

Euanthes and the World of Rhetoric in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*

KATHERINE A. MCHUGH
The University of Edinburgh

In Book Three of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* there is an *ekphrasis* of a painting, one of three within the entirety of the novel. The description takes place after the protagonists' arrival at Pelusium, as they happen upon the Temple of Zeus and come across "double images" (εἰκόνα διπλῆν, 3,6,3) which have been signed by the artist Euanthes (3,6,3).¹ The main aim of this article is to consider the name of this artist, as opposed to the painting itself; it seeks to prove that Euanthes was not a real figure, but a name created by Achilles which is imbued with rhetorical references in keeping with the intellectual climate of 2nd Century AD Greek literature. The name Euanthes and its possible rhetorical connotations will be explored in conjunction with a detailed consideration of Achilles' use of *ekphrasis* throughout *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and his interest in rhetorical education in order to assert that some of the author's playful in-jokes have been understudied, and that they can provide us with a clearer picture of how the author strives to appeal to his reader; that is, a reader who is steeped in a rhetorical education themselves. The article also considers the other two *ekphraseis* of paintings in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* (which occur in Books One and Five) in order to aid with an understanding of Achilles' use of the rhetorical technique and how significant rhetoric is to his novel as a whole. It also examines some examples from other authors of the period (namely, Lucian and Aelius Theon) in order to support the suggestion of Euanthes as a word embedded in rhetoric.

Before delving into the *ekphrasis* in Book Three, and the name Euanthes, a wider consideration of the treatment of the visual artist in Achilles Tatius is necessary to provide further evidence of the fact that he was highly invested in using his novel to both comment upon and compete with visual art, whilst also incorporating ideas of rhetoric. To substantiate the argument that Achilles is interested in

¹ The Greek text is taken from Garnaud (1991); translations are my own.

visual art, as well as the relationship between fictional literary and physical worlds of art, one may compare his work with the other imperial Greek novelists. Achilles often refers specifically to an artist in his work; the word *γραφεύς* (painter) is used five times in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* (1,1,4, twice at 3,3,4, 3,7,1 and 3,8,2) and not at all by the other three novelists. Another word for a visual artist, *ζωγράφος*, is used five times by Achilles (1,1,12; 3,6,3; 3,7,3; 5,3,4 and 5,3,7). It is used once by Chariton, not in an *ekphrasis*, but in a description attempting to evoke a beautiful image of Callirhoe holding her baby, “the sort of image which not even a painter had created” (*Call.*,3,8,6). The word for an artist or craftsman, *τεχνίτης*, is perhaps the most interesting to explore here if we also want to consider the relationship between the visual artist and rhetorician. It is used only once by Heliodorus in an *ekphrasis* of a carved stone (*Aeth.*,5,14,4), and in no place in Longus or Chariton; Achilles uses it twice in ekphrastic context (1,1,4 and 1,1,6). Most significantly, Xenophon of Ephesus uses it once, in a rhetorical context. Describing the wealthy Aristomachus, Hippothous says that he is a “craftsman” (*τεχνίτης*) “of speeches” (*λόγων*) (*Eph.*,3,2,8). The fact that the same word can be used for a rhetorician and a visual artist is highly significant when it is put into the context of Achilles Tatius’ work; as will be explored further below, in the naming of Euanthes, Achilles was preoccupied with the relationship of the rhetorical, literary and visual worlds. The same phrase for a “craftsmen of speeches” may also have been used by Antonius Diogenes in his *Wonders Beyond Thule*. Photios, in his summary of the lost work, describes Dinias giving Cymbas tablets made of cypress in a manner learned from a scribe, Erasinides, a *τεχνίτης λόγων*.² Achilles uses the word *τεχνίτης* both times for a visual artist. However, its usage in other authors’ works in a context of the written word or that of speeches highlights how a craftsman of a visual work of art and one of a written work were associated. As we further explore the *ekphrasis* in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, and how Achilles might be creating a deceit as he, the writer, is really the creator of the ‘visual’ art he describes, it becomes clear how closely related the worlds of the visual and rhetorical arts were.

