INTRODUCTION
THE GENRES OF EKPHRASIS

Jaś Elsner

1. Defining Ekphrasis

The ancient handbooks on rhetoric (known as the *Progymnasmata*) define ekphrasis thus:

> Ekphrasis is a descriptive speech which brings the thing shown vividly before the eyes.[1]

As has recently been emphasised, this Graeco-Roman definition by no means refers only to descriptions of works of art, by contrast with the usual modern meaning of the word ekphrasis, and our use of the term in this volume.[2] On the contrary, the subjects listed by the handbooks include persons (*prosōpa*), places (*topoi*), time (*chronoi*) and events (*pragmata*), with the later *Progymnasmata* adding plants (*phyta*), animals (*zōa*) and festivals (*panegyreis*).[3] These are themselves glossed by examples:

> An example of people is Homer's 'he was bandy-legged and lame in one foot'; of actions, the description of a land or sea battle; of times, peace and war; of places, harbours, sea-shores and cities; of seasons, spring, summer and festival. You could also have a mixed ekphrasis—such as the night battle in Thucydides. For night is a time, but battle is an action.[4]

These examples (especially the focus on battles) show that ekphrasis is as much a venture into descriptive narrative as into description *per se*.[5] Its aim is above all about creating an emotional effect in an audience's imagination and literally bringing the object described before the eyes of the listener or reader:[6] if the techniques of narrative work to this end, as well as those of 'pure' description, then so much the better. At the heart of the rhetorical prescriptions for ekphrasis lie the twin qualities of clarity (*saphēneia*) and visibility (*enargeia*), which together form the means or strategy by which the art of bringing a described object to the mind's eye is effected.[7] Hence the claim by the *Progymnasmata* attributed to Hermogenes:

> The special virtues of ekphrasis are clarity and visibility; the style should contrive to bring about seeing through hearing. However, it is equally important that expression should fit the subject: if the subject is florid, let the style be florid too, and if the subject is dry, let the style be the same.[8]

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

Theon, our earliest writer of such handbooks, does refer to the Homeric arms of Achilles as an instance of ekphrasis,[9] but it is only the very late examples of the *Progymnasmata* that turn to art explicitly—when Aphthonius presents a model description of a temple on the Acropolis of Alexandria and Nicolaus mentions the description of 'statues, paintings or anything of this sort'.[10] The modern use of the term 'ekphrasis' to mean exclusively the description of art, which is the near-ubiquitous understanding of the word today,[11] seems to have been inaugurated in an article by Leo Spitzer on the Grecian Urn in 1955.[12] But there is not the slightest doubt that a specific genre of descriptions of works of art evolved in antiquity—seeking its inspiration above all in the *Iliad*'s account of the Shield of Achilles,[13] a genre that came eventually to represent the culmination of the practice of ekphrasis. In the epic tradition, this found its way into major set-piece descriptions of works of art in writers like Apollonius Rhodius, Catullus' hexameter *epyllion* poem 64, Vergil's *Aeneid,* Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and so forth. This large and diverse category of literary descriptions of works of art—always a subset of the wider ancient definition of ekphrasis, but always also a special and outstanding set of cases—was systematically and thoroughly complied by Paul Friedländer in 1912 as instances of what he called *Kunstbeschreibung*.[14]

The remarkable resilience of this category—spanning ancient writing from Homer to late antiquity in verse and prose and in a range of genres from epigram to epic, from novels to epideictic oratory—militates strongly against an excessive reliance on the hand-book prescriptions for ekphrasis, which were produced mainly with school children in mind. Despite the correct insistence on the breadth of the term's ancient meanings, there is little doubt that Graeco-Roman writers and readers would have recognised the description of art as a paradigmatic example of ekphrasis with a significance relatively close to modern usage. It is, I would submit, in recognition of this, that the Elder Philostratus, probably the same virtuoso sophist who wrote the *Life of Apollonius*, the *Lives of the Sophists* and the *Heroicus* in the early third century CE,[15] chose specifically to compose two books consisting entirely of show-case ekphraseis of works of art (plus a preface) in his *Imagines.* This text, itself sufficiently influential in antiquity to spawn surviving imitations in the *Imagines* of the Younger Philostratus (who purports to be the Elder's nephew) and in the ekphraseis of Callistratus, effectively created a new genre—the pure collection of descriptions of art rather than their appearance as embedded descriptive pauses within a wider narrative frame.[16] It is not impossible that it was the existence of the corpus of Philostratus and his successors that prompted Nicolaus to introduce the specific discussion of the description of sculpture and painting into his *Progymnasmata* in the fifth century.

For ease of use and in recognition of modern practice, the present volume uses the term 'ekphrasis' for the description of art, although the papers by Rebecca Langlands and Anne Rogerson extend beyond this to ekphrasis of the body and other elements of description. Its essays address all aspects of ekphra-

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

sis, from the self-standing prose descriptions in the Philostratean tradition and in the genre of ekphrastic epigram to the self-consciously literary exploration of works of art embedded in much longer narrative and rhetorical texts in prose and verse. In the latter case there are particular qualities of self-referentiality, mirroring and *mise-en-abîme*, that may inevitably come into play when a work of literary art, such as a long poem, novel or speech, turns to the description of a work of plastic or pictorial art such as a sculpture, textile or painting.[17] The uses of *enargeia* and *saphēneia* to summon the fictive object to the reader's eyes can have fundamental and varied effects in relation not only to the specific objects described, but to the larger interpretation of the text in which they appear. The aim here is to address some of the range of approaches and effects possible in the variety of ancient ekphrasis of art. What is striking is that there is not just one genre of this kind of description, but several, with different kinds of literary force in a range of very different kinds of literary performance from epic to prose fiction, from tragedy to epigram, from display oratory to religious or allegorical exegesis.

2. The Ekphrasis of Art

The range of options in ekphrastic writing about art that developed over much more than a millennium from Homer to late antiquity might be characterised in literary terms as dividing between the apparently self-standing ekphrasis and the ekphrasis that appears as an episode or interlude within a larger literary work. Both forms go back to archaic Greece. The paradigm of a leisurely descriptive intervention about a work of art within a long narrative is clearly the Shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18.478-608, a work that was to have fundamental influence not only on other epic uses of ekphrasis but also on the place of ekphrasis in other kinds of fictional narratives (such as the prose novel, for example). From a completely different arena of archaic poetics, the epigram was born as originally a brief verse caption inscribed on a statue or relief. We have some fine and touching examples on those appealing and enigmatic free-standing statues known as *kouroi* and *korai* from the sixth century BCE.[18] But when such poems came to be written down, and hence separated from their originary monument, and when especially Hellenistic and later writers came to imitate the forms of these epigrams as a kind of genre in their own right, the so-called ekphrastic epigram was born. The following discussion sketches some aspects of both these traditions, let us call them 'self-standing ekphrasis' and 'interventive ekphrasis', as they developed in both verse and prose, both Greek and Latin, through antiquity.

