

THE DRUNKEN HERAKLES

A NEW ANGLE ON AN UNSTABLE SUBJECT

(PLATES 81 and 82)

This author's debt to both Virginia Grace and Dorothy Thompson seems past measuring as he recalls the help, inspiration, and personal kindness received from both over many long years and that special quality that they have both imparted to that unique scholarly enterprise, the Athenian Agora Excavations. He must, however, crave their indulgence in what follows for a certain chronological vagueness, concerned as it is with what is for him, though certainly not for them, the most difficult of all periods of Greek art. By limiting himself to material in the Fitzwilliam he hopes, none the less, also to make it a special tribute from the English Cambridge.

PROBABLY the finest Hellenistic bronze in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge is the statuette of Herakles from the Leake collection¹ apparently depicting the garlanded and inebriated hero staggering almost completely off balance, his back arched and his knees half bent and the tension of keeping himself upright seeming to show through every muscle, from the parted toes through the straining legs to the forward-thrust abdomen (Pl. 81). Although, as we shall see later, it does seem to show some earlier antecedents, it has normally been regarded as a splendid product of developed Hellenistic Greek art of about the 2nd century B.C.

Colonel Leake acquired the statuette on June 16, 1805, at Vrachori, now the modern town of Agrinion, in Aitolia. He writes of it as follows under that date:²

A beautiful little bronze figure of Hercules, wanting an arm, which I observed yesterday in my lodging, and which my host stated to have been found at Vlokhó, a monastery on a lofty hill to the eastward of Vrachóri, where he described some extensive ruins, at once points out the probability of that place being the site of Thermus; which, at the time when Greek art was in perfection, was noted for numerous statues.

The next day he set off just after 5 a.m. to visit the site where it had been found, a few kilometers to the northeast of Vrachori and apparently that of the ancient Agrinion, although he confidently identified it as Thermon, or Thermos, which actually lay further east, off the east end of Lake Trichonis.

The statuette is a finely worked, hollow, lost-wax casting. The hero is shown bearded and wearing a vine garland closely bound with a fillet whose ends hang down behind to

¹ Fitzwilliam Museum, no. GR.1.1864. Bought by Cambridge University from estate of W. M. Leake. H. 22.9 cm. *Specimens of Antient Sculpture, Aegyptian, Etruscan, Greek and Roman II*, London (Society of Dilettanti) 1835, pls. 31, 32; A. Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, Cambridge 1882, p. 267, no. 102; H. A. Chapman, *Handbook to the Collection of Antiquities and Other Objects, Fitzwilliam Museum*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1904, p. 62, with plate facing; S. Reinach, *Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine I*, Paris 1906, p. 474, no. 2; R. Nicholls, "Greek and Roman Bronzes in Cambridge," *Apollon*, 1966, pp. 112–119, fig. 12.

² W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, London 1835 (repr. Amsterdam 1967), I, pp. 125–126.

either side of the neck. The club, held in his left hand, is missing apart from the small stub-end that was cast with the hand; the rest of it was clearly a separate casting fitting into a round, tapered socket, 0.75 cm. in diameter, cut in the hand. His right arm, which may also have been cast separately, is missing from a little below the shoulder. Otherwise the figure is intact, apart from a tiny area of the inner right thigh beside a bronze spigot, or core-pin. Like others of the Leake bronzes, the figure has been manually cleaned, virtually to bare metal over parts of the body, and repatinated black; but, over much of the figure, traces survive under the black of a rich green patina, in some places heavy and with a layer of cuprite. An interesting and curious feature was noted several years ago by the Museum's former principal technician, Norman Rayner, whose recent death has been a bitter loss. This is a precisely defined, slightly recessed, stippled rectangle, 2.5×1.7 cm., in the middle of the hero's back, just under his shoulder blades. The simplest explanation seems to be that this area was dressed to take solder securing a horizontal strut of these dimensions extending from a vertical support behind. What is strange is that, at the angle at which the figure is at present mounted, that strut would meet his back at an intolerably oblique angle.

