

1.

THE LABOURS OF HERACLES,

A LITERARY AND ARTISTIC EXAMINATION.

By

SUSAN ESTELLA GIBBONS, B.A., M.A. (London).

A Thesis

submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (Ph.D)  
in the Faculty of Arts,  
London University

October 1975



ProQuest Number: 10097340

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10097340

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

This thesis is primarily concerned with the documentation of the artistic and literary evidence for each of the traditional twelve labours of Heracles, in the course of which I have made certain discoveries relating to the concept and content of the labours.

Heracles is made to perform labours at least as early as the Iliad. The Greeks generally referred to them as ἀθλοί, contests in return for a prize, in this case immortality. It is not until the fifth century B.C. that a specific number is defined, namely twelve, by a fragment of Pindar and the metopes of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia. The Cerberus, lion, and hind labours and possibly those of Geryon and the hydra were defined as such before the metopes, which provide a very early and isolated appearance of all the twelve labours of the later canon. I believe these metopes show Elis claiming Heracles as her special hero to emphasise her newly-found identity.

As regards the myths which became the traditional labours, Cerberus, lion, hydra and Geryon date at least to the eighth century B.C., birds and possibly Amazons to the seventh, and the rest, with the possible exception of Augeas, to c. 550.

The characteristic feature of the labours is the exhibition of heroism: most involve fighting, often against monstrous opponents. Sometimes public benefaction is demonstrated but this is developed more by later writers. Many heroic deeds of Heracles could have been made into labours. The choice at Olympia seems to demonstrate Heracles' close connection with the surrounding area highlighted by the labours he performed

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

in the remote corners of the Greek world as a panhellenic hero.

It was not until the local nature of Olympia's interpretation of the individual labours was forgotten that it was adopted as the canon.

Abstract .....	5
Acknowledgements .....	5
Preface .....	6
Bibliography, primary works .....	9
Bibliography, secondary works .....	12
Abbreviations .....	20
Chapter I The Concept of the labours: when and why it originated .....	23
Chapter II The Nemean Lion .....	32
Chapter III The Lernaean Hydra .....	75
Chapter IV The Stymphalian Birds .....	102
Chapter V The Cretan Bull .....	116
Chapter VI The Cerynithian Hind .....	143
Chapter VII The Amazons .....	169
Chapter VIII The Stables of Augeas .....	209
Chapter IX Cerberus .....	227
Chapter X The Apples of the Hesperides .....	239
Chapter XI Geryon .....	250
Chapter XII The Horses of Diomedes .....	319
Chapter XIII The Erymanthian Boar .....	326
Chapter XIV The rôle of Olympia in establishing the canon of the labours .....	367
Appendix I Other Amazonomachies .....	375
Appendix II 'The new Heracles poem of Pindar' .....	389

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	2
Acknowledgements .....	5
Preface .....	6
Bibliography, primary works .....	9
Bibliography, secondary works .....	12
Abbreviations .....	20
Chapter I     The Concept of the labours: when and why it originated .....	23
Chapter II     The Nemean Lion .....	35
Chapter III    The Lernaean Hydra .....	75
Chapter IV     The Stymphalian Birds .....	102
Chapter V      The Cretan Bull .....	116
Chapter VI     The Cerynitian Hind .....	148
Chapter VII    The Amazons .....	169
Chapter VIII   The Stables of Augeas .....	209
Chapter IX     Cerberus .....	225
Chapter X      The Apples of the Hesperides .....	259
Chapter XI     Geryon .....	290
Chapter XII    The Horses of Diomedes .....	319
Chapter XIII   The Erymanthian Boar .....	338
Chapter XIV    The rôle of Olympia in establishing the canon of the labours .....	367
Appendix I     Other Amazonomachies .....	378
Appendix II    'The new Heracles poem of Pindar' .....	380

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor, Professor P.T. Stevens and also to Professor J. Barron, for giving up so much of his time in the early evening and vacation, to enable me to complete my thesis while working full-time: without his help my task would have been much more difficult. I am also very grateful to Professor P.E. Corbett for his help during the early stages of my work on Heracles and to Mr P.T. Buckley, M.A. for his discussion of historical problems.

For the literary evidence I have found very useful the encyclopaedia of Pauly-Wissowa. As regards the artistic evidence I have made extensive use of Frank Brommer's, Essays über griechische Heldensagen for appearances of the labours in Greek vase-painting: I have been able to examine pictures of roughly two-thirds of the vases listed for the various labours, the rest being either unpublished or published in inaccessible works. I have generally followed Brommer in my references to whereabouts and shape; I have kept the Greek forms for the names of shapes and artists. I have often cited plates in the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum and, unless otherwise stated, I have given the number of the volume according to Museum rather than country; if Attic black-figure vases are referred to I have not given the type reference (III M or III Be) but have given such a reference for all other fabrics. For a brief résumé of the literary and artistic evidence for the various labours Brommer's recent book, Herakles, die zwölf Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur, has proved helpful, and for a fuller account of Roemer's Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie

PREFACE

My principal aim in this thesis has been to examine in detail, chiefly from the evidence of Greek art and literature, each of the myths which constitute the traditional twelve labours of Heracles. In each case I have dated the first appearance of the myth both in its own right and as a labour, discussed its nature and possible origins, listed and dated its variants, attempting to establish which is the main tradition, and summed up my discoveries in a conclusion.

For the literary evidence I have found very useful the encyclopaedia of Pauly-Wissowa. As regards the artistic evidence I have made extensive use of Frank Brommer's, Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage for appearances of the labours in Greek vase-painting: I have been able to examine pictures of roughly two-thirds of the vases listed for the various labours, the rest being either unpublished or published in inaccessible works. I have generally followed Brommer in my references to whereabouts and shape; I have kept the Greek forms for the names of shapes and artists. I have often cited plates in the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum and, unless otherwise stated, I have given the number of the volume according to Museum rather than country; if Attic black-figure vases are referred to I have not given the type reference (III H or III He) but have given such a reference for all other fabrics. For a brief resumé of the literary and artistic evidence for the various labours Brommer's recent book, Herakles, die zwölf Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur, has proved helpful, and for a fuller account, W. Roscher's Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie.

My first and last chapters discuss the concept, origin, nature, and content of the twelve labours. Necessarily these two chapters are much concerned with the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, which depicts on its metopes all the labours of the later canon long before they are accepted as such, a phenomenon which I have tried to explain.

I have dealt with the labours in the order followed by the sculptor of the Olympia metopes since this is their earliest appearance. However, I have exactly reversed the order in which they are listed by Pausanias.<sup>1</sup> He begins on the left of the Eastern end and lists the metopes in the order in which one would see them if walking completely round the temple from left to right. I, on the other hand, have begun at the right of the Western end with the Nemean lion, since this seems to be firmly established as the first labour by this time. I, therefore, believe that one was intended to begin viewing the metopes at this point<sup>2</sup> and to walk completely round the temple from right to left, thus seeing the metopes in the following order: lion, hydra, birds, bull, hind, Amazons, Augeas, Cerberus,<sup>3</sup> Hesperides, Geryon, Diomedes, and boar.

This is somewhat different from the order given by the late mythographers, whose arrangements also differ slightly one from

---

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias' list corresponds in his general positioning of the metopes with their actual find-spots.

<sup>2</sup> It should also be noted that the approach to Greek temples generally led to the Western end (cf. the Parthenon).

<sup>3</sup> Pausanias omits Cerberus but his position can be fixed from the find-spot. See note (1) above.



BIBLIOGRAPHYI PRIMARY WORKS USED

- C. Albizzati, Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano (Rome, 1925-39)
- Apollodorus, The Library, ed. Sir J.G. Frazer (London, 1921)
- B. Ashmole and N. Yalouris, Olympia, The sculptures of the Temple of Zeus (London, 1967)
- Sir J.D. Beazley, Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford, 1956)  
Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford, 1963)  
The Development of Attic Black-Figure (Berkeley, California, 1951)  
Paralipomena, Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters and Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters (Oxford, 1971)
- D. von Bothmer, Amazons in Greek Art (Oxford, 1957)
- F. Brommer, Herakles, die zwölf Taten des Helden in Antiker Kunst und Literatur (Munich/Cologne 1953)
- Herakles und die Hesperiden auf Vasenbildern',  
Jd.I. 57 (1942) 105-23
- 'Herakles und Hydra auf attischen Vasenbildern',  
Marburger Winckelmann-Programm (1949) 3-8.
- Vasenlisten zur Griechischen Heldensage, 3rd ed.  
(Marburg/Lahn, 1973)
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum
- J. Déchelette, Les Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule romaine,  
Vol. II (Paris, 1904)
- Diodorus Siculus, ed. C.H. Oldfather and others (London, 1933-67).
- Euripides, Herakles, ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Berlin, 1933)
- W.G. Forrest, 'Themistocles and Argos', C.Q. N.S. 10 (1960)  
221-241.
- Fouilles de Delphes vol. IV Fasc. 2
- E. Gerhard, Auserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1840-58)
- B. Graef and E. Langlotz, Die Antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen (Berlin, 1925-33)
- R. Hampe, Frühe griechische Sagenbilder in Böotien (Athens, 1936)

- U. Hausmann, Hellenistische Reliefbecher (Stuttgart, 1959)
- Heraion alla Foce del Sele II, ed. P. Zancani-Montuoro and U. Zanotti-Bianco (Rome, 1954)
- Hesiod, Theogony, ed. M.L. West (Oxford, 1966)
- Homer, The Iliad, ed. W. Leaf (London, 1900)
- The Odyssey, ed. W.B. Stanford (1950)
- S.H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology (Middlesex, 1963)
- Hyginus, Fabulae, ed. H.J. Rose (Leiden, 1934)
- Astronomica, ed. B. Bunte (Leipzig, 1875)
- F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (Berlin, 1923-58)
- G. Kinkel, Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (Leipzig, 1877)
- E. Kunze, Archaische Schildbänder, Olympia Forschungen II (Berlin, 1950)
- E. Langlotz, Griechische Vasen in Würzburg (Munich, 1932)
- B. Luce, 'The Studies of the Exploits of Heracles on Vases', AJA 28 (1924) 296-325
- Lyrice Graeca Selecta, ed. D. Page (Oxford, 1968)
- V.J. Matthews, Panyassis of Halikarnassos (Belfast, 1968)
- R. Merkelbach and M.L. West, Fragmenta Hesiodica (Oxford, 1967)
- A. Nauck, Fragmenta Tragicorum Graecorum (Hildesheim, 1964)
- J. Overbeck, Die Antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste (Leipzig, 1868)
- The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. E. Lobel
- Pauly-Wissowa, Pauly's Real Encyclopädie
- Pausanias, ed. H. Hitzig and H. Blüner (Berlin, 1896/Leipzig, 1901 and 1907)
- C. Pavese, 'The New Heracles Poem of Pindar', Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 72 (1967) 47-88
- H. Payne, Necrocorinthia (Oxford, 1931)
- Pindar, Carmina cum fragmentis, ed. B. Snell, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1959 and 1964)
- Poetae Melici Graeci ed. D.L. Page (Oxford, 1962)
- E. Pottier, Vases antiques du Louvre (Paris, 1897-1922)

- G.M.A. Richter, Attic Red-Figured Vases: a survey (New Haven, 1946)
- M. Robertson, 'Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase-Painters,' C.Q. 19 (1969) 207-20
- W. Roscher, Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie (Leipzig, 1884-1937)
- A. Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen (Berlin and Leipzig, 1927)
- N.K. Sandars, The Gilgamesh Epic (Middlesex, 1960)
- B. Sauer, Das Sogennante Theseion (Leipzig, 1899)
- K. Schauenburg, 'Der Gürtel der Hippolyte,' Philologus 104 (1960) 1-13
- 'Herakles und die Hydra auf Attischen Schalenfuss' Archäologischer Anzeiger (1971) 162ff.
- B. Shefton, 'Heracles and Theseus on a Red-Figured Iousterion' Hesperia 31 (1962) 330-368 and 414-415
- Sophocles, Trachiniae, ed. H.C. Jebb (Cambridge, 1955)
- C.M. Stibbe, Lakonische Vasenmaler der sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Amsterdam, 1972)
- A.D. Trendall, The Red-Figured Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily (Oxford, 1967)
- P. Walcot, Hesiod and the Near East (Cardiff, 1966)
- C. Watzinger, Griechische Vasen in Tübingen (Reutlingen, 1924)
- C. Wendel, Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium (Berlin, 1958)
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Pindaros (Berlin, 1922)

II SECONDARY WORKS USED

- Aelian, De Natura Animalium, ed. R. Hercher (Leipzig, 1864)
- Aeschylus, Tragoediae, ed. D. Page (Oxford, 1972)
- G. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art (Göteborg, 1971)
- E. Akurgal, Griechische Reliefs aus Lykien der VI Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 1941)
- C. Albizzati, Due Nuove acquisti del Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco (Rome, 1929)
- C. Aldred, Egypt to the End of the Old Kingdom (London, [1965])
- P. Amandry, 'Héraklès, Eurysthée et le Sanglier d'Erymanthe sur deux appliques de Bronze trouvées à Delphes', B.C.H. (1943) 150ff.
- A. Andrewes, Greek Society (Middlesex, 1967) 228ff.
- Antioch - on the Orontes IV part i, ed. F.O. Waage (Princeton, 1948)
- Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica ed. H. Fränkel (Oxford, 1961)
- P. Arias and M. Hirmer, History of Greek Vase-Painting (London, 1962)
- Aristophanes, ed. F.W. Hall and W.M. Geldart (Oxford, 1900, 1901)
- Auction Sale: Monnaies et Médailles S.A. Basle
- Ausonius, ed. H.G. Evelyn-White (London, 1919-21)
- Bacchylides, Carmina cum fragmentis, ed. B. Snell (Leipzig, 1958)
- R. Ballheimer, Griechische Vasen aus dem Hamburger Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Hamburg, 1905)
- J. Baron, 'Ibycus: To Polycrates', B.I.C.S. 16 (1969) 118ff.
- P.V.C. Baur, Catalogue of the Rebecca Darlington Stoddard Collection of Greek and Italian Vases in Yale University (New Haven, Connecticut, 1922)
- Sir J.D. Beazley, Etruscan Vase Painting (Oxford, 1947)
- Festschrift A. Rumpf (Krefeld, 1952)
- The Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems (Oxford, 1920)
- Sir J.D. Beazley and F. Magi, La Raccolta Benedetto Guglielmi nel Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco (Rome, 1939)
- O. Benndorf, Griechische und Sicilische Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1883)
- Die Metopen von Selinunt (Berlin, 1873)

- O. Benndorf and G. Niemann, Das Heroon von Gjölbashi-Trysa (Vienna, 1890)
- S. Benton, 'Herakles and Eurystheus at Knossos', J.H.S. 57 (1937) 38ff.
- H. Bloesch, Antike Kunst in der Schweiz (Zurich, 1943)  
Formen attischer Schalen (Berne, 1940)
- J. Boardman, Greek Gems and Finger Rings: early bronze age to late Classical (London, 1970)
- E. Boehringer, Greifswälder Antiken (Berlin, 1962)
- O. Brendel, 'Immolatio Boum', R.M. 45 (1930) 196-226
- A. Bruhn, Oltos and Early Red-Figure Vase-Painting (Copenhagen, 1943)
- E. Bulanda, Katalog der griechischen Vasen im Bosnisch-Herzegowinischen Landesmuseum zu Sarajewo (Vienna, 1912)
- Callimachus, ed. R. Pfeiffer (Oxford, 1949 and 1953)
- M. Cavalieri, Meligunis, Lipara (Palermo, 1960-5)
- Claudian, Carmina Minora, ed. J. Koch (Leipzig, 1893)
- P.A. Clement, 'Geryon and others in Los Angeles', Hesperia 24 (1955) 1-24
- J. Collignon, Lysippe (Paris, 1905)
- Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum
- F. Courby, Vases Grecs à Reliefs (Paris, 1922)
- De Coursey Fales Jnr, 'An Unpublished Fragment attributed to Kleitias', AJA. 67 (1963) 211
- J.H. Croon, The Herdsman of the Dead (Utrecht, 1952)
- R.M. Dawkins, The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta (J.H.S. Suppl. 5)
- Delphes (France, 1957)
- P. Devambez, Grandes Bronzes du Musée de Stamboul (Constantinople, 1937)
- Dionysius Periegetes, ed. G. Bernhardt (Leipzig, 1828)
- L. Drees, Olympia (London, 1968)
- J. Dubois-Maisonneuve, Introduction à l'étude des Vases antiques (Paris, 1817)
- P. Ducati, Pontische Vasen (Berlin, 1932)

- J. Dugas, Délos X (Paris, 1928)
- T.J. Dunbabin, The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours  
(Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, supp. paper  
8, 1957)
- E. Dyggve, Das Laphrion der Tempelbezirk von Kalydon (Copenhagen,  
1948)
- J.H. Edmonds, Fragments of Attic Comedy (Leiden, 1959)
- G.R. Edwards, 'Hellenistic Pottery, Small Objects from the  
Pnyx II', Hesperia Suppl. 10. 79ff.
- Euripides, Hippolytus, ed. W.S. Barret (Oxford, 1964)  
Ion, ed. A.S. Owen (Oxford, 1939)  
Tragoediae, ed. G. Murray (Oxford, 1902-9)
- K. Fittschen, Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagen Darstellungen  
bei den Griechen (Berlin, 1969)
- R. Flacelière and P. Devambez. Héraclès - Images et Récits (Paris,  
1966)
- H. Frankfort, Cylinder Seals (1939)
- P. Friedländer, Herakles: Sagen geschichtliche Untersuchungen  
(Berlin, 1907)
- K. Friis-Johansen, Les Vases Sicyoniens (Copenhagen, 1923)
- A. Furtwängler, Die Antiken Gemmen (Munich, 1900)  
La Collection Sabouroff (Berlin, 1883-7)  
Königliche Museum zu Berlin, Beschreibung der  
Vasensammlung im Antiquarium (Berlin 1885)
- A. Furtwängler and K. Reichold, Griechische Vasenmalerei  
(Berlin, 1904-32)
- P. Gardner, The Types of Greek Coins (Cambridge, 1883)
- J. Garstang, The Hittite Empire (London, 1929)
- Aulus Gellius, Noctes Atticae, ed. C. Hosius (Leipzig, 1903)
- E. Gerhard, Gesammelte akademische Abhandlungen und kleine  
Schriften (Berlin, 1866-8)  
Etruskische und Kampanische Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1843)  
Trinkschalen und Gefässe des Königlichen Museums  
zu Berlin (Berlin, 1848-50)
- L. Ghali-Kahil, La Céramique Grecque (Paris, 1960)

- L. Ghali-Kahil, Les Enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène dans les textes et les documents figurés (Paris, 1955)
- Museum  
S.W. Grose, Fitzwilliam, Catalogue of the Mc.Clean Collection of Greek Coins I (Cambridge, 1923-9)
- W. Grünhagen, Antike Originalarbeiten der Kunstsammlung des Instituts (Berlin, 1942)
- C.H.E. Haspels, Attic Black-Figure Lekythoi (Paris, 1936)
- Herodotus, Historiae, ed. C. Hude (Oxford, 1908)
- H. Heydemann, Die Vasensammlungen des Museum Nazionale zu Neapel (Berlin, 1872)
- R. Higgins, Minoan and Mycenaean Art (London, 1967)
- Hirsch Collection (Paris, 30 June - 2 July 1921)
- H. Hoffmann, Griechische Kleinkunst für Kunst und Gewerbe (Hamburg, 1963)
- Ten Centuries that Shaped the West: (Greek and Roman Art in Texas Collections) (Mainz, 1970)
- Homer, Opera V ed. T. Allen (Oxford, 1912)
- R.G. Hood, Greek Vases in the University of Tasmania (Tasmania, 1964)
- J.C. Hoppin, A Handbook of Greek Black-Figure Vases (Paris, 1924)
- Horace, Odes ed. E.C. Wickham, revised by H. Garrod (Oxford, 1912)
- G.L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis (London, 1969)
- Illustrated London News (4-xii-54)
- F.W. Imhoof-Blümer and P. Gardner, Ancient Coins illustrating lost Masterpieces of Greek Art: A Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias (Chicago, 1964)
- F. Inghirami, Pitture di Vasi fittili (Fiesole, 1833-7)
- Isocrates, ed. F. Blass (Leipzig, 1895)
- P. Jacobsthal, Göttinger Vasen (Berlin, 1912)
- Ornamente griechischer Vasen (Berlin, 1927)
- Theseus auf dem Meeresgrunde (Leipzig, 1911)
- O. Jahn, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung Königs Ludwig in der Pinakothek zu München (Munich, 1854)
- W. Klein, Euphronios: eine Studie zur Geschichte der Griechischen Malerei (Vienna, 1886)

- H. Klumbach, Tarentiner Grabkunst (Reutlingen, 1937)
- A. Körte, 'Bruchstücke einer Didaskalischen Inschrift', Hermes 73 (1938) 123ff.
- W. Kraiker, Katalog der Sammlung antiker Kleinkunst des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität Heidelberg I (Berlin, 1931)
- K. Kübler, Kerameikos VI (Berlin, 1959-70)
- E. Kunze, Kretische Bronzereliefs (Stuttgart, 1931)
- L. de Lacroix, Monnaies et Colonisation dans l'Occident Grec (Brussels, 1965)
- A. Lane, 'Laconian Pottery', B.S.A. 34 (1933/4) 99-189
- Larisa III (Berlin, 1940-42)
- B. Luce, 'List of vases showing Heracles and the Nemean Lion', A.J.A. 20 (1916) 460ff.
- R. Lullies and M. Hirmer, Greek Sculpture (1956)
- P. MacKendrick, The Greek Stones Speak (London, 1962)
- P. Marconi, Agrigento (Florence, 1929)
- S. Marinatos and M. Hirmer, Crete and Mycenae (1960)
- Megara Hyblaea 2 (Paris, 1964)
- A. Merlin, Vases Grecs du style Géométrique au style à figures noires (Paris)
- H. Metzger, Les Représentations dans la Céramique attique du VI siècle (Paris, 1951)
- J. Millingen, Peintures antiques de vases grecs de la Collection de Sir John Coghill Bart. (Rome, 1817)
- P. Mingazzini, Vasi della Collezione Castellani (Rome, 1930 and 1971)
- A. Neugebauer, Staatliche Museum von Berlin: Führer durch das Antiquarium II (Berlin, 1932)
- B. Neutsch and others, Die Welt der Griechen im Bilde der Originale der Heidelberger Universitätssammlung (Heidelberg, 1948)
- M. Nilsson, The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology (Cambridge, 1932)
- D. Ohly, Griechische Goldbleche der VIII Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Berlin, 1953)
- Olynthus XIII ed. D.M. Robinson (Baltimore, 1950)

- Ovid, Metamorphoses, ed. R. Ehwald (Leipzig, 1915)
- D.L. Page 'Fragments of Greek Lyrical Poetry, P. Oxy. 2637  
P.C.Ph.S. 196 N.S. 16 (1970) 91ff.
- Greek Literary Papyri (London, 1942)
- 'Stesichorus, P. Oxy. 2735 fr. 1, 2618 fr. 1, 2619  
fr. 1' P.C.Ph.S. 195 N.S. 15 (1969) 69ff.
- R. Pagenstecher, Expedition Sieglin: die griechisch-ägyptische  
Sammlung Ernst von Sieglin ii
- H.W. Parke and J. Boardman, 'The Struggle for the tripod and  
the first Sacred War', J.H.S. 76 (1957) 276-282
- H. Payne and G.A. Young, Archaic marble Sculpture from the  
Acropolis (1936)
- Perachora I & II, ed. H. Payne and T.J. Dunbabin (Oxford, 1940  
and 1966)
- G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, Histoire de l'Art dans l'antiquité X  
(Paris, 1911-14)
- A.W. Picard-Cambridge, The Theatre of Dionysos in Athens  
(Oxford, 1946)
- E. Pfuhl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen (Munich, 1923)
- Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting (London, 1926)
- Pliny the Elder, Naturalis Historiae, ed. J. Sillig (Hamburg and  
Gotha, 1851-8)
- Quintus Smyrnaeus, The Fall of Troy, ed. A.S. Way (London 1913)
- Raoul-Rochette, Monuments inédits d'antique figurée (Paris, 1837)
- G.M.A. Richter, The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks  
(New Haven, 1950)
- G.M.A. Richter and L. Hall, Red-Figured Athenian Vases in the  
Metropolitan Museum of Art (New Haven, 1964)
- G.M.A. Richter and M.J. Milne, Shapes and Names of Athenian  
Vases (New York, 1935)
- A. de Ridder, Les Bronzes antiques du Louvre I and II (Paris,  
1913 and 1915)
- Catalogue de Vases Peints de la Bibliothèque  
Nationale (Paris, 1902)
- D.M. Robinson and C.G. Harcum, A catalogue of Greek Vases in  
the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology (Toronto, 1930)
- W.H. Roscher, Omphalos (New York, 1974)
- A. Rumpf, Sakonides (Leipzig, 1937)

- G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War (Hertfordshire, 1972)
- H. Schaal, Griechische Vasen (Teil II: rotfigurig) (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1928)
- K. Schauenburg, 'Herakles und Omphale', Rheinisches Museum für Philologie 103-104 (1960-61) 57ff.
- K. Schefold, Kertsche Vasen (Berlin, 1930)  
Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art (London, 1966)  
Untersuchungen zu den Kertschen Vasen (Berlin, 1934)
- R. Schöne, Le antichità del Museo Bocchi di Adria (Rome, 1878)
- P. Schweinfurth, Grundzüge der byzantinisch-osteuropäischen Kunstgeschichte (1947)
- B. Schweitzer, Greek Geometric Art (London, 1971)  
Herakles: Aufsätze zur griechischen Religions und Sagengeschichte (Tübingen, 1922)
- R. Seltman, Greek Coins (1933)
- Seneca, Tragoediae, ed. R. Peiper and G. Richter, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1902)
- Servius, Qui feruntur in carmina Vergilii commentarii (Leipzig, 1902-27)
- Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarii, ed. G. Thilo (Leipzig, 1927)
- M. Sestieri-Bertarelli, Il Museo archeologico di Potenza (1957)
- A. Severyns, Le Cycle d'Épique dans l'école d'Aristarque (Paris, 1928)  
Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus III (Paris, 1953)
- H. Sichtermann, Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien aus der Sammlung Jatta in Ruvo (Tübingen, 1966)
- Sotheby Catalogue
- Sophocles, Fabulae ed. A.C. Pearson (Oxford, 1924)
- E. Strommenger and M. Hirmer, Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien (Munich, 1962)
- Studies presented to D.M. Robinson, ii. ed. G. Mylonas (St. Louis, 1951-3)
- Les Tableaux des Anciens ... provenant de l'hôtel de Madame I. Péreire (Paris 4 June 1937)

- W. Technau, Exekias (Leipzig, 1936)
- Theocritus, Idylls ed. A.S.F. Gow (Cambridge, 1950)
- H.A. Thompson, 'The Excavation of the Athenian Agora, Twelfth Season', Hesperia 17 (1948) 149ff.
- E.M.W. Tillyard, The Hope Vases (Cambridge, 1923)
- A.D. Trendall, Christchurch New Zealand, Greek Vases in the Logie Collection (Christchurch, 1971)
- Frühitaliotische Vasen (Leipzig, 1938)
- Paestan Pottery, a study of the Red-figured Vases of Paestum (Rome, 1936)
- Phylax, B.I.C.S. Supplement 8
- P.N. Ure, Sixth and Fifth Century Pottery from Rhitsona (London, 1927)
- R.P. de Vaux, 'Les Prophètes de Baal sur le mont Carmel', Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth V (1941)
- Virgil, Opera ed. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969)
- H.B. Waters, Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum (London, 1896)
- F. Wetzel, Assur und Babylon (Berlin, 1949)
- A. Zannoni, Gli Scavi della Certosa di Bologna (Bologna, 1876)
- Bulletin of Correspondance Hellénique
- Bulletin de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Beaux-Arts
- Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London
- British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins
- British Museum Quarterly
- F. Brummer, Speziallexikon zur Griechischen Kunstgeschichte (Munich/Lena, 1975)
- F. Brummer, Speziallexikon der griechischen Kunst in antiker Kunst und Literatur (Munich/Lena, 1953)
- Journal of the British School at Athens
- Corpus Inscriptionum Antiquarum
- Classical Studies
- The Classical Quarterly

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations used are the same as in Liddell and Scott apart from the following:

<u>A.A.</u>	<u>Archäologischer Anzeiger</u>
<u>A.B.L.</u>	C.H.E. Haspels, <u>Attic Black-Figure Lekythoi</u> (Paris, 1936)
<u>A.B.V.</u>	Sir J.D. Beazley, <u>Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters</u> (Oxford, 1956)
<u>A.J.A.</u>	<u>American Journal of Archaeology</u>
<u>A.M.</u>	<u>Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: athenische Abteilung</u>
<u>A.O.</u>	R.M. Dawkins, <u>The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta</u> (J.H.S. Supplement 5)
<u>Arch. Rep.</u>	<u>Archaeological Reports</u> (Published by the Hellenic Society and the British School at Athens)
<u>A.R.V.</u>	Sir J.D. Beazley, <u>Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters</u> , 2nd edition (Oxford, 1963)
<u>A.V.</u>	E. Gerhard, <u>Auserlesene Vasenbilder</u> (Berlin, 1840-58)
<u>A.Z.</u>	<u>Archäologische Zeitung</u>
<u>B.C.H.</u>	<u>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</u>
<u>B d'A</u>	<u>Bollettino d'Arte del Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione</u>
<u>B.I.C.S.</u>	<u>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London</u>
<u>B.M.C.</u>	<u>British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins</u>
<u>B.M.Q.</u>	<u>British Museum Quarterly</u>
<u>Br.</u>	F. Brommer, <u>Vasenlisten zur Griechischen Helden- sage</u> (Marburg/Lahn, 1973)
<u>Brommer, Her.</u>	F. Brommer, <u>Herakles, die zwölf Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur</u> (Munich/ Cologne, 1953)
<u>B.S.A.</u>	<u>Annual of the British School at Athens</u>
<u>C.I.Gr.</u>	<u>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum</u>
<u>Cl.Rh.</u>	<u>Clara Rhodos</u>
<u>C.Q.</u>	<u>The Classical Quarterly</u>

- C.R. The Classical Review
- C.V. Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum
- E.K.V. E. Gerhard, Etruskische und kampanische Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1843)
- E.V.P. Sir J.D. Beazley, Etruscan Vase Painting (Oxford, 1947)
- F.G.H. F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (Berlin, 1925-58)
- F.G.S. R. Hampe, Frühe griechische Sagenbilder in Bötien (Athens, 1936)
- Gaz. Arch. Gazette Archéologique
- Heraion II Heraion alla Foce del Sele II, ed. P. Zancani-Montuoro & U. Zanotti-Bianco (Rome, 1954)
- H.S.Ph. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
- Jd.I Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
- J.H.S. Journal of Hellenic Studies
- K. G. Kinkel, Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (Leipzig, 1877)
- K.V. K. Schefold, Kertsche Vasen (Berlin, 1930)
- L.C.S. A.D. Trendall, The Red-Figured vases of Lucania, Campania, and Sicily (Oxford, 1967)
- L.G.S. Lyrica Graeca Selecta, ed. D. Page (Oxford, 1968)
- M.M. Auct. Auction Sale: Monnaies et Médailles S.A. Basle
- Mon.Ant. Monumenti Antichi
- Mon.Ined. Monumenti Inediti
- Mon.Piot Monuments Piot. Fondation Eugène Piot.
- M.U.Z. E. Pfuhl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen (Munich, 1923)
- M.W. R. Merkelbach and M.L. West, Fragmenta Hesiodica (Oxford, 1967)
- M.W.Pr. Marburger Winckelmann-Programm 1949
- N.C. H. Payne, Necrocorinthia (Oxford, 1931)
- NcK A. Nauck, Fragmenta Tragicorum Graecorum (Hildesheim, 1964)
- N.Sc. Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità

<u>Par.</u>	Sir J.D. Beazley, <u>Paralipomena</u> (Oxford, 1971)
<u>P.C.Ph.S.</u>	<u>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</u>
<u>P.M.G.</u>	D.L. Page, <u>Poetae Melici Graeci</u> (Oxford, 1962)
<u>P. Oxy.</u>	<u>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</u> , ed. E. Lobel.
<u>R.A.</u>	<u>Revue Archéologique</u>
<u>R.E.</u>	<u>Pauly's Real Encyclopädie</u>
<u>R.G.</u>	Sir J.D. Beazley & F. Magi, <u>La Raccoltà Benedetto Guglielmi nel Museo Gregoriano Etrusco</u> (Rome, 1939)
<u>R.M.</u>	<u>Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts: römische Abteilung</u>
<u>St. Etr.</u>	<u>Studi Etruschi</u>
<u>T.G.</u>	E. Gerhard, <u>Trinkschalen und Gefässe der Königlichen Museum zu Berlin</u> (Berlin, 1848-50)
<u>U.K.V.</u>	K. Schefold, <u>Untersuchungen zu den Kertschen Vasen</u> (Berlin, 1934)

Certainly in the eighth century BC the general concept of the labour seems to be well known in its basic details, but it appears that the individual labours were not specified. Hermes's help<sup>4</sup> is mentioned and his continues throughout to be his pre-decessor; Hera's jealousy<sup>5</sup> is also described but not related in connection with the labour but rather in the delaying of his birth. It is interesting that the Greek word used for the labour from the beginning is one which generally refers to a contest of toil, usually for a prize, and the actual reason for the labour is immortality. I shall return in this later<sup>6</sup> in this chapter when I come to discuss the reason for the invention of the labour.

1. cf. W. Leaf, Notes, Iliad (London, 1900) note on 15, 613

2. 15, 30.

3. G. 167ff.; cf. Odyssey II 623ff.

4. Il. 8, 362ff.; Od. II 626 where Hermes as well as Athena is mentioned as helping with the Caribaeus labour.

5. Il. 19, 96ff.

6. See pages 29ff.

CHAPTER ONE: THE CONCEPT OF THE LABOURS: WHEN AND WHY IT  
ORIGINATED

Heracles' labours are mentioned as early as the Iliad where they are referred to as ἄεθλοι, a form of the word generally used to describe them in the rest of Greek literature. In Iliad 8 (363) they are described as performed for Eurystheus and in 15 (639f.) Eurystheus is said to have conveyed his orders to Heracles via Copreus, a fitting name, with its association with κόπρον, for one helping to protect the cowardly Eurystheus.<sup>1</sup> No number is given to the labours in the Iliad but Heracles is merely described as πολλά περ' ἀθλήσαντα<sup>2</sup>. Only Cerberus<sup>3</sup> is quoted among the individual labours and the myth was apparently so well known by this time that the hound did not have to be mentioned by name.

Certainly in the eighth century BC the general concept of the labours seems to be well known in its basic details, but it appears that the individual labours were not specified. Athena's help<sup>4</sup> is mentioned and she continues throughout to be his protectress; Hera's jealousy<sup>5</sup> is also described but not actually in connection with the labours but rather in the delaying of his birth. It is interesting that the Greek word used for the labours from the beginning is one which generally refers to a contest of toil, usually for a prize, and the actual reward for the labours is immortality. I shall return to this later<sup>6</sup> in this chapter when I come to discuss the reason for the invention of the labours.

---

1. cf. W. Leaf, Homer, Iliad (London, 1900) note on 15, 639

2. 15,30.

3. 8, 367ff.; cf. Odyssey XI 623ff.

4. Il. 8, 362f; Od. XI 626 where Hermes as well as Athena is mentioned as helping with the Cerberus labour.

5. Il. 19, 96ff.

6. See pages 29ff.

Apart from the Cerberus myth which is mentioned as a labour in the Iliad, although not given a number, none of the later canon is definitely referred to as such until the fifth century. It is possible that the first two, the lion and the hydra, were regarded as labours before this, as I shall argue when I come to look at them in detail, since they give Heracles useful weapons for carrying out the others, but there is no actual proof. Most of the later canon do not seem to appear as labours until their appearance on the metopes of the temple of Zeus at Olympia which were probably carved during the decade 470-460 BC<sup>1</sup>.

These metopes pose a great problem since they depict all the deeds which appear in the canon of labours compiled by the late mythographers but are not adopted as such in extant literature until these mythographers.<sup>2</sup> They are thus completely

- 
1. Pausanias says the temple was built from the spoils of the destruction of Pisa, which was destroyed by the Eleans (V 10.2). He is here likely to be referring to a revolt of Pisa c. 472 B.C. over the question of synoecism, since we know from Herodotus (IV 148.4) that various towns were destroyed by the Eleans in his own day. This makes more sense than viewing the incident as referring to the war between the people of Pisa and Elis (Paus. VI 22.4) when Demophon had just been succeeded by Pyrrhus, since Demophon was king in the forty-eighth Olympiad c. 580 (Paus. VI 22.3); on this question see L. Drees, Olympia (London, 1968) 114. The metopes must have been put into place before the roof and, therefore, before the pediments. We know the Spartans hung a dedication on the Eastern pediment in 457 to commemorate their victory at Tanagra (Paus. V 10.4) and the pediment must therefore have been finished by this time. The metopes suit a date between 470 and 460 from their severe style.
  2. Both U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Herakles 60f. and F. Brommer, Herakles, die zwölf Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur (Munich/Cologne, 1953) 53ff. comment on the appearance at Olympia but offer no explanation.

isolated and apparently exert no influence on the subject of all twelve individual labours in either art or literature until the first century BC. The reason for this I shall try to establish in the concluding chapter of this thesis but I must state straight away why I believe the sculptor to have had the twelve labours in mind here and not merely to have chosen a random selection of deeds, which happened to be turned later into the labours. Much effort has been expended in obtaining twelve metopes since they are placed above the inner colonnade, an unprecedented place for metopes at this time<sup>1</sup>. The normal scheme of placing two metopes at each intercolumniation has been adhered to, giving twelve in all; had they been placed in the normal position above the outer colonnade fourteen metopes at each end would have been made.

The apparant contrivance in producing twelve metopes, together with the fact that they depict the twelve labours formed by the late mythographers into the canon strongly suggests that the sculptor at Olympia was aiming at a depiction of the labours and this seems made certain by a fragment of Pindar<sup>2</sup> which apparently gives the number twelve. It cannot be dated in relationship to the metopes but even if it is later and was influenced by them this would point to an existing tradition

- 
1. One may compare the later frieze of the Parthenon and metopes of the Hephaesteum.
  2. Oxyrhyncus Papyri no. 2450, ed. E. Lobel. See also C. Pavese, 'The New Heracles Poem of Pindar', Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 72 (1967) 47-88. Verse 43ff. reads as follows:

τοῦτ' ἄρ[α δωδ]έκατο[ν  
 Ἔρας ἐφεσμάτις Σθενέλοιο δ' μιν  
 διὸς κέ[λ]ευσε<ν> μόνον  
 ἄνευ συ[μμ]αχίας ἔμεν

Lobel's conjecture δωδέκατον seems convincing.

that the metopes did depict the twelve labours rather than a random selection of deeds. It thus seems likely that the notion of twelve labours dates at least to the 460's BC<sup>1</sup>.

The grouping together of a number of deeds of Heracles in both art and literature was fairly common before and after the Olympia metopes, but it cannot be said whether they were intended to depict labours or a random selection of deeds since none have exactly the same contents as the metopes or, therefore, as the accounts of the labours by the late mythographers. The lost chest of Cypselus<sup>2</sup> and the throne of Bathycles<sup>3</sup> displayed the earliest groupings and the metopes at Paestum<sup>4</sup> and on the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi<sup>5</sup> also predate the Olympia metopes. In literature, Herakleia were written by both Pisander<sup>6</sup> and Pherecydes<sup>7</sup> incorporating many of the deeds which

- 
1. I cannot agree with Brommer, Her. 6lf. that there is no evidence that the concept of twelve labours existed before Hellenistic times.
  2. Paus. V 17.9-19.9. Heracles was here pictured with a flute-player, the hydra (two metopes), Atlas, Geryon, and the centaurs. For an illustration see K. Schefold, Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art (London, 1966) 72-3 fig. 26.
  3. Paus. III 18.10-16. Heracles was here pictured with Cycnus, centaurs, Thourius, Diomedes, Nessus, hydra, Cerberus, Geryon, Actorione, lion, Orius, Achelous and on his way to Olympus.
  4. Heraion alla Foce del Sele II ed. P. Zancani-Montuoro and U. Zanotti-Bianco (Rome, 1954) pll. 53-60, 69-71, 64-65, 76, 75, 89, 72-73, 66-68, 74 showing Heracles with centaurs, Cercopes, Nessus, tripod, lion, hydra, boar, Eurytion and possibly Antaëus.
  5. B.C.H. 47 (1923) pll. 16-18. Heracles is here depicted with Geryon (6 metopes), lion, hind, Cycnus, hydra, mares, Amazons, tripod (3 metopes), Diomedes.
  6. G. Kinkel, Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (Leipzig, 1877) fragments 1-11. See note (1) below, page 27
  7. F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Berlin 1923-58) 3<sup>F</sup> 68-84. He regarded the Hesperides as a labour, saying Heracles took the apples to Eurystheus. See page 259.

were later canonised as labours but one cannot know whether they intended them as labours and gave them a definite number, although this is possible, especially in view of the inscription<sup>1</sup> which states that the former described *χῶσους ἐξεπόνασεν ... ἄεθλους*. After the construction of the Olympia metopes Herakleia were written by Panyassis<sup>2</sup> and Rhianus<sup>3</sup> among others, but little is preserved. It seems certain, however, that Sophocles<sup>4</sup> and Euripides<sup>5</sup> actually intended to list some or all of the labours, from other contexts<sup>6</sup> clearly the meaning of *μόχθοι*. Sophocles only gives six but there seems general emphasis on the number twelve in the Trachinae<sup>7</sup>, it being said that 'in the twelfth month of the twelfth year Heracles will complete his labours'. Euripides does list twelve but does not emphasise the number<sup>8</sup>. In art after Olympia various deeds occur together on the Hephaesteum in Athens<sup>9</sup> and the Heracleum in Thebes<sup>10</sup>, the former comprising all but three of the later canon of labours with no additions, the latter omitting two

- 
1. See G.L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis (London 1969) 101 quoting Theocritus, Idyll 22. He may have named the lion as a labour. See pages 35 & 38f.
  2. F 1 - 26 K
  3. F.G.H. 265 F 49-54
  4. Trachinae 1091ff.
  5. Hercules Furens 355ff.
  6. Cf. Soph. op. cit. 1170 ... *μόχθων τῶν ἐφεστώτων ἐμοὶ / λύσιν τελεῖσθαι* ... Eur. op. cit. 830: *ἐπεὶ δὲ μόχθους διεσπέρσ' Εὐρυσθέως*.
  7. vv. 824ff.
  8. He lists lion, centaurs, hind, mares, Cycnus, Hesperides, pirates, Atlas, Amazons, hydra, Geryon and Cerberus.
  9. B. Sauer, Das Sogennante Theseion (Leipzig, 1899) pl. vi.
  10. Paus. IX 11.4: *τὰ πολλὰ τῶν δῶδεκα καλουμένων ἄθλων*.

of the later canon and making one addition; this would mean that just eleven were shown but it should be remembered that Pausanias only manages to list eleven of the twelve Olympia metopes<sup>1</sup>.

It can be seen that there is much variation in the subjects chosen in the various groupings, and, indeed, they may not be intended to refer to any more than deeds. It is surprising that the Hephaestum and Heracleum do not differ drastically from the contents of the Olympia metopes<sup>2</sup> and it is possible that they were influenced thereby but omitted those myths that were mainly local to the area of Olympia.<sup>3</sup> Certainly the evidence for the notion of twelve labours being in existence by the fifth century seems convincing, especially that of the Olympia metopes and the probable Pindar reference, which are backed up by the passages of Sophocles and Euripides.

As regards the concept of the labours, a similar idea can be found in the Bellerophon myth, since he is set tasks by the king of Lycia, Iobates; these consist of killing the Chimaera, fighting the Solymi, and the Amazons, and warding off an ambush from the bravest of the Lycians<sup>4</sup>. For successfully accomplishing these he is eventually rewarded with Iobates' kingdom. However, there are various differences from the labours of Heracles since Bellerophon's acts are not

---

1. See page 7, note (3).

2. In each case Augeas and birds are omitted. The Hephaestum also omits the bull and the Heracleum adds Antaeus.

3. See pages 114f. and 224 and chapters on birds and Augeas passim.

4. Homer Il. 6.156ff.

referred to as ἄθλοι and they are imposed as a punishment for the crime of murder<sup>1</sup> instead of the death demanded by Proetus. However, it is interesting that the notion of these deeds of Bellerophon are as early as the Iliad<sup>2</sup> and taken together with the labours of Heracles could point to a Mycenaean interest in a hero performing deeds for another, perhaps inspired by the allegiance apparently owed by important chiefs to the main ruler.<sup>3</sup>

However, I feel that there is more than this to the concept of the labours. As has been said<sup>4</sup>, the word ἄθλος implies toil for a reward and in this case the reward was immortality. Hesiod<sup>5</sup> specifically states that after the labours Heracles married Hebe<sup>6</sup> and dwelt among the Immortals ἀκήματος and ἀγήραος and in a fragment of pseudo-Hesiod<sup>7</sup> he is specifically described as θεός and ἀθάνατος. In the Odyssey<sup>8</sup> there remains a twofold tradition regarding what happened to Heracles after 'death', since Odysseus is said to meet his shade in Hades while the real Heracles lives among the gods, married to Hebe. The idea of Heracles gaining

- 
1. Heracles' labours were imposed before not after the murder of his children. See page 33 and note (2).
  2. See note (2) above (page 28)
  3. See Hom. Il. passim.
  4. See page 23
  5. Theogony, 950ff.
  6. For his marriage to Hebe cf. Hom. Od. XI 603f.; Pindar, Nemean i 71; Eur. Orestes 1685f.
  7. Fragmenta Hesiodica ed. R. Merkelbach and M.L. West (Oxford, 1967) 25.26.
  8. XI 601ff. D. Page in The Homeric Odyssey (Oxford, 1955) 25f. regards this twofold tradition as evidence of interpolation at this point but I feel my interpretation on page 33 shows that this need not be so.

immortality after the labours is often stated<sup>1</sup> and it is also said that he is married to Hebe with Hera's permission<sup>2</sup>, her jealousy having subsided.

There is thus a good deal of evidence that the labours were imposed as a means for Heracles to gain immortality and this is very important as echoing earlier oriental stories in which the quest of man for immortality was a very important theme. An obvious example is the Akkadian version of the Gilgamesh Epic in which after the death of his friend Enkidu the hero begins to think about his own death and how he can avoid it. Since his only ancestor to have escaped death is Utnapishtim, the sole survivor of the flood, Gilgamesh goes in search of him and on finding him after many adventures is told the whereabouts of the 'plant of life'. However, this is stolen from him by a snake and the epic ends with his death.

There are, in any case, general similarities between the Gilgamesh<sup>3</sup> and Heracles myths. Both are helped by a close companion, Enkidu and Iolaus, both kill a giant, Humbaba<sup>4</sup> and Antaeus<sup>5</sup>, both fight bulls, the bull of Heaven<sup>6</sup> and the

---

1. cf Hom. Hymn XV 4ff.; Theocritus, Idyll XXIV 82ff.; Diodorus Siculus, IV 9.5; Apollodorus, Library, II 4.12.

2. See reference in note (7) above (page 29).

3. See, N.K. Sandars, The Epic of Gilgamesh (Middlesex, 1960)

4. Sandars, op. cit. 69f.

5. He is connected with both the Hesperides and Geryon labours. See pages 259, 262, 293, & 295.

6. Sandars, op. cit. 85f.

Cretan bull<sup>1</sup>, and both fight lions, Gilgamesh several<sup>2</sup> and Heracles the Nemean lion<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, both are endangered by a woman; both Ishtar<sup>4</sup> and Deianeira<sup>5</sup> are moved to act out of feelings of spurned love, although the former tries to bring death and fails, while the latter tries to bring back love but unintentionally causes death. Moreover, Ishtar also performs a similar function to Hera since both play the role of the malevolent goddess. Both heroes have one mortal and one immortal parent<sup>6</sup>. Both wear a lionskin, Gilgamesh after the death of Enkidu<sup>7</sup>, Heracles after the slaying of the Nemean lion<sup>8</sup>. Both are strong men, the former being described as 'strong as a savage bull'<sup>9</sup> and 'strong as a star from heaven'<sup>10</sup>.

The Gilgamesh and flood stories also appear in the earlier Sumerian mythology but without the underlying theme of immortality<sup>11</sup>. The Babylonians' preoccupation with this theme indicates that they regarded their gods as jealously keeping immortality for themselves, it being stressed that the

- 
1. See pages 116ff.
  2. Sandars, op. cit. 94
  3. See pages 35ff.
  4. Sandars, op. cit. 83ff.
  5. Soph. Tr. passim
  6. Sandars, op. cit. 60 and 64. The goddess Ninsun was Gilgamesh' mother.
  7. *ibid* 91
  8. See pages 35ff
  9. Sandars op. cit. 60
  10. *ibid*, 61
  11. See S.H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology (Middlesex, 1963) 30-32, 36-38, 46.

only mortal ever to win it was Utnapishtim and that Gilgamesh lost his chance of it. The theme of the quest for immortality is found in other Akkadian myths including that of Adapa<sup>1,2</sup>.

There are certainly references to Heracles gaining immortality early on and it is specifically linked with the completion of the labours. Moreover, he performs various acts in which he conquers death, in figurative terms, as when he descends to the Underworld and reappears with Cerberus<sup>3</sup>, the earliest Greek account of a mortal actually performing this feat; this recalls the Akkadian Tammuz myth<sup>4</sup>, the difference being that both Tammuz and Ishtar, who came down to rescue him, were already immortal. Moreover, Heracles is represented as wounding Hades<sup>5</sup>. Later the pyre of Oite becomes connected with his death<sup>6</sup> and immortality<sup>7</sup> and this has obvious connections with the Phoenix<sup>8</sup> rising from the flames and also Melcarth<sup>9</sup>, who was regarded as the Phoenician equivalent to Heracles, was burnt on a pyre.

---

1. *ibid.* 56-58.

2. For a general study of the influence of oriental myth on Greek epic see P. Walcot, Hesiod and the Near East (Cardiff, 1966)

3. See pages 225ff

4. Hooke, *op. cit.* 39-41

5. See pages 237ff

6. Soph. Tr. 1191ff. Sophocles does not link the pyre with immortality.

7. Eur. Heracl. 910ff; Theoc. Id. XXIV 82f.

8. She regained her youth in the fire and Dionysius (XL 394-8) compares her with Heracles. This may well be a late tradition about the Phoenix since it does not occur until Ovid (Metamorphoses XV 392-407) in this version.

9. See R.P. de Vaux, 'Les Prophètes de Baal sur Mont Carmel', Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth 5 (1941). Coins of Tarsus are shown depicting Melcarth, who had connections with Heracles in that both were burnt on the pyre and both wore lionskins.

I feel that the Odyssey passage reflects a current belief in Heracles gaining immortality, although it has not yet been finalised into the main version of what happens to him after death. Possibly the notion of a mortal actually gaining immortality was so unusual that at first it was difficult to rid it of the tradition that mortals went to Hades after death; this would explain the two traditions about where the dead Heracles was to be found. The 'traditional' account seems to be found in the Iliad<sup>1</sup> where it is stated that not even Heracles escaped death, although he was loved by Zeus.

Certainly the imposition of the labours requires some such explanation since Heracles, unlike Bellerophon, does not incur them through any fault of his own. Admittedly he kills his children but this is stressed as happening after the performance of the labours<sup>2</sup>. Certainly he did not undertake the labours of his own volition and the difference between the Gilgamesh and Heracles myths seems to be that the former made the quest for immortality his main preoccupation whereas Heracles' gaining of it was a reward for performing the labours. The nature of a reward demands that it be given by another: in this case Zeus is likely to have been the giver. Diodorus<sup>3</sup> specifically says that Zeus had promised Hera that a child born first on a certain day should be king of Argos, but that when she tricked him by delaying the birth of Heracles he agreed that he should perform twelve labours for

---

1. 18.117f.

2. Eur. H.F. passim; Diod. (IV 11.1-2) says this happened when he was depressed at the imposition of the labours.  
See page 29

3. IV 9.4-5

Eurystheus and then become immortal. Apollodorus<sup>1</sup> says that the Delphic oracle sent Heracles to serve Eurystheus after which he became immortal. Nowhere is it stated that Hera imposed the labours, as might be expected, although she sometimes provides creatures for him to fight.<sup>2</sup> The only evidence we have attributes their imposition to Zeus and this would be a very uncharacteristic thing for a father to do were it not for the reward at their completion, which seems to have been immortality, a theme no doubt inspired by earlier Eastern stories, notably those from Babylon.

Consider (P. 1. 1)

1. II 4.12
2. lion, hydra.

Alexandria (Ptolemy)

Helici (Ptolemy)

Page (Harvard, 1962) 229

Pausanias (Fr. 278)

P. 1. 1

Consider (Ptolemy)

47):

1. It may well be that A. P. ...  
 2. mention A. ...  
 3. See page 147.

CHAPTER TWO: THE NEMEAN LION

This labour was fairly early defined as the first. It was set in the Northern Peloponnese and together with the second labour, the hydra, set in a neighbouring locality, provided Heracles with valuable weapons for carrying out the rest of the labours. It was a popular myth and perhaps derived from the East.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

- Hesiod (Th. 326ff.): The Nemean lion was the child of Echidna<sup>1</sup> and Orthus; it was nurtured by Hera and caused havoc around Nemea until it was killed by Heracles.
- Pisander (F 1 K): It seems likely that Pisander regarded this as the first labour and described Heracles as killing the lion without a weapon. He also seems to have been the first to dress Heracles in the lionskin and give him the club<sup>2</sup>.
- Stesichorus (Poetae Melici Graeci ed. D.L. to give Heracles club, lionskin and bow. Page (Oxford, 1962) 229) Stesichorus is also claimed as the first to give Heracles club, lionskin and bow.
- Pseudo-Hesiod (Fr. 250 Telamon requested Heracles to put on M.W.): the skin and vaunt himself.
- Pindar (Isthmian VI 47): Heracles killed the Nemean lion as the first of his labours.

---

1. It may well be that ἡ δ' ἄρα refers to the Chimaera, recently mentioned, rather than to Echidna. See M.L. West's edition of Hesiod, Theogony (Oxford, 1966) note on v. 326.

2. See pages 38ff.

- Bacchylides (IX 4 ff.): Hera troubled Nemea for a long time with a lion which was killed by Heracles as the first of his labours.
- (XIII 46ff.): Heracles' sword could not penetrate the body of the lion but bent in the effort; Heracles overcame the beast with his bare hands.
- Sophocles (Tr. 1091f.): The Nemean lion is mentioned among the μόχθοι.
- Euripides (H.F. 153f.): Lycus tries to discredit Heracles by saying that he actually caught the lion in a trap whereas he claimed to have strangled it with his bare hands.
- (H.F. 359ff.): Heracles killed the Nemean lion and wore its skin, with the jaws around his head.
- Panyassis (F 1 and 2 K): Panyassis seems to have recorded the myth of the lion and perhaps described Heracles wearing the skin.<sup>1</sup>
- Pseudo-Theocritus (XXV 204ff.): Eurystheus made the slaying of the lion the first labour. Heracles met it by its lair and first tried shooting it with arrows but they would not penetrate the skin. He then opposed his cloak, draped over his bunched arrows, and clubbed the lion. His club broke in half but the lion was stunned and

---

1. See V.J. Matthews, The Poetical remains of Panyassis of Halikarnassos (Belfast, 1968) 46f. The two fragments are as follows: F1. δέρμα τε θήρειον Βεμβινήταο λέοντος ...  
F2. καὶ Βεμβινήταο πελώρου δέρμα λέοντος.

Heracles was able to strangle it. The skin could not be cut with wood, stone or iron and so he removed it with the lion's own claws and wore the skin for protection.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 11, 3 & 4): The first labour was to kill the Nemean lion which was huge and could not be wounded by iron, bronze or stone, but only by the human hand. Heracles lured it into its lair, and strangled it, and wore the skin for protection against the other labours.

Apollodorus (II V 1): It was the first labour to bring back the skin of the Nemean lion. First Heracles tried to shoot it but it was invulnerable; he pursued it with his club but it hid in a cave. Heracles blocked up one entrance and entered through the other. He strangled the lion and took it to Mycenae. Eurystheus was amazed and refused to allow him to bring his spoils into the city, telling him to leave them at the gate. Eurystheus obtained a bronze jar to hide in and sent his orders to Heracles by means of Copreus.

Hyginus (Fabulae XXX 2): Heracles killed the Nemean lion, nurtured by Hera, and kept the skin for protection.<sup>1</sup>

From the literary evidence, the myth of the Nemean lion apparently dates to the eighth century although it must be said that the editor of the Oxford text<sup>2</sup> of Hesiod regards his mention of the lion as spurious. It will be necessary to examine the artistic evidence for appearances of the myth in eighth-century art since these might suggest the Hesiod reference to be genuine<sup>3</sup>. Certainly the basic elements of this myth are present in Hesiod, namely the connection of the lion with Hera and its death at the hands of Heracles, while characteristically of early mythical accounts little detail is given as to how it was killed.

The myth was definitely in existence in the middle of the seventh century BC but comment must be made on the references to Pisander since it is not completely certain what his version contained. If he did state it to be the first labour this is the earliest example of the numbering of an individual labour and the trend is not followed in extant literature until the

---

1. A late papyrus, contemporary with the record of the cure by Sarapis (See D.L. Page, Greek Literary Papyri (London, 1942) no. 96), talks of Heracles strangling the lion but adds no new information. See D.L. Page 'P. Oxy 2331 and others' Classical Review NS 7 (1957) 189ff. The date is third century A.D.

2. Friedrich Solmsen (Oxford, 1970)

3. M.L. West, Hesiod, Theogony (Oxford, 1966) does not place these lines in square brackets.

fifth century. The reference in Pseudo-Eratosthenes<sup>1</sup> merely describes τινεσ as referring to it as the first labour, while Pisander is credited with describing Heracles wearing its skin and killing it in Nemea. The Germanicus scholiast in rather strange language describes the lion as placed in the sky ob primos labores. Hyginus<sup>2</sup> describes it as the first labour and as killed by Heracles unarmed; however, when he writes de hoc it is not clear whether hoc is neuter referring to the whole of the previous sentence and means that Pisander and others made it the first labour and described it as killed with bare hands or whether hoc is masculine and merely refers to them writing about the lion, without specifying the details. It is thus necessary to say that while Pisander definitely made Heracles kill the lion and wear the skin<sup>3</sup>, as is clear from the Pseudo-Eratosthenes<sup>4</sup> reference, he may well not have

- 
1. τινεσ δέ φασιν ὅτι Ἡρακλέους πρῶτος ἄθλος ἦν εἰς τὸ μνημονευθῆναι. φιλοδοξῶν γὰρ μόνον τοῦτον οὐχ ὄπλοις ἀνεῖλεν ἀλλὰ συμπλακεῖς ἀπέπνιξε. λέγει δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ Πείσανδρος ὁ Ῥόδιος, ὅτι καὶ τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ ἔσχεν, ὡς ἔνδοξον πεποιηκώς. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐν τῇ Νεμέᾳ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φονεύθεισ.
  2. *Astronomica* II 24 p. 66 ed. B. Bunte (Leipzig, 1875). *Nonnulli etiam hoc amplius dicunt, quod Herculis prima fuerit haec certatio, et quod eum inermis interfecerit. De hoc et Pisandrus et complures alii scripserunt*'.
  3. The first surviving representation of Heracles wearing the lionskin occurs on a Melian amphora (Ath. NM 354, F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur Griechischen Heldensage* (Marburg/Lahn, 1973); Scheffold, *op. cit.* pl. 57c) and the next on a Chiot fragment (Ath. Acr 435, B. Graef and E. Langlotz, *Die Antiker Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen* (Berlin, 1925-33) pl. 24, 450a). These vases are close in date to Pisander who was an islander - these vases come from the islands.
  4. See ~~page xxx~~ note (1).

described him killing it with his bare hands or performing it as the first of his labours. There must also be doubt as to whether Pisander was the first to make Heracles wear the lion-skin since Strabo attributes this to τῶν τὴν Ἡράκλειαν ποιησάντων, εἴτε Πείσανδρος ἢν εἴτ' ἄλλος τις although his claim may be strengthened by the fact that elsewhere Strabo refers to Pisander as ὁ τὴν Ἡράκλειαν γράψας ποιητῆς Ῥόδιος<sup>1</sup>. At any rate it would seem that Stesichorus' claim to have been the first to deck out Heracles in this way is likely to be invalidated. At least one might suppose that Stesichorus described the myth of the lion, although of course no details of such an account can be known.

Certainly by the fifth century the story of the lion being invulnerable as far as weapons were concerned was current, and it may be arguable that the story of Heracles putting on the lionskin - probably as early as Pisander - is proof of an early belief in its invulnerability since this would seem to be the whole point of wearing it. It may, therefore, be true that Pisander described the lion as needing to be killed with bare hands. However, the idea of skinning it with its own claws is likely to be a later refinement, as also the sequence of weapons used in preliminary attempts to kill it, given by Apollodorus and Pseudo-Theocritus, who apparently follow the same source. This is not to say that there was not early on a fixed tradition of weapons being used, as suggested by the artistic evidence, but only that the stereotyping of it was late. Certainly the use of the cloak, as described by Pseudo-Theocritus, seems attested earlier in art<sup>2</sup>, although

---

1. See F 1 K. n.1.

2. See pages 67ff.

the detail of the bunched arrows is not certainly found, and also the lion's lair<sup>1</sup> is sometimes depicted. These will be examined in the next section.

This myth well accords with the spirit of the labours, being both an act of benefaction if the Hesiod reference is genuine and one of great heroism since Heracles accomplishes an apparently impossible act at great personal risk. Certainly the cowardice of Eurystheus, suggested by Apollodorus' account, enhances the heroism of Heracles, and this pithos motif is also found in connection with the boar<sup>2</sup> and Cerberus<sup>3</sup> myths. The reference to Copreus can be traced back to Homer<sup>4</sup> where he is also made to convey the orders of the cowardly Eurystheus. It cannot with certainty be stated that this was regarded as a labour until the fifth century, the first specific source to make it so being Pindar in an ode that dates to c. 480BC<sup>5</sup> and which also states it to be the first labour, although it is possible that Pisander c. 650 made it the first labour and that other labours were assigned a number earlier than is recorded in extant literature. It might well be that since Heracles received from this myth his traditional dress it was easy to regard it as the first of the labours, and therefore it was given a number long before the others, perhaps together with the hydra which formed the traditional second

---

1. See page 70

2. See pages 352ff.

3. See page 251

4. Hom. Il. 15, 639f.

5. U. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Pindaros (Berlin, 1922) 181

labour. It is, at any rate, noteworthy that these are the only two labours whose numbers never vary.

Finally in this section I shall make brief mention of another Greek myth involving the slaying of a lion, namely that of Alcahous and the lion of Cithaeron. He was son of Pelops and Hippodameia, and the myth about him seems to be a fairly early one, since apparently Hesiod<sup>1</sup> wrote about him, although the details are not known. The Eoiae<sup>2</sup> by pseudo-Hesiod apparently gave his lineage but no details about his contest with the lion occur until Dieuchidas<sup>3</sup> (4th century BC) who says that he went from Mycenae into exile to escape punishment for the murder of Chrysippus and met a lion which was damaging the area around Megara and overcame it. Pausanias<sup>4</sup> records the place where Alcahous killed the lion as Cithaeron.

It is possible that this lion myth was influenced by that of Heracles since there is no evidence for its appearance early on, although admittedly Hesiod could have recorded this story but the details be lost. It may be that if, on examining the artistic evidence, any doubtful representations of Heracles and the lion occur they should be ascribed to Alcahous, and this will be borne in mind in the second section of this chapter<sup>5</sup>.

It is interesting that this myth was included in the Heracles saga, perhaps initially out of confusion with that of

---

1. M.W. Fragment 259a

2. *ibid.* frag. 11, 3ff: ]εγείνα[τ  
, Αλ]κάθορον τ[ε  
, Ἴπποδά[μα  
τα\_τος δὲ Πυλ[...

3. F.G.H. 485 F 10

4. I. 41. 4

5. See pages 67 & 72.

the Nemean lion. By the time of Apollodorus<sup>1</sup>, in whom it makes its first appearance in surviving literature linked with Heracles, it has been turned into a feat which Heracles carries out in his early youth.

#### B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

Certainly lions were a popular theme in Greek art, appearing as early as the Mycenaean inlaid daggers<sup>2</sup> of the fifteenth/sixteenth century BC, which depict hunting scenes. In Geometric art they are found on gold bands<sup>3</sup>, Cretan bronze shields<sup>4</sup>, Boeotian fibulae<sup>5</sup> and Attic vases<sup>6</sup>. These early scenes appear unconnected with any particular event or story, depicting either hunting scenes or groups of men actually fighting lions; they are thus unconnected with Heracles and the Nemean lion but might well have provided inspiration for such a myth.

It is known that there were mountain lions in Greece at the time of Xerxes<sup>7</sup> and so the Greeks apparently had first-hand

---

1. II iv 9-10

2. S. Marinatos & M. Hirmer, Crete and Mycenae (1960) pl. XXXV-XXXVII

3. eg. Ath. NM 2601 and London, BM 1219. See D. Ohly, Griechische Goldbleche der VIII Jahrhundert v. Chr. (Berlin, 1953) fig. 9, pl. V & fig. 10, pl V.

4. eg. Heracleum Mus. Inv. no 7. See E. Kunze, Kretische Bronzereliefs (Stuttgart, 1931) no. 6, pl. 10-20 and Beilage I.

5. eg. Athens NM 3697. See R. Hampe, Frühe griechische Sagenbilder in Böotien (Athens, 1936) pl.9

6. Athens NM 14.475. See B. Schweitzer, Greek Geometric Art (London, 1971) pl. 70; Copenhagen NM 727, *ibid.* pl. 69.

7. Herodotus, VII 125-6.

knowledge of them. However, inspiration for artistic renderings of lions certainly is likely to have come from the East, especially as in the Geometric period, when many lion scenes appear, trade communications between East and West were opening up again at trading stations such as Al Mina.

There are numerous examples of Oriental renderings of lions. A Gerzean tomb at Hierankopolis contained a wall-painting<sup>1</sup>, dating to the late Predynastic period of Egypt, which shows a man standing with his hands on the necks of two lions which rest their front paws on his waist. He is unarmed and the grouping looks rather 'heraldic'. A similar group can be seen on an ivory knife from Gebel<sup>2</sup> belonging to the same period. These scenes appear to be forerunners of the Cretan renderings of the "Mistress" and "Master of the animals." On a stele from Uruk<sup>3</sup> dating to the second quarter of the fourth millenium BC is an Early Sumerian rendering of a man plunging his spear into the chest of a lion standing on its hind legs; underneath, another man aims an arrow at the lion's head. A seal of the fourth to third millenium<sup>4</sup> depicts a "goat-man" between two lions, which stand heraldically on their hind legs. A Middle Assyrian seal<sup>5</sup> shows a kneeling man lifting a lion over his head in sign of triumph. North Syrian work<sup>6</sup> of the eighth/seventh century

- 
1. C .Aldred, *Egypt to the end of the old Kingdom* (London, [1965]) 33, fig. 21.
  2. *Ibid.* 35, fig. 23.
  3. E. Strommenger and M. Hirmer, *Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien* (Munich, 1962) pl. 18.
  4. Strommenger & Hirmer, *op. cit.* pl. 42.
  5. *Ibid.* pl. 186.
  6. Schweitzer, *op. cit.* pl. 71.

BC in the form of two identical statue bases in Sendshirli and Carchemish depicts a grouping very similar to that on the Attic Geometric cup from Anavysos<sup>1</sup>.

It can thus be seen very clearly that there was an abundance of oriental tradition of the drawing of lions in Greek art. Moreover there were oriental myths of men fighting lions, as those of Gilgamesh and Samson, which possibly acted as an inspiration for the myth of Heracles fighting a lion. These traditions probably persisted to the eighth century and were then adopted by the Greeks in their closer contact with the East.

I shall now turn to actual representations of Heracles and the Nemean lion. It will be found that these fall roughly into two divisions<sup>2</sup>: those depicting the use of weapons and those depicting Heracles killing the lion with his bare hands, the former perhaps beginning earlier than the latter. Inside these two groups smaller divisions are possible according to the weapon used and the pose adopted.

