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II. SKYPHOI

1. Concave-rimmed skyphoi: problems of typology

Compared to cups, the overall variation and importance of skyphoi in Attic black- and red-figure is very limited. Skyphoi by more major painters are comparatively rare; and late(r) black-figure skyphoi appear to stem from minor workshops and painters, who often specialised in them. Nevertheless, enough development and differences exist to warrant a typology of shape, as advanced by A.D. Ure and, recently, A.N. Malagardis.

Ure's classification of Attic skyphoi, which goes all the way back to 1927, is based only on specimens found in graves at Rhitsona, as investigated by P.N. Ure and herself. Although her quite extensive lists cover a large portion of the possibilities regarding shape and decoration, not all the variations are represented. As the concave rimmed skyphos is here of main interest because it is the type which the Theseus Painter decorated, I shall concentrate on it.

Ure divided the deep-bowled skyphoi with a concave rim into several types: A2-J and AP-Q (fig. 35). In shape they are all basically the same: relatively large, with a rather deep bowl and a wide rim; a concave, more or less offset lip; horizontal handles, attached at an angle close to the division between rim and body; a fillet between the body and foot; and a foot generally in the form of a heavy disc, though varying much in shape.

However, Ure's arguments for extensively dividing the concave-rimmed skyphoi into many types, appear, in my judgement, very vague and artificial. She identified them simply by observing that one type of skyphos is comparatively larger or smaller than another, or that one type has sphinxes and/or palmettes at the handles, while another has not. In most cases, the distinctions seem irrelevant and unnecessarily subjective; at any rate, they are useless as markers for distinguishing groups, workshops or potters. Basically, the main and most objective features of Ure's typology are seen in differences in the secondary decoration.

The main features of Ure's skyphos types, as described by her, are as follows. Type A1 differs from types A2-J and AP-Q by a single trait: the rim is convex and rounded, with a reserved groove below, instead of concave and off-set as in the other types. Many of the type A1 skyphoi were linked by Beazley to the FP Class of Cups and the Group of Courting Cups mainly because of their handle motif of palmettes and pendent lotus and their style of figurework. Skyphoi of type A2 generally share the figure style and handle decoration of A1, while also being among the earliest Attic type skyphoi which have the basic shape elements of types A3-J and AP-Q, including the concavely shaped rim. Their rims are black.

---


132 See, for example, a shape like a Heron Class skyphos with eyes, as the one attributed to the Caylus Painter, Washington 1362: S.J. Schwarz, *Greek Vases in the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.* (Rome 1996) no. 25, pls. 34-35; or a shallow skyphos with an ivy rim and eyes: Burrows and Ure, *Rhitsóna*, 277, no. 31.184, pl. 11a.

133 Ure, *Sixth and Fifth*, 57-73. Ure has no type I. Type P is basically similar, but has a somewhat larger figure frieze.

134 Ure also classified other types of skyphoi, later adopted by Beazley. Types K, L and R are 'shallow cup-skyphoi', connected to the Haimon Group; types M and N skyphoi of Beazley's 'Pistias Class'; type O skyphoi of the so-called Hermogenian type. These seem not to be linked to Heron Class skyphoi, with a single possible exception: a shallow skyphos from Rhitsona, of the shape of types K, L, or R, has ivy on the rim; Burrows and Ure, *Rhitsóna*, pl. 11a, Herakles reclining between eyes.

135 Ure gives an overview of different types of skyphos feet (*Sixth and Fifth*, 58, fig. 5), but, insofar as can be judged, they seem not to play an important role in Ure's typology.

136 *Para* 80-85.

137 See also W. Günther, 'Ein Attisch schwarzfiguriger Skyphos mit erotischen Werbeszene', *AA* 1995, 487-495, esp. 489.
The decoration of Ure's type B skyphos (all but one of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi are of this type, see Kanellopoulos 842, Cat. no. 78, pl. 33 a-b) consists of two rows of ivy or dots on the rim, a figure frieze which almost completely covers the bowl, and tongues between various arrangements of horizontal lines and stripes on the lower bowl. 

Ure's type A3 skyphoi are sort of intermediate between types A2 and B. They have the lotus-palmette motif at the handles which characterises types A1-2, but they also show ivy on the rim which is standard for type B as well as for many skyphoi of the CHC Group. The chronology of the type A3 skyphoi seems not to differ significantly from that of type B. As the number of known A3 skyphoi is extremely small, it is difficult to say whether they can rightfully be considered an intermediate stage in the 'development' from type A2 to type B, or whether they must instead be seen as a variant based on type B, with elements of type A2.\textsuperscript{138} However, the style of decoration, as seen on the few extant type A3 skyphoi, is closest to that of types A1-2. Therefore type A3 is probably a continuation of type A2, with the ivy rim as an additional trait.

Of types C-J, P and Q, the main shared characteristic is that, in contrast to type B, they all have a narrow figure frieze, which results from the broad black band at the bottom of the bowl. Although Ure isolated many subtypes of these narrow-frieze skyphoi, they can in principle be divided according to three distinct decorative systems: ivy on the rim and tongues above the foot; black rim and tongues; and black rim and no tongues (fig. 35, second row). The subdivisions of these types make Ure's typology needlessly complicated. This becomes all the more evident from the fact that definitely 90 per cent (or more) of the skyphoi of types C-J, P and Q were made in a single workshop, that is, the CHC Group, or are connected to it. Therefore the differences would doubtless be more indicative of the personal decorative choices within that group of painters than of different types, classes or workshops.\textsuperscript{139}

To simplify Ure's overly intricate typology, A.N. Malagardis recently proposed that types C-J, P and Q should be compressed into one type: type C (possibly with a few subdivisions indicating that some skyphoi have an ivy rim, others a black one, or that some have tongues, others not).\textsuperscript{140} The types would then tally somewhat more closely with real workshop differences: type A corresponds with the FP Class and the Group of Courting Cups, type B with the Krokotos Group and White Heron Group, type C with the CHC Group and near it.\textsuperscript{141} Another complicating factor must be considered, however. In the classification system of B.A. Sparke and L. Talcott for the black-glaze skyphoi from the Athenian Agora, the letters 'A' and 'B' are also used for a typology of skyphoi. However, there these letters refer to standard skyphoi used in red-figure.\textsuperscript{142} Their type A skyphoi is not lipped and has horizontal handles placed close to the rim; their type B is comparable to their type A except for the addition of one vertical handle, like on the numerous red-figure owl-skyphoi. Further, they refer to the Heron Class skyphoi as a 'cup-skyphoi',\textsuperscript{143} but, in my view, it is hardly shallow enough to deserve that name. Moreover, as Ure's typology for Heron Class skyphoi is widely accepted, either in its old form or the simplified one of Malagardis, we can best adhere to it.\textsuperscript{144}

The earliest skyphoi with the shape and decorative scheme of the kind made by the Theseus Painter (type B) appear to be by the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe.\textsuperscript{145} He is one of the earliest painters of skyphoi

\textsuperscript{138} Compared to the other types, only a few skyphoi of type A3 are known.

\textsuperscript{139} One very unnecessary division in Ure's typology is, for example, between types C and D: C is larger than 20.0 cm in height, D smaller.

\textsuperscript{140} Malagardis, \textit{Skyphoi}. Pipili uses this simplified classification in \textit{CVA} Athens 4. Malagardis also gives the chronology of these skyphoi: A1 and A2 (560-530 B.C.) eventually type 'A3'; B (530-500 B.C.); C (500-450 B.C.). To simplify matters, it may suffice to name the sub-groups of the last C1-3.

\textsuperscript{141} Of course there are exceptions. The Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, for example, decorated type B skyphoi, but he does not appear to belong to the Krokotos/White Heron Groups. The Theseus Painter decorated at least one type C skyphos, Kannelopoulos (Cat. no. 78, pl. 33 a-b).

\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Agora} XII, 64-87, nos. 334-54, 360-63, pls. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{143} \textit{Agora} XII, 109, n. 3, "early Cup-skyphoi." For other literature on the typology of skyphoi and critique see Freyer-Schauenburg, \textit{Skyphoi}, 20-22; \textit{Agora} XXIII, 58-61; \textit{CVA} Athens 4; and esp. Malagardis, \textit{Skyphoi}.

\textsuperscript{144} Recently used in \textit{CVA} Athens 4, and even Beazley adapted a simplified form of Ure's classification (\textit{ABV}, 617) in the manner of Malagardis.

\textsuperscript{145} Beazley named this painter after the olpe Nicosia C 809, \textit{ABV} 452,1; \textit{Beazley Addenda}\textsuperscript{2} 114. Type B skyphoi with ivy on the rim by this painter are: Havana, \textit{ABV} 453,10 (Beazley Archive) and Athens, NM 363, \textit{ABV} 200, 453,11, Athens \textit{CVA} 4, pl.
with an off-set lip (type A2, black rim, and type B, ivy rim) as well as of skyphoi without lip (type A1). The Painter of the Nicosia Olpe is generally placed between 540 and 520 B.C. and must be considered earlier than the Krokotos Group.\(^{146}\) Stylistically, he seems to have more in common with painters of skyphos types A1-3 than with painters of type B skyphoi like those of the Krokotos Group.

The dimensions of the skyphoi by the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe are close to those of Krokotos Group skyphoi. The latter can be described as relatively small – generally around 15.0-16.0 cm high – with a similar, simple torus foot.\(^{147}\) Several skyphoi of the 'narrow band type' connected to the CHC Group, while bearing some resemblance to the figure style of Little Master cups, are possibly also relatively early.\(^{148}\) However, they have not yet been precisely dated.