Another question that it has been difficult to answer is just what the function of such a figure might have been. Certainly the usual votive role of Herakles statuettes would hardly seem appropriate here if the current interpretation is correct that the hero is shown blind drunk and about to fall flat on his back. But the Cambridge statuette seems quite differently and far more dynamically conceived, as compared with the groups showing Herakles staggering drunkenly and supported by satyrs or other followers of Dionysos; this is true, too, of those examples where the hero's posture shows some analogies.³ It does, in fact, seem difficult to reconcile the muscle texture and shimmering tension of the Leake Herakles with any concept of a man about to fall senseless. What is interesting is that, if the whole statuette is tipped so that the stippled area below the shoulder blades is vertical and the figure's balance is perfectly restored, then the pose does seem to become more meaningful. For the tension in the bent legs and the arching of the back seem much more appropriate to a man proceeding carefully down a steep slope and, possibly, holding his liquor phenomenally well!

Various other bronze statuettes of similar type and scale have been linked with the Leake Herakles. The two best known of these, both rather more fragmentary, are in American collections, in New York⁴ and Baltimore.⁵ The New York example, reputedly from

³ E.g., F. Matz, *Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs*, IV, ii, *Die dionysischen Sarkophage*, Berlin 1968, III, pl. 250; the types discussed, *ibid.*, II, pp. 216–217.

⁴ Metropolitan Museum, no. 15.57. *Bull. Met. Mus.* 10, 1915, pp. 236–237, with figures; G. M. A. Richter, *Handbook of the Classical Collection*, New York 1930, pp. 194–195, fig. 133; *Master Bronzes, Selections from the Museums and Collections of America* (exhibition, Fine Arts Academy), Buffalo 1937, no. 93; G. M. A. Richter, *Handbook of the Greek Collection, Metropolitan Museum*, Cambridge, Mass. 1953, p. 125, pl. 104:d; M. Bieber, *Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, New York 1961, p. 140, figs. 577–578, 580; G. M. A. Richter, *Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*, New Haven 1970, p. 43, fig. 139; J. Kenfield, "A Bronze Herakles in the Metropolitan Museum: Drunkard or Wrestler?" *AJA* 80, 1976, pp. 415–419, figs. 1, 2, 5. In Kenfield (*loc. cit.*), it is regarded as from a group of Herakles and Antaios, following Dr. Hill's reinterpretation of the Baltimore bronze (footnote 5 below), although this seems unlikely in the light of the more complete examples to be dealt with below. The Herakles and Antaios type in question seems Alexandrian, in view of its occurrence of coins of the Alexandrian mint, and the small bronzes of this kind have a distinctively Egyptian flavor; in the Fitzwilliam they are well represented

Smyrna, seems to have shown the same posture as the Leake Herakles save that, to judge from the shoulder line, the arm positions were reversed, so that the hero apparently held the club in his right hand. The Baltimore bronze, on the other hand, seems to have been a completely reversed version, with the result that its posture is a mirror image of that of the Leake figure. The heads also show notable differences, neither of the American examples wearing garlands. The hair also differs. In particular, the tight, curly locks of the New York statuette have much more of the character of the Myronian Herakles and give a curious, eclectic flavor to a figure otherwise so much more advanced in style.

Three further statuettes are much better preserved but rather less adequately published. They hold, or once held, a kantharos or similar vessel in one hand and the club in the other. One of these,⁶ found at Tirebolu (the ancient Tripolis) on the Black Sea coast of Turkey, corresponds in pose and type with the Leake bronze, but introduces a variant feature, a lionskin looped over the left arm holding the club; in Reinach's drawing a poor rendering of the ivy garland on the hero's head accidentally and quite falsely suggests a saucy hat. The others are both in Naples and closer to the partly reversed type of the New York bronze. The first of these, from Herculaneum,⁷ is more corpulent and paunchy than the Leake bronze and bare-headed; it has now lost the vessel in its left hand. The other, from Pompeii,⁸ is intact, but seems an even freer adaptation of the type, apparently wearing a fillet but no garland.

The type is also copied in the late Italian Renaissance in bronze statuettes of slightly smaller size, presumably taking their direct inspiration from other ancient examples discovered by that time but not known to modern literature on the subject. Indeed, there is a legend that one of today's leading authorities on Renaissance bronzes was, when a trainee at the Fitzwilliam, set the task by a former Director of establishing that the Leake Herakles was also of Renaissance date! Two examples in Florence⁹ and Parma¹⁰ regarded as 16th-

by the example from the Birchner and Sir Robert Greg collections in Cairo, now Fitzwilliam Museum, no. GR.4.1954: *Hesperia* 27, 1958, p. 316, note 18; R. Pagenstecher, *Expedition Ernst von Sieglin*, II, *Die griechische-ägyptische Sammlung Ernst von Sieglin* I, A, p. 55, fig. 50 (where the material is wrongly described as clay); for one of the small-scale "drunken Herakles" figures of the type dealt with here, see *ibid.*, p. 67, pl. 27:1.

