CHAPTER THREE

RHETORIC AND MEDICINE IN THE HIPPOCRATIC CORPUS. A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF RHETORIC IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

The second half of the fifth century BC is characterised by the birth and development of various arts, or τέχναι.¹ Amongst these arts, rhetoric and medicine do not seem to share anything in common: one of them is the art of persuasion with speech, the other is the art of healing bodies with medicine. However, there were close relationships and reciprocal influences between these two arts. The influence of medicine on rhetoric is well-known. In the fifth century, Gorgias, in his *Encomium of Helen*, compared the power of speech on the soul with the power of drugs, φάρμακα, on the body.² And Plato, in both his *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*, takes medicine in general, and Hippocrates in particular, as a model to define the aims and method of genuine rhetoric.³ However, despite its evidence and importance, the reverse relationship of the influence of rhetoric on medicine is currently poorly understood. It is this rhetorical aspect of medical literature that I would like to stress; more precisely, I would like to show that knowledge of certain works of the Hippocratic Corpus is indispensable for the history of rhetoric during its initial development in the fifth century.

¹ See, for example, A.-J. Festugière, *Hippocrate. L'Ancienne Médecine (Introduction, traduction et commentaire)* (Études et commentaires, 4) (Paris, 1948), p. 32.

² Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen* DK 82 B 11 (14) = Radermacher 39 (14). See, for example, J. de Romilly, *Magic and Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), pp. 20–21. We recall that Gorgias had close links with the medical world; see Plato *Gorgias* 456b (quoted *infra*, p. 51).

³ Plato, *Gorgias*, *passim*, from 464a; *Phaedrus* 270 b ff. There is a substantial bibliography on this passage in the *Phaedrus*. See, for example, the different points of view of R. Joly, "La question hippocratique et le témoignage de Phèdre," *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 74 (1961), 69 ff. and J. Jouanna, "La Collection hippocratique et Platon (Phèdre, 269c–272a)," *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 90 (1977), 15 ff. R. Joly, "Platon, Phèdre et Hippocrate: vingt ans après," in F. Lasserre and Ph. Mudry (eds.), *Formes de pensée dans la Collection hippocratique* (Actes du IV^e Colloque international hippocratique, Lausanne, 21–26 septembre 1981) (Lausanne, 1983), pp. 407–421, with the comments by J. Jouanna, *ibid.* p. 422. See also F. Robert, "En marge du Colloque hippocratique de Lausanne: du nouveau sur Hippocrate et le Phèdre," *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 95 (1982), xviii–xxii.

The history of the origins of Greek rhetoric is a frustrating topic, due to the great contrast between the abundance of testimonia about the men and their works and the rarity of preserved texts. As with other arts, the birth of rhetoric was marked by the publication of treatises that defined its conditions and rules. Although we know the names of authors such as Tisias, Thrasymachus and Theodorus, amongst others, as well as indications of the content of their works, notably thanks to Plato's *Phaedrus*,⁴ we do not possess any of these theoretical works. If we refer to the traditional corpus, judicial speeches from the fifth century preserved in their entirety are limited to school exercises and the speeches of Antiphon, as well as Gorgias' *Defence of Palamedes*, and epideictic speeches to Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*, to which we should probably add Ps.-Xenophon's *Constitution of Athens*. No example survives of the political speeches, known indirectly through the reconstructed speeches of Thucydides.⁵ According to this traditional corpus, then, there exist only one or two examples of epideictic speeches from the fifth century. However, we possess two other fully preserved epideictic speeches that date from the same period and that are composed, just like Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*, according to the rules of rhetoric. In a strange twist of fate, the very reason that explains their survival also explains why they are unknown to specialists of rhetoric. These epideictic speeches have been transmitted faithfully to us not because of their genre, but rather because of their content, for they are about medicine. And if specialists of rhetoric neglect or do not know these speeches, whose rhetorical qualities are undeniable, it is because they have been passed down as part of a vast medical collection, the Hippocratic Corpus, where they are surrounded by other works that sometimes do not have any rhetorical character. These two epideictic speeches, of unknown authorship, are the treatise *Breaths*, which shows that all illnesses, in spite of their diversity, originate from a single source, the air, and the treatise *The Art*, which constitutes a speech in defence of medicine by refuting its detractors.⁶

⁴ Plato *Phaedrus* 266e–267c.

⁵ On the bibliography concerning classical rhetoric, see the article by R. Weil in *Association Guillaume Budé*, Actes du XIe Congrès (Pont-à-Mousson, 29 août–2 septembre 1983), I: Rapports, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1985, pp. 13–61.

⁶ *Breaths* and *The Art* were edited and translated by É. Littré, *Œuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, t. VI (Paris, 1849), pp. 2–26 (*The Art*) and pp. 90–115 (*Breaths*). However, this edition is now outdated because Littré was not aware of all the ancient manuscripts. A more recent critical edition, based on the ancient manuscripts, is that of I.L. Heiberg, *Hippocratis opera*, CMG I, 1 (Berlin, 1927), pp. 9–19 (*The Art*) and pp. 91–101 (*Breaths*). It was preceded by two separate editions and commentaries based on the ancient manuscripts: Th. Gomperz, *Die*

The Art and *Breaths* are not the only works in the Hippocratic Corpus likely to have been spoken out loud before an audience. They form part of a larger group of oral works, i.e. works that were composed to be read aloud, even if they subsequently circulated in written form. Since *The Art* and *Breaths* both display features common to the oral works of the Corpus, we must first highlight these common traits, i.e. those features that allow us to define this group of oral works, before demonstrating the original place both *The Art* and *Breaths* occupy within this group thanks to their rhetorical quality.

