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Because of the great influence ascribed to the Asklepieion of Epidauros both in Antiquity and modern times, scholars generally characterize the development and spread of the cult of Asklepios as directed from Epidauros. Therefore, the debate has hitherto left little room for the local and Panhellenic dimensions of early Greek Asklepieia. This thesis will challenge this as of yet rarely disputed communis opinio by analyzing to what extent early Greek Asklepieia resulted from local interests and Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change. It will do so by means of a comparative analysis of the geographical placement, layouts and structures, and religious practices of early sanctuaries of Asklepios, using the material and textual evidence of Asklepieia that were founded between the late sixth- and fourth centuries BCE. As such, this study will demonstrate that the cult of Asklepios was shaped by a combination of local and global tendencies. Panhellenic elements were adopted by sanctuaries of Asklepios and subsequently adapted to serve the local needs of the sanctuary and its associated polis. Therefore, every early Greek Asklepieion was to some extent a glocalizing sanctuary.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristid. Or.</td>
<td>Aristides, <em>Orationes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesch.</td>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td><em>Persae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollod.</td>
<td>Apollodorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibl.</td>
<td><em>Bibliotheca</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar.</td>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut.</td>
<td><em>Plutus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arist.</td>
<td>Aristote (Ἀθηναϊκήν πολιτεία)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cic.</td>
<td>Cicero (De legibus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eur.</td>
<td>Euripides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacch.</td>
<td><em>Bacchae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod.</td>
<td>Herodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippoc.</td>
<td>Hippocrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epid.</td>
<td><em>Epidemiae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morb. sacr.</td>
<td><em>De morbo sacro</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. hom.</td>
<td><em>De natura hominis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>Homer (Iliad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isae.</td>
<td>Isaicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoc.</td>
<td>Isocrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad. Phil.</td>
<td><em>Ad Philippum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paus.</td>
<td>Pausanias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pind.</td>
<td>Pindar (Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ol.</td>
<td><em>Olympian Odes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth.</td>
<td><em>Pythian Odes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phdr.</td>
<td><em>Phaedrus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>Plato (Phaedo, Protagoras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phd.</td>
<td><em>Phaedo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prt.</td>
<td><em>Protagoras</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut.</td>
<td>Plutarch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mor. De Herod.</td>
<td>Moralia, De Herodoti malignate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mor. Quaest. Rom.</td>
<td>Moralia, Quaestiones Romanae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strab.</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuc.</td>
<td>Thucydides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitr.</td>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

‘Leave anyone to do so who has not learnt the history of Epidaurus. The most famous sanctuary of Asclepius at Argos.’¹

Eminent Epidauros: the unilateral debate on the spread of the Asklepios-cult

Already in Antiquity, the widespread fame of the Asklepieion of Epidauros – a healing sanctuary of Asklepios, located on the Argolid peninsula – could not be doubted. First of all, the reputation of the Epidaurian Asklepieion in ancient times is evidenced by the many iamata (healing reports) that were inscribed on six steles that stood within the precinct of the Asklepieion of Epidauros.² The iamata include tales about men, women and even children from twenty-four different places all over the Greek world, who had travelled far in order to be miraculously healed at Epidauros (fig. 1).³ Another example of the renown of the Asklepieion of Epidauros in ancient times can be found in Athens. Here, a festival named the Epidauria was celebrated in honor of Asklepios on Boedromion 17 or 18, in the middle of the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁴ The cult of Asklepios arrived in Athens in 420 BCE: approximately one century after the installment of the cult in Epidauros, which is generally accepted to be one of the first cult places of Asklepios.⁵

¹ Paus. 2.23.4 (transl. Jones).
² Of these six original steles that were witnessed by Pausanias (2.27.3-4), only four remain; see also Solin 2013, 7; see LiDonnici (1989, 45-130) for translations of the Epidaurian iamata.
⁴ For a discussion on the date of the Epidauria, see Parker 2005, 348, n. 88; Parke 1977, 65.
⁵ We know the precise moment of the arrival of the cult of Asklepios in Athens from the Telemachos monument (Lambert 2010, 156-157; Lefantzin and Jensen 2009, 101; Wickkiser 2009a). The inscription describes how the god arrives and is welcomed by Telemachos, who founded the sanctuary in honor of Asklepios and Hygieia during the archonship of Astyphilos (420/419 BCE) (see IG II² 4 665; Parke 1977, 64). The monument was inscribed not long after. Stephen Tracy (2016, 149-151, 154) attributes the hand of the text to the Cutter of IG II² 17, who was active between ca. 414 and 385 BCE; it is moreover hard to identify the location of the first cult of Asklepios because in some cases, the archaeological and literary sources are contradicting. Strabo mentions that it is Trikka, ‘where is the earliest and most famous temple of Asclepius’, not Epidauros (Strabo 9.5.17 (transl. Jones). However, the famous temple Strabo speaks of has as of yet never been found (see Perrot 2016, 210). His statement can therefore not be corroborated through the material record.
Figure 1: The different birthplaces of dedicants and visitors mentioned in the Epidaurian iamata. Epidauros is indicated in black (own work).

The earliest structures of the Asklepieion of Epidauros are dated to the late sixth century BCE.\(^6\) By the late fifth century BCE, the Epidaurian Asklepieion had gained so much renown that the city of Athens decided to build its own Asklepieion and organized festivities in honor of Asklepios.\(^7\) A final example of the widely recognized central position of the Asklepieion of Epidauros is the introduction of the Asklepios-cult to Rome in 291 BCE. Although the Roman Asklepieion was founded multiple centuries after the establishment of the cult at Epidauros and was located over a thousand kilometers away from the Argolid, modern-day scholars and ancient authors agree that the Asklepieion on Tiber island was introduced to Rome directly from Epidauros.\(^8\)

The popularity of the Asklepieion of Epidauros in ancient times moreover did not go unnoticed by present-day scholars. Within the ongoing debate on the distribution of the cult of Asklepios, many scholars confirm the central position of the Epidaurian Asklepieion and

---

\(^6\) Riethmüller 2005a, 156.
\(^7\) Although Pausanias (2.26.18) claims that the Epidauria coincide with the date of Asklepios’ arrival, the first epigraphical evidence of the festival appears on the Lycurgan skin-sale records (IG II\(^2\) 1496), which can be dated to 335 or 334 BCE; see Mitchel 1962, 219 n. 15; Tracy 1995, 93.
\(^8\) Plut. Mor. Quaest. Rom. 286D; Renberg 2006, 88; Melfi 2007a, 97.
emphasize the important role of the sanctuary in the spread of the cult throughout ancient Greece from the fifth century BCE onwards. Among these scholars is Calloway Scott, who evaluates the first Asklepieia ‘as they began and radiated outwards from the metropole of Epidauros’. Scott is not alone in arguing that the expansion of the Asklepios-cult came from Epidauros. Milena Melfi and Jürgen Riethmüller – who both wrote extensive and influential works on sanctuaries of Asklepios in the Greek and Roman world – also regard Epidauros as a starting point for the spread of the cult and moreover argue that many Asklepieia were founded from Epidauros. Nevertheless, even in these influential scholarly works, remarks about the Epidaurian nature of the spread and origins of early Greek Asklepieia are often not accompanied by references to the evidence on which these statements are based – not to mention a comprehensive evaluation of this presumed evidence. The few remarks that are in fact backed up by textual or material sources often rely on the work of Pausanias, who tells us that the most famous sanctuaries of Asklepios had their origin from Epidauros and lists some Asklepieia as offshoots from Epidauros. However, scholars usually do not assess the validity of the testimonies of Pausanias as evidence for the study of the foundation of the first sanctuaries of Asklepios in Greece. Pausanias lived during the second century CE, which is almost 700 years after the first Asklepieia were founded. Therefore Pausanias’ work may be an accurate source for the establishment of some of the later Asklepieia (like those at Pergamon and Smyrna), although scholars generally do not distinguish between earlier and later cults when discussing the Epidaurian offshoots that are mentioned by Pausanias. In doing so, scholars thus wrongly apply the works of Pausanias.

Moreover, scholarly statements about the Epidaurian nature of the spread and origins of early Greek Asklepieia are sometimes backed up by epigraphical sources, such as the aforementioned Epidaurian iama. An example of a healing report that has been used to substantiate claims about the Epidaurian origins of certain Asklepieia is the iama of Thersander.

---

9 Scott 2017, 135.
10 Melfi 2007a, 15; Riethmüller 2005a, 55-62.
11 Paus. 2.26.8; cf. Solin 2013, 8-9.
12 See Elsner 1992; this first wave of newly built Asklepieia happened during the early fifth century BCE. A second wave would occur around the late fourth century BCE (see Wickkiser 2003, 64).
13 The Asklepieia of Pergamon and Smyrna are both categorized by Pausanias (2.26.8) as founded from Epidauros. The Asklepieion of Smyrna can be perceived as an indirect offshoot from Epidauros because it was founded by the Pergamenes. While it is possible that Asklepios was worshipped in Pergamon already in the fourth century BCE, there is no reliable evidence for this claim. The structural remains of the sanctuary date back as far as 275 or 250 BCE and the sanctuary only reached its height during Roman times (Renberg 2017b, 155-156). The cult of Asklepios was brought to Smyrna from Pergamon in the early second century CE (Ascough 2005, 48; cf. Paus. 2.26.9).
of Halieis. Thersander was carried back to Halieis after incubation in the abaton (a stoa where visitors of the Asklepieion slept to be cured by the god) at Epidauros produced no healing visions. When he arrived back home, Thersander was miraculously cured by a sacred snake from the Asklepieion that had travelled with him on his wagon. Hereafter, the city of Halieis erected a sanctuary for Asklepios, which consequently became known as an offshoot from Epidauros.\textsuperscript{14} Scott utilizes the example of Halieis to illustrate an Epidaurian effort which he calls “serpentine colonialism”: the habit of the Asklepieion of Epidauros to involve snakes in the founding myths of its \textit{filialgründungen}.\textsuperscript{15}

The use of founding myths as evidence for the Epidaurian origin of Asklepieia, however, is not without complications. These stories frequently bear underlying socio-political motives, as they indicate alliances and legitimize communal claims. As Lynn LiDonnici argues, the tale of the founding of the Asklepieion at Halieis in \textit{iama} B13 is very likely to originate from an official inscription that was professionally composed and set up by the polis of Halieis. The healing report at Epidauros would have had a counterpart that was displayed at Halieis.\textsuperscript{16} During the fourth century BCE, Halieis was only a small settlement in the southwestern corner of the Akte, although the people of Halieis maintained regular contact with Epidauros.\textsuperscript{17} For a marginal polis such as Halieis, having strong bonds with an influential sanctuary such as the Asklepieion at Epidauros would have been advantageous. Even more so, possessing a sanctuary that had been legitimized by the Asklepieion of Epidauros was favorable for the reputation of the Asklepios-cult at Halieis.

Not only the polis of Halieis, but also the Epidaurian Asklepieion would also have benefited from its role in the establishment of the Asklepieion at Halieis. Clarisse Prêtre argues that one important goal of the Epidaurian \textit{iamata} was to propagate the competence of both the sanctuary and the god Asklepios.\textsuperscript{18} The healing report of Thersander was openly displayed at Epidauros and showed visitors of the sanctuary how Asklepios in Epidauros was powerful enough to found a new cult in Halieis. This story thus not only benefitted the polis of Halieis, but also enlarged the appeal of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. In reality, the role of the Epidaurian Asklepieion in the foundation of the Asklepieion at Halieis may have been

\textsuperscript{14} This healing report is henceforth referred to as B13, as I follow the classification of Lynn LiDonnici (1989), who created editions and translations of the Epidaurian \textit{iamata}, and distinguishes between stele A, B, C and fragments of stele D. As such, the healing report of Thersander is the thirteenth \textit{iama} on stele B (LiDonnici 1989, 83-84). This corresponds to \textit{iama} 33 in the work of Edelstein and Edelstein (1945, 235-236).

\textsuperscript{15} Scott 2017, 156.

\textsuperscript{16} LiDonnici 1989, 194, 256.

\textsuperscript{17} Scott 2017, 156-157; Sheppard 2015, 104.

\textsuperscript{18} Prêtre 2018, 24.
minuscule. What mattered for the polis of Halieis was receiving recognition from Epidaurus. As such, the *iama* of Thersander illustrates how founding myths often contain underlying socio-political motives, such as communal claims and alliances.

This is not to say that the Asklepieion at Halieis cannot be perceived as founded from Epidaurus because the Asklepieion of Epidaurus doubtlessly played a role in the founding of the Asklepieion of Halieis. Rather, the *extent* to which the Epidaurian Asklepieion was actually involved in the establishment and formal aspects of the cult of Asklepios remains unknown, while scholars treat founding myths such as the healing report of Thersander of Halieis as evidence for the influence the Asklepieion of Epidaurus would have had on its offshoot. Again, the actual influence of the Epidaurian mother-sanctuary on its offshoots may have been minuscule, making these founding myths a problematic type of evidence for the role of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus in the foundation of other early Greek Asklepieia.

Another method that some scholars employ to prove that an Asklepieion may be an Epidaurian offshoot, is by examining the geographical placement of the sanctuary. In his extensive and recent publication on incubation rituals in the ancient world, Gil Renberg defines an Asklepieion as an Epidaurian offshoot when the architectural and topographical elements of the sanctuary match those of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus. However, this method is inherently flawed. To demonstrate the shortcomings of Renberg’s argument, I will now briefly elucidate the methodological flaws of the “topographical” side of his claim because both the architectural and topographical elements of early Greek Asklepieia will be discussed at length in chapter 1 and 2 of this thesis.

By ‘topographical elements’, Renberg denotes the layout of the Alipheira Asklepieion, which is essentially linked to the geographical placement of the sanctuary. The placement of Asklepieia within the landscape is a much-debated topic, since sanctuaries of Asklepios are often located outside of urban centers or even in rural places – much like the Epidaurian Asklepieion. Over the years, many theories have been devised in order to explain the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia, among which the idea (supported by Renberg) that the geographical placement of these sanctuaries was modelled after the rural location of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus. A first deficiency of this argument is that it is often difficult to determine whether a sanctuary is urban or extra-urban. Some scholars, like Fritz Graf, classify

---

19 No archaeological evidence for the cult of Asklepios at Halieis has as of yet come to light. See Scott 2017, 156 n. 62.
20 Cf. LiDonnici 1989, 256.
21 Renberg 2017a, 182-183 n. 160.
22 See also Plut. *Mor. Quaest. Rom.* 286D.
an Asklepieion as extra-urban when it is located within the city walls, but outside of the walls of the acropolis. Others believe that a sanctuary needs to be at least outside of the city walls in order to be extra-urban, and even other scholars simply refrain from giving an unambiguous account of what constitutes an extra-urban cult.

There are many other possible explanations for the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia. For example, it could be argued that the peripheral placement of sanctuaries of Asklepios is linked to the availability of natural water sources rather than to the topography of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. Access to fresh spring water is a vital element of most healing cults, not only of that of Asklepios. Furthermore, some Asklepieia are built near or even upon older cult sites of Apollo – as will be demonstrated in paragraph 1.5 of this thesis. In this case, the placement of these sanctuaries may be a result of Asklepios joining his father; not an imitation of the siting of the Epidaurian Asklepieion. Of course, these are only two brief examples of alternative explanations for the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia. The issues surrounding the geographical placement of sanctuaries of Asklepios will be discussed elaborately in the first chapter of this thesis, which will demonstrate that topographical elements are subject to interpretation and are therefore no suitable indicator for Epidaurian offshoots.

Fortunately, some scholars are more cautious in their statements about the Epidaurian character of Asklepieia. In her 2003 publication on the development and spread of the cult of Asklepios, Bronwen Wickkiser analyzes the beginnings of the cult without specifically mentioning Epidauros as a catalyst for the emergence of Asklepieia elsewhere. Rather, Wickkiser discusses a few individual Asklepieia which she believes to be founded by the Asklepieion of Epidauros and supports her claims adequately. Not once in her work does she generalize multiple or even all Asklepieia as Epidaurian offshoots. Another scholar who takes a well-considered position in the debate on the development and spread of early Greek Asklepieia, is Hedvig von Ehrenheim. From the viewpoint of incubation rites, von Ehrenheim states that:

24 E.g. Scott 2017, 189; Scott (2017, 142 n. 15) moreover accuses Riethmüller (2005a, 2005b) of not explaining his view on what constitutes an extra-urban sanctuary.
25 See Croon 1967; Wickkiser 2010, 50; the Asklepieia of Athens and Corinth are competent examples of Asklepieia that were deliberately built in the vicinity of water. See Lang 1977, 3; Kopestonsky 2016, 719 (for a map showing all of the springs of ancient Corinth); Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 116; Wycherley 1978, 182.
26 See for example Corinth (see van der Ploeg 2018, 46; Roebuck 1955, 147; Robinson 1976, 203-209; Bookidis and Stroud 2004), Gortyn (see Liritzis et al. 2017, 3), Mytilene (see Riethmüller 2005a, 108) and Kos (see Liritzis et al. 2017, 4, 14); the Asklepieion of Epidauros is built near an older cult site of Apollo Maleatas (see Tomlinson 1983, 9-13, 22, 92-94; Riethmüller 2005a, 154-157).
27 For a more elaborate description of her project, see Wickkiser 2003, 11-12.
28 Wickkiser 2003, 61-66; see for example her discussion of the Asklepieion of Athens (Wickkiser 2003, 184).
In the cult of Asklepios, where the largest ritual uniformity might be expected, as the cult spread fast in the fourth century and many Asklepieia were founded from one single sanctuary, Epidauros, variation and adaptation to local practices seem on the contrary to have been the norm.\footnote{Von Ehrenheim 2011, 195; this argument is central to the third chapter of her doctoral thesis.}

While von Ehrenheim thus believes that ritual characteristics were often transferred to new Asklepieia specifically from Epidauros, she also acknowledges that there was a great deal of local variation to be observed within sanctuaries of Asklepios.\footnote{Cf. von Ehrenheim 2011, 103.}

Apart from von Ehrenheim’s argument, the disquisition above illustrates that there is little room for the local and Panhellenic dimensions of Asklepieia within the debate on the development and spread of the Asklepios-cult. One side of the scholarly debate acknowledges the role of Epidauros as ideological “sender” of the newly founded cults when textual evidence declares the Asklepieion of Epidauros as the founder of a sanctuary. In addition to recognizing the Epidaurian Asklepieion as the “mother sanctuary” of other Asklepieia, scholars may or may not argue that these sanctuaries of Asklepios adopted Epidauros’ form precisely. While I do not reject the Asklepieion of Epidauros as the founder of other sanctuaries, the majority of the scholarly statements about the influence of the Epidaurian Asklepieion on the establishment and development of early Greek Asklepieia seems to rely on assumptions rather than a careful assessment of the evidence.

The other side of the debate goes even beyond the “sender” role of Epidauros by classifying Asklepieia that were not evidently founded by the Asklepieion of Epidauros as offshoots from Epidauros, based on formal aspects that show similarities to the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros. These scholarly remarks about the presumed Epidaurian nature of certain Asklepieia are often implicit. For example (as will be demonstrated in paragraph 2.3), scholars generally perceive stoa-like structures at sanctuaries of Asklepios as incubation dormitories, replicated from the Epidaurian abaton.

The aforementioned assumptions are in turn shaped by the “sender” role of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, which was, as mentioned above, as emphasized in Antiquity as it is in modern times. Since the scholarly debate stops at the “sender” approach, this thesis aims to go beyond this aspect of the debate. My goal is not to debunk the centrality (meaning both its renown and the often-emphasized “sender” role) of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, but to challenge this as of yet rarely disputed \textit{communis opinio} by highlighting the other (ergo non-Epidaurian) side of the debate. The aim of this thesis is therefore to analyze to what extent early
Greek Asklepieia resulted from local interests and Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change.

**Methodology**

This research will be conducted by means of a comparative analysis. The material and textual evidence of a variety of early Greek sanctuaries of Asklepios will be compared to each other and to the material and textual record of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. This comparison should yield a series of similarities and differences, which may indicate whether early Greek Asklepieia were modelled after the Asklepieion of Epidauros, emerged from local interests or were the outcome of Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change – or even a combination of multiple of the aforementioned alternative answers to the question to what extent the Asklepieion of Epidauros had a pan-Greek influence.

It is moreover important to note that it is possible that some of these sanctuaries possessed a combination of these characteristics (Epidaurian, local, Panhellenic and glocalizing) because this thesis focusses on three different aspects of early Greek Asklepieia, which will in turn constitute the subjects of the three chapters of this thesis: sanctuary location, layouts and structures, and religious practices. Within one sanctuary of Asklepios, these three individual aspects could thus in theory each manifest itself differently, making the Asklepieion a truly glocalizing sanctuary. I am furthermore aware of the fact that the abovementioned three aspects are not the only indicators for Epidaurian, local and global features of sanctuaries of Asklepios. However, it is not within the scope of this thesis to study all of these (possible) indicators, which include (e.g.) the founding myths, religious festivals, visitors and administration of Asklepieia. Rather, the three aspects that are thoroughly examined in this thesis form a starting point from which further research can emerge. Building on the outcome of the analyses of the geographical placement, internal arrangements, structures and religious practices, other studies – perhaps utilizing a similar comparative approach – can be conducted.

In chapter 1, the goal of the comparative analysis of Asklepieia is to determine whether their position within the landscape was modelled on the location of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, or the result of local and/or Panhellenic influences. The aim of this chapter is not to

---

31 The exact number of Asklepieia that are within the scope of this thesis will be discussed below.
32 Terms such as “global” and “Panhellenic” and “glocalizing” will be elucidated in what follows.
33 Possible follow-up research would include studies on the aforementioned founding myths, religious festivals, visitors and administration of Asklepieia. Moreover, since the spread of Hippocratic ideas also seems to have a pan-Greek character, the interaction between Hippocratic ideas and early Greek Asklepieia may also be an interesting focus for future studies on the question to what extent Asklepieia were the result of Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change.
find the one true interpretation or to create a new theory to explain the placement of early Greek Asklepieia, but rather to demonstrate that it does not suffice to simply attribute the placement of sanctuaries of Asklepios to the act of reproducing the location of the Asklepieion at Epidauros – as is often done by modern-day scholars. Archaeological remains of Asklepieia and their placement within the landscape will be the main type of evidence on which the research in this chapter is based, but literary evidence is also important for this analysis. For example, the work of Pausanias includes descriptions of the placement of some Asklepieia and the distance between the sanctuary and the city, which may fill in the blanks when the archaeological record is lacking.34

Chapter 2 will zoom in from the macro-level analysis of the preceding chapter by comparing the layouts and individual structures of the Asklepieia at Corinth and Athens to that of the Epidaurian Asklepieion. The Athenian and Corinthian Asklepieia will serve as case studies in this chapter because they are compatible with the Epidaurian Asklepieion in renown (both ancient and modern) and the extent to which they were excavated.35 These three sanctuaries are all thoroughly excavated, and the discrepancy between the amount and quality of the evidence of these sanctuaries should therefore be little. This comparison should reveal whether the structures and layouts of these sanctuaries were modelled after the image of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, whether they originated from local interests or if they resulted from trends that affected the entire Greek world during the Classical and early Hellenistic periods. The similarities and differences between the structures at Asklepieion of Epidauros and those at the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens will be discussed with regard of the different building phases at each sanctuary to give a coherent chronological overview. Archaeological and literary sources – such as remains of temples, stoas, theaters and descriptions thereof by ancient authors – again constitute the most essential types of evidence for this analysis. However, epigraphical evidence also plays an important role in this chapter. Building inscriptions may elucidate what was built at sanctuaries of Asklepios and when it was built.36

The third chapter of this thesis will zoom in on the precincts even further, focusing on the diverse religious identities of sanctuaries of Asklepios. Three religious practices that took place at Asklepieia will be analyzed to expose the similarities and differences between the religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia and consequently determine whether a religious practice can be perceived as a local, Panhellenic or Epidaurian tradition – or a combination

34 See for example Pausanias’ description of the Asklepieion of Corinth (Paus. 2.4.5).
35 Melfi 2007a, 17; Wickkiser 2010, 40; Wickkiser 2003, 2.
thereof. The three types of religious practices that are studied in this chapter are the execution of sacrificial rituals, the dedication of anatomical votives and the composition of *iamata*. The focus of this chapter will be on only three religious practices because it is not within the scope of this thesis to scrutinize all of the religious practices that took places at sanctuaries of Asklepios. Moreover, sacrificial rituals are suitable for a comparative analysis, seeing that sacrifices were executed at every Asklepieion. Votive limbs and *iamata* are characteristic of the cult of Asklepios and are therefore convenient sources for an examination of the different manners in which Asklepios was worshipped at his sanctuaries. Besides *iamata* and anatomical votives, the research of this final chapter primarily relies on literary testimonies, inscriptions and reliefs that describe and depict sacrificial practices.

_Epidaurian, local, Panhellenic and glocalizing_

In this thesis, I will thus explore some of the alternative answers to the question to what extent the Asklepieion of Epidaurus had a pan-Greek influence – beyond the fact that it was widely regarded as a very important sanctuary and likely founded a number of *filialgründungen*. As mentioned above, scholars often compare sanctuaries of Asklepios to the Epidaurian Asklepieion and as such, define certain aspects (e.g. topographical, architectural and cultic characteristics) of Asklepieia that resemble those of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus as being “Epidaurian” in nature. Admittedly, this is a convenient method and this approach will therefore also be central in this thesis. As mentioned in the discussion of the methodology of this thesis above, the parameters of concepts such as centrality and influence that determine the extent to which a sanctuary resembles the Asklepieion of Epidaurus consist of both material remains and religious practices. A comparison of a multitude of Asklepieia to the Asklepieion of Epidaurus could yield outcomes that deviate from the prevailing observation that certain Asklepieia possessed features that resemble aspects of the famous Asklepieion at Epidaurus.

A first option is that, instead of the majority of their features being Epidaurian in nature, early Greek Asklepieia possessed more distinct local characteristics. These local characteristics may be reflected in (for example) the layout of the sanctuary, the ritual practices or even the aforemenioned geographical placement of the Asklepieion. Moreover, perhaps some Asklepieia may initially have been local phenomena that eventually became more uniform sanctuaries by the end of the fourth century BCE (when great numbers of new Asklepieia were built and existing sanctuaries got refurbished) through decennia or even ages of mutual feedback, or vice versa: early Greek Asklepieia may also have started out as uniform and Panhellenic phenomena, which ultimately grew more local after adapting certain features to
their own local needs. Another alternative answer to the question to what extent the Epidaurian Asklepieion influenced other Asklepieia, may be that sanctuaries of Asklepios from all over the Greek world were subject to the dynamics of mutual feedback: affecting one another by developing into powerful, global (Panhellenic) sanctuaries by adopting features from other Asklepieia.

A third alternative exists, namely the possibility that both local and Panhellenic features manifested in sanctuaries of Asklepios, creating so-called glocal (a contraction of “global” and “local”) sanctuaries. In this thesis, the term “glocalization” is employed to indicate a correspondence between what is local and what is global. While glocalization was originally created as a framework to analyze aspects of our modern society, glocalization can also be utilized to study ancient phenomena because in essence, it illustrates how local characteristics interact with global elements – and vice versa. The concept of glocalization is dependent on the implications of two other terms (which are equally important for the perception of glocalization): local and global. The “local” half of glocalization, in this thesis, consists of the Asklepieia and the cities and towns which they were connected with. While they may transcend these boundaries, regional traditions are also classified as local practices in this thesis because on a religious level, regional customs are oftentimes part of the local interests of a sanctuary. Local identities are moreover not static, but fluid and dynamic as they change over time. When, in this study, a phenomenon is classified as local, this classification thus only applies within a specific timeframe.

The “global” side of glocalization naturally encompasses the global characteristics of sanctuaries of Asklepios. However, in ancient times, “global” was not exactly global because the world in its entirety was less connected than it is nowadays. Globalization is – much like glocalization – a theoretical framework that was created with the modern world in mind, although by now the term is widely used in premodern studies and therefore does not need extensive justification. In this thesis, global features of Asklepieia are phenomena that applied to Asklepieia all over the Greek oikoumene (meaning the whole “inhabited world”). I moreover use the terms “global” and “Panhellenic” synonymously. Anything global in this

---

37 I am aware of the fact that local interests are also very much dependent on regional, national and even global processes. Therefore, not only the absolute local, but also the regional and national interests specific to each polis need to be taken into account to determine the extent to which an Asklepieion can be viewed as a local product.