Having looked briefly at the evidence for the fact that Achilles was particularly interested in the visual artist and how their arts can be associated with rhetoric, I now turn to look in-depth at the paintings by Euanthes in Book Three of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. In doing so, I hope to illustrate that Euanthes the artist

² See Photios, *Bibl. Cod.* 166, 111a. The possible use of this phrase by Antonius Diogenes is particularly interesting because of the pseudo-documentary nature of the *Wonders Beyond Thule*. If, as this article suggests, Euanthes is a literary figure constructed by Achilles to appear to be an historical figure, then this is in itself pseudo-documentarism. For more on pseudo-documentarism in ancient literature, see esp. Hansen (2003) and Ni Mheallaigh (2008)

encapsulates the relationship between the visual and rhetorical, as his very name seems to fit into a world imbued with rhetorical education. In the *ekphrasis* of Euanthes' artworks, Achilles appears to be suggesting a diptych, with one image of Andromeda and one of Prometheus. Cleitophon informs the reader of the connected themes between the two: "both are chained to rocks", "wild beasts are the "executioners" of both" and "members of the Argive family are protectors of both" (Πέτραι μὲν ἀμφοῖν τὸ δεσμωτήριον, θῆρες δὲ κατ' ἀμφοῖν οἱ δῆμοι ... ἐπικούροι δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἀργεῖοι δύο συγγενεῖς, 3,6,4). The *ekphrasis* has an abrupt end at the close of 3,8 and then immediately the main narrative begins again at 3,9. Within the corpus of scholarship on Achilles Tatius, a great deal of attention has been paid to the *ekphraseis*, with many discussing their proleptic function. In this case, there has been a focus on the foreshadowing function of the two paintings; as Bartsch comments, they "foreshadow different aspects of the same event".³ That is, the (false) sacrifice and disembowelment of Leucippe at 3,15. Clearly this is the case; both Andromeda and Leucippe are chained up, waiting for death. Andromeda's position chained to the rock-hollow is described, and the narrator says that if someone were to see her beauty she would be like "a new statue" (ἀγάλματι καινῷ, 3,7,2), but if they saw the chains and the sea-monster, they would see the rock as an "improvised/contrived tomb" (αὐτοσχεδίῳ τάφῳ, 3,7,2). Leucippe, too, is "tied up with hands behind her back" (ὀπίσω τῷ χεῖρε δεδεμένην, 3,15,1) and a σορός (tomb) has been made for her near to the altar (3,15,1). In terms of the painting of Prometheus, the violent image of the bird feeding upon his belly after having ripped it open (Ὄρνις ἐς τὴν τοῦ Προμηθέως γαστέρα τρυφᾷ: ἔσθηκε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀνοίγων, ἥδη μὲν ἀνεωργμένην,⁴ 3,8,1-2) is clearly reflected in the disembowelment of Leucippe, where her entrails "immediately leapt out" after she was cut open (τὰ σπλάγχνα δὲ εὐθὺς ἐξεπήδησεν, 3,15,5). The bird eats the insides of Prometheus, and after cutting Leucippe open the brigands, too, feast on their victim. Bartsch discusses how the "proleptic similes" which are the paintings of Andromeda and Prometheus at first cause the reader to feel confident that they have discovered the link between the paintings and what later happens, but that this is Achilles' deceit as it then turns out that the sacrifice and disembowelment of Leucippe was ultimately fake.⁵ The analysis of the *ekphrasis* which characterizes it as a foreshadowing technique is very likely,

³ Bartsch (1989), 55. See also Morales (2004) for comments on the proleptic functions of the *ekphraseis* in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*.

⁴ "A bird fed on the stomach of Prometheus, and it stood there opening it up, or had already opened it".

⁵ Bartsch (1989), 58-59.

and even more credit can be given to this interpretation when one considers that the painting of Europa in Book One does the same thing.⁶

However, it is not just through the subject matter of the paintings themselves in which Achilles is deceitful. He is, in fact, deceitful from the very outset when he names Euanthes. Few have commented on Euanthes, and when they do it is to dismiss him as an authorial creation without any further explanation, or to determine that he must have been a real artist. Vilborg writes that the name was “certainly ... fictitious” without giving any further analysis or explanation.⁷ Phillips, on the other hand, states that Euanthes was a real artist (although attested nowhere else) and that Achilles’ description is of a painting by him. He notes similarities of Achilles’ description with Roman wall paintings and determines that these are based on a Hellenistic model which was by Euanthes.⁸ However, the attempt to prove that Achilles was referring to a specific painter merely because of a similarity between the composition of some Roman wall paintings and the description in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is unnecessary. Phillips does not consider that Achilles whilst may have been aware of common tropes in contemporary wall paintings, he is basing his (literary and completely constructed) description on an amalgam of this visual imagery as opposed to attempting to describe a real artwork. In his article, Phillips argues for a *terminus ante quem* for a Hellenistic artist (that is, one whom he deems to have been Euanthes), establishing this date through a sculptural group of Herakles and Prometheus which it is claimed is a copy of a painting also by the same artist (as the second painting in Achilles Tatius is also of Prometheus). There is, however, nothing concrete as evidence to validate this claim. D’Alconzo also examines archaeological evidence of paintings of Andromeda and of Prometheus, determining that the paintings in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* are “inscribed in the iconographical history of their figures, which means that their existence might have been possible.” He then goes on to a detailed analysis of depictions of pairings of Andromeda and of Prometheus in the archaeological record, utilizing depictions on Apulian vases to determine that it is possible that the two were paired together; on this basis, he concludes that Achilles knew of this joint iconography, and that he used it as the beginning of his inspiration for his story (as opposed to creating the image and using it to create a proleptic function).⁹

