

Ana Šumenković
Faculty of Philosophy,
University of Belgrade
sumenkovicana@gmail.com

Original Scientific Paper
UDC 94:929 Демостен
614.25(038)

821.143.09-5 Демостен

Received: September 01, 2024

Revised: December 01, 2024

Accepted: December 07, 2024



DOCTORS ON TRIALS THE PHYSICIAN AS A WITNESS IN DEMOSTHENES' ORATION *CONTRA CONONEM*

Abstract

This paper aims to outline the position and standing of physicians in the ancient law contexts, represented by the physician as a witness in Demosthenes' oration *Contra Cononem*. This oration is a speech for a wealthy client, Ariston, a victim of Conon's beating. The attack itself and subsequent injuries were described in medical terms. In this paper, I will try to show that there is more to be gleaned from the oration *Contra Cononem*, especially concerning the importance of understanding the impact of a physician's testimony on the outcome of the legal process.

Keywords: Demosthenes · *Contra Cononem* · physician · health · healing.

Healing and healers in the Greek world

The ancient Greeks, as evident from medical and philosophical documents, especially of the sixth to fourth centuries BCE, were the first to break with the metaphysical/supernatural conceptions of health and disease (Tountas, 2009: 185-6), though from the Hellenistic era on medicine became speculative and even superstitious (Edelstein, 1987: 202). The specific role of physicians in classical Greece must also be taken into consideration. In Homeric times, physicians were of inferior standing, but with the improvement of Asclepius' position after 700 BCE came an upgrading of medicine and at the same time a re-orientation of medical care (Tountas, 2009: 189).

Greek physicians were appreciated far and wide, as can be seen from the example of Apollonides of Cos, a mid-fifth century physician who successfully treated a wound of Megabyzus, or Ctesias of Cnidus, a court doctor of Artaxerxes II, who treated the wound Artaxerxes received during personal combat with Cyrus at Cunaxa, in 401 BCE (Tuplin, 2004: 319-320). Even Aristotle came from a medical family with connections to the Macedonian court. Although a state health service did exist in ancient Greece, and its

varieties are found in all parts of the Greek world, throughout the whole duration of classical antiquity (Woodhead, 1952: 236), and although the physician who was employed in this state health service probably received a stipend comparable to that of an artist or architect employed by the city, this state physician was not at the same time a state coroner or a physical examiner (Amundsen, Ferngren, 1977: 204). It seems that not even the office of coroner had existed. This is in great part because of the distinctly private nature of Athenian law, where even homicide was considered a private offense.

Physicians were expected to look healthy and plump, to gain credibility among the common crowd, but also clean, well-dressed, and sweet-smelling, and follow some moral considerations: not only to be silent but also most regular in life, grave and kind to all, serious but not harsh, just in every social relation, and self-controlled towards maidens, women, and precious possessions (Phillips, 1953: 73-4). They were regarded as a source of great authority, which could even be transferred to those lacking. Individuals could summon physicians as witnesses, to certify an illness or to give testimony, and those professional testimonies were especially respected, which is evidenced not only by Demosthenes' oration *Contra Cononem* but by the writings of Plato and Aristotle as well (Phillips, 1953: 209).

The use of word “physician” in Demosthenes' orations

Health in general is not a rare motif in Demosthenes' orations. Health, or absence of it, could be the reason stated in court for someone's behaviour, like in Demosthenes' speech against Neaera:

λογισμὸν ἀνθρώπινον καὶ εἰκότα λογιζόμενος, ὅτι πονηρῶς μὲν ἔχοι καὶ οὐ πολλὴ ἐλπίς εἴη αὐτὸν περιγενήσεσθαι, τοῦ δὲ μὴ λαβεῖν τοὺς συγγενεῖς τὰ αὐτοῦ μηδ' ἅπαις τετελευτηκέναι ἐποιήσατο τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἀνέλαβεν ὡς αὐτόν: ἐπεὶ ὅτι γε ὑγιαίνων οὐκ ἂν ποτε ἔπραξεν, μεγάλῳ τεκμηρίῳ καὶ περιφανεῖ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐπιδείξω. (Dem. 59.57)

