

Andromeda as *marmoreum opus* in Roman Literature and Wall Painting

AMELIE LUTZ

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

amelie.lutz@campus.lmu.de

Abstract

The idea of Andromeda as a *marmoreum opus* (Ov. *Met.* 4.675) features prominently in ancient literature: in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in Euripides' *Andromeda* and in an ekphrasis by Achilles Tatius, texts that all comment on her perfect, art-like appearance. My paper explores how this phrase comes to characterise Andromeda in Roman literature and wall painting. I argue that the three early-imperial fresco types depicting Andromeda explore and yet cast different perspectives on Andromeda's relationship with stone. The 'Landscape Type', with its impressive rock, highlights the materiality of the stone and contrasts it with Andromeda's marble-likeness. The 'Liberation Type' reflects on the mimetic potential of wall painting staging Andromeda in a state of oscillation between statue and living woman. Lastly, the 'Lovers Type' plays on the threat of petrification in presenting Andromeda as an anti-Medusa. The iconotextual notion of Andromeda as *marmoreum opus* and its varied and dynamic pre- and afterlives in Roman visual arts proves an illuminating case study of a reciprocal dialogue between text and image.

In Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Perseus at first mistook Andromeda for a marble statue: *marmoreum ratus esset opus* (Ov. *Met.* 4.675). A surviving fragment of Euripides' influential *Andromeda* relates the the lovers' first encounter in similar terms (TrGF 5.125): "... what maiden's likeness, a statue carved by an expert hand to her very form in stone?"¹ The motif of the marble statue

1 Trans. Collard and Cropp 2008: 141.

is again taken up in an ekphrasis of a fictitious Andromeda painting in a 2nd century CE novel by Achilles Tatius (*Ach. Tat.* 3.7): “She rested within its embrace, and while, if one gazed upon her beauty, one would compare her to a newly carven statue.”²

Although this recurring literary characterisation of Andromeda as *mar-morem opus* comments on the heroine’s visuality and thus seems to resonate an intermedial exchange, previous research has not yet explored its implications in Roman visual culture.³ Recent scholarship, such as Salzman-Mitchell (2005: 77–84), focused on the literary aspect of the objectification of Andromeda through a “fixing gaze” in the *Metamorphoses*. Similarly, Jas Elsner (2007: 3) discussed Andromeda as his first example for a “visual culture of the art gallery” that fills the viewer with “longing, nostalgia, and frustrated erotic desire” (2007: 24). While these approaches view Andromeda’s literary and visual appearance through the lens of objectification, this paper does not focus on gendered power dynamics but rather aims to explore the phenomenon of her characterisation as *figure of stone* in Roman visual culture, of which her objectification is but one aspect.

The core of this analysis will be the rich, varied and well-contextualized visual evidence of Andromeda in Campanian wall painting. Schmaltz (1989: 262–3) distinguishes three types of Andromeda frescoes that depict consecutive scenes of the myth: The ‘Landscape Type’, focusing on Andromeda’s captivity, the ‘Liberation Type’, and the ‘Lovers Type’, showing Perseus and Andromeda as a happy couple.⁴ Considering the large quantity and variety

2 Trans. Gaselee 1969: 149.

3 Previous research includes: Lorenz 2008: 124–149; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1989; Phillips 1968; Schauenburg 1981: 774–790; Vorster 2014.

4 The eight extant examples for the landscape type only appear in the third Pompeian wall painting style, the six examples for the liberation type mostly in the third but also the fourth style, and the ten examples for the lovers type only appear in the fourth style (Schmaltz 1989: 262–3).

of execution of the extant frescoes, I will analyse one representative example of each type, as they all provide a different lens on Andromeda's connection to stone and display dynamic reflections of a medial dialogue on *marmoreum opus*. This paper will look specifically at the visual inspirations as well as responses to the literary motif of *marmoreum opus*, that occurs at least three times in literature, in Euripides, Ovid, and Achilles Tatius, without, however, seeking for "a telltale correspondence between the minutiae of both media" (Squire 2009: 304). The images are no illustrations of the texts, according to Weitzmann's (1959: 1) definition that "illustrations are physically bound to the text whose content the illustrator wants to clarify by pictorial means", and the texts do not contain quotations of famous works of art. Instead, there is a fluid relationship of text and image that is best understood as iconotextuality, which refers to "not only works which really show the interpenetration of words and images in a concrete sense (but also) art works in which one medium is only implied" (Wagner 1996: 16). This approach, "where images conjured verbal discourse, and where texts summoned up images" (Squire 2009: 297) without favouring either text or image, will help us to better understand the complex and intertwined relationship of images and texts in the case of Andromeda. It will shed light specifically on why stoniness became an important underlying theme in Roman visual conceptions of Andromeda, and on why Roman wall paintings in particular explored different concurrent interpretations of Andromeda's stoniness.⁵

