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Veiling, αἰδός, and a red-figure amphora by Phintias*

At p. 319 n. 203 of my recent book, I discuss the appearance of the letters ΑΙΔΟΣ ... designating the figure of Artemis on an Attic red-figure amphora (depicting the rape of Leto by Tityos) by Phintias (Louvre G42; ARV² 23, 1 [Paralipomena 323, Astdenda] 154; see now also LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollon 1069, vi, Leto 34; PLATE I ...). That this constitutes an association between the goddess and aidōs is the position of Kretschmer [Die griechischen Vaseninschriften (Göttingen 1894) 17]; Norwood [Essays on Euripidean drama (Berkeley 1954) 76 n. 2], and Scheffold [Göttler und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst (Munich 1978) 68]. Certainly analogous titles/epithets exist—the cult of Artemis Eukleia is discussed by Braund [JHS c (1980) 184-5], and Scheffold [nt. 3] 330 n. 152 points to a possible description of Artemis as Αρετή on a black-figure neck amphora by the Antinemes Painter (Basel iii, 3; the figure so designated, however, is not certainly Artemis). But the view of von Erffa [ΑΙΔΟΣ und verwandte Begriffe. Philologus Suppl. xxx. 2 (Leipzig 1937) 58] and F. Eckstein (in LIMC i.1, 352-3) that the letters are an abbreviation of the genitive Artemidos is not to be dismissed, notwithstanding Kretschmer’s assurance [Vaseninschriften 197] that ΑΙΔΟΣ not ΑΡΤΕΙΔΟΣ is the correct reading (note that the vase also names Leto in the gen.). An association of Artemis and aidōs makes sense, and a cult would not be impossible, but we should be wary of assuming either from such doubtful evidence.

* For assistance in the preparation of this note, I am indebted to: W.G. Arnott; H. Bemardoff; D.H. Berry; F. Cairns; C.J. Classen; G. Davies; R. Hannah; Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung; Seminar für klassische Philologie und Institut für Archäologie (Göttingen); Department of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Antiquities, Musée du Louvre; A.H. Sommerstein; and two referees, one anonymous and one (C. Sourvinou-Inwood) not.

Aidos (Oxford 1993).

2 Cf. E. Gerhard, Auserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin 1948-50) i 81; J. Overbeck, Griechische Kunstmythologie (Leipzig 1871-89) iii 387.


4 On (Art.) Eukleia, see now LIMC ii i, 677 (L. Kahil); H.A. Shapiro, Personifications in Greek art (Zurich 1993) 70-8.


6 Scheffold (n. 3) 337 n. 353 also identifies as Arete the figure crowning Heracles on two vases described by J.D. Beerg [AK iv (1961) 56 no. 7; 57 no. 6].

7 F. Hauser, in A. Furtwängler and K. Reichhold, Griechische Vasenmalerei (Munich 1904-02) ii 273 n. 1, rejects the ‘abbreviation’ view, but interprets the letters as a slip for ‘Ἀρήμπτως: cf. H.R. Immerwahr, Attic script (Oxford 1990) 67. The hypothesis of M. Vickers and D. Gill, Arthur’s Crafts (Oxford 1994)—that Attic painted pottery (including its inscriptions) imitates gold- and silverware—might explain how a slip was made (see esp. 164) but cannot prove that a slip was made.

The note does its job, after a fashion; but, in common with the works it cites (and most other discussions of the scene) it overlooks the most obviously relevant detail in the image—that Leto is depicted as veiling (i.e. drawing her himation over) her head. This is a feature which this representation of the actual moment of the rape shares with several versions of its aftermath: as Greifenhagen has shown, the single female figure to whom Tityos clings, with whom he flees, or away from whom he falls when attacked by Apollo and/or Artemis must be Leto rather than Ge; the once prevalent identification of the goddess with Ge rests on an illegitimate comparison with Anta触及 alleged need to maintain contact with his mother, on a naive belief that a

8 The complete list of inscriptions is: (A) ΧΑΙΡΕ ΚΑΙΡΕ (both horizontal, to left of Apollo) ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝ (vertical, to right of ΑΡ) ΛΕΤΟΥΣ (vert., to right of L) ΧΑΙΡΕ, horiz., above Art.’s raised right hand) ΑΙΔΟΣ (vert., to right of Art.) (B) ΣΟΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ (horiz., above the two central figures) ΚΑΛΟΣ (horiz., to top scene) ΣΟΣΤΙΝΟΣ (vert., to right of figure on far left) ΧΑΡΕΣ (vert., to right of discus-thrower) ΧΑΙΡΕ (vert., between acontist’s legs) ΔΕΣΜΟΣΤΑΤΕ (vert., to right of acontist) ΣΟΣΤΙΑΣ (vert., to right of spectator on far right); see Immerwahr (n. 7) 66-7. Sotinos and Sostatos are the two older spectators; κορόδος goes with Sostratos and Demostratos is the recipient of the greeting; but it is unclear whether the discus-thrower is Sostratos or Chares, the acontist Chares or Demostratos; and neither χαίρε nor κορόδος inscriptions need refer to individuals depicted on the vase. On A, the three χαίρε inscriptions are most probably extra-iconic; given their position, it is unlikely that they and the other inscriptions are to be construed as one complete sentence (‘Hail Apollo, son of Leto, hail Aidos!’).

