

NOTES

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

At p. 319 n. 203 of my recent book,¹ 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 αἰδώς is the position of Kretschmer [*Die griechischen Vasenschriften* (Gütersloh 1894) 197],² Norwood [*Essays on Euripidean drama* (Berkeley 1954) 76 n. 2], and Schefold [*Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst* (Munich 1978) 68].³ Certainly analogous titles/epithets exist—the cult of Artemis Eukleia is discussed ... by Braund [*JHS* c (1980) 184-5],⁴ and Schefold [(n. 3) 330 n. 152]⁵ points to a possible description of Artemis as Aretê on a black-figure neck amphora by the Antimenes Painter (Basel iii, 3; the figure so designated, however, is not certainly Artemis).⁶ But the view of von Erffa [*ΑΙΔΟΣ und verwandte Begriffe*, *Philologus* Suppl. xxx. 2 (Leipzig 1937) 58] and F. Eckstein (in *LIMC* i.1, 352-3) that the letters are an abbreviation of the genitive *Artemidos* is not to be dismissed, notwithstanding Kretschmer's assurance [*Vasenschriften* 197]⁷ that ΑΙΔΟΣ not [ΑΠΤΕ]ΜΙΔΟΣ is the correct reading (note that the vase also names Leto in the gen.).⁸ An association of Artemis and αἰδώς 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. Bernsdorff; D.H. Berry; F. Cairns; C.J. Classen; G. Davies; R. Hannah; Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung; Seminar für klassische Philologie und Institut für Archäologie (Göttingen); Department of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Antiquities, Musée du Louvre; A.H. Sommerstein; and two referees, one anonymous and one (C. Sourvinou-Inwood) not.

¹ *Aidôs* (Oxford 1993).

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

³ = *Gods and heroes in late archaic Greek art* (Eng. trans. Cambridge 1992) 71 (cited hereafter from trans.). Cf. A. Greifenhagen, 'Tityos', *Jb. Berl. Mus.* i (1959) 19; J. Hani in J. Duchemin (ed.), *Mythe et personnification* (Paris 1980) 105.

⁴ On (Art.) Eukleia, see now *LIMC* ii.1, 677 (L. Kahil); H.A. Shapiro, *Personifications in Greek art* (Zürich 1993) 70-8.

⁵ On *ABV* 269, 41 (*LIMC* ii pl. 553, Artemis 1300); cf. P.E. Arias and M. Hirmer, *A history of Greek vase painting* (rev. B. Shefton, London 1962) 318.

⁶ Schefold (n. 3) 337 n. 353 also identifies as Aretê the figure crowning Heracles on two vases described by J.D. Beazley (*AK* iv [1961] 56 no. 3, 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 Ἀρτέμιδος; 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 most⁹ 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:¹⁰ as Greifenhagen has shown,¹¹ 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;¹² the once prevalent identification of the goddess with Ge rests on an illegitimate comparison with Antaeus' alleged need to maintain contact with his mother,¹³ on a naive belief that a

⁸ The complete list of inscriptions is: (A) XAIPE KAIPE (both horizontal, to left of Apollo) ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝ (vertical, to right of Ap.) ΔΕΤΟΥΣ (vert., to right of L.) XAIPE (horiz., above Art.'s raised right hand) ΑΙΔΟΣ (vert., to right of Art.) (B) ΣΟΕΤΡΑΤΟΣ (horiz., above the two central figures) ΚΑΛΟΣ (horiz., at top right of scene) ΣΟΤΙΝΟΣ (vert., to right of figure on far left) ΧΑΠΕΣ (vert., to right of discus-thrower) XAIPE (vert., between acontist's legs) ΔΕΜΟΣΤΡΑΤΕ (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; καλός goes with Sostratos and Demostros is the recipient of the greeting; but it is unclear whether the discus-thrower is Sostratos or Chares, the acontist Chares or Demostros; and neither χαίρει nor καλός inscriptions need refer to individuals depicted on the vase. On A, the three χαίρει inscriptions are most probably extra-ionic; 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 Aidôs!').

