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Veiling, αιδός, 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, Addenda 2] 154; see now also LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollon 1069, vi, Leto 34; PLATE I ...). That this constitutes an association between the goddess and αιδός is the position of Kretschmer [Die griechischen Vasenschriften (Göttingen 1894) 17], Norwood [Essays on Euripidean drama (Berkeley 1954) 76 n. 2], and Schefeld (Götter- 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 Schefeld [indebted to: W.G. Arnott; H. Bemsdorff; D.H. Berry; F. Cairns; Greifenhagen, "Tityos", Jb. Berl. Mus. i (1959) 19; J. Hani in J. 81; J. Overbeck, Griechische Kunstmythologie (Leipzig 1871-89) iii 387; cf. Gerhard, Auserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin 1840-58) i 81; J. Overbeck, Griechische Kunstmythologie (Leipzig 1871-89) iii 387].  


* Aidos (Oxford 1993).  

* For assistance in the preparation of this note, I am indebted to: W.O. ARNOTT; H. BEMSдорFF; D.H. BERRY; F. CAIRNS; C.J. CLASSEN; G. DAVIES; R. HANNAH; ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT Stiftung; Seminar für klassische Philologie and Institut für Archäologie (Göttingen); Department of Greek, Eruscan and Roman Antiquities, Musée du Louvre; A.H. Sommerstein; and two referees, one anonymous and one (C. SOURVINOU-Inwood) not.  

2 Aidos (Oxford 1993).  

3 Cf. E. Gerhard, Auserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin 1840-58) i 81; J. Overbeck, Griechische Kunstmythologie (Leipzig 1871-89) iii 387.  


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


7 Schefeld (n. 3) 337 n. 353 also identifies as Arete the figure crowning Heracles on two vases described by J.D. Shapiro, Personifications in Greek art (Zurich 1993) 70-8.  

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


12 Cf. H. BEMSдорFF, Auserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin 1840-58) i 81; J. Overbeck, Griechische Kunstmythologie (Leipzig 1871-89) iii 387.  

13 See most recently M. Moore in LIMC iv, 175-6, L. Kahli, ibid., vi 1, 260.  

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

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 Antaeus' alleged need to maintain contact with his mother, on a naive belief that a
figure who appears either to run away from Apollo or to stand between Apollo and his victim cannot be Apollo’s own mother, 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. 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.

Veiling of the head in such circumstances clearly represents the victim’s στίχωσις, covering one’s head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between στίχωσις, the eyes, exposure and visibility. Numerous passages make the connexion between στίχωσις 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 στίχωσις at what she has said and to her wish to conceal her tears and the στίχωσις in her eyes (244-6). This association between στίχωσις and the veil is also apparent in passages where the former is not mentioned: Penelope’s repeated gesture; for example, of drawing her κρησμένον 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.

That an artistic representation of a woman veiling can be construed as a representation of στίχωσις is apparent from a passage in Pausanias’ account of Laconia (iii 10.10-11):

They say that the στράλα τος of Aidos, around thirty stades from the city, is a dedication of Hercules, 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, then he begged 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 [εξαλαυγόμενη] in response to the question; Icarius, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the στράλα τος to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself [εξαλαυγόμενη]...

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


22 See M. Nagler, Spontaneity and tradition (Berkeley 1974) 44-72, 80, who also (47-9) notes the significance of the removal of the κρησμένον at H. xxii 468-72, Od. vi 100 (cf. H. F. North, Sophocles [Ithaca 1966] 308 n. 143). Contrast F. Studniczka, Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht (Vienna 1886) 125-7; H. Haakh, Gymnasium lxvi (1959) 374-80; and Neumann (n. 12) 179 n. 134, who believe that Penelope is unveiling herself in order to appear more attractive to the suitors. Cf. K. Fries Johan- sen, The Attic grave reliefs of the classical period (Copenhagen 1951) 41 n. 1, re sepulchral reliefs; C. M. Galt, AIA xxxv (1931) 373-93; also the summary of a paper by M.E. Mayo in AIA lxxvii (1973) 200, which appears to have argued that the drawing of the veil always represents unveiling (even in rape scenes). There need be no dispute that the gesture can (be intended) to be attractive to men, since manifestations of στίχωσις (lowering the eyes, blushing, etc., as well as veiling) were attractive to men; cf. J.M. Redfield, Arethusa xv (1982) 196.
herself, rather than a personified Aidos);25 the link between a woman’s \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \) 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 \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \). On vases, the veiling which signifies \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \) 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 \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \). 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 \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \); veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \).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 \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \); in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to