⁶ For discussions of the proleptic functions of the Europa *ekphrasis*, see in particular Bartsch (1989) and Morales (2004).

⁷ Vilborg (1962), 69. See also Whitmarsh (2001), 154.

⁸ Phillips (1968), 4-6; 15. See also D’Alconzo (2014).

⁹ D’Alconzo (2014), 82-89. See also Garson (1978), 83-85 who asserts that it is impossible to know whether Achilles is writing about works of art he saw, and if he is he “refine[d] them considerably in his own imagination”. This leaves it open to interpretation as to whether Garson considers Euanthes’ work to have been real or not, but he does then go on

Neither of these advocates of the painting as real consider Euanthes further, which leaves open the question of whether he was indeed real and that we simply do not have any surviving evidence, or whether he was entirely fictional. Indeed, if we are to consider that the paintings are entirely Achilles' literary construction, it is instead more important to go back and consider Vilborg's assertion of a fictitious painter whilst investigating what evidence there is for this assertion. In doing so, one can examine whether Achilles had more to say through his introduction of Euanthes, particularly in reference to the world of rhetoric.

Of the three *ekphraseis* of paintings in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, it is only in Book Three that an artist is named. Indeed, Achilles does not elsewhere refer to any real persons, whether that be artists, writers or historical figures; it certainly stands out that Euanthes is named. It is therefore inconsistent with the rest of the novel for a real figure to be inserted only at this point. On the other hand, by naming the artist, Achilles lends an air of authority to his description. However, this air of authority is similar to the ways in which authors in pseudo-documentary works suggest historicity within fiction; that is, perhaps the author's attempt at lending authority to his work is a cover-up for the complete fiction of it.¹⁰ An exploration of the name Euanthes might shed some light on what Achilles is doing here, and I would like to suggest that it is connected to the meaning of the word as flowery or colorful.¹¹ Looking at this word and its use in rhetorical and ekphrastic contexts in particular proves fruitful. It has been well-established that Achilles Tatius was interested in rhetoric and rhetorical theory, and was well-versed in the sort of rhetorical exercises found in the *Progymnasmata*.¹² It therefore seems significant that in Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata*, in his section on *ekphrasis*, the word appears. The rhetorician talks about the "virtues of *ekphrasis*" (ἀρεταὶ ἐκφράσεως, Ael., *Prog.*, 119-20) and in this says that the whole description should be similar to the subject matter, giving the example:¹³

to say that Achilles must have had a great interest in art because of his "reasoned speculation on the considerations which could have prompted Euanthes to pair his Andromeda and Perseus paintings". He gives no opinion as to whether Achilles was writing about a real artist who paired these paintings, or whether he paired them himself in his writing and attempts to explain why his fictional painter paired them.

¹⁰ In addition to the above (n. 2) bibliography for pseudo-documentarism, see the discussion in Cameron (2004), 126-159 on false citations and their prevalence in the Imperial Period. If Euanthes is a false name and a fiction of Achilles, the *ekphrasis* is, in way, a false citation of a work of art.

¹¹ *LSJ*, s.v., εὐανθής, II.

¹² Bartsch (1989), 7-13; Morales (2004), 89-90.

¹³ In this section, Theon says that these virtues are *sapheneia* (clarity) and *enargeia* (vividness). As noted below, Achilles' *ekphraseis* successfully utilize the rhetorical idea of *enargeia* as the significant quality in a descriptive passage, and thus there is more to suggest a

εἰ μὲν εὐανθές τι εἶη τὸ δηλούμενον, εὐανθῆ καὶ τὴν φράσιν εἶναι.

