The σοφοι of Philostratus' *Imagines*: Ekphrasis and Images in Fiction

By

Pearl Peiru Liao

Submitted in accordance with the requirements of the degree of

Masters by Research

University of Leeds

The School of Languages, Cultures and Societies

30 November 2023

I confirm that the work submitted is my own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The right of Pearl Peiru Liao to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by Pearl Peiru Liao in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Acknowledgements

This work was sponsored by the Adrian Newall Classics Scholarship.

My sincerest thanks to the committee and university for this award.

Σοφοί:

Thank you,

Owen and Emma, for your enduring patience, enthusiasm, and guidance in supervising this project;

Fábio, for the most enjoyable first lecture at university;

Shakeel, Karen, for your support;

And for David, on whose account I pursued Classics.

Φίλοι:

Tadhg, for playing παῖς to this discourse;

Rachel, Isa, and Kat, for keeping me sane,

And Andrea, Charlotte, and Keziah, of course,

without whom this would not have been the same.

Contents

1. Introduction 5
1.1. Philosophising through Fiction 12
1.2. The *mise-en-abyme* 16
1.3. Contrast and collaboration: depictions of word and image 19
1.4. Personal temporalities 23
1.5. Time in the narrative 24
2. Authors and Authenticity: Aesop, Daedalus, and Penelope 28
2.1. Aesop: Fables 1.3 31
2.1.1. Authorship 34
2.1.2. All the World’s a stage: representations 41
2.1.3. Interlocutions 45
2.2. Daedalus: Pasiphaë 1.16 47
2.2.1. Daedalus σοφιστής 51
2.2.2. The Hollow μηχάνημα 56
2.2.3. Visualising creation 62
2.3. Penelope’s Web: Looms 2.28 69
2.3.1. Integrating Interpretations: Discussions with παῖς 72
2.3.2. Liminal figure: Spiders on a line 76
2.3.3. Web-walker: Philosophy through appreciation 81
3. Time and Interpretation 85
3.1. Drama at dinnertime: Cassandra 2.10 88
3.1.1 Refining interpretations 91
3.2. Making artefacts of mourning: Hippolytus 2.4 95
3.2.1. Viewing (in) the scenery 99
3.2.2. Commemorative craftsmanship 102
Conclusion 105
Bibliography 107
Appendix - Figures 115

1. Introduction

Establishing what we know of the *Imagines* is in many ways more difficult than the reading of the Greek text itself. The *Imagines* (or *Eikones* in Greek) which we are concerned with in this study is the first of two bodies of work titled *Imagines* and attributed to 'Philostratus'. [1] The author of the second *Imagines* refers to the author of the first series as his maternal grandfather (μητροπάτορι),[2] and so distinguishes himself as Philostratus 'the Younger', against the author of the first *Imagines*, whom we shall call Philostratus the Elder in the tradition of present scholarship concerned with this work.[3] Philostratus was born around 170 CE, and his works give some clue to his life through his patrons and descriptions.[4] Bowie infers that *Apollonius of Tyana* was written after the death of Julia Domna (193-217 CE), as she is not mentioned in the present tense.[5] *On athletics* and *Heroicus* both mention the achievements of a historical athlete, Aurelius Helix, who achieved a double victory at the 219 CE Capitoline games,[6] and his second Olympic victory in 213 CE or 217 CE.[7] Much has been written about *Lives of the Sophists*, which provided modern scholars with the term 'Second Sophistic' to describe the declamatory movement of c. 60-230 CE,[8] and was dedicated to Gordian, either Gordian I, proconsul of Africa in 237/8 CE,[9] or Gordian III, dated around 242 CE.[10] Historical context, and

---

[1] The tenth century Byzantine encyclopedia, the Suda, gives us three Philostrati, of which the *Imagines* is commonly attributed to the second. Further detail is uncertain, though the contemporary scholarly consensus accepts Flavius Philostratus or Philostratus the Elder as author of this series of *Imagines,* with his grandson, the Younger Philostratus, writing a different collection at a later date, acknowledging his grandfather in the foreword. Philostratus the Elder is understood to be the same author as that of *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (Τὰ ἐς τὸν Τυανέα Ἀπολλώνιον, *Vita Apollonii*), *Lives of the Sophists* (Βίοι Σοφιστῶν, *Vitae Sophistarum*), *Gymnasticus* (On athletics), *Epistolae,* and *Heroicus.* Certainty is in this instance unnecessary for the sake of dialogue with critics such as Squire (2009) and Whitmarsh (2005), as the intertextuality between *Imagines* and its contemporary texts exists regardless of authorship. I will refer to the author of the *Imagines* as Philostratus under the presupposition that the *Imagines* is a text which had to have been written.

[2] Philostratus the Younger, *Imagines* 1.pr.2; Elsner, 2009, pp.6-7.

[3] Bowie and Elsner, 2009.

[4] Bowie, 2009, pp.22-25, suggesting 180-240 CE for Philostratus' teenage and adult years, with his active period in sophistry potentially between 203-207 CE (p.20).

[5] Bowie, 2009, p.29.

[6] Cassius Dio (79.10.2-3) in Bowie, 2009, p.29.

[7] Münscher (1907) pp.497-8; 553-4 and Jünthner (1909) pp.97-9, in Bowie, 2009, p.29.

[8] Philostr. *V.S.* 1.19; Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2016, 'Second Sophistic'.

[9] Avotins (1987) pp.242-7, in Bowie, 2009, p.29.

[10] Jones (2002), in Bowie, see n.5.

allusion itself, is addressed and explored in the text of the *Imagines*, with the many Greek authors referenced by the narrator creating a 'surface impression of an entirely unremarkable Hellenism'.[11] Focussing our study instead on the culture of viewing and interpretation of visual material artefacts the narrator curates in his speeches, working from an aim stated in the introductory proem, that from these descriptions, one might learn to interpret and identify what we find excellent in them (ὧν ἑρμηνεύσουσί τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3).[12] This process is an epistemological undertaking which approaches art as a product of skilled craftsmanship, one of physical dexterity which makes it akin to the mental dexterity honed through speech, debate, and philosophical thought. Philostratus' *Imagines* engages with artwork and painting as a dialect of philosophical communication and contemplation not dissimilar to that of the narrative voice.

Philosophy, the studying of the fundamental nature of existence, reality, and knowledge, is a passionate and dedicated act of pursuit, the characterisation of which pursuit we will come to see over the course of studying the *Imagines.*[13] Though a certain approach or attitude may be considered a personal 'philosophy', the Greek term φιλοσοφία inherently relates to the idea of demonstrating appreciation and love[14] towards σοφία, understood in this study as *wisdom*, but also as *skill.*[15] As we shall see, Philostratus' *Imagines* leans heavily into the latter meaning of σοφία, as it

[11] MacDonald, 2022, p.116, especially n.12 for the explicit references to Greek authors: Homer (1.1, 1.8, 2.2, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10, 2.28, 2.33, 2.34); Aesop (1.3); Plato (1.4); Anacreon (1.15); Sappho (2.1); Xenophon (2.9); Pindar (2.12, 2.24); and Euripides (2.23; quoted in 2.4). This study analyses ekphrases 1.3, 1.16, 2.4, 2.10, and 2.28, drawing upon 2.34 and the proem amongst others to shape our understanding of the text. Rather than engage directly with arguing whether this Hellenism is founded (as textually, it is supported), we instead draw inspiration from contemporary Roman artefacts, specifically funerary sarcophagi in our study of Hippolytus (see §3.2) and Pompeiian wall-painting in Daedalus (§2.2; see also n.190 for the narrator's comments on Daedalus' 'Attic-ness' in *Imag.* 1.16.1)

[12] Greek quotations are taken from the Loeb Classical Library edition (1931), with translations guided by Fairbanks from that edition and supplemented by my own interpretations drawing from the Greek-English lexicon (LSJ); particular deviations from the Loeb will be indicated with LSJ references throughout.

[13] Though space will not allow, the Hunters ekphrasis (1.28) is an excellent example of where joyous erotic pursuit (of the desirable youths) is directly paralleled with a hunt, the object of which is both the depicted boar and the narrator's argument.

[14] LSJ φίλος I: (a) friend, lover (b) object of love; and (2) of things, pleasant, welcome.

[15] LSJ σοφία A: 'cleverness or skill in handicraft and art'; (2) 'intelligence, practical wisdom'; and (3) 'learning, wisdom'.

is used repeatedly to describe and praise the artistic skill of painters and technical craftsmen.[16] The visual artistic subjects of the *Imagines* challenge and enhance the reader-viewers' perceptions of reality, by supporting the narrator's explanation of how our understanding of knowledge is divined from reality, and how realities can be shaped by different methods of interpretation. Just as painters invariably produce varied products based on the same idea or subject, philosophers each form their individual perceptions of reality, the communication of which is not unlike ekphrasis, in that the imagination of the audience must be inspired to arrive at a similar conclusion to the directing speaker.[17] In this way, philosophy is more than the thoughts produced at the end of a process, demonstrated as the act of creation, which is made evident through the narrator's conception of the painting process in his attempts to understand the painter's process and artistic choices, rather than merely observe the finished products. The narrator characterises philosophy as the active and continuous engagement with ideas, and Philostratus' *Imagines* differs from traditional dialectic in that the ideas brought forward to the speaker come in the form of images, rather than questions.[18]

Whether philosophy can be accurately communicated is subsequently the underlying question dwelt upon by Philostratus' work. This theme unites the product which is the text and the declarations of the proem to teach recognition and communication, but more specifically, the recognition of one's own senses, and a sensitivity towards translating feelings into thoughts into speech, much as painters will transform shapes with colour and line into familiar forms. The perfect example lies in the title of the text itself – the idea of the εἰκών, which is at once a mental similitude, such as an 'image in the mind', and a visual representation in physical artistic medium,[19] or, as Philostratus thoroughly demonstrates, the εἰκών as ekphrasis, as textual or verbal description. Although the durability of a painter's final product may be considered more incorrigible than a

[16] Omogunwa, 2018, for example, has argued excellently against Plato's theory of mimesis (Plato, *Rep.,* X) with 'The Carpenter as a Philosopher-Artist', an approach to art as a worthy equal to philosophy which resonates with my own interpretation of Philostratus. See also n.21.
[17] See n.225 for definition of ekphrasis.
[18] As is the case when the Socratic method is employed and a series of questions are asked by the teaching philosopher figure to the ruminating student.
[19] LSJ εἰκών II; A.

mutable, flexible line of thought and language which may become mangled over time and translation, the ekphrastic sense of vividness and motion which the narrative provides to static pictures reminds us that by tracing technique and critically engaging with these creative products of painting and philosophy, we are performing the act of philosophy, and thus we will be able to better understand how to convey ourselves and be receptive to the worlds around us.

The narrative provided by Philostratus in the *Imagines* depicts the performance of a philosophical investigation. The narrator is characterised as a 'philosopher', a lover of learning and wisdom, through his textual allusions to diegetic and extradiegetic sources of knowledge, as well as his reported experiences which resemble those of a sophist.[20] In speaking and deliberating on the visual spectacle of paintings, the narrator reveals his interpretation of the artworks, providing a narrative and flow for the images he sees. This process is philosophical, not just in its appreciative tone for artistic skill, but also in that it allows for a greater understanding of how knowledge is a product of interpretation and a mediated co-perception of reality shared with other minds.

This collaborative process towards an enriched philosophical perspective calls to mind dialogic philosophical works which are alluded to, if not directly referenced by Philostratus.[21] Philosophical texts such as Plato's *Republic* are known for their dialogic approach to discussing, sharing, and challenging knowledge, and also the application of an approach to philosophy known as the Socratic method.[22] The narrator of the *Imagines* presents his philosophical thoughts as reported speech; dialogic in the most immediate sense.[23] However, as other critics have noted, the speaker of

[20] Newby, 2009, 'a man attended by a group of youths, eager to hear him speak' calls to mind the characterisation of sophists in *Lives of the sophists* (p.323).
[21] Schoess, 2022, p.211 argues lucidly that Philostratus' reference to the ἀλήθεια ('truth') within painting in the opening of his proem 'immediately positions him in dialogue with, and in opposition to, Plato'; (Plato, *Rep.*, X. 595c-602c). See also n.96, p.25.
[22] Ox. Ref.: 'The method of teaching in which the master imparts no information, but asks a sequence of questions, through answering which the pupil eventually comes to the desired knowledge. Socratic irony is the post of ignorance on the part of the master, who may in fact know more about the matter than he lets on.'
[23] *Im.* 1.pr.4-5 sets up the delivery of the speeches to a young boy (παῖς) and a group of youths (the μειρᾰκῐᾰ of 1.pr.5): see p.18.

the *Imagines* has no true interlocutor despite the presence of the boy. [24] This collaborative role in the philosophical dialogue, therefore, filled by the painter-philosopher of the images the narrator engages with.[25]

In this study, we shall consider the construction of artefacts as a philosophical process, be those artefacts visual, textual, or even vocal.[26] The *Imagines* plays with each of these kinds of artefacts, not in the least through the presentation of the narrative, its invitation to consider the text as a recreation of 'speeches',[27] and the paintings which he proposes to describe, but within these very paintings as well. The main body of the *Imagines* comprises of short ekphrastic descriptions of paintings, which the preface explains were seen in a villa in Naples sometime during the author's life. Each of the ekphrases is self-contained, each discussing a painting in such vivid detail, that the way the painting is conveyed becomes more akin to a narrative scene than a descriptive observation on the painting's forms, figures, and techniques. There are few links between the ekphrases, nothing of traditional narrative form to indicate how or if the speaker and his companions are moving about the villa, no mention of indicative motions or emphasis in tone or body language. However, the overarching introduction to the *Imagines* reminds the reader to consider the descriptions as part of a journey through the villa, the introduction of each new artwork itself indicative of the narrator's

[24] Despite the fact that some language such as in the beginning of Bosphoros (1.16.6) is construed as dialogue from the boy, it does not fully exist outside the construction and direction of the narrative. In this way, the narrator could be projecting thoughts that he perceives or expects from the boy, and still falls within the plausible dialogue of the narrator figure.
[25] See §2.3 in particular, and notes 132 and 133.
[26] For this discussion, I use 'artefact' in its most literal sense of 'an object made or modified by human workmanship', OED 1.a., rather than in the archaeological sense of being a relic. I also consider it in the sense of 'a non-material human construct', 3, and so can apply to the speeches of Philostratus, as the sense of making (*facere*) through art (*arte*-) resonates with the textual usages of σοφία, interpreted as 'wisdom in art'. c.f. n.71, characterisation of σοφία as Kunstverstandnis, and Primavesi and Giuliani's translation which acknowledges the allusion to the artifice of both painters and philosophers throughout the *Imagines.*
[27] LSJ ὁμιλίας (3) 'lectures' (1.pr.3); 'these discourses of mine' μοι τουτωνὶ τῶν λόγων (1.pr.4); 'to praise the paintings' δεῖν ἐπαινεῖν τὰς γραφάς (1.pr.5). LSJ ἐπαινέω also notes that the verb carries connotations of public declamation (IV), which is in keeping with many scholarly characterisations of the narrator as a sophist (such as Webb, 2006), and the *Imagines* as a text which should be 'read against the rationalised discussions of rhetorical ecphrasis in the *Progymnasmata,* and not least contemporary discussions about *mimesis* and *phantasia*' and 'its larger Second Sophistic context' (Squire, 2009, p.340).

movement. As such, the *Imagines* can be considered as a narrative piece as well, despite its dialogue being undiluted by the traditional narrative structures which indicate time, action, and place.[28]

In considering Philostratus' literary narrative as an ongoing, self-conscious, act of creation, this study will go towards an understanding of how the artificiality of the text influences the presentation of paintings as products of human imitation and comprehension. In particular, we will consider the characterisation of the narrator as a ζωγράφος, one who writes (γράφειν) about living things (τᾶς ζωᾶς) against the traditional and diegetic definitions of ζωγράφος 'painter', through descriptions of figures which aspire towards lifelikeness. The narrator attributes motion and emotion to these painted figures, surpassing the dimensional limitations of painting through language. But most importantly, a consistent presentation of like-mindedness or *homophrosyne* with the painter within the narrative characterises an exchange between visually drawn and textually written γραφή as a discussion between equal thinkers in intricately linked mediums.

The descriptive passages of the paintings navigate the relationship between representation and realism. In praising the lifelikeness of painted figures, the skill of their depiction, the narrator often describes actions or emotions which are impossible to depict in the representative medium, the painting.[29] The narrator describes figures performing multiple tasks, constructing a narrative sequence only possible through the inclusion of a temporal dimension to the painting. The more lifelike these figures are, in that they are implied to experience the passage of time, of action and consequence, the less realistic the paintings, which show these scenes, become. Enhanced realism in the paintings, specifically due to descriptions of change over time, transgress the realms of

[28] Recent approaches taken to the *Imagines* as fiction most notably include Webb, 2006, who gives the basis that additional depth to understanding the text can be gained from considering not the veritableness of its authenticity, but rather its capacity for influencing perceptions of fiction and reality. C.f. also n.132.
[29] C.f. Shaffer, 1998, p.304: 'In the act of describing a picture, the author of an *ekphrasis* can assign thoughts, motives, and emotions that are not immediately visible to the painted characters; moreover, the author is free to add details to the picture brought in from myth, literature, and historiography'.

possibility available within the static dimensions that characterise real paintings.[30] Yet the inception of these descriptions, Philostratus writes,[31] is to 'speak in praise of the paintings',[32] so the existence of these impossible scenes of moving figures are accredited to the artform of painting. One approach is to suggest that that these descriptions convey a different kind of truth (ἀλήθεια),[33] that rather than representing realism of that which is drawn (γραφή), Philostratus' ekphrases aspire to recreate a 'culture of the word' γραφή to mean both painting and writing, through the visual subject matter of the descriptions, and the language (λόγος) with which it is conveyed.[34] Rather than focus on 'the hermeneutic, persuasive, and prescriptive force' of ekphrasis as scholars have proven and established,[35] this study explores how the hermeneutic space is created by the characterisation of the *Imagines* as a philosophical discourse between the narrator and the painter, whose artworks are often presented on the brink of speech.[36] Beyond a literary 'tribute to the power of ekphrasis',[37] the narrative is concerned also with how images offer structure and anchorage to present thinking, and trigger philosophical considerations of how the viewer's experience of time adds the dimension of movement to the idea of a synchronic image.

---

[30] Scholars from the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were quite divided on the authenticity of the descriptions: Welcker (1825), Brunn, and Wickhoff have been noted for their readings of the *Imagines* as a document of real paintings, whereas Caylus, Friedrichs, Matz, and Robert argued against such an approach. Lehmann-Hartleben's (1941) remarkable reconstruction of the villa and its rooms based on entirely on Philostratus' narrative is itself a testament to the 'demonstrative force' of Philostratus' objects, including the villa, being perceived as real artefacts, as monuments (Elsner, 1994, p.225). Even in his refutation of Lehmann's study, Bryson admits that such an approach is 'uncannily true' to the ekphrastic nature of the text, which 'seeks to fuse the words with something beyond words […] with what is real, in a web that is no longer lexical […] but alive' (Bryson, 1994, p.267; refer also to pp.256-57 in the same work for contextualisation of the Campania wall-paintings debate and comparison with the *Imagines*).

[31] For the purpose of this study, Philostratus the author *wrote* the *Imagines*, while the text itself is *narrated* by an author-persona in the Preface, and a narrator-character in the body of the work. Both of these latter figures, voicing the narrative, will be referred to *narrators* for simplicity, which will be more deeply addressed in §1.1, and §2.1.1.

[32] Text and translations of the *Imagines* in this study are drawn from Fairbanks' 1931 translation, supplemented with additional readings from the Greek-English lexicon. *Imag.* 1.pr.5.

[33] C.f. n.21 and n.71.

[34] Elsner, 2000, p.260.

[35] Shaffer, 1998, p.304.

[36] *Imag.* 1.12.1 'shouting' (παραβοῶσι); 2.1.3 'makes us listen' (παρέχει ἀκούειν); 2.6.5 'perhaps if we listen attentively, it will speak in Greek' (κἂν παρακοῦσαι βουληθῶμεν, τάχα ἐλληνιεῖ); see also discussion of speaking statues in the discussion of Dodona (2.34.3) and Memnon (1.7.3) in 3.2, and for apostrophe see §2.1. for the analysis of Hunters 1.28.

[37] Webb, 2006, p.119.

1.1. Philosophising through Fiction

By approaching the text as a philosophical one, and moreover, articulating our discoveries,[38] the reader fulfils the narrator's expectation that we will learn how to explain (ἑρμηνεύω), and take interest (ἐπιμελές) in, the qualities we perceive therein. Bates' recent paper skilfully recognises that Philostratus does not focus on tragedy itself, but rather the philosophical debates surrounding it.[39] Where this study differs from recent works is the focus on the presentation of the narrator's interactions with the painter's craft and ideas, and how this characterises the *Imagines* as a mimetic philosophical attempt to engage dialectically with visual material artefacts, be those paintings or texts. The narrator characterises his potential interlocutors themselves as imitators, and therefore artists: those who are wanting to prove (βασανίζοντι) the origin of imitation laid down by the narrator are thus simultaneously described as needing only to 'rub upon the touch-stone' to find out.[40] Rather than being a dialectic between several characters placed in 'the mimetic drama of characterised exchange', the narrator of the *Imagines* is by himself 'a vehicle of philosophical thought',[41] but invites dialogue by engaging with the approaches of other figures, perceiving their skills (τέχνη) as a form of philosophical refinement of interpretation. In addition to characterising the painter of the paintings as a philosopher,[42] whose like-mindedness with the narrator consolidates the descriptive observations, Philostratus makes philosophers into painters.

Critics have compared Philostratus' manipulation of 'dense figurative language' and 'verbal expression as though it were almost solid, painterly, and plastic', thus comparing Philostratus' use of

[38] LSJ ἑρμηνεύω II, 2, 3 III – Fairbanks gives the meaning 'interpret'; however, this relates to more closely to the translation of foreign tongues rather than philosophical interpretation. Choosing to present the Greek as 'interpret' may well reflect the act of translation undertaken, just as my use of 'articulate' puts into words the act of literary expression. C.f. n.61.
[39] Bates, 2021, pp.141-42: 'Philostratus does not so much "visualise the tragic" here as *visualise philosophy visualising the tragic*" [original emphasis].
[40] *Imag*. 1.pr.1; LSJ βασανίζω A.
[41] Laird, 2003, p.122; p.121. C.f. Philostr. *Heroicus* and *VS.*
[42] See §2.1: The painter 'philosophizes' (φιλοσοφεῖν) – not only loving his craft and 'honoring' (ἐπιμέλεια) it as Aesop does, through creation; he also provokes thought on the nature of philosophy as imitative. See n.109.

language with the artist's creative reproductions.[43] Such language elicits the image of pressing materials together, the touchstone being that 'on which pure gold leaves a yellow streak'.[44] In the textual form of the *Imagines,* Philostratus is indeed 'testing' imitation, pressing together the visual and verbal. This experiment results in a γραφή created by physical and mental process not dissimilar to the technique of painters, who make marks to expand and test their knowledge in the pursuit of their questions. Therefore, the following statements about the inherent nature of *mimēsis* and reproductive crafts such as ekphrasis and painting (τῆς τέχνης) become apparent:

> … βασανίζοντι δὲ τὴν γένεσιν τῆς τέχνης μίμησις μὲν εὕρημα πρεσβύτατον καὶ ξυγγενέστατον τῇ φύσει
>
> … but for one who is merely seeking the origin of the art, imitation is an invention most ancient and most akin by nature[45]
>
> Philostratus, *Imagines*, 1.pr.1

Philostratus has here in the lexical field incorporating γένεσιν, πρέσβυς, συγγένεια and φύσις created an embedded characterisation of imitation, by associating it with progeniture. Imitation is associated with genesis, bringing together linear imitation and the cyclical nature of life. In contemplating painting and *mimēsis*, the narrator brings forward epistemological and ontological questions on the nature and posterity of humankind.[46] In searching for the origin of painting, these querents themselves become γραφικός, capable of line-making. Such a feat is easy – after all, procreation is inherent to the nature of humankind, and painting is but another form of creation. In

[43] Shaffer, 1998, p.303; McCombie also notes that 'the art critic is necessarily an orator' (2002, p.152), while Newby also perceptibly identifies the multiple attitudes towards the relationship between word and image in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius;* the 'idea that the only fitting response to visual beauty is an articulation of it' is challenged by an invitation to 're-evaluate the power of the silent image' (2002, p.128). This mediation of rivalry between word and image characterises the philosophical foundation of the *Imagines.*
[44] LSJ A; Thgn.417.
[45] Translation adapted 'to nature' changed to reflect LSJ φύσει, 'by nature, in character'. Though Fairbanks' translation invites the interpretation that imitation is a recreation of nature, this adaptation better conveys the semantic implication of innateness, considering also he gives φύσει as 'by nature' in 1.16.1 (see p.48). See also pp.24-25.
[46] Art and imitation exist in the earliest records of human existence and can be seen in the oldest surviving prehistoric relics of human artwork, such as the Altamira and Sulawesi cave paintings; for Philostratus however, Plato's cave may have been more relevant to the conceptualisation of the imaginary museum: c.f. Schoess, 2022.

the search for an understanding of artefacts, graphic or literary, Philostratus seems to remind us not to forget the importance of their intentional creation.

The materiality of philosophical literature welcomes effects directly comparable to properties of mythological images in Roman wall paintings, such as are described throughout the *Imagines*.[47] A singular depiction, or text, exists within a web of meaning and variations, all of which may inform that individual response on the subject. Newby most eloquently states the artistic, cultural, and ideological possibilities of viewing wall-paintings, in that they 'can be seen as artistic objects, transportive agents and ideological messengers' in their capacity to create parallel worlds of mythological subject matter.[48] Philostratus, rather than create a philosophical 'shutting off the source of knowledge' with impenetrable and imperceptible walls,[49] invites us to pay attention to the decoration of the liminal through wall-paintings, offering ways to pass through the boundaries of our own perceptions by engaging with that of others. As such, paintings are presented as philosophical interpretations which allow us to reach past previously uncrossable limitations, and these conductive painters as philosophers worth studying under.[50]

Analysing examples best shows the different approaches to the layered philosophy of the *Imagines*: the parameters of authorship and authenticity will be explored in the ekphrases describing Aesop (1.3) by closely reading these passages in conversation with the techniques and language used in the 'author's' preface. The position of author within the text will be further developed by examining the diegetic presentation of Daedalus (1.16) and intertextual shroud surrounding and displacing Penelope (2.28). These will further illustrate my methodology to focus on descriptions which expand on the author's presentation of the creation of artefacts. The narrator of the *Imagines* attributes motion, action, consequences, and characterisations to the painted figures, all of which

[47] Squire notes, however, that Philostratus' paintings are 'free-standing panel paintings, or *pinakes* (*Im.* I.praef.4), not the sorts of mural frescoes that survive from Campania' (2009, p.341).
[48] Newby, 2016, p.137.
[49] Georgiadou and Larmour in Laird, 2003, p.120.
[50] Cf. §2.1. for Philostratus' relationship with 'Aristodemus of Caria', pp.31-34.

results in an anthropomorphism through the temporal dimension of the narrative. The ekphrasis chosen to further show the creation of the artefact in the *Imagines* is Hippolytus (2.4), where this study will examine how anthropomorphism is used to present lamentation. This specific literary device creates a discourse of recognition, of self and other, and the ever-present subjectivity in presentations of philosophical arguments.

Discussions on the emotional experience of viewing should necessarily be based on a thorough understanding of how the narrator presents and attempts to nurture an appreciation for visual and verbal artefacts and products of philosophy. Worth comprehensively interrogates Aristotle's identification of emotional dilemma when faced with beautiful representations of painful subjects,[51] suggesting also that emotions evoked by fictions are not 'the same kind, class, or intensity of emotion that real events provoke'.[52] In many ways, the technical beauty of a painful subject encapsulates a visual grieving and mourning experience, inherent to the highly visual culture in which the *Imagines* can be placed.[53] This will be addressed and challenged in §3.1, the portion of this essay analysing the ekphrasis of Cassandra 2.10, and concluded as we consider the significance of contemporary historical artefacts, specifically funerary monuments, in the context of Philostratus' Hippolytus 2.4 description. We will expand upon Worth's approach, considering the narrator's use of fictional and depicted space in the *Imagines* to present beauty and tragedy in subjective interpretations, which are defined by commemoration and lamentation. As this study will show, the narrator of the *Imagines* does not shy away from subjectivity, rather, he recognises and invites criticism of himself as a reader. The narrator's subjectivity is not presented as a flaw. In fact, it is

[51] Aristotle. *Poetics.* 1448b 11-12 in Worth, S. 2000, p.333.
[52] For Worth, this distinction between emotions triggered by mimesis and those by reality are determined by categories of thought which can be identified as synchronic and continuous. Worth, 2000, pp.333-334, defines these as 'occurrent' and 'dispositional' beliefs, however, for the purpose of this study, I have adapted the vocabulary to limit confusion. Occurrence is defined as a sort of 'mental act that happens at a particular point of time', i.e., incidental, or synchronous; and dispositional, to describe a presumed belief which arises on the bases of continuous ongoing conditions.
[53] See Bakke, 2022.

used to create passages of both immersion and self-awareness, and it is only through the scope of these extremes that the theme of interpretation becomes apparent.[54]

1.2. The *mise-en-abyme*

This mimetic process of interpretation is noted by McCombie as a 'translation of images into words, a textualization of viewing' which 'produces from the painting another artefact'.[55] This new textual artefact, the *Imagines,* provides a space which can capture and continue the dialectical presentation of viewing.[56] Bryson goes so far as to call the *Imagines* 'one of the great ruins of antiquity', insofar as the text allows us an impression of classical painting, and an 'imaginary museum' to peruse. [57] When the narrator introduces the descriptions of *Imagines*, he presents it thus:[58]

> ὁ λόγος […] εἴδη ζωγραφίας <u>ἀπαγγέλλομεν</u> ὁμιλίας αὐτὰ τοῖς νέοις ξυντιθέντες, ἀφ᾽ ὧν <u>ἑρμηνεύσουσί</u> τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου <u>ἐπιμελήσονται</u>.[59]
>
> The present discussion, […] we propose to describe examples of paintings in the form of addresses which we have composed for[60] the young, that by this means they may learn to <u>put into words</u>* and <u>to appreciate</u> what is esteemed in them.
>
> Philostratus, *Imag.* 1.pr.3
>
> *translation adapted[61]

The narrative of the introduction (ὁ λόγος) indicates that it will expand itself beyond its textual form to incorporate descriptive speeches, which reflexively draws attention to the verbal and

[54] Bates, 2021, citing Thein, 2002, identifies the assent and withholding of assent to what the narrator sees as the characterising factor of Philostratus as a Stoic philosopher engaging with the theory of *catalepsis,* p.141.
[55] McCombie, 2002, p.152.
[56] Analysis of the *mise-en-abyme* is developed in the example of Daedalus in §2.1, especially on p.43.
[57] Bryson, 1994, p.255.
[58] The voice of the *Imagines* will be referred to throughout as the narrator, the literary and linguistic choices in the text are ascribed to the Author Philostratus. In this study I will discuss how the narrator is characterised, and address distinction between the narrator of the preface and the narrator of the *Imagines* in Section 1.1., where I will delve into the matter of author-persona, authenticity, and authority more fully. For the separation of author and narrator of the *Imagines*, see Webb (2006).
[59] From LSJ μέλω (A) 'to be an object of care or be an object of thought'.
[60] τοῖς νέοις is in the dative, as such can be read as 'to' or 'for'.
[61] The Greek does not specify whether the 'paintings' or the 'addresses' are the 'them' the narrator hopes the young will interpret and appreciate; Fairbanks' supplementation of 'paintings' in this last line has therefore been removed to reflect this ambiguity and further consolidate the narrator's characterisation of painting and addresses as communing and comparative mediums of philosophy. See also n.38, pp.11-12, and n.71.

philosophical dimension of λόγος as speech and debate.[62] Indeed, the narrator refers to his text as 'these discourses' (τῶν λόγων, 1.pr.4), but when reporting the speech given at the time of the addresses (ὁμιλίας, 1.pr.3), he captures the dialogue of his declaration to make the paintings subject of 'declamatory demonstration' (ἐπίδειξιν αὐτὰ ποιησόμεθα, 1.pr.5), which characterises the narrator as an sophist.[63] By noting the implicit repetition of dialogue in the narrator's introduction, we note the separation of the voice of the author into the previous distinctions; the narrator specifically dons a new tone and persona, that of his previous self, revisiting thoughts from a past time. McCombie also notes this change, that this is where the 'distinction between the finished publication and the initial speeches […] blurs' and the dramatized extemporaneous speeches 'usurp the text'.[64] This character-narrator indicates his intention to speak demonstratively (ἐπίδειξιν), separating his intentions from that of the author-narrator in writing the *Imagines*, which is to present the discussion (ὁ λόγος). It just so happens that the discussion is presented in the form of embedded narrative.[65]

By the limitations of the literary dimension, the realism of the painting is stretched by the language used to convey the similarities between word and image. There exists a persuasive case that the *Imagines* is an epideictic showcase of the author's rhetorical ability and erudition,[66] which further gives explanation for the stylistic choices made in the narrative, but this approach also falls prey to dichotomising word and image. Grethlein has most recently noted that we should not fall into 'the Philostratus trap', mistaking a 'claim to transparency with transparency itself'.[67] Focussing

---

[62] LSJ λόγος (V) 'continuous statement, narrative (whether fact or fiction), oration' as 'instruction'; λόγος (IV), speech and debate.
[63] C.f. Webb, 2006 for the characterisation of 'Philostratus' as Sophist; Newby draws upon *Lives of the sophists,* pointing out similarities in 'a man attended by a group of youths, eager to hear him speak' (2009, p.323).
[64] McCombie, 2002, p.152.
[65] For the attribution of works to Philostratus, see (Elsner, 2009, A Protean Corpus, p.4), and a comprehensive attempt at creating a timeline of possible activity, see (Bowie, 2009, Philostratus: the life of a sophist, pp.19-32) in the same volume: Bowie, E., and Elsner, J. (eds.) 2009. *Philostratus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cf. Philostr. *Heroicus.* C.f. n.1, n.27, and analysis in §2.1.
[66] See n.63 above. C.f. p.42, n.153.
[67] Grethlein, J. 2023. In the Philostratus trap: An enactive and embodied perspective on the Imagines and their enargeia. *The Journal of Hellenic studies,* pp.1-18; p.16.

on the textuality of the frame runs the risk of overshadowing the importance of the visual experience Philostratus so vividly recreates. With the nested narratives and characterisation of his narrator character in diegetic co-existence with the paintings, the narrative of the *Imagines* should be taken as a documented dialectic, where the narrator debates with the reticent boys in his entourage, the tacit painter-philosopher, and even the figures in the depictions. We are experiencing a didactic practise, as Bakke (2022), Newby (2016), and Webb (2006) make clear, but we witness a 'mimetic drama' of single sided dialogue, as opposed to 'characterised exchange' such as in *Heroicus* or the *Symposium* as identified by Laird.[68] As narrator shows preference for the 'ardent listener and eager to learn' young son of his host (εἰς ἔτος δέκατον, ἤδη φιλήκοος καὶ χαίρων τῷ μανθάνειν), who 'was watching me as I came upon [each painting]' (ὃς ἐπεφύλαττέ με ἐπιόντα αὐτὰς, *Imag.* 1.pr.5), rather than those 'annoying young men' who came to and fro the house of his host requesting teaching from the narrator (παρεῖχεν ὄχλον τὰ μειράκια φοιτῶντα ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ξένου, *Imag.* 1.pr.4), we might consider that imitation of technique is here implied to be better than asking for instruction.[69] The effect of tantalising the reader and causing frustration through a hierarchy of visuality ultimately encourages the students removed from the source to seek out these material artefacts in person.

