Notes

(1) A preliminary presentation of some of the arguments on which the conclusions of the present paper is based will appear in vol. 2 of the Halikarnassos Publication to which I must refer for further references as well.

(2) See, for instance, Klaus Sallmann, **Der kleine Pauly** 5 (1975) s.v. Vitruvius, col. 1309-1313.

(3) On these aspects see **The Cambridge Ancient History** IX, The Roman Republic 133-44 B.C. (1971) 638 ff.

(4) **The Times Atlas of The World** (1973) pl. 36, square H4; **Soil Map of Europe** (FAO 1965); H.Walter and H.Lieth, **Klimadiagramm Weltatlas** (1964), Mittelmeerraum (8) Typus VII 414.

(5) am indebted to Tönnes Bekker-Nielsen MA, who is working on a research project concerning communication in the Roman Empire, for having calculated the following hypothetical time-table for Vitruvius' itinerary:

Zela-Halikarnassos (ca. 1200 km) = 40 days

Halikarnassos-Athens (on ship across the Aegean) = 10 days.

Athens - Aulona (ca. 600 km = 20 days

Aulona - Brundisium (on ship across the Adriatic) = 3 days

Brundisium - Rome (ca. 500 km) = 20 days

It is a matter of conjecture how many days it might have taken Vitruvius to cross the Aegean from Halikarnassos to Athens. Provided that he obtained passage to Rhodes, there would probably have been frequent opportunities for him to get onboard a vessel bound directly for Athens. According to Vegetius of the 4 th century AD (**re milit.** 4.39) the sailing season par excellence was from 27 May to 14 September, while the outside limits were lo March and lo November (L.Casson, **Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World** (1970) 270). The daily average distance by land is here rated at 30 km which is a moderate figure. Ancient itineraries such as **Itinerarium Antonini** and **Itinerarium Burdigalense** indicate that it would normally vary between 20 and 30 Roman miles i.e. 30 and 45 km and might exceptionally amount to as much as 50 miles or more.

LETO AND THE CHILDREN

Brunhilde S. Ridgway

Ekrem Akurgal has always been interested in all aspects of Anatolian art and culture; it is hoped that he will enjoy this study which attempts to interpret a well-known sculptural type in the light of Lycian legends.

The type in question is that of a peplophoros in a running pose, holding in her arms, at shoulder level, two children who have been identified as Artemis and Apollo with their mother Leto. Known at first only from depictions on coins and two marble statuettes in Rome (Fig. 1), the composition has now acquired additional importance through the discovery of three over-life size replicas: one in the theater at Miletos (Figs. 2-3), one from Building Q in Pisidian Kremna and another from nearby Seleukia (Figs. 4-5) (2). Although these large copies are headless and fragmentary, only scars or breaks occurring at the shoulders where the children once rested, the appearance of the original can be approximately reconstructed through one of the two statuettes in Rome, in the Torlonia Museum. This piece, too, was severely damaged and has been extensively restored (for instance, all three heads are modern), but the lower bodies of the children remain, and enough of Leto's neck muscles to show that she was looking back while running to her right. A third statuette now provides additional evidence (3). At present on loan to the J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu, California (Figs. 6-7), the piece is, to my knowledge, unrestored, although Artemis' head, which once broke off and was repaired in antiquity, has been reattached. Leto and Apollo are headless, but the children's bodies are almost entirely preserved, showing that the infant Apollo had his arms outstretched in the opposite direction from the flight. His bare upper torso contrasts with that of his sister, who is heavily covered by chiton (?) and himation. We shall return to this statuette later, to determine its relationship to the other replicas. For the moment, let us examine the meaning of the scene.

It has been generally assumed that Leto is depicted while fleeing from Python, the monster sent by jealous Hera to chase her around the world.

