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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, 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 αἰδός is the position of Kretschmer [Die griechischen Vasenschriften (Göttingen 1894) 197]; Norwood [Essays on Eupiridean drama (Berkeley 1954) 67; and Scheffold (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 Scheffold [n. 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 Erfka [ΑΙΔΟΣ und verwandte Begriffe, Philologus Suppl. xxx. 2 (Leipzig 1937) 58] and F. Eckstein (in LIMC i.i, 352-3) that the letters are an abbreviation of the genitive Artemidos is not to be dismissed, notwithstanding Kretschmer’s assurance [Vasenschriften 197] that ΑΙΔΟΣ not [ΑΠΤΕ][ΜΙΔΟΣ is the correct reading (note that the vase also names Leto in the gen.). An association of Artemis and αἰδός makes sense, and a cult would not be impossible, but we should be wary of assuming either from such doubtful evidence.

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
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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 ( Apollo’s) covering one’s head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between (Apollo’s) eyes, exposure and visibility. Numerous passages make the connexion between Apollo and his victim cannot be Apollo’s veiling; covering one’s head is a typical response of the recipient of unwanted erotic attentions.

They say that the (Apollo) of Aidos, around thirty stades from the city, is a dedication of Phaedra, 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 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 in response to the question; Icarius, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the (Apollo) to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself.

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

21 Pho. 1485-92; Pl. Phdr. 237a, Aeschin. i 26 (etc.); on veiling as stage business in tragedy see F.L. Shisler, AJP lxvi (1945) 385.

21 See M. Nagler, Spontaneity and tradition (Berkeley 1974) 44-72, 80, who also (47-9) notes the significance of the removal of the (Apollo) at II. xxi 468-72, Od. vi 100 (cf. R. Seaford in T.H. Carpenter, C.A. Faraone [eds.], Masks of Dionysus [Princeton 1993] 177-21, id. Reciprocity and ritual [Oxford 1994] 333, 350-1). Contrast F. Studniczka, Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht (Vienna 1886) 125-7; H. Haakh, Gymnasium lxv (1959) 374-80; and Neumann (n. 12) 179 n. 134, who believe that Penelope is unveiling herself in response to the question; Icarius, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the (Apollo) to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself.

22 See Cairns (n. 1) 15, 98-9 n. 1, 151, 158, 184, 217-18, 231, 292-3, 312, 352; also in CQ 46 (1996).
herself, rather than as a personified Aidos);[23] the link between a woman’s αὐτῶν ὄμα & 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 αὐτῶν ὄμα &. On vases, the veiling which signifies αὐτῶν ὄμα & is not to be sharply distinguished from that which signifies ‘marriage’, for the latter is merely a ritualized form of a gesture which in every lifetime 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 αὐτῶν ὄμα &. 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 αὐτῶν ὄμα &: veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies αὐτῶν ὄμα &.\[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 αὐτῶν ὄμα &: in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to

\[22\] Cf. E. Eckstein, LIMC i.1, 352; also R. Schulz, ΑΙΔΩΣ (Diss. Rostock 1910) 98-9; von Effra, ΑΙΔΩΣ 57.

\[23\] Cf. the remark of Pliny (xxxv 63) that in his portrait of Persephone Zeuxis pittissa mores videtar (cited by H.T. Carpenter, Art and myth in ancient Greece [London 1991] 235); Carpenter is no doubt right to say that Zeuxis depicted Persephone as in his fig. 347 (Chiusi 1831, ARV² 1300, 2); the pose of this seated, veiled Persephone is very similar to that of the Persepolis torso which Eckstein, JDAI iv.4 (1959) 137-57, LIMC i.1, 352-3 (pl. 270, Aidos as in LIMC 1.2), the authors of the Aidos/Persephone discussed by Pausanias; against this identification, see E. Langlotz, JDAI lxxvi (1961) 72-99; cf. W. Gauer, JDAI cv (1990) 31-65.


\[25\] 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 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 αὐτῶν ὄμα & and the normal focus of women’s αὐτῶν ὄμα & is sexual. For the bride’s veiling as expression of her αὐτῶν ὄμα & see E. IT 372-6. There, Iphigenia’s αὐτῶν ὄμα & is clearly a genuine emotional reaction; but it may be naive 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 αὐτῶν ὄμα & at leaving her father (as in the Pausian passage) and at the thought of her future as a sexual being is also a valuable indication of her loyalty to her κόρης and of her innocence, and thus of her eligibility and promise as a wife; there may therefore have been a considerably 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. Kuhrt (eds.), Images of women in antiquity (London 1983) 109-17; Redfield (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 1994] 6-7; cf. Würzburg 160, A. Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen (Leipzig 1927 no. 14 psl 31-4).

\[26\] See R. Perle, Roscher, ML ii 3276-7; Langlotz (n. 24) 84-5; North (n. 21) 308-9; M. Grant, Roman imperial money (Amsterdam 1972 ‘1954) 159-61.

cover the face;[7] equally, the heavily draped women and boys on vases indicate, by the mere fact of their covering themselves, their observance of the demands of στήθος/κοσμορροφήσις. [8] 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 στήθος and not-στήθος, but between representations of occurrent and dispositional στήθος, τόκος and ξύλου.

