

NOTES ON PSEUDO-PLUTARCH'S *LIFE* OF ANTIPHON¹

The *Lives of the Ten Orators* (Περὶ τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων), preserved in the manuscripts of Plutarch's *Moralia* (832b–852e) but almost universally acknowledged not to be the work of Plutarch himself,² have been much maligned by modern scholars, and the information they provide has been treated with extreme caution, not to say disdain. My purpose here is to demonstrate that the first of these biographies, the *Life* of Antiphon (832b–834b), repays close study and, far from being worthless, reliably preserves a tradition which provides useful material on its subject.³ Some of what appears below is inevitably going over well-trodden ground,⁴ but there is, in my opinion, sufficient material in the *Life* which has been overlooked or misinterpreted to justify the following re-examination.⁵

Pseudo-Plutarch's *Life* of Antiphon, like his biographies of the other orators, consists of a series of facts and anecdotes which are strung together in a simple style that facilitates analysis. The author begins, as in all the *Lives*, with the patronymic and demotic of his subject (832b), after which the *Life* may be divided into three major sections, covering Antiphon's public activities (832c–e), his life span (832f–833c), and

¹ I am most grateful to the Editor and the anonymous *CQ* reader for numerous observations and criticisms which have improved this article immeasurably.

² See A. Schaefer, *Commentatio de libro Vitarum X Oratorum* (Dresden, 1844); M. Cuvigny, *Plutarque, Oeuvres Morales*, vol. XII-1 (Paris, 1981), p. 25. Little close attention has been paid to the *Lives*, except in the context of the later Photian version; see A. Prasse, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Vitis X oratorum* (Diss., Marburg, 1891); R. M. Smith, 'Photius on the Ten Orators', *GRBS* 33 (1992), 159–89, with further bibliography. I have not seen R. A. McComb, *The Tradition of 'The Lives of the Ten Orators' in Plutarch and Photius* (Diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1991).

³ There is a case, which I readily acknowledge, that such a study should incorporate all ten of the *Lives*, and this piece would then become a book-length project. Without pre-empting the investigation, my initial reading suggests that the material in the *Lives* varies greatly in quality, but this is often due not so much to an incompetent or careless author as to the variability of the source material at his disposal. Since, then, there were different sources available for each of the *Lives*, which will have raised different problems (see Cuvigny [n. 2], pp. 28–34), there is some justification for this preliminary examination of an individual *Life*. See further n. 16 below.

⁴ See e.g. J. S. Morrison, 'Antiphon', *PCPhS* n.s. 7 (1961), 49–58; H. C. Avery, 'One Antiphon or two?', *Hermes* 110 (1982), 145–58; G. Pendrick, 'Once again Antiphon the Sophist and Antiphon of Rhamnus', *Hermes* 115 (1987), 47–60; idem, 'The ancient tradition on Antiphon reconsidered', *GRBS* 34 (1993), 215–28; M. Gagarin, 'The ancient tradition on the identity of Antiphon', *GRBS* 31 (1990), 27–44; idem, *Antiphon. The Speeches* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 5–6; J. Wiesner, 'Antiphon, der Sophist und Antiphon, der Redner—ein oder zwei Autoren?', *Wiener Studien* 107 (1994), 225–43.

I should state my position here on the two main Antiphontean questions, though the concomitant dangers of circular argument are very much to be borne in mind. I am inclined to accept the identity of Antiphon the orator and sophist, mainly on the grounds of the evidence for sophistic activity by the former (see section II). This in turn suggests the authenticity of the *Tetralogies* as being exactly the kind of teaching material that sophists will have used. See further on the latter question Gagarin (1997), pp. 8–9.

⁵ The text of the *Life* and the fragments of Antiphon's speeches mentioned below may be consulted in the Teubner edition of Antiphon by F. Blass and T. Thalheim (Stuttgart, 1914), though Blass and Thalheim do not adopt the regular '832b' style of numbering from Stephanus' edition of Plutarch. See also the Budé edition of M. Cuvigny (n. 2) and the Loeb of H. N. Fowler, *Plutarch's Moralia*, vol. X (Cambridge, MA, 1936). My translations are deliberately literal.

his works (833c–d). To the end of the *Life* are added the decree and judgement passed against Antiphon in 411 B.C. (833d–834b). The decree, Pseudo-Plutarch tells us, was ‘appended’ by Caecilius (ψήφισμα . . . ὁ Καικίλιος παρατίθεται), presumably to the treatise he compiled about Antiphon (Καικίλιος δ’ ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ συντάγματι, 832e); and it is apparent that Pseudo-Plutarch, like the other secondary sources Photius (cod. 259) and Philostratus (*Lives of the Sophists* 15), derives all or most of his information on Antiphon from this biography written by Caecilius.

