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HEALING HEROES: THE TEXT OF THE HIPPOCRATIC OATH

Abstract

This essay considers the Greek text of what has come down to us as the Oath of Hippocrates. Particular attention has been paid to the contemporary meaning and connotation of the language of the text, as well as style and register in general, in an attempt to gain a clearer overall understanding of the canonical version of the Hippocratic Oath in terms of the culture and prevailing usage of the period. By so doing, the essay also addresses the question of how we might view the composition date of the oath, which has until recently been thought to date to the end of the fifth or beginning of the fourth century BC.
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Introduction

Ancient Greek texts whose authorship and date remain largely unclear have had an extraordinary influence on the formation of Western thought and values. Although what has come down to us as the Hippocratic Oath, or Oath of Hippocrates, can in no way be likened to the Greek New Testament in terms of size or impact, it has, nonetheless, come to assume an almost Biblical aura, despite the absence of substantive clues regarding by whom and when it was formulated. This text of 20-odd lines bears the title ὍΡΚΟΣ (horkos), which means oath or an oath: There is no article in the title, and ancient Greek had no indefinite article as such. Jones in his informative essay The Doctor’s Oath refers to the oath as Oath; as it seems to me that this is the most faithful rendering, this is how I shall refer to it, too. After all, as Steven Miles says, “The Oath may be the only survivor of dozens of such oaths.”

The swearing of oaths permeated every area of Greek society: government, social administration, law, commerce, and a vast spectrum of public and private human interactions. Oaths were accordingly part of the Greek formal and colloquial language and of everyday
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consciousness. The presence of oaths in Greek culture constituted a cohesive force in society. Oaths had shaped the action of the Iliad and had continued to appear as crucial elements in Greek literature ever since. An understanding of the significance of oaths in the lives of the ancient Greeks is essential to forming any meaningful interpretation of their motivations and the dynamic forces that shaped their culture. Alan H. Sommerstein, with reference to Richard Janko’s scholarly definition in his commentary on the Iliad, proceeds to define an oath as “an utterance whereby the speaker—the swearer—does the following three things simultaneously”: (1) makes a declaration, either assertory or promissory; (2) specifies superhuman power(s) as witnesses thereto and guarantors of its truth; (3) invites a conditional self-curse. As we will see, Oath meets these three basic criteria of a classical Greek oath.

I was prompted to look at the Greek text of Oath as a result of reading two papers by Heinrich von Staden: ‘The Oath’, the Oaths, and the Hippocratic Corpus (von Staden, 2007) and “In a Pure and Holy Way”: Personal and Professional Conduct in the Hippocratic Oath? (von Staden, 1996). While both of these papers scrutinize the text of Oath in different ways, the later paper examines the language of Oath in terms of the Hippocratic writings in general and particularly those regarded as having been composed in the classical era. In addition to asking how far Oath shows signs of conforming to classical Hippocratic usage or otherwise, von Staden’s paper also considers the extent to which Oath is typical of conventions of the genre of oath, such a pervasive element of ancient Greek culture. In his introductory remarks to this paper, von Staden states: “Some, though not all, of the results of the analysis that

3 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), XXXVIII: “Le Serment n’est que la garantie qui en appelle aux dieux pour une bonne exécution du contrat, comme c’était le cas déjà chez Homère où le serment était une garantie d’un pacte entre deux parties.”
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follows in fact suggest that a re-examination of the date of the Oath might be called for...”

Von Staden’s relatively brief study is, for all its brevity, highly significant although he stops short of articulating any definite conclusion on the matter. On the other hand, Jouanna (2018) argues that in any attempt to date Oath, quite apart from internal linguistic comparisons and matters related to the genre of oaths in contemporary society, importance should also be accorded to a study of the legal ramifications of the ξ(σ)υγγραφή that prevailed in classical times. 8

Scholarly opinion still dates Oath to the classical period. 9 On this point, Jones’ approach is still very convincing: “It is indeed hard to believe that the nucleus, at least, of Oath does not go back to the ‘great’ Hippocrates himself.” 10 Whether it ultimately goes back to Hippocrates or not, it seems likely that what is now the canonical version 11 may well be viewed as a later accretion around an earlier nucleus. 12 This canonical version of Oath is based largely on what is known as the MV manuscript tradition, informed in recent studies by reference to the former section of Ambrosianus gr. 134 (B 113 sup.) and P. Oxy. XXXI 2547. 13

I have based my comments largely on the text adopted by von Staden (2007), while also preserving his division of the text and numeration. I have departed from von Staden’s 2007 text only at 6.ii φθορίης, τῆς τε ἄλλης, where I have preferred Jouanna’s φθορῆς τε τῆς ἄλλης. Elsewhere, where von Staden’s adopted text differs from Jouanna (2018), 14 I have

10 Jones, 1924, 40–45.
12 The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th ed., s.v. “Asklepios.” Interestingly, in this entry (p. 181), we find: “The site of an early sanctuary is uncertain; when in 366/5 BC, the city of Cos was rebuilt, Asclepius received a sanctuary in a grove of Apollo Cyparissius (LSAM 150A, dated 325–300 BC); the famous oath, sworn to Apollo, Asclepius (his daughters) Hygieia and Panacea, and ‘all the gods and goddesses’, belongs to the same period.”
13 For details of the manuscript tradition and other historical aspects of the origin of the text of Oath, see note 11.
14 J. Jouanna, Budé I (2).
indicated this in parentheses, as well as adding Jouanna’s numbering and translation. Apart from Jouanna’s translation of *Oath*, which I give for reference as being the latest available at the time of writing, translations or paraphrases are mine unless indicated. Except in the initial exposition of the text of *Oath*, I have entered examples of text in the original Greek rather than in a transcription into the Roman alphabet, in the belief that all medical students should invest the short time it takes to learn the Greek alphabet, as a knowledge of Greek, no matter how basic, will enrich their study of medicine and its language.

**Note on Hippocratic texts used**

When referring to the text of treatises in the *Hippocratic Corpus*, I have mainly used Littré’s *OEUVRES COMPLETES* and the 11-volume Loeb set as listed below. Volumes of the Budé edition reached me as I was finishing this essay, so I had but little opportunity to consult these most recent and authoritative editions.

- **Littré**
  - Emile Littré, *OEUVRES COMPLETES D’HIPPOCRATE*, 11 volumes (Paris, 1839-1861) (cited as Littré, volume number, page number, line number)

- **Loeb**
    - Volume XI: Diseases of Women 1–2.)
    (cited as Loeb, volume number, page number, line number)

