁶ As a parallel for fort-cum-cultic complex, Lolos (2005: 287) points to the well known example of Poseidon’s temple at Sounion. Interestingly there is a (possible) fourth century cult of Asklepios at Sounion, for which see below.

¹¹⁷ Lolos 2005; 2011.

¹¹⁸ At this polis too, perhaps not surprisingly, Pausanias (2.13.5) records yet another shrine of Asklepios just down from the acropolis and before the agora, like in Sikyon town and Argos. The modern day church of Panagia Rachiotissa, nearby a temple of Demeter, was repeatedly identified with the Asklepieion by early modern visitors, but no archaeological work has confirmed this (Alcock 1991: 437; Riethmüller 2005: 61-3). Ultimately the cult there cannot be dated, but the Classical authority of A.’s pairing with Demeter is well established, and given the prominent position of the church (if we may indeed associate the church with the Asklepieion) on the acropolis, there is no reason to think the healing cult was a late addition (cf. Benedum 1986).

¹¹⁹ Lolos 2005: 287: “the fort of Titane is part of the defensive system of Sikyonia, and would provide safety for the people living around the sanctuary...”. According to Pausanias (2.12.3-14.4) Phlious was only some 40 stades distant from Titane. Pausanias also records for us primordial hostilities between Sikyon and Phlious, in the form of Dorian invaders launching their assaults from Sikyon. See Alcock 1991 for historical overview and evidence of considerable demographic expansion in the Phliasian plain beginning in the late Archaic period.

the ancient Greeks,” McInerney suggests that it unfolded in the more nuanced distinction between the order of settled agricultural land and the wild transience of herding on the borderlands.¹²⁰ This pairing represented two contrasting worlds with different conceptual repertoires regarding movement and fixity, boundaries and community. McInerney argues that as agricultural production expanded within the more fertile low lands, this created pressure on herding populations which were displaced outward to the territorial margins. The result was the creation of “conflict zones” along the highlands where territorial boundaries were always fuzzier, just as we have seen developing in the Akte. Cults at these border sites therefore not only asserted (and mediated) territorial claims of one or another city-state, but were integrated at the interface of agrarian and pastoral economies as institutional tools of mediation precisely *away* from urban centers.¹²¹

As at the Epidaurian metropole, Titane was linked directly to Sikyon by a sacred way, and its thick fortification walls and commanding position leave little doubt about its role in protecting and surveilling the Sikyonian border.¹²² At the same time, as Lolos has demonstrated, the sanctuary sat at an important cross-roads of a number of *poleis*, again confirmed by the wide variety of ceramic finds which have come to light there. The settlement was therefore not only situated along the pastoral outer band of the Sikyonia, but created the middle of a spiders-web connecting various important population centers outside the Sikyonia, hinting at the cult’s very

¹²⁰ McInerney 2006: 40.

¹²¹ McInerney 2006; 2010.

¹²² Paus 2.11.1-5. The gate which leads to Sikyon is called “Holy” (πόλιν καλουμένην Ἱεράν), around which there were numerous sanctuaries. Directly on the road to Titane, Pausanias records precincts of Demeter Prostasia/Kore and a Nympheion; further on the road there was an open grove sacred to the Eumenides. Pausanias describes the festivals celebrated at both places, indicating that this was a very important sacred processional way, which accords with the old age of the finds at the Titane site.

“centrality” along the margins.¹²³ The Titane Asklepieion would not only have offered a place of healing and protection to those who lived or pastured nearby, but may also have acted as the nearest and most logical place to settle whatever disputes arose before the eyes of the gods. Indeed, echoes of the need to “tame” the kinds of lawlessness of these wild places is evinced precisely in the dark and weird wind magic, with its chthonian connections to the agricultural earth and Medea’s own outsider-y status, appropriated and controlled by the local priest every year.

As an itinerant healer, Asklepios should have found a suitable place in this *imaginaire* of transhumance and mobility. The most important variants of Asklepios’ birth myth depict him as either as a cast-away, discovered and suckled in the mountain wastes by a she-goat and a goatherd,¹²⁴ or raised and educated by the hybrid centaur Chiron.¹²⁵ In both, Asklepios belonged from the first to the semi-wild places of the world and is imbued with their inherent marginality.¹²⁶ Titane thus picks up on the Epidaurian cult’s role not just in the fixing and protection of territorial bounds, but in its mediation of disputes which could flare up around them. This was probably especially necessary over the course of the Classical period (when Titane began to be fortified) as the nearby Phliousian population grew and put more land under cultivation, creating more and more pressure on the territorial edges. Ultimately, then, Asklepios

¹²³ For the agricultural and pastoral profile of this area of the Sikyonia, see Lolos 2011: 269-376.

¹²⁴ Paus. 2.26.3. This tradition, although recorded for the first time only in Pausanias, is surely known earlier on as in, e.g., *IG* II² 4692. Jost 1985: 495f. points to the possibility that this strand of myth is archaic and actually belongs to an Arkadian tradition most clearly evinced by the existence of an Asklepios Pais at Thelpousa (Paus. 8.25.3) which possessed an urban Asklepieion on the agora; see also Riethmüller 2005: 237-40 for its identification as a small *naos* within the Trajanic agora, *pace* Jost 1985: 60f. Again, according to the Periegete (8.25.11) Thelpousa controlled another extra-urban Asklepieion, which has yet to come to light.

¹²⁵ E.g., Pi. *Pyth.* 3; Macedonius’ *paian* to Asklepios and Apollo (= *IG* 1³ 171b. 10-12).

¹²⁶ See Parke 1985 for Apollo’s agrarian and nomadic proclivities, especially as Lykios, so frequent in the Peloponnese.

appears just as much of a healer of inter-polis and interpersonal conflict as he does of the individual body, and this wider social function in arbitration should be given due consideration when thinking about the geographical proclivities of Asklepieia.

This is an important point because, as we have seen, studies of healing cults tend to focus exclusively on their role as places of *healing* as if this were an analytical category on its own, rather than considering the way “healing” is implicated in social action or any of the other projects which were configured and conducted through the social world of cult. Rather than transposing assumptions about the activities of the healing onto the character of the landscape, it is essential that we consider, too, the sorts of activities (both real and imagined) that went on in the places we find healing cults. These early cults demonstrate the “logic” underlying healing was manifold and dynamic, that Asklepios may occupy the town center as well as the grove and mountain, and that these roles can be fitted into the complicated patterns we employ to describe the construction and regulation of Greek social spaces through cult.

Athens: Delimiting the Body Politic

I conclude this chapter with a study of the role played by Asklepieia in defining the religious landscape of Attica. This offers a natural concluding point not least because Athenian healing cults have occupied a leading place in the scholarship on Asklepieia generally.¹²⁷ But, more importantly, because they were distributed all over Attic territory, Athenian healing cults offer a rare synthesis of all their forms of “marginality,” and create an opportunity for observing

¹²⁷ For a still indispensable account of Attic healing cults see Kutsch 1913:16-39, 59-120; Edelsteins 1945 collects the remaining evidence; Kerenyi 1973; Verbanck-Piérard 2000 for an updated account of Attic healing cults with attention to the sources after Kutsch 1913; similarly, Melfi and Vikela 2002 with more attention to the relation between Asklepios and Amphiaraos; Vikela 2006 for internal comparison of Attic healing cults and what amounts to the outlines of a social history of healing cults. For targeted histories of Amphiaraos, Petrakos 1974; Sineux 2007, and below.

the logic gathering them together. At Athens we find them as we do other Asklepieia: situated on the acropolis,¹²⁸ within the agora,¹²⁹ by the harbor¹³⁰ and city-wall, as well as fusing with country-side sanctuaries like Eleusis, Oropos, Rhamnous, and Sounion with their well-established roles in defining and defending the Attic landscape. Altogether, then, Athens affords a synoptic and concise view of healing cults' instrumental role in promoting territorial unification and political integration through the provision of healing.

The chronology of Asklepios' introduction into Athens is by now well-trod ground. Much attention has been given to the gods' arrival in the Zea harbor of Piraeus in 420 BC, his subsequent "entertainment" in the city Eleusinion, and his eventual establishment on the South Slope of the Acropolis. These events are known to us through the brilliantly reassembled "Telemachos Monument," and the relative archaeological clarity of his large sanctuary on the

¹²⁸ Asklepieia on or next to acropoleis: Thorikos (*infra*); Megara (*IG VII 113*, but undated); Phlious (at least fourth century, *supra* and Alcock 1991: 437f.); Sikyon (*supra* and Lolos 2011); Messenian Asine (3rd century? cf. *IG IV 1409*); Alipheira (Paus. 8.26.4-6; see now Alevidis and Melfi 2005); Gortys (see Martin and Metzger 1941; Martin 1948; Jost 1985; Riethmüller 2005 and *supra*); Boeotian Orchomenos (manumission inscriptions from 3rd century forward: e.g., *IG VII 3191*. Cf. Schachter 1981: 107); and Phocian Stiris (3rd century?; cf. *IG IX 1, 37*).

¹²⁹ Asklepieia on agorai: Argos (*supra* and Paus. 2.21.1; Epidauros *astu* (Paus. 2.29.1, *IG IV 1577*; probably located next to a cult of Apollo Maleatas, mirroring the extra-urban locale. See Riethmüller 2005: 90-91 n.82); Gytheion, next to a cult of Apollo Karneios, but possibly imperial-era (Paus. 3.28.1; *IG V, 1 1156*; *IG II² 4526*); Sparta, like Argos, location unclear, but following Pausanias somewhere within the agora (Paus. 3.12.1; 15.10; cf. a votive relief depicting Asklepios and Hygieia, Sparta Mus. Inv. 710); the major civic cultic complex of Asklepios at Messene (cf. Paus. 4.31.10; see Riethmüller 2005: 156-66 for an exhaustive account of the cult layout and recent discovery of Geometric and Archaic levels underneath the Hellenistic temple); Patrai, next to a temple of Artemis Limnatis (Paus. 7.20.9; Riethmüller 2005: 186); Aigeira? (Paus. 7.26.7; cf. a fourth century inscribed statue base, *SEG 11 1268*); Thelpousa, destroyed by Pausanias' time (8.25.3) but mentioned in the context of another sanctuary of the Twelve Gods, and so likely on the agora (cf. Jost 1985: 61); and Eleteia (Paus. 10. 34.6; cf. further Hellenistic manumission inscriptions at *IG IX 1, 120-7*).

¹³⁰ Asklepieia by harbors: Corinthian Kenchreai (Paus. 2.3.5; *IG XII 1, 26*; see Lolos 2011: 104; Riethmüller 2005: 48-53; Rife 2010: 412); Piraeus, *infra*; Megara/Pagai (?) cf. Riethmüller 2005: 44-46; Phalara (fourth century, see *SEG 3 464*); Antisara (fourth century, Riethmüller 2005: 325); Peparethos (4/3rd century, Riethmüller 2005: 326-7); Delos (fourth century, e.g., *IG XI 2, 142. 25*; 144. 68); Kartheia, Keos (4/3rd century, see *IG XII 5, 550*); Lebena (see Chap 2); Lisos (3rd century, see *SEG 28 750=CEG 847*); Smyrna (Hellenistic?) cf. Paus. 2.26.8; 7.5.9.; Aristid. *Or.* 50. 102.). Other Asklepieia at or near gates: Epidauros Limeria (Paus 3.23.10); Hermione (?) cf. *IG IV 692*; Alipheira (above); Gortys (above); Pheneos (Hellenistic, see Müller 2005: 219-24; Kissas 2010; Giannakopoulos et al. 2012); Thasos (fourth century, see *IG XII, 8 265*). This inscription does not securely locate the cult by the city gate, but suggests its proximity to the "garden of Herakles by the gate," by charging the priest of Asklepios' with cleaning the garden).

Acropolis.¹³¹ In fact, the monument's relief sculpture portrays Asklepios' early cult in Zea harbor, identifiable through the inclusion of a ship's prow flanked by a votive depicting incubation and a lounging dog, confirming that Zea was the first place of his worship.¹³² Thus, by the close of the fifth century, Asklepios and Hygieia possessed at least three sanctuaries within the city walls.¹³³ It has been commonly supposed, and perhaps not unreasonably so, that Athens brought Asklepios in as a reaction to the devastations wrought by the plague which struck the city in 430, and that the cult then spread following the fluid avenues of empire.¹³⁴ Nevertheless, I hope by the end of this chapter that it will be clear how Athenian incorporation of Asklepios mimics the inclusion of his cult elsewhere and that Athens was responding to wider cultic trends embedded in processes of social and political change and that this is evinced by the cult's geographical and mythic attachments.

To understand the history of this process it is necessary to revisit briefly the model of health as a form of social discourse, especially as it interpenetrated with Athenian cultic life. Like Sphyros at Argos, Alexanor at Sikyon, Polemocrates at Euas, and myriad other local cults—Attica supported an entire ecosystem of healing deities prior to Asklepios' arrival. Apollo

¹³¹ Beschi 1967/8 for the Telemachos Monument. See Garland 1987 for Asklepios' place in Piraeus and 1992 for a more detailed accounting of the granting of *enktesis* and the phenomenon of new gods in the later fifth century Athenian landscape; see Parker 1996: 175-86 for points *pace* Garland; Clinton 1994 for the inclusion of the cult and the festival of the *Epidauria*; Ogden 2010 for reinterpretation of the evidence above; Wickkiser 2008 for further comments on *enktesis* on the acropolis and the local political history of the Attic Asklepieion. Further, Wickkiser 2009 for doubts concerning Asklepios' connection with the Athenian plague. For a new history of Asklepios' "residency" in the Eleusinion, see Lawton 2015. For the Acropolis Asklepieion, see Riethmüller 1999 with comments on the *bothros* and Asklepios' status as *heros* or *theos* (see also Erhenheim 2011 and Baker 2013 *pace*; Vikela 2006 pro); Lefantzis and Jensen 2009 for persuasive reconstruction of the multiple phases of the acropolis Asklepieion altar and doubts concerning the 'archaic' date of the *bothros*. See, also, now, Petridou 2015b: 179-80.

¹³² Cf. Wickkiser 2008: 67-76; Lamont 2015: 40.

¹³³ Within the first half of the fourth century he was worshipped as well in the Amyneion by the Pnyx (see *IG II²* 4365, c. 350 BC), the Amphiaraion (see below) and possibly in the Kerameikos (*IG II²* 4417), in addition to various cults within the Attic country side which will be considered below.

¹³⁴ E.g., Mikalson 1984; 2010; Edelsteins 1945; Garland 1992; Parker 1996; Verbanck-Piérard 2000; Mitchell-Boyask 2008; see Wickkiser 2008 and 2009 for one of the few rejections of this narrative.

*Paian*¹³⁵ was an early healer in Attica, but as elsewhere we encounter him too as Apollo *Apotropaios*, *Alexikakos*,¹³⁶ and *Prostaterios*,¹³⁷ assuming his familiar role as protector and warden against maladies.¹³⁸ Aphrodite was also the recipient of prayers regarding child-birth and reproductive health in general. This is confirmed by the dedication of reproductive ex votos at her sanctuary in Daphni, as well as the one she shared with Eros on the slopes of the Acropolis.¹³⁹ Similarly, Artemis received anatomical dedications as *Kalliste* along the road to the Academy and as *Kolainis* within the city.¹⁴⁰ Herakles, although a comparative stranger to the democratic mythological landscape of fifth century Athens, makes an occasional appearance in the Athenian record as a healer.¹⁴¹ So too, there is abundant, if sketchy, evidence pointing to a

¹³⁵ First attested as “Paian” in 429/8 BC in the “Treasury of the Other Gods” *IG I³ 383*. *IG I³ 1468bis* (426/5 BC) records the dedication of an altar to Apollo Paian at Delos, probably, as Diod. Sic. (12.58.6-7; cf. Thuc. 3.58 and Chap. 1) in connection with a resurgence of the plague in 426 as the motivation for the purification and sanctification of the island. He appears again in the Erchian calendar, receiving sacrifice nearby Hera Thelchinia and Zeus Epopetes, on the same day as Apollo Pythaeus and Leto (see Verbank-Piérard 2000).

¹³⁶ *Apotropaios* LSCG 18a=SEG 21. 541 and in the Marathonian Calendar; also *IG I³ 255* (probably); *IG II² 1358*; *IG II² 5009*; for *Alexikakos* *IG II² 4850* received worship at the Thargelia (LSS 14.49). See Faraone 1992: 59-66.

¹³⁷ Demosth. *Meid.* 52-3 (see *infra*); *IG II² 4727*; *IG II² 4852* (as Προστατηρίω[ι] [Ἄ]ποτροπαίωι); see further Kearns 1989: 14 n.28; Mikalson 1998: 115f. It is difficult to establish with certainty Prostaterios as present earlier than the mid fourth century. The oracle quoted by Demosthenes presumably is somewhat earlier than the speech but its original date is unknown.

¹³⁸ See Parker 2005: 414 for the “spatial dimension” of this protection. That is, Apollo’s protective aspect is not generalized as an abstracted warding away, but is embodied at points of access, just as Asklepios’ cults by gates and doors.

¹³⁹ van Straten 1981: 120-1; Vikela 2006: 46. See Riethmüller 2005: 115 for the parallel constellation Aphrodite/Eros-Hippolytus-Asklepios on both the Athenian Acropolis and the Troizenian plain.

¹⁴⁰ van Straten 1981: 116; Vikela 2006: 46-7, who is correct in adding that these powers were native to these particular divinities as guardians of women, and that these do not represent “healing” sanctuaries in the same capacity as Asklepieia. Demeter at Eleusis was also the recipient of votives depicting eyes (cf. Vikela 2006: 47), sometimes lumped in with the general category of healing votives. I suspect the eyes in this context refer more directly to the drama of revelation and the significance of seeing which culminate initiation. They thus stand as a salient reminder that not all anatomical ex votos are readily identifiable with a “locus affectus.”

¹⁴¹ Schol. ad Ar. *Ran* 501; Dem. *Meid.* 52. For Herakles *Alexikakos* in the mid fourth century BCE, see *IG II² 1582*.

panoply of early “minor” healing figures like the mysterious *Heros Iatros*,¹⁴² *Aminos*,¹⁴³ *Halôn*,¹⁴⁴ *Amphilochos* and *Aristomachos*¹⁴⁵ distributed throughout the city and dotting the Attic country-side.

We are acquainted, already, with Athens’ most prominently situated healer, *Athena Hygieia*, guarding the acropolis by the beginning of the fifth century.¹⁴⁶ From the viewpoint of this “panthéon d’santé,” it is clear that from the start of the fifth century, and likely much earlier, healing cults had a strong presence in and around Athens.¹⁴⁷ In considering *Asklepios*’ Athenian history, more critical weight needs to be placed on the fact that these healing cults and the legends supporting them were already threaded into the burgeoning democratic ideology, whether by political geography or the sociality of the festival calendar. *Hygieia*, as we have seen, was not relegated to descriptions of individual wellbeing and the newly emerging ethical techniques of self-care. Both she and this wide host of healing deities played an integral part in imagining the community and its social interrelations.

In addition to the civic contexts in which we have encountered *hygieia*, it/she was often featured with corporations of deities—both “civic” and “domestic.” For instance, *Demosthenes*’ *Against Meidias* quotes an oracle which pairs *hygieia* with *Zeus Hypatos*, *Herakles*, and *Apollo*

¹⁴² See *IG II²* 839, and Dow 1985.

¹⁴³ *Aminos* received cult near the *Pnyx*, where traces of healing activities go back to the sixth century. The inscriptions of the fourth century show him inexorably paired with *Asklepios* and *Hygieia*, forming a triad which persists well into the first century AD (*IG II²* 4435; 4457; 4487; *orgeones* of *Aminos*, *Asklepios* and *Dexion* c.350 BCE *IG II²* 1252+999=*SEG* 26:135). Cf. Verbank-Piérard 2000; Vikela 2006.

¹⁴⁴ *Halôn* is otherwise unknown except for the tradition which associates him with the priesthood held by *Sophocles* and so links him to *Asklepios*. *Vit. Soph.* 11=*TrGF* 4 T1 39-40; see Connolly 1998: 2 and 11.

¹⁴⁵ See *infra*.

¹⁴⁶ *IG I³* 824 (c.475 BC); *IG I³* 506 (statue base *post* 433); *Plut. Per.* 13.13; *Paus.* 1.23.4 reports *two* statues related to *hygieia* on the acropolis, one for *Athena Hygieia* and another for simply *Hygieia*. See Chapter One.

¹⁴⁷ Verbank-Piérard 2000.

Prostaterios, where we again see a relational approach to *hygieia* as a good secured through an allegiance of divinities whose epithets create a lofty superintendence and insuperable protection of space (*hypatos, prostaterios*).¹⁴⁸ In the context of Demosthenes' speech, this triad is summoned specifically in relation to the ancestral duty of the state to coordinate and sponsor choruses for Dionysos, commanded by both oracles at Delphi and Dodona. The spatial dimension of creating *hygieia* was thus notionally extended to the expansive imaginary domain of the choral performance, embodying in a particular place and time through the kinetics of song and dance the communalism implicit in the union of lofty Zeus, Herakles, and Apollo.¹⁴⁹

Health and healing cults, in their way, patterned the social structures and mental habits of both domestic and civic life at Athens before the Epidaurian god's arrival there, creating a ready framework for the god's inclusion and promotion. This throws into sharp relief much of the discussion addressing his installation in Athens, which, while noting with interest this rich appointment of pre-existing healing deities, often highlights the civic choreography and pageantry which attended Asklepios' emigration as cultic innovation.¹⁵⁰ What we must understand, then, is that while Asklepios' transplantation to Attic soil *was* conspicuous for its attraction of civic symbolism, it stands at the culmination of a trend which viewed health as part of the cultic nexus already tying together individual, family, and city. In terms of the social symbolism of his inclusion into the civic pantheon—which we will see rested very much on the

¹⁴⁸ Dem. *Meid.* 52-3. Intriguingly, this list echoes the coalition of gods the author of the Hippocratic *Regimen* 4.89 recommends invoking for the sake of good health. This included in the case of “good signs” Helios, Zeus Ouranios (identical with Hypatos?), Zeus Ktesios (see *supra*), Athena Ktesia, Hermes and Apollo. In the case of “adverse signs” one ought to call on “the Averters,” Earth, and the heroes.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Kowalzig 2007. It is also relevant to note the propinquity of the Athenian Asklepieion *en astu* to the theater of Dionysos Eleutherios and the Odeion as well as Asklepios' incorporation into the festal program of the Greater Dionysia.

¹⁵⁰ Garland 1992; Clinton 1994; Parker 1996; see especially Wickkiser 2008 *passim*; Lawton 2015.

topographic associations of his cult—Asklepios stands out in degree rather than kind. To distinguish this god from the rest of the “panthéon de santé,” we must then turn to the way in which Athenian social history played out in the uses and organization of cultic space.

At Home Abroad: Asklepios in Piraeus and the Acropolis

Unfortunately, Asklepios’ first Athenian cult in the Zea harbor is buried under impenetrable layers of modern construction. Excavations of Piraeus by Dragatsis in the nineteenth century, however, brought to light a series of votive reliefs depicting adorants worshipping large, rampant snakes, some of which were dedicated to Zeus Meilichios or Philios, while others featured iconographic similarities to reliefs uncovered at the Acropolis Asklepieion.¹⁵¹ Further inscriptions, including an honorary decree for a Hellenistic priest of Asklepios and a *horos* stone, ultimately confirmed the site as the location of the Piraeus Asklepieion.¹⁵² According to Dragatsis’ reports concerning a peribolos wall there, the cult was situated roughly 80m east from Zea along the major artery connecting the naval harbor to the Hippodamian *agora* and the slopes of the Mounychia Hill.¹⁵³ Until 2007 this was the state of our material knowledge of the cult, when the reports of Petridaki’s rescue excavations expanded our understanding of the sanctuary site considerably.¹⁵⁴ The discovery of inscribed votive stelae, anatomical ex-votos, and a Classical/Hellenistic statue of a young girl holding a goose within the context of a rectangular building at what must have been the sanctuary’s rear, permits the

¹⁵¹ See Riethmüller 2005; Lamont 2015. Dedications to Zeus Meilichios, *IG II²* 4617-20, where, tellingly, 4619 (fourth century?) features an Asklepiades son of Asklepiadoros as the dedicant; for Zeus Philios, e.g., *IG II²* 4623-26.

¹⁵² Cf. *IG II²* 4453; *IG I³* 1081.

¹⁵³ Lamont 2015: 38.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Papadopoulou 2015; Lamont 2015, who cites Petritaki 2010 (*non vidi*).

conclusion that the total area of the sanctuary was considerably larger than previously thought, extending south all the way to the harbor's fortification walls.

So too, this sanctuary either bordered on or included the areas in which Zeus received worship as Meilichios and Philios, and possibly even maintained connections with the Serangeion nearby, which was outfitted with a bathing complex.¹⁵⁵ From a *lex sacra* (discussed in the Appendix) we find also that Asklepios was honored in Piraeus with the usual suspects: Maleatas, Apollo, Hermes, Iaso, Akeso, and Panacea, who share his altars and *naos*.¹⁵⁶ Jessica Lamont has proposed that repeated sacrifice to this expansive constellation of gods as “sunnaoi theoi” was central to the process of naturalizing, or “appropriating” Asklepios for an Athenian context.¹⁵⁷ This may be so, but so too it mirrors the atmospheric tension which characterized Piraeus as a “shared” place. The harbor area was simultaneously a symbol of Athenian sea-power and the radical democracy which drove it, yet it was also subject to unique and intensive forms of political regulation by the *astu*.¹⁵⁸ For Piraeus was haven to the unassimilable metics and *xenoi* through whose hands and labor flowed the commercial wealth which enriched the city. Within the Athenian conceptual imaginary, this harbor district was therefore both central and peripheral, quintessentially Athenian and profoundly foreign. Repeated ritual in honor of a wide collectivity of gods in this new Athenian sanctuary for a manifestly Epidaurian god may thus have underlined Asklepios' own perceived role as a driver of Athenian social integration within

¹⁵⁵ Lamont 2015. For the Serangeion, see Harp. s.v. Σηράγγιον, quoting Aristophanes' lost *Georgoi*, probably produced in 424, and so predating Asklepios' arrival.

¹⁵⁶ *IG* II² 4962.

¹⁵⁷ Lamont 2015: 37; 44.

¹⁵⁸ See, e.g., von Reden 1995.

such a fraught place.¹⁵⁹ That is to say, Asklepios' presence in the Piraeus may itself have facilitated Athenian appropriation and naturalization of the exogenous as much as he was himself "naturalized" by such a ritual. The god's arrival there and his subsequent inclusion in the Eleusinion kept alive the productive tension of this alterity, as the Piraeus itself continued to welcome in the new arrivals of peoples, goods, and gods from abroad which would contribute to the fabric of Athenian society.

The Piraeus sanctuary also activated Asklepios' strong cultic and geographical ties with Demeter and Kore.¹⁶⁰ Again, we know from the Telemachos Monument that before moving into his larger, proprietary *temenos* on the southern slope of the Acropolis, Asklepios was housed with the goddesses in the Eleusinion, where he and *Hygieia* likely maintained a shrine thereafter. This cultic apparatus, as Carol Lawton argues, probably comprised an altar and *agal mata* in the sanctuary's forecourt.¹⁶¹ This seems almost guaranteed by an Athenian tradition which held that, like Herakles, Asklepios arrived amidst the Greater Mysteries and was therefore initiated into the mystic rites as well. Thereafter, Athenians celebrated Asklepios' arrival in the *Epidauria* festival which took place on 18 Boedromion. This was a conveniently "empty" day within the Mysteries,

¹⁵⁹ The symbolic power of the Statue of Liberty to convey American ideals to incoming migrants despite the fact that the statue itself was originally gift of the French state seems an apt parallel.

¹⁶⁰ Benedum 1986; Parker 1996; Wickkiser 2008; Petridou 2015. See, e.g., a fourth century votive-relief (*NM* 1332=*IG* II² 4359) which depicts Asklepios with Demeter and Kore receiving a procession of suppliants (identified by some as *iatroi*, for which see Chapter 2).

¹⁶¹ Cf. Lawton 2015: 26. The existence of such a shrine there is also suggested by the large number of votive reliefs depicting Asklepios and Hygieia discovered in the immediate area of the Eleusinion.

during which initiates stayed at home, while a smaller procession was conducted between the god's cults at Piraeus and the Eleusinion.¹⁶²

From the very earliest, then, the geography of the god's cult was staged and determined according to familiar topographic patterns in which the city's problematical "periphery" at Piraeus was connected to the Agora. Furthermore, this festival was embedded within a wider ritual process whereby the Athenian "center" was linked to the Eleusinian "periphery" through the procession of those participating in the Mysteries. Indeed, the triangulation of Piraeus-Athens-Eleusis was strengthened by the fact that, by the close of the fifth century, the Eleusinians had founded their own Asklepieion just outside of the deme center.¹⁶³ We shall touch on that sanctuary again below, but for now, I think, it seems clear that Asklepios' multiple cult sites created complex processional relations which tended to stress the interconnection of the Athenian center with two of its most important "borders."

As Christa Benedum pointed out, the closeness of Demeter and Asklepios at Athens probably owed something to the soteriological interventions of the two gods, underpinned by the importance of agriculture to health.¹⁶⁴ But the purpose of such festal and topographical proximity in Athens was surely meant not only to stress the relationship between the salvific aspect of Eleusinian mystery religion and the healer of all maladies. Wickkiser noted too that Asklepios' inclusion within the Mysteries would not "have been without studied implications for Asklepios"

¹⁶² For the festival of the Epidauria, see *IG II²* 974.11 and 975. 5-8; Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 56.4; Philost. *VA* 4.18; Paus. 2.26.8 (Asklepios' initiation in the Mysteries). See Deubner 1932: 72-3 (but nb. the correction at Dow 1970 that it was the eponymous archon, not the archon *basileus*, who was charged with organizing the event). Clinton 1994 reconstructs this celebration which, probably, 'reenacted' the installation of the god in the city center by processing from the Piraeus to the shrine at the Eleusinion. Although, see Connolly 1998 for amendments to the involvement of Sophocles's house in the procession. See now also Melfi 2010; Petridou 2015.

¹⁶³ Reinforced by the historical importance of Eleusinian families in the priesthood of the Piraeus Asklepieion. See, e.g., *IG II²* 4962.11-12; *IG II²* 47. 24-6.

¹⁶⁴ Benedum 1986. Reiterated by Parker 1996; Wickkiser 2008; Lawton 2015.

for whom added attention would have come from the international character of the Greater Mysteries.¹⁶⁵ She observes as well that participation in the Mysteries was made more or less compulsory for Athenian *summachoi* by the “First Fruits Decree,” perhaps a decade before Asklepios’ arrival, which mandated the dedication by Athen’s client states of *aparchai* to Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.¹⁶⁶ These first fruits were, on the one hand, clearly an expression of growing Athenian financial control over her empire.¹⁶⁷ But beyond Wickkiser’s observation that Asklepios’ involvement in such an internationally centripetal festival suggests the political ardor with which he was received at Athens, this situation tends to corroborate Asklepios’ broader involvement in processes of integrating populations and generating communal interchange through the provision of health. Indeed, we can easily imagine that it was precisely through such festal participation that Asklepios’ cult spread to the Aegean and Ionian *poleis* which may have been more allergic to Epidauros’ own Doric affiliations.

A similar relationship obtained between Asklepios and Dionysos. The Asklepieion on the Acropolis slope overlooked the theater of Dionysos *Eleutherios* and the Odeion.¹⁶⁸ Like the *Epidauria*, the Athenian festival of the *Asklepieia* was inserted into the wider program of the Greater *Dionysia*, cementing through ritual the association of the two gods. Historically, it is perhaps no accident that the aitiological account of Dionysos *Eleutherios*’ place in the Athenian

¹⁶⁵ Wickkiser 2008: 87.

¹⁶⁶ *IG I³* 78; see Cavanaugh 1998.

¹⁶⁷ A well known inscription from the 460’s (*IG I³* 6) shows that the profits from the local dedications of such *aparchai* were to be transferred to Athena’s treasury on the acropolis, which, notionally, functioned as the state treasury; for the treasury on the acropolis as the “state-treasury,” cf. Thuc. 2.13.3.

¹⁶⁸ Wickkiser 2008: 84 notes the architectural parallelism between the Odeion in the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleutherios and the Telesterion at Eleusis, serving as a (further) visual point triangulating the cultic association of Dionysos, Demeter/Kore, and Asklepios. For the intimate spatial relationship between the sanctuary and theater, see Mitchell-Boyask 2008: 105-22, with comments on the relationship between drama, healing, and the significance of the cult for the *polis*. One should, however, take *cum grano salis* that work’s motivating hypothesis that Athens’ political interests in the cult were determined entirely by the plague of 430.

pantheon is structured around a communal disease and its remittance.¹⁶⁹ The scholiast to Aristophanes explains that, when Dionysos entered Attica from Eleutherae, he was initially rebuffed by the Athenians and so punished the men with a genital disease until they welcomed him into the city. The surface level of the *aition* fulfills the function of explaining the place of apotropaic *phalloi* as props on the stage.¹⁷⁰ The historical subtext, however, is uncovered by the Athenians' original "unwillingness" to accept Dionysos into the city. This hesitancy, probably, masks the political reality of Eleutherae's forced absorption into Attica, and an Athenian desire to gloss over, or, rather, to *invert* the violent coercion of her territorial expansion.¹⁷¹ Similar to Eleusis which bordered the Megarid, Eleutherae occupied an interstitial frontier location as the "gateway to Boeotia," with a temple of Dionysos there helping mark off Attic land.¹⁷² Even if there does not appear to have been an Asklepieion at Eleutherae, the *Dionysia* included Asklepios, both within its festival calendar and by concluding the procession from Eleutherae right next to his precinct. Even if we reject the notion that Asklepios was "invited" to Athens *ob pestem*, the placement of the city Asklepieion in a spatial dialogue with the Theater would certainly have invoked memories of another, ancient plague, forging a relationship between Asklepios' healing abilities and the enactment of the city's collective, mythic past. Asklepios' infusion into the Eleutherian procession through his sanctuary's contingency to the Theater

¹⁶⁹ Schol. ad Ar. *Ach.* 243.

¹⁷⁰ Burkert 1985: 52f.

¹⁷¹ The absorptive nature of the festival is hinted at, too, by the centripetal direction of the Greater Dionysia's *pompe* and *xenismos* which moved from Eleutherae at the Athenian "*eschara*" (*IG* II² 1006) to the Athenian center at the Agora, and later the sanctuary of Dionysos Eleutherios (see Sourvinou-Inwood 2003 for the development of this process). We will see more fully below how this imbricates Asklepios into a complex heartbeat of cultic life as he follows the expansion and contraction of civic territory as imaged through centripetal and centrifugal movement.

¹⁷² Paus. 1.2.5; 20.3; 29.2. For Eleutherae's importance in the protection of Attic territory, see now Fachard 2013.

therefore re-inscribed healing and disease as powerful structural devices for the “historical” assembly of the community through the arrival and introduction of its (new) gods.

As in the case of the Eleusinian Mysteries, Athens’ ability to retrofit local cult festivals like the *Dionysia* to meet her imperial aims are well known and need little comment.¹⁷³ By the mid fifth century, those present at the Greater Dionysia were not limited to the Attic community, but were members of a wider ambit of Athenian allies conscripted into participation through their financial obligations to the Delian league. It was during the Dionysia that the allies’ yearly tribute was put on public display. Like the dedication of the “First Fruits,” and the annual reassessment of the tribute during the Panathenea, these acts of mandatory financial contribution were socially embedded in ritual participation. As a result, these performances signaled more than just Athenian “imperial control” over her allies.¹⁷⁴ Rather, these demands illuminated the “religious” scope of Athens’ imperial agenda as it was managed and orchestrated through a Turnerian frame of *communitas*.¹⁷⁵

Just as it had done with the local annexing of Eleutherae and Eleusis, religious ritual was a principal mechanism by which Athens attempted to integrate the disparate parts of its “empire” into a wider notional community. It is possible to understand, then, the interrelation of Athens’ imperial project and her ritual topography as an attempt to create a cultic community that mapped the expansion of a new Aegean-wide political identity. Previous scholars have missed that Asklepios was therefore not simply grafted into a symbolic system meant to impress or persuade visiting allies of Athenian might. Rather, he was enlisted into the cultic dynamics of a

¹⁷³ E.g., Goldhill 1990; Sourvinou-Inwood 1994; 2003.

¹⁷⁴ Pace Wickkiser 2008: 88.

¹⁷⁵ Kowalzig 2007: 20, who notes, additionally, that of course this ritual *communitas* was not strong enough to pull the whole project off.

far-reaching campaign whose chief aim was political and territorial integration—both foreign and domestic—on an unprecedented scale.¹⁷⁶

Oropos: Asklepios/Amphiaraos on the front-lines

Asklepios' influence was thus not restricted to the Acropolis and Piraeus, but looked widely across the Attic landscape and, perhaps, across the Aegean. Athens' interest in new healing figures was not, however, restricted to Asklepios. She "recruited" another healing figure, the Argive-Boeotian hero Amphiaraos, who was different from, but unmistakably modeled upon, the Epidaurian healer. Moreover, in addition to the aforementioned Asklepieion at Eleusis, there existed important rural healing cults in the demes of Oropos, Rhamnous, and Sounion, all of which (except Oropos) received increased cultic investment in the early fifth century, probably as part of the interrelated projects of Kleisthenic democratic reform and territorial defense.¹⁷⁷ While these healing sanctuaries were indeed "extra-urban" by virtue of their situation outside the Athenian center, such a designation overlooks the role performed by these Amphiaraia and Asklepieia in helping to protect, define, and articulate the Attic landscape with the civic imaginary of the healthy body politic.

Amphiaraos' most famous sanctuary was the one situated east of the small port-town of Oropos, itself nestled within the very north-eastern corner of Attica, looking north across the straights towards Euboean Eretria.¹⁷⁸ By the end of the fourth century, suppliants came from all

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Morris 2008.

¹⁷⁷ Paga 2015.

¹⁷⁸ Eretria, it is worth noting, possessed, probably from the fourth century on, two Asklepieia: an urban cult and an extra-urban one. While neither have been excavated, the extra-urban sanctuary has been located along the eastern border of Eretrian territory (cf. Riethmüller 2005: 256-60). The well known *lex sacra* (IG XII 9, 194) regulating a festival procession for Asklepios from the city center to the extra-urban cult confirms the cult's civic importance and suggests its role in delimiting the Eretrian community, possibly inspired by the Athenian developments to the south.

over the Greek world to receive miracle cures from Amphiaraos and to make incubatory, oracular enquiries of the hero-seer. Despite its Athenian reputation, Oropos first appears in the historical records of the fifth century as a contested space, a borderland over which the Athenians and Boeotians squabbled for the centuries to follow.

The most recent archaeological surveyors describe the city's situation thus: "[g]eographically, Oropos was part of Boeotia, politically an extension of Attica, and commercially a part of the Euboeian network."¹⁷⁹ Athens, especially, was eager to secure Oropos as the primary entrepôt of grains and cereals from Euboea and the north, while Thebes was equally concerned to deprive her rival of this strategic and economic foothold.¹⁸⁰ Nevertheless, despite Athens' unflagging efforts to maintain control of this crucial port-town, Oropos resisted full integration into the Athenian political machine and Theban attempts to pull her into the Boeotian League alike. Amidst the push and pull of Athenian-Theban hostilities, the Oropian Amphiaraion emerged as the fulcrum by which these competing states attempted to leverage influence and broadcast control. The warrior-seer-healer Amphiaraos and his important sanctuary thus presents a frothing microcosm of the wider political program of staking and reinforcing claims over disputed territories through the ownership of healing cults. Previous scholarship, however, has overlooked that Amphiaraos' healing character should not, in fact *cannot*, be disassociated from this fundamentally "frontier" nature.¹⁸¹

The early history of the cult there is not wholly clear. While Herodotus informs us that Athens took Oropos from Thebes by force in 506, we know little directly of the city itself or the

¹⁷⁹ Cosmopoulos 2001.

