INTRODUCTION

I THE IDENTITY OF ANTIPHON

Among the plethora of Antiphons known from the later fifth and the fourth centuries BC, particularly at Athens, are several who have often been confused, in antiquity as well as in modern scholarship. These include Antiphon son of Sophilus, of the deme Rhamnus, the famous Athenian logographer and politician who was an originator of the oligarchic coup of 411;[1] Antiphon ὁ σοφιστής, who disputes with Socrates in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*;[2] and Antiphon the tragic poet, who is cited several times by Aristotle. The poet Antiphon is certainly to be distinguished from Antiphon of Rhamnus. For while the latter was tried and executed at Athens in 411 on a charge of treason, a widespread ancient tradition puts the former's death in Syracuse, at the hands of the elder Dionysius. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1385a9–10; Plutarch, *De Stoicorum repugnantiis* 1051C–D, *Quomodo adulator* 68A–B; [Plut.], *Vitae X or.* 833B–C; Philostratus, *Vitae sophistarum* 499–500.[3] Joël (1893–1901), 2.649 with n. 1 rejected this ancient tradition and identified all the above-mentioned Antiphons, as does the author of the pseudo-Plutarchan *Vit. X or.*[4] (Philostratus

[1] *PA* 1304; Fraser and Matthews (1994), s.v. Ἀντιφῶν (57); Thucydides, 8.68.

[2] *PA* 1278; Fraser and Matthews (1994), s.v. Ἀντιφῶν (4); *Memorabilia* 1.6.1–15 = T1.

[3] Cf. Narcy (1989), 225, 240.

[4] To the confusion of Antiphons [Plut.] adds the figure of Antiphon son of Lysonides (*PA* 1283; Fraser and Matthews [1994], s.v. Ἀντιφῶν (5)). Avery (1982), 153 n. 32 and Edwards (1998) sought to defend the credibility of [Plut.]. The former argued that the confusions result from conflation of different sources, each of which offers reliable information about the particular Antiphon it deals with; the latter interpreted expressions such as λέγεται, ὥς φασι, δοκεῖ, and ὥς τινες as disclaimers by which [Plut.] sought to avoid responsibility for

also confuses the poet with Antiphon of Rhamnus.) But the credibility of [Plut.] is non-existent, and the chronological grounds for distinguishing the poet Antiphon and the Rhamnusian are convincing.[5] Chronological and other considerations also seem to rule out identification of the poet with Xenophon's Antiphon.[6] In the past, this identification was supported by Joël, Luria, and others; more recently, Narcy has defended it as at least possible.[7] Narcy points out that the encounters of Antiphon and Socrates depicted by Xenophon are mentioned in Aristotle's Περὶ ποιητῶν, a work on poets (cf. T5 with commentary); he suggests this may imply that Xenophon's Antiphon was himself a poet. But the suggestion is fanciful; and the parallels Narcy tries to draw between F44(a)I.13–23 (from the sophist Antiphon's Περὶ ἀληθείας) and the anecdotes about the poet are unconvincing. The real problem of identity concerns not the poet Antiphon, but the relationship between Xenophon's Antiphon "the sophist" and Antiphon of Rhamnus. Modern commentators more often than not have identified these two – the so-called unitarian position.[8] But according to Hermogenes of Tarsus (*De ideis* 399.18–400.6 = T2(a), ll. 1–10), Didymus of Alexandria and many others distinguished the Rhamnusian Antiphon

information he considered dubious. These arguments amount to special pleading.

[5] On the unreliability of [Plut.] cf. Taylor (1772), 268–73; van Spaan (1773), 825; Sauppe (1896), 512–13; Andrewes in Gomme et al. (1981), 170; Cuvigny (1981), 27–31.

[6] Cf. van Spaan (1773), 827; Sauppe (1896), 513; Nestle (1942), 389–90; Schmid (1940), 99; Untersteiner (1954), 228 n. 7 = (1967), 2.45 n. 7.

[7] Cf. Luria (1924b), 330, (1927b), 1065; Joël (n. 1 above); Narcy (1989), 225–26, 240–41. Wilamowitz (1959), 1.61 n. 1 also considered the identification possible.