- **Budé** (volumes consulted)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.i. (J: 1a.) Ὅμων (Omnuo)</td>
<td>I swear (J: Je jure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.ii. Ἀπόλλωνα ἰητρὸν καὶ Ἀσκληπιόν καὶ Υγείαν καὶ Πανάκειαν καὶ θεῶς πάντας τε καὶ τάσσας, ἱστορας ποιεύμενος, (Απολλόνα iētron, kai Asklepion, kai Hygeian, kai Panakeian, kai theous panta-te kai pasas, historas poioumenos,)</td>
<td>by Healing Apollo, Asklepios, Hygeia (goddess of health), Panakeia (goddess of universal remedy), and by all the gods and goddesses, invoking them as my witnesses (judges), (J: par Apollon médecin, par Asclépios, par Hygie et Panacée, et par tous les dieux et toutes les déesses, les prenant à témoin,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.iii. ἐπιτελέα ποιήσειν κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ κρίσιν ἐμὴν ὅρκον τόνδε καὶ συγγραφὴν τῆνδε· (epitelea poiēsein kata dynamin kai krisin emēn horkon tonde kai xungraphēn tēnde:)</td>
<td>to fulfill this oath and contract to the best of my ability and judgment. (J: d’exécuter, selon ma capacité et mon jugement, ce serment et ce contrat;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.iv. (J: 1b.) ἑγγήσασθαί τε τὸν διδάξαντά με τὴν τέχνην ταύτην ἵσα (J: ἵσα) γενέτειραι ἐμοῦ (hégesasthai men ton didaxanta me tēn technēn tautēn isα genetēsin emoisi)</td>
<td>[I swear] to regard him who has taught me this technē as equivalent to my parents, (J: Je jure) de considérer d’abord mon maître en cet art à l’égal de mes propres parents;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.v. καὶ βίου κοινωσάσθαι καὶ χρεῶν χρηίζοντι μετάδοσιν ποιήσασθαι· (kai biou koinōsasthai, kai chreōn chrēizonti metadosin poiēsasthai:)</td>
<td>to live my life communally with him and to share what I have with him whenever he is in need, (J: de mettre à sa disposition des subsides et, s’il est dans la besoin, de lui transmettre une part de mes biens;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.vi. καὶ γένος τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ (J: αὐτέου) ἁδελφοῖς ἵσαν (J: ἱσαν) ἐπικρινέσθαι (kai genos to ex autou adelphois ison epikrinein arresi)</td>
<td>and to judge his offspring (issue) in the same terms as my male siblings, (J: de considérer sa descendance mâle à l’égal de mes frères;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.vii. (J: 1c.) καὶ διδάξειν τὴν τέχνην ταύτην, ἢν χρηίζωσι μανθάνειν, ἄνευ μισθοῦ καὶ συγγραφῆς, (kai didaxein tēn technēn tautēn, en xrēizōsi manthanein, aneu misthou kai zungraphēs)</td>
<td>and to instruct them in this technē without fee or contract if they desire to learn it, (J: et de leur enseigner cet art, s’ils désirent l’apprendre, sans salaire ni contrat;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.viii. παραγγελίαις τε καὶ ἄκρογγοις καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ἀπάσης καὶ καθήμενοι καὶ μετάδοσιν ποιήσασθαι ὑποδοθεῖ ἀπὸ τις ἔμοι καὶ τοίς τοῦ με (J: éme) διδάξαντος καὶ μαθητῆς· (kai parangeliēs te kai akroēsios kai tēs loipēs)</td>
<td>and to share rules, lectures, and all the rest of learning with my sons, the sons of my teacher, and such apprentices as are bound by contract and oath in accordance with the code of medical practice, but with no other person. (J: de transmettre les préceptes, les leçons orales et tout le reste de l’enseignement à mes fils et à ceux de mon maître, et aux disciples liés par un contrat et un serment, suivant la loi médicale, et à nul autre.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oath: Greek text</td>
<td>Oath: translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapasēs mathēsios metadosin poiēsasthai huioisi te emoisi, kai toisi tou eme didaxantos, kai mathētai</td>
<td>2.i. I will use all forms of regimen for the benefit of patients to the best of my ability and judgment, (J: I'utiliserai tout le régime pour l'utilité des malades selon ma capacité et mon jugement;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunnegegrammenosi te kai hōrkismenois nomōi iētrikōi, allói de oudeni.)</td>
<td>2.ii. [while also swearing] to the best of my conscience to safeguard patients from wrongdoing and anything likely to cause them harm. (J: mais si c’est pour leur perte ou pour un injustice à leur égard, (je jure) d’y faire obstacle selon ma conscience.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.i. (J: 2.) Διαιτήμασί τε πᾶσι</td>
<td>3.i. I will not give any individual any drug that might result in death even if requested. (J: Je ne remettrai à personne une drogue mortelle si on me la demande,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρήσομαι ἐπ᾽ ὠφελείᾳ κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ</td>
<td>3.ii. Neither will I take any initiative in suggesting anything of the sort. (J: ni ne prendrai l’initiative d’une telle suggestion.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρίσιν ἐμήν, (Diaitēmasi te</td>
<td>3.iii. By the same token, I will not give an abortive pessary to a woman. (J: De même, je ne remettrai pas non plus aux femmes un pessaire abortif.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.ii. ἐπὶ δηλήσει δὲ καὶ ἀδικίᾳ</td>
<td>4.i. In a spirit of purity and holiness (J: C’est dans la pureté et la piété)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴρξειν κατὰ γνώμην ἐμῆν.</td>
<td>4.ii. will I guard constantly (J: que je passerai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.i. (J: 3.) Οὐ δώσω δὲ οὐδὲ</td>
<td>4.iii. my life (bios) and profession (technē). (J: ma vie et exercerai mon art;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάρμακον οὐδενὶ αἰτηθεὶς θανάσιον,</td>
<td>5.i. I will not perform surgery—least of all on patients suffering from urinary stones, (J: Je n’inciserai pas non plus les malades atteints de lithiase,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ou dōsō de oude pharmakon oudeni aitētheis thanasimon,)</td>
<td>5.ii. but I will give way to specialists versed in this practice. (J: mais je laisserai cela aux hommes spécialistes de cette intervention.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.ii. οὐδὲ ὑφηγήσομαι ξυμβουλίην</td>
<td>6.i. Into whatever household I may enter, I will enter for the benefit of patients, (J: Dans toutes les maisons ou je dois entrer, je pénétrerai pour l’utilité des malades,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοιήνδε·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.iii. ομοίως δὲ οὐδὲ γυναικὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεσσὸν φθόριον δώσω.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(homoiōs de oude gynaiki pesson phtorion dōsō.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.i. (J: 4.) Ἀγνῶς δὲ καὶ ὁσίως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hagnōs de kai hosiōs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.ii. διατηρήσω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.iii. βίον ἐμὸν καὶ τέχνην ἐμὴν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bion emon kai technēn emēn.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.i. (J: 5.) Οὐ τεμέω δὲ οὐδὲ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μὴν λιθιῶντας,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ou temeō de oude mēn lithiōntas,)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.ii. ἐκχωρήσω δὲ ἐργάταις ἀνδράσι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρήξιος τῆς δε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ekchōrēsō de ergatēisin andrasi prēxios tēsde.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.i. (J: 6.) Ἐς οἰκίας δὲ ὡς συν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐσῖο, ἐσελεύσομαι ἐπὶ ὃψει, ἐσελεύσομαι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Es oikias de hokosas an esiō, eseleusomai ep'ōpheleieīi kamnontōn,)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.ii. ἐκτὸς ἐὼν πάσης ἁμαινης ἐκοινίζης καὶ φθορῆς τε τῆς ἄλλης (instead of von Staden’s φθορίης, τῆς τε ἄλλης) καὶ ἁφροδισιῶν ἔργων ἀνάβειν ἐπὶ τὸ γυναικεῖων σωμάτων καὶ ἄνδρειν, έλευθέρων τε καὶ δουλῶν.</td>
<td>remaining beyond all deliberate wrongdoing, corruption, and particularly sexual acts on male or female persons, whether they be free or enslaved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.i. Τοιαῦτα τὰ Ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον,</td>
<td>In regard of such things I see or hear in the course of treatment or even in the course of human life outside treatment as should never be spoken of indiscreetly outside,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.ii. Σιγήσομαι, ἄρρητα ἡγεύμενος τὰ τοιαῦτα.</td>
<td>I will hold my tongue, because I regard such things as unutterable secrets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.a. Ορκον μὲν οὖν μοι τόνδε ἐπιτελέα ποιέοντι, καὶ μὴ συγχέοντι,</td>
<td>Accordingly, if I fulfill this oath and do not seek loopholes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.b. εἴη ἐπαύρασθαι καὶ βίου καὶ τέχνης</td>
<td>may it be my fate to enjoy the fruits of both my life (bios) and profession (technē),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.c. δοξαζομένῳ παρά πάσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐς τὸν αἰεὶ</td>
<td>being held in high esteem by all men until the end of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.a. παραβαίνοντι δὲ καὶ ἐπιορκοῦντι,</td>
<td>If, on the other hand, I infringe the oath and perjure myself,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.b. τάναντα τούτων</td>
<td>may the opposite fate befall me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Invoking Olympian patrons as witnesses and judges to an oath and contract

(1.i., 1.ii.)

A solemn oath is in fact a prayer, and *Oath* is no exception, not unnaturally opening with the performative verb ὀμνύω, *I swear*, in the first person singular, indicating both the personal and formal nature of what is to come. Sommerstein notes significantly that oaths beginning thus (*omnumi oaths*) are “not as frequent in our data as one might expect.” He also points out that oaths “administered by the state or by other bodies such as local communities or religious societies are hardly ever, to our knowledge, expressed in this [omnuo/omnumi] way.” Next follow in the accusative case the gods invoked as witnesses and judges to the act of swearing: Ἀπόλλων ἰητρός (Apollōn iētros), Apollo the Healer; Ἀσκληπιός, Asklepios; Ὑγεία, Hygeia; Πανάκεια, Panakeia, and, as if for good measure, θεοί πάντες τε καὶ πάσαι, all the gods, both male and female. The inclusion of all the gods and goddesses is a relatively common formula characteristic of particularly solemn oaths. As noted by von Staden (2007) and Jouanna (2018), evidence from epigraphy and papyrus, while telling us much about such ritual conventions of oath as the roll call of divine witnesses, tends to point to the Hellenistic period.

---

15 ὀμνύμι, ὀμνύω: Although thematic verb forms generally gave way to athematic forms in the development of Greek, the process is sporadic and complex. (LSJ: “for pres. ind. the Trag. and Ar. use only ὀμνύμι, Hdt. and Att. Prose writers also ὀμνύω ...” In *Oath*, therefore, the athematic form in no way points to a later date of composition. The form ὀμνύμι is found, ironically, in some versions the so-called metric oath (Hp., *Iusi. II*), where it is incompatible with the meter. ὀμνύμι is also found in *Ambrosianus*. See Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 8–9. Also see: Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 303–310.


17 Sommerstein and Torrance, 2014, 376.

18 von Staden, 2007, 435 (“The first unambiguously attested example of this structure [list of deities + all the other gods and goddesses] dates to 310 BC...” Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 12–13.
1.1 Apollo

The role of Apollo in Greek mythology is complex, as is amply described by Fritz Graf.\(^{19}\) Here in Oath, the Olympian is invoked in conjunction with the *epiklēsis* ἵητρός (*iētros*, the Ionic form of ἵατρός (*iatros*)). In hierarchical terms, therefore, as the only Olympian named, Apollo represents the head of the swearer’s profession (*technē*), ἵητρός serving as a focusing epithet to maximize the efficacy of the prayer by pointing to that deity’s relevance to the context. The epithet ἵητρός / ἵατρός in conjunction with Apollo is found in Aristophanes’ *Birds* (584) and on occasion in inscriptions.\(^{20}\) Graf tells us that Appolon Iatros was central in Miletus’ colony Olbia, founded in 600 BC, suggesting that the cult was imported from Miletus itself at an even earlier stage.\(^{21}\) The deity’s appearance in Oath, however, is the only case of Apollo being invoked as the witness to an oath under the *epiklēsis* ἵητρός / ἵατρός.

