ANDROMEDA.

[PLATE V.]

I.

THE romantic tale of the beautiful princess Andromeda, and how Perseus freed her from the dragon, has been treated by two of the great tragedians, Sophocles and Euripides. Here, if anywhere, Sophocles is thrown into the shade by his rival, so much so that the most important elements of Sophocles' version have been given to the drama of Euripides. Therefore if we wish to restore to Sophocles what justly belongs to him, we must first define as clearly as possible what belongs to Euripides. For although a great deal has been written about this brilliant achievement of Euripides, yet conclusions that seemed settled are constantly being called in question or denied, while questionable or erroneous views are once more put forward as correct. Only after the genuine remains of Euripides' play have been separated out can we hope to form any conception of the Andromeda of Sophocles, or to give any reasoned answer to the question which is the earlier, Euripides' play, which was performed with the *Helena* in 412 B.C., or Sophocles' play, the date of the first performance of which has not come down to us.¹ The poetry of Euripides was Latinised by Ennius, but the fragments of the Latin tragedy do not give substantial help towards the reconstruction of the Greek one.

The *Andromeda* of Euripides lacked the narrative prologue with which the poet usually prefaced his plays for the sake of some special dramatic effect. Here it suited his purpose better to leave it out.² The only person who could have spoken it was Andromeda herself, because she was on the stage from the beginning. In accordance with the idea of the drama, Andromeda, as the bride of death, had been led forth to the sea-shore

¹ See Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien*, ii., p. 644 i. p. 349; Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragödie*, pp. 162 and 561; Robert, *Arch. Zeit.*, 1878, p. 16; Wecklein, *Münchener Sitzungsberichte* 1888, i., p. 87; Wernicke, *Pauly-Wissowa i.*, 2156; Engelmann, *Archaeologische Studien zu den Tragikern*; cf. also below, p. 111.

² Robert, *loc. cit.* p. 18, tries to prove, on very insufficient evidence, the existence of a prologue in the customary form, and, strangely enough, supposes it spoken by Echo.

The scholion which refers to the beginning of Andromeda's lament, Fr. 114, as τοῦ προλόγου τῆς Ἀνδρ. ἡ εἰσβολή tells against and not in favour of Robert's theory, as Wecklein demonstrates, p. 87, ff. Engelmann's use of the British Museum Hydria, E 169, as evidence for a prologue of this kind, which S. Reinach (*Revue Critique*, 1900, p. 109) thought ingenious but Bethe (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1900, p. 2082) rejected, falls to the ground along with the accompanying interpretation of the vase.

during the night, and just before daybreak, when the action of the piece begins, she was standing chained to the rock and ready for sacrifice. With no set narrative, but with heart-breaking lament, she begins to speak, calling on holy night, who delays her departure. It would be difficult to imagine what information a prologue could have given, that could not be better made clear as the action unfolds itself. The device (ridiculed by Aristophanes) of making Echo always repeat the last word of the lament not only is a startling stage effect, but in an admirable way brings home to the spectator the absolute loneliness of the victim abandoned to a cruel death (Fr. 114-116, Nauck²). Then when the Chorus of Andromeda's companions arrives on the scene Echo obeys the maiden's behest and is silent. This is far from being unnatural, for the character of the lament alters, and instead of resounding in deserted space it is addressed to friends who are standing close by (Fr. 117-122). Now follows the dialogue with Perseus, who comes through the air, and this informs the spectator of everything he requires to know concerning the persons of the action, except what has already been communicated by Andromeda or the Chorus (Fr. 123-131, 135 spoken (1) by Perseus, (2) by Andromeda³). To them enter Andromeda's parents, who come to learn their daughter's fate, Cassiopeia perhaps appearing as *καφὸν πρόσωπον*, bowed with grief.⁴ In any case the conversation here is chiefly between Cepheus and the stranger, who induces Cepheus to promise him his daughter as the prize of his help.⁵ Apollodoros ii. 44, and Ovid, *Metam.*, iv., 704, give this incident, though this does not prove its occurrence in Euripides. Fragment 143, spoken by Cepheus to Perseus, is the only one which can with certainty be assigned to this conversation, but the objections raised by Cepheus later on prove that he had given the promise. This scene, as we shall soon see, had a special attraction for the vase-painter. With the well-known invocation of Eros, Fr. 136, Perseus then walks or flies away.

The successful issue of the fight is announced, probably not by Perseus himself, because the narrative would not seem natural in his mouth, either before or after the rescue of Andromeda, but by a messenger. From his report the grammarians and rhetors preserved what Frs. 145, 146 give, and perhaps also the obscure line 147, with 148 and 155,⁶ while the elder Philostratus used it as the source of his fictitious picture (i. 29). It is not likely that anyone except Andromeda heard the messenger's tale, for when Perseus appears again to loose Andromeda's chains, the Chorus only are present on the scene. It is not until everything seems to be turning out

³ Wecklein very rightly separated them, but gives the second verse to Cepheus.

