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IV. OTHER SHAPES

1. Pelikai

Shape

Only eight pelikai of standard type are attributed to the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. 150-157, pls. 47-49). They can be divided into two groups: large and small. Apart from their dimensions, the small and large pelikai are further distinguished by aspects of shape like types of feet and rims as well as by their chronology. Stilistically, the Theseus Painter’s large pelikai are clearly earlier than the small ones.

The heights of the Theseus Painter’s three large pelikai (Cat. nos. 150-52, pls. 47-48 a-b, fig. 61) range from 33.4 to 37.8 cm. Each has a torus mouth and a torus foot. R.M. Becker assigned the specimens in Malibu and Columbia (Cat. nos. 150-51, pl. 47) to the workshop of the Nikoxenos Painter on the basis of their strong resemblance in shape to the latter’s large pelikai; 287 which applies equally to those of the Eucharides Painter, for which see below. It is also notable that the shape and general decoration of the Theseus Painter’s large pelike in San Antonio (Cat. no. 152, pl. 48 a-b), which was unknown to Becker, are very similar to that of his large pelike in Malibu and Columbia. 288 Becker further suggested that the Theseus Painter and the Nikoxenos Painter were closely linked, as they evidently decorated pelikai, which were fashioned in the same workshop. 289 This link seems to be evident from the pottery, but the decoration of the Theseus Painter and that of the Nikoxenos Painter are not closely connected. Some minor similarities exist between him and the Eucharides Painter only, as explained below.

However, the most evident correspondences between the Theseus Painter and both the Nikoxenos Painter and the Eucharides Painter lie in the potterwork of the pelikai they decorated. The Theseus painter’s pelike in Columbia (Cat. no. 151, pl. 47 c-d), for instance, is nearly identical in shape and very close in dimensions to Louvre F 376 by the Nikoxenos Painter. 290 The Malibu pelike (Cat. no. 150, pl. 47 a-b) has a slightly different foot which is more similar to the feet of Louvre Cp 10785 291 and Kassel T 675, 292 both of which Becker placed, by shape, in the "Umkreis der Nikoxenos-Werkstatt", although the painters of these two pelikai are not necessarily related to the Nikoxenos Painter. Beazley attributed the Kassel pelike, for instance, to the Leagros Group. In addition, compare the shape of fig. 61 (Theseus Painter) and fig. 79 (Nikoxenos Painter). In shape, each of the other two large pelikai of the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. 150, 152, pls. 47 a-b, 48 a-b) is slightly broader and plumper than the Columbia pelike.

Thus, it remains very difficult to establish the character of the supposed relation between the Theseus Painter and the Nikoxenos workshop. A significant stylistic relation, as seen in the case of the Krokotos Group and the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi or the Athena Painter and his lekythoi, seems not to exist; and except for the kalpis London B 346 (Cat. no. 159, pl. 50 a, below), no other type of vase decorated by the Theseus Painter finds a counterpart in the output of Nikoxenos workshop. It would therefore seem that although he decorated pelikai which were actually potted in the Nikoxenos workshop, he was less narrowly connected with its artisans than with those of the Krokotos Group and the Athena Painter.

287 Becker, Peliken, 8-9, catalogue 11, nos. 31-32.

288 The San Antonio pelike was not published when Becker, Peliken, appeared (see ibid., 105, n. 43).

289 Becker, Peliken, 9. The Nikoxenos Painter and the Eucharides Painter are known to have worked in both black-figure and red-figure. Beazley was in some doubt whether the Eucharides Painter was either a pupil of or a late phase of the Nikoxenos Painter, although he kept on treating them as separate individuals. For the black-figure vases of the Nikoxenos Painter and the Eucharides Painter see ABV 392-98; Para 172-74; Beazley Addenda 103-104.

290 Becker, Peliken, no. 20; ABV 393,16. Also comparable in shape is Oxford G 247, Becker, Peliken, no. 24; ABV 396,21; Para 173; Beazley Addenda 104, Eucharides Painter.

291 Becker, Peliken, no. 34a, "Umkreis der Nikoxenos-Werkstatt", a red-figure pelike not attributed to a particular painter.