The author of *Ancient Medicine* clearly attests that there exist within the medical literature, alongside written treatises, some treatises that were read out loud before an audience; he begins his treatise with the following words: “All those who have undertaken to speak (λέγειν) or write (γράφειν) about medicine.”⁷ The contrast between λέγειν, ‘to speak’, and γράφειν, ‘to write’, proves without any doubt the existence of two distinct categories of medical works. Specialists of the Hippocratic Corpus are convinced that it has preserved works meant for oral delivery. For example, Festugière, in his introduction to *Ancient Medicine*, acknowledges four treatises that he calls ‘programmatic speeches’: *Ancient Medicine*, *The Art*, *Breaths* and *Nature of Man*.⁸ However, this selection of works remains somewhat impressionistic. It is now possible to adopt a more scientific approach to the problem by using the complete index of the Hippocratic Corpus.⁹ The distinction between the two categories of written and oral works can be made within the Hippocratic Corpus by means of the criterion of what I call ‘internal references’. Within the works included in the Hippocratic Corpus—I pass over the numerous works in the form of notes or aphorisms—the authors

Apologie der Heilkunst: eine griechische Sophistenrede des 5. vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1910) (Introduction, text and commentary, German translation and extensive commentary); A. Nelson, *Die hippokratische Schrift Περὶ φουσῶν. Text und Studien* (Uppsala, 1909) (Introduction, text and commentary. Latin translation and critical commentary). [Postscript: The most recent critical edition of *Breaths* and *The Art* is now: J. Jouanna, *Hippocrate. Des vents. De l'art* (Paris, 1988).]

⁷ *Ancient Medicine*, ch. 1, 1.570 L. (= Heiberg 3, 1).

⁸ A.-J. Festugière, *Hippocrate. L'ancienne médecine (Introduction, traduction et commentaire)* (Études et commentaires, 4) (Paris, 1948), pp. viii–xiii (II. L' Ancienne Médecine discours programme).

⁹ This is the index created by the Laboratoire de recherches hippocratiques in the Université Laval, Quebec: *Concordantia in Corpus Hippocraticum. Concordance des Oeuvres Hippocratiques*. Éditée par Gilles Maloney et Winnie Frohn. Avec la collaboration de Paul Potter. 5 Vols. and one Supplement (Hildesheim 1986–1989). * [Postscript: In addition, there now is the *Index Hippocraticus*, ed. by K. Alpers, A. Anastassiou, D. Irmer and V. Schmid, 4 Vols. and one supplement (Göttingen 1989–2007) and of course the electronic Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.]

frequently make internal references, either to what they have already discussed or to what they are going to discuss. For these internal references, apart from neutral verbs whose meaning can convey either written or oral activity (such as φράζειν, 'to explain', or δηλοῦν, 'to show'), we find terms related to λέγειν or γράφειν. It is clear that all the treatises in which the author references his own work by using terms related to γράφειν are written treatises. Thus, we are assured of the presence in the Hippocratic Corpus of more than twenty treatises, often very extensive, which were composed directly for written publication.¹⁰ To determine the group of oral works (which concerns us here), we would like to be able to apply a similarly reliable criterion as for the written works and say that all the works in which the author uses, to refer to his own work, systematically and exclusively words relating to λέγειν or its synonyms, were composed to be read aloud. Unfortunately, the criterion is not absolutely decisive because, even in the internal references to written works, terms related to λέγειν can be used alongside those related to γράφειν. For example, in the surgical treatise *On Fractures*, which is a written work, an internal reference uses both γράφειν and λέγειν: "this has already been said in what was previously written" (εἴρηται μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐν τοῖσι πρόσθεν γεγραμμένοισιν).¹¹ These uses of λέγειν in written prose, without doubt a heritage from oral prose, lend ambiguity to its meaning. Given this ambiguity, we cannot be absolutely certain that the works which systematically and exclusively use terms related to λέγειν or its synonyms were composed to be read aloud before an audience. Nevertheless, only these works were likely to have been read orally, and these are the works that we will call oral works. A precise inventory adds five other works to the four treatises that Festugière considered as speeches: two of the best known fifth-century treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus, *Airs, Waters, Places* and *The Sacred Disease*, the treatise *Nature of the Child*, a treatise on illnesses (= *Diseases 4*) and a treatise *Diseases of Women*, partially preserved in the gynaecological treatises.¹² What strengthens the impression

¹⁰ Here is the list. The texts are quoted according to the order of Littré's edition. Vol. 2: *Prognostic, Regimen in Acute Diseases, Epidemics 1*. Vol. 3: *Epidemics 3, Wounds in the Head, Fractures*. Vol. 4: *Joints, Mochlicon*. Vol. 5: *Epidemics 2, 5, 6, 7*. Vol. 6: *Affections, Places in Man, Wounds, Regimen*. Vol. 7: *Internal Affections, Nature of Women, Seven Month's Child*, part of *Eight Month's Child* (though this is uncertain because the only passage where we find the verb γράφω is thought by some to be interpolated). Vol. 8: *Diseases of Women 1 and 2* (with the reservation that this is a heterogeneous collection; see below, p. 43, n. 12), *Glands*. Vol. 9: *Prorrhetic 2, Physician, Crisis, Critical Days*.

