

Eric D. Nelson  
Pacific Lutheran University

### History of an Appendix: What's Hippocratic about the Pseudepigraphics?

As a part of the body of “Hippocratic” medical writings, the Hippocratic pseudepigrapha have had a widely varied estimation over time. Once considered a window into the world and spirit of the author of the “best” writings of the Corpus, the speeches and letters are now sometimes considered the Corpus’ quixotic appendix: a small and irritable appendage whose purpose and usefulness have passed into obscurity.

And yet, even as late-comers to the collection, pseudepigrapha have an interesting role in the history of the Corpus. The earliest, the speeches *Presbeutikos* (*Speech of the Envoy*) and *Epibomios* (*Speech from the Altar*) may have been a catalyst for the Corpus’ eponymous branding in Alexandria and an impetus in the long ensuing history of the “Hippocratic Question.” Later, variations of an epistolary tradition, originating elsewhere, were brought into the Corpus and figured in the ensuing traditions of Hippocratic biography from perhaps the first century BC. However, the pseudepigrapha of the Corpus represent only a fragmentary picture of the Hippocratic lore that burgeoned from the third century BC through the second century AD. This Hippocratica, some of which were eventually incorporated into the Hippocratic *vitae*, included both elaborations of—and backlashes against—Hippocrates’ emerging (or established) stardom.

Within this context, the permutations of pseudepigrapha that attend early compilations of the medical texts provide an opportunity to consider the implications of their selection. Most earlier investigations have focused on the development, possible relations, authorship, or the historicity of episodes (e.g. Philippson 1928; Diller 1933; De Lay 1969; Sakalis 1983; Smith 1990; Rubin-Pinault 1992; Rütten 1992; Jouanna 1999; Nelson 2005). Here, I examine the choices to include pseudepigrapha from the perspective of those who selected or rejected them from among their other options. What do these choices say about those who made them and about the Corpus that they had in mind?

I first consider the pseudepigraphic speeches, whose association with the Corpus appears to go back to its original compilation in Alexandria. The implications of their inclusion in the Corpus depend to a degree on whether the speeches were discovered among (and thus helped form a conception of) materials that became the Corpus, or whether they were added to materials already conceived of as a corpus in the mind of its compilers. I then consider the epistolary episodes included in the major manuscript traditions. In these instances, editors certainly selected or rejected Hippocratica to augment a Corpus about which they already had formed ideas and assumptions. However, like the speeches, the epistolary episodes betray a degree of ambivalence about Hippocrates and, rather than clarify the pseudepigrapha’s relation to the medical texts, seem to make them even more difficult to reconcile.

I use these observations to suggest that the apparent tensions of the pseudepigrapha and the rest of the Corpus arise largely because the narratives and discursive frameworks by which readers often seek to impose coherence on them (such as authorship or the recognition of certain rationalizing elements) were not those that motivated their formation and development. I argue that we might look instead to the developing elite identity of Greek physicians and scholars who associated themselves with the intellectual history for which the Corpus became a touchstone. The assemblage of medical writings, as Smith (1990) has suggested, may have been motivated primarily by the desire to preserve the available examples of this tradition at a moment in time. The pseudepigrapha, however, seem chosen to illustrate a “Hippocratic” Hippocrates. This “Hippocratic,” however, is not identified by the embrace of theoretical or methodological approaches made distinct by the Corpus. Nor is he identified as the author of texts parsed out of the Corpus. Rather, he is recognized as having an elite status through his participation in the tradition that the Corpus represents and by his engagement, based on this status, with other culturally significant individuals and events. Hippocrates’ life and mythology lent itself particularly well to such modeling, and may explain why these aspects were more important, despite their ambiguities, to the compilers of the Corpus than to our own concerns.