

CALL ME BATIEIA.

THE MEANING OF NICKNAMES IN AMAZON MYTHS

ARTURO SANCHEZ SANZ
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
asblade@msn.com

ABSTRACT. The Amazon stories in written sources have provided us with most of the names of their protagonists. Antiope, Hippolyta and Penthesilea are the best known, but there were many others. Sometimes they corresponded to secondary characters in works by lesser-known authors, which prevented them from achieving the same renown. The iconographic sources not only reveal the scope of these myths in certain social spheres, but also provide new variants, to the point of creating a panorama that is necessary for the analysis of the Amazon universe. Despite this, and the large volume of information available in art, only a small part of it includes written references to its protagonists. The present work offers a broad and complete record of Amazon onomastics present in art and literature throughout antiquity. Its study provides a basis for unravelling not only the Amazon image in the Hellenistic collective imaginary, but also its political organisation and the transfer of power associated with its mythical culture.

KEYWORDS: Amazons, onomastics, Hippolyta, Antiope, Penthesilea.

1. Introduction

Myrina is rarely remembered. Sometimes, for various reasons, some of the most important Amazon nicknames have been forgotten, as was the case with such important figures as the Lybian queen Myrina¹, despite being the first to be mentioned by Homer himself², compared to the greater popularity achieved by figures such as Hippolyta, Antiope or Penthesilea. However, these are not the only Amazon names known in antiquity. There were many others, many of them directly related to royalty, from which it is possible to try to unravel the thought processes that led to the belief in a mythical Amazon society based on a hereditary monarchical system.

¹ A. Sanchez Sanz (2025a) 7.

² *Il.* 2.814.

A fragment of the Proto-Corinthian Enocoe (640 BC)³ shows one of the earliest known scenes of amazonomachy in vase painting. The scene shows two figures facing each other, on the right a bearded hoplite with a Corinthian helmet and an aspis, and on the left a female figure with the same type of helmet and a curved bow, who has been identified as an amazon thanks to the inscription between the two figures. There was probably another lost figure that would have helped us to identify the male figure, which is why it has been placed in this category, given the impossibility of knowing whether it was Achilles or (more likely) Theseus. What is interesting about his existence is not only the use of this appellative to facilitate recognition of the scene, but also the fact that this generic option, alluding to his people, was used instead of one of the proper names known for such episodes, such as Penthesilea or Antiope.

It has been suggested that these names were not yet established in the tradition at such an early date⁴, although we can rule out such an interpretation with some certainty, since as early as the 8th century BC Homer or Arctinus of Miletus⁵ themselves had no problem recognising Amazon names such as Myrina or Penthesilea, proving their appearance and popularisation in the collective imaginary at an indeterminate time⁶, but always before these authors. For this reason, it seems more likely that the appearance of this appellative was simply an attempt to help the spectator identify the scene for what it was, an Amazonomachy whose purpose was to recall the confrontation between Greeks and Amazons as part of the mythical tradition, rather than to refer to a specific episode among those already known. Not surprisingly, the symbolic differences between the two figures at this time were little different from the later predominance of oriental costumes and Phrygian caps in vase painting or the *chitoniskos* in other media, since both figures appear to be wearing the same hoplite's uniform, distinguished only by the presence of a bow or the use of a different skin tone.

This compilation brings together the Amazon personal names found in written and iconographic sources, as well as those provided by reference works⁷ such as

³ Museum of Aegina 2061; LIMC, *Amazones*, 638.

⁴ LIMC, *Amazones*, 638.

⁵ Hom. *Il.* 2.814; 3.184-189; 6.185-186; Arctinus of Miletus in Procl. *Chr.* 2; Escol. Hom. *Il.* 24.804.

⁶ A. Sanchez Sanz (2025b) 49; (2017) 146).

⁷ Mayor (2014b, 431-437) offers a list of names with more than 200 entries, the problem is that most of them do not really belong to Amazons, but to women who in Antiquity in one way or another were related to the military sphere, and this can lead to error. We will deal here only with those names that have undoubtedly been presented as belonging to Amazons by different direct sources.

the LIMC⁸ or the Beazley Archive (from now onwards BA), and by specialists such as Bothmer⁹. They are usually given in full, although the fragmentary state of some pieces has allowed only partial reconstruction. Each of them includes a reference to the source and the number of known occurrences, in order to verify their occurrence in each context.

2. Amazon onomastics in ancient sources

The total number of references is 211, which is high and directly related to the number of existing texts and works. However, although the proportion is similar, the numerical value of the two sources is very different (see Appendix 01). The known classical sources alluding to the Amazon universe provide up to 114 appellatives, while the 4,475 iconographic pieces dedicated to this theme barely reach 109¹⁰. Most of them appear in vase painting, and only in exceptional cases are they included in other artistic media (mosaics, reliefs, sculptures, paintings, etc.), which could be due to the fact that vases were intended for a more private and illustrated environment than works placed in public spaces. This is not surprising, since these works represent 76.6% of the known Amazon iconography; however, although the number of vases with red figures is smaller than those known here for black figures, they are the ones that most frequently contain this information¹¹. Only 12 are repeated (5.3%), a surprisingly low number.

Many refer to the protagonists of the most prominent stories (Penthesilea, Hippolyta or Antiope), but others also seem to have achieved a certain status. Hyginus describes Clymene as an Amazon queen who occupied the throne at a time much earlier than the one he ascribes to Hippolyta herself¹², whose name also appears on two ceramic pieces alluding to Theseus and on an Amazonomachy. If we are to believe Hyginus, it seems unlikely chronologically that she was present at the abduction he carried out. On the other hand, the battle scene would force us to accept that there were clashes before the first ones described in the classical sources. It is possible that this circumstance was accepted in the Hellenistic imaginary, since both peoples were accepted as having existed before their best-known accounts. However, the scarce congruence of the contexts in which these appellations appear is evidence of a clear invention on the part of craftsmen and scholars, whose

⁸ A. Mayor (2014b) 653.

⁹ *Ibid.*: 234.

¹⁰ A. Sanchez Sanz (2019) 22.

¹¹ D. Bothmer (1957) fig. 77. 1.

¹² *Fab.* 163.

survival over time may have favoured their common acceptance and accidental appearance.

The list of Amazon queens provided by Hyginus contains two more of these common names, Glaucé and Ocyale. Like Clymene, the order of this list makes them predecessors of Hippolyta. However, Pseudo-Apolodorus states that Glaucé was one of the known nicknames for Hippolyta, along with Melanippe, added by Diodorus¹³, which may indicate some confusion in the sources as to the different traditions. Glaucé appears on three pieces of pottery, all relating to Heraklean Amazonomachies. This would disprove Hyginus' version in favour of the other allusions, if we assume that their relationship was in some chronological order, or show that this interpretation is a mistake. His account is the only written mention we have of Ocyale, who appears in only one vase painting scene before Theseus, which again seems to contradict this assumption.

Hiera appears in the work of Philostratus as the wife of the Heraclid Telephus, and her name is inscribed on the altar of Pergamon, apparently as a direct allusion to the myth that developed in that region. Hippo is mentioned by Callimachus in the context of an Amazon religious ritual, but her presence in art is reduced to a piece of pottery with a Heraklean Amazonomachy. One of the most common appellations is that of Melanippe, with up to five known written references for a single vase painting inscription. Diodorus and Pseudo-Apolodorus again argue that it was Hippolyta, although Pindar gives her a separate identity as a victim of Telamon, one of the Argonauts, who he claims accompanied Herakles on his ninth labour¹⁴. The allusions of Apollonius and Pompeius Trogo point in this direction. They see her as the sister of Hippolyta, who was kidnapped by Herakles in order to obtain the girdle as ransom. All these authors place her in the context of the same story, to which the amazonomachy in the only vase painting scene belonging to her could allude. However, even these latter accounts do not agree on the final destination, which would be further evidence of the existence of different traditions or distorted interpretations of an earlier account.

The case of Andromache is particularly relevant. She is the name most often repeated in the iconography (23), even more than the most famous Amazons. In fact, although some of these pieces refer to a single Amazons (4), the majority show Amazonomachias facing unnamed enemies (3), as well as in battles associated with the three great Amazon myths involving Theseus (1), Achilles (1) and Herakles (13). The only written reference is to the Trojan episode itself¹⁵. In Greek mythology,

¹³ 4.16.

¹⁴ Just as Helanicus states (*FHG.* 33 cfr. *Escol. Pin. N.* 3.64).

¹⁵ *Tz. PH.* 35.

her name was shared with the wife of the Trojan Hector, translated as "she who fights with/as a man", which is not without a certain irony. While the daughter of the Theban king has always been the paradigm of the devoted wife (along with Penelope or Nausicaa), it was her Amazon counterpart who really lived up to her name, until her defeat by Achilles. In fact, it was Achilles who killed Aetion and his seven sons¹⁶, another sign of the relationship between the two women that shows two very different examples of heroism in Greek culture. Hector's wife went so far as to advise him on military strategy, and in return received a reminder of the role of women in greek society¹⁷.