Concave-rimmed skyphoi were evidently produced also in Boeotia at a rather early time. The preserved examples are signed by the potter Teisias, who apparently worked in Boeotia, but who according to his signatures came originally from Athens. They date prior to 515 B.C., although it is uncertain how much earlier. With concave rim and deep bowl, their shape compares to that of skyphoi by the Theseus Painter, Krokotos Group and Painter of the Nicosia Olpe. The foot, however, is rather more like an echinus than a torus, as commonly met in Heron Class skyphoi. In shape, Teisias' skyphoi look like an intermediary between Hermogenian skyphoi and Heron Class skyphoi.\(^{149}\) Their secondary decoration also differs from that of Heron Class skyphoi although the general scheme is quite similar: a laurel branch on the offset lip instead of ivy, and alternate red and outline rays instead of red and black tongues.\(^{150}\) They are otherwise solid black.\(^{151}\) The Boeotian connection comes not as a complete surprise because the large concave-rimmed skyphoi seems to have later enjoyed a certain popularity in Boeotia, as suggested by the many Heron Class skyphoi (many type B skyphoi by painters of the Krokotos and Sub-krokotos Groups, but also of type C, by and near the CHC Group) which came to light in graves at Rhitsona.

The exact origin of the shape of the Heron Class skyphoi is difficult to establish, however. The shape as such could rather easily have developed from the type A1 skyphos, with as intermediary the likewise concave-lipped skyphos of type A2. If we keep in mind cups and earlier skyphoi with an off-set lip, like the Hermogenian kind of skyphos, it comes not as a surprising that a potter might decide to place, as it were, a similar lip on top of a type A1 skyphos. The question of origin of shape combined with decorative systems (ivy and tongues) remains to be answered. The innovation possibly emerged in the workshop where the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe was employed, to judge from the fact that he seems to have introduced the decorative system of the type B skyphos. On the other hand, it might equally have been borrowed from Boeotia, where it was conceivably invented by someone like Teisias.

2. Heron Class skyphoi by the Theseus Painter

The basic shape of the skyphoi decorated by the Theseus Painter is quite uniform and conforms fundamentally to other type B skyphoi. It differs from them only in details such as dimensions, foot shape, etc. (see figs. 40-53 and 73-76). Differences also mark the skyphoi which the Theseus Painter decorated. The most striking difference regards the dimensions. The height and width can diverge quite a

\(^{146}\) For the most recent literature on the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe see CVA Athens 4, 38-40, pl. 27.

\(^{147}\) Compare the profile drawing of Athens, NM 363 by the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe (CVA Athens 4, fig. 8.5) with the drawings of skyphoi in the circle of the Krokotos Group (CVA Athens 4, figs. 9.2-4, 10.1-2).

\(^{148}\) See, for example, Thebes B.E. 64.342 (Green, Birds, 102, no. 12, 106, fig. 15 a-b), incorrectly dated around 480 B.C.; Athens, NM 22837 (CVA 4, pl. 58.7-5), dated 520-500 B.C.; Heidelberg 279 (CVA 1, pl. 42.7-8), dated 510 B.C.; once London market (Christie's London 26 Nov. 1980, 71, lot no. 292).

\(^{149}\) The Hermogenian skyphoi is also a type that precedes the Heron Class type. Whether Hermogenian skyphoi were 'forerunners' of the Heron Class type is difficult to say; possibly they influenced the placement, as it were, of a concave rim on top of the type A skyphos, as seen in type A2 and further.


\(^{151}\) Black-glazed skyphoi of a more normal 'Heron' type also exist: some have ivied rims, others not. However, most have tongues. See, for example, Thebes R 80.106, Ure, Sixth and Fifth, pl. 9.
bit. This is illustrated by the profile drawings of two fragmentary skyphoi from the Acropolis (Cat. nos. 2 and 76, pls. 2 a, 32 a-b, figs. 52-53): the large skyphos Acropolis 1280 has a diameter of ca. 30.0 cm, whereas that of Acropolis 1281 measures only 21.5 cm.

By far the majority of skyphoi decorated by the Theseus Painter are what might be termed medium or large. Of about 44 skyphoi with preserved and known total height, 15 measure between 16.0-17.0 cm, and 21 between 17.0-18.8 cm. Their diameters vary between 19.7-25.0 cm (Table 3a).152

At least five other skyphoi by the Theseus Painter are considerably larger; these I refer to as ‘very large’ (perhaps also Acropolis 1280, which has a very wide diameter). They measure between 24.5-30.0 cm in height and 28.5-32.0 cm in diameter.153 Of them, the largest measured skyphos is Delos B 6142: 30.0 cm high and 32.0 cm across the rim (Cat. no. 73, pl. 31 a-b).154 The other very large skyphoi are hardly any smaller. In size, these very large skyphoi can even be comparable to small kraters.155

Three of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi are exceptionally small, lower than 16.0 cm (possibly also Acropolis 1281 which, to judge from its diameter, must have been very small). The painter’s smallest known skyphos is in Winchester: height 15.3 cm, diameter 21.7 cm (Cat. no. 4, pl. 1 c-d).156

The proportions of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi also vary quite a bit. Most of them are squat and broad, generally having a much greater diameter than height, although some are occasionally proportionately higher and narrower. An extreme example is Athens, NM 498: height 17.0 cm, diameter 19.0 cm only (Cat. no. 80, pl. 34 e-f). At present, no other skyphoi by the Theseus Painter is known by the author to have a diameter of less than 20.0 cm. Even the lowest skyphoii, Winchester College (Cat. no. 4, pl. 1 b-c), still measures 21.7 cm across the rim.

The relative dimensions of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi are found in Table 3a, where we see that the diameter is nearly always 20 to 40 per cent greater than the height. The diameter of the proportionately widest skyphoi, Winchester College – which, importantly, is stylistically one of the painter’s earliest – is

152 I. Scheibler suggests that the standard dimensions of Heron Class skyphoi might be around 16.0-18.0 cm high and 22.0-23.0 cm in diameter; Skyphoi, 17, 19. According to her, this would very closely approximate the measure of a chous (approximately three litres), for example, the amount of wine to be drunk at the Anthestenia. See also G. Wissowa (ed.) Pauly’s Real Enzyklopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft III (Stuttgart 1899) 2526-27, ‘Chous’. Judging from the great differences in the dimensions of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi, it seems doubtful that Scheibler’s observation could apply to all of them. But most of them (32 of the 44 complete and measured vases) indeed fall quite comfortably within her limits (see also Table 3a), including: Syracuse 26857, Mississippi 1977.3.69, London B 79, Bologna C 44, Havana, Luganillas coll., Taranto 4448, Monopoli, private coll., London 1926.11.15.1, Mt. Holyoke, Syracuse 53263, Naples 81154, once Kropatschek coll., Cotecechia coll. R 32, Toledo 63.27, White and Levi coll., once Basle market, Naples 81159, Greifswald 197, Locce 560, once Basle market, Tampa 86.52, Stuttgart KAS 74, New York 10621.49, Taranto 4449, Amsterdam 290, Taranto 4591, Athens 13916, Copenhagen 6571, Brussels R 327, Haverford EA-1989-4, Harvard 60.321, Bonn 1646 (Cat. nos. 1, 7-9, 11, 14, 16, 18-19, 22, 24, 26-27, 30, 32-35, 37-38, 40-42, 44, 49-50, 53-55, 57, 64, 68, pls. 1 a-b, 3 c-e, 4, 5 b, 6 c-d, 7 c-d, 8 e-d, 9 a-b, 10 a-b, 11, 12 d-e, 13 d-e, 14 c-e, 15, 16 c-d, 17, 18 a-b, 19, 21 c-d, 22, 24-25, 26 c-d, 28 a-e, 29, figs. 40-42, 44-45, 47-49).

153 Conservatori, ht. 25.0 cm, diam. 31.0 cm; St. Petersburg 4498, ht. 24.5 cm, diam. 29.2 cm; Delos B 6138, ht. 27.5 cm, diam. 28.5 cm; once US market, ht. 26.0 cm; diam. 28.0 cm (Cat. nos. 70-71, 74-75, pls. 29 a-d, 6 b, 30 a, 31 c-e, 33 e). The skyphoi Delos 6140 and Acropolis 1280 (Cat. nos. 72 and 76, pls. 30 c-d, 32 a-b, fig. 52) are only partly preserved, but their dimensions were considerable: Acropolis 1280 has a diameter of ca. 30.0 cm, Delos B 6140 has a remaining ht. of 22.5 cm and a diam. of 29.5. It was not possible for me to measure the skyphos in Salerno, which is also very large (bt. and diam. certainly around 30 cm, Cat. no. 79, no profile illustrated).

154 It should be noted that this skyphos has been heavily restored, which might influence the present-day dimensions. Nevertheless, the skyphos must have been very large.

155 For (column-) kraters with similar dimensions compare, for example: Louvre Camp 11259, ht. 29.0 cm, diam. 26.8 cm; Louvre Camp 11260, ht. 26.7 cm, diam. 29.7 cm; Louvre Camp 11277, ht. 30.7 cm, diam. 29.6 cm; Louvre Camp 11282, ht. 18.2 cm, diam. 16.5 cm; Louvre CA 2209, ht. 24 cm, diam. 20.0 cm (CV4 Louvre 12, pls. 165.1-2, 166.5-7, 177, 182.1, 13.7, 187.2, 189.1-2).

