THE JUDGMENT OF PARIS.

TWO UNPUBLISHED VASES IN THE GRAECO-ETRUSCAN MUSEUM AT FLORENCE.

[PLATE LXX.]

MY object in the following paper is two-fold; first, to comment on two hitherto unpublished vases relating to the myth of the Judgment of Paris; secondly, to discuss the typography of the myth generally, and in particular to offer some suggestions as to the origin of its early art form.

First as to the unpublished vases. Both the amphora and the pinax are now in the Graeco-Etruscan Museum at Florence. The drawings and photographs were executed under the kind supervision of the Director of the Museum, Sig. Milani; he was however unable to tell me where the vases were found: they are manifestly both of Attic work. It is fortunate that they both are now in the same Museum, as they present certain well-marked analogies in treatment, evident at the most cursory glance.

A detailed description of the two vases is superfluous, as accurate reproductions lie before the reader, but I would call attention to one or two points. The amphora (Plate LXX. and Fig. 1) I should class as belonging to very early black-figured manner—before the regular B. F. Attic style is fully established—with reminiscences of the so-called ‘Chalcidian’ and of the ‘Corinthian’ styles. We note especially the curiously cut cloaks of the women, which appear frequently on Corinthian vases, of which there are numerous examples in the Louvre; and we note also the rosettes on the animal frieze and the very ‘Chalcidian’ *horror vacui*, e.g. the little owl between the feet of Hermes.

The dress of the figures has on the other hand marked analogies with the François vase, and with such early bits of work as the Marathon plate (Köhler, *Mitt.* 1882, Taf. 3). This

FIG. 1.—OBVERSE OF AMPHORA IN PLATE.

analogy is specially marked in the dress of Paris, where the Dionysos of the Marathon plate wears just such a fine-ribbed chiton indicated by waving lines. This love of ribbed lines is further observable in the wavy lines that indicate the trees

(see on this 'Chalcidian' peculiarity, Cecil Smith, 'Four Archaic Vases from Rhodes,' *Journal Hell. Stud.* V. p. 224). I may note in passing that these fine-ribbed chitons continued in special favour with the potter Amasis (*e.g.* the figure of Dionysos, *A. Z.* 1884, Taf. 15). The figure of Paris is identical in dress and almost identical in posture on both amphora and plate. It is in every detail (ungirt, ribbed chiton with border

FIG. 2.—PINAX IN MUSEUM AT FLORENCE.

at neck and feet, narrow form of Doric himation) exactly similar to that of Peleus in the vase which shows such marked analogies to the style of Amasis (Heydemann, *Griech. Vas.* T. 6, 4, see F. Studniczka, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht*, p. 66).

The only substantial differences between the treatment in the two vases are (1) the figure of Hermes which differs in

dress and action, (2) on the amphora we have two figures added to fill up the ampler space. I attach no mythological importance to them; they are primarily space fillers, secondarily, they are engaged in what if we discuss Italian art we should call the 'sacre conversazioni.' As regards the amphora as a whole it falls under the class noted by Dr. Furtwängler, in his catalogue of the Berlin vases, as *Attische Amphoren*, 2β, Gruppe 3, though it precisely corresponds to none of the Berlin specimens. Of published vases the nearest to it in character is the recently published amphora found at Corneto, with Herakles and the Amazons and the hunt of the Calydonian boar (*Monumenti*, 1884, Taf. ix.-x.). The pinax has two holes in the upper part of the rim which seem to have been made for the purpose of passing a string through to suspend it. As to the treatment of the myth we may note that it is an instance of the class I shall call in my scheme *b*. Hermes leads the three goddesses into the presence of Paris, Paris betrays alarm:—before passing on I would call attention to the fact that, similar though the goddesses are, the centre one (whom I believe to be uniformly Athene) is distinguished by the presence of spots on her cloak, and further by the talaric chiton after the Ionian fashion of the *ἐλκεχίτωνες* (*Il.* 13, 685): these *ἐλκεχίτωνες* appear in Corinthian, 'Chalcidian' and early Attic work, and, as Mr. C. Smith has remarked, appear on the Harpy tomb (see *op. cit.* p. 230).

I turn to my second point, the discussion of the typography of the myth.

I do not intend to attempt the complete enumeration of all known instances. The black-figured vases have recently been exhibited in tabular form by Dr. A. Schneider in his *Der troische Sagenkreis in der ältesten griechischen Kunst* (Leipzig, 1886), and as this book is in the hands of every student of the Trojan cycle of myths, I shall adopt his lettering in referring to the vases, and shall not repeat his enumeration of the familiar literature of the subject. He does not undertake to give a list that shall be complete, nor do I think such completeness at all essential for the discussion of the question of typography: instances of the myth are, as every one knows, remarkably numerous, and in a great number of cases the treatment is in all matters of importance perfectly uniform: the mere enumeration of such is a barren task and may well

be omitted. The essential thing is to accumulate sufficient material for the safe establishment of the principal type-forms, subsequent instances will then only need to be noted in so far as they present variations.

