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**Introduction**

Illness and injury have been common problems throughout history. From ancient times, sick people, wishing for a cure, relied on physicians and/or gods, such as the god of medicine Asclepius. They received treatments and some of them might have even had surgical operations. Moreover, in the cult of Asclepius, patients were ‘remedied’ through divine dreams during incubation or temple sleep\(^2\). After the rise of Christianity, this role was partly succeeded by church; some sick people flocked in church expecting their cure. The narrative of healing miracles through dreams appeared in that context.

As for castration, it is a well-known fact that castrated men or eunuchs were present in the Byzantine Empire, especially as servants in the imperial court. However, as legal sources briefly referred to, castration was needed not only to create servants or hurt someone, but also to treat disease\(^3\). As a result, examining the phenomenon of castration as medical treatment might be valuable for understanding medical practice and considering the variety of eunuchs in the Byzantine society.

An important source concerning castration for medical reasons is a hagiographical text, especially the *Miracles of St. Artemios*, because the martyr St. Artemios specialized in cure of some disorders of male genitals\(^4\). It was supposedly written in the last decade of the reign of Constans II (r. 641-668) by a Constantinopolitan author and the most of narratives in the *Miracles* (41/45) dealt with miracle healings of hernias and genital diseases\(^5\). G. Sidéris emphasises the importance of these narratives, considering that they suggests that men from various classes were frequently castrated by doctors on account of some illness in Constantinople\(^6\).
However, there are two questions concerning descriptions in the *Miracles*. The first one is about the details of the ‘castration’. What symptoms caused the operation? How did the saint or doctors operate the genital diseases? Furthermore, another question arises as to what extent the operations in the *Miracles of St. Artemios* reflected actual medical treatments. Previous scholars, who examine the hagiographer’s identity or the relation between medical knowledge and religion, are not interested in the details of operations in the *Miracles*. On the one hand, when scholars discuss the hagiographer’s identity, they note that the author of the *Miracles* is familiar with the medical terminology and with the contemporary doctors and hospitals in the capital. However, this fact is not helpful for their examination, because medical knowledge and its vocabulary were rather fashionable among the literary intellectuals of Byzantium. On the other hand, those who examine the relation between medical knowledge and religion emphasise the polemical aspect against physicians in the *Miracles*, whilst they also notice that the miracle collection has the information on the practice of the surgery. They then consider the descriptions about the methods of physicians not as actual medical treatments but as a kind of polemical rhetoric, by which compilers of miracle stories were keen to attract support and to emphasise the credibility of divine healing in competition with traditional medicine. In addition, even scholars who are interested in castration, like Sidéris, do not discuss the details of the description in the *Miracles of St. Artemios*. As a result, though these studies are valuable, there has been little modern discussion about how medical sources referred to castrations or removals of testicles and how these sources treated symptoms in hagiographical sources. This situation might be partly due to the fact that the operations are narrated as ‘miracles’, namely, ambiguous and extraordinary stories.

Despite this, the article of A. P. Alwis is remarkable, because she exceptionally uses a medical text of the seventh-century physician, Paul of Aegina and indicates that Paul’s descriptions had something in common with some symptoms in the *Miracles of St. Artemios*. Her method is stimulating in regard to consider that the miracle stories reflect the real world, even if these stories seem to be extraordinary. However, she does not take into account sufficiently the surgical operations in the *Miracles*, because her primary interest is not to
examine operative methods for diseases, but to make tentative diagnoses for some of sufferers in order to investigate the masculinity of the ordinary Byzantine men.

Therefore, this paper will examine the surgical methods in the Miracles of St. Artemios and compare the ambiguous descriptions of operations in this text with surgical operations described by Paul of Aegina in order to elucidate in detail the nature of castration as medical treatment. In the end, I will indicate that these two kinds of sources mutually demonstrate that the knowledge and practice of operations for genital diseases spread to Byzantine society.

