

## ENARGEIA IN THE ANCIENT CRITICISM OF POETRY

It is quite common nowadays for scholars to use the word *euphrasis* when referring to passages in ancient poetry which describe phenomena like objects, people, scenes, actions and works of art in a strikingly pictorial way. But *ἐκφρασις* was not the only term in ancient literary criticism to denote pictorial vividness in literature. Another was *ἐνάργεια*, and the aims of this paper are to define it, to demonstrate its particular importance for all ancient literary theory, to examine the dating of its earliest usage and to make a suggestion about its origin<sup>1</sup>).

The most thorough definition of *ἐνάργεια* is found in the comments of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the rhetorical style of Lysias:

ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐνάργειαν πολλὴν ἢ Λυσίου λέξεις. αὕτη δ' ἐστὶ δύναμις τις ὑπὸ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἄγουσα τὰ λεγόμενα, γίνεταί δ' ἐκ τῆς τῶν παρακολουθούτων λήψεως. ὁ δὲ προσέχων τὴν διάνοιαν τοῖς Λυσίου λόγοις οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται σκαιὸς ἢ δυσάρεστος ἢ βραδὺς τὸν νοῦν, ὅς οὐχ ὑπολήφεται γινόμενα τὰ δηλούμενα ὄρᾶν καὶ ὡσπερ παροῦσιν οἷς ἂν ὁ ὀρίτωρ εἰσάγη προσώποις ὀμιλεῖν.

*Lys.* 7; I.14,17 Us.-Rad.

According to Dionysius, *ἐνάργεια* is the stylistic effect in which appeal is made to the senses of the listener and attendant circumstances are described in such a way that the listener will be turned into an eyewitness (*ὄρᾶν*); he will inevitably see the events Lysias depicts and, as it were, feel in the presence of the characters he introduces. The sense uppermost in Dionysius' mind is plain sight.

Ps.-Demetrius (*Eloc.* 209<sup>2</sup>) emphasizes the detail of description which *ἐνάργεια* entails:

γίνεταί δ' ἢ ἐνάργεια πρῶτα μὲν ἐξ ἀκριβολογίας καὶ τοῦ παραλείπειν μηδὲν μηδ' ἐκτέμνειν ...

1) I am indebted to Mr. D.A. Russell and Prof. A.A. Long for discussions on parts of this article.

2) For the dating of this treatise see below, p. 305.

As examples, he quotes two strikingly pictorial passages in Homer<sup>3)</sup>. Another method for producing *ἐνάργεια*, he says, is repetition, *διλογία*, which will, however, appeal to the emotions rather than to the senses (211 ff.). Finally, he says that description of the attendant circumstances of an action can result in *ἐνάργεια*, just as Dionysius claims:

γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τὰ παρεπόμενα τοῖς πράγμασι λέγειν ἐνάργεια.

ibid. 217

One example is Plato's vivid description of Hippocrates blushing in the dawn light at *Protag.* 312a; the other, of unknown authorship, appeals to hearing.

The rhetors, in their discussions of *ἔκφρασις*, see in *ἐνάργεια* the *ἀρετή* of pictorial description. Theon's formulation of the *ἀρεταὶ ἐκφράσεως* as *σαφήνεια μὲν μάλιστα καὶ ἐνάργεια τοῦ σχεδὸν ὁρᾶσθαι τὰ ἀπαγγελλόμενα* demonstrates this<sup>4)</sup>. Hermogenes talks in a similar fashion:

ἀρεταὶ δὲ ἐκφράσεως μάλιστα σαφήνεια καὶ ἐνάργεια· δεῖ γὰρ τὴν ἐρμηνηίαν διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς σχεδὸν τὴν ὄψιν μηχανᾶσθαι.

*Prog.* 10; II.16,32 Sp.<sup>5)</sup>

Sometimes *ἐνάργεια* is used almost interchangeably with *ἔκφρασις*; an example is the Anonymus Seguerianus who defines it as a *λόγος ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον* (I.439,10 Sp.).

In the Latin authors *ἐνάργεια* is expressed by the words *demonstratio*, *evidentia*, *illustratio*, *repraesentatio* and *sub oculos subiectio*. The treatise *ad Herennium*, for example, talks of *demonstratio* in the following terms:

Demonstratio est cum ita uerbis res exprimitur ut geri negotium et res ante oculos esse uideatur. Id fieri poterit si quae ante et post et in ipsa re facta erunt comprehendemus, aut a rebus consequentibus aut circum instantibus non recedemus<sup>6)</sup>.

*ad Herenn.* 4.55.68

3) *Il.* 21.257 and 23.379.

4) *Prog.* 11; II.119,27 Sp. Theon is probably to be dated to the 1st or 2nd century A.D.

5) Cf. Nicolaus, *Prog.* 12; III.491,26 Sp.: *ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος ἀφηγηματικὸς, ὑπ' ὄψιν ἐναργῶς ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον. πρόσκειται δὲ 'ἐναργῶς', ὅτι κατὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα τῆς διηγήσεως διαφέρει· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ψιλὴν ἔχει ἔκθεσιν πραγμάτων, ἢ δε πειράται θεατὰς τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἐργάζεσθαι.*

6) Cf. *ibid.* 2.30.49.

Sight is here considered the chief sense appealed to, and the pictorial description of events before, during and after the action, or of its consequences or attendant circumstances, is said to be the method for producing the vividness associated with *demonstratio*.