24 Cf. the remark of Pliny (xxxv 63) that in his portrait of Penelope Zeuxis pictorre mores videtur (cited by T.H. Carpenter, *Art and myth in ancient Greece* [London 1991] 235); Carpenter is no doubt right to say that Zeuxis depicted Penelope as in his fig. 347 (Chiusi 1831, ARV2 1300, 2); the pose of this seated, veiled Penelope is very similar to that of the Persepolis torso which Eckstein, *JDAI* lxvii, (1959) 137-57, *LIMC* i.1, 352-3 (pl. 270, Aidos in *LIMC* 12), which regards as an Aidos/Penelope discussed by Pausanias; against this identification, see E. Langlotz, *JDAI* lxxvi (1961) 72-99; cf. V. Gauer, *JDAI* cv (1990) 31-65.


28 For Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 18) 69 the gesture of veiling is in itself polysemic, but in the particular context of erotic pursuits conveys an allusion to the marriage veil; this allusion is certainly present (for the representational schemes ‘marriage’ and ‘abduction’ constantly feed off each other in Greek art), but the basic reason why veiling is common to brides and to the objects of erotic pursuit (as well as to victims of rape, e.g. Leto) is that veiling typically expresses \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \), and the normal focus of women’s \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \) is sexual. For the bride’s veiling as expression of her \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \), see E. ItT 372-6. There, Iphigeneia’s focus of women’s \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \) is clearly a genuine emotional reaction; but it may be naíve to assume that reflections of such anxiety in literature and myth are to be understood purely in terms of female psychology, for the bride’s \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \) at leaving her father (as in the Pausanias passage) and at the thought of her future as a sexual being is also a valuable indication of her loyalty to her kútoσ and of her innocence, and thus of her eligibility and promise as a wife; there may therefore have been a considerable element of cultural role-playing as well as of spontaneous emotion in her attitude. See I. Jenkins, *BICS* xxx (1983) 137-46; cf. Redfield (n. 22) 183-92; H. King in A. Cameron and A. Kuert (eds.), *Images of women in antiquity* (London 1983) 109-17; H.P. Foley, * Ritual irony* (Ithaca NY 1985) 86-9 etc.; Seaford (n. 25) 106-30; *JHS* cvii (1988) 118-24.

29 Cf. Stitt, *Die Götterbilder der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 1890), at least discusses veiling, sees the connexion with \( \omega \delta \omicron \varsigma \varsigma \) (84 and n. 7), and notes the iconographic link between wedding, abduction, and the ‘marriage of death’ (278-9), but his discussion is brief and unsystematic. In Neumann (n. 12) veiling receives no discussion in its own right, and prima facie similar poses involving the veiling of the head are distinguished as the most tenuous of criteria.
cover the face;

32 If vases typically show the procession, with bride and groom in chariot, and the bride normally draws her mantle; on rf vases the bride is most often led, veiled but not veiling, χερὶν ἐξ ἀντροφορίᾳ; see Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 26-34 (with ill.). Cf. veiling/χειρὶν ἐξ ἀντροφορίᾳ motifs in the 'marriage of death' on Berlin 1902 (ARV 363, 37); Athens NM 1926 (ARV 846, 193); also the grave relief of Myrrhine (Athens NM 4485; Frits Johansen [n. 22] fig. 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 [Figs. and pl. R] cf. Hera and Zeus on the Parthenon frieze [K. Scheffold, Die Göttersage in der klassischen and hellenistischen Kunst (Munich 1981) pl. 302], where Hera clearly is revealing her attractions to Zeus in what I.S. Mark [Hesperia lxxi (1984) 303-4] regards as an allusion to the ἀντροφορίᾳ; but (a) unveiling implies previous veiling, to which χειρὶν is still relevant, and (b) this unveiling should not be assimilated to the modest gesture of drawing the himation across the face (see n. 22 above). (On the ἀντροφορία, see J.H. Oakley, AA (1982) 113-18; R.F. Sutton in id. [ed.], Didaldikon: studies ... Schoeder; Wascona, III. 1989) 359-79; Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 25-6, 30. Rehm (n. 28) 141-2.)

33 On Mantelknaben and ωπάζυρα, see Sittl (n. 27) 7-8 (to his ref add Aesch. i. 26 [Athens], Xen. Lac. Pol. 3. 4 [Sparta]). Illustrations in Dover (n. 18) 8637, 791, 851 (boys), 867 (woman); M.F. Kilmer, Greek Erotica (London 1939) 1916, 322, 576, 622.1 (boys), C1 (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. Béard [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 (Parus. 7a, 1 bis. Add. 49; Würzburg 452 [ARV 63, 6; LIMC i pl. 60]. Achilles 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. Cambitoglou, The red-figured vases of Apulia (Oxford 1978-82) 17 no. 71. Ghali-Kahil (n. 28) pl. 29c]; cf. the shy Maenad on Chiusi 1830, ARV 975, 36. See in gen. Galt (n. 22).