#### I. THE USE OF WEAPONS

Nowhere in the literary evidence is Heracles described as killing the lion with a weapon, although at least from the time of Bacchylides, he was thought to have made preliminary attempts with weapons before being forced to use his bare hands. It is, therefore, possible that when a weapon is drawn in art

---

1. (NM 14.475). See page 43, note 6

2. I shall necessarily cut across Brommer's divisions. All his group A: a show Heracles wrestling with the lion and I shall not list any of these. However, a few from his group A: b show him using weapons and these I shall place under the appropriate categories in my lists. I shall divide the vases of his other lists according to the portrayal of weapons or unarmed combat.

Heracles is thought of as engaged in a preliminary attempt to kill the beast. However, there are some occasions when he is shown actually plunging his sword into the lion<sup>1</sup>, and obviously succeeding in killing it. The traditional invulnerability of the skin has thus been ignored. Various interpretations of this are possible: since these representations antedate Bacchylides they may show an earlier version in which the lion's skin was not regarded as invulnerable, although this would lend less point to the early tradition that Heracles wore the skin, perhaps even early on described as invulnerable by Pisander; the most likely answer seems to be, however, that artists were not concerned with giving an accurate rendering of a myth, often lacking a precise knowledge of mythology, and that here they have forgotten or never known the tradition that the skin was invulnerable.

Four weapons are given to Heracles by artists for performing this task: spear, sword, club and bow, although appearances of the first are not certainly connected with this myth. I shall now list the representations of each in chronological order, according to their earliest appearance.

#### a) Use of the Spear

This weapon is mainly confined to Geometric and it must be admitted straight away that it is not certain whether the pieces dating to this time are, in fact, representations of our myth. This being the case, I shall examine each in detail.

1. London BM 3204, Boeotian fibula<sup>2</sup>.
2. Athens NM 256, tall pyxis, Boeotian Geometric<sup>3</sup>.

---

1. See pages 48ff.

2. Hampe, *op. cit.* pl. 1.

3. *Ibid.* pl. 24, V8

3. Athens, Kerameikos 407 (4923), stand, Attic Geometric<sup>1</sup>.
4. From Phanai in Chios, fragment, Attic Geometric<sup>2</sup>.
5. Kotyle-fragment, Corinthian<sup>3</sup>.

The Geometric pieces date roughly to the last quarter of the eighth century BC. The Boeotian pieces depict a naked male pointing a long spear at a large lion with gaping mouth. On the Attic stand, however, the man is helmeted and fights the lion with sword as well as spear. The fragment from Phanai (4) again depicts a helmeted man; he has a sword at his waist and opposes his shield to the lion. Identification of subject-matter is also tentative as regards the only piece outside the Geometric period (5). A lion with bared teeth faces a man who raises a spear but there is difficulty in identifying the long object above the spear; since only a fragment survives it is possible that a general lion hunt was originally depicted.

It is thus obvious that the identification of Heracles and the Nemean lion here can only be a suggestion and it is possible that the spear was never a weapon given to Heracles in his fight with the lion. However, one must observe that Heracles

- 
1. K. Kübler, Kerameikos VI (Berlin, 1959-70) pl. 69. Two legs of the stand are preserved.
  2. Annual of the British School at Athens 35 (1934-5) pl. 35, 33.
  3. B.S.A. 43 (1948) 15, fig. 5, no. 29.

was perhaps depicted as a warrior in early art<sup>1</sup> and that the spear would be appropriate to this type of dress. It does seem likely that the Corinthian piece does not represent this myth since one would expect Heracles to be given some identification by this time. The spear of the early examples, as well as being appropriate to a warrior, would also be the fitting equipment of a hunter and there is no way of deciding whether the Geometric pieces are meant to depict an incident from a general hunting scene or a mythological one. Obviously if they did represent Heracles and the lion Hesiod's mention of the lion could be considered likely to be genuine, since the story would be shown to date to the late eighth century.

#### b) Use of the Sword

This is the most common weapon given to Heracles and the representations may begin as early as c. 700 BC; they continue into the fifth century.

1. From Sunium, clay relief<sup>2</sup>.
2. Olympia B 848, shield-band<sup>3</sup>.
3. Olympia B 1654, shield-band<sup>4</sup>.
4. Olympia B 1650, shield-band<sup>5</sup>.
5. New York 40.11 20, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.

- 
1. Athenaeus, 12.512f. This is perhaps the implication of his reference to the guise given to Heracles by Homer, apparently followed by Megaclides. Athenaeus attributed the traditional guise of club, lionskin and bow to Stesichorus, but it probably was invented by Pisander (see page 39); before this it is not certain how Heracles' attire was conceived. There is no actual reference to it in Homer, although he is described as a bowman (*Od.* VIII 224f), and is often described in battle, perhaps suggesting warrior dress.
  2. *Ἐφνημεροίς* 1917, 197 fig. 10.
  3. E. Kunze, *Archaische Schildbänder*, Olympia Forschungen II (Berlin, 1950) 74 pl. 53.
  4. *Ibid.* IV, 8g, pl. 19.
  5. *Ibid.* XXVIII 43y, pl. 53.
  6. Br. 122 Ab 36: *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum* 36 (1941)

6. Munich 1382 (J 645) belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
7. Munich 1397 (J 1079), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
8. Würzburg 245, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
9. Würzburg 247, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
10. Würzburg 248, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
11. Paris, private collection, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
12. London BM B 160, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
13. Rome, Capitoline Museum 47, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
14. Rome, Vatican 348, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
15. Lost, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
16. Richmond, Virginia 62, 17, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.

---

189 figs. 2 & 3; Sir J.D. Beazley, Attic Black-figure Vase-painters (Oxford, 1956) 317.1 ab.

1. Br. 126 Ac 4; Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum I pll. 18, 1. 19, 2; A.B.V. 135, 47
2. Br. 126 Ac 6; CV I pl. 30, 2; A.B.V. 134, 20.
3. Br. 126 Ac 7; K. Langlotz, Griechische Vasen in Würzburg (Munich, 1932) pl. 79.
4. Br. 126 Ac 8; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 67; A.B.V. 134.17.
5. Br. 126 Ac 9; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 80; A.B.V. 134.18.
6. Br. 126 Ac 10; Auction Sale: Monnaies et Médailles S.A. Basle 26 no. 105; Sir J.D. Beazley, Paralipomena (Oxford, 1971) 56, 56 bis.
7. Br. 126 Ac 11; C.V. 3 pl. 28, 1; A.B.V. 134, 15.
8. Br. 126 Ac 13; C.V. I pl. 18, 2; A.B.V. 134, 19.
9. Br. 126 Ac 14; C. Albizzati, Vasi dipinti del Vaticano (Rome, 1925-39) pl. 44; A.B.V. 134, 16
10. Br. 126 Ac 15; F. Inghirami, Vasi Fittili (Fiesole 1833-7) pll. 61-2; A.B.V. 134, 13
11. Br. 126 Ac 17; M.M. Auct. 22 no 127; Par. 56, 42 bis.

17. Toronto 300, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
18. Oxford 1965. 135, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
19. Louvre F 82, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
20. Madrid 10947 (L56), cup, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
21. Hannover 1962, 78, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
22. Louvre E 812, neck-handled amphora, Chalcidian<sup>6</sup>.
23. Naples H 2705 (81103), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
24. Rome, Vatican 355, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
25. Heidelberg 63.9, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
26. Munich 1385 (J 729), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
27. Compiègne 982, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
28. Florence 3778, oinochoe, Pontic<sup>12</sup>.
29. Florence 3779, oinochoe, Pontic<sup>13</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 127 Ac 19; D.M. Robinson and C.G. Harcun, A Catalogue of Greek Vases in the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology (Toronto, 1930) pl. 35; A.B.V. 134, 11.
  2. Br. 127 Ac 21; B.S.A. 32 (1931/2) 7, no 37, fig. 2 and pl. 3; A.B.V. 137, 59.
  3. Br. 127 Ad 5; C.V. 8 pl. 78, 9; A.B.V. 167.
  4. Br. 128 Ad 14; C.V. 1 pl. 1, 1e; A.B.V. 172u.
  5. Br. 121 Ab 2; C.V. 1 pl. 7, 2.
  6. Br. 141 C 1; A. Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen (Berlin & Leipzig, 1927) 162 no. XIV pl. 215.
  7. Br. 120 Ab 32; C.V. 1 pl. 11, 4.
  8. Br. 122 Ab 25 (erroneously numbering the vase 255); Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 46.
  9. Br. 125 Ab 59; C.V. 4 pl. 170.
  10. Br. 126 Ac 5; C.V. 1 pl. 25, 1; A.B.V. 310u.
  11. Br. 126 Ac 20; C.V. Fr. 3. pl. 3, 2; Par. 108, 6.
  12. Br. 141 C 20; Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 85 (1970) 40, fig. 7.
  13. Br. 141 C 21; Jd.I 85 (1970) 40, fig. 8.

30. London BM 1929. 5-13.2, stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
31. Brussels R 297, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
32. Brussels R 290, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
33. Berkeley 8.3339, kekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
34. Naples Stg. 130, kyathos, Attic Black-figure<sup>5</sup>.

It can be seen that this was a composition type particularly common in one school of artists, namely Group E, numbers (7) - (19) being their work, all belly-handled amphorae. Often by this group the sword is shown driven into the lion's mouth - (6), (8), (9), (10), (14), (16), (17), (18) - and it is possible that this was a considered attempt to depict a version of Heracles killing the lion with his sword, which could by-pass the tradition that the hide was invulnerable: the sword in these representations does not pass through the hide. However, in many of the other representations here listed the sword is shown actually passing into it, either ignoring or through ignorance of the tradition of invulnerability. The pieces which show the sword not yet plunged in - (1), (2), (4) and (32) - might be regarded as depicting Heracles' preliminary attempt to kill the lion before he discovered the invulnerability of its skin, but in view of the number of pieces attesting at least an artistic version of him actually killing the lion with the sword, it is likely that this was intended by representations where the sword does not yet transfix the beast as well.

- 
1. Br. 140 B 24; Sir J.D. Beazley, Attic Red-figure Vase-painters (Oxford, 1963) 2nd ed. 287, 26.
  2. Br. 124 Ab 53; C.V. 2 pl. 15, 1 a & b.
  3. Br. 125 Ab 58; C.V. 2 pl. 21, 15 a & b; C.H.E. Haspels, Attic Black-figure Lekythoi (Paris, 1936) 229, 2.
  4. Br. 125 Ab 76; C.V. (California) 1 pl. 27, 4; A.B.V. 464, 10.
  5. Br. 131 Ae 28; C.V. 1 pl. 45, 3; A.B.V. 609, 4.

This group is an early one, apparently beginning c. 700 BC. It is continued in the first half of the sixth century by three shield-bands and after its popularity on the belly-handled amphorae of Group E stops shortly after the beginning of the fifth century.

A brief word must also be said here about two pieces which show the use of the sword but are not certainly representations of this subject:

1. Xanthos, relief from the Lion Tomb<sup>1</sup>.
2. Rome Vatican, Astarita, bowl, Etruscan black-figure<sup>2</sup>.

I cast doubts on the subject matter of (1) in deference to Akurgal<sup>3</sup>, who regards the pose as too 'heraldic' to represent Heracles and the lion but sees it as a continuation of the Eastern tradition of the Eastern hero overcoming wild animals. However, so much of the sculpture from Xanthos reflects Greek influence that I see no reason why that of the lion tomb should not have been intended to depict Heracles and the lion but given a distinctly Eastern colouring. (2) is doubtful because it shows a man with two lions and unless the same lion has been drawn twice for decorative effect - this is the case with Iolaus on a vase depicting the Cretan bull<sup>4</sup> - this cannot represent the Nemean lion.

---

1. E. Akurgal, Griechische Reliefs aus Lykien der VI Jahrhunderts  
(Berlin, 1941) 19 fig. 4.

2. Br. 141 c vgl.

3. See note (1).

4. See page 135, no 4 & 136.

c) Use of the club

This, of course, is Heracles' traditional weapon and as such may be shown regardless of whether it had a justifiable place in a particular myth. This group begins c. 640 and continues until the fifth century, apart from one isolated Hellenistic example. This single appearance in Hellenistic is slightly unusual since the club alone is often given to Heracles in this period in representations of other labours.

1. Syracuse, alabastron, Transitional Corinthian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Moscow, alabastron, Early Corinthian<sup>2</sup>.
3. Athens, Acropolis, plaque<sup>3</sup>.
4. Cambridge G 60, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Louvre F 108, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Tübingen D 25, dinos-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Laon 37976, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Rhodes, amphora, Clazomenaeon<sup>8</sup>.
9. Würzburg 306, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 141 C 11; H. Payne, Necrocorinthia (Oxford, 1931) no. 83
  2. Br. 141 C 12; Payne, op. cit. no. 842a
  3. N.C. 126 & pl. 45.8.
  4. Br. 123 Ab 23; C.V. 1 pl. 18, 1; A.B.V. 172m.
  5. Br. 130 Ae 7; C.V. 4 pl. 34, 4, 8, 12, & 16; A.B.V. 220, 30.
  6. Br. 131 Ae 31; C. Watzinger, Griechische Vasen in Tübingen (Reutlingen, 1924) pl. 10.
  7. Br. 125 Ab 60; C.V. Fr. 20 pl. 14, 7 & 8.
  8. Br. 141 C 4; Clara Rhodos 4, 144 fig. 138.
  9. Br. 128 Ad 20; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 91, 97; A.B.V. 267, 14.

10. Berlin F 1895, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
11. Earlier Rome market, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
12. Robinson collection, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
13. From Orvieto, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
14. Palermo, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
15. Louvre F 46 (Camp.137) hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
16. Louvre F 47, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
17. Tarquinia RC 8307, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
18. Heidelberg white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
19. Syracuse 43. 432, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
20. Bucharest, Magheru, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
21. St. Louis 677 (WU 3279) lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
22. Louvre F 167, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.
23. Athens NM E 876, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>14</sup>.
24. Vienna, Bizot collection, sigillata, Roman-Gallic<sup>15</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 130 Ae 8; E. Gerhard, Etruskische und Kampanische Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1843) pl. 14; A.B.V. 268, 31.
  2. Br. 128 Ad 23; E. Gerhard, Auserlesene Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1840-58) pl. 94; A.B.V. 281, 1m.
  3. Br. 130 Ae 12; C.V. Robinson 1 pl. 36; A.B.V. 277, 12.
  4. Br. 130 Ae 3; Studi Etruschi 30 (1962) pl. 14a.
  5. Br. 130 Ae 4; Jd. I 80 (1965) 99, fig. 22.
  6. Br. 130 Ae 9; C.V. 6 pl. 66, 1.
  7. Br. 130 Ae 10; C.V. 6 pl. 66, 3 & 5; A.B.V. 309, 100
  8. Br. 130 Ae 16; C.V. 1 pl. 8;
  9. Br. 131 Ae 25; A.A. (1916) 178, fig. 9,9a
  10. Br. 131 Ae 26; Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità NS 1 (1925) 194, fig. 23; A.B.L. 230, 12.
  11. Br. 131 Ae 27; C.V. 2 pl. 38, 1, 6 & 7.
  12. Br. 132 Af 4; American Journal of Archaeology 44 (1940) 200 figs. 11-13; A.B.V. 522, 5.
  13. Br. 131 Ae 29; E. Pottier, Vases antiques du Louvre (Paris, 1897-1922) II pl. 76; A.B.V. 614, 4.
  14. Br. 130 Ae 13; A.B.V. 563, 576.
  15. Br. 143 E 21; J. Déchelette, Les Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule romaine (Paris, 1904) II 77, no. 465.

In many of these representations the cloak is also depicted opposed to the lion in the manner of a shield, as described by Theocritus, and these will be considered again later with the aspect of the cloak in mind, the pertinent numbers being (5), (10), (12), (14), (15), (16), (18), (19) and (20). Others depict Heracles using the bow as well as the club: (13), (21) and (22). In most of the examples he brandishes the club but in (7) and (13) he merely has it in his hand, probably just as an attribute. The Hellenistic example deserves special comment since it is the only Hellenistic piece to show the club being used in this labour, the others showing Heracles strangling the lion. Moreover, the representation of this piece shows striking similarity to the type of composition favoured by Hellenistic artists for the hind<sup>1</sup>: Heracles kneels on the back of the lion, with one hand on its mane, and brandishes his club in the air.

I feel it is highly likely that these representations of the use of the club are merely the result of the artists giving to Heracles his traditional weapon rather than to any special tradition. However, it is possible that they are evidence for the earlier existence of the version given by pseudo-Theocritus that Heracles attempted to club it while opposing his cloak<sup>2</sup>, since the depiction of the cloak has been noted here, and also the bow occasionally appears which, according to this source, was used in Heracles' very first attack on the lion.

---

1. See pages 157ff. He does not usually brandish his club at the bull.

2. For further comment on the cloak see pages 67ff.

d) Use of the Bow

This is not a large group and most of the pieces have already been mentioned in connection with the club; the bow is only used on its own in one example, (no. 3 below). The group does not begin until the end of the sixth century and ends in the early years of the fifth century.

1. From Orvieto, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. St. Louis 677 (WU 3279), lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. New York 06.1021.66, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Louvre F 167, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.

It is interesting that in (2) the lion stands at the doorway to its cave with prey beneath its feet. The lair<sup>5</sup> is a detail mentioned by pseudo-Theocritus, Diodorus and Apollodorus.

e) Representations where the identity of the weapon is unclear.

In these pieces the available picture is not at all clear and it cannot be determined whether the weapon used is the club or the sword.

1. Louvre F 107, Nicosthenic neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.

---

1. See page 54, no. 13 and note (4)

2. See page 54, no. 21 and note (12)

3. Br. 129 Ad 29; G.M.A. Richter & M.J. Milne, Shapes and names of Athenian Vases (New York, 1935) fig. 118; A.B.V. 440, 3.

4. See page 54, no. 22 and note (13).

5. For further comment see page 69.

6. Br. 130 Ae 6; C.V. 4 pl. 34, 4 & 7; A.B.V. 321, 39.

2. Villa Giulia 20909, 20911, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
3. Syracuse 24672, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
4. Frankfurt VF B 316, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.

These, then, are the representations of Heracles and the Nemean lion in which a weapon is used, often actually to kill the beast. It has been seen that where the lion is shown killed in this manner the tradition of the invulnerability of the hide is contradicted. As has been argued, although this tradition is not definitely stated until Bacchylides who post-dates most of the representations listed in this section, the idea of Heracles wearing the skin seems to go back as far as Pisander and possibly also the idea of its invulnerability; at any rate this action seems to have had little point unless the skin was invulnerable. In fact, as has already been stated,<sup>4</sup> Heracles' first two labours gave him useful tools for carrying out the rest: an invulnerable shield and poison from the hydra for his arrows. The latter idea dates at least to the end of the seventh century and it does seem likely that the skin was regarded as invulnerable by this time as well. However, it is stated in pseudo-Hesiod that Heracles put on the lionskin and vaunted himself and it is perhaps possible that the wearing of the skin could be regarded in early days as a sign of achievement without emphasis on the idea of invulnerability.

However, considering the lack of mythological accuracy usually displayed by artists I favour the theory that where Heracles is shown killing the lion with a weapon and probably

---

1. Br. 131 Ae 22; Monumenti Antichi 42 (1955) 302, fig. 54.  
 2. Br. 131 Ae 23; Mon. Ant. 17 (1906) 282, fig. 209; Par. 87, 25.  
 3. Br. 131 Ae 30; C.V. 2 pl. 51, 5 & 6.  
 4. See page 35.

also when he simply brandishes one at it, the artist was giving his own version of the killing, without concern for the contradiction of the actual literary account thereby made.

## II HERACLES KILLING THE LION WITH HIS BARE HANDS

This section can mainly be divided into two groups, according to whether Heracles and lion are in standing pose, the lion being strangled in the crook of Heracles' arm, or whether they are lying down in wrestling pose, as will be seen to be popular also for the Erymanthian boar<sup>1</sup> and especially for the Cretan bull<sup>2</sup>.

Brommer's group A:a is confined to examples of the latter but there are other representations to be added from other sections of his Vasenlisten. His group A:b contains mostly examples of the strangling motif but I have already listed a few examples therefrom which show the use of weapons. I shall in this section again list examples from other sections of Brommer for these motives and also from media other than vase-painting.

It is noteworthy that the strangling motif enjoys an earlier and longer tradition than the wrestling one, beginning c. 625 BC and continuing until Hellenistic times where it is the most popular, and almost the only, composition-type employed. However, it is only rendered once in Attic Red-Figure: in this medium the wrestling motif is predominant.

### a) Strangling.

As has already been stated, this motif is characterised by the strangling of the lion in the crook of Heracles' arm as he stands or occasionally kneels. There are many examples of this and the fact of its existence in the last quarter of the seventh

---

1. See pages 344ff.

2. See pages 129ff.

century suggests that the tradition of the hide's invulnerability was also in existence at this time. I shall not list any of Brommer's group A:b: I have already listed those which show the use of weapons and the rest may be considered to depict Heracles strangling the lion.

1. Olympia B 1911, shield-band<sup>1</sup>.
2. Olympia B 1921, shield-band<sup>2</sup>.
3. Olympia B 969, shield-band<sup>3</sup>.
4. Olympia B 1888, shield-band<sup>4</sup>.
5. Olympia B 1010, shield-band<sup>5</sup>.
6. From Noicaturro, plaque<sup>6</sup>.
7. Olympia B 972, shield-band<sup>7</sup>.
8. Perachora, cup, Corinthian<sup>8</sup>.
9. Olympia B 1555, shield-band<sup>9</sup>.
10. New York, Metropolitan Mus. & Fogg Mus. resp. From Etruria, two bronze tripods<sup>10</sup>.
11. Brussels R 289, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure.

- 
1. Kunze, op. cit. XIV; 24d, pl. 39.
  2. Ibid. XIII, 22d pl. 36 & 37.
  3. Ibid. V, 11d, pl. 21.
  4. Ibid. XVI, 28e, pl. 40.
  5. Ibid. III, 7c, pl. 14.
  6. Ibid. VI, 12c, pl. 73 & Beilage 2.
  7. Ibid. XLII, 60y, pl. 66.
  8. Perachora II, ed. T.J. Dunbabin (Oxford, 1966) no. 2542, pl. 106 & 110.
  9. Kunze, op. cit. XXXII, 50y, pl. 60.
  10. A.J.A. 12 (1908) 302 & 308, B3a, pl. xv and C2c, pl. XVII.
  11. Br. 121 Ac 1 (erroneous reference to C.V.); C.V. 2 pl. 16, 4; A.B.V. 133, 3.

12. Copenhagen NM 7068, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
13. Catania, cup-fragment, Laconian<sup>2</sup>.
14. Bologna 151, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
15. Heidelberg S 25, rim-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
16. Palermo, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
17. Boulogne 63, column-krater, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
18. Louvre Camp. 10680, hydria-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
19. Villa Giulia M 597, band-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
20. Villa Giulia 762, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
21. Olympia B 986, shield-band<sup>10</sup>.
22. Paestum, metope<sup>11</sup>.
23. Louvre CA 822, siphon, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
24. Florence 80675, amphora, Etruscan black-figure<sup>13</sup>.
25. Athens P 3719, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>14</sup>.
26. London BM B 621, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>15</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 126 Ac 2; C.V. 3 pl. 102, 1; A.B.V. 134, 14
  2. Br. 141 C 9; Bollettino d'Arte 45 (1960) 253, fig. 11.
  3. Br. 126 Ac 12; C.V. 5 pl. 95, 1 & 2; A.B.V. 255, 5.
  4. Br. 127 Ad 2; C.V. 1 pl. 43, 8.
  5. Br. 128 Ad 10; Journal of Hellenic Studies 52 (1937) pl. 6, 2; A.B.V. 675u
  6. Br. 128 Ad 17; A. Rumpf, Sakonides (Leipzig, 1937) pl. 24.
  7. Br. 128 Ad 21; C.V. 11 pl. 147, 3.
  8. Br. 128 Ad 11; P. Mingazzini, Vasi della Collezione Castellani (Rome, 1930 & 1971) pl. 94, 2; A.B.V. 251, 2.
  9. Br. 129 Ad 31; C.V. 1 pl. 4, 1; A.B.V. 283, 10.
  10. Kunze, op. cit. XXXIV, 52a, pl. 62.
  11. Heraion II pl. 75
  12. Br. 136 Ag 36; Revue Archéologique 34 (1899) 8, fig. 6.
  13. Br. 141 C 18; St. Etr. 36 (1968) 31 ff. & pl. 2.
  14. Br. 135 Ag 13; Perachora II pl. 141; A.B.V. 646, 198 bis.
  15. Br. 129 Ad 28; P. Jacobsthal, Ornamente griechischer Vasen (Berlin, 1927) pl. 29; A.B.V. 434, 2u.

27. Frankfurt VF B 298, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
28. Karlsruhe B 3048, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
29. New York X 21.25 (GR 523), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
30. Basel, private collection, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
31. Naples H 2861 (81571). bell-krater, Apulian red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
32. Vienna and Tyszkiewicz collection resp. Etruscan scarabs<sup>6</sup>.
33. Tarentum 682, 683, 684, 687, 689, 692, 698, 702, 705, 708, coins<sup>7</sup>.
34. Heraclea, coins<sup>8</sup>.
35. Pnyx, 103, mould-fragment<sup>9</sup>.
36. Alexandria, medallion<sup>10</sup>.
37. Alexandria Mus. cup-medallion<sup>11</sup>.
38. Athens, Agora P 19881, Megarian bowl<sup>12</sup>.
39. Samos, Megarian bowl<sup>13</sup>.
40. Antioch, Megarian bowl<sup>14</sup>.
41. Athens, NM 2109, Megarian bowl<sup>15</sup>.
42. Yale, Megarian bowl<sup>16</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 127 Ac 25; C.V. 2 pl. 48, 1-3.
  2. Br. 128 Ad 18; C.V. 1 pl. 11, 6 & 7; A.B.V. 626, 1m.
  3. Br. 130 Ad 33; A.J.A. 20 (1916) 441, fig. 5; A.B.L. 239, 138.
  4. Br. 138 Ag 58; M.M. Auct. 22 pl. 40, 136; Par. 254.
  5. Br. 142 D 1; A.D. Trendall, Frühitaliotische Vasen (Leipzig, 1938) pl. 17b.
  6. A. Furtwängler, Die Antiken Gemmen (Munich, 1900) pl. xvii, 56 & 57 & pl. lxi, 20.
  7. S.W. Grose, Fitzwilliam Museum: Catalogue of the Mc.Clean Collection of Greek Coins I (Cambridge, 1923) pl. 26, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 29.
  8. P. Gardner, The Types of Greek Coins (Cambridge, 1883) pl. V, 6 & 32.
  9. Hesperia Supplement 7 (1943), 127 no. 103.
  10. Br. 142 E 3; R. Pagenstecher, Expedition Sieglin: die griechisch-ägyptische Sammlung Ernst von Sieglin II 3 fig. 75.
  11. Br. 142 E 4; Pagenstecher, op. cit. II 1.56f., fig. 54.
  12. Br. 142 E 6; Hausmann op. cit. pl. 64, 1-3.
  13. Br. 142 E 7; Hausmann op. cit. pl. 63.
  14. Br. 142 E 10; Antioch-on-the Orontes IV part i (Princeton, 1948) fig. 17, 27.
  15. Br. 142 E 11; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 62, 1.
  16. Br 142 E 12; A.J.A. 45 (1941) 230, fig. 1, & pl. 12.

43. Bauassai, Mus. de Mende, sigillata, Romano-Gallic<sup>1</sup>.  
 44. St. Germain Mus., sigillata Romano-Gallic<sup>2</sup>.  
 45. Florence from Ortobello, cup, Etruscan<sup>3</sup>.  
 46. From Orvieto, cup, Etruscan<sup>4</sup>.

This is certainly a popular motif, both in the sixth century and in Hellenistic times, and South Italian art contains a fairly large number of examples. This would imply, even without the literary evidence, that the killing of the lion without the use of weapons was a popular tradition.

#### b) Wrestling

In this motif Heracles and lion lie in wrestling pose and, as has been said, a similar pose will be seen to be used in compositions of both the boar and the bull<sup>5</sup>, predominantly in representations belonging to the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth century, as is the case with such scenes of the combat with the lion. All of Brommer's group A:a depicts this scheme and it can thus be seen to contain numerous examples; I have no need to list the examples from Brommer's A:a group but will merely note that they confirm the theory that this motif begins in the third quarter of the sixth century and continues until c. 450 BC.

---

1. Br. 143 E 18; Déchelette, op. cit. 78, no. 466.

2. Br. 143 E 20; Déchelette, op. cit. 209, no. 63.

3. Br. 143 E 24; Hesperia Supplement 7 (1943) 157, fig. 69.

4. Br. 143 E 25; Mon. Ant. 9 (1871) pl. 24, 6.

5. See page 58 & notes (1) & (2)

1. Fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Louvre C 10229, Caeretan hydria-fragment<sup>2</sup>.
3. Lund Univ. 596, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Tarquinia 654, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Leipzig T 635, belly-handled amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. London BM B 193, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Private collection, belly-handled amphora-fragments, Attic red-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Villa Giulia M 472, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
9. New York 74.51.1331 (CP 1968) hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
10. Louvre F 128, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>10</sup>.
11. Bologna 361, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>11</sup>.
12. Athens Acr. 65 (A 192) cup-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>12</sup>.
13. Heidelberg 40, cup-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>13</sup>.
14. Louvre G 71, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>14</sup>.
15. Copenhagen 127, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>15</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 128 Ad 13; Megara Hyblaea 2 (Paris, 1964) pl. 89, 8.
  2. Br. 141 C 6; Monuments Piot 41 (1946) 56, fig. 14.
  3. Br. 128 Ad 19; Jd.I 80 (1965) 101, fig. 24; Par. 84, 9.
  4. Br. 129 Ad 32; C.V. 1 pl. 14.
  5. Br. 140 B 13; Jd.I 78 (1963) 317, fig. 22; A.R.V. 2. 3, 3
  6. Br. 140 B 14; Jd.I 76 (1961) 55, fig. 7; A.R.V. 2. 4, 8.
  7. Br. 140 B 16; Jd.I 76 (1961) 49, fig. 1.
  8. Br. 129 Ad 34; Mingazzini, op. cit. pl. 65, 1; A.B.V. 291.
  9. Br. 129 Ad 24; Jd.I 80 (1965) 103, fig. 56; A.B.V. 314m.
  10. Br. 139 B 9; Pottier, op. cit. pl. 73; A.R.V. 2. 58, 50.
  11. Br. 139 B 13; A. Bruhn, Oltos and Early Red-figure Vase Painting (Copenhagen 1943) fig. 53; A.R.V. 2. 65, 113.
  12. Br. 139 B 12; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. II pl. 4; A.R.V. 2. 73, 26
  13. Br. 139 B 2; W. Kraiker, Katalog der Sammlung antiker Klein-kunst des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität Heidelberg I (Berlin, 1931) pl. 7; A.R.V. 2. 89, 22.
  14. Br. 139 B 7; Revue Art Ancien (1901) 9; A.R.V. 2. 89, 21.
  15. Br. 138 B 1; C.V. 3, pl. 136; A.R.V. 2. 138, 1.

16. Munich 2620 A (J 439) cup, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
17. Boston 00.334, kantharos, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
18. Vatican, hydria, Etruscan black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
19. New York 10.210.10, oinochoe, Etruscan<sup>4</sup>.
20. London BM B 307, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
21. fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
22. Athens, Acr. 1428, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
23. Athens, Acr. 1465, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
24. Cambridge 37.7, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
25. Earlier Coghill, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
26. Turin 4602, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
27. Louvre MNB 909, lekythos, Attic red-figure<sup>12</sup>.
28. Copenhagen NM VIII 458, bowl, Attic red-figure<sup>13</sup>.
29. Philadelphia L64-185, stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>14</sup>.
30. Louvre G 177, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>15</sup>.
31. Earlier Florence, kalpis, Attic red-figure<sup>16</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 138 B 4; J.C. Hoppin, A Handbook of Greek Black-figure Vases (Paris, 1924) 470-1; A.R.V. 2. 129, 23.
  2. Br. 140 B 28; E. Pfuhl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen (Munich, 1923) fig. 320; A.R.V. 2. 126, 27.
  3. Br. 141 C 14; Sir J.D. Beazley & F. Magi, La Raccolta Benedetto Guglielmi nel Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco (Rome, 1939) 92, pl. 28.
  4. Br. 141 C 16; Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum 6 (1911) 31, fig. 3.
  5. Br. 128 Ad 22; C.V. 6 pl. 76, 4; A.B.V. 361, 17.
  6. Br. 134 Ag 26 & 27 (erroneously twice); Megara Hyblaea 2 pl. 110, 4;
  7. Br. 135 Ag 10; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 79; A.B.V. 69, 2m.
  8. Br. 135 Ag 11; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 79; A.B.V. 214, 41.
  9. Br. 129 Ad 26; C.V. 2 pl. 2, 2; A.B.V. 607m.
  10. Br. 129 Ad 30; J. Millingen, Peintures antiques des vases grecs de la collection de Sir John Coghill Bart. (Rome, 1817) pl. 34, 2; A.B.V. 528, 31 = 535, 9.
  11. Br. 129 Ad 39; C.V. 2 pl. 17, 1.
  12. Br. 140 B 29; A.B.L. pl. 39, 1; A.R.V. 2. 301, 4.
  13. Br. 140 B 30; C.V. 3 pl. 136, 1.
  14. Br. 140 B 26; A.J.A. 11 (1907) 119; A.R.V. 2. 187, 62.
  15. Br. 139 B 3; Pottier, op. cit. pl. 126; A.R.V. 2. 194a.
  16. Br. 139 B 8; Inghirami, op. cit. pl. 63; A.R.V. 2. 209, 171.

32. Villa Giulia 984, column-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
33. Florence/Chicago Univ. stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
34. Switzerland, private collection, belly-handled amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
35. Compiègne 1054, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
36. London BM E 168, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
37. Florence 3984, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>6</sup>.
38. Moscow Inv. 79, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>7</sup>.
39. New York 21.88.1, kalpis, Attic red-figure<sup>8</sup>.
40. Würzburg 532, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>9</sup>.
41. Hobart, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>10</sup>.
42. London BM E 104, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>11</sup>.
43. Munich 8714, kalyx-krater fragment, South Italian<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 140 B 21; C.V. 2 pl. III lc, 15; A.R.V. 2. 239, 21.
  2. Br. 140 B 25; A.J.A. 42 (1938) 346, 3; A.R.V. 2. 247, 2.
  3. Br. 140 B 15; Jd.I. 76 (1961) 49, fig. 4.
  4. Br. 139 B 2; C.V. Fr. 3 pl. 13, 6; A.R.V. 2. 246, 10.
  5. Br. 139 B 5; C.V. 5. pl. III lc, 73, 3 & 74, 2; A.R.V. 2. 263, 43.
  6. Br. 139 B 6; C.V. 2 pl. III 1, 57, 1 & 58, 1; A.R.V. 2. 271, 2.
  7. Br. 139 B 7; A.A. (1927) 317, no. 12, figs. 16 & 17.
  8. Br. 140 B 12; G.M.A. Richter & L. Hall, Red-figured Athenian Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New Haven, 1964) pl. 24, 27; A.R.V. 2. 252, 40.
  9. Br. 139, B 1; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 195 & 210; A.R.V. 2. 587, 54.
  10. Br. 139 B 21; R.G. Hood, Greek Vases in the University of Tasmania (Tasmania, 1964) no. 37, pl. 12a; A.R.V. 2. 1624, 80.
  11. Br. 139 B 11; J.H.S. 25 (1905) 278; A.R.V. 2. 1293, 1.
  12. Br. 142 D 3; A.A. (1957) 390ff., no., 12, fig. 15.

The popularity of this motif in Attic red-figure is particularly striking and it is noteworthy that it often occurs on cups since it is well suited to a small field<sup>1</sup>. It appears that this scheme superceded that of strangling in the late sixth and early fifth century, for representations of Heracles killing the lion with his bare hands, but that the other came back into vogue in the fourth and subsequent centuries.

### c) Unarmed

In the three scenes listed below it is clear that Heracles is thought of as using his bare hands against the lion but they cannot be classified under either of the two preceding headings.

1. Louvre F 106, Nicosthenic neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
2. New York 20.250, Band-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Hamburg, oinochoe, Etruscan black-figure<sup>4</sup>.

In all, Heracles is unarmed; in (1) he touches the lion's paw, in (2) he chases the beast, and in (3) they are about to lunge at one another.

### I/II UNCERTAIN WHETHER HERACLES IS ARMED OR NOT

1. Delphi, Treasury of the Athenians, metopes<sup>5</sup>.
2. Athens, Hephaesteum metopes<sup>6</sup>.

- 
1. It often appears on black-figure lekythoi in the case of boar and bull. See pages 58 & 62.
  2. Br. 130 Ae 5; C.V. 4 pl. 35, 13.
  3. Br. 130 Ae 17; C.V. 2 pl. 31, 47.
  4. Br. 141 C 13; A.A. (1917) 104, no. 35, fig. 35.
  5. Delphes (France, 1957) pl. 123.
  6. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI, 1.

In both of these pieces Heracles is strangling the lion in the crook of his arm but his right hand is not preserved and there is no means of knowing whether or not it originally held a weapon. Sauer, in his reconstruction of the Hephaesteum metope, gives Heracles a sword but this seems pure guesswork on his part. In fact, since this appearance of the sword would be so much later than the others I think it likely it did not occur here. In fact, there is no example of the use of weapons after the beginning of the fifth century except for one isolated example of the club in Hellenistic, which seems in any case to be influenced by renderings of the Cerynitian hind<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, I think it likely that the Hephaesteum metope employed the strangling motif. It is not possible to make such a guess about the Delphi metope, but certainly the roughly contemporary metope from Paestum<sup>2</sup> depicted Heracles strangling the lion and this could have been the case at Delphi too.

I shall now turn to other elements of composition which overlap the divisions made hitherto.

(i) Use of the cloak.

These representations, which cover the period from c. 530 to the early fifth century, depict Heracles holding out his cloak over his arm towards the lion as if it were a shield. He is often menacing the beast with a weapon held in his other hand. Such representations have been identified as Alcaethous fighting the lion of Cithaeron but there seems no reason for this. In fact, this scheme better suits Heracles and the Nemean lion because pseudo-Theocritus says that Heracles wielded

---

1. See pages 54, no. 24 & 55.

2. See page 60, no. 22.

his club with one hand while with the other he held before him his cloak, folded round his bunched arrows. These several representations so well accord with this description, especially those which show Heracles using the club, that it is likely that this aspect of the myth dated back to the end of the sixth century. Admittedly no bunched arrows can be seen with the possible exception of example (8) below, but these would be difficult to draw and were perhaps a feature of the use of the cloak not fully understood by artists. If this is the meaning of the outstretched cloak in these pieces, they are likely to depict a preliminary attempt by Heracles to kill the lion since Theocritus says that it is after he has benumbed it with his club that he is able to strangle it.

1. Louvre F 108, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Louvre G 72, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Berlin F 1895, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Palermo, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Louvre F 47, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Robinson collection, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Athens NM 12627, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

- 
1. See page 53, no. 5 and note (5)
  2. Br. 139 B 8. Pottier, op. cit. pl. 97; A.R.V. 2. 174, 11.
  3. See page 54, no. 10 and note (1).
  4. See page 54, no. 14 and note (5)
  5. See page 54, no. 16 and note (7).
  6. See page 54, no. 12 and note (3).
  7. Br. 130 Ae 18; J.H.S. 75 (1955) 95, pl. 7, 2.

8. Villa Giulia 20909, 20911?, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
9. Heidelberg, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
10. Syracuse 43.432, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
11. Bucharest, Magheru, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
12. Naples Stg. 130, kyathos, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
13. Frankfurt VF B.316, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
14. Syracuse 24672, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
15. Athens, Acr. 1397, skyphos-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.

The club is wielded in (1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (9), (10), (11), and the sword in (12); it is not possible to decide whether the weapon is meant to be club or sword in (8), (13) and (14). All these examples have been looked at before under the preceding categories but the rest of this group, in which the cloak is used on its own, do not appear in my other lists<sup>9</sup>.

It appears that these vases, which do not belong to a single school, did have a particular version in mind, since otherwise the outstretched cloak would be meaningless, and it is likely that this was the version, later recorded by pseudo-Theocritus, of the use of the cloak over bunched arrows to serve as a shield, although the detail of the arrows is generally omitted, either because the artists did not know of it or because it was too difficult to render.

- 
1. See page 57, no. 2 and note (1).
  2. See page 54, no. 18 and note (9).
  3. See page 54, no. 19 and note (10).
  4. See page 54, no. 20 and note (11).
  5. See page 51, no. 34 and note (5).
  6. See page 57, no. 4 and note (3).
  7. See page 57, no. 3 and note (2).
  8. Br. 131 Ae 20; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 77; A.B.V. 577 to 17.
  9. It should be noted, however, that in (2) and (15) Heracles' right hand is not preserved and could originally have held a weapon.

(ii) Depiction of the lion's den

There are not many examples of this and Brommer lists them in his group A:f of which (4) has already been twice listed in connection with club and bow<sup>1</sup>. I merely wish to remark, without repeating Brommer's list, that this feature is again first mentioned by pseudo-Theocritus who says that the lion came to its den towards evening and Heracles waylaid it beside the path. Its depiction on vases of the early fifth century shows that Theocritus was apparently following an earlier source dating at least to this time.

(iii) The lion already dead.

1. Whereabouts unknown to me, kylix, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
2. Munich 563, kylix, Attic Black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Palermo, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
4. Olympia, metope<sup>5</sup>.
5. London BM G29, relief kelebe, Hellenistic<sup>6</sup>.

(1), (2) and (5) are mentioned by Luce<sup>7</sup> and are very interesting as showing Heracles skinning the lion. In (1) it lies on its back while Heracles, identified by his club, stands over it, holding its back legs in his left hand. Unfortunately

---

1. See pages 54, no. 21 & 56, no. 2.

2. A.V. pll. 132-3, 1 & 2.

3. O. Jahn, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung Königs Ludwig in der Pinakothek zu Munchen (Munich, 1854) 186.

4. Br. 140 B 20; Jd.I 49 (1934) 42; A.R.V. 427, 2.

5. B. Ashmole & N. Yalouris, Olympia, the Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus (London, 1967) pl. 143.

6. H.B. Walters, Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum IV (London, 1896) 242.

7. 'List of vases showing Heracles and the Nemean Lion', A.J.A. 20 (1916) 460ff. On this point see 473.

it cannot be seen what he was using for skinning the beast since his right hand is on its inner side and, therefore, not drawn. It cannot, therefore, be known whether the version of Theocritus was current at this time, namely in the early fifth century, in which Heracles had to skin the lion with its own claws. Certainly by the second quarter of the fifth century the invulnerability of the hide was known but perhaps the logical refinement of skinning the beast with its own claws was reserved for later. Unfortunately, no picture is available for (2) but the description talks of Heracles "disembowelling" and, therefore, presumably skinning it, although it does not say what he used for doing so.

In (3) it appears that the lion is dead but this need not be the case. Heracles sits contemplatively above it as it lies face down on the ground, perhaps debating how to remove the skin. However, it could be that the lion is thought of merely as sleeping in its den, hence its positioning below Heracles, although no actual den is drawn, and Heracles is thought of as contemplating how to get to it.

the  
In/Olympia metope, however, the beast is certainly dead. It lies on its face with its head on its paw, perhaps substantiating the claim of (3) to depict it in death. Heracles has his right foot on its back in a conquering attitude. The state of the metope is fragmentary but it is clear that Heracles originally rested his elbow on his knee and his face on his hand. Typical of Olympia, Athena is present and a quiet moment of the myth has been chosen.

Oddities.

1. Rhodes, cup, Laconian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Utrecht, bell-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.

Finally in my examination of the artistic evidence for this labour I shall comment briefly on two pieces listed by Brommer as representing the Nemean lion but which seem to me to depict something different. In (1) a man is shown with a lion attached, apparently, to reins; he wears a tunic and has long hair and beard. It could be that this representation is meant to be Heracles and is influenced by such scenes of him with Cerberus but perhaps it is intended to be taken together with the satyr and Dionysus who appear next to it.

(2) seems more likely to portray Cerberus and will be examined again with that labour<sup>3</sup>. Athena stands on the left of the scene next to Heracles with his club; he faces a tree next to which sits a woman, under whom is half an animal head, presumably meant to be looking out from behind a rock. This woman would have no place at all in the lion labour unless this is a conflation of Hesperides and lion myths, but if the scene related to Cerberus she could be intended for Persephone.

Possibly such doubtful representations could make reference to Alcathous and the lion of Cithaeron, but there is nothing to substantiate this.

CONCLUSION

This labour is never given any number, other than the first

1. Br. 141 C 8; C.V. 1. pl. IIID 3.
2. Br. 140 B 18; Studies presented to D.M. Robinson, II, ed. G. Mylonas, (St Louis, 1953) pl. 35.
3. See page 252, no. 2.

and the second labour is also standardised, as the hydra. Both gave to Heracles very useful weapons for carrying out his other labours and this is likely to have been the reason they were placed at the beginning of the list.

The myth of the Nemean lion may well have been in existence in the eighth century in view of the lack of evidence that the Hesiod passage ought to be regarded as spurious, and also the possibility that the subject was portrayed in Geometric art. The position regarding the eighth-century evidence is similar to that for the hydra<sup>1</sup>, since the editor of the Oxford text of Hesiod also wishes to remove the reference to Heracles killing this creature, and yet various Geometric pieces can lay a claim to be representations of the hydra, although admittedly their subject-matter is far more certain than that of those which have been examined as possible representations of the lion.

The earliest representations, even discounting the doubtful Geometric ones, show Heracles using weapons against the lion. It has been admitted that there is no actual reference to the invulnerability of the skin until Bacchylides but that this is the likely inference to be drawn from Heracles wearing the skin, unless he was just thought of as boasting in his conquest, and he is certainly shown wearing it in the hydra representations in the Corinthian fabric, scarcely there in boasting mood. It has been pointed out that the first two labours gave Heracles useful attributes; it is known that Stesichorus mentioned him dipping his arrows into the hydra's poison and it is likely

---

1. See page 79 note 2 and pages 83ff.

that the invulnerability of the hide was also known in the sixth century. I have already suggested that the drawing of weapons for this labour probably merely demonstrates the lack of accurate mythological knowledge on the part of artists and it will be seen that their basic conception of the majority of the labours is confined to pictures of Heracles brandishing various weapons and attended by Athena, Iolaus and Hermes, sometimes individually, sometimes all together, regardless of whether these details belong to each particular myth.

There is certainly a much larger weight of evidence for Heracles killing the lion with his bare hands - which substantiates the literary accounts - since it must be remembered that Brommer lists numerous examples of this in his Groups A:a and A:b which I have not found it necessary to list again in this thesis. This idea first appears in art in the last quarter of the seventh century, apparently substantiating the theory that it was much earlier than the first extant appearance in literature in Bacchylides, and it is interesting that this is not long after the date of Pisander, whom I have suggested at least to imply this detail.

This is a myth which well accords with the spirit of the labours from the point of view of demonstrating heroism, especially in the combat without weapons, and if the Hesiod passage is genuine the idea of benefaction was inherent in this myth in early days. This was also a creature sent by Heracles' enemy, Hera, as was the hydra.

CHAPTER THREE: THE LERNAEAN HYDRA

This is another early story, set in the Northern Peloponnese. Its number seems standardised in the list of labours as the second. This is a popular labour again possibly derived from the East<sup>1</sup>.

A LITERARY EVIDENCE

- Hesiod (Th. 313ff.): Among the children of Typhon and Echidna was the Lernaean hydra which Hera used against Heracles; he slew it  $\nu\eta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota$   $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\tilde{\omega}$  with the help of Iolaus and the advice of Athena.
- Pisander (F. 2 K): Pisander gave the hydra many heads<sup>2</sup>.
- Stesichorus (P. Oxy. 2617 F4 Col. 2, 3ff.): One of Heracles' arrows is described as "befouled with the blood and gall of the hydra".
- Alcaeus } (PMG. 569): Alcaeus gave the hydra nine heads;  
Simonides } Simonides gave it fifty.
- Hecataeus (EGH. 1F 24): Hecataeus wrote about the Lernaean hydra. Aelian in whom this statement is preserved, describes it as τὸν ἄθλον τὸν Ἡράκλειον but it is not clear whether Hecataeus referred to it in this way.
- Pherecydes (EGH. 3 F 70): Lerna is mentioned as a town but no reference to the hydra is preserved.

1. See page 82f.

2. Paus. II 37.4. κεφαλὴν δὲ εἶχεν (ἡ ὕδρα), ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, μίαν καὶ οὐ πλείονας. Πείσανδρος δὲ ὁ Καμινεύς, ἵνα τὸ θηρίον τε δοκοῖη φοβερώτερον καὶ αὐτῷ γίνηται ἡ ποίησις, ἀξίλοχρεως μᾶλλον, ἀντὶ τούτων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐποίησε τῇ ὕδρα τὰς πολλὰς.

- Panyassis (F. 3 K): The crab seems to have been placed among the stars by Hera because alone it climbed out of the pool and bit Heracles' foot, although others fought with him<sup>1</sup>, when he was killing the hydra. Heracles was angry and crushed it with his foot.
- Hellanicus (EGH. 4F 103): To explain the proverb "not even Heracles Herodanus (EGH. 31F 23): fought against two", Herodorus and Hellanicus say that when Heracles approached the hydra Hera sent a crab and since he could not fight against two, Heracles summoned Iolaus to help.
- Sophocles (Tr. passim): Nessus was killed with an arrow steeped in the hydra's blood. He tells Deianeira to scrape the gall from his wound and make it into a love charm. This eventually brings about Heracles' death.
- (Tr. 1094): The hydra is mentioned as a μόχθος.
- Euripides (HF. 419ff.): Heracles cut off and seared the many heads of the hydra and smeared the blood on his arrows.
- (HF. 1274-5): Heracles tells Theseus of the hydra with heads that grew again, (ἀμφίκρανον καὶ παλιμβλαστή).
- (Ion 191ff.): The chorus see on the Temple of Apollo at Delphi<sup>2</sup>, Heracles killing the hydra χρυσέαις ἄρπαις and next to him Iolaus with a firebrand.

---

1. Perhaps this refers to Iolaus and Athena.

2. See page 99, no. 19 & note (7).

Plato Philosophus  
(Euthydemus 297 C):

Socrates tells Dionysodorus he is inferior to Heracles who was no match for the hydra, with its many heads that grew again when cut off, or a match for the crab against which Heracles summoned Iolaus. The language of this passage is metaphorical.

Virgil, (Aeneid VI 287-8):

The hydra is described as belua Lernaee horrendum stridens.

(Aen. VIII 300):

The hydra is described as Lernaeeus turba capitum anguis.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 11,  
5 & 6):

For the second labour Heracles had to kill the Lernaean hydra with its one body and one hundred snake heads, which was thought invulnerable since when one head was cut off two more grew in its place. Heracles put a stop to this by making Iolaus cauterize the stumps; when the hydra was dead he dipped his arrows into its poison.

Apollodorus (II v 2):

It was the second labour to kill the Lernaean hydra which had nine heads, of which eight were mortal but the middle one immortal. Iolaus drove his chariot to Lerna. Heracles scared the hydra out of its lair with burning darts and caught hold of it, but it wound itself round his foot. When he tried to smash the heads with his club two more grew up in place of one

and a crab also came to the hydra's help and bit his foot. Heracles killed the crab and called Iolaus to cauterize the hydra's stumps. He cut off the immortal head and buried it, putting a heavy rock on top. He then dipped his arrows into the hydra's blood. Eurystheus refused to count this among the ten labours because Iolaus had helped.

Hyginus (Fab. XXX 3): Heracles killed the nine-headed hydra, the child of Typhon at the spring of Lerna. It was so poisonous that it killed men afflatu and they also died from breathing its tracks. He was helped by Athena. He dipped his arrows into its blood and eventually died because of this.

(Fab. CLI): The hydra is mentioned among the children of Typhon and Echidna together with Cerberus, Ladon, Scylla, the snake at Colchis, the Sphinx and the Chimaera.

(Astronomica II xxiii): Hera placed the crab among the stars because it bit Heracles' foot when he was fighting the hydra.

Servius (Ad Aen. VI 287): Servius gives a rationalistic account of the hydra which makes it into locum ... evomentem aquas. He mentions as the traditional Roman story the fact that the hydra uno caeso tria capita exrescebant and says that Heracles, therefore, used fire against it.

One sees immediately that the hydra story is very well attested in extant literature from an early date. Indeed, it is highly probable that, like the Nemean lion, it was influenced by earlier Eastern stories of heroes slaying many-headed dragons, such as the Akkadian story of Marduk and Tiamat<sup>1</sup>; representations of such stories are common in Eastern art, especially on seals, and will be examined in this chapter together with the artistic evidence for the hydra.

Very many traditional elements of the hydra myth are present in the earliest evidence<sup>2</sup>: the agency of Hera; the help of Iolaus and Athena; the slaying of the hydra with a metal weapon; and the hydra's parentage. Certainly from the time of Pisander it was thought to have many heads, and its monstrous parentage, as given by Hesiod, certainly hints at a monstrous nature. The number differs from writer to writer: nine is a popular one, occurring in Alcaeus, Apollodorus and Hyginus; Simonides gives it fifty heads; Diodorus gives it one hundred. Apollodorus may have invented the story that the middle head was immortal; at any rate, it does not occur elsewhere in extant literature ~~xxx600xx~~. From c. 600 BC dates the notion that its gall was poisonous, although strangely enough this is not specifically stated until Hyginus. The fact can be easily deduced, however, from the tradition that Heracles dipped his arrows into the gall and from the later tradition that he died himself because of this.

---

1. See Hooke, op. cit. 41ff.

2. It must be admitted that the editor of the Oxford Text regards these lines as spurious.

The crab story, on the evidence of extant literature, seems to date to the first half of the fifth century BC, although the wording of the Panyassis reference does not make it clear whether he actually mentioned the crab, or just the hydra being killed by Heracles. However, the artistic evidence will prove this element of the myth to be early as well<sup>1</sup>. It is not clear from the sources whether the crab went of its own accord to help the hydra or was sent by Hera; however, there seems general agreement that it bit Heracles' foot and was killed by him; for this bravery it was rewarded by Hera with a place among the stars.

The presence of Iolaus is explained with reference to the attack of the crab by Herodorus and Hellanicus; possibly they were merely looking for a convenient explanation of the proverb "against two not even Heracles could fight". Accounts differ as to Iolaus' role: he is present in Hesiod's account although the crab is not; according to Apollodorus he is called in after Heracles has killed the crab; Plato, however, agrees with Herodorus and Hellanicus in making him come to the rescue after the crab bite. It is interesting that Apollodorus makes Iolaus Heracles' charioteer in this labour, since he is depicted as such on some early vases<sup>2</sup>. He also says that Iolaus' involvement caused Eurystheus to reject this as a labour. Euripides is the first to talk of Iolaus cauterizing the stumps and so the tradition that more heads grew as one was cut off, intricately connected with the cauterizing motif, can be presumed also to be comparatively late; substantiation of this will be sought in the artistic evidence. Diodorus and Apollodorus say that two heads grew for every one cut off, and Servius says three.

---

1. See page 85.

2. See page 85f.

Euripides specifies Heracles' weapon as a sickle but otherwise the exact weapon he uses is not named<sup>1</sup>.

This myth is not named as a labour in extant literature until Sophocles and it is interesting that no reason is given for its performance until the hint of Hyginus: tantum vim veneni habuit ut afflatu homines necaret. This suggests the idea of benefaction. Presumably this might be inferred early on from the idea of its gall being poisonous, but perhaps in early days it was regarded rather as a test of strength and skill and the benefaction idea came later, as will be seen to be the case in many of the other labours.

Linked to this labour, but not an integral part, is the Nessus story, made possible by the tradition that Heracles' arrows were dipped into the hydra's blood and thereby became poisonous. This dates to the early sixth century and the hydra myth should have come first. The story of the death of Nessus at Heracles' hands occurs in Archilochus<sup>2</sup>, who was writing at least fifty years earlier than Stesichorus, the first extant writer to tell of dipping the arrows into the hydra's blood. A love charm is said to bring about the death of Heracles in pseudo-Hesiod<sup>3</sup> but it is not linked with Nessus. However, Bacchylides<sup>4</sup> is the first extant writer to link the two. Thus, it is likely that Heracles' death was originally quite unconnected with Nessus: it appears as such in the Iliad<sup>5</sup>, the Odyssey<sup>6</sup>

- 
1. Hesiod mentions a metal weapon but does not give details.
  2. Scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica 1, 1212-19a.
  3. Fr. 25, 20ff. (MW).
  4. XVI 23ff. ed. B. Snell (Leipzig, 1959)
  5. 18.117ff.
  6. XI 601ff.

where two separate traditions are given, and in Hesiod's Theogony<sup>1</sup>; the last two refer to his apotheosis. When the connection took place is not clear, but it was certainly in existence by the first quarter of the fifth century<sup>2</sup>. Nothing more need be said here about this offshoot of the hydra myth: it seems to have been devised to give a fixed tradition to the manner of Heracles' death and it is indeed fitting that he should die indirectly because of Hera's creature, the hydra.

#### B ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

Before turning to the Greek representations of this myth I shall make brief reference to some Eastern compositions which suggest that the hydra story may have been inspired by Eastern mythology. A Sumerian clay impression<sup>3</sup> in fragmentary state depicts in its lowest zone a creature with snake's tail. It originally had seven heads; five remain on the body and the other two are held by a man who faces the creature.

An Akkadian seal<sup>4</sup>, dating roughly to 2500 BC, found at Tell Asmar (Eshnunna), in a temple dedicated to the "Lord of Vegetation", shows a figure, apparently the god of fertility, fighting a seven-headed dragon, of which four heads seem already dead. There is help given by a second figure who holds a long pole, as does the first figure, but near to it long tongues of fire leap up, as Frankfort<sup>5</sup> notes; this seems a likely forerunner of Iolaus and the firebrand, although this aspect of the myth

---

1. vv. 950ff.

2. In Bacchylides

3. J.H.S. 54 (1934) 40, fig. 1.

4. J.H.S. 54 (1934) pl. II 1; H.H. Frankfort, Cylinder Seals (1939) pl. XXIIIj.

5. *op. cit.* 121-2.

does not seem to appear in the hydra story until comparatively late. The creature on the seal has a dragon's body with four legs, thus differing from the snake body of the hydra<sup>1</sup>.

A creature similar to the hydra existed in Ugaritic mythology, as well as in Sumerian and Akkadian: one tradition describes Baal's victory over Chaos as the slaying of the seven-headed dragon Lotan<sup>2</sup>. A similar tradition can be seen in Hebrew mythology since according to Psalm 74: Yahweh in contest with the waters killed the many-headed Leviathan and then created night and day.<sup>3</sup>

The channel of influence on Greek legend and art coming from the East was probably opened after the Dark Ages when Greece began to trade with the East once again; she would come into contact with Oriental ideas at various trading stations.

I shall now turn to an investigation of the artistic evidence for the legend of the Greek hydra. The material begins early and is continuous, again attesting to the general popularity of this myth, belonging as it does to many fabrics.

#### I. Heracles uses the sword

This group begins in the second half of the eighth century BC and contains the earliest artistic representation of this myth, which slightly antedates Hesiod, the earliest extant literary source. The group ends, however, in the last quarter of the sixth century, being superceded, as will be seen, by the use of the sickle. In many of these representations it is

- 
1. The Sumerian clay impression is more similar to renderings of the hydra.
  2. Hooke, op. cit. 82.
  3. vv. 12-17; See Hooke, op. cit. 106.

Iolaus who brandishes the sickle: (1), (2), (4), (6), (7), (12) and (13). The crab appears in the earliest and is common in this group, indicating that this element of the myth existed from the start, a fact not indicated by extant literature.

1. London BM 3205, fibula, Boeotian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Philadelphia, private collection, fibula, Boeotian<sup>2</sup>.
3. Sparta, relief<sup>3</sup>.
4. Breslau, aryballos, Corinthian<sup>4</sup>.
5. Louvre CA 2511, cup, Corinthian<sup>5</sup>.
6. Jena, cup, Corinthian<sup>6</sup>.
7. Louvre CA 3004, skyphos, Corinthian<sup>7</sup>.
8. From Perachora, kotyle, Corinthian<sup>8</sup>.
9. Market, Tyrrhenian amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
10. Louvre E 851, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
11. Earlier Basseggio, amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
12. Tarquinia, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
13. Naples H 2761 (81126), cup, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.

- 
1. F.G.S. no. 101 pl. 2.
  2. Ibid. no. 135 pl. 8.
  3. R.M. Dawkins, The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta (J.H.S. Suppl. 5) 212, pl. 103.
  4. Br. 81 C 1; N.C. no. 481, fig. 45A.
  5. Br. 81 C 2; N.C. no. 994.
  6. Br. 81 C 3; N.C. no. 987, fig. 45B.
  7. Br. 81 C 6; Mon. Piot 40 (1944) pl. 3 & 4.
  8. Br. 81 C 7; Perachora II pl. 102 no. 2481.
  9. Br. 79 A 10; M.M. Auct. XVI no. 84 pl. 20.
  10. Br. 79 A 3; A.A. (1971) figs. 15-16; A.B.V. 97, 24.
  11. Br. 79 A 13; A.V. pl. 95-96; A.B.V. 97, 25.
  12. Br. 79 A 5; N.Sc. NS 6 (1930) pl. 7, 1; A.B.V. 308, 64.
  13. Br. 80 A 34; C.V. 1 pl. 23, 3; A.B.V. 262, 47.

It will be helpful to describe the earliest examples.

(1) is very fragmentary. It is possible to count five snake heads, near to which is a man who grasps them where they meet the body; his right hand is empty but near to it, and probably thought of as inside it, is the end of a sword blade. Towards the tail of the creature is a small figure holding a sickle. From later representations the scene can be identified as the slaying of the hydra; the figure holding the necks is marked as Heracles by the crab under his feet and thus the little figure must be Iolaus. Fishes complete the watery setting of Lerna.

In (2) two figures in hoplite dress face each other. Between them is the hydra; four necks are still attached to the body while part of another floats in a free field. The figure on the left holds a sickle in his right hand and one hydra head in his left; behind him two spears are propped up. The figure on the right also holds a head in his left hand but brandishes a scimitar in his right; the crab under his feet designates him as Heracles.

(3) is fragmentary but the subject can be identified as Heracles in tunic and greaves, with sword hilt in hand, holding one hydra head while another bites his lower leg; a third head is preserved and there is plenty of room for others to be restored as well as the body. Dawkins<sup>1</sup> dates this 740-710 BC since it was found with Geometric pottery but not with Laconian I.

In the Corinthian examples Heracles' chariot is often depicted, occurring in (4), (5), and (6). The chariot is empty

---

1. A.O. 212.

in (5) and (6), doubtless indicating that the charioteer is Iolaus. (4) is odd, however, since two chariots are shown, of which one is empty and the other contains a figure inscribed  $\Lambda\alpha\pi\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ . Presumably they are meant to belong to both Heracles and Iolaus and the latter is not thought of here as Heracles' charioteer. The inscription is also odd since Heracles seems to have had no connection with Lapiths. The inscription  $\Gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  for the Siren is also unknown. The chariot is also depicted on the Tyrrhenian amphora (9), again with Iolaus as charioteer, and this time actually in the chariot. The chariot is depicted side-view except in (5) where it is frontal. As Payne<sup>1</sup> points out, this shows that a frontal chariot is attested for the hydra legend and justifies the inclusion of the one on the chest of Cypselus with the hydra scene instead of its original wrong restoration side-view; it was wrongly connected by Pausanias<sup>2</sup> with the adjacent scene of the Games of Pelias. It is interesting that the chariot occurs in art so early since it does not appear in literature until Apollodorus. Again, then, one sees signs of this myth being complete early on.

It has already been stated that the literary evidence does not specify Heracles' weapon until Euripides and the sword well suits Hesiod's loose description of the killing  $\nu\eta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ \chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\tilde{\omega}$ . The common appearance of Iolaus with the sickle suggests the existence of a tradition which has not survived in literature, and it is notable that this is the weapon taken over by Heracles. Representations of Heracles with sword and sickle overlap chronologically. There are also a few fairly early representations

---

1. N.C. 126 and works there cited.

2. V 17. 9-11.

of Heracles combatting the hydra with the bow, but the use of the sword remains the most popular early artistic version.

## II Use of the sickle.

The earliest representation in this group dates to the Middle Corinthian period and the latest may occur on the Hephaesteum dating c. 430 BC, although the sickle has not actually been preserved here. At any rate the sickle tradition can be seen to antedate Euripides, the earliest extant source to record it. In (4), (9) and (10) the firebrand has been depicted or restored; this will be discussed together with a description of the works in question. Other works depicting Iolaus with the firebrand but Heracles with a weapon other than the sickle will also be mentioned here.

1. Lost, kotyle, Corinthian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Berlin F 1801, "Little Master" band-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Lyons E 406a, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Palermo V 763 (275), stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Switzerland, private collection, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 81 C 5; N.C. no. 942, pl. 45C.
  2. Br. 80 A 31; Brommer, Her. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ pl. 10a; A.B.V. 230, lu.
  3. Br. 79 A 15; J. Dugas, Studies presented to D.M. Robinson II 55ff., pll. 15 & 16; A.B.V. 268, 29.
  4. Br. 80 B 6; N.Sc. NS 1 (1925) 152, fig. 19; A.R.V. 2. 251, 34.
  5. Br. 79 A 6; A.A. (1971) 168, fig. 4; Par. 111, 37 bis.

6. Trieste S 454, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
7. Lipari, band-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
8. Orvieto, cup-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
9. Olympia, metope<sup>4</sup>.
10. Athens, Hephaesteum metope<sup>5</sup>.

Iolaus is present in many of these scenes, often holding a sickle as well - (1), (3), and (4) - while in (6) and (7) it is difficult to identify his weapon. It is possible from the shape that it is meant to be a firebrand but it could also be a sword or club. In the Palermo piece (4) he holds a firebrand in each hand, and on the Hephaesteum metope he is restored with a firebrand. The latter, as it has survived, only shows Heracles and Iolaus partially preserved: the rear figure touches the shoulder of the front one and his arm probably originally went past the other's shoulder; remains of a drape are preserved and Iolaus often holds Heracles' cloak. Heracles ought to be the figure nearest the hydra; one snake body and the bases of two necks are preserved. It seems reasonable to restore the scene as Iolaus ready to cauterize the stumps left by Heracles who grasps a neck and holds a sickle: the position of his arm suggests cutting motion and he is likely to have been using the sickle rather than the sword, which is not depicted in such scenes after the sixth century.

---

1. Br. 79 A 12; C.V. 1 pl. 2, 3.

2. Br. 80 A 35; Archaeological Reports 1966/7, 46, fig. 28.

3. Br. 80 B 4; A.V. pl. 148; A.R.V. 2. 133, 16.

4. Ashmole & Yalouris op. cit. pl. 152.

5. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI, ii.

The Olympia metope depicts the firebrand but not in the hands of Iolaus, who is not rendered. Apparently both sickle and firebrand are used by Heracles here, one in each hand: the sculptor gives more space to the hydra than on the Hephaestum metope with the result that there is less room for its combatants. It is interesting that the firebrand does not appear in art until rather late, the last quarter of the sixth century to be exact, and is not commonly rendered. It appears on three other pieces, an Attic white-ground lekythos in Agrigentum<sup>1</sup>, an Attic red-figure oinochoe in Leningrad (B 4257)<sup>2</sup> and a South-Italian volute-krater in Policoro<sup>3</sup>. It is impossible to identify Heracles' weapon in the first piece but in the second and third he brandishes his club; the first two date to the early fifth century and the third to c. 380. The notion of the firebrand appears first in extant literature in Euripides whom these pieces antedate. However, in view of the date of the artistic evidence a literary source for it dating at the latest to the last quarter of the sixth century is required. One of the Lyric poets might be such a source: it is conceivable that the scene was depicted nearer the middle of the sixth century<sup>4</sup> on pieces that have not survived.

The crab is present in (1) but not in the later examples; probably it was often depicted in early times to distinguish Heracles from Iolaus. The chariot can be seen in (1) as in some of the Corinthian pieces in Group I; in (7) there are

1. Br. 80 A 24; F. Brommer 'Herakles und Hydra auf attischen Vasenbildern', Marburger Winckelmann-Programm 1949 pl. 1, 2; A.B.V. 521m.

