



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Pluperfects and the Artist in Ekphrases: From the Shield of Achilles to the Shield of Aeneas (and Beyond)

de Jong, I.J.F.

DOI

[10.1163/1568525X-12341706](https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12341706)

Publication date

2015

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Mnemosyne

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Jong, I. J. F. (2015). Pluperfects and the Artist in Ekphrases: From the Shield of Achilles to the Shield of Aeneas (and Beyond). *Mnemosyne*, 68(6), 889-916.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-12341706>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)



BRILL

MNEMOSYNE 68 (2015) 889-916

MNEMOSYNE

A Journal
of
Classical Studies

brill.com/mnem

Pluperfects and the Artist in Ekphrases

From the Shield of Achilles to the Shield of Aeneas (and Beyond)

Irene J.F. de Jong

GLTC, Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam

i.j.f.dejong@uva.nl

Received: August 2013; accepted: December 2013

Abstract

This study discusses the figure of the artist in classical ekphrases, in particular the pluperfects of verbs of making of the type ἐτέτυκτο, ἤσκητο, ἐκεκόσμητο, ἐτετείχιστο, *caelaverat*, *fecerat*, *struxerat* which evoke that artist. After setting up a framework of the various other ways in which the artist can be represented in ekphrases, I zoom in on the pluperfects and show how they are used differently in Greek and Latin ekphrases: in Greek the medio-passive pluperfect describes a finished object while at the same time acknowledging the act of making and hence the maker; in Latin the active pluperfect occurs in analepses which evoke the act of making by a maker as an event of the past. I end with the remarkable use of the pluperfect by Vergil in the shield of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8. He uniquely combines the Greek epic tradition of the refrain of verbs of making with the Latin analeptic force of the tense, in order to keep reminding the narratees of the maker of the shield, Vulcan, and his prophetic powers and of the earlier, crucial scene of the divine smith forging the shield.

Keywords

Homer – Vergil – ekphrasis – Greek and Latin pluperfect – artists in literature

Introduction

Ekphrasis in recent years has become a much discussed topic, both inside classics and in literary or cultural studies in general.¹ Most attention has been paid

1 This interest in ekphrasis was initiated in classics by Bartsch 1989; good collections in Elsner 2002a and Bartsch-Elsner 2007, who also have an extensive bibliography.

to the images depicted on the work of art described and to their relationship with the text in which the ekphrasis is incorporated: what is the relationship between the scenes on Achilles' shield and the *Iliad*, between the scenes on Jason's cloak and the *Argonautica*, or between the scenes on Aeneas' shield and the *Aeneid*? In this article I will focus on the artist. He or she is one of the four agents that are involved in the 'construction' of a work of art in a literary text, the other being the narrator-focaliser, the narratees, and (often) an observing character in the story itself (more on this in sections 1-2). An important role in the evocation of the artist is played by pluperfects of verbs of making, of the type ἐτέτυκτο, ἤσκητο, ἐκεκόσμητο, ἐτετέλιχτο, *caelaverat, fecerat, struxerat*. This tense, not the most frequent one in either Greek or Latin, is found regularly in ekphrases and hence can be considered something of a hallmark.² Sketching first the other ways in which artists can figure in an ekphrasis (sections 3-5), I next zoom in on these pluperfects in Greek and Latin ekphrasis and discuss how the basic meaning of these tenses (which is not identical in Greek and Latin) is used for literary purposes (sections 6-8). The final section (9) is devoted to an intriguing series of pluperfects in Vergil's shield of Aeneas, the significance of which has not yet been rightly understood.

1 A Model for Analysing Ekphrases³

The 'construction' of ekphrases of man-made or god-made objects or works of art, including buildings and cities,⁴ involves four different agents. When a narrator-focaliser in the course of his narrative describes an object, he focalises it and, putting his focalisation into words, enables his narratees to see it in their imagination. The narrator-focaliser is an indispensable factor between narratees and object: without him they 'see' nothing. But the narratees are important too, since frequently some interpretative effort is needed to piece together mentally what is being described in words by the narrator. The narrator and

2 Cf. de Jong 2011, 7.

3 I introduced this model in de Jong 2011; it is largely a combination of Fowler 2000 and Becker 1995.

4 My corpus takes a middle position between the restricted modern definition of ekphrasis as the description of a work of art and the broader one of antiquity, which includes the description of tempests, scenery, and persons. For the latter, see, e.g. Webb 2009, 11-15. I will use the terms ekphrasis and description indiscriminately in this paper, though not all description is an ekphrasis and ekphrases often involve narration next to description. To sort out this second point is the object of the PhD of Niels Koopman, written under the supervision of Dr. R.J. Allan (VU Amsterdam) and myself.

his narratees are the first two agents involved in an ekphrasis.⁵ The third agent is the artist of the work of art or maker of the object, whom the narrator most of the times refers to. The fourth agent is the figure of the observer: a narrator often makes one of his characters look at the object or work of art. In this way ekphrases are firmly integrated into the story, but of course the figure of the observer also offers all kinds of other possibilities: he or she may interpret the object, correctly or incorrectly, and he or she may react emotionally to it.⁶

Apart from the agents, there is also the object itself, and here we may distinguish its physical nature or the *opus ipsum*, as Becker calls it (its texture, size, shape, material, colour etc.), and the subject matter of the images on the object, what is depicted or the *res ipsae* (figures in a certain pose and in a certain setting, often engaged in a certain action or even a series of actions).

My model for the analysis of narrative ekphrases thus comprises six elements and can be summarized as follows:

1. narrator-focaliser
2. narratees
3. maker or artist
4. observer in the story
5. physical nature of the object (*opus ipsum*)
(in the case of representational art:)
6. subject matter of the images (*res ipsae*)

2 Two Illustrations: The Cloak of Jason and the Doors of the Temple of Juno

The model can be illustrated well in connection with the ekphrasis of the cloak of Jason in Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* 1.721-731:

5 The interpretative activities of the narrator-focaliser and the narratee will become thematised in Imperial Greek authors, cf. e.g. Philostr. Jun. *Im.* 10.12 ('But look again at the works of peace. This is clearly fallow land, to be thrice-ploughed, *I think, if one may judge at all* by the number of the ploughmen'), 19 ('But as they move in a circle [boys and girls dancing], look at this, you see *in your imagination* the whirling of a wheel, the work of a potter trying out his wheel to see whether or not it turns with difficulty').

6 Ekphrases in the Imperial Greek period may even involve a fifth agent: a guide, e.g. Lucian *Cal.* 5 ('according to the interpretation given me by the guide to the picture'), and see Bartsch 1989, 41-44.

Αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἄμφ' ὤμοισι, θεᾶς Ἴτωνίδος ἔργον,
 δίπλακα πορφυρέην περονήσατο, (...).
 τῆς μὲν ῥηίτερόν κεν ἐς ἠέλιον ἀνιόντα
 ὄσσε βάλοις ἢ κείνο μεταβλέψειας ἔρευθος·
 δὴ γὰρ τοι μέσση μὲν ἐρευθήεσσα τέτυκτο·
 ἄκρα δὲ πορφυρὴ πάντη πέλεν, ἐν δ' ἄρ' ἐκάστω
 τέρματι δαίδαλα πολλά διακριδὸν εὖ ἐπέπαστο.⁷
 Ἐν μὲν ἔσαν Κύκλωπες ἐπ' ἀφθίτω ἤμενοι ἔργω,
 Ζηνὶ κεραυνὸν ἀνακτι πονεύμενοι·

And he pinned around his shoulders a double cloak of purple, the work of the Itonian goddess, (...). You could cast your eyes more easily towards the rising sun than behold that brilliant redness. For its centre was red, and the border all the way round purple, and along the entire edge many wondrous scenes had been skilfully woven. Upon it were the Cyclopes seated at their task, fashioning a thunderbolt for their master Zeus.