⁵ Walters Art Gallery, no. 54.723. Formerly Hirsch collection. *Hotel Drouot catalogue*, June 30–July 2, 1921, p. 28, no. 196, pl. 2; *The Greek Tradition* (Baltimore Museum and Walters Art Gallery), Baltimore 1939, p. 58, no. 15; D. K. Hill, *Catalogue of Classical Bronze Sculpture*, Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore 1949, p. 48, no. 98, pl. 22; Bieber, *op. cit.*, p. 140, fig. 579. In *Hesperia* 27, 1958, pp. 311–317, pl. 55:c, re-interpreted as from a group of Herakles and Antaios (cf. footnote 4 above).

⁶ *Annali e bullettini, Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica*, 1854, pp. 114–115, pl. 34; Reinach, *op. cit.* (footnote 1 above), II, Paris 1908, p. 204, no. 7. Analogous figures, with cup, club, and lionskin, but in no way off balance and with arm positions reversed, so that the club is held in the right hand, occur in other art, e.g. on a Roman sarcophagus in Bolsena (Matz, *op. cit.* [footnote 3 above], I, pl. 48, top) and a cameo among the Arundel and Marlborough gems (A. Furtwängler, *Die antike Gemmen*, Leipzig and Berlin 1900, pl. 65, no. 47).

⁷ Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 5180. (J. Ward-Perkins and A. Claridge) *Pompeii A.D. 79*, exhibition catalogue, Royal Academy, London, November 20, 1976–February 27, 1977, no. 215, with figure.

⁸ Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 5266. *Real Museo Borbonico* XVI, Naples 1857, pl. 8, right.

⁹ Florence, Museo Nazionale. L. Planiscig, *Piccoli bronzi italiani del Rinascimento*, Milan 1930, p. 24, pl. 107, fig. 185. For a possible, much tinier version of this type, see E. Babelon and J.-A. Blanchet, *Catalogue des bronzes antiques de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris 1895, p. 237, no. 569.

century north Italian, the one garlanded and the other bare-headed, go closely together. They held the club in the right hand, while the left appears empty, but the composition has changed dramatically; the figure is now definitely conceived of as toppling backwards and the legs are straddled very much further apart. The New York bronze has been linked to that in Parma, formerly regarded as an ancient find from Veleia, but, in fact, the two figures are very different in character. Another late Renaissance type is closer to the ancient statuettes; the hero holds the apples of the Hesperides in his left hand, while his club is gripped in the right, but at the same lower angle as on the Florence and Parma figures; an interesting instance of this type is a statuette in Modena where Herakles is returned to a state of equilibrium by a ball placed under his left (i.e. rear) foot.¹¹

Here, then, the matter rested when, in 1975, yet another relatively intact ancient statuette of the same type appeared on the London market and one seemingly, too, with a long but ill-known earlier history. The Fitzwilliam Museum entered into negotiations with its latest owner, Ivor Giblin, and through his ready co-operation it came to Cambridge for technical investigation and temporary display and eventually, in 1977, was bought from him by the Museum.¹² It shows the hero in essentially the same pose as the Leake bronze and still attached to a giant acanthus leaf, itself with a slightly concave under-surface apparently shaped to fit the shoulder of a huge metal vessel. Herakles holds his club in his left hand while his right presses against his chest a big, squat kantharos, apparently filled with moderately large fruit—possibly the apples of the Hesperides? He wears an ivy garland with large clusters of berries bound with a very broad fillet, or mitra (Pl. 82:a–c).

The statuette is again a lost-wax hollow casting. It shows small casting faults at the knee and calf of the left leg. Larger areas of surface have also since broken away from behind the left thigh and from the small of the back, where the wall was particularly thin. The right arm with the kantharos appears to have been cast separately and joined on a little below the shoulder. The large acanthus leaf to which the figure still adheres was clearly also a separate casting, the statuette's feet being apparently secured to its two projections by socketed tangs and solder. In addition, an approximately rectangular socket, 1.7 × 1.5 cm., completely pierces the back between the shoulder blades and seems clearly intended to receive a probably horizontal metal strut to the back of the figure, secured in place by solder; the opening is now somewhat irregular because, when the strut was wrenched away, adjoining parts of the back broke away with it. If this strut was indeed horizontal, as seems probable, then the downward projection of the end of the club, possibly trimmed off to meet it, confirms that the whole figure was tilted considerably forward to a point where it was in

¹⁰ Parma, Museo Nazionale di Antichità, no. B 105. F. d'Andria in *Contributi dell'Istituto di Archeologia* III, Milan 1970, pp. 34–36, no. 11, pls. 5, 6, with earlier bibliography provided and where first recognized as of Renaissance date; *AJA* 80, 1976, pp. 415–419, figs. 3, 4.