This comment may reflect Homer's own opinion on the matter, but in another passage he does not hesitate to point out that the Trojan women helped to defend their walls¹⁸. Agamemnon and Odysseus also did not hesitate to hand over control of their kingdoms to their wives¹⁹, although Clytemnestra was under the supervision of a herald, and many other Homeric female characters showed attitudes far removed from this ideal. This is the case with Clytemnestra herself, but also with Circe, Calypso, etc.²⁰ These female prototypes were not very desirable and in part resembled what the Amazons themselves represented. Contact with the sacred was frightening²¹, even more so when associated with the feminine, as shown by such figures or by Medea herself, for although she was mortal, her "barbarian" condition was combined with that of a sorceress, distancing her even further from the human, to the point of creating a comparable fear. With the exception of Penelope, and perhaps Nausicaa, the rest of the Homeric female characters in the *Odyssey* are presented as paradigms of the dangers of greater female freedom (even in the case of goddesses).

Despite having a name as closely related to the Amazon as Andromache, the only written source that seems to mention Antianeira is Tzetzes, either as one of

¹⁶ Hom. *Il*, 6.394.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 490-93; *Od*, 1356-57.

¹⁸ Hom. *Il*, 18.514-15

¹⁹ Contrary to Cantarella (1987, 29), who argues for a total presence of Greek misogyny in Homeric works, or Penrose (2016, 6) who extends this kind of thinking to Hellenic civilisation.

²⁰ Parroni (1950) 322.

²¹ This is why men delegated it to women whenever possible, as was the case with the Delphic Pythia. (Zaidman 1991, 417).

the warriors who accompanied Penthesilea to Troy²² or as the queen who succeeded her²³. Iconography does not provide many other examples, as she only appears in one Amazonomachy. It is possible that the artisans initially produced these battle scenes with a generic character, although they are very significant. The subsequent addition of certain appellatives may have allowed them to be adapted to specific themes without the need to add specific visual elements for the same purpose. This possibility would require a greater knowledge of the Greek mythical universe on the part of the possible recipients.

It seems more likely that these appellatives, especially the less common ones, were also used universally, with the sole purpose of identifying their protagonists as Amazons, regardless of specific accounts and when there could be any doubt. In fact, Homer used it as an adjective to describe the Amazons (*Αντιάνειραι*)²⁴, sometimes interpreted as 'manly' or 'rivals of men'. Originally, however, this supposed animus would not really be founded, suggesting perhaps a meaning more associated with 'similar'²⁵, and even Homer does not use the word 'manly'. and even Homer does not use it when speaking of Myrina, replacing it with *πολύσκαρθμος*, thus removing any terminological doubt about her personality²⁶. In any case, although the most widespread accounts were well known to the common Greek population, only the elite had the financial means to acquire decorated pottery. The references inscribed on this support were much more frequent than on the others, which implies a clear special character compared to the scenes found in public places. This could indicate a special interest on the part of the craftsmen to offer them in a social context where they could be more easily accepted.

The list of female warriors offered by Tzetzes also includes Anchimache as the only allusion for which we have evidence. Her presence in the iconography of the Trojan Amazons always seems to be very limited, because here too she is present in a Heraklean Amazonomachy. Her meaning is related to the previous ones and therefore very appropriate for an Amazon, which could explain her presence in seemingly unrelated episodes. In Greek mythology, the root 'mache' (*Μαχη*) referred to a particular type of personified spirits (*daimones*) and was associated with

²² Tz. *PH*. 176.

²³ Mimn. *Trag. FHG*. 21a.

²⁴ *Il*, 6.185-186.

²⁵ B. Weimbaum (2000) 118.

²⁶ Bachofen (1861, 73-74) claims that the Amazons would not represent an element contrary to the masculine but that their death would reflect the "true sublimity of the feminine", defending its reality since human development could not take place without the existence of a matriarchal stage.

battle or combat²⁷. It is present in Andromache, Anchimache, Areximache, Aristomache, Deinomache, Eumache, Hippomache, Nicomache or Pirgomache, so this association was common and considered appropriate for the Amazonian setting. Most of these names appear exclusively in the art, perhaps with the same intention of facilitating their identification along with the rest of the compositional elements. Some of them even seem to show a certain irony on the part of their creators, as in the case of Anchimache, whose meaning seems to be an attempt to ridicule the Amazon people through their "deserved" defeat. Moreover, in Greek mythology, the mother of the Argonauts Idmon²⁸ and Eurytus (wife of Menelaus of Sparta)²⁹ was also known as Antianeira, whose expedition is sometimes linked to the Amazon universe³⁰, and Anchimache was the wife of Eurystheus, the promoter of Herakles' work.

3. Nomenclature in Greek myths

Apart from the best known in literature and art, most of these appellatives appear in isolation, although they are very numerous in comparison. In fact, it is not uncommon for them not to be mentioned at all in written accounts, or for their protagonist to be barely mentioned along with a prominent female companion. In art, despite their scarce presence in relation to the large number of existing works, they appear more frequently in vase painting scenes of Amazonomachias³¹. Isolated references, sometimes including some of their opponents, also predominate, since the examples that provide a greater number are scarce in all types of sources. There seems to have been no need to use them regularly. Many accounts make general allusions to their culture, where this information may not have been considered relevant, and in other cases it may have been taken for granted.

In art, the largest percentage corresponds to little-known references that could have been created from characteristics, adjectives, customs, etc. typically associated with Amazons, belonging to lost traditions or resulting from the distortion of older ones. This could be the case with Ainia and Ainippe, Androdameia and Andromeda, Antiope and Antioque, Caroppe and Chaleros, Hipsiphila and Hipsophila, etc. We cannot even rule out the possibility that some entries in both sources were influenced by each other, although it is difficult to know in what proportion.

²⁷ Hes. *Th.* 226 ss.

²⁸ Orph. *Arg.* 187. Although it has sometimes also been called Asteria (Escol. A. R. 1.139).

²⁹ A. R. 1.56; Hyg. *Fab.* 14.

³⁰ A. R. 2.770; V. *Fl.* 6.364-386.

³¹ A. Sanchez Sanz (2024e) 78.

Some incomplete names could refer to other known names, such as Cali[...] to Calia, If[...] to Iphito or Iphinome, [...]epyleia to Telepyleia, etc.; and the text sources indicate the use of several names for the same Amazon, which would reduce these results.

This situation demonstrates the heterogeneous nature of the Greek mythical universe. The diachrony of the Amazon narratives shows how easily they could be expanded or modified according to the needs and interests of an individual or group of individuals, thus invalidating their reduction to a synchronic scheme. It is possible that the more popular narratives were less permeable to such practices, at least in essential aspects that could affect their purpose. Nothing, however, prevented the generation of new episodes or versions of old stories that were still vaguely present in local traditions or, more generally, in the collective imaginary³². In fact, the high volume of exports in the pottery trade may have led to the appearance of many of the less common appellatives, thanks to the reduced knowledge of Greek mythology in certain periods and places. In any case, the craftsmen seem to have attached less importance to this information than to the importance of visual symbolism in interpreting the scenes. Most of the inscribed pieces do not belong to a single author or workshop, but to a large number of them (such as the Camtar Painter, the Painter of Thymiades, the Painter of Prometheus, the Painter of Achilles, etc.) and belonging to different periods.

Antiope is one of the most frequent figures (22). Her name appears in nine written sources and eleven iconographic works. However, more than thirty authors mention her story, sometimes using other appellatives or indirectly, a situation that is repeated with other important figures such as Hippolyta and Penthesilea. Most of her portrayals correspond to the episode of Theseus (7), together with amazonomachies without mentioning her opponents (2), a play facing Herakles and another play in which she appears alone. These include a scene in which two Amazons are identified as Antiope and Penthesilea³³. However, none of the known accounts place them in the same context, so perhaps the craftsman simply wanted to refer to two of the most famous Amazons without paying attention to this detail. This would explain the frequent presence of references to individual Amazons in scenes outside their known episodes, as these appellations would be used freely.

Hippolyta appears in a similar number of classical authors, although she is mentioned directly in only thirteen of them, in addition to six inscriptions. Despite the fact that the number of iconographic pieces associated with Herakles in the Ama-

³² A. Sanchez Sanz (2024c) 434; (2025c) 21.

³³ Beazley Archive Vase Number (BAVN) 214365.

zon area is enormous, his name is hardly ever inscribed in them, which seems logical if we consider that his iconography is very characteristic. The same could be said of Hippolyta, since it would be easy to identify her opponent without having to remember her name. However, in this case the classical sources refer more often to female warriors such as Melanippe or Andromache fighting the hero than to Hippolyta herself, which would raise greater doubts. In fact, only one of the works in which her name appears corresponds to a Heraklean Amazonomachy, while three of these scenes do not show the hero, another is in front of Theseus (inscribed) and one in which she appears alone. Thus, perhaps many of the amazonomachies that do not provide information about the Achaeans could refer to Theseus himself, reflecting the traditions that make him participate in the ninth labour³⁴, since his appearance does not differ from that assigned to the rest of the hoplites.