His reasoning in the matter was both natural and to be expected. He was in a precarious condition and there was not much hope that he would recover. He did not wish his relatives to get his property nor himself to die childless, so he adopted this boy and received him back into his house. That he would never have done this, if he had been in good health, I will show you by a strong and convincing proof. (Trans. DeWitt & DeWitt)

It is surprising, then, that Demosthenes uses the word „physician“ (ιατρός) in 7 speeches, only 11 times total. However, the way this word was used makes up for its relative sparsity. The first group consists of results where the word “physician” is used in a general sense, the second group consists of results where this word is used in an individual sense, and the third and last

group consists of results where Demosthenes used the word “physician” as an element of his state-speeches.

The first group is the most numerous, with six results. For example, in Dem. 47. 62, Demosthenes used this word as follows:

ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν μοι ἀπηγγέλθη εἰς Πειραιᾶ τὰ γεγενημένα ὑπὸ τῶν γειτόνων, ἐλθὼν εἰς ἀγρὸν τούτους μὲν οὐκέτι καταλαμβάνω, ἰδὼν δὲ τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας ἐκπεφορημένα καὶ τὴν γραῦν ὡς διέκειτο, καὶ ἀκούων τῆς γυναικὸς τὰ γενόμενα, προσελθὼν τῷ Θεοφῆμῳ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ ἔωθεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μάρτυρας ἔχων ἐκέλευον αὐτὸν πρῶτον μὲν τὴν καταδίκην ἀπολαμβάνειν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν, ἔπειτα τὴν ἄνθρωπον θεραπεύειν ἣν συνέκοψαν, καὶ ἰατρὸν εἰσάγειν ὃν αὐτοὶ βούλονται. (Dem. 47.62)

When, then, the news of what had been done was brought me in Peiraeus by the neighbors, I went to the farm, but found that these men had left; I saw, however, that the household goods had been carried off and in what plight the old woman was. My wife told me what had taken place, so, early next morning, I approached Theophemus in the city, having witnesses with me, and demanded, first that he accept payment of the amount of his judgement, and go with me to the bank, then, that he should provide for the care of the old woman whom they had beaten, calling in any physician whom they pleased. (Trans. Murray)

In the second group of results, Demosthenes takes a step further and uses the word „physician“ in an individual sense. He even lets us glimpse the real physicians, mentioned by name, in Dem. 33.18, and Dem. 40.33. In the speech against Apatourius (Dem. 33.18), the speaker mentions by name a certain physician, Eryxias, an intimate friend of Aristocles and, obviously, smarter of the two, since he came up with a plan against the speaker:

ὁμολογήσας δὲ ἐξοίσειν τὰς συνθήκας ὁ Ἀριστοκλῆς ἐμφανεῖς μὲν οὐπω καὶ τήμερον ἐνήνοχεν, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν συγκειμένην ἀπαντήσας εἰς τὸ Ἡφαιστεῖον, προῦφασίζετο ὡς ὁ παῖς περιμένων αὐτὸν ἀπολωλεκῶς εἶη τὸ γραμματεῖον καθεύδων. ὁ δὲ ταῦτα κατασκευάζων ἦν Ἐρυξίας ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἐκ Πειραιῶς, οἰκείως ἔχων τῷ Ἀριστοκλεῖ: ὅσπερ καὶ ἐμοὶ τοῦ ἀγῶνος αἰτίος ἐστίν, διαφόρως ἔχων. καὶ ὡς ἐσκήψατο ἀπολωλέναι ὁ Ἀριστοκλῆς, ἀκούσατε τῶν μαρτυριῶν. (Dem. 33.18)

Aristocles promised that he would produce the articles, but up to this day has not brought them to light. He did meet us on the appointed day at the Hephaestum,¹ but made the excuse that his slave while waiting for him had fallen asleep and lost the document. The man who concocted this plot was Eryxias, the physician from Peiraeus, an intimate friend of Aristocles, the same man who out of enmity toward me has also got up this action against me. Now in proof that Aristocles pretended that he had lost the document, hear the depositions. (Trans. Murray)