I. The descriptions in the Miracles of St. Artemios: physician and saint

Miracle collection is a literary genre flourished between the fifth and the seventh centuries and consists of short narratives relating a saint’s miracles\(^\text{11}\). Each of the stories collected in the Miracles of St. Artemios has a standard structure\(^\text{12}\). At the beginning, the narrator introduces a protagonist of various ages from various social classes suffering from a certain particular disorder, like a tumour or a hernia (κήλη/καταβαρής). Most sufferers were men with the exception of an example concerning a female hernia patient, Mir. 24. Moreover, when a small child became ill, his mother often appeared as a protagonist. Although sufferers occasionally consulted a physician, they became more ill when they did so. Then, left with no other choice, they visit the Church of St. John Prodromos in Constantinople, where the relics of St. Artemios are kept\(^\text{13}\). While awaiting a miraculous cure, St. Artemios appears to them in a dream. The saint talks with the sufferers and sometimes healed them personally by touching their bodies. The stories end on a happy note: when the sufferers wake up, they find themselves healthy and glorify God. In these narratives, the narrator of the Miracles refers to operations, when physicians attempted wrongfully to treat their patients and when St. Artemios cured diseases. Table 1 lists these narratives referring to methods of physician and/or personal treatment of St. Artemios.

1. Negative descriptions of surgeons

Recent scholars have demonstrated that medicine and religion were not exclusive of each other in that period, indicating a benign
attitude to medicine in Christian treatises, priests with medical abilities, and Christian hospitals\textsuperscript{14}. However, a hostile attitude against medicine could be a traditional pose from the Roman and Hellenistic world\textsuperscript{15}. The author of the \textit{Miracles of St. Artemios} often criticized physicians as ineffective in order to emphasise the saint’s achievements although he actually accepted that sufferers relied on physicians first\textsuperscript{16}.

Concerning castration, some sufferers were told to have an operation by their friends or doctors before they turned to the saint\textsuperscript{17}. In Mir. 25 and Mir. 44, two persons, both named George, were advised to have their testicles amputated. Yet both of them protested that many operations were unsuccessful and many patients had ended up dying in the course of the operation. The mortality caused by castration was also emphasised in the Justinian’s \textit{Novels} saying that three of ninety who have been castrated have hardly survived\textsuperscript{18}. Exceptionally, Mir. 21 said that Stephen, who suffered a rupture of his testicles, actually underwent surgery in the hospital of Sampson after many treatments had been performed\textsuperscript{19}. After three days’ treatment with cold cauteries\textsuperscript{20}, the surgeon performed the surgery (τομή) and the cauterization (καῦσις). Thus, although he feared he would die, his life was restored. However, it was not the surgery but the saint’s miracle that cured his disease completely, because after the surgery the same condition recurred and he reverted to his former state.

On the other hand, the descriptions of operations were inserted in the epilogues of some miracle stories, in which incisions on the ailing body part and use of a scalpel (ξίφος) suggested a surgical operation by a physician. Nonetheless, the operations were always looked down upon in comparison with the miracle cures. Mir. 25 connected the medical treatment of hernia with the doctors’ scalpels and blunt retractors (τυφλάκιστρα) and judged that their treatment was useless. Moreover, in Mir. 26, the narrator criticized a doctor who was about to operate on swollen testicles with scalpel. He spoke to Hippocrates and criticized his knowledge or surgical operation, because the operation might kill the patient, whilst God could make him well. In addition, the epilogue of Mir. 27 referred to the operation of swollen testicles by simple or double incisions (ἁπολοτομία/διπλοτομία), and Mir. 28 suggested that an intestinal hernia was operated by an oblique incision (λοξῆς γέγονεν διαιρέσεως χρεία).
2. Operations by St. Artemios

In spite of the criticism against medicine, the author of the *Miracles* narrates that St. Artemios occasionally appeared in sufferers’ dreams in the guise of a physician. When the saint healed sufferers with his own hands, he merely touched or pushed the ailing part in most cases except for Mir. 28, in which the saint grabbed the child suffering from intestinal hernia by his right foot and dangled him upside down.

Other stories describe how sufferers awoke and cried out in pain because the saint squeezed their testicles forcefully or trod on their stomach or testicles.

St. Artemios, like a surgeon, operated upon diseased testicles. However, the descriptions are so vague that it is difficult to understand the saint’s actions precisely. For example, miracle operations in a dream were occasionally accompanied by blood and pus in actuality. When St. Artemios pricked the sufferers’ testicles with the point of a scalpel, Mir. 13 narrates that the skin of his testicles was ruptured and covered with blood and pus while blood and pus oozed out from the hole made by the saint in Mir. 22.