The same could be said of the scenes in which Penthesilea is mentioned, since Achilles himself has no particular iconography in art. The Trojan Amazon is mentioned in only nine of the sixteen authors who place her in this episode, along with nine works of art. In fact, most of the known accounts in this case date from the 1st century BC, although most of these inscriptions belong to votive shields from the Archaic period. Arctinus of Miletus and Stesychorus³⁵ show that she was already well known by this time, although she appears less frequently in texts than her more prominent counterparts. Although she is a contemporary of Arctinus, her absence from the Homeric work seems to reflect the timing of this episode, after the death of Hector.

This situation could be linked to the enormous increase in their representations on sarcophagus reliefs, especially in Roman times³⁶, although it is difficult to say which was more influential. The inscriptions correspond to confrontations with Achilles (2), appearances alone (2) and several pieces whose deterioration makes them unrecognisable (3). One of them belongs to an Etruscan vase³⁷, which is evidence of a greater knowledge of Greek mythology in cultures with which trade was more fluid. Nevertheless, the work shows Penthesilea and a companion in the form

³⁴ Plutarch (*Thes.* 26-27), states that those who separated the two episodes were in the majority, among whom he includes himself, although he only mentions Philocorus among those and his account has not come down to us. So did Lycophron (*Alex.* 1322), Paus. (1.2), Isocrates (12.193), Agias of Trecene (cf. Paus. 1.2), Justin (*Epit.* 2.26), Euripides (*Herakl.* 215), Ps. Apollod. (*Epit.* 1.16) and Ovid (*Her.* 21.120-125).

³⁵ Arctinus of Miletus in Proclus (Chr. 2. Schol. Hom. *Il.* 24.804). Stesychorus (cf. Tz. ad *Lyc.* 266).

³⁶ A. Sanchez Sanz (2023b) 87.

³⁷ BNF Inv. De-Ridder.920-b.

of ghosts, a scene that is unknown in literature and art, which could be an attempt to adapt it to one's own tradition or to particular tastes in this field.

A considerable number of Amazon names seem to derive from their supposed founding activity. This is mainly located in the Near East, and is in fact linked to the colonising activity carried out by the Greeks in Ephesus, Smyrna, Myrina, Cyme, etc.³⁸ The various traditions that allude to it are usually of a local character, probably interested in enjoying the prestige offered by such ancestors. Their existence is justified by stories that tell of the appearance of the capital of the Asian Amazons, Themyscira, by its founder³⁹, or of the same attitude demonstrated by their African counterparts on numerous occasions.

Each of these cities minted its own coins to commemorate such an event, to the point of becoming the main iconographic references in this sense, perpetuated for centuries with different designs associated with the Tyche (goddess of fortune, chance, providence and fate). Apart from the isolated representation of Queen Myrina, most of these toponyms do not seem to belong to Amazon queens, despite the additional prestige that this could imply, not even in the case of Themyscira. In fact, we know of no homonyms for the most important eastern rulers, such as Hippolyta or Penthesilea. In the case of Cyme, Pitane and Priene, we know from Diodorus that they were the bravest companions of Myrina⁴⁰, which is why he gave them such an honour.

Myrina is mentioned by four of the six classical authors who allude to her story, several times by other names such as Batieia⁴¹ or Aegea⁴², but we do not know of a single iconographic representation directly related to this adventure⁴³. The same is true of Thalestris (sometimes Minithia), whose presence in written sources is even greater than that of Myrina herself⁴⁴, due to her relationship with Alexander III of Macedon. Nevertheless, it is likely that they existed, even if only in small numbers, as in the case of Theseus and Achilles. Moreover, were it not for a Pompeian mural from the 1st century AD, we would think that her confrontation with Bellerophon never appeared in art.

³⁸ M. Sakellariou (1958) 407-410; B. Devambez (1976) 267-276.

³⁹ App. *Mith.* 78.

⁴⁰ 3.55.6.

⁴¹ Hom. *Il.* 2.814; Str. 12.21-22.

⁴² Sex. Pompeius, *Festi De verborum* "Aegaeum".

⁴³ Galahad (1975, 301-311) also gives it historicity, making the Tuareg women descendants of the Lybian Amazons.

⁴⁴ A. Sanchez Sanz (2024b) 15; (2024d) 322.

The most important concentration of Amazon names in art corresponds to the Heraklean amazonomachies (52). However, only three of them appear in the literature, Antiope, Hippolyta and Glaucé, and most of those who appear in other scenes of the amazonomachies are not present in the texts either. Melanippe belongs to this group, although her absence from the iconography may be due to the assertion of Pseudo-Apolodorus⁴⁵. Faced with the possibility of using different appellatives, the artisans may have chosen the best known, since the three scenes in which Glaucé appears also belong to the ninth work. The same is true of the isolated allusions to other participants or the almost identical lists that later authors offer about them⁴⁶, which also have no inscribed references. On the contrary, most of the appellatives used by the artisans in the scenes of the amazonomachies do not appear in the written accounts.

The high number of sources for the best-known stories means that there are many references to them. The episode of Achilles is the second most common (33), although most of the pieces do not belong to ceramics, but to reliefs and sculptures for which we know hardly any inscriptions. The trend is reversed in the extensive lists of Tzetzes⁴⁷ and Quintus of Smyrna⁴⁸. The iconography provides only three mentions, in which only the protagonist, Penthesilea, is repeated. We already know the case of Andromache, who not only fights Herakles and Theseus in other scenes but also appears in recurring amazonomachies, but Ainia does not appear in any account.

There are only five names of Amazons in the stories of Theseus, as opposed to the twenty-six that appear in art. The latter usually appear at the moment of the abduction and after the final defeat, while the inscriptions always refer to the former. Only three appellatives that are always associated with this episode are exclusive to literature (Melanippe, Molpadia and Moltys), and only two are shared between the two sources (Antiope and Hippolyta). Molpadia came to literary prominence when Antiope's death at the Battle of Athens was attributed to her, although she seems to have been of no interest in iconography⁴⁹. Herodorus of Heraklea attributes this feat to Moltys⁵⁰. It is possible that both names were used to refer to the same Amazon, due to the distortion caused by the passage of time in the original sources, or to the existence of different local traditions in Hellanicus' native Lesbos and in Heraklea Pontica, the home of Herodorus. In any case, Moltys

⁴⁵ *Epít.* 1.16.

⁴⁶ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Thibais*; Eustathius cfr. Dionysius Periegetes, 828.

⁴⁷ *PH.* 182.

⁴⁸ 1.43-46.

⁴⁹ Plut. *Thes.* 27; Paus. 1.2.

⁵⁰ *FHG.* 16, cfr. Tz. *ad Lyc.* 1332.

does not appear in the known Amazon iconography. In all the cases we have seen, the majority of Amazon epithets always show an enormous difference between the proportions given by the accounts and the iconography, and the coincidences are always even rarer, which could indicate a great independence between the two sources.

Table 1. Written and iconographic quotations of Amazons in scenes with Herakles

Herakles					
Art				Literature	Both
Ainippe	Calia	Kydoime	Telepyleia	Antiope	Antiope
Alcinoe	Ceppe	Kleoptoleme	Thero	Glauce	Glauce
Alkaia	Ch[...]ila	Lauce	Toxaris	Hippolyta	Hippolyta
Anaxilea	Enphilo	Leontice	Toxis	Melanippe	
Anchimache	Euoppe	Lycopis	Toxophile		
Andromache	Glauce	M[...]	Thraso		
Andromeda	Hegeso	Pantariste	Xanthippe		
Antiope	Hippo	Phisto	[...]a[...]		
Areto	Hippolyta	Pyrgomache	[...]da		
Areximache	Hipponice	Scyleia	[...]e		
Aristomache	Hipsiphila	T[...]	[...]epyleia		
Barkida	Iphito	Teisiphile	[...]om[...]		
Cali[...]	Iph[...]	Telamon	[...]ys[...]		

Table 2. Written and iconographic quotations of Amazons in scenes with Achilles

Achilles					
Art	Literature				Both
Ainia	Alcibie	Aspidocharme	Eurylophe	Oistrophe	Penthesilea
Penthesilea	Andro	Bremusa	Evandre	Penthesilea	
	Anchimache	Chalcaor	Gortyessa	Pharetre	
	Androdaïxa	Cnemis	Harmothoe	Polemusa	
	Andromache	Clonie	Hecate	Thermodosa	
	Antandre	Derinoe	Hippothoe	Thorece	
	Antianeira	Derimacheia	Iodoce	Toxoanassa	
	Antibrote	Enchesimargos	Ioxeia	Toxophone	

Their appearance in generic amazonomachies scenes, which do not mention any of their opponents, is more limited (19). This is not a typology specific to art, since accounts such as the formation of the Sauromathian people include battles that do

not provide this specific information either⁵¹. Nevertheless, the presence of names such as Hippolyta, Penthesilea or Antiope, as well as the existence of figures with exclusive iconography such as Heracles, allows us to intuit the stories to which they could refer, otherwise their identification would be complicated. Most of these appellatives reappear in art and do not appear in the known stories. It is possible that at least some of them belong to lost traditions, although it seems more likely that their existence is linked to the creative freedom of the craftsmen responsible. In fact, the Greeks did not seem to need these scenes to refer to a specific myth, since their purpose was maintained by their reference to the defeat of the Amazons.