⁴ In support of this view note that in Ennius (assuming that Ribbeck, p. 167, was right when he gave Fr. xvi of the *incerta* to Andromeda) Perseus addresses his question as to who she is not to the mother herself but to the daughter.

⁵ Robert considers such a promise inconsistent with the later refusal by Cepheus, and he does not believe that Perseus spoke with Cepheus at all, previous to the death of the monster. This view is refuted by the vases, the fragments, and the action of the piece.

⁶ Several fragments of Ennius belonging to this part are preserved, v. Ribbeck, p. 168 f.

well that the lovers' happiness is threatened by the re-entrance of Cepheus. It is a touch characteristic of Euripides that Cepheus, at once monarch and barbarian, having made a promise in the stress of difficulty, refuses to keep his word now that the difficulty is over, and will not give his daughter to the stranger without father or lands. Out of the dispute arising from this situation a number of verses of transparent meaning have been preserved. Of these we may with sufficient certainty assign Fr. 141, 142, 1-3, 144 to Cepheus, Fr. 139, 140, 142, 4, to Perseus, and Fr. 137, 138, 151-153 to the Chorus. Andromeda must have been present, and the words of Cepheus, Fr. 141, could have been addressed only to her. If in addition the mother appeared and tried to dissuade Andromeda, she could only have done so after the exit of Cepheus, unless there was a fourth actor. Evidently the words of Eratosthenes, *Catast.* 17, σωθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Περσέως οὐχ εἴλετο τῷ πατρὶ συμμένειν οὐδὲ τῇ μητρὶ, taken in their exact sense, imply that Cepheus and Cassiopeia both argued with their daughter, and both in vain. Probably the father laid stress on paternal authority and the external conditions of birth and position, while the mother would urge parental rights and filial obligations. It is easily seen what a good subject for dispute this makes, and the poet would bring forward the strongest arguments to induce Andromeda to remain, so that her independent resolve to follow her preserver in love and gratitude, disregarding all traditional obligations, might be thrown into triumphant relief. So, too, we should like to assign Andromeda's words, Fr. 132,⁷

ἀγρου δέ μ', ὦ ξεῖν', εἴτε πρόσπολον θέλεις
εἴτ' ἄλοχον εἴτε δμῳίδ' . . .

to this final resolve, and not to her first dialogue with Perseus.

A second turn of affairs and a new obstacle might now occur through the claim of a rival lover previously betrothed to Andromeda, whether he is called Phineus, Agenor, or any other name, and an episode of this kind would not be difficult to fit into the action of the drama, if tradition supplied it. The betrothed might add his expostulations to those of the parents, only it would be necessary to assume that this relation was indicated in the first part of the drama as well as in the second. The objection that here would be a superfluity of motives must give way if tradition required it. But the reverse is the fact. Eratosthenes does not mention Andromeda's betrothed, and among the fragments there are none which needs must be interpreted as spoken by Phineus or to him or about him,⁸ nor is there any such frag-

⁷ Laertius Diogenes, iv. 29, quotes these words as ἐχόμενα, therefore immediately following Fr. 129. In the story told there, certainly the one quotation follows as an answer to the other, but this was scarcely possible in Euripides, as the question seems to require stichomythy, while these verses evidently form the close of a longer speech. Indeed, the verses themselves give no answer to Perseus' question: ὦ παρθέν' εἰ σώσαιμί σ' εἴοι μοι χάριν; and in the earlier

situation they are scarcely suited to the virgin modesty of Andromeda.

⁸ In Wecklein's attempt to assign the character of Phineus to Euripides' drama, we look in vain for any argument even partially satisfactory. His theory which gives Fr. 149 to Phineus (in whose case we should expect to find the ἔρωσ emphasis), 141 to Phineus, spoken to Cepheus, 142, and then later 143, to Phineus, similarly addressed to Cepheus, is to me

ment extant of the *Andromeda* of Ennius, which we know to have been a Latin rendering of Euripides' play. In the vase-pictures, again, which show us separate scenes of the play or summarise the situation, Phineus does not appear, nor is his mask one of those forming the group in the Pompeian wall-painting which has been interpreted by Robert. Opinions vary, however, about the value of the last piece of evidence. In Sophocles' drama, on the other hand, Phineus, as we shall presently see, played a principal part, and the mythographers, as Ovid had done before them, combined the motives of the two dramas each after his own fashion.