¹¹ *On Fractures*, ch. 25, 3.498,7 f. L. (= Kuehlewein 82,11 f.).

¹² The title *Nature of the Child during Birth* is given by the author himself in two internal

that the treatises of this group were first pronounced in the form of an oral presentation or speech is the importance of the first person, which serves to reinforce the presence of the speaker before his audience. In all the treatises of this group, without exception, we frequently find the use of verbs in the first person, if necessary supported by the presence of ἐγώ or ἔγωγε. Although the use of the first person is present in certain written treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus, the predominance of the use of the first person in the oral works is obvious when we make an inventory of the verb φημί, 'I say'. This form is more significant for our purpose since it adds nothing to the meaning of the phrase, but has the unique role of emphasising the affirmations of the author. In the 49 instances of φημί in the first person attested in the Hippocratic Corpus, 39 are found in the group of oral works, a ratio of 80%. This is all the more remarkable since this group represents only a small part of the Hippocratic Corpus; what is more remarkable still is that each treatise from the group of oral works delineated by the criterion of internal references uses φημί in the first person.¹³

references (*Diseases of Women* 1, ch. 1, 8.10,7f. L. ἐν τῇ φύσει τοῦ παιδίου τοῦ ἐν τόκῳ and ch. 73 *ibid.* 152,22–154,1; cf. also ch. 44, *ibid.*, 102,5f. with a variant reading). This work, which should be read as one whole, was divided in the manuscript tradition into two treatises (*Generation and Nature of the Child*). The treatise *Diseases* (= the current *Diseases* 4 of our manuscripts) forms a separate whole. Littré had reason to adopt a continuous numeration of *Generation / Nature of the Child*; but he was wrong to continue this numeration for *Diseases* 4; since the author himself quotes his work *Nature of the Child during Birth* as a whole, there is no reason to go against what he says; see the comparable position, but with different arguments, of I.M. Lonie, *The Hippocratic Treatises 'On Generation', 'On the Nature of the Child', 'Diseases IV'* (Ars Medica/Abteilung 2, Griechisch-lateinische Medizin 7) (Berlin, 1981), p. 43ff. R. Joly (*Hippocrate, De la génération, De la nature de l'enfant, Des Maladies IV, Du Foetus de huit mois* [Collection des universités de France] [Paris, 1970], p. 11f.) highlighted the oral character of these texts; according to him, *Generation / Nature of the Child* and *Diseases* 4 form two ἀκρόασεις that were subsequently reunited in their publication; but then why did the author preserve, in this case, the title *Nature of the Child during Birth* as an internal reference in the written version? The title of the third ἀκρόασις of the author, *Diseases of Women*, is also known to us by internal references (*Generation / Nature of the Child*, ch. 4, 7.476,15f. L. = Joly 47,28f.; ch. 15, *ibid.* 496,9f. L. = Joly 58,22; *Diseases* 4, ch. 57 (ch. 26), 7.612 L. = Joly 124,1f.) H. Grensemann (*Knidische Medizin I*, [Ars Medica/Abteilung 2, Griechisch-lateinische Medizin 4] [Berlin, 1975]) has correctly and clearly determined the preserved fragments in the gynaecological treatises (what he calls layer C); he published these fragments in *Hippokratische Gynaekologie* (Wiesbaden, 1982).

¹³ Here is a list of the thirty-nine uses of φημί in the oral works: *Ancient Medicine* 4; *Nature of Man* 4; *The Sacred Disease* 3; *Airs, Waters, Places* 2; *The Art* 2; *Breaths* 1; in the three other oral works composed by the same author, the form φημί is more frequent again: *Nature of the Child during Birth* (= *Gen./Nat. Child*) 6; *Diseases* 4.12; *Diseases of Women* (layer C of *Diseases of Women* and *Sterile women*) 5. The use of φημί in the written treatises is far less frequent: *Eight Month's Child* 2 (but this could be an oral work, see *supra* p. 42, n. 10); *Regimen in Acute Diseases* 1.2; *Regimen* 1; *The Heart*, with three instances of its use, is an exception, but it is

Thus, these are some of the formal characteristics that assure the unity of the group.

Despite this unity, there is unquestionably diversity. We can distinguish two categories within the oral works of the Hippocratic Corpus: a didactic oral speech, or 'course', and an epidictic oral speech, or 'discourse'. The best representatives of the first category ('courses') are the treatises *Airs, Waters, Places* and *The Sacred Disease*, and two texts written by the same author, *Generation/Nature of the Child* and *Diseases 4*. The only true representatives of the second category (epidictic speeches) are, as I said at the start, *The Art* and *Breaths*.¹⁴

An initial difference is the length of the oral speech. The 'discourses' contrast with the 'courses' on account of their brevity. The 'courses' preserved in the Hippocratic Corpus require between one hour and ten minutes and one and a half hours to be read out loud. These are lectures where the author enters into great detail, aiming at clarity and not effect. There is a significant phrase by the author of *Nature of the Child*, ch. 18: "But I am going to repeat it for more clarity" (μέλλω δὲ δεύτερον νῦν ὀνομάζειν σαφηνίης εἴνεκα).¹⁵ This phrase seems to imply the oral speech of a teacher who was not, unlike the orator, under pressure from the water clock. Conversely, the two epidictic discourses, *The Art* and *Breaths*, last no longer than twenty-eight and thirty minutes respectively. They are short communications that aim to win over the audience by their brevity and brilliance.