It is through the author's attempts to present an argument (λόγος) that the material nature of the text becomes apparent. This textual artefact is paralleled by the painted material artefact within it and is akin to the part-human Fables in its own mimetic representation of Philostratus' speaking human form.[70] In order to account for the *Imagines* as a whole text, form and context, this study attempts to unravel some of the narrative's embedded acknowledgements of artificiality. Understanding literature and paintings as the textual and pictorial products of the same creative

[68] Laird, 2003, p.122.
[69] McCombie is not alone in identifying that 'the young men are a clear surrogate for Philostratus' reader', as Philostratus creates a 'mimetic hierarchy' which prevents the reader from viewing the painting (2002, pp.152-53); Webb, for example, identifies the young men as 'auditeurs intra-diégétiques' (intra-diegetic listeners, 2010, §4). See also n.103 and n.133 below.
[70] See §2.1.2 below.

process of line-making (γράφειν) provides the stage on which Philostratus performs for his audience how to engage with word and image as equals contributors to knowledge (φορὰ γὰρ ἴση ἀμφοῖν ἐς).[71] The *Imagines* is a discursive text, a discussion not on painters (ὁ λόγος δὲ οὐ περὶ ζωγράφων), but the responses to their works (ἀλλ᾽ εἴδη ζωγραφίας ἀπαγγέλλομεν, 1.pr.3) through an adjacent graphic medium of text.[72]

1.3. Contrast and collaboration: depictions of word and image

> Ἔγνως, ὦ παῖ, ταῦτα Ὁμήρου ὄντα ἢ οὐ πώποτε ἔγνωκας δηλαδὴ θαῦμα ἡγούμενος,[73] ὅπως δήποτε ἔζη τὸ πῦρ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι; συμβάλωμεν οὖν ὅ τι νοεῖ, σὺ δὲ ἀπόβλεψον αὐτῶν, ὅσον ἐκεῖνα ἰδεῖν,[74] ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἡ γραφή.
>
> Have you noticed, my boy, that the painting here is based on Homer, or have you failed to do so because you are lost in wonder as to how in the world the fire could live in the midst of the water? Well then, let us try to get at the meaning of it. Turn your eyes away from the painting itself so as to look only[75] at the events on which it is based.
>
> Philostratus*,* *Imagines*, 1.1.1

The intangibility and invisibility of Philostratus' paintings when conveyed through the medium of text draws attention by its absence to the tangible and visible word. The textual praise of visual material artefact deepens an appreciation for the various kinds of visuality. The presence of artefacts is the reason for which the text – and speeches – were made,[76] and so perception, impression, and communication of one visual γραφή is the foundation for the discourse of the *Imagines,* a literary

[71] *Imag.* 1.pr.1. ἀμφοῖν suggests merely 'both': whereas Fairbanks (1931) gives 'poets and painters'; Schönberger and Malinka (1968) and Baumann (2011) provide 'beide Künste' (both artforms); Primavesi and Giuliani (2012) suggest '*aletheia* und *sophia* als Vermögen der Malerei' (truth and wisdom as capabilities of painting) [original emphasis, my translation] (2012, p.51, n.86). For this argument, 'word and image' encompasses the products of γράφειν we tangibly engage with. As the study will show, γράφειν is a process of philosophical interpretation, which inherently deals with both truth (ἀλήθεια) and wisdom (σοφία).
[72] Note LSJ ἀπαγγέλλω provides (1): report 'in answer'; (2) report 'of a speaker or writer'; (3) 'recite, declaim'; and (II), 'explain, interpret', see also p.7 above.
[73] LSJ ἡγέομαι (A): 'go before, lead the way'.
[74] LSJ οἶδα, c.f. εἶδον.
[75] LSJ ἀποβλέπω (4): to 'look upon with love, wonder or admiration'.
[76] See n.23, p.8.

visual γραφή. Even further, the physical dimensions and appearances of these painted artefacts give anchorage to the fleeting existence of the spoken word, as the space they occupy contextualises the relativity of the narrator's insistence to look elsewhere (ἀπόβλεψον) in order to discuss the meaning (συμβάλωμεν οὖν ὅ τι νοεῖ).[77] This playful co-existence and reciprocal enrichment is evident in the ancient world, as Squire proves of sculpture and text, eloquently stating that rather than passively 'captioning' and 'illustrating' one another, words and images enlarge each another's 'field of reference, leading viewers and readers through a plurality of different interpretative possibilities'.[78] The narrative is guided not only by the composition of the paintings, but also the architectural context and premise of the narrative, the 'four, maybe five storeys' (τεττάρων οἶμαι ἢ καὶ πέντε ὀροφῶν, 1.pr.4) of the Neapolitan villa.[79] This interconnectivity with the material culture of paintings means that the visuality of Philostratus' *Imagines* does not place painting 'in competition with the Philostratean ecphrastic text',[80] though it may appear as such when the painted subjects of the description defy the visual medium they are verbally presented in.

This veiled symbiosis of word and image is exemplified by this first description. The battle between Hephaestus and Scamander is introduced in abstract, alluding to an awe-striking and paradoxical scene in which fire lives in water (ἔζη τὸ πῦρ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, 1.1.1). One might compare the impossibility of fire within water with the impossibility of perceiving painting through text. But these antagonistic elements are described with intimate familiarity, defying impossibility. 'Here fire is

[77] The sense of combination and accumulation with συμβάλλω (LSJ A) also applies to thoughts and perceptions, which may be put together to 'contribute' to a discussion (A.10), hence 'discussion'.
[78] Squire, M., 2009. *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.297.
[79] Squire, among others, identifies the subverted vivid authentication of Philostratus' setting with this architectural uncertainty (2009, p.342). See again at n.253.
[80] Elsner, 2007, p.310. For Elsner, the text's capacity to re-dramatize synchronic still-life paintings of dramatic narrative brings the reader closer to the diachronic medium of tragedy than painting can. Though Elsner eloquently identifies the diachronic (i.e. temporal) flow of the textual narrative, the question I ask is not whether the *Imagines* achieves verisimilitude to other mediums, but rather how the text explores the process of creation, frequently aligned with the process of philosophizing, in some degree touched upon by Elsner in 2000, p.260 (but oddly not carried into the discussion of tragedic subjects). See §2.1.2.

flooding with full stream[81] against the plain' (πῦρ δὲ τοῦτο πολὺ μὲν πλημμυρεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πεδίου, 1.1.2). In this passage, water 'lives' in fire, as the dynamic description relies on a contemporaneous impression of watery movements to be understood. This concurrency of fire and water does well to remind us how paintings are presented in defiance of physical limitation throughout the *Imagines*; though impossible to recreate an image with words tangibly in the real world, the power of ekphrasis to recreate the experience of viewing a painting is the core technique of our narrator.[82] Rather than considering ekphrasis to be a competition between word and image, we should recognise that combining (συμβάλλω) two kinds of γραφή allow us to experience paradoxical representations, which can be both in motion and still, both continually changing and at once immutable, just as painted fire might exist in water, and text can juxtapose elements to convey an enriched meaning about internal tensions.

Newby considers silence as the alternative to articulating appreciation of the visual, identifying that the experience of 'mute wonder' (θαῦμα) 'can lead one towards better understanding or knowledge of the phenomenon' which provokes it.[83] The narrator recognises this in his own audience, asking if in their experience of the painting, wonder has come first (θαῦμα ἡγούμενος, 1.1.1), but implying that what must come after, as he shows, is the interpretation and comment on (ἑρμηνεύειν) the types of depictions from life (εἴδη ζωγραφίας, 1.pr.3). Though mute wonder may be the striking first sign of visual appreciation, we cannot enter into dialogue with an awestruck viewer. As we have begun to explain, types of depiction (γραφή) discussed in this text are not limited to the iconographic; we should also consider text a form of visual depiction, made up of lines. Paintings, like text, rely not on sound, but shape to convey meaning; likewise, the word is

[81] Adapted translation: Fairbanks favours the general term 'mightily' to account for πολύς. It can be used to describe 'heavy' rain (LSJ πολύ), and moreover expresses a metaphorical gushing as though from a river (LSJ πολύς 2c). Accompanied by and alliterating plosively with πλημμυρεῖ, the language evokes imagery of forceful bodies of water or rainfall to describe the movement of fire.

[82] Miles, G. 2018, p.90.

[83] Newby, 2002, p.129. See also MacDonald, 2011, *Thauma* and Aesthetic Education in Philostratus' *Imagines*, for a characterisation of θαῦμα and mental paralysis in the face of mimesis as a threat (iv), in a similar vein to arguments encompassed in Bates' 2021 paper and touched upon in Elsner 1996.

considered a series of lines in the narrative of the text through the vocabulary of γραφή. In this sense, the mute wonder of the viewer is preserved in the silent representation of the textual artefact. However, to develop our understanding further, we must engage as the narrator does in dialogue, to explain why aspects of the artefact we might find notable (τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3) have rendered us speechless. As Grethlein lucidly identifies the falsity of immersion achieved by Philostratus' 'rhetorical brilliance', so too this study considers the interpretative articulation of viewing a 'mediation on […] ekphrastic practise',[84] and more specifically, on the praiseworthy development of hermeneutic skills by those practising it.

Experiencing art is presented as inherently discursive, where sight and knowledge are mediated by epistemological uncertainties, emphasised by the narrator's challenges of Ἔγνως, ὦ παῖ […] πώποτε ἔγνωκας (1.1.1).[85] Subjects mythological or historical support philosophical debate, by scaffolding the argument, grounding concepts within or against a representative εἰκών.[86] The medium of painting can present contradictory elements such as flames amongst waves, just as the medium of text Philostratus uses may juxtapose language to create new imagery. Even as fire can live implausibly in an environment of water (ἔζη τὸ πῦρ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, 1.1.1), the lived experience of paintings, visual material artefacts, exists in a narrative textual space. The narrator himself likewise belongs in two incompatible frames: the present of the text publication and the past of the speeches. As Webb notes, the text is not only a reflection of the nature of fictional immersion, but an experience which '[brings to life the immersion of the reader]',[87] thus documenting a

[84] Grethlein, 2023, p.1.
[85] Repetitions of γιγνώσκω.
[86] Bates, for example, reads a criticism of Stoicism in 2.23 (2021), whereas Thein argues Stoic *phantasia* accounts for an ekphrastic bridging between nature and the imitation (2002, p.136); Elsner considers a critique of erotic naturalism in Narcissus 1.23 (1996), Squire considers the tendency of critical history surrounding the structure *Imagines* towards logocentrism (2009, p.354), to name a few. Closest to the approach of this study is Shaffer, 1998, p.307, who notes that Philostratus aligns 'the formal properties of each painting' with 'the moral or philosophical intention of the artist', but does not pursue the characterisation of painting as a philosophical process, the graphic artefact as a catalyst for discourse, nor that the narrator's recognition of the artist is repeatedly characterised as an attempt to engage in philosophical dialogue.
[87] "[…] non seulement pour réfléchir sur la nature de l'immersion fictionnelle mais aussi pour faire vivre cette immersion au lecteur": Webb, 2010, §26.

confrontation of the continuous being (the viewer) and the synchronic, still image. This temporal juxtaposition results in text and image influencing each other in the space of the narrative, adding the experience of viewing to the singular moment in a depiction.

1.4. Personal temporalities

While viewing a painting, we will only ever see the artificial synchronic 'duration' of an image, but our knowledge and recognition of figures and actions will supplement our understanding of what is shown, as the narrator often insists we should do.[88] A diachronic narrative of the viewing experience allows the narrator to describe the images in motion, as if to keep up with the passage of time which the reader will dedicate to viewing the γραφή. This process, by nature, challenges the synchronicity of a finished painting, instead infusing it with the diachronic flow of a narrative. A lateral effect of this is the vividness of the narrator's descriptions, creating a sense of motion and *energeia* in the ekphrastic text. Thus, Philostratus characterises the engagement with paintings in his text as dialectic, by re-textualising the constituents of the image, in order to bring them to the attention of his diegetic characters (ὁ παῖς and τὰ μειράκια)[89] and extradiegetic readers. We are given opportunity to experience the images, if not to directly view them in order to interact with the simultaneous forms of γραφή discursively to seek ἀλήθεια of interpretation within, or despite, those viewing experiences.

The *Imagines* encompasses multifaceted discussions of the process of producing γραφή as a form of philosophy. In order to recognise how Philostratus presents these, we first look at how the narrative 'self' of the author is characterised. Each description of the *Imagines* is a facsimile of the

[88] For example, the narrator directs us to look away (ἀποβλέπω) in order to see (ὅσον ἐκεῖνα ἰδεῖν) that which the painting is from (ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἡ γραφή 1.1.1) to initiate an introspective search into memory, and therefore, the past. The narrator's use of the phrases 'if you are not ignorant' (εἰ μὴ ἀγνοεῖς, 1.14.1), 'I suppose you know that passage of the Illiad' (οἶσθά που τῆς Ἰλιάδος τὴν γνώμην, 1.1.1); 'you have come across, I think, in Homer' (ἐντετύχηκας οἶμαι παρ᾽ Ὁμήρῳ, 1.8.1); 'possibly you have heard that from your nurse' (τάχα που καὶ τίτθης διακήκοας, 1.15.1), and assumption of what the audience ought to know (οἶσθα γάρ που τὸ […] λεγόμενον, 1.6.6), contribute to an impression of expected cultural education of the diegetic boy listener, also known as *paideia.* See Newby 2016 and von Möllendorff 2014 for more on *paideia* in Roman literary and visual.

[89] Referred to as 'the boy' and 'the young men', *Imag.* 1.pr.5. C.f. n.68.

viewing as it occurred, not only enhancing the vividness of the ekphrastic description, but the impression that the text shows the narrator's first impressions of each painting.[90] The challenge to the impression of extemporaneity has been noted independently by other critics as being tied to the narrator's use of the term 'depiction' (γέγραπται), the act of creating a γραφή. Kostopoulou notes that 'depiction' allows the narrator to describe painting and writing simultaneously, showing that ekphrasis is both a 'description of a painting *and* [..] a story about the [contents of the] painting' and does so through 'continually intertwining stillness and movement'.[91] By drawing attention to this similarity between painting and writing the narrator invites his viewer-readers to think on him and his artefact of the text in the same way that he himself engages with the artistic representations of his diegesis. By using the term 'depiction', the narrator paints himself into the picture, ready for our philosophical critique and contemplation.

1.5. Time in the narrative

> […] δι᾽ ἣν καὶ λόγου ἡ τέχνη ἅπτεται. καὶ βουλομένῳ μὲν σοφίζεσθαι θεῶν τὸ εὕρημα διά τε τὰ ἐν γῇ εἴδη, ὁπόσα τοὺς λειμῶνας αἱ Ὧραι γράφουσι, διά τε τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ φαινόμενα, βασανίζοντι δὲ τὴν γένεσιν τῆς τέχνης μίμησις μὲν εὕρημα πρεσβύτατον καὶ ξυγγενέστατον τῇ φύσει· εὗρον δὲ αὐτὴν σοφοὶ ἄνδρες τὸ μὲν ζωγραφίαν, τὸ δὲ πλαστικὴν φήσαντες.
>
> […] whereby art partakes of reason.[92] For one who wishes to become wise,* the invention* belongs to the gods – witness on earth all the designs with which the Seasons paint the meadows, and the manifestations in the heavens, but for one who is merely seeking the origin of the art, imitation is an invention most ancient and akin by nature;* and wise men invented it, calling it now painting, now plastic art.
>
> Philostratus, *Imagines*, 1.pr.1

[90] It is hinted in the proem that these are not the first thoughts the narrator had on the topic of the paintings, as it had 'already occurred to me to talk on the subject' before he was asked to deliver speeches (1.pr.3).
[91] Kostopoulou, 2009, p.90.
[92] λόγου ἅπτεται given as 'partakes of reason'; this study suggests reading this as 'partakes in discussion' as a less archaic and more thematically coherent and interesting alternative.

*translation adapted[93] [94] [95]

The narrator, in explaining that the mimetic technique of painting is εὕρημα πρεσβύτατον, 'an invention of elders', alludes to the narrative theme which characterises the *Imagines:* pedagogy. Suggesting thus that learning is a process of imitation, and that our attempts to philosophise are what allows us to recognise the inherent importance (πρεσβύτατον)[96] of imitation, the narrator's explanation encompasses that painting, and the appreciation thereof can be passed through the generations, and also is the way in which contemporaries appreciate the ancients.[97] The last of the narrator's parallel phrasing describes mortal imitation as kindred by, and also to, nature, ξυγγενέστατον τῇ φύσει**.** This is understood to metaphorically refer to kinship and innateness on account of birth, to the effect of describing the antiquated nature of imitation being obvious, and at once expressing that imitation is quite literally, a close approximation of nature. There is an additional irony to this phrasing, as the imitative act of painting by necessity reflects the painter's time, making imitation a contemporary, rather than ancient act. The imitative image captures the present experience of an older artefact, and so is forever separated from its subject by time.

Time, in this introduction, is mentioned in the form of divine personification. The Horai (αἱ Ὧραι) are key to critically understanding the themes of viewership and self-reflexivity Philostratus develops in his text. It is through these goddesses, the divine collection of beings representing the Seasons, as portions of time, that the narrator introduces the skill of γράφειν with the meanings and

---

[93] 'a clever theory' has been exchanged for 'to become wise' to reflect σοφίζεσθαι as a verb. LSJ σοφίζεσθαι is given as 'be cunning', or 'play the sophist'. This has been adapted to maintain the original flow and to link this line to this study's analysis of the *Imagines* as a demonstration of philosophical engagement with σοφία (see pp.4-7).

[94] 'of painting' removed from translation, as this is a supplementation to the original Greek grammar.

[95] See n.45, p.13.

[96] LSJ πρεσβύτατος 'first in importance, 'first-born'; πρέσβυς (2) 'taking precedence', (A) old man, elder, hence, an importance as inherent as life itself; ancestry and progeniture being a form of imitation and replication. This description of imitation as innate and pre-eminently important with inferred superiority due to age challenges the precedence of reality and life, thus situating Philostratus' work in dialogue with and against Plato's conception of art imitating life; ' "Being inferior and rubbing shoulders with the inferior, imitation produces the inferior." ' (*Rep.* X. 603b-c, trans. Emlyn-Jones and Preddy, 2013), as discussed and challenged by Schoess (2022, pp.211-212, see also n.20, p.6) and Omogunwa (2018, pp.1-7). See also page 18 of this study.

[97] Much has been said about Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, not least that a biographical recapitulation serves as an appreciative documentation of ancient achievements.

metafictional applications of ‘paint’ and ‘write’. The Horai, understood as aspects of time,[98] ‘paint the meadows’ (τοὺς λειμῶνας αἱ Ὧραι γράφουσι, 1.pr.1),[99] consolidating the interpretation that the passage of time alters the appearance of natural bodies, not only as the colours change in the seasons, but also how visual change can be witnessed as light casts different shadows throughout the day. In naming the Horai, the narrator introduces an element of repetition, of cyclical change in the environment, but also an element of growth. The ‘shapes’ (εἴδη) with which the Horai ‘paint’ also encompass the natural cycles of life and death which take place on account of the Seasons, and are visible through the appearance, change, and disappearance of forms over time. This cyclical temporal change in forms is paralleled by the presentation of the celestial manifestations (οὐρανῷ φαινόμενα). It is thus suggested by the upwards grandeur in the phrase ἐν οὐρανῷ φαινόμενα, that the εἴδη the Horai wield and provide are both recognisable within and superior to the mortal realm. The narrator thus establishes two planes, an upper and a middle, wherein εἴδη appear, wherein things can be seen, emulating the multiple layers of the narrative; the world of the painted figures, within a painting, observed by the diegetic narrative characters, presented in the text of the *Imagines.*

Further, as both Thein and Elsner separately observe, Philostratus’ *Imagines* forms a ring-composition through the mention of the Horai, both in the proem and in the immersive final ekphrasis 2.23.[100] The Horai, contextualised in the narrative as divine counterparts to mortal artists, are responsible for the changing appearances of the Earth, while human imitators strive merely to recreate the work of the Horai. Any human writer, painter - or, to mimic the Greek, “graphist” may be applicable to both - imitates the Horai in the way that their craft takes hours to produce a new image or text through laborious line-making, as well as striving to show a visible change through their work. Whether it is the production of coloured figures, as the narrator of the *Imagines* sets out

[98] LSJ ὥρα (II).
[99] C.f. the wilting meadows mourning Hippolytus (§3.2.1), n.368 and n.373.
[100] Elsner, 2000, pp.256-57; Thein, 2002, p.137. C.f. n.311.

to praise, or the completion of a written work designed to inspire images in the mind, the creative process falls under the tutelage of the Horai. It is fitting that Philostratus' work begins and ends with acknowledgement of their part, representing the hours taken to write and then read the *Imagines*, and the seasons which grant wisdom by allowing us to recognise the natural artistry of change and time. As Thein puts, the narrator does not elaborate on how the 'singular details' relate to their framework, rather creating 'a space and time of possible events, of human perceptions and divine interventions'.[101]

The role of the Horai as divine representations of the seasons and increments of time is to the extent of their artwork inextricable. In sharp contrast to this eternal, ephemeral, and divine version of γράφειν, the εἴδη which are described in this written collection are supposedly static paintings, where the temporal dimension of a narrative is notably absent when compared to a recitation or a drama.[102] This dimension is provided by the oration of the narrator, as his written (and spoken words) forge a new path of time to spend experiencing an εἴδη. Subsequently, the passing of time within the observed results of γράφειν imbues the artworks the narrator describes with a sense of vivacity, and impression not of a frozen moment, but a re-liveable collection of stories, actions, and consequences, all encapsulated within the description of each individual image. These are the miniature cycles which imitate the natural cycles illustrated by the Horai, a connection which deepens a critical understanding of the narrator's commentary through semantic choice in the proem.

When the narrative is internalised, the reader becomes privy to the *Imagines* as an immersive documentation of rhetorical skill, becoming aligned with both the narrator, the sophist, and the young audience, the narrative's assumed diegetic listeners. Recognising the reader's implication in the roles of teacher and pupil in the *Imagines* further mirrors the experience of the

[101] Thein, 2002, p.137.
[102] The narrator of the *Imagines* overtly recognises this in his comparison between painted and dramatic tragedies in Cassandra 2.10.

narrator's young audience; they must learn to discern *how* the painters have recreated life so vividly, and thus become aware of when an imitator's skill may deceive them.[103] As Lehmann-Hartleben put it, since the late nineteenth century, 'the problem of [the *Imagines'*] authenticity did not matter so much', identifying that for some scholars, the critical and appreciative attitudes towards art Philostratus depicts provides ample talking points for *real* works of ancient art.[104] That is true for this study, insofar as Philostratus' presentation of criticality provides the reader with an opportunity to engage with the σοφία of painters and writers alike, and that this study considers the *Imagines* a work of ancient art. Noting that the *Imagines* reflects a historical interdisciplinary, visual, educational culture, it is moreover integral to acknowledge the fictional dimension of the *Imagines* double the pedagogic potential of the paintings. Ekphrasis is by nature reflexive, an imitation of reality like any other artwork. As such, the *Imagines,* being a text comprised almost wholly of ekphrastic descriptions, is imbued with metafictional qualities, especially evident in its exploration of the ability of written text and painting has to convey change and movement despite being static and inanimate representations of forms and figures.

2. Authors and Authenticity: Aesop, Daedalus, and Penelope

Philostratus' presentation of authority in the *Imagines* can best be understood and explained by considering the parts of the narrative which present creator figures most intricately. We have established that for Philostratus, 'those who examine' (βασανίζοντι) are themselves line-makers.[105] It is only fitting that the first subjects we line-makers study are themselves 'graphists' of a kind. Aesop, Daedalus, and Penelope are depicted in the midst of their crafts, alongside their creations, who, in addition to the painter figure, are used by the narrator to reinforce his own sentiments, and further to imply the philosophical nature of making and studying paintings due to the nature of

[103] C.f. the narrator's implicit praise for the boy's observation of his own approach to paintings as audience surrogate, n.69.
[104] Lehmann-Hartleben, 1941, p.17, see also n.30 on p.11 of this study.
[105] See n.40, n.44, and analysis of βασανίζοντι on pp.11-12; *Imag.* 1.pr.1.

interpretation. Critics such as Shaffer have insightfully identified that the 'pictorial description' embedded in the text may 'convey a hidden meaning', but suggest that the purpose of this layering allows 'the sophisticated author' to 'gently lead readers […] so that they will arrive at the desired interpretation of what is symbolized by the painting'.[106] Rather than direction, this study considers the construction of ekphrasis as a representation of a dialectic, a textual work, engaged in dialogue with other visual γραφή to reflect the philosophical process of interpretation, which must internally reproduce images in order to respond to them. In this way, we will explore how the narrator elaborates on his statement that craft can engage in discussion (ἦν καὶ λόγου ἡ τέχνη ἅπτεται, 1.pr.1).

For Miles, characterisation of interpretation in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* and *Heroicus* is achieved in the characterisation of 'an active interpreter, in whom *mimēsis* is just as much at work as in the image'.[107] The narrator is an example of active interpreter, who translates the image he sees into words and text, producing 'from the painting another artefact'.[108] This internalised interpretation, when manifested, becomes a recognisable artefact. For this study, it is the text of the *Imagines.* Elsner notes such synchronised characterisations in the Aesop ekphrasis between the painter and the narrator specifically since the narrator notes how the painting 'philosophizes in representing the persons of the Fables'.[109] Whereas Elsner focusses on the pedagogic interplay achieved in representing the parallel relationship of leaders with their listeners (the fox to the chorus, Aesop to the Fables, and Philostratus to his audience),[110] this section considers the creative processes Philostratus deems necessary for thought and interpretation, focussing on the characterisation of creators in the narrative. The association of depiction with philosophizing

[106] Shaffer, 1998, p.307.
[107] Miles, 2018, p.27. It is through this active interpreter the recreation of the image occurs, a process which directly corresponds to *phantasia*, the philosophical theory of internalised 'impression' that defines for scholars such as Bates and Grethlein the experience of witnessing. Bates, 2021; Grethlein, 2023, attempts to posit an enactive response to perception which suggests personal expectations of 'actual and potential interactions' factors into successful vividness, pp.4-8.
[108] McCombie, 2002, p.152. C.f. §1.2.
[109] Elsner's translation, 2000, p.260. φιλοσοφεῖ δὲ ἡ γραφὴ καὶ τὰ τῶν Μύθων σώματα. *Imag.* 1.3.2.
[110] Elsner, 2000, p.260.

(φιλοσοφεῖν) recurs throughout the *Imagines* when the narrator identifies with the painter by recognising a similarity of opinion and appreciation.

By presenting these creators as characters, Philostratus gives the viewer an opportunity to consider how authors are perceived on the same level as their creations. Recognising the focus on how Aesop, Daedalus, and Penelope are shown to interpret through their crafts of storytelling, sculpting, and weaving, the descriptions of which can be considered as *mises-en-abyme* which reflect differing approaches to interpretation. This chapter deconstructs the presentation of these creators, to apply new understanding of the form and content to the *Imagines* as a whole. Starting with the early Fables ekphrasis, we will see a reflection of the authorial figure in the folding framework of the narrative, which will allow us to revisit the preface of the *Imagines* with greater insight into how the narrator presents authority and control over narrative.