Table 3. Written and iconographic quotations of Amazons in scenes with Theseus

Theseus					
Art				Literature	Both
Andromache	Caroppe	Euriphileia	Monichos	Melanippe	Hippolyta
Androdameia	Clymene	Hippolyta	Myiane	Molpadia	Antiope
Alexandra	Chaleros	Kreousa	Ocippe	Moltys	
Aminomene	Doris	Laodoke	Ocyale		
Antiope	Ecephyle	Melousa	Phylakos		
Aristomache	Eumache	Mimnousa	[A]omache		

Table 4. Written and iconographic quotations of Amazons in Amazonomachy scenes

Amazonomachies				
Art				Both
Amynomene	Caroppe	Hairem[...]	Melanippe	Hippolyta
Andromache	Clymene	Hippolyta	Nicomache	Antiope
Antianeira	Doris	Kreousa	Ocyale	
Antiope	Ecephyle	Laodoke	Oigme	
Aristomache	Eumache	Mimnousa		

Scenes depicting single Amazons with inscriptions relating to their names are more common than we might initially think (16), but only some of those depicted are relatively well known, since most of them are not repeated in the two sources. In fact, although the accounts of the life and customs of the Amazons are numerous, they hardly include any of their own names, and these are the most common. In iconography, these seem to have been chosen to give greater prestige to the figure, since their appearance and iconography do not differ from the others when

⁵¹ As in the case of the sauromathians (Hdt. 4.110-117; Plin. *NH.* 6.19; Ephor. *FHG.* 78 cf. Scymnus Chius 5.102 ff., *Epit.* 5.847 ff.).

they appear with their companions. We know of a partial name ([---]ykila) which could correspond to this category if it were Hipsophila, or to the Heraklean amazonomachies which refer to Hipsiphila.

Particularly interesting are the written references to Amazons performing rituals (Upis, Hippo, Otrere or Antiope), a situation that is not repeated in the scenes depicting this type of activity. In fact, there is a clear difference between the vase painting representations and the only piece of this theme on another type of support, a mosaic found at Ouled Agla (300 AD), the two types being separated by more than six centuries. The vases always depict individual scenes in front of an altar, with no details to identify the recipient deity, while the mosaic shows a group scene with several Amazons dancing and making offerings to Artemis. This image is closer to the written references, which never describe these solitary actions and often refer to the performance of ritual dances.

In this sense, Penthesilea's intention before Priam could be understood as an example of individual piety towards the gods, although in reality it was an act of personal atonement, and perhaps for this reason her name does not appear in these representations. Similarly, the vase painting never includes temples, only small altars⁵², perhaps out of a desire to reaffirm the barbarism⁵³ associated with a culture that lacked the great religious constructions that gave prestige to the great civilisations of antiquity. Their existence in the Amazon would have meant giving them a greater cultural development, on a par with that of the Greeks themselves. Perhaps this is why classical texts sometimes mention rudimentary religious centres⁵⁴, but they also make them the founders of important religious centres both in their own territory⁵⁵ and far away, as in the case of the Artemision of Ephesus⁵⁶. The Ouled Agla mosaic preserves the presence of an altar and adds a temple in the background with a statue of a goddess. It is possible that it refers to Artemis herself in Ephesus, acting as an offertory, although this city is far from Ouled Agla itself (Algeria), or to another of the numerous temples dedicated to this goddess in the Greek area. The Amazons were to be seen as strong and courageous, worthy enemies of the great Greek heroes, but also associated with an inferior culture in order to justify their defeat.

⁵² E.g. Beazley Archive Vase Number 207767.

⁵³ A. Sanchez Sanz (2023a) 4.

⁵⁴ Sometimes simple altars of pebbles (A. R. 2.1160-1170).

⁵⁵ D. S. 2.46; 3.55.

⁵⁶ Call. *H.* 206, 238; Pin. *Fr.* 174.

Table 5. Written and iconographic quotations from Amazons in an independent way

Single Amazons				
Art				Both
Antoxena	Deinomache	Hippomache	Memnon	Hippolyta
Andromache	Doloppe	Hippomene	Penthesilea	Penthesilea
Caroppe	Eumache	Hipsophila	Pesinasa	Antiope
Crisis	Hippolyta	Iole	[...]ys[...]	

4. Amazon Queens

Finally, our knowledge of Amazon royalty comes exclusively from the literature. Some sources even provide lists that are not easy to interpret because they do not include any additional information that would allow us to know aspects such as the model of succession. Only a few of them also appear in art (Penthesilea, Andromache, Antiope, Hippolyta, Clymene, Glauce and Ocyale), although the scenes never show any symbolic distinction between their protagonists (in their clothing, equipment or attitude), even less through inscriptions, so that their status is revealed to us only through the classics. It is possible that some of the appellatives present in the iconography also allude to sovereigns unknown in our accounts. It is difficult to say for sure, but if we were to go by art alone, we could not even consider Hippolyta or Penthesilea as rulers, so these sources do not allow us to expand on these references. In fact, we cannot rule out the possibility that the artisans did not even grant such a status to the lesser known, such as Ocyale or Clymene.

Hyginus' list is one of the most important sources of knowledge about Amazon queens. He mentions Ocyale, Dioxippe, Iphinome, Xanthe, Hippothoe, Otrera, Antioque, Laomache, Glauce, Agave, Theseis, Hippolyta, Clymene, Polydora and Penthesilea, in that order. There are no names of kings, which is logical given the mythical nature of Amazon stories and their idiosyncrasies. That Hippolyta, Penthesilea and Otrera were rulers is attested in other sources, although we know little more about the rest. We could understand this relationship as a family tree, but this does not seem to be the case, or at least it would be out of chronological order or contain errors. Penthesilea is usually regarded as the last Amazon queen⁵⁷, and her place in this list would seem to confirm this, although the sources alluding to Alexander

⁵⁷ D. S. 2.46; Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

and Thalestris would cast doubt on this⁵⁸. In another passage Hyginus makes Penthesilea the sister of Hippolyta, both daughters of Otrera, which is confirmed by Quintus of Smyrna and Pseudo-Apollodorus⁵⁹. However, in his list, six rulers separate Otrera from Hippolyta, and three more separate Hippolyta from Penthesilea.

Clymene appears in general amazonomachy scenes and confronts Theseus, which would place her in the same context as Hippolyta and Antiope. Hyginus mentions her after Hippolyta herself⁶⁰, which could confirm her accession to the throne after the ninth labour, if we understand the text to imply a chronological order. In this case, we could intuitively assume that the artisans who represented her had knowledge of this tradition, although this is not the case with Glaucé, which again shows this freedom of interpretation in the mythical context. Glaucé also appears in the list, but several places before Hippolyta, which would place her at a much earlier date, whereas in the iconography she always appears fighting in Heraklean amazonomachies. Perhaps a clue can be found in Pseudo-Apollodorus, who states that it was another name for Hippolyta, which fits the depictions⁶¹ but contradicts Hyginus.

There is always the possibility that there was some confusion due to the distortion of some traditions, although we cannot rule out the possibility that the craftsmen used known but decontextualised names, whether they did so consciously or not. Hyginus considers Ocyale to be the first Amazon queen, and therefore before the others. The art alone places it in a generic Amazonomachy, which could have several explanations.

⁵⁸ Even the Amazon narrative that appears in the Inaro-Petubastis Cycle, the creation of which some date from the increase in Hellenic influence over Egypt from the 4th century BC (Almasy 2007, 35).

⁵⁹ Hyg. *Fab.* 30.112; Q. S. 1.20-30; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 5.1.

⁶⁰ *Fab.* 163.

⁶¹ *Epit.* 5.2.

Table 6. Written and iconographic quotations of Amazon queens

Amazon Queens				
Literature				Both
Agave	Dioxippe	Laomache	Penthesilea	Andromache
Andromache	Eurypyle	Lycastia	Polydora	Antiope
Antiope	Glauce	Marpesia	Thalestris /Minitia	Clymene
Antioque	Hippolyta	Myrina	Theseis	Glauce
Cadesia	Hippothoe	Ocyale	Xanthe	Hippolyta
Clete	Iphinome	Orithyia		Ocyale
Clymene	Lampeto	Otrere		Penthesilea

The most probable one always seems to be the heterogeneity of the Greek mythical universe, which is open to any interpretation. However, the mere presence of Amazons in even earlier times could necessarily imply the existence of confrontations with the Greeks prior to those known to us, as an essential part of the myth, whose stories have been lost but were part of older or less widespread traditions. This would suggest that some of the general Amazonomachy scenes may have referred to them.

