Aspects of Ecphrastic Technique in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

Aspects of Ecphrastic Technique in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

By

Elizabeth Norton

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Aspects of Ecphrastic Technique in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,
by Elizabeth Norton

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4271-0, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4271-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This work sets out to examine Ovid's treatment of the plastic arts and, more specifically, the creators of these arts within the *Metamorphoses,* by looking at the poet's portrayal of artists and their work. This will be done by examining the three major *ecphrastic* episodes in the text as well as three so called '*quasi-ecphrastic'* episodes. I have chosen to take an intertextual approach to the text and, to this end, I shall be discussing Ovid's place within the tradition of *ecphrasis*, with close reference to those of his predecessors who used *ecphrasis* to express their artistic freedom.

When it comes to *ecphrasis*, the temptation is perhaps to gloss over Ovid, after all there are only three major *ecphrases* in the *Metamorphoses* and those are all shorter than the shield of Achilles by some way – in fact: "In view of the prominence of art it is surprising that so few *ecphrases* are found: the *Aeneid* can show fully as many."[1] I have therefore chosen Ovid as my subject because, whilst Ovidian scholarship has received a great deal of attention in recent years, there still seems to be room for a more detailed study of this particular topic. There has been a wealth of research into all aspects of Ovid's work since the 1940s from Fraenkel's *Ovid: a poet between two worlds*[2] and Wilkinson's *Ovid recalled*[3] to Hardie and Boyd's[4] companions, which cover all Ovid's works and have illuminated the work of an author who, until fairly recently, had been discounted as a frivolous pretender to Virgil's epic crown. More specifically: Vincent, Leach and Knox[5] have written innovative works on individual *ecphrases* from the *Metamorphoses* and Heffernan has included the poet in his extensive survey of the genre in his *Museum of Words*.[6] On *ecphrasis* and

---

[1] Solodow (1988), 228.
[2] Fraenkel (1945).
[3] Wilkinson (1955).
[4] Hardie (2002), *The Cambridge companion to Ovid* and (1999), *Ovidian Transformations*. Weiden Boyd (2002), *Brill's companion to Ovid.*
[5] Vincent (1994), *Between Ovid and Barthes: Ecphrasis, orality, textuality in Ovid's Arachne*, Leach (1974), *Ecphrasis and the theme of artistic failure in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Knox (1988), *Phaethon in Ovid and Nonnus.*
[6] Heffernan (2004).

its place in antiquity, Jaś Elsner has led the way in advancing our knowledge, with his work culminating in an edition of *Ramus* dedicated solely to ancient *ecphrases*[7] and receiving renewed treatment in Webb's recently published *Ecphrasis, imagination and persuasion in ancient rhetorical theory and practice*.[8] The study of allusion has also taken off since 1966 when Kristeva coined the term 'intertextuality' to denote a reader-focussed approach to authorial allusion, and Ovid is a prime candidate for intertextual studies. As Myers notes, "The increasingly fat commentaries on his works reveal a greater awareness of and attentiveness to Ovid's dense allusiveness."[9] However, what is often neglected is the intersection between studies of Ovid's *ecphrases* and his allusions. The tradition of *ecphrasis* as a notable topos in ancient literature stretches right back to Homer, and Ovid with his skill for parody, makes full use of the genre's pedigree. Although little has been written on Ovid's *ecphrases* from an allusive perspective, notable exceptions are Stephen Wheeler, whose *Imago Mundi* is ground breaking in its take on not only Ovid's *ecphrases*, but on his *ecphrastic* approach to writing in the first half of the *Metamorphoses*, and Sophia Papaioannou, who uses an intertextual approach in her examination of the Crater of Aeneas; an episode rarely covered in detail. Ovid: "a poet utterly in love with poetry"[10] is a tantalising subject for any study of ancient literature and is well deserving of further study.

Ecphrasis itself brings together the plastic and literary arts, giving voice to one and clarity to the other: if *Poema loquens pictura, pictura tacitum poema debet esse*, *ecphrasis* is therefore a combination of the best parts of the two. "That art is both more closed and more open than literature makes the phenomenon of *ecphrasis* where they meet of peculiar interest."[11]

This merging of art and literature leads us inevitably to the creator of both media. Kurman noted that:

[7] Ramus special edition (2002), *The verbal and the visual : cultures of Ecphrasis in antiquity*
[8] Webb (2009).
[9] Myers (1999), 194.
[10] Murray (1921), 116.
[11] Fowler (1991), 31.

> "What we do see in Homeric *ecphrases*…is the complementing of divine creation with an almost equal regard, on the part of the poet, for the creation of man – the artist."[12]

It is this emphasis on the power of the human artist and his interaction and competition with the divine that Ovid seems to explore in his *ecphrases*. Eleanor Leach succinctly sums up the gist of my research:

> "It has often been remarked that Ovid shows a particular interest in artists and their works of art, an interest that often manifests itself in the use of words from the vocabulary of the graphic arts but is also apparent in the precise descriptions that allow the postures of his characters to be visualised as clearly as those of statues and his scenes to be envisioned with all the detail of actual paintings."[13]

Indeed, as Leach suggests, Ovid uses 'artistic' vocabulary throughout the *Metamorphoses*, but it is in his use of *ecphrasis* that we see Ovid truly taking advantage of his talent for description. Trained in rhetoric, Ovid uses rhetorical narrative pauses to allow free reign to his already fertile imagination and, in doing so, to step outside the main plot of the text and offer us more of himself:

> "It is well known that the device of *ecphrasis* offers the poet an opportunity to reflect upon his own art while describing the art of another."[14]

The importance one places on *ecphrasis* as a topos is dependant on the point of view; do authors use *ecphrasis* to enhance the text as a whole or simply to 'show off' their skills? Indeed if *ecphrasis* merely "tests the writer's powers of *enargeia*"[15] does this then negate its importance by putting it out of kilter with the rest of the text? As Harrison asks:

> "do passages of formal description, often long and apparently digressive, play an organic or functional role in the narrative in which they appear, or are they mere decorations, examples of 'narrative pause'?"[16]

---

[12] Kurman (1974), 3.
[13] Leach (1974), 102. See also Solodow, whose introduction to *The world of Ovid's Metamorphoses* is at pains to note that "Art and artists are Ovid's special interests in the poem" (Solodow [1988], 2).
[14] Wheeler (1995), 117.
[15] Hardie (2002), 173.
[16] Harrison (2001), 70.

Ovid, criticised even in his own time for his literary posturing, may be seen as using *ecphrasis* simply for the sake of digression, of pausing mid-story to demonstrate his skills of rhetoric. However, I hope to show that, although this is true, Ovid's *ecphrases* also bring us closer to understanding the poet's own feelings than any other part of his work.