Rock and marble: Andromeda blending into stone

The materiality of stone becomes at once apparent in the fresco from the so-called "Mythological Room" in Boscotrecase (Anderson 1987: 48–49; Blanckenhagen 1990), the best preserved example of the 'Landscape Type' (fig. 1): The rock to which Andromeda is bound dominates the whole image. It rises up from the bottom of the fresco and at first seems rather accessible and idyllic with a few shrubs and a mournful female figure, probably Cassio-

5 For similar comparative approaches for Ariadne and Narcissus see e.g.: Elsner 2007 67–109; 132–176.

peia, reminding us of the mother's boastful vanity as the cause of her daughter's exposure to the *kêtos*. But as the rock grows ever more steeply, its surface becomes rougher and its form more menacing, resembling a gloomy hand that holds the tiny figure of Andromeda in its grip. This impression is evoked also by Achilles Tatius' ekphrasis (*Ach. Tat.* 3.7): here, the natural rock fits perfectly to Andromeda's body, as if rock and girl were made for each other, so much that it encloses her like a tomb. While Achilles Tatius' painting adds a funerary component, it shares with the Boscotrecase fresco the character of the rock as a natural force and the instrument of Andromeda's suffering. In the earlier literary and visual tradition of the myth, the rock was no standard element. In the Sophoclean *Andromeda*, the heroine was probably bound to poles and in South Italian vase images, Andromeda can be tied to a variety of objects. Possibly, Andromeda was first tied to a rock in Euripides' *Andromeda*.⁶ In contrast to the Greek tradition, Roman sources consistently present the rock as an established element of Andromeda's myth, in visual arts and literature alike. A rock in the supposed original location of the myth in Ioppa even seems to have become a memorial site, or a tourist attraction (Plin. *HN* 5.69; Strab. *geogr.* 16.2.28). We can only speculate how the rock gained such popularity in the Roman context but considering the visibility of the rock, Hellenistic visual culture probably played an integral role to inspire literary versions which again might have inspired visual representations.

The Boscotrecase fresco not only prominently features the rock as the mythological setting, it also explores Andromeda's relation to the rock and characterises her desperate situation. It acts as a spatial divider and isolates Andromeda, placing her out of reach from civilisation and human power—only a flying demigod can reach her. Andromeda's oppressive isolation is enhanced by the surrounding sea and sky, seemingly limitless, coalescing spheres. It remains unclear where the sea ends and the sky begins: the horizon is blurred and the architectural structures in the background are faint, thus creating a disorienting terrain. Even the scene on the far right, where king Cepheus

6 This might be suggested by TrGF 5. 114 and 125 (Collard – Cropp: 2008: 125; Klimek-Winter 1993: 160; Wright 2008: 204).

greet Perseus in front of his palace, lacks a proper ground as if floating in the air. The all-dominating green-blue colour of the sea takes on a special meaning and power as a “sea of troubles”, resonating with a prominent motif in the Euripidean escape-tragedies (Wright 2005: 207). The actual mythological threat, on the other hand, the *kétos*, is visually disempowered. Its twisting body vanishes into the deep green-blue surrounding and only its feathery tail and head with yellow and lilac highlights stand out in detail. While Roman authors tend to “describe monsters so vast that they could hardly be represented iconographically” (Ogden 2013: 128), the *kête* in Roman art in contrast tend to be reduced to a playful attribute or decorative motif. Serpents acting as dangerous aggressors therefore prove to be a difficult subject in visual media and their menace cannot be expressed through their iconography alone (Muth 2017: 347). In the case of the Boscotrecase fresco, it is the visual superiority of the sea that assumes the role of an oppressive power, overpowering even the *kétos*. The prominent natural elements in the fresco, the sea and the rock, are thus crucial for creating the atmosphere of impending doom and desperation.⁷

A similarly gloomy atmosphere is also evoked in the Polyphemus fresco from the same room in Boscotrecase. Polyphemus is also positioned on a massive rock in the centre of the fresco but his rock offers a contrasting interpretation: for Andromeda, the rock expresses the danger of nature and the hopelessness of her situation, whereas the cyclops is at home on his rock with its peaceful and bucolic atmosphere. The rough stone accurately reflects the uncultivated and crude nature of its inhabitant Polyphemus, but in Andromeda’s case, it is the opposite of her delicateness and beauty.⁸ The choice of colour is interesting in this regard: the darker colour of the rock and Andromeda’s lower dress stand in contrast to the light colour of her upper body in the

7 Newby 2012: 377: “The way that poets such as Ovid and Vergil depict active and threatening landscapes suggests a construction of the natural world as a place of potential violence, realised in art through the visualization of violent events within natural landscapes.”