2. Br. 81 B 13; Brommer, Her. pl. 10b.

3. Br. 82 D 1; B.d'A. 46 (1961) 146, fig. 31.

4. It would thus be close to the date of Ibycus and other lyric poets.

two chariots as on the Breslau aryballos of Group I, although here one may belong to the next scene. The drawing of the hydra may also be commented on in a few cases since in (3) it is given two bodies instead of the usual one and in (7) it has two tails. In (4) where the hydra is given as many as thirteen heads one is wound round Heracles' waist and tucked into his belt; this is a novel composition and perhaps reflects a similar tradition to that of Apollodorus who says that the hydra wound itself round Heracles' foot.

### III Use of the Club.

I shall take this group next as one of its number has already been mentioned in connection with the firebrand. It is roughly contemporary with scenes where Heracles uses the sickle, but continues longer, becoming the main weapon depicted in Hellenistic times, as is often the case.

1. Athens Acropolis, poros pediment<sup>1</sup>.
2. Hamburg 1925, 185, bronze box-foot, Etruscan<sup>2</sup>.
3. Leningrad B 4257, oinochoe, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Bonn 358, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. San Fransisco, Legion 1924.2, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Athens NM CC 792, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. London, BM 1929, 5-13.2. stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>7</sup>.

---

1. Brommer, Her. 16-17, fig. 5.

2. A.A. (1928) 440, fig. 152, no. 125.

3. See note (2), ~~xxxxx~~, page 89.

4. Br. 80 A 20; M.W.Pr. pl. 1, 1; A.B.L. 241, 13.

5. Br. 80 A 27; C.V. (U.S.A. 10) pl. 13; A.B.V. 538, 5.

6. Br. 80 A 28; M.W. Pr. pl. 2;

7. Br. 81 B 7; British Museum Quarterly 4 (1930) pl. 16; A.R.V. 2.287, 26.

8. Vienna, collection of Apostolos Zenon, from Phaestus, silver stater<sup>1</sup>.
9. Policoro Museum, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>2</sup>.
10. Würzburg 911, Megarian bowl<sup>3</sup>.
11. Athens P 441 and P 394, Megarian bowl-fragments<sup>4</sup>.
12. Louvre H 263, guttus<sup>5</sup>.
13. Berlin F 2882, bowl<sup>6</sup>.
14. Alexandria, Coll. Lucas A. Benachi, clay lamp, Roman<sup>7</sup>.
15. Madrid museum, from Liria, mosaic, Roman<sup>8</sup>.

(1) and (2) are interesting and may be looked at in detail. The pediment belongs to the first quarter of the sixth century. In the corner a crab is visible and next to it a two-horse chariot team graze while the charioteer, with one foot on the ground and facing Heracles, holds the reins; this is probably meant to be Iolaus since he is not in the scene elsewhere. Heracles, with his club, faces the hydra of which eight heads are preserved; its tail fills the right-hand corner of the pediment<sup>9</sup>. This piece is almost a century earlier than the first appearance of this composition on vases. However, it has already been said that artists often depict Heracles using the club just because it is his traditional attribute regardless of whether it is documented as used in a particular myth in literature.

---

1. Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 59, 4.

2. See page 89, note (3).

3. Br. 82 E 3; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 59, 3;

4. Br. 82 E 2; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 58, 1.

5. Br. 82 E 5; C.V. 15 pl. IVE. 28, 2.

6. A. Furtwängler, La Collection Sabouroff (Berlin, 1883-7) pl. 74, 3.

7. Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 59, 1.

8. Brommer, Her. pl. 31.

9. Cr. Triton and 'Blue Beard' pediments. See R. Lullies & M. Hirmer, Greek Sculpture (1956) 40, fig. 2 & pll. 24-5.

In (2) there is little to distinguish the figures of Heracles and Iolaus except that the left-hand figure seems to brandish a club while the right-hand one has a sword. Iolaus would thus be the one with the long hair, tunic and quiver while Heracles the one with short hair and naked. Their poses are identical, both brandishing their weapons over their heads; the hydra is between them. This group seems to belong to the early fifth century.

(3) has already been considered in connection with the firebrand. (4) and (5) are replicas of one another by the Haimon Painter. Heracles seems to have used his club to knock off some of the heads: this is presumably his intention in the Leningrad piece (3), where the stumps will be cauterized. This seems a particularly bloody and difficult way of removing the heads and leads me to suppose this to be solely an artistic version, where the artists have given Heracles the club regardless of whether it is appropriate.

(6) is interesting as showing the hydra subject on both sides with a subtle difference in moment. On one side Athena, with visor down, faces the hydra, while Heracles, holding one of its heads, brandishes his club at it; on the other side Athena, with visor up and right arm outstretched, faces the hydra while Heracles stretches out his right hand, apparently having taken something from a bag or pile in the crook of his left arm. It is not clear whether he offers it to Athena or the hydra, but if to the latter it could be a drugged piece of food, thus showing a variant tradition. Athena's raised arm seems to command him to halt. Apart from this oddity the

hydra is shown on both sides wrapped round a tree, something which also occurs on the vase in Leningrad<sup>1</sup> showing Heracles aiming his bow. This is likely to imply confusion with the Hesperides snake and it is possible that neither this vase nor the Leningrad one are meant to depict the hydra but rather Ladon, whose appearance has been confused with that of the hydra. If this is so what Heracles holds in the crook of his arm could be apples, even though none appear on the actual tree.

(7) is interesting as possibly depicting the use of two weapons against the hydra, since Heracles brandishes his club in his right hand but holds slack bow and quiver in his left. This vase will also be mentioned under group IV.

The Policoro vase is another example of Iolaus using the firebrand while Heracles uses the club. It dates to c. 380 BC.

The coin from Phaistus is an early example of the hydra depicted round Heracles' foot, as described by Apollodorus. The coin belongs to the late Classical period but this motif becomes fairly common in Hellenistic art, appearing in (10), (11), (13), and also in the Roman lamp, (15).

Certainly Hellenistic and Roman art are not very original in the weapon they give to Heracles, with the club often appearing in Hellenistic, presumably because it was such a traditional weapon of Heracles. At any rate these many Hellenistic renderings of the hydra myth show that it enjoyed a long popularity.

---

1. See page 94, no. 4 & 95.

IV. Use of the bow.

This group probably begins in the early sixth century, although it could be earlier, depending on the date of the chest of Cypselus. There are not many examples of this composition and the group does not continue beyond the early fifth century.

1. Jena, cup, Corinthian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Chest of Cypselus<sup>2</sup>.
3. Leipzig, cup-fragment, Laconian<sup>3</sup>.
4. Leningrad 610 (Inv. 2351), neck-handled amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. London BM 1929, 5-13.2, stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.

(1) has already been listed in Group I but arrows pierce some of the hydra's nine heads, apparently giving a version where Heracles first made an attempt with the bow. The reproduction of (2) shows Heracles aiming a bow from the right-hand side. It has already been noted that the chariot on the right belongs to the hydra scene rather than to the adjacent scene of the Games of Pelias<sup>6</sup>.

(3), the Laconian fragment, may also depict the use of the bow at the first attempt, since Heracles seems to be brandishing a weapon in his hands, identified as the club by Lane although there does not seem enough left for a positive identification. Along one of the two bodies are a row of what seem to be arrow-heads.

---

1. See page 84, note (6).  
 2. Paus. V 17.11. For a reproduction see Schefold, op. cit. fig. 26.  
 3. Br. 82 C 12; A. Lane, 'Laconian Pottery', B.S.A. 34 (1933/4) 136 & pl. 34b; C.M. Stibbe, Lakonische Vasenmaler der sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Amsterdam, 1972) no. 157.  
 4. Br. 80 B 1; M.W. Pr. pl. 3; A.R.V. 2. 18, 2.  
 5. See page 90, note (7)  
 6. See page 86

(4) is another of the pieces which shows the hydra wound round a tree<sup>1</sup> and as such should perhaps be classified in Group V below, as showing confusion with the Hesperides snake. The action is divided between the two sides of the vase with Heracles on one side aiming the bow, and the hydra and tree on the other. It is the number of heads which leads to the identification of the hydra here, since the creature has seven heads, whereas Ladon is generally only given one. No fruit appears on the tree but the artist here may certainly have been influenced by the snake in Hesperides scenes.

(5) has already been considered among scenes where Heracles uses the club<sup>2</sup>. Certainly the use of both club and bow seems implied here, as on the Jena cup (1), and it is possible that this was also the case with the Leipzig fragment (3), if Lane is correct in his identification of the club here.

It is rather surprising that the representations of this group are not more numerous, since the presence of the bow in this labour is implied by the tradition that Heracles dipped his arrows into the hydra's blood. Presumably this was mainly felt to have no bearing on how he killed the hydra but rather to have been a weapon he always carried with him, using for the actual killing either sword or sickle in the popular-tradition.

#### V. Confusion with the snake of the Hesperides

1. From the Corinthian Kerameikos, Pinax-fragment, Corinthian<sup>3</sup>.
2. From Hagios Floros, bronze statuette<sup>4</sup>.
3. Leningrad 551, Cornelian scaraboid<sup>5</sup>.

1. See page 90, no. 6 & 92f.

2. See page 90, no.7

3. A.J.A. 35 (1931) 22, fig. 22.

4. A.J.A. 38 (1934) 310, fig. 4.

5. J. Boardman, Greek Gems and finger Rings: Early Bronze Age to Late Classical (London, 1970) pl. 372.

4. Louvre 157, bronze group<sup>1</sup>.
5. Potenza, bronze group<sup>2</sup>.
6. London, BM, coin from Phaestus<sup>3</sup>.

The earliest of these pieces belongs to the early sixth century. All show Heracles fighting a one-headed snake, which should identify it as Ladon but there is no tree to make the identification certain. Thus, it needs to be said that no firm identification of myth is possible here, especially as in the Potenza piece (5) a motif of the hydra is employed, with the snake wound round Heracles' leg. In (3), (4) and (6) Heracles brandishes his club and this also seems to have been the original weapon of (1), since he <sup>still</sup> wears bow, quiver and sword. In (2) and (5) the weapon is lost and cannot be identified by process of elimination as in (1), but from Heracles' pose it seems likely to have been the club.

As has already been said,<sup>4</sup> it is perhaps necessary to place in this group Athens NM CC 792 and Leningrad 610, vases which depict a many-headed snake wound round a tree, the weapons used being club and bow respectively. Again it seems impossible to identify the subject-matter for certain.

The prominence of the club in these confused scenes is interesting since it has already been suggested as a weapon having no real place in this myth but represented by artists

- 
1. A de Ridder, Les Bronzes antiques du Louvre I (Paris, 1913) pl. 17.
  2. M. Sestieri-Bertarelli, Il Museo Archeologico di Potenza (1957) 26, fig. 60.
  3. W. Wroth, A Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum (London, 1886) IX pl. 15.5.
  4. See page 93, no. 6 & 95, no. 4.

simply because of its traditional association with Heracles. These artists, clearly not following closely literary tradition, might easily be confused as to the exact differences between Ladon and the hydra. Clearly the confined field of many of the examples limited the amount of detail that could be given, but one would suppose some hint of a tree or more than one head would be possible if there had been an awareness of these details as distinguishing features.

#### VI. Odd compositions

1. Munich 836, neck-handled amphora, Pontic<sup>1</sup>.
2. Würzburg, statue<sup>2</sup>.

In (1) Heracles holds a cat-type animal in each hand, dangling one in front of the twelve-headed hydra. He wears a short cloak, tied at the shoulder, and has no attributes to identify him: it is only the hydra which identifies the myth. Presumably he is meant to be using the cats as a bait, but this is a unique variant. The piece belongs roughly to 550 BC.

The statue (2) shows Heracles with a snake body draped over him, culminating in a woman's head, draped over his shoulder, with six snake necks instead of hair. Heracles is firmly identified by the lionskin over his lower left arm and the snake body with many necks seems to allude to the hydra; the expression on the face indicates it is dead. This is presumably some unique interpretation on the part of the sculptor. This piece apparently dates around the end of the fourth century BC.

1. Br. 82 C 20; P. Ducati, Pontische Vasen (Berlin, 1932) pl. 24a.

2. Museum Helveticum 8 (1951) 185-9.

VII. Scenes which cannot be classified according to composition.

These scenes are generally either too fragmentary to classify or else Heracles' weapon has not been preserved. It will add nothing to describe them individually and so I shall merely list them.

1. Heidelberg, University, fibula, Boeotian geometric<sup>1</sup>.
2. Heracleum, Nat. Mus., relief pinax-fragment<sup>2</sup>.
3. Athens NM, dinos, Corinthian<sup>3</sup>.
4. Throne of Bathycles<sup>4</sup>.
5. Palermo, krater, Corinthian<sup>5</sup>.
6. Louvre C 10506, Tyrrhenian amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Samos, cup-fragments, Laconian<sup>7</sup>.
8. Oxford G 133.4, cup-fragment, Laconian<sup>8</sup>.
9. Samos, Vathy K 176, cup-fragment, Laconian<sup>9</sup>.
10. Olympia B 1913 shield-band<sup>10</sup>.
11. Thasos, Inv. 341 krater-fragment<sup>11</sup>.
12. London, Graf Seilern, Caeretan hydria<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. F.G.S no. 72; B. Schweitzer, Herakles: Aufsätze zur griechischen Religions- und Sagen-geschichte, (Tübingen, 1922) fig. 34, 35.
  2. K. Fittschen, Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagen-darstellung bei den Griechen (Berlin, 1969) 149.
  3. Br. 81 C 8 & 11 (erroneously twice); Ephemeris (1970) 87ff. fig. 1 & pl. 31a.
  4. Paus. III 18.10-16.
  5. Br. 81 C 4; N.C. 1194.
  6. Br. 79 A 8; A.A. (1971) 169, figs. 8 & 9; Par. 39u.
  7. Br. 82 C 15; Stibbe, op. cit. no. 158 a & b, pl. 49, 5-6.
  8. Br. 82 C 13; Stibbe, op. cit. no. 162; Lane, op. cit. pl. 34c.
  9. Br. 82 C 14; Stibbe, op. cit. 206a pl. 68, 3; Lane, op. cit. 163, 3.
  10. Kunze, op. cit. XLI, 59y, pl. 65.
  11. Br. 79 A 18; L. Ghali-Kahil, La Céramique grecque (Paris, 1960) pl. 38, 117.
  12. Br. 82 C 16; Mon. Piot 44 (1950) 8, fig. 6. This vase is complete but has certain odd features. On the left is a male with a sickle, apparently wearing a close-fitting helmet with a 'pony-tail'. The male on the right holds a conical object which could be a sword, club, or firebrand. Therefore,

13. Athens Acr. 450 (E1), skyphos-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
14. Kiel, private, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
15. Myconos KZ 1134, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
16. Group by Tisagoras<sup>4</sup>.
17. Thasos, Limenas A7, skyphos-fragment<sup>5</sup>.
18. Argive-Corinthian plaque from Corinth<sup>6</sup>.
19. Temple of Apollo at Delphi<sup>7</sup>.
20. Athens, Acr. 358 (B33) cup-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>8</sup>.
21. Olympia TC 1829, Megarian bowl.<sup>9</sup>

---

it is not possible to classify this among composition-groups based on weapon-type.

1. Br. 80 B 3; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 38; A.R.V. 2. 66, 134.
2. Br 80 A 32; A.A. (1971) 163, fig. 1.
3. Br. 79 A 17; A.A. (1971) 171, fig. 14.
4. Paus. X 18.6.
5. Br. 80 A 30; Ghali-Kahil, op. cit. pl. 34, 70.
6. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung (1916) 44, fig. 8.
7. A.S. Owen in his commentary on Euripides, Ion (Oxford, 1939) v. 190 apparently presumes the chorus are looking at metopes. However, there seems no certain evidence for this. I feel Euripides could be describing paintings, sculptures or tapestries, perhaps put into the temple just before the play was written.
8. Br. 81 B 10; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 27; A.R.V. 2. 477, 291.
9. Br. 82 E 1; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 59, 2.

CONCLUSION

The hydra labour was an early one with the story probably having oriental origins, since snakes and dragons formed an important part of Eastern mythology. This labour gave Heracles an important defence, namely poison for his arrows, and this came to be indirectly the cause of his own death. Originally Heracles seems to have been thought to have used the sword and Iolaus the sickle against the hydra. Iolaus was present from early times as was the crab. The story can certainly be dated to the eighth century BC, even without the testimony of Hesiod, since it appears on Geometric fibulae of the last part of this century. In fact this seems a good enough criterion for disagreeing with the editor of the Oxford text of Hesiod that the description of the hydra is spurious.

The story of more heads growing for each one cut off presumably did not appear until the late sixth century together with the tradition of the firebrand, which is described as used by Iolaus to cauterize the stumps. In the late sixth century the sickle becomes the main weapon used by Heracles although he is depicted with it on a few earlier pieces. Iolaus is still sometimes shown with the sickle and, strangely enough, the firebrand is not often depicted in art, although it came to form the main literary tradition. Both club and bow are sometimes given to Heracles but these need not imply an actual literary tradition; they may merely belong to the artistic one, as being traditional weapons of Heracles.

Nine is the most common number of heads given to the hydra in art, but any number from six to thirteen is shown. Perhaps the tradition of nine was quite a strong one; at any rate, it is the only number attested in literature that could be

depicted in art, since the other numbers are too great. Probably the actual number was never fixed and it was good enough to make it many-headed. It is the number of heads which distinguishes the hydra from the Hesperides snake, which is generally given only one, or very occasionally two. Sometimes, however, the two snakes may be confused in art.

This labour is the most complete in early days of all the labours and its number was probably fixed early on, together with that of the Nemean lion. Both give Heracles useful weapons for carrying out the other labours and both seem probably of oriental origin.

καταγεται, (καταγεται),

(E.G.H. 372): These birds were driven off by Heracles who had been given a rattle (κλαυθρον) to crash and frighten them.

(E.G.H. 373): These castanets (καταγεται) were used by Heracles himself.

(Pollux Rhodius (3.293C)):  
Not even Heracles, when he came to Arcadia, could drive away the Stymphalian birds but he managed to frighten them off with a bronze rattle (κλαυθρον).

(E.G.H. 374): It was the fifth labour to drive the birds out of Lake Stymphalus; they were numerous and were destroying the surrounding district. Unable to war-  
case them by force, owing to their large numbers, Heracles used his ingenuity and made a bronze rattle (κλαυθρον) with which he frightened them forever.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE STYMPHALIAN BIRDS

The setting for this labour is a lake in Arcadia in the Northern Peloponnese and it is Heracles' task to rid it of the birds which infest it. In the literary evidence he is generally described as frightening them off with a rattle whereas in art this version is not preserved and he is represented killing them with various weapons.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

- Pisander (F 4 K): Pisander of Camirus οὐ φησὶ that Heracles killed the birds, saying that he chased them off with the noise of castanets. (κρόταλα).
- Pherecydes (F.G.H.3F72): Pherecydes says the Stymphalides were birds and were driven off by Heracles who had been given a rattle (πλαταγή) to crash and frighten them.
- Hellanicus (F.G.H.4F104): These castanets (κρόταλα) were made by Heracles himself.
- Apollonius Rhodius (2.1052ff.): Not even Heracles, when he came to Arcadia, could drive away the Stymphalian Birds but he managed to frighten them off with a bronze rattle (πλαταγή).
- Diodorus Siculus (IV 13,2): It was the fifth labour to drive the birds out of Lake Stymphalus; they were numerous and were destroying the surrounding district. Unable to overcome them by force, owing to their large numbers, Heracles used his ingenuity and made a bronze rattle (πλαταγή) with which he frightened them away forever.

- Apollodorus (II v 6): It was the sixth labour to drive off the Stymphalian Birds, which settled at lake Stymphalus because they were afraid of wolves. Heracles did not know how to accomplish the task until Athena gave him some bronze castanets (κρόταλα), made by Hephaestus. When Heracles crashed them the birds flew upwards in fright and he then shot<sup>1</sup> them.
- Pausanias (VIII 22.4): There is a story about Lake Stymphalus that man-eating birds dwelt there and were shot down by Heracles. They may have been connected in origin with the Stymphalides of the Arabian Desert which were the same size as cranes but looked like the ibex except for their long, straight beaks.
- Hyginus (Fab. XXX 6): As the fifth labour Heracles killed with arrows the Stymphalian birds who were hit emissis pennis suis.

Two different sources may be traced here using the words κρόταλα and πλαταγή respectively, variously rendered in translation as "castanets" and "rattle". Pisander, Hellanicus and Apollodorus use the former, Pherecydes, Apollonius and Diodorus the latter, although it is possible that the choice of word was made by the preserving source in passages that only survive in works of others.

1. The idea of shooting them, but without the help of the rattle, is taken up by Seneca e.g. Agamemnon, 849, Quintus Smyrnaeus (VI 227-31) and Hyginus (~~Agamemnon~~).

The birds seem to have connection with Mars, as do certain other of Heracles' opponents<sup>1</sup>. Apollonius<sup>2</sup> talks of the Argonauts seeing one of the birds "that haunt the isle of Ares" and Servius<sup>3</sup> indicates that these were the Stymphalian birds, referring to them as the alumnae Martis<sup>4</sup>.

The reason for disposing of the birds is left vague in the early sources and it is not until Diodorus that the information is given that they destroyed the countryside around Stymphalus. This is substantiated and extended by Servius<sup>5</sup>, who makes men their victims too: Cum essent plurimae volantes tantum plumarum de se emittebant ut homines et animalia necarent, agros et semina cooperirent. This is an odd and apparently uniquely Roman idea. It is perhaps clarified a little by Claudian's statement<sup>6</sup>: spicula vulnifico quondam sparsisse volatu. This would seem to imply that their feathers formed a kind of dart which was perhaps poisonous. However, it may refer to a type of pellet such as owls drop, again presumably containing some sort of harmful substance: pellets contain feathers and so this idea would accord with Servius' description. Pausanias,<sup>7</sup> moreover, specifically refers to these birds as ἀνδροφάγοι, thus taking their harmful nature to its extreme. It is likely

---

1. Cf. Cercopes, mares of Diomedes and the Amazons.

2. 2.1033f.

3. Ad Aen. VIII 299.

4. They are also connected with Mars by the Elder Pliny (Natural History 4, 32)

5. See reference in note (3) above

6. Carmina Minora 9, 2 ed. J. Koch (Leipzig, 1893)

7. VIII 22.4.

that Hyginus' words, as quoted above, refer to the harmful nature of their feathers since penna can mean a 'feather' as well as a 'wing'.

It is obvious that in the literary accounts the methods of dealing with the birds fall into two neat versions, use of rattle and bow; these look distinct chronologically but find a meeting point in Apollodorus, who unites both versions. One look at the artistic evidence, however, will show that these neat chronological divisions cannot be sustained.

On the evidence of literature, the myth dates to around the middle of the seventh century and so is a fairly early one. It is not specifically called a labour until Diodorus, although its appearance at Olympia indicates it was thought of as one in the fifth century, at least in the Northern Peloponnese<sup>1</sup>. Its non-appearance in the Attic dramatists may well indicate that it never formed part of the Attic Heracles tradition. At any rate, it appears together with the other labours only at Olympia, being eliminated from the metopes of the Hephaesteum<sup>2</sup> and the pediment of the Theban Heracleum by Praxiteles<sup>3</sup>.

This myth does not in the early days accord well with the spirit of the labours in general, unless there was an early tradition, now lost, about the dangerous nature of the birds, thus providing an opportunity for heroism. The idea of Heracles being given the rattle to drive them off indicates a certain lack of heroism, although it is not possible to glean

---

1. See chapters 1 & 14.

2. The Augeas legend is also omitted from both these works and the reason in both cases is likely to be that they were considered local legends.

3. Paus. IX 11.4.

the actual words of the early sources from the authors who quote them, and it is possible that others, as well as Hellanicus, described Heracles making the rattle himself.

The fact that this myth does not well accord with the spirit of the labours until late suggests that it may well have been mainly a local Peloponnesian legend of the area around Arcadia, which would explain its inclusion on the Temple of Zeus, as that of the Augeas legend<sup>1</sup>; its appearance among the labours would need justifying when the temple was generally accepted as providing the canon for the labours; hence, Diodorus' assertion of the skill and ingenuity shown by Heracles. Its earliest appearance in Pisander need not be a surprise, since Rhodes was a Doric area, doubtless influenced from the Peloponnese.

Admittedly it appears in Pherecydes but he is likely to have been following a Peloponnesian source since his version is different from any rendered in Attic art. He follows a different source from Hellanicus, his contemporary, if the words ascribed to them for rattle or castanets are authentic.

#### B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

The artistic evidence, like the literary, is rather sparse but in no way compares with the dearth for the Augeas legend. It is very odd that no artistic version survives of the rattle, which was, as has been shown, very common in the literary accounts. Indeed, in most of the representations Heracles seems about to kill the birds; moreover, the earliest artistic version shows a weapon not recorded in extant literature, namely the sling.

1. See page 219

(a) Use of the Sling

This version originates around the middle of the sixth century BC and can be seen on four pieces.

1. London, BM B163, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Boulogne 420, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Louvre F387, amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Selinus, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.

The weapon here is unmistakably a sling and cannot be a badly drawn rattle, since the stone is often depicted poised inside. Admittedly the rendering does not indicate much familiarity with how to use a sling, it being held out in front at catapult level rather than above the head where a sling should be poised; the artists cannot have a catapult in mind since the stone would then spring straight back at Heracles' own chest.

Special comment may be made here about (3) since Iolaus appears, although not strictly justified by the literary tradition; he does, of course, often appear in art as the traditional helper of Heracles, as does Athena. The two comrades appear on separate sides of the vase and so the picture is continuous all round. Iolaus is dressed as a hoplite, perhaps suggesting something about the dangerous nature of the birds.

Numbers (1) and (2) date c. 550, while (3) and (4) may be placed in the early fifth century.

1. Br. 208 A 3; C.V. 3 pl. 29; A.B.V. 134, 28.

2. Br. 207 A 2; Le Musée 2 (1905) 268, fig. 11; A.B.V. 134, 29.

3. Br. 208 A 8; R. Flacelière & P. Devambez, Héraclès-Images et Récits (Paris, 1966) pl. 7; A.B.L. 238, 132.

4. Br. 208 A 5; Arch. Rep. (1966/7) 40, fig. 19a.

(b) Use of the Bow

This weapon is attested in literary accounts of this myth but not until late; Apollodorus mentions it being used alongside the rattle but it has already been stated that the rattle appears nowhere in surviving art. The earliest appearance of the bow dates to the early fifth century, thus considerably antedating its first literary appearance; thereafter, however, it does not occur again until Hellenistic and Roman art, and so is hardly common.

1. Vienna, Kh. Mus. IV 1841, white-ground lekythos<sup>1</sup>.
2. Berlin F 2882, relief terra cotta jug, Hellenistic<sup>2</sup>.
3. Athens, Ag. P 17877, terra cotta jug, Hellenistic<sup>3</sup>.
4. Corinth CP 523, Relief bowl, Roman<sup>4</sup>.
5. Madrid museum, from Liria, mosaic, Roman<sup>5</sup>.

Number (1) dates to the early fifth century, (2) and (3) are Hellenistic, (4) and (5) are Roman.

(c) Use of the Sword

1. Copenhagen NCG1, oinochoe Attic Geometric<sup>6</sup>.
2. Munich 1842 (J 1111), lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

(1), dating 720/700 BC, has the usual Geometric problems as regards identification of subject-matter and so I have not

- 
1. Br. 208 A 6; Brommer, Her. fig. 7; A.B.V. 522.
  2. Furtwängler, op. cit. pl. 74, 3.
  3. Br. 208 E 1; Hesperia 17 (1948) pl. 64.
  4. Hesperia 11 (1942) 166f. I.1. figs. 5a and 6a.
  5. Brommer, Her. pl. 31.
  6. Br. 208 S.a; Brommer, Her. pl. 18b.
  7. Br. 208 A 4; A.V. pl. 105/6; A.B.V. 455.

placed this group first, despite the early date of the oinochoe. On the shoulder is a man holding a bird by the neck, while in front of him are nine more birds. He apparently holds a sword behind him, but even the identification of this is not certain. If the oinochoe does represent Heracles and the Stymphalian Birds it is older than the earliest literary accounts and provides an earlier version than the rattle one. This identification is, however, by no means certain and this could well be a picture of a trapper trapping birds or of a farmer driving birds away.

With (2) the identification of subject-matter is certain, but not the identification of the weapon. Luce<sup>1</sup> names it as the club, giving as another example of this weapon's appearance in this myth a skyphos in the Hague<sup>2</sup>, which I am unable to identify. However, I take Heracles' action in the Munich piece to be not one of hitting but of plunging. There are no attributes, if the club theory is discounted, but I take the larger figure to be Heracles: he holds a standing bird by the throat and seems about to plunge in a sword. Behind him is a small naked man, presumably Iolaus, also about to plunge a sword into a standing bird. This piece dates to the fifth century.

Thus once again the killing-motif may be depicted and once again the weapon is not named in extant literature.

(d) Representations where the version is not known

1. Olympia, metope<sup>3</sup>.

1. A.J.A. 20 (1916) 473f.

2. Scheuleer Collection no. 393.

3. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pl. 153-6.

2. Stymphalus, acroteria<sup>1</sup>.

3. Stymphalus, coins<sup>2</sup>.

Pausanias' statement<sup>3</sup> that the Stymphalian Birds were represented on the Temple of Zeus is very useful, since otherwise it would be difficult to identify the subject-matter of the metope concerned. Typical of the composition of these metopes, it shows a quiet moment in the myth: Athena sits on a rock, her body twisted towards Heracles, who stands facing her, stretching out an object in his right hand. Pausanias is not explicit enough to indicate the version intended. It is just possible that the rattle was depicted here, being returned to Athena by Heracles: presumably, for the scene to make any sense, he must either be handing over the rattle or the offering of a dead bird. It seems to me that there is not enough space for a bird to be shown between Heracles and Athena here and I suggest that the rattle was the object in Heracles' hand<sup>4</sup>. If the rattle did originally appear on this metope it is particularly unfortunate it has not been preserved as it would have been its only appearance in surviving art.

The acroteria of the Temple of Stymphalus (2) were apparently just statues of birds, reinforcing, together with the coins, the local colour of this myth. Both acroteria and coins (3) merely

---

1. Paus. VIII 22. 4 & 7.

2. F.W. Imhhoof-Blumer & P. Gardner, Ancient Coins illustrating lost Masterpieces of Greek Art: a Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias (Chicago, 1964) pll. TX-XII & p. 99.

3. V 10. 9.

4. As metal attachments were common, perhaps an actual bronze rattle was shown originally.

allude to the myth without stating any particular version. Of the latter, two have heads of birds, one the head of Heracles, and a fourth the figure of Heracles with his traditional attributes of club, lionskin and bow.

(e) Doubtful representations

1. London BM 3204, fibula, Boeotian, Geometric<sup>1</sup>.
2. Athens, Acr. 1298, skyphos-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Athens, Agora S 1295 and S 1260, late Archaic marble<sup>3</sup>.

The fibula, dating probably to the beginning of the seventh century BC, shows two men holding birds by the neck, while others fly around. This could represent Heracles and Iolaus with the Stymphalian Birds; Iolaus appears in other pictures of this myth. However, as with the Geometric oinochoe, there is nothing to allow of a positive identification of Heracles here. The scene could, therefore, portray bird-catchers or angry farmers driving off some birds from their crops<sup>4</sup>.

On the skyphos-fragment, (2), only birds are preserved, the neck and body of one and apparently the wings of others. It is obviously too fragmentary to allow of any positive identification of subject-matter or to give any indication of the version depicted, even if it could be linked with the Stymphalian Birds.

In (3) a head is preserved, which can be identified as Heracles by the lionskin; the inclination of the head suggests

---

1. F.G.S. No. 100, pl. 1.

2. Par 208 A 7; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. I pl. 72; A.B.L. 250, 9.

3. H.A. Thompson, Hesperia 17 (1948) 174f. & pl. 49-50.

4. cf. Copenhagen NCGI page 108, no. 14.

that he was swinging his club or perhaps his sword and two drill holes indicate that this originally rested on the side of his head. His opponent would be on his right. A beaked head with crest was found nearby; it is of the same date as the head and could belong to a Stymphalian bird. No positive identification of subject-matter is possible, of course, but if the pieces did belong together as part of a scene at Lake Stymphalus this would be the only certain<sup>1</sup> surviving use of the club in representations of this myth. However, I have stated that the weapon here could possibly have been the sword, used in slashing motion, and the linking of the beak with the head can be no more than a suggestion.

#### CONCLUSION

It has been noted<sup>2</sup> that most of the artistic representations of this myth show Heracles killing or about to kill the birds. The exceptions are the Geometric oinochoe and fibula<sup>3</sup>, which cannot be said with certainty to depict this myth, as is the case with those pieces listed under 'doubtful representations' namely the acroteria and coins of Stymphalus<sup>4</sup>, which do not state any particular version, and also the Olympia metope<sup>5</sup>, which could possibly have depicted Heracles handing over his rattle to Athena. In literature on the other hand, the killing version does not appear until late and the rattle motif forms the main tradition.

---

1. See page 108, nos. (1) & (2) u. for possible renderings of the club in this myth.

2. See page 106.

3. See pages 108 - 9

4. See page 110

5. See pages 109f.

It has been suggested that the early literary evidence is Peloponnesian inspired;<sup>1</sup> perhaps it was this which established the tradition of the rattle. It is certainly noteworthy that the only artistic piece which might have depicted the rattle is Peloponnesian. The lack of reference to the Stymphalian birds in Attic drama has been noted<sup>2</sup> and certainly in Attic art it does not extend beyond a few black-figure examples of the period c. 550 to shortly after 500 BC. The version depicted in Attic is Heracles killing the birds and this might reflect an Attic tradition of this myth, although not followed by Pherecydes; this might apply especially to the rendering of the sling, which is an unusual weapon, not documented at all in the literary accounts, and not simply confined to one school of artists.

However, it will be seen throughout this thesis that artists generally had little precise knowledge of individual myths and that they often produced for each labour versions which differed one from another mainly according to whether Heracles was given sword, club, or bow as his main weapon, regardless of what was specified in the literary traditions. Perhaps they considered such renderings to be more interesting artistically than the existing literary tradition and this may well have been the case with the myth of the Stymphalian birds: a picture of the rattle version would necessarily be rather static. Perhaps, then, the pieces in question do not depict any established literary tradition, but rather an artistic version, possibly felt to be more vivid, possibly through ignorance of the current literary version. On the other hand, it is always possible

---

1. See pages 105 - 6

2. See page 105

that the version of killing the birds, as recorded by Hyginus, existed in literature much earlier and was followed by these artists. Unfortunately, there seems no way of knowing.

Interest in this myth certainly waned after the early fifth century, except for its appearance on the Temple of Zeus. It does not appear again in either literature or art, apart from the local art of Stymphalus, until Hellenistic times, when the bow is the main weapon shown, possibly owing to a Hellenistic source not preserved, or possibly dictated by the whim of the artists. At any rate, it is not until Apollodorus that the bow-version gains any popularity in literature, and even here it is placed alongside the tradition of the rattle. However, this could represent an attempt to reconcile two already existing traditions.

It has been indicated before that no act of heroism or benefaction is implied by this labour until late<sup>1</sup> and it is noteworthy that in surviving art the birds are in no way depicted as monstrous but rather as ordinary water-birds, although sometimes fairly large ones. The need to stress them as monstrous came about, I believe, when a need was felt to justify their presence among the late canon of labours.

It is my contention that the myth of the Stymphalian birds was essentially a local one and was placed on the Temple of Zeus at Olympia, among the labours, precisely for this reason<sup>2</sup>. A parallel for this can be found in a more extreme form in the Augeas myth, which never certainly appears in art except on

---

1. See pages 105 - 6

2. I shall deal with the reasons for the placing of the labours of Heracles on the temple of Zeus in my final chapter.

this temple. For a brief period the Stymphalian birds were taken into Attic legend, changed from bird-scaring to bird-killing at least in Attic art, although Pherecydes preferred to follow the Peloponnesian version.

It is possible that the general theme of a man mastering birds was inspired by the East. This can be seen to have been a theme of Eastern legend from an Assyrian seal<sup>1</sup> of the ninth/eighth century BC, which depicts a man surrounded by rather awesome-looking birds, his hands round the neck of one. Certainly the Rhodian poet, Pisander, would be in a good geographical position to receive the tides of Oriental influence and, in view of the Doric affinities of Rhodes, could incorporate this into his version of the legend of Heracles, the great Doric hero.

---

1. Frankfort, op. cit. 198 pl. 34c.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE CRETAN BULL.

This labour is not well documented in extant literature until the late mythographers but, strangely enough, it was extremely popular with Attic vase-painters, especially the later black-figure painters of small pots. It is a fairly late myth, not beginning until roughly the middle of the sixth century BC, and from the lack of information as to the actual story of the myth, as opposed to the identification of the bull, it is likely to have been considered not a very interesting one. This myth is closely linked with the Theseus story of the bull of Marathon, the same bull being involved in both. Its popularity in Attic vase-painting is certainly strange in view of the existence of the Theseus tradition, which one would expect these artists to favour in exclusion to the other. Perhaps the Heracles myth was commonly rendered in Attic to enhance Theseus' fame for undergoing a similar adventure and also, in fact, for finishing off a task left unfinished by Heracles, since he is made to kill the bull.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

Acusilaus (EGH, 2F29): Acusilaus says that the bull connected with Heracles was that which carried Europa to Crete for Zeus.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 13,4): It was the seventh labour to bring from Crete the bull loved by Pasiphae. Heracles accomplished this with the help of Minos and rode it over the sea to the Peloponnese.

(IV 59,6): The bull of Marathon, overcome by Theseus, was the same as that which Heracles brought from Crete to Greece.

- Apollodorus (II v 7): It was the seventh labour to bring back the Cretan bull. Apollodorus quotes Acusilaus and then says that others identify the bull as the one given up by Poseidon when Minos pledged to sacrifice to him whatever appeared from the sea. When he saw how beautiful the bull was, Minos kept it and sacrificed another to Poseidon, who was angry and made it savage. Minos refused to help Heracles catch the bull; he accomplished it alone and took it to Eurystheus. It was then released but went to Marathon and caused damage.
- Pausanias (I 27. 10): The Cretans say this bull was sent to Crete by Poseidon because Minos failed to respect him. They say it was carried over from Crete and became one of Heracles' labours. It was set free but came into Marathon and killed, among others, Minos' son Androgeus. For this Minos exacted tribute, the food for the Minotaur. Theseus later drove the bull to the Athenian acropolis and sacrificed it to Athena.
- Hyginus (Fab XXX 8): Heracles brought the bull alive to Greece from Crete. It was the bull with which Pasiphae mated.

Bulls were important animals in Crete and often appear in Minoan art. They were important in a religious context and horns of consecration were almost universal at Minoan shrines, being used to mark consecrated ground. These horns were probably representative of the whole bull, which was a symbol of power and reproductive fertility; there is no evidence that bulls were actually worshipped. Moreover, several myths connect Crete with individual bulls and these may have been influenced by the Minoan ritual. Examples are Pasiphae and the bull, their offspring the Minotaur, the bull sent by Poseidon, and the bull which carried Europa to Crete, whether or not this was the same as Pasiphae's lover. It seems natural, moreover, that a legend involving Heracles with a Cretan bull should be linked with one of these, and we see this happening in various combinations in the few extant sources. As has been already pointed out, writers seem to have been more interested in identifying the bull than in recounting the actual myth. Certainly the tradition is confused as to which Cretan bull this was.

As regards the linking of the Theseus and Heracles bull stories, it is likely to have taken place when the Athenians were expanding the Theseus saga and giving him deeds to match up with those of Heracles; this seems to have occurred in the later years of the sixth century, since Pherecydes is the first extant source to incorporate the expanded tradition and many vases depict it around this time. It obviously enhanced Theseus' glory to finish off a deed left unfinished by Heracles; he thus performed an act of heroism and benefaction, in an

Attic setting, since the bull was causing havoc in Marathon. The bull of Marathon appears for the first time in any surviving medium on a vase by Oltos<sup>1</sup> and is thus later than the first apparent renderings of the Cretan bull c. 550 BC<sup>2</sup>, and c. 530 on a vase by the Andocides Painter<sup>3</sup>. More will be said about these pieces later especially about the significance of the composition of the last, but it does seem that the Heracles myth was the earlier. Thus the Theseus bull story was apparently a secondary one and seems always to have concerned the same bull as that captured by Heracles since there is no contrary tradition.

All the sources talk of Heracles bringing the bull back alive, and this was an obvious prerequisite of Theseus killing it. However, when I examine the artistic evidence I shall suggest that there may have been an earlier tradition, before the story of the bull of Marathon began, which made Heracles kill the Cretan bull, although this has not survived in extant literature.

Diodorus is the only source to say how Heracles got the bull back to Greece and he was perhaps influenced by the story of Europa riding on a bull to Crete. Nowhere are we told how he actually caught it although Diodorus allows Minos' help, whereas Apollodorus, being concerned, presumably, with the

---

1. Madrid 11267 (Br. 254 B 17; A.R.V.<sup>2</sup>. 58, 53.)

2. Volute-krater in Taranto and lip-cup Market 1967 and 1970.  
See pages 137, no.1 & 140, no. 1.

3. See page 123, no.1.

validity of this labour<sup>1</sup>, says that Minos refused to help. This labour is stressed as heroic by the later sources, since Apollodorus tells how Poseidon made the bull savage and Pausanias implies as much when he says it was sent to punish Minos; moreover, Quintus Smyrnaeus<sup>2</sup> describes it as 'fire-breathing'. There seems to be no idea of benefaction contained in this labour. It was probably regarded as suitable for a labour since such a large animal would be difficult to catch, especially as all bulls are potentially dangerous, and it would also be difficult to bring it back over such a large expanse of sea.

It is likely that Crete was chosen as the homeland of this bull because of the significance of bulls on that island, and also because of the myths about other specific bulls connected with it. Mycenae was greatly influenced by Crete c. 1600-1450<sup>3</sup>, and myths linking the two areas are not surprising. It is also interesting, however, that Theseus has various connections with Crete, and with Minos in particular, both in the myth of the Minotaur and also in that which deals with Minos' ring<sup>4</sup>. Perhaps this made his connection with this bull all the easier, and it is noteworthy that Pausanias records in chronological order the catching of the Cretan bull, the exacting of the tribute for Minos and the slaying of the bull at Marathon. Here, however, it is not completely clear whether Heracles comes into contact with the bull in Crete or in Argos; obviously the latter setting would introduce a novel element into the story.

- 
1. He rejects the hydra on the grounds that Heracles had help. (See page 78) and the Augeas labour because he was paid. (See page 211)
  2. VI 236ff.
  3. See R. Higgins, Minoan and Mycenaean Art (London, 1967) 76ff.
  4. cf. Bacchylides 17.

B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

As has already been mentioned, there is much artistic evidence for this myth although difficulty is incurred in trying to distinguish between Heracles and Theseus in bull scenes. Compositions are similar and it is not even possible to distinguish in those scenes with a killing motif since Heracles is occasionally shown in scenes suggestive of this and, on the other hand, Theseus does not always need to be shown killing the bull, since the artist could choose to depict him capturing it or leading it to Athens. Theseus should not in this myth have a beard, since this is an early deed for him, whereas Heracles ought to be shown with a beard, since this labour occurred during his full manhood. Moreover, Theseus should not be drawn with bow and arrows, since these were never among his attributes; he is often depicted wearing a hat and/or chiton and carrying a spear, and it will be necessary to look for these in identifying him. Unfortunately by c. 470 BC Heracles' traditional attribute, the club, was also possessed by Theseus by the time he encountered the bull of Marathon, since he had taken that of Periphetes<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, Heracles' other traditional attribute, the lionskin, is not often rendered in this myth, thus making matters even more difficult<sup>2</sup>. The main criterion I shall have to adopt in

- 
1. The Periphetes myth is first depicted in surviving art on an Attic black-figure pelike, Laon 37978 (Br. 244 A1) dating c. 500, on a metope of the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, and on an Attic red-figure cup, Munich 2670 (Br. 211 B1) dating c. 470. In the last piece the club may be brandished by Theseus; there is no evidence of its depiction before this time.
  2. On distinguishing features see B. Shefton, 'Heracles and Theseus on a red-figure louterion', Hesperia 31 (1962) 330ff. On the point in question see 367f.

identifying Heracles is the presence of bow and quiver, which often hang from a convenient tree; to distinguish Theseus I shall look for hat and spear; sometimes the presence of beard or tunic may help in identification but too much emphasis should not be placed on these. However, it must be remembered that artists were seldom well-versed in the finer details of mythology, and the task of distinguishing the heroes in the various representations is not likely to be an easy one; sometimes it will be necessary to admit that no firm distinction can be made.

I shall begin with a type of composition which may reflect the original version of the Cretan bull myth before Theseus was connected with it. It shows Heracles leading along the bull, and some of these scenes have sacrificial connotations. My second and largest group contains the standard composition and shows Heracles bending forward, either about to engage, actually wrestling with, or binding with ropes a charging bull. The third group depicts him using the club, against the bull and the implications of this will be discussed later<sup>1</sup>.

#### I. Heracles leads along the Cretan bull.

In these scenes Heracles is depicted, often wearing the lionskin, walking beside a bull and holding its horns. These could merely represent him taking the bull to Eurystheus, but in several of these scenes the bull appears to wear a sacrificial fillet and there are various other signs of impending sacrifice. Since these scenes are rather similar one to another, if some have sacrificial connotations the others ought to have too, and the idea of sacrifice may be upheld by a few other pieces

---

<sup>1</sup> See pages 141ff.

where Heracles is not actually leading the bull along; these will be looked at towards the end of this section.

Certainly the frequent presence of the lionskin in these scenes makes it certain that the hero here is Heracles and it is unlikely that the bull is any other than the Cretan; at least, we nowhere hear of him in connection with any other bull. These representations are close chronologically to those which must depict the Cretan bull, and it would be most confusing if Heracles were shown in the process of sacrificing an unspecified bull in unspecified context. A more acceptable explanation seems to be that this group contains the original tradition about the Cretan bull, namely that Heracles brought it over to Greece and sacrificed it<sup>1</sup>, perhaps to Athena, with whom he is occasionally pictured in scenes with a sacrificial flavour, or perhaps he was even ordered by Eurystheus to sacrifice it to Hera. Obviously the idea of sacrificing the Cretan bull conflicts with the notion that Theseus sacrificed the same bull when it came to Marathon, but this may be explained by assuming that the Theseus legend modified the Heracles legend by making Theseus, and not Heracles, sacrifice the bull. The first appearance of the Theseus bull myth is on a vase by Oltos<sup>2</sup>, which dates to the last decade of the sixth century, that is, almost twenty years after the Andocides Painter had drawn the first surviving Heracles sacrificial scene.

The pieces in this group are as follows:

1. Boston 99.538, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
2. Berlin F 1856, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.

1. My thanks go to Prof. J. Barron for suggesting this idea to me.

2. See page 119, note (1) for references thereto.

3. Br. 205 A3 & B 1, Sir J.D. Beazley, The Development of Attic Black-Figure (Berkeley, California, 1951) pl. 34-5; A.B.V. 255,6.

4. Br. 204 A1; E. Gerhard, Trinkschalen und Gefässe des Königl. Museums zu Berlin (Berlin, 1848-50) pl. 15, 1-2; A.B.V. 370, 130.

3. Louvre F 299, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
4. Earlier Bourgeois-Thierry, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
5. Palermo GE 1896.2, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
6. Budapest 51.17, olpe, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
7. Brussels A 1582, pelike, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
8. Catania, Gemarelli, pelike, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
9. Rhodes 13484, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
10. Thebes, olpe, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
11. Selinus, coin<sup>9</sup>.

In (1), (2), (9) and (10) the bull seems to wear a sacrificial fillet and more details of sacrifice are added in the first two, with Heracles carrying a roasting spit and wine-skin in (1), which could be used in a sacrificial feast, and in (2) the sacrificial slab is depicted in front of Heracles and bull. In all of these scenes, except (11), Heracles wears the lionskin and so there can be no doubt as to identification. Moreover, the subject matter of (11) seems certain since Selinus was very close to the little colony of Heraclea Minoa and so likely to represent Heracles and bull. The subject seems fixed as mythological<sup>10</sup> from that of the companion coin which shows

- 
1. Br. 195 A 3; C.V. 6 pl. 72, 1; A.B.V. 362, 29.
  2. Br. 196 A 14; A.V. pl. 98, 3-4; A.B.V. 385, 29.
  3. Br. 199 A 78; A.B.L. pl. 15, 4; A.B.V. 385, 30.
  4. Br. 196 A 10; Bulletin Hongrois 7 (1955) 9ff.; Par. 167, 252.
  5. Br. 200 A 1; C.V. 3 pl. 26, 6; A.B.V. 608, 3.
  6. Br. 205 A 5; O. Benndorf, Griechische und Sicilische Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1883) pl. 42, 3; A.B.V. 608, 5.
  7. Br. 205 A 6; C.V. 1 pl. 82; A.B.V. 437, 1u.
  8. Br. 205 A 7; Hesperia 11 (1942) pl. 3; A.B.V. 536, 38.
  9. R. Seltman, Greek Coins (1933) pl. 24, 8.
  10. See L. deLacroix, Monnaies et Colonisation dans l'Occident Grec (Brussels, 1965) 34ff.

Artemis and Apollo. There is a local river god on the reverse of both coins. Sometimes Heracles holds his club in these scenes, but it appears merely to be a traditional attribute or at most a weapon of coercion, rather than a threat to the bull's life, as the weapons used in Group III may be.

As regards the other scenes with sacrificial flavour, two quiet scenes may be examined, where Heracles stands with the bull in the presence of Athena:

1. Rome, Vatican 379, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Paris, Cab. Méd. 219, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.

In (1) Heracles stands with his club over his shoulder, pointing with open hand at a little bull, which stands on the inner side of Athena. Hermes is present and perhaps also Dionysus; the figure I identify as the latter has a wreath round his head and holds a branch; the presence of Dionysus could symbolise the life-blood of animals, which is about to be shed in sacrifice. In (2) only Athena, Heracles and the bull are present; Heracles stands holding his bow slack and looking back at the bull.

Obviously the exact nature of these scenes cannot be determined and it is possible that they are merely a general allusion by the artist to the Cretan bull myth, and do not depict any specific incident therein. However, it is also possible that they depict a quiet moment before Heracles offers up the bull to Athena, who receives the sacrifice in the Theseus legend of the bull of Marathon.

---

1. Br. 195 A 18; Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 60.

2. Br. 194 A 9; C.V. 2 pl. 75; A.B.V. 509.

The last piece which may allude to the sacrifice of the bull is a little different, since both Theseus and Heracles are present. This is a relief in the Barracco collection<sup>1</sup> dating to the fourth century BC. This piece could even allude to the fact that both Heracles and Theseus were credited with sacrificing the same bull. It is a quiet composition with Theseus standing and Heracles sitting, leaning his club on the bull's back. However, once again it may be nothing more than a general allusion to the myth but this time embracing both heroes who had dealings with this same bull.

Finally in this section, it is necessary to examine briefly scenes where, owing to lack of attributes, it is not certain whether Heracles or Theseus leads the bull.

1. Louvre E 666, cup-fragment, Laconian<sup>2</sup>.
2. Naples H 2773 (Inv. 81129), cup, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Turin 4106, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
4. Hobart, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
5. Cambridge 8.27, kyathos, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
6. Louvre M N 137, neck-handled amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>7</sup>.
7. Private collection, Megarian bowl-fragment<sup>8</sup>.

- 
1. O. Brendel, 'Immolatio Boum', Mitteilungen des deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: römische Abteilung 45 (1930) 196-226. On this piece see 215ff. and pl. 82.
  2. Br. 203 C 1; C.V. 1 pl. Dc 3, 7.
  3. C.V. 1 pl. 30, 1.
  4. Br. 195 A 21; C.V. 2 pl. 6.
  5. Br. 252 A 4 sub 'Theseus'; R.G. Hood, Greek Vases in the University of Tasmania (Tasmania, 1964) no. 15, pl. 8a; A.B.V. 695, 219bis.
  6. Br. 202 A 56; C.V. 1 pl. 21, 2; A.B.V. 613, 42.
  7. Br. 252 A 2 sub 'Theseus', (On investigation I found Br. 252 A 2 & 3 to be the same); C.V. 5 pl. 56, 10; A.R.V. 2. 194, 3.
  8. Br. 204 E 1; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 47, 2.

8. Athens, Kerameikos, Megarian bowl-fragment<sup>1</sup>.
9. Private collection, Switzerland, plate<sup>2</sup>.
10. Alexandria Museum, plate<sup>3</sup>.

In (1) a figure runs to the right with his right arm round the neck of a bull. From the point of view of date this piece should depict Heracles, if my theory is correct as to relative dating, since there should be no representation of Theseus and the bull this early.

After this, from the point of view of date, either hero is possible. In (2) the hero is bearded, but this is not a certain enough attribute. In (3) the scheme is slightly different, since the hero, as well as holding the bull's horn, has a rope around its forelegs. The other side shows a capture scene where the hero seems to be Heracles from the presence of the quiver, but this does not mean that both sides of the vase necessarily show the same hero.

The first three vases in this group are classified by Brommer under 'Heracles and the bull' whereas (4) he classifies under 'Theseus', which is probably correct since the bull bucks, as it often does when Theseus is leading it along and the hero also wears tunic and hat. In (6) the hero may also wear a hat, which again would suggest him to be Theseus. In (5) there are no attributes at all and it is impossible to identify the hero.

---

1. Br. 204 E 2; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 60, 2.

2. Br. 204 E 3; Antike Kunst Solothurn (1967) no. 203 pl. 28.

3. Br. 204 E 4; RM Ergänzungsheft 14 (1968) 174, note 919.

As regards the Hellenistic pieces, (7) shows the hero leading the bull along on a rope and brandishing a club, apparently to keep it in check. In (8) he holds the bull's ear, as in (5), but his head is not preserved and neither are any attributes. The club under the hero's feet in (9) may be meant as an attribute to distinguish Heracles. The last piece in the list again does not admit of any positive identification of subject-matter.

At any rate, this section has revealed that there was apparently a tradition that Heracles sacrificed the Cretan bull instead of letting it go. This would necessarily be a separate one from that connecting this bull with the bull of Marathon, and from the artistic evidence it seems to have been earlier and, in fact, is likely to represent the original tradition about the Cretan bull, even though it is not the earliest appearance of the myth in any medium<sup>1</sup>. Certainly there are definite implications of sacrifice in some of the renderings, and it is noteworthy that there are various scenes of Theseus leading along the bull, presumably to Athens, to be sacrificed<sup>2</sup>. This may be another reason for seeing a sacrificial motif in scenes where Heracles leads the bull along.

## II Scenes involving the charging bull

### IIa charging

I place this scheme first in this group because it shows an earlier stage in the capture of the bull than b)

---

1. See page 119, note (2) for vases dating c. 550 BC

2. Cf. Plut. Thes. 14.1. who says he sacrificed it to Apollo.

and c). The problem with these representations is that it is not certain whether they depict Heracles or Theseus. This is not a popular type of composition, there being only three examples. Heracles has hardly yet come into contact with the bull, which bears down on him.

1. New York 59.15, cup, Laconian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Thebes, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Berlin F 2137, column-krater, South Italian<sup>3</sup>.

(1) shows a naked male figure rushing at a bull, which he touches on the neck. This is rather an early piece as far as the two bull stories are concerned and this perhaps makes it likely that the hero is Heracles<sup>4</sup>. The cup dates to around the middle of the sixth century. In (2) the hero cannot be identified because only his legs are preserved. In (3) a figure in tunic and brandishing a club holds on to the horn of a charging bull. The hero has a beard but we have seen before that this is not an adequate means of identification. I cannot tell the date of this vase since the only picture of it available to me is a drawing.

#### IIb Heracles wrestling with the bull

This type of composition does not begin until the latter years of the sixth century, but is the most popular rendering, appearing frequently on fifth-century Attic black-figured

- 
1. Br. 204 C 3; Stibbe, op. cit. no. 300 & pl. 104, 1.
  2. Br. 201 A 29; Ἐφημερίδα (1915) 126, figs. 22-3; A.B.V. 561, 530.
  3. Br. 203 C 2; U. Dubois-Maisonneuve, Introduction à l'étude des Vases Antiques (Paris, 1817) pl. 34.
  4. See page 119 and note (1). The Oltos vase is the earliest evidence for the Theseus myth.

lekythoi. The bull is in charging pose, but Heracles has come to grips and is wrestling with it, rather as he is often shown wrestling with the Nemean lion and Erymanthian boar<sup>1</sup>. Presumably such compositions were popular on lekythoi because they fitted easily into a confined space and did not make too much demand on the artist's talent.

1. Louvre C 11284, column-krater, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
2. London BM B 277, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Louvre F 239, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
4. Louvre F 240, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
5. London BM B 309, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
6. Boston 00.334, kantharos, Attic red-figure<sup>7</sup>.
7. Ferrara 16336, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
8. Como C 26, kyathos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
9. Ferrara 16341, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
10. Parma C 139, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
11. Piraeus Mus., skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. See pages 62ff. & 344ff.
  2. Br. 202 A 48; C.V. 12 pl. 183; Par. 156.
  3. Br. 195 A 13; C.V. 4 pl. 70, 1; A.B.V. 343, 8.
  4. Br. 194 A 10; C.V. 4 pl. 47, 1-2 & pl. 46, 5-6; A.B.V. 394, 7.
  5. Br. 194 A 11; C.V. 4 pl. 47, 3-5; A.B.V. 370, 129.
  6. Br. 196 A 5; C.V. 6 pl. 81, 2; A.B.V. 364, 56.
  7. Br. 203 B 7; R.M. 5 (1890) 324, pl. 12; A.R.V. 2. 126, 27.
  8. Br. 196 A 23; C.V. 2 pl. 22, 3.
  9. Br. 202 A 57; C.V. 1 pl. 2, 1 & 2.
  10. Br. 196 A 22; C.V. 2 pl. 10, 1.
  11. Br. 199 A 81; C.V. 1 pl. 19, 1 & 2.
  12. Br. 202 A 38; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 48.

12. Olympia Be 634, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
13. Bologna 73, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
14. Tübingen D 61, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
15. Nicosia 1968/V30/348, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
16. Copenhagen NM 1, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
17. Verona, Teatro 49, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
18. Delos 569, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
19. Thebes 46.68, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
20. Karlsruhe (B90) 178, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
21. Cambridge 99, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
22. Cambridge 98, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
23. Cambridge 97, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
24. Paris, Mus. Rodin, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.
25. Madrid 10958 (L 84), lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>14</sup>.
26. Athens Rosolymou from Draphi, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>15</sup>.
27. Matera, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>16</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 202 A 37; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 49; A.B.V. 521 ab.
  2. Br. 196 A 21; C.V. 2 pl. 36, 5; A.B.V. 527, 28.
  3. Br. 196 A 13; C. Watzinger, Griechische Vasen in Tübingen (Reutlingen, 1924), pl. 9; A.B.V. 527, 6 = 535, 5.
  4. Br. 195 A 26; A.J.A. 74 (1970) pl. 20, 8.
  5. Br. 194 A 1; C.V. 3 pl. 108, 3; A.B.V. 605, 3.
  6. Br. 195 A 25; C.V. 1 pl. 1a & b; Par. 302.
  7. Br. 198 A 44; Dugas, Délos X (Paris, 1928) pl. 42; A.B.V. 547, 247.
  8. Br. 198 A 53; P.N. Ure, Sixth and fifth century Pottery from Rhitsona (London, 1927) pl. 15, 12; A.B.V. 547, 246.
  9. Br. 197 A 6; C.V. 1 pl. 14, 1; A.B.V. 547, 249.
  10. Br. 198 A 54; C.V. 1 pl. 22, 21; A.B.V. 547, 253.
  11. Br. 198 A 55; C.V. 1 pl. 22, 7; A.B.V. 547, 242.
  12. Br. 198 A 56; C.V. 1 pl. 22, 8; A.B.V. 547, 251.
  13. Br. 197 A 16; C.V. (Fr.16) pl. 17, 14; A.B.V. 547, 255.
  14. Br. 200 A 102; C.V. 1 pl. 30, 1; A.B.V. 547, 257.
  15. Br. 198 A 38; Bulletin du Correspondance Hellénique (1958) 682, fig. 20, 2; Par. 277.
  16. Br. 199 A 72; N.Sc. 20 (1966) 225, fig. 84.

28. Villa Giulia 1447, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
29. Fogg 1927.141, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
30. Adria A 184, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
31. Goluchow Inv. 31, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
32. Sarajevo 82, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
33. Athens 651 (CC 1094), cup, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
34. Reading University 26 VII 2, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
35. Paris, Mus. Rodin 302, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
36. Karlsruhe, B 3049, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
37. Athens NM 3290 (CC 907) lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
38. Leningrad, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
39. Capua 162, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
40. Villa Giulia 48335, column-krater, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 201 A 10; C.V. 3 pl. 49, 12; A.B.V. 559, 493.
  2. Br. 201 A 18; C.V. (U.S.A. 8) pl. 11, 1a; A.B.V. 559, 492.
  3. Br. 202 A 43; R. Schöne, Le antichità del Museo Bocchi di Adria (Rome 1878) pl. 15, 4; A.B.V. 569, 670.
  4. Br. 201 A 15; C.V. 1 pl. 42, 4; A.B.V. 558, 485.
  5. Br. 200 A 97; E. Bulanda, Katalog der griechischen Vasen im Bosnisch-Herzegöwinischen Landesmuseum zu Sarajewo (Vienna, 1912) 279, fig. 41; A.B.V. 547, 248.
  6. Br. 201 A 24; H. Bloesch, Formen attischer Schalen (Berne, 1940) 29, 1 & pl. 7, 5; A.B.V. 560, 514.
  7. Br. 152 A 125 (2nd edition); C.V. 1 pl. 9, 7; A.B.V. 562, 557.
  8. Br. 202 A 36; C.V. (Fr. 16) pl. 13, 3 & 9; A.B.V. 568, 640.
  9. Br. 197 A 7; C.V. 1 pl. 14, 2; A.B.V. 547, 243.
  10. Br. 197 A 19; A.M. 73 (1958) 91, Beilage 69; A.B.V. 508, 3 (identified as Heracles and lion).
  11. Br. 200 A 98; A.A. (1913) 204, fig. 50; A.B.V. 491, 52.
  12. Br. 201 A 9; C.V. 2 pl. 12, 1-3.
  13. Br. 202 A 50; Mon. Ant. 42 (1955) 1025, fig. 265c.

41. Palermo, Mormino 629, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
42. Palermo, Mormino 128, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
43. Tarquinia RC 1629, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
44. London BM E 104, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
45. Enserune, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
46. Berlin F 3145, Nestoris, Lucanian<sup>6</sup>.

Numbers (1) to (6) date to the late sixth century, (7) to (43) to the first quarter of the fifth century, (44) to the third quarter of the fifth century, and (45) and (46) to the early years of the fourth century. It can thus be seen to be a composition-type which lasted over a century, but which occurred only rarely after the first quarter of the fifth century, when it enjoyed its main period of popularity, especially in the work of the Haimon Group.

As I have indicated before, I identify Heracles in scenes of this myth by the presence of bow and quiver, since he seldom wears the lionskin. In (5), however, he does wear the skin and this vase is worthy of special comment, since to the right of the scene is a male holding a spear and wearing a cloak and big hat. This could be Iolaus, but he is not

- 
1. Br. 199 A 79; C.V. 1 pl. 14, 5-6.
  2. Br. 199 A 80; C.V. 1 pl. 14, 12-13.
  3. Br. 195 A 20; C.V. 2 pl. 35, 3; A.B.V. 598, 31.
  4. Br. 203 B 3; Shefton op. cit. 346; A.R.V. 2.1293, 1.
  5. Shefton, loc. cit.; C.V. (Collection Mouret) pl. 8, 7 & 8. The identification of subject-matter here is helped by no. (44) where club and lionskin are carried by a follower.
  6. Br. 204 D1; A.D. Trendall, The red-figured vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily (Oxford, 1967) no. 921 & pl. 72, 2.

usually shown in a hat, and I wonder whether it could be Theseus. The artist would then be suggesting the connection of the bull with both heroes<sup>1</sup>. There are many attributes drawn to distinguish Heracles: bow, quiver, lionskin and also the club, which stands in front of the bull. All these, together with the hat and spear of Theseus, could have been the artist's way of asserting the presence of both heroes.

Theseus and Heracles apparently appear on the same vase, (32), in Goluchow, although here they are on separate sides of the vase and each is shown in wrestling pose with the bull. On the supposed Heracles side, Athena is seated, and club and cloak appear in a tree; the supposed Theseus on the other side wears a hat, and here Athena stands, and cloak and sword are drawn in the field. It is the different weapons, the club and hat apparently being used as attributes, which suggest that the two heroes are shown in their own dealings with the bull on separate sides of the vase. If my analysis is correct, this is another attempt to link the bull-exploits of Heracles and Theseus.

Wrestling scenes where the identification of the hero is uncertain

1. Northwick, Spencer Churchill, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
2. Thebes R 18.50, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Laon 37.906, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.

---

1. Cf. the Taranto relief in the Barracco collection, page 126, note 1.

2. A.V. pl. 313; A.B.V. 333, 25.

3. Br. 202 A 41; B.S.A. 14 (1907-8) pl. 13e; A.B.V. 627, 3ab.

4. Br. 253 A 12; C.V. 1 pl. 15, 3.

4. Berkeley 8.35, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
5. Madrid 10933 (L 79) neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
6. New York GR 555, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
7. Louvre C 11280, column-krater fragments, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
8. Louvre C 11284, column-krater fragments, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
9. Earlier Candelori, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
10. Barcelona, fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

These vases must be examined individually. Brommer places numbers (2), (4), (5), (6), and (9) under 'Heracles' and the rest, except (1), which he does not include, under 'Theseus', but I feel that his classifications are not always correct.

In (1) the hero wears a hat, which should identify him as Theseus, and his cloak hangs from a tree, while in (2) he also wears a hat. In the former a four-horse chariot appears and also a naked youth with a spear, who is presumably meant to be Pirithous, even though he is not documented in literary accounts as taking part in this myth<sup>8</sup>; he is possibly holding Theseus' spear.

- 
1. Br. 200 A 107; C.V. (California 1) pl. 27, 3 a & b; A.B.L. 247, 1.
  2. Br. 195 A 25; C.V. 1 pl. 20, 3a; A.B.V. 601, 22.
  3. Br. 201 A 20; G.M.A. Richter & M.J. Milne, Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases (New York, 1935) fig. 185; A.B.V. 559, 489.
  4. Br. 253 A 32; C.V. 12, pl. 180.
  5. Br. 253 A 33; C.V. 12 pl. 183.
  6. Br. 201 A 13; A.V. pl. 98, 5-6; A.B.V. 559, 486 (Brommer gives wrong reference).
  7. Br. 254 A 39; C.V. 1 pl. 12, 2; Brommer's A.B.V. reference is unintelligible.
  8. Iolaus often appears with Heracles merely as a traditional companion.

(3) shows the hero as beardless, which should suggest Theseus, but the quiver hangs in the field, which ought to indicate Heracles; the artist seems confused.

(4) is odd in depicting three figures with cloak and club, and also cloak and club hanging in a tree. There is also a quiver in the tree and the hero should thus be Heracles, with Iolaus, drawn three times, holding his club and cloak, but he seems to wear a hat, which is indicative of Theseus. Once again the artist seems confused.

The picture of (5) is very unclear but two cloaks hang in the field and the hero seems to be beardless. Therefore, I would suggest him to be Theseus and not Heracles as Brommer identifies him<sup>1</sup>.

The hat in (6) suggests the wearer to be Theseus. In (7) he has a beard but there are no attributes, apart from a cloak, and the question of identification must be left open, as in (8) and (10), which are too fragmentary to offer any clues.

(9) seems more likely to represent Theseus, as there is a hat on the hero's head and just a cloak suspended. The naked figure holding out another cloak would then be Pirithous.

It has thus been seen that the hat can be used to distinguish Theseus, as also the appearance of a cloak without bow and quiver, and that Pirithous may sometimes be

---

1. 195 A 25

depicted with him. Moreover, the artists sometimes show themselves confused and place some attributes of both figures in the scene thus making impossible clear identification of which hero they had in mind.

### II c Heracles capturing the Cretan bull

These scenes are very similar to those of wrestling, with the bull's head down in charging motion and Heracles virtually in wrestling pose, except that he has obviously got the better of the bull and is securing ropes around its back-legs and body. These scenes are not so numerous as the straight wrestling ones but begin earlier, in the middle of the sixth century, and in contrast scarcely appear at all on fifth-century lekythoi.

