

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

11-1-1966

Ἄσχηλό εωτήρ, Ἰησοῦς εωτήρ

Donald Tanner

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_tannerd@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tanner, Donald, "Ἄσχηλό εωτήρ, Ἰησοῦς εωτήρ" (1966). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 847.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/847>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

'Ασκληπιὸς Σωτήρ, Ἰησοῦς Σωτήρ

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirement for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Donald F. Tanner

November 1966

45653

Approved by: _____

Walter J. Betting
Advisor
11/23/66

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST LOUIS MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ASKLEPIOS AND THE CULT OF HEALING.	5
Asklepios: Man or God?	5
Birth legends.	5
The death of Asklepios	6
Evaluations from History	6
Character and Description.	8
Descriptive titles	8
Concerns for men	9
Expansion of the Cult.	10
Initial inroads.	10
Bridge between the ages.	11
Temple sanctuaries	12
Σωτήρ and Healer.	16
Usage of σωτήρ in general.	16
References to Asklepios as σωτήρ	16
The Healer and his cures	17
Summary.	18
III. THE NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLES IN THE LIGHT OF A COMPARISON OF CHRIST AND ASKLEPIOS	20
The Hellenistic and Rabbinic Background for Understanding the New Testament Healing Miracles	20
Healing miracles prior to the Christian era.	20
The contributions of the rabbinic and Hellenistic traditions	21
The Healing Miracles of Christ and Asklepios.	23
Motive and content	23
Parallels in characteristic structure.	25

Chapter	Page
The Healing of the Blind Man in John 9.	27
John's use of miracles.	27
Comparison of John 9:1-12 with similar healings of Asklepios	28
Christ and Asklepios Viewed Together. .	30
Asklepios and the Early Christian Apologetic.	32
The concern of the early Gospel . . .	32
The Christian polemic against Asklepios	34
IV. CONCLUSION.	36
FOOTNOTES.	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the Healer Asklepios of Golden Age Greece and the healing miracles preserved in the early Christian Gospel. This present study was motivated by a preliminary exegetical consideration of the healing of the blind man in John 9:1-12. At the time of that initial study in May, 1964, the author became interested in parallels to this pericope in the healings of Asklepios. Thought was given to the possibility that the writer of the Gospel of John composed his record with the healings of Asklepios in mind, and that certain emphases in the Gospel are outstanding because the writer was influenced by the traditions concerning the Healer Asklepios. The possibility of such an influence is underscored by Edelstein:

The appearance of Asclepius and the rise of his worship must be interpreted as a religious phenomenon. To understand the Asclepius religion one must acknowledge the god in Asclepius. Of all the ancient gods, Asclepius was the leading figure in the struggle between the dying world of pagans and the rising world of the Christians.¹

The study of the origin of Asklepios and the development of the cult of healing which was associated with him become important if the suggestion that the healing miracles attributed to Asklepios shed light on the healing miracles of Christ, is to be considered. This paper attempts to understand the background and environment of the Gospel miracle

accounts. It is hoped that this attempt will help to determine the specific and unique message about Jesus the Christ which the miracles depict.

Before considering the New Testament healing miracles in the light of a comparison between Jesus the Savior and Asklepios the Savior, I will give an overview of the material from historical traditions which deals with the question whether Asklepios was a man, a god, or both. The growth of the healing cult is traced to demonstrate the extent to which the followers of Asklepios had opportunity to confront a great many people throughout the Mediterranean world at the time of Christ. In preparation for a discussion of the possible relationship of Asklepios to Jesus I will present an examination of the titles **Σωτήρ** and Healer given to Asklepios. Included in this discussion will be various descriptions that demonstrate his significance in the thinking and life of the Graeco-Roman world. It does not seem probable that a study of the healings of Asklepios on the basis of texts from Epidauros would establish a direct connection with the healing miracle tradition of Christ. Rather, these Epidauros texts might illuminate the traditional process regarding the healing miracles of Jesus the Savior. There may be some merit in the suggestion of H. J. Rose that the miracle tradition surrounding Christ was a outgrowth of the significant position which the cult of Asklepios held at the beginning of the Christian era:

Asklepios became the god of all classes of society, worshipped by the bond and free, rich and poor, until the triumph of Christianity, which was obliged to produce a counteraction in the shape of its healing miracles.²

Because the milieu of the New Testament era produced not only the Gospel tradition of Christ's healing miracles, but also sustained the tradition of the Healer Asklepios, there seems to be a possible relationship between the two traditions. The simple texts of the healings of Asklepios recorded on stone, papyrus, and earthenware have helped us, first, to a knowledge of the Holy Scripture on its linguistic side, and then, to no small understanding of the characteristics which distinguish it as unique.³

In the second chapter I will present the New Testament healing miracles in the light of a comparison of Christ and Asklepios. An investigation of the Hellenistic and Rabbinic background for understanding these miracles will precede the comparison. After presenting a general discussion of the parallels in the characteristic structure of the healing miracles of Christ and Asklepios, I will deal specifically with the Healing of the Blind Man in John 9:1-12. A comparison of the structure and vocabulary of this pericope to a similar healing by Asklepios will lead into a consideration of primary source material which links Christ and Asklepios. Finally, a presentation of the early Christian apologetic concerning Christ and Asklepios as Healers will focus on the concern of the early Gospel.

Throughout the paper no conclusions about the relationship of Christ and Asklepios will be drawn. In the light of a need for a more exhaustive study^{of} the exact relationship between Christ and Asklepios and the healing miracles of the Gospels the present study seeks to leave the question open ended. Nevertheless, I have proceeded with the assumption that there are certain distinct values which non-Christian, non-literary texts possess for the study of Primitive Christianity. In the first place, these texts put a proper philological estimate on the New Testament and on Primitive Christianity. They also point to the right literary appreciation of the text. A more thorough study would be a contribution to the form critical study of the Gospels. Finally, these non-Christian healing texts give us information on points in the history of religion and culture which can help us to understand and evaluate the contact and contrast between Christianity and the ancient world.⁴

CHAPTER II

ASKLEPIOS AND THE CULT OF HEALING

Asklepios: Man or God?

Birth Legends

The birth of Asklepios is enshrouded with a most interesting legend. He is recognized as the son of Apollo and the virgin, Coronis. As Coronis was traveling with her father, the king of Boethia, on his journey to conquer Peloponesus, she delivered her child secretly near Epidauros. A goat suckled the baby, and a dog protected him. A shepherd discovered the young child when he saw a bright light and heard a voice: "This child will find remedies that will even revive the dead."¹ Another legend maintains that Asklepios was miraculously delivered from the funeral pyre of his mother, Coronis. This is an interesting piece of folklore which has its parallel in the story of the Wonderful Twins that sprang from the ashes of the Koronides, the maidens who received high heroic honors at Orchomenos.² While the legends follow the patterns of other Greek hero-gods, more careful examination of the content of the birth legends shows that the story of the birth of Asklepios is a repetition of an un-Homeric and assuredly pre-Homeric mythologem.³

The question whether Asklepios was divine or human is not solved on the basis of a clear record of birth.

