

# The Ancient Tradition on Antiphon Reconsidered

Gerard J. Pendrick

ONE OF THE STRONGEST ARGUMENTS for the existence in the late fifth century of a sophist Antiphon, author of *Περὶ ἀληθείας* and other philosophical works, distinct from the politician and logographer Antiphon of Rhamnus, is a small but significant body of ancient 'separatist' evidence. In a recent discussion of the ancient tradition on 'Antiphon', Michael Gagarin seeks to explain away the separatist tendencies of the tradition and argues for the identity of the aforementioned Antiphons.<sup>1</sup> I propose to re-examine Gagarin's treatment of the evidence<sup>2</sup>—explicit and implicit—in order to demonstrate that the separatist case is stronger than Gagarin and others have supposed.<sup>3</sup> In addition, I shall argue that the 'unitarian' aspects

<sup>1</sup> "The Ancient Tradition on the Identity of Antiphon," *GRBS* 31 (1990: hereafter 'Gagarin') 27–44. Gagarin is in the main responding to G. Pendrick, "Once Again Antiphon the Sophist and Antiphon of Rhamnus," *Hermes* 115 (1987: hereafter 'Pendrick') 47–60.

<sup>2</sup> Other recent discussions tending to unitarian conclusions include: F. Declava Caizzi, "Le fragment 44 D.K. d'Antiphon et le problème de son auteur: quelques reconsiderations," in 'H ἀρχαία σοφιστική, *The Sophistic Movement* (Athens 1984) 97–107, "Ricerche su Antifonte. A proposito di POxy. 1364 fr. 1," in M. Capasso, F. De Martino, and P. Rosati, edd., *Studi di filosofia presocratica* (Naples 1985) 191–208, "Il nuovo papiro di Antifonte: POxy. LII, 3647," in F. Adorno et al., *Protagora, Antifonte, Posidonio, Aristotele. Saggi su frammenti inediti e nuove testimonianze da papiri* (Florence 1986) 61–69, and "'Hysteron Proteron': La Nature et la loi selon Antiphon et Platon," *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale* 91 (1986) 291–310; M. Ostwald, "Nomos and Phusis in Antiphon's *Περὶ ἀληθείας*," in M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde, edd., *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer* (Atlanta 1990) 293–306. These authors are not primarily concerned with the ancient testimonia and their arguments will not be considered here.

<sup>3</sup> Michel Narcy ("Antiphon [no. 209]," in R. Goulet, ed., *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* I [Paris 1989] 225–44, esp. 225–30) reviews the ancient testimonia on Antiphon. His discussion focuses on the evidence of the *corpus Aristotelicum* and of the pseudo-Plutarchean *X orat.*, on the basis of which he confidently distinguishes Antiphon of Rhamnus from Antiphon the tragic

of the tradition do not constitute a decisive stumbling-block to the separatist position.

The only surviving ancient discussion of the problem of the Antiphons is that of the rhetorician Hermogenes,<sup>4</sup> who reports the opinions of Didymus of Alexandria and others as a preface to his own discussion of the style of the various works current under the name of Antiphon.<sup>5</sup> Hermogenes' report includes these points: (1) the claim that there have been many Antiphons, two of them σοφιστεύσαντες;<sup>6</sup> (2) the identification of these latter two as Antiphon the rhetor (*i.e.*, Antiphon of Rhamnus, *cf.* 400.22 ὁ τοίνυν Ῥαμνούσιος Ἀντιφῶν) and

---

poet, but comes to no certain conclusions about the identity of the author of the sophistic works. The data furnished by the *corpus Aristotelicum*, however, are inconclusive (see n.27 *infra*) and the *X orat.* is a hopeless confusion. Here I shall concentrate rather on those strands of the ancient tradition that seem to permit a probable resolution of whether the author of the sophistic works is or is not identical with Antiphon of Rhamnus.

<sup>4</sup> On Hermogenes see Christ-Schmid-Stählin II.2<sup>6</sup> 929–36; L. Radermacher, "Hermogenes (22)," *RE* 8.1 (1912) 865–77; and most recently M. Patillon, *La Théorie du Discours chez Hermogène le Rhéteur* (= *Collections d'Études anciennes* 117 [Paris 1988]), who distinguishes (8–19) the author of *Περὶ ιδεῶν* ("Hermogenes the rhetor") from Hermogenes the "sophist" who appears in Philostr. *VS* 577f.