The ekphrasis is presented by (1) the primary narrator-focaliser 'Apollonius' to (2) his narratees, who become explicit in the second-person verb ὄσσε βάλοις; there is a reference to (3) the maker in θεᾶς Ἴτωνίδος ἔργον, while (5) the *opus ipsum* is present in the references to colours (ἐρευθήεσσα, πορφυρὴ). The description of (6) the *res ipsae*, finally, starts with Ἐν μὲν ἔσαν. There is no (4) observer of the images on the cloak (although the general effect which Jason and his brilliant red cloak makes on the Colchian women will be conveyed *after* the ekphrasis: 1.774-784).

For a clear example of an observer we may turn to the ekphrasis of the doors of the temple of Juno in Vergil *Aeneid* 1.453-458:

namque sub ingenti lustrat dum singula templo,
 reginam opperiens, dum, quae fortuna sit urbi,
 artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem
 miratur, videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnas
 bellaque iam fama totum volgata per orbem,
 Atridas Priamumque et saevum ambobus Achillem.

For while at the foot of the high temple he [Aeneas] scans, waiting for the queen, each image and while he marvels at the city's fortune and the hands of the artists vying with each other and the results of their

7 ἐπέπαστο is the widely accepted conjecture of Ruhnken for the MS's ἐκέαστο.

toil, he sees the battles of Ilium in due order, the warfare now known to the whole world through their fame, the sons of Atreus, and Priam, and Achilles, angry at both.

At the beginning of the ekphrasis Aeneas is explicitly and repeatedly mentioned as its observer (*lustrat, miratur, videt*) and throughout it his observations and emotions will colour the narratees' perception of what is depicted.⁸

In these two examples the artist is evoked explicitly (θεᾶς Ἰτωνίδος ἔργον, *artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem*) and more fleetingly, in the form of two pluperfects of verbs of making (τέτυκτο, ἐπέπαστο).⁹ In the next section I will take a closer look at these and other ways in which a maker or artist can figure in an ekphrasis.

3 The Maker or Artist in an Ekphrasis

A maker or artist may be represented in an ekphrasis of an object in four different ways, in a decreasing order of visibility in the text:

- (a) the maker is maximally visible when the object is described while it is being made;
- (b) the maker may also figure in an analepsis or flashback of the making of the object;
- (c) the maker may be indicated in a brief tag of the type: 'the work of X';¹⁰

8 See further the analysis in Putnam 1998, 23-54.

9 Not all pluperfects in ekphrases concern verbs of making. There are also, occasionally, pluperfects found in the description of *res ipsae*, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 18.493 ('much marriage chanting arose, ὀρώρει), [Hes.] *Sc.* 288 ('they were clothed, ἐστάλατ', in chitons'); Verg. *A.* 642-643 ('Not far thence... carts had torn, *distulerant*, Mettus apart'). Sometimes it is difficult to decide: 'around it, the assembly of the gods, measureless wealth had been placed, ἐστεφάνωτο' ([Hes.] *Sc.* 204), placed by the persons in the *res ipsae* or by the artist? I will not further discuss these other pluperfects in this article, but refer to e.g. Fowler 2000, 78, note 43 and Putnam 1998, 125.

10 Work of Hephaestus (*Od.* 4.617; Mosch. *Europa* 38; Nonn. *D.* 3.132; 5.137); work of Athena (*A.R.* 1.721); work of Alcimedon (Verg. *Ecl.* 3.37); work of Zeuxis, Protogenes, Apelles (Petr. *Sat.* 83); work of Gallician craftsmen (Sil. *Punica* 2.397). Cf. variants at Verg. *A.* 1.455 ('the hands of the artists vying with each other and the results of their toil'); Apul. *Met.* 5.1 ('a royal building, wrought and built not by the art or hand of a man, but by the mighty power of a god'); Hld. 3.4.2 ('the one who made that belt had devoted all his talents on it, having never before made such a thing nor being able to make it ever again').

- (d) in Greek the existence of a maker may be, fleetingly, acknowledged through the use of a pluperfect like ἐτέτυκτο, since this describes an object as the result of an act of making, and hence implies a maker even when she or he is not mentioned.¹¹

In the Appendix I give an overview of ekphrases of man-made and god-made objects in Greek and Latin literature and the ways in which the maker is referred to. This overview shows that the maker or artist almost invariably is referred to one way or another, often in a combination of types a-d. I will discuss examples shortly.

Given the regular presence of the maker in ekphrases, his absence may be taken as significant. One such case is the ekphrasis of the coverlet on the bed of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus *Carmen* 64, which nowhere indicates the origin or maker of the coverlet. The result is, as Gaisser suggests, that the stories depicted on it lack a source and authority, and this tallies with their 'labyrinthine' style, the quick changes in time and space.¹² It may also be that the suppression of the maker is meant to point up that the coverlet is nothing but a verbal construct, i.e. an ekphrasis written by Catullus; this fits the often observed extreme narrativisation of this ekphrasis, which abounds in apostrophes, rhetorical questions, direct speeches, and analepses.¹³ In the case of Statius' *Thebaid*, the fact that most of his ekphrases (7 out of 9) are lacking a reference to the maker likewise may signal this author's self-consciousness: *he* has made the works of art.¹⁴

Let us now briefly look at categories a (section 4) and b (section 5), leaving c out of consideration altogether, before turning to the Greek and Latin pluperfects.

11 Becker (1995, 43) has somewhat different categories: "direct mention of the artisan, mention of workmanship or material of the work, and attention to the process of manufacture".

12 Gaisser 1995, esp. 588-589.

13 Cf. Laird 1993.

14 The other instances of ekphrases without a reference to the maker are: *Il.* 22.468-472; *Od.* 21.11-41; *E. Ion* 184-218; *Verg. A.* 5.250-257; *Prop.* 2.31; *Luc. Bellum civile* 10.111-126; *Sen. Thy.* 641-682; *Sil. Punica* 1.81-92; *Val. Fl. Argonautica* 2.654-658; and *Longus* 4.3.2.

4 The Maker in a Description of an Object While It Is Being Made (Type A)

The procedure of describing an object while it is being made was recognised as one specific type of ekphrasis by ancient scholars. Thus Theon in his *Progymnasmata* 118.22-24 (Sp.) writes: αἱ δὲ καὶ τρόπων εἰσὶν ἐκφράσεις, ὅποια τῶν σκευῶν καὶ τῶν ὄπλων καὶ τῶν μηχανημάτων, ὃν τρόπον ἕκαστον παρεσκευάσθη, ‘there are also ekphrases of the manner, such as those of pieces of equipment and weapons and siege engines, describing in which manner each was made.’¹⁵ The most famous example of this procedure is Hephaestus making Achilles’ shield in *Iliad* 18.478-609, with a refrain of ‘he made’ vel sim. (ἐν . . . ποιήσε: 490, 573, 588; ἐν . . . ἔτευξ’: 483; ἐν . . . ἐτίθει: 541, 550, 561, 590, 607; ἐν . . . ποικίλλε: 590) announcing each new scene.¹⁶ The Homeric narrator arguably opts for this form of description in order to stress the intense and sustained work of the divine smith, exerting himself to make a beautiful shield for the—doomed—mortal Achilles.