39 The chronological delimitation of this thesis will be discussed below.

40 Cf. Pitts and Versluys 2015, 11-17.

41 See Inglis and Robertson 2005 for an elaboration on the oikoumene.
study refers to aspects of Asklepieia that can be observed throughout the entire Greek world, which is (broadly speaking) also the meaning of Panhellenism.

Consequently, the term “Panhellenism” needs clarification. It is first of all important to note that this thesis is concerned with religious Panhellenism, which distinguishes itself from the political or even idealistic version of Panhellenism, evident from Aeschylus’ play *Persae*. Here, Aeschylus contrasts the Greeks with the Persians and addresses the Greeks as one – an ideal that can also be found in Isocrates’ letter to Philip II, in which Isocrates expresses his desire for a permanent state of peace between Athens and Philip, ending the curse of mutual warfare in Hellas.42 Because of this idealistic connotation of Panhellenism, most scholars perceive Panhellenism as belonging exclusively to the Hellenistic period.

Catherine Morgan, however, points out that the formalized framework of Panhellenic cult activity can be seen as emerging in the early sixth century BCE.43 In doing so, Morgan relies heavily on the work of Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, who argues that the polis mediated all religious activities of its citizens.44 It is important to mention here that I do not follow Sourvinou-Inwood’s distinction between polis cults and non-polis cults because in doing so, Sourvinou-Inwood implicates a misguided difference in value judgement between cults that were regulated by the polis and cults that knew no polis interference. However, the unnuanced nature of Sourvinou-Inwood’s argument does not dismiss the possibility that Panhellenic religious systems may have existed as long as the polis itself: from the eighth century BCE onwards.45 Following Morgan’s framework, Panhellenism in this thesis thus refers to the standardization of cult activity throughout the Greek world.46

Both Panhellenism and glocalization offer a new perspective to study the rise and development of the cult of Asklepios. Panhellenism creates a contrast between what is local and what is pan-Greek. This contrast can help to understand the emergence and development of early Asklepieia, since it demonstrates what was successfully adopted by multiple sanctuaries and what was locally adapted. Consequently, understanding why certain features of the cult of Asklepios became Panhellenic phenomena can offer new insights in Greek religion.

---

43 Morgan 1993, 27.
44 Esther Eidinow (2011, 13-14) rightly points out that Sourvinou-Inwood’s argument focuses implicitly on and perhaps works best for (a specific perception of) Classical Athens, where most religious activities were configured around the polis (e.g. the demes, phratries and gene). While Sourvinou-Inwood’s argument that the polis mediated all religious activities of its citizens is thus not very nuanced, Eidinow’s criticism does not exclude the possibility that Panhellenic religious systems existed (to whatever extent) from the eighth century BCE onwards – and as such, does not contradict Morgan’s argument.
in general during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, as this indicates what aspects of religion were valued all over the ancient Greek world.

The theoretical framework of glocalization moreover offers a more comprehensive understanding of the adoption of material culture and religious practices, which is a valuable addition to the debate on the spread and development of the Asklepios-cult, where the act of replicating elements from other sanctuaries is usually seen as one-way traffic from the Asklepieion of Epidauros to other early Greek Asklepieia. Panhellenism and glocalization moreover cannot be understood separately. Beyond a purely ideological level, Panhellenism inevitably becomes a melting pot, shaped by local forces into a glocalizing final product.

**Boundaries and terminology**

Chronologically, I choose to remain within the boundaries of the sixth and fourth centuries BCE (600-300 BCE). This delimitation allows for the study of some of the earliest Asklepieia, such as Epidauros, Gortyn and Trikka, which were founded in the sixth century BCE. Asklepieia that are dated to the sixth century BCE are few and evidence from this period is scarce. Although evidence from the sixth century will thus only make up a small portion of this thesis, it is a crucial period since it comprises not only the onset of the cult of Asklepios, but also includes the cults that were eventually partially or even fully replaced by that of Asklepios.47

As mentioned above, the fifth century BCE formed an important turning point for both the development of the cult of Asklepios, and is therefore central to this thesis. During the fourth century BCE (and continuing into the third), over 200 new sanctuaries of Asklepios were built throughout the Greek world.48 Moreover, some of the already existing sanctuaries were profusely refurbished.49

In order to determine whether early Greek Asklepieia were indeed modelled after the Asklepieion of Epidauros or influenced by Panhellenic/and or local tendencies, it is important to disclose what these refurbishments and newly built sanctuaries looked like. Were these new Asklepieia modelled after one or more of the older sanctuaries of Asklepios, or did they instead deviate from the older tradition? Did the refurbishments look uniform, or were they unique to each individual sanctuary? The chronology and different building phases of Asklepieia are motifs in all three chapters. As such, the aforementioned questions about the chronology and

47 Older cult sites upon which Asklepieia were built will be elaborated on in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this thesis.
48 Yalouris 1976, 311; for a problematization of this estimate, see Wickkiser 2003, 61.
49 Wickkiser 2003, 64.
building phases of early Greek Asklepieia can be answered in the concluding remarks of this thesis.

The material and textual evidence of twenty-seven Asklepieia are studied in this thesis, including sanctuaries of Asklepios at Epidauros, Corinth, Athens, Piraeus, Trikka, Alipheira, Hermione, Tithorea, Sikyon, Titane, Gortyn, Lebena, Delphi, Troezen, Pharsalos, Paros, Argos, Leuktra, Messene, Dion, Patrae, Tegea, Pherei, Thasos, Mytilene, Pheneos and Kos. It is important to mention here that some Asklepieia will appear more frequently throughout this study than others, depending on the quantity and quality of their archaeological and textual record. Based on their documentation, some of the aforementioned sanctuaries lend themselves better for certain analyses than others. For example, the Asklepieon of Corinth was excavated between 1929 and 1934 by Ferdinand de Waele, with a supplementary study in 1947. The results of the excavations were published in 1951 by Carl Roebuck as Volume XIV in the Corinth series.50 While the Asklepieion of Corinth is thus excavated and documented thoroughly, almost no literary evidence about the sanctuary remains. In fact, Pausanias is the only ancient author to mention the cult of Asklepios at Corinth.51

The Asklepieia that are studied in this thesis are selected with two criteria in mind. Firstly (and obviously), all of the Asklepieia in this study were founded between the sixth and fourth centuries BCE. In this context, it is also important to note that dating sanctuaries is sometimes problematic because at some Asklepieia, the archaeological and literary evidence is contradicting.52 The issues surrounding the dating of early Asklepieia form another reason not to adopt a starting date of this research that coincides with the establishment of the supposed first ever sanctuary of Asklepios (either Trikka or Epidauros, see n. 5), but to take into account all of the sixth century BCE. Secondly, it is important to establish the definition of “Asklepieion”, since this will disclose how I have selected the sanctuaries that are relevant for this study. As the term “Asklepieion” is a neologism, the interpretation of this concept may not be as straightforward as it seems.

This thesis acknowledges the healing aspect of a sanctuary when healing was practiced within the sanctuary, either by cult personnel, actual iatroi (doctors) or Asklepios himself through incubation. It is generally agreed upon that an Asklepieion should have a “healing aspect”, but this principle is vague. When this criterion is applied, still each and every sanctuary of Asklepios can be named an Asklepieion because as a god of healing, Asklepios and healing

50 De Waele 1933, 417-420; Roebuck 1951, 1-7.
52 See for example the case of the Asklepieion of Trikka, n. 5 on page 8 of this thesis.
are virtually inseparable. References to sickness and medicine can thus be found in even the smallest of structures dedicated to him, but mere requests to Asklepios to heal a sick dedicant are not enough to categorize a sanctuary of Asklepios as an Asklepieion because these dedications do not evidence actual healing practices. Healing is evidenced by healing inscriptions (*iamata*), anatomical votives, literary sources, votive reliefs, surgical instruments and architectural structures that were specifically built to accommodate incubation, like the Epidaurian stoa-like building that is more commonly known as the abaton.\(^{53}\) Sanctuaries where healing was practiced thus only make up part of the entire cult.

Moreover, the size of a sanctuary is an important factor in identifying an Asklepieion. Asklepieia are usually full-size sanctuaries because they need to accommodate large numbers of visitors that are attracted to the healing qualities of the site, structures that are suitable for healing practices and enough cult personnel to care for the sick. It is therefore unlikely that a single temple of Asklepios can function as an Asklepieion.\(^{54}\)

It was necessary to formulate these parameters for the definition of an Asklepieion in this study because scholars often remain unclear about their perception of what constitutes an Asklepieion. One glance at the extensive work of Jürgen Riethmüller demonstrates that there were countless temples, sanctuaries and other structures dedicated to Asklepios all over the ancient Greek world, but not even half of these are classified as Asklepieia by Riethmüller.\(^{55}\) While incubation practices are commonly perceived as an important aspect of Asklepieia, it seems that not all of the sanctuaries that are categorized as “Asklepieia” in Riethmüller’s work yielded evidence for temple sleep. Like Riethmüller, I do not recognize evidence of incubation as a (sole) decisive characteristic for the definition of an Asklepieion because it is often difficult to recognize incubation practices in the archaeological record.\(^{56}\) There are other healing practices (such as surgery and the distribution of medicines) on which the classification of an

---

\(^{53}\) For a photograph of the surgical instruments that were found at the Asklepieion of Corinth, see Lang 1977, 31.

\(^{54}\) There is no evidence for healing practices in single shrines or temples in Greece. However, in New Kingdom Egypt we know of at least one epigraphical source that records a worshipper’s overnight stay at a small shrine of the serpent goddess Mertseger in Thebes. This source is known as the stele of Qenherkhepeshef. The text was written during the 19\(^{th}\) Dynasty and has been perceived by some scholars as a reference to incubation and the consumption of sacred water. It is therefore not completely impossible for a single temple to function as an Asklepieion, but without the support of written sources it is hard to recognize healing practices such as incubation. As mentioned above, temple sleep – particularly in its most basic form – hardly leaves any traces in the archaeological record. For translations of the text on the stele of Qenherkhepeshef, see Lang 2012, 52; Nunn 1996, 110; see also Forshaw 2014, 34; for a problematization of the stele of Qenherkhepeshef as a source for incubation, see Renberg 2017a, n. 106.

\(^{55}\) See Riethmüller 2005a and 2005b.

\(^{56}\) Incubation dormitories are notoriously hard to identify because there is not one building type exclusively associated with the practice. Incubation moreover does not necessarily leave archaeological or architectural traces: it could also be practiced outside, in the open air, or in buildings with a different primary function. For an elaboration on the issues surrounding the identification of an incubation dormitory, see paragraph 1.3.
Asklepieion as engaging in healing practices may be based. While I thus agree with Riethmüller on not placing great emphasis on incubation practices as a decisive characteristic for the identification of an Asklepieion, this thesis does not follow Riethmüller's classification because he does not clarify the exact meaning and use of his terms.

Lastly, I should briefly note here that the excavation of the sanctuaries can cause inconsistencies in the quantity and quality of the archaeological evidence. The circumstances in which the sites were excavated need to be taken into account if the evidence proves to be problematic for the argument.

Before we set out to analyze the evidence, it is necessary to elucidate another term that will be used throughout this thesis. The term “cult” namely needs further explanation: what is the cult of Asklepios and where can it be detected? I choose to use the definition proposed by Floris van den Eijnde, who adopts the concept of cult in its most literal sense, namely as “taking care of” (Lat. colo/cultus) matters that relate to the interests of the gods or (consequently) the community: ‘A cult is defined by those, often ritualized and re-performed, communal acts that tend to the interests of the community through its gods, heroes or ancestors in a more or less fixed environmental context. As such, both these acts and the place of performance are considered to be “sacred.”

This definition is suitable for the research of this thesis because the described ‘acts’ and ‘place of performance’ often translate into material evidence. At the same time, this material evidence causes problems for the study of cults. As van den Eijnde moreover observes, a great variety of rituals is lost to our view because aside from a few fixed categories such as libation vessels or remains of animal sacrifice, ritual content is largely invisible in the material record. The term “cult” is therefore useful to refer to a non-specific set of rituals being shared by a group of people at a certain place. When mentioning the cult of Asklepios, this thesis thus refers to all cult activity related to Asklepios. The ‘place of performance’ is the Asklepieion.

58 Van den Eijnde 2010, 16.
Chapter 1: Sanctuary Location

Interpreting the placement of Asklepieia within the ancient Greek landscape

In this chapter, the analysis of the material evidence of early Asklepieia will start off at a macro-level by discussing the placement of healing sanctuaries within the landscape of the ancient Greek world. It is necessary to understand the motivations behind the placement of Asklepieia to determine whether their position within the landscape was modelled on the location of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, or the result of local or Panhellenic influences. The aim of this chapter is not to find the one true explanation or to create a new theory to elucidate the placement of early Greek Asklepieia, but rather to demonstrate that it does not suffice to simply attribute the placement of the majority of Asklepieia to the act of reproducing the location of the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

In what follows, I will first of all elaborate on the term “extra-urban”, since this term occurs frequently within the debate on the siting of Asklepieia. Three different types of extra-urban Asklepieia will be discussed to demonstrate the diverse scholarly views on what constitutes an extra-urban Asklepieion. I will explain how these different approaches to extra-urban sanctuaries manipulate the debate on the central position of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. Next, this chapter will set forth explanations for the extra-urban placement of sanctuaries of Asklepios. First of all, one of the most common explanations will be discussed, namely the so-called sanatorium hypothesis. Thereafter, some of the less prominent theories about the geographical placement of Asklepieia will be analyzed, such as the idea that sanctuaries of Asklepios were placed outside of the city to properly accommodate temple sleep, the argument that an extra-urban location is only suitable for a relatively new cult like that of Asklepios and theories about how the placement of Asklepieia can be explained by the fact that Asklepios joined older cult sites of Apollo or other (rural) deities.

All of these theories will be scrutinized to determine whether they can explain the placement of extra-urban Asklepieia or that the placement of these sanctuaries can be seen as modelled after the location of the Asklepieion at Epidauros. Lastly, the Asklepieia that some scholars consider to be urban sanctuaries will be examined. Some of the Asklepieia that will
be analyzed here also appear in the preceding paragraphs on extra-urban sanctuaries. I will discuss how these Asklepieia can simultaneously be perceived as urban sanctuaries. As such, the issues that surround the terminology of both urban and extra-urban sanctuaries will become clear in this paragraph and are followed by conclusions about the findings of this chapter.

1.1 The borders of the city: defining “extra-urban”

As mentioned above, I will now elaborate on the term “extra-urban”, since this term occurs frequently in the debate on the siting of Asklepieia. Scholarly views on what constitutes an extra-urban Asklepieion are diverse and often do not correlate. As such, the issues that surround the terminology of both urban and extra-urban sanctuaries will become clear in this paragraph and are followed by conclusions about the findings of this chapter.

A significant amount of Asklepieia are perceived as located outside urban centers. These extra-urban Asklepieia can be divided into three main categories. The first type of extra-urban Asklepieia are rural sanctuaries, situated at some distance from the urban center of the poleis to which they adhered. The Asklepieion of Epidauros belongs to this first group, situated as far as ca. 8 km from the town. Other remote Asklepieia include Kos (4 km southwest of the town), Troezen (almost 2 km from the agora) and Sikyon (over 10 km away.

---

60 For a long time, it has been widely accepted that not just many, but the majority of Asklepieia were extra-urban. Cf. Scott (2017, 142), who argues that this view has recently been debunked by a joint survey of literary and archaeological sources. This discrepancy will be elaborated on later in this chapter.
61 It is important to note that the island of Crete housed many extra-urban Asklepieia, but the extra-urban placement of Cretan sanctuaries is not exclusive to the cult of Asklepios or other deities who are commonly associated with rural or peripheral sites. Long before the Classical period, it was a common practice in Crete to demonstrate and legitimize the possession of territory by placing extra-urban sanctuaries near the frontier of a polis. Although Crete also possessed urban cults and the location of Asklepieia within the Cretan landscape is thus consistent with the rest of Greece, this longstanding Cretan practice makes it unsuitable to view the placement of Cretan Asklepieia as anything other than a continuation of local tradition. See Chaniotis 2009, 59-60; for an overview of extra-urban Cretan Asklepieia, see Baldwin Bowsky 2016, 135.
from the nucleated settlement). A second group of extra-urban Asklepieia consists of sanctuaries situated near harbors. Although the general image of a harbor (limēn) is far from pastoral, Classical Greek harbors are generally located outside of the urban center and are often even removed from the town. Moreover, despite the increase in sophistication of harbors during the Classical period, simple beach harbors remained common. Therefore, many scholars categorize Asklepieia by harbors as extra-urban sanctuaries. Examples of early Greek Asklepieia in the vicinity of harbors include those at Zea (Piraeus), Kenchreai (Corinth), Lebena (Crete), Phalara, Antisara and Delos, of which some are located in strongly urbanized areas, indicating an ambiguity in the scholarly utilization of the term “extra-urban”.

The last main category of extra-urban healing sanctuaries that has been observed by scholars consists of Asklepieia that are situated near city walls and/or gates. Like Asklepieia neighboring harbors, these sanctuaries are perceived as peripheral or liminal rather than rural. The Arkadian town of Gortyn accommodated two cults of Asklepios: one just outside of the city walls and the other abutting the walls of the acropolis. The Asklepieion at Alipheira is very similar to the latter, the only difference regarding their location being the fact that the acropolis walls in Alipheira played a dual role as city walls. This places the Alipheira Asklepieion largely outside of the city walls because the sanctuary was built into the acropolis walls, near the entrance of the town. A final important example of an Asklepieion that is close to the city walls and gates is the Asklepieion of Corinth, which lies just within the city walls (see fig. 2 below).

---

63 Renberg 2017a, 124; Scott 2017, 165-168; for Kos, see Ito 1986, 149; for Troezen, see Welter 1941, 32; for Sikyon, see Lolos 2005, 293. In the case of the Asklepieion of Sikyon, however, a word of caution is needed. While the Asklepieion was located within the borders of the city-state of Sikyon, it was situated near a settlement named Titane. Pausanias (2.11.6) calls Titane a χωρίον and mentions that the people who lived around the Asklepieion that was built there were mostly cult personnel. The term χωρίον refers to the countryside and is distinguished by Pausanias from other terms that indicate an inhabited area, like πόλις (city), πόλισμα (town) and χώμη (village). Yannis Lolos (2005, 279) therefore argues that Titane was simply a sacred place in Sikyonia with a settlement around it. The Asklepieion of Sikyon is thus located within a rural environment and far away from the city of Sikyon, but not removed from the nearest settlement.

64 Oleson and Hohlfelder 2013, 5-6.

65 This is best illustrated by Scott (2017, 183-185), who describes Piraeus as an important border of Athens and argues that Asklepios’ multiple cult sites in Athens created complex processional relations that stress the interconnection of the Athenian center with its periphery: Piraeus and Eleusis.

66 Scott 2017, 177 n. 130; Wickkiser 2010, 39; the Corinthian Asklepieion at Kenchreai is not to be confused with the Asklepieion located just within the city walls of Corinth, near the springs of Lerna. This intra-mural sanctuary is of an earlier date than the Corinthian harbor-Asklepieion and will be discussed at length below. Cf. Paus 2.2.3; 2.4.5.

67 The liminality of early Greek Asklepieia and the issues surrounding the term “liminal” will be discussed in paragraph 1.4.

68 Scott 2017, 170 n. 106; Alevridis and Melfi 2005, 273-274.

69 Alevridis and Melfi 2005, 274; Renberg 2017a, 165.

70 Wickkiser 2010, 39; Chaviara-Karahaliou 1990, 135; for a more complete list of intramural Asklepieia, see Scott 2017, 142 n. 14.
Figure 2: City center and north side of Corinth in Roman times. Note how the Asklepieion is located just within the city walls, more than half a kilometer from the agora (after Lang 1977, 2).
As we have seen in the introduction of this thesis, the multiple categories of Asklepieia that are considered to be extra-urban cause some sanctuaries of Asklepios to be wrongly associated with the Asklepieion at Epidauros. In terms of geographical placement (and the implications thereof), sanctuaries that are situated just outside of the city walls can hardly be equated with sanctuaries that are located multiple kilometers away from their corresponding city or town. The term “extra-urban” is therefore meaningless in the debate on Epidaurian offshoots. The variety of scholarly interpretations of what constitutes an extra-urban Asklepieion is misleading and may contribute to the characterization of some sanctuaries of Asklepios as influenced by the Asklepieion of Epidauros, while in reality, these associations are based on very differing geographical correlations. Again, the aim of the following paragraphs is not to find the one true explanation or to create a new theory to elucidate the placement of early Greek Asklepieia, but rather to demonstrate that it is unsatisfactory to understand the siting of extra-urban Asklepieia as modelled after the geographical placement of the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

1.2 The sanatorium hypothesis

This perceived pattern of extra-urban cult sites of Asklepios has been observed by many scholars over the past century and as a result, various theories have been devised in an attempt to explain this phenomenon. The most long-standing and prominent of these theories is the so-called sanatorium hypothesis.\(^1\) This theory claims that Asklepieia tended to be extra-urban because the ancient Greeks associated crowded urban space with unsanitary conditions, while extra-urban and rural locations were perceived as healthy and salubrious.\(^2\) In other words, the geographical position of the Asklepieion would have enabled the sanatorium-function of the sanctuary.

The sanatorium hypothesis is largely based on remarks about health in the works of Vitruvius and Plutarch. Vitruvius states that:

> First, if for all temples there shall be chosen the most healthy sites with suitable springs in those places in which shrines are to be set up; secondly and especially for Aesculapius and Salus [Health]; and generally for those gods by whose medical power sick persons are manifestly healed. For when sick persons are moved from a pestilent to a healthy place and the water supply is from wholesome fountains, they will more quickly recover. So will it happen that the divinity (from the nature of the site) will gain a greater and higher reputation and authority.\(^3\)

\(^1\) The term “sanatorium hypothesis” was coined by Scott (2017, 141).

\(^2\) Modern-day scholars who support the sanatorium hypothesis include J. H. Croon (1967), Mabel Lang (1977), Jürgen Riethmüller (2005a) and Robin Mitchell-Boyask (2008, 105-121).

\(^3\) Vitru. De arch. 1.2.7 (transl. Granger).
Vitruvius thus describes what he believes to be healthy sites and relates these places to the cult of Asklepios. Like Vitruvius, Plutarch also tries to understand the relationship between Asklepieia and their location.\textsuperscript{74} In his *Quaestiones Romanae*, Plutarch contemplates why the Roman cult of Asklepios was located on the *insula Tiberina*:

‘Why is the shrine of Asclepius outside the city? Is it because they considered it more healthful to spend their time outside the city than within its walls? In fact the Greeks, as might be expected, have their shrines of Asclepius situated in places which are both clean and high. Or is it because they believe that the god came at their summons from Epidaurus, and the Epidaurians have their shrine of Asclepius not in the city, but at some distance? Or is it because the serpent came out from the trireme into the island, and there disappeared, and thus they thought that the god himself was indicating to them the site for building?’\textsuperscript{75}

Nowadays, many scholars disagree with the sanatorium hypothesis that was built upon these sources.\textsuperscript{76} Calloway Scott argues that even the most rural Asklepieia were not peaceful and isolated: ‘These were bustling international centers which would have thronged year-round with all manner of administrators, inn-keeps, merchants, and vendors to meet the basic hieratic needs of their many suppliants and “tourists.” During festivals, they would have resembled small cities more than bucolic and remote retreats.’\textsuperscript{77}

While Scott is doubtlessly right about the tumultuous nature of large extra-urban Asklepieia, his argument specifically denotes a later period, in which Asklepieia became crowded cult centers – not the moment they were established. Hoping for success does not preclude seeking out a “healthy” location for a new cult. Moreover, even in its earliest phase, the Asklepieion of Epidaurus could have accommodated large numbers of visitors despite its unsophisticated architecture terms.\textsuperscript{78} This is evidenced by the case of the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia, where large numbers of visitors probably stayed in tents that left no trace in the archaeological record.\textsuperscript{79}

The real issues surrounding the sanatorium hypothesis can be found in the literary sources on which the theory is based. In the fragment above, Plutarch suggests that health might

\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Lang 1977, 3; Scott 2017, 136-141.
\textsuperscript{76} Cf. Cilliers and Retief 2013, 70-72.
\textsuperscript{77} Scott 2017, 143. Note that for this argument, Scott takes the Asklepieia at Epidaurus, Kos and Pergamon as examples. The Asklepieion of Pergamon is not taken into account in this thesis since the earliest monumental evidence from the site dates from the third century BCE, which is too late to regard the sanctuary as one of the earliest Asklepieia. See Melfi 2016, 91.
\textsuperscript{78} The image of the unsophisticated early Epidaurian Asklepieion derives from the work of Richard Tomlinson and is contradicted by Wickkiser (2010, 47). However, Tomlinson might refer to an earlier phase of the Epidaurian Asklepieion than the period denoted by Wickkiser. See Tomlinson 1983, 22-23; the chief sanctuary (possibly a sanctuary of Apollo) of the polis of Epidaurus was probably located at the town, since the extra-urban sanctuaries of the city were so poor and ill-equipped. See Tomlinson 1983, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{79} García Romero 2013, 148.
not be the only criterion for selecting a cult site for Asklepios. His tone is speculative because he speaks of events that took place long before he lived. This chronological gap between the textual evidence of the sanatorium hypothesis and the earliest sanctuaries of Asklepios makes it impossible for the testimonies of both Plutarch and Vitruvius to explain the placement of early Greek Asklepieia. Vitruvius lived during the first century BCE, while Plutarch died in 119 CE: hundreds of years after the first Asklepieia were built. Vitruvius and Plutarch likely searched for an explanation *ex post facto* for what they observe, which may not correspond with the actual historical events. The “sanitarianists” thus base their argument on sources that likely do not represent the ideas of most of the period the argument covers, while no earlier textual sources containing thoughts on healthy places are known. From a modern point of view, rustic places seem likelier to be beneficial for one’s health than crowded urban areas, but the lack of ancient evidence for this view makes the sanatorium hypothesis precarious.

### 1.3 A good night’s rest: incubation and extra-urban sanctuaries

Various other explanations for the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia exist. One of these explanations comes from the work of Bronwen Wickkiser, who argues that the remote placement of sanctuaries of Asklepios makes sense for a cult that relies on incubation (ergo therapeutic sleep) for its cures. Wickkiser thus implies that rural and quiet places would allow the incubant to sleep without being disturbed by noises that were common in the tumultuous cities. If Wickkiser is correct, this would mean that Asklepieia had to accommodate temple sleep from the very beginning of the cult. For the majority of Greek healing sanctuaries, however, there is no evidence to support this claim. Although incubation was practiced in the Mediterranean long before the onset of the cult of Asklepios, it is often difficult to ascertain whether incubation was practiced at a sanctuary from architectural traces alone. Egyptian evidence for the practice of incubation dates back as far as the New Kingdom (1550-1069 BCE), while Greek evidence for incubation rituals does not predate the early Classical period.

---

80 McEwen 2003, 1; Karamanolis 2020.
81 Another peculiarity of the evidence of the sanatorium hypothesis is that Vitruvius never specifically mentions rural or remote places in relation to Asklepios: he merely points at the necessity of the proximity and abundance of fresh spring water on the sites of healing cults. However, because Vitruvius mentions the healthiness of rural places elsewhere, this argument is not strong enough to remove Vitruvius’ work from the sanatorium hypothesis.
82 Wickkiser 2010, 40.
83 See for example the stele of Qenherkhepeshef in this thesis, page 22 n. 54; it is important to note that divinatory (or “oracular”) incubation is the first type of incubation that can be detected in the Greek world and was practiced from the Classical period onwards (if not the Archaic period, see Renberg 2017a, 310). Divinatory incubation may thus predate therapeutic (“medical”) incubation, of which the evidence is linked to the emergence of the cult of Asklepios (see Renberg 2017a, 115-125, 271-272); chronology of ancient Egypt after Teeter 2011.
It is moreover important to determine whether the practice of incubation could have spread from Egypt to Greece before the arrival of Asklepios. Hippocratic medicine seems to show some non-coincidental textual concurrences between Near Eastern and Egyptian medical traditions, including seemingly identical therapies and a shared organizational approach.\textsuperscript{84} There is plenty of evidence for trading networks between Egypt and the Aegean, the Levant and Crete during the middle and late Bronze Age, as demonstrated by the thousands of lime plaster fragments decorated with Minoan-style wall-paintings in the Nile Delta.\textsuperscript{85} During the Archaic period, Egyptian knowledge may have reached Greece in a direct networked manner through Archaic trading hubs such as Naukratis, and in an indirect manner through Levantine contacts.\textsuperscript{86} It is therefore possible that knowledge of incubation rituals in Greece predate the Classical period, although no earlier evidence of Greek incubation practices has survived.