1. Taranto, volute-krater, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Naples H2773 (Inv 81129), cup, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Rome Vatican 389, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Robinson collection, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Munich 1407 (J 614), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Turin 4106, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. New York 41.162.193, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

---

1. Br 202 A 53; Atti et Magna Grécia 8 (1967) pl. 15; A.B.V. 195, 4.

2. C.V. 1 pl. 30, 1.

3. Br. 195 A 19; Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 55; A.B.V. 288, 8.

4. Br. 195 A 28; A.J.A. 60 (1956) 5ff., no. 7, pl. 14.

5. Br. 195 A 35; C.V. 1 pl. 37, 2; A.B.V. 290 ab.

6. Br. 195 A 21; C.V. 2 pl. 6. See page 126, no. 3 for other side.

7. Br. 195 A 31; C.V. (U.S.A. 1) Gallatin pl. 3, 3.

8. Fogg 52, 132, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
9. Leningrad Inv. 5571, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
10. Sundbyberg, Throne Holst, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
11. Chicago University, lekythos-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
12. Louvre G 263, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
13. Syracuse 21127, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
14. Würzburg 375, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

Certainly the Taranto volute-krater, (1), is very interesting, as being one of the earliest appearances of this myth, and rather suggests, from the point of view of date, one of the lyric poets as the source. It does not preclude the idea of sacrifice, but gives no hint of it and so we cannot know for certain whether the sacrifice motif was in the myth from the beginning or whether it was a variant formed later on<sup>8</sup>. Certainly the idea of tying it up suggests that Heracles is going to take the bull somewhere alive, but this could just be to Eurystheus and it could then be set free. At any rate, from surviving evidence the wrestling scenes appear to be derived from the capture ones and then to supercede these in the fifth century. Certainly neither

- 
1. Br. 195 A 29; C.V. (U.S.A. 8) Fogg pl. 8, 1.
  2. Br. 196 A 8; A.A. (1930) 26, figs. 7 & 8.
  3. Br. 195 A 23; A.M. 73 (1958) Beilage 70.
  4. Br. 200 A 109; A.J.A. 47 (1943) 395, no. 10.
  5. Br. 203 B 1; Shefton, op. cit. 346; A.R.V. 2. 341, 89.
  6. Br. 199 A 88; Mon. Ant. 17 (1907) 382, fig. 283; A.B.L. 63.
  7. Br. 197 A 10; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 107; A.B.V. 499, 30.
  8. See page 140, no. 1 for another early piece.

capture nor wrestling scenes add anything to our knowledge about the details of this myth.

Capture scenes where the identification of the hero is uncertain

1. London BM B 474, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM B 488, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Paris, Mus. Rodin T.C., 145, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Louvre C 10907, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.

Again I shall look at these difficult vases in detail.

(1) has no attributes at all, except for the heavy beard of the hero, which has been said before not to be sufficient grounds for firm identification. In (2) the club is in a free field and could be put in as an attribute of Heracles. (4), of which no picture is available, is said by Shefton<sup>5</sup> to contain no attributes. (3) on the other hand seems a confusion of both heroes, since a quiver hangs in the field but the hero appears to wear a hat.

Scenes where it is not clear whether capture or wrestling is involved

These pieces cannot be classified, either because no picture is available of them and the description given of them is vague, or else because they are too fragmentary.

- 
1. Br. 196 A 20; A.V. pl. 98, 1-2; A.B.V. 378, 250.
  2. Br. 196 A 19; H. Walters, A Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum II (London, 1893) 16 fig. 25; A.B.L. 214, 186.
  3. Br. 253 A 13; C.V. (Fr.16) pl. 17, 6; A.B.V. 499, 28.
  4. Br. 203 B 2; Shefton, op. cit. 346 note 71; A.R.V. 2. 430, 36.
  5. Shefton, loc. cit. note 4.

1. Market 1967, 1970. lip-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Villa Giulia, four lekythoi, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Villa Giulia, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Lipari, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Adria Bc 20 and B 69, cup-fragments, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.

No picture is available for (1) but it is merely described in the Sotheby Catalogue<sup>6</sup> as, "Heracles fighting the Cretan bull". Its chief interest lies in its date, which is c. 550 BC, thus showing the volute-krater with the capture scene<sup>7</sup>, to be no isolated instance of the drawing of this myth so early. It is possible that the lip cup also represented a capture scene, but it is, of course, possible that wrestling scenes were drawn at this time but that none have survived.

No picture is available of (2) and (3) and the Italian description of Heracles struggling or overthrowing the Cretan bull does not make it clear whether ropes were depicted or not.

Of (4) a picture is available, but the vase is too fragmentary for a clear classification of composition as to wrestling or capture.

(5), by the Antiphon Painter, shows the hero's right foot

- 
1. Br. 202 A 34; Sotheby Catalogue (27-XI-67) no. 125 = (4-V-70) no. 111.
  2. Br. 199 A 83, 85, 86, 87. (Brommer also adds A 84 but this seems not to depict Heracles and the bull); Mon. Ant. 42 (1955) 858ff. nos. 5, 10, 16, 32.
  3. Br. 201 A 22; Mon. Ant. 42 (1955) 834 no. 23.
  4. Br. 199 A 71; M. Cavalier-Melignis, Lipara ii (Palermo, (1960-5) pl. 45; Par. 237.
  5. Br. 203 B 4; C.V. 1 pl. 6, 8b; A.R.V. 2. 341, 87.
  6. See ~~above~~ above, note (1) for reference.
  7. See page 137, no.1.

on the ground and left foot on the inner side of the bull's nose, with the knee bent. The end of the club is visible, perhaps a distinguishing attribute, but not necessarily. The bull has its chin on the ground and a halter round its nose. It is, therefore, likely to represent a capture scene, but with a different type of binding from the normal rope round the length of the body. However it is not certain whether the combatant is Heracles or Theseus.

### III The possible aggressive use of the club against the bull

This group will comprise scenes where Heracles is apparently about to use his club to kill the bull. There are no black-figure examples and all the red-figure ones are post 450 BC, although it may well be the theme of the Olympia metope.

1. Olympia, metope<sup>1</sup>.
2. Athens, Agora P 12641, Louterion, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Adolphseck 77, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Chicago Art Institute 89.18, kalyx-krater, Etruscan red-figure<sup>4</sup>.

All that is preserved of the Olympia metope is the bull, upright and apparently in quick movement, and Heracles with his back to it but looking round. His right arm is swung back and it seems likely that he was originally wielding the club. The scene is restored with a halter on the bull's nose, likely from a hole in the sculpture for a metal attachment. It is not entirely certain, therefore, whether this piece should be

- 
1. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pll. 162-7.
  2. Br. 203 B 11; Shefton, op. cit. 330ff.
  3. Br. 203 B 8; Brommer, Her. pl. 22; A.R.V. 2. 1346, 1u.
  4. Br. 204 D 2; Sir J.D. Beazley, Festschrift A. Rumpf (Krefield, 1952) pl. 3.

placed here or in the first group of Heracles leading along the bull, but it may certainly be said that both Heracles and bull look aggressive.

In (2), traces of the lionskin are enough to identify Heracles and I find it odd that Brommer places this among his representations of Theseus and the bull; the appearance of Theseus on the other side of this vase, pictured at the wedding feast of the Lapiths, cannot attest to his appearance on the bull scene. This vase shows Heracles about to smash his club down on the bull's lowered head. This is the scheme of (3) except that Heracles and bull are further apart. In (4) Heracles, wearing the lionskin, has one arm around the bull's neck and with the other brandishes his club. There may be a slight contamination with Theseus-scenes here as the bull rears up. In all these pieces the identification of Heracles is certain.

Representations where the identification of the hero is uncertain

1. Salonika Inv. 34. 359, bell-krater fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Leningrad, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.

In (1) a naked figure, young and beardless, has his back to the bull but faces it and holds his club. It is not clear whether the club is meant to be a weapon of attack or an attribute. The similarity of the pose to that of the Olympia metope, may, however, indicate the hero to be Heracles. In (2) the hero,

- 
1. Br. 203 B 9; Olynthus XIII, ed. D.M. Robinson, (Baltimore, 1950) pl. 132.
  2. Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 55.

in tunic, approaches the bull, holding bow in one hand and club in the other. Again it is not clear whether the club is an attribute to identify Heracles or a weapon of attack.

As previously stated, we have no surviving tradition that Heracles killed the Cretan bull and certainly by this time the myth was well established that this same bull was set free and killed by Theseus. Admittedly a sacrificial version has been recorded but this is probably an early version and seems unlikely to have continued into the mature red-figure period when the Theseus myth takes precedence in Attic art over the Heracles myth. I think it must be said that either Heracles is thought to be about to capture the bull after stunning it with his club but not about to kill it, or else the artists have drawn him in the act of killing the bull, giving to Heracles his traditional weapon because they did not possess any precise knowledge of the myth to indicate to them that this bull was killed not by Heracles but by Theseus.

#### IV. Scenes where the composition is uncertain

1. Louvre, Camp. 10677, hydria-fragments, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Athens, Acr. 1990, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Sunium, relief<sup>3</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 195 A 4; C.V. 11 pl. 146, 4-5; A.B.V. 332, 18.
  2. Br. 201 A 26; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. I pl. 89 (It is misnumbered 1090); A.B.V. 654, 3.
  3. Hesperia 10 (1941) 163ff., fig. 3, no. 3; A.M. 73 (1968) 83ff. & Beilage 64-6.

In (1), on one fragment a seated Hermes is pictured and also a seated Athena and on the other the rear of a bull in front of a striding figure, apparently wearing tunic and greaves; in front of him is a thin club, thin enough to be made of metal, like that taken by Theseus from Periphetes<sup>1</sup>. A thin strap hangs from above which could belong to a quiver but it could also belong to a sword-sheath as is sometimes shown in scenes of Theseus and the bull. Presumably the hero, probably Theseus, is leading the bull along.

(2) shows a naked youth with sword and cloak over his outstretched arm. He kneels on his right knee and faces towards the rear and tail of a bull, perhaps about to spring up after it. There is nothing to identify either Heracles or Theseus and the scene may refer to neither.

The Sunium relief shows on one section a man and the front and body of what is apparently a bull, and on the other the rear of the animal. There are other scenes of Heracles on the same relief and so the identification of the hero seems certain. Shefton<sup>2</sup>, following Young<sup>3</sup>, thinks it corresponds to the scenes of Heracles clubbing the bull, as on the red-figure louterion and on the kalyx-kraters in Adolphseck and Leningrad<sup>4</sup>. However, I find the restoration by Dörig<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Apollod. III xvi. 1.

2. *op. cit.* 330ff.

3. *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 163ff.

4. See pages 141, nos. 2 & 3; 142, no. 2.

5. *A.M.* 73 (1968) 88ff & Beilage 64-6.

more plausible since the right shoulder of the hero is rounded, telling against a raised arm, needed for brandishing the club; moreover there would not really be room for this in the available space. Dörig restores the scene with both the hero's hands against the bull's body, pulling ropes tight around its feet. He sees Theseus as the hero, comparing the Delphi bull metope, but the other scenes of Heracles on this relief suggest him as the hero. Certainly there is nothing else to suggest which hero is meant.

There is reason to believe that the story of the Cretan bull could have been influenced from the East. We possess a small stone relief, dating to the Old Babylonian period, which shows a figure holding a club in one hand and the horn of a bull in the other; he leads the bull along<sup>1</sup>. Behind is another figure holding onto the tail. As Wetzel points out, this may well depict a scene from the Gilgamesh epic which tells how Ishtar sent the bull of Heaven after Gilgamesh and how he killed it with the help of Enkidu<sup>2</sup>. The details are slightly different but not enough so to argue against the relief being a representation thereof. There are other similarities between the Heracles story and the Gilgamesh epic: Gilgamesh encounters lions and he is also accompanied by a close friend Enkidu, just as Heracles is accompanied by Iolaus<sup>3</sup>.

#### CONCLUSION

This myth can apparently be dated to about 550 BC and this might suggest that it found its origin in one of the lyric

- 
1. F. Wetzel, Assur und Babylon (Berlin, 1949) 9, fig. 2.
  2. See Sandars, op. cit. 86.
  3. See pages 30 ff. for a more detailed discussion of the similarities between these two myths.

poets, perhaps influenced by Eastern tradition, since it has been seen that Gilgamesh has to fight a bull among his adventures; it is interesting that this bull was sent by Ishtar, a goddess who became an enemy to Gilgamesh, and that the Cretan bull was one of the labours imposed on Heracles by the agency of Hera, the goddess who was his enemy.

From the various scenes with sacrificial connotations which begin c. 530 BC it is likely that in the early tradition Heracles was thought of as sacrificing the bull. Admittedly there are two earlier representations dating c. 550<sup>1</sup> where no sacrificial aspect appears and it is thus possible that in the beginning it was not specified what happened to the bull after capture but by c. 530, when <sup>the</sup>Andocides Painter painted his sacrificial scene, the story of sacrifice by Heracles had been evolved. However the early pieces do not preclude the idea of sacrifice, since they show an earlier incident in the story, namely initial attempts at capture. Moreover, it is, of course, possible that sacrificial scenes were drawn before 530 but have not survived. Scenes of wrestling and capture become the common artistic type at the end of the sixth century and since these imply nothing about the ultimate fate of the bull they are very suitable at a time when a new Theseus legend was emerging in which he killed the Cretan bull, when it came to Marathon after being freed by Heracles. Sacrificial scenes die out soon after the turn of the century: certainly when the new Theseus myth arose Heracles could no longer be thought of as sacrificing the bull. There is no

---

1. See pages 137, no. 1 & 140, no. 1.

evidence that Theseus was ever thought to fight a separate bull from that of Heracles or that his bull myth is any older than c. 510<sup>1</sup> which would well suit the date of Pherecydes, who is the earliest writer to include the expanded Theseus tradition.

The Heracles myth was still popular in Attic art even after the advent of the Theseus bull story and, in fact, it even increased in popularity on small pots. However, it seems to have been popular with a fairly small group of painters in the fifth century, whereas the Theseus myth enjoyed widespread popularity in Attic red-figure, in which fabric there are very few representations of Heracles and the bull. It is noteworthy that it did not appear on the Hephaesteum in Athens.

Certainly the lack of detail given in either art or literature as to the actual story of this myth is striking. The wrestling and capture scenes give none, and granted that in the scenes where the club is brandished Heracles at most is thought to be about to stun the bull or the artists are guilty of possessing a poor mythological knowledge, there are no interesting details there either. The fact that the tradition was fairly straightforward and artistically undemanding was perhaps the reason why it only really gained popularity on pots of inferior quality and why the literary sources were more interested in identifying the bull than in recording what happened to it. The only detail we seem to possess about the story is that the bull came from Crete, from where Heracles had to bring it to Greece, and that in the early days he was thought to sacrifice it but was made to set it free after the tradition arose that Theseus met the same bull, when it was causing havoc in Marathon, and sacrificed it to Athena.

1. The vase by Oltos, page 119, no. 1

CHAPTER SIX. THE CERYNITIAN HIND

This is another of the labours set in the Northern Peloponnese and may not be a very early myth. Once again the opponent is an animal but it does not seem to have been regarded as fierce until late times, the difficulty of the task seeming originally to lie in catching the swift creature and in not offending Artemis to whom it was sacred.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

Author of the Theseis (K. p. 217)		ἐπιμελῶς οἱ ποιηταὶ τὴν
Pisander (F 3 K)	= (Schol.	θήλειαν ἔλαφον κέρατα ἔχουσιν
Anacreon (P.M.G. 408)	Pind.	εἰσάγουσι, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν
Pherecydes (F.G.H. 3F71)	O. III 52a)	θηλάζουσιν τὸν Τηλέφον
		γράφουσι ... τέτακται δὲ
		καὶ παρὰ Ἀνακρέοντι· ἀγανῶς/ οἰά τε νεβρὸν νεοθηλέα
		γαλαθηνὸν, ὅστ' ἐν ὕλαις
		κεροέσεως ὑπολειφθεὶς ὑπὸ
		μητρὸς ἐπτόθη <sup>1</sup> ...
(cf 50 b):		θήλειαν δὲ εἶπε καὶ χρυσο-
		κέρων ἀπὸ ἱστορίας· ὁ γὰρ
		<τὴν> Θησήϊδα γράψας τοιαύτην
		αὐτὴν ... καὶ Πείσανδρος ὁ
		Καμιρεὺς καὶ Φερεκύδης. <sup>2</sup>

Pindar (O. III 25-31): Heracles met Artemis in Istria when, on the command of Eurystheus, he went to fetch the hind with the golden horns.

- 
1. Zenodotus and Aristophanes amended κεροέσεως to ἐροέσεως. See P.M.G. 408
  2. It cannot, of course, be certain that these four authors connected Heracles with this hind.

This hind had been dedicated to the goddess by Taygete.

Euripides (HF. 375ff.): Heracles killed the hind with the golden horns, which was ravaging the countryside, and dedicated it to Artemis of Oenoe.

Callimachus (Hymn III, to Artemis, 100ff.): Artemis found grazing by the foot of a mountain σκαίρουσας ἑλάφους, which always gathered by the River Anaurus. They were larger than bulls and had golden horns. Artemis caught four out of the five, but one escaped over the River Celadon by the plan of Hera, so that it might become one of the labours of Heracles. It took refuge in the Ceryneian Hill. Artemis yoked the other four hinds to her chariot.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 13,1): It was the fourth labour to bring back the swift hind with the golden horns. Heracles employed more cunning than strength, catching it with nets according to some sources, catching it asleep according to others, and wearing it out by pursuit in another tradition.

Apollodorus (II v 3): It was the third labour to bring the Cerynitian hind alive to Mycenae from Oenoe. It had golden horns and was

sacred to Artemis and so Heracles did not want to harm it. Having followed it for a year he came upon it when it was tired and shot it; carrying it on his shoulders through Arcadia, he met Apollo and Artemis, who was angry with him for killing or attempting to kill her sacred animal. Heracles explained this was an order from Eurystheus and Artemis was appeased and allowed him to take the hind to Mycenae. Hyginus (Fab. XXX.5): Heracles brought alive to Eurystheus the fierce stag (cervum) which lived in Arcadia.

In sources other than Pindar the hind is associated with Arcadia, although the specific locality is not certain. Callimachus links it with the Ceryneian Hill; Apollodorus calls the hind Cerynitian and Pausanias<sup>1</sup> mentions a river Cerynites rising in Arcadia. At any rate, most of the sources mention Oence, a town in Arcadia. In the Pindar passage, however, Heracles is in the North, made certain by the reference to Boreas<sup>2</sup>. One cannot know whether this version was peculiar to Pindar since it is not clear whether the earlier sources who mentioned a horned hind placed their hinds in the North<sup>3</sup> or, indeed, connected them with Heracles. Taygete, however, who appears in Pindar's account, was closely connected with

---

1. VII 25.5.

2. Q. III 31.

3. It is not clear whether τοιαύτην should refer to locality as well as to the ideas of θήλειαν and χρυσοκέρων.

the Peloponnese, giving her name to Mount Taygetus in Laconia<sup>1</sup> and bearing to Zeus Lacedaemon<sup>2</sup> and Eurotas<sup>3</sup>. The idea behind the Pindar version may be that Taygete dedicated the hind to Artemis in the Southern Peloponnese but that it travelled around with her. This version may well reflect the early tradition about Artemis' origin, since her worship was thought to come from the Hyperboreans in the North<sup>4</sup>. The Hyperboreans are mentioned in this Pindar ode since Heracles takes the olive branch for Olympia from them. This ode celebrates a victory of 476<sup>5</sup> and is likely to have been written fairly near this date. It is interesting that hind and Amazons, both connected by Pindar with Istria<sup>6</sup>, are placed side by side on the Olympia metopes.

There are in the extant accounts three different versions of how Artemis became connected with this hind. Pindar says that it was dedicated to her by Taygete, the incident occurring, as we know from other sources,<sup>7</sup> after the goddess had turned her into a deer and thus enabled her to escape the advances of Zeus. Euripides gives Artemis no connection with the hind until it is dedicated to her after Heracles has killed it. Callimachus says that there were five such hinds and that Artemis only caught four, perhaps implying no connection at all

---

1. Schol. Eur. *Orestes* 626.

2. Apollod. III x 3; Paus. III 1.2.

3. Stephen of Byzantium sub Ταύγετον

4. Hdt. 4.35. Arge and Opis are probably Apollo and Artemis. See ed. A.D. Godley (London 1928) 235, note 1.

5. See Wilamowitz, op. cit. 240 sub '*Olympien II*'.

6. See page 181 and note (2) for the connections of the Amazons.

7. Cf. Schol. Pind. *O.* III 53d.

between the goddess and the one caught by Heracles. It is not surprising to find Artemis connected with the hind since she, as a goddess, seems to have derived from the early *πότνια Θηρῶν* found in Minoan and Mycenaean worship, although it is odd that other sources connecting her with hinds describe her killing them: she is called *ἐλαφηβόλος* in Homeric Hymn xxvii and *θηρόφονος* by Euripides<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps the special nature of this hind saved it from such a fate at her hands.

It has already been said that there is no evidence to connect Heracles with the hind before Pindar and this labour need not be a very early one. Moreover, although they are said to have horns, there is no indication that the same hind was the subject of all the sources earlier than Pindar.

Apart from different traditions as to locality and connection with Artemis, there seem to have been two separate traditions about what Heracles did to the hind, namely, whether it arrived at Eurystheus alive or dead. Hyginus is the only one to specify that it was alive; Pindar and Diodorus do not specify either way; Euripides and Virgil say that he killed it, the latter specifying the bow as the weapon. Apollodorus seems to record a confused tradition, perhaps trying to reconcile the two variants, as would seem to be the case in his account of how Heracles dealt with the Stymphalian Birds<sup>2</sup>. The difficulty is that he mentions bringing it back alive but also says that Heracles shot it. R. Wagner's<sup>3</sup> reading of

---

1. H.F. 378.

2. See pages 103 & 105.

3. *Mythographi Graeci i* (Leipzig, 1894). EA reads *κτείναντα* which does not make sense.

κτείνοντα, however, can be taken to mean, "attempting to kill" and thus not conflict with the idea of bringing it back alive, which Apollodorus makes a prerequisite of the labour.

Although this is not specifically called a labour until Diodorus it is inferred to be such by Pindar's statement that Heracles pursued it by order of Eurystheus. In Euripides this well accords with the spirit of benefaction since mankind is helped by being rid of a public nuisance, which is ravaging the countryside; this is presumably why in this account Heracles is made to kill it and for both these reasons it is not originally sacred to Artemis. In these details, this version stands apart from the others, and it may well represent the Attic version of the myth. After the Euripides version this labour becomes more of a deed of prowess: Diodorus mentions its speed and Apollodorus implies it when he says that Heracles pursued it for a year. It is not until Hyginus that the fearsome nature of the deer is taken up again, this being used to highlight Heracles' heroism, coupled with the statement that he took it alive to Eurystheus.

As with the mares of Diomedes, Heracles is dealing with a female animal, and in both cases Hyginus makes them male<sup>1</sup>, perhaps because he mistranslated his sources or perhaps, in the case of the hind, because he believed the criticisms of Aristophanes and others that hinds do not have horns<sup>2</sup>. At any rate, the artistic evidence will be examined for signs of a male deer.

#### B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

The striking feature of the artistic representations of

1. See pages 321 & 323.

2. See page 148, note (1)

this labour is that the two most popular compositions depict traditions not recorded in extant literature, namely the struggle for the hind with Apollo and the breaking off of the horns. This must point to the inadequacy of the literary evidence we possess for this myth. Both types date to the third quarter of the sixth century BC, the latter lasting to Hellenistic and Roman times, when it becomes the standard composition for this labour.

### I. The struggle between Heracles and Apollo.

The composition of this group is undoubtedly influenced by scenes depicting the struggle for the tripod, which first occur in art in the late eighth century on the leg of a bronze tripod from Olympia<sup>1</sup>, and are particularly popular in the sixth century<sup>2</sup>. Indeed, the hind often appears in tripod scenes<sup>3</sup>.

1. Oxford 1934.333, plate, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
2. Rome Vatican, 390, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
3. Rome, Vatican 454, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
4. Würzburg 199, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
5. Vienna University Inv. 631 a, amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>8</sup>.
6. Heidelberg 260, oinochoe fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.

---

1. H.W. Parke & J. Boardman, 'The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War', J.H.S. 77 (1957) 276ff. On this point see 278 and note 11.

2. Br. sub 'Dreifuss'; Parke and Boardman, op. cit. 279f.

3. Parke & Boardman, op. cit. 280 & note 31.

4. Br. 77 A 26; Brommer, Her. pl. 16; A.B.V. 115, 4.

5. Br. 75 A 7; Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 113.

6. Br. 77 A 18; Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 155; Par. 95, 95.

7. Br. 75 A 2; Brommer, Her. pl. 15b; A.B.V. 287, 5.

8. Br. 77 B 3; C.V. 1 pl. 7; A.R.V. 2. 54, 3.

9. Br. 77 A 21; C.V. 1 pl. 40, 4.

7. Earlier Bassaeo, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
8. Leiden, kyathos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
9. Basel, Cahn 190, pelike-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
10. Villa Giulia, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.

The composition of these scenes generally places Apollo on the left and Heracles on the right; Heracles generally has the hind under his arm and Apollo tries to pull it away from him. Artemis is sometimes present, as in (1), (2), (4), (5) and (7). This is presumably a general reference to her connection with the hind or perhaps with animals in general. Apollodorus states that Heracles met Artemis and Apollo while taking the hind to Eurystheus, although he says nothing about fighting Apollo. Certainly Heracles is thought of as prepared to menace Apollo since he brandishes his club at him in (2), (4), and (7). In (9), however, Heracles and Apollo are on separate sides of the vase.

(1) is an "odd-man-out" according to composition, since Heracles does not hold the hind in his arms but rather points his bow at it<sup>5</sup>, while it jerks its front legs upwards. Apollo faces it, clad in his panther skin, with his right hand against the neck of the hind. On the inner side of the creature is a woman, presumably Artemis: she raises her right hand while her left is on her hip, probably in defiance of Heracles whom she faces. What the line protruding from the front of the hind is supposed to be is impossible to tell: perhaps it was

---

1. Br. 76 A 16; N.Sc. 16 (1919) 21, fig. 6.

2. Br. 77 A 23; N.Sc. 16 (1919) 21, fig. 7.

3. Br. 78 B 6; Beiheft Antike Kunst 7 (1970) 51ff. pl. 27, 4 & 5, Par. 347, 73 bis.

4. Br. 77A 22; Par. 314.

5. This could indicate that he is going to kill it but also that he will stun it as in Apollodorus' version.

a preliminary sketch or an artist's error, which was not erased.

These scenes, apart from (1), give no indication as to whether the hind is meant to be dead or alive, but perhaps they make more sense if it is alive since Apollo is trying to get it back. This composition covers the period roughly from 550 to 475 BC.

## II. Heracles running off with the hind.

In these scenes Heracles runs off with the hind under his arm, unimpeded by Apollo. These scenes all belong roughly to the last quarter of the sixth century.

1. Berlin F 1859, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Thasos, Limenas 1117, skyphos-fragments, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Market 1937, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Leningrad, pelike, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.

I have placed this group after the scenes of the struggle with Apollo since Heracles is shown in the same pose with the hind as he was in the majority of the struggle scenes, and the former may have been the inspiration for this composition-type.

(1) is the only piece in this group without difficulties. However, Hermes is depicted even though he could have no

- 
1. Br. 75 A 1; A. Furtwängler, Königliche Museum zu Berlin, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium (Berlin 1885) 350.
  2. Br. 77 A 24; Ghali-Kahil, op. cit. pl. 35, 75; A.B.L. 250, 20.
  3. Br. 76 A 9; Les Tableaux des Anciens ... provenant de l'hôtel de Madame I. Péreire (Paris, 4-6-37) no. 30.
  4. Br. 77 B 4; K. Schefold, Untersuchungen zu den Kertschen Vasen (Berlin, 1934) no. 504.

possible connection with this myth. Possibly the artist was influenced by his appearance in Cerberus scenes where his presence is well documented. The problem with (2) is that it is rather fragmentary and so even an identification of subject-matter is rather difficult. A thigh and part of a leg are preserved and possibly the bottom of the lionskin. Also preserved are the back legs, thin and hooved, of what is probably a deer, above ground level. Thus, the subject is likely to be Heracles and the hind, but it is not certain that Apollo was not also originally depicted, trying to snatch it away.

(4) is odd in that a Nike flies above Heracles' head as he runs off with the hind and turned away from him sits a girl, who looks back at him while a satyr leans on her shoulder. This could well imply the existence of a satyr play on this subject.

(3) also contains a winged figure, but this time it seems to want to snatch away the hind, which is most odd. Athena and another woman, presumably Artemis, are also present.

### III. Heracles breaking off the hind's horns.

This composition enjoys a continuous tradition from the early third quarter of the sixth century until Roman times and beyond, becoming the standard composition in Hellenistic renderings of this myth. As has already been stated, it does not occur at all in extant literature and it certainly implies a version in which Heracles was only required to take back the horns to Eurystheus, as opposed to the whole animal. This would still be a labour of skill, since he would have to catch

the hind first and he would also be vulnerable to all sorts of objections from Artemis for despoiling her sacred beast, unless, of course, in this tradition it was not thought of as originally sacred to her. Certainly the horns, being golden, would have an intrinsic value of their own, and Eurystheus could be thought to covet them. Certainly the extensive appearance of such scenes implies a fairly weighty literary tradition for this version.

1. London BM B 231, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Market, 1958, amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Paris, Louvre G 263, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Olympia metope<sup>4</sup>.
5. Athens, Hephaesteum, metope<sup>5</sup>.
6. Bologna 303, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Athens, Agora P 17.877, bowl, Hellenistic<sup>7</sup>.
8. Athens, Agora P 19.881, bowl, Hellenistic<sup>8</sup>.
9. Athens, NM 12618, bowl, Hellenistic<sup>9</sup>.
10. Athens, Kerameikos, bowl-fragment, Hellenistic<sup>10</sup>.
11. Louvre H 264, plate, Hellenistic<sup>11</sup>.
12. Paris, Cab. Méd. 1206, guttus, Hellenistic<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 75 A 6; Brommer, *Her.* pl. 15a; *A.B.V.* 139, 10.
  2. *M.M. Auct.* 18 pl. 30, 102.
  3. Br. 77 B 2; Brommer, *Her.* pl. 17; *A.R.V.* 2. 341, 89.
  4. Ashmole & Yalouris, *op. cit.* pl. 172.
  5. Sauer, *op. cit.* pl. VI. iii.
  6. Br. 77 B 1; *C.V.* 4 pL. III I 82, 7 & 83, 2; *A.R.V.* 2. 1184, 6.
  7. Br. 78 E 2; *Hesperia* 17 (1948) pl. 64.
  8. Br. 78 E 3; Hausmann, *op. cit.* pl. 64.
  9. Br. 78 E 4; Hausmann, *op. cit.* pl. 65, 2.
  10. Br. 78 E 1; Hausmann, *op. cit.* pl. 65, 1.
  11. Br. 78 E 6; *C.V.* 23 pl. IV E 28, 1.
  12. Br. 78 E 7; *Jd.I Ergh.* 8 (1909) 97, fig. 44, no. 189b.

13. St. Germain Mus. 28125, sigillata, Gallic<sup>1</sup>.
14. Berlin F 2882, bowl, Hellenistic<sup>2</sup>.
15. From Utica, fragment, Roman<sup>3</sup>.
16. Madrid museum, from Liria, mosaic<sup>4</sup>.
17. Ravenna museum, marble relief<sup>5</sup>.

The composition of these pieces is fairly standard, Heracles usually forcing down the hind, with his knee in its back, and having his hand on the horns, about to break them off. (1) is different as it is the only surviving piece to show Heracles holding one of the horns already broken off, and it makes it absolutely plain that he is actually going to break them off in the other representations; in (1) he holds the other horn, apparently about to break it off too. The female figure with bow, facing him, is probably Artemis; it seems odd that she should allow him to do this if the animal is sacred to her and, as I have already said, this tradition may imply that it was not. Her presence here may indicate that Heracles was thought to dedicate the horns to her, rather as in Euripides' account he is said to dedicate the whole animal. However the artist may merely wish to allude to her connection with the hind, even though she must then stand idly by while her sacred animal is desecrated.

(17) is interesting as it definitely shows a stag instead of a hind, but at this late date (sixth century AD) it

- 
1. Br. 78 E 8; Déchelette, op. cit. 265, no. 54.
  2. Furtwängler, Sabouroff pl. 74, 3.
  3. Br. 78 E 10; Gazette Archéologique 6 (1880) pl. 33, 3.
  4. Br. Her. pl. 31.
  5. P. Schweinfurth, Grundzüge der byzantinisch-osteuropäischen Kunstgeschichte (1947) pl. VIII fig. 15.

is no help for deciding whether there was an actual tradition about a stag, since it is likely that here the sculptor has simply been inaccurate.

(2), by the Acheloös Painter, is interesting as possibly showing Athena trying to dissuade Heracles from breaking off the horns, since she stands in front of him with her right arm raised. Perhaps the painter is here regarding the act as irreligious as far as Artemis is concerned.

Thus it may be said that the relationship of Artemis to this variant is not clear but that it enjoys a consistent and standard rendering in art from about the middle of the sixth century BC until the sixth century AD with (1) being the only surviving example where Heracles has already broken off one of the horns.

#### IV. Heracles clubbing the hind.

It is possible that this group represents a version in which Heracles killed the hind, but it must always be borne in mind that the club may be drawn simply as the traditional weapon of Heracles, regardless of whether it has a place in the actual myth. In any case, Heracles could be thought to be merely intent on stunning the hind, just as he seems to stun it with the bow in Apollodorus' account, or else he could be intending to smash off its horns, although this would be a rather reckless way of removing them.

1. Munich 2003 (J 355), mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.

2. Delphi, Athenian treasury, metope<sup>2</sup>.

3. Agrigento V 1568, oinochoe, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.

1. Br. 77 A 25; Brommer, Her. pl. 13b; A.B.L. 105.

2. Brommer, Her. pl. 6b.

3. Br. 78 B 5; Arch. Repl. (1963/4) 43, fig. 15.

As can be seen, this is rather late<sup>1</sup> and not a very popular type of representation, and this may indicate that it was merely an inaccuracy on the part of a few artists. In fact, (3) is the only piece where it can certainly be said that Heracles brandishes his club at the hind. In (1) Heracles, holding his club in his left hand, faces the hind, which rears up. He could not really be said to be brandishing his club here and so perhaps it is merely given to him as an attribute, especially as he is without the lionskin to identify him, and he may just be shown encountering the hind in an allusion to this myth, rather than shown in the actual act of capture.

In (2), Heracles, with the lionskin about his neck, kneels on the rump of the hind with his left knee. Only the torso of the hind is preserved; Heracles seems to have had his left hand on its neck or head. The scheme of the knee in the back suggests that he is about to break off the horns, but from the position of his right arm and the inclination of his head he seems rather about to hit it with his club although admittedly this is not preserved.

In (3) the hind sits on its back legs; it has no horns. Heracles has his left arm round its neck in strangle-hold and swings his club above his head. On the left stands Artemis and on the right Apollo; all three are inscribed. The club may be thought of as coercive rather than as a death weapon. We must presume that the artist has merely forgotten about the horns.

---

1. This does not begin until the fifth century BC.

V. Quiet scenes depicting Heracles and Athena standing with the hind.

As the title of this group indicates there is no action in these scenes and one must suppose that Heracles is shown with his helper, Athena, after the hind has been tamed, or that he is about to dedicate it to her, or else that the artists are merely making a general allusion to this myth. All three pieces belong to the last quarter of the sixth century.

1. Cambridge G 49, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. London, BM B 198, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Louvre F 272, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.

These compositions are very stylised, with Heracles and Athena facing one another and virtually ignoring the hind, which stands between them in (2) and (3), but behind Heracles in (1). Heracles is armed in some way in all three, but does not aim any weapon at the hind, and in (3) he actually holds a lyre, which presumably relates to his musical talents. Beazley<sup>4</sup> links none of these scenes with the Cerynitian hind but describes the first two as "Heracles and Athena", and the third as "Heracles playing the cithara". Admittedly the hind only has horns in (1) but this should not be a serious difficulty in identification since we saw that the hind of the Agrigento piece in Group IV had none either.<sup>5</sup> It must surely

---

1. Br. 75 A 5; C.V. 11 pl. 1; A.B.V. 316, 1.

2. Br. 76 A 15; A.V. pl. 246; A.B.V. 283, 12.

3. Br. 75 A 4; C.V. 5 pl. 56, 4; A.B.V. 383, 6.

4. A.B.V. See notes (1) - (3) for specific references.

5. See page 160, no. 3 & 161.

be that scenes of Heracles with a hind have some relation to this labour but the degree of stylisation inclines me to think that they are just vague allusions to it.

#### VI. Oddities

These pieces cannot be classified according to composition and may not, indeed, all be representations of this subject.

1. Philadelphia private collection, fibula, Boeotian geometric<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM B 169, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Bareiss Collection, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. New York D. Rockefeller, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Florence 3871, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Boulogne 421, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Rome, Vatican, hydria, Etruscan black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

The geometric fibula dates to the last quarter of the eighth century BC and depicts on the other part Heracles and

- 
1. F.G.S. no. 135 & pl. 8.
  2. Br. 76 A 14; A.V. pl. 100; A.B.V. 306, 37.
  3. Br. 76 A 10; M.M. Auct. 26 pl. 31, no. 94.
  4. Br. 77 A 17; D. von Bothmer, 'Greek vases lost and found' Robinson Studies II 135 no. 2 (reference to 'stag' probably an error); A.B.V. 306, 40.
  5. Br. 76 A 11; C. Albizzati, Due nuove acquisti del Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco (Rome, 1929) 13, fig. 8; A.B.V. 383, 2.
  6. Br. 75 A 3; A.V. pl. 98.
  7. Br. 78 C 1; R.G. no. 92 & pl. 28.

the hydra<sup>1</sup>. It is a good deal earlier than any of the other evidence for the hind, either literary or artistic, and is also interesting as possibly substantiating Hyginus' version of a stag. The difficulty lies, of course, in the common Geometric problem of identification of subject-matter. A hoplite warrior brandishes a spear in his left hand, while in his right he holds the horn of a deer. Below this deer is a smaller one, in semi-vertical position, with its nose under the belly of the other. At first sight it seems to be in suckling position, thus indicating the former to be a hind with horns, but near the nose of the smaller deer there seems to be a large phallus. Surely the Geometric artist could not mean this to be an udder? One must suppose, then, that the smaller deer is not meant to be feeding from the other but that its position is just an oddity of Geometric composition. The warrior's spear is close to the smaller deer's head and so perhaps he has wounded it and it is meant to be falling.

There are, thus, three choices as regards interpretation of subject-matter. The warrior could be Heracles, who was depicted as a warrior in early times<sup>2</sup>, and if so the little deer is being suckled by the hind with the golden horns, whose udders are badly drawn; the purpose of drawing the smaller deer would presumably be to identify the other as a hind despite its horns. The warrior could be Heracles and the deer be a stag, thus confirming the tradition of Hyginus, but it is then difficult to explain the presence of the smaller deer. The scene could have nothing to do with Heracles at all; the presence of the

---

1. See page 84, no. 2, & 85.

2. If this is the correct interpretation of the Athenaeus passage. See page 48, note (1).

hydra on the other part of the fibula does not make it necessary to connect this scene with Heracles as well. In fact, in view of the difficulties involved in the first two theories, and also the fact that this fibula is much earlier than any of the other evidence for this myth, the third theory seems to be the most attractive; I therefore suppose this fibula to represent an ordinary hunting scene and to be unconnected with the Cerynitian hind.

(2) and (3) may be connected with Apollo rather than with Heracles, who seems not to be depicted. In the former, a man with tunic and quiver touches the rump of a hind with his right hand and the antlers with his left. Beazley identifies him as Apollo, but it is hard to explain the other two youths who are present. We know that the horned hind was generally regarded as sacred to Artemis and it seems reasonable for her brother to be shown playing with it, and he may here just be in the presence of some of his friends. In (3) the figure with cloak, beard and long hair, wearing an animal skin and holding a bow, looks more like Apollo than Heracles, as he is presumably identified by Brommer, who places this vase in his list of representations of Heracles and hind. Certainly the skin looks more like a panther skin than a lion skin. This vase is odd in other ways, since next to the hind, which incidentally has no horns, is a man fighting a centaur and there is also a male in long cloak present.

(4) is described by Beazley as showing a "man with sword pursuing a deer, and another man in front, looking back". There is no picture available for this vase; it sounds like a general hunting-scene, but without a picture no decision can be reached as to subject-matter.

(5) appears to be a tripod scene rather than the struggle for the hind between Heracles and Apollo.

(6) seems to be a confusion between the hind and Hesperides labours. Heracles looks back at the hind which stands in front of a tree laden with fruit. Two women hold out their hands, presumably in supplication, although it is not clear whether they are imploring Heracles not to hurt the hind or not to pick the fruit. No snake is shown. This picture is certainly odd, since there seems no connection at all between these two myths; perhaps the artist is merely making a general allusion to two of Heracles' labours.

(7) shows a naked, seated figure with what looks like a wide-bladed scimitar, although it could possibly be a club, holding on a lead a bucking deer, without horns. This is next to a scene of Heracles and the lion and it is just possible that it shows Heracles and the hind in contamination with the Cerberus myth, where Heracles takes home his spoils on a lead<sup>1</sup>.

#### CONCLUSION

The artistic evidence, as usual, contains a greater number of versions than the literary, although it seems that two important traditions have failed to survive in literature, namely Heracles' struggle with Apollo for the hind and also the tradition that Heracles broke off the hind's horns. It is just conceivable that the former was solely confined to art and owed its entire inspiration to scenes of the struggle for the tripod, but I feel that the latter must have had a literary antecedant since it is shown in several different fabrics and

---

1. See pages 244ff.

spans many centuries. It seems likely that these two compositions were the most popular in art because they provided greater artistic scope than the versions preserved in extant literature.

It seems likely that Euripides' version of the hind being killed was not taken up by artists. Certainly the animal is alive while Heracles is breaking off the horns, and there would seem no point in killing it thereafter. Moreover, when he is shown carrying it away, with or without the hindrance of Apollo, it is likely to be thought of as alive, as are all the other creatures which the labours require him to take to Eurystheus. In the quiet scenes with Athena the hind is alive, and it has been noted that in the clubbing scenes it is not necessary to presume that Heracles is about to kill it. It seems likely that Euripides' version was confined to him and did not gain wider acceptance.

The existence of a hind with horns seems to go back at least to the middle of the seventh century, since Pisander is credited with writing about one, but there is no evidence at all that he connected it with Heracles. The earliest literary reference to the myth of Heracles and the hind occurs in Pindar, although the earliest surviving artistic representation goes back to shortly after the middle of the sixth century, perhaps suggesting one of the lyric poets as the source. It is interesting that both the struggle with Apollo and the breaking off of the horns are shown in the third quarter of the sixth century, perhaps indicating a debt to the same source.

It is not possible to know whether the tradition of five hinds with golden horns was invented by Callimachus, but

certainly there is no evidence that the hind which suckled Telephus was the same as that caught by Heracles. The idea of a hind with horns certainly troubled ancient academics, but the fact that golden horns were also a phenomenon does not seem to have struck them. This hind or these hinds were, of course, special and it is noteworthy that all the creatures involved in Heracles' labours have some special feature. There is no evidence that Hyginus was following an authentic tradition in his mention of a stag, but he may have been influenced by the rationalising tendencies of the Alexandrians. It must not be lost sight of that this is not the only female animal to be associated with Heracles, since the horses of Diomedes were mares. Why this was so is not possible to deduce, but I feel it may have had something to do with the notion of the deadliness of the female of the species in the Diomedes myth,<sup>1</sup> and in the hind myth to be connected with making the creature special.

---

1. See page 322.

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE AMAZONS

In dealing with this labour of Heracles it will be necessary also to discuss in detail the activities of Theseus in connection with the Amazons, since he is variously described as taking part in Heracles' expedition against the Amazons and making a separate expedition of his own: it is important to investigate which of these traditions is the earlier and also to decide whether Heracles was ever thought of as making a separate expedition specifically without Theseus. The sources for the Heracles and Theseus Amazon legends will form the literary evidence; a brief look at the exploits of other heroes against the Amazons may be found in Appendix I.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCEI. Heracles' expedition, without mention of Theseus

Ibycus (P.M.G. 299): This source, commenting on the story of Heracles fetching the girdle of Hippolyte, states that Ibycus alone calls the amazon who owned the belt Oeolyce, daughter of Briareus.

Pindar (N III 36ff.): Telamon<sup>1</sup> sacked the city of Laomedon together with Iolaus and followed Iolaus to war with the Amazons.

(Fr. 172): Peleus went with Heracles to the plain of Troy, and went in quest of the girdle of the Amazon.

---

1. Pisander (Athen. IX 783c) says Heracles gave Telamon a cup for valour and this could refer to the Amazon campaign, which could then be dated c. 650. G.L. Huxley, op. cit. 104f. regards the campaign as Troy.

(N V 25ff.): Hippolyte lied that she was raped by Peleus.

N.B. The Scholiast on Pindar (N III 38)

says that Telamon killed Melanippe during this expedition from lust, and adds that according to some Peleus was also present on the expedition.

Euripides (H.F. 408ff.): Heracles gathered a force from the whole of Greece; he took the girdle and brought it back to Mycenae.

Hellanicus (FGH 4 F106): Hellanicus stated that all who sailed in the Argo went with Heracles on his expedition against the Amazons.

Apollonius Rhodius  
(2.964ff.): The Argonauts came to the Amazons, where once Melanippe daughter of Ares had been ambushed by Heracles; Hippolyte gave him her girdle to ransom her sister and he sent her back safe.

Apollodorus (II V 9): It was the ninth labour to fetch the girdle of Hippolyte, a present from Ares, her father. Hippolyte promised it to Heracles, but Hera took on her appearance and stirred up the Amazons. They attacked Heracles, suspecting treachery, killed Hippolyte and took the girdle.

Hyginus (Fab. XIV 30): Heracles had the Chalciopes as allies when he took the girdle of the Amazons.

Scholiast on Ap. Rh. Sthenelus, son of Actor was killed  
 2. 911-14: when fighting with Heracles against  
 the Amazons.

II. Separate expedition for Theseus.

(F.G.H.)  
 Pherecydes } (3F 151) Theseus made an expedition of his own  
 Hellanicus } (4F 166): after Heracles, and took an Amazon  
 Herodorus } (31F 25a) prisoner. Plutarch thinks this the  
 likliest version since "it is not  
 recorded that anyone else who shared  
 his expedition took an Amazon prisoner<sup>1</sup>".

Pindar (Fr. 175): According to Pindar, Antiope was  
 carried off by Pirithous and Theseus;  
 the presence of Pirithous perhaps  
 makes it more likely that this refers  
 to a separate expedition from that  
 of Heracles.

Bion (Plut. Thes. xxvi): Theseus invited Antiope on board when  
 she came with gifts from the Amazons,  
 when he touched on their coast; he  
 then put out to sea with her. This  
 does not seem to be part of an hostile  
 expedition but was probably an exploit  
 of his own.

---

1. We do not know what name they gave to the Amazon, but it  
 is possible that Pherecydes, who is near to the date of  
 Pindar and the inscribed vases, called her Antiope.

III Theseus accompanies Heracles against the Amazons

Hegias of Troezen (Paus. I.2.1): Heracles was unable to take Themiscyra on the Thermodon in siege but Antiope desired Theseus, who was campaigning at the same time as Heracles, and she surrendered the place.

Euripides (Heracl. 216ff.): Iolaus tells Demophon that once he and Theseus sailed with Heracles to win the belt of the Amazon.

Philochorus (FGH 328 F 109): Theseus, while on campaign with Heracles against the Amazons, received Antiope as a reward for his valour.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 16, 1-4): It was the ninth labour to fetch the girdle of Hippolyte, queen of the Amazons. He sailed to Euxine and encamped near Themiscyra, where the palace of the Amazons was situated. He first demanded the girdle but, when it was refused, he started battle. He gave Antiope to Theseus and set free Melanippe in return for the girdle.

(IV 28, 1-4): The surviving Amazons invaded Attica in revenge for what Heracles had done, being particularly annoyed that Theseus

had Antiope, or according to other traditions, Hippolyte, as a slave. The Scythians helped them. They were defeated by Theseus.

Hyginus (Fab. XXX 10): Heracles took away the girdle of Hippolyte and gave Antiope to Theseus.

Scholiast, Euripides, When Theseus, together with Heracles, was Hippolytus 10: making war on the Amazons on account of the girdle, he took Antiope prisoner and took her back to Greece; he married her and begat Hippolytus.

IV Uncertain which expedition is referred to

Simonides (Apollod. Theseus joined Heracles in the expedition Epit. 1. 16): against the Amazons and, according to Simonides, carried off Hippolyte<sup>1</sup>.

It may be noted in passing that both Herodotus<sup>2</sup> and Isocrates<sup>3</sup> refer to the Amazons' invasion of Attica. Herodotus merely says that they came from the river Thermodon and were defeated, while Isocrates actually names Hippolyte<sup>4</sup> as the Amazon whom they came to recover, since she had fallen in love with Theseus and come to Attica with him. However, neither of these passages can be said specifically to refer to a separate expedition of Theseus, for the second one need only compare the statement of Diodorus that the Amazons came to punish both Heracles and Theseus, but the latter in particular. Plutarch<sup>5</sup>, quoting the author of the Theseis, talks of Heracles

---

1. All that can be attributed to Simonides is the statement that he carried off Hippolyte.

2. IX 27.4.

3. XII 273 c-d.

4. See pages 177ff.

5. Theseus XXVIII 1 & 2.

defending Theseus against the Amazons when Antiope attacked him for marrying Phaedra and this would presumably imply an original joint expedition. However, this is the only place in which Plutarch mentions the author of the Theseis and disagrees with him; this could mean that this work is not a good early source but Hellenistic.

It is necessary to examine in detail the references quoted earlier. It is immediately obvious that Heracles headed a large expedition against the Amazons and that his aim was to gain the girdle of their queen, the significance of which will be dealt with later, as will the identity of the queen. Theseus' dealings with the Amazons seem to centre around the abduction of one of their number, generally but not always, Antiope; this seems to be the case whether or not he accompanies Heracles. It is nowhere stated that Theseus headed a large expedition, as did Heracles, and no reason is given for him going to Amazon territory in passages where he does not accompany Heracles. He is never described as going in quest of the girdle on his own account and even on Heracles' expedition is never described as fighting to win it but only in connection with one particular Amazon, who is generally given to him as a gift, although the reason is left vague.

It is necessary to consider which is the earliest myth. First I will examine the references to Heracles' expedition which do not mention Theseus, in the hope of deciding whether their silence about the latter indicates a tradition in which he definitely was not present or whether they have simply omitted this part of the myth. Most of these sources are cursory references from poetry and one would not expect them

to give a full account. However, Apollodorus, who is concerned with giving a full version, omits all reference to Theseus, which is important as suggesting that he believed him not to have been involved. It is noteworthy that Pherecydes, whom he sometimes uses as a source<sup>1</sup>, gives Theseus a separate expedition. Both Euripides and Hyginus, however, can be seen sometimes to omit reference to Theseus but in other passages to describe them campaigning together, indicating that the fact of Theseus' presence can be omitted as irrelevant. We can see that it is not possible to solve this problem, but it can, at least, be stated that Theseus was not a very important part of the joint campaign; many Greeks were involved in the expedition, especially in Pindar's account, and Theseus seems to have been just one of many "great names" taking part.

Perhaps it is more important to consider whether the Theseus Amazon story was originally part of the larger Heracles' expedition, or whether it was a separate legend, joined to the Heracles' myth later, or to which the Heracles myth was itself joined. Matters would be reasonably uncomplicated if we could be sure of the identity of Hegias of Troezen: we know a poet called 'Agias of Troezen' to have been the author of the *Nostoi*<sup>2</sup> and Pausanias<sup>3</sup> Hegias seems so close to this name

---

1. cf. Hesperides labour, pages 259 & 262

2. Agias' authorship is attested by Proclus (A. Severyns, Recherches sur la chrestomathie de Proclus III, (Paris, 1953) fr. f. 276). The inscription on a Hellenistic bowl can be restored from Proclus (See A. Severyns, Le Cycle d'Épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, (Paris, 1928) 403ff & figure).

3. I. 2.1.

that it seems likely they are one and the same person, especially as their home town is the same. If this identification is correct our evidence for Theseus being part of Heracles' expedition could go back as far as the eighth century BC, but we cannot date the Nostoi; the only surviving lines<sup>1</sup> offer no clues and we know that Nostoi were being written down to the sixth century BC<sup>2</sup>.

If one discounts the Hegias reference, the earliest extant source for the shared expedition is Euripides, since the Simonides reference is not explicit enough to make it certain that Simonides actually meant Theseus to have carried off Hippolyte during the joint expedition. Thus, the first certain reference to a separate Theseus expedition is earlier; much of the new Theseus story appears for the first time in Pherecydes and it is possible that he invented the Amazon story, but we cannot, of course, be certain. From this evidence it would appear that the shared expedition came about when the Theseus Amazon legend was already established and a link between the two heroes was stressed by representing the deeds of both on the same vase or piece of sculpture<sup>3</sup>.

The problem with this, however, is that Theseus plays such an unimportant part in Heracles' expedition, whereas one would assume that if the Athenians made a joint expedition from two separate ones, Theseus would have been given a rôle equally important with that of Heracles<sup>4</sup>. Moreover, to anticipate

---

1. *Homeri Opera* vol. V. ed. T. Allen (Oxford, 1912) 141 VI.  
 ἀντίκα δ' Αἴθωνα θῆκε φίλον κόρον ἠβώοντα  
 γῆρας ἀποξύσασα ἰδυίῃσι πράκιδεσσι  
 φάρμακα πόλλ' ἔψουσ' ἐπὶ χρυσείοισι λέβησιν.

2. Eumelus of Corinth (187F 6 K) Stesichorus *P.M.G.* 208.

3. cf. *Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi*.

4. The evidence for a Heracles Amazon expedition and that for a Theseus Amazon expedition are roughly contemporary.

the artistic evidence, we never see Theseus depicted in Heracles' amazonomachy. These features could imply that the separate Theseus legend grew out of his relatively unimportant rôle in Heracles' expedition. This would require a date earlier than c. 510 BC for the joint expedition, which could well be supplied by Hegias of Troezen, who, as has been seen, is likely to have been the author of the Nostoi, without demanding an early date for Hegias.

Another complex problem involved in the Amazon adventures of Theseus and Heracles is the names assigned to the individual Amazons particularly associated with each of them. It is commonly supposed that Theseus seized or was given Antiope and that Heracles sought the girdle of Hippolyte, but the ancient sources give a less clearly defined account. Perhaps the following lists may clarify the matter:

## THESEUS

Connected with ANTIOPE by Hegias of Troezen

Pindar

Philochorus

Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Herodorus

(by implication)

Bion

Diodorus Siculus

Hyginus

Connected with HIPPOLYTE by Stesichorus<sup>1</sup>

Simonides

Isocrates

Istrus

Clidemus (Plut. Thes. xxvii)

Argument to Euripides, Hippolytus

1. P.M.G. 193 vv. 25-6.

Connected with MELANIPPE by an unnamed source quoted by Apollodorus (Epit. 1. 16)

## HERACLES

Connected with HIPPOLYTE by Apollonius Rhodius

Diodorus Siculus

Apollodorus

Hyginus

Scholiast on Euripides' Hippolytus.

Connected with OEOLYCE by Ibycus

Connected with DEILYCE by Scholiast to Apollonius Rhodius.

It is certainly odd that Heracles' amazon is not named as Hippolyte until the time of Apollonius, after which it became standard; in fact, she is not named at all in literature before this time, except by Ibycus who calls her Oeolyce, although it will be seen that on Attic black-figure vases she often appears as Andromache, a name not linked with Heracles at all in extant literature. It would thus appear that the ancient writers had not defined the specific owner of the girdle until Hellenistic times. It is not even said to belong to the Amazon queen until the time of Diodorus.

Another important point is that Heracles is not associated with Hippolyte in sources contemporary with those that associated her with Theseus. The latter seems to have been associated with her by reason of his fatherhood of Hippolytus<sup>1</sup>, an old cult figure brought into the legend. The antiquity of Hippolytus seems to indicate the derivation of Hippolyte from his name, as his natural mother. Stesichorus is our first

1. See Eur. Hippolytus passim

extant source to link Theseus with Hippolyte, if we accept Lobel's conjecture<sup>1</sup>, and he is followed by Simonides. We know Stesichorus to have been responsible for many mythical innovations<sup>2</sup> and it may well be possible that he was the first to treat the Theseus-Phaedra-Hippolytus legend and in doing so coined the name Hippolyte. Euripides took up his innovations in the Helen myth and he was certainly interested in the Hippolytus legend, writing two plays on the subject. The connection between Theseus and Hippolyte may originally have been a rather insignificant detail of a non-Amazon legend. The version of Theseus carrying off Antiope is the better documented Amazon tradition and could be somewhat earlier, depending on the date of Hegias. If this is so, the Hippolyte myth may later have become confused with the Antiope myth because both concerned Amazons.

Another aspect of the Heracles Amazon labour must here be investigated, namely the nature of the girdle and why Heracles should be sent to fetch it. In fact this information is not given by any of the sources, although a hint may perhaps be found in Apollodorus, in that it was a gift from Ares and as such was presumably divine. One would suppose its nature to have been at some stage defined, although the rarity of its appearance in works of art may imply that it was not precisely visualised. It is certainly possible that the girdle was connected with the Amazon's virginity and that to get so close to such a warlike creature was a great feat, although it cannot be denied that the lack of mention of resultant offspring is unusual.

---

1. See page 177, note (1).

2. P. Oxy. 2506 Fr. 26 col. ii.

This labour was not performed for the benefit of mankind and often seems not to have been of insuperable difficulty: Hippolyte even initially offers her girdle in Apollodorus' account. Moreover, Heracles is supported by a large force and it is surprising that Apollodorus counts this as a labour since he says that Eurystheus discounted the hydra because Heracles had help<sup>1</sup>. Presumably he was thought to have taken the actual girdle himself, no mean feat in view of its proximity to such a warlike creature especially if it symbolised her virginity. Diodorus alone makes this labour an act of benefaction.

In conclusion to this section it may prove useful to examine briefly the nature of the Amazons. They were a race of female warriors, perhaps derived from the warlike Hittites: the geographical area of Amazons and Hittites is similar<sup>2</sup>, Ephesus, Smyrna and other towns being traditionally founded by Amazons<sup>3</sup>. They were said to cut off their right breasts to prevent them getting in the way of their bows: both Hellanicus<sup>4</sup> and Diodorus<sup>5</sup> record that they burned the place with iron to stop their breasts growing again.

Pherecydes<sup>6</sup>, among others, says the Amazons were daughters of Ares, and this is interesting as adding to the list of his

---

1. See page 78.

2. See J. Garstang, The Hittite Empire (London, 1929) 73.

3. Strabo 11.5.4.

4. F.G.H. 4 F 107.

5. II 45.3.

6. F.G.H. 3 F 15.

offspring fought by Heracles<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, it gives a convenient explanation of their warlike nature. It was probably this traditional fierceness, heightened by stories of them cutting off their right breast to make them even better fighters, that made them suitable opponents for Heracles in one of his labours. There is nothing to suggest that this myth was thought of as a labour any earlier than the Olympia metopes. The Amazons are connected with Isthria in Pindar<sup>2</sup> rather than with Themiscyra, and Pindar also connects the Cerynitian Hind with Isthria, it being interesting that hind and Amazons are placed side by side at Olympia.

#### B ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

In dealing with the artistic evidence extensive use will be made of Von Bothmer's comprehensive work, Amazons in Greek Art<sup>3</sup>, whose numbers will be given in brackets, although I shall cut across his divisions according to fabric and composition by examining in detail and listing works inscribed with the names of particular Amazons connected with Heracles and Theseus and also by looking for specific representations of the actual girdle. I shall not attempt to classify all the material, as this has been done very well by Bothmer, but I shall make a few additions. It will be necessary to look both at representations of Heracles and Theseus.

---

1. Cf. Stymphalian birds and Cycnus.

2. O. VIII 47. The date of this ode is c. 460 BC (Wilamowitz, op. cit. 398). See page 151.

3. (Oxford, 1957).

I HERACLES(a) Fighting a single Amazon

In this group Heracles is depicted with one main Amazon combatant, although others may be in the field; she is often falling, trying to avoid Heracles' blow, while sometimes he holds on to her helmet-crest. There are very many such representations, suggesting that the version of Heracles fighting one Amazon direct, presumably for her girdle, was a popular one. The girdle, however, is not depicted. Many representations are not inscribed but a few do give us the name of Heracles' opponent and it is these that I wish to examine. The interesting point, however, is that all record names not attested for this Amazon in extant literature; the most popular being Andromache.

(i) Andromache.

1. Tarquinia RC 5564, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure (II 1)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Cambridge G 44, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure (II 3)<sup>2</sup>.
3. Boston 98. 916, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure (II 8)<sup>3</sup>.
4. New York 07.156.7 & 56 128 a-c frag., neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure (II 11)<sup>4</sup>.
5. Louvre E 857, dinos, Attic black-figure (II 25)<sup>5</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 11 A 71; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. II, 1; A.B.V. 84, 1.
  2. Br. 10 A 38; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. II, 2; A.B.V. 84, 2.
  3. Br. 8 A 19; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. V; A.B.V. 98, 46.
  4. Br. 8 A 20; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. VII; A.B.V. 99, 51.
  5. Br. 21 A 28; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. XIV-XVI; A.B.V. 104, 123.

6. From Serra Orlando, Volute<sup>krater-</sup>fragments, Attic red-figure  
(Not in Bothmer)<sup>1</sup>.
7. Berlin 2263, cup, Attic red-figure (IX 3)<sup>2</sup>.
8. Berlin F 1848, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure  
(III 106)<sup>3</sup>.
9. Vienna 3600, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure  
(III 179 bis)<sup>4</sup>.
10. London E 45, cup, Attic red-figure (IX 8)<sup>5</sup>.
11. Paris, Cab. Méd. 535, 699, cup-fragments, Attic red-figure  
(IX 9)<sup>6</sup>.
12. Cerveteri, Tyrrhenian amphora, Attic black-figure (Not in  
Bothmer)<sup>7</sup>.

In all of these the Amazon is half-running, half-falling, as Heracles brandishes a weapon against her, most often a sword. Special attention may be given to the cup by Oltos, (7), since the name Andromache seems to be inscribed against the wrong figure, namely one of the watching Amazons instead of the Amazon whom Heracles actually fights. Telamon is attested as a member of the expedition earlier than Pindar's account, by the five early black-figure pieces of the Tyrrhenian Group (1) to (5), where his name is actually inscribed.

- 
1. Br. 23 B 6; A.J.A. 61 (1959) pl. 44, 25; A.R.V. 2. 28, 10.
  2. Br. 23 B 7; Brommer, Her. pl. 24a; A.R.V. 2. 62, 85.
  3. Br. 8 A 2u; E.K.V. pl. 17, 3-4; A.B.V. 671, 2u.
  4. Br. 11 A 75; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. XLV, 2: Par. 166, 125 bis.
  5. Br. 23 B 15; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXIX, 4; A.R.V. 2. 316, 8.
  6. Br. 23 B 11; Sir J.D. Beazley, Der Kleophrades-Maler (Berlin, 1933), pl. 8, 10.1, 11-12, 15.1-6, 30.5, A.R.V. 2. 191, 103.
  7. Br. 8 A 10

It is interesting that all these representations show Heracles using force against the Amazon and that this version must have been in existence in the second quarter of the sixth century. There is no evidence to identify Theseus on any of them, but they do not, of course, exclude the notion of Theseus accompanying Heracles at this time since the artist might merely have chosen not to depict him. It is interesting that Hippolyte is inscribed on (10), but only as a reinforcement to help Andromache. Very interesting is the fact that she is never inscribed as Heracles' opponent, thus supporting the literary evidence that she was not thought of in this rôle until late.

As has been said, in extant literature Andromache never appears as Heracles' opponent and indeed seldom appears at all as an Amazon,<sup>1</sup> possibly only appearing as such from the influence of the vase-painters .

Bothmer suggests that the uninscribed works with similar composition are meant to depict Andromache<sup>2</sup>, but this seems a rather dubious suggestion in view of the other names that are inscribed alongside Heracles' opponent in similar compositions; the fact that the inscribed works with Andromache are more numerous may be caused by the accidents of survival.

The other inscribed opponents of Heracles are as follows:-

(ii) Antimache

1. Athens, Acrop. 1781, fragment, perhaps from a Merrythought cup, Attic black-figure (II 36)<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Schol. Hom. Il. 3.189.

2. See eg. page 45.

3. Br. 18 A 8; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pll. 83 & 86; A.B.V. 198, 2.

(iii) Barcida

1. Louvre G 107, neck-handled amphora, Attic red-figure (IX 6)<sup>1</sup>.

(iv) Cydoeme

1. Arezzo 1465, volute-krater, Attic red-figure. (IX 5)<sup>2</sup>
2. London B.M. E 18, cup, Attic red-figure (IX 4)<sup>3</sup>.

(v) Toxaris

1. Tarquinia RI 23.236, cup-fragment, Attic red-figure (IX 7)<sup>4</sup>.

(vi) Hipponice

1. Once Naples, Cella, Nolan amphora, Attic red-figure (IX 19)<sup>5</sup>.

It is (ii) and (iv.1.) that are particularly similar to the Andromache pieces as regards the pose of Heracles and Amazon, showing that similarity of composition is not necessarily sufficient to indicate a similar tradition. It is not certain whether all, or indeed any, of these pieces took the name of the Amazon from an actual literary tradition rather than coining their own. In the case of Andromache it is not impossible that various artists influenced one another over the name and it is noteworthy that the first five examples are all by the same group. It is interesting that Euphronios has left three vases each with a different Amazon inscribed as opponent, namely Barcida, and Cydoeme, and Toxaris.

Also in this section may be examined the earliest surviving representation of Heracles' Amazonomachy.

- 
1. Br. 23 B 5; C.V. 6 pl. III Ic 33, 1-4; A.R.V. 2. 18, 1.
  2. Br. 23 B 3; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXIX, 3; A.R.V. 2.15,6.
  3. Br. 23 B 8; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXIX 2; A.R.V. 2.62,86.
  4. Br. 23 B 4; A.R.V. 2. 17, 19.
  5. Br. 23 B 21; Bullettino Archeologico Napolitano NS 1, pl. 10, 1-3; A.R.V. 2. 653, 2u.

(vii) Andromeda

1. From Samothrace, alabastron, Early Corinthian. (I 4)<sup>1</sup>.

Heracles, Iolaus and possibly Menoetas, confront Andromeda, Alcinoia, and Areximacha. The three men stand in a line, as do the three Amazons, but Heracles and Andromeda are in the middle and thus clearly marked as opponents. It is very interesting that Iolaus appears at this early date, indicating that he was perhaps an original part of the myth. This vase indicates that Heracles' expedition dates to the late seventh century BC, a time when Stesichorus was linking Theseus with Hippolyte in the Hippolytus myth. Nothing can be deduced about the help of Theseus; all that can be said is that either Theseus was not thought of as part of Heracles' expedition at this time, or else this vase-painter did not wish to include him in his scene.

It is interesting that the composition of Heracles fighting a single Amazon appears early on (although admittedly the composition of the Corinthian alabastron differs from the others) and is a continuous one. Obviously force was considered necessary for Heracles to gain his objective and this would justify the inclusion of this myth among the labours. The composition of this version remains remarkably unchanged in non-Attic as well as in Attic art and one or two examples are found in Hellenistic times. In the Archaic Period it is found in Chalcidian<sup>2</sup>, Campanian<sup>3</sup>, Boeotian<sup>4</sup> and

---

1. Br. 23 C 1; A.M. 32 (1908) 112, fig. 32.

2. Orvieto Mus. 192, hydria; Br. 23 C 2; Rumpf, op. cit. no 151 pl. 140 & 142. B.M. B154, neck-handled amphora; Br. 24 C 3; Rumpf, op. cit. no. VI pl. 203.

3. Catania 4155, oinochoe; Br. 24 C 4; Libertini, Museo Biscari no. 658, pl. 69.

4. Ath. Acr. 466, skyphos-fragments; Br. 24 C 4; Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 22.

Laconian<sup>1</sup> as well as in Attic and Corinthian, while in later times it is found also in South Italian<sup>2</sup>. I would also place in this group the metope from Selinus Temple E<sup>3</sup>, which belongs to the Late Archaic period; again Heracles grasps the Amazon's helmet-crest but she is upright rather than half-falling. All this presents a very unified artistic tradition and also shows this myth was popular in a variety of areas.