¹⁸⁰ Thuc. 7.28.1. See Sineux 2007.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Parker 1996: 146-9; Sineux 2007: 91-2.

sanctuary during this time.¹⁸² Herodotus also seems to know the cult of Amphiaraos as a Theban institution,¹⁸³ and never explicitly references this cult at Oropos.¹⁸⁴ Cultic use at the site in the early fifth century is entirely murky;¹⁸⁵ within the second half of the fifth century, however, it appears the Oropian Amphiaraion was functioning as the community's principal civic cult, not only delimiting its extra-urban territorial boundary, but acting as a festival grounds as well as an administrative and juridical seat.¹⁸⁶ The Amphiaraion was therefore doubtless the focus of Oropian civic and religious life. Consequently, it was to this sanctuary that Athens looked to invest for the purposes of fortifying political influence and securing her economic and territorial interests.¹⁸⁷

The fourth century inscriptional record conjoined with survey archaeology of land use reveal the amount of administrative energies poured into the region and confirm the sanctuary's

¹⁸² Hdt. 5.77.1. Athens used Oropos as a base for naval operations against the Persians and continued to use the port to support her maritime and commercial interests in the region thereafter, until losing control of the land again to the Thebans in 411. In 395 the city was 'officially' integrated into the Boeotian *koinon*, although it was technically granted "independence" in 387 and was very shortly re-absorbed by Athens in 378/7. However, not long after in the 360s the Eretrians, with the help of Thebes, 'liberated' the city from Athens until 335, when the town was again under Athenian jurisdiction.

¹⁸³ Cf. Hdt. 1.46; 1.49; 1.52; 1.82; 8.134. Although, Herodotus never specifies the location of the Theban Amphiaraion, which has led some (e.g. Sineux 2007: 16) to suspect Herodotus' Athenian bias by deliberately talking around Amphiaraos' place in Theban religion. H.'s comments at 8.134 make clear, however, Amphiaraos' role as a Theban "ally," and, indeed, Herodotus' silence concerning Athenian "ownership" of Amphiaraos is equally pronounced.

¹⁸⁴ See Parker 1996; Sineux 2007 for recital of the interpretive difficulties.

¹⁸⁵ As Parker 1996: 136, relegated to a single herm (*JG I*³ 1476).

¹⁸⁶ Petrakos 1968; Cosmopoulos 2001; Sineux 2007.

¹⁸⁷ As Sineux (2007) points out, it is also to this period that we can date Euripides *Suppliants* (420's) and its clear anti-Theban/pro Argive agenda. Again, as in the case of Hymetho/Deiphontes, we discover in the plays of Euripides an acute Athenian interest in Argive myth for the purpose of framing contemporary geopolitical debates. Indeed, Sineux argues that this is an important fact in the selection of Amphiaraos as a healing figure at Oropos as opposed to, e.g. Asklepios. In addition to the political benefits of his Argive ties, Amphiaraos, the complicated warrior-seer-healer of Argos, perfectly encapsulates the complex tensions of the political and territorial situation at Oropos. In this he may well be right. Part of his argument, however, rests on an assumption that Asklepios, as a healing figure, was not appropriate to the purposes of asserting territorial claims or negotiating boundaries, which, it should be clear by now, he very much was. This line of argument also glosses over the degree to which the cultic procedure of incubation at Amphiaraia looked to Asklepieia, as well as the really striking degree of iconographic assimilation with Asklepios that Amphiaraos had experienced already by the end of the fifth century.

significance in the eyes of Athenians and Boeotians alike. It appears that each time Athens regained control of the Oropia, she took care to reassert and reinforce her jurisdictional control through policies and improvements announced at the Amphiaraion.¹⁸⁸ So too, patterns of land use and habitation seem to shift according to the influence and aims of the “controlling” city state, demonstrating both the penetration of Athenian and Theban authority over the Oropian interior and their interests in doing so.¹⁸⁹

Of course, the sanctuary was not simply a physical marker meant to project Athenian/Theban power—Amphiaraos may have been a warrior, but the Amphiaraion was not itself a military installation, despite its strategic location. It seems to me that at least some of the sanctuary’s authority stemmed from the deliberative aspect of its oracular services, again in accord with its territorial marginality. A court speech of the fourth century orator Hyperides, *For Euxenippos*, demonstrates precisely how seriously the Athenians took the juridical power of the sanctuary to resolve matters of territorial dispute. The *Euxenippos* reveals as well that by the end of the fourth century at least some land of the Oropia—τὰ ὄρη τὰ ἐν Ὀρωπιῶ—had been divvied up equally among the Athenian tribes.¹⁹⁰ The court case itself is extremely interesting, if rather

¹⁸⁸ Cf. *SEG* 36.442, a bouletic decree concerning the restoration of water-works (essential to any healing sanctuary, but evidently particularly important at Oropos) c. 370. Knoepfler (1986) argues that these were important hydraulic installations made by the Athenians originally in the 420s, i.e. during the first phase of Athenian territorial interests in the cult. The decree thus corresponds with renewed Athenian administration and efforts to restore matters to their pre-Boeotian state. Indeed, the proposer of the decree, Pandios, can probably be identified with the *bouletes* who inaugurated honors for Dionysos of Syracuse also in connection with anti-Theban sentiment. To this period must date too the well known *lex sacra I.Or. 277*(=*LSCG* 69), immediately after Athens regained administrative control of the sanctuary. This decree returns the pre-incubatory fee to Attic drachmas from the Boeotian standard, as well as making rather explicit the priestly duties, including the registration of incubants by their “nationality.” Similarly, another decree from 335 (*IG* II² 333) typically attributed to Lycourgos’ reforms, references offerings to Amphiaraos (and Asklepios), surely to be situated in the context of Athens’ reacquisition of Oropos; again in 333/2 (*IG* II² 338=*I.Or.* 295) we find honors granted for the (encore) restoration of fountains. This period, in fact, sees a small explosion of hydraulic works in the Amphiaraion, cf. Argoud 1979.

¹⁸⁹ Cosmopoulos 2001.

¹⁹⁰ Hyper. *Pro Eux.* fr. 29. Because much of the Oropia is very hilly and the phrasing here unclear, it has been a matter of debate how much of the Oropia was divided among the tribes and how the division was regulated. For the whole matter of Hyperides’ speech, see Sineux 2007: 105-6.

obscure, as it turns on the question of whether two tribes had to return their lands to *the sanctuary*, and, if so, what sorts of remunerations those tribes which were permitted to retain control of their Oropian holdings were obliged to pay. Evidently the Assembly at Athens initially found it entirely acceptable to put the question to Amphiaraos himself, and so sent a delegation of three representatives to incubate and return the god's response. As Sineux emphasizes, while we may be missing key contextual clues to understanding fully Hyperides' speech, the whole "Euxenippos affair" illustrates amply the continued importance of Oropos to Athens in the fourth century, particularly in her desire to "fairly" incorporate and integrate Oropian land through the authoritative instrument of Oropian cult itself.

For Sineux, however, Amphiaraos' specifically martial history motivates and determines his selection as an appropriate divinity of the contested frontier. Because Amphiaraos was a Argive/Theban hero swallowed up by the land outside the city of Thebes and digested as part of the religious landscape, he neatly symbolized Athens' own gobbling up of land that had historically been considered Boeotian.¹⁹¹ Even if Sineux is right in emphasizing the importance of this dispute in the promotion of Amphiaraos as an appropriate cult figure in lieu of a placid figure like Asklepios, we have nevertheless seen above the ease with which Asklepios was pulled into territorial disputes and Athenian interest in situating his sanctuaries at boundaries. In fact, what we know of the cultic life in and around the Oropos Amphiaraion makes the sanctuary there seem much more like an Atticizing interpretation of the Epidaurian healing cult.

In addition to Pausanias' vivid sketch of the rituals performed there, the corpus of Classical and Hellenistic inscriptions discovered at the sanctuary offers vital evidence for

¹⁹¹ Sineux 2007: 97-109.

incubatory praxis and confirms that the procedure was very clearly a localized version of the healing ritual of Epidauros.¹⁹² On the one hand, the homogeneity of incubatory consultation, which came to include oracular consultation as well,¹⁹³ testifies to the rapid monopolization of religious therapies under the Asklepieian rubric. Moreover, through the dating of the sanctuary we can infer that cultic practice was introduced primarily around the activity of healing (as opposed to therapeutics being spliced onto an earlier oracle). This is significant because it makes the Amphiaraion the earliest known cult which “imported” Asklepios’ therapeutic methods wholesale. The cultivation of a healing Amphiaraos thus emerges as a conscious attempt at blending together two disparate traditions in order to create a potent and pragmatic cultic figure whose regional authority and history were integrated with the increasingly super-regional appeal of the medical god.

The syncretism of Amphiaraos-Asklepios is clearest in the iconographic record.¹⁹⁴ The visual representations of Amphiaraos discovered at Oropos belong mostly to the fourth century and show that Amphiaraos was there practically indistinguishable from Asklepios. Principally, votive relief sculptures for Amphiaraos favor the motifs familiar from those dedicated to Asklepios at Athens and elsewhere. These often feature Amphiaraos, bearded with himation and medical staff, greeting families of suppliants or laying his healing hands directly upon sick

¹⁹² Paus. 1.34.5f. See last chapter for *leges sacrae* from Oropos prescribing the process of proper incubatory rites, particularly with reference to sacrificial procedure. A point of procedural departure can be found here in Pausanias, who states that it was customary to sacrifice a ram and sleep upon its fleece (the chthonian/purificatory relations here being more or less clear). But see Lupu 2003 whose reading of *I.Or.* 277/8 demonstrates a wide degree of sacrificial flexibility and individual choice; however, Chaniotis, *SEG* 53.465, argues this flexibility is only permitted in connection with public sacrifice and not individual incubation. Gorrini and Melfi 2002 similarly underline the degree of flexibility permitted in the donation of the *iatra* the amount dedicated upon successful healing.

¹⁹³ Of course, Asklepios’ cures were never wholly separated from the oracular, and some of the *iamata* concern oracular matters more than they do therapeutic ones.

¹⁹⁴ Compare *LIMC* entries Asklepios and Amphiaraos. See van Straten 1981 and 2000; Gorrini and Melfi 2002. See, also, Chapter Two.

incubants. In fact the degree of assimilation was so total that he was often accompanied by Asklepios' constant companion, Hygieia. Finally, the dedicatory inventories from Oropos reveal precisely the same sorts of offerings which characterize the Athenian Asklepieion inventories, viz. a variety of anatomical *ex votos* and votive medical instruments.¹⁹⁵

As Amphiaraos began to ape Asklepios' image and activities, so too the divinity's massive altar at Oropos powerfully documents the Athenian strategy of utilizing healing figures to communicate an ideology of democratic collective identity through its gods. Amidst Oropos' hot and constant territorial contestation, the Altar evinces the effortful processes of that agenda's imposition. Pausanias mentions the altar "in parts" before Amphiaraos' temple—the foundations of which reveal its rather impressive dimensions of c. 5 x 9 meters—and describes how it was dedicated to an ensemble of divinities, constellated around Amphiaraos.¹⁹⁶ The front of the altar was divided into five panels, the first of which was dedicated to Zeus, Herakles, and Apollo *Paian*; the second to "the heroes and their wives"; while the middle panel was occupied by Hestia, Hermes, Amphiaraos, and the children of Amphilochos.¹⁹⁷ The fourth panel honored Aphrodite and Panacea, together with Iaso, Hygieia and Athena *Paionia* while the last panel was given to the nymphs and Pan, as well as two important rivers, the Acheloös and Kephisos.

¹⁹⁵ *I.Or.* 309-15, the earliest of which is dated to the fourth century, although the more comprehensive lists are later. Compare those from the Athenian Asklepieion in Aleshire 1989.

¹⁹⁶ Paus. 1.34.3; cf. Petrakos 1968: 48-9. Excavations reveal that the altar seen by Pausanias was larger than the one used in the fifth and fourth centuries. This altar, although smaller, was complemented by a small theater known from a fourth century inscription as the θέατρον τὸ κατὰ τὸν βωμόν (*I.Or.* 292.29-30). Presumably this theater was meant for the spectators of sacrifices, but for whatever reason, when the altar was expanded at the end of the fourth century, the theater was demolished and its stones cannibalized for other building and renovation projects throughout the sanctuary (e.g. the ever-important waterworks).

¹⁹⁷ Cf. *I.Or.* 280/281 for the fourth century altar-stones bearing the names Ἀμφιαράο Ἀμφιλόχο Ἑρμοῦ and Ἰστίης, confirming Pausanias' report for the Classical period. For the pairing of Hestia and Hermes, see Vernant 1969. Their relationship is manifest in the central panel of an altar which was simultaneously the "fixed" center of Oropian religious life and the destination of *theoria* and *hiketai* defined by their movement, particularly through different social spaces and identities. That the healing figure triangulates this fixity-mobility dynamic is entirely consistent with Asklepios' own characteristics as a healer "on the move."

In an important article on Attic healing cults, Annie Verbanck-Piérard recognized on this altar the presence of all the major figures of Athens' healing pantheon,¹⁹⁸ but without situating their role within the history of Athenian claims on Oropian territory. Now, Apollo, Herakles and Zeus were the precise triad invoked by Demosthenes for health, but so too, Aphrodite, Athena, and Hygieia look back to the civic activities symbolizing social unity through a civic and erotic language of health and healing. The presence of figures like the Nymphs, Pan, Acheloös and Kephisos probably register the importance of water in healing sanctuaries like Oropos, but they also color this assembly with an unmistakably Athenian identity.¹⁹⁹ Indeed, Pausanias informs us that the Athenians maintained an altar (*bomos*) of Amphilochos (Amphiaraos' son) in Athens,²⁰⁰ and an inscribed votive relief from the late fifth century shows that the River Kephisos received cult within Athens in which the primordial river Acheloös somehow figured.²⁰¹ The divinities on this altar populate a quasi-cosmogonical ensemble of healing divinities as an emblem of Athenian cultic, social, and political life. In other words, the altar marking the religious center of the Amphiaraion redeploys the familiar religio-medical repertoire in the service of Athenian local imperialism. Ultimately, as Asklepios in Piraeus, so too Amphiaraos' affiliation with a host of recognizably Athenian divinities thus "naturalized" the hero's Athenian allegiances and reinforced the underlying assimilative function of the cult.

¹⁹⁸ Verbanck-Piérard 2000. Except of course Asklepios (whose presence is anyway surely invoked through the inclusion of Panacea, Iaso, and Hygieia).

¹⁹⁹ So, too, it was probably not lost on an Athenian visitor that the Asklepieion *en astu* was located nearby the Cave of Pan and the Nymphs, and a number of votive reliefs and dedications to these divinities were discovered within the Asklepieion: e.g., the Archandros relief to Pan and Nymphs: *IG* II² 4545=NM 1329. See also *SEG* 1 248, Pharsalian Pantakles' fourth century Hymn to the Nymphs, which includes Asklepios (with Connor 1988 and Riethmüller 2005).

²⁰⁰ Paus. 1. 34.3. Cf. *IG* II² 7175 for a dedication to Amphilochos as *heros iatros*.

²⁰¹ *IG* I³ 986 and *IG* II² 4546 (c. 410 BC). See, e.g., Larson 1995; Kaltsas 2002.

Conclusion

Over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries Athenian demes continued to erect healing cults in “frontier” spaces which were charged with defensive, religious, and democratic significance. These cults appear uniformly across the Attic country-side in places which had seen earlier cultic investment as a part of the post-Kleisthenic democratization of the religious landscape. Towns in border demes like Rhamnous, Sounion, Eleusis, and Thorikos²⁰² all experienced conspicuous monumentalizing efforts at the end of the 6th and beginning of the fifth centuries BC, no doubt as part of an effort to strengthen a sense of Athenian identity through a shared landscape.²⁰³ In light of Asklepios/Amphiaros’ place within Athenian civic religion and their wider tendency towards social aggregation, it is perhaps not surprising that healing sanctuaries should have sprung up in all these places at the close of the next century. Some appear as “stand alone” sanctuaries, like the one erected just outside the urban center of Eleusis on the banks of the river Kephisos.²⁰⁴ As Eleutherae and Oropos marked Boeotian borders, so Eleusis had long delimited Attic territory from the Megarid, and, as we have noted, formed an important chapter in Athens’ history of territorial consolidation through cultic integration.²⁰⁵

²⁰² See Mussche et al. 1971; Riethmüller 2005: 41-3 for the possibility of an Asklepieion/Amphiarion just below the acropolis of Thorikos, whose original levels date to the 6th century, but which underwent several distinct building phases. Amidst the industrial quarter of the town exists the remnants of a (probable) cult complex including an *oikos*—arranged as a double *sekos*—and an enclosed hall, long enough to provide incubation. The grounds for guessing that this was a healing cult rests only upon an inscription which came to light in the “hall,” restored by Bingen (Mussche 1971: 149f.) to read the name *Hygieia*, a votive prayer offered by a mother for the health of her daughter, and some fragmentary terracottas which may represent anatomical votives (Riethmüller 2005: 43). Given the early nature of the building—if indeed it was occupied by a healing divinity at all—it probably served a local figure like Aristomachos or Aminos, who was supplanted by Asklepios or Amphiaros and Hygieia.

²⁰³ See, e.g., Paga 2015 with a useful index of cultic building projects and dates.

²⁰⁴ So far, no architectural remains have come to light. The location and date are based upon the discovery of statuary, dedications, and anatomical ex votos which place this sanctuary at the end of the fifth or the very beginning of the fourth century BC. Cf. *IG II²* 4366-81 (fifth/fourth BC); *IG II²* 4479 for a ζάκορος of Asklepios from the important Eleusinian family of the Eumolpidae; see Riethmüller 2005: 22-5; Lawton 2015.

²⁰⁵ For Athenian incorporation of Eleusis, see Osborne 1994: 152-3 (9-8th century); Parker 1996: 25; Hall 2014: 55-6 (*terminus ante quem* end of the 6th century).

Others joined older cultic complexes, as Amphiaraos at the important fortress town of Rhamnous.²⁰⁶ Over the course of the fifth century he gradually displaced the local healing figure Aristomachos,²⁰⁷ to whom was dedicated a small sanctuary, which was built next to the city's fortification-walls and garrison-gate.²⁰⁸ So too, by the middle of the fourth century, Asklepios was receiving cult nearby Poseidon's lofty sanctuary at Sounion, the eastern-most Athenian promontory, which projected her might out over the Aegean. Where, exactly, Asklepios' sanctuary was situated within that temenos remains unclear—but dedications for the healer god and other gods with whom we often find him associated permit a guess that his cult was near the eastern gate of the fortified area.²⁰⁹

The deliberate geographical distribution of healing cults in spaces freighted with symbolic import demonstrates that Athenian interest in Asklepios was not narrowly circumscribed by singular historical events, whether we choose to relate them to plague or desires to improve relations with Epidauros. Attic healing cults formed part of a coherent socio-

²⁰⁶ Rhamnous, like Oropos, also looked out to Euboea across the straight, and was fundamental to securing the roads and commercial mobility around the northeastern grid of Attica. See Ober 1983; Oliver 2007; Sineux 2007. At the beginning of the fifth century, the town's growing economic and political importance were reflected by amplified cultic expenditures, principally upon its unique cults of Themis and Nemesis, located some 500m outside the town's walls. Athenian investment in these twin Rhamnian cults seems to have accelerated with the Kleisthenic reforms and again after the Battle Marathon, emphasizing the cult's significance in the overall religious landscape of Athens. See Paga 2015.

²⁰⁷ Two marble busts discovered at Rhamnous flesh out the evolution from local hero to super-regional god. The first, dated to c. 480 shows Aristomachos as a warrior while the second, produced at the close of the fifth century, depicts the familiar and kindly bearded visage of the Asklepios/Amphiaraos. Similarly, votive reliefs of the sort familiar from healing sanctuaries depicting the god receiving a retinue of suppliants have been discovered among the ruins. See Verbanck-Piérard 2000; Gorrini and Melfi 2002; Riethmüller 2005; Sineux 2007.

²⁰⁸ For the archaeology of the site, see Petrakos 1999: 307; Gorrini and Melfi 2002: 252-3. For Aristomachos as a local figure, buried in Marathon, see schol. ad Dem. *De falsa legat.* 249. The dedications found in and around the sanctuary give a good sense of how fluid the identity of the figure worshipped there remained. Nearly every possible combination of Aristomachos, *hero iatros* and Amphiaraos is attested in the fourth century record: *D.Rh.* 170=SEG 33.200 for fourth century dedication to Aristomachos as *heros iatros*; *D.Rh.* 169=SEG 49.227 for fourth century dedication to Amphiaraos alone; *D.Rh.* 173=IG II² 4436=SEG 31.177 (+181) (fourth/3rd century) for *heros iatros* as Amphiaraos.

²⁰⁹ IG II² 1181 (331/30 BC) references a sacrifice to Asklepios Soter and Hygieia; see IG II² 2857 for the cults' expansion or renovation in the 3rd century BC. For location of cult, see Riethmüller 2005: 40f. with bibliography.

political program which linked multiple sanctuaries at the urban/imperial center to those in the outer demes. This reinforced Athenian territorial claims at places which had historically been problematic, whether in reality or in the Athenian imaginary, particularly along the Boeotian and Euboean borderlands. But so too Asklepios' presence—or that of one of his healing substitutes—at these important borderland sites elaborated the patterns of monumental investment begun at the close of the sixth century, which had themselves reflected and promoted the systemic social reorganization of the Athenian *demos*. This pattern included, too, his very first cult within the Piraeus—a *deme* which was as quintessentially Athenian, urban, and democratic as it was removed and foreign. Such a wide distribution not only evoked a sense of cultic integration but suggests their importance as institutions which articulated the political body as such. Asklepios' wide-spread presence throughout the Attic landscape may have created a sense of uniformity with the expectation that, whether at the edges of Attic territory or in the city, one could find healing which was available to all.²¹⁰

In doing so, Athens was not innovating. Rather, she simply extended and refined the practices forged by the city states of the Argeia and Akte, and, perhaps even Arkadia, which were likewise utilizing healing cults at various boundaries to integrate their bodies politic or to regulate their own porous points of entry. Particularly within the other democratic cities, a large number of healing cults may also have emphasized integration into an increasingly unified politico-religious body. Argos erected multiple urban cults and adopted names with Asklepiadic associations to displace the previous patronymic system in favor of deme and phratry identifications.

²¹⁰ A commitment which was paralleled and reinforced by the new institution of the *iatros demosios*. See Cohn-Halft 1956; Samama 2003; Nutton 2013.

Ultimately, then, it is difficult to accept the premise that healing cults of the classical era were located in the countryside because they were perceived as offering peaceful relaxation or quarantine apart from urban centers. In fact, there appears to be no *single quintessential geographical characteristic* of healing cults independent of the particular needs of individual city states. As we saw at the chapter's beginning, in grappling with Vitruvius and Plutarch's accounts of Asklepieia, we are dealing fundamentally with the problem of the meaning which inheres in space and the historical particularities of that meanings' construction. Healing cults therefore follow no fixed rules of geography or demography, but rather concretized social and ideological configurations as they emerged from inter-polis relations and communities' self-reflexive imaginations. Within that wider framework, they occupied interstitial and marginal places, wherever those margins were felt to require arbitration, mediation, or integration. That is, the provision of ritual healing which saw the social reintegration of the individual body permeated healing cult's wider collective function, and vice versa. These cults help to define, shape, and mediate the tensions which accrue around the borders as Asklepios himself emerged as a quiet, but nevertheless galvanizing deity in whom a civic ideology of health and wellbeing found a forceful expression.

CHAPTER FOUR

Medicine as Meeting Place

The previous chapters have plotted a course in which discourses of health and the activities of healing gods helped relate both individuals to their wider social groups and the wider social group to itself within the context of a single, overarching “Greek” culture. In this chapter I offer a series of cases which expands this frame to consider the medical encounter as it sat at the interface *between* different cultural groups. This will give us a better feel for the edges of medicine as a socially embedded phenomenon in antiquity, as we look at how Greeks perceived (and constructed) their own world of medical practices vis-à-vis the practices of others. It will also cast new and important light upon the ways that medicine created conditions for cultural interchange and new cultural forms as by-products of such transactions. This stands apart from other histories of medicine which, in as much as they are predominantly interested in tracing the transfer of medical knowledge, technology, and materials from one culture to another, are guided by the implicitly teleological concern of intellectual development, and less in the collaborative aspects of their making and meaning. This chapter, by contrast, attempts a broader synthesis of medical, religious, and cultural histories of Mediterranean transcultural interactions, by exploring medicine not simply as a commodity of exchange—whether in the form of medical goods, gods, ideas, or expertise—but as a locus for creative blending and hybridity in the service of various and different strategies of cross cultural communication.

A guiding premise of this dissertation has been that medicine can be viewed as a field of socio-cultural relations and that the medical encounter is an intrinsically socio-cultural phenomenon. It is characterized by two or more parties engaged in particular relationships of

power and the production of specific kinds of knowledge which is negotiated and applied to the body in dependent ways. As such, the healing encounter bears some superficial resemblance to the possible sorts of relationships which obtain between different cultural groups as they meet and exchange goods, ideas, and values. This is not to say that the framework of the medical encounter maps exactly that of, say, transcultural economic exchange. But they share a processual and interpretive grammar. Neither are one way procedures. Both are collaborative and both involve situationally specific configurations of power and the semantic adaptation of ideas to pre-existing world views as they move from one context to another.¹ That is, both require the formulation of avenues of communication and interpretation, whereby mutually agreeable results can be achieved even when there is not necessarily consonance of meaning, whether that result is a favorable course of therapy or the exchange of goods. Because both medicine and the objects of exchange are invested with meaning specific to cultural and social contexts, where we find medical ideas, practitioners, and goods crossing cultural boundaries, they may throw light on the interpretive processes whereby what those objects/practices mean are reworked to fit new contexts.

This chapter focuses on these processes of interpretation, examining the ways that medico-religious and medico-magical discourse were especially well suited for creating unique cultural forms because of their inherent symbolic flexibility and pragmatism. Here I examine four specific cases wherein “medicine” played a key role either in defining cultural identity or in providing material for the fashioning of new ones. That is, we will see how medicine formed a

¹ Pratt 1991; Ulf 2009. For new views on the importance of cross-cultural collaboration in the production of early modern and colonial science, see Cook 2005a and 2005b; Raj 2007; Harrison 2015; Winterbottom 2016. This movement corresponds to “de-centering” trends current in post colonial history and new anthropology more widely.

matrix for the growth of new and unique modes of communication and interaction between two groups or more, a process which resulted in new cultural forms, such as hybridized cults, gods, and heroes, cosmopolitan healers and recipes, and collaborative forms of knowledge-making.

In the first place, however, we begin with medicine not as a shared, common ground, but rather by exploring the historical moment and context in which certain aspects of medical practice became “Greek” and entered the wider repertoire of practices by which Greeks created a specifically “Hellenic” identity. Beginning with the emergence of “Greek medicine” as such is useful here because it exposes the historically discursive nature of medicine as a cultural system as it relates to formations of cultural identity. This, in turn, underlines the adaptability of medicine as a form of practice and so brings into sharper relief the places where that adaptability is put to use for shared ends. The other three cases therefore turn to this very adaptability, moving from the powerful capitals of Bronze Age monarchs to the poleis of the Classical and Hellenistic eras, in order to narrate the multiform continuity of medicine as a medium of interactivity between groups. Beginning with the movements of religious healers between the political and cultural centers of the Late Bronze Age, we will see that the fabrication of a common medico-religious culture facilitated political communications between leaders and that temples helped to organize and produce medical knowledge. Jumping forward in time, the Hellenistic assimilation of Asklepios with the Semitic god Eshmun among the cities of the Levant equally shows the collaborative, political purposes to which medical syncretisms could be put; and, finally, the popularity of Apollo Ietros in Pontic colonial adventures lights up the ways that medico-religious figures helped different cultural groups liaise through the creation of common forms of cultural praxis, like formation of new cults, social clubs, and myth. By

bringing these disparate cases into dialogue I illuminate the long history and (typically unnoticed) role of religious healers/healing in forging and regulating avenues of cross-cultural communication within the Mediterranean—what cultural theorists have termed the “Middle Ground”—and so make the case for seeing medicine as a meeting-place.²

Herodotus, Hippocrates, and Medicalizing the Other

I take up the question of “when did Greek medicine become Greek,” answering it in part by considering what the ancient sources themselves claim about the history of a “Greek medicine” (as a specific subset of more diffuse knowledge traditions). Specifically, I attempt to situate these narratives within the broader context of the formation of a Hellenic identity which was founded upon a nexus of collective history, cultural practices, and institutions.³ Indeed, we will find that within the writings of the Greek authors of the Classical and Hellenistic periods, medicine—in its religious and secular guises, and particularly in their union—emerged as intrinsic to the set of strategies utilized to separate Greeks from non-Greeks. We will see this unfold in three different but interrelated ways.

The role played by early scientific and medical literature in explaining physiological, and therefore cultural, differences between peoples is by now well known.⁴ For instance, within Herodotus there is an especially pronounced tendency towards this sort of geographical

² For “Middle Ground” in the Classical “colonial” encounter: see, e.g., Petropoulos 2002; Tsatsklazde 2006; Ulf 2009; Malkin 2002 and 2011; Demetriou 2012. See Grottanelli 1982 for an early collection of narratives about itinerant healers common to Greek and Near-eastern traditions, and Zaccagnini 1983 (with additional cuneiform sources), who attempts to integrate these insights into a diachronic, economic analysis of regulations on the mobility of healers in the Mediterranean basin in the late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. See further Moyer 2005, who re-assesses Grottanelli and Zaccagnini in light of the work of Burkert 1992 and 2004, and Boardman 1999. “Medical meeting-place” is consciously adapted from Vivian Nuttans’ two influential articles (1992 and 1995) on the marketplace of healers in antiquity (see chapter 2).

³ The literature on the emergence and formation of Greek identity is now vast and the issue still very much contested. A (partial) survey of recent works most central here (with bibliographies) includes Hall 1997; 2004; Hall 1998; Osborne 1998; Malkin 1998; 2001; 2011; Gruen 2011; Demetriou 2012; Skinner 2012; Vlassopoulos 2013.

⁴ E.g. Thomas 2000.

determinism taking the form of linkages between landscape, *habitus*, and history. This Herodotean view can be seen as one branch of a wider intellectual movement which sought to explain with precision the relation between environment and culture.⁵ The author of *Airs, Waters, Places* advances one perspective of this relationship, explaining at the conclusion of his work that changes in season, the nature (*physis*) of the land, and the quality of its waters will have the greatest impact on determining the character of the people who occupy it.⁶

For the *Airs* author, the superiority of Greek culture—both in its political institutions and the values of the people—rests upon the hardiness instilled within those born there by a variable and harsh climate.⁷ The author goes on to compare Asiatic “softness” via the productivity and mildness of the land. Interestingly, even the Greeks living among them cannot escape the aversion to bravery, hard work and industry that such a pleasant environment was supposed to engender.⁸ The text expresses, ultimately, a complicated and not wholly coherent vision of the dynamic between nature (*physis*) and custom (*nomos*) in producing an ethnic character, in as much as the application of *nomos* is occasionally capable of supervening upon the formative forces of *physis*.⁹ Indeed, we are ultimately left to wonder what makes these Asiatic Greeks Greek. The author does not square this circle for us, but one perceives the power of Hippocratism in explaining the unique qualities of Hellenic physical and cultural characteristics through “empirical” methods. The epistemic structures of scientific and medical discourse were thus

⁵ Thomas 2000; Chiasson 2001; Jouanna 1999; 2010.

⁶ *Aer.* 24. For the chronological relationship between Herodotus’ *Histories* and *Aer.*, see Jouanna 1999; Chiasson 2001. The tradition is continued at, e.g., Arist. *Pol.* 1327b; Polyb. 4.9.1.

⁷ *Aer.* 23.

⁸ *Aer.* 12.29-31: Τὸ δὲ ἀνδρεῖον καὶ τὸ ταλαίπωρον καὶ τὸ ἔμπονον καὶ τὸ θυμοειδὲς οὐκ ἂν δύναται ἐν τοιαύτῃ φύσει ἐγγίγνεσθαι οὔτε ὁμοφύλου οὔτε ἀλλοφύλου, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀνάγκη κρατέειν. Cf. Hdt. 1.142.

⁹ Cf. *Aer.* 14, accounting for the origins of the so-called Longheads; see also 24.20-2.

conscripted into the wider cultural program of probing and defining what it meant to be Greek against the bodies, habits, landscapes, and histories of other peoples (at precisely the same time similar cultural experiments were being conducted on the tragic stage and in the pages of the historians).¹⁰ That is not simply to say that medicine made its own Hartogian mirror, whereby some constructed Other reflexively demonstrated the qualities of “Greekness.” Indeed, Rosalind Thomas sees the early medical authors as fundamentally more “humanist” than tragedians like Euripides, arguing that there was more interest in establishing a common “human nature” than in promoting cultural chauvinism.¹¹ At the same time, the medico-ethnographic writings betray no interest in local voices or informants, developing new positions of objective “autopsy” and reasonable surmise to project knowledgeable authority. As medicine gained increasing legitimacy in the production of such authoritative knowledge during the Classical era, this authority was extended to underwrite a supposedly empirical license for ideas about culture and physical difference. Again, as Thomas has shown, medical matters infiltrated the historical writings of Herodotus (as well as Thucydides), not only because of their shared intellectual emphasis on autopsy and inference from observation, but as one particular way of framing the substance of historiographical and ethnographic argumentation.¹²

Going beyond the contributions of scientific theory in supporting preexisting impressions of cultural difference, we can begin to see at this time an awareness among Greeks that technological practice itself might be crucial to the formation of that difference. Here medicine

¹⁰ Cf. Hall 1998. For Hellenistic extensions of geographically determined physiology, see Arist. [*Phgn.*] 805a28; 806b15-17; and 812a13-14 for the rare skin-based prejudice: οἱ ἄγαν μέλανες δειλοὶ, ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἴγυπτίους, Αἰθιοπας; cowardly Ethiopians again at [*Phgn.*] 812b32.

¹¹ Thomas 2000: 93. So, too, as Moyer 2011 insists, Herodotus’s representation of a timeless Egyptian culture owed much more to an active, archaizing project of his Late Period priestly informants than has been recognized.

¹² Thomas 2000; Tuplin 2004.

appears to have occupied an important place in the Greek *imaginaire*, and in it perhaps no place was more significant than Egypt. Early Greek writers had widely acknowledged the superiority of Egypt in medical matters. Indeed, already in Homer the Egyptians were bruted for their medical prowess and superabundance of potent *pharmaka*. At the same time, there was no sense in the epics that Egyptian medicine was itself practically distinct, or that medicine as a human endeavor had begun there.¹³ It seems simply that, by divine fiat, the Egyptians possessed more and better drugs. In fact, Homer avers that these Egyptian healers were originally descendants of the race of Paiaon, who, as we saw in the first Chapter, was the primordial Graeco-Mycenaean god of healing.¹⁴ Despite their famous skill, Egyptian healers were, in the relatively culturally un-differentiated world of Homeric epic, ultimately linked back into the wider world-system of the Homeric audience.¹⁵

Again, it was not until Herodotus and authors of the fourth century that we can discern a movement to distinguish medicines tagged explicitly as “Greek” or “Egyptian” according to the *methods* of their practice.¹⁶ Moreover, the difference was not located simply with the quality and quantity of Egypt’s healers. Rather, it was exemplified by the overall health of the Libyan and Egyptian people, which fact for Herodotus was a by-product of their environment in conjunction

¹³ *Od.* 4.227-232; Cf. *Od.* 17.384, where the healer of evils (ἰητῆρα κακῶν) is listed as one of those technicians a chief might invite from abroad; see, however, the more pedestrian description of Greek physicians at *Il.* 11. 514-15.

¹⁴ Chapter One: 38-40; Graf 2008: 60f.

¹⁵ As distinct from “ethnically” undifferentiated: see Hall 1997: 42f.

¹⁶ For the prestige associated with Egyptian doctors (especially at the Persian court) *Hdt.* 2. 84; 3.1; 3.22; and the entire Democedes episode at 3.122f.

with their medical customs.¹⁷ In fact, by introducing the environment's capacity to exert a salutary effect on Egyptian constitutions, Herodotus opened up a possible alternative explanation for the historical association of these people with good health, one that deemphasized their technical skill as physicians. The well known Democedes episode (which, in fact, also functions as a proximate explanation for the Persian invasion of Greece) pivots still further away from Egypt as the land of expert medicine.¹⁸ There, the Greek physician Democedes succeeds in curing the Persian king Darius' twisted ankle, precisely where the King's entire retinue of Egyptian physicians had failed.¹⁹ What is more, Herodotus explains that Darius' ankle-sprain was quite severe, and that the Egyptian physicians, because they employed "harsh" methods only exacerbated the King's pain and discomfort. By contrast, Darius himself associates Democedes with a *techne iatrike*—a technical, medical art—and it is through his application of Greek remedies (Ἑλληνικοῖσι ἰήμασι χρεώμενος) that Darius eventually recovers to full health.²⁰ Democedes' success hinges on a recognized division between the Egyptian healers and their "harsh" methods—consonant with the description of their regular purges—and the emergence of superior Greek ones.

Thomas has also argued that the *Histories* demonstrate an engagement with "ethnographies of health," a careful attention to the health-care related practices of other peoples.

¹⁷ Hdt. 2.77 describes monthly emetic purges. See, however, Thomas 2000: 36f who suggests that Herodotus *corrects* Egyptian theories of health in this passage, engaging them in Hippocratic terms when he claims that (in contrast to Egyptian theories of *whdw*, see below) "illnesses fall upon people when they experiences changes of every sort, but particularly changes of weather." Thus, we see Herodotus engaging with precisely the same explanatory scheme proposed by Hippocratic authors at, e.g. *Aer.* 12; *Epid.* 1.23; *Hum.* 18.

¹⁸ See Thomas 2000: 28-9; Moyer 2005 for the role of medicine in framing the historical action of the whole of Book Three of the *Histories*.

¹⁹ Hdt. 3.129-37. See Tuplin 2004. For the historicity of the episode and its reliance on narrative tropes, see Moyer 2006: 227 n. 8

²⁰ Hdt. 3.129.

These, she suggests, had been inaugurated by Hippocratic writers and Herodotus' own observations were in some ways shaped by this community of interests and culture of disputation.²¹ Pushing beyond this, however, we might say that Herodotus' fascination with the different ways medicine was practiced by various peoples reveals more than a desire tacitly to challenge or to correct other intellectuals regarding natural phenomena and their causes. Like religion or gender-roles, the activities involved in healing surface at this time as a relevant unit of cultural analysis, capable of revealing deep, structural differences in values and beliefs between groups. Much as Arthur Kleinman's accounts of medical anthropology discussed in Chapter Two, Herodotus does this "ethnography of health" amidst his descriptions of wider cultural "systems" in which these observations make sense of—and are made sensible by—the constellation of cultural practices beside which they are placed. While Herodotus tells us little explicitly about Greek medicine (other than that it was practiced by healers like Democedes) he records Egyptian,²² Babylonian,²³ Persian,²⁴ Scythian,²⁵ and even Indian²⁶ attitudes about health, disease, the body, and patient-practitioner relationships. Babylonians, for example, apparently had no professional physicians, but rather utilized an egalitarian form of medicine in which the sick solicited medical aid and advice for free in the street from passers-by (a practice which Herodotus much approves). Egyptian dietary regimens, especially their purging habits, are

²¹ Cf. Thomas 2000: 28f.