If the subject shown is “flowery”, then the speech should be “flowery”. (Ael., *Prog.*, 119-120).¹⁴

Aelius Theon’s work is considered to be the earliest of these collections of rhetorical exercises to give *ekphrasis* a definition and place within rhetorical theory.¹⁵ It is, therefore, possible that Achilles was aware of Aelius Theon’s definition and discussion of *ekphrasis*, perhaps even of the example with εὐανθές. The artist’s name, then, could be a reference to the world of rhetoric and the origins of *ekphrasis*; perhaps Achilles uses it to hint at the rhetorical teaching of what a good *ekphrasis* is, telling his reader that his own descriptive language can rival that of a great speech. Achilles has used the word which Theon uses as he emphasizes the importance of the description matching the subject-matter in vividness. This is clearly what Achilles himself attempts in his vivid descriptions, and the insertion of Euanthes as the name of the artist may be a playful reference to what his *ekphraseis* achieve. Furthermore, Achilles is seemingly *not* describing a real painting in his *ekphrasis* of Euanthes’ painting; if Euanthes is a construct then so, too, are the paintings. Achilles is, in fact, competing with himself as he describes an image created in his own mind with his own words. This is indicative of how important a rhetorical education was to his writing, and highlights how he plays games with his reader in connection to this background. The conjecture that Euanthes is a reference to rhetorical teaching, and perhaps even Theon’s work in particular, might not prove by itself that the name of the painter was created by Achilles and was not of a real figure.¹⁶ However, some evidence from Lucian further shows that the word was important in a rhetorical context, lending more credence to the idea.

link between *to euanthes* which is used by Theon as his example of what a good speech should describe, and Achilles’ Euanthes being a possible reference to rhetorical teaching as the author picked up on the word as one associated with *enargeia* and a “flowery” description.

¹⁴ I follow Spengel (1885) in the numbering of Theon’s *Progymnasmata*.

¹⁵ Kennedy (2003), 1; Webb (2009), 14.

¹⁶ It is, however, interesting to note that Cleitophon’s name (“famous-speaker”) is also connected to rhetoric, as Ní Mheallaigh (2007), 240 notes. This lends credence to another name with similar associations. Cleitophon’s name also has Platonic allusions, if one considers the Platonic work of the same name. It is, therefore, more likely that Achilles is using names for allusive purposes elsewhere as well. This article is not the place to delve into Cleitophon’s role as narrator and his own use of rhetoric, but see in particular Whitmarsh (2003), 191-205 on what sort of narrator Cleitophon is and the affects this has on the text and the readership.

Lucian uses εὐανθής multiple times in rhetorical, and also ekphrastic, contexts. In *de Domo* he describes the “paintings on the walls” in the hall (τὰ τῶν τοίχων γράμματα, *Dom.*, 9) and says that one might well compare them to “the face of spring and a flowery meadow” (ἔαρος ὄψει καὶ λειμῶνι δὲ εὐανθεῖ καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι παραβαλεῖν, *Dom.*, 9).¹⁷ Moreover, in the *Heracles* the word is used by the Celt who is an exegete of a painting of Heracles. The Celt is describing the representation of Heracles to Lucian, and tells him that Celts see Heracles, not Hermes, as λόγος (*Herc.*, 4). He goes on to explain that Heracles is represented as an old man because “an old man has wiser things to say than the youth” (τὸ δὲ γῆρας ἔχει τι λέξαι τῶν νέων σοφώτερον, *Herc.*, 4) before giving the example of the Trojan counsellors:

καὶ οἱ ἀγορηταὶ τῶν Τρώων τὴν ὅπα ἀφιᾶσιν εὐανθηῖ τινα· λείρια γὰρ καλεῖται, εἴ γε μέμνημαι, τὰ ἄνθη.

And the counsellors of the Trojans speak flowery words – the flowers mentioned are lilies, if I remember correctly. (*Herc.*, 4)

From these two examples it is clear that εὐανθής was a word associated with rhetoric and the “flowery” nature of a powerful speaker, and that this in turn has been translated by authors of the Imperial period into the context of *ekphrasis*. It seems that both Lucian and Achilles Tatius have picked up on the term as one associated with these ideas, and the usage can thus be associated with the cultural milieu of the 2nd century AD and the influence of a rhetorical education on these authors.¹⁸ The use of the word by Lucian and Theon also provides evidence that the artist is indeed Achilles’ own creation and that he is using a word he knows to be associated with rhetoric, which in turn is associated with *ekphrasis*, in order to send a sign to his readers who were educated in a similar environment and would be aware of the mischievous play on words.

The fact that εὐανθής was frequently used in rhetorical contexts lends strength to the idea that Euanthes is most likely a fiction of the author. Achilles has used a common theme of visual imagery and rhetorical language to lend realism to his fiction, but if one considers the various layers of readership there might be for the novel it is clear that a reader educated in the same world as Achilles or Lucian

¹⁷ Text from Lucian Macleod (1987), Volumes 1-4. Translation is my own.