[8] Cf. Joël (1893–1901), 2.638–73 and (1921), 663 n. 3; Croiset (1917); Aly (1929), 105–77; Hommel (1941); Morrison (1961) and (1972), 108–11; Avery (1982); Decleva Caizzi (1969), 71–83, (1984), (1985), 69, (1986b); Gagarin (1990), (1997), 5–6. Narcy (1989) offers a lengthy survey of the modern debate.

from the "other" Antiphon who was author of Περὶ ἀληθείας and similar philosophical works. Since Hermogenes' "other" Antiphon is plausibly identified with the Antiphon depicted by Xenophon, there arises the possibility of distinguishing a "sophist" Antiphon from the Rhamnusian politician and logographer – the so-called separatist position.[9] Morrison (1961), 54; Narcy (1989), 230, and others have objected to the use of the term "sophist" in this context (cf. below). But its use is no mere modern custom (as these commentators pretend): it goes back at least to Xenophon, and is repeated in later ancient authors.[10] Three types of evidence have been brought to bear in the discussion on the identity of Antiphon: the ancient testimonia; the linguistic and stylistic characteristics of the various works current in antiquity under the name of Antiphon; and the ethical, political, and religious ideas these works have been thought to reveal. The ancient testimonia, which offer the surest support for the separatist position, will be considered first.

The earliest and best evidence for the existence of a sophist Antiphon distinct from Antiphon of Rhamnus is provided by Xenophon's account of a series of conversations between Socrates and Antiphon ὁ σοφιστής (cf. T1).[11] Antiphon's purpose in all three conversations is to discredit Socrates as a teacher, in order to win over some of his followers (cf. commentary on T1). Two interrelated characteristics of the Antiphon in the *Memorabilia* are cru-

[9] Cf. van Spaan (1773), 824–27; Blass (1887–98), 1.93–94; Bignone (1938), 161–215; Schmid (1940), 98–100; Untersteiner (1954), 228–30 = (1967), 2.45–47; Pendrick (1987), (1993).

[10] Cf. below, and commentary on T1, l. 1; T3, ll. 1–2.

[11] On the importance of Xenophon's evidence cf. Seeliger (1924), 15; Schmid (1940), 100. Schmid contended that Xenophon's Antiphon could not be the Rhamnusian because all datable conversations in the *Memorabilia* fall in the last decade of the fifth century (after his execution). But the contention is untenable; cf. Avery (1982), 151 n. 26, with references.

cial to the question of his identity. The first is his status as a professional, paid educator and rival of Socrates (something which is implied by the entire episode). This characteristic almost certainly distinguishes Xenophon's man from Antiphon of Rhamnus. For despite many claims to the contrary, there is no conclusive evidence that Antiphon of Rhamnus was a professional teacher of the kind implied by Xenophon's portrait of Antiphon. The later ancient tradition that made Thucydides the pupil of Antiphon of Rhamnus rests on mere inference and can be dismissed (cf. commentary on T2(a), ll. 15–17, with references). Nor does Socrates' joke at *Menexenus* 236A (ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅστις ἐμοῦ κάκιον ἐπαιδεύθη, μουσικὴν μὲν ὑπὸ Λάμπρου[12] παιδευθείς, ῥητορικὴν δὲ ὑπ' Ἀντιφῶντος τοῦ Ῥαμνουσίου, ὅμως κἂν οὗτος οἷός τ' εἴη Ἀθηναίους γε ἐν Ἀθηναίοις ἐπαινῶν εὐδοκιμεῖν) prove that the Rhamnusian taught rhetoric. Most likely Antiphon owes his mention here to his reputation as one of the outstanding *practitioners* of oratory in the late fifth century. His identification as a teacher (ἐπαιδεύθη) is probably no more than an accommodation to the context, in which he and Lamprus are ironically juxtaposed with Aspasia and Connus, the supposed teachers of Socrates.[13] Plutarch, *De gloria Atheniensium* 350C speaks of the Rhamnusian as the head of a school: τοὺς ἐν ταῖς σχολαῖς τὰ μειράκια προδιδάσκοντας τοὺς Ἰσοκράτεις καὶ Ἀντιφῶντας καὶ Ἰσαίους. But such evidence (despite Morrison [1961], 49 n. 3, [1972], 123–24) is late and unreliable. In this context it is worth recalling that at the Rhamnusian's trial on the charge of treason, the prosecution evidently mentioned his activity as a paid logographer: ἀλλὰ μὲν δὴ λέγουσιν οἱ κατήγοροι ὡς συνέγραφόν τε δίκας ἄλλοις καὶ ὡς [ὡς Crönert: τὸ ε ed. pr.]