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

¹⁰ Certainly London E 278 (ARV² 226, 2; *LIMC* vi pl. 133, Leto 36 = Apollon 1070 = Ge 43); Munich 2689 (ARV² 879, 2; *LIMC* ii pl. 275, Apollon 1071 = Ge 45 = Leto 45); Louvre G375 (ARV² 1032, 54; Leto designated ΜΕΛΟΥΣΑ); 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* vi pl. 133, Leto 38 = Artemis 1368); perhaps also Berlin 1835 (ABV 286, 10: A. Furtwängler, *Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium* [Berlin 1885] 331-2); and possibly those 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.

¹¹ (n. 3) 19-27; cf. P. Zancani Montuoro and U. Zanotti-Bianco, *Heraion alla Foce del Sele* (Rome 1951-4) ii 325-9, J. Henle, *Greek myths* (Bloomington 1974) 35-7.

¹² The interpretation which see Ge as practically a fixture in scenes of the pursuit/killing of Tityos goes back to Overbeck (n. 2) iii 383-90, and is well represented by the entries s.v. 'Tityos' in Roscher and *RE* (e.g. K. Scherling in *RE* vi A 1599: 'Wenn eine Frau neben T. oder zwischen ihm und Apollon steht, so ist es seine Mutter Ge'); despite rebuttal by Greifenhagen and Henle, it has some more recent adherents (e.g. G. Neumann, *Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst* [Berlin 1965] 178 n. 127, 189 n. 280). See most recently M. Moore in *LIMC* iv.1, 175-6, L. Kahil, *ibid.* vi.1, 260.

¹³ Greifenhagen (n. 3) 22, against (e.g.) Waser in Roscher, *ML* v 1047, Scherling 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 104; G. Oertel in Roscher, *ML* i 362; A. Furtwängler in Roscher, *ML* i 2208; E.N. Gardiner, *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 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 αἰδώς; covering one's head is a gesture which belongs in the general complex of associations between αἰδώς, the eyes, exposure and visibility.¹⁹ Numerous passages make the connexion between

αἰδώς and veiling explicit: in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, for example, the removal of Phaedra's headdress at 201-2, symbolizing the casting off of restraint which is apparent in her subsequent sublimated ravings, is answered by her desire to have her head covered again at 243, a desire which she explains with reference both to her αἰδώς at what she has said and to her wish to conceal her tears and the αἰσχύνη in her eyes (244-6).²⁰ This association between αἰδώς and the veil is also apparent in passages where the former is not mentioned: Penelope's repeated gesture,²¹ for example, of drawing her κρήδεμνον 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 αἰδώς is apparent from a passage in Pausanias' account of Laconia (iii 20.10-11):

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

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

¹⁴ On one vase (New York 08.258.21, *ARV*² 1086, 1: *LIMC* ii pl. 275, Apollon 1072 = Leto 37) the figure depicted between Leto's children and Tityos in the pose supposedly typical of Ge is named as Leto.

¹⁵ The presence of Ge in a version of the pursuit of Tityos is guaranteed by the inscription ΓΕ on a Tyrrhenian amphora in the Louvre (E 864, *ABV* 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* 97, 32; *LIMC* Ge 11 = Leto 42 = Niobidai 3], Villa Giulia, *ABV* 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 Greifenhagen (n. 3) 11, 14) is prepared to allow that this is Ge rather than Leto. Leto's veiling, however, is more easily motivated than Ge's, and on the other vases depicting a veiled woman that figure is clearly Leto. But it is sufficient for our purposes that 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 Aegisthus Painter, Louvre G 164 [*ARV*² 504, 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 (untypically) falling to earth (E. Buschor in Furtwängler-Reichold [n. 7] iii 280); but the figure does veil, does stretch out her hand to Apollo, and her position in front of a palm suggests Leto or Artemis. Leto remains a strong possibility (so Greifenhagen [n. 3] 25-7), but the scene is enigmatic. See further A. Griffiths, *JHS* cvi (1986) 65 n. 37 and *BICS* xxxvii (1990) 131-3.

¹⁷ Contrast Henle (n. 11) 37. The significance of Leto's veil is reflected in the detail given by Apollonius (i 759-62) and the Suda (s.v. 'Tityos'; iv 564-5 Adler), that Tityos dragged Leto by the καλύπτρη/κρήδεμνον. Cf. Zancani Montuoro and Zanotti-Bianco (n. 11) ii 326.