292 Becker, Peliken, no. 44, "Umkreis der Nikoxenos-Werkstatt"; ABV 376,223m; Para 176; Beazley Addenda 100, Leagros Group.
In comparison to the larger pelikai the Theseus Painter's five small pelikai (Cat. nos. 153-57, pls. 48 c-d-49, fig. 62) differ not only in their dimensions (height ranging from 17.2 to 19.1 cm.) but also in the shape of their rims and feet.293 The foot has a rather straight, vertical side,294 the rim resembles a pointy torus with a sloping top.295 All the small pelikai of the Theseus Painter show slight differences in the details of their rims and feet.

Becker placed the Theseus Painter's small pelikai in an independent class: "Klasse der kleinformatigen Theseus-maler Peliken."296 According to her, they were then the only known small-size Attic black-figure pelikai.297 However, Von Bothmer mentioned at least one other small pelike which has comparable dimensions and the same kind of panel decoration.298 It has been neither attributed to a particular painter nor noted by Beazley.

Pelikai of smallish size are indeed very rare. Even the rather clumsy pelike associated with the Red-line Painter are considerably larger than the Theseus Painter's small pelikai.299 Pelikai of such small size become more frequent only in the later red-figure period.300

The execution and quality of the potterwork of the Theseus Painter's small pelikai is quite inferior to that of the large ones. In comparison, their handles, rims and feet are basically crude, simple forms without any refinement. Viewed in combination with the later style of figure painting, this suggests that they must date from later in the painter's career. Becker argues that the small scale and the 'inferior' workmanship of the Theseus Painter's small pelikai are indications that they must originate in a separate (but unidentified) workshop which produced small shapes like the skyphoi and lekythoi which the Theseus Painter decorated.291 However, as treated above, many of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi are relatively large and their decoration is better and earlier than that of his small pelikai. Furthermore, the his skyphoi and lekythoi, unlike his pelikai, can be associated with distinct artisans and workshops: Krokotos Group, Athena Painter, Edinburgh Painter.

According to Becker,302 the pelike Cab. des Médailles 250 (Cat. no. 156, pl. 49 e-f) stands apart from the Theseus Painter's four other small pelikai. Minor differences are seen in the shape of the rim, which is flatter, and the foot, which is more complex and ridged. On the other hand, its style and secondary decoration are similar to those of the other small pelikai.

Painting and drawing

Each panel of the Theseus Painter's large pelikai has a border of quite carefully rendered pendent lotuses at the top and simple, single lines on the sides and at the bottom (Pls. 47, 48 a-b).303 Other decorative elements like palmettes under the handles, as found on the Nikoxenos Painter's pelikai, are not included. The Theseus Painter's basic kind of ornamentation is common to many other black-figure pelikai.304 Pelikai decorated in the same manner are placed in the Leagros Group and, especially, by or near the

---

293 Compare the drawings of Columbia and the two small pelikai Louvre F 391 and Munich 1678, in Becker, Peliken, pl. 38 c, and pl. 9 a, d.
294 Becker describes it as a "Mischung aus Torus und Echinus", Peliken, 24.
295 Becker, Peliken, 24, "Schräg aufsteigende Lippe mit sanft gewölfter Oberseite."
296 Becker, Peliken, 24-25, cat. 27-28, nos. 78-82. Also Dresden 218, either the Theseus Painter or the Athena Painter.
297 Except for a miniature pelike from the Kerameikos, which is even smaller: 12.15 cm high; Becker, Peliken, cat. no. 68.
299 See Becker, Peliken, cat. nos. 59-77. Whereas the small pelikai by the Theseus Painter all measure less than 20.0 cm in height, the average for pelikai from the Red-line Painter's workshop is much more than 20.0 cm.
300 See, for example, the small pelikai by the Geras Painter, Becker, Peliken, cat. nos. 176-204. But apart from their dimensions they are not comparable to the Theseus Painter's small pelikai.
301 Becker, Peliken, 25.
302 Becker, Peliken, 24-25.
303 See also Bothmer, Pelikai, 42-43, nos. 13-23.
304 See the preceding note.
Acheloos Painter.\textsuperscript{305} One of the Nikoxenos Painter's pelikai has the same kind of simplified secondary decoration.\textsuperscript{306}

On the other hand, the secondary decoration of the small pelikai is different: each has a double row of carelessly placed dots at the top and on the sides of the picture panel. This further confirms what is suggested by the potterwork: the large and small pelikai form two separate groups, even though they were decorated by the same painter. Von Bothmer has compiled a short list of pelikai with the same type of panel ornamentation as the Theseus Painter's small ones: in fact, most of them are by the painter himself.\textsuperscript{307}