I. ANTIPHON'S PATRONYMIC AND DEMOTIC

There is no reason to doubt Pseudo-Plutarch's opening statement that ‘Antiphon was the son of Sophilus and of the deme Rhamnus’ (Ἀντιφῶν Σοφίλου μὲν ἦν πατρός, τῶν δὲ δήμων Ῥαμνούσιος), since these names appear in the record of the judgement passed on Antiphon at his trial (834a). It is clear from Harpocration (s.v. Ἄνδρων) that the decree, and the judgement which was recorded under it (ὑπογέγραπται), were found by Caecilius in the collection of decrees compiled by Craterus in the third century B.C. Further, Plato calls Antiphon ‘the Rhamnusian’ at *Menexenus* 236a, a title also given to him by Aristotle, according to Cicero (*Brutus* 47). We should also note that Pseudo-Plutarch regularly records, where appropriate, the names of the orators' fathers and demes,⁶ but does not record the names of their tribes. It is then interesting that Antiphon's tribe is correctly given as Aeantis in the *Life of Antiphon* found in the Antiphontean manuscripts, which Blass/Thalheim regarded as wholly dependent on Pseudo-Plutarch. It may have been a simple enough task for the author of this *Life* to deduce the name of the tribe, but he may also have had access to another source—was he, for example, using Caecilius independently?⁷

II. ANTIPHON'S PUBLIC ACTIVITIES

Having established Antiphon's lineage, Pseudo-Plutarch continues with Antiphon's rhetorical training and ability, which lay behind his public activities. Of these he provides several illustrations, beginning with his political career, his school and his argument with Socrates:

μαθητεύσας δὲ τῷ πατρί (τὴν γὰρ σοφιστὴς, ᾧ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην φασὶν ἔτι παῖδα ὄντα φοιτῆσαι) καὶ δύναντι λόγων κτησάμενος, ὥς τινες νομίζουσιν ἀπ’ οἰκείας φύσεως, ὥρμησε μὲν πολιτεύεσθαι, διατριβὴν δὲ συνέστησε, καὶ Σωκράτει τῷ φιλοσόφῳ διεφέρετο τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων διαφορὰν, οὐ φιλονείκως ἀλλ’ ἐλεγκτικῶς, ὥς Ξενοφῶν ἱστόρηκεν ἐν τοῖς Ἀπομνημονεύμασιν. (832c)

[Having been a pupil of his father (for he was a sophist, whose school they say Alcibiades attended when a boy), and having acquired power at speaking, as some think through his natural ability, he began a public career, set up a school and had his disagreement with Socrates on the matter of words, not contentiously but for argument's sake, as Xenophon has narrated in his *Memoirs*.]

⁶ He is generally accurate, though he is unclear as to Andocides' deme (834b). For the other orators cf. 835c, 836e, 839e, 840a, 841a–b, 844a, 848d, and 850b. Pseudo-Plutarch only mentions one tribe, Aegaeis, in connection with the Hermes of Andocides (835b), though Andocides' deme Cydathenaeum was in fact in the tribe Pandionis, the deme Cydantidae being in Aegaeis. Demosthenes' tribe Pandionis is recorded in the decree at 851a.

⁷ Gagarin (n. 4, 1990), pp. 38–9 with n. 43, notes that the author of the shorter *Life* seems to distinguish the orator and the poet, and so doubts that this *Life* was entirely dependent on Pseudo-Plutarch. I would argue that Pseudo-Plutarch also distinguishes the two (see sections III and IV below).

Pseudo-Plutarch regularly identifies his subjects' tutors, recurrent names among these being Plato and Isocrates.⁸ There seems little reason to doubt that Antiphon learned the techniques of public speaking from his father, partly because of the role fathers would regularly play in their sons' education,⁹ but more because the opportunities for rhetorical training will not have been widespread in the period of Antiphon's youth. This activity of Sophilus would then indeed justify calling him a sophist, though the Sophilus-sophist link would have been easy to make. Nevertheless, if Antiphon was born about 480¹⁰ and his father some time around 510, and if we take 460 as a *terminus post quem* for the beginning of sophistic activity at Athens,¹¹ Sophilus is likely only to have been into his fifties before embarking on his sophistic career, which in itself is quite possible.¹² The possibility is increased if we lower the date of Antiphon's birth to about 470.¹³ The mentioning of the father's activity then affords Pseudo-Plutarch the opportunity to introduce that favourite subject of anecdotes, Alcibiades. Other sources name Alcibiades' tutor as Zopyrus (Plato, *I Alc.* 122b; Plut. *Alc.* 1.2), but this does not preclude the possibility that he later received sophistic training from Sophilus (cf. also Suid. s.v. Ἀλκιβιάδης). Alcibiades was not born until about 450¹⁴ and is not likely to have attended Sophilus' school 'when a boy' much before 430, by which time Sophilus would have been well into his sixties at least, but may have been anything up to about eighty years old. This perhaps makes Alcibiades' attendance at his school improbable, but it is by no means impossible, and again the tradition reported by Pseudo-Plutarch is tenable.¹⁵ Furthermore, it is important here to underline a recurring feature of the *Life*, that the author combines firm assertions, sometimes backed up by the name of their source, with unattributed statements in which he clearly has far less confidence. Thus, whereas Pseudo-Plutarch states Antiphon's father was a sophist, he only reports the story that Alcibiades attended Sophilus' school ('they say') in a parenthetical remark, which may be an indication that he is not totally sure of the veracity of this tale.¹⁶ Strangely, Pseudo-Plutarch's source missed the opportunity here to mention that

⁸ The exception is again Andocides; for the other orators cf. 835d (Lysias: the Syracusans Tisias and Nicias), 836e-f (Isocrates: Prodicus, Gorgias, Tisias, and Theramenes), 839e (the identity of Isaeus' teacher is lost in a MS. lacuna), 840b (Aeschines: Isocrates and Plato, or Leodamas, though there was an alternative tradition denying that he had teachers, 840f), 841b and 842c (Lycurgus: Plato, Isocrates, and unnamed sophists), 844b-c and 845b-c (Demosthenes: several teachers, but especially Isaeus), 848d (Hyperides: Plato and Isocrates), and 850c (Dinarchus: Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phalerum).

