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; ARV 23, 15; Parisalopomena 323, Addenda 154; see now also LIMC II pl. 275, Apollon 1069, vi, Leto 34; PLATE I ...). That this constitutes an association between the goddess and aitidos is the position of Kretschmer [Die griechischen Vasenschriften (Göttingen 1894) 1]; Norwood [Essays on Euripidean drama (Berkeley 1954) 76 n. 2], and Schefold [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 Schefold [tn. 3] 330 n. 152] points to a possible description of Artemis as Aretē on a black-figure neck amphora by the Antimenes Painter (Basel iii, 3; the figure so designated, however, is not certainly Artemis). But the view of von Erffa [AIDOS 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 Artemidou is not to be dismissed, notwithstanding Kretschmer's assurance [Vasenschriften 197] that ΑΙΔΟΣ is not ΑΙΤΕΙΔΟΣ or ΑΙΤΕΙΔΟΣ is the correct reading (note the vase also names Leto in the gen.). An association of Artemis and aitidos 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. Berndorff; D.H. Berry; F. Cairns; C.J. Clasen; G. Davies; R. Hannah; Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung; Seminar für klasische 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.

1 Aidos (Oxford 1993).
2 Cf. E. Gerhard, Ausserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin 1940-58) i 81; J. Overbeck, Griechische Kunstmythologie (Leipzig 1871-89) i 387.
4 On (Art.) Eukleia, see now LIMC i.1, 677 (L. Kahil); H.A. Shapiro, Personifications in Greek art (Zurich 1973) 100-8.
6 Schefold (n. 3) 337 n. 353 also identifies as Aretē the figure crowning Heracles on two vases described by J.D. Beazley (AK iv [1961] 56 no. 7; 57 no. 6).
7 F. Hauser, in A. Furtwängler and K. Reichold, Griechische Vasenmalerei (Munich 1904-92) ii 273 n. 1, rejects the 'abbbreviation' view, but interprets the letters as a slip for 'Αρητήμωσος; cf. H.R. Immerwahr, Attic script (Oxford 1990) 67. The hypothesis of M. Vickers and D. Gill, Artful 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: 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

The complete list of inscriptions is: (A) ΧΑΙΡΕ ΚΑΙΡΕ (both horizontal, to left of Apollo) ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ (vertical, to right of Ap.) ΑΙΤΕΥΣ (vert., to right of L.) ΧΑΙΡΕ (horiz., above Art.'s raised right hand) ΑΙΤΕΟΣ (vert., to right of Art.) (B) ΣΩΤΡΑΣΤΟΣ (horiz., above the two central figures) ΚΑΙΟΣ (horiz., at top right of scene) ΣΟΤΙΝΟΣ (vert., to right of figure on far left) ΧΑΙΡΕ (vert., to right of discus-thrower) ΧΑΙΡΕ (vert., between acontist's legs) ΔΙΕΜΟΡΤΑΤΕ (vert., to right of acontist) ΣΟΙΣ(πιατε) (vert., to right of spectator on far right); see LIMC i.i, 66-7. Seinos and Seinos are the two older spectators; κωδος goes with Sostratos and Demonstratos is the recipient of the greeting; but it is unclear whether the discus-thrower is Sostratos or Chares, the acontist Chares or Demonstratos; and neither χαίρε nor κωδος 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').

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

Certainly London E 278 (ARV 194 266, 2; LIMC ii pl. 133, Leto 36 = Apollon 1070 = Ge 43); Munich 2689 (ARV 195 879, 2; LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollon 1071 = Ge 45 = Leto 45); Louvre G375 (ARV 196 1032, 54; Leto designated ΜΕΟΛΟΣ; a rf krater from the Loeb Collection (Munich, Loeb 472; J. Sieveking, Bronzen, Terrakotten, Vasen der Sammlung Loeb [Munich 1930] 61 and pl. 48; LIMC ii pl. 133, Leto 38 = Artemis 1360); perhaps also Berlin 1835 (ABV 286, 10; A. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium [Berlin 1885] 331-2); and possibly those canvassed in nn. 15-16 below). On an Argive-Corinthian shield-band relief of c. 540 in Basle (LIMC ii pl. 133, Leto 40) Leto draws her veil just as on the vases.