> "All *ecphrases* have something about them of the bravura piece, the ornamental digression, but their very conspicuousness prompts the reader to reflect upon their potential relationship to the main current of the poem."[17]

In reflecting on the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid's *ecphrases* tell of a world where art surpasses nature and preserves it, where words can make pictures come alive, and where human artists are constantly punished for daring to outdo the *Deus artifex*. The power of art and the frailty of the artist both serve to shed light on Ovid's own views on the subject: he himself seeks to better the art (both natural and crafted) that he describes and, in an amazing feat of *prolepsis*, he too is punished for its creation. Indeed:

> "Since, as is now widely recognised, a reference to a practitioner in one artistic medium can reflect on any other type of artist, all artists in the *Metamorphoses* reflect to some extent on the one Artist – the poet himself."[18]

However, Ovid's views on artists are dependent on our interpretation of them. Authorial intent is difficult to discern despite the wealth of knowledge we have of the poet. In order to ascertain a hypothesis on Ovid's view of artists, I have relied on an intertextual approach: in considering how Ovid both adhered to and changed the work of his forebears, we may discern his personal concerns. It will be shown that Ovid often altered his sources to bring out different nuances of the myths he told[19] whilst retaining a sense (albeit largely parodic) of his literary predecessors.

> "Two things characterise the Augustan poet's approach to the genre: an abiding concern for the traditional, stereotyped boundaries of the genre;

---

[17] Leach (1974), 104.
[18] Sharrock (1991), 37. Papaioannou agrees that "an *ecphrasis*, and specifically a pictoral narrative of an artwork, corresponds directly to the epic poet's talent, being a sophisticated mode of artistic self-reference. (Papaioannou [2005], 23).
[19] See Leach (1974), 104.

> and in tension with this, a strong interest in testing and in going beyond these boundaries."[20]

Ovid plays a constant game of alternately honouring and parodying other authors. He is keen to prove his knowledge of and ability to mimic tradition, yet desperate to show his audience that he can take the past and make it better. The differences between Ovid and Homer may arise from Ovid's belief that he could improve upon the bard; it may also arise from his knowledge that he cannot equal him. Likewise, "Any attempt to challenge the *Aeneid* on its own ground would only have highlighted Ovid's shortcomings"[21] So Ovid adds comedy to his epic, and a Hellenistic flavour to his *ecphrasis*. All this serves to give us *ecphrases* that are uniquely 'Ovidian' and give great insight into the poet's character and beliefs.

In chapter one I shall discuss the origins of *ecphrasis* as both a genre and a rhetorical exercise: looking at its literal meaning, how it developed in the Hellenistic period and the words and motifs with which it is associated. This will include a brief discussion of authors from Aristotle to Quintilian and the *Progymnasmata* that form the basis of our understanding of the rhetorical topos. I shall touch briefly on simile as an additional means of conveying *enargeia* as well as outlining Ovid's own fondness for using rhetoric to embellish his works. I shall consider the origins of *ecphrasis* as a fusing of art and literature particularly in light of Plato's doctrine of *mimesis*.

In chapter II I shall discuss authorial intent and the opposing views of post-Kristevan commentators on this and intertextuality. This will involve a survey of current thinking on the subject from Conte, Hinds and others, and some consideration of the extent to which we may discern Ovid's own use of allusion and parody. I shall attempt to give perspective to the limits of reader interpretation by considering Jaussian readings and defining the importance of focalisation in this type of study. I shall then give an account of the key terminology that has been developed in the course of recent scholarship on *ecphrasis,* including the importance of *prolepsis* and narrative pause as well as others to illuminate the theoretical approaches taken by other scholars in the study of *ecphrasis*. Finally I shall discuss the origins of the modern definition of *ecphrasis* as a description of a work of art or artefact, to which I have chosen to adhere in this study. Although the

[20] Hinds (1992), 82.
[21] Griffin (1977), 61.

modern definition differs greatly from the ancient one and indeed although "One searches in vain for any unambiguous use of the term to mean 'description of a work of art' in any source before the late nineteenth century"[22], I have nonetheless chosen to use this definition, partly in the name of brevity and partly to emphasise the relationship between Ovid's use of the topos and his treatment of artists. Therefore, unless explicitly stated, all references within this study to *ecphrasis* are to the modern definition; and the role of *ecphrasis* as a purely rhetorical device, while explored, is down-played to maintain the literary balance of the work.

In chapter III I shall look at early *ecphrases* from the archaic and classical periods starting, of course, with Homer. I shall begin with an exploration of Homer's 'artistic imagery' and how this relates intertextually to Ovid as well as the ways in which Ovid uses Homeric simile outside his *ecphrases* in order to contextualise this part of the study. I shall then consider the shorter *ecphrastic* episodes from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* including the brooch of Odysseus and the cup of Nestor before moving on to detailed discussion of the shield of Achilles which, as will be shown, has great significance for all subsequent writers of *ecphrasis*. Continuing to look at archaic *ecphrases* I shall then discuss Pseudo-Hesiod's *Shield of Heracles* in reference to both Homer and Ovid before moving on to the classical period. For this I have chosen to concentrate on that most plentiful of classical literature: tragedy. Aeschylus' *Septem* marks a new departure for the genre of *ecphrasis* and I shall add to this Aeschylus' *Phoenissae* and Euripides' *Ion* to form a picture of the changes and innovations that *ecphrasis* underwent in the classical period.

In chapter IV I shall continue this 'history of *ecphrasis'* into the Hellenistic and Roman periods to give a well rounded picture of the influences of Ovid's predecessors on his own style. I shall begin with Theocritus' *Idyll I* and Apollonius' cloak of Jason in the *Argonautica* as these are prominent works in a period which marked a shift from the *ecphrases* of metal works to those of textile works and provided the inspiration for Ovid's Hellenistic flamboyance. I shall then move on to Roman *ecphrases*, beginning with Catullus *64,* which may be said to provide the influence for more than one of Ovid's works as well as his *ecphrasis*. This is of particular interest in light of the arguments for authorial intent and reader interpretation as it calls to our attention the question of focalisation. I shall then move on to a thorough discussion of

[22] Webb (2009), 5.