Cicero gives further confirmation of the close connection of *ἐνάργεια* and sight when talking of *inlustris oratio*, which may be identified with λέξις ἐνάργειαν ἔχουσα<sup>7)</sup>:

Inlustris est autem oratio, si et uerba grauitate delecta ponuntur et translata et supralata et ad nomen adiuncta et duplicata et idem significantia atque ab ipsa actione atque imitatione rerum non abhorrentia. Est enim haec pars orationis, quae rem constituat paene ante oculos; is enim maxime sensus attingitur, sed et ceteri tamen et maxime mens ipsa moueri potest<sup>8)</sup>.

*Part. Or.* 6.20

Likewise Quintilian:

Illa uero, ut ait Cicero<sup>9)</sup>, sub oculos subiectio tum fieri solet cum res non gesta indicatur sed ut sit gesta ostenditur, nec uniuersa sed per partis: quem locum proximo libro<sup>10)</sup> subiecimus euidentiae. Et Celsus hoc nomen isti figurae dedit: ab aliis ὑποτύπωσις dicitur, proposita quaedam forma rerum ita expressa uerbis ut cerni potius uideantur quam audiri.

*Inst. Or.* 9.2.40

At *Inst. Or.* 6.2.32 he states that *ἐνάργεια* will result from φαντασία (*uisiones*). At 8.3.61f. he places *ἐνάργεια* among the 'ornaments' and emphasizes the close link of *ἐνάργεια* with sight; later in this section he says that *ἐνάργεια* can result from the description of attendant circumstances, which he calls *accidentia*, quoting Virg. *Aen.* 3.29f. and 7.518 (*Inst. Or.* 8.3.70)<sup>11)</sup>.

The ancient testimonia, therefore, demonstrate that *ἐνάργεια* and its Latin equivalents denote that stylistic quality of

7) Quint. *Inst. Or.* 6.2.32: *ἐνάργεια*, quae a Cicerone inlustratio et euidentia nominatur.

8) See further *De Or.* 3.53.202, *De Inv.* 1.54.104, 1.55.107, 2.26.78, *Or.* 40.139, *Top.* 26.97.

9) Cic. *De Or.* 3.53.202.

10) *Inst. Or.* 8.3.61 ff.

11) The later Latin rhetors follow the traditional teaching about *ἐνάργεια*; cf. Julius Rufinianus, *Schem. Dian.* 15 (Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.*, p. 62): *ἐνάργεια* est figura, qua formam rerum et imaginem ita oratione substituimus, ut lectoris oculis praesentiaequae subiciamus.

descriptive representation which makes a vivid appeal to the senses, in particular to sight; a number add the consideration that it will be produced by detailed description of the attendant circumstances of an action.

Now although this definition has been extracted from treatises on rhetoric, its relevance is not confined to that field. For example, *ἐνάργεια* is also important in Hellenistic historiography; thus Polybius expresses his desire that his readers profit by certain examples of tactical skill and courage in his *Histories τῶν μὲν ἀναμιμνησκόμενοι, τὰ δ' ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν λαμβάνοντες* (9.9.10)<sup>12</sup>). But this paper is concerned with the importance of *ἐνάργεια* for criticism of poetry.

*Ἐνάργεια* was considered particularly exemplified in poetry, even by the rhetoricians. When Quintilian illustrates his comments on it, he draws his examples, as he often does when illustrating a point, from the poets, especially Virgil. We have already seen him quoting from that poet in connection with the *ἐνάργεια* that comes from describing *accidentia*. In his section on *φαντασίαι (visiones)* 'from which *ἐνάργεια* will follow' (*Inst. Or.* 6.2.32 ff.) he quotes extensively from the *Aeneid*, and when discussing *ἐνάργεια* as one of the 'ornaments' he illustrates his comments by citing the description of the boxing fight (*Inst. Or.* 8.3.63)<sup>13</sup>). Further evidence to show the specific relevance of the term to poetry and to the literary criticism of poetry will be discussed later.

We can now proceed to an examination of the importance of our term in ancient theory about pictorial description in poetry.

We have seen, first of all, that *ἐνάργεια* is central to the theory behind *ἔκφρασις* as one of its *ἀρεταί*. For our purposes it is sufficient to note the almost formulaic definition of *ἔκφρασις* as it occurs in the Greek rhetors, for example in Theon: *ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον* (*Prog.* 11; II.118,6 Sp.), from which it is clear that

12) See F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 2 vols. Oxford 1957-1967 ad loc. (vol. II p. 132), vol. I p. 15 and his note on 12.25 h2 (vol. II p. 396); see further Plb. 2.56.8, 20.12.8, Agatharch. *G. G. M.* 1.120,45, D. H. *Pomp.* II.239,14 Us.-Rad., Plut. *De Glor. Ath.* 347 A.

13) The quotations are *Aen.* 9.476, 11.40, 11.89, 10.782; 5.426. Cicero, moreover, makes a famous comment on the vivid pictorialism of the traditionally blind Homer at *Tusc.* 5.39.114.

ἔκφρασις, by nature, entailed appealing to the sense of sight, the characteristic feature of ἐνάργεια<sup>14</sup>). Now the rhetors considered ἔκφρασις to be a device taken from the poets and historians: in the *Ars Rhetorica*, which is falsely ascribed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus and probably written in the first century A.D., we read:

εἰσεροῦν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἀμάρτημα (sc. αἱ καλούμεναι ἐκφράσεις)  
ἐν ταῖς μελέταις κατὰ ζῆλον τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ τῶν ποιημάτων.