2.i. Interventive Ekphrasis: Imbrications of an Interpretative Tradition

The classic interventive ekphrasis, the paradigm for the entire tradition, is the Shield of Achilles. Although the first ekphrasis in ancient literature, it presents

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

a narrative pause where the text turns from its relentless obsession with the unfolding of war to a vision of war's other: scenes of peace, festival, agriculture, song and dance, as well as war.[19] This microcosm that includes, indeed emphasises, what the *Iliad* is not, or what it might have been if Paris had not abducted Helen or if the Trojans had returned her to the Greeks, is ironically the pictorial motif emblazoned on that very weapon which Achilles will use in his rampage of Books 20-22, the weapon that arrests Hector's last throw (22.290f.) and defends Achilles as he makes his final charge upon his foe (22.313f.). Yet the shield's momentary raising of our eyes from the narrative flow of war to scenes of an idealised 'everyday' life set in something closer to the audience's world than the poem's main action, recalls the workings of the similes but on a much grander scale.[20]

In narratological terms, Homer's Shield—a pause in the narrative that allows other kinds of narratives to figure both within the main text and bracketed apart from it, an implicit meditation on the totality of the text within which it constitutes but a small episode,[21] and yet a material item with its own significant part to play in the *Iliad*'s main story—fundamentally prefigures the role of ekphrasis in the later tradition. Whether we think of later epic (from Apollonius Rhodius via Vergil and Ovid to Statius and Silius Italicus),[22] of epyllion—hexameter epics condensed into the space of a single book (like the pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis* or Catullus' poem 64),[23] of pastoral poetry (from Theocritus to Vergil),[24] of novels in prose (for example, the romances of Longus, Apuleius, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus),[25] the descriptive inset about a work of art becomes not only virtually a necessary trope to prove a text's participation in the great tradition, but also an increasingly complex device for authorial self-reflection on how readers might relate to the text. The topos even extends to less strictly literary genres, such as biography and history.[26] It is striking that in genres like epic, where many examples of ekphraseis survive, the intertextual patterns of reference become extraordinarily complex (as discussed in this volume by Helen Lovatt in relation to Statius and his forebears). Within a tradition such as this, there is an inevitable tendency for the trope of ekphrasis itself to turn to all kinds of variation and innovation. Vergil's numerous examples of ekphrasis in the *Aeneid*, for instance, systematically vary the kinds of objects described and their materials from murals to silver-gilt dishes to a cloak to bronze doors, to cedar statues, to shields, to a sword-belt.[27] This not only offers a *variatio* of visual textures figured in words, but also a range of intertextual reference to earlier ekphrastic paradigms from the shields in Homer, Hesiod and tragedies like the *Septem* to textiles (for instance in Euripides' *Ion*, Apollonius' *Argonautica* and Theocritus *Idyll* 15) and so forth. At the same time, there is a tendency to push the limits of what is possible in ekphrasis even further—into other topoi within narratives (such as simile, as discussed here by Anne Rogerson) and towards topics whose subject-matter is ever less obviously describable (as in the case of sex-change, discussed in this volume by Rebecca Langlands). In certain cases, not least Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*,

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

there is a phenomenon that Tim Whitmarsh in this collection calls 'ekphrastic contagion' in which the special concerns of ekphrasis (with issues such as illusion, artifice, the gaze, interpretation) may be said to seep beyond the descriptions proper and into the governing thematics of the text.[28] In other cases, especially the strange and marked phenomenon in the surviving epyllia—the Hesiodic or Pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis* and Catullus 64—where the ekphrasis expands beyond any normal limits and threatens to take over the entire text, we are offered a layering of alternative narratives that interrelate obliquely with those of the main text in ways that may support its thrust but may also not permit easy resolution or closure.[29]

In this section, since I cannot hope to cover the range and wealth of the numerous individual examples of interventive ekphrasis from the entire tradition, I will focus on some specific features of the earlier (and hence most imitated, most canonical) instances. My aim will be to show some of the general features of the interventive tradition both borrowed from these early paradigms and developed from them by contrast and creative variation. To open with the supreme model, what is particular about the Homeric shield, by contrast with its later epigone and imitations, is the systematic focus on *making*.[30] The description is wholly constructed through the incremental progression of what Hephaestus made as he made it,[31] with a wonderful double-take as the divine craftsman's dancing floor is compared with the one made by the paradigmatic human craftsman, Daedalus, for Ariadne (18.590-92). The genius of the *Iliad*'s shield is that it stages a divine artist, who is not Homer, creating a great and universalising epic which is not the *Iliad*, in a different artistic form to be sure (the art of the shield-maker rather than that of the epic poet) but recounted in the language, narrative form and poetic space of the *Iliad* itself.

It is striking that the surviving archaic and Classical instances of ekphrasis which were so dependent on Homer seem specifically to ignore these emphases on making, and on the exclusive worlds of the poem as a whole and its other which the Shield as poem-within-the-poem represents. Hesiod's (or pseudo-Hesiod's) Shield of Heracles, from the poem named the *Aspis*—perhaps a self-standing piece or perhaps a fragment of one of the Hesiodic catalogue poems[32]— is careful to describe the imagery on the Shield, but never from the point of view of the craftsman making it (*Aspis* 139-317). Rather, the Shield is presented as an example of 'objective' description, covering the iconographic realities of what was depicted on it, although its rivalry with the Shield of Achilles necessitates frequent genuflection to Hephaestus as its maker (219, 244, 297, 313, 319), with praise lavished on his artistry in accomplishing visual wonders like the flying Perseus (216-23) or the women crying like living beings (242-44). Within a larger narrative of the poem—recounting the great set-piece duel of Heracles and Cycnus, son of Ares—Heracles puts on his armour, and we are made to survey on the shield a visual landscape whose emphasis reverses the peaceful thrust of the Shield of Achilles (though it includes a short section on a peaceful city with festivals and dances in deference to Homer

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

at 270-313). Instead, the Shield of Heracles offers a mythic and heroic vision of war. Effectively the Hesiodic shield sets the duel of Heracles and Cycnus in a cosmic setting where great personifications—Fear, Strife, Pursuit, Flight, Tumult, Panic, Slaughter, Uproar and Fate (144, 148, 154-56)—dominate a world of conflict. War is the model—between beasts (168-77), mythical heroes (178-90, 216-37) and men (237-70), with special descriptions allotted to the gods of war (Ares and Athena, 191-200). In a deliberate competition with the Homeric model, the Shield of Heracles provides not an other to the poem's main narrative but rather gives that narrative its full cosmological setting: the ekphrastic space of the *Aspis*, contained within the poem, is effectively the description of the larger space of war that contains the main action.