The content of Euripides' drama, thus defined, is reflected in a number of ancient representations,⁹ the older of which are the more faithful and complete. Usually *Andromeda* is seen as she must have stood on the stage when the play opened, with arms outstretched, fastened by chains to the rocks or to a couple of tree trunks, or (in one instance) to two pillars. The objects which serve the double purpose of wedding and funeral gifts are placed round her. A maiden is in the act of bringing an amphora, the *λουτροφόρος*,¹⁰ or some other object. This may imply that in the drama the Chorus were still bringing on the gifts, or possibly the painter added this feature of his own accord to explain the objects already standing there, for, as we shall see, he might have borrowed this idea from Sophocles or from the representations which followed Sophocles. Perseus stands beside *Andromeda* and speaks to her in C, G, Cepheus appears in E, and Perseus turns from *Andromeda* to address Cepheus in D. The mother is present in B (and F?) seated (a characteristic position for her, cf. the constellation "Cassiopeia's Chair," v. Eratosthenes, who refers to Sophocles, c. 16), and bowed down by sorrow in such a manner that she could easily be represented in the scene by a *κωφὸν πρόσωπον*. In A, on the other hand, she is looking vaguely up to one of her attendants, and, as in the other vase, is turned away from *Andromeda*, a posture which seems to imply that in the drama they did not converse.¹¹

inconceivable. Indeed, even though Wecklein finds in Fr. 144 "the most convincing proof of a dispute of the kind between Phineus and Cepheus," there are obviously no proofs of it.

⁹ I have marked the first four vases with the same numbers as Trendelenburg, *Annali*, 1872, p. 169, thus:

- A. *Mon. d. I.* viiii. 38, Engelmann, p. 72.
- B. *Memorie dell' accademia ercolanense*, 9. Pl. to p. 197; cf. Watzinger *de vasculis pictis Tarentinis*, p. 39.
- R. Rochette *Mon. d'Ant. fig.* Pl. 41; Engelmann, p. 73.
- D. B.M. *Vases*, F 185, iv. Pl. vii. Engelmann from ditto, p. 8.
- E. Berlin Krater, *Arch. Anz.* 1893, p. 91, 50; *Jahrb.* 1896, Pl. 2; Engelmann, p. 69.
- F. Berlin Hydria, *Arch. Anz.* 1893, p. 93, 57.
- G. Vase in Bari, Engelmann, p. 6, perhaps the

one briefly described by Barnabei in *Bull. d. I.* 1885, p. 50, which Helbig, p. 52, compared with a Capuan vase not represented in any of the drawings belonging to the Institute.

H. S. Angelo vase. See below. All these vases were found in Lower Italy (F?). E is assigned by Furtwängler as Attic to the end of the 5th century B.C., so that it might have been painted soon after the performance of Euripides' *Andromeda*.

¹⁰ Cf. Trendelenburg, p. 118. But the special form to which Milchhöfer and particularly Wolters (*Ath. Mitth.* 1891, xvi. 391 ff.) drew attention can perhaps only be traced on H and, imperfectly, on C.

¹¹ It is impossible to guess what the unskilful craftsman who painted C meant by the two "conversing" figures to the right. Their gestures

This situation is again indicated by the Pompeian wall-painting already referred to, which, after the favourite Alexandrine fashion of "short hand," groups the masks instead of the complete characters. The mask of Perseus is to the left, Andromeda's is at the top, the masks of the parents are below, and in the centre appears the head and neck of the *κῆτος*. The absence of the messenger, and perhaps also the absence of the *deus ex machina* (Athena, as Robert conjectures),^{11a} together with the arrangement of the masks, corresponding to the grouping of the actors in the scene, shows distinctly that the painter intended to represent, not the masks of the whole drama, but only those belonging to that principal scene as represented on the stage.¹² While the parents remain with Andromeda, Perseus goes away to the fight. The fight and the group round Andromeda are combined into one picture on vases A, B, and F, the scene of the fight being placed on a lower plane than the other. Etruscan urns, and similarly a cista,¹³ showing, as usual, a preference for the most drastic stage effects, represent Andromeda close to the *κῆτος*, which is about to devour her, while on the other side Perseus is just raising the gorgoneion to turn the monster to stone.¹⁴ In the urn-reliefs Cepheus is present, seated, as in E, showing that his share in the action was more important than Cassiopeia's. Wall-paintings representing the fight omit all the other characters except Andromeda.

The second part of the drama offered much less attraction to the vase-painter, evidently because the emotions dealt with lay deeper below the surface. In the first part, even if the monster was not visible, Andromeda's figure chained to the rock and surrounded by funeral gifts was enough in itself to arouse terror and pity in the other characters of the drama and in the spectators. But how could a painter represent a dispute between Perseus and Andromeda's parents as to which had the stronger claim on the rescued girl? Hence the only vase-painting, H, which gives this later scene, was not at once correctly interpreted by the archaeologist¹⁵ who performed the valuable service of freeing it from the distorting restorations with which it was encumbered. In this painting Andromeda, though unbound, is still standing between the two tree trunks, a clear indication of the earlier part of the story, and a proof that this scene was enacted on the same spot as the earlier one.¹⁶ The dish of fruit and the fillet of victory, which Andromeda is evidently about to offer to Perseus, form the visible expression of her gratitude,

make them appear deaf and dumb. But cf. Trendelenburg, *Annali*, 1872, p. 114 f., on the restoration of the picture.

^{11a} Engelmann, *loc. cit.* p. 76, prefers to assign this part to Aphrodite.