It should be noted that, understandably enough, the Homeric narrator does not refer to Hephaestus’ activity of making the shield all the time. When turning to the *res ipsae* of the scenes in more detail, he describes what was to be seen: ‘In it [one of the two cities depicted] there *were*, ἔσαν, marriages and feasting, and they *were escorting*, ἡγίνεον, the brides from their houses through the city under the light of burning torches’. Rather than saying ‘Hephaestus *made* marriages and feasting, Homer says ‘there *were* marriages and feasting’. I call this the (purely) descriptive mode, i.e. the mode which simply describes an object as it is. All classical ekphrases combine the descriptive mode (featuring the imperfect or present tense) with references to the maker.

The format of a description of an object while it is being made, although hailed by Lessing as the only right form of description in literature,¹⁷ has not found many followers in Greek and Latin literature. Homer uses it only once more, when describing Odysseus’ raft (*Od.* 5.233-262), clearly in order to “bring to the fore Odysseus’ skill”, an important aspect of this hero’s characterization.¹⁸

15 I owe this reference to Niels Koopman.

16 Hamon (1993, 198-199) speaks of ‘le travailleur descripteur’: ‘la déclinaison d’une liste de termes peut, également . . . être introduite, régie, et à la fois justifiée par la mise en scène d’un personnage de travailleur’ and calls this ‘la description homérique’. For refrains in epic (i.e. the recurrence of the same word or phrase in a continuous series of passages dealing with the same subject), see van Otterlo 1944, 31-33.

17 Lessing 1766, chapter 16.

18 See de Jong 2001, ad 5.233-262.

Herodotus uses it to describe the pyramid of Cheops (*Hist.* 2.124-125), both in order to explain how this ‘Wonder’ came about and to stress its maker’s cruelty towards his own people (cf. his introduction of Cheops as the king ‘who brought his people to utter misery’: 2.124.1). Ovid employs it in *Metamorphoses* 6.53-128 for the figurative tapestries woven by Minerva and Arachne, obviously to evoke the atmosphere of contest between goddess and mortal.¹⁹

Only at the end of classical literature do we find three sustained examples again. Both Quintus of Smyrna in his *Posthomerica* 12.104-158 and Tryphiodorus in his *Capture of Troy* 57-105 describe the Wooden Horse while it is being made by Epeus. These poets seem to seek innovation by elaborating what so far, probably, had been no more than brief remarks in previous authors (e.g. *Od.* 8.493: [the Horse] τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ or Verg. *A.* 2.15-16: *instar montis equum divina Palladis arte | aedificant sectaque intexunt abiete costas*),²⁰ and by employing the procedure made famous by Homer in connection with the shield of Achilles for another famous object, the Wooden Horse.²¹ Claudian in the *Rape of Proserpine* 1.246-272, finally, tells how Proserpine was embroidering a cloth while her mother Ceres is away from home. Choosing the ‘description while making’ type allows Claudian to produce one of the few unfinished literary objects of antiquity: Proserpine stops embroidering when Venus, accompanied by Diana and Pallas, enters her room. The ensuing rape, set up by these goddesses, brutally puts an end not only to her peaceful handworking but to her entire virginal existence.²²

5 The Maker in an Analepsis of the Making of an Object (Type B)

An example of a reference to the maker in an analepsis is *Iliad* 7.219-223:

Αἴας δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε φέρων σάκος ἧῦτε πύργων,
χάλκεον ἑπταβόειον, ὃ οἱ Τυχίος κάμε τεύχων,

19 Other examples: Hdt. 1.50, 98.3-99.1; 2.96, 129.3-132.2; 4.88; E. *Ion* 1141-1165; Th. 4.100; Verg. *G.* 1.169-175; 3.26-39; D.S. 17.115.1-5; 18.26.3-27.5.

20 I say ‘probably’ since we do not know whether the making of the Wooden Horse was described in, e.g., the *Ilias Parva*.

21 Quintus of Smyrna also has an ekphrasis of Achilles’ shield (5.6-101) but presents it in the descriptive mode.

22 Another unfinished literary object is found in Verg. *A.* 6.14-33, where Daedalus is not able to picture the death of his son Icarus on the bronze doors of the temple of Apollo. Cf. Putnam 1998, 81: “a study in artistic incompleteness that is extraordinary complete as a poetic act”. Note that this ekphrasis also remains incomplete because Aeneas is interrupted in his looking (6.33-41).

σκυτοτόμων ὄχ' ἄριστος, "Υἷη ἐν οἰκίᾳ ναίων,
ὅς οἱ ἐποίησεν σάκος αἰόλον ἑπταβόειον
ταύρων ζατρεφῶν, ἐπὶ δ' ὄγδοον ἤλασε χαλκόν.

Ajax came closer, carrying a shield like a tower, made of bronze and seven ox-hides, which Tychius had made for him, far the best of the workers in leather, living in Hyle, who had made for him a glittering shield with seven layers of hide from full-grown bulls and had put on it an eighth layer of bronze.

Instead of seeing a shield being made before our eyes, as was the case with the shield of Achilles, the narrator here evokes the making of the shield of Ajax in the form of an analepsis. The aorists κάμε, ἐποίησεν, and ἤλασε are so called 'past-in-the-past' aorists, which means that they are anterior to the state of affairs in the story, the ἦλθε of Ajax coming closer.²³ We will see below (section 8) that Latin uses the pluperfect in these contexts.

Sometimes the analepsis more or less takes up the entire ekphrasis, as here, or at *Od.* 14.5-14 (Eumaeus' pigsty, which he built himself and the building of which symbolises his loyal devotion to his absent master); *Od.* 23.189-201 (Odysseus' marital bed, which Odysseus made and the making of which is recalled by him as a token of recognition for Penelope); and Callimachus *Hymn* 2.58-64 (the Apollo temple on Delos, which was built by Apollo himself, the analepsis exemplifying the preceding statement that 'Phoebus delights in the founding of cities').

But most of the time the analepsis is brief and only part of an ekphrasis. An example is found in the ekphrasis of the ball which Aphrodite promises Eros in return for making Medea fall in love with Jason:

τό οἱ ποίησε φίλη τροφὸς Ἀδρήστεια
ἄντρῳ ἐν Ἰδαίῳ ἔτι νήπια κουρίζοντι, (...).

(I will give you Zeus' lovely toy), which his dear nurse Adrastea made for him while he was still a babbling baby in the Idaean cave, (...). (A.R. 3.133-134)

The ekphrasis will go on for another seven lines, but the brief analepsis at its opening serves to entice the young Eros: here is an object which was once

23 Rijktsbaron 2002, 20.

made for Zeus not just by the default divine artisan Hephaestus but by the Asian mother-goddess Adrastea and which therefore has an exotic quality.²⁴

6 (In Greek) A Maker Fleetingly Acknowledged in a Pluperfect (Type D)

I now turn to the pluperfects of verbs of making, which are found so regularly in ekphrases, and start with the Greek ones: ἐτέτυκτο, ἤσκητο, ἐκεκόσμητο, ἐτετείχιστο, etc. Instead of the active forms with an explicit reference to a maker of types a and b ('X (had) made' object Y), we are now dealing with medio-passive forms, which means that the maker is not mentioned but is conceptually present (object Y 'had been made', sc. by someone).²⁵ Since the force of the perfect stem in Greek is to refer to a state which is the result of a preceding action,²⁶ a narrator can have his cake and eat it: using pluperfects of the type ἐτέτυκτο he both describes an object and acknowledges an act of making and hence a maker.