Finally under this heading I shall list a number of additions to Bothmer, which depict the same scheme of Heracles fighting a single Amazon, although, of course, it is not certain which one.

1. Frankfurt VFß 319, Tyrrhenian amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
2. Hamburg 1961, 61, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
3. Christchurch (NZ) 55/58, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
4. Thasos 1703, plate, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
5. Ménil Fondation, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.

---

1. Rome, private collection, cup; Br. 24 C 6; Stibbe, op. cit. no. 193.

2. Taranto, Apulian bell-krater fragment; Br. 24 D 3; A.D. Trendall, Frühitaliotische Vasen (Leipzig, 1938) no B 4. Ruvo, Jatta 1096, Apulian volute-krater; Br. 24 D 4; H. Sichtermann, Griechische Vasen in Unteritalien aus der Sammlung Jatta in Ruvo (Tübingen, 1966) no. 39, pl. 60 & 61. Madrid 11066, bell-krater; Br. 24 D 8; K. Schauenburg, 'Der Gurtel der Hippolyte', Philologus 104 (1960), fig. 1.

3. Bothmer VII 4; O. Benndorf, Die Metopen von Selinunt (Berlin, 1873) pl. 7.

4. Br. 8 A 2ab; C.V. 1. pl. 23, 1 & 2, 25, 3 & 4.

5. Br. 18 A 2; H. Hoffmann, Griechische Kleinkunst für Kunst und Gewerbe (Hamburg, 1963) figs. 6 & 7.

6. Br. 19 A 25; A.D. Trendall, Christchurch New Zealand, Greek Vases in the Logie Collection (Christchurch, 1971) no. 23.

7. Br. 22 A 48; B.C.H. 83 (1959) 430, fig. 3 & pl. 24.

8. Br. 12 A 83a; H. Hoffmann, Ten Centuries that shaped the West (Mainz, 1970) no. 173.

6. Basel BS 453, neck-handled amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
7. Palermo, Mormino 104, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
8. Bucharest 0428, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.

cf. also the fragments:

1. From Megara Hyblaea, krater-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
2. Greifswald 193, fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.

Briefly to examine the fragments, on (1) fragment 5, a shield and legs are visible, with perhaps the end of a lionskin, while on fragment 6 a warrior is preserved, apparently a woman in view of the use of white for the flesh. In (2) Heracles, identified by the lionskin, combats a figure with a shield; the flesh in this instance is not painted white and it is possible that we should rather identify a man here, such as part of Geryon; however, artists do not always identify the Amazons by giving them white flesh<sup>6</sup>.

#### (b) Heracles receiving the girdle

There are only five examples of the girdle in surviving art; it is represented as a belt, either held out long or with the ends fastened. There is no suggestion of the use of force in these scenes; the idea of a peaceful handing-over of the girdle appears for the first time in Apollonius Rhodius in extant literature, when it is given as ransom for

- 
1. Br. 23 B 23; Antike Kunst (1970) 87, pl. 38, 1; A.R.V. 2. 1634, 30 bis.
  2. Br. 16 A 79a; C.V. 1 pl. 17, 8-11.
  3. Br. 20 A 10; C.V. 1 pl. 22, 6.
  4. Br. 21 A 27; Megara Hyblaea 2 pl. 94, 5 & 6.
  5. Br. 22 A 50; E. Boehringer, Greifswälder Antiken (Berlin, 1962) pl. 16.
  6. Cf. Louvre E875 dinos, Attic black-figure (Br. 21 A 28; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. XIV-XVI; A.B.V. 104, 123. See page 182, no. 5).

Melanippe, but the appearance of these representations by the third quarter of the fifth century BC suggests that some tradition of this sort existed much earlier than Apollonius. It appears from the testimony of Pausanias that the girdle was also depicted at Olympia both on the bronze group by Aristocles and on a metope of the temple of Zeus.

1. Olympia, group by Aristocles. (VII 6)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Olympia, metope. (VII 5)<sup>2</sup>.
3. Naples H 3241 (8\_1949), hydria, Lucanian.<sup>3</sup>
4. Bari, amphora, Apulian.<sup>4</sup>
5. Barletta, Museo Civico, volute-krater, Italian<sup>5</sup>.
6. Manchester IV E 30, krater, Campanian<sup>6</sup>.
7. Corinth CP 523, relief bowl, Roman<sup>7</sup>.

Nothing is preserved of the group by Aristocles and very little of the Olympia metope, with no girdle surviving. Both entirely depend for their supposed rendering of the girdle on the evidence of Pausanias; of the bronze group he says that "Heracles is depicted fighting for the belt with a mounted Amazon" and of the Olympia metope that it shows "Heracles taking the Amazon's girdle"<sup>8</sup>. It is possible to restore the fragments of the metope to show Heracles standing with club raised in left hand over a fallen Amazon, who holds up her

- 
1. Paus. V 25.11.
  2. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pl. 173.
  3. Br. 24 D1; L.C.S. 36 no. 137, pl. 12.3 & 4.
  4. Br. 24 D 15; Antike und Abendland 10 (1961) 98.
  5. Br. 24 D 13; Schauenberg, op. cit. fig. 3.
  6. Br. 24 D 5; L.C.S. 415, no. 359.
  7. Hesperia 11 (1942) 166f. I.1. figs. 5b & 6b.
  8. V 10.9.

shield for protection, and it is possible that he held the girdle in his right hand. It must be emphasised that the girdle has not survived and also that Pausanias' mode of expression proves loose when describing the Diomedes metope at Olympia<sup>1</sup>. It may be the case with the Aristocles group and with the metope that he is using a well-known aspect of the myth to refer to the labour as a whole, regardless of whether he actually saw the girdle depicted. I thus believe that there is not enough proof for regarding Olympia as the locality for the first rendering of the girdle in art.

The Naples piece (3) dates to the third quarter of the fifth century BC; it shows a number of Amazons and one Greek apart from Heracles; perhaps the Greek is to be regarded as Telamon or Iolaus. Heracles sits with his quiver on his back and club in his hand quietly receiving the long girdle. The weapons may be there just for attributes, or they could represent the initial threat of force, perhaps to the Amazon's sister before the handing over of the girdle. The Bari amphora, (4), dates to the late fifth century and shows Heracles standing in front of a seated Amazon, who gives him her girdle in the presence of two other Amazons. In (5), Heracles leans on his club in leisurely pose, facing an Amazon, who holds out her fastened girdle; she leads a horse, and there is another Amazon in the field above. This piece dates to c. 350 BC. Of (6), which dates 330/320 I have been able to look at no picture but from Trendall's description<sup>2</sup> I gain the information that it shows "Heracles receiving the girdle". The Roman

---

1. See page 333.

2. See page 189, note (6).

piece (7) shows the Amazon falling back against her horse, holding out her girdle.

All the vases are South Italian and it is interesting that South Italian representations of the Hesperides myth also favour quiet scenes<sup>1</sup>. It is always possible that the idea of Heracles using force in the presence of women was disliked there and so a quieter aspect of this myth was adopted. It is interesting that South Italy is, with one exception, the only place to have produced representations of the actual girdle and I wonder whether this was the result of taking literally Greek sources relating to a girdle, whereas in the original Greek story it was understood that it was the Amazon's virginity that was sought. This may be why there is no reference to Heracles having to take the girdle back to Eurystheus, although in most of the labours this sort of proof of completion is demanded. At any rate, whether following an actual literary tradition or not, these pieces do foreshadow Apollonius' account of a peaceful handing over of the girdle, taken up by Diodorus and mentioned as an attempt by Apollodorus.

(c) Heracles quietly parleying with the Amazons

Once again this scheme is confined to South Italian, showing a peculiar liking for such a mood in this fabric. Certain of these scenes date slightly earlier than those of Group (b), to before the middle of the fifth century.

---

1. The quiet parleying scenes of Group C are also confined to South Italian.

1. Port Sunlight X 2149, kalyx-krater, Campanian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Ruvo, Jatta 423, Panathenaic amphora, Apulian red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Bari 4393, column-krater, Lucanian<sup>3</sup>.
4. Seattle Art Museum, Panathenaic amphora, Apulian red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. New York 19.192.81.7, volute-krater, Apulian<sup>5</sup>.

These pieces do not require individual comment as their content is summed up by the title of this group. Generally, other Amazons are present, apart from the one with whom Heracles is talking, presumably the queen. (1) and (2) date before the middle of the fifth century, (3) is later fifth century and (4) and (5) belong to the later fourth century. This type of composition was thus in existence for more than a century.

As can be seen, most of the South Italian examples of this myth show a quiet moment, but there are a few which go back to the traditional scheme of Heracles fighting a single Amazon<sup>6</sup>.

(d) Perhaps the campaign shared by Heracles and Theseus

It is not often that Heracles and Theseus are shown campaigning against the Amazons together and the main claimants to be representations of such a theme must be examined. It is very important to bear in mind that if the

- 
1. Br. 24 D 6; E.M.W. Tillyard, The Hope Vases (Cambridge, 1923) pl. 38, no. 27; L.C.S. 308, no. 569.
  2. Br. 24 D 7; Sichtermann, op. cit. no. 71 pl. 114ff.
  3. Br. 24 D 2; L.C.S. 59 no. 292 pl. 29, 1 & 2.
  4. Br. 24 D 14; Schauenburg, op. cit. fig. 6.
  5. Br. 24 D 12; Schauenburg, op. cit. fig. 5.
  6. See page 187, note (2).

artist intended to show these two heroes together he should have given them easily identifiable attributes and so, especially in the Attic pieces, one would expect Theseus, whose attributes were less obvious than Heracles', to be very clearly marked by his sunhat, long hair, and spears.

1. Delphi, Athenian Treasury, metopes (VII 3)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Olympia, Throne of Pheidias' Zeus<sup>2</sup>.
3. Athens, Hephaesteum, metope (XI 1)<sup>3</sup>.
4. London, BM. 531-42 & Athens, Frieze from Bassae (XI.34)<sup>4</sup>.
5. London, BM. Mausoleum frieze<sup>5</sup>.

The Delphi metopes seem to date to the years after 490<sup>6</sup>. Here the exploits of Heracles and Theseus are depicted on the same work, the labours of Heracles appearing on the North face, with some of the other deeds, the deeds of Theseus appearing on the South. Each has an individual Amazon metope but they are too fragmentary to be of any interest. The real interest lies in the Amazonomachy along the façade since it is not clear which of the heroes is taking part. Bothmer<sup>7</sup> suggests that it is deliberately left vague, owing to Heracles and Theseus each having an independent Amazon metope, but I feel this is unlikely. There are two possibilities, of which I think the former is more probable: either it depicts the Theseus expedition or it depicts the joint expedition, either at Themiscyra

---

1. *B.C.H.* 47 (1923) 404 & pl. 14-18.

2. Paus. V 11.4.

3. Sauer, *op. cit.* pl. VI, vii.

4. von Bothmer, *op. cit.* pl. LXXXVIII.

5. Lullies and Hirmer, *op. cit.* pl. 201-4.

6. Paus. (X 11.5) says that it was built out of the spoils of Marathon.

7. 118.

or afterwards in the invasion of Attica, said, by Diodorus, to be aimed at punishing Heracles in general and Theseus in particular. The former seems more probable to me because this temple is an Athenian project and depicts the new expanded Theseus story for the first time in art, no doubt for propaganda purposes, slightly antedated by Pherecydes, the first extant source to tell of an independent Theseus expedition against the Amazons. It thus seems more likely that this new Amazon myth would be used to balance the Heracles and Geryon saga of the Western metopes, than the joint expedition, since the Athenians were presumably not aiming at uniting the two heroes by placing them side by side on this building, but rather at showing that their own hero, Theseus, had as much claim to fame as the Dorian hero, Heracles.

Of (2) Pausanias<sup>1</sup> writes: "On the bars between the feet of the throne on which Pheidias' Zeus sits at Olympia is Heracles' regiment fighting with the Amazons. Each side has twenty-nine figures, Theseus being one of Heracles' allies". The difficulty is that this piece does not survive and Pausanias is the only evidence we have. The foot-stool of the throne represents Theseus fighting against the Amazons - τὸ Ἀθηναίων πρῶτον ἀνδραγάθημα ἐς οὐχ ὁμοφύλους<sup>2</sup>, - presumably in the invasion of Attica and it is unlikely that the throne had the same subject; it is thus probable that it represented the battle at Themiscyra. It is possible that Pausanias is wrong in his identification of Theseus here but Euripides who is contemporary with the throne of Zeus says that both Heracles and Theseus campaigned together. Thus it is possible that

---

1. See note (2), page 193.

2. Paus. V 11.7.

the joint expedition was represented in art but has not been preserved, owing to the accidents of survival.

The Bassae frieze, dating 420-400 BC, had as one of its subjects Greeks fighting Amazons, and the presence of the lionskin on one of the figures identifies him as Heracles. There is nothing to identify Theseus in any of the other figures and we must assume that he is not there and that this is the scene at Themiscyra, with Heracles campaigning on his own. The situation of Bassae in the Peloponnese makes this version a more likely subject, especially at a time when a separate Theseus Amazonomachy had become part of the saga of the Attic hero.

The Mausoleum apparently dates around the middle years of the fourth century BC; on the main frieze Greeks and Amazons appear. Ashmole<sup>1</sup> identifies one of the figures as Theseus and also claims to have found the centre block, on which is a figure with club and lionskin, presumably Heracles. It is not clear whether the scene of the battle is meant to be Themiscyra or Attica, although the position of Heracles in the centre may indicate that this is meant to be the expedition he led to Themiscyra.

Thus we can see that two pieces, the throne of Zeus at Olympia and the Mausoleum frieze, seem to lay claim to depicting the joint expedition, a century apart in time possibly both depicting the actual siege of Themiscyra rather than the invasion of Attica.

#### (e) Heracles and Hippolytus

Heracles and Hippolytus appear together once in surviving

---

1. J.H.S. 71 (1951) 16-18.

art on a non-Attic kalyx-krater in Basel<sup>1</sup>. No picture is available and I owe my scant knowledge of it to Brommer. He attributes it to the Darius Painter and says that it is inscribed with the names Scythes, Rhodope, Heracles, Hippolytus and Antiope. According to Herodotus<sup>2</sup>, Scythes was the son of Heracles by a Thracian creature, perhaps thought to be Rhodope, with the same name as a Thracian mountain. Presumably, by the same analogy, Hippolytus could be thought to be Heracles' son by Antiope, thus using a version which made Antiope the Amazon from whom Heracles took the girdle, presumably equated with virginity, if he had a son by her. This would be a completely different tradition from that which makes Hippolytus son of Theseus. It is interesting that the Scythes story is also connected with a girdle and this may be the reason for placing these figures together on this vase: Herodotus says that Heracles left instruction for Scythia to go to whichever of his three sons by the creature put on a certain girdle and bent the bow.

## II THESEUS

Once again we find Theseus depicted with Amazons of different names although Antiope is the most common. It is interesting that he is shown fighting Hippolyte whereas Heracles with whom this Amazon has come traditionally to be associated is never shown fighting her.

### (a) Antiope

1. New York 12.198.3, hydria, Attic black-figure (VIII 5)<sup>3</sup>.
2. London E 41, cup, Attic red-figure. (VIII 7)<sup>4</sup>.

---

1. Br. 74 D

2. 2. 4.9-10.

3. Br. 217 A 4; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXVII, 3.

4. Br. 217 B1; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXVIII, 4; A.R.V. 2.58,51

3. Munich 1414 (J 7), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure (VIII 3)<sup>1</sup>.
4. Louvre G 197, amphora, Attic red-figure (VIII 9)<sup>2</sup>.
5. Vatican, Astarita, psykter-fragments, Attic red-figure (VIII 10)<sup>3</sup>.
6. Oxford 1966.471, cup-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
7. Ferrara T 1052, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure (X 4)<sup>5</sup>.
8. Paris, Cab. Méd. 421, kalyx-krater fragments, Attic red-figure (X 57)<sup>6</sup>.
9. Leningrad St. 1143, hydria, Apulian<sup>7</sup>.

Numbers (1) to (5), (9) and possibly (6) are abduction scenes; in (1), (2), (3), and (9) Theseus takes Antiope away in a chariot, while in (4) and (5) he carries her off. No picture is available of (6): I therefore have to rely on Beazley<sup>8</sup> for my information about this vase. The back of a chariot team advancing to the left and the fore-arms of the driver are preserved; beyond the chariot part of a warrior is preserved rushing to the left; there is also part of an inscription "TEIA" and this is likely originally to have read "ANTIOPEIA". Whether Antiope was in the chariot or the

- 
1. Br. 216 A 1; C.V. 1 pll. 48, 1.49, 1. & 52, 3; A.B.V. 367, 87.
  2. Br. 217 B 4; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXVIII, 5; A.R.V. 2. 238, 1.
  3. Br. 217 B 5; von Bothmer, op. cit. 129f.; A.R.V. 2. 242, 77.
  4. Br. 217 B 3; A.R.V. 2. 319, 4 bis.
  5. Br. 215 B 1; Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, Rivista dell'Istituto NS 2 (1955) 15-25, figs. 1-13; A.R.V. 2. 991, 53.
  6. Br. 215 B 3; O. Benndorf & G. Niemann, Das Heroon von Gjölbaski-Trysa (Vienna, 1890) 137, fig. 128; A.R.V. 2. 1030, 30.
  7. Br. 215 D 1; Jd. I. 73 (1958) 59, fig. 7.
  8. A.R.V. 2. 319, 4 bis.

warrior is meant to be Theseus running after her is not certain. Presumably if the warrior is not Theseus he is meant to be Pirithous. It seems to be an abduction scene, as there is no sign of fighting taking place. Theseus is often accompanied by Pirithous in such scenes<sup>1</sup>.

Numbers (7) and (8) are different, however, and it is interesting that both are later than the others and belong to Classical Attic red-figure, suggesting the appearance of a variant in this period. In (7), by the Achilles Painter, Theseus fights Antiope, while Pirithous fights Andromache, and in (8), it is almost certain that the Amazon Theseus fights is Antiope, although all that is left of her name is "ἰοπ." Thus we see that in Classical Attic red-figure Theseus is made to fight Antiope rather than abduct her.

The division between the abduction and fighting-scenes is a chronological one, apart from the Leningrad hydria, which is roughly contemporary with the Classical red-figure pieces. I feel that Bothmer<sup>2</sup> words his idea too strongly when he says this hydria "bears little or no resemblance to the other abduction scenes and must be regarded as an independent creation", since a look at the vase in question will show it not to be very different from the Attic pieces. Theseus, inscribed, is in the chariot with Antiope, also inscribed, and the charioteer is in the chariot too. The only slightly unusual feature is that Antiope looks mesmerized, perhaps stunned with fright. One would not, after all, expect a South

---

1. cf. Pindar, page 171.

2. op. cit. 130.

Italian piece to be the same as Attic. This vase is very important in showing that the abduction theme did not die out in art after the early fifth century; we know that it continued in literature.

It is an interesting fact that Theseus is never shown abducting any other Amazon than Antiope in the inscribed pieces, and this suggests that this version was standardised. This seems to substantiate Bothmer's identification of all abduction scenes as representations of Theseus and Antiope, as he does in his chapter VIII.<sup>1</sup> He also includes the Eretria pediment<sup>2</sup> which shows the Amazon in Theseus' arms and also half-inside the chariot.

All the abduction scenes<sup>3</sup>, excluding the Leningrad piece, are fairly close chronologically, dating to the end of the sixth century and the first quarter of the fifth. It is notable that this is the time when Pherecydes was writing and he was the first to tell of the abduction.

The fact of Theseus fighting Antiope accords well with the statement ascribed to the Author of the Theseis that Antiope attacked Theseus for marrying Phaedra, indicating that the battle occurred when the Amazons invaded Attica. As has been stated, however, Theseus is also shown with other Amazons on inscribed pieces, always fighting, never abducting. All belong to the Classical period.

---

1. N.B. in some sources he abducts Hippolyte but in none contemporary with the abduction scenes in art.

2. 124, no. 1.

3. Theseus may be shown abducting Helen as early as the proto-corinthian aryballos Louvre CA 617 (Br. 222 C 1; K. Friis-Johansen Les Vases Sicyoniens, (Copenhagen, 1923), pl. 22, 1.) The iconography of the Antiope pieces may be based on earlier vases showing the abduction of Helen. See L. Ghali-Kahil, Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène dans les textes et les documents figurés (Paris, 1955) plates passim.

(b) Andromache

1. London BM 99.7-21.5, dinos, Attic red-figure. (X 12)<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM E 157, kantharos, Attic red-figure. (X 100)<sup>2</sup>.

In (1), Theseus rushes against Andromache, followed by Pirithous and another Greek. Hippolyte and two other Amazons rush to defend her. In (2), Theseus attacks Andromache, while on the other side of the vase Phorbas fights Alexandre. It should also be noted that Andromache appears on Ferrara T 1052,<sup>3</sup> where she fights Pirithous. The appearance of Hippolyte on (1) is interesting.

(c) Melousa

1. Oxford 522, stamnos, Attic red-figure. (X 62)<sup>4</sup>.
2. Leningrad 769 (St. 1680), kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure (X 58)<sup>5</sup>.

(d) Hippolyte

1. Boston 95,48, lekythos, Attic red-figure. (X 30)<sup>6</sup>.
2. Chantilly, neck-handled amphora, Attic red-figure. (X 68)<sup>7</sup>.

In (1) Hippolyte, on horseback, fights Theseus and an unnamed Greek; also, another Greek is attacked by an Amazon. In (2) Hippolyte and Deinomache attack Theseus. A lekythos

- 
1. Br. 215 B 6; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXXVII 2; A.R.V. 2.1052, 29.
  2. Br. 215 B 12; C.V. 4 pl. III 1 34, 2 & 35, 1; A.R.V. 2.1213, 2u.
  3. See page 197, no.7.
  4. Br. 215 B 2; C.V. 1 pl. III I 29,3; A.R.V. 2.1028, 3.
  5. Br. 215 B 4; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXXX, 1; A.R.V. 2.1037, 3u.
  6. Br. 215 B 8; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXXVII, 6; A.R.V. 2.1248, 2.
  7. Br. 215 B 10; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXXX, 4; A.R.V. 2.1176, 25.

in New York, (31.11.13) (X 15)<sup>1</sup>, should also be noted here: Hippolyte appears, thrusting her spear at Phalerus, while Theseus attacks an unnamed Amazon. Hippolyte also appears on the London dinos, (99.7-21.5), looked at above<sup>2</sup>. It is possible that she is not rushing to defend Andromache but rather to defend Theseus, since we must not lose sight of the literary evidence which names Hippolyte as the Amazon abducted by Theseus, and Isocrates actually says the Amazons invaded Attica to punish Theseus for the abduction of Hippolyte. We have no means of knowing whether the artist had this version in mind here but the possibility must be considered.

(e) Antianeira

1. Naples RC 239, lekythos, Attic red-figure (X 16)<sup>3</sup>.

Here we see Theseus attacking Antianeira while Phalerus fights Clymene. It should be noted that ἀντιάνειρα in Homer<sup>4</sup> is an adjective for Amazons.

It is interesting that Theseus is helped by Phalerus and Phorbas in certain representations. Phalerus<sup>5</sup> is<sup>a</sup>/likely helper since he is an Athenian, apparently giving his name to Phalerum and there is an Attic hero Phorbas<sup>6</sup>.

1. Br. 215 B 9; von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. LXXVII, 1; A.R.V. 2. 1248, 9.

2. See also page 200, no. 1.

3. Br. 215 B 11; Jd.I. 30 (1915) 109, fig. 9; A.R.V. 2. 1174, 6.

4. Il. 3. 189.

5. Paulys' Real Encyclopädie XIX.2 1664ff.

6. Various other states claimed a hero of this name. See R.E. XXI 528.

It seems likely that all these scenes where Theseus fights an Amazon refer to the invasion of Attica, although it is just possible that some, or all, depict a version where Theseus used force on his original expedition, when he took an Amazon away, whether campaigning on his own or with Heracles; however, none of the literary accounts talk of Theseus fighting the Amazons except in Attica. Variant traditions are given about the invasion of Attica, most saying that the Amazons came to punish Theseus for his abduction of one of their number, while Diodorus mentions their desire to punish Heracles as well, for his original invasion. The author of the Theseis, however says they were called in by Antiope to punish Theseus for leaving her to marry Phaedra, and this latter seems likely to have been the version of the pieces where Theseus is shown fighting Antiope. In the other pieces, it is likely that the motivation for the invasion has come from the Amazons themselves, although, of course, the non-presence of Antiope here need not preclude the Theseis version being in the artist's mind. We have seen that in one piece Hippolyte may be made to come to the rescue of Theseus, helped by other Amazons, but perhaps the presence with her of the other Amazons makes this unlikely. Certainly the tradition of the invasion of Attica was strong at this time, possibly appearing at Delphi and probably appearing on the footstool of the throne of Zeus at Olympia<sup>1</sup> and written about by Herodotus and then later by Isocrates. It seems that this invasion was very closely connected with the Theseus

---

1. See page 193f.

Amazon story, since a hostile force being driven out of Attica was very useful for propaganda purposes and one wonders whether, if this did appear on the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, built out of the spoils of Marathon, it was put there to hint at the other foreign hostile force recently driven from Attica, namely the Persians.

In this section we may also look briefly at two sculptural representations which may depict the invasion of Attica:

1. Athens, Parthenon, Western metopes. (XI 2)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Athens, Shield of Athena Parthenos. (XI page 209)<sup>2</sup>.

All that can be said for certain about these pieces is that a large-scale Amazonomachy is depicted and the locality makes it likely that this is meant to be the invasion of Attica. Heracles does not appear but no figure can be specifically identified as Theseus either. We know<sup>3</sup>, moreover, that Micon painted Amazons in the Hephaesteum and Pisianctum, and again locality favours the scene as the invasion of Attica. These pieces are also contemporary with the vases which apparently allude to the invasion.

### III AMAZONOMACHIES WHERE THE HERO CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED

1. Nauplia 4509, shield-fragment (I 1)<sup>4</sup>.
2. Samos, from the Heraion, shield-fragment. (I 2)<sup>5</sup>.
3. From Perachora, plaque. (I 14)<sup>6</sup>.

- 
1. A.J.A. 3 (1899) 403ff. & pl. 5-6, figs. 1-14.
  2. von Bothmer, op. cit. 209ff.
  3. Paus. I 15.2 & 17.2; Aristophanes, Lysistrata 678-9; von Bothmer, op. cit. 163.
  4. von Bothmer, op. cit. pl. I a-b.
  5. A.M. 58 (1933) 120, Beilage 37, 1.
  6. Perachora I pl. 50, 4-5.

(1) and (2) date to the first quarter of the seventh century and so are rather earlier than the Early Corinthian alabastron,<sup>1</sup> the first inscribed piece of either Amazonomachy we possess. The Nauplia fragment shows on the left a warrior holding a shield and spear; he is marked as a man by his short tunic. At the bottom of the scene is a fallen man. In the centre, a large man brandishes a sword and holds the helmet of an opponent, who points a spear at him; the opponent wears a long skirt with one leg bare; one thinks of the early representations of those monstrous women, the Gorgons<sup>2</sup>, and this could well be another type of monstrous woman, an Amazon. From the representations of Heracles and Andromache where he holds her helmet it is possible to think of the Heracles' amazonomachy here. It seems that in early times he may have been depicted as a warrior<sup>3</sup>. This would be the earliest surviving representation and would be near the date of Hegias of Troezen if he is an early writer. Unfortunately, of course, none of this can be substantiated, since the motif of holding the helmet is not enough for fixing an identification. This might represent Achilles and Penthesilea, which we know to have been included in the Aethiopis<sup>4</sup>. Admittedly, one thinks of this as just a duel but it would not be uncharacteristic of early art to embellish. It could also represent one of the other early Amazon tales, referred to in the Iliad, namely Bellerophon or Priam fighting Amazons<sup>5</sup>.

---

1. See page 186.

2. London B.M. A 748, Rhodian plate (P. Arias & M. Hirmer, A History of Greek Vase-Painting (London, 1962) pl. 29).

3. See page 48, note (1).

4. See Appendix I.

5. See Appendix I.

Thus, no clear conclusion can be made about subject-matter and this is also the case with the other shield-fragment, (2), whose subject-matter is even more impossible to analyse since only a small fragment remains.

In (3) a female runs to the right, while on the left a man brandishes a weapon, which is hard to identify. Obviously it is not completely certain that this is an Amazonomachy, and certainly no identification of combatants is possible.

In passing we may also note three bronzes of a fleeing Amazon from the Acropolis (Ath. 6589, 6622, 6624)<sup>1</sup>, which could be part of three pairs of Amazon and opponent, but we could not identify that opponent. An intaglio bronze<sup>2</sup> shows a warrior with his spear against the breast of a fallen Amazon; again there is no way of identifying the myth, although it might be said that it is a little similar in attitude to Exekias' rendering of Achilles and Penthesilea<sup>3</sup>.

#### CONCLUSION

The artistic evidence, although adding to the number of Amazons linked with each hero, does to some extent clarify certain points. It supports the theory, based on the literary evidence, that Hippolyte was not connected with Heracles until late: she nowhere appears fighting him and only once appears at all in his presence, when she is merely a reinforcement to help Andromache, whom he fights. The earliest connection between Heracles and Hippolyte is in Apollonius Rhodius and

---

1. de Ridder, op. cit. 327-9 nos. 815-17, fig. 321.

2. Boston 27.682, Sir J.D. Beazley, The Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems (Oxford, 1920) pl. 2 & 9.

3. See Appendix I

from this time she becomes standardised as the owner of the girdle. It is interesting that the sources linking Heracles and Hippolyte, and Theseus and Hippolyte do not overlap chronologically. The Theseus account, however, seems confused between Antiope and Hippolyte in sources of similar date but Antiope may well be the Amazon of the earlier version since Hegias is likely to have been an early source and it is noteworthy that Theseus is never depicted abducting Hippolyte in surviving art. This may indicate that the Hippolyte tradition was a secondary one, perhaps introduced originally merely to give a name to the mother of Theseus' son Hippolytus; confusion probably arose once Theseus became connected with two Amazons. Certainly there is no Attic tradition linking Theseus with Hippolyte until the fourth century; Euripides studiously avoided giving a name to Hippolytus' mother, but simply referred to her as an Amazon. This would explain why Attic vases of the sixth and fifth century simply represent Antiope as the Amazon abducted. It is a mystery, however, why Hippolyte should have been standardised as Heracles' Amazon after her earlier connections with Theseus.

It seems very likely that the girdle actually referred to the Amazon's virginity, and this could well be derived from some such idea as that contained in Homer's epithet for Amazons, ἀντιάνδρα, which as well as meaning a match for men, seems to allow of the interpretation "against men". It would be a very heroic deed to take the virginity of such a creature. This would certainly explain why the girdle is so seldom depicted; its appearance in South Italian need not be surprising,

as has been already suggested<sup>1</sup>, since the artists could well be interpreting literally the myth. The quiet scenes of South Italian have been seen to foreshadow the account of Apollonius but this does not mean the artist need necessarily have had Hippolyte in mind as the Amazon with the belt, as she is so named by Apollonius; it is possible but we can say no more than that.

As regards the various other opponents given to Heracles and Theseus, it is very probable that the artists themselves chose their names. It is possible that there was a literary tradition naming *Andromache*, since she occurs so often, but it is also possible that the vase-painters were copying one another, especially as the *Heracles-Andromache* vases are close to one another chronologically.

As has been said, the difficulty in distinguishing chronologically between the two expeditions centres mainly around the date of Hegias of Troezen. Without the testimony of Hegias, Heracles expedition is seen to be the earlier from its appearance in Ibycus around 550 BC, and also from its appearance on the Corinthian alabastron of c. 620. We do not know, of course, whether Theseus was included in this expedition at this early time, but I feel it likely that Hegias is the author of the *Nostoi* and that he should therefore be placed in the seventh century; this would mean that in the early myth Theseus did campaign with Heracles but that afterwards he was given an expedition of his own, when the Athenians were

---

1. See page 191.

giving him a more important rôle as their state hero, and giving him deeds on a par with the already firmly established, originally Dorian hero, Heracles. I feel that Theseus, in any case, plays such an unimportant part in Heracles' expedition that he is unlikely to have been given this rôle after his importance had been established at Athens. The different traditions existed side by side after the separate Theseus tradition emerged. Certainly the tradition of Heracles fighting the Amazons is a long and continuous one, whereas the Theseus expedition is confined to a few sources and seems to have been surpassed in importance by the invasion of Attica, which apparently derived from it, a retaliation for the abduction of the Amazon. It is the abduction motif that seems to have been taken out of the Heracles myth and formed into the Theseus myth. None of this can actually be proved, of course, but this seems to me the most satisfactory way of interpreting the Amazon myths of these two heroes.

CHAPTER EIGHT THE STABLES OF AUGEAS

This labour, which involved clearing the dung from the stables of Augeas, King of Elis, is closely connected with the defeat of the Actorione/Molione and the founding of the Olympic Games; it is, therefore, necessary to include references which do not specifically refer to the cleaning of the Stables, in the belief that they are relevant to this labour. Literary documentation is fairly full in extant literature; this is most important since the labour occurs very seldom in works of art, a fact which will be investigated.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

- Hecataeus (EGH. IF25): The Epeians went on an expedition with Heracles against Augeas and destroyed both Augeas and Elis.
- Pherecydes (EGH. 3F79a): Heracles was defeated by Cteatus and Eurytus, the Molione, in the expedition against Augeas. This fact is also attributed to Echephylidas, Comarchus and Ister, and explains the saying  $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\ \omicron\upsilon\delta'\ \delta\ \epsilon\prime\text{Ηρακλής}$ .
- (EGH. 3F79b): Heracles fought the Molione, allies of Augeas, and, being unable to defeat them out in the open, ambushed and killed them; he then ravaged Elis.
- Pindar (O. X 24ff.): Heracles founded the Olympic Games after slaying the Molione in his attempt to exact payment from Augeas; he ambushed them at Cleonae because they had ravaged his army in Elis and he then burned the city and killed Augeas.

Callimachus (Aetia Fr. 77  
and notes):

Heracles cleared away τὴν Αὐγέου  
κόπρον on the command of Eurystheus  
and Augeas refused payment because  
he had been acting under orders.  
Phyleus, Augeas' son was made  
arbitrator, but when he made the  
judgement in favour of Heracles  
he was banished to Dulichium.  
Heracles ravaged Elis, recalled  
Phyleus, and restored Elis to him.  
He then founded the Olympic Games.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 13,3):

It was Heracles' sixth labour to  
clean out the stables of Augeas  
and to do it unaided. The stables  
were full of dung and Eurystheus  
wished to insult Heracles with this  
labour. Refusing to carry it out  
on his shoulders, Heracles diverted  
the River Alpheus through the  
stables and thus cleaned them in  
one day; this was very ingenious  
since he accomplished the labour  
without doing anything to make  
himself unworthy of immortality.

(IV 33,1-4):

After returning from Troy, Heracles  
marched against Augeas because  
he had refused payment; he was at  
first unsuccessful but later took  
the city, recalled Phyleus and gave  
him Elis.

Apollodorus (II v 5): It was the fifth labour to carry out the dung of Augeas' cattle in one day. Heracles did not mention he had been sent by Eurystheus but offered to carry out the dung in return for the gift of some cattle; Augeas agreed and Heracles made Phyleus witness. He diverted the Peneus, as well as the Alpheus, through the cattle yard. However, Augeas discovered this had been done for Eurystheus and denied promising payment, banishing Phyleus, for arbitrating in Heracles' favour, and also Heracles himself. Eurystheus refused to count this among the ten labours, since it was done for hire.

(II vii 2): After the Gigantomachy, Heracles marched against Elis with an Arcadian army. Augeas appointed as his generals Cteatus and Eurytus, the Siamese twins, who were very strong and whose human father, Actor, was Augeas' brother. Heracles became ill and made a truce with the Molione, who noticed he was ill and attacked. Heracles retreated but at the third Isthmian festival he ambushed and killed the Molione at Cleonae, when they were sent by the Eleans to sacrifice. After killing Augeas and restoring Elis to Phyleus he founded the Olympic Games.

Pausanias (V 1.9): Augeas persuaded Heracles to clear away

the dung covering most of his kingdom either in return for part of his kingdom or for some other reward. He used the River Menius to accomplish his task and, because it was done by cleverness rather than hard work, Augeas refused payment. There is no mention of Phyleus being made arbitrator, but it is merely stated that he disagreed with his father's withholding of payment, and, therefore, was banished. Augeas prepared against attack by making friends with Amarynceus and the sons of Actor.

(V 2. 1 & 2): Heracles did not fare well in the war against Augeas, since the youthful sons of Actor were superior. Reference is then made to their ambush and death. Their mother tried to impose the death penalty on him in revenge but, being unsuccessful, instructed the Eleans to keep away from the Olympic Games.

(V 3. 1): Heracles then ravaged Elis with an army gathered from Argos, Thebes and Arcadia; Pausanias departs from the normal tradition by saying that he left Augeas unpunished.

(VIII 14.9): Heracles' brother Iphicles was wounded in the first battle against Augeas and died of his wounds.

Hyginus Heracles cleared away the dung in one day by  
(Fab.XXX 7): using the river; he had Zeus for helper.

Such then is the literary evidence for the cleaning of Augeas' stables; it is fairly full and it is odd that the

story did not find its way into Latin writers. A further detail is given by Zenodotus<sup>1</sup> and Aelian<sup>2</sup> that Lepreus, son of Caucon and grandson of Poseidon, recommended that Augeas bind Heracles when he demanded payment, but this looks like a later addition. An interesting account is given by pseudo-Theocritus<sup>3</sup> of how Heracles is conducted to Augeas, on a visit by Phyleus and gives an account of the slaying of the Nemean lion. I did not include this in my review of the evidence for the labour since nothing is mentioned of the cleaning of the stables and there is no hint of hostility. It may be that Theocritus has deliberately picked a point in the story before the hiring of Heracles by Augeas and the contract may have been agreed ~~on~~ during his visit. He may have wished to lend credence and colour to his poem by making Heracles tell the story of one Peloponnesian labour to someone who was to become closely involved in another. An interesting detail we glean from this passage is that the cattle were given to Augeas by his father Helius.

In turning to a closer examination of some of the literary evidence it is clear that all the essential elements of the story, with the exception of the dung, are mentioned by Pindar and this detail must surely be implied by the reference to the payment which was linked thereto. Pindar's narrative is condensed and this suggests that the story was well known in the first quarter of the fifth century BC, thus making a

---

1. Athen. 10. 412a.

2. Verae Historiae I 24

3. XXV passim

detailed account unnecessary. In fact, the story can be dated at least to the end of the sixth century, since the remarks of Hecataeus and Pherecydes about Heracles' expedition against Augeas must form part of this labour. Pherecydes is the first extant source to link together Heracles, Augeas and the Actorione: the last two have an earlier existence, going back at least as far as Homer and independent of Heracles; moreover, Augeas and the Actorione at this time are only connected in so far as the latter fight in the Elean army in the reprisal attack on the Pylians for their raid on the cattle of Itymoneus<sup>1</sup>, where they are described as<sup>2</sup>:

... παῖδ' ἔτ' ἐόντ' οὔ κω/μάλα εἶδοτε θούριδος ἀλκῆς ...

The Actorione are referred to in battle with Nestor, who says that he would have slain them had not Poseidon carried them off, enshrouded in mist<sup>3</sup>. The only other substantial reference to them again connects them with Nestor, who says that in the funeral Games of Amarynceus he was only passed in the chariot-race by the Actorione<sup>4</sup>. It is noteworthy that in Homer it was to the Olympic Games that the Pylians were sending the chariot and team retained by Augeas<sup>5</sup>, whereas, according to later writers, the games were not founded until Heracles had ravaged Elis and killed Augeas<sup>6</sup>; moreover, there is no reference to the games being founded by Heracles. The story of Heracles' connection with the Actorione may well have replaced that of their dealings with Nestor. At any rate the latter story does not occur after the Iliad. Some of the original details occur

1. Il. 11. 696ff. See also 670ff.

2. Il. 11. 710f.

3. Il. 11. 750ff.

4. Il. 23.638ff.

5. Il. 11. 698ff.

6. Cf. Pind. O. X 24ff.

in the Heracles' version as with the mention of Amarynceus, whom, according to Pausanias, Augeas enlisted alongside the Actorione to help him against Heracles, whereas in Homer the Actorione are alive and competing with Nestor in the funeral games of Amarynceus; thus there is a certain confusion of chronology between the earlier and later version.

As regards Augeas, there seem only three references to him in Homer, of which one makes him father of Agasthenes,<sup>1</sup> another brother-in-law of Molius,<sup>2</sup> and the third tells of him withholding the chariot and team of the Pyliaus.<sup>3</sup> He is thus not connected with Heracles nor does he hold a position of any prominence. One last point of interest about him comes not from Homer but from Apollonius Rhodius,<sup>4</sup> who states that he sailed with the Argonauts. Heracles also went on this voyage at the time he was returning with the Erymanthian boar.<sup>5</sup> Apollonius may not have had in mind any connection of Augeas with a labour of Heracles.

It is apparent that the legend of Augeas and Heracles arose some time between the writing of the Iliad and the time of Pherecydes and Hecataeus. It was possibly known in the middle of the sixth century BC, since Ibycus<sup>6</sup> refers to the killing of the Actorione:

---

1. Il. 2. 624.

2. Il. 11. 739.

3. Il. 11. 698ff.

4. 1. 172.

5. See page 338.

6. P.M.G. 285.

τούς τε λευκίππους κόρους  
τέκνα Μολιόνας κτάνον,  
ἄλικας ἰσοκεφάλους ἐνιγυιούς  
ἀμφοτέρους γεγαῶτας ἐν ὤσει  
ἀργυρέωι.....

Heracles is the only person credited with their death: in the Iliad they are snatched away before Nestor gets a chance to kill them. It would seem likely that the verb κτάνον is first person singular here and the lines spoken by Heracles: it would be possible for it to be third person plural and to include along with Heracles another agent such as the army of Tiryns, although in extant literature he is not mentioned as being in company when he killed the Actorione. At any rate, it seems that the killing of the Actorione by Heracles was known in the time of Ibycus, but the caveat must be added that it is not certain it was then part of the Augeas legend rather than an independent myth.

We cannot know whether this story was regarded as a labour at the outset, since connection with Eurystheus is not mentioned until Callimachus and here we cannot be sure the idea does not just belong to the source which quotes him. However, it does appear on the temple of Zeus, presumably implying it to be such in the second quarter of the fifth century. I shall discuss the significance of its appearance on the temple when I come to the artistic evidence. It is certainly an odd story to be included among the labours since it was undertaken for Heracles' personal emolument under contract to a second Peloponnesian king, and does not imply any idea of general benefaction or of heroism. Later writers seem aware of this and Apollodorus does say that Eurystheus refused to count it among the labours since it was done for hire; his craft and ingenuity are pointed out by Pausanias and Diodorus, the latter attempting to fit this among the labours by saying that

Eurystheus included it as an insult. A fairly coherent account may be culled from the sources which only differ from one to another in matters of detail, such as the nature of the reward and name of the river employed by Heracles for his task.

Finally, an interesting point may be gleaned from Hyginus' statement that this labour was performed maiolem partem Iove adiutore. He is the only extant source to give Heracles a helper and it is noteworthy that the only helper shown in art is Athena, on the Temple at Olympia. Athena is Heracles' protectress and often appears in this capacity in art, especially in vase-painting, but Zeus' help is exceptional. Unfortunately, we have no artistic evidence to show whether Hyginus is here reflecting an early tradition, whether it is his own notion, whether he is imperfectly remembering the Olympia metope or whether he intends the help of Zeus to cover that of Athena as well, since it was Zeus who appointed her Heracles' protectress. At any rate it may certainly be said that Zeus' help would be well commemorated by the founding of the Olympic Games in his honour, the act attributed to Heracles after the punishment of Augeas.

#### B ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

This labour hardly appears in art in any medium. Its earliest and best representation occurs on one of the Olympia metopes; it may be the subject of a statue by Lysippus; it appears on two Roman pieces, a fragmentary relief bowl and the mosaic from Liria. Excluding the lost Lysippan statue, this is the total number of surviving representations, a phenomenon which I shall try to explain in this section. As the evidence is so meagre I shall examine each piece in order of chronology without making divisions according to composition.

The metope from Olympia<sup>1</sup>

This piece is described by Pausanias<sup>2</sup> as showing Heracles "clearing the ground of dung for the Eleans". The two figures in the metope are Athena and Heracles; the whole of Athena is preserved: she stands on the right-hand side facing left, resting her left hand on her shield and pointing to the ground with her right, which, as can be deduced from the hole therein, originally held an object, probably her spear. Of Heracles, the head, shoulders and most of the arms are preserved, and also his lower legs, widely spread; he bends slightly forward and his hands, swung back hold some kind of pole. It could appear that he is shovelling, tossing the dung over his head, but his left hand grips the end of the pole which must mean that the front of it is towards the ground; moreover, if he were tossing it over his shoulder it would hit Athena in the eye! The fact that he is using a pole indicates that he is not going to carry out the dung, at least on his shoulders; possibly he is meant to be gathering some on a shovel, ready to carry it out but it seems more likely that he is about to swing into stabbing motion to burst the banks of the river, and thus wash away the dung; Athena's spear probably pointed to the place where he was to burst the bank. This interpretation accords well with the only method of removing the dung recorded in extant literature.

A question must obviously arise over the relative dating of the metope and Pindar's reference to the Augeas episode.

---

1. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. p11. 202-11.

2. V 10.9.

Olympian XI was written for Hagesidemus in 476 BC<sup>1</sup> and Pindar<sup>2</sup> promises to devote a fuller account to him later; this he does in ode X and the passage of time between the two cannot have been very long or Hagesidemus' victory would have been forgotten. We know that the metopes at Olympia cannot have been designed until after 470 BC when the booty from the Pisa revolt was collected to raise money for the temple. It would thus appear that the Pindaric Ode came first and it is highly likely that it provided inspiration for the inclusion of this myth on the temple. Pindar does not give a detailed account, which I have taken to indicate familiarity with this myth, at least in the Northern Peloponnese.

The appearance of this myth at Olympia, despite its non-appearance in any previous surviving art, indicates to me that it was a local legend in origin, and the fact that it occurs so seldom thereafter indicates that it remained so, probably until it was given a firm place in the literary tradition of the labours by the late mythographers: it does not occur at all in extant Attic drama and was thus not included in the lists of labours given by Sophocles and Euripides. As has been shown<sup>3</sup>, it seems likely that the sculptor of the temple intended to have twelve metopes and that this was probably aimed at depicting the twelve labours. Apart from the fact that the Augeas story was a local one, with Augeas being king of Elis, the inclusion of this myth among the labours is likely to have been influenced by its connection with the Olympic Games, since

---

1. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 218.

2. ll ff.

3. See page 25.

Pindar tells us that Heracles founded them after killing the Actorione in the war with Augeas. Possibly this account of the founding of the games was also a local one;<sup>1</sup> I have pointed out above that in the Iliad the games were regarded as taking place while the Actorione and Augeas were still alive. If the building of the temple of Zeus at Olympia at this particular time was designed as a kind of assertion of Elis and the Northern Peloponnese against the domination of Sparta, the home sight as the scene for one of the labours of Heracles would be an advantage, and we know that the temple had<sup>a</sup> local designer<sup>2</sup>.

#### The Statue by Lysippus

This statue no longer survives but we can get an idea of its appearance from the late writer Nicetas Choniates<sup>3</sup>, although he apparently attributes it to 'Lysimachus': κατήρειπτο τοίνυν 'Ηρακλῆς ... μεγαλωστὶ κοφίνῳ ἐνιδρυμένος τῆς λεοντῆς ὑπεστρωμένης ἄνωθεν ... ἐκάθητο δὲ μὴ γωρυτὸν ἐξημμένος, μὴ τόξον ταῖν χεροῖν φερῶν, μὴ τὸ ῥόκαλον προβαλλόμενος, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν δεξιὰν βάσιν ἐκτείνων ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν χεῖρα εἰς ὅσον ἐξῆν, τὸν δὲ εὐώνυμον, πόδα κάμπτων εἰς τὸ γόνυ καὶ τὴν λαιὰν χεῖρα ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος ἐρείδων, εἶτα τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς χειρὸς ἀνατείνων, καὶ τῷ πλατεῖ ταύτης ἀθυμίας πλήρης καθυποκλίνων ἥρεμα τὴν κεφαλὴν.....

It is the reference to the basket which has led to the supposed link with the Augeas legend and Brommer<sup>4</sup> goes so far as to say that: Bei ihr schient Herakles sich nicht des Alpheios bedient sondern den Mist mit einem Korb weggetragen zu haben.

1. See page 372

2. See page 372, & note (1).

3. J. Overbeck, Die Antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Kuenste (Leipzig, 1868) no. 1472.

4. Her. 29.

None of the extant ancient accounts of this myth describe Heracles carrying away the dung in a basket; none represent him dejected, as he appears to have been in the Lysippan piece, but rather as accomplishing the work quickly and cleverly by means of a river; moreover, none actually connects this statue with the Augeas legend.

It is thus tempting to dismiss this statue as having nothing to do with the Augeas story, but in the two Roman pieces a basket and bucket are shown respectively and Tzetzes<sup>1</sup> lists under works perhaps by Pheidias: ... ἐκφοροῦντα Ἡρακλῆν τὴν κόπρον τοῦ Αὐγαίου, perhaps indicating that there was a tradition in the fifth century that Heracles did not use the river to clear away the dung, although Tzetzes' late date makes him a rather dubious source. The Roman pieces will be described hereafter, but it is necessary to say that the statue of Lysippus may have made reference to the Augeas legend but that the presence of a basket is not sufficient to make this a certain fact, since there is no action to help with identification of subject matter, as there is on the Roman works. A basket could equally well make reference to some of the other deeds of Heracles, such as his menial tasks in the service of Omphale<sup>2</sup>, and indeed a pun was often made on ὀμφαλή and ὀμφαλός<sup>3</sup>, the latter often being represented with a net over it, which could make it look like a basket; Heracles' dejection in this context would be very fitting. Moreover, the basket could have reference

---

1. Overbeck, op. cit. no. 773.

2. Diod. IV 31, 5-8; Apollod. II 6.3. On this task see also K. Schauenburg, 'Herakles und Omphale', Rheinisches Museum für Philologie 103 (1960) 63 and works there cited.

3. W.H. Roscher, Omphalos (New York, 1974) pl. VI and other plates passim.

to the Hesperides labour, since on one black-figure vase<sup>1</sup> Heracles is shown picking the apples with a basket on his arm. The second century relief from Toulouse, cited by A. Furtwängler<sup>2</sup>, showing Heracles resting with his right foot on a basket could likewise allude to one or other of these.

Corinth CP 523. Roman fragmentary relief bowl<sup>3</sup>

In this scene Heracles uses a tool to pick at a rock to divert the river. He kneels on what could be a basket, and this might substantiate the claim of Lysippus' statue to depict the Augeas story. Perhaps the basket in the Roman piece was meant as a container for tools, although it could represent an original intention by Heracles to carry away the dung before Athena suggested using the river, or before he thought to do so himself: Athena's part in this labour is not mentioned in extant literature. If the basket does represent an original intention, the Lysippus statue's dejected pose could refer to dejection at the failure of the first plan before the second plan had been formulated. All this, of course, assumes that the object depicted on the bowl is a basket, which it may not be.

Madrid Museum, mosaic from Liria<sup>4</sup>

The bucket in this piece would probably have the same function as a basket on the relief bowl; Heracles holds a fork which he seems to be about to bring down on what looks like a pile of dung. If this is the case the drawing is

1. See page 268, no.1.

2. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften (1902) 441ff.

3. Hesperia 11 (1942) 169, no 13, figs. 5-6c.

4. Brommer, Her. pl. 31.

inaccurate since the fork is the wrong way up for picking up the dung. If what we see on the right hand side of the picture is meant to be a river bank then Heracles is about to breach it with the back of his fork. There are difficulties with both interpretations: either Heracles is picking up dung, contrary to the normal version, but using the wrong side of his fork; or else he is about to breach a river bank which looks more like a pile of dung.

#### CONCLUSION

From the evidence advanced, it is clear that there is no proof that this story was in existence before the second half of the sixth century BC, and whether it is placed early or late in this period depends on whether the killing of the Actorione was linked to the Augeas legend in the time of Ibycus. There may be some early representations of the Actorione<sup>1</sup> but there is no indication of Heracles in them, and the identification of the Siamese twins themselves is rather dubious. The method of cleaning the stables is standard in the literary evidence, although it is possible that a version in which Heracles at least tried to carry out the dung is depicted in art, although this method could not possibly have been attempted in Pausanias' version, in which the dung had to be removed from most of Augeas' kingdom.

I have suggested that the Augeas legend was a local Elean legend, which was included among the labours on the Temple of Zeus both for this reason and because it was connected with what was probably the local Elean version of the founding of the Olympic Games. The Augeas story must have been well-known

---

1. See G. Ahlberg, Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art (Göteborg, 1971), 240-252.

in Elis in the early fifth century and this fact allowed Pindar to make only cursory reference to it. If, as I believe, the temple of Zeus was part of Elean propaganda at the time her differences with Sparta were reaching a height, it is not surprising that the art of this temple did not have anything like immediate influence outside. This would explain why the Attic dramatists did not pick up this local legend from the temple but rather concentrated on well-known Heracles' myths. It would not be until the temple lost its political significance that it would assert its influence generally over the canon of Heracles' labours, as opposed to being the interpretation of the labours designed in the interests of the Northern Peloponnese.<sup>1</sup>

1. See chapter 14, *passim*.

Heracles (Th. 510ff.): Heracles was the only one of the heroes who needed dog as help.  
(Th. 769): It is Ares looking that Demeter opened the gates of Elis.  
Stesichorus (F.G.B. 206): Zeus the title 'Demeter' is known.  
Acusilaos (F.G.B. 2.9 35): Acusilaos (and Herodotus) said Heracles and Hygieia the daughter of Ares looked (Demeter) Demeter.  
Herodotus (V 56ff.): Heracles brought up the sound of Ares.

CHAPTER NINE: CERBERUS

This is the earliest of the labours to be defined and was probably the earliest Greek story involving a mortal's descent to the underworld. Heracles brought back Cerberus to Eurystheus and during this labour rescued from the underworld Theseus and, in some accounts, Pirithous.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

Homer (Il. 8.362f.): Athena says that Zeus should remember how she saved Heracles when he was worn out ὑπ' 'Ευρυσθέως ἄεθλων and mentions him being sent to bring back the hound of Hades.

(Od. XI 625f.): The shade of Heracles, talking to Odysseus about his bondage to Eurystheus, mentions bringing up Cerberus, whom he merely refers to as κύνα. He adds that he was guided by Hermes and Athena, and that this was the most difficult μόχθος Eurystheus could devise.

Hesiod (Th. 310ff.): Echidna was the mother of Cerberus, fifty-headed dog of Hades.

(Th. 769): It is here implied that Cerberus guarded the gates of Hades.

Stesichorus (P.M.G.

206): Just the title 'Cerberus' is known.

Acusilaus (F.G.H.

2 F 13): Typhon the parents of the immortal (ἀθάνατον) Cerberus.

Bacchylides (V 56ff.): Heracles brought up the hound of Hades.

Hecataeus (F.G.H. 1 F 27): There was a serpent at Taenarum called the 'Hound of Hades' because of its poisonous bite. Heracles took it to Eurystheus. Homer, who first mentioned it, did not give it a name or description as he did the Chimaera. Others called it Cerberus and made it a three-headed dog.

Sophocles (Tr. 1097ff.): The three-headed hound of Hades, offspring of Echidna, is mentioned among the μόχθοι.

(Phaedra, A. Nauck,  
Fragmenta Tragicorum  
Graecorum, Hildesheim,  
1964):

ἔσαινεν οὐρᾶ νῶτα  
κυλλαίνων κάτω κάτω<sup>1</sup>.

Euripides (H.F. 426ff.): Given twelfth in the list of μόχθοι is the fact that Heracles has gone to Hades and not yet returned.

(loc. cit. 610ff.): On Heracles' return he is questioned about Cerberus. He says that he was not Persephone's gift but that he fought for him, having gained strength from seeing the Holy Mysteries. Cerberus is at present in Hermione, in the sacred grove of Demeter, and Eurystheus does not yet know of Heracles' return. He was so long in Hades because he rescued Theseus, a prisoner there.

1. Cf. Apollod. II 5 12: τὴν δὲ οὐρᾶν δράκοντας, κατὰ δὲ τοῦ νώτου παντοίων εἶχεν ὄφρων κεφαλᾶς.

- (loc. cit. 1276ff.): Heracles, talking to Theseus, says that he crowned all his labours by fetching the ~~the~~ three-headed watchdog of Hades. He asks Theseus to accompany him to Argos to claim his reward.
- (Heracl. 218f.): Iolaus reminds Demophon, son of Theseus, that Heracles saved his father from Hades.
- Philochorus (F.G.H. 328 F 18): Aedonius, king of the Molossians, had a daughter called Persephone and a dog, Cerberus, which killed Pirithous, when about to defile the girl; Heracles saved Theseus when he too was about to be killed.
- Herodorus and Euphronius (F.G.H. 31 F 31): Cerberus was brought back by Heracles and spewed out gall, from which grew the drug aconitum.
- Diodorus Siculus (IV 25, 1): It was the eleventh labour to bring back Cerberus from Hades. Heracles first went to Athens to take part in the Eleusinian Mysteries where Orpheus was in charge of initiation.
- (IV 26, 1): Heracles descended into Hades and was warmly welcomed by Persephone, who allowed him to free Theseus and Pirithous. He received Cerberus in chains and took him to the upper world.

Apollodorus (II v 12): It was the twelfth labour to fetch from Hades Cerberus, who had three dog-heads, the tail of a dragon, and on his back the heads of snakes. Before he went he was cleansed of the slaughter of the centaurs by Eumolpus at Eleusis, and initiated into the Mysteries. He went down to Hades at Taenarum. All the souls fled except Meleager and Medusa; Heracles drew his sword against the latter but Hermes reminded him she was a shade. He came upon Theseus and Pirithous who asked him to rescue them. He took Theseus by the hand and raised him, but when he tried to raise Pirithous the earth shook and he was left there. Heracles asked Pluto for Cerberus and he agreed, provided that he took him without weapons; thus, in cuirass and lionskin, Heracles put his arms round Cerberus' neck and, although the snake in the tail bit him, he eventually yielded. Heracles carried him off and ascended at Troezen. He showed Cerberus to Eurystheus and then took him back to Hades.

Pausanias (II 35.10): At Clymenus' sanctuary in Corinth is an opening in the earth, through which Heracles is thought to have brought Cerberus in Hermionean legend.

Hyginus (Fab. XXX 13): As the twelfth labour Heracles led up the dog Cerberus, son of Typhon, from Hades.

(Fab. LXXIX 3): When he came to fetch the three-headed Cerberus, Heracles saved Theseus and Pirithous on request to Pluto.

(CLI): Cerberus was related to Ladon and the hydra.

As can be seen, this legend enjoyed a continuous popularity from Homeric times onwards and has the unique distinction of being regarded as a labour in the Iliad. Homer never actually names Cerberus, nor gives a description of him and this is likely to indicate that he was so well-known even at this early time<sup>1</sup> as to render specific identification of him unnecessary. His connection with Hades is perhaps sufficient to suggest some sort of monstrous nature and this is substantiated by Hesiod's description of him as the 'fifty-headed child of Echidna', which thus also links him by implication with other monstrous children of Echidna, such as the sphinx, chimaera and hydra. Later a 'classical restraint' was placed on the number of heads, which was standardised as three, although Horace<sup>2</sup> follows the tradition of Pindar by referring to him as belua centiceps. Apollodorus gives the fullest description of Cerberus with his three dog heads, the snake tails on his back and his own snake-tail<sup>3</sup>. It is interesting if Acusilaus did specifically make

---

1. Od. XI may have sixth century interpolations. - See page 29 and note (8) - but the Iliad passage is earlier.

2. Odes II 13, 34.

3. cf. Virgil, Aen. VI 419 and Horace, Odes III 11, 17f. & II 13, 33ff.

him immortal, although this idea may rather belong to the preserving source and may even be the result of faulty textual restoration. However, a reference to immortality could be an interpretation of the fact that he was always present at the gate of Hades.

There is no mention of Heracles harming Cerberus: generally it is not specified how his removal was achieved, as is the case in the accounts of Homer, Bacchylides, Hecataeus, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodorus, Diodorus, Pausanias and Hyginus, although Euripides does make it clear that a fight was needed, and that he was not just a gift of Persephone, which presumably indicates the existence of an earlier tradition that Cerberus was such a gift, and indeed such a version is later implied by Diodorus. Apollodorus again gives the most detailed account saying that the use of weapons was prohibited by Hades and that Heracles overcame Cerberus with a strangle-grip. Various places could lay claim to being the point of ascent or descent to the Underworld, with Pausanias making a specific reference to Hermionean legend, an example from the doubtless many local legends.

One can appreciate why this was included among the labours, as it well fits the category of overcoming dangerous monsters and it is interesting that Cerberus is related to the adversaries of various other labours-hydra, Ladon, Geryon and Orthus. We may note that Homer refers to it as the most difficult labour that Eurystheus could devise, thus emphasising the heroism of Heracles. Homer gives no number to it, but later it was generally regarded as the last. Euripides is the first to make it such, but the reward which he mentions

is not specified; as he is to fetch it from Argos it presumably involved Eurystheus and so we may presume it refers to freedom from his service, perhaps also implying the promised immortality which is his final goal.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Rescue of Theseus and Pirithous

The Theseus and Pirithous underworld myth is closely associated with this labour, presumably to enhance the benefaction idea of Heracles' heroism, and we should try to establish how early this connection took place and whether the Theseus and Pirithous story was originally a separate myth in its own right. It seems it was known in the time of Homer, since in Odyssey XI 631 Odysseus expresses a desire to have met Theseus and Pirithous in the underworld. However, Heracles, whom Odysseus does meet, is clearly meant to be a shade by this time and the allusion to the Cerberus myth is clearly meant to be an allusion to an event long past. Thus, Odysseus may well just be thinking of the shades of Theseus and Pirithous after their death, unless the myth was current at this time that neither Theseus nor Pirithous was rescued but both remained for all time in the underworld, an idea perhaps echoed by Diodorus<sup>2</sup>, who says that some writers say that both never returned<sup>3</sup>. This might indicate a time when Heracles was unconnected with this myth.

---

1. See pages 23 & 29ff.

2. IV 63, 4.

3. cf. possibly Virgil, page 236, note (4).

Hesiod, according to Pausanias<sup>1</sup>, is recorded by some as writing about the descent of Theseus and Pirithous to Hades, and the Minyad also contained a reference to their descent, again according to Pausanias<sup>2</sup>, who says that, in his opinion, Polygnotus was influenced by this poem in his drawing of Charon in his wall-painting of the Underworld. It does, in fact, seem possible, as Mathews suggests<sup>3</sup>, that the poem attributed to Hesiod and the Minyad were one and the same. The bones of Hesiod were said to be buried at Orchomenos<sup>4</sup> and it is possible that the Minyad received its name because it was composed or recited at Orchomenos. It is unlikely to have been actually written by Hesiod but it may well have been the work of one of his followers. The conversation between Theseus and Meleager<sup>5</sup> presumably belonged to the same poem. There is no indication as to whether Heracles was also included in this poem or these poems, and the same is true of the version of Panyassis<sup>6</sup>, who says that the rock grew to the flesh of Theseus and Pirithous and held them in the Underworld, a version which Pausanias indicates to be different from the normal version which seems to have been that they were bound to chairs.

The first specific literary reference to Heracles' connection with this myth occurs in Euripides but the artistic

---

1. IX 31.5. (See Frr. 280-1 M.W.)

2. X 28.1.

3. Op. cit. 74 and note 79.

4. Paus. IX 38.4. Minyas was a king of that area.

5. Paus. (X 31.3) says Meleager appeared in the Minyas and Boiae. He certainly appears in passages attributed to the Περσέθου κατάβασις (280.10 M.W.) and Boiae (25.10 M.W.) cf. Apollodorus page 174.

6. F 9 K.

evidence must here be anticipated by reference to an Olympic shield-band<sup>1</sup> which shows Theseus and Pirithous sitting on chairs, imploring the help of Heracles; this dates to the first quarter of the sixth century and thus makes it likely that Panyassis, and perhaps the Minyad, according to its date, did include a reference to Heracles as rescuer.

Thus, the original question does not admit of a decisive answer. If Homer was thinking of their descent to the Underworld when he mentioned Theseus and Pirithous in the Odyssey passage, thus implying them to be still imprisoned, then one can assume there was a very early tradition of this myth and one unconnected with Heracles, unless, of course, this was an interpolation as Hereas<sup>2</sup> thought. This would be a time when Theseus was not an important mythical figure and could thus be allowed to meet an ignominious end in Hades. By the sixth century, Heracles became the rescuer, a story easy to introduce into the myth of his descent to the Underworld to fetch Cerberus; this was probably invented in the early stages to increase Heracles' heroism rather <sup>than</sup> from the notion that Theseus could not be left in the Underworld. Two separate myths, in any case, seem more plausible than the idea of a complex Cerberus myth growing up from within itself, especially as the meetings with Medea and Meleager are also included therein, regardless of whether Homer knew of the Theseus descent. Perhaps Heracles' meeting with Meleager was influenced by that between Theseus and Meleager attributed to Hesiod.

The idea of a separate composite myth for the Theseus and Pirithous descent is perhaps enhanced by the fact that in later

---

1. See page 254, no. 1.

2. F.G.H. 486 F 1.

times, and probably also early on, it was half of a myth about a compact between Theseus and Pirithous either to marry one of the daughters of Zeus<sup>1</sup> or else, having captured Helen, daughter of Tyndareus, to cast lots for her hand in marriage and the winner to help the loser find a wife<sup>2</sup>. At any rate, it was connected with the rape of Helen by the two friends while she was still a young girl; Pirithous either chose Persephone, after losing the draw for Helen, or else originally chose her from among the daughters of Zeus. We can see that this gives a reason for the descent to Hades, such as none of the early sources provides, although it is likely that the attempted rape of Persephone<sup>3</sup> was known early on to give a purpose to their descent.

We know that Stesichorus<sup>4</sup> made Helen and Theseus the parents of Iphigenia, thus acknowledging the rape and we may infer from a scholiast to the Iliad<sup>5</sup> that the Cypria told the story of Helen's abduction by Theseus, making it part of the Paris/Menelaus story. We are, furthermore, told by Pausanias that it was depicted on the chest of Cypselus and the Amyclae throne<sup>6</sup>. The stories of the abduction of Helen and the descent to the Underworld thus both seem to be early and may well have been connected even in early times.

---

1. Apollod. Epitomy I 23f.

2. Diod. IV 63,3; Plut. Thes. XXXI.

3. Ap. Rh. I. 101ff; Cf. Apollod. II v. 12; Diod. IV 63,4.

4. P.M.G. 191.

5. 3.242 A D.

6. V 19.3 & III 18.15 resp.

A brief word is needed about the method of retention in the Underworld, and also the method of rescue. Panyassis made a rock grow to them<sup>1</sup>, whereas the standard version seems to have been that they were bound to chairs. As Frazer<sup>2</sup> points out, Apollodorus may have been following Panyassis in his account of how Theseus and Pirithous grew to the chair of Forgetfulness<sup>3</sup>, as may Aristophanes much earlier, since, commenting on λίσσοι in the Equites the scholiast<sup>4</sup> says that Theseus was stuck so fast that when Heracles pulled him up he left part of his posterior behind and this was why the Athenians were flat in that part of their anatomy<sup>5</sup>. It is certainly indicative that the scholiast uses πέτρα instead of θρόνος to describe to what he was stuck, since this seems to follow the tradition in Panyassis. The allusion to such a tradition in the Knights could, as Matthews<sup>6</sup> points out, indicate the influence of Panyassis on the Athenians or on Aristophanes, or could merely refer to a local Athenian legend, of which no record remains. Diodorus<sup>7</sup> merely says that they were put in chains, and Hyginus<sup>8</sup> that a furiis strati diuque lacerati sunt.