9 But not all: see Roscher, ML v 1043 (O. Waser).

10 Certainly London E 278 (ARV² 226, 2; LIMC ii pl. 133, Leto 36 = Apollon 1070 = Ge 43); Munich 2689 (ARV³ 879, 2; LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollon 1071 = Ge 45 = Leto 45); Louvre G375 (ARV² 1032, 54; Leto designated MWXo)oa); a rf krater from the Loeb Collection (Munich, Loeb 472; J. Sieveking, Bronzen, Terrakotten, Vase der Sammlung Loeb [Munich 1930] 61 and pl. 48, Kharouz 86 = Leto 38 = Artemis 1368); perhaps also Berlin 1835 (ABV 286, 10: A. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium [Berlin 1885] 331-2); and possibly those canavassed in nn. 15-16 below). On an Argive-Corinthian shield-band relief of c. 540 in Basal (LIMC ii pl. 133, Leto 40) Leto draws her veil just as on the vases.


12 The interpretation which see Ge as practically a fixture in scenes of the pursuit/killing of Tityos goes back to Overbeck (n. 2) iii 383-90, and is well represented by the entries s.v. ‘Tityos’ in Roscher and RE (e.g. K. Scherling in RE vi A 1099: ‘Wenn eine Frau neben T. oder zwischen ihm und Apollon steht, so ist es seine Mutter Ge’); despite rebuttal by Greifenhagen and Henle, it has some more recent adherents (e.g. G. Neumann, Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst [Berlin 1965] 178 n. 127, 189 n. 280). See most recently M. Moore in LIMC iv,1, 175-6, L. Kahil, ibid. vi,1, 260.

13 Greifenhagen (n. 3) 22, against (e.g.) Waser in Roscher, ML v 1047, Scherling in RE vi A 1599: ‘Wenn eine Frau neben T. oder zwischen ihm und Apollon steht, so ist es seine Mutter Ge’; despite rebuttal by Greifenhagen and Henle, it has some more recent adherents (e.g. G. Neumann, Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst [Berlin 1965] 178 n. 127, 189 n. 280). See most recently M. Moore in LIMC iv,1, 175-6, L. Kahil, ibid. vi,1, 260.
figure who appears either to run away from Apollo or to stand between Apollo and his victim cannot be Apollo’s own mother,14 and on an assumption that the appearance of Ge (guaranteed by an inscription) on one particular rendering of the episode makes her presence a canonical element of the scene.15 But in any depiction of the killing of Tityos featuring Apollo (or Apollo and Artemis), their victim, and a female figure, the economy of the scene demands that that figure be Leto. The goddess featured in such scenes does not always veil, but does so often enough to make the veiling an aid to identification;16 for the veiling of the head is a typical response of the recipient of unwanted erotic attentions.18

Veiling of the head in such circumstances clearly represents the victim’s atd6v; covering one’s head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between atd6v; the eyes, exposure and visibility.19 Numerous passages make the connexion between atd6v; and veiling explicit: in Euripides’ Hippolytus, for example, the removal of Phaedra’s headdress at 201-2, symbolizing the casting off of restraint which is apparent in her subsequent sublimated ravings, is answered by her desire to have her head covered again at 243, a desire which she explains with reference both to her atd6v; at what she has said and to her wish to conceal her tears and the atd6vgvn in her eyes (244-6).20 This association between atd6v; and the veil is also apparent in passages where the former is not mentioned: Penelope’s repeated gesture.21 for example, of drawing her τριθέμενον across her face before entering the company of the suitors clearly belongs, as a precaution dictated by a woman’s proper modesty, with her scrupulous care in ensuring that she is always flanked by two attendants.22

That an artistic representation of a woman veiling can be construed as a representation of atd6v; is apparent from a passage in Pausanias’ account of Laconia (iii 20.10-11):

They say that the δραχμα of Aidos, around thirty stades from the city, is a dedication of Leto, and that it was created on the following account: when Icarius gave Penelope as wife to Odysseus, he tried to make Odysseus, too, settle in Lacedaemon, but when he failed in that, he then beggèd his daughter to stay behind, and as she set off for Ithaca he followed the chariot and kept pleading with her. For a while, Odysseus put up with this, but finally he told Penelope either to follow him willingly or choose her father and return to Lacedaemon. She, they say, made no reply, but veiled her head [ἀγαλματισμένης] in response to the question; Icarius, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the δραχμα to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself [ὑπακολουθήσατο].

It is clear from the story that Pausanias relates that the δραχμα portrayed a veiled woman (probably Penelope

14 On one vase (New York 08.258.21, ARV4 1086, 1: LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollon 1072 = Leto 37) the figure depicted between Leto’s children and Tityos in the pose supposedly typical of Ge is named as Leto.

15 The presence of Ge in a version of the pursuit of Tityos is guaranteed by the inscription ΓΕ on a Tyrrhenian amphora in the Louvre (E 864, ARV 97, 33; LIMC ii pl. 274, Apollon 1066 = Ge 10); cf. Moore (n. 12) 175; n.b. Ge does not veil here.

16 Two other vases (Tarquinia RC 1043 [ARV 502, 11; Sourvinou-Inwood pl. 6]; Madrid Leningrad 11038 [ARV 586, 46; K.J. Dover, Greek homosexuality [London 1978] R750]; London E 64 (ARV4 455, 9); Paris, Petit Palais 316 (ARV 594, 58).