To be sure, no depiction of the snake appears on the coins, or even on the funerary altar of Luccia Telesina which is decorated with a vaguely comparable figure in relief; but the latter occurs in the middle of a more complex scene that is open to different interpretations (4), and the coins could give abbreviated forms of a more elaborate bronze monument. Even had the snake not appeared in the original monumental version --it has been argued-- the impression of flight created by Leto's pose, and the presence of the two infants would have sufficed to recall the episode to the viewer's mind. In addition, it has been suggested that the child Apollo was in the act of shooting Python with his bow, a deed which, on Euripides' testimony, he is supposed to have performed from his mother's arms (5).

This interpretation may have been influenced, however indirectly, by the Torlonia replica (Fig. 1), where Apollo has been restored in torsion to his left with arms extended. Yet this pose is now confirmed by the unrestored statuette in California (Figs. 6-7). I believe nonetheless that the total composition conforms neither to the literary accounts nor to the iconography of the shooting of Python as preserved in other ancient monuments.

Only two depictions on vases exist of this event, but both show Leto holding only Apollo in her arms and standing quietly, facing in the same direction as the shooting infant (6). Aside from Euripides' mention, which does not include Artemis, a similar description is given by Klearchos of Soloi of a bronze statue which stood in Delphi, allegedly on the stone on which Leto stepped when Python, from his cave, attacked her and Apollo performed his deed. In the same passage the goddess is said to have come from Chalkis to Delphi with both twins, but the monument obviously emphasized the role played by the Delphic god and therefore subordinated or entirely removed his sister from the scene (7). A possible Etruscan version of the same episode, acted out by terracotta akroterial figures along the ridgepole of the Portonaccio temple at Veii, shows a tall Leto in forward motion with a small boy on her left arm; fragments of a terracotta snake recovered from the same context suggest that Python was included in the scene (8). It would therefore seem that at least from ca. 500 B.C. onward this version of the killing of Python was known in Greece as well as in Etruria. If, however, both pictorial and literary sources are to be credited, Artemis was not present and Leto was not fleeing.

Several ancient versions are known of the encounter between Apollo and the dragon, and have been conveniently summarized by Fontenrose (9). The one recounted by the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, in which the snake

is female and is killed by an already grown god, stands unique. There the motivation seems to be to rid the place of an evil creature, since Apollo is about to establish his oracle there. A second version, attested by Simonides, Apollodoros, Aelian and Ovid, knows a male monster named Python which guards the shrine of Ge or Themis and which Apollo kills to take over the place, using many arrows. The third version, related by Euripides and Klearchos, has already been summarized. Only in the fourth version, given by Lucan, Lucian, Hyginus and commentators, is Python sent by Hera to pursue the pregnant Leto, but the snake then retreats to Delphi, where Apollo goes to avenge his mother. A fifth and last version purports that Python was a human brigand and need not concern us here.

If the actual chase by the monster took place while Leto was pregnant, the statuary type under discussion could not depict that version of the legend. Nor could it show the killing of Python by the child Apollo in a sort of visual synthesis of anachronistic moments, because Artemis would not be included. But another story was told in antiquity about Léto and her wanderings with the new-born twins, and it would seem to fit the sculptural type as preserved.

According to Ovid's **Metamorphoses** VI, vv. 317-381, Leto, soon after giving birth to the divine twins on Delos ("puerpera") and still being pursued by Hera, fled to Lycia where, thirsty and exhausted, she tried to drink the clear waters of a pool. When Lycian peasants prevented her from doing so, the goddess implored them, not only in her name but also in that of her infants who, from her arms, were stretching out their hands in entreat:

> "...hi quoque vos moveant, qui nostro bracchia tendunt parva sinu." et casu tendenbant bracchia nati. (358-359).

When the Lycians persisted in their refusal, threatening her and even muddying the waters of the pond to prevent her from drinking, the irate Leto transformed them into croaking frogs and condemned them to live perpetually in water and slime.