Virgil's epic *ecphrases* and the long standing argument of his influence upon Ovid and the poets' rivalry. I shall finish by briefly looking at Virgilian metamorphoses as a possible source of allusion in Ovid's own *Metamorphoses* to give added perspective to the extent of the debt of allusion owed by Ovid to Virgil. In my choice of *ecphrases* in chapters IV and V I have been selective because of size constraints, and am fully aware of the gaps that this may leave in the study. However, I have chosen those which I believe to be most relevant to the nature of the work. In the same way, reference to post-Ovidian authors is minimised because of the emphasis that I have placed on authorial intent. This unfortunately means that the likes of Achilles Tatius and, of course, Philostratus are missing from a study of *ecphrasis* (an unusual occurrence). However, as their writings could produce no allusion within Ovid, I have chosen to forego discussion of them.[23]

In chapter V I shall move on to Ovid's own *ecphrases*, beginning with the Palace of the Sun in book 2. I shall consider Ovid's references for the myth itself as well as possible sources for the *ecphrasis* proper. I shall analyse the text in an attempt to apply to it the theory of *ecphrastic* study as defined in chapter two, and suggest Ovid's most likely influences which, in this case, may be those of the Hellenistic period. I shall then consider the Crater of Aeneas in book 13, returning to both Homer and Virgil in order to discuss Ovid's deviation from the epic 'norm' set out by his predecessors. I shall also consider the sources for the myth as portrayed on the crater, thus examining both the macro and microcosm of the episode and concentrating on the focalisation evident within the piece. Finally I shall discuss the Arachne *ecphrasis* of book 6, which is by far the largest and most important of Ovid's *ecphrases*, as well as being the one that gives us the best idea of Ovid's treatment of artists. I shall again consider the sources for Ovid's myths as well as the parts of it that may be his own invention, and consider the consequences of this for the direction of this study.

Having introduced these nuances of Ovid's treatment of artists in relation to his use of *ecphrasis*, chapter VI will then consider three episodes within the *Metamorphoses* that I have deemed *quasi-ecphrastic,*[24] in that they

[23] Of interest on the subject however, are the following: Beall *Word painting in the Imagines of the elder Philostratus* (1993), McCombie *Philostratus, Histoi, Imagines, 2.28: ecphrasis and the web of illusion* (2002), and Morales *Vision and narrative in Leucippe and Clitophon* (2004).

[24] See Hardie (2002), 174.

conform in some way to the definitions of *ecphrasis* outlined in the first chapter, but are not strictly in line with my final definition of the trope and, although they do not conform to our definition of *ecphrasis*, they are nonetheless invaluable to our interpretation of Ovid's view of artists. I shall begin with the story of Philomela, the sources Ovid may have used and the facets of the story which make this at once a *quasi-ecphrasis* and an indication of the place and fate of artists within the *Metamorphoses*. I shall then discuss the most symbolic of all artists, Daedalus, and Ovid's treatment of his story and his art. This will further illuminate the treatment of creative personalities in the text and elucidate the role of the reader/interpreter within the epic. Finally I shall consider the myth of Pygmalion; again a possible case of Ovid's own inventive genius, and the power attributed to artists within the *Metamorphoses,* as well as Ovid's view of his own place within the hierarchy of artists.

It is my intention that, in the course of this study, I may be able to ascertain as far as possible Ovid's opinion of his own place in the long tradition of artists and poets, which began with Homer and his feelings on the relative merits of artistic invention, as well as defining our own limits as interpreters of a text which relies heavily on allusion to which modern scholars may not always have access. This is by no means an exhaustive or definitive survey of what is a vast and complex subject. I hope, however, to play a part in unravelling the threads of this scholarly web.

CHAPTER ONE

RHETORICAL BACKGROUND

The basis of this study is the idea that, through Ovid's use of *ecphrasis*, we might learn more about his views on art, artists and permanence. In other words, the focus is on authorial intent, a subject that has courted much controversy in recent scholarship. Indeed it is necessary at this point to clarify several of the theoretical approaches utilised within this work so that my methodology in later chapters might be more clearly discernable. To this end I have laid out here, not only a brief history of *ecphrasis*, but also my reasons for the definition of the term used in the course of this study, as well as commentary on the debate surrounding intertextuality and authorial intent.

Ecphrasis

Although widely used, the term *ecphrasis* is a particularly complicated one and its history doubly so.[1] The first example of what is recognisable to us as *ecphrasis* appears in Homer[2] and so is a phenomenon represented in our earliest extant literature. However the term itself, its rhetorical connotations and its development into an independent 'genre', are rather younger, as Becker has deduced:

> "Of the over five hundred occurrences of the word ἔκφρασις (in a search on the Ibycus system), nearly two-thirds occur in Eustathius, and very few occur before the third or fourth century A.D. The infinitive ἐκφράζειν appears once in Demetrius, *On Style* 165 (first century B.C. or A.D.), meaning 'to decorate', or 'to adorn'. The treatise *On the Sublime* attributed

[1] As Atkins says, "However successfully we may seem to have traced the origin of a particular idea or doctrine, we shall still, as a rule, be able to find some anticipation of that idea, some earlier statement leading up to the actual doctrine." (Atkins [1957], 11). This is particularly true in the case of *ecphrasis*, as the term itself is open to interpretation and many passages which appear to discuss *ecphrasis* do not use the term.

[2] Perhaps the "earliest extant judgement of the fine arts" (Atkins [1957], 13).

> to Longinus (probably written in the second century A.D.) does not mention *ecphrasis*. *Ecphrasis* is mentioned in the *Rhetoric* attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (but probably composed at least a century later), in a section on mistakes in judicial speeches (10.17)."[3]

The first extant mention of *ecphrasis* in rhetorical texts is in the *Progymnasmata*[4] of Aelius Theon. Theon states:

> "Ecphrasis is descriptive language, bringing what is portrayed clearly before the sight. There is ecphrasis of persons and events and places and periods of time."[5]

He then goes on to give examples of *ecphrasis*, citing primarily Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides.[6] This particular set of *Progymnasmata* has been assigned a date of approximately the 1st century AD[7] when schools of rhetoric had been in operation for several hundred years. Theon clearly considers the practice of *ecphrasis* to have been popular for some time as he says that:

---

[3] Becker (1992), 5.

[4] Of the complete surviving *Progymnasmata* there are, first Theon, and then Hermogenes, Apthonius the sophist and Nicolaus the sophist, as well as fragments from others including Sopatros. These are all along roughly the same lines, although Theon's has more of what one might call character and individuality, as Kennedy says: "only Theon…suggests that students might be asked to write about their own experiences – something that did not again become a subject of elementary composition until the romantic period" (Kennedy [2003], x).

[5] Theon *Progymnasmata*, 11.118. (All *Progymnasmata* references are to Spengel, using the Kennedy [2003] translation).

[6] Of particular relevance is his description of that type of *ecphrasis* which is pertinent to this study: "There are also *ecphrases* of objects, such as implements and weapons and siege engines, describing how each was made, as the making of the arms in Homer" (Theon *Progymnasmata* 11. 118).This is of note on several counts: that he mentions the arms of Achilles (the first and most notable of the *ecphrases*), that he counts weapons primarily among his objects and that he specifically notes the 'making' of these tools. Theon clearly considers the oldest *ecphrases* to be those which typify the genre, despite the considerable advances which had been made in the use and style of *ecphrasis* since the archaic period.