a late treatise. The use of the first person future of ἐρέω also appears almost exclusively in oral works: twenty-five instances of use in a total of twenty-seven in the entire Hippocratic Corpus; but the usage is split differently within oral works: twenty cases in the three treatises of the same author and two in the *Airs, Waters, Places*. As for the use of the first person present of λέγω, it is used twelve times in the oral works: *Ancient Medicine* 5; *Diseases* 4.4; *Nature of Man* 2; *The Art* 1. However, it is also found in the written works, particularly in *Prorrhetic* 2 (four or five times!), where the first person forms λέγω and γράφω are found side by side in the same sentence (ch. 4, 9.20, 10f. L.). If we look at the total use of φημί, ἐρέω and λέγω, leaving to one side the ambiguous case of *Eight Month's Child*, we find seventy-six instances in oral works, compared to twenty-three in the rest of the Hippocratic Corpus. This represents a total of 84.45%.

¹⁴ We can associate two other treatises with the category of discourses, but they do not present all of the characteristics. *Nature of Man* begins like a polemical discourse addressed to a large audience (ch. 1, 6.32, 1–3 L. = Jouanna p. 164, 3–5), but then turns into a technical speech. *Ancient Medicine* also begins with a long polemical introduction (ch. 1 and 2, 1.570, 1–572, 15f. L. = Heiberg 36, 2–37, 6) which precedes the announcement of the subject (ch. 2, 1.572, 15f. L. = Heiberg 37, 7f.); because of this start, it is allied with the category of discourses, but it does not finish with a *peroratio*, unlike the discourses of *Breaths* and *The Art*.

¹⁵ *Nat. Child*, ch. 18, 7.504, 2f. L. (= July 63, 1f.).

A second, more fundamental, difference concerns the beginning and end of the oral speech. In order to begin his lesson, the author of a 'course' does not concern himself with rhetoric. A single phrase will suffice. For example, the start of the treatise *Airs, Waters, Places*: "For anyone who wishes to undertake the correct study of medicine, here is what he must do" (Ἰητρικὴν ὅστις βούλεται ὀρθῶς ζητεῖν, τάδε χρὴ ποιεῖν).¹⁶ There follows the discussion of the subject, i.e. the listing of factors that the itinerant doctor, who arrives in an unknown city, should take into account to carry out correctly his profession. The beginning of the 'course' *Nature of the Child* (= *Gen./Nat. Child*) is also laconic, but more to the point. The speech begins with an elegant formula, which is a variant of the famous maxim, Νόμος μὲν πάντα κρατύνει, 'law governs everything'. Then the author, eager to start his topic, continues, without slowing pace: "The seed of man comes from every humour in the body; it is the strongest part, which is separated from the rest."¹⁷ If we now examine the start of the two epidictic speeches of *The Art* and *Breaths*, the contrast is obvious. Both begin with a long introduction (thirteen lines of the Littré edition of *The Art*; thirty lines of *Breaths*). The introduction in both discourses is concerned with general ideas, which prepare and precede the declaration of the subject. In *The Art*, we find wise reflections that still apply today, on competence, incompetence and jealousy in the discipline. Here is an extract:

In my opinion, to discover something that was unknown before and, once discovered, makes things better than if it had not been discovered, is the ambition and work of intelligence, as is to bring to fruition something that was half completed. Conversely, to strive, thanks to the art of speeches, which has nothing honourable about it, to discredit that which was discovered by others, without adding anything better, but slandering discoveries to those who do not know better, is not, in my opinion, the ambition and work of intelligence; on the contrary, it is a detrimental sign of nature, or an ignorance of the art.¹⁸

In the introduction to *Breaths*, we find reflections on the art of medicine and the difficult, yet rewarding, job of a doctor. A passage of this introduction delighted both Christians and pagans in Late Antiquity, from Plutarch to Eustathius, including Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Isidore of Pelusium, Simplicius, to name some of the best known. Here is the passage: "The doctor sees terrible things,

¹⁶ *Airs, Waters, Places*, ch. 1, 2.12,1 L. (= Diller p. 24,1).

¹⁷ *Gen/Nat. Child*, ch. 1, 7.470,1 L. (= Joly p. 44,1).

¹⁸ *The Art*, ch. 1, 6.2,3–10 L. (= Heiberg p. 9,4–11).

touches horrible things and the misfortunes of others bring a harvest of sorrows that are peculiarly his" ('Ο μέν γάρ ἰητρὸς ὀρεῖ τε δεινά, θιγγάνει τε ἀηδέων, ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίῃσί τε συμφορῇσιν ἰδίας καρποῦται λύπας).¹⁹ We can compare these two introductions not only for their length or for the presence of general reflections, but also for the way in which they begin. Both start with Εἰσι τινες, followed by a relative clause (*Breaths*: Εἰσι τινες τῶν τεχνέων αἵ, "there are some arts which"; *The Art*: Εἰσι τινες οἱ, "there are people who"). The relative clause in the speech of *The Art* straightaway describes its opponents in a striking phrase: "There are some people who make an art out of discrediting arts" (Εἰσι τινες οἱ τέχνην πεποίηνται τὸ τὰς τέχνας αἰσχροεπεῖν). Hearing this beginning of a polemical introduction, specialists in rhetoric are quick to compare the two speeches of Isocrates, that of the *Encomium of Helen*: Εἰσι τινες οἱ μέγα φρονοῦσι 'there are some men who are immensely proud', and that of *Nicocles*: Εἰσι τινες οἱ δυσκόλως ἔχουσι 'there are some men who become annoyed'. The similarity between how these four speeches begin is probably not due to chance; it very likely attests the existence of a rhetorical procedure practised in the fifth century.