17 Contrast Henle (n. 11) 37. The significance of Leto’s veil is reflected in the detail given by Apollonius (i 759-62) and the presence of Ge (guaranteed by an inscription) on one particular rendering of the episode makes her presence a canonical element of the scene. But in any depiction of the killing of Tityos featuring Apollo (or Apollo and Artemis), their victim, and a female figure, the economy of the scene demands that that figure be Leto. The goddess featured in such scenes does not always veil, but does so often enough to make the veiling an aid to identification; for the veiling of the head is a typical response of the recipient of unwanted erotic attentions.

18 See, e.g. Leningrad 709 (ARV4 487, 61; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, Reading Greek culture [Oxford 1999] pls 9-10); Leningrad 777 (ARV4 502, 11; Sourvinou-Inwood pl. 6); Madrid Leningrad 11038 (ARV 586, 46; K.J. Dover, Greek homosexuality [London 1978] R750); London E 64 (ARV4 455, 9); Paris, Petit Palais 316 (ARV 594, 58).
herself, rather than a personified Aidos);23 the link between a woman’s atòδος and her veiling, therefore, was so close that an artistic representation of the gesture could be construed as a representation of the quality itself.24 Even more interesting, however, is the obvious fact that Pausanias’ story is an aition of the veiling of the bride in the context of her wedding;25 this, I think, makes it certain that we are not to think of the veiling of the bride as something distinct from veiling as a manifestation of atòδος. On vases, the veiling which signifies atòδος is not to be sharply distinguished from that which signifies ‘marriage’, for the latter is merely a ritualized form of a gesture which in everyday life might accompany a spontaneous emotional reaction or constitute a conventional way of displaying one’s feminine virtue.26

Since there is very little indeed on veiling in the standard works on ancient gestures,27 it is worth pausing to consider in what circumstances the covering of the head does and does not betoken atòδος. We have seen that the actual drawing of the veil, in the case of Penelope, of Leto, and of other victims of rape, can be a clear sign of atòδος; veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies atòδος.28 The same gesture is found also in scenes in which the wife bids farewell to the departing warrior, where, far from being merely a gesture of ‘greeting’,29 the tugging at the veil reminds us of the woman’s marital status, indicates that her thoughts focus on her relationship with her husband, and promises fidelity in his absence. It is no coincidence that the drawing of the mantle before the face is the gesture most often chosen to represent the personified Pudicitia on imperial Roman coins,30 nor is it fortuitous that Pudicitia seems to have been particularly associated with the univira.31 The gesture in this latter case clearly conveys the same message as it does in the case of Penelope in the Odyssey. But the veil need not actually be drawn to indicate atòδος; in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to

23 Cf. F. Eckstein, LIMC i.1, 352; also R. Schulz, AlläΩΣ (Diss. Rostock 1910) 98-9; von Erffa, AlläΩΣ 57.

24 Cf. the remark of Pliny (xxxv 63) that in his portrait of Penelope ZeuXis pinnax aeores videatur (cited by T.H. Carpenter, Art and myth in ancient Greece [London 1991] 235); Carpenter is not quite sure that this, I think, makes it certain that we are not to think of the veiling of the bride as something distinct from veiling as a manifestation of atòδος. On vases, the veiling which signifies atòδος is not to be sharply distinguished from that which signifies 'marriage', for the latter is merely a ritualized form of a gesture which in everyday life might accompany a spontaneous emotional reaction or constitute a conventional way of displaying one's feminine virtue.

25 This gesture in this latter case clearly conveys the same message as it does in the case of Penelope in the Odyssey. But the veil need not actually be drawn to indicate atòδος; in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to
cover the face; equally, the heavily draped women and boys on vases indicate, by the mere fact of their covering themselves, their observance of the demands of αὐδος/σεφαιροσφήνη. If there is a distinction to be drawn between the act of drawing the veil and the practice of covering the head, it is presumably not one between αὐδος and not-αὐδος, but between representations of occurrent and dispositional αὐδος, πατος and ἐφις.

Other representations of veiled figures may seem further removed from αὐδος; Neumann, for example, considers that the veiled Penelope mentioned above (n. 24) portrays ‘anxiety’ (banges Harran), and distinguishes this pose from others in which the veiled figure manifests grief, sorrow, resentment, or dejection. But above all, Penelope is a heroine of conjugal αὐδος; her attitude in the scene under discussion is certainly one of sad dejection, but the veiled head will also convey a message about her status as a married woman, her resistance to erotic attentions, and her loyalty. Equally, anger and resentment clearly have a part to play in the motivation of Achilles (lamenting the loss of Briseis, rejecting the arguments of the ambassadors) and Ajax (at the judgement of the arms) as represented by vase-painters, but their veiling must also have something to do with their sense of humiliation and exposure to the ridicule of others. Perhaps the attitude in which veiling seems furthest removed from αὐδος is that of grief; clearly, grief and αὐδος have much in common—both are emotions in which one retreats into oneself and cuts oneself off from others, and both involve the sinking feeling of dejectedness which the Greeks called κστήματα. This is as much as to suggest that veiling need not carry connotations of αὐδος as such, but may be a symptom of something that αὐδος shares with other emotions; yet in two ways, I think, the veiling which accompanies grief may have more to do with αὐδος than that. First, where the veiled and grieving figure is a woman, veiling may suggest αὐδος qua (wifely, motherly, daughterly, sisterly, etc.) loyalty to the deceased, or, where the veiled figure is the deceased herself, the αὐδος which characterized the woman in life. More importantly, however, veiling as an accompaniment to any emotion may indicate a way of concealing emotion of grief with it. Thus, in the Homeric hymn to Demeter it is clear that Demeter veils her head and lowers her eyes as part of her grief at the loss of her daughter (40-2, 183, 194, 197), yet this is precisely the behaviour from which Metaneira construes αὐδος at 213-15, and passages in Homer and Euripides offer unequivocal examples of the αὐδος which conceals or keeps private grief and other emotions. Thus on works of art depicting veiled and grieving women, the veiling may be at once a manifestation of grief, a sign of a restrained and modest response to which ct56x is still relevant, and (b) this unveiling should be assimilated to the modest drawing of the himation across the face (see n. 22 above). (On the ἁνακαλαλαντητητα, see J.H. Oakley, AA (1982) 113-18; R.F. Sutton in id. [ed.], Daidalikon: studies ... Schoder [Wauconda, Ill. 1989] 357-9; Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 25-6, 30; Rehm (n. 28) 141-2.)