[7] References to Theodorus of Gadara and Dionysus of Halicarnassus put him no earlier than the late first century BC, while Quintillian refers to a Theon twice (*Institutio Oratoria* 3.6.48/9.3.76), if he is the same man as the author of the *Progymnasmata*, this puts him no later than AD 95, when Quintillian was writing.

> "What is called *topos* and *ecphrasis* have very clear benefit since the ancients have used these everywhere, all historical writers using ecphrasis very frequently and orators using commonplace."[8]

The *Progymnasmata* themselves are first mentioned in *Rhetoric for Alexander* probably by Anaximenes, in the late fourth century BC, which has come down to us with the works of Aristotle, although neither author explicitly mentions the term *ecphrasis* as such. We might hope, however, that it was at around this time that the rhetorical concept of *ecphrasis* developed, as it was at this time that rhetoric itself began to develop alongside the late Athenian democracy. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is one of our first complete writings on the subject,[9] and he is said to credit Empedocles of Agrigentum as the father of rhetoric and a man of Homeric genius, because of his use of metre.[10] Accordingly we may suggest that the development of rhetoric truly began in the mid fifth century BC and that terms such as *ecphrasis* would have begun to emerge and be consolidated through the Classical and Hellenistic periods. This is unfortunately where any study of rhetoric falls short: there is little material extant from the Hellenistic period. We can be certain from commentary and later scholia that rhetoric was developing at great speed during this time, but our detailed knowledge is hampered by the disappearance of all but a few fragments of critical works. We know, for example, that Theophrastus wrote *On Style*, which was "probably the first treatise to deal with style as a subject independent of rhetoric in general",[11] and it was at this point that the study of literature became more introspective.

> "For the artist, no longer interested in the state, literature ceased to be in the old sense an expression of the community, and became rather the craft of coteries, with whom "Art for Art's sake" was a guiding principle."[12]

---

[8] Theon *Progymnasmata* 1.60.

[9] Although there are others now lost to us, which may have proved most useful according to their titles:

> "Θηραμένης Κεῖος, σοφιστής. Μελετῶν βιβλία γ΄, περὶ ὁμοιώσεως λόγου, περὶ εἰκόνων ἤτοι παραβολῶν, περὶ σχημάτων."
>
> "Theramenes of Ceos, sophist. [He wrote] three books of exercises, On likeness in speech, On illustrations or Comparisons, On figures." (Suda s.v). Trans. Whitehead.

[10] Diogenes Laertius 8.57.

[11] McCall (1969), 53.

[12] Atkins (1952), 166. Atkins is most dismissive of this new fashion in writing and in particular of the Asiatic style, made popular by such writers as Hegesias of Magnesia, and calls it "an artificial style which depended for its effects on

The definitions first suggested in Aristotle were no doubt compounded and advanced in this period and it is to the Hellenistic period that we may be most tempted to attribute the invention of the *Progymnasmata* in the form now familiar to us. The first Latin evidence for the study of rhetoric is probably the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, often ascribed to Cicero but in all probability by 'person unknown'. Although the term *ecphrasis* is again missing from the piece, there is discussion on a related term and one that almost certainly foreshadows the use of *ecphrasis* in the *Progymnasmata*: *descriptio*, the Greek *ἐνάργεια*.

Description

Each of the surviving *Progymnasmata* describes *ecphrasis*, with little delineation, as "descriptive speech, bringing what is described clearly before the eyes."[13] This idea of description as one of the fundamental objectives of rhetoric precedes the use of the term *ecphrasis* by several centuries and, whilst *ecphrasis* as a trope is more concisely developed, one may trace its origins back through the use of *enargeia*. We may therefore return to Aristotle[14] who states that (*Rhetoric* 3.10.6):

> "τοῖς δ' ὀνόμασιν, ἐὰν ἔχῃ μεταφοράν, καὶ ταύτην μήτ' ἀλλοτρίαν, χαλεπὸν γὰρ συνιδεῖν, μήτ' ἐπιπόλαιον, οὐδὲν γὰρ ποιεῖ πάσχειν. ἔτι εἰ πρὸ ὀμμάτων ποιεῖ· ὁρᾶν γὰρ δεῖ τά πραττόμενα μᾶλλον ἢ μέλλοντα. δεῖ ἄρα τούτων στοχάζεσθαι τριῶν, μεταφορᾶς ἀντιθέσεως ἐναργείας."
>
> "as to words, they are popular if they contain metaphor, provided it be neither strange, for then it is difficult to take in at a glance, nor superficial, for then it does not impress the hearer; further, if they set things "before the eyes"; for we ought to see what is being done rather than what is going to be done. We ought therefore to aim at three things--metaphor, antithesis, actuality."[15]

---

epigrams, strained metaphors, false antitheses, over-elaborate rhythms and the like" (167), all of which, regardless of one's opinions of the style, acted as a perfect breeding ground for the development of such literary devices as simile and *ecphrasis* as they were increasingly developed and elaborated by writers like Apollonius.

[13] Nicolaus the Sophist *Progymnasmata* 11.68.

[14] Or indeed earlier, if we follow McCall's thinking that the *εἰκονολογία* in Socrates' account of Polus (*Phaedrus* 269A.) can translate as "speech with images" (McCall [1969], 4.

[15] Aristotle *Rhetoric* 3.10.6. Trans. Freese (1959).

He again cites Homer as his example, and we see the overlap between *enargeia* and *ecphrasis*, having defined the term according to the *Progymnasmata*. By *enargeia*, Aristotle means the bringing of seemingly inanimate objects to life so that we, the reader 'see them' clearly before our eyes.[16] "αὗτις ἐπὶ δάπεδόνδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδής" ("and it is to creating actuality in all such cases that his popularity is due as in the following examples")[17] this discussion of *enargeia* is within Aristotle's writing on metaphor and simile and these terms are, as will be shown, closely linked to *ecphrasis*. As far as *enargeia*, and indeed rhetoric itself are concerned, we again suffer from a lack of information over the Hellenistic period[18] and so must return to the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* for its discussion of *descriptio*. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is the first complete Latin treatise on rhetoric available to us and is generally assigned a date of 86-82 BC.[19] It is book four, on *elocutio* that is of interest. The author lists *descriptio* thus (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.39.51):

---

[16] Aristotle's other prerequisite for good writing is propriety :

> "τὸ δὲ πρέπον ἕξει ἡ λέξις, ἐὰν ᾖ παθητική τε καὶ ἠθικὴ καὶ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πράγμασιν ἀνάλογον. τὸ δ' ἀνάλογόν ἐστιν ἐὰν μήτε περὶ εὐόγκων αὐτοκαβδάλως λέγηται μήτε περι εὐτελῶν σεμνῶς, μηδ' ἐπὶ τῷ εὐτελεῖ ὀνόματι ἐπῇ κόσμος·"
>
> "Propriety of style will be obtained by the expression of emotion and character, and by proportion to the subject matter. Style is proportionate to the subject matter when neither weighty matters are treated offhand, nor trifling matters with dignity, and no embellishment is attached to an ordinary word" (3.7.1-3).