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 vii A 1599: 'Wenn eine Frau neben T. oder zwischen ihm und Apollon steht, so ist es seine Mutter Ge'); despite rebuttal by RE vii 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 Gebarden 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.

12 Greifenhagen (n. 3) 22, against (e.g.) Waser in Roscher, ML v 1047, Scherling in RE vii A 1602; the motif of Antiæus' need to maintain contact with Earth appears to be post-classical: see Gerhard (n. 2) ii 104; G. Oertel in Roscher, ML i 362; A. Furtwängler in Roscher, ML i 2208; E.N. Gardner, JHS xxv (1905) 282-4; and R. Olmos/L.J. Balmaseda in LIMC i.1, 810-11.

NOTES
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.16 The goddess featured in such scenes does not always veil, but does so often enough to make the veiling an aid to identification;17 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 atlas; covering one's head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between atlas and the eyes, exposure and visibility.19 Numerous passages make the connexion between atlas and veiling explicit: in Euripides’ Hippolytus, for example, the removal of Phaedra's headress 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 atlas and at what she has said and to her wish to conceal her tears and the atlas of her eyes (244-6).20 This association between atlas and the veil is also apparent in passages where the former is not mentioned: Penelope’s repeated gesture.21 for example, of drawing her krathmenon 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 atlas is apparent from a passage in Pausanias’ account of Laconia (iii 20.10-11):

They say that the deklyma of Aidos, around thirty stades from the city, is a dedication of Leto, and that it was created on the following account: when Icarus gave Penelope as wife to Odysseus, he tried to make Odysseus, too, settle in Lacedaemon, but when he failed in that, he then 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 [ἐγκαλαυμαζόμενη] in response to the question; Icarus, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the deklyma to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself [ἐγκαλαυμαζόμενη].

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

14 On one vase (New York 08.258.21, ARV 5 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 ΙΕ 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. Two other vases (Tarquinia RC 1043 [ABV 5 97, 32; LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollon 1072 = Leto 37]) the figure depicted between Leto’s veiling should be a regular element of the scene, whereas the very presence of Ge is certain in only one example, and the possibility of her veiling highly uncertain.

16 Henle (n. 11) 37. In only one case (a calyx krater by the Agustinus Painter, Louvre G 164 [ARV 5 504, 1; LIMC Ge 44 = Leto 44]) is there any difficulty in identifying a single veiled female as Leto (cf. Henle, 175-6 n. 7). The difficulty lies in the strange ‘pin cushion’ object attached to the figure’s chest, into which Apollo has apparently shot his arrows; some see this as symbolic of the invulnerability of Ge (e.g. Waser in Roscher, ML v 1050), or of Apollo’s arrows (ultimately) falling to earth (E. Buschor in Furtwangler-Reichold [n. 7] iii 280); but the Veiling of the head in such circumstances clearly represents the victim’s atlas; covering one’s head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between atlas and the eyes, exposure and visibility. Numerous passages make the connexion between atlas and veiling explicit: in Euripides’ Hippolytus, for example, the removal of Phaedra’s headress 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 atlas and at what she has said and to her wish to conceal her tears and the atlas of her eyes (244-6). This association between atlas and the veil is also apparent in passages where the former is not mentioned: Penelope’s repeated gesture. for example, of drawing her krathmenon 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 atlas is apparent from a passage in Pausanias’ account of Laconia (iii 20.10-11):

They say that the ἀθηλίαμα of Aidos, around thirty stades from the city, is a dedication of Leto, and that it was created on the following account: when Icarus gave Penelope as wife to Odysseus, he tried to make Odysseus, too, settle in Lacedaemon, but when he failed in that, he then begged his daughter to stay behind, and as he 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 [ἐγκαλαυμαζόμενη] in response to the question; Icarus, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the ἄθηλίαμα to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself [ἐγκαλαυμαζόμενη].