¹⁸ See Whitmarsh (2001), 90-130 for an extended discussion of *paideia* the literature of the Roman Empire. In particular, see pages 96-108 on *paideia* and social status, in which the author discusses how rhetoric and “articulate language” were characteristic of the elite classes, and how authors played with the idea of *paideia* and its connection to literature.

would pick up on the associations of the artist's name and immediately recognize that there will succeed an *ekphrasis* which has been constructed out of the world of rhetorical teaching and the *Progymnasmata*. Euanthes is a sort of in-joke for these readers who are aware of the literary and rhetorical nuances of the word. It may also suggest that Achilles is hinting that his *ekphrasis* is going to be a good one, in following with the teaching of those such as Aelius Theon and his "virtues of *ekphrasis*". The author indicates that it is not just rhetoric or a visual work of art which can produce visual energy and lifelike quality, but an *ekphrasis* which takes place in the very literary world of words on a page. Achilles has masterfully incorporated the rhetorical idea of *enargeia* into his *ekphraseis*.¹⁹ It is not a painter, Euanthes, who has created this lifelike quality in a painting; instead, the author Achilles Tatius has created the same, perhaps even greater, effect through written words.

Achilles' use of Euanthes as a name is, in part, an attempt by the author to draw his educated reader into a world of rhetoric and thus to get them to consider whether the skilled writer can compete with visual art by using rhetorical techniques. If we consider Lucian's *de Domo* again, there is more evidence for an author of this period's ideas on rhetoric and its ability to compete with the silent, static arts of the literary and visual worlds. Lucian questions a rhetorician's ability to bring a work of beauty (in this case a magnificent hall) to life. There is a suggestion that an ordinary man, on seeing such beauty, is content to look upon it and not try to express equal beauty in speech. However, in terms of an educated man we are told:

ὅστις δὲ μετὰ παιδείας ὄρᾳ τὰ καλά, οὐκ ἄν, οἶμαι, ἀγαπήσειεν ὄψει μόνη καρπώσαμενος τὸ τερπνὸν οὐδ' ἂν ὑπομείναι ἄφωνος θεατῆς τοῦ κάλλους γενέσθαι, πειράσεται δὲ ὡς οἶόν τε καὶ ἐνδιατρίψαι καὶ λόγῳ ἀμείψασθαι τὴν θέαν.

But when a man who is educated sees beautiful things, he would not, I think, be pleased to pluck their delightful fruit with only his eyes, nor would he abide to be a silent spectator of their beauty, but he would try as hard as he could to linger and to match the sight with his speech. (*Dom.*, 2-3)

This suggests that a beautiful work of visual art must be contested with by a rhetorician who is skilled and educated. Just so, Achilles' literary work has to be consumed by someone who is educated in a similar world for them to understand

¹⁹ Webb (2009), 5 describes *enargeia* as the "defining quality" of *ekphrasis*. See also Morales (2004), 90.

joke of the name of Euanthes. Achilles is the creator of both the image and the description, and this is handed down to his reader through his writing. He is, in a way, competing with and attempting to outdo himself in order to create a description of something fictional which is so successful as to make the work (and its fictional creator) appear to be real.

After his original comments on description and a good rhetorician, Lucian then refers to the *Phaedrus* (the scene of the *locus amoenus*), stating:

καίτοι Σωκράτει μὲν ἀπέχρησε πλάτανος εὐφυῆς καὶ πόα εὐθαλῆς καὶ πηγὴ διαυγῆς μικρὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἴλισσοῦ, κἀνταῦθα καθεζόμενος Φαίδρου τε τοῦ Μυρρινουσίου κατειρωνεύετο καὶ τὸν Λυσίου τοῦ Κεφάλου λόγον διήλεγχε καὶ τὰς Μούσας ἐκάλει, καὶ ἐπίστευεν ἦξειν αὐτὰς ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρημίαν συλληγομένας τῶν περὶ τοῦ ἔρωτος λόγων, καὶ οὐκ ἠσχύνετο γέρον ἄνθρωπος παρακαλῶν παρθένους συνασομένας τὰ παιδευαστικά. ἐς δὲ οὕτω καλὸν χωρίον οὐκ ἂν οἰόμεθα καὶ ἀκλήτους αὐτὰς ἐλθεῖν;