The theoretical earlier existence of Greek incubation rites consequently allows for the possibility that the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia anticipated temple sleep from the very beginning, but the mere hypothetical prominence of incubation within the cult of Asklepios is not enough to conclude that the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia is linked to temple sleep. Wickkiser’s argument would become more convincing if at least a vast majority of extra-urban Asklepieia can be related to incubation practices, but this is not the case. Although incubation does appear to have been widely practiced – not only at the Asklepieia of major cities but also at smaller and more primitive sanctuaries – incubation was not evidenced at every Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{87}

Gil Renberg examines Greek cult sites of Asklepios that are often associated with incubation by modern-day scholars and argues that many of these sites have been wrongly linked to incubation practices.\textsuperscript{88} Some examples of extra-urban Asklepieia that are insufficiently, dubiously or wrongly linked to incubation are Lato (Crete), Alipheira and Troezen.\textsuperscript{89} The main reason for the inaccurate identification of Asklepieia as incubation sites is

\textsuperscript{84}Scott 2017, 220; for examples of these similarities, see Asper 2015; scholars are, however, divided on whether or not similarities between Greek, Near Eastern and Egyptian medicine are coincidental. On the one hand, Markus Asper (2015, 21) argues that these resemblances do not seem reducible to anthropologically widespread forms of medical thought or by random accident. Philippa Lang (2012, 123), on the other hand, argues that broad conceptual similarities between cultures can be explained as abstracted formal and physiological principles, which derive from the basic empirical observation of the body. Scott (2017, 223) agrees with Asper on this matter, suggesting that early Greek medicine did not develop independently of Near Eastern or Egyptian practices.

\textsuperscript{85}Von Rüden 2019.

\textsuperscript{86}Scott 2017, 234; for Archaic Naukratis, see Villing 2006.

\textsuperscript{87}Renberg 2017a, 166.

\textsuperscript{88}Renberg 2017a, 523-527.

\textsuperscript{89}For Lato as an extra-urban sanctuary, see Baldwin-Bowsky 2016, 135; cf. Renberg 2017a, 529; for Alipheira, see Renberg 2017a, 165-166; for Troezen, see Renberg 2017a, 124-125.
that it is often difficult to recognize incubation practices in the archaeological record. First of all, incubation dormitories are notoriously hard to identify.\textsuperscript{90} There is not one building type exclusively associated with the practice, which makes it difficult to indicate the presence of an incubation dormitory without the help of literary or epigraphical evidence.\textsuperscript{91}

Usually, the presence of a stoa or a lengthy open portico is perceived as proof for incubation at an Asklepieion. This idea is based on the stoas that were found at some of the more famous Asklepieia, such as the Epidaurian abaton, the Doric east stoa at the Athenian Asklepieion and the stoa at the Oropos Amphiareion, which have, according to Renberg, ‘each served as a model for our conception of the typical incubation dormitory.’\textsuperscript{92} The common scholarly perception of what incubation dormitories should look like further complicates the identification of such structures because it influences the expectations of excavators wanting to find the incubation dormitory when unearthing an Asklepieion, making them prone to circular reasoning.

The aforementioned typical dormitory structures have not been unearthed at every cult site of Asklepios. In fact, some sites do not reveal any kind of structure that could have accommodated temple sleep, while in some cases, the sanctuaries have actually been associated with incubation in textual evidence. This problem is perhaps best illustrated by the Asklepieion at Troezen, which has been referred to in two of the Epidaurian iamata as a sanctuary that performed incubation rituals, although no building that was obviously related to incubation has been discovered.\textsuperscript{93} Moreover, incubation does not necessarily leave any archaeological or architectural traces: it could also be practiced outside, in the open air, or in buildings with a different primary function.\textsuperscript{94} An overall lack of evidence thus makes it impossible to prove or disprove that incubation was a key factor for the geographical placement of Asklepieia.

1.4 A proper place for a new cult

Numerous scholars have argued that the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia can be explained by the relative novelty of the Asklepios-cult in the fifth century BCE. This is a rather recent

\textsuperscript{91} Renberg 2017a, 124; cf. Riethmüller 2005a, 385.
\textsuperscript{92} Renberg 2017a, 124.
\textsuperscript{93} The Athenian Asklepieion forms another example of this problem. See Renberg 2017, 136 n. 48 and paragraph 2.6 of this thesis for an elaboration on the case of Athens; for the two Epidaurian iamata (B3 and C5), see LiDonnici 1989, 71-72, 110-111; for a discussion of some potential incubation structures at the Troezen Asklepieion, see Renberg 2017a, 124-125.
\textsuperscript{94} Wickkiser 2010, 43; Sara Aleshire (1989, 29-30) has argued that whenever an incubation dormitory is absent at a sanctuary of Asklepios, incubants would have slept in the temple of Asklepios. This argument has been convincingly disproved by Hedvig von Ehrenheim (2011, 78).
argument within the debate about the geographical location of Asklepieia and was first suggested by Vivian Nutton: ‘For one thing, Asclepius was a latecomer, as the siting of his temples demonstrates. They are rarely found within the main religious area in a town centre.’\textsuperscript{95} Nutton does not elaborate on this remark any further, nor does she substantiate her claim with evidence. Moreover, Nutton’s argument does not explain the instances in which new cults were established in urban centers or other central areas, as can be regularly observed in Athens. If Nutton is correct, it would mean that temples and sanctuaries could never be demolished to make room for a new cult. Her argument leaves no room for socio-religious change and is therefore less convincing. Nutton’s idea was nevertheless adopted by Louise Cilliers and François Retief, who, like Nutton, argue that Asklepios’ position as a latecomer (relative to the older Olympians ‘who usually had their temples in the center of a town’) can be seen as a possible reason why Asklepieia are usually situated outside of the main religious area.\textsuperscript{96} Much like Nutton, Cilliers and Retief only devote one separate comment to the matter and do not reflect any more on this subject.

The connection between the new cult of Asklepios and its place within the landscape is discussed more extensively by Rachel Levine, although her argument concerns new cults in general and not specifically that of Asklepios. Levine argues that ‘the introduction of something new was potentially threatening to the order of things – it put the community in a liminal position where the older deities of a city risked being challenged and overthrown.’\textsuperscript{97} Levine’s argument is not without issues. The term “liminality” causes confusion because its application is often anachronistic. A phenomenon is usually categorized as liminal when it is situated between civilization and wilderness.\textsuperscript{98} However, there is no ancient equivalent of the term and it is moreover difficult to determine what the ancient Greeks thought of as civilized and uncivilized landscapes. Remarks on this topic have a danger of becoming speculative, making it virtually impossible to ascertain whether the location of an Asklepieion was liminal and if so, whether this liminality would have had implications for the perception of the sanctuary within the ancient Greek society.

Furthermore, for liminality to exist, a core and periphery are needed because liminality denotes anything that lies on the border between core and periphery. These are also problematic

\textsuperscript{95} Nutton 2013, 107-108.
\textsuperscript{96} Cilliers and Retief 2013, 71-72; Cilliers’ and Retief’s claim that the older Olympians ‘usually had their temples in the center of a town’ is moreover evidently wrong. For example, the shrines of ‘older Olympians’ such as Zeus and Apollo are frequently found in extra-urban territories. See Chaniotis 2009.
\textsuperscript{97} Levine 2008, 107.
\textsuperscript{98} See Bremmer 2012.
terms and may be misleading. Core and periphery imply that influence and resources radiate out from locations uniformly, while in fact, these processes are much more fluid.99 A periphery may eventually become a center and vice versa. For example, Crete – an important center during the Bronze and Early Iron Age, as well as during the Early Archaic period – becomes more peripheral during the Classical period, while Macedonia becomes a center during the Hellenistic period but was a periphery before the reign of Phillip and Alexander.100 Such a binary approach is thus unsuitable for an analysis of the placement of Asklepieia, which was governed by tendencies of social and cultural change and would therefore have been an apparent dynamic practice.

Moreover, Scott argues that the “latecomer theory” overlooks the many cases (to be discussed below) in which healing cults were deliberately integrated into spaces that held a significant continuity with older and politically powerful cults.101 If Scott is correct, the siting of Asklepieia can be more credibly linked to the presence of earlier cults than to what would have been considered a proper place for a new cult. Moreover, scholars who advocate the latecomer-theory do not provide an explanation for the many intra-mural or urban sanctuaries of Asklepios, making the latecomer-theory unilateral and ambivalent. It may be because of the abovementioned inaccuracies that remarks about the extra-urban placement of Asklepieia being linked to the relative novelty of the cult of Asklepios have, as of yet, not gained much attention within the debate on the siting of early Greek Asklepieia.

1.5 Joining his father: Asklepios and the cult of Apollo

Another prevailing observation is that sanctuaries of Asklepios are frequently built upon older cult sites of Apollo. Before discussing these sites, it is necessary to elaborate on the connection between Asklepios and Apollo. First of all, an obvious mythological link between the two gods exists in that Asklepios is Apollo’s son. A multitude of local variations of this story exist, but it will suffice here to briefly recount the most common version of the myth: the version from Pindar’s third Pythian Ode, written around 474 BCE. Here, Apollo falls in love with the mortal princess Coronis, but after Coronis becomes pregnant with Apollo’s child, she gives in to the advances of a local prince, Ischys. When Apollo learns of her infidelity, he shoots Ischys and sends his sister Artemis to kill Coronis. Despite Coronis’ betrayal, Apollo still cares for his son.

99 Knappett 2013, 5, 125-150.
100 Tzifopoulos 2011, 165.
101 In other words: sites at which the cult of Asklepios joined or even replaced an older cult, for example the cult of Apollo in paragraph 1.5; cf. Scott 2017, 141 n. 10.
He grabs the unborn Asklepios from his mother’s pyre and gives him to the centaur Chiron to be raised. From Chiron then, Asklepios learns the art of healing.\footnote{Pind. \textit{Pyth.} 3.8-46; cf. Graf 2009, 77.}

Apollo is known to possess healing powers as well. In the \textit{Iliad}, it is Apollo who both sends and cures the plague that terrorizes the camp of the Greeks.\footnote{Hom. \textit{Il.} 1.443-447; 1.16, 20-21, 43-45.} Homer remains somewhat reticent about Apollo’s role in healing, but Apollo might be more closely connected with illness already in the \textit{Iliad} than the story is willing to concede. The paean that the Greeks addressed to him derived from healing songs, and Apollo as a physician was worshipped mainly in eastern Greece, from where Homer was said to come.\footnote{Rutherford 1994, 113.} The paean’s name originates from Paeon, who was the private physician of the gods in the Homeric epics. Paeon later became one of Apollo’s epithets, which in Classical times was usually spelled as Paean or Paián.\footnote{Graf 2009, 66.} Therefore, while Asklepios learnt the art of healing from the centaur Chiron, he may have inherited some of his healing abilities from his divine father.\footnote{Graf 2009, 14; it is important to note that mythological accounts do not reflect on this discrepancy between the learnt and inherited healing qualities of Asklepios. This concept was adopted from the work of Fritz Graf.}

A cultic connection (beyond the abovementioned mythological link) between Asklepios and his father Apollo can, first of all, be found at the Asklepieion of Epidaurous. Here, on the slopes of Mount Kynortion, a short distance east of the sanctuary of Asklepios, lies the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas (fig. 3).\footnote{Paus. 2.27.7; McInerny 2013, 12; Tomlinson 1983, 92; Riethmüller 2005a, 154; Graf 2009, 78.} Worship of Apollo Maleatas at this site dates back to the mid-eighth century BCE, although cult activity at the site of Apollo Maleatas began much earlier: a Mycenaean cult center was found beneath the foundations of the sanctuary of the Malean Apollo and habitation at the site reached back even earlier.\footnote{Graf 2009, 78; Kõiv 2015, 138; Tomlinson 1983, 22; Amott 1996, 267; Hägg 1997, 16; Liritzis et al. 2017, 2-3; three Early Helladic (EH I) graves are excavated at the site of Apollo Maleatas, see Weiberg 2007, 178, 190, 212; the cult of Apollo Maleatas is moreover not exclusive to Epidaurous. Another sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas can be found on a high mountain peak of Prophitis Ilias at Kosmas on the Parnon mountain range in Kynouria, Laconia. See Pavlides 2018.} Worship of Apollo Maleatas did not cease at the outset of the cult of Asklepios in the valley, but continued into Roman times.\footnote{Tomlinson 1983, 94; Melfi 2010, 329-330.} As opposed to other Asklepieia, the placement of the Asklepieion of Epidaurous itself remains remarkably undebated.\footnote{The locations of the Asklepieia of Athens and Corinth are particularly well-discussed. See for example Bookidis 2003 (on Corinth) and Mitchell-Boyask 2008 (on Athens).} Perhaps this lack of scholarly attention for the siting of the Asklepieion of Epidaurous is inspired by the assumption that this was the first and most important sanctuary of Asklepios and that later Asklepieia modelled their locations after

105 Graf 2009, 66.
106 Graf 2009, 14; it is important to note that mythological accounts do not reflect on this discrepancy between the learnt and inherited healing qualities of Asklepios. This concept was adopted from the work of Fritz Graf.
107 Paus. 2.27.7; McInerny 2013, 12; Tomlinson 1983, 92; Riethmüller 2005a, 154; Graf 2009, 78.
108 Graf 2009, 78; Kõiv 2015, 138; Tomlinson 1983, 22; Amott 1996, 267; Hägg 1997, 16; Liritzis et al. 2017, 2-3; three Early Helladic (EH I) graves are excavated at the site of Apollo Maleatas, see Weiberg 2007, 178, 190, 212; the cult of Apollo Maleatas is moreover not exclusive to Epidaurous. Another sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas can be found on a high mountain peak of Prophitis Ilias at Kosmas on the Parnon mountain range in Kynouria, Laconia. See Pavlides 2018.
110 The locations of the Asklepieia of Athens and Corinth are particularly well-discussed. See for example Bookidis 2003 (on Corinth) and Mitchell-Boyask 2008 (on Athens).
Epidauros. To bridge this scholarly gap, I will now briefly discuss two possible explanations for the placement of the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

When the location of the Asklepieion of Epidauros and more specifically, the question why it is situated near a sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas is considered, it first of all becomes apparent that the Archaic site of Apollo Maleatas lacks evidence for healing practices. Robert Arnott therefore argues that the sanctuary of the Malean Apollo cannot be linked to healing.\footnote{Arnott 1996, 267; the Bronze Age cult was probably that of a hero (called Maleatas) rather than a full deity. See Tomlinson 1983, 9, 12.} However, the absence of an evident long history of healing at Mount Kynorton does not mean that the location of the Asklepieion below the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas was not selected because of its vicinity to an earlier healing site. Healing practices at Mount Kynorton may have existed but not shown up in the archaeological record.

A second potential explanation for the geographical placement of the Asklepieion at Epidauros is that Asklepios joined his mythological father here. A direct route from the Asklepieion to the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas would be 600 m long (see fig. 3), but because both sanctuaries were located in a rural and mostly uninhabited area, the two precincts can –

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{sanctuaries.png}
\caption{The sanctuaries of Asklepios and Apollo Maleatas at Epidauros (after Melfi 2010, 327).}
\end{figure}
regardless of the distance between them – still be perceived as relatively near. Apollo can also be attested from an early date not only at Kynortion, but also at the Asklepieion in the valley below.\textsuperscript{112} A late sixth century BCE cup dedicated to Apollo Pythios was found there, indicating that although Apollo’s own sanctuary was at some distance, the cults of Apollo and Asklepios were connected at the Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{113} This consequently enhances the argument that the Asklepieion of Epidauros was built at the foot of Kynortion to emphasize Asklepios’ bond with his father.

Before elaborating on explanations and theories for the connection between cult sites of Asklepios and Apollo other than those at Epidauros, it is necessary to evaluate other Asklepieia that were built near or even upon older cult sites of Apollo, although identifying such sites is not without complications. Because the cult of Apollo was popular during the Classical period, it is often hard to establish whether or not Asklepieia were built deliberately close to sanctuaries of Apollo. In the Peloponnese alone, fifty-one cult sites of Apollo are known, of which fourteen full temples and sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{114} The Asklepieion of Athens lies approximately 500 meters away from the temple of Apollo Patroos (the ancestral Apollo), which was situated at the northwestern corner of the Agora.\textsuperscript{115} The earliest remains of this temple can be dated to the late sixth century BCE, before the establishment of the cult of Asklepios at Athens.\textsuperscript{116}

The distance between the Athenian Asklepieion and the temple of Apollo Patroos is very similar to the distance between the Asklepieion and the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas at Epidauros (600 m), but connecting the cults of Apollo and Asklepios at Athens would be far-fetched because the Athenian Asklepieion is, unlike the Asklepieion of Epidauros, situated within an urban area. A multitude of temples and sanctuaries were closer to the Asklepieion than the temple of Apollo Patroos at the Agora, which makes any kind of link between the precincts highly unlikely. The case of Athens illustrates that mere proximity to a cult site of Apollo does not indicate an evident relation between the cults of Apollo and Asklepios, certainly not when the sanctuaries are located in an urban area. Moreover, the abovementioned

---

\textsuperscript{112} It is, however, important to note that the elevation of Mount Kynortion would have made the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas less accessible from the Asklepieion.

\textsuperscript{113} τὸ [Ἀ]πόλλωνός ἐμι τῷ Πυθίῳ (IG IV\textsuperscript{2} 1 142); cf. Κόιν (2015, 138), who dates the cup at the early fifth century BCE.

\textsuperscript{114} Dengate 1988.

\textsuperscript{115} Hedrick 1988, 185; for a brief overview of the cult of Apollo, see Graf 2009, 88; Apollo Patroos cannot be associated with healing practices, but the cult of Apollo Paean did exist in Classical Athens. However, paens were performed by sacred guilds associated with cults of Apollo. At Athens there were the Puthaistai and Deliastai, associated with the two major Apolline centers, and the Orkhestai, who took part in ritual dances around the temple of Delian Apollo during the \textit{Thargelia}. The Athenian cult of Apollo Paean thus did not have its own fixed cult center. See Rutherford 1994, 114.

\textsuperscript{116} Hedrick 1988; Cromey 2006, 49, 65.
prevalence of the Apollo-cult in Classical times drastically lessens the likelihood that all Asklepieia that were located at some distance from a cult site of Apollo were geographically modelled after the Asklepieion of Epidaurus.

A more distinct unification between the cults of Apollo and Asklepios can be observed at precincts where a sanctuary of Asklepios was deliberately built upon older foundations of the cult of his father. Examples are the Asklepieia at Trikka, Corinth, Pharsalos, Delphi, Kos and Mytilene. I will now briefly discuss the foundations of the cult of Apollo that lie beneath the Asklepieion at Corinth to demonstrate this phenomenon by means of a case study. In the sixth century BCE, Corinth knew two cults of Apollo, one of which was located on the spot that later became the Asklepieion. Little archaeological evidence of this Corinthian temple of Apollo remains. The architects of the later Asklepieion cleared the ground to form a firm foundation for the new sanctuary, first in the late fifth century BCE and again at the end of the fourth century BCE, when the modest fifth-century architectural remains were razed to make way for a more elaborate building program. Moreover, excavation trenches that were dug prior to the excavations of 1968 severely disrupted the archaeological fill within the precinct of Apollo.

The association of the site with the cult of Apollo therefore relies mainly on textual sources, such as a mid-sixth century BCE fragmentary column-krater with the inscription ‘I am (the possession) of Apollo’ (fig. 4) that was found within the precinct of the Asklepieion. One of these literary clues to the identification of the foundations beneath the Asklepieion can be found in a passage from Pindar, in which he recalls ‘the twin kings of birds [eagles] to the temples of the gods’. Because the Corinthians initiated the placement of eagles as finials at the apex of each end of Doric temples, Henry Robinson argues that ‘if it does in fact refer to an

---

117 Note that the cult of Apollo at Trikka cannot be supported with archaeological evidence because the sanctuary has as of yet never been found. The early presence of Apollo Maleatas at Trikka is mentioned in the Hymn of Isyllos: an inscribed stele from Epidaurus, erected around 280 BCE, telling the genealogy and birth of Asklepios at Epidaurus (IG IV^2 1 128; SEG 49-378). See also Melfi 2007a, 51-52; for Apollo at Pharsalos, see Riehmüller 2005a, 106; at Delphi, the Asklepieion was situated within the sanctuary of Apollo. See Scott 2014, 226; for Kos, see Wickkiser 2010, 40; the Asklepieion at Mytilene was preceded by the cult of Apollo Maloeis, of which evidence dates from ca. 440 BCE but seizes after 400 BCE when the Asklepieion was established (Riehmüller 2005a, 108). The case of Mytilene is unusual because Asklepios’ takeover generally did not result in a complete discontinuation of the cult of his father.

118 This sixth century temple of Apollo had a Protocorinthian predecessor that was built around 680 BCE but was destroyed by fire a century later. See Roebuck 1990, 47; see fig. 2 for a plan of the city of Corinth.

119 Lang 1977, 3; Roebuck 1955, 147; Wickkiser 2010, 41; see fig. 8 on page 57 of this thesis for a layout of the earliest phase of the Corinthian Asklepieion and fig. 9 on page 60 for a layout of the sanctuary after the fourth-century BCE renovations.

120 Robinson 1976, 205-206.

121 Roebuck 1951, 16; cf. Lang 1977, 3; for the date of the krater, see de Waele 1933, 420.

actual building in Corinth and to a building practice of which Pindar was cognizant, [this] would
doubtless apply to the peripteral temple of Apollo of the mid-6\textsuperscript{th} century.'\textsuperscript{123} The scarce amount
of both material and literary evidence moreover makes it impossible to determine whether
Apollo was venerated as a healing god at Corinth before the arrival of the cult of Asklepios.\textsuperscript{124}

\textit{Figure 2: Krater rim dating to the middle of the sixth century BCE with a dedication to Apollo: \textit{Ἀπόλλων ἵππου} (after Roebuck 1951, 16).}

Although it is uncertain when and how Asklepios appeared at Corinth, Mabel Lang argues that it seems likely that Asklepios joined Apollo here, perhaps first in junior capacity, following a period in which the two cults overlapped and Asklepios gradually took over the cult site of his father.\textsuperscript{125} Inscribed pottery indicates that Asklepios joined Apollo by the end of the fifth century BCE and shortly after, the first structures of the Asklepieion were built.\textsuperscript{126} Both Lang and Wickkiser argue that this Corinthian situation of Asklepios joining a preexisting cult of Apollo is typical, if we may judge both from what happened elsewhere (Trikka, Pharsalos, Delphi, Kos and Mytilene) and from the mythological accounts of the relationship between Apollo and Asklepios.\textsuperscript{127} Lang emphasizes the mythological bond between Asklepios and Apollo and

\textsuperscript{123} Robinson 1976, 236 n. 103; other scholars, however, argue that Pindar is referring to the pediments (\textit{ἀετῶματα}) because they would resemble the outstretched wings of an eagle (Race 1997, 195 n. 5). The foundations beneath the Corinthian Asklepieion are thus associated with the cult of Apollo on somewhat meager grounds, but because no other deities have been convincingly linked to the temple, I prefer to identify the precinct as a former cult site of Apollo.

\textsuperscript{124} Nancy Bookidis (2003, 253) and Ronald Stroud (2004, 406; in collaboration with Bookidis), however, claim that the precinct was dedicated to Apollo as a healing god, but do not support their statements with evidence.

\textsuperscript{125} Lang 1977, 3-4.

\textsuperscript{126} Melfi 2007a, 507; these early structures of the Asklepieion include a small building of uncertain function (the \textit{oikos}), a cella-like structure with four large postholes and a drainage channel, and three wells to provide water. See fig. 8; Wickkiser 2010, 37-38.

\textsuperscript{127} Wickkiser 2010, 40; Lang 1977, 4.
explains the placement of some early Asklepieia within the landscape of the ancient Greek world through the kinship of these two deities.128

If Lang and Wickkiser are right, the cult locations of the Asklepieia at (i.e.) Corinth, Trikka, Pharsalos, Delphi, Kos and Mytilene cannot be understood as reproductions of the placement of the Asklepieion at Epidauros. Rather, the geographical placement of these sanctuaries can be understood as the cult of Asklepios integrating with that of his mythological father because the mythological connection between Asklepios and Apollo makes an older cult site of Asklepios’ father a suitable and logical place for an Asklepieion. The healing aspect of the god Apollo further enhances the sensibility of integrating the cult of Asklepios with that of Apollo because first of all, the healing qualities of Apollo create a connection between Asklepios and his father other than their mythological bond. Secondly, even though no evidence of Apollo as a healer has been found at sites where Asklepios joined his father, healing Apollo would have legitimized the holiness and healing capacities of Asklepieia that were placed upon or near older cult sites of Apollo. A general awareness of the ancient Greeks of Apollo’s healing powers would be sufficient to make claims about the competence of the siting of Asklepieia that were placed upon remains of the cult of Apollo.

However, not every early Asklepieion was built upon a former precinct of Apollo; in fact, not even a majority of sanctuaries of Asklepios can be classified as such. It can therefore be argued that the placement of Asklepieia upon cult sites of Apollo happened only if this location was convenient or even beneficial for the polis. While the mythological and skill-based link between Asklepios and Apollo would doubtlessly have been an important element for the eventual placement of Asklepieia, the ideal location for a new cult was different for each polis. If the relationship between Asklepios and Apollo was truly decisive, the Athenian Asklepieion would not have been built on the south slope of the Acropolis but on the Agora: near or upon the temple of Apollo Patroos.129 The placement of early Greek Asklepieia at cultic remains of Apollo thus cannot be understood as a reproduction of an Epidaurian tradition merely because the Asklepieion of Epidauros was located near a sanctuary of Apollo, because without textual evidence, it is impossible to determine whether the integration of the cult of Asklepios with that of Apollo was in fact an Epidaurian invention. Rather, the joining of Asklepios and his father

---

129 A potential reason for the Athenians not to demolish the temple of Apollo Patroos for the sake of the Asklepieion may be that the cult of the ancestral Apollo was indispensable for the Athenian cultic life. At least one phratry in fourth-century BCE Athens introduced young boys at the Thargelia with a sacrifice to Apollo Patroos (Isae. 7.15-16). Moreover, Fritz Graf (2009, 88) argues that the cult of Apollo Patroos replaced the many small clan sanctuaries with one central sanctuary, which gave the democratic city better control over the clan cults that could harbor aristocratic resistance against democracy.
can be seen as one of the glocalizing characteristics of the cult of Asklepios, since it occurred frequently enough to be understood as a recurring pattern by a multitude of scholars but happened only if the cult location suited the local interests of the polis.¹³⁰

1.6 Asklepios and the cult of the nymphs

Apollo is not the only deity on whose cult sites later sanctuaries of Asklepios were placed. In what follows, I will discuss earlier cult sites of other deities at which Asklepieia were found, including those of Pan, Artemis, Hermes, Acheloos and most notably the nymphs.¹³¹ What these deities have in common is that they are often classified (by modern-day scholars as well as ancient authors) as rural deities, presiding over nature and water, often removed from the city and located in caves or near springs.¹³² At first glance, the rural character of these deities does not seem coincidental, seeing that they were situated at extra-urban cult sites. To further explore the relationship between these rural cults, the cult of Asklepios and their mutual cult locations, I will analyze former cult sites of the nymphs, since these are the most common older rural cults upon which Asklepieia were built. I will also discuss theories about these rural cult sites that are important to consider before deciding whether these Asklepieia can be understood as offshoots of the Epidaurian Asklepieion.