To make sense of this situation, we could think that the first degree of the succession corresponded to the queen's sisters and the second to her daughters, which would reduce the number of generations that could be deduced from Hyginus. In this case, Dioxippe, Iphinome, Xanthe and Hippothoe must have been sisters or daughters of Ocyale, sisters of Otrera, or, one of them, sister of Ocyale and mother of Otrera. The same would apply to the queens between Otrera and Hippolyta: Antioque, Laomache, Glauce, Agave, Theseis. This assumption would imply a system of succession based on primogeniture, or on the greatest suitability among the candidates of the same lineage, as a prerequisite for granting this right. In any case, it seems necessary to assume an extremely short reign in all cases.

However, Apollonius indicates that Otrera and Antiope were contemporaries⁶², even though at the time of Theseus' abduction the queen seems to have been Hippolyta⁶³, so it does not appear that the succession required the death of the previous sovereign. In fact, although several authors point to Hippolyta's death as the crime Penthesilea wanted to atone for⁶⁴, others do not identify the victim⁶⁵, and

⁶² 2.378-390.

⁶³ A. Sanchez Sanz (2021) 22.

⁶⁴ A. R. 1.20-30; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 5.1.

⁶⁵ D. S. 2.46.

this assumption would not invalidate her accession to the throne. It is even possible that the replacement was understood to be necessary when the queen was unable to perform her role adequately. Only in this way would it be possible to explain the apparent contradictions in the written sources. Anyway, Hyginus may have alluded to monarchs of different Amazon kingdoms⁶⁶, although it seems easier to blame this confusion on the variety of existing traditions or on the imagination of their promoters.

Tzetzes is the other author who offers us more names of female rulers, this time all related to the Trojan War⁶⁷. Although the sources always place Penthesilea as the leader of the Amazons, he states that several of her companions were also monarchs. The problem arises when we see that, in fact, he does not indicate which of those he mentions held this title, nor what hierarchical system they would have used, adding only that several of them died in battle. This situation would be difficult to explain, unless Tzetzes shared the opinion of Apollonius or was implying that there was some kind of collegial government among the Amazons, in the Spartan or Roman style. This possibility never appears in the sources, although it would also explain the chronological problems in Hyginus' list. In any case, Tzetzes does not indicate the motives of these queens for collaborating with Penthesilea. The most detailed account of this episode is attributed to Quintus of Smyrna⁶⁸, although the two authors must have followed different traditions, since they agree only on the participation of Hippothoe, apart from Penthesilea herself, and Quintus describes her as a servant of the queen, like the rest of her companions.

Antiope and Melanippe do not appear in Hyginus' list. The former is only given this title in some versions, mainly those that exclude Theseus from the ninth work, as the others identify her as the sister of Hippolyta. The same status is attributed to Melanippe, since she is never mentioned as a queen. Perhaps Hyginus also considered Melanippe and Hippolyta to be the same person, and was referring only to the line that ruled Themyscira, not the other possible Amazon kingdoms. We might even think that this was a construct to lend some veracity to his account. In any case, we may be trying to link traditions that have never been considered in this way. What is important is that Amazon culture always seems to have been based on a monarchical system of government, matrilineal of course, and its origins lie in an indeterminate time much earlier than the early accounts seem to allude to. A time necessary to achieve the fame that would make them worthy opponents of the great Greek heroes. Only in this way would their defeat serve to

⁶⁶ Apollonius (2.995-1001) states that there were at least three in Asia Minor.

⁶⁷ *PH*. 182.

⁶⁸ 1.43-46.

enhance the virtues of the victors. In any case, mythology does not attach importance to contradictions, because in mythology everything is possible, even in the case of supposed antagonists⁶⁹.

5. Conclusion

There is little doubt, or at least there should be, about the mythical nature of the Amazon narratives, which is why it is difficult to try to impose any kind of rational structure on the data provided by their stories. Amazon mythopoiesis, like the rest of greek mythology, did not prioritise the creation of a logical structure, even in the smallest details. It was enough to create a story that was coherent enough to be accepted by the common people, so that its teachings would achieve the basic objective of establishing rules of behaviour based on tradition. However, on many occasions there was a certain interest in giving the narrative veracity by including known facts, which is why the main Amazon names of those heroines who confronted the most important Greek heroes are repeated with little or no variation, except in the usual cases of confusion between the different sources used by each of their authors (as in the case of Antiope and Hippolyta).

The royal character associated with many of these figures responded to the need to give them added value as adversaries, so that they could be recognised as the antithesis of their male counterparts, who would ultimately prevail over them as a reflection of the logical victory of order over the chaos they themselves represented. The existence of a royal lineage thus became necessary and gave rise to the appearance of genealogies such as those indicated, although these only offer a certain "coherence" in terms of the best-known characters in such narratives. The rest, which mainly mention their ancestors, form part of the discourse as a means of providing their people with an ancestral tradition that allowed them to become a powerful society, even against the social norms recognised as part of the "natural order".

From this possible ideology, each of the writers and artisans showed a certain freedom in contributing Amazon appellatives outside the more common ones, some of them perhaps coming from lost traditions, but probably most of them generated directly from their own imagination. The only apparent rule that seems to have operated in most of them, probably in order to be accepted, is that their meaning had some kind of direct relationship with some of the most well-known

⁶⁹ Mythology was used to create models for understanding the role of human beings on earth, death, diversity (of sexes, intelligences, appearances) or group identity (Díez de Velasco 2015, 267; 1998, 17; Sanchez Sanz 2024a, 81).

characteristics associated with Amazon behaviour, as is the case with the appellatives referring to the equestrian sphere for their fondness and skill in the art of riding, or those intended to certify their aversion to all things masculine or their combative capacity.

Annex. 01

Amazon nomenclature in the art and literature of Antiquity

Name	Literature sources	Iconographic sources
Agave (queen for Hyginus) ⁷⁰	1	
Aella ⁷¹	1	
Ainia ⁷²		1
Ainippe ⁷³		3
Alexandra ⁷⁴		1
Alcaia ⁷⁵		1
Alcinoe ⁷⁶		1
Alcibie ⁷⁷	1	
Alcippe ⁷⁸	1	
Alkaia ⁷⁹	1	
Amastris ⁸⁰	1	
Amazo ⁸¹	1	
Amynomene ⁸²		1
Anaea ⁸³	2	

⁷⁰ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

⁷¹ D. S. 4.16.

⁷² Fragment of terracotta relief. Achilles with shield of Gorgon and possibly Penthesilea, although the inscription indicates "Ainia" (Metropolitan Museon of Arts 42.11.33). D. Bothmer (1957) 3.

⁷³ Beazley Archive 29047 and 310045; D. Bothmer (1957) 3.

⁷⁴ Beazley Archive 216556.

⁷⁵ D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 3.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*: 3.4.

⁷⁷ Q. S. 1.43-46.

⁷⁸ D. S. 4.16.

⁷⁹ F. Buecheler and A. Riese (1894) 392.

⁸⁰ Dem. Bith. *FHG.* 9 (cfr. Steph. Byz. v. *Ταρσός*).

⁸¹ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Ephesos*.

⁸² Beazley Archive 216945. D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 15.

⁸³ Stephanus Byzantius s. v. *Anaia*; Ephor. *FHG.* 86.

Anaxilea ⁸⁴		1
Anchimache ⁸⁵	1	2
Andro ⁸⁶	1	
Androdaixa ⁸⁷	1	
Androdameia ⁸⁸		1
Andromache ⁸⁹	1	23
Andromeda ⁹⁰		1
Antandre ⁹¹	1	
Antianeira ⁹²	1	1
Antibrote ⁹³	1	
Anticlea ⁹⁴	1	
Antiope ⁹⁵ (sometimes as queen in texts)	9	13
Antioque (queen) ⁹⁶	1	
Antoxena ⁹⁷		1
Areto ⁹⁸		1
Areximache ⁹⁹		1
Aristomache ¹⁰⁰		3
Asbite ¹⁰¹	1	

⁸⁴ D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 3.

⁸⁵ Beazley Archive 9002701; 1957: 9. 36; Tz. *PH*. 182.

⁸⁶ Tz. *PH*. 179.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ D. Bothmer (1957) 125. 10.

⁸⁹ Tz. *PH*. 182; Beazley Archive 13715, 29047, 200145, 213446, 216557, 9020181; D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 1 and 3; 7, 8 and 11; 8. 25; 48. 106; 57. 179bis; 101. 112; 131. 3; 132. 8 and 9; 150. 38; 161. 4; 162. 12; 186. 100; 203. 161. Tarquinia RC 5564.

⁹⁰ D. Bothmer (1957) 3. 4.

⁹¹ Q. S. 1.43-46.

⁹² D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 16; Tz. *PH*. 182.

⁹³ Q. S. 1.43-46.

⁹⁴ Call. *H*. 3, 206 and 238.

⁹⁵ Plut. *Thes.* 26-28 and *Rom.* 6; A. R. 2.378-390; Ps. Apollod. *EpIt.* 1.16; D. S. 4.28; Hyg. *Fab.* 30; Paus. 1.2; Herodorus of Heraklea *FHG.* 16 (cfr. Tz. *ad Lyc.* 1332); Iust. *Epit.* 2.20; D. Bothmer (1957) 124. 3, 5 and 7; 125. 9 and 10; 150. 38; 161. 4; 181. 57; 197. 120; 199. 141; Beazley Archive 4854, 214365, 23214 (D. Saunders 2014, 188).