As seen in the shape and ornamentation, the large and small pelikai attributed to the Theseus Painter can also be distinguished by style. The large pelikai basically conform with the style and chronological phase of the painter's skyphoi; compare for example the style and, especially, the incising of the auto-playing satyrs and goats on the skyphos which was once in the Basle market (Cat. no. 37, pl. 15 c-d) with those on both sides of the Malibu pelike (Cat. no. 150, pl. 47 a-b). The Theseus Painter employed comparatively much colour on the large pelikai (especially the one in San Antonio, pl. 48 a-b). The Columbia pelike, on the other hand, is rather carelessly incised.

In the view of T.H. Price, the Columbia pelike is of "inferior quality [...] and probably painted by a pupil of the painter of a pelike in Chicago."\textsuperscript{308} The painter of this Chicago pelike was identified by Beazley as the Eucharides Painter, who, as known, is narrowly related to the Nikoxenos Painter.\textsuperscript{309} The notion that the painter of the Columbia pelike – the Theseus Painter – must therefore be considered a pupil of the Eucharides Painter is neither accepted nor rejected by Becker. However, no other observer, including Beazley, has suggested a possible connection between the Eucharides Painter and the Theseus Painter. In my opinion, the possibility seems indeed far-fetched if we consider the above-mentioned indications that the Theseus Painter stems from the Krokothos Group and was later connected to the Edinburgh Painter and the Athena Painter.

On the other hand, some similarities - generally minor - are seen in the work of the Theseus Painter and the Eucharides Painter.\textsuperscript{310} In part, they concern style, as the Eucharides Painter sometimes has a somewhat curly way of incising, which in instances can be reminiscent of the Theseus Painter. But they are mainly found in their treatment and arrangement of subjects.\textsuperscript{311} The stylistic resemblances between the Nikoxenos Painter and the Theseus Painter are even weaker.

In contrast, the style of the Theseus Painter's small pelikai can only be characterised as very clumsy and late. Much of his typically flowing incising is absent. Nevertheless, details are still recognisably by his hand, although they have been rendered much more carelessly than in his earlier work; for example, see the incisions of the chests, bellies, legs and knees of the naked youths in Munich 1678, (Cat. no. 154, pl. 49 a-b), and compare the incisions of the donkeys in Cab des Médailles. 250, (Cat. no. 156, pl. 49 e-

\textsuperscript{305} London 1865.11-18.40 (Bothmer, Pelikai, no. 13, ABV 384,20, Beazley Addenda 4 101); Cambridge 57.1937 (Bothmer, Pelikai, no. 14, ABV 386,11, Beazley Addenda 4 102); Delphi 236 (Bothmer, Pelikai, no. 18, ABV 388); Amsterdam (forthcoming CVA, near or recalling the Acheloos Painter).

\textsuperscript{306} Louvre F 376 (Bothmer, Pelikai, no. 21; ABV 393).

\textsuperscript{307} Bothmer, Pelikai, 43, nos. 24-28.

\textsuperscript{308} Price, Pelike, 432.

\textsuperscript{309} Chicago University; ABV 396,23; Beazley Addenda 4 104.

\textsuperscript{310} Compare in particular the Columbia pelike (Cat. no. 151, pl. 47 c-d).

\textsuperscript{311} Both painters are fond of goats, which are rather characteristic of each painter. Both of them also like to portray Apollo with female companions and processions like komoi and thiasoi; compare also Hermes with maenads and goats in St. Petersburg 1517 by the Eucharides Painter (Para 174,33\textsuperscript{309}, Beazley Addenda 4 104). One particular and otherwise unparalleled subject might appear on two vases by the Eucharides Painter and the Theseus Painter. The Eucharides Painter's pelike Oxford G 247 (563) (ABV 396,21; Para 173; Beazley Addenda 4 104) shows, on one side, a satyr on a rock, a goat, another standing satyr and a figure in front, identified as Hermes. The seated satyr holds an object which has been variously identified: according to T.H. Price, a musical instrument, according to Beazley, a box and 'abacus', for which see JHS 28 (1908) 314-15; CVA Oxford 2, pl. 8.7-8; Price, Pelike, 432. The satyr holding an object, however, is very similar to the one on the Theseus Painter's lekythos in a German private coll. (Cat. no. 133, pl. 41 d-e) who has a writing-pad in his lap, holds a styluslike object, and is surrounded by goats and another satyr who Beazley thought was 'counting the flock'. Possibly both vases depict the same or similar themes, thus hinting at a possible relation between the two painters. The connection between these vases was previously noted by C. Blümel in the initial publication of the German lekythos, in Antike Kunstwerke (Berlin 1953), 16-17. Price also noted the similarities between the subjects of both vases but did not let this influence her interpretation (Price, Pelike, 432, n. 12).
f) with those of the skyphos Mississippi 1977.3.69 (Cat. no. 7, pl. 3 c-e). There is very little colour on the small pelikai.