*Ars Rhet.* 10.17; II.372,9 Us.-Rad.

Moreover, the rhetors draw most of their examples of ἔκφρασις from poets or historians, particularly Homer, Herodotus and Thucydides<sup>15</sup>). 'Ἐνάργεια is therefore integral to a device which is said to be inspired by historiography and poetry.

We may now consider the importance of ἐνάργεια to the Latin equivalent of ἔκφρασις, *descriptio*. The first extant definition of the term is found in the treatise *ad Herennium*, which places *descriptio* among the figures of diction; there it denotes the vivid exposition of the consequences of an action which will arouse indignation or pity<sup>16</sup>). The importance of visual appeal is quite plain and the connection of *descriptio* with ἐνάργεια is equally so. Quintilian, for instance, in his discussion of ἐνάργεια at *Inst. Or.* 8.3.61 ff. (see above, p. 299) adduces as an example a 'descriptio conuiuii luxuriosi' in Cicero<sup>17</sup>), and, after quoting the passage,

14) For discussions of ἔκφρασις see E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 1876, p. 335 f.; P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius*, 1912 (the Introduction); G. Geissler, *Ad Descriptionum Historiam Symbola*, 1916; Downey's entry on 'Ekphrasis' in *Realenzyklopädie für Antike und Christentum*, 1959; J. Palm, 'Bemerkungen zur Ekphrasis in der griechischen Literatur', in *Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Uppsala* (1965-1966), pp. 109-211.

15) For example, Theon *Prog.* 11; II.118,9 Sp. quotes from Homer's description of Eurybates (*Od.* 19.246), Thersites (*Il.* 2.217 ff.) and the preparation of Achilles' arms (*Il.* 18.468-613); he cites, *inter alia*, Herodotus' description of the ibis (2.76), the hippopotamus (2.71) and the crocodile (2.68 f.), Thucydides' description of the siege of Plataea (2.75-78) and the machine used by the Boeotians in capturing the garrison at Delium (4.100).

16) *ad Herenn.* 4.39.51: *descriptio nominatur quae rerum consequentium continet perspicuam et dilucidam cum grauitate expositionem ... hoc genere exornationis uel indignatio uel misericordia potest commoueri, cum res consequentes comprehensae uniuersae perspicua breuiter exprimuntur oratione.* Priscian *Praxeexerc.* 10.29 G.L. III.438, 21 merely translates the Greek rhetors' definition of ἔκφρασις: *descriptio est oratio colligens et praesentans oculis quod demonstrat* (quoting Virg. *Aen.* 1.315 ff.).

17) From the lost *Pro Gallio* (*Fr. Orat.* 6.1 Schoell).

remarks 'Quid plus uideret qui intrasset?' (66f.)<sup>18</sup>). Moreover, the poetic nature of the device is explicitly stated. Quintilian advises the schoolboy 'ut sit ea (sc. narrandi ratio) neque arida ... neque rursus sinuosa et arcessitis descriptionibus, in quas plerique imitatione poeticae licentiae ducuntur, lasciuia'<sup>19</sup>). The Younger Pliny remarks that it is often necessary to become 'almost poetic' in oratory: 'nam saepe in oratione quoque non historica modo sed prope poetica descriptionum necessitas incidit ...'<sup>20</sup>). The most important piece of evidence for the special relevance of *descriptio* to poetry is, of course, Horace's complaint that the poets of his day are too often tempted to 'stitch in' an untimely 'purple patch' which breaks the dramatic unity of their poems<sup>21</sup>). 'Ενάργεια is, once again, found to be central to a literary technique of importance in poetry.

There remain two terms which are synonymous with *ἐκφρασις* and *descriptio*. One is *διατύπωσις* which is defined by Aquila Romanus *De Fig. Sent. et Eloc.* 13 (Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.*, p. 26):

diatyposis, descriptio uel deformatio, ubi rebus subiectis personarum et formas ipsas et habitus describimus et exprimimus<sup>22</sup>).

If the text is right, Quintilian uses it in this sense at *Inst. Or.* 9.2 41<sup>23</sup>); it was also part of the rhetorical vocabulary of Cae-

18) Moreover, in his section on *sub oculos subiectio* beginning at 9.2.40 (quoted above), he records that vivid description of places is assigned by some to that figure: *locorum quoque dilucida et significans descriptio eidem uirtuti adsignatur a quibusdam, alii τοπογραφίαν* dicunt (9.2.44).

19) *Inst. Or.* 2.4.3. Sen. *Suas.* 3.4-5 criticizes Arellius Fuscus for imitating and expanding at unnecessary length upon a description of the moon in Virgil (*Georg.* 1.427-9, 432-3); cf. *Contr.* 2 *praef.* 1.

20) *Ep.* 7.9.8.

21) *A.P.* 14-23; C.O.Brink, *Horace on Poetry: the 'Ars Poetica'*, 1971, p. 98 notes that Horace is hinting at the technical term *descriptio* in 'describitur' (*A.P.* 18). See also Sen. *Apocol.* 2.