<sup>5</sup> *Περὶ ιδεῶν* 399.18–400.21 Rabe: *Περὶ δὲ Ἀντιφῶντος λέγοντας ἀνάγκη προειπεῖν, ὅτι, καθάπερ ἄλλοι τέ φασιν οὐκ ὀλίγοι καὶ Δίδυμος, ὁ γραμματικός, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ἱστορίας φαίνεται, πλείους μὲν γεγονάσιν Ἀντιφῶντες, δύο δὲ οἱ σοφιστεύσαντες, ὧν καὶ λόγον ἀνάγκη ποιήσασθαι· ὧν εἰς μὲν ἔστιν ὁ ῥήτωρ, οὐπὲρ οἱ φονικοὶ φέρονται λόγοι καὶ (οἱ) δημηγορικοὶ καὶ ὅσοι τούτοις ὅμοιοι, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ καὶ τερατοσκοπὸς καὶ ὄνειροκρίτης λεγόμενος γενέσθαι, οὐπὲρ οἱ τε *Περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας* εἶναι λέγονται λόγοι καὶ ὁ *Περὶ ὁμοιοῦς* [καὶ οἱ δημηγορικοὶ] καὶ ὁ *Πολιτικός*. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔνεκα μὲν τοῦ διαφόρου τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις ιδεῶν πείθομαι δύο τοὺς Ἀντιφῶντας γενέσθαι (πολὺ γὰρ ὡς ὄντως τὸ παραλλάττον τῶν ἐπιγραφομένων τῆς Ἀληθείας λόγων πρὸς τοὺς λοιπούς), ἔνεκα δὲ τοῦ καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις ἱστορουμένου πάλιν οὐ πείθομαι· Θουκυδίδην γὰρ Ἀντιφῶντος εἶναι τοῦ Ῥαμνουσίου μαθητὴν ἀκούω πολλῶν λέγοντων, καὶ τὸν μὲν Ῥαμνούσιον εἰδὼς ἐκείνον, οὐπὲρ εἰσὶν οἱ φονικοί, τὸν Θουκυδίδην δὲ πολλῶν κεχωρισμένον καὶ κεκοινωνηκότα τῷ εἶδει τῶν τῆς Ἀληθείας λόγων, πάλιν οὐ πείθομαι. οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' εἴτε εἰς ὁ Ἀντιφῶν ἐγένετο, δύο λόγων εἶδεσι τοσοῦτον ἀλλήλων διεστηκόσι χρησάμενος, εἴτε καὶ δύο, χωρὶς ἐκάτερος ὁ μὲν τοῦτο ὁ δὲ ἐκείνο μετελθὼν, ἀνάγκη χωρὶς περὶ ἐκατέρου διελθεῖν· πλεῖστον γὰρ, ὡς ἔφαμεν, τὸ μεταξύ.*

<sup>6</sup> σοφιστεύσαντες probably means "teach rhetoric" (e.g. Strab. 13.1.66), or more generally "be a sophist" (e.g. D.L. 9.56); *cf.* Pendrick 55 n.39; LJS *s.v.*

another Antiphon, said to have been a dream-interpreter; and (3) a division of works.<sup>7</sup>

The evaluation of Didymus' views as reported by Hermogenes is of crucial importance to the problem at hand. Like others before him,<sup>8</sup> Gagarin (36f, 43) contends that Didymus presented no "specific" or "significant" evidence—e.g. biographical details<sup>9</sup>—in support of the distinction he drew between Antiphon of Rhamnus and the 'other' Antiphon, but relied merely on considerations of style. For if Didymus had offered such evidence (so the argument goes), Hermogenes would surely have cited it in support of the distinction drawn by Didymus; instead, Hermogenes' exclusive reliance on stylistic arguments proves that he knew no other ones. This *argumentum ex silentio* dies hard, but it should be rejected for the following reasons. First, Hermogenes is a critic of style, and his emphasis on the stylistic criteria both for and against Didymus' distinction probably reflects his own preoccupations, not those of Didymus. It is misleading to say, as Gagarin (36) does, that although "Hermogenes' primary concern is style," he "has evidently investigated carefully the matter of identity. He cites the evidence of Plato and others favoring the unitarian position." In fact, Hermogenes' "evidence"

<sup>7</sup> When Gagarin writes (36) "He [Hermogenes] is inclined to assign the sophistic works to the latter because, he reasons, their style is so different that the same man cannot have written them," he appears to imply that the division of works is Hermogenes'. The wording of the text shows otherwise: οὐπερ οἱ τε Περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι λέγονται λόγοι κτλ.

<sup>8</sup> Gagarin 36f, 43; for a list of others who have so argued see Pendrick 56 n.42. Another recent exponent of this view is B. Cassin, "Histoire d'une identité: les Antiphons," *L'écrit du temps* 10 (1985) 65-77, whose discussion (67-70) is flawed by her misunderstanding of Hermogenes' technical terminology (on which cf. Patillon [*supra* n.4] 103-278; G. Lindberg, *Studies in Hermogenes and Eustathios* [Lund 1977] 8-128, 200-62). By way of the supposed ambiguity of εἶδος ("style," "genre"), Cassin (71ff, cf. Gagarin 38) passes from stylistic differences to the notion of "compétence" and intimates that separatists ancient and modern divide the Antiphons not only on the basis of stylistic considerations but also in the belief that the 'rhetorical' works should belong to an orator and the 'philosophical' works to a sophist. No evidence whatsoever suggests that this consideration influenced Hermogenes, Didymus, or any other ancient critic.