In other words that the style of writing should be appropriate to the subject matter, just as the *Progymnasmata* say of *ecphrasis*:

> "One should not recollect all useless details and should make the style reflect the subject, so that if what is described is colourful, the word choice should be colourful, but if it is rough or frightening or something like that, features of the style should not strike a discordant note with the nature of the subject." (Theon 119-22).

It is therefore easy to discern a development from the one term to the other.

[17] Aristotle *Rhetoric* 3.11.3 (from *Odyssey* 11.598). Trans. Freese (1959).

[18] The works now lost include Theophrastus *περὶ λέξεως* and Hermagoras on whose work the *Progymnasmata* are most probably based, as Kennedy says "with him the rhetorical handbook and the traditional system of ancient rhetoric achieved almost its full development" (Kennedy [1963], 318.).

[19] McCall (1969), bases this date on internal evidence which has been generally accepted and has disproved several theories on the authorship of the piece including those which attempt to credit Cornificius as the author.

> "Descriptio nominatur, quae rerum consequentium continet perspicuam et dilucidam cum gravitate expositionem"
>
> "Vivid description is the name for the figure which contains a clear, lucid, and impressive exposition of the consequences of an act" [20]

This of course is not *ecphrasis* as we might understand it, and the author illustrates his definition with examples of how description might be employed to evoke pathos in a jury by illustrating the possible consequences of their decision,[21] but the term still appears to be synonymous with *enargeia* and is under the heading *exornationes sententiarum* suggesting that description is an embellishment; an artistic, almost sophistic aside or addition to add weight to an argument, but not an essential part of it.[22] The author of the *Ad Herennium* also mentions *effictio*, which he takes to be a description of a person so clear as to be recognisable to the jury[23] and *demonstratio*, a similar term but referring to an event, which will again "ante oculos esse videatur." ("pass vividly before our eyes")[24]

---

[20] *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.39.51. Trans. Caplan (1964).

[21] "Quodsi istum, iudices, vestris sententiis liberaveritis, statim, sicut e cavea leo emissus aut aliqua taeterrima belua soluta ex catenis, volitabit et vagabitur in foro."

> "But, men of the jury, if by your votes you free this defendant, immediately, like a lion released from his cage, or some foul beast loosed from his chains, he will slink and prowl about in the forum." (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.39.51 Trans. Caplan (1964).)

The author gives examples for both the prosecution and the defence and despite the lack of what one might term *ecphrastic* detail, the evocation of pathos within the speech is certainly reminiscent of Nicolaus the Sophist, who remarks of *ecphrasis:*

> "in deliberative speaking we often encounter a necessity to describe the thing about which we are making the speech, in order to be more persuasive , and in prosecuting or defending we need the amplification that comes from making an *ecphrasis*" (Nicolaus the Sophist *Progymnasmata* 11.70).

[22] Indeed Beaujour believes *ecphrasis* to be particularly suited to epideictic oratory and says that "Such gratuitous uses of *ecphrasis* were always tainted with the dubious reputation of sophistry: a profitable but somewhat undignified display of skill, an ungentlemanly indifference to usefulness, truth, justice, wisdom and the common good" (Beaujour [1981], 30).

[23] *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* 4.49.63. Trans. Caplan (1964).

[24] Ibid 4.55.68.

In fact it is in this context, as a purely rhetorical elaboration, that the *Ad Herennium* introduces us to a new dimension of description; the mnemonic (3.22.37):

> "Imagines igitur nos in eo genere constituere oportebit, quod genus in memoria diutissime potest haerere. Id accidet, si quam maxime notatas similitudines constituemus; si non multas nec vagas, sed aliquid agentes imagines ponemus; si egregiam pulchritudinem aut unicam turpitudinem eis a tribuemus; si aliquas exornabimus, ut si coronis aut veste purpurea, quo nobis notatior sit similitudo."

> "We ought then to set up images of a kind that can adhere longest in memory. And we shall do so if we establish likeness as striking as possible; if we set up images that are not many or vague, but do something; if we assign to them exceptional beauty or singular ugliness; if we dress some of them with crowns or purple cloaks, for example so that the likeness may be more distinct to us"[25]

Our first glimpse of *ecphrasis* from the Latin corpus therefore, has led us further still from definition we first encountered in the *Progymnasmata*; how then, might later writers amalgamate these disparate nuances of description? Our attention turns to the closest contemporary of the *Ad Herennium*, Cicero's various works on rhetoric. The melding of what may well be a Hellenistic approach to description (both the author of the *Ad Herennium* and Cicero himself were known to have drawn on Theophrastus) and that which is more familiar to us as *ecphrasis*, may be down to the work of Cicero:

> "It has often been pointed out that in rhetorical theory Cicero reaches back beyond the technical Hellenistic age to the broader Aristotelian approach to

[25] Ibid 3.22.37. One cannot help but make the link between the *Ad Herennium's veste purpurea* and Apollonius' cloak *ecphrasis* in the *Argonautica* (see further below) it is tempting to imagine that this was the intention of the author of *Ad Herennium*. One must wonder, however, how much effect the mnemonic capacity of description had on Ovid as, whilst the memorising and recitation of his work was inevitable, Ovid lived in an age when the written word was solid and tangible; copied and distributed to be read first hand: what was taught to Ovid as a rhetorical device became far more than a method of declamation in the hands of an accomplished poet. (see *authorial intent* pg 34).

> rhetoric and, even further back, to the pre-Platonic view that philosophy and the art of persuasion are not incompatible."[26]

De Inventione, older than the *Ad Herennium* by several years but incomplete, would appear to be the earliest Latin work on rhetoric;[27] although only the first part of a five part treatise on *elocutio* has survived, we may assume, or at least hope, that description would have been covered in the text as, judging from later works on rhetoric, it was a well established trope. Our most important example of Cicero's contribution to rhetoric however is *De Oratore*, written some forty years later. Despite this being Cicero's longest work on the subject of rhetoric, it has little to say on our subject. There is no mention of *ecphrasis* or any of the terms directly associated with it that we have so far discussed. What we have from Cicero is a discussion of metaphor, which is of particular importance to the current work. In this he tells us that (*De Oratore* 3.40.161)

> "Nam et 'odor urbanitatis' et 'mollitudo humanitatis' et 'murmur maris' et 'dulcitudo orationis' sunt ducta a ceteris sensibus, illa vero oculorum multo acriora, quae paene ponunt in conspectu animi, quae cernere et videre non possumus."

