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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; ARV^2 23, 1; Paralipomena 323, Addenda 2; 154); see now also LIMC ii pl. 275. Apollo 1069, vi, Leto 34; PLATE I ...). That this constitutes an association between the goddess and αἰδός is the position of Kretschmer [Die griechischen Vaseninschriften (Göttingen 1894) 197]; Norwood [Essays on Euripidean drama (Berkeley 1954) 76 n. 2], and Scheffel [Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst (Munich 1978) 68]. Certainly analogous titles/epiteths exist—the cult of Artemis Eukleia is discussed by Braun [JHS c (1980) 184-5]; and Scheffel [fn. 3] 330 n. 152 points to a possible description of Artemis as Aretē on a black-figure neck amphora by the Antonitennes Painter (Basel iii, 3; the figure so designated, however, is not certainly Artemis). But the view of von Erffa [ΑΙΔΟΣ und verwandte Begriffe, Philitologus 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 [Vaseninschriften 197] that ΑΙΔΟΣ not [ΑΡΤΗΕ]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.

* For assistance in the preparation of this note, I am indebted to: W.G. Arnott; H. Bemsdorff; 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, Etruscan and Roman Antiquities, Musée du Louvre; A.H. Sommerstein; and two referees, one anonymous and one (C. Sourvinou-Inwood) not.


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


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


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

7. F. Hauser, in A. Furtwängler and K. Reichold, Griechische Vasenmalerei (Munich 1904-32) ii 273 n. 1, rejects the "abbreviation" view, but interprets the letters as a slip for 'Ἀρτημός; 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.

8. The complete list of inscriptions is: (A) ΧΑΙΡΕ ΚΑΙΡΕ (both horizontal, to left of Apollo) ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ (vertical, to right of Art.) ΑΕΤΟΤΟΣ (vert., to right of L.) ΧΑΙΡΕ (horiz., above Art.'s raised right hand) ΑΙΔΟΣ (vert., to right of Art.) (B) ΣΟΣΡΕΤΑΣΟΣ (horiz., above the two central figures) ΚΑΔΣΟΣ (horiz., at top right of scene) ΣΟΣΙΝΟΣ (vert., to right of figure on far left) ΧΑΡΕΣ (vert., to right of discus-thrower) ΧΑΙΡΕ (vert., between acontist's legs) ΔΕΜΟΣΙΟΣ (vert., to right of acontist) ΣΟΣΙΑΣ (vert., to right of spectator on far right); see Immerwahr (n. 7) 66-7. Sotinos and Sosias are the two older spectators; κολός goes with Sostrotas and Demostratos is the recipient of the greeting; but it is unclear whether the discus-thrower is Sostrotas or Sotares, the acontist Chares or Demostratos; and neither χαρεῖ nor κολός inscriptions need refer to individuals depicted on the vase. On A, the three χαρεῖ 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!).


10. Certainly London E 278 (ARV^2 226, 2; LIMC ii pl. 133, Leto 36 = Apollo 1070 = Ge 43); Munich 2689 (ARV^2 879, 2; LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollo 1071 = Ge 45 = Leto 45); Louvre G375 (ARV^2 1032, 54; Leto designated ΜΕΛΟΙΟΣ); a rf krater from the Loeb Collection (Munich, Loeb 472; J. Sieveking, Bronzen, Terrakotten, Vasen der Sammlung Loeb [Munich 1930] 61 and pl. 48, line 13 pl. vii, 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 vi pl. 133, Leto 40) Leto draws her veil just as on the vases.


12. The interpretation which see Ge as practically a fixture in scenes of the pursuit/killing of Tityos goes back over Backebook (n. 2) iii 383-90, and is well represented by the entries s.v. "Tityos" in Roscher and RE (e.g. K. Scheringer in RE vi A 1599: "Wenn eine Frau neben T. oder zwischen ihm und Apollon steht, so ist es seine Mutter Ge"); despite rebuttal by Greifenhagen and Henle, it has some more recent adherents (e.g. G. Neumann, Gesten und Gebarden in der griechischen Kunst (Berlin 1965) 176 n. 127, 189 n. 280). See most recently M. Moore in LIMC iv.1, 175-6, L. Kahil, ibid. 1, 260.

13. Greifenhagen (n. 3) 22, against (e.g.) Waser in Roscher, ML vi 1047, Scheringer in RE vi A 1602; the motif of Antaeus' need to maintain contact with Earth appears to be post-classical: see Gerhard (n. 2) ii 189 n. 280; M. Moore 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.
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 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 παρθένός; covering one’s head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between παρθένος, the eyes, exposure and visibility.19 Numerous passages make the connexion between παρθένος 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 παρθένος at what she has said and to her wish to conceal her tears and the παρθένος in her eyes (244-6).20 This association between παρθένος and the veil is also apparent in passages where the former is not mentioned: Penelope’s repeated gesture.21 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.22

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

They say that the δηράλαια 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 [ήχυσαν] in response to the question; Icarus, recognizing that she wished to leave with Odysseus, let her go, and dedicated the δηράλαια to Aidos; for this, they say, was the point on the journey that Penelope had reached when she veiled herself [ήχυσαν ἀπό θυρεόσθεν].