Actually, the situation is slightly more complex in the first two examples of such pluperfects in a Greek ekphrasis, those occurring in the Shield of Achilles:

ἡ δὲ μελαίνετ' ὀπισθεν, ἀρηρομένη δὲ ἐώκει,
χρυσείη περ ἑοῦσα· τὸ δὲ περὶ θαῦμα τέτυκτο.

And it [the field] darkened behind them, and looked like earth that is ploughed, though it was made of gold. That very much **was/had been made** a marvel (*Iliad* 18.548-549)

24 Other examples: *Il.* 2.101; 4.110-11; 23.743; *Od.* 7.92-94; [Hes.] *Aspis* 219-220, 318-20; Hdt. 2.148; *A. Th.* 491-492; *A.R.* 3.222-223, 228-234; Theoc. *Idyls* 15.80-81; Herod. *Mimiamb*s 4.22-24; Verg. *Ecl.* 3.44-46; *A.* 6.32-33; Sil. *Punica* 2.416-417; Val. Fl. *Argon.* 1.428-429; Luc. *Herc.* 4; *Dom.* 22-31 passim; *Cal.* 5; Apul. *Met.* 2.4; J. *BJ* passim e.g. 5.148, 161; Philostr. *VA* 1.2.5; Philostr. *Jun. Im.* 10.15; Q.S. *Posthomerica* 5.4-5; 10.203-204; Hld. *Aeth.* 5.14.4; Nonn. *D.* 3.133; 5.138; 25.337. Such brief analepses referring to the making of an object are also found outside ekphrases, in shorter descriptions of objects (e.g. *Il.* 18.369-371: 'Thetis reached the house of Hephaestus, imperishable, dazzling, outstanding among the dwellings of the other gods, of bronze, *which the cripple-footed god had made with his own hands.*').

25 Cf. Allan 2003, 58-59: in the passive middle the "agent is rarely expressed by an explicit noun-phrase" but is "conceptually present".

26 See e.g. Chantraine 1927, 4: "l'état atteint à la suite d'un procès antérieur", and Rijksbaron 2002, 1: "the perfect stem signifies both that a state of affairs is completed and that as a result a *state* exists".

and

Ἐν δ' ἀγέλην ποίησε βοῶν ὀρθοκραιράων
αἱ δὲ βόες χρυσοῖο τετεύχαιο κασσιτέρου τε, ...

On it he made a herd of straight-horned cows:
the cows **were/had been made** of gold and tin, ... (*Il.* 18.573-574)

How are we to analyse the two pluperfects? It is a well-known fact that in Homer the pluperfect of the verb *τεύχομαι* may serve as a metrically expedient variant of (the imperfect of) *εἰμί*; singers could exploit the force of the pluperfect of describing a state and use *(ἐ)τέτυκτο* for *ἦν*.²⁷ A good example is *Od.* 9.190 καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, 'and he [Polyphemus] was an amazingly monstrous man', where *ἐτέτυκτο* cannot have its literal meaning 'had been made', since we are dealing with a living being. At *Il.* 18.574 it seems to me improbable that after the aorist *ποίησε* (573), which refers to Hephaestus at this very moment in the story making the shield, the pluperfect *τετεύχαιο* would all of a sudden refer to the making of the shield as a thing from the past ('had been made'); an interpretation *τετεύχαιο* ≈ *ἦσαν*, 'were', is more plausible. *τέτυκτο* at 18.549, coming at the end of a scene, more easily might have its full pluperfect sense, but I still consider an analysis *τέτυκτο* ≈ *ἦν* more likely. This analysis of the Homeric two pluperfects is backed up by the ekphrasis of Heracles' Shield in [Hesiod]'s *Aspis*, where *ἐν* ... *τέτυκτο* (154, 208) alternates with *ἐν* ... *ἔην/ἦν*, *ἔσαν* (144, 161, 168, 178, 201, 216). However, *τέτυκτο* and *τετεύχαιο* are not *just* metrical variants; they have a slight evocation of the 'making' and hence the maker attached to them.²⁸

This association is not so important in Homer, where the maker Hephaestus is very prominently present anyway. But it is vital in other ekphrases, and the pluperfect (*(ἐ)τέτυκτο*, *τετεύχαιο*) will remain in use throughout the history of Greek epic ekphrasis, indeed it is by far the most common pluperfect of a verb of making found: *Aspis* 154, 208; A.R. 1.727, 759; 3.237; Mosch. *Europa* 42, 47; Q.S. *Posthomerica*: 6.208, 220, 256, 268, 273, 285; 10.187; and Nonn. *D.* 5.181.²⁹

27 See *LfggrE* 2b (W. Beck).

28 Cf. *LfggrE* B: "med.pass. τ. also in copula-similar use ... but ... always with (sometimes very vague) reference to some kind of process". Martin Hammond in the Penguin translation of 1987 aptly translates: 'this was the marvel of his craftsmanship'.

29 And cf. the *τέτυκται* which we regularly find in ekphrases in non-narrative (present tense) contexts, e.g. Theoc. 1.32 *ἐντοσθεν δὲ γυνά τι θεῶν δαίδαλμα τέτυκται*, 'and within a woman is fashioned, like a work of art made by gods'.

Apollonius Rhodius already seems to play with the common association of ἐτέτυκτο with the artist/maker in *Argonautica* 1.731-733:

ὄς τόσον ἤδη
παμφαίνων ἐτέτυκτο, μίῃς δ' ἔτι δεύετο μούνον
ἀκτίνος

by now it [the thunderbolt the Cyclopes are working on] was as good as finished in all its radiance, and only one ray was still lacking

Instead of using ἐτέτυκτο in connection with the maker of Jason's cloak, Athena, he employs it for the makers in the *res ipsae*, the Cyclopes.

Apart from (ἐ)τέτυκτο and τετεύχατο, we also find pluperfects of other verbs of making in the other ekphrases. Often they are used in a refrain (like the aorist and imperfect verbs of making in the Homeric Shield), to announce new scenes: [Hesiod]'s shield of Heracles (ἠλήλαντο, ἐν... τέτυκτο, ἐν... ἐτέτυκτο, ἐστήρικτο), Apollonius Rhodius' cloak of Jason (ἐτέτυκτο, ἐν... ἐπέπαστο, ἤσκητο, ἐν... πεπονήατο, ἐν... ἐτέτυκτο), and Quintus of Smyrna's shield of Eurypylus (ἐν... ἐτέτυκτο, ἄγχι... πεπόνητο, ἐξείης... ἐτέτυκτο, ἤσκητο, ἐν... ἤσκητο, ἄγχι... πεπόνητο, ἀμφί... τετεύχατο, ἐτέτυκτο, ἐτέτυκτο, ἐν... ἐτέτυκτο).

7 The Pluperfect of Verbs of Making in Greek Prose Ekphrases

So far I have discussed Greek pluperfects of verbs of making in epic texts, but they also occur in prose ekphrases. I start with some instances in Herodotus' description of Babylon:

τὸ μὲν νυν μέγαθος τοσοῦτόν ἐστι τοῦ ἄστεος τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου, ἐκεκόσμητο δὲ ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλο πόλισμα τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν. (...) δεῖ δὴ με πρὸς τούτοις ἔτι φράσαι (...) τὸ τεῖχος ὄντινα τρόπον ἔργαστο. (...) ἐτετείχιστο μὲν νυν ἢ Βαβυλῶν τρόπῳ τοιῶδε, (...)