The contrast between 'courses' and 'discourses' is just as clear at the end of the speech as it is at the start. 'Courses' end just as abruptly as they started, with a short concluding phrase, often too general to be appropriated to the subject. Here is the end of *Airs, Waters, Places*: "From these observations, you may judge the rest without error" (ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων τεκμαιρόμενος τὰ λοιπὰ ἐνθυμείσθαι καὶ οὐχ ἁμαρτήσῃ).²⁰ The end of the 'course' *Nature of the Child* is even less rhetorical; the last sentence signals quite simply that the speech is finished: "This speech, spoken in full, is ended" (Οὗτος ὁ λόγος ὧδε εἰρημένος ἅπας τέλος ἔχει).²¹ By contrast, the two 'discourses' of *The Art* and *Breaths* have long conclusions (seven lines in the Littré edition of *The Art* and eight lines of *Breaths*). This conclusion obeys the rules of rhetoric. All the theories of rhetoric of the fifth century, as Plato clarifies in *Phaedrus*, 267 d, agree in saying that the conclusion of a speech should remind the audience of the points of the subject that was discussed. In both *The Art* and *Breaths*, the conclusion effectively recalls the points demonstrated. For example, the start of the conclusion of *Breaths*: "Thus, it is clear that breaths are the most

¹⁹ *Breaths*, ch. 1, 6.90,4–6 L. (= Heiberg 91,5–7). For the testimonia relating to this passage, see J. Frings in *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften* 43 (1959), 1–12, with the further comments of K. Schubring, "Übersehene Zitate," *Hermes* 88 (1960), 451–455.

²⁰ *Airs, Waters, Places*, ch. 24, 2.92,11–13 L. (= Diller 24,3).

²¹ *Generation/Nature of the Child*, ch. 32, 7.542,1–2 L. (= Joly 83,26f.).

active agents in all diseases. Everything else is a concomitant and secondary cause. I have demonstrated that this is where the cause of diseases lies. I had promised to demonstrate the cause of diseases. I have shown that air exercises its sovereignty over the universe and over living beings.”²² The conclusion of the *The Art* begins similarly: “Thus, that medicine contains within it plentiful reason to bring help and that it rightly does not treat diseases that it cannot heal, or treat patients it does treat without error, is shown by the words pronounced here.”²³ It is not only the reminder to the audience of the points talked about that these two epilogues have in common; it is also the desire to convince. The two authors are intent on highlighting that they have demonstrated the thesis that they announced at the start. In the two conclusions, terms of demonstration are piled up. The verb ἐπιδείκνυμι is used twice in the conclusion of *Breaths* and once in *The Art*,²⁴ which also uses δηλώω, ‘to show’, and ἐπίδειξις, ‘demonstration’. Thus, they can be counted as two epidictic speeches.

These two epidictic speeches are distinguished from the ‘courses’ not only by their length and methods of composition, but also by their style. If we take the distinction made by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* between the two categories of style, we can say that the ‘courses’ are more characterised by λέξις εἰρομένη, and the ‘discourses’ by λέξις κατεστραμμένη.²⁵ As an example of λέξις εἰρομένη (i.e. a style that is free-running, unless there is no more to say on the subject), Aristotle quotes the start of Herodotus’ *Histories*: Ἡροδότου Θουρίου ἥδ’ ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις. We could also quote the start of a Hippocratic ‘course’, *The Sacred Disease*: Περὶ τῆς ἱερῆς νόσου καλεομένης ὧδε ἔχει, “Concerning the disease called sacred, here is what there is to say.”²⁶ The use of λέξις κατεστραμμένη (i.e. the periodic style) is present in some ‘courses’, notably the *The Sacred Disease* and, to a lesser extent, *Airs, Waters, Places*.²⁷ However, the speeches of *Breaths* and *The Art* are different from all the other treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus for their systematic use of λέξις κατεστραμμένη. The principal characteristic of the periodic style is the use of antithesis, which contrasts two parts of a sentence of the same length

²² *Breaths*, ch. 15, 6.114,13–17 L. (= Heiberg 101,16–20).

²³ *The Art*, ch. 13, 6.26,6–9 L. (= Heiberg 19,3–6).

²⁴ *Breaths*, ch. 15, 6.114,15 and 16 L. (= Heiberg 101,18 and 19); *The Art*, ch. 13, 6.26,10 L. (= Heiberg 19,7).

²⁵ Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1409a28 ff.

²⁶ *The Sacred Disease*, ch. 1, 6.352,1 L. (= Grensemann 60,1).

²⁷ See, for example, in *The Sacred Disease*, the antithesis of ch. 1, 6.352,5–8 L. (= Grensemann 60,6f.).