> "For while the rest of the senses supply (such metaphors) as 'the fragrance of good manners' and 'the softness of a humane spirit' and the 'roar of the waves' and 'the sweet style of speaking', those (metaphors) drawn from the sense of sight are much more vivid, virtually placing within the range of our mental vision objects not actually visible to our sight."[28]

Again, there is a clear link to the *enargeia*[29] in the *Progymnasmata* but the terminology is once more absent and we are given instead the impression of *veritas* rather than *enargeia*, which stands in for *ecphrasis* in Quintilian. Closer perhaps to *enargeia* is *delucidum*, which Cicero uses in his *De Partitione Oratoria* to illustrate 'clarity' (*De Partitione Oratoria* 6.20):

> "Est enim haec pars orationis quae rem constituat paene ante oculos, is enim maxime mens ipsa moveri potest. Sed quae dicta sunt de oratione dilucida, cadunt in hanc illustrem omnia; est enim pluris aliquanto illustre

[26] McCall (1969), 87.
[27] Although the two works may share a common source (Caplan [1954], xxii).
[28] Cicero *De Oratore* 3.40.161. Trans. Rackham (1960).
[29] Atkins tells us that "In the use of (*enargeia*) Cicero was said to be supreme" (Atkins [1952], 269).

> quam illud dilucidum: altero fit ut intellegamus, altero vero ut videre videamur."
>
> "For it is the department of oratory which almost sets the facts before the eyes- for it is the sense of sight that is most appealed to, although it is nevertheless possible for the rest of the senses and also most of all the mind itself to be affected. But the things that were said about the clear style all apply to the brilliant style. For brilliance is worth considerably more than the clearness above mentioned. The one helps us to understand what is said, but the other makes us feel that we actually see it before our eyes."[30]

Quintilian and *Phantasia*

Quintilian's opinion of description, as stated, relies again on the employment of *enargeia*. Quintilian states that *enargeia* arises from impressions given by those who possess *εὐφαντασίωτος*, the power to present images realistically.[31] He mentions that what the Greeks call *ἐνάργεια* may be called *illumination* or *actuality*.[32] This skill is particularly useful to the orator because (*Institutio Oratoria* 6.2.32):

> "quae non tam dicere videtur quam ostendere; et adfectus non aliter, quam si rebus ipsis intersimus, sequentur. An non ex his visionibus illa sunt; 'Excussi manibus radii, revolutaque pensa'?"
>
> "(*enargeia*) makes us seem not so much to narrate as to exhibit the actual scene, while our emotions will be no less actively stirred than if we were present at the actual occurrence. Is it not from visions such as these that (Virgil) was inspired to write – 'Sudden her fingers let the shuttle fall, and all the thread was spilled'?"[33]

Again we have a very plausible link to the *Progymnasmata* through the use of clarity to produce mental 'pictures', but once more we are not told

---

[30] Cicero *De Partitione Oratoria* 6.20. Trans. Rackham (1960). What was previously said on clearness refers to five ornaments of style listed as "*dilucidum, breve, probabile, illustre, suave*." (*Part Or* 6.19.)
[31] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 6.2.30. Trans. Butler (1960).
[32] Quintilian tells us that these are the names given by Cicero, which Butler (1960), 434, suggests may be a reference to the passage in *De Partitione Oratoria* mentioned above.
[33] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 6.2.32 Trans. Butler (1960). from (*Aeneid* 9.474.)

explicitly that these are descriptions. When Quintilian does refer to description he does so under a clause he has taken from Celsus, *subiecimus evidentiae*[34] which Butler translates as *vivid illustration*. He gives it the Greek name *ὑποτύπωσις*, which again suggests that the purpose of description is to bring a given situation before the eyes (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.2.40)

> "Ab aliis ὑποτύπωσις dicitur proposita quaedam forma rerum ita expressa verbis, ut cerni potius videatur quam audiri: 'Ipse inflammalus scelere ac furore in forum venit, ardebant oculi, toto ex ore crudelitas eminebat'"

> "Others give the name of ὑποτύπωσις to any representation of facts which is made in such vivid language that they appeal to the eye rather than the ear. The following will show what I mean: 'he came into the forum on fire with criminal madness: his eyes blazed and cruelty was written in every feature of his face'"[35]

In this passage Quintilian admonishes modern authors for their outlandish use of vivid description[36] (in particular Seneca, whom he suggests is too

---

[34] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 9.2.40. Trans. Butler (1960). Quintilian states that he draws in this instance upon Cicero (*De Oratore* 3.53.202. Trans. Rackham (1960).) who refers to the same figure as *sub oculos subiecto*, although in fact Cicero here refers to the more non-committal *paene subiecto* and suggests that it is more an amplification than ornamentation, intended to clarify one's speech rather than elaborate it. Lausberg meanwhile interprets Quintilian's use of *evidentia* in a more traditionally '*ecphrastic'* manner "The *evidentia*…is the vivid and detailed description of an object…by means of enumeration of its sensible peculiarities." (Lausberg [1975], 224). However, as Beaujour points out, this interpretation seems peculiar to Lausberg himself rather than appearing in a reading of the original text (see Beaujour [1981], 29).

[35] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 9.2.40. Trans. Butler (1960). Here Quintilian quotes Cicero's *Verrines* 5.62.161.

[36] However, as Laird notes "This idea that *descriptiones* in literary discourse are ornaments, somehow detachable from their contexts, brings out their role as objects of aesthetic appreciation." (Laird [1996], 93). This may indicate their status outside rhetoric, which tended to assume that "painting/poetry comparisons were usually made illustratively to adorn arguments about something else – most often the visual arts were used subordinately in analogies to show how good writing or speaking could be effected." (Laird [1996], 76.) This means that, as something 'apart' from the rhetoric in which they figure, they become what *ecphrasis* is later understood to be – a genre in its own right.

dramatic[37]) but does mention that the clear and vivid description of places is variously called *τοπογραφια* as it is in the *Progymnasmata*. What gives an orator the power to create such images is, according to Quintilian, what the Greeks call *φαντασία,* and the Romans call *visiones*.[39] *Phantasia*, like *enargeia*, brings things vividly before the eyes, but is intended rather as an aid to the orator himself for, to make a judge feel pity and grief for a defendant, it is essential to create those feelings in one's own mind (*Institutio Oratoria* 6.2.29)

> "Primum est igitur, ut apud nos valeant ea quae valere apud iudicem volumus, adficiamurque antequam adficere conemur."