156 Its smaller dimensions (and style) made Ure think that this skyphos is early work of the Theseus Painter, still very much rooted in the style and practice of the Krokotos Group, some vases of which, she believed, are generally a bit smaller than those by later painters. Krokotos Painter: Cab. des Médailles. 343, ht. 16.2 cm, diam. 22.5 cm; London 1920.2-16.3, ht. 13.0 cm. Durand Painter: Boston 99.524, ht. 16.8 cm, diam. 22.5 cm; Thebes 6027 (R 31.172), ht. 16.0 cm, diam. 22.0 cm; Athens, NM 368, ht. 15.5-8 cm, diam. 21.0 cm. Krokotos Group, various: Athens, NM 14906, ht. 11.8-12.4 cm, diam. 17.1 cm; Athens, NM 12532, ht. 11.8 cm, diam. 17 cm; Agora 26657, ht. 16.4 cm, diam. 22.0 cm; Thebes 6094 (R 31.173), ht. 15.7 cm, diam. 22.1 cm; Athens, NM 416, ht. 16.2-16.4 cm, diam. 22.4-23 cm. The height of Heidelberg 277 is given as 25.9 cm (CV4 1, 69), which is clearly incorrect, as the diameter is 22.6 cm, and the vase is clearly wider than it is high; probably 15.9 cm is meant.
1.418 times the height. Whereas the diameter of the most slender skyphos, Delos 6138 (Cat. no. 74, pl. 31 c-e), which is also one of the painter's latest, measures only 1.036 times the height. Therefore, as appears generally to happen in the course of a vase-shape's chronology, as established by H.J. Bloesch, 157 the Theseus Painter's low and wide skyphoi would be his earliest. They are connected by size to the relatively small skyphoi of the Krokotos Group. High and slender skyphoi, on the other hand, can be assigned to a later phase of the painter's work. The Theseus Painter's very large skyphoi, to judge from both their painting style and their very different appearance from the small, broad Krokotos skyphoi, might have been made relatively late in his career.

Additional variation marks the feet of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi. The most frequently occurring foot, further referred to as 'type 1' (38 of the 52 preserved specimens), is spreading, with a convex base and curving, concave upper section; the base has the appearance of a heavy torus disc (figs. 40-45). The same type of foot is met on skyphoi by other Heron Class painters. Less common are the feet of skyphoi by the Theseus Painter in which the profiles of both the base and the upper section are concave, further referred to as 'type 2' (11 of the complete and fragmentary skyphoi with preserved feet, see figs. 46-50). The difference, however, is not indicative of a chronological change in the potterwork, as both types occur side by side in all phases of the Theseus Painter's stylistic development, that is, at least as long as he painted skyphoi. The skyphoi with either type of foot vary equally in their dimensions and proportions. 158 In addition, the supposition that skyphoi with both kinds of feet were being painted within the same chronological limits is supported by the similarities of their decoration regarding not only style but also subject and composition. 159 On the other hand it is striking that some subjects (and specific arrangements of subjects) are found on skyphoi which have only one type of foot; for example, the Theseus Painter's more or less complete ephedrismo skyphoi, all of which have type 1 feet (Cat. nos. 54-55, 57, pls. 25, 26 c-d).

Furthermore, it is curious that, in some instances, skyphoi with feet of one type seem to have stayed together until they reached their final destination, as if they were potted and sold in batches. Striking examples are the two skyphoi from Naples with type 1 feet (Cat. nos. 24 and 33, pls. 11 a-e, 14 a-b, figs. 40-41), and, even more so, the four from Taranto, all with type 2 feet and all but one found in the same grave (Cat. nos. 13-14, pls. 6, 44, 50; figs. 46-49). Perhaps this implies that skyphoi with feet of types 1 and 2 were possibly not always potted and sold together or at least that they were sometimes kept separate.

Feet similar to type 1 widely occur on other skyphoi of types B and C. They can, for example, be seen in the CHC Group. Feet of type 2 are rarer and seem to be limited to skyphoi of painters in the direct vicinity of the Theseus Painter, 160 although they are not met in the Krokotos Group. 161

A third type of foot, in two degrees, appears on only two of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi (Cat. nos. 73 and 80, fig. 51). Both of them were manufactured relatively late in the painter's career (see development) which perhaps suggests that a third potter, as discussed below, entered the workshop at that time. The foot of the very large example from Salerno (Cat. no. 79, pl. 34 a-d) is a torus with an oblique, straight top. 162

---

157 See, i.a., Bloesch, Stout and Slender, 29: "[...] the development of Greek vase-shapes follows a regular course from heavy and plump forms to more slender and elegant ones."

158 See, i.a., Boston 99.523 (Cat. no. 6, pl. 3 a-b), with 'type 1' foot, measures 15.7 x 22.0 cm; Taranto 4447 (Cat. no. 13, pl. 6 a-b), with 'type 2' foot, measures 15.9 x 22.1 cm.

159 See, i.a., Bari Cotecchia (type 1) and once Helgoland, Kropatscheck (type 2, Cat. nos. 26-27, pls. 11 e-f, 12 d-e), both with Herakles and Hermes shaking hands.

160 See, i.a., Cat. nos. N1, N25, N46. The only skyphoi in the CHC Group (among hundreds) with a type 2-like foot is Leiden I. 1906/1,3 (CVA 2, pl. 65, fig. 19). Other types of feet are found among the CHC Group skyphoi, for example, an inverted echinus (Prague 5952 (CVA 1, pl. 36), which finds no counterpart in skyphoi by the Theseus Painter, but is known from a skyphos by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 (Athens, NM 365, Cat. no. N30).

161 The Painter of Philadelphia 5481 and the Painter of Rodin 1000, both of whom might be considered closest to the Theseus Painter, decorated skyphoi with feet of types 1 and 2, which might be one of the same potters who fashioned skyphoi for the Theseus Painter.

162 Delos B 6142 (Cat. no. 73, pl. 31 a-b) and Athens, NM 498 (Cat. no. 80, pl. 34 e-f, fig. 51). The foot of the Delos skyphos is shaped differently from that of Athens, NM 498: the former has two distinctly separate levels, the latter smoothly curving ones.
However, the differences in the shape of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi are not limited to their proportions, feet and dimensions only. The contours of the bowls of most skyphoi with type 1 feet form an uninterrupted convex curve, whereas most skyphoi with type 2 feet have a bowl which straightens or shows a very slight concave curve in the very lowest section just above the foot fillet.  

Viewed in combination, the differences seem to point to different potters' hands. It would therefore appear that the Theseus Painter decorated the skyphoi of at least two potters, each of whom supplied his skyphoi with one kind of foot (type 1 or type 2). Possibly a third potter was responsible for the skyphoi with feet in two degrees. Whether one of these men was the Theseus Painter himself is, of course, difficult to determine. However, if we bear in mind the large variety of other very distinctive shapes which he painted, as dealt with below, and the clearly different workshops to which they belong, it is in my opinion doubtful that the Theseus Painter was a potter as well. Insofar as the shapes themselves are concerned, there is no detectable continuity at all in the work of this painter. The only way I could imagine that it would be possible to discover whether he was indeed a potter is to establish whether one of the two main foot types ceased to exist when he stopped decorating skyphoi. But such a precise moment in time is impossible to pinpoint. Furthermore, the Painter of Rodin 1000 and the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 (see below) also seem to have decorated skyphoi by the potter(s) of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi, which makes it almost impossible to decide whether any one of these painters was also a potter (see also below, chapter V, workshop connections).

The Heron Class skyphoi apparently vanished at the end of the black-figure period, as no example is attested in red-figure (with the possible exception of a small, ivy-rimmed, red-figure skyphos fragment). At least one example of this type of skyphos is embellished in Six's technique. Its shape, ornaments and dimensions are very similar to those of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi, although a possible relation in the figurework is not immediately evident.

3. Painting and drawing

Secondary decoration

The rims of the Heron Class skyphoi decorated by the Theseus Painter show either a double row of upright and pendant ivy-leaves or simply two rows of dots, in each instance separated by a central line. On the basis of the stylistic development of the painting of the main frieze, it seems that most of the skyphoi with ivy rims are earlier than those with dots. The division between the rim ornament and the figure frieze consists of a stripe and line or, less frequently, two stripes. Below the figure frieze there is a band of alternately red and black tongues or, seldom, a band of only black tongues. Lines and stripes in

163 This feature is also visible in Guardia Perticara; Taranto 4447-9; Monopoli, private coll.; Syracuse 53263; once Helgoland, once Kropatschek coll.; Agora P 1544; Taranto 4591 (Cat. nos. 10, 13-14, 16, 22, 26, 44-45 and 50; pls. 5a, 6, 7 e-d, 10 a-b, 11 e-f, 19, 20 a-b, figs. 46-50). The lower concave curve is sometimes very slight, however, and some of the torus-footed skyphoi seem to curve similarly.

164 The skyphos Athens, NM 498 (Cat. no. 80, fig. 51) is shaped rather differently from the Theseus Painter's other skyphoi; it is much slimmer and has a rather straight rim.

165 Acropolis 482, Graef and Langlotz, Akropolis II, pl. 39; ARV² 266,90, Syriskos Painter. Perhaps also Acropolis 499, ARV² 66,135, and Athens NS AP 430, ARV² 66,137, Ottos.

166 Malibu 76.AE.127, J. Burnet-Grossman, 'Six's Technique at the Getty', GVGettyMus 5 (1991) 13-26, fig. 2. The height is 16.0 cm, the diameter ca. 23.2 cm. The foot is rather like foot type 1.