Before however I begin the work of classification I will briefly note a few vases which do not appear in existing lists, and which seem to me to be of sufficient importance to be registered. I number them separately; belonging as they do to all styles and periods, I cannot attempt to incorporate them into Dr. Schneider's list. Three belong to the Antikenkabinet at Copenhagen, two are in the Louvre, one in the National Museum at Naples, two at Palermo.

1. Oinochoë. Copenhagen. B. F. Paris turns to fly at the approach of Hermes and the three goddesses.

2. Lekythos. Copenhagen. B. F. Paris turns to face Hermes, who is followed by the three goddesses: behind Paris a low chair, from which he has just risen.

3. Lid of a Pyxis. Copenhagen. Fine Attic style; published *Vases peints*, Dumont et Chaplain, III. plate x. This vase, though long known to exist, has attracted but little notice. The representation is unique: Hera advances in a chariot drawn by four horses, Athene by two bearded snakes, Aphrodite by two Erotes.

4. Amphora. Paris. B. F. Three goddesses stand almost in a line. Paris attempts to fly. Hermes seizes him by the left wrist (*vide* wood-cut to type *B*).

5. Amphora. Paris. B. F. Two goddesses only. Paris attempts to fly. Hermes raises left hand in speech: inscriptions unintelligible.

6. Krater. Naples. Very late R. F. (Heydemann, *Cat.* 2870). Paris seated (below handle) in Phrygian dress and holding spear. To him behind small tree approaches Hermes followed by two chariots, each drawn by two horses and containing each two goddesses. In the front chariot Athene and Hera, behind Aphrodite and Artemis. Above Hermes indications of rock and foliage behind which appears Pan holding pedom: inscriptions ΠΑΡΙΞ ΑΘΑΝΑΙΗ ΑΡΤΙΙΥΞ ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΑ . . ΗΕ . . Lower part of figure of Paris effaced and upper part of Hermes. The drawing is very late and coarse, the manner of depiction both as regards the presence of Artemis and Pan and the inscription ΠΑΡΙΞ

(in place of the customary Ἀλέξανδρος) unique, but I see no reason to suspect the genuineness of the vase, though possibly the inscriptions are modern.

7. Fragment of Vase. Palermo. Fine red-figured. Paris in Phrygian cap, high boots, Greek chiton, holding in left hand two spears, is seated on rock. Hermes in chiton, chlamys, and flat hat, raises left hand in token of speech. This occupies the whole fragment, probably obverse of a cotylos. We may suppose that on the reverse the three goddesses were depicted.

8. Amphora. Palermo. R. F. Obverse, Paris seated on rock, wears chlamys and flat hat and boots: right hand raised meditatively to support chin, left hand holds club. To him approaches Athene only, in helmet and aegis, right hand holding spear, left rests on hip: behind her Hermes in similar attitude. Reverse, youth draped, holds staff: to him approaches draped female figure offering alabastron; behind her, second draped figure.

I would add also that the oinochoë marked *A* in Dr. Schneider's list and 5 in Overbeck's, and noted as belonging to Colonel Coghill, is in the possession of Mr. Ionides, of Holland Park, London, by whose kind permission I saw and identified it. The Aegina amphora marked 'q' 'Privatbes. i. Athen,' must be I think the one I examined in the private collection of M. Rhousopoulos: it is of the most delicate archaic style, the flesh parts of the women white, the centre figure holds a spear so that she may safely be described as Athene. Hermes does *not* wear Flügelschuhe, only the high, pointed boots. On the reverse is the combat of Theseus and Minotaur. In any tabular view of the typography of a myth it seems to me a grave oversight to omit the indication of the *reverse* subject; for purposes of identification, if for nothing else, it is essential.

I now proceed to the classification. I have preferred to keep the number of classes or of type forms few, and to note under these few heads the more important modifications. The classification is in many respects so obvious that its main outline has been already anticipated, but I shall hope to show, when I come to the question of the origin of the original type form, that the somewhat stricter system I propose is not without its use. I letter the types in capitals, the modifications in small letters.

TYPE A.—Procession form, Paris absent.

Hermes advances, usually to the right, followed by the three goddesses. Usually Athene only is characterised, and, when characterised, she invariably walks second. Hera and Aphrodite (Athene also sometimes) uncharacterised.

TYPE A.

TYPE B.—Procession form, Paris present, *standing*.

As before but Paris present; he stands, facing Hermes.

b. Modification of B. Paris shows alarm in one of three ways.

1. He simply turns to fly.
2. Hermes seizes him by the arm or shoulder.
3. Hermes actually wrestles with Paris.

TYPE B 3.

TYPE C.—Procession form, Paris present, seated.

The order of the goddesses fluctuates; Paris usually surrounded by some attempt at scenic effect, a tree, a house, his flocks, etc.

c. Modification, the goddesses arrive in chariots.

c². One or two goddesses represented instead of three.