> "Accordingly the first is that those feelings should prevail with us that we wish to prevail with the judge, and that we should be moved ourselves before we attempt to move others."[40]

This definition of *Phantasia* as what might be translated loosely as 'imagination', stems from Aristotle who defines it as a way of speaking, in order to make oneself clear, and notes that it is an ornamental device to charm the hearer and play on their emotions which, but for their gullibility, should not be necessary (*Rhetoric* 3.1.6).

> "τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς λέξεως ὅμως ἔχει τι μικρὸν ἀναγκαῖον ἐν πάσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ· διαφέρει γάρ τι πρὸς τὸ δηλῶσαι ὡδὶ ἢ ὡδὶ εἰπεῖν, οὐ μέντοι τοσοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἅπαντα φαντασία ταῦτ' ἐστί, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀκροατήν· διὸ οὐδεὶς οὕτω γεωμετρεῖν διδάσκει."

> "However, in every system of instruction there is some slight necessity to pay attention to style; for it does make a difference, for the purpose of making a thing clear, to speak in this or that manner; still, the difference is

---

[37] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.130. Trans. Butler (1960). He similarly accuses Ovid of being "utroque lascivior" ("wanton on both counts") at 10.1.93 and bemoans the fate of Ovid's Medea, which may have been all the greater had he controlled his language (10.1.98.)

[38] As Phillimore in his translation of Lessing "What we call 'poetical pictures' the Ancients called Phantasie'…and what we call the illusion, the deceit of the picture, they called the energy" (Phillimore [1874], 144.)

[39] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 6.2.29. Trans. Butler (1960).

[40] Ibid.

> not so very great, but all these things are mere outward show for pleasing the hearer; wherefore no one teaches geometry in this way."[41]

Clearly there is some disparity between these two definitions, with Aristotle considering *Phantasia* to be a mode of speech and Quintilian believing it to be a mental preparation on the part of the orator; but once more the term rests on the concept of *enargeia* – of bringing things before the eyes, and it is to this rhetorical concept that I believe we owe the definition of *ecphrasis* laid down in the *Progymnasmata* of which our first surviving copy, that of Aelius Theon, was written at approximately the same time as the *Institutio Oratoria*.[42] We may say at this point in history that the evolution of *ecphrasis* was complete. The authors discussed are by no means the only ones whose discussions of rhetoric may shed light on the current discussion,[43] but their treatments are substantial and the progression from one to the next forms a solid line of development of style from the 4th century BC to beyond Ovid's own time. It is however a matter of some consternation that the term does not appear in surviving Latin rhetorical handbooks but, as Innocenti suggests

> "Ancient Roman rhetoricians do not offer a systematic theory of vivid description in their rhetorical treatises, perhaps because it was treated at the

---

[41] Aristotle *Rhetoric* 3.1.6. Trans. Freese (1959). Although even this rhetorical definition is called into question in light of Aristotle's use of *Phantasia* in *De Anima* 3.3 to indicate an innate capacity in humans and animals (see Caston [1996] 20-55.).

[42] It is for this reason that I have neglected to incorporate later treatises on rhetoric such as Longinus' *On the Sublime*, and it is also appropriate to end here as (although necessary from a rhetorical standpoint) we have now somewhat 'overshot' Ovid who is the focus of this thesis.

[43] One text of interest is the *On Style*, previously attributed to Demetrius, where the author discusses enargeia (section 209) in terms similar to those defined by Aristotle. However, as a date for the piece has yet to be agreed on by scholars, it serves little purpose in establishing a chronology of the development of rhetorical *ecphrasis*. There are also the two Senecas to consider: the elder Seneca's *Controversiae* are incomplete and so is of little help. The younger Seneca is of course best known for his tragedies in which he employs the rhetorical style with an abandon that led Quintilian to admonish his elaborateness (see further above). He also uses *ecphrasis* in his work and, while not mentioning the term within his rhetoric, he discusses *imago* (comparison) and says that "ut et dicentum et audientem in rem praesentum adducant" ("this is to bring both speaker and listener face to face with the subject under discussion") (Seneca *Epistulae Morales* 59.6 Trans. Gummere (1925).).

> early stages of a student's education and because it may be produced in various ways to achieve various purposes."[44]

Nonetheless, the use of elaborate language in the description of various different subject matter was a clearly defined concept in antiquity and is what I would like to define as the *artistic imagery* that is the focus of my study of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The other type of *artistic imagery* on which I will focus in later chapters is simile, in particular that which relates to, or is directly incorporated into *ecphrasis*. My reason for integrating a discussion of such a seemingly disparate term into this treatment is the resemblance between the two and indeed that one (*ecphrasis*) developed parallel to or out of the other (simile). My discussion of the origins and development of simile will remain relatively concise as it is a subject that has received much attention in the past fifty years.[45]

Simile

As with *ecphrasis*, there appears to be little mention of simile in early texts, as McCall notes: "In most of the early teachers of rhetoric, there is simply no record of any discussion of comparison."[46] And so, despite tempting glimpses of Gorgias' *λέξεως σχηματισμοῖς περιττοτέροις*[47] we must again turn firstly to Aristotle. Aristotle uses primarily παραβολή and εἰκών to describe comparison. In chapter four Aristotle describes εἰκών in relation to what appears to be a well established term, μεταφορά (*Rhetoric* 3.4.406b):

> "ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν μεταφορά: διαφέρει γὰρ μικρόν: ὅταν μὲν γὰρ εἴπῃ [τὸν Ἀχιλλέα] ὡς δὲ λέων ἐπόρουσεν, εἰκών ἐστιν, ὅταν δὲ "λέων ἐπόρουσε", μεταφορά· διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἄμφω ἀνδρείους εἶναι, προσηγόρευσεν μετενέγκας λέοντα τὸν Ἀχιλλέα. χρήσιμον δὲ ἡ εἰκὼν καὶ ἐν λόγῳ, ὀλιγάκις δέ· ποιητικὸν γάρ."

> "The simile also is a metaphor; for there is very little difference. When the poet says of Achilles, 'he rushed on like a lion', it is a simile; if he says, "a

[44] Innocenti (1994), abstract.
[45] See particularly McCall's exhaustive work on the subject *Ancient rhetorical theories of simile and comparison* (1969).
[46] McCall (1969), 1.
[47] Diodorus Siculus 12.53.4. Trans.Oldfather (1962).