167 Ivy is an extremely common rim ornament for Attic vases. For Siana cups see, i.a., Brijder, Siana Cups I, nos. 111, 121-22, 124 etc., pls. 21 d, 24-25, 26 a-b. Also kraters, S. Frank, Attische Kelchkratere, Eine Untersuchung zum Zusammenspiel von Gefäßvorm und Bemalung (Frankfurt 1990) 69-88, pl. 2. For column-kraters with ivy rim see CVA Louvre 12, pls. 169-89. For ivy on the rim compare also kyathoi; for example, one in Six's technique, Villa Giulia 78670-1, L. Hannestad, The Castellani Fragments in the Villa Giulia, Athenian Black-figure, vol. 1 (Aarhus 1989) no. 366. See also M. Blech, Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen (Berlin and New York 1982) 55-57.

168 Tongues above the foot are a common motif of earlier skyphoi; compare, for example, the skyphos of Corinthian type by
various combinations run above the tongues. Most commonly they consist of a stripe with a group of three lines. Other variants are: a line between a pair of stripes and three lines; a stripe and four lines; a pair of stripes and three lines; a line between a pair of stripes; three broad stripes; and a pair of stripes. On the skyphos Syracuse 26857 (Cat. no. 1, pl. 1 a-b) the border above the tongues is more elaborate: a group of three lines between stripes, and a group of three lines with a separate single line below.

Below the tongues there is a pair of two thin lines or no decoration at all. A red stripe surrounds the moulding between the bowl and foot. Concentric circles, usually two, are painted under the foot, which, as a rule, are not a trait of skyphoi by painters of the older Kroktos Group. The interior of the Theseus Painter’s skyphos is solid black, apart from a small reserved tondo with a concentric circle and dotted centre.

The figure zone occupies the main part of the bowl. On at least one skyphos, Kanellopoulos 842 (Cat. no. 78, pl. 33 a-b), the frieze is made narrow by a large black section above the tongues, which leaves only about half of the bowl’s surface available for the figurework. This arrangement is standard in the CHC Group. Possibly the correspondence indicates that, on the one hand, the Theseus Painter and the White Heron Group and, on the other, the CHC Group are linked to some extent. The figurework of the Theseus Painter’s narrow-figure skyphos belongs rather late in his stylistic development. In contrast to the CHC Group, but in accordance with the Kroktos Group, the Theseus Painter and associated painters usually placed ornaments below the handles of their skyphoi. The most common motif is a white bird, generally identified as a heron. The supposed workshop of skyphos manufacturers has therefore been called the White Heron Group. Most of the Theseus Painter’s herons have an elegantly curving long neck, spreading, angular wings, and short, pointy tail. The exceptions are seen below the handles of London 1926.11-15.1 and Gioia del Colle (Cat. nos. 17 and 92, pls. 8 b and 37 b). The wings are folded and the tails long, with individually marked feathers. The herons on both these skyphoi look quite like the plumper birds with folded wings under the handles of skyphoi by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481, for which see below. This may be a reason why Beazley did not assign the London skyphos to the Theseus Painter. Nevertheless, it shows enough other stylistic traits to make an attribution certain. Some of the Theseus Painter’s herons are turned to the right, others to the left.

White herons are also seen under the handles of skyphoi by painters of the so-called Sub-kroktos Group and the later White Heron Group. They are lacking, however, on skyphoi of the Kroktos Group and others. White herons by different painters are often painted differently and can in themselves sometimes provide additional stylistic indications for an attribution.

Goats are another common handle motif of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi. His few other choices include: squatting youths or a youth jumping while standing on his hands, horseman, amphora.

the C Painter, Louvre MNC 676 (ABV' 57,118; Beazley Addenda' 16). See also a skyphos by the Affecter, Athens Benaki Museum 33042, M. Pipili, 'A Skyphos by the Affecter in Athens: Dispersed Fragments Reassembled', in O. Palagia, Greek Offerings, Essays in Honour of John Boardman (Oxford 1997) 87-94.

169 Ure, Kroktos, 90, 95.

170 See, i.a., CVA Athens 4, pls. 45-48.

171 It is difficult to decide whether the decoration of this vase might imply that the Theseus Painter also worked in the CHC Group or that it was an experiment done outside that group.

172 See J. Pollard, Birds in Greek Life and Myth (Plymouth 1977) 68-69, mentioning a crest as a prominent feature of herons. However, a crest is not seen on the birds at the handles of vases by the Theseus Painter and other painters of the White Heron Group. According to E. Böhr, the birds are not herons at all, but cranes (said in response to my lecture at the ALAC, Amsterdam, 1998).

173 See also ch. I.3.

174 See, for example: Winchester College Museum, also with a similar (yellow) 'heron' in the central part of the vase; London 1926.11-15.1; Naples 81154; Agora P 1543; Laon 37996 (Cat. nos. 4, 17, 24, 28, 29; pls. 1 c-d, 8 b, 11 c, 12 c, 13 b, and fig. 29).

175 See, i.a., Athens, NM 362 by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481, Ure, Kroktos, 93, no. 17, pl. 9.3; CVA Athens 4, pl. 35. Compare also Louvre CA 1812, Ure, Kroktos, 94, n. 17, pl. 7.1, 4.

176 That is, the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, the CHC Group, etc.

177 See, for example, Mississippi 1977.3.69, London 1902.12-18.3, once Basle market, Agora P 1544 (Cat. nos. 7, 18, 37, 45; pls. 3 d, 8 de-e, 15 d, 20 c).

178 Taranto 4449 and Conservatori (Cat. nos. 44 and 70, pl. 19 e). Also Harvard 1960.321 (Cat. no. 64, pl. 28 b), although this figure is more integrated into the main scene.
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and, on all the ephedrismos skyphoi, intertwined tree trunks (see fig. 34 b). The krater under the handle of Syracuse 26857 (Cat. no. 1, not figured) is a sign, among others, that this skyphos is early because the motif links it to the Krokotos Group whose painters frequently featured kraters below the handles of skyphoi. Pendent lotuses below the handles, in combination with palmettes beside them, as on skyphoi of Ure's type A1-3, are not a trait of any of the Theseus Painter's 'heron skyphoi'. Nor are other ornaments seen next to the handles, like the small palmettes and sphinxes of the CHC Group.

Figure work
More than any other shape, the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi show his most typical and characteristic painting style. The stances and movement of the figures are often more imaginative and complicated than those of figures on his other vase-shapes. Also his depictions of scenic motifs like trees or other environmental elements are much more varied, including rocks, water and architectural references. Moreover, in contrast to most other kinds of vases by the Theseus Painter, the skyphoi are relatively more richly furnished with such elements. Similarly, there is a greater range of animals, monsters and the attributes of people. In this respect, it is noteworthy that the style of most of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi gives rise to less debate and poses fewer difficulties of attribution than many of his other vase-shapes.

On quite a few skyphoi, however, the Theseus Painter deviates from his common style. The high, slender skyphos Athens, NM 498 (Cat. no. 80, pl. 34 e-f), for example, has very stiff, rather thin figures, as if their proportions were influenced by the slim shape of the skyphos, which might further result from their late workmanship. The appearance of the satyrs of Kanellopoulos 842 (Cat. no. 78, pl. 33 a-b), may likewise be influenced by the height of the figure frieze, but in the opposite sense, as their extremely sturdy, muscular bodies may be due to the confined space of the narrow frieze which, so to speak, crushes them into its smaller field; their proportions are exceptional for figurework by the Theseus Painter. The painting is rather careless and would therefore date from late in his career.

Composition
The Theseus Painter variously arranged the scenes of skyphoi. The simplest arrangement is a row of figures, as in his procession-like komoi. More complex are the groups that recur several times, like the figures of ephedrismos skyphoi where each group consists of a boy carrying another one, preceded by a walking boy. The most common type of composition, however, has a main scene in the centre and, on either side, trees or male and female bystanders; trees may fill other areas of the scene. Some central compositions are heraldic, for example the Winchester skyphos (Cat. no. 4, pl. 1 b-c), which shows a heron in front of a central tree, flanked by maenads on confronting goats.

A common trait of the Theseus Painter's painting, which applies especially to skyphoi, is the frequent repetition of a representation on both sides of the same vase. In several instances (for example the ephedrismos skyphoi, Cat. nos. 54-63, pls. 25-27, or Herakles reclining with Hermes, Cat. nos. 25-28, 75, pls. 11 e-f, 12, 33 c) the scenes are almost identical in subject, the number and positioning of the figures, and other aspects of the composition. On the other hand, both sides of many skyphoi have comparable subjects in which some details are slightly altered, by which the Theseus Painter created

179 Taranto 4449 (Cat. no. 44, pl. 19 d).
180 Delos B 6142 (Cat. no. 73, pl. 31 b).
181 St. Petersburg 4498 (Cat. no. 71, not illustrated).
182 See Cab. des Médailles. 343 by the Krokotos Painter (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 1; ABV 206,1; Para 93,1; Beazley Addenda 55); Heidelberg 277 by the same painter (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 2; ABV 206,2; Para 93,2; Beazley Addenda 55); Louvre CA 443, by the same painter (Ure, Krokotos, 91); Athens, NM 14906 (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 3; Para 94; CVA Athens 4, pl. 30); Athens, NM 12626, attributed to Ure's 'Herm Painter' (Ure, Krokotos, 92, no. 10; CVA Athens 4, pl. 33).
183 Ure, Sixth and Fifth, 58-9. See also Para 83-86, 91.
184 See also, Steiner, Visual Redundancy, 197-219.
variation. Good examples are two skyphoi with a sacrificial procession on each side (Cat. nos. 40-41, pl. 17). Both have basically the same pictorial components: two naked men carrying an amphora, a male leading a bull, a male dragging along a boar, and males with sacrificial objects. On each skyphos, however, the figures' stances and the combinations of the elements differ. Other skyphoi show equal variation: on both sides of Taranto 4447 (Cat. no. 13, pl. 6 a-b), for instance, Heracles is portrayed sitting on a shore, waving towards Helios (A), or climbing up the shore while looking round at him (B); otherwise the remainder of each scene is identical on both skyphoi. Another example is Conservatori (Cat. no. 70, pl. 29 c-d): on each side Hermes is similarly posed reclining on a goat or a ram.