²² Hdt. 2.77; 2.84f.

²³ Babylonian physicians Hdt. 1.197. Interestingly, Herodotus' report here flies in the face of much of what we think we know of the social organization of medical care in the Near-Eastern world (for a more detailed picture of which, see further below). One laments the loss of Ktesias of Knidos's works of ethnography, as he, like Democedes, was himself a physician serving unwillingly at the court of Artaxerxes.

²⁴ Hdt. 1.138; 7. 181.

²⁵ Hdt. 4.68.

²⁶ For the Indians' *lack* of medicine see Hdt. 3.100; for the sparse comments on Indian medicine in Ktesias, see Tuplin 2004.

described in detail, as part of a larger inset narrative on the correlation of bodily cleanliness and piety within Egyptian society. So, too, as we shall discuss further below, Scythian medical practice emerges as deeply bound up within that people's eschatological proclivities—or so it appeared to Greeks fitting Scythian practices to their own soteriological mindset.²⁷ For Herodotus, then, Greek science did not just offer a geographical template for theorizing/explaining cultural difference, to utilize, discard, or engage polemically as he saw fit. The very existence of such a science at all as a unique “Greek” development validated the basic, heuristic value of partitioning and ordering peoples according to cultural technologies, a practice which continued well into the Hellenistic era (and perhaps found no more expert practitioners than the Romans).²⁸

If authors like Herodotus made (or at least revealed) *iatrike* available as a unit of cultural analysis, the next step was to furnish this particular *techne* with a history, and, preferably, a specifically Greek one. This was not exclusively the case, however, and here we can detect the history of medical praxis as a matter of dispute in the wider push and pull over whether, and which, Greek institutions and traditions originated “at home” or “abroad.”²⁹ So, Isocrates, in his *Busiris*, claimed that medicine and philosophy were originally Egyptian discoveries that had

²⁷ Cf. Soranus' later and more informed comments on Thracian and Scythian medicine at *Gyn.* 2.12. See Bolton 2015.

²⁸ So, again, Arist. *Pol.* 1286a12-14, later expanded on by Diod. Sic. 1.82, describes the embeddedness of medicine within popular and legal traditions of Egypt. Diodorus describes the legal responsibilities of the Egyptian doctor, in addition to giving details about the funding and public availability of physicians there. Probably reflecting the (more or less) codified nature of Egyptian medical texts within the temples there, Diodorus explains that if doctors failed to treat their patients according to guidelines laid down by an ancient *nomothetes* (a visible act of cultural interpretation, but one that, with Moyer 2011: 47f., may reflect the active participation of his native informants), they could themselves be penalized with death. Aristotle, for his part, sees this as a problem with Egyptian medicine—because it lacks flexibility in relating the universal (law) to the particular (illness)—while Diodorus praises the “public” nature of health-care. Importantly, both authors understand the interpenetration of medicine, law, and society as a marker of “Egyptian” culture. Cf. Jouanna 2012; von Staden 1989: 8f. See also Nijhuis 1995; Nutton 2013 for Rome's hostile early reception of Greek medicine.

²⁹ E.g. Hdt. 2. 89 and the Greeks' inheritance of Egyptian divinities.

been absorbed by the perennially visiting Greek sophists like Pythagoras.³⁰ On the other hand, not all authors were so sanguine about the alleged Egyptian origins of medicine.³¹ The author of *Ancient Medicine*, in the earliest positivist history of medical development, draws a sharp distinction between the Greek inventors of the medical art and barbarians who, he claims, still only practiced rudimentary dietetics if they practiced it at all.³² As Jouanna notes, this history has the effect of silently lumping the Egyptians, so widely venerated, in with an undifferentiated group of unsophisticated *barbaroi*. So too, while Isocrates is generally complimentary of the Egyptian discoverers of medicine, he seems to keep the historical facts of its origins quite separate from the art's contemporary practice as a Greek institution.³³

Like the *VM* author, Plato's *Republic* offers a parallel account of the origins of medicine in which the traditional place of the Egyptians falls out entirely.³⁴ Interestingly, here Asklepios makes his appearance for the first time as the progenitor and original pedagogue of the medical

³⁰ Isoc. *Bus.* 21-22 (although, he also specifies Busiris as the child of Poseidon and Libya, who in turn was descended from Zeus and Io); cf. Hekataios of Miletos *BNJ* 1 F20 for a survey of the invention of other cultural technologies abroad, such as the "Kadmean letters."

³¹ See Jouanna 2012: 13f. Jouanna understands the incremental eclipse of Egyptian medicine within ancient medical historiography through the (Roman) ethno-imperial problem of determining whether those practicing medicine in Egypt were Egyptian doctors or Greek doctors who simply happened to be from Egypt. That framing may have been the relevant for Rufus of Ephesus and Galen, but within the context of Classical medicine, the tensions deserve to be more richly contextualized within the processes, problems, and pressures which lead to a crystalizing Hellenic cultural identity as it was influenced by the interactions and exchanges with "outsiders" at places like Naukratis.

³² *VM* 5.

³³ Indeed, at Isoc. *Bus.* 12 he *also* utilizes Herodotean/Hippocratic environmental explanations for Egypt's good health!

³⁴ Pl. *Resp.* 405a-6b. Plato here names Herodicus, whom he regards as the father of dietetic medicine, as the principal target of his attack (cf. Pl. *Prt.* 316a; *Epid.* 6.3.18). Nevertheless, as history of the development of medicine in miniature he may here have both the dietetic and Egyptian histories of Isocrates and the *VM* author in mind as models against which he is working.

art³⁵ (that is, independent of his mythic associations with Chiron and the Epic Cycle).³⁶ What is more, Plato appeals directly to Homeric authority in his claim for the Asklepiian origins of the medical art by highlighting the skill Asklepios' sons Machaon and Podiliraos displayed at Troy, all the while eliding Homer's more famous and wide-spread account of Egyptian medicine and pharmacology. In the *Republic*, then, Plato turns the sons of Asklepios to his own particular ends of narrating the intellectual history of a markedly Greek form of medical practice with roots as old as the Homeric epics, the great hallmark of Greek collective identity. Ironically, in this account, Greek physicians contemporary to Plato actually undermined the pedigree and prestige of this medicine with their newfangled medical terminology, humoral confabulations, and obsessive concern for the corruptible body.³⁷ On this Platonic view, the rationalist practitioner, with his drugs, purges, and emetics, looked rather more like the Egyptian doctor with their rigid regimens as described by Herodotus and Isocrates! So, while there was a lively disagreement over the particulars in the history of the invention of Greek medicine among intellectuals like Isocrates and Plato, Herodotus and the Hippocratic authors, these different accounts shared an awareness of medicine as a domain of cultural practice which could be historicized in order to fit a number of visions about an imagined "Greek" past as it related to the lived present. Whether these histories foregrounded Greek cultural borrowings from hoary and august cultures like

³⁵ This of course inaugurated a long history in which Asklepios was promulgated as the *inventor* of medical science, of which Hippocrates was direct inheritor (and see further below). Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 186d; Hipp. [*Ep.*] 2; [*Ep.*] 20; Celsus *Med.* 2; [Galen] *Intro. sive med.* 14; Isid. *Ety.* 4.3.1-2 (including Asklepios' invention of medicine and its prohibition after his death until the time of Artaxerxes, when Hippocrates restored it), but compare *Ety* 4.4.1 which sorts Apollo/Asklepios/Hippocrates as the founders of the three most prominent medical "sects" of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.16.75 for a truly multi-cultural history of medicine's discovery and advancement; Cic. *De nat. deo.* 3.22.57 (three Asklepioi); see Edelsteins 1945: T337-47.

³⁶ Cf. Hom. *Il.* 418-19; Pi. *Nem.* 3.54-6; Xen. *Cyn.* 1.1-6; Philostr. *Her.* 9-10; Heraclitus *Quaes. Hom.* 15; for epic, see Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.105; Sext. Emp. *Math.* 1.260-62 (various epic traditions, including Thebes); Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.3.9-10.

³⁷ Compare Thuc. 2.48 (with Hornblower *CT* ad loc.) for similar dismissal of medical terminology.

Egypt or depicted a Greece of indigenous cultural practice is less material than the fact that during the Classical period medicine was perceived by these thinkers to have been a medium through which cultural identity could be expressed or negotiated.

Lastly, we encounter the Alexandrian valorization of Hippocrates as a cultural hero—a kind of medical Herakles who keeps the world safe for Greeks and opposes her enemies.³⁸ This is especially clear in the so called *Epistulae Hippocratis*, a pseudepigraphic corpus of letters and speeches (typically) assigned to the Hellenistic period, supposedly penned to or by Hippocrates and other historical persons such as Democritus, Gorgias, and Crateuas.³⁹ Of particular interest is the exchange of letters between Hippocrates and various agents of the King Artaxerxes I.⁴⁰ In these, we discover that the Persian king attempted to lure the famous physician to his court to help combat a plague (νοῦσος λοιμική) which was laying waste to the Persian country, army, and people.⁴¹ Hippocrates, however, refused the King’s inducements of wealth and courtly power, responding flatly that he could never be persuaded to “save Persians from disease, in as much as Persians are enemies of the Greeks.”⁴² Such overtures to Greek physicians to join the Persian court were not without precedent: as we noted above, Democedes worked as a captive for King

³⁸ Cf. Hipp. [*Ep.*] 10. 41.

³⁹ For fourth century dating of the *Decree*, *Speech from the Altar*, and *Embassy*, see Smith 1990 (following Erotian); Rubin-Pinault 1992; and now Nelson 2016. It seems that these “speeches”—though last in the modern arrangement of the text—occupy the first layer of composition chronologically, followed by the letters. But such a chronology will likely never be secure. At best it is clear that the entirety of the corpus was not composed all at the same time, but came together through slow and disparate accretion, finalized probably in the first century AD.

⁴⁰ Hipp. [*Ep.*] 1-9.

⁴¹ It is possibly noteworthy that λοιμική is only attested by one other text from this period (before which it appears not at all): Hekataios of Abdera’s excursus on the expulsion of the Jews from Egypt (Phot. *Bibl.* 244=Diod. Sic. 40.3=FGrH 264 F6). This is interesting precisely because it explains ethnic differentiation and the establishment of a separate Jewish society through divine anger caused by cultural blending. See Chapter One.

⁴² Hipp. [*Ep.*] 4, 5a. The version of *Ep.* 5 contained in *P. Oxy* 1184 begins with an introductory script describing (in third person) Hippocrates’ “vigilance for the reputation of his science and his love of the Greeks.”

Darius, and Apollonides of Kos actually did serve Artaxerxes I.⁴³ So too, the historian-physician Ktesias of Knidos claimed, like Democedes, to have served as a captive under Artaxerxes II.⁴⁴ Indeed, the autobiographical account penned by Ktesias—who was, incidentally, himself author of two important early ethnographies known as the *Indica* and *Persica*—may have served as an important model for the *Letters* author(s).⁴⁵

Despite their fictitious nature and rhetorical function, these letters contain new, popular information about Hippocrates' biography and shed valuable light on plausible cultural attitudes about the status of “Greek” medicine in the early Hellenistic world.⁴⁶ This again points up the kind of “boundary work” medicine could perform for Greeks interested in inventing their own intellectual and cultural histories. For instance, in the second letter we learn that Hippocrates was seventeen generations removed from Asklepios on his father's side and a Heraclid on his

⁴³ Moreover, these all fit the narrative pattern observed in Grottanelli 1982 in which a foreign healer is detained, or nearly so, in a royal court, against his wishes, extending the historiographical *Nachleben* of this trope well into the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

⁴⁴ Ktesias *FGrH* 14 F34 and F44 for Apollonides fate in Megabyzus court.

⁴⁵ See Jouanna 1999: 24f. for the “plausibility” of such an invitation, but this is part of Jouanna's conviction that the letters contain authentic information about Hippocrates' biography. More skeptical are Smith 1990; Rubin-Pinault 1992; and Tuplin 2004. For the *Persica*, *Indica*, and Ktesias' reputation as a source, see Bigwood 1978 and 1989; and now Stronk 2007.

⁴⁶ For several authors, like Rubin-Pinault 1992; Nelson 2005 and 2007, these later “Coan” speeches are not simply rhetorical exercises or historico-literary diversions. Rather, they are directly related to, or take as their source material literature directly related to, the Coan synoikismos of the late 4th century as well as the political campaign to secure *asylia* for the newly founded Coan Asklepieion. This not only explains the emphatic genealogical connection between Hippocrates, Asklepios, and Herakles in these documents, but helps to contextualize the prevalence of the Macedonian princes in the speeches as Heraclids. These later speeches thus not only enshrine the benefits (*euergasia*) and honors Koans had performed on behalf of all Greeks, notably Athens, but establish mythically ratified connections of *suggeneia* and *charis* between the island polity and the Antigonid dynasty. These pseudepigraphic documents, then, are both clear windows into the sorts of literary production typical of the Hellenistic period and important documents illuminating the way that Greeks understood, commented upon, and manipulated their history to fit the present. It is entirely telling, then, that not only was the figure and history of a “Hippocrates” subsumed into the wider project of dividing Greek and non-Greek, this same figure could be exploited for the formation of inclusionary narratives tying together peoples who traditionally had little or no official place within such histories.

mother's, i.e., a direct descendant of Zeus from both sides (ἀμφοτέρα σπέρματα).⁴⁷ Again, the author has Artaxerxes II's agent claim that it was through Hippocrates' hands and divine nature that medicine was moved from a trifling private enterprise into the status of a full blown science. More than this, the letter is an important document because it conjoins for the first time two separate traditions: the first that Asklepios was the actual inventor of the science of medicine and a second, related, one by which physicians were known as Asklepiads.⁴⁸ The union is here achieved in an explicitly genealogical manner, rather than, like the *technitai* of Dionysos, taking the name of a patron divinity. The overall effect is the creation of a contiguous and coherently ethno-cultural history of Greek medicine from its divine discovery by Asklepios as it was handed down from generation to generation and culminated at the hands of Hippocrates. The contrast with earlier histories which rooted this origin of Greek medicine either with Egyptians (Isocrates) or early human experimentation (*Ancient Medicine* author) is stark.

Not only does such an account present a genealogy of specifically Greek forms of science—the Presocratic philosopher Democritus is also treated as the literal embodiment (ἡ Ἑλλάς ὅλη δεῖται σοῦ φυλάξαι σῶμα σοφίης) of Greece's intellectual activities in the tenth letter—but Hippocrates weaponizes Greek *iatrike* against the *barbaroi* in the great clashes of East against West by refusing to save the Persians from the devastating plague. Hippocrates thus joins the

⁴⁷ This “fact” appears to rework Hekataios' claim, reported in Hdt. 2.143-4 (where it is debunked by Egyptian priests) that he could trace his own genealogy back to a god in the 16th generation, or, as Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella (2003: 345) suggest, “at the traditional date of the Ionian Migration.” If the author of the letter has Hekataios here in mind, the effect would be to cast further legitimacy both upon Asklepios' antiquity as a god and Kos' place as a seat of his worship.

⁴⁸ For Asklepiadai as a general term for doctor, cf. Thgn. 431; Eur. *Alc.* 968-70; Pl. *Resp.* 405-06 (same as above) where Asklepiads are representative of secular practice. See Chapter 2 (with Smith 1990 and Paul 2013) for a Koan *koinon* of the Asklepiadai known from a Delphic inscription. This was probably originally an aristocratic group tasked with administering Asklepios' cult, and not a medical guild. Phot. *Bibl.* 176 (=FGrH 115 F103) reports that the mid-late 4th century historian Theopompus defined Asklepiadai as those physicians who “come from Knidos and Kos, descendants of Podelarios,” suggesting the gradual development of the genealogizing of the profession.

ranks of his famous forebears Podilaraos and Machaon in Greek expeditions against the Asiatic barbarian. More than ringing Homeric resonances of Greek identity, this account repeatedly activates the social power of *loimos* as a topos of collective self-imagination and representation and, as a narrative theme, recurs in other entries of the pseudepigraphic writings. Notably, the *Dogma Athenaion* (*Decree of the Athenians*) and the *Epibomios* (*Speech at the Altar*) recall Hippocrates' supposed role in saving all of Greece from an encroaching plague which had devastated "barbarian" lands.⁴⁹ Hippocrates' involvement in banishing the plague from Athens (representative, by cultural metonymy, for all of Greece) thus quite literally assimilates him to Herakles, also held to have saved Athens from plague during the Peloponnesian War.⁵⁰

The *Presbeutikos*, the final and longest speech of the pseudepigraphica, purports to be an appeal made by Hippocrates' son Thessalos to dissuade Athens from invading Kos in 407 BCE, clearly much influenced by Thucydides' Melian Dialogue.⁵¹ Beyond smuggling Koans and the Asklepiadai into a range of events significant for the definition of a specifically Greek world—including the Trojan, Sacred, and Peloponnesian Wars—Thessalos expands at length upon the way that Hippocrates saved Greece from another (entirely fictitious) plague. In this case, the epidemic did not originate at the Persian frontier, but brewed along the North-western borders of Greece: Illyria and Paeonia.⁵² Like Artaxerxes' appeals to the Greek physician, the kings of these peoples (τούτων τῶν ἐθνέων βασιλῆες) tried to seduce Hippocrates with offers of vast wealth and

⁴⁹ Hipp. [*Ep.*] 25-6.

⁵⁰ See Rubin-Pinault 1992.

⁵¹ Hipp. [*Ep.*] 27. See Smith 1990.

⁵² For the connection of these plagues with later Roman tradition which asserted Hippocrates' role in combating the plagues or the Athenian plague with fire, see Pliny *HN* 7.37 (Illyrian plague); 36.69 (plague with fire); Galen *Theriac ad Pisonem*; with Rubin-Pinault 1986; 1992.

honors if he would come to their aid, which he again declined in favor of saving all Hellenic peoples.⁵³

Thessalos describes how, once his father had learned the true severity of the plague, he turned away from the lands of the *barbaroi*. Gathering various family members (Thessalos included) together with his best pupils, he dispatched them to different cities of Greece to circulate prophylactic instructions.⁵⁴ In describing where Hippocrates sent his sons and students, Thessalos draws up a virtual map of Hellenic membership, moving from the Thessalians, to the Macedonians, and Athenians, followed by the Greeks living along the Hellespont and Cyclades, Boeotia, and the Peloponnese.⁵⁵ Tellingly, this mapping of the Greek world culminates with Hippocrates' visit to Delphi, where Thessalos reports that he prayed to Apollo on behalf of all the Greeks.⁵⁶ Incidentally, the letter's phrasing indirectly recalls the language of Pindar's 6th *Paian*, in which "sacrifice is made on behalf of all Greeks" at the Delphic Theoxenia (to ward away an impending famine or plague!).⁵⁷ Pindar's Panhellenic *paian* was only one of a large corpus of *paianes* performed at the Delphic Theoxenia, seemingly for the purpose of defining the wider religious community of Greeks.⁵⁸

⁵³ [Hipp. [Ep.] 27.7.3-5.

⁵⁴ Hipp. [Ep.] 27.7.20. Hippocrates "instructions" against plague appear to follow the model established by other mythic traditions which readily attached themselves to archaic sages. E.g., Epimenides, Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 1; Plut. *Sol.* 12-14; Neanthes, *FGRH* 84 F16 (=Athen. 13.602c); Paus. 1.14.4; Max. Tyr. *Diss* 10.1; Suda, s.v. Epimenides (see Chapt. 1). Compare also *Getty Hex.* 28-31 with Rutherford 2013a, for the possibility that the hexameters were set up as just such apotropaic or purificatory instructions.

⁵⁵ Thessalian and Macedonian claims to Hellenic identity were hardly uncontroversial during the classical period, but with Alexander's rise were normalized. See Meli 2015.

⁵⁶ The letter thus joins a cadre literary examples which place Delphi as the epicenter for Panhellenic, collective action: cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1128-34; for the topos of *theoria* as creating Panhellenic *communitas* in the particular context of Persian(!) hostility see Isoc. *Paneg.* 182.

⁵⁷ Pi. fr. 52f. 62-3: θύεται ἀγλαῆς ὑπὲρ Πανελλάδος | ἄν τε Δελφῶν | ἔθνος εὖζατο λιμοῦ...

⁵⁸ See, e.g., Philodamos' *Paean to Dionysos* in Chapter One. See further Kowalzig 2007: 184-5.

Consequently, the Panhellenic character of Thessalos' synopsis of Hellenic geography, capped by Hippocrates' ritual activity at Delphi invites comparison with one of the most important arbitrating mechanisms of Hellenic cultural identity within the Classical and Hellenistic world: participation in the Panhellenic festivals at common times and places.⁵⁹ That is to say, Thessalos' account approximates a kind of theoric logic in reverse (in which *theorodokoi* were sent out to various regions of Greece to invite poleis to the Pythian or other Panhellenic games).⁶⁰ While non-Greeks were known to have participated in general activities at the "common" sanctuaries, there appears to have been a pronounced sense that *theoria* and entrance into the Games were limited to Greeks only.⁶¹ By sending out Hippocratic "delegates" in this way, the *Presbeutikos* activates the Panhellenic associations embedded within the Greek religious networks of the Classical and Hellenistic periods, cannily (re)framing them in terms of the medical energies of a doctor-hero. While the rest of the world burned, Greeks, and Greeks only, were made safe by the soteriological actions of Hippocrates and the Asklepiadai, the descendants of Apollo who presided at Delphi. Differently, then, from those letters which mobilize Hippocrates/Asklepios as symbols of Hellenicity through simple opposition to the Persian king, the *Presbeutikos* offers a nuanced example of how medicine, disease, and religion could be productively pooled into one another as instruments for circumscribing an imaginary Hellenic community.

⁵⁹ Cf. Hdt. 5.22 on Alexander I of Macedon's attempt to prove Hellenic ancestry for admission to the Olympic games. For birth requirements, see Hall 2002: 154-58; Rutherford 2013b: 265-66. Again, the inclusion of the Heraclid Macedonians in Thessalos' list is telling of the *Presbeutikos*' potentially political aims in securing relations with the Antigonids.

⁶⁰ See now Rutherford 2013b, for a comprehensive overview of *theoria*, *theorodokoi*, and *proxenia* from the origins of pilgrimage onward.

⁶¹ Oracular consultation appears to have been broadly open. For activities limited to Greeks only, see the survey at Rutherford 2013b: 273-74.

Independent of the historicity of the pseudepigraphica—particularly in relation to Hippocrates’ life or the political aims of the recently synoikized Kos—these writings illustrate just how Greeks of the Classical and Hellenistic periods perceived 1) the epistemic structures underlying medicine as a *techne* 2) the ethnic-specific features of that medical *techne* and 3) the power of collective histories of medicine to limit (or expand) the boundaries of Hellenic belonging. Ultimately, then, we are invited to recall the discussion at Chapter One, of the creation of imagined communities through the internally coherent fabric of communal health and well as oppositional threats of sickness. As a shared Hellenic identity crystallized around a particular repertoire of cultural practices and institutions, we find that Hippocrates and Asklepios became more tightly bound together as emblematic of Greece’s own claims to the invention of medicine and pride in the apogee of its practice.

Médecines sans frontières: A Mediterranean Medical *Koine*?

Modes and means of transmitting knowledge

We turn away now from the “invention” of Greek medicine as a means of cultural segregation and towards the search for Greek medicine’s origins within the dimly lit early contacts maintained across Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Aegean cultures. In this section, I look to current debate surrounding the degree to which early Greek medicine was influenced by the older medical traditions forged in Egypt and Mesopotamia. I do so as a way to think about medicine as a medium which could facilitate communication and interchange, rather than one used to create distance and difference. We will therefore briefly sketch the contours of this debate before moving on to observe how medicine in Egypt and Mesopotamia was embedded in wider ideological and social structures, principally through the regulatory activity of temples and

palace centers. These temples appear doubly important in the ensuing story, as we trace both the development of what we might call a medico-religious *koine* of healing/plague gods stretching from Sumerian to Roman times, and the movement of religiously affiliated healers scuttling to and fro between the hubs of Aegean power and culture as signifiers in an emergent political language. Charting this medical mobility brings into view the multiplex role of medical interchange as a mechanism of cross-cultural negotiation aimed at the creation of common grounds, whether through the absorption of foreign medical lore or the syncretism of medical gods. Ultimately, rather than occupying ourselves with the history and trajectories of intellectual influence—itsself a problem entangled in methodological issues and contemporary disciplinary histories—we reframe the issue, taking medicine as a meeting place where different groups might interact and create new cultural forms in the process.⁶²

Markus Asper, among a handful of other scholars, is the most recent to argue that certain texts within the Hippocratic corpus show “non-coincidental textual concurrence” between at least Near-Eastern and, possibly, Egyptian medical traditions.⁶³ That is to say, some of the texts which have come down to us from these cultures resemble one another in ways which do not seem reducible to anthropologically widespread forms of medical thought (e.g., hot and cold/balance and imbalance as etiological principles, common to Greeks as well as the Aztec) or by random accident. Most scholars who have looked to assess the impact of foreign influence upon the Greek medical tradition tend to focus on a particular layer of the Corpus, the so-called “Knidian texts.” While most Classicists no longer classify these as belonging to a single group or

⁶² For the question of determining influence, see, e.g., Ulf 2009. Within the specific context of medical traditions moving East to West, see Burkert 1992; 2004; Laskaris 2001; Moyer 2005; 2011; Asper 2015 and further below.

⁶³ Asper 2015; see also Geller 2004 and below.

“school” situated in Knidos, this subcorpus of texts, which is generally taken to include *Internal Affections* (*De internis affectionibus*), *On Diseases 2* (*De morbis 2*, or, at least the first 12 chapters),⁶⁴ *On Affections* (*De affectionibus*), and the *Diseases of Women 1 and 2* (*De morbis mulierum*), show some marked stylistic and practical differences from the remainder of the Corpus and, probably, represent its earliest “layer.”⁶⁵

I forego rehearsing the catalogue of ostensible cross-cultural “concurrences.” It is worth simply noting that these similarities manifest mostly at the level of diagnostic techniques,⁶⁶ cognate anatomical and physiological theories,⁶⁷ and a handful of seemingly identical therapies,⁶⁸ especially between Greek and Egyptian traditions.⁶⁹ More significantly, Asper points to a shared organizational approach: Hippocratic nosological treatises list and describe diseases in much the same fashion as Mesopotamian and some Egyptian ones: they name the disease, enumerate its symptoms, offer therapeutic advice and follow it with a general prognosis (“he will

⁶⁴ Cf. Craik 2015: 175-81.

⁶⁵ See Langholf 1990; Totelin 2009; Asper 2015.

⁶⁶ Jouanna 2012; Asper 2015, all three employ a common understanding of disease as an independent and exterior entity (an “ontological” view of illness), with a set course and repertoire of symptoms which permitted for accurate diagnosis, treatment, and prognosis

⁶⁷ For the general question of human dissection in ancient Greek medicine see Lloyd 1975 and von Staden 1992; for its relation to Egyptian knowledge derived from mummification, see von Staden 1989: 29-30; Nunn 2002: 42f. and Lang 2012: 198-99 add that the dissection involved in embalming would have offered little practical knowledge that was not already available to the common butcher.

⁶⁸ Both Hipp. *Mul.* 3. 4 and the Carlsburg papyrus (and Kahun 28) recommend making a pessary of garlic, inserting it into the vagina and leaving it overnight. If garlic can be smelled on the woman’s breath the next day, she will either become pregnant (Greek) or give birth normally (Egyptian). See Iversen 1939. Jouanna (2012: 5-6) points out that despite the similarity in phraseology and configuration of the “test,” their purposes are not quite the same. See Totelin 2009:181-3 for further parallels. So too Lang 2012: 122 shows that another supposed example of direct borrowing (milk of a recent mother as a pharmaceutical ingredient) is common in ancient China as well.

⁶⁹ For general assertions of Egyptian influence on Greek medicine see, e.g. Steuer and Sanders 1959; Ghalioungui 1968 and 1983; see more recently Ritner 2000: 114-5; 2006; 2007. Ritner’s 1989 review (rehearsed in 2007) of von Staden 1989 gives a fairly negative assessment of the usually highly regarded (by classicists) portrait of Egyptian medicine and its impact on Greek medical history, especially through the so called Knidian school of medicine (see also David 2005: 143-145).

recover in x days”).⁷⁰ The shared patterns of textual arrangement supports the idea this was, at some point, a conventional means of producing, packaging, and storing medical knowledge.⁷¹ Moreover, this particular means of formal organization is not an obvious one and so its simultaneous, multiple appearance across cultures alludes to some apparently shared origin.

Yet, even if one accepts this evidence as compelling for a widely shared medical culture, there remains the problem of elucidating the agents of interactivity which could have produced it. Since Burkert’s *Orientalizing Revolution*, there has been postulated the “shipment” of medical lore from the Near East to Greece, whether by enterprising merchants or itinerant physicians plying their trade, introducing new ideas and medical goods into foreign markets.⁷² Yet, the absence of any real material or written evidence for such medical interaction has hindered the acceptance and understanding of the precise mechanism of exchange.⁷³ Indeed, the continued paucity of such evidence for direct transmission creates high barriers of proof, leading more cautious scholars like Philippa Lang (2012: 123) to conclude that:

There was thus considerable common conceptual ground in [Greek and Egyptian] notions of health and illness, and a limited degree of similarity in their theories of physiology and disease, but this is a notional and *partial correspondence between meta-features* of medicine in two ancient cultures.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Asper 2015: 25 offers an instructive side-by-side comparison of the textual patterns of three “cases,” one Egyptian, one late Assyrian, and a “Knidian” passage. Surveys of the overlap between Babylonian and Greek medicine: Geller, 2004; 2007; 2014 (esp. introduction and Chapter 1); Stol 2004; Thomas 2004. See also (with reservations!) Scurlock 2004 who is both too quick to attribute Near-eastern background to specific Greek practices and, generally, over-reliant on the method and prospects of a comparativist, retrospective diagnosis.

⁷¹ Absent, among these texts, too, is the individual case history. Persons as individuals do not appear in these texts, which often look simply to the place affected and/or the the divine agent behind the illness episode. The Babylonian texts, in particular, appear to be the additive products of many individual episodes. This emphasizes the institutional nature of these medical traditions, codified orally or otherwise over centuries.

⁷² Again, see the earlier works of Grottanelli 1982 and Zaccagnini 1983; Burkert 1992; 2004. See Moyer 2005 for criticism of Burkert’s often unidirectional movement of technical expertise and freelance labor from the crumbling centers of Near Eastern power to the “free” economies of the West.

⁷³ See recently Haubold 2013 for the problem in the context of Near Eastern influences on early Greek epic.

⁷⁴ Emphasis added.

Lang, among others, doubts the direct influence of Egyptian medical culture on the development of Greek science. While she thus allows for broad conceptual similarities between cultures, these are explained away as abstracted formal and physiological principles, easily suppliable from basic empirical observation of the body. At the same time, what she describes as the “correspondence between meta-features” may actually hang together well with Asper’s proposal that these features had a common substrate which underwent independent elaboration within separate cultural spheres over long periods of time. For Asper, the accretion of parallels does seem sufficiently compelling to suggest that early Greek medicine did not develop wholly independently of Near Eastern or Egyptian practices.

The credible evidence seems therefore to rest less in parallel conceptions of disease or bodily functionality, but in the seemingly institutionalized strategies of textually fixing or storing such information.⁷⁵ Ultimately, Asper suggests that, rather than knowledge moving openly with goods or, as it were, on the backs of singular doctors or merchants—who on their own would have been poor broadcasters of ideas anyway—we might account for the spread of information by hypothesizing the movement of knowledge via tradition-bound groups of practitioners.⁷⁶ Such guild-like, “closed” consortia, he argues, would have been fundamentally conservative, handing down information to subsequent generations, probably within kin or similarly tightly bound social cooperatives.⁷⁷ These groups would have traded on knowledge as a commodity itself, accounting for both its gradual spread and the guarded nature of its keeping. So too, such group

⁷⁵ Asper 2015: 27.

⁷⁶ Asper 2015: 29.

⁷⁷ See, for instance, Hipp. *Jusj.* 4-8 for multi-generational transmission of knowledge between the physician, his teacher, and his children. See von Staden 1996: 412f.

structures, surely relying as well on oral tradition for multi-generational instruction, helps us not only to account for the longevity of the time frames with which we are dealing, but also gaps within textual records and between cultures.⁷⁸

The institutional nature of such medical exchange and acculturation seems, to me, likely. Like Burkert's merchants, however, the evidence for such consortia has seemed circumstantial rather than material.⁷⁹ On the other hand, I suggest that temples offer a likely suspect for the administration and organization of such consortia, which both shaped the production of medical knowledge within Egyptian, Babylonian—and to some extent even Mycenaean/Minoan—societies and related these forms of knowledge making to existing social structures. Indeed, medical practice in these cultures was, for the most part, indistinguishable from the organizational arms and projects of religious action and authority, which may equally account for its “conservatism” and overall longevity. So too, as we will see below, these same medical practitioners, trained within the temples, were also cultivated as diplomatic agents between Bronze Age centers of power. Medical exchange in this world was therefore not exclusively about the reciprocal trade of objects and information, but was deeply intertwined with the religious and bureaucratic structures which knotted together other social relations and arrangements.

Medico-religious knowledge as state ideology

In both Near-Eastern and Egyptian contexts the divine was not just invoked in offering authoritative accounts of health, disease, and responsibility. In both cultures temples functioned

⁷⁸ So too, it would account for the lack of medical loan-words between Greek, Akkadian, and Egyptian medical traditions. Asper 2015: 29-30.

⁷⁹ Compare Shapin 1994 for similar problems of “invisible technicians” up through the Medieval period.

as the repositories of the essential texts used by practitioners of medicine, even if the healing encounter usually took place in the home, not the sanctuary.⁸⁰ In the Sumerian and Akkadian sources, the principal practitioners were the *asû* and the *āšipu* (Sumerian *šim-mu₂*), both servants of the goddess Gula, who, as we will see below, emerged as the central healing divinity of the Near East.⁸¹ Both *asû* and the *āšipu* were tied to temples and their corresponding theological frameworks for health, disease and responsibility. This is especially visible in the case of the authoritative *Diagnostic Handbook*, an exhaustive list of 40 books describing physical symptoms and observations fused with complex divine etiologies and elaborate ritual therapeutics.⁸² For all its empirical rigor, the *Diagnostic Handbook* frames disease as divine assaults upon the body, and the major goal of the *asû* is to identify what particular god needed to be propitiated and the proper ritualized recipe to do so. So too, in the cuneiform sources, medical “treatises” were often framed as discussions between various gods of magic and healing, and important poems like the “Hymn to Gula” celebrate her as an arch-*asû*, on whom all medical activity was modeled and depended.⁸³

Critically, within Mesopotamian scribal cultures, the reproduction of texts were not only crucial for the processes of medical and theological apprenticeship, but constituted a central form of cultural reproduction.⁸⁴ That is, the duplication and dissemination of such ancient and

⁸⁰ Cf. Avalos 1995; Robson 2008; Lang 2012.

⁸¹ See Böck 2013 for the gradual syncretic assimilation of local healing deities to Gula (who, herself could be assimilated to Ištar).

⁸² For summary of the distinction between the *asû* and the *āšipu*, see e.g., Avalos 1995; Abrahams 2003; Geller 2010; see Robson 2008: 468f. who argues the distinction between *asû* and the *āšipu* is only one of terminological register, and had no bearing on practice. For the *Diagnostic Handbook*, see Heeßel 2000; Scurlock and Andersen 2005.

⁸³ Foster 2005; Böck 2013. Interestingly, as Robson 2008 makes clear, like Hygieia’s associations with Aphrodite, Gula/Ninisina was overtly sexualized in many of these poems.

⁸⁴ Avalos 1995.

authoritative medical texts contributed to a wider system of copying and editing the principal religious, legal, economic, or scientific documents of Babylonian and Assyrian cultures, a system for which the temple served as the paramount instrument and archive.⁸⁵ This institutionalized copying thus literally inscribed medical practice and its transmission into the wider ideological structures stabilizing Babylonian/Assyrian culture and society, helping to account for its many millennia of “continuous” practice.⁸⁶ Already, we can see the organization and preservation of knowledge in more formalized ways than those suggested for Asper’s shady consortia: not only are such practitioners and their methods quite visible, they were well placed in key social positions and institutions.

By contrast to the thousands of surviving medical cuneiform tablets, the majority of what we know of Egyptian medicine is derived from a dozen or so papyri, most of which date to a range of 1800-1200 BCE, although they are widely believed to contain much older lore, stretching back perhaps well into to the third millennium BCE.⁸⁷ Like Babylonian medicine, this gives the feeling of a stunning continuity of tradition secured by longstanding social institutions and traditions. It is not surprising then that within Egyptian society the most visible healers were typically associated with the temple and its archive of medico-religious texts.⁸⁸ So too, there was little to no professional or social differentiation between priests, magicians, physicians, or scribes

⁸⁵ See Robson 2008: 465f. for Gula’s presence in the curse which prefaces Hammurabi’s law code, which itself includes regulations of certain medical procedures. Ultimately, the law code is an excellent demonstration of the imbrication of theology, law, medicine, and political power within a Babylonian context.

⁸⁶ Cf. Geller 2010; 2014.

⁸⁷ See Ritner 2000, although in 2007: 210 he counts 18 medical papyri in addition to individual prescriptions.

⁸⁸ Cf. Nunn 2002: 98-131. It is clear that there existed multiple sectors of care in Egypt, including magicians (*sa*), priests (*wab*) and “physician” (*swmw*). However, as numerous papyri and inscriptions make clear, these were not exclusive titles, and we know of a number of physician-priests. Ultimately, the hierarchical production and transmission of knowledge and medical practice was orchestrated through the temple.

within the context of temple healing. As we will see, one reason for the conservatism of medicine was that, as a branch of religious knowledge, it consequently also constituted a piece of a royal ideology whose principal concern was to broadcast the impression of an unbroken chain of tradition and divinely assured power over what was, in reality, a fractious Nile basin.⁸⁹ This meant that in Egyptian medicine, as with Babylonian, physiological and pathological theories were fundamentally a blend of empirical observation and divine action in the service of propping up larger cosmological structures. For instance, the explanatory model of disease known as *wekhedu*—a dangerous and mobile pathogen creating blockage and/or toxic rot within the body—was not exclusive of religiously oriented explanations for the cause of disease. In fact, they were simply different strands of a larger etiological ecosystem.⁹⁰ Often such causes of blockages or pathogenic residues were imagined as coming from exterior hostile daemonic forces, especially during the nighttime.⁹¹ A cluster of magico-medical spells are designated to ward off just such nighttime attacks,⁹² while another group of papyri identify and associate a broad scope of physical and social disorders with the assaults of divinities, demons, and ghosts all imagined as injurious material intruding into the body.⁹³

Egyptian medicine projected onto the workings of the body a larger cosmological rhythm which pitted the forces of order and unity against those of chaos. A collection of treatments

⁸⁹ For constant rebellion on the Nile, see Broodbank 2013. For the question of “innovation” in Egyptian medicine, see Ritner 2000.

⁹⁰ See, e.g., Nunn 2002: 45-60.

⁹¹ The body was especially subject to such attacks at night, when the sun god Ra and his companions sailed the river of the Underworld and fended off the assaults of the giant serpent Apophis. This way the cosmic order was nightly endangered and daily reasserted. See e.g., the Coffin Text spell 873 or the Brooklyn Magical papyrus 47.218.156 which offers the king protection during sleep against the ejaculate of hostile demons attacking via the ear. See Ritner 1990 and more generally Lang 2012: 109.

⁹² Ritner 1990: 34f.