TYPE C.

TYPE D.—Procession form abandoned.

Paris seated or standing in the centre or to the right or left. The three goddesses grouped around in every variety of pose. Often many unimportant accessory figures.

d. Important accessory figures indicated often in back-ground. Themis, Eris, Zeus, chariot of Helios, and especially Apollo, Artemis, and Apolline symbols.

TYPE D.

Before discussing the origin of type *A* and its development into *B*, *C* and *D*, I must offer a few somewhat disjointed remarks on certain instances of the several types.

With reference to type *A* the important facts to be borne in mind are (1) that the type is confined so far as I am aware to black-figured Attic vases, (2) that frequently the goddesses are not characterized at all, where they are it is to Athene only that prominence is given. The Attic origin of the work may account for her prominence, but it does *not* account for her taking invariably the second place: in red-figured vases, *e.g.* the Hieron cup in Berlin, she not unfrequently walks first. I shall have to offer later a suggestion to account for this middle position.

Dr. Schneider has rightly observed with respect to the Xenokles cup that the crouching or seated attitude of Hermes is merely due to inadequate space—we are not to regard it as Overbeck has done as representing a preliminary deliberation. I would add however that at the time when Xenokles worked in all probability the type of the *seated Paris C* was in vogue, and that this may have suggested the seated Hermes. I would add further what seems to have passed hitherto unnoticed, that in the Xenokles cup the goddesses present a curious modification of the 'three in one cloak' type: the upper part of the cloak is common to all, but each has also a separate piece over or outside the arm. I am taking for granted that Overbeck's reproduction based on that of Raoul Rochette is correct: the cup itself is lost. Dr. Furtwängler thinks that this type of two or more women enveloped in one cloak is nothing but a *simplification conventionnelle*, and has no reference to actual custom (*Collection Sabouroff, Coupe d'Argos*, plate li.). On the general principle I am not inclined to agree with him: when two women or more stand, those farthest from each other face to face with a large and unnecessary space of cloak stretched out between them, I cannot regard the treatment as *une simplification*. My own impression is that there was some religious ceremony in which two or more women enveloped themselves in one cloak, that this ceremony was depicted on vase paintings, that subsequently seeing its convenience the vase painter adopted the type for mere ordinary scenes in which two or more women similarly attired walked together.

This I believe to be the case in the Xenokles cup, and Xenokles, always a cramped, somewhat confused draughtsman, halts between two opinions, and makes an impossible cloak half common to all three, half separate to each.

Dr. Schneider gives seventeen instances of the simple procession type of Hermes and the three goddesses; many additions might be added, but these are amply sufficient to establish it.

We pass to type *B*.

Instances in which Paris is simply standing quietly awaiting the arrival of the procession are comparatively rare. It is noticeable also that in several instances of this type one of the goddesses is omitted (*e.g.*, *G. A. V. clxxii.*). This I attribute not so much to carelessness on the part of the artist as to the fact that his eye was thoroughly habituated to the type *A*, *i.e.* three figures preceded by a fourth. How curiously the artist was filled with the processional character of the scene may be noted in *G. A. V. clxxiii.* where Paris heads the procession and Hermes (taking the place of Paris) turns round to watch it approaching: the figure of Paris has been called Apollo or a Muse because he holds the lyre: a black-figured Muse does not so far as I know exist, and the black-figured lyre-playing Apollo is quite a different figure.

I would further remark that type *B* so long as it is black-figured remains strictly processional: but the type was taken over by red-figured vase painters, and under the influence no doubt of type *D*, where the processional order is lost, its strict early form becomes modified. An example of what I mean is the delicate red-figured pyxis of the Sabouroff Collection at Berlin (Furtwängler, *Coll. Sab. lxi.*): here Athene stands *behind* Paris, and Hera the last in order turns her back on Aphrodite to meet Iris or some winged female messenger who approaches.

In type *B* there is distinctly perceptible the beginning of a desire to characterize Hera and Aphrodite, as well as Athene. Hera walks first, Aphrodite last. It is easy to see the reason: the fact of the *judgment* is distinctly emphasized by the presence of Paris, and therefore clear differentiation becomes necessary. I pass to a very interesting variation of *B*, *i.e.* the scheme (*b*) in which Paris expresses reluctance, and as a rule undergoes compulsion. Dr. Schneider notes seven instances; if to these we add two Paris amphoras (Nos. 4 and 5 of my list) and the two

