

The Serpent and the Medicine

Ancient Healing, the Rod of Asclepius, Pharmakeia, and the Christian Question of Where Healing Comes From

Alisha Bradley, M.A.

October 2026 | Version 1.0

Independent working paper. This paper presents developing hypotheses, research questions, and interdisciplinary inquiry. It has not undergone peer review.

Abstract

The serpent remains one of the most recognizable symbols associated with medicine. Its history reaches into ancient Greek healing traditions centered on Asclepius, where religious ritual, dream incubation, practical treatment, and sacred symbolism existed together. The original Hippocratic Oath likewise invoked Apollo, Asclepius, Hygieia, and Panacea. For a Christian reader, this history raises an important question: what should be made of a medical tradition whose early cultural environment included devotion to gods that Christianity does not recognize as divine? This paper examines that question without making the historical leap that modern medicine is therefore demonic. It distinguishes origin from present function, medicine from idolatry, and treatment from ultimate healing agency. It also examines the Greek pharmakon/pharmakeia word family, the biblical use of pharmakeia for sorcery, the serpent as both a medical and biblical symbol, and the possibility that beliefs about treatment, dependence, fear, expectancy, and divine healing may have measurable psychological and biological consequences. The central proposal is that medicine as instrument and medicine as source are not the same theological proposition.

Author's Note

This paper grows out of a video in which I explored the serpent imagery of medicine, ancient Greek healing cults, the Hippocratic tradition, pharmakeia, and the Christian conviction that healing ultimately comes from God. The video was intentionally theological and devotional. In converting those ideas into a working paper, several historical claims require greater precision. Delphi, not “Deli,” was the sanctuary associated with Apollo and the Pythia. The Python of Greek myth was associated with Delphi; the historical sources reviewed for this paper do not establish a Greek “marine kingdom” as the source of medical healing. The Pythia functioned primarily as an oracle, not as a dispenser of medical remedies. And although Hippocratic medicine had cultural and professional ties to Asclepian tradition, claims of a literal, historically verified bloodline from Apollo to Hippocrates go beyond what the evidence can establish.

Those corrections do not remove the question that originally interested me. Ancient Greek medicine developed in a world in which healing, religion, ritual, gods, sacred serpents, dreams, natural remedies, observation, and emerging rational medicine overlapped. The question is how a Christian framework should understand that inheritance - and, more importantly, how

Christians should distinguish the use of a medical tool from placing ultimate faith in the tool itself.

Why Is There a Serpent in Medicine?

The best-known medical serpent is the Rod of Asclepius: a single serpent entwined around a staff. Asclepius became the Greco-Roman god of medicine, and ancient healing sanctuaries dedicated to him - the Asclepieia - spread across the Mediterranean. Historical and archaeological scholarship describes these sites as places where religious ritual and therapeutic practice were intertwined. Patients could receive practical care while also participating in purification, sacrifice, prayer, sacred sleep, dream interpretation, and other religious practices.

Serpents were closely associated with Asclepius and his sanctuaries. Ancient and modern medical-historical literature describes nonvenomous snakes in Asclepian ritual and identifies the snake-entwined staff as the enduring symbol of the medical profession. Interpretations of the serpent include renewal and regeneration because a snake sheds its skin, as well as mythological associations with Asclepius himself. Whatever interpretation is preferred, the symbol did not originate as a modern pharmaceutical logo. It emerged from an ancient religious-medical world.

A related symbol, the caduceus of Hermes, contains two serpents and wings and is frequently confused with the Rod of Asclepius. The historically medical emblem is the single-serpent Rod of Asclepius. That distinction matters because modern use of serpent imagery is not evidence that contemporary physicians are knowingly participating in an ancient cult. Symbols can survive after the worldview that generated them has changed.

Apollo, Delphi, and the Pythia

Greek mythology linked Apollo with prophecy, plague, purification, and healing. At Delphi, Apollo was associated with the defeat of Python, and the priestess who delivered the Delphic oracle was known as the Pythia. Ancient accounts describe the Pythia entering an altered or inspired state and delivering oracles that were interpreted for those who sought guidance.