¹⁸ See, e.g. Leningrad 709 (*ARV*² 487, 61; C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' *Greek culture* [Oxford 1991] pls 9-10); Leningrad 777 (*ARV*² 502, 11; Sourvinou-Inwood pl. 6); Madrid 11038 (*ARV*² 586, 46; K.J. Dover, *Greek homosexuality* [London 1978] R750); London E 64 (*ARV*² 455, 9); Paris, Petit Palais 316 (*ARV*² 639, 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), *Pho.* 1485-92; *Pl. Phdr.* 237a, Aeschin. i 26 (etc.); on veiling as stage business in tragedy see F.L. Shisler, *AJP* lxxvi (1945) 385.

²¹ *Od.* i 333-4, xvi 415-16, xviii 209-10, xxi 64-5; interpreted as a gesture of σωφροσύνη by Julian *Orat.* iii 127c-d (cf. H. F. North, *Sophrosyne* [Ithaca 1966] 308 n. 143).

²² See M. Nagler, *Spontaneity and tradition* (Berkeley 1974) 44-72, 80, who also (47-9) notes the significance of the removal of the κρήδεμνον at *Il.* xxii 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* lxxvi (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* sepulchral reliefs; C.M. Galt, *AJA* xxxv (1931) 373-93; also the summary of a paper by M.E. Mayo in *AJA* lxxvii (1973) 200, which appears to have argued that the drawing of the veil *always* represents unveiling (even in rape scenes). There need be no dispute that the gesture can (be intended to) be attractive to men, since manifestations of αἰδώς (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 αἰδώς 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 αἰδώς. On vases, the veiling which signifies αἰδώς is not to be sharply distinguished from that which signifies 'marriage', for the latter is merely a ritualized form of a gesture which in everyday life might accompany a spontaneous emotional reaction or constitute a conventional way of displaying one's feminine virtue.²⁶

Since there is very little indeed on veiling in the standard works on ancient gestures,²⁷ it is worth pausing

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

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

²⁵ On the wedding veil, see M.L. Cunningham, *BICS* xxxi (1984) 9-12; D. Armstrong and E.A. Ratchford, *BICS* xxxii (1985) 1-14; R. Seaford, *JHS* cvii (1987) 124-5; A. Carson in D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before sexuality* (Princeton 1990) 160-4; and J.H. Oakley, R.H. Sinos, *The wedding in ancient Athens* (Madison, Wis. 1993) *passim*, esp. 25-6, 30-2, 44.

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 off each other in Greek art), but the basic reason why veiling is common to brides and to the objects of erotic pursuit (as well as to victims of rape, e.g. Leto) is that veiling typically expresses αἰδώς, and the normal focus of women's αἰδώς is sexual. For the bride's veiling as expression of her αἰδώς, see E. *IT* 372-6. There, Iphigeneia's αἰδώς 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 αἰδώς at leaving her father (as in the Pausanias passage) and at the thought of her future as a sexual being is also a valuable indication of her loyalty to her κούριος and of her innocence, and thus of her eligibility and promise as a wife; there may therefore have been a considerable element of cultural role-playing as well as of spontaneous emotion in her attitude. See I. Jenkins, *BICS* xxx (1983) 137-46; cf. Redfield (n. 22) 183-92; H. King in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Images of women in antiquity* (London 1983) 109-17; H.P. Foley, *Ritual irony* (Ithaca NY 1985) 86-9 etc.; Seaford (n. 25) 106-30, *JHS* cviii (1988) 118-24.

²⁷ C. Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 1890), at least discusses veiling, sees the connexion with αἰδώς (84 and n. 7), and notes the iconographic link between wedding, abduction, and the 'marriage of death' (278-9), but his discussion is brief and unsystematic. In Neumann (n. 12) veiling receives no discussion in its own right, and *prima facie* similar poses involving the veiling of the head are distinguished on the most tenuous of criteria.