32 If vases typically show the procession, with bride and groom in chariot, and the bride normally drawn as a mantle; on rf vases the bride is most often led, veiled but not veiling, χειρα’ ἐν χαρπην; see Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 26-34 (with ill.). Cf. veiling/χειρα’ ἐν χαρπην motifs in the ‘marriage of death’ on Berlin 1802 (ARV 363, 37); Athens NM 1926 (ARV 846, 193); also the grave relief of Myrrhinhe (Athens NM 4485; Fries Johansen (n. 22) 82). Equally, some representations of Roman Pudicitia depict a veiled rather than a veiling woman; S.W. Stevenson, A dictionary of Roman coins (London 1964) 668. Some (quasi) wedding scenes are better understood as depicting unveiling rather than veiling (e.g. the Selinus metope showing Zeus and Hera: O. Benndorf, Die Metopen von Selinunt [Berlin 1873] 54-6 and pl. 8; cf. Hera and Zeus on the Parthenon frieze [K. Schefold, Die Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst (Munich 1981) pl. 302], where Hera clearly is revealing her attractions to Zeus in what I.S. Mark (Hesperia liii (1984) 303-4) regards as an allusion to the ἀνακαλαλαντητητα; but (a) unveiling implies previous veiling, to which αὐδος is still relevant, and (b) this unveiling should not be assimilated to the modest drawing of the himation across the face (see n. 22 above). (On the ἁνακαλαλαντητητα, see J.H. Oakley, AA (1982) 113-18; R.F. Sutton in id. [ed.], Daidalikon: studies ... Schoder [Wauconda, Ill. 1989] 357-9; Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 25-6, 30; Rehm (n. 28) 141-2.)

33 On Mantelknaben and (ὁ4xπξτερταλ, see Sittl (n. 27) 7-8 (to his refs add Aeschin. i 26 [Athens], Xen. Loc. Pol. 3. 4 [Sparta]). Illustrations in Dover (n. 18) R637, 791, 851, (boys), 867 (woman); M.F. Kilmer, Greek Erotica (London 1993) R196, 322, 576, 622 (boys), (Cl (woman); cf. the muffled boy on Munich 2421 (ARV 23, 7); cf. also the progressive unmuffling of the woman undergoing ‘Bacchic initiation’ (Florence 391, ARV 769, 4; Oxford 1924.2, ARV 865, 1; C. Bérard et al.), A city of images [Eng. trans. Princeton 1988] figs 199-200); also the gesture of drawing the veil practised by women encountering strange men (Paras. 73, 1 bis, Add. 49; Würzburg 452 (ARV 563, 6; LIMC i pl. 60. Achilleus 351); London F 175 [A.D. Trendall, The red-figured vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily (Oxford 1967) 103 no. 539; LIMC iv pl. 304, Helene 73; Bari 4394 [A.D. Trendall and A. Cambittioglio, The red-figured vases of Apulia (Oxford 1978-82) 17 no. 71, Ghal-Kahl (n. 28) pl. 29]; cf. the shy Maenad on Chiisi 1830, ARV 975, 36; See in gen. Galt (n. 22).

34 Op. cit. (n. 12) 134 (on the rf Pen.), 130-52 (in general), with figs 67-9, 71-2. 76. For Neumann these attitudes, in which veiling is a common factor, are distinguished by the position of the hands; but he cites no evidence to corroborate the fine nuances he assumes.

35 London E 76 (ARV 406, 1; LIMC iii pls 133, 136, Briseis 1, 14; Ach. veiled, Briseis veiled and led χειρα’ ἐν χαρπην; Munich 8770 (Paras. 341, Add. 139; LIMC i pl. 104, Achilles 445); London E 56 (ARV 185, 39); cf. LIMC i, Achilles 439-48, 452-3.

36 Vienna 3695 (ARV 429, 26; LIMC i pl. 243, Aias I 81); London E 69 (ARV 369, 2; LIMC i pl. 244, Aias I 84).

37 As in the mourning figures in the ‘Penelope pose’ in Langlotz (n. 24) figs 17-23; D.C. Kurtz and J. Boardman, Greek burial customs (London 1971) pl. 44; see also Friis Johansen (n. 22) 36-7 and fig. 18, figs 25, 79, 83; cr. the ‘weeping women sarcophagus’, R. Lullies and M. Hrimer, Greek sculpture (New York 1960) 89-90 and pls 207-9; also the female mourners of Mennon on the cup, Ferrara 44885 (ARV 882, 35).

38 In the three examples in Haakh (n. 22) pls 16-18; cf. Friis Johansen (n. 22) figs 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 21, 24, 67. On the deceased’s veiling/unveiling, cf. Rehm (n. 28) 40 and n. 49.