2.1. Aesop: Fables 1.3

Near the end of this ekphrasis, the narrator states innocuously:

> οἶδεν ὁ ζωγράφος, ὅτι αἱ τῶν μύθων φροντίδες ἀνειμένης τῆς ψυχῆς δέονται. φιλοσοφεῖ δὲ ἡ γραφὴ καὶ τὰ τῶν Μύθων σώματα. θηρία γὰρ συμβάλλουσα ἀνθρώποις περιίστησι χορὸν τῷ Αἰσώπῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου σκηνῆς συμπλάσασα, κορυφαία δὲ τοῦ χοροῦ ἡ ἀλώπηξ γέγραπται· χρῆται γὰρ αὐτῇ ὁ Αἴσωπος διακόνῳ τῶν πλείστων ὑποθέσεων, ὥσπερ ἡ κωμῳδία τῷ Δάῳ.
>
> The painter knows that for the construction of the fables, relaxation of the spirit is required. The painting both philosophizes and [gives] bodies to the fables. For it combines animals with men to make a chorus about Aesop, composed of the actors in his fables;[111] and the fox is painted as leader of the chorus; for he is being treated by Aesop as a messenger of many proposals,* as comedy uses Davus.
>
> Philostratus, *Imagines* 1.3.2
>
> *translation adapted[112]

We will firstly focus on the presentation of authorship and authority, to consider how the author figure is characterised as a philosopher, and his works as a form of philosophical dialectic, as was initially suggested in our introduction. By considering how language evoking direction and control is used to characterise Aesop in Fables 1.3, we can evaluate whether this dynamic is subverted by his characters, the Fables. This subversion also reflects the larger suggestion of an artefact's autonomy outside of its creator, an approach which forms the basis of more recent critical theories such as those of Barthes, Iser, and Fish.[113] By considering Miles' theory of interpretation as an internalisation, or rather, re-internalisation of an artefact, we may substantiate this study's evaluation of the *Imagines* as a dialectic. The engagement with visual art is presented as the

---

[111] I refer the reader to the LSJ for συμπλάσσω: (2) 'of speakers and writers […] by agreeing on an [sic] hypothesis and a fiction'; (3) 'metaph., feign or fabricate together'.

[112] LSJ διάκονος (dat. sg.) can be understood as servant, messenger (A), or religious official (2), as opposed to a person in bondage (δοῦλος). Fairbanks' translation appears to have brough together the characterisation of 'cunning slave' from Roman comedy and the metatextual servitude of the fox character through his reading of the comparison to the stock figure, Davus. For characterisations of the 'cunning slave', see Schironi, 2014. Also, for the consideration of trickery of the fox figure as orchestrator of events, c.f. Levine, 1991, and Avery, 2020, especially xi. My translation additionally makes an attempt to remain coherent with διακόνῳ τῶν πλείστων ὑποθέσεων to highlight the presentation of Aesop's 'purpose' for the fox to convey suggestions.

[113] Barthes, R. 1977; *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy,* 2008. s.v. reader response theory.

narrator's engagment with an interlocutor of great wisdom and skill, recognised through the narrator's repeated praise of the painter's τέχνη, thus forming a philosophical dialogue in this recognition of skills used for interpretation. This skill in a craft, and moreover, the process which the artist undertakes, is one which has engaged the narrator in discussion and deliberation, as is implied by ἣν καὶ λόγου ἡ τέχνη ἅπτεται (1.pr.1). More than a reference to symmetry and technical, mathematical principles,[114] the language the narrator used to point out that art is joined with λόγος is reused in the Fables ekphrasis, where the painted figures of Aesop as well as his creatures are attributed the power of speech and λόγος (1.3.1), which leads us through our second section.

The second section of the Aesop study explores the depiction of figures, and how in this ekphrasis, we are led to believe that hybrid creatures from Aesop's stories can be seen alongside their creator in the painting. This is possible due to the painting being an artefact created by a painter, rather than Aesop himself, developing the first theme of authority by recognising a mimetic hierarchy.[115] In this passage, 'the bodies of the Fables' (τὰ τῶν Μύθων σώματα, 1.3.2)[116] draws attention to the hybrid animal figures in the painting, but also to the textual 'body' Aesop composes to house the Fables. The language here describing Aesop 'weaving some fable' (ὑφαίνει μῦθον) is mirrored in the chiasmus αὐτὸν ἀναδήσοντες καὶ στεφανώσοντες αὐτὸν, where the Fables 'wreath and crown' Aesop.[117] In a sense, these honours the Fables do in crowning Aesop with an olive crown (θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ) not only mirrors the crafting Aesop does, but also the level of cultivation and respect for the Fables the narrator initially indicates with ἐπιμελέομαι.[118] This parallel works both to praise Aesop, and to indicate the narrative reciprocity the narrator suggests the painter shows. A reciprocity between author and creation emphasises to us the final theme of interlocution, pairing

[114] He who scorns painting 'witholds her praise from symmetry of proportion, through which art partakes in reason': ξυμμετρίαν τε οὐκ ἐπαινεῖ, δι᾽ ἣν καὶ λόγου ἡ τέχνη ἅπτεται (1.pr.1). See also p.24 for context. In depth discussions of the usage of λόγου in 1.3 will elaborate on the more literary and verbal reading of λόγος; see below §2.1.1.
[115] McCombie, 2002, p.152.
[116] Which Elsner gives as 'persons': Elsner, 2000, p.260.
[117] *Imag.* 1.3.2.
[118] LSJ ἐπιμελέομαι A, 3.

re-internalisation with self-mythologising. This enriches this study's consideration of Philostratus' characterisation of philosophy as synthesis, and artistic synthesis as a philosophical process.

The concept of philosophizing (φιλοσοφεῖν)[119] presented in the above passage is applicable to the painter (ὁ ζωγράφος), the process, and the painting (ἡ γραφὴ). The description avoids providing a clear, consistent characterisation of Aesop as either character or creator, instead overlaying multiple different authorities. The idea of authorship and authority in this ekphrasis is closely interlinked. The description of Aesop is primarily structured by his comparison to a dramatist, a director. The language Philostratus uses to describe the painting of Aesop is alive with the semantics of dramaturgy, becoming abundantly clear in the final lines, by use of σκηνῆς (stage, theatre)[120] to refer to the composition of the painted figures, which include the Fables (μῦθοι), and further liken Aesop's works to drama. Yet this also draws attention to the presentation of Aesop alongside his creations. Aesop as dramatist is authored by the painter, who depicts Aesop on the same visual level as his creations. Philostratus' phrasing, describing the theatrical (ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς), places the figure of Aesop at the centre of the chorus of Fables (χορὸν τῷ Αἰσώπῳ). By referring to Aesop as a dramatist, even while describing a scene in which Aesop appears alongside his chorus of chimeric characters, the text offers a paradox of power and authority for our consideration. As a *mise-en-abyme*, this painting of a storyteller places creator and creation in the same scene, thus reflecting the presence of the Philostratean author-persona in his own work.

In order to understand how the narrator self-authorises, we first look at the narrator's comparison of Aesop to Homer, Hesiod, and Archilochus, wherein the pointed judgement passed by the narrator that Aesop cared most for Fables, is reflected in the painting. Aesop is crowned by Fables in a wreath of young olive (θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ 1.3.2), suggesting victory in his craft. This construction suggests that the Fables have deemed Aesop praiseworthy (ἀγαπῶντες, 1.3.1), as the

---

[119] *Imag.* 1.3.2, see n.109.
[120] *Imag.* 1.3.2. LSJ ἀπὸ τῆς [ἐκείνου] σκηνῆς - 'connected with the theatre'; ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου σκηνῆς συμπλάσασα: relating to those [theatrical] scenes fabricated (LSJ συμπλάσσω).

narrator does, and this is further implied by the artefact of the painting.[121] No matter whether the painting is considered real or a figment of Philostratus' narrative, it consolidates the narrative's theme of praise. Considering the painting as a fabrication would show how Philostratus amplifies the impact of his narrative by introducing the elusive figure of painter, whose artistic choices the narrator resounds with. This invited comparison of narrator and painter is an echo of the relationships Philostratus establishes between Aesop and the poets, and Aristodemus and Eumelus in the proem (1.pr.3). Comparisons used throughout the *Imagines* qualify and increase the presence of characters in the text, creating layers of believability which in many places, amount to credibility. The characterisation of the author is established in the same way that the narrator characterises other writers that he 'recognises'. The contemplation on whether this recognition is fictional or real speaks to the narrator's ability to create an immersive work, which subtly challenges the reader's assumptions and perceptions of the presentation of truth (ἀλήθεια).

2.1.1. Authorship

> Φοιτῶσιν οἱ Μῦθοι παρὰ τὸν Αἴσωπον ἀγαπῶντες αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐπιμελεῖται. ἐμέλησε μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ μύθου καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἀρχιλόχῳ πρὸς Λυκάμβην, ἀλλ᾽ Αἰσώπῳ πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκμεμύθωται, καὶ λόγου τοῖς θηρίοις μεταδέδωκε λόγου ἕνεκεν.
>
> The Fables are gathering around Aesop, being fond[122] of him because he devotes himself to them.[123] For Fables were an object of care for both Homer and Hesiod, and even for Archilochus to the Lycambes, but Aesop recounted[124] all there is about people, and shared words with his animals so that they might debate.
>
> Philostratus, *Imagines*, 1.3.1

[121] The 'painting' artefacts as metaphors for praise and lamentation is investigated in more depth in the Hippolytus (2.4) study (see §3.3).
[122] LSJ ἀγαπάω (I), to greet with affection.
[123] LSJ ἐπιμελέομαι (3); see also the narrator's use of ἐπιμελήσονται in the proem (1.pr.3), consider as to be 'engaged' with Aesop, as the narrator encourages his listeners to engage with, take an interest in, paintings/speeches, consider n.59 and n.61 on p.15.
[124] LSJ μυθέομαι (I): speak, tell, but also significantly (II): to 'consider' internally, 'to oneself'.

At the start of the ekphrasis, Aesop is presented in comparison to the poets, under the suggestion that he is foremost among Homer, Hesiod, and Archilochus, in his cultivation of the Fables (ἐπιμέλομαι).[125] The superiority of Aesop in the art of creating the fable is explained, one reason being that Aesop thought about (μυθέομαι) all aspects of human life (πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 1.3.1) in his work. The narrator's proclivity for this kind of praise has been noted as exaggeration, however, we will consider the ways in which it is honest reflection of the narrator's characterisation of Aesop as a philosophical thinker, who, like the narrator, forms a philosophical discourse on reality and representations. The narrator's recognition of Aesop's ability to encompass all sides (πάντα) of being human hints at the human ability to make use of λόγος, understood primarily in the context of Fables as 'speech' or 'reason'; the ability and capacity to debate,[126] even from within a piece of artwork or literature. In this way, the dialectic abilities of the Fables mirror those of the narrator, especially in the similarity of language to 1.1.1 where debate is phrased as to 'put together' meaning (συμβάλωμεν οὖν ὅ τι νοεῖ),[127] and further, in the way the painter puts together the human and animal forms (θηρία γὰρ συμβάλλουσα ἀνθρώποις, 1.3.2).

The use of λόγος anthropomophises the animal (θηρία) characters, both in description, and characterisation, contributing towards an essential part of their identity as Fables.[128] The Fables are part human, part animal, blurring not only physical boundaries, but boundaries between reality and

[125] Cultivation, as in care for, drawing upon ἐπιμελεῖται (1.3.1) derived from LSJ ἐπιμελέομαι (3).
[126] LSJ λόγος is a difficult word to translate. It relates to rationality and communication, reflecting reason in the senses of: transaction and evaluation ('account' I.1.b; 'value' and reputation I.4); 'relation, correspondence, proportion' (II); or the more language based legal 'plea' (III.1.b); 'argument' in the philosophical sense of 'discourse and reflection on reality' (III.2); laws and principles (III.2.d, III.3); and pertinently to the overall shape of philosophical subjectivity, (IV), 'inward debate of the soul', in the sense of 'thinking, reasoning' (IV.1) and the communication of such. (IV) necessitates the user have 'creative reason' and 'reason as a faculty' (IV.2.b), and hence the larger proportions of meanings documented under LSJ λόγος V – VII pertain to speech, expression, and 'dialogue, as a form of philosophical debate' (VI.3.c). This section and indeed this study focuses upon the meanings given under VI.3, 'discussion, debate, deliberation', drawing upon the impression of the word as a whole under its surrounding definitions. Of course, it also carries the implication of 'fable' (V.1), 'legend' (V.2), and 'tale, story' (V.3), which greatly deepens the metafictional implications of this passage, given the capabilities of Aesop's Fables to tell their own stories.
[127] See n.77, p.19.
[128] See n.157 on συμβάλλουσα used in *Imag.* 2.2.4 and 2.3.2. C.f. §3.3 of this essay, on the anthropomorphism through grief in Hippolytus 2.4.

fiction. The Fables are capable of speech, reason, philosophical argument – in this sense, they are not so different from their creator, Aesop. The hierarchy of creation, or as McCombie would say, the 'mimetic hierarchy',[129] has been collapsed through the equaliser of λόγος. By giving his Fables speech and reason, Aesop creates an infinite possibility of discussion and creation in the world of his characters, and it is on account of this infinity that the narrator confidently asserts Aesop has depicted πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, despite the implausibility of this statement itself. The paradox is resolved due to the possibilities that emerge even within the paradoxical phrasing of λόγου τοῖς θηρίοις μεταδέδωκε λόγου ἕνεκεν (1.3.1).

Philostratus, like the character of Aesop, shares with us (μεταδίδωμι) his λόγος (speeches) after considering (ἐκμεμύθωται) the theoretical sides of painting.[130] This instigates his self-characterisation within the narrative. It comes as an interjection midway through the preface, where the voice of the author recognises others (ἄλλοις), in particular, Aristodemus of Caria, since they share an established personal relationship. Miles and Demoen point out the parallel of 'one teacher and master of μῦθος' – the narrator of the *Imagines* – 'describing the representation of another', Aesop,[131] but the narrator of this fable is *himself* a representation, a recapitulated version of the initial narrator of the proem. The parallels run much deeper than just between the narrator and Aesop. There are, across the *Imagines,* two aspects of the narrator. The first introduces us to art critical and philosophical theory, presenting the 'present' premise of the text ('this discussion', ὁ λόγος) as a recollection of past speeches (1.pr.3). The narrator of the descriptions is a past aspect, though we are made to listen to him as though he is the same narrator, despite his speech being embedded like that of a character.[132] The narrator of the proem is silent throughout the

[129] McCombie, 2002, p.153, c.f. n.69 above.
[130] C.f. n.21 on Philostratus' philosophising in dialogue with Plato's theories.
[131] Miles and Demoen, 2009, p.36.
[132] For example, 'So this shall be, I said' ἔσται ταῦτα, ἔφην (1.pr.5), and 'And the boy, I said, I will set ahead' ὁ μὲν παῖς, ἔφην, προβεβλήσθω (1.pr.5). Speech marks have been removed to show the significance of φημί in the imperfect first person singular as ἔφην, indicating past declaration. The root of προβεβλήσθω, βάλλω, is used in Philostr. *VA* 4.13: καὶ ἱερὸν περὶ αὐτὸ βαλόμενος, 'and he marked out a sanctuary around it' (LCL 16, Jones, 2005), given as 'build' in the sense to 'lay as foundation' or 'begin to form' (LSJ βάλλω III.B.4).

descriptions, having introduced the text, not unlike the boy whose requests instigated the speeches, and to whom they were addressed.[133] The illusion of the speaker of each ekphrasis as the 'present' narrator is aided by the vivid present tense throughout the descriptions, but as a whole, the sense of time in the *Imagines* is fractured between a memory and the moment of writing, the demarcation of which is purposefully elusive, yet noticeable in the tonal and tense changes in the proem.

As the aesthetic and theoretical language of art theory gives way to an anecdote, indicative characterisation of the author's identity is given. Philostratus exhibits authorial self-embedding within the narrative as he begins the story proper of how the *Imagines* came to be.

> ὅσοι μὲν οὖν κράτος ἤραντο τῆς ἐπιστήμης καὶ ὅσαι πόλεις καὶ ὅσοι βασιλεῖς ἔρωτι ἐς αὐτὴν ἐχρήσαντο, ἄλλοις τε εἴρηται καὶ Ἀριστοδήμῳ τῷ ἐκ Καρίας, ὃν ἐγὼ ἐπὶ ζωγραφίᾳ ξένον ἐποιησάμην ἐτῶν τεσσάρων—ἔγραφε δὲ κατὰ τὴν Εὐμήλου σοφίαν πολὺ τὸ ἐπίχαρι ἐς αὐτὴν φέρων
>
> Now the story of the men who have won mastery in the science of painting, and of the states and kings that have been passionately devoted to it, has been told by others,* notably by Aristodemus of Caria, whom I visited for four years in order to study painting; and he painted in the technique of Eumelus, but carrying much more charm.
>
> Philostratus, *Imag*. 1.pr.3
>
> *translation adapted[134]

Not only does this inform the reader of the author's credibility, but this claim also gives the reader the sense that the text is rooted in reality.[135] By relating to a contemporary figure, Philostratus reminds us that the experiences and authority of the author of the *Imagines* can be corroborated by Aristodemus of Caria, should we ever decide to seek him, or his text, out. This authentication device,

Indeed, the narrator begins 'to form' the boy before himself. Further, the 'present' narrator, much like us, stand in the history of the 'past' narrator, and despite being the one who forms the foundations, is silent, like the boy whose curiosity is the foundation for the speeches, and 'later', the text.

[133] *Imag.* 1.pr.5, c.f. n.69 for the diegetic audience as surrogate for the reader.

[134] Fairbanks supplies 'writers' which perhaps narrows the reader's consideration of 'others' being inclusive of oral or visual transmissions: specifically, ἄλλοις τε εἴρηται is here an Alexandrian footnote, a vague 'it is said by others'. LSJ ἔρομαι from which εἴρηται comes includes the meanings (2) to 'learn by inquiry', (3) 'question', and inquire, which repeats the narrator's suggestions of interrogation raised by use of βασανίζοντι to describe seekers (refer to n.39, pp.10-11 above).

[135] See n.134 on the use of Alexandrian footnote.

described more succinctly by the German term *Beglaubigungsapparat*, creates a false sense of reality by presenting specific details from the 'author's life', since it cannot be proved to be more than veiled characterisation beyond the scope of the story. The extent of the narrator's personal relationship with Aristodemus is consolidated by a comparative opinion, that Aristodemus paints more pleasingly (πολὺ τὸ ἐπίχαρι) than Eumelus. Elsner's insight on Herodotus' narration is applicable here; not only the relationship building, but the aside that he specifically visited Aristodemus for four years in order to study painting is part of a 'self-authorising strategy'.[136] Such time studying justifies Philostratus as an authority on the skill and products of painting, and is showcased in his ability to finely assess and arbitrate the examples he presents in the body of the *Imagines.*

Attention to the placement of Aesop near the beginning of the *Imagines* has been drawn by Miles and Demoen, in that his character 'emphasises the work's educational function', especially towards a younger audience.[137] Such placement therefore echoes the introduction to the *Imagines* as compositions for the young and uninitiated (1.pr.3), and as such, the reference to Aesop's ability to convey reason (λόγος) through animal characters, or, as Fairbanks puts it, 'point a moral' (1.3.1), can be considered to reflect the discursive nature of the ekphrasis.[138] Elsner also notes that by presenting Aesop as 'a *σοφός'*,[139] Philostratus creates a parallel between the narrator's voice and the painter in the narrative depicting a wise author figure. This can be greatly enhanced, by considering that Aesop does for his Fables what the narrator and painter are shown to do for Aesop; characterise him as a great storyteller, wise in λόγος, presented as infinitely creating stories.

---

[136] Elsner, 1994, p.231.
[137] Miles and Demoen, 2009, p.36. Though M. and D. note that 'the use of fables for teaching children … [was] … much less dominant among the ancient uses of fables' (n.31), they provide that in *Vitae Apolloniae* (5.14), Philostratus characterises Menippus with a presumption that fables are 'only fit for old women and children' (p.36).
[138] See Introduction §1.4.
[139] Original emphrasis. Elsner, 2000, p.260. *Imag.* 1.3.2.

By narrating that Aesop is weaving a fable (ὑφαίνει μῦθον), the narrator shapes Aesop into a character by borrowing a Homeric metaphor.[140] Aesop's 'weaving a fable' (τινα ὑφαίνει μῦθον, 1.3.2) evokes the language used to describe the machinations of Menelaus and Odysseus weaving a story (μῦθον) together through words and 'devices': μύθους καὶ μήδεα πᾶσιν ὕφαινον.[141] In the act of description, the narrator has created an impression of Aesop both as character and creator, a feat which in itself emulates the skilful weaving of Homer, who uses the language of textiles to enrich the reception of mental craftwork. Here, the narrator uses language which shows mental and physical skill, characterising Aesop's ability with a duality that reflects aspects of painting and philosophy. On the whole, the narrator can be said to be using the language of philosophical discourse to discuss paintings and mental craftwork. The narrator informs us that since Aesop λόγου τοῖς θηρίοις μεταδέδωκε, 'gives a share of λόγος to the Fables' (1.3.1), the Fables themselves are capable of speech, and thus, telling stories themselves, given their ability to use λόγος and create λόγος.[142] Just as the narrator's interpretation of Aesop is 'weaving some fable' (τινα ὑφαίνει μῦθον, 1.3.2) in the painting, Aesop's characters are likewise given the opportunity to create characters through language within the realms of their reality by their co-creators, the narrator, the painter, and Aesop. Though they are not the ones borrowing the Homeric metaphor to describe their artistic subject, they emulate such 'weaving' in their actions of 'wreathing' Aesop (ἀναδέω, 1.3.2), leading the reader-viewer to consider how the subjects of description reflexively act upon their interpreter.[143]

We have already introduced the interpretation of μεταδέδωκε as to 'communicate with',[144] which in many ways echoes the discussion the narrator presents himself as having with his audience.

[140] Miles and Demoen point out that this 'Homeric weaving of words is adapted to Aesop composing a fable' (2009, p.35).
[141] *Il.* 3.212. trans. Murray.
[142] LSJ λόγος (V.3).
[143] In the marginally simpler analysis of Hippolytus 2.4 in 3.2 of this essay, we shall consider how the artefact is inherently an object of praise and commemoration, one whose merit in craftsmanship not only enhances the subject of its making, but also the one who made it. C.f. *Imag.* 1.23, Ἡ μὲν πηγὴ γράφει τὸν Νάρκισσον, ἡ δὲ γραφὴ τὴν πηγὴν καὶ τὰ τοῦ Ναρκίσσου πάντα: 'Here the pool depicts Narcissus, and conversely, the depiction, the pool and the whole of Narcissus'.
[144] LSJ μεταδέδωκε (3).

Aesop λόγου μεταδέδωκε, communicates with his Fables through speech and discourse, for the sake of debate (λόγου ἕνεκεν, 1.3.1), but that *they* might also debate among themselves. This resonates with some clarity the narrator's declared intention at the beginning of the text: to give a share of speeches to the young on the form of paintings (ὁ λόγος […] περὶ […] εἴδη ζωγραφίας […] τοῖς νέοις), so that they might learn to describe[145] and devote themselves to what is excellent in them.[146] Indeed, the narrator uses the same verb, ἐπιμελεῖται, ἐμέλησε, to describe the dedication of Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, and moreover, Aesop, to fables (μύθου, 1.3.1).[147] Here is an example of metalepsis, where the figurative ability of the Fables to speak and use λόγος is considered as an ability which self-perpetuates internally. As we shall see in in our discussion of Looms 2.28, the verb 'weaving' (τινα ὑφαίνει μῦθον, 1.3.2) used to describe Aesop's construction of the Fables undergoes a similar refraction, whereby its usage in the narrative creates a *mise-en-abyme* of an interpretative cycle.[148]

By scrutinising the characterisation of Aesop in this ekphrasis, we learn more about the author figure present in the *Imagines,* and moreover, how the narrator recapitulates his intentions laid out in the proem.[149] Aesop, as well as being a 'master of μῦθος', is the narrator's ideal student. In the presentation of an author figure, master of his craft, the narrator creates a character whose praiseworthy actions relate to cultivation (ἐπιμελέομαι), and by relation, to interpretation (ἑρμηνεύω). Moreover, this characterisation of Aesop places him in dialogue with his creations, as they all share the power of λόγος, providing a contrast to the narrator with his domination of the text of the *Imagines.* The presentation of Aesop reflects the reader's impression of Philostratus throughout the *Imagines*, for he is varyingly the author, as well as a character in his own narration.

---

[145] Or even 'write about' (LSJ ἑρμηνεύω II.3), c.f. n.61.
[146] See p.16 and n.123 above.
[147] LSJ ἐπιμελέομαι (3.): 'to be engaged in, cultivate any pursuit, art, etc.'.
[148] See §2.3.1. n.257.
[149] Alternatively, how his later summary in the proem reflects his earlier presentations and speeches teleologically, focussing on the purpose he intended for the audience, rather than truly capturing the experience and other voices no doubt present 'at the time' in Naples.

In this sense, the *Imagines* is also shown to philosophize (φιλοσοφεῖν), as it depicts the construction of knowledge and through writing (γραφὴ).

2.1.2. All the World's a stage: representations

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, this study considers how the narrator of the *Imagines* internalises the paintings he sees to produce a new creation: these are the speeches, which we are told have been immortalised in the body of the *Imagines* text (1.pr.4-5). Though only the text remains, this verbal process of articulating a new response, or vocal artefact, is recorded in the descriptions. In this sense, the *Imagines* is a visual γεγραπται (depiction) of this interpretative process. This process of manifesting interpretation can be seen in creative figures featured in Philostratus' descriptions. The characterisation of these figures, and the presentation of their surroundings as extensions of their character, presents a dynamic wherein the creative vision 'attempts to master and make meaning of the world'.[150] The narrator's description of the creative figure relating to his creations is in the Aesop ekphrasis presented as art of the mastery of Aesop over his surrounding chorus as a dramatist and director of his fictions.

By presenting Aesop as a dramatist, and likening the painting to a scene on stage, the narrator draws an implicit comparison between viewing drama and viewing art. The narrative invites the reader to consider a drama as the product of the dramatist, who creates a story that is embodied by both actors and represented by text. In this way, the ekphrasis compares the hierarchy of represented characters with the authority of the playwright in a drama. More broadly, referencing drama increases the dynamism of the painting as the viewer is prompted to think of moving figures of a performance, to associate the text with actors who share space with the viewer, which enriches the reading experience of the text.[151] On a literary level, considering the liminal space between audience and performer evokes an intangible, yet distinctive separation of dimension between

[150] On 'gaze' in the ancient novel: Morales, H. 2004, p.35.
[151] C.f. Introduction §1.1; Squire, 2009, p.297, the mutual reciprocal enrichment of image and text.

performance and audience, comparable to a world of flesh observing a world of paint and plaster. However, the greatest impact of this comparison is to place the authority and control of the figure of a creative in contention with the figures of the 'created' (συμπλάσασα), ultimately reminding us that the power of direction and depiction rests with the painter.

The presentation of Aesop as dramatist reveals that regardless of Aesop's creative control over his fox and fables as author of his narratives, in this painting, he is also a performer. From the painter's perspective, indistinguishable from the narrator's perspective, and subsequently, that of the reader, Aesop becomes as much a fictionalised (συμπλάσασα)[152] figure as those he creates. Just as Aesop is assigned the dual roles of writer and dramatist through the narrator's interpretation of the painted Aesop figure, the narrator of the *Imagines* is presented as character and author, taking on more roles through the reader's interpretation in the same way that Aesop becomes like a dramatist in both the painter and narrator's rendition of his person. Miles and Demoen's study offers grounds for a comparison between Aesop as educator to children,[153] and by extension his chorus of Fables (λόγου τοῖς θηρίοις μεταδέδωκε, 1.3.1) and the 'sophist-persona' narrator and the 'internal audience' of the young son of the host and the older boys in the frame of the narrative.[154] The narrative frame invites the reader to visualise this Neapolitan chorus, with the boy as tacit coryphaeus,[155] in a similar fashion to Aesop, silently weaving despite his mastery over work and speech (μῦθος and λόγος) while surrounded by his students who are also his creations.

The anthropomorphising of Aesop's fictions into part-human, part-animal figures itself reflects the nature of fictional figures as only partly human, as εἰκών (semblance).[156] As mere

[152] 1.3.2 from συμπλάσσω 'feign or fabricate together (3).
[153] Miles and Demoen, 2009, p.36: Through Aesop, children 'become students of the affairs of life' (τὰ παιδία μαθηταὶ γίνονται τῶν τοῦ βίου πραγμάτων, 1.3.1).
[154] Miles and Demoen, 2009, p.36.
[155] Though as we shall see, despite his frequent textual silence, the young boy does indeed serve the function of coryphaeus in Looms 2.28, where his opinions form the foundations before (προβεβλήσθω, 1.pr.5) the narrator's description and interpretation of the painting. See section 2.3 below.
[156] LSJ εἰκών II; a sentiment which carries over to the title of the work. Both the text and the paintings are *semblances* of something else.

representations of reality, when characterised with the ability to reason, the Fables are described with a form that prompts the viewer to ask in what way the Fables show human features. Whether their linguistic capabilities are attributed to human body parts, or rather that in the form of animals they walk upright like humans, the reader is not to know from this ekphrasis alone. The Fables are συμβάλλουσα, a composite of θηρία (beast) and ἄνθρωποι (humans), as well as in their fabrication (συμπλάσασα 1.3.2), a touch of the theatrical (ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου σκηνῆς, 1.3.2). Though συμβάλλουσα has textual evidence to mean the literal conjoining of human and animal body parts, the same sentence draws attention to their fictionality and even the textual dimension in the interlocutional sense of συμπλάσασα. [157] If the narrator is attempting to decide on what is 'hypothesis' and what is 'fiction',[158] he the speaker is certainly debating with the γραφεύς (painter, writer). The enduring human aspect of Aesop's fables is, as the narrator establishes, the incorporation of all of the human (πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 1.3.1), which he has suggested can be accounted for through the infinite capacity of λόγος to develop, approximate, and argue.

The figures of writer and character, listener and speaker, transgresses the boundaries between narrator and narrative, seen in the hybrid bodies of the Fables themselves. Squire, like McCombie,[159] describes a 'three-tiered hierarchy' created through the layering of writing recreating artistic replication of nature.[160] The roles of the figures change based on the perspective of the viewer, and the addition of each representational layer. The mediations of Aesop on the human condition are explored through his fabular characters, who appear as figures in the painting, interpreted as hybrid creatures by the painter. This is in turn textualized in the narrator's interpretation of the figures of Aesop and his Fables. Aesop, the painter, and the narrator can be attributed authority over the appearance of the Fables, for each contributes to the cumulative

[157] συμβάλλουσα, which is used in *Im.* 2.2.4 to describe the act of painting Cheiron, is used to mean 'combine': to combine horse with human ἵππον ἀνθρώπῳ συμβαλεῖν, as Demoen and Miles point out (2009, pp.34-5 n.25). C.f. n.111; LSJ συμπλάσσω: (2) 'of speakers and writers […] by agreeing on an hypothesis and a fiction'. Also consider n.245 on *Imag.* 2.2.4.
[158] See above note.
[159] McCombie, 2002, p.152.
[160] Squire, 2009, pp.234-5.

impression of their bodies (φιλοσοφεῖ δὲ ἡ γραφὴ καὶ τὰ τῶν Μύθων σώματα, 1.3.2). In viewing these interpretations simultaneously, we learn not only about the narrator's approach towards interpretations, but also see that our recognition through the *Imagines* is in part owed to the narrator's emulation of the painter's form, and of Aesop's, forming the *mise-en-abyme* of interpretational artefacts. For Squire, the relationships between these three levels not only create 'entangled dialectics between images and words', but also 'between artifice and nature'.[161] In addition to Aesop giving the idea of the Fable[162] textual, artificial bodies in the forms of animal characters, the painter and the narrator give the Fables visual appearances in bodies which are rife with literary and metaliterary symbolism. Going on to point out the 'intellectual questions about the fluid boundaries between reality and fiction', [163] Squire touches upon the essence of the approach of this essay to Philostratus' text. The text is constructed in such a way which invites intellectual questions when the prose challenges the reader-listener's ability to distinguish between the hierarchy of reality and recreation.