It is clear from the story that Pausanias relates that the ἁθήλιαμα 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 krathmenon at H. xiii 468-72, Od. vi 100 (cf. H. F. North, Sophroklymata [Ithaca 1966] 308 n. 143).
herself, rather than a personified Aidos); the link between a woman's 
"ai66" and her veiling, therefore, was so close that an artistic representation of the gesture could be construed as a representation of the quality itself. 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; 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 "ai66". On vases, the veiling which signifies "ai66" 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. Since there is very little indeed on veiling in the standard works on ancient gestures, it is worth pausing to consider in what circumstances the covering of the head does and does not betoken "ai66". 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 "ai66"; veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies "ai66". The same gesture is found also in scenes in which the wife bids farewell to the departing warrior, where, from being merely a gesture of 'greeting', 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, nor is it fortuitous that Pudicitia seems to have been particularly associated with the "univira". 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 "ai66"; in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to accompany a spontaneous emotional reaction or detail which recalls the wedding ceremony; the latter is yet more explicitly recalled in Polydeuces' use of a chariot to carry off Hilaeria (who also draws her veil). (On the chariot, cf. R. Lindner, Der Raub der Persephone in der antiken Kunst [Würzburg 1984]. Cf. Arezzo 1460, ARV² 1157, 25 (Pelops and Hippodamia), and depictions too numerous to list of the abduction and recovery of Helen in L. Ghalis-Kahlil, Les Enlevements et le retour d'Hélène (Paris 1955) and LIMC iv pls 291-359 (passim). Cf. R. Rehm, Marriage to death [Princeton 1994 40]). On abduction/marriage, cf. A. van Gennep, The rite of passage (Eng. trans. London 1960) 123-9; T.B.L. Webster, Father and patron in classical Athens (London 1972) 107; Jenkins (n. 26); Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 18) 65-70 and passim, ead. BICS xxvii (1973) 12-21; Rehm 36-40. The occurrence of the bridal gesture in other contexts suggestive of "ai66" is reason to doubt the contention of Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 30, 36, 44 that it always signifies unveiling in wedding iconography. Like Mayo, (n. 22), they refer to "the gesture known as the anakalyptis" (44); but no ancient author uses the term άνακλαλπτις in the sense or the connexion they require. Haakh (n. 22) 375-6; see his pl. xv (= Munich 2415, ARV² 1143, 2; for the correct interpretation, see, G. Davies, Apollo cxxi no. 389 [July 1964] 4-7; cf. Würzburg 160, A. Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen (Leipzig 1927) no. 14 pls 31-4; See R. Peter in Roscher, ML iii 3276-7; Langlotz (n. 24) 84-5; North (n. 21) 308-9; M. Grant, Roman imperial money (Amsterdam 1972 't 1954) 159-61. See Livy x 23, 3-10 (esp. 9); Festus p. 242, Paulus p. 243 Müller; cf. Peter in Roscher, ML iii 3277-9; G. Williams, JRS xlvii (1958) 23-4; N. Rudd, Lines of enquiry (Cambridge 1976) 42-3; Hani (n. 3) 107; E. D'Ambra, MDAI(R) xxxvii (1991) 243-8, Private lives, imperial virtues (Princeton 1993) 36-9, 56-8, 79; G. Davies in E. Marshall, M. Harlow (eds.), Messages from the past (Exeter 1996).
cover the face;32 equally, the heavily draped women and boys on vases indicate, by the mere fact of their covering themselves, their observance of the demands of αἶδος/μορφοφόρωσις.33 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 αἶδος and not-αἶδος, but between representations of occurrence and dispositional αἶδος, αἴδουs and εἶδος.