(*pariosis*) that end with the same sound (*paromoiosis*). The introduction of *Breaths* alone presents six examples of this; one of the most representative is the famous definition that it gives of medicine: “For medicine is subtraction and addition: subtraction of what is in excess, addition of what is lacking” (ἡτρικὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀφαίρεσις καὶ πρόσθεσις, ἀφαίρεσις μὲν τῶν πλεοναζόντων, πρόσθεσις δὲ τῶν ἐλλειπόντων).²⁸ The antithetic parts introduced by μὲν and δὲ are of comparable length (eleven and nine syllables), and they end with the same sounds (πλεοναζόντων / ἐλλειπόντων); and each part comprises two cola which are opposed in meaning and correspond in sound: ἀφαίρεσις μὲν—πρόσθεσις δὲ, and τῶν πλεοναζόντων—τῶν ἐλλειπόντων. A concerted use of *pariosis* and *paromoiosis* also characterises *The Art*. For example, here is a discussion ironically showing the theory of opponents who, in the case of the patient’s death, place responsibility on the doctor and excuse the patient: “In this way, for doctors it is possible to prescribe something that is not appropriate; but for patients it is not possible to contravene what is prescribed” (ὥς τοῖσι μὲν ἡτροῖσιν ἔνεστι τὰ μὴ δέοντα ἐπιτάξαι, τοῖσι δὲ νοσέουσιν οὐκ ἔστι τὰ προσταχθέντα παραβῆναι).²⁹ The antithetic parts introduced by μὲν and δὲ are exactly the same length (nineteen syllables) and end in homoeoteleuton (ἐπιτάξαι—παραβῆναι). Each part is divided into four cola which correspond in pairs by perfectly respecting the laws of *pariosis* and *paromoiosis*: first group of cola, seven syllables τοῖσι μὲν ἡτροῖσιν—τοῖσι δὲ νοσέουσιν; second group of cola, three syllables ἔνεστι—οὐκ ἔστι; third group, five syllables τὰ μὴ δέοντα—τὰ προσταχθέντα; fourth group of cola, four syllables ἐπιτάξαι—παραβῆναι.

To confirm the rhetorical character of these two speeches, we should compare them to two other epideictic speeches from the fifth century that have been preserved, particularly Gorgias’ *Encomium of Helen*. A comparison between *Breaths* and the *Encomium of Helen* was actually undertaken at the end of the last century in two studies published in 1887, an article by E. Maass in the journal *Hermes*, and a chapter in the *Attische Beredsamkeit* by F. Blass.³⁰ Having been revived at the start of the twentieth century by E. Norden in his work on ancient artistic prose,³¹ this comparison was very quickly forgotten. Wolf Aly, in his *Formprobleme der frühen griechischen*

²⁸ *Breaths*, ch. 1, 6.92,11–13 L. (= Heiberg 92,8–10).

²⁹ *The Art*, ch. 7, 6.10,19–21 L. (= Heiberg 13,10–12).

³⁰ E. Maass, “Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Griechischen Prosa,” *Hermes* 22 (1887), 566–572; F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 89–91.

³¹ E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa I*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1915), p. 44f.

Prosa in 1929, studies *Airs, Waters, Places*, but does not quote *Breaths*. Modern works on rhetoric, for example that of V. Buchheit on epideictic speech, or that of G. Kennedy on the art of persuasion, do not mention the Hippocratic Corpus.³² However, the comparison between the *Encomium of Helen* and *Breaths* merits further investigation, as well as extension to *The Art*. It reveals some common traits amongst these three speeches that correspond to Aristotle's definition of epideictic speech. All three speeches concern praise and criticism. The author of *Breaths* praises the power of the air in the universe, which is comparable to the praise of the power of speeches in the *Encomium of Helen*. The same metaphor of the 'sovereign' is applied to the principle that is praised. In the *Encomium of Helen*, the speech is a δυνάστης μέγας; in the treatise *Breaths*, ch. 3, the air is a μέγιστος δυνάστης.³³ The author of *The Art* writes an apology for an art attacked by its detractors, just like Gorgias writes an apology for a woman decried by her accusers.³⁴ The composition technique is also similar in the three speeches: introduction, announcement of the subject, retrospective and prospective transitions, epilogue. However, a study of the artistic prose shows that, of the two discourses in the Hippocratic Corpus, the one that is closest to the *Encomium of Helen* is *Breaths*. In *The Art*, parallel or antithetic parts of the periodic phrase can be very long or, if they are brief, can be inserted in a much longer sentence whose architecture is guided less by formal symmetry than by a dense and nuanced thought. Conversely, in *Breaths*, as in the Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*, parallel or antithetic clauses of the periodic phrase are short and constitute the essential structure of a short sentence, lending it a rapid and regular rhythm. A comparison between the three conclusions will serve as an example. Whilst in *The Art*, the conclusion is formed of a single, extremely long, sentence, which comprises two long subordinate propositions which outline the principal proposition, in *Breaths* and in Gorgias, there is a series of short phrases or parts of short phrases alongside each other, which begin with a verb in the first person (in *Breaths* Ὑπεσχόμεν—ἐπέδειξα—ἤγαγον; in Gorgias Ἀφείλον—ἐνένειμα—ἐπειράθην—ἐβουλήθην).³⁵ We can make other

³² V. Buchheit, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristoteles* (Munich, 1960); G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, (Princeton, 1963).

³³ Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen*, DK 82 B 11 (8) = Radermacher 39 (8); *Breaths*, ch. 3, 6.94,3 L. = Heiberg 92,21f.

³⁴ Compare in particular Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen* DK 82 B 11 (2) = Radermacher 39 (2) and *The Art*, ch. 1, 6.2,15–18 L. (= Heiberg 9,15–18).