8 On the antithetical combination of frescoes showing Polyphemus and Andromeda see Bergmann 1999: 92.

fresco. Against the dark and rough rock, Andromeda's skin shimmers white like marble and thus highlights and displays her beauty.⁹ Like marble was perceived by Roman viewers, this delicate part of Andromeda appears to be like "a shaped, crafted, polished work of art" (Bradley 2006: 13). But as stone is of course immobile and lifeless, likening Andromeda to be marble also comments on her incapability to escape her imprisonment and ultimately renders her lifeless too.

These evocations of Andromeda's marbleness are further elaborated by Achilles Tatius, whose ekphrasis relies on the knowledge of such compositions as the Boscotrecase fresco. In linking the engulfing power of the rock to the statuesqueness of her body (*Ach. Tat.* 3.7), he even suggests that her statue-likeness is enabled or even caused by her captivation. The stillness of her petrified body has an impact on the way she is exposed to the gaze of onlookers, readers, and viewers alike. As Andromeda is unable to move, Achilles Tatius' ekphrasis extensively lingers on the description of Andromeda's body. In the *Metamorphoses* likewise, Perseus' long gaze at Andromeda plays an important role. Referring to Mulvey's influential 'gaze theory', which states that the narrative pauses as soon as a female body is focused on,¹⁰ Salzman-Mitchell (2005: 78–80) interprets Perseus' gaze on Andromeda's statue-like figure in the *Metamorphoses* as a prime example of the gender-paradigm of male activity versus female passivity. The statuary mode of Andromeda, both in the *Metamorphoses* and Achilles Tatius' ekphrasis, further stresses the role of viewing, not only the viewing performed by the embedded onlooker Perseus but also the one to be performed by the reader. But Andromeda's body exceeds this stereotypical passive and object-like role and instead seems to turn into an ide-

9 On the Aethiopian origin of Andromeda and for brief discussions on her skin-colour in visual and literary representations see: Bérard (2000); Gruen (2011); Salzman-Mitchell (2005: 165–166); McGrath (1992) on the reception in the 16th and 17th century; for discussions on skin-colour in general see: Bradley (2009: 137–150); Snowden (1970 and 1983); Thompson (1972).

10 Cf. L. Mulvey, Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema, *Screen* 16, 1975: 6–18.

al object of a viewer's prolonged gaze, a statue.¹¹ While the link of the stillness of the art object with the gaze is a strong motif in literature, the fresco from Boscotrecase, despite its interest in the theme of stone and petrification, does not zoom in to exploit Andromeda's body as an object of a gaze with openly erotic intent—the figure is simply too small for this purpose. The fresco, rather, lets her figure stand out with her light colour, marble-white against the grey stone and relies on the viewer's imagination to evoke the marvellous beauty of Andromeda. In this way, it focuses on the materiality of stone through contrasting the threatening natural element of the rock and the delicate figure of Andromeda as a *marmoreum opus*, petrified in the form of artful beauty. Such an interplay of materiality might even have influenced the revival of Euripides' literary motif of the *marmoreum opus* in the *Metamorphoses* and later Achilles Tatius.

The liberation: from marble to human

The 'Liberation Type' further explores the marble-like quality of Andromeda. The best-preserved and most-discussed fresco of this type comes from the House of the Dioscuri (VI.9.6) (Richardson 1955: 155–156) (fig. 2). Earlier research believed this fresco to be a copy of a famous masterpiece by the 4th century BCE painter Nikias, which has since been disproved or at least doubted.¹² In the depicted scene, Perseus has already defeated the *kêtos* and now leads Andromeda down from her rock. But on closer examination, the composition of the fresco reveals a visual, temporal, and narratological paradox: while Andromeda's left foot is about to take its first step down from the rock, highlighted by her gracefully lifting her dress, her left hand is still chained to the rock, thus forming an incompatible motion sequence.

11 This was suggested by my second reviewer. On the connection of a lover with the image of his beloved, see Bettini (1999), though he does not discuss the case of Perseus and Andromeda.