Asklepieia that were located at sites that were previously sacred to the nymphs can be found at Lebena, Athens, Pharsalos and Corinth.¹³³ The Asklepieia of Pharsalos and Corinth are placed near rather than upon cult sites of the nymphs, making the relationship between

¹³⁰ Cilliers and Retief 2013, 72; Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 117; Wickkiser 2003, 54-58; van der Ploeg 2018, 46; Graf 2009, 94-98.
¹³¹ This paragraph will focus exclusively on cultic remains that predate the cult of Asklepios. Cults of deities other than Asklepios that were later added on the precinct or practiced simultaneously with the cult of Asklepios will be discussed briefly in the introduction of the third chapter of this thesis; Levine 2008, 58-59; Scott 2018; Winter 1982, 483; Kopestonsky 2016, 721; Melfi 2007b, 120.
¹³² Levine 2008, 58; Melfi 2009, 617; cf. Graf 1992, 183-184; the ancient Greek association of the abovementioned deities with ruralness and even wilderness is perhaps best illustrated by the introduction of Pan in Athens. Pan came to Athens from Arkadia, where he was worshipped in sanctuaries and temples. The sanctuary that was given to Pan by the Athenians was cave at the northwest side of the Acropolis: a “rustic” space in the middle of the city. This positioning connected Pan to Aphrodite and the nymphs, who also had caves at the base of the Acropolis. In Arkadia, Pan was never associated with the nymphs. His association with the nymphs through the placement of his cult within the wider Athenian religious landscape therefore defined Pan’s character in Athens and confirms the status of both Pan and the nymphs as rural gods. Cf. Scott 2018, 218-220.
¹³³ Melfi 2007b, 120; Renberg 2017a, 151; Kopestonsky 2016, 743, 711; it is moreover striking that none of these Asklepieia were situated in Arkadia, since the cults of rural deities were particularly popular here and their worship goes back to a very early period. Artemis is by far the most frequently mentioned, followed by Demeter and Kore, Pan and Apollo (see Winter 1982, 483). Perhaps these rural cults in Arkadia were deemed too important by the local inhabitants to replace them with sanctuaries of Asklepios; in Corinth, the cult of the nymphs was attached to the Lerna springs, which were in turn connected to the Asklepieion. The Corinthian Asklepieion is therefore linked to both Apollo and the nymphs. This relationship between Apollo and the nymphs is not unique to Corinth. Anywhere in ancient Greece, the nymphs acted as attendants for not only Apollo, but also for Hermes, Dionysos, and Artemis. See Kopestonsky 2016, 713; Larson 2001, 5, 11.
Asklepios and the nymphs here a little less evident than at Lebena and Athens, where the precincts of Asklepios completely overlap the sacred space of the nymphs. The Asklepieion of Corinth is moreover particularly interesting because here, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, both the nymphs and Apollo were present. At the Athenian Asklepieion was a small cavern in the rock of the Acropolis, containing a spring that was sacred to the nymphs before the Asklepieion was built. The architects of the early Asklepieion at Athens preserved this spring and later integrated it into the back wall of the fourth century BCE stoa.

The Asklepieion of Lebena was situated at a cliff near the sea, on a spot that was sacred to the nymphs, Hermes and Achelous: a river god. We know that the Lebena Asklepieion was built upon a cult site of these gods from a chronicle that was composed between 200 and 170 BCE (fig. 5). The chronicle states that: ‘The altar of Hermes which were called (...) (and the altars) of the nymphs and of Achelous (...) where the inhabitants of Lebena make sacrifices still today (...) according to the ancient law, a pig to Achelous and a kid to the nymphs (...) that Asklepios sent from Epidaurous to Lebena and (...) the god commanded (...).’ Melfi argues that the longstanding worship of the nymphs, Hermes and Achelous is mentioned in the Lebena chronicle to emphasize the sanctity of the site and its ensuing capability to house the cult of Asklepios. While the approval of the nymphs may indeed have been a decisive factor in the placement of the Asklepieion at Lebena, it cannot be said with certainty that specifically the nymphs were needed to prove the sacredness of the site – any other god would have sufficed to merely make the precinct sacred.

---

134 The Asklepieion at Pharsalos was situated near the Alogopati cave, where the nymphs were worshipped in conjunction with Pan, Hermes, Apollo, Herakles, Chiron, Asklepios, Hygeia and some unnamed deities. See Kopestonsky 2016, 743; Riethmüller 2005b, 293; Levine 2008, 59; as mentioned above, the Asklepieion of Corinth was situated in close proximity to the famous Lerna springs, which were likely a place of worship for the nymphs. See Kopestonsky 2016.
135 Further research is needed to fully understand the connection between Asklepios, Apollo and the nymphs, not only at Corinth, but also at other sanctuaries of Asklepios that were placed upon older cult sites of Apollo and/or the nymphs.
136 See fig. 13 on page 67 of this thesis; cf. Friese 2019, 54.
138 IC I xvii 10; cf. Chaniotis 1988, 48; Melfi 2007b, 165.
140 Melfi 2007b, 166.
In Athens, where there would have been no doubt about the religious legitimacy of the Acropolis rock, the Asklepieion was also built in a spot that was sacred to the nymphs. Therefore, what relationship was there between Asklepios and the nymphs? Fritz Graf argues that the main reason for Asklepia to incorporate rustic elements such as springs, caves and rural deities such as the nymphs, was to create a pastoral atmosphere associated with epiphany.141 This epiphanic environment would in turn be beneficial for the stimulation of healing dreams, which were a vital element for incubation rituals.142 Again, this theory does not explain the specific relationship between Asklepios and the nymphs, because the nymphs were not the only deities that were linked to springs and caves.

A striking similarity between Asklepios and the nymphs that may provide an answer to the question above, is that springs and other water sources play an important role in both cults. In literature, nymphs are associated with water, trees, and mountains.143 It is therefore not surprising that within the precincts of Asklepios at Athens and Lebena, the water sources are connected to the nymphs. Water is a vital element, not only of the cult of Asklepios, but of healing cults in general.144 Natural water sources in particular were often attributed with healing

---

141 Graf 1992, 183.
142 See Platt 2011.
143 However, most archaeological evidence of cultic activity for the nymphs is found at extramural caves. The cults of the nymphs at Corinth seems to form an exception to this rule. Here, their cult is focused mainly at water sources within or near the city itself. See Kopestonsky 2016, 711.
144 Croon 1967; the importance of water for healing rituals can already be observed in seventh-century BCE Egypt in the form of so-called healing statues. These statues were covered with magical healing texts, and usually depicted elite men or seated goddesses. The power of the text was obtained not by reciting, but by pouring water over the stone and then drinking it or applying the charged fluid to a body part. See Price 2016, 196; Forshaw 2014, 33.
powers and are therefore often present at sanctuaries of Asklepios. It is because of these beliefs that some scholars link the abundance of wells and springs at Asklepieia to incubation rituals. The importance of water for both the cult of Asklepios and that of the nymphs therefore better explains the phenomenon of Asklepieia that were built upon older cult sites of the nymphs.

However, natural water sources are not exclusively sacred to the cults of Asklepios and the nymphs. Actually, springs or fountains were also often included in sanctuaries of Apollo, who also happens to be closely linked to the nymphs. The placement of Asklepieia at former cult sites of the nymphs (and Apollo) may therefore be a result of the presence of sacred water rather than the joining of two or more gods with a meaningful symbolic relationship. The location of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus, however, cannot be explained by the presence of (older) natural water sources. At Epidaurus, there were only a few wells, scattered around the precinct. The earliest Epidaurian well dates back to the late sixth, or at latest, the early fifth century BCE.

It can thus be concluded that the placement of Asklepieia that are built near springs and fountains (whether or not sacred to the nymphs or other rural deities) is not modelled after the geographical placement of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus, but can instead be attributed to the importance of natural water sources of an especially healthy nature, not only for the cult of Asklepios, but also to the cults of Apollo and the nymphs. The important role of water in cult activity for Asklepios can be observed all over the Greek world and may therefore be understood as a Panhellenic phenomenon that in some cases likely determined the placement of early Greek Asklepieia. However, the analysis above has demonstrated that Asklepieia adopted this global phenomenon and subsequently adapted it to their own local needs. For example, the Corinthian Asklepieion possessed an abundance of natural water sources while the Athenian Asklepieion only included one small spring.

145 For an overview of Cretan temples and shrines of Asklepios that are located adjacent to springs, see Baldwin Bowsky 2016, 135.
146 Renberg 2017a, 150.
147 Larson 2001, 5, 11; Kopestonsky 2016, 721; see for example the Castalian spring near the temple of Apollo at Delphi (Scott 2014, 253).
148 Some wells in the Epidaurian Asklepieion date back to (at least) the late sixth century BCE, but these are not natural water sources. The early wells at Epidaurus will be discussed in paragraph 2.2.
149 Tomlinson 1983, 46; see also number 1A, fig. 6 on page 53 of this thesis.
150 The Corinthian waterworks will be discussed at length in paragraph 2.3.
1.7 The “exceptions”: intramural and urban Asklepieia

Despite the large numbers of Asklepieia that are identified as extra-urban sanctuaries, many sanctuaries of Asklepios were located inside urban centers. In fact, the once widely accepted view that the majority of Asklepieia were extra-urban has been debunked by Calloway Scott.\(^\text{151}\) Among the Asklepieia that will be discussed in this paragraph are also sanctuaries that scholars have placed into either of the two categories, indicating the ambiguity surrounding the criteria of both categories. In what follows, I will therefore first list some of the urban Asklepieia and examine how and why these Asklepieia can be understood as urban sanctuaries. Thereafter, the abovementioned problems surrounding the terms “urban” and “extra-urban” will be illustrated by an analysis of the case of the Asklepieion of Athens, which is perceived as an urban sanctuary by some scholars but has also been classified as an extra-urban cult center. This will lead to a perceptive consideration of the extent to which the geographical placement of these urban sanctuaries of Asklepios can be viewed as a reflection of the siting of the Asklepieion at Epidauros.

All scholars, even those who categorize most Asklepieia as extra-urban sanctuaries (e.g. Fritz Graf), acknowledge that there was no consistency in the placement of Asklepieia in both the Greek and Roman worlds.\(^\text{152}\) Bronwen Wickkiser mentions that ‘not all were in obviously liminal areas’ and goes on to list some of the Asklepieia that were, in her view, situated in the very center of the polis.\(^\text{153}\) The work of Calloway Scott includes a more elaborate treatment of Asklepieia that he considers to be urban. Scott rightly argues that all intramural Asklepieia should be interpreted as urban sanctuaries, ergo all sanctuaries that are situated within the enclosure of the polis. According to Scott, a list of intramural Asklepieia should include (at least) those at Athens, Piraeus, Corinth, Argos, Leuktra, Messene, Patrae, Tegea, Pharsalos, Pherai (in Thessaly), Thasos, Paros, Mytilene, Sikyon and Gortyn.\(^\text{154}\) Perhaps surprisingly, Scott’s list also includes the Asklepieia at Corinth, Athens, Piraeus and Pharsalos. As demonstrated earlier in this chapter, these Asklepieia have been categorized as extra-urban by other scholars based on their position near a harbor, or the city or acropolis walls. However,

\(^{151}\) See Scott (2017, 142), who states that a joint survey of literary and archaeological sources has destabilized the assertion that the majority of Asklepieia were located outside of urban centers, but unfortunately does not refer to these works.


\(^{153}\) Wickkiser 2003, 263.

\(^{154}\) These are only the Asklepieia listed by Scott that were established before the end of the fourth century BCE. For a list including also sanctuaries of Asklepios founded after that time, see Scott 2017, 142 n. 14; cf. Riethmüller 2005a, 241-242 (Athens); Riethmüller 2005b, 25 (Piraeus), 54 (Corinth), 135 (Leuktra), 157 (Messene), 185 (Patrae), 225 (Tegea), 292 (Pharsalos), 305-306 (Pherai), 327 (Thasos), 340 (Paros), 360 (Mytilene); both Sikyon and Gortyn possessed two Asklepieia: one intramural and one outside of the city walls. See Scott 2017, 165-166, 170 n. 106.
because these four sanctuaries were located within city walls, they should be identified as urban sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{155}

For this thesis, however, thinking in binary terms such as urban and extra-urban is disadvantageous. The criteria on which both classifications depend can vary greatly, making the terms unreliable and devoid of explanatory value. Therefore, the placement of early Greek Asklepieia should not be compared to the siting of the Asklepieion of Epidauros based on whether these sanctuaries can be put into the same (extra-urban) category, but rather on similarities in their environmental contexts.\textsuperscript{156} Indicators of these similarities are predominantly of environmental nature (such as surroundings consisting of uncultivated elements, like forests, mountains and fields), but also the distance between the Asklepieion and its associated city or town. In other words, the placement of an Asklepieion within the landscape resembles that of the Asklepieion of Epidauros when it does so on a physical and visible level, not on a categorical level. When environmental similarity is taken as a primary criterion, relatively few locations of Asklepieia can be perceived as modelled after the geographical placement of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. The comparative analysis of the preceding paragraphs has shown that the only Asklepieia that geographically resemble the Asklepieion of Epidauros are the sanctuaries at Kos, Troezen and Sikyon, since these sanctuaries were situated at a considerable distance from their corresponding poleis and were located in a rustic landscape.

The case of the Asklepieion on the Athenian Acropolis may moreover demonstrate that adaptation is not a unilateral process. When in the fourth century BCE the cult of Asklepios became increasingly popular and Asklepieia arose everywhere, not all eyes were on the Epidaurian Asklepieion all of the time – despite its indisputable prominence. The Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn respectively date to the second half of the fourth century BCE and the early fourth century BCE.\textsuperscript{157} Both sanctuaries were abutting the walls of an acropolis, much like the Athenian Asklepieion. Sofoklis Alevridis and Milena Melfi claim that the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn can be considered part of a group of sanctuaries with a distinctive Epidaurian character. Their placement along the Alpheios river would, according to Alevridis and Melfi, confirm their Epidaurian nature – ‘evidenced by the strong emphasis placed on water in the healing process’.\textsuperscript{158} Moreover, Alevridis and Melfi observe the Epidaurian origins of the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn through their spatial organization, although unfortunately,

\textsuperscript{155} See Apostolopoulos et al. (2013, 413) for a map that shows the walls surrounding Piraeus.
\textsuperscript{156} Henceforth referred to as “environmental similarities”.
\textsuperscript{157} Renberg 2017a, 182 n. 160; Scott 2017 170 n. 106; cf. Wickkiser 2003, 62 n. 191.
\textsuperscript{158} Alevridis and Melfi 2005, 279.
Alevridis and Melfi do not support their argument with examples of the similarities between the internal arrangements of the Asklepieia of Alipheira, Gortyn and Epidauros.\textsuperscript{159}

Regardless of whether or not the layouts of the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn resemble the plan of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, the placement of the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn may be understood as modelled after the location of the Athenian Asklepieion rather than that of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. The Epidaurian Asklepieion was not located anywhere near an acropolis, while the Athenian Asklepieion was built just below the Acropolis walls almost a century before the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn were established; allowing these poleis enough time to copy the placement of the Athenian Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{160} Moreover, Alevridis’ and Melfi’s claim that the strong emphasis placed on water at the Asklepieia of Alipheira and Gortyn demonstrates their Epidaurian origins is inadequate, since as demonstrated above, water was a crucial element in virtually every healing cult. The case of the Asklepieion of Athens thus illustrates that the location of Asklepieia can be modelled on sanctuaries of Asklepios other than the Asklepieion of Epidauros, and that imitation can be observed from the environmental similarities between their locations.

\section*{1.8 Conclusions}

This chapter has aimed to establish whether the locations of Asklepieia within the ancient Greek landscape were modelled after the geographical placement of the Asklepieion of Epidauros or were dictated by local and/or global determinants. In so doing, I have evaluated some of the preexisting explanations for the placement of Asklepieia. Some theories proved more credible than others. For instance, both the sanatorium hypothesis and the argument that incubation was a decisive factor for the geographical placement of Asklepieia cannot be verified by any evidence and are thus difficult to validate. Moreover, the latecomer theory appears to rely on outdated views and anachronistic terms, and therefore should not be utilized to explain the geographical placement of extra-urban Asklepieia.

The mythological connection between Asklepios and Apollo makes older cult sites of Asklepios’ father favorable places for Asklepieia, and the healing aspect of the god Apollo further enhances the rationale of integrating the cult of Asklepios with that of his father. However, because only a handful of sanctuaries of Asklepios can be placed into this category,

\textsuperscript{159} Plans of the Asklepieia of Gortyn and Alipheira can be found in Melfi 2007a, 213, 217, 218, 230. However, it is difficult to observe any similarities between the layouts of the Asklepieia at Gortyn, Alipheira and Epidauros from these plans without further explanation in the work of Alevridis and Melfi.

\textsuperscript{160} Further research into the socio-political relationships between Alipheira, Gortyn and Athens is needed to explain the similarities between the placement of their Asklepieia.
the establishment of Asklepieia upon older cult sites of Apollo likely happened only if this location was profitable for the polis. The placement of early Greek Asklepieia at cultic remains of Apollo cannot be understood as a reproduction of an Epidaurian tradition merely because the Asklepieion of Epidauros was located near a sanctuary of Apollo. The analysis of paragraph 1.4 has demonstrated that more determinants were at play and that the ideal location for a new cult would have been different for each polis.

The importance of water for the cults of Asklepios, Apollo and the nymphs may have been an important drive to establish Asklepieia upon these older cult sites. Moreover, because the novel Asklepios-cult superseded some of the (water-related) healing aspects of both Apollo and the nymphs, the placement of Asklepieia at former cult sites of these deities may be a result of the presence of sacred water rather than the joining of two or more gods: an outcome of this chapter that has to this day not been considered by other scholars. The location of the Epidaurian Asklepieion, however, cannot be explained by the presence of natural water sources because these were not present within the precinct. It can therefore be concluded that the placement of Asklepieia that were located in the vicinity of springs and fountains was also not modelled after the geographical placement of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. Rather, the important role of water in cult activity for Asklepios can be observed all over the Greek world and may therefore be understood as a Panhellenic feature that in some cases likely determined the placement of early Greek Asklepieia and could be adapted to suit the local needs of each sanctuary.

An evaluation of the terms “urban” and “extra-urban” moreover led to the conclusion that thinking in these binary terms is unfavorable for the aim of this thesis. A more helpful approach would be to compare the placement of early Greek Asklepieia to that of the Asklepieion of Epidauros based on the environmental similarities between their locations. This approach yields few locations of Asklepieia that can be perceived as modelled after the geographical placement of the Asklepieion of Epidauros. Moreover, the location of Asklepieia may be inspired by sanctuaries other than the Asklepieion of Epidauros, as demonstrated by the environmental similarities between the locations of the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn, and that of the Athenian Asklepieion.

Again, the aim of this chapter was not to find one overarching explanation or to create a new theory to elucidate the placement of early Greek Asklepieia. The analysis of this chapter has established that there is no suitable evidence (in the form of written sources) to explain the siting of sanctuaries of Asklepios within the landscape. My goal was therefore to demonstrate that attributing the placement of Asklepieia to the act of reproducing the location of the Asklepieion at Epidauros – or to any other single explanation – is a meager explanation. The
ideal placement, not only of Asklepieia but of all sanctuaries, depended on a variety of factors and was therefore different for each city or town. The location of early Greek Asklepieia was instead governed by Panhellenic tendencies (such as the importance of natural water sources for healing activities) and local interests (like the availability and ritual employment of those water sources). If these local aspects were subsequently adaptations of Panhellenic phenomena – e.g. the waterworks at the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens – they can be classified as glocalizing aspects.

At other Asklepieia, such as those at Kos, Troezen and Sikyon, an environmental connection to the Asklepieion of Epidauros may have been a vital part of the local identity of the sanctuary. However, the Asklepieia of Kos, Troezen and Sikyon were exceptions to the rule, as most early Greek Asklepieia did not display any distinct Epidaurian characteristics (an extra-urban placement and a considerable distance between the sanctuary and the city or town) in their geographical placement. It is moreover important to emphasize that, even if present, a resemblance to the placement of the Epidaurian Asklepieion would have been only one of many elements that constitute the local and global identities of a sanctuary.

Instead of being Epidaurian reproductions, the placement of Asklepieia thus mainly depended on a mixture of Panhellenic factors that were subsequently adapted to the local needs of the cult of Asklepios. The decentral motivations for the placement of early Greek Asklepieia can first of all be observed in the similarities between the placement of the Asklepieia at Alipheira, Gortyn and Athens. The similar placements of these sanctuaries demonstrate that Asklepieia all across ancient Greece were subject to trends of (mutual) feedback, which thus not only came from the direction of Epidauros. Instead, the placement of the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn near the walls of an acropolis seems to be inspired by the placement of the Asklepieion of Athens, seeing that the Athenian Asklepieion was built before the sanctuaries of Asklepios at Alipheira and Gortyn were established. Secondly, the joining of Asklepios and his father occurred frequently enough to be understood as a recurrent pattern by a variety of scholars and can therefore be seen as one of the Panhellenic characteristics of the cult of Asklepios. However, not every early Asklepieion was built within a precinct of Apollo: the placement of Asklepieia upon older cult sites of Apollo happened only if this location suited the local interests of the polis.

In short, the findings of this chapter are as follows: spiritually high-quality water played a very important role in the cult of Asklepios. Preexisting sanctuaries of Apollo and the nymphs often included natural water sources because they were already connected with various health aspects before the arrival of Asklepios, which made it easy for the ancient Greeks to fit
Asklepios in with these other deities – who moreover held a tight familiar connection. The importance of water for the Asklepios-cult was not necessarily an Epidaurian manifestation, but a Panhellenic phenomenon which was subsequently implemented differently in each location, making it a glocalizing aspect of early Greek Asklepieia.

The Panhellenic, local and perhaps also Epidaurian characteristics of the Asklepios-cult will be analyzed in more detail in the following chapter, where the layouts and individual structures of numerous early Greek Asklepieia will be compared to those of the Asklepieion at Epidauros. This comparative analysis may reveal whether their plans were modelled after the internal arrangements and appearance of the Asklepieion of Epidauros or whether they were shaped by local interest or even global processes of social and cultural change.
Chapter 2: Layouts and Structures

'It is not the architecture that defines the cult – it is the cult and its rituals that define the architecture.'

A comparison of the plans and structures of early Greek Asklepieia

In the previous chapter, the analysis of the material evidence was conducted at a macro-level by an evaluation of the placement of healing sanctuaries within the ancient Greek landscape. The goal was to demonstrate that simply classifying the extra-urban placement of certain Asklepieia as reproductions of the location of the Asklepieion at Epidauros based on a mere categorical analogy is inadequate. Rather, it appeared that the ideal placement for a sanctuary of Asklepios depended on a variety of factors and is therefore different for each city or town. Zooming in from their geographical placement, this chapter will compare the layouts and individual structures of the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens to that of the Epidaurian Asklepieion. This comparison should reveal whether the structures and layouts of sanctuaries of Asklepios were modelled after the image of the Asklepieion of Epidauros or whether early Greek Asklepieia were formed by local and/or global tendencies.

Apart from the previously discussed study of Alevridis and Melfi on the Epidaurian origins of the Asklepieia at Alipheira and Gortyn based on similarities between the spatial organizations of these sanctuaries, the internal arrangements of early Greek Asklepieia have, as of yet, not often been compared to the layout of the Asklepieion at Epidauros. Because of this lack of scholarly attention, it is necessary here to display and examine the layouts of the Asklepieia at Epidauros, Corinth and Athens to determine whether their plans are in fact similar, since scholars claim that the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens were offshoots from the Epidaurian Asklepieion and that they therefore share formal aspects in terms of their architectural and structural arrangements.

161 Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 112.
162 Alevridis and Melfi 2005, 279; a similar argument was made by R. Martin and H. Metzger already in 1941, concerning the non-coincidental connection between the layouts of the Asklepieia of Gortyn and Epidauros. For a summary of this argument, see Scott 2017, 170 n. 106.
163 Cf. Solin 2013, 9; Renberg 2017a, 179, 182-183; Hughes 2017, 30.
First of all, the layout of the Asklepieion of Epidauros will be discussed briefly so as to give an overview of the different structures and buildings within the precinct. This paragraph will be kept concise because all of the Epidaurian structures will be elaborated on in the following paragraphs, when these structures are compared to the structures at the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens. The Athenian and Corinthian Asklepieia will serve as case studies in this chapter because they are compatible with the Asklepieion of Epidauros in renown (both ancient and modern) and the extent to which they were excavated. These three sanctuaries were all thoroughly excavated. The discrepancy between the amount and quality of the evidence from the Asklepieia of Epidauros, Corinth and Athens should therefore be as little as possible, making these sanctuaries suitable candidates for a comparative analysis. As such, the following analysis is heavily dependent on archaeological data. While, in some cases, written testimonies may provide clues about the arrangement of structures within a precinct and are therefore also included in this chapter, archaeological remains are a more abundant type of evidence for this study.

Not only the composition of the different buildings, but also the individual structures themselves will be examined and compared to similar structures at the other two Asklepieia of this case study. These include temples of Asklepios, incubation structures, sacred pits, theaters, dining halls, waterworks (springs, wells and bath buildings), peribolos walls and propylaea. The similarities and differences between the structures at Epidauros, Corinth and Athens will be discussed with regard of the different building phases at each sanctuary in order to give a coherent chronological overview. The Asklepieion of Corinth is moreover of a slightly earlier date than the Athenian Asklepieion and will therefore be discussed secondly, after the outlines of the Asklepieion of Epidauros have been presented. The Asklepieion at Athens will be analyzed thirdly, followed by the concluding remarks of this chapter. Ultimately, the aim of this chapter is to determine whether the structures at each Asklepieion of this case study were modelled after structures at Epidauros or originated from local interests and/or trends that affected the entire Greek world during the Classical and early Hellenistic periods.

---

164 Kabbadias 1891, 9-10; cf. Melfi 2007a, 17; Wickkiser 2010, 40; Wickkiser 2003, 2.
Figure 6: The main area of the Asklepieion at Epidauros (after Tomlinson 1983, 42).
2.1 The layout and development of the Asklepieion of Epidaurus

One of the earliest structures of the Epidaurian Asklepieion (see fig. 6 above) is a square stoa-like building that was named “Building E” (number 22 on fig. 6) by Panagiotis Kabbadias, the first excavator of the Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{165} Building E dates back to the second part of the fifth century BCE, although it was possibly preceded by less monumental structures. Inscribed dedications on bronze vases were found in this area, together with ash and other sacrificial debris. The deposit in which the dedications and debris were found probably dates back to the early fifth century BCE and therefore predates the construction of Building E, indicating that there was cultic activity at this part of the site before the first substantial architectural structures were established.\textsuperscript{166}

The purpose of Building E is uncertain, but it was evidently an important structure since it was preserved as the sanctuary developed and later structures were arranged to take account of its position.\textsuperscript{167} Usually, the altar that corresponds to the temple is placed to the east of the temple at some distance of the entrance, aligned with the central axis of the building.\textsuperscript{168} The altar of Asklepios (12) that belongs to the temple of Asklepios (13), however, is placed slightly to one side of the central axis of the temple because it had to leave room for the position of Building E.

Among the earliest structures of the Asklepieion are also a few wells that were scattered around the precinct. The earliest well (1A) was found near the propylon (1) and dates back to the late sixth, or at latest, the early fifth century BCE.\textsuperscript{169} Directly to the east of the later fourth century stoa lies an earlier building (11) that dates back to the mid-fifth century BCE. It is located adjacent to a well and measures roughly 2 by 3 m.\textsuperscript{170} The square altar of Apollo (21) is also of a very early date and can be placed within the late fifth century BCE. Together, Building E, the early well, the small 2 by 3 building and the square altar of Apollo constitute the first building phase of the Epidaurian Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{171}

---

\textsuperscript{165} The ancient name of the building remains unknown. Modern-day works have retained Kabbadias’ label for it. Cf. Melfi 2007a, 25.

\textsuperscript{166} Tomlinson 1982, 72-73.

\textsuperscript{167} Theories about the function of Building E will be discussed in paragraph 2.2.

\textsuperscript{168} Miles 2016, 218; cf. Wycherley 1978, 182.

\textsuperscript{169} This well has been securely dated based on the Z-shaped clamps that fixed the blocks together. See Tomlinson 1983, 46.

\textsuperscript{170} Melfi 2007a, 25.

\textsuperscript{171} By acknowledging these structures as belonging to the first building phase, I deviate from Tomlinson’s chronology, who places the first building phase at Epidaurus in the early fourth century, when the earliest sanctuary (which was still entirely unsophisticated in architectural terms) was transformed into a substantial Asklepieion. See Tomlinson 1983, 23. I recognize the fourth-century construction works as the second building phase at Epidaurus.
The altar of Asklepios, the temple of Asklepios, the abaton and the tholos all belong to the fourth-century BCE developments of the sanctuary, which would have been the second building phase at the Asklepieion of Epiđauros. The altar, temple, abaton and tholos are moreover the structures that define the central area of the precinct. This central area is somewhat constricted, on the one hand, as mentioned above, by the structures that were there prior to the fourth century, such as Building E and the square altar of Apollo. On the other hand, the surrounding hills which slope down to the north and east form a constricting factor for the placement of the structures within the central area of the Asklepieion.