³⁵ Compare *The Art*, ch. 13, 6.26,6–12 L. (= Heiberg 19,3–9), *Breaths*, ch. 15, 6.114,13–20 L. (= Heiberg 101,16–23) and Gorgias, *Encomium of Helen*, DK 82 B 11 (21) = Radermacher 39 (8).

connections between the style of Gorgias and *Breaths*; I will only cite one. A particular case of pariosis and of paromoiosis is the use of two similar terms linked with καί, comparable not only for their length and for their sounds, but also for their meaning. There are fourteen examples of this forced redoubling of the expression in Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*, of the type ἀμαρτία καὶ ἀμαθία. In *Breaths* the list is longer again (twenty-one examples) and the rhetorical ability of its author equals that of Gorgias. Indeed, *Breaths* offers the couplets ρεῦμα καὶ χεῦμα and πληθεῖσαι καὶ πρησθεῖσαι, which are also found in Gorgias' couplet προβήσομαι καὶ προθήσομαι, since all three are formed by the simple changing of a letter.³⁶ In short, of all the epidictic discourses preserved from the fifth and fourth century, the closest to Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen* is the Hippocratic treatise *Breaths*. It is testimony to a fashion whose excesses appear tempered and overshadowed in *The Art*.

Since the two speeches of *Breaths* and *The Art* are distinguished from all the other treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus by their rhetorical character, we might ask a question concerning their origin: were they composed by doctors, or are they works by orators or sophists, mislaid in a collection of medical writings? The *opinio communis* of specialists on Hippocrates is that their authors were sophists. Certain critics have even ventured to propose names. *The Art* was attributed to a pupil of Protagoras by Th. Gomperz and to Hippias by Dupréel.³⁷ More useful, but also not very convincing, is the solution that attributes them to the iatrosophists, new centaurs (half-doctor, half-sophist) who owe their existence to the imagination of philologists applying to the fifth century BC a much later term from the fifth century AD; moreover, they distort its true meaning.³⁸ However, if we re-read these two speeches without prejudice (and also possibly without misinterpretation), it appears that their content agrees with the basic ideas of Hippocratic medicine, and also with its spirit. For example, *Breaths*, in spite of the law of sophistic

³⁶ *Breaths*, ch. 3, 6.94.4 L. (= Heiberg 93,1) and ch. 8, 6.102,22 f. L. (= Heiberg 96,23); Gorgias *Encomium of Helen* DK 82 B 11 (5) = Radermacher 39 (5).

³⁷ Th. Gomperz, *Die Apologie der Heilkunst: eine griechische Sophistenrede des 5. vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1910), p. 27. E. Dupréel, *Les sophistes*, (Bibliothèque scientifique. Philosophie et histoire, 14.) (Neuchâtel, 1948), p. 242 ff. However, see L. Edelstein (ΠΕΡΙ ΑΕΡΩΝ und die Sammlung der hippokratischen Schriften, [Problemata 4] [Berlin, 1931], p. 105 f.) who departs from the *opinio communis* and believes that it is the work of a doctor, and not a sophist.

³⁸ The term ιατροσοφιστής is not attested until Damascus in the *Souda*, s.v. Γέσιος, LSJ translates it as 'professor of medicine'.

eulogy, remains faithful to the rational spirit of Hippocratic medicine. The deification of the principle that is praised, which appears to be a rule in sophistic eulogies, is absent from *Breaths*. In Gorgias, speech (λόγος), the object of the eulogy, carries out divine works (DK 82 B 8 θειότατα ἔργα); likewise, in the speech Plato gives the doctor Eryximachus in his *Symposium*, love, which is the universal principle, like the air in *Breaths*, is a 'god' (θεός), which extends its power over everything, both divine and human matters (καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπινα καὶ κατὰ θεῖα πράγματα 186b1–3). In *Breaths*, air also exercises a universal power, but all reference to the divine has been carefully avoided. The traditional antithesis between the divine and the human (ἀνθρώπινα—θεῖα) is replaced by the opposition τοῖσι ὅλοισι—τοῖσι θνητοῖσι, 'the universe—mortal beings', and the notion of immortal is rendered by ἀένανον and not ἰθάνατον, abolishing any reference to gods or immortals.³⁹ This filtering of vocabulary constitutes the most remarkable unity of the Hippocratic Corpus, despite the diversity of doctrines, methods and styles, and is the discreet yet sure sign that *Breaths* is not the work of a sophist mislaid in the library of a medical centre, but of a Hippocratic doctor in the wider meaning of the term.

That a doctor from the fifth century needed to combine the art of persuasion and the art of healing is better understood if we account for the situation of a doctor in this period. In the absence of any regulation of the medical profession, the doctor had to compete constantly with his rivals both for his medical competence and his art of persuasion, whether this was before an audience limited to the entourage of patients during home visits, or before the larger public in a doctor's surgery or, finally, before the peoples' assembly. The usefulness of the art of persuasion in a medical career is attested indirectly by a passage of Plato's *Gorgias*: "Often," Gorgias says to Socrates (456 b), "when I have accompanied my brother or some other doctor to see one of his patients who refused to drink a medicine or trust the doctor to operate on him with a knife or fire, whilst the doctor was not able to persuade him, I have succeeded in persuading him solely by the use of rhetoric. I say that if a rhetorician and a doctor were to go to any city, and had there to argue before the peoples' assembly or any other assembly as to which of them should be elected as doctor, the doctor would not appeal; but the specialist of the word would be chosen if he wished." From these almost paradoxical examples, Gorgias wishes to show the superiority of rhetoric over medicine. However, the passage also indirectly attests that knowledge