12 On the relationship of this fresco with the masterpiece by Nikias see Bergmann 1995: 95–96; Lauter-Bufe 1967: 20–29; Phillips 1968; Rodenwaldt 1909: 230; Schauenburg 1981: 789; Schefold 1979: 153–158; Schmaltz 1989: 259.

The composition of Andromeda's posture therefore cannot consist of one single moment, as for example the neighbouring fresco of Medea in the House of the Dioscuri, which can be considered as a depiction of a "pregnant moment", as proposed by Lessing (cf. Bergmann 1996). In contrast to this concept, the mode to describe a painting in ekphrases is a serial process, i.e. the content of the painting is narrated like a moving spectacle, as, for example, in the case of Philostratus, whose description of paintings has been called a dramatization of the images (Beall 1993: 351). Similarly, in this Andromeda fresco, her figure is composed of different motifs that relate to separate moments of the mythological narrative. This creates a polychronic image, consisting of multiple conflated motifs within one and the same body.¹³ In condensing a temporal sequence into the image, at the same time, multiple properties and qualities of Andromeda's character are expressed in the different motifs and merged into one body. In his ekphrasis of a painting depicting Perseus and Andromeda, Lucian praises the painter for having depicted much in little space, meaning specifically different personal qualities (ἐν βραχεῖ δὲ πολλὰ, Luc. *Dom.* 22). In the fresco from the House of the Dioscuri, too, each motif highlights a different quality of Andromeda's character: her beauty, her desperation and hopelessness, her "statuesqueness", her fortunate rescue, her love to Perseus, and the resulting happy ending. This suggests that her seemingly incoherent body posture on the one hand helps to create the temporal sequence of imprisonment to liberation, and on the other hand offers an attributive characterisation of the heroine.¹⁴

It is particularly the motif of Andromeda's chained left hand that creates the tension in the composition of the fresco – it must then have a special significance if it was not eliminated for the sake of the composition. In the fresco, Andromeda's arm is forced into an unnatural position and from the elbow

13 This mode of storytelling can also be found in Athenian vases, as described by Giuliani (2003: 159–164).

14 This double function of the incompatible combination of motifs is also proposed by Biefeldt (2005: 119) for Orestes.

upward appears greyish, almost anaemic, while her hand hangs lifeless in its shackles, similar to Achilles Tatius' description (*Ach. Tat.* 3.7): "Her hands were stretched out against the wall of rock (...) and the fingers white with the pallor of death."¹⁵ Quite contrary to the fresco from Boscotrecase, the colour of her hand now astonishingly resembles the colour of the rock behind her, both a greyish shade of white. The hand almost seems disembodied from Andromeda herself as if it belonged to the rock instead of her body. This creates the impression that Andromeda is not wholly human—but rather in parts a *marmoreum opus*. Also, the smaller rock, on which she stands in the fresco, forms a pedestal, which Moormann (2008: 198) identifies as a key feature of painted statues in wall painting. It is obvious that the fresco references a sculptural tradition of Andromeda that shows a comparable composition, in that it depicts Andromeda in the highly transitory image between captivity and liberation. A particularly well-preserved statue in the Sammlung Wallmoden shows Perseus helping Andromeda to step down from the rock and holding up her bound arm (fig. 3). A statue of the same type in Dresden contrasts the white Parian marble of Andromeda's body with the dark *marmo bigio* of her dress and thus accentuates her marble-white skin even more (Sinn et al. 2017: 33; Vorster 2011: 333–338). In a Late Hellenistic context, those statues were probably displayed in a landscape setting (Vorster 2015: 43), as for example the statues of Marsyas. Although well-known statues do not usually find direct resonance in wall painting as "one-to-one imitations" (Moormann 2008: 207), especially not Hellenistic groups (Allroggen-Bedel 1999: 360), these Andromeda statues and the frescoes are conceptually connected (Vorster 2015: 41). The awareness of Andromeda's sculptural tradition must have inspired her depiction in wall painting and the intermedial reference created an even stronger opportunity to present Andromeda as *marmoreum opus*.