<sup>9</sup> Narcy (*supra* n.3: 228) remarks that Hermogenes' information on the 'other' Antiphon "est dépourvue d'éléments biographiques," but fails to note that the same holds for his information on Antiphon of Rhamnus.

for the unitarian position is stylistic as well.<sup>10</sup> Secondly, Hermogenes may well have encountered Didymus' views on Antiphon in an abbreviated form (since Didymus' works were often excerpted)<sup>11</sup> or at second hand, which could account for his failure to cite the sort of specific evidence that Gagarin desiderates. Thirdly, neither Gagarin nor any other unitarian cites any evidence for the supposition that Didymus would base his solution to a literary-historical problem such as the identity of Antiphon exclusively or primarily on stylistic evidence.<sup>12</sup> Finally, Hermogenes *does* in fact allude to evidence other than that of style in support of Didymus' distinction, when he says *πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ἱστορίας φαίνεται*. Whatever Hermogenes means by *ἱστορία*,<sup>13</sup> his words imply acquaintance with factual information of some sort in support of the separatist position, and it is not unreasonable to assume that Didymus also was acquainted with such information. (It may even be that Hermogenes is indebted to Didymus for his knowledge on this point.) In sum, nothing in Hermogenes' report warrants the inference that Didymus based his distinction of the Antiphons exclusively or primarily on stylistic considerations; the reference to *ἱστορία* implies rather the reverse.

<sup>10</sup> Hermogenes interprets Plato's remark (*Menex.* 236A) about someone taught rhetoric by Antiphon who could win repute praising Athenians among Athenians as an allusion to Thucydides (cf. J. S. Morrison, "Antiphon," *PCPS* NS. 7 [1961] 56) and evidence that Antiphon of Rhamnus was Thucydides' teacher. But since Thucydides' style resembles that of *Περὶ ἀληθείας*, the author of that work, Hermogenes reasons, should be identical with the Antiphon mentioned by Plato (*i.e.*, the Rhamnusian) who was Thucydides' teacher.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. L. Cohn, "Didymos (8)," *RE* 5 (1903) 446.

<sup>12</sup> An additional argument against the notion that Didymus divided the Antiphons on grounds of style is the division of works that Hermogenes reports (probably from Didymus; cf. *supra* n.7). For the substantial stylistic differences between the extant fragments of *Περὶ ἀληθείας* on the one hand and *Περὶ ὁμονοίας* on the other (which led W. Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos*<sup>2</sup> [Stuttgart 1942] 385–88, 396f with nn.114ff, 399 with n.130, to attribute these works to different Antiphons) suggest that something other than stylistic criteria lay behind the ancient attribution of these works to one and the same author.

<sup>13</sup> Gagarin (36 n.31) criticizes C. Wooten (*Hermogenes' On Types of Style* [Chapel Hill 1987]) for translating *ἱστορίας* as "history," a sense that is by no means impossible (cf. LSJ *s.v.* II). He thinks it refers to Hermogenes' own "inquiry" or "investigation."

It ought furthermore to be emphasized that on Hermogenes' testimony (which there is no reason to doubt) Didymus was far from alone in distinguishing the Antiphons, as "many others" (ἄλλοι ... οὐκ ὀλίγοι, litotes for "quite a few") shared his view. Therefore, when Gagarin characterizes the unitarian tradition in antiquity as "nearly unanimous" (43) and the separatist tradition as "isolated" (43; cf. "widely scattered exceptions," 44), he unjustifiably ignores Hermogenes' explicit testimony to the contrary.

Whatever evidence Didymus may have had for his views on Antiphon, for us Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.1–15 provides the strongest support for the separatist thesis. Xenophon depicts the attempts of "Antiphon the sophist" (Ἀντιφῶντα τὸν σοφιστήν) to win over some of Socrates' associates (ὁ γὰρ Ἀντιφῶν ποτε βουλόμενος τοὺς συνουσιαστὰς αὐτοῦ παρελῆσθαι προσελθὼν τῷ Σωκράτει κτλ.).<sup>14</sup> Two interrelated features of Xenophon's Antiphon that bear on the question of his identity are his status as a professional, paid teacher (implied by the entire episode) and the designation "sophist," which Xenophon attaches to him. Like other unitarians, Gagarin (30–33) argues that these features are compatible with the belief that Xenophon's Antiphon is the Rhamnusian.

In the first place, however, the evidence adduced by Gagarin and others to prove that Antiphon of Rhamnus was a teacher is very weak.<sup>15</sup> It consists of the following: (1) Socrates' jest at Pl. *Menex.* 236A that even someone more poorly educated than himself, someone who had been taught music by Lamprus<sup>16</sup> and rhetoric by Antiphon of Rhamnus, would be able to win repute by praising Athenians before Athenians; (2) the late tradition that Antiphon of Rhamnus was the teacher of Thucydides; (3) the *Tetralogies* attributed to the Rhamnusian. But the *Menex.* passage is perfectly intelligible on the assumption that Antiphon is mentioned because he was one of the outstanding *practitioners* of dicanic rhetoric in the later fifth

<sup>14</sup> The encounters of Antiphon the sophist and Socrates in *Mem.* are probably fictitious, whether invented by Xenophon or borrowed from another Socratic author (cf. n.28 *infra*). For a full discussion of this passage with references to earlier literature, see Pendrick 47–52.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Andrewes, in A. W. Gomme, K. J. Dover, and A. Andrewes, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* V (Oxford 1981) 173f.