The two sides of other skyphoi display different but thematically related scenes which illustrate episodes of one story or of a group of related stories. Among them, we see different Labours of Theseus on either side (Cat. nos. 29-30, 76, pls. 13, 32 a-b) or Heracles wrestling with Alkyoneus (A) and Hermes leading away the cattle (B) (Cat. no. 14, pl. 6 c-d). Very rarely there is no relation at all between the themes of both sides of a skyphos by the Theseus Painter.  

### Added colour

Added colour is a leading feature of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi: red, white and yellow. Often colour is the main tool by which he defines certain pictorial elements: the sun and fish of Taranto 4447 (Cat. no. 13, pl. 6 a-b), furniture patterns, etc. Added red and white are generally employed as on all his other kinds of vases. In two respects, however, they receive specific application on the skyphoi only: red for the alternate tongues below the figure friezes, white for the herons below the handles. The added colour is abundant and can express festiveness, like the coloured garments and wreaths of the figures of Athens, Agora P 1544 and Acropolis 1282 (Cat. nos. 45 and 66, pls. 20, 23 d), depicting a komos and a procession, respectively.

Yellow is the added colour which typifies the Theseus Painter's forerunners in the Krokotos Group. But elsewhere in Attic black-figure this colour is extremely rare. In the Theseus Painter's work it is commonly met only on the skyphoi.

### Drawing

As in the case of the Theseus Painter's painting, as described above on pages 14-17, most characteristics of his incising technique and style can be recognised on the skyphoi. The incising of the skyphoi seldom diverges from the norm. In a few specimens the incising is noticeably more carefully executed than that of other skyphoi. This, combined with the fact that these skyphoi are relatively small and very colourful, with much added yellow, all of which are characteristics of the earlier Krokotos Group, suggests that they date from an early phase in the painter's career. The anatomical incising, although displaying many features of his basic style, is drawn with more care and detail than usual; see for example the satyrs of the skyphos Syracuse 26857 (Cat. no. 1, fig. 1, pl. 1 a-b). Whereas these satyrs, on the one hand, show many anatomical details which are typical of the painter (continuing line from collarbone to biceps, wavy chest line with high nipples, lines from thigh to knee, etc.), they diverge, on the other, from the Theseus Painter's standard in other respects, like the detailed execution of the head and genitals. Further, note also the highly detailed drawing of the hippocamp of New York 17.230.9 (Cat. no. 3, pl. 2 b) and the careful execution of the maenads' garments on Syracuse 26857 and the Winchester College skyphoi, with in the first instance the maenads even wearing the turban with wide, coloured

---

185 Examples might be the skyphoi Boston 99.523 and Guardia Pertica with 'amazons and griffins' on one side and a lion about to attack cattle on the other (Cat. nos. 6 and 10, pls. 3 a-b, 5 a).
186 Ure 26857, Acropolis 1281, New York 17.230.9, Winchester College, Acropolis 1271 (Cat. nos. 1-5, pls. 1-2).
187 Ure attributed this skyphos to the Theseus Painter (Krokotos, 96, 103). Beazley apparently had doubts and placed it near the Theseus Painter (Para 259). M. Pipili (CVA Athens 4, 42) says it is in "the manner of the Theseus Painter." In my opinion, it is by the Theseus Painter himself.
188 They are even wearing nebrides, otherwise not featured on vases by the Theseus Painter.
bands which typifies the Krokotos Group.\textsuperscript{189}

However, a difference in the way of drawing need not always be evidence of a chronological difference, but might just result from an unusual element or stance. Without parallel in the work of the Theseus Painter, for example, are the rendering of the above-mentioned abdomen of Alkyoneus in Taranto 4448 (Cat. no. 14, pl. 6 c-d, fig. 22) and the anatomical incisions of the satyr in Naples 81154 (Cat. no. 24, pl. 11 a-e, fig. 2). Some incised features, on the other hand, may well be indicative of relatively late workmanship. Several of the Theseus Painter's very large skyphoi display yet more flowing drawing and less detail than usual.\textsuperscript{190} Even later might be the incising of Athens, NM 498 (Cat. no. 80, pl. 34 e), which is especially careless and scrappy, reminiscent of the painter's lekythoi.

Finally, the incising of the skyphos Bonn 1646 (Cat. no. 68, pl. 29 a), which Haspels assigned to the Theseus Painter, stands somewhat apart. The circular eye, the almost donut-shaped ear, and the rather clumsy, stiffly outlined left arm and hand are not especially characteristic of the Theseus Painter but are more in line with the style of the Painter of Philadelphia 5481; further contrast Basle, Cahn collection (Cat. no. 69, pl. 29 b), showing the same subject, which displays the Theseus Painters' typically robust, flowing incisions.\textsuperscript{191} Yet as only a few traits in the style of the Bonn skyphos might warrant a rejection of Haspels' attribution and as the subject and composition remain very close to that of the Basle fragment, the Bonn skyphos is retained by me in the Theseus Painter's corpus.

Unpublished Skyphoi (not examined)

Some of the unpublished skyphoi attributed by various authors to the Theseus Painter could not be studied by me at first hand for diverse reasons: their current whereabouts are unknown, they could not be found in their storage rooms, permission was denied, etc. (Cat. nos. 113-124). Most of them, however, were examined and attributed by either Haspels or Beazley.

Some of them, though unseen by me, are doubtless by the Theseus Painter. The detailed description of Acropolis 1286 by Graef and Langlotz, with Dionysos in a donkey-cart (Cat no. 114), clearly finds its parallel in Mississippi 1977.3.69 (Cat. no. 7, pl. 3 c-e).\textsuperscript{192} Only a few other vases depict a

\textsuperscript{189} Compare Heidelberg 277 by the Krokotos Painter (\textit{CVA} 1, pl. 42.3-5; \textit{ABV} 206,1; \textit{Para} 93,1); Thebes 6064 (R 31.173, \textit{ABV} 209,2; \textit{Para} 94); Athens 14906 (\textit{Para} 94; \textit{CVA} Athens 4, pl. 30).

\textsuperscript{190} St. Petersburg 4498, Delos 6140, Acropolis 1280 (Cat. nos. 71-72, 76).

\textsuperscript{191} The Basle fragment has been attributed to a painter of the White Heron Group, near the Theseus Painter, in its initial publication (H.J. Bloechs, \textit{Das Tier in der Antike}, 400 Werke ägyptischer, griechischer, etruskischer und römischer Kunst aus privatem und öffentlichem Besitz, \textit{Archäologisches Institut der Universität Zürich}, 21. Sept. – 17. Nov. 1974, 39 no. 227, pl. 38) as well as in the \textit{LIMC} VIII, s.v. 'Triones', no. 110. The style, however, is typical of the Theseus Painter; compare the heads of the satyr on St. Petersburg 4498, of Hermes on Delos B 6140, of Prokrustes on the lekythos Athens 515 and of the men on the lekythos Louvre CA 1837 (Cat. nos. 71, 72, 136, 140, pls. 30 a, d, 43 a-b, 44 c-d, figs. 3, 21). It can doubtless be given to the painter. Also the subject is incorrectly identified in the \textit{LIMC}, where it is stated that a male triton is holding a female. The composition of the preserved upper part, however, is identical to that of the skyphos in Bonn where the fish-tail is clearly attached to the female figure.

similar scene, and none of them so closely matches the published description as the Mississippi skyphos. Furthermore, other typical motifs of the Theseus Painter on the Acropolis fragments are a youth looking round while walking in front of the donkey-cart and the goats under the handles.

The attribution of the fragments Acropolis 1275 (Cat. no. N9), on the other hand, is less secure, which explains its omission from the main catalogue of this book. It illustrates a palaestra scene which, of course, is a highly common theme in black-figure. However, Graef and Langlotz's description (it has not been published photographically) is so similar to the palaestra scene of the fragmentary skyphos Amsterdam 2159 (Cat. no. 43, pl. 18 c-e) that the Acropolis fragment most probably was also painted by the Theseus Painter, or a painter near him.¹⁹³ Like the Amsterdam skyphos, it shows a flute-player (parts of the long mantle preserved), trainer and kneeling youth with spears (pl. 18 c-e) as well as white herons under the handles.

Several other unpublished skyphoi attributed by Haspels and Beazley find iconographical parallels in work of the Theseus Painter and can therefore be given to him on their authority: compare Berlin 4528 (Cat. no. 115) with Bonn 1646 and Basle, Cahn collection (Cat. nos. 68-69, pl. 29 a-b); Berlin (Cat. 116) with Conservatorii (Cat. no. 70, pl. 29 c-d); Basle, Kamblì collection (Cat. no. 117), with vases where Herakles is regaled by Athena (Cat. nos. 18-21, pls. 8 d-e, 9); Louvre Cp 108.56 (Cat. no. 118) with once Basle market and Eleusis 314 (Cat. nos. 37, 110, pl. 15 c-d). The remainder of the skyphoi not seen by me are either fragments or have no clear parallel in the work of the Theseus Painter and therefore cannot be assigned with any certainty to him on the basis of the published descriptions only (Cat nos. 113, 119-124).

