VARIES

SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

Entheastiká. Medical accounts of religious madness in the *Anonymus Parisinus*[*]

E-ISSN 2531-7288
ISSN 0394/9001

Sandro Passavanti
Southern Denmark University, DK

MEDICINA NEI SECOLI
Journal of History of Medicine and Medical Humanities
37/3 (2025) 165-194

Received: 08.08.2025
Accepted: 23.09.2025
DOI: 10.13133/2531-7288/3197

Corresponding author:
sandropassavanti@hotmail.it

Abstract

This article examines the twentieth chapter (*Perì entheastikōn*) of the 1st-century AD medical treatise *Anonymus Parisinus*, devoted to a chronic mental disorder whose sufferers believe themselves under divine influence and act on false opinions about the gods. After outlining the nosological context of the work, it analyses the doxographical section reporting the aetiological views of Praxagoras of Cos and a retrospectively constructed 'Hippocratic' doctrine. Praxagoras situates the pathology in the heart and aorta, linking it to pneumatic disturbances comparable to those characteristic of epilepsy, mania, and melancholy, and offering a possible pathophysiological correlate of the Peripatetic doctrine of *enthousiasmós*; the "Hippocratic" view anachronistically frames the disease as a form of melancholy affecting the superstitious, a perspective also paralleled in Erotian's *Hippocratic Lexicon*. The paper then examines the author's description of symptoms – self-mutilation, frenzied movement, collapse in sacred spaces – closely associated with Metroac cult practices, and his distinctive therapeutic programme. This combines dietary measures, avoidance of ritual stimuli, and verbal admonition to correct false beliefs, supported by respected authority figures. The study situates *Perì entheastikōn* within broader Greco-Roman conceptions of 'religious madness' and highlights its pragmatic, practice-oriented approach to treatment.

Keywords: Anonymus Parisinus - Praxagoras of Cos - Ancient Psychopathology - Religious Madness - Metroac Cults

The Greek medical text known as the *Anonymus Parisinus* (*AP*), dated approximately to the 1st century AD, is one of the very few surviving examples of an ancient medical treatise genre that was likely widespread in the Greco-Roman era, nowadays referred to as "nosological" literature[1]. Nosological writings offered a systematic, head-to-toe catalogue of diseases – often divided into chronic and acute conditions – with each entry further subdivided into sections of variable length detailing their symptoms, causes, and treatment. Although the origins of this genre can be traced back to Classical medical literature, the only works of this format and of some length transmitted to our time (besides the *AP*) are the partially preserved treatise *On the Causes, the Signs, and the Cure of Acute and Chronic Diseases* by Aretaeus of Cappadocia (2nd c. AD) and the *Acute and Chronic Diseases* by Caelius Aurelianus (5th c. AD), the latter being a paraphrase of a homonymous work by the Greek physician Soranus of Ephesus (2nd c. AD)[2].

In contrast to these two texts, however, the *AP* is distinguished by a decidedly more practical purpose[3]. The works of Aretaeus and Caelius are not only rare examples of nosological treatises but also the most significant and extensive testimonies of the medical schools to which their authors belonged (respectively, the "Pneumatic" and the "Methodic" schools). Consequently, these works possess a theoretical scope aimed at contextualizing the formulation of their doctrines within the framework of their respective *sectae* and, at times, in opposition to other doctrinal options attested at their time. This dimension is essentially absent in the *AP*. Various attempts to identify the author of the *AP* as being affiliated with one of the ancient medical schools have not yielded any concrete results (he regularly cites "dogmatic" authors such as Hippocrates, Diocles, Praxagoras, and Erasistratus; at times he leans in favor of a pneumatic pathophysiology, while on other occasions he adopts diagnostic procedures comparable to those known in Methodism); the theoretical observations present in the text are mostly brief notations that do not aspire to provide a unified theoretical framework for the treatise as a whole. Although the *AP* essentially retains the layout and structure found in other nosological treatises, it appears rather - as recently suggested by Orly Lewis - as an ' handbook' for experienced medical practitioners, in which the sections dedicated to the treatment of diseases are considerably more extensive than those dealing with signs and causes, and where the details of therapies are often left to the judgment and experience of the reader[4].

In this article, I will focus on Chapter XX of the *AP*, titled *Perì entheastikōn*. This brief text – whose heading is variously translated in recent scholarship as "On neurosis", "On fanaticism", "On frenzy"[5] – concerns a chronic mental condition whose defining feature is the patients' belief that they are under the influence of a divinity. The *AP* opens with a concise survey of views attributed to Praxagoras of Cos and Hippocrates. The second and third sections of the chapter are devoted, as is customary in the treatise, to the description of symptoms and treatment, where the author appears to speak in his own voice. This article offers a two-part analysis of this chapter. First, I examine the

doxographical framework through which the *AP* reports the views of Praxagoras and Hippocrates. Second, I investigate the author's diagnostic and therapeutic account of the condition. By reconstructing the context and internal logic of the chapter's various sections, I argue that the *AP* – perhaps in line with a broader trend of his time – anachronistically brings together a range of medical theories that differ substantially in both target and doctrinal orientation. In doing so, he bears witness to a crucial moment in the formation of a wider nosological category of 'religious madness'.

The chapter *Perì entheastikōn*

Given his frequent references to other authors and the relative scarcity of explicitly personal opinions, it is surprising that the *AP* devotes space to a discussion of a particular pathology which shows only a few other references in ancient medical writings. The author devotes to this condition a whole chapter within the section on chronic diseases, after those on mania and melancholy. He entitles it *Perì entheastikōn*, a label on whose meaning is far from immediately clear but which surely bears no manifest medical connotation. The adjective *entheastikós* is indeed quite rare in extant ancient literature and it is most often attested in philosophical contexts with reference to divine influence on human beings, as it is suggested by its etymological closeness with the adjective *entheos* ("having a god within") and its several cognates. Its oldest occurrence is found in a speech by the Athenian in Plato's *Laws*, where it designates the "inspired" genos of poets who "accompanied by the Graces and the Muses, […] tend to hit upon the truth in any particular situation"[6]. It also recurs in Aëtius' *Placita*, where it designates – according to J. Mansfeld and D. Runia – the "visionary (*i.e.* prophetic) element" (*entheastikón)* of divination sent by the gods *(theopémpton)*, as differentiated by the "element of divine possession" (*enthousiastikón)* which constitutes the divinity of the soul[7]. The term *entheastikós* thus clearly belongs to the large family of words derived from *entheos*, such as *enthousiasmós* and *enthousíasis*, which are employed as early as Plato to denote the fact of – or the belief in – divine inspiration acting within and through a human being[8]. However, despite the meaning it has in Plato and (possibly) in Aëtius, any inspirational or divinatory meaning cannot correspond to the *medical* use made of this word by the *AP*.

As can be argued already from its positioning immediately after the 'psychopathological' chapters *Perì manías* and *Perì melancholías*, the section *Perì entheastikōn* describes a particular syndrome involving substantial cognitive and emotional disturbances, where the primary meaning of the substantive adjective *entheastikós* is replaced by a clearly derivative or figurative sense of the term. The heading may refer either to individuals suffering from this condition (*hoi entheastikoí*) or to the condition itself – the use of the plural form suggesting the idea of 'fits' or 'episodes' of the disorder[9]. In keeping with his usual approach, the *AP* does not begin its account by describing or defining the disease. Rather, it opens with a brief doxographical survey

in which the earlier opinions on its causes by Praxagoras of Cos and Hippocrates are recounted. Before turning to the sections *On signs* and *On therapy* – which the *AP* does not overtly attribute to other authors – it is worthwhile to first examine the etiological section and the witnesses it conveys.

1. The *AP*'s doxographical report on the cause (*aitía*) of *entheastiká*: Praxagoras of Cos and 'Hippocrates'.

a. Praxagoras on the "enthusiastic affection" (*entheastikòn páthos*): a physiological correlate of Peripatetic *enthousiasmós*?

The first etiological account reported in the text is ascribed by the *AP* to Praxagoras of Cos, the Greek physician lived in the late fourth and early 3rd century BC[10]:

> *Only Praxagoras, of all the ancients, briefly mentions the enthusiastic affection (*entheastikou páthous*), saying that [it] is in the region of the heart itself and of the thick artery (*pacheia artēría*) [that the disease originates]; [he believes] that there is also a certain rising of bubbles (*pompholýgōn*); for it is because of this [scil. the rising of bubbles], he says, that [the artery] is cleared out* (ekkenoutai)*, but that [the sick] toss at times their arms and at times their head*[11].

The *AP*'s reference to 'the Ancients' (*hoi archaioi*), as Ph. van der Eijk has shown, must not be taken as a general reference to earlier authors but rather as a precise nod to four physicians – Hippocrates, Diocles of Carystus, Praxagoras, and Erasistratus – on one occasion simply called 'the Four' (*hoi téssares*), whose views the author of AP repeatedly invokes in several chapters12. Only Praxagoras among them contributes a fleeting mention of the so-called "enthusiastic affection"13, which he appears to have treated as a distinct pathological entity. The text offers no definition of the condition, but proceeds to outline its underlying pathophysiological process, from which we can glean insights for a clearer understanding and contextualization.

The affection is said to arise "around the heart itself and the thick artery" (*i.e.* the aorta14), a claim that must be understood against Praxagoras' physiological tenets15: Praxagoras, who adopted a cardiocentric view (likely following Aristotle, he thought the heart to be the seat of cognition and will) is the first medical author for whom we have clear evidence of a distinction between two kinds of vessels, arteries (*artēríai*) and veins (*phlébes*). According to him, veins alone carry blood, whereas arteries – included the "thick artery" stemming from the heart – conduct *pneuma*, an airy substance denser than external air that permeates the body. *Pneuma*, endowed with both motor and sensory potency, flows through the hollow arteries, which branch from the aorta and taper toward the periphery – a process that modern readers might liken to an electrochemical impulse propagating along a neural pathway. Near the surface of

the body, these vessels collapse and change into neura, cord-like structures (nerves, tendons, ligaments) essential for movement. In Praxagoras' view, the arterial pulsations drive the pneumatic flow into these non-hollow extremities, thereby conveying cognitive and motor impulses from the heart.

The fact that the affection arises in the cardiac region and the "thick artery" therefore implies an irregularity in the heart's biological functions and, consequently, in the flow of the pneuma, with concomitant disturbances of vital faculties. Although this detail is not explicitly stated in our report, it can be inferred from a recurring explanatory schema found elsewhere in the *AP*'s testimony on Praxagoras, notably in disorders chiefly marked by disorders of thought: the origin of phrenitis is attributed to an "inflammation of the heart", whose "natural function is reasoning" (*phrónēsis*); the cause of *manía* is recognised as a "swelling of the heart", where "he thought that reason (*phrónēsis*) is […] located"; *melancholía* is said to occur "because black bile accumulates in the region of the heart and alters the psychic faculty" (*tēn psychikēn dýnamin trepoúsēs*)16. The persistence of this model in the case of the *entheastikòn páthos* therefore indicates that Praxagoras likewise regarded it as a pathology characterised by significant mental imbalances.

However, on our evidence about him, we cannot discern any parallel between the pathogenesis of *manía*, *melancholía*, and *phrenitis* and, on the other hand, the most evident characteristic of Praxagoras' account of the *entheastikòn páthos*, i.e. the bubbling of the pneumatic flux as it courses from the heart into the aorta, which empties it and provokes the convulsive shaking of the arms and head marking the disease. Rather, it is the etiology of epilepsy, again according to the *AP*' report on Praxagoras, that affords us a more fitting point of comparison in this regard:

> *Praxagoras says that [epilepsy] arises in the region of the thick artery when phlegmatic humours form inside it. These, [he says], when they bubble, block the passage of the psychic pneuma coming from the heart and this thus shakes the body and causes spasm; and when the bubbles settle down again the affection comes to an end*[17].