¹² Hence the absence of the mask of Phineus would be no proof of the absence of that character in Euripides' play. Robert, p. 15-20, evidently considers these to be the masks of the whole drama, not of one scene. Similarly Wernicke.

¹³ *Mon. d. I.* vi. 40.

¹⁴ This is expressed so clearly that one hardly

understands how Koerte, *Urne Etrusche*, ii. p. 103, could dispute it solely on account of trifling and unimportant inconsistencies.

¹⁵ G. Patroni, *Atti della r. accademia di Napoli* 1894, vol. xvii. ii., Pl. 5, referred it to an adventure of Paris. The correct interpretation was touched on in *Röm. Mitth.* 1895, p. 95, and more exhaustively treated by Trendelenburg, *Arch. Anz.* 1896, xi. 204.

¹⁶ Koerte *loc. cit.* p. 104, 3, assumes a change of scene on grounds which are unintelligible to me, like most of his remarks in this connection.

and the fruit seems at the same time to be a reminiscence of the thank-offerings brought by the Ethiopians to refresh the hero after his struggle. The exhaustion and fatigue of Perseus is indicated here by his leaning on his left elbow against a pillar. Philostratus indicates his weariness by making him recline on the grass—also on the left elbow, *στηρίζων δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀριστεροῦ ἀγκῶνος*.¹⁷

It is true that Cepheus on his knees as a suppliant before Perseus is conceived quite differently from the Cepheus of the fragments which contain the dialogue. This is not really, however, an inconsistency in character but an alternation in mood, such as Euripides loves to elaborate. The Ethiop King, mean-spirited in danger, haughty and arrogant when the danger is removed, becomes once more humble and cringing (though in vain) when Andromeda turns against him and gives her decision for Perseus. This final humiliation of Cepheus could hardly have been invented by the vase-painter. The presence of Cassiopeia, seated, fits in with our reconstruction of this part of Euripides' play. Only when Cepheus has done his utmost and failed will she try to persuade her daughter, but the vase-painter introduces her by anticipation into the preceding scene. The youth with the two spears, although nothing of his Oriental dress remains but the shoes, may certainly be classed as an attendant of the King (by comparison with *A*). There is no thought of Phineus: on the contrary, the wreath, which can only be intended for Perseus, recalls the gratitude of the people in Euripides (Philostratus).

II.

It has been supposed by some (of late by Ribbeck),^{17a} that the Andromeda of Sophocles was a satyric play, but no convincing evidence for this view has been brought forward. The feeling, however, that the quotation from this piece—*ἵπποισιν ἢ κύμβαισι νανστολεῖς χθόνα*—had a comic intention, may not be quite mistaken. We shall soon see that the question, just because of its rather affected expression, admirably fits the character to whom, according to its content, we must assign it. Mythographic notices and fragments, not of the Greek original, but of the Latin rendering by Accius, give us some notion of the action of the piece, and definite information is supplied by a vase-painting clear and easy of interpretation, although, with shame be it spoken, so often misunderstood by accomplished archaeologists,¹⁸ a remarkable instance of the paralysing force of a time-honoured tradition.

¹⁷ If this, as we may assume, was referred to in the narration of the fight, then certainly Perseus himself could not have been the narrator.

^{17a} *Loc. cit.* especially pp. 163, 169 and 564. For the opposite view v. Robert, *loc. cit.* 5, 17, 12.

¹⁸ Birch, *Archaeologia*, 1855, 36, 1 p. 53, 68,

Pl. 6; Minervini, *Memorie d. accad. ercolan.*, 9, p. 221; Trendelenburg *loc. cit.*, p. 111; Furtwängler, *Arch. Anz.* 1893, p. 91; Knatz, *Quomodo Persei fabulam artifices graeci et romani tractaverint*, Bonn diss. 1893, p. 34, 2, and 53; Bethe *Jahrb.* 1896, p. 299; Wernicke, *loc. cit.*, p. 215, f.; C. Smith, *B.M. Vases*, iii. p. 152; Engelmann, *loc. cit.*, pp. 10 and 66.

The hydria of the British Museum (E 169; here Pl. V.), the only Andromeda vase, as Furtwängler rightly stated, found not in Lower Italy but in Vulci, has been acknowledged by every one except Panofka¹⁹ as a representation of the Andromeda myth. But it cannot be founded on the Andromeda of Euripides because the style shows that it must have been painted some decades before the year 412 B.C. It was Knatz who saw this most clearly, and traced (*loc. cit.*, p. 53) the style of Polygnotus in the painting. There remains the play of Sophocles, and it was suggested (*e.g.* Knatz, *loc. cit.*, p. 53 f; Bethe, *loc. cit.*, p. 296) that this was the origin of the vase; but the idea bore little fruit.