40 See Od. viii 83-6 (Od. covers his face out of αὐδος; cf. viii 532), xix 118-22 (cf. Il. xxiv 90-1); E. Herr, 1162, 1200, Or. 280-2, 14 981-2. Thus even the veiling of Priam as he grieves for Hector on a Melian relief (Toronto 926.32, Carpenter [n. 24] fig. 319) may indicate an element of αὐδος in the way that he copes with his emotions; cf. Achilles grieving for Patroclus on London E 363 (ARV 586, 36, Carpenter fig. 313); on mourners’ restraint on Attic white-ground lekythoi, see H.A. Shapiro, AJA xciv (1991) 652-3.
to grief, and a hint at the woman's possession of οἶδως/σκοφοστήνη in a wider sense.

Even if this suggestion is unacceptable, it is undeniable that οἶδως and veiling, and especially οἶδως and the drawing of the himation across the face, are closely associated; and we have seen that the veiling of Leto is a recurrent feature in representations of her abduction. This makes it extremely unlikely that the appearance of ΑΙΔΟΣ on the Phintias vase should have nothing to do with Leto's gesture. That the image has at its centre a female figure giving clear sign of her οἶδως makes it distinctly improbable that the vase-painter should have used those letters purely as a deliberate abbreviation of the genitive 'Ἀρτέμιδος. And that an inscription is verschrieben is to be assumed only where it makes no obvious sense in context. Yet the precise significance of the word οἶδως is still not entirely clear. Of the possible explanations the following seem least improbable:

(1) Ἀρτέμιδος is the title of the picture; this is the option favoured by Waser,24 and is not as unlikely as it at first seems, given that there are vases on which inscriptions constitute titles.25 One might argue that the two words are not particularly close, that they do look like identifications of the figures beside whom they are written, and that the genitive is most naturally taken, here as often elsewhere, as giving the character's name (sc. οἶδως). This interpretation, however, might draw further support from the fact that on the other, non-mythological side of the vase, the words ΧΑΙΠΕ ΔΕΜ-ΟΣΠΑΤΕ, which obviously are to be construed by (part of) one of the characters in the scene.

(2) Artemis is given the title Aidos, analogous to Artemis Eukleia and (the putative) Artemis Arete. Yet although Artemis is a figure with whom ceteris paribus Artemis would make this interpretation more likely than the previous.

Broadly, these are alternatives; other interpretations could only be refinements or combinations of the above.

41 In Roscher, ML v 1043; cf. n. 9.
42 See Kretschmer, Vaseninschriften 83; Immerwahr (n. 7) 112, 183-4.
43 Vases regularly shift between the nom. and the gen. in naming figures (Kretschmer 137).
44 The personification in E. Hipp. 78 (Aidos as Artemis' gardener; cf. Aidos as Athena's nurse, schol. vet. A. PV 12c Herington) does not prove that Artemis herself could be designated Aidos. Personification of οἶδως on a vase (cf. the many similar cases in Shapiro [n. 4]) would not be impossible (though no example exists), but that is not what we have here, where the figure in question is clearly Artemis. (On personification of οἶδως, see Han [n. 3].)

(One might argue, for example, that οἶδως could refer to Leto's veiling without having to be construed with the genitive, Ἀρτέμις, and some might be tempted to argue for a sophisticated pun in which ΑΙΔΟΣ both refers to Leto's gesture and designates Artemis.) On balance, and with some hesitation, I think Waser's straightforward explanation the most probable, but submit that, whatever sense we make of the inscriptions, the appearance of the letters ΑΙΔΟΣ cannot be irrelevant to the fact of Leto's veiling.

Thus we have gone some way towards understanding the significance of Phintias' depiction of the rape of Leto. But there is more to be said about the meaning of the scene, and about the relation between that scene and the overall decoration of the vase.45

First, the portrayal of the rape of Leto (a rarity, since normally it is the aftermath of the rape which is depicted) has much in common with other scenes of abduction; the basic pose, in which the abductor lifts his victim aloft is very common,46 but, more particularly, the grip which Tityos employs is also a recurrent motif in such scenes.47 This is a grip which is also found in other, quite different mythological scenes, especially featuring Heracles and Theseus,48 but its appearance in numerous representations of the everyday techniques of