Other representations of veiled figures may seem further removed from αἶδος. Neumann, for example, considers that the veiled Penelope mentioned above (n. 24) portrays 'anxiety' (anges Harren), and distinguishes this pose from others in which the veiled figure manifests grief, sorrow, resentment, or dejection.34 But above all, Penelope is a heroine of conjugal αἶδος; 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)35 and Ajax (at the judgement of the arms)36 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 αἶδος is that of grief; clearly, grief and αἶδος 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 κατάθυτος. This is as much as to suggest that veiling need not carry connotations of αἶδος as such, but may be a symptom of something that αἶδος shares with other emotions; yet in two ways, I think, the veiling which accompanies grief may have more to do with αἶδος than that. First, where the veiled and grieving figure is a woman, veiling may suggest αἶδος qua (wifely, motherly, daughterly, sisterly, etc.) loyalty to the deceased,37 or, where the veiled figure is the deceased herself,38 the αἶδος 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 the possible result that we are dealing with a 'Bacchic initiation' scene 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 contrives αἶδος at 213-15,39 and passages in Homer and Euripides offer unequivocal examples of the αἶδος which conceals or keeps private grief and other emotions.40 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

32 Βf 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, χείρα τοῦ χαρπής: see Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 26-34 (with ill.). Cf. veiling/χείρα τοῦ χαρπής motifs in 'the marriage of death' on Berlin 1902 (ARV 63, 37); Athens NM 1926 (ARV 846, 193); also the grave relief of Myrrhae (Athens NM 4485; Friis 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 on Munich 2421 (ARV 23, 7); cf. also the progressive unmuffling of the woman undergoing 'Bacchic initiation' (Florence 391, ARV 769, 4; Oxford 1924, 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 (Para. 73, 1 bis, Add. 49; Würzburg 452 [ARV 63, 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. Cambitoglou, The red-figured vases of Apulia (Oxford 1978-82) 17 no. 71, Gaih-Kahil (n. 28) pl. 299]; cf. the shy Maenad on Chiuse 1830, ARV 975, 36. See in gen. Galt (n. 22).

34 Op. cit. (n. 12) 134 (on the rf. Per.), 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
to grief, and a hint at the woman’s possession of αἰδος/ οἰκοδομή in a wider sense.

Even if this suggestion is unacceptable, it is undeniable that αἰδος and veiling, and especially αἰδος 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 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 αἰδος makes it distinctly improbable that the vase-painter should have used those letters purely as a deliberate abbreviation of the genitive ’Αρτέμιδος. And that an inscription is verschrrieben is to be assumed only where it makes no obvious sense in context. Yet the precise significance of the word αἰδος is still not entirely clear. Of the possible explanations the following seem least improbable:

(1) Αἰτητός αἰδος is the title of the picture; this is the option 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. εἰδος).43 This interpretation, however, might draw further support from the fact that on the other, non-mythological side of the vase, the words ΧΑΙΠΕ ΔΕΜ- ΟΞΡΜΕΠΤΑΤΕ, 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 Artemis might naturally be associated, it seems odd that attention should be drawn to her αἰδος in a context where that of someone else is so clearly depicted. It is, of course, a requirement of αἰδος 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 αἰδος in this scene, and it seems to me that only independent evidence (of which there is none)44 for αἰδος 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 Rosch, 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 αἰδος 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 αἰδος, see Han [n. 3].)
of the palaestra which reveals its essential nature, the grip is a visual metaphor from the world of wrestling and 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 éρετς; 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 δήμης ἔρετς, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their έρεσσαδα watch their naked exercise with interest (and no doubt more), but do not touch, whereas Tityos is a paradigm of excessive ἔρως, 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 ἔρως, 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) ἔρημιν and older (superior) ἔρετς 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) ὑδρήστας and divine (superior) οἶνομενη.