[12] On Lamprus cf. Abert (1924), 586–87.
[13] On the *Menexenus* passage cf. Pohlenz (1913), 262 n. 1; Méridier (1931), 79; de Vries (1949), 257, and especially Clavaud (1982), 76, 263–77.

ἐκέρδαινον ἀπὸ τούτου (*De rerum mutatione* fr. 1a, II.14–22; cf. Thucydides, 8.68). Yet while the prosecution called attention to Antiphon's practice of *writing* speeches for pay, there is nothing here about *teaching* oratory for pay. Xenophon's Antiphon, by contrast, is a paid, professional educator (cf. below). Many critics point to the *Tetralogies* as evidence that Antiphon of Rhamnus did in fact teach rhetoric.[14] But there are serious grounds for doubting that the *Tetralogies* were written, or could appropriately serve, as models for the use of students (as is usually supposed). Other motives for their composition and "publication" are readily conceivable, and they do not by themselves prove that their author was a professional teacher of rhetoric (cf. Dover [1950], 59). In sum, the case for regarding Antiphon of Rhamnus as a professional teacher is very weak (cf. Andrewes in Gomme et al. [1981], 173–74). Gagarin (1990), 30 contended that Antiphon of Rhamnus' intellectual interests and wide influence entitle him to "be considered a teacher in some sense," but this is irrelevant to the question at hand. For Xenophon depicts a sophist and professional rival of Socrates who is a teacher in much more than the vague sense indicated.

The second feature of Xenophon's Antiphon serving to distinguish him from the Rhamnusian is the epithet τὸν σοφιστήν which Xenophon attaches to him (cf. van Spaan [1773], 825; Gernet [1923], 175 with n. 2). It is often argued to the contrary that this epithet could not serve to differentiate Xenophon's man from the Rhamnusian, who as a teacher and practitioner of rhetoric would quite naturally be designated a sophist.[15] As was argued above, however, the evidence that Antiphon of Rhamnus taught rhetoric is

[14] Cf. Bignone (1938), 166 n. 1; Nestle (1942), 391 with n. 89; Morrison (1961), 49 n. 3; Avery (1982), 156 with n. 39; Gagarin (1990), 30 n. 13.

[15] Cf. Gomperz (1912), 58; Croiset (1917), 15–16; Bignone (1938), 162; von der Mühll (1948), 1; Morrison (1961), 51 with n. 3; Guthrie (1971a), 286; Avery (1982), 151 n. 26; Gagarin (1990), 31–33.

far from compelling. The epithet σοφιστής could certainly be applied to a logographer like Antiphon, particularly in a hostile context. Cf. Aeschines, *or.* 1.175; Demosthenes, *or.* 59.21; von der Mühll (1948), 1 n. 3; Gagarin (1990), 31–32. But the real issue is not whether Xenophon *could* have referred to the Rhamnusian as a sophist, but whether he would have done so, and why. As Gagarin (1990) has shown, Antiphon of Rhamnus is usually identified in ancient texts by name alone, or by name and demotic, or by name together with the epithet ῥήτωρ, which in this context means "politician" (cf. Dodds [1959], 194). If Xenophon's epithet τὸν σοφιστήν referred to the Rhamnusian, it would represent an unusual designation requiring some sort of explanation. Croiset (1917), 15 and Gagarin (1990), 32–33 attempted to provide one by suggesting that Xenophon added the epithet to avoid confusion and to distinguish his man from others of the same name. Croiset thought of possible confusion with the poet Antiphon; Gagarin, with the Antiphon killed by the Thirty (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenica* 2.3.40). But it is difficult to see why Xenophon would have felt the need to distinguish his Antiphon from either of these men, neither of whom could easily be confused with a professional teacher and rival and contemporary of Socrates (cf. Avery [1982], 151 n. 26). More important, these suggestions fail to account for the specific designation "sophist," in particular its pejorative tone and note of hostility. (Gagarin [1990], 33 acknowledged the tone but did not try to explain it.) There is an element of truth in Gigon's contention that τὸν σοφιστήν serves to identify Antiphon "von vornherein" as an opponent of Socrates (cf. Gigon [1953], 152; Avery [1982], 151 n. 26). Yet this too fails to come to grips with the fundamental issues. Those who would identify the Antiphon in the *Memorabilia* with Antiphon of Rhamnus do not even attempt to explain Xenophon's choice of the Rhamnusian (of all people) to exemplify Socrates' sophistic rivals or his adoption