The temple of Asklepios is flanked at the north by the abaton (15): a stoa where visitors of the Asklepieion slept to be cured by either Asklepios or Apollo. The western half of the abaton is a later addition and dates to the late Hellenistic or even Roman period. The temple of Asklepios was built before the first part of the abaton was constructed. From building inscriptions, we know that the temple was built in four years and eight months, and that the construction likely started somewhere between 375 and 370 BCE. The construction of the tholos began after the completion of the temple of Asklepios and took much longer to build: at least twenty-seven years. Its circular plan stands out between the many rectangular buildings within the precinct.

Structures outside of this compact central area are generally of later dates. The theater (not visible on fig. 6, see fig. 7) which lies approximately 400 m from the central area of the Asklepieion was part of the third building phase and can be dated to the late fourth century BCE. The stadium (30) belongs to the latter part of the fourth century as well. It is mentioned in a late fourth century inscription that was found in a fountain house within the precinct. This inscription creates a terminus ante quem for the stadium, although construction at the stadium continued also after the late fourth century BCE. The katagogion (or hostel building), the
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172 Tomlinson 1983, 55.
173 Kabbadias 1891, 10; Tomlinson 1983, 55.
174 The heading of the Epidaurian iamata states that these are the ‘Cures by Apollo and Asklepios’, which further substantiates the hypothesis of the Apollonian pantheon that was among the findings of the first chapter of this thesis. See LiDonnici 1989, 45.
175 Tomlinson 1983, 68.
176 Melfi 2007a, 32; IG IV² 1 103, A-B.
177 The appearance of the tholos will be discussed at length in paragraph 2.4.
178 According to Tomlinson (1983, 87), the second building phase occurred, between the late fourth and early third centuries BCE; the theater at Epiđauros is one of best-preserved theaters in all of Greece. Cf. Declercq and Dekeyser 2007.
180 Melfi 2007a, 44; Tomlinson 1983, 91.
propylon and the banqueting hall (26) all date back to the first part of the third century BCE.\textsuperscript{181} Other structures were built in late Hellenistic and Roman times and are therefore not included in this overview. These later structures also include some Roman fountain houses and storage chambers, which seem to be replacements of earlier buildings. Little is known about the earlier versions of these buildings because of the invasive Roman building program.\textsuperscript{182}

\textbf{Figure 7:} General layout of the sanctuaries of Asklepios and Apollo Maleatas. Note how the theatre and the square katagogion are located at some distance to the south-east of the main area of the Asklepieion (after Tomlinson 1983, 40).

\textsuperscript{181} The \textit{katagogion} is not visible on fig. 6. It was situated at the south-east corner of the Asklepieion, between the theater and the central area of the sanctuary. See fig. 7; Tomlinson 1983, 83-84, 30.

\textsuperscript{182} Tomlinson 1983, 50.
Figure 8: Plan of the early Asklepieion at Corinth. The dotted lines indicate the walls of the later fourth-century temple (after Wickkiser 2010, 42).

2.2 Common cultic activity? The early Asklepieion of Corinth

I will now turn to the sanctuary of Asklepios in the city of Corinth, which was established in the late fifth century BCE and is not to be confused with the later harbor-Asklepieion of Kenchreai.183 As mentioned in paragraph 1.5, the early sanctuary of Asklepios at Corinth originally belonged to Apollo, whom Asklepios joined here in the late fifth century. The architecture of the sanctuary in this period seems modest and enigmatic, consisting of a small building of uncertain function (the so-called oikos), a cella-like structure containing four post-holes and a drainage channel, and a few wells (see fig. 8 above). It is difficult to compare the

---

183 The Asklepieion and Lerna were excavated in the early 1950s. The findings of these excavations are presented in Roebuck 1951 and Lang 1977; cf. Wickkiser 2010, 37.
early structures at Corinth to the earliest building phases of the Asklepieia at Epidauros and Athens, since – unlike the long-preserved Building E at Epidauros – all of the earliest buildings in Corinth were razed to make way for the more elaborate building program of the fourth century BCE. The chronology of the earliest structures within the Asklepieion can therefore not be disclosed, but because their foundations largely remain, their purpose is not hopelessly obscure.\footnote{184 Wickkiser 2010, 40-41.}

While the oikos does not resemble any of the earliest structures at the Asklepieion of Epidauros, wells were in fact present at Epidauros during the earliest phase of the Asklepieion, as mentioned above. However, as demonstrated in paragraph 1.7 of this thesis, water was a crucial element in virtually every healing cult. It is therefore difficult to understand wells and other water sources at Asklepieia as reflections of the Asklepieion at Epidauros. Moreover, the placement of the wells at the early Asklepieion of Corinth and Epidauros do not correlate. According to Bronwen Wickkiser, the foundations of the cella-like structure at Corinth resemble those of the fifth century BCE Epidaurian structure east of the abaton (fig. 6, number 11) and an early building at the Athenian Asklepieion.\footnote{185 Wickkiser 2010, 41.} All of these structures measure approximately 2 by 3 m.

The Epidaurian building has been identified by Milena Melfi as a bath building, based on its drainage provisions and proximity to a well.\footnote{186 Melfi 2007a, 25.} Vassilis Lambrinoudakis, however, interprets the building as a place for ritual dining because of cuttings in the floor, possibly for couches and a table, and a water channel running around the perimeter of the room.\footnote{187 Lambrinoudakis 2002, 214-219; cf. Wickkiser 2010, 41 n. 13.} In order to determine which of these interpretations is correct, the purpose of Building E should be disclosed because it would have been contemporaneous with the 2 by 3 m structure. The functions of the two buildings would therefore have complemented each other. Unfortunately, the precise function of Building E is just as unsure as that of the 2 by 3 m structure. Building E measures about 15 by 12 m and consists of a courtyard open to the west, facing the square altar of Apollo. It also included two small shrine-like rooms: one at the west end of the north wing and another, containing an altar, at the south end of the building.\footnote{188 Tomlinson 1983, 73.}

Tomlinson suggests that Building E was the original cult building of Asklepios.\footnote{189 Tomlinson's interpretation of Building E was later adopted by Melfi (2007a, 25). As of yet, no other worthwhile interpretations of Building E exist.} The long room on the south side of the structure would then accommodate incubation, while the
courtyard functioned as a predecessor of the early third-century BCE banqueting hall.\textsuperscript{190} If Tomlinson is right, Lambrinoudakis’ interpretation of the 2 by 3 m structure east of the Epidaurian abaton becomes less convincing because the function of the small structure as a place for ritual dining would then overlap with one of the purposes of Building E as a dining hall.\textsuperscript{191} Melfi’s suggestion that the small fifth-century building functioned as a bath building is therefore more compelling. The close vicinity of the 2 by 3 m structure to a well was a unique feature of the structure, seeing that Building E was not located near a water source. Water was used in Asklepieia (and healing sanctuaries in general) for ablutions.\textsuperscript{192} In some Asklepieia, visitors were required to (ritually) clean themselves before engaging in incubation.\textsuperscript{193} Therefore, if both Melfi and Tomlinson are right, the bathing function of the small fifth-century building would have complemented the incubation aspect of Building E.

A structure of similar measurements at the Asklepieion of Athens is often identified as a \textit{bomos} (altar) by scholars.\textsuperscript{194} Michaelis Lefantzis and Jesper Jensen, however, prefer to classify it as a small building because they are not convinced that this was in fact the altar of Asklepios.\textsuperscript{195} Much like Lefantzis and Jensen, Wickkiser takes a tentative stance on the interpretation of the foundations of the small cella-like structure in Corinth, arguing that: ‘Although we do not yet know the function(s) of this structure, the presence of similar buildings at other Asklepieia suggests common cultic activity.’\textsuperscript{196}

On the one hand, these three largely contemporaneous structures at three different Asklepieia had similar appearances, while on the other hand, they seem to have had dissimilar purposes: the structure at Epidaurus most likely functioned as a bath building, the building at Athens has been interpreted as an early temple of Asklepios and the cella-like structure at Corinth cannot be linked to either of these functions and could therefore have had an even

\textsuperscript{190} When after the fourth century BCE these functions were dispersed in other structures across the sanctuary, Building E may have become the temple of Apollo. While there is evidence of worship of Apollo at the Epidaurian Asklepieion, no obvious temple of Apollo has as of yet been discovered. See Tomlinson 1983, 75.

\textsuperscript{191} All preparation and consumption of food in a sanctuary is referred to as “ritual dining” (see Berlin 1999, 31). In scholarly works, the dining activities in Building E are not usually referred to as ritual dining, although the dining activities at both the smaller fifth-century structure and Building E may thus be classified as ritual dining.

\textsuperscript{192} This practice was moreover not specific to Asklepieia or other healing sanctuaries. Water at the entrance of a sanctuary was primarily intended for the symbolic purifications that were required of all who entered any Greek sanctuary. These rituals are evidenced by the Hippocratic \textit{De morbo sacro}: ‘We ourselves fix boundaries to the sanctuaries and precincts of the gods, so that nobody may cross them unless he be pure; and when we enter we sprinkle ourselves, not as defiling ourselves thereby, but to wash away any pollution we may have already contracted.’ See Hippoc. \textit{Morb. sacr.} 4.53-60 (transl. Jones).

\textsuperscript{193} However, this is only one of the many purposes of water in the cult of Asklepios. For an overview of the uses of water at Asklepieia, see Renberg 2017a, 239-249.

\textsuperscript{194} Cf. Papaefthymiou 2009; the Athenian structure will be elaborated on in paragraph 2.4.

\textsuperscript{195} Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 92; cf. Wickkiser 2010, 41 n. 13.

\textsuperscript{196} Wickkiser 2010, 41.
different purpose. Wickkiser’s claim that the presence of similar buildings at different Asklepieia ‘suggests common cultic activity’ is thus incorrect. While the general shape of the bath building at Epidauros may have been adopted by the Asklepieia of Athens and Corinth, the cultic activity at these three structures was evidently adapted to serve the local interests of each individual Asklepieion.

In general, the layouts of the earliest phases of the Asklepieia at Corinth and Epidauros were modest and plain. However, this does not imply that these sanctuaries were struggling. Already during its earliest phase, the Asklepieion of Epidauros was receiving visitors from all over the Greek world. As demonstrated in paragraph 1.3 of this thesis, not much is needed in terms of architecture to worship Asklepios. Water for purification, an altar for sacrifices and a place for visitors to incubate were all that was necessary for an Asklepieion to function.

**Figure 9:** Plan and cross-sections of the Asklepieion and Lerna at Corinth (after Lang 1977, 16-17).
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197 This is evidenced by the *iamata*, which were inscribed in the fourth century BCE but also record events that took place in the fifth century or even before that time. See LiDonnici 1995, 76-78.

198 Wickkiser 2010, 43.
2.3  Well-watered Corinth: the Classical and early Hellenistic Asklepieion

In the late fourth century BCE, the Asklepieion of Corinth underwent major changes. All of the earliest structures were demolished and its new plan shows a rectangular precinct, surrounded by walls on the south and east sides, a large building (probably the abaton or inner sanctum) on the west and a colonnade on the north side (see fig. 9 above).\(^{199}\) The rectangular plan of the renovated Corinthian Asklepieion resembles the layouts of the Asklepieia at Kos and Messene. The urban Asklepieion at Messene was built at the end of the fourth century BCE and shows strong characteristics of Hellenistic architecture (fig. 10).\(^{200}\) Here, a colonnade surrounded the temple, which was situated in the center of the court, much like the temple at the Asklepieion of Corinth. The type of planning that was used in the Asklepieion of Messene is a relatively early example of what became more common in late Hellenistic and Roman times.\(^{201}\) The Asklepieion at Kos consists of multiple terraces – some of which can still be observed today (fig. 11).\(^{202}\) These early Hellenistic terraces show rectangular layouts, similar to those of the post-Classical Asklepieia at Corinth and Messene.

![Figure 10: Plan of the Hellenistic Asklepieion of Messene (after Yoshitake et al. 2004, 208).](image)

---

\(^{199}\) Lang 1977, 9.

\(^{200}\) These Hellenistic characteristics can primarily be found in its compact and rectangular layout that was centered around the temple. Cf. Riethmüller 2005b, 156-166; Melfi 2007a, 250; Yoshitake et al. 2004, 213.

\(^{201}\) Yoshitake et al. 2004, 213.

\(^{202}\) Senseney 2007, 556.
Although the fourth-century layouts of the Asklepieia of Corinth and Epidauros thus seem radically different at first glance, some small similarities can be discerned. Like the temple of Asklepios at the Epidaurian Asklepieion, the temple at Corinth is oriented towards the east and has a corresponding altar placed at some distance of the entrance, aligned with the central axis of the temple. However, eastern temple orientations were very common in ancient Greece, which makes it difficult to perceive the placement of the temple of Asklepios as anything other than a prevailing Greek practice.\textsuperscript{203} The altar at the Corinthian Asklepieion has a distinct long shape and therefore resembles the altar of Asklepios at Epidauros (fig. 6, number 12), but cannot be understood as modelled after the Epidaurian altar since long altars are a regional type.\textsuperscript{204}

\textsuperscript{203} In mainland Greece, however, there was more variety in temple orientations, although the eastern orientation remains the most common. See Boutsikas 2007; cf. Miles 2016, 206, 218.

\textsuperscript{204} Although the Asklepieia of Corinth and Epidauros were some 60 km removed from each other, they can be regarded as situated within the same region. The two sanctuaries were in close contact, as evidenced by the discovery of Corinthian limestone in buildings within the Asklepieion of Epidauros. Corinthian limestone was shipped from the harbor of Kenchreai to Epidauros and then hauled up to the sanctuary. Tomlinson 1983, 35; cf. Lang 1977, 10.
These narrow altars also occur, for example, at Isthmia and at the sanctuary of Hera at Perachora.205

Moreover, the arrangement of the colonnade north of the temple of Asklepios seems – again, at first glance – very similar to the composition of the temple of Asklepios and the abaton at Epidauros, although upon closer examination, the opposite holds true. Lacking a more obvious purpose, this north colonnade presumably functioned as shelter for visitors, not as a place for incubation rituals.206 The structure west of the temple of Asklepios is confidently marked as “abaton” on fig. 9, while in fact, its purpose as incubation dormitory is debatable because there is no textual evidence for the practice of incubation at Corinth.207 On the one hand, Gil Renberg argues that its identification as an incubation dormitory is plausible. Excavations at Epidauros have revealed that the inner half of the fourth-century abaton was largely closed off to give incubants shelter and privacy, and the similar division of this structure at Corinth into an open area and a closed-off inner area therefore contributes to its identification as an incubation dormitory.208

On the other hand, Renberg remains skeptical about classifying this building as an incubation structure, since “it is impossible to discard completely the earlier suggestions that this hall was used for storage or employed by the priests in some other capacity, and any conclusion regarding incubation having been practiced at the Corinthian Asklepieion is speculation, no matter how plausible.”209 Because of the ambivalence surrounding the structure north of the temple of Asklepios, this building cannot be perceived as modelled after the abaton at the Asklepieion of Epidauros.

The differences between the plans of the Asklepieia at Corinth and Epidauros are more numerous and obvious than their similarities. First of all, the layout of the Asklepieion of Corinth appears to be more rectangular, compact and planned, likely as a result of the invasive fourth-century building plan. This forms a stark contrast with the more organic layout of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, which did not undergo such a destructive renovation as the Corinthian Asklepieion during the fourth century BCE. Secondly, the Asklepieion of Corinth lacks most of the structures that define the Epidaurian Asklepieion, such as the tholos, the

205 Tomlinson 1983, 55.
207 Renberg 2017a, 157, 154.
stadium, the theater, the *katagogion*, the banqueting hall and perhaps thus even the abaton.210 Conversely, the Asklepieion of Corinth includes a feature that cannot be found at Epidauros: the springs of Lerna.211

The Lerna court was located immediately to the west of the Asklepieion and was connected to the sanctuary by a ramp.212 The complex consisted of a springhouse fed by a subterranean aqueduct and a series of five reservoirs cut into the rock. The area around the springs was monumentalized with a peristyle court, which was part of the same fourth-century BCE building plan that renovated the Asklepieion and consequently emphasizes the relationship between the Asklepieion and Lerna.213 The springs of Lerna are moreover not the only water sources of the Asklepieion. Wickkiser describes how ‘on the upper level of the precinct, there is a well near the entrance to the sanctuary, and behind the west colonnade is a room with a waterproof basin equipped with a sophisticated system of in- and out-take pipes, into which one could descend by narrow steps.’214 The use of this latter structure is unknown, but the presence of such elaborate waterworks further emphasizes the extreme importance of water at the Asklepieion of Corinth.

The waterworks of the Corinthian Asklepieion were thus the most elaborate waterworks of any known Asklepieion, which raises questions. Did the springs, wells and reservoirs of the Asklepieion and Lerna primarily serve the needs of the cult, or did they also serve the needs of the people living in the area? As mentioned above, water had many different purposes in sanctuaries of Asklepios. It was used for bathing, purification rituals, specific cures and also for drinking.215 However, these applications of water have all been recorded in other Asklepieia, including Epidauros, which was a much larger sanctuary but did not have such excessive
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210 Directly below the “abaton” was a series of rooms that possibly functioned as *hestiatoria* (banqueting halls), although this part of the precinct presumably belonged to the Lerna complex instead of the Asklepieion. See fig. 9, section B-B; Renberg 2017a, 157; the absence of a guesthouse may be explained by the fact that the Asklepieion was located just within the city walls of Corinth and thus at a short distance from the urban center where travelers and visitors of the Asklepieion could find a place to rest.

211 The springs got their name from excavator Carl Roebuck, who adopted this name from the work of Pausanias (“a spring called Lerna. Pillars stand around it, and seats have been made to refresh in summertime those who have entered it. By this gymnasium are temples of Zeus and Asclepius.” See Paus. 2.4.5 (transl. Jones).

212 See the courtyard and ramp on fig. 9.

213 Wickkiser 2003, 65 n. 204; de Waele 1933, 424; Pausanias’ distinction (see n. 205 above) between the Asklepieion and Lerna by naming them separately may moreover provide an important clue about the relationship between the Asklepieion and Lerna. Their relationship was probably only of a practical nature: although the Asklepieion and Lerna were connected (physically) by a ramp and a building plan, they were perceived (at least by Pausanias) as individual precincts instead of Lerna being fully integrated into the Asklepieion – or vice versa.

214 Wickkiser 2010, 50.

215 Renberg 2017a, 239-249; for an example of a cure that involved water, see Aristid. *Or.* 47-51; cf. Petsalis-Diomidis 2010, 139.
provisions of water as the Asklepieion of Corinth.\textsuperscript{216} Such copious amounts of water were thus not needed to perform rituals and provide visitors and cult personnel with water. It is therefore unlikely that the waterworks of the Asklepieion and Lerna served only the needs of the sanctuary of Asklepios.

\textit{Figure 12: The springs along the northern walls of Corinth (after Landon 2003, 49).}

Did the inhabitants of the area perhaps use the water of the Asklepieion and Lerna for their day to day lives? Multiple studies have shown that numerous springs ran along the north wall of Corinth, where the Asklepieion and Lerna were also located (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{217} The people living in this area therefore presumably had no shortage of water. However, Wickkiser claims that there may have been a lack of water in Corinth during the fourth century BCE because at that time, all of Greece seems to have been hit hard by drought.\textsuperscript{218} It is unlikely that this period of drought caused the Asklepieion and Lerna to expand their waterworks because if Wickkiser is right, similar practices may be observed in Asklepia all over Greece during the fourth century BCE – which is not the case. Yet another explanation for the plentiful water sources at the Asklepieion and Lerna is that they were designed to display the abundance of water in Corinth in general and perhaps even in this area in particular.\textsuperscript{219} The system of reservoirs within the

\textsuperscript{216} Wickkiser 2010, 51.
\textsuperscript{217} Kopestonsky 2016, 716-731; cf. Landon 2003.
\textsuperscript{218} Wickkiser 2010, 51; cf. Camp 1982.
\textsuperscript{219} In ancient literature, Corinth was known by its epithet “well-watered Corinth” and remarks about its many water sources can be found in a multitude of testimonies. See for example Paus. 2.3.5 (transl. Jones): ‘The Corinthians have baths in many parts of the city’ and Plut. Mor. De Herod. 870E (transl. Pearson and Sandbach): ‘Once by Corinth’s fairest springs we dwelt.’
Asklepieion and Lerna may be understood as belonging to a larger trend of hydraulic installations in Corinth in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, such as renovations to the Peirene fountain and the construction of the fountain of Glauke, which both rely on reservoir systems similar to that of the Asklepieion and Lerna.220

As of yet, none of these explanations have been identified as the one true reason for the excessive waterworks at the Asklepieion of Corinth. What can be said with a degree of certainty, however, is that the importance of water at the Asklepieion derived from local interests. Apart from the highly unlikely explanation that the springs, wells and reservoirs of the Asklepieion and Lerna would primarily have served the needs of the cult, all of the arguments above relate to local and regional interests. The explanation that the plentiful water sources at the Asklepieion and Lerna were designed to display the abundance of water in (this particular area of) Corinth may be the most likely reason of all. The fact that the Asklepieion was located near the springs of Lerna from the very beginnings of the Asklepieion and that both precincts were renovated within the same building program further emphasizes the role of water as a distinct Corinthian element within the sanctuary of Asklepios here.

Although the Asklepieion at Corinth may have looked at the Asklepieion of Epidauros and duplicated the style of the small fifth-century BCE bath building, it has become clear from the analysis above that the Asklepios-cult in Corinth took on a distinct manner of worship from the very start. During the fourth-century renovations, the Asklepieion abandoned its only Epidaurian style-elements and transformed into a typically Hellenistic sanctuary with a rectangular layout, resembling the Asklepieia at Kos and Messene. Besides adopting a global Hellenistic style in its layout, the Asklepieion of Corinth shows a distinct regional element: the long altar, which was also present at the Epidaurian Asklepieion. An apparent local feature of the Asklepieion of Corinth can be found in the integration of the Lerna springs within the plan of the sanctuary. Water became the Asklepieion’s main focus and while the abundance and complexity of its waterworks were unique Corinthian characteristics, the ritual use of water was a Panhellenic characteristic of Asklepieia. Not only at Epidauros but at virtually every Asklepieion, water played an important role. As such, the fourth-century Asklepieion of Corinth displayed both local and Panhellenic features.

2.4 The central area of the early Asklepieion at Athens

The text on the Telemachos monument allows us to securely date the arrival of the cult of Asklepios at Athens to 420 BCE, on Boedromion 17 or 18.\textsuperscript{221} The early Asklepieion of Athens was built on the east terrace of the south slope of the Acropolis.\textsuperscript{222} As can be seen on fig. 13 above, the earliest building phase consisted of few and unsophisticated structures, much like the early plans of the Asklepieia at Epidauros and Corinth.\textsuperscript{223} The aforementioned spring within the Acropolis rock and a drain leading the water away from the edges of the Acropolis rock held a central position within the precinct. This drain probably primarily facilitated the collection of water from the spring for ritual purposes, but it is argued that it also served a more

\textsuperscript{221} Lambert 2010, 156-157; Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 101; Wickkiser 2009a; for a reconstruction of the Telemachos monument, see fig. 16.

\textsuperscript{222} Although it has long been uncertain whether the early Athenian Asklepieion stood on the middle or east terrace of the Acropolis, it is now conclusively proved that the early sanctuary of Asklepios – like the thoroughly renovated fourth-century BCE Asklepieion – was situated on the east terrace. See Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 91.

\textsuperscript{223} It is difficult to determine whether the simple layout of the early Athenian Asklepieion can be placed within the aforementioned tradition of unsophisticated first building phases or if it was due to the time and manpower that was spent on other ongoing building projects at the Acropolis during the late fifth century BCE. Around this time, the Acropolis was still under construction to restore the damage done by the Persians. The temple of Athena Nike and the Erechtheion were being reconstructed and in the sanctuary of Dionysos, a large Odeion had been built, likely accompanied by changes to the theater. See Wickkiser 2003, 129.
practical goal. The drain diverted the water from the propylon – which was made of wood, as mentioned on the Telemachos monument.\textsuperscript{224}

Also located in the central area of the sanctuary was the small rectangular structure that has been compared to similar structures at the Asklepieia of Epidauros and Corinth by Bronwen Wickkiser.\textsuperscript{225} As mentioned in paragraph 2.2, the Athenian structure is often identified as the altar of Asklepios. The reason for its identification as a \emph{bomos} (altar) can once again be found on the Telemachos monument. Here, it is stated that Telemachos dedicated an altar to Asklepios, among other deities whose names are now largely illegible.\textsuperscript{226} Apart from the Telemachos monument, textual evidence for the altar of Asklepios is sparse. Moreover, the structure was almost completely rebuilt in ca. 300 BCE, when the stoa was constructed.\textsuperscript{227} The drastic fourth-century renovations make it difficult to disclose the precise function of the structure during the late fifth century BCE, of which only the foundations remain.\textsuperscript{228}

Potsherds found in pits below the structure date from prehistoric times until the end of the fifth century BCE, creating a stable but not very precise \emph{terminus ante quem}.\textsuperscript{229} Fortunately, the construction date of the structure can be finetuned by the text on the Telemachos monument, which consistently mentions the archons that reigned during individual constructions at the Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{230} According to the inscription, the altar was set up by Telemachos himself when the sanctuary was founded in 420 BCE. The text remains silent about what happened between 418 and 415 BCE. Michaelis Lefantzis and Jesper Jensen argue that the temple must have been built during these years because the construction of a temple is not mentioned later in the inscription:

\begin{quote}
‘Since such an important structure would surely have received mention somewhere in the inscription, a temple must have been erected to house the cult statue in 414/3 B.C. […] Our structure’s first construction phase should therefore be placed under one of the archon names from 418/7 to 416/5 B.C.’\textsuperscript{231}
\end{quote}

Lefantzis and Jensen are thus convinced that the foundations of the structure belong to the first temple of Asklepios on the Acropolis and that it was placed there somewhere between 418 and 415 BCE.

\textsuperscript{224} Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 116 n. 21; the wooden gateway is indicated as the ξυλοπύλιον on fig. 13.
\textsuperscript{225} Wickkiser 2010, 41.
\textsuperscript{226} Papaefthymiou 2009, 67.
\textsuperscript{227} Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 92.
\textsuperscript{228} Aleshire 1989, 20 n. 5; cf. Papaefthymiou 2009, 78; Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 93.
\textsuperscript{229} Papaefthymiou 2009, 73; cf. Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 100.
\textsuperscript{230} For example, ‘When Karias was archon, a \emph{peribolos} was built apart from the wooden gateway’ (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 4960, lines 32-34, transl. Wickkiser). Karias was archon in 415/414 BCE, see Wickkiser 2003, 119, n. 410.
\textsuperscript{231} Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 103.
This interpretation of Lefantzis and Jensen excludes the altar of Asklepios that is mentioned so prominently on the Telemachos monument, and they also do not indicate an alternative location for the altar. However, Lefantzis and Jensen argue that the structure must have been the temple of Asklepios based on a convincing and elaborate analysis of each of the different blocks of the foundation during the different building phases. Furthermore, their identification of the structure as a temple does not eliminate the possibility that the altar was placed within the structure. As mentioned above, the fillings of the pits below the structure indicate an approximate construction date at the end of the fifth century, which allows the foundations of the altar to be established in 420 BCE: before the structure developed into a small cult building at least two years later.

If anything, the chronological overview above demonstrates that while this early Athenian structure had a ground plan similar to that of the bath building at Epidauros, it shows no functional similarities to the Epidaurian structure – as also appeared to be the case with the cella-like structure at the Asklepieion of Corinth. On a functional level, the Athenian structure may have shared some of the features of Building E (such as its shrines), although on a physical level, these two buildings looked nothing alike. In the late fifth century BCE, the Asklepieion at Epidauros too possessed an altar. This was the square altar of Apollo, which as its name gives away, had a different shape than the rectangular foundations of the Athenian structure. The Athenian altar and temple thus cannot be understood as stylistic reproductions of the altar of Apollo and Building E at the Epidaurian Asklepieion.