22) Cf. Alexander *π.σχημ.* 1.24, III.25,12 Sp.: *διατύπωσις δ' ἄρ' ἐστίν, ὅταν ἅμα προσώπων καὶ πραγμάτων παρασυναγωγήν ποιησάμενοι μὴ τοὺς λόγους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐναργήματα καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰ εἶδη διατυπώμεθα*; Anon. *τέχνη*, I.457,18 Sp.; Phoebammon *π.σχημ.* 2, III.51,18 Sp.; Tiberius *π.σχημ.* 43, III.79,16 Sp.; Zonaeus *π.σχημ.* 19, III.163,30 Sp.; Anon. *π.σχημ.* 19, III.180,5 Sp.

23) Sed haec quidem tralatio temporum, quae proprie *μετάστασις* dicitur, in diatyposi uerecundior apud priores fuit; in *diatyposi* is the reading of B and is printed in Winterbottom's text, with reservations expressed in the apparatus. Moreover, Plutarch says of Thucydides' account of the sea

cilius of Calacte<sup>24</sup>) The other term is *υποτύπωσις*, defined by Nicolaus, *Prog.* 7; III.476, 12 Sp.:

ἔστι δὲ ὑποτύπωσις κεφάλαιον εἰς ὄψιν ἄγον τὸ γεγενημένον καὶ δι' ἐκφράσεως θεατὰς τῶν ἀτόπων ἐργαζόμενον ἡμᾶς.

It is used by Quintilian at *Inst. Or.* 4.2.3, 9.2.40<sup>25</sup>) and 9.2.58. Since Quintilian includes both terms in his discussion on *sub oculos subiectio* at *Inst. Or.* 9.2.40ff. we may conclude that *ἐνάργεια* is central to them.

It is also relevant to the concept of *φαντασία* (*uisio*) which Quintilian defines in the following statement:

Quas *φαντασίας* Graeci uocant (nos sane uisiones appellemus), per quas imagines rerum absentium ita repraesentantur animo ut eas cernere oculis ac praesentes habere uideamur, has quisquis bene ceperit is erit in adfectibus potentissimus.

*Inst. Or.* 6.2.29

By accurate mental visualisation of a situation, he continues, *ἐνάργεια* will follow (6.2.32). We have already seen how he illustrates this *ἐνάργεια* with examples from Virgil; Quintilian plainly regards *φαντασία* as applicable to poetry as well as rhetoric. Now his remarks are strikingly similar to those of Ps.-Longinus *de Subl.* 15.1<sup>26</sup>):

ἤδη δ' ἐπὶ τούτων κεκράτηκε τοῦνομα ὅταν ἂ λέγεις ὑπ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ πάθους βλέπειν δοκῆς καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν τιθῆς τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

This is the way the term is used in Ps.-Longinus' 'own day' (*ἤδη ἐπὶ τούτων*); it has been taken over from earlier Stoic philosophy, as is clear from the Stoic definition Ps.-Longinus records<sup>27</sup>). He agrees with Quintilian in making sight the predominant sense appealed to in *φαντασία*, and also shares the belief that *ἐνάργεια*

battle in the harbour of Syracuse *τῇ διαθέσει καὶ τῇ διατυπώσει τῶν γιγνομένων γραφικῆς ἐναργείας ἐστίν* (*Mor.* 347C).

24) Tiberius *π.σχημ.* 43, III.79,15 Sp.: *τὴν δὲ διατύπωσιν παρήκεν Ἀψίνης, Κακίλιος δὲ ἔθηκεν ἐν τοῖς τῆς διανοίας σχήμασιν.* Caecilius was possibly born c. 50 B.C. (*R.E.* s.v. Caecilius 2, col. 1176 [1899]). For another use of the word, see Ps.-Longinus *de Subl.* 20.1.

25) Quoted above, p. 299.

26) See D. A. Russell, 'Longinus' on the Sublime, 1964 ad loc. (p. 121).

27) *de Subl.* 15.1: *καλεῖται μὲν γὰρ κοινῶς φαντασία πᾶν τὸ ὁπασούν ἐννόημα γεννητικὸν λόγον παριστάμενον*; see Russell, p. 120 who compares the definition with the Stoic account of *λογικὴ φαντασία* in Diog. Laert. 7.49.

will be a consequence of it. He differs, however, in limiting 'visual vividness' to rhetoric; in poetry, he says, the aim is 'astonishment' (ἐκπληξίς):

ὥς δ' ἕτερον τι ἢ ῥητορικὴ φαντασία βούλεται καὶ ἕτερον ἢ παρὰ ποιηταῖς οὐκ ἂν λάθοι σε, οὐδ' ὅτι τῆς μὲν ἐν ποιήσει τέλος ἐστὶν ἐκπληξίς, τῆς δ' ἐν λόγοις ἐνάργεια, ἀμφοτέροι δ' ὁμως τό τε (παθητικόν) ἐπιζητοῦσι καὶ τὸ συγκεκινημένον<sup>28</sup>).

ibid. 15.2

From this summary it may be concluded that the concept of ἐνάργεια is central to all ancient theory on pictorial vividness in literature and that it was felt to have special relevance to poetry. But there is further evidence to show firstly that the term ἐνάργεια predates ἐκφρασις, *descriptio*, φαντασία and their equivalents, and secondly that one of its earliest known applications in literary criticism was to poetry.

In order to demonstrate the possibility that ἐνάργεια predates all the 'description' terms, it must first be ascertained, as accurately as the circumstances will allow, when the terms first came into common use<sup>29</sup>).