The fluid unity between artifice and nature is present in the dichotomous hybridity of the anthropomorphic Fables, who are at once objects of creation and themselves capable of judgement and action ('gathering' παρὰ ἀγαπῶντες, 1.3.1; 'wreathing and crowning' ἀναδήσοντες καὶ στεφανώσοντες, 1.3.2), and further in the nature and appearance of the hollow heifer which Daedalus constructs for Pasiphaë (1.16.1), which is the subject of the next part of this chapter. In several ways, these two descriptions whose source stories revolve around the animal have been addressed in similar ways by our narrator, who frames the paradoxical amalgamation of the human and an animal as a thought-provoking challenge to our synchronous perceptions of an image as

[161] Squire, 2009, p.235.
[162] The writer capitalises οἱ Μῦθοι παρὰ τὸν Αἴσωπον (1.3.1), differentiating these which can 'gather' (παρὰ ἀγαπῶντες), from the objects of poetic attention, ἐμέλησε μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ μύθου καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ […] (1.3.1). Again, the distinction between οἱ Μῦθοι (1.3.2) who partake in crowning Aesop, from the 'stories' Aesop is 'weaving', ὑφαίνει μῦθον (1.3.2). Although the capitalisation of the Greek may be editorial changes, the inherent distinction between Fables as active subjects and fables as objects of others' actions remains in the integral structure of the description.
[163] Squire, 2009, p.235.

either wholly human or bestial. The sense of both-ness echoes the paradox between opposing elements of fire and water in 1.1.1 which was discussed in the Introduction, showing how painting can overcome paradox through visual juxtaposition, and how through a narrative which depends on ἐνάργεια, clarity and vividness, words and images are not in contest, but rather collaboration (συμβάλλω).[164]

2.1.3. Interlocutions

> κορυφαία δὲ τοῦ χοροῦ ἡ ἀλώπηξ γέγραπται· χρῆται γὰρ αὐτῇ ὁ Αἴσωπος διακόνῳ τῶν πλείστων ὑποθέσεων, ὥσπερ ἡ κωμῳδία τῷ Δάῳ.
>
> and the fox is painted as leader of the chorus; for he is being treated by Aesop as a messenger of many proposals,* as comedy uses Davus.
>
> Philostratus, *Imagines,* 1.3.2
>
> *translation adapted[165]

In the last lines of the ekphrasis 1.3.2, shown above, the phrase διακόνῳ τῶν πλείστων ὑποθέσεων implies that the fox is Aesop's favoured mode authorial influence, as the leader of the chorus may be the device through which the plot of the play is introduced, such as through the stock figure of the cunning slave, referenced in this passage as Davus.[166] This joins together the idea of Aesop as author and dramatist once more, elucidating the similarities in using characters to influence narrative events on the last note of this ekphrasis. This painting, and the narrative of the *Imagines*, however, is using Aesop in this manner, in philosophizing over the representation of the artists' self within their artefacts. To paraphrase Philostratus, the focus of the narrative is written as Aesop, for he is being treated by the painter as representation of the philosopher, just as philosophy uses Sophocles.[167]

This passage enriches the translations of λόγος in 1.3.1. as 'speech' or 'reason'. Fairbanks interprets that Aesop characterises his animals with speech (λόγου) so that they might discuss

[164] See n.128.
[165] See n.112.
[166] See above note.
[167] As Laird points out, Lucian and Plato use the figure of Sophocles in dialectics: Laird, 2003, p.121-4, c.f. n.67.

internal and moral experiences (1.3.1). Yet, gleaning understanding from the passage necessitates consideration that the repetition of λόγου plays on the word's various meanings each time. Philostratus provides an antanaclasis to the essence of 'speech for the sake of discourse', but may also include the reverse implication, that Aesop gives the animals 'reason so that they can speak'. This additional layer of meaning in λόγος recalls Philostratus' earlier usage in 1.pr.3., where the term applies to both a discursive argument and a fictional narrative.[168] When reading λόγος with the meaning of 'fable', 'tale', or 'story', this acknowledges that the Fables of Aesop themselves are capable to telling fables. This also forms a self-reflexive comment by the narrator on himself as a giver of λόγοι as established above (1.pr.3), as well as a feature of the narrative of the *Imagines*.[169] Thus, in Philostratus' ekphrastic description of Aesop, a fellow writer, the narrative implies the potential of an infinite series of characters, capable of narration, creating new characters, themselves capable of telling new stories. This *mise-en-abyme* ultimately invites the reader to consider their position as viewers of a narrative, and to what extent that narrative is embedded.

Miles' definition of the interpretative process as mimetic has been expanded through comparison to the production of artefacts, drawing on McCombie to considering the text as a new, responding artefact.[170] In further analysing scenes presented in the *Imagines* as *mises-en-abyme* of this process, these foundations allow us to identify the characterisation of this creative and interpretative process as a philosophical one. Philosophy is shown as creative, and artistic creation is characterised as philosophical. Dedicating the following section to the Pasiphaë ekphrasis will continue to focus our study on the presentation and representation of narrative and how this is communicated through the painter and narrator's co-creation of this scene.

---

[168] LSJ λόγος (V.1); (2); (3). C.f. n.126.
[169] See §2.1.1, c.f. n.123.
[170] McCombie, 2002, p.152, see p.16 of this study.

2.2. Daedalus: Pasiphaë 1.16

> Ἡ Πασιφάη τοῦ ταύρου ἐρᾷ καὶ ἱκετεύει τὸν Δαίδαλον σοφίσασθαί τινα πειθὼ τοῦ θηρίου, ὁ δὲ ἐργάζεται βοῦν κοίλην παραπλησίαν ἀγελαίᾳ βοῒ τοῦ ταύρου ἐθάδι. καὶ ἥτις μὲν ἡ εὐνὴ σφῶν ἐγένετο, δηλοῖ τὸ τοῦ Μινωταύρου εἶδος ἀτόπως συντεθὲν τῇ φύσει· γέγραπται δὲ οὐχ ἡ εὐνὴ νῦν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐργαστήριον μὲν τοῦτο πεποίηται τοῦ Δαιδάλου…
>
> Pasiphaë is in love with the bull and begs[171] Daedalus to devise something to persuade the beast,* and he is fashioning a hollow cow like a cow from the herd to which the bull is accustomed. What their union[172] brought forth is shown by the strange form of the Minotaur, who is constructed* strangely by nature. Their union is not depicted here, but this is the workshop of Daedalus described* […]
>
> Philostratus, *Imag*. 1.16.1
>
> *translation adapted [173] [174] [175]

In the beginning of this chapter, we introduced Miles' theory of internalised reproduction,[176] and will expand on this theme by considering physical reproduction in the ekphrasis of Pasiphaë 1.16. In this description, the narrator tells us Daedalus will be contriving something to persuade, σοφίσασθαί τινα πειθὼ, (1.16.1), later described as a 'device' (μηχανήματος, 1.16.3). The purpose of πειθὼ here is more strongly associated with the erotic visual elements of the concept, rather than deceptive

[171] LSJ ἱκετεύω translations (A.2) indicate that this verb is used to denote supplication; in Homer, this is used to mean to 'approach as a suppliant' (A; Hom. *Od.* 15.277). Therefore, read also as 'supplicates'.
[172] LSJ εὐνὴ A.4: 'marriage bed', hence 'union'.
[173] LSJ provides Πειθώ as the divine personification of persuasion (A). As seen in the creation of Pandora in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Peitho provides 'golden necklaces about [Pandora's] body' (ll. 73-74), and the 'wheedling words', Breitenberger points out, are placed in Pandora by Hermes (ll.77-79), characterising seductive speech as 'shameless and deceitful from the very beginning', 2007, pp.120-121. Peitho is associated with the seductive appearance of Pandora in the act of adorning the woman's body and is separated from the idea of persuasive language by the figure of Hermes.
[174] See LSJ συντεθὲν (II): 'construct or frame a story' (II.3) as well as 'put together' (II.6). Here the Minotaur is not only referred to as a product of unnatural birth, but also as a fictional body which must be actively constructed by some artistic hand. The Minotaur is here subject to two kinds of 'construction', the organic synthesis of birth and the artificial synthesis of art, drawing attention to the construction and retelling of the mythology in this description. Cf. the bodies of the Fables above, §2.1.2, n.157, p.43.
[175] Added to draw attention to πεποίηται. This third person singular comes from ποιέω: heavy with artistic and poetic, as well as constructive implications. In prose, ποιέω can be used to replicate a verb, such as the previous 'γέγραπται' referring to the painter's depiction (LSJ B.4), as Fairbanks presents it. The verb 'depiction' (γέγραπται) (c.f. §1.3) may apply to the writing of the text as much as the painting of the image (LSJ γραφή), so one may interpret this as antanaclasis. ποιέω (A.2) may refer more generally to the painter 'bringing into existence' the workshop in paint, while reflexively, the author certainly 'writes' it (A.4). The depth and complexity of attribution and authority here is deeply entangled, as to be expected as we become more familiar with the narrator-author's exquisite techniques.
[176] Miles, 2018, p.27.

wordplay. The erotic success of the device is presented in the mention of the outcome of the Minotaur (1.16.1). It is apparent, however, that both erotic and linguistic aspects of πειθὼ are present in Philostratus' ekphrasis.[177] On the most immediate level to the reader, it is apparent that the writing of the text is an exercise of πειθὼ, to persuade the reader to visualise the images described, but further, to convince that the text is an accurate facsimile of the narrator's lived events. As we explored the self-authorising and authentication of the narrator as a parallel to the authentication and praise of Aesop, so appears a similar parallel with the figure of Daedalus. The narrator's interpretative process of the painting is mirrored in Daedalus' interpretation of Pasiphaë's desire through σοφίσασθαί, a process that denotes skilful and clever crafts as well as production through an art.[178]

The description of the hollow cow as μηχάνημα has connotations of an intangible creation as well as a physical machine. The μηχάνημα is much less tangible than other figures in the narrator's description; the ἁρμονίᾳ τῆς βοὸς ('framework of the cow', 1.16.2) is barely described at all. The meaning of 'subtle contrivance'[179] or 'machination' is used in Euripides' *Heracles* (l.855) where it denotes Hera's plans (Ἥρας κἀμὰ μηχανήματα), and the simultaneously physical and conceptual device of Clytemnestra's entrapment of Agamemnon is labelled τὸ μηχάνημα by Orestes in Aeschylus' *Libation-Bearers* (l.981). As such, the philosophical and metaphysical implications of Daedalus skilfully devising (σοφίζω) this contrivance (μηχανήματος) characterise him as much of a storyteller as Aesop, in that he actualises a narrative through the creation of a physical artefact. Thus, the emphasis on Daedalus' σοφία associates the sculptor's creative process with both the narrative sophistry undertaken in the ekphrasis and the γραφοι of the painter in, and writer of the *Imagines.* This focus on production and reproduction of artefacts offers structure with which to

[177] Daedalus' role as matchmaker may be derived also from the Greek. LSJ ἐργαστήριον: the word translated as 'workshop' was also used as a 'euphemism for a brothel' (A), which resonates with the carnal goal of Daedalus' task established in this opening passage. C.f. n.186 below.
[178] LSJ σοφίζω (A.2; II.2).
[179] LSJ μηχάνημα (II).

understand the core ekphrastic exercise of the narrative, to engage with the narrator's πειθὼ and analyse this theme as an internal philosophising on the attraction to appearances, which are in part manufactured, and in part containing part of ourselves within them.

This ekphrasis can also help us dismantle and understand the critical debates that have arisen surrounding visual art and art ekphrasis relating to the *Imagines* more broadly. More recent scholars such as Squire and Bakke have drawn attention to logocentrism in classical studies, the focus on the literariness of a text rather than a comprehensive approach which draws upon the visual materiality of contemporary culture.[180] However, other arguments that highlight the restrictive nature of 'pinning literature down to known facts and artefacts' also stand true, in that we should distinguish between precise, actionable 'obedient' ekphrasis, and inconsistent, 'disobedient' ekphrasis.[181] Philostratus' *Imagines,* like Homer's shield of Achilles, often falls into the latter of Laird's categories, being quite impossible to translate back into a work of visual art like that which the ekphrasis is purported to have originated from. Rather than this literary creativity undermining the importance of visual material culture, we should understand the influence and opportunity paintings and images had on learning in Greek and Roman education, as Bakke elucidates.[182] By approaching the ekphrastic descriptions of the *Imagines* as philosophical dialectics, wherein the μηχάνημα of the text combines the visual and the verbal, we can begin to understand how the narrator of this text urges his audience to take a combined approach to interpretation, to draw upon the internal and external experiences of viewing, and further to recreate this process to understand our relationships with artefacts more clearly.

The descriptive absence of the μηχάνημα can be utilised in our understanding of this. As an artefact undergoing synthesis in this passage, one might expect it to be the focus of the ekphrasis, and to be able to find parallels in Philostratus' description of Daedalus' creativity with that of the

[180] Bakke, 2022, p.281; Squire, 2009, p.8.
[181] Laird, 1993, p.19.
[182] Bakke, 2022.

painter, and further himself as a writer. This is not the case. The narrator focuses on the Erotes over the hollow heifer, and subsequently on how this is done 'to bind something of Aphrodite to it' (ὡς Ἀφροδίτης τι αὐτῷ ἐπιδεῖν, 1.16.2), namely in that the μηχάνημα will be the vehicle for Pasiphaë's desire. We will explore this more deeply in passage 2.2.2 below, developing our understanding of the narrative as substitute for the hollow heifer, as it too conveys Pasiphaë towards her union with the bull along the trajectory of her myth. Appreciating this ekphrasis requires that we put into words and interpret (ἑρμηνεύω, 1.pr.3) what is excellent in the painting (δόκιμος, 1.pr.3), and in doing so we must consider which aspects of the figures in the text and the paintings are esteemed as trustworthy (δόκιμος),[183] so unlike the bull, we are not convinced by what is merely a semblance of what is familiar to us (πειθὼ […] ἐργάζεται […] παραπλησίαν […] ἐθάδι, 1.16.1).

[183] LSJ δόκιμος: 'of persons, trustworthy' (A.1); 'of things, excellent' (A.2). As the previous discussions on verisimilitude and self-authorising established, there is an impression created of authenticity. The true question is not whether or not the text can be believed, but how it invites interrogation and what philosophical questions it allows us to consider.

2.2.1. Daedalus σοφιστής

This section will consider Daedalus as an active interpreter in the description. Building upon Miles' identification of the Philostratean interpreter figure in the narrative as an embodiment and characterisation of the mimetic process of interpretation,[184] we will consider how Daedalus interprets Pasiphaë's desire. Daedalus' actions in his initial introduction are presented with the verb σοφίζω (1.16.1), indicating not only his skill in his craft,[185] but that this is the ability which Pasiphaë specifically requests when she makes her supplication (ἱκετεύει τὸν Δαίδαλον σοφίσασθαί, 1.16.1). This creates a familiar situation: a skilled 'sophist' is approached and pleaded to create something for the asker. Whereas Daedalus sets about actualising his μηχάνημα with divine aid, the narrator of the *Imagines* deigns to produce verbal addresses instead (ὁμιλίας, 1.pr.3).

In sharing his handiwork with Erotes, Daedalus can be considered one amongst their number in bringing about Pasiphaë's lustful union with the bull, 'affixing something of Aphrodite' to his artefact (ὡς Ἀφροδίτης τι αὐτῷ ἐπιδέον, 1.16.2). The implication that Daedalus conducts eroticism through his creative labour can be seen in the language chosen by the narrator to describe his place of work as well as his occupation. Understanding that the ἐργαστήριον is fundamentally a 'place of work',[186] Daedalus' workshop becomes a place of 'love-craft' as he works with the Erotes, as shown by συνεργός, which implies Daedalus shares the 'same trade' as the love-gods.[187] As other critics have observed, erotic subjects within the *Imagines* are brought to the attention of the reader for discussion, such as the intercourse between Pasiphaë and the bull in this passage of the *Imagines* we will discuss shortly.[188] The narrator, like Daedalus, is a craftsman of erotic understanding, achieved through the physical product of his labour, a perspective made evident in the narrator's self-

---

[184] Miles, 2018, p.27.
[185] Hence this subtitle, 'Daedalus, master of his craft'.
[186] LSJ ἐργαστήριον A; ἐργαστήριον μὲν τοῦτο πεποίηται τοῦ Δαιδάλου, 1.16.1.
[187] LSJ συνεργός II; Greek provided as ξυνεργοὺς, potentially a dialectal variation of spelling, at 1.16.2.
[188] Webb, for example identifies the boy's interest in the 'erotic possibilities' of the paintings, noting that this contributes to his characterisation as a self-aware and independent character (2006, pp.127-8), and such curiosity may be met with the sexual connotations of ὁμιλία (LSJ 2), when understood beyond social intercourse or instruction (LSJ A, 3). The intellectual appropriateness of the 'intercourse' for the audience is emphasised by 'for the young' (or 'the new') in ὁμιλίας αὐτὰ τοῖς νέοις ξυντιθέντες, 1.pr.3.

reflective framing provided for Daedalus. This focus on the production of, rather than the physical artefact itself in the description of Daedalus allows the reader to consider that the addresses of the *Imagines* are not intended for the young (τοῖς νέοις) alone, but in being recorded speeches in the form of text, their physical documented nature welcomes a different, additional kind of audience for whom the text was made after the initial delivery of the speeches.

The narrator describes Daedalus as having 'an appearance of utmost wisdom as well as an intellectual gaze'[189] (τὸ εἶδος ὑπέρσοφόν τι καὶ ἔννουν βλέπων, 1.16.1).[190] This focus on Daedalus' 'power of sight' (βλέπων)[191] creates a similar internal *mise-en-abyme* to the recurring λόγος of the Fables in 1.3. As we view Daedalus, so too can he perceive,[192] and it is with this perception and insight that he successfully aids Pasiphaë with his creative wisdom (σοφία). The intellectual context of Daedalus' gaze is however contrasted with the description of Pasiphaë who is 'looking round upon'[193] (περιαθρέω, 1.16.4) the bull, and indeed the desiring bull, who 'gazes fondly at the cow' (ἱλαρὸν βλέπων ἐς τὴν βοῦν, 1.16.4). Permutations of βλέπω recur in this final passage of 1.16, with the cycle of unreciprocated longing looks only further differentiating these gazes from Daedalus' discerning eye, which in its mention has no determinable subject in the narrative (1.16.1). What Daedalus sees, perhaps, is what the narrator focuses on, as the Erotes used by Daedalus (1.16.2) become subject of the description. This focalisation through Daedalus to show how he co-operates

[189] LSJ βλέπω (A) suggests 'power of sight', which can be understood in the metonymical sense of 'eye'.
[190] For the insistent repetition of Daedalus' being Attic, or 'Attic-ness' (ἀττικίζει, 1.16.1), c.f. *Imag.* 1.pr.4 and n.11, and refer to S. Goldhill, 2001, and T. Whitmarsh, 2002. For arguments pertaining to Philostratus' 'pro-Hellenic identity', see Kirby-Hirst, 2014, pp.76-104 (p.79). For a more nuanced discussion on the entanglement of identity in the late Graeco-Roman classical period, consider Whitmarsh, 2009, pp.114–28, McCloskey, 2017, pp.63-83, especially p.83, and Hodkinson, 2011, p.28, on how the contests between identity are reflected in philosophical approaches. The characterisation of the narrator as persistently longing to interact with certain figures in the paintings is for some critics suggestive of distance between contemporary viewer and ancient source, however, arguments potentially made for a Hellenic nostalgia (e.g. Elsner, 1996, p.249) are substantially based on in the mimetic distance between representation and reality, which this dissertation focusses on as the distance between external explanation and internal interpretation (see p.6).
[191] LSJ βλέπω (A).
[192] For the recurrent paradox of perception in the paintings, the self-evident subject of study is Narcissus (1.23). For further reading on the Narcissus of the *Imagines*, see Webb, 2006, especially p.128-132, and for a larger context, consider Elsner, 1996.
[193] LSJ περιαθρέω (2).

with the Erotes to manufacture his device[194] (τοὺς Ἔρωτας ξυνεργοὺς ποιεῖται τοῦ μηχανήματος, 1.16.2)[195] develops the description of the interpretative process we have begun to uncover in Fables 1.3.

Here, as in Aesop, a *mise-en-abyme* is curated to draw our attention to creative authority, and how the interpretative process necessarily produces new artefacts, even if those artefacts are verbal speeches with no physical body. As we uncover the role of the μηχάνημα by analysing the presentation of its role in Pasiphaë's story, we shall see that its presence is infused in the very text itself. Daedalus' 'subtle contrivance' (μηχανήματος) is more than just a plan; the narrator notes its success by stating that, yes, we all know what the union between Pasiphaë and bull brought forth, even if the Minotaur is not *actually* 'shown' (δηλοῖ 1.16.1).[196] The union of bull and man-made heifer is specified as not depicted (γέγραπται δὲ οὐχ, 1.16.1), in contrast to the workshop of Daedalus depicted (ἐργαστήριον μὲν τοῦτο πεποίηται τοῦ Δαιδάλου, 1.16.1) and the vivid Erotes (ἐναργεῖς, 1.16.2). It should be considered that in addition to being an ancillary detail 'from myth', [197] the mention of the union is presented as the culmination of Pasiphaë's desire and Daedalus' plan. Daedalus' μηχάνημα is as strangely composite in nature as the Minotaur itself (εἶδος ἀτόπως συντεθὲν τῇ φύσει, 1.16.1),[198] being part human and part device, part real and imitative. The painting is a reimagining of Daedalus' lifelike works, a *mimēsis* of an even better artistic

[194] Or even, as we shall see, 'put together his plan', given literary and poetic readings of ποιεῖται and μηχανήματος as we shall see shortly below in the analysis of who πεποίηται the workshop of Daedalus (1.16.1).
[195] LSJ συνεργός suggests that rather than Daedalus 'using' the Erotes, he is 'working together' (A) with them, and moreover that they are 'of the same trade' (II). In addition to n.177 on ἐργαστήριον as 'brothel' and p.52 above, we could consider that Daedalus is in some ways also performing the work of the Erotes just as they are described as performing his constructive task for him. C.f. n.240.
[196] The language of obfuscation and revelation persists throughout the ekphrasis; see for example n.219 and implications given on Pasiphaë's motiving desires.
[197] Shaffer, 1998, p.304.
[198] Compare LSJ ἄτοπος A: 'out of place' and LSJ συντίθημι A: 'place' or 'put together'. The narrator here uses an oxymoron, his linguistic choices showing the juxtaposition of the disparate being constructed. See also LSJ συντίθημι II.b: to 'compose or make one thing of or from another' and II.3: to 'construct or frame a story'. As Schaffer would observe, the narrator certainly frames his ekphrasis with a mythological allusion to 'expand the scope of the purely descriptive *ekphrasis'* (original emphasis), though I still have to disagree that this is for the purpose of leading the audience 'to the desired interpretation of the work of art' being described (1998, p.307).

verisimilitude to life.[199] Philostratus' further re-textualisation in turn creates a mimetic hierarchy, which touches upon the inherent intangibility of reproductions when compared with the original object. The focus on the bovine μηχάνημα as a vehicle for both Pasiphaë and her desire suggests that the literal in-corporation of self is necessary to effectively present and convey a narrative.

The narrator brings us to Daedalus' workshop (ἐργαστήριον τοῦ Δαιδάλου), which is fully reproduced (τοῦτο πεποίηται),[200] in contrast to the undepicted union between Pasiphaë and the bull (γέγραπται δὲ οὐχ ἡ εὐνὴ).[201] In providing written context of the story, this union has indeed been depicted in a textual supplement which enhances understanding of the visual scene the narrator goes on to describe. Here, the γραφή bridges the differences between painting and textual narratives, inviting the reader to consider the *Imagines* as iconotext despite the lack of visual images,[202] as the form of the text writes (γραφει) what is not depicted (γέγραπται οὐχ). Conversely, we are told that the painting has reproduced (πεποίηται) the workshop to a degree which is not captured in the text. Thus, ποιέω and γράφω are complimentary modes of synthesis, which together form a full impression of the setting.

This symbiotic partnership is developed when the narrator presents Daedalus' creations in varying stages of completion. The structure aligns quality of textual language with discernibility of visible form, by using verbs of motion to describe the most finished statues. As though the narrator is carving the statues out with his words, he specifies the sense of motion the figures carry in two alliterative verbs: βαινω, βαδίζω. The finished form is therefore characterised not by a discernible outline, but rather the line of motion the narrator imbues these forms with.

---

[199] C.f. ζωγραφία, ζω-γραφία; painting from life.
[200] Schönberger provides *gemalt* 'painted' for πεποίηται, p.129.
[201] *Imag.* 1.16.1.
[202] Iconotext is an artefact which utilises both images and text to convey meaning; this consideration of the *Imagines* informed and inspired by Squire, 2009, esp. p.297. For a prime example, see *Imag.* 1.4.2., provided and explained in n.261 below.

> περιέστηκε[203] δὲ αὐτῷ ἀγάλματα[204] τὰ μὲν ἐν μορφαῖς, τὰ δὲ ἐν τῷ διορθοῦσθαι, βεβηκότα ἤδη καὶ ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ τοῦ βαδίζειν.
>
> and about it are statues,[205] some with forms blocked out, others, in the midst of refinement,* are already stepping forward and give the promise of walking about.
>
> Philostratus, *Imag*. 1.16.1
>
> *translation adapted [206]

This progression from vague μορφή ('shape') to being διορθοῦσθαι ('refined') shows the state of the statues being first described as static, incomplete forms, to being a part of a verb denoting corrective change. Ultimately, the narrator assigns actions to the statues, in the infinitive (βαδίζειν) and the perfect as well (βεβηκότα ἤδη), creating a sense of continuity and temporal change that is linked to the creative process these statues undergo. The diachronic narrative engagement with the static painted image discussing Daedalus' progressive refinement recreates the painter's process of creating forms which are first indistinct and then clearer. The addition of detail is therefore a process of developing creative σοφία, the understanding of what will create meaning for the viewer and which artistic choices will construct narrative through a synchronous image. The narrative maps the progression of an artefact towards a synchronous 'finished' state, the state in which it will reach audiences of the like of the youths, the narrator, and through some degrees of separation, the reader.[207]

---

[203] Note the linguistic and narrative similarity to περιεστῶτες: 'bystanders', LSJ περιΐστημι B.

[204] 'Refinement' draws upon the meanings 'to set right', influenced by Schönberger's translation: to 'correct' or 'revise' implies prior error, whereas 'refinement' gives a stronger allusion to the creative process, see n.238.

[205] The word ἀγάλμα has multiple meanings which may add a more abstract weight to this section. Understanding ἀγάλμα as a device for 'glory' or 'honour' (LSJ A) draws a parallel to Aesop being 'surrounded' by his creations which celebrate and crown him (περιίστησι χορὸν τῷ Αἰσώπῳ, 1.3.2; περιέστηκε, 1.16.1). In these two ekphrastic descriptions then, the creator has been surrounded by his creations which represent a degree of his honour and achievement. These diegetic, representative forms shape the narrative of each painting, but also reflects the diegesis of the textual narrative, of each painting being 'stood around' (περιέστησαν) by the narrator and his companions.

[206] Cf. LSJ διορθόω (2): διορθόω λόγον 'tell my tale aright' (Pi.O.7.21), and Schönberger 1968, 'noch ohne die letzte Hand', p.129: lit. 'still without the last hand'; still without the finishing touch. In *VS* 1.17.2, 'reconcile'. See also at n.238.

[207] As is developed below, Shaffer's analysis of verbal interpretation recognises that description allows for the assignation of motive (Shaffer, 1998, p.304), allowing us to consider how Pasiphaë's motives shape the narrative.

This focus on the process of producing these lifelike statues contributes to the characterisation of Daedalus as an interpreter and philosopher in this ekphrasis. The narrator of the Pasiphaë ekphrasis presents Daedalus as a skilled craftsman and indulges in Athenian exceptionalism, describing his character as Attic in 'both his greatly wise appearance and his thoughtful gaze' (καὶ τὸ εἶδος ὑπέρσοφόν τι καὶ ἔννουν βλέπων, 1.16.1). In this ekphrasis, Daedalus' appearance indicates to the narrator intelligence, with which 'Attic' (ἀττικίζει) becomes synonymous, recalling the narrator's praise of the Neapolitan population for their 'Attic-ness' (1.pr.4). Within the declarations of the narrator, this associates the figure of Daedalus to those peoples the narrator recognises for 'their earnestness for discussion' (τὰς σπουδὰς τῶν λόγων Ἑλληνικοί εἰσι, 1.pr.4).[208] Subsequently, this associates the figure of Daedalus with sophistry, and the dialectic curated between the figure of painter and narrator throughout the *Imagines.* As we can see in the Pompeiian wall paintings in the appendix (Figures 1 and 2), in this narrative respect and in the painting shown in Figure 1, Daedalus is presented as a bridge, capable of bringing together separate elements with his unique insight. In this way, the figure of Daedalus is used as a device in the narrator's philosophising of the painting, in as much as Daedalus uses the μηχάνημα of the hollow heifer to interpret Pasiphaë's desire.

2.2.2. The Hollow μηχάνημα

The function of the hollow μηχάνημα to hold Pasiphaë's form, as a vehicle for her desire, is achieved by changing her outward appearance (εἶδος). This artefact allows for the internalisation of the viewer, Pasiphaë, as this is Daedalus' interpretation of what she desires. Pasiphaë does not think she is a heifer, though it could be argued that the anthropomorphism of the bull and cow as 'girl' and 'lover' at 1.16.4 indicates a focalisation of her inability to distinguish human relations from

[208] Philostratus' plural use of σπουδή in *VA* 4.27, 34, has been recognised in LSJ to mean 'disputation' (A.II.3).

bestial ones. But in order to satisfy her lust, Daedalus recognises that she must appeal to the bull's desires, and so he creates an artefact that serves to be for each viewer what they desire: for Pasiphaë, the method of satiation for her lust, and for the bull, a heifer of his own species. Despite the function of the heifer artefact hinging on its verisimilitude, it is not the descriptive focus of the ekphrasis. Ideologically, we understand that this dependence on realism reflects the discourse surrounding *mimēsis* and the nature of imitation, while encompassing rather than engaging with those discourses. The ultimate success of the device indicates the skill of the creator, in that two differing desires are brought together through the artefact which presents two distinctive realities. The hollow heifer is therefore a manifested representation of the art of persuasion, πειθὼ, as Pasiphaë seeks to seduce the bull, but requires some artifice (σοφίσασθαί, 1.16.1) and the aid of Daedalus in order to achieve this. The Pasiphaë ekphrasis 1.16 offers a wealth of discussion on the visual and rhetorical aspects of πειθὼ and keeping in mind the production of an artefact as philosophical process, we have explored the Pasiphaë ekphrasis for the way in which Daedalus interprets and shows mastery in πειθὼ. This in turn contributes to our understanding of how narration is presented as a philosophical process.

The presentation of Pasiphaë in Latin poetry has been tied significantly to her identity as Cretan, a place characterised by transgression, contradictions, and political paradoxes. [209] Although internal conflict and contradiction of identity may reflect and account for its appeal within Roman literature,[210] the presentation of Pasiphaë in Philostratus' ekphrasis is not so much one of internal identity so much as the paradox of representation. Armstrong suggests that Pasiphaë's erotic transgression challenges the rigidity of boundaries, yet identifies that Pasiphaë's lust is often categorised as a form of adultery in the Ovidian poetic context of unbridled female passion.[211] In the

[209] Armstrong, 2006, p.12.
[210] Armstrong, 2006, p.12.
[211] Armstrong recognises that Pasiphae's lust is difficult to categorise, suggesting that Pasiphaë's transgression is presented as a worse form of adultery due to its bestial nature; in this way, Ovid can *recommend* human adultery as a more acceptable alternative: Armstrong, 2006, pp.111-113.

Philostratean ekphrasis, there is little mention of the circumstances resulting in her love for the bull, but the theme of transgression and the blurring of boundaries pervades, albeit in the technical realms rather than erotic. The narrator focuses on Daedalus' construction of a hollow heifer at Pasiphaë's behest (1.16.1-2). The context of this visual description is not an emotional resonance with the themes of love and transgression, but rather a resonance with the technical aspects of producing artefacts.