A structure that stands out for its circular shape is the sacred pit (or bothros, literally “pit”) at the northwest corner of the precinct. It can be dated to the late fifth century BCE and therefore belongs to the very first building phase of the Asklepieion, together with the peribolos and the abovementioned structure. The pit was lined with polygonal masonry: the same technique and also in the same small-scale proportions that were used for the construction of the peribolos. Stairs are cut into the rock at its western end and there may have been more

---

232 See Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 94-101 for a detailed examination of the blocks; Lefantzis and Jensen (2009, 102) argue that the superstructure was made entirely of wood and thus left no traces in the archaeological record, but bolt holes for the doors can be detected on some of the blocks. These bolt holes are among the most convincing evidence for the identification of the structure as a temple.

233 See fig. 6, number 22.

234 See fig. 6, number 21.

235 Renberg 2017a, 136.

236 There are some issues surrounding the date of the sacred pit and when it became connected to the Asklepieion. However, the technicalities of these issues are irrelevant for this thesis because the purpose of the sacred pit is more important for the following comparison between the Athenian pit and structures at the Asklepieion of Epidauros. For a summary of the debate on the connection of the sacred pit to the Asklepieion and its date, see Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 111.

stairs and other structures surrounding the sacred pit, but the full arrangement of the sacred pit before the abscission (κατατομή) of the Acropolis rock for the construction of the Doric stoa is unknown. The purpose and nature of the sacred pit are obscure and much debated. Consequently, most scholars remain vague in their statements about the Athenian bothros, stating that it ‘presumably served some sacrificial purpose’ or that ‘for cultic reasons, Asklepios needed a sacred pit for his chthonic character’. A more straightforward argument that prevailed for some time is that the pit may have served as a cistern that held water for (incubation) rituals. However, the lack of waterproof plaster eliminates this possibility.

Similarly little is certain about the tholos at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus. While the tholos is of a later date than the sacred pit at Athens, seeing that the construction of the tholos started between 365 and 360 BCE, an examination of this Epidaurian building may provide some clues about the function and nature of the Athenian sacred pit. At first glance, the Epidaurian tholos shows no similarities to the bothros, since the tholos was a substantial circular building with a diameter of about 20 m (fig. 14 and 15). Its foundations are still visible today and consist of six concentric rings, of which the inner rings form an uncomplicated maze. The innermost ring surrounds a pit that once contained a pillar that held wooden steps whose other ends were supported by a ring wall. The architects of the tholos thus intended that the central superstructure of the building should be accessed through this pit, making the pit an important – if not the most important – element of the tholos. It is because of this pit in the center of the tholos that scholars compare the Athenian bothros to the tholos and attempt to uncover the exact purpose of both structures in doing so.

---

238 Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 111.
239 Wycherley 1978, 182; Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 111; although the latter remark seems comparatively convincing, Lefantzis and Jensen do not elaborate on what constitutes these ‘cultic reasons’ and therefore remain vague about the purpose of the sacred pit.
240 Aleshire 1989 26, nn. 6, 7.
241 Renberg 2017a, 151 n. 72.
242 Melfi 2007a, 32.
243 Traces of this attachment are still visible. See Tomlinson 1983, 61.
Figure 14: Plan of the tholos at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus (after Tomlinson 1983, 62).

Figure 15: Frontal view of the Epidaurian tholos (the details on the roof are conjectural) (after Tomlinson 1983, 63).
A widespread theory on the extraordinary arrangement of the inner foundations of the Epidaurian tholos is that it would have housed the sacred snakes. However, it is unlikely that snakes would have tolerated the darkness that was created by the closed off outer two rings of the structure, and the maze would not have stopped the snakes from escaping the tholos.\textsuperscript{245} This false interpretation has subsequently influenced the debate on the sacred pit at the Asklepieion of Athens, which is also occasionally argued to have contained snakes.\textsuperscript{246} Another theory about the function of both the tholos and the bothros is that they refer to an early hero cult of Asklepios. According to this theory, the pits would symbolize Asklepios’ fictive grave and were used for pre-incubation rituals and other sacrificial activities. This view is not without problems, as it is based on the assumption that holocausts and enagismoi of blood were common in the cult of Asklepios.\textsuperscript{247} A holocaust (also known as the holokautesis) denotes the complete destruction of a sacrificial victim in the fire, as opposed to the more common thysia, where only the non-edible parts of the victim were burned and the edible meat could be consumed by dedicants.\textsuperscript{248} Enagismoi required an initiate to stand in a pit and to be immersed with the blood of a sacrificial animal.\textsuperscript{249}

Most divine recipients of destruction sacrifices, such as the holokautesis and enagismoi can be categorized as chthonic deities.\textsuperscript{250} In the myths, Asklepios started out as a mortal hero and was later transformed into a god.\textsuperscript{251} Destruction sacrifices are generally perceived as an indication of this origin.\textsuperscript{252} However, if such rituals are to be understood as an expression of the chthonic character of Asklepios, it is remarkable that this type of sacrifice is so rarely attested.\textsuperscript{253} The only written evidence is an inscription from Epidauros that mentions the holokautesis as performed for an unnamed god: [ὁ]λοκαύτησιν τῶι θεῶι.\textsuperscript{254} While this god is usually identified as Asklepios and his chthonic mythological background makes him a likely recipient for this type of sacrifice, Asklepios is not specifically named in this document. Moreover, this inscription dates to the third century BCE.\textsuperscript{255} The omission of Asklepios’ name,
together with the almost two centuries between the Epidaurian inscription and the bothros and tholos make the inscription unfit to explain the purpose of both sacrificial pits.

Despite the little and questionable evidence for the practice of holokautesis and enagismoi rituals in the cult of Asklepios, the concept that both the bothros and the tholos served a ritual purpose – connected to particular forms of sacrifice to the dead hero Asklepios – is hitherto the most likely explanation of all. Unlike the other claims discussed above (such as the snake pit hypothesis and the statement that these pits ‘presumably served some sacrificial purpose’) the argument that sacred pits in sanctuaries of Asklepios were linked to Asklepios’ chthonic nature cannot be debunked by material and textual evidence or logical reasoning. Although it lacks solid material evidence, the chthonic theory fits mythological accounts. Several mythical burial places of the mortal hero Asklepios are known throughout Greece, one of which was at Epidauros. It is therefore perhaps no coincidence that the tholos with its conical roof is reminiscent of a tumulus over a burial chamber.256

While the Athenian bothros and the Epidaurian tholos show no physical resemblance, they probably both played a role in destruction sacrifices linked to Asklepios’ chthonic nature.257 The question that remains is whether the sacred pit at the Athenian Asklepieion can be understood as modelled after the tholos at Epidauros or as a Panhellenic phenomenon that was materially modified to fit the interests of the Asklepieion at Athens. On the one hand, sacred pits are rarely attested at other Asklepieia, which makes the pits at Athens and Epidauros seem connected.258 On the other hand, while one of Asklepios’ mythological burial places is said to be in Epidauros, the Athenian bothros was built approximately half a century before the construction of the tholos started.259

As of yet, no earlier structure (respectively to the bothros) at the Asklepieion of Epidauros has been found that could have served as a sacred pit. The sacred pits are thus neither convincingly Epidaurian nor Athenian. While sacred pits are a rather unique phenomenon at sanctuaries of Asklepios, the mythological background to which they refer must have been well-known throughout ancient Greece. Asklepios’ death was recounted even centuries later by

257 Although the surroundings of the bothros may have looked different before the κατατομή, its original appearance would not have resembled that of the Epidaurian tholos.
258 The two large symmetrically placed square cuttings (see fig. 9, D) on either side of the temple of Asklepios at the fourth-century BCE Asklepieion at Corinth have been interpreted in a variety of ways, among which also the suggestion that the sacred serpents were kept here. See Lang 1977, 10.
authors such as Cicero, which makes it likely that at least the chthonic mythological background of the sacred pits had a Panhellenic nature.\textsuperscript{260}

This paragraph has demonstrated that while the sacred pits at Athens and Epidauros can be understood as global features, their physical appearance was locally adapted. This interaction between global and local is what makes the bothros and the tholos glocalizing phenomena. Ironically, the local and global dynamics of the sacred pits are the exact opposite of the nature of the interaction between the global and local features of to the 2 by 3 m fifth-century Athenian structure and the Epidaurian bath building. While these buildings had similar ground plans and measurements, they seem to have had very different purposes. It is difficult to determine whether the similarities between their appearances can be perceived as regulated by Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change or as a mere coincidence. However, the fact that both buildings were, like the tholos and the bothros, the outcomes of locally implemented global features makes that these structures too may be understood as glocalizing phenomena.

\subsection{2.5 The stork in the tree: along the edges of the early Athenian Asklepieion}

The Athenian Asklepieion was confined by various limiting topographical elements from its earliest phase onwards. At the north side of the sanctuary, the Acropolis rock forms a natural boundary. The remaining sides of the Asklepieion were enclosed by a stone peribolos, of which 6.19 m of the south side and 4.66 m of the east side can still be observed today.\textsuperscript{261} In the late fifth century BCE, the sanctuary was entered via a wooden gateway, also known as the wooden propylon or the ξυλοπύλιον.\textsuperscript{262} We know from the Telemachos monument that the first wooden gateway was built between 415 and 414 BCE, when the construction of the peribolos also initiated.\textsuperscript{263} A year later, 'when Teisandras was archon, the wooden gateway was rebuilt'.\textsuperscript{264}

The south side of the Asklepieion is thought to have been close to the path of the Pelargikon: the wall that surrounded the Acropolis.\textsuperscript{265} The Pelargikon owes its name to the stork, which is called a πελαργός in ancient Greek. One of the reliefs on the Telemachos monument depicts a double doorway and a stork sitting in a tree next to it (fig. 16). Some scholars argue that this relief symbolizes the topography of the Asklepieion, with the doorway

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[Cic. Leg. 2.19.]
\item[Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 104.]
\item[Literally “wooden gateway”; for an elaboration on the dating of the peribolos, see Lefantzis and Jensen 2009, 108-109; cf. Papaefthymiou 2009, 67.]
\item[IG II\textsuperscript{2} 4960, lines 32-34.]
\item[IG II\textsuperscript{2} 4960, lines 34-36.]
\item[Rhodes 2009, 4; the precise path of the Pelargikon is unsure, but this does not affect the argument that will be discussed in what follows because its proximity to the Asklepieion is certain.]
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
representing the wooden gateway and the stork depicting the Pelargikon. According to Wickkiser, the images on the Telemachos monument prove that the boule and the demos played a central role in integrating and positioning the Asklepieion at Athens: ‘The area marked by the Pelargikon was of interest to the demos of Athens in the second half of the 5th c. BC, as attested by IG I3 78, the First-Fruits decree.' The importance of the Pelargikon for the boule and the demos meant that Telemachos must have received the approval of the boule and the demos in order to establish the Asklepieion near the Pelargikon.

---

**Figure 16:** Reconstruction of the Telemachos monument. Note the stork next to the double doorway on the third panel (after Wickkiser 2003, 285).

---

266 Beschi 1967, 386-391; cf. Wickkiser 2003, 130; the position of the stork to the right of the double doorway further strengthens this theory because the wooden gateway faced east and the Pelargikon was situated south of the left door of the gate. See fig. 13.

267 Wickkiser 2003, 130.

268 For the full argumentation, see Wickkiser 2003, 129-131.
Boundaries thus seem to have held ideological relevance and were therefore essential to the Asklepieion at Athens. The significance of the borders of the Athenian Asklepieion contrasts with the way in which the limits of the Asklepieion at Epidauros were indicated. The Epidaurian Asklepieion did not include a barrier in the form of a peribolos wall. It seems there was only a line of posts or marker stones, of which now no visible traces remain.\textsuperscript{269} The Asklepieion of Epidauros did include a propylon (fig. 6, number 1), although this structure was not built until the early third century BCE and shows no similarities to the wooden gateway at Athens.\textsuperscript{270} The third-century Epidaurian propylon was a stone building with entrance ramps, clear passages to either sides and no doors (fig. 17). However, directly south of the propylon at Epidauros was the aforementioned late sixth-century BCE well (fig. 6, number 1A).\textsuperscript{271} The placement of the propylon near this early well suggests that the boundaries of the sacred area of the Epidaurian Asklepieion were in this location already in the earliest phase of the sanctuary. It is therefore possible that the stone propylon was preceded by a wooden structure, like the wooden gateway at the Asklepieion of Athens. However, an earlier propylon or any other type of boundary is not mentioned in the textual record.

\textit{Figure 17: Plan of the propylon at the Epidaurian Asklepieion (after Tomlinson 1983, 44).}

\textsuperscript{269} Tomlinson 1983, 41.
\textsuperscript{270} This date is based on the architectural characteristics of the building. See Roux 1961, 274.
\textsuperscript{271} See paragraph 2.1.
How can these dissimilar amounts of emphasis on the boundaries of the sanctuaries of Asklepios at Athens and Epidauros be explained? An answer to this question may be found when the geographical placements of both sanctuaries are revisited. The Asklepieion at Epidauros was an extra-urban cult, while the Athenian Asklepieion can be categorized as an urban cult – as has been established in paragraph 1.6.272 A clearly defined peribolos may therefore be understood as a characteristic of urban Asklepieia and perhaps even of urban sanctuaries in general.273 This theory is supported by the discovery of a peribolos wall at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Piraeus, which was also situated within an urban center.274 At urban sanctuaries, defining the boundaries of the precinct was a necessity because without a clear demarcation, the sacred area could be confused with the sacred area of another shrine or even with profane zones. The emphasis on the peribolos and wooden propylon at the Athenian Asklepieion is therefore a distinct local element. The essence of its boundaries is fitted to the local needs of the sanctuary, which are in turn determined by its placement.

Situated just outside of the Asklepieion is the theater of Dionysos Eleutherios. Although the theater does not fall within the peribolos of the Asklepieion, Robin Mitchell-Boyask argues that there was a significant relationship between the theater of Dionysos and the Asklepieion. Central to Mitchell-Boyask’s claim is the idea that the establishment of the sanctuary of Asklepios at Athens was a response to the plague that struck the city between 430 and 426 BCE.275 Mitchell-Boyask is convinced that because of the plague, Athens would have been in need of the Asklepios-cult and built its Asklepieion near the theater as a result of the longstanding associations between poetry, drama and healing that became more urgent because of the plague.276 However, this view is now considered outdated after Bronwen Wickkiser rightly argued that plague alone cannot account for the cult’s importation to Athens. The chronology of the Athenian events from 430 BCE onwards leaves a remarkable gap between cause and effect: Asklepios’ sanctuary was founded ten years after the plague initially struck, and six years after its last major outbreak.277

272 I follow Scott’s criteria of what constitutes urban and extra-urban Asklepieia here. See paragraph 1.7 of this thesis.
273 Further research is needed to substantiate this claim.
274 Scott 2017, 182; as mentioned in paragraph 1.1, many scholars categorize Asklepieia near harbors as extra-urban sanctuaries because harbors were usually unsophisticated settlements located outside of urban centers, but the sanctuary of Asklepios at Piraeus cannot be classified as such. Especially during the late Classical period, Piraeus was a prosperous and densely populated area. See Grigoropoulos 2009, 172.
276 For a more detailed account of the associations between poetry, drama and healing, see Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 109.
277 Wickkiser 2009b, 55-56.
While the claim that the establishment of the Asklepieion at Athens near the theater of Dionysos was a response to the plague is central to Mitchell-Boyask’s argument, it is not his sole evidence for the relationship between the theater and the Asklepieion. He also lists several similarities between Asklepios and Dionysos, such as their mutual festivals and birth myths, and their association with snakes and healing.\textsuperscript{278} The connections between Asklepios and Dionysos thus contributed to the decision of the Athenians to build the Asklepieion near the theater of Dionysos – perhaps similarly to the manner in which the relationship between Asklepios and Apollo in some cases determined the placement of other Asklepieia.\textsuperscript{279} The theater of Dionysos was extensively refurbished during the Peace of Nicias (421-416 BCE) and therefore predates the theater at the Asklepieion of Epidauros.\textsuperscript{280} The earliest proposed date for the start of the construction of the Epidaurian theater is approximately 360 BCE.\textsuperscript{281}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Semele</th>
<th>Coronis</th>
<th>Ariadne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman loves god</td>
<td>Semele loves Zeus</td>
<td>Coronis loves Apollo</td>
<td>Ariadne loves Dionysus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman betrayed god</td>
<td>Semele asks to see real Zeus</td>
<td>Coronis beds a man</td>
<td>Ariadne loves Theseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>god kills woman</td>
<td>Semele immolated by the lightning of Zeus</td>
<td>Artemis kills Coronis</td>
<td>Ariadne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>god’s son saved from fire</td>
<td>Dionysus born a god Zeus’ thigh</td>
<td>Apollo snatches fetus of Asclepius</td>
<td>(Ariadne dies giving birth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son has special powers</td>
<td>Dionysus sewn in Zeus’ thigh</td>
<td>Asclepius a healer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Figure 18: A schematic representation of the similarities between the stories of the mothers of Asklepios and Dionysos (and Dionysos’ lover Ariadne) (after Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 108).}

Because of the apparent connection between the Athenian Asklepieion and the nearby theater, it can thus be stated that the Asklepieion of Athens “included” a theater before the Epidaurian

\textsuperscript{278} As mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, the \textit{Epidauria} was celebrated in honor of Asklepios during the Eleusinian Mysteries – a festival in which Dionysos played a key role. A procession arranged by the archon may have re-enacted Asklepios’ mythical arrival. See Arist. \textit{[Ath. Pol.]} 56.4. The second Athenian celebration of Asklepios took place during another festival of Dionysos, namely the City Dionysia. See Parke 1977, 64-65, 135; for an overview of the similarities between the stories of the mothers of Asklepios and Dionysos (and Dionysos’ lover Ariadne), see fig. 18 below; Dionysos could heal through wine: ‘he gave to mortals the vine that puts an end to pain’ (Eur. \textit{Bacch.} 772 (transl. Kovacs). The attribution of healing powers to Dionysos and especially comparing these with the healing powers of Asklepios is problematic. This is a rather uncertain and meagre similarity which seems out of place amidst the three other similarities between Asklepios and Dionysos given by Mitchell-Boyask (2008, 107-109).

\textsuperscript{279} Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 109.

\textsuperscript{280} Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 118.

\textsuperscript{281} Burford 1969, 75; cf. Tomlinson 1983, 87; the more generally accepted date of the Epidaurian theater lies around 330 BCE. See Melfi 2007a, 44.
Asklepieion contained a theater. Therefore, it is possible that the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidaurus decided to build a theater because of the connection between the theater of Dionysos and the Asklepieion at Athens. Moreover, the Asklepieion of Epidaurus was not alone in doing so. After the fifth century BCE, more Asklepieion-theater configurations emerged in other poleis, including Messene, Pergamon, Dion and Corinth.\(^{282}\)

According to Mitchell-Boyask, ‘theaters do not stand next to Asclepius shrines so that sick people can catch a play during their cures; the drama is part of the cure.’\(^{283}\) It is, however, difficult to determine why drama was considered beneficial for healing, since there are no conclusive written sources on this matter.

Regardless of why drama would improve the healing process or whether it was part of the cure at all, the fact that multiple other Asklepieion-theater configurations arose after the Athenian Asklepieion was built near the theater of Dionysos cannot be ignored. When the placement and orientation of these theaters within Asklepieia is examined, it moreover becomes clear that theaters near and in sanctuaries of Asklepios should not be perceived as mere reflections of the Athenian Asklepieion, but rather as the result of mutual feedback between Asklepieia throughout the Greek world. While the cavea or theatron (seating area) of the theater of Dionysos at Athens is turned away from the Asklepieion, other sanctuaries that included a theater oriented the cavea of the theater towards the main temple.\(^{284}\) The inclusion and orientation of theaters within sanctuaries of Asklepios thus grew more uniform overtime and as such, became a Panhellenic element of the early Greek cult of Asklepios.

In conclusion, the edges of the Asklepieion at Athens possessed unique characteristics. The phenomenon of placing theaters within or near sanctuaries of Asklepios started in Athens, and the pronounced peribolos and wooden propylon were evidently fitted to the local needs of the Athenian Asklepieion. However, since the nature of the peribolos and propylon at Athens was largely determined by the placement of the Asklepieion, it has become clear that these structures can also be understood as an emerging Panhellenic tradition – shared with many other urban sanctuaries throughout ancient Greece.

---

\(^{282}\) At Messene, a theater was integrated into the side of the Asklepieion, which was founded in the fourth century BCE. In Dion, the theater was located approximately 300 m uphill from the sanctuary of Asklepios and at Corinth, the theater is situated closer (350 m) to the Asklepieion than any other civic structures in the area. The theater at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus lies 500 m away from the central area of the sanctuary. However, as mentioned in paragraph 1.5 of this thesis, these distances must be put in perspective, considering the placement of these sanctuaries in either urban or extra-urban areas. Cf. Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 117.

\(^{283}\) Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 117.

\(^{284}\) This can be observed in Epidaurus and also at the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, where the audience gazed at the temple of Apollo and the Asklepieion, which was situated slightly further down the slope of the hill. See Mitchell-Boyask 2008, 118.
2.6 The Asklepieion of Athens after the fourth-century renovations

Like the Asklepieia at Corinth and Epidauros, the Asklepieion of Athens was also thoroughly renovated in the fourth century BCE (see fig. 19 above). The most prominent structure that was added to the sanctuary during this period is the Doric stoa that was built against the Acropolis rock, starting in 300/299 BCE. This stoa served as an incubation dormitory and could house large numbers of suppliants because it had an upper story, which makes it a comparatively early example of a type that became common in Hellenistic times. It is argued that this stoa replaced an earlier incubation structure, which was likely built atop the rocky ledge of the Acropolis that was cut away when the late fourth-century stoa was constructed. This is deduced from the fact that the Athenian Asklepieion has produced evidence for incubation that predate even the earliest sources for incubation rituals at the Asklepieion of Epidauros.

---

285 Papaefthymiou 2009, 70.
287 Wycherley 1978, 182.
288 Renberg 2017a, 133.
289 Gil Renberg (2017a, 136 n. 48) argues that this earlier structure is probably represented in a processional relief and – at least generically – in one or two other fragmentary incubation reliefs. The second source for incubation rituals at the early Athenian Asklepieion is a comic narrative by Aristophanes (Ar. Plut. 740-741
Very little is known about this earlier structure and the idea that it stood on the spot where the later stoa was built is based primarily on the fact that no other suitable structure within the original sanctuary can be identified as an incubation dormitory.\(^{290}\) This lack of evidence makes it impossible to compare the pre-Hellenistic incubation structure at Athens with possible early incubation dormitories at Epidaurus – such as Building E. However, the late-fourth century stoa at the Athenian Asklepieion does resemble the Epidaurian abaton.\(^{291}\) It shows a seclusion (on both the upper and lower level) similar to that of the abaton at Epidaurus and is oriented towards the temple. As such, the Athenian stoa and temple somewhat resemble the arrangement of the Epidaurian Asklepieion, where the temple of Asklepios was also oriented towards the east, with the abaton north of the temple and the open portico looking out on the temple.

A unique feature of the Doric stoa at Athens, however, is the integration of the aforementioned spring into the back wall of the stoa. The \textit{bothros} was also integrated into the renovated Asklepieion. It kept its original position within the sanctuary and was situated close to the temple, much like the tholos at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus. The Athenian temple was also part of the fourth-century building plan and was quite small, measuring 10.4 by 6 m, which is significantly smaller than the temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus (23.28 by 12.3 m).\(^{292}\) The Athenian temple of Asklepios had an altar, about 17 m to the east of the entrance of the temple.\(^{293}\) As can be seen on fig. 19, the altar is not aligned with the axis of the temple but placed slightly south of it. With this imperfect placement, the Athenian altar seems to mimic the position of the altar of Asklepios at the Epidaurian Asklepieion. Here, as mentioned in paragraph 2.1, the altar was placed slightly north of the central axis of the temple because it was conformed to the placement of Building E.

However, the location of the Athenian altar cannot be explained by its surroundings, like the altar at Epidaurus. Rather, the Athenian altar is located where it is because it was built on the spot of an earlier structure: the aforementioned late fifth-century BCE cult building.\(^{294}\) Although the Athenian altar was thus displaced for different reasons than the altar of Asklepios

\(\text{transl. Henderson): 'I clapped my hands for sheer joy and woke my master, and the god immediately disappeared into the temple, the serpents too.' This proves that incubation was practiced outside of the temple, either in the open air or within a different structure.}\)

\(^{290}\) Renberg 2017a, 136.

\(^{291}\) The most obvious difference, however, is that the abaton at Epidaurus did not have multiple levels. The absence of a second floor at the abaton may be due to the early date of the structure: multiple story stoas did not exist when the Epidaurian abaton was constructed. See Coulton 1976, 53-57.


\(^{293}\) Papaefthymiou 2009, 68, 70.

\(^{294}\) See paragraph 2.4; the placement of the altar upon the foundations of the earlier structure become especially clear when the position of the spring relative to the altar/structure is compared on fig. 13 and 19.
at Epidauros, the position of both altars was essentially determined by older structures. It is, however, difficult to recognize the position of the Athenian altar as an Epidaurian tradition. The placement of the altar upon the foundations of the earlier structure likely enhanced the religious competence of the altar by taking on the sacredness of the late fifth-century structure – a practice that can also be observed from the placement of Asklepieia upon older cult sites of Apollo.295

Another fourth-century addition to the Athenian Asklepieion are the four square dining rooms west of the bothros.296 These show similarities to other dining complexes and so-called hestiatoria in sanctuaries of Asklepios throughout the Greek world.297 The inclusion of dining rooms within Asklepieia in which both priests and visitors dined is moreover characteristic of the fourth century BCE: the Epidaurian banqueting hall (fig. 6, number 26) was built around 300 BCE; the Asklepieion of Corinth includes fourth-century dining halls in its abaton-like building; there is a hestiatorion in the sanctuary of Asklepios at Alipheira that dates to the second half of the fourth century BCE; an inscription records the hestiatorion of the Asklepieion on Delos and at the Asklepieion at Gortyn, a dining structure named an oikos was found.298

It is striking that most of these dining halls can be dated earlier than the banqueting hall at the Asklepieion of Epidauros. However, as mentioned in paragraph 2.2, Richard Tomlinson suggests that the courtyard of Building E functioned as a predecessor of the banqueting hall.299 The prominent practice of dining within sanctuaries of Asklepios was therefore possibly an Epidaurian tradition that became custom at other Greek Asklepieia. Nevertheless, the dining halls at Athens, as the hestiatoria in other Asklepieia and even the banqueting halls at Epidauros itself do not resemble the layout of Building E. It is therefore likely that the practice of dining at Asklepieia was adopted from Epidauros and subsequently adapted to serve the local interests of each Asklepieion by the fourth century BCE. Moreover, the banqueting hall of Epidauros can be understood as a Panhellenic product of mutual feedback because it is late in the sequence of fourth-century dining halls and its layout resembles that of other dining halls within sanctuaries of Asklepios.300

295 See paragraph 1.5.
296 Bookidis 1983, 155.
298 For an elaboration on the regulations of dining at Epidauros, see Tomlinson 1969, 109-111; note that the banqueting hall was not the first structure with a dining function at Epidauros. As mentioned in paragraph 2.2, Building E likely served as dining hall long before the banqueting hall was built; Tomlinson 1983, 78; Lang 1977, 11; Alevridis and Melfi 2005, 275-277.
299 Tomlinson 1983, 75.
300 Alevridis and Melfi 2005, 277.
The rest of the structures shown on fig. 19 (such as the small stoa south of the temple and the propylon west of this stoa) were added in Roman times.\textsuperscript{301} Ultimately, the layout of the Asklepieion of Athens after the fourth-century renovations does not seem very similar to the internal arrangements of the fourth-century BCE Asklepieion at Epidauros. The plan of the Athenian Asklepieion is much less elaborate, covering a strip of land of approximately 80 m along the Acropolis walls, whereas the Asklepieion of Epidauros in its entirety comprises an area of multiple kilometers.\textsuperscript{302}

There are, however, some elements within the post fourth-century Athenian Asklepieion that do resemble the arrangements of the Asklepieion at Epidauros, such as the position and orientation of the stoa, the temple and the altar. Nevertheless, the renovated Asklepieion of Athens can best be understood as the result of an entire age of mutual feedback between Asklepieia all over the Greek world. This is especially well-demonstrated by the fact that the sanctuary was renovated during the fourth century BCE, like many other sanctuaries of Asklepios. It is striking that the Asklepieion of Epidauros itself was also subject to these forces of mutual feedback – as evidenced by the aforementioned late fourth-century banqueting hall that resembles other dining halls within sanctuaries of Asklepios.