This fragment shows a pattern clearly akin to that of the 'enthusiastic' *pathos*. The origin of epilepsy is likewise placed in the cardiac area, but here a precise pathogenic role is assigned to *phlegmatic* humours gathering in the aorta[18]. The accumulation of cold and thick phlegm in the vessels is also held responsible for apoplexy[19], whereas the onset of epilepsy is ascribed more in detail to the formation of "bubbles" that alter the physiological flowing of the pneuma and causes motor impairment (shakes and spasms) until the 'effervescence' of the humour subsides. Although the Anonymous does not explicitly invoke specific humours in describing the pathogenic process involved by the "enthusiastic affection", he equally refers to the role of "bubbles" (*pompholýges*), but limiting their action to the emptying of the thick artery and the subsequent remission of the fits[20]: while in epilepsy the bubbling of heated phlegm

provokes the obstructions and the perturbation of the regular stream of the pneuma and leads to impairments of motor functions, in the enthusiastic affection the bubbles "evacuate" (*ekkenoutai*) the aorta and elicit disordered movements of the head and the hands. As summarized by Orly Lewis, Praxagoras' model appears to posit that bubbles form in the aorta and cardiac region and then migrate into the arteries supplying the head and arms (notably the carotid and axillary branches), thereby setting those parts in motion while simultaneously expelling from the chest area the very substance responsible for the disorder[21].

Each of these points gains significance when seen as a potential connection between Praxagoras' and Aristoteles' thought, supplementing those previously identified by scholars in other respects[22]. In the seventh book of the *Politics*, where he deals with the importance of music for the education of the citizens, Aristotle adopts a classification formerly developed by "certain persons in philosophy", who distinguished the different "tunes" (*mélē*) into "ethic" (*i.e.* "relating to character", *ēthiká*), "practical" ("relating to action", *praktiká*), and "inspirational" or "enthusing" (*enthousiastiká*)[23]. While ethic and practical tunes induce to moods conducive respectively to individual character development and action, "inspirational" music reveal its utility in that it somehow 'purifies' and 'heal' individuals from the excesses of the emotion (*páthos*) they are under the influence of. This is not an emotion whatsoever, but precisely what Aristotle calls *enthousiasmós* and describes as "a passion of the character connected with the soul" (*páthos tou perì tēn psychēn ēthous*), comparable to other passions such as piety (*éleos*) and fear (*phóbos*)[24]. Just like all emotions (*pathē*), *enthousiasmós* depends on the desiderative part of the *psychē* and is universally present among humans, although to varying degrees from individual to individual, and depending on circumstances:

> *For there are certain persons who are possessed* (katokōchimoi) *by this motion, but as a result of the sacred tunes* (ek… hierōn melōn) – *when they use the tunes that put the soul in a frenzy* (exorgiázousi tēn psychēn) – *we see them calming down* (kathistaménous) *as if obtaining a cure and purification* (hōsper iatreías tychóntas kaì katharseōs)*. This same thing, then, must necessarily be experienced also by the pitying and the fearful as well as by the generally passionate* (pathētikoús)*, and by others insofar as to each falls a share in such things, and there must occur for all a certain purification* (tina kátharsin) *and a feeling of relief* (kouphízesthai) *accompanied by pleasure* (meth' hēdonēs)[25].

Aristotle maintains here the traditional terms for ecstatic raptures, though displacing them within a completely lay and naturalistic horizon. Those who are in the grip of *enthousiasmós* are told *katokōchimoi*, literally "possessed". But the responsibility for such 'possession', far from coming from a divine entity, is uniquely ascribed to the so-called "sacred tunes" (*hierē mélē*), suitable for stirring hearers to frenzy. Aristotle refers here to the tunes of Olympus – a semilegendary musician who probably lived in Phrygia in the 7th c. and whose cloudy figure was confused with that of a mythical

homonymous pupil of the satyr Marsyas[26] – which he takes as a renowned example of "inspirational" (*enthousiastiká*) Phrygian melodies requiring the flute (*aulós*) as their main instrument[27]. These references undoubtedly show that Aristotle is not alluding here to any form of supposedly 'divine' inspiration, but rather to the musical and choreutic elements of Dionysian and Corybantic rituals, which made extensive use of Phrygian tunes and flute music.

However, nothing is said in the *Politics* about the nature of this passion and its physical correlates (as, for example, is the case in the *De anima* with anger, *orgē*, that the dialectician the physiologist would define, respectively, as a "desire for retaliation" and as a "boiling of the blood and heat around the heart"[28]). But Aristotle, as rightly emphasized by C. Lord, owing to the universality he attributes to the passion of *enthousiasmós*, distinguishes a healthy form – present, therefore, in most individuals – from an extreme and pathological form to which only certain people would be subject. In the first case, *enthousiasmós* is associated with the "harmless delight" (*cháran ablabē*, 1342a16) experienced by the great majority of men when they listen to "inspirational tunes": a genuine form of musical enjoyment, from which one can draw pleasure and satisfaction. As regards pathological 'enthusiasts', on the other hand, the same Phrygian music works "as if" (*hōsper*) they obtained "a healing and a purification" (1342a 10-11), or, rather, "a certain purification" (*tina kátharsin*) and a feeling of relief accompanied by pleasure (*meth' hēdonēs*, 14-15) – that is, a "quasi-medical treatment" for a condition wholly analogous to a "mental disturbance, a kind of madness"[29].

We need not linger here on the question of whether the catharsis of *enthousiasmós* in Aristotle should be understood as a homeopathic or allopathic process[30]. What is more important to stress is that, alongside the recognition of a distinctly pathological condition affecting certain individuals, Aristotle offers a thoroughly naturalistic understanding of orgiastic rituals as a remedy that produces effects similar to those of tragic *kátharsis*. This remedy is not to be understood as a definitive healing of pathological *enthousiasmós*, but rather as a measure that periodically mitigates and contains its symptoms, thereby preventing the condition from developing into more serious and dangerous forms[31].

Aristotle's depiction of pathological 'enthusiasts' in the *Politics* is, in several respects, also reminiscent of that of melancholic individuals as outlined in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. These are described as "always in need of a cure" (*aeì déontai iatreías*), since "their body is continually being stung because of the blending [of the humours within it]"[32], and therefore – as suggested by Ph. van der Eijk – they "can be regarded as chronically ill patients" being, in most severe cases, "beyond cure" due to their psychophysical constitution permanently inclined toward illness[33]. It is, however, in the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problem XXX* that the melancholic condition – with some significant variations from what can be found in Aristotle's own writings[34] – is used

not only to account for ordinary melancholics, but also to explain the physiological processes underlying some of the most notorious ecstatic phenomena of Classical religious experience. The author of *Problem XXX*, diverging from Aristotle's account of melancholy, treats black bile not merely as cold by nature, but also as subject to heating, which allows him to consider two opposite pathological forms of melancholic imbalance. An excess of cold black bile causes "apoplexy or torpor or spiritlessness or fear" (*apoplēxías ē nárkas ē athymías… ē phóbous*), whereas, when the same humour "becomes overheated, produces high-spiritedness with song, and insanity (*ekstáseis)*, and the breaking out of sores and such things". Hot-tempered melancholics – that is, individuals in whom hot black bile is naturally and persistently predominant over other humours – are described as mad (*manikoí*), of good nature (*euphyeís*), amorous (*erōtikoí*), and easily stirred to anger and desire (*eukinētoi pròs toùs thymoùs kaì tàs epithymías*). Furthermore, it is precisely as a condition marked by overheated black bile, naturally and persistently predominant over other humours, that this text understands those altered states traditionally attributed to divine influence. Among these, the author also includes what he calls the "enthusiastic diseases" (*nosēmasin… enthousiastikoís*), thus offering a possible physiological complement – or, most likely, a further elaboration – to the account of pathological *enthousiasmós* offered by Aristotle in the *Politics*:

> *But many too, owing to this heat being near the location of the intelligence* (noerou topou)*, fall ill with madness or enthusiasm, whence come Sibyls and Bakides and all the inspired persons* (entheoi)*, when (the condition) comes not through disease but through natural mixture*[35].

In such subjects, hot black bile may 'hit' the seat of intellectual faculties (a notion which is not entirely Aristotelian, for the *nous* has not bodily organs, but nonetheless pertinent to the function of *sensorium commune* ascribed by Aristotle to the heart[36]) and makes their *krasis* unleash "manic" or "enthusiastic" states. These explain the condition of "all the inspired persons" (*entheoi*) – the use of the plurals "Sibyls" and "Bakides", rather than the singular forms typically expected for these individual figures, is a signal of the author's universalizing intent – who therefore owe their exceptional traits uniquely to their physical constitution and to its paroxysmal (and therefore momentary) disorders. Even here, we are dealing with 'predisposed' individuals able to reach – *bon gré mal gré* – anomalous psychophysical dispositions.

Considered altogether, these Aristotelian and Peripatetic references to *enthousiasmós* allow us to reassess the meagre evidence we possess on Praxagoras. It is true that in this short text there is no mention of musical factors in the pathogenesis of the *enthousiastikòn páthos* – although, as will become clear in the following paragraphs, the Anonymous does address the issue thereafter, in relation to his account of Hippocratic doctrine and in his own account of the disorder. Yet it is hard to overlook that the text appears to offer an important complement to what we read in Aristotle's *Politics*.

Aristotle describes pathological *enthousiasmós* – a condition he never defines in physiological terms – as undergoing a "certain purification" through "sacred tunes", a process that he considers similar to medical treatment. For Praxagoras, likewise, the "enthusiastic affection" originates in the region of the heart and the aorta, the centre of motor and cognitive activity. His claim that the "bubbles" arising in that area "empty" (*ekkenoutai*) the aorta suggests that Praxagoras conceived of the disorder as a form of obstruction or occlusion of that very vessel. As O. Lewis notes, he does not explain how such bubbles come to form in that part of the body[37]. But why not consider the possibility that what we read in the testimony constitutes the physiological correlate of the *kátharsis* that sacred music, according to Aristotle, produces in those affected by pathological *enthousiasmós*? If so, the triggering factor of the enthusiastic paroxysm might well have been the listening to Phrygian-like melodies, which causes the "boiling up" of the humours and, consequently, the clearing of the aorta and the violent release of *pneumatic* flows to the limbs and the head, thus producing at once the frenzied movements of orgiastic dances and the remission of the affection. This process is clearly understandable as a *kátharsis* in its medical meaning of expulsion of a humour or a substance from the body, or, as in this case, from a specific part of it, the most consistently attested connotation of the term in both the Hippocratic writings and in the Aristotelian corpus[38].

Further inferences may offer new elements to help situate Praxagoras' thought within the theoretical framework developed in the Peripatetic tradition. The occlusion of the "thick artery" – which, based on the information preserved by the *AP*, appears as the primary pathological factor in the *enthousiastikòn páthos*, later 'healed' by evacuation through the action of bubbles aroused in that area – finds a possible parallel in another fragment we have already encountered and may now reconsider from a different angle. According to the *AP*, Praxagoras traced the origin of melancholy to an accumulation of black bile in the region of the heart resulting in the disruption of cognitive faculties[39]. This process is broadly comparable to what we find in the *Problem XXX*, where the proximity of overheated black bile to the location of intelligence – namely, the heart – is said to cause various altered psycho-physical states traditionally attributed to divine intervention, including the "enthusiastic diseases". Could hot black bile, then, be the humour responsible for the obstruction around the heart and aorta in Praxagoras' account of the enthusiastic affection, or at least have played a part in that process? The available evidence does not allow for a definitive answer: Praxagoras' humoral theory included eleven humours, seven of which, according to Galen, were merely variants of the four canonical ones – blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile. Other fluids might also have been invoked to explain the condition[40]. Nevertheless, all things considered, it is not implausible to suppose that, within the Peripatetic framework in which Praxagoras appears to be working when addressing the enthusiastic affection, hot black bile played a role

similar to that described in *Problem XXX* for the same type of disorders. And that, following Aristotle's medical, or quasi-medical, conception of the 'purification' of *enthousiasmós* through "sacred music", Praxagoras took up that insight, rearticulating it in terms of pathophysiological processes comparable to those he proposed for other conditions, such as epilepsy or apoplexy. Despite some elements that remain unclear, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that the brief testimony on Praxagoras preserved by the *Anonymus Parisinus* fits coherently among other Peripatetic accounts of enthusiastic states – and may, in fact, represent their specifically medical counterpart.

b. "Hippocrates" on the 'enthusiastic affection'?

Following the reference to Praxagoras, the aetiological section of the chapter *Perì entheastikōn* in the *AP* presents a sentence reporting what Hippocrates is said to have claimed about the same condition (*pathos*):

> *Hippocrates, in consequence [of his own doctrines], says that this affection* (pathos) *is a kind of melancholy* (melancholías eidos) *which befalls patients who are inclined to superstition* (epì tò deisidaimonésteron tetramménōn tōn paschóntōn) – *for flutes* (auloí) *and frankincense stimulate the affection*[41].