The nearest we come to Apollo Iētros / Iatros as an oath witness in classical Greek literature is Apollo Paian, which can also be translated as *Apollo the Healer*. There is a distinct possibility that the god Paiawon, attested in two Linear B texts from Knossos on Crete, is the same as the epithet Paian. Indeed, Homer’s Παιήων\(^{22}\) is presented as a deity, physician to the gods rather than to mortals, possibly distinct from Apollo.\(^{23}\) Apollo, incidentally, does not appear to figure in Linear B texts, and, with a high degree of probability is non-Mycenaean.\(^{24}\) In the context of oaths, the speculation that Apollo could have made his first appearance in human records as a guarantor or witness of a treaty is highly seductive: The Alaksandus treaty (c.1280 BC) between the Hittites and Wilusa (?Troy / Ilios?) ends with a list of guarantors, one of which is


\(^{21}\) Graf, 2008, 69–70.

\(^{22}\) *Odyssey* (4.232), Paiēōn is associated with Egypt: “And in medical knowledge the Egyptian leaves the rest of the world behind. He is a true son of Paeon the Healer.” (Rieu) ἵητρός δὲ ἐκαστὸς ἐπιστάμενος περὶ πάντων / ἀνθρώπων: ἦ γὰρ Παεόνος εἰς γενέθλησι.

\(^{23}\) In the *Odyssey* (4.232), Paiēōn is associated with Egypt: “And in medical knowledge the Egyptian leaves the rest of the world behind. He is a true son of Paeon the Healer.” (Rieu) ἵητρός δὲ ἐκαστὸς ἐπιστάμενος περὶ πάντων / ἀνθρώπων: ἦ γὰρ Παεόνος εἰς γενέθλησι.

\(^{24}\) Graf, 2008, 67.
Appaliuna. In this treaty, the gods on the side of Wilusa are: “The Stormgod of the Army, [one name lost,] x-ap-pa-li-u-na-as, the male and female gods, mountains, rivers, [springs] and the subterranean river(?) of Wilusa.”

Interestingly, this ancient treaty also echoes our Oath with the “male and female gods” being an invocation common to both, while the “subterranean river” is reminiscent of power of the Styx as primeval guarantor of oaths in Hesiod and Homer, among others.

As for Apollo, however, Homer shows no ambiguity in portraying this Olympian as firmly on the side of Troy. Indeed, if we equate King Alaksandus with Alexandros (Paris) of Troy, the parallel is borne out in Homer’s depiction of Apollo as the deity who aided Paris in the killing of Achilleus. It was Apollo, after all, that built the walls of Troy. His first appearance on the stage of Greek literature is as destroyer, as the bringer of plague: the offended who judges and exacts revenge. It is through divination that Apollo is transformed from instigator of pestilence into healer. We might even refer to Apollo as the wounding healer. As we see from Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, disease was early conceived as a postlapsarian evil beyond the control of mortals. The epithet ἰητρός focuses the Olympian’s role as the prime deity invoked, a role which can be ambiguous in its breadth: just as the sun’s rays can heal, they can also scorch. ἰητρός points to healer in its broadest sense, in the context of a cosmology in which Apollo fends off evil as a purifying force. Apollo as a healing force can better be appreciated in terms of iatromantis (ἰατρόμαντις), whose role as the prophet and interpreter of Zeus, is powerfully described in Aeschylus’ *Eumenides*. In

---


26 Ἰ. 784, 793.

27 Ἰ. 2.755, Ἰ. 8.369, Ἰ. 14.271, Ἰ. 15.37, Ὀδ. 10.514.

28 Ἰ. 1. 473.

29 Hes. *WD* 90–91: ἀτερ χαλεποῖο πόνοι / νοῦσον τ’ ἄργαλέων...; *WD* 102: νοσοὶ δ’ ἀνθρώποισιν ἐφ’ ἥμέρη, αὐτὶ ἐπι νοκτὶ...
Aeschylus, both Apollo and Asklepios are referred to as *iatromantis*. It is the meditative element that most likely gives us our word *medicine*, the *medi* of medicus and medicina. After all, the healer is one capable of divining the cause of disease. Originally, the diviner’s role had been to identify just which of the *gods* had been offended, a role that gradually developed into what we see argued in the *The Sacred Disease*—to look instead to the *symptoms* for an aetiology.

Apollo had long been identified with the Asclepiads, who had played a significant role in the “sacred wars” fought to secure the shrine to Apollo at Delphi. Asclepiads of Cos and Cnidus had issued a decree that required an Asclepiad arriving in Delphi and hoping to consult the oracle there to swear an oath that he is an Asclepiad by male descent. From this, we see that Asclepiads were accorded certain religious privileges in Delphi.

For all this, the author of *The Sacred Disease* would argue against the efficacy of ritual cures by a seer, denying the intervention of deities as the cause and urging us to look for the remedy in the affairs of man. *The Sacred Disease*, in arguing for a more rational approach to medical aetiology, is arguing more against the divinatory nature of incubation; this treatise maintains, however, a healthy concept of ὅσιος and ἐὐσεβής. *Oath*, likewise, upholds a simultaneous awareness of the divine and the human, both being intertwined from the very opening of *Oath* and maintained until its close.

31 It is in all probability not the case that the *medi* of medicine can be identified with the *medi* of mediator. See Thelma Charen. “The Etymology of Medicine.” *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 39.3 (1951): 216–221. Print.
33 Jouanna, 1999, 34-35. Also, on the differences between the applications and implications of the *Delphic Oath* and *Hippocratic Oath*, see Jacques Jouanna, Philip J. Van Der Eijk, and Neil Allies, *Greek medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: selected papers* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 117.
34 *Morb. sacr.*: ὅστε τὸ θεῖον μηκέτι αἴτιον εἶναι, ἀλλά τι ἀνθρώπινον (Loeb, *Hippocrates II*, 144).
35 *Regimen in Acute Diseases* describes the diametrically opposed diagnoses of contemporary medical practitioners as no doubt appearing to laymen as the contradicting conclusions of diviners. (*Acut.* Loeb II, 68 VIII, 5–15).
1.2 Asklepios

Asklepios, son of Apollo, brings us to a different domain. Whereas the age-old epithets describing Apollo had included ἑκάεργος, ἑκηβόλος and ἕκατος, which all emphasize agency intervening from a distance, Asklepios brings us into a closer, more recent cosmology. Asklepios was not nurtured by his father in any way, let alone in the healing arts, but by Chiron, the centaur of superior pedigree, dual in nature and educator to heroes. Though himself immortal, Chiron was to fall victim to the ambiguity of pharmakon smeared on the arrowheads of Heracles, and in the ensuing agony to renounce his immortality. While the remote Apollo works from afar, Asklepios is characterized by a willingness to engage with the sick in person as healing craftsman. In fact, his love for humanity extends to self-sacrifice. He occupies two realms at the same time: half man and half god, with the power to mediate between the living and the dead, a power he ultimately uses to resurrect mankind from the dead. It is in this extreme form of mediation that lies his destruction at the hands of Zeus. Duality is central to the identity of Asklepios. Just as hero and demigod Asklepios is the issue of Apollo, the family of Hippocrates saw itself as being descended from Asklepios through his sons the warrior physicians Machaon and Podalirius. The duality that characterizes Asklepios also extends to his origins: Messenia and Tricca in Thessaly, according to local myths already established in the sixth century BC. In Homer, Asklepios is the “blameless physician,” while Pindar depicts him as “Asklepios, the gentle hero, craftsman in remedies for the limbs of men tormented by disease.” For craftsman, Pindar uses the word τέκτων, bringing to mind τέχνη, concept central to Oath and Greek medicine.

---

36 This etymology (working from afar or striking from afar) is in fact doubtful, being a construction of later grammarians. For more likely etymologies, see LSI, s.v. ἑκάεργος, ἑκηβόλος and the web-based Greek-English etymological dictionary (Ελληνικά-Αγγλικά ετυμολογική λεξικό), s.v. ἑκάεργος: (http://etymology_el_en.enacademic.com/2230%E1%BC%91%CE%BA%E1%BD%B1%CE%B5%CF%81%CE%B3%CE%BF%CF%82).
38 Il. 4. 194, 11. 518; ἀμυμων, “blameless,” is significantly an epithet never used of the gods (LSJ).
39 Jouanna, 1999, 43.
in general. Asklepios’ role as a context-specific witness is far more clearly defined than that of Apollo. Interestingly but not surprisingly, oaths sworn by Asklepios tended to be male oaths, as is precisely the case with *Oath*.  