The picture is composed as a frieze in the older manner, and runs round the shoulder of the hydria, possibly with some reference to the funereal destination of the vase. At the first glance one might think that the one group of three figures, placed among separated figures, forms the central point of the composition. But this is not quite correct, for while there are only three figures to the left of the group, there are five to the right, and the principal action is among these five. Indeed, the middle line falls between the five figures to the right and the six, whose value is about the same as the five, to the left. The Hellenic youth to the extreme right, in chlamys, hat and boots, holding two spears, evidently wears the typical travelling dress; hence he is a stranger, arrived from a distance. The others are clearly non-Greeks, barbarians. Perseus is recognisable even without harpe and gorgoneion, for he wears little wings on his boots and others on his hat. The right hand, as often occurs in figures of Hermes, is raised to the hat, not merely to press it more firmly on the head, but as an expression of painful emotion. The King too, who wears a long robe and an Oriental cap, seems to be crushed by affliction. He rests both hands on his staff, and with the fixed look of hopeless despair watches the three Ethiopians at their work. One of them is digging a hole in the ground, a second holds up a post ready to drive in, while a third has another post evidently meant for the same purpose.²⁰ Doubtless these are the posts to which Andromeda is to be bound. The posts do not belong to the Euripidean story, for he speaks of the victim being chained to the rock,²¹ hence they must be remnants of an older tradition incorporated with Euripides' version as illustrated in AB(D)GH. The offerings to furnish forth the bride of death are being carried in from the left: a

¹⁹ *Arch. Anz.* 1855, p. 65. His own explanation (Tithonos, Eos, Memnon), was as foolish as possible.

²⁰ Probably the painter did not intend to make one post shorter than the other. It happened while the background was being blacked in round the head of the kneeling Ethiopian.

²¹ Fr. 125. The words

παρθένου τ' εἰκώ τινα
ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαῖνων τειχισμάτων
σοφῆς ἄγαλμα χειρός

have been misunderstood by those ancient

writers who talk of an αὐτοφυὲς ἄγαλμα. 'Automorph' i.e. "natural formation" means the stone structure in front of which, like an image in high relief, made by an artist (σοφῆς χειρός), the maiden stands. In C, where one is almost reminded of skulls (cf. Accius, *Fr.* x. Immane se habet templum obvallatum ossibus), and on Etruscan urns it resembles a niche in the rock. Cf. Bethe, *Jahrb.* 1896, p. 296. From this is taken Antiphilus' epigram in Ovid iv. 672, Apollodor. ii. 43.

chest, vases of ointment, a garment (on the left arm of the middle figure), a mirror, fillets and a chair. This agrees in many points with the play of Euripides, and yet there are essential differences. In Euripides and the pictures that are founded on his version part of the action is finished before the scene opens; here, all is preparation. In Euripides Perseus comes flying through the air after Andromeda has stood in chains all through the night; here, Perseus is present while the posts are built up to form a kind of gallows. In Euripides most of the gifts are in place; here, they are only being brought in. And where is Andromeda herself? Any unprejudiced reader would surely expect to see her represented, according to tradition, as a figure of girlish grace and modesty. It seems hardly possible, but is nevertheless true that all archaeologists from Birch to Engelmann, with the one exception of Panofka, interpreted the half-comic, lazy, effeminate figure of a youth as Andromeda! This figure wears the same shoes and headdress as the old King, but instead of the long robe he has a short tunic girt round the hips, while through the arm-holes of the tunic appears a variegated Oriental garment closely fitting to arms and legs. When Panofka disputed the figure being female (there being no evidence that it is female), the other critics, strangely enough, neglected to seek for the name of the young barbarian prince, which lay so near the surface, and adduced the Amazon costume as favouring their own theory.²² True, the costume is similar to the Amazon dress, but the figure could not be an Amazon, unless she were wounded, and eastern women in their everyday life were not dressed as Amazons, so far as we know.

How the old vase-painters imagined Andromeda, Cassiopeia and other women is sufficiently shown by the known Andromeda vases (especially A, B, D, G), and everybody knows that ancient art individualised the female figure with much more reserve than the male. In short, the supported figure is a youthful barbarian, a prince by his dress. The Oriental *τροφή*, to collect examples of which was a special theme for Greek historians, but which in later times also was only too common among the Greeks, is shown by his posture of fatigue, leaning on two servants who, like all the subordinate characters in the picture, have Ethiopian features. In the same way Hephaestus leans on his attendant nymphs, and Dionysus, old or young, is supported by two of his retinue.²³ The most exact literary description of this attitude is contained in what Poseidonius says about Alexander, son of Ptolemy VII. Athenaeus XII. 550b: *ἐν πολλῇ δὲ τροφῇ ζῶν, οὐδὲ πατεῖν οἶός τ' ἦν εἰ μὴ δυσὶν ἐπαπεριδόμενος ἐπορεύετο*. The young Ethiopians hold their master's hands, not, as one might suppose, to lead him along against his will, for there is no sign of force or of resistance, the prince being too weak even to keep hold of his supports. The vase-painter has expressed with

²² Thus Birch, Minervini; Bethe, p. 298 f., even goes so far as to suppose that the Ethiopian seated to the left on E is female and the representative of the Chorus, although the figure is exactly the same as the one in the Vulci hydria.