Now comes a rather positive role of a named physician in Demosthenes' *Against Boeotus* 2. This was Euthydicus, who told the whole truth to the court of Areopagus, and thus saved an innocent man from a wrongful vengeance:

καὶ εἰ μὴ Εὐθύδικος ὁ ἰατρός, πρὸς ὃν οὗτοι τὸ πρῶτον ἦλθον δεόμενοι ἐπιτεμεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν εἶπεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν, τοιαύτην ἂν δίκην οὗτος εἰλήφει παρ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντος, ἦν ὑμεῖς οὐδὲ κατὰ τῶν τὰ μέγιστ' ἀδικούντων ὑμᾶς ἐπιχειρήσαιτ' ἂν ποιήσασθαι. ἵνα δὲ μὴ δοκῶ διαβάλλειν αὐτόν, ἀνάγνωθί μοι τὰς μαρτυρίας. (Dem. 40.33)

And if Euthydicus, the physician, to whom these men had gone in the first instance, asking him to make a cut on the head of Boeotus—had not told to the court of the Areopagus the whole truth, this man would have taken such vengeance upon me, who was guilty of no wrong toward him, as you would not try to inflict on those who were guilty of the greatest wrongs toward you. That I may not be thought to be slandering him, read, please, the depositions. (Trans. Murray)

The third group brings us back to the communal grounds, based on the state speech in which the word „physician“ was used, in Dem. 3.33, Dem. 25.95, and Dem. 26.26. In the third Olynthiac oration, delivered sometime in the year 349/8 BCE (Sealey, 1993: 139), Demosthenes was supporting Olynthus' plea for help. He not only criticizes a new type of orators, who do not lead, but follow the demos, nor appeal to the greater good, but to what is pleasing, he extends his criticisms to Athens of his time, comparing it to Athens that existed between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars (Miller, 2002: 406). Demosthenes paints a gloomy picture of Athens, where the private houses of the orators are more stately than public buildings (Ibid 407). There is still hope if Athenians find their courage and follow the examples laid by their forefathers; otherwise, they will continue to exist in this neither living nor dead state:

ἐὰν οὖν ἀλλὰ νῦν γ' ἔτι ἀπαλλαγέντες τούτων τῶν ἐθῶν ἐθελήσητε στρατεύεσθαι τε καὶ πράττειν ἀξίως ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ταῖς περιουσίαις ταῖς οἰκοὶ ταύταις ἀφορμαῖς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔξω τῶν ἀγαθῶν χρῆσθαι, ἴσως ἂν, ἴσως, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τέλειόν τι καὶ μέγα κτήσασθ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων λημμάτων ἀπαλλαγείητε, ἃ τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσι παρὰ τῶν ἰατρῶν σιτίοις διδομένοις ἔοικε. καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖν' οὐτ' ἰσχὺν ἐντίθησιν οὐτ' ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἐξᾶ: καὶ ταῦθ' ἃ νέμεσθε νῦν ὑμεῖς, οὐτε τοσαῦτ' ἐστὶν ὥστ' ὠφέλειαν ἔχειν τινὰ διαρκῆ, οὐτ' ἀπογνόντας ἄλλο τι πράττειν ἐξ, ἀλλ' ἔστι ταῦτα τὴν ἐκάστου ραθυμίαν ὑμῶν ἐπαυξάνοντα. (Dem. 3.33)

If, therefore, even at the eleventh hour, you can shake off these habits, and consent to fight and act as becomes Athenians and to devote the abundant resources that you have at home to the attainment of success abroad, perhaps, men of Athens, perhaps you may gain some important

and unqualified advantage and may be quit of these paltry perquisites. Like the diet prescribed by doctors, which neither restores the strength of the patient nor allows him to succumb, so these doles that you are now distributing neither suffice to ensure your safety nor allow you to renounce them and try something else; they only confirm each citizen in his apathy. (Trans. Vince)

In a similar metaphor, in Dem. 25.95, the speaker compares Aristogeiton to a monster and urges his compatriots to expel him, like a physician cauterizes or cuts away cancer, an ulcer, or some other incurable growth:

τὸ μὲν οὖν νοουθετεῖν τοῦτον μανία: ὃς γὰρ οἷς ὁ δῆμος ἅπας τοὺς ἐνοχλοῦντας ἑαυτὸν νοουθετεῖ θορύβοις μηδεπώποθ' ὑπεῖξε μηδὲ διетράπη, ταχύ γ' ἂν φροντίσειέ τι τοῦ παρ' ἐνὸς λόγου. ἀνίατον, ἀνίατον, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἔστι τὸ τούτου. δεῖ δὴ πάντας, ὥσπερ οἱ ἰατροί, ὅταν καρκίνον ἢ φαγέδαιναν ἢ τῶν ἀνιάτων τι κακῶν ἴδωσιν, ἀπέκαυσαν ἢ ὅλως ἀπέκοψαν, οὕτω τοῦτο τὸ θηρίον ὑμᾶς ἐξορίσαι, ῥῖψαι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ἀνελεῖν, μὴ περιμείναντάς τι παθεῖν, ὃ μὴτ' ἰδίᾳ μῆτε δημοσίᾳ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ προευλαβηθέντας. (Dem. 25.95)

Surely, then, to admonish such a fellow is madness. A man who never yielded or shrank before the storm of protest with which the whole Assembly admonishes those who offend it, would readily heed the protest of an individual! His case is incurable, men of Athens, quite incurable. Just as physicians, when they detect a cancer or an ulcer or some other incurable growth, cauterize it or cut it away, so you ought all to unite in exterminating this monster. Cast him out of your city; destroy him. Take your precautions in time and do not wait for the evil consequences, which I pray may never fall either on individuals or on the community. (Trans. Murray)

This seems to be a constant theme in Demosthenes' orations – in his speech On the Chersonese, Demosthenes implied that a man with the behaviour of Phillip II could not be considered sane:

οὔτε τὴν Εὐβοίαν ἠλευθερώσατε, οὔτε τῶν ὑμετέρων αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ἐκομίσασθε, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος μὲν ὑμῶν οἴκοι μενόντων, σχολὴν ἀγόντων, ὑγιαίνοντων (εἰ δὴ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντας ὑγιαίνειν φήσαιμεν), δὴ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ κατέστησε τυράννους, τὸν μὲν ἀπαντικρὺς τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐπιτεχίσας, τὸν δ' ἐπὶ Σκιάθον, (Dem. 8.36)

Have you neither liberated Euboea nor regained any of your lost possessions? On the other hand, while you stay at home, at leisure and in health” – (if indeed they could say that men who behave thus are in health – “Philip has set up two despots in Euboea, entrenching one right over against Attica and the other as a menace to Sciathus; (Trans. Vince)

In addition, the metaphor in Dem. 26.26 is similar to the one in Dem. 25.95, only this time, instead of urging his audience to follow the example of physicians and unite against madness, the speaker acts against savagery, comparing physicians' purging of maladies from the human body to the legislators' expulsion of savagery from the citizens' souls:

δηλον δέ: τῶν γὰρ πόλεων ταύτας ἄριστ' οἰκουμένας ἵδοιμεν ἂν ἐν αἷς ἄριστοι νομοθέται γεγόνασιν: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν ἀρρωστήματα τοῖς τῶν ἱατρῶν εὐρήμασι καταπαύεται, τὰς δ' ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἀγριότητας αἱ τῶν νομοθετῶν ἐξορίζουσι διάνοιαι. (Dem. 26.26)

This is clearly so, because we can see that those cities are best ordered which have given birth to the best lawgivers. For as the distempers of the body are arrested by the discoveries of physicians, so savagery is expelled from the soul by the wise purposes of the legislator. (Trans. Murray)

Demosthenes' oration *Contra Cononem*

Demosthenes had not only been one of the greatest politicians and orators of his time, he was also a very famous and industrious logographer. Like modern lawyers, Greek logographers often took cases in which success required arguments that were inconsistent with values they expressed in other speeches, but Demosthenes, whose logographic career advanced after his legal battles with scheming relatives, seems to have carefully chosen his cases (Kennedy 1994: 68, 70). One of Demosthenes' most commended speeches written for others, his *oratio* 54, often cited as *Contra Cononem* (Against Conon), is almost always dated in 341 BCE. It concerns a case of assault (Worthington, 2000: 199) Conon and his sons committed on Ariston, probably one of Demosthenes' affluent acquaintances, and plausibly even one of his friends, given the great politician's care in choosing his cases.