For Christian theology, Apollo is not a legitimate god to be worshiped. But historical description and theological interpretation should remain distinct. History can establish that Greeks worshiped Apollo and sought divine guidance at Delphi. Christian theology can then evaluate that worship as idolatry. History by itself cannot establish that Apollo was literally a demon, just as historical method cannot establish that no spiritual agent was involved. That question belongs to the larger interdisciplinary problem explored throughout this Working Paper Series: what can historical, psychological, biological, and theological methods each legitimately claim?

Asclepieia: Ritual and Treatment Together

The Asclepieia are especially important because they resist a simplistic story in which ancient healing was either “pure superstition” or “pure medicine.” Recent historical reviews describe them as organized healing environments where spiritual faith, patient expectation, environmental design, practical therapies, and emerging empirical medicine could operate side

by side. Patients might fast, bathe, exercise, receive massage or other treatment, make offerings, and then sleep in a sacred area in hopes of receiving a healing dream or encounter with Asclepius. This practice is commonly called incubation.

That mixture creates a useful comparison with contemporary health care. A modern clinician may reject the ontology of Asclepian religion while still recognizing that expectation, ritual, relationship, environment, sleep, touch, diet, movement, and meaning can affect human experience and sometimes clinical outcomes. The existence of measurable psychological or physiological mechanisms does not retroactively validate the gods invoked in the ritual. Likewise, identifying religious elements in ancient medicine does not invalidate every practical observation or treatment that emerged from the same culture.

The Hippocratic Oath and Its Gods

The ancient Hippocratic Oath begins by invoking Apollo the physician, Asclepius, Hygieia, Panacea, and the gods and goddesses as witnesses. That fact is not speculative; it is preserved in translations of the oath and in histories of medicine. The invocation located the physician's ethical promise inside the religious world of ancient Greece. The oath then articulated obligations concerning teachers, patients, harm, confidentiality, conduct, and professional responsibility.

Modern medical graduates generally do not swear the ancient oath in its original pagan form. Medical schools that use physician pledges often employ revised or modern versions. It would therefore be historically inaccurate to claim that a contemporary doctor who takes a modern professional oath has automatically entered a covenant with Apollo or Asclepius. The more defensible Christian question is different: What does it mean that part of Western medicine's ethical ancestry emerged in a religious world whose gods Christianity rejects, and which elements of that ancestry remain merely historical rather than spiritually operative?

Pharmakon, Pharmakeia, and a Necessary Distinction

The Greek word family surrounding pharmakon deserves particular care. Pharmakon could refer to a drug, remedy, poison, or substance, depending on context. Pharmakeia likewise has a semantic history involving the administration or use of drugs, poisoning, and magical or sorcerous practices. In Galatians 5:20, pharmakeia appears among the "works of the flesh" and is conventionally translated "sorcery" or "witchcraft." Related language also appears in Revelation in contexts of sorcery.

The etymological relationship between these Greek terms and the modern English words pharmacy and pharmaceutical is real. But etymology alone does not establish moral identity. The fact that pharmacy and pharmakeia share a linguistic ancestry does not mean that filling a prescription is equivalent to practicing the sorcery condemned in Galatians. In the New Testament context, pharmakeia denotes practices of magic or sorcery, not a blanket condemnation of medicinal substances. This distinction is essential if the theological argument is to remain lexically and historically responsible.

The more interesting question is why drugs, poisons, remedies, enchantments, and ritual practices could occupy overlapping semantic territory in the ancient world. That overlap reminds us that ancient societies did not always divide medicine, religion, magic, and pharmacology into the categories modern Western culture now treats as separate.