Such is the size of the city of Babylon, and it **had been/was designed** like no other city we know of. (...) It is necessary that I also explain (...) how the wall **had been/was built**. (...) In that way Babylon **had been/was furnished** with walls, (...). (Hdt. 1.178.2-180.1)

Once more, we may hesitate whether to translate ἐκεκόσμητο etc. with a pluperfect, and stress the past process, or with an imperfect, and stress the resulting state. Both Legrand in the Budé and Godley in the Loeb choose the second

option. Here, I would prefer a pluperfect translation since in the same ekphrasis Herodotus from time to time elaborates on the way the Babylonians built their city, in an analepsis:

δεῖ δὴ με πρὸς τούτοισι ἔτι φράσαι (...) τὸ τεῖχος ὄντινα τρόπον ἔργαστο. ὀρύσσοντες ἅμα τὴν τάφρον ἐπλίνθουσιν τὴν γῆν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ὀρύγματος ἐκφερομένην, ἐλκυσάντες δὲ πλίνθους ἰκανὰς ὡπτησαν αὐτὰς ἐν καμίνοισι.

It is necessary that I explain (...) how the wall had been built. As they dug the fosse, **they made** bricks of the earth which was carried out of the fosse they dug out, and when they had moulded the bricks in the right shape **they baked** them in ovens. (Hdt. 1.179)

After ἔργαστο Herodotus in a flashback returns to the time when the wall was built, and explains how the Babylonians made the bricks with which the wall was built.

Pluperfects are also found in the famous ekphrasis of Europa on the bull at the opening of Achilles Tatius *Leucippe and Clitophon*, e.g. 1.1.2-13:

ἔγραψεν ὁ τεχνίτης ὑπὸ τὰ πέταλα καὶ τὴν σκιάν· καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἡρέμα τοῦ λειμῶνος κάτω σποράδην διέρρει, ὅσον τὸ συνηρεφές τῆς τῶν φύλλων κόμης ἀνώξεν ὁ γραφεύς. (...) ὀχρηγός τις ἐγγέγραπτο δίκελλαν κατέχων (...).

The artist had painted also the shadow thrown by the leaves. And the sun **was gently breaking through**, here and there, in the meadow, where **the painter had represented** openings in the thick roof of foliage. (...) A gardener **had been painted** holding a fork (...).

We see that Achilles Tatius here uses, next to the purely descriptive mode ('the sun was gently breaking through...'), both types b and d to refer to the maker of the painting: brief analepses with the past-in-the-past aorist (ἔγραψεν, ἀνώξεν) and the pluperfect (ἐγγέγραπτο). Whereas in epic ekphrases references to the maker are generally found at structurally crucial points, such as the beginning and end of the passage as a whole or of individual scenes, here the references seem strewn over the ekphrasis more randomly, by way of variation with the purely descriptive mode.³⁰ The alternation between (active) aorist ἔγραψεν and (medio-passive) pluperfect ἐγγέγραπτο likewise seems due to a desire to vary. Nothing prevented the author from writing 'the shadow had

30 Two more pluperfects are found at 1.1.9 and cf. at the very end (1.1.13): εἶπερ ἂν αὐτῶν γεγράφθαι καὶ τὰ κινήματα.

been painted' (instead of 'the artist had painted the shadow') or 'the painter had painted a gardener' (instead of 'a gardener had been painted').³¹

8 The Pluperfect of Verbs of Making in Latin Ekphrases

When we now turn to the pluperfect of verbs of making in Latin ekphrases, we note a major difference with the Greek use: since the force of the pluperfect in Latin is that of anteriority³² and the verbs are active, the pluperfects do not form a separate category, as in Greek, but function, like the Greek past-in-the-past aorists, in analepses of the making of the object (my type b). Here are some examples:

quae Clonus Eurytides multo **caelaverat** auro

(the sons of Aegyptus slain and the bedchambers drenched in blood) which Clonus, son of Eurytus, **had chiselled** in much gold (Verg. *A.* 10.499, Pallas' belt)

fabricaverat Alcon

Hyleus et longo **caelaverat** argumento.

Hylean Alcon **had made** it

and he **had engraved** it with a long story. (Ov. *Met.* 13.683-684, Anius' goblet)

aurea quin etiam praesaga Mulciber arte
vellera venturosque olim **caelarat** Achivos.

(...)

haec tum miracula Colchis

struxerat ignipotens nondum noscentibus, (...).

Indeed, even the golden fleece and the Greeks who would once come **had** Mulciber with prophetic skill **carved**. (...) These marvellous scenes **had** the fire-god once **made** for the Colchians, though they did not yet

31 Similar combinations of aorists and pluperfects in e.g. Luc. *Dom.* 22-31 or Paus. 10.25-31.

32 See e.g. Pinkster 1999, 232: "the pluperfect is used to locate states of affairs at a moment that is anterior to a moment in the past", and Adema 2008, 111-126.

understand, (...). (V. Fl. *Argonautica* 5.433-454, doors of the temple of Sol in Colchis)

The analeptic references to the maker are inserted at the beginning or end of the ekphrasis, or at an important point of a scene.³³

We may conclude that the pluperfects of verbs of making, which are such a defining element of Greek and Latin ekphrases, function in different ways: the Greek pluperfect is a medio-passive form and describes an object as finished but with a fleeting recollection of it being the product of a maker; the Latin pluperfect is an active form and recalls the maker and his act of making in an analepsis. The first is used repeatedly throughout an ekphrasis, the second is usually found only once or twice in an ekphrasis. There is one Latin ekphrasis, however, where the Greek and Latin traditions of the pluperfect are combined, in a highly effective way.

9 The Pluperfects in the Ekphrasis of the Shield of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 8.617-731)

While Latin epic ekphrases on average have one or two pluperfects of verbs of making (usually at the beginning or end of the ekphrasis), the ekphrasis of the shield of Aeneas has no less than six. They start off the ekphrasis as a whole (*illic ... fecerat Ignipotens* (8.628), and announce or conclude four of its seven individual scenes:³⁴ *illic ... fecerat* (630), announcement of scene one; *nec procul hinc ... addiderat* (637), announcement of scene two; *hic ... extuderat* (665), conclusion of scene five; and *hic finxerat* (726), conclusion of scene seven. Scene six is introduced by a reference to Vulcan in the present tense (*hinc procul addit*: 666), while the longest and most important seventh, depicting the recent past, has an extra pluperfect in the middle, which draws attention to one of its high points: Cleopatra (*illam fecerat Ignipotens*: 710). Conversely, the absence of a pluperfect when Augustus is mentioned (678) may be equally significant, as Barchiesi suggests: "Augustus is just himself, a maker of history, not an artist-made icon".³⁵

33 At Verg. *A.* 6.32 the one and only pluperfect of the ekphrasis (*conatus erat*) has dramatic force: it transports us back to the moment of Daedalus trying to depict the fall of his son. See also note 22.

34 I follow Harrison 1997 for this division into seven scenes: (1) 630-634; (2) 635-641; (3) 642-645; (4) 646-651; (5) 652-666; (6) 667-70; (7) 671-728.

35 Barchiesi 1997, 276.

The pluperfects have not attracted much attention by commentators. If they comment on them at all, they merely note that they recall that we are dealing with a work of art. Heinze suggests that “*nur der Form wegen gelegentlich an den Schild und seinen Verfertiger erinnert wird*” (my italics).³⁶ The one interpreter who has come up with an explicit evaluation is David West, who suggests that while “Homer is presenting the autopsy of the omniscient epic poet (...) in Vergil the pluperfects take us into the mind and eyes of Aeneas”.³⁷ In my view this suggestion is untenable and I will propose a different one.