to consider in what circumstances the covering of the head does and does not betoken αἰδώς. 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 αἰδώς; veiling in marriage, or veiling in abduction presented as marriage or marriage presented as abduction, also signifies αἰδώς.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 αἰδώς; 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 Meidias Painter's depiction of the rape of the Leucippides (London E 224, *ARV*² 1313, 5; L. Burn, *The Meidias painter* [Oxford 1987] 16-17, 25 and pls 1a, 2b-3, 4b-9b); Eriphyle is lifted aloft by Castor, who holds her exactly as Tityos does Leto on the Phintias vase (cf. 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 Hileaira (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*² 1157, 25 (Pelops and Hippodameia), and depictions too numerous to list of the abduction and recovery of Helen in L. Ghali-Kahil, *Les Enlèvements 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 Genneep, *The rites of passage* (Eng. trans. London 1960) 123-9; T.B.L. Webster, *Potter 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 αἰδώς 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 *anakalypsis*' (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*² 1143, 2; for the correct interpretation, see G. Davies, *Apollo* cxl no. 389 [July 1994] 6-7; cf. Würzburg 160, A. Rumpf, *Chalkidische Vasen* (Leipzig 1927) no. 14 pls 31-4.

³⁰ 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 [1954]) 159-61.

³¹ 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* xlviii (1958) 23-4; N. Rudd, *Lines of enquiry* (Cambridge 1976) 42-3; Hani (n. 3) 107; E. D'Ambrà, *MDAI(R)* xcvi (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 αἰδώς/σωφροσύνη.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 αἰδώς and not-αἰδώς, but between representations of occurrent and dispositional αἰδώς, πάθος and ἔξις.

Other representations of veiled figures may seem further removed from αἰδώς; Neumann, for example, considers that the veiled Penelope mentioned above (n. 24) portrays 'anxious expectancy' (*banges 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 αἰδώς; 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

³² Bf 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, χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ; see Oakley and Sinos (n. 25) 26-34 (with ill.). Cf. veiling/χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ motifs in the 'marriage of death' on Berlin 1902 (ABV 363, 37); Athens NM 1926 (ARV² 846, 193); also the grave relief of Myrrha (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* [Berlin 1873] 54-6 and pl. 8; cf. Hera and Zeus on the Parthenon frieze [K. Schefold, *Die Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst* (Munich 1981) pl. 302], where Hera clearly is revealing her attractions to Zeus in what I.S. Mark [*Hesperia* liii (1984) 303-4] regards as an allusion to the ἀνακαλυπτήρια); but (a) unveiling implies previous veiling, to which αἰδώς 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 ἀνακαλυπτήρια, see J.H. Oakley, *AA* (1982) 113-18; R.F. Sutton in *id.* [ed.], *Daidalikon: studies ... Schoder* [Wauconda, Ill. 1989] 357-9; Oakley and Sinos [n. 25] 25-6, 30; Rehm [n. 28] 141-2.)

³³ On *Mantelknaben* and σωφροσύνη, 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 1993) R196, 322, 576, 622.1 (boys), C1 (woman); cf. the muffled boy on Munich 2421 (ARV² 23, 7); cf. also the progressive un-muffling of the woman undergoing 'Bacchic initiation' (Florence 391, ARV² 769, 4; Oxford 1924.2, ARV² 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.*² 49; Würzburg 452 [ARV² 63, 6; *LIMC* i pl. 60, Achilles 35]; 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. 29]); cf. the shy Maenad on Chiusi 1830, ARV² 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.

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 αἰδώς is that of grief; clearly, grief and αἰδώς 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 κατήφεια. This is as much as to suggest that veiling need *not* carry connotations of αἰδώς as such, but may be a symptom of something that αἰδώς shares with other emotions; yet in two ways, I think, the veiling which accompanies grief may have more to do with αἰδώς than that. First, where the veiled and grieving figure is a woman, veiling may suggest αἰδώς *qua* (wifely, motherly, daughterly, sisterly, etc.) loyalty to the deceased,³⁷ or, where the veiled figure is the deceased herself,³⁸ the αἰδώς 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 σωφροσύνη. 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 αἰδώς at 213-15;³⁹ and passages in Homer and Euripides offer unequivocal examples of the αἰδώς 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

³⁵ London E 76 (ARV² 406, 1; *LIMC* iii pls 133, 136, Briseis 1, 14; Ach. veiled, Briseis veiled and led χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ); Munich 8770 (*Para.* 341, *Add.*² 189; *LIMC* i pl. 104, Achilles 445); London E 56 (ARV² 185, 39); cf. *LIMC* i, Achilles 439-48, 452-3.