<sup>16</sup> On Lamprus see H. Abert, "Lamprokles (1)," *RE* 12.1 (1924) 586f and A. von Blumenthal, "Sophokles (1)," *RE* IIIA.1 (1927) 1042f.

century; his functioning as a teacher need be—and probably is—no more than an accommodation to the context.<sup>17</sup> The late tradition that Antiphon was Thucydides' teacher rests in all likelihood on mere inference from Thucydides' high praise of the Rhamnusian (8.68) and is a good example of Hellenistic scholars' fondness for constructing pupil-teacher relationships.<sup>18</sup> Finally, there is good reason to doubt that the *Tetralogies* were written as models for the use of students; other motives for their composition and 'publication' are conceivable and do not by themselves prove that their author taught rhetoric.<sup>19</sup> Gagarin, to be sure, argues (30) that "Anyone with the intellectual interests and wide influence of the Rhamnusian could surely be considered a teacher in some sense." But Xenophon's depiction of Antiphon as a professional educator and rival to Socrates seems to require that this Antiphon have been rather more than "a teacher in some sense."

As regards the epithet 'sophist', it must be conceded to Gagarin (31f) and others that this term could be applied to a logographer like Antiphon of Rhamnus, especially in a hostile context.<sup>20</sup> The question, however, is not whether Xenophon *could* have called the Rhamnusian a 'sophist' but whether he would have done so, and why. The Rhamnusian is usually identified in ancient texts by name and demotic, or by name along with the epithet ῥήτωρ (= "politician"), or by bare name; 'sophist' would be an unusual designation for him,<sup>21</sup> and we

<sup>17</sup> Cf. R. Clavaud, *Le Ménexène de Platon et la rhétorique de son temps* (Paris 1982) 76, 263–77; Pendrick 49 n.11. Note that in his speech of defense on the charge of treason Antiphon of Rhamnus refers (fr. 1, p.109.2f Thalheim) to the prosecutors' mention of his paid logographical activity, but says nothing about *teaching* oratory for pay.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. [Plut.] *X orat.* 832E: Καικίλιος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ συντάγματι Θουκυδίδου τοῦ συγγραφέως καθηγητὴν [Wytttenbach: μαθητὴν Mss.] τεκμαίρεται γεγονέναι ἐξ ὧν ἐπαινεῖται παρ' αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀντιφῶν Cf. further *supra* n.10 and Pendrick 49 n.11.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. K. J. Dover, "The Chronology of Antiphon's Speeches," *CQ* 44 (1950) 44–60, esp. 59. Gagarin's claim (30 n.13) that one purpose of the *Tetralogies* "must have been to provide others with a model for techniques of forensic oratory" takes no account of the difficulties involved in this supposition to which Dover calls attention.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Pendrick 51f with nn.19–23.

<sup>21</sup> "Antiphon the sophist" appears (apart from Hermogenes' σοφιστεύσαντες) elsewhere only in *Simpl. in Phys.* 273.36 Diels and the confused entries in the *Suda s.v.* Ἀντιφῶν (A2744–46 Adler: from Hesychius, cf. Adler *ad loc.*; H. Schultz, "Hesychios (10)," *RE* 8 [1913] 1322ff).

should have to account for Xenophon's use of it. Gagarin senses this and suggests that Xenophon may be trying to distinguish his Antiphon, the Rhamnusian, from Antiphon the trierarch (son of Lysonides, *cf.* [Plut.] *X orat.* 832F–33B) who is mentioned (in a speech of Theramenes) at *Hell.* 2.3.40. But this fails to account for the specific designation 'sophist' and especially for the "perjorative touch" that Gagarin (33) admits inheres in the designation. On the other hand, if Xenophon's Antiphon *was* a professional teacher ('sophist') distinct from the Rhamnusian, this would account not only for the epithet 'sophist' and the hostility of Xenophon's portrait as a whole, but also more generally for Xenophon's use of this Antiphon as a type of the sophistic opponent of Socrates.<sup>22</sup> It is noteworthy that Gagarin, like other unitarians, does not even attempt to explain why Xenophon would choose Antiphon of Rhamnus (of all people) as a typical sophistic opponent of Socrates, nor why he would harbor towards the Rhamnusian (with whose politics at least one would suppose he sympathized) the animosity evident in his portrait of Antiphon. Gagarin, however, objects (31f) that Xenophon could not have intended to identify a sophist Antiphon distinct from the Rhamnusian unless such a sophist had been well-known in the fourth century, and even then would "surely" have distinguished him by means of a demotic, patronymic, or ethnic. That the sophist Antiphon was well-known in the fourth century Gagarin regards as "very unlikely" because the next reference to such a figure occurs nearly a millenium later (*Simpl. in Phys.* 273.36 Diels). But the scarcity of later references to "Antiphon the Sophist" does not rule out the possibility of his having been a familiar figure in the fourth century B.C. And in fact, Xenophon's very wording (Ἀντιφῶντα τὸν σοφιστήν) seems to imply that he was sufficiently well-known to be identified briefly thus as "the sophist."<sup>23</sup> As to the objection that Xenophon would have identified his Antiphon by means of an

<sup>22</sup> On Xenophon's Antiphon as a type *cf.* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* II (Berlin 1932–33) 217 n.1; O. Gigon, *Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien* (=Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 5 [Basel 1953]) 152, 165.