Apollodorus is the only one to be specific about the method of rescue, saying that Heracles pulled Theseus up by

- 
1. The words 'instead of chairs' probably belong to Pausanias since he is contrasting Panyassis' version with the Polygnotan version of chairs.
  2. Apollodorus II (London, 1921) 153.
  3. Cf. Horace (Odes IV 7. 27ff.) who says that Pirithous was bound by 'Lethaean bonds'.
  4. 1368.
  5. Hesychius sub λίσσοι' and Aulus Gellius, Noctes Atticae 10. 16. 13.
  6. op. cit. 75f.
  7. IV 63, 4.
  8. Fab. LXXIX.

the hand, but on examining the artistic evidence I found that there were other versions. Both Theseus and Pirithous are not always rescued: Euripides does not mention Pirithous; Philochorus, Apollodorus and Plutarch say he could not be rescued; Hyginus says that both were saved as does Critias<sup>1</sup>; Diodorus in one place<sup>2</sup> says that both were saved and in another<sup>3</sup> only Theseus, while Virgil<sup>4</sup> only mentions Theseus and says he never returned. At any rate, the increased importance of Theseus is shown in the fact that he could not be left in Hades, whereas Pirithous, a less important mythical figure, could be allowed to remain. The time Theseus was in Hades is alluded to by Apollonius, who says that he did not sail with the Argo as he was in Hades.

It is interesting that Cerberus is never depicted in art with Theseus and Pirithous and this raises the question of where they were thought to be imprisoned, since Heracles strictly only needed to go to the gate of the Underworld to fetch Cerberus. However, there may be a reference in literature connecting Theseus and Cerberus. The Hippolytus/Phaedra story took place while Theseus was in Hades, according to Hesychius, and a fragment of the first Hippolytus of Euripides<sup>5</sup> seems to contain a description of Cerberus fawning

---

1. Nck. 3. 546f.

2. IV 26,1.

3. IV 63,4.

4. Aen. VI 618. Perhaps vv. 601ff. however, indicate that Virgil regarded both Pirithous and Theseus as remaining:  
 quid memorem Lapithas Ixiona Pirithoumque  
 quos super atra silex iam iam lapsura cadentique  
 imminet adsimilis;

5. W.S. Barret, Eur. Hippolytus (Oxford, 1964). 24, G & H.

on Heracles or Theseus. If Theseus were the character with Cerberus here this would be the only place where they are specifically linked together.

The rescue of Theseus recalls Heracles' heroism in rescuing Prometheus, as recorded in the Προμηθευς Λυόμενος<sup>1</sup> of Aeschylus and also his helping of Philoctetes at the end of Sophocles' play of that name<sup>2</sup>. His benefaction to individuals as well as to mankind is thus demonstrated.

#### Fight with Hades

Homer<sup>3</sup> tells how Heracles wounded Hades ἐν πύλω ἐν νεκύεσσι. There is, however, a dispute concerning this passage as to whether πύλω should have a capital letter, and thus mean the place, Pylos, in which case ἐν νεκύεσσι would mean "among the corpses", or a small π and thus refer to the Gate of Hell, in which case νέκυς would mean a shade, as often in the Odyssey. Looking at this piece in isolation it should be noted that Hades is not a god who usually takes part in human battles and so would be unlikely to be at Pylos when Heracles was there fighting the Neleids,<sup>4</sup> and that thus the second meaning of νέκυς is more likely. The only occasion Heracles is recorded as being in Hades is during the Cerberus labour and perhaps early on he was thought to have taken Cerberus by force and this rough aspect was later replaced by the tradition that Cerberus was a gift from Persephone and later still by the heroic winning of the animal. The description of Heracles

1. See Pherecydes reference, page 259.

2. 1409ff.

3. Il. 5. 395ff.

4. Il. 11. 690ff.

given a few lines below the Hades passage<sup>1</sup> certainly accords with an early notion of a violent Heracles; whether this was shown in his dealings with Cerberus or not:

σχέτλιος, όβριμοεργός, ός ούκ όθετ' αΐσυλα ρέζων,  
 ός τόξοισιν έκηδε θεούς, οϊ "Ολυμπον έχουσι.

However, this Iliad passage cannot be taken in isolation since later writers definitely place Hades at Pylos when wounded by Heracles. Panyassis states that Hera was shot by Heracles εν Πύλῳ ήμαθόεντι<sup>2</sup> and in another fragment<sup>3</sup> links the wounding of Hera and Hades to the same incident; the epithet ήμαθόεις, the common one applied to Pylos, makes the reference to the actual place certain. Homer, although talking of the wounding of both Hera and Hades seems to make them separate incidents and to place only the Hades incident εν Πύλῳ. Pindar<sup>4</sup> records a similar version to that of Panyassis, although Hera is not mentioned; Apollo and Poseidon are present, however, and these gods would not be in Hades. Apollodorus<sup>5</sup> is even more specific, saying that, after the capture of Elis, Heracles marched against Pylos, slaying Periclymenus and wounding Hades, who was siding with the Pylians.

There are thus two alternatives. Either it is necessary to reject all of these references to the wounding of Hades,

1. Il. 5. 403f.

2. F 20 K.

3. F 21 K; cf. also F 6 K.

4. O. IX 29ff.

5. II vii 31.

as being unconnected with the Cerberus labour, or it is necessary to say that Homer regarded Hades as being wounded in the Underworld but all other authors misunderstood him to be referring to the Pylos incident and thus brought about a conflation of both stories, describing Heracles wounding Hades during the battle with the Pylians; the Hera incident was joined onto the Hades one, although originally they seem to have been regarded as taking place at different times.

I find the latter a more pleasing explanation, even though it is the more hypothetical, mainly because I find no good reason for Hades, a god who does not normally take part in human affairs, fighting in Heracles' battle against the Pylians. This interpretation may be substantiated by artistic representations of Cerberus, since artists<sup>1</sup> often depict Cerberus at the gate of Hades, which could well hark back to the old story of Heracles wounding Hades ἐν πύλῳ when he came for Cerberus, although admittedly Cerberus traditionally guarded the entrance. It should be noted that these artists are earlier than Panyassis, the first extant source to record a version apparently different from that in the Iliad. If this theory is correct, the incident in the Iliad is likely to have been connected with the story of Cerberus, although not stated as such. Hereafter, the two events became separated and the Hades myth became confused. Certainly the idea of a violent Heracles seems to have been dying out by the time of the Iliad, perhaps suggesting it to belong to Mycenaean tradition.

---

1. See pages 243 & 247.

B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

It has been seen that the earliest literary reference to this labour goes back as far as <sup>the</sup>Iliad and one would therefore expect to find very early artistic representations of the subject too; however, this is not so, and the earliest artistic representation occurs on a Middle Corinthian kotyle. This may be due merely to the accidents of survival or else may have resulted from a general lack of interest in this myth for artistic purposes in early days, for some reason that it is not possible to determine.

The representations divide themselves into neat groups according to the part of the story illustrated.

a. Scenes before the capture of Cerberus.

1. Lost, kotyle, Corinthian.<sup>1</sup>
2. Orvieto, Faina 78, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 48.16, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Louvre F 204, belly-handled amphora, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Moscow, Pushkin 70, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Würzburg 203, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Würzburg 308, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Tarquinia RC 976, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.

---

1. Br. 96 C 3; N.C. fig. 45c, no. 942.

2. Br. 92 A 6; W. Technau, Exekias (Leipzig, 1936) pl. 11-13; A.B.V. 144, 9.

3. Br. 92 A 13; Gazette des Beaux Arts 15 (1943) 185, figs. 1-2; A.B.V. 140, 1u.

4. Br. 95 B 2; Pottier, op. cit. pl. 78; A.R.V. 2. 4, 11.

5. Br. 92 A 11; Jd.I. 76 (1961) 61, fig. 14; A.B.V. 255, 8.

6. Br. 91 A 8; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 43; A.B.V. 328, 6ab.

7. Br. 93 A 1; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 93; A.B.V. 267, 19.

8. Br. 91 A 16; C.V. 1 pl. 13; A.B.V. 269, 45.

9. Brussels R 300, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
10. St. Louis, Washington University 668 (3274), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
11. Earlier Rome market, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
12. Naples Stg. 267, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
13. Worcester (Massachusetts) 1935.59, olpe, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
14. Boulogne 68, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
15. Louvre F 241, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
16. Rome, Vatican 372, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
17. Louvre CA 2992, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
18. Florence, amphora-fragment from Campana Collection, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
19. Villa Giulia 48,329, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
20. Market 1937, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
21. Capesthorpe Hall, kalpis, Attic red-figure<sup>13</sup>.
22. Altenburg 233, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>14</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 91 A 1; C.V. 3 pl. 23, 2; A.B.V. 288, 9.
  2. Br. 92 A 23; A.J.A. 44 (1940) 192, figs. 8 & 9; A.B.V. 328, 7ab.
  3. Br. 92 A 7; A.V. pl. 130; A.B.V. 279, 49.
  4. Br. 92 A 5; C.V. 1 pl. 4.3; Par. 138, 4.
  5. Br. 94 A 4u; Jd.I. 76 (1961) 63, figs. 18 & 19; Par. 193.2.
  6. Br. 91 A 9; Le Musée 2 (1905) 275; A.B.V. 385, 2.
  7. Br. 91 A 11; C.V. 4 pl. 47, 6; A.B.V. 383, 5.
  8. Br. 92 A 8; Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 50; A.B.V. 368, 107.
  9. Br. 93 A 4; A.V. pl. 131; A.B.V. 360, 10.
  10. Br. 93 A 15; A.B.V. 368, 100.
  11. Br. 91 A 15; Mon. Ant. 42 (1955) 1024, fig. 263; A.B.V. 370, 132.
  12. Br. 92 A 25; Les Tableaux des Anciens pl. 10 no. 33.
  13. Br. 93 A 13; J.H.S. 78 (1958) 20 pl. 9; A.R.V. 2.232, 3.
  14. Br. 95 B 4; Jd.I. 8 (1893) 163; A.R.V. 2. 137, lab.

The Middle Corinthian example will be looked at in detail, both since it is the earliest surviving representation of the Cerberus labour and since it may also make allusion to the idea of Heracles wounding Hades. Hades, staff in hand, stands behind his throne on the left-hand side of the scene; between him and Heracles is a woman, apparently protecting him from the boulder wielded by Heracles; she is given no attributes and it is not clear whether she is meant to be Athena or Persephone, as both would be appropriate. Hermes is behind Heracles and almost touches his boulder-wielding arm, as if in restraint. The one-headed Cerberus is on the extreme right of the picture and does not seem to be of much concern to Heracles. The theory that this vase depicts Heracles' attack on Hades would explain both the wielding of the boulder and the lack of immediate interest in Cerberus. An alternative view, upheld by Conze<sup>1</sup>, is that the artist has conflated two separate events, the attack on Hades and the capture of Cerberus, but there seems to be no need for this view in the light of the Iliad passage; Conze finds the picture comical, but I find it more sombre in tone.

The rendering of Cerberus with only one head is exceptional, but he does have long snake heads coming from his body in more traditional fashion. Payne<sup>2</sup>, following Furtwängler<sup>3</sup>, finds the single head an early feature and this could be so since this is earlier than the other representations, although Payne's contention that it is the earliest "by far" seems an exaggeration.

---

1. Archäologische Zeitung 16 (1859) 34-5.

2. N.C. 130.

3. Sabouroff, text to (i) pl. 74.

As regards the other representations of this group, Heracles is generally armed with his club. In (17) he holds a noose and in (13) Hermes may hold a noose; Heracles holds a chain before Cerberus in (4), (5), (12), and (22). The seated Hades is apparently present in (7) and the woman is probably Persephone, while both certainly appear together in (9), (10) and (16) and probably in (2), where fragments of many figures can be seen; Persephone appears without Hades in (5), (16), (17), (18) and (21) and she is pictured in these examples behind the gate of Hell, with Cerberus in front of her, sometimes raising her arm, presumably in gesture of defiance. In (11), the youth with bow may be Iolaus, who, although not mentioned in literature as connected with this labour, may be included here by artistic licence. Athena and/or Hermes are often depicted, the presence of the latter being well documented, since he acted as Heracles' guide. A snake, symbolising the powers of darkness, can be seen in (21). The composition of (7) stands a little apart from the rest, since it is spread round the shoulder and rather reminiscent of a hunting scene.

Cerberus is always shown as two-headed, except in (22), where he is given only one head, apparently refuting Payne's statement that this was an early feature, since this vase dates to the fifth century; however, this would just reflect lack of knowledge as to the physical details of Cerberus on the part of the artist. Certainly the standard Attic version seemed to favour a two-headed-Cerberus, as will be seen in other representations.

II Scenes after the capture of CerberusIIa Heracles has mastered Cerberus

These scenes show Heracles leading Cerberus along, either still at the gate of Hades, or else in an unspecified setting.

1. Throne of Bathycles.<sup>1</sup>
2. London, Erskine collection, cup, Laconian<sup>2</sup>.
3. Louvre CA 1870, amphora, Pontic<sup>3</sup>.
4. Reggio Cal. 4001, Panathenaic amphora-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Athens NM 1269 (CC838), tripod-pyxis, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Earlier W.W. Hope, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Berlin F 1828, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Louvre F 34, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
9. Louvre F 228, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
10. Louvre A 481, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
11. Lyons E 406 b, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.

- 
1. Paus. III 18.10-16. This depicted 'how Heracles brought home the hound of Hades'.
  2. Br. 96 C 7; Stibbe, op. cit. pl. 72, no. 217.
  3. Br. 96 C 4; A. Merlin, Vases grecs du style géométrique au style à figures noires (Paris) pl. 24, 1.
  4. Br. 93 A 16; Archeologica Classica 4 (1952) 153ff., pl. 30, 1; A.B.V. 147, 6.
  5. Br. 94 A 8u.
  6. Br. 95 A 9; Raoul-Rochette, Monuments inédits d'antiquité figurée (Paris, 1837) pl. 49; A.B.V. 184u.
  7. Br. 92 A 1; A. Neugebauer, Staatliche Museum von Berlin: Führer durch das Antiquarium II (Berlin, 1932) 44.
  8. Br. 92 A 3; C.V. 3 pl. 14, 7.
  9. Br. 91 A 10; C.V. 4 pl. 43, 1; A.B.V. 269, 46.
  10. Br. 92 A 2; C.V. 4 pl. 29, 4 & 30, 1.
  11. Br. 93 A 3; Dugas, Robinson Studies II 57, pl. 17; A.B.V. 280, 3.

12. Munich 1493 (J153) neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
13. Louvre Cl1281, column-krater fragments, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
14. Louvre Camp. 10676, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
15. Boston, Ol.8025, plate, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
16. Würzburg 472, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
17. Rome, Vat. Gug. 42, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
18. Gotha Ahv 31, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
19. Boulogne 412, pelike, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
20. Lost, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
21. Leningrad, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
22. Bari Museum 4305, column-krater, Etruscan black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
23. From Gemboros, fragment of a stamped pithos<sup>12</sup>.
24. Hamburg 1899, 98, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.
25. London BM 93.7-12.11, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>14</sup>.
26. Naples H3378 (Inv.81102), hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>15</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 91 A 7; Brommer, Her. pl. 27b; A.B.V. 316, 7.
  2. Br. 94 A 1u; C.V. 12 pl. 181.
  3. Br. 93 A 5; C.V. 11 pl. 146, 6.
  4. Br. 96 B 8; M.U.Z. fig. 356; A.R.V. 2. 163, 6.
  5. Br. 96 B 7; Brommer, Her. pl. 27a; A.R.V. 2.137m.
  6. Br. 92 A 9; R.G. I pl. 15, 42.
  7. Br. 91 A 3; C.V. 1 pl. 33, 1.
  8. Br. 94 A 7u; J.H.S. 71 (1951) 42, no. 2, pl. 21b; A.B.V. 376, 220.
  9. Br. 92 A 24; Inghirami, op. cit. II pl. 36, 40; A.B.V. 370, 131.
  10. Br. 93 A 9; A.B.V. 364, 59.
  11. Br. 96 C 5; E.V.P. 17.
  12. B.S.A. 20 (1913-14) pl. 5d.
  13. Br. 94 A 5u; R. Ballheimer, Griechische Vasen aus dem Hamburger Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Hamburg, 1905) 17 f. no. 4; A.B.V. 528, 33.
  14. Br. 92 A 4; C.V. 3 pl. 34, 3; A.B.V. 397, 28.
  15. Br. 93 A 8; C.V. 1 pl. 34, 3; A.B.V. 477, 9.

27. Brussels R299, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
28. Copenhagen NM 76 B, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
29. New York 41.162.178, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
30. Los Angeles A5933 (5025), neck-handled amphora. Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
31. Athens NM 1013, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
32. Boston 03.838, hydria-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>6</sup>.
33. Berlin 3232, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>7</sup>.
34. Taranto Museum, relief-fragment<sup>8</sup>.
35. Naples H 3222, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>9</sup>.
36. Karlsruhe 388, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>10</sup>.
37. Naples SA709, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>11</sup>.
38. Naples SA 11, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>12</sup>.
39. Bonn 2676 B, fragment, Apulian red-figure<sup>13</sup>.
40. Munich 3297 (J849), volute-krater, South Italian<sup>14</sup>.
41. Berlin F 2882, bowl, Hellenistic<sup>15</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 94 A 1ab; C.V. 2 pl. 21, 18.
  2. Br. 94 A 2ab; C.V. 3 pl. 112, 6; A.B.L. 223, 3.
  3. Br. 92 A 21; C.V. (U.S.A. 8) Gallatin pl. 39, 2; A.B.V. 509, 155.
  4. Br. 91 A 20; Sotheby Catalogue 14-V-46 pl. I no. 15; A.B.V. 479, 4.
  5. Br. 94 A 5ab; C.V. 1 pl. 11, 10; A.B.L. 221, 8.
  6. Br. 96 B 9; J.H.S. 70(1955)32, fig.8; A.R.V. 2. 209, 162.
  7. Br. 95 B 5; Jd.I. 8 (1893) pl. 2, 1; A.R.V. 2. 117, 2.
  8. H. Klumbach, Tarentiner Grabkunst, (Reutlingen, 1937) 59, no. 42, 170.
  9. Br. 97 D 4; H. Heydemann, Die Vasensammlungen des Museo Nazionale zu Neapel (Berlin, 1872) 510ff.
  10. Br. 97 D 1; A.W. Picard-Cambridge, The Theatre of Dionysos in Athens (Oxford, 1946) fig. 27.
  11. Br. 97 D 3; Jd.I. 73 (1958) 64, fig. 10.
  12. Br. 97 D 5; Jd.I. loc. cit. fig. 11.
  13. Br. 97 D 6; Jd.I. 73 (1958) 74 fig. 13.
  14. Br. 97 D 2; Picard-Cambridge, op. cit. fig. 24.
  15. Furtwängler, op. cit. pl. 74, 3.

Heracles holds Cerberus by means of a chain or rope, and often brandishes his club, no doubt as added coercion. The door-post of Hades is visible in (13), (19), (25), (26), (29), and (31), and so here the setting is obviously still Hades, even though the dog has been captured; this idea is enforced in (19) by the appearance of the snake, symbol of death. Persephone is present in (13), (19) and (26) and Pluto in (29). In the rest, the setting is not specified, and in (2) and (27) Heracles and Cerberus are alone, although the size of the field may well have dictated this; however, in (12), the placing of Cerberus and Heracles alone must be deliberate, and the depiction of Sisyphus on the other side may indicate this Cerberus scene to be set in Hades too. Iolaus is present in (4) and (8), and in (22), where he drives Heracles' chariot. Again Hermes and/or Athena are often present.

The method of capture is slightly unusual in (33), since, instead of holding Cerberus on a lead or chain, Heracles has a rope round his front legs. Cerberus is generally drawn with two heads, as we saw to be the standard Attic rendering, but on the stamped pithos, (23), he is drawn as one-headed and on the South-Italian examples he is drawn with three heads. In the latter, a new scheme is standard, with Heracles arching his body, trying to counterbalance the pull of Cerberus; Heracles is not preserved in (39), but from its similarity to the other South Italian pieces on this theme it is likely that he was at the other end of the lead. Cerberus also has three heads in the Hellenistic version and this thus appears to be the standard later conception in art as well as literature.

Special comment may be made on (35), since it may be part of a larger Underworld scene, the frieze in the Munich Glyptothek. Both are fragmentary and seem to belong to the same date. No proof can be offered for the connection but it is certainly a possible one.

IIb Hermes has mastered Cerberus

1. Montagnola, Purrmann collection, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Villa Giulia 48329, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Paris, Cab. Méd. 269, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Philadelphia market, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Athens NM 17372, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.

As the title of this group suggests, Hermes, and not Heracles, has control of Cerberus and, in fact, in (3) to (5) the scene consists of only Hermes and Cerberus, and these scenes cannot with certainty be linked to the Heracles labour: Hermes, in his capacity of guider of souls, often had to visit the Underworld, and it is possible that the artist merely wanted to depict him and Cerberus together and did not mean any particular inference to be put on the presence of a lead. Perhaps Hermes is even taking Cerberus for a walk.

The first two pieces in the group do, however, definitely have reference to the labour. In (1) Hermes holds Cerberus

- 
1. Br. 91 A 14; Jd.I 76 (1961) 62, figs. 15 & 16; Par. 141, 5.
  2. Br. 91 A 15; Mon. Ant. 42 (1955) 1024, fig. 263; A.B.V. 370, 132.
  3. Br. 94 A 2u; C.V. 2 pl. 65.
  4. Br. 95 A 16; Par. 229.
  5. Br. 95 A 12; A.B.V. 491, 61.

by the neck at the gate of Hades; the dog sits quietly on his hind legs. Heracles waits, chain in hand. Hermes seems here to have performed for Heracles the most difficult part of the labour. In (2) Heracles sits resting on his club, facing Cerberus, who is at the gate, while Hermes parleys with Persephone. The implication is that he is bargaining for the dog and Heracles is just waiting until Cerberus is handed over.

It is not certain whether these vases imply an actual established tradition, in which Hermes helped Heracles in his labour; the infrequent occurrence of such scenes is more indicative of an artistic tradition since it is only in (1) and (2) that it can be positively identified. However, granted that there was a tradition in which Cerberus was a gift of Persephone and in which no slur was intended on Heracles' heroism, it is possible that there was an actual tradition of Hermes interposing in this way, without detracting from the heroism or the validity of the labour.

IIC Athena has subdued Cerberus.

1. Edinburgh 1881.44.27, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.

Athena stands on the inner side of Cerberus, apparently having subdued him, while Heracles, weaponless, backs away. This is a novel composition and the same arguments may be used of it as were used of the scenes where Hermes seems to have subdued Cerberus or to be on the point of winning him from Persephone.

---

1. Br. 91 A 19; A.V. pl. 129; A.B.V. 312, 4.

IID Heracles ascends to earth with Cerberus.

1. Olympia, metope<sup>1</sup>.
2. Hephaesteum, metope<sup>2</sup>.

This composition is confined to these two pieces of sculpture, at least as far as surviving art is concerned. In (1), the body of Heracles is preserved; it is bent forward in dragging motion. Of Cerberus, just the head and forelegs are visible, and these are at ground level; certainly another head could have been originally painted on<sup>3</sup> and there is no need to regard Cerberus as necessarily rendered here as single-headed. A foot is preserved next to Heracles', which is thought by Ashmole and Yalouris<sup>4</sup> to belong to Hermes rather than Athena, since he, as guider of souls, would know the exit to the Underworld well. I feel, however, that there is no need to be so literal, and in fact, I feel Athena to be the more likely figure here, since she appears so often with Heracles on these metopes.

(2) is very similar except that a rock, part of the head of Cerberus, and the rocky path are the only detail preserved. Its composition can be deduced from that of the Olympia metope. No other figure has been restored by Sauer, but it is not certain

---

1. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pl. 198.

2. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI. vi.

3. Cf. the West pediment at Olympia which could have had a feast painted in the background to judge from the vase which seems almost a reproduction of it. (New York 07.286.84, volute-krater:- Br.223 B2; F.R. pl. 116-117; A.R.V.2. 613,1).

4. op. cit. 28f.

that originally no-one else was present; it may, however, be indicative that Heracles is usually shown without divine aid on the metopes of the Hephaesteum, and so may be intended to be alone with Cerberus here.

### IIIe Heracles bringing Cerberus to Eurystheus

There are only two renderings of this stage of the myth, both on Caeretan hydriae and both apparently influenced by a type of composition common in scenes of the Erymanthian Boar.

1. Louvre E 701<sup>1</sup>.
2. Villa Giulia 50649<sup>2</sup>.

The strange feature about these scenes is that Eurystheus hides in his pithos, which is generally recorded as part of the boar labour and once as part of the lion labour. However, Eurystheus and pithos are placed here on the left of the scene, whereas when Heracles brings back the boar, Eurystheus is generally on the right; perhaps the artists were consciously trying to emphasise the difference and to infer that the pithos was an integral part of the Cerberus labour as well, or perhaps they were merely confusing with the Cerberus story an incident which belonged to another labour. Certainly they have produced dramatic pictures.

Another feature that is different from the Attic renderings is that Cerberus is given three heads instead of two, and for clarity they are painted in different colours. He is also fiercer than he is portrayed in Attic. Heracles brandishes his club to keep him in check on the lead. These two representations are very similar to one another and are probably the work of the same school if not by the same artist.

---

1. Br. 96 C 1; C.V. 9 pl. III Fa 8.

2. Br. 96 C 2; Mingazzini, op. cit. pl. 38.

III Anomalies

1. Clazomenian fragment<sup>1</sup>.
2. Utrecht, bell-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.

Brommer included (1) among his representations of Cerberus but points out that while Schefold<sup>3</sup> so identifies it, R.M. Cook<sup>4</sup> mit Recht disagrees, regarding it as a youth holding a horse. A study of the fragment reveals a man, facing left and wearing headgear which could possibly be the lionskin, with sharp lines over the brow. Behind him is an animal with open mouth; his hand is very near its mouth, and this could indicate the presence of a rope. The nose seems rather small for a horse but the traces of a preliminary incised sketch of the head and reins of a horse seem to make Cook's identification certain.

In (2), Athena and Heracles, in lionskin and holding club, stand in front of a tree, on a branch of which sits a woman, below her is what looks like half the head of a dog, presumably meant to be looking out from behind a rock. Van Hoorn<sup>5</sup> feels this could be Cerberus whereas Beazley<sup>6</sup> says, "the dog is hardly Cerberus". I think that this picture may show a conflation of two labours, Cerberus and the Hesperides, the artist making a general allusion to them. It is noteworthy that these labours appear side by side at Olympia.

- 
1. Br. 96 bottom; Larissa III pl. 58, 1.
  2. G. Van Hoorn, 'Kynika' Robinson Studies II 106-10 pl. 35. See also page 72.
  3. See note 1.
  4. B.S.A. 47 (1952) 135 e, note 54, 1.
  5. See note 2.
  6. A.R.V. 2.1053, 42.

IV Scenes which are too fragmentary to classify

1. Salonika, amphora-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Basel, Cahn 317, belly-handled amphora-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Acropolis, plinth<sup>3</sup>.

(1) merely depicts Heracles and an animal mane on his inner side; this looks to me more like the Nemean lion.

(2) shows Heracles with sword or club raised in his left hand, looking to the left, and Hermes also looking left. They may well have originally been looking back at Cerberus, since Hermes often accompanies Heracles on this labour. (3) merely shows the feet of man and dog and there is nothing to indicate whether the man was Heracles and the dog Cerberus.

V Cerberus on his own

1. Market 1964, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
2. Policoro, fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.

These cannot be seen as having reference to Heracles, but are presumably the result of the artist's wish to draw Cerberus, an important mythical figure in his own right. In (2) he is standing at the gate of Hell.

VI Representations of Theseus and Pirithous in the Underworld

It is necessary to examine such scenes, since it has been noted that this legend became closely connected with the

- 
1. Br. 93 A 14ab; Olynthus XIII, ed. D.M. Robinson (Baltimore, 1950) 70, pl. 28, 4.
  2. Br. 92 A 12; Antike Kunst, Beiheft 7 pl. 27, 1.
  3. H. Payne & G.A. Young, Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis (1936) pl. 124, 4.
  4. Br. 95 A 17.
  5. Br. 95 A 19; R.M. Ergh. Heft 11, 135, pl. 17, 4.

Cerberus labour. The dispersal of representations is odd: there are three early ones, but no Attic examples until towards the middle of the fifth century; a few Apulian examples belong to the fourth century.

1. Olympia B 2198, shield-band<sup>1</sup>.
2. Louvre, G 341, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Berlin Inv 30035, lekythos, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. New York 08.258.21, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Boston 99.539, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Karlsruhe B 4, volute-krater, Apulian red-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Ruvo, Jatta 1094, volute-krater, Apulian red-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Karlsruhe B 1549, 1550, krater-fragments, South Italian<sup>8</sup>.

(1) is inscribed with the names of Theseus, Pirithous and Heracles. Theseus and Pirithous are shown on a single chair, with their arms stretched out imploringly. Heracles, naked, faces them, about to draw his sword. This is a novel idea in the rescue story, not mentioned in literature or depicted again in surviving art, presumably indicating that he is going to cut their bonds. This is certainly evidence for the original version making them confined by chairs.

- 
1. Kunze, op. cit. XXIX bis; Schefold, Myth and Legend in Early Greek Art 69, fig. 24.
  2. Br. 27 Blu and 491 B2, connected in each case with the Argonauts; E. Pfuhl, Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting (London, 1926) fig. 77; A.R.V. 2. 601, 22.
  3. Br. 220 B 1u; H. Schæl, Griechische Vasen (Teil II: rotfigurig), (Bielefeld & Leipzig, 1928) fig. 36. A.R.V. 2. 532, 57.
  4. Br. 221 B 4; A.R.V. 2. 1086, 1.
  5. Br. 221 B 3; A.R.V. 2. 1142, 1.
  6. Br. 221 D 1; C.V. 2 pl. 62.
  7. Br. 221 D 2; Sichtermann, op. cit. no. 36, pl. 52-4.
  8. Br. 221 D 3; C.V. 2 pl. 64, 7.

However, in the fifth century pieces, (2) to (4), the version depicted is that of Panyassis, where they are stuck to a rock; these vases are by the Niobid Painter, Alcimachos Painter and Painter of London E 105 respectively, and are not far apart chronologically. In (2) we apparently see a reclining figure with a pair of spears, sunhat, two curls and a sword; Pirithous sits on a rock, apparently looking gloomy because he knows he will not be rescued. Pollux, Castor, Athena and Heracles are also present. In (4) we see on the right-hand side Theseus with his sunhat trying to push himself up with his spears and right hand; he sits on a rock beside Pirithous, bearded and holding a spear. Heracles stands resting holding his limp bow in his right hand; Hermes and Meleager are also inscribed and this vase seems to give a comprehensive picture of Heracles' adventures in the Underworld. (3) shows Heracles trying to pull up a seated figure with spear, who closely resembles the figure I identify as Pirithous in the New York vase. If this is Pirithous, it could depict Heracles' unsuccessful attempt to free him, but Critias<sup>1</sup> stated that both were saved, and so the artist could have this version in mind; Beazley regards this figure as Theseus with a growth of beard.

In (5), the chair version appears, with both Theseus and Pirithous being guarded by Dike, a new feature; Heracles advances towards them stretching out his cloak. What significance the cloak had, if any, is not clear, but the lack of weapons probably suggests that he is going to try to pull them up.

---

1. A contemporary of the painters of these vases.

In (6) Theseus sits with a spear, while Heracles, talking to him, has one foot raised on a rock.

### CONCLUSION

The Cerberus labour is a very early one, being the only individual labour to be named in the Iliad and Odyssey; from the cursory reference to it there, it seems to have been very well known at that time and may well go back as far as the Mycenaean period. It is not possible to account for its relative lack of popularity, at least in early art. There are no certain representations before the sixth century and representations do not become common until the last quarter of the sixth century and the early part of the fifth, with capture scenes enjoying the longest tradition. In the middle of the fifth century the scheme of Pirithous and Theseus in the Underworld seems to have been the most popular composition for Heracles' underworld scenes and Cerberus is not drawn. Perhaps the interest in this story at this time was engendered by Panyassis' account of it.

As regards the representation of Cerberus, he is shown in Attic with two heads, with only one exception. It is in fact, not until the middle of the fifth century that the number of heads is standardised in literature as three. Earlier than this Cerberus is shown on the two Caeretan hydriae with three heads but this may well have been a token number to represent the fifty or one hundred he is credited with in literature, just as the two heads of Attic were probably a token figure adopted generally in that fabric.

Nowhere is Heracles shown harming Cerberus, and the version of Apollodorus, in which he captured him in a strangle-grip, is not rendered. There is no indication of whether

Heracles had to struggle for the dog or whether he was a gift from Persephone, who is often depicted, but her occasional gesture with arm raised could be interpreted as a sign for Heracles to leave Cerberus alone. The artists do not seem to have been much concerned over this point but prefer to show the moment before or the period after the capture. In one or two instances it seems that Heracles has not achieved the capture himself but that it has been engineered by Athena or Hermes. On one occasion Heracles seems to be shown using force against Hades and this may be an allusion to his wounding of Hades ἐν πύλῳ in the Iliad<sup>1</sup> which I have interpreted as the gate of the Underworld; this is apparently a reminiscence of the original idea of a violent Heracles.

As time passed, the Underworld adventure was expanded to include the rescue of Theseus, and sometimes Pirithous, which was an incident adding to his rôle as benefactor, and also the meeting with Meleager and Medea, the former possibly inspired by that of Odysseus in the Odyssey or of Theseus in the Hesiodic fragment. Late Attic red-figure vases reflect this expanded tradition in their general Underworld scenes, where Heracles is depicted with the various people he met down there.

Certainly the motif of descent to the Underworld was a popular one in ancient mythology: the descent of Ishtar in Akkadian myth may be compared and of Odysseus<sup>2</sup> and Aeneas in

---

1. See pages 237ff.

2. It should be noted, however, that Odysseus does not go right into the Underworld, since the souls came up to meet him.

Greek and Roman myth, the former apparently influencing the latter. Perhaps the Heracles descent was the original one in Greek mythology since the idea of fetching Cerberus seems a well-known story, even by the time of the Iliad, which is generally agreed to be earlier than the Odyssey. This descent as well as influencing other myths such as the descent of Odysseus could have been influenced itself by Eastern legend, as we have seen to be the case with various other labours. At any rate, descent to the Underworld, whenever it is undertaken, seems to be the ultimate in heroism. This labour was often regarded as the last, at least in later mythology, possibly because Heracles had, as it were, conquered death, and this provided a fitting end for the labours, after which he gained immortality<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. For a general discussion of the connection of the theme of immortality see M. Nilsson, The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology (Cambridge, 1932) 214f.

CHAPTER TEN      THE APPLES OF THE HESPERIDESA. LITERARY EVIDENCE

Pherecydes (F.G.H.  
3 F 16a & 17):

At the wedding of Hera, Earth gave her apple trees with golden apples. The nymphs at the Eridanus, daughters of Zeus and Themis, advised Heracles to ask Nereus from where he might obtain the golden apples. On the way to the Hesperides Heracles killed Antaeus<sup>1</sup> in Libya and Busiris in Egypt, and then crossed Ocean in the cup of the Sun<sup>2</sup>. He shot the eagle which was devouring Prometheus' liver and in return Prometheus advised him not to go after the apples himself, but to ask Atlas to fetch them, while he, Heracles, held up the heavens for him. Heracles told Atlas to fetch three apples, but afterwards Atlas said he would take them to Eurystheus himself; Prometheus was present and advised Heracles to ask Atlas to take the heavens back while he wrapped something round his head. This gave Heracles a chance to pick up the apples, which had been put down by Atlas while taking hold of the heavens, and he took them to Eurystheus.

1. See pages 264 & 295.

2. See pages 264 & 295.

- The apples were guarded by a snake, son of Typhon and Echidna, which had one hundred heads and various voices.
- (F.G.H 16b): Hera's gardens extended as far as Mount Atlas and because the daughters of Atlas kept picking the golden apples she set the snake Ladon to guard them.
- Panyassis (F. 10 K): Heracles came to the Hesperides on the command of Eurystheus and killed ab ictu the snake of Hera, which guarded them.
- Sophocles (Tr. 1099f.): One of the labours was the snake that guarded the golden apples of the Hesperides.
- Euripides<sup>1</sup> (H.F. 394ff.): Heracles killed the snake which coiled round the tree of the Hesperides. This is given sixth among the μύθοι.
- (H.F. 403ff.): Given eighth among the μύθοι is the holding up of the heavens for Atlas.
- Agroetas (Schol. Ap. Rh. 4. 1396-9b): It was not apples but very beautiful sheep which were called golden, and these had a wild shepherd, who was called a snake because of his savagery<sup>2</sup>.

---

1. As Matthews points out (op. cit. 83) Euripides may have been influenced by Panyassis since some of his language is similar to Avienus' translation of Panyassis eg, 'Hesperidum ... locos': 'Ἐσπερίαν ἐς ἀβάν'.

2. This is likely to be a fourth century story and can be compared with the story of Minos having an adviser called Tauros which resulted in the myth of the Minotaur according to Philochorus (F.G.H. 328 F 17) and one may compare the versions of Clidemus (F.G.H. 323 F 17) and Demon (F.G.H. 327 F 5) which appear in Plutarch (Thes. XIX): in the same work (XXXI 4) Plutarch also tells how Pluto, Core and Cerberus were rationalised.

Apollonius Rhodius (4. 1400): The Argonauts came to the grove where Ladon kept watch over the golden apples in the Garden of Atlas. The snake had been severely wounded by Heracles and only the tip of its tail was still moving. The wound had been made by Heracles' arrows, soaked in hydra's blood.

(4. 1432ff.): Aegle tells the Argonauts how Heracles came and killed the snake and took the golden apples. She says he killed Ladon with his bow, his eyes "flashing beneath scowling brow."

Diodorus Siculus (IV 26,2-4): The last labour was to bring back the apples of the Hesperides and so Heracles sailed again for Libya. Diodorus reports the variant tradition of the μῆλα<sup>1</sup> being sheep, guarded by a shepherd called Dracon. Heracles killed their guardian and took them to Eurystheus and then waited for the immortality Apollo had prophesied.

(IV 27, 3-5): Atlas married his niece, Hesperis, and had seven daughters, the Atlantides, whom Busiris, king of Egypt, desired and he set pirates to

---

1. The same Greek word is used for both.

fetch them. Heracles came upon them by chance and killed the pirates, giving the girls back to Atlas, who was so grateful that he helped him in his last labour and taught him astronomy. During his last labour Heracles also killed Antaeus, Busiris, and Emathion.

Apollodorus (II v 11): It was the eleventh labour to fetch the golden apples from the Hesperides; the apples were not in Libya, as some say, but on Mt. Atlas among the Hyperboreans. Apollodorus now gives the version of the story attributed to Pherecydes; however, he adds that some say Heracles did not get the apples from Atlas but picked them himself, killing the snake. He took the apples to Eurystheus who gave them back to him; Athena took them and returned them to the Hesperides, since it was not lawful to put them down anywhere.

Hyginus (Fab. XXX 12): In the eleventh labour Heracles killed at Mt. Atlas the huge snake, son of Typhon, which guarded the golden apples of the Hesperides and took them to Eurystheus.

(Astron. II xv): Heracles was directed to the Hesperides by Prometheus.

It appears that there were also satyr plays concerned with this myth, and this is supported by the artistic evidence<sup>1</sup>. It is the Atlas version of the myth that so appears, no doubt because it offered scope for lampoon. A recently discovered papyrus<sup>2</sup> contains a dialogue between Heracles and Atlas, in which Heracles is trying to persuade the other to resume his burden of the heavens; the language is rather colloquial. Of course, it is by no means certain that this represents part of a satyr play but it is a possibility. The care in copying displayed by the papyrus suggests the author to have been important and the fifth century may be suggested as the time of writing as being the time when Attic drama flourished. Apart from this papyrus a satyr play of c. 250 may be preserved in the didascalialia<sup>3</sup> between the lists of comedy and tragedy.

Although the earliest certain reference to the myth of Heracles and the Hesperides occurs in Pherecydes it is possible that it was also treated by Hesiod. It is at least certain that Hesiod<sup>4</sup> connects Atlas and the Hesperides, talking of Atlas "holding up the heavens on his head and arms, standing at the borders of the earth, near the Hesperides, since this lot was assigned to him by Zeus." It is possible, as West<sup>5</sup> points out, that a line naming Heracles was originally

---

1. See page 281f.

2. Bibliotheca Bodmeriana 1974.

3. See A. Körte, 'Bruchstücke einer Didaskalischen Inschrift', Hermes 73 (1938) 123 ff.

4. Th. 517ff. & 746ff.

5. Hesiod, Theogony 228-9, note on v. 216.

inserted but has been lost, but there are other references by Hesiod to the Hesperides and apples in which there is still no mention of Heracles<sup>1</sup>. There seems no good reason why the Hesperides legend should not have been originally independent of Heracles, connected with Atlas from the point of view of locality. Apart from Hesiod, Pisander may have treated this myth, presumably including the Heracles element since he mentioned the killing of Antaeus<sup>2</sup>. There seems originally to have been contamination between the Geryon and Hesperides labours, with Antaeus being connected with both<sup>3</sup>. Apart from Antaeus, Pisander seems to have mentioned Clymene<sup>4</sup>, the mother of Atlas, and also to have talked of Heracles travelling in the cup of the sun<sup>5</sup>, which is connected with both Geryon and Hesperides<sup>6</sup>. If he did treat in any detail the Hesperides labour, it is possible that he used the Atlas version because of his reference to Clymene, but it is also possible that he mentioned Atlas to mark locality and not as a participator in this myth.

From the literary evidence it can be clearly seen that this myth has two different versions: most common is that in which Heracles fetched the apples of the Hesperides himself, killing the snake which guarded them; such is the version

1. Th. 215ff., 334f.

2. F 6 K.

3. See page 295 for a fuller account.

4. See G. Lippold, 'Mythographisches', Philologus 68 (1909) 152-4.

5. F 5 K.

6. See page 295.

recorded by Panyassis, Sophocles, Euripides, Apollonius Rhodius, and Hyginus, and is one version mentioned by Diodorus. In Pherecydes and Apollodorus, on the other hand, there appears the story that, on the advice of Prometheus, Heracles persuaded Atlas to fetch the apples, while he held up the heavens in his stead. It appears that Apollodorus has taken his version from Pherecydes and this leaves a rather thin tradition, which is suggestive of a variant rather than of the main line of the story; the suggestion that Pisander recorded the Atlas version is far too tentative to alter this picture.

I am inclined to believe that Atlas' original part in the story was simply one of locality, as seems clear from the reference in Theogony 517ff.<sup>1</sup> This locality was somewhere in the West, but fixed by Herodotus<sup>2</sup> as North West Africa. It is interesting, however, that Apollodorus places Atlas in the land of the Hyperboreans in the North, thus varying in locality as well from the other sources. Apollodorus says that Heracles had picked a branch of olive before freeing Prometheus and this fits in well with the account of Pindar<sup>3</sup> of his journey to the North to fetch an olive branch for the Olympic Games, as Matthews<sup>4</sup> points out. Even after Atlas had been given an active rôle in the Hesperides labour, writers often still merely referred to him to mark the locality of the Hesperides; Euripides in the Hippolytus<sup>5</sup> says the apples were near Atlas and Apollonius says they were in the garden of Atlas. In Euripides' Heracles,

---

1. See page 263 & note (4).

2. 4. 184, 3-4.

3. O. III. 11ff. See page 151.

4. op. cit. 83f.

5. 742ff.

the killing of the Hesperides snake and the holding up of the heavens by Heracles are given as separate  $\mu\delta\chi\theta\omicron\iota$ , in sixth and eighth place respectively. This may have been an attempt to remove the confusion caused by the two different versions of Heracles fetching the apples himself and holding up the heavens while Atlas fetched them. It is possible, on the other hand, that the Atlas story was originally a separate myth, simply involving the tricking of Heracles to hold up the heavens, or else was a show of strength on his part, and that this was afterwards joined onto the Hesperides labour because of the similarity of locality.

It is interesting that Pherecydes is said to have mentioned the snake, even though recording the Atlas version, although he need not have given it the name Ladon. It is not stated whether in Pherecydes' account Atlas had any dealings with the snake, but there seems every indication that it was a traditional occupant of the garden which could not be left out of the story, and this idea seems supported by the fact that Hesiod<sup>1</sup> mentions the snake. Certainly the snake motif is popular in the Heracles legend since he combats snakes on three occasions, in his cradle<sup>2</sup>, at Lerna<sup>3</sup> and in the garden of the Hesperides. The snake, being such a dangerous creature, provided a good opportunity for showing Heracles' heroism and also could be a symbol of the malevolence of Hera, since all three were sent by her.

---

1. Th. 334f.

2. See for example Pindar, N. 1. 33ff.

3. See chapter 3.

As regards the way in which Heracles killed the Hesperides snake, only one weapon is specifically mentioned in literature, namely the bow, with arrows tinged with hydra's blood. It is possible, however, that Panyassis mentioned a weapon, taken up by Avienus in his words ab ictu, suggesting the sword or club<sup>1</sup>. There is no certain evidence that the snake was named before Apollonius Rhodius.

This myth does not seem to have been regarded as a labour before the time of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, at a time when the Geryon and Hesperides myths seem separate<sup>2</sup>. After this it is mentioned as a labour by Panyassis, Sophocles and Euripides. Diodorus and Apollodorus are obviously following different traditions, since the latter makes it the eleventh labour and the former the twelfth. It is possible that Pherecydes, apparently Apollodorus' source, also made it the eleventh labour.

#### B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

The artistic evidence for this labour is not voluminous, perhaps because the myth was earlier eclipsed by the Geryon story to which it seems to have been joined, and perhaps the snake aspect of the myth was eclipsed, at least in art, by the early and artistically more interesting hydra. A number of different types of composition are in evidence but I shall divide my material broadly into two groups according to whether Heracles has gone to the Hesperides himself or has sent Atlas, further subdividing these groups to include all variations of composition.

---

1. cf. Matthews, *op. cit.* 82 and note 84.

2. The apparent early connection of these two myths will be dealt with in greater detail in the chapter on Geryon. See page 295.

I HERACLES FETCHES THE APPLES HIMSELF

This general division contains a far greater number of representations than the second but the version of Heracles actually killing or about to kill the snake occurs surprisingly seldom in view of the weight of literary evidence for it.

a) Heracles and the snake

This group can be further subdivided according to whether Heracles is actually attacking the creature, not in combat with it, or whether the identification of this snake, as opposed to the hydra, is not entirely certain.

a)i. Heracles attacks the snake.

1. Gela, Navarro 125, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Private collection, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Berlin F 2283, relief column-krater, Hellenistic<sup>3</sup>.
4. Munich Inv 7583, clay dish, Roman<sup>4</sup>.
5. Sommière, relief-bowl, Romano-Gallic<sup>5</sup>.
6. Madrid Museum, from Liria, mosaic.<sup>6</sup>

It can be seen that this version is not depicted in surviving art until the early part of the fifth century<sup>7</sup>, when it is confined to two examples, not appearing again until the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Certainly this is odd, considering the popularity of this version in literature, although it is true that it does not begin in literature until even later.

- 
1. Br. 71 A 1; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 107, fig. 1; A.B.V. 476.
  2. Br. 71 A 5; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 110-11, figs. 4-6; A.B.V. 499,34.
  3. Furtwängler, op. cit. pl. 74, 3.
  4. Br. 74 E 3; Münchner Jahrbuch 6 (1926) 90-1, fig. 27.
  5. Br. 74 E 7; Déchelette, op. cit. 78, no. 468.
  6. Brommer, Her. pl. 31.
  7. See page 271f for possible earlier pieces.

In (1) the snake, wound round the tree, has actually been decapitated, although it is not clear which weapon Heracles used for this feat: his sword is at his waist and his club lies on the ground. In all the other examples the snake is still in one piece and Heracles brandishes his club at it. This may well reflect a similar tradition to that perhaps recorded by Panyassis, whom the private lekythos (2) antedates, since "ab ictu"<sup>1</sup> might well refer to the blow of a club. This then might have been the original version of how the snake was killed, with that of the bow, as recorded by Apollonius, a later tradition.

a) ii. Heracles neither fights nor threatens the snake.

1. Paris, Cab. Méd., from Cyrene, coin<sup>2</sup>.
2. Berlin 3261, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. London BM 544, mirror, Etruscan<sup>4</sup>.
4. London BM, from Phaestus, coin<sup>5</sup>.
5. Naples H2852 (82294) hydria, Campanian<sup>6</sup>.
6. Rome, Vatican, Mus. Greg. Etr. 15589, bottle, Etruscan<sup>7</sup>.
7. Saint Germain 32762, Romano-Gallic<sup>8</sup>.
8. Vienna Mus. Romano-Gallic<sup>9</sup>.
9. From Vienna, relief applique fragment, Romano-Gallic<sup>10</sup>.
10. London, BM, sarcophagus, Roman<sup>11</sup>.
11. Coin of Antoninus, Roman<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. See page 267.
  2. Jd.I. 57 (1942) 121, fig. 13.
  3. Br. 71 A 3; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 109, fig. 2; A.B.V. 472.
  4. J.H.S. 69 (1949) 4f., fig. 2.
  5. B.M.C. 9, 62 no. 8, pl. 15. 4.
  6. Br. 73 D 3; L.C.S. 429 no. 487.
  7. Br. 74 E 4; Jd.I. Ergh. 12 (1930) 25, figs. 17-18.
  8. Br. 74 E 6; Déchelette, op. cit. 78, no. 469a.
  9. Br. 74 E 8; Déchelette, loc. cit. no. 469.
  10. Br. 74 E 9; Déchelette op. cit. 266, no. 56.
  11. B.C.H. 74 (1950) 224-32, fig. 2.
  12. Ibid. fig. 3.

The earliest piece in this group dates c. 540 BC and shows a Hesperid diverting the snake, while Heracles rests on his club, and in theme is rather similar to (5). This is interesting as denoting the non-hostility of the Hesperides to Heracles, to the extent of actually helping him in his labour, and in this first section of representations I shall list a subdivision where they actually pick the apples for him; in fact, in extant literature there is no tradition of the Hesperides opposing him.

(2), which dates to the first quarter of the fifth century, shows Heracles apparently running away from the snake. His hand is cupped but I cannot see any apples; it may be that he is thought of as holding them, in which case he has picked them without having to fight the snake. On the other hand, if he is not meant to be carrying apples he is perhaps meant merely to be backing away at the first shock of seeing the snake, which is made more ferocious by reason of having two heads. Perhaps the number of heads represents a slight confusion with the hydra although this is usually given far more than two. It is said that Pherecydes<sup>1</sup> gave this snake a hundred heads, although perhaps either Pherecydes was confusing the two snakes or the scholiast to Apollonius, in which this is recorded, misunderstood Pherecydes. (3), in fact, gives the snake three heads, and Heracles is shown walking away from tree and snake with apples in his hand, preceded by Athena, perhaps indicating that apples were meant to be in his hand in (2).

The coin from Phaestus displays a rather stylised composition with the snake on the left, the tree on the right,

---

1. F.G.H. 3 F 16b.

and Heracles in the middle. This seems merely an allusion to the myth with no attempt at detail. This dates fifth/fourth century BC. The other pieces are all late and show Heracles picking the apples without resistance from the snake, which is wound round the tree, except (10), in which he faces the tree and the snake may be thought of as biting him.

It seems, therefore, that there was a tradition in which Heracles did not have to fight the snake in order to fetch the apples, either because it was diverted by a Hesperid or because it did not attack him for some reason. The fact that this occurs in a number of fabrics suggests that this may reflect an actual tradition rather than merely be the inaccurate rendering of one group of artists.

At any rate, the tradition of Heracles gathering the apples himself can now be dated to c. 540. It is just possible that it can be dated even earlier from a fragment by Kleitias<sup>1</sup> in the Agora. There is no picture available but it is described as follows by De Coursey Fales Jnr.:<sup>2</sup> "... a skirt and the legs of two men are immediately recognisable. The person in the middle is Heracles. There is reason to believe that he is in the moment of triumph with Ladon". However, as he does not give a reason for this belief, it is impossible to evaluate his identification and it must remain a very remote possibility that Heracles and the Hesperides snake were represented c. 570 BC, an earlier date than is otherwise certainly known for the existence of this version.

---

1. A.P. 840.

2. 'An Unpublished Fragment attributed to Kleitias', A.J.A. 67 (1963) 211.

a) iii Identity of the snake not completely certain

Certainly confusion can arise between the hydra and Ladon in the minds of artists and several scenes apparently showing the hydra wound round a tree have already been examined<sup>1</sup>. I do not propose to list again the other pieces which depict a one-headed snake with no tree positively to identify it as Ladon, since I have listed them all in dealing with the hydra<sup>2</sup>. However, I wish to make the point that they are likely to be representations of the Hesperides snake because of the single head. This is very interesting since the earliest of these pieces, a fragmentary Corinthian pinax<sup>3</sup>, dates to the beginning of the sixth century. A man brandishes a weapon at the snake, which is wound over his left arm; he wears bow, quiver and sword and so, if the figure is Heracles, the weapon brandished seems to have been the club, thus making this piece similar to those of a)i, where he used his club against the snake<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, the version of Heracles fighting the snake for possession of the apples may tentatively be dated to the beginning of the sixth century with the caveat that there is a possibility that the snake here is the hydra rather than Ladon, or the man is not Heracles.

b) Heracles attacks the Hesperides.

There is only one piece in this group but it certainly represents a variant tradition to those vases in a)ii<sup>5</sup> which showed the Hesperides helping Heracles in his labour.

- 
1. See page 90, no.6 & 94, no.4.
  2. See pages 95ff.
  3. A.J.A. 35 (1931) 22, fig. 22.
  4. See page 268f.
  5. See also Group d page 274f.

1. Once Basel market, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.

The Hesperides hold out their hands, apparently in complaint, and Heracles brandishes his club at them. This scene perhaps comes closest to the account of Apollonius, in which the Hesperides are said to weep for Ladon and so presumably are hostile to Heracles. Certainly in group a)i no Hesperides are present when Heracles fights the snake, and so their reaction cannot be seen. It must also be said, however, that this vase may be badly drawn and the artist may have intended Heracles to be brandishing his club at the snake, which is wound round the tree, especially as it is nowhere recorded that Heracles fought the Hesperides to obtain the apples; however, it could also represent the individual interpretation of this artist, if Heracles is intended to be menacing the Hesperides.

c. Heracles and the apple-tree

1. Berlin 8414, bronze sheet, Corinthian inspired<sup>2</sup>.
2. Delphi, theatre, frieze<sup>3</sup>.
3. Corinth CP 1638, relief bowl-fragment, Roman<sup>4</sup>.
4. Saint Germain 31690, relief vessel, Romano-Gallic<sup>5</sup>.

- 
1. Munich Sale Catalogue, Münzen et Médailles S.A. Basel, 9-20 Oct. 1970 at Kunstmuseum, Berne, side 5, lower plate.
  2. N.C. 130; A.A. (1894) 117f., fig. 12.
  3. B.C.H. 74 (1950) 224-32 + pl. 34.
  4. Br. 74 E 1; Hesperia 11 (1942) 169, no. I. 3, figs. 5-6f.
  5. Br. 74 E 5; Déchelette, op. cit. 265, no. 65.

These pieces probably make general allusion to this myth rather than represent any particular detail, although it is clear that Atlas is not involved. The bronze sheet (1) may be archaic and is certainly so in style. Heracles holds his club but certainly no snake is visible. The frieze (2) dates to c. 159 BC and here Heracles, as restored, actually reaches into the tree for an apple. The other two pieces merely show Heracles beside the tree; in (3) he brandishes his club and extends his bow and it therefore seems likely that the snake was originally shown.

d) The Hesperides pick the apples for Heracles.

This group certainly depicts a version in which Heracles was helped positively in this labour by the Hesperides. As to whether this was a version found in literature/<sup>it</sup>is perhaps doubtful since it is mainly confined to South Italian vases, and could perhaps represent a popular artistic version of the myth in this period.

1. Nauplia, white-ground alabastron, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM E 224, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Paris, Petit Palais 327, kalyx-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Amsterdam (1426) 3505, pelike, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. New Haven 138, pelike, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Naples H 2873 (81847), lekythos, South Italian<sup>6</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 72 B 2; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 114-15, figs. 810.
  2. Br. 72 B 5; C.V. 6 pl. III Ic 91, 1a; A.R.V. 2. 1313, 5.
  3. Br. 72 B 14; U.K.V. fig. 73; A.R.V. 2. 1457, 8.
  4. Br. 72 B 15; H. Metzger, Les Représentations dans la Céramique attique du VI siècle (Paris, 1951) 203 no. 22.
  5. Br. 72 B 16; P.V.C. Baur, Catalogue of the Rebecca Darlington Stoddard Collection of Greek and Italian Vases in Yale University (New Haven, Connecticut, 1922) pl. 9, fig. 26.
  6. Br. 73 D 4; A.D. Trendall. Paestan Pottery, pl. 4 no. 52.

7. Naples H2885 (8\_1865) kalyx-krater, Apulian<sup>1</sup>.
8. Naples H2893, lekythos, South Italian<sup>2</sup>.
9. Turin,(?) pelike, South Italian<sup>3</sup>.
10. Athens NM 12618, Megarian bowl<sup>4</sup>.

In all of these pieces Heracles is inactive, generally sitting by the tree or resting on his club. It is interesting that all the South Italian examples show one Hesperid diverting the snake with a phiale, while another picks the fruit. This seems a particularly South Italian motif and is found with variation on the Campanian piece of group a)ii, where Heracles picks the apples<sup>5</sup>. The relief bowl, (10), may display an interesting variant, since a Hesperid grasps the neck of the snake while she holds towards Heracles an apple branch in her other hand. The idea of holding the snake back is unique and it may be that the idea of a single Hesperid holding out an apple branch indicates love for Heracles, since in antiquity an apple was considered a lover's gift<sup>6</sup>. However, such an interpretation may well read too much into the scene.

e) Quiet scenes in the garden of the Hesperides.

This group contains quiet scenes, in which many people, including Heracles, sit in the garden of the Hesperides,

---

1. Br. 73 D 5; E. Gerhard, Gesammelte akademische Abhandlungen und kleine Schriften I (Berlin, 1866-8) 63, no 1 & pl. 20, 3.

2. Br. 73 D 6; Gerhard, op. cit. 227, no. 2 & pl. 20, 1.

3. Br. 73 D 9; Gerhard, op. cit. 64, no. 2.

4. Br. 74 E 12; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 67, 2.

5. See pages 269, no.5 & 270

6. See J. Conington, P. Vergili Maronis, Opera (London, 1881) vol. 1, note on Eclogue III 64 and references there cited.

designated by tree and serpent in the centre. Leisurely inactivity is the mood, and the artists seem merely to wish to allude to the myth. It is noteworthy that they are all Attic red-figure and date to c. 450 BC and so are the product of one particular group of artists. However it can be said that these vases allude to the version in which Heracles rather than Atlas went for the apples.

1. New York 08.258.20, pelike, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM B 227, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. New York 24.97.5, hydria, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. London BM, krater, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Lost, pelike, Lucanian<sup>5</sup>.

## II ATLAS FETCHED THE APPLES FOR HERACLES

There are not many representations which depict Atlas actually fetching the apples while Heracles holds up the heavens, but others seem to allude to this version by showing Atlas holding up the heavens with the apples in his hands. Others (II b) may well depict Atlas simply because he belongs to the same locality and a further group (II d) treat this version in satyric manner.

### a) Atlas fetched the apples

1. Chest of Cypselus<sup>6</sup>.
2. Athens NM 1132 (CC 957), lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

---

1. Br. 72 B 11; Metzger, op. cit. 202, 17 & pl. XXVII. 2.; A.R.V. 2. 1472, lu.

2. Br. 72 B 12; K. Schefold, Kertsche Vasen (Berlin, 1930) pl. 7.

3. Br. 72 B 13; Richter & Hall, op. cit. pl. 166;

4. J.H.S. 41 (1921) pl. VII v. 3.

5. Br. 73 D 18; A.J.A. 43 (1939) 634, fig. 11; L.C.S. 172, no. 986.

6. Paus. V 18.4.

7. Br. 71 A 4; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 105-23, fig. 3; A.B.V. 522, 50.

3. Olympia, metope<sup>1</sup>.
4. Olympia, throne of Zeus<sup>2</sup>.
5. Vatican, mirror, Etruscan<sup>3</sup>.
6. Boston N 98736, scarabaus, Etruscan<sup>4</sup>.
7. Boston N 27724, scarabaus, Etruscan<sup>5</sup>.

For (1), only the testimony of Pausanias is available; he tells how Atlas holds up heaven and earth on his shoulders and carries the apples of the Hesperides. As restored, Heracles approaches Atlas. It is just possible that Atlas is only depicted here with the apples as belonging to the same locality, but it is perhaps more likely that the myth of him fetching the apples is implied, even though strictly he should have put down the apples before taking up the heavens. Artists often give strange conflations of events in myths, giving as many aspects and attributes as they can in a single scene to identify their subject-matter. Atlas may here be made to hold the heavens simply to identify him. If this piece does depict the version of Atlas fetching the apples for Heracles, it is the oldest evidence available for it, belonging at least to roughly 570 BC.

In the other pieces in this group, apart from (4), Heracles is holding up the heavens. In (2) he bends under their weight, while Atlas runs towards him, holding out four apples in his hands. This vase dates to the early fifth century.

---

1. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pll. 186-93.

2. Paus. V 11.5.

3. J.H.S. 69 (1949) 3f. & pl. IIIb.

4. St. Etr. 10. (1936) 399-405.

5. Ibid.

The Olympia metope (3) shows Athena helping Heracles to bear the weight. She stands upright and only uses one hand, showing no sign of strain, and thus demonstrates that what is hard for a mortal is easy for a goddess. It should be observed that Pausanias<sup>1</sup> described the scene as: "Heracles on the point of taking over Atlas' burden", but there can be little doubt that the figure holding up the heavens is Heracles or else Athena's help would not make sense. Moreover, he has a cushion on his head: Pindar<sup>2</sup> describes his small stature, and a protection for his head is mentioned in connection with this labour by Pherecydes<sup>3</sup>, ~~although~~ albeit not used while he is actually holding the heavens. His obvious strain is also suitable to one not accustomed to the task. Atlas faces him with arms outstretched: he presumably once held out the apples, perhaps worked in bronze. Athena is not mentioned in the literary accounts of this labour but she is often shown at Olympia in her rôle of Heracles' helper.

The appearance of this version at Olympia perhaps suggests it to be the Peloponnesian version, even though it is first certainly recorded in literature by the Athenian Pherecydes<sup>4</sup>. It is noteworthy that this version also appears on the bars of the throne of Zeus at Olympia (4). Again, the only evidence is Pausanias, who says that Atlas was shown holding up the heavens with Heracles close, ready to take them over. However, it must be conceded that Pausanias may have read too much into this picture and Heracles merely have come into contact

---

1. V 10. 9.

2. I. III/V 71.

3. See page 259.

4. It is possible that Pisander told this story. See page 264.

with Atlas as situated in the locality of the Hesperides. In (5) Atlas has presumably taken back the heavens: Heracles leaves him, holding the apples.

(6) is interesting as showing the (2-headed) snake, even though Atlas picks the apples from the tree; this supports the theory that this was a traditional occupant of the garden and, as has been said, Pherecydes seems to have mentioned it, even though following the Atlas version of the myth<sup>1</sup>. Heracles, identified by club and lionskin, holds up the heavens. This scarab dates just after the middle of the fifth century BC. The other gem (7) merely shows Heracles holding up the universe, identified by the inscription "hercle". Perhaps also in this group should be placed the throne of Bathycles, although it is very difficult here to determine whether Atlas was merely marking locality or took part in the story; Pausanias<sup>2</sup> names Atlas along with other exploits of Heracles on the throne.

b) Atlas present simply to mark locality?

As suggested by the title of this group, I feel that Atlas may well be present in these scenes simply as being a figure traditionally situated near the garden of the Hesperides, although this may be partly influenced by the myth of his participation in this story.

1. Olympia, group of Theocles<sup>3</sup>.
2. Berlin F 3245, fragment, Apulian<sup>4</sup>.
3. London BM F 148, amphora, Campanian<sup>5</sup>.

---

1. See page 266.

2. Paus. III 18. 10.

3. Paus. VI 19. 8.

4. Br. 73 D 1; Gerhard, op. cit. pl. 19; E.V.P. 43.

5. Br. 73 D 2; Gerhard, op. cit. pl. 20 4, 5, & 6; L.C.S. 667, no. 1.

4. Naples H 3255, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>1</sup>.

(1) is again only known from Pausanias, who says that, "Theocles, son of Hegylus made in silver at Olympia Atlas holding up the universe and Heracles and the apple tree of the Hesperides with the wound snake round it." The other works in this group are all South Italian vases. (2) is rather odd: in one zone are depicted Silene, Atlas sitting on a throne, Heracles resting on his club, and Hermes, all inscribed, and also a woman whose inscription is lost. In the lower zone, the snake is seen around the tree, before which one Hesperid holds a bowl while another sits with a lyre. Presumably the two zones are connected but the precise significance of the upper one is not clear. Possibly it may be the artist's interpretation of Heracles led by Hermes to a meeting with Atlas to persuade him to help in his labour; the presence of Silene would be justified since Atlas traditionally held up the heavens and Silene, the goddess of the moon, could be thought of as connected with them.

(3) is again odd. On one side is a small tree with a few apples and round the bottom is a tightly-coiled serpent with two fierce heads. A tightly-draped woman and naked man stand on either side of the tree, each stretching a hand towards one head of the snake. It is not even certain whether the man is Heracles. On the other side of the vase, a naked Atlas, with bull's head, holds up the universe. Next to him stands a draped man; his identify is not certain but his square hat could make him an astronomer<sup>2</sup>.

---

1. Br. 73 D 7; Gerhard, op. cit. pl. 2; E.V.P. 84.

2. See Diod. IV 27, 3-5 (page 261f.)

(4) could easily be placed among the quiet scenes in the garden of the Hesperides<sup>1</sup>. The scene is full of people at different levels, engaged in conversation one with another; Atlas is placed at the top of the scene and Heracles points towards him.

c) Scene where it is not clear whether Heracles or Atlas is present.

1. Berlin F 3196, lebes gamikos, South Italian<sup>2</sup>.

This is, in any case, an odd scene and appears to be a variation of the quiet scenes in the garden. On the right is the tree, with apples at the top but no snake. Two Hesperides rest on the tree and gossip; one holds a spear, and the artist is perhaps confused between Hesperides and Amazons. On the left stands a male with crossed straps over his chest, which presumably supported a quiver. In his left hand he holds a bowl, perhaps to receive the apples, and in his right presumably an apple branch. This figure is bearded but there seems nothing to identify him as either Heracles or Atlas, and indeed it may be neither.

d) Satyric scenes.

It has been stated already that there is evidence that the Heracles/Atlas theme formed the subject of satyr plays<sup>3</sup> and there are a number of artistic representations which confirm this, beginning in the early part of the fifth century BC.

---

1. See page 275f.

2. Br. 73 D 13; Gerhard, op. cit. pl. 21, 5; L.C.S. 72, no 366 & pl. 33, 9.

3. See page 263.

1. New York 22.139.73, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM E 539, oinochoe, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Leningrad St.1788, pelike, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Adria BC 2, cup-fragment, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Milan, Moretti collection, krater, Apulian<sup>5</sup>.

(1) shows a satyr sitting up in the tree with the snake and there is also an odd creature present. On (2) a satyr fights a snake on a tree which grows wine-jars and (3) shows the Hesperides picking apples for Dionysus, designated by his thyrsus and the presence of two satyrs. In (4) a satyr apparently holds an apple in his hand. (5) shows Heracles, sad and dejected, holding up the heavens in the presence of two satyrs holding his quiver and club.

In fact, only the last piece suggests connection with Atlas, but, since this version provides more scope for a satyr play than the other, it is likely that the other pieces merely allude to the satyric overtones without including the detail of Atlas.

\*\*\*\*\*

I shall now turn to representations which cannot be classified under the broad division of Heracles going to the Hesperides himself or sending Atlas in his stead.

- 
1. A.B.V. 502, 2.
  2. Br. 72 B 4; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 113, fig. 11; A.R.V. 2.776, 2 & 1669.
  3. Br. 72 B 17; Metzger op. cit. 204, no. 24 & pl. 14, 4.
  4. Br. 72 bottom; C.V. 1 pl. III.1.7, 1; A.R.V. 2. 857, 3.
  5. Br. 73 D 15; A.D. Trendall, Phylax (B.I.C.S. suppl. 8) 29, no. 42 & pl. II.

(i) Heracles with the apples, but the circumstances of their picking unknown.