In addition, Stephen in Mir. 41 saw St. Artemios holding a golden lancet, with which the saint traced a perfect circle over all the ailing parts of testicle. Nonetheless, this operation has a clear implication of being a Christian miracle, because the circle signifies the religious symbol, the omnipotent Holy Trinity. Mir. 44 indicates the miracle treatment of hernia amputating a testicle by a cord. After refusing an operation, the sick man George sees St. Artemios with a medical instrument and a cord; he understands that the man was a person who performs hernia operations. Then, the saint binds the ligament of George’s left testicle and orders the sufferer to pull one end of the cord. As he, obeying the saint’s order, pulls one end and the saint pulls the other end, George seems to amputate his testicle. In comparison with these miracles, the treatment of Mir. 25 is more metaphorical, for the saint appears as a butcher in the dream of another George who refused surgery. The butcher incised the sufferer’s lower abdomen with a knife, took out all his intestines, and rearranged them.

The *Miracles of St. Artemios* referred to some operations on
genitals (actual or imaginary). However, we are unable to judge with
certainty from the ambiguous miracle descriptions whether the saint or
physician removed the patients' testicles, namely performed 'castrations'
as medical treatment. Furthermore, even in the cases of Mir. 25 and
Mir. 44, which suggested testicular amputation, the descriptions of
surgical operations were suggestions that were never followed and
might simply be a means of criticising medicine.

II. Therapeutic methods in medical sources: Paul of Aegina

Concerning the surgical operations for genital diseases (especially,
testicular amputation), there are not many examples before the
seventh century. The first-century Aulus Cornelius Celsus mentioned
symptoms of hernia and their surgical treatment, although his influence
on medicine in late antiquity have supposedly been negligible\textsuperscript{26}. He
explained concerning cirsocele that 'but if a varix has developed between
the inner tunic and the testicle itself and its cord, there is but one
method of treatment, to excise the testicle entirely'\textsuperscript{27}. Furthermore,
Leonides, who was a Greek physician in the second and the third
century, said that testicles should be cut out in the operation of
cirsocele\textsuperscript{28}. On the other hand, the six-century physician Aetios of Amida
advised doctors to avoid any operation because of its risk, although he
did not explain the detail of the surgical method\textsuperscript{29}.

In the seventh century, Paul of Aegina (c.625-c.690), a physician
who likely practiced in Alexandria, wrote \textit{Epitome of medicine}\textsuperscript{30}. Although this is an encyclopaedia of medicine containing extracts from
the earlier medical writers, it is remarkable that his \textit{Epitome} is more
than mere repertory of the past, especially in a description of surgery.
As H. Hunger indicates Paul's 'Praxisorientierheit', scholars suggest
that Paul's Book VI contains detailed descriptions concerning surgical
methods based on his experience in Alexandria\textsuperscript{31}. Therefore, Paul of
Aegina provides enough information about surgical methods for hernias
or other genital diseases, although we are not able to affirm whether his
knowledge was common in the empire, especially in Constantinople\textsuperscript{32}.

1. Paul's surgical methods for genital diseases

Paul arranged surgical methods for various genital disorders from
VI.61 (on the parts about the testicles) to VI.69 (on hermaphrodites).
At first, it might be necessary to note Paul’s description of castration. He distinguished castration from treatments for testicular disorders; however, it was placed just after hernia operations. According to him, the operation of castration had an object opposite to the original goal of medicine, which was to restore preternatural states to natural. There were two methods of castration: compression of testicles by fingers and excision of testicles by scalpel. He said that subjects of castration were children and a purpose of the operation was to repress sexual desire.

In addition to this, he mentioned four kinds of diseases that could become the subject of removal of testicle: (i) hydrocele (the accumulation of inert fluid in the scrotum), (ii) sarcocele (a fleshy tumour formed in any part around scrotum), (iii) cirsocele and pneumatocele (a varicose state of testicular vessels), and (iv) enterocoele (intestine hernia). The symptoms of these diseases were a swelling of the genitals (scrotum or testicles), which was sometimes accompanied with pain in the case of sarcocele. For the first three of these diseases, Paul’s operations did not always involve the removal of testicles; he noted the necessity of making a mere incision with a scalpel down to the ailing part and dissecting out a tumour (ii) or discharging the fluid (i) or blood (iii). However, if patients were in a worse condition, such as their one or both testicles were directly diseased, Paul instructed the amputation of their ailing testicle(s). He also applied the same treatment to every patient who had intestinal hernia:

...then we take a large-sized needle containing a doubled thread of ten pieces, and we pass it through the middle at the extremity of the peritoneum close to the incision; and cutting the double we make four pieces of them, and laying them over one another in the form of the Greek letter X, we bind the peritoneum securely, and again twisting round the pieces we secure it so that none of the nutrient vessels may have a free passage to it lest any inflammation be occasioned, and we apply another ligature farther out, less than two fingers’ breadth distant from the former. After making these ligatures we leave about the size of a finger of the peritoneum, and cut off the whole all round, removing at the same time the testicle, then making an incision at the lower part of the scrotum to favour the discharge, we introduce...
an oblong pledget, and apply embrocations of oil and bandages as for hydrocele.  