34 Op. cit. (n. 12) 134 (on the rf Pent.), 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 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 αὐλοθύμος is that of grief; clearly, grief and αὐλοθύμος 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 κακοφαίνεται. This is as much as to suggest that veiling need not carry connotations of αὐλοθύμος as such, but may be a symptom of something that αὐλοθύμος shares with other emotions; yet in two ways, I think, the veiling which accompanies grief may have more to do with αὐλοθύμος than that. First, where the veiled and grieving figure is a woman, veiling may suggest αὐλοθύμος qua (wifely, motherly, daughterly, sisterly, etc.) loyalty to the deceased, or, where the veiled figure is the deceased herself, the αὐλοθύμος which characterized the woman in life. More importantly, however, veiling as an accompaniment to any emotion may indicate a way of concealing emotion or coping with it with a withdrawal. 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 αὐλοθύμος at 213-15, and passages in Homer and Euripides offer unequivocal examples of the αὐλοθύμος 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

35 London E 76 (ARV 406, 1; LIMC iii pls 133, 136, Briseis 1, 14; Ach. veiled, Briseis veiled and led χειρὶν ἐξ ἀντροφορίᾳ; Munich 8770 (Parag. 341. Add. iii 189; 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 Frits Johansen (n. 22) 36-7 and fig. 18, figs 25, 79, 83; cf. the 'weeping women sarcophagus'. R. Lullies and M. Hirmer, Greek sculpture (New York 1960) 89-90 and pls 207-9; also the female mourners on Memnon the cup, Ferrara 44885 (ARV 882, 35).

38 As in the three examples in Haak (n. 22) pls 16-18; cf. Frits 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.

39 See Cairns (n. 1) 157-8, and contrast N.I. Richardson, The Homeric hymn to Demeter (Oxford 1974) ad. locc. Cf. the figure in the 'Penelope pose' from the 'Tomb of Persephone' at Vergina, identified as Demeter by M. Andronicos, Vergina (Athens 1987) 88-9 and fig. 48.

40 See Od. viii 83-6 (Od. covers his face out of αὐλοθύμος; cf. viii 532), xix 118-22 (cf. H. xxiv 90-1); E. Her. 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 αὐλοθύμος 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 in Attic white-ground lekythoi, see H.A. Shapiro, AJA xcv (1991) 652-3.
to grief, and a hint at the woman's possession of οίνος/σώματος in a wider sense.

Even if this suggestion is unacceptable, it is undeniable that οίνος and veiling, and especially οίνος 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 the letters ΑΙΑΟΣ 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 οίνος 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 verscrieben is to be assumed only where it makes no obvious sense in context. Yet the precise significance of the word οίνος is still not entirely clear. Of the possible explanations the following seem least improbable:

(1) Απότοις οίνος is the title of the picture; this is the opinion favoured by Waser,41 and is not as unlikely as it at first seems, given that there are vases on which inscriptions constitute titles.42 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. οίνος).43 This interpretation, however, might draw further support from the fact that on the other, non-mythological side of the vase, the words ΧΑΙΓΕ ΔΕΜ-ΟΞΤΠΑΘΕ, which obviously are to be construed together, are similarly written vertically and separated 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 οίνος might naturally be associated, it seems odd that attention should be drawn to her οίνος in a context where that of someone else is so clearly depicted. It is, of course, a requirement of οίνος that one should defend one's mother's honour, but this is a requirement which applies equally to Apollo. Leto clearly has a much stronger claim to οίνος in this scene, and it seems to me that only independent evidence (of which there is none)44 for οίνος as a cult-title or epithet of 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. vert. A. PV 12c Herington) does not prove that Artemis herself could be designated Aidos. Personification of οίνος 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 οίνος, see Hani [n. 3].)
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 Theseus 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 practicing their skills in the proper context of the gymnasion, their youth and their beauty manifesting the admired ideal of athletic ἐστία; 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 divine ἐστία, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their ἐστίαζον watch their naked exercise with interest (and no doubt more), but do not touch, whereas Tityos is a paradigm of excessive ἐστία, embodying the familiar metaphor of sex as wrestling in a hybristic, 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 ἐστία, 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) ἐμμενος and older (superior) ἐστίατως, and the mythological scene, which shows a mortal attempt to enter the sphere of the divine, many pursuits being carried to excess, and an improper relationship between mortal (inferior) ἐμμενος and divine (superior) στίου-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; χαρά (four times, often with specific addressee) is a typically sympotic imperative, and the single kalos-inscription also places the vase in the pederastic milieu of the aristocratic symposium. These inscriptions also fit well with the στίου inscription, for στίου is one of the canonical sympotic virtues, just as its negation, διώκει, is typically seen as a matter of symptotic 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 felicity 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 διώκει of Tityos, much as the χαρά, εὐνοία, and εὐφροσύνη of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus.