Shaffer suggests that 'the act of describing a picture' allows the narrator to assign motive to painted figures such as Pasiphaë,[212] and this will indeed be the case as we later consider the description and painting as narratives focalised through the erotic gaze of Pasiphaë. Pasiphaë's act of supplication in the first line is described in the present tense, in a way which leads the reader to presume she is depicted in this action in the painting, or even indeed the resulting progeny of the Minotaur (καὶ ἥτις μὲν ἡ εὐνὴ σφῶν ἐγένετο), until the narrator quashes that presumption;[213] the 'present' synchronic moment of the image is implied as Pasiphaë's plea (ἱκετεύει) and Daedalus' building of the hollow heifer (ἐργάζεται βοῦν κοίλην, 1.16.1). As the ekphrasis develops however, the form of Pasiphaë does not appear to be beseeching Daedalus (ἱκετεύει τὸν Δαίδαλον), but rather stands outside workshop (Ἡ Πασιφάη δὲ ἔξω περὶ τὰ βουκόλια, 1.16.4). As we will explore, this positioning of Pasiphaë outside the workshop indicates her independent narrative agency. She stands externally to Daedalus' place of creativity, and is not like one amongst his statues, despite the similarity of her description 'inspecting' the bull 'all around'[214] (Ἡ Πασιφάη δὲ ἔξω περὶ τὰ βουκόλια περιαθρεῖ τὸν ταῦρον, 1.16.4) to the description of the statues standing about the workshop (περιέστηκε δὲ αὐτῷ ἀγάλματα, 1.16.1).[215]

[212] Shaffer, 1998, p.304.
[213] See pages 48 and 54 above; Pasiphaë ἐρᾷ καὶ ἱκετεύει; γέγραπται δὲ οὐχ ἡ εὐνὴ νῦν. C.f. n.171 and n.174.
[214] LSJ περιαθρέω A.
[215] See n.205 on ἀγάλμα.

Thematically focussed on visual presentation, the narrator presents Daedalus' device as a visual persuasion (πειθὼ), to convince the bull it sees something familiar (τοῦ ταύρου ἐθάδι, 1.16.1). The visuality of this persuasion, as we have introduced, is the formal focus of this ekphrasis, which can be consolidated by the narrator's description of Pasiphaë at 1.16.4: 'she hopes to draw him in by her figure and her divine and gleaming stola' (οἰομένη προσάξεσθαι αὐτὸν τῷ εἴδει καὶ τῇ στολῇ θεῖόν τε ἀπολαμπούσῃ). Not only does Pasiphaë fail her attempted visual seduction before us, thereby substantiating her reason to beg Daedalus for a different kind of persuasive physical appearance (εἶδος), but the characterisation of her dress as ἀπολαμπούσῃ, 'shining' brightly or 'reflecting light'[216] contrasts the description of the painted, living cow's form, ὑποφαίνει (lit. 'to bring to light', 'dawn', but used to mean 'suggest' or 'reveal' here) some characteristics of a young girl.[217] Whereas Pasiphaë's desire shines brightly, the narrator recognises the cow spurns the bull, dimly illuminating (-φαίνει) an anthropomorphic characterisation. Not only are Pasiphaë and the cow framed thus as parallels and erotic rivals for the bull's attention, but the language used to do so contrasts them with references to light, shadow, mirroring these with overt desire or the coy rejection thereof. Daedalus interprets Pasiphaë's desire by enabling her union through the production of the hollow heifer, and that this creation is the bovine reflection (εἰκών) of Pasiphaë's internal desire. This act of interpretation (σοφίσασθαί, 1.16.1) is itself reflective of the painter's process, who adds Erotes to the scene, and the narrator, who focuses on these beings symbolic of desire. Rather than being a result of sympathy for Pasiphaë,[218] these interpretative reflections capture the essence of their key character as a result of narrative focalising through the figure of Pasiphaë. The narrative suggests that her desire is to herself innocuous, as the language of the final lines suggest.

[216] LSJ ἀπολάμπω A.2, cf. DGE and Bailly abrégé; resplendent, brilliant.
[217] See n.220 on ὑποφαίνω below; 1.16.4; and considered again at pp.65-66 below, especially n.248.
[218] As we shall see with the Hippolytus ekphrasis (2.4) in 3.3, the narrator is not afraid to lament, indicating where pathos should be experienced.

The understanding of the dynamics between the painted figures is shaped by identifying the erotic gaze of Pasiphaë, and acknowledging her agency outside of the creator figure, not unlike the agency of the Fables in relation to Aesop.[219] The narrator frames the narrative with contextualising statements which describe Pasiphaë's internal emotions – 'Pasiphaë is in love with the bull' (Ἡ Πασιφάη τοῦ ταύρου ἐρᾷ, 1.16.1) – and a focalised negative image of Pasiphae: the avoidant cow, whose 'leap shows a little of a girl who flees from under the wanton violence of a lover' (ὑποφαίνει[220] κόρης δή τινος ὑποφευγούσης ἐραστοῦ ὕβριν, 1.16.4). In suggesting that the cow behaves like a girl (κόρης δή τινος) escaping sexual violence,[221] the narrator gives hint of criticising Pasiphaë's lustful indulgence and her display of desire, rather than prudent girlish modesty in the face of a lover's advances. This comparison of animal to human anthropomorphises the cow through the literary comparison to a human girl, a construction which at once implies an expected sexual σωφροσύνη (*sophrosyne*)[222] becoming of human women and presents an anthropomorphic inverse to Pasiphaë becoming bovine through the μηχάνημα to consummate her desires. Armstrong's observation of the Pasiphaë figure in relation to the wild can be used here, that Pasiphaë's 'passion is presented in terms which […] equate the animal more closely with the human'.[223] However, rather than suggesting Pasiphaë is more bovine than human in her desire,[224] the narrative of the *Imagines* 1.16 gives the impression that, as a result of the interpretative processes at work in the story, Pasiphaë's lust is neither condemned nor characterised as perverse or transgressive. Instead, these depictions are interpretations of her desire, and so create a relatively sympathetic narrative through observing her perspective.

---

[219] C.f. p.36.
[220] LSJ ὑποφαίνω: 'show a little', 'give indications of' (2), also suggests reveal from darkness, to 'bring to light from under' (A) or bring to the surface from somewhere hidden. My translation also incorporates δή τινος by suggesting 'the behaviours of' a girl.
[221] LSJ ὕβρις provides 'violence' if the subject is an animal (A.3), however, as this action is given as that 'of a lover', ἐραστοῦ, the connotations of rape and lust (A.2, II.2) become more predominant.
[222] In this context, the 'moderation of sensual desires', specifically 'temperance in relation to women', LSJ σωφροσύνη (A.2).
[223] Virgil (70 -21 BCE), *Eclogues* 6.48-51, in Armstrong, 2006, pp.81-82.
[224] Cf. Armstrong, 2006, n.25 p.82.

The description of the Erotes as ἐναργεῖς, 'vivid' or 'visible' on account of their partaking of the cow's construction utilises a term frequently used to define the rhetorical function of ekphrasis in contemporary *Progymnasmata*.[225] Recalling the explicit characterisation of Aesop as a dramatist, we may now consider Daedalus a similar kind of executive of the scene he inhabits, as he is bringing the thing shown 'vividly before the eyes'; both the thing contrived to lure (σοφίσασθαί τινα πειθὼ, 1.16.1), as well as providing tasks for the Erotes to do which makes them vividly visible (ἐναργής, 1.16.2). Daedalus, with his creative intent (σοφίζω, 1.16.1) brings both his design and assistants to life with his artistic direction. The Erotes, as assets of Daedalus' τέχνη, are bestowed the recognition the narrator usually reserves for the painter, who notes all their 'skill of hand and colours' (ὑπερβεβλήκασι πᾶσαν καὶ σοφίαν, ὁπόση χειρός τε καὶ χρωμάτων, 1.16.2). The narrator offers his insight here behind Daedalus' intentions: Daedalus works with the Erotes 'so as to bind it with something of Aphrodite' (ὡς Ἀφροδίτης τι αὐτῷ ἐπιδεῖν, 1.16.2), and so, the spotlighting of the Erotes emphasises the theme of desire in this ekphrasis, and the myth of Pasiphaë in love with the bull (Ἡ Πασιφάη τοῦ ταύρου ἐρᾷ, 1.16.1). The Erotes labour in Daedalus' workshop under his direction, but semiotically they draw attention to the way erotic desire has instigated the scene of this painting. Emphasising through their constructive actions that the crafting of the cow is instigated by Pasiphaë, not only her initial supplication (ἱκετεύει) but on account of her desire (τοῦ ταύρου ἐρᾷ, 1.16.1), their presence in the scene suggests a sympathetic focalisation on Pasiphaë's emotions. Although she herself appears but briefly in the description, Pasiphaë's desire in the form of the Erotes is thus present throughout, and moreover, they physically contribute to the construction of the vehicle for her union with the bull (ἡ εὐνὴ σφῶν, 1.16.1).

[225] 'Ekphrasis is a descriptive speech which brings the thing shown vividly before the eyes', Elsner, 2002, p.1; Webb, 2009, pp.[]. *Progymnasmata* from Theon §118.6-120, 1st century CE, (Patillon, ed. pp.66-69), preserved by 'Hermogenes' §10.47-50, c.2nd century CE (Rabe, ed. pp.22-23), again in Aphthonius §12.46-49 (Rabe, ed. pp.36-41) and Nicolaus (Felten, ed. pp.67-71) of the 4th – 5th centuries CE.

2.2.3. Visualising creation

Figure 1 of the appendix shows a wall-painting depicting Daedalus with the hollow cow, which appears largely completed, standing together before Pasiphaë. Through this, we will reiterate how and why the narrator prioritises describing the figures of the Erotes in his description, describing them specifically as ἐναργεῖς (‘vivid’, 1.16.2) through description of mechanical, repetitive motion (1.16.3). As critics such as Newby and Bakke have noted,[226] the presence of images and paintings such as this one in the domestic and public spaces of the Roman world made mythological subjects ‘easily available’ for a rhetorical teacher.[227] Bakke goes further to convincingly explain that the narrator’s approach to interpretation (ερμηνεύω) is not performed with verisimilitude or art critical commentary in mind, but rather to use the image and his interpretation ‘to whatever the situation requires’.[228] This can be seen throughout the *Imagines,* as the narrator draws upon the narrative of the artefact to elucidate his own methods (τέχνη), shaping his interpretation in a way which, to the reader, resonates with the approach of the painter. Therefore, the narrator’s approach to describing the figures in his ekphrasis reveals the method of interpretation (ερμηνεύω) he wishes his audience to discern and adapt, just as he has done from the works of the painter (1.pr.3).

Studying mythological wall-paintings such as these, Newby notes that subtle permutations of similar scenes in Roman artwork has shifted critical focus onto the Roman contexts of the images in their own right.[229] This attention to nuance in each image and the flexibility of interpretation is likewise emulated in the narrator’s approach to the paintings. The narrator’s adding of ‘supplementary figures’[230] to the body of the Pasiphaë description in the mention of the Minotaur indeed shows the elements the narrator is drawing upon to shape his interpretation. Rather than intended to guide us to the same understanding as the speaker,[231] we can consider the elements

[226] Newby, 2016, esp. pp. 137-8.
[227] Bakke, 2022, p.291.
[228] Bakke, 2022, p.291.
[229] Newby, 2016, p.138.
[230] Newby, 2016, p.138.
[231] Shaffer, 1998, p.307, c.f. n.106.

added by the interpreter there to illustrate his lesson, especially given the way his descriptive language of these additional figures can be seen to reflect the larger theme of interpretation.[232] In addition to this, we might consider the mythological context of Daedalus' characterisation,[233] which, while is not recapitulated by the narrator as it is for Aesop (1.3.1), adds another layer of emphasis to the narrator's approach to the subject.

The contrast between the emphasis on Daedalus' ability to produce realism in his statues, which give the promise to walk about (ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ τοῦ βαδίζειν 1.16.1)[234] and the language of sophistry (σοφίσασθαί, 1.16.1) used to describe his technique (τέχνη), can be understood by considering both as aspects of Daedalus' wisdom (σοφία). His ability to create realistic artefacts and affinity for artistry is reflected, for the narrator, in the appearance of Daedalus (εἶδος ὑπέρσοφόν, 1.16.1), and Daedalus' shrewd, perceptive approach to interpreting the world around him is in the same sentence noting his thoughtful gaze (ἔννουν βλέπων, 1.16.1). In marking the external and internal worlds of Daedalus, the narrator indicates this figure has a twofold depth which has been achieved through mental and technical practise, presenting Daedalus as a more authoritative and masterful parallel to the Minotaur's strange natural dichotomy.

This interpretation of Daedalus can be enriched by considering his depiction in earlier Roman artwork, as it reminds us, the viewer, of the importance of confronting an artefact with a perceptive eye. The painting of Figure 1. (see appendix) appears on the left wall of a room in the Casa dei Vettii in Pompeii, and dates to mid first century CE.[235] The darker, saturated colours of the figure of Daedalus contrast the pale body of the cow on his left, which, like Daedalus, faces away

[232] See in particular the use of the Minotaur to discuss forms (εἶδος) and semblances (εἶδον) in §2.2.1, pp.49-54.
[233] For historical references to Daedalus' ability, see Oldfather's translation of Diodorus Siculus (ca. 80-20 BCE) (4.76.1-6): 'In natural ability (φύσει) he towered far above (ὑπεραίρων ἐζήλωσε) all other men and cultivated the building art (τὴν τεκτονικὴν τέχνην), the making of statues, and the working of stone. […] that the beholder thought that the image made by him was a being endowed with life (ζῷον).' LCL 340, 1939, p.57.
[234] See §2.2.1 for analysis of 1.16.1, Daedalus' workshop and statues becoming more refined through description.
[235] See Fig. 1a in the appendix for a partial view of the room.

from the viewer creating an illusion of depth to the painting. The central placement of Daedalus might suggest to the viewer that we should consider Daedalus the central character, and that his position facing away from the audience is indicative that the scene is structured from his perspective.[236] The young craftworker in the foreground, though within the range of Daedalus' gaze, is close to us, the viewer, than the character of Daedalus. His placement and narrative similarity to the narrator's Erotes (1.16.2-3) evokes the figures of the Fables. The description of Erotes in the ekphrasis 1.16 suggest an interpretation of the 'original' constructive process has been made. Such as Aesop the man did not commune with the Fables, but the figure of Aesop can do so in a painted interpretation of his τέχνη.[237] With this visual reference, we can better consider the mimetic hierarchy of representations we have explored in §2.1. Here, we can apply an understanding of depth[238] to the series of interpretations through which we view the figures of Aesop, and now Pasiphaë, who is here depicted as further from the audience than Daedalus. As Daedalus in this painting stands between us and Pasiphaë, so too the creative figure of Daedalus mediates any reception of Pasiphaë, by constructing and providing for her the cow εἰκών here standing beside him.

Daedalus' outstretched right hand places a final panel-piece onto the cow, reminiscent of Schönberger's translation that some of the sculptures in Daedalus' workshop await 'the finishing touch'.[239] His opposite hand reaches out in parallel to the seated Pasiphaë, and in our line of vision, his hand hovers on her chest, a placement which could be construed as touching her heart. Though an understanding of proportion and perspective informs us they are not presented as touching, the real limitations of the flat painted image in fact support this interpretation. This link between Pasiphaë's body and the cow's through Daedalus is extremely pertinent to the narrative of the

[236] For the narrative focalisation through Daedalus at 1.16.2 see §2.2.1, p.53 above.
[237] See §2.1.2.
[238] C.f. Armstrong, 2006, p.40, on intertextuality filling the present viewing experience with 'chattering voices of past apparitions', referring to these sequential allusions as 'chains of reference'. Consider the narrator's description of visual depth in Bosphoros (1.13.9), which creates a sense of embeddedness attributed to the addition of colours and shadow, making figures indistinct from the representation of their surroundings.
[239] Schönberger, 1968, p.129. Refer back to n.206.

Pasiphaë myth, as well as the presentation of this myth through Philostratus' ekphrasis. Daedalus works with Erotes (καὶ τοὺς Ἔρωτας ξυνεργοὺς, 1.16.2) to construct this device, language which suggests he is in the same trade as the Erotes.[240] In this painting, we can see a young labourer in the bottom right corner, tool in hand aloft, reminiscent of the narrator's suggestion to consider the leading movement as an alternating one (τουτὶ δ᾽ ἐναλλὰξ ἡγώμεθα, 1.16.3), one which gives way to repetition. The narrator asserts that the Erotes 'alternate' (ἐναλλὰξ) high and low positions over the saw in order to work it (1.16.3), reinvigorating a static moment of visual depiction such as in this painting, with his interpretation of the image, associating it with a diachronic, repetitive action.

As we have seen from analysing the Aesop ekphrasis, the creative figure is presented as creating a material artefact which reflects their wisdom and skill (σοφία). This artistic ability is also recognised in the works of the painter the narrator is observing, and likewise these visual artworks are praised. For Daedalus, it is his ability to present to each viewer what they desire. His μηχάνημα is hollow in more than just form, for it is in the very narrative of the ekphrasis given meaning by the viewers. The text implicitly compares the gazes (βλέπω) of Pasiphaë and the bull with that of Daedalus. Pasiphaë and the bull gaze upon other figures and associate them with yet more forms.[241] The bull will gaze upon the μηχάνημα and be persuaded it sees a cow of its own heard the like of which it is accustomed to (1.16.1), in doing so, fathers the Minotaur, a creature which, like the Fables, is the product of humanity in their reason (λόγος) and inhuman in their animal and textual forms. The natural form[242] of the Minotaur (τὸ τοῦ Μινωταύρου εἶδος, 1.16.1) is 'strangely composite' (ἀτόπως συντεθὲν, 1.16.1),[243] reflecting the union between human and animal, not only it its birth, but also in the unnatural bovine semblance (εἰκών) of its mother, Pasiphaë.[244] The joining

[240] LSJ συνεργός (II): 'colleague'. Refer also to n.195 above.
[241] As established in §2.2.2., from p.57, and especially on pp.60-61, considering 1.16.4 as focalised through Pasiphaë suggests that she may struggle to distinguish the human from the bestial in the use of metaphors describing the cow and the bull as 'girl' and 'lover' respectively (see page 61 for full quotation).
[242] LSJ εἶδος (II): form, kind, or nature.
[243] See §2.1.2; also n.198 on the juxtaposition of ἄτοπος and συντίθημι.
[244] Here we are comparing the natural human εἶδος of Pasiphaë, who in addition to her robe are described as luminous and of exceeding beauty (τῷ εἴδει καὶ τῇ στολῇ θεῖόν τε ἀπολαμπούσῃ καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἶριν, 1.16.4), with the synthesised εἰκών of the heifer she will don. See also p.60 above for this comparison.

of animal and human which the narrator praises in depictions of the Centaurs is not used here,[245] since whereas the 'contrasting colours aids in producing the united beauty of the whole' of the Female Centaurs,[246] the author shies away from describing the verisimilitude of Daedalus' device. That would, in this instance, show the narrator as having been similarly deceived by Daedalus' creation as the bull will be. Instead, he uses the form of the Minotaur as an explanatory symbol conjured to show the narrator's insight into Daedalus' skill (τέχνη).

The narrator suggests that Pasiphaë looks upon the bull and compares it with a human lover,[247] as the text's appreciation for the artful representation of the bull is preceded by a focalisation through her thoughts – 'she knows of what sort she loves' (καὶ γὰρ γινώσκει, ὁποίων ἐρᾷ, 1.16.4). The term ὁποῖος suggests degree of 'quality',[248] as well as 'kind', allowing the narrator to be intentionally vague as to Pasiphaë's clarity of knowing (γιγνώσκω), for while she might be aware, the description has stated that the bull will not. The narrative, in observing these kinds of misguided viewership, implicitly frames the narrator as Daedalus, who understands the desires of Pasiphaë and the bull, having worked out through his wisdom (σοφίσασθαί, 1.16.1) what form to best create to unite the two. Like the Daedalus of the Pompeiian painting (Fig.1), one eye is facing outwards, the other into the painting, leaving the possibility that the figure might turn his incredibly wise (ὑπέρσοφόν) and thoughtful gaze (ἔννους βλέπων, 1.16.1) upon us. The narrative challenges the viewer therefore to recognise where we might be deceived by our own attractions to what we find good in these representations (δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3), reminding us that through the attempt to interpret and explain ourselves (ἑρμηνεύσουσί), we can discern if what we see is truly trustworthy, and thus, excellent (δόκιμος).[249]

---

[245] Though to combine the horse with the human is not wondrous, […], it seems to me [the mark of] an excellent painter: ἀλλὰ ἵππον ἀνθρώπῳ συμβαλεῖν θαῦμα οὐδέν, […] ἀγαθοῦ οἶμαι ζωγράφου, 2.2.4.
[246] *Imag.* 2.3.2.
[247] See §2.2.2 and n.241 above.
[248] LSJ ὁποῖος (1).
[249] LSJ δόκιμος (1): 'of persons, trustworthy'; (2): 'of things, excellent'.

In addition to the praise of painterly σοφία as praise and proxy for philo-σοφία, we have started to consider philosophical re-internalisation of an artefact as a step in an interlocution process, as it allows the interpreter to engage with the creator of the artefact on a philosophical level. This section has focussed on the representation of Daedalus as a creative figure similar to Aesop, albeit an artist who uses sculpture as opposed to fable. The physicality of Daedalus' creations contrasts Aesop's textual and oral fables, and while Aesop's Fables take physical form in the painting, we have noted that the exact appearance of those forms itself instigates a discussion into what is recognisably human in form or ability to speak and reason (λόγος). Likewise, Daedalus' sculptures and hollow heifer are mentioned in the description but are in varying states of incompleteness. Yet the immateriality of these sculptures is shown through their contrast to the depiction of the Erotes, who, like the Fables, exist in the painting as the painter's interpretation of the creative figure's craft. Whereas the Fables are reinterpreted as physical creatures, the Erotes suggest that Daedalus' sculpture of the hollow heifer is an interpretative process which, shaped around Pasiphaë and the bulls' perceptions, creates a subtle device.

This builds upon Miles' mimetic interpretative process and helps us understand the characterisation of the narrator as an active interpreter, like Daedalus in this ekphrasis. Through close analysis of Daedalus' response to Pasiphaë's supplication (1.16.1), considering the placement of the Erotes figures as a transgressional presence in the narratives, and examining the focalised description of the bull and cow present in the painting with anthropomorphic language (1.16.4), this section has considered how Daedalus, the painter, and the narrator represent viewing, and characters' subjective interpretations shaped by desire. In offering a method so as not allow desire to shape us, even as the Erotes shape Pasiphaë's destiny, the narrator allows us to further consider how interpretations and representations can be a basis and educational voice in a philosophical discussion. Much scholarship on the *Imagines* either notes the lack of 'material parallels' on the

contents, often taking a more literary approach.[250] Viewing a painting in this section has enhanced our approach to the text, and moreover allowed us to realise that, as we have seen in the Pasiphaë ekphrasis, ascribing meaning to a hollow device (μηχανήματος) can work against us, so much so that we lose ourselves to reflections of ourselves.[251] In the final part of this chapter, we will consider how the narrator deals with this entanglement with the representation, and how he maintains his characterisation of himself through the qualities of the paintings he describes.

[250]Bates, 2021, pp. 138-139 identifies the constrast in Philostratus' *Hercules Furens* 2.23 to other material artworks; see also Xian, 2017, pp.335-338, identifying the self-referential use of explicit and hidden reference through Philostratus' intertextual links to Callimachus and Hesiod in 2.28; Squire and Elsner's comprehensive study (2016) does both, considering representations of Homeric language and metaphor in 1.1, as well as iconographic depictions of Scamander (see especially pp.64-69). Squire, 2009, criticises 'logocentrism' by stressing the importance of drawing from the 'viewing cultures constructed by contemporary painting' (p.341). Lehmann-Hartleben, 1941, p.28 compares textual accounts of Pliny, Lucian, and Plutarch with *Imag.* 1.17.
[251] C.f. Narcissus, *Imag.* 1.23.

2.3. Penelope's Web: Looms 2.28

In the previous section on Aesop, we established how the author of the *Imagines* characterises himself through the voice of the narrator. For the *Imagines* in particular, the literary paradox of author versus narrator presents itself as an ouroboric beast. The characterisations of the author formulate the narrator's self-authorising and the authentication of his authority to speak on the matter (1.pr.3). The voice of the narrator in turn suggests the creative σοφία of the painter figure, which has led many readers and critics into an endless quest for authenticity.[252] Rather than approach the text with the intention to discern the truthfulness of the narrative, we consider the *Imagines* as a fictional dialectic, whose focus is primarily on the philosophical interlocutions the author develops through the premise of describing paintings. As Squire points out, the narrator undermines his own vivid authentication of his account by introducing uncertainty,[253] which for this reader indicates that plausibility is not the priority of the narrator's focus. Though narrator's inability to recall the exact size of the villa at 1.pr.4 also suggests that the narrator is drawing upon a flawed recollection of events, the seamlessness of his recreated speeches contrasts this. We shall revisit the role of Time in the narrator's approach towards interpreting images in the next chapter, as he exhibits how the reader's rationalisations of authenticity depend on their conceptions of time. In this way, we focus on how the author creates opportunities for contemplation and directs the reader to select realisations of our approach through the subjects in the narrative.

> Καλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα τοῦ ζωγράφου· τὸ γὰρ οὕτω γλίσχρως[254] ἀράχνην τε αὐτὴν διαπονῆσαι[255] καὶ στίξαι κατὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὸ ἔριον αὐτῆς ὑπομόχθηρον γράψαι καὶ τὸ ἄγριον ἀγαθοῦ δημιουργοῦ καὶ δεινοῦ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὁ δ᾽ ἡμῖν καὶ τὰ λεπτὰ διύφηνεν.
>
> Now the painter has been successful in these respects also: that he has wrought the spider itself in so painstaking a fashion, has marked its spots with fidelity to nature and drawn* its wretched wool* and its dreadful wildness* - all this is the

[252] See n.30, for example.
[253] 1.pr.4, Squire, 2009, p.342, cf. n.79.
[254] LSJ γλίσχρος (4): 'of painting, carefully, with elaborate detail'.
[255] LSJ διαπονέω (A): 'work out with labour'; (2): 'till or cultivate completely'; (II): 'to work hard'. Thus, to work to exhaustion, painstakingly, extensively.

mark of a good craftsman and one skilled in depicting the truth. And he has also woven these fine lines for us.*

Philostratus, *Imagines* 2.28.3

*translation adapted[256] [257] [258] [259]

In the previous sections, we have considered how the narrator consciously creates a new artefact (a speech or λόγος) through his interpretative process of a visual material artefact (the paintings). These visual paintings also document the interpretative process of a painter figure, whom the narrator generates a sense of, through his critical praise of the technique (τέχνη) and artistic wisdom (σοφία) present in the images. As we refer to the proem introducing the descriptions to understand the principles that the narrator wishes to alert us to, we are reminded that in the 'symmetry' (ξυμμετρίαν, 1.pr.1) of painting, 'the craft' partakes in λόγος (δι᾽ ἣν καὶ λόγου ἡ τέχνη ἅπτεται,[260] 1.pr.1).[261] Our understanding of how Philostratus presents contemplation and the gaining of knowledge through observing visual material artefacts is informed by the way the narrator approaches his subjects, as a thoughtful mediation between his own beliefs and the painted

---

[256] Specifically, the Greek γράψαι from the ambiguous γράφω which can refer to both painting and writing should be distinguished from ζωγραφέω which is 'to paint from life' (LSJ); this translation captures that.

[257] LSJ μοχθηρός (A); LSJ ἔριον; 'wool' here maintains the lexical field of weaving and reflexive language used throughout this ekphrasis. A weaver itself, the spider here is made of wool, the product of other's handiwork.

[258] LSJ ἄγριος (I). Consider also (II), 'savage' morality and (2) wild temper in its silent nature, in contrast to the moral talking beasts of Aesop (1.3.1) and the anthropomorphic effect of λόγος as discussed above.

[259] The narrative reference to λεπτὰ διύφηνεν evokes the sense of the spider's web (c.f. Fairbanks), however LSJ λεπτός (II) suggests fineness of detail, like thin threads. It is this that Xian and McCombie identify as the indicator of Callimachean aesthetics of fineness (Xian, 2017, p.336). My translation allows for interpretation of the language applying description of the spiders' webs, Penelope's weaving, the fineness of painterly detail, and the narrator-author's weaving of words and meaning textually, returning once more to the nature of γραφή as a 'representation by means of lines' (LSJ A). Further, λεπτός may also, albeit rarely, be used to indicate the delicateness of voice (II.2); thus, the indiscernible 'voice' of the narrator is also noted by this description.

[260] LSJ ἅπτω also suggests that the sense of 'join' can be placed in a context of contest (A.2), a more striking sense of competition between image and word which was addressed in our introduction.

[261] C.f. *Imag.* 1.4.2, ἀναλογία ταῦτα, ὦ παῖ· δεῖ γὰρ κλέπτεσθαι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις κύκλοις συναπιόντας. Consider LSJ κύκλοις II.6 for 'circle or wall round a city', and ἀναλογία for *analogy* (LSJ II and III). The success of the analogy relies on understanding painting. A rounded wall which has no end (ἐπιτηδείοις) is painted with vanishing point to show the recession of the wall into the distance, conveyed by the narrator by focussing on diminishing figures. The narrator achieves layered meaning through his emphasis on the painter's skill (τέχνη), as this reflexively uses artistic technique as contrast and metaphor for the text itself. This is a true conjoining (ἅπτεται, 1.pr.1) of τέχνη and λόγος, where the word draws attention to the image and the concepts of painting enhance the meaning of the text, producing a form of iconotext where the principles of language and painting are both inextricably significant to a wholistic understanding of the passage (Squire, 2009, p.297. See n.202 for definition).

artefact. We are able to consider how he reinforces his observations by the praise he projects onto the painter figure in the narrative. Thus, the narrator's praise demands scrutiny, as it reflects what the narrator deems excellent in the paintings (ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἑρμηνεύσουσί τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3). In this way, we are navigating the text of the *Imagines* as a negotiation, one not only between the narrator and the painter, but also more broadly between the individual and the culture of art, be that literary, visual, or philosophical.[262] The artefact can be considered 'the product of a negotiation between the creator […] equipped with a complex, communally shared repertoire of conventions, and the institutions and practices of society'.[263] Philostratus creates a product documenting the negotiation between a creator, the sophistic narrator, and the artefacts of the painter's negotiations with places, figures, and stories linked to ideologies of their society.[264]

This theory has been developed by close study of the text, by considering that the various painted scenarios of creators and their created artefacts are constructed by the narrative as *mises-en-abyme,* which ultimately reflect a set of a philosophical questions the text navigates via its replications of itself – the Philostratean narrator infused throughout his addresses. This approach to Philostratus' narrative text has been informed by Laird's approach to classical fiction, as he considers fictional scenarios opportunities for layered philosophical discourse which are enhanced by the medium.[265] The process of emulating philosophical discussion, and further enhancing the discourse

[262] The approach of the new historicist, as explained by Bennett and Royle, recognises that 'any reading of a literary text is a question of negotiation, a negotiation between text and reader within the context of a history or histories that cannot be closed or finalized', p.141. As well as recognising ourselves as readers of Philostratus, we can apply this theory to Philostratus as reader of the visual text of the painting. The narrator not only 'reads' the narrative of the figures, but also interprets and reproduces the visual artefact as a whole through his critique. What we read is the narrator's reading, made manifest in text. This text-in-a-text format draws attention to the interpretative process, which is the part of practising philosophy which produces new material to consider, be those materials verbal, textual, or visual representations of critical thinking and philosophy.
[263] Greenblatt, S. 1990, p.158, in: Bennett and Royle, 2016, p.141.
[264] Newby in particular acknowledges that wall-paintings were opportune springboards for contemporary discussion of political and social ideas, which comes back to Philostratus' appreciation of artefacts for their potential to evoke discussion (1.pr.4-5): Newby, Z., 2016. Paideia, Rhetoric and Self-representation: Responses to Mythological Wall-paintings. In *Greek Myths in Roman Art and Culture: Imagery, Values and Identity in Italy, 50 BC–AD 250.* Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.137-163.
[265] Laird, 2003, pp.115-12. I describe interpretation and graphic documentation as 'philosophical discourse' as Philostratus presents these creative processes as inextricably and inherently philosophical.

through literary self-awareness,[266] is recognised as an interpretative process most articulately by Graeme and McCombie, as they acknowledge that interpretation is necessarily productive.[267] This production is, rather than a pure act of creation, a negotiation which is 'a subtle, elusive set of exchanges, a network of trades and trade-offs, a jostling of competing representations'.[268]

The work of artifice produced by the narrator which best exemplifies this negotiation is Looms 2.28. McCombie touches upon the co-creative nature of this discourse, of the Homeric competing with the Philostratean, when he describes the boy as a competitor to the narrator, whose praises sung of the Penelope painting (τὸν τῆς Πηνελόπης ἱστὸν ᾄδεις, 2.28.1) echo the Homeric opening to the *Iliad.*[269] Considering that the boy's inquisitive nature is what prompts the inception of the supposed original verbal speeches (1.pr.5), the boy, the narrator and their respective paintings thus begin to form a dialogue of art-critical discussion. In this section, we will consider how the narrator weaves and unweaves a delicate entanglement between his interpretation of the spider painting and the weight of the *Odyssey*: an inextricable literary and physical presence in the narrative of the text, represented in the Neapolitan gallery by a painting of Penelope's loom, and present in the text through the boy's praise (2.28.1) and the narrator's own thematic echoes, an entanglement which has generated insightful commentary on Callimachean aesthetics present among the Hesiodic and Homeric references.[270]

2.3.1. Integrating Interpretations: Discussions with παῖς[271]

The discourse the narrator builds between himself and his perception of the painter is from the outset of Looms 2.28 influenced by the boy's own philosophical judgements of what is excellent in painting (ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἑρμηνεύσουσί τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3), seen by the way the

[266] Laird provides an example of this in Lucian's *VH*, where Lucian's depiction of Socrates empathises with a character he hears about who is trapped in a story (2003, p.115).
[267] Graeme, 2018; McCombie, 2002.
[268] Greenblatt, S. 1998, p.7, in: Bennett and Royle, 2016, p.141.
[269] Homer, *Il.* 1.1: Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, 'Of the wrath, sing, goddess'; McCombie, 2002, p.147.
[270] Xian, 2017, recently expanded the existing focus on allusions to the Odyssey with notes drawing upon McCombie (2002) to develop commentary on the Callimachean aesthetics of fineness (λεπτότης).
[271] *Imag.* 1.1.1: 'my boy', 'dear boy', 'o' boy'; vocative form of ὁ παῖς.

narrator alludes to the *Odyssey* despite his turn towards the spider painting (2.28.1).[272] These Homeric allusions, rather than warp Philostratus' spider narrative, provides a frame (ἱστός) upon which the ekphrasis builds. Pertinent here is Shaffer's insightful note on the technique of sophistic rhetors, how they would 'introduce ancillary incidents to embellish their descriptions', explaining that their 'mythological and historical allusions' thus framed 'the exact meaning of the episodes shown in the painting'.[273] Thus, such focus on the Homeric in Looms 2.28 and the criticism of it consolidates the body of the ekphrasis as a negotiation and exploration of the art of philosophy and interpretation, especially of literary themes.