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

14 On one vase (New York 08.258.21, ARV² 1086, 1; LIMC ii pl. 275, Apollo 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 ΘΕ on a Tyrrhenian amphora in the Louvre (E 864, ARV 97, 33; LIMC ii pl. 274, Apollo 1066 = Ge 10); cf. Moore (n. 12) 175; n.b. Ge does not veil here.

16 Other two vases (Tarquinia RC 1043 [ARV 97, 32; LIMC Ge 11 = Leto 42 = Niobida 3], Villa Giulia, ARB 121, 6 [LIMC iv pl. 97 Ge 12 = Leto 34]) offer more than one female character (besides Art.), and so also permit an identification of Ge as a participant (cf. Moore, loc. cit.); in both, the central female figure, between pursuers and pursued, is veiling, and Greifen- 


18 See, e.g. Leningrad 777 [ARV² 502, 11; Sourvinou-Inwood pl. 6]; Madrid 11038 [ARV² 586, 46; K.J. Dover, Greek homosexuality [London 1978] R750]; London E 64 (ARV² 455, 9); Paris, Petit Palais 316 [ARV² 593, 58].

19 See Cairns (n. 1) 15, 98-9 n. 151, 158, 184, 217-18, 231, 292-3, 312, 352; also in CQ 46 (1996).

20 Cf. Her. 1159-62, IT 372-6, Or 459-61 (Cairns [n. 1] 292-3, 3); 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.


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 ll. 468-72, Od. vi 100 (cf. H. R. Seaford, Iliad 11 [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 order to appear more attractive to the suitors. Cf. K. Friis Johansen, The Attic grave reliefs of the classical period (Copenhagen 1951) 41 n. 1, re sephral reliefs; C.M. Galt, AJA xxxix (1931) 373-93; also the summary of a paper by M.E. Mayo in AJA lxvii (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 παρθένος (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);\(^{23}\) the link between a woman’s ßαμμακία 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 ßαμμακία. On vases, the veiling which signifies ßαμμακία is not to be sharply distinguished from that which signifies ‘marriage’, for the latter is merely a formalized 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 ßαμμακία. 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 ßαμμακία; veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies ßαμμακία.\(^{28}\) 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 ßαμμακία; in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to

---

23 Cf. F. Eckstein, LIMC i.1, 352; also R. Schulz, AИΔΗΣ (Diss. Rostock 1910) 96-9; von Erffa, AИΔΗΣ 57.

24 Cf. the remark of Pliny (xxxv 63) that in his portrait of Penelope Zeuxis pirasse more venit (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, ARV\(1\) 1300, 2); the pose of this seated, veiled Penelope is very similar to that of the Persepolis torso which Eckstein, JDAI lxxiv.1 (1959) 137-57, LIMC i.1, 352-3 (pl. 270, Aidos), and in LIMC 12, 1972, p. 33 as discussed by Pausanias; against this identification, see E. Langlotz, JDAI lxxvi (1961) 72-99; cf. W. Gauer, JDAI cv (1990) 31-65.


26 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 ßαμμακία, and the normal focus of women’s ßαμμακία is sexual. For the bride’s veiling as expression of her ßαμμακία, see E. IT 372-6. There, Iphigeneia’s focus of women’s ßαμμακία is sexual. For the bride’s veiling as expression of her ßαμμακία, see E. IT 372-6. There, Iphigeneia’s focus of women’s ßαμμακία is sexual. For the bride’s veiling as expression of her ßαμμακία, see E. IT 372-6. There, Iphigeneia’s focus of women’s ßαμμακία is sexual.

27 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 ßαμμακία. 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 ßαμμακία; veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies ßαμμακία.\(^{28}\) 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 ßαμμακία; in the iconography of the wedding, the head is veiled, but the veil is not necessarily drawn to