Support for Asklepios' being a god is found in the Helium Regem of Julianus where we find a passage couched in language reminiscent of the Logos passage of John 1:

Since the Sun fills the whole world of our life with order, he begets Asclepius in the world, even though he has had him by his side even before the beginning of the world.⁴

The Death of Asklepios

For Homer and the epic poets of the Homeric school Asklepios was not a god but a mortal hero. He was thought to have been a hero who died a natural death, and only when dead was he venerated as a true hero, similar to the dead royal heroes.⁵ If this is true, it is probable that during his lifetime Asklepios was only an excellent physician. According to one legend which presents Asklepios as a human being, he suffered death because of his deeds as a physician. Asklepios revived the dead and thus transgressed the limits set for mankind. As a result of this opposition to the gods, death came on him when he was struck with a lightening bolt from the hand of Zeus.⁶

Evaluations from History

Even the question whether or not Asklepios actually lived as a man must remain open-ended. To ancient physicians Asklepios was the prototype of their profession. The hero-god was regarded by the Hellenes as in the most intimate sense the founding father and the patron of the medical art and profession.⁷ The Homeric poems say nothing

about the divinity of Asklepios or any related myth which might suggest that he was a god. It seems probable that the writer of these poems inferred that Asklepios had been a "hero physician." As a physician, Asklepios was thought to have begun his practice in his native town, the Thessalian city of Triikka, which is mentioned in the Iliad.⁸ Although at one time he may have been a physician on earth, Asklepios seems to have acquired his divine power of healing through his deification after death.⁹ Thus far the evidence suggests the strong possibility that Asklepios was a historical personality. Farnell concludes:

This review of the various lines of evidence gives us reason for rejecting what may be called the orthodox, academic view that Asklepios was fundamentally and from origin a chthonian deity, and inclines us to the belief in his human origin as a culture hero.¹⁰

In contrast to the position which affirms the essential historicity of Asklepios, there are scholars who maintain that Asklepios was in no sense a historical personality. If their position is upheld, the legend surrounding Asklepios reveals an idealized image of a physician of the day rather than the historical truth of a definite individual. Against the modern proponents of the historicity of Asklepios it must be maintained that if he was a real man, tradition has obliterated all detail concerning his existence to such a degree that it can no longer be proved.¹¹ If Asklepios is a god, he is no Olympian. Although his art type is modelled after that

of Zeus, he never became an Olympian because he remained functional rather than personal in his role as the Savior-Healer.¹² Worship of Asklepios as god was removed from the context of worship of the Olympian gods in general. However, a notable exception to the general practice is found in the association of Apollo with his son, Asklepios, at Epidauros. In fact, the union of father and son seems to have reached to identity of personality according to inscriptions that record dedications to 'Apollo-Asklepios.'¹³

Character and Description

Descriptive Titles

In popular Greek belief the *δαίμων* is a being, often thought of as a spirit, endowed with supernatural powers, capricious and incalculable. These powers are exhibited in unusual places at particular times and are at work in the events of human life. They were thought to be placated and controlled by magical means.¹⁴ Asklepios is described as the *δαίμων* of the fertility of the earth. As Savior and Healer, he remains very close to man and to the earth.¹⁵ The pagan Aristides found salvation of body and soul in Asklepios, and he took comfort in his faith in this *δαίμων* as his personal savior.¹⁶

Asklepios also won such titles as 'Savior of the World,'¹⁷ 'the great Joy to all mortals,' 'Lord,' 'Healer,'¹⁸ 'Gentle One,' and 'the greatest Lover of Men.' Further, Asklepios reveals himself to Aristides as 'the World Soul,'

the one Plato calls 'the Soul of the Universe.'¹⁹

Concerns for Men

The various titles which were ascribed to Asklepios indicate that he dealt with the needs of men in a spirit of love and gentleness. Campbell Bonner, following the words of Aristides closely, states:

Asklepios is the mildest, kindest, most loving of the gods. He is a refuge from all troubles and is accessible to the call of suffering humanity whatever the occasion of need.²⁰

Although the powers of Asklepios seem quite extensive, he chooses to concentrate these powers in ministering to the physical needs of men. Those who followed Asklepios in his healing cult became known as Asklepiadai. They too perpetuated the practice of walking about the countryside healing diseases in the name of the god Asklepios. The followers of Asklepios are described by Farnell:

The type of Asklepios was a blend of two virtues: on the one hand, of the ~~σοφία~~ ~~σοφία~~, or deep wisdom, enriched by science, the traditional Hellenic ideal, an ideal which gives a unique value to their best religious thought, and on the other, of the philanthropy, or love of mankind, which permeates their religion rarely and at a time later and with less force. They recognized, as we do, the physicians calling as the most philanthropic of all social activities, and they transferred this quality in the fullest measure to the physician-god.²¹

In the cult of the divine Healer a faith in a providence which did not disdain to concern itself with the intimate life of the individual developed to an extremely high point. The tendency to include the concern for spiritual well-being of the individual also grew in addition

to the concern over bodily ailments. This development is discussed by Bonner:

The divine Healer of the body becomes also the Physician of the soul. Asklepios sympathized with the sufferings of humanity, healed diseases, and allayed the anxieties of people. It was inevitable that he should be progressively aggrandized by theological speculation until he became a personal Savior with far reaching attributes and the object of devout adoration.²²

In spite of the continually growing concern for the total man, there is apparently no eschatological aspect to Asklepios' care for humanity. It would be difficult to pick out a definite passage illustrating his solicitude for the welfare of the soul.

Neither is there a passage in which Asklepios tells about the life to come. As a physician, it was not his task to concern himself with the Beyond. His salvation of men was limited to this world.²³ An inscription of the 3rd century B.C. records a cure of Asklepios at Epidauros which links the cure with a παρουσία of the savior-god himself. τὰν τε παρουσίαν τὰν αὐτοῦ παρεμφάνισε ὁ Ἄσκληπιός .²⁴ "And Asklepios manifested his παρουσία." This usage refers to the manifestation of appearance in time and does not point to any life to come.

Expansion of the Cult

Initial Inroads

An important aspect of the study of Asklepios is the

spread of the healing cult and its influence on the Hellenistic and Roman minds. The once obscure hero or Erdgott of the Thessalian city of Triikka migrated to Epidauros in the 6th century B.C. and further extended his influence through the union with Apollo. At the close of the 5th century B.C. Asklepios and his daughters came to Athens, where the poet Sophocles became his first apostle.²⁵ More often it is the fate of a hero-god to become a local divinity but never to emerge as a Panhellenic god. Among all the Greek communities in which the Asklepios cult flourished there were no mysteries and no mystic theology evolved concerning him.²⁶

Bridge Between the Ages

The cult of Asklepios had spread to Athens from Argolis in 421 B.C. As a kind of bridge between the religion of the great cities of the ancient Mediterranean world Asklepios' cult spread to Memphis in Egypt where the god appeared under the guise of the sage Imhotep.²⁷ The ability of the healing cult to spread throughout the world marks the continuing popularity of Asklepios. In Phoenicia he became Esmoun. In 293 B.C. the cult spread to Insula Tiberina. Asklepios was among the first of the foreign gods to be admitted to the Roman Temple.²⁸ A bridge from ancient Greece had been made.

