

This paper examines the lovesickness of four of Greek poetry's most famous lovers: Sappho (fr. 31), Euripides' Phaedra (*Hippolytus*), Theocritus' Simaetha (*Idyll 2*), and Apollonius' Medea (*Argonautica*, book 3). Although this brief examination cannot pretend to be comprehensive, such a broad sample of periods and genres (Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic; Lyric, Tragedy, Pastoral, and Epic) permits us to observe how Greek poets began using medical thought more and more, and how they adapted it to the ends of their genres. The catalogue of symptoms experienced by Apollonius' Medea, in the end, allows us to see most clearly the result of this development.

Sappho reports nine symptoms of love, including the pallor (*χλωροτέρα*) that would be elaborated by much later medical writers (e.g., Ferrand, Sydenham) into a bogus disease (*chlorosis*), based upon misreadings of both Sappho and Hippocrates (W. H. Race *CA* 1983, 92–101; H. King 1998, 188–204). The main symptom of this disease was supposed to be 'greenness,' the main cause virginal envy, and the main remedy sex. Despite the illegitimacy of the diagnosis, however, girls suffered from its symptoms for four hundred years—an instructive example of the influence of medical theory upon culture that serves us well when we come to Apollonius' Medea.

Before coming to her, this paper examines Phaedra and Simaetha, each one producing more elaborate, and more specifically medical symptoms. Parallels for some of Phaedra's eleven symptoms, for instance, can be found in Hippocrates' *Epidemics* as well as in Thucydides' description of the Athenian plague (a description that is itself indebted to Hippocratic medicine). As for Simaetha, Giangrande (*AMal* 1990, 121–123) has called her portrait the *locus classicus* of "medizinische Genauigkeit." By our count, she suffers from sixteen symptoms of love. We find that eight of these repeat symptoms experienced by Sappho and Phaedra, while eight of them are novel. Giangrande has argued that these are the symptoms of consumption found in Hippocrates and Galen. There are weaknesses in this argument, but fortunately there is no need to quarry a precise diagnosis from the medical authors: instead of choosing symptoms for their medical verisimilitude, Theocritus seems to be choosing them to suit his pastoral genre. Hair-loss, for example, represents a quintessential loss of youthful beauty (Brown *CQ* 1984, 38).

If lovesickness is a disease, Apollonius' Medea is in critical condition. She suffers from thirty-six symptoms. These symptoms are very specific, particularly as they afflict her mind (Apollonius has her suffer in her *θυμός* 284, *καρδίη* 287, *φρένες* 289, *κῆρ* 446, *νόος* 447, *πραπίδες* 765, and *ψυχή* 1016). Like his predecessors in the poetic diagnosis of love, Apollonius synthesizes the symptoms of earlier poetic lovers as well as those described by medical writers. Most peculiar of all is the pain in the base of her skull—her *νείατον ἰνίον* 762–763, or literally, her lowest occiput—which appropriates at least the recent anatomical discoveries of Herophilus (Solmsen *MH* 1961, 150–197). This paper concludes by recalling the influence of medicine upon culture and then suggesting that in addition to exhibiting his anatomical sophistication Apollonius may also be describing a real symptom of a bogus disease not unlike *chlorosis*.