Any ambiguity with Asklepios lies in the fundamental duality that underlies *pharmakon* as a tool of the medical practitioner, perhaps most poignantly expressed in Socrates’ final words at the close of Plato’s *Phaedo*. This ambiguity is also evident in the contributions of the Asclepiads to the “holy wars.” Both these cases, in which *pharmaka* are used in human affairs to destroy human life, first in the name of justice and then in the name of military strategy, are addressed head-on by *Oath: I will not give any individual any drug that might result in death even if requested*. However, it is not so much ambiguity as duality that gave Asklepios his appeal: he has the status of both god and man, having been snatched from the womb of his mortal mother Coronis as she was consumed on the pyre, victim to the anger of either Asklepios’ father Apollo, or possibly Apollo’s sister Artemis. Humans were no doubt able to identify more with Asklepios than with Apollo; after all, Asklepios had craved immortality. While, in the hierarchical order of the Olympians, it is natural that Asklepios come second to Apollo (which is always the case on official inscriptions at Epidaurus), of the four gods named as judges to *Oath*, Asklepios is the most essential entity in any consideration of ancient Greek medicine. Indeed, he is synonymous with the centers and practitioners of Greek healing: The blameless physician of the Iliad, where his deity is not in evidence, had become a cult that enjoyed vigorous expansion during the fifth and fourth centuries BC to the extent of virtually covering the Mediterranean world in Asclepian

---

40 Sommerstein and Torrance, 2014, 376.
41 Pl. *Phd.* 118: ὦ Κρίτων, ἔφη, τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ ὀφε ίλομεν ἀλεκτρυόνα· ἀλλὰ ἀπόδοτε καὶ μὴ ἀμελήσητε. Crito, we owe Asklepios a cockerel. Make sure our debt is paid. With but a few minutes left to live, Socrates is aware that the *pharmakon* has had its desired effect and that now payment should be made. The dosage had been meticulously measured out, thus preventing Socrates from repaying his debt in the form of a libation.

incubation shrines. How the blameless physician became a god whose cult spread with such phenomenal speed and momentum is not fully understood. It is, however, significant that Asklepios was known to reveal himself to devotees as a deity personally concerned with their well-being.44

1.3 Hygeia, Panakeia, and all the gods

Unlike the Olympian Apollo and the heroic Asklepios, whose etymologies are obscured in the mists of time, Hygeia and Panakeia are respective personifications (hypostases) of health and universal remedy respectively. There is little ambiguity in either of these designations. The most frequently depicted daughter of Asklepios in the Asclepian cult, Hygeia had been the epiklēsis of Athena, and clearly the deity had a profound connection with healing.45 An inscription tells us that Hygeia accompanied Asklepios to Athens in 420 BC.46 Apollo, Asklepios, and Hygeia appear as a trio in a dedication from Epidaurus: Ἀπόλλωνι, Ἀσκλαπιῶι, Ὕγιείᾳ.47 Interestingly, Aristophanes in his late work Plutus (388 BC), omits Hygeia, introducing the variation of Iaso (goddess of recovery or recuperation) and Panakeia accompanying Asklepios ministering to sufferers at an incubation sanctuary.48 Hygeia and Panakeia, the third generation of the divinities invoked as judges to the oath-taking, both extend the unbroken genealogy and strike a balance with the two male divinities. The other offspring of Epione and Asklepios, namely the divine Iaso, Akeso, and Aegle are not invoked. The appeal of Hygeia lies in the maintenance of health through preventative medicine, while that of Panakeia lies in the restoration of health through remedy. There are no recorded

45 Jouanna, 1999, 323.
46 Inscriptiones Graecae II2. 4960a.
47 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 10.
48 Aristoph. Pl. 701–702: οὖν, ἀλλ᾽ Ἰασὼ μὲν τις ἄκολουθος' ἡμα / ὑπηρυθρίας χή Πανάκει' ἀπεστράφη / τὴν Σέρῳ ἑπιλαβοῦσ' - οὐ λιβανωτὸν γάρ ἔδεω. While Asklepios does not react to Cario’s farting, Iaso blushes and Panakeia turns away and holds her nose.
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instances of Panakeia otherwise appearing with the other three deities named in Oath.\(^{49}\) The order in which the gods are invoked naturally reflects the divine hierarchy, but also the characteristic of Oath to move from the general to the particular. The invocation also forestalls the structural balance and the striving for a universal inclusiveness that characterize Oath.

The expression θεοὺς πάντας τε καὶ πάσας is a dramatic flourish that indicates how universal (“all encompassing”: Torrance\(^{50}\)) Oath sets out to be. Apart from the enclitic (which allows it to trip splendidly off the tongue), instances of this formula occur in Xenophon\(^{51}\) and Demosthenes,\(^{52}\) although θεός is generic (as ἄδελφος later), making the τε καὶ πάσας emphatic yet strictly speaking unnecessary.\(^{53}\)

The participial phrase ἵστορας ποιεύμενος requires that we supplement an object to precede the complement ἵστορας or take the preceding list of deities as the object of ποιεύμενος, in which case the deities become the objects of both ὀμνύω and ποιεύμενος.\(^{54}\) It is interesting to speculate as to what degree ἵστωρ and μάρτυς (the more common word for witness in oaths) are indeed synonyms in this context. Sharing an identical etymology with the English “witness” (both the English and the Greek signifying one who knows or one who is privy to critical knowledge), ἵστωρ is certainly the less common word. Lycurgus uses ἵστωρ

\(^{49}\) von Staden, 2007, 432.
\(^{51}\) Xen. An. 6. 1. 31 and 7. 6. 18.
\(^{52}\) Dem. De cor. 141.
\(^{53}\) See, for example, Xen. Ἀν. δύνημι πάντας θεῶς and Xen. Συμφ. πάντας τούς θεῶς, in addition to the famous instances in Eur. Med. 747: θεῶν τε συντιθείς ἄπαν γένος and 752: δύνημι Γαίαν Ἡλίου θ从容 ἀγνόν σέλας / θεῶς τε πάντας ἐμμενέναι ἂ σου κλύω.
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with ποιεῖσθαι, while μάρτυρας with ποιεῖσθαι is far more common, occurring routinely in
Thucydides.⁵⁵ In the Iliad, for example, ἵστωρ always tends toward umpire or arbiter, which
might entitle us to regard this word as being the weightier of the two in the context of Oath.⁵⁶
Rather than equating the gods with simple witnesses to an oath, who do not normally punish
any transgression, it is more accurate to see the gods as arbiters, who are more likely also to
decide what punitive measures are to be taken against the transgressor.⁵⁷ The compound
ξυνίστωρ is similarly used in tragedy, reinforcing the literary and dramatic nature of the
word.⁵⁸ Jouanna (2018) denies that ἵστωρ is particularly poetic, seeing it rather as a
characteristic of the underlying Ionic dialect.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, both subsequent reciters and
readers of Oath would no doubt have felt a difference in register—an exalted, epic quality that
ἵστωρ brings when compared with the Attic equivalent.

1.4 Verbal and written commitment (1.iii.)

The swearer promises to fulfill this (the following) oath and this (the following)
contract (ξ(σ)υγγραφή: written set of conditions, introducing the dual nature of Oath: the
verbal nature of an oath and the more lasting documentary nature of a contract) to the best of
his ability and judgment. This contract was not simply a documentary version of Oath, but
would have been drafted to reflect the circumstances of each of the swearers.⁶⁰ Jouanna
(2018) notes that it is this pair of entities, the oath and the contract, that have the greatest

---

⁵⁵ The Peloponnesian War, Book 1, chapter 78; Book 2, chapter 71; Book 4, chapters 28, 87.
⁵⁶ "The old sacramental formula ἵστο Zeis is an appeal to the divinities as eyewitnesses and consequently as
irrefutable judges ..." Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University, The Oath in Ancient Greece,
⁵⁷ Kenneth James Dover, Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle (Indianapolis: Hackett,
1994), 249.
⁵⁹ Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 14–15.
⁶⁰ ibid., 16–17: “Le serment (ὁρκος) qui doit nécessairement être prononcé pour être efficace (même s’il est
écrit) est le garant du « contrat » écrit (ξυγγραφή) qui a été rédigé entre le maître et le disciple et se trouve
présent aussi (cf. τήνδε) lors de la prestation du serment. Ce contrat n’est évidemment pas la copie écrite du
Serment, mais le contrat particulier a chaque disciple qui varie en fonction de ses biens et de ses ressources.”
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claim to our attention in interpreting *Oath* as a whole: the ξ(σ)υγγραφή being a significant legal device of the classical era, to which an oath was a verbal adjunct. Jouanna points to examples of the classical era from Demosthenes and Plato. Consisting of individually tailored clauses varying in accordance with individual circumstances and the monetary sums involved, ξ(σ)υγγραφαί are, according to Jouanna, central not only to the interpretation of *Oath*, but also to any attempt to date it.