²³ With this we may compare the relief of Aphrodite raised from the sea, for it is strikingly similar and older than Sophocles. *Ant. Denkm.* ii. Pl. vi. *Röm. Myth.* 1892, p. 71, Pl. ii.

unusual skill in the whole posture of body and limbs²⁴ and in the fixed stare on the face his idea of the nerveless, effeminate youth. The instinct which suggested Sardanapalus to the first author who published the vase was therefore correct.

This degenerate prince can be no other than Phineus (or Agenor), betrothed to Andromeda. In order to bring out his characteristics in the most effective way, the painter has set him and his attendants in full front view. And yet no one could say that he is disconnected from the other figures to the right and left. It is he on whose behalf the three young Ethiopians are bringing the bridal gifts.²⁵ As the attendants approach Phineus their steps resolve themselves into a standing posture. For Phineus has arrived at the "grave," as one may say, of Andromeda, and even if we did not know it from the other vases, we should guess that the funeral offerings are meant for her. The place of the action is apparently the same as in Euripides,²⁶ for the stakes must have been set up on the sea-shore. The time may be later in the day, but is earlier as regards the action, for here we see going on what in Euripides was accomplished before the drama opened. Cepheus has arrived with his servants (who do not form the Chorus) in order that he may obey the oracle by preparing the place for his daughter's death. Keeping to the picture we must next suppose that Perseus enters as a traveller on foot. Everyone must feel that the wonderful entrance through the air, invented by Euripides, and the opening of the piece by the lament of Andromeda chained, are two features which must exist together or not at all, and which form a wonderfully effective combination. What an error of taste it would be to make Perseus enter flying while the gallows was still being erected! The wings on his hat and shoes tell us who he is, but his whole appearance, if we may trust the picture, is more that of an unassuming wayfarer than of a marvellous prodigy. Attention is here concentrated on Phineus, therefore Perseus must have been on the scene before, and must have held a conversation with Cepheus to prepare the audience for Phineus' entry. Phineus comes with funeral gifts for his bride, but

²⁴ This flabby figure reminded Engelmann (*loc. cit.*, p. 66) of a puppet, or at least he assumed that this idea had occurred to others. Further, in the representations of the *Andromeda* of Euripides, A, B, Cepheus is supported by an Ethiop. Whether Euripides transferred this attendant figure from Phineus to Cepheus, regarding it merely as a support of old age as in the case of Hecuba (*Hec.* 594), or whether the vase-painter made the change, seems impossible to decide.

²⁵ On this account Birch and Trendelenburg supposed the figure to be female, for the offerings were such as could be intended only for a woman.

²⁶ Robert, p. 17, with whom Bethe agrees, conceives of Sophocles' *Andromeda* as played in front of the palace. He appears to have no

definite grounds for this view except his own opinion that Perseus (whom he quite rightly thinks of in Sophocles' play as walking, not flying on at his first appearance) could arrive on foot only near the palace and not on the shore. There seems to be no difficulty here except in Robert's own preconceptions. For the Vulci vase-painting refutes his view that "Perseus' first appearance is from the shore after slaying the monster." Tümpel *Die Äthiopienländer des Andromedamythus*, p. 132, would like to shift the scene to Persia because the *σάφρον* mentioned in Fr. 131 is a Persian garment! In p. 177 he tries to exclude Phineus from the *Andromeda* of Sophocles! Unfortunately the vase shows, not only Phineus, but also his negro attendants.

his whole attitude shows that he will not think of lifting a hand to save her.

A scene very similar to this one occurs in one of the plays of Euripides. *Alcestis*, the young wife of Admetus, has, like *Andromeda*, fallen a victim to the anger of an offended deity, for she has unhesitatingly offered herself, in the absence of any other substitute, to suffer death in her husband's stead. She might live if another could be found to suffer the penalty. But Admetus' parents, though aged, still cling to life, and Pheres contents himself with bringing offerings for the grave. As the Chorus see Pheres entering and announce his approach to Admetus, v. 611 ff., they utter words which might almost equally be said with regard to Phineus in the *Andromeda* of Sophocles:

καὶ μὴν ὁρῶ σὸν πατέρα γηραιῷ ποδι²⁷
στείχοντ', ὀπαδούς τ' ἐν χεροῖν δάμαρτι σῇ
κόσμον φέροντας, νερτέρων ἀγάλματα.