2. Comparison with the Miracles of St. Artemios

The symptoms and surgical methods in Epitome of Medicine corresponds to the swelling on the sufferer’s testicles and the incision with a scalpel narrated in the Miracles of St. Artemios. Besides basic information, these two texts are also united in a point of cause of hernia; Paul explained that an intestinal hernia — the sinking of intestine into the scrotum — was caused by the rupture or stretching of the peritoneum as a result of certain violent movements, such as a blow, a leap, loud crying and so on. The protagonists of the Miracles also had hernia from these causes, for example, Stephen, deacon of the Hagia Sophia and a ποιητής of the Blue Faction. He said himself that his testicles were ruptured either from shouting acclamations or from lifting a heavy weight.  

Moreover, Paul’s explanation could fill out the hagiographical text and help us to understand the miracle surgeries of St. Artemios. The first point is the description of blood and pus, which oozed out from the diseased part of the sufferer’s body as a result of St. Artemios’ ‘miracle operation’ by touching the testicle with the point of a scalpel. Concerning the operations of hydrocele, Paul said that after the operations (a mere incision or a removal of testicle(s)), an incision was again made with a sharp-pointed scalpel for discharging coagulated blood and pus. This means that the saint’s incision in a dream was only the last step of a surgical operation for genital diseases. Although it is uncertain whether the narrator omitted intentionally the main part of the operation, there is a possibility that he knew this process and used the description of ‘blood and pus’ to suggest the end of the saint’s operation and the patient’s cure.  

The second point is a code which St. Artemios bound the ligament of the hernia patient’s testicle in Mir. 44. Although it seems to be mere miracle, Paul’s description suggests that the saint’s action might be based on medical practice, a ligature; he instructed that surgeons should enclose vessels in a ligature when they removed testicles. It is true that, strictly speaking, a ἡπαχ βαστακήρα (ligament) did not mean vessels and that making a ligature might be an ordinary measure whenever
physicians incised vessels. However, there is another similarity: the reference to ‘seven days’. In the chapter on intestinal hernia, Paul said:

These after the operation (the removal of the testicles) straightway bathed their patients in a long wooden trough containing hot water, until the seventh day, repeating this as often as five times during the period of a day and a night, more especially with children; and it succeeded wonderfully, for they remained free from inflammation, and the ligatures fell out speedily along with the parts.

Interestingly, Mir. 44 narrated that after making a ligature George said to the saint in the guise of physician: ‘Oh me, you will tie me up with a surgeon’s thread and for seven days it is not possible to undo the suture, as I hear, and what I avoided out of fear, I have come back to’. The fact that at the end of his dream he seemed to have amputated his testicle probably meant that this operation by St. Artemios was that of intestinal hernia and the removal of testicles and the falling out of ligature occurred at the same time in a miracle dream, omitting the main part of the operation. Nevertheless, Alwis suggested that the operation in Mir. 44 was not for hernia but for cirsocele, for Paul explained the ligature for evacuating blood collected in the cirsoideal tumour in detail in VI.64. However, his description of ligature was common in the other operations and his explanation of cirsocele did not provide any information related to Mir. 44 such as seven days or testicular amputation. Accordingly, it is suitable to consider that George had an operation for intestinal hernia in his dream.

There could be no doubt that surgical methods in Paul’s Epitome of medicine and the descriptions of the Miracles of St. Artemios have some common points. However, it might be wrong to consider that the author of the Miracles quoted Paul’s theories from his writings, for he could have other sources of knowledge: medical writings and medical practices in the capital. In particular, Mir. 28 implies that the narrator read the works of some surgeons, which told him that the symptom of the sufferer was intestinal hernia, even though it gives us no hint about the surgeons and the content of their operations and, compared with the miraculous cure, it ends with the same irony to medical operations. In addition, more importantly, he referred to the therapeutic
methods not instructed by Paul, such as the three-days cold cauterities before surgery in the hospital of Sampson. As a result, it suggests another possibility that the methods of testicular amputation were derived from the medical knowledge and custom which had already been accepted in the Constantinople rather than from the writings of Paul of Aegina. To be sure, it is an inconclusive question, because we could not know how doctors treated genital diseases before Paul. However, considering the fact that a castration for medical treatment were more or less mentioned in the sixth century, it might not be unlikely that the surgical method for genital diseases had been already known or even performed by physicians in Constantinople when Paul completed his Epitome in Alexandria.