### 4. Skyphoi near the Theseus Painter

In comparison with the other specialists in Heron Class skyphoi, to which the Theseus Painter has been reckoned since Haspels, the Theseus Painter looks exceptionally gifted, if only because the output of nearly all the other painters is mediocre. This unquestionably holds for the later painters of Heron Class skyphoi and, to a lesser extent, the earlier painters of the Krokotos Group as well as for the Theseus Painters contemporaries in the Sub-krokotos Group. In addition, these painters, for the most part, remain stylistically undefined and seem, moreover, to have limited themselves to skyphoi.¹⁹⁴ In contrast, the Theseus Painter's style is met on very many vases ranging over a variety of shapes. Nevertheless, the Heron Class skyphoi and their recognisable painters' hands are numerous enough to warrant comparison with the Theseus Painter.

Near the Theseus Painter or possibly his own work

Regarding a relatively large number of skyphoi, it is difficult to decide whether they are only near the Theseus Painter or were actually painted by him. Several of them have actually been attributed to the painter, but some of these attributions remain either doubtful or are even downright incorrect. The reasons vary: the piece in question is a fragment which preserves few indications supporting a definite attribution; a complete vase shows details which are uncommon for the Theseus Painter; the published photographs simply do not illustrate details which clinch an attribution.

Athens, NM 18720 (Cat. no. N1, fig. 74), for instance, whose potterwork is very close to that of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi with type 2 concave feet (compare especially Agora P 1544, Cat. no. 45, fig.

---

¹⁹³ See below, chapter XII.3, sports, and n. 759, with a description of Acropolis 1275.

¹⁹⁴ With the possible exceptions of Ure's Krokotos Painter and the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 as well as Beazley's Painter of Rodin 1000. Whereas around 200 vases can be attributed to the Theseus Painter, only 5 vases can be given with certainty to the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 and 10 are probably or possibly by his hand. Six vases are attributable to the Painter of Rodin 1000. Both painters are furthermore known to have decorated skyphoi only. The Krokotos Painter, on the other hand, has both skyphoi and eye-cups. But also in the case of this painter the number of identified vases is very small in comparison to the Theseus Painter.
50), was attributed by Beazley to the Theseus Painter. In my view, however, the attribution cannot be considered certain, as many details diverge from the painter’s standard style, although the carelessness of the workmanship makes it difficult to be more definite. All things considered, it seems to me improbable that Athens, NM 18720 is by the Theseus Painter.\textsuperscript{195} The same uncertainty applies to Olympia BE 634 (Cat. No. N2); even Beazley could not decide whether this skyphos must be regarded as by the Theseus Painter himself or only as near him.\textsuperscript{196}

Further, the painting of a rim fragment from Chiusi (Cat. no. N3) has much in common with the Theseus Painter’s style, but not in every detail, especially the very crowded network of vines contrasts with his usually small number of flowing branches. A fragment in Parma showing a partial komos was identified as part of a skyphos and attributed to the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. N10). It can hesitantly be linked to him, but since the style is closest to that of his late kyathoi and unlike anything seen on his skyphoi, it could conceivably be only part of a kyathos of his; not enough remains to be certain. However, in addition, it is difficult to decide whether or not some smallish fragments (Cat. nos. N4-9, 11-14) are by the Theseus Painter. While some of them are close to him, it seems safest to keep them in the vague category of skyphoi which are ‘by or near the Theseus Painter’.

### The Krokotos Group

The Krokotos Group was defined by Ure in 1955, partly adopted by Beazley in \textit{ABV}, and then elaborated by him in \textit{Para}.\textsuperscript{197} Its members appear to have mainly decorated skyphoi and type A cups. The name derives from the yellow chiton - \textit{krokotos} - often worn by females. The chief, or at least the group’s most clearly definable, painter is Ure’s Krokotos Painter. Another named painter of skyphoi is the Durand Painter. Several identified but unnamed hands painted skyphoi connected to the Krokotos Group.\textsuperscript{198}

Both Ure and Beazley are not very informative regarding the question of which painters, groups and workshops might have influenced the Krokotos Group. Ure remarked that some stylistic elements and the use of subjects and added yellow reminded her of Exekias.\textsuperscript{199} On similar grounds, Malagardis sees a connection between Group E and the Krokotos Group, if not direct descent.\textsuperscript{200} In my opinion, the similarities between, on the one hand, Exekias and Group E and, on the other, the Krokotos Group are not apparent. Notably, Beazley mentioned no possible link between the Krokotos Group and either Group E or Exekias. Nor do Ure or Malagardis mentioned any connections between the cup shapes of the Krokotos Group and those of Group E or Exekias. A tie cannot be discerned in their skyphoi either. Instead, as stated above, the Krokotos Group skyphoi seem, in shape and decorative scheme (type B), to

---

\textsuperscript{195} Its (sparse) incising is not characteristic of the painter. See, i.a., the continuous incision on the arm of the mantle figure on B or the nearly unincised goats under the handles. Its style also shares features with those of the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 (rather stiff incisions which lack the flowing lines of the Theseus Painter, rounded ears, circular eyes, etc.).

\textsuperscript{196} \textit{ABV}, 520, ‘by or near the Theseus Painter’.

\textsuperscript{197} For the Krokotos Group see esp.: Ure, \textit{Krokotos}; \textit{ABV} 205-209; \textit{Para} 93-99; Bell, \textit{Krokotos Cups}, 1-15; \textit{Beazley Addenda}\textsuperscript{55} 55; recently \textit{CVA} Athens 4, 41-43; \textit{CVA Amsterdam} 2, 125-129. Several skyphoi in the Krokotos Group were found in ‘grave 31’ at Rhisona. Based on style and the other grave contents, they are dated to around c. 515 B.C.; see Sparkes, \textit{Taste}, 128-29. For examples with yellow (esp. the krokotos) see Athens, NM 368 (Ure, \textit{Krokotos} 91, no. 8; \textit{Para} 94; \textit{CVA} Athens, NM 4, pl. 29); Athens, NM 14906 (Ure, \textit{Krokotos} 90, no. 3; \textit{Para} 94; \textit{CVA} 4, pl. 30; Athens, NM 12532 (Ure, \textit{Krokotos}, 90, no. 5; \textit{CVA} 4, pl. 31.1-4); Agora P 26652 (\textit{Para} 94; \textit{Beazley Addenda}\textsuperscript{55}); Thebes 6094 (R 31.173) and Thebes 6027 (R 31.172) (\textit{ABV} 209,1-2).

\textsuperscript{198} Several other hands or subgroups of exclusively cup painters in the Krokotos Group were distinguished by both Ure and Beazley. However, these divisions are often confusing because they partly overlap and have been given different names. Ure’s Winchester group, for example, forms part of Beazley’s Group of Walters 48.42, but some of the vases attributed to that group by Beazley were placed elsewhere by Ure. For the cup painters of the Krokotos Group several hands were also distinguished: again Krokotos Painter; Winchester Group (Ure); Group of Walters 48.42 (Beazley); Durand Painter, who as one of the few named painters also decorated skyphoi (both Ure and Beazley); Painter of Munich 2050; Painter of Munich 2100. The work of the last two painters was identified by both Beazley and Ure, although Ure did not supply these painters with names (Ure, \textit{Krokotos}, 96-97, 100). Later, E.E. Bell added another name to the Krokotos workshop: Mask and Siren Painter (Bell, \textit{Krokotos Cups}, 1-15).

\textsuperscript{199} Ure, \textit{Krokotos}, 101-102, also referring to J.D. Beazley, \textit{Development of Attic Black-figure} rev. ed. (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1986) 65, on the use of yellow or a yellowish brown by Exekias.

\textsuperscript{200} Malagardis, \textit{Skyphoi}.
derive from the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, who is not at all stylistically related to Group E. To be fair, however, the latter can also be said about the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe in relation to the Krokotos Group.

Furthermore, Beazley makes no mention of the Krokotos Group's specific relation to the Theseus Painter. But he indirectly offers some clues to his thinking on the matter. Whereas the Theseus Painter is presented in a chapter at the end of ABV among the late lekythos painters, the Krokotos Group is firmly anchored in his chapter on painters of type A cups.\(^\text{201}\) No linkage is suggested between the Krokotos Group and the Theseus Painter, apart from their decorating Heron Class skyphoi. The foregoing implies that Beazley saw no particularly close relation between the Krokotos Group and the Theseus Painter. It seems to me, however, that they are narrowly linked, as Ure evidently thought.

As a rule, the Krokotos Group skyphoi are somewhat smaller than those of later painters/groups, whereas the basic shape and subsidiary decoration are very much the same. However, two basic features of later skyphoi are missing on the skyphoi of the Krokotos Group: the white heron and the concentric circles under the foot.\(^\text{202}\)

The number of subjects on Krokotos Group skyphoi is limited. By far the most favourite one is Dionysos or a Dionysos-like figure reclining on the ground (in a vineyard?), surrounded by attendants.\(^\text{203}\) Another popular theme is Dionysos mounted on a donkey, amidst followers.\(^\text{204}\) One subject in particular links the Krokotos Painter/Group with the Theseus Painter: a lion about to attack bulls. It is featured several times by both painters.\(^\text{205}\) As observed above, the strong stylistic similarities between the lions of Boston 55.923 by the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. 6, pl. 3 a-b) and those of London 1920.2-16.3 by the Krokotos Painter\(^\text{206}\) suggest that the first may very well have been the latter's pupil.