Many of the later characterisations of the ekphrasis of art can be seen in the *Aspis*—a clear intertextual thematic relation between the narratives of the poem as a whole and those of the Shield, as well as between this description and its Homeric paradigm, and a remarkable emphasis on the sounds made by the shield's images (when the shield rings with the feet of the running Gorgons, 231-33, or when the women cry out with shrill voices, 243).[33] But what Heracles' shield shares with that of Achilles is the fiction of a descriptive totality, a parallel text to that of the main poem within the confines of a described work of art that interfaces and contrasts with as well as complementing the greater poem within which it stands. What the ekphrastic ventures of Greek tragedy—especially in its Euripidean incarnation—would add to the mix was the dramatisation within ekphrasis of a *point of view*.[34] Inevitably, in drama any reference to the gaze or to looking carries a potential self-reflexivity in relation to the spectator of the play.[35] Within a literary setting defined by a complex of gazes (both real—audience watching actors, actors observing each other and looking at the audience; and imaginary—action that is not actually shown being vividly described so as to be present in the mind's eye of the viewers), any work of art described within a play has possibilities as a metatext on the play's own nature as visual representation.[36]

In Euripides' *Ion*, a play with two major ekphrastic insets as well as a key but brief description near the end, the ekphrastic emphasis resists the Homeric account of making and the Hesiodic panoptic description of an objective work of art, in favour of a more overtly subjective and interpretative set of visual 'takes' on the objects viewed. The entry of the Chorus (of Creusa's maidservants), *Ion* 184-218, is staged as a series of touristic observations of the sculptures at the temple of Apollo at Delphi.[37] The writing repeatedly highlights words of sight.[38] The visual narrative (an iconography) is constructed through disparate Choric voices piecing together—for the most part, in the first persons singular and plural—a series of individual views and interpretations which together come to constitute a viewing of the temple sculptures.[39] By contrast, the second ekphrasis (the astronomical aspects of which are discussed by Robert Hannah in this volume), describing the tent constructed by Ion (1132-65) as a kind of interior scene within the play and a theatrical stage within which to

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

claim his own identity,[40] is visualised not as a series of refracted views of a given and pre-existing work of art from a collection unfamiliar to tourists, but as the conception of Ion himself. Its imagery, created from the sacred tapestries in the storerooms at Delphi is not Ion's own creation (as were the shields made by Hephaestus for both Achilles and Heracles) but his *selection* of hallowed works,[41] for instance relics made by the Amazons and dedicated by Heracles himself (1144f.) as well as barbarian hangings (1159) and not least a tapestry dedicated by an anonymous Athenian (1164f.). This is an expert choice, since Ion has spent his life to date in the service of Apollo's temple and knows its treasures. While the Chorus' viewing of the temple sculpture is dramatised as action, each member seeing as she speaks, the tent is *described* in a great messenger speech—summoned to the audience's eyes as something that has already happened elsewhere (off-stage, at any rate) rather than what we must imagine as happening now in theatrical time. Both ekphraseis are constructed as diffracted and brief sketches of different mythological subjects—strung together as a patchwork of what the Chorus visitors happen to notice or to recognise (in the temple sculptures) and of what Ion has chosen to select and to juxtapose in the tent.

But the meanings of the tent's imagery and its function are not simple. The revelation staged in the tent—that Creusa has attempted to poison Ion, believing him to be her husband's, Xuthus', illegitimate son (1177-1228)—is only unravelled when the Delphic priestess presents Ion with the crib and coverlets in which he was exposed as an infant (1337-63). Creusa recognises the objects she herself made and wrapped around her own lost child (1395-1438), and mother and son are reunited. Strikingly the weaving imagery of the tent (ὑφάσματα, 1141, 1159) is refigured as the ὑφάσματα made by Creusa (1417f., 1424), and the Amazons' robes (πέπλοι, 1143) dedicated by Heracles are echoed by the unfinished πέπλοι with an image of a Gorgon fringed by snakes like an Aegis (1421-24, the text's final brief ekphrasis), which Creusa wove.[42] Just as the fragmentary viewings of the Chorus stage a series of interpretative and partial responses to the temple,[43] so the weaving imagery frames a series of partial and ambivalent revelations of the truth. The image of weaving both describes falsehoods wrongly believed by others to be true (see esp. 1410) and also defines the tokens that deliver the truth about Ion's parentage. Yet in the play's conclusion, this pattern of multiple views and dialogic interpretations is carried to the very status of truth itself. At the close, Athena insists (1601-03) that the truths unravelled by the recognition of long-lost textiles be concealed from Xuthus, so that he continues to believe the falsehood, revealed to him by Apollo's own oracle, that Ion is his own son (530-32), unless he 'misinterpreted the riddle' (533). Just as the view of the oracular temple has to be constructed by the audience from multiple Choric (mis?)interpretations and the patchwork of the tent frames Creusa's mistaken attempt to kill the man who turns out to be her own son, so the text's final set of weavings (with their Athenian iconography) reveal a truth (Ion's actual parentage) which must nonetheless confirm a falsehood

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

(Xuthus' incorrect, but divinely directed, view of his own position in that parentage).

My point is that the dramatic development of interventive ekphrasis, here combining with key devices in the plot, adds the crucial element of interpretation and hence hermeneutic insecurity to the ekphrastic models originated by Homer and Hesiod. It is this mix of elements that will be essential to the future of the phenomenon of ekphrasis in Hellenistic and Roman culture:[44] the pictorial digression which opens an other world to the text that includes it; the visual *mise-en-abîme* that reflects, furthers and reinforces the narrative frame in which it figures; and the visual work of art subject to competing interpretations within a text that considers self-reflexively the interpretative uncertainties and anxieties of the framing text's own meanings. Those interpretative complexities include not only the staging of multiple and potentially opposed responses to the described visual imagery, but also the generation of those ironies whereby readers may perceive other meanings implied in an ekphrasis than those within the text represented as looking at the object being described.

The range of options available for ekphrastic meanings that developed in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds was vast. The close focus on human artists (alongside such divine craftsmen as Hephaestus, Vulcan and Athena)[45] in writers like Theocritus, Vergil and Lucian (not to speak of ekphrastic epigram)[46] turns the theme towards issues of creativity, with the maker of the work of art described by the text always a potential figure for its author and the sheer artifice of the finest painting or sculpture a metaphor for the artistry of the text in which it appears. The literary fascination with the materials of artifice alternatively may shift the potential focus to a self-reflection on poetics—whether the specific choices of a particular writer or a more general theoretics of writing itself,[47] a topic discussed here in relation to Philostratus by Duncan McCombie. Choice of material or association may allow the opening of a specifically gendered angle to a narrative—as in the basket of Europa in Moschus' poem or the use of the coverlet of the marriage bed of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus 64 to depict the failed relationship of Ariadne and Theseus from the jilted lady's point of view.[48] The interesting trope among the novelists and orators to use a described picture as a kind of frontispiece—whether the introduction to a novel or the *prolalia*, the prologue, to a speech—points to the ways ekphrasis can be said to summarise or define in pictorial terms a theme worked out at much greater narrative or propositional length in the rest of the texts.[49] The tendency of such images to offer meanings that may be apparent to a reader but not to the viewers internal to the text is a further development of the complex thematics of ekphrasis and interpretation.[50] The supreme development of this topic is the creation of a tradition of exegetic ekphrasis in both prose and verse, here analysed in relation to the fourth century Christian Latin poets Prudentius and Paulinus by Christian Kässer: Texts like the *Tabula Cebetis* or the *Calumny* of Apelles and *Hercules* as examined by Lucian, as well as a number of later Christian examples, draw on a philosophical and religious tradition of non-ob-