Unpublished or not seen by the author
Louvre F 391 (Cat. no. 157) has not been properly published. In Becker's drawing, however, it can be seen that Louvre F 391 is shaped similarly to the Theseus Painter's other small pelikai, which led her to assign it without hesitation to her group of "kleinformatigen Theseus-maler Peliken", which would confirm Beazley’s initial attribution.

One of the very rare black-figure neck-pelikai has been attributed to the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. 158). Unfortunately it must yet be published. A neck-pelike has a distinctly off-set neck, like a neck-amphora, but with the body's largest diameter below the halfway point. Von Bothmer has listed only six neck-pelikai in black-figure, among which the one attributed by Beazley to the Theseus Painter. Becker mentions no additional black-figure examples, while noting a few which are red-figure or black-glaze.

Related pelikai and erroneously attributed pelikai
None of the painters associated with the Theseus Painter, whether they specialised in skyphoi, like the Krokotos Group, or in lekythoi, like the Athena Painter, are known to have decorated pelikai. Beazley mentioned one unpublished pelike which he considered by either the Theseus Painter or the Athena Painter. It is apparently shaped like the Theseus Painter's small pelikai, as Becker incorporated it in her group of "kleiformatigen Theseus-maler Peliken." Without proper publication, however, it cannot of course be established whether this pelike was indeed decorated by either the Theseus Painter or the Athena Painter.

A pelike once in the market (Cat. no. N96) has been assigned to the Theseus Painter. Although the shape and dimensions are roughly comparable to those of his larger pelikai, the style is not his. As the published photograph is very poor, it is impossible to see whether this pelike was decorated by a painter near the Theseus Painter or perhaps by the painter himself.

2. Kalpides

Shape
Only four kalpides have been given to the Theseus Painter. As regards his pelikai, his kalpides can be divided into two categories: large and small. In contrast to the large pelikai, however, the two large kalpides, London B 346 and Madrid 10930 (Cat. nos. 159-60, pl. 50), have only their dimensions in common - 37.5 and 38.0

312 A rather dark photograph can be seen in the Beazley Archive Pottery Database, vase no. 351535.
313 Becker, Peliken, 92, nn. 309-10, states that no photograph could be found in the Beazley archive.
315 Becker, Peliken, 87-88, nos. 318-30. According to Becker, the earliest neck-pelikai are found in the circle of the Pioneers (Becker, Peliken, nos. 318-19). The (published) black-figure neck-pelikai are chronologically not far away from the Theseus Painter. In style, New York 07.86.72 is also rather close to the Theseus Painter (Bothmer, Pelikai, no. 5, pl. 22; Becker, Peliken, no. 320). The shape of the Theseus Painter’s neck-pelike (echinus mouth, as mentioned in, Select Exhibition of Sir John and Lady Beazley's Gifts to the Ashmolean Museum 1912-1966, Oxford 1967, 102, under no. 379) might be similar to that of Würzburg 233 (Bothmer, Pelikai, no. 6; Becker, Peliken, no. 329; E. Langlotz, Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg Griechische Vasen, Munich 1932, pl. 61).
316 Dresden 218: Fara 260; Becker, Peliken, cat. no. 76.
cm high, respectively - whereas their shape, decoration and even drawing style diverge quite a bit. The dimensions of the Madrid kalpis are not certain, as it is heavily restored. However, the scale of the body and foot definitely indicate that it must originally have been of similar or equal height.