⁹⁶ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

⁹⁷ Beazley Archive 200091.

⁹⁸ D. Bothmer (1957) 6 6.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* 3. 4.

¹⁰⁰ Beazley Archive 310050, 215562; D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 16.

¹⁰¹ Sil. Ital. *Punica* 2.58.

Aspidocharme ¹⁰²	1	
Asteria ¹⁰³	1	
Aturmuka ¹⁰⁴		1
Barkida ¹⁰⁵		1
Bremusa ¹⁰⁶	1	
Cadesia (queen) ¹⁰⁷	1	
Chalcaor ¹⁰⁸	1	
Ch[...]ila ¹⁰⁹		1
Cali[...] ¹¹⁰		1
Calia ¹¹¹		1
Caroppe ¹¹²		1
Chaleros ¹¹³		2
Celaeno ¹¹⁴	1	
Ceppe ¹¹⁵		1
Cnemis ¹¹⁶	1	
Clete (queen) ¹¹⁷	2	
Clymene (queen for Hyginus) ¹¹⁸	1	2
Clonie ¹¹⁹	1	
Crisis ¹²⁰		1

¹⁰² Tz. *PH.* 180.

¹⁰³ D. S. 4.16.

¹⁰⁴ It is considered a deformation that actually refers to Andromache and appears on an Etruscan vase next to Penthesilea. M. Martelli (1987) no. 174B.

¹⁰⁵ D. Bothmer (1957) 131. 6.

¹⁰⁶ Q. S. 1.43-46.

¹⁰⁷ A. R. 1000.

¹⁰⁸ Tz. *PH.* 181.

¹⁰⁹ D. Bothmer (1957) 131. 5.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 132. 8.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*: 8. 25.

¹¹² *Ibid.*: 203. 161.

¹¹³ Beazley Archive 215562; D. Bothmer (1957) 203. 161.

¹¹⁴ D. S. 4.16.

¹¹⁵ D. Bothmer (1957) 8. 25.

¹¹⁶ Tz. *PH.* 181.

¹¹⁷ Lyc. 1.992; while Tzetzes (*ad Lyc.* 995) identifies her as the wet nursemaid of Penthesilea.

¹¹⁸ Hyg. *Fab.* 163; D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 15 and 16.

¹¹⁹ Q. S. 1.43-46.

¹²⁰ D. Bothmer (1957) 203. 161.

Cyme ¹²¹	2	
Cyrene ¹²²	1	
Deinomache ¹²³		2
Derinoe ¹²⁴	1	
Derimacheia ¹²⁵	1	
Deianira ¹²⁶	1	
Dioxippe (queen for Hyginus) ¹²⁷	1	
Doloppe ¹²⁸		1
Doris ¹²⁹		1
Dorimacheia ¹³⁰		1
Echephyle ¹³¹		1
Enchesimargos ¹³²	1	
Enphilo ¹³³		1
Epheso ¹³⁴	2	
Eriboea ¹³⁵	1	
Escileia ¹³⁶		1
Esmirna ¹³⁷	1	
Estonikia ¹³⁸	1	

¹²¹ Str. 12.21-22; Q. S. 3.55-7.

¹²² Call. *H.* 3.206 and 238.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 182. 68; Beazley Archive 215581.

¹²⁴ Q. S. 1.43-46.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ D. S. 4.16.

¹²⁷ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

¹²⁸ Beazley Archive 213403. D. Bothmer (1957) 198. 132.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*: 162. 15.

¹³⁰ Etruscan vessel from the mid-4th century BC on which she is mentioned under the Etruscan name of Hinthia Turmucas (BNF Inv. De-Ridder.920-b). Probably an Etruscan invention of a non-existent myth, since she appears next to Penthesilea in Hades with a bandage on her chest, which in Etruscan art is evidence of a violent death. LIMC, *Amazones etruscae*, 662.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Tz. *PH.* 180.

¹³³ Beazley Archive 300727.

¹³⁴ Str. 12.21-22; Heraclid. Pont. Gr. *FHG.* 3.315.3.

¹³⁵ D. S. 4.16.

¹³⁶ A. Mayor (2014b) 436.

¹³⁷ Str. 12.21-22.

¹³⁸ Call. *Fr.* 693.

Eumache ¹³⁹		2
Euoppe ¹⁴⁰		1
Euryale (queen) ¹⁴¹	1	
Eurybe ¹⁴²	1	
Euriphileia ¹⁴³		1
Eurylophe ¹⁴⁴	1	
Eurypyle (queen) ¹⁴⁵	1	
Evandre ¹⁴⁶	1	
Glauce (queen for Hyginus) ¹⁴⁷	2	3
Gogoioigi or Gogiwiki ¹⁴⁸		1
Gortyessa ¹⁴⁹	1	
Gryne ¹⁵⁰	1	
Gugamis ¹⁵¹		1
Hairem[...] ¹⁵²		1
Harmothoe ¹⁵³	1	
Harppe ¹⁵⁴	2	
Hecate ¹⁵⁵	1	
Hegeso ¹⁵⁶		1

¹³⁹ Beazley Archive 213874 and 9017192.

¹⁴⁰ D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 8.

¹⁴¹ V. *Fl.* 5.610 and 6.364-386. It could refer to Eurypileus. Valerius makes her queen who helped the king of Colchis Aetes against Perseus.

¹⁴² D. S. 4.16.

¹⁴³ D. Bothmer (1957) 125. 10.

¹⁴⁴ Tz. *PH.* 181. It could refer to Eurypyle.

¹⁴⁵ Arr. *FHG.* 48 (cfr. Eustathius ad Dionys 772). It could refer to Euriphileia.

¹⁴⁶ Q. S. 1.43-46.

¹⁴⁷ Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 5.2; Hyg. *Fab.* 163; D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 1 and 3; 8. 25.

¹⁴⁸ Tyrrhenian amphora with black figures (O.L.L. Group, 550–530 BC). A. Mayor (2014a) 478.

¹⁴⁹ Tz. *PH.* 178.

¹⁵⁰ *Serv. ad Aen.* 4.345.

¹⁵¹ Red-figured rhyton from Susa attributed to the Painter of Sotades (475–450 BC). A. Mayor (2014a) 476.

¹⁵² Beazley Archive 9026499.

¹⁵³ Q. S. 1.43-46.

¹⁵⁴ Sil. Ital. *Punica* 2.58; V. *Fl.* 6.364-386.

¹⁵⁵ Tz. *PH.* 182.

¹⁵⁶ D. Bothmer (1957) 8. 25.

Helena ¹⁵⁷	1	
Hiera ¹⁵⁸	1	1
Hippo ¹⁵⁹	1	1
Hippomache ¹⁶⁰		1
Hippomene ¹⁶¹		1
Hipponice ¹⁶²		1
Hipopula ¹⁶³		1
Hippolyta/e (queen) ¹⁶⁴	14	6
Hippothoe (queen for Hyginus) ¹⁶⁵	3	
Hipsiphila ¹⁶⁶		1
Hipsophila ¹⁶⁷		1
Iodoce ¹⁶⁸	1	
Iole ¹⁶⁹		1
Ioxeia ¹⁷⁰	1	
Iphinome (queen for Hyginus) ¹⁷¹	1	
Iphito ¹⁷²		1
Iph[...] ¹⁷³		1

¹⁵⁷ In fact, it is not indicated that she was an Amazon, but the daughter of the Aetolian Tithyrus, but she died facing Achilles in Troy (Ptol. Hephaestion, *NH.* 4, cfr. Phot. *Bibl.* 190).

¹⁵⁸ Philostr. *Her.* 23.26. The scene of Telephus with the death of Hiera appears in panels 22-24 of the Pergamon altar.

¹⁵⁹ Call. *H.* 238; D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 8.

¹⁶⁰ Beazley Archive 213403; D. Bothmer (1957) 198. 132.

¹⁶¹ Beazley Archive 215581.

¹⁶² D. Bothmer (1957) 133. 19.

¹⁶³ Beazley Archive 200170.

¹⁶⁴ Tz. *PH.* 11; Plut. *Thes.* 27; E. *Herakl.* 215; Isoc. 12.193; A. R. 2.770 and 960; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 2.9, 5.1 and 1.16; Verg. *Aen.* 11.651-665; D. S. 2.46; Hyg. *Fab.* 30 and 163; Arr. 7.13; Paus. 1.42; Q. S. 1.23 and 6.241-245; Iust. *Epit.* 2.23; Beazley Archive 213658, 215581 and 216938; D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 8; 162. 12 and 15; 177. 30; 182. 68; 203. 161.

¹⁶⁵ Hyg. *Fab.* 163. While Tzetzes and Quintus of Smyrna make her a companion of Penthesilea in Troy. Tz. *PH.* 176; Q. S. 1.43-46.

¹⁶⁶ D. Bothmer (1957) 131. 5.

¹⁶⁷ D. Bothmer (1957) 150. 38.

¹⁶⁸ Tz. *PH.* 178.