The adverbial phrase κατὰ δύναμιν is fairly standard in classical Greek (e.g., Hdt. 3.142), also appearing in the Corpus (*On Joints* and *Letters*) as an adverbial phrase meaning *in as far as possible*. Although the phrase also appears in oaths of the Hellenistic period, the combination κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ κρίσιν ἐμὴν does not occur at any period. Nonetheless, as a neat, economic turn of phrase, it is extremely effective and characteristic of *Oath*’s leanness of expression. While κρίσις in the *Hippocratic Corpus* is normally used to mean a *medical crisis*, the word is used twice in the sense of *judgment*. Still, κατὰ κρίσιν, in the sense of *to the best of one’s judgment*, is a rarity at any period. Judgment regarding the timing of a physician’s intervention surrounding medical crisis is a *critical* Hippocratic skill, a paramount element of *technē*. The expression κατὰ κρίσιν is therefore powerful in contextual associations. Κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ κρίσιν ἐμὴν also puts the person of the swearer emphatically at the center of *Oath* as one who strives to fulfill his potential through the application of

---

61 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), XXXII.
64 *Aph*. 1.1; *Morb*. 3.1.2 (excluding post-classical works) In the case of *Aph*. 1.1, ἡ δὲ κρίσις χαλεπή, while the meaning is clearly judgement/decision is difficult, it could equally in any other context be the crisis is distressing.
65 Polyb. 6.11.8 κατὰ κρίσιν means “deliberately” “as a result of the deliberate decision to do so.”
individual will and personal responsibility: he calls on the gods as judges to his integrity, not as aids in his endeavor.

Extremely emphatic, the recurring ἐμὴν can but be interpreted as “my own personal” (i.e., being swayed by no other), thus reinforcing the element of personal commitment. Also, in this connection, we need to recall Sommerstein’s observation that oaths administered by official bodies do not, as a rule, belong to the category of omnumi oath. Thus, the first person singular is exceptionally prominent from the very first word of Oath, which simultaneously demonstrates an official (in some respects at least) yet intensely personal register, successfully unifying these elements in a highly convincing format.

2. Conditions of the inter-generational transmission of technē (1.iv.–1.viii)

Following on from ποιῆσειν as the first infinitive and direct object of ὀμνύω, the second infinitive ἡγήσασθαι initiates this relatively long grammatical unit. Unlike ποιῆσειν, it is not, however, a future infinitive; it is aorist, as are the following κοινώσασθαι and ποιῆσασθαι. Jones notes that “manuscript authority in favour [of the aorists] is overwhelming.” In The Doctor’s Oath (1924), Jones leaves them as aorists, while emending them to future infinitives in his Loeb edition. Thus emended, the future infinitives, being consistent with ἐπικρίνειν and διδάξειν, also reinforce promissory nature of Oath. However, it is worth bearing these aorist alternative readings in mind and considering the essential differences between the future infinitive and the aorist infinitive in this context.

66 Jones, 1924, 43.
67 It is worth returning to the Greek grammars concerning the infinitive in ancient Greek:
68 The mixing of future and aorist infinitives is “not an uncommon usage” according to Edelstein. See Ludwig Edelstein, Ancient Medicine: The Selected papers of Ludwig Edelstein, ed. Oswei Temkin and C. Lilian
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Jouanna makes the most sense in this regard when he remarks that it seems unlikely that the original had a neat string of future infinitives, some of which were subsequently rewritten as aorist infinitives. He therefore recommends leaving the mixed sequence as it is rather than emending for contrived coherence. 69

At all events, this passage brings us to the specifics of ὅρκος ὅδε καὶ ξυγγραφὴ ἥδε in respect of what von Staden describes as “the socio-pedagogic dimensions” 70 of the oath-taker’s technē. In this sense, therefore, Oath turns from the divine to the human and the obligations that bind the three generations of practitioners of technē: the oath-taker himself, his forbears and his offspring, or successors, the demigod Asklepios being the bridge in the professional lineage, linking the divine and the human.

2.1 Transmitters of technē to be viewed as having parental status (1.iv.)

While one would expect ἴσον, which would parallel the following ἀδελφοῖς ἴσον, ἴσα, a neuter plural, is a common adverbial from Homer onward, although, as von Staden points out, it occurs but once elsewhere in the Hippocratic Corpus, where it is distinctly Hellenistic. Likewise, διδάσκειν with a double accusative is predominantly Hellenistic in the Corpus. 71 Nonetheless, each of these has sufficient precedent in classical Greek. What is significant is the noun γενέτης, which the context requires that we translate parents or begetters. There are, however, instances of γενέτης 72 having been used in the sense of

---

69 Jouanna, 2018, 18 (Budé I (2), 18): “Il paraît peu vraisemblable qu’il y ait eu à l’origine une séquence régulière d’infinitifs futurs qui ait été transformée de façon si irrégulière en infinitifs aoristes. Il vaut mieux laisser le texte tel qu’il est, plutôt que reconstituer une cohérence qui risque d’être artificielle.”


72 For Erotian’s gloss on this lexical item, see Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), XIII, CXVIII–CXIX.
ancestors and male offspring, which incidentally reinforces the inter-generational currents and elevated ring that pervades Oath.\textsuperscript{73} Technē, at once diachronic and synchronic as the professional core of Oath, is qualified by the demonstrative ὁδὲς, not infrequently to be differentiated from ὁδέ, the demonstrative used with oath and covenant immediately preceding. ὁδὲς rather suggests that we know largely what is involved.\textsuperscript{74} Interestingly, Ambrosianus gives τήνδε rather than ταύτην.

2.2 Communal brotherhood (1.v.)

Hard on the heels of τέχνη comes ἤτος (bios, object of the third infinitive κοινώσασθαι), a word closely bound up with technē in Oath and here most likely to be interpreted as livelihood, which the swearer promises to share with the one who has taught him the technē. Κοινώσασθαι and μετάδοσιν ποιήσασθαι are differentiated despite having a degree of semantic overlap, leading to both often being rendered “share.” This differentiation is significant in how we interpret bios in this context. The verb κοινώσειν occurs nowhere else in the Hippocratic texts, whereas we do find relatively frequent instances of the similar verb κοινωνεῖν—for example, in relation to the working of joints.\textsuperscript{75} In classical Greek generally, this verb can denote communal participation in something, as κοινωνεῖν might be interpreted as doing here. Κοινώσασθαι is an aorist middle infinitive rather than the future active infinitive

\textsuperscript{73} Jones, 1924, 44-45: “It should be noticed that all the linguistic peculiarities of Oath occur in the passage that bind the apprentice to his guild.” A rare occurrence in Classical literature occurs in Euripides (Or. 1011), where it can only be interpreted as my son.


\textsuperscript{75} Index Hippocraticus, 1989, s.v. κοινωνεῖν.
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we might have expected.\textsuperscript{76} Might not the middle voice here express reciprocity? After all, if we think of livelihood as “a means of securing the necessities of life,”\textsuperscript{77} then we would have a degree of repetition with these two verbs of sharing, repetition which is uncharacteristic of our sparsely worded Oath. Might not\textit{κοινώσσαι} be expressing a form of communal living that extends beyond the sharing of daily necessities into the sharing of the more abstract—ideas, values, culture? At all events, \textit{to share one’s life/livelihood} is a rare and striking expression, inevitably bringing to mind the\textit{κοινή} (\textit{koinon}: association of physicians) constituted by the male lineage of the Asclepiads,\textsuperscript{78} which is, in revolutionary fashion, being redefined here in terms of\textit{bios} and\textit{technē} both.

\textit{Χρέος} often indicates an obligation or debt that needs to be paid, but in this context, the plural rather denotes that which is necessary in the course of\textit{bios}, or according to\textit{LSJ}, “anything useful or serviceable.” Jouanna (2018) comments that\textit{χρέος} belongs to the Ionic Greek of the classical period, occurring five times in Herodotus.\textsuperscript{79} The lack of determiner must be significant in exactly how we interpret\textit{bios} in this instance. This also goes for the presence and absence of determiners (possessive adjectives and articles) with the operative nouns throughout Oath as a whole, which is not strictly consistent. As noted above, the lack of definite article, in conjunction with the middle voice of the infinitive might enable us to interpret\textit{βίου κοινώσσαι} as something wider and more reciprocal than \textit{share my livelihood} in this context, extending to “shared values in life.” It is not going too far to see in this striking phrase multiple individual synchronic entities (\textit{bioi}) acting reciprocally in the service of the diachronic\textit{technē}.