vases now published for the first time, we have in all eleven instances of the *b* scheme: they are in fact more numerous than *B*. They are uniformly black-figured with the single but well-marked exception of the British Museum stamnos (Overbeck, *G. H.* ix. 8). I think the reason of this is not far to seek. The great Attic cylix painters Hieron, Brygos, and their contemporaries, took up the type with Paris *seated*, and by their graceful treatment of it effaced the popularity of the standing type. The rude motive of the actual struggle was supplanted by such gentler sentiments as amazement and admiration. Whether there was any literary tradition of the struggle between Paris and Hermes I do not pretend to decide; it is by no means necessary to presuppose such tradition; the artist is quite as well able to invent such a modification of the story as the poet himself: indeed in one instance he noticeably goes back on *artistic* in place of literary tradition in the well-known lekythos of the Berlin Museum (Furtwängler, *Cat.* 2005, *Arch. Zeit.* 1882, Taf. 11) where the Peleus and Thetis wrestling scheme is adopted for Hermes and Paris. We may note also that in all early conceptions of myths we find a tendency to the exhibition of forcible situations with a view to emphasizing the compulsory obedience to the will of the gods.

In type *C* the essential advance in the treatment of the subject is that Paris is *seated*; he no longer forms any part of the procession, nor is he liable to be confused with Hermes who approaches him. A sort of transition from the standing to the seated type is to be noted in the Copenhagen lekythos (number 2 of my supplementary list): here Paris has just risen from a low chair. Type *C* is an essentially red-figured type, but two black-figured instances are known, Overbeck, ix. 6, and an amphora in the British Museum: in both Paris is seated in a quaint inclined position on a rock, indicated by a curved line.

The vase painter of type *C* seems to give his fancy full rein as regards the order of precedence among the three goddesses: in the Hieron cylix (Berlin, 2291) Athene is first; in another Berlin cylix of the fine Attic style (Berlin, 2536), Aphrodite; in the Brygos cylix they are undistinguishable; in a Nolan amphora of the British Museum (Overbeck, *G. H.* x. 1), Aphro-

dite heads the procession. Olympian etiquette is fast becoming relaxed, among the goddesses there is a rapidly growing feeling of democratic equality.

It is not necessary to dwell on all the graceful picturesque variations of the simple theme, which are due wholly to the play of the vase painter's fancy. To turn from the stiff stereotyped procession of types *A* and *B* and the black-figured instances of *C* to the work of the red-figured cylix painters is to pass from frost-bound winter to the new impulse, the budding life of spring. Sometimes Paris is seated in a little temple house and watches unabashed with kingly grace the coming of the goddesses: at another he hides his face behind his cloak in rustic terror. Brygos makes him sing to his lyre, and with up-turned head take no notice of the coming procession; sometimes a flock of goats gathers thick about him, sometimes a single sheep suffices as a symbol. With the goddesses there is every graceful variety of posture and attribute. Hera holds a small lion, or Aphrodite a tiny love-god perched upon her hand or perhaps a throng of loves clustering about her head. To base any theory on this endless diversity of attributes and arrangement would be useless and absurd. With respect however to the presence of the love-gods I would notice one particular instance, both because I think it marks a definite advance in feeling and because it has some interest with respect to Dr. Benndorf's new theory of interpretation as to the 'Thanatos' drum of the column from Ephesus in the British Museum. In a cyathos of the Berlin Museum (No. 2610, *Annali* 1833, tav. d'agg. E.) which belongs to type *C*, Eros is standing evidently talking to Aphrodite and encouraging her as to the issue: a full-grown Eros is quite common when we come to type *D*, but in the procession form *C* with this one exception he never appears. The Erotes one or many who hover about Aphrodite in type *C* whether one or many are *attributive*, scarcely personal; when Eros enters as a distinct personality, powerful to persuade and compel, not merely as a sort of symbol of the charm of Aphrodite, we have an evident advance in sentiment, we are nearing the Praxitelean manner. In fact as regards Eros the myth in question has three stages: 1st, in types *A* and *B* Eros is wholly absent, 2nd, in *C* he is present *attributively*, 3rd, in *D* and in the one case cited of *C* he

is present *personally*, often in his three aspects as Eros, Pothos, and Himeros. If Dr. Benndorf (*Bulletino d. Comm. Archeologica Comunale*, Rome, 1886, xiv. 1, 2, 3, p. 54) is right in interpreting the scene on the Ephesos drum as the Judgment of Paris, we have a full-grown personal Eros in the processional type, just as in the cyathos in question.

Type *C* undergoes many modifications according to the space at command or the fancy of the painter, *e.g.* in the Nolan amphora of the British Museum referred to before and in the amphora (wood-cut to type *C*), Paris and the three goddesses occupy the obverse, Hermes alone the reverse: in the Palermo fragment (my number 7) Paris and Hermes occupy one side and (presumably) the three goddesses the other.

Modification *c* calls for no special comment. It is so far as I know confined to the two instances I have cited, the Copenhagen and the Naples vases (my list 3 and 6). It was a pleasant fancy of the vase painters to make the goddesses come in their chariots, but it is a fancy that suggests that the interest of the myth itself was somewhat exhausted and needed the stimulus of artificial treatment.