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; χορευει (four times, once with specific addressee) is a typically symptic 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 ἔσθησις inscription, for ἔσθησις is one of the canonical symptic virtues, just as its negation, ὑδρήσις, is typically seen as a matter of symptic 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 ὑδρήσις of Tityos, much as the χαρις, εὐνομία, and εὐφόροντην of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus.

See (e.g.) Berlin 1853, CVA Berlin v. pl. 33:2; Vatican 414 (ABV 343, 3); bronze group, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore 54.972 (Poliaff fig. 32; cf. Gardiner, Athletics fig. 171; O. Tzachour-Alexandri, Mind and body [Athens 1988] pl. 165); Boston 01.0819 (ARV 24, 11); Munich 1461 (Gardiner fig. 164).

For literary parallels, see Pl. P. 4. 90-3.


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


See LIMC ii, Apollo 630-45b, 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. Kahl in J.N. Coldstream and M.A.R. Colledge (eds.), XI international congress of classical archaeology [London 1978] 78 and pl. 32; LIMC ii Artemis 1225a) depicts a veiled Leto, matron of a divine family (Zeus, Apollo) greeting the arrival of Artemis.
in Olympian 1 and Ixion in Python 2. As does much archaic poetry, Phintias’ vase, created for the enjoyment of symposiasts, 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 ποιημα, beauty, and πρασίνα against a negative mythological paradigm which emphasizes the limits of human striving.41

DOUGLAS L. CAIRNS
University of Leeds

41 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 Platôn*

Poésie 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’élégance 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 Platôn,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 Ialia De domo.

Chez Lucien, comme chez Pindare, la somptuosité de la matière ou de l’édifice s’applique à une phrase d’apparat rehaussee, directement ou indirectement, par des fables. Pindare célèbre ainsi les exploits des Théandrides: ‘Si tu me prescris encore, dit-il à Timascharès 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 (πίθυς) d’un simple mortel l’égal des rois’ (Ném., IV 82-5).4 Dans la Ville Néméenne, dédiée à Sogènes d’Égine, Pindare compare au charme des fables d’Homère la préciosité de sa poésie: ‘J’imagine que la renommée d’Ulysse a dépassé ses éprèves grâce au charme d’Homère. Car les fictions et la poésie au vol sublime lui ont donné je ne sais quel prestige. l’art nous dupe, en nous séduisant 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 soustrait à la rosee marine’ (v. 20-79). L’hymne est comme un précieux collier, ou bracelet, fait d’or, d’ivoire et de corail.5

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 dîres des mortels vont au-delà du vrai (ὑπέρ τόν ἀληθῆ λόγον): des fables (μύθοι) ornées de chatoyantes ficions (δεδομένους πεθές πνεύματος) nous illusionnent (ἐξαπατώντος)” (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 blaspéphatoire l’éclat divin d’une autre fable, véridique, en célébrant Pélôps, dont l’âme d’Olympie immortalisa la gloire: ‘Excellent bien que l’eau; mais l’or, étincelant 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 part l’hymne que mille voix répétent’ (Olymp., I, 1-8). Après avoir évoqué le héros dont ‘s’exprit ’ Poséidon, quand Cléothô le retira du bassin pur, l’épale parle de l’éclat 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 Sipylo: ‘L’homme ne doit attribuer aux dieux que des belles actions, dit-il: c’est la voix la plus sûre. Aussi, parfois de Tantale, vais-je parler de toi autrement que mes devanciers: je dirai que, lorsque ton père, convive des dieux, leur offrant à son tour un banquet, les invita à la fête irreprochable du Sipyle … ce jour-la, le Maître du trident splendide te ravit; l’amour avait dompté son cœur.6


5 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.

1 Voir Isoc., Sur l’échange, 166, citant Pindare, et se comparant à lui pour ses éloges d’Athènes.


3 C’est une des définitions du véritable art de l’élégance dans le Phèdre, 269 c-d.


7 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)