This episode of the **Metamorphoses**, inserted as it is between the two more famous narrations of Niobe and Marsyas, has received relatively little attention in modern times. As for antiquity, that Ovid himself drew his inspiration from earlier sources can be inferred from an expanded and slightly varied account of the same legend by Antoninus Liberalis, who presumably during the Antonine or Severan period wrote in Greek a **Metamorphoseon Synagoge.** This work, preserved to us in only one

manuscript (the ninth century A.C. codex Palatinus Heidelbergensis graecus 398), is in turn based almost exclusively on Hellenistic sources and, in the case of the Lycian episode, on Nikander of Kolophon (the second century B.C. author of **Heteroioumena)** and on Menekrates of Xanthos (a late fourth century B.C. historical writer of **Lykiaka).** Antoninus Liberalis states that, after the twins' birth, Leto went from Asteria to Lycia, seeking to take her children to the Xanthos river, where she was eventually led by wolves. But she first stopped at the spring Melite on her way, hoping to bathe the babies. Shepherds prevented her, because they were watering their cattle, and Leto left. But she returned to punish the shepherds who had chased her (τοῖς ἀπελάσασιν αὐτὴν βουκόλοις); finding them still at the fountain, she turned them into frogs (10).

Since Ovid's and Antoninus Liberalis's sources seem to have been, if not both Lycian, at least both from Asia Minor, it is likely to assume that they recounted local traditions. Indeed the Lycian connections of Apollo and Leto have often been stressed by modern commentators and go back to the earliest literary mentions of the god: the Iliad and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (11). The cult of Leto was widespread in Asia Minor, especially at Xanthos, where recent discoveries confirm the antiquity of buildings and offerings at the Letoon (12). If the sculptural type of Leto and the children is in fact to be connected with the Lycian legend of the peasants transformed into frogs, it would be logical to assume that its prototype was created expressly for that area --a theory strengthened by the fact that the only large-scale replicas of the group come from cities at the very borders with Lycia. We should now consider when such a prototype could have been created.

Since the numismatic reproductions are unhelpful for stylistic analysis, only the marble replicas, both in large and small scale, can be profitably studied for chronological purposes. Regrettably, only one of the three statues from Asia Minor has been fully published (the one from Kremna), but the copy from Pisidian Seleukia is known through photographs (Figs.4-5).It differs from all others in that a chiton has been added under Leto's overfolded peplos and is visible at the hem and at the neck opening; in addition, a long lock trailing on the right side of the throat suggests a loose coiffure not present in the other replicas. The Miletos copy (Figs.2-3) makes the apoptygma folds more symmetrical.

The large statue from Kremna and the statuette in the Conservatori echo traits of the Severe style, not only in the flattened running pose but also in the pattern of the folds; the Torlonia statuette, the Miletos and the

Seleukia statues have a richer treatment of the costume that is more in keeping with a fourth century date. The new replica in the Getty Museum, although undoubtedly simplified because of its size-- it is the smallest of the three statuettes-- seems closer to the Kremna figure in the rendering of the kolpos and to the Conservatori one in that of the overfold, but the deep pouch created at the bend of the right knee is reminiscent of Hellenistic formulas, and the costume worn by the little Artemis seems neither Severe nor Classical (13).

Attempts to connect the statuary type with mentions in the literary sources have not been convincing. The bronze monument mentioned by Klearchos of Soloi can only be given a date **ante quem** of the late fourth century B.C., since Klearchos was a pupil of Aristotle, but could be as early as ca. 500 B.C. on the testimony of the vases. We have already argued, however, that the Delphic group included only Leto and the child Apollo and therefore did not correspond to ours. A statue of Leto by Skopas is described by Strabo (14.1.20) as being in Ephesos, but the goddess is said to be holding a scepter, while the two children are in the arms of Ortygia standing beside her (14). Were we even to assume that the statuary type known to us represents Ortygia rather than Leto herself, it would be difficult to explain the running pose in a context that seems otherwise regal and dignified.