Finally we may note under type *C* a transition stage to *D*. In a lekythos published by Welcker, *A. D. v. Taf. B, 1*, the procession form is beginning to disappear. The centre goddess Athene stands in repose with her feet crossed, not advancing at all; the hindmost goddess, whether Hera or Aphrodite, is *seated* balancing the seated figure of Paris.

Lastly in type *D* the procession form wholly vanishes: whatever thought (and this question we shall consider later) prompted this procession form in the early types is now wholly forgotten. Paris is the centre of the scene, Hermes and the three goddesses are scattered about—as it seems, no matter how. A very troublesome element in the late form of this as of every other myth are the accessory figures. These for the most part are unmeaning, attendants perhaps, women with fans, extra gods, space-filling ‘supers’ of every kind. This fourth century type came in of course with the love of loud showy compositions, perspective elements and all the other signs of decorative and expressive decadence. Often in this class of vase the figures are so vaguely characterized that it is impossible to say if the painter really intended to depict a ‘Judgment’ or

not; the impression left on one's mind is that he was too idle and indifferent to care to make up his mind what he really did mean. Among the mass of such vases, vulgar to look at, unprofitable to discuss, there stand out, however, a small number which we class as *d*, i.e. the type with *important* accessory figures. These I would note under two heads. 1st. Those which seek to lend a new motive to the contest by the introduction of Themis or Eris: such are the well-known Karlsruhe vase (Overbeck, *H. G.* xi. 1), with Eris; its scarcely less well-known sister of St. Petersburg (see woodcut, type *D*). 2nd. Those which add a new factor in the conditions of the judgment by the introduction of Zeus or Apollo with Delphic surroundings—instances of this are the new Vienna krater (*Vorlegeblätter*, Serie E, xi. a vase of the highest interest which adds new emphasis to problems already suggested by such vases as *Vorlegeblätter*, Serie A, x. 2, and A, ix. 1. In these it will be remembered that Zeus appears and seems to delegate the Judgment rather to Apollo than to Paris. This new conception I believe to be in close connection with the *Themis* origin of the strife—the figure of Themis seated on the Delphian tripod (*Vorlegeblätter*, Serie A, xi. 2) in the middle of a cylix will not be forgotten. Together with the appearance of Themis as new *cause*, and Apollo as new *decider* of the strife, there appears the desire to add scenic effect by introducing in the background the chariot of Helios and the figure of Selene or Eos—but this may probably be put down to the general love of the fourth and fifth century for this cosmical background.

It is my purpose here only to raise the question of the special connection of Apollo with the myth. I do not see my way at present to the solution of the difficulty. It is of course perfectly easy to conceive that the delicate question of the priority of the goddesses was referred to the Delphic oracle, but what we really want to know is what causes the marked appearance in the fourth century of this factor in the depiction of the vase-paintings. Was there some special literary impulse or did some great monumental picture or sculptural group suggest the idea—or, lastly, was there some great contemporaneous impulse to the worship of Apollo which caused this element to be introduced into the Judgment—and into many other myths?

I turn from this general discussion of the typography of the myth to the more definite and positive subject of my paper, *i.e.* my theory as to the origin of the early type-form of the 'Judgment.'

At the outset we are met by a fact that piques curiosity and prompts us to investigation. Every commentator on the 'Judgment' vase-paintings has noticed one curious point. I mean the presence and long persistence of type *A*. Hermes and the three goddesses *alone, without Paris*. Surely it is a curious way to represent the myth with the principal figure conspicuous by its absence. The early vase painter if he was nothing else was a story-teller and a somewhat garrulous one, he was much more likely to err in the addition than in the suppression of detail: no technical difficulty here stands in his way—if he could draw four figures he could add a fifth—why then in so large a number of cases does he advisedly dock the scene of its principal actor, and represent a purely preliminary stage? Further, why does he adopt the procession-form at all? We are so used to this procession-form that it perhaps requires some effort of the imagination to conceive of the myth as embodied otherwise, but if we rid ourselves of preconceived notions, surely the natural way of representing the myth would be something of this sort: Paris in the centre facing the successful goddess Aphrodite to whom he speaks or hands a crown, behind him—to indicate neglect—the two disappointed goddesses, Hermes anywhere, just to indicate the mandate of the gods, in fact such a form as actually appears later on a pyxis already cited, Furtwängler, *Sabouroff Collection*, lxi. Wherever, in fact, we have an order strictly processional, *Hermes* present always and always conspicuous, we have a form that seems to me to tell its own story, *i.e.* that it was not *made* for the myth but merely adapted and taken over, having had originally another and more apposite significance—a myth in which Paris played no part at all.