28 For the interaction of ‘marriage’ and ‘abduction’ motifs, see (e.g.) the Medias Painter’s depiction of the rape of the Leucippides (London E 224, ARV\(^1\) 1313, 5; L. Burn, The Medias painter [Oxford 1987] 16-17, 25 and pls 1a, 2b-3, 4b-9b); Eriphyle is lifted aloft by Castor, who holds her exactly as Titys does Leto on the Phintias vase (c.f. n. 47 below), but the tugging at her veil is at once a spontaneous response to sexual outrage and a detail which recalls the wedding ceremony; the latter is yet more explicitly recalled in Polydeuces’ use of a chariot to carry off Hilairea (who also draws her veil). (On the chariot, cf. R. Lindner, Der Raub der Persephone in der antiken Kunst [Würzburg 1984].) Cf. Arezzo 1460, ARV\(^1\) 1157, 25 (Pelops and Hippodameia), and depictions too numerous to list of the abduction and recovery of Helen in L. Ghali-Kahil, Les Enlevements et le retour d’Hélène (Paris 1955) and LIMC iv pls 291-359 passim (cf. R. Rehm, Marriage to death [Princeton 1994] 39). On abduction/marriage, cf. A. van Gennep, The rites of passage (Eng. trans. London 1960) 123-9; T.B.L. Webster, Partner and patron in classical Athens (London 1972) 107; Jenkins (n. 26); Sourvinou-Inwood (n. 18) 65-70 and passim, ead. BICS xx (1973) 12-21; Rehm 36-40. The occurrence of the bridal gesture in other contexts suggestive of ßαμμακία 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 anakalyptos’ (44); but no ancient author uses the term ἀνακάλυψις in the sense or the connexion they require.

29 Haakh (n. 22) 375-6; see his pl. xv (= Munich 2415, ARV\(^1\) 1143, 2; for the correct interpretation, see G. Davies, Apollo cxxi no. 389 [July 1994] 6-7; cf. Würzburg 160, A. Rumpf, Chaldische Vasen (Leipzig 1927) no. 14 pls 31-4; 32.

30 See R. Peters in Roscher, ML iii 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;[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 oδδός/σωματοφυσία. 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 oδδός and not-oδδός, but between representations of occurrent and dispositional oδδός, oδδός and ἔχεις.

Other representations of veiled figures may seem further removed from oδδός. Neumann, for example, considers that the veiled Penelope mentioned above (n. 24) portrays "anxieties" (Hanges, Harren), and distinguishes this pose from others in which the veiled figure manifests grief, sorrow, resentment, or dejection. But above all, Penelope is a heroine of conjugal oδδός; 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 oδδός is that of grief; clearly, grief and oδδός 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 κατηγορία. This is as much as to suggest that veiling need not carry connotations of oδδός as such, but may be a symptom of something that oδδός shares with other emotions; yet in two ways, I think, the veiling which accompanies grief may have more to do with oδδός than that. First, where the veiled and grieving figure is a woman, veiling may suggest oδδός qua (wifely, motherly, daughterly, sisterly, etc.) loyalty to the deceased,[33] or, where the veiled figure is the deceased herself, the oδδός which characterized the woman in life. More importantly, however, veiling as an accompaniment to any emotion may indicate a way of concealing emotion of coping with it, with oneself. 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 oδδός at 213-15,[34] and passages in Homer and Euripides offer unequivocal examples of the oδδός which conceals or keeps private grief and other emotions. Thus on works of art depicting veiled and grieving women, the veiling may be at once a manifestation of grief, a sign of a restrained and modest response to which ct56x is still relevant, and (b) this unveiling should not be assimilated to the modest gesture of drawing the himation across the face (see n. 22 above). (On the ὄμπλεπτική, see J.H. Oakley, AA (1982) 113-18; R.F. Sutton in id. [ed.], Daidalikon: studies ... Schoeder [Wascona, Ill. 1989] 357-9; Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 25-6, 30; Rehm (n. 28) 141-2.)

33 On Mantelknaben and (ο4xποτερίτα, see Sittl (n. 27) 7-8 (to his ref add Aesch. i 26 [Athens, Xen. Luc. Pol. 3. 4 [Sparta]). Illustrations in Dover (n. 18) R867, 791, 851 (boys), 867 (woman); M.F. Kilmer, Greek erotica (London 1993) R196, 322, 576, 622.1 (boys), Cl (woman); cf. the muffled boy on Munich 2421 (ARV2 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. Bédard [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 (Par. 73, 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. 299]; cf. the shy Maenad on Chiusi 1830, ARV 975, 36; See in gen. Gatt (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.
to grief, and a hint at the woman’s possession of οἶδωκός/σαράγοντα in a wider sense.

Even if this suggestion is unacceptable, it is undeniable that οἶδωκός and veiling, and especially οἶδωκός 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 OZTPATE, which obviously are to be construed here as often elsewhere, as giving the character’s name improbable: the inscription is verschrieben is to be assumed only where should have used those letters purely as a deliberate abbreviation of the genitive Ἀρτέμις. 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 οἶδωκός is still not entirely clear. Of the possible explanations the following seem least improbable:

(1) Αἰτως οἶδωκός 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. οἶδωκός).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–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 οἶδωκός might naturally be associated, it seems odd that attention should be drawn to her οἶδωκός in a context where that of someone else is so clearly depicted. It is, of course, a requirement of οἶδωκός that one should defend one’s mother’s honour, but this is a requirement which applies equally to Apollo. Leto clearly has a stronger claim to οἶδωκός in this scene, and it seems to me that only independent evidence (of which there is none)44 for οἶδωκός 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. vetr. A. ΠV 12c Herington) does not prove that Artemis herself could be designated Aidos. Personification of οἶδωκός 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 οἶδωκός, see Hani [n. 3].)