One attribution that has found occasional support is based on a passage of Pliny (**NH** 34, 77), who saw a bronze "Latona puerpera Apollinem et Dianam infantes sustinens" in the Temple of Concord, made by Euphranor. Several authors have assumed that the goddess was portrayed in a solemn pose, appropriate for a cult image, and have equated the work with representations of Fecunditas on Roman coins (15). This correlation cannot be confirmed, but the Romans' predilection for dedicating within their temples Greek works meaningful in a Latin context would support this interpretation. Concordia, in Imperial times, was especially symbolic of harmony within the royal family, and the concept of political peace was traditionally associated in Roman minds with fruitfulness, both of fields and of men --witness the Ara Pacis panel.

The connection of our statuary type with Euphranor, though considered attractive, has also been thought unprovable by O. Palagia (16), who has carried out the most thorough recent study of the fourth century master. On the basis solely of the two statuettes in Rome, she would agree, however, that the prototype was probably made in the 370s B.C. Much more hypothetical is the attribution to a late fifth century Praxiteles,

father of Kephisodotos, postulated on the basis of a certain resemblence between the Leto and the Eirene and Ploutos, and of a passage of Pausanias (1.44.2) who in Megara saw statues of Apollo, Artemis and Leto "by Praxiteles" (17). Nothing, however, in the Greek source specifies which Praxiteles, or indicates that the three images were compositionally connected or even that Leto's children were shown as infants. At the other end of the chronological spectrum, J.Inan, in publishing the figure from Kremna, stressed stylistic similarities with the Running Niobid in Copenhagen and the Demeter Cherchel, and therefore advocated a date ca. 450-440 B.C. (18). She rightly underscored the special significance of the Kremna replica, which at the time of her writing was the only one known at a large scale. She also judiciously stated, however, that it was impossible to derive from the numismatic evidence any indication of the specific city where the original stood, since many provinces of the Roman Empire had copies of the same Greek sculptures and depicted them on their coinage. Her words have proved prophetic in light of her own discovery at Seleukia and the third replica found at Miletos.

The popularity of the motif on Anatolian coins could, however, be taken as indication that the original stood in that general area, if not in any one of the minting cities. If we are correct in assuming that the legend depicted is Leto's encounter with the Lycian peasants, an original location of the monument in Xanthos, perhaps at the Letoon, would be in keeping with the diffusion of the numismatic type. This interpretation of the composition had in fact been considered by F. Wehrli, but he rejected it because some coins from Hierapolis and Tripolis bear the legend Letoia Pythia which he interpreted as proof of a Delphic connection. He therefore assumed that the legend of the killing of Python had been imported from Delphi together with the feast (19). Since there is reason to believe, as we have seen, that the iconography of the Delphic episode involved Leto and Apollo alone, the argument can be resumed.

If, however, our sculptural type depicts the Lycian legend, a date for its creation long before the Ovidian poem seems unlikely. Admittedly, Antoninus Liberalis provides sufficient proof that earlier sources for the story existed, but his version is pedestrian and different enough from Ovid's to emphasize, by contrast, the importance of the vivid narrative by the Roman poet. By the same token, both Menekrates and Nikander are relatively too late for the proposed dates of our sculptural group, nor do they seem to have drawn from an existing iconographic tradition. But can a post-Ovidian date be defended on present evidence?

On the basis of four replicas --the two statuettes in Rome and the Kremna and Seleukia statues-- A.Gulaki has already argued that the Leto type should be considered classicistic rather than classical. She compares the goddess with the mid-fifth century B.C. runner in Delphi and finds many common traits; she also notes, however, that the treatment of Leto's apoptygma is not in keeping with the Severe style, and neither is the visibility of her kolpos, given the length of the overfold. The strong bend of her right leg and the pattern of folds at the knee recalls the Running Maiden from Eleusis, but therefore speak for a date earlier than the 450s. Gulaki concludes that the Severe traits of the Leto are "quoted" from disparate sources, as made possible by the much later date of the composition (20).