Welcker (*A. D.* v. 366) felt the difficulty and in the manner of his times accounted for it by supposing the procession-form based on some special *literary* emphasis on the going to Ida; he concludes that 'die Poesie gleich diesem ersten Theile einen gewissen Charakter oder Glanz gegeben hätte' (Welcker, *Ep. Kyklos* II. 88). Dr. Lückenbach in his *Verhältniss der griech-*

ischen Vasenbilder, 592, denies this literary source and suggests that the early art form of the myth was due to the *love of archaic art for processions*. Dr. Schneider, *Der troische Sagenkreis*, p. 99, revives Welcker's *literary* interpretation, according to the reactionary canons he consistently adopts throughout his book. In general I have no hesitation in saying that I am with Dr. Lückebach in his method of interpretation, and entirely adverse to Dr. Schneider, but in this particular question I have my own solution to offer which coincides entirely with neither of theirs. The general question would need to be discussed in connection with a large number of myths, and this is beyond the scope of the present paper; I can therefore here only say that though I thank Dr. Schneider for pointing out (p. 2) the ever-present peril of the exaggeration of a principle, I still adhere to the 'Schulprogramm' (*op. cit.* p. 2) of typography to which he is so strongly averse, and I hope in this individual instance I am now discussing to support and strengthen my position.

I will first state why it seems to me that the explanations both of Dr. Schneider and Dr. Lückebach are inadequate. First Dr. Schneider's *literary* explanation. Proklos says, *νεῖκος περὶ κάλλους ἐνίστησιν Ἀθηνᾶ Ἡρὰ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη, αἱ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν Ἰδῇ κατὰ Διὸς προσταγὴν ὑφ' Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἄγονται*—here Dr. Schneider stops, but it is better to cite the whole passage, *καὶ προκρίνει τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπαρθεὶς τοῖς Ἑλένης γάμοις ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος*. Now taking this passage as a fair summary of the account of the Judgment in the Cypria, one is forced to own that in all probability the poet dwelt on three points, the beginning of the strife among the goddesses, the coming of Hermes and his leading them to Paris, and the Judgment itself. But suppose the ancient vase-painter to be perfectly unfettered in his choice, there is nothing to make him give preference to the procession to Ida: in fact that, if anything, is the transitional unimportant moment; the two important moments are, the kindling of the strife and the pronouncing of the Judgment. If therefore we even suppose (which I do not for a moment) that the vase-painter based his representation on the account in the Cypria, what governed his selection of the moment? and why did he choose the least important? I wish to make clear that I agree with Dr. Schneider in supposing that the going to Ida was described in the Cypria, but

I disagree with him in supposing that that is sufficient to account for the marked prominence of the procession-form in the art expression of the myth.

If the vase-painting were based on the literary form, what we should naturally have would be *e.g.*, obverse, the three goddesses led by Hermes to Ida, reverse, the actual judgment but quite distinct in type, whereas what we *do* find is that the procession is the root and ground of the art form, the all-important and constant factor in it, and Paris is present or absent in a very strange and subordinate fashion.

Turning to Dr. Lückenbach we find that his suggestion is that archaic art loved processions, hence the Judgment is conceived of as a procession. Surely this is going a little too far, we can scarcely wonder that Dr. Schneider is roused to wrath. Ancient art did undoubtedly love processions, but not with a passion so foolish and unreasonable : the Judgment is a situation essentially stationary, Hermes a subordinate figure ; in depicting other myths, ancient art is not driven to express its thought in terms of an inappropriate procession ; it is indeed, as I am always eager to maintain, usually governed by traditional form but not to the extent of unnecessary obscurity in the thought to be expressed. We need a stronger motive power, we are driven it seems to me to the supposition that the black-figured type *A* was not invented at all for the myth it represents, but was taken over from a conception processional in its nature, and in which Hermes played a prominent and necessary part.

Type *A* contains unfortunately no very early instances, no Corinthian work, not even any very early Attic work, only for the most part vases of the stereotyped black-figured style. The vases I publish here for the first time are among the earliest instances, and yet the artist is obviously only repeating a thrice-told tale. Where Corinthian and early Attic vases fail us we turn of course to literature and ask if we have any account of Peloponnesian works of art embodying the myth at an earlier date. On both the chest of Cypselos and the throne of Apollo at Amyclae it appears—and in both it is satisfactory to find that the treatment coincides with that of type *A*. The presence of Paris is not indeed, as some have said, precluded, but the main emphasis is laid on Hermes and the form is evidently processional. The passages of Pausanias are too well known to

need citation. What it is important to us to note is that the established type of the myth in the art of the seventh century B.C. was that of a procession of the goddesses led by Hermes, and this type it was that was taken over to the B. F. Attic vase-paintings of the sixth and fifth century.

We have yet another branch of evidence to examine. It is not well to consider vase-paintings in complete isolation: have other departments of art, *e.g.* sculpture, bronzes, terra-cottas of archaic style so early that they might be supposed to have influenced B. F. vase-paintings, left us any instances of the 'Judgment of Paris'?