⁹³ See, e.g., Borghouts 1978: nos. 22-27; 50-57; 59.

against snake-bites from the sixth century BCE, housed at the Brooklyn Museum, creates suggestive points of contact between the every-day dangers of desert life and the cosmic struggle between the sun-god Ra and his serpentine antagonist Apophis.⁹⁴ These sorts of mythological analogies are the effective essence of lots of magic, but such substitutions and assimilations posit a fundamental relationship between the struggles of the divine and the precariousness of being physically embodied. The breakdown of somatic order could therefore be caused by physiological processes nested within an overarching bio-cosmology which, again, tended to naturalize magical practices and the temple as best suited for health related needs. As we will see further below, plagues and epidemics were likewise understood to be both seasonal and divinely related, typically associated with the healing/plague god Sekhmet, whom the physician often served as a priest.⁹⁵ What bears keeping in mind, then, is the way in which medico-religious practice was not a separate arena of action, but one which mobilized and relied upon whole symbolic and ideological systems, both in terms of achieving practical efficacy and acquiring larger authority. Consequently, when medical practitioners travelled, as we will see, they carried not just healing goods and expertise, but entire cosmological frameworks from which their respective choices of *materia medica* and the actions surrounding their use took on meaning (even if they were also efficacious in ways we would recognize pharmacologically).

Divine Arrows of Pestilence

The jig-saw puzzle fit of these medical cosmologies illuminates the concurrences between Mediterranean medical cultures, as the divinities which embodied Mediterranean ideas

⁹⁴ Lang 2012: 110.

⁹⁵ Nunn 2002; Lang 2012.

concerning sickness, disease, and health likewise shared a non-negligible degree of similarity. Indeed Egyptian, Babylonian, Hittite, and Aegean cultures reveal a suggestive patterning which exists in a clutch of plague/medical gods connecting early Sumerian religion to the Graeco-Roman world. These plague gods have a number of characteristics in common, not least of which is a consistent association with the bow as the principal weapon of their pestilential fury. Christopher Faraone has suggested that “the image of arrows showered down upon a group of people seems to be a common ancient explanation of the multiple appearances of fevers and epidemic plagues in an army or any other closely packed group of people.”⁹⁶ To this we can apply Brooke Holmes’ observation concerning the arms of Apollo as a conceptual model of disease. For Holmes, the image of the bow and arrow not only pairs the lethality of disease and its essential exteriority, which, as we saw, was fundamental to Babylonian-Assyrian, Egyptian, and early Greek attitudes. The bow-and-arrow of disease also captured the twin problems of epistemological distance (the archer, like the cause of disease, cannot be seen) and the ontological gulf screening the human from the divine.⁹⁷ At the same time, the figures we encounter below are not just represented as firing, unseen and unknowable, pestiferous arrows to decimate whole cities or armies of man. The bow and arrow are equally significant for shooting at to avert and destroy any impending disease or threat, as Apollo and Artemis *Propylaios* or *Prostaterios* and their frequent, talismanic doorway statues attest.⁹⁸ These figures all share a duality, wielding their weapons both for and against the interests of the wider community.

Nergal, a central Babylonian divinity of the underworld and death was often explicitly, if

⁹⁶ Faraone 1994: 52.

⁹⁷ Holmes 2010b.

⁹⁸ Cf. Borghouts 1976; Graf 1992 and 2008; Faraone 1994: 54f. and 2003.

not exclusively, identified as the harbinger and cause of plague.⁹⁹ While he occupied a variety of theriomorphic guises in his long cultic life, he was primarily represented as a massive and insuperable bull, but also hybridized as a lion.¹⁰⁰ His principal weapon in Akkadian sources is the bow and arrow, which he used to shower the enemies of the king or whole towns of people with pest.¹⁰¹ At the great temple of Hatra in Iraq, Nergal is iconographically identified with Herakles, whose ability to ward away disease with his bow as Alexikakos has been noted.¹⁰² Nergal is also frequently identified with Erra (Hittite Irra), who sometimes took his place or was considered as Nergal's twin.¹⁰³ In an early epic, the *Epos Erra*, this god is equally depicted carrying the bow and arrows of pestilence. Further, he is paired with seven (or fourteen) henchmen, who were either armed with the weapons of plague, or even named as particular diseases.¹⁰⁴ Over time Nergal/Erra's image moved westward and we find the same god under new names in other cities and cultures. For instance, in the ancient cities of Ebla and Ugarit he was Resheph, a powerful deity who likewise banished plague and who was also later assimilated with Heracles.¹⁰⁵

In a Hittite incantation to dispel a "plague year," a physician named Zarpiya calls on Sandas, who is described as equipped with bow and arrow.¹⁰⁶ In another Luwian inscription

⁹⁹ See Wiggermann 2001. *RLA* s.v. "Nergal. A." Münnich 2013, however disputes any early underworld character, identifying him originally as a ruler of heaven who took on an chthonic valence only later. Regardless, he is always a figure of terrifying and insurmountable power.

¹⁰⁰ Münnich 2013.

¹⁰¹ Mastrocinque 2008.

¹⁰² Al-Salihi 1971.

¹⁰³ Mastrocinque 2008.

¹⁰⁴ Wiggerman 2002. As Reiner 1960 notes, the *epos*, along with a collection of other spells meant to banish diseases and evil, include amuletic instructions to be buried within the walls of a house to activate its protective properties. Similar instructions are known in association with Apollo Paian at, e.g. the Getty Hexameters l. 1-3 (cf. Johnson 2013).

¹⁰⁵ See generally Wiggermann 2002 for Nergal. For Resheph, see now the excellent accounts in Lipinksi 2009 and Münnich 2013.

¹⁰⁶ *KUB* 37. 10.3.13. See Schwartz 1938.

Sandas is accompanied by the “dark-ones,” likely disease bearing henchman.¹⁰⁷ In fact, Sandas/Sandon appears in Eastern Graeco-Roman iconography until quite late, and is regularly depicted in association with a lion-headed goat, likely the source for the Greek hybrid-monster Chimera. Sandas/Sandon was equated later on with Herakles, and so Mastrocinque has persuasively argued this Sandas was the Cilician incarnation of Nergal/Erra/Irra.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, he was to be appeased with a scapegoating sacrifice with structural parallels to the Ionian scapegoats described earlier.¹⁰⁹ Given Apollo’s potential Lycian genesis (e.g. his frequent epithet Apollo *Lykeios*), it has been proposed that his origins are to be found in influences of such bow-wielding, plague-bringing/averting figures, principally Resheph.¹¹⁰

Whatever the case, Resheph, as the Semitic embodiment of the warrior-plague god, finds contacts with the Egyptian Sekhmet, still another lion-headed deity.¹¹¹ She was imagined as the burning, solar vengeance of the sun god armed with plague and pestilence.¹¹² As we have seen, she was also the principal deity served by the Egyptian medical priests, the *wab* and *swnw*.¹¹³ More than this, we saw that she too was flanked by seven attendants, who “shoot arrows of pestilence” out of their mouths. Thus the “Seven Arrows of Sekhmet” was a powerful magic

¹⁰⁷ Riel 2010.

¹⁰⁸ See also Laroche 1973.

¹⁰⁹ Mastrocinque 2008. See Chapter 1.

¹¹⁰ He is early associated with Apollo on Cyprus, where a pestilential year as was known as “hand of Resheph” (see *EA* 13-14; 35-39.). For Apollo’s early history with Resheph, see Burkert 1975. For Apollo’s Eastern origins, see Burkert 1992: 49-50; Beekes 2003; Graf 2008.

¹¹¹ For Resheph’s healing aspect in Egypt, see Chester-Beatty Papyrus VII: 4.9; Leiden Magical Papyrus I 343 + 345, for which Lipinski 2009 argues a Ugaritic point of origin. For Resheph’s cultivation by Ahmenhotep II in Egypt, see Münnich 2013: 80f. This is precisely the time in which we find other Semitic deities intruding into spell and medical lists. For Resheph’s healing and protective qualities in private cult, *ibid.* 115

¹¹² Cf. Nergal’s principal astral symbol, Mars, which was also associated with the burning heat of pestilence. See Reiner 1995. So, too, Resheph in his Egyptian context, is consistently figured as a solar deity and ruler of heaven.

¹¹³ Nunn 2002; Aposta 2014.

spell, utilized both for causing and banishing disease. Likewise, the Edwin Smith papyrus contains an evocative spell against nighttime diseases, barring “the bitterness of the night-demons, those of smallness, Sekhmet’s messengers.”¹¹⁴ Consequently, icons of the goddess were exchanged on the Egyptian New Year to ensure a healthy year to come.¹¹⁵

In this sampling lattice of disease-and-healing gods we find the typical operations of Mediterranean polytheism at work. Deities from one locale seem either to have been imported into new contexts, or local deities took on new and added dimensions coordinated for mutual intelligibility with figures of foreign cult.¹¹⁶ The result is a striking overlap in what we might label the theological “structural meta-features,” including: bows and arrows as the almost exclusive weapon of plague; seven attendants or seven arrows of that plague; astronomical associations with summer and burning; leonine imagery; and a uniform reception within the Graeco-Roman world as some form of Herakles or the Delian twins Apollo/Artemis. Overall the evidence encourages me to the view that this was not a conventional theological framework which all Mediterranean cultures shared, but was rather an additive product of cultural interchange against which we ought to read similar overlaps in the broader medical culture.

Sekhmet permits the clearest glimpse of such interchange and the movement of medico-religious iconography and materials from Egypt into the Levant and early Greek world, as Electra Apostola has shown. Among the ninth century burial-finds at Lefkandi was discovered a

¹¹⁴ Probably the reference here is to malarial mosquitos. Cf. Sallares 2002; Scheidel 2001 on malaria in Egypt; *SEG* 39. 1305 for θεὸς πύρετος (fever god, surely=malaria) and *SEG* 36 780 (with Dunst 1968) for the Samian malarial daimon Τεταρταῖος.

¹¹⁵ Pinch 1994; Apostola 2014.

¹¹⁶ Indicative of the two-way nature of exchange: Resheph, originally perhaps an Eblaite or Ugaritic deity, features in an Egyptian victory stele declaring that the pharaoh Amenhotep II “charged over the Orontes like Resheph” (cf. Lipinski 2000).

necklace featuring 53 figurines of the lion-headed Sekhmet.¹¹⁷ The Lefkandi Sekhmet initiates a larger series of Geometric and later Archaic finds which spanned from Euboea, with its early Levantine trade-networks, and Cretan sanctuaries at Kommos—where Sekhmet was possibly absorbed into the Delian triad¹¹⁸—to Rhodian manufactories, which distributed her faience images north to Greek Aegean locales.¹¹⁹ The earliest Sekhmet figurines likely made their way through Levantine ports-of-trade, like Al-Mina, where that goddess was also popularly associated with the Phoenician goddess of war, Astarte. As we will see, Astarte played an important role as the consort of Eshmun, the Sidonian healing god *par excellence*. For now it is enough to note that early Iron-Age Greeks probably did not receive information about Sekhmet directly from Egyptians until sometime in the 7th century BCE and it is of course no guarantee that religious iconography carried with it medical lore. Rather, this is a potent example of how materials take on new meanings according to new contexts, as at Lefkandi Sekhmet’s necklace was first and foremost a prestige item attesting the breadth of Euboean social networks, and less likely an expression of ideas regarding the body and sickness. Yet at the same time it is perhaps not coincidental that Rhodes was the principal clearing house for these Egyptian medico-religious objects and, perhaps, ideas.¹²⁰ It was, after all, only a quick skip to nearby Knidos, with which we identified the earliest traditions of Greek medicine and its evident structural similarities to wider Mediterranean conceptions of disease and healing.

“Hybrid” recipes and incantations

¹¹⁷ Aruz et al. 2014: 3.

¹¹⁸ Hdt. 2.59; for Egyptian festival of Artemis/Bastet, see Asheri et al. ad loc. For Sekhmet at Kommos, see Shaw 1980.

¹¹⁹ Andrews 1994; Apostola 2014.

¹²⁰ Burkert 1992.

Reinforcing this shared framework of healing divinities, we can make out the movements of healers themselves. Indeed, though only dimly, a few scraps of medico-magical papyri and cuneiform epistles limn the horizons of an Aegean in which medical ideas and practitioners flowed along trade and political networks, not just as goods but as agents of political communication. These too show that medical knowledge and men did not possess stable meanings, but were exploited for particular ends. For instance, the London Medical Papyrus, dated to the reign of Tutenkhamun (1333-23BCE) at the end of the 18th Dynasty, contains mostly prescriptions and incantations, no fewer than six of which are in Semitic languages other than Egyptian, rendered in a syllabic script. Fascinatingly, some of these invoke foreign gods in the company of Egyptian ones. Spell 27 calls on the Egyptian Amun together with *Ištar-ummi*—mother Ištar. The following spell (28) pairs Ištar again with the Semitic healing god Eshmun.¹²¹ Not only do such medical spells register the syncretic cosmopolitanism of 18th Dynasty Egypt with its mutual incursions into the Levantine politics, religion, and culture; it evinces the actual permeability of Egyptian medical traditions as they sought out the exotic power of foreign healing deities and the wider cultural ties they may have brought.

Two further passages are in “*Keftiu*” typically taken to mean “Cretan” or “Aegean.”¹²² The first of the incantations is meant to combat an “Asian illness.”¹²³ The second incantation references what are taken to be a pairing of Minoan divinities, Razaja/Razija and Ameija/

¹²¹ Recall Sekhmet’s assimilation with Astarte/Ištar above.

¹²² Haider 2001 translates the spells thus: “Incantation of the Asiatic illness of the Kaftu foreign land” (London Medical Papyrus, Spell 32) “Incantation of the illness Samuna...R/Lazaja/R/Lazija, the great god Ameija/Amija, god, this sentence must be said four times.” (London Medical Papyrus, Spell 33). Haider collects as well the remaining “well known” mid-second millennium evidence for Minoan-Egyptian contacts, including the “Kaftu boats” built in the harbor of Memphis and a writing tablet with Minoan names. See also Broodbank 2013.

¹²³ Arnott 2005: 165.

Amija.¹²⁴ Ritner's edition of the text includes a fascinating incipit: "To Santas, to Kapupa! Come Here! Make me strong on my insides."¹²⁵ This is interesting primarily given the prominence of Santas/Sandon as a healing/plague god in the Cilician/Lyidian pantheon, as we saw above.¹²⁶ We thus find a blending of Aegean and Anatolian deities within an Egyptian incantation. These fascinating, if maddeningly obscure, spells evidence the perceived efficacy of "foreign" cult practices within a medical encounter, for both, we assume, the practitioner and the patient. So too they materialize the transferal of medico-religious ideas. Santas was absorbed into a cosmopolitan hybrid, blending Minoan and Anatolian prescriptions against an "Asian" disease; a hybrid adapted, presumably, to the framework of local Egyptian systems of signification. Despite the (primarily Greek) reputation for hostility towards innovation, we find Egyptian medicine as a flexible system ready to adapt figures from multiple cultural contexts and mold them into new, creative forms of medical practice.

To these powerful magico-medical deities and spells we can add the importation of *materia medica* into Egypt from Crete. The Ebers papyrus, itself somewhat earlier than the London Medical Papyrus, but likewise recording older herb-lore, relays the following remedy against constipation (Papyrus Ebers 28):¹²⁷

Another remedy to cause purgation...*gntn6* (unknown herb)...which are like beans from the Keftiu land.

¹²⁴ Arnott 1999; 2014 for Minoan healing cult.

¹²⁵ Ritner 2000: 111.

¹²⁶ See Riel 2010: 191 for Kabuba's history and origins. She may have been the precursor the Kybele.

¹²⁷ Arnott 2005: 167, trans. Grapow 1958. Conversely, an unknown pulse called the "Egyptian bean" is a frequent ingredient found in Hippocratic preparations for purgatives in *Mul.* 1.

Materially, among the cargoes of the famous shipwreck off Uluburun was found nearly a ton of *Terebinthos* resin—widely used in Aegean medical/ritual recipes and probably moving West to Crete where the tree producing the resin does not grow.¹²⁸ Although vague, these scraps of medicinal lore fall well in line with what we now know about the well established trade-networking connecting the Aegean, Levant, and Egypt in the middle of the 2nd millennium. For instance, Minoan contact with Deltaic Egypt is thick on the ground, emerging especially on the painted walls of the city of Avaris.¹²⁹

Medical Diplomacy

Much more eloquent testimony concerning the movement of doctors is to be found in the voluminous correspondence between Egyptian and Hittite kings, preserved in cuneiform.¹³⁰ Indeed, it is well known that the Hittite and Babylonian courts employed Egyptian doctors.¹³¹ The royal epistolary records of the late Bronze Age reveal more than just a diaspora of opportunistic Egyptian healers, however, opening a window on more formalized structures for their exchange. For instance, we discover requests for Egyptian doctors to be sent to the Hittite capital at Hattusa. Two Hittite lords (Hattusili and Tadhaliya IV) sent letters to Ramesses II

¹²⁸ Totelin 2009; Beckmann 2009.

¹²⁹ Haider 2001; Broodbank 2013

¹³⁰ The earliest cuneiform correspondence regarding the movement of healers is actually internal to the city-state of Mari, e.g., *ARM* 1. 115; 14. 3; 26. 267-70; 26. 278; analogously, 26. 279-280 speak of “diviners” sent to heal ailments; see also *ABL* 391 and 870 (=Oppenheim 92 and 99) for Neo-Assyrian parallels, attesting the continuity of practice. Interestingly, *ARM* 6. 39 shows an elite sending his healer to another town to learn the recipe for a certain efficacious salve, with the expectation that he be sent right back. All in all, we find a close management of the requests for and receipts of doctors along Zaccagnini’s (1983: 247-9) “redistributive” model, where skilled laborers of various professions were dispatched from the administrative center to its more peripheral districts to fill need *ad hoc*. This internally “redistributive” model existed along side of and complemented the international, “reciprocativ” model (1983: 249f.) in which physicians were loaned between palaces as part of a larger system of gift exchange, but were never intended as permanent gifts.

¹³¹ Ghaliounghui 1983 gathers the references for Egyptian doctors serving for other Persian kings.

prevailing on him to send learned Egyptian doctors.¹³² In the case of the former, Ramesses peevishly consented to send a handful of doctors to aid Hattusili's aging sister in her attempts at becoming pregnant, while the latter finds him much more graciously sending physicians to look after Tadhaliya's cousin, whose ailments eluded local practitioners.¹³³ Two later inscriptions, the Udjahorressnet inscription and the Bentreš stele, which date to the Saïte and Ptolemaic periods respectively, record Egyptian doctors visiting the Persian and Mittani (Hittite) courts in diplomatically significant roles.¹³⁴ Fascinatingly, these documents show self-consciously archaizing elements—indeed, the Bentreš stele declares itself as a product of Ramesses II's time, possibly harkening to a well known oral history—confirming that the patterns of medical mobility remained active and relevant well after the fall of indigenous rulers.¹³⁵

Turning south of the Anatolian kingdom to the Levant, Ugaritic letters to the pharaohs also show an occasional dependence on Egyptian practitioners.¹³⁶ Despite the impression given in later Greek texts, it is important to emphasize that Egypt was not the only clearing house for medical expertise. These same kings and cities equally called upon Babylonian healers and

¹³² *KUB* III 67 (CTH 163) in Bryce 2002: 170. See Zaccagnini 1983: 250-1 for several more instances of Egyptian loans to Hittite royals.

¹³³ *KBo* XXVIII 30 in Bryce 2002: 171.

¹³⁴ For the Udjahorressnet inscription see Lloyd 1982 with Moyer 2005 and 2011. For the Bentreš stele, see Zaccagnini 1983: 255. Meier 2007: 189 n16 revises the compositional date between the eighth and fourth centuries, but still sees it as an important document for portraying the realistic expectations an Egyptian might entertain about travel abroad.

¹³⁵ The narrative of the Bentreš stele is actually rather more complicated and revealing. According to the stele, Bentreš was a sister-in-law of Ramesses II's who had taken ill. Ramesses acceded to her father's plea for a learned Egyptian doctor to travel to Asia to heal her. It seems the doctor was able to identify the illness as a form of demonic possession, but unable to cure it, and so returned to the Egyptian court. Ramesses then sent a statue of the Theban god Khonsu together with a large coterie of attendants and a processional fleet, who successfully drove out the afflicting demon. Like the human healers sent abroad, detainment was a real possibility, as the lord of Bahkten did not send the statue of Khonsu back immediately. For the international travel of gods, see Meier 2007 and further below.

¹³⁶ Amarna correspondence (*EA* 49. 22-45). See Moran 1992 for translations of the letters.

medicine in times of need.¹³⁷ Indeed, a letter from Hattusali III to the Babylonian King Kadashman-Enlil reveals that the latter was rather annoyed that the Hittite court had neglected to return a physician sent in the rule of the former's brother, Muwatalli, and requested the swift repatriation of his servant.¹³⁸ Another entry in the Amarna correspondence (*EA* 23) shows the other side of the coin, as it were: here we find the statue of the Hurrian goddess Shaushka, tutelary goddess of Hattusali III,¹³⁹ sent to the court of Amenhotep III, probably to relieve him of a speech-related disability.¹⁴⁰ So too, in *EA* 35, a detailed report of Cyprio-Egyptian trade, the Cypriot king requests a religious expert known as an "eagle conjurer," probably in connection to an epidemic outbreak called "hand of Nergal/Resheph" which is also mentioned as devastating his lands. And finally, Robert Arnott and Chris Faraone point to a Hittite divination text (c. 1330-20) which records the arrival of a Mycenaean statue (possibly from Lesbos) at the Hittite capital to benefit the king and heal him since his own local medics have failed.¹⁴¹

Here, then, we can make out the filaments of a wide ranging, Bronze Age network of medicinal practitioners, integrating all the major hubs of Eastern Mediterranean palatial societies. As Cohen and Westbrook, following Zaccagnini, point out, it is rather remarkable how much the requests for and loans of physicians between courts resemble elite level exchanges in luxury and prestige goods, like silver, copper, or cedar.¹⁴² In this regard, the shipment of physicians looks rather more like the (typically invisible) trade in more fundamental and

¹³⁷ Bryce 2002; 2005 suggests that Hittite kings called on Babylonian healers when political flare-ups obstructed such requests of Egypt.

¹³⁸ *KBo* I 10 + *KUB* III 72. Bryce 2002: 172.

¹³⁹ S.v. Shaushka in van der Toorn et al. 1999.

¹⁴⁰ Zaccagnini 2000: 146. See Morgan 1992: 61-2 for reservations concerning the healing mission

¹⁴¹ *KUB* V 6; see Faraone 1992: 27 n. 77; Arnott 2002; 2005: 168; Meier 2007.

¹⁴² Zaccagnini 2000: 146.

sustaining resources, like grain or oil, on which communities depended. Despite the scantiness of the overall portrait, it nonetheless evinces that the comings and goings of healers themselves performed real functions in the maintenance of interpersonal and inter-political relationships.

As Cyprian Broodbank explains, it was precisely at this point in time that we can begin to distinguish a Mediterranean *koine* of consumer goods and tastes developing across the highest echelons of palace societies, which was surely intended, in part, to “blur the lines of elite cultural boundaries.”¹⁴³ Thus, to the mechanisms of a burgeoning international “diplomacy,” conducted through the development of shared cultural aesthetics, we can add the reciprocal exchange of human healers and the hybridization of divine ones. Medicinal practice, like the iconography of prestige goods, offered another symbolic medium through which cosmopolitanism could be elaborated and performed by global elites desiring to enlarge points of shared cultural identity. Nevertheless, Broodbank, among others, has cautioned that the image of an international, harmonious community of elites fostering culturally generic and unaffiliated stylistic forms belies the reality of significant cultural difference which intervened in the processes of reception.

As cultural theorists and historians since Mary Louise Pratt have made clear, the meaning invested in objects, ideas, or even persons, was never the same “abroad” as in its native context.¹⁴⁴ The very act of movement was always liable to trigger shifts in signification. Here, again, the “trade” in physicians and the adaptation of healing gods is especially evocative. In reality, it is unlikely an Egyptian doctor would have likely been any more effective than a local healer in the treatment of a Hittite queen. These healers acquired power and prestige from their

¹⁴³ Broodbank 2013: 399. See also Feldman 2006 and 2015.

¹⁴⁴ Pratt 1991; Ulf 2009.

exotic points of origin and because of the social and political capital expended on that acquisition. At the same time, medicine is not simply or reductively a part of a prestige economy. Tadhaliya's letter to Ramesses II makes deadly clear how urgently the need of a skilled physician is felt. The loan and receipt of a foreign expert may have engendered real feelings of relief and gratitude, thickening the bonds of trust and reciprocity across elite society.

Thus the incorporation of foreign healers and *materia medica* met multiple and interactive purposes. It was embedded within the forms of communication and commerce between royal elites faced with the challenges of negotiating relationships abroad to promote trade, ensure stability, and avoid conflict. But even as it worked to "shrink" the distances between elites, it participated in and traded upon the awareness of forms of cultural difference: "Asiatic diseases" were fought by enfolding Asiatic deities into traditional Egyptian medico-magical forms. Because the symbolic substrate of this medicine was itself already fused to the mutually intelligible forms of religious life within all these cultures, respectively, they were highly adaptable to one another, as we have seen in the fluid pantheon of plague/healing gods. In the late Bronze and Early Iron Age Mediterranean, then, medical practice formed both an *object* of cultural interchange in the form of knowledge and religious ideas, as well as the very mechanism of that exchange in the persons of doctors and the bodily needs of those they practiced upon. That is, medicine operated as a complex cultural interface, bringing together individual actors with mutual interests within the wider semantic field of cultural and religious differentiation. When we discuss, then, the directionality of influence or the evolution of epistemic features within the intellectual history of such medicine, we ought not to lose sight of

the way that medicinal practice in this world was embedded in particular strategies of interchange and adapted to new contexts as they serviced various social relationships.

Asklepios and Eshmun

The Phoenician god Eshmun, with whom Asklepios was assimilated by Greeks of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, offers a later and quite different example of healing at the center of transcultural encounters.¹⁴⁵ Before we saw the movement of healers as part of a wider exchange between royal “equals” in an attempt to find common ground and secure stability both at home and abroad. Despite the antiquity of Eshmun as a god, his role in Graeco-Phoenician (a reductive if not wholly disposable label) relations appears more a product of the processes of hellenization which occurred in the region after the conquests of Alexander.¹⁴⁶ That is, we will find the equation of Asklepios and Eshmun as part of a creative, pragmatic strategy by which Phoenicians and Greeks alike tried to maximize mutual understanding (and prestige) within a world increasingly dominated by Hellenic habits and institutions. Here, again, we will find the broader social significance of health and healing as the animating point of contact in this inter-cultural dialogue.

¹⁴⁵ Eshmun was widely venerated at the cities of Sidon, Tyre, Amrit, Serapta, as well as among the Phoenician colonies, from Carthage to the Iberian peninsula.

¹⁴⁶ Lipinski 1995; Rigsby 2007; Bonnet 2013.

In reality, the explicit co-identification of Eshmun and Asklepios within Eshmun's cult at Sidon did not take place early.¹⁴⁷ Although arguments from silence must surely be taken *cum grano salis*, the earliest inscriptional reference to Asklepios-Eshmun at Sidon itself dates only to the 1st century BCE.¹⁴⁸ Meanwhile, the very earliest general evidence tying Eshmun to Asklepios comes from the fourth century BCE, but it seems that early on Eshmun was more readily associated with Apollo, especially in the western Mediterranean and North Africa.¹⁴⁹ As we noted above, Eshmun was an ancient Syrian god, invoked as a foreign deity within the Ebers Medical Papyrus.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, mention of this deity is found early on within the third millennium archives from the city of Ebla, where his name is most likely derived from *oil*, and so perhaps means something like the “one who anoints.”¹⁵¹ Early Phoenician references to the god come with two eighth and seventh century treaties brokered between Assyrian kings and local, Levantine rulers. In both texts Eshmun is called on together with Melqart to enforce the pact through the dual threats of pestilence and famine should either party violate the agreed-upon

¹⁴⁷ The Graeco-Roman literary sources are all late: Asklepios at Sidon: Strabo 16.2.22; Asklepios at Carthage: Strabo 17.3.4; App. *Pun.* 130; and Apul. *Flor.* 18.38; Antoninus Placentius (6th cent. AD) refers to an “Asklepios” River outside Sidon. For Asklepios' foreign origins in Greece: Paus. 7.23.7-8 Sidon; Asklepios' origins in Phoenician as Ἐσμουνός, son of the god Sarkos, see Dam. *Isid.* 348. The earliest potential dedications to Asklepios as Eshmun are to be dated to the middle of the 2nd century BCE (c.166), in which a Tyrian dedicated in the Delian sanctuary of Asklepios (*I.Délos* 2322=SEG 40. 660). Similarly, a now famous trilingual inscription in Latin, Greek, and Phoenician from second century BCE Sardinia (c. 180 BCE, *CIL* I² 2226) translates Eshmun as Asklepios/Aesculapius. Kleon, the dedicant of this inscription calls himself “the overseer of the salt.” Curiously, Philo of Byblos (Eus. *Praep. Evang.* 1.22f.) informs us that Suduc (equivalent to Damascius' Sarkos, Eshmun's father) was the “inventor of salt” and gave birth to Asklepios. Suduc/Eshmun/Asklepios may thus have had some role in the production and sale of salt? The earliest Syrian inscription for Asklepios dates to the end of the close of the fourth century BCE in Sarepta (see Daly 1980); inscriptions from Sidon bearing Asklepios' name date only from the middle of the first century BCE onwards (see Rigsby 2007). Although, see SEG 7. 265, an undated dedication evoking the presence of Πανάκεια within Eshmun's Sidonian temple. According to Yon 2008, the honorary inscription *I.Kit.* 2030 (=SEG 20 133) featuring Asklepios and Hygieia should be understood as Ptolemaic assimilation of an earlier cult of Eshmun. See Xella 1992.

¹⁴⁸ Rigsby 2007.

¹⁴⁹ Benseddick 1997; 2010.

¹⁵⁰ Xella 2001 for the earliest evidence of Eshmun in the Near East.

¹⁵¹ Fevier 1975; Benseddick 2010; see Lipinski 1995: 154-155 for several other early ritual and toponymical references to Eshmun in the third millennium.

terms.¹⁵² This would seem to locate Eshmun squarely within our coterie of terrible Near-eastern deities, smiting their political enemies or the impious (which, of course, are not so different) with plague. So, too in the second treaty Eshmun is specifically tied to the “deprivation of oil.” As a healer, then, he is clearly associated with the nutriment of the agricultural world as it “grounded” notions of sickness and health with the power of gods and kings over the land.¹⁵³ At the same time, his plague bearing aspect aligns him much more strongly with the eastern Apollo of pestilence than with the benignity of Asklepios.

Archaeological sources confirm that Eshmun was worshipped at two important sanctuaries at Sidon: an urban one in “Sidon-on-the-Sea,” and an extra-urban sanctuary watered by the holy spring of Ydal where he and his consort Astarte were worshipped.¹⁵⁴ Numerous sixth century inscriptions have come to light there and underline two crucial functions of the god’s sanctuary: first is the centrality of the king in maintaining and negotiating the welfare of the community through the performance of royal rituals. Second, dedicatory statuettes of children, particularly elite boys, speak to the place of Eshmun’s cult in age-and-life-rituals meant to usher the young into adult society.¹⁵⁵ This suggests that Eshmun’s healing powers at Sidon are a subsidiary form of his broader role managing long-term social stability as it was ensured by elite ritual practice. That is, there is some question whether we should consider Eshmun’s sanctuary at Sidon primarily as a “healing” sanctuary at all. And, if we do not take it to be first and foremost a

¹⁵² Lipinski 1995: 156.

¹⁵³ See further Benseddik 2010: 11f. See Chapter One for cognate conceptions within the Archaic Greek world.

¹⁵⁴ For the two sanctuaries, see Dunand 1966; Lipinski 1995; Stucky 2005; Bonnet 2013. The existence of the later cult is mentioned by an inscription on the sarcophagus of the late sixth/early fifth century king Eshmunazor II, whose name testifies to his close relationship with the god. There we read that the king “built a temple for Eshmun, prince of the sanctuary, at the source of the Ydal opposite the mountains...” see *KAI* 14 and 15. *N.b.* the phenomenon of dual urban/extra-urban healing cults as they articulate a Sidonian royal vision of the community.

¹⁵⁵ Bonnet 2013.

healing cult, what are we to make of the motivations which lay behind his later assimilation with Asklepios?

Evidently it has been clear to scholars working with the Phoenician sources that in the case of Apollo, assimilation with Eshmun was not founded simply, or even primarily, on their mutual healing aspects. For instance, Benseddik argued that, although healing was clearly an important aspect of the Sidonian deity, of old Eshmun was a powerful poliadic god around and through whom Phoenician civic and cosmological order was established.¹⁵⁶ Indeed, looking back to the seventh century treatise concluded between Asahraddon and Baal of Tyre brings Melqart and Eshmun together on equal footing—they are both revered as powerful gods who can guarantee political stability and bring the twin terrors of plague and famine in retribution for the infraction of political agreements.¹⁵⁷

Similarly, Eshmun was widely popular from early on among the peoples of Phoenician Carthage. Theophoric names derived from Eshmun remained in vogue among Roman Carthaginians, and show that Eshmun was thoroughly blended with Asklepios there.¹⁵⁸ Again we find that Eshmun was not only a healer among the Carthaginians, although his association with doctors was strongly established, but a significant figure of Punic collective and individual identities.¹⁵⁹ All of this suggests to me that the eventual assimilation of Asklepios/Apollo with Eshmun was based upon a perception of the appropriateness of their roles in Greek civic life as it related in turn to the function of healing. Moreover, this may explain the almost exclusive nature

¹⁵⁶ Benseddik 2010; Xella 1992.

¹⁵⁷ K 3500 + K 4444 + K 10235; see Lipinski 1995.

¹⁵⁸ Benseddik 2010: 12, with Romanized names like *ASMUNIUS* pointing to the prominence of both Asklepios and Eshmun.

¹⁵⁹ See Salem 1995 for a dedication made by a family of Carthaginian physicians to Eshmun; both father and son have Eshmun-derived theophoric names.

of their *translatio* in the ancient world. While the translation of a god from one polytheistic system to another was fluid and unfixed—meant to bring out situationally salient aspects of the target divinity rather than offer an exact and universally valid counterpart—beyond Asklepios/Apollo, for Eshmun there appears to have been no alternative. This is all the more striking, given the early connection between Eshmun and Melqart, and Melqart’s frequent co-identification with the Greek Herakles within the more usual tangle of Near-eastern gods traced above.¹⁶⁰

As a means of solving one corner of the puzzle, Corinne Bonnet has recently observed that neither “syncretism” nor “acculturation” are sufficient models for explaining or capturing the complex social strategies and cultural aims which lie behind the cross-cultural co-identification of two gods.¹⁶¹ The acceptance of Asklepios by Sidonians and other Phoenicians must be understood in the wider context of the strategies developed and employed by Phoenicians in negotiating new workable realities under intensified Greek cultural, political, and economic presence in the years after Alexander. The co-identification of Asklepios and Eshmun is thus not a simple matter of mapping the two most “like” deities, one on to another. Like the blending of Aegean and Anatolian deities in Egyptian spells, the assimilation of the two gods was a creative, adaptive solution which fulfilled a function for Graeco-Phoenician dealings.

Indeed, Bonnet points out that the introduction of Asklepios to Eshmun’s Sidonian sanctuary did little to change cultic or dedicatory practice, as the offerings received by Eshmun-Asklepios continued to focus upon the collective wellbeing of the family and the city.¹⁶² On the one hand, for Bonnet this suggests that when Sidonians adopted Asklepios they did not accept his

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Hdt. 2.44, for Herakles-Melqart at Tyre; Bonnet 1988.

¹⁶¹ Bonnet 2013.

¹⁶² Bonnet 2013: 48.

focus upon the “individual.” Rather, Sidonians and others sought to cultivate ties with the internationally expanding web of Asklepieia, their cultural capital, and financial revenues which his cults were generating, especially in the Dodecanese.¹⁶³ But even this more nuanced framing misses the full reality of the matter. As I have argued, Asklepios’ concern with “individual” religion is too simplistic an understanding of his cult or social function. Like Eshmun, his concern was equally oriented towards the collective wellbeing of groups and the power of ritual participation as a mechanism for reestablishing individual belonging. Bonnet is thus correct in observing that Phoenicians did not focus upon the individual dimension of Asklepios’ healing cult; rather they perceived (somewhat better than we!) that the god’s appropriateness lay in capturing the relationship between civic stability, health, and healing (possibly as it was originally rooted in the soil through the sustenance of olive oil). The pairing of the two communicated and offered more than a simple opportunity to drop into Greek cultic networks.

In that regard we should not overlook Sidonian efforts to co-opt or appropriate Greek figures for themselves. Sidonians were quite capable of utilizing Hellenic cultural and religious institutions to acquire social prestige for themselves, while at the same time smuggling Phoenician traditions into them.¹⁶⁴ As Philo of Byblos claims—and he is echoed by both Pausanias’ “Phoenician stranger” and Damascius—Asklepios’ origins were to be located in Phoenicia, where he was the eighth son of the demi-god Suduc.¹⁶⁵ Like Asklepios, this Eshmun

¹⁶³ See *SEG* 36. 758 (= *IG* XII 4 546) c. 325 BCE, for a Graeco-Phoenician bilingual inscription made by king of the Sidonians to Aphrodite/Astarte “on behalf of those sailing” (ὕπερ τῶν πλεόντων) with Demetriou 2012: 93-4. Bonnet 2013 understands that this dedication was made for theoric pilgrims sailing to Kos and paid for from the sacred funds of Eshmun and so suggests Sidon’s deliberate forging connections with the Koan Asklepieion at the time of its founding.

¹⁶⁴ Bonnet 2013.

¹⁶⁵ See n. 148 above.

was a hunter who died and was revived by his divine lover Astarte. The resonances with Asklepios' own divine birth-death-apotheosis and his connections with dogs and hunting are clear.¹⁶⁶ These sources are all late, and so it is difficult to know how accurately they reflect Phoenician religious beliefs as they existed on the ground in the Hellenistic period.¹⁶⁷ Nevertheless, such traditions reveal that Phoenicians attempted to forge durable links with Greeks through the creation of primordial, genealogical connections between the two mythic traditions. The co-identification correlates Sidonian efforts to tap into the expanding popularity of Asklepios (as a Greek figure) all the while preserving the familiar significance of their own history and institutions. Interpreting Asklepios as Eshmun thus made sense for Phoenicians seeking a mode or portal of interaction with Greeks which had the added effect of elevating the stature of their own local god. As the later mythic traditions of Pausanias' Sidonian stranger show, the assimilation of Asklepios with Eshmun was not a simple procedure of translation or acculturation, but the creative enterprise of mutual negotiations. Indeed, the following section will offer a final case-study of another medical cult which brokered ethnic relations and middle ground identities in part through its ability to convert cultural knowledge and practice in a single, mutually suitable figure.

Life on the Edge: Apollo Among the Scythians

Greek colonial activity around the Black Sea area during the archaic and early Classical period has recently generated intense interest in cultural hybridity and "Middle Grounds," as

¹⁶⁶ For Asklepios figured as a hunter in the Thracian north under Roman Imperial administration, see Liapis 2007.

¹⁶⁷ For the historiography of Philo of Biblos and the *Quellenforschung* of his Phoenician sources, see Baumgarten 1988.

Greeks interacted with local peoples, mostly “Scythians” and “Thracians.”¹⁶⁸ We therefore conclude by turning our attention to the Black Sea as an area in which new forms of communication and culture were developed as Greeks and indigenous populations came to meet, trade, and live side by side. This gives us a chance to observe how novel modes of cross-cultural transaction were engendered through medico-religious cult, namely that of Apollo Ietros or Apollo the Healer. In this final section, we will observe how this medical-warrior god help to create common grounds between arriving Greeks and local Scythians, how this god offered a basis for common, “hybrid” identities and a symbolic medium through which forms of economic exchange could take place. We will also see how the associations of this “medical” cult at the world’s edge, gave birth to a band of quasi-legendary medico-magical figures embodying the magical powers of song, the purification of the body, and the immortality of the soul in the attainment of special knowledge. Such medical knowledge allowed them to move across multiple domains, whether cultural or metaphysical, demonstrating their power them as hybrid creations. Ultimately, this permits us to see yet another way in which “medicine” offered a framework for the articulation of new and wide reaching social and cultural forms.