The speech *Against Conon* starts with the speaker's – Ariston's – statement that, following the advice of his family and friends, maybe even Demosthenes himself, he decided to charge Conon with a less serious, private suit for assault (though he could press on with a more serious charge of hubris and robbery) providing first unnamed witnesses for his case. Conon, supported by several of his friends, attacked Ariston and his friend Phanostratus in a drunken state. Ariston, severely beaten, received first help from the passers-by, and on their way to his home the group was met by the victim's relative, Euxitheus and a friend Meidias. Ariston then goes on to describe his injuries, obviously using his physician's phrases, lending the doctor's authority to his perhaps less-than-ideal credibility:

τότε μὲν τοίνυν παραχρῆμ' ὑπὸ τῶν πληγῶν ἅς ἔλαβον καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως οὕτω διετέθην, ὥς ἀκούετε καὶ μεμαρτύρηται παρὰ πάντων ὑμῖν τῶν εὐθὺς ἰδόντων. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τῶν μὲν οἰδημάτων τῶν

ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ τῶν ἐλκῶν οὐδὲν ἔφη φοβεῖσθαι λίαν ὁ ἱατρός, πυρετοὶ δὲ παρηκολούθουν μοι συνεχεῖς καὶ ἀλγήματα, ὅλου μὲν τοῦ σώματος πάνυ σφοδρὰ καὶ δεινὰ, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν πλευρῶν καὶ τοῦ ἥτρου, καὶ τῶν σιτίων ἀπεκεκλείμην. [12] καὶ ὥς μὲν ὁ ἱατρός ἔφη, εἰ μὴ κάθαρσις αἵματος αὐτομάτῃ μοι πάνυ πολλὴ συνέβη περιωδύνῳ ὄντι καὶ ἀπορουμένῳ ἤδη, κἂν ἔμπυος γενόμενος διεφθάρην: νῦν δὲ τοῦτ' ἔσωσεν τὸ αἷμ' ἀποχωρῆσαν. ὥς οὖν καὶ ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, καὶ παρηκολούθησέ μοι τοιαύτη νόσος ἐξ ἧς εἰς τοῦσχατον ἦλθον, ἐξ ὧν ὑπὸ τούτων ἔλαβον πληγῶν, λέγε τὴν τοῦ ἱατροῦ μαρτυρίαν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐπισκοπούντων. (Dem.54.11-12.)

At that time, then, as the immediate result of the blows and the maltreatment I received, I was brought into this condition, as you hear from my own lips, and as all the witnesses who saw me at the time have testified. Afterwards, although the swellings on my face and the bruises, my physician said, did not give him great concern, continuous attacks of fever ensued and violent and acute pains throughout all my body, but especially in my sides and the pit of my stomach, and I was unable to take my food. [12] Indeed, the surgeon said that, if a copious hemorrhage had not spontaneously occurred, while my agony was extreme and my attendants were at their wits' end, I should have died of internal suppuration; but as it was, this loss of blood saved me. To prove now that these statements of mine are true, and that from the blows which these men dealt me there resulted an illness so severe that it brought me to the point of death. Read the depositions of the surgeon and of those who came to see me. (Trans. DeWitt & DeWitt)

Presumably, it is now Euxitheus and Meidias who testify about Ariston's injuries, as does the doctor; a doctor, probably the same one, and others also testify about the severity of Ariston's injuries and the difficulties of his convalescence.

With those testimonies, Ariston's case appears complete. But he continues, anticipating Conon's excuses of being only a bystander, pointing out that even verbal assault is against the law (Worthington 2000: 200). Then, once again, the story revolves around witnesses – Ariston accentuates Conon's insisting that Ariston's witnesses swear to their testimony, and finally, when Conon suggests the torture of several of Ariston's slaves, Ariston and his witnesses call out his challenge as a delaying tactic.