If we ask this question in its point-blank form the answer has to be 'No.' Of this myth so widely popular in B. F. vase-painting, other forms of contemporary art have left us, so far as I am aware, no trace; but if we put the question in another and more abstracted form—if we ask, has archaic art left us any type of these goddesses linked together by a common purpose and under the guidance of Hermes? the answer will I think be more favourable, and will to my mind offer the solution of the difficulty.

A large class of reliefs exist, of which two in the Sabouroff collection at Berlin (Furtwängler, *Coll. Sab.* plate xxviii.) may be taken as typical, or again, the well-known relief from Gallipoli, now at Vienna.

The subject is Hermes conducting three nymphs into the presence of Pan. Pan is seated on a rock. The resemblance to type *C* of our myth is obvious and striking even at the most superficial glance. The style, however, of these nymph reliefs is uniformly late: the earliest known is I believe the Archandros relief published by Milchhöfer, *Mitt.* V. p. 206. It may date about the time of Pheidias, or a little later. Now obviously if these reliefs of late date were all we had, we could base nothing on the resemblance, however striking it might be. Happily we can trace back the type to earlier days. Dr. Furtwängler, in his admirable paper on the Charites of the Acropolis (*Mitt.* III. 181) has shown beyond a doubt that these frequent nymph reliefs are but the descendants of a much earlier type, namely, of the Charites led by Hermes. He distinguishes three stages in the development—1st, the Charites alone, 2nd, the Charites led by Hermes, 3rd, the Charites transformed into nymphs and

led by Hermes into the presence of Pan. I believe that in the second stage we find the origin of our myth type *A*. Literature abundantly connects Hermes and the Charites: the prayer at the Thesmophoria will not be forgotten (Aristoph. *Thesm.* line 300), καὶ τῷ Ἑρμῇ καὶ Χάρισιν; Plutarch says (*de recta aud. rat.* 13), ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν ταῖς Χάρισιν οἱ παλαιοὶ συγκαθίδρυσεν, and again (*de nat. deorum* cap. XVI., p. 164) Ἡγέμονα παραδιδόασιν αὐτῶν (τῶν Χαρίτων) τὸν Ἑρμῆν; in Samos Hermes was worshipped as Χαριδώτης, and in a sacrificial

FIG. 3.—NYMPH RELIEF FROM GALLIPOLI.

inscription in pre-Eucleidic letters found at Eleusis, Hermes Agoraios and the Charites are named together. For the whole literature of the subject I refer to O. Benndorf, 'Die Chariten des Sokrates,' *A. Z.* 1869, p. 58, where he discusses the well-known Vatican relief of the Three Graces and the other replicas of the same subject.

I only cite these passages to show that the worship of Hermes as leader of the Three Graces was familiar to οἱ παλαιοὶ; it is therefore, *a priori*, highly probable that in very early days there

were votive reliefs representing Hermes and the Three Charites, although our earliest actual instances are of the fourth century, B.C.—those referred to by Dr. Furtwängler (*op. cit.*). A very closely analogous monument of the early fifth century is the Thasos relief in the Louvre, where the Charites are certain from the inscription. Hermes is their leader, as Apollo is that of the Muses.

I am inclined to think that my view of the origin of type *A* may be confirmed by an examination of details, and this in two special particulars. (1) I have repeatedly noted that in type *A* one goddess only is characterized, *i.e.* the middle one, Athene. It is I think a noticeable fact that in the type of the Charites later developed into the Nymphs one trait is almost constant—the middle figure turns *en face*. This, of course, arose from the desire to compose the group pleasantly. In type *A* frequently, though not always, Athene turns her head and looks back at the third goddess. It has been usual to interpret this by supposing that the third goddess was either a sort of Cinderella, disliked and snubbed by the two elder goddesses, or else that she is regarded with fear proleptically as the successful rival. I am not prepared to say that one or other or both these notions were not in the mind of the red-figured vase painter, but I think the variant attitude of the second goddess was already fixed in accordance with the Charites type; in fact, I think the attitude suggested the thought rather than the thought the attitude. If contempt or fear had been the primary motive of the attitude both the goddesses would have equally turned round to gaze at Aphrodite, instead of one only. It would perhaps be fanciful to draw attention to the fact that the second Charis is draped in the Doric chiton again merely from the desire to get variety in the design, and that this possibly may have suggested the position of the severer Athene; the third Charis or Nymph frequently muffles the hand in drapery, an attitude which appears also in the Aphrodite of many of the vase-paintings.

(2) Very frequent attributes in the hands of any or all of the goddesses are flowers and fruit. The fruit, indeed, has given rise often to wrong interpretations, and has been made to stand for the golden apple of Discord, which, as is now well known, never appears on vase-paintings. Now I am well aware that it

is no unfrequent thing to find a woman figure carrying flowers and fruit when no special meaning can be attached to it. I cannot, however, forbear noting that in the hands of the Charites they have peculiar significance. Our word Graces but feebly and partially expresses the function of these goddesses, and seizes indeed only their later and more superficial aspect. The Charites are primarily *nature goddesses of increase*, the givers of all good things to man, the goddesses of fruitfulness. Aphrodite herself is but the mightiest of their number; her worship was closely associated with theirs. In the regular Charites and Nymph type of the reliefs the three hold hands, and therefore cannot carry gifts, but in the closely-analogous type of the Eumenides reliefs (*Mitt.* IV. 9) the three Eumenides hold flowers, in their capacity of benevolent givers of gifts.