⁹ See B. S. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Athens* (London, 1993), pp. 82-6. The speaker of Antiphon's *Second Tetralogy* talks of training his son (Ant. 3.2.3).

¹⁰ See section III below.

¹¹ See G. B. Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (Cambridge, 1981), p. 42.

¹² Like most others, I was very doubtful about this in M. Edwards and S. Usher, *Greek Orators I. Antiphon and Lysias* (Warminster, 1985), p. 21.

¹³ As did M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* (Berkeley, 1986), pp. 361-2. See section III below.

¹⁴ See J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.* (Oxford, 1971), p. 18.

¹⁵ It is also possible that the school continued to be regarded as 'Sophilus' school' after he himself ended his active participation in it, perhaps with his son taking over the reins (I am grateful to the Editor for this suggestion).

¹⁶ Various formulations are used in this and the other *Lives* when Pseudo-Plutarch does not name his source. These include *φασι* and expressions including this verb, such as *ὡς/ὡσπερ τινές φασι* (twice in 832c; cf. 837a, 837b, 837d twice, 838b, 840c, 844b, 847a, 847b, 847e, 848a) or simply *ὡς τινες* (835c, 836a twice, 837f twice, 841b, 843e, *ὡς ἐνιοι* 846c, 849c, 850e); *ὡς τινες νομίζουσιν* (832c); *δοκεῖ* (832f; cf. 850b); *οἱ δ' . . . ἱστοροῦσιν* (833a, though Lysias is then

there was an abusive oration against Alcibiades attributed to Antiphon (cf. Plut. *Alc.* 3.1; Athen. 12.525b).

That Antiphon himself possessed a natural ability at speaking is not in question, and this tradition clearly derives from Thucydides (8.68), who describes him as 'being pre-eminent in intellectual power and in expressing his thoughts' (κράτιστος ἐνθυμηθῆναι γενόμενος καὶ ᾧ γνώϊη εἰπεῖν). But did he enter on a political career? Thucydides seems to contradict Pseudo-Plutarch here, but what the historian says is 'he did not come forward to speak before the assembly or in any other public arena willingly, but remained an object of suspicion to the people on account of his reputation for cleverness' (ἐς μὲν δῆμον οὐ παριὼν οὐδ' ἐς ἄλλον ἀγῶνα ἐκούσιος οὐδένα, ἀλλ' ὑπόπτως τῷ πλήθει διὰ δόξαν δεινότητος διακείμενος). This is not the same as saying Antiphon never embarked on a political career, which he perhaps abandoned when he acquired his bad reputation,¹⁷ nor do we know how many times he may have spoken in public 'unwillingly'—and public speaking is the obvious way that he would have gained his reputation for cleverness amongst the people at large in the first place.¹⁸ Additionally, his involvement behind the scenes in writing politically motivated speeches for others and in the revolution of the Four Hundred clearly comes within the sphere of political activity.¹⁹

There can be little doubt also that Antiphon was a teacher of rhetoric (and hence was himself a sophist),²⁰ since Plato confirms this at *Menexenus* 236a.²¹ The *Tetralogies*, if genuine works of Antiphon, are further evidence, so too the collection of proems and epilogues (frr. 68–70), and the rhetorical handbook mentioned by Pseudo-Plutarch at 832e.²² Later, Cicero included Antiphon in his survey of early Greek rhetorical theorists, alongside Corax and Tisias, Protagoras, Gorgias, Lysias, Theodorus, and Isocrates (*Brutus* 47); and there is a longer list in Dionysius (*First Letter to Ammaeus* 2). None of this proves that Antiphon 'set up a school' (διατριβὴν δὲ συνέστησε), whatever that means precisely (we might have expected Antiphon to

named; cf. 848c); ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος (833b); λέγεται (833c; cf. 839c, 847d, 849d, 850a) and other expressions including this verb (837f, 839c, 838f, 839f, 840b, 840d, 840f, 841e, 844d, 847b twice, 849c); and εἰσὶ δ' οἱ . . . ἀναφέρονσιν (833d).

¹⁷ The anonymous reader makes the helpful suggestion that in the μὲν/δέ clauses the δέ might have an adversative force, indicating that Antiphon began a public career but then set up a school (and so abandoned his active political ambitions).

¹⁸ This tradition was picked up by Plutarch at *Nicias* 6.1. Thucydides might, of course, be simply alluding to Antiphon's trial.

¹⁹ For the latter point see Morrison (n. 4), pp. 57–8. There is a possibility that Antiphon was a *tamias* in 429/8, with R. Develin, *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 121.

²⁰ The fact that Antiphon the orator may be termed a sophist does not, of course, prove that he is the same person as the Antiphon who wrote the sophistic pieces *On Truth* and *On Concord*. But 'sophist' is an apt description of the man described by Thucydides. See further n. 24 below.

²¹ See Morrison (n. 4), p. 49, n. 3, *pace* K. J. Dover, 'The chronology of Antiphon's speeches', *CQ* 44 (1950), 44–60, at 59.