**Conclusion**

These examinations indicate that the narratives of the *Miracles of St. Artemios* are based on contemporary medical knowledge represented by Paul of Aegina in many points. This means that the operations in the *Miracles* were not mere fantasies in a dream. Conversely, the case of Mir. 44 in particular suggested that the surgical methods of intestinal hernia which were explained in Paul’ Epitome of medicine were reflected in the descriptions of the saint’s operation. Setting aside a question about the sources of medical knowledge, this perhaps means that these methods were narrated in the *Miracles*, because Paul’s instruction on intestinal hernia operation, namely the removal of testicles was not theoretical, but practical ones even in the capital. Therefore, the advice for sufferers in Mir. 25 and Mir. 44 that they should have their testicles amputated might be a realistic one, not mere polemical rhetoric against physicians. The surgical method for intestinal hernia might have been common in seventh-century Constantinople. Finally, turning our eyes to the problem of the *Miracles’* audience, Nesbitt indicates that the appearance at the end of certain miracles of what can be described as short sermonettes means that the *Miracles of St. Artemios* were read to the patients at St. John’s and were read aloud at the Saturday vigil. If we accept his opinion, it is supposed that the author wrote these miracle stories on the assumption that the audience had also known the operative procedure of genital diseases and the castration as medical treatment.
Consequently, operation in the case of genital diseases or the removal of testicle(s) were actually considered as an option of medical treatment. It might be a hasty conclusion that the castration as medical treatment was carried out frequently because Paul suggests that this was the last resort for physicians. However, we could suppose that, as the narrator of the Miracles of St. Artemios suggests, patients of genital diseases were of various ages and classes and some of the patients were treated by castration running the risk of death.
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Notes

1 This phrase is used by Tougher. S. Tougher, *The eunuchs in Byzantine history and society*, New York, 2008, pp. 26-28. In modern medicine, ‘castration’ might be distinguished from orchidectomy (the surgical removal of a testicle), and be meant the removal of both testicles or removal of the penis. J. M. Grass and N. A. Watkin, ‘From mutilation to medication: the history of orchidectomy’, *British journal of urology* 80, 1997, p. 373. This paper treats orchidectomy as something like castration.


3 Legal sources treated the castration caused by sick as exception. Canon 1 of the first council of Nicaea (325) concerning the suspension of self-mutilated or self-castrated clergy stipulated that if anyone have been amputated by physicians because they were in sick, or if he has been cut off by barbarians, he could remain among the clergy. In imperial legislations, *Nov.* 142. 2, in which the emperor Justinian I (r. 527-565) prohibited castration inside the empire, permitted exceptionally castration on account of some illness (διὰ πάθος): εἰ μέντοι διὰ πάθος συμβῇ δούλον εὖνουχισθῆναι, κάκεινον κελεύσαμεν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τυγχάνειν’ οἱ γάρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντες ἐλεύθεροι πάθει ὥς εἰκός τοιοῦτῳ περιπίπτοντες ἑαυτῶν ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν, ἵνα ἀνθέλσας θεραπειάν ἑαυτοῖς προζάγειν.

4 Artemios was a dux of Egypt in 360. After his debatable death under the emperor Julian (r. 361-363), he was known to be a martyr. J. W. Nesbitt, ‘Introduction’, in V. S. Crisafulli and J.W. Nesbitt (trans. and comm.), *The Miracles of St. Artemios*, Leiden/New York/KölN, 1996, pp. 1-4; Mir. 17, 24.


7 For the author of the *Miracles*, scholars accept that he might be an adherent of the cult and a member of the all-night vigil society. Nesbitt, op. cit., pp. 26-27; Efthymiades, op. cit., pp. 1-26; I. Csepregi, ‘Who is behind


17 Regarding penile disease, some doctors proposed cutting ailing part of a protagonist of Mir. 20, who had seven sores on the tip of penis.

18 *Nov.* 142. pr. In some miracles, surgical operation by St. Artemios in a dream also reminded the sufferers of their death, as the sufferers or their family asked the saint, without noticing his identity, whether he killed the patient. Mir. 25, 28, 42.