It goes almost without saying that the historiographical report we read in these few lines cannot be taken at face value. None of the writings in the Hippocratic Corpus endorse such a view: no connection can be established between the Hippocratic descriptions of melancholic symptoms and the pathology addressed here, nor is there any explicit mention of *deisidaimonía* ("superstition") or of the action of musical instruments on patients[42]. Yet, the key to understanding this otherwise puzzling account is provided by the author himself: Hippocrates is said to hold this opinion not directly, but "in consequence [of his own doctrines]" (*katà tò akólouthon*). As Ph. van der Eijk has shown, through similar formulations – which recur frequently in the *AP* – the author implies that a pathological pattern somewhat analogous to the one under consideration may be inferred even from sources that do not explicitly mention it. This is precisely the case with the enthusiastic affection where the reference to Hippocrates should be taken to mean that "in his discussion of melancholy, Hippocrates distinguished one kind which was later labelled *entheastica* by Praxagoras"[43]. Another clue for understanding the passage has been offered by I. Garofalo, who, in a note on this section, proposed that the *AP*'s reference to Hippocrates should be taken to reflect "an aetiology probably extrapolated" from the Hippocratic treatise *On the Sacred Disease*[44]. These suggestions clearly point us in the right direction and provide a valuable basis for reconstructing the historiographical operation performed here by the

Anonymous of Paris. Nonetheless, a closer look at the Hippocratic material itself may invite a slightly different interpretive emphasis.

It must be stressed, first, that the Hippocratic writings contain no systematic treatment of *melancholía*, nor do they frame this condition in terms of distinct "species". On the contrary, the Hippocratic texts refer only occasionally to mental disorders caused by imbalances of black bile, which is most often associated with other, predominantly somatic pathological manifestations[45]. Similarly, nothing in the passage suggests that the Anonymous is directly referring to the humoral etiology adopted by the author of *On the Sacred Disease* to explain the dramatic features of epileptic seizures, where phlegm and bile are invoked[46]. A more meaningful parallel may instead be found in the opening chapters of the same treatise, where impious and atheistic attitudes are ascribed to the "magicians, purifiers, mendicants, and charlatans" who first attributed the onset of epileptic fits to divine will, thus calling "sacred" a condition which, according to the Hippocratic author, "is not a bit more divine or sacred than other diseases"[47]. Even in this case, however, the correspondence is at best partial. In the *AP*'s account, it is not the healers who attempt to cure a naturally caused disease with "purifications and incantations" who are accused of 'superstitious' beliefs – as is the case in *Sacred Disease* – but rather the patients themselves, who are said to suffer from the condition owing to their inherent predisposition to *deisidaimonía*. The *AP*'s report of a supposed Hippocratic doctrine of the *entheastikòn páthos* can thus be understood, at most, as the outcome of an attempt to assimilate heterogeneous symptoms and textual cues into the nosological categories current in the author's time. Still, a comparison with other contemporary texts reveals that the interpretive framework emerging between the lines of the *AP* passage was not isolated in the imperial period. This is what Erotian wrote in his scholia on the treatise *On the Sacred Disease*, specifically glossing the lemma *theion* ("divine"):

> *Some say that the sacred disease* (hieran noson) *is divine* (theion). *For it is said to be god-sent and called 'sacred'* (theopempton te hieran) *because it is divine. Others have taken it to be superstition* (tēn deisidaimonian). *[…] Still others maintain that the enthusiastic affection* (enthousiastikón pathos) *is divine. […] And those who assume that epilepsy is divine have failed to understand the man [scil. Hippocrates]. For he himself openly reproaches those who, calling the passion 'god-sent', assert: "In my opinion, it is not a bit more divine or sacred than other diseases, but it as a nature akin to other ailments"* (Morb. sacr., 1). *Moreover, those who consider it mere superstition are exceedingly naive. For Hippocrates did not care, when writing on prognosis, to make mention of those who fall ill because of foods, nor of mania, nor of the enthusiastic affection*[48].

In addition to those who, like the charlatans described in the Hippocratic treatise, regard epilepsy (and the enthusiastic affection) as a "divine" disease because it is "sent by the gods", Erotian mentions those who consider this pathology a form of "superstition", as if it were provoked neither by the gods nor by a particular humoral imbal-

ance, but rather by the patients' own mistaken beliefs concerning, one may suppose, the role of the gods in triggering seizures. This is a view Erotian does not hesitate to label as "naïve", since it fails to take into account the literal content of Hippocratic writings: not only of *On the Sacred Disease*, from which he quotes *verbatim* to forestall any possible misinterpretation, but also of the *Prognostic*, a work in which neither *manía* nor the enthusiastic affection are mentioned. As if to say: there is no need to make Hippocrates say what he, in fact, never wrote – a philologically grounded position, which stands in stark contrast to the retrospective approach adopted by the *AP*. Yet Erotian's passage is of relevance to our analysis, as it allows for a more precise contextualization of the *AP*'s reading of Hippocratic epilepsy. It also reveals a likely confusion between the 'sacred disease' and the enthusiastic affection, a confusion that may still have been current at the time of Erotian and the Anonymous insofar as both conditions were thought to involve the patients' *deisidaimonía*. While this interpretation – along with the idea of divine origin – is firmly rejected by Erotian with regard to epilepsy, it is explicitly embraced by the *AP* in relation to the *entheastikòn páthos*, as is shown in the sections he devotes to the signs and therapy of the disease.

2. Signs and therapy of *entheastiká* in the *Anonymus Parisinus*: a medical reading of Metroac-like worship

After the doxographical section on the causes of the disease, the *AP* presents his discussion of its "signs" (*sēmeia*) and "therapy" (*therapeía*), without making any reference to other medical authorities. The former section will be addressed first.

a. The signs of 'enthusiastic fits': "superstition" (*deisidaimonía*) as misjugment on the divine

> *Enthusiasts* (entheastikoí) *get excited* (paroxýnontai) *mostly from incense vapours and flutes, dancing and superstition with regard to the divine* (hypò… tēs pròs tò theion deisidaimonías). *During attacks* (katà… toùs paroxysmoùs) *they have the face blushing and toss the head and the arms here and there and disfigure themselves with whips and irons, cutting the skin surface. They run away like oxen and take shelter in certain holy places, when they fall from the constant fatigue, and after a little while stand up again in control of themselves* (anístantai en phronēsei) [49].

The development of the section on signs first marks a transition from the preceding paragraph on causes: here, the *AP* lists the factors that trigger the fits of the disease – incense vapours, flute music, dancing, and religious superstition. These are all elements which, although never presented together, have appeared in the other sources examined so far, and are now brought together in sequence in the Anonymous' synthesis. It is also noteworthy that the author focuses exclusively on the most acute manifestations of the condition (*paroxysmoí*), as if to imply their alternation with a more

latent pathological state, a pattern already characteristic of Aristotle's and Praxagoras' thought[50].

The account then moves directly to the visible manifestations of such episodes, omitting any reference to the physiological disturbances that may have caused them. The *AP* lists here facial flushing, frenzied movements of the head and arms, and, most notably, acts of self-disfigurement and self-flagellation carried out by the *entheastikoí* during their fits. This is clearly an eccentric detail compared to what has been attested in earlier sources and suggests that the cultic realities to which the Anonymous refers cannot be the same as those that figures like Aristotle and Praxagoras had sought to conceptualise in earlier periods: we have no evidence of self-mutilating behaviours in Dionysiac or Corybantic rituals. Further insight into the phenomenon described in our text can indeed be found in the treatise *On the Signs and Causes of Chronic Diseases* by Aretaeus of Cappadocia (probably dating to the second half of the 2nd c. AD, and thus slightly later than the *AP*)[51].

Aretaeus discusses a particular species (*eidos*) of mania (*maníē*), which he ironically calls "inspired" (*entheos*), marked by self-injurious behaviours that patients interpret as the fulfillment of the will of "their own gods" (*theois idíois*). These crises are triggered by flute music, inebriation, and collective euphoria. As in the *AP*, the 'inspired' maniacs described by Aretaeus also experience episodes of extreme exhaustion after their fits, resembling a sort of 'mystical' relief although there are attributed by the Cappadocian physician to the physical suffering they had just inflicted upon themselves[52]. To these shared features, the account of the *AP* adds that the *entheastikoí* take refuge in "certain sacred places", where they collapse from fatigue and, after a short interval, recover the self-possession they had entirely lost during the attack[53].

The extent of the correspondences between the two texts leaves little doubt as to the phenomenon that the diagnosis of the *AP* is aimed at. In both texts, one may recognize the main features of Metroac rites: religious festivals celebrated in honour of female deities such as the Great Mother, Cybele, Mâ, Bellona, *Dea Syria* or Rhea, which were particularly popular during the imperial period. Ancient sources contain numerous accounts of the rituals performed by the devotees of these goddesses, known as *galli* (Gr. *gálloi*). These descriptions frequently highlight the madness-like aspects of their self-mutilating practices, often presented either as acts of submission to the will of their deities or as attempts to emulate their divine and majestic femininity[54]. At times, the alleged divine inspiration of the *galli*, precisely because of the irrational and violent practices it entails, is also portrayed as an utter pretense in open conflict with basic theological principles. This is the case in Apuleius, who, as a Platonist, reproaches the devotees of the Great Mother for acting "as if", he writes, "the gods' presence was not supposed to make men better than themselves, but rather weak or sick"[55].

A similar stance is adopted toward the frenzied practices of the *entheastikoí* both by Aretaeus and by the *Anonymus Parisinus*, who each regard them as the consequence

of a delusional religious belief. Aretaeus defines this belief as a "pious fancy" (*eusebēs phantasíē*), a maniac "assumption" (*hypólēpsis*) which leads the patients to irrational actions – a feature that aligns with his description of mania as a disease primarily affecting reasoning[56]. The Anonymous, as we have seen, lists among the causes of the *entheastiká* the "superstition with regard to the divine". That "superstition" (*deisidaimonía*) should be cited as a precipitating factor of *entheastiká* is particularly significant, as it may point to a philosophical background that helps align the *AP*'s use of the term with Aretaeus' own characterisation of Metroac religious beliefs as distortions of rational judgment. In fact, the term occurs only very rarely in the extant ancient medical literature. One such instance is found in Aretaeus, for whom *deisidaimonía* is one of the "species" (*eidē*) under which melancholy may manifest itself, alongside misanthropy and hatred of life (a statement that strongly echoes the *AP*'s report on an allegedly Hippocratic notion of *entheastikòn páthos* as an *eidos* of melancholy)[57]. Elsewhere, however, the notion is understood more specifically in its technical sense as a *páthos*. This is the case, for instance, with a prolific author like Galen, who uses the word only once, in a polemical remark concerning those "affections of the soul" (*páthē… tēs psychēs*) from which old age supposedly frees us, along with wrath and avarice[58]. The notion, more interestingly, also appears in the *Anonymus Londiniensis* (1st c. AD), who offers a schematic classification of the affections to which human beings are subject. In this framework, *deisidaimonía* is listed among the "primary" affections of the rational part of the soul that occur "through movement" (*katà kínēsin*), alongside grief (*lýpē*), fear (*phóbos*), and avarice (*philargyría*), and contrasted with the "static affections" (*páthē katà schésin*), which – when concerning the body – include conditions such as lethargy, paralysis, and numbness[59].