2.7 Conclusions

The aim of this chapter was to determine whether the layouts and structures of the Asklepieia at Corinth and Athens were modelled after the internal arrangements and appearance of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, or whether they originated from local interests or resulted from trends that affected the entire Greek world during the Classical and early Hellenistic periods. After an elaborate comparison between the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens and the Asklepieion at Epidauros, four different types of elements within these sanctuaries of Asklepios can be distinguished: Epidaurian, local, Panhellenic and glocalizing elements. In other words, the structures and layouts of the Asklepieia at Corinth and Athens may be categorized as either modelled after similar arrangements or buildings at Epidauros, resulting from local interests, influenced by Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change or locally implemented global elements.

Perhaps surprisingly – since scholars identify the sanctuaries of Asklepios at Corinth and Athens as offshoots (both originally and functionally) from the Epidaurian Asklepieion –

\textsuperscript{301} The propylon seems to have had a predecessor, but not enough evidence remains to identify this earlier structure. See Wycherley 1978, 183.
\textsuperscript{302} Wickkiser 2003, 129; see fig. 6.
the Epidaurian elements that were observed in this chapter form the smallest category of all. In fact, only the suspected incubation dormitories at Corinth and Athens show similarities with the abaton at Epidaurus. One of the stoas at the fourth century Asklepieion of Corinth has a closed-off inner half, similar to the Epidaurian abaton. However, this building cannot be perceived as modelled after the abaton at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus. The lack of textual evidence for incubation practices at Corinth makes it impossible to confirm that this stoa was indeed an incubation dormitory like the Epidaurian abaton. As opposed to the Corinthian stoa, the identification of the Doric stoa at the Asklepieion of Athens as an incubation dormitory can be substantiated by written source material. The stoa of Athens moreover largely resembles the Epidaurian abaton although it also contained some unique features, such as the integration of the natural spring into its back wall.

The more elaborate categories that resulted from the comparative analysis of this chapter are the local, Panhellenic and glocalizing elements. An essentially local feature of the fourth century Asklepieion of Corinth is the altar, which has a characteristic long shape and therefore resembles the altar of Asklepios at Epidaurus. Yet the narrow altar at Corinth cannot be understood as modelled after the Epidaurian altar because these long altars are in fact a regional type. Like the Corinthian altar, the altar at the fourth century Asklepieion at Athens also showed similarities to the altar of Asklepios at Epidaurus; not in its appearance, but its placement relative to the temple. The altars at Athens and Epidaurus were both not aligned with the central axis of their corresponding temples, although they were displaced for different reasons, making it difficult to understand the position of the Athenian altar as a display of Epidaurian tradition. The placement of the altar at Athens upon the foundations of the earlier foundations of the temple of Asklepios likely enhanced the religious competence of the altar through taking on the sacredness of the late fifth-century structure.

As for the Panhellenic elements of the Asklepieia at Corinth, Athens and Epidaurus that were observed in the comparative analysis above, it is first of all striking that all three Asklepieia that were studied in this chapter underwent drastic renovations during the fourth century BCE. The new plan of the Corinthian Asklepieion in particular consisted of rectangular and centered structures, resembling the layouts of the Asklepieia at Kos and Messene – both Asklepieia that possessed strong characteristics of Hellenistic architecture. Because it is not possible to indicate an exact starting point of this wave of renewal within sanctuaries of Asklepios, it is more likely that the fourth-century building plans at Epidaurus, Corinth and Athens were the result of mutual feedback between Asklepieia and indeed other sanctuaries throughout the Greek world. An example of these forces of mutual feedback can moreover be
found at the Asklepieion of Epidauros itself, where in the late fourth century BCE a banqueting hall was built that resembled other (earlier) dining halls within sanctuaries of Asklepios.

Another Panhellenic element that could be observed in all three Asklepieia is the presence of a theater near or within the sanctuaries. The Asklepieion of Athens “included” a theater before the theater at the Epidaurian Asklepieion was constructed. Therefore, it seems that the Epidaurian theater was modelled after the theater that was connected to the Asklepieion at Athens. After the fifth century BCE, Asklepieion-theater configurations also emerged in other poleis, such as Corinth. An examination of the placement and orientation of theaters within Asklepieia moreover revealed that theaters near and in sanctuaries of Asklepios should not be perceived as mere reflections of the Athenian Asklepieion, but rather as a result of mutual feedback between Asklepieia all over the ancient Greek world.

The first distinct locally implemented global (ergo globalizing) features to be observed were the 2 by 3 m structures at the early sanctuaries in Corinth and Athens, which (according to Wickkiser) resemble a small fifth century building at the Asklepieion of Epidauros. While the measurements and general layouts of these three structures are indeed similar, their cultic functions were nothing alike. It is difficult to determine whether the similarities between their appearances can be perceived as regulated by Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change or as a mere coincidence. However, the fact that the different cultic purposes of the three structures were local implementations of a global layout makes that they may be understood as glocalizing phenomena. The most apparent glocalizing elements of the Asklepieion of Corinth can be found in its abundant waterworks. While the ritual use of water was a Panhellenic characteristic of the cult of Asklepios, the abundance and complexity of the waterworks at Corinth were unique Corinthian characteristics that likely served to display the abundance of water in the area.

The sacred pits at Athens and Epidauros can also be understood as glocalizing phenomena. While the Athenian bothros and the Epidaurian tholos show no physical resemblance, they likely played a role in destruction sacrifices linked to the chthonic side of Asklepios’ nature. The mythological background to which the sacred pits refer was well-known throughout ancient Greece. Moreover, if the sacred pits at Asklepieia were in fact Epidaurian influences, the fourth-century renovations of the Athenian Asklepieion would presumably have included a tholos-like structure surrounding the sacred pit. It is mainly for these reasons that the sacred pits at Athens and Epidauros can be understood as global phenomena with a locally adapted physical appearance. Another glocalizing feature of the Athenian Asklepieion can be found in its emphasis on boundaries. The importance of the peribolos and wooden propylon at
the Athenian Asklepieion is in the first place a local element, since the essence of its boundaries were conformed to the local needs of the sanctuary. However, because the local needs of the Asklepieion of Athens were essentially determined by its placement within an urban area, the importance of the peribolos and the propylon are also global features – shared with many other urban sanctuaries throughout ancient Greece.

In conclusion, the Asklepieia of Corinth, Athens and Epidauros all seem to have possessed many locally adapted Panhellenic features. Despite the reputation of the Athenian and Corinthian Asklepieia among scholars as offshoots from the Epidaurian “mother sanctuary”, the comparative analysis of this chapter has demonstrated that the sanctuaries of Asklepios in Corinth and Athens included very few decidedly Epidaurian elements. The following chapter will zoom in on a wider array of early Greek Asklepieia by analyzing their diverse religious practices. Similar to the study of chapter 2, the aim of chapter 3 is to uncover the similarities and differences between early Asklepieia and as such, to determine to what extent early Greek Asklepieia resulted from local interests and Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change.
Chapter 3: Religious Practices

The divergent religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia

From the preceding comparison of the layouts and individual structures at the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens to those of the Asklepieion at Epidauros, it has become clear that the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens both possessed substantially more local and Panhellenic features than Epidaurian elements, despite their reputation as offshoots from the Epidaurian “mother sanctuary”. Moving on, chapter 3 will zoom in even further on the material and textual evidence of various Asklepieia by analyzing the diverse religious identities of sanctuaries of Asklepios. “Religious identity” is defined here as the religious practices that took place at an Asklepieion: who was worshipped and how.

At first glance, the answer to the question ‘who was worshipped at an Asklepieion’ might seem obvious, but Asklepios was not the only god who was venerated at his sanctuaries. Artemis, for example, had her own temple in the Asklepieion of Epidauros near Building E, where she received preliminary sacrifices.\(^{303}\) Statues of Artemis were found at the Lebena Asklepieion, and she was also present at the early Asklepieia in Messene, Delos and Sikyon.\(^{304}\) Artemis moreover has a familiar connection to Apollo, who in turn fathered many nymphs. As demonstrated in the first chapter of this thesis, Apollo and the nymphs were also frequently present at cult sites of Asklepios. Herakles was often associated with Asklepios in sanctuaries at Troezen, Messene, Athens, Epidauros, Titane and Hyettos.\(^{305}\) Demeter was worshipped at the Asklepieia of Epidauros, Hermione, Troezen, Sikyon and Paros, and the Piraeus Asklepieion included a cult of Zeus Meilichios (or Philios).\(^{306}\) Unfortunately, it is not within the scope of this thesis to study all of these different divine alliances at sanctuaries of

\(^{303}\) These sacrifices were preliminary to incubation rituals; Tomlinson 1983, 75; Melfi 2009, 609; see number 23 on fig. 6.

\(^{304}\) Melfi 2009, 609; for Artemis at the Asklepieion of Sikyon, see Paus. 2.10.2.

\(^{305}\) Forsén 1996, 149; cf. Wickkiser 2003, 95.

\(^{306}\) Benedum 1986; Scott 2017, 182.
Asklepios. Therefore, this chapter will focus solely on how Asklepios himself was honored at his sanctuaries.

First, the rituals for Asklepios that were performed at early Greek Asklepieia will be analyzed and compared to the ritual activities at the Asklepieion of Epidauros. This examination of the ritual performances at Asklepieia will be followed by a similar analysis and comparison of the disparate types of anatomical votives that have been found at many sanctuaries of Asklepios. Since these anatomical votives typically constitute the majority of the material on which the iamata (inscribed healing reports) are based, the iamata will be discussed next to determine whether the practice of inscribing miraculous healings at sanctuaries of Asklepios can be perceived as a local, Panhellenic, Epidaurian or glocalizing tradition.

Central to this chapter are the religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia and the way in which these identities differ from or correspond with the religious identity of the Asklepieion of Epidauros or other sanctuaries of Asklepios – making the religious practices at each sanctuary Epidaurian, local or global traditions, or a combination of these. The goal of this chapter is not to scrutinize the religious practices at every Asklepieion within the scope of this thesis, but rather to expose the similarities and differences between the religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia.

3.1 Cocks and goats: sacrifices for Asklepios

As discussed in paragraph 2.4, the Athenian bothros and the Epidaurian tholos may have been connected to forms of chthonic sacrifice and can – because of their widely-known mythological background – be understood as global phenomena with a locally adapted appearance. It has also been established in paragraph 2.4 that sacred pits and their corresponding chthonic rituals are a rather unique phenomenon at sanctuaries of Asklepios. Therefore, I will now turn to more the common forms of sacrifice that took place at Asklepieia.

Emma Stafford has argued that Asklepios generally received an unremarkable range of both animal offerings (birds, cattle, pigs and sheep) and bloodless offerings (sacrificial cakes and fruit). However, a remarkably large amount of evidence for the sacrifice of cocks is found at sanctuaries of Asklepios. Among the evidence for the practice of sacrificing cocks

---

307 Further (large-scale) research on the polytheistic practices at Asklepieia is needed to better understand the similarities and differences between early Greek Asklepieia.

308 For specific examples of both types of sacrifice, see Stafford 2008, 17, 6-9, 10-12.

309 See fig. 20 for a terracotta cock from the Asklepieion of Corinth. This votive probably commemorated or replaced a real-life sacrifice, similar to the statuettes of pigs dedicated to Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis. See Parke 1977, fig. 25.
to Asklepios are Socrates’ presumed last words: ‘Crito,’’ he said, “we owe Asclepius a cock. See that you all buy one, and don’t forget.”

Although this passage from the work of Plato has caused speculation from Antiquity onwards, Socrates’ remark implies that sacrificing a cock was a standard way of honoring Asklepios, making this passage an important source for the study of animal sacrifice at Asklepieia.

Figure 20: Terracotta figurine of a cock from the Asklepieion of Corinth (after Stafford 2008, 7).

The offering of cocks was a shared characteristic of essentially every Greek Asklepieion, and Stafford therefore argues that these sacrifices demonstrate the extent to which the cult of Asklepios was important at an individual and family level: cocks would have been cheap enough for most people to afford. Sacrifices to Asklepios made by the public typically included more costly animals, such as pigs, lambs and bulls. However, at some Asklepieia, the manner in which these larger animals were sacrificed deviated from the sacrificial practices at other sanctuaries of Asklepios. Pausanias records a sacrifice at the Asklepieion of Titane: ‘The parts of the victims which they offer as a burnt sacrifice, and they are not content with cutting out the thighs, they burn on the ground, except the birds, which they burn on the altar.’

Scott Scullion classifies this ritual as a “moirocaust”: a partial destruction sacrifice which he also observes at Selinous, in the sacrifice for Zeus Meilichios. Like the holocaust rituals that were discussed in paragraph 2.4, recipients of these rituals are traditionally

311 Stafford 2008, 17; the low cost of cocks is evidenced by a third-century BCE work from Herodas, in which two women visit the Asklepieion of Kos. One of the women tells Asklepios that they ‘should have made an ox or a sow heaped with much crackling, and not a cock’ (Herod. 4.14-17 (transl. Rusten and Cunningham), but that they lacked the wealth to do so; cf. van Straten 1990, 254.
312 Paus. 2.11.7-8 (transl. Jones).
categorized as chthonians. If Scullion is correct about the chthonic nature of moirocaust rituals, the Asklepieia at Titane and Epidauros are the only two Asklepieia that have yielded written evidence for Asklepios as recipient of chthonic sacrificial rites. The Asklepieia of Epidauros and Titane (and perhaps also the Athenian Asklepieion, which included a sacred pit that can be linked to Asklepios’ chthonic nature but lacks textual evidence on destruction sacrifice) therefore seem to be somewhat more connected – at least on a sacrificial level – to the chthonic side of Asklepios than other Greek Asklepieia.

The evidence for sacrificial practice at Epidauros itself is rather thin. Although there must have been more large-scale sacrifices during the quadrennial festivities at Epidauros (the Asklepieia), there is little to no evidence for the sacrificial events of this festival. One of the most important written sources for Epidaurian sacrifice is thus, once again, the work of Pausanias. Pausanias contrasts the sacrificial traditions at the Asklepieion of Epidauros with those at the Asklepieion of Lebena (a sanctuary that was, according to Pausanias, founded by the Cyreneans): ‘There is this difference between the Cyreneans and the Epidaurians, that whereas the former sacrifice goats, it is against the custom of the Epidaurians to do so.’ Elsewhere in his work, Pausanias mentions another Asklepieion that, like the Asklepieion of Epidauros, abstained from sacrificing goats: ‘Seventy stades distant from Tithorea is a temple of Asclepius […]. He receives divine honours from the Tithoreans, and no less from the other Phocians […]. It is usual to sacrifice to the god any animal except the goat.’

So why was it customary at the Asklepieion of Lebena to sacrifice goats while Pausanias explicitly mentions that offering goats was abstained from in two other Asklepieia? There are two plausible explanations for the perhaps atypical sacrificial tradition at Lebena. The first explanation is that the custom of offering goats at the Lebena Asklepieion was a remnant of the preceding cult of the nymphs at the site of Asklepios, seeing that goats were the conventional sacrificial animals for the nymphs. The new cult of Asklepios in Lebena may therefore have adopted the sacrificial practices of the older local cult to ensure a successful assimilation with

313 Scullion 2000, 165.
314 For the holocaust rituals at Titane, see Paus. 2.11.7-8; for Epidauros, see IG IV2 1 97, line 21.
315 Further research into both the mythology of Asklepios and the cult sites themselves is needed determine why the Asklepieia of Epidauros, Titane and Athens were more connected to the chthonic side of Asklepios than other Asklepieia.
316 Stafford 2008, 15.
317 The accounts of Pausanias were written during the second century CE, long after the first Asklepieia had been established. However, Pausanias’ testimonies on Epidaurian sacrifice probably recall rituals that had been practiced for ages. Moreover, his work does not conflict with the few Epidaurian material sources for sacrificial practices – which are mainly votive reliefs. See Stafford 2008, 15.
318 Paus. 2.27.9-10 (transl. Jones).
319 Paus. 10.32.12 (transl. Jones).
320 Käppel 2006.
the long-established cult of the nymphs at the precinct. Another explanation for the sacrifice of goats at the Lebena Asklepieion may be found in the birth myth of Asklepios. Pausanias tells us the Epidaurian version of the heroic myth of Asklepios, in which the infant Asklepios ‘was given milk by one of the goats that pastured about the mountain, and was guarded by the watchdog of the herd.’

Stafford tentatively argues that the prohibition on sacrificing goats at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus might reflect this Epidaurian version of the myth, although it is important to note that prohibitions such as these often occur in Greek religion without any obvious explanation.

Stafford fails to connect the Epidaurian prohibition on the use of goats as sacrificial animals to larger trends of feedback between sanctuaries of Asklepios. The fact that Pausanias mentions the sacrifice of goats (or the lack thereof) at only three Asklepieia does not mean that these were the exceptions to the rule. Rather, Pausanias’ explicit references to the regulations surrounding the sacrifice of goats at the Asklepieia of Epidaurus, Tithorea and Lebena might indicate a dichotomy in sacrificial traditions at sanctuaries of Asklepios all over the ancient Greek world. Asklepieia that acknowledged the Epidaurian myth would then choose not to sacrifice goats, and the sanctuaries of Asklepios that recognized other birth myths would have offered goats. If this is correct, the sacrificial rituals at the Asklepieion of Tithorea would have a specific Epidaurian character, and the custom of sacrificing goats at the Lebena Asklepieion might indicate that the Lebena Asklepieion did not acknowledge the Epidaurian myth of Asklepios. However, the longstanding tradition of sacrificing goats to the nymphs may also have contributed to the practice of goat sacrifice at Lebena. It is therefore difficult to determine whether the offering of goats at Lebena was a result of local tendencies or a conscious decision not to recognize the Epidaurian version of Asklepios’ birth myth.

To conclude, the sacrifices at the Asklepieia of Epidaurus and Titane appear to be connected more with the chthonic side of Asklepios than was the case at other Greek Asklepieia. Whether destruction sacrifices at sanctuaries of Asklepios can be understood as Epidaurian phenomena is uncertain, since these types of sacrifice reflect the chthonic mythology surrounding Asklepios, which is not specifically Epidaurian. Moreover, the moirocaust (a partial destruction sacrifice) that was practiced at the Asklepieion of Titane differs from the holocaust (a total destruction sacrifice) that is mentioned in an inscription at the Epidaurian

322 Stafford 2008, 10, 17.
323 Further research on the sacrifice of goats in large numbers of Asklepieia is needed to confirm this hypothesis.
324 While the accounts of Pindar and Apollodorus both report the death of Asklepios, neither of these myths can be identified as an Epidaurian version of the story. See Pind. Pyth. 3.47-58; Apollod. Bibl. 3.10.3-4.
Asklepieion. However, both types of sacrifice were adopted from a Panhellenic myth, while the implementation of the ritual was adapted to suit the local interests of the sanctuary.

Furthermore, early Greek Asklepieia generally seem to have had similar sacrificial practices, such as the offering of cocks. The lack of evidence for animal sacrifice at the Asklepieion of Epidauros, however, makes it difficult to determine whether the use of cocks as sacrificial animals was modelled after the sacrificial practices of the Epidaurian Asklepieion by a multitude of Asklepieia or whether this widely shared sacrificial tradition can be understood as a Panhellenic phenomenon. Cocks were affordable for most dedicants, making them suitable for individual and family sacrifices. The abundance of evidence for the sacrifice of cocks at Asklepieia therefore reflects the individual and personal aspect of the cult of Asklepios – which seems to be greater than the public side of the cult. This individual importance of the cult of Asklepios is moreover a global feature of Asklepieia. Therefore, the sacrifice of cocks at sanctuaries of Asklepios can be perceived as a Panhellenic characteristic.

What can be categorized as an Epidaurian element, however, is the practice of abstaining from sacrificing goats – as observed at the Asklepieion of Tithorea by Pausanias. The use of goats as sacrificial animals at the Asklepieion of Lebena may in turn be influenced by the Asklepieion of Epidauros, albeit in a completely opposite manner. Even if the sacrifice of goats at the Lebena Asklepieion was a way of rejecting the Epidaurian birth myth of Asklepios, this sacrificial tradition may also be (partially or fully) shaped by the presence of the long-established cult of the nymphs at the site of the Asklepieion.

3.2 A helping hand: anatomical votives

A type of votive gifts typically associated with healing sanctuaries are anatomical votives: body parts made of clay, stone (preferably marble) or precious metals, often life-size, three-dimensional and heavy, and sometimes depicting diseases (the so-called pathognomonic votives).325 It is argued that worshippers dedicated votive limbs to Asklepios to ask for the healing of a body part.326 Many of the limbs have holes pierced at their tops in which an iron

326 The precise use of anatomical votives was not as straightforward as is often believed. For example, the body part portrayed by the votive did not always represent the diseased limb of the dedicant. The fifth- and fourth-century BCE votive limbs that were found at the Asklepieion of Corinth, for instance, were made of terracotta (Hughes 2008, 220). The clay was local and the workshops were situated near the Asklepieion (Oberhelman 2014, 49). The Corinthians thus did not model anatomical votives on command but had them ready in the shops: mass-produced and mold-made (Hughes 2008, 222; de Waele 1933, 422). It is therefore possible that dedicants bought votives that were affordable and available, even if these did not correspond with their diseased body part. Votive symbolism in Antiquity was thus extremely elastic, and the mass-produced votive limbs may have been employed to communicate a multitude of different messages to the god (Hughes 2008, 222). Moreover, in many
bar, a hook or a piece of rope could be inserted. Arms, legs, hands and feet were often hung from the walls or suspended from the ceiling. Other pieces have holes in their bottoms in which pins could be inserted to keep them standing upright on shelves or on the ground. Heads and chests were sometimes flattened in the back so that they could be placed flat against the wall. These assumptions are supported by reliefs, among which one on the Telemachos Monument that depicts votive limbs hanging from the temple walls.

Figure 21: Late fifth- and fourth century BCE anatomical votives in the Corinth museum (after Lang 1977, 14).

Anatomical votives were found at the early Asklepieia in Corinth, Athens, Piraeus, Epidaurus, Kos, and Delos, while other fifth- and fourth-century Asklepieia – such as those at Lebena and Trikka – did not yield any anatomical ex votos. Of these sanctuaries, the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens have produced the greatest volume and variety of votive limbs. At Corinth, a total of seven deposits of votive offerings were found. Ferdinand de Waele, one of the first excavators of Corinth, reported that from the huge heap of fragments, the following cases it is unclear whether the votive limbs were dedicated after the healing or before – as a request for a miracle; Asklepios was furthermore not the only Olympian to receive anatomical votives. Anatomical ex votos were also found (e.g.) in the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Daphni and in the sanctuary of Aphrodite and Eros on the north slope of the Acropolis, although not in great numbers (Vikela 2006, 46–47). This sporadic dedication of anatomical votives in non-healing sanctuaries may have resulted from the aforementioned large-scale production of votive limbs, although this has never been considered as a plausible cause for this practice in the scholarly debate on anatomical ex votos.

327 Oberhelman 2014, 49; Hughes 2008, 220; de Waele 1933, 422.
329 De Waele 1933, 444; Papadopoulou 2015, 61.
331 The newest material in these votive deposits dates to the late fourth century BCE. See Roebuck 1951, 128–129.
votive limbs could be restored: ‘some ten legs with thighs, nine feet to the knee, nine entire arms, three hands to the elbow, one upper arm, five feet with their original finished top, some twenty feet probably belonging to larger limbs, and some twenty hands.’\footnote{De Waele 1933, 442-443; the individual Corinthian votives were published in Roebuck 1951, 114-128; see fig. 21.} The remaining fragments could, according to de Waele, easily double or triple these numbers. Among the largest categories of anatomical votives that were found in Corinth are hands (some 125), breasts (circa 65, offered singly or in pairs) and male genitals (35).\footnote{According to Oberhelman (2014, 50) there were even more hands: about 145; cf. de Waele 1933, 441; Hughes 2008, 220; Schörner 2015, 400; all in all, over 200 terracotta anatomical votives were found at Corinth, but the total amount of votive limbs may have been even higher. The votives that were fashioned from precious metals were often melted down shortly after the compilation of the inventories (Hughes 2008, 221) and chances are that the poorest of dedicants offered body parts made of perishable materials, like wood or wax, which would thus also not have survived (Graham and Draycott 2017, 6).} All of these different body parts were also found at the Athenian Asklepieion, but interestingly, the composition of the votive limbs deviates from the Corinthian material.

In a recent study, Steven Oberhelman has analyzed the quantities and types of anatomical votives found at Asklepieia all over the ancient Mediterranean world in order to sketch out a map of healing centers that specialized in particular diseases. At the Asklepieion of Athens, 154 eye votives were found, 25 ears (13 single ears, and 6 pairs) and 17 faces. Eye votives thus make up 40 percent of the body part votives at the site. Oberhelman therefore argues that eye problems were the major concern at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Athens, following the idea that votive limbs were dedicated to ask for the healing of the body part they portrayed.\footnote{Oberhelman 2014, 47, 52.} Not only eyes, but the head or parts thereof in general seem to have been a specialty of the Athenian Asklepieion – either the healing or sculpting thereof.\footnote{Note that votives portraying faces and heads are hard to interpret because they can depict anything from skin diseases to nasal conditions and various forms of headaches. See Oberhelman 2014, 51-52.} However, as mentioned above, votive symbolism was extremely elastic, which makes Oberhelman’s argument less convincing.

Unlike the Athenian corpus of anatomical votives, very few eye votives were found at the Asklepieion of Corinth.\footnote{Chaviara-Kharahaliou 1990.} Here, Oberhelman (like de Waele) observes large numbers of hands and male genitalia, and argues that the remarkable number of hands may be directly related to the suppliants’ way of life: ‘an agricultural or rural lifestyle, which involved, given the high number of feet, much walking.’\footnote{Oberhelman (2014, 50) moreover suggests that the large quantities of votive hands indicate that the Corinthian Asklepieion was also visited by suppliants from the farming areas beyond Corinth.} Many of the male genitals display phimosis, probably caused by a venereal disease. According to Oberhelman, this backs up the reputation...
of Corinth as a city of prostitution and rampant sexual immorality. However, Corinth was known as a famous harbor city in Antiquity. Therefore, the Asklepieion was perhaps frequented by sailors and travelers who knew that the sanctuary served as a healing place for sexually transmitted diseases.

As mentioned above, votive symbolism is very interpretative. The mass-produced and (in the case of Corinth) mold-made anatomical votives did not always represent the diseased limb of the dedicant, and the patterns observed by Oberhelman and his interpretations thereof are therefore somewhat misleading. Regardless of the meaning of the quantity and composition of the different types of anatomical votives at Asklepieia, there are pronounced differences between the various corpora of anatomical ex votos – as evidenced by Oberhelman’s study of the votive limbs that were found at the Asklepieia of Corinth and Athens. Unfortunately, at Epidauros, not enough anatomical votives remain to discern a pattern that can in turn be compared to the corpora of the Athenian and Corinthian Asklepieia. Nevertheless, because the Asklepieion of Epidauros does not seem to play a leading role in the practice of dedicating anatomical votives while votive limbs were found at many early Greek sanctuaries of Asklepios (where they presumably served a common purpose) the practice of dedicating body part votives to Asklepios can, in essence, be perceived as a global phenomenon. However, the differences between the corpora of the Asklepieia at Athens and Corinth demonstrate that Asklepieia were able to adopt this Panhellenic practice and adapt it to their local interests – such as the prevalence of eye diseases in the area or the needs of visiting sailors.

3.3 Monumentalizing miracles: the iamata

The anatomical votives that were discussed above are inherently linked to the aforementioned iamata because these healing reports catalogue (anatomical) votives that were dedicated sometime earlier. The testimonies surrounding these votives were inscribed on slabs of stone and, at least in the Asklepieion of Epidauros, displayed at the very center of the sanctuary, where visitors could read them before engaging in incubation or other rituals. A total of forty-four iamata, dating to the second half of the fourth century BCE, were found at the Asklepieion of Epidauros, and nine second-century BCE healing reports were recovered at the Asklepieion

---

338 Oberhelman 2014, 50.
339 Paus. 2.2.3.
340 Melfi 2007a, 35.
341 Wickkiser 2003, 90.
342 Paus. 2.27.3-4.
of Lebena.\textsuperscript{343} This chronological gap between the two corpora of healing reports should not pose a problem for the analysis in this paragraph because as mentioned above, the \textit{iamata} catalogue votive material that was dedicated earlier. The stories always look back on (remarkable) historical events.