19 Mir. 21.

20 ‘cold cautery’ refers to the application of various caustic substances. Crisafulli and Nesbitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 257-258.

21 Mir. 2, 6, 40, 42, 44.

22 Mir. 5, 9, 12, 29, 32, 36, 37, 39, 40.

23 Mir. 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 35.

24 Mir. 3, 13, 22, 25, 41, 42, 44.

25 The circularity of O symbolises ‘the alpha and the omega’. When the saint traced the figure for a third time, he uttered the words concerning the Holy Trinity. Crisafulli and Nesbitt, *op. cit.*, p. 288.
26  Celsus, *De med.* VII.18-24.

27  Celsus, *De med.* VII.22.5. *Ubi vero inter imam tunicam et ipsum testiculum nervumque eius ramex est ortus, una curatio est, quae totum testiculum abscedit.*

28  Paul. VI.64.2. ‘ο δὲ Λεωνίδης φησίν, ὡς, ἐὰν μὲν τινα τῶν τρεφόντων τὸν δίδυμον ἀγγείον ἀποκιρσωθεί, οὕτω δὲ πάντα, σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸν δίδυμον χρὴ λαμβάνειν, ἴνα μὴ τῶν τρεφόντων ἐστερημένος ἀγγείον ἀπομαρανθείσῃ. ‘Leonides says, that when a few of the vessels which nourish the testicles are in a varicose state this operation should be performed, but that when all are affected, the testicle should be cut out along with them, lest being deprived of its nutrient vessels it should decay’.

29  Aet. XIV. 21-23.


32  However, J. Haldon supposes that doctors in the capital had been familiar with medical theories of the contemporary medical writers, such as Paul of Aegina. Haldon, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

33  Paul. VI.68.

34  Paul. VI.62.

35  Paul. VI.63.

36  Paul. VI.64.

37  Paul. VI.65.

38  Paul. VI.65.3. εἰτα λαβόντες βελόνην εὑμεγέθη λίνον ἔχουσαν διπλόν δεκάπλοκον πρὸς τὸ πέρας τοῦ περιτοναίου τὸ πρὸς τῇ διαιρέσι τοῦ μέσου διείρομεν, κόψαντες δὲ τὴν διπλόν τέσσαρας ἀρχὰς ποιήσομεν καὶ ταῦτας κατὰ χιασμὸν ἀντεμπλέξαντες ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τὸν περιτόναιον ἰσχυρῶς ἀποσφίγξαντες καὶ πάλιν τὰς ἀρχὰς περιειλήσαντες ἐπισφίγξαντες τῆς γενναίως, ώς μηδὲν τῶν τρεφόντων ἀγγείων ἐτι χορηγεῖν δύνασθαι, ἵνα μὴ ἐντεῦθεν φλεγμονή γένηται, καὶ δεύτερον ἐξωτέρω δεσμόν ἐμβαλοῦμεν ἥττον ἢ δύο δακτύλους ἀπέχοντα τοῦ προτέρου. μετὰ δὲ τούτους τοὺς δεσμοὺς τοῦ περιτόναίου ἄλλον αὐτὸν κατὰ κύκλον ἀποτέμωμεν, συναφαρωνόμενον δηλαδὴ καὶ τὸν δίδυμον, καὶ πάλιν τὴν καθ’ ὑπόρρυσιν τὸν ὀσχέον διαίρεσιν τὸν τε λημνίσκον διεισβαλόντες τὰς ἐλαιοξυρίας καὶ τοὺς ἐπιδέσμους ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν υδροκηλικῶν ἐπιβαλόντες ἄπαντα τὰ λοιπὰ, καθάπερ ἐκεῖσε λέλεκται, διαπραξόμεθα.
39 Mir. 21. Εξηγήσατο καὶ Στέφανος, διάκονος τῆς ἀγιωτάτης Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας καὶ ποιητής μέρους Βενέτου, τουτόν τι. ‘Κατά τῶν διδύμων μου’, φησίν, ‘σπάσμα μοι γέγονεν, εἴτε ἀπὸ κραυγῆς, εἴτε ἀπὸ βάρους, εἰπεῖν οὗκ ἐπίσταμαι’. A rupture caused by lifting a heavy weight was also referred to in Mir. 7 and Mir. 40. Alwis, op. cit., p. 10.