The London kalpis is skilfully potted, with a high torus mouth, concave on top, heavy torus foot, and rather sharply angled curve from shoulder to body. According to Haspels, it is comparable to the kalpides Athens, NM 1037 by the Nikoxenos Painter and Würzburg 325 near the Eucharides Painter, both of which, like the Theseus Painter’s large pelikai and the London kalpis, might be connected to the workshop of the Nikoxenos and Eucharides Painters.\(^{318}\) Haspels further observed that the kalpis Athens, NM 1037 is stylistically connected to "the more careless work of the Athena Painter."\(^ {319}\) A kalpis assigned to the Eucharides Painter himself, Vatican 427, supplies further confirmation of a possible relation.\(^{320}\) But as in the case of his pelikai the exact nature of the relation between the Theseus Painter's London kalpis and the Nikoxenos-Eucharides workshop remains unclear: nevertheless, the London kalpis strongly indicates that some kind of tie must have existed.

The Madrid kalpis is stylistically much later than the one in London.\(^ {321}\) Because of heavy restoration, nothing much can be said about the original shape, possibly even the present height is not correct. The rim and neck, which unfortunately do not belong to the kalpis, may have been joined to it in the last nineteenth century and may even derive from a red-figure example.\(^ {322}\) The foot, which might be part of the original kalpis, differs very much from that of the one in London. In short, although both kalpides were definitely decorated by the Theseus Painter, they stand quite far apart from one another because of the differences in their potterwork, secondary decoration, style and chronology.

In contrast, the small kalpides in Utrecht and Uppsala (Cat. nos. 161-62, pl. 51, figs. 63-64) have much more in common with another. Unlike the London kalpis, they are rather crudely potted (and decorated). Their dimensions and shape differ somewhat.\(^ {323}\) The Uppsala kalpis has a torus-like rim with an additional ridge on the inner edge, the foot is an echinus. In the Utrecht kalpis both the rim and foot are torus-shaped. Although not entirely comparable in shape, the Theseus Painter's small kalpides seem to bear resemblances to the kalpides decorated by the Painter of Vatican G. 49, one of the artisans who was associated with the Athena Painter's workshop.\(^ {324}\) Also somewhat similar are the kalpides by the Painter of the Half-palmettes.\(^ {325}\)

Painting and drawing

The painting and drawing of the London kalpis (Cat. no. 159, pl. 50 a) is generally careful, with pendent lotuses on the top of the panel and a net-pattern on the sides. This ornamental scheme is very common in the work of the Nikoxenos Painter and the Eucharides Painter, appearing on most of their kalpides.\(^ {326}\)

The figure style of the London kalpis greatly resembles the general style of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi. It shows his typically flowing incising. The garment folds of the three females surrounding Apollo are quite neatly drawn. And also the drawing of the deer is carefully rendered. Although the shape and secondary decoration find parallels in the Nikoxenos workshop, as remarked, the style of painting and drawing seems to have little or nothing in common with either the Nikoxenos Painter or the Eucharides Painter. On the other hand, Würzburg 325, which is near the Eucharides Painter,\(^ {327}\) is rather close in subject matter and composition to the Theseus Painter’s London kalpis.

318 Athens 1037 (ABV 393,18, Nikoxenos Painter, found in the Marathon tumulus, ABL 145). Würzburg 325 (ABV 398,5; Beazley Addenda* 104, near the Eucharides Painter).
319 ABL 145.
320 ABV 397,31; Beazley Addenda* 104.
321 According to Haspels, it is very late (ABL 146).
322 Earlier suspected by Beazley and confirmed to me in a letter from P. Cabrera, National Archaeological Museum, Madrid.
324 Compare, for example, ABV 536,42-43 and Para 268,44-47.
325 ABV 573; Para 287; Beazley Addenda* 137.
326 ABV 393,17-20, 393,1-2, 393,397,30-35, 398,5; Para 172, 174; Beazley Addenda* 103, 104.
327 ABV 398,5.
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The Madrid kalpis (Cat. no. 160, pl. 50 b) was manufactured much later. Stylistically it is comparable to the lekythos Berlin 2005 (Cat. no. 145, pl. 46 e), which also shows what Haspels called "exaggerated crinkliness" of the garment folds. Furthermore, it has the distinction of being the only known white-ground kalpis by the Theseus Painter.