28) It should be noted, however, that Ps.-Longinus does not follow this up in practice, for after this passage he quotes Eur. *Orest.* 255-7 and *I. T.* 291 and says ἐναυθ' ὁ ποιητῆς αὐτὸς εἶδεν Ἐρωνας· δ' δ' ἐφαντάσθη, μικροῦ δεῖν θεάσασθαι καὶ τοῦς ἀκούοντας ἠνάργιασεν (15.2), a statement which recalls the rhetors' comments on ἐνάργεια and shows that Ps.-Longinus thought ἐνάργεια as important in poetry as in rhetoric; a further modification of the distinction occurs at 15.8-11, where he concedes the usefulness of τὸ κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐκπληκτικόν (15.11) in rhetoric (see Russell on 15.2).

29) Unfortunately, the Homeric scholia do not help us in dating the first occurrences of terms like διατόπωσις, ἐκφρασις, ἐκφράζω, ἐνάργεια, ἐναργής, ἐναργῶς, ὑποτόπωσις and φαντασία. To an overwhelming extent the scholia do not take us back further than the text, commentaries and monographs of Aristarchus; the only certain exceptions to this are opinions attached to named and datable scholars, and, to the best of my knowledge, there is no use of our terms in which that happens: for examples of the use of the terms see M.-L. von Franz, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen der Ilias-scholien im Codex Ven. B und Townleianus*, Diss. Zürich 1943, pp. 19-34 and J. Baar, *Index zu den Ilias-Scholien: die wichtigeren Ausdrücke der grammatischen, rhetorischen und ästhetischen Textkritik*, *Di. Beitr. zur Altertumswiss.* xv, Baden-Baden 1961, s. vv. Von Franz quotes *Pap. Ox.* 1086, datable to the first century B.C., which, in a comment on *Il.* 2.811, seems to claim that Homer 'reveals himself as an eyewitness' (αὐτόπτηρ); this possibly means that the notion in the scholia that Homer's powers of pictorialism make him, as it were, an eyewitness (v. Σ ad *Il.* 4.470,473, 8.66, 11.167; cf. 16.406) goes back to the second century B.C., but that is all we can say.

"*Ἐκφρασις* itself seems to be a relatively late coinage and, so far as we know, Theon is the first to have given it formal definition. We do not find an example of the noun till the first century A.D. to which the *Ars Rhetorica* cited above for its criticism of *ἔκφρασεις* must be ascribed. It is true that the verb *ἔκφράζειν* occurs in Ps.-Demetrius *Eloc.* 165<sup>30</sup>) and that G.M. A. Grube argues for a date of this work at around 270 B.C. or not much later<sup>31</sup>). However, in the passage concerned, *ἔκφράζειν* ('express ornately': L. S. J.<sup>9</sup> s. v.) does not denote the specifically pictorial type of description associated with *ἔκφρασις*, and, anyway, Grube's thesis has been seriously challenged by D.M. Schenkeveld<sup>32</sup>). In the light of the fragmentary nature of our evidence it would be wrong to exclude the possibility that the term was current earlier, but Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and others would surely have used it in their treatises if it existed in their time<sup>33</sup>).

*Descriptio* is understandably not attested as a literary or rhetorical term before the first century B.C. And we have already seen that *φαντασία* in its literary meaning of 'visualisation' had come into vogue only in Ps.-Longinus' day, which appears to be at least later than the first century B.C.<sup>34</sup>).

The evidence for believing that *ἐνάργεια* was current much earlier as a literary term with specific relevance to poetry is Philodemus' *On Poetry* Book 5<sup>35</sup>). There Philodemus reports and attacks the view of a Hellenistic critic<sup>36</sup>) that *ἐνάργεια* was the prime object of poetry:

30) *ἔπειτα ἀφανίζεται (sc. τὸ γέλοιο) ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἐρμηνείας, καὶ ἀπὲρ γέλοιο θάνατος γίνεται. αἱ μέντοι χάριτες εἰσι μετὰ σωφοσύνης, τὸ δὲ ἔκφράζειν τὰ γέλοια ὁμοίον ἐστὶ καὶ καλλωπίζειν πύθηκον.*

31) G.M.A. Grube, 'The Date of Demetrius "On Style"', *Phoenix* xviii (1964), pp. 294-302; id., *The Greek and Roman Critics*, 1965, pp. 119-121 (with bibliography).

32) *Studies in Demetrius 'On Style'*, 1964, pp. 135-48. Schenkeveld ascribes the treatise to the first century A.D. - a return to the late dating of e.g. W. Rhys Roberts, *Demetrius on Style*, 1902, pp. 49-64.

33) Moreover, Cicero and the author of the treatise *ad Herennium* were most likely translating by *descriptio* not *ἔκφρασις* but *διατύπωσις*, a term attested, as we have seen (p. 303, n. 24), for the first century B.C. (so e.g. Caplan on *ad Herenn.* 4.39.50).

34) On the date and authorship of *de Subl.* see Russell, op. cit., pp. xxii-xxx.

35) C. Jensen, *Philodemos über die Gedichte fünftes Buch*, 1923. Philodemus was born c. 110 B.C. and died soon after 40 B.C. (*R.E.* s.v. Philodemus 5, col. 2445 f. [1938]).