\textsuperscript{76} Interestingly,\textit{κοινωνεῖν} is middle in its future form, and also has a stronger tendency to take a genitive of the thing shared.
\textsuperscript{77} English Oxford Living Dictionaries: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/livelihood.
\textsuperscript{78} Jouanna, 1999, 51–2.
\textsuperscript{79} Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 20.
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Μετάδοσιν ποιέω, equivalent of μεταδίδωμι,\(^{80}\) echoes κοινώω, both taking a genitive of the thing shared.\(^{81}\) Von Staden\(^{82}\) points to Deichgräber’s illuminating suggestion of an allusion to Hesiod.\(^{83}\) Whatever the truth of the matter, this passage in Hesiod is a fine example of βιός in the sense of livelihood, informing and illuminating the interpretation of this crucial word, which von Staden discusses at length.\(^{84}\)

2.3 Redefining lineage (1.vi.)

The hefty and portentous phrase γένος τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ is consistent with the exalted (epic) register of Oath, also being a characteristic expression of curses.\(^{85}\) While this turn of phrase is thus highly consistent with the formal genre of the oath, we might have expected to see it somewhat later—in expressing the element of self-curse that normally concludes an oath. Γένος does have the meaning of offspring in classical Greek, although this is predominantly poetic.\(^{86}\) Also, γένος is highly resonant as a term in the sense of the Asclepiad lineage.\(^{87}\)

Ἄρρεσι is thrown into an emphatic position as if to stress “maleness” as a condition of what could be a generic use of the noun. This adjective would normally be redundant, except that here it expresses maleness as a crucial condition.\(^{88}\) This expression is strongly reminiscent of κατ’ ἀνδρογένειαν, the extremely rare noun common to the speech of

81 Notable in this context is the usage of Galen at Opera II, 280: καὶ τοῖς ἐξω τοῦ γένους ἔδοξε καλὸν εἶναι μεταδίδοναι τῆς τεχνῆς...ἐκοινώνουν τῆς τεχνῆς.
82 von Staden, 2007, 441.
84 von Staden, 2007, 441, who, while citing instances of curses containing this phrase, also notes that the Hippocratic Corpus contains no other instances of the word in the sense of offspring.
85 Significant combination of γένος καὶ οἰκίαν, in the setting of a curse, is found in Demosthenes: Dem. 19.71.
86 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), XIII.
87 See Jones, Hippocrates II: regarding ἠδελφισμένος in Precepts V. Edelstein (Ancient Medicine, 46) suggests the translation “brothers of male lineage.”
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Thessalus in *Speech of the Envoy* (*Or.Thess.* 9.416.17) and an inscription from Delphi. It is this latter that reveals the existence of a κοινόν comprising Asclepiads of both Cos and Cnidus, although *Speech of the Envoy* had indicated only Cos. κοινόν, a league or association, is also strongly suggestive of siblinghood and shared interests (cf. βίου κοινόσασθαι).

2.4 Immunity from fees and contracts (1.vii.)

Μισθός is the word used for fee or payment in Plato’s *Protagoras*. Χρηίζω occurs for a second time in a brief space; while the first instance suggests need, this second instance indicates desire, which accounts for the infinitive that follows as object. This verb is important in that it stresses personal desire to learn or individual calling to the profession rather than descent from the ancestors of Asklepios. Διδάσκειν, hitherto in the form of an aorist participle referring to the one who taught the swearer, now assumes futurity in the form of the future infinitive with the swearer as notional subject, undertaking to teach the healing craft to such as may wish to learn it, as if to unify the past, the present and the future into a lineage of shared knowledge, shared livelihood, and shared values to be augmented with each passing generation or unit of bios.

91 von Staden: “unique within the Corpus.” However, the use with an infinitive has an elevated tone in keeping with *Oath*. For example, Aesch. *PV* 235, 285. Also, of incidental contextual interest (though indicating need with genitive nouns) are: Hom. *Il*. 11. 835: χρηίζοντα καὶ αὐτόν ἀμύμονος ἰητῆρος (of Machaon himself) and Hes. *Op*. 499, 501: χρηίζον μισθοί, κακὰ προσελέξατο θυμῷ. / ἐλπὶς δ᾽ οὐκ ἕγαθη κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζει, / ἣμενον ἐν λέσχῃ, τῷ μὴ βίος ἄρκιος εἴη.
Jouanna (2018) (Budé I (2)), 20–21 comments that this verb is a familiar presence in Herodotus, 18 times in all: four times with the genitive and three times with the infinitive.
2.5 Who qualifies for transmission of technē? (1.viii.)

Here we have the specifics of what is involved in the transmission of the technē to aspirants from a variety of possible backgrounds in addition to the hereditary lineage. The same periphrasis for sharing occurs again within a short space of time. The sharing described occurs over three generations, as if to reflect the three generations of gods named as guarantors. Significantly, the first to be shared is παραγγέλια (παραγγέλη, rare Ionic form), which, although meaning a set of rules or precepts in this context, retains connotations of παραγγέλλω, with its original meaning of transmitting or passing on a message. Miles very plausibly equates these rules with “medical precepts such as the diagnostic, therapeutic and prognostic inferences contained in works like Aphorisms, Precepts, or Proorhetic I.”

Παραγγέλια (παραγγέλη) in the plural form appears, of course, as the title of the work Precepts, but nowhere else in the Hippocratic texts. An interesting instance of the word occurs in Aristotle’s Nikomachean Ethics, where it signifies “professional tradition” and is used in tandem with τέχνη. Ranging from command to advice, παραγγέλια also seems to have a ring somewhat similar to our manual.

Ἀκρόασις, literally that which is listened to, is used in the sense of a lecture. The only other unquestioned occurrence of the word in the Corpus is in Precepts. Polybius also uses the word in this sense, which is otherwise uncommon and predominantly post-classical. Jones interprets this word as some reference to esoteric teaching. Miles comments that the

92 Jones, Loeb II, 276 (in his introduction to Decorum): “Precept, oral instruction and all other teaching,” is a curiously verbose expression, and may very well allude, among other things, to mystic λόγοι imparted to initiated members of a physicians’ guild.”
93 Miles, 2004, 36.
94 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 23: “C’est un traité déontologique [Préceptes], mais trop récent pour apporter quelque lumière sur le Serment.”
96 Praec. 12. See Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 23.
97 Plb. 32.2.5.
98 Jones, 1924, 46.
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term in this setting “refers to synthetic presentations by respected teachers as exemplified by
Prognostic, Joints, or Fractures.”

Μάθησις signifies the act of learning, education or instruction, which Miles believes
“may refer to speculations about the science of medicine.” Herein lies Oath’s link with the
contents of the Hippocratic Corpus, namely a gathering of teaching materials, whether lecture
notes, textbooks, research findings or essays on wider philosophical themes. In its broadest
interpretation, we could see this as involving teaching from texts, teaching orally, and
teaching in a clinical setting. Jouanna admits that the designation of this word can not be
pinned down, but suspects that it largely has to do with practical learning. The swearer is
hereby committing himself to the dissemination of both transmitted knowledge and personal
insights through lecturing and writing. Παραγγελία is the technē as handed down to the
present. Ἀκρόασις is the transmission of knowledge in the present, while such ἄπασσα
μάθησις as remains is the technē augmented in a universal setting. This sequence of nouns is
characteristic of Oath in its comprehensiveness and awareness of chronological flow.

Not only does the undertaking to share include sharing with the sons of the swearer
and with the sons of the one who has instructed the swearer, but it also extends to the
obligation to share with any pupil bound by the act of swearing and of becoming a signatory
to a contract. A standard word in classical Greek for disciple or apprentice, μαθητής,
is otherwise used in the Corpus only in the late works Prorheticus II and Decretum. Here it is
qualified by two participles, dramatic reminders of and parallels to Oath’s portentous opening:

100 Jones, Loeb I, xxii: “In the first place the heterogeneous character of the Corpus should be observed. It
contains:
(1) “Text-books for physicians; (2) Text-books for laymen; (3) Pieces of research or collection of material for
research. (4) Lectures or essays for medical students and novices. (5) Essays by philosophers who were
perhaps not practising physicians, but laymen interested in medicine and anxious to apply to it the methods
of philosophy. (6) Note-books or scrap-books.”
101 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 23: “Ce qui constitue le reste de l’enseignement n’est pas précisé: on pense
surtout à l’enseignement pratique.”
102 Index Hippocraticus, 1989, s.v. μάθησις.
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ἐπιτελέα ποιήσειν ... ὥρκον τόνδε καὶ ξυγγραφήν τήνδε. Συγγεγραμμένος is the perfect participle of the middle συγγράφεσθαι, while ὥρκισμένος is the perfect participle passive of the verb ὥρκιζειν, a causative verb that literally means “make swear.” The participles clearly express the resultative / perfective aspect of both verbs, namely “once they have put their signature to a contract and have been sworn in.” The difference in the voice of the two verbs is intriguing, ὥρκισμένος reminding one of ἡδελφισμένος at Precepts V. The dative adverbial νόμῳ ἰητρικῷ is to be taken as modifying both συγγεγραμμένος and ὥρκισμένος. Given the legal importance of the contract set before the swearer of Oath, it makes sense that νόμῳ ἰητρικῷ apply just as much to συγγεγραμμένος. Von Staden discusses in some detail the expression νόμῳ ἰητρικῷ. Rarity though the collocation νόμος ἰατρικός is, ἰητρική τέχνη is the central theme of what Jones describes as the “quaint little piece called Law” (Νόμος), enabling us to see the phrase νόμος ἰατρικός as representing the conditions conducive to the ideal attainment of ἰητρική τέχνη. In the treatise Νόμος, however, the word νόμος makes no appearance other than in the title; nor is the phrase νόμος ἰατρικός anywhere to be found. Yet, surely Oath sees itself as the embodiment of νόμος ἰατρικός.