²² The evidence for three books of *rhetorikai technai* is collected at frr. 71–6 (cf. also Quint. 3.1.11), and although their authenticity was questioned by Pollux (fr. 74), we do not know on what grounds. What these handbooks consisted of exactly is unclear. For different views see G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963), p. 54; T. Cole, *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore, 1991), pp. 81, 84–5. Kennedy distinguished between exposition of precepts and collections of examples, such as Antiphon is also credited with (i.e. the *Tetralogies* and the collection of proems and epilogues); but Cole will only allow model speeches and illustration by example. I have supported the more traditional view of Kennedy (in a paper on narrative in the early orators delivered to the literature seminar at the Institute of Classical Studies), but either way, if Antiphon was a teacher of rhetoric, there is little reason to doubt that he wrote rhetorical treatises.

take over his father's school when the latter grew old, rather than establishing a new one);²³ but if the Antiphon of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* is the orator,²⁴ and if the implication of his criticism of Socrates that the latter did not take fees is that Antiphon himself did, the school is certainly a possibility. This tradition was also known to Plutarch, who in discussing those who taught the youth in schools (τοὺς ἐν ταῖς σχολαῖς τὰ μειράκια προδιδάσκοντας) names 'men like Isocrates, Antiphon and Isaeus' (*de glor. Ath.* 350c).

A further element connected with Antiphon's didactic career is the claim that he was the teacher of Thucydides, but it should be emphasized that this was an inference made by Pseudo-Plutarch's source Caecilius:²⁵

Καικίλιος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ συντάγματι Θουκυδίδου τοῦ συγγραφέως καθηγητὴν τεκμαίρεται γεγενῆσθαι ἐξ ὧν ἐπαινείται παρ' αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀντιφῶν. (832e)

[Caecilius, in the treatise he wrote about him, conjectures that he was the teacher of the historian Thucydides from the terms in which Antiphon is praised in his work.]

In fact, the texts of both Pseudo-Plutarch and Photius say that Caecilius inferred Antiphon was Thucydides' *pupil*, though *μαθητὴν* is regularly emended after Wytttenbach to *καθηγητὴν*. The tradition that Antiphon was the teacher also appears in Hermogenes (*Peri ideon* 399f Rabe) and later writers, and, given the relative ages of the two men (the historian was probably born after 460), is the more likely. It is then unclear whether Pseudo-Plutarch, Caecilius, or a copyist was responsible for the error. We can only guess, like Caecilius and the other sources, at the actual relationship between the two, but for our purposes here it is enough to underline that Pseudo-Plutarch attributes the inference of pupillage to Caecilius.

Antiphon's reputation as an innovator, both as the first professional speech-writer and as the first to publish rhetorical treatises, is Pseudo-Plutarch's next topic. The former element of this tradition (also found at Diod. in Clemens Alex. *Stromateis* 1.79.3; Quint. 3.1.11; Ammian. Marc. 30.4.5) is regularly interpreted to mean that Antiphon was the first logographer to publish commissioned speeches,²⁶ though I have argued that Antiphon was indeed the first to write speeches for others for money.²⁷ Either way, it is worth emphasizing that Pseudo-Plutarch, and presumably therefore Caecilius, did not possess any speeches earlier than Antiphon, and he in fact supports the tradition by reference to the absence of earlier forensic speeches, while adducing the names of leading political figures:

²³ See n. 15. Other members of the canon whom Pseudo-Plutarch records as setting up schools were Isocrates (837a–b), Isaeus (839f), and Aeschines (840d–e).

²⁴ The case that the Antiphon of Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.6.1–15 (whom Xenophon expressly calls 'Antiphon the sophist') was the same person as the orator has been strongly argued by Gagarin, following Morrison and Avery, and I have nothing to add here (see n. 4). It is worth noting, however, that the words οὐ φιλονείκως ἀλλ' ἐλεγκτικῶς show that Pseudo-Plutarch, or rather Caecilius, had more than one source available, since they are clearly meant to counter Aristotle (in Diog. Laert. 2.46), who talks of Antiphon 'the diviner' (ὁ τερατοσκόπος) who 'disputed contentiously' (ἐφίλονίκει) with Socrates. Pseudo-Plutarch unfortunately gives no indication of the date of Antiphon's teaching activities and his dispute with Socrates.

²⁵ For another inference, possibly drawn by Pseudo-Plutarch himself, cf. 839e.

²⁶ As by A. W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K. J. Dover, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (HCT) vol. 5 (Oxford, 1981), p. 173; P. A. Cartledge in Cartledge *et al.* (edd.), *Nomos* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 49.

²⁷ In an as yet unpublished paper on oratory and literacy delivered to the ancient history seminar at Bristol University.

τῶν γοῦν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων οὐδενὸς φέρεται δικανικὸς λόγος, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν κατ' αὐτόν, διὰ τὸ μηδέπω ἐν ἔθει τὸ συγγράφειν εἶναι, οὐ Θεμιστοκλέους, οὐκ Ἀριστείδου, οὐ Περικλέους. (832d)

[At any rate no legal speech is extant of any of those who lived before him, nor even of his contemporaries, because speech-writing was not yet in vogue, not of Themistocles, Aristides, or Pericles.]