<sup>23</sup> In any case, the rarity of the designation "Antiphon the sophist" is at least as strong an argument against the notion that Xenophon would have referred in this way to Antiphon of Rhamnus as it is against the possibility that a sophist Antiphon was well-known in the fourth century B.C.

ethnic, demotic, or patronymic, Gagarin seems to forget that Xenophon seldom employs additional means of identification beyond the bare name, and especially eschews demotics in the identification of Athenians.<sup>24</sup> The likeliest conclusion remains that Xenophon designates his Antiphon as “the sophist” in order to distinguish him from the (better-known) Rhamnusian.<sup>25</sup>

Considerable evidence suggests that the identity of Xenophon’s Antiphon was controversial already in antiquity. The author of the pseudo-Plutarchean *X orat.* or his source identified Xenophon’s Antiphon with the Rhamnusian.<sup>26</sup> But in Diogenes Laertius’ citation of a list of disputes involving famous poets and philosophers from the third book of Aristotle’s *On Poets*,<sup>27</sup> Antiphon ὁ τερατοσκόπος is said to have contended

<sup>24</sup> Cf. D. Whitehead, “Athenians in Xenophon’s *Hellenica*,” *LivClM* 13 (1988) 145ff, who concludes (146) that “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.” On the other hand, Xenophon’s use of such identificatory tags as Callistratus ὁ δημηγόρος (*Hell.* 6.2.39, 3.3) and Nicostratus ὁ καλὸς ἐπικαλούμενος (*Hell.* 2.4.6; all three passages cited by Whitehead 146) shows that the conditions Gagarin (32) lays down for the use of supplementary designations are much too rigid. That the sophist Antiphon was an Athenian is likely on other grounds and is suggested as well by Xenophon’s failure to identify him by means of an ethnic (cf. *Mem.* 4.4.5, *Symp.* 4.62; *An.* 2.6.17, but contrast *Symp.* 1.5, 4.62 and *Mem.* 2.1.21).

<sup>25</sup> The evidence of Xenophon fully justifies the modern custom of distinguishing Antiphon “the sophist” from Antiphon of Rhamnus, despite the objections of Morrison (*supra* n.10: 54), Nancy (*supra* n.3: 230), and others.

<sup>26</sup> 832c: διατριβὴν δὲ συνέστησε [Antiphon of Rhamnus] καὶ Σωκράτει τῷ φιλοσόφῳ διεφέρετο τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων διαφορὰν οὐ φιλονείκως ἀλλ’ ἐλεγκτικῶς, ὡς Ξενοφῶν ἱστόρηκεν ἐν τοῖς Ἀπομνημονεύμασιν. (On φιλονείκως cf. below.) Likewise Phot. *Bibl.* 486 (=VII 42 Henry) and the anonymous *Vit. Antiphontis* 7, both of which seem (pace Gagarin 39 with n.43) to depend on [Plut.].

<sup>27</sup> 2.46=fr. 75 Rose. In the remainder of the *corpus Aristotelicum* the sophist Antiphon is referred to three times without distinguishing epithet (*Ph.* 185a17, 193a12ff; *Soph. El.* 172a7); the Rhamnusian is referred to three times by name alone (*Ath. Pol.* 32.2, *Eth. Eud.* 1232b6–9, fr. 624 Rose), and Antiphon the tragic poet is referred to twice with the epithet ὁ ποιητής (*Rh.* 1385a10, [*Mech.*] 847a20) and three times without it (*Eth. Eud.* 1239a37, *Rh.* 1379b15, 1399b27). Like others before him (e.g. Morrison [*supra* n.10] 51–55; K. Joël, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* I [Tübingen 1921] 663 n.3), Gagarin (33) infers from Aristotle’s manner of citation that he identified the author of the sophistic works with the Rhamnusian. But Aristotle probably felt it unnecessary in most cases to identify explicitly which Antiphon he had in mind, especially in



eristically (ἐφιλονείκει) with Socrates. Because Aristotle in all probability refers to the disputes in the *Memorabilia*,<sup>28</sup> the epithet τερατοσκόπος applies to Xenophon's Antiphon. Whether it goes back to Aristotle (as is usually assumed) or was added by Diogenes or by an intermediate source, the epithet "diviner" implies that its author considered Xenophon's Antiphon to be someone other than the Rhamnusian (who would hardly be referred to in this way).<sup>29</sup> Even clearer evidence is provided by a passage of Athenaeus (637E–F), in which Democritus charges that after Adrastus had written a monograph in six books on historical and literary problems in Theophrastus' Περὶ ἠθῶν and Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*,<sup>30</sup> in which he discussed at length Antiphon the tragic poet and the character Plexippus from his *Meleager*, a certain Hephaestion plagiarized<sup>31</sup> Adrastus

---

works such as the *Ph.* and the *Soph. El.*, which were addressed to the specialized and knowledgeable audience of his school. If Aristotle could take for granted his audience's knowledge of the details of Antiphon's quadrature (as he evidently does in *Ph.* 185a14–17 and *Soph. El.* 172a7), surely he could also assume their familiarity with the identity of the Antiphon in question. Nancy (*supra* n.3: 225ff) ignores this consideration in his discussion of the Aristotelian evidence.

<sup>28</sup> Some scholars (e.g. Gigon [*supra* n.22] 152; K. Joël, *Der echte und der xenophontische Sokrates* II.2 [Berlin 1901] 638; G. Altwegg, *De Antiphonte qui dicitur Sophista Quaestionum particula I. De libro ΠΕΡΙ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑΣ scripta* [Basel 1908] 7f) have argued that Aristotle depends not on Xenophon but on an older Socratic work that was Xenophon's source as well. Although this is not improbable, their chief argument (Aristotle's designation of Antiphon as τερατοσκόπος against Xenophon's τὸν σοφιστήν) is very weak.