Νόμος and Oath are inextricably bound up with δίκη, whose original significance leans heavily toward custom, usage. Interestingly, at Fractures VII, νόμος is qualified by δίκαιος to indicate “correct procedure.” Νόμος is frequently used in the treatises concerning the

103 Interestingly, ὥρκιζειν, having since lost its causative nature, is used in the modern Greek translation of Oath as the equivalent of ὀμνυμί/ὀμνύω.
105 Jones, Loeb II, 275: “Note that allusion is made to νόμος ἰατρικός, and that it is at the end of our Νόμος that the reference to initiation occurs.”
106 Dover, 1994, 253: The relationship of νόμος (in accordance with customary procedure) and δίκη is telling.
treatment of joints and fractures\textsuperscript{107} to signify procedure, and although it is overwhelmingly used in the singular, it is used in the plural when indicating a number of different procedures (\textit{Mochl. 41}). This makes it less likely that \textit{procedure} is the meaning here in \textit{Oath}, where the singular is more likely to mean something nearer \textit{code of practice}.\textsuperscript{108}

This stipulation governing the scope of sharing closes with a negative, the first to appear in \textit{Oath}: \textit{ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐδὲν ἰ, }which can be interpreted in two ways. Von Staden translates the dative thus: “—to my sons and the [sons] of him who has taught me and to the pupils who have both made a written contract and sworn by a medical convention but by no other,” whereas a more traditional interpretation is the one we find in Jones\textsuperscript{109}: “—to my sons, to the sons of my teacher, and to pupils who have signed the indenture and sworn obedience to the physicians’ Law, but to none other.” Jouanna (2018) likewise translates as “—et à nul autre.” Whichever of these interpretations is the more consistent with the original intent of \textit{Oath}, it constitutes a stricture, a limitation to what is otherwise a generous opening up of the Asclepian hereditary guild, while at the same time committing the swearer to what is the first of two pledges to professional secrecy.

3 Principles of therapy (2.i.–5.ii.)

This section of \textit{Oath} turns to specific questions of medical practice. The change in theme is signaled grammatically: infinitives as object of \textit{I swear} give way to finite verbs in the first person singular. It is significant that the first sentence of this section marks its transitional nature by creating a grammatically awkward combination of a finite first person

\begin{footnotes}
\item[107] Off. 8, Fract. 7, Art. 18, 87.
\item[108] Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 22. notes that \textit{ὡρκισμένοις νόμῳ ἰητρικῷ} is probably echoed in Scribonius Largus’ Epistula 3–4: “Idcirco ne hostibus quidem malum medicamentum dabint \textit{qui sacramento medicinae legitime est obligatus}…”
\item[109] Jones, 1924, 9.
\end{footnotes}
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future and a future infinitive. The sequence of what the swearer undertakes to do and not to do is: I WILL > I WILL > I WILL NOT > I WILL NOT > I WILL NOT > I WILL > I WILL NOT > I WILL.

Accompanying this grammatical shift there comes a thematic change of direction from social obligations to pledges regarding specific areas of medical therapy. The first sentence of this transition is significantly hybrid in nature, containing a finite first-person future χρήσομαι, harking forward and then reverting fleetingly to a future infinitive εἴρξειν, as if to direct our gaze backwards.

3.1 All manner of regimen (2.i.)

The neuter plural διαιτήματα, like the feminine singular διαίτα, in a medical context most often signifies a mode of living or regimen, whether constituting diet or otherwise. While much attention has been devoted to such “prohibitions” as appear in Oath, which are nothing more than personal pledges to avoid certain conduct, not enough weight has been given to this positive commitment of the swearer to avail himself of all [kinds of]

110 Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 24: remarks on this mix of finite verb and infinitive thus: “On laissera l’alternance entre le mode personnel et l’infinitif sans chercher à corriger un texte dont la souplesse est parfois déroutante.”

111 For the collocation διαιτήματα τε χρῆσθαι as used in the Corpus, see von Staden, 2007, 443. διαιτήματος (διαίτης)... χρῆσθαι is regularly used in Regime I, the verb χρῆσθαι also being used with the adjuncts of regimen.

112 For a caution regarding the “semantic field covered by diaita, see Hynek Bartoš, Philosophy and dietetics in the Hippocratic “On Regimen”: a delicate balance of health (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 14.

113 When the writer wants to be more specific or amplify the meaning, for example, he will augment διαιτήματα/διαίτα/διαιτητική (e.g., Hp.Acut.(Sp.)54 / διαιτώμαι with ἐσθίω, πίνω, προσφέρωμαι, τροφή etc. Types of food (ατία) and drink (ποτά) and an intermediate form of nourishment known as ῥύφημα (soup / gruel) are the elements of diet. Elements of diet are seen by the author of Regimen I (Loeb IV, 226) as each having a natural potency as well as a potency through the agency of human τέχνη. A similar distinction is made (ibid.) between types of exercise – natural and artificial – which must be used in the correct proportion to food, constitution, age, location, season and climate. As far as the translation of διαιτήματα goes, Edelstein translates this as “dietetic measures” (Ludwig Edelstein, Ancient Medicine (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins, 1967), 6.) while von Staden translates as “regimens” (von Staden, 1996, 407). Jones, on the other hand, simply says “treatment” (Jones, Loeb, 1939, 299) and Temkin says “dietetic regimens” (Owsei Temkin, “On Second Thought” and Other Essays in the History of Medicine and Science (Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 23). Jouanna translates as “(tout) le régime” Jouanna 2018 (Budé I (2)), 3.
regimen (dietetic treatment). After all, what is more central to the Hippocratic world of medicine than how the writers viewed regimen itself both as part of technē and the philosophy that imbued technē?

When the writer of Ancient Medicine states that only medicine will lead to a clear understanding of “natural science,” he points to the duty of the physician as lying in the study of what man is in relation to what he drinks and eats and in his relation to his routine pursuits. It is these elements that are the subject of regimen. The evidence from the Hippocratic Corpus frequently shows regimen to have taken the form of a diet prescribed in stages and designed to correspond to such stages of the patient’s condition as led up to and away from the crisis. The estimation of when the crisis is most likely to occur (timing = καιρός) is a crucial element of διαιτητική (and thus technē as a whole). Regimen in Acute Diseases particularly reinforces the impression that of the three elements of nutrition (solids, soups (semi-liquids), and liquids), solids were avoided surrounding crisis while diet was particularly sparse preceding crisis (ἄχρι ἂν κριθῇ ἡ νοῦσος). This treatise and Ancient Medicine give a similar description of the significance of considering diet, the former asserting that such inquiries are pertinent to the greater part of the most essential elements of technē, being conducive to health in cases of illness, to freedom from illness in states of health, to good condition in athletes in training, and to attaining whatever state anyone should wish. Similarly, the author of Ancient Medicine sees an awareness of the properties

114 GM. Budé II (1), (XX), 146, 17–19: ὅ τί τέ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὰ ἐσθιόμενα τε καὶ πινόμενα καὶ ὅ τι πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα ἐπιτηδεύματα.
115 Κρίσις (medical crisis), κρίσις (judgment), and καιρός (timing of medical intervention) are inextricably bound in Greek medicine.
and nature of nutriment as essential, for, he maintains, it is upon these that the entire life of men depends whether in health, in recovery or in sickness.117

In the Hippocratic treatise Regimen I (end of fifth century or first half of fourth century), the claims made for regimen are medically and philosophically of great significance: used correctly (εἰ δὲ ὀρθῶς διαιτῆσθαι), regimen can improve even the innate disposition of a person. Regimen I states that administration of an effective regimen is thought to benefit the constitution of the soul by improving the balance of the dual fundamental elements of living organisms: water (the cold, humid nourishing force) and fire (the hot, dry mobilizing force).118

For example: “Given the right kind of regimen, a patient will become even more intelligent and astute than his natural disposition.”119 Again, we see that the innate properties of the soul can be improved or refined through regimen: εἰ δὲ ὀρθῶς διαιτήσθαι, βελτίως γίνοντο ἂν καὶ οὕτω.120 Conversely, bad regimen will cause deterioration of the soul.121

In certain places, the Hippocratic Corpus suggests that dietary medicine was a relatively recent innovation in contrast with other more traditional interventions.122 As we have just seen, however, it is clear that the writer of Ancient Medicine saw a consciousness of the role of regimen as the necessary origin of the medical art itself.123 Yet, the concept of regimen, or dietetics, has in the treatises of the Corpus evolved into a therapeutic speciality independent, say, of even purging, venesection (which naturally involves cutting), and certain

117 FM. Budé II (I), (XIV), 135, 11–13: καὶ διὰ ταύτων πᾶς ὁ βίος καὶ ὑγιαίνοντι καὶ ἐκ νοῦσον ἀνατρεφόμενον καὶ κάμνοντι.  
118 “It is the blending that causes ‘intelligence’ or the lack thereof”: Vict I: Περὶ μὲν οὖν φρονίμου καὶ ἀφρονίμου φυγὴς η σύγκρητος αὕτη αἰτίη ἐστίν... (Loeb IV (XXXVI) 292, 1–2).  
119 Vict. I: εἰ δὲ ὀρθῶς διαιτήσθαι, καὶ φρονιμώτερος καὶ ἀφρονίμωτερος γένοιτο. (Loeb IV (XXXV) 282, 25–26)  
120 Vict. I: Loeb IV (XXXV) 286, 69–70.  
121 βελτίως δὲ καὶ οὕτως ὀρθῶς διαιτήσθαι, γένοιτο ἂν, καὶ κακιῶν μὴ ὀρθῶς. (Loeb IV, (XXXV) 288, 92–93).  
122 Acut. Loeb II (III), 64, 4–6), from which we can gather that regimen was initially no great concern of the Cnidians.  
123 FM. Budé II (1), (III), 120–121.
HEALING HEROES: THE TEXT OF THE HIPPOCRATIC OATH

pharmaceutical interventions. A medically prescribed diet was seen as quite distinct from medicating, purging, cauterizing or surgery. Nonetheless, given that a considerable amount of what we know of Hippocratic dietetics is found in Regimen in Acute Diseases, it is necessary to remember that regimen can variously indicate therapeutic dietetics, scrupulously timed interventions surrounding crisis, and regimens prescribed in therapy of non-critical ailments. In addition, the final nine chapters of Nature of Man (Regimen in Health, Loeb IV, 43–59) deal with regimen as a means of maintaining health by varying intake of fluids and solids according to age, season, physique and so on.