40 Paul. VI.62.3. εἰ δὲ ὁ δίδυμος σήν ἢ ἐτέραν τινά κάκωσιν ἐχὼν εὐρεθείη, δεῖ τὰ ἄγγεια τὰ σῖν τῷ κρεμαστήρι βρόχῳ διαλαβόντας αὐτὸν τὸν κρεμαστήρα διατέμνοντας ἐξελείν τὸν δίδυμον. ... μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καθέντες πυρῆνα μὴ λίθη διὰ τῆς διαφέρεσος κάτω πρὸς τὸ πέρας τοῦ όσχεος δι’ αὐτοῦ τὸν όσχεον κυρτώσαντες ἑκοῖμι σμιλίῳ τὴν καθ’ ὑπόρρυσιν παράσχωνεν τομήν. ἤνα καὶ οἱ θρόμβοι τοῦ αἴματος καὶ τὸ πῦον δι’ αὐτῆς ἐκκρίνοιντο. This measure might be applied after other operations. Celsus, De med. VII.19; Paul. VI.65.3.

41 Paul. VI.65.4. οὗτοι δὲ αὐτοί μετὰ τὴν χειρουργίαν ἐλοῦσιν εὐθὺς τοὺς κάμνοντας ἐν πυέλω μακρᾷ ξυλίνῃ ψεύδων ύδωρ ἐχοῦσιν μέχρι τῆς ἑβδόμης ἡμέρας ἕως πεντάκις τοῦ νυκτημέρου τούτῳ πράττοντες, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῶν παιδίων, καὶ θαυμασίως ἐξέβαινεν ἀφλεγμάντων τοὺς μενόντων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν βρόχων ἀμα τοῖς σώμασι ταχέως ἀποπιπτόντων.

42 Mir. 44. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἀσθενῶν· ‘Οὐαί μοι, ἀπολινῶσαί με ἔχεις καὶ ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας οὐκ ἔνι λῦσαι τὴν ἀπολίνωσιν, ὡς μανθάνω, καὶ ὃ ἐφύγεν δειλιῶν, εἰς αὐτὸ πάλιν’.

43 Mir. 44. ὁ φαινόμενος ιατρός· ‘Σῦρον μόνον’. καὶ ὡς ἔσυρεν ὁ νοσῶν τὴν μίαν ἄρχην, κρατῶν ὁ ἅγιος Ἀρτέμιος τὴν μίαν ἄρχην ἐσυρὼν καὶ ἔδοξεν ἀποτεμεῖν τὸν δίδυμον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πόνου διωπνισθη ἁγωνίων· ‘The one who appeared as the physician said: “Just pull the cord”. And the patient pulled one end, St. Artemios held onto the other end and pulled and he seemed to amputate his testicle and he woke up in agony from the pain’.

44 Alwis, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

45 Mir. 28. καὶ μὴν τοῦτο τὸ εἶδος οἱ κηλογράφοι χειρουργοί ἐντεροκήλην ὀνομάζειν εἰώθασιν· ὅπερ καὶ πλεῖον τῶν ἑτέρων διδυμικῶν νοσημάτων. ‘And to be sure those surgeons who write about hernias are accustomed to call this kind an “intestinal hernia”, which indeed is more severe than other testicular disorders’.

46 Mir. 21.

47 Nesbitt, op. cit., pp. 25-27.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom/disease</th>
<th>Method of physician</th>
<th>Treatment by St. Artemios’ methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Testicular disease</td>
<td>Squeezing the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Foot pain/three hernias</td>
<td>In the guise of a physician/squeezing the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Boil on testicles</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>An incision with a scalpel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Testicular disease</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hernia</td>
<td>Touching the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Testicular disease</td>
<td>In the guise of a physician/squeezing the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hernia (intestinal rupture)</td>
<td>Treading on the stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hernia</td>
<td>Touching pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hernia</td>
<td>Touching the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Testicular disease</td>
<td>Pricking the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Testicular disease</td>
<td>Treading on the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Seven sores on the tip of the penis</td>
<td>Ineffective/contemplating surgery</td>
<td>Advised to apply white vinegar and salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rupture in testicles</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dropsy in chest/hernia</td>
<td>Consultation with a physician/bandage</td>
<td>In the guise of a friend of the patient/touching the skin of the testicle with a scalpel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hernia</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Conversation with the patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Testicular disorder</td>
<td>An advice of testicular amputation</td>
<td>In the guise of a butcher/piercing the patient’s lower abdomen with a knife and arranging the intestines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Swollen testicles</td>
<td>In the guise of a sailing master/putting three nomismata on the stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Intestinal hernia</td>
<td>Grabbing the patient’s right foot, and dangling and shaking the patient upside down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Hernia</td>
<td>Pushing a testicle into the intestines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Intestinal and genital injury</td>
<td>Consultation with a physician</td>
<td>Touching the navel and lower abdomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32' Swelling of two genitals</td>
<td>Touching the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hernia</td>
<td>Planting the hand on the patient’s testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Hernia</td>
<td>A physician demanding 12 nomismata</td>
<td>Placing the hand on the patient’s testicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Hernia</td>
<td>Touching the testicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Many severe diseases</td>
<td>Touching the intestines and belly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Intestinal troubles/swollen left testicle</td>
<td>In the guise of a physician/pushing the testicle gingerly and making the sign of the cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Pain in and swelling of the left testicle</td>
<td>Holding a medical lancet made of gold/tracing a perfect circle over the testicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Swelling of the left testicle</td>
<td>In the guise of a physician/inserting an instrument near the testicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Pain in and swelling of the right testicle</td>
<td>An advice of testicular amputation</td>
<td>In the guise of a physician who performed hernia operations/binding the ligament of the left testicle with a cord and pulling each end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
論文要旨