The similarity is too great to be accidental. We may assume that the *Andromeda* of Sophocles was earlier than the *Andromeda* of Euripides, merely from a consideration of the great heightening of stage effect brought about by Euripides' innovations in the entrance of *Andromeda* and *Perseus*. But whether Sophocles' *Andromeda* was earlier than the *Alcestis* (acted in 438 B.C.) or not can only be decided when we have discovered which of these two plays treats with greater freshness, force and originality the motive of affection commuting its obligations to the form of gifts. It stands to reason that the effect is the stronger, or, in other words, that the despicable character of the person commuting these obligations is the more emphasised, the greater the claim the victim can make on his generosity and courage. Pheres, though near the end of his span of life, lies under no such strong obligation to sacrifice himself in the place of his son's wife as Phineus does towards his betrothed, especially as Phineus is not required to give his life, but merely to risk it in the conflict while fighting for her safety. This contrast would come out more clearly if we were in a position to compare the whole scene of Sophocles' *Andromeda* with the similar one in the *Alcestis*. The situation in the *Alcestis* is a painful one. One man buys his own life by the death of his wife, while the other clings to his few remaining years, and refuses to sacrifice them for his son. The scene in the *Andromeda*, as we can see from the vase-paintings, is more of a nature to rouse the sympathy of a Greek audience. After the exchange of a few words between Phineus and Cepheus, the dispute develops itself between Phineus, the cowardly barbarian who abandons his betrothed, and *Perseus*, the Hellenic hero, who will fight for her and win her. If, thus, we conclude that Euripides borrowed the dramatic motive from Sophocles, we must date

²⁷ Did old Pheres, like Phineus, walk with some support? Certainly it was in accord with

the situation to represent him as feeble as possible.

the vase-painting also by its style rather before than after 438. Since the vase-painting represents the transition between the scene of Perseus' entrance to Cepheus and the following scene where Phineus is also present, we may clearly assume the existence of these two scenes in the *Andromeda* of Sophocles. The first scene would explain the situation and the second would unfold a contrast of character such as Sophocles loved to portray. As to the continuation of the piece, we can find no better evidence than the picture, and with a knowledge of the myth as a background it will not be difficult to sketch the principal features of what remains.

The dialogue between Phineus and Perseus might have taken place before Perseus had seen Andromeda. But it seems scarcely conceivable that Andromeda, the chief character, should only enter after the two scenes depicted on the vase. Perhaps she opened the piece with her mother, and went off after the *parodos*. The *stasimon* must follow the dialogue between Phineus and Perseus, and after that Andromeda may have been led to the place of death, mourning like Antigone. Her mother seems, from Eratosthenes 16, to have gone with her and to have sat beside her while she stood in chains. This was the crisis at which Perseus might have first seen Andromeda, and when once Phineus had given up his betrothed as dead, Perseus could woo her, and Andromeda could give her promise in return for the promised rescue. Perseus himself might announce the fight and the victory. The consequence of this will be to produce a *περιπέτεια* of which the vase-painting gives a premonition and which Euripides' version confirms. Phineus, who had abandoned his bride when she was to be the prey of the monster, claims her again as soon as she is saved. Euripides transferred this change of mind from Phineus to Cepheus and allowed the character of Phineus to fall out altogether. In the play of Sophocles Cepheus was a man of honour, if we are to judge by the deep distress he evidences on the vase-painting.^{27a} It is not he but Phineus who threatens the lovers in the second part of the drama. We know that the story ends happily for them and that Phineus dies, but we cannot even conjecture how this came about.

Reversing the order we followed in examining the *Andromeda* of Euripides, let us now start with what certainty we can obtain from the vase-painting and see how much more we can add from literary tradition. Of the few extant fragments the one cited on page 104 is more suited to the Phineus of the picture than to the Cepheus, because of the affectation which it evidences; Fr. 124 would be a worthy expression of the courage of Perseus; 126 *αὐτοχέλεσι ληκύθοις*, perhaps another blundering remark of the Ethiop prince, must refer to the funeral vases brought by Phineus, and possibly 131 designates the Oriental garment called *σάρητον*. Fr. 127 *ἀμφίπρυμνον πλοῖον* might be a metaphor for the sea-monster rush-

^{27a} Compare the Cepheus of Euripides on the vases ABE.

ing backwards and forwards in the fight with Perseus. Ovid, in telling the story, compares the monster to a ship, iv. 706, and later on, 721, describes its movements upwards and downwards, backwards and forwards. Possibly Fr. 125 ἰδοὺ δὲ φοῖον μᾶσθλητα δίγονον may belong to the same narrative passage, and may refer to the incident which Ovid v. 727 describes as *falcato verberat ense*, following it up immediately by the words *belua puniceo mixtos cum sanguine fluctus ore vomit*. Finally Fr. 129, the one word ζευξίλεως, explained by Hesychius as ζευκτὸς λαός, or, as it probably stood ζευκτῆς λαοῦ ἢ ὃ ὑπεξευγμένοι εἰσὶ λαοί, fits in almost literally with the Phineus of the vase-painting, who places his arms like a yoke on the necks of his subjects that they may carry or push him forward. Thus conjectures may be made about the meaning and place of these few slight fragments, though they do not add much to our conception of the whole.