¹¹ Modena, Museo Estense. W. Bode, *Die italienische Bronzestatuetten der Renaissance*, Berlin 1906, pl. 86; d'Andria, *op. cit.*, p. 36, pl. 5, right.

¹² Fitzwilliam Museum, no. GR.5.1977. Bought from the Sir Robert Greg Fund. Height between 24.2 and 24.5 cm., according to angle at which figure is set. Width of acanthus leaf 13.3 cm. *Christie Catalogue*, July 16, 1975, p. 45, no. 201, pl. 17; *Annual Report of Fitzwilliam Museum Syndicate*, 1976, p. 8, 1977, p. 11.

perfect equilibrium and that the acanthus leaf was some way down on the curving shoulder of the vase.

This statuette is clearly of the same type as the Leake Herakles, but seems almost a travesty of the latter, revealing the hero in a paunchier, shorter-legged and distinctly less muscular guise. Indeed, the most remarkable thing about it is the negligence and imprecision of the surface modeling. The statuette has been subjected to harsh manual cleaning in modern times and has then been repatinated black, but there are residues of oxide and a greenish patina underneath. The modern cleaning has also stripped away most of the residue of a surface coating in a second metal which clearly originally covered the whole of both statuette and acanthus leaf. This does, however, still survive at several points on both, in hollows of the ribbing of the leaf, between toes and fingers, in the crotch and armpits and along the inside of the right arm, under the beard and over parts of the hair, fillet, and garland and of the kantharos and its contents.¹³ This second metal layer now has a preserved thickness of between 0.05 and 0.1 cm. It is covered by the dark patina and its own salts, but readily cleans to a silvery color and appears to show quite fine chasing where its surface is well preserved. It seems softer than silver, and analysis by Dr. J. A. Charles of the Department of Metallurgy and Materials Science in Cambridge has established that it is an alloy of tin and lead of much the same type as a solder often used by bronzeworkers and thus a material readily available to them. Dr. Charles has also concluded that it was applied to the surface of the bronze by dipping it into the molten alloy. With such a thick surface coating, there would be little advantage in working to a fine finish or adding detailed modeling on the bronze casting itself, which would also have had its plugged casting faults readily concealed by it. Clearly statuette and leaf were intended to give the effect of having been made of silver. The mind, however, hesitates to accept the idea of a whole huge vessel fabricated in such false "silver". If one may concentrate briefly on the acanthus leaf, it is tempting to regard this as a small part of a much larger system of *appliqué* foliate decoration in high relief of a kind familiar from later Hellenistic and early Roman silverware¹⁴ and other metalwork. Here it seems more attractive to surmise that "silver" leaf and statuette were intended to form a contrast against the main surfaces of the vessel, be these of natural or gilt bronze.

It now remains to consider what kind of vessel carried these statuettes and could have displayed the appropriate vast size and broad, convex shoulder, as well as the vertical neck to secure their back supports. There seems to be only one possibility regularly adorned with statuettes in this way and that is the volute-krater. In the very childhood of the Hellenistic style, splendid antecedents are provided for such a usage by the magnificent volute-krater from Dherveni, with its handles flanked on either side by statuettes of similar size.¹⁵ But the Dherveni figures are seated on the shoulder of the vessel, whereas our Herakles statuettes

¹³ Too poorly preserved, however, over the fruit to determine whether or not gold leaf was overlaid above it at this point.

¹⁴ E.g. D. E. Strong, *Greek and Roman Silver Plate*, London 1966, pls. 31:a, 33:a, b, 39:a, b.