Before returning to the question of the incoherence between Andromeda's captivity and liberty, we need to digress into art-historical discourse to understand this citation of the marble Andromeda in wall painting. Marble

15 Trans. Gaselee 1969: 149.

as a material is especially suited to express extraordinary realism of mimetic artworks (Isager 1991: 177), evoking “brilliance and artistic perfection” (Bradley 2006: 13). Through her presentation as a work of statuary, Andromeda is linked to old tropes connected to the statuary tradition: beauty, lifelikeness, and lifelessness. In the *Metamorphoses*, this ambivalence is recognised, as Perseus recognises that Andromeda only appears like a statue (*marmoreum ratus esset opus*, *Met.* 4.675, my emphasis) and reacts with a *stupor* (*Met.* 4.676). This physical reaction for the highest amazement is reserved for truly fantastic marvels, a *mirum* or *thauma*, a wonder to behold (cf. Prier 1999). At the core of this notion seems to be precisely this impossibility to explain such a marvel (Platt 2009: 44) and the impossibility to distinguish between life-like art and art-like life, as is the case with Andromeda’s beauty. This ideal and picture-perfect beauty exceeds nature’s boundaries and can only be found in the realm of art, not in one single woman (Salzman-Mitchell 2008: 307), as the anecdote of Zeuxis’ famed Helena painting illustrates (Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 2.1). The creation of a perfect woman as a work of art is expressed in a nutshell in the myth of Pygmalion and his ivory girl in the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 10.243–97) and Andromeda as a *marmoreum opus* can be understood as an inversion of the ivory girl: while the created girl comes alive, Andromeda becomes like a statue and turns into an almost lifeless artwork (Segal 1998: 19–20; Sharrock 1991: 49). In the fresco of the House of the Dioscuri, only the fettered part of Andromeda’s skin seems marmoreal. But precisely where Perseus touches her arm, it acquires a more vital colour, as if she comes to life through the touch of her lover, like Pygmalion’s ivory girl, whose miraculous animation manifests through touch (*Met.* 10.281–6). Thus, in the fresco, Perseus seems to save Andromeda not only from the *kêtos* but also from her imprisonment as a lifeless statue. While this continuation of the motif cannot be realised by the statuary groups because of their marble materiality, wall painting can explore such a mimetic enlivenment of Andromeda’s statuary format through Perseus.

Moreover, this touch carries yet another association beyond that of Andromeda’s re-animation. It is placed exactly in the centre axis of the fresco and is the only physical and emotional connection between the lovers. Perseus does not demolish Andromeda’s chains, as he does expectedly in literary versions

of the myth (e.g. Luc. *Dial. mar.* 14), but instead seems to be supporting her chained arm. While Schmaltz (1989: 267) and Lorenz (2008: 135) both are reminded of the *cheir epi karpo*, which in Greek iconography represents the husband's claim of his newly-wed bride, this grip of the elbow differs from this. Again, literature may help provide a link between Andromeda's chains and what Ovid casts as the bonds of love (Ov. *Met.* 4.678–9): "Oh! those are not the chains you deserve to wear, but rather those that link fond lovers together!"¹⁶ Perseus does not seek Andromeda's true liberation but rather wishes to transform her fetters into chains of love, thus alluding to the notion of *servitium amoris* in Latin love poetry (Tib. 1.1.55; Murgatroyd 1981: 596). The theme of love was already a striking feature in Euripides' drama, where Perseus calls on Eros before his fight against the *kētos* (TrGF 5.136; Gibert 1999). Eros' hand in the lovers' fate is even more pointedly realised in Philostratus' ekphrasis of an Andromeda painting, in which not Perseus but Eros frees Andromeda and leads her down from her rock (Philostr. *Imag.* 1.29.2). The liberation of Andromeda is thus visualized as an act of love by the personification of love who takes on the role of her lover. If we return to the fresco in the House of the Dioscuri, we can see how this motif of the captivating force of love has been potently visualized: Perseus upholds Andromeda's chains. While he is freeing her, he is becoming unfree himself.

Toying with petrification?

The happy union of Andromeda and Perseus is depicted in the 'Lovers Type', as seen for example in a fresco from the House of the Prince of Naples (VI.15.8) (fig. 4): The couple sits side by side, leaning towards each other, while Perseus holds the Gorgon's head above his own to produce a reflection of it in a pond at their feet. While depictions of erotic couples in a pyramidal scheme admittedly are common in the fourth style (cf. Provenza 2008), the reflection of Medusa in the water, which is particularly well-pre-

16 Trans. Miller 1916 (revised by Goold): 227. Similarly, in Manilius' rendition of the myth, Perseus envies Andromeda's "lucky" chains (Manil. 5.573: *felicisque vocat, teneant quae mebra, catenas*).

served in this fresco, turns the gorgoneion into more than just a ‘meaningless prop’ (Schmaltz 1989: 268). The motif of reflection also plays a crucial role in the myth of Narcissus, which is popularly featured in fourth style frescoes (Balensiefen 1990: 130–162).¹⁷ Like Perseus’ stupefied reaction to the sight of Andromeda, Narcissus, too, is completely stunned by his reflection, even like a statue in Parian marble (*adstupet; e Pario formatum marmore signum*, *Met.* 3.418–9). For Narcissus, the sight of his reflection proves to be deadly, whereas the sight of Medusa is rendered safe only if perceived in reflection. In the myth, this fact proves the crucial instrument for her annihilation as Perseus uses Athena’s shield as a mirror. In these frescoes, however, heroic armour is exchanged for a calm pond to show the reflection of the gorgoneion. This pond is not only reminiscent of Narcissus’ pond but also represents the extreme opposite and a tamed version of the former “sea of troubles” featured in the ‘Landscape Type’.