A most significant contribution to the religious life of the Roman period was completed when Asklepios

allied himself with Demeter and thus joined this world and the other. This contribution gave to his worship an importance far beyond that of a merely materialistic healing cult.²⁹

Temple Sanctuaries

A study of the establishment and development of the temple sanctuaries of Asklepios is necessary to bolster the argument that Asklepios was elevated to the level of a deity after his death, that Epidauros was the city of his origin, that his worship spread throughout the *οἴκου-
μένη*, and that he continued to exercise his power up to the end of the Roman period.

The sanctuaries of Asklepios, like those of the popular gods and goddesses, were situated in all places which pious reverence considered sacred, either on account of old traditions or because they seemed to have something divine associated with them. Asklepieia were established in valleys and on the tops of mountains, outside of towns, and within the city walls. Locations in cities where human activity was concentrated were most prevalent. Although it seems highly improbable that Asklepios was a god from the point of origin, it is more likely that he was worshipped as a deity in the towns, as a local god, after his death. As a local god Asklepios acquired all the power of attraction that accrued to ancient deities through their presence in the community. In the early

stages of the healing cult, it had been necessary for most people who sought Asklepios' help to make a lengthy journey, because his shrines were still scarce. Later, the invalids could go to temples near their homes. For the town folk, this was the sanctuary of their own city; for the peasants, it was the shrine in their provincial capital.³⁰

A wealth of buildings and monuments were crowded into the boundary of the sacred grove of the sanctuaries. Not all the temples of Asklepios were built on as lavish a scale as at Cos, Epidauros, and Pergamum, the main seats of the cult. But many other locations could compete with them, if not in the spaciousness of their layout, at least in the perfection of their design and the beauty of their adornment. Of all the sanctuaries of Asklepios that arose in the course of time, the one at Epidauros may have been the one in which Asklepios was elevated to the level of godhead. If this is correct, we would expect that the other places of worship did not spring up independently, but rather that they had some connection with one another. The ancients thought that most of the important centers were outgrowths of the original center at Epidauros.³¹

In the first half of the 4th century B.C. the cult of Asklepios was admitted to the colonies of Asia Minor. Erythrae was the first to receive the Healer, and the shrine at Pergamum was founded not long after by Archias. Shortly after 350 B.C. Ephesus became still another seat

of the cult. This Ephesian temple remained famous throughout antiquity.³²

The Asklepieia were hardly less numerous than the sanctuaries of many Greek gods in the period of the early Roman Empire. Hundreds of these temples are still known today.³³ Until the 2nd century A.D. the influence of Asklepios increased steadily. At the beginning of the 2nd century the Emperor Hadrian seems to have favored the shrine at Epidauros more than any other. During this century the authority of the Asklepios temples was at its zenith.

The beginning of downfall of the Asklepios cult was precipitated by the growth of Christianity. This growth threatened to destroy the foundations of the ancient religious life.³⁴ During the 3rd century A.D. Christianity began to make additional inroads as the influence of the Asklepios cult continued to wane. The sanctuary at Pergamum was destroyed by an earthquake between 253 and 260 A.D. and was not rebuilt.³⁵

The 4th century brought reverses and successes for the struggling cult. Constantine destroyed the sanctuary at Aegae. Eusebius Caesariensis in De Vita Constantini, III, 56 records this significant event:

The Emperor, therefore, acting fairly, holding the true Savior a jealous God, commanded that this temple, too, be razed to its foundations. At one nod it was stretched to the ground...and with it fell the one lurking there, not a demon or a god, but a kind of deceiver of souls, who had practiced

his deceit for a very long time. Manifestly through the miraculous power of the Savior Himself the temple there was destroyed to the roots so that not even a trace remained there of the former madness.³⁶

The fate of Aegae was symbolic. To an ever increasing extent the sanctuaries of the pagans became quarries for the shrines of Christ. In Syria in the 5th century A.D. the Asklepios cult seems to have been exterminated by the authorities. Even at this late date, however, the faithful worshipped the Asklepios of Ascalon openly. Edelstein discusses the end of the remnant of the Asklepios cult:

The temples of Asclepius, then, held out well nigh into the sixth century, the time at which even the last vestiges of paganism were finally stamped out all over the ancient world. The hero of physicians, who had become a god at the beginning of the classical period, proved to be as strong as those deities who were revered from time immemorial, if he was not even more powerful than they turned out to be. The temples of the Oriental gods withstood the onslaught of Christianity no longer than did the Asclepieia. The god of medicine who cured the sick had shown charity toward the poor, philanthropy toward all; he had been satisfied with small gifts in exchange for the greatest boon, health and freedom from disease; he had been mild and helpful, as he appeared to men in their dreams, and as he stood before their eyes in his statues. His deed and his merits endeared the son of Coronis to the ancients. That is why his divine abodes were among the last to fall.³⁷

A survey of the history of the temple sanctuaries of Asklepios reveals his significant position in the lives and thoughts and religious expressions of the people of the Graeco-Roman world in the millennium from 500 B.C. to 500 A.D.

Σωτήρ and Healer

Usage of Σωτήρ in General

Most of the gods of late antiquity were called saviors, although it may be true that Asklepios was honored with this title more than any of them. In Asia Minor the Emperors were worshipped as divine saviors.³⁸ During the reign of Ptolemy IV, σωτήρ was used as a title for Serapis and Isis. In this connection σωτήρ is probably in a votive use, that is, in thanksgiving for some particular benefit received from the god. It is not used in the theological sense, Savior from death.³⁹ Σωτήρ is neither unique to Asklepios nor to the group of healing physicians to which he belonged.