The panel of the Madrid kalpis has carelessly painted net-bands on the sides. Very remarkable are the ovolos around the rim and the band of red-figure florals at the base of the neck. Beazley remarked in a review of the Madrid CVA featuring the kalpis that the qualification 'restored' is too mild a description for the condition of this vase, probably implying that the restored and/or alien parts outnumber the original ones.\(^{328}\)

In contrast to the Theseus Painter's large kalpides, the two small ones are closer to one another. Each has a simple meander above the figured panel (in Uppsala, on the neck, to the right; in Utrecht, on the shoulder, to the left).\(^{329}\) Further, the figure decoration is comparatively more sober, as also applies to the small pelikai.

The style of the Utrecht and Uppsala kalpides is quite careless, even in comparison to the Madrid kalpis. It resembles that of the Theseus Painter's small pelikai and some of his lekythoi, all of which can be designated as late or even very late.

Erroneously attributed kalpis

A kalpis in the German market has recently been attributed to the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. N97). Its shape is indeed rather similar to the Theseus Painter's London kalpis. Stylistically, however, it is more similar to the Eucharides Painter, to whom I am more inclined to attribute it.

3. Olpai

Shape

The two olpai attributed to the Theseus Painter are Athens, NM 13262 and Berlin 3230 (Cat. nos. 163-64, pls. 52 a-b). The one in Athens shows an unbroken curve from the rim to the footless base. The handle is no higher than the rim. Beazley classed the Athens olpe among several 'red bodied olpai', which exhibit no apparent connection in style or workshop. In shape, however, the Athens olpe is more or less comparable to the olpai Rhodes 1350\(^{330}\) and Agora P 2700,\(^{331}\) the latter of which is fragmentary. Like the Athens olpe by the Theseus Painter, they are flat-bottomed. On the other hand, the style of painting and drawing of neither of them is particularly close to the Theseus Painter, and both of them seem to predate Athens, NM 13262.

The olpe Berlin 3230 has an ogival rim and an echinus foot. According to A.J. Clark, the form of its ogival rim is special, comparable to that of olpai in the Leagros Group and by the Painter of Vatican G. 49.\(^{332}\) Overall, however, the Berlin olpe has more in common with the olpai of the Painter of Vatican G. 49; for the shape, compare it for example to Berlin 1919 and Amsterdam 3417 by that painter,\(^ {333}\) each of which has the lipped rim and torus foot of the Berlin olpe. The correspondence is not too surprising, as both the Theseus Painter and the Painter of Vatican G. 49 are linked to the Athena Painter's workshop.

\(^{328}\) J.D. Beazley, 'Review of CVA Madrid', JHS 51 (1931) 121.

\(^{329}\) The Uppsala kalpis is the smallest of the two, its shoulder is also much more rounded. Melldahl and Flemberg compare it to a kalpis by the Painter of the Half-palmettes: London B 349, Melldahl and Flemberg, 63-64, fig. 10.

\(^{330}\) ABV 450,1, "lower part of the vase reserved, no distinct foot, small lip"; Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, no. 382, 215.

\(^{331}\) ABV 450,2; 451,11; Agora XXIII, no. 682.

\(^{332}\) Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, 346.

\(^{333}\) Berlin 1919 (ABV 536,36; CVA 7, pl. 38,1-2; Amsterdam 3417, ABV 536,39, forthcoming CVA Amsterdam).
Painting and drawing

The figure style of the small olpe Athens, NM 13262 (Cat. no. 163, pl. 52 a) resembles that of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi. It has the same curly, flowing incisions; compare for instance the naked males of his komos and ephedrismos skyphoi (Cat. nos. 54-63, pls. 25-27) The stance of the komast on the Athens olpe is very close to that of the komast to the left of handle B/A of the skyphos Agora P 1544 (Cat. no. 45, pl. 20 b) and even more, though in mirror image, to the partial komast on side B of the cup-skyphos Agora P 1383 (Cat. no. 177, pl. 56 d-g).

The olpe Berlin 3230 (Cat. no. 164) shows a rather common decorative scheme above the figure panel: ivy on the rim, net and meander below, dot-bands on the sides. This kind of neck ornamentation is very common, for example, in the work of the Painter of the Half-palmettes. In contrast, Athens, NM 13262 is undecorated apart from a single figure on the otherwise completely red-ground body. The painting of the Berlin olpe is much cruder than that of the Athens olpe and more like that of the Theseus Painter's late lekythoi and small pelikai. Therefore, it was doubtless made late in the painter's career.