Other representations of veiled figures may seem further removed from στήθος. Neumann, for example, considers that the veiled Penelope mentioned above (n. 24) portrays 'axi6; a δευτέρα' (ranges 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 στήθος; 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 στήθος is that of grief; clearly, grief and στήθος 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 καρδιά.

This is as much as to suggest that veiling need not carry connotations of στήθος as such, but may be a symptom of something that στήθος shares with other emotions; yet in two ways, I think, the veiling which accompanies grief may have more to do with στήθος than that. First, where the veiled and grieving figure is a woman, veiling may suggest στήθος qua (wifely, motherly, daughterly, sisterly, etc.) loyalty to the deceased, [35] or, where the veiled figure is the deceased herself, [36] the στήθος which characterized the woman in life. More importantly, however, veiling as an accompaniment to any emotion may indicate a way of concealing emotion or prefer to act 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 στήθος at 213-15, [37] and passages in Homer and Euripides offer unequivocal examples of the στήθος which conceals or keeps private grief and other emotions. [38] 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 emotion.

[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, χειρός ετη χαριανή; see Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 26-34 (with ill.). Cf. veiling/χειρός ετη χαριανή motifs in the 'marriage of death' on Berlin 1902 (ARV 363, 37); Athens NM 1926 (ARV 846, 193); and the grave relief of Myrrhine (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 showing Zeus and Hera; O. Benndorf, Die Metopen von Selinunt [Frg. 1873] 54 and pl. R; cf. Hera and Zeus on the Parthenon frieze [K. Scheffold, Die Göttergasse 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 iii (1984) 303-4] regards as an allusion to the ἀνακολουθησις; but (a) unveiling implies previous veiling, to which στήθος 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 ἀνακολουθησις, see J.H. Oakley, AA (1982) 113-18; R.F. Sutton in id. [ed.], Daidalikon : studies ... Schoder [Wauconda, Ill. 1989] 359-72; Oakley and Sinos [n. 25] 25-6, 30, Rehm [n. 28] 141-2.)

[33] On Mantelknaben and (οξποτεντα), see Sittl (n. 27) 7-8 (to his refs add Aeschin. i 26 [Athens], Xen. Lac. Pol. 3. 4 [Sparta]). Illustrations in Dover (n. 18) R637, 791, 851 (boys), 867 (woman); M.F. Kilmer, Greek Erotica (London 1973) R196, 322, 576, 622.1 (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, 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 (Paras. 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 Aпуlia (Oxford 1978-82) 17 no. 71, Ghali-Kahil (n. 28) pl. 29]; 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. 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 χειρός ετη χαριανή; Munich 8770 (Para. 341, Add. 189; LIMC i pl. 104, Achilles 445); London E 56 (ARV 185, 39); cf. LIMC i, Achilles 439-48, 52-3.

[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; 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 of Mennon on the cup, Ferrara 44885 (ARV 882, 35).

[38] As 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.

[39] See Cairns (n. 1) 157-8, and contrast N.I. Richardson, The Homic hymn to Demeter (Oxford 1974) ad. loc. 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 στήθος; cf. viii 532, xix 118-22 [cf. Il. xxiv 90-1]; E. Her. 1162, 1200, Or. 280-2, 14981-2. 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 στήθος in the way that he copes with his emotions; cf. Achilles grieving for Patroklos on London E 363 (ARV 586, 36, Carpenter fig. 313); on mourners' restraint on Attic white-ground lekythoi, see H.A. Shapiro, AJA xv (1991) 652-3.
to grief, and a hint at the woman's possession of οἶδας/οἶδασσώμη in a wider sense.

Even if this suggestion is unacceptable, it is undeniable that αἰτίας and veiling, and especially οἶδας 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 ΑΙΔΩΣ 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 οἶδας makes it distinctly improbable that the vase-painter should have used those letters purely as a deliberate abbreviation of the genitive 'Αρητήμιδος. 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 οἶδας is still not entirely clear. Of the possible explanations the following seem least improbable:

(1) Αρητήμιδος is the title of the picture; this is the option favoured by Waser;91 and is not as unlikely as it at first seems, given that there are vases on which inscriptions constitute titles.92 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. οἶδας).93 This interpretation, however, might draw further support from the fact that on the other, non-mythological side of the vase, the words ΧΑΙΠΕ ΔΕΜΟ-ΟΞΤΠΑΤΕ, 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 οἶδας might naturally be associated, it seems odd that attention should be drawn to her οἶδας in a context where that of someone else is so clearly depicted. It is, of course, a requirement of οἶδας 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 οἶδας in this scene, and it seems to me that only independent evidence (of which there is none)94 for οἶδας 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.

91 See Kretschmer, Vasenischriften 83; Immerwahr (n. 7) 112, 183-4.
92 Vases regularly shift between the nom. and the gen. in naming figures (Kretschmer 137).
93 The personification in E. Hipp. 78 (Aidos as Artemis' gardener; cf. Aidos as Athena's nurse, schol. von A. PV 12c Herington) does not prove that Artemis herself could be designated Aidos. Personification of οἶδας 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 οἶδας, see Hani [n. 3].)