³⁹ *Breaths*, ch. 4, 6.96,1f. L. (= Heiberg 93,18f.); ch. 3, 6.94,16 L. (= Heiberg 93,12).

of rhetoric was indispensable to succeed in a medical career, above all as a public doctor, since appointment depended on a speech that a doctor had to give before the peoples' assembly in a democratic city.⁴⁰ Moreover, the doctor did not necessarily remain in one city, but could move around, either to enrich his experience,⁴¹ or to win a more prestigious and richer city; we remember the example of Democedes of Croton, reported by Herodotus,⁴² who was the public doctor of Aegina before being public doctor of Athens; thus, over the course of his career a doctor could have cause to make several speeches before the peoples' assembly to prevail over his rivals. No speech of this type has been preserved,⁴³ yet this short reminder of the working conditions of a doctor is enough to confirm that genuine doctors could be the authors of rhetorical speeches.⁴⁴ However, if a doctor is capable of being an orator, he is careful to distance himself from the oratorical specialist and to denounce a negative τέχνη of speeches, as a study of *The Art* shows.⁴⁵

Although I have not been able to discuss the matter in more detail, which is relatively secondary to the specialist in Greek rhetoric, I hope to have shown that the traditional corpus of classical Greek rhetoric should be enriched by the two speeches preserved in the Hippocratic Corpus, *The Art* and *Breaths*. These two speeches are written in Ionian Greek, like Gorgias' *Encomium*

⁴⁰ On the speech of public doctors to the peoples' assembly of Athens, see also Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 4.2.5. On the public doctor in Greece, see L. Cohn-Haft, *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece*, (Smith College studies in history 42) (Northampton, Mass., 1956), 91 p.

⁴¹ One of the best known treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus, *Airs, Waters, Places*, is addressed to an itinerant doctor who arrives in a city unknown to him; see above, p. 45.

⁴² Herodotus 3.131.

⁴³ We cannot agree with H. Diels ("Hippokratische Forschungen II. III," *Hermes* 46, [1911], 273–274), who considers *The Art* and *Breaths* to be speeches made with a view to appointment ('Habitationsreden').

⁴⁴ We must move away from the prejudice that tends to contrast medical competence with rhetorical knowledge; for a clear formulation of this prejudice, see B.A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque: procédés et réalisations* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks 65,2) (Amsterdam, 1958), p. 254: "The only difference that matters here between medicine and rhetoric is that the first remains the prerogative of a limited circle of specialists, while every free citizen could be called overnight to speak to the assembly or before the tribunal. He therefore had an interest to teach himself this art. Thus, rhetorical theory, which is intentional comprehension, had a thousand reasons to be formed, whilst scientific prose was content with expressing itself, without any theory, in the manner that appeared to be the most efficient." Against this prejudice, see L. Edelstein, ΠΕΡΙ ΑΕΡΩΝ *und die Sammlung der hippokratischen Schriften* (see above, n. 37), pp. 102–109.

⁴⁵ *The Art*, ch. 1, 6.2,6 L. (= Heiberg 9,7). The author denounces, with the detractors of the arts, an 'art of bad speech'.

of *Helen*, which is not surprising since the initial development of Greek rhetoric in the fifth century did not have Athens as its centre. To conclude, I would like to propose a new connection, aimed not so much at the specialist, but humanists. The author of *Breaths* begins his eulogy on air in the following way: “Air is a very powerful sovereign that rules everywhere and over everything. Wind is a flow and a stream of air (ἡέρος ρεῦμα καὶ χεῦμα). When the air, in large quantity, provokes a powerful flow, trees are uprooted due to the violence of the wind, the sea swells with waves, huge ships (ὀλκάδες ἀπείρατοι μεγέθει) are thrown around. This is the power that it has in these things. However, it is invisible (ἀφανής) to the eye, but visible (φανερός) to reason.”⁴⁶ François Rabelais, in his eulogy on Pantagrueion (hemp), shows that, thanks to this plant, the power of the air is brought under control: “By means of this plant, invisible substances are visibly arrested, caught, detained, as though imprisoned ... through it, by retention of waves of the air, stout cargo ships, ample cabined barges, mighty galleons, ships holding a thousand or ten thousand men, are launched out of their stations and driven forward at the will of their commanders.”⁴⁷ The combination of the opposites ‘invisible/visibly’ in Rabelais about the winds recalls the antithesis ἀφανής / φανερός in the Hippocratic treatise about the air; the “winds of the air” of Rabelais appear to be a translation of ἡέρος ρεῦμα; and above all the ‘stout cargo ships’ correspond to the ὀλκάδες ἀπείρατοι μεγέθει. Rabelais, a doctor and humanist, knew the Hippocratic Corpus very well, because he edited certain treatises, and the eulogy to the air in *Breaths* is probably recalled here. Rabelais also competes with Hippocrates and operates, through comparison with him, a reversal: whereas *Breaths* showed the superiority of the air over human skill, Rabelais celebrates a *technē* that masters the power of the air. Thus, he transforms the ancient eulogy of a natural force into a modern eulogy of human genius.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ *Breaths*, ch. 3, 6.94,2–9 L. (= Heiberg 92,21–93,5).

⁴⁷ Rabelais, *Tiers Livre*, ch. LI (ed. Pleiade, p. 508).

⁴⁸ This article is the text of a paper presented at the *Congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé sur la Rhétorique* (Nancy/Pont-à-Mousson, 1983).