The editors of the *Anonymus Londiniensis* link this conception of *deisidaimonía* as a "primary" (*proēgoumenon*) affection of the soul to Stoic classifications of the passions[60]. For the Stoics, "primary" passions such as fear (*phóbos*) and grief (*lýpē*) arise from the "representation of an evil" (*phantasía kakou*), a stance attributed to Hecato of Rhodes and Zeno by ancient doxographers[61]. *Deisidaimonía*, as its etymology implies, was considered by Andronicus of Rhodes a species (*eidos*) of fear, more specifically as "fear of the divinity" or an "exaggeration of the reverence toward the gods"[62]. It is therefore plausible that the *AP*'s use of the term echoes a Stoic view of the passions as *misjudgments* of the rational soul – namely, errors in beliefs concerning the divinities – much like Aretaeus' own terminology of *eusebēs phantasíē* ("pious fancy") and his diagnosis of mania addressed to his 'inspired' patients as being the result of a single, mistaken "assumption" (*hypólēpsis*) regarding the will of "their own gods". The term *hypólēpsis* itself has Stoic resonances: the Pseudo-Andronicus, for instance, defines *páthos* as "an irrational movement of the soul based on an assumption regarding evil or good (*di' hypólēpsin kakou ē agathou*), contrary to nature (*parà phýsin*)"[63]. That the *deisidaimonía* of the *entheastikoí* mentioned by the *Anonymus*

Parisinus may be understood within this very framework is further suggested by the continuation of the text itself, where, as we shall shortly see, the "false entrenched opinions (*dóxai*) they hold about the gods" become the primary target of the therapeutic treatment. The analogous use of the terms *hypólēpsis* and *dóxa* made respectively by Aretaeus and the *AP*, moreover, finds additional support in Stoic doctrine, where the two are sometimes used interchangeably[64].

b. The therapy of *entheastiká*: dietetics, relapse prevention, and 'catechism'

The *Anonymus Parisinus* is the only extant medical ancient text prescribing specific therapeutic measures for pathological enthusiasm (the relevant books by Aretaeus on the treatment of chronic diseases having not survived). Despite its brevity and a lacuna in its final part, this section of the treatise constitutes a unique case in ancient medical literature and thus merits separate examination:

> *You should treat the enthusiasts initially with water-drinking and light regimen and then try, by making use of admonition through discourse* (dià tōn logōn nouthesía), *to rid them of the entrenched false opinion they hold about gods* (aphistan tēs empephykuias eis autoùs pseudōs perì theōn doxēs)*; have them avoid the sounds of the flutes and the noises of the tympani, the emanations of fumigations. The affection is in fact excited* (ekkaietai) *by such things. Let persons for whom they have respect or fear be with them*[65].

The prescription of general dietetic measures such as increased water intake and a light dietary regimen indicates that the physician's initial concern in treating the *entheastikoí* was the reduction of excessive temperamental heat. Even in the absence of a detailed physiological explanation of the condition, such a therapeutic orientation suggests that the author adhered to a causal model centered on pathological heating, as was the case with Praxagoras and Aretaeus. These measures are further complemented by preventive prescriptions aimed at avoiding the recurrence of acute episodes, such as the prohibition for patients to listen to flutes or tympana, or to inhale incense fumes, insofar as the disease could be stimulated – or more precisely, "kindled" (*ekkaietai*) – by such external factors. The use of this verb underscores the 'flammable' nature of these patients' temperament. Restrictions of this kind, however, are by no means unique in ancient medicine. A significant parallel is found in Caelius Aurelianus, who explicitly warns against the use of music in the treatment of mad patients. Caelius reports that Phrygian flute music was sometimes recommended by physicians for patients suffering from pathological *maestitudo* ("sadness"), due to its pleasant and stimulating character. He strongly objects to this approach, rejecting music therapy altogether on the grounds that musical stimulation affects even healthy individuals. It follows, then, that more serious consequences are to be expected in those already afflicted by *furor* (*i.e. manía*). In such cases, patients may even come to display behaviours apparently reminiscent of divine possession:

> *Some recommend that melodies be played on pipes for the patient, the melodies differing in mode. They say that one mode, which they call Phrygian, is of pleasant character and serves to arouse those who are known to have fallen into madness* (in furorem) *from sadness* (ex maestitudo)*; another mode, called the Dorian, is grave, has a sobering effect when the mind is impaired, and, as in war, inspires firmness and strength. The Dorian mode, they say, is for those whose insanity is marked by laughter and childish hilarity. But actually the sound of music congests the head, as is perfectly clear even in the case of healthy persons. In fact, as many report, music inflame some into madness. Since the sound of melody congest the head* (cantilenae sonus caput impleat)*, as is most clearly evident even in those who are in full health, it may, at any rate – as many report – inflame some into madness* (accendat aliquos in furorem)*, so that, in their prophesying, they often seem to be possessed by the god* (saepe vaticinantes deum accepisse videantur)[66].

The reference to "prophesying madmen" (*in furorem… vaticinantes*) suggests that Caelius may here be alluding to religious phenomena that are in some respects akin to those evoked by both the *Anonymus Parisinus* and Aretaeus. Although this is not a feature of the 'enthusiasts' as they are described by either of these authors, it is attested in other sources, which at times report instances of the prophetic utterances delivered by the *galli*[67]. This is a particularly intriguing point, especially in light of Jackie Pigeaud's hypothesis that this section of Caelius' treatise draws heavily on the wording of his 2nd-century AD source Soranus of Ephesus[68]. In the introductory part of his chapter on *furor*, Caelius appears to acknowledge the divine origin of the four "species" (*eidē*) of "divine madness" distinguished by Plato in the *Phaedrus* – the prophetic, the 'telestic' (*i.e.* ritual or initiatory), the poetic, and the erotic – whose origins are respectively ascribed to Apollo, Dionysus, the Muses, and Aphrodite and Eros[69]. These forms of madness are explicitly excluded by Caelius from the domain of medical expertise, insofar as they are not regarded here as purely somatic phenomena[70]. Soranus and Caelius must therefore have admitted the non-medical nature even of Dionysian-like madness, whose association with Phrygian auletic music had already been clearly stated by Plato. However, the claim that the *vaticinantes* "appear (*videantur*) to be possessed by a god" as a result of the disturbing effects of certain musical modes on a disordered mind suggests that the form of inspiration referred to in this context was, in fact, understood as nothing more than a physiological alteration kindled by external stimuli – not to mention the fact that the verb *vaticinor* can mean both "to prophesy" and "to rant" or "to talk foolish stuff"[71]. To leave intact Caelius' programmatic assignment of somatic madness to the field of medicine – thus excluding what he explicitly refers to as "divine or inspired mania" (*furorem… divinum sive immissum*)[72] from its jurisdiction – it may be assumed that the naturalistic interpretation of inspired states alluded to here does not apply to all forms of divine possession, but only to some, and that these may have included Metroac frenzy, as is it the case with the reports by the *AP* and Aretaeus.

The most distinctive contribution of the *Anonymus Parisinus* lies, however, in its prescription of interventions that exemplify what Jackie Pigeaud has termed "ancient relational therapy"[73]: a therapeutic approach encompassing all practices that involve the relational context between the patient and their social milieu – authority, persuasion, education, distraction, and coercion. Pigeaud coined this expression to evoke the late 19th-century concept of *traitement moral* championed by Philippe Pinel, while marking a clear distinction between the two. Authors such as Celsus and Caelius Aurelianus offer evidence of similar interventions within the treatment of mental diseases, ranging from physical restraint in severe cases to more imaginative or dialogical forms of therapy, such as reading literary or philosophical texts, attending theatrical performances, or initiating conversations that stimulate rational faculties. At times, these interventions verge on rhetorical trickery – as when Celsus suggests announcing a fictitious inheritance to a wealthy patient fearful of poverty, or when Caelius recommends engaging the patient on familiar occupational matters to re-focus their attention. In other cases, dialogical reasoning is employed in a more philosophical spirit of persuasion[74].

What sets the relational measures prescribed by the *Anonymus Parisinus* apart is the likely social standing of the patients to whom these interventions are directed. Unlike the elite, literate subjects typically envisaged by Celsus and Caelius Aurelianus, the *entheastikoí* most likely belonged to lower social strata (in a recent study, F. Van Haeperen tellingly describes the *galli* as "poor wretches" living on the margins of ancient society)[75]. The proposal to subject such individuals to a form of "admonition through words" (*nouthesía diá tōn lógōn*), aimed at "ridding them of the entrenched false opinion they hold about the gods", though framed as tentative (*peirasthai*), would at first glance seem to conflict with the limited education that can reasonably be attributed to these individuals, and hence with their potential ability to engage in theologically informed discourse. Even for literate patients, the therapeutic power of speech is regarded as limited in imperial medicine. Caelius Aurelianus, for instance, although acknowledging the potential usefulness of philosophical discourse to counter emotional disturbances such as "fear, sorrow, and wrath" (*timorem vel maestitudinem aut iracundiam*) – primarily with a view to physical health – remains skeptical of its actual efficacy, famously noting that "no philosopher has ever set forth a successful treatment for this disease"[76].

More plausibly, the therapeutic strategy proposed by the *AP* may align with the pragmatic approach found in some passages of Caelius Aurelianus. In particular, Caelius acknowledges that when patients are "unacquainted with literature" (*qui literas nesciat*) the physician cannot rely on 'relational therapies' that involve reading, theatrical performances, or philosophical discussions. Instead, he suggests engaging the patient with topics relevant to their own trade – for instance, agricultural issues if the patient is a farmer, or navigational problems if he is a pilot – in an effort to stimulate their attention[77]. The *AP*'s focus on correcting false religious beliefs can thus be seen as related – though not reducible – to this therapeutic trend documented in Caelius: given that the

'consecrated' lives of the *galli* also shaped their economic and every-day existence, religious beliefs may have been inseparable from the practical organization of their lives. The therapeutic strategy outlined by the *Anonymus Parisinus* constitutes an exceptional case in the ancient medical tradition. Nowhere else do we find such a clear articulation between verbal correction (*lógoi*) and authoritative control, employed together in the treatment of religiously induced mental disturbances. Rather than adopting the philosophical dialogue or rational persuasion attested in other roughly contemporary sources, the physician opts for a method of admonition aimed at correcting theological error, while entrusting patient care to figures "for whom the patient has respect or fear". This combination of *lógoi* and relational authority reflects the eminently practical orientation of the treatise already highlighted by O. Lewis and evoked at the beginning of this study[78]. Whether original or drawing from now-lost sources, the therapeutic model it proposes stands apart from other documented approaches to mental illness, and confirms the marginal yet distinctive status of pathological 'inspired' madness, a condition that lies outside the canonical triad of *manía*, *phrenitis*, and *melancholía* that structured ancient psychopathological reflection at least from Celsus onward.

At the same time, the *Anonymus Parisinus* provides a rare perspective on a neglected dimension of religious practices considered transgressive or borderline unlawful in antiquity. While the doxographical accounts on Hippocrates and Praxagoras of Cos testify to an early theoretical engagement with the physiology of ritual madness, this text reveals that, by the imperial age, enthusiasm had become a matter of clinical concern, addressed through a set of concrete therapeutic provisions.

Bibliography, notes and references

* This article is part of a project supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 897297. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers of Medicina nei Secoli for their insightful suggestions and valuable advice.

Primary sources

Aëtius, *Placita Philosophorum.*
Mansfeld J and Runia DT (eds), Aëtiana. V, An edition of the reconstructed text of the Placita with a commentary and a collection of related texts. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2020.
[Andronicus of Rhodes], *De passionibus*.
Glibert-Thirry A (ed.), Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, Περι παθῶν. Leiden: Brill; 1977.
Kreuttner X (ed.), Andronici qui fertur libelli περὶ παθῶν (De affectionibus). Heidelberg: Winter; 1884.
Anonymus Londiniensis.
Manetti D (ed.), Anonymus Londiniensis. De Medicina. Editio altera. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter; 2022.

Ricciardetto A (ed.), L'Anonyme de Londres. P.Lit.Lond. 165, Brit.Libr. inv. 137. Un papyrus médical grec du I[er] siècle après J.-C. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2016.
Anonymus Parisinus.
Garofalo I (ed.), Fuchs B (transl.), Anonymi medici de morbis acutis et chroniis. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill; 1997.
Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*.
Hanson JA (ed.), Apuleius. Metamorphoses (The Golden Ass), Volume II: Books 7-11. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1989.
Aretaeus, *De causis, signis et curatione acutorum et diuturnorum morborum*.
Hude C (ed.), Aretaeus. Corpus Medicorum Graecorum; II. Berlin: Akademie Verlag; 1958.
Aristides Quintilianus, *De Musica*.
Winnington-Ingram RP (ed.), Aristides Quintilianus De Musica Leipzig: Teubner; 1963.
Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*.
Bartlett RC and Collins SD (eds), Aristotle's Nicomachean ethics. Chicago (Ill.)-London: University of Chicago Press; 2011.
Aristotle, *De Anima*.
Shields C (ed.), Aristotle. De Anima. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 2016.
Aristotle, *Politica*.
Lord C (ed.), Aristotle's Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2013.
Aristotle, *Problemata*.
Mayhew R and Mirhady DC (eds), Aristotle. Problems, Volume II: Books 20-38. Rhetoric to Alexander. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2011.
Aspasius, *In Ethicam Nicomacheam*.
Heylbut G (ed.), Aspasius in Ethica Nicomachea. Berlin: Weimar; 1889.
Caelius Aurelianus, *Celeres et Tardae Passiones.*
Bendz G and Pape I (ed. and transl.), Caelius Aurelianus Tardarum Passionum Libri / Chronische Krankheiten. Berlin: Akademie Verlag; 1990.
Drabkin IE (ed.), Caelius Aurelianus. On Acute Diseases and on Chronic Diseases. Chicago (Ill.): University of Chicago Press; 1950.
Diocles of Carystus, *Fragmenta*.
Van de Eijk Ph J (ed.), Diocles of Carystus. Volume One, Text and Translation. A Collection of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2000.
Erotianus, *Lexicon Hippocraticum*.
Nachmanson E (ed.), Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio: cum fragmentis. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri; 1918.
Hippocrates, *De morbo sacro*.
Potter P (ed.), Hippocrates. Prognostic. Regimen in Acute Diseases. The Sacred Disease. The Art. Breaths. Law. Decorum. Dentition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2023.
Plato, *Leges*.
Schofield M (ed.), Griffith T (transl.), Plato. Laws. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge: CUP; 2016.
Plato, *Symposium*.
Sheffield FCC (ed.), Howatson MC (transl.), In: Plato: The Symposium. Cambridge: CUP; 2008.
Praxagoras of Cos, *Fragmenta*.
Lewis O (ed.), Praxagoras of Cos on arteries, pulse and pneuma: fragments and interpretation. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2017.
Steckerl F (ed.), The fragments of Praxagoras of Cos and his school. Leiden: Brill; 1958.