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

vious or non-literal meanings by which to make sense of the described image, usually explained by a learned and aged exegete.[51]

2.ii. Self-Standing Ekphrasis: Allusions to a Monumental Tradition

The so-called ekphrastic epigram has its genesis in inscription.[52] The ancestry of the genre, and a perpetual memory in its later performances, lies in the poet's words composed for and about a work of art and then actually carved upon it. The wonderful statue of Phrasikleia, carved in the second half of the sixth century, speaks out:[53]

> CEMA ΦPACIKΛEIAC KOPE KEKΛECOMAI AIEI
> ANTI ΓAMO ΠAPA ΘEON TOYTO ΛAXOC' ONOMA
> (CEG 24)

> The tomb (*sēma*) of Phrasikleia. I shall forever be called maiden (*korē*)
> Since in place of marriage this name is what the gods have allotted me.

Her words are the most literal and basic meaning of ekphrasis—a 'speaking out' whereby the stone addresses its viewers who pass it by.[54] Yet swiftly, as the genre moved from actual inscriptions on objects to their written-down collection—to purported inscriptions and to more descriptive evocations or praises of valued works—the 'speaking out' of ekphrasis became that of the poet about a work of art. As late as Ausonius, the great Bordeaux orator who became tutor to the emperor Gratian and consul in 379 CE, we find the inscriptional basis of ekphrastic epigrams combined with a sophisticated reflection that speaks of the object:

> nunc te marmoreum pro sumptu fecimus; at cum
> Augustus frater remeauerit, aureus esto.
> (Ausonius *Epig.* 5)

> For now, considering expense, we have made you marble; but when
> Your brother the Augustus returns, be gold![55]

Here the poet speaks with the easy intimacy of personal closeness to the emperor himself. According to its manuscript heading, the epigram was inscribed on a marble statue of the young Valentinian II (371-92), Gratian's half-brother: yet its co-existence as a written-down poem in its own right, playing with some of Vergil's lines at *Eclogue* 7.35f., and positing an absent statue of gold to replace the marble (which would itself be absent from a non-inscribed version

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

of the couplet), point to a highly self-conscious literary procedure in which Ausonius not only speaks about the statue (addressed as 'you') but also about its golden alternative. One wonders if the promise to replace marble with gold at the return of the fourth century Augustus is not a playful improvement on Augustus' claim to have found Rome made of brick and left it made of marble (Suet. *Aug.* 28).

But relatively early, certainly by the time of the Hellenistic poet Posidippus of Pella, writing in the third century BCE, it is impossible to tell whether such a poem is a real epigraph, composed for a patron and once carved on an actual tomb, say, or whether it is a complex play of fictions:

> Τίμων, ὅς σκιό[θηρον ἐθή]κατο τοῦθ', ἵνα μετρῆι
> ὥρας, νῦν ἴδ' ἐκ[εῖ κεῖται ὑπ]αὶ πεδίον·
> αὕτη[56] παῖς θ[εραπεύει, ὁ]δοιπόρε, τὴν ἔλιφ', εἴως
> ἐνδέχετ' ἐλπ[ίδ' ἔχειν π]αρθένον ὡρολογεῖν·
> ἀλλὰ σὺ γῆρας ἱκοῦ, κούρη· παρὰ σήματι τούτωι
> σωρὸν ἐτεων μέτρει τὸν καλὸν ἠέλιον.
>
> (Posidippus 52)[57]

> Timon who set up this sun-dial to measure the hours,
> See, he now lies there underground.
> This girl, whom he left behind, looks after him, passer-by,
> As long as there is hope that the maid will read the hours.
> But do you reach old age, young girl. Next to this tomb
> For years on end measure the beautiful sun.

The object described is both a tomb and a sundial: it marks the end of time (for Timon at least) and measures the hours as they reflect time's movement to an end for others—such as the passer-by and the reader. Much is unclear in the Greek (much being editorial reconstruction from a damaged papyrus), but the girl is surely a statue perhaps holding the sundial, perhaps standing by its side, perhaps making up some part of the gnomon itself.[58] She reads the hours of Timon's memory, always approaching his old age in the form of her youth (παῖς ['girl'], παρθένον ['maid'], κούρη ['young girl']) as she measures the sun over the years beside his tomb. We have moved here from the kind of epigram represented by Phrasikleia—present and inscribed on the statue, forever framing its speech—to the epigram as another's speech about a monument, evoking an intricate vision of monumental commemoration (actual or fictional) that plays on generations, observers, age and youth, time and its ending, space beneath 'the beautiful sun' and beneath the earth.

Yet every case of ekphrastic epigram is also an invitation for intertextual revelry on a level equal to that of the interventive tradition. To keep with the two epigrammatic poets already quoted (separated by some six hundred years), consider the startling case of Ausonius ep. 12 in relation to Posidippus 142:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

'cuius opus?' 'Phidiae, qui signum Pallados, eius,
quique Iouem fecit, tertia palma ego sum.
sum dea.' 'quae?' 'rara et paucis Occasio nota.'
'quid rotulae insistis?' 'stare loco nequeo.'
(Ausonius *Epig* 12.1-4)[59]

'Whose work are you?' 'I am Phidias', he who made the statue of Pallas, I'm his!
And he made the Jupiter. I'm his third best piece!
I'm a goddess' 'Which one?' 'Opportunity, infrequent, and known to few.'
'Why are you standing on a wheel?' 'I can't stand still'...

'τίς πόθεν ὁ πλάστης;' 'Σικυώνιος.' 'οὔνομα δὴ τίς;'
'Λύσιππος.' 'σὺ δὲ τίς;' 'Καιρὸς ὁ πανδαμάτωρ.'
'τίπτε δ' ἐπ' ἄκρα βέβηκας;' 'ἀεὶ τροχάω.' 'τί δὲ ταρσοὺς
ποσσὶν ἔχεις διφυεῖς;' 'ἴπταμ' ὑπηνεμιος.'
(Posidippus 142.1-4)[60]

'Who and from where is the sculptor?' 'From Sicyon.' 'And his name?'
'Lysippus.' 'And who are you?' 'Opportunity the omnipotent.'
'Why do you stand on tiptoe?' 'I am always running.' 'Why do you have
A pair of wings on your feet?' 'I fly with the wind.'

I only quote the first four lines of these two dialogic poems (that of Ausonius is 16 lines and that by Posidippus is 12 in length), whose form brilliantly incorporates some of the dramatic effects of interventive ekphrasis into the epigrammatic tradition. Clearly Ausonius is imitating Posidippus, directly interrelating with his poem and making significant alterations which mark his differences from the model. There may be more than half a millennium between them, but these poems seem to speak directly and intimately to each other, just as much as they create a dialogue in which the object speaks with its view (and hence the poem with its reader).