The first point I would like to make is that Vergil, using a string of no less than six pluperfects of making in a refrain, both recalls the refrain of verbs of making in the shield of Homer (ἐν . . . ποίησε; ἐν . . . ἔτευξ', ἐν . . . ἐτίθει, ἐν . . . ποίειλλε) and the refrain of pluperfects in the shield of [Hesiod] (ἠγήλαντο, ἐν . . . τέτυκτο, ἐν . . . ἐτέτυκτο, ἐστήρικτο) and the cloak of Apollonius Rhodius (ἐτέτυκτο, ἐν . . . ἐπέπαστο, ἤσκητο, ἐν . . . πεπόνητο, ἐν . . . ἐτέτυκτο).³⁸

The next thing to realise is that the pluperfects have their usual analeptic force but in a crucially different way: they constitute not an *external* analepsis, as in the other cases (in which the making of the objects has taken place in an undefined past positioned before the start of the main story), but rather an *internal* analepsis. Only just before the Vergilian narrator had recounted how Vulcan, at the behest of Venus and assisted by the Cyclopes, made Aeneas' shield (8.416-453). The account is brief, of course, so as to postpone the detailed description of the shield to the moment when Aeneas receives it, but it is vital, as I will explain shortly.

When handing over the shield to her son Venus explicitly remarks that it has been made by Vulcan (8.612). So in principle Aeneas knows that Vulcan made the scenes, though he himself had not been present at the occasion. Aeneas is also emphatically introduced as the observer figure at the opening of the ekphrasis:

ille, deae donis et tanto laetus honore,
expleri nequit atque oculos per singula volvit, (...).

36 Heinze 1976, 400.

37 West 1990, 304.

38 Heckenlively 2013, 651-653 for structural resemblances between Vergil and Homer (a refrain of verbs of fabrication), and Vergil and [Hesiod] (a refrain of adverbs or prepositional phrases). Nelis 2001, 355 notes that both Aeneas' shield and Jason's cloak are 'finished objects' but does not discuss the pluperfects. Latin epic ekphrasis does know the technique of the refrain, but such refrains do not concern verbs of making.

He, rejoicing in the gifts of the goddess and such great honour, cannot be sated and turns his eyes from scene to scene (...). (Verg. *A.* 8.617-618)³⁹

Both facts make West's idea that the pluperfects "take us into the mind and eyes of Aeneas" at first sight plausible. However, this interpretation is subverted by the famous concluding lines of the ekphrasis:

Talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis,
miratur rerumque **ignarus** imagine gaudet,
attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum.

Such scenes he admires on the shield of Vulcan, gift of his mother, and **not knowing** the deeds he rejoices in the images, lifting on his shoulder the fame and fortunes of his grandchildren. (Verg. *A.* 8.729-731)

Rerum ignarus makes it simply impossible that the preceding description of the images represented Aeneas' focalisation, since it does display a detailed knowledge of 'the deeds', including the names of the historical persons and places involved. We are dealing here with an ekphrasis of which a character is the ostensible observer figure but not its actual focaliser, a truly spectacular narratological sleight-of-hand! The situation here crucially differs from the ekphrasis of the doors of the Juno-temple in Carthage (briefly discussed in section 2), where Aeneas is—and can be—both observer and focaliser, since the events depicted belong to a past in which he himself participated.

For Aeneas to be able to understand the images on his Shield, he would have to be clairvoyant and this he obviously is not. The one who *is* clairvoyant, however, is the shield's maker, Vulcan, as the Vergilian narrator had taken care to impress on us at the very start of the ekphrasis:

Illic res Italas Romanorumque triumphos
haud vatum **ignarus** venturique inscius aevi
fecerat Ignipotens (...).

There the history of the Italians and the triumphs of the Romans had the Lord of fire fashioned, not unversed in oracles, or unknowing of ages to come (...). (Verg. *A.* 8.626-628)

39 We are reminded of his viewing at 676 (*cernere erat*) and 707 (*videbatur*), though these signals are much weaker than those in book 1: *videbat* (466), *adgnoscit* (470), *conspexit* (487).

While Aeneas will turn out to be *ignarus*, Vulcan is *haud ignarus*, a deliberate echo. Vergil has invested Vulcan with a quality that the god does not generally have and certainly did not—need to—have in the case of the shield of Achilles with its omnitemporal depictions of human life, but that is crucial for Aeneas' shield, depicting as it does Roman future history. Here lies the key to understanding Vergil's unique choice to use the Greek format of a refrain of pluperfects.⁴⁰

For the repeated pluperfects keep reminding the narratees of the maker of the shield and his prophetic powers and hence divinely authorise the history depicted. But the pluperfects also make them recall the scene of Vulcan forging the shield, which, as Egelhaaf-Gaiser has convincingly argued, is a crucial one in the *Aeneid*.⁴¹ To his Cyclopes Vulcan announces that he must make *arma acri... viro* (8.441). The obvious echo of the proem (*arma virumque cano*) advertises the importance of this moment, but the addition of *acri* also marks the change: the upcoming war with the Italians, with an eye on which Venus has ordered her son's shield, will change Aeneas from an innocent wanderer into a passionate warrior and avenger (cf. the reference to him as *acer in armis* at 12.938). This 'civil war' against the Italians will be the first of many bloody confrontations (and the scenes on the shield help the narratees recall them) that are the corollary of becoming a world power (cf. the programmatic *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*: 1.33).

With the shield Vergil once more provides Aeneas with a tableau of the future glory of Rome; cf. the *Ahnenschau* presented him by Anchises at 6.756-892 and the guided tour of future Rome given him by Evander at 8.306-369. In this case, however, he must do without an interlocutor who can explain things to him. He is awarded the role of observer, but only superficially. The main agents in the 'construction' of the Shield are the divine artist, narrator, and narratees, in that it is Vergil's description in words of what Vulcan had made in metal which allows the narratees not only to 'see' the shield in their imagination but also, unlike Aeneas, to understand what is depicted on it.⁴²

Why is Aeneas emphatically introduced as observer at the beginning of the ekphrasis only to be unmasked as ignorant observer at the end of it? When Turnus does not 'read' Pallas' belt, the Vergilian narrator forcefully takes his

40 Cf. Adema (2008, 116): "the making of the shield plays an important role in this ekphrasis, since it is one of the ways in which the narrator solves the problem of describing the shield while its onlooker (Aeneas) does not understand what he is seeing. Instead of describing what Aeneas sees, the narrator tells what Vulcanus made".

41 Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2008. I owe this reference to Bettina Reitz.

42 Cf. Putnam 1998, 121 and Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2008, 226-232, esp. 229.

character to task (*nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae*, ‘o mind of men, not knowing fate or coming lot’: 10.501). Such harsh words are lacking in the case of Aeneas, who is allowed, simply, to enjoy the glorious general picture. Are the narratees supposed to share his enjoyment of Roman history, or should they, bringing in their knowledge of the violent nature of that history, unmask such a position as naive?⁴³ As so often in Vergil, it is difficult to decide what message he wants to convey but asking the question remains vital.