¹⁵ *BCH* 87, 1963, pls. 15–20; M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, Cambridge 1975, pp. 482–484, pl. 141:b. For earlier bronze krater figures see *AthMitt* 94, 1979, pp. 77–91, pls. 13–26.

are standing upon it. We are thus, presumably, dealing with vessels about twice the size of the Dherveni krater if the statuettes were not to overtop the neck. Many of the features already noted on the figures themselves become more explicable on this basis. If one is concerned with matching pairs of figures flanking the handles of such vessels, then simple symmetry dictates that the pose of some should be a partial or complete mirror image of that of others. Other things follow from this, too. Herakles is clearly to be regarded as ambidextrous as to which is his club arm, and that weapon may be being wielded to slightly more purpose than at first seemed the case. If, as appears likely, he is standing near the steep edge of the shoulder of the vessel, then his tense bent legs, arched back and thrust-back shoulders may simply be due to his maintaining his balance at the edge of an ever more precipitous slope. His eyes, too, may be downcast not so much because he is in a drunken stupor as to bring his gaze into relation with that of his beholders whose own eye level would inevitably be below his in view of the size of the krater on which he stood and their reclining posture as they partook of the wine from it. The hero is clearly in a festive mood, as witness his garland and kantharos, but he may be less inebriated than has been supposed. On the other hand, whether the large acanthus leaf on which the Giblin figure stands represents part of a foliate infilling within the handle spilling out on to the shoulder or is part of a continuous leafy frieze around the shoulder of the vessel can now only be guessed at.

We now come to the vexed matter of determining the date of these statuettes, a matter on which the author has already pleaded his limitations. The treatment of their bodies, heads, and general musculature is clearly strongly influenced by the work of Lysippos and particularly by his Herakles figures. But there is also a curious eclecticism especially to be noted in their more variable features, such as hairstyle and garland, and already remarked on in the case of the New York example. Sometimes, however, these features, too, seem to hark back to the work of Lysippos. Thus the curiously bound garland of the Leake Herakles finds its counterpart in the bronze version from Pompeii of Lysippos' seated Herakles.¹⁶ In execution, however, all the extant examples would seem rather to belong to a mature, revivalist, and somewhat backward-looking stage of Hellenistic art. The Leake bronze may be about the earliest. It has already been suggested that it may belong to the 2nd century B.C., and it can scarcely be any later than the 1st century B.C. The Giblin statuette is probably one of the latest, possibly already into the 1st century after Christ, to judge from the form of the squat kantharos held by the hero. But the tolerable consistency with which they all reproduce a single type suggests that they may all derive from a single early Hellenistic masterpiece. If the interpretation advanced above is correct, this, too, was presumably a giant volute-krater and one whose art was held in the highest esteem far and wide.

We have seen above how, divorced from their original function, these statuettes, or rather other examples of them seemingly now lost, were misinterpreted in the Italian

¹⁶ F. de Visscher, *Héraklès épitrapezios*, Paris 1962, p. 65, pl. 20 (= *AntCl* 30, 1961, p. 125); may one possibly wonder whether the smaller bronze versions of the seated bearded Herakles (*ibid.*, pls. 17, 26) or even their famous small original could once have been conceived to rest on a krater shoulder like the Dherveni figures? It is impossible now to guess what other types of statuettes may have formed the rest of the decoration of the vessels with the Herakles figures of the Leake type, but, if the hero appeared in more than one guise, then the iconographic links observed by d'Andria (*op. cit.* [footnote 10 above], p. 35) between the "drunken" Herakles and the Heracles passing water may be of interest.

Renaissance, when they inspired contemporary versions of the drunken Herakles falling backwards. Analogous changes in interpretation may also have arisen much earlier. Thus, among the ancient examples already considered, some doubt attaches to the function of the statuette from Pompeii, partly because it does not seem to have been associated with such a vessel when found and partly because of the somewhat different position of the feet, leading Finati to the conclusion that the hero was dancing,¹⁷ and of other possible indications of drunkenness, e.g. in the treatment of the eyes. Furthermore, it seems likely that various classes of much smaller Roman bronze votive figures of Herakles of only slightly different type may owe something to the statuettes just considered. These votive figures, however, give little hint of advanced intoxication and normally adopt an upright striding posture and add that other notable attribute, the lionskin.¹⁸ One may cite almost identical examples in Paris¹⁹ and Rouen²⁰ and, rather different, a statuette in Sofia.²¹ Even here, however, among these smaller statuettes, there is at least one example, recently on the market, that definitely appears to be from the shoulder of a vessel.²² This is a figure, only 11.3 cm. high, of the partly reversed variety of the New York bronze, but with the addition of a lionskin over the left forearm holding the kantharos. Its preserved left foot seems to have been soldered to an ancient curved metal surface. Its advanced right foot, possibly originally more securely attached to the same surface, has been completely torn away, but what survives of the lower leg and ankle leaves little doubt that the ground on which the hero once stood curved steeply downwards at this point. There would thus seem to have been at least one krater of more modest and manageable size decorated with such statuettes.