Where Posidippus provides a commentary on one of Lysippus' most famous pieces, a now lost bronze statue in Sicyon whose most potent record is indeed this poem,[61] Ausonius keeps hold of the object but changes the artist. Posidippus offers us at least the affect of autopsy and its implications (even if he never actually saw the Lysippan original in Sicyon), while Ausonius' only autopsy in relation to a work of art is his reading of Posidippus. The interest in iconographical details, in which Ausonius follows Posidippus' order for when they come in the poem, allows both the performance of a playfully accurate description and the development within epigram of certain elements of the exegetic tra-

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

dition—which in this case are expressed as the responses of the statue itself. Effectively, in an implicit self-reflection on the nature of ekphrastic epigram, Posidippus' poem stages ekphrasis in both the sense of a viewer's commentary on a work of art and the object's own 'speaking out'; and Ausonius revels in this form and continues it. A real sculpture in Posidippus becomes an imaginary one for Ausonius, with the explicitly stated secondary quality of Ausonius' piece in being third best after Phidias' Zeus and Athena figuring in material terms the poem's secondary nature as a composition after Posidippus. Just as Posidippus' epigram must necessarily be secondary to the famous Lysippan masterpiece it describes, so Ausonius' poem stages a double secondariness—to a famous epigram by Posidippus and ironically to a non-existent statue by Phidias.

Yet, of course, this elaborate framing of self-deprecation by Ausonius is the preparation for a reversal. Ausonius' poem, borrowing so much from Posidippus, turns out not to praise a single statue of a winged Kairos but rather a group of Occasio and Metanoia (9-16), a group in which the male Kairos of Posidippus/Lysippus is (despite the parallel if not exactly identical iconography) in fact female (*sum dea*, 3). These figural changes, and the move to a non-existent object (whose reality is entirely dependent on this poem, as opposed to the real object that was the cause of Posidippus' poem), allow Ausonius to outperform Posidippus in the epigram's final lines. For Posidippus, Lysippus' Kairos was set up as a lesson for the viewer (διδασκαλίην, 12). Ausonius, however, *performs* the lesson of his pseudo-Phidian group:

> 'tu quoque dum rogitas, dum percontando moraris,
> elapsum disces me tibi de manibus.'
>
> (*Epig.* 12.15f.)

> 'You too, while you keep asking all these questions and
> procrastinating with your interrogation,
> Will learn that I've slipped though your hands.'

The reader's very questions, staged by the poem and the poem's imitation of Posidippus, are the cause of missing the Opportunity. Is this a meditation on the problem of losing oneself in captions when one is meant to be looking at art? Is the poem—having staged its own secondariness and then reversed this by being the inventor of its object of description—now performing an ironic and negative commentary on the need for ekphrasis and for epigram in relation to art? The intense intertextuality of these two poems, with that of Ausonius capping or one-upping that of Posidippus, is itself a figure for the problematic and complex relations between real works of art and their dependent descriptions and fictive works of art and the descriptions that invented them.

At least as early as the Posidippus papyrus now in Milan, from the third century BCE,[62] the tendency to *group* these kinds of self-standing descriptive

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

epigrams as a literary collection led to the creation of books (and portions of books) of self-standing ekphrastic epigrams.[63] In the Posidippus papyrus, poems 1-15 describe carved gems, playing with the trope of natural wonders made yet more wonderful by human artifice;[64] poems 42-61 describe tombs, some in the first person as if the deceased were speaking and some in the third, all purporting to be epitaphs; poems 62-70 describe statues. This model of literary collection would lead, by the time of the *Greek Anthology*, to whole books of ekphrastic epigrams—such as Book 2 (which contains Christodorus of Coptus' poems on the statues collected in the Baths of Zeuxippus in fifth century Constantinople),[65] or the sepulchral epigrams gathered in Book 7 or the many epigrams describing works of art in Book 9, of which the series on the fifth century statue Myron's *Cow* from Athens is a particularly fascinating sequence.[66] The poetic florilegium retains a particular linkage to the material genesis of ekphrastic epigrams in actual monuments. It creates a virtual collection—itself the paper reflection of real museums of esteemed objects (like the marbles and bronzes in the Baths of Zeuxippus) or of ideal collections of idealised pieces. We can never know into which of these categories Posidippus' gem cabinet (poems 1-15) might have fitted, but its obsessive *variatio* of kinds of stone,[67] colours,[68] exotic geographical provenances for the precious objects,[69] and kinds of objects,[70] seems to hint at the evocation of a choice and select collection of spectacular exemplars.

This kind of collection of ekphrastic epigrams into books or sections of books indicates how, as early as the third century BCE, the ekphrastic had become a trope, even a genre, within epigram—with poems created as direct reflections or commentaries upon earlier poems.[71] Such a literary procedure might be said almost to lose sight of the original works of art which putatively gave rise to these epigrams, so we might very well ask how many of the authors of poems on Myron's *Cow* had actually seen the thing in Athens. But one might argue that the very thematics of presence and absence—a poem's distantiation from its object of description and the description's ability to bring that object back to the mind's eye through *enargeia*—was central to the aesthetic of the genre. This problematic has significant effects for the culture of the gaze and viewing as constructed by epigrams (particularly by numerous poems on offering different angles on a single object like Myron's *Cow* or the *Aphrodite of Cnidus*) and—as Verity Platt argues in this volume—for the dynamics of divine epiphany in poems describing cult images, where the absence of the object described and yet made present through the poem, resonates against the absence from yet presence of a god in his or her statue.

3. The Innovations of Philostratus

It is from the multiple potential forms offered by this epigrammatic genre of poetry—the discreteness of any individual poem, yet its significant placing within a collection and its inseparability from the other poems around it—that

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

Philostratus derived one part of the dynamic governing his prose descriptions of paintings.[72] He was able to unite this strand of what I have called self-standing ekphrasis with the longer and more discursive traditions of ekphrastic intervention in a rhetorical, fictional, pastoral or epic narrative. The irony of Philostratus' method (not something lost on the Elder Philostratus himself, one suspects) is that it enabled him to indulge in a number of the wider subjects of ekphrasis (as defined by the *Progymnasmata*) such as the description of places and landscape, the evocation of particular times and seasons or festivals, the account of battles, *as if they were paintings*.[73] Equally, the creation of a genre of pure ekphrasis of art allowed Philostratus wittily to usurp the other genres (not least pastoral, epic and tragedy) within which ekphraseis of art had in the past appeared as themselves now entirely subsumed within his paintings and his descriptions.[74] In certain cases he directly quotes earlier authors—letting antiquated diction flavour the style of description in ways that might evoke the epic, pastoral or tragic grandeur of his topic, perhaps with some ironic intent.[75] But at other times the very subject of the picture takes an attentive or learned reader back through a tour of canonical ekphrastic paradigms. At 1.13.8-10 when the fishermen's look-out gazes deep into the sea searching for fish, one may wonder if our own gaze is not being drawn to the fishing scenes on the cup in Theocritus *Id.* 1.40-44 and the fisherman looking out to sea in the *Aspis* 207-15. Likewise the weavings in 1.28—both Penelope's loom and those of the spiders, the latter explicitly praised for their λεπτότης—look not just to the precedents of Homer and Hesiod (both explicitly quoted) but to the ekphrastic tapestry tradition of Euripides' *Ion*, Apollonius, Theocritus *Id.* 15, Catullus 64 and especially the ways Hellenistic poets turned that imagery to a reflection on poetics.[76] By framing the whole exercise in terms of the perception and appreciation of paintings, and by including the problematic of the gaze within some of his descriptions (for instance Narcissus, at 1.23), Philostratus plays the game of using his described paintings as a commentary (even a meta-description) of certain core issues in the philosophy of perception, as examined in this volume by Karel Thein.