Conclusion

In this study I have asked attention for the artist in classical ekphrases, a fascinating but hitherto underexposed element in these much researched passages. More in particular, I have discussed pluperfects of verbs of making as one of the ways in which such a maker can be evoked, the Greek differing from the Latin. In Greek the medio-passive pluperfect describes a finished object while at the same time acknowledging the act of making and hence the maker, in Latin the active pluperfect occurs in analepses describing the act of making by a maker as an event in the past. While in Greek ekphrases pluperfects tend to be found in a refrain, they usually occur only once or twice in Latin epic ekphrases.

Only Vergil once combines the Greek and Latin use of the pluperfect, when he inserts no less than six pluperfects in the ekphrasis of the Shield of Aeneas. This is an intertextual gesture on the one hand, recalling the refrains of the shields of Achilles and Heracles and Jason’s cloak, but a brilliant narrative move on the other, since it keeps reminding the narratees of the artist Vulcan and his prophetic powers and of the earlier scene of Vulcan making the shield. Vergil split up what in Homer was one scene—Hephaestus making the shield with the Homeric narrator ‘watching’—into two separate scenes, first Vulcan

43 According to Pluss (1884, 284-285), the reader is filled with a “wohltuendes ästhetisches Gefühl” to know more than Aeneas, and this in turn fills him with a cheerful desire to join the hero in his search for a new fatherland; Lyne (1987, 209) sees Aeneas’ ignorance as the result of Venus cheating him with apparently cheerful images and suggests that we are dealing with “something akin to dramatic irony”: “Aeneas toils in the service of gods and nation without the sort of knowledge of that toil which would make it more easily supportable”; Egelhaaf-Gaiser (2008, 225-226) suggests that Aeneas’ ignorance encourages the reader not to be satisfied with a superficial positive viewing, like that of the hero, but to use his superior historical knowledge for a refined interpretation of his own; this is also, more or less, the position of Putnam (1998, 168-169).

making the shield and then the narrator and Aeneas looking at it, but the pluperfects crucially link them.^{44, 45}

Bibliography

- Adema, S.M. 2008. *Discourse Modes and Bases. A Study of the Use of Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid* (thesis vU, Amsterdam)
- Allan, R.J. 2003. *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek: A Study of Polysemy* (Amsterdam)
- Barchiesi, A. 1997. *Virgilian Narrative (b)-Ekphrasis*, in: Martindale, C. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge), 271-281
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel. The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton)
- Bartsch, S., Elsner, J. (eds.) 2007. Special issue on ekphrasis, CPh 102.1
- Becker, A.S. 1995. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis* (London)
- Chantraine, P. 1927. *Histoire du parfait grec* (Paris)
- Egelhaaf-Gaiser, U. 2008. *Werkstattbesuch bei Vulcanus: Triumphale Geschichtsbilder aus Vergils intertextueller Waffenschmiede (Aen. 8, 407-453)*, in: Krasser, H., Pausch, D., Petrovic, I. (eds.) *Triplici invecus triumpho. Der römische Triumph in augusteischer Zeit* (Stuttgart), 209-237
- Elsner, J. (ed.) 2002a. Special issue on ekphrasis, Ramus 31
- 2000b. *Introduction. The Genres of Ekphrasis*, Ramus 31, 1-19
- Fowler, D. 2000 (1991). *Narrate and Describe. The Problem of Ekphrasis*, in: *Roman Constructions. Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford), 64-85
- Friedländer, P. 1912. *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius. Kunstbeschreibungen justinianischer Zeit* (Berlin)
- Gaiser, J.H. 1995. *Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64*, AJPh 116, 579-616
- Hamon, P. 1993. *Du descriptif* (Paris)

44 This crucial linking force of the pluperfect has been overlooked by Putnam (1998, 168): "... the event [of Vulcan making the shield] is placed in past time, remote from the hero's present posture ... The Roman poet focuses attention instead on the receiver's act of contemplation."

45 I wish to thank Suzanne Adema, Mark Heerink, Niels Koopman, Caroline Kroon, Michiel van der Keur, the members of the Amsterdamse Hellenistenclub, PhD-students and faculty-members of the literature and linguistics caucuses of Classics in Cambridge, and an anonymous referee of *Mnemosyne* for their feedback, Nina King for her polishing of my English.

- Harrison, S.J. 1997. *The Survival and Supremacy of Rome: the Unity of the Shield of Aeneas*, JRS 87, 70-76
- Heckenlively, T.S. 2013. *Clipeus Hesiodicus: Aeneid 8 and the Shield of Heracles*, Mnemosyne 66, 649-665
- Heinze, R. 1976 (1915). *Virgils epische Technik* (Darmstadt)
- de Jong, I.J.F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge)
- Koopman, N. 2014. *Ancient Greek Ekphrasis: Between Description and Narration* (thesis University of Amsterdam)
- 2011. *The Shield of Achilles. From Metalepsis to Mise en Abyme*, Ramus 40, 1-14
- Laird, A. 1993. *Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64*, JRS 83, 18-30
- Lessing, G.E. 1766. *Laokoon oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie* (Berlin)
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford)
- van Otterlo, W.A.A. 1944. *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition* (Amsterdam)
- Nelis, D. 2001. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Oxford)
- Pinkster, H. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (London-New York)
- Pluss, H.T. 1884. *Vergil und die epische Kunst* (Leipzig)
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs. Ekphrasis in the Aeneid* (New Haven-London)
- Rijksbaron, A. 2002. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek. An Introduction* (Amsterdam)
- Webb, R. 2009. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Farnham)
- West, D.A. 1990 (1975-1976). *Cernere erat: the Shield of Achilles*, reprinted in: Harrison, S.J. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford), 295-304

Appendix. References to Maker in Ekphrases of Man-made or God-made Objects in Greek and Latin Literature

Below I give a chronological list of ekphrases, i.e. descriptions of some length (at least 5 verses), of man-made or god-made objects, including buildings or cities, and the types of reference to the maker they display. Objects of representational art are marked with an asterisk. In drawing up this list I started from the passages mentioned by Friedländer 1912, Becker 1995, 2, and Elsner 2002b, 4, and gradually added my own findings. Most instances derive from poetry since there ekphrases have been most discussed (and hence collected); I am well aware that there probably will be many more instances from prose texts. When a (prose) text contains many ekphrases, I only give a few examples.

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Homer					
<i>Iliad</i> 2.101-108	Agamemnon's sceptre		x (Hephaestus)		
4.105-111	Pandarus' bow		x (anon. craftsman)		
7.219-223	Ajax' shield		x (Tychius)		
10.261-271	Meriones' helmet				x
11.19-28	Agamemnon's corselet*				x
11.32-40	Agamemnon's shield*				x
18.478-609	Achilles' shield*	x (Hephaestus)			x
22.468-472	Andromache's headdress				
23.741-747	Patroclus' bowl		x (Sidonian men)		x
<i>Odyssey</i> 4.125-132	Helen's basket				x
4.615-619	Menelaus' bowl			x	x
5.233-262	Odysseus' raft	x (Odysseus)			
7.81-134	Alcinous' palace		x (Hephaestus)		x
11.609-614	Heracles' baldric*			x	x
14.5-14	Eumaeus' farm		x (Eumaeus)		x
19.226-231	Odysseus' brooch*				x
21.11-41	Odysseus' bow				
23.189-201	marital bed		x (Odysseus)		
[Hesiod]					
<i>Aspis</i> 139-320	Heracles' shield*		x (Hephaestus)	x	x
Aeschylus					
<i>Septem</i> 375-649	shields of the Seven		x (anon. blazoner)		x
Herodotus					
<i>Histories</i> 1.50.2-3	golden ingots	x (Croesus)			
1.98.3-99.1	Agbatana	x (Deioces)			x
1.178.2-87	Babylon		x (Semiramis, Nitocris)		x