References to Asklepios as Σωτήρ

Asklepios won for himself the title 'Savior of the World.'⁴⁰ A stele from Epidauros records, "...καὶ Σωτήρι Ἀσκληπιῷ."⁴¹ Festugiere recalls the testimony of Aristides, "It was there (at the Warm Springs of Smyrna) that the Savior first began to give me revelations."⁴² Aristides approves of the identification of Asklepios with Zeus and calls him "the Soul of the Universe:"

This is he who guides and governs the universe, Savior of all things, guardian of the immortals, bringing salvation to all that is and is to be.⁴³

F. Beare also associates Asklepios and Zeus with the title 'Savior.'⁴⁴

The Healer and His Cures

The curative power of Asklepios seems to have been virtually unlimited. The Greek geographer Strabo affirms this power in Geographica, viii, 6, 15, "Asclepius is believed to cure diseases of every kind and has his temple full of the sick."⁴⁵

Collections of the real cures of Asklepios were recorded on votive tablets or πίνακες. These testimonies include cures that were effected by medical, surgical, and psychic means. The original collections of the cures were gradually surrounded with creations of popular fancy. Nevertheless, the aims of the collections were likely propaganda and advertisement of the shrine, the encouragement of visitors and pilgrims, warnings not to forget the proper thankoffering, and the stimulation of courage and hope for a cure.⁴⁶

Asklepios refused healing assistance only on moral grounds. Only those who were virtuous were cured. In spite of this strong position taken on personal virtue, Asklepios cured his patients whether they were devotees or disbelievers.⁴⁷

There was no personal gain associated with the healing cult of Asklepios. Julianus in Epistulae, 78, 419b maintains, "Asclepius does not heal men in the hope of repayment, but rather in fulfillment of his particular function to benefit mankind."⁴⁸ Interestingly, Asklepios

seems to be motivated in every instance by the desire to reach out to men wherever possible and heal them.

Summary

Thus far in the paper I have traced the growth and development of the rich tradition surrounding the Healer Asklepios and the cult in which he thrived. Beginning with the legends about his birth and death, I presented evaluations from his contemporaries and from others in history concerning the question, "Was Asklepios a man, a god, or both?" It seems probable that Asklepios was a hero physician, who was worshipped at cultic sanctuaries during his life and was quickly surrounded by legends asserting his deity after his death.

The character of Asklepios was discussed in the light of the titles ascribed to him on the basis of the concerns he showed for all men regardless of their social position. The expansion of the healing cult from the earliest stages in the city of Epidauros to the later stages when the Asklepios cult became the bridge between the religions of the Greek and Roman ages resulted in the growth of a large number of cultic sanctuaries throughout the Mediterranean world. These sanctuaries of Asklepios were among the last pagan temples to fall to the influence of Christianity as late as 500 A.D. The great number of temples and the extent to which they

covered the geographical area of the Roman world in the early Christian centuries indicate the significant influence the Asklepios cult continued to have at that time.

Finally, I examined the uses of the word σωτήρ in the Greek-Roman world and particularly as this title refers to Asklepios. The title Σωτήρ is closely associated with the ability of Asklepios to cure a great variety of ills. The task remains to compare the Christ to Asklepios, the Σωτήρ, with the hope that such a comparison might shed light on the healing miracles of the New Testament.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLES IN THE LIGHT OF A COMPARISON OF CHRIST AND ASKLEPIOS

The Hellenistic and Rabbinic Background for Understanding the New Testament Healing Miracles

Healing Miracles Prior to the Christian Era

In the period of history succeeding the conquests of Alexander the Great, the religions of the Near East learned to speak Greek, and in the process suffered more or less change through their exposure to the Greek influence. The miracles of such Healers as Asklepios are not the least significant contribution to this Hellenistic influence. The ancient world revelled in the miraculous and expected miracles to happen. The result was that many events were interpreted as miraculous. We may call this superstition, or a kind of primitive religion, or a childlike faith depending on our evaluation of the phenomenon.¹ S. V. McCasland warns that even though many cures were effected in the names of divine beings from many parts of the world, we must be on guard against the numerous legends that accompany these accounts.²

Medical and surgical cures are prevalent in the Hellenistic accounts of healing. These cures most likely were understood as miraculous events, the gods working through men to accomplish the miracle. There are also a significant number of miraculous cures effected through

a dream which have been preserved at the temple sanctuaries. The Hellenic miracle stories are distinguished by a marked scarcity of exorcisms and resuscitation.³ Two sources are notable exceptions. First, Philoseudes by Lucian of Samosata is a collection of yarns about mythology, quack remedies, exorcisms, and other cures. Second, The Life of Apollonios of Tyana narrates the travels, teachings, and marvels of Apollonios, a Greek philosopher and wandering magician.⁴ Detailed descriptive stories in Greek literature dealt with interesting single occurrences of popular origin. The content of these stories focused on the close relationship between the gods and human beings.⁵

The Contributions of the Rabbinic and Hellenistic Traditions

The Rabbinic contribution to the understanding of illness and the cure of disease emphasizes the belief that sin and suffering and sickness were indissolubly linked together. Rabbi Ammi maintained that there is "no suffering without sin." Rabbi Alexandrai expressed another unique Jewish contribution, "No man gets up from sickness until God has forgiven all his sins."⁶ This Rabbinic emphasis on the forgiveness of sins underlies the unique element in the healings of Jesus over against the healings of Asklepios, which were not associated with the forgiveness of the patients' sins. The study of the Rabbinic contributions is important for the assessment of the uniquely Judaeo-Christian view of the relation of forgive-

ness to healing.

Although Christianity was fundamentally Jewish in origin, it was born into a world that had become thoroughly Hellenized. The significance of this fact cannot be ignored. Even in Palestine a considerable leaven of Greek influence had been introduced.⁷

In the Greek-Roman world religion and healing were closely associated. *Σωτηρία* connoted more to both Christians and pagans than its special meaning "salvation which religion bestows." It connoted health of body and soul. Angus suggests, "Neither Christians nor pagans distinguished rigidly between physical ills of body and maladies of the soul."⁸ Christianity, following the example Jesus the Savior, deliberately and consciously assumed the form of a religion of salvation for both body and soul.

Some scholars infer very close generic relationships between Christianity and the pagan cults of the early Christian centuries. Gerald Friedlander in Hellenism and Christianity supports this view:

Heathen mythology is much older than Christianity. It is Christianity which has adopted - perhaps unconsciously - its dogmas and practices from the heathen cults which obtained in the lands where the Church arose and flourished.⁹

However, as we have already seen, at the crucial point of forgiveness the uniqueness of Christianity becomes manifest and challenges any rash assumption of a close

generic relationship.

McGinley raises the question, "Do the Gospel healing stories so resemble their Rabbinic and Hellenic parallels that they must have originated in a similar way?"¹⁰

Traits common to the Gospel, Rabbinic, and Hellenistic traditions may be only those due to the choice of subject matter and the unity of human nature. In an attempt to answer the question which he raised McGinley maintains:

The synoptic tradition did not originate or develop in the same fashion as the rabbinic and Hellenistic literature. It was not a compilation of popular anecdotes, careless of the reality of facts.

The Jewish and Greek converts to the primitive Christian community did not introduce into the synoptic tradition the motifs of the rabbinic and Hellenic traditions they knew so well.

The evidence that the Jewish and Greek converts did not introduce previously well known motifs into the synoptic tradition lies in all those traits which distinguish the Gospel story from its contemporary traditions, particularly in a completely different historical and spiritual tone.¹⁰

The Healing Miracles of Christ and Asklepios

Motive and Content

Some aspects of the primitive Christian miracle accounts seem to be clarified if we notice two processes within Hellenistic religious history. First, the myths were replaced by miracle stories. Secondly, the boundaries between god and god-sent men disappeared.¹¹ Even within the cult of Asklepios the mythical element re-treated before the onslaught of the great number of heal-

ings. Whoever wished to spread the miracles of the cult used these stories as the instrument of the mission.