<sup>29</sup> Gagarin (41 n.50) rejects this line of reasoning because we know neither who added the epithet τερατοσκόπος nor why it was added. But our ignorance on the former point does not, in my view, seriously weaken the conclusion drawn in the text above. If Aristotle really called Xenophon's Antiphon ὁ τερατοσκόπος, this would confirm Hermogenes' identification of his 'other' Antiphon, i.e., the sophist, with Antiphon the diviner.

<sup>30</sup> The Adrastus (Casaubon's correction for the meaningless ἄδραντον of the Mss) in question is almost certainly the well-known Aristotelian commentator of the second century, on whom see P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen* II (Berlin 1984) 294–332, esp. 323–30 on his monograph on Aristotle and Theophrastus; on Theophrastus' Περὶ ἠθῶν cf. O. Regenbogen, "Theophrastus (3)," *RE* Suppl. 7 (1940) 1479f.

<sup>31</sup> This Hephaestion is perhaps the well-known metrician, although other identifications are conceivable: cf. Moraux (*supra* n.30) 295 with nn.7f with further literature. On accusations of plagiarism in ancient literature cf. E. Stemplinger, *Der Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (Leipzig 1912); K. Ziegler, "Plagiat," *RE* 20.2 (1950) 1956–97. It is impossible to tell whether Athenaeus' (Democritus') allegation is true, false, or exaggerated.

and published a monograph entitled<sup>32</sup> *On the Antiphon in Xenophon's Memorabilia*. Unfortunately, nothing further is known of this work. But it is difficult to believe that the identity of Xenophon's Antiphon was not *one* of the topics discussed by Hephaestion. Gagarin rejects this inference and argues (41f) that Adrastus probably discussed the characters of Antiphon the poet and Plexippus and that Hephaestion in turn discussed Antiphon's manner of arguing with Socrates (*cf.* the passages from [Plut.], Phot., and the *Vit. Antiph.* cited above).<sup>33</sup> But Gagarin has failed to take into account the available evidence that suggests that Adrastus' monograph devoted extensive attention to literary-historical questions of all kinds.<sup>34</sup> In light of our evidence for his broad interests and learning, and in view of Athenaeus' remarks (καὶ πλεῖστα ὅσα καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀντιφῶντος εἰπόντος), it is likely that Adrastus' discussion of Antiphon the poet was more wide-ranging than Gagarin suggests and that it touched on the question of the identity of this Antiphon vis-à-vis other people of the same name, including Xenophon's Antiphon.<sup>35</sup>

Many other ancient and medieval sources, from Aristotle to the *Suda*, quote from or refer to the works attributed in Hermogenes to the sophist Antiphon without distinguishing their author from Antiphon of Rhamnus.<sup>36</sup> Among these,

<sup>32</sup> Gagarin (41 with n.48) follows Morrison in interpreting Athenaeus' words ἐπέγραψεν τι βιβλίον as "added a book." But the same verb is used a few lines earlier in the sense of "entitle" (*cf.* LSJ *s.v.* II.2), and there is no reason to think it means anything different here.

<sup>33</sup> Gagarin argues further that Hephaestion's title "does not suggest that the work concerned the question of identity." Perhaps; but still less does it suggest that Hephaestion discussed "Antiphon's manner of argument with Socrates."

<sup>34</sup> *Cf.* Moraux (*supra* n.30) 323–30; on Adrastus' philological and literary-historical interests and knowledge *cf.* Moraux *passim*, esp. 314–17, 323ff, 330ff.

<sup>35</sup> It is not necessary to suppose, as some have (e.g. W. Aly, *Formprobleme der frühen griechischen Prosa* (= *Philologus* Suppl. 21.3 [Leipzig 1929]) 112 and Untersteiner, in M. Untersteiner and A. Battezzare, *Sofisti. Testimonianze e Frammenti* IV [Florence 1962] 26), that Adrastus or even Hephaestion identified Xenophon's Antiphon with the tragic poet.

<sup>36</sup> Ancient writers from Thucydides (8.68) and Lysias (12.67) onwards who cite or refer to Antiphon of Rhamnus without distinguishing him from the sophist Antiphon represent a different case. The Rhamnusian was a famous politician and orator familiar to anyone in antiquity who had read Thucydides or studied the history of rhetoric or fifth-century Athens. It is quite unlikely that ancient authors who wished to refer to him felt it necessary to distinguish him from the much less familiar sophist, even if they were

Gagarin sees particularly strong support for the unitarian position in Valerius Harpocration, whose *Lexicon of the Ten Attic Orators*<sup>37</sup> cites speeches of the Rhamnusian and the works attributed to the sophist Antiphon in precisely the same way without any hint that they may belong to different authors.<sup>38</sup> Thus Gagarin infers that Harpocration must have known of Didymus' separatist arguments and dismissed them, and furthermore could not have been aware of "any significant scholarly opinion favoring a separatist view." These inferences are unjustified. In the first place, although Harpocration cites several commentaries of Didymus on the Attic orators and utilizes some of his lexicographical works, we do not know where Didymus expressed his views on Antiphon, and it is completely uncertain (pace Gagarin) whether Harpocration knew of them.<sup>39</sup> In the second place, although Harpocration questions the authenticity of two speeches ascribed to Antiphon, it is unclear on what source (or sources) he depends for ascriptions in the *corpus Antiphonteum* (and elsewhere).<sup>40</sup>

---

aware of the distinction. Critics such as Gagarin, Morrison (*supra* n.10) *passim*, Aly (*supra* n.35) 109–13, Altwegg (*supra* n.28) 6–12, and Narcy (*supra* n.3) 225–30, who have collected and analyzed the ancient evidence on "Antiphon" with a view to the problem of identity, have unjustly neglected this consideration.