³⁶ Vienna 3695 (ARV² 429, 26; *LIMC* i pl. 243, Aias I 81); London E 69 (ARV² 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 Memnon on the cup, Ferrara 44885 (ARV² 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.J. Richardson, *The Homeric hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) *ad. locc.* Cf. the figure in the 'Penelope pose' from the 'Tomb of Persephone' at Vergina, identified as Demeter by M. Andronicos, *Vergina* (Athens 1987) 88-9 and fig. 48.

⁴⁰ See *Od.* viii 83-6 (*Od.* covers his face out of αἰδώς; cf. viii 532), xix 118-22 (cf. *Il.* xxiv 90-1); *E. Her.* 1162, 1200, *Or.* 280-2, *IA* 981-2. Thus even the veiling of Priam as he grieves for Hector on a Melian relief (Toronto 926.32, Carpenter [n. 24] fig. 319) may indicate an element of αἰδώς in the way that he copes with his emotions; cf. Achilles grieving for Patroclus on London E 363 (ARV² 586, 36, Carpenter fig. 313); on mourners' restraint on Attic white-ground lekythoi, see H.A. Shapiro, *AJA* xcvi (1991) 652-3.

to grief, and a hint at the woman's possession of αἰδώς/σάφροσύνη in a wider sense.

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

(1) Λητούς αἰδώς 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. εἶδος).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-ΟΣΤΡΑΤΕ, 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* αἰδώς might naturally be associated, it seems odd that attention should be drawn to *her* αἰδώς in a context where that of someone else is so clearly depicted. It is, of course, a requirement of αἰδώς 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 αἰδώς in this scene, and it seems to me that only independent evidence (of which there is none)⁴⁴ for αἰδώς 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, *Vasenschriften* 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 αἰδώς 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 αἰδώς, see Hani [n. 3].)

(One might argue, for example, that αἰδώς could refer to Leto's veiling without having to be construed with the genitive, Λητούς, 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 322-9 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*² 62, 77).

⁴⁷ See Dover R750 (cf. n. 18 above); Castor and Eriphyle (cf. n. 28 above); Boreas and Oreithyia (Munich 2345, *ARV*² 496, 2; *LIMC* iii pl. 19, Boreas 626; cf. K. Neuser, *Anemoi* [Rome 1982] 30-87); Theseus and 'Corone' (Munich 2309, *ARV*² 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*² 146, 2]; Berlin 2279 [*ARV*² 115.2]; London, V&A 4807.1901 [*ARV*² 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, 3-4, 8b.

⁴⁸ Examples featuring Heracles now most conveniently in *LIMC*; see s.vv. 'Acheloo's', 'Antaios I', 'Halios Geron', 'Herakles', 'Nereus'. Cf. R. Vollkommer, *Herakles in the art of classical Greece* (Oxford 1988). Theseus and Cercyon, see the Hephaesteum metope (Brommer [n. 46] pl. 7b); vases: London E 36 (*ARV*² 115, 3); London E 48 (*ARV*² 431, 47); Florence 91456 (*ARV*² 108, 27); Madrid 11265 (*ARV*² 1174, Aison 1); Louvre G 104 (*ARV*² 318, 1); Louvre G 195 (*ARV*² 381, 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; Schefold (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,⁴⁹ 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;⁵⁰ 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 ἀρετή; their older companions watch with interest, but decorously.⁵¹ The youths practise the javelin and the discus—not events in themselves, but part of the pentathlon.⁵² 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.⁵³ 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;⁵⁴ 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,

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 (Poliakoff fig. 32; cf. Gardiner, *Athletics* fig. 171; O. Tzachou-Alexandri, *Mind and body* [Athens 1988] pl. 165); Boston 01.8019 (*ARV*² 24, 11); Munich 1461 (Gardiner fig. 164).