The New Testament miracle accounts may be seen to have this underlying motive to spread the new cult.¹²

McGinley suggests that the result of combining novellistic motifs and actual cure accounts forms a tradition that is analogous to the tradition of the Gospel healings. These New Testament miracles, he suggests, are a somewhat colored record of actual cures which have been augmented by the insertion of material from well known wonder stories and the whole collection is presented under the particular viewpoint of each of the Gospel writers.¹³

Bultmann and Dibelius regard the miracle stories of the Gospels as being closely parallel, not merely in form, but also in content and motive to the miracle stories of the contemporary Jewish and Hellenistic world.¹⁴

Perhaps the content of the New Testament healing miracles has not only come down to us as edited stories told for their own sake, but also as the record of a cultus similar to the reports of the healing miracles of Asklepios. The inscriptions from the Asklepios shrine at Epidauros deserve special consideration because their non-literary form more closely approaches the Gospel style than the tales from the classical writers. Further, these texts were read by pilgrims and visitors for 500 years and thus widely influenced the Hellenic miracle tradition. Finally,

they offer an abundance and variety of stories that can be adapted to detailed analysis.¹⁵

In all such comparisons, however, the uniqueness of Christ as Healer must always remain the unspoken assumption. Unlike non-Christian wonder workers of His time Jesus is never presented as the healer-avenger, who sometimes cures and sometimes maims. His healing activity is a sign of the dawn of the age of salvation, the end-time reign of God. Christ's person is intimately bound up with His proclamation and healings as a sign of the dawning of God. The content of the healings of Christ focuses on the challenge of faith in the redemptive action of God which broke through into history in the Savior's person, words, and deeds.¹⁶

Parallels in Characteristic Structure

Wonder stories were popular in the Hellenistic Age. Perhaps these stories assumed a similar form in the literature because of the widespread appeal which they had.¹⁷ McGinley isolated a definite pattern for the accounts that originated within the Greek cultus: 1) a description of the illness, 2) the incubation and divine apparition, 3) verification of the result, and 4) veneration of the deity as opposed to the satisfaction of curiosity.¹⁸

Martin Dibelius also lists the characteristic pattern of ancient healing stories:

- 1) The history of the illness

- 2) Telling of unsuccessful cures
- 3) Healers were laughed at by the multitudes
- 4) Data about the greatness of the disease
- 5) Contact between the patient and the healer
- 6) Miracle working formula
- 7) Spittle: medium of folk healing
- 8) Relating the success of the miracle¹⁹

According to the critical appraisal of Reginald Fuller, only three miracle stories of the Gospels exhibit the pure form of a Hellenistic wonder story, without any modification: Peter's mother-in-law (Matt. 8:14-15, Mark 1:29-31, Luke 4:38-39, the deaf mute (Mark 7:31-37), and the blind man of Bethsaida (Mark 8:22-26, John 9:1-12).²⁰ There are other Gospel miracles which have characteristics similar to some of the characteristics of the Greek stories.

In the Hellenistic accounts the public is assured that the cure of the disease was a success. In the narratives of healing from Epidaurus the motif of proof occurs in various forms. At the end of the story of the healing of Midas (Lucian, Philopseudes, ii) the man carried his bed and could walk. Similar proof of the success of the miracle healing of the lame man occurs in Matt. 9:6 and its synoptic parallels and in John 5:9. At the raising of the maiden by Apollonius (Philostratus, Vita Apollonius, iv, 45) she let her voice be heard and returned to her father's house.²¹ When Jesus had raised Jairus' daughter, Mark 5:42-43, Luke 8:55, she walked and ate demonstrating that she was alive. John 12:2 makes a point of mentioning that Lazarus sat at the supper table with Jesus after he

had been raised from death.

The use of spittle in healing blindness is associated with ancient medical practice. Even though both Christ and Asklepios made use of spittle for healings, Jesus used the spittle symbolically. He heals because He wills the cure through His power and authority.²² This power is portrayed as sovereign and personal, due neither to medical skill nor to prayer.

The Healing of the Blind Man in John 9

John's Use of Miracles

Because saviors and revealers, religions and philosophies were in considerable number in the Hellenistic world in the first and second centuries, the writer of John had the task of setting forth the true Savior and the true revelation, using thought patterns familiar to the people to whom he addressed his Gospel.

John uses miracles as springboards for the revelation discourses. Thus he shifts the emphasis away from the miracles as displays of divine power and reinterprets them as signs which the Pre-existent is bringing into the world. This Incarnate Life is an epiphany, not of a pagan wonder worker, but of the light and truth of God.²³ The Fourth Gospel is thus, in a sense, a reworking and restatement of the earliest Christian message in terms designed to make it intelligible to the Hellenistic world.

Since John is interested in translating the Gospel into forms that could be understood in a world permeated with Greek modes of thought, it is not surprising to note that the Johannine miracles contain features which are in common with pagan wonder stories. The two features which distinguish the synoptic stories from the pagan parallels are much less conspicuous in the signs of the Gospel of John. These two features are: 1) the specific Christian teaching in the dialogue and 2) the coloring of the narrative with Old Testament motifs.²⁴

Comparison of John 9:1-12 with Similar Healings of Asklepios

An interesting healing is inscribed at the temple of Asklepios on the island of Tiber near Rome:

Οὐαλεριῶ Ἄπρω στρατιώτῃ τυφλῷ
 ἐχρημάτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἐλθεῖν καὶ λάβεῖν
 αἷμα ἐξ ἀλεκτρυῶνος λευκοῦ μετὰ
 μέλιτος καὶ ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπι-
 χρεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. καὶ
 ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἐλήλυθεν καὶ
 ἠυχαρίστησεν δημοσίᾳ τῷ θεῷ.²⁵

This inscription indicates one of the parallels between the healing miracles of Asklepios and Christ's healing of the blind man in John 9:1-12. Note the paratactical usage of καὶ in this inscription from Tiber. It is found frequently both in this passage and in John 9:7-11.

Other significant parallels can be adduced. The formula used by Asklepios, which is preserved in a text from Epidauros, parallels the procedure which Christ followed in healing the blind man in the pericope from John 9.²⁶ The Greek words **πλός** , **νίπτω** , and **ανοίχω** are found in both accounts. The form **ἐπέχρισεν** is used by the healed man in John 9:11 to describe how Christ treated his eyes. The Gospel writer used **ἐπέθηκεν** to describe the anointing in John 9:6. A form of **χρίω** is used in the account of the healing by Asklepios.