In basic agreement with this argument, I would add a few observations of my own. The sandals, in the replicas where they are visible, show the Hellenistic contouring of the sole around the toes and the side cylinders which suggest at least a second century B.C. date (21). The Severe style proper in Asia Minor is remarkably under-represented, not only because of the chance of the finds or the political conditions of the early fifth century which prevented much sculptural output, but also because of the innate conservatism of the area, which tended to perpetuate earlier stylistic traits in various forms of "lingering Archaic." The way of holding the infants virtually at shoulder level, in fact, has been considered an Archaic Ionic trait contrasting with western or mainland Greek representations of kourotrophoi, who hold the babies against the chest or in the lap (22). We could therefore assume that the statuary type --under the impetus of Ovid's popularity-- was created during the Augustan period or later, at a time when the Severe style had come to stand for antiquity and venerability. The local (?) sculptor who produced the original patterned it after Archaic/Severe models, but --unconsciously ?-- added more advanced traits inevitably revealing a later date. The type became popular throughout Anatolia because of the strong tradition of worshiping Leto in various forms. How appropraiate for private dedications this composition was considered is shown by the Kremna statue, donated in the late Antonine period by a Lucius Aetius Iulianus together with his son Rutilius and his daughter Lucilla.

For all its popularity in Anatolia, the sculptural type seems to have remained primarily limited to that geographical area; Rome knew it only through statuettes, perhaps private commissions of Romans who had seen service in Asia Minor. The Torlonia and Malibu replicas could be third century A.C. in date and only the Conservatori example may be earlier

(Antonine). Certainly the myth found no other known graphic illustration, and we have to wait until the seventeenth century for a visual rendering of Ovid's dramatic conceit of men turning into frogs: the marvellously explicit figures of the Fountain of Latona executed by the Marsy brothers for Versailles after the designs by Ch. Le Brun directly inspired by the Latin poet (23).

Bryn Mawr College

FOOTNOTES

* I wish to express my gratitude to the curators of Classical art at the J.Paul Getty Museum, who secured permission for me to publish the statuette on loan to their collection and provided me with photographs; Marit Jentoft-Nilsen checked several details of the piece on my behalf. Alice A.Donohue was most helpful in supplying references to the ancient texts and to the remarkable fountain at Versailles. Jale Inan and Andreas Linfert generously gave me photographs of the Seleukia and Miletos replicas respectively. To all I extend my sincere thanks.

(1) A list of the pertinent coins appears in O.Palagia, **Euphranor** (Leiden 1980) 38, section III. Cf. also M.Bieber, **Ancient Copies** (New York 1977) fig. 466; H.von Aulock, **IstMitt-BH** 22 (1979) nos. 1167.1191.1199-1201 (I.Domna) and 1687-96 (Leto). Statuettes in Rome: 1) Conservatori Museum, Mon. Arc. 31, height 0. 68 m.; Palagia, **Euphranor,** 38 no. 3 with previous bibliography, fig. 60; Bieber, **Ancient Copies,** 105-106, figs. 467-68; Helbig⁴ no. 1501 (H.von Steuben). The figure is said to preserve traces of Apollo's feet, but I was unable to discern them when I examined the statue in 1982; the detailed treatment of the back mantle tip over Leto's left shoulder and breast would suggest a different positioning of the Apollo from that of the other replicas. Museo Torlonia no. 68, height 0.86m. (0.92m. with base); Palagia, **Euphranor,** 38 no. 2, figs. 58-59; Bieber, **Ancient Copies,** 105-106 figs. 469-470. O.Benndorf believes that another piece in the Museo Torlania is a replica of the running Leto, but combined in a pastiche with a replica of the Eirene and Ploutos: **Röm Mitt 1** (1836) 116no.240; this identification is apparently accepted by A.Mahler, **RA** 1906 II 290 and n.4. I know the piece only from a drawing in S.Reinanch, **Repertoire** II 418, 1 R, and since modern repairs are mentioned by Benndorf, I cannot judge the validity of the suggestion.