Erroneously attributed olpai

In my opinion, nothing in the style of painting and drawing of the three olpai assigned to the Theseus Painter by C. Fournier-Christol (Cat. nos. N99-101) suggests a relation to the Theseus Painter. Nor do they seem to be linked to him in any other way. On the other hand, all three were indeed decorated by a single painter.

4. Oinochoai

Shape

The Theseus Painter's oinochoai vary considerably in shape and class. Louvre F 342 (Cat. no. 165, pl. 52 c-d) is Beazley's type II and has been assigned by him to the Class of Cambridge 162. Four of the other five oinochoai of this class are by painters of the Leagros Group (including the Acheloois Painter); one "recalls late Psiax." Clark remarks that Louvre F 342 differs slightly from the core group of the class and might even issue from another workshop. In shape, it rather resembles Bologna Pu 203 by the Edinburgh Painter, who is also related to the Leagros Group. It has a similarly squat body and flattish, ridged, trefoil rim. Therefore, while Louvre F 342 may stand apart from the rest of the Class of Cambridge 162, it still might have a Leagran connection.

The oinochoe London B 513 (Cat. no. 166, pl. 53 a-c, fig. 66) is, according to Clark, also "comparable to the Class of Cambridge 162." However, details of the shape differ from those of the Theseus Painter's Louvre oinochoe: the rim has the form of a high, smoothly curving trefoil; the echinus foot, in comparison to that of the Louvre oinochoe, is broader and less ring-like; and the section of the
handle is concave, whereas that of the Louvre oinochoe is more or less cylindrical. Nevertheless, the Theseus Painter's London oinochoe also seems associated with the Leagros Group.

Whereas the decoration of the next two oinochoai is by the Theseus Painter, the potterwork is linked to the Athena Painter's workshop. Adolphseck (Cat. no. 169, pl. 54 c-d) is a standard type of the Athena Painter's workshop (Beazley's shape I, group IV or V, class C). The oinochoe once in Brussels, Theodor collection (Cat. no. 168, pl. 54 a), while also found in the Athena Painter's workshop, is shape II and belongs to the Class of London B 630. In shape, however, both oinochoai are otherwise very close with regard to their handles, rims and bodies.

Petit Palais 313 (Cat. no. 167, pl. 53 d-e) is a white-ground 'flat-mouthed' oinochoe which has also been assigned to the Class of London B 630. However, it stands apart from the core group of the Class of London B 630 because of its circular mouth and has therefore been placed in a subgroup showing a range of divergences. Petit Palais 313 further differs from the core group because of its highly curving handle and broad, bulging body. As seen above, the Class of London B 630 is associated with the oinochoai of the Athena Painter's workshop.

The unpublished oinochoe once in the New York market (Cat. no. 170) has been attributed by Clark to the Theseus Painter. Apparently it is comparable, in shape, to the many oinochoai of the Keyside Class. But as I have been unable to see it I cannot make further comment.

Painting and drawing

The decoration of the Theseus Painter's oinochoai can be divided into two categories: elaborate, with much added ornament, or sober and white-ground. The first comprises the very neatly decorated oinochoai Louvre F 342 and London B 513 (Cat. nos. 165-66, pls. 52 c-d, 53 a-c): on the sides of the figure panel, rows of carefully rendered pendent ivy-leaves divided by a line, and, on the shoulder, enclosed alternate red and black tongues.

Whereas the white-ground oinochoai Petit Palais 313, once Brussels and once Adolphseck 13 (Cat. nos. 167-69, pls. 53 d-e, 54) are more sparsely decorated, with less added colour. Each has a simple row of black tongues on the shoulder and a black lower body, in the manner of oinochoai from the Athena Painter's workshop. Petit Palais 313 is also provided with an ivy branch on each side of the body.

The oinochoe once in Brussels, described by P. Heesen as very close to the Theseus Painter, is in fact attributable to the painter himself; compare for example the warrior on the lekythos Bonn 307 (Cat. no. 143, pl. 46 a-b), the anatomical incisions of the Herakles in the tondo of the cup Taranto IG 6515 and, especially, the armed dancers of the oinochoe once in Adolphseck (Cat. no. 169, pl. 54 b-c); further see also the subject of Bonn 307 and San Antonio 86.134.157 (Cat. nos. 143 and 152, pls. 46 a-b, 48 a-b).