Though the narrator notes 'you think it to have all the parts of the loom' (δοκεῖ σοι πάντα ἱστοῦ ἔχειν, 2.28.1), he proceeds to add to the existence of the painting with the prescriptive power of description, an act which negotiates the details of the Penelope painting into the description of the narrator's preferred spider painting. Rather than move straight onto the spider painting, the narrator engrosses the boy's praise, supplying his own description of Penelope's loom, taking control of the narrative by building upon the already 'complete' loom (πάντα ἱστοῦ ἔχειν), stretching it tighter as it is 'stretched tight by the warp', embellishing and adding 'with embroidered flowers laid down under the threads' (στήμοσί τε ἱκανῶς ἐντέταται καὶ ἄνθεα[274] κεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν μίτων, 2.28.1). The narrator is aligned with Penelope and the painter, revealing new fragments of a creation along each line of text. Instead of identifying a competition between the boy and the narrator for control of the text, the presence of their diverging preferences in artwork creates space for interlocution and the expansion of understanding through philosophical exchange. The narrator of Looms 2.28 is not trying to merely absorb and speak over the boy's words; he recognises that the boy in the narrative text is as semiotically significant for the reader as the figures described in the painting.

[272] McCombie 2002 suggests that a cursory description of Homer is more than enough to encapsulate the Penelope painting, given the weight and fame of its subject p.147.
[273] Shaffer, 1998, p.307.
[274] LSJ ἄνθος A.3: 'in plural, embroidered flowers on garments'.

Just as Penelope is described as 'unweaving' (καὶ ἀναλύει ἃ διύφηνεν, 2.28.1), our attention is directed to 'look at the spider' (ὅρα καὶ τὴν ἀράχνην, 2.28.1). Penelope's weaving figure is on the surface displaced, yet the presence of the spiders weaves a narrative of desolation and domestic ruin, one which linguistically resonates with Penelope's struggle. Despite attempting to unravel the presence of Penelope in his description of the spiders, the narrator succeeds only in weaving her further into his narrative. The ruins the narrator describes are 'inhabited only by spiders' (ἀλλ᾽ ἔστιν οἰκητὸς ἀράχναις μόναις, 2.28.2) and are woven through with a suggestion that Penelope an orchestrator of this ruin; it is her dedication to widowhood and refusal to take a new master (δεσπότης) which has left the house bereft (χηρεύει) but for spiders to inhabit. Webb suggests that 'Penelope's deceptive weaving is juxtaposed by the spider's webs, in which flies are trapped, like Agamemnon in *Cassandra'*,[275] but the unwoven threads of Penelope's narrative are picked up by the narrator of the *Imagines* and used anew. This relationship between the overarching presence of Penelope and the narrator's entanglement in her narrative suggests rather that rather than a clear juxtaposition between the orderly, meticulous spiderwebs and the undone, non-existent work of Penelope, the figure of Penelope and her weaving is just as difficult for the narrator to navigate and escape once she has been brought into the conversation by his audience (2.28.1).[276]

Armstrong captures the impact of this kind of literary memory, stating that the more 'the game of intertextuality' is played, 'the longer the chains of reference grow', filling 'the present text' with 'chattering voices of past apparitions'.[277] For a description that attempts to distinctly characterises itself against a painting of Penelope's loom (ἀγαθῇ γραφῇ, 2.28.1),[278] this ekphrasis

[275] Original emphasis, Webb, 2015, p.211, in Xian, 2017, pp.337-338: 'le tissage trompeur de Pénélope est compare aux toiles d'araignée représentées à côté dans lesquelles des mouches sont prises au piège, comme l'Agamemnon de *Cassandre.'*

[276] One might consider that if Philostratus had omitted Penelope and her loom from this ekphrasis entirely, readers would still find a way to compare and contrast his description with something of Homer's. Given that possibility, the narrator (with help of 'the boy') gets ahead of his critics and takes the ultimate course of action by incorporating it into his speech.

[277] Armstrong, R. 2006. *Cretan Women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.40.

[278] McCombie, 2002, p.146.

has nonetheless been the centre of a critical spotlight for its Homeric intertext, leaving the narrator's attention on the spiders in the margins. The voices filling the present text Looms 2.28 appear less to be the voices of past poets as Armstrong suggests, such as Homer (2.28.1) and Hesiod (κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον, 2.28.2), and rather the critical interpretations of modern scholars. Just as the boy attempts to praise the painting of Penelope, modern critics likewise seek to resolve the influence of historical literature and aesthetics on Philostratus' text. Xian observes that Philostratus masterfully uses 'explicit and hidden reference' just as Looms 2.28 presents an explicit painted γραφή and an 'exceedingly fine and scarcely visible' (τὰ ὑπέρλεπτα καὶ μόλις ὁρατά, 2.28.1) textual γραφή,[279] suggesting that understanding the explicit and the hidden is required for deeper understanding, and that it is the recognition of the latter that separates the learning πεπαιδευμενοι ('educated ones')[280] from the learned σοφιστής (sophist). Carolyn Macdonald's more recent study recognises this depth by acknowledging that an awareness of Latin intertextuality may have enriched the reading of the *Imagines* for those contemporary readers familiar with Ovid, as well as evoking introspection for each reader of their own literary cultural 'commitments'.[281] These critics have suggested that knowledge and recognition of familiar cultural influences enriches a reading of the text by allowing for the recognition of more possible interpretations of Philostratus' description. The possibilities for these interpretations are woven into the fabric of the description, and moreover, recognised by the narrator in the fine characterisation of the spiders. We will revisit the artefacts' encompassing of potential interpretations through the description of Cassandra 2.10, but in first understanding the characterisation of the painter's dedication to his craft, we will see how the narrator emulates this focus in his appreciation of artefacts.

[279] Xian, 2017, p.338.
[280] C.f. LSJ ἁπλότης, 'simplicity' (A.II,2), understood in the sense of 'uneducated'.
[281] MacDonald, 2022, p.116.

2.3.2. Liminal figure: Spiders on a line

> αἱ δὲ ἔριθοι δι᾽ αὐτῶν βαδίζουσι τείνουσαι τοὺς κεχαλασμένους τῶν μίτων. Ἀλλὰ καὶ μισθὸν ἄρνυνται τοῦ ὑφαίνειν καὶ σιτοῦνται τὰς μυίας, ἐπειδὰν τοῖς ἱστοῖς ἐμπλακῶσιν.[282]
>
> And the weavers[283] travel across them, drawing tight such of the threads of warp* as they have become loose. But they win a reward[284] for their weaving and feed on the flies whenever any become enmeshed in the webs.
>
> Philostratus, *Imag*. 2.28.3-4
>
> *translation adapted [285]

The figure of the spider is identified as τὸ ζῷον, a word that has both 'real-world' and art critical meaning.[286] Speaking of a 'real' creature, τὸ ζῷον signifies a 'living being', an animal. This meaning lends itself to the term for painting, ζωγραφέω, to 'paint from life'.[287] To complicate matters somewhat, the figures represented in painting can also be known as τὸ ζῷον, a 'figure' which does not have to be animal. As such, the figures of our narrative are all τὸ ζῷον, figures depicted in art, who resemble lifelike humans and creatures. As we have explored earlier, Philostratus blurs the line between human and animal in his depiction of the hybrid Fables,[288] and the symbolism of Daedalus' μηχάνημα as part human and part fabricated animal. The animal aspect of these creations serves as a counterpart to the human, the perceived 'real'. The hollow heifer is part woman and part machine,

[282] LSJ ἐμπλέκω (2): metaphorically, 'weave by subtle art'. The obvious interpretation is 'entangled' (A), however, the word also means to 'weave in' or 'entwine'. In this way, we might consider the boy's voice and the threads of Penelope's story 'woven into' the narrator's web.
[283] LSJ ἔριθος (A) has broad connotations of 'labourer' as well, which arguably applies to any who δημιουργέω; works to make products of arts and crafts (LSJ 2).
[284] LSJ ἄρνυμαι (A): also suggests 'striving' in the sense of trying to 'win reputation for'. This verb used in the context of weaving spiders evokes not only the success of Penelope (c.f. τῷ οἱ κλέος οὔ ποτ᾽ ὀλεῖται ἧς ἀρετῆς, Hom. *Od.* 24.196-200), but also the painter, whom the narrator praises for his ἀγαθοῦ δημιουργοῦ, excellent practice of his craft (LSJ δημιουργέω A).
[285] LSJ μίτος (A); I have adapted Fairbanks' with this interpretation of μίτος as 'threads of warp'. Note also that this may refer to strings of a lyre as well as spiders' web, adding aural dimension to this polysemantic term.
[286] LSJ ζῷον (A): 'living being, animal'; (II) 'in art, figure, image, not necessarily of animals'. Herodotus' use of ζῷον to refer to bees (Hdt.5.10) should be considered when reading *Imag.* 1.23.2, regarding the 'deception', ἐξηπατῆσθαι χρὴ, of the bee: οἷς καὶ μέλιττα ἐφιζάνει τις, οὐκ οἶδα εἴτ᾽ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς, εἴτε ἡμᾶς ἐξηπατῆσθαι χρὴ εἶναι αὐτήν. See also the use at Hdt.4.88. in reference to the act of painting the Bosphorus, c.f. Philostr. *Imag.* 1.12-13.
[287] LSJ ζωγραφέω (A).
[288] See n.128, n.157, p.43, on Fables, and n.198, p.54 on the Minotaur.

but the overall appearance of the creature gives the device a third part, the part which compels (πειθὼ, 1.16.1) is the semblance (εἰκών) of beast suggesting 'familiarity' (*ἀγελαίᾳ* βοῒ τοῦ ταύρου ἐθάδι, 1.16.1). In this section, we will consider how the figure of the spider is used by the narrator to discuss the creative products of interpretation more broadly, with focus on how the different boundaries and features artistic and textual γραφή can come together and co-exist, much like the hybrid bodies of the figures in the paintings. In this way, the spider is not only described as occupying thresholds,[289] but also represents the liminality of engaging with interpretation, and the close proximity of representation to reality. In the case of the reader, it is the images generated by the ekphrasis which occupy the same space in the mind as the text before us, and as such, the *Imagines,* like the spider, occupies both a 'real-world' and imaginary space.

The narrator's statement that 'the creature loves to weave in silence (φιλεῖ γὰρ τὸ ζῷον ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ διαπλέκειν,[290] 2.28.2) contrasts the language of the boy's praise (ᾄδεις, 2.28.1 - ἀείδω, 'to sing') and evokes the image of Penelope's loom, giving off not even a whisper (οὐχ ὑποφθέγγομαι) at the beginning of the ekphrasis. Indeed, the spider in this silence is a direct contrast to our narrator, only on account of whose speeches do we have a text to work from. The silent spider is aligned with tacit figure of Penelope, and both figures (ζῷον) are championed by characters of sound, the boy and the narrator.[291] Echoes of Penelope's story are given voice in the narrator's descriptions of the spiders. Noting that παρυφαίνει passes judgement on the superior weaving of

[289] *Imag.* 2.28.2.
[290] LSJ διαπλέκω (A) presents us also with a metaphorical meaning 'to try every twist', to 'wind all ways'. Considering this interpretation alongside the Herodotean metaphor, to 'finish the web of one's life' (Hdt.5.92.ζ), the verb 'to weave' used here suggests both living through the act and dying in its completion.
[291] For more on the nature of sound and its usage in ekphrasis, see Laird, 1993, pp.18–30; Hines, 2022; and further Verhelst 2022, pp.697-711 for Philostratus' propensity to reference sound associated with visible emotional expressions (pp.705-6); for example, the convincingness of expression often leads the narrator to state ἀκούειν δόκει, 'it seems possible to hear them' (1.9.4).

the spiders,[292] the narrator recognises the spider as another creative figure,[293] whose habits and very presence implies the ruin of the house of Odysseus (*Imag.* 2.28.2). The characterisation of the house bereft of a master (χηρεύειν δεσποτῶν, 2.28.2) also alludes to Penelope as widowed (χηρεύω), however this absence of the master (δεσπότης) grows to utter abandonment when the narrator subsequently displaces Penelope from this descriptive narrative by stating that the abode ἔστιν οἰκητὸς ἀράχναις μόναις· 'is inhabited by spiders only' (2.28.2). Like Aesop and Daedalus, these spiders are wordless, yet convey narrative with the presence of their being. The narrator's interpretation of these figures creates a verbal artefact which weaves together the nature of the figures building upon the context of their surroundings, hinting that like the spider, like the painter, shares an ability with the narrator to represent in lines (γραφή), according to their skill (ἀγαθοῦ δημιουργοῦ καὶ δεινοῦ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 2.28.3) and understanding of their environments.

A parallel between the weaving in Looms 2.28 can be drawn against the depiction of Aesop in 1.3. In the same way that the narrator finds the preference of the spider for silence (2.28.2) agreeable in his explanation for the scene, the narrator shares a moment of agreement with the painter on the characterisation of Aesop weaving in a relaxed manner. The narrator states that 'the painter knows' (οἶδεν ὁ ζωγράφος, 1.3.2), focalising through the painter to give his own opinion stronger resonance. The narrator suggests that the 'loosening of thoughts' and 'relaxation of spirit' is required for weaving stories (αἱ τῶν μύθων φροντίδες ἀνειμένης τῆς ψυχῆς δέονται, 1.16.2), statements which should be further considered in the context of Penelope's unweaving (ἀναλύει ἅ διύφηνεν, 2.28.1). The narrator's juxtaposition of ἀναλύω and διυφαίνω, in addition to being a

[292] LSJ παρυφαίνω (A.II) 'excel in weaving'. Both Fairbanks (1939) and McCombie (2002, p.146) suggest 'excel', McCombie in particular implying that the spider's superior weaving indicates that the mention of Penelope is a digressional 'false start' and that she is absent from the painting, to be displaced by spiders (McCombie, 2002, p.147). We might thus also consider that παρυφαίνω means to 'weave beside or along', in regard to hemming an edge (A). This sense of 'weaving along' also offers room for interpreting it to mean 'weave alongside', as in the spider weaves alongside Penelope, in a neighbouring painting. As the text suggests, the two weavers occupy a shared space, both being viewed by the narrator, and also as depictions by the painter (2.28.3).
[293] In addition to 'the silk-weavers' (τοὺς Σῆρας, 2.28.1). LSJ Σήρ (II): 'silkworm' by (Pausanias 6.26.6); 'silk-weaver' applies in an interpretation of both the people ('the Seres') and the creatures.

reference from Homer,[294] reflects the paradoxical nature of the text. Even as unravelling is described, the text necessarily grows bigger with γραφή, 'writing'.[295] The sense of loosening thoughts (φροντίδες ἀνειμένης, 1.3.2)[296] is echoed in Penelope's unravelling (ἀναλύω) which implies a wandering.[297] As such, the wandering path of the narrative, rather than digressive, should be considered as the narrator's pursuit of δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται (1.pr.3), what he finds excellent in not only the painting, but his interpretation of the painting.

Reading the narrator's comments on the spiders' weaving behaviour as commentary on the subjective nature of philosophy and the personal experience of interpretation also explains why instead of consolidating the boy's preference for the Penelope painting (2.28.1), the narrator focuses on an 'empty' scene of a house in ruin (2.28.2). The domestic void in the spider painting shows in negative relief to the figure of Penelope. The figure of the spider is, as the narrator notes of the painter, painstakingly cultivated (διαπονῆσαι καὶ στίξαι, 2.28.2). The language used here evokes agricultural and domestic production,[298] featuring therefore the painter as the centre of this particular household scene. From 2.28.3 onwards, the narrator no longer describes the appearance of the spiders, instead focusing on the web. The description of the web is, on the surface, an appreciation for the spiders' ability (τέχνη), but the description simultaneously voices the narrator's praise for the painter's web, his painting. We might consider the appreciation of the spiders and their webs an opinion shared by the narrator and the painter, who has, as the narrator explains, gone to painstaking lengths to honour the spiders in their depiction.[299] The narrator's recognition of the painter's efforts, itself being praise, highlights how creative labour itself is a form of recognition and praise. Thus, when the narrator chooses to philosophise on this painting, interpreting and

[294] LSJ ἀναλύω (B.A); Homer, *Od.* 2.105.
[295] LSJ γραφή (II).
[296] LSJ ἀνίημι (II.5).
[297] LSJ ἀναλύω (A.A).
[298] LSJ διαπονέω (2) 'till or cultivate completely'; (II) to work hard; LSJ στίζω: to punctuate grammatically (A.6.2), evocative of stippling, stabbing, and tattooing. In the context of 2.28, consider also 'stitching'.
[299] τὸ γὰρ οὕτω **γλίσχρως** ἀράχνην τε αὐτὴν **διαπονῆσαι**, 2.28.3: 'with elaborate detail'; laboriously.

articulating its merits, the narrator creates an artefact dedicated to the virtues of the painting, which itself is an interpretation of spiders, echoing the actions of the painter.

Though we might speculate as to why the narrator chooses his painting over the boy's, the focus should remain on the act of interpretation which reveals what the narrator appreciates; as such, the virtues he perceives are spoken extensively about. It is worthy to note that the narrator never offers negative criticism of this painting, instead praising ugliness (ὑπομόχθηρον, δεινοῦ) depicted as truthful (τὴν ἀλήθειαν) to the spider's nature (κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, 2.28.3). The narrator's judgement on the subjects of the painting can be read as highly objective, noting that artistic honesty simply represents, and does not necessarily flatter or exaggerate. The recurring praise of ἐνάργεια in the painting does not solely evoke verisimilitude; rather, the sense of the word measures perceptibility, that something particularly ἐναργής can be *well seen*.[300] It is possible to judge whether representations are κατὰ τὴν φύσιν (close to nature), however, such judgement can only be made on a perceptible object, and tangible artefacts are easier to judge than the 'delicate web' (λεπτὸς ἱστὸς, 2.28.3) of text and language. As the narrator describes the dichotomy of control and entrapment in this scene, he refers to the spiders not as ἀράχνη, but as ἔριθοι.[301] The painter, praised for his excellent handicraft (ἀγαθοῦ δημιουργοῦ, 2.28.3) is in a similar fashion characterised as a δημιουργός,[302] identified by his skilled workmanship. The painter may here be considered more skilled than the humble wool-worker (ἔριθος),[303] as he weaves from the wretched wool (ἔριον ὑπομόχθηρον) of the spider a delicate and most elaborate scene, elevating the raw material through his τέχνη as δημιουργός.

[300] LSJ ἐναργής (A); ἐνάργεια (2).
[301] See n. 283, on ἔριθος.
[302] From which we get the word 'demiurge', LSJ δημιουργός (3).
[303] LSJ ἔριθος (A). Consider that the narrator describes the fuzzy bodies of the spiders as having τὸ ἔριον ὑπομόχθηρον, 'most wretched wool', see pp.70-71.

2.3.3. Web-walker: Philosophy through appreciation

By orienting this approach alongside (ἐκ γειτόνων, 2.28.1) the analyses of Aesop and Daedalus, we might consider the 'empty' spider painting to be the one where the narrator's control of the narrative struggles the loudest in the silence of Penelope's shuttle ('but it does not sound, the shuttle', μόνον οὐχ ὑποφθέγγεται ἡ κερκὶς, 2.28.1).[304] But rather than search for what the structure of the *Imagines* might imply or reference,[305] we have considered how the narrator's interpretations of this painting recaptures a sense of unspoken dialogue as he acknowledges the boy's praise of the peripheral Penelope painting. In keeping philosophical discourse in mind, we see how the narrator generates a critical dialogue through internalisation and comparison of artefacts, and also how this negotiation between two paintings shows an engagement toward visual artefacts the narrator is attempting to foster in his audience. Moreover, the narrator's characterisations of the painter and the spider suggest that these figures are comparable in their dedication to their craft – albeit that the δημιουργός painter is more skilled than the ἔριθος spider, since he not only recreates their webs but depicts the weaver also. At this point, we might consider the narrator's awareness and appreciation for these figures' τέχνη a sign of his φιλο-σοφία, his love of wisdom.

In the previous sections on Aesop and Daedalus, we began to understand the characterisation of creator figures as philosophers, who internalise in order to understand, and produce artefacts as part of their interpretative processes. More importantly, the artefacts they produce (μῦθοι and μηχανήματος) are tools by which the reader might understand each creator's philosophical process. Aesop gives his characters the power of λόγος so they might use it (1.3.1), thus using his Fables to discern the moral complexities of human life through writing (πάντα τὰ τῶν

[304] McCombie, 2002, p.146, and Fairbanks, 1939, pp.248-9, translate this as 'the shuttle all but sings', which suggests that the vibrancy of the instrument. On the other hand, the wider extant usage of the term ὑποφθέγγομαι suggests delicateness, to 'speak in an undertone', 'suggest', in the sense of whisper. C.f. Bailly abrégé (2): 'murmurer'.

[305] Bryson, for example postulates that the positioning of Looms 2.28 after the Birth of Athena 2.2.7 evokes the story of Arachne (*Ov. Met.* 6.140-144), whereby Looms is a 'transformation of Ovid's contest' (1994, p.272).

ἀνθρώπων ἐκμεμύθωται, 1.3.1).[306] Philostratus' painter goes one step further to 'mythologise' Aesop by presenting him beside (ἐκ γειτόνων, 2.28.1) his Fables, a creative decision framed by the narrator not only as iconographic characterisation of the Fables, but also to reflect the external products of writing as balanced alongside the internal process of philosophising (1.3.4). Daedalus devises at Pasiphaë's behest (1.16.1), constructing a physical device described in a word which also suggests a mental or strategical device, (μηχάνημα, μηχανήματος). The descriptions document the practise of expertise in the figures' various τέχνη, exercises which involve clever devising (σοφίσασθαί, 1.16.1) and language evoking physical construction, especially when Aesop is described as 'weaving a fable' (τινα ὑφαίνει μῦθον, 1.3.2) in the Homeric style of 'weaving' (ὕφαινον) a plan or story (μῦθον).[307] In this latest section, we have seen that weavers are characterised as labourers, that despite a division in skill and ability, these figures equally have time at their disposal to dedicate to their crafts. In the next chapter, we will see how the narrator applies himself to his craft of description, and expressly brings to our attention the opportunities for study that material artefacts present. Being synchronous and unchanging, artefacts contrast the diachronicity of dialogue and performance, allowing us to dwell and develop our interpretations.[308]

Though it is tempting to perceive the painter as a shadow of Philostratus' creative self, it is equally important to recognise the figure of the painter as an autonomous figure, capable of interpretation and creation. The narrator fosters this recognition through his critique of the painted figures of Aesop and Daedalus, applying similar praise to their skill in their craft (σοφίσ) with similar language and tone as he does for diegetic artists (1.pr.2). By recognising how the narrator presents other creators, we can begin to understand how he perceives himself. It is also helpful to our understanding to consider the painter as a figure separate to the narrator, as even though both may

[306] ἐκμεμύθωται from ἐκ-μυθέομαι; LSJ μυθέομαι: to 'speak', 'recount', 'converse' (A.I); 'say over to oneself' or 'consider' (A.II). Aesop therefore ἐκμεμύθωται all sides to human life, consider 'expresses outwards from internal speaking', encapsulated by a verb that balances the exteriority of speech, ἐκ, with the interiority of rumination, μυθέομαι.
[307] μύθους καὶ μήδεα πᾶσιν ὕφαινον. Hom. *Il.*3.212. trans. Murray.
[308] See Introduction §1.4, p.23.

be fabricated by the author Philostratus, the *Imagines* is the documentation of one philosopher's discourse on the philosophy (lit. love of σοφίσ) of another figure. The narrator's recognition of the painter's appreciation and skill of their craft is established in his praise of Aesop, as he characterises Aesop as a celebrated figure for *his* appreciation for the fables. In fact, Aesop is praised by his fables themselves (Φοιτῶσιν οἱ Μῦθοι παρὰ τὸν Αἴσωπον ἀγαπῶντες αὐτόν 1.3.1), capturing a reflexivity between the artist's medium and the artist. Aesop's fables crown their writer, the paintings do credit to the painter, as they invite such attention (1.pr.4-5), and the text of the *Imagines* documents the narrator's critical skills in observation, interpretation, and articulation.

In this chapter, we established how the author of the *Imagines* replicates the experience of interpretation, drawing upon Miles and McCombie to shape our approach to understanding how the interpretative process creates a new product. Each act of interpretation by the narrator creates a new spoken replica of the painting, just as the painter produced each painting through interpreting reality with images. Philostratus adds another layer to this mimetic hierarchy, framing the body of the *Imagines* as another reproduction, a recreation of his speeches in textual form. In this way, we approached creator figures as *mises-en-abyme* for the figure of the narrator, the writer, and the painter. By closely considering how these figures, namely Aesop and Daedalus, are presented within the descriptions in which they appear, we gleaned greater understanding that one unifying feature of these artistic figures is their σοφία*,* their artistic 'skill'(τέχνη), or more broadly, their 'wisdom' in matters of skill (σοφία). The connection to linguistic sophistry can be found therein, and therefore frames the interpretations of these figures in a philosophical light when we consider cogitation and a search for understanding necessitates an internal replication as part of the learning and interpretative process. In the *Imagines*, the replications of thought are manifest in the forms of artefacts, those painted by the painter, spoken by the narrator, or written by the author. When these artefacts are represented in the narrative (both of painting and narration), they are expansive, elusive, and complex. Aesop's fables dance around him on an intertextual comparison to dramaturgy, Daedalus' hollow heifer is put together by the hands of gods of love, Penelope herself is

excelled by a spider (παρυφαίνει τὴν Πηνελόπην, 2.28.1) even as the narrator helps her to undo her weaving.

3. Time and Interpretation

In our previous chapter, we have taken a close look at the modes of viewing the narrator constructs for us. Through his appreciation of the painter, the narrator explains what he finds esteemed in the painter's artistic choices (ἑρμηνεύσουσί τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3), and through his characterisation of the creative figures of Aesop, Daedalus, Penelope and spiders, we see a pattern of focus and contemplation in attitudes toward their handiwork. In characterising these figures, the narrator relates his own interpretative process, one which produces both the descriptive speeches in the narrative and the text of the *Imagines.* Goldhill describes the essential narrative moment of ekphrasis as one which characterises 'the moment of looking *as* a practise of interpreting, of reading',[309] which we can see in the *Imagines.* There is a further step, however, in that there is not only narrative guidance on 'how to look as' the text itself is 'seeing',[310] but further how to *convey* what can be seen, an action indicated by the narrator's mention of ἑρμηνεύω (ἑρμηνεύσουσί, 1.pr.3) as a skill he wishes to cultivate in his audience. For the narrator of the *Imagines*, time is pivotal to producing an interpretation, recognised by other critics in the narrator's reference to the Horae in both the preface and the final description of the collected texts.[311]

In this last chapter, we will attempt to draw our understanding of the narrator's philosophical approach to artefacts further by considering the emphasis placed on time throughout the narrative. The significance of time can be explained through an analysis of Cassandra 2.10, furthered by an evaluation of the Hippolytus ekphrasis as a lamentation of a lamentation, which, in its own right, is also a verbal monument. This is informed by the final description of the second book of the *Imagines,* concerning the Horae (2.34), a piece well-visited by critics,[312] which considers how the narrator's representation of the artist figure producing artefacts through interpretation is

[309] Original emphasis: Goldhill, 2007, p.2.
[310] Goldhill, 2007, p.2.
[311] Elsner, 2000, pp.256-8, documents this as a ring-composition. See also n.100.
[312] See Elsner, 2000, in particular.

reversed, as the artefact may be considered to produce the figure of the artist. This will be discussed in the parameters of the focus of this study in the attitude towards art-philosophy the narrator constructs, namely how the philosophy of the text ultimately intends to make curious philosophers of its audience.

This section draws upon the narrator's description of the murder of Agamemnon (2.10), which is painted and described with a similar narrative to that described by the ghost of Agamemnon in the *Odyssey* (11.387-89;409-424). We will briefly consider the way the narrator presents the narrative of the painting, in which he states there is more to be seen than in a drama (εἰ δ᾽ ὡς γραφήν, πλείω ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄψει, 2.10.1); this will resolve some critical differences perceived between the emotional impact of fictional as opposed to real events. Rather than focus on the subjectivity of emotional impact – as the narrator can by nature only present his own impressions – we will instead concentrate on the presentation of the synchronous and continuous experiences of artefacts, which, through the interpretation of a viewer-reader, can be understood as a narrative. As established in §1.4, narrative is diachronic, as it depends on the continuous sequencing of events to emulate the passage of time. The necessity of a diachronic interpretation of an artefact can be explained by building upon the narrator's comments at the end of 2.10.1, marking the point at which the narrator begins to go over the scene again.