Going forward it should be kept in mind that “Scythian,” like the ethnonym “Phoenician,” is an etic Graeco-Roman coinage which indigenous peoples of the Pontus likely never used of themselves. It thus stands as an externally imposed reduction of a number of different peoples and kin groups with complex relationships to one another. At the same time, as Caspar Meyer has recently discussed, a culture which we can usefully call “Scythian” linked

¹⁶⁸ For a survey of the issues involved in the terminology of “colonialism”—particularly its potential for anachronistically framing relationships between “colonizer” and “colonized” in the ancient world—see, e.g., Osborne 1996; Tsjetsklazde 2006; Hall 2007; Ulf 2009; Malkin 2011; Demetriou 2012; Meyer 2013: 254f.

groups which were affiliated through particular networks of production and exchange which promoted an elite nomadic lifestyle; a marked martial ideology; particular land-management practices; and an artistic-symbolic system which tended to reflect these features.¹⁶⁹ Similarly, the peoples living south of the Danube were more widely identified as “Thracians,” not Scythian. These different groups were clearly marked by real cultural and social differences. Yet, there was a good deal of lateral intermingling between groups, and it is often difficult to distinguish one group from another based purely on material culture and Greek literary sources.¹⁷⁰ More to the point, even if religious and social practice varied between the “Scythians” along the North Pontus and Russian steppe and “Thracians” to the South and West, as we shall see below, a common eschatological string helps to guide us through Graeco-northern relations as they involved the popularity of Ietros’ cult. In particular, we will see that this cult, taught with its military and medical associations, pulled together a cluster of legendary healers, ideas, and symbols. Apollo’s wide distribution along the Pontic littoral evinces the efficacy of a mutually elaborated confluence of medical myth and ritual as it helped to bundle and ease economic and social transactions across cultural groups in the Graeco-Pontic North.

To begin with, it is difficult to say anything uncontroversial about the kinds and amounts of early cross-cultural interchange which occurred between Scythians and the Greeks of the Black Sea colonies, let alone what effect such interchange may have had on settler identity, especially as this was expressed by religious practice. This is in part because we cannot make wholly affirmative statements about Archaic-era indigenous demography or distribution along

¹⁶⁹ Meyer 2013: 95-118.

¹⁷⁰ See Taylor 1994: 393-98 for some of the difficulties in untangling Scythian and Thracian cultural and ethnic identity.

the Black-Sea littoral, which would impact the degree to which Greeks and locals were forced to encounter one another and compete for space.¹⁷¹ Still, with the proper caveats in place, there has nonetheless emerged something of a consensus that there existed sustained, complex, and high frequency exchange between the peoples of the steppe and the Greek settlers in domains that extended well beyond anonymous and remote commercial trade.¹⁷² By the end of the seventh century large quantities of Greek pottery are known in Scythian forest-steppe sites, far from the coast, amounts which only increased steadily into the fifth.¹⁷³ Conversely, words of Scythian origin seem to appear on Archaic and early Classical Athenian pots.¹⁷⁴ Analyses of burial practices along the Pontic Greek cities show a great deal of Graeco-Scythian commingling and some intermarriage.¹⁷⁵ The amount of fine metalwork and jewelry crafted by Greek artisans for a specifically Scythian elite, including Skyles' famous signet ring, indicate the development of hybrid aesthetic forms.¹⁷⁶ A common narrative theme of the pieces made for Scythian consumers are scenes derived from the labors of Herakles or the Trojan cycle, suggesting the intersection of myth and cult in the manufacture of prestige goods as an important medium of intercourse

¹⁷¹ Cf. Muratov 2015.

¹⁷² For Graeco-indigenous mixing, cf. Hdt. 4.7f. and, for later antiquity, Dio. Chrys. *Or.* 36 (on the conventions and *topoi* see Bähler 2007: 145-60). For the vexed issue of early Graeco-Scythian interactions see Boardman 1994; Solovyov 1999; Petropoulos 2005; Braund 2007 and 2008; Rusjaeva 2006 and 2007; Moreno 2007; Peterson 2010; Skinner 2012; Vlassopoulos 2013; and now, importantly, Mayor et al. 2014. Vocal views against such interaction at, e.g., Kryzickij 2007; Osborne 2008; and some hedging concerning intensive archaic interaction at Muratov 2015.

¹⁷³ Thousands of Greek potsherds have been uncovered in the sedentary communities of the forest steppe at Belsk and Nemirovo. For English-language surveys of the finds in the inland sites, see now Petropoulos 2005: 43-54; Vakhtina 2007: 23-38. "Greek" contacts with Thracian peoples are still older; squarely secured during the Mycenaean period, and reflected in both Homeric and Hesiodic epic (see Taylor 1994: 384-88).

¹⁷⁴ Mayor et al. 2014.

¹⁷⁵ Peterson 2010; see also Skinner 2012 and Vlassopoulos 2013.

¹⁷⁶ See further Moreno 2007: 153f.

between the Greeks and local peoples.¹⁷⁷ A stunning fourth century electrum vase of Greek workmanship, discovered in a royal Scythian kurgan, speaks more directly to our concerns. One scene depicts two Scythian warriors, one expertly bandaging the other's shin; another scene seems to show a dental procedure taking place.¹⁷⁸ Yet, beyond such material proof of interaction (and much like the question surrounding the development of shared medical ideas between Bronze Age Egypt and the Greek world) the mechanisms of transmission, the lexicon of its negotiation, and procedures of mutual signification have largely fallen out of view for the late archaic period.

Partial solutions may rest with figures of local cult which began to arise within the Pontic cities in the Archaic period. In light of the discovery of a periurban archaic sanctuary of Aphrodite (known as *Oikous*—probably a toponym) in Miletus in the late 1980s, Alan Greaves has recently discussed the importance of Aphrodite in anchoring Pontic *apoikiai* to the Ionian homeland whence the vast majority of the cities along the Euxine were originally settled.¹⁷⁹ At the same time, however, these cults of Aphrodite generated additional *epikleseis*, emphasizing her role as a goddess of seafaring with names like *Euploia*, *Pontia*, *Pontike*, and *Nauarchis*, which, so far as we know, find no parallel within the Milesian “home” pantheon, even as they are

¹⁷⁷ For Greco-Scythian iconography, see Boardman 1994. For the place of such objects in general discussions of “Greek identity” see Skinner 2012 and Vlassopoulos 2013; more specific to the question of Pontic identity, see Meyer 2013: 189-241.

¹⁷⁸ From the Kul Oba kurgan, currently housed in the Hermitage Museum K-O 11 (see Meyer 2013: 13 for images).

¹⁷⁹ For survey of site excavations, see Senff 2003. Greaves 2004 for colonial relations. See also Ustinova 1999: 21f. for Aphrodite's eventual significance in the Bosphoran kingdom. Motivations behind the Ionian settlement patterns in the north are still a matter of dispute, between those who see the early expansion of Milesian trade interests and those who prefer to see Lydio-Cimmerian incursions creating pressure on the Milesian population. For exogenous pressures, see, e.g., Tsetzkladze 1994 and 1998; Solovyov 1999; for trade, Petropoulos 2005: 15f. Greaves 2007 offers a more nuanced vision of the dynamic interrelation of population pressures and trade dependencies. For questions around the dating of the Euxine colonial movements, see Ehrhardt 1983 Gorman 2001. See Meyer 2013: 255f. for a critical appraisal of the cottage industry of dating Pontic colonialism.



Fig. 3. Map of Black Sea/Cults of Apollo Ietros

attested among other maritime poleis.¹⁸⁰ Such nautical epithets fit Aphrodite's role as a maritime goddess and these Pontic cities' maritime orientations and the important roles they played in anchoring long-range trade networks.¹⁸¹ More than this, however, they suggest that Aphrodite equally promoted local identities in addition to supporting established connections with the metropolis. This was especially true of the Bosphoran cities where Aphrodite Ourania's cult seems to have emerged from a thick entanglement with local religious tradition, and became a center

¹⁸⁰ According to Greaves 2004: 31 she is known at Olbia (and Cyzicus) as *Euploia* (*IosPE* P 168) and *Pontia* (*I. Olbia* 68). At Cyzicus, Istros, and Olbia she is apparently also known as *Pontike* (cf. Ehrhardt 1983: 165), and as *Nauarchis* at both Pantikapaion (*CIRB* 30) and Anapa (*CIRB* 1113). A later Roman inscription from Miletus (*Miletos* 484.19), however, knows Aphrodite as *Aphrogeneia*.

¹⁸¹ For the relationship between Aphrodite, protection of maritime activities, and sex, see Demetriou 2010 and Parker 2002.

piece of late Classical and Hellenistic local elite identity.¹⁸² Cult in the Black Sea region was thus a versatile instrument which simultaneously activated collective “remembrance” of an Ionian past but also expressed new identities as they emerged from the requirements of developing social and cultural arrangements to suit a new home.¹⁸³

The only god of greater importance than Aphrodite among the Ionian cities of the Black Sea was Apollo, who acted as the primary poliadic divinity protecting the foundation and stability of colonies generally.¹⁸⁴ So, too, his popularity among these cities was likely related to the centrality of a pair of Apolline cults in Miletos, where he was celebrated within the urban center as Delphinios and at his famous extra-urban sanctuary at Didyma-Branchidae.¹⁸⁵ Apollo was known under a wide collection of epithets in the Pontic colonies, but was most popularly and widely worshipped as *Ietros* (Ionic form of *Iatros*) and, a little later, as Delphinios, where it appears there was a complicated relationship between his guises as Doctor and “Dolphin.”¹⁸⁶ Of central importance for us is Yulia Ustinova’s recognition that, contrary to earlier scholarly consensus, *Ietros*’ origin should not be sought in the Milesian pantheon, but, like Aphrodite’s

¹⁸² Ustinova 1999: 24f.; Meyer 2013: 264-5.

¹⁸³ Pace Moreno 2007: 148 and a pronounced sense of Ionian “conservatism” among the Black Sea cities.

¹⁸⁴ E.g., Malkin 1987.

¹⁸⁵ See Parke 1985; Gorman 2001; Greaves 2002; 2009; 2012.

¹⁸⁶ See Graf 1979: 2-22 for the “unbeantwortbar” etymology of Delphinios; regardless of origins, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* shows that he was thought of in association with dolphins and the sea by the 6th century. See Burkert 1994.

epichoric variations, is to be understood as growing out of the local, Pontic interactions.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, as we will see in more detail, Ustinova has argued that the cult of Apollo Ietros acted as a pathway for Greeks to absorb local Scythian religious and medical knowledge.¹⁸⁸ Tweaking Ustinova's observations somewhat, I think we better understand Ietros as a figure through whose symbolic and ritual registers Greeks and Scythians could manage a number of beneficial arrangements. The very success of this project made Ietros' cult a natural focal point in the development of Pontic religious, social, and commercial contacts, encouraging the cult's spread among the cities of the Black Sea even as it eventually waned within late Classical Olbia, displaced by the more politically centralized Delphinios.¹⁸⁹ From these "marginal" Apolline interactions sprung a flurry of associated "hybrid" figures, both real and mythical, who trickled down into a wider Greek *imaginaire*. Such figures—like Abaris, Aristeas, Orpheus, and Rhesus—possess potent forms of blended medical knowledge, exemplifying medicine's dynamic role as

¹⁸⁷ Ustinova 2009b; Graf 2008: 68-69; Meyer 2013: 261. The crux of the issue comes from a passage of Strabo (14.16) who explains that Apollo and Artemis' epithet *Oulios* at Miletus and Delos was derived from οὐλεῖν (τὸ γὰρ οὐλεῖν ὑγιαίνειν), which scholars have believed rather than οὐλίος, "terrible," or "baneful," from which the polar aspect of "healing" could be equally well understood (cf. Pherc. fr. 106b). Historians have generally taken this as firm evidence of an early "healing Apollo" at Miletus and Delos. To my mind, that Strabo's gloss was necessary at all implies that, if there had ever been a connection between *Ietros* and *Oulios* as a part of metropolis/apoikia relations, it had been forgotten. In fact, a funerary inscription at Olbia for an Elean "Oulios, son of Theodotus" from 450-425 (*SEG* 51. 976) is the only trace of an *Oulios* at Olbia, suggesting that the name may have had origins elsewhere than Miletos. The other issue lingers in a possible connection between *Oulios* and a "school" or family of physicians in Velia (=Elea, in fact, see *SEG* 30 1225). There, several first century AD inscriptions have been discovered in the edifice of an unidentified building, naming three φωλαρχοί with *Oulios* names, who are also named as *iatroi* (*I. Velia* 20-24). This, however, may be a cognate phenomenon to the *koinon* of Asklepiadaí at Kos, which began only as an aristocratic organization (see *supra*). At any rate, φωλέον is an extremely rare word meaning "cave, or lair," and is suggestive of an *abaton*, and we would more naturally understand these individuals as cult officials than leaders of a "school" (see Musitelli 1980). Indeed, we find a third century BCE cult of Apollo *Pholeuterios* at Istros (*ISM* 1.105; Pippidi 1984). This cult may indeed have medical associations. But these should be more properly be understood through Apollo's connection with local religious practices which involved caves and prophetic utterance (cf. Ustinova 2009a: 116).

¹⁸⁸ Pace, e.g., Graf 2008: 70, for whom Ietros' popularity is explained by special "health-needs" related to the Pontic climate.

¹⁸⁹ For Delphinios as a figure of Olbian democracy, see Rusjaeva 2006.

a cultural medium through which to conduct relationships and project identities, and so help us to bring this chapter to a close.

By the fourth century BCE the cult of Ietros was well established among the cities of the Black Sea littoral.¹⁹⁰ Cults are known from inscriptional and archaeological evidence among the Bosporan cities like Pantikapaion, Hermonassa, Myrmekeion, and Phanagoria.¹⁹¹ Especially at Pantikapaion, where Aphrodite's cult was so important, it appears that Apollo was equally involved with the dynastic Spartocid identity as it coalesced in the fourth century.¹⁹² As Meyer has recently discussed, it was within this Spartocid context that the most famous Greco-Scythian art works—like the “medical” electrum vase mentioned above—emerged in the Classical period as a means of transcultural elite communication and exchange. But so too, Apollo Ietros' cult was equally important on the western shore with its Thracian contacts. His cult is attested early in the fifth century at the city of Istros—one of the oldest Pontic colonies—at the mouth of the Danube, a major hub of mercantile exchange with the interior.¹⁹³ Further to the south, another important node of Thracian transaction was Apollonia Pontica, where, according to Pliny and Strabo, a

¹⁹⁰ See Ustinova 2009b; Petropoulos 2010; Moschakis 2013; Muratov 2015 for surveys of the cults. The earliest evidence for Asklepios in the Black Sea is all late fourth century, within the major hubs of Pantikapaion (*CIRB* 957 for a late and unusual “cave” sanctuary of Asklepios); Chersonesus, where there has been found characteristic anatomical votives, as well as grave *stelai* for what looks like a family of physicians originally from Tenedos (*SEG* 36. 697/8); and Olbia where the earliest evidence for Asklepios' cult is 3rd century BCE statuary, corroborated by the late third century Protogenes Decree (*IOSPE* I² 32).

¹⁹¹ Pantikapaion: Tolstoi 166 (fifth century); *CIRB* 6 (389-48 BCE); *CIRB* 10 (349-10 BCE). See Muratov 2015: 593 for conjectures on the sanctuary site; Hermonassa: *CIRB* 1037 (389-48BCE); *CIRB* 1044; Myrmekeion: *SEG* 48. 1006 (graffito on a black Attic kylix 500-450 BCE); Phanagoria *CIRB* 974 (3rd century BCE). A cult is known at Chersonesus from a fourth century BCE graffito (unpublished).

¹⁹² See Meyer 2013: 261.

¹⁹³ Istros: (5-4th centuries) *IScMI* 144=*SEG* 55.789; *IScMI* 104; 169; 314A. For the role of rivers in Pontic settlement selection, Petropoulos 2005: 58-9.

colossal 13m bronze statue of Apollo Ietros towered imposingly over the harbor.¹⁹⁴ In 2009, renewed excavations in the temenos area brought to light several temple foundations, and in 2013 a shard of archaic east-Greek pottery inscribed with Apollo's name, strongly suggesting that at least one of the religious structures belonged to him.¹⁹⁵ Found too in the earliest contexts of the temenos was Thracian pottery mixed in with the typical Greek wares, as well as bronze slag indicating early sixth century access to Thracian copper sources in the nearby hills.¹⁹⁶

But the earliest and most revealing traces of the cult are densely clustered in the important polis Olbia-Berezan, where the first Scythian commercial contacts were likely developed.¹⁹⁷ At Berezan—probably the original settlement and then the emporion/manufactory center of Olbia—dedications to Ietros began in the early sixth century (although no cult structure has yet come to light).¹⁹⁸ Shortly thereafter, within the newly founded community of Olbia, temple excavations and inscriptions from the Western *temenos* demonstrate that Apollo Ietros and Aphrodite were the principal political deities of the city.¹⁹⁹ These excavations show that sometime in the third quarter of the sixth century, mud-brick temples of Apollo Ietros and

¹⁹⁴ See Pliny (*HN* 34.18) and Strabo (7.6.1) for the cult statue at Apollonia Pontike as a work of Calamis, dating it to the mid to late fifth century at the latest. It was later removed by the Romans to the Capitoline hill. Beyond the newly discovered (so far unpublished?) archaic inscription for Ietros, inscriptional evidence is all Roman. Second century BCE coinage shows a laureate “Iatros” (n.b. Attic spelling) holding bow and arrow, likely an icon of his colossal cult statue.

¹⁹⁵ See Damyonov 2012: 2-3 for other possible epigraphic evidence relating to the cult.

¹⁹⁶ Damyonov 2012: 3-4.

¹⁹⁷ For Ietros at Olbia: 6th-5th centuries, *IGDOLbia* 54-59; *IGDOLbia* 66; 4th century *IosPE* I² 164, *I.Olb.* 65A (4th century statue base with name of Athenian sculptor Stratonides). For the growth and development of Olbia and its relation to the nearby “emporion” Berezan, see Tsetskladze 1998 and 2006; Solovyov 1999; Kryzickij 2003; Rusjaeva 2006; Peterson 2010. For the development of the religious and administrative district, at the center of which Ietros sat, see especially Rusjaeva 1995 and 2006; Kryzickij 2003.

¹⁹⁸ *IGDOLbia* 54 (c.600-575BCE) and 55 (c.550-25BCE).

¹⁹⁹ See now the complementary articles Rusjaeva 2015 and Bujskikh 2015 for the startling discovery of a sanctuary of Aphrodite *Demia*—possibly cognate with Aphrodite *Pandemos*—at Olbia as well.

Aphrodite were erected.²⁰⁰ By the close of that century, however, this rudimentary place of worship was replaced by a more impressive stone temple, complete with custom clay polychrome acroteria (manufactured in Miletos)²⁰¹ and roof tiles bearing the label Ἰητρόον, confirming the temenos as Apollo's. So too, over the course of this century Ietros was increasingly worshipped in conjunction with mixed epithets which detail his involvement with local geography. We find Ietros as the “ruler of Borysthenes,” “ruler of the Histros,”²⁰² and celebrated in his temenos as Apollo Boreas—Apollo of the North Wind—or even as Bearer of Victory in the North.²⁰³ An interesting ring inscribed both inside and out appears to be an amulet of a third century Apolline association known as the Βορεικοὶ θιασῖται, and features the names of both Scythian and Greek members (although names are not a sure index of ethnicity). Within such epithets we can already make out the role of Ietros in articulating Greek relationships and attitudes to their new geographic surrounds. As we will see again below, this Apollo both proclaimed “ownership” over these places and framed it in ways which seem inclusive of Graeco-indigenous social relations, rather than coming at their expense.

²⁰⁰ Rusjaeva 2006.

²⁰¹ Moschakis 2013; similarly, Rusjaeva 2003: 11 records reported findings of Milesian manufactured polychrome acroteria from the Olbian sanctuary of Achilles at Leuke (similar to roof tile for the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Istros). This offers a good parallel for Milesian “involvement” in politically important cult at Olbia with no origins in the Milesian *patria*. More generally, Rusjaeva makes a compelling case for the visual and political links between the two temples, constructed at almost the same time, with similar sanctuary plans and scalar-ratios.

²⁰² *IGDOLbia* 57 “[A]πόλλωνι Ἰητροῦ Βορυσθένε[ος μεδέοντι]” and *IGDOLbia* 58 “Ἐάνθος Πό[σιος] Απόλλωνι Ἰητρ[ῶν] Ἰστρο μεδέοντ[ι] Ὀλβιοπολίτης”; *IosPE I* 164; *IGDOLbia* 90; while Bravo (*SEG* 51. 969) points out that reading μεδέων here is far from secure, more important is the association between Ietros and the local toponym.

²⁰³ *IGDOLbia* 83A/B (sixth century BCE). See also *IGDOLbia* 93 and 95.

Indeed, it is likely no accident that Apollo, Herakles,²⁰⁴ and Achilles²⁰⁵ played a central role in the religious life, charter myths, and iconography shared with the Scythian people, so famed and feared for their prowess with the bow. The potential for the bow-bearing figures Achilles and Herakles to anchor common points of reference and cultural interchange between Greeks and Scythians have been well discussed at this point.²⁰⁶ Consequently, I leave these heroes largely to the side here, concentrating instead on Apollo's association with the bow as this symbol ramified outside its obvious martial context and mobilized a variety of other points of contact.²⁰⁷

Bronze-cast arrowhead money, the earliest form of Olbian/Pontic currency, is frequently cited as a curiosity in this culturally mixed milieu.²⁰⁸ From the sixth to the early fifth centuries this proto-currency is often found dedicated within sanctuaries of Apollo Ietros who, apropos of his Ionian origins and medicalizing interventions, was depicted principally with his bow of plague-and-healing.²⁰⁹ But this form of money is also widely found among indigenous settlements within the Graeco-Scythian zones of contact, which has been interpreted as a form of local currency.²¹⁰ The symbolic weight placed on the bow by both Scythians and Greeks within

²⁰⁴ For Herakles' Scythian charter, see Hdt. 4. 8-10; he is already genealogically connected with the Scyths at Hes. fr. 150. 15-16 West; cf. Diod. Sic. 2.43; Val. Flacc. 6. 48; *IG XIV* 1293 A93f.

²⁰⁵ Achilles as "ruler" of Scythia goes back to at least to Alc. fr. 354 L-P (cf. *SEG* 52 749 for a similarly worded 5th century Pontic graffito); Pi. *Nem.* 4.49 locates him on the "White Island," (see *IGDolbia* 48 and 49; *IosPE I*² 326 and 672 for Achilles as "ruler of Leuke"). Pinney 1983 would place the association between Achilles and Scythians back with the epic tradition; Hedreen 1991, however, sees the epic *Aithiops* and Ionian cartographic practices as key; see also Rusjaeva 2010; Skinner 2012.

²⁰⁶ E.g., Skinner 2012; Vlassopoulos 2013.

²⁰⁷ See Bujskikh 2007; Skinner 2012: 168.

²⁰⁸ Hind 2007; dedications of arrowhead money at sanctuaries of Ietros, see Rusjaeva 2006; Skinner 2012.

²⁰⁹ So his cult-statue (known through consistent numismatic iconography) cf. Rusjaeva 2006; see also the Berezan bone fragment (below) in which Ietros is known as *toxophoros*—"bow wielding."

²¹⁰ See Hdt. 4.81.5 for Scythian use of arrow-heads as an instrument of demographic measurement, consequently transformed into a monument. See Hind 2007; Skinner 2012 for arrow and dolphin coinage as "local" currency.

the context of economic interchange speaks to the power of cultic symbolism in establishing mutually agreeable social protocols. So too, scholars have linked the arrival of Apollo Delphinios to an apparent change in the symbolism of this local currency. Towards the close of the sixth century, Olbia, as well as several other *poleis* along the western littoral, began minting dolphin shaped coins, with obvious contacts with the cetaceous Apollo Delphinios.²¹¹ The gradual—but never total—substitution of dolphin-shaped casts for the older arrowhead ones has thus been taken to confirm the later importance of Delphinios at the expense of Ietros. Whether that is true, the symbolic potential of the dolphin in unifying trading alliances is corroborated by the near identical mints of Sinope, Istros, and Olbia later on in the late fifth/early fourth century. These monies featured a dolphin in the clutches of an eagle, and apparently reference the consolidated orchestration of their fishing-related trading interests.²¹²

Numismatists, however, have shown that both arrowhead and dolphin-shaped monies were still in circulation at the same time that Olbia was minting more these main-stream Greek coins—influenced, mostly likely, by Athens. Indeed, both coinage types remained popular well through the fifth century, which further suggests that they possessed a function differentiated from the standard casts.²¹³ The phenomenon of parallel types of “money”—each aimed at different economic networks, actors, and timeframes of reciprocity, finds a later parallel in the more formally elaborated exchange systems of the fourth century Spartocids. There, Caspar

²¹¹ Rusjaeva 2006.

²¹² Hind 2007.

²¹³ Cf. Hind 2007; Osborne 2008.

Meyer again points out two orders of local exchange, with the Greco-Scythian hybrid artworks operating on the long-term, symbolic level.²¹⁴

Certainty is elusive, but the conjunction of arrow-head/dolphin and more typical forms of coinage; their prevalent discovery in Scythian contexts; and increased Scythian demand for goods during the fifth century hint at Apollo's semantic centrality to different economic networks each with their own internal conventions. That is, the distribution of arrowhead, and then dolphin-shaped, monies in the Scythian territories illuminates Ietros/Delphinios' role in tying together transcultural systems of commercial exchange, where more ritualized forms of reciprocity held sway. The rise of similar, but not exact, dolphin stamped coins in Greek cities suggests that this "ritual" money might be converted into cash, and thereby linked into wider eastern Greek networks, in which towns like Olbia and Istros were crucial players.²¹⁵ Under the auspices of this Apolline currency, then, Greeks and Scythians may have traded local goods, or Scythians acquired Greek products which grew poorly or had not yet been introduced to northern climes. For instance, despite a prickly resistance to Dionysiac cult, the Scythian elite relied upon the Greek cities and traders to keep them well supplied with wine, an important form of social capital among Scythians, used in certain ritual circumstances to reinforce social hierarchies and militaristic values.²¹⁶ So too, themes of sympotic conviviality feature prominently in Greek works found in later Scythian tombs of the Bosporan steppe.²¹⁷ Trading wine under Apollo's

²¹⁴ Cf. Meyer 2013: 243 (following Parry and Bloch 1989's influential model of complementary modes of short and long term exchange. See Chapter One for its relevance to Aristophanes).

²¹⁵ See, e.g., Moreno 2007.

²¹⁶ Hdt. 4.66 for the local governor's annual commensal dispensation of wine to those who had killed an enemy in combat in a given year. This illustrates the way in which wider Aegean commercial networks (Olbian wine typically arrived from Thasos, Chios, and Lesbos) are integrated into local ones as a means of supporting existing elite social structures (cf. Ulf 2009, who discusses similar connections between Geometric Euboean and Attic economies).

²¹⁷ See Meyer 2013: 288-294.

regulatory supervision may have offered a suitable workaround for the otherwise objectionable figure of Dionysos. Ultimately, then, we can see the way that Ietros, together with Delphinios, offered a stabilizing hand to forms of exchange in ways which secured mutual benefits.

Herodotus' account of mixed-Greek Scythian populations largely seems to corroborate such transcultural exchange.²¹⁸ At the same time, frictions were bound to arise from continual contacts with their inexorable misunderstandings and mutual suspicions. Indeed, the archaeological record shows that eastern Pontic colonies faced much more violent realities in terms of local interactions than their counterparts to the west of the Crimea.²¹⁹ Likewise, at Olbia-Berezan, Herodotus discusses some outright hostility to Greek culture, again, particularly with regard to mystery religion and ecstatic cult as it surrounded Dionysos or Kybele. This conflict is illustrated vividly in the legends about figures like Anacharsis and Skyles. Both were supposedly of mixed Greek descent, with Scythian mothers and broadly educated in Greek affairs, but ultimately put to death by their Scythian home communities for their initiations into Greek rites at Olbia.²²⁰ Yet even within this potentially violent atmosphere, they could be doubly imagined as vehicles for the transmission of local knowledge and cultural blending: Anacharsis was one of the rotating Seven Sages, said by Ephorus to have introduced the potter's wheel to Greece; Skyles' ring, mentioned above, displays his name written prominently in Greek letters.²²¹

²¹⁸ Hdt. 4.17 for the Kallipidai and Alazones; 4.108-09 for the Gelonoi, widely identified with the forest-steppe city at Belsk (see *supra*).

²¹⁹ See Muratov 2015 for destruction levels at Pantikapaion, Nymphaion, and other communities around the Kimmerian Bosphoros.

²²⁰ For Skyles, see Hdt. 4.78-80; Anacharsis as Graeco-Scythian: Hdt. 4.76; Plut. *Sol.* 5; Diog. Laert. 1.101-5. Based on Diogenes, it appears that there may have been a work on Scythian customs circulating the world under his name. See also Mayor et al. 2014: 452f. for a catalogue of famous Athenian figures (allegedly) of mixed Greek-Scythian/Thracian descent.

²²¹ For Anacharsis' technological inventions see Ephorus *BNJ* 70 F42 (=Strabo 7.3.9); Diog. Laert. 1.105; Pliny *HN* 7.198.

Thus, the relationship between Scythian and Greek religious worlds was not starkly oppositional. In fact there is considerable evidence of mixed participation which resulted in the creation of novel forms of dedicatory practice. For instance, an early fifth century black figure kylix from Olbia finds a non-Greek dedicating to Hermes.²²² Two late fifth/early fourth century *defixiones* likewise attest not only Scythian indigenous names, but clearly suggest the involvement of these persons in local juridical disputes.²²³ More interesting for our purposes are dedications which (again) upset the partition between Apollo Ietros and Delphinios by hinting at the merger of these gods in Scythian and Greek affairs. Outside the modern city of Kiev a late sixth century BCE amphora was discovered with the inscription Δελφινίο ξυνή Ἰητροῶ, “I belong to Delphinios (and) Ietros.” This suggests an acceptance among a local Scythian population of Apollo in both these guises.²²⁴ What is more, another mid sixth-century inscription on the neck of a Klazomenian amphora was discovered within Ietros’ sanctuary at Olbia, recording the dedication of “paternal honey to Apollo Boreas” by a certain “Anaperres son of Anachursis the Scythian.”²²⁵ The name Anacharsis surprises, and, even if we are not dealing with the actual descendant of the legendary Anacharsis, this confirms at least mixed-Scythian involvement in Greek cult to Apollo, again suggestively named Boreas. As we discussed above, Ietros was associated with Boreas/Borysthene/Istros as the “ruler” or victor over the local lands, but these

²²² *SEG* 30. 909: Ἰγδαμπαίης: Ἐρμηῖ (c.490-470BCE).

²²³ *SEG* 44. 669; see further Skinner 2012; Vlassopoulos 2013.

²²⁴ Cf. an Olbian graffito (*IDGOlbia* 99a) listing Apollo together with a composite of *four* epithets Ἀπόλλ(ωνι) Δελφινί(ωνι) Ἰητροῖ Θαρρηλί(ωνι) Λυκεῖ(ωνι), together with a calendrical listing of Ionian months of the year; this points to the inherent elasticity of the god in representing both local and Ionian traditions as mutually inclusive, with Ietros (note, too, the Attic spelling) sandwiched between Delphinios and Thargelios.

²²⁵ *SEG* 53. 788: Ἀναπέρρης Ἀναχύρσοῦ Εκ(ο)λότη(ς) Ἀπ(ό)λλωνι βορῆι μέλι πατρ[όιον? ἀνέθηκεν]. But see loc. cit. for the attestation of Anacharsis as a popular Scythian name in Athens.

hybrid forms, reflected as well in the thiasos of the North, suggest forms of collaborative participation rather than one-way exertions of force or territorial claims.

The dedicatory evidence hints at the place of Ietros as a figure of the “middle ground,” whose attributes and features were agreeable enough to create a shared point of contact for Greeks and Scythians alike. Moreover, Apollo’s role as a conduit for the productive incorporation of Scythian traditional lore is equally visible in the legends which tether him and a number of his associates to a variety of adventures. These stories function ethnographically to create a repertoire of “facts” about the Graeco-Scythian North, especially as a land rich in associations with death, rebirth, and powerful medical magic as they relate divine immanence to the body. That is to say, it is through a prism of medically related actors, beliefs, and patterns of thought that Greeks formulated their versions Scythian custom and religion—again, essential to maintaining mutual social relations—which display conceptual links to the Ietros cult.

Apollo’s associations with the North via his residence among the Hyperboreans are well known. Like Apollo’s annual return, the mythical and quasi-mythical figures which are attached to him similarly commute between Greek and Scythian lands, ferrying with them a tangle of traditions and blended knowledge. The earliest such figure was Aristeas of Proconnesos—one of the first Milesian settlements (c. 700-675 BCE) along the Propontis and so a likely spring for early legends about Greek interactions in the North.²²⁶ Herodotus tells us that Aristeas was possessed by Apollo (φοιβόλαμπτος) and under his divine guidance explored the lands above the Graeco-Scythian contact-zone. In his journeys Aristeas visited the Issedones, the Arimaspeans,

²²⁶ Not to be confused with the other Aristeas (sometimes Aristaïos), mythical son of a nymph, who also had affinities with Asklepios and Orpheus. Apart from his Vergilian life, he too was associated with cavernous prophecy and is thought to have cleansed the Cyclades of a plague: Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2. 518; Diod. Sic. 4. 82; cf. Ustinova 2009a. For the founding date of Proconnesos, see Ehrhardt 1983: 38-40.

and gold-guarding griffins before finally reaching the Hyperboreans. Aristeas allegedly wrote an account of these travels in epic verse called the *Arimaspeia*, after the one-eyed Arimaspeans, which was known to Pindar, Hekataios, pseudo-Aeschylus, and, clearly, Herodotus.²²⁷

I am less concerned whether the historical Aristeas really traveled among the Scythians, and would lay rather more emphasis on the stories which grew up around Aristeas' fantastic journey from Proconnesos to the world's edge. Following Herodotus, this crossing was framed by his apparent death and disappearance from a local fuller's shop, and eventual return to Proconnesos years later, followed by another sudden vanishing. This, Herodotus reports, was mirrored by a spectral reappearance some two centuries later at Metapontion, where he instructed the citizens to build him an altar. Aristeas joins a cast of mortal figures, from Odysseus to Epimenides and the Presocratic Parmenides, whose access to extraordinary, boundary-crossing knowledge was contingent upon divinely sanctioned passages from one plane to another.²²⁸ Significantly for us, Aristeas' journey not only reworks this familiar epistemic motif towards the specific geographic and ethnographic projects of making "foreign knowledge" available to Greeks, but does so in a way that itself relies upon a set of Northern ideas about the body, life, and death as they relate to the acquisition of that authoritative knowledge.

Similarly, Abaris, a Scythian-Greek sophist and priest of Apollo, was said either to have travelled the world in possession of an arrow given him by Apollo, or, more fantastically, to have

²²⁷ Cf. Pi. fr. 271 Maehler; Hekataios of Miletos *FGrH* 1 F 193-4; Aesch. *PV*. 805; Hdt. 4.13-15. For Aristeas—especially with reference 1) to Herodotus' use of him as a historical source and 2) to the role of "shamanism" as a common background for all the following figures (Abaris/Zalmoxis/Orpheus etc..)—see originally Meuli 1935, to which Bolton 1962; Burkert 1972; Eliade 1972; and West 2004 are all reacting; see also Dowden's 2009 entry in *BNJ* 35. See Ustinova 2009a for caves/*katabaseis* as important portals to special knowledge.

²²⁸ E.g., Parmenides' proem DK 28 B1. For the Hyperboreans as the limits of proper human knowledge, Pi. *Pyth.* 10.29-30. Is it a coincidence that the first word of this poem, whose gnomic core trains so tightly on the Hyperboreans, is *Olbia*?

ridden about the world upon that arrow.²²⁹ We have documented the symbolic importance of Apollo's arrow not only for medical gods widely, but for Scythians and Greeks specifically as a means of exchange. Regardless of whether Abaris traveled upon or simply carried his arrow, his Apolline missile was totemic of movements between geographical and cultural domains. Just as arrowhead currency permitted goods to move from one zone to another, so Abaris' arrow allowed him to shuttle back and forth his exotic expertise, which itself often had a medical bent. Indeed, he was famously held to have cleansed Athens, Sparta, and Hyperborean lands of plague. In Abaris, we therefore find a neat synthesis of Apollo's arms and medical mobility in the service of expressing hybrid forms of identity and knowledge.

We hear of another curious figure, a Crotonian named Leonymos, wounded in battle on the Sargas by Ajax, who was the first to travel to the "White Island," where he was healed by Achilles and then miraculously whisked home.²³⁰ As Burkert points out, the White Island was equally interpretable as the White Rock of the underworld. Leonymus' fabulous journey from Italy to Achilles' (Olbian) shrine on the Pontus thus reiterates the pattern of life, death, and return as it informed Greek perceptions of the far North. So too, the antipodean locales which frame the story draw together the furthest edges of the "Greek world" through the healing powers of myth and cult.²³¹

²²⁹ Hdt. 4.36 for carrying the arrow; Suda s.v. Ἄβαρις (cf. *BNJ* 34 T1) has him flying to the Scythians and Hyperboreans on Apollo's arrow; see Iamb. *VP* 28 and 92 for Abaris' associations with kathartic purifications of plague at Sparta (cf. Paus. 3.13.2; Apollonius *Mir.* 4.1.2); associations with Zalmoxis (below) and healing charms, cf. Pl. *Chrm.* 258c; Abaris, Apollo, and Hyperborean plague Lycurg. *Or.* 14 fr. A5. See Burkert 1972; Ustinova 2009a.

²³⁰ Paus. 3.19.12-13; Conon *FrGH* 26F 1 18. See Burkert 1972: 141.

²³¹ This is culminates a recurrent pattern linking the Pontic with Magna-Graeca in matters theo-medical. Note above the point of contact with Apollo Pholeuterios (on the Black Sea and Italy); Aristeas reappears in Metapontium and is often foregrounded in discussions of Pythagoreanism there (see Burkert 1972); Zalmoxis (below) is similarly an important commuter between the Pontic North and Pythagoreans in Sicily.

One of the central figures of Thracian religion, Zalmoxis, bundles these eschatological ideas.²³² The earliest (Greek) sources tell us that Zalmoxis was originally a man, himself part of the multicultural milieu around Thrace and the Propontis.²³³ Herodotus reports that Zalmoxis had served Pythagoras as a slave, from whom had learned Ionian sophistications. After winning his freedom he returned to the Pontus, where he secretly built an underground chamber. Stealing himself into this lair for several years, he then “miraculously” reappeared to the local Thracians, the Getai, seeming to possess supernatural powers and expounding a religion of immortality. While Herodotus expresses skepticism about the Pythagorean elements of the story, a number of other Greek sources agree with the historian that through the worship of Zalmoxis the Getai and other Thracian tribes were “made immortal” (ἀθανατίζοντες).²³⁴ Beyond the relationship between Zalmoxis and Pythagoras and the metaphysical questions of what that “immortality” entailed, the motif disappearance/reappearance with special knowledge recalls Aristeas’ Pontic ventures quite clearly. Indeed, as Aristeas relied on Apollo, it was through Zalmoxis that the Getai made oracular consultations and divine communications, which it seems was bound up with the procedure of “becoming immortal.” Both were achieved through a gruesome human sacrifice, in which a “messenger to Zalmoxis” was selected by lot to deliver the community’s requests to the god. He was subsequently tossed upon an array of javelins, and, if the man died, this was taken as a sign of Zalmoxis’ favor to the community’s wishes; if he survived the impaling, it was surely evidence of the man’s impurity and sin, and a new community messenger was chosen. Zalmoxis’

²³² For Zalmoxis around the Pontus see Eliade 1972: 22-75.