Even though in the frescoes of both previous types Perseus is in possession of the gorgoneion, he never uses his “obvious super-weapon” (Ogden 2013: 128). Ironically, in the most peaceful composition of the ‘Lovers Type’, the gorgoneion is now ostentatiously presented above the heads of the protagonists as a prerequisite of the happy ending. Perseus’ final enemies in the *Metamorphoses*, like Andromeda’s former suitor Phineus (*Met.* 5.1–235), are defeated with the gorgoneion, leaving behind a “statue gallery of his petrified opponents” (Hardie 2002: 178).

Interestingly, in the fresco of the House of the Prince of Naples, the mirrored gorgoneion is not depicted upside down but looks straight out of the fresco, rather threateningly like a second dangerous gorgoneion, reinforcing the threat of petrification for the viewer. The gorgoneion in Perseus’ hand, however, even looks towards Andromeda, creating a connection between Andromeda and Medusa. This juxtaposition draws attention to the similarities and differences of both characters (Salzman-Mitchell 2005: 83): Medusa’s

17 For further analysis on representations of Narcissus in wall painting see e.g. Balensiefen 1990: 130–162; D’Angelo 2012; Elsner 2007: 132–176; Zanker 1962.

petrifying gaze was conquered by Perseus' superiority of sight, whereas Andromeda is capable of dangerously stupefying Perseus with her appearance whilst seeming petrified like a marble statue. Andromeda thus might be understood as an "anti-Medusa", both women being "opposite sides of the coin" (Heslin 2018: 90). The disembodied gorgoneion in the fresco then not only serves as a visual reminder for Perseus' heroic victories, but also for the danger of being turned into a statue – by either one of the three protagonists. In the frescoes as in the *Metamorphoses*, Andromeda's myth ends as it began, by possibly becoming statue-like (Hardie 2002: 183).

Conclusion: From text to image – from image to text

Andromeda's relationship with stone, more explicitly marble, permeates her depiction in wall painting, each type focusing on a different aspect of a stony materiality. The wide range of associations of Andromeda as *mar-morem opus* reveals a fruitful intermedial exchange between motifs shared between literary and visual culture. This intertwined interaction of text and image works both ways, so that "in the same way that images engage with a viewer's knowledge of texts (...) so too might texts play upon a number of visual associations" (Squire 2009: 305).

To conclude this case-study on Andromeda, I would like to propose a scenario for the historical dynamics of this text-image-relationship. While Euripides probably serves as a first foundation of Andromeda's relationship with stone, it seems likely that a Hellenistic statuary group with its emphasis on landscape setting provided the stimulus for stone as a key material theme in both Roman wall painting and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This landscape setting is translated into the 'Landscape Type' with the rock as its threatening key agent, contrasting the rock's roughness with Andromeda's delicate figure and using its sinister materiality as a poignant foil for Andromeda's marble-likeness. The 'Liberation Type' was inspired by the composition of the Hellenistic sculptures and highlights the ambivalence of Andromeda's statuesque condition in a polyvalent image, that ultimately enables her 'revitalisation' through Perseus' touch. The 'Lovers Type' pursues a different direction with its playful take on the danger of petrification. Not only does this type evoke

visual representations of Narcissus, it also reflects the fate of Perseus' petrified enemies and presents Andromeda as a counterpart of Medusa. Lastly, the ekphrases of Philostratus and Achilles Tatius both rely on the knowledge of the visual and literary tradition of Andromeda and amplify certain elements, for example the funerary connotation or the involvement of Eros.

What role, then, does Ovid's phrase *marmoreum opus* play, dating between the 'Landscape' and 'Liberation Type'? Instead of influencing the images, the images rather seem to have inspired this wording: the multifaceted spectrum of Andromeda's connection to stone is narrowed down and fixated in Ovid's *marmoreum opus*, which then has an ekphrastic nature. Ultimately, the iconotextuality of this notion creates a reciprocal dialogue of text and image.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Ruth Bielfeldt, who also supervised my Master's thesis at the Institute for Classical Archaeology at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich in autumn 2020, on which this paper is based on, for numerous inspiring discussions, her constructive suggestions, and her support of my academic progress. I am also much indebted to Viktoria Räuchle for her constant guidance and for providing me with so many insights.