<sup>37</sup> Gagarin's attribution to this Harpocration of a *Περὶ τῶν Ἀντιφῶντος σχημάτων* must be a slip; the *Suda* attributes it to a Gaius Harpocration: cf. L. Radermacher, "Harpokration (4)," *RE* 7.2 (1912) 2412. My citations of Harpocration are by page and line of Dindorf's edition.

<sup>38</sup> Some of Gagarin's figures (39) for Harpocration's citations of Antiphon are inaccurate: Harpocration cites *Περὶ ἀληθείας*, *Περὶ ὁμονοίας*, and *Πολιτικός* by title 29 times, not 26; and *Περὶ ἀληθείας* is cited once (pace Gagarin) without specification of book (*s.v.* ἄγοι, 4.8).

<sup>39</sup> On Harpocration's use of Didymus see Cohn (*supra* n.11) 458f. Harpocration cites Didymus 39 times (not 36, as Gagarin states), but not one of these has to do with a problem of ascription. There is no evidence that Didymus wrote a commentary on Antiphon (cf. Cohn 460)—although of course he may have.

<sup>40</sup> The speeches in question are *Πρὸς Φίλιππον ἀπολογία* (90.7f) and *Κατὰ πρῦτάνεως* (269.14f). The only authorities that Harpocration cites by name on a problem of ascription are Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Callimachus on the authenticity of *Πρὸς Κριτίαν περὶ τοῦ ἐνεπισκήμματος*, attributed to Demosthenes (133.4–7). There is reason to believe (see K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* [Berkeley 1968] 15–19) that Harpocration made use of Dionysius' opinions on the ascription of speeches in the Lysianic corpus, but no evidence that Dionysius devoted attention to such problems in the *corpus*

Caecilius of Caleacte is known to have devoted critical attention to problems of ascription in the *corpus Antiphonticum*, but Harpocration cites him only once (118.9), and not on a matter of ascription.<sup>41</sup> Further, it is clear from several cases where the evidence of papyri has made it possible to compare Harpocration's work with the sources available to him that he offers only a small selection from the learning at his disposal.<sup>42</sup> In view of these considerations, it is quite unwarranted to draw the inferences Gagarin does concerning Harpocration's knowledge of discussions on the identity of Antiphon, and in particular to infer that he knew and rejected the separatist views of Didymus and others.

What Harpocration's citations from *Περὶ ἀληθείας*, *Περὶ ὁμονοίας* and *Πολιτικός* do demonstrate is that these works formed part of the *corpus Antiphonticum* in antiquity.<sup>43</sup> How

---

*Antiphonticum*. It should be noted that Harpocration is not always consistent in the matter of ascription. For example, he cites *Κατὰ Νεαίρας*, attributed to Demosthenes, five times with the qualification εἰ γνήσιος (79.15, 89.19, 96.11, 161.8, 188.18), but seven times without it (e.g. 24.14 *etc.*, 49.12, 65.7, 76.7, 79.4). Similarly, *Κατὰ Θρασυβούλου*, attributed to Lysias, is cited four times with, and four times without, the qualification εἰ γνήσιος; and *Κατὰ Νικίδου* (*ἀργίας*), attributed to the same author, is cited three times with, but six times without, the εἰ γνήσιος.

<sup>41</sup> On Caecilius, who according to [Plut.] *X orat.* 833c=fr. 100 Ofenloch rejected twenty-five of the sixty speeches current under the name of Antiphon, cf. Blass, *Att. Ber.* 1<sup>2</sup> (1887) 102ff; J. Brzoska, "Caecilius (2)," *RE* 3.1 (1897) 1181f. Blass claimed (102) that Harpocration reflects Caecilius' views on the ascription of Antiphontean speeches; this may be right but is not supported by evidence. Although Aly (*supra* n.35: 113) and others have maintained that Caecilius did not distinguish the sophist Antiphon from the Rhamnusian, Blass (102f) thought that he did and that accordingly he classified the sophist's writings among the works falsely ascribed to the Rhamnusian. The reason why Harpocration does not question their ascription, according to Blass (103), is because "sie doch von einem Antiphon stammten." Again, this may be right but there is no evidence. Note that Harpocration seems not to have utilized, at least directly, Caecilius' lexicographical works on the orators: see Brzoska 1186.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. H. Schultz, "Harpokration (5)," *RE* 7.2 (1912) 2413f with references. We possess, however, only an abridged version of Harpocration's *Lexicon*. In his attempt to use the evidence of Harpocration to discredit that of Didymus, Gagarin (39f) presents an exaggerated picture of the former's scholarship.