(2) To my knowledge, the Miletos replica is mentioned only by A.Linfert in his review of B.Vierneisel-Schlörb, **Klassische Skulpturen des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.** (Munich Glyptothek Catalogue 2, 1979): see **BonnJbb** 181 (1981) 614, comment to no. 26 and n. 11 on p. 280, where Vierneisel-Schlörb discusses the Leto type.
Replica from Kremna, now in Burdur Museum: J.Inan, **Türk Ark Derg** 19.2 (1970, publ, 1972) 51-73, esp. 66-68 no. 5, pl. 20.2. Height 1.75m. (plus plinth h. 0.14 m.).
Statue from Seleukia, now in Antalya Museum: to my knowledge, not officially published, but for photographs of both the Kremna and Seleukia statues see A.Gulaki, **Klassische und Klassizistische Nikedarstellungen. Untersuchungen zur Typologie und zum Bedeutungswandel bewegter Figuren** (Bonn 1980) figs. 49-50; cf. discussion on pp. 100-102 and ns. 386-387.

(3) Privately owned, on loan to the J.Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, California, L.78. AA.4; height 0.361m. (height of plinth 0.05 m.). The head of Artemis has a strong iron-red discoloration and the staining has spread down the back of the small figure. It is due to an ancient iron pin, now removed.

(4) Funerary Altar of Luccia Telesina, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti; W.Amelung, **Vat.Kat.** I (1903) 462 no. 230, pl. 47; Palagia, **Euphranor,** 38 Section II B, no. 4, fig. 61; Helbig⁴ no. 367 (E.Simon), The running figure holding two children has been provided with a long mantle which forms a niche behind her head and streams out behind her. She is flanked by a figure reclining on rocky ground, probably a personification of locale, and by a standing female holding aloft a shield decorated with a gorgoneion. Although Python is not present, the scene has been given the traditional interpretation, and it is assumed that the gorgoneion should help fight the snake by turning him into stone. This possibility seems unlikely, since the Gorgon head clearly appears as a shield device, not as the real decapitated Medusa.

In addition, the costume of the Leto looks considerably different from the sculptural type under discussion. Since no mention of Leto is epigraphically made on the altar, which is funerary in nature, perhaps the relief should be interpreted along the lines of a Roman legend. A.C.Luccius Telesinus was consul ordinarius in 66; since Luccia was probably his daughter or sister, her altar should be dated during the Flavian period.

(5) For these suggestions on the interpretation and integration of the group see, e.g., von Steuben in Helbig^4 no. 1501. For Euripides' statement see **Iphig. Taur.** vv. 1249-1251 (repeated by Palagia, **Euphranor**, 36).

(6) These vases are also listed by Palagia, **Euphranor**, 37, Section I: A) Attic B-f (white) lekythos, Paris, Cab. Méd. 306, **ABV** 572, 7; M. Pallottino, **ArchCl** 2 (1950) pl. 37.1; J. Fontenrose, **Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins** (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959) 17,fig.1. This lekythos has a "double" by the same painter (not included by Palagia), and I therefore list the two vases under a single entry, especially since the second vessel is not as well preserved as the first: Bergen VK-62-115; **CVA** Norway 1 (1964) pl.33.3-5; see also the text on p.31 for relevant discussion.

B) Attic r-f lekythos, Berlin 2212, **ARV**^{2} **730**, 8; **EAA** vol. 4, s.v. Latona, p. 506 fig. 593.
I do not include here one more vase, Palagia's C, Fontenrose, **Python**, 19 fig. 3; E.Loewy, **JdI** 47 (1932) 66 and fig. 18 on p. 65. This item is only known through a drawing by W. Tischbein, since it was part of the Hamilton collection and is now lost. Palagia, in consultation with A.D. Trendall, suggests that the vessel was South Italian, probably Apulian perhaps of the first half of the fourth century. Loewy uses it to strengthen his theory on the pictorial origin of certain sculptural compositions (**JdI** 47, pp. 47-68, esp. 66-67), and in fact the rocky setting of the scene, at that date, is only conceivable in painting. Details have been either altered or misunderstood in the drawing, since both children appear to have a bare torso, and their arms outstretched toward the snake suggest entreaty rather than fear; in addition, Apollo does not have his bow and therefore the scene could not represent the Killing of Python. Yet the snake is shown in his cave, thus indicating a setting in Delphi and not his chasing of Leto through the world. Admittedly, the running pose of the Leto on the vase makes her almost a mirror image of the sculptural type, but her costume (a peplos belted over the apoptygma) differs and a scarf mantle has been added (the back mantle of the statuary replicas is omitted).