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

50 For literary parallels, see P. I. 3/4.61-73 (Her. and Antaeus; cf. N. 4.62-5, Peleus' wrestling with Theseus 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 Achaeus; cf. Davies ad loc., and Gardiner JHS [1906] 16); Theocr. 25.262-71. For Plato (Leg. 796a), too, Antaeus and Cercyon are paradigmatic pankratists.

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

53 On the pentathlon, see Gardiner, Athletics (n. 48) 177-80; H.A. Harris, Greek athletes 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 Panathenaic amphorae (cf. Gardiner, Athletics 177; Webster [n. 28] 213; J. Neilis 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.


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

in Olympian 1 and Ixiôn in Pythonian 2. As does much archaic poetry, Phintias’ vase, created for the enjoyment of sympoiaists, embeds the general values of the aristocratic community in the specific context of the drinking party; and as in Pindar, the occasion of the symposium is used to set the heights of human πνος, beauty, and ἀριστεία against a negative mythological paradigm which emphasizes the limits of human striving.61

DOUGLAS L. CAIRNS
University of Leeds

61 On the intersection of archaic poetry and vase-painting, see Lissarrague (n. 57) 123-39.

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’éloquence d’apparat1 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,2 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’3, s’appropriant la représentation éclatante et précieuse des hymnes de Pindare, apparaît chez Lucien dans la prolalia Electrum et la lalia De domo.4

Chez Lucien, comme chez Pindare, la somptuosité de la matière ou de l’édifice s’applique à une parole d’apparat rehaussée, directement ou indirectement, par des fables. Pindare célèbre ainsi les exploits des Théandrides: ‘Si tu me prescris encore, dit-il à Timasarque 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 fulgurante, mais que l’hymne qui célèbre les grands exploits fait (τεφορέα) d’un simple mortel l’égal des rois’ (Ném., IV 82-5).5 Dans la Ville Néméenne, dédiée à Sogénes d’Égine, Pindare compare au charme des fables d’Homer à la préciosité de sa poésie: ‘J’imagine que la renommée d’Ulysse a dépassé ses épreuves grâce au charme d’Homer. Car les fictions et la poésie au vol sublime lui ont donné je ne sais quel prestige. L’art nous dispose, 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-là! La Muse, elle, assemble l’or avec l’ivoire blanc et la fleur du lys qu’elle a soustraite à la rosee marine’ (v. 20-79). L’hymne est comme un précieux collier, ou bracelet, fait d’or, d’ivoire et de corail.6

Pindare souligne le chatoiement trompeur de la fabule éloignée de la vérité, quand il évoque, dans la Ière Olympique, un diadème d’or ciselé, serti de pierrières: ‘Ah! le monde est plein de merveilles—et parfois aussi les dîres des mortels vont au-delà du vrai (ὑπ’ τον ἅλοιπον λόγον); des fables (μύθους) ornées de chatoyantes fictions (ἄλογοι και πολλοί) nous illusionnent (ἐξιπαστώντο)’ (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 fabule blaspéminatoire l’éclat divin d’une autre fable, véridique, en célébrant Pélôps, dont l’âme? n’est que de la gloire immortalisée la gloire: ‘Excellent bien que l’eau; mais l’or, étincelant comme une flamme qui s’allume dans la nuit, efface tous les tâches de la même 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 part l’hymne que mille voix répètent (Οlymp., I, 1-8). Après avoir évoqué le héros dont s’exprit’ Poséidon, quand Clitôthé le retira du bassin pur, l’épaula par la clarté de l’ivoire’ (Olymp., I, 25-27). Pindare récuse cette tradition qui suppose que le corps de Pélôps ait disparu dévoré par les dieux lors d’un festin offert par Tantale sur le Sipyle: ‘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, convive des dieux, leur offrant à ton tour un banquet, les invita à la fête irréprochable du Sipyle ... le jour-là, le Maître du trident splendide te ravit; l’amour avait dompté son cœur.7


3 Pour ‘la fleur de lys soustraite à la rosee marine’, j’adopte l’interprétation du scholiaste retenue par A. Puech, op cit., 92 et 100.
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)