<sup>43</sup> The same conclusion follows from Hermogenes and Philostr. *VS* 500 (σοφιστικοὶ δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι μὲν, σοφιστικώτερος δὲ ὁ Ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁμονοίας). In contrast, the complete absence in the lexicographical tradition of citations from the dream-book current in antiquity under the name of Antiphon

and when they came to be included therein is not known; a likely guess is that Callimachus catalogued them among the works of Antiphon of Rhamnus in his *πίναξ* of orators.<sup>44</sup> Now, the bare fact of their inclusion no more proves that their author is identical with Antiphon of Rhamnus than (say) the inclusion of speeches of Apollodorus son of Pasion in the *corpus Demosthenicum* proves that Apollodorus was the same person as Demosthenes.<sup>45</sup> Yet there can be little doubt that this inclusion exercised great influence in later antiquity in helping to perpetuate (if not to create) the confusion of the sophist Antiphon with Antiphon of Rhamnus.<sup>46</sup> For once these works were included in the *corpus Antiphonteum*, it was possible for anyone to cite them without reservation as belonging to 'Antiphon' or 'Antiphon of Rhamnus', whether or not he may have known or suspected that they belonged to a sophist Antiphon distinct from the Rhamnusian. The *corpus Platonicum* provides an instructive parallel: clearly, later writers

---

implies that this work was not included in the standard *corpus Antiphonteum*.

<sup>44</sup> On Callimachus' *πίνακες* cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* I (Oxford 1968) 127ff; for the *ῥητορικά* cf. frs. 430ff, 443–48 Pfeiffer.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*<sup>2</sup> (Bern 1971) 671. Dover's discussion (*supra* n.40: 23–26) of the uncertainties involved in the ascription of works of the Attic orators and the value of Callimachus' ascriptions is important in this context.

<sup>46</sup> A passage of Philodemus (*On Poetry* 187.3=87B93 D.-K.) has been variously interpreted as the earliest extant instance of confusion between the Antiphons (so Altwegg [*supra* n.28] 8) and Untersteiner [*supra* n.35] 167) or as evidence, almost contemporary with that of Didymus, for the unitarian view (so Gagarin 33 with n.23; F. Deleva Caizzi, "Le fragment" [*supra* n.2] 97 with n.13). In the course of a discussion about the effects of the sounds of letters (cf. F. Sbordone, "Filodemo e la teoria dell' eufonia," *RendNap* n.s. 30 [Naples 1955] 25–51), Philodemus refers to *τινος τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἀντιφῶντος, εἴτ' οὖν ῥητορικὸς εἶτε καὶ φιλόσοφος ἠβούλετ' εἶναι*. T. Gomperz ("Philodem und die ästhetischen Schriften der Herculianischen Bibliothek," *SBVienna* 123.6 [1891] 49 n.3) saw here a reference to Glaucus of Rhegium's *On the Ancient Poets and Musicians*, which some in antiquity attributed to "Antiphon" ([Plut.] *X orat.* 833D). But D.-K. *ad loc.* more plausibly suggest that Philodemus is referring to the *ῥητορικὰ τέχναι* current in antiquity under the name of Antiphon (cf. especially fr. 76 Blass-Thalheim, as well as frs. 73, 75). In any case, it is doubtful whether this passage has anything to do with the identity of Antiphon. It appears rather that Philodemus is simply expressing a sarcastic judgement on what he sees as the philosophical pretensions (*καὶ φιλόσοφος ἠβούλετ' εἶναι*) of the author of the work in question.

felt free to cite as Plato's even works that they knew were spurious, on the principle that any work included in available editions of Plato could be quoted as Plato's.<sup>47</sup> In these circumstances, the 'unitarian' tendencies of the ancient tradition on Antiphon, to which Gagarin<sup>48</sup> and others attach great weight, lose much of their force as evidence. For Galen, Harpocration, and the other authors who cite the sophistic works without distinguishing their author from Antiphon of Rhamnus simply reproduce the mistaken ascriptions handed on in the *corpus Antiphonteum*.

In conclusion, a significant body of ancient evidence points to the probable<sup>49</sup> existence in the late fifth century of a sophist Antiphon distinct from Antiphon of Rhamnus. This emerges most clearly from Xenophon's portrait of "Antiphon the sophist" in the *Memorabilia*, and is confirmed by the opinion of Didymus (and many others) as reported by Hermogenes. The uncertainty in later antiquity regarding the identity of Xenophon's Antiphon lends further support to this conclusion. On the other hand, if the majority of (extant) ancient authors who refer to the works of the sophist Antiphon ignores this distinction, this does not prove that it is mistaken. The failure to distinguish Antiphon the sophist may result from the inclusion of his works in the *corpus Antiphonteum*.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 1994

<sup>47</sup> Cf. L. Tarán, *Academica. Plato, Philip of Opus and the Pseudo-Platonic Epinomis* (Philadelphia 1975) 7 with n.23.

<sup>48</sup> *Passim*, esp. 27f, 37, 39f, and 42f.

<sup>49</sup> It must be stressed that the arguments presented here do not amount to conclusive proof of the separatist case. To admit this, however, is not to detract from the conclusions reached in this paper; for on the problem of the identity of Antiphon, probability is the best that can be achieved without new and decisive evidence.