1. Rome Vatican, Guglielmi, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Berlin F2271, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Athens, Hephaesteum, metope<sup>3</sup>.
4. Naples, Museo Nazionale, Farnese Heracles<sup>4</sup>.

Heracles is shown with the apples in these representations, but it is not possible to know whether he went himself to pick them or took them from Atlas. In the first two pieces, both of which belong to the end of the sixth century, Heracles runs with the apples, in (1) on stony ground, in (2) over undesignated countryside. Heracles could equally well be running back to Mycenae from the Hesperides or from Atlas.

As restored, the metope, (3), shows Heracles holding the apples towards a Hesperid, or perhaps taking them from her. However, I see no reason why the female has been restored as a Hesperid rather than Athena, since in the Olympia metope depicting this labour Athena is dressed in a peplos and given no attributes. Moreover, Apollodorus states that Heracles gave the apples to Eurystheus who gave them back to him and after this Athena took them back to the Hesperides. This well suits the gesture here, which seems to be one of giving on the part of Heracles, and which does not make much sense if directed at a Hesperid.

- 
1. Br. 71 A 6; Beazley, Development of Attic Black-figure, (Berkeley, California 1951) 86.
  2. Br. 72 B 9; Beazley, loc. cit. note; A.R.V. 2. 111 m.
  3. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI x.
  4. M. Collignon, Lysippe (Paris, 1905) fig. 18.

The Farnese Heracles by Lysippus probably merely alludes to the Hesperides labour without hinting at any particular version; Heracles holds apples in one hand.

(ii) Scenes of the Hesperides without Heracles.

1. Skyphos fragments, Corinthian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Lausanne, from Greece, lekythos, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Catania 768, pelike, South Italian<sup>3</sup>.
4. Ruvo, Jatta 1097, volute-krater, South Italian<sup>4</sup>.
5. Paris market, hydria, Campanian<sup>5</sup>.

(i) is very fragmentary and it is conceivable that Heracles was originally depicted; this would then be the earliest representation of this myth, belonging to the middle of the seventh century. However, the presence of Heracles is by no means certain and, in fact, it is not completely certain that this vase even depicts the Hesperides tree. A tree is visible with large round fruit on it; to the left the hand of a woman, drawn in outline, may stretch towards it.

(2) does not seem to allude to Heracles at all but to an unknown incident, since a centaur approaches the Hesperides. The other three pieces show just the Hesperides in their garden and there is nothing to allude to Heracles, unless their very presence was meant to call him to mind

(iii) Anomalies

This group consists of odd representations which have

- 
1. Br. 73 C 1; Megara Hyblaea 2 pl. 22.
  2. Br. 72 bottom; A.R.V. 2. 1317m.
  3. Br. 73 D 10; Gerhard, op. cit. 67, no. 6.
  4. Br. 73 D 8; Sichtermann, op. cit. no. 72, pll. 119-122.
  5. Br. 73 D 17; Gerhard op. cit. 65, no. 4; L.C.S. 381, no. 139 & pl. 147, 1.

some connection with the Hesperides.

1. Boulogne 406, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Boulogne 421, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Naples (ex Spinelli 692), oinochoe, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Louvre MN 734, pelike, Attic red-figure<sup>4</sup>.

(1) depicts Heracles attacking a snake that guards a fountain. This may well have nothing at all to do with the Hesperides snake but may be an odd reference to the hydra at the spring of Lerna, despite the single head.

(2) appears to show a conflation between the Hesperides myth and that of the Cerynitian hind, and has been mentioned in connection with that labour<sup>5</sup>. A stag stands in front of the apple tree and also two woman, presumably Hesperides, who hold out their hands, apparently as a sign of protection to the animal. This may show some sort of link between the two labours because of the connection between the Hesperides and the land of the Hyperboreans, which appears in Pherecydes, and

Heracles' chasing of the hind in this locality, which appears in Pindar<sup>6</sup>.

(3) shows Heracles with an old man and a woman, who, because she offers him a sprig, may be a Hesperid. (4) shows Heracles drinking with a woman and a man, who could perhaps be Atlas, but there is no evidence for this; the scene could be satyric.

---

1. Br. 79 A 14 (sub 'Hydra') & 190 A1 (sub 'Schlange'); A.B.V. 332, 21.

2. Br. 71 A 2; A.V. pl. 98.

3. Br. 72 bottom; A.R.V. 2. 1403, 2m.

4. Br. 72 bottom; C.V. 8 pl. III Id 48, 3-5; A.R.V. 2.1472, 2u.

5. See page 163, no.6 & 166.

6. See pages 148 & 150f.

(iv) Representations doubtfully ascribed to this myth.

1. Lekythos-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. London BM D 6, white-ground lekythos, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. London BM E 772, pyxis, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.

(1) merely shows part of a tree bearing round fruit, and (2) shows a woman reaching into a tree to pick an apple. In (3) a fountain-spout fills up a hydria, while a woman faces it. There are two other women in the scene as well as a tree containing apples and snake. On the right is another woman with apples in her hand and inscribed as Thetis, who is not included among the Hesperides. This is perhaps a conflation of two myths.

(v) The Hesperides myth linked with Heracles' immortality.

Diodorus<sup>4</sup> says that Heracles took the apples of the Hesperides to Eurystheus and then waited for the immortality Apollo had prophesied. From the evidence of these two vases the link between the two stories appears to be earlier than Diodorus.

1. Leningrad 640 (1641), stamnos, Attic red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
2. From Chiusi, amphora, Etruscan red-figure<sup>6</sup>.

---

1. Br. 71 vgl.; Megara Hyblaea 2 pl. 103, 11.

2. Br. 72 B 8; M.U.Z. fig. 527; A.R.V. 2.763, 1.

3. Br. 72 B 6; F.R. pl. 57, 2; A.R.V. 2. 806, 90 (Brommer erroneously 860, 90).

4. See page 261.

5. Br. 72 B 1; P. Jacobsthal, Theseus auf dem Meeresgrunde (Leipzig, 1911) pl. 3, 6; A.R.V. 2. 639, 56.

6. Br. 73 D 11; Jd.I. 57 (1942) 119; E.V.P. 42 f.

In (1), Athena introduces Heracles to two gods of which one is Poseidon, but behind him is the apple tree and the snake. In (2) Heracles, holding an apple, faces Zeus; behind them is an apple tree.

Hesiod<sup>1</sup> is the first to mention Heracles gaining immortality after the completion of the labours and the tradition is a continuous one as I have indicated in the first chapter<sup>2</sup>. The Hesperides labour was obviously regarded as the last by these particular artists since otherwise there could be no point in referring to it in scenes of Heracles being received among the gods.

#### CONCLUSION

From the evidence of surviving art it is not possible to decide whether the version of Heracles or Atlas fetching the apples was the earlier. If the Corinthian pinax-fragment did depict Heracles and Ladon, the Heracles version is the earlier; if not, the chest of Cypselus is the earliest surviving representation and makes the Atlas version the earlier.

Certainly the three appearances of the Atlas version at Olympia, if one counts the Theocles group, suggests this to be the Peloponnesian version, as does its depiction on the chest of Cypselus and perhaps on the throne of Bathycles. It may be that Pisander was the first to record this version, but this has already been shown to be a rather tenuous suggestion. However, the story of Heracles fighting Ladon may also have been known in the Peloponnese if the Corinthian pinax did depict it. Thus, perhaps it is wisest to suggest

---

1. Th. 950ff.

2. See pages 29ff.

that both versions had Peloponnesian origins, but were subsequently taken up by Attic writers according to the version preferred by each; it seems that the snake version was the one more popular in Attica but perhaps the more frequent appearance of the Atlas story in Peloponnesian art, and especially its rendering on the early chest of Cypselus confirms this as the main version originally. Probably it arose because of Atlas' traditional connection with the Hesperides by way of locality. It may be that the other version arose because of the traditional place of the snake as guardian of the apples and it is even possible that Atlas rather than Heracles was originally thought to have come to grips with it. Certainly the snake appears in Pherecydes, who describes Atlas fetching the apples. Perhaps the version of Heracles going to pick the apples himself was invented to enhance his heroism in this deed, since the holding up of the heavens rather suggests brute force of the type hinted at in the Iliad.<sup>1</sup>

As has already been observed, this myth is not particularly popular in either early art or literature and it is likely that this was caused by its original attachment to the Geryon legend<sup>2</sup> which seems to have received greater prominence. Pherecydes apparently separates the two but still confuses some elements and it is not really until the fifth century that the Hesperides myth gains any prominence<sup>3</sup>,

---

1. 5.403f. See page 238

2. See page 295.

3. This perhaps indicates that the Geryon legend was the more important aspect of the combination.

particularly in later Attic red-figure and in South Italian work where it was a subject particularly suited to the crowded scenes that were common in these media.

It seems likely that the Olympia metopes were responsible for making both Hesperides and Geryon myths into labours presumably because each was by this time popular in its own right. Certainly the Geryon legend received great prominence in sixth-century lyric poetry and in sixth-century art; possibly the long account by Pherecydes of the Hesperides myth, perhaps in an attempt to give it its own corporate form, was responsible for bringing it into vogue.

Certainly there had been much Peloponnesian interest in the West since the eighth and seventh centuries with the foundation of colonies but these were never founded further West than Sicily and Corcyra. Therefore, the West could still be a symbol of remote regions and represent the edge of the world. It seems that the sculptor at Olympia wished to emphasise not only Heracles' connection with the area around Elis, but also his visits to other places by referring to adventures in extreme West and North.<sup>1</sup> His special protection of Elis was thus made more prominent when set against his role as a panhellenic hero.

---

1. See page 375f.

CHAPTER ELEVEN: GERYON

This is an early myth which enjoys a continuous popularity in both literature and art. It is one of those set outside the Peloponnese and, as has been said, its locality is, in fact, close to that of the Hesperides story with which it seems to have been joined in early times. It is standardised as the tenth labour in the later canon, and also at Olympia, and the Hesperides is often regarded as the eleventh; possibly they were usually placed next to each other in the list because of the close links between them in early times.

A LITERARY EVIDENCE

Sometimes this will have to be explained more than has been usual in my examination of the literary evidence for the labours since several of the early sources are available only in fragment form, and both content and authorship need to be carefully established.

Hesiod (Th. 287ff.): Three-headed (τρικέφαλος) Geryon was son of Chrysaor and Calliroe, daughter of Ocean. Heracles killed him on the island of Erythia and drove his cattle to Tiryns. He also killed the herdsman Eurytion and the dog Orthus.

309ff.: Geryon's dog, Orthus, was brother of Cerberus and the Lernaean hydra.

Pisander (F 5 K): Heracles crossed Ocean in the cup of the Sun, which he took from Ocean.

Stesichorus (Geryoneis: Heracles crossed Ocean in the cup of Lyrica Graeca Selecta, the Sun (55) when he came to Geryon, ed. D. Page, (Oxford, apparently on Erythia (54). Geryon 1968) 51-56. had six hands, six feet and was winged (56). His mother implored him not to fight Heracles (56c) but he apparently regarded himself as immortal (56e). At any rate, he was killed by Heracles who pierced his forehead with an arrow smeared in hydra's blood (56e). Stesichorus mentioned the herdsman of Geryon. (54)

Ibycus? (P. Oxy 2735

Fr 11. 17-18):

Chrysaor and Geryon are mentioned.

P. Oxy 2637 Fr 5.

col. ii a 7ff.):

Something is referred to as βαθ[ὸν αἰθ]έρα τάμνων. In the commentary on this papyrus it is suggested that these words could refer to Bellerophon, since Pegasus is the subject of fragment (c), but they could also refer to Geryon with less reorganisation of lines, if Ibycus, like Stesichorus, regarded him as winged. He is described as 'three-headed', a detail which Acesandrus is said to have rationalised<sup>1</sup>. To have survived on

1. The relevant lines are as follows, restored by Page (see reference in note (1), page 292) :-

"Ι]βυκος ἐτέρω  
 ἀ]πὸ χθονὸς εἰς  
 ..]ρ[...αν βαθ[ὸν αἰθ]έρα τάμνων. 'A-  
 κέ]σανδρος ἐ[ν τῷ.] περὶ Κυρήνης

papyrus both fragments must be by one of the main lyric poets and on grounds of dialect and metre they must be by either Stesichorus or Ibycus. Ibycus seems the predominant name in the second papyrus and I attribute this piece to him<sup>1</sup>.

Pherecydes (F.G.H.

3F 18a):

Heracles travelled to Erythia in the cup of the Sun, which the latter gave him after being threatened by his bow.

Hecataeus (F.G.H.

1F 26):

Geryon must have lived on the mainland because Eurystheus could not otherwise have learned about his cattle; he was king of Ambracia in Amphilochoi.

Pindar (Frag. 169):

cf. Frag. 8

Proof of the statement νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς are the ἔργα of Heracles, since he drove to Eurystheus the cattle of Geryon without being asked to do so or paid.

(I. l. 12f.):

The dogs of Geryon trembled before Heracles.

Aeschylus (Ag. 870ff.): Clytemnestra compares Agamemnon to

the three-bodied (τριώματος) Geryon.

(Heracl. fr. 74 Nck.): Heracles crossed Ocean in the golden

---

τὸν [πε]ρὶ τοῦ τρο[ικ]εφάλου μῦθου  
ἀναίρω[ν] φησιν [α]ὐτὸν ἐπὶ τεθρίπ-  
που ὄχ[ε]ϊσθαι μ[ετ]ὰ δύο παραβα-  
τῶν....

1. For further considerations of authorship see D. L. Page in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society no. 196 NS 16 (1970) 91ff. and no 195 NS 15 (1969) 69ff. See also J. Barron, 'Ibycus: To Polycrates', Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies 16 (1969) 140.

cup and killed the herdsmen and their triple (τρίπτυχος) master who brandished in his hands three spears and three shields, and wore three helmets. His cattle were driven away.

(Προμηθευς Λυομενος  
fr. 199 Nck.):

Heracles angered the Ligurians by driving the cattle of Geryon through their territory.

Hellanicus (F.G.H.

4 F 110):

Eurytion was the son of Ares and Erythia.

F.G.H. 4 F 111):

Heracles drove the cattle of Geryon to Argos: one of the heifers gave its name to Italy.

Euripides (HF. 422ff.):  
cf. 1271-2.

Heracles killed the three-bodied (τρισώματος) Geryon with arrows smeared with the blood of the hydra.

Diodorus Siculus (IV.  
17, 1-3 and 18, 2):

It was Heracles' tenth labour to bring back the cattle of Geryon from the coast of Spain. He gathered a large force together because Chrysaor, king of Spain, had three awesome sons. Eurystheus set this as a labour because he felt it was impossible to accomplish. The Antaeus and Busiris episodes occurred during this time. Heracles met each son of Chrysaor separately and killed him. He drove off the cattle.

Apollodorus (II v 10): It was the tenth labour to fetch the cattle of Geryon from Spain; these were red and guarded by the herdsman, Eurytion, and two-headed dog, Orthus. Geryon is described as: τριῶν ἔχων ἀνδρῶν συμφυῆς σῶμα, συνηγμένον εἰς ἓν κατὰ τὴν γαστέρα, ἐσχισμένον δὲ εἰς τρεῖς ἀπὸ λαγόνων τε καὶ μηρῶν. The Sun lent him his cup to cross Ocean after Heracles aimed his bow at him. Orthus attacked him but Heracles killed it with his club and he also killed Eurytion, who came to the dog's aid. Heracles was driving off the cattle when he was attacked by Geryon, who had been told of the events by Menoites, who was grazing the cattle. Heracles killed Geryon with his bow and then put the cattle in the cup, which he afterwards returned to the Sun.

Hyginus (Fab. XXX 11): Heracles killed Geryon, (trimembrem), son of Chrysaon, uno telo as the tenth labour.

Scholiast (ad Ap. Rh. 4.1399 d): The island where Geryon lived was named after one of the Hesperides. He had a dog, Orthus, brother of Cerberus, which Heracles killed.

The Geryon legend was also the subject of a comedy by Ehippus<sup>1</sup> and of a tragedy by Nichomachus<sup>2</sup>, but we do not know any details of the plots.

As has already been stated, there seems to have been some confusion between details of the Geryon and Hesperides myths. Pherecydes is variously quoted<sup>3</sup> as making Heracles sail in the cup of the Sun to Geryon and to the Hesperides. Stesichorus in the Geryoneis<sup>4</sup> seems to have made a reference to the island of the Hesperides, and the scholiast to Apollonius<sup>5</sup> says that Geryon's island was named after one of the Hesperides. Moreover, there is confusion as to whether Heracles met Antaeus and Busiris during the Geryon or Hesperides adventures, Diodorus placing them both in the former and the latter<sup>6</sup>, and Pherecydes<sup>7</sup> and Apollodorus<sup>8</sup> in the latter. Certainly Pherecydes seems at the centre of the confusion, being credited with apparently conflicting accounts. It thus seems possible that these two myths, taking place in the same area, were originally joined, and this explains the confusion, especially in Pherecydes' account, at which time they were presumably becoming separated, as later shown by the Olympia metopes. This would certainly explain the overlapping and also the fact that later sources quote different versions, if they were trying to discuss two stories out of the original one.

---

1. J. H. Edmonds, Fragments of Attic Comedy (Leiden, 1959) vol. II Frag. 3.

2. Nck. 591.

3. F.G.H. 3 F 18 a & 17.

4. L.G.S. 56 B.

5. 4. 1399 d.

6. IV 17, 4-18, 1 and IV 27,3 resp.

7. F.G.H. 3 F 17

8. II v 11.

It is possible that Hesiod's reference to Heracles driving the cattle to Tiryns is indicative that this part of the myth, at least, was regarded as a labour even in early times, since Eurystheus is sometimes regarded as king of Tiryns<sup>1</sup>. However, this is not a necessary inference since Heracles could just be bringing the cattle back for himself<sup>2</sup> and there is no actual mention of Eurystheus until Hecataeus. In fact, Pindar says that Eurystheus did not ask Heracles to bring back the cattle, although it seems this myth was regarded as a labour by Pindar's time since he uses the word ἔργα to describe it. His reference may have aimed at giving some glory to what was earlier regarded as Heracles' selfish deed of driving off the cattle for himself or else his words could be taken to indicate that the labour at this stage did not consist of driving off the cattle. Both theories seem plausible, but the latter seems to be substantiated by the fact that it is not until Diodorus that the bringing of the cattle is made the important part of the labour; Euripides does not refer to it at all, but merely talks of Heracles killing Geryon, and this is certainly the aspect of the myth generally depicted in art. Moreover, Hyginus, who may have been following an early source, makes no reference to the cattle.

As regards the description of Geryon, his triplicity seems to have been part of the myth in early days, although it is not certain just how much of him was regarded as triple. Hesiod describes him as three-headed; Stesichorus says that he had six hands and six feet and was also winged; Ibycus regarded

---

1. Eur. *Alcestis*, 481.

2. Diodorus (IV 10,2) infers that Heracles was born in Tiryns.

him as 'three-headed' and possibly as winged. Thus in early times it is not certain that he was regarded as any more than three-headed or possessing more than three sets of hands and feet. It is not until Aeschylus that he is specifically called 'three-bodied'. The artistic evidence will have to be examined to clarify this point. The feature of wings, as recorded by Stesichorus and perhaps by Ibycus, is a unique feature, but will be found on two Chalcidian vases, examined with the artistic evidence<sup>1</sup>. Certainly in Latin literature he seems to have been standardised as 'three-bodied'. Naturally various writers tried to rationalise Geryon to normality. Acesandrus<sup>2</sup> talked of Geryon ἐπὶ τεθρίππου ὄχ[ε]ῦσθαι μ[ετ]ὰ δύο παραβατῶν; Diodorus<sup>3</sup> made him into the three sons of Chrysaor and Servius<sup>4</sup> into three islands.

Geryon is attended by the herdsman, Eurytion, son of Ares and Erythia, and Orthus, son of Typhon and Echidna. The editor of the Oxford text of Hesiod regards as spurious Hesiod's reference to them and I shall examine the artistic evidence to see whether there is any evidence for their existence so early. Eurytion seems to have been mentioned by Stesichorus, although he may not have been named. Pindar records something out of the ordinary in his reference to the κύνες of Geryon; it is possible that he is using singular

---

1. See pages 303, no. 2 & 313, no. 3

2. P. Oxy. 2637 Fr. 5 col. ii 8ff. See page 291f.

3. IV 17,2.

4. Aen. VII 662.

for plural, but it is also possible that there was a more rationalised tradition in which **Geryon** was given two dogs rather than one dog with two heads. Apollodorus is the first extant source to mention the two heads, but Orthus is certainly of monstrous family from the first and the artistic evidence shows that the idea of two heads is far earlier than Apollodorus. There is no certainty that Eurytion and Orthus were actually named before Apollodorus and again the artistic evidence must be searched, this time for inscriptions of their names.

A word must be said about the home of Geryon, which is generally regarded as Erythia, an island off the coast of Spain or sometimes in Spain itself. As Matthews points out<sup>1</sup>, the idea of Heracles going to Erythia in the cup of the Sun suggests it to be in the far West, and, moreover, also the original link with the Hesperides myth would suggest this. It is noteworthy that Hesiod, for whom no mention of the cup of the Sun is recorded, leaves the location vague and it may well be that the idea of using the cup suggested the general locality. Pisander is the first to mention Heracles using this cup, but no reference to his destination survives. Perhaps no reference is needed as it has been suggested that the Hesperides story was linked to this in early times and it has been shown that Pherecydes was variously regarded as making Heracles sail in the cup to Geryon and to the Hesperides. As Matthews<sup>2</sup> says, the placing of these stories in the West may well reflect early Rhodian exploration in the Western Mediterranean and the founding<sup>of</sup> a Rhodian colony called

---

1. op. cit. 84f.

2. op. cit. 67.

Rhode<sup>1</sup> on the coast of Spain and may also be influenced by the Rhodian cult of Helios<sup>2</sup>. Herodotus<sup>3</sup> is more specific and, quoting the Pontic Greeks, places Erythia near Gadeira. Diodorus places it on the coast of Spain and Apollodorus in Spain. Hecataeus and Arrian seem to regard Ambracia on the mainland as a more likely setting for Geryon, but they are indulging in pure rationalisation. The home of Geryon and the name of Eurytion's mother are the same, according to Hellanicus; presumably the name of the mother was taken from that of the place in an attempt to give Eurytion lineage comparable to that of Geryon and Orthus. An earlier stage in describing Eurytion seems to be Stesichorus' reference to him as living opposite Erythia<sup>4</sup>.

It is necessary now to consider how Heracles killed Geryon. This remains unspecified in Hesiod, and Stesichorus is the first to name the weapon as the bow, whose arrows were tinged with the blood of the hydra. In fact, the only writers specifically to name the weapon make it the bow, although Apollodorus introduces the club as well for the killing of Orthus and presumably Eurytion too. It will be necessary to see how far the artistic evidence sustains this version. A word must be said about Hyginus, however, since he mysteriously refers to Heracles killing Geryon uno telo. Telum can be a general Latin word for 'weapon' but more often refers to something thrown such as a javelin. Hyginus, then, either thought of Heracles piercing all three bodies of Geryon at

---

1. Strabo 14. 2. 10.

2. cf. P. Friedländer, Herakles: Sagengeschichtliche Untersuchungen (Berlin, 1907) 25.

3. 4, 8.1-2.

4. L.G.S. 54 and note on Strabo.

the same time with a single javelin, which would give a variant tradition, or else uno here has the significance of "the same" and Heracles is thought of as using one weapon several times to kill all three bodies. ~~Consequently~~ The second interpretation seems to distort the Latin and one would expect the former suggestion to be correct and Hyginus to be recording a variant.

As regards the cattle of Geryon, Apollodorus is the only extant source to describe them as red. One wonders whether Eurystheus coveted them for that reason, but perhaps Diodorus gives a more convincing reason for the imposition of this labour in that it was regarded as impossible. This is not a labour in which Heracles performs any general benefaction, although Diodorus tries to invent some in this connection since he says that during the performance of this labour Heracles cleared Crete of wild beasts and slew Antaeus and Busiris, who were a menace to all. Certainly in this labour Heracles has a chance to show his heroism, since he is confronting a monstrous opponent with a threefold advantage; Geryon because of his monstrous nature<sup>1</sup> is comparable, for example, to the Nemean lion, Lernaean hydra, and Thracian mares, all of whom were considered invulnerable because of some monstrous characteristic; and Geryon in the Stesichorus passage may consider himself immortal.<sup>1</sup>

Various legends sprang up concerning Heracles' return journey with the cattle. This tendency began in Aeschylus, where Prometheus prophesies that Heracles will fight ἐτάρβητον Αιγύων στρατόν<sup>2</sup> after annoying them by leading the cattle through

---

1. L.G.S. 56 E col. ii, epode v.8.

2. Nck. Fr. 199 and references there cited.

their territory. These various subsidiary legends are beyond my scope here, but may be referred to in passing. Heracles, arriving at Pylos with the cattle, was almost robbed by Neleus and his sons, according to Isocrates<sup>1</sup>, but he spared Nestor, who did not take part; this is obviously derived from Homer's account of his battle against the Pylians. Diodorus makes Heracles indulge in various pursuits during this labour and gives him a long and complicated journey home<sup>2</sup>. All this seems part of the general tendency to make the Heracles story into one long and complete saga of Heracles' life.

One more myth may be mentioned which seems to have been connected with the Geryon myth by Stesichorus<sup>3</sup>, and that is the Pholus myth. This is odd since in later times<sup>4</sup> this is thought of as taking place while Heracles was pursuing the Erymanthian Boar. It is possible that the passage of the 'Geryoneis' is merely looking back to the Pholus adventure and that it had no connection with the West, but it is not impossible that it was originally joined to the Geryon story and later attached to the boar labour.

#### B ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

The evidence here neatly divides itself according to the weapon depicted in the killing of Geryon and this will be seen to be far more varied than in the literary evidence, probably often due to the whim of the artists rather than

---

1. Oratio VI (Archidamus) 119 D.

2. IV 18ff.

3. P.M.G. 51.

4. cf. Diod. IV 12,1-2. See page 338ff.

adherence to actual traditions of particular weapons. Herdsman and dog are often represented between Heracles and Geryon, although it is often a case of one or the other, rather than both, being depicted; Eurytion tends to be the more popular of the two. Athena and a lamenting woman, who may be the mother of Eurystheus<sup>1</sup>, often appear as spectators. The cattle are not often included but a few representations will be examined near the end<sup>2</sup> which show Heracles and cattle and omit Geryon.

Geryon is generally represented as 'three-bodied' with limbs in sets of three; he usually advances with three spears and shields and often one or more of his bodies fall back dead. Where this type of representation does not occur it will be pointed out. Interesting is Aeschylus' description of Geryon in the Heracleidai since it is close to the way he is depicted in art; Aeschylus may well have been describing him from some artistic piece, possibly one of the sixth-century Attic vases.

Apart from one isolated instance, the Geryon legend does not appear in art until the second quarter of the sixth century BC, when it had probably gained popularity in the poem of Stesichorus, probably a popularity to be continued by Ibycus around the middle of the century, which probably explains the fairly numerous representations near this time, especially on vases by Group E. After the turn of the sixth century representations of this myth are not very numerous.

---

1. See page 316f.

2. See page 315f.

I Use of the bow

1. London BM A 487; 65.7-20.17., pyxis, Proto-Corinthian<sup>1</sup>.
2. Paris, Cab. Méd. 202, neck-handled amphora, Chalcidian<sup>2</sup>.
3. Villa Giulia 19539, column-krater, Etruscan black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. Villa Giulia 1225, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Bologna, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Earlier Noel des Vergers, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Paris, Cab. Méd. 223, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Munich 1719 (J 407), hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
9. Delos, Heraeum 547, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
10. From Francavilla, psykter-amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
11. <sup>Athens</sup> Hephaesteum, metopes<sup>11</sup>.

This group, which contains the earliest artistic representation of the Geryon legend, is surprisingly sparse when one considers that the bow is the standard weapon referred to in the literary accounts, in so far as the accounts refer

- 
1. Br. 63 C 3; Friis-Johansen, op. cit. 94, no. 22, & 144, pl. 24, 2.
  2. Br 63 C 1; C.V. 1 pl. 24.
  3. Br. 63 C 5; Mon. Ant. 42 (1955) 206, pl. 3.
  4. Br. 61 A 14; C.V. 3 pll. 29 & 30, 1 & 2.
  5. Br. 59 A 12; C.V. 2 pl. 12, 3 & 4.
  6. Br. 62 B 2; W. Klein, Euphronios, eine Studie zur Geschichte der Griechischen Malerei (Vienna, 1886) 306 & 81; A.R.V. 2. 628, 4.
  7. Br. 59 A 5; C.V. 1 pll. 38, 4 & 5, 39, 1 & 2; A.B.V. 308, 77.
  8. Br. 61 A 16; B. Neutsch & others, Die Welt der Griechen im Bilde der Originale der Heidelberger Universitätsammlung (Heidelberg, 1948) fig. 17; A.B.V. 361, 13.
  9. Br. 61 A 5; Dugas, Delos X pl. 39, 69; A.B.V. 379, 274.
  10. Br. 61 A 15; Attic Memorie della Società Magna Grecia 11/12 (1971/2) 75ff. pl. 29, 30.
  11. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI. viii-ix.

to a weapon at all. The first two pieces in the group are very interesting, one for its early date, the second for its unusual depiction of Geryon, and I shall examine each in detail.

(1) dates to c. 680 BC and so is easily the earliest piece of artistic evidence. Heracles, with quiver on his back, runs towards Geryon, drawing his bow. Even in this very early example Geryon is drawn as three-bodied and this is perhaps an argument in favour of not taking Hesiod's 'three-headed' at its face value. All three bodies are still alive, which is unusual compared with the later representations in which at least one is usually dead, and also unusual is the presence of the cattle, around the pyxis. The animal behind Heracles does not look bovine and it may be that this is meant to be Orthus, thus suggesting that the lines of Hesiod describing him as Geryon's dog are not spurious.

The Chalcidian amphora, (2), is interesting as being one of the only two pieces to depict Geryon as winged, a detail found in Stesichorus and perhaps also in Ibycus, who would be a more likely source of influence here, both as regards date and locality<sup>1</sup>. The figures depicted are more than the basic group of Heracles and Geryon: Athena is present; Orthus, not inscribed, lies on his back dead; Eurytion lies dead on his face, an arrow in his back, and the inscription proves that his name was known in the middle of the sixth century. A frontal chariot is also represented; this could belong to Heracles or perhaps to Geryon, since in Stesichorus<sup>2</sup> there may

---

1. Ibycus came from Rhegium which was not far from Chalcis.

2. P.M.G. 56 A v. 6 but this may be used by Athena rather than by Geryon.

be a reference to one in the context of Geryon. Heracles advances towards Geryon, aiming his bow; all three bodies advance but the middle one is already pierced by an arrow. Geryon, apart from being winged, has only one pair of legs between all three bodies; Stesichorus describes him as having six feet and this may well be further indication that he was not the inspiration for this vase but possibly rather Ibycus was the source.

Of the rest of the pieces, Orthus appears in (5), where he menaces Heracles' foot, and in (7) and (9); the striking feature is that in all three he is given two heads, thus showing this feature to be much earlier than Apollodorus, the first extant writer to mention it. Eurytion appears in (6), (8), (10) and (11). In the last example, Geryon wields a stone at Heracles, which seems to place him on a level with the uncivilised creature the Minotaur, which is often shown with a stone<sup>1</sup>. The lamenting woman appears on (6). (10) is fragmentary, showing Heracles aiming his bow above the head of the crouching Eurytion and a hand on an advanced spear, no doubt belonging to Geryon. There is certainly enough preserved for our purposes here. Eurytion has an arrow in his neck and it should be noticed that here, and in (2), the version is different from that of Apollodorus, where it is implied that he is clubbed to death.

A special mention may be made here of the Hephaestum (11), since two metopes are given over to this subject and there are only ten metopes available for the depiction of the

---

1. Roman Market (Basseggio), hydria, Attic black-figure (Br. 233 Ac 42; A.V. pl. 311; A.B.V. 105, 133).

labours. On one metope Eurytion lies dead while Heracles, his body preserved to the thighs and the top of his left arm stretched out, has been convincingly restored with the bow. On the second metope two bodies are dead, slumping, one forward, the other backwards, as in (7) in this list; the third is upright and prepares to throw a stone. This rendering of the Geryon scene seems in the tradition of multi-metope scenes of the sixth century, as that of Heracles and Nessus at Paestum<sup>1</sup>.

## II Use of the sword

1. Olympia, from Delphi, shield-band<sup>2</sup>.
2. Olympia B 237, shield-band<sup>3</sup>.
3. Olympia B 1957, shield-band<sup>4</sup>.
4. Villa Giulia 50683, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
5. Syracuse 12063, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
6. Louvre F 53, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
7. Naples H 2725 (Inv. 81094), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
8. London BM B 194, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
9. Tarquinia 621, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.

- 
1. Heraion II pl. 32-3, 64-5.
  2. Kunze, op. cit. 38z, xxiv and pl. 50.
  3. Ibid. 39z, xxiv and pl. 51.
  4. Ibid. 17a, x and pl. 30.
  5. Br. 61 A 18; Rumpf, Sakonides pl. 15, b & c; A.B.V. 108, 14.
  6. Br. 59 A 15; C.V. 1 pl. 6, 3; A.B.V. 131, 6.
  7. Br. 60 A 8; C.V. 3 pl. 19; A.B.V. 136, 49.
  8. Br. 60 A 15; C.V. 1 pl. 4, 1; A.B.V. 133, 6.
  9. Br. 60 A 13; C.V. 3 pl. 37, 1; A.B.V. 136, 56.
  10. Br. 60 A 19; C.V. 1 pl. 15; A.B.V. 133, 10.

10. Baden, Ros, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
11. Naples 112849, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
12. Fogg 1972.42, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
13. Heidelberg S 178, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
14. Greifswald 140, fragmentary belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
15. Munich 1379 (J 81), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
16. London BM B 221, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
17. Berkeley 8/3851, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.
18. Vannes 2157, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
19. London BM B 157, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
20. London BM B 310, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
21. London BM B 220, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
22. Earlier Paris, Péreire, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 61 A 24; H. Bloesch, Antike Kunst in der Schweiz (Zürich, 1943) pl. 15-17; A.B.V. 133, 5.
  2. Br. 60 A 16; C.V. 1 pl. 5, 3; A.B.V. 138, 2u.
  3. Br. 60 A 20; Hirsch Collection (30 June - 2 July 1921) pl. 6, no. 141; A.B.V. 133, 8.
  4. Br. 59 A 1; C.V. 1. pl. 36, 1-4; A.B.V. 147, 1.
  5. Br. 60 A 3; Boehringer, op. cit. pl. 12.
  6. Br. 60 A 4; Brommer. Her. pl. 21b; A.B.V. 301, lab.
  7. Br. 59 A 10; C.V. 4 pl. 54, 1; A.B.V. 321, 4.
  8. Br. 59 A 19; C.V. (California I) pl. 21, 1a; A.B.V. 283, 11.
  9. Br. 59 A 7; C.V. (Fr. 24) pl. 1, 4.
  10. Br. 60 A 12; C.V. 3 pl. 26, 3.
  11. Br. 61 A 17; C.V. 6 pl. 78, 3; A.B.V. 361, 12.
  12. Br. 59 A 9; C.V. 4 pl. 53, 4; A.B.V. 340, 1u.
  13. Br. 59 A 6; Tableaux des Anciens pl. 10, 32; A.B.V. 484, 11.

(1) belongs to the second quarter of the sixth century and (2) - (13) to the middle. The only fifth century example is (22). Numbers (4) and (6) are interesting as implying that Heracles is using the sword after previously wounding Geryon with the bow, since the latter is transfixing in one or more of his heads by an arrow; in (6) Eurytion is also transfixing with an arrow. Eurytion is visible in all except (13) and he may have been originally present here since the piece is fragmentary. In (14) he is in rather an unusual pose, on all fours, and there may be an arrow going into his chest, although this could be a sword. Orthus is present in (8). The lamenting woman appears in (17), and in (11) both<sup>a</sup> draped man and woman appear. In (7) and (21), rather unusually, all the bodies of Geryon seem to be still alive.

It is highly likely that the following shield-bands also have this type of composition:

- (i) Olympia B 1637<sup>1</sup>.
- (ii) Olympia B 1913<sup>2</sup>.
- (iii) Olympia B 973<sup>3</sup>.

These are very close to the shieldbands, (1) - (3), both in composition and date but are too fragmentary to allow of absolute certainty.

1. Kunze, op. cit. XXVII, 42x and pl. 52, 7, and Beilage 7, 3.

2. Ibid. XLI, 59a and pl. 65.

3. Ibid. XLIX, 67y and pl. 63.

III Use of the club

1. Los Angeles A 5832, 50-137, earlier collection Saint-Ferriol 186, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Würzburg 245, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Louvre F 55, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
4. New York 56.171.11, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Rome, Vatican 347, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Castle Ashby, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Rome, Vatican Gug. 39, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Munich 2620 (J 337), cup, Attic red-figure<sup>8</sup>.
9. Würzburg 246, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.
10. Erlangen M 231 (=Mun. J 308), belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>10</sup>.
11. London BM B 156, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
12. Earlier Rome market, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 60 A 6; Hesperia 24 (1955) 1, no. 1 & pl. 1a & 2a; A.B.V. 133, 7.
  2. Br. 60 A 5; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 79; A.B.V. 133, 1.
  3. Br. 60 A 9; C.V. 3 pl. 15, 6; A.B.V. 133, 4.
  4. Br. 60 A 21; Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum NS 15 (1957) 169; A.B.V. 133, 2.
  5. Br. 60 A 17; Albizzati, op. cit. pl. 43; A.B.V. 138, 1ab.
  6. Br. 59 A 8; A.V. pl. 108; A.B.V. 329, 5.
  7. Br. 60 A 18; R.G. pl. 14; A.B.V. 312, 3.
  8. Br. 62 B 1; M.U.Z. fig. 391; A.R.V. 2. 16, 17.
  9. Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 66; A.B.V. 296, 8.
  10. Br. 60 A 2; Grünhagen, op. cit. 37; Jahn, op. cit. 89.
  11. Br. 60 A 11; C.V. 3 pl. 27, 1.
  12. Br. 59 A 14; A.V. pl. 104.

13. Dublin NM, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
14. Villa Giulia 50387, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
15. Berlin F 1999, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
16. Würzburg 230, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
17. Würzburg 343, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
18. Olympia, metope<sup>6</sup>.
19. Berlin F 3258, volute-krater, Apulian<sup>7</sup>.
20. Naples H 1924 (82286), lebes gamikos, Lucanian red-figure<sup>8</sup>.
21. Athens NM 12618, Megarian bowl.<sup>9</sup>

Numbers (1) - (5) are by or near Group E; (6) - (12) belong to the last quarter of the sixth century; (13) - (17) belong to the first quarter of the fifth century; (18) to c. 470; (19) and (20) to the fourth century; (21) to the third century.

Eurytion is present in (1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), (10), (14) and (15). In (3) and (6) he has an arrow in his breast, and in (7) a stone in his hand, just as Geryon wields

- 
1. Br. 61 A 8; Tillyard, op. cit. no. 38.
  2. Br. 59 A 13; Mingazzini, op. cit. pl. 69, 7, no. 489; A.B.V. 394, 1m.
  3. Br. 61 A 3; A. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium, 426; A.B.L. 217, 21.
  4. Br. 59 A 3; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 62.
  5. Br. 62 A 21; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 103; Par. 181.
  6. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pll. 180-185.
  7. Br. 63 D 1; A. Furtwängler, op. cit. 910.
  8. Br. 63 D 2; L.C.S. 148, no. 836, pl. 70, 4 & 5.
  9. Br. 63 E 1; Hausmann, op. cit. pl. 67, 1.

a stone on the Hephaesteum metope<sup>1</sup>. Orthus is present in (1), (4) and (14). In (14) the artist seems to have paid the penalty for trying to depict both dog and herdsman in a confined space, since the composition is very confused at this point.

The use of two weapons seems to be shown in (8), where one head of Geryon has an arrow in each eye and Heracles carries bow and arrows in his left hand; he also carries this in (13), as well as brandishing the club. The lamenting woman is present in (8), (11), (12) and (13). In the late pieces (19) - (21) Heracles opposes his lionskin to Geryon in the form of a shield; the skin was invulnerable and so a great protection. In (20) Geryon is three-headed rather than three-bodied, perhaps as a result of the artist taking one of the early sources literally.

#### IV Use of the spear

There is only one surviving example of this scheme:

1. Louvre F 115, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.

This is odd in that Heracles holds a hoplite shield, possibly going back to the time when he was described and represented in armour, in the days before Pisander<sup>3</sup>.

\*\*\*\*\*

These, then, are the weapons depicted and, as has already been stated, there is a much greater variety than in literature, as one would expect. Certainly,

---

1. See page 305f.

2. Br. 59 A 4; C.V. 4 pl. 37, 10 & 11; A.B.V. 319, 4.

3. See page 48, note (1).

~~From the vase-painters~~ there seems to have been a tradition that Heracles used first the bow from a distance and then the sword at close quarters. The method of death is commonly not shown when Orthus, Eurytion or one of the bodies of Geryon are already dead but one cannot expect artists accurately to record every detail of a myth. The tradition of various weapons being used seems to have been in existence in the third quarter of the sixth century and as such may have appeared in Ibycus, but it is always possible that artists paint whatever weapon they choose, while the literary accounts are more concerned with the story that Heracles killed Geryon than with details of what weapon he used; art, of course, cannot ignore the details of weapon because in a visual medium this has to be shown. Thus, the appearance of different weapons may be nothing more than happenstance. Certainly I feel M. ~~Robinson~~<sup>1</sup> puts the case too strongly when he says "suddenly in the fifth century the story becomes immensely popular in a new guise". Heracles wearing the lionskin shoots the giant, having killed the hound and herdsman, and when he closes may use the club rather than the sword". The artistic evidence just examined does not support this claim.

I feel that it is entirely necessary to bear in mind that these variants may be no more than the choice of different artists when faced with the necessity of giving Heracles a weapon of some description to kill Geryon, since the literary accounts were not particularly concerned with this detail.

---

1. M. Robertson, 'Geryoneis: Stesichorus and the Vase-painters' C.Q. 19 (1969) 207-20.

Representations where no weapon is visible.

1. Chest of Cypselus<sup>1</sup>.
2. Perachora 2542, fragmentary cup, Corinthian<sup>2</sup>.
3. London BM B 155, neck-handled amphora, Chalcidian<sup>3</sup>.
4. Athens Acr. 2424, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
5. Brussels R 289, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
6. Eretria, Lekythos fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. London BM B 426, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Delphi, Athenian treasury, metopes<sup>8</sup>.
9. Berlin F 2007, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>9</sup>.

I shall examine each piece individually since they do not fall under one general category.

The earliest piece, the chest of Cypselus, (1), only survives in the testimony of Pausanias, but it seems that Geryon had triple form; no information is given as to the other figures depicted with him or the manner in which he was killed.

- 
1. Paus. V 19. 1.
  2. Br. 63 C 4; Perachora II 262, no. 2542 & pll. 106 & 110.
  3. Br. 63 C 2; Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen no. 6, fig. 1 & pll. XIII-XIV.
  4. Graef & Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 98.
  5. C.V. 2 pl. 16, 4; A.B.V. 133, 3.
  6. Br. 61 A 6; J. Boardman, 'Pottery from Eretria' B.S.A. 47 (1952) 42, no. 12 & pl. 14.
  7. Br. 61 A 12; C.V. 2 pl. 21 and text-note page 8 and figure; A.B.V. 256, 20.
  8. Fouilles de Delphes IV Fasc. 2 pll. XLIV-XLV.
  9. Br. 61 A 4; Neugebauer, op. cit. 49.

Apart from (3) and (9) the rest of the pieces in my list are too fragmentary for any weapon to be identified. Of special interest are the metopes of the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, (8), the six in question being those along the back of the building. Three showed cattle, one the chariot of Heracles or possibly of Geryon<sup>1</sup>, one Orthus, another Geryon. It does not seem entirely clear where Heracles appeared in this scheme; there would certainly be room for him above the dead Orthus but he could also have been shown on the same metope as Geryon, in close combat, presumably with either sword or club. However, with the large amount of space available to the sculptor it seems more likely Heracles was placed in the Orthus metope and thus possibly given a bow or even a spear. This treasury gives another example of the sixth-century penchant for multi-metope scenes, as already seen reflected in the Geryon metopes of the Hephaesteum<sup>2</sup>.

(3), on the other hand, specifically shows Heracles not brandishing any weapon, but merely stretching out his hands towards Geryon. This may mean that he is about to finish him off with his bare hands: two bodies are already dead. It may be, however, that the artist is simply alluding to the combat, without concerning himself with detail<sup>3</sup>.

(9) does not depict Heracles at all but only Geryon, with one body dead, accompanied by a dead Orthus and also by Athena and perhaps his mother. Clearly the Heracles labour

---

1. Cf. page 297 & note (2).

2. Cf page 306.

3. As on the other Chalcidian vase carrying this subject, Geryon is winged and has only one pair of legs. See page 303, no.2 & 304f.

is alluded to without any specific weapon being shown, or indeed, the hero himself.

In only the Chalcidian piece (3) is it possible to say that the artist intended not to give Heracles any weapons; it is possible that this was the case in some of the others but without a complete picture of them it is not possible to know, nor, indeed, what the weapon was, if depicted.

### Heracles and Cattle

In these representations Geryon is not depicted but the myth is alluded to by Heracles' presence with cattle. As can be seen, such representations are not very numerous and certainly the combat with Geryon seems to have provided the main interest in this labour, if it did not form the main-story line, in the earlier time<sup>1</sup>.

1. Throne of Bathycles<sup>2</sup>.
2. Earlier Rome market, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Bologna 51, column-krater, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
4. Boulogne 476, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.

It is possible that, rather than alluding to the Geryon labour as a whole, these pieces show Heracles' personal advantage gained from it, namely the cattle, if this was,

---

1. See page 296.

2. Paus. III 18.3.

3. Br. 62 vgl.; A.V. pll. 105-6.

4. Br. 62 vgl.; A. Zannoni, Gli Scavi della Certosa di Bologna (Bologna, 1876) pll. 76, 9 & 23, 4; A.B.V. 376, 234.

5. Br. 62 vgl.; A.B.V. 377, 245.

as seems likely, a feature of the myth before the late mythographers. Brommer includes in his list one other piece which he claims shows only Heracles and cattle, but without a picture available there is no way of checking this. This is as follows:

(i) Basel, cup. Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.

The unidentified lamenting woman

A brief word must finally be said about the identity of the lamenting woman who appears on many Attic black-figure representations and also occasionally in red-figure. Since she is not confined to one group of painters she presumably had a link with the story and was not a mere unidentified spectator. The choice of identification seems to lie between the mother of Geryon and mother of Eurytion, just as Eurystheus' mother seems to have been depicted on some vases showing the Erymanthian boar<sup>2</sup>.

Geryon is many times described as son of Chrysaor and Calliroe and the latter would be apt in these representations, especially as Stesichorus devotes a long speech to her before the battle with Heracles. Moreover, when the lamenting woman appears she is placed close to Geryon, a factor which must surely be taken into consideration. Robinson<sup>3</sup>, however, prefers to identify her as Erythia, mother of Eurytion, but offers no sound reason for this. In fact, the parentage of Eurytion is not well attested, appearing for the first time

---

1. Br. 62 vgl.; A.B.V. 60, 6.

2. See page 365

3. op. cit. 217.

in extant literature in Hellanicus. Personally, I wonder whether Eurytion is a significant enough figure in the myth to warrant the rendering of his mother in representations of it, a fact surely indicated by the fact that Eurytion himself is not always rendered.

I thus believe the unidentified woman to be Calliroe, mother of Geryon, and perhaps both parents to be depicted on the vase<sup>1</sup> where both man and woman appear, although, since this is the only appearance of man and woman, they could be merely unidentified spectators.

#### CONCLUSION

The Geryon legend dates at least to the early seventh century and it is quite possible that the main features of the myth were present from the beginning. Certainly by the early seventh century Geryon was conceived as three-bodied, as shown by the Early-Corinthian pyxis<sup>2</sup>. Hesiod's reference to Orthus and Eurytion is regarded as spurious by the editor of the Oxford text but, whatever the truth of this, the same early pyxis may show Orthus, and Eurytion seems to have been described by Stesichorus in the early sixth century.

It has been seen that the driving of the cattle to Greece was not at first stressed as an important part of the labour and it may even have been done by Heracles for his own advantage: the reference to Tiryns in Hesiod may refer to

---

1. Naples 112849. See page 307, no. 11.

2. See page 303, no. 1 & 304.

Heracles' home rather than to Eurystheus' and the Pindar passage may continue this idea by telling of Heracles driving the cattle back without being asked to do so or paid. Certainly the cattle do not play an important part in art, they only occur on a few representations, including the early pyxis, and may allude to Heracles' action in bringing them back for himself rather than to the Geryon labour as a whole. Until the late mythographers it is the killing of Geryon that is stressed, both in literature and art, and it is Diodorus who is the first specifically to say that the labour consisted in driving back the cattle, making the killing of Geryon subsidiary to this. Perhaps it was an attempt to make the story more respectable: the driving away of cattle from a monstrous personage would show Heracles in a more heroic light than a mission specifically to kill Geryon even though he was not offering harm to anyone. At any rate, there does not seem to have been much interest in specifying the exact manner in which Geryon was killed; writers left this vague while artists are likely to have followed their own whim in the weapon which they gave to Heracles.

It seems that at first the Geryon and Hesperides labours were combined in one myth and there are definite traces of this in the account of Pherecydes<sup>1</sup>. Presumably by the time of the Temple of Zeus they were regarded as separate since they occupy two separate metopes.

---

1. See page 295. It seems that at this time the separation of these two myths was underway and that this led to the confusion inside Pherecydes' account of the details of each.

CHAPTER TWELVE: THE HORSES OF DIOMEDES

The Diomedes of this labour is the son of Ares and Cyrene and king of the Thracian tribe the Bistones; he must be distinguished from the hero of the same name, son of Tydeus and Deipyle, who fought for the Greeks against the Trojans<sup>1</sup>.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

Pindar (P. Oxy. 2450<sup>2</sup>): This piece is fragmentary but can be seen to describe Heracles subduing the mares of Diomedes, killing their master near the Bistonian marsh; he was son of Ares and king of the Cicones<sup>3</sup>. Heracles mastered the mares by throwing a man into their feeding troughs<sup>4</sup> to divert them; he then tore from the wall the chains that bound all of them. He led them off, controlling them with his club<sup>5</sup>.

Hellanicus (F.G.H.

4 F 105):

The Abdera in Thrace was named after Abderus, son of Hermes, with whom Heracles fell in love. He was torn to pieces, according to Hellanicus and others by αἱ Διομήδους ἵπποι.

1. Iliad, passim.

2. See Appendix II.

3. A tribe of the same area as the Bistones if not actually identical therewith.

4. φάτναι.

5. Cf Aristophanes of Byzantium (Nck. Fr. 42) who said that Pindar called the mares προβάτα and described their feeding-troughs as φάτναι. His statement helps with the restoration of vv A 28 & 21.

Euripides (H.F. 380ff.): Heracles mastered with curbs<sup>1</sup> the mares<sup>2</sup> of Diomedes, yoked to a four-horse chariot; he did this for Eurystheus. The horses fed on human flesh in their troughs. The locality is described as beyond the River Hebrus<sup>3</sup>.

(Alc. 481ff.): Heracles is on his way to Thrace to fetch the horses for Eurystheus when he comes to Admetus' house. He is questioned by the chorus on his mission; they inform Heracles that the horses are man-eating and say that he will have to kill Diomedes if he is to come back alive.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 15, 3-4): It was the eighth labour to bring back τὰς ... ἕκτους which had bronze feeding-troughs, secured by iron because of the horses' strength. They fed on human flesh and Heracles mastered them by feeding Diomedes to them to sate their hunger. He was then able to lead them to Eurystheus, who consecrated them to Hera, and their stock continued till the time of Alexander the Great. It was after this labour that Heracles joined the

---

1. ψαλίοις

2. Note the gender of the Relative Pronoun.

3. A river in Thrace.

Argonauts<sup>1</sup>.

Apollodorus (II v 8):

It was the eighth labour to bring back τὰς ... Ἴππους to Mycenae; these mares ate human flesh. Heracles went with a group of volunteers; he overpowered the grooms and drove the horses to the sea, pursued by the Bistones. He gave them to Abderus, son of Hermes, with whom he fell in love, but they dragged him along the ground and killed him, whereupon Heracles routed Diomedes and the Bistones. He founded Abdera in memory of Abderus and gave the mares to Eurystheus, who set them free; they were killed by wild animals on Mount Olympus.

Hyginus (Fab. XXX 9):

Heracles killed Diomedes and his four stallions, which fed on human flesh, with the help of his servant Abderus. The horses are named as Podargus, Lampon, Xanthus and Dinus.

(Fab. CCL 2):

Included under the title Quae quadrigae rectores suos perdiderunt is Diomedem Martis filium.

Late writers tried to find causes for the wildness of the horses. Pliny<sup>2</sup>, for example, attributes it to the potency of

1. Apollonius (l. 124ff.) connects the boar labour with the time of Heracles joining the Argo. See page 338.

2. N.H. 25, 94.

the plants around Abdera, while Aelian<sup>1</sup> believes it to be caused by the River Cossinitus, which flows into Abdera: the former makes them stallions, the latter mares. Moreover, various horses are said to be descended from them. Servius<sup>2</sup>, making them stallions, mentions the story that the horses of Aeneas were descended from them but does not himself believe it; Gellius<sup>3</sup> quotes Gavius Bassus and Iulus Modestus as saying that the horse of Gnaeus Seius was descended from them; Probus<sup>4</sup> says some report that the mares of Glaucus, described by Asclepiades of Tragilus<sup>5</sup> as eating raw flesh, were in fact has equas of Diomedes, which were brought to Eurystheus by Heracles, but were stolen by Sisyphus and given to his son Glaucus.

In the majority of the sources the horses are regarded as mares, albeit particularly ferocious ones. It is possible that this reflects the belief that the "female of the species is more deadly than the male" or else it may have aimed at making these particular horses more horrific in contrast with the general notion of mares being docile. Certainly the horses appear as mares in the earliest extant source, Pindar; it is not until late that they appear as stallions, in Pliny, Hyginus<sup>6</sup> and Servius. Perhaps there was an early tradition, now lost, which also made them stallions or perhaps these

---

1. De Natura Animalium XV 25.

2. Ad Aen. I. 752.

3. iii 9.

4. To Virgil, Georgics, III 266f.

5. F.G.H. 12 F 1.

6. Hyginus also gives them masculine names.

writers mistranslated their Greek sources, since it is very often only the gender of the article which marks the horses as mares. Hyginus on another occasion has changed a female animal into a male, namely the Cerynitian Hind<sup>1</sup>.

The mares of Diomedes seem to have had no separate existence outside the Heracles myth<sup>2</sup> and not to have been very popular in literature, it being noteworthy that their only appearance in Attic drama occurs in Euripides, who liked to treat the less popular myths. Pindar gives a fairly full account. It is not possible to date this poem but it is interesting that it juxtaposes the Geryon and Diomedes myths which were also placed side by side on the Temple of Zeus at Olympia; without the date of the poem, however, it is impossible to trace the direction of influence here. All that can be said is that by the 460's BC this legend about Diomedes was regarded as a labour and that it also appears as such in Euripides. The end of the Pindar poem is not preserved and it is possible that mention was made of Heracles driving the mares to Eurystheus. The idea of them being man-eating is implied by Heracles throwing a man to them; it is interesting that it is not Diomedes who is thrown to them, as in Diodorus; we know from Pindar that Diomedes was killed by Heracles but it is not clear how, nor whether this takes place before or after the capture of the horses. The killing of Diomedes is also mentioned by Euripides, although again the manner is not

---

1. See pages 150, 153, & 168

2. In the Iliad the Greek Diomedes is associated with the divine horses of Rhesus (10. 435ff.), cf. R.E. VI 1. 817-818.

specified. Euripides' description of the method of capturing the horses may be influenced by Pindar since the ψάλια are a similar notion to the chain that bound them to the wall and by which Heracles led them away. In most of the accounts Heracles captures the horses but Hyginus states that he killed them<sup>1</sup>. The artistic evidence will be examined with a view to establishing whether Hyginus was here following an earlier source, or introducing an innovation, possibly in ignorance.

The Abderus element in the myth is likely to have been a later addition. It is possible that the derivation of the name of Abdera<sup>2</sup> in the passage referring to Hellanicus should be attributed to Stephen of Byzantium, the author, rather than to Hellanicus. It is interesting that Apollodorus gives Abderus' death as Heracles' main reason for killing Diomedes, rather than making it a necessary preliminary to the capture of the horses. He thus seems to be following a variant tradition which attached no difficulty to their capture. It is also interesting that Apollodorus makes Heracles go with a large force to Thrace, which does presumably hint at the difficulty of the task but, on the other hand, it is likely he is not thought of as making much use of it or else this labour would presumably have been discounted like that of the hydra on the ground that Heracles had help<sup>3</sup>.

As regards the fate that befell the horses in those accounts which describe them taken to Eurystheus, no two authors agree.

---

1. Cf. the Erymanthian boar, page 339.

2. At any rate the locality is fixed by the name Abderos; perhaps this was originally a local legend.

3. See page 78.

Diodorus rationalises them into real horses and says that their breed continued until the time of Alexander, Apollodorus says that they were killed by wild beasts on Mount Olympus, and Probus that they were taken from Eurystheus by Sisyphus and given to his son Glaucus.

The idea of throwing Diomedes to his own horses gives a sort of poetic justice<sup>1</sup> and it is interesting that other opponents of Heracles are "hoist with their own petard" such as the Nemean lion<sup>2</sup>, which is skinned with its own claws, and Antaeus<sup>3</sup>, who is beaten at his own sport of wrestling. Hyginus also presumably infers that Heracles was the instrument when he talks of Diomedes being eaten by the horses in Fabula CCL, since in XXX he says that Heracles, assisted by Abderus, killed Diomedes. It seems that the killing of Diomedes assumed, at least in late times, a more important part in the legend, although perhaps only in a minor variant: an inscription of the second century AD<sup>4</sup> does not mention the horses at all when talking of this labour but stresses the slaying of Diomedes and gaining mastery over Thrace.

This labour accords with those that tell of beating a monstrous opponent, the danger of which is effectively brought out in the stichomythia of the Alcestis passage. Heracles' heroism is thus highlighted. The act can also be regarded as a benefaction since presumably the horses were a general danger, but this idea is not stressed until late. The story itself

---

1. Also more heroic than Pindar's version of throwing any man to them.

2. See pages 37 & 40.

3. See, for example, Apollodorus, II v 11.

4. C.I.Gr. 5984.

is one of those which tell of Heracles fighting a son of Ares, as with the myth of Cycnus<sup>1</sup>; the Stymphalian birds are also connected with him<sup>2</sup>. One would expect it to be said that Diomedes received his horses from his divine father but this is not the case, at least in extant literature. At any rate, it is likely that some general antagonism was thought to exist between Heracles and Ares.

As has been stated, the Diomedes myth appears rather late and is not very popular; I feel this may be at least partly explained by reference to the myth connecting Heracles with the horses of Laomedon<sup>3</sup>. These were given to Tros by Zeus in return for his son Ganymede and thus passed to Laomedon. Sarpedon is made to talk of Heracles sacking Troy because Laomedon refused him the horses when he had done him service; this service, as Hellanicus<sup>4</sup> says, consisted in saving Laomedon's daughter, Hesione, from a sea monster sent by Apollo and Poseidon to punish Laomedon for not honouring his debt to them<sup>5</sup>. Laomedon cheated Heracles by giving him mortal horses instead. Therefore, Heracles marched against him and sacked Troy and took the horses that way. Diodorus<sup>6</sup> and Apollodorus<sup>7</sup> actually make them mares.

---

1. cf. R.E. XI 2. 2435ff.

2. See page 104.

3. R.E. XII 1. 752ff.

4. F.G.H. 4 F 108.

5. They built the wall.

6. IV 42, 5-7.

7. II v 9.

The Laomedon story enjoyed an earlier tradition than that about Diomedes since it occurred in Homer<sup>1</sup> and was still being told by the late mythographers. There are definite similarities between the two and I believe that the former may have somewhat eclipsed the latter, even though it may have provided the inspiration for the legend of Heracles and the horses of Diomedes. Where subjects were similar, artists and authors seem to have favoured one at the expense of the other: I believe that this was the reason for the comparative scarcity of representations of the Hesperides snake as opposed to those of the hydra<sup>2</sup>.

#### B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE

The artistic material representing this myth is rather limited, again indicating that it was not particularly popular among the Heracles stories<sup>3</sup>. However, it is also noteworthy that the Laomedon story is not pictured in art. It may have been that these subjects did not provide scope for interesting artistic representations. The Diomedes story appears in art earlier than it appears in extant literature about the middle of the sixth century on the throne of Bathycles.

##### (a) The Death of Diomedes.

I begin with this group because to it may belong the earliest documented artistic version of this labour. This is

---

1. Il. 5. 640ff.

2. See page 267.

3. This would certainly be the case if it was originally a myth of the Abderos area.

interesting as being also the detail that captured the imagination of the author of the late inscription<sup>1</sup>. It has to be admitted that the male in all these pieces cannot be firmly identified as Diomedes since Pindar does record a version in which Heracles brought about the death of someone else as well, but this is confined to Pindar in extant literature and the following are perhaps more likely to depict the main recipient of death, Diomedes.

1. Throne of Bathycles<sup>2</sup>.
2. Florence, cup-fragments, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Naples H 2506, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
4. Taranto 5110, oinochoe, Apulian red-figure<sup>5</sup>.
5. Athens, Agora P 23225, Megarian bowl. }<sub>6</sub>
6. Athens, Agora P 404, krater-fragment. }

The only evidence for the throne of Bathycles, which does not survive itself, is the statement of Pausanias that it depicted "Heracles punishing Diomedes the Thracian". It can be seen that it cannot with certainty be said that Heracles killed him in this version since it is possible that the punishment consisted rather in having his horses taken away from him; in this case it may be that the horses were shown on the throne and not Diomedes, since his name is used by Pausanias merely to refer to the myth in general in his description of the Olympia metope on the subject<sup>7</sup>.

---

1. See page 325 & note (4)

2. Paus. III 18. 12.

3. Br. 187 B 2; A.R.V. 2. 58, 47.

4. Br. 187 A 3; Vasensammlung Neapolis 322.

5. Br. 187 D 1; C.V. 1 pl. IV Dr 8, 2.

6. Br. 187 E 1 & 2; Hausmann, pl. 62, 2; Hesperia, Supplement 10, 107, no. 120.

7. See page 333.

The red-figure cup-fragments (2) were painted by Oltos and thus date to the last quarter of the sixth century. Again it is not possible to say for certain whether the death of Diomedes was depicted since, although on one side an arm hangs out of a horse's mouth, on the other side Diomedes seems to be pictured. It is certainly possible that Diomedes is drawn at two separate stages in the myth but it would also be possible for the arm in the mouth to represent the unidentified figure of the Pindar version, especially as Heracles brandishes his club in coercion once the animal has sated its appetite<sup>1</sup>. There seems no way of settling this. Both alternatives are interesting. If this vase gives the version that appears in Pindar it both antedates him and also gives the only other appearance of the version in any medium; if Diomedes is here shown eaten by his own horse it is much earlier than the first reference to the story, which appears in Diodorus, and could perhaps indicate that this was the main line of the myth while the Pindar version was perhaps his own variant.

(3) seems less problematical as regards the identification of Diomedes. Heracles, using the lionskin as a shield<sup>2</sup>, stands behind three horses, holding bow and arrows in his left hand and brandishing his club in his right, not apparently at the horses but rather at the naked figure of Diomedes, who runs away. This does not give any specific manner of death to Diomedes, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ as (2) may offer, nor does it show Diomedes dead, but it does indicate that Heracles is pursuing him, presumably with hostile intent, before capturing the horses.

---

1. This detail appears in Pindar.

2. Its invulnerability makes it very useful for such purposes.

(4) also brings its problems: Heracles has his arms around the neck of a horse on either side of him and apparently holds the club in his right hand. The interest of this piece lies in the figure to the left of Heracles with spear, shield and net; this could be Diomedes about to throw the net over Heracles to ensnare him, so that he may then finish him off with his spear, rather as Clytemnestra used the net in the murder of Agamemnon<sup>1</sup>. This would give an elaborate tradition to Diomedes' resistance to Heracles. However, the weapons do suggest those of a hunter and the figure could be a helper of Heracles, about to catch the horses, which Heracles is taming. Iolaus is not mentioned as taking part in this labour, although this need not prevent an artist from depicting him so. At any rate, Abderus also helped Heracles in this labour according to Hyginus and this could be evidence that this version was earlier than him. There can be no means of knowing which version the artist intended.

For my knowledge of (5) and (6) I must rely on the description of G. Roger Edwards<sup>2</sup> who finds P 404 (6), of which only a fragment remains, identifiable as a representation of this labour from comparison with P 23225 (5). He says that Heracles, at least in the latter, has his right foot on "what seems to be the head of a prostrate human figure, presumably Diomedes, just slain". If he is right, this would be a version in which Diomedes was killed in a way other than being thrown to the horses. Three horses can be picked out, with Heracles holding the head of one.

---

1. Aesch. Ag. 1115.

2. 'Hellenistic Pottery, Small Objects from the Pnyx II' Hesperia Supplement 10, 79ff. On the pieces in question see

Not much information can be gained from this group of representations; they rather provide food for speculation. However, even if the throne of Bathycles did not show the death of Diomedes the fact of this labour being represented on it dates the story at least to the middle of the sixth century.

(b) Heracles possibly intending to kill the horses.

This is the next earliest group, but again there is a good deal of uncertainty about it, since it is merely the choice of weapons depicted which suggests Heracles is going to attempt more than capture; it is possible that the killing motif was not in the mind of the artist at all. However, if Heracles is meant here to be about to kill the mares this is very important as showing Hyginus' statement that he did so reflects an early tradition.

1. Leningrad, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>1</sup>.

2. Vienna, 4404, cup-fragments, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.

(1) is by Psiax and thus dates to the last quarter of the sixth century. Inside the cup Heracles is drawn with his right arm around the neck of a mare, and apparently sticking a spear into her neck with his left hand; this surely suggests more than capture. The mare has a snake coming from her nose, presumably to suggest her monstrous nature.

(2) is fragmentary and again depicts this labour on the inside of the cup. The top of Heracles' head is preserved together with the lionskin and also parts of the bow, which he was presumably pointing. On the right the head and forelegs

---

1. Br. 187 A 2; B.S.A. 46 (1951) 150, note 29 & pl. 16a;  
A.B.V. 294, 22.

2. Br. 187 B 3; C.V. 2 pl. 99, 1.

of a horse are preserved and the back legs are preserved on a separate fragment. There seems to be an arrow in its neck, on the side turned away from Heracles, and again this suggests more than capture.

It does appear that the killing, or at least wounding, of the mares was known at the end of the sixth century although it may have been the interpretation of individual vase-painters not well-versed in the actual myth rather than a significant variant.

(c) Heracles opposes the horses with his club

This group contains the most numerous examples but even here there are not many. Moreover, all the pieces do not seem to refer to exactly the same moment in the myth. The group begins in the first quarter of the fifth century.

1. Syracuse 14569, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Scarab<sup>2</sup>.
3. England, private collection, scarab<sup>3</sup>.
4. Olympia, metope<sup>4</sup>.
5. Athens, Hephaesteum, metope<sup>5</sup>.

An interesting feature of (1) is that the mares are winged, probably to enhance their monstrous nature, as does the snake on the Leningrad cup<sup>6</sup>. One cannot help thinking of the winged

---

1. Br. 186 A 1; Brommer, Her. pl. 19b. A.B.V. 487.

2. A. Furtwängler, Antike Gemmen (Munich, 1900) I pl. 8, 59.

3. Ibid. pl. 6, 47.

4. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pl. 179.

5. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI. v.

6. See page 331.

Geryon, who appears in the Geryoneis of Stesichorus<sup>1</sup> and also in Chalcidian vase-painting<sup>2</sup>. The depiction of four horses may be deliberate since Euripides and others say that they were a four-horse chariot team, the main function of horses. Heracles grasps one around the neck and brandishes his club.

(2) and (3) again belong to the late Archaic period; their representations are similar, with Heracles leading off a single horse, perhaps back to Eurystheus; he holds its bridle and threatens it with his club. The size of the field probably dictated the rendering of a single horse.