Narrative which arises from a synchronous artefact, such as painting, which exists in a static, preserved, immutable state, depends on the mutability of time experienced by the viewer-reader in order to occupy a narrative space beyond the physical limitations of the artistic medium and graphic representation. Whereas in drama, the viewer's experience is tied to the concurrent performance of the scene, in static visual arts, as the narrator claims and presents, the viewer is not inhibited by the brevity of the performance, but rather is able to dwell over an instance for an indeterminable length of time to form her opinions, and moreover, to describe her interpretation (ἑρμηνεύω, 1.pr.3). Another instance of interpretative time can be seen in the Hippolytus ekphrasis (2.4). Similarly, like

Cassandra, the figure of Hippolytus in 2.4. is described on the cusp of death, his 'chest breathes still, as if it will not surrender the soul'.[313] The narrator notes the synchronicity of the depiction in the last lines of the description, stating that Hippolytus does not move on from (ἀπολείπει) the period of youth (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπολείπει τὸ μειράκιον, 2.4.4), a statement which resonates with modern analysis of the idea of '*mors praematura,* a virtuous life brought to a halt by an untimely end' prevalent around the second century CE in the iconography of a number of Roman sarcophagi.[314] The closing comments of this chapter will be informed by critical consideration of visual material artefacts such as sarcophagi in understanding the way in which the narrator presents the scene of Hippolytus' death. This will begin to establish a wider cultural context whereby this study may be taken further and developed, by drawing from visual material artefacts which, rather than resembling the paintings of the *Imagines* in form,[315] might be viewed and interpreted in the same way in which our narrator has encouraged us to philosophise on representations of life.

---

[313] τὸ μὲν στέρνον ἔμπνουν ἔτι καθάπερ μὴ μεθιέμενον τῆς ψυχῆ, 2.4.4.

[314] Lorenz, 2016, p.88; pp.71-88 for the Louvre sarcophagus and specifically pp.72-3 for details on the sixteen sarcophagi which depict the death of Meleager primarily dated to 'the second half of the second century CE'.

[315] Such as the Campanian wall-paintings

3.1. Drama at dinnertime: Cassandra 2.10

> καὶ εἰ μὲν ὡς δρᾶμα ἐξετάζομεν, ὦ παῖ, ταῦτα, τετραγῴδηται μεγάλα ἐν σμικρῷ, εἰ δ᾽ ὡς γραφήν, πλείω ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄψει.
>
> If we examine this* closely as drama, my boy, a great tragedy has been enacted[316] in a short space of time, but if [we examine this closely] as a γραφή,* you will see more in it [than a drama].*
>
> Philostratus, *Imag*. 2.10.1.
>
> *translation adapted [317] [318] [319]

Here, all reader-viewers of and within the *Imagines* are presented with a γραφή, as opposed to dramatic performance. For the narrator's diegetic audience, a painting of the last banquet of Agamemnon sits still before them; for the reader, the writer's γραφή is available for us to examine (ἐξετάζομεν). As mentioned previously, the passage of time is a frequent theme in the *Imagines,* if not in the descriptions of figures which transgress their painted bounds to perform all manner of activities,[320] then in the space taken up by the narrator's words themselves. In noting that he should take advantage of the synchronicity of an image to take longer to analyse the scene, the narrator gives a much longer description of the piece. As critics have argued, Philostratus' rhetoric is not 'an adequate description of the phenomenology of representation',[321] but in doing so overlook the consideration that the *duration* of the text may be a more than adequate representation of the interpretative process of representations. The text, like the visual γραφή, exists as a synchronous finished artefact, and yet contains the basis for a diachronic reading wherein narrative can be construed. In mapping the thinking process of the narrator, the text of the *Imagines* itself does as it

---

[316] [in tragedy]; LSJ τραγῳδέω (A). Metaphorically, τραγῳδέω (II) suggests 'tell in a tragic style', or 'declaim'. Therefore, 'enacted' may also be read as 'described'.

[317] LSJ ἐξετάζω (IV) gives the meaning of 'proving', not unlike βασανίζοντι (1.pr.1); see §1.2. Removed 'scene' from original translation as no corresponding Greek is available. γραφή left untranslated to maintain the polysemy of this phrase.

[318] No Greek is available for 'we examine this closely' rather, the structure suggests a repeated application of the earlier verb ἐξετάζομεν, hence square brackets provided to indicate supplementation.

[319] LSJ πλείων (II.1).

[320] Grethlein's study of Hunters 1.28 provides an excellent approach to the language and structural techniques of the narrator which both immerse and disrupt the reader (2023).

[321] Grethlein, 2023, p.3.

recognises of paintings; it captures the process of the philosopher and the outcome of their interpretation. [322] In this description in particular, we see repeated attempts of describing the painting, two interpretations which are made distinct by the narrator's indication to think of the piece ὡς γραφήν, as a depiction, and further, as a series of progressive refinements. In fact, the figure of Cassandra is mentioned three times, and it is only in the final passage that we are met with the narrator's usual depth of detail and ascription of motion, discerning the intentions of the figure.

The description of the banquet scene can be divided into two parts, marked by the quotation above. The narrator's first description across 2.10.1 accounts for the entire scene, describing in quick succession 'those who lie here and there' ([o]ἱ κείμενοι κατ᾽ ἄλλος ἄλλο), 'those exhaling [their last]' (οἱ ἐκπνέοντες), the man who lies gasping beside a bowl (ἀνδρός, ὃς πρὸς αὐτῷ σπαίρει), and lastly, the 'girl in the prophetess' robes' (κόρη τε χρησμῳδὸς τὴν στολὴν) who 'looks at the axe about to fall upon her' (πέλεκυν ἐμπεσούμενον ἑαυτῇ βλέπουσα, 2.10.1). Then, in a reversal of the primacy of mythological context seen in Pasiphaë 1.16, and most notably, in Scamander 1.1.1,[323] we are told it is in such a manner that Agamemnon is welcomed back from Troy by Clytemnestra (- τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἥκοντα ἐκ Τροίας ἡ Κλυταιμνήστρα δέχετα, 2.10.1). The namelessness of the men and Cassandra in this initial description is devoid of mythological markers until Agamemnon's name is given, a delay in presenting recognition that emulates Cassandra's own oracles (χρησμούς τε ἀπιστουμένους ᾄδουσαν, 2.10.1), as we cannot be sure the figures are those in the house of the Agamemnon until the narrator names them as such. The dependence of the reader on the sequence of narration becomes evident in the structuring of this description.

[322] In sequentially describing distinct elements, the narrator, like the painter, makes clearer the shape of the overall painting as the painter would do in applying more time and skill to the painting. C.f. §2.2.1 on refinement of form, especially the bottom of p.55.

[323] Ἔγνως, ὦ παῖ, ταῦτα Ὁμήρου ὄντα ἢ οὐ πώποτε ἔγνωκας. As well as in several other descriptions, such as Ariadne 1.15, the narrator presupposes the reader-viewer's knowledge to provide the mythological frame on which he builds his description (see 2.3): τίτθης διακήκοας· σοφαὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖναι τὰ τοιαῦτα (1.15.1); 'you have heard from your nurse; for such women are skilled in [telling] these things'.

As the narrator resolves to look at the events ὡς γραφήν, as painted or written, the description begins again describing the torches, utensils, and foods depicted in the painting – 'For look! These torches support light – thus these things are during the night' (Σκόπει γάρ· λαμπτῆρες οὗτοι χορηγοὶ φωτός—ἐν νυκτὶ γὰρ ταῦτά που, 2.10.2). The focus on viewing has been re-established, but this description does not mention the vividness of the figures or the skill of the painter.[324] Noting also that χορηγοὶ is the plural form of χορηγός, chorus-leader,[325] it is therefore fitting that the torches lead this secondary description, leading us into the narrative and setting the stage. The narrator's placement of these furnishings in his description is overturned as he describes that these things are in fact not in order (ἐν κόσμῳ δὲ3 οὐδὲν τούτων·, 2.10.2). Ironically, this second description follows the order of the first, repeating that things have been kicked over (λελάκτισται, 2.10.2), echoing the kicked over mixing vessels described in the initial description with the participle λελακτισμένος (2.10.1). The narrator expands on the elements mentioned in the initial description, proving that πλείω ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄψει, we will see more from the same (2.10.1).

[324] Rather, one could argue that the narrator is ensnared by the unfolding plan (τέχνῃ, 2.10.1) of Clytemnestra. See Webb (2010) for the theme of narrative entanglement in Cassandra 2.10 and Looms 2.28 (in Xian, 2017, pp.336-8).
[325] LSJ χορηγός (A).

3.1.1 Refining interpretations

The death of Cassandra is repeated in the description. Each time, more detail is added, and the figure of Cassandra becomes clearer as the narrator reiterates what he sees, enriching his description. This manner of repetition evokes the phenomenon of refinement the narrator documents when he describes the statues of Daedalus' workshop (1.3.1).[326] We have already discussed the narrator's initial mention of her, wherein she is not named:

> κόρη τε χρησμῳδὸς τὴν στολὴν εἰς πέλεκυν ἐμπεσούμενον ἑαυτῇ βλέπουσα
>
> a maiden in the garb of a prophetess who gazes at the axe which is about to descend upon her
>
> Philostratus, *Imag*. 2.10.1.

The description of her appearance comes embedded in a sentence ultimately describing the direction of her gaze (βλέπουσα). This verb, βλέπω, carries connotations of expectation as well, in the sense of looking forwards,[327] which aptly alludes to the power of divine foresight befitting a prophetess (χρησμῳδὸς). As we discovered in the Pasiphaë 1.16 analysis, the description of a character's gaze can be understood as a marker of focalisation,[328] and here such observes the focus of Cassandra upon the 'welcome' she and Agamemnon are to expect.[329] In the midst of the narrator's subsequent contextualisation, he names the figures of Clytemnestra and Agamemnon, but Cassandra is again only mentioned periphrastically as 'the daughter of Priam' (τήν τοῦ Πριάμου κόρην):

> […] τήν τε τοῦ Πριάμου κόρην καλλίστην νομισθεῖσαν τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι χρησμούς τε ἀπιστουμένους ᾄδουσαν ἀποκτείνει θερμῷ τῷ πελέκει.
>
> […] and the daughter of Priam, esteemed by by Agamemnon as of surpassing beauty, [who] sang* of oracles not believed, she[330] slays with the still warm axe.

---

[326] §2.2.1; c.f. n.322 above.

[327] LSJ βλέπω (II.3).

[328] For Daedalus, see the beginning of 1.16.1, discussed above under §2.2.1; Pasiphaë περιαθρεῖ is among many gazes (βλέπει) exchanged in the narrative, and are extended through the metaphor of the erotic pursuit (ἐραστοῦ ὕβριν) at the close of the ekphrasis at 1.16.4 (see pages 54 and 58).

[329] τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἥκοντα ἐκ Τροίας ἡ Κλυταιμνήστρα δέχεται τούτῳ τρόπῳ (2.10.1).

[330] Clytemnestra.

Philostratus, *Imag*. 2.10.1

*translation adapted [331]

The interpretations of the painting break away here to the critique of drama the narrator addresses to the boy (ὦ παῖ, 2.10.1) we have already shown above. The narrator's willingness to effectively restart his interpretation illustrates the immutable opportunity the synchronic depiction of tragedy offers, as opposed to a diachronic impression of a play. Each time we look at the figure of Cassandra in this description, the descriptions are longer, more detailed. Just as the painter applies more brushstrokes to bring clarity to his image,[332] the narrator must create more lines in order to bring clarity to his expression, to refine his γραφή. The narrator's repeated observations serve an authenticating function also; a sense of extemporaneity is created as the narrator checks himself and 'truthfully' recreates his self-improvement.

> κυριώτερα δὲ ἐν οἴκτῳ τὰ τῆς Κασάνδρας, ὡς ἐφέστηκε μὲν αὐτῇ μετὰ τοῦ πελέκεως ἡ Κλυταιμνήστρα μανικὸν[333] βλέπουσα καὶ σεσοβημένη τὰς χάιτας καὶ τραχεῖα τὴν ὠλένην, αὐτὴ δὲ ὡς ἀβρῶς τε καὶ ἐνθέως ἔχουσα περιπεσεῖν ὥρμηκε τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι ῥιπτοῦσα ἀφ᾽ αὑτῆς τὰ στέμματα καὶ οἷον περιβάλλουσα τῇ τέχνῃ αὐτόν, διηρμένου δὲ ἤδη τοῦ πελέκεως ἀναστρέφει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκεῖ, βοᾷ δὲ οὕτω τι οἰκτρόν, ὡς καὶ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα τῷ λοιπῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐλεεῖν ταῦτα ἀκούοντα· μεμνήσεται γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν Ἅιδου πρὸς Ὀδυσσέα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν ψυχῶν.
>
> But even more striking in its pathos is the figure of Cassandra -- the way Clytemnestra is in the midst of setting upon her the axe,* eyes crazed and* her hair flying and elbows bent savagely,* and the way Cassandra herself, tenderly and in a state of inspiration, has tried to throw herself upon Agamemnon as she hurls her fillets[334] from her and so intending to shield him with her craft;* and as the axe is now poised above her, she turns her eyes toward it and utters so pathetic[335] a cry that even Agamemnon, with the remnant of life that is in him,

[331] ἀείδω; c.f. Πηνελόπης ἱστὸν ᾄδεις (2.28.1), addressed to the boy, §2.3.1. Similarly, the praises the boy sings are somewhat dismissed by the narrator, despite the Homeric influence echoing in the following description. Though Cassandra's prophecies are distrusted (ἀπιστέω), her visions likewise come about: Cassandra's vision, Eur. *Ag.* 1256-1294 and up to her final appearance at 1330.
[332] C.f. Pasiphaë 1.16.1, see n.204 and n.206 under §2.2.1.
[333] LSJ μανικός (II.2). C.f. Euripides' description of Cassandra through the voice of Clytemnestra in *Ag.* 1064-68: ἦ μαίνεταί - 'she is mad' (LSJ μαίνομαι A), the state of 'having mania' (Dillon, 2008, p.9, n.43).
[334] C.f. ῥιπτοῦσα with Eur. *Trojan Women* 256-68, Hecuba to Cassandra: **ῥῖπτε**, τέκνον, ζαθέους κλά- | δας καὶ ἀπὸ χροὸς ἐνδυ- |τῶν στεφέων ἱεροὺς στολμούς – 'throw off, my child, your holy laurel branches and from your body strip the sacred garlands you wear'.
[335] As in 'deserving of pathos'.

pities her, hearing her cry; for he will recount it to Odysseus in Hades in the concourse of souls.

Philostratus, *Imag*. 2.10.4

*translation adapted [336] [337] [338] [339]

This final passage of the Cassandra 2.10 ekphrasis characterises Cassandra as a figure we might find comparable to Aesop, Daedalus, and Penelope. The narrator perceives in the figure of Cassandra an intention to protect (περιβάλλουσα)[340] Agamemnon with her skills (τῇ τέχνῃ), but her construct is much less clear than the artefacts produced by previous workers of τέχνη we have studied in this essay. While we cannot with certainty identify a material artefact involved,[341] considering the artefacts of the previous creators are strongly associated with the mythological, and also in the case of Aesop, historic, contexts, we can identify the artefact with which the narrator associates Cassandra's mythological and literary renown. While for Aesop, it is his Fables, for Daedalus, the hollow heifer μηχάνημα, and for Penelope and the spiders,[342] their weaving, Cassandra's notable artefact is ostensibly her cry (βοᾷ), which as the narrator states, is recounted by the ghost of Agamemnon as οἰκτροτάτην (most piteous) to Odysseus in the assembly of souls (ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν ψυχῶν, 2.10.4) in book eleven of the *Odyssey.*[343] This Homeric superlative is

[336] Word order changed to reflect the Greek.
[337] Use of polysyndeton with καὶ incorporated by providing 'and'.
[338] LSJ τραχύς (4), my interpretation incorporates the plural noun.
[339] LSJ οἶος (III.b): οἷός εἰμι 'I intend', in the sense that 'through such means' or 'as such' Cassandra might achieve the outcome stated by περιβάλλουσα, to (metaphorically) 'put upon a person', in this context, her godly (ἐνθέως) powers (LSJ περιβάλλουσα A.2). However, the use of τέχνη in the previous lines, πέπλου τέχνῃ τινὸς ἀπείρου τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα περισχοῦσα (2.10.1), 'with the inescapable woven device she enveloped Agamemnon', thus evokes the casting of the mantle on Agamemnon even as interpretations of περιβάλλουσα τῇ τέχνῃ αὐτόν (2.10.4) might suggest some kind of counter-charm from Cassandra.
[340] LSJ περιβάλλω (II): to 'surround or enclose for one's advantage or defence'. However, the sense of 'encompass' (III) is very similar to περισχοῦσα (2.10.1) describing the action of Clytemnestra. See note above.
[341] One might, for example, suggest that the religious garlands Cassandra tears from herself (ῥιπτοῦσα ἀφ᾿ αὐτῆς τὰ στέμματα) are what she casts upon Agamemnon.
[342] And 'the silk-weavers' (τοὺς Σῆρας, 2.28.1), as well as Aesop (τινα ὑφαίνει μῦθον, 1.3.2). LSJ Σήρ (II) notes that this was used to mean 'silkworm' by Pausanias (6.26.6), therefore 'silk-weaver' which may apply to the people ('the Seres') as well as the creature. However, the silk-worm does not quite enjoy the same mythological association with weaving as the arachnid (see for example, Arachne in Ovid, *Met.* 6.103-145).
[343] Homer, *Od.* 11.421-3a: οἰκτροτάτην δ᾿ ἤκουσα ὄπα Πριάμοιο θυγατρός, |Κασσάνδρης, τὴν κτεῖνε Κλυταιμνήστρη δολόμητις |ἀμφ᾿ ἐμοί - 'but the most pitiable cry I heard came from the daughter of Priam, Cassandra, [who even as] conniving Clytemnestra killed her, clung to me' [my translation].

reinterpreted by our narrator, who describes the wail as 'so piteous, that even […]' (τι οἰκτρόν, ὡς καὶ […], 2.10.4), choosing a structure which implies the emotion behind the cry made it hauntingly memorable to Agamemnon's departing soul.

Considering this cry as a product of Cassandra's τέχνη is not so far a leap when considering that the narrator describes her prophetic art as the way she 'sang prophecies disbelieved' (χρησμούς τε ἀπιστουμένους ᾄδουσαν).[344] Cassandra's vocalisation through ᾄδειν is indeed how the narrator contextualises her, and in this way, Cassandra is a much more similar figure to the narrator and the diegetic interlocutor,[345] the boy. Her artefact is a vocal interpretation of what she sees, not only in the synchronic moment of her death as Agamemnon describes it,[346] but also the precognitive spoken prophecies which went tragically unheeded. It is only at the close of this ekphrasis that the narrator reaches this βοᾷ (2.10.4), however, he has up to this point presented Cassandra's moment of death twice already, as seen in the two quotations above. Unlike the artefacts of Penelope, Daedalus, and Aesop, which can be described as they are to some degree as visual material artefacts, the spoken artefact of Cassandra is purely acoustic, and has to be embodied and articulated by the narrator in order to capture the sense of foreshadowing and climax as the moment of the axe fall is described again and again. The vividness of the final passages (2.10.2-4) gives emphasis to the final description of the shriek as so piteous it generates a Homeric allusion.

If we consider the final lines of the ekphrasis as the literary and mythological context which frequently initiates a speech, then the repetitive structure of the description can be seen as a subversion, and moreover, a reversal of the temporal structure established, of bringing in 'ancillary incidents' to build upon them a new description.[347] The narrator's search for what he finds excellent in the painting (δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3) may not seem particular fruitful in this instance – for indeed he does not mention any particular artifice of the painter – but rather the narrator's *search* is

[344] LSJ ἀπιστέω (A) 'disbelieve, distrust'.
[345] See §2.3.1.
[346] Homer, *Od.* 11.421-3a.
[347] C.f. n.273, in §2.3.1 of this essay; Shaffer, 1998, p.307.

what should be recognised as significant in this ekphrasis. The moment of critical clarity, to examine (ἐξετάζομεν) the piece in its merits of being γραφή (ὡς γραφήν, 2.10.1) suggests, more than anything, that we should relish the opportunity afforded by graphic representations in their immutability. Though meanings and interpretations may be reconsidered, revised, and restated through the diachronic experience of the reader-viewer, the base artefact of the γραφή does not change, and in many ways like Cassandra herself, can be thought of as having presupposed all interpretations which may come from it. What we interpret from a text or piece of artwork is based on our engagement with that artefact, and so the narrator invites us to do as he does, to focus on what is there, to discern our interpretations of what they mean ('thus this all takes place at night!' - ἐν νυκτὶ γὰρ ταῦτά που, 2.10.2), and to not be overwhelmed by μεγάλα ἐν σμικρῷ, the great many things that can exist within a short space of time (2.10.1).

3.2. Making artefacts of mourning: Hippolytus 2.4

This closing section to our analysis aims not to stray too far from the ἱστός of the work which has come before. The author of the *Imagines* may seem to struggle to orient representations of artefacts with each other, as by the limitations and approach of his speeches, he presents only the interpretative, personal experience of viewing. Nevertheless, the narrator's description of the Penelope and spider paintings in Looms 2.28.1 tentatively compares not the two artefacts directly, but their dual impact on his interpretation, and attempts to create his own philosophical product in his address. In recognising some artefacts external to the *Imagines*, we the reader must maintain a similar level of control of the web we weave when loose threads outside the frame of the text are brought in.

The narrator considers the direct voices of artefacts in some of his descriptions, flanking the corpus of the *Imagines* with the speaking statues of Memnon (1.7.3) and Echo (2.33.3). Unlike the prophecies of Cassandra, which the narrator emulates in his speech upon visiting an image of her

death, the voices attributed to the Memnon and the Echo reverberate against the diegetic boundaries of Philostratus' fictional world in the narrative of the text. This has formed the basis for other studies on the nature of sound in ekphrasis,[348] among which recognise the narrator's use of sound to emphasise the strength of the pictorial representation, and vividness of emotion.[349] It is this aspect of emotional connection that we will briefly conclude upon in this last section. The statue of Memnon is described as σοφίσματι, speech producting (λαλοῦντι), but also in this language identified by the narrator, as capable of producing its own artifice,[350] by having a technique of its own which give comfort to the goddess of the day (1.7.3).[351] In this artefact then, there is no creator figure like the spiders, for it is not described as created or painted by any skilled worker, but rather that Memnon has changed himself into a stone monument (μεταβεβληκὼς εἰς λίθον, 1.7.3).[352] This artefact is not fashioned, but a transformation of a figure, changed in death into an unchanging, synchronic artefact. This crystallisation (or petrification) of Memnon upon his death suggests themes in funerary memorialisation, which we will develop through the figure of Hippolytus, whose story is recreated across several decorated sarcophagi surviving from the century before the time of Philostratus.[353]

As stated in the introduction and consolidated in the last chapter, this study considers the interpretation of visual or textual artefacts as a creative process,[354] a process which realises the dialogic potential of object or image by engaging with and articulating its latent narrative. Specifically, this interpretative process is mirrored in the narrative of the painting through the characterisation of characters who design or compose narratives, among whom are Aesop as a writer and dramatist, and Daedalus as the architect contributing to the consummation of the

[348] See n.290.
[349] Verhelst, 2022.
[350] LSJ σόφισμα (A): acquired skill; (II): 'clever device'; but also 'in less good sense, sly trick, artifice' (2); 'quibble, sophism' (3).
[351] λαλοῦντι σοφίσματι παραμυθεῖσθαι τὴν Ἡμέραν.
[352] LSJ λίθος (III): 'gravestone'.
[353] Late first to mid-second century CE; see Bowie, 2009, pp.22-25 for the dates 180-240CE for Philostratus' teenage and adult years.
[354] Developing McCombie's theory of interpretation as reproduction (2002, p.152) introduced in n.55.

Pasiphaë myth.[355] In the Hippolytus ekphrasis, the narrator adds to the painting, much in the manner that Shaffer describes: through 'the act of describing a picture, the author of an *ekphrasis* can assign thoughts, motives, and emotions' to the painted figures, that for the viewer are not immediately apparent.[356] We will explore the implications of this assignation on the characterisation of mourners in the Hippolytus ekphrasis 2.4, and lastly consider how the narrator philosophises on the impact of material artefacts on their reader-viewers.

The left side panel of a Roman sarcophagus illustrated in Figure 3 of the appendix shows the scene of Hippolytus' upturned chariot, horses rearing and twisted in all directions, reminiscent of the narrator's description of the horses 'disdaining the yoke' (ὡς ἀτιμάσαντες τὸν ζυγὸν, 2.4.2). This funerary monument, among others included in the appendix, have heavily informed the development of this study, by contrasting the textual ubiquity of the *Imagines* with other forms of artistic τέχνη and γραφή. The greater accomplishment of painting (πλείω σοφίζεται, 1.pr.2), as opposed to the plastic art of sculpture, is suggested by the narrator as painting's greater achievements in spite of its limited dimension, in contrast to the many means of the other plastic arts (πολλῶν […] τέχνη, 1pr.2). As such, the linear (γραφή) dimension of the text relates more closely to painting (ζωγραφία) than the plastic arts (πλαστικῆς 1.pr.1-2). The dimension of the reader, with a physical text on the other hand, notes more similarities to the dimensions of freestanding or raised sculpture than text. This final portion of the study intends to highlight the significant interactions the reader-viewer may have with material artefacts, as the inherent co-existence of artefacts with the interpreter has not only been shown in the previous chapters but pervades the hermeneutic space of the interpretation as well, reflecting the figure of the interpreter as the interpreter makes their descriptions.

[355] See §1.2.
[356] Shaffer, 1998, p.304.

Recent studies on the *Imagines* have been inspired by Roman visual material culture in their approaches to the text,[357] but instead of imagining the kind of studied readers who may have initially received the *Imagines,*[358] we consider the contemporary viewing culture of funerary artefacts in which the writer was situated. Like the 'Protean corpus' of Philostratus himself, each text of which responds and reworks the genre 'against which it is constructed',[359] the narrator's approach to viewing and interpreting artefacts seeks to produce a new insight into the object against which it is constructed. The product of the narrator's interpretation, is, as we have seen, another artefact created through the 'textualization of viewing'.[360] The text of the narrative documents this process of interpretation, just as the painted products the narrator views hold within them the interpretative process of the painter's τέχνη.[361] In these paintings also, we have seen that other figures are in the midst of a similar creative interpretative process, most notably Daedalus, who constructs a μηχάνημα which will join together the body of Pasiphaë and the εἰκών of the heifer.[362] In the Hippolytus ekphrasis, however, the narrator takes a more active role, suggesting the anthropomorphism of figures which witness the death of Hippolytus (2.4.3). In using language which implies the appearance of bodies for the features of the painting, the narrator, in the literary dimension of his interpretation, successfully anthropomorphises the mountains, meadows, and streams.

Like the Fables of Aesop (1.3), the exact appearance of these figures is unclear. Instead, they are defined by their mourning for Hippolytus, in the actions which they do. Just as the Fables' ability to use λόγος humanises them to an uncertain degree, the grief of Hippolytus' surroundings transforms them into familiar, human-like figures. As we shall explore in this section, the mourners the narrator summons out from the painting through his narration reflects the emotional evocation

[357] Newby, 2016, esp. p.137; Bakke, 2022; MacDonald, 2009; and on philosophical approaches to epistemology, Bates, 2021, to name a few.
[358] MacDonald, 2009, pp.116-17.
[359] Elsner, 2009, p.7.
[360] McCombie, 2002, p.152.
[361] See in particular §2.1.3 and §2.3.1.
[362] See the Roman wall-painting (Fig. 1) discussed in §2.2.3.

of artefacts, in drawing pathos from the viewer. In doing so, the narrator develops his interlocution with the artwork, no longer using the figure of the painter as proxy for a like-minded philosophical dialogue (λόγος).[363] The narrator's anthropomorphism of the painted figures is marked by a turn in the middle of the narrative, like that in Cassandra 2.10.1, but this one is marked by a direct address. The narrator exclaims '-And you, chastity-loving youth' (Σὺ δέ, μειράκιον σωφροσύνης[364] ἐρῶν, 2.4.3) marking the narrator's engagement with the narrative of the painting, an immersion which only begins to break with the final lines. As we saw with the Cassandra ekphrasis, the narrator engages with the artefact in the manner in which enhances his interpretation of the painted narrative. Whereas Cassandra 2.10 bore the spirit of repetition not dissimilar to scholarly re-reading, in effect voicing Cassandra's prophecies, in Hippolytus 2.4 the narrator directly speaks to the figure of Hippolytus, visualising the myth,[365] but further himself as part of that myth by familiarly lamenting the loss of Hippolytus.

3.2.1. Viewing (in) the scenery

> σκοπιαὶ μὲν γὰρ αὗται, δι᾽ ὧν ἐθήρας σὺν Ἀρτέμιδι, δρύπτονται τὰς παρειὰς ἐν εἴδει γυναικῶν, λειμῶνες δ᾽ ἐν ὥρᾳ μειρακίων, οὓς ἀκηράτους ὠνόμαζες, [366] μαραίνουσιν ἐπὶ σοὶ τὰ ἄνθη, Νύμφαι τε αἱ σαὶ τροφοὶ τουτωνὶ τῶν πηγῶν ἀνασχοῦσαι σπαράττουσι τὰς κόμας ἀποβλύζουσαι[367] τῶν μαζῶν ὕδωρ.
>
> Indeed those mountain-peaks over which you hunted with Artemis, tear their cheeks in the forms of women, and the meadows in the form of beautiful youths, meadows which you called "undefiled", wither[368] their flowers for you, and Nymphs who were your nurses raising themselves up from the springs pull their hair to pieces and pour out water from their chests.
>
> Philostratus, *Imagines*, 2.4.3*

[363] See 2.1.3 and 2.3.
[364] LSJ σώφρων (II): 'having control over the sensual desires', that is 'temperate' and 'chaste'. The juxtaposition of σωφροσύνης ἐρῶν emulates the conflict caused by desire in the Hippolytus myth (2.4.1).
[365] In a manner not unlike that of the 'vivid tragic messenger': Taplin, 2007, p.24.
[366] Euripides, *Hipp.*73-74;76 ἀκηράτου λειμῶνος; ἀκήρατον.
[367] LSJ βλύζω: 'bubble, gush forth', with wine, 'spout'. C.f. ἐκχέω of blood: καὶ δεξώμεθα, ὦ παῖ, τὸ αἷμα κόλπον αὐτῷ ὑποσχόντες· ἐκχεῖται γάρ (1.4.4).
[368] LSJ μαραίνω (A) suggests also to 'quench fire', in the sense of extinguish or 'go slowly out'. The transitive usage suggests the meadows change something about their εἶδος, inasmuch as the mountains behave in the manner of women (ἐν εἴδει γυναικῶν, 2.4.3).

*translation adapted with less archaic language and changes noted

The narrator can here be seen to πᾰ́θους μεταδέδωκε with the painting, just as Aesop λόγου μεταδέδωκε with his Fables.[369] The repeated address to σοὶ is read here as an apostrophe to the dying figure of Hippolytus. As the character of Hippolytus does not exist on the same narrative plane as the narrator and his listeners, we can consider this an apostrophic address to an absent figure.Yet the construction of the narrative indicates that the narrator is speaking to an image of Hippolytus. In one of the more striking direct addresses by the narrator to a painted figure,[370] the narrator paints a scene of lamentation, naming the sorrow of figures mourning Hippolytus and giving voice to that emotion. This passage marks the anthropomorphising of Hippolytus' surroundings, who are described as geographical places of familiarity, but whose relationships to Hippolytus are described in anthropomorphic terms. The mountains are implied not only to have witnessed Hippolytus hunting with Artemis (δι᾽ ὧν ἐθήρας σὺν Ἀρτέμιδι), but that they now mourn the loss this activity by tearing their cheeks (δρύπτονται τὰς παρειὰς).[371] The waters who are characterised as Hippolytus' nurses (σαὶ τροφοὶ, 2.4.3) and thus anthropomorphised, pour out water Hippolytus will no longer drink from their breasts (τῶν μαζῶν ὕδωρ), reminiscent of wet-nurses having lost children. Similarly, the meadows praised by Hippolytus in Euripides[372] shed their beauty, a result comparable to the effects of tearing at the hair and cheeks.