Another parallel is the pool which is central in the healing procedure of both Christ and Asklepios. Many of the temples of Asklepios had such a pool which was used as a medium for healing. In John 9:7 Jesus told the blind man, "Go and wash in the Pool of Siloam." The Pool of Siloam mentioned in John 9:7, 11 and in John 5:2, 7 is also referred to in the Old Testament in Isaiah 8:6 and Nehemiah 3:15.²⁷

Toksöz describes the prominent position and role of the pool at the Aesculapium at Pergamum:

Carved out of the rock near the western gallery is one of the oldest constructions of the Aesculapium. It had four steps leading down into the pool. Once it had been surrounded by walls on three sides and was covered by a roof.

Patients would come here, smear their bodies with mud, and then wash themselves with the water from the pool.²⁸

Just south of the city of Tiberias the cult of Asklepios

took hold in the 1st century A.D. The grove of Asklepios near Sidon in Phoenicia also thrived during this time. Healing springs were significant for the cult practice at both of these locations.²⁹

Christ and Asklepios Viewed Together

As far as Christianity can be compared at all to any of the Greek and Roman cults, the Asklepios ideal seems to be nearest the ideal of Christ. Christ was a Physician who saved the lives of the sick and who took suffering on Himself by bearing the troubles of others. Eusebius affirms this description of the Savior:

Christ is a physician devoted to save the lives of the sick, who sees the horrible danger yet touches the infected place, and in treating another man's troubles brings suffering on himself.³⁰

The vogue of the term 'physician' in reference to Jesus in the early Christian centuries indicates not only how widely human was the conception of His functions, but also testifies to the deep sense of need in the centuries when Christianity and paganism stood face to face. It may also indicate remote influence of the Asklepios cult, for Asklepios is depicted in similar words by Lucianus in Bis Accusatus, 1:

For Asclepius, pestered by the sick, sees dire sights, and touches unpleasant things, and in the woes of others reaps sorrow for himself.³¹

The name **Σωτήρ**³² was applied to the divinities of the mystery religions, to Asklepios, and to the reigning

emperors. The appearance of **Σωτήρ** in the later strata of the New Testament as a Christological term cannot be derived exclusively from the imperial cultus. The philosopher, the Christian teacher, and the medical practitioner were all healers in a sense. The word **σωτηρία** meant health in the fullest sense and the alleviation of pain physically and spiritually.³³

Wendland discusses the concepts underlying **Σωτήρ** :

Σωτήρ ist stets der Nothelfer, der Heil und Rettung bringt. Das hebräische **יְשׁוּעָה**, das in der medialen Form ursprünglich das Raum machen in der Bedrängnis bezeichnet kommt dem **σώζειν** näher als heilen oder als "Heiland" dem **σωτήρ**.³⁴

Christ extended help to sinners and publicans; and Asklepios rejected those who were impure and did not think holy thoughts. In other aspects, Asklepios remains close to the ideal of the Christ. Had later Hellenism produced its own prophet, a peer in genius to the prophets of Palestine, there were rich germs that might have quickened into a high theology in the pathetic legends of the birth and death and life story of the god-man Asklepios.³⁵ In the treatise called "Asklepios" of pseudo-Apuleius a long address and prayer to Asklepios reflects a strikingly Christian tone.³⁶

An interesting passage from Acta Pilati preserves Pilate's understanding of the relationship between Christ and Asklepios:

They said to Pilate: "He is a sorcerer and casts

out devils in the name of the devil who rules the devils, and everything is obedient to him." Pilate said to them: "It is not possible to cast out devils in the name of an impure spirit but rather in the name of the god Asclepius."³⁷

Finally, Asklepios the Healer bought slaves their freedom. Deissmann recognizes a parallel to Christ as the new Healer who gave men their freedom from the slavery of sin and law, redeeming them with a price of self-sacrifice.³⁸

Similarity between Asklepios and Christ is deeply rooted in the essence of the two figures. In the historical process that had shaped and reshaped the concept of Asklepios, one might almost venture that Asklepios had become an anticipation of Jesus who was to be proclaimed to men.³⁹

Both were sent into the world to be helpers of men. Christ, in his love for men, invited them to come to Him. This could also be said of Asklepios. Compare Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me all you that labor, and I will give you rest," with the saying of Asklepios recorded by Epicetetus in Dissertationes, IV, 8, 28-29, "Come together all you who are suffering . . . and look at me who is free from every suffering."⁴⁰

Asklepios and the Early Christian Apologetic

The Concern of the Early Gospel

The early Church preached Christ the Lord, who was the

Savior. In contrast to the competitor saviors, Jesus was the Redeemer-Healer whose saving acts were not performed for ulterior evil ends or were not inspired by the devil. Christianity was an emergence rather than another syncretism. It had to defend itself in terms of current Greek thought and carry a polemic against polytheism. In addition the Church was faced with the challenging task to vindicate its claims to be specifically new and unique as the true divine revelation.⁴¹

In certain respects the confession of the early Church attempted to relate to the confession of the followers of Asklepios. The confession of Justin Martyr in Apology, I seems to make this attempt:

And when we say also the Logos, who is the first born of God, was produced without sexual union, namely, Jesus Christ, our teacher who was crucified, who died, rose again, and ascended to heaven; we propound nothing different from what you believe regarding those you esteem as the sons of Zeus.⁴²

In the early Christian propaganda the Gospel was presented as a therapeutic of body, mind, and soul. Medical language was introduced into moral teaching and preaching. Religious language was employed in the work of medicine.⁴³ Clement refers to Christ, the Logos, as "the only physician of human infirmities, the all sufficient physician of humanity. The Logos is called Savior because He has devised rational medicine for men."⁴⁴ The content of the "rational medicine" was conveyed to individuals by Christ: "Thy faith hath made thee whole."⁴⁵

To be "made whole" was to be healed of disease and forgiven of sin. The name of Jesus itself implies deliverance in both of these dimensions.

The proclamation of the early Church emphasized the concern to affirm the uniqueness of Jesus, "There is only one physician, Jesus Christ, our Lord."⁴⁶ Tertullian calls Him "Christ the Healer" and Augustine contributes the title, "the Omnipotent Physician."⁴⁷

The Christian Polemic Against Asklepios

Some Christians attempted to take their witness for Christ directly to the cult of Asklepios. Antipas secretly penetrated the cult at the Aesculapium of Pergamum and won success as a dentist and physician. He was discovered and condemned to death by burning in the great copper ox of Pergamum.⁴⁸

The testimonies and actions of Christianity against Asklepios are marked by a tone of uneasiness, an apprehension which was not apparent in the Church's censure of Zeus, Apollo, or Athena. According to the Christian testimony, Asklepios was a successful healer. However, the Christian apologists were quick to point out that, unlike Christ, Asklepios could not "command the wicked spirit to come out of a man."⁴⁹

The apologists task was most difficult because the so-called Christian virtues of loving kindness and care for the sick were not neglected by their pagan contempor-

aries. The deep concern for people was demonstrated particularly in the cult of Asklepios. The decisive reason for the disquiet aroused among Christians by the Asklepios cult was the great similarity between the deeds of Christ and Asklepios as healers. Justin expresses this similarity:

When we say that Jesus made well the lame and the paralytic and those feeble from birth, and that he raised the dead, we seem to be mentioning deeds similar to and identical with those said to be performed by Asclepius.⁵⁰

The heathen themselves claimed, "What Jesus does, he does in the name of the god Asclepius."⁵¹ Justin lends testimony to this heathen view:

When the Gentiles learned about the prophecies to the effect that Christ would heal every disease and would raise the dead, they brought forward Asclepius.⁵²

The opposite is also held to be true:

When the devil brings forward Asclepius as the raiser of the dead and healer of other diseases, he has imitated the prophecies about Christ.⁵³

Christ's followers in the early Church realized that in Asklepios they faced one of the strongest enemies of their Master. Lactantius referred to Asklepios as "the archdemon." Tertullian called him "a beast so dangerous to the whole world." Eusebius maintained, "He draws men away from their true Savior."⁵⁴ In the last half of the 8th century A.D. Alcuin attacked the Christ-Asklepios parallel and called Asklepios the false Christ, the "Scolapius falsator." It seems that the Church was more than casually aware of the threat which Asklepios posed.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Asklepios, the Savior and Healer, and the cult which grew and developed to perpetuate his miraculous healings continued to influence the Greek and Roman world from 500 B.C. to 500 A.D. Perhaps this influence, regardless of the degree, contributed to the emphasis which the early Church placed on Jesus as the Savior, who performed similar miracles of healing. Perhaps the early Church, in writing its Gospel, preserved a rich healing miracle tradition similar to the Asklepios cult in order to focus on the unique element of the forgiveness of sins which Jesus the Savior offered.

Throughout the paper I have attempted to couch the possibility of a direct relationship between Jesus the Savior and Asklepios the Savior in very cautious terms. I do so because additional study of the apparent similarities seems necessary. Although in some respects their miracles are similar, the association of forgiveness of sins with the healings of Christ establish them as unique.

Questions and studies must still be pursued before less tentative statements could be made concerning the influence of the Asklepios cult on the early tradition, either written or oral, concerning the miracles of Christ.

The power and authority of Christ must be studied

and compared to the authority and power which other saviors and healers claimed to have had. A more thorough study of the word *ἰατρικὴ* and its cognates in ancient Greek, as well as Hellenistic, intertestamental, and New Testament Greek literature. *is necessary.*

In addition, a more extensive comparison of healing texts would have to be done. A beginning could be made through a study of the structure and vocabulary of accounts from other Greek healers, from the Mystery Religions, from rabbinic sources, and also from Christian healings of the early centuries.

I would hope that such a continued study might shed further light on the possibility of an influence of the healing cult of Asklepios on the miracle tradition surrounding Christ and the uniqueness of Jesus as Savior and Healer.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

¹Emma J. Edelstein and Ludwig Edelstein, Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1945), II, pp. 110-111.

²H. J. Rose, Ancient Greek Religion (London: Hutchinson's University, 1946), p. 149.

³Adolf Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (New York: Doran, 1927), p. 144.

⁴Ibid., p. 10.

CHAPTER II

¹Cemil Toksöz, Aesculapium of Pergamum (Ankara: Ayyildiz Matbaasi, 1960), pp. 8-9.

²Lewis R. Farnell, Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1921), p. 243.

³C. Kerényi, Asklepios, translated from the German by R. Manheim (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1959), p. xxi.

⁴Edelstein, I, p. 151.

⁵Kerényi, p. 70.

⁶Edelstein, II, p. 46.

⁷Farnell, Hero Cults, p. 268.

⁸Kerényi, pp. xiii-xiv.

⁹Edelstein, II, p. 95.

¹⁰Farnell, Hero Cults, p. 246.

¹¹Edelstein, II, p. 63.

¹²Jane Ellen Harrison, Epilégomena to the Study of Greek Religion and Themis (New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1962), p. 381.

¹³Lewis R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1907), IV, p. 239.

¹⁴Werner Foerster, "Daimōn and its Cognates," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited and translated from the German by Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), II, p. 8. δαίμων is used to designate a) "gods" b) "lesser deities" c) "an unknown superhuman factor at work" d) "anything which overtakes man." In the Gospel of John the people's estimate of Jesus is expressed in the phrase δαίμόνιον ἔχει (καὶ ἡδύεται) in 7:20; 8:48, 49, 52; 10:20, 21.

¹⁵Harrison, Epilegomena, p. 384.

¹⁶Campbell Bonner, "Some Phases of Religious Feeling in Later Paganism," Harvard Theological Review, XXX (July 1937), 131.

¹⁷Infra, p. 31.

¹⁸S. Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World (London: John Murray, 1929), p. 430.

¹⁹Andre-Jean Festugiere, Personal Religion Among the Greeks (Berkeley: University of California, 1954), p. 96.

²⁰Bonner, p. 129.

²¹Farnell, Hero Cults, p. 276.

²²Bonner, p. 124.

²³Edelstein, II, p. 129.

²⁴Deissmann, p. 370.

²⁵Lewis R. Farnell, "Greek Religion," in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1913), VI, p. 418.

²⁶Jane Ellen Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion (New York: Meridian Books, 1955), p. 343.

²⁷E. O. James, The Ancient Gods (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1960), p. 241.

²⁸Edelstein, II, p. 252.

²⁹Ibid., p. 129.

³⁰Ibid., p. 233.

³¹Ibid., p. 238.

³²Ibid., p. 249.

³³Ibid., p. 251. According to Pauly-Wissowa, Thraemer lists 186 sanctuaries. These are only a selection from among 410 localities which Thraemer had at his disposal and which form a still more impressive testimony to the enormous expansion of the cult. Cf. Alice Walton, The Cult of Asklepios (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1894), passim. This is an old, but comprehensive study of the references made to Asklepios in ancient Greek literature as well as a thorough treatment of the sanctuaries, temple attendants, and ceremonial ritual of the cult.

³⁴Edelstein, II, p. 251-255.

³⁵Ibid., p. 255.

³⁶Edelstein, I, pp. 419-420.

³⁷Edelstein, II, p. 257.

³⁸Ibid., p. 133.

³⁹Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 93.

⁴⁰Angus, p. 430.

⁴¹Gerhard Dellling, editor, Antike Wundertexte, in Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, edited by Hans Lietzmann (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1960), LXXIX, p. 24.

⁴²Festugiere, p. 100.

⁴³Bonner, p. 130.

⁴⁴Francis Beare, The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), p. 58. Cf. Ευτρε in Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, V, (1904), 335ff.

⁴⁵Edelstein, I, p. 194.

⁴⁶Laurence J. McGinley, Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives (Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944), p. 122. Cf. also Edelstein, I, passim.

⁴⁷Edelstein, II, p. 113.

⁴⁸Angus, p. 431. Cf. Edelstein, I, p. 164.

CHAPTER III

¹William Barclay, The Mind of Jesus (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 70.

²S. V. McCasland, "Miracles," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, p. 400.

³McGinley, p. 151.

⁴Ibid., pp. 122-123.