And indeed, a well-grown tree and thriving grass and a clear spring, not far from Ilissus, were enough for Socrates; sitting there, he spoke with irony to Phaedrus of Myrhillus and criticized the speech of Lysias, the son of Cephalus, and called upon the Muses, and he believed that they would come to a deserted place, talking together, for a discourse on love, and he did not take shame – even though an old man – to call maidens to fool about with him in matters concerning the love of youths. Do we not think that they would come to a place so beautiful, even if they were not called? (*Dom.*, 4)

The *Phaedrus* is used by Lucian here as an example of how a beautiful setting enhances a passion for speech, just like the impressive hall.²⁰ The *Phaedrus* is also used by Achilles in his *ekphrasis* of Europa. The setting described after the first *ekphrasis* is clearly Phaedran, as the initial narrator takes Cleitophon and leads him to a grove of plane trees for discussion:

Καὶ ταῦτα δὴ λέγων δεξιούμαι τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τινος ἄλσους ἄγω γείτονος, ἔνθα πλάτανοι μὲν ἐπεφύκεσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πυκναί, παρέρρει δὲ ὕδωρ ψυχρὸν τε καὶ διαυγές, οἷον ἀπὸ χιόνος ἄρτι λυθείσης ἔρχεται.

And saying these things I took his hand and led him to a neighboring grove, where many thick plane trees were growing, and cold and clear water was flowing through, the sort which comes from recently melted snow. (1,2,3)

²⁰ See Trapp (1990) for more on the *Phaedrus* in Second Century Greek literature.

This can be compared with the setting at the beginning of the *Phaedrus*, where Phaedrus and Socrates go to have their dialogue at Phaedrus' suggestion of cooling their feet in a stream, and sitting where there is the "tallest plane-tree" (τὴν ὑψηλοτάτην πλάτανον, *Ph.*, 229a). Socrates himself then undertakes his own *ekphrasis* of sorts in describing the *locus amoenus*. He says:

νή τὴν Ἥραν, καλή γε ἡ καταγωγὴ. ἦ τε γὰρ πλάτανος αὕτη μάλ' ἀμφιλαφὴς τε καὶ ὑψηλή, τοῦ τε ἄγνου τὸ ὕψος καὶ τὸ σύσκιον πάγκαλον, καὶ ὡς ἀκμὴν ἔχει τῆς ἄνθης, ὡς ἂν εὐωδέστατον παρέχοι τὸν τόπον: ἦ τε αὖ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῆς πλατάνου ῥεῖ μάλα ψυχροῦ ὕδατος, ὥστε γε τῷ ποδὶ τεκμήρισθαι.²¹

By Hera, it is a fine place for resting. For this plane tree is tall and especially wide-spreading, and the height and shade of the chaste-tree are all-beautiful, and it is at the peak of flowering, so that it makes the place most beautifully-scented: And the spring is most-graceful as it flows under the plane tree, and is of especially cool water, as is determined by my foot. (*Ph.*, 230b)

The plane-tree grove is important in both texts, and both contain references to a cool stream flowing by. Achilles' ἔνθα πλάτανοι μὲν ἐπεφύκεσαν πολλαὶ καὶ πυκναί, παρέρρει δὲ ὕδωρ ψυχρόν τε καὶ διαυγές surely took its inspiration from the ἦ τε αὖ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῆς πλατάνου ῥεῖ μάλα ψυχροῦ ὕδατος of Socrates; the educated reader of Achilles Tatius is, therefore, awakened to the idea that they may read his text through a Platonic and rhetorical lens. The discussions in the *Phaedrus* are seemingly about love, but are in fact primarily about the art of rhetoric.²² Thus, we are already introduced at the beginning of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* to a novel which is packed full of rhetorical references. It is, therefore, not unlikely that Euanthes' name is another one of these, as the author plays on the idea of how best a descriptive passage should be written.

Ní Mheallaigh discusses the Phaedran influence on *Leucippe and Cleitophon* in reference to the first *ekphrasis* of Europa, suggesting that the painting of Europa "represents the textuality of the novel".²³ She draws upon the painted figures' inability to actually emit sound to back up this point; although the setting is one of "pseudo-orality", we are in fact very much within a textual world. Lucian and

²¹ The Greek text is taken from Yunis (2011). Translation is my own.

²² See Yunis (2011), 1-7 for a discussion of the art of rhetoric within the *Phaedrus*.

²³ Ní Mheallaigh (2007), 231-237. See also the interesting discussion in Goldhill (2011), 98 where the author stresses the importance of rhetoric to literature of the Second Sophistic, but says that it is difficult to say that these rhetorical performances constitute 'orality' "if by orality we mean a category opposed to literacy."