This, along with Thucydides' well-known remark at 1.22.1 that he and his informers found it hard to remember the precise words of the speeches he recreates, strongly supports the theory that deliberative (as opposed to forensic) speeches were not regularly published in the fifth century, but equally accords with the idea that there was little distinction drawn in that period between forensic and deliberative oratory.²⁸ Pseudo-Plutarch's list of those who did practise logography when Antiphon was already old similarly contains the names of politicians (Alcibiades, Critias, and Archinus) alongside that of Lysias. It is also interesting that whereas Pseudo-Plutarch again adds the qualification 'as some say' (ὥσπερ τινές φασιν) in respect of the logographic tradition, this time he indicates his general agreement with it (γοῦν). On the other hand, he is in no doubt that Antiphon 'was the first to publish rhetorical handbooks' (πρῶτος δὲ καὶ ῥητορικὰς τέχνας ἐξήνεγκε). This ignores the Sicilian tradition, but may be true of Athens.²⁹

Pseudo-Plutarch concludes this section by returning to Antiphon's rhetorical ability and providing an estimation of the qualities of his speeches:³⁰

ἔστι δ' ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἀκριβὴς καὶ πιθανός, καὶ δεινὸς περὶ τὴν εὖρεσιν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπόροις τεχνικός, καὶ ἐπιχειρῶν ἐξ ἀδήλου, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰ πάθη τρέπων τοὺς λόγους, τοῦ εὐπρεποῦς μάλιστα στοχαζόμενος. (832e)

[In his speeches he is accurate and persuasive, clever in invention and skilful in difficult cases, attacking unexpectedly, addressing his arguments to both the laws and the emotions and aiming especially at propriety.]

This judgement is repeated very closely by Photius:

εἰσὶ δ' αὐτοῦ οἱ λόγοι τὸ ἀκριβὲς καὶ πιθανὸν καὶ περὶ τὴν εὖρεσιν δεινὸν οἰκειούμενοι. ἔστι δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπόροις τεχνικός, καὶ τὰς ἐπιχειρήσεις ἐξ ἀδήλου ποιούμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰ πάθη τρέπων τοὺς λόγους, τοῦ εὐπρεποῦς μάλιστα στοχαζόμενος. (cod. 259)

[His speeches have as their qualities accuracy and persuasion and cleverness in invention. The man is skilful in difficult cases, attacking unexpectedly and addressing his arguments to both the laws and the emotions, and aiming especially at propriety.]

Since Photius moves on to a discussion of Antiphon's style, which he attributes to Caecilius and which is not in Pseudo-Plutarch, he is clearly using Caecilius

²⁸ See Kennedy (n. 22), pp. 203–6; Edwards and Usher (n. 12), pp. 7–10; J. Trevett, 'Did Demosthenes publish his deliberative speeches?', *Hermes* 124 (1996), 425–41. Pseudo-Plutarch himself interestingly does not draw the distinction made by Aristotle at *Rhetoric* 1.3.

²⁹ On the Sicilian tradition see e.g. Kennedy (n. 22), pp. 58–61. Pseudo-Plutarch adds that his sharp intellect earned Antiphon the nickname 'Nestor'. This would have been entirely appropriate to one of the leading intellectuals of his day, but there is no evidence for it earlier than Pseudo-Plutarch. Interestingly, given the Sicilian tradition, Plato assigns the name to Gorgias at *Phaedrus* 261c.

³⁰ A similarly brief stylistic judgement introduced by ἔστι δέ is found in the *Life* of Andocides (835b); still briefer comments are made on Lysias (836b), Isaeus (839e, partly in a lacuna), and Dinarchus (850e).

independently, and the opinions of both Pseudo-Plutarch and Photius will in fact derive from Caecilius.³¹

III. ANTIPHON'S LIFE SPAN

Pseudo-Plutarch tells us that Antiphon was born *κατὰ τὰ Περσικά καὶ Γοργίαν τὸν σοφιστήν, ὀλίγω ὢν νεώτερος αὐτοῦ* ('at the time of the Persian wars and the sophist Gorgias, being slightly younger than he'). For Ostwald (n. 13), pp. 361–2, the dating of Antiphon's birth to c. 480 is inconsistent with Antiphon's beginning to publish his speeches when aged about sixty and his involvement in the oligarchic revolution when about seventy, and so he would lower the orator's date of birth by a decade. But as with the activities of Sophilus and Alcibiades discussed above, there is nothing intrinsically impossible about Pseudo-Plutarch's dating. We do not know who suggested 'at the time of the Persian wars', whether it was partly an inference from the allegation made against Antiphon at his trial that his grandfather was connected with the tyrants (fr. 1) or perhaps was the date given by Antiphon himself in a lost part of his defence speech. Besides, for Caecilius' purposes such a rough guess, informed or otherwise, would have sufficed as a general indication of the date—and he need not have disagreed with a dating to what we would call 470. Hence Pseudo-Plutarch's statement is not at all 'doubtful';³² it is simply not precise enough by modern standards.