(7) Klearchos of Soloi, ap. Athenaios 15, 701c; the passage is cited by Palagia, **Euphranor**, 37 and n. 184, where she accepts the traditional interpretation: although Klearchos specifically stated that Leto was holding only one of her two children, he was probably referring to the story and not to the bronze group at Delphi. A spirited and convincing argument is however made by A Mahler, **RA** (supra n. 1) 290-296, who stresses that if the Delphic sculpture was meant to codify the legend, it could not have differed from it in this important detail.

(8) Pallottino, **ArchCl** (supra n 6) 122-79, made the original identification; see esp. pp. 129-36 and the reconstruction, pl. 38.3. The theory is accepted by M.Sprenger and G. Bartoloni, **The Etruscans, their History, Art and Architecture** (New York 1983, English translation of original German/Italian ed. 1977) 112-13, captions to fig. 121. The issue is left open by T. Hadzisteliou-Price, **Kourotrophos. Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities** (Leiden 1978) 63 m: "Leto or Etruscan Goddess?", but the akroterion is included by Palagia in her listing of surviving works (**Euphranor**, 38.1), and by K.Schefold, in **Die Göttersage in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst** (Munich 1981) 42-46, fig. 46.

(9) Fontenrose, **Python** (supra n. 6) 13-22, esp. 21. For additional discussion of the encounter of Apollo and Python and its depiction in the visual arts, see L.G.Kahil, "Apollon et Python," in **Mélanges offerts à K. Michalowski** (Warsaw 1966) 481-90.
The lekythos Louvre CA 1915 (white ground b-f) which Kahil presents shows Apollo, appearing relatively grown-up, on a mound probably representing the omphalos, in front of which stands a tripod. Apollo's opponent is an anguiped monster with human head and torso an unusual rendering of Python with affinities to Typon. Egyption connections in the story are also explored.

(10) For this account and comments on the author and his sources see M. Papathomopoulos, **Antoninus Liberalis. Les Métamorphoses** (Paris 1968) no. 35; on p. 148 n. 7, Papathomopoulos suggests that Ant. Lib. fused together two traditions, one about the spring Melite, probably derived from Nikander and changed by Ovid, and the other about the Xanthos river, going back to Menekrates and ignored by

Ovid. That Ovid may have used the same earlier sources is suggested, e.g., by F. Wehrli, in **RE** suppl. 5 (1931) s.v. Leto, cols. 570-571 (and cf. also M.Wellmann, **RE** 7[1] (1910) s.v. Frosch, col. 115), and by H. Metzger, in Metzger et al., **FdXanthos 6. La stèle trilingue de Létôon** (Paris 1979) 9-10. That the literary accounts may represent an effort to reconcile the cult of Leto with that of the Nymphs, very prominent at the Letoon in Xanthos, is suggested by A.Balland, **FdXanthos 7. Inscriptions d'époque impériale du létôon** (Paris 1981) 16-18 and ns.33-42. Other accounts of the same story are in Prob. ad Virg. **Georg.** 1.378, Servius **ad loc.**, Myth. Vatic. I.10,II.95. These last two authors attribute the transformation to Demeter rather than to Leto (Papathomopoulos, p.148 n. 1; see also p.xiv).

For other comments on Antoninus Liberalis and the writing of metamorphoses in antiquity see J. Renner, "A Papyrus Dictionary of Metamorphoses," **HSCP** 82 (1978) 277-93, esp. 278 and n. 5.

