

OIKOYMENH

Antisthenica Cynica
Socratica

Edited by
Vladislav Suvák

PRAHA
2014

OIKOYMENH
Hennerova 223, CZ 150 00 PRAHA 5
<http://www.oikoymenh.cz>

KATALOGIZACE V KNIZE – NÁRODNÍ KNIHOVNA ČR

Antisthenica Cynica Socratica / edited by Vladislav Suvák. – Praha :
OIKOYMENH, 2014. – 436 s. – (Mathésis ; 9)
Anglický, francouzský, italský a španělský text

14(38) * 141.2(38)
– Antisthenés, ca 455-ca 360 př.Kr.
– řecká antická filozofie
– kynismus
– eseje

14(3) – Antická, starověká filozofie [5]

This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency
under the contract No. APVV-0164-12.

Antisthenica Cynica Socratica
Edited by Vladislav Suvák
Copy-edited by Aleš Havlíček
Peer-reviewed by Filip Karfík, Andrej Kalaš
Published by OIKOYMENH Publishers, Prague, Czech Republic
Typesetting by martin.tresnak@gmail.com
Cover design by Zdeněk Ziegler
Printed by Alfaprint

© OIKOYMENH, 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored
in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior written permission of OIKOYMENH Publisher, Prague.

ISBN 978-80-7298-194-6

Contents

Foreword	7
I. En defensa del encuentro entre dos Perros, Antístenes y Diógenes: historia de una tensa amistad <i>Pedro Pablo Fuentes González</i>	11
II. Antisthenes between Diogenes and Socrates <i>Vladislav Suvák</i>	72
III. La logica di Antistene nell' <i>Aiace</i> e nell' <i>Odisseo</i> <i>Giuseppe Mazzara</i>	121
IV. Words of Representation and Words of Action in the speech of Antisthenes' Ajax <i>Susan Prince</i>	168
V. Filosofia e retorica in Antistene <i>Aldo Brancacci</i>	200
VI. The methodological dimension of antisthenic philosophy and some platonic reactions against homeric criticism <i>Claudia Mársico</i>	226
VII. Socratic investigation of names: toward an exegetic method? <i>Igor Deraj</i>	246
VIII. Antisthène et l'autarcie <i>Louis-André Dorion</i>	282
IX. Diogenes of Sinope as Socrates mainomenos <i>Livia Flachbartová</i>	308

X. Did the early Cynics speak against homosexuality? <i>Kajetan Wandowicz</i>	351
XI. Fuir les cérémonies de la table : la posture cynique de Charles Coypeau Dassoucy <i>Dominique Bertrand</i>	362
XII. Antisthenes and Hegel <i>Will D. Desmond</i>	377
Abbreviations	391
Bibliography	397
Index locorum	421

FOREWORD

Every attempt to reconstruct the thinking of an ancient philosopher whose writings are preserved only in fragments is risky. It requires a huge effort and hard work – philological, historical, and philosophical. But even all this is not sufficient when we try to understand the thinking of a philosopher such as Antisthenes in the context of ancient discussion and confrontation. Besides philological, historical and philosophical work, efforts to reconstruct Antisthenes' thought also require a great degree of imagination of a kind which will not become mere fantasizing but will enable us to develop the textual evidence in all possible ways. This imagination would then lead us from fragmentary theses to the questions they answer and even beyond.

The contributions contained in this collection of essays attempt to reconstruct Antisthenes' thinking in the wider context of ancient philosophy. Antisthenes is approached as an important personality forming some kind of bridge between the classical Socratic tradition of thought and Hellenistic forms of Socratism. In this respect, a crucial place is held by Cynicism, which espouses the Socratic legacy thanks to Antisthenes' ethical teaching.

There is no doubt Antisthenes was one of the most influential personalities of 4th century philosophy. It is even possible Antisthenes had been considered to be the most influential Socratic in the first decades after Socrates' death. We should not forget that Plato did not become a great philosopher by himself but thanks to several waves of Platonism which developed his teaching. Antisthenes' works, in contrast, influenced Hellenistic thought and postclassical literature almost instantly.

There are some fundamental differences between Antisthenes' and Plato's understanding of Socrates' philosophy which resulted

Foreword

in different portrayals of Socrates and different forms of Socratic thought. Among the principal attributes of Antisthenes' Socratism can be found the priority of practical decision-making over theoretical answers to the question *What is virtue?* It is probable Antisthenes was the first Socratic who associated the philosophical life with constant work on oneself – asceticism. In Antisthenes' thought we can also search for the beginnings of a rigorously approached ethical life leading to a sharp contrast between right and wrong action in the Cynical-Stoical line of thought.

Differences between Antisthenes' and Plato's Socratism are related to several fundamental questions which can be seen in their distinct approach to philosophical activity. The deep contrast between Sophistic rhetoric and Socratic philosophy pointed out by Plato's dialogues acquires in Antisthenes' thought the form of alternative approaches to education. Logical paradoxes which are, according to Plato, used by eristic argumentation to confuse our reason, gain in Antisthenes a particular ethical sense without the requirement for theoretically grasped truth as the criterion of a good life. Unlike Plato, Antisthenes does not need geometrical paradigmatic solutions when he tries to overcome the tension between conventional opinions (*doxai*) and ethical knowledge (*epistēmē*). In this way we may continue even further, arriving at a point where we consider two different ways of developing Socrates' legacy as well as two different ways of philosophizing. Both of these influenced the following generations of philosophers: Antisthenes influencing rather more the Hellenistic lines of thought and Plato the late ancient philosophical schools. As we know, Neo-Platonism was the most important philosophical platform for Christian Patristics and determined which philosophical works were preserved in medieval libraries and which philosophical thoughts were developed within the medieval theologies.

Contributions included in our collection of essays deal with these questions from various points of view. As the title *Antisthenica Cynica Socratica* indicates, Antisthenes cannot be strictly separated from Cynicism, which acknowledges Antisthenes as its philosophical forerunner. On the other hand, by examining Cynicism we can search for themes specific to the Cynics which then enable us to form a notion of Antisthenes as the Socratic, who – in contrast to Plato or Aristotle – founded an alternative philosophical position. If we called this position "practical", we would not be defining it quite specifically

Foreword

enough. However, the aim of our effort is not systematic integration of Antisthenes into “the history of ancient philosophy”. Instead the purpose of this work is to look for possible forms of ancient thought which help us to understand better not only the Socratic tradition but also ourselves and how we think about history, or rather, how we have *not* thought about it until now.

As the reader will notice, editorial policy remains the same as in the previous volumes of this series. We have limited ourselves to establishing, throughout the volume, a reasonable degree of uniformity in dealing with quotations from classical authors and works, abbreviations, references, transliterations, and typography.

Finally, we would like to express our thanks to Livia Flachbartová for the compilation of the Index locorum.

The Editor