The Biblical Serpent Complicates the Symbol

For Christians, the serpent cannot be treated as a one-dimensional symbol. Genesis associates the serpent with deception and the fall. Yet Numbers 21:4-9 records God instructing Moses to make a bronze serpent and lift it up so that Israelites who had been bitten could look upon it and live. Centuries later, 2 Kings 18:4 reports that Hezekiah destroyed that same bronze serpent because the people had begun burning incense to it. In John 3:14-15, Jesus invokes the lifted serpent in speaking about the Son of Man being lifted up.

This sequence introduces a theological distinction central to this paper: an instrument through which help is received can become an object of misplaced trust or worship. The bronze serpent was not inherently the source of healing. When it became an object of devotion, its role changed. This does not create a direct biblical analogy to pharmaceuticals, but it provides a theological category for asking whether something beneficial can be used without being treated as ultimate.

Medicine as Instrument, Medicine as Source

My central theological proposition is that medicine as an instrument and medicine as a source are not the same claim. A Christian may receive surgery, medication, rehabilitation, psychotherapy, or other forms of care while believing that God remains the ultimate source of life and healing. In that framework, medicine is neither automatically rejected nor deified. It is evaluated as a human tool whose benefits, limitations, risks, and appropriate uses must be discerned.

This distinction also protects against two opposite errors. One error is medical idolatry: treating a drug, clinician, diagnosis, or health system as though it possesses ultimate authority over life, identity, prognosis, or healing. The other is medical rejectionism: assuming that because ancient medicine developed alongside pagan religion, modern evidence-based treatment should therefore be refused. Neither conclusion follows from the historical record.

The practical Christian question becomes: Can I use this intervention without locating my ultimate hope, identity, or spiritual allegiance in it? That question is theological rather than pharmacological, but it may have psychological consequences worth studying.

Fear, Dependence, and Healing Expectancy

The original video proposed that chronic medical management can sometimes cultivate fear of sickness and a sense of permanent dependence. That proposition should not be universalized. For many people, ongoing medication or monitoring is lifesaving, stabilizing, preventive, or genuinely restorative. Continued treatment is not evidence of spiritual bondage. At the same time, the subjective meaning a patient assigns to treatment may matter. A person can

experience a medication as a useful tool, as evidence that the body is permanently broken, as a source of safety, as a source of fear, or as one component of a larger healing process.

These meanings create testable questions. Health psychology already studies expectancy, illness beliefs, perceived control, treatment adherence, stress, placebo and nocebo effects, and quality of life. A spiritually integrated research program could add questions about divine healing expectancy, religious coping, perceived dependence on treatment, fear of recurrence, and the distinction between receiving medical care and locating ultimate healing agency in medicine.

A Researchable Model

The theological claim that God heals cannot be reduced to expectancy. But expectancy itself can be measured. Future studies could compare patients who share similar diagnoses and treatment regimens but differ in how they conceptualize the source and meaning of healing. Researchers could examine whether spiritually grounded healing expectancy is associated with differences in anxiety, symptom vigilance, autonomic arousal, treatment adherence, perceived control, quality of life, or recovery trajectories.

A stronger design would distinguish several constructs that are often collapsed together: faith in God, confidence in treatment, fear of illness, fear of treatment, perceived medication dependence, spiritual struggle, positive religious coping, healing expectancy, and unrealistic treatment refusal. Doing so would allow researchers to ask whether a person can simultaneously maintain strong Christian healing expectancy and responsible engagement with medical care.

Primary Research Questions

1. How did religious ritual, practical treatment, dream incubation, and emerging empirical medicine interact within the Asclepieia?
2. What historical pathways led the Rod of Asclepius to remain a medical symbol after the decline of explicit Asclepian worship?
3. How should the pharmakon/pharmakeia word family be interpreted across classical Greek, biblical Greek, medical, magical, and toxicological contexts?
4. Does the New Testament use of pharmakeia support a distinction between ordinary medicinal use and drug-associated sorcery or magical practice?
5. How do Christian patients distinguish medicine as an instrument from medicine as the ultimate source of healing?
6. Are fear of illness, perceived treatment dependence, and healing expectancy associated with measurable differences in stress physiology, symptom perception, adherence, or quality of life?
7. Can strong belief in divine healing coexist with appropriate medical treatment without increasing unsafe treatment refusal?
8. Do spiritually integrated interventions alter nocebo-like expectations, catastrophic illness beliefs, or hypervigilance while preserving responsible medical decision-making?