of such a hostile attitude toward a man with whose politics (at least) he might be thought to have sympathized. Once it is granted that Xenophon's Antiphon is a professional educator distinct from the Rhamnusian, then the epithet "sophist" (with its pejorative overtones) and the professional rivalry with Socrates fall into place.[16] Gagarin (1990), 31–32 objected that Xenophon could not have distinguished a "sophist" Antiphon from Antiphon of Rhamnus unless such a figure had been well known; and even then would have added a demotic, patronymic, or ethnic designation (rather than τὸν σοφιστήν) in order to do so. Now, the fact that other references to a "sophist" Antiphon are much later than Xenophon does not by itself prove (*pace* Gagarin) that such a figure was unknown in the fourth century. On the contrary, Xenophon's use of the tag τὸν σοφιστήν seems to presuppose some familiarity with the identity of the man so (briefly) designated. The suggestion that Xenophon would have used an ethnic, demotic, or patronymic ignores the fact that he seldom employs additional means of identification beyond the bare name, and in particular eschews demotics in the identification of Athenians. As Whitehead (1988), 146 concluded: "Xenophon took no *systematic* care, either with Athenians or in general, to distinguish between *homonyms* in his narrative by providing them with patronymics or other marks of additional identification."[17] Xenophon sometimes employs patronymics in connection with non-Athenian sophists (cf. *Memorabilia* 4.4.5, *Symposium* 4.62, *Anabasis* 2.6.17; but contrast *Symposium* 1.5, *Memorabilia* 3.1.1). His failure to

[16] On Xenophon's Antiphon as a "type" of the sophist hostile to Socrates cf. Wilamowitz (1931–32), 2.217 n. 1; Gigon (1953), 152, 165.

[17] Cf. Whitehead (1988), 145–47. But examples such as Callistratus ὁ δημηγόρος (*Hellenica* 6.2.39, 6.3.3) and Nicostratus ὁ καλὸς ἐπικαλούμενος (*Hellenica* 2.4.6) show that the conditions Gagarin (1990), 32 laid down for the use of supplementary designations in Xenophon are too rigid. Cf. Whitehead (1988), 146.

do so in Antiphon's case may well indicate that the latter was in fact an Athenian (cf. below).

Two further features of Xenophon's portrait of the sophist Antiphon have led critics to identify him with Antiphon of Rhamnus.[18] One is Antiphon's evident greed or φιλαργυρία (cf. T1 with commentary). This is a characteristic for which Antiphon of Rhamnus is known to have been attacked in comedy. Cf. [Plut.] *Vitae X or.* 833c (= Plato, fr. 110): κεκωμῴδηται δ' εἰς φιλαργυρίαν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος ἐν Πεισάνδρῳ. As Philostratus and others make clear, however, Antiphon of Rhamnus' reputation for greed arose from his practice of writing speeches for money. Cf. Philostratus, *Vitae sophistarum* 499 (= Plato, fr. 110): καθάπτεται δὲ ἡ κωμῳδία τοῦ Ἀντιφῶντος ὡς δεινοῦ τὰ δικανικὰ καὶ λόγους κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου ξυγκειμένους ἀποδιδομένου πολλῶν χρημάτων αὐτοῖς μάλιστα τοῖς κινδυνεύουσιν; Antiphon, *De rerum mutatione* fr. 1a, II.14–22 (quoted above); Diodorus Siculus *apud* Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.16.79.3; Ammianus Marcellinus, 30.4.5. The greed which characterizes Xenophon's Antiphon should be related instead to his status as a professional educator or sophist. The sophists' practice of charging fees for instruction opened them generally to accusations of greed (cf. Blank [1985], 3–6 and *passim*); and Xenophon in particular often mentions this practice (cf. *Symposium* 1.5, 4.62; *Anabasis* 2.6.16; T1, ll. 81–83). The second feature concerns the matter of politics. In his third and final exchange with Socrates (T1, ll. 97–102), Antiphon criticizes the latter for undertaking to teach the art of politics without practicing it. This line of attack has suggested to many that Xenophon's Antiphon must himself be a professional politician, and therefore identical with Antiphon