Studies

Baslez F-M, Les Galles d'Anatolie: images et réalité. Res Antiquae 2004;1:234-245.
Beard M, The Cult of the "Great Mother" in Imperial Rome. The Roman and the "Foreign". In: Rasmus Brandt J, Iddeng W (eds), Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012.
Belfiore ES, Tragic pleasures: Aristotle on plot and emotion. Princeton (N. J.): Princeton University Press; 1992.
Borgeaud Ph, La Mère des dieux. De Cybèle à la Vierge Marie. Paris: Seuil; 1996.
Centrone B, Μελαγχολικός in Aristotele e il Problema XXX 1. In: Centrone B (ed.), Studi sui Problemata physica aristotelici. Napoli: Bibliopolis; 2011. pp. 309-339.
Cobolet G (eds), Lire les médecins grecs à la Renaissance. Aux origines de l'édition médicale. Paris: Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de Médecine; 2004. pp. 99-112.
De Stefani C, Note ad Areteo di Cappadocia. Incontri di Filologia Classica 2021-2022; 21:185-196.
Flashar H, Melancholie und Melancholiker in den medizinischen Theorien der Antike. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter; 1966.
Jackson SW, Melancholia and Depression: From Hippocratic Times to Modern Times. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1986.
Jacques J-M, La bile noire dans l'Antiquité grecque. Médecine et littérature. Revue des études anciennes 1998;100(1-2):217-234.
Jouanna J, Aux racines de la mélancolie: la médecine grecque est-elle mélancolique? In: Clair J and Kopp R (eds), De la mélancolie. Paris: Gallimard; 2007. pp. 11-51.
Jouanna J, Le glossaire d'Érotien et le Pronostic d'Hippocrate. Découvertes et problèmes: du grain au divin. Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 2012;156(4):1463-1501.
Latham L, "Fabulous Clap-Trap": Roman Masculinity, the Cult of Magna Mater, and Literary Constructions of the Galli at Rome from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity. The Journal of Religion 2012;92(1):84-122.
Lewis CT and Short C (eds), A Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1879.
Lewis O, The clinical method of the Anonymous of Paris. In: Bouras-Vallianatos P (ed.), Exploring Greek Manuscripts in the Library at Wellcome Collection in London. New York: Routledge; 2020.
Lord C, Education and culture in the political thought of Aristotle. Ithaca (N.-Y.): Cornell University Press; 1982.
Mansfeld J, Democritus, fragments 68B18 and B21 DK. Mnemosyne 2004;57(4):484-488.
Martin DB, Inventing superstition: from the Hippocratics to the Christians. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2004.
Müri W, Melancholie und schwarze Galle. Museum Helveticum 1953;10(1):21-38.
Nutton V, Ancient Medicine. London-New York: Routledge; 2004.
Nutton V, Aretaios. In: Cancik H, Schneider H (eds), Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike (I). Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler; 1996. pp. 1051-1052.
Oberhelman SM, On the Chronology and Pneumatism of Aretaios of Cappadocia. In: Haase W, Temporini H (eds), Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW), II (37, 2). Berlin-New York: De Gruyter; 1994. pp. 941-966.
Omont HA, Minoïde Mynas et ses missions en Orient (1840-1855) Paris: Imprimerie nationale; 1916.
Passavanti S, Mad Rituals. Aretaeus of Cappadocia on 'Divine' Frenzy. Med. Secoli

2025;37(2):143-166.
Pigeaud J, Folie et cures de la folie chez les médecins de l'Antiquité gréco-romaine. La manie. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2010.
Pigeaud J, Pro Caelio Aureliano. In: Sabbah G (ed.), Mémoires III. Médecins et Médecine dans l'Antiquité. Saint Étienne: Centre Jean Palerne; 1982. pp. 105-117.
Pigeaud J, La maladie de l'âme. Étude sur la relation de l'âme et du corps dans la tradition médico-philosophique antique. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 1981.
Polito R, Competence Conflicts between Philosophy and Medicine: Caelius Aurelianus and the Stoics on Mental Diseases. CQ 2016;1:358-369.
Raffa M, Theophrastus of Eresus: Commentary Volume 9.1: Sources on Music (Texts 714–726C). Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2018.
Rauhala M, 'Obscena Galli Praesentia'. Deshumanizing Cybele's Eunuch Priest Through Disgust. In: Lateiner D, Spatharas D (eds), The Ancient Emotion of Disgust. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press; 2017. pp. 235-252.
Rolle A, Dall'Oriente a Roma. Cibele, Iside e Serapide nell'opera di Varrone. Pisa: ETS; 2017.
Roller LE, In Search of God the Mother. The Cult of Anatolian Cybele. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press; 1999.
Roselli A, The Gynaecological and Nosological Treatises of the Corpus Hippocraticum: the Tip of an Iceberg. In: Colasanti G, Lulli L (eds), Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture. Volume 2: Case Studies. Berlin: De Gruyter; 2016; pp. 187-203.
Roselli A, Nosology. In: Pormann PE (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Hippocrates. Cambridge: CUP; 2018. pp. 180-199.
Roselli A, Les malades d'Arétée de Cappadoce. In: Jouanna J, Leclant J (eds), La médecine grecque antique. Actes du 14ème colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 10 & 11 octobre 2003. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres; 2004. pp. 163-176.
Roselli A, Les éditions d'Arétée et le commentaire de Pierre Petit. In: Boudon-Millot V et Cobolet G (eds), Lire les médecins grecs à la Renaissance. Aux origines de l'édition médicale. Paris: Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de Médecine; 2004. pp. 99-112.
Spaemann R, "Fanatisch" und "Fanatismus". Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte 1971;15:256-274.
Staden H, Purity, Purification, and Karharsis in Hippocratic Medicine. In: Vöhler M and Seidensticker B (eds), Katharsiskonzeptionen vor Aristoteles Zum kulturellen Hintergrund des Tragödiensatzes. Berlin: De Gruyter; 2007. pp. 21-51.
Thumiger C, The Early Greek Medical Vocabulary of Insanity. In: Harris WV (ed.), Mental Disorders in the Classical World. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2013. pp. 61-95.
Urso AM, Dall'autore al traduttore. Studi sulle Passiones celeres et tardae di Celio Aureliano. Messina: EDAS; 1997.
Ustinova Y, "Hands of gods" at Work: Magic and Hippocratic Catharsis. JCH 2023;8(1-2):45-68.
Rousseau N, Ὅτι ἀλαζών ἐστι μάρτυς ἡ ἐτυμολογία: Galen on Etymology, Theory and Practice. In: Zucker A and Le Feuvre C (eds), Ancient and Medieval Greek Etymology Theory and Practice I. Berlin: De Gruyter; 2021. pp. 125-176.
van der Eijk Ph J, The Anonymus Parisinus and the doctrines of "the Ancients". In: van der Eijk Ph J (ed.), Ancient Histories of Medicine. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 1999. pp. 295-331.
van der Eijk Ph J, Cure and (in)curability of mental disorders in ancient medical and philosophical thought. In: Harris WV (ed), Mental disorders in the classical world. Brill: Leiden-Boston; 2013. pp. 307-338.
Van Haeperen F, Rappresentazioni e ministri della Mater Magna a Roma e nelle province occidentali dell'Impero. In: Fontana F, Murgia E (eds), Sacrum facere. Atti del IV Seminario

di Archeologia del Sacro. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste; 2018. pp. 241-262.
Van Haeperen F, Étrangère et ancestrale. La Mère des dieux dans le monde romain. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf; 2019.
Van Haeperen F, Des "médecins de l'âme". Les prêtres des Religions orientales selon Cumont. In: Bonnet C, Ossola C, Scheid J (eds), Rome et ses religions: culte, morale, spiritualité. En relisant Lux Perpetua de Franz Cumont. Supplemento a Mythos. Rivista di Storia delle Religioni 1(n.s). Caltanissetta: Salvatore Sciascia Editore; 2010. pp. 49-62.

1. I follow van der Eijk Ph J, The Anonymus Parisinus and the doctrines of "the Ancients". In: van der Eijk Ph J (ed.), Ancient Histories of Medicine. Leiden-Boston: Brill. 1999; pp. 295-331 and Lewis O, The clinical method of the Anonymous of Paris. In: Bouras-Vallianatos P (ed.), Exploring Greek Manuscripts in the Library at Wellcome Collection in London. New York: Routledge; 2020. pp. 25-53 in referring to the *Anonymus Parisinus* also as 'the Anonymous' or 'the *AP*'.
2. For a discussion of the dating and authorship issues concerning the *AP*, see Garofalo I (ed.), Anonymi medici De morbis acutis et chroniis. Brill: Leiden-Boston; 1997. p. xi and, more extensively, van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 1. pp. 296-300, 326-329. The first manuscript of the *AP* was discovered in 1840 by the Greek philologist Konstantinos Minoïdes Mynas (1798–1859) in the library of the monastery on Mount Athos during the first of his missions on behalf of the French government. The current designation of this work derives from the fact that Mynas' find – the most complete witness of the text – was subsequently transferred to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (and then catalogued as Parisinus suppl. gr. 636; on Mynas, his expeditions and their outcomes, see Omont HA, Minoïde Mynas et ses missions en Orient (1840-1855) Paris: Imprimerie nationale; 1916). After some troubled and inconclusive editorial vicissitudes involving leading figures of 19th century German philology (on which see van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 1. pp. 295-302), the treatise was published only in 1997 by Ivan Garofalo under a new title, *Anonymi medici de morbis acutis et chroniis*, collating its three known further witnesses (cf. Garofalo I, Ref. 2. pp. xiv–xxiii). – Early examples of nosological treatises are the Hippocratic *Diseases I*, *II*, *III*, *IV*, *Affections*, *Internal Affections* (the "tip of the iceberg" of a much more substantial "submerged literature" produced in the 5th and the 4th c. BC, as A. Roselli has defined them [Roselli A, The Gynaecological and Nosological Treatises of the Corpus Hippocraticum: the Tip of an Iceberg. In: Colasanti G, Lulli L (eds), Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture. Volume 2: Case Studies. Berlin: De Gruyter; 2016; pp. 187-203; for an overview of the content and the structure of Hippocratic nosological treatises see Roselli A, Nosology. In: Pormann PE (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Hippocrates. Cambridge: CUP; 2018. pp. 180-199. pp. 187-195). The 4th-century Greek physicians Diocles of Carystus and Praxagoras of Cos also wrote treatises *On Affections, their Causes and Treatment* (see Van de Eijk Ph J (ed.), Diocles of Carystus. Volume One, Text and Translation. A Collection of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary. Brill: Leiden-Boston; 2000. pp xxxiii, 187-188 [fragm. 109], 224-225 [fragm. 132a] and Lewis O (ed.), Praxagoras of Cos on Arteries, Pulse and Pneuma: Fragments and Interpretation. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2017. p. 5 [= fragm. 109a Steckerl]). Aretaeus extant work was edited in 1923 by Karl Hude (Hude C (ed.), Aretaeus. Corpus Medicorum Graecorum; II. Berlin: Akademie Verlag; 1958). For an overview of the current state of research on the dating of Aretaeus, see Oberhelman SM, On the Chronology and Pneumatism of Aretaios of Cappadocia. In: Haase W, Temporini H (eds), Aufstieg

und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW), II (37, 2). Berlin-New York: De Gruyter; 1994. pp. 941-966; Nutton V, Ancient Medicine. London-New York: Routledge; 2004. p. 210; Nutton V, Aretaios. In: Cancik H, Schneider H (eds), Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike (I), Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler; 1996. pp. 1051-1052; Roselli A, Les malades d'Arétée de Cappadoce. In: Jouanna J, Leclant J (eds), La médecine grecque antique. Actes du 14ème colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 10 & 11 octobre 2003. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres; 2004. pp. 163-176, p. 164 n. 1, and Roselli A, Les éditions d'Arétée et le commentaire de Pierre Petit. In: Boudon-Millot V et Cobolet G (eds), Lire les médecins grecs à la Renaissance. Aux origines de l'édition médicale. Paris: Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de Médecine; 2004. pp. 99-112, p. 99). De Stefani C, Note ad Areteo di Cappadocia. Incontri di Filologia Classica 2021-2022;21:185-196 (whom I follow here) convincingly dates Aretaeus' period of activity to the second half of the 2nd century. – For the issue of the relationship between Caelius Aurelianus' *Passiones* (Bendz G and Pape I [ed. and transl.], Caelius Aurelianus Tardarum Passionum Libri / Chronische Krankheiten. Berlin: Akademie Verlag; 1990) and its source, Soranus, see Pigeaud J, Pro Caelio Aureliano. In: Sabbah G (ed.), Mémoires III. Médecins et médecine dans l'Antiquité. Saint Étienne: Centre Jean Palerne; 1982. pp. 105-117 and and Urso A M, Dall'autore al traduttore. Studi sulle Passiones celeres et tardae di Celio Aureliano. Messina: EDAS; 1997.