Ariston compares Conon's witnesses – his drinking buddies, notorious libertines and brutes, whose testimony was manufactured to suit Conon's needs – to his own, independent passers-by and a doctor, „the sort of witnesses one ought to produce before the democratic court“, once again ascertaining the importance and social standing of his witnesses. Then Ariston goes on to condemn Conon's involvement of his family and especially his anticipated oaths upon their heads, so when he offers his free oath, it is conventional, in accordance with the entire oration:

ταῦτ' ἐγὼ καὶ τότε ἠθέλησ' ὁμόσαι, καὶ νῦν ὁμνῶ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τὰς θεὰς ἅπαντας καὶ πάσας ὑμῶν ἕνεκ', ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ τῶν περιεστηκότων, ἣ μὴν παθὼν ὑπὸ Κόνωνος ταῦθ' ὧν δικάζομαι, καὶ λαβὼν πληγὰς, καὶ τὸ χεῖλος διακοπεῖς οὕτως ὥστε καὶ ῥαφῆναι, καὶ ὑβρισθεὶς τὴν δίκην διώκειν. καὶ εἰ μὲν εὐορκῶ, πολλὰ μοι ἀγαθὰ γένοιτο καὶ μηδέποτ' αὐθις τοιοῦτο μηδὲν πάθοιμι, εἰ δ' ἐπιορκῶ, ἐξώλης ἀπολοίμην αὐτὸς καὶ εἴ τί μοι ἔστιν ἢ μέλλει ἔσεσθαι. (Dem.54.41)

I swear by all the gods and goddesses, for your sake, men of the jury, and that of the bystanders, that I have in very truth suffered at the hands of Conon this wrong for which I am suing him; that I was beaten by him, and that my lip was cut open so that it needed stitches, and that it is because of gross maltreatment that I am prosecuting him. If I swear truly, may many blessings be mine, and may I never again suffer such an outrage; but, if I commit perjury, may I perish utterly, I and all I possess or ever may possess. (Trans. DeWitt & DeWitt)

Now it finally becomes clear why Ariston is lending any authority in every way possible, be it by witnesses, or physician's dignity, or even religion itself – it seems that he was no stranger to such brawls, at least judging by Conon's assessment that the judges would deem those allegations against Ariston credible (Martin, 2009: 284).

Furthermore, it seems that this incident had some a religious background and that both Ariston and Conon's sons were members of rival groups, which explains why Ariston gives his description some wider social significance: he opposes ordinary, decent people to these wanton, hubristic upper-class boys, who put on grim looks, dress like Spartans, and form a band of *hetairoi*, thus embodying many of the prejudices against subversive elements within Athens (Ibid 285). But where Ariston had at least a simulacrum of understanding for the misjudgements of the youth, he had none for the actions of a grown man, and he depicts the actions of Conon's group as an inversion of and contempt for conventional values; more than that, by linking religious offenses to Conon Ariston characterizes him as a sacrilegious villain, a not uncommon feat in oratory to this day.

Conclusion

Though health is a relatively frequent theme in Demosthenes' orations, physicians are mentioned rarely: according to our preliminary research, the word "physician" is present in 7 of 61 orations attributed to Demosthenes. This does not mean that the role of physicians in these orations was uninteresting, or of little consequence; on the contrary, the portrait of a physician that emerges from these orations is one of undoubted social dignity and authority; the doctor's authority is so great that it can compensate even the complicated history of the accuser, as shown in Demosthenes' oration *Contra Cononem*.

When Demosthenes' audience is taken into consideration, as well as his goals in using the word „physician“, three distinctive groups emerge: first, there are places where he used this word in a general sense, almost always appealing to emotion; then, those where Demosthenes used the word „physician“ in an individual sense, even naming some physicians; finally, there is a sort of „state-speech“, where Demosthenes compared physical health of an individual to metaphorical health of a state, or legislature.