By their very nature, regimens generally took time as somewhat prolonged courses of treatment, involving not only diet, but other aspects of lifestyle (ἐπιτηδεύματα) such as exercise, bathing, sleep, clothing, administering of emetics and clysters, and sexual conduct. For example, adjuncts of regimen that figure in Regimen I XXV alone include: runs (δρόμοι), massages (τρίψεις), wrestling (πάλη), walks (περίπατοι), vomiting (ἔμετοι), purging (καθαίρεσθαι), unction (χρίεσθαι), bathing (λούεσθαι), sexual intercourse (λαγνεύειν), exercise (πόνοι/γυμνασία), and vapour baths (πυριᾶσθαι). It is also worth considering to what extent praying (εὔχεσθαι) and other religious conduct played a part in what was regarded as regimen. Prayer certainly appears to be an adjunct of regimen, as is suggested by Regimen IV, which ends thus: “A person who follows these recommendations as they have been recorded will experience a life of health. Indeed, I have discovered regimen, in as far as

---

124 Bartoš, 2015, 100–102.
125 See 187 and 188.
126 Jouanna, 1999, 161–162. Also De Arte, Loeb II, (V) 196, 14–18, where proof of the existence of technē is evinced in regard to what a patient does or does not do in his daily life even without medical intervention.
it is possible for a mortal to discover it, with [the aid of] the gods." In fact, there are only two other places in the Hippocratic Corpus where Apollo, principal witness to Oath, makes an appearance, one of these also being in Regimen IV. Here, interestingly, it is prescribed that, in conjunction with modified regimen (ἐκδιαιτᾶσθαι), prayers be made to Apollo whenever “heavenly signs” are propitious.

In contrast, Plato’s view of the relatively new dietetic approach is divided. On the one hand, he has Socrates speak favorably of “curing the part along with the whole” in the Charmides. Conversely, however, the Republic reveals Plato as one who views the practice of dietetics (μακρὰν δίαιταν) as contrasted with the patient’s customary diet (εἰωθυῖαν δίαιταν) or swifter interventions such as medication, purging, cauterizing or surgery as an impediment to the smooth working of society: normal diet will either restore a patient or kill him; either way is preferable to neglecting one’s work. However one regards the matter, such forms of treatment would presumably have been the preserve of those with sufficient leisure to fulfill the prescription.

128 The final sentence of Regimen IV, Loeb IV, 446: τούτοισι χρώμενος ὡς γέγραπται, ὑγιανεῖ τὸν βίον, καὶ εὐρηταὶ μοι δίαιτα ὡς δυνατὸν εὑρεῖν ἀνθρώποι σώματα σῶν τοῖσι θεοῖσιν.
129 Pict. IV: Loeb IV, 436, 128–131: καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι εὔχεσθαι, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖσιν Ἡλίῳ, Διὶ ὑγιοι, Διὶ κτησίῳ, Ἀθηνᾷ κτῆσι, Ἑρμῇ, Ἀπόλλωνι ... 
130 Pl. Chrm. 156b3-c6. See also Pl. Tim. 89C: ὥσ παράδειγμα εὐδαίμονι πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, καθ’ ὅσον ἂν ἧ τυ σχολῆ: That is, regimen is to be preferred to medication for the “control” of disease providing one has the time.
131 Pl. Resp. 3.15 (406d-e). Totelin (Laurence M. V. Totelin, Hippocratic recipes: oral and written transmission of pharmacological knowledge in fifth- and fourth-century Greece: Studies in ancient medicine (Boston: Brill, 2009), 132.) also points to Aristophanes’ Frogs (Ra. 936–943), where current dietetic terms are used mockingly. (Ἀλλ᾽ ὡς παρελαβόν τὴν τέχνην παρὰ σοῦ ὁ πρῶτος εὐθὺς ἤδονον ὑπὸ κόμπασμάτων καὶ δριμάτων ἐπάχθων ἤγαγεν μὲν πρώτοτον αὐτήν καὶ τὸ βάρος ἀφέθη σοι ἐπιλλίοις καὶ περιπάτοις καὶ τευτλίσας λευκὸς γυλὸν διδοὺς ἑτομλυμάτων ἀπὸ βιβλίων ἄπτηθον: ἔιτ᾽ ἀνέτρεφον μονῳδίαις)
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Given that the version of Oath adopted by Jouanna (See note 9.) and von Staden reflects Ambrosianus and P. Oxy. XXXI 2547 by adding πᾶσι after regimens, it is all the more necessary when interpreting διαιτήματα to bear in mind the myriad facets of this term as evinced in the Corpus, and particularly the distinction between short-term dietetic interventions and regimens designed to be effective over the long term both for therapy and maintenance of health.

3.2 Guarding patients from harm and injustice (2.ii.)

This is a cardinal phrase in Oath, though it is somewhat cryptic in terms of language. Εἴργεῖν is by nature a transitive verb. It is therefore necessary to expand the statement thus: “to guard [them] [from that which is] to [their] harm and injustice.” Perhaps the most famous use of this verb in the sense of shutting out or keeping at a distance can be found in the plea to Achilleus by the ghost of Patroklos. Εἴργεῖν occurs with relative frequency and in a variety of guises in the Corpus, meaning keep in (retain), keep out / away from, or abstain from.

Miles points out that “it seems quite unlikely that the parsimoniously written Oath would use benefit the ill and guard them from injustice to make a single point,” concluding that the thrust of ἄδικεν Εἴργεῖν constitutes “a commitment to a medical ethic that looks outward to improve the public health by engaging public policy that unjustly harms health.” While such a reading is insightful, ἄδικεν Εἴργεῖν also foreshadows the personal pledges of self-restraint that come later in Oath: in other words, an implicit undertaking to safeguard patients from wrongdoing at the swearer’s own hands (abstain), as well as any injustice from

---

132 See Jones, 1924, 18: “A few of its [Ambrosianus’] are merely errors, but the majority show that our vulgate represents but one line of descent, and that probably not the best.”
133 Il. 23.72.
134 Index Hippocraticus, 1989, s.v. Εἴργω.
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without (protect). This turn of phrase is comprehensive, but certainly not prolix: for it is conceivable that physicians might benefit patients in terms of medical outcome without protecting them other forms of trickery and exploitation. In other words, Oath here calls on the swearer to pledge both excellence of technē and bios (character) in dealing with the suffering. The construction with εἴργειν here is highly elliptical, but to keep someone away from something or to keep something away from someone conceivably involves an element of coercion. If, however, we accept the reading of Ambrosianus at this point, κατὰ γνώμην ἐμήν would mean to the best of my conscience (a well attested interpretation of γνώμη) just as much as to the best of my judgment. Here ἀδίκιη is coupled with δήλησις, both being set in contrast with ὀφελεῖα. Of a common origin with our word deleterious (τὸ δηλητήριον meaning poison in the apocryphal Letters), δήλησις signifies that which is injurious both to health and to well-being in general, having much in common with φθόριος, especially when echoed by φθορῆς τε τῆς ἄλλης at 6.ii. Δήλησις is used in Herodotus with the preposition ἐπί to mean the general intent to harm someone.

136 von Staden, 2007, note 8 (428) and note 76 (443).
137 See, for example, Aesch. Eum. 674: ἀπὸ γνώμης φέρειν ψήφον δικαίως (“with a good conscience,” LSJ) and Ar. Ran. 355: διὰ τῆς γνώμης μὴ καθαρεύει “has not a clear conscience,” LSJ). The latter instance is more recently translated “pure mind,” which has great bearing on the discussion of ἀγνῶς δὲ καὶ ὁσίως. Dover (1994, 123) comments on the “denotational field” of γνώμη thus: “Neither word [γνώμη or διανοία], however, is confined to decisions and conclusions which result from intellectual analysis; both could be applied to states or attitudes of mind which we would regard of affirmation of general moral principle or sustained orientation of the will.”
138 Ep. 19.
139 For textual variants, Ambrosianus has ἐπί ἀλλασι (the plural meaning wiles, treachery at Il. 3.202; 4.339, etc.; Papyrus Oxyrhynchus (P.Oxy. 2547) has ἐπὶ ὀλέθρως, which signifies destruction, being very close to φθόριος.
140 Hdt. 1.41, 4.112.