3. The essentially practical orientation of the text is emphasised by Lewis O, Ref. 1, whose "underlying assumption is that [the author] considered his treatise comprehensive and sufficient for guiding a practicing physician" (Lewis O, Ref. 1. p. 26).
4. See van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 1. pp. 326-329 and Lewis O, Ref. 1. pp. 48-49.
5. See Steckerl F (ed.), The fragments of Praxagoras of Cos and his school. Leiden: Brill; 1958. p. 81 ("neurosis"), Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 120 (transl. by B. Fuchs "fanaticism"), van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 1. pp. 305, 316 and Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 77 *et passim* ("frenzy").
6. Plat., *Leg.*, 682a 3-5: θεῖον γὰρ οὖν δὴ καὶ τὸ ποιητικὸν ἐνθεαστικὸν ὂν γένος ὑμνῳδοῦν, πολλῶν τῶν κατ' ἀλήθειαν γιγνομένων σύν τισιν Χάρισιν καὶ Μούσαις ἐφάπτεται ἑκάστοτε (Griffith T (translation) In: Schofield M, Plato. Laws. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge: CUP; 2016).
7. *Plac. Phil.*, 904e (= *SVF* II, 1190), Mansfeld J and Runia DT (eds), Aëtiana. V, An edition of the reconstructed text of the Placita with a commentary and a collection of related texts. Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2020. p. 1759, 1-6: Πλάτων καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ τὴν μαντικὴν εἰσάγουσι κατὰ τὸ θεόπεμπτον εἶναι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐνθεαστικόν, καὶ κατὰ θειότητα τῆς ψυχῆς, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐνθουσιαστικόν· καὶ τὸ ὀνειροπολικὸν καὶ τὸ ἀστρομαντικὸν καὶ τὸ ὀρνεοσκοπικὸν καὶ τὸ ἱεροσκοπικόν. οὗτοι τὰ πλεῖστα μέρη τῆς μαντικῆς ἐγκρίνουσι ("Plato and the Stoics admit divination in that it is sent by a god, which is its visionary (*i.e.* prophetic) element, and also because of the divinity of the soul, which is the element of divine possession" (trans. Mansfeld-Runia, p. 2138) – In their commentary to this passage, the editors have proposed relating *entheastikón* to the verb *theáomai* ("to see" or "to contemplate"), thereby explaining its distinction from *enthousiastikón*: while the former term would suggest the human faculty of "envisioning" godsent dreams (hence their translation as 'visionary element'), the latter emphasizes the capacity of the soul to "host" the gods within itself, that is, to be 'possessed' (Mansfeld-Runia, pp. 1762-1763). As far as I can tell, however, the alternation between the variants *entheastikós* and *enthousiastikós* in the material discussed below does not reflect any significant difference in meaning.
8. See *e.g.* Plat., *Ion*, 533e5, 535c2, 536b3; *Phdr.*, 241e5, 249d2 (ἐνθουσιάζω), 249e2 (ἐνθουσίασις), 263d2 (ἐνθουσιαστικός); *Tim.*, 71e6 (ἐνθουσιασμός). The term

ἐνθουσιασμός also appears in a fragment of Democritus (DK 68B18 = LM D217) preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*., VI, 168, against whose authenticity, however, see Mansfeld J, Democritus, fragments 68B18 and B21 DK. Mnemosyne 2004;57(4): 484-488. pp. 486-487).

9. See *infra* n. 50 and Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 198.
10. On the life and works of Praxagoras, see Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 1-6.
11. Prax., fr. 26 Lewis [1-5] (Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 76-77 = *An. Par*., XX, 1, 1 Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 120, 12-20): Πραξαγόρας τοῦ ἐνθεαστικοῦ πάθους μόνος ἐπ᾽ ὀλίγον τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐμνήσθη φάσκων περὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτὴν εἶναι καὶ τὴν παχεῖαν ἀρτηρίαν· γίνεσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν πομφολύγων ἐπανάστασιν ποσήν· διὰ τοῦτο γάρ φησιν ἐκκενοῦται, ἀλλ᾽ ὁτὲ μὲν τὰς χεῖρας, ὁτὲ δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ῥιπτοῦνται (transl. Lewis with slight modifications).
12. See van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 1. pp. 303-304 and 2001: xv–xvii.
13. For a reading of μόνος ἐπ᾽ ὀλίγον different from that proposed by O. Lewis, which I follow here, see van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 2. pp. 148-149 (= Diocles fr. 76), who translates line 2 of the present fragment as follows: “Praxagoras was almost the only one to mention the affection of frenzy”.
14. For the identification of the “thick artery” with the aorta, see Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 199, 220-221.
15. For what follows on the role of *pneuma* in motor and cognitive activity in Praxagoras see Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 275-298.
16. See Prax., fr. 22 Lewis 5-7 (Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 70-71 = *An. Par*., I, 1, 2 [Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 2, 7-10]): Φρενίτιδος αἰτία. […] Πραξαγόρας δὲ φλεγμονὴν τῆς καρδίας εἶναί φησι τὴν φρενῖτιν, ἧς καὶ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἔργον φρόνησιν οἴεται εἶναι· ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς φλεγμονῆς ταρασσομένην τὴν καρδίαν τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους συστατικὴν γίνεσθαι (transl. Lewis with slight modifications); fr. 23 Lewis, 1-4 (Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 72–73 = *An. Par.*, XVIII, 1, 1 [Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 112, 17-20]): Μανίας αἰτία. Πραξαγόρας τὴν μανίαν γίνεσθαί φησι κατ᾽ οἴδησιν τῆς καρδίας, οὗπερ καὶ τὸ φρονεῖν εἶναι δεδόξακε· μὴ ἐπιγίνεσθαι δὲ αὐτῇ πυρετοὺς διὰ τὸ μηδὲ τὰ ἐκτὸς οἰδήματα ποιεῖν πυρώσεις (transl. Lewis); fr. 24 Lewis, 1-3 (Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 72-73 = *An. Par.*, XIX, 1, 1 [Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 116, 22-25]): Μελαγχολίας αἰτία. Πραξαγόρας καὶ Διοκλῆς μελαίνης χολῆς περὶ τὴν καρδίαν συστάσης καὶ τὴν ψυχικὴν δύναμιν τρεπούσης φασὶ γίνεσθαι τὸ πάθος (transl. Lewis).
17. Prax., fr. 25 Lewis [1-5] (Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 74 = *An. Par.*, III, 1, 1 [Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 18, 10-15]): Ἐπιληψίας αἰτία. Πραξαγόρας περὶ τὴν παχεῖαν ἀρτηρίαν φησὶ γίνεσθαι φλεγματικῶν χυμῶν συστάντων ἐν αὐτῇ· οὓς δὴ πομφολυγουμένους ἀποκλείειν τὴν δίοδον τοῦ ἀπὸ καρδίας ψυχικοῦ πνεύματος καὶ οὕτω τοῦτο κραδαίνειν καὶ σπᾶν τὸ σῶμα· πάλιν δὲ κατασταθεισῶν τῶν πομφολύγων παύεσθαι τὸ πάθος (transl. Lewis).
18. Arteries “in their natural state” (*katà phýsin*), according to Praxagoras, contain only pneuma and not humours (see on this point Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 229-230, 275-278, who thinks that presence of humours in these vessels would affect their innate pulsation).
19. See Prax. fr. 27 Lewis [1-4] = *An. Par.*, IV, 1 (Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 24, 21 – 26, 3): Ἀποπληξίας αἰτία. Πραξαγόρας καὶ Διοκλῆς περὶ τὴν παχεῖαν ἀρτηρίαν γίνεσθαί φασι τὸ πάθος ὑπὸ φλέγματος ψυχροῦ καὶ παχέος ὡς μηδ᾽ ἐν αὐτῇ οὐχ ὅτι πνεῦμα παραπνεῖσθαι δύνασθαι· καὶ οὕτω κινδυνεύειν τὸ πᾶν ἐγκαταπνιγῆναι (“The cause of apoplexy. Praxagoras and Diocles say that the affection is generated in the region of the thick artery by cold and thick phlegm, so that inside it [*scil*. the thick artery] no pneuma whatsoever can blow through and, thus, the entire [pneuma in the body] is in danger of being stifled”, transl. Lewis).

20. That bubbles played a similar role in Praxagoras' accounts of the enthusiastic affection and epilepsy was already underlined by Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 200.
21. See Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 199.
22. For a survey of studies on "Praxagoras' acquaintance with Aristotle's works and doctrine" and a further refinement of the question, see Lewis O, Ref. 2. pp. 234-239, 282-284, 251, 304.
23. Aristotle's source on this point could be his pupil Aristoxenus (cfr. Lord C (ed.), Aristotle's *Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2013: *ad loc.*), as an analogous classification figures in [Arist.], *Probl.*, XIX, 48: "the Hypophrygian [mode] has a character of action (ἡ μὲν ὑποφρυγιστὶ πρακτικόν) (…), while the Hypodorian has a magnificent and steadfast character (ἡ δὲ ὑποδωριστὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ στάσιμον) (…) but the Phrygian (…) is *inspirational* and Bacchic, (ἡ [ὑπο]φρυγιστί· ἐνθουσιαστικὴ γὰρ καὶ βακχική) (…). Under the influence of this (harmonia), therefore, we are affected in a certain way; and the weak are affected more than the strong" (κατὰ μὲν οὖν ταύτην πάσχομέν τι· παθητικοὶ δὲ οἱ ἀσθενεῖς μᾶλλον τῶν δυνατῶν εἰσί, my italics). Yet this distinction is also reminiscent of a Platonic model that, according to Aristides Quintilianus (II, 5, 13-16, Winnington-Ingram RP (ed.), Aristides Quintilianus De Musica. Leipzig: Teubner; 1963. p. 58, 18-21, cfr. Raffa M, Theophrastus of Eresus: Commentary. Volume 9.1: Sources on Music (Texts 714–726C). Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2018. pp. 82-83.) "the ancients" (*hoi palaioí*) had followed, and that made correspond each of these three passions to each of the three parts of the soul according to Plato: "leasure is rife in its appetitive part, grief and its offspring anger in the spirited part, and enthusiasm in the rational" (περὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν αὐτῇ τὴν ἡδονὴν πλεονάζουσαν, περὶ δὲ τὸ θυμικὸν λύπην καὶ ταύτης ὀργὴν ἔκγονον, περὶ δὲ τὸ λογικὸν τὸν ἐνθουσιασμόν, transl. Barker slightly modified).
24. Arist., *Pol.*, VIII, vii, 4, 1340a 11-12 (the translations of the passages from Aristotle's *Politics* quoted here are taken from Lord C, Ref. 23)
25. *Ivi*, 1342a 8-15: Καὶ γὰρ ὑπὸ ταύτης τῆς κινήσεως κατοκώχιμοί τινές εἰσιν, ἐκ τῶν δ' ἱερῶν μελῶν ὁρῶμεν τούτους, ὅταν χρήσωνται τοῖς ἐξοργιάζουσι τὴν ψυχὴν μέλεσι, καθισταμένους ὥσπερ ἰατρείας τυχόντας καὶ καθάρσεως· ταὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο ἀναγκαῖον πάσχειν καὶ τοὺς ἐλεήμονας καὶ τοὺς φοβητικοὺς καὶ τοὺς ὅλως παθητικούς, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους καθ' ὅσον ἐπιβάλλει τῶν τοιούτων ἑκάστῳ, καὶ πᾶσι γίγνεσθαί τινα κάθαρσιν καὶ κουφίζεσθαι μεθ' ἡδονῆς.
26. See *ivi*: 1340a 9-10. – Olympus is also mentioned by Plato in the *Symposium* (215c), where his music is told to "take hold of men (*κατέχεσθαι ποιεῖ*) in a unique way" since, "because of its divine origin (διὰ τὸ θεῖα εἶναι), it reveals those who are in need of the gods and of initiation rites" (τῶν θεῶν τε καὶ τελετῶν), transl. Howatson MC In: Sheffield FCC (ed.), Plato: The Symposium. Cambridge: CUP; 2008.
27. Arist., *Pol.*, 1340b 4-5, 1342b 1-7.
28. Arist., *De an.*, I, 1, 403a 29 – b 1 (transl. Shields C (ed), Aristotle. De anima. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 2016. p. 3).
29. Lord C, Education and culture in the political thought of Aristotle. Ithaca (N. Y.): Cornell University Press; 1982. pp. 126-134.
30. Lord C, Ref. 29. pp. 121-122. argues for the homeopathic nature of the 'cure' for pathological *enthousiasmós* that, according to Aristotle, is provided by the experience of sacred music (the intensification of *enthousiasmós* brought about by Phrygian music 'purifies' the diseased *per similem*). For the allopathic interpretation, see Belfiore ES, Tragic pleasures: Aristotle on plot and emotion. Princeton (N. J.): Princeton University Press; 1992.