We are rather better off as regards the *Andromeda* of Accius. Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragoedie*, p. 564, rightly perceives that it was founded on an original different from that which was the source of Ennius' play. But as he assumes that the *Andromeda* of Sophocles was a Satyric play, he naturally does not find his original there. Ribbeck's attitude (evidently quite unprejudiced) to the drama of Accius may be given in a translation of his own words. "It was not a foregone conclusion, as in Ennius and Euripides, that Andromeda herself was exposed to the monster. On the contrary, the parents must have disputed the question with the betrothed, Phineus or Agenor, and this would bring out the inherent weakness in the character of the betrothed, complicated by the motive of love to the maiden." If for "parents" we read "Cepheus" we have the very scene represented on the Vulci vase. Hence we should assign Fr. 3 *nisi quid tua facultas tulat opem, peream*, to Cepheus (addressing Phineus), and Fr. 4 *nec quei te adiutem invenio: hortari piget, non prodesse id pudet*, to Phineus (addressing Cepheus). Fr. 6 *namque ut dicam te metu aut segnitie adiuvere (?) dubitare haud meumst* might have been previously spoken by Perseus to Phineus. When Perseus first sees Andromeda he may compare her to a statue of a divinity, and then might follow Fr. 10. *Immane te habet templum obvallatum ossibus*. These words do not necessarily imply that Andromeda had stood a long time on the spot, a circumstance inconsistent with the vase-painting. For in the version of Sophocles (followed by Fr. 1 of Accius), as well as in that of Euripides, the monster devoured many victims before the oracle was appealed to. Therefore Andromeda would naturally be bound at the place where the dragon always seized his victims. Fr. 12 reads *quod beneficium haud sterili in segete, rex, te obsesse intelleges*. Ribbeck supposes that Perseus spoke these words to Cepheus after his betrothal to Andromeda. This is certainly correct, but is it not evident from the words that Perseus is not asking the consent of Cepheus (as in Euripides, Ovid iv. 703), but that Cepheus has offered his daughter to Perseus of his own accord after Phineus has abandoned her and after the mind of Perseus has been sufficiently revealed by his dialogue

with Phineus, and that now Perseus is promising gratitude? This fits very well with the upright character of Cepheus as we become aware of it in the vase-painting, a character which finds expression in the words he speaks to Perseus and Andromeda after the rescue, Fr. 11 *alui, educavi: id facite gratum ut sit seni*. Certainly in Fr. 14 he seems unwilling to give up his daughter, but Fr. 103 *meministin te spondere mihi gnatam tuam?* if rightly introduced here from the *incerta*, might very well be spoken by Phineus, instead of by Perseus as Ribbeck supposes. In any case the former suitor must come on the scene again after the rescue of Andromeda. It is very clear that Ribbeck separated two halves that belong together in assigning the first, viz., the abandonment of Andromeda by Phineus, to Accius (Sophocles), and the second, viz., the quarrel with Perseus and the renewed claim on the rescued girl, to Ennius (Euripides). Ribbeck himself admitted that these two parts were related to each other, and the evidence of Ovid makes it certain that they should be joined. For Ovid relates circumstantially and vividly how Phineus came with a troop of armed men and fell on Perseus at his wedding feast "*En, ait, en, adsum praeceptae conjugis ultor*," V. 10. Cepheus takes the part of Perseus against him as we should expect,²⁸ and reproaches him for his cowardice: *scilicet haud satis est quod te spectante revincta est* (corresponding almost exactly to the vase-painting) *et nullam quod opem patruus sponsusve tulisti*. The scene referred to here as already past was acted in the drama of Sophocles, and we must assign to the same drama the scene in which this reminiscence is made. The contrast between the cowardice of Phineus and the courage of Perseus, as shown in the vase-painting, is here pointed and sharpened by the words *timidissime Phineu*, 224, given as a repartee to *Perseu fortissime*, 216, 221.

We see, then, that Ennius (and possibly Livius Andronicus before him) chose the newer and more famous drama of Euripides for his adaptation, while Accius, two generations later, placed the *Andromeda* of Sophocles on the Roman stage. Ovid made use of both, the first part of his narrative being taken from Euripides and the second from Sophocles. Sophocles' tragedy, if it was earlier than the *Alcestis* of Euripides, must have been performed in Athens about three decades before the *Andromeda* of Euripides. It has been pointed out (p. 109) that there may have been a certain similarity between this play and the *Antigone*, performed in 441 B.C. What we know of the two plays makes it clear that that of Sophocles was the earlier. The entrance of Perseus, the bringing in of Andromeda, are much simpler and more natural than the elaborated stage effects added by Euripides. It is hardly conceivable that the more elaborated form preceded the simpler. Sophocles seems to have found his chief dramatic interest in the contrast between Perseus and Phineus, set off by the gracious presence of Andromeda,

²⁸ In Apollodorus, also, Phineus is the only betrothed of Andromeda, and makes him an adversary. Hyginus gives Agenor as the ally of Cepheus.

barbarian by birth, but Greek in beauty of form and spirit. Yet the Andromeda of Sophocles can hardly have found opportunity to express that noble self-forgetfulness which the Andromeda of Euripides shares with the other heroines of his plays, with a Theonoe, a Makaria, an Iphigeneia.

E. PETERSEN.

ROME, *August*, 1903.

HYDRIA IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.