¹⁶⁹ D. Bothmer (1957) 199. 141.

¹⁷⁰ Tz. *PH.* 179.

¹⁷¹ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

¹⁷² D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 1; Beazley Archive 300779.

¹⁷³ Beazley Archive 300727; D. Bothmer (1957) 9. 39.

Isokrateia ¹⁷⁴	2	
Khasa ¹⁷⁵		1
Kheuke ¹⁷⁶		1
Kleoptoleme ¹⁷⁷		1
Koia ¹⁷⁸	1	
Koinia ¹⁷⁹	1	
Kokkymo ¹⁸⁰	1	
Korone ¹⁸¹		1
Kreousa ¹⁸²		1
Kydoime ¹⁸³		2
Lampeto (queen) ¹⁸⁴	1	
Laodoke ¹⁸⁵		1
Laomacha/e (queen for Hyginus) ¹⁸⁶	1	
Latorea ¹⁸⁷	1	
Lauce ¹⁸⁸		1
Leontice ¹⁸⁹		1
Lycastia (queen) ¹⁹⁰	1	
Lyce ¹⁹¹	1	
Lykopolis ¹⁹²		3
Lysippe ¹⁹³	1	

¹⁷⁴ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Thibais*; Eustathius cfr. Dionysius Periegetes, 828.

¹⁷⁵ A. Mayor (2014b) 434.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁷ D. Bothmer (1957) 8. 25.

¹⁷⁸ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Thibais*.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁰ Call. *Fr.* 693,

¹⁸¹ A. Mayor (2014b) 434.

¹⁸² Beazley Archive 215562.

¹⁸³ D. Bothmer (1957) 131. 4 and 5.

¹⁸⁴ Iust. *Epit.* 2.12.

¹⁸⁵ Beazley Archive 215562.

¹⁸⁶ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

¹⁸⁷ Ath. 1.57.

¹⁸⁸ Beazley Archive 300779. It could be Glaucé.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 13715.

¹⁹⁰ A. R. 1000.

¹⁹¹ V. *Fl.* 6.364-386.

¹⁹² D. Bothmer (1957) 9. 40; 131. 3 and 4; Beazley Archive 13715.

¹⁹³ Ps. Plut. *Fluv.* 14

M[...] ¹⁹⁴		1
Maia ¹⁹⁵	1	
Marpe ¹⁹⁶	1	
Marpesia (queen) ¹⁹⁷	1	
Melanippe ¹⁹⁸	5	1
Melo ¹⁹⁹		1
Melousa ²⁰⁰		2
Menalippe ²⁰¹	1	
Menippe ²⁰²	1	
Memnon ²⁰³		1
Mimnousa ²⁰⁴		1
Molpadia ²⁰⁵	2	
Monichos ²⁰⁶		1
Moltys ²⁰⁷	1	
Myiane ²⁰⁸		1
Myrina (Batiea for Hom. and Stb.) (Egea for Festus) ²⁰⁹	4	
Myrleia ²¹⁰	1	

¹⁹⁴ D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 3.

¹⁹⁵ Call. *Fr.* 693. Daughter of the queen of the Amazons.

¹⁹⁶ D. S. 4.16. She seems to be different from Queen Marpesia, as she is pitted against Herakles in Hippolyta's time.

¹⁹⁷ Iust. *Epit.* 2.12.

¹⁹⁸ Pin. *N.* 3.64; A. R. 2.960; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 5.2 and 1.16; Iust. *Epit.* 2.23; D. S. 4.16; D. Bothmer (1957) 197. 120.

¹⁹⁹ A. Mayor (2014b) 435.

²⁰⁰ D. Bothmer (1957) 181. 58; 182. 62.

²⁰¹ Jordanes 8.56-7. Although this is a late author, he may have used earlier sources. It could be a deformation of Melanippe, since he has her confront Herakles in the ninth labour.

²⁰² V. *Fl.* 364-386.

²⁰³ Beazley Archive 206239.

²⁰⁴ D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 15.

²⁰⁵ Plut. *Thes.* 28; Paus. 1.2.

²⁰⁶ Beazley Archive 215562.

²⁰⁷ Herodorus of Heraklea *FHG.* 16 (cfr. Tz. *ad Lyc.* 1332).

²⁰⁸ Beazley Archive 215562.

²⁰⁹ Hom. *Il.* 2.814; Str. 12. 21-22; D. S. 3.40 and 52; Sex. Pompei *Festi De verborum "Aegaeum"*.

²¹⁰ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Myrleia*. Possible eponym for a city in Bithynia.

Myrto ²¹¹	1	
Mytilene ²¹²	1	
Nicomache ²¹³		1
Oas oas ²¹⁴		1
Ocippe ²¹⁵		1
Ocyale (queen for Hyginus) ²¹⁶	1	1
Oigme ²¹⁷		1
Oistrophe ²¹⁸	1	
Otrera/e (queen) ²¹⁹	3	
Orithyia (queen) ²²⁰	1	
Palla ²²¹	2	
Pantariste ²²²		3
Pentasilas ²²³		1
Penthesilea (queen for Hyginus, Tzetzes and P. Trogo) ²²⁴	9	9 ²²⁵
Pesinasa ²²⁶		1
Pharetre ²²⁷	1	

²¹¹ Esc. cfr. A. R. 1.752; compare with Paus. 8. 14. 8, where it is considered that the Sea of Myrtles was so named after a woman of that name.

²¹² D. S. 3.55.

²¹³ *Ibid.* 9026499.

²¹⁴ A. Mayor (2014b) 435.

²¹⁵ D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 16.

²¹⁶ Hyg. *Fáb.* 163; D. Bothmer (1957) 162. 16.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 194. 110.

²¹⁸ Tz. *PH.* 179.

²¹⁹ A. R. 2.378-390; Hyg. *Fab.* 30, 112 and 163; Tz. *PH.* 8; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 5.1.

²²⁰ Iust. *Epit.* 2.17.

²²¹ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Thibaïs*; Eustathius cfr. Dionysius Periegetes, 828.

²²² D. Bothmer (1957) 6. 3; 7. 8; Beazley Archive 29047.

²²³ G. Bonfante and L. Bonfante (2002) 195.

²²⁴ Tz. *PH.* 8; Ps. Apollod. *Epit.* 5.1 and 2; Verg. *Aen.* 1.488-493 and 11.651-665; D. S. 2.46; Hyg. *Fab.* 163; Plin. *NH.* 7.201; Q. S. 1.48-53; Iust. *Epit.* 2.31; Sen. *Tro.* 236 ss. D. Bothmer (1957) 70. 2; 80. 105; 4. 10, 12 and 13; 152. 67; 199. 141. Beazley Archive 214365; BNF Inv. De-Ridder.920-b.

²²⁵ These include three archaic shield reliefs and an Etruscan vase (BNF Inv. De-Ridder.920-b). Next to Hinthia Turmucas, identified as Penthesilea. M. Martelli (1987) no. 174B; LIMC, *Amazones etruscae*, 662.

²²⁶ D. Bothmer (1957) 198. 132; Beazley Archive 213403.

²²⁷ Tz. *PH.* 178.

Phoebe ²²⁸	1	
Phisto ²²⁹		1
Pitane ²³⁰	1	
Phylakos ²³¹		1
Philippa ²³²	1	
Pkpupes ²³³		1
Polemusa ²³⁴	1	
Polydora (queen for Hyginus) ²³⁵	1	
Priene ²³⁶	1	
Protis ²³⁷	1	
Prothoe ²³⁸	1	
Pyrgomache ²³⁹		1
Sanappe ²⁴⁰	1	
Scyleia ²⁴¹		1
Serague ²⁴²		1
Serpot ²⁴³	1	
Sanape/Sinope ²⁴⁴	3	
Sisyrbe ²⁴⁵	2	
Smyrna ²⁴⁶	2	
Sosia ²⁴⁷		1

²²⁸ D. S. 4.16.

²²⁹ D. Bothmer (1957) 8. 25.

²³⁰ D. S. 3.55.

²³¹ Beazley Archive 215562.

²³² D. S. 4.16.

²³³ A. Mayor (2014b) 435.

²³⁴ Q. S. 1.43-46.

²³⁵ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

²³⁶ D. S. 3.55.

²³⁷ Call. *Fr.* 693. Daughter of an Amazon queen.

²³⁸ D. S. 4.16.

²³⁹ D. Bothmer (1957) 161. 4.

²⁴⁰ Andron of Teos *FHG.* 2 (cfr. Escol. A. R. 2.946)

²⁴¹ D. Bothmer (1957) 9. 39; Beazley Archive 300727.

²⁴² A. Mayor (2014b) 436.

²⁴³ Vienna Papyrus 6165.

²⁴⁴ Orosius 1.15; Ps. Scymn. 986-997 ; Hecat. *FHG.* 352 (cfr. Escol. A. R. 2.948).

²⁴⁵ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Σίσυρβα*; Str. 14.1.4. A part of Ephesus was called Sisyrba.

²⁴⁶ Stephanus Byzantius. vv. *Smyrna*, *Ephesos*; Str. 11.5.5, 12.3.22, 14.1.4. That gave its name to the city.