Pseudo-Plutarch then records three versions of Antiphon's death. The first and correct version, that it was by execution for his involvement in the revolution of the Four Hundred, derives from Thucydides and the decrees appended to the *Life*. Pseudo-Plutarch knows this was how Antiphon met his end, but there is clearly a confusion of two Antiphons in his remark on Antiphon's role in the revolution:

ἦν αὐτὸς δοκεῖ συγκατασκευάσαι, ὅτε μὲν δυσὶ τριηραρχῶν ναυσίν, ὅτε δὲ στρατηγῶν, καὶ πολλαῖς μάχαις νικῶν, καὶ συμμαχίας μεγάλας αὐτοῖς προσαγόμενος, καὶ τοὺς ἀκμάζοντας ὀπλίζων, καὶ τριῆρεις πληρῶν ἐξήκοντα, καὶ πρεσβεύων ἐκάστοτε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰς Λακεδαίμονα, ἥνικα ἐτετέχιστο Ἡετιώνεια. (832f)

[in which he seems himself to have played a role, at one time by being trierarch of two ships, at another by being general, and being victorious in many battles, and securing important alliances for them, and by arming the men of military age, and by manning sixty triremes, and by being their envoy on every occasion to Sparta at the time when Eëtionieia had been fortified.]

Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.3.40) mentions an Antiphon who supplied two triremes during the war and was later put to death by the Thirty. This must be the son of Lysonides, whom Pseudo-Plutarch, in the second version of Antiphon's demise, rightly equates with the Antiphon put to death by the Thirty:³³

οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀνηρῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἰστοροῦσιν, ὥσπερ Λυσίας ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀντιφώντος θυγατρὸς λόγῳ· ἐγένετο γὰρ αὐτῷ θυγάτριον, οὗ Κάλλαισχος ἐπεδικάσατο. ὅτι δ' ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀπέθανεν, ἰστορεῖ καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν. ἀλλ' οὗτός γ' ἂν εἴη ἕτερος, Λυσωνίδου πατρός, οὗ καὶ Κρατίνος ἐν Πυτίνῃ ὡς πονηροῦ μνημονεύει. πῶς γὰρ ἂν ὁ προτεθνεὺς καὶ ἀναιρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα εἴη; (833a–b)

³¹ Though Smith (n. 2) argues for considerable independence of thought in stylistic matters on the part of Photius.

³² As *HCT* 5.172; Ostwald (n. 13), p. 361, n. 94. Kerferd (n. 11), p. 44, dates Gorgias' birth to c. 485.

³³ For this Antiphon see Davies (n. 14), pp. 327–8.

[But some record that he was put to death by the Thirty, as Lysias in his speech in defence of Antiphon's daughter; for he had a daughter whose hand in marriage Callaeschrus claimed at law. That he was put to death by the Thirty is also recorded by Theopompus in the fifteenth book of his *Philippics*. But this would have been another Antiphon, the son of Lysonides, whom Cratinus also mentions as a rogue in his *Flask*. For how could a man who had died before and been put to death by the Four Hundred be alive again in the time of the Thirty?]

However, the other details given here by Pseudo-Plutarch are not to be found in Xenophon. Thucydides (8.90) discusses the fortification of Eëtionia and the embassy to Sparta, among whose members was an Antiphon. This is naturally to be taken as referring to the orator, though it might conceivably be the son of Lysonides. But there is no other record of either man being general, and the victories are obscure, as well as exaggerated. It seems, therefore, that Pseudo-Plutarch, or rather Caecilius or an earlier source, conflated the accounts of Thucydides and Xenophon, but that they had to hand at least one other text now lost to us, such as Lysias' speech in defence of Antiphon's daughter or the *'Philippics'* of Theopompus to which Pseudo-Plutarch refers.³⁴ It is also possible that the story of Antiphon's actions on behalf of the Four Hundred derives from Antiphon himself—fr. 5 of his own defence speech is a reference in Harpocration to the speech under the heading *Eëtionia*. But it should be noted again that Pseudo-Plutarch is not quite sure of Antiphon's involvement—*δοκεῖ* ('it seems') is the verb used in the relative clause, perhaps indicating the influence of Antiphon's denial of involvement in his defence speech. It should further be noted that following the *δοκεῖ* there are two *ὅτε* clauses, with most of the details coming after *ὅτε δὲ στρατηγῶν* ('at another by being general')—was Pseudo-Plutarch or Caecilius uneasy about the identification in an earlier source of the trierarch and general? In other words, the *ὅτε μὲν* clause is the root of the confusion and indicates the conflation. Without it there is a perfectly possible, if otherwise unattested, generalship for the orator in 411, along with an embassy which is confirmed by Thucydides.³⁵ There is clearly some rhetorical exaggeration over what an ageing Antiphon achieved as general, and this might go back to Antiphon's own account—where he denied that the accusation of these activities had any basis in fact, or even perhaps (by a sophisticated twisting) maintained that they were performed on behalf of the democracy. If there is anything at all to this interpretation, Antiphon's involvement in the revolution was not quite so 'back-room' as Thucydides implies in 8.68. If, on the other hand, all such activities be denied to Antiphon the orator, an alternative is that the son of Lysonides was the general, the evidence for which will have come from Lysias or Theopompus—one element of the defence of the daughter could have been the commonplace listing of services rendered to the state. Either way, we should not dismiss this generalship out of hand.