The two metopes, (4) and (5), are similar to one another. At Olympia, Heracles had his left hand across the nose of a rearing horse and his pose suggests he had the club in his other hand. Pausanias is not very exact in his description saying that above the temple doors is "the labour with Diomedes the Thracian" although Diomedes himself is not depicted; presumably he is using Diomedes' name loosely to refer to the labour as a whole<sup>3</sup>. On the Hephaesteum, Heracles has his hand between a horse's ears; again he has been restored as wielding his club, which seems plausible. This rendering is odd, however, as the horse is a stallion, since it seems to have genitalia. It is difficult to know whether this was deliberate, thus providing a precedent for Hyginus' description of the horses as stallions, or whether it is a mistake. Certainly oddities

---

1. See page 291.

2. See pages 303, no. 2 & 304; 313, no. 3 & 314 & note (3).

3. See page 328.

do occur, as with the representation of Theseus and the boar of Crommyon<sup>1</sup>, and they seem best regarded as artists' mistakes. At Olympia the underside of the horse is not preserved but one would expect a mare to have been shown here along with the main tradition. The appearance of a single horse again is sufficient to allude to the myth in a fairly small field.

(2) and (3) recall Pindar's statement that Heracles led off the horses, controlling them with his club, although, since the date of the Pindar passage is not known, it cannot be said whether they derived from his account. In (4) and (5) Heracles seems about to get the horse under control, while in (1) he may be still in the middle of mastering them.

It is very possible that a relief from Sunium<sup>2</sup> should be placed in this category. A mare bucks on its hind legs; Heracles has his left arm out and his right arm, though not preserved, seems to have been held back, probably holding a weapon, which was probably the club.

- 
1. B.M. E 36, cup, Attic red-figure (Br. 248 B 1; A.R.V. 2. 1269, 4. See page 340 & note (6).
  2. Hesperia 10 (1941) 163ff., fig. 5 face B2.

Perhaps also under this heading should be placed the Attic red-figure cup by the **Kodros Painter**<sup>1</sup>, in that it shows Heracles with the horses under control, as on the scarabs, and one of the weapons he holds is the club. The horses walk in front of him; in his left hand he holds the bow but it is not poised.

(d) The version cannot be identified

1. Delphi, Treasury of the Athenians, metope<sup>2</sup>.

All that is preserved is the rear leg of a horse from the foot to just above the knee. There is something close to the hoof<sup>3</sup>, but it cannot be identified. From the size of the field it seems that the horse was rearing and it is possible that the composition was similar to that of the Olympia and Hephaestum metopes.

CONCLUSION

The first appearance of the Diomedes story can be dated to around the middle of the sixth century B.C., although there is no evidence as to whether it was regarded as a labour at

---

1. Altenburg 232 (Br. 187 B 1; Rome, German Institute drawings, 11, 9; A.R.V. 2. 1270, 14.

2. B.C.H. 47 (1923) p11. 16-18 N 3.

3. This could be the head of Diomedes; see page 330 for a parallel.

that time nor about the version that then existed. It has been noted that it was not a popular story either in literature or art. It seems possible that the story of the mares arose in Thrace in the region around Abdera to explain some fearful aspect of the place and that it found its way into the Heracles cycle when the Greeks became acquainted with Thrace. On the other hand, the story, which has no separate existence outside the Heracles saga, may have been invented on the mainland, probably in the Peloponnese, and set in Thrace because it seemed to suit the rather barbaric nature of the countryside. Certainly there were Peloponnesian connections with the area near Thrace in the form of the foundation of Chalcedon by Megara in 676 BC and of Byzantium in 660, and the foundation of Potidaea by Corinth in 600. The connection of Abdera with Abderus may be a local one, although it may have been a Greek device to link closely myth and locality. It is possible that the story of divine horses belonging to King Rhesus of Thrace was an inspiration for this myth, especially as the 'other' Diomedes was involved with them<sup>1</sup>. The horses of Laomedon may also have been an inspiration, horses with which Heracles enjoyed an earlier connection.

Certainly the Diomedes story was known in Attica by the end of the sixth century, as can be seen from its appearance on a few vases and also on the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, and so by this time it is likely to have been fairly well established among Heracles' exploits; it certainly caught the imagination of Euripides, although admittedly he did like to treat less-popular myths; it also appeared on the Hephaestum in Athens and Heracleum in Thebes, along with most

---

1. See page 323 & note (2).

of the other labours of the later canon. For some reason, however, it never really became popular in art, perhaps because it did not offer an interesting subject per se, although one might argue the same about the subject-matter of the bull labour, which was extremely popular in this medium, and much may be owed to accidents of survival.

As regards the variants of the myth, it is likely that the idea of the horses being stallions, as opposed to mares, was due to a mistake or misinterpretation, and it is possible too that there was no actual version in which they were killed: artists were often non well-versed in mythology and Hyginus may be recording an inaccuracy. Certainly the tradition that Diomedes was killed dates to the end of the sixth century and may even have been part of the myth from the beginning; it is not possible to date the origin of the version in which Diomedes was neatly 'hoist by his own petard' by being thrown to his own horses, although it perhaps has an air of sophistication attributable to later writers.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN.THE ERYMANTHIAN BOAR

This is another of the animal labours set in the Northern Peloponnese. It is generally regarded as the third or fourth labour, but placed last on the temple of Zeus.

A. LITERARY EVIDENCE

Homer (Od. VI 103f.): There were wild boars near Erymanthus.

Hecataeus (F.G.H I F 6): Psophis was ravaged by a boar.

Sophocles (Tr. 1097): The boar is mentioned as a labour after the Nemean lion, hydra and centaurs.

Apollonius Rhodius  
(l. 124ff.): Heracles brought the boar alive from Lampia near Erymanthus, carrying it in chains on his shoulders. He put it down at the gate of the agora at Mycenae<sup>1</sup> and went off to join the Argonauts, against the wishes of Eurystheus.

Diodorus Siculus (IV 12, 1-2): It was Heracles' third labour to bring back alive the Erymanthian boar; this was very difficult because of the danger either of killing it or being killed by it. When Eurystheus saw Heracles carrying the boar on his shoulders he was terrified and hid in a bronze vessel. Heracles' adventure with Pholus occurred about this time. (IV 12, 3ff.).

---

1. Cf. Herodorus (F.G.H. 31 F 24).

- Apollodorus (II v 4): It was Heracles' fourth labour to bring back alive the Erymanthian boar, which was ravaging Psophis. On the way, he passed through Pholoe and met Pholus and the centaurs. After exhausting the boar by chase he trapped it and took it to Mycenae.
- Pausanias (VIII 24. 5): The Erymanthian boar was of great size and strength.
- Hyginus (Fab. XXX 4): Heracles killed the Erymanthian boar.

The legend connecting Heracles with a boar at Erymanthus does not appear in extant literature before the second half of the fifth century BC but it is possible that Heracles also appeared in the account of Hecataeus since Psophis is in the same area as Erymanthus and is the setting for the boar in Apollodorus' account. It seems that this boar was derived from the tradition of Erymanthus as the home for wild boars in the Odyssey.

This is variously described as the third or fourth labour, with Diodorus and Apollodorus obviously using different traditions. B.Luce<sup>1</sup> finds difficulty in this and tries to normalise the event as the third labour, failing to see that a myth may have a number of variants. He states that Sophocles makes it the third labour but, while it is the third to be mentioned of those which occur in the later canon, it is in fact fourth in the list, being placed after the reference to the centaurs. The latter refers to the Pholus legend, in which Heracles was

---

1. 'Studies of the exploits of Heracles on Vases' A.J.A. 28 (1924) 296ff.

entertained by Pholus the centaur with wine that belonged to all the centaurs, who attacked when they smelled it. Heracles killed them but Pholus, in removing an arrow from one of them, dropped it on his foot and died because of the poison of the hydra, with which it was steeped<sup>1</sup>. This story in later times was connected with the boar labour in so far as it was regarded as taking place at roughly the same time, but there is no evidence for any earlier connection<sup>2</sup> and in the Sophocles passage here mentioned and also in Euripides<sup>3</sup> this seems to have been regarded as a labour in its own right. Luce thus appears wrong in thinking that the Sophocles reference to centaurs and boar refer to the same labour and this is substantiated by the fact that a 'τε' is inserted between all the μόχθοι in Sophocles list, indicating that they were each thought of as separate. It will not be necessary to make any further reference to the Pholus story since it was never an integral part of the boar labour and may be earlier than the latter, first appearing at the end of the seventh century in Stesichorus<sup>4</sup> and on an Early Corinthian skyphos in the Louvre<sup>5</sup>.

Luce may again be criticised for his statement<sup>6</sup> that:  
'this labor is <sup>the</sup> only one of the achievements of the hero that

- 
1. Cf Diod. IV 12, 3-8; Apollod. II v 4.
  2. It is connected with the Geryon labour in Stesichorus. See page 301.
  3. H.F. 360ff. where the boar is not mentioned among the μόχθοι.
  4. See note (2).
  5. Louvre L 173 (Br. 182 C 1; N.C. no 941, pl. 31, 9-10). The subject may appear as early as a Geometric amphora in Copenhagen, 7029 (Friis-Johansen, op. cit. I 46, fig. 110) which shows a man confronting a centaur.
  6. op. cit. 296.

Apollonius Rhodius deems worthy of mention" since it takes no account of his reference to the Amazons<sup>1</sup>, the Stymphalian Birds<sup>2</sup>, and the apples of the Hesperides<sup>3</sup>; moreover, the main reason for Apollonius' mention of the boar seems only to give a chronological setting to Heracles' joining of the Argo.

Diodorus says that Eurystheus was so scared that he hid in a jar when Heracles brought the boar to Mycenae<sup>4</sup>. This enhances the bravery of Heracles by comparing it with the cowardice of Eurystheus, and it will be seen from the artistic evidence to be part of the myth in its early stages. A similar effect is achieved by Pausanias' reference to the size and strength of the boar and Athenaeus'<sup>5</sup> reference to its size. Thus the heroic aspect of the labour is highlighted and it also seems to have been an act of benefaction since the boar is described as ravaging the countryside. This idea occurs as early as Hecataeus, granted that this is the same boar, as seems likely, and is stressed in Latin literature<sup>6</sup>.

All the sources here mentioned, with the exception of Hyginus, make Heracles bring the boar to Mycenae alive. This is not the only instance in his reference to the labours where Hyginus differs in this detail<sup>7</sup> and it seems that he had some idea that Heracles killed most of the creatures he encountered

---

1. 2. 964ff.

2. 2. 1052ff.

3. 4. 1396ff.

4. This detail also occurs in the lion and Cerberus labours. See pages 37 & 251.

5. IV 130A.

6. Cf. Ovid, Met. IX 192; Seneca, Ag. 832 & H.F. 228; Silius Italicus III 38.

7. Cf. The mares of Diomedes (page 321).

in the labours. It is possible, however, that this idea did not originally belong to Hyginus but to some late source which he imitated; it is noteworthy that the same version also appears in late writers such as Ausonius<sup>1</sup> and Eustathius<sup>2</sup>. It is just possible that he was following an early version and it will be necessary to look for traces of one in the examination of the artistic evidence.

Finally in this section, it should be pointed out that boars seem to have been rather a popular theme in Greek mythology, often in the context of boar hunts, no doubt because much heroism was needed to hunt a boar. The myth of the hunting of the Calydonian boar goes back at least as far as the Iliad<sup>3</sup> while in the Odyssey<sup>4</sup> the hunting of a boar on Parnassus with Autolycus is mentioned as the occasion on which Odysseus received his famous scar. Slightly later than the legend of the Erymanthian boar is that which connects Theseus with the sow of Crommyon<sup>5</sup>, doubtless influenced by the Heracles' story and on one vase even represented as a boar<sup>6</sup>, no doubt by mistake. Boar and sow seem inevitably to have been linked at least in late times by a tradition which made the sow the mother of the boar<sup>7</sup>. There also seems to have been confusion

---

1. XXXIII

2. Dionysius Periegetes 414.

3. 9. 527ff.

4. XIX 392ff.

5. Its first appearance seems to be on the Cyclic vases of the late sixth century BC. See Br. 248.

6. London B.M. E36, cup (Br. 248 B 1).

7. Strabo VIII 6. 22.

between the Erymanthian and Calydonian boars<sup>1</sup>, and it is noteworthy that Heracles was married to Deianeira, daughter of Oeneus<sup>2</sup> of Calydon.

#### B. ARTISTIC EVIDENCE.

The earliest artistic representations occur about a century earlier than the first specific references in literature to Heracles subduing the Erymanthian boar, and thus date roughly to the middle of the sixth century BC, perhaps showing one of the lyric poets to be the source. The material may be conveniently divided according to the aspect of the legend depicted, since every aspect is drawn in art from Heracles' initial encounter with the boar right to his arrival with it in Mycenae. Luce<sup>3</sup> and Kunze<sup>4</sup> are generally in agreement as to the various schemes for different parts of the myth, but where they disagree it will be pointed out. Luce's list follows the order of events chronologically, with the exception of Group I, which depicts the use of weapons and therefore ought, in my opinion, to stand outside the general pattern, as I shall discuss later; I shall, therefore, reserve the discussion of scenes with the use of weapons until later and begin my Group I with the pieces Luce places in his group II. I shall not, like Luce further subdivide my list according to the spectators who are present but merely pass comment on this

---

1. Callimachus (Hymn to Diana 220) mentions the Arcadian boar in Calydon: Pausanias (VIII 47.2) says that in the temple of Tegea was an offering of the skin of the Calydonian boar; Tegea is closer to Erymanthus than to Calydon. See Wilamowitz Herakles 63.

2. Soph. Tr. eg. v. 6.

3. op. cit.

4. op. cit. 104-6.

if required. Brommer<sup>1</sup> divides his list of black-figure representations into "pithos" and "non-pithos" types (Aa and Ab respectively); I, therefore, shall not need to list all the representations of the "pithos" type that occur on vases but merely explain the composition and refer to Brommer's list; however, the "pithos" scenes in other media will, of course, be listed and examined. I shall include, where possible, the vases of Luce's lists in my lists, fitting them in to the chronological pattern, but unfortunately Luce is so vague in his reference to his material that it is not always possible to identify the vases he mentions. I shall, therefore, only include the vases for which I can find a definite whereabouts and number, placing the others at the end of each section.

#### I Heracles overcoming the boar (Luce Group II)

This is represented in art by the scheme of Heracles and the boar facing each other; Heracles is bent forward, with one hand on the boar's flanks, while the animal also bends forwards, kneeling on its left front leg. This is somewhat similar to the "Liegekampf" position of Heracles strangling the Nemean lion<sup>2</sup>, as Luce observes, and also the schemes of Heracles wrestling with the Cretan bull<sup>3</sup>. I can find no example of this composition-type in any medium other than vase-painting and here it is mainly confined to fifth-century Attic black-figure lekythoi, especially by the Haimon Group, as was the case with such scenes of lion and bull.

---

1. 47ff.

2. See pages 62ff.

3. See pages 129ff.

1. Florence, Mus. Arch., skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Market 1919, oinochoe, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. Naples Stg. 150, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure.  
(L11)<sup>3</sup>.
4. Louvre F 299, hydria, Attic black-figure. (L26)<sup>4</sup>.
5. Syracuse from Gela, volute-krater fragment, Attic black-figure (L27)<sup>5</sup>.
6. London, Dr. Schuler, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. Earlier Cecil Torr, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.
8. Dresden ZV 1822, white-ground lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L 16)<sup>8</sup>.
9. Göttingen 20, lekythos, Attic black-figure (L 17)<sup>9</sup>.
10. Athens NM 1582, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L 31)<sup>10</sup>.
11. Paris, Mus. Rodin 851, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>11</sup>.
12. Athens NM, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>12</sup>.
13. Athens Agora P2715 and 2722, lekythos-fragments, Attic black-figure<sup>13</sup>.

- 
1. Br. 52 Ab 6; N.Sc. 20 (1923) 132, Fasc. II pl. 1, 5.
  2. Br. 52 Ab 16; Sotheby Catalogue (22/23-v-19) no. 260.
  3. Br. 53 2 ab; A.B.V. 385, 1.
  4. Br. 52 Ab 10; A.B.V. 362, 29.
  5. Br. 52 Ab 9; Mon. Ant. 17 (1907) 311f., fig. 229.
  6. Br. 51 Ab 25; This is identical to no. (7).
  7. Br. 51 Ab 27; Sotheby Catalogue (2-vi-29) no. 24.
  8. Br. 50 Ab 1u; A.A. (1971) 171, fig. 13.
  9. Br. 50 Ab 3u; P. Jacobsthal, Göttinger Vasen (Berlin, 1912) pl. VI, 20; A.B.L. 244, 74.
  10. Br. 50 Ab 8u & 51 Ab 13 (erroneously repeated); A.M. 18 (1893) 51, fig. 1; A.B.V. 547, 229.
  11. Br. 50 Ab 6u; C.V. (Fr. 16) pl. 17, 7; A.B.V. 547, 234.
  12. Br. 50 Ab 7u & 9u (erroneously repeated); Deltion 11 (1927-8) 91, fig. 1, no. 8; A.B.L. 242, 27.
  13. Br. 51 Ab 16; Hesperia 15 (1946) pl. 55, 148; A.B.V. 547, 233.

14. Market 1969, skyphos, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
15. Stuttgart, KAS 89, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
16. New York 41.162.78, Gallatin collection, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L18)<sup>3</sup>.
17. Fogg 362, lekythos-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
18. Berlin F 2034, tripod-pyxis, Attic black-figure (L28)<sup>5</sup>.
19. London, BM B 462, kyathos, Attic black-figure (L29)<sup>6</sup>.
20. Athens P 3778, lekythos, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

The representations in this group do not begin until the late sixth century and, as has been said, most of the fifth century examples (6ff.) can be positively assigned to the Haimon Group. The scheme scarcely changes from vase to vase, as one would expect since it is confined to only a few schools. (2), however, is different in that Heracles is establishing a wrestling hold from behind and it is possible that this is a mixture between wrestling-type and that of picking up the boar (Group II). Various spectators are often present and also Heracles' cloak and weapons are often shown hanging in a tree, as in wrestling scenes with the lion and bull.

I shall now list those representations which Luce claims to depict this composition but which cannot be positively identified. I presume they belong to the end of the sixth

- 
1. Br. 52 Ab 7; Sotheby Catalogue (1-vii-69) no. 98 fig.
  2. Br. 50 Ab 5u; C.V. 1 pl. 21.3-5; Par. 277.
  3. Br. 52 Ab 38; Luce, op. cit. fig. 2; A.B.V. 538.
  4. Br. 52 Ab 41; C.V. (U.S.A. 8) Fogg pl. XI, 5; A.B.V. 547, 237.
  5. Br. 52 Ab 18; Brommer, Her. pl. 13a; A.B.V. 556, 442 bis.
  6. Br. 52 Ab 17; A.B.V. 556, 447.
  7. Br. 51 Ab 17, 51 Ab 20 & 53 Ab 5 (three times in error); Perachora II pl. 143; A.B.V. 547, 230.

century and beginning of the fifth, but there is often no way of verifying this or even the actual type of composition, since a picture is not available.

1. Myconos, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure. (L12)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Athens CC 977, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L14)<sup>2</sup>.
3. Louvre F 455, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L19)<sup>3</sup>.
4. Piraeus Museum, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L20)<sup>4</sup>.
5. Syracuse, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L21)<sup>5</sup>.
6. Formerly Ministry of Education, Athens, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L22)<sup>6</sup>.
7. Sabattini Sale catalogue 16, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L23)<sup>7</sup>.
8. Formerly, Athens market, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L24)<sup>8</sup>.
9. Eugène Piot Sale catalogue, p32 no 105 lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L25)<sup>9</sup>.
10. Syracuse, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L31)<sup>10</sup>.
11. Eugène Piot Sale catalogue p32 no 116, lekythos Attic black-figure. (L33)<sup>11</sup>.
12. Vienna, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L34)<sup>12</sup>.

- 
1. Luce, op. cit. 319 n. 4 says that he saw this vase in 1915 and noted it.
  2. Klein, op. cit. 91, 8.
  3. No details given.
  4. No details given.
  5. No details given. This could presumably be either Br. 51 Ab 30, 31, or 32.
  6. No details given.
  7. No details given.
  8. Klein, op. cit. 91, 10.
  9. No details given.
  10. No details given.
  11. No details given.
  12. No details given. Possibly this is Br. 51 Ab 33 or 34.

II. Heracles picking up the boar (Luce Group III)

Once again this part of the story is confined to Attic black-figure vases. This group is represented in surviving art just a few years earlier than Group I, but is not found before the last quarter of the sixth century. Heracles holds the back legs of the boar in the air, while its front legs are on the ground and its snout points downwards; the 'wheelbarrow-type' is an apt description. Again all the pieces in this group are very similar as regards composition; spectators are often present.

1. Würzburg 182, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
2. Tarquinia 680, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
3. London BM B 492, oinochoe, Attic black-figure. (L39)<sup>3</sup>.
4. Cambridge G 57, kalpis, Attic black-figure. (L35)<sup>4</sup>.
5. Bologna 64, (C67) olpe, Attic black-figure. (L38)<sup>5</sup>.
6. Syracuse 21965, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.
7. London BM B 447, cup, Attic black-figure. (L36)<sup>7</sup>.
8. Athens NM 644 (CC 1097), cup, Attic black-figure<sup>8</sup>.

Numbers (1) - (6) date to the last quarter of the sixth century and the rest to the early fifth century.

- 
1. Br. 50 Ab 2ab; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 54; A.B.V. 327, 4u.
  2. Br. 50 Ab 9; C.V. 2 pl. 30, 1; A.B.V. 283, 2.
  3. Br. 52 Ab 14; A.B.V. 256, 19.
  4. Br. 52 Ab 12; C.V. 1 pll. 16, 4 & 17, 4.
  5. Br. 52 Ab 15; C.V. 2. pl. 38, 3.
  6. Br. 50 Ab 8ab; Mon. Ant. 17 (1907) pl. 9; A.B.V. 375, 218.
  7. Br. 52 Ab 2; A.B.V. 560, 520.
  8. Br. 52 Ab 3; A.B.V. 560, 522.

In this section there is just one piece in Luce's list which cannot be identified:

1. Syracuse, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L40)<sup>1</sup>.

IIIa. Heracles carrying the boar to Mycenae (Luce Group IV a)

In these scenes Heracles carries the boar on his shoulders; it is the boar's back which rests on his shoulders and its legs are in the air. Heracles and boar are alone, without spectators and without Eurystheus, and this is why these scenes are thought to depict the journey to Mycenae rather than the arrival there. This group begins fairly early with the Heidelberg Painter, who dates just after the middle of the sixth century.

1. Palermo, cup-fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>.
2. Basel, Erlenmeyer, cup, Attic black-figure<sup>3</sup>.
3. Heidelberg S 27, rim-cup, Attic black-figure<sup>4</sup>.
4. Munich 1560 (J 694), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
5. Leningrad, Ermitage, bronze tripod<sup>6</sup>.
6. Louvre CA 551, Megarian bowl<sup>7</sup>.

- 
1. No details given.
  2. Br. 53 Ab 3 & Ab 7 (repeated erroneously); A.B.V. 682, 63.
  3. Br. 53 Ab 9; Par. 27, 58 bis.
  4. Br. 52 Ab 1; C.V. 1 pl. 44, 6.
  5. Br. 50 Ab 1ab; A.B.V. 327, 5u.
  6. Jd.I. 58 (1943) 213, fig. 6.
  7. Br. 54 E 1; Luce, op. cit. 297, fig. 1; Hausmann, op. cit. 90, no. 9. This piece is slightly different in that Heracles is in semi-kneeling position with the boar on his shoulders; there is no sign of Eurystheus. It is not certain whether Heracles is simply weighed down by the huge boar or in the act of picking it up or setting it down. On the other hand, the artist may have none of these interpretations in mind but merely have aimed at making an allusion to this myth. In another scene Athena hands Heracles the club; these scenes probably record completely separate incidents, since Heracles possessed the club by the time he encountered the boar.

The first two are probably by the Heidelberg Painter, although Beazley is not completely certain about (1); (3) seems of similar date, but has not been assigned to any particular artist. (4) belongs to the last quarter of the sixth century and (5) seems to date roughly to the end of the sixth century. (6) is Hellenistic.

Luce's representations which cannot be identified are as follows:

1. Würzburg, Urlichs 108, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L42)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Formerly Basseggio, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L43)<sup>2</sup>.
3. Paris, Bib. Nat. 323, kylix-fragment, Attic black-figure. (L44)<sup>3</sup>.
4. Adria, Mus. Bocch. 57, kylix, Attic black-figure. (L45)<sup>4</sup>.
5. Berlin Inv 3161g., Megarian bowl. (L46).<sup>5</sup>

I have placed (5) in this list because, although Luce cites the Museum number and reference to Courby, there is no picture to make possible verification that this does show Heracles carrying the boar to Mycenae.

Finally in this group I must turn to three representations which may show Heracles carrying the boar or could have been originally part of "pithos" scenes, and as such have depicted the arrival in Mycenae.

1. Calydon, metope<sup>6</sup>.
2. In Athens, relief.<sup>7</sup>

---

1. Klein, op. cit. 91β.

2. Ibid δ.

3. No details given.

4. No details given. Luce regards this piece as rather doubtful in its subject-matter.

5. F. Courby, Les Vases grecs à Reliefs (Paris, 1922) 298, no. 25.

6. E. Dyggve, Das Laphrion der Tempelbezirk von Kalydon (Copenhagen, 1948) 160f., fig. 164, & pl. 19, 2A & 20y, 2A.

7. J.H.S. 57 (1937) 41, fig. 3.

3. Delphi inv. 6792 & 1871, bronze appliques<sup>1</sup>.

There is not much preserved of the Calydon metope. The head of a bearded man can be seen and the part behind the head can be identified as the boar because of the bristles on top of its back. It seems odd that Heracles and the Erymanthian boar should be depicted at Calydon, but sometimes there seems to be a connection suggested between the Calydonian and Erymanthian boars<sup>2</sup>, not surprising since the regions of Erymanthus and Calydon are fairly close, separated by the Isthmus of Corinth, and there may have been a story, not preserved, that they were one and the same animal. Certainly the scheme of carrying the boar on the shoulder is a popular composition for the Erymanthian boar but not for the Calydonian one<sup>3</sup>, but the fact that the belly, rather than the back, rests on the shoulders is unusual. The fact that it would provide the earliest evidence for the Erymanthian boar means it is necessary to treat this piece with caution, although it is not too much earlier than the Heidelberg Painter's cups. It is not possible to be sure of the exact subject-matter: it could be Heracles either carrying home the Erymanthian boar or bringing it to Eurystheus, who has not been preserved, possibly implying a contamination of the two boar myths since it appears at Calydon, or it could possibly represent Meleager carrying off the Calydonian boar, although this is not part of the literary tradition or a scheme which usually occurs in art.

---

1. B.C.H. 66-7 (1942-3) 150ff., figs. 1-3 & pl. 8.

2. See page 340f.

3. Generally shown in hunting scenes with many participants. Cf the François Vase (Beazley, Development of Attic Black Figure, plate 11).

The relief in Athens, (2), shows the boar's back resting on Heracles' shoulders in the normal pose but its head is on the left, which is unusual. This may well have been influenced by Attic red-figure vase-painting<sup>1</sup>, in which the boar is usually brought down on Eurystheus rump-first as opposed to head-first in black-figure. It is thus possible that Eurystheus was originally depicted here, despite Benton's<sup>2</sup> contention that, since Heracles is not actually in the act of bringing down the boar, Eurystheus was probably not present. In fact, there are examples of "pithos" scenes where Heracles is still advancing and not yet bringing down the boar while Eurystheus cowers in his pithos<sup>3</sup>. The bottom part of the relief is not preserved and there would be enough space there for Eurystheus and pithos. Benton dates this piece to c. 520 BC.

One bronze applique from Delphi, (3), shows Heracles carrying the boar on his shoulders in the usual manner. This should probably be taken with the other applique showing Eurystheus in his pithos. P. Amandry<sup>4</sup> dates these appliques to the end of the sixth century.

#### IIIb. Driving the boar to Mycenae (Luce Group IV B)

1. Louvre F 236, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure. (L48)<sup>5</sup>.

1. Louvre G 17 (Br. 53 B 1) dates to the last quarter of the sixth century and perhaps Benton's date for the relief is a little high. See note (2).

2. J.H.S. 57 (1937) 40.

3. Cf. for example the Cnossus relief, recorded by Benton. This seems an extraordinary oversight on her part.

4. 'Héraklès, Eurysthée et le sanglier d'Erymanthe sur deux appliques de bronze trouvées à Delphes', B.C.H. (1943) 150ff. for ideas on how these two appliques were originally arranged.

5. Br. 50 Ab 4ab; C.V. 4 pl. 46.

2. Fogg 60.314, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>.
3. Louvre MR 607, guttus, Hellenistic<sup>2</sup>.

The subject-matter of this group is not completely certain. (1) is the only one named by Luce, and Kunze<sup>3</sup> advances a different interpretation, saying that Heracles is catching the boar, in which case it should presumably be placed in a subdivision of group I. As regards all three, it would also be possible to classify them in the group showing the use of weapons. Because of these difficulties I shall examine each of these pieces in detail.

In (1) the boar stands facing to the right; Hermes and Athena stand on either side; Heracles, wearing the lionskin, his bow and quiver on his back and sword at his waist, brandishes his club in his right hand. If Luce's identification is right, he would be using the club as a method of coercion on the journey, rather as he does in Cerberus scenes where he drives Cerberus back to Eurystheus, and it may be influenced thereby. The problem with Kunze's interpretation of this vase, namely that Heracles is catching the boar, is that one would expect the boar to be running away or at least to be putting up some resistance, but this does not seem to be the case. The difficulty with Luce's suggestion is perhaps that Heracles is drawn a little far away from the boar, but this could merely be artistic licence.

(2) is similar, except that Athena is not present. Hermes walks in front of the boar while Heracles brandishes his club at it. In fact, here the boar does seem to run and this would take away the objection I made to Kunze's interpretation of (1).

---

1. Br. 50 Ab 11; A.J.A. 60 (1956) 10, no.11 & pl. 7; Par. 169,  
4 bis.

2. Br. 54 E 2; C.V. 15 pl. IV E 28, 3.

3. op. cit. 104, note (2).

In (3) the boar is also running, while Heracles is behind, possibly with his club, but the picture is too blurred for sure identification.

It will be seen that it is not possible to make any firm identification of subject-matter. One must merely say that these scenes could represent Heracles driving the boar to Mycenae instead of carrying it, and using his club for coercion; or else they could show him running after it to capture it, rather in the manner described by Apollodorus, and using his club to frighten it; or they could be an example of the use of weapons, implying a version in which Heracles wounded or killed the boar, and thus needing to be classed in my Group V below.

#### IV The arrival at Mycenae (Luce Groups V and VI)

A few black-figure representations show Heracles and the boar beside the pithos. It would seem from his pose that he has just put the boar down, but there is no sign of Eurystheus either in or out of his pithos. Presumably it is necessary to assume that he is meant to be entirely enclosed inside; this is unusual, although the presence of the pithos may just be meant to mark the scene as Mycenae.

1. Boulogne 64, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure. (L49)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Louvre F 213, belly-handled amphora, Attic black-figure. (L50)<sup>2</sup>.
3. Würzburg 203, neck-handled amphora. (L51?)<sup>3</sup>.

An interesting variant appears on a black-figure neck-

- 
1. Br. 53 Ab 1; Le Musée 2 (1905) 276.
  2. Br. 50 Ab 12; C.V. 3 pl. 26, 4; A.B.V. 369, 110.
  3. Br. 50 Ab 3ab; Langlotz, op. cit. pl. 43u. A.B.V. 328, 6ab. This is likely to be the same as Ulrichs 250.

handled amphora found at Orsi<sup>1</sup>, already mentioned as showing Heracles picking up the boar. On the other side Eurystheus is shown rushing into his pithos, with Hera at his side. Thus there are two aspects of the myth on the same vase; the arrival in Mycenae is not actually shown but is implied by the action of Eurystheus getting into his pithos.

Another variant apparently shows Heracles and Eurystheus, in his pithos, but no boar. Moreover, it cannot be certain that the creature here was meant to be the boar since Cerberus and lion also appear in 'pithos' scenes<sup>2</sup>.

1. Market 1965, cup, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>.

2. Marseilles 1369, amphora, Campanian red-figure<sup>4</sup>.

By far the commonest manner of showing the arrival, and by far the commonest scheme for representations of this myth in general, is that of Heracles advancing with the boar on his shoulders towards Eurystheus, who cowers in his pithos; Heracles is often in the act of bringing down the boar on top of him. Eurystheus and pithos are generally on the right of the picture. This is certainly the part of the myth which gave artists most scope for a vivid and dramatic rendering and this probably explains its popularity. This is the scheme of the first two vases in Brommer's group C<sup>5</sup>, where the second,

---

1. Syracuse 21965. See page 348, no. 6.

2. See page 341 & note (4).

3. Br. 53 vgl.; Sotheby Catalogue (28-vi-65) no. 98 H.

4. Br. 54 D 2; Courby, op. cit. pl. 10a.

5. Br. 53. No picture is available of C 3.

the Etruscan neck-handled amphora in Washington, anticipated the red-figure scheme of the boar being plunged down on Eurystheus rump-first<sup>1</sup>. Brommer's red-figure pieces numbers (1) - (3) show the "pithos" composition, but the krater in Palermo (3) shows the boar being brought down head-first, thus showing that Luce's scheme of head-first for black-figure, and rump-first for red-figure needs to admit of some exceptions.

In black-figure the "pithos" scenes mainly belong to the last quarter of the sixth century. There are only three red-figure examples and these do not date past the first quarter of the fifth century.

I shall here list the representations cited by Luce which do not allow of identification and thus cannot be found in Brommer's list.

1. Stuttgart, Hauer Collection, fragmentary amphora, Attic black-figure. (L54)<sup>2</sup>.
2. Formerly in Sieglin collection, relief pyxis, Hellenistic. (L55)<sup>3</sup>.
3. Chiusi, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L57)<sup>4</sup>.
4. Castellani Sale catalogue (1884) 61, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L62)<sup>5</sup>.
5. Palermo, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L66)<sup>6</sup>.
6. Chiusi, stamnos, Attic red-figure. (L67)<sup>7</sup>.

---

1. See Luce, op. cit. 314.

2. Jd.I. 11 (1896) 180, no. 10.

3. Pagenstecher, op. cit. 197, fig. 176 & pll. XXIIw & XXIII.

4. Klein, op. cit. 90 no. u.

5. *Ibid.* no. x.

6. This is possibly Palermo 1113 (Br. 47 Aa 26) but this cannot be certain.

7. No useful details given.

7. Corneto-Tarquiniæ, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L68) & (L71)<sup>1</sup>.
8. Noel des Vergers Sale catalogue 112, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L72)<sup>2</sup>.
9. Formerly Trieste, Fontana collection, amphora, Attic black-figure (L73)<sup>3</sup>.
10. Formerly in Pizzati collection, Florence, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L76)<sup>4</sup>.
11. Florence, Mus. Arch., amphora, Attic black-figure. (L77)<sup>5</sup>.
12. Naples 2475, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L79)<sup>6</sup>.
13. Once Candelori collection, now lost, amphora, Attic black-figure. (L85)<sup>7</sup>.
14. Vienna, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L91)<sup>8</sup>.
15. Campana IV-VII, 219, 299, 496 respectively, lekythoi, Attic black-figure. (L92-94)<sup>9</sup>.

I shall now turn to an examination of "pithos" scenes in media other than vase-painting.

- 
1. L 71 is found in N.Sc. 1876, 6; Klein, op. cit. 90 no. t. It might be Br. 48 Aa 31, or 32 or 33.
  2. No details given.
  3. No details given.
  4. Klein, loc. cit. no. s.
  5. No details given. It could be Br. 47 Aa 22 or 23.
  6. Klein, loc. cit. no. k.
  7. Ibid. no. r.
  8. No useful details given.
  9. Klein loc. cit. nos. o.p. & q respectively. Luce thinks it likely that one is Louvre F 229 (Br. 47 Aa 18) and another Leningrad 49 (Br. 49 Aa 13).

1. Olympia E 161, shield-band<sup>1</sup>.
2. Agrigento, Mus. Arch. stele.<sup>2</sup>
3. Paestum, metope.<sup>3</sup>
4. Olympia, metope<sup>4</sup>.
5. Cnossus, relief<sup>5</sup>.
6. Hephaesteum, metope<sup>6</sup>.

In (1), which dates to the third quarter of the sixth century, the boar's snout actually touches the arm of Eurystheus. In (2) Eurystheus' hand is preserved near the boar's head and the shape of the pithos near Heracles' feet. The Paestum metope, (3), is unusual for its representation of Eurystheus, who brings down the lid of the pithos over his head. Not much is preserved of the Olympia metope (4): Eurystheus hides in his pithos, facing left as usual, and part of the leg, head and shoulders of Heracles are preserved; the preservation of the boar's head and part of the legs shows that it was in its usual position, with its back resting on Heracles' shoulders. In the Cnossus relief (5), Heracles and boar are not yet bent over Eurystheus but still advancing towards him. In (6) the boar is almost perpendicular as it is lowered onto Eurystheus.

It is also necessary to consider two more pieces which are fragmentary but which may originally have depicted this scheme.

- 
1. Kunze, op. cit. XXXVIII, 56a and pl. 32 & 3.
  2. P. Marconi, Agrigento (Florence, 1929) 197, fig. 134.
  3. Heraion II pl. XXXVI, LXXII & LXXIII.
  4. Ashmole & Yalouris, op. cit. pl. 174.
  5. J.H.S. 57 (1937) 42-3 & pl. 111.
  6. Sauer, op. cit. pl. VI, iv.

1. Olympia Bl685, shield-band<sup>1</sup>.
2. Istanbul, statue attributed to Myron<sup>2</sup>.

Kunze gives good reasons for the tentative identification of this subject in (1) and I would like to add to his argument the suggestion that if the remains at the bottom of the fragment are the front legs of the boar this is a very similar composition to that of the Hephaestum metope, a scheme which also appears on a vase in Warsaw (198042)<sup>3</sup>. Any firm identification of subject-matter is, of course, impossible.

The bronze statue (2) attributed by Devambez<sup>4</sup> to Myron from grounds of date and also because it shows lively action<sup>5</sup>, is preserved only to the waist. It shows a man, with left arm raised and crooked, looking down. Certainly this could have shown Heracles carrying the boar or about to bring it down on Eurystheus but this can only be guesswork from the general pose of the figure.

It must also be remembered that the Calydon metope, the relief in Athens and the bronze applique from Delphi may have represented this point in the story rather than Heracles carrying the boar back to Mycenae<sup>6</sup>.

The appearance of Eurystheus in his pithos as early as the third quarter of the sixth century is very important as showing ~~that~~ this aspect to be part of the original story

---

1. Kunze, op. cit. VIII, 14d & pll. 24 & 73.

2. P. Devambez, Grandes Bronzes du Musée de Stamboul (Constantinople, 1937) 35ff. and pll. 8-12.

3. Br. 48 Aa 34; C.V. 1 pll. 15, 1 & 16; Par. 126, 1 bis.

4. op. cit. 35ff.

5. Cf. Discobolos and Marsyas statues (See G.M.A. Richter, The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks (New Haven, 1950) figs. 581 & 584 respectively.

6. See pages 348ff.

---

and not a late invention by Diodorus, who is the first extant writer to record it.

I shall now turn to what I consider to be rather odd representations of this myth.

#### V. The Use of Weapons. (Luce Group I)

Luce<sup>1</sup> points to certain vases which show Heracles using weapons against the boar as if he is going to kill it (Group Ia) but is bothered by the fact that "it is definitely stated by mythographers that Heracles was ordered to bring the boar back alive". However, he says he is convinced that the kylix in the Gallatin collection represents this myth because of the presence of the club, and that it does not, therefore, represent the final slaying of the Calydonian boar. He also says that he is inclined to add all vases where a single figure attacks a boar as possible representations of this myth.

In fact, not all the mythographers say that the boar was brought back alive, since according to Hyginus, Heracles aprum occidit. It is thus possible that this group, which I shall list below and is called Ia by Luce, reflects a variant tradition which is not recorded in extant literature until very late. The inference of these representations seems to be that the boar will be killed and, as Luce says, the presence of the club on the Gallatin piece suggests the combatants to be Heracles and the Erymanthian boar and so sets a precedent for this type of variant.

---

1. *op. cit.* 310.

1. Naples 2705 (81103), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>1</sup>. (L4)
2. Madrid 10915 (L 77), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>2</sup>. (L3)
3. New York 41, 162.9, Gallatin collection, kylix, Attic red-figure<sup>3</sup>. (L5)

In (1), which dates to the end of the sixth century, Heracles is bringing down his club in the centre of the boar's back; this picture is under one handle while under the other we see him strangling the Nemean lion. In (2), dating to the first quarter of the fifth century, Heracles' weapon is not a club but a sword, which he points close to the boar's head. In (3), which dates to the second quarter of the fifth century, Heracles raises a sword, as if about to slash it down on the boar, while in his other hand he holds the club, presumably as an identificatory attribute. Beazley<sup>4</sup> describes the scene as 'a hunter attacking a boar', but the club certainly seems to suggest the attacker to be Heracles.

These pieces are rather late but there are two Laconian cup-fragments, which appear in Luce<sup>5</sup> but not as such in Brommer, which date to the third quarter of the sixth century. They are both similar one to another, both showing Heracles with his left hand on the boar's back pointing a thin sword blade close to the boar's head.

- 
1. Br. 50 Ab 6ab; C.V. 1 pl. 11, 3.
  2. Br. 50 Ab 10; C.V. 1 pll 20, 1b & 21, 1a; A.B.V. 602, 25.
  3. Cr.V. (U.S.A. 1) Gallatin pll. 19 & 20, A.R.V.<sup>2</sup> 882, 39.
  4. A.R.V. 2. See ~~xxxxxx~~ note (3) for reference.
  5. Munich Sieveking 383 (L1) (Sieveking Catalogue 33 & pl. XIII; Leipzig University Museum (L2) (Jd. I. 16 (1901) 191, fig. 3).

It does, therefore, seem that there may have been an actual variant that Heracles had to kill the boar<sup>1</sup>; it is unlikely to have been merely an artistic one since, although the vases which show it are few, it does appear in various fabrics and covers a fairly wide chronological period. Certainly it does not seem to be a popular variant. It is always possible, however, that both artists and Hyginus were in error, through ignorance of the exact story of the myth.

It should be noted that the three vases examined under Group III b could also be included here<sup>2</sup>.

Luce also records a Group I b where he says that weapon and wrestling-types are contaminated. In this I agree with him and I feel that these pieces should be made a subdivision of my Group I and that they do not show Heracles about to kill the boar but rather wrestling with it and that the appearance of the club, which is the weapon shown in this group, along the boar's body is only an identificatory attribute. Of Luce's group I can only identify two:

1. Athens NM 383 (1961) (CC 860), lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L6)<sup>3</sup>.
2. Palermo, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L7)<sup>4</sup>.

The other pieces in Luce's list are as follows:

- 
1. This is the inference from the sword: the club can be drawn merely as traditional, without the implication of wounding. Perhaps the killing version was influenced by the Calydonian boar myth.
  2. See pages 350ff.
  3. Br. 51 Ab 10; A.B.V. 547, 232.
  4. Br. 51 Ab 29; H. Heydemann, Griechische Vasenbilder (Berlin, 1970) Hilfstafel no. 2. Luce makes this vase no. 32 as well. He is either in error or else saw the other side of the vase and identified it as Heracles wrestling with the boar.

1. New York, Gallatin, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L6 bis)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Berlin 1979, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L8)<sup>2</sup>.
3. Berlin 1980, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L9)<sup>3</sup>.
4. Berlin 1981, lekythos, Attic black-figure. (L10)<sup>4</sup>.

Perhaps also to this group belong:

1. Louvre F 299, hydria, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
2. column-krater fragment, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.

In (1) the club seems to be along the boar's body, although the picture is not very clear, whereas in (2) Heracles seems to be in wrestling pose and his right arm is swung back; perhaps he originally held the club, which has not been preserved; this might qualify then for a place among the group of the aggressive use of weapons listed above, (Luce Ia).

#### VI Use of the cloak

1. Fogg 1927 141, mastoid, Attic black-figure<sup>7</sup>.

On one side of this vase is the normal scheme of Heracles overcoming the boar but on the other he crouches with his cloak over his left arm, extending it towards the boar; there is no weapon in his hand. This immediately recalls one group of black-figure representations of the Nemean lion<sup>8</sup>, where the artists seem

- 
1. No details given. Luce, op. cit. 319 n. 3. says Gallatin sent him a picture.
  2. Klein, op. cit. 91 no. 6.
  3. Ibid. no. 4.
  4. Ibid. no. 2.
  5. Br. 52 Ab 10; A.B.V. 362, 29.
  6. Br 52 Ab 8; M. Cavalier-Meligunis, op. cit. pl. 40, 12.
  7. Br. 53 Ab 19; C.V. (U.S.A. 8) Fogg pl. XI, 1b; A.B.V. 559, 492.
  8. See pages 67ff.

to be depicting the version later described by Theocritus, where Heracles uses his cloak for protection while he prepares to club the lion, although in art the sword is sometimes substituted for the club or else no weapons are drawn at all. No such version is recorded for overcoming the Erymanthian boar and this is the only time the cloak is shown used in this way in surviving representations of this myth. I, therefore, suggest that the artist here either confused the two myths or else copied this scheme from vases depicting the lion, without considering its significance. Kunze<sup>1</sup>, in fact, gives this vase a place in the chronological sequence of events, placing it first, as being the ambushing of the boar, but the unique quality of the composition and its similarity to representations of the Nemean lion perhaps place it on its own outside this sequence. This vase is not mentioned by Luce.

#### VII Heracles and the Calydonian Boar?

##### 1. Ferrara, volute-krater, Attic red-figure<sup>2</sup>.

Unfortunately the picture is not clear enough to see what is really happening but on the neck, where this scene occurs, there are many figures and it is not even possible to see which is Heracles<sup>3</sup>. Certainly the presence of many figures is usually an indication of the picture representing the Calydonian boar hunt. The artist here may have been confused and thought of Heracles as fighting that boar rather than the Erymanthian one. This vase

---

1. op. cit. 104 note 2.

2. Br. 53 B 4; Illustrated London News (4-xii-54) 1014-5, figs. 10 & 11.

3. The large number present is suggestive of the Calydonian boar hunt and the picture is labelled 'Heracles and the boar of Calydon'. This piece is fairly late and the artist may have confused the two boar myths.

is placed in the first quarter of the fourth century, a time when representations of the Erymanthian boar are not common. The style is said to be close to that of Midias.

#### VIII Odd pose

##### 1. Relief, Roman<sup>1</sup>.

Here Heracles, with the lionskin knotted around his throat, has the head of the boar over his shoulder and holds its jowls. In his right hand seem to be the remains of the club. This is an odd angle for the boar; presumably the back legs were thought of as hanging down behind. Heracles could be thought of as carrying the boar home in a rather awkward position or else to be in the process of throwing it over his shoulder as he wrestles with it.

#### Spectators

Luce contends that Eurystheus' mother is sometimes represented and this claim needs to be examined. A red-figure kylix by <sup>2</sup>Olto depicts a woman inscribed as Caliphobe and a man inscribed as Sthenelus, the name given to the father of Eurystheus in literature. Luce<sup>3</sup>, therefore, argues that Caliphobe is his mother, even though he admits that this name is never given to her in extant literature. Certainly this is possible, since there seems little point in naming her if she is not meant to be special and she does appear next to Eurystheus' father; the artist may have got the name wrong or be recording a variant tradition. However, I do not feel that Luce is right in assuming that every time a supplementary woman occurs she is meant to be Eurystheus' mother, as one should not argue from one artist's spectators to another's if they are not named. Certainly on some occasions the woman may be Hera, who might be drawn with reference to her hostility towards Heracles.

1. Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum 9 (1914) 59-60, fig. 1.

2. Louvre G 17 (Br. 53 B 1; A.R.V. 2. 62, 83).

3. op. cit. 317.

As regards the other spectators, it is quite common to find Athena, Hermes, and even Iolaus, who is given no part in this myth in literature; all three are traditional helpers of Heracles. The only time when spectators do not occur is in scenes of carrying the boar back to Mycenae.

#### CONCLUSION

This myth dates to the middle of the sixth century and this may imply an origin in one of the lyric poets. It is not a myth that enjoys a particularly wide popularity, being at its height at the end of the sixth century and beginning of the fifth. It seldom occurs earlier and its appearance in red-figure, post-Archaic non-Attic work, and Hellenistic is very limited. This may have been the result of the competition for representation by other boar myths and the Heracles one certainly seems to be eclipsed in Attic red-figure by the legend of Theseus and the sow.

It is not regarded as a labour until the Temple of Zeus and it appears as such in Sophocles, but not in Euripides; it certainly well fits among those labours which are involved with the capture of wild animals in the Northern Peloponnese<sup>1</sup> since it would be quite a feat of heroism to capture a boar since all boars are potentially dangerous, and this aspect of the animal is emphasised, at least in later literature. It is likely that the boar referred to by Hecataeus as ravaging Psophis was the same as the Erymanthian boar, which we have seen to be in existence in legend at this time; thus, the story about it ravaging the countryside would be part of the original myth in all probability, and so the idea of benefaction by Heracles in performing this labour would be present from the beginning.

---

1. See chapter 14.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN. THE RÔLE OF OLYMPIA IN ESTABLISHING THE  
CANON OF THE LABOURS

In this final chapter I shall attempt to establish why the Temple of Zeus at Olympia displays all the deeds which constitute the later canon of labours, roughly four hundred years before this canon became the generally accepted tradition, for there is no other surviving evidence in any medium which places all these deeds together as labours before the time of the late mythographers. During the course of this discussion I shall also suggest reasons for the establishing of the particular deeds in question as labours.

I have already stated my reason for believing that the sculptor of the Olympia metopes was at pains to depict the twelve labours rather than a random selection of deeds<sup>1</sup>, and I believe that the clue to the problems connected with these metopes lies in the political climate of the first half of the fifth century BC. It appears that then Sparta became involved in a power struggle with the states of the Northern Peloponnese, of which Elis was an important member, the area wherein was situated the Temple of Zeus.

It will be necessary to go into the history of the Peloponnese in the first half of the fifth century in some detail. A. Andrewes<sup>2</sup> stresses that it was during this time that Sparta turned into a completely military state, eclipsing all branches of the arts, rather than in the sixth century, as previously thought, when art like poetry and pottery still

---

1. See page 25.

2. Greek Society (Middlesex, 1967) 228ff.

flourished there. The cause appears to have been extreme pressure on Sparta from within the Peloponnese, brought to bear by the Northern states of Elis, Mantinea, Argos and an Arcadian League, probably dominated by Tegea. Both Andrewes<sup>1</sup> and W.G. Forrest<sup>2</sup> point to around 470/465 as the crucial time in Peloponnesian politics and this seems, in fact, to have been the culmination of earlier anti-Spartan feelings within the Peloponnese.

This anti-Spartan feeling manifested itself in four ways. Andrewes<sup>3</sup> has shown that Tegea was hostile to Sparta in the 480's and only resolved hostilities because of the Persian threat. After 479 and the end to this threat there was a return to hostilities. Elis and Mantinea arrived late for the Battle of Plataea in 479<sup>4</sup>. As the skirmishing and build-up to this battle was spread over roughly two weeks<sup>5</sup> such lateness must be interpreted as dissatisfaction with Spartan leadership of the Greek forces. Such hostility would clearly carry on during the 470's. Argos was the traditional enemy of Sparta. Her last great defeat had been in 494 at the Battle of Sepeia but her hatred of Sparta was enough for her to declare neutrality

---

1. 'Sparta and Arcadia in the Early Fifth Century', Phoenix 6 (1952) 1ff.

2. 'Themistocles and Argos', C.Q. NS 10 (1960) 221ff.

3. loc. cit.

4. Hdt. IX 76-7.

5. Hdt. IX 39ff.

in the Persian Wars<sup>1</sup>. W.P. Wallace<sup>2</sup> has argued convincingly, on the evidence of Herodotus<sup>3</sup> and numismatics, that Cleomenes, after his deposition as king of Sparta, had formed an anti-Spartan Arcadian league.

There can thus be seen to have been a deep resentment in the Peloponnese to Sparta's hegemony. The Persian wars eased the threat for a while but once these were over, Sparta had to face the festering discontent of the Northern Peloponnese.

According to Herodotus<sup>4</sup> and Diodorus<sup>5</sup> Sparta was hostile to Athens' formation of the Delian League because it meant the transfer of hegemony against Persia to Athens. However, after the Metoemaridas debate<sup>6</sup>, which cooled the Spartan tempers, relations between Athens and Sparta were cordial on the surface until the Spartan offer of help to Thasos in 465<sup>7</sup>, in reply to the Athenian expedition there.

It is true that Sparta had no reason to interfere with the Delian league during most of the 470's because Athens was keeping to the terms of the league's constitution, but c 472/1 Athens reduced Naxos to slavery<sup>8</sup>. Thucydides makes a great issue of this since Naxos sets the precedent for the conversion of the Delian League into the Athenian Empire.

---

1. Hdt. VII 148-9.

2. J.H.S. 74 (1954) 32ff.

3. VI 74.

4. VIII 3.

5. XI. 50.

6. See note (5)

7. Thuc. I. 101.

8. Thuc. I 98.

This transition increased in speed after the great victory at the Eurymedon in 469 BC when the Persian threat to Greece was finally and completely removed. Athens expedition against Thasos in 465 for purely selfish economic reasons clearly showed the true nature and intention of Athenian imperialism<sup>1</sup>. The result was that Sparta offered to invade Attica if Athens should take action against Thasos.

The obvious question to be answered is why Sparta ignored events in 472 and 469 onwards but decided to act in 465. The clue to this can be found in Philochorus<sup>2</sup> who says "Athens seized the hegemony on account of the disasters that overwhelmed Sparta". It appears, therefore, that Sparta was till then fully involved with the political problems in the Peloponnese.

Forrest<sup>3</sup> has shown clearly the problems that Sparta had to face in the late 470's. Tegea along with the Arcadian league had become actively hostile again. Argos had recovered her strength and her anti-Spartan ambitions. Elis and Mantinea in 471 underwent synoecism, which led to them becoming democracies. In fact, by 470 a strong democratic anti-Spartan league covering the Northern Peloponnese, incorporating the above cities, had been established through the diplomacy of Themistocles who was residing in Argos<sup>4</sup> after his ostracism in 471. We know that this confirmed anti-Spartan politician

---

1. Thuc. I. 100.

2. Schol. Aristophanes Lysis. 1138 - G.F. Hill, Sources for Greek History BC 478-431. (Oxford, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ 1897) 302, no. 71.

3. loc. cit. passim.

4. Thuc. I. 135.

was "often travelling about in the rest of the Peloponnese"<sup>1</sup> when his condemnation was voted. He was undoubtedly involved in anti-Spartan activity and on a priori grounds he seems to have been the main instrument in uniting this Northern block. This would explain Sparta's eagerness to secure the condemnation of Themistocles in 469<sup>2</sup>. The Battle of Tegea was fought c. 469 which Sparta won but was unable to save Mycenae<sup>3</sup>, an important outpost, from attack by Argos and Tegea. Here, then, is the reason for Sparta's avoidance of conflict with Athens. Her pre-eminence and, indeed, survival depended on her security within the Peloponnese.

Before the formation of the Northern league the individual states had been constantly under threat from Sparta<sup>4</sup>, but the league gave them security from this, while synoecism and democracy gave them inspiration to assert their own individuality, made possible by the fact that the league was essentially a symmarchy, rather on the lines of the Peloponnesian league<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, no feelings of nationalism hindered the emergence of their individual identities, for the cultivation of which they now possessed both the security and the inspiration.

---

1. See note (4), page 370.

2. See note (4), page 370.

3. Forrest loc. cit. 232.

4. Spartan foreign policy was one of aggrandisement and it was natural for these Northern states to wish to protect themselves; it is worth noting that Elis was a neighbour of Messenia, the home of the Helots.

5. See G.E.M. de Ste Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War (Hertfordshire, 1972) 106f.

I suggest that the building of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia was an act of assertion by Elis of her newly-found independence and corporate identity, made possible by the synoecism, democratisation and joining of the anti-Spartan league. It is known to have been designed by a local architect<sup>1</sup> and the positioning of it in the famous religious sanctuary visited from far and wide at the time of the games would give Elis a wide audience to which to parade its new spirit. I suggest that at this time Elis was claiming Heracles as a Northern Peloponnesian hero and used this temple to do so<sup>2</sup>.

The appearance of Heracles is striking since, although he was depicted ~~as the sole hero~~ on the metopes at Paestum, Selinus, and Delphi he was not depicted as the sole hero. The Olympia metopes, on the other hand, are entirely devoted to Heracles and display all twelve of his labours. Admittedly it might be argued that he was special to Olympia because he was the founder of the Olympic Games, but there is no evidence that the tradition of Heracles founding the Games existed before the Odes of Pindar, appearing for the first time in extant literature in three odes celebrating victories of 476 BC. Certainly this tradition was given special emphasis in the 470's even if it was not invented then. Could it not be that the foundation of the Games was attributed to Heracles in this period as part of a plan to assert a close connection of the hero with this area? This would in turn justify his sole importance on all the metopes which emphasise his close connections with the area even more.

---

1. Libon of Elis (Paus. V. 10. 3)

2. Admittedly in 457 Sparta hung a dedication on this temple but by this time the Northern league had apparently broken up. (Neither Argos nor Mantinea fought at Dipaea in 465 and after this we hear no more about an anti-Spartan symmarchy until the Battle of Mantinea in 418).

The traditional myth connected with the games could not be omitted, and, therefore, the first chariot race between Pelops and Oenomaus was placed in a prominent position, on the East pediment. The subject of the West pediment, however, is one not connected with Olympia, perhaps a deliberate action. By rendering the popular myth of the Centaurs and Lapiths, the sculptor may well have aimed at giving a wider, less personal appeal to the sculpture than the Northern Peloponnesian bias of East pediment and metopes. To do so would bring out Olympia's rôle as a pan-Hellenic centre.

The placing of the labours of Heracles on the temple seems deliberately justified by the recent emphasis on the tradition of Heracles founding the Olympic Games, and to have been done at the expense of what was architecturally normal<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, the actual deeds chosen as labours seem a deliberate attempt to link Heracles with the Northern Peloponnese. Six of the labours, lion, hydra, birds, hind, boar, and Augeas are set there and all could be interpreted as ridding the area of harm, as if Heracles is being marked out as its special protector, although the benefaction idea of the labours as a whole does not occur until late. This might not be sufficient evidence on its own of an attempt to set aside Heracles as the special hero of the area but the appearance of the Augeas myth among the labours seems conclusive. This was entirely a local legend, appearing seldom in literature and scarcely after Olympia in the whole of Greek art. There can have been no other reason for its inclusion at Olympia than to give to the

---

1. See page 25.

area of Elis a part in the labours, especially as it is so different in spirit from the other labours, since it implies neither heroism nor benefaction. The rest of these six<sup>also</sup> have as their locality areas in the new Northern league and the myth of the Stymphalian birds appears also to have been an essentially local legend, judging from its few early appearances. Perhaps the fact that Heracles was shown performing an act of 'benefaction' for most of these areas was meant to be a proclamation that he was their special protector and as such a match for the Spartans.

Admittedly one should not see nationalistic tendencies in the Northern league, manifesting in a desire for joint identity, but it seems possible that Heracles, already a Dorian hero, should be proclaimed as the hero specially associated with the towns of that area by Elis which was its cultural centre. This seems to have been done by proclaiming half the labours to be deeds performed in that locality, making use for the most part of legends which were already in existence, at least in the preceding century. This would serve as striking propaganda for the new identity of each of these individual members of the league. More point would be added by the fact that Sparta had given herself close ties with Heracles<sup>1</sup>.

There were other precedents, no doubt followed by the Eleans, for the proclaiming of special connection with a certain hero. Athens had done so with Theseus<sup>2</sup> and just before the building

- 
1. The Spartan Royal Family claimed descent from him.
  2. Athens also took up Heracles around this period, often depicting him in art c. 530-480; he was also written about quite extensively by Pherecydes. The adoption of Theseus as her special hero seems to have taken place under the sons of Pisistratus to judge by the expanded tradition appearing in Pherecydes and the vases of his time.

of the Temple of Zeus, Cimon had discovered the "bones of Theseus" on Scyrus<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, c. 540 the Spartans had recovered the "bones of Orestes" from Tegea<sup>2</sup>. It was an important mark of distinction if individual or community could claim such a connection<sup>3</sup>.

If my interpretation is correct, it is easy to see why the six myths mentioned above were included among the labours on the Temple of Zeus but it is necessary to consider the reasons for including the other six. These, apart from the Cerberus legend, probably included because of its antiquity<sup>4</sup>, were possibly included because of their connection with remote points of the compass. The Geryon and Hesperides myths are connected with the far West, the Amazons and mares with the far North and the bull with the Southern Mediterranean, probably also justified by the close affinity between Crete and Mycenaean territory<sup>5</sup>. These geographical extremities might well point to Heracles being the true pan-Hellenic hero, visiting all lands, placed beside and, in fact, on the temple<sup>6</sup> interwoven with the labours set in the Northern Peloponnese; they would set Heracles' special protection of the Northern Peloponnese<sup>7</sup> in the relief of his all-embracing heroism. The

---

1. Paus. III 3.7.

2. Hdt. I 67-8.

3. Sparta took great pains to represent herself as pre-Dorian with connections with Agamemnon; Herodotus (VII 159) talks of Agamemnon turning in his grave if he heard of the Greek embassy to Gelon in Syracuse in 480.

4. It is named as a labour in the Iliad. See page 225.

5. It is noteworthy that none are connected with the far East, perhaps because this was a sensitive area after the recent Persian invasions.

6. It is noteworthy that by the time of Diodorus and Apollodorus it was preferred to list the labours in two neat groups. See page 376

7. Wilamowitz, Herakles 64ff. apparently sees Argos as important in the formation of the labours.

emphasis on Heracles' importance generally would make his special protection of a particular area even more striking.

This interpretation of the reason for the inclusion of the labours of Heracles on the Temple of Zeus at Olympia gives an almost self-evident reason for the fact that these particular deeds do not form the canon of the labours until late. In the fifth century the metopes represented a local tradition, part of Elean propaganda, and as such would not influence one who wished to give a list of labours. This explains why other deeds are included by Sophocles and Euripides in their list of *μύθοι* and why the sculpture of the Hephaestum and Heracleum at Thebes, which is likely to have depicted the labours, omits some which appear at Olympia<sup>1</sup>. It seems natural enough that a site as important as Olympia should have established the tradition of the individual labours but that this took place at a time when the local connotations had been forgotten. It is not clear when this took place but it can be seen to have happened by the first century B.C. The numbers differ in various accounts, showing the mythographers to be following different sources. They were by then re-arranged in a more orderly form, those performed in the Northern Peloponnese generally placed first and followed by the other six. There was no longer any propaganda to require the two different types of locality to be interwoven.

On this analysis, the metopes of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia were vital for the establishment of the canon for the

---

1. Perhaps the rest were fairly well established as labours by this time. It is significant that it is the two labours with the most local flavour, Augeas and the Stymphalian Birds, which take the longest to find general acceptance.

twelve labours. It explains why this canon was not generally adopted in its entirety for almost four centuries and why the individual twelve were chosen as labours.

---

In summary to this whole thesis it may be said that a few of the myths adopted as labours seem to date at least to the eighth century but the majority appear for the first time c. 550 B.C. and may well have found their origin in one of the lyric poets, it being noteworthy that both Stesichorus and Ibycus seem to have been fond of the Heracles legend. Not many were earmarked as labours until the Olympia metopes, which aimed at demonstrating a close connection between Heracles the pan-Hellenic hero and the Northern Peloponnese. The lion and hydra labours were apparently meant to be viewed first, being already firmly established, it would seem, as first and second labour. The order of the rest at Olympia was probably considered of no great importance apart from the general need to intermingle Peloponnesian and non-Peloponnesian localities. This would explain why the order in the late mythographers can vary so much except for the first two labours, which remain constant.

At first the Olympia tradition was essentially local and therefore isolated. Gradually it gained greater acceptance until by the first century all the labours depicted at Olympia were accepted as the canon. This occurred when the local nature of this tradition had been forgotten.

APPENDIX I. OTHER AMAZONOMACHIES(a) Achilles and Penthesilea

Aethiopsis: (C.I. Ital. et Sicil. argumentum) πενθεσιληα ἀμαζων  
 1285): παραγινεται ἀχιλλευσ πενθεσιληαν ἀποκτεινοι.  
 cf Quintus Smyrnaeus I 538ff.

In art this subject appears on the following inscribed pieces:

1. Olympia B 237, shieldband<sup>1</sup>.
2. Olympia B 975, shieldband<sup>2</sup>.
3. Olympia B 1555, shieldband<sup>3.4</sup>.
4. London B 210, neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>5</sup>.
5. Munich 1502 (J 478), neck-handled amphora, Attic black-figure<sup>6</sup>.

These pieces are not very different from the scenes of Heracles fighting Andromache and one wonders whether they would have been attributed to Heracles had they not been inscribed. They underline the fact that there is no really safe criterion for identifying a particular Amazon unless an inscription is given.

- 
1. Kunze, op. cit. XXIV, 39w & pl. 50; von Bothmer, op. cit I.10.
  2. Kunze, loc. cit. XXIX, 44b & pl. 56-7; von Bothmer, op. cit. I. 12.
  3. Kunze, loc. cit. XXXII, 50b & pl. 60; von Bothmer, op. cit. I. 13.
  4. Kunze seems right in supposing that the other shieldbands with similar compositions but uninscribed, refer to the same subject.
  5. Br. 353 A 1; A.V. pl. 206; A.B.V. 144, 7.
  6. Br. 354 A 3; A.V. pl. 205, 1-2; A.B.V. 321, 10.

(b) BellerophonHomer (Il. 6. 186ff.):cf. Pindar (O. XIII 87).

Bellerophon slew the Amazons who strove with men as his third task for the king of Lycia on the instructions of Proetus. Perhaps it is not out of the question that the inclusion of the Amazonomachy among the labours of Heracles was influenced by this task of Bellerophon.

(c) PriamHomer (Il. 3 189):

Priam was allied with the Phrygians when they were attacked by the Amazons.

(d) Dionysus

Diodorus Siculus (III 7,1):

Dionysus fought alongside the Amazons and neighbouring Libyans against Cronus.

None of the last three stories are depicted in art. It must be noted that Suidas<sup>1</sup> says Homer wrote an "Amazonia", although it is not known what this contained and is likely to have been one of the numerous spurious works attributed to him.

---

1. 44.

## APPENDIX II

The text of the new Heracles poem of Pindar relating to Diomedes.

- 9 .....] Διομήδεος ἵππους  
 10 .....μ]όναρχον Κικόνων  
 παρὰ] Βιστοῦνίδι λίμνῃ  
 12 χαλκοθώρ]ακος Ἐνυαλίου  
 .....] ἔκπαγ'λον υἷον,  
 -----  
 15 .....[.ραῖντα μέγαν,  
 οὐ σὺν κό]ρῳ ἄλλ' ἀρετῶ.  
 3 .....γ]ὰρ ἀρπαζομένων τεθνάμεν  
 .....]μάτων ἢ κακὸν ἔμμεναι.  
 .....] ἐσελθῶν μέγα  
 6 .....ν]υκτὶ βίας ὀδόν  
 20 .....]ρεν, λαβῶν δ' ἔν[α] φ[ῶτ]α πεδάρσι[ον  
 φά[τ] 'ναις] ἐν λιθίναις βάλ[ε -υυ-  
 9 ἵπκ.[.....]έγαν φρέ[ν υ-  
 καί ν[ιν.....].ζον. ταχέως  
 δ' ἀράβη[σε] διὰ[λ]ευκῶν  
 25 12 ὅστῃ[ων] δοῦπος ἐ[ρ]<ε>ϊκομένων.  
 ὁ δ' ἄφ[αρ π]λεκτόν τε χαλκόν  
 -----  
 ὑπερη[...].ε τραπεζᾶν  
 προβά[τ]ων ἀλυσιωτόν  
 3 δι' ἐρκ[έ]ων, τεῖρε δὲ στελεῶ  
 30 ἄλλαν [μ]ὲν σκέλος, ἄλλαν δὲ πᾶ[χυν,  
 τᾶν δὲ πρυμνὸν κεφαλᾶς