⁵⁰ For literary parallels, see Pi. *I.* 3/4.61-73 (Her. and Antaeus; cf. *N.* 4.62-5, Peleus' wrestling with Thetis in an ode for a boy wrestler); B. 13. 46-57 (Her. and lion); B. 18. 26-7 (Thes. and Cercyon); S. *Tr.* 497-530 (Her. and Achelous; cf. Davies *ad loc.*, and Gardiner *JHS* [1906] 16); Theoc. 25.262-71. For Plato (*Leg.* 796a), too, Antaeus and Cercyon are paradigmatic pankratiasts.

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

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

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

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

as any good reproduction will show, are luxuriating in the ἀνθος ἡβης, the first down of their beards sprouting on their cheeks; their ἐρασταί 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 wrestling⁵⁵ in a hybriatic, 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) ἐρώμενος and older (superior) ἐραστής, 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) αἰδουμένη.

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; χάριε (four times, once with specific addressee) is a typically sympotic imperative,⁵⁷ and the single *kalos*-inscription also places the vase in the pederastic milieu of the aristocratic symposium.⁵⁸ These inscriptions also fit well with the αἰδώς inscription, for αἰδώς is one of the canonical sympotic virtues, just as its negation, ὕβρις, is typically seen as a matter of sympotic excess.⁵⁹ 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;⁶⁰ it is this peace and harmony that are destroyed by the ὕβρις of Tityos, much as the χάρις, εὐνομία, and εὐφροσύνη of divine hospitality are shattered by the transgressions of Tantalus

⁵⁵ Cf. Pi. *P.* 4.90-3.

⁵⁶ See (e.g.) A. *Ag.* 1206; S. *fr.* 618, 941.13 R (with Pearson *ad loc.*); Ar. *Ach.* 273-6, 994, *Peace* 896-9, *Eccl.* 259-61, 964-6; see J. Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane* (Paris 1965) 336; J. Henderson, *The maculate Muse* (New Haven 1975) 156, 169-70; M.B. Poliakoff, *Studies in the terminology of the Greek combat sports* (Frankfurt 1986) 41-2, 101-36. Cf. Παλαιστῶ (a hetaira) on a rf psykter, Leningrad 644 (*ARV*² 16, 15; Kretschmer, *Vaseninschriften* 209, Kilmer [n. 33] R20). N.b. the metaphorical use (Ar. *Ach.* 274; cf. Ael. *Ep. Rust.* 9, Straton, *A.P.* xii 206, 222, ps.-Luc. *Asinus* 10) of μέσον λαβεῖν/ἔχειν (*vel sim.*), i.e. Tityos' hold on Leto; see Gardiner (n. 48) *JHS* (1905) 24-6, 288, *Athletics* 191-2; Poliakoff, *Studies* 40-53.

⁵⁷ See Kretschmer, *Vaseninschriften* 195-6; F. Lissarrague, *The aesthetics of the Greek banquet* (Eng. trans. Princeton 1991) 60-7.

⁵⁸ See Webster (n. 28) 42-62 *passim*, Dover (n. 18) 117-19.

⁵⁹ On sympotic virtues and vices, see K. Bielohlawek, *WS* lviii (1940) 11-30; W.J. Slater, *ICS* vi (1981) 205-14; id. in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica* (Oxford 1990) 213-20; N.R.E. Fisher, *Hybris* (Warminster 1992) 71-2, 203-7, 218-19, 223-4, etc.

⁶⁰ See *LIMC* ii, Apollon 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 similarly, the 'relief of the gods', Brauron Mus. 1180 (L. Kahil 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 *Pythian* 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 πῶνος, beauty, and ὄρετῆ against a negative mythological paradigm which emphasizes the limits of human striving.⁶¹

DOUGLAS L. CAIRNS

University of Leeds

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

L'ecphrasis de la parole d'apparat dans l'*Electrum* et la *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'éloquence 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,² 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',³ s'appropriant la représentation éclatante et

* Cet article est la version augmentée, et pourvue de notes, des deux premières parties de la communication que j'ai présentée au colloque international sur la Lyrique antique de l'Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille III (juin 1993). La troisième partie, qui traite des *Ethiopiennes* d'Héliodore, a paru, remaniée et pourvue de notes, dans *Poésie et Lyrique antiques*, Lille, 1996, 179-202.