Achilles may very well be drawing on the *Phaedrus* for a similar reason. They mesh together a beautiful scene with the idea of words and speech, suggesting that one complements the other. The parallels to Lucian, and the *Phaedrus*, strongly suggest that Achilles has these ideas of the similarities and the tension between words and the visual in mind. By inserting this vivid *ekphrasis* and introducing it immediately with rhetorical intertexts and undertones at the beginning of his novel, the reader is made overtly aware of these tensions. A question can then be raised as to whether Achilles is aware of the constraints of literature and oratory to bring visual imagery to life, or whether he believes this can be overcome by a skilled enough author or rhetorician. Achilles' constant references to an artist indicate that he is aware that such a work is not reality and cannot be reality; a skilled describer may create the *enargeia* that is needed for *ekphrasis*, but neither the written description nor the artwork is actually a reality of whatever is being imitated. Yet if the artist he has written about in Book Three is not actually real, then a double deceit is created; the author *can* in fact compete with the 'artist'.

A look at the final *ekphrasis* in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* (of the "defilement of Philomela, the violence of Tereus and the cutting out of her tongue" (Φιλομήλας γὰρ εἶχε φθορὰν καὶ τὴν βίαν Τηρέως καὶ τῆς γλώττης τὴν τομήν, 5,3,4) provides even greater evidence for the significance of a rhetorical education for an understanding of the more niche references in the text. Firstly, the subject matter of the painting is highly significant in a rhetorical sense; Philomela loses her ability to speak, and thus the art of rhetoric is inaccessible. Instead, she communicates by means of the visual arts:

Φιλομήλα παρειστήκει καὶ ἐπετίθει τῷ πέπλῳ τὸν δάκτυλον καὶ ἐδείκνυ τῶν ὕφασμάτων τὰς γραφάς.

Philomela stood nearby and placed her finger on the garment, and she showed the images on the textile. (5,3,5)

Achilles is indicating that there is a close link between speech and the visual arts and their expressive abilities. To further indicate that the author is interested in the combination of rhetoric and art, the ingredients of an *ekphrasis*, one can explore Cleitophon's response to the subject of the painting. At 5,5,4, as exegete to Leucippe, he says:

ἡ γὰρ Φιλομήλας τέχνη σιωπῶσαν εὔρηκε φωνήν.

For the skill of Philomela found a silent voice.

Clearly we are to see the connections between different τέχναι and the fact that Philomela has used one (her weaving/artistic ability) in place of the other (rhetoric).²⁴ Just before this point, Cleitophon tells Leucippe that Tereus “took away the flower of speech” from Philomela (κείρει τῆς φωνῆς τὸ ἄνθος, 5,5,4).²⁵ The metaphor of the flower here seems to be suggestive of the power of rhetoric associated with the voice; it can be linked to Euanthes and the association of flowers with both the rhetorical arts and, concurrently, *ekphrasis* itself.²⁶ Indeed, the equation of Philomela’s power of speech as τὸ ἄνθος supports the assertion of Euanthes as a playful reference to rhetoric and the role of *ekphrasis* as a technique within the art. The elimination of τῆς φωνῆς τὸ ἄνθος allows the reader to see that the power of Philomela’s visual art is equal to the communicative ability of her voice. Morales comments upon the silencing of Leucippe, and how the *ekphrasis* of Philomela is the culmination of this, “adumbrat[ing] and reflect[ing] her voicelessness”.²⁷ *Ekphraseis* in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* do reflect events in the main narrative, and one might therefore see the lack of Leucippe’s voice reflected in Philomela, yet in this instance the rhetorical undertones are what Achilles is emphasizing. Morales focuses more specifically on the proleptic and allusive function of the *ekphrasis*, without pinpointing the very technical aspect of Achilles’ play with words and allusions which are not just intratextual, but which refer to the art of writing, and its interplay with other arts, more generally.

To conclude, the naming of Euanthes, a witty reference to rhetorical teaching, situates the paintings of Book Three in an entirely fabricated world of an intelligently playful author who is communicating to his reader on a variety of levels.

²⁴ See Roisman (2006), 9-11 and her discussion of Helen’s weaving in *Iliad* 3 for another example of a female character within literature utilizing her own feminine τέχνη as a means of (silent) communication. Roisman then discusses the progression of Helen in the *Iliad* from a powerless figure who speaks through her weaving into a “public speaker”, talking at Hektor’s funeral in *Iliad* 24. Interesting parallels can be drawn between this and Helen’s metaphorical speaking through weaving, to that of Philomela in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. Achilles uses a story of a woman’s weaving, a common trope, for his own purposes of examining the art of rhetoric and how its traits might be applied to other arts; a theme very fitting for the intellectual climate of the time.