The third version of Antiphon's death, that he was executed on the orders of Dionysius I of Syracuse, introduces Antiphon the tragic poet, who was known to Aristotle and was clearly distinguished by him from the orator (e.g. *Rhet.* 2.6.27, 1385a10).³⁶ Pseudo-Plutarch's apparent identification of the orator and tragedian has been taken by scholars as one of the major confusions in his account, made worse

³⁴ Davies (n. 14), p. 327, n. 1, suspects a textual error in Pseudo-Plutarch's reference to the fifteenth book of Theopompus' *Philippics*, proposing book five of his *Hellenica* as the obvious place for such a statement. The source of the error (if such it be) is again unclear.

³⁵ Note, however, that Develin (n. 19), p. 161, is sceptical about the tradition of a generalship, and rules out the possibility that it was held by Antiphon the orator.

³⁶ See Gagarin (n. 4, 1990), p. 33.

because he knows the true circumstances of Antiphon's death. Even though his connecting the poet with Dionysius when tyrant at Syracuse (although Dionysius' rise to sole power did not in fact begin until 405) is a chronological error which he may not have had cause to suspect, it seems that both the lure of the anecdote and the desire to attribute yet more literary talents to Antiphon were too tempting to resist. But does Pseudo-Plutarch really write so carelessly? We should note that whereas he makes the unequivocal statement 'he lived until the overthrow of the democracy by the Four Hundred' (παράτετακεν ἕως καταλύσεως τῆς δημοκρατίας ὑπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων γενομένης), he introduces the two alternative versions with 'some record that he was put to death by the Thirty' (οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀνηρῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦσιν) and the vague 'there is also another story about his death' (ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος περὶ τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ). In other words, he knows what happened to Antiphon but is reporting other versions given in his source; and while it is true that he openly rejects the second version but not the third, he certainly does not give any indication that he accepts the latter. Moreover, it is also highly probable that Pseudo-Plutarch knows the tragic poet was not the same person as the orator (see below).

IV. ANTIPHON'S WORKS

Pseudo-Plutarch records that sixty speeches of Antiphon were preserved, of which twenty-five were pronounced spurious by Caecilius.³⁷ We possess fifteen (three forensic speeches and the three sets of four *Tetralogies*³⁸) and we know the titles or parts of titles of some nineteen other deliberative and forensic speeches, though one of these may be wrongly attributed to Antiphon (fr. 60) and the authenticity of another is queried by Harpocration (fr. 65). There are also two books of the *On Truth*, the *On Concord*, the *Politicus*, and the *Abuse of Alcibiades*, which are counted as epideictic speeches by Blass.³⁹ On the assumption that all these works were among the sixty, some of them must have been among Caecilius' twenty-five spurious speeches, though it is impossible to tell which ones.⁴⁰ We do not know the grounds on which Caecilius pronounced speeches spurious, though his judgements may have been primarily based on chronological and stylistic criteria,⁴¹ and we would not necessarily agree with him if the speeches were extant—note, for example, that of the sixty speeches ascribed to Isocrates, Dionysius pronounced twenty-five genuine, Caecilius twenty-eight (Ps.-Plut. *Isocrates* 838d). Pseudo-Plutarch's total also shows that the selection process whereby Antiphon's homicide speeches were chosen to represent his work and were subsequently preserved in the manuscripts had not taken place by the (uncertain) time he was writing. His subsequent remark that

³⁷ The standard introductory formula is *φέρονται δ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι* (836a, 838d, 840e, 847e, 849d, 850e with *καί* added); *τοῦ ῥήτορος* replaces *αὐτοῦ* here and at 843c; *σῶζεται* is used at 835a, *καταλέλοιπε* at 839f.

³⁸ There can be no doubt that the *Tetralogies* were included here, and that each speech was counted separately, as F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit* vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1887), p. 102, n. 2.

³⁹ Blass (n. 38), p. 106. Again, the *On Truth* and *On Concord* may have been written by a separate Antiphon (see n. 20).

⁴⁰ If we count the fifteen that survive and seventeen of the fragments, there is not enough room for the epideictic speeches; if we do not count the *Truth*, *Concord*, and *Politicus*, there are thirty-five including the two doubtful speeches and the *Abuse of Alcibiades*. But there may, of course, have been other speeches known to Caecilius, and we possess numerous fragments of uncertain origin.

⁴¹ On the assumption that Caecilius' method was similar to that of Dionysius, for whom these criteria were of the utmost importance (cf. D.H. *Lysias* 12, *Dinarchus* 4–7).

Antiphon was ridiculed for love of money by Plato (Comicus) in his *Peisander* at first sight seems out of place here, and we might have expected Pseudo-Plutarch to move on from Antiphon's speeches to the rhetorical treatises which were mentioned in section I. It is likely that Caecilius connected the orator's output with the tradition that he was the first to charge fees, and hence was money-loving. Antiphon's reputation was well-known, and he admits in his own defence speech that he profited from writing speeches for others (fr. 1a, col. II.14–III.24).⁴²