pp. 322-326, based on the observation that "musical motion cures because it is itself, and produces in the sufferer, motion that is completely different from the motion that characterizes the disease" (*ibid.*: 324).

31. See on this Lord C, Ref. 29. p. 129.
32. Arist., *Eth. Nic.*, 1154b 11-13 (transl. Bartlett RC and Collins SD (eds), Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. Chicago (Ill.)-London: University of Chicago Press; 2011).
33. van der Eijk Ph J, Cure and (In)curability of Mental Disorders in Ancient Medical and Philosophical Thought. In: Harris WV (ed.), Mental Disorders in the Classical World. Brill: Leiden-Boston; 2013. pp. 307-338, pp. 323-325.
34. For an overview of the differences between Aristotle's discussion of *melancholía* and *melancholikós* and that found in *Problem XXX*, see Centrone B, 'Μελαγχολικός in Aristotele e il *Problema XXX* 1'. In: Centrone B (ed.), Studi sui Problemata physica aristotelici. Napoli: Bibliopolis; 2011. pp. 309-339, pp. 323-334.
35. *Ivi*, 954a 35-39: πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι τοῦ νοεροῦ τόπου τὴν θερμότητα ταύτην νοσήμασιν ἁλίσκονται μανικοῖς ἢ ἐνθουσιαστικοῖς, ὅθεν Σίβυλλαι καὶ Βάκιδες καὶ οἱ ἔνθεοι γίνονται πάντες, ὅταν μὴ νοσήματι γένωνται ἀλλὰ φυσικῇ κράσει (Mayhew R (transl.) and Mirhady DC (eds), Aristotle. Problems, Volume II: Books 20-38. Rhetoric to Alexander. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2011. pp. 273-311).
36. Cfr. Arist., *Mot. An.*, 467b 28-30.
37. Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 199.
38. Among the most recent contributions on Hippocratic *kátharsis*, see Staden H, Purity, Purification, and Katharsis in Hippocratic Medicine. In: Vöhler M and Seidensticker B (eds), Katharsiskonzeptionen vor Aristoteles Zum kulturellen Hintergrund des Tragödiensatzes. Berlin: De Gruyter; 2007. pp. 21-51 and Ustinova Y, "Hands of gods" at Work: Magic and Hippocratic Catharsis. JCH 2023;8(1-2):45-68. Belfiore ES, Ref. 30. pp. 306-314 offers a broad overview of occurrences of *kátharsis* in its physical and medical sense within the Aristotelian corpus.
39. Prax., fr. 24 Lewis (see *supra*).
40. Gal., *De fac. nat.*, 2, 9 [K. II: 141,7-9 = Helmreich: 203,18-22] = Praxag., fr. 21 Steckerl. Lewis O, Ref. 2. p. 196 suggests that, in epilepsy as understood by Praxagoras, the overheating of phlegm may be responsible for the formation of bubbles that lead to the release of the arterial obstruction caused by this very humour, and ultimately to the spasms typical of the syndrome (as well as, perhaps, to another characteristic symptom: foaming at the mouth). From this, one might infer that the same humour was thought to cause the obstruction of the aorta in the enthusiastic affection. However, I believe that the hypothesis of overheated phlegm raises several difficulties, given that this humour is cold and moist by nature. To my knowledge, there are no texts that explicitly consider the possibility of its pathological overheating. The etymology of *phlegma* from *phlegein* ("to burn") – as proposed by ancient thinkers such as Prodicus and Philolaus of Croton – does not reflect the standard medical understanding of this humour, which consistently associates it with coldness and passivity (see on this Rousseau N, Ὅτι ἀλαζών ἐστι μάρτυς ἡ ἐτυμολογία: Galen on Etymology, Theory and Practice. In: Zucker A and Le Feuvre C (eds), Ancient and Medieval Greek Etymology Theory and Practice I. Berlin: De Gruyter; 2021. pp. 125-176. pp. 136-141.
41. *An. Par.*, XX, 1, 2 (Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 120, 18-20 = Prax., fr. 26 Lewis, 6-8): Ἱπποκράτης δέ, κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον, μελαγχολίας εἶδός φησι εἶναι τὸ πάθος τοῦτο ἐπὶ τὸ δεισιδαιμονέστερον τετραμμένων τῶν πασχόντων. αὐλοὶ γὰρ καὶ λιβανωτοὶ τὸ πάθος παρορμῶσιν (transl. Lewis).

42. The term δεισιδαιμονία, while used by earlier authors such as Xenophon and Aristotle in a neutral sense – closer to "piety" or "religiosity", as its etymology ("fear of the divinity") suggests – acquires the alternative, pejorative connotation of "superstition" (*i.e.* a deviant excess of religiosity) from Theophrastus onwards, without entirely losing its earlier meanings (see Martin DB, Inventing Superstition: from the Hippocratics to the Christians. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2004. pp. 19-20).
43. van der Eijk Ph J, Ref. 1. pp. 316-317.
44. Garofalo I, Ref. 2 *ad loc*.
45. On the Hippocratic references to black bile and 'melancholy' see Müri W, Melancholie und schwarze Galle. Museum Helveticum 1953;10(1):21-38; Flashar H, Melancholie und Melancholiker in den medizinischen Theorien der Antike. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter; 1966. pp. 29-49; Pigeaud J, La Maladie de l'âme. Étude sur la relation de l'âme et du corps dans la tradition médico-philosophique antique. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 1981. pp. 122-138; Jackson SW, Melancholia and Depression: From Hippocratic Times to Modern Times. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1986. pp. 30-31; Jacques J-M, La bile noire dans l'Antiquité grecque. Médecine et littérature. Revue des études anciennes 1998;100(1-2):217-234, pp. 218-221; Jouanna J, Aux racines de la mélancolie: la médecine grecque est-elle mélancolique? In: Clair J, Kopp R (eds), De la mélancolie. Paris: Gallimard; 2007. pp. 11-51. pp. 11-22; Thumiger C, The Early Greek Medical Vocabulary of Insanity. In: Harris WV (ed.), Mental Disorders in the Classical World: Leiden-Boston: Brill; 2013. pp. 61-95. pp. 62-64.
46. Hipp., *Morb. sacr.*, 16-17.
47. *Ibid*.: 1-2 (transl. Potter P (ed.), Hippocrates. Prognostic. Regimen in Acute Diseases. The Sacred Disease. The Art. Breaths. Law. Decorum. Dentition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2023).
48. Erot., fragm. 33 (Nachmanson E (ed), Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio: cum fragmentis. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri; 1918. pp. 108, 10 - 109, 12): ‹Θεῖόν› τινές φασι τὴν ἱερὰν νόσον. Ταύτην γὰρ εἶναι θεόπεμπτον ἱεράν τε λέγεσθαι ὡς θείαν οὖσαν. Ἕτεροι δὲ ὑπέλαβον τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν. […] Ἄλλοι δὲ θεῖόν φασι τὸ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος. […] Καὶ οἱ τὴν ἐπιληψίαν θεῖον οἰόμενοι εἰρῆσθαι οὐκ ἀνέγνωσαν τὸν ἄνδρα. Ῥητῶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐνθάδε μέμφεται τοὺς θεόπεμπτον ὀνομάζοντας τὸ πάθος δι' ὧν φησιν· 'οὐδέν τί μοι τῶν ἄλλων νούσων δοκέει θειοτέρη εἶναι οὐδ' ἱερωτέρη, ἀλλὰ φύσιν ἔχει ἣν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ νοσήματα'. οἵ τε τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν οἰόμενοι εἰρῆσθαι σφόδρα εἰσὶν εὐήθεις. οὐ γὰρ ἔμελεν ‹Ἱπποκράτει› περὶ προγνώσεως γράφοντι μεμνῆσθαι τῶν διὰ τὰς τροφὰς νοσούντων, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὴν μανίαν οὐδὲ τὸ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος. – The translation of Erotian's citation from the Hippocratic *De morbo sacro* follows that of P. Potter (ref. 47) with slight modifications that account for the variants between the reading transmitted by Erotian and Potter's edition. – For the notion of 'divine' in Erotian's *Lexicon* see also Jouanna J, Le glossaire d'Érotien et le Pronostic d'Hippocrate. Découvertes et problèmes: du grain au divin. Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 2012;156(4):1463-1501, pp. 1475 ff.
49. *An. Par.*, XX, 2, 1-2 (Garofalo I, Ref. 2. pp. 120, 21 – 122, 6, transl. Fuchs slightly modified): Ἐνθεαστικῶν σημεῖα· οἱ δὲ ἐνθεαστικοὶ μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ θυμιαμάτων καὶ αὐλῶν καὶ λιβανωτοῦ παροξύνονται, ὀρχήσεώς τε καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον δεισιδαιμονίας· κατὰ δὲ τοὺς παραξυσμοὺς ἐνευρευθὲς ἔχουσι τὸ πρόσωπον, τήν τε κεφαλὴν καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἄλλοτε ἄλλῃ ῥιπτοῦσιν. αἰκίζονται δὲ αὐτοὺς μάστιξι καὶ σιδήροις ἐνχαράσσοντες τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν. ἐκθέουσι δὲ βοηδὸν καὶ εἴς τινας ἱεροὺς τόπους καταφεύγουσι κάμνοντες· ὁτὲ διὰ τὸ συνεχὲς τοῦ κόπου πίπτουσι καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ ἀνίστανται ἐν φρονήσει.