²⁵ König (2017), 416-432 on the rose/flower and voice in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. Here the author discusses the flower’s association with the mouth, and thus voice (and the lack of it, in Leucippe’s case) in the novel.

²⁶ The cutting or picking of flowers or fruit is a common trope in Greek literature, symbolizing a plethora of things such as the taking of virginity (e.g. Daphnis picking an apple at Daphnis and Chloe 3,33-34). Within the story of Philomela, it seems likely the cutting of the flower also contains some sexual undertones. However, here the author’s agenda of its association with the art of speech seems clear; within the literal rape of Philomela, Achilles has also emphasized how one form of τέχνη has been seized from her.

²⁷ Morales (2004), 201.

Perhaps there is some truth to Hägg's assertion that Achilles introduces *ekphraseis* because he likes to describe and his readers like to read those descriptive passages, and there is certainly truth to the views of scholars such as Morales and Bartsch who focus on the proleptic functions of the *ekphraseis* and point out that deeper thought has been put into the (often deceitful) descriptions.²⁸ However, in these cases too little attention has been given to the rhetorical specifics in which an author such as Achilles would have been deeply educated. Studying this, especially in conjunction with an author such as Lucian, lends another dimension to the *ekphrasis* in Book Three and shows us that Achilles was playing a game from the very creation of his fictional painting. By studying this in conjunction with the other two *ekphraseis* in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and their own relationships to rhetoric, one can determine that Achilles was creating descriptions which were not only influenced by his rhetorical training, but referring back to it specifically. Euanthes is the culmination of this; the biggest in-joke which the author uses for a reader educated in the same way to be entertained by. Through this one name, Achilles is letting this sort of reader into the rhetorically imbued background of his literary skill.

Bibliography

- Bartsch, S. (1989), *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton and Oxford.
- Cameron, A. (2004), *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford.
- D'Alconzo, N. (2014), 'A Diptych by Euanthes: Andromeda and Prometheus (Ach. Tat. 3,6-8)', *AN* 11, 75-91.
- Garnaud, J. (1991) (ed.), *Achille Tatius D'Alexandrie: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris.
- Garson, R.W. (1978), 'Works of Art in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *Acta Classica* 21, 83-86.
- Goldhill, S. (2011), 'The Anecdote: Exploring the Boundaries between Oral and Literate Performance in the Second Sophistic', 96-112 in Johnson, W. A. and Parker, H. N. (eds), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford.
- Hägg, T. (1971), *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm.
- Hansen, W. (2003), 'Strategies of authentication in ancient popular literature', 301-313 in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (eds), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden and Boston.
- Kennedy, G. A. (ed.) (2003), *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, Atlanta, Ga.

²⁸ Hägg (1971), 241; Bartsch (1989); Morales (2004).

- König, A. (2017), 'The Fragrance of the Rose: An Image of the Voice in Achilles Tatius', 416-432 in Slater, N. W. (ed.), *Voice and Voices in Antiquity: Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World*, Vol. II, Leiden and Boston.
- Macleod, M. D. (ed.) (1987), *Luciani Opera Volumes 1-4*, Oxford.
- Morales, H. (2004), *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Cambridge.
- Ní Mheallaigh, K. (2007), 'Philosophical Framing: The Phaedran Setting of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', *ANS* 10, 231-244.
- (2008), 'Pseudo-documentarism and the limits of ancient fiction,' *American Journal Philology* 129, 403-431.
- Phillips, K.M. (1968) 'Perseus and Andromeda', *American Journal of Archaeology* 72, 1-23.
- Roisman, H. (2006), 'Helen in the Iliad: Cause Belli and Victim of War: From Silent Weaver to Public Speaker', *American Journal of Philology* 127, 1-36.
- Trapp, M. (1990), 'Plato's Phaedrus in second century Greek literature', 141-173 in Russell, D. A. (ed.), *Antonine literature*, Oxford.
- Vilborg, E. (ed.) (1962), *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Stockholm.
- Webb, R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Surrey and Burlington, VT
- Whitmarsh, T. (2001), *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford.
- (2003), 'Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony and Eroticism in Achilles Tatius', 191-205 in Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M. and Keulen, W. (eds) (2003), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden and Boston.
- Yunis, H. (ed.) (2011), *Plato: Phaedrus*, Cambridge.