** Les éditions utilisées, ainsi que les traductions, éventuellement modifiées, sont le plus souvent celles de la Collection des Universités de France. Mais pour Platon, j'ai utilisé aussi les traductions de la Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Et pour le *Timée* et le *Critias*, j'ai consulté la traduction de L. Brisson avec la collaboration de M. Patillon, G.F. Flammarion, Paris, 1992. Pour Lucien, les références sont à l'édition des Oxford Classical Texts. La traduction de l'*Electrum* est redevable à celle de E. Chambry, coll. Garnier. Celles du *De domo* de Lucien et du *Peri Ideôn* d'Hermogène sont miennes.

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

² Pour l'influence de Pindare sur Platon: *Ion*, 534a-b; *Ménon*, 81b-c; et J. Duchemin, 'Platon et l'héritage de la poésie', in *R.E.G.* Lxviii (1955) 12-37. Voir aussi Aelius Aristide, *Défense de la rhétorique*, 109. Sur l'esthétique de la seconde sophistique héritière de l'art de Pindare et de Platon: M.M.J. Laplace, 'Éloquence et navigation à l'époque impériale', *Actes du XIe congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (Paris 1985) t.I: 72-4. Pour l'importance des citations et références à Pindare chez Aelius Aristide, voir *Hymnes à Athéna*, 6; à *Zeus*, 22; 25; à *Dionysos*, 6; *Panégryque au puits de l'Asclépiéion*, 16; *Lalia à Asclépios*, 12; *Isthmique à Poséidon*, 25; *Dithyrambe aux Athéniens*, 25, 8.

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

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 Théandrides: 'Si tu me prescris encore, dit-il à Timarque d'Egine, de dresser pour ton oncle maternel ... une stèle plus blanche que le marbre de Paros, sache que l'or qu'on pose au feu n'est plus que splendeur fulgurante, mais que l'hymne qui célèbre les grands exploits fait (τεύχει) d'un simple mortel l'égal des rois' (*Ném.*, IV 82-5).⁴ Dans la VIIe *Néméenne*, dédiée à Sogènes d'Egine, Pindare compare au charme des fables d'Homère la préciosité de sa poésie: 'J'imagine que la renommée d'Ulysse a dépassé ses épreuves 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 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.⁵

Pindare souligne le chatolement trompeur de la fable éloignée de la vérité, quand il évoque, dans la Ière *Olympique*, un diadème d'or ciselé, serti de pierreries: 'Ah! le monde est plein de merveilles—et parfois aussi les dires des mortels vont au-delà du vrai (ὕπερ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον): des fables (μῦθοι) ornées de chatoyantes fictions (δεδοδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις) nous illusionnent (ἐξαπατώντι)' (v. 28-29). C'est à quoi Pindare renonce dans cette ode consacrée à Hiéron de Syracuse qui est elle-même présentée comme le joyau suprême, le pur éclat de l'or, parce qu'elle substitue à l'éclat d'une fable blasphématoire l'éclat divin d'une autre fable, véridique, en célébrant Pélops, dont l'arène d'Olympie immortalisa la gloire: 'Excellent bien que l'eau; mais l'or, 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 répètent' (*Olymp.*, I, 1-8). Après avoir évoqué le héros dont 's'éprit ... Poséidon, quand Clôthô le retira du bassin pur, l'épaule parée de l'éclat de l'ivoire' (*Olymp.*, I, 25-27), Pindare récuse cette tradition qui suppose que le corps de Pélops ait disparu dévoré par les dieux lors d'un festin offert par Tantale sur le Sipyle: 'L'homme ne doit attribuer aux dieux que de belles actions, dit-il: c'est la voie la plus sûre. Aussi, fils de Tantale, vais-je parler de toi autrement que mes devanciers: je dirai que, lorsque ton père, convive des dieux, leur offrant à son tour un banquet, les invita à la fête irréprochable du Sipyle ... ce jour-là, le Maître du trident splendide te ravit: l'amour avait dompté son cœur.

⁴ Voir A. Puech, *Pindare. Néméennes*, C.U.F. (Paris 1923) 48, sur les critiques auxquelles Pindare répond dans la strophe V de cette ode: 'Ces critiques visaient sans doute le grand développement qu'il donne aux mythes'.

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.



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)