45 Here I build on the suggestion of R. Osborne, Classical landscape with figures (London 1987) 110-11, that the scenes on this amphora are related. For a suggestive approach to interaction between figure-scenes on vases, see F. Lissarrague in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), Art and text in ancient Greek culture (Cambridge 1994) 12-27, esp. 18-19, 22-5.
46 See (e.g.) Tityos and Leto themselves on a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (Zancani Montuoro and Zannoni-Bianco [n. 11] ii 329-9 and pl. 93); cf. Theseus and Antiope (a) from the temple of Apollo at Eretria (F. Brommer, Theseus [Darmstadt 1982] pl. 19) and (b) on a rf cup in Oxford (1927-4065, ARV 62, 77).
47 See Dover R750 (cf. n. 18 above); Castor and Eryphile (cf. n. 28 above); Boreas and Oreithyia (Munich 2345, ARV 496, 2; LIMC iii pl. 19, Boreas 626; cf. K. Neuser, Anemoi [Rome 1982] 30-87); Theseus and 'Corone' (Munich 2309, ARV 27, 4); Peleus and Thetis (e.g. P. Jacobsthal, Die melischen Reliefs [Berlin 1931] no. 14 and pl. 8, no. 15 and fig. 2, vases: Boston 1972.850 [Carpenter (n. 24) fig. 287]; Munich 2619A [ARV 146, 2]; Berlin 2279 [ARV 115, 2]; London, V&A 4807.1901 [ARV 89, 14]; Villa Giulia 2491 [J.D. Beazley, Etruscan vase painters (Oxford 1947) 7, 80-4, pl. xx, 1]). See X. Krieger, Der Kampf zwischen Peleus und Thetis in der griechischen Vasenmalerei (Diss. Münster 1973 [1975]) 21, 25-43, 55-60, 66-74, 89-105, 113-21, with pls 2b-c, 3-4, 8b.
48 Examples featuring Heracles now most conveniently in LIMC; see s.vv. 'Achellos', 'Antioos I', 'Halios Geron', 'Herakles', 'Nereus'. Cf. R. Vollkommer, Herakles in the art of classical Greece (Oxford 1988). Theseus and Cercyon, see the Hephaesteum metope (Brommer [n. 46] pl. 8, no. 15 and fig. 2; vases: London E 36 [ARV 115, 3]; London E 48 [ARV 431, 14]; Florence 91456 [ARV 108, 27]; Madrid 11265 [ARV 1174, Aison 1]; Louvre G 104 [ARV 318, 1]; Louvre G 195 [ARV 381, 174]. On wrestling/pankration techniques in mythological scenes, see E.N. Gardner, JHS xxv (1905) 14, 282-4, xxvi (1906) 11-12, 15-18, Athletics in the ancient world (London 1930) 181, 205, 220; Scheefold (n. 3) 71, 94, 138, 311; Brommer (n. 46) 19; M.B. Poliakoff, Combat sports in the ancient world (New Haven 1987) 136-9; on mythological paradigms for wrestling/athletics, see Webster (n. 28) 56, 62, 251, 260, 265.
of the palaestra which reveals its essential nature, the grip is a visual metaphor from the world of wrestling and/or the pankration. Clearly, where Theseus and Heracles employ this grip, this belongs with their general presentation as paradigms of athletic prowess; a similar allusion to youthful athleticism is apparent in Peleus’ wrestling with Thetis and Atalanta. Equally clearly, however, Tityos is nobody’s ideal athlete; but a paradigm may be negative as well as positive, and this is where the athletic scene on the other side of the vase comes in. One is already invited to consider the possibility of a relation between the two scenes by virtue of the compositional parallel; but the relation goes beyond the merely aesthetic. The athletes on side B are practising their skills in the proper context of the gymnasium, their youth and their beauty manifesting the admired ideal of athletic ἑρμή; their older companions watch with interest, but decorously. The youths practise the javelin and the discus—not events in themselves, but part of the pentathlon. These events, then, suggest combination with (and absence of) other events; on the other side of the vase we have a metaphor drawn from one of those events, indeed that in which the pentathlon actually culminated. On the athletic side of the vase two pentathletic events are being pursued properly, on the mythological the techniques of the palaestra and the prowess which athletic training develops are being misused; on the one side the pursuit of excellence by the youthful and the beautiful is presented for our delectation, while on the other a male athlete carries his desires beyond mortal limits.

There may be more: the athletes and their admirers on side B form two couples, distinguished by their being equipped with two pairs of matching garlands; the youths, as any good reproduction will show, are luxuriating in the δέος Εἰρήνης, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their ἱππόται watch their naked exercise with interest (and no doubt more), but do not touch, whereas Tityos is a paradigm of excessive ἱππόται, embodying the familiar metaphor of sex as wrestling in a hybistic, all too literal form. In short, the vase presents us with a juxtaposition of norm and transgression in two areas, that of sport and that of ἱππόται, a juxtaposition which is effectively underlined by the contrast between the athletic scene, which depicts a natural and appropriate passage from youth to manhood, appropriate male interests, and a proper relationship between youthful (inferior) ἑρμήνευς and older (superior) ἱππόται, and the mythological scene, which shows a mortal attempt to enter the sphere of the divine, manly pursuits being carried to excess, and an improper relationship between mortal (inferior) ὑπόται and divine (superior) στιβοῦ-μένη.

These scenes and their juxtaposition are at home in the world of the symposium, a fact which is underlined by the vase’s other inscriptions; χορέε (four times, once with specific addressee) is a typically sympotic imperative, and the single καλος-inscription also places the vase in the pederastic milieu of the aristocratic symposium. These inscriptions also fit well with the στιβός inscription, for στιβός is one of the canonical sympotic virtues, just as its negation, διόρθως, is typically seen as a mark of symposiastic excess. It is perhaps not irrelevant that Leto and her children are commonly depicted as a threesome, enjoying the pleasures of music and festivity which are the mark of the perpetual fecundity of the gods, to which mortals can only approximate in the transient atmosphere of the symposium, it is this peace and harmony that are destroyed by the διόρθως of Tityos, much as the χαρίς, εὐνοῦμα, and εὐφροσύνη of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus.

49 See (e.g.) Berlin 1853, CVA Berlin v. pl. 33:2; Vatican 414 (ARV 343, 3); bronze group, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore 54.972 (Poliaffki fig. 32; cf. Gardiner, Athletics fig. 171; O. Tzachor-Alexandri, Mind and body [Athens 1988] pl. 165); Boston 01.8019 (ARV 24, 11); Munich 1461 (Gardiner fig. 164).