⁵Festugiere, p. 103.

⁶Barclay, p. 75.

⁷G. H. Box, Early Christianity and Its Rivals (New York: McBride and Company, 1925), p. 55.

⁸Angus, p. 414.

⁹Gerald Friedlander, Hellenism and Christianity (London: Vallentine and Son's, 1912), p. 137.

¹⁰McGinley, p. 153.

¹¹Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 96.

¹²Ibid.

¹³McGinley, p. 119.

¹⁴Alan Richardson, The Miracle Stories of the Gospels (London: SCM Press, 1941), p. 24.

¹⁵McGinley, p. 121.

¹⁶Reginald Fuller, Interpreting the Miracles (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 41.

¹⁷Wilfred L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, edited by H. Chadwick (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953), I, p. 42.

- ¹⁸McGinley, p. 119.
- ¹⁹Dibelius, p. 82. Most of the cures at Epidaurus are characterized by the practice of incubation, ἐγκαθεύδειν.
- ²⁰Fuller, Interpreting, p. 34.
- ²¹Dibelius, pp. 89-90.
- ²²McGinley, p. 150.
- ²³Fuller, Interpreting, p. 228.
- ²⁴Ibid., p. 92.
- ²⁵Deissmann, p. 135.
- ²⁶Edelstein, I, p. 272.
- ²⁷S. V. McCasland suggests that in these Old Testament passages the waters of Siloam are understood as the type of the divine kingdom of David in contrast to the waters of the River Euphrates, the symbol of earthly power, in "The Graeco-Roman World," The Interpreter's Bible, edited by George Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1952), VII, pp. 88-94.
- ²⁸Toksöz, p. 28.
- ²⁹McCasland, "The Graeco-Roman World," p. 92.
- ³⁰Eusebius, The History of the Church, translated by G. A. Williamson (Baltimore: Penguin, 1965), p. 386.
- ³¹Edelstein, I, p. 197.
- ³²Supra, p. 8.
- ³³Angus, p. 414.
- ³⁴Paul Wendland, "Σωτήρ," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, V (1904), 348.
- ³⁵Farnell, Hero Cults, p. 279.
- ³⁶Farnell, "Greek Religion," p. 422.
- ³⁷Edelstein, I, p. 176.
- ³⁸Deissmann, p. 329.

³⁹Edelstein, II, p. 137.

⁴⁰Edelstein, I, p. 205.

⁴¹James, p. 320.

⁴²Friedlander, p. 134.

⁴³Angus, p. 414.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 420.

⁴⁵Mark 5:34; Luke 8:48.

⁴⁶Cyril C. Richardson, Early Christian Fathers, in The Library of Christian Classics, edited by John Baillie (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), I, p. 90.

⁴⁷Angus, p. 420.

⁴⁸Toksöz, p. 6.

⁴⁹Edelstein, II, p. 132.

⁵⁰Edelstein, I, p. 48.

⁵¹Edelstein, II, p. 134.

⁵²Edelstein, I, p. 176.

⁵³Ibid., p. 49.

⁵⁴Edelstein, II, p. 132.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angus, S. The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World. London: John Murray, 1929.
- Barclay, William. The Mind of Jesus. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John. London: SPCK, 1960.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Edited and translated by William F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Beare, Francis W. The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947.
- Bonnard, P. "Jesus," A Companion to the Bible. Edited by J. Von Allmen. New York: Oxford Press, 1958.
- Bonner, Campbell. "Some Phases of Religious Feeling in Later Paganism," Harvard Theological Review, XXX (July 1937), 119-140.
- Bousset, W. Kyrios Christos. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1964.
- Box, G. H. Early Christianity and Its Rivals. New York: McBride and Company, 1925.
- Buttrick, George, editor. The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East. New York: Doran, 1927.
- Delling, Gerhard. Antike Wundertexte. Vol. LXXIX in Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1960.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

- . The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: The University Press, 1960.
- Dyer, Louis. Studies of the Gods in Greece at Certain Sanctuaries Recently Excavated. London: Macmillan, 1891.
- Edelstein, Emma J. and Ludwig Edelstein. Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies. 2 vols. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1945.
- Eusebius Pamphilus. The History of the Church. Translated by G. A. Williamson. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.
- Farnell, Lewis R. Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1921.
- . "Greek Religion," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. 6. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1913. Pp. 416-418.
- . The Cults of the Greek States. Vol. IV. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Festugiere, Andre-Jean. Personal Religion Among the Greeks. Berkeley: University of California, 1954.
- Filson, Floyd. Origins of the Gospels. New York: Abingdon Press, 1938.
- Foerster, Werner. "Daimōn and its Cognates," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. II. Edited and translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Fuller, Reginald H. Interpreting the Miracles. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- . The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- Grant, Frederick, editor. Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1953.
- Harrison, Jane Ellen. Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion and Themis. New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1962.
- . Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion. New York: Meridian Books, 1955.
- Kerenyi, C. Asklepios. Translated from the German by R. Manheim. New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1959.

- Knox, Wilfred L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.
Vol. I. Edited by H. Chadwick. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.
- Lenz, Friedrich W. The Aristeides Prolegomena. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1959.
- Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon.
9th edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940.
- McCasland, S. V. "Miracles," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. III. Edited by George Buttrick.
Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Religious Healing in First Century Palestine.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- "The Graeco-Roman World," The Interpreter's Bible.
Vol. VII. Edited by George Buttrick. New York:
Abingdon Press, 1952. Pp. 88-94.
- McGinley, Laurence J. Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives. Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944.
- Nestle, E. and Kurt Aland, editors. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
- Nicklin, Thomas. Gospel Gleanings. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1950.
- Nilsson, Martin P. Greek Popular Religion. New York: Columbia University, 1940.
- Oliver, James H. "The Ruling Power," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. New series. Vol. XLIII, part 4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1953.
- Rengstorf, K. H. Die Anfänge Der Auseinandersetzung Zwischen Christusglaube und Asklepios Frömmigkeit.
Münster: Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1952.
- "Asklepios," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 3rd edition. Edited by Kurt Galling. Vol. I.
Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957. Cols. 648-649.
- Richardson, Alan. The Miracle Stories of the Gospels.
London: SCM Press, 1941.

- Richardson, Cyril. Early Christian Fathers. Vol. I in The Library of Christian Classics. Edited by John Baillie. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.
- Rose, H. J. Ancient Greek Religion. London: Hutchinson's University, 1946.
- Taylor, F. J. "Savior," A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Company, 1962.
- Toksöz, Cemil. Aesculapium of Pergamum. Ankara: Ayyildiz Matbaasi, 1960.
- Walton, Alice. The Cult of Asklepios. Vol. III in The Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. Edited by Benjamin Wheeler, Charles Bennett, George Bristol, and Alfred Emerson. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1894.
- Wendland, Paul. "Sötēr," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, V (1904), 335-353.
- Wissowa, Georg. Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung. Vol. II, 2. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1896.