Philostratus, and the tradition of independent prose descriptions of works of art which he inaugurated, stands as a fundamental development of *Kunstbeschreibung*,[77] in which the description of art finally became the supreme exemplar of ekphrasis as defined by the writers on rhetoric. My discussion here, designed to introduce a series of essays on the literary texture of the ekphrasis of art in antiquity, has eschewed the theme's implicit relations with actual images and the history of art. But in Philostratus and his successors this was clearly and explicitly at stake, beyond the metaphorics of ekphrasis in the interventive tradition and beyond the play with being a real caption in the epigrams: for the *Imagines* are self-confessedly an education in how to look at pictures (*Imag.* 1.pr.3).[78] We know that at least one major surviving ekphrasis from Byzantium was delivered in front of the work of art it praised,[79] and the problematics of how to speak in relation to and within the building one is trying to describe is

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

one of the governing dynamics of Lucian's scintillating discussion in *De Domo*, explored in this collection by Zahra Newby.[80] Clearly, the world of the visual, on which ekphrasis is fundamentally parasitic, cannot be divorced from the description of art any more than the tradition of ekphrastic writing which preceded and is played upon by any given instance of ekphrasis. Bringing to mind the described object with *enargeia* required listeners or readers to have sufficient familiarity with the kinds of art that were the subjects of ekphrasis. The play of text and image, with the former regularly one-upping the latter in a competition whose terms were dictated in ekphrasis by the literary side of that debate, nonetheless gives the visual a space and a significance which the overwhelmingly literary (rather than art historical) approach to ekphrastic writing has substantially underplayed.[81] Clearly ekphrastic writing, whether implicitly or deliberately and self-professedly (as in the case of Philostratus) was a meditation on the viewing and reception of art, and even an education in how to look.[82]

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

NOTES

1. This definition appears in a series of *Progymnasmata* from Theon in the first century CE via 'Hermogenes' (perhaps second century) to Aphthonius and Nicolaus in the fourth and fifth centuries. Although there are minor changes between one handbook and the next, the texts are substantially the same—each rhetorical topic (such as ekphrasis) lifted largely wholesale from an earlier textbook. One assumes their main function was in elementary stages of the training of students. On the *Progymnasmata* in general, see Webb (2001) with further bibliography. The sections dealing with ekphrasis are: Aelius Theon *Progymnasmata*, ed. M. Patillon (Paris 1997), 118.6-120 (pp.66-69); 'Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata*, ed. H. Rabe (Leipzig 1913), 10.47-50 (pp.22f.): Aphthonius *Progymnasmata*, ed. H. Rabe (Leipzig 1926), 12.46-49 (pp.36-41); Nicolaus *Progymnasmata*, ed. J. Felten (Leipzig 1913), pp.67-71. On ekphrasis in the *Progymnasmata*, see e.g. Bartsch (1989), 7-10; Becker (1995), 24-31; Webb (1999), 11-15; and more generally also Downey (1959) and Pernice and Gross (1969).

2. See esp. Webb (1999); also Zanker (2003), 59f.

3. See Webb (1999), 11.

4. I quote from 'Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata* 10.48f.

5. For some salient reflections on this issue, as well as a superb bibliography, see Fowler (1991).

6. See Webb (1997a and 1997b).

7. There is a large literature on *enargeia* in particular: see e.g. Graf (1995), Dubel (1997), Webb (1997b).

8. 'Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata* 10.49f.

9. Theon *Progymnasmata* 118 (p.67) and 119 (p.69).

10. Aphthonius *Progymnasmata* 12.47-49 (pp.39-41); Nicolaus *Progymnasmata*, p.69. See Webb (1999), 11.

11. For example Dubois (1982); Fowler (1991); Krieger (1991); Heffernan (1993); Mitchell (1994), 151-82; Scott (1995); Hollander (1995); Wagner (1996); De Armas (1998).

12. The piece is Spitzer (1955), esp. 207, 218, 223. See Webb (1999), 10.

13. See e.g. Becker (1995).

14. See Friedländer (1912), 1-103.

15. On Philostratus see Anderson (1986); Billaut (2000); Bowie and Elsner (forthcoming).

16. This genre was identified and discussed by Bertrand (1881).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

17. Becker (1995), 4f. Dällenbach (1989) mainly misses the relevance of ekphrasis to his discussion of *mise-en-abîme*, but veers close at 96f.

18. An excellent collection of inscribed archaic epigrams is Friedländer and Hoffleit (1948). A famous example is the inscription for Kroisos on the Anavyssos Kouros now in Athens, *ibid.* no. 82.

19. The standard accounts are Marg (1957), 20-37; Reinhardt (1961), 410f.; Schaderwaldt (1965), 357-74; Taplin (1980); Becker (1990); Edwards (1991), 200-32; Stanley (1993), 3-26; Becker (1995); Scully (2003).

20. See Becker (1995), 47-50, with bibliography. For further reflection of the relation of simile to ekphrasis, in the case of Vergilian epic, see Rogerson in this volume.

21. A good example of the potential of a major ekphrasis to generate ambivalent or multiple meanings in this regard is the rival tendencies among critics in relation to the powerful programmatic description of a cup in Theocritus *Id.* 1. Some (e.g. Rosenmeyer [1969], 91) have seen it as offering 'typical scenes of the non-pastoral world' (i.e. constituting Theocritus' bucolic other), while others (e.g. Halperin [1983], 175-89) have seen its imagery as typifying the themes of Pastoral generally! See now at length Manakidou (1993), 53-83.

22. On Apollonius, see e.g. Manakidou (1993), 102-73 with bibliography; on Vergil the literature is vast but Putnam (1998) is fundamental; for Ovid, see Barkan (1986), 1-18, 73-78 (on artists); Heffernan (1993), 46-53; Hardie (2002b), 173-78; for Statius, see Harrison (1992) and Lovatt in this volume; for Valerius Flaccus (*Arg.* 5.433-55), see Hershkowitz (1998) 20-23; on Silius Italicus, see Fowler (1996), 63-74.