9. How can researchers distinguish theological trust from denial, spiritual hope from unrealistic certainty, and treatment discernment from medically dangerous disengagement?

10. What would a Christian model of healing look like that recognizes prayer, spiritual agency, biological processes, clinicians, medicines, surgery, behavior, and community without confusing instrument with source?

Research Boundaries

This paper does not establish that modern medicine or pharmacology is demonic because ancient Greek medicine developed within a pagan religious culture. It does not establish that the serpent symbol proves ongoing spiritual allegiance to Asclepius, that contemporary physicians are participating in ancient worship, or that pharmaceuticals are equivalent to the pharmakeia condemned as sorcery in the New Testament. Shared etymology is not sufficient evidence for those conclusions.

The paper also does not recommend stopping medication, avoiding physicians, discontinuing psychiatric treatment, or replacing necessary medical care with prayer alone. Medication can relieve symptoms, prevent complications, treat disease, stabilize psychiatric conditions, and in some cases contribute directly to remission or cure. Whether a particular treatment should be started, changed, or stopped is a clinical question that depends on the treatment and the individual patient.

My theological position is that healing ultimately belongs to God and that Christians should guard against idolatry in every domain, including health. My research question is whether the way people locate healing agency - in God, in themselves, in clinicians, in treatments, or in some combination - has measurable consequences for cognition, emotion, physiology, behavior, and recovery.

Working Proposition

The history of medicine does not require Christians to choose between faith and medical care. It requires a more precise distinction. Ancient medicine demonstrates that healing practices have always carried beliefs about what the human person is, where illness comes from, and where healing power resides. Modern medicine has changed dramatically, but those deeper questions remain.

The serpent on the medical staff is therefore useful not because it proves a hidden modern covenant, but because it forces the question into view: What do we believe is healing us?

My working proposition is that medicine can be received as an instrument without becoming an object of ultimate trust. For Christian theology, the physician may treat, the medicine may act, the surgery may repair, and the body may respond - while God remains the ultimate source of life. The empirical question that follows is whether this distinction in belief changes the experience and trajectory of illness in ways that can be measured.

References

Angeletti, L. R., Agrimi, U., Curia, C., French, D., & Mariani-Costantini, R. (1992). Healing rituals and sacred serpents. *The Lancet*, 340(8813), 223-225.

Karagiorgou, A., Michaleas, S. N., Dimitriadis, I., Marinos, G., & Karamanou, M. (2026). Sacred healing in ancient Greece: The Asclepieia as early holistic health care systems at the intersection of religion and medicine. *Journal of Religion and Health*. Advance online publication.

Maltezou, H. C., et al. (2024). Asclepieia in ancient Greece: Pilgrimage and healing destinations, the forerunner of medical tourism. *Journal of Religion and Health* / historical review. PMID: PMC10917557.

National Library of Medicine. (2002/2022). Greek Medicine: The Hippocratic Oath and Asclepius. U.S. National Library of Medicine, History of Medicine Division.

Papageorgiou, M. G. (1975). Incubation as a form of psychotherapy in the care of patients in ancient and modern Greece. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 26(1), 35-38.

Ramoutsaki, I. A., Haniotakis, S., & Tsatsakis, A. M. (2000). The snake as the symbol of medicine, toxicology and toxinology. *Veterinary and Human Toxicology*, 42(5), 306-308.

Thayer, J. H. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, entry φαρμακεία (pharmakeia), Strong's 5331.

The Holy Bible, New King James Version. Numbers 21:4-9; 2 Kings 18:4; John 3:14-15; Galatians 5:20; Revelation 9:21; 18:23.

© 2026 Alisha Bradley. All rights reserved.