I also wish to thank my two anonymous reviewers for their thorough assessment and their valuable comments. And lastly, I am most grateful to the editors of this volume for offering me this chance to publish my paper and for their quick support concerning all matters – my heartfelt thanks.

REFERENCES

- Allroggen-Bedel, A. 1999. Hellenistische Gruppen in der römisch-kampanischen Wandmalerei. In *Hellenistische Gruppen. Gedenkschrift für Andreas Linfert*. Mainz: von Zabern, 357–363.
- Anderson, M.L. 1987/88. Pompeian frescoes in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. *The Metro-*

politan Museum of Art Bulletin 45: 1–56.

Balensiefen, L. 1990. *Die Bedeutung des Spiegelbildes als ikonographisches Motiv in der antiken Kunst*. Tübingen: Wasmuth.

Beall, S.M. 1993. Word-Painting in the ‘Imagines’ of the Elder Philostratus. *Hermes* 121: 350–363.

Bergmann, B. 1995. Greek masterpieces and Roman recreative fictions. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97: 79–120.

Bergmann, B. 1996. The Pregnant Moment: Tragic Wives in the Roman Interior. In Kampen, N.D. (ed.). *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 199–218.

Bergmann, B. 1999. Rhythms of Recognition: Mythological Encounters in Roman Landscape Painting. In de Angelis, F. and Muth, S. (eds.). *Im Spiegel des Mythos. Bilder und Lebenswelt*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 81–107.

Bettini, M. 1999. *The Portrait of the Lover*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Bielfeldt, R. 2005. *Orestes auf römischen Sarkophagen*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Blanckenhagen, P.H. and Alexander, C. 1990. *The Augustan villa at Boscotrecase*. Mainz: von Zabern.

Bradley, M. 2006. Colour and Marble in Early Imperial Rome. *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 52: 1–38.

D’Angelo, T. 2012. Mirroring eyes: Narcissus and the others in Pompeian wall paintings. In Colpo, I. and Ghedini, F. (eds.). *Il gran poema delle passioni e delle meraviglie. Ovidio e il repertorio letterario e figurativo fra antico e riscoperta dell’antico*. Padua: Padua University Press, 223–234.

Elsner, J. 2007. *Roman eyes. Visuality and subjectivity in art and text*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gibert, J. 1999/2000. Falling in love with Euripides (Andromeda). *Illinois Classical Studies* 24/25: 75–91.

Giuliani, L. 2003. *Bild und Mythos. Geschichte der Bilderzählung in der griechischen Kunst*. München: C.H. Beck.

Hardie, P.R. 2002. *Ovid’s Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Heslin, P. 2018. *Propertius, Greek Myth, and Virgil: Rivalry, Allegory, and Polemic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Isager, J. 1991. *Pliny on Art and Society: The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- Klimek-Winter, R. 1993. *Andromedatragödien. Sophokles, Euripides, Livius, Andronikos, Ennius, Accius. Text, Einleitung und Kommentar*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Lauter-Bufe, H. 1969. *Zur Stilgeschichte der figürlichen pompejanischen Fresken*. Köln: PhD dissertation submitted to the Universität zu Köln.
- LIMC I.1, 1981, 774–790, s.v. 'Andromeda I' [K. Schauenburg].
- Lorenz, K. 2008. *Bilder machen Räume. Mythenbilder in pompejanischen Häusern*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Maaskant-Kleibrink, M. 1989. The stuff of which Greek heroines are made. *Bulletin antieke beschaving. Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology* 64: 1–49.
- McGrath, E. 1992. The black Andromeda. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 55: 1–18.
- Moormann, E.M. 2008. Statues on the wall: The representation of statuary in Roman wall painting. In Eliav, Y.Z. (ed.). *The Sculptural Environment of the Roman Near East: Reflections on Culture, Ideology, and Power*. Leuven: Peeters, 197–224.
- Murgatroyd, P. 1981. *Servitium Amoris* and the Roman Elegists. *Latomus* 40(3): 598–606.
- Muth, S. 2017. Die raffinierte Darstellung einer kaum darstellbaren Gewalttat. In Muth, S. (ed.). *Laokoon: Auf der Suche nach einem Meisterwerk*. Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, 335–352.
- Newby, Z. 2012. The aesthetics of violence: Myth and danger in Roman domestic landscapes. *Classical Antiquity* 31: 349–389.
- Ogden, D. 2013. *Drakon. Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, K.M. Jr. 1968. Perseus and Andromeda. *American Journal of Archaeology* 72: 1–23.
- Platt, V. 2009. Where the wild things are: Locating the marvellous in Augustan wall painting. In Hardie, P.R. (ed.). *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 41–74.