The Sub-krokotos Group

The so-called heirs of the Krokotos Group were labelled by Ure the Sub-krokotos Group, to which she attributed skyphoi only. In contrast to the Krokotos Group proper, the subgroup is not included in ABV or Para. Ure also pointed out that some of the subgroup's painters could also be considered 'members of the Krokotos Group itself, because the boundaries between the Krokotos- and Sub-krokotos Group are sometimes rather vague.'\(^\text{207}\) The Sub-krokotos Group comprises several painters identified by Ure: Hydra Painter, Herm Painter, Painter of the Louvre Argos, Painter of Philadelphia 5481 (see below) and unnamed painters.

The Sub-krokotos skyphoi are often slightly larger than those of the Krokotos Group, but insofar as known they are never so large as some of those by the Theseus Painter. Added colour is less extensively used, although there often is considerable application of yellow. Like the Theseus Painter's skyphoi, the Sub-krokotos skyphoi feature herons below the handles and concentric circles under the foot.

Thematically, the Sub-krokotos Group shows greater variation than the Krokotos Group. Herakles, Trojan subjects and other kinds of myth are more often met. The range of subjects, however, is much smaller than in the work of Theseus Painter.

\(^{201}\) Between Chalidising cups and the Painter of Vatican G. 69, rather early in ABV ch. XIII.

\(^{202}\) Ure, Krokotos, 90, 93.

\(^{203}\) See, i.a., Heidelberg 277 by the Krokotos Painter (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 2; Para 93.2; Beazley Addenda\(^2\) 55), Thebes 6094 (31.173, Ure, Krokotos, 91, no. 7; Para 94), Athens, NM 368 (Ure, Krokotos, 91, no. 8; Para 94; CVA Athens 4, pl. 29), Athens, NM 14906 (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 3; Para 94; CVA Athens pl. 30).

\(^{204}\) See, for example, Cab. des Médailles 343 (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 1; ABV 206.1; Para 93.1; Beazley Addenda\(^2\) 55) by the Krokotos Painter, and Thebes 6027 (R 31.172, Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 6; ABV 209.1; Para 94; Beazley Addenda\(^2\) 56).

\(^{205}\) Boston 99.523 and Guardia Perticara (Cat. nos. 6 and 10, pl. 3 a-b, 5 s) by the Theseus Painter, and, in the Krokotos Group, London 1920.2-16.3 (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 4; Para 93.3); St. Petersburg B 402 (Gorbunova, Ermitazhe, 52-53, no. 33); Athens, NM 12532 (Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 5; CVA Athens 4, pl. 31.1-4).

\(^{206}\) Ure, Krokotos, 90, no. 4; Para 93.3.

\(^{207}\) Ure, Krokotos, 93.
The Painter of Philadelphia 5481

The Painter of Philadelphia 5481 was identified and named by Ure, who placed him in the Sub-krokotos Group.\(^{208}\) She also considered him in some respects nearer to the Athena Painter than to the Theseus Painter.\(^{209}\) But the remark seems a bit awkward, as the Athena Painter neither is a skyphos painter nor is in any way related to the Krokotos Group. In fact, of all the painters of the Krokotos, Sub-krokotos and White Heron Groups, the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 is closest in style and general appearance to the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. N25-32, possibly also N33-38).

However, the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 was not accepted by Beazley. He placed two skyphoi which Ure attributed to that painter near his Painter of Rodin 1000.\(^{210}\) M. Pipili, on the other hand, considers several skyphoi to be probably by or near the Painter of Philadelphia 5481, augmenting Ure’s list.\(^{211}\) More can be added, thereby forming a relatively large group. The number, however, is meagre compared to that of the skyphoi attributable to the Theseus Painter.

The secondary decoration of the skyphoi by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 is generally very close to that of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi, and their shape is often nearly identical. Quite possibly the same potter or potters fashioned skyphoi for both painters; compare the profile drawing of Athens, NM 635 (Cat. no. N30, fig. 74) to the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi with type 1 torus feet (figs. 40–45). Several other skyphoi of the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 have the Theseus Painter’s ‘type 2’ foot.\(^{212}\) In contrast, the foot of Athens, NM 362 (Cat. no. N26, fig. 75) is entirely different and has the form of an inverted echinus, which is not yet attested among the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi.

The overall styles of these two painters differ quite noticeably. The incising of the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 is less fluent than that of the Theseus Painter, showing more straight and angular lines which give the figures a much stiffer appearance. It generally resembles scribbling, usually with shorter lines, and has been less carefully executed.\(^{213}\) In addition, the white herons of the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 differ from those of the Theseus Painter; they are much plumper, look round, have a short straight neck, and hold their wings tight against the body. On the other hand, there are some minor stylistic connections.\(^{214}\) The positioning of incised lines and the painted contours are often similar. Especially their mantle figures are often particularly close. The Painter of Philadelphia 5481 is therefore stylistically nearer to the Theseus Painter than is the Painter of Rodin 1000. The differences and resemblances between the two painters are most clearly visible on two skyphoi with nearly identical subjects: Herakles mousikos in Syracuse 53263 by the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. 22, pl. 10 a-b) and in Athens, NM 635 by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 (Cat. no. N30). But as far as their subject matter is concerned, the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 clearly has other favourites than the Theseus Painter, preferring a procession of four old men (Cat. nos. N26-27).

The Painter of Rodin 1000

Beazley first identified the Painter of Rodin 1000 in ABV, but later, in Para, he referred to the five skyphoi formerly attributed by him to that painter only as "near the Theseus Painter";\(^{215}\) the painter had ceased to exist as an individual hand in his lists.\(^{216}\) Nonetheless, I think that Beazley was initially right

---

208 Ure, Krokotos, 95.
209 Ure, Krokotos, 95: "In some respects he seems to be nearer to the Athena Painter."
210 Thebes 17097 and Athens 362, each with a procession of four old men turned to the right (Cat. nos. N26-27).
211 CVA Athens 4, 47.
212 Type 2 skyphoi by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481: namevase (Cat. no. N25), once Basle market (Cat. no. N29). Both not illustrated.
213 The double, semicircular ear by the Painter of Philadelphia 5481, for example, never occurs in the work of the Theseus Painter.
214 Compare esp. Athens 635 (Cat. no. N31) by or near the Painter of Philadelphia 5481, and Syracuse 53263 by the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. 22, pl. 10 a-b), which show many stylistic similarities. Compare also the right-hand male figure of Syracuse with mantle figures by the Painter of Philadelphia.
215 ABV 521-22; Para 259.
216 Even prior to Beazley, the Painter of Rodin 1000 had been regarded as a separate hand near the Theseus Painter, in Mercklin, Werkstatt, 1-14.
when he recognized work of a specific painter.

Few vases can be given to the Painter of Rodin 1000 (Cat. nos. N39-44, possibly also N45): the five attributed by Beazley and one other (possibly two) which can be added. In ABV Beazley also placed two skyphoi near the Painter of Rodin 1000, which Ure had instead assigned to the Painter of Philadelphia 5481.217

The shapes and ornaments of skyphoi by the Theseus Painter and the Painter of Rodin 1000 are very similar. In fact, the skyphoi of both painters could have been fashioned by the same potter(s), as, in shape, they are not significantly different.218 Also the white herons below the handles of their skyphoi are nearly identical, although the Painter of Rodin 1000 also adopted a dolphin as handle ornament,219 as commonly seen on other skyphoi, none of which, however, is by the Theseus Painter. On the other hand, their styles and choice of subjects stand rather apart. Nevertheless, both painters have at least one theme for skyphoi in common: Theseus fighting Skiron (Cat. nos. 29-30, pl. 13 c, e and, Painter of Rodin 1000, Cat. no. N44). But in contrast to the Theseus Painter, the Painter of Rodin 1000 seems to have had a preference for Perseus and the Gorgons (Cat. nos. N39-41).220

The painting style of the Painter of Rodin 1000 is much rougher than that of the Theseus Painter, and his drawing capabilities are much more limited. Facial and anatomical incising, for example, is often almost absent. The details of heads are marked with a few lines or strokes, legs generally show no incising; the folds of clothing are indicated very carelessly, with only a few curving lines. The similarities are obvious enough to place the Painter of Rodin 1000 near the Theseus Painter.

Miscellaneous skyphoi near the Theseus Painter

Although the term 'near' is a rather vague indicator of a connection between one artisan and another, it remains a useful means of underscoring fundamental similarities in styles, shapes and subjects. As discussed above, similarities exist in all three categories between the Theseus Painter, Painter of Rodin 1000 and Painter of Philadelphia 5481.

In addition, several other skyphoi have features of style, shape, theme or all three combined in common with the Theseus Painter's skyphoi, although the correspondences are less clearly defined. They cannot be attributed to individual hands. It may well be that a relatively large group of artisans was linked in one way or another to the Heron workshop.

Thematically, Bologna 130 (Cat. no. N46) shows a direct, undeniable tie to the Theseus Painter. It illustrates a procession with Dionysos in a ship-cart, a theme which is, as far as vase-paintings go, otherwise known only from two skyphoi by the Theseus Painter.221 In shape, it is identical to the concave-footed skyphoi by that painter (type 2, fig. 73). However, the style of the figurework, both the painting and the incising, differs noticeably from that of the Theseus Painter and is more reminiscent of work of the Painter of Rodin 1000.