36) Jensen originally thought col. 3.12 ff. referred to Neoptolemus of

(But when the critic says) *πρω-*  
*τον κ[αὶ ἐλάχιστον τῶ]ν εὖ*  
*προ[ν]σοομένων τὸ σ]ν-*  
*τόμ[ως καὶ ἐναργῶ], τῶ[ν*  
*δὲ [π]οιημάτων τὸ ἐναρ-*  
*γ]ῶ[ς καὶ συντόμως, τὰ] δ' ἀμ-*  
*φό[τερα] τῆ[ς τέ]χνης εἶ-*  
*ναι καὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ζη-*  
*τη[τέον ἐστίν], τ[ί] προ[ῶ]τον*  
*καὶ [τί ἐλά]χ[ι]στον βούλε-*  
*ται ση[μαίνει]ν· εἰ μὲν*  
*γὰρ τ[ὸ π]ρωτον ἴ[δι]ον τῶ[ν*  
*προ[νό]ουμέ[ν]ων, [ψ]υ[χ]ρό[ν] ἐσ-*  
*τι τὸ [π]ρο[νοη]σάμενον*  
*ἄλλ[λων] πολλ[ῶ]ν τοῦτο*  
*πρό[τε]ρον λέ[γ]ειν· καὶ*  
*θαν[μάξ]ω δ[ιὰ τίν]' αἰ-*  
*τίαν [ἐλά]χιστο[ν] εἶπε τ[ὴν]*  
*συν[τομ]ίαν κ[αὶ] τῆν ἐνά[ρ]-*  
*γε[ι]αν [πρω]τον ...*

col. 3.12-31

Whatever the authorship of this view, it is beyond doubt that a Zeno, reasonably identified by Jensen as Zeno of Sidon, Philodemus' teacher<sup>37</sup>), mentioned, presumably in a textbook<sup>38</sup>), a similar view about *ἐνάργεια*: a passage which occurs in Philodemus' section on *αἱ παρὰ Ζήνωνι δόξαι* (coll. 26-36), apparently a collection of the precepts of certain Hellenistic critics, reads as follows:

*καὶ μόνον ἐναργῶς καὶ*  
*ἐμφοτικῶς σημαίνει[ν]*  
*ἀ[ξ]ιωτ[ί] [sc. ἡ δόξα] καὶ συντόμως, κα-*  
*θάπερ οὐ δυναμένον φαύ-*  
*λ[ως] ἔχειν προσόντων*

Parium (op. cit., p. 114f.); later he considered coll. 1-8 dealt with the teachings of Heraclides of Pontus (*R.M.* lxxxiii [1934], p. 196 and 'Herakleides von Pontos bei Philodemos und Horaz', *S.B.P.A.* [1936], pp. 292-320); both of these conjectures are doubtful; see C.O.Brink, *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, 1963, p. 50.

37) Jensen, op. cit., p. 95; cf. Brink, *Prolegomena*, p. 51. Zeno cannot have been born much later than c. 150 B.C. (*R.E.* s.v. Zenon 5, col. 122 [1972]).

38) Brink, *Prolegomena*, p. 50f.

τούτων, δέον καὶ σαφῶς  
καὶ εὐπρεπῶς καὶ τοῖς ἄλ-  
λοις ἅπασιν ἐπιτεύγμασι  
κεχρημένως εἰπεῖν.

col. 27.17-25

'*Ἐνάργεια* can therefore safely be said to have been current as a technical term in the criticism of poetry in the second century B.C. just as its use in historiography is attested for that century in Polybius and Agatharchides as we have seen<sup>39</sup>); it thus seems to predate all the other literary terms for 'visual description'; moreover, it is clear that in its early history it was felt to be specifically relevant to poetry, as well as being central to all later literary and rhetorical theory on the subject.

Can we establish the provenance of the term as used by Hellenistic literary critics like those whom Philodemus quotes?

The adjective *ἐναργής* is, of course, very common in the poets from Homer to the end of the classical period. There it means 'visible, palpable in bodily shape especially of the gods appearing in their own forms' (L. S. J.<sup>9</sup>s. v. 1), 'manifest to the mind's eye' (ibid. s. v. 2), and, of words etc., 'clear, distinct' (ibid. s. v. 3). The noun is first attested in fourth-century prose, and, in that century, gains increasing importance in philosophical texts. It occurs only once in Plato: in the *Politicus* the Stranger refers to the *ἐνάργεια* that comes from pigments and the blending of colours in a painting (277c). Here the word denotes visual clarity. The adjective occurs, for instance, in the *Phaedo*, where it refers to the immediacy and trustworthiness attributed in orthodox thinking to senses like sight (83c). Aristotle appears not to have used the noun at all<sup>40</sup>), but he uses the adjective in

39) Above, p. 300 and n. 12.

40) The reading *ἐνάργεια* at *Rb.* 1410<sup>b</sup>36, 1411<sup>b</sup>28, 29 etc. is that of the oldest MS, A (Par. 1741), but is indefensible. Aristotle heads the section in question with the words *λέγω δὴ πρὸ ὀμμάτων ταῦτα ποιεῖν ὅσα ἐνεργούοντα σημαίνει* (1411<sup>b</sup>24) and, after drawing examples from Homer, he remarks *ἐν πάσι γὰρ τοῦτοις διὰ τὸ ἐμψυχα εἶναι ἐνεργούοντα φαίνεται* (1412<sup>a</sup>3). He is talking about *ἐνέργεια*, the representation of things in a state of actuality; it bears its proper philosophical sense and is in opposition to *δύναμις*, potential latent existence or capacity for action; it includes personification and describing events *πραττόμενα* (1410<sup>b</sup>34; cf. 1386<sup>a</sup>29ff.). *ἐνάργεια* is the reading in the modern texts, e.g. those of Bekker, Spengel, Cope-Sandys, Römer, Ross and Dufour-Wartelle. Consequently, the view that Theophrastus inherited a use of *ἐνάργεια* from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, held, for example, by A. Mayer, *Theophrasti περὶ λέξεως Libri Fragmenta*, 1910,