²³³ Hdt. 4.93-6. See, also Strabo 7.3.5. for a slightly different account of Zalmoxis’ (called Zamolxis) life and career.

²³⁴ Hdt 4.93; 4.94; 5.4; followed by Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F73, both (?) of whom may be dependent on Damastes of Sigeum (Burkert 1972: 156). For the importance of caves, prophecy, and healing in Thracian and Scythian religion see Ustinova 2009a; 2009b.

cult thus mingled the purification of the pious soul (a form of healing) and the production of oracular knowledge through the destruction of the body in a way that resembled also Orphic religion (more on which below).

Beyond this soteriological dimension, a passage of Plato's *Charmides* identifies Zalmoxis as a healer in the more traditional sense.²³⁵ Plato not only associates him with the other healer/sage Abaris, but also explicitly connects him with Thracian *iatroi* and their medical incantations.²³⁶ Socrates explains that he himself learned a healing charm from the Thracian doctors who served their "their king and god" Zalmoxis, adding again that those doctors have the power to "become immortal." It appears that these *iatroi* were priests of the god, and it may have been through their use of *epoidai* that they not only healed the sick (as Socrates claimed) but initiated worshippers into the mysteries of "becoming" immortal, possibly in underground caves.²³⁷ The connection with initiations, prophecy, and healing through the power of song echo strongly Apollo and the sages just discussed, but they also look to an additional set of famous figures of Greek legend: Musaeus, Orpheus, and the more obscure Rhesos, all of whom possessed important northern ties.²³⁸

Orpheus and Musaeus had long standing relationships with the North and Thrace and as arch-weavers of song were important representatives of Apollo.²³⁹ With their supernatural mastery of music came naturally a reputation for the discovery or invention of songs with

²³⁵ So, too, Strabo 7.3.5, where the phrase *προλέγοντα τὰς ἐπισημασίας* is taken to mean astronomical predictions (based on the things Zalmoxis learned from Pythagoras) but is equally good Greek for medical prognosis.

²³⁶ Pl. *Chrm.* 156d-e; 158b.

²³⁷ Ustinova 2009a.

²³⁸ Cf. Olen's associations with the Hyperboreans and (Delian/Delphic) Apolline cult in a medical context (Eleithyia's role as midwife to Leto). See Paus. 1.18.5; 10.5.7-8.

²³⁹ E.g. Strabo 10.3.17: οἱ τ' ἐπιμεληθέντες τῆς ἀρχαίας μουσικῆς Θρᾶκες λέγονται, Ὀρφεύς τε καὶ Μουσαῖος.

healing power.²⁴⁰ Of course, Orpheus’ own associations with healing, death, prophecy and cult geared towards a “blessed” afterlife are well known. Given Zalmoxis’ widespread importance around the Eastern Pontus, I suspect that it is no coincidence that Olbia-Berezan has been rich in early and unique Orphic finds, which ought to be situated within the wider religious context of cross-cultural contact (again, not simply *interpretatio graeca*). The most attention grabbing of these distinctive finds has been a sixth century bone fragment discovered at Berezan inscribed in (very bad) hexameters. The inscription features Apollo disguised in weird, quasi-metaphorical forms as a wolf and a lion, then as the bow-bearing Ietros and Delphinios, all framed in a riddling numerological scheme based on progressing factors of seven—a number of significance both for Apollo and Orphism—which seems to foretell a blessed future for the people of Olbia.²⁴¹ Whether this was something of an Orphic shibboleth or an oracular fragment from Didyma, no completely decisive argument has yet been put forward.²⁴² But even if we decide

²⁴⁰ For Orpheus’ connections with healing and song: Ar. *Ran.* 1031-2; Strabo 9.30.4; Musaeos, Ar. *ibid*; cf. Thamyris, another important Thracian singer with connections to Apollo. For Aristaeas’ later connection with these figures, see Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 41 (= Eus. *Praep. Evang.* 10.11.7).

²⁴¹ *SEG* 36 694=*IDGOlbia* 93

<p>Side A Ἑπτὰ· λύκος ἀσθενῆς, ἐβδο- μήκοντα· λέων δεινός, ἐπτ(α)- κόσιοι· τοξοφόρος φίλι(ο)ς δωρε- ῆ δυνάμ’ ἠτηῆ(ρ)ος, ἑπτακι(σ)χι- λι(οι)· δελφίς φρόνιμος εἰρή- νη Ὀλβίη πόλι....</p>	<p>Seven. The feeble wolf Seventy. The terrible lion Seven Hundred. Bow-wielding, friendly gift power of the healer. Seven thousand The wise dophin peace for the city Olbia...</p>
<p>Side B Ἀπόλλωνι Διδυμ(αῖοι) Μιλησίοι</p>	<p>To Apollo Didymaios Milesian</p>

²⁴² The question surrounding the “hexameters” of *IDGOlbia* 93 is whether this represents an Orphic fragment (e.g., West 1983; Ustinova 2009b) or an oracular response from Didyma heralding the arrival of Delphinios from Miletus (Burkert 1994; Rusjaeva 2006; Bravo 2007). The major difficulty of seeing this fragment as an oracular response from Didyma is our scrappy evidence from archaic Didyma-Branchidae does not support hexametric responses (cf. *Milet* I.3 132 A and 178; Didyma 11, with Parke 1985 *App. A.*, where Heracleides Ponticus quotes two lines of hexameter, but these are likely late versifications). Onyshvych reads the inscribed plaque as a hymn or prayer (cf. μακαρίζω ἐκεῖ· μέμνημαι Λητῶ<ς>); Boshnakova 2007 (*non vidi*) sees a prosodion to Apollo. This is not the place to enter into the thorny and heated debate around precisely what “counted” as Orphic in the Archaic and Classical world, for which, see West 2003.

that it does not belong with our Orphic materials, its eschatological mood sits comfortably with the innovative religious life of the town and in that sense contextualizes the more explicit Orphic material which has come to light.

A number of other inscribed bone-shards feature paired abstract ideas, which emphasize the soteriological bent of Orphic initiation but which are also compatible with a number of the features of “Zalmoxism” and the lives of our northern adventurers.²⁴³ One striking fragment of these Orphic inscriptions reads “Life, Death, Life, Dionysos, *Orphikoi*.”²⁴⁴ Two others read “Peace-War-Truth-Falsehood” and, tantalizingly, “Truth-Body-Soul,” which seems almost to recall Aristeas’ journey into Scythian lands.²⁴⁵ In fact, the earliest Orphic dedication was found inscribed upon on a bronze mirror of Scythian fabrication!²⁴⁶

Some of these bone fragments also feature zetas and alphas inscribed on their margins, in addition to crudely incised figures which may render boats. While a number of these have been put forward, to my knowledge no one has yet suggested that these letters abbreviate ZA(lmoxis)/ZA(molxis).²⁴⁷ If this is the case, it offers persuasive evidence for the mutual and collaborative interpretation of Scythian and Greek religious traditions upon precisely the basis we have been discussing. But even if we do not accept that the letters zeta and alpha abbreviate Zalmoxis, the

²⁴³ The so called “Orphic” fragments include *IGDOLbia* 92 (c.500BCE); 94A, B, and C (=SEG 28. 659-661). These are tremendously fascinating objects in and of themselves and so the literature on these fragments is now large and growing. For the eschatological “string” of these fragments, see Hinge 2007.

²⁴⁴ *IGDOLbia* 94A: Βίος Θάνατος Βίος Ζ(?) Ἀλήθεια Ζα(γρεύς?) Ζ(?) Διόν(υσοῦς) Ὀρφικοί.

²⁴⁵ *IGDOLbia* 94B: Εἰρήνη Πόλεμος Ἀλήθεια Ψεῦδος Διόν(υσοῦς); 94C: Διόν(υσοῦς) Ἀλήθεια Σῶμα Ψυχή. The reduplication of words and the contrastive pairing of ideas seems to anticipate the inscription on the *Boreikoi thiasos* ring described above. Moreover, the ring’s combination of circular form and content, a movement of ideas from “Life” up through Apollo, then Sun, the Kosmos, and Light, is suggestive of a never-ending cycle of regeneration, and thus may be linked with the mystery religion of the Orphic tablets.

²⁴⁶ See Peterson 2010: 54f. for a comments on this mirror, doubling, and alterity.

²⁴⁷ Rusjaeva 1972 (ed. pr.) suggests understand the Z as letter initial of Z(agreus), often associated with the Dionysiac dimension of Orphism (but see Edmunds 1999 *pace*). Explicit reference to Dionysos as (Orphic) *Lenaios*, *IGDOLbia* 92.

body, soul, life, and acquisition of truth run through these fragments in a pattern which is by now familiar across cultural lines. What is more, these Orphic fragments were uncovered in the central precinct of Apollo Ietros and not Dionysos, as their Orphic character might lead us to have guessed. Taken together with innovative dedications like Anaparres' discussed above, Apollo the Doctor's cult has all the appearance of a space suited to the mutual accommodation of both local and Greek religious praxis.

We have seen again how medico-religious practices created a cultural interface for groups to conduct different yet related transactions. The popularity of Ietros' cult on the Black Sea was likely not wholly motivated by Greek desires to absorb or learn local traditions and lore; rather medico-religious practice there was at the center of a middle ground, in and through which new and shared cultural forms could develop to foster bilateral social arrangements and communication. Within Ietros' cult we find flexible and creative forms of dedicatory practice involving Greek, Scythian, and Thracian traditions alike. Especially at Olbia this cult seems to have been a shared space, encouraging the emergence of a symbolic media in which commercial and therapeutic activity were embedded. The significance of Apollo in this context is underlined, too, by the development of a roster of figures whose traditional associations with the god and the North rested upon a foundation of medico-religious ideas encircling the magical powers of song, the purification of the body, and the immortality of the soul in the attainment of special knowledge. Such knowledge—often medical—allows them to move across multiple domains, whether cultural or metaphysical, tagging them as hybrid creations. So too, the eventual global circulation of Abaris, Aristeas, and Zalmoxis is typical of middle-ground creations, as they were dislodged from their original context and reabsorbed by the Greek “center,” undergoing a second

order shift in signification. Indeed, their very peregrinations seem to become emblematic of the integration of Northern and Western worlds into a wider “Greek” one, yet in a way that simultaneously emphasizes their exotic origins, esoteric medical powers, and divine proximity.

Conclusion

We have, then, over the course of roughly a millennium, traced the movement of different kinds of “medical” knowledge and the figures who possessed it—both human and divine—between different cultural groups. We have found that medical lore and its technologies were not simply packets of information, shipped as cargo from one zone to another unaltered, but worked as a middle ground between them. Because medicine was (and is, still) bound up in wider cultural systems which imply particular social relations, its meaning was subject to change and reconfiguration as it moved from one cultural domain to the next. *Materia medica* from Crete takes on a new valence when blended with Asiatic incantations in Theban Egypt. Sekhmet the plague bearing lion goddess, could be productively adapted to the protective Delian triad in the mixed zone of Geometric Crete. Consequently, determining the directionality of intellectual or practical “influences” becomes less revealing than medicine’s implication in wider transcultural dialogues. That is, adaptations disclose to us the central point that medicine was not only an object of exchange. That is because the cultural systems surrounding medicine and the medical encounter surfaces as an appropriate locus for the establishment or refinement of the frameworks surrounding exchange itself. These transactions might take place along existing networks, such as the “trade” of medical practitioners in the Bronze age. Or they might produce novel cultural forms and institutions at the “peripheries.” The new synthetic figures (and their cult-places) which result from such interactions, like Eshmun-Asklepios, Abaris, or Zalmoxis were capable

of being (re)absorbed in cultural “centers,” where they again took on new meanings and histories. At the same time, medical culture was not always employed for the purposes of intercultural exchange, but like the late Classical/Hellenistic culture-hero Hippocrates, for the purposes of establishing narrower criteria for group identity. My hope has been that, by bringing together such disparate strands of formal and cult medical practice within models of economic and cultural interchange, we can illuminate the way that medicine existed as a social and cultural medium capable of hosting a variety of interactions aimed at different goals beyond the local scope of healing the body.

Conclusion(s)

Over the course of the last four chapters I have tried to revise some of the ways that scholars have traditionally gone about studying the history of Greek medicine as it relates to religion. I have done so in the belief that we might better understand medicine as a “field” in which a wide spectrum of social relationships, power dynamics, and cultural forms took shape. I suggest this is profitable as a method of historical inquiry to the extent that it offers new degrees of clarity in accessing ancient actors’ own categories and attempting to make sense of their world with them. I have tried doing so in the first place by drawing attention to the way that conceptions of health—and therefore concepts of the body and its care—are hybrid conformations of biology as it is mediated through language and socio-cultural priorities. To that end, I have tried to show that, for Greeks, conceptions of bodily health were not easily divisible from conceptions of community health and social solidarity. I argued that, traditionally, *hygieia* captured both these meanings and pooled them together, and that an emphasis on the corporeal aspect of health in modern scholarship is a by-product of medical and philosophical interventions. Consequently, I suggested that we ought to consider the activity of healing—the creation, maintenance, and restoration of *hygieia*—always with this particular social sense in mind. In chapters two and three, then, I pursued this line of argument as the social texture of health and healing were relevant to the individual healing encounter at cults of Asklepios, and to aspects of communal life in the polis. In the second chapter, I argued that an important aspect of ritual activity at healing cults was its emphasis on suppliant interpretation of healing narratives as restorative of forms of social agency and reintegration. In the third chapter, I extended that argument to the level of the community, suggesting that sanctuaries were located in spaces felt to

need a kind of “healing,” like borderlands or urban locales which were perceived as “marginal.” Finally, the concluding chapter took up medicinal discourse, practice, and practitioners as loci and agents for the creation of new cultural forms or modes of expression, concentrating on their role in abetting transactions across cultures (or reflexive cultural self-definition). These new forms often took the shape of medical gods, cults, or other kinds of specialized religious knowledge, because it was symbolically fluid and adaptive to a variety of situations and demands. The imbrication of the latter three chapters illustrates and, I hope, justifies the initial claim that we can and should study the medical encounter as a context (and not just *in context*) which produces subjectivities according to specific circumstances (“Hippocratic” vs. cultic); political structures which reflexively image their communities; and an array of social discourses and cultural forms. In the final analysis, I hope that this contribution will ultimately broaden the scope of inquiry and the methods used in the doing of ancient medical and religious history.

At the same time, there is still much further work to be done, as each chapter leaves certain questions unanswered and other important ones unasked. With regard to the first chapter, one might notice that Platonic and Aristotelian traditions concerning health, the soul, and collective political life are absent. Indeed, one could—and should—write an entire diachronic history about the shifting conceptions of and emphases upon *hygieia* from the archaic period onward. Ideally, this history would not only include these important philosophic and biological works, but incorporate data from the more robust inscriptional record of the Hellenistic period, where *hygieia* and *soteria* emerge as conceptual pair in civic statutes and diplomatic correspondence. Moreover, one would want to explore possible links between the ecological

profile of the Mediterranean and strategies of risk management as they related to communal conceptions of health.

As I noted in the acknowledgements, my personal history and experience with illness is now much more enfolded into the writing of this dissertation than when I began it. My experience with cancer, its effect on my sense of identity and the way I derive meaning from illness, have only highlighted the importance of the second chapter for me. Even before my diagnosis, however, I had already felt a growing sense of dissatisfaction with the overly determined and slightly outdated framework of “EM’s.” Going forward I am increasingly interested in phenomenological work on the experience of illness.²⁴⁸ This is especially so for my vision of the second chapter, where ideally it exists as a dyad. The first will still focus on the *iamata* as open narratives which cultivated interpretive agency and helped suppliants read themselves as one among an entire community of the sick. The second part of this argument will focus on the dedication of anatomical ex votos and their relationship to a visual audience of sick viewers.²⁴⁹ Indeed, a variety of material and written sources confirm that anatomical votives were intended to communicate directly to a viewing audience. As we have seen, temple inventories from healing sanctuaries and the *iamata* themselves indicate that suppliants were expected to tour the sanctuary and to inspect carefully the votive dedications made there. Herondas’ fourth *Mimiambos* especially discloses how such scrutiny of corporeal depictions might stimulate imaginative, even sympathetic thoughts about the bodies and affective states of others. In light of this, I suggest that anatomical ex-votos, as mimetic substitutions of the bodies

²⁴⁸ See, e.g. Csordas 1994 and 2008; Carel 2016.

²⁴⁹ Now a cottage industry: see Weinryb 2015; Hughes 2016; Draycott 2017.

of others, promoted reflections about the experiences of the subjective self. In the social context of the sanctuary, such assemblages would have reinforced ritual modes of attention to one's body as it was integrated into a larger community of worshipers, and so more strongly supports the whole thrust of the second chapter as it stands now.

Apropos of several points in the second chapter, too, is a driving question about economics. One thing I tried very hard to do was precisely move us away from “the medical market-place” model underlying histories of therapeutic selection, focusing instead on the kinds of “subject” a patient became under the care of different healers. This came at the expense of considering valid and important questions (some of which are *partially* taken up in the Appendix) about the costs of cultic medical care relative to seeing a Hippocratic physician. The limited evidence seems to suggest that cash “entry fee” for healing sanctuaries was minimal and that sacrificial offerings were scaled to one's means. But beyond the question of relative fees, there are the questions about the costs of hieratic travel (both of money and time). On the level of the polis we would want to know average outlays made for the construction of Asklepieia or how much was required to secure the services of an *iatros demosios*. These questions are important not just for economic historians, but because they help to flesh out the framework of “medicine as framework of social action.” This is because, as we saw in the fourth chapter, ancient economics existed on the sliding scale of more and less “socially embedded” forms of expenditure and exchange. Better—or at least more centrally collected—data would help us to better understand the dynamics of this crucial piece of the puzzle.

Finally, the endeavor to study the “where of cult” by analyzing the geographical and mythographical traditions around cults of Asklepios in Chapter Three is clearly only a beginning.

Already, for the sake of space and continuity, large sections concerning an early, urban Asklepieion in Corinth and a whole network of early, urban cults in Arcadia met the chopping block. So too, there were a large number of healing cults in the Cyclades, where cults of Apollo were again central to the management of inter-polis networks and the enactment of collective memory. What the texture of Asklepios' cult was like in these island settings and how his history was written by and for the people there, remains an open question. Thus, there remains much to do, and much to think about in advancing this project and its ultimate goal of expanding our historical and methodological horizons.

Appendix: Evidence for and Nature of Incubatory Healing

Much of the discussion above has implicitly dealt with a category of ritual procedure widely known as “incubation.” In the *iamata*, this act of oneiric contact is typically referred to by the verbs ἐγκαθεύδω or ἐγκοιμάομαι, and so may also be called *enkoimesis*.¹ What actions, behaviors, and performances, exactly comprised this ritual, and were they always the same everywhere? Indeed, the question whether there existed a “paradigmatic” or archetypal form of incubation has much exercised scholars of religion since the 19th century. Nevertheless, a consensus has grown up that it was a loosely defined yet recognizable practice, characterized by sleeping in or on a marked and restricted space (known in the *iamata* as the *abaton*, *adyton*, or elsewhere the *enkoimeterion*) in the hope of divine epiphany to receive an oracle or miracle cure.² Still, as Hedvig von Ehrenheim has emphasized, there was no universal routine within Greek incubatory practice, and Asklepios hardly monopolized the field of oneiric communication.³ Even within his cults there appears to have existed a high degree of local variation in ritual procedure. It appears they tolerated a great deal of modification, as, for example, in the specific constellation of deities to whom the suppliant was supposed to give

¹ What follows is based in large part upon Graf 1993; Ehrenheim 2011 and 2016 with certain revisions and additions. One question which these scholars address (and which I avoid) is the problem of whether incubation (and so Asklepios, by extension) is a “chthonic” practice, and, if it is, what this means for the character of Asklepios as a divinity. For the question with regard to Asklepios’ cult specifically, see Riethmüller 1999 and 2005; *contra* Verbanck-Piérard 2000; see Stafford 2008 for a “middle path.” For “chthonic and olympian” or “hero and god” as heuristic frameworks for sacrificial ritual generally, see, e.g., Scullion 1994 and 2000; Ekroth 2002; Parker 2005; Stafford 2005.

² See Wacht 1997:180 for what is now the standard definition of ancient incubation. Also Ehrenheim 2011; Petridou 2015. For challenges to the necessity (and ubiquity) of an *abaton* in healing cults or for incubation, see Vikela 2006; Baker 2013.

³ Ehrenheim 2011: 110f. Other famous incubatory sanctuaries included the Amphiaraion at Oropos (and another at Rhamnous, see Chapter 3), the sanctuary of Hemithea at Kastabos (see Diod. Sic. 5.62-63); Brizo at Delos (Semios of Delos *BNJ* 396 F4=Athen. *Deip.* 8.12; cf. Hsch. s.v. Βριζώ; and *IG XI*² 165. 44 for a μαντεῖον there, but, given the context, this could equally refer to the Delian Asklepieion); so too oracle/healing cults of Podaleirios (Lycophr. *Alex.* 1047-8).

offerings.⁴ Though much previous scholarship has been dogged by the over extrapolation or over-application of single pieces of evidence,⁵ it seems possible to draw conclusions regarding the general shape and choreography of ritual incubation at cults of Asklepios, as well as those of the healing hero and ersatz-Asklepios-figure, Amphiaraos.

In her collection of the *testimonia* for incubation in the Classical and Hellenistic world, Ehrenheim notes that we are faced by the additional challenge of sorting out incubatory rites from other forms of worship at healing and oracular cults. She suggests three orders of ritual. In the first place, she argues there were the “every day religious habits” which existed at any sanctuary. These included various abstinences, libations, purifications and sacrifice which reinforce the sacred character of the sanctuary.⁶ Second, there were ritual actions which were routine, performed by all worshippers, yet “sharpened” for those intending to incubate. Here we find specially articulated forms of purification and the inclusion of particular deities to whom *prothumata* (preliminary sacrificial offerings) were given. Finally there were those rituals undertaken *exclusively* by suppliants seeking to incubate within the sanctuary *abaton*. Broadly speaking, this final class of rituals comprises unusual activities meant to signal the extraordinary character of the incubating suppliant and their readiness to come into divine contact.

Somewhat curiously, however, incubants at Asklepieia appear less ritually marked than those undergoing incubation—both for healing and oracular epiphany—at other sanctuaries

⁴ Ehrenheim 2011: 46f.

⁵ E.g., the early (and still widely cited) studies by Alice Walton (1894) and even the Edelsteins (1945) whose works predate or exclude important epigraphic evidence. Over-application is particularly the case with regard to the *Lex Sacra Hallenstrasse* (*IvP* III 161A/B), a detailed prescription of ritual practice from Pergamum, an Imperial era inscription whose contents, however, date probably to the Hellenistic period (see, for instance, Petsalis-Diomidis 2005). Due to the the level of detail, and the supposedly close relationship this sanctuary maintained with its mother cult at Epidauros (e.g., Pausanias 2.26.8) this inscription is often invoked as a model for all Asklepieia.

⁶ Ehrenheim 2011: 144-5.

within the ancient world.⁷ Within the particular context of healing cults, the act of incubation itself appears as the only special feature which was not a familiar part of the everyday ritual furniture of Greek religious life. At the shrines of Acharaka, Drion, and Lebadeia where suppliants sought out dream-oracles, we discover especially “marked” activities like mandatory fasting and spooky, “chthonian” sacrifices of a black ram. By contrast, these are absent from the prescriptions at most Asklepieia.⁸ Incubatory ritual was designed for a singular purpose: visionary contact with a divinity (or their avatar). In this way it stands well apart from the bulk of Greek mechanisms for communicating with the divine, which was usually managed through an intermediary, whether a priest(ess) or seer. In as much as epiphanic contact stands out as the principal attraction of Asklepios’ healing cult, then, it remains something of a surprise that the ritual requirements to achieve the appropriate status for such contact are comparatively minimal.

The process of incubatory healing began with leaving one’s door and participating in the sacred mobility of pilgrimage. The significance of such travel was layered and reinforced by the preparatory abstinences to which suppliants submitted before entering a sanctuary. At Pergamum incubants underwent total sexual abstinence for at least three days prior to incubation, as well as abstained from the consumption of goat meat.⁹ Again, the process of preparing for incubation began well before entering the sanctuary and demonstrates an attention towards a heightened

⁷ Ehrenheim 2011.

⁸ Kalchas on Mount Drion (Strabo 6.3.9, Lycophr. *Alex.* 592); and the *Ploutonia* at Acharaka and Hieropolis (Strabo 14.1.44 and 13.4.13) in which suppliants slept in a cave to gain access to divine therapy, although it seems this was done through an intermediary (cf. Plin. *NH* 2.209). Compare, too, the oracle of Boeotian Trophonios (e.g., Hdt. 1.46, 8.134; Ar. *Nub.* 506-8; Paus. 9.39.4; Plut. *Mor.* 950e-52d; Philost. *VA* 8.19). See also the Classical votive relief found in Livadia (*NM* 3942) and Clark 1968; Bonnechère 2003 for the cult. The preparations for incubating at these latter two cults were extremely intensive and could take several weeks. For these (mostly) cave oracles, see Ustinova 2009 and Friese 2013. For dreams and dreaming in antiquity generally, see the contributions in Harris 2009.

⁹ For sexual and dietary purity, see *IvP* 161A l. 13. A less rigorous form of sexual purity is found in a recently discovered Hellenistic *lex sacra* from an Asklepieion at Yüntdag outside Pergamum (*SEG* 60 1332) which commands that impurity from sexual encounters, from contact with a funeral, the dead, or an abortion be washed off “from head to toe”—presumably by a dousing of the head. See Müller 2010 for the text and commentary.

sense of ‘purification’ generated through a carefully articulated set of behaviors conveying varying degrees of significance. On arriving at a sanctuary like Epidauros suppliants funneled through the monumental Propylon into the *temenos*.¹⁰ The lintel of the gateway was famously inscribed with the words: Ἄγνὸν χρῆ ναιοῖο θυωδέος ἐντὸς ἰόντα ἔμμεναι, ἀγνεία δ’ ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὄσια (Pure must be the one entering the fragrant temple, and purity is thinking holy things).¹¹ The preparatory intent of such an imperative is clear: epiphanies demand that the suppliant be possessed of and maintain an appropriately respectful attitude, a message reiterated throughout the *iamata* themselves.¹²

More than that, as a clear demarcation of a new physical and cognitive space with corresponding physical and cognitive demands, the gateway and inscription act as an important transitional moment in the suppliant’s journey. Not only did it mark the passage from the profane to the sacred which is so fundamental to the structuration of ritual, it marked the next phase in the suppliants’ recovery and so also offers a moment of narrative reflection, pregnant with expectation. So too, in this context the identification of purity with a certain modality of thought is unique and striking. It calls the suppliants’ attention to the *act* of cognition, not just the pious requirement to police one’s thought and behavior within the sanctuary space. By specifying φρονεῖν as a definitive aspect of purity, thought itself becomes a central and self-conscious activity expected of the suppliant. This suggests not only an encouragement to reflect on the

¹⁰ Constructed as part of the major building campaign of the second quarter of the 4th century. See Burford 1969; Tomlinson 1983.

¹¹ Ἄγνὸν χρῆ ναιοῖο θυωδέος ἐντὸς ἰόντα ἔμμεναι. ἀγνεία δ’ ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὄσια. The notice comes from Porphyry (*De abstinentia* 2.19), ostensibly quoting Theophrastus’ *De pietate*, and so it has traditionally been held that the inscription was a part of the 4th century building campaign at Epidauros (Burford 1969; Parker 1983: 322-5; von Staden 1996; Edelsteins 1945: 181). While Bremmer (2002: 108) substantially down-dates the inscription as quoted to some time around the beginning of the 1st century, it is likely that some similar inscription existed in its place indicating the importance of purity in effecting successful cures at the sanctuary.

¹² See, for instance, A3, A4, A7, A9 A11, B16, C4.

journey to that point, with its movements and abstinences, but a proleptic purpose. As we have seen with the healing narratives above, the stimuli of the healing rituals to be performed made significant demands on the imagination, particularly in its capacity to project ones own experiences into a wider *corpora* of suffering. To demand cognitive purity was, I suspect, not simply a stale religious monition, but a signpost pointing to the role of the ethical imagination as it would play out in the healing encounter.

This imperative to intellectual purity was recapitulated and elaborated by a series of purificatory rites, which must have augmented and completed the feeling of transformation. The first such act for any worshipper was the sprinkling of the head or body with water from the *perirrhacteria* located by the entrance.¹³ This was customary for anyone moving from an unmarked profane space to a marked sacred one.¹⁴ In addition to this preliminary sprinkling, however, purificatory bathing may have enjoyed an especially significant role at Asklepieia.¹⁵ Indeed, Asklepieia were often located near springs or other water sources.¹⁶ Whether a full bath was required was probably another matter of local stipulation.¹⁷ It is also unclear whether in the

¹³ Ehrenheim 2011: 32. One can still observe wells or basins just inside the entry points of well preserved Asklepieia like Athens, Corinth, Kos, Pergamum, Epidauros, and Alipheira.

¹⁴ Cf. Cole 2004.

¹⁵ Ginouvès 1962: 352-61; Parker 1983: 213. Contra, Edelsteins 1945: 149 n. 16. The Edelsteins argue that incubation in Asklepieia was characterized by a “lack of complicated ritualistic rules.” As above, comparison with other incubatory rituals shows those undertaken at Asklepieia to be relatively undemanding, but in the light of later archeological and inscriptional findings the Edelsteins’ claim appears far too simplistic.

¹⁶ See, e.g. Dignas 2008.

¹⁷ See Ar. *Pl.* 656; Xen. *Mem.* 3.13.3 for cold water baths at the Oropos Amphiaraion. This is confirmed in the case of Oropos by the existence of a 4th century fountain and bath complex (see Sineux 2007). Paus. 1.34.4. reports that it was prohibited to bathe in the sacred spring, and so incubants probably would have done so in the river which splits the sanctuary. The Epidaurian *iamata* mention fountains and baths (see C22) which were expanded under the Romans (Paus. 2.27.6). While the archeological evidence hints at the importance of baths in the cults of Asklepios, these features could be multi-functional, especially within the Roman period, and the identification of bathing structures is especially given to circularity. Ginouvès (1962: 352-57) claims that a simple submersion under water was required before incubation, a conclusion with which Melfi (2007: 498-506) concurs, adding that ablutions were probably made on entering the *temenos* and during preparations for entering the dormitory; but see Yegül 2013 for reservations about the scale and place of bathing in Greek healing rites.

Classical period a conceptual distinction obtained between “purificatory” bathing as a component of ritual incubation and baths given as part of a therapeutic regimen.¹⁸ At any rate, given the very general importance of water for Greek ritual,¹⁹ and its particular necessity in transforming the individual for epiphanic contact, it is very likely that a bath of some kind was the norm at major healing sanctuaries. This bath is particularly pronounced in Aristophanes’ *Ploutos*, in which the god (as well as Carion, who accompanies him) is dowsed in cold salt water before incubating.²⁰ Ehrenheim suggests that baths of this sort would have contributed to the “sharpening” effect, underscoring the ritual separation of the incubatory suppliant from the general run of worshippers. In the absence of more evidence for bathing activities at Classical Asklepieia, however, we cannot determine with any certainty whether this kind of “sharpening” of ritual through cold or salt baths was normative. So, while it is certain that ritual purification involving some sort of washing was widely practiced at Asklepieia, it is difficult to say more.

After this washing up, the suppliant entered upon a series of bloodless offerings, often to a corporate *ensemble* of gods who attended Asklepios in his sanctuaries. The most usual offering here was in the form of honey-cakes/paste (*popanon*, *arrestes*, and *pelanon*).²¹ Again, the collected evidence points to a high degree of flexibility from sanctuary to sanctuary with respect

¹⁸ Many Asklepieia of the Roman period have more elaborate bathing complexes which reflect more closely Roman conventions about hygiene than Greek ones. See Wickkiser 2010 for the bath house in the Roman renovation of the Asklepieion at Corinth, and Yegül 2013 for (relatively) small complexes at Epidauros, Messene, Gortyn, and the Amphiaraion at Oropos.

¹⁹ Burkert 1985: 76f; Cole 1988: 161; see Dunant 2002 for the importance of springs in a very wide variety of Attic cults.

²⁰ Ar. *Pl.* 665f. Compare, also, Aelius Aristides’ continual “baths” (often swims in the midst of winter).

²¹ Ehrenheim 2011. See, e.g., Ar. *Pl.* 661; *IG* II² 4962; *IG* IV² 1, 309; *IvP* III 161A/B. Sometimes, too, a bloodless sacrifice of cakes and fruits appears to have occupied the place of the main offering, see *NM* 1335=*LIMC* Asklepios 96. Asklepios’ taste for honey cakes must have been widely held. It is attested further in Theophrastus’ (*HP* 9.11.2.) report that those harvesting a kind of botanical known as the “Asklepieian *panakea*” bury a honey-cake for the god in its place (again confusing the distinction between “official” religious therapeutic practice and more “traditional” or “magical” lore). For cakes in sacrifice generally, see Kearns 1994.

to the exact constellation of divinities and the offering required.²² As we have noted, in the iconography, especially relief sculpture, Asklepios is constantly portrayed as surrounded by his immediate family.²³ It is no surprise, then, that we find a pronounced emphasis on family reflected in the cluster of gods and goddesses who receive *prothumata* before incubating. To these cakes were added libations—attested, however, only in the *Ploutos* and in Hellenistic additions to the *lex sacra* from the Piraeus—which were so ubiquitous a piece of ritual that it is nearly impossible to imagine a suppliant failing to perform them at significant moments throughout the preparatory sequence. Significantly, these *prothumata* to gods other than Asklepios seem to be a uniform *part* of his worship, an essential episode in generating the proper mood and atmosphere for incubation.

As inscriptions from Epidauros and Pergamum show, after the *prothumata* had been completed, suppliants performed a blood sacrifice of some kind. Indeed, three of the *iamata*

²² In Epidauros it is clear from the *iamata* (A5) that a *prothusia* was made (the whole phrase is προεθύσατο καὶ ἐποίησε τὰ νομιζόμενα; what exactly the *prothumata* and *nomizomena* (cf. *SEG* 44.505 l.16) were is unclear: does *prothuo* here mean sacrifice directly before incubation, or a “warm-up” sacrifice to associated deities before the main blood event? Wörrle tends to the former while Ehrenheim the later. I am inclined to side with Ehrenheim, based on analogy with inscriptions from other Asklepieia and Isyllos’ long hymn. These suggest that the first offerings were likely given to Apollo Maleatas. Two sources from Athens attest to cakes. *Ar. Pl.* 660-61 reports that *popana* were placed on the altar and the *trapeza* within the dormitory. Perhaps more reliably, the *lex sacra* from the Piraeus Asklepieion records cakes as *prothumata* given to: Maleatas, Apollo, Hermes, Iaso, Akeso, Panakeia, and finally to the enigmatic “dogs and hunters” (likely a reference to the mythological tradition of Asklepios’ exposure and discovery by hunters on Mt. Kynortion (Dog-mountain) outside Epidauros). Similar instructions are found in *IvP* 161A. The deities receiving cakes (Zeus Apotropaios, Zeus Meilichios, then to an Artemis, whose epiklesis is lost in a lacuna, as well as Artemis Prothyraia, Ge, Tyche, Mnemosyne, and Themis) before receiving the blood sacrifice of a piglet. While I suspect that it is the simple fact of sacrifice that is important for the suppliant rather than the complex and perhaps not always scrutable collection of deities, there is a distinctly apotropaic quality within the assembly of deities in the *IvP* 161A, most obvious in the figure of Zeus Apotropaios, but also implied in the figure of Artemis Prothyraia, who was an important figure especially in the warding off of diseases (see Faraone 1992: 57-9).

²³ See, e.g., *NM* 1402=*LIMC* Asklepios 248 for Asklepios flanked by five family members. The Edelsteins (1945: 186f) frame this picture in developmental terms, in which the “young” still heroic Asklepios did not carry enough authority to warrant worship on his own. As the popularity and influence of his godhead became more widespread, sacrifices to deities other than Asklepios grew “obsolete.” *IvP* III 161A shows that this was not the case, and that Asklepios, even “at the height of his power” was the capstone in a series of deliberately selected associative powers, and strict diachronic developmentalism cannot be claimed for his cult. I would rather emphasize the socialism of the cult and the ritual insistence on an incorporated network of powers as crucial to Asklepios’ status.

mention sacrifice before incubation, and one of them seems to indicate this sacrifice would have been conducted with the aid or supervision of temple staff.²⁴ These documents do not prescribe any specific animal for such sacrifices and the literary and iconographic evidence points to a wide variety of suitable sacrificial victims, including cocks,²⁵ pigs,²⁶ sheep,²⁷ and cattle.²⁸ Again, sorting out those dedications which are meant to commemorate acts of incubation from “general” familial or civic worship is often tricky, and so their value as evidence for incubation has again to be taken with appropriate caution. The Edelsteins have suggested a general prohibition on the sacrifice of goats in cults of Asklepios, but this was probably not universally the case.²⁹ Ultimately, divining any kind of universal practice from these sources is not possible.

²⁴ A5, D2, and D3; temple staff in A5. See also Ar. *Pl.* 660f.; Herod. *Mim.* 4. For the involvement of temple staff at Oropos, see *I.Or.* 277+8, but see reservations at n. 211.

²⁵ Asklepios is famously associated with the sacrifice of cocks: e.g., Pl. *Phd.* 188a; see Roebuck 1951: 138-43 and Lang 1977 for terracotta rooster votives at Corinth; Aleshire 1989: 14 for votive cocks in the Athenian inventories. The Telemachos monument (*IG* II² 4960) also depicts the temple of Asklepios (in Piraeus) with rooster akroteria; see also Herod. *Mim.* 4.

²⁶ E.g., *IvP* III 161B.2. Interestingly, it prescribes additional piglet sacrifices in the case of subsequent inquiries (ὕπερ ἄλλου πράγματος ἐπερω]τῆαι, προθυ[έσθω χοῖρον ἄλλον). On the votive reliefs of Athens, pigs are the most frequently depicted sacrifice. See, e.g., *NM* 1377=*LIMC* Asklepios 201; *NM* 1330=*LIMC* Asklepios 63; *NM* 1334=*LIMC* Asklepios 338; *LIMC* Asklepios 248; van Straten 1995: R33 (Epidauros) and R6 (Athens); *NM* 1395 (probably Amphiaraios); *NM* 1384 (probably Amphiaraios). In the case of these latter two examples, it is difficult to disambiguate Amphiaraios from the very generalized iconography of the “banqueting hero,” who appears almost always to be offered a sacrificial pig.

²⁷ E.g., *NM* 1333=*LIMC* Asklepios 66; *LIMC* Asklepios 202; *NM* 1407=*LIMC* Asklepios 202; *NM* 1395 (probably Amphiaraios).

²⁸ E.g., *NM* 1429=*LIMC* Asklepios 64; *NM* 1434=*LIMC* Asklepios 386; *IG* IV² 1, 41=*LSCG* 60 for a bull (and a rooster) although this appears to be a sacred procession from Epidauros to the sanctuary; similarly *IG* IV² 1, 47 for sacrificial contributions of the Astypalaians.