The wilting of the meadows' blooms (μαραίνουσιν ἐπὶ σοὶ τὰ ἄνθη, 2.4.3) draw attention to Hippolytus as a viewer, who praised the meadows for being 'unspoilt' (ἀκηράτους ὠνόμαζες, 2.4.3). No longer to be praised by Hippolytus, the blooms of the meadows 'wither' (μαραίνω) from sight, a term which associates dying away with disappearance.[373] While this is framed by the narrator as a

[369] *Imag.* 1.3.1, see §2.1.1.
[370] See also Hunters 1.28.1.
[371] LSJ δρύπτω (A): to tear one's cheek 'in sign of mourning'.
[372] This is perceived as the narrator's reference to Euripides *Hipp.* 73-74;76, see n.366.
[373] See n.363 above on μαραίνω (LSJ A, II).

response to the death of Hippolytus, it should also be considered a fading of the diegesis of Hippolytus' narrative without the figure to affirm the existence of his surroundings. In this sense, the meadows are not only lamenting the loss of a painted peer, but the central viewing figure, outside of whose commemorative praise (ἀκηράτους ὠνόμαζες, 2.4.3) they indeed fade from both literary and narrative view. The mythological and dramatic significance of the meadows cannot exist without association to the figure of Hippolytus, so the actions of the meadows should be considered more than a mourning action, a progression towards non-existence, as a subjective experience cannot exist when the viewer has died.

As such, the figure of Hippolytus is not truly dead in this painting, nor will be. The narrative of change and death that exists around the figure of Hippolytus is referenced by the depiction of the painting, but the synchronicity of the image itself is incorrigible by the passage of time. Here, the narrator's lament notes the artifice of the painter in showing change. The meadows are *wilting* (μαραίνουσιν, 2.4.3), the mountains are *tearing* (δρύπτονται) at their cheeks and the Nymphs are *pulling* their hair to pieces (σπαράττουσι). The vivid present the narrative presents thus recreates the synchronicity of the painting, which will only ever perpetually *be* rather than *having been* or *being about to be* any different. The artefact of the painting preserves this moment, and is noted by the narrator, who in doing so, produces his own artefact preserving the moment of dying in the form of his narration (2.4.4):

> καὶ τὸ μὲν στέρνον ἔμπνουν ἔτι καθάπερ μὴ μεθιέμενον τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸ δὲ ὄμμα περιαθρεῖ τὰ τετρωμένα. φεῦ τῆς ὥρας,[374] ὡς ἄτρωτός τις ἐλελήθει οὖσα. οὐδὲ γὰρ νῦν ἀπολείπει τὸ μειράκιον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπιπρέπει τι καὶ τοῖς τραύμασι.
>
> [your] chest is still breathing as though it would not let go of the soul, and [your] eye gazes at all [your] wounds. Alas, your [time of] beauty, how it might have proved* against wounds no one would have dreamed. For not even now does it quit the body, but it becomes even [your] wounds.*

[374] May also be read as 'when' if we consider τῆς ὥρας as unit of time; LSJ ὡς (Ad): 'Alas the youth when you should have been unwounded!'

Philostratus, *Imag.* 2.4.4

*translation adapted [375] [376] [377]

3.2.2. Commemorative craftsmanship

Hippolytus' anthropomorphised mourners are introduced under the perceived intention of the painter:

> […] ὥστε ὠδύρατο καὶ ἡ γραφὴ θρῆνόν τινα ποιητικὸν ἐπὶ σοὶ ξυνθεῖσα.
>
> […] so that mourns even the γραφὴ,* having composed[378] for your honour a lament.*

Philostratus, *Imagines*, 2.4.3

*translation adapted[379] [380]

The narrator identifies mourning for Hippolytus' honour (ὠδύρατο […] σοὶ ξυνθεῖσα) as the purpose of the depiction (γραφὴ), thus echoing the effect of his own description. The narrator's direct address to Hippolytus exudes his personal pity in his recognition of the loss of the mountains, meadows, and springs; for if the image does not show anthropomorphic figures, then the addition of emotion to these features, as Shaffer notes, is the artifice of the speaker.[381] Going beyond Shaffer's observation that a narrator can add to figures through description, it is conceivable that in this ekphrasis, the narrator *forms figures* (εἰκών) through his description of grief and mourning. As

[375] τῆς ὥρας, echoes the meadows ἐν ὥρᾳ μειρακίῳ, in the metaphorical 'springtime of life', or 'bloom of youth' (LSJ II). As such, it might be considered a shortened expression for the 'beauty of youth'.
[376] οὖσα as present participle of εἰμί; consider 'through which you [might have] escaped your wounds'
[377] LSJ ἐπιπρέπω (A) to be conspicuous, (II) beseem, suit; 'ἐπιπρέπει it is fitting'. Though Fairbanks' 'a charm lingers' carries a similar meaning, my version retains the Greek grammatical structure to a greater degree.
[378] Note that συντίθημι is the same verb used in 1.16.1 to describe the strange appearance of the *composition* of the Minotaur; εἶδος ἀτόπως *συντεθὲν* τῇ φύσει. The usage here therefore carries connotations of visual composition, in addition to the narrative sense of constructing a story (LSJ συντίθημι, II.3). C.f. §2.2.1.
[379] Maintaining polysemy once more, as this is pertinent to the discussion that the narrator's speech is simultaneously applicable to the painting and the textual work of the *Imagines.*
[380] θρῆνόν ποιητικὸν taken together suggests 'poetic lament' (LSJ ποιητικός II). However, we should also consider that ποιητικός denotes a capability 'of making', in the sense of being 'creative, productive' (LSJ A). Describing the γραφὴ product as ποιητικός recalls the λόγος of Aesop's Fables, the implication being that they have λόγος, and are capable of λέγω, speaking, and therefore storytelling (1.3.1); see §2.1.3.
[381] Shaffer, 1998, p.304.

explored above, the description of the meadows paints a picture of the highly reflexive nature of viewing. To extend this, the descriptions in the *Imagines* as a whole which form so many figures through recognition likewise and inextricably form the figure of the narrator.

The narrator forms himself by describing, associating, and interpreting the artefacts he is faced with, and archives this process in the text of the *Imagines.* In this way, we might consider the γραφὴ in the quote above to apply in the broadest fashion to the painting within the narrative, and the textual narration which contains it. The death of Hippolytus ekphrasis presents the *mise-en-abyme* of the creative figure in connection to their product, and thus offers the means through which to look outwards from the image, at the interpreter. The γραφὴ commemorates Hippolytus, but in doing so, reveals the composer of the dirge (θρῆνόν τινα ποιητικὸν, 2.4.3), which, more than the painter, aptly describes the 'speaking' narrator, whose description occupies a linguistic dimension adjacent to the audible nature of a lament. In the narrator's recognition of the painting as a commemorative artefact, he in turn emulates the act of recording the tragedy, adding figures of lamentation through his anthropomorphising language to reflect a sense of sorrow in the artefact he is interpreting.

When studying the Hippolytus ekphrasis, like the Cassandra (2.10), it is tempting to draw upon extant dramatic texts through which we might contextualise the topics the narrator's description. This, however, would not fully acknowledge the structure of repeated interpretations that the narrator forms for us. As seen in the descriptions studied in this paper, the narrator's approach to viewing is informed by the artefact he sees. The themes that the narrator chooses to praise and articulate (ἑρμηνεύω, 1.pr.3) to the audience are those which are inspired from his viewing of the paintings, and the recurrent feature of the creative figures and their τέχνη. By drawing upon the previous analyses on this study, we can recognise here in the Hippolytus (2.4) that the narrator seeks to directly engage in the construction of the scene, showing his hand which in the other ekphrases, is much more subtly integrated. This serves to illustrate the theme of

commemoration and lamentation in the narrative of the painting, as the figures the narrator creates from the background are more recognisable 'artificial' figures than the text of the description. Though it may appear on the surface that the narrator has lost his approach or been overcome by emotion, the textual, verbal product of his skills (τέχνη) shows that he is a skilled interpreter, who has built upon the base artefact of the painting and integrated new figures and features into his lamentation.[382] The anthropomorphic effects of the narrator's description goes further, indicating that interpretation can contribute to the development and mythologising of an event, such as the death of Hippolytus.

[382] On the supplementation of figures as additions of rhetoric, c.f. §2.3.3; Shaffer, 1998, pp.304-307; Newby, 2016, p.138.

Conclusion

Across the descriptions we have studied from the *Imagines*, the selected works have elucidated specific aspects of perspective, narration, and authority. In doing so, we have recognised how interpretation is presented, and applied the narrator's approach to artefacts back onto the textual artefact of his narration by interpreting the text of the *Imagines*. This reflexivity is achieved on account of understanding creative skill as forms of philosophy, as both in the sense of refinement of a constructive skill (σοφία) as well as an approach to epistemology. The narrator characterises the painted works as interpretations of reality which document the philosophy of the painter, recording for the viewer the means and method of interpretation which can be so luxuriously repeatedly studied on account of its constancy. Regarding this, an incontestable truth appears: the artefact or text of any kind, be it painted, woven, written, or spoken, is eternal and unchanging; what changes are the perceptions and philosophies of the individuals who engage with them in their posterity, some of which can be so perceptive, they spark a semblance of life within the inanimate artefact they engage with. Philostratus' appreciation for this truth is evident, as he declares it in the very opening of his work.

> Ὅστις μὴ ἀσπάζεται τὴν ζωγραφίαν, ἀδικεῖ τὴν ἀλήθειαν
>
> Whosoever scorns painting is unjust to truth
>
> Philostratus, *Imag.* 1.pr.1

In this last chapter, we have considered the materiality of contemporary artefacts in our reality to identify how the diegesis of the narrator is oriented around visual material artefacts. The descriptions of the narrator, following the frame (ἱστός) of the artefacts with which he interacts, has provided this study with a significant material artefact which documents the creative process of interpretation. In this way, my interpretation of Philostratus' works contributes to what we know of Graeco-Roman ekphrasis by identifying the narrator's consideration of artefacts as extant records of methodology and philosophy. Philostratus' use of ekphrastic technique allows the reader to perceive

and conceive of his approach. The σοφία of the narrator in his topic and his chosen τέχνη of speech and ekphrasis is used to compare himself to the painters, and in doing so, he maps out a philosophical approach he has woven from his knowledge and imparted onto his audience.

This preliminary study into the self-documenting hermeneutic philosophy of interpretation has noted, in the Hippolytus ekphrasis in particular, the importance of products of interpretation. These products, considered as artefacts, are by nature commemorative, and reflexively, the commemorative artefact can by degrees reveal the interpretative process of the creator. Building on the understanding that visual material artefacts are not simply representations of the natural and imagined world, we can see them as a reflection of the viewer's approach and appreciation of the world around them, a construct of philosophy in the sense of love for a craft as well as love for wisdom and understanding. Philostratus' *Imagines* invites us to approach for ourselves such visual artefacts with the aim of understanding our interpretations and how we articulate them (ἑρμηνεύσουσί τε καὶ τοῦ δοκίμου ἐπιμελήσονται, 1.pr.3), and further suggesting that we should apply scrutiny to our appreciation to everything which is a product of the τέχνη of σοφοι, as they will reveal to us their truths with sufficient study.

Bibliography

Translations

Fairbanks, A. 1931. *Philostratus, Imagines; Callistratus, Descriptions.* Loeb Classical Library 256. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schönberger, O., and Kalinka, E. 1968. *Philostratos: Die Bilder*. Munich: Ernst Heimeran Verlag.

Supplementary Greek texts and translations

Aelius Theon, 1997. *Progymnasmata*. Patillon, M. ed. Paris.

Aeschylus. 2009. *Oresteia: Agamemnon. Libation-Bearers. Eumenides.* Sommerstein, A. H. ed. trans. Loeb Classical Library 146. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aphthonius, 1926. *Progymnasmata.* Rabe, H. ed. Leipzig.

Euripides. 1998. *Suppliant Women. Electra. Heracles.* Kovacs, D. ed. trans. Loeb Classical Library 9. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Diodorus Siculus. 1939. *Library of History, Volume III: Books 4.59-8.* Oldfather, C. H. trans. Loeb Classical Library 340. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Homer. 1924. *Iliad, Volume I: Books 1-12.* Murray, A. T. trans. Wyatt, W. F. rev. Loeb Classical Library 170. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Homer. 1987. *The Iliad.* Hammond, M. trans. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

'Hermogenes'. 1913. *Progymnasmata.* Rabe, H. ed. Leipzig.

Plato. 2013. *Republic, Volume II: Books 6-10.* Emlyn-Jones, C., and Preddy, W. ed. trans. Loeb Classical Library 276. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Anderson, G. 1086. *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* London: Croom Helm.

Armstrong, R. 2006. *Cretan Women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arthur-Montagne, J. 2021. 'Through the Eyes of a Child: The Boy Viewer in Imperial Ekphrasis'. *Classical Philology.* **116**, pp.183-207.

Avery, A. L. 2020. *Reynard the Fox*. Oxford: Bodleian Library.

Bakke, J. 2022. 'Painting, Interpretation, Education: Tables of Knowledge in the *Imagines* of Philostratus the Athenian'. *Open Cultural Studies*. **6**(1), pp.280-293.

Barthes, R. 1977. *The Death of the Author.* trans. Heath, S. *Image, music, text.* London: Fontana, pp.142-148; *A Dictionary of Critical Theory.* [Online]. 2010. s.v. Iser, Wolfgang. [Accessed 5 October 2023]. Available from: www.oxfordreference.com.

Bartsch, S., and Elsner, J. 2007. 'Introduction: Eight Ways of Looking at an Ekphrasis'. *Classical Philology.* **102**(1), pp.i-vi.

Bates, A. 2021. 'Philostratus Visualises the Philosophical: *Imagines* 2.23, Hercules *Furens* and the Cataleptic Impression'. *American Journal of Philology.* **142**(1), pp.137-175.

Beckman, E. 2020. *Do You See What I'm Saying? Painting and Paideia in Philostratus' Imagines.* Ph.D. thesis, Indiana University.

Bennett, A., and Royle, N. 2016. *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism, and Theory.* 5th ed. Oxon: Routledge.

Böck, B., Luzzatto, M. J., and Küppers, J. 'Fable'. In: Cancik, H., Schneider, H. *Brill's New Pauly*. Brill Reference Online. doi: 10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e408170.

Borg, B. E. ed. 2004. *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic.* Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Bowie, E. 2019. 'The Denigration and Marginalisation of Women in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*'. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne: Femmes grecques de l'Orient romain.* **18**, pp.207-219.

_______. 2009. Philostratus: 'The Life of a Sophist'. In: *Philostratus,* Bowie, E. and Elsner, J. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.19-32.

Bowie, E., and Elsner, J. 2009. *Philostratus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breitenberger, B. 2007. *Aphrodite and Eros: The Development of Erotic Mythology in Early Greek Poetry and Cult.* New York: Routledge.

Bryson, N. 1994. 'Philostratus and the Imaginary Museum'. In: Goldhill, S., and Osbourne, R. eds. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.255-283;312-314.

Ceserani, G. 2011. *Italy's Lost Greece: Magna Graecia and the Making of Modern Archaeology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corbett, E. P. J. 1965. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dillon, M. 2010. 'Kassandra: Mantic, Maenadic or Manic? Gender and the Nature of Prophetic Experience in Ancient Greece'. *Proceedings of the AASR Conference, University of Auckland, New Zealand July 6-11, 2008.*

Elsner, J. 2000. 'Making the Myth Visual: The Horae of Philostratus and the Dance of the Text'. *Römische Mitteilungen.* **207**, pp.253-276.

______. 1994. 'From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: monuments, travel and writing'. In: Goldhill, S., and Osbourne, R. eds. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.224-254;309-312.

______. 1996. ‘Naturalism and the Erotics of the Gaze: Imitations of Narcissus’. In: Bergmann, B., and Kampen, N. eds. *Sexuality in Ancient Art.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp.247-261.

______. ed. 1996a. *Art and Text in Roman Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

______. 2004. ‘Seeing and Saying: A Psychoanalytic Account of Ekphrasis’. *Helios.* **31**(1-2), pp.157-185.

______. 2007. ‘Philostratus Visualises the Tragic: Some Ekphrastic and Pictorial Receptions of Greek Tragedy in the Roman Era’. In: Kraus, C., Foley, H., Goldhill, S., and Elsner, J. eds. *Visualising the Tragic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.309-37.

______. 2007a. ‘Viewing Ariadne: From Ekphrasis to Wall Painting in the Roman World’. *Classical Philology.* **102**(1), pp.20-44.

______. 2007b. *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text.* Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

______. 2009. ‘A Protean Corpus’. In: *Philostratus,* Bowie, E. and Elsner, J. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.3-18.

Elsner, J., and Squire, M. 2016. ‘Homer and the Ekphrasists: Text and Picture in the Elder Philostratus’ ‘Scamander’ (Imagines I.1)’. In: Blintiff, J. and Rutter, N. K. eds. *The Archaeology of Greece and Rome: Studies in Honour of Anthony Snodgrass.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.57-99.

Feeney, D. C. 2005. ‘The beginnings of a literature in Latin’. *Journal of Roman Studies.* **95**, pp.226-240.

Goldhill, S. Forthcoming. ‘Latin Literature and Greek’. In: Gibson, R., and Whitton, C. eds. *The Cambridge Critical Guide to Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

________. 1994. ‘The naive and knowing eye: ecphrasis and the culture of viewing in the Hellenistic world’. In: Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R. eds. 1994. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.197-223.

________. 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

________. 2007. ‘What Is Ekphrasis For?’ *Classical Philology.* **102**(1), pp.1-19.

________. 2012. ‘Forms of attention’. *The Cambridge Classical Journal.* **58**, pp.88-114.

________. 2018. [Review of Philostratus: Interpreters and Interpretation. Image, Text and Culture in Classical Antiquity]. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review.* [Accessed 5 February 2023].

Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R. eds. 1994. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grethlein, J. 2023. ‘In the Philostratus trap: an enactive and embodied perspective on the *Imagines* and their *enargeia’. The Journal of Hellenistic Studies.* pp.1-18.

Gyselinck, W., and Demoen, K. 2009. 'Author and Narrator: Fiction And Metafiction In Philostratus Vita Apollonii'. In: Demoen, K. and Praet, D. eds. *Theois Sophistès.* Mnemnosyne, Supplements, vol. 305. Leiden: Brill, pp.95-127.

Heffernan, J. A. W. 1991. 'Ekphrasis and Representation'. *New Literary History.* **22**(2), pp.297-316.

Hines, C. 2022. 'Ekphrasis and the Mind's Ear: The Play of Sound in Pseudo-Hesiod's *Aspis*'. *Mnemosyne.* [Online]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525x-bja10160.

Hodkinson, O. 2011. *Authority and Tradition in Philostratus'* Heroikos. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.

Holliday, P. J. 1998. [Review of *Myth, Meaning, and Memory on Roman Sarcophagi,* by M. Koortbojian]. *Studies in Iconography.* **19**, pp.233-236.

Holloway, R. 1975. *Influences and styles in the late archaic and early classical Greek sculpture of Sicily and Magna Graecia.* Louvain: Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art.

Hunter, R. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the reception of Hellenistic poetry at Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, C. P. 2004. 'Multiple identities in the age of the Second Sophistic'. In: Borg, B. E. ed. *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic.* Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp.13-22.

Jong, I.J.F. de. 1987. *Narrators and focalizers: the presentation of the story in the Iliad.* Amsterdam: Grüner.

Kampen, N. 1996. *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy.* ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemezis, A. 2014. 'Roman Politics and the Fictional Narrator in Philostratus' *Apollonius*'. *Classical Antiquity*. **33**(1), pp.61-101.

Kirby-Hirst, M. 2014. 'Philostratus' Heroikos: Protesilaos, Achilles and Palamedes unite in defence of the Greek world'. *Acta Classica.* **57**, pp.76-104.

Koopman, N. 2022. [Review of Ecphrastic shields in Graeco-Roman literature: the world's forge]. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review.*

Koortbojian, M. 1995. *Myth, Meaning, and Memory on Roman Sarcophagi*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Accessed 18 August 2023]. Available from: http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft4199n900/.

Kostopoulou, V. 2009. 'Philostratus' *Imagines* 2.18: Words and Images'. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies.* **49**(1), pp.81-100.

Laird, A. 1993. 'Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64'. *The Journal of Roman Studies*. **83**, pp.18–30.

______. 2003. 'Fiction as a discourse of philosophy in Lucian's Verae Historiae'. In: Panayotakis, S. Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. eds. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill, pp.115-127.

Lehmann-Hartleben, K. 1941. 'The Imagines of the Elder Philostratus'. *The Art bulletin*. **23**(1), pp.16-44.

Levine, R. 1991. 'Pandarus as Davus'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen.* **92**(4), pp.463-468

MacDonald, C. 2011. '*Thauma* and Aesthetic Education in Philostratus' *Imagines*'. Halifax: Classical Association of Canada.

___________. 2022. 'Echoes of Ovid? Memories of the *Metamorphoses* in Philostratus's *Imagines*'. *Helios.* **49**(2), pp.113-145.

Mawford, K., and Ntanou, E. 2021. *Ancient Memory: Remembrance and Commemoration in Graeco-Roman Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

McCloskey, B. 2017. 'Achilles' brutish Hellenism: Greek identity in the Heroikos'. *Classicual Philology.* **112**(1), pp.63-85.

McCombie, D. 2002. 'Philostratus, Histoi, *Imagines* 2.28: Ekphrasis and the web of illusion'. *Ramus.* **31**(supplement 1-2: The Verbal and the Visual: Cultures of Ekphrasis in Antiquity), pp.146-157.

Miles, G. 2009. 'Reforming the Eyes: Interpreters and Interpretation in the *Vita Apolonii*'. In: Demoen, K. and Praet, D. eds. *Theois Sophistès.* Mnemnosyne, Supplements, vol. 305. Leiden: Brill, pp.129-160.

_______. 2019. *Philostratus: Interpreters and Interpretation.* Milton: Taylor & Francis Group.

Miles, G., and Demoen, K. 2009. 'In Praise of the Fable. The Philostratean Aesop'. *Hermes*. **137**(1), pp.28-44.

Möllendorff, P. von. 2014. 'Mimet(h)ic *Paideia* in Lucian's *True History*'. In: Cueva, E., and Byrne, S. eds. *A Companion to the Ancient Novel.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp.522-534.

Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newby, Z. 2002. 'Testing the Boundaries of Ekphrasis: Lucian on the Hall'. *Ramus.* **31**(1-2: The Verbal and the Visual: Cultures of Ekphrasis in Antiquity), pp.126-135.

________. 2002a. 'Imperial Monuments'. *The Classical Review*. **52**(2), pp.340–341.

________.2009. 'Absorption and Erudition in Philostratus' *Imagines*'. In: Bowie, E., and Elsner, J. *Philostratus.* Cambridge: CUP, pp.322-342.

________.2016. 'Paideia, Rhetoric and Self-representation: Responses to Mythological Wall-paintings'. In *Greek Myths in Roman Art and Culture: Imagery, Values and Identity in Italy, 50 BC–AD 250.* Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.137-163.

Omogunwa, I. J. 2018. 'The Carpenter as a Philosopher-Artist: a Critique of Plato's Theory Mimesis'. *Philosophy Pathways.* **222**, pp.1-6.

The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, 2008. s.v. reader response theory.

The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome. [Online]. 2010. s.v. Second Sophistic. [Accessed 07/06/2023]. Available from: www.oxfordreference.com.

Panayotakis*, S.*, Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. eds. 2003. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond.* Leiden: Brill.

Pollitt, J. J. 1990. *The art of ancient Greece: sources and documents.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Primavesi, O. and Giuliani, L. 2012. 'Bild und Rede: Zum Proömium der Eikones des zweiten Philostrat'. *Poetica*. **44**(1), 25-79.

Rutter, N. K., and Sparkes, B. A. eds. *Word and Image in Ancient Greece.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Schironi, F. 2014. 'The Trickster Onstage: The Cunning Slave from Plautus to Commedia dell'Arte'. In: Douglas Olsen, S. ed. *Ancient Comedy and Reception: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Henderson.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp.447-478.

Schoess, S. A. 2022. 'Reading Homer and the Epic Cycle through *Ekphrasis*: Philostratus' Epic *Imagines'.* In: Bassino, P. and Benzi, N. eds. *Sophistic views of the epic past from the classical to the imperial ages.* London: Bloomsbury Academic, pp.211-235.

Shaffer, D. 1998. 'Ekphrasis and the Rhetoric of Viewing in Philostratus' Imaginary Museum'. *Philosophy & Rhetoric.* **31**(4), pp.303-316.

________. 1998a. 'The Shadow of Helen: The Status of the Visual Image in Gorgias's *Encomium to Helen'. Rhetorica.* **16**(3), pp.243-257.

Spinelli, A. 2022. 'Beyond social and functional interpretations of wall paintings: mythological imagery in the tablinum at Pompeii and Herculaneum'. *Journal of Roman Archeology.* **35**, pp.177-193.

Squire, M. 2018. *Sight, Description, and Knowledge in Imagines of the Elder Philostratus.* [Online]. [Accessed 27 Auguest 2023]. Available from: https://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/research/projects/]

________. 2009. *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

________. 2013. 'Ekphrasis at the forge and the forging of ekphrasis: the 'shield of Achilles' in Graeco-Roman word and image'. *Word & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry.* **29**(2), pp.157-191.

Taplin, O. 2007. *Pots and Plays: Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

________. 2007a. 'A New Pair of Pairs: Tragic Witnesses in Western Greek Vase Painting?' In: Kraus, C. S., Goldhill, S., Foley, H. P., and Elsner, J. eds. *Visualising the Tragic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.177-196.

Thein, K. 2002. 'Gods and Painters: Philostratus the Elder, Stoic *phantasia* and the Strategy of Describing'. *Ramus.* **31**(1-2: The Verbal and the Visual: Cultures of Ekphrasis in Antiquity), pp.136-145.

______. 2022. *Ecphrastic Shields in Graeco-Roman Literature: The World's Forge.* Abingdon; New York: Routledge.

Verhelst, B. 2022. 'From Myth to Image to Description: Emotions in the *Ekphrasis Eikonos* of Procopius of Gaza'. In: de Bakker, M., and van den Berg, B., and Klooster, J. eds. *Emotions and Narrative in Ancient Literature and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Irene de Jong.* Leiden: Brill, pp.697-711.

Webb, R. 2006. 'The *Imagines* as a Fictional Text: *Ekphrasis, Apatē and Illusion'*. In: Constantini, M., Graziani, F., and Rolet, S. eds. *Le défi de l'art: Philostrate, Callistrate et l'image sophistique*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, pp.113-136.

_______. 2009. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

______. 2010. 'Les *Images* de Philostrate: entre le regard et la constitution de mythe'. In: Auger, D. and Delattre, C. eds. *Mythe et fiction.* Paris: Presses universitaires de Paris Nanterre, pp.349-365

______. 2013. 'Les *Images* de Philostrate: une narration éclatée'. In: Michel, B. ed. *La trame et le tableau: Poétique et rhétoriques du récit et de la description dans l'Antiquité grecque et latine.* Poitiers: Pu Rennes, pp.19-33.

______. 2015. 'Homère dans les *Images* de Philostrate'. In: Dubel, S., Favreau-Linder, A., and Oudot. E. eds. *À l'école d'Homère: la culture des orateurs et des sophistes*. Paris: Ulm, pp.203–14.

Whitmarsh, T. 1999. 'Greek and Roman in Dialogue: The Pseudo-Lucianic Nero'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies.* **119**, pp.142-160.

___________. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

___________. 2005. *The Second Sophistic.* Greece and Rome: New surveys in the classics, vol. 35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

___________. 2011 *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

___________. 2013. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicsm.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Worth, S. 2000. 'Aristotle, Thought, and *Mimēsis*: Our Responses to Fiction'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* **58**(4), pp.333-339.

Xian, R. 2017. 'Two notes on Philostratus' *Imagines* 2.28 ('Looms')'. *The Classical Quarterly.* **67**(1), pp.335-338.

Zanker, P., and Ewald, B. 2012. *Living with Myths: the Imagery of Roman Sarcophagi.* Slater, J. trans. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeitlin, F. 1994. ‘The artful eye: vision, ecphrasis and spectacle in Euripidean theatre’. In: Goldhill, S., and Osborne, R. eds. *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.138-196.

Appendix - Figures

Figure 1. Roman fresco depicting Daedalus and Pasiphae, north wall of Casa dei Vettii (VI. 15.1.p), c.60-79 CE.

(Parco Archeologico, Pompeii).

Source: Panetta, M. R., (ed.) 2005: *Pompeji. Geschichte, Kunst und Leben in der versunkenen Stadt*. Belser: Stuttgart, p. 365, via https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Pompeii_-_Casa_dei_Vettii_-_Pasiphae.jpg [Accessed 6 November 2023].

Figure 2. Roman fresco depicting Daedalus and Pasiphae, left, north and eastern walls of Casa dei Vettii (VI. 15.1.p), c.60-79 CE.

(Parco Archeologico, Pompeii).

Source: © 2006 Peter Stewart, via flickr.com [Accessed 25 November 2023].

Figure 3. Marble sarcophagus with scenes from the myth of Hippolytus and Phaedra. Left side panel: the death of Hippolytus, c.150-200 CE.

Discovered in Rome on Via Aurelia in 1853.

(The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg).

LIMC Monument #10107

Source: © 2014 Ilya Shurygin via https://ancientrome.ru/ [Accessed 9 September 2023]

Fig. 4. Marble Roman sarcophagus with scenes from the myth of Hippolytus and Phaedra. Front panel: Hippolytus and hunting party; Phaedra's nurse, with letter, centre left, c.150-200 CE

(The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg).

© 2014 Ilya Shurygin via https://ancientrome.ru/ [Accessed 9 September 2023]

Fig. 5. Marble Roman sarcophagus with scenes from the myth of Hippolytus and Phaedra. Rear panel: Hippolytus and hunting party attacking boar, bottom right, c.150-200 CE

(The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg).

© 2014 Ilya Shurygin via https://ancientrome.ru/ [Accessed 9 September 2023]

Fig. 6. Roman sarcophagus with scenes from the myth of Hippolytus and Phaedra. Front panel: Hippolytus, centre, and youths with hunting dogs; woman, Phaedra(?), centre left, c.100-200 CE

Fig. 7. Roman sarcophagus with scenes from the myth of Hippolytus and Phaedra. Back panel: the death of Hippolytus, centre; Hercules with club, right; seated female figure with bull, c.100-200 CE

(Museu d'Historia de la Ciutat de Tarragona, Tarragona).

Source: © Roberto Piperno via romeartlover.it/Tarragona4.html#Hippolytus [Accessed 9 Septemper 2023]

Fig 8. Marble Campanian sarcophagus with myth of Phaedra and Hippolytus, c.240-250 CE

(Duomo, Capua).

(Lucignano, A. 2010. Sarcofagi campani d'età imperiale romana: importazioni e produzioni locali. *Bollettino di Archeologia*. Special, pp.63-72, p.69

Source: © Ilya Shurygin, 2015 via ancientrome.ru/ [Accessed 10 September 2023]

Fig. 9. Marble Campanian sarcophagus with myth of Phaedra and Hippolytus, front panel close up, c.240-250 CE

(Duomo, Capua).

(Lucignano, A. 2010. Sarcofagi campani d'età imperiale romana: importazioni e produzioni locali. *Bollettino di Archeologia*. Special, pp.63-72, p.69

Source: © Ilya Shurygin, 2015 via ancientrome.ru/ [Accessed 10 September 2023]

Figure 10. Campanian red-figure bell krater attributed to the Painter of Naples 3227, c.350-325 BCE (Galerie Günter Puhze, Freiburg).

Katalog Galerie Günter Puhze 8 (1989) no. 227 ill.; Oakley, J. H., The Death of Hippolythos in south Italian Vase-Painting, QuadTic 20 (1991) 66 no. 8 fig. 16.

Source : http://ark.dasch.swiss/ark:/72163/080e-76abca1b60221-2 [Accessed 28 August 2023]

Figure 11. Apulian red-figure volute krater attributed to the Darius Painter, c.340-320BCE (London).

Source: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/image/198837006 [Accessed 28 August 2023]