the passage where he emphasizes the need for the working out of a dramatic plot with strict attention to the visual consequences of scenes and staging (*Po.* 1455<sup>a</sup>22-9)<sup>41</sup>). He also uses it to describe senses and sensibilia, and in this connection we shall not be surprised to find it once again closely linked with sight. Aristotle calls the latter the 'clearest' of all the senses (*Pr.* 7.5. 886<sup>b</sup>35)<sup>42</sup>). For Aristotle, therefore, *ἐναργής* is primarily associated with vision, though he does apply it to certain things which affect the senses, heat and cold (*Part. An.* 2.2.648<sup>a</sup>35)<sup>43</sup>).

So far we have not seen the word used as a real philosophical technical term. But, according to Sextus Empiricus<sup>44</sup>), Theophrastus used it as such; Sextus tells us that Theophrastus considered τὸ ἐναργές common to the twofold criterion of truth, sense of things sensible (αἰσθητά) and intellectual perception of things intelligible (νοητά). Theophrastus will presumably have included sight in τὸ ἐναργές, but its application seems to have been very broad, especially if it can refer to νόησις τῶν νοητῶν.

Most important, however, is the appearance of ἐνάργεια and ἐναργής in the writings of Epicurus. There, as in Theophrastus, ἐνάργεια is raised to the status of a specific technical term. It is used in Epicurus' canonic to denote 'the clear view'<sup>45</sup>), which is a product of immediate empirical apprehension<sup>46</sup>) and which

pp. xvff., 16f. (cf. J. Stroux, *De Theophrasti Virtutibus Dicendi*, 1912, p. 33f.), is also baseless. Mayer's reasons for ascribing the term to Theophrastus, for example that the passages containing discussions of ἐνάργεια by Ps.-Demetrius (*Eloc.* 191-220), Dionysius (*Lys.* 4-7) and Cicero (*Part. Or.* 6.19-20) have a common source which must be Theophrastus (op. cit., pp. 166f., 170f.), are equally unconvincing. Neither Aristotle nor Theophrastus, therefore, appears to have known ἐνάργεια as a technical term in rhetoric, and the same seems to be true of the other schools of rhetoric in the fourth century (for Isocrates, see Kroll, *R. E. Suppl.* VII s.v. Rhetorik col. 1111 [1940]).

41) The adjective is also used in a literary context at *Po.* 1462<sup>a</sup>17f.: εἶτα καὶ τὸ ἐναργές ἔχει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων. Yet even here Aristotle is not talking of literary pictorialism, but of the fact that 'even when read tragedy is more vivid than epic, because all the characters speak in the first person and narrative is virtually eliminated' (D.W. Lucas, *Aristotle: Poetics*, 1968 ad loc. [p. 255]).

42) The word is also used to denote vivid colours in painting at *Sens.* 440<sup>a</sup>10.

43) In the Ps.-Aristotelian *Mir. Ausc.* 839<sup>a</sup>2 it refers to the sense of hearing.

44) *M.* 7.218.

45) A. A. Long, 'Aisthesis, Prolepsis and Linguistic Theory in Epicurus', *B. I. C. S.* xviii (1971) pp. 114-33, especially p. 117f.

46) *Ep.* 1.82.3-7.

is the indispensable condition for those sense impressions (*φαντασίαι*) which alone can be trusted as evidence for the external properties of objects<sup>47</sup>); all true opinion must be based upon it<sup>48</sup>). Notably, it is in his section on sight (*Ép.* 1.46–52.4) that the concept of *ἐνάργεια* in perception is discussed most fully<sup>49</sup>). In Epicurus, therefore, the links of *ἐνάργεια* with sight are quite explicit.

Finally, we may note the use of the word by the Stoics. The first extant occurrence of it is in Antipater of Tarsus<sup>50</sup>); in the fragment concerned he is probably attacking the Epicurean position on the beneficence of the gods<sup>51</sup>), and talks about ‘the *ἐνάργεια* which we have of the gods’. The word was probably adopted from the Epicureans<sup>52</sup>) and later gains importance in Stoicism; *ἐναργές*, for example, is used by Posidonius<sup>53</sup>). The word therefore seems to have come into the Stoa some time in the second century B.C.

Having surveyed the development of the term down to the second century B.C., I wish to suggest that Hellenistic literary critics borrowed it from contemporary philosophy and that its use by the Epicureans, with its emphasis on sight, made it particularly attractive to them. There is nothing inherently implausible about thinking that literary critics could have borrowed a technical term from philosophy: firstly, this is, as we have seen, precisely what happened in the case of *φαντασία*; and secondly, it would have been perfectly natural for literary criticism to turn to philosophy for terms to describe aspects of literature concerned with sensory perception, which is again evidenced by the history of *φαντασία*. There are, moreover, a number of considerations which make the hypothesis a possibility. Firstly, the Hellenistic literary term shares with Epicurean

47) *Ép.* 1.50.8–52.3; see Long, art. cit., p. 117.

48) *Vit.* 33.12f.; *Ép.* 1.82.3–7; *Sent.* 22 (4.146.5–7).

49) Moreover, ancient writers after Epicurus, when trying to explain his methods of distinguishing between clear and unclear impressions, resort to examples from the sphere of vision: e.g. Sextus Empiricus, *M.* 7.212, quoted by Long, loc. cit.