²⁹ Pausanias (2.26.6 and 10.32.12) reports the prohibitions at Epidauros, Pergamum, and Roman Tithorea, but says it is permitted at Cyrene, an Epidaurian branch. A *lex sacra* from Erythrai (*IErythrai* 2.205.9=*LSAM* 24) hints at the possible prohibition of goat in sacrifices to Apollo and Asklepios, and *IvP* 161A.15 states incubants must be pure of goat meat for three days. The only evidence for the general validity of the rule comes from the second century AD writings of Sextus Empiricus (*Pyrr.* 3.220-221), but his witness is too late to utilize for the Classical period. See Edelsteins 1945: 184-190; Stafford 2008: 214 and Ehrenheim 2011: 29 who doubt the universality of the proscription.

Inscriptions, like those from Oropos,³⁰ Amphipolis, and Pergamum suggest a familiar degree of flexibility, both between sanctuaries and suppliants, according to their economic means.³¹ While the sacrifice before incubation, including the payment of a monetary fee,³² was no doubt important, it was the thanksgiving sacrifice or dedication after incubation that stands out in the inscriptional, iconographic, and literary records.³³

According to *IvP* 161A, during the preliminary sacrifices the suppliant wore the laurel wreath of Apollo. After the completion of the sacrifice, and before incubating, the suppliant exchanged this wreath for the olive wreath of Asklepios. Again, according to this inscription the suppliant was to leave the wreath behind on the *stibas* upon which he or she had slept during the incubation period.³⁴ In addition to the wearing and exchange of wreaths through the ritual sequence, in some cases we find special vestments. At some point in the process the suppliant

³⁰ The inscriptions from Oropos (*IOr.* 277+8) are problematic for multiple reasons. This *lex sacra* is, of course, for Amphiaraos, not Asklepios, and although the two cults overlap in many ways, given the very particular history of the Oropos cult, it is difficult to extrapolate from here to universal practice. More specifically, it is not clear from inscriptions 277 & 278 that a pre-incubatory sacrifice is described (see recently Lupu 2003 and 2004 who argues for pre-incubatory sacrifice; Chaniotis *pace* with *SEG* 53 466 and Sineux 2007: 140).

³¹ See Aleshire 1991: 74 for a range of offerings from 1 obol to 500 drachmas; Stafford 2008: 212-3; Ehrenheim 2011: 68-71. So, too, the regulation of whether sacrificial meat was to be consumed within the sanctuary (οὐ φόρα) appears to have been a local one: Titane (Paus. 2.11.7-8), Epidauros (Paus. 2.27.1), Athens (*IG* II² 1364), Oropos (*I.Or.* 277. 31-32), and Cretan Lisos (*SEG* 28 750=*CEG* 847) have such stipulations, but Herod. *Mim.* 4 shows dedicants at Kos sacrificing a chicken and taking the meat “to go” (although it should be noted that sacrifice is for continued good health, and not necessarily healing).

³² Internal evidence for fees, called ἱάτρα, see *iama* B2, *IG* IV² 1, 248(=Peek 105); *IG* IV² 1, 258 (4th century BC); *IG* IV² 1, 126.20 (early second century AD); *IG* IV² 1, 560; at Pergamum *IvP* III 161A.31-2/B.14-16; at Amphipolis *SEG* 44. 505; at Oropos *I.Or.* 277.20 and possibly *I.Or.* 278.7-8, with Lupu 2003; *I.Erythrai* 205 contains details about 4th century hieratic fees, but these are probably in a civic context (see Dignas 2008). For independent archaeological evidence for *thesauroi* at Corinth, Epidauros, and Kos, see Dignas 2002; Ehrenheim 2011.

³³ E.g. Herod. *Mim.* 4. The *iama* C5 describes them only and unhelpfully as *nomizomena*. See also van Straten 1995. Thanksgiving would have been offered by any worshipper, but animal sacrifice seems to have been more usual for those who had incubated (but not exclusive, see Ehrenheim 2011: 95-7).

³⁴ The nature of the “*stibas*” is itself controversial; does it imply sleeping on a leafy bed *directly* on the ground with its chthonic associations, or does it simply mean a crude mattress, as, e.g. Hdt. 4.71. See *LSJ* s.v. στιβάζ 2, although the second exemplum (Ar. *Pl.* 633) pertains exactly to the question of mattresses in the Asklepieion at Athens!

dressed all in white,³⁵ or in some manner of “customary garb.”³⁶ The evidence is not clear whether only those incubating wore white and wreaths, but the leaving behind of the wreath on the bed after successful incubation would, by definition, been exclusive to those incubating.

One must also try to find space in the foregoing sequence for activities which we have good reason to guess happened, but cannot place with certainty. We have addressed throughout hymns to various gods, most significantly those to Asklepios and Hygieia that were inscribed in Epidaurous as a kind of “liturgical” program, and examined the manner in which the performance of these hymns generated corporate cohesiveness amongst the participants. When did suppliants—or, in the case of those too incapacitated to join in song, their families—sing these songs? It is possible that they were sung during the offering of the *prothumata*, as a component of the prayer which preceded and ensured the efficacy of the incubation. It is equally possible that the hymns fell into their own portion of the ritual program which forms something of an ellipsis in the inscriptional record.³⁷ Regardless of their timing, it is certain that the singing of hymns were a central part of the ritual fabric, seemingly for both the individual and the group.

³⁵ Aristid. *Or.* 44.30. Walton 1894: 76-82; Dillon 1994: 245 (also citing *LSAM* 14) make white clothing the general rule for suppliants of Asklepios. Again, the Edelsteins (1945: 149-50) claim there were no special cult accoutrement or fees. Isyllos’ hymn includes a *lex sacra* describing the manner of procession to the Epidaurian sanctuary: men are to approach with “hair unbound” and in “holy fashion wearing white,” (see Bremmer and Furley 2001: vol. 1, 161). Processional participants, too, are to wear crowns of laurel and olive, for Apollo and Asklepios respectively. However, an inscription from late 4th century Euboea (*JG* XII.9.194=Edelsteins T787) commands “many-colored raiment” (ἑσθηῖτι ποικίλη) but clearly in a larger processional context. The problem then is the limit of inference. Both inscriptions are late Classical/early Hellenistic, and do not concern incubatory practice exactly. *LSAM* 14 and Aristides witness incubatory rules, but we cannot be sure that this evidence held for the Classical period. Following Ehrenheim, who cites Aeschin. *In Ctes.* 77 and *LSCG* 83-84-39-40, white clothing seems appropriate for thanks offering in the Classical period, and so I am more inclined to view it as the ritual norm for incubation in the cults of Asklepios in the 5th and 4th centuries.

³⁶ *IVP* III 161 A-14-15. For the vague “customary” clothing, see Ar. *Plut.* 625.

³⁷ Suggested by the *lex sacra* from Erythrai (4th century BC) *I.Erythrai* 2.205.34-37 in which the suppliant is instructed to “sing the paian” after the dedication of the god’s portion of the sacrifice. The inscription continues with the fragmentary opening of the paian to be sung. The back of the inscription holds the more widely known “Erythraian Paian” familiar from the previous chapter. See Bremmer 2001 and Furley, vol 2: 212. Wilamowitz argued that the “front” paian was for individual suppliants, while that on the back was intended for choral performance within civic settings. Cf. *LSAM* 27 (with Lupu 2005: 74f. Although see Dignas 2008: 164).

Bibliography

- Abrahami, P. 2003. "A propos des fonctions de l'asû et de l'āšipu," *Le Journal des Médecins Cunéiformes* 2: 19-20.
- Ackerman, J. 2012. "The Ultimate Social Network." *Scientific American*, 306 (6): 37-43.
- Alcock, S. 1991. "Urban Survey and the *Polis* of Phlius," *Hesperia* 60: 421-64.
- Alcock, S. and Osborne, R. eds. 1994. *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
- Aleshire, S. 1989. *The Athenian Asklepieion: the People, their Dedications, and the Inventories*. Amsterdam.
- . 1991. *Asklepios at Athens: Epigraphic and Prosopographic Essays on the Athenian Healing Cults*. Amsterdam.
- Alevridis, S. and Melfi, M. 2005. "New Archaeological and Topographical Observations on the Sanctuary of Asklepios in Alipheira," *Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens*.
- Al-Salihi, W. 1971. "Hercules-Nergal at Hatra," *Iraq* 33(2): 113-15.
- Amundsen, D. 1977. "Images of the Physician in Classical Times," *The Journal of Popular Culture* 11(3): 642-55.
- Andrews, C. 1994. *Amulets of Ancient Egypt*. London.
- Antonaccio, C. 1994. "Placing the Past: the Bronze Age in the Cultic Topography of Early Greece," in Alcock and Osborne: 79-104.
- Apostola, E. 2014. "Cross Cultural Relations between Egypt and Greece in the Early Iron Age: Representations of Egyptian Lion-Headed Deities in the Aegean," in Pinarello, M., Yoo, J., Ludock, J., and Walsh, C. eds. *Current Research in Egyptology* 2014. London: 100-112.
- Argoud, G. 1979. "Installations hydrauliques de l'Amphiaraiion d'Oropos," in Fossey, J.M. and Giroux, H. eds. *Actes du 3e Congres International sur la Béotie Antique, Montréal-Québec oct-nov*. Amsterdam.
- Arnott, R. 1996. "Healing and Medicine in the Aegean Bronze Age," *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 89: 265-70.

- . 1999. “Healing Cult in Minoan Crete”, in P.P Betancourt, Karageorghis V., Laffineur R. and Niemeier W.D. *Meletemata: Studies in Aegean Archaeology Presented to Malcolm H. Wiener as he enters his 65th year*. Liege.
- . 2014. “Healers and Medicines in Mycenaean Greek Texts,” in Michaelides, D. ed., *Medicine and Healing in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: 44-53.
- Aruz, J., Graf, S.B. and Rakic, Y. 2014. *Assyria to Iberia at the Dawn of the Classical Age*. New York.
- Asad, T. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore.
- . 2011. “Thinking about Religion, Belief, and Politics”, in Orsi, R. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*. Cambridge: 36-57.
- Asper, M. 2007. *Griechische Wissenschaftstexte. Formen, Funktionen, Differenzierungsgeschichten*. Philosophie der Antike 25. Stuttgart.
- . 2015. “Medical Acculturation? Early Greek Texts and the Question of Near Eastern Influence”, in Holmes, B., and Fischer, D-K. eds. *The Frontiers of Ancient Science: Studies in Honor of Heinrich von Staden*. Berlin: 19-46.
- Aston, E. 2004. “Asclepius and the Legacy of Thessaly,” *CQ* 54: 18-32.
- Athanassakis, A. and Wolkow, B. 2013. *The Orphic Hymns: Translation, Introduction, and Notes*. Baltimore.
- Avalos, H. 1995. *Illness and Health-Care in the Ancient Near-East*. Atlanta.
- Bäbler, B. 2007. “Dio Chrysostom’s Construction of Olbia,” in Braund, D. and Kryzhistij, S.D. eds. *Classical Olbia and the Scythian World*. Oxford: 145-60.
- Baker, P. 2013. *The Archaeology of Medicine in the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge.
- Baker, P., Nijdam, H., and van’t Land, K. eds. 2011. *Medicine and Space: Body, Surroundings, and Borders in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Leiden.
- Barnes, D. 1995. *The Making of a Social Disease: Tuberculosis in Nineteenth-Century France*. Berkeley.
- Barton, T. 1994. *Power and Knowledge: Astronomy, Physiognomy and Medicine under the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor.

- Baumgarten, A. 1988. *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Beekes, R. 2003. "The Origin of Apollo," *JANER* 3: 1-21.
- Beckmann, S. 2009. "Resin and Ritual Purification: Terebinth in Eastern Mediterranean Bronze Age Cult," in Stampolidis, N., Kanta, A., and Giannikouri, A. eds. *Athanasia: the Earthly, the Celestial and the Underworld in the Mediterranean from the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age*. Athens: 29-40.
- Behr, C. 1981. *P. Aelius Aristides, The Complete Works*. Vol. II, Orations xvii-liiii. Leiden.
- Bell, C. 2009. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Benedum, C. 1986. "Asklepios und Demeter," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 101: 137-157.
- Benseddik, N. 1997. "Esculape et Hygie en Afrique : classicisme et originalité," *Antiquités africaines* 33(1): 143-51.
- . 2010. "Asklépios, Eshmun mais encore..." *Bolletino Archeologia Online*. 11-21.
- Bernal, M. 1985. *Black Athena: Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. Vol. III. New Brunswick.
- Bershadsky, N. 2012. "The Border of War and Peace: Myth and Ritual in Argive-Spartan dispute over Thyreatis," in Wilker, J. ed. *Maintaining Peace and Interstate Stability in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Heidelberg: 49-77.
- . 2013. *Pushing the Boundaries of Myth: Transformations of Ancient Border wars in Archaic and Classical Greece*. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Beschi, L. 1967/68. "Il monumento di Telemachos, Fondatore dell'Asklepieion ateniese," *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente* 80: 13-41.
- Bigwood, J.M. 1978 "Ctesias' Description of Babylon," *AJAH* 3: 32-52.
- . 1989. "Ctesias' *Indica* and Photius," *Phoenix* 43(4): 302-316.
- Bilde, P. G., Højte, J. M., and Stolba, V. F. eds. 2006. *Cauldron of Ariantas: Studies Presented to A.N. Sceglov on Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Aarhus.

- Bilde, P.G., Petersen, J.H., and Attema, P. eds. 2008. *Meetings of Cultures in the Black Sea Region: Between Conflict and Coexistence*. Aarhus.
- Bing, P. 2004. "Posidippus' *Iamatika*", in Acosta-Hughes B., Kosmetatou E., and Baumbach, M. eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Volg. VIII 309)*. Hellenic Studies Series 2. Cambridge, Ma.
- Blakley, S. 2006. *Myth, Ritual, and Metallurgy in Ancient Greece and Recent Africa*. Cambridge.
- Bliquez, L.J. 2014. *The Tools of Asklepios. Surgical Instruments in Graeco-Roman Times*. Studies in Ancient Medicine 43. Leiden.
- Boardman, J. 1994. *Greeks Overseas: Their Colonies and Trade*. London.
- Bodel, J. and Oylan, S. eds. 2008. *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity. The Ancient World: Comparative Histories*. Malden.
- Böck, B. 2013. *The Healing Goddess Gula*. Leiden.
- Boedecker, D. 2008. "Family Matters: Domestic Religion in Classical Greece," in Bodel and Oylan: 229-47.
- Bolton, J.D.P. 1962. *Aristeas of Proconnesus*. Oxford.
- Bolton, L. 2015. "Patience for the Little Patient: The Infant in Soranus' *Gynaecia*," in Petridou and Thumiger: 265-84.
- Bonnechère, P. 2003. *Trophonius de Lébadée. Cultes et Mythes d'un Cité Béotienne au Miroir de la Mentalité Antique*. Leiden.
- Bonnet, C. 1988. Melqart. *Cultes et Mythes de l'Héraclès tyrien en Méditerranée*. Studia Phoenica VIII. Namur-Louvain.
- . 2013. "Individualization as an Historical Trend in the Religion of Phoenician Cities in Hellenistic times," in Rüpke J. ed. *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.: 41-57.
- Boorse, C. 1977. "Health as a theoretical concept," *Philosophy of Science* 44 (5): 542–573.
- . 2011. "Concepts of Health and Disease," in *Philosophy of Medicine*, ed. Gifford, F. Oxford: 13-64.

- Borghouts, J.F. 1978. *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*. Leiden.
- Boshnakova, A. 2007. "Hermeneutics of the Archaeological Artifact: Destruction and Reconstruction of the Lost Meaning," in K.Boshnakov ed. *Jubilaeus VI. Sbornik v pamet na Karel i Hermenegild Škorpil*. Sofia.: 51-102.
- Bourdieu, P. 1976. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. trans. Nice, R. Cambridge.
- . 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power," *Sociological Theory* 7(1): 14-25.
- Bowie, A.M. 1996. *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy*. Cambridge.
- Braund, D. ed. 2005. *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (sixth century BC - first century AD)*. Exeter.
- . 2007. "Ethnic, Religious, Economic, and Political Interactions in the region of Olbia 600-100 BC," in Braund and Kryzickij: 37-78.
- . 2008. "Scythian Laughter, Conversations in the Northern Black Sea Region in the 5th Century BC," in Bilde et al.: 347-68.
- Braund, D. and Kryzickij S.D. eds. 2007. *Classical Olbia and the Scythian World*. Oxford.
- Bravo, J. 2004. "Heroic Epiphanies: Narrative, Visual, and Cultic Contexts," *ICS* 29: 63-84.
- Breem, K. 2013. *A World Full of Signs: Ancient Greek Divination in Context*. Leiden.
- Bremmer, J. 1983. "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," *HSCP* 87: 299-320.
- . 2002. "How Old is the Ideal of Holiness (Of Mind) in the Epidaurian Temple Inscription and the Hippocratic Oath?" *ZPE* 141:106-108.
- Broodbank, C. 2013. *Making of the Middle Sea: A History of the Mediterranean from the Beginning to the Emergence of the Classical World*. Oxford.
- Bryce, T. 2002. *Life and Society in the Hittite World*. Oxford.
- . 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford.
- Buemer, M. 2016. "Hygieia, Identity, Cult and Reception," *Kleio-Historia* 3: 1-21.
- Bujskikh, S.B. 2007. "Der Achilleus-Kult und die griechische Kolonisation des unteren Bug-Gebiets," in Bresson, A. ed. *Une koinè pontique: cités grecques, sociétés indigènes et*

- empires mondiaux sur le littoral nord de la mer Noire (VIIe s. a.C.-IIe s. p.C.).*
 Bordeaux: 201-13.
- Bundrick, S. 2014. "Selling Sacrifice on Classical Athenian Vases," *Hesperia* 83(4): 653-708.
- Burford, A. 1969. *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros: A Social and Economic Study of Building in the Asklepien Sanctuary, during the Fourth and Early Third Centuries B.C.* Toronto.
- Burkert, W. 1972. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism.* Cambridge, Ma.
- . 1975. "Apellai und Apollon," *Rheinisches Museum* 118: 1-21.
- . 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: the Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Archaic Period.* Cambridge, Ma.
- . 1994. "Olbia and Apollo of Didyma: A New Oracle Text," in Solomon, J. ed. *Apollo Origins and Influences.* Tucson: 49-60.
- . 2004. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: The Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture.* Cambridge, Ma.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* London.
- . 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex.* London.
- Buxton, R. ed. 2000. *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion.* Oxford.
- Calame, C. 1997. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece. Their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Function.* orig. pub. 1977. trans. D.B. Collins and J. Orion. Lanham.
- Callard, F. and Fitzgerald, D. 2015. *Rethinking Interdisciplinarity across the Social Sciences and Neurosciences.* London.
- Cartledge, P. 2002. *A Regional History of Sparta.* 2nd ed. London.
- Cavanaugh, M.B. 1998. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion, and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.* Atlanta.
- Chaniotis, C. 1995. "Illness and Cures in the Propitiatory Inscriptions and Dedications of Lydia and Phrygia," in van der Eijk et. al.: 323-44.

- . 2010. “Dynamic of Emotion and Dynamic of Rituals: Do Emotions Change Ritual Norms?” in Brosius, C. and Hüsken, U. eds. *Ritual Matters: Dynamic Dimensions in Practice*. London 2010: 208-233.
- Chiasson, C. 2001. “Scythian Androgyny and Environmental Determinism in Herodotus and the Hippocratic *περὶ ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων*,” *Syllecta Classica* 12: 33-73.
- Cilliers, L. and P. Retief. 2013. “Dream Healing in Asclepieia in the Mediterranean,” in Oberhelman: 69-92.
- Clark, R. J. 1968. “Trophonius, the Manner of his Revelation,” *AJP* 99: 63-75.
- Clark, M. 2012. *Exploring Greek Myth*. Malden, Ma.
- Clay, J.S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus*. Princeton.
- Clifford, R.J. 1990. “Phoenician Religion,” *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research*.
- Clinton, K. 1992. *Myth and Cult: the Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Stockholm.
- . 1994. “The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asklepios in Athens,” in Hägg: 17-34.
- Cohen, J. 2015. *Stone: an Ecology of the Inhuman*. Minneapolis.
- Cohen, R. and R. Westbrook. 2000. *Amarna Diplomacy: The Beginnings of International Relations*. Baltimore.
- Cohn-Haft, L. 1956. *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece*. Northampton, MA.
- Cole, S. 1988. “The Uses of Water in Ancient Greek Sanctuaries,” in Hägg, R., Marinatos, N., and Nordquist, G. eds. *Early Greek Cult Practice*. Stockholm.: 161-65.
- . 2004. *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience*. Berkeley.
- Coleman, S. and Elsner, J. eds. 2002. *Pilgrim Voices: Narrative and Authorship in Christian Pilgrimage*. London.
- Collins B.J. 1990. “The Puppy in Hittite Ritual,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42(2): 211-26.
- Collins, D. 2008. *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*. London.
- Connolly, A. 1998. “Was Sophocles Heroised as Dexion?” *JHS* 188: 1-21.

- Connor, W.R. 1988. "Seized by Nymphs: Nympholepsy and Symbolic Expression in Classical Greece," *CA* 7(2): 155-89.
- Conrad, I., Neve, M., Nutton, V., and Wear, A. eds. 1995. *The Western Medical Tradition 800 BC-1800 AD*. Cambridge.
- Cook, H. J. 2005a. *Matters of Exchange: Commerce, Medicine, and Science in the Dutch Golden Age*. New Haven.
- . 2005b. "Global Economies and Local Knowledge in the East Indies: Jacobus Bontius Learns the Facts of Nature," in Swan, C. and L. Schiebinger. eds. *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*. Philadelphia: 100-118.
- Corner, S. 2010. "Transcendent Drinking: the Symposium at Sea Reconsidered," *CQ* 60: 352-75.
- Cosmopoulos, M. 2001. *The Rural History of Ancient Greek City-States: The Oropos Survey Project*. Oxford.
- Craddock, S. 2000. *City of Plagues: Disease, Poverty, and Deviance in San Francisco*. Minneapolis.
- Craik, E. M. 1998. *Hippocrates: Places in Man*. Oxford.
- . 2001. "Thucydides on the Plague: Physiology of Flux and Fixation," *CQ* 51:102-108.
- . 2015. *The Hippocratic Corpus: Content and Context*. London.
- Croissant, F. 1990. s.v. "Hygieia," in *LIMC* 5: 544-72.
- Damyonov, M. 2012. "Two Decades of Archaeological Research in Apollonia Pontica (Sozopol, Bulgaria), AIA 112th Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, January 5-8, 2012.
- Daston, L. and Galison, P. 2009. *Objectivity*. New York.
- Day, L.J. 1984. "Dog Burials in the Greek World," *AJA* 88(1): 21-32.
- Dean-Jones, L. 1994. *Women's Bodies in Classical Greek Science*. Oxford.
- Dean-Jones, L. and Rosen, R. eds. 2016. *Ancient Concepts of the Hippocratic: Papers Presented at the XIIIth International Hippocrates Colloquium Austin, Texas*. Leiden.

- Demetriou, D. 2012. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: the Archaic and Classical Greek Multicultural Emporia*. Cambridge.
- Demoulin, H. 1979. *Epiménide de Crète*. New York.
- Deubner, L. 1932. *Attische Feste*. Berlin.
- Dignas, B. 2002. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- . 2008. “A Day in the Life of a Greek Sanctuary,” in Ogden, D. ed. *A Companion to Greek Religion*. London: 163-77.
- Dillon, M. P. J. 1994. “The Didactic Nature of the Epidaurian Iamata,” *ZPE* 101: 239-260.
- . 1997. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*. London.
- Dodds, E. R. 1973. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Domansnkij, J, and Marcenko K. 2006. “Towards Determining the Chief Function of the Settlement of Borysthenes,” in Bilde et al.: 29-36.
- Dontcheva, I. 2002. “Le syncrétisme d’Asclépios avec le Cavalier Thrace,” *Kernos* 15: 317-324.
- Douglas, M. 1968. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London.
- Dow, S. 1970. “Attische Feste, the Epidauria and the Arkhon,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 113: 273-76.
- . 1985. “The Cult of the Hero Doctor,” *BAmSocP* 22: 33-47.
- Draycott, J. ed. 2017. *Bodies of Evidence: Ancient Anatomical Votives, Past, Present and Future*. New York.
- Dugas, C. 1921. “Le sanctuaire d’Aléa Athéna à Tégée avant le IVe siècle,” *BCH* 45: 389.
- Dunbar, H. 1883. *A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes*. Oxford.
- Dunst, G. 1968. “Ein samischer Fiebergott,” *ZPE* 3: 149-53.
- Edelstein, E.J., and Edelstein, L. 1945. *Asclepius: Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. Baltimore.

- Edelstein, L. 1967. *Ancient Medicine: Selected Papers of Ludwig Edelstein*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edmunds, R. 1999. "Tearing Apart the Zagreus Myth: A Few Disparaging Remarks on Orphism and Original Sin," *CA* 18(1): 35-73.
- Edwards, M. 1997. "Constructions of Physical Disability in the Ancient Greek World: the Community Concept," in Mitchell, D., Snyder, S. eds. *The Body and Physical Difference: Discourses of Disability*. Ann Arbor: 35-50.
- Ehrhardt, N. 1983. *Milet und seine Kolonien*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Ehrenheim, H. 2011. "Greek Incubation Rituals in Classical and Hellenistic Times," diss. Stockholm University.
- van der Eijk, Horstmanhoff, P. and Schrijvers, H. F. J. eds. 1995. *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*. vols. 1-2. Amsterdam.
- van der Eijk, P. 1990. "The Theology of the Hippocratic Treatise on the *Sacred Disease*." *Apeiron* 23: 87-119.
- . 1991. "'Airs, Waters, Places' and 'On the Sacred Disease': Two Different Religiosities?" *Hermes* 119: 168-176.
- . 2004. "Divination, Prognosis and Prophylaxis: The Hippocratic Work 'On Dreams' (*De victu* 4) and its Near Eastern Background", in Horstmanhoff and Stol: 187-218.
- . ed. 2005. *Hippocrates in Context*. Amsterdam.
- . 2016. "On 'Hippocratic' and 'Non-Hippocratic' Medical Writings," in Dean-Jones and Rosen: 17-47.
- Ekroth, G. 2002. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero Cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic Periods*. *Kernos* Suppl. 12. Liège.
- Eliade, M. 1972. *Zalmoxis: The Vanishing God*. trans. Trask, W. Chicago.
- Elsner, J., and Rutherford, I. 2005. *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods*. Oxford.

- Engelhardt T. 1976. "Ideology and Etiology," *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*: 26(6): 256-68.
- Ereshefsky, M. 2009. "Defining 'Health' and 'Disease'", *Studies in the History of Biology and Biomedical Science*, 40: 221-7.
- Fachard, S. 2013. "Eleutherai as the Gates to Boeotia," in Fachard, S. and Brélaz, C. eds. *Pratiques militaires et art de la guerre dans le monde grec antique. Études offertes à Pierre Ducrey à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire*. Paris: 81-106.
- Faraone, C. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual*. Oxford.
- . 2003. "Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis," in Dodd, D. and Faraone, C. eds. *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*. London: 43-69.
- . 2008. "Household Religion in Ancient Greece," in Bodel and Oylan: 210-34.
- . 2011. "A Tradition of Dactylic Paeans to Apollo and Asclepius: Choral Degeneration or a Flexible System of Non-Strophic Dactyls?" *Mnemosyne* 64: 202-31.
- Faraone, C. and Obbink, D. eds. 2013. *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic, and Mystery in Ancient Selinous*. Oxford.
- Fearn, D. 2003. "Mapping Phleious: politics and myth-making in Bacchylides 9," *CQ* 53(2): 347-67.
- Fehr, B. 2014. "Socio-Historical Approaches," in Marconi, C. ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture*. Oxford: 579-601.
- Feldman, M. 2006. *Diplomacy by Design: Luxury Arts and an "International Style" in the Ancient Near East, 1400-1200 BCE*. Chicago.
- . 2015. *Communities of Style: Portable Luxury Arts, Identity, and Collective Memory in the Iron Age Levant*. Chicago.
- Flemming, R. 2013. "The Invention of Infertility in the Classical Greek World: Medicine, Divinity, Gender," *Bull. Hist. Med.* 87(4): 565-90.
- Flower, M. 2008. *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.

- Ford, A. 2006. "The Genre of Genres: Paeans and Paian in Early Greek Poetry," *Poetica* 38(3): 277-95.
- . 2013. "Poetics of Dithyramb," in Kowalzig, B. and Wilson, P. eds. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: 313-331.
- Forsén, B. 1996. *Griechische Gliederweihungen. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrer Typologie und ihrer religions- und sozialgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*. Helsinki.
- Foucault, M. 1973. *Birth of the Clinic*. London.
- . 1975. *Discipline and Punish*. London.
- Frederiksen, R. 2011. *Greek City Walls of the Archaic Period, 900-480 BC*. Oxford.
- Friese, W. 2013. "'Through the Double Gates of Sleep' (Verg. *Aen.* 6.236): Cave Oracles in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," in Mavridis, F., and Jensen, J. eds. *Stable Places, Changing Perceptions: Cave Archaeology in Greece*. Oxford.
- Frontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle, its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*. Berkeley.
- Furley, W. and J. Bremmer. 2002. *Greek Hymns*. Vols I-II. Tübingen.
- Gadamer, H.G. 1996. *The Enigma of Health*. Stanford.
- Garner, S. 2006. "Artaud, Germ Theory, and the Theater of Contagion," *Theater Journal* 58: 1-14.
- Garland, R. 1987. *The Piraeus: From the Fifth to the First Century BC*. Ithaca.
- . 1992. *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. Ithaca.
- van der Geest, S. 1991. "Marketplace Conversation in Cameroon: How and Why Popular Medical Knowledge Comes into Being," *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry* 15: 69-90.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York.
- Geller, J.M. 2004: "East Meets West: Early Greek and Babylonian Diagnosis," in Horstmanshoff and van der Eijk: 11-62.
- . 2007. "Phlegm and Breath—Babylonian Contributions to Hippocratic Medicine" in Finkel and Geller. eds. *Disease in Babylonia*. Leiden: 187-199.

- . 2014. *Science Technology and Medicine in Ancient Cultures*, Vol. 2. Berlin.
- Gerber, D. E. 1988. “The Measure of Bacchus, Euenus Fr. 2 West,” *Mnemosyne* 41: 39-45.
- Gesler, W. and R. Kearns. 2002. *Culture/Place/Health*. London.
- Ghalioungui, P. 1983. *The Physicians of Pharaonic Egypt*. Berkeley.
- Giannakopoulos, G., Kissas, K., Lehner, M., Scherrer, P., Spyrali, Z., and Tausend, K. 2012. “Pheneos – Bericht zur ersten Grabungs- und Surveykampagne im August 2011,” *ÖJh* 81: 51-65.
- Gilmour, G. 1997. “The Nature and Function of Astragalus Bones,” *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 16: 167-175.
- Ginouvès, R. 1955. “Chronique de fouilles de découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1953,” *BCH* 78: 173.
- . 1962. *Balaneutikè: Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*. Paris.
- Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Goldhill, S. 1990. “The Great City Dionysia and Civic Ideology,” in Winkler and Zeitlin: 97-129.
- . 2002. “Smashing Bodies: The Corinthian Tydeus and Ismene Amphora (Louvre E640),” in Porter: 19-49.
- Good, B. 1993. *Medicine, Rationality, Experience*. Cambridge.
- Gorman, V. 2001. *Miletos. The Ornament of Ionia: A History of the City to 400 B.C.E.* Ann Arbor.
- Gorrini, M.E. 2005. “The Hippocratic Impact on Healing Cults: The Archeological Evidence in Attica,” in van der Eijk: 135-56.
- Gorrini, M.E. and M. Melfi. 2002. “L’archéologie des cultes guérisseurs: Quelques observations,” *Kernos* 15: 247-265.
- Gourevitch, D. 1984. *Le triangle hippocratique dans le monde gréco-romain : le malade, sa maladie et son médecin*. Rome.
- Graf, F. 1979. “Apollon Delphinios,” *Museum Helveticum* 36: 2-22.

- . 1980. “Milch, Honig und Wein. Zum Verständnis der Libation im griechischen Ritual,” *Perennitas. Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich*. Rome: 209-221.
- . 1992a. “Heiligtum und Ritual: Das Beispiel der griechisch-römischen Asklepieia,” in Schachter: 159-203.
- . 1992b. “An Oracle Against Pestilence from a Western Anatolian Town,” *ZPE* 92: 267-79.
- . 2005. “Rolling the Dice for an Answer,” in Johnston, S.I., and Struck, P. eds. *Mantike: Studies in Ancient Divination*. Leiden: 51-97.
- . 2008. *Apollo. Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World*. London.
- Grafton, A. 1992. *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery*. Cambridge, Ma.
- Greaves, A. 2004. “The Cult of Aphrodite in Miletos and its Colonies,” *Anatolian Studies*, 54: 27-33.
- . 2007. “Milesians in the Black Sea: Population, Trade and Religion,” in Gabrielsen, V. and Lund, J. eds. *The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*. Aarhus: 9-22.
- . 2010. *The Land of Ionia: Society and Economy in the Archaic Period*. Malden.
- . 2012. “Divination at Archaic Branchidai-Didyma,” *Hesperia* 81: 177-206.
- Green, M. ed. 2014. *The Medieval Globe: Pandemic Disease in the Medieval World: Rethinking the Black Death*. Michigan.
- Griffin, A. 1982. *Sikyon*. Oxford.
- Grottanelli, C. 1983. “Healers and Saviours of the Eastern Mediterranean in Preclassical Times,” in Bianchi, U. and Vermaseren, M. J. eds. *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero Romano*. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale su La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero Romano. Roma 24-28 settembre 1979. Leiden: 649-70.
- Hägg, R. ed. 1994. *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*. Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 November 1991. Stockholm.

- Haider, P. 2001. "Minoan Deities in an Egyptian Medical Text," *Aegeum* 22.
- Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hall, J. 1995. "How Argive was the "Argive" Heraion: The Political and Cultic Geography of the Argive Plain 900-400 BC," *AJA* 99(4): 577-613.
- . 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- . 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago.
- . 2007. *A History of the Archaic Greek World*. London.
- . 2014. *Artifact and Artifice: Classical Archaeology and the Ancient Historian*. Chicago.
- Halpern, B. 2000. "The Canine Conundrum of Ashkelon: A Classical Connection?" in Stager, L. E., Greene, J. A., and Coogan, M. D. eds. *The Archaeology of Jordan and Beyond: Essays in Honor of James A Sauer*. Winona Lake.
- Hankinson, R.J. 1998. "Magic, Religion and Science: Divine and Human in the Hippocratic Corpus," *Apeiron* 31: 1-34.
- Hanson, M.H., Nielsen, T.H., and Rubenstein, L. eds. 2000. *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History*. Aarhus.
- Hardy, G. and Totelin, L. 2016. *Ancient Botany*. London.
- Harris, C.R.C. 1973. *The Heart and the Vascular System in Ancient Greek Medicine: from Alcmaeon to Galen*. Oxford.
- Harris, W.V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Ma.
- . ed. 2009. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, Ma.
- Hart, G.D. 1966. "Ancient Coins and Medicine," *Canadian Medical Association* 94(2): 77-89.
- Haubold, J. 2013. *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature*. Cambridge.
- Hartigan, K. 2009. *Performance and Cure: Drama and Healing in Ancient Greece and Contemporary America*. London.
- Hedreen, G. 1991. "The Cult of Achilles in the Euxine," *Hesperia* 60(3): 313-30.

- Heeßel, N. 2000. *Babylonisch-assyrische Diagnostik*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 43. Münster.
- Heinrichs, A. 2007. "Writing Religion: Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority, and the Religious Discourse of the Polis," in Yunis, H. ed. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: 38-58.
- Herzog, R. 1931. *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion*. *Philologus*, suppl. 22.3. Leipzig.
- Hind, J.G.F. 2007. "City Heads/Personifications and Omens from Zeus (the Coins of Sinope, Istria and Olbia in the V-IV Centuries BCE)," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 167: 9-22.
- Hobden, F. 2013. *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge.
- Hodkinson, S. 1999. "An Agonistic Culture? Athletic Competition in Archaic and Classical Spartan Society," in Hodkinson, S. and Powell, A. eds. *Sparta: New Perspectives*. London: 147-87.
- Holmes, B. 2010a. "Marked Bodies (Gender, Race, Class, Age, Disability, Disease)," in Garrison, D. ed. *Cultural History of the Human Body*, Vol. 1. Oxford.
- . 2010b. *The Symptom and the Subject: The Emergence of the Physical Body in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
- . 2013. "In Strange Lands: Disembodied Authority and the Physician Role in the Hippocratic Corpus and Beyond," in Asper, M. ed. *Writing Science: Medical and Mathematical Authorship in Ancient Greece*. Berlin: 431-72.
- Horden, P. 2008. *Hospitals and Healing from Antiquity to the Later Middle Ages*. Burlington.
- Horden, P., and Purcell, N. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea*. London.
- Horden, P., and Smith, R. eds. 1998. *The Locus of Care: Families, Communities, and Institutions in the Provision of Care Since Antiquity*. London.
- Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides*. vol 1. Books I-III. Oxford.
- Horstmanshoff, H. F. J. 2004. "Did the God Learn Medicine? Asklepios and Temple Medicine in Aelius Aristides' *Sacred Tales*," in Horstmanshoff and Stol: 324-42.

- Horstmanshoff, H. F. J., and Stol, M. eds. 2004. *Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine. Studies in Ancient Medicine 27*. Leiden.
- Hughes, J. 2008. "Fragmentation as Metaphor in the Classical Healing Sanctuary," *Social History of Medicine* 21(2): 217-36.
- . 2017. *Votive Body Parts in Greek and Roman Religion*. Cambridge.
- Hurwitt, J. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic to the Present*. Cambridge.
- Israelowich, I. 2012. *Society, Medicine, and Religion in the Sacred Tales of Aelius Aristides*. Leiden.
- . 2015. *Patients and Healers in the High Roman Empire*. Baltimore.
- Iversen, E. 1939. "Papyrus Carlsberg No. VIII, with Remarks on the Egyptian Origin of some Popular Birth Prognoses" in Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. ed. *Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* 26/5. Copenhagen: 21-22.
- Jameson, M. 1969. "Excavations at Porto Cheli and Vicinity: Preliminary Report I: Halies 1962-68," *Hesperia* 38(3): 311-42.
- . 1974. "The Excavation of a Drowned Greek Temple," *Scientific American* 231: 110-19.
- . "The Submerged Sanctuary of Apollo at Halieis in the Argolid of Greece," *National Geographic Society Reports* 14: 363-67.
- Jameson, M., Runnels, C. N., and van Andel, T. H. 1994. *A Greek Countryside: The Southern Argolid from Prehistory to the Present Day*. Stanford.
- Jenner, M.S. and P. Wallis. eds. 2007. *Medicine and the Market in England and Its Colonies c. 1450-1850*. New York.
- Johnson, S.I. 2013. "Myth and the Getty Hexameters," in Faraone and Obbink: 121-56.
- Jones, C.P. 1987. "Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," *JRS* 77: 139-55.
- Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*. Paris.
- Jouanna, J. 1989. "Hippocrate de Cos et le sacré." *Journal des Savants*, January-June. 3-22.