(11) Cf., e.g., **Il.** 4.101, where Apollo is called Lykegenes, although the epithet, like Lykios, has received different translations. For the Homeric Hymn, see esp. v. 179, where the god is said to own Lycia. For a commentary in this sense, F. Càssola, **Inni omerici** (Verona 1975), 83-86, and 79-104 on the Hymn to Apollo as a whole (text and translation on pp. 106-51). See also G.M.A. Hanfmann, "On the Gods of Lydian Sardis," in R.M. Boehmer and H.Hauptmann, eds., **Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens** (Festschrift K.Bittel, Mainz 1983) 219-31, esp. 230-31.
It is unnecessary, in this context, to stress the well-known Anatolian connections of Artemis, and to recall the strong tradition that she was born not in Delos but in Asia Minor (Ortygia of the literary sources being located, or claimed to be located, near Ephesos). For Leto's cult see Wehrli, **RE** (supra n. 10) cols. 555-58.

(12) A summary of the history of the sanctuary can be found in Metzger et al. (supra n. 10) 9-28.

(13) Gulaki, **Nikedarstellungen** (supra n. 2) 304 n. 389, has noted that in the "western replicas" (the two statuettes in Rome), Leto's left foot is turned inward, in the direction of the movement, while in the two "eastern replicas" the foot is turned outward. The statuette in the Getty Museum seems to represent a position transitional between the two.
No traces of the children exist in the three statues from Asia Minor as preserved, although breaks occur at the relevant points on both shoulders. Probably the large scale of the sculptures (and the consequent danger of breakage) demanded that the children be carved separately from the main figure, or even that they be eliminated entirely. That they were present in the original (bronze) group is however attested by the reproductions on coins, and I suspect that they also appeared in the marble replicas despite the present lack of evidence.

(14) For Strabo's passage see A.F. Stewart, **Skopas of Paros** (Park Ridge 1977) 129 no. 21, see also 111-12. Note how appropriate the presence of Ortygia is for a group in Ephesos, given the city's claim as the birthplace of one twin. In Imperial times Ephesos seems to have been embellished with several monuments (of different dates) illustrating myths traditional and peculiar to that city: cf. the case of the Ikaros/Daidalos myth and perhaps even that of the Amazons: B.S.Ridgway, **Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture. The Problem of the Originals** (Ann Arbor 1984) 100.

(15) For this opinion see, e.g., H.von Steuben in Helbig[4], no. 1501. On the Romans' criteria in selecting works for their temples see Ridgway (supra n. 14) 17-18.

(16) Palagia, **Euphranor**, 36-39, especially concluding paragraph.

(17) This theory is by Mahler (supra ns. 1 and 7) 290-96.

(18) J. Inan (supra n. 2). An even earlier, Severe, date is advocated, e.g., by von Steuben in Helbig[4].

(19) F.Wehrli, **RE** Suppl. 5 (supra n. 10) col. 571.

(20) Gulaki (supra n. 2) 100-102. For the Delphi Runner see her fig. 46, or P. de la Coste Messelière, **Délphes** (Paris 1943) fig. 223. Running Maiden from Eleusis: Gulaki fig. 45; B.S. Ridgway, **The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture** (Princeton 1970) figs. 36-37.

(21) I had already expressed this opinion in **Roman Copies** (supra n. 14) 87 and ns. 40-44, where I also mentioned the statuette in the Getty Museum, although I had not studied the issue in depth at the time. For the sandals see esp. my n. 43.

(22) On this point see Hadzisteliou-Price, **Kourotrophos** (supra n. 8) 47, section D, I, and figs. 34-37. Although the type begins in the Archaic period, the tradition continues to be represented in later monuments. The Veii akroterion (her no. (449), mentioned supra n. 8) is included by her in the same category. The author also comments that this posture, in Attica, was common for silenoi and slaves, who may have thus been characterized as Easterners.

(23) T.F. Hedin, **The Sculpture of Gaspard and Balthazard Marsy** (Columbia, Missouri, 1983) 140-46, no. 19, figs. 19.1-12; see also pp. 54-58 for the history of the monument.