I believe it to be a mere coincidence, and attach no importance whatever to the fact, but it is curious to note that in gems of late date (*e.g.* Overbeck, *G.H.* XI. 9) the three goddesses take the precise form of the later representations of the Graces and pose in an attitude evidently copied from the group most familiar in the replica of Siena.

My special business is with the origin of the *art form* of the myth, but I would note that there is a certain analogy between the Charites and even the *literary* aspect of the goddesses of the Judgment. The myth of the judgment has been for the most part regarded as having its origin in the beauty-contests, *καλλιστεία*, which are known to have taken place among mortal women; others regarded it as an echo of the Three Sisters Saga common to so many nations. It is possible and probable that many strands may have gone to its weaving, and I do not pretend to the trained mythological sense necessary for their disentanglement. I would throw out, however, this concluding suggestion. May not an element in the myth be this, that the three goddesses are the *Charites as rivals*, the gift-givers at strife? As gift-givers they appear before Paris; as gift-givers we may remember these very three goddesses conjointly with Artemis dowered the daughters of Pandareus (*Odyssey*, XX. 64). We cannot too carefully remember that as rivals in *beauty* they appear only in late degenerate art. I cannot therefore for a moment regard the *καλλιστεῖον* as the kernel of the myth. This notion is contemporary with the

in-coming of the golden apple; rather to my mind there underlies the myth a thought far more austere and reverent. The Judgment of Paris is a conflict of *σημεῖα*; the perfectly fortunate man needs for the dowering of his life the *χάρις* of glory, the *χάρις* of wisdom, the *χάρις* of love; but it may be he must choose between them, and according to ancient thinking the mightiest of these is Aphrodite, the *χάρις* of love.

It may seem that this is an abstract notion unnatural to early days, but I think the further one goes back to the origines of Greek mythology the more one is struck by a certain fluctuating quality, a certain instability of personality, interchangeability of attributes. It is not so much vagueness as a certain economy of utterance both literary and artistic which makes one thing serve many purposes. It is like the absence of precise differentiation in the early uses of mood and tense. Hence it seems to me that in regarding the three Judgment goddesses as rival Charites we are in harmony with the spirit of early mythological developments: the method is sound for the literary form of the myth as for its artistic expression.

Briefly to resume, it seems to me probable, as regards the art form of the myth:—

1. That the origin of type *A* was the taking over of the type of Hermes leading the Charites.
2. That this accounts for the prominence of Hermes and the at first subordinate position or even absence of Paris.
3. That it further accounts for the fact that at first the middle goddess only is differentiated.
4. That the theory of the subordinate position of Paris in the myth is further supported by the fact that in fourth century representations there is observable a tendency to refer the Judgment to Apollo rather than Paris.
5. That possibly as Hermes and the Charites are the prototype of Hermes and the three goddesses, so the seated Pan in the Nymph reliefs may be the prototype of Paris and his rival surroundings in red-figured vase-paintings.

That as regards the myth itself of the Judgment apart from its art form:—

1. An important element in the myth is the aspect of the three goddesses as rival Charites or gift-givers.
2. That the myth in this form may have existed long

before the Trojan war, and had no necessary connection with Paris.

3. That it was connected with Paris in consequence of the prominence given to Aphrodite, and therefore by a writer (possibly the author of the *Cypria*) who desired to honour Aphrodite.

4. That the notion of the *καλλιστεῖον* leaving, as it does, no trace in early literature or early art cannot be regarded as the origin of the myth. The Judgment was, like the conflict between Athene and Poseidon, a contest of characteristic gifts, *σημεῖα*.

It occurs to me that the view stated above as to the origin of the type may serve to throw light on a curious late black-figured amphora of the Berlin museum (Furtwängler's *Cat.* 2154). On the obverse of this vase Hermes *carrying a ram* precedes three female figures in the regular "Judgment" scheme. The women carry flowers and fruit. Hermes Kriophoros might without any absurdity precede the three Graces as goddesses of fertility. To suppose that he carried a ram when escorting the three goddesses to the Judgment would be manifestly ridiculous. The vase, however, is so Etruscan in style that any misunderstanding might easily occur. If the painter was copying, he must, I think, at any rate have had before him not a representation of the Judgment but of Hermes and the Graces, and one in which the original designer clearly intended to express this subject. Dr. Furtwängler explains as "Zug zum Parisurteil (?)" The undersized youth preceding Hermes I cannot for a moment suppose to be Paris, he is I think just a boy attendant.

JANE E. HARRISON.