> lion, he rushed on," it is a metaphor; for because both are courageous, he transfers the sense and calls Achilles a lion. The simile is also useful in prose, but should be less frequently used, for there is something poetical about it."[48]

Aristotle goes on to say that simile (εἰκών) is a term in common usage, and gives a list of authors (none of whom are extant) that make use of it, but his insistence that it is 'poetical' negates its practicality in rhetoric because such terms are less likely to be persuasive – this is quite the opposite of *enargeia*, which may be employed specifically because of its persuasive qualities and so at this early stage in the development of rhetoric it appears that there is some considerably divergence in the meanings of simile, and what will later become recognisable as *ecphrasis*. Aristotle's most interesting comment on subjects which relate to the current work occur shortly after this however, when he says (*Rhetoric* 3.11.1412a7-10)

> "ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐδοκιμούσαις εἰκόσιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀψύχων ταὐτά· "κυρτά, φαληριόωντα: πρὸ μέν τ' ἄλλ', αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλα" κινούμενα γὰρ καὶ ζῶντα ποιεῖ πάντα, ἡ δ' ἐνάργεια κίνησις."

> "In his popular similes also he proceeds in the same manner with inanimate things: Arched, foam-crested, some in front, others behind; for he gives movement and life to all, and actuality is movement."[49]

Similes, to be successful, must appear alive – they must contain *enargeia*, and the two therefore, although of unequal desirability, are inexorably linked. As is the case with *ecphrasis* however, we are sadly lacking in evidence from the Hellenistic period. Although there are scant references in other classical texts as well as hints from the interval, we must once more 'fast forward' to the Roman period to gain any real insight into the progression of the use of simile in rhetoric. In Latin texts, by far and away the most common term for simile is *similitudo*, which appears in the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* where we are told "Ante oculos ponendi negotii causa sumetur similitudo" ("A comparison will be used for vividness and be set forth in the form of a detailed parallel")[50] The example then given is that of a lyre player, who should be talented as well as finely clothed. The

[48] Aristotle *Rhetoric* 3.4.406b. Trans. Freese (1959).
[49] Ibid 3.11.1412a7-10 (quoting from *Iliad* 13.799).
[50] *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* 4.47.60. Trans. Caplan (1964).

simile itself is greatly extended[51] and furthermore we are told that the comparison "sub aspectus omnium rem subiecit" ("sees everything vividly"), the prerequisite for *ecphrasis* cited in the *Progymnasmata*. Certainly from this point on the two terms, simile and *ecphrasis*, appear to run parallel to one another, although simile is used, not so much to evoke pathos, but rather "aut laudis aut vituperationis" ("to either praise or criticise")[52] However, the word used for simile in this passage is *imago*, which here means the same as *similitudo*, but McCall admits "The word occurs several times in the section on memory in Book III, but always in the sense of 'pictorial image.'"[53] Here *imago* is used to describe the 'pictures' one creates in the mind to aid the memory, once more returning us to the *Ad Herennium's* use of *imago* as mnemonic. That the same word is used of both simile and pictures, and that both forms are linked to mnemonics, retrogressively suggests that vivid description may have arisen in the oral tradition as an aid to memory, which forms an interesting starting point for the origin of *ecphrasis* in the archaic period.

On the subject of simile, Cicero is sadly of little use. McCall both praises and laments his 'philosophical' approach to rhetoric:

> "Cicero makes frequent use of terms of comparison but never really undertakes any detailed treatment of them…in the midst of the overall development of ancient rhetoric along lines of increasingly lifeless and automatic classifications, Cicero injects a temporary antidote of refreshing humanitas in his continuing search for the ideal orator."[54]

In fact it is not to *De Oratore* that we now turn but to the earlier *De Inventione*, which mentions, like the *Ad Herennium*, *imago* and *similitudo*, but with rather different definitions: in the case of *imago*, the definition is similar, but Cicero's *imago* is explicitly a mode of speech, unlike the mnemonic function performed by the definition in *Ad Herennium*.[55] *Similitudo* on the other hand, whilst sometimes used in a similar fashion, more often indicates "an element of probable proof; it thus constitutes the quality of resemblance, rather than a stylistic figure of comparison."[56] It is

---

[51] See pg 68. Homeric simile.
[52] *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* 4.49.62. Trans. Caplan (1964).
[53] McCall (1969), 79. The section of the *Ad Herennium* is 3.16.28-24.40.
[54] McCall (1969), 87.
[55] Cicero *De Inventione* 1.30.49 Trans. Rackham (1960). and *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* 4.49.62. Trans. Caplan (1964).
[56] McCall (1969), 93.

not therefore an elaboration in the same way that *dilucidum* is in Cicero, and it is an entirely separate entity to metaphor.[57]

Quintilian, like Cicero, uses *similitudo* more than other terms for comparison, but also mentions *simile* as well as several other terms not covered here. *Similitudo* is mentioned several times in passing, along with *exemplum,* the overall impression being that the two terms were "ornaments to a *causa*",[58] but is first discussed in depth in book five when he brings the reader full circle to Aristotle by remarking "nostri fere similitudinem vocare maluerunt, quod ab illis (proprie) παραβολή dicitur" ("Roman writers have, for the most part, preferred to give the name of 'comparison' to that which the Greeks call 'parable'").[59] While *similitudo* is an ornamentation of speech, *simile* is quite clearly a historical comparison; the description of a specific past event (real or imagined) used to persuade the audience of the truth of what is being argued.[60] Quintilian also comments briefly on the Greek, saying it is the mode of comparison used by the Greeks to express the appearance of people and things and that it should be used more sparingly "quo probabilius fit quod intendimus." ("than those comparisons which help to prove our point")[61] He once more uses *similitude,* however, in book eight, where he considers it very much a part of vivid description and therefore akin to *enargeia* (8.3.72)

> "Praeclare vero ad inferendam rebus lucem repertae sunt similitudines; quarum aliae sunt, quae probationis gratia inter argumenta ponuntur, aliae ad exprimendam rerum imaginem compositae."
>
> "The invention of similes has also provided an admirable means of illuminating our descriptions. Some of these are designed for insertion among our arguments to help our proof, while others are devised to make our pictures yet more vivid."[62]

---

[57] Metaphor and simile share a particularly fraught relationship in ancient rhetoric, with opinions varying on their status "Aristotle's opinion is that metaphor is the general term and that simile is merely a special, slightly inferior, type of metaphor...Cicero, followed by Quintilian, reverses Aristotle's argument, claiming that simile is the genus and metaphor the species (Cicero 2:123; Quintilian 3:305)." (Addison [1993], 402.)
[58] McCall (1969), 186.
[59] Quintilian *Institution Oratoria* 5.11.1. Trans. Butler (1960).
[60] Ibid 5.11.6.
[61] Ibid 5.11.24.
[62] Ibid 8.3.72.