50. The passage admits a double interpretation: *entheastikoí* may refer either to the patients (cfr. Paul. Aeg., III, xiv, 1, 12-14: τινὲς δὲ καὶ δοκοῦσιν ὑπό τινων μειζόνων ἐφορᾶσθαι δυνάμεων καὶ προλέγειν τὰ ἐσόμενα καθάπερ ἐνθεάζοντες, οὓς καὶ ἐνθεαστικοὺς ἰδίως ὀνομάζουσιν ("some believe to be watched over by certain superior forces and to foretell the future as if they were divinely inspired, and are therefore referred to specifically as *entheastikoí*") or to the paroxysmal crises themselves, which may be triggered (*paroxýnontai*) by the factors listed in the text.
51. For this dating hypothesis on Aretaeus' treatise, see *supra,* Ref. 2. – For what follows on Aretaeus' analysis of "inspired mania" (*entheos maníē*) see Passavanti S, Mad Rituals. Aretaeus of Cappadocia on 'Divine' Frenzy. Med. Secoli 2025;37(2):143-166.
52. See Aret., *SD* I, vi, 11, 29-42 (Hude C, Ref. 2. pp. 43, 31 - 44, 4): Τέμνονταί τινες τὰ μέλεα, θεοῖς ἰδίοις ὡς ἀπαιτοῦσι χαριζόμενοι εὐσεβεῖ φαντασίῃ· καὶ ἔστι τῆς ὑπολήψιος ἡ μανίη μοῦνον, τὰ δ' ἄλλα σωφρονέουσι. ἐγείρονται δὲ αὐλῷ καὶ θυμηδίῃ, ἢ μέθῃ, ‹ἢ› τῶν παρεόντων προτροπῇ. Ἔνθεος ἥδε ἡ μανίη. κἢν ἀπομανῶσι, εὔθυμοι, ἀκηδέες, ὡς τελεσθέντες τῷ θεῷ· ἄχροοι δὲ καὶ ἰσχνοὶ καὶ ἐς μακρὸν ἀσθενέες πόνοισι τῶν τρωμάτων ("Some slash their limbs as if their own gods exacted it, pleasing them in a pious fancy. This mania uniquely concerns this assumption, while for the rest they are sane. They are stirred by the sound of flutes and elation, by inebriation, or by the incitement of those around them. That's what divine mania is. When they recover from madness, they are cheerful and heedless, as though they were initiated to the god; yet they are pallid and emaciated, and feeble because of the pains of their wounds"; my transl.).
53. This point precisely reflects the very origin of the Latin word *fanaticus*, a term particularly apt for rendering the *entheastikoí* (as Brian Fuchs did in his English translation of the *AP*, see *supra*, n. 5). In Latin, *fanum* designates a consecrated space, most often associated with non-Roman deities, while in Christian authors it typically refers to pagan shrines, conveying a sense of exoticism often tinged with suspicion or rejection. More narrowly, the term was used to denote the temples of foreign divinities such as Cybele, Isis, and Serapis (see Spaemann R, "Fanatisch" und "Fanatismus". Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte 1971;15:256-274). Devotees of these cults, who spent significant time in such sanctuaries, came to be known as *fanatici*.
54. On extant sources and recent scholarship concerning the Galli and their ritual practices see Borgeaud Ph, La Mère des dieux. De Cybèle à la Vierge Marie. Paris: Seuil; 1996. Roller LE, In Search of God the Mother. The Cult of Anatolian Cybele. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press; 1999; Baslez F-M, Les Galles d'Anatolie: images et réalité. Res Antiquae 2004;1:234-245; Latham L, "Fabulous Clap-Trap": Roman Masculinity, the Cult of Magna Mater, and Literary Constructions of the *Galli* at Rome from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity. The Journal of Religion 2012;92(1):84-122; Beard M, The Cult of the "Great Mother" in Imperial Rome. The Roman and the "Foreign". In: Rasmus Brandt J, Iddeng W (eds), Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice. Oxford: OUP; 2012. pp. 323-361; Rauhala M, 'Obscena Galli Praesentia'. Deshumanizing Cybele's Eunuch Priest Through Disgust. In: Lateiner D, Spatharas D (eds), The Ancient Emotion of Disgust. Oxford-New York: OUP; 2017. pp. 235-252; Rolle A, Dall'Oriente a Roma. Cibele, Iside e Serapide nell'opera di Varrone. Pisa: ETS; 2017. pp. 11-122; Van Haeperen F, Des "médecins de l'âme". Les prêtres des Religions orientales selon Cumont. In: Bonnet C, Ossola C, Scheid J (eds), Rome et ses religions: culte, morale, spiritualité. En relisant Lux Perpetua de Franz Cumont. Supplemento a Mythos. Rivista di Storia delle Religioni 2010;1(n.s.):49-62;

Van Haeperen F, Étrangère et ancestrale. La Mère des dieux dans le monde romain. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf; 2019; Van Haeperen F, Rappresentazioni e ministri della Mater Magna a Roma e nelle province occidentali dell'Impero. In: Fontana F, Murgia E (eds), Sacrum facere. Atti del IV Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste; 2018. pp. 241-262.

55. Apul., *Met.*, VIII, 27 (Hanson JA (ed), Apuleius. Metamorphoses (The Golden Ass), Volume II: Books 7-11. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1989. pp. 94-95).
56. See Aret., *SD*, I, vi, 8, 1 (Hude C, Ref. 2. pp. 43, 3-4): [οἱ μαινόμενοι] οὐ γιγνώσκουσι δὲ περὶ αὐτέων ὡς χρὴ γιγνώσκειν.
57. Aret., *SD*, I, v, 3, 8 (Hude C, Ref. 2. pp. 40, 3).
58. Gal., *In Hipp. Epid.* VI (K XVIIb: 256, 3 = Wenkebach-Pfaff, CMG, V 10, 2, 2, p. 275, 30).
59. *An. Lond.*, col. I, 22-32 (Manetti D (ed.), De Medicina. Anonymus Londiniensis. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter; 2022. p. 2 = Ricciardetto A (ed.), Un papyrus médical grec du Ier siècle après J.-C.: P.Lit.Lond. 165, Brit.Libr. inv. 137 / L'Anonyme de Londres. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2016. pp. 1-2).
60. See Manetti D, Ref. 59 and Ricciardetto A. Ref. 59 *ad loc*.
61. See Ps.-Andron. Rhod., *Pass*., I, 1 (Glibert-Thirry A (ed.), Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, Περι παθῶν. Leiden: Brill; 1977. p. 223, 11 = *SVF* III, 391); Diog. Laërt., VII, 111 (*SVF* III, 412), Aspas., *In Eth. Nic*., II, 2 (Heylbut G (ed), Aspasius in Ethica Nicomachea. Berlin: Weimar; 1889. p. 45, 16-17) – references from Manetti D, Ref. 59 *ad loc.* and Ricciardetto A. Ref. 59: LV n. 146.
62. Andron., *Pass*., 3 (Kreuttner X [ed], Andronici qui fertur libelli περὶ παθῶν (De affectionibus). Heidelberg: Winter; 1884. p. 16, 12-13 = *SVF* III, 409): δεισιδαιμονία δὲ φόβος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἢ ὑπερέκπτωσις τῆς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμῆς.
63. Ps.-Andron. Rhod., *Pass*., I, 1 (Glibert-Thirry A, Ref. 61. p. 223 = *SVF* III, 391): πάθος ἐστὶν ἄλογος ψυχῆς κίνησις [δι' ὑπόληψιν κακοῦ ἢ ἀγαθοῦ] καὶ παρὰ φύσιν.
64. See for instance *SVF* III, 378 and 548. – It should also be noted that *deisidaimonía* was considered a *páthos* also in the Peripatetic tradition. A chapter of Theophrastus' *Characters* – a caricatural inventory of eccentric psychological types, each embodying an extreme from the Aristotelian scale of vices and virtues – bears the title 'The Superstitious Man' (*ho deisidaímōn*). Although not theorised, the vice of *deisidaimonía* is depicted through the man's compulsive behaviour: ritual-like practices are performed with such obsessive care that they verge on parody (Theophr., *Char.*, XVI, 1). Superstition is thus cast as a passion by excess: Plutarch saw it as an exaggeration of religiosity, whereas atheism represented its deficiency (Plut., *Superst.*, 166e). Similarly, Didymus Cæcus (4th c. AD) treated superstition as a vicious excess of the virtue of piety (*eusébeia*), the deficiency of which was impiety (*asébeia*) (Did. Cæc., *In Zacch*., V, 16, 5 and 17, 2). The hypothesis of a Peripatetic influence on the *AP*'s notion of *deisidaimonía* might encourage an interpretation of the condition of the *entheastikoí* in terms of a psycho-physical 'superstitious temperament' precipitating the fits. However, this would come at the expense of a more strictly *mental* conception of the notion – one that emerges more clearly from the comparison with the *Anonymus Londiniensis* and, as we shall see in the next paragraph, from the therapeutic approach to the *entheastiká* that follows in the *AP*.
65. *An. Par*., XX, 3, 1-2 (Garofalo I, Ref. 2. p. 122, 7-15): Ἐνθεαστικῶν θεραπεία· τοὺς δὲ ἐνθεαστικοὺς κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν θεραπευτέον ὑδροποσίᾳ καὶ λεπτῇ διαίτῃ· τῇ δὲ διὰ τῶν λόγων νουθεσίᾳ χρωμένους πειρᾶσθαι ἀφιστᾶν αὐτοὺς τῆς ἐμπεφυκυίας εἰς αὐτοὺς

ψευδῶς περὶ θεῶν δόξης. ἐκκλινέτωσαν δὲ καὶ φωνὰς αὐλῶν καὶ ἤχους τυμπάνων, καὶ θυμιαμάτων ἀποφοράς. ἐκκαίεται γὰρ τὸ πάθος ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων. Συνέστωσαν δὲ αὐτοῖς ἄνδρες οὓς αἰδεσθήσονται ἢ φοβηθήσονται (transl. Fuchs slightly modified).

66. Cæl. Aur., *Chron*., I, v, 175-176 (Bendz G and Pape I, Ref. 2. p. 534, 15-23; transl. Drabkin IE (ed.), On Acute Diseases and on Chronic Diseases. Chicago (Ill.): University of Chicago Press; 1950. p. 557 with modifications): *utuntur etiam decan‹ta›tionibus tibiarum varia modulatione, quarum alteram Phrygiam vocant, quae sit iucunda atque excitabilis eorum qui ex maestitudine in furore‹m venisse› noscuntur; aliam diram vel quae occupata mente pudorem suadeat, iniecto rigore, ut in bello, quam Dorion appellant, in his qui risu vel puerilibus cachinnis afficiuntur, cum cantilenae sonus caput impleat, ut etiam recte valentibus apertissime vide[a]tur, vel certe, ut plerique memorant, accendat aliquos in furore‹m›, quo saepe vaticinantes deum accepisse videantur*.
67. On the supposed prophetic powers of the *galli*, see for instance Plut., *Marius*, 17, 5 - 6; Liv., XXVII, ix, 9; Polyb., XXI, 6.
68. Pigeaud J, Folie et cures de la folie chez les médecins de l'Antiquité greco-romaine. La manie. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; 2010. p. 154.
69. Plat., *Phdr.*, 244a - 249e.
70. Cæl. Aur., *Chron*., I, v, 145 (Bendz G and Pape I, Ref. 2. p. 516, 6–9): *alium* [*furorem*] […] *ex alienatione mentis et corporis compassione* […] *sive iniquitate, de quo scripturi sumus*.
71. See Lewis CT and Short C (eds), A Latin Dictionary, Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1879 *s.v. vaticinor*. Cfr. Cic., *Sest*., 10, 23 (*vaticinari atque insanire*) and *Id*., *Fam.*, 2, 16, 6 (*sed ego fortasse vaticinor, et haec omnia meliores habebunt exitus*).
72. Cæl. Aur., *Chron*., I, v, 144 (Bendz G and Pape I, Ref. 2. p. 514, 30-31; transl. Drabkin I E, Ref. 66. p. 534).
73. Pigeaud J, Ref. 68. pp. 147-188.
74. See Cels., *De med.*, III, xviii, 10-11, 20-22; Cæl. Aur., *Chron.*, I, v, 162–167 (cf. Pigeaud J, Ref. 68. pp. 148-150).
75. Van Haeperen F, Ref. 54. p. 40 ("des pauvres hères").
76. Cæl. Aur., *Chron.*, I, v, 167 and 154 (Bendz G and Pape I, Ref. 2. pp. 528, 21-25 and 522, 3-5; transl. Drabkin IE, Ref. 66). On the "competence conflicts between philosophy and medicine" in the imperial age see Polito R, Competence Conflicts between Philosophy and Medicine: Caelius Aurelianus and the Stoics on Mental Diseases. CQ 2016;1:358-369.
77. *Ibid.*, 165 (Bendz G and Pape I, Ref. 2. p. 528, 2-4; transl. Drabkin IE, Ref. 66).
78. See *supra* n. 3. – Cfr. also Lewis O, Ref. 1. p. 42: "'words' or 'reason' (λόγοι, λόγος) are therapeutic 'tools' which the physician applies in attempting to cure the patient. These are not forms of 'emotional' or 'philosophical' therapy, which centred on ethical improvement and philosophical discourse between patient and 'therapist', rather, the measures recommended by *AP* are means to address specific distressed feelings or behaviour which occur on account of a particular pathology".

Orcid: Sandro Passavanti https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6028-6029