23. For *Aspis*, see Van Groningen (1958), 109-23; Lamberton (1988), 141-44; Becker (1995), 31-38; Vernant (1996), 390-92. On Catullus 64, see e.g. Klingner (1956), 31-66, on the ekphrasis; Fitzgerald (1995), 140-68; Theodorakopoulos (2000).

24. On Theocritus, see Manakidou (1993), 51-101, and Goldhill (1994), 216-23. For Vergil's *Eclogues* (esp. 3.36-42), see e.g. Faber (2000) with bibliography.

25. Generally on ekphrasis in prose literature, see Rousselle (2001), 382-84. For ekphrasis in Longus see e.g. Hunter (1983), 38-51, and Zeitlin (1990); for Apuleius e.g. Laird (1997); Slater (1998); Egelhaaf-Geiser (2000), 116-45; for Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, the standard account remains Bartsch (1989), but see also Morales (forthcoming).

26. For biography, see Philostratus *VA* 2.20 (the bronze tablets at Taxila) with Fowler (1996), 58-60, and Rousselle (2001), 391-99 (which examines some other Philostratean instances too), and Eusebius *VC* 3.25-53 (Constantine's churches, mainly in Palestine), 4.58-60 (the Mausoleum in Constantinople). Both these works might be said to be biographies on an epic scale, and to be using ekphrasis to heighten their appeal to grandeur. For history, see e.g. Polybius 4.59.3-11 (Seleucia), 10.9.8-10.13 (New Carthage in Spain), 10.27.1-13 (Ecbatana in Media); Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 8.63-98 (Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem), 15.410-20 (Herod's Temple in Jerusalem); Ammianus Marcellinus *Res Gestae* 16.10.13-15. Snodgrass (2001), 127f., suggests that the Chest of Cypselus in Pausanias 5.17.1-19.10 is one of several Pausanian attempts at ekphrasis within the periegetic genre in which he was writing.

27. The relevant passages are *Aen.* 1.453-93, 1.640-42, 5.250-57, 6.20-37, 7.789-92, 8.630-728, 10.495-505. On materials, see Simon (1982). I find Putnam's insistence on there being six ekphraseis in the *Aeneid* in Putnam (1998), 23, followed e.g. by Hardie (2002b), 177, somewhat artificial.

28. See Hardie (2002b), 173-78, on the roles of art in Ovid's *Met.* and Whitmarsh in this volume on Heliodorus. The ekphraseis of the *Aeneid* are usually read separately, even in Putnam's fine book of 1998 which collects his various individual essays on the theme. But I would argue that they have a deliberate and incremental relationship that in part governs the unfolding of the entire narrative. See Elsner (forthcoming a).

29. On the strange interrelation between ekphrasis and epyllion (in connection with largely lost works of Callimachus and their Latin imitations), see Thomas (1999), 93-100.

30. E.g. Dubois (1982), 13-18, 19-21; Becker (1995), 48, 88-92, 96-98.

31. The emphasis on the artist's making is incrementally repeated at 18.478, 483, 490, 541, 550, 561, 573, 587, 607.

32. *Aspis* 1 opens with the words ἢ οἵη ('or like her') which are characteristic of the catalogue poems.

33. For sound in ekphrasis, see Laird (1993), 20-24.

34. The general literature on ekphrasis in tragedy is strikingly thin. But see Philipp (1968), 26f., 31-34. On shields (echoing the epic tradition) see Harrison (2001), 77-81, with bibliography.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

35. So Zeitlin (1994), 142f.

36. See Zeitlin (1994), 147.

37. Cf Arnott (1996), 114f.; Rutherford (1998), 138-41; Zacharia (2003), 14-20.

38. ἰδού (190); πρόσιδ' (193); ὁρῶ (194); ἄθρησον (201); πάνται τοι βλέφαρον διώσω (205); σκέψαι (206); δερκόμεσθ' (208); λεύσσεις (209); λεύσσω (211); ὁρῶ (214).

39. See Zeitlin (1994), 148-52.

40. As Zeitlin (1994), 153, puts it. On this passage see Goff (1988); Zeitlin (1989), 166-77; Zeitlin (1994), 152-56; Zacharia (forthcoming 2003), 31-39, with full bibliography.

41. So (rightly) Zacharia (forthcoming 2003), 31.

42. Cf Zeitlin (1989), 174.

43. So explicitly Zacharia (2003), 11.

44. Cf Gutzwiller (1991), 90-94, on Theocritus' κισσύβιον (*Id.* 1.27-56), esp. 91 on the uses of epic and the dependence of this account on dialogue and reaction, as initiated in dramatic ekphrasis. Also Burton (1995), 93-122, on the development of multiplicities of reaction, varied interpretations and viewings in the Hellenistic ekphraseis of Theocritus and Herondas following Euripides' *Ion*, and Manakidou (1993), 9 and 10-17, who emphasises 'subjective' elements in Hellenistic ekphrasis and derives its dramatic nature from Menander. Her book systematically discusses 'objective' and 'subjective' elements in Hellenistic ekphrasis.

45. *Iliad.* 18.473; *Aspis* 123, 244, 297, 313, 319; Apollonius Rhodius *Arg.* 1.721; Vergil *Aen.* 8.370-453—where the account of the artist is interestingly separated from that of the shield.

46. I am thinking of the following texts: Theocritus *Id.* 5.104f. re Praxiteles; Vergil, *Aen.* 6.20-37 re Daedalus; Lucian *Herodotus* 4 re Aetion (painter of the 'Marriage of Roxana and Alexander'), *Zeuxis* 3, 5, 7-8, 11 re Zeuxis and *Calumny* 2-6 re Apelles. The reference to real artists is virtually ubiquitous in ekphrastic epigram—most immediately one thinks of Myron (*Greek Anthology* 9.713-42, 793-98) and the Posidippan corpus (with Austin and Bastianini [2002a]): 62, 65, 142 (Lysippus); 63 (Hecataeus); 64 (Cresilas); 66, 69 (Myron); 67 (Theodorus); 68 (Chares and Myron); 70 (Polyclitus and Lysippus).

47. Classic cases within the Hellenistic canon include Apollonius *Arg.* 1.721-67 (with Shapiro [1980]; Hunter [1993], 52-59; Manakidou [1993], 101-42) and Theocritus *Id.* 15.79 (on λεπτότης) with Burton (1995), 102-04, and Manakidou (1993), 40-47.

48. On Catullus' Ariadne, see Fitzgerald (1995), 146-49. On Moschus *Rape of Europa* 37-62, see Manakidou (1993), 174-211. For gendered ekphrasis and viewing, esp. in Hellenistic writing including epigrams, see Skinner (2001), 201-04 and 206-11.

49. Such frontispieces include several *prolaliae* by Lucian (*Heracles, De Domo, Herodotus, Zeuxis*—on which see esp. Maffei [1994], xv-lxxi), the *Tabula* of Cebes and the openings of the novels of Longus and Achilles Tatius. The motif was first analysed by Schissel von Fleschenberg (1913).

50. A classic instance is the way this is staged in the first ekphrasis of the *Aeneid* at *Aen.* 1.453-93, with e.g. Boyd (1995), 78-80. But proleptic ekphrasis in general is an example of this, with Harrison (2001).