[18] Cf. Croiset (1917), 16; Aly (1929), 110; von der Mühll (1948), 1; Morrison (1961), 57; Avery (1982), 152–55.

of Rhamnus.[19] (Others agree with the inference that Xenophon's Antiphon practiced politics, but deny that he ought for this reason to be identified with the Rhamnusian.) However, it does not follow from Antiphon's criticism that he himself practiced politics. For one thing, Antiphon does not so much urge Socrates to engage in politics (as is usually supposed) as bring out an alleged contradiction between Socrates' teaching on the one hand, and his practice on the other. Nothing is said (or implied) about Antiphon himself teaching politics, and so nothing follows about him practicing politics. Moreover, Antiphon's criticism (as Leonardo Tarán points out to me) is a topos or commonplace, comparable to Aristotle's remark that while the sophists profess to teach politics, it is not they but the politicians who practice it (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1180b35–1181a2), and to Plato's comments on the discrepancy between Homer's poetic representations of war and politics and his lack of practical experience in such matters (*Republic* 599c–600e).[20] These considerations undermine the inference that Xenophon's Antiphon is himself a practicing politician, and therefore identical with the Rhamnusian.

The identity of Xenophon's Antiphon was a matter for disagreement already in later antiquity. In the list of rivalries involving famous poets and philosophers cited by Diogenes Laertius from the third book of Aristotle's Περὶ ποιητῶν (2.46 = T5), Antiphon ὁ τερατοσκόπος is said to have contended eristically (ἐφιλονείκει) with Socrates. This refers in all probability to the encounters in the *Memorabilia*. Whoever was responsible for the designation

[19] So Croiset (1917), 16; Aly (1929), 110; Morrison (1961), 58; Avery (1982), 151.

[20] Cf. Tarán (1981), 4 n. 11. Nestle (1940), 47 with n. 45 argued that *Memorabilia* 1.6.15 is derived from Plato (cf. *Apology* 31cff.; *Gorgias* 521d) and as such reveals nothing about Antiphon.

τερατοσκόπος seems not to have identified Xenophon's Antiphon with the Rhamnusian, to whom he would hardly have referred with this epithet.[21] On the other hand, the author of the pseudo-Plutarchan *Vitae X or.* (or his source) identified the Antiphon in the *Memorabilia* with Antiphon of Rhamnus.[22] Speaking of the Rhamnusian, he remarks: διατριβὴν δὲ συνέστησε καὶ Σωκράτει τῷ φιλοσόφῳ διεφέρετο τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων διαφορὰν οὐ φιλονείκως ἀλλ' ἐλεγκτικῶς, ὡς Ξενοφῶν ἱστόρηκεν ἐν τοῖς Ἀπομνημονεύμασιν (*Vit. X or.* 832C).[23] Additional evidence of interest in the identity of Xenophon's Antiphon is provided by Athenaeus, who mentions a monograph entitled *On the Antiphon in Xenophon's Memorabilia* written by a certain Hephaestion (cf. *Dipnosophistae* 15 673D–F = T4, with commentary). According to Athenaeus, Hephaestion plagiarized the material for his monograph from an earlier monograph by Adrastus of Aphrodisias, who had discussed both Antiphon the tragic poet and the character Plexippus from the latter's tragedy *Meleager*. Hephaestion's and Adrastus' interest in the Xenophontic Antiphon almost certainly extended to the question of his identity *vis-à-vis* other personages of the same name (cf. Sauppe [1896], 509; von der Mühll [1948], 1 n. 2; commentary on T4). This inference is rejected by Avery (1982), 151 n. 24 and Gagarin (1990), 41–42, the latter of whom suggested that Adrastus discussed the moral character of the poet Antiphon and of the *dramatis persona* Plexippus, while Hephaestion discussed the Xenophontic Antiphon's manner of

[21] The epithet is usually ascribed to Aristotle; but cf. commentary on T5. Gagarin (1990), 41 n. 50 rejected the inference, on the grounds that we do not know who added the epithet or why it was added. But our ignorance on these points does not really affect the issue.

[22] On the unreliability of [Plut.] cf. nn. 4–5 above.

[23] Similarly Photius, *Bibliotheca* 486a (8.42) and the anonymous *Vita Antiphontis* 7. According to Blass (1887–98), 1.93, these depend on [Plut.]; but others disagree (cf. commentary on T6).