- . 1999. *Hippocrates*. Trans. by M.B. DeBevoise. Baltimore.
- . 2010. *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen. Selected Papers*. Leiden.
- Kadletz, E. 1978. "The Cult of Apollo Deiradiotes," *TAPA* 108: 93-101.
- Kaltsas, N. 2002. *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum, Athens*. trans. Hardy D. Los Angeles.
- Käppel, L. 1992. *Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 37. Berlin.
- Kearns, E. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica*. London.
- . 1994. "Cakes in Greek Sacrifice Regulations," in Hägg: 65-70.
- Kelly, T. 1977. *A History of Argos to 500 BC*. Minneapolis.
- Kerényi, K. 1959. *Asklepios: Archetypal Image of the Physicians' Existence*. Athens.
- Kindt, J. 2012. *Rethinking Greek Religion*. Cambridge.
- King, H. 1998. *Hippocrates' Women: Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece*. London.
- . 2002. "Chronic Pain and the Creation of Narrative," in Porter: 269-86.
- . ed. 2005. *Health in Antiquity*. London.
- Kissas, K. 2011. "Neue Forschungen in der antiken Stadt Pheneos/Peloponnes," *ÖJh* 80: 155-166.
- Kleinman, A. 1980. *Patients and Healers in the Context of Culture: An Exploration of the Borderland Between Anthropology, Medicine, and Psychiatry*. Berkeley.
- . 1988. *The Illness Narratives: Suffering, Healing, and the Human Condition*. New York.
- Klöckner, A. 2010. "Getting in Contact: Concepts of Human-Divine Encounter in Classical Greek Art," in Bremmer, J., and Erskine, A. eds. *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations*. Edinburgh: 106-125.

- Knox, B. 1957. *Oedipus at Thebes: Sophocles' Tragic Hero and His Time*. New Haven.
- Kolde, A. 2003. *Politique et Religion chez Isyllos d'Épidaure*. Basel.
- Konstan, D., and Dillon, M. 1981. "The Ideology of Aristophanes' Wealth," *AJP* 102: 371-394.
- Körte, A. 1896. "Die Ausgrabungen am Westabhang der Akropolis IV." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 21: 276-332.
- Kosak, J. 2002. "The *polis nosoussa*," in Hope, V. and E. Marshall. eds. *Death and Disease in the Ancient City*. London: 35-54.
- . 2004. *Heroic Measures. Hippocratic Medicine and the Making of Euripidean Tragedy*. Leiden.
- Kousoulis, P. and K. Magliveras. eds. 2007. *Moving Across Borders: Foreign Relations, Religion and Cultural Interactions in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Leuven.
- Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performance of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Oxford.
- . 2013. "Dancing Dolphins on the Wine-Dark Sea: Dithyramb and Social Change in the Archaic Mediterranean," in Wilson, P. and Kowalzig, B. eds. *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford: 31-58.
- Kraut, A. 1995. *Silent Travelers: Germs, Genes, and the Immigrant Menace*. Baltimore.
- . 2010. "Immigration, Ethnicity, and the Pandemic." *Public Health Reports* 125(3): 123-33.
- Kranz, P. 2010. *Hygieia—Die Frau an Asklepios' Seite*. Untersuchungen zu Darstellung und Funktion in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit unter Einbeziehung der Gestalt des Asklepios. Athens.
- Kryzickij S.D. 2003. "Olbia," in Grammenos, D.V. and Petropoulos, E.K. eds. *Ancient Greek Colonies in the Black Sea*. vol 1. Thessaloniki: 389-505.
- . 2007. "Criteria for the Presence of Barbarians in the Population of Early Olbia," in Braund and Kryzickij.
- Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold: The Politics of meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton.

- Kutsch, F. 1913. *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen*. Giessen.
- Labrinoudakis, V. 1980. "Staatskult und Geschichte der Stadt Epidauros." *Archaiaignosia* 1: 39-63.
- . 1990. "Un réfugié argien à Épidaure au Ve siècle avant J.C.," *CRAI*: 174-85.
- . 2002. "Conservation and Research. New Evidence on a Long Living Cult. The Sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas and Asklepios at Epidauros," in Stamatapoulou, M. and Yeroulanou, M. eds. *Excavating Classical Culture. Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*. Oxford. 213-24.
- Lackoff, G. and M. Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. 2nd ed. Chicago.
- Lamont, J. 2015. "Asklepios in the Piraeus and the Mechanisms of Cult Appropriation," in Miles: 37-50.
- Lang, M. 1977. *Cure and Cult in Ancient Corinth: A Guide to the Asklepieion*. Athens.
- Lang, P. 2012. *Medicine and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Leiden.
- Langholf, V. 1990. *Medical Theories in Hippocrates: Early Texts and the Epidemics*. Berlin.
- . 2011. *Medical Theories in Hippocrates*. Leiden.
- Laroche, E. 1973. "Un synrétisme gréco-anatolien: Sandas=Hékaklès," in Laroche, E. ed. *Les syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine*. Besançon: 103-114.
- Larson, J. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults*. Madison.
- Laskaris, J. 2002. *The Art is Long: On the Sacred Disease and the Scientific Tradition*. Leiden.
- Laquer, T. 1990. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, Ma.
- Lawton, C. 2015. "Asklepios and Hygieia in the City Eleusinion," in Miles: 25-36.
- Lederberg, I. 2003. "Of Men and Microbes," *Frontiers of the New Century*, Summer: 53-55.
- Lefantzis, M., and Jensen, J. T. 2009. "The Athenian Asklepieion on the South Side of the Akropolis: Early Development c. 420-360," in Jensen, J.T., Hinge, G., Schultz, P., and

- Wickkiser, B. eds. *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult: Context, Ritual and Iconography*. Aarhus: 91-124.
- Lennox, J.G. 1995. "Health as an Objective Value," *Journal of Medical Philosophy*, 20 (4): 499-515.
- Letts, M. 2015. "Questioning the Patient, Questioning Hippocrates: Rufus of Ephesus and the Pursuit of Knowledge," in Petridou and Thumiger: 81-103.
- Leven, K. H. 1993. "Miasma und Metadosis—antike Vorstellungen von Ansteckung," *Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte* 11: 44-73.
- LeVen, P. 2014. *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Leventi, I. 2003. *Hygieia in Classical Greek Art*. Oxford.
- Liapis, V. 2011. "The Thracian Cult of Rhesus and the Heros Equitans," *Kernos* 24: 95-104.
- LiDonnici, L.R. 1995. *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Atlanta.
- Lipinksi, E. 1995. *Dieux et déesses de l'univers phénicien et punique*. Leuven.
- . 2009. *Resheph: A Syrio-Canaanite Deity*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*. Leuven.
- Lissarrague, F. 1990. *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of wine and Ritual*, trans. A. Szegedy Maszak. Princeton.
- Lloyd, G.E.R. 1966. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argument in Early Greek Thought*. Cambridge.
- . 1975. "Alcmaeon and the Early History of Dissection," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 59(2): 113-147.
- . 1979. *Magic, Reason, and Experience: Studies in the origin and development of Greek Science*. Cambridge.
- . 1983. *Science, Folklore, and Ideology: Studies in the Life Sciences in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- . 1991. *Methods and Problems in Greek Science*. Cambridge.

- . 2003. *In the Grip of Disease*. Cambridge.
- Lolos, Y. 2005. “The Sanctuary of Titane and the City of Sikyon,” *ABSA* 100: 275-98.
- . 2011. *Land of Sikyon*. Athens.
- Longo, V. 1991. “I segreti del tempio di Asclepio in Epidaurio,” *Atti della Accademia Ligure di Scienze e Lettere* 48: 437-46.
- Longrigg, J. 1993. *Greek Rational Medicine: Philosophy and Medicine from Alcmeon to the Alexandrians*. London.
- Lonsdale, S.J. 1979. “Attitudes Towards Animals in Ancient Greece,” *G&R* 26(2): 146-159.
- Lupu, E. 2003. “Sacrifice at the Amphiareion and a Fragmentary Sacred Law from Oropos,” *Hesperia* 72 (3): 321-40.
- . 2004. *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents (NGSL). Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 152*. Leiden.
- MacGillivray, J.A., J.M Driessen, and L.H. Sacket 2000. *The Palaikastro Kouros: A Minoan Chryselephantine Statuette and its Aegean Bronze Age Context*. London.
- Maclachlan, B. 1993. *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry*. Princeton.
- MacLeod, C. 1983. *Collected Essays*. Oxford.
- Makres, A. 2009. “Unpublished Ephebic List in the Benakion Museum of Kalamata,” in Mitchell, L. and Rubinstein, L. eds. *Greek History and Epigraphy: Essays in Honor of P.J. Rhodes*. Swansea: 185-200.
- Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden.
- . 2011. *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Mann, J. 2012. *Hippocrates: On the Art of Medicine*. Leiden.
- Marinatos, N., and Hägg, R. eds. 1993. *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*. London.
- Martha, J. 1879. “Inscriptions du Péloponnèse,” *BCH* 3: 191-2.
- Martin, R. 1948. “Les enceints de Gortys d’Arcadie,” *BCH* 71-2: 81-147.

- Martin, R. and Metzger, H. 1941. "Chronique de Fouilles: Gortys," *BCH* 64-5: 274-86.
- . 1976. *La religion grecque*. Paris.
- Martzavou, P. 2012. "Dream Narrative, and Construction of Hope in the 'Healing Miracles' of Epidauros," in Chaniotis, A. ed. *Unveiling the Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*. Stuttgart: 172-199.
- Mastroncinque, A. 2008. "The Cilician God Sandas and the Greek Chimaera: Features of Near Eastern and Greek Mythology Concerning the Plague," *JANER* 7(2): 197-219.
- Mayor, A., Colarusso, J., and Saunders, D. 2014. "Making Sense of Nonsense Inscriptions Associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian Vases," *Hesperia* 83: 447-93.
- McK. Camp II. 2000. "Walls and the Polis," in Hansen et al.: 41-58.
- McInerney, J. 2006. "On the Border: Sacred Land and the Margins of the Community," in Rosen and Sluiter: 33-61.
- . 2010. *The Cattle of the Sun: Cows and Culture in the World of the Ancient Greeks*. Princeton.
- . 2014. "The Gods of (Con)fusion: Athena Alea, Apollo Maleatas, and Athena Aphaia," *Classica et Medievalia* 64: 51-72.
- McNeil, W. 1976. *Plagues and Peoples*. New York.
- Meier, S. A. 2007. "Transporting Deities Across International Boundaries," in Kousoulis, P. and K. Magliveras: 185-208.
- Melfi, M. 2007. *I Santuari di Asclepio in Grecia*. Vol. 1. Rome.
- . 2010. "Ritual Spaces and Performances in the Asklepieia of Roman Greece," *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 105: 317-38.
- Meuli, K. 1935. "Scythica," *Hermes* 70: 121-67.
- Meyer, C. 2013. *Greco-Scythian Art and the Birth of Eurasia*. Oxford.
- Mikalson, J. 1984. "Religion and the Plague in Athens, 431-23 B.C." in Boegehold ed. *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday*. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 10. Durham: 117-25.

- . 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley.
- . 2010. *Greek Religion*. Princeton.
- Miles, M. 2015. ed. *Autopsy in Athens: Recent Archaeological Research on Athens and Attica*. Oxford and Philadelphia.
- Mili, M. 2015. *Religion and Society in Ancient Thessaly*. Oxford.
- Mitchell-Boyask, R. 2008. *Plague and the Athenian Imagination*. Cambridge.
- Mitropoulou, E. 2001. Λατρεία Ασκληπιού και Υγείας στην Αρκαία—*The Worship of Asklepios and Hygieia in Arkadia*. Athens.
- Moreno, A. 2007. *Feeding the Democracy: the Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*. Oxford.
- Morris, C., and Peatfield, A. 2014. “Health and Healing on Cretan Bronze Age Peak Sanctuaries,” in Michaelides: 54-63.
- Morris, I. 2008. “The Greater Athenian State,” in Morris, I. and Scheidel, W. eds. *The Dynamics of Ancient Empires: State Power from Assyria to Byzantium*. Oxford.: 99-177.
- Moschakis, K. 2013. “Healing gods : the cult of Apollo Iatros, Asclepius and Hygieia in the Black Sea Region,” masters thesis, International Hellenic University.
- Moyer, I. 2006. “Golden Fetters and Economies of Cultural Exchange,” *JANER* 6: 225-59.
- . 2011. *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*. Cambridge.
- Müller, H. 2010. “Ein Kultverein von Asklepiasten bei einem Attalidischen Phrourion im Yüntdag,” *Chiron* 40(1): 427-438.
- Münnich, M. 2013. *The God Resheph in the Ancient Near East*. Tübingen.
- Muratov, M. 2015. “Greek Religion in the Northern Black Sea: The Case of the Bosporan Kingdom,” in Eidinow, E. and Kindt, J. eds. *Oxford Handbook of Greek Religion*. Oxford: 589-602.
- Murray, O. 1990. *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford.
- . 2009. “Symptotic Culture,” in Raaflaub, K. and van Wees H. eds. *Blackwell's Companion to Archaic Greece*. London: 508-524.

- Musitelli, S. 1980. "The Meaning of ΦΩΛΑΡΧΟΣ," *PP* 193: 241-57.
- Mussche H.F., Bingen J., Servais J., Paepe R., Bussers H., Gasche H. 1971. *Thorikos 1968. Rapport préliminaire sur la cinquième campagne de fouilles. Voorlopig verslag over de vijfde opgravingscampagne*. Brussels.
- Naiden, F. 2005. "Hiketai and Theoroi at Epidauros," in Elsner and Rutherford: 73-95.
- Neils, J. 1992. "The Morgantina Phormiskos," *AJA* 96 (2): 225-35.
- Nelson, E. 2005. "Coan Prenotions and the Authorship of the Presbeutikos," in van der Eijk: 209-236.
- . 2007. "Hippocrates, Heraclids, and the 'Kings of the Heracleidai': Adaptations of Asclepiad History by the Author of the "Presbeutikos," *Phoenix* 61(3): 234-46.
- . 2016. "Tracking the Hippocratic Woozle: Pseudepigrapha and the Formation of the Corpus," in Dean-Jones and Rosen: 117-140.
- Nijhuis, K. 1995. "Greek doctors and Roman patients," in van der Eijk, Horstmanshoff, and Schrijvers: 49-67.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1906. *Griechische Feste von Religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*. Leipzig.
- Nunn, J.F. 2002. *Egyptian Medicine*. London.
- Nünning, V., Rupp, J., and Ahn, G. eds. 2014. *Ritual and Narrative: Explorations and Case Studies*. Beilefeld.
- Nussbaum, M. 1994. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton.
- Nutton, V. 1988. *From Democedes to Harvey: Studies in the History of Medicine*. London.
- . 1992. "Healers in the Medical Market place: towards a Social History of Graeco-Roman Medicine," in Wear.: 15-58.
- . 1995. "The Medical Meeting Place," in van der Eijk et al.
- . 2000. "Did the Greeks Have a Word for It?," in Conrad, I. and Wujastyk, D. eds. *Contagion: Perspectives from Pre-modern Societies*. London.: 137-62.

- . 2013. *Ancient Medicine*. 2nd ed. London.
- Ober, J. 1983. *Fortress Attica: Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier*. Leiden.
- . 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens*. Princeton.
- Oberhelman, S. ed. 2013. *Dreams, Healing, and Medicine in Greece: From Antiquity to the Present*. Burlington, Vt.
- . 2014. “Anatomical Votive Reliefs as Evidence for Specialization at Healing Sanctuaries in the Ancient Mediterranean World,” *Athens Journal of Health* 1: 47-62.
- Ogden, D. 2010. *Drakon: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman World*. Oxford.
- Oliver, J. G. 2007. *War, Food, and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens*. Oxford.
- Oppenheim, L. 1967. *Letters from Mesopotamia*. Chicago.
- Osborne, R. 2008. “Reciprocal Strategies: Imperialism, Barbarism and Trade in Archaic and Classical Olbia,” in Bilde et al.: 333-47.
- Padel, R. 1992. *In and Out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self*. Princeton.
- Paga, J. 2015. “The Monumental Definition of Attica in the Early Democratic Period,” in Miles: 108-125.
- Page, D.L. 1953. “Thucydides’ Description of the Great Plague at Athens,” *CQ* 3: 97-119.
- Papadopoulou, C. 2015. “New Discoveries in Piraeus,” *AR* 61: 56-64.
- Papakonstantinou, M. 2012. “The Asclepieion of Daphnous. A new Discovery at Agios Konstantinos in Phthiotida,” Annual Meeting of the Swedish Institute.
- Parke, W. 1985. *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- . 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford.
- . 2005a. *Polytheism and Society in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.

- . 2005b. “ὡς ἦρωι ἐναίζειν,” in Hägg, R. ed. *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Cthonian*. Stockholm: 37-45.
- . 2011. *On Greek Religion: Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* 60. Ithaca.
- Parker, V. 1994. “Some Aspects of the Foreign and Domestic Policy of Cleisthenes of Sicyon,” *Hermes* 122: 404-424.
- Parry, A. 1969. “The Language of Thucydides’ Description of the Plague,” *BICS* 16: 106-118.
- Parry, J. and Bloch, M. 1989. *Money and the Morality of Exchange*. Cambridge.
- Paul, S. 2013. *Cultes et Sanctuaires de l’île de Cos*. Leige.
- Pearcy, L. 1988. “Theme, Dream, and Narrative: Reading the *Sacred Tales* of Aelius Aristides,” *TAPA* 118: 377-91.
- . 1992. “Diagnosis as Narrative in Ancient Literature,” *AJP* 113: 595-616.
- Peatfield, A. 1990. “Minoan Peak Sanctuaries: history and society,” *Opuscula Atheniensi* 18: 117-31.
- Pedley, J.G. 1974. “Carians in Sardis,” *JHS* 94: 96-99.
- Peek, W. 1962. *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros*. Leipzig.
- Perdrizet, P. 1911. “Le miraculeuse histoire de Pandare et d’Echedore,” *ARW* 14: 54.
- Perkins, J. 1994. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*. London.
- Peterson, J. C. 2010. *Cultural Interactions and Social Strategies on the Pontic Shores: Burial Customs in the Northern Black Sea Area C. 550-270 BC*. Aarhus.
- Petrakos, V.C. 1968. *Ὁ Ὠρωπὸς καὶ τὸ λέρων τοῦ Ἀμφιαραοῦ*. Athens.
- . 1997. *Οἱ Ἐπιγραφές τοῦ Ὠρωποῦ*. Athens.
- . 1999. *Ὁ δῆμος τοῦ Ῥαμνοῦντος. Ἡ Τοπογραφία*. Athens.
- . 1999. *Ὁ δῆμος τοῦ Ῥαμνοῦντος. Οἱ Ἐπιγραφές*. Athens.
- Petridou, G. 2015. *Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*. Oxford.

- Petridou, G. and Thumiger, C. 2015. *Homo Patiens: Approaches to the Patient in the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill.
- Petropoulos, E. K. 2005. *Hellenic Colonization in Euxeinos Pontos: Penetration, Early Establishment, and the Problem of the "Emporion" Revisited*. Oxford.
- Petsalis-Diomidis, A. 2002. "Narratives of Transformation: Pilgrimage Patterns and Authorial Self-Presentation in Three Pilgrimage Texts," in Coleman and Elsner: 84-109.
- . 2005. "The Body in Space: Visual Dynamics in Greco Roman Healing Pilgrimage," in Elsner and Rutherford: 183-218.
- . 2012. *Truly Beyond Wonders: Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios*. Cambridge.
- Pfaff, C. 2003. "Archaic Corinthian Architecture 600-480," in Williams and Bookidis: 95-140.
- Piérart, M. 1981. "Notes sur trois noms de phratries argienne," *BCH* 105(2): 611-13.
- . 1983. "Phratries et "Kômai" d'Argos," *BCH* 107(1): 269-275.
- . 2000. "Argos. Un autre démocratie," in Hansen and Nielsen: 279-314.
- Pinault, J.R. 1992. *Hippocratic Lives and Legends*. Studies in Ancient Medicine 4. Leiden.
- Pinch, G. 1994. *Magic in Ancient Egypt*. London.
- Pinney, G.F. 1983. "Achilles Lord of Scythia," in Moon, W. G. ed. *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*. Madison: 127-147.
- Pippidi, D.M. 1984. *Parerga: Écrits de Philologie, d'Épigraphie, et d'Histoire ancienne*. Paris.
- Platt, V. 2011. *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature, and Religion*. Cambridge.
- Polignac, F. 1994a. *Cults and Territory: the Origins of the Greek City-State*. Chicago.
- . 1994b. "Mediation, Competition, and Sovereignty: The Evolution of Rural Sanctuaries in Geometric Greece," in Alcock and Osborne: 3-19.
- Polinskaya, I. 2006. "Lack of Boundaries, Absence of Oppositions," in Rosen and Sluiter: 62-92.

- Porter, I. ed. 2002. *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ann Arbor.
- Porter, R. 1985. "Doing Medical History from Below," *Theory and Society* 14: 175-98.
- Pouilloux, J. 1954. *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte*. Paris.
- Prêtre, C. and Charlier, W. 2009. *Thérapies divines: analyse épigraphique et paléopathologique de textes de guérison grecs*. M. Villeneuve-d'Ascq.
- Race, W. 1982. "Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns," *GRBS* 23: 5-14.
- Raj, K. 2007. *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650–1900*. London.
- von Reden, S. 1995a. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London.
- . 1995b. "Piraeus, a World Apart," *G&R* 42(1): 24-37.
- Reiner, E. 1960. "Plague Amulets and House Blessings," *JNES* 19(2): 148-55.
- . 1995. *Astral Magic in Babylonia*. Philadelphia.
- Regard, M., and Landis, T. 1997. "'Gourmand syndrome': Eating Passion Associated with Right Anterior Lesions." *Neurology*, 48: 1185–1190.
- Ricl, M. 2010. "Current Archaeological and Epigraphical Work in the Region of Lydia," in H. Bru-G. Labarre ed. *L'Anatolie des peuples, des cites et des cultures (Ile millénaire av. J.-C. – Ve siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Besançon.: 189-195.
- Riethmüller, J. 1999. "Bothros and Tetrastyle: The *Heroon* of Asklepios at Athens," in Hägg, R. ed. *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*. Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology of Ancient History, Göteborg University, 21-23 april 1995. Stockholm: 123-43.
- . 2005. *Asklepios: Heiligtümer und Kult. Studien zu Antiken Heiligtümern*. Vols. 1-2. Heidelberg.
- Rigsby, K. 2007. "A Greek Dedication at Sidon," *Tyche* 22: 143-50.
- Ritner, R.K. 1989. "Review of von Staden 1989," *Newsletter of the Society for Ancient Medicine and Pharmacology*. 39-40.
- . 1990. "O.Gardiner 363: A Spell Against Night Terrors," *JARCE* 27: 25-41.

- . 2000. “Innovations and Adaptations in Ancient Egyptian Medicine,” *JNES* 59(2): 107-117.
- . 2001. “Magic in Medicine,” in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford: 326-29.
- . 2006. “The Cardio-vascular System in Egyptian Thought,” *JNES* 65(2): 99-109.
- . 2007. “Cultural Exchange between Egyptian and Greek Medicine,” in Kousoulis, P. and K. Magliveras: 209-21.
- Rhodes, R., N. Gligorov, and Schwab, A.P. (eds.) 2013. *The Human Microbiome: Ethical, Legal, and Social Concerns*. Oxford.
- Ricoeur, P. 1981. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*. trans. Thompson, J. Cambridge.
- Riethmüller, J. 1999. “*Bothros* and Tetrastyle: The *Heroon* of Asklepios at Athens,” in *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*. ed. Hägg. Stockholm: 123-43.
- . 2005. *Asklepios: Heiligtümer und Kult. Studien zu Antiken Heiligtümern*. Vols 1-2. Heidelberg.
- Robertson, N. 2009. *Religion and Reconciliation in Ancient Greek Cities: The Sacred Laws of Selinus and Cyrene*. Baltimore.
- Roebuck, C. 1951. *The Asklepieion and Lerna*. Vol. 14 of *Corinth: Result of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. Princeton.
- Robson, E. 2008. “Mesopotamian Medicine and Religion: Current Debates, New Perspectives,” *Religion Compass* 3: 455-83.
- Rorty, R. 1990. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth*. Cambridge.
- Rosen, G. 1958. *A History of Public Health*. Baltimore.
- Rosen R. 2011. “Spaces of Sickness in Graeco-Roman Medicine,” in Baker et al.: 227-45.
- Rosen, R. and Horstmanshoff, M. 2003. “The *Andreia* of the Hippocratic Physician and the Problem of Incurables,” in Rosen, R. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in the Ancient World*. Leiden: 95-114.

- Rosen, R. and Sluiter, I. 2006. *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden.
- Rosenzweig, R. 2004. *Worshipping Aphrodite: Art and Cult in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor.
- Rüpke, J. ed. 2013. *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Rusjaeva, A. 1995. "Investigations of the Western Temenos of Olbia," *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 1(1): 80-102.
- . 2003. "The Temple of Achilles on the Island of Leuke in the Black Sea," *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 9(1): 1-16.
- . 2006. "The Main Development of the Western Temenos of Olbia in the Pontos," in Bilde et al.: 93-116.
- . 2007. "Religious Interactions between Olbia and Scythia," in Braund and Kryzickij: 93-102.
- Rutherford, I. 1999. "To the Land of Zeus...:Patterns of Pilgrimage in Aelius Aristides," *Aevum Antiquum* 12: 133-48.
- . 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.
- . 2004. "Χορὸς εἷς ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως (Xen. Mem. 3.3.12): Song-Dance and State-Pilgrimage at Athens," in Murray, P. and P. Wilson. eds. *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford.
- . 2013a. "The Immortal Words of Paeon," in Faraone and Obbink: 157-70.
- . 2013b. *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Rynearson, N. 2008. "Constructing and Deconstruction the Body in the Cult of Asklepios," accessed on http://web.stanford.edu/dept/archaeology/journal/newdraft/2003_Journal/rynearson/paper.pdf
- Sallem, A. 1995. "Deux inscriptions carthagioises inédites," in Fantar, M.H. and Ghaki, M. ed. *Actes du IIIe Congrès international des Etudes phéniciennes et puniques*. Tunis: 363-5.
- Sallares, R. 2002. *Malaria in Ancient Rome*. Oxford.

- Sallares, R., Bouwman, A., and Anderung, C. 2004. "The Spread of Malaria to Southern Europe in Antiquity: New Approaches to Old Problems," *Med. Hist.* 48(3): 311–328.
- Salmon, J.B. 1984. *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC*. Oxford.
- Samama, E. 2003. *Les médecins dan le monde grec. Sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical*. Paris.
- Sanchez, M.G and E.S. Meltzer. 2012. *The Edwin Smith Papyrus: Updated Translation of the Trauma Treatise and Modern Medical Commentaries*. London.
- Scarry, E. *The Body in Pain: the Making and Unmaking of the World*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Schachter, A. 1981. *The Cults of Boeotia*. *BICS Supplement*. Vols. 1-2. London.
- Scheidel, W. 2001. *Death on the Nile: Disease and the Demography in Roman Egypt*. Leiden.
- Schiefsky, M. 2005. *Hippocrates on Ancient Medicine. Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden.
- Schlesier, R. 1992. "Olympian versus Chthonian religion," *SCI* 11: 38-51.
- Schniedewind, M., and Z. Cochavi-Rainey. 2014. *The El-Amarna Correspondence: A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets*. Leiden.
- Schröder, S. 1999. *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian*. Stuttgart.
- Schumacher, R. 1993. "Three Related Sanctuaries of Poseidon: Geraistos, Kalaureia, and Tainaron," in Marinatos and Hägg: 62-87.
- Scurlock, J. 2004. "From Esagil-kin-apli to Hippocrates," *Le Journal des Médecines Cunéiformes* 3: 10-30.
- Scurlock, J. and Anderson, B. 2005. *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine: Ancient Sources, Translations and Modern Medical Analyses*. Chicago.
- Scott, R. 2010. *Miracle Cures: Saints, Pilgrimage, and the Healing Powers of Belief*. Berkeley.
- Scullion, S. 1994. "Olympian and Chthonian'," *CA* 13: 75-119.
- . 1998. "Three Notes on Attic Sacrificial Calendars," *ZPE* 121: 116-122.

- . 2000. “Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinous,” *ZPE* 132: 163-71.
- . 2002. “Nothing to do with Dionysos: Tragedy Misconceived as Ritual,” *CQ* 52(1): 102-37.
- . 2005. “‘Pilgrimage’ and Greek Religion: Sacred and Secular in the Pagan Polis,” in Elsner and Rutherford.: 11-30.
- Schwartz, B. 1938. “The Hittite and Luwian Ritual of Zarpiya of Kezzuwanta,” *JAOS* 58(2): 334-53.
- Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City State*. Oxford.
- . 2004. *Money and the Early Greek Mind*. Cambridge.
- Senff, R. 2003. “Das Aphroditeheiligtum von Milet,” *Asia Minor Studien* 49: 11-29.
- Seve, M. 1993. “Les concours d’Épidaure,” *REG* 106: 303-28.
- Shapiro, A. 1993. *Personifications in Greek Art*. Zürich.
- Sherwin-White, S. M. 1978. *Ancient Cos*. Göttingen.
- Shiple, G. 2004. “Lakonia,” in Hansen and Nielsen: 569-98.
- Sineux, P. 1999. “Le péan d’Isyllos: forme et finalités d’un chant religieux dans le culte d’Asklépios à Épidaure,” *Kernos* 12: 153-66.
- . 2007. *Amphiaraios: Guerrier, devin et guérisseur*. Paris.
- Singer, M. and Erikson, P. I. eds. 2011. *A Companion to Medical Anthropology*. London.
- Sinn, U. 1993. “Greek Sanctuaries as Places of Refuge,” in Marinatos and Hägg: 88-109.
- Skinner, J. 2012. *The Invention of Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus*. Oxford.
- Smith, A. 2011. *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*. Leiden.
- Smith, J. Z. 1978. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Chicago.
- Smith, W. 1990. *Hippocrates. Pseudepigraphic Writings*. Leiden.

- Solovyov, S.L 1999. *Ancient Berezan: the Architecture, History and Culture of the First Greek Colony in the Northern Black Sea. Colloquia Pontica 4*. Leiden.
- Sommerstein, A. 2001. *Wealth: a Text and Commentary*. The Comedies of Aristophanes vol. 11. Warminster.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1994. "Something to do with Athens: Tragedy and Ritual," in Lewis, D., Osborne R., and Hornblower, S. eds. *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford: 269-90.
- . 2000a. "What is Polis religion?" in Buxton: 13-37.
- . 2000b. "Further Aspects of Polis Religion," in Buxton: 38-55.
- . 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Lanham, Md.
- von Staden, H. 1989. *Herophilus: The Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria*. Cambridge, Ma.
- . 1990. "Incurability and Hopelessness: The Hippocratic Corpus," in *La Maladie et les Maladies dans la Collection hippocratique: Actes du VIe Colloque international hippocratique*. Quebec: 75-122.
- . 1992. "The Discovery of the Human Body: Human Dissection and its Cultural Context in Ancient Greece," *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine* 65(3): 223-41.
- . 1996. "In a Pure and Holy Way: Personal and Professional Conduct in the Hippocratic Oath," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 51: 404-37.
- Stager, L.E. 1991. "Why Were Hundreds of Dogs Buried at Ashkelon?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17(3): 26-42.
- Stafford, E. 2000. *Worshipping Virtues: Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece*. Swansea.
- . 2005. "Hérakles: encore et toujours le problème du *heros theos*," *Kernos* 18: 391-406.
- . 2008. "Cocks to Asklepios: Sacrificial Practice and Healing Cult," in Mehl, V. and Brulé P. eds. *Le Sacrifice Antique*. Rennes: 205-21.

- Stafford, E. and J. Herrin. 2005. *Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium*. Burlington.
- Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*. Princeton.
- Steuer, R.O. and Sanders, J. B. 1959. *Ancient Egyptian and Cnidian Medicine*. Berkeley.
- van Straten, F. 1981. "Gifts for the Gods," in Versnel: 65-151.
- . 1995. *Hiera Kalá: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Leiden.
- . 2000. "Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries," in Buxton: 247-84.
- Stronk, J. 2007. "Ctesias of Cnidus: a Reappraisal," *Mnemosyne* 60(1): 25-58.
- Swain, S. 1994. "Man and Medicine in Thucydides." *Arethusa* 27: 303-327.
- Taylor, T. 1994. "Thracians, Scythians, and Dacians, 800 BC-AD 300," in Cunliffe, B. ed. *The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe*. Oxford: 373-410.
- Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- . 2000. *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge.
- . 2006. "Thucydides' Intellectual Milieu and the Plague," in Rengakos, A. and Tsakmakis, A. eds. *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Leiden: 87-108.
- van der Toorn, K., Becking, B., and van der Hoorst, P. 1999. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden.
- Thumiger, C. 2015. "Patient Function and Physician Function in the Hippocratic Cases," in Petridou and Thumiger: 105-37.
- Tomlinson, R. 1972. *Argos and the Argolid from the End of the Bronze Age to the Roman Occupation*. London.
- . 1983. *Epidauros: Archeological Sites*. London.
- Tordoff, R. "Coins Money and Exchange in Aristophanes' *Wealth*," *TAPA* 142: 257-293.

- Totelin, L. 2009. *Hippocratic Recipes: Oral and Written Transmission of Pharmaceutical Knowledge in Fifth and Fourth Century Greece*. Leiden.
- Tsetzkladze, G. R. 1994. "Greek Penetration of the Black Sea," in Tsetzkladze, G. R. ed. *The Archaeology of Colonisation*. Oxford: 87-110.
- . 1998. "Greek Colonization of the Black Sea Area: Stages, Models, Native Populations," in Tsetzkladze, G.R. ed. *The Greek Colonisation of the Black Sea Area*. Stuttgart: 9-69.
- . 2006. "Revisiting Greek Colonisation," in Tsetzkladze, G. R. ed. *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*. Volume 1. Leiden. 1-60.
- Tuplin, C. 2004. "Doctoring the Persians: Ctesias of Cnidus, Doctor and Historian," *Klio* 86(2): 305-47.
- Ulf, C. 2009. "Rethinking Cultural Contacts," in Rollinger, R. and Schnegg, K. eds. *Kulturrekontakte In Antiken Welten: Vom Denkmodell Zum Fallbeispiel*. Leuven: 507-66.
- Ustinova, Y. 2009a. *Caves in the Ancient Greek Mind: Descending Underground in the Search for Ultimate Truth*. Oxford.
- . 2009b. "Apollo Ietros: A God of Pontic Origin," in Stähler, K. and Gurdian, G. eds. *Die Griechen und ihre Nachbarn am Nordrand des Schwarzen Meeres*. Münster: 245-98.
- Vakhtina, M. 2007. "Greek Archaic Orientalising Pottery from the Barbarian Sites of the Forest-Steppe Zone of the Northern Black Sea Coast," in Gabrielsen and Lund: 23-38.
- Verbanck-Piéard A. 2000. "Les héros guérisseurs: des dieux comme les autres!" in Pirenne Delforge, P. and Suarez de la Torre, E. eds. *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs*. Liège.: 281-332.
- Vernant, J.P. 1969. "Hestia-Hermes: The religious expression of Space and Movement among the Greeks," trans. Piat, H. *Social Science Information* 8(4): 131-168.
- Vikela, E. 2006. "Healer Gods and Healing Sanctuaries in Attica: Similarities and Differences," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 8:41-62.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge.
- Vlastos, G. 1966. *Studies in Greek Philosophy: the Presocratics*. Princeton.

- Vollgraf, W. 1909. "Inscriptions d'Argos," *BCH* 33: 171-200.
- Voyatzis, M. 1999 "The Role of Temple Building in Consolidating Arkadian Communities," in Nielsen, T. and Roy, J. eds. *Defining Ancient Arkadia*. Copenhagen: 130-168.
- . 2004. "The Cult of Athena Alea at Tegea and its Transformation over Time," in Wedde, M. ed. *Celebrations. Sanctuaries and the Vestiges of Cult Activity*. Selected papers and discussions from the Tenth Anniversary Symposium of the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 12-16 May 1999. Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens. 187-206.
- Wacht, M., 1997. "Inkubation," in *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*. E.Dassmann. ed. Vol. 138, 179-266.
- Wagman, R. 1995. *Inni di Epidauro*. Biblioteca di studi antichi 75. Pisa.
- Wald, P. *Contagious: Cultures, Carriers and the Outbreak Narrative*. Durham.
- Walton, A. 1894. *The Cult of Asklepios*. Ithaca.
- Watson, P.A. 1995. *Ancient Stepmothers: Myth, Misogyny, and Reality*. Leiden.
- Wear, A. 1992. *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays*. Cambridge.
- Webster, C. 2015. "Voice Pathologies and the 'Hippocratic Triangle'," in Petridou and Thumiger: 166-99.
- Wecowski, T. 2014. *The Rise of the Greek Banquet*. Oxford.
- Wee, J. Z. 2015. "Case History as Minority Report in the Hippocratic *Epidemics*," in Petridou and Thumiger: 138-165.
- Weinryb, I. ed. 2016. *Ex-voto: Votive Giving Across Cultures*. New York.
- Wells, L. 1998. *The Language of Healing from Homer to New Testament Times*. Berlin.
- West, M.L. 1982. "Orphics in Olbia," *ZPE* 45: 17-29.
- . 1983. *The Orphic Hymns*. Oxford.
- West, S. 2004. "Herodotus on Aristeeas," in Tuplin, C. ed. *Pontus and the Outside World: Studies in Black Sea History and Historiography*. Leiden: 43-68

- Wickkiser, B. 2008. *Asklepios, Medicine, and the Politics of Healing in Fifth-Century Greece*. Baltimore.
- . 2010. “Asklepios in Greek and Roman Corinth,” in Frisen, S., Schowalter, D., and Walter, J. eds. *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies in Religion and Society*. Leiden: 37-65.
- . 2013. “The *Iamatika* of the Milan Posidippus”, *CQ* 63(2): 623-32.
- Wiggermann, F. “Nergal, A.” in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie*. Berlin.
- Williams, C. and Bookidis, N. eds. 2003. *Corinth: the Centenary 1896-1996*. Athens.
- Winkler, J. and Zeitlin, F. eds. 1990. *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*. Princeton.
- Winterbottom, A. 2016. *Hybrid Knowledge in the Early East India Company World*. London.
- Worman, N. 2000. “Infection in the Sentence: The Discourse of Disease in Sophocles *Philoctetes*,” *Arethusa* 33(1): 1-36.
- Wright, J. C. 1994. “The Spatial Configuration of Belief: The Archaeology of Mycenaean Religion,” in Alcock and Osborne: 37-78.
- Xella, P. 1992. “Eshmun von Sidon: Der phönische Asklepios,” in Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O. eds. *Mesopotamica-Ugaritica-Biblica: Festschrift für Kurt Bergerhof zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres*. Neukirchen. 481-98.
- . “Le plus anciens témoignages sur le dieu Eshmoun: un mise au point,” in Michèle Daviau, P. M., Wevers, J. W., and Weigl. M. eds. *The World of the Aramaeans II: Studies in History and Archaeology in Honour of Paul Eugène Dion*. Sheffield. 230-42.
- Yegül, K. *Bathing in the Roman World*. Cambridge.
- . 2013. “Roman Baths at Isthmia and Sanctuary Baths in Greece,” in Gebhardt, E. and Gregory, T. eds. *The Bridge of the Untiring Sea: The Corinthian Isthmus from Prehistory to Late Antiquity*. Princeton.: 247-69.
- Yon, M. 2008. “Lieux de culte à Kition,” in Bouet, A. ed. *D'Orient et d'Occident : mélanges offerts à Pierre Aupert*. Paris: 151-62.

Zaccagnini, C. 1983. "Patterns of Mobility Among Near-Eastern Craftsmen," *JNES* 42: 245-64.

———. 2015. "The Interdependence of Great Powers," in Cohen and Westbrook: 141-53.

Zeitlin, F. 1996. *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago.

Zumbrunnen, J. 2015. "Fantasy, Irony, and Economic Justice in Aristophanes' Assemblywomen and Wealth." *American Political Science Review* 100: 319-33.