Unlike the Epidaurian \textit{iamata}, which were inscribed on free-standing steles, the tales of Lebena were engraved directly onto the walls of the stoa. None of these texts survive completely because the inscriptions extended across the divisions of the building blocks of the stoa, and consecutive blocks have as of yet not been discovered. Vacats and proper names on the remaining blocks indicate the existence of approximately twenty-two tales, and the original count would probably have been even higher.\textsuperscript{344} Later authors, such as Strabo and Pausanias, inform us that corpora of miracle cures were inscribed also at the Asklepieia of Trikka, Kos and Pergamon, although no \textit{iamata} were discovered at these sites.\textsuperscript{345}

Something all of the \textit{iamata} had in common are the various purposes they served.\textsuperscript{346} First of all, the \textit{iamata} strengthened the faith of visitors of the sanctuary in their healing. When reading or hearing about the miraculous healings of previous visitors, dedicants would grow confident that Asklepios was capable of curing their ailments.\textsuperscript{347} The \textit{iamata} moreover served to convince dedicants of the capacities of Asklepios and assured those who did not get well that the fault must be theirs.\textsuperscript{348} Some of the Epidaurian healing reports even fully revolve around expressions of disbelief and the negative outcomes thereof for skeptical visitors.\textsuperscript{349} Secondly, the healing reports at Asklepieia served a specific didactic purpose. Although the \textit{iamata} did not constitute a set of specific cult regulations, the stories made clear what the temple authorities expected of their visitors.\textsuperscript{350} For example, some of the Epidaurian \textit{iamata} mention the suppliant

\textsuperscript{343} The second-century BCE \textit{iamata} from Lebena are included in the analysis of this paragraph because these tales are presumably based on votives and stories that date back to at least the fourth century BCE, when the sanctuary was established; cf. Wickkiser 2003, 63, 90 n. 299; LiDonnici 1989, 148; Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, 221.

\textsuperscript{344} LiDonnici 1989, 147-149.

\textsuperscript{345} Strab. 8.6.14; Paus. 2.26.8; Scott 2017, 100; Ahearne-Kroll 2014, 103; the Pergamene \textit{iamata} will not be included in what follows because they are of a much later date than most of the \textit{iamata} from Epidaurus and Lebena. For the Pergamene inscriptions, see Habicht 1969.

\textsuperscript{346} Note that the majority of our knowledge about the functions of the \textit{iamata} is based on the textual content of the Epidaurian \textit{iamata}, since the Epidaurian corpus is the most substantial of the four Asklepieia that yielded healing reports.

\textsuperscript{347} Prêtre 2018, 26; according to Walter Jayne (1935, 235), one purpose of the \textit{iamata} that ties in with this function was to ‘render the mind of the visitors more susceptible to dreams and visions, as well as to make it more pliable for mental suggestion and for carrying out the practical measures directed by these divine revelations.’ For a long time, the first part of Jayne’s statement could not be confirmed by any kind of evidence, but more recent studies have shown that (ancient) art and literature can indeed evoke epiphanies. See Platt 2011.

\textsuperscript{348} Many people made the pilgrimage to an Asklepieion only to die once they arrived. At Epidaurus, special buildings in which the sick could die were placed outside the borders of the sacred area. See LiDonnici 1995, 25.

\textsuperscript{349} See \textit{iamata} A3, A4, A9, A11.

\textsuperscript{350} Dillon 1994, 240.
making a sacrifice after being healed (and some even state the time in which the thank-offerings had to be executed), some include incubation regulations and others explain the technicalities of proxy-healing: the act of visiting an Asklepieion and performing the necessary rituals in someone else’s place (see fig. 22).  

\textit{lamata} including comments on behavior, offerings, rules, formalities/NA

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{An overview of the amount of comments on cult regulations in the Epidaurian \textit{iamata} (own work).}
\end{figure}

A striking similarity between the corpora of \textit{iamata} from the Asklepieia of Epidauros and Lebena in particular is that they both contain tales that refer to Hippocratic medicine. One healing report from Epidauros records Asklepios performing surgery on a girl:

\begin{quote}
‘Arata of Lacedaimon, dropsy. For her sake, her mother slept here, while she remained in Lacedaimon, and she sees a dream. It seemed to her the god cut off the head of her daughter and hung the body neck downwards. When fluid had run out for a long time, he untied the body and put the head back on the neck. Having seen this dream she returned to Lacedaimon and found on her arrival that her daughter was healthy and that she had seen the same dream.\end{quote}  

This superhuman surgery corresponds to humoral theory because it essentially revolves around draining fluid from the girl’s body. According to humoral theory – a cornerstone of Hippocratic medicine – the human body consists of four humors (or fluids): blood, phlegm, yellow bile and black bile. Sickness is due to excessive levels of one of these humors, and the excess must be

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{lamata} mentioning offerings: A1, A4, A5, A6, A10, A15, B25; \textit{iamata} mentioning incubation regulations: A17, A20 B6; \textit{lamata} on proxy healing: B1, B4.
\item \textit{lama} B1 (transl. LiDonnici); cf. LiDonnici 1989, 69.
\end{itemize}
removed to restore the balance of bodily fluids and accordingly, the health of the patient.\textsuperscript{353} A \textit{iama} from Lebena describes the use of cupping instruments:

‘The god ordered Phalaris, the son of Euthychion, of Lebena, who had no children and was already in his fiftieth year, to send his wife to sleep in the Temple, and when she entered the Adyton he put the cupping instrument on her belly and ordered her to leave in a hurry and she became pregnant.’\textsuperscript{354}

While cupping is one of the oldest medical practices, the use of cups in ancient Greece is recognized as a typically Hippocratic method.\textsuperscript{355} Hippocratic texts describe how cups should be used to remove excessive blood from the affected area of the body, which again corresponds to Hippocratic humoral theory.\textsuperscript{356} The “Hippocratic” \textit{iamata} at Lebena and Epidauros thus recount humoral theory and are moreover both – perhaps incidentally – cases of proxy healing.\textsuperscript{357} Lastly, the conditions from which the people of Lebena and the visitors of the Epidaurian Asklepieion suffer seem largely similar, with the \textit{iama} from Lebena including sciatica, infertility, stomach pain, a two-year cough and a shoulder ulceration.\textsuperscript{358} Most of the differences between the individual medical cases in both corpora can be explained logically by the fact that the \textit{iama} at both Asklepieia are, of course, based on the healing encounters of different individuals.

However, there are also plenty of differences between the healing reports from Epidauros and Lebena, which, according to Lynn LiDonnici, ‘may indicate regional preferences of the two sanctuaries or changes in taste and activity over time.’\textsuperscript{359} First of all, apart from their mutual employment of Hippocratic medicine, the \textit{iama} from the Asklepieia of Epidauros and Lebena show that these sanctuaries both used different medical treatments.\textsuperscript{360} The Lebena group

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{353} Hippoc. \textit{Nat. hom.} 4; cf. Wickkiser 2010, 46; Jouanna 2012b, 335.
\item \textsuperscript{354} T426 (transl. Edelstein and Edelstein); cf. Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, 239; \textit{IC} I xvii 9.
\item \textsuperscript{355} The earliest textual evidence for the use of cupping instruments can be found in the Egyptian Ebers Papyrus (ca. 1550 BCE). See Christopoulou-Aletra and Papavramidou 2008, 899; this method was moreover certainly known in Epidauros by the fourth century BCE, as evidenced by images of a cupping glass on the reverse of coins that were issued by the polis of Epidauros. See LiDonnici 1989, 150.
\item \textsuperscript{356} Cupping is mentioned in multiple Hippocratic texts. See for example Hippoc. \textit{Epid.} 5.7 for the use of cups on the lower extremities.
\item \textsuperscript{357} Lynn LiDonnici views the absence of cupping instruments in the Epidaurian \textit{iama} as a difference between the Lebena tales and the Epidaurian corpus. In doing so, LiDonnici neglects the detail that cupping was a Hippocratic method and that both groups of inscriptions therefore include a report mentioning Hippocratic medicine. See LiDonnici 1989, 150.
\item \textsuperscript{358} LiDonnici 1989, 149; the distinction between the ‘people of Lebena’ and the ‘visitors of the Asklepieion of Epidauros’ is made here because the individuals that are mentioned in the Lebena texts largely hail from Lebena itself or the neighboring city of Gortyn, whereas dedicants mentioned in the Epidaurian \textit{iama} came from all over the Greek world (see fig. 1).
\item \textsuperscript{359} LiDonnici 1989, 148-149.
\item \textsuperscript{360} Regardless of whether the god or the cult personnel performed the healing, the tales reflect the standards of medical knowledge at Lebena and Epidauros.
\end{itemize}
namely mentions specific plants and herbs, such as lettuce, laurel, chestnut, and myrtle, which were frequently utilized in secular contemporary medicine. In the Epidaurian *iamata*, only general terms like φάρμακα (medicines) and ποία (herb) can be found.\(^{361}\) This discrepancy in the terms that were employed by the Asklepieia of Epidaurus and Lebena to describe medical treatments may perhaps be explained by the multiple centuries between the creation of the two corpora. Over time, the practices at sanctuaries of Asklepios perhaps incorporated increasingly more techniques from secular medicine. However, as argued by LiDonnici, local taste may also have played a role in this difference in emphasis on the medical treatments in the *iamata* of Epidaurus and Lebena.\(^{362}\)

Moreover, the Lebena tales appear to be of a less miraculous nature than the Epidaurian *iamata*. This difference in the overall appearance of the Lebena tales relative to the Epidaurian *iamata* can, much like the disparate medical terms that were discussed above, also be explained by the aforementioned passage of two centuries between the creation of each corpus. The somewhat more “ordinary” healing reports from Lebena may indicate a change in the expectations of the ancient Greeks about how Asklepios worked and what was likely to occur in his sanctuaries. When the first Epidaurian *iamata* were inscribed, less Greeks had visited an Asklepieion themselves (or knew someone who had) than by the time the Lebena tales were composed. LiDonnici therefore convincingly argues that years of oral tradition ‘would lead to a curbing of some of the wilder fantasies people might have had about activities at the shrines and consequently to more "workaday" content of dreams reported or experienced.’\(^{363}\)

Lastly, the heading of the first healing report of the Lebena group mentions that the tales were drawn directly from their original wooden plaques, without any intermediate collection or editing.\(^{364}\) The final corpus therefore likely represents the organizational and linguistic preferences of a single redactor or team of redactors. The circumstances in which the healing reports at the Asklepieion of Lebena were composed are thus radically different from the conditions in which the Epidaurian *iamata* were created. Because the Asklepieion of Epidaurus was established more than a hundred years earlier than the Asklepieion at Lebena, the Epidaurian Asklepieion developed and evolved over a much longer period of time.\(^ {365}\)

\(^{361}\) Wickkiser 2003, 91.

\(^{362}\) LiDonnici 1989, 150-151.

\(^{363}\) LiDonnici 1989, 151; because oral history is usually associated with extravagant tales, LiDonnici’s argument may sound unconvincing. However, decades after the beginnings of the Asklepios-cult, the ancient Greeks would have been familiar with the cult and its practices. Many stories about the healings that took place in sanctuaries of Asklepios would have circulated the ancient Greek world, leaving little room for exaggeration.

\(^{364}\) Ahearne-Kroll 2014, 111 n. 54.

\(^{365}\) LiDonnici 1989, 151-153.
of votive materials on which the *iamata* at Epidaurus were based was therefore much broader than that of the Lebena group, which is consequently reflected in the disparate nature of the Epidaurian *iamata*.

Before concluding this paragraph, it is important to repeat here that it is impossible to compare all of the known corpora of *iamata* because those of the Asklepieia at Trikka, Kos and Pergamon have never been found. In turn, this makes it difficult to determine whether the Lebena tales were in fact modelled after the *iamata* of Epidaurus, seeing that the Asklepieion of Trikka potentially outdates the Epidaurian Asklepieion.\textsuperscript{366} The tradition of inscribing healing reports at sanctuaries of Asclepios could therefore also be a Thessalian invention. It is thus impossible to tell whether or not the mere act of creating *iamata* at an Asklepieion can be understood as the reproduction of an Epidaurian practice. Similarities between the healing reports of Epidaurus and Lebena should be very distinct in order for the Lebena tales to be categorized as “Epidaurian” – which is not the case. Moreover, the differences between the healing reports from Epidaurus and Lebena may, hypothetically speaking, be representative of the missing *iamata* from Trikka, Kos and Pergamon as well.

The mutual purposes of all of the *iamata* are therefore features that can be perceived as Panhellenic rather than Epidaurian. Moreover, the most plausible reasons for Asklepieia to compose a set of healing reports are of a practical nature: namely to convince visitors of the capacities of both Asclepios and his sanctuaries. Another Panhellenic feature, specifically of the excavated healing reports, is the manifestation of Hippocratic medicine in the Asklepieia of both Epidaurus and Lebena. With the birth of Hippocrates of Kos (ca. 460 BCE), a large-scale change in ancient Greek medicine was effected.\textsuperscript{367} Pre-Hippocratic medicine became increasingly influenced by the early teachings of natural philosophy, and this new concept of *iatrike* (medicine) spread throughout the Greek world in the course of the following centuries.\textsuperscript{368}

The process that led Hippocratic medicine to become the norm was gradual and stimulated from multiple directions: the new way of *iatrike* did not have a single inventor or instigator. Much of what we know of Hippocrates – and perhaps equally much of what the ancients knew about him – is almost certainly a fabrication. A plurality of phenomena that

\textsuperscript{366} Strabo 9.5.17; *IG* IV\textsuperscript{2} 1 128; *SEG* 49-378; cf. Melfi 2007a, 51-52.

\textsuperscript{367} ‘Hippocrates of Cos, the Asclepiad’, as he is referred to by Plato (*Prt*. 311b (transl. Lamb); cf. Wickkiser 2003, 28.

\textsuperscript{368} Wickkiser 2003, 15.
marked new developments in natural healing coalesced around his name.\textsuperscript{369} The spread of Hippocratic medicine from the fifth century BCE onwards is therefore an adequate example of a Panhellenic process, which was furthermore reflected in the healing reports of two different Asklepieia in two different parts of the ancient Greek world – the Argolid peninsula and Crete.

A third Panhellenic aspect of the \textit{iamata} can be found in the fact that the ailments that are described in the healing tales at Epidaurus and Lebena largely overlap. This phenomenon also derives from the changes in ancient Greek medicine that took place during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. The idea that \textit{iatrike} as a \textit{techne} (practical skill) and not the practitioner (\textit{iatros}) is limited, resulted in the emergence of illnesses that \textit{iatroi} perceived as being untreatable. According to Wickkiser, these new insights ultimately caused the cult of Asklepios to flourish during the fifth century, as those who were declared incurably ill by their local \textit{iatros} resorted to sanctuaries of the healer god to be cured.\textsuperscript{370} Regardless of whether or not Wickkiser is right, it is striking that the illnesses that are described in the \textit{iamata} can often be placed within this new category of incurable diseases (see fig. 23).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{afflictions.png}
\caption{An overview of the nature of the various ailments described in the Epidaurian \textit{iamata}. Note how blindness, paralysis and infertility - all not treatable by means of contemporary secular medicine - form three of the largest categories (own work).}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{369} Jouanna 2012a, 97; it is remarkable, given his fame, how scarce contemporary literary sources on Hippocrates are. Two references from the work of Plato are all that remains (see Pl. \textit{Prt.} 311b-d; Pl. \textit{Phdr.} 270c); cf. Wickkiser 2003, 29.
\textsuperscript{370} Wickkiser 2003, 15, 76.
The differences between the healing reports of the Asklepieia at Epidauros and Lebena – such as their dissimilar medical treatments, the credibility of the stories and the homogeneity of their structural and linguistic aspects – can moreover also best be understood as the results of Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change, or even as logical outcomes of the passage of time. However, as argued by LiDonnici, these differences may also demonstrate the regional preferences of the two sanctuaries. Further research into the local medical practices of Epidauros and Lebena is needed to establish what is local and what is global, and as such, to determine what was locally implemented, ergo glocalizing.

3.4 Conclusions

The goal of this chapter was to determine to what extent the religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia differed from or corresponded with the religious identity of the Asklepieion of Epidauros – and other sanctuaries of Asklepios. After an analysis of the sacrificial practices, anatomical votives and inscribed healing reports at sanctuaries of Asklepios, the various aspects of these religious practices can be categorized into three different types of elements: Epidaurian, local, Panhellenic and glocalizing elements. In other words, the religious practices at early Greek Asklepieia can be understood as either modelled after similar ritual performances or religious material evidence at Epidauros, resulting from local interests, influenced by Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change, or locally implemented Panhellenic phenomena.

The only possibly Epidaurian feature of the religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia can be found in the tradition of (not) sacrificing goats. The fact that Pausanias explicitly mentions the regulations surrounding the sacrifice of goats at three individual Asklepieia might indicate that the sanctuaries that acknowledged the Epidaurian myth would abstain from sacrificing goats, while sanctuaries of Asklepios that recognized other birth myths would have offered goats. Both sides of this dichotomy were thus influenced by Epidauros, although the sacrificial tradition at Lebena may also have been affected by the presence of the long-established cult of the nymphs at the site of Asklepios, making the sacrifice of goats at the Asklepieion of Lebena a local practice.

The Panhellenic characteristics of religious practices at sanctuaries of Asklepios are numerous. The most distinct Panhellenic feature of the sacrificial tradition at early Greek Asklepieia appeared to be the sacrifice of cocks. These birds were affordable for most dedicants, and the abundance of evidence for the sacrifice of cocks at Asklepieia therefore reflects the individual and personal aspect of the cult of Asklepios all over the ancient Greek
world. The *iamata* also displayed Panhellenic characteristics, such as their shared purposes (namely to convince visitors of the capacities of both Asklepios and his sanctuaries) and the similarities between both the diseases and the treatments thereof in the healing reports at Epidauros and Lebena. Likewise, the spread of Hippocratic medicine can be seen as a Panhellenic process, since this new way of *iatrike* did not have a single inventor or instigator and could be observed all over the Greek world from the fifth century BCE onwards.

The process that led Hippocratic medicine to become the norm was gradual and stimulated from multiple directions, as evidenced by the healing reports mentioning Hippocratic methods that were found in two very different parts of the Greek world. The largely overlapping illnesses that are described in the two corpora are also due to changes in ancient Greek medicine. Those who were perceived as incurably ill now resorted to sanctuaries of the healer god to be cured, instead of visiting a local *iatros* – a phenomenon that was not specific to certain cities or regions but applied to all of Greece during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. Not only the aforementioned similarities, but also the differences between the groups of *iamata* of the Asklepieia at Epidauros and Lebena can be attributed to the Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change that took place over a span of more than a hundred years. The circumstances in which the healing reports at the Asklepieion of Lebena were composed were thus radically different from the conditions in which the Epidaurian *iamata* were created, although these differences may also demonstrate the regional preferences of the two sanctuaries and the transformation thereof over time.

The differences between the *iamata* at Epidauros and Lebena can therefore be perceived as products of glocalization. This interaction between global and local elements within the religious identities of early Greek Asklepieia can be observed in more aspects of the religious practices that were analyzed in this chapter. A second glocalizing ritual aspect can be found in the destruction sacrifices at the Asklepieia of Epidauros and Titane. The two different types of destruction rituals that were employed at these Asklepieia were adopted from a Panhellenic myth. However, the implementation of the rituals was adapted to the local interests of the sanctuary: the moirocaust (a partial destruction sacrifice) that was practiced at the Asklepieion of Titane namely differed from the holocaust (a total destruction sacrifice) that was mentioned in an inscription at the Epidaurian Asklepieion.

Thirdly, the anatomical votives that were given to Asklepios can also be understood as the result of glocalization. Because votive limbs were found at many early Greek sanctuaries of Asklepios (where they presumably served a common purpose), the practice of dedicating body part votives to Asklepios was in essence a global practice, although the execution thereof
was anything but homogenous. The differences between the corpora of anatomical votives at the Asklepieia of Athens and Corinth demonstrate that Asklepieia were able to adopt this Panhellenic practice and adapt it to their local interests. This act of adopting a Panhellenic feature and subsequently adapting it to the local preferences of the sanctuary is a truly glocalizing characteristic – which appeared to be particularly present in the religious practices of early Greek Asklepieia.
Because of the great importance ascribed to the Asklepieion of Epidauros both in Antiquity and modern times, scholars hitherto regarded the development and spread of the cult of Asklepios as instigated by Epidauros. Statements about the influence of the Asklepieion of Epidauros on the establishment, appearance and religious practices of other Asklepieia often relied on assumptions rather than on a careful assessment of all available evidence. The goal of this thesis was not to debunk the centrality and importance of the Asklepieion of Epidauros, but to challenge this as of yet rarely disputed *communis opinio* by analyzing to what extent early Greek Asklepieia resulted from local interests and Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change.

The comparative approach of this thesis has yielded outcomes that deviate from the prevailing observation that certain Asklepieia possessed features resembling aspects of the famous Asklepieion at Epidauros. As a matter of fact, the examination of the placement, layouts, architectural structures and religious practices of early Greek Asklepieia produced merely three Epidaurian characteristics: the environmental similarities between the locations of the Asklepieia at Epidauros, Kos, Troezen and Sikyon (but only there), the utilization of stoas as incubation dormitories (going back to building E), and the tradition of abstaining from the sacrifice of goats. The lack of further, evidently Epidaurian features in sanctuaries of Asklepios indicates that the term “Epidaurian” – which many scholars use to describe aspects of Asklepieia that resemble similar phenomena at the Asklepieion of Epidauros – is inherently flawed. In fact, various aspects of the Athenian Asklepieion could probably be listed that were just as influential as the aforementioned Epidaurian characteristics.

In order to disclose what truly constitutes an “Epidaurian” feature, abundant evidence is needed, especially in the form of written evidence. However, textual source material on what the ancients themselves thought of as Epidaurian phenomena has never been found, which contributes to the ambivalent nature of the term. It is moreover extremely difficult to determine which elements of the Asklepieion at Epidauros itself were a result of Panhellenic influences. Like all other early Greek Asklepieia, the Epidaurian Asklepieion would also have been subject
to trends of mutual feedback – as demonstrated by the examination of the fourth-century BCE banqueting hall at Epidauros in paragraph 2.6. Consequently, the ambivalence surrounding the term “Epidaurian” makes it undesirable to classify phenomena at other sanctuaries as such. Instead of studying sanctuaries of Asklepios within this unilateral framework, considering the cult of Asklepios in terms of local and global features creates a more comprehensive and innovative understanding of the motives and forces behind the development and spread of the cult.

The local and global features of early Greek Asklepieia can in turn hardly be appropriated as separate categories. Very little Panhellenic elements remain truly uniform because once they had been successfully adopted by sanctuaries of Asklepios, they were virtually always adapted to serve the local needs of the sanctuary and its associated polis. It may therefore be argued that early Greek Asklepieia barely contained any purely Panhellenic characteristics. Only the most elementary concept of the largest of the observed trends in this thesis can be classified as altogether Panhellenic or global: namely the changes in ancient Greek medicine during the fifth century BCE and the subsequent spread of Hippocratic medicine that instigated the expansion and development of the cult of Asklepios. Similarly, apart from a few fundamentally local aspects (such as the rectangular regional type of altars at Corinth and Epidauros), the local characteristics that have been observed in this thesis were always local implementations of Panhellenic phenomena.

Elements within sanctuaries of Asklepios that were locally adapted forms of Panhellenic features thus form the most extensive category of outcomes by far. As a result of the abundant global components of the cult, visitors and dedicants all over the ancient Greek world must have had a clear understanding of what took place at sanctuaries of Asklepios by the end of the fourth century BCE – when many new Asklepieia were built and already existing sanctuaries got thoroughly renovated. To revisit the questions about the implication of the chronology and building phases of early Greek Asklepieia that were introduced at the very beginning of this thesis, the fourth-century developments are thus neither exclusively local nor global, but glocalizing because these Panhellenic fourth-century progressions were always conformed to the local needs of each sanctuary.

Through decades of mutual feedback, Asklepieia developed into more global sanctuaries, while simultaneously becoming increasingly unique because individual sanctuaries adapted these Panhellenic features to suit their own local needs. Locally implemented Panhellenic trends include mythological aspects, such Asklepios’ chthonic mythology and his connection to Apollo, and cultic features, like the importance of water for the cult of Asklepios.
and the dedication of anatomical votives at his sanctuaries. Asklepieia were only built on former cult sites of Apollo or the nymphs when this location benefited the local interests of the polis and the cult – which could for example be in need of access to natural water sources. As such, the unique waterworks of the Asklepieion of Corinth were likely created to display the abundance of water in the city.

An Asklepieion can thus be classified as glocalizing, not only when the sanctuary and its cultic activity contain separate local and Panhellenic aspects, but particularly when these Panhellenic aspects are locally implemented, creating a sophisticated fusion between local and global characteristics within the precinct. This thesis has demonstrated how, between the late sixth- and fourth centuries BCE, the cult of Asklepios was shaped by a combination of local tendencies and Panhellenic processes of social and cultural change. Therefore, every early Greek Asklepieion was to some extent a glocalizing sanctuary. Exactly to what extent an Asklepieion can be classified as a glocalizing sanctuary depends on the amount of glocalizing aspects that it contained, relative to the number of essentially local aspects.

The ratio of glocalizing to entirely local characteristics is perhaps best illustrated by the case of the Asklepieion of Lebena. As discussed in paragraph 3.1, Pausanias tells us that it was customary there to sacrifice goats: something that was abstained from in the Asklepieia at Epidauros and Tithorea. The custom to sacrifice goats at Lebena may have been a local tradition, originating from the sacrificial practices of the older local cult of the nymphs, who typically received goats as sacrificial animals. However, this distinct local feature of the cult of Asklepios at Lebena can consequently be linked to a glocalizing phenomenon. The placement of the Lebena Asklepieion at an older cult site of the nymphs was determined by the Panhellenic importance of water for the cult of Asklepios. In turn, the actual placement of Asklepieia at natural water sources (that were originally sacred to the nymphs) happened only if this location benefited the local needs of the cult and the polis – as demonstrated in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6.

Moreover, healing reports were found at the Lebena Asklepieion, which can be understood as glocalizing texts because they displayed Panhellenic characteristics in their shared purposes and the similarities between the diseases and the treatments described in the iama at both Lebena and Epidauros. Meanwhile, the differences between the iama at both sanctuaries can be explained both by the fundamentally different circumstances in which the two corpora of healing reports were composed and the regional preferences of the two sanctuaries, which transformed over time. As such, early Greek Asklepieia could contain both local and glocalizing aspects. The available material and textual evidence of the Asklepieion of Lebena thus shows equally many local and global features, although further research into the
material record of the Lebena Asklepieion may produce an even more nuanced answer to the question to what extent this sanctuary can be classified as a glocalizing sanctuary.

It is moreover important to emphasize again here that, while the Lebena Asklepieion is among the Epidaurian offshoots listed by Pausanias, the analysis of the material and epigraphical record of the Asklepieion of Lebena in this thesis has yielded no elements decidedly deriving from Epidauros. The case of Lebena demonstrates that Asklepieia had their own agency to choose and express their own glocalizing identity, instead of being required to display their relationship with the mother-sanctuary at Epidauros. It may therefore be concluded that glocalization in sanctuaries of Asklepios can be understood as the opportunity of the sanctuary to adopt and adapt Panhellenic phenomena and in doing so, express their unique identity.

So, who exactly were the agents behind the processes of glocalization in early Greek Asklepieia? Was the manifestation of the identity of the sanctuary decided by cult personnel, the polis authorities or the local inhabitants themselves? Further research into the motivations behind expressions of glocalization is needed to answer these (and more) questions about the identity of the agents of glocalization. As mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, this study may form a starting point from which further research can emerge because it has focused on only three aspects of early Greek Asklepieia. Since it has been confirmed in paragraph 3.3 of this thesis that the spread of Hippocratic ideas – like the spread of the cult of Asklepios – had a pan-Greek character, follow-up research may aim to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of the interaction between Hippocratic ideas and early Greek Asklepieia. As Hippocratic medicine was also a Panhellenic feature of Asklepieia, further research into the local implementations of Hippocratic methods in sanctuaries of Asklepios may enhance our understanding of the glocalizing characteristics of both ancient Greek medicine and early Greek Asklepieia.
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