One might argue, for example, that οἶδας could refer to Leto's veiling without having to be construed with the genitive, Αρητήμιδος, and some might be tempted to argue for a sophisticated pun in which ΑΙΔΩΣ 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 ΑΙΔΩΣ 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.95

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,96 but, more particularly, the grip which Tityos employs is also a recurrent motif in such scenes.97 This is a grip which is also found in other, quite different mythological scenes, especially featuring Heracles and Theseus.98 but it is its appearance in numerous representations of the everyday techniques

95 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.
96 See (e.g.) Tityos and Leto themselves on a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-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).
97 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 and Thetis in der griechischen Vasenmalerei (Diss. Münster 1973 [1975]) 21, 25-43, 55-60, 66-74, 89-105, 113-21, with pls 2b-c, 4-3, 8b.
98 Examples featuring Heracles now most conveniently in LIMC; see s.vv. 'Acheloos', 'Antioos I', 'Halois Geron', 'Herakles', 'Nereus'. Cf. R. Volkommer, Herakles in the art of classical Greece (Oxford 1988). Theseus and Cercyon, see the Hephaesteaum metope (Brommer [n. 46] pl. 7b); vases: London E 36 (ARV 115, 3); London E 48 (ARV 431, 47); 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; Scheftold (no. 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 érōtē; 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 in that which the pentathlon actually culminated. On the athletic side of the vase two pentathlon 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 delection, 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 δρωσις ἐνίκης, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their ἐρωταδέλφον watch their naked exercise with interest (and no doubt more), but do not touch, whereas Tityos is a paradigm of excessive ἐρως, 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 ἐρως, 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) ἔρωμενος and older (superior) ἐρωτάδελφος, 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) ὑβριστής and divine (superior) ὑβρισμένη.

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; χαρίστε ὑπέρ τῆς (four times, once 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 ὑβρισμός inscription, for ὑβρισμός is one of the canonical sympotic virtues, just as its negation, ὑβρίς, is typically seen as a matter of sympotic 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 ὑβρίς of Tityos, much as the χάρις, εὐνοῦμο, and ἐφοροῦσσα of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus.

49 See (e.g.) Berlin 1853, CVA Berlin v. pl. 33.2; Vatican 414 (ABV 343, 3); bronze group, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore 54.972 (Polakoff fig. 32; cf. Gardiner, Athletics fig. 171; O. Tzachar-Alexandri, Mind and body [Athens 1988] pl. 165); Boston 01.8019 (ARV² 24, 11); Munich 1461 (Gardiner fig. 164).

50 For literary parallels, see Pl. P. 4.90-3.


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


56 See LIMC ii, Apollo 630-45b, 515a-54, Artemis 1105-23 (n.b. Leto [alone] is veiled on at least three of these [Apollo 635b, 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 *Ilios* in *Python* 2. As does much archaic poetry, Phintas’ 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 πονες, beauty, and άπειρωτικό (against a negative mythological paradigm which emphasizes the limits of human striving).

DOUGLAS L. CAIRNS

*University of Leeds*

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

L’ecphrasis 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*

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’eloquence 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 fable 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 rehaussée, directement ou indirectement, par des fables.

Pindare célèbre ainsi les exploits des Théandreides: ‘Si tu me prescris encore, dit-il à Timasarcos 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 ne est plus que splendeur fulgurante, mais que l’hymne qui célèbre les grands exploits fait (περίτοις) d’un simple mortel l’égal des rois’ (*Ném.*, IV 82-5).

Dans la *Ville Néméenne*, dédiée à Sogènes d’Égine, Pindare compare au charme des fables d’Hermé de la préciosité de sa poésie: ‘J’imagine que la renommée d’Ulysse a dépassé ses époques grâce au charme d’Homère. Car les fictions et la poésie au vol sublime lui ont donné le seul prestige que 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 *Ire Olympique*, un diadème doré ciselé, serti de pierres: ‘Ah! le monde est plein de merveilles—et parfois aussi les dires des mortels vont au-delà du vrai (υπὲρ τὸν ἀλλοθρῆ λόγον); des fables (μῦθοι) ornées de chatoyantes fictions (δέδακτοι μηνεία κοῦτσις) nous illusionnent (ἐξαπατώμενοι)’ (v. 28-29). C’est à quoi Pindare renonce dans cette ode consacrée à Héron 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, vériquide, en célébrant Pélôs, dont l’ârène d’Olympie immortalisa la gloire: ‘Excellent bien que l’eau; mais l’or, éteignant 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 qui mille voix repètent’ (*Olymp.*, I, 1-8). Après avoir évoqué le héros dont s’exprima Posidéon, quand Clotho 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 Pélôs ait disparu dévoré par les dieux lors d’un festin offert par Tantale sur le Sipyle: ‘L’homme ne doit attribuer aux dieux que des fables. Tresser des fleurs en couronnes, tâche facile. Mais l’or, éteignant comme une flamme qui s’allume dans la nuit, efface tous les trésors de la fière opulence, dit Pindare.

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


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


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

NOTES
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)