50 For literary parallels, see Pl. L. 8/9-10 (Her. and Antaeus; cf. N. 4.62-5, Peleus’ wrestling with Thetis in an ode for a boy wrestler); B. 13. 46-57 (Her. and lion); B. 18. 26-7 (Thes. and Cercyon); S. Tr. 497-530 (Her. and Achelous; cf. Davies ad loc., and Gardiner JHS [1906] 16); Theocr. 25.262-71. For Plato (Leg. 796a), too, Antaeus and Cercyon are paradigmatic pankratiasts.

51 One is himself stripped for exercise, the other an interloper (not a trainer; Arias-Hirmer [n. 5] 318).

52 On the pentathlon, see Gardiner, Athletics (n. 48) 177-80; H.A. Harris, Greek athletics and athletics (London 1964) 77-80; id. Sport in Greece and Rome (London 1972) 33-9. The javelin, discus, and jump were peculiar to the pentathlon, and thus were used, singularly or in combination, to denote that event on Panathenaeic amphorae (cf. Gardiner, Athletics 177; Webster [n. 28] 213; J. Neils et al., Goddess and polis [Princeton 1992] 35, 85-6, 205 n. 46); D.G. Kyle, Athletics in ancient Athens (Leiden 1987) 180-1, notes that the same pentathletic events also tend to be combined in generic ‘palaestra’ scenes.

53 Cf. B. 9.30-9, where discus, javelin, and wrestling represent the pentathlon.

54 The relation between the mythological and non-mythological sides of the vase thus bears comparison with those (contemporary) vases discussed by Webster (n. 28) 56, 251 which juxtapose athletic events and mythological paradigms of athletic events.


57 See Webster (n. 28) 42-62 passim, Dovet (n. 18) 117-19.


59 See LIMC ii, Apollo 630-45h, 651a-54, Artemis 1105-23 (n.b. Leto [alone] is veiled on at least three of these [Apollo 651b, Artemis 1110, 1116]). Perhaps similar, the ‘relief of the gods’, Brauron Mus. 1180 (L. Kahil in J.N. Coldstream and A. Murray (ed.), Sympotica (Oxford 1990) 213-20; N.R.E. Fisher, Hybris (Warminster 1992) 72-1, 203-7, 218-19, 223-4, etc. The work of the ἄνθρωπος, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their ἱππόται watch their naked exercise with interest (and no doubt more), but do not touch, whereas Tityos is a paradigm of excessive ἱππόται, embodying the familiar metaphor of sex as wrestling in a hybistic, all too literal form. In short, the vase presents us with a juxtaposition of norm and transgression in two areas, that of sport and that of ἱππόται, a juxtaposition which is effectively underlined by the contrast between the athletic scene, which depicts a natural and appropriate passage from youth to manhood, appropriate male interests, and a proper relationship between youthful (inferior) ἑρμήνευς and older (superior) ἱππόται, and the mythological scene, which shows a mortal attempt to enter the sphere of the divine, manly pursuits being carried to excess, and an improper relationship between mortal (inferior) ὑπόται and divine (superior) στιβοῦ-μένη.

These scenes and their juxtaposition are at home in the world of the symposium, a fact which is underlined by the vase’s other inscriptions; χορέε (four times, once with specific addressee) is a typically sympotic imperative, and the single καλος-inscription also places the vase in the pederastic milieu of the aristocratic symposium. These inscriptions also fit well with the στιβός inscription, for στιβός is one of the canonical sympotic virtues, just as its negation, διόρθως, is typically seen as a mark of symposiastic excess. It is perhaps not irrelevant that Leto and her children are commonly depicted as a threesome, enjoying the pleasures of music and festivity which are the mark of the perpetual fecundity of the gods, to which mortals can only approximate in the transient atmosphere of the symposium, it is this peace and harmony that are destroyed by the διόρθως of Tityos, much as the χάρις, εὐνοῦμα, and εὐφροσύνη of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus.
L’écphrasis de la parole d’apparat dans l’Electrum et le De domo de Lucien, et la représentation des deux styles d’une esthétique inspirée de Pindare et de Platon*

Poesie d’apparat et de célébration, la lyrique de Pindare s’identifie à la préciosité d’un métal ou d’une pierre, et à l’art somptueux de l’orfèvrerie ou de l’architecture. Rivalisant avec elle, l’élloquent d’apparat reprend et développe ces images à l’époque impériale, pour se représenter et exposer son esthétique, l’esthétique de la seconde sophistique, qui, inspirée de celle de Pindare et de Platon, unit la fabule et la vérité de l’ailleurs, l’illusion et la sagesse divine.

La démonstration d’une parole d’apparat, ‘oratoire et persuasive’, s’appropriant la représentation éclatante et précieuse des hymnes de Pindare, apparaît chez Lucien dans la prolalia Electrum et la lalia De domo.

Chez Lucien, comme chez Pindare, la somptuosité de la matière ou de l’édifice s’applique à une parole d’apparat rehausse, directement ou indirectement, par des fables. Pindare célèbre ainsi les exploits des Théânderides : ‘Si tu me prescris encore, dit-il à Timasahrès d’Égine, de dresser pour ton oncle maternel ... une stèle plus blanche que le marbre de Paros, sache que l’or qu’on passe au feu n’est plus que splendide fuligulante, mais que l’hymne qui célèbre les grands exploits fait (τεθηκα) d’un simple mortel l’élégie des rois’ (Ném., IV 82-5).