- Prier, R.A. 1989. *Thauma idestai. The Phenomenology of Sight and Appearance in Archaic Greek*. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.
- Provenziale, V. 2008. *Echi di propaganda imperiale in scene di coppia a Pompei: Enea e Didone, Marte e Venere, Perseo e Andromeda*. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Richardson, L. 1955. The Casa dei Dioscuri and Its Painters. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 23: 1–165.
- Rodenwaldt, G. 1909. *Komposition der pompejanischen Wandgemälde*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Salzman-Mitchell, P. 2005. *A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image and Gender in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Salzman-Mitchell, P. 2008. A whole out of pieces: Pygmalion's ivory statue in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. *Arethusa* 41: 291–311.
- Schefold, K. 1979. Die Andromeda des Nikias. In Cambitoglou, A. (ed.). *Studies in Honour of Arthur Dale Trendall*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 155–158.
- Schmaltz, B. 1989. Andromeda. Ein campanisches Wandbild. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 104: 259–281.
- Segal, C. 1998. Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the *Metamorphoses*. *Arion* 5: 9–41.
- Sharrock, A.R. 1991. Womanufacture. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 81: 36–49.
- Sinn, F., Vorster, C. and Lazzarini, L. 2017. Marmoranalysen zu ausgewählten Antiken der Skulpturensammlung SKD Dresden. *Marmora* 13: 25–67.
- Squire, M. 2009. *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vorster, C. 2011. Statue der Andromeda. In Knoll, K., Vorster, C. and Woelk M. (eds.). *Katalog der antiken Bildwerke II. Idealskulptur der römischen Kaiserzeit*. München: Hirmer, 333–338.
- Vorster, C. 2014. Inszenierung und Zitat. Die Befreiung der Andromeda in den Bildmedien der römischen Kaiserzeit. In Boschung, D. and Jäger, L. (eds.). *Formkonstanz und Bedeutungswandel*. Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 15–39.
- Vorster, C. 2015. Gruppe des Perseus und der Andromeda. In Fittschen, K. and Bergemann, J. (eds.). *Katalog der Skulpturen der Sammlung Wallmoden*. München: Biering & Brinkmann, 39–43.

Wagner, P. 1996. Introduction: Ekphrasis, Iconotexts, and Intermediality – the State(s) of the Art(s). In Wagner, P. (ed.). *Icons – Texts – Iconotexts: Essays on Ekphrasis and Intermediality*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1–40.

Weitzmann, K. 1959. *Ancient Book Illumination*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wright, M. 2005. *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies: A Study of Helen, Andromeda and Iphigenia among the Taurians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zanker, P. 1966. Iste ego sum. Der naive und der bewusste Narziss. *Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn* 166: 152–170.

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Text and translations taken from:

Achilles Tatius. 1969. *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Trans. Gaselee, S. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Euripides. 2008. *Fragments: Aegeus–Melcager*. Trans. Collard, C. and Cropp, M. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Manilius. 1977. *Astronomica*. Trans. Goold, G.P. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ovid. 1916. *Metamorphoses, Volume I: Books 1–8*. Trans. Miller, F.J. (revised by Goold, G.P.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.



Fig. 1. Fresco from the Villa of Agrippa Postumus in Boscorease in the 'Landscape Type'. 3rd Pompeian Style, around 10 BCE – 0. Metropolitan Museum of Art New York, Inv. 20.192.16.



Fig. 2. Fresco from the House of the Dioscuri (VI.9.6) in the 'Liberation Type'. 4th Pompeian Style, 62–79 CE. Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, Inv. 8998. – with permission of the Ministry of Culture (Italy) – National Museum Naples.



Fig. 3. Plaster cast of the sculpture group from the Amphitheatrum Castrense in the 'Liberation Type' (Sammlung Wallmoden Hannover). First quarter of the 2nd century CE after a model from the 1st century BCE. Institute of Archaeology, University of Göttingen, Photo: Stephan Eckardt.



Fig. 4. Fresco from the House of the Prince of Naples in the 'Lovers Type' (VI.15.8). 4th Pompeian Style. Archaeological Parc of Pompeii, in situ. – with the permission of the Ministry of Culture (Italy) – Archaeological Parc of Pompeii.