The next three alleged literary activities of the orator, as a composer of tragedies, of a treatise on curing distress, and of a book *On Poets*, all stem from confusions with other writers of the same name, and Pseudo-Plutarch is clearly aware of this. With regard to Antiphon's writing of tragedies, it should again be noted that Pseudo-Plutarch introduces this remark not with a definite statement, 'he wrote tragedies' (following 'sixty speeches are preserved' and 'he is ridiculed'), but with 'he is said to have written tragedies' (λέγεται δὲ τραγωδίας συνθεῖναι), and adds that he did this 'both by himself and with the tyrant Dionysius' (καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ σὺν Διονυσίῳ τῷ τυράννῳ). The 'treatise on curing distress' (τέχνη ἀλυσίας) is connected with a sojourn in Corinth as a stress-counsellor, but the anecdotal nature of this story is apparent. It is doubtless possible that an Antiphon fired by his father's sophistic teaching and for some reason visiting Corinth had an early attempt at making money by offering his services as a counsellor. On the other hand Morrison (n. 4), p. 57, made the ingenious suggestion that this story derives from comedy, on the analogy of Socrates' *phrontisterion* in Aristophanes' *Clouds*. If so, it is perhaps further evidence for Antiphon's teaching activities, his school becoming the clinic. But equally, Pseudo-Plutarch seems to be repeating a tradition which connected the counsellor specifically with the tragedian and which guessed that it was his dissatisfaction with this activity that led to his giving it up for a career in oratory—and although this time the statements are unequivocal, we should remember once more that Pseudo-Plutarch himself does not claim that his Antiphon wrote tragedies. Finally, Pseudo-Plutarch informs us that 'there are those who ascribe also to Antiphon the book *On Poets* by Glaucus of Rhegium' (εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ τὸ Γλαύκου τοῦ Ῥηγίνου περὶ ποιητῶν βιβλίον εἰς Ἀντιφῶντα ἀναφέρουσιν). This ascription was presumably connected in fact with Antiphon the poet, and Pseudo-Plutarch does not, of course, indicate that he agrees with the anonymous authorities for it.

Pseudo-Plutarch ends this section by returning to Antiphon's speeches and says that four in particular were commended, presumably by Caecilius:⁴³

ἐπαινεῖται δ' αὐτοῦ μάλιστα ὁ περὶ Ἡρώδου, καὶ <ὁ> πρὸς Ἑρασίστρατον περὶ τῶν ταῶν, καὶ ὁ περὶ τῆς εἰσαγγελίας, ὃν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ γέγραφε, καὶ ὁ πρὸς Δημοσθένην τὸν στρατηγὸν παρανόμων. (833d)

[His most admired speeches are the one concerning Herodes, the one against Erasistratus concerning the peacocks, the one on the Impeachment, which he wrote in his own defence, and the one against the general Demosthenes for an illegal proposal.]

It is interesting that only one of these, the *Herodes*, survives in the manuscripts, showing again that the selection process mentioned above had not yet happened. There are, in addition, two references to the *Herodes* speech in Harpocration (s.v. Διεστίναντο, Φροῦδος). Of the other three, we have papyrus fragments of

⁴² Cf. the money-loving Antiphon in Xen. *Mem.* 1.6 (see n. 23), and see in detail Avery (n. 4), pp. 151–5.

⁴³ This was clearly not Pseudo-Plutarch's choice—n.b. the passive verb ἐπαινεῖται.

Antiphon's defence speech *On the Revolution* and otherwise six references in Harpocration (fr. 1–6); two quotations from the *Against Erasistratus* in Athenaeus (fr. 57), as well as one reference in Aelian (fr. 58) and one in Harpocration (fr. 59); and there are seven references in Harpocration to the speech *Against Demosthenes* (fr. 8–14), which was in fact a defence against an indictment brought by the general. But there are also numerous references in Harpocration to other speeches of Antiphon (e.g. ten to the *Nicocles* and nine to the speech for the Lindians), so it is by no means certain that other critics would have agreed with this judgement. It is then unclear why the speech against Hippocrates was singled out in addition: ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἱπποκράτους τοῦ στρατηγοῦ λόγον καὶ εἶλεν αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐρήμου ('he also wrote a speech against the general Hippocrates and got judgement against him by default'). Since it is mentioned by both Pseudo-Plutarch and Photius, it will have been noted by Caecilius and was presumably a *cause célèbre*. The text of Pseudo-Plutarch reads *ιατροῦ στρατηγοῦ*, that of Photius has *ιατροῦ*, i.e. the doctor Hippocrates of Cos, as opposed to the Athenian general who died at Delium in 424. It has been suggested that the former was more likely to have lost the case by default,⁴⁴ but in a *cause célèbre* it may be that the general is preferable. Did Antiphon or his client prosecute Hippocrates when he was on campaign, as Alcibiades' enemies did to him in 415 (Thuc. 6.61)?

V. CONCLUSION

Many of the details of the life of Antiphon presented by Pseudo-Plutarch cannot be tested against earlier sources, but I hope this analysis has shown that where we have some means of making a reasoned judgement, Pseudo-Plutarch's account is regularly found to be defensible. Even what may appear at first glance to be confusions of the orator with the trierarch and tragic poet prove not to be such when we read the text closely and observe the author's use of disclaimers such as *λέγεται*, and indeed superficial readings should not be allowed to cloud our judgement of the general reliability of the information he preserves. We cannot tell how much of it derives directly from Caecilius, or to what extent Pseudo-Plutarch attempts to clarify what he found in his source or sources. But we should at least have confidence in Pseudo-Plutarch's handling of the tradition and begin to take seriously his credibility as the biographer of the first in the canon of ten Attic orators.

Queen Mary and Westfield College, London

MICHAEL J. EDWARDS

⁴⁴As by Blass (n. 38), pp. 105–6.