50) *De Stoicorum Repugnantiis* 38; see the chapter of F.H.Sandbach, ‘Ennoia and Prolepsis in the Stoic Theory of Knowledge’, in A.A.Long (ed.), *Problems in Stoicism*, 1971, p. 32. Antipater’s death (by suicide) is dated to before 137 B.C. by H.Dörrie in *Der kleine Pauly*, vol. 1, s.v. Antipatros 9 col. 395 (1964).

51) So Sandbach, loc. cit.

52) Sandbach, loc. cit.

53) ap. Galen. *De Plac.* p. 400, Müller; cf. Plut. *Comm. Not.* 1083C.

*ἐνάργεια* special relevance to the sense of sight: it may thus have been felt particularly appropriate for denoting pictorial vividness in literature. Secondly, Epicurus uses the term in his linguistic speculations, according to which the primary meaning of a word is the 'clear' one<sup>54</sup>): the Hellenistic critics may easily have thought that a word used in linguistics might also be appropriate in literary theory<sup>55</sup>). Thirdly, the Epicureans are well known for their proselytizing activity, and scholars and philosophers borrowed one another's technical terms, *ἐνάργεια* being in fact a proven case in point<sup>56</sup>); this intellectual interchange provides suitable background to the kind of borrowing that I am suggesting. Fourthly, Hellenistic historians seem to use *ἐνάργεια* in its strict philosophical sense; for instance, Polybius talks of the value of ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἐνάργειαν πίστις, making specific reference to autopsy (20.12.8). Finally, it may be significant that Zeno of Sidon and Philodemus, who both addressed themselves to the question of the importance of *ἐνάργεια* in poetry, were both prominent Epicureans<sup>57</sup>).

---

54) *Vit.* 33.6; cf. C. Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus*, 1928, pp. 268 ff.

55) Similarly, critics like Ps.-Longinus borrowed the term *φαντασία* from Stoic epistemology.

56) See Sandbach, loc. cit.

57) There remains the view that the notion of *ἐνάργεια* was developed first by scholars who wanted to praise the pictorial vividness of Homer, for instance that of his similes: see e.g. W. Kroll, *R. E.* Suppl. vii s. v. Rhetorik col. 1111 (1940) (with lit.) and D. A. Russell, 'Longinus': *On the Sublime*, Oxford 1964, p. 121. Certainly the scholia often refer to Homer's *ἐνάργεια* and the similes are singled out for special praise in this regard (see the lists of examples in G. Lehnert, *De scholiis ad Homerum rhetoricis*, Leipzig 1906, p. 110 and von Franz, op. cit., pp. 19-34, especially p. 33 n. 35 for relevant scholia on the similes which include Σ ad *Il.* 5.140, 11.414, 12.279, 13.475, 23.692), but for the reasons indicated above (n. 29), the hypothesis is unprovable: as far as I have been able to ascertain, these scholia are in no case attached to a named and datable scholar, so that they could all be quite late. Finally, it is misleading of R. R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Literary Criticism on Vergil*, Ann Arbor 1974, p. 124 n. 2 to infer from von Franz that terms like *φαντασία* and *ἐνάργεια* are Stoic in origin: von Franz, op. cit., p. 20 argues for Stoic influence only in the case of *φαντασία*, with which I agree (see above, p. 303), and leaves the question of the origin of *ἐνάργεια* open; nor is Schlunk's reference to P. de Lacy, 'Stoic Views of Poetry', *A. J. P.* lxix (1948), 241-71 of any value here, for de Lacy's article does not mention either *φαντασία* or *ἐνάργεια*.

*Addendum*

Plutarch's view of poetic *ἐνάργεια* also deserves consideration for he makes an important step in the theory connected with it. He takes up Simonides' famous dictum that painting is silent poetry and poetry is talking painting (*Mor.* 346 F; cf. 17 F, 58 B) and argues that the link between the arts is pictorial vividness. He describes poetry as 'an imitative art and faculty analogous to painting' (*Mor.* 17 F–18 A): the arts are analogous because they both in their different materials and means aim at the vivid and accurate depiction of the subject as it is in reality (e.g. *Mor.* 18 A: ἡ δὲ μίμησις, ἅν τε περὶ φαῦλον ἅν τε περὶ χρηστὸν ἐφίκηται τῆς ὁμοιότητος, ἐπαινεῖται) in order to produce the desired emotional effects (*Mor.* 18 A, 347 A). This will often entail the use of pictorialism: at *Mor.* 347 A–C Plutarch argues that Thucydides aims to make his reader a spectator and talks of the γραφικὴ ἐνάργεια which characterizes his descriptions (see above, n. 23); a second aim, concomitant with pictorial vividness, is the production in the reader's mind of the emotions felt by the original witnesses. Plutarch therefore makes explicit the analogy between fine art and literature which was implied in all earlier discussion of *ἐνάργεια*. (Of course, Horace's phrase 'ut pictura poesis' at *A.P.* 361 does not infer anything about pictorialism in poetry: see C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: the 'Ars Poetica'*, Cambridge 1971, pp. 368–71). For a history of the analogy and of pictorialism in later poetry, see J. H. Hagstrum, *The Sister Arts: the Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray*, Chicago 1958, though the present article may serve as a corrective of certain of the work's misapprehensions over the details of the history and theory of *ἐνάργεια* in antiquity.

Christchurch, N. Z.

G. Zanker