²⁴⁷ A. Mayor (2014b) 436.

T[...] ²⁴⁸		1
Thalestris (queen, sometimes called Minithia) ²⁴⁹	1	
Tecmessa ²⁵⁰	1	
Teisiphile ²⁵¹		1
Telamon ²⁵²		1
Telepyleia ²⁵³		1
Themiscyra ²⁵⁴	2	
Thermodosa ²⁵⁵	1	
Thero ²⁵⁶		1
Theseis (queen for Hyginus) ²⁵⁷	1	
Thiba ²⁵⁸	2	
Thoe ²⁵⁹	1	
Thorece ²⁶⁰	1	
Thraso ²⁶¹		1
Toxaris ²⁶²		1
Toxis ²⁶³		1
Toxoanassa ²⁶⁴	1	
Toxophile ²⁶⁵		1
Toxophone ²⁶⁶	1	
Tralla ²⁶⁷	2	

²⁴⁸ D. Bothmer (1957) 9. 38.

²⁴⁹ Iust. *Epit.* 2.33.

²⁵⁰ D. S. 4.16.

²⁵¹ D. Bothmer (1957) 131. 5.

²⁵² Beazley Archive 29047.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*: 9.39.

²⁵⁴ App. *Mith.* 78; Eustace of Thessaloniki (cfr. Hom. *Il.* 2.814).

²⁵⁵ Q. S. 1.43-46.

²⁵⁶ D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 8.

²⁵⁷ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

²⁵⁸ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Thibaïs*; Eustathius cfr. Dionysius Periegetes, 828.

²⁵⁹ V. *Fl.* 6.364-386.

²⁶⁰ Tz. *PH.* 181.

²⁶¹ D. Bothmer (1957) 131. 5.

²⁶² D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 7.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*: 131. 5.

²⁶⁴ Tz. *PH.* 177.

²⁶⁵ D. Bothmer (1957) 8. 25.

²⁶⁶ Tz. *PH.* 177. Perhaps a deformation of Toxophile.

²⁶⁷ Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. *Thibaïs*; Eustathius cfr. Dionysius Periegetes, 828.

Trasibula ²⁶⁸		1
Upis (queen) ²⁶⁹	1	
Xanthe (queen for Hyginus) ²⁷⁰	1	
Xanthippe ²⁷¹		1
[...]a[...] ²⁷²		1
[...]odameia ²⁷³		1
[...]da ²⁷⁴		1
[...]epyleia ²⁷⁵		1
[...]e ²⁷⁶		1
[...]ndr[...] ²⁷⁷		1
[A]omache ²⁷⁸		1
[...]om[...] ²⁷⁹		1
[...]opis ²⁸⁰		1
[...]ykila ²⁸¹		1
[...]ys[...] ²⁸²		2
Total	114	109

REFERENCES

- Almasy, A. (2007) "A Greek Amazon in an Egyptian Story: The Character of Queen Serpot in the Cycle of Petubastis," in: K. Endreffy, A. Gulyas, eds. *Proceedings of the Fourth Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists, 31 August-2 September 2006*. Budapest, *Studia Aegyptiaca* No. 18, 31-37.
- Bachofen, J. (1861) *Das Mutterrecht: eine Untersuchung über die Gynäiokratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur*. Verlag von Kraiss und Hoffmann.
- Bonfante, G., Bonfante, L. (2002) *The Etruscan Language: An Introduction*. Palgrave.

²⁶⁸ Beazley Archive 13715.

²⁶⁹ Call. *H.* 238.

²⁷⁰ Hyg. *Fab.* 163.

²⁷¹ D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 9.

²⁷² D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 9.

²⁷³ Beazley Archive 23214. Could refer to Androdameia (Saunders 2014, 188).

²⁷⁴ D. Bothmer (1957) 125. 10.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 9. 39; Beazley Archive 300727.

²⁷⁶ D. Bothmer (1957) 7. 11.

²⁷⁷ Beazley Archive 23214. Could refer to Andromache (Saunders 2014, 188).

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 213874.

²⁷⁹ D. Bothmer (1957) 132. 9.

²⁸⁰ Beazley Archive 23214. Could refer to Lykopsis (Saunders 2014, 188).

²⁸¹ D. Bothmer (1957) 64. 275.

²⁸² *Ibid.*: 132. 9; Beazley Archive 9025175.

- Bothmer, D. (1957) *Amazons in Greek Art*. Clarendon Press.
- Buecheler, F., Riese, A. (1894) *Anthologia Latina*. Teubner.
- Cantarella, E. (1987) *Pandoras Daughters. The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Devambez, P. (1976) "Les Amazones et l'Orient, «Revue Archéologique», *Études sur les relations entre Grèce et Anatolie offertes à Pierre Demargne* 2, 265-280.
- Díez de Velasco, F. (2015) "Los sentidos del epínetro: Imaginarios de lo femenino (y amazónico) en la Atenas Clásica," *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico* 11, 557-584.
- Díez de Velasco, F. (1998) *Lenguajes de la religión: mitos, símbolos e imágenes de la Grecia Antigua*. Trotta.
- Galahad, S. (1975) *Mutter und Amazonen eirl Umriss weiblicher Reiche i Galahad*. Non-Stop.
- Martelli, M. (1987) *La Ceramica degli Etruschi*. Novara.
- Mayor, A. (2014a) "Making Sense of Nonsense Inscriptions Associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian Vases," *Hesperia* 83, 447-493.
- Mayor, A. (2014b) *The Amazons: Lives and Legends of Warrior Women across the Ancient World*. Princeton University Press.
- Parroni, G. (1950) *Commenti Mediterranei all'Odissea di Omero*. Milan.
- Penrose, W. (2016) *Postcolonial Amazons. Female Masculinity and Courage in Ancient Greek and Sanskrit Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Sakellariou, M. (1958) *La Migration Grecque en Ionie*. Athènes.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2025a) *Amazons in Digital Era. The reception of the warrior woman image*. Bloomsbury.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2025b) "Amazonas. Mujeres guerreras en el cómic franco-belga del s. XXI," in: C. Costa Campos, L. F. Bantim De Assumpção, C. Agostini de Souza, L. Hecko, eds. *Antiguidade e Usos do Passado - desafios e propostas de ensino, pesquisa e extensão (Vol.3)*. Río de Janeiro, Editora da Universidade de Vassouras, 49-84.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2025c) "Destroy Your Enemy Becoming Your Friend: Priam and the Amazons in the Trojan War," *Clotho* 6(2), 5-26.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2024a) "El corazón de las amazonas. Reimaginando la mitología," in: C. A. Costa Campos, L. F. Bantim De Assumpção, eds. *História em Quadrinhos na Perspectiva da Prática de Ensino*. Río de Janeiro: Editora da Universidade de Vassouras, 81-133.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2024b) "Alexander and Thalestris. A Midsummer Night's Dream in Hyrcania". Proceedings of the XI Congress of the Spanish Society of Iranology (SEI), 26-27 October 2023. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 13-42.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2024c) "Rethinking the amazon image. Modern paradigms vs. inherited tradition,". In: E. Marco Arocas, A. Faus Bartomeu, eds. *Cuerpos en tránsito: explorando intersecciones emergentes y raíces culturales*. Madrid, Dykinson, 434-450.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2024d) "Mythical Eugenics. The Macedonian-Amazonian Royal Alliance in Classical Sources," *Cercetări Arheologice. Revistă a Muzeului Național de Istorie a României* 31(2), 321-332.

- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2024e) "Gryphomachias. Amazons and Grypes in Ancient Art," *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 11(3), 77-86.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2023a) "La heráldica amazónica," *Thersites. Journal for Transcultural Presences & Diachronic Identities from Antiquity to Date* 16, 1-82.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2023b) "The memory of Amazon myths in Roman epigraphy, 1st-7th centuries AD," *New Classicist (Institute of Classical Studies. School of Advanced Study. University of London)* 09, 87-116.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2021) "Cimerios, amazonas y el arte griego," *Studia Histórica. Historia Antigua* 39, 5-26.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2019) *Ars Amazónica. Estudio de fuentes y análisis comparativo*. Complutense University of Madrid.
- Sanchez Sanz, A. (2017) "Mujeres Guerreras. El mito amazónico en la Época Arcaica y Clásica," in: C. Kesser Barcellos, S. Corsi, C. E. Costa, Campos, eds. *Experiências Religiosas no Mundo Antigo. Volume II*. Brasil, Prismas, 145-158
- Saunders, D. (2014) "An Amazonomachy attributed to the Sileus Painter," in J. O. Oakley, ed. *Athenian Potters and Painters III*. Oxbow Books, 187-196.
- Vv.Aa. (1981-1999) *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Artemis.
- Weimbaum, B. (2000) *Islands of Women and Amazons: Representations and Realities*. University of Texas Press.
- Zaidman, L. (1991) "Las hijas de Pandora," in G. Duby, M. Perrot, eds. *Historia de las mujeres en occidente. Vol. 1: La Antigüedad*. Taurus, 373-420.