More similar in style to the Theseus Painter are Acropolis 1314 and Athens, NM 13907 (Cat. nos. N47-48). The former has been reduced to fragments, which makes it impossible to distinguish details of the original shape; the latter has the well-known torus-shaped foot, but seen in combination with a concave curve in the lower bowl. Their subjects also associate them with the Theseus Painter: Acropolis 1314 has Theseus in front of the labyrinth, recalling Acropolis 1280 by the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. 76, pl. 32 a-b); and Athens, NM 13907 has, on one side, Herakles reclining with a warrior and, on the other, a satyr. The Heraklean theme reminds one of the reclining Herakles of several of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi (Cat. nos. 24-28, 75,pls. 11-12, 31 c-e, 33 c), although the drawing is very dissimilar.

St. Petersburg B 404 is somewhat peculiar (Cat. no. N49). Its style and shape are completely unlike those of skyphoi by the Theseus Painter. The figures, while being carefully drawn, show a peculiar,

---

218 Type 1' feet definitely seen in Rodin 1000, once Hamburg, private coll., Rodin 552 (Cat. nos. N39-40, N44).
219 Once Hamburg, private coll. (Cat. no. N48).
220 Only on the kyathos Malibu 86.AE.146 by the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. 192, pl. 58).
221 Additionally the subject is also featured on an Italian lead sheet, and possibly also on a black-figure fragment of unknown shape and painter's hand (see below, iconography).
uncommon kind of incising. On the other hand, the subject and composition are very reminiscent of the Theseus Painter: on each side, Theseus fighting Prokrustes, which the Theseus Painter depicted more than once (Cat. nos. 29-30, 136, pls. 13, 43 a-b), but which is otherwise very rare in Attic black-figure, hence the supposed link to the Theseus Painter.

Four skyphoi in Budapest, Germany, Boston (99.525) and Copenhagen (834; Cat. nos. N50-53) have their rare subjects in common with the Theseus Painter: satyr chorus, komos, oil/winepress and Herakles leading a monster. Stylistically, they are not especially close to each other. On the other hand, compositional similarities and shared decorative elements suggest they may have been made in rather close proximity to each other.

The style of Cambridge GR 180-1910, with a hunting scene (Cat. no. N54), bears some resemblance to that of the Theseus Painter. The same can be said of the skyphoi in the Guarini and the Casuccini collections as well as Reading 26.xii.10 (Cat. nos. N55-57), which also share similarities in shape.

Finally, many skyphos fragments are, or might be, near the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. N58-64). I have not seen the one in Tel Aviv (Cat. no. N77) which, according to Beazley, is near the Theseus Painter.

Erroneously attributed skyphoi

Many vases, skyphoi among others, have been attributed to the Theseus Painter since his initial identification by Haspel in 1936. The majority of them has been attributed by both Haspel and Beazley, but several have subsequently been assigned by a variety of scholars. The precise criteria for some of the later attributions are not always clear, however. In some instances they seem to centre solely on the shape (especially skyphoi), superficial stylistic similarities or even only iconographical connections.

Therefore many of the later attributions can be considered dubious, if not incorrect.

At first glance it can be seen that several skyphoi or fragments have definitely been mistakenly given to the Theseus Painter: the fragments Harvard, Fogg Art Museum 1995.18.31, Athens, North Slope A-P 1549 and 2069, and a fragment from Elea (Cat. nos. N90, 92-93). The fragment Bucharest V 8455 (Cat. no. N91), once attributed to the Theseus Painter himself, is nearer to the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe.

Other skyphos fragments, in the Cahn collection, pose problems. They show scenes of a prothesis and a fountain house. Attributed by Beazley to the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. N79-85), they form, instead, a distinct, autonomous group for the following reasons. The ivy ornament of the rim, with atypically large and carefully painted leaves, is without parallel in the work of the Theseus Painter. The subjects also seem unusual for him, and, of them, only the fountain house is again met on another skyphos, which is unattributed (Athens, NM 12531). Furthermore the style, with its elaborate incising of hair and garment folds and the different rendering of facial features, is very uncharacteristic of the Theseus Painter; contrast especially the male faces of Basle, Cahn collection HC 954 and HC 955 (Cat. nos. N83-84), and the very differently rendered mourners on loutrophoroi by the Theseus Painter.

All these elements give the Basle fragments a much more old-fashioned look. One might consider them the earliest known work of the Theseus Painter, which possibly explains their rather stiff figurework and incising. On the other hand, it can rightly be objected that stylistically they cannot easily be associated with the Krokotos Group, which seems odd if we bear in mind that the Theseus Painter most

222 Compare Basle Market (Cat. no. 37, pl. 15 c-d), and see Szilágyi, Satyrchor.

223 Comparable to Acropolis 1306 and Monopoli private (Cat. nos. 15-16, pl. 7 a and c).

224 Tarquinia 637 was also placed by Beazley near the Theseus Painter and called a skyphos. However, it is definitely a fragmentary amphora and stylistically not very close to the Theseus Painter (ABV 521, "by the Theseus Painter or near him").

225 See Table 15.

226 See, for example, the skyphos Bologna 130 (Cat. no. N46) with Dionysos in a ship-cart, attributed in ABL 253,15 to a painter near the Theseus Painter, but by several scholars, for instance, Van Straten, Hiera Kala, 198, no. V 24, to the painter himself. Such attributions seem to be solely based on the theme which is identical to that of Acropolis 1281 and London B 79 (Cat. nos. 2 and 8, pls. 2a and 4 a), both by the Theseus Painter himself.


228 Malagardis, Deux temps; CVA Athens 4, pl. 28.

229 Compare esp. the heads of male mourners on loutrophoroi by the Theseus Painter (pl. 59).
probably stems from that group, with which, as explained above, he has doubtless much in common. In fact, the style of the Basle fragments differs too much from that of the Theseus Painter as we know it to be early work of his. In short, the Basle fragments cannot convincingly be assigned to the Theseus Painter or to a painter in his immediate vicinity.

Similar doubts concern a large skyphos in a German private collection, which G. Güntner attributed to the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. N88). However, it is not stylistically similar to the painter and the decoration is quite odd: large, carefully painted ivy leaves on the rim (very similar to the Basle fragments) and only a single line along the upper and lower edges of the figure frieze, which is made narrow by a broad black band below. In addition, the execution of the tongues is not repeated on the Theseus Painter's skyphoi: they are enclosed by lines, rounded at the top. And the painter's oeuvre supplies no parallel to the subject of the quadriga race and the handle ornaments of hydriae and, especially, palmettes. Lastly, the shape, proportions and dimensions are not in harmony with the Krokotos Group and White Heron Group. To a lesser degree, the characteristics of the skyphos in the German collection, as sketched above, also apply to two other skyphoi given to the Theseus Painter: Zimmermann collection and once in the market (Cat. nos. N86-87). In my opinion, these skyphoi are not by the Theseus Painter and may even issue from an entirely different workshop. Nor are Basle HC 335 and 339 by him (Cat. nos. N89-89bis), as their drawing is not paralleled in his work.

5. Concluding remarks

For more than one reason the skyphoi can be considered the Theseus Painter's leading shape, in the first place because of their sheer number as compared to that of the other vase types he decorated. Further, they seem to mark the very beginning of his career. Third, his chief stylistic traits can be most clearly discerned on them.

As discussed above, the Theseus Painter most probably began working as a painter of skyphoi in the Krokotos Group and the White Heron Group. He was possibly a pupil of the Krokotos Painter or one of his colleagues, which seems to be implied by skyphoi like Syracuse 26857 and Winchester (Cat. Nos. 1 and 4, pl. 1) whose painting is rather close to the Krokotos Group (use of added yellow, kraters under the handles, etc.). In my view, the Theseus Painter can be reckoned among the painters of Ure's Sub-krokotos Group, the full heirs of the Krokotos Group itself. He can therefore be regarded as a colleague of the Herm Painter, Hydra Painter and Painter of Philadelphia 5481, the last of whom stands closest to him. Of the later painters of the White Heron Group, the Painter of Rodin 1000 is worth singling out, not because of the quality of his work, but because he is the only named painter of that group and because of the links between his skyphoi and the Theseus Painter's regarding shape, themes, stylistic elements and the form of the white herons.

It is hard to say whether the Theseus Painter potted any of his skyphoi. In any event, it is quite certain that they were fashioned by at least two potters, possibly more, and that the same potters also supplied the Painter of Philadelphia 5481 and the Painter of Rodin 1000. That the Theseus Painter also worked as potter is, in my estimation, highly doubtful.

The link between the Krokotos Group, White Heron Group and other manufacturers of Heron Class skyphoi, like the CHC Group, is not especially clear. The Painter of the Nicosia Olpe seems to be the first to have adorned type B skyphoi, although stylistically he shows more affinities with type A skyphoi than with the Krokotos Group. The connection between the painters of type B skyphoi and the CHC Group, which was the other major producer of concave-rimmed skyphoi, is equally puzzling. In style, secondary decoration and possibly in shape, these skyphoi seem not to be related. On the other hand, the Theseus Painter is known to have decorated at least one 'narrow band' skyphos, which is the trademark of the CHC Group.

231 The Painter of the Nicosia Olpe has many more type A skyphoi (examples of both type A1, with convex rim, and A2, with concave rim) than type B skyphoi (two known specimens only).
Another enigmatic point is the small number of Heron Class skyphoi by painters other than the Theseus Painter, as compared to his very numerous specimens. Perhaps this difference is due simply to the chance of survival or discovery, or perhaps much pottery by painters of Heron Class skyphoi has not yet been recognised.