51. The fundamental discussion is Schissel von Fleschenberg (1913), 103-05; see also Rousselle (2001), 384-89. On the *Tabula*, see Elsner (1995), 40-46; Trapp (1997); Rousselle (2001), 389-91. For Lucian's *Calumny*, see Rousselle (2001), 392f. For a satirical inversion of this exegetic motif, see Petronius *Sat.* 83-90, with Elsner (1993), 35f.

52. Generally on the ekphrastic epigram, see Friedländer (1912), 55-60; Rossi (2001), 15-27, esp. 19-21 on epigraphic origins and 65-73 for epigrams as captions to works of art; for the Posidippan contribution, see Gutzwiller (2002a) and Zanker (forthcoming 2003). See also Stevens (1983) on the Latin tradition.

53. On Phrasikleia and her inscription, see Svenbro (1993), 8-25; Sourvinou-Inwood (1995), 249f.; Steiner (2001), 13f., 258f. For the find, Mastrokostas (1972).

54. On this meaning of ekphrasis, see Steiner (2001), 299, but see Webb (1999), 7, for varieties of etymological derivations. For the Second Sophistic staging of statues talking back within the generic frame of epistolary fiction, see Rosenmeyer (2001).

55. See Green (1991), 380, and Kay (2001), 79f., for commentary. For the inception of the self-standing ekphrasis in the Latin epigrammatic tradition (especially in Statius' *Silvae*) see Newlands (2002), 38-43, 49f., 74 (also on Martial 9.43 and 44) and for Martial see Nauta (2002), 102-04.

56. I read αὖτη, Ewen Bowie's emendation of the papyrus reading of Ἄστη, with Austin and Bastianini (2002b: addenda and corrigenda to poem 52); *contra* Bastianini, Gallazzi and Austin

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338

(2001), 172f., and Austin and Bastianini (2002a), 74.

57. See Bastianini, Gallazzi and Austin (2001), 172-74; Austin and Bastianini (2002a), 74f.

58. See Austin and Bastianini (2002b) on poem 52.

59. See Green (1991), 284f.; Kay (2001), 97-103, with further references.

60. See Austin and Bastianini (2002a), 180f.

61. On the object see for instance Pollitt (1986), 53f.; Stewart (1990), 187f.; Smith (1991), 66. Note also Callistratus *Ekphraseis* 6 and Himerius *Eclogues* 14.1.

62. On which see Bastianini, Gallazzi and Austin (2001); Austin and Bastianini (2002a).

63. On the issue of grouping epigrams into books, see esp. Gutzwiller (1998), 15-114, 227-332; Gutzwiller (2002b); and now Parsons (2002), esp. 115-18 on the Milan papyrus.

64. Poems 16-20 give us a further set of stones, but not carved by gem-carvers so far as we can trust their descriptions. On some aspects of the *lithika*, see Hutchinson (2002), 1-3; Bing (2002); and Kosmetatou (forthcoming 2003), who cites several forthcoming articles.

65. See Bassett (1996), 495-97, with bibliography.

66. For Myron's Cow see *Greek Anthology* 9.713-42, 793-98, to which Posidippus 66 must now be added. Simon Goldhill has an as yet unpublished discussion on these poems; I am grateful to him for letting me see it.

67. If we trust all the restorations! Ruby: poem 3; grey-stone: poem 4; lapis lazuli: poem 5; beryl: poem 6; carnelian: poem 8; mother-of-pearl: poem 11; shell, emerald and bezel: poem 12; jasper: poem 14.

68. Grey: poem 4; blue: poem 5; yellow/honey-coloured: poem 7; dark: poem 14; 'thickly streaked with white': poem 15.

69. India: poems 1, 2; Persia: poems 4, 5, 8 (a gem inscribed with the emblem of Darius which defeats Indian rubies but is, one presumes, defeated by its own inscription into Greek verse), 11, 13; Arabia: poems 7, 10.

70. A drinking horn: poem 2; a bowl carved from ruby (unless this means an image of a bowl on a small gem): poem 3; a bracelet: poem 4; a pendant for a necklace: poem 6; an inlaid necklace: poem 7; a gem on a chain (apparently not a necklace or a finger-ring): poem 8; a seal: poem 9; some kind of cylinder: poem 10; two composite pieces involving shell: poems 11 and 12.

71. Key discussions include Goldhill (1994) and Gutzwiller (2001).

72. For parallels between Philostratus' *Imagines* and collections of poetry, see Elsner (2000b), 253-66.

73. For places, see e.g. Philostratus *Imag.* 1.9 (a marsh), 1.12f. (the Bosphorus), 2.14 (Thessaly), 2.17 (islands), 2.33 (Dodona); for times, seasons and festivals, see 1.2 (night), 1.25 (the Andrians), 2.1 (singers celebrating Aphrodite), 2.6 and 2.32 (athletic festivals); for battles, see 1.1, 1.7, 2.7, 2.10 (episodes from the Trojan War), 1.4, 2.29, 2.30 (episodes from the Theban War), 2.9, 2.31 ('historical' scenes from the Persian Wars).

74. For pastoral, see e.g. 2.20-23, 2.11; for Homeric epic, see 1.1, 1.7, 2.7; for tragedy, see 1.18, 2.4, 2.10.

75. E.g. 1.1.2 (where, we are told, it all comes from Homer) with *Il.* 16.100, 21.333, 337f., 343; or 1.2.5 quoting Eur. *Bacch.* 836, 852. See discussions in Schönberger and Kalinka (1968) *ad. loc.*

76. See at length McCombie in this volume.

77. Another highly creative appropriation of the ekphrastic tradition to inform the structural arrangement of lengthy panegyric is Procopius *De Aedificiis*, with Webb (2000). Procopius, focussing on the architectural tradition of ekphrasis (reaching back to the descriptions of the Jerusalem temples in Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 8.63-98 and 15.410-20 and Eusbius *VC* 3.27-53, and explicitly celebrated in Aphthonius' fourth century model description of the temple at Alexandria in his *Progymnasmata* 12.47-49), is succeeded by the accounts of such as Paul the Silentiary (with Friedländer [1912]).

78. Cf Elsner (1995), 28f.

79. I mean Photius' inaugural homily for the apse mosaic of St Sophia in 867 CE: see Cormack (1985), 146-58; James and Webb (1991), 4 and 12f.; Nelson (2000), 143-52. Procopius' account of St Sophia in *De Aed.* 1.1.23-78, as well as the ekphraseis of the church by Paul the Silentiary and others were clearly written in the expectation that the assumed readership (in Constantinople at any rate) could compare the description with its exemplar.

80. See also Goldhill (2001), 160-67.

81. There are of course exceptions—for instance James and Webb (1991) or Elsner (2000b).

82. See esp. Goldhill (1994); Goldhill (2001); Elsner (1995), 21-48.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. IP address: 80.82.77.83, on 09 May 2017 at 01:14:09, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048671X00001338