Dans la Ville Néméeenne, dédiée à Sógénes d’Égine, Pindare compare au charme des fables d’Hermé de l’or de la préciosité de sa poésie : ‘J’imagine que la renommée d’Ulysse a dépassé ses épreuves grâce au charme d’Hermé. Car les fictions et la poésie au vol sublime lui ont donné je ne sais quel prestige. L’art nous dupe, en nous séduisant par des fables ... Au vainqueur ... je ne mets point de mauvaise grâce à payer mon tribut d’éloges. Tresser des fleurs en couronnes, tâche facile. Rejette-la ! La Muse, elle, assemble l’or avec l’ivoire blanc et la fleur du lys qu’elle a soustraite à la rosée marine’ (v. 20-79). L’hymne est comme un précieux collier, ou bracelet, fait d’or, d’ivoire et de corail.

Pindare souligne le chatoiement trompeur de la fable éloignée de la vérité, quand il évoque, dans la Ière Olympique, un diadème d’or ciselé, serti de pierres : ‘Ah ! le monde est plein de merveilles – et parfois aussi les dix morts vont au-delà du vrai (ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλλοθρή λόγον); des fables (μῦθοι) ornées de chatoyantes fictions (δεδουλακέναι ψευδές πουκλείου) nous illusionnent (ἐξασφαλίζοντι)’ (v. 28-29). C’est à quoi Pindare renonce dans cette ode consacrée à Hérion de Syracuse qui est elle-même présentée comme le joyau suprême, le pur éclat de l’or, parce qu’elle substitue à l’éclat d’une fable blasphématoire l’éclat divin d’une autre fable, véridique, en célébrant Pélops, dont l’arène d’Olympie immortalisa la gloire : ‘Excellent bien que l’eau ; mais l’or, éclatant comme une flamme qui s’allume dans la nuit, efface tous les trésors de la fière opulence, dit Pindare. Veux-tu chanter les jeux, ô mon âme ? ne cherche pas, au ciel désert, quand le jour brille, un astre plus ardent que le Soleil, et n’espère pas célébrer une lice plus glorieuse qu’Olympie ! De là l’hymne que milie voix répétent’ (Olym., 1, 1-8). Après avoir évoqué le héros dont ‘s’éprit ... Poséidon, quand Cléitho le retira du bassin pur, l’épaula parée de l’éclat de l’ivoire’ (Olym., I, 25-27), Pindare récuse cette tradition qui suppose que le corps de Pélops ait disparu dévoré par les dieux lors d’un festin offert par Tantale sur le Sipylo : ‘L’homme ne doit attribuer aux dieux que de belles actions, dit-il : c’est la voie la plus sûre. Aussi, fils de Tantale, vais-je parler de toi autrement que mes devanciers : je dirai que, lorsque ton père, convivant avec des dieux, leur offrant à son tour un banquet, les invita à la fête irremplaçable du Sipylo ... lors de ce jour-là, le Maître du trident splendide te ravit : l’amour avait dompté son cœur.’

1 Voir Isocr., Sur l’échange, 166, citant Pindare, et se comparant à lui pour ses éloges d’Athènes.
3 C’est l’une des définitions du véritable art de l’éloduction dans le Phèdre, 269 c-d.
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On the intersection of archaic poetry and vase-painting, see Lissarrague (n. 57) 123-39.
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NOTES

LES EDITIONS UTILISÉES, DEUTEROME-SAINT-POSTE, NEMEENNES, C.U.F. (PARIS 1923) 48, SUR LES CRITIQUES AUXQUELS PINDARE RÉPOND DANS LA STROPE V DE CETTE ODE: ‘CES CRITIQUES VISUENT SANS DOUTE LE GRAND PROGRÈS QU’IL AURAIT DÉJÀ FAIT’. 5 Voir Paul-Émile Bogaert, Hymnes à Athéna, 6; à Zeus, 22; à Dionysos, 6; Panégyrique au puits de l’Asclépiedion, 16; Lalia à Asclépios, 12; Ismétique à Poséidon, 25; Dithyrambe aux Athéniens, 25, 6.

Les citations auxquelles Pindare répond dans la strophe V de cette ode : ‘Ces critiques visaient sans doute le grand développement qu’il a déjà réalisé’. 5 Voir Paul-Émile Bogaert, Hymnes à Athéna, 6; à Zeus, 22; à Dionysos, 6; Panégyrique au puits de l’Asclépiedion, 16; Lalia à Poséidon, 25; Dithyrambe aux Athéniens, 25, 6.

Dans la suite de la communication que j’ai présentée au colloque international sur la Lyrique antique de Rome, la troisième partie, qui traite des Ethiopiques d’Héliodore, a paru, les traductions de la Bibliothèque de la Pélie, et les traductions de la Collection des Universités de France. Mais pour Platon, j’ai utilisé aussi les traductions de la Bibliothèque de la Pélie. Et pour le De domo de Lucien, et la représentation des deux styles d’une esthétique inspirée de Pindare et de Platon*.


1 Voir Isocr., Sur l’échange, 166, citant Pindare, et se comparant à lui pour ses éloges d’Athènes.
3 C’est l’une des définitions du véritable art de l’éloduction dans le Phèdre, 269 c-d. precios
Attic red-figure amphora by Phintias: (a) Apollo, Tityos, Leto, Artemis; (b) athletes and companions (Louvre G42; photograph by M. Chuzeville, reproduced by kind permission of the Louvre Museum)