While this article was being written, a further bronze figure clearly flanking the handle of a volute-krater and in an ostensibly Hellenistic style was acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum. It is proposed to conclude with a brief publication of it, if only because it seems to confirm the persistence of such elaborately decorated vessels in the Hellenistic period and, possibly, beyond.²³ This solid lost-wax casting depicts a satyr-boy sitting on rocks, leaning back and wearing a long nebris knotted at his left shoulder; he holds a large bunch of grapes in his right hand against the nebris and a lagobolon, or pedom, in his left; on his head is a garland, apparently of pine, fastened with a fillet whose ends hang down behind (Pl. 82:d, e). The nebris, its short pelt indicated by incision, is drawn taut across his back and extends down behind to his ankles, forming a kind of undulating flat ground on which his body and legs rest; indeed, its gravity-defying character may suggest that the composition is itself an

¹⁷ Text to *Museo Borbonico* XVI (footnote 8 above), pl. 8.

¹⁸ Cf. also the representations in other materials already cited in footnote 6 above.

¹⁹ Babelon and Blanchet, *op. cit.* (footnote 9 above), p. 236, no. 565. The authenticity of this and the Rouen figure is questioned by d'Andria (*op. cit.* [footnote 10 above], p. 35), and it is possible that they should be added to the list given earlier of much later essays on this theme.

²⁰ E. Espérandieu and H. Rolland, *Bronzes antiques de la Seine-Maritime*, Paris 1959, p. 41, no. 58, pl. 24.

²¹ *RA* 31, 1897, p. 231, no. 29, fig. on p. 232.

²² *Christie Catalogue*, December 10, 1981, p. 43, no. 207, with figure. Now Jerusalem market. See also footnote 4 above for Egyptian example.

²³ Fitzwilliam Museum, no. GR.75.1981. Given by the Trustees of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine; formerly collections of Sir Hercules Read and Sir Henry Wellcome. Pres. height 7.0 cm., pres. length 8.3 cm. *Sotheby Catalogue*, November 5–9, 1928, p. 56, no. 590.

adaptation partly inspired by a standing figure. The rocks below are indicated as a summary narrow mass, pierced by a large round rivet hole, 0.85 cm. in diameter, and resting, in turn, on a sort of continuation of the cylindrical rod that rises beyond the satyr's feet, presumably to meet the volute part of the krater handle. This rod seems to have been bent askew when the upper part of the handle was wrenched away. Presumably the complete krater handle with its pair of flanking figures was formed as a single casting. The statuette was apparently attached to the lower part of the shoulder of the vessel, to judge from the position of the rivet hole, part of the inner edge of the nebris behind the satyr's legs being possibly cut back to help it fit to the steep curve. The bronze is much bruised and also pitted by earlier corrosion; it has been harshly cleaned and patinated black.

Although he seems to lack exact counterparts, the satyr-boy is typical of a range of representations that are normally regarded as the creation of early Hellenistic times, although they are mainly now known from the copies and adaptations of Roman sculpture and decorative art. In the present author's judgment—and he would stress that this is highly subjective—the execution of the little bronze does not seem to belong to an early Hellenistic date. The shallowness of the head and the treatment of the hair, garland, and fillet at the back seem rather to imply that it is a product of the revival, especially in Italy, of much earlier types of Greek metal vessels in the late 1st century B.C. and the 1st century after Christ, a revival doubtless prompted by the discovery of original Greek bronze vessels at centers such as recolonized Corinth. The little satyr is but a humble counterpart of the Leake Herakles, but may help tell a part of the same tale. And both summon us to fill our cups to two very remarkable ladies.

RICHARD NICHOLLS

FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM
Cambridge, England



a.



b.



c.

Bronze Herakles from the Leake
Collection GR 1.1864, Fitzwilliam
Museum, Cambridge



a.



b.

a–c. Bronze Herakles from the Giblin Collection,
Fitzwilliam Collection, Cambridge



c.



d.



e.

d, e. Bronze satyr from the
Wellcome Collection,
Fitzwilliam Museum,
Cambridge