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

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

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

45 Here I build on the suggestion of R. Osborne, Classical landscape with figures (London 1987) 110-11, that the scenes on this amphora are related. For a suggestive approach to interaction between figure-scenes on vases, see F. Lissarrague in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), Art and text in ancient Greek culture (Cambridge 1994) 12-27, esp. 18-19, 22-5.
46 See (e.g.) Tityos and Leto themselves on a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (Zancani Montuoro and 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).
47 See Dover R750 (cf. n. 18 above); Castor and Eryphyle (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); Pleus and Thestis (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 Thestis in der griechischen Vasenmalerei (Diss. Münster 1973 [1975]) 21, 25-43, 55-60, 66-74, 89-105, 113-21, with pls 2b-c, 3-4, 8b.
48 Examples featuring Heracles now most conveniently in LIMC; see s.vv. ‘Acheloos’, ‘Antios I’, ‘Halios Geron’, ‘Herakles’, ‘Nereus’. Cf. R. Vollkommer, Herakles in the art of classical Greece (Oxford 1988). Theseus and Cercyon, see the Hephaestean 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. Gardiner, JHS xxv (1905) 14, 282-4, xxvi (1906) 11-12, E. Kampf zwischen Peleus and Thestis in der griechischen Vasenmalerei (Diss. Münster 1973 [1975]) 21, 25-43, 55-60, 66-74, 89-105, 113-21, with pls 2b-c, 3-4, 8b.

Examples featuring Heracles now most conveniently in LIMC; see s.vv. ‘Acheloos’, ‘Antios I’, ‘Halios Geron’, ‘Herakles’, ‘Nereus’. Cf. R. Vollkommer, Herakles in the art of classical Greece (Oxford 1988). Theseus and Cercyon, see the Hephaestean 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. Gardiner, JHS xxv (1905) 14, 282-4, xxvi (1906) 11-12, 15-18, Athletics in the ancient world (London 1930) 181, 205, 220; Scheftel (n. 3) 71, 94, 138, 311; Brommer (n. 46) 19; M.B. Poliakoff, Combat sports in the ancient world (New Haven 1987) 136-9; on mythological paradigms for wrestling/athletics, see Webster (n. 28) 56, 62, 251, 260, 265.
of the palaestra which reveals its essential nature, the grip is a visual metaphor from the world of wrestling and/or the pankration. Clearly, where Theseus and Heracles employ this grip, this belongs with their general presentation as paradigms of athletic prowess; a similar allusion to youthful athleticism is apparent in Peleus’ wrestling with Thetis and Atalanta. Equally clearly, however, Tityos is nobody’s ideal athlete; but a paradigm may be negative as well as positive, and this is where the athletic scene on the other side of the vase comes in. One is already invited to consider the possibility of a relation between the two scenes by virtue of the compositional parallel; but the relation goes beyond the merely aesthetic. The athletes on side B are practising their skills in the proper context of the gymnasium, their youth and their beauty manifesting the admired ideal of athletic ἀθλητής; 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 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 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 ἀθλητής, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their ἀθλητής; they watch their naked exercise with interest (and no doubt more), but do not touch, whereas Tityos is a paradigm of excessive ἀθλητής, 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 ἀθλητής, 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) ἀθλητής and older (superior) ἀθλητής, 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) ἀθλητής and divine (superior) ἀθλητής.

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; χααρε (four times, once with specific addressee) is a typically sympotic imperative.

The single kalos-inscription also places the vase in the pederastic milieu of the aristocratic symposium. These inscriptions also fit well with the ἀθλητής inscriptions, for ἀθλητής is one of the canonical sympotic virtues, just as its negation, ἄθλητης, 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 ἄθλητης of Tityos, much as the χααρε, ευνούμον, and ἐορφοσόντῃ of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus.
in Olympian 1 and Ixion in Pythonian 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 πολεμικός, beauty, and ἄρετα against a negative mythological paradigm which emphasizes the limits of human striving.61
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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 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’élloquent 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, mais de la renommée et de l’éloquence, dans un registre de prestigie, pour des figures comme le Peri Ideên d’Hermogène sont miennes.

4 Les éditions utilisées, ainsi que les traductions, éventuelles, sont celles de la collection des Éditions de l’Hermé, pour le De domo de Lucien, et la représentation des deux styles d’une esthétique inspirée de Pindare et de Platon.


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


3 C’est l’une des définitions du véritable art de l’élloquent dans le Phèdre, 269 c-4.
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)