治療行為としての去勢
—『聖アルテミオスの奇蹟譚』とアエギナのパウロス

紺谷由紀

ビザンツ帝国における去勢行為の目的として、皇帝の宮廷で奉仕する宮廷宦官の供給や政敵の排除、犯罪者に対する処罰などが広く知られている。しかしその一方で、言及は多くないものの、去勢が男性生殖器の疾患を治療する目的で行われていたことが史料から示唆される。この病気治療のための去勢について検討することは、外科手術のような当時の医学的状況に加え、ビザンツ社会における去勢の多様性を理解するうえで重要であると思われる。

7世紀半ば頃に成立したと考えられる『聖アルテミオスの奇蹟譚』（以下『奇蹟譚』）は、聖アルテミオスの遺物が納められたコンスタンティノープルの洗礼者ヨハネ教会を主たる舞台として、聖人の遺物、あるいは患者たちの夢の中で聖人が引き起こしたという治癒の奇蹟にまつわる物語を収録したものである。その大半が生殖器の疾患、特にヘルニアの治癒に関わるものであるため、『奇蹟譚』は治療のための去勢を考察する上での貴重な史料である。しかしその一方で、奇蹟という性質上、治療の叙述は曖昧かつ非現実的な表現が多いことから、『奇蹟譚』における手術の描写と当時の帝国における実際の医療行為との関連性について十分な検討はなされてこなかった。

そこで本稿は、『奇蹟譚』と同時期の人物と考えられている医師アエギナのパウロスの『医学要覧』を用い、彼の説明する生殖器疾患の症状や手術法を、『奇蹟譚』内で語られる医師や聖アルテミオスによる治療と比較することで、曖昧な奇蹟の物語の背後に隠された7世紀ビザンツ社会における治療行為としての去勢の詳細を明らかにすることを試みる。

アエギナのパウロスは、陰嚢水腫、精巣腫瘍、陰囊静脈瘤として現在知られる疾患について、その症状が深刻な場合には精巣の摘除を提案し、さらに腸ヘルニアに至っては、あらゆる場合において精巣摘除によって治療されるうると述べる。また、これらの疾患に関するパウロスの説明と、『奇蹟譚』の登場人物たちの症状や聖アルテミオスが彼らに施した治癒の描写との間には様々な類似点が存在することから、『奇蹟譚』が対象とする病は腸ヘルニアを含む陰囊に関するものであり、『奇蹟譚』で語られた精巣の摘除も単なる
誇張ではなく、現実的な治療法の一つとして想定されていたと考えられる。
『奇蹟譚』の著者がいかにかかる医学的知識を獲得したのかという点に関して断定できないものの、両史料の類似性は、『奇蹟譚』の記述が完全な創作ではないことを意味すると同時に、アエギナのパウロスの『医学要覧』に記された手術法が単なる理論上のものではなく、当時のコンスタンティノープルでも知られ、医師たちにより実行されていた可能性を示唆するものであるといえるだろう。頻繁に行われていたとは言い難いか、『奇蹟譚』は、精巣摘除としての去勢が治療行為として当時の人々に知られており、様々な年齢、社会的地位の患者たちが時に死の危険を冒して手術を受けたことを示しているのである。