The fact that Demosthenes finds it important to highlight that one of Ariston's witnesses is a physician shows that the social standing of doctors was rarely disputed. Ariston condemns the attitude of Conon's witnesses towards the written document of witnesses' testimony, the *grammateion* and their attitude about false testimony on behalf of *hetairoi* (Worthington, 2000: 200), and thus Demosthenes uses the physician's authority to smooth over Ariston's potentially troublesome history. If Ariston's lack of authority transferred to his witnesses Conon, loosely connected to the case in comparison to his son, could walk free for both the insult and injury.

I believe that much more could be gleaned from this aspect of Demosthenes' orations, which could improve our understanding of social relations and status of physicians in antiquity.

References:

Primary Sources

Dem. 3 = Demosthenes. "Olynthiac 3" in Butcher, S.H. (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1903). Clarendon Press. Oxford.

Dem. 8 = Demosthenes. "On the Chersonese" in Butcher, S.H. (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1903). Clarendon Press. Oxford.

Dem. 25 = Demosthenes. "Against Aristogeiton 1" in Butcher, S.H, and Rennie, W. (eds.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1907 and 1921). E Typographeo Clarendoniano. Oxonii.

Dem. 26 = Demosthenes. "Against Aristogeiton 2" in Butcher, S.H, and Rennie, W. (eds.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1907 and 1921). E Typographeo Clarendoniano. Oxonii.

Dem. 33 = Demosthenes. "Against Apatourius" in Rennie, W. (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1921). E Typographeo Clarendoniano. Oxoni.

Dem. 40 = Demosthenes, "Against Boeotus 2" in Rennie, W. (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1921). E Typographeo Clarendoniano. Oxoni.

Dem. 47 = Demosthenes. "Against Evergus and Mnesibulus" in Rennie, W. (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1931). E Typographeo Clarendoniano. Oxoni.

Dem. 59 = Demosthenes. "Against Neaera" in Rennie, W. (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes*. (1931). E Typographeo Clarendoniano. Oxoni.

Demosthenes. *Demosthenes with an English translation by Norman W. DeWitt, Ph.D., and Norman J. DeWitt, Ph.D.* Cambridge, MA. (1949). Harvard University Press. London.

_____. *Demosthenes with an English translation by A. T. Murray, Ph.D., LL.D.* Cambridge, MA. (1939). Harvard University Press. London.

_____. *Demosthenes with an English translation by J. H. Vince, M.A.* Cambridge, MA. (1930). Harvard University Press. London.

Secondary Sources

Amundsen, Ferngren, 1977 = Amundsen, D. W. & Ferngren, G. B. (1977). The Physician as an Expert Witness in Athenian Law. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 51(2), 202-213. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Edelstein, 1937 = Edelstein, L. (1937). Greek Medicine in its Relation to Religion and Magic. *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*, 5(3), 201-246. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kennedy, 1994 = Kennedy, G. A. (1994). *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton University Press.

Martin, 2009 = Martin, G. (2009). *Divine Talk: Religious Argumentation in Demosthenes*. Oxford University Press.

Miller, 2002 = Miller, J. (2002). Warning the 'Dêmos': Political Communication with a Democratic Audience in Demosthenes. *History of Political Thought*, 23(3), 401-417. Imprint Academic Ltd.

Phillips, 1953 = Phillips, E. D. (1953). Doctor and Patient in Classical Greece. *Greece & Rome*, 22(65), 70-81. Cambridge University Press.

Sealey, 1993 = Sealey, R. (1993). *Demosthenes and His Time: A Study in Defeat*. Oxford University Press.

Tountas, 2009 = Tountas, Y. (2009). The Historical Origins of the Basic Concepts of Health Promotion and Education: The Role of Ancient Greek Philosophy and Medicine. *Health Promotion International*, 24(2), 185-192. Oxford University Press.

Tuplin, 2004 = Tuplin, C. (2004). Doctoring the Persians: Ctesias of Cnidus, Physician and Historian. *Klio*, 86, 305-354.

Woodhead, 1952 = Woodhead, A. G. (1952). The State Health Service in Ancient Greece. *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 10(3), 235-253. Cambridge University Press.

Worthington, 2000 = Worthington, I. (ed). (2000). *Demosthenes, Statesman and Orator*. Routledge.