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
2.91.2	Perseus' temple				
2.96	boats of Egyptians	x			
2.124-125	Cheops' pyramid	x (Cheops)			x
2.129.3-132.2	Mycerinus' image of cow	x (Mycerinus)			x
2.137-138	temple of Bubastis				x
2.148	labyrinth		x		x
2.169-170	(temple at Sais)				x
3.47	Amasis' breastplate				x
4.88	painting of Darius*	x (Mandrocles)			
Thucydides					
<i>Peloponnesian War</i> 4.100	engine of Boeotians	x			
Euripides					
<i>Electra</i> 452-478	Achilles' shield and sword*			x	x
<i>Ion</i> 184-218	pediment of Apollo temple*				
1141-1165 <i>Phoenissae</i>	festive tent	x (Ion)			
1107-1140	shields of Seven*				
Apollonius of Rhodes					
<i>Argonautica</i>					
1.721-767	Jason's cloak*			x	x
3.132-141	Zeus' ball		x (Adrastea)		x
3.215-248	Aeetes' palace		x (Hephaestus)		x
4.423-434	Hysipyle's mantle*		x (Graces)		
Callimachus					
<i>Hymns</i> 2.58-64	Apollo temple on Delos		x (Apollo)		
Theocritus					
<i>Idyls</i> 1.27-56	goatherd's cup*				x
15.78-86	embroidered tapestries*		x		

(cont.)

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Herodas					
<i>Mimiambos</i> 4.21-38, 56-78	statues*, painting*		x (sons of Praxiteles)		x
Moschus					
<i>Europa</i> 37-62	Europa's basket*			x	x
Catullus					
<i>Carmen</i> 64.50-266	coverlet on bridal bed of Peleus and Thetis*				
Vergil					
<i>Eclogae</i> 3.36-47	Menalcas' and Damoetas' cups*		x (Alcimedon)	x	
<i>Georgics</i> 1.169-175 3.26-39	plough doors of temple of Augustus*	x x (first-person)			
<i>Aeneid</i> 1.453-495 5.250-257 6.18-33	doors of Juno-temple in Carthago* cloak* doors of temple of Apollo in Cumae*			x	
8.617-731 10.496-500	Aeneas' shield* Pallas' belt*		x (Vulcan) x (Eurytides)		
Diodorus Siculus					
<i>Library of History</i> e.g. 5.44.1-5 17.115.1-5	temple of Zeus Hephaestion's funeral building	x (Alexander the Great)			x
18.26.3-27.5	Alexander's funeral waggon	x (anon. workmen)			x
Propertius					
<i>Elegies</i> 2.31	porticus of Apollo temple on Palatine				

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Lucan					
<i>Bellum civile</i> 10.111-126	Cleopatra's palace				
Ovid					
<i>Metamorphoses</i> 2.5-18	doors of palace of Sol*		x (Vulcan)		
6.53-128	tapestries woven by Minerva and Arachne*	x			
13.681-701	Anius' goblet*		x (Alcon)		
Seneca					
<i>Thyestes</i> 641-682	palace of the Pelopids				
Petronius					
<i>Satyricon</i> 83	paintings*			x	
Silius Italicus					
<i>Punica</i> 1.81-98	temple of Dido in Carthage*				
2.401-452	Hannibal's shield*			x	
3.32-44	doors of Heracles' temple in Gades*				
6.653-697	painting in temple at Liternum*		x (anonymous artists)		
15.421-432	Hasdrubal's cloak*				
Valerius Flaccus					
<i>Argonautica</i> 1.120-148	Argo*	x			
1.427-432	cloaks of Castor and Pollux*		x (Leda)		
2.409-417	Hypsipyle's tunic*		x (Hypsipyle)		
2.653-658	goblets of Cyzicus*				
5.407-454	doors of temple of Sol in Colchis*		x (Vulcan)		
Josephus					
<i>Bellum Judaicum</i> e.g. 5.136-247	Jerusalem		x		x

(cont.)

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Statius					
<i>Thebaid</i> 1.540-551	Danaus' bowl*				
2.269-305	Harmonia's necklace*		x (Vulcan)		
4.166-172	Capaneus' shield*				
6.531-539	Heracles' bowl*				
6.540-547	Admetus' mantle*				
7.41-63	Mars' palace		x (Vulcan)		
9.332-338	Creanaeus' shield*				
10.56-64	robe for Juno*				
12.665-671	Theseus' shield*				
Lucian					
<i>Hercules</i> 1-4	Celtic painting of Heracles*		x (anon. painter)		x
<i>de Domo</i> 5	golden plane of Persian king				x
7-8	ceiling				x
22-31	paintings*		x		x
<i>Calumniae</i> 5	painting*		x (Apelles)		
<i>Toxaris</i> 6	painting*				x
<i>Herodotus</i> 5-6	painting of Alexander and Roxana*				
<i>Zeuxis</i> 4-7	painting*				x
Pausanias					
<i>Description of Greece</i> e.g. 5.11	statue of Zeus in Olympia				x
10.25-31	painting in lesche of Cnidians in Delphi*		x (Polygnotus)		x
Apuleius					
<i>Metamorphoses</i> 2.4	statues of Diana and Actaeon*		x (anon. producer)		
5.1	Cupid's palace			x	

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Philostratus					
<i>Vita Apollonii</i> e.g. 1.25	Babylon, embroidered tapestries*		x (Medea)		x
<i>Imagines</i> e.g. 1.15	painting of Ariadne*				x
Achilles Tatius					
<i>Clitophon and Leucippe</i> 1.1.2-13 2.3.1-2 2.11.2-3 3.6.1 3.6.3-8.7 5.3.4-8	painting of Europa* wine bowl* Callirhoe's necklace statue of Zeus Casius paintings of Andromeda and Prometheus* painting of Philomela*		x (anon. painter) x (anon. painter) x (anon. painter)		x x
Longus					
<i>Daphnis and Chloe</i> prologue 1-2 4.3.2	painting* paintings*				
Philostratus Junior					
<i>Imagines</i> e.g. 10.5-20	painting of Achilles' shield*		x		
Xenophon of Ephese					
<i>An Ephesian Tale</i> 1.8.2-3	embroidered baldachin*				x
Quintus of Smyrna					
<i>Posthomerica</i> 5.6-101 6.198-293 10.179-205 12.104-158	Achilles' shield* Eurypylos' shield* Philoctetes' baldric*, quiver* Wooden Horse		x (Hephaestus) x (Hephaestus) x (Epeus)		x x x

(cont.)

	Object	Reference to Maker Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
Heliodorus					
<i>Aethiopica</i> 3.3-5	Theagenes' cloak*, pin*				
3.4.2-4	Chariclea's breast band*			x	
5.13.3-14.4	ring				x
Tryphiodorus					
<i>Capture of Troy</i> 57-105	Wooden Horse	x (Epeus)			
Claudian					
<i>Rape of Proserpine</i> 1.246-270	Proserpine's weaving	x			
2.33-54	Diana's dress			x	
Nonnus					
<i>Dionysiaca</i>					
3.131-179	Electra's palace		x (Hephaestus)	x	x
5.135-189	Aphrodite's necklace*		x (Hephaestus)	x	
18.67-92	Staphylus' palace				
25.387-562	Dionysus' Shield*		x (Hephaestus)		
40.298-365	the city of Tyr				
41.14-96	the city of Beirut				