The drawing of the Louvre and London oinochoai stylistically resembles that of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi; compare for instance the naked body of Polyphemos on the Louvre oinochoe with the naked youths of ephedrismos and komos skyphoi. In addition, Odysseus and his companions, with their petasos-like caps, are similar to the Theseus Painter's many depictions of Hermes on skyphoi. Note also the satyr with frontal face in London 513 and such satyrs in Lecce 560 and Basle, Cahn HC 1405 (Cat. nos. 38-39, pl. 16 b-d).

The style of the Theseus Painter's remaining oinochoai is less careful and accords more with his lekythoi and other later work, which is not at all remarkable because these oinochoai are linked with the Athena Painter's workshop, just as are most of his lekythoi; compare for example the manner in which the kneecaps are incised on many of the Theseus Painter's lekythoi (as not seen on his skyphoi) and on the oinochoai in the Petit Palais and once in Brussels and Adolphseck. Another characteristic of both his lekythoi and other later work is the quite stiff, rudimentary drawing of faces and bodies.

340 ABV 526-32; Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, no. 1671.
341 Heesen, Theodor, 70-72, no. 9. For the class see ABV 525-26; Para 263; Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, 840-42, nos. 1690-99.
342 Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, no. 1699.
343 ABV 525-26.
344 Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, no. 1103.
Related oinochoai and erroneously attributed oinochoai

As we have seen, most of the Theseus Painter's oinochoai are connected to the workshop of the Athena Painter in regard to shape and, to a lesser degree, style. Thus, as in the case of the lekythoi, they confirm that the potterwork of vases by the Theseus Painter closely associates him with the Athena Painter's workshop. Haspels was the first to attribute quite a few oinochoai to the Athena Painter \(^{345}\) and an even larger number to his workshop. Beazley reorganised her list and reattributed many of the oinochoai which she had initially assigned to the Athena Painter to other workshop painters. \(^{346}\) He also furnished some of them with names: Painter of Sèvres 100, \(^{347}\) Painter of Vatican G. 49 \(^{348}\) and Painter of Rhodes 13472. \(^{349}\) Two of the latter's oinochoai belong to the Athena Painter's workshop. \(^{350}\) Beazley also identified different classes of oinochoai in the Athena Painter's workshop \(^{351}\) and the Athena Painter himself adorned a few of the same varieties as the Theseus Painter: a single oinochoe of the Class of London B 630, \(^{352}\) several oinochoai of classes IV and V.

One oinochoe placed by Beazley near the Athena Painter (Cat. no. N21) \(^{353}\) is, in my opinion, very close to the Theseus Painter. It is shape IV and depicts a gigantomachy with Hermes. While deviating in some details, it definitely shows important stylistic elements of the Theseus Painter. It remains uncertain, however, whether the oinochoe is by the painter himself or only near him.

A white-ground oinochoe with athletes has been designated as "probably by the Theseus Painter", although the style, especially the incising, is not similar to his. Therefore the oinochoe is definitely not by him. \(^{354}\)

5. Cups and cup-skyphoi

Shape

Six cups and one cup-skyphos are given to the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. 171-177, pls. 55-56, figs. 68-70). None of them, it seems, finds links to painters and groups which are generally associated with him, like the Krokotos Group, Sub-krokotos Group or the Athena Painter. The cups can be subdivided. J.R. Guy places Malibu 96.AE.96 (Cat. no. 171, pl. 55 a-c) near the Theseus Painter, but it can certainly be assigned to the painter himself (compare for example the figure on side B with the komast of Agora P 1383, Cat. no. 177, pl. 56 d-g, mentioned below). It is almost identical in shape, dimensions and ornamentation to two cups attributed by Beazley to the Painter of Nicosia C 975. \(^{355}\) The specific shape of the Malibu 96.AE.96 and those of the Painter of Nicosia C 975 are rather atypical. The contour of the body and stem form an uninterrupted curve, like type B cups. The foot is a rather uncommon, high torus

---

\(^{345}\) ABL 259-60.

\(^{346}\) ABV 524.

\(^{347}\) ABV 533-34.

\(^{348}\) ABV 534-36.

\(^{349}\) ABV 449.

\(^{350}\) Lece 563 (Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, no. 1798, ABV 449,6, 527,15; Para 195, 264) and Cab. des Médailles 271 (Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, no. 1797, ABV 449,9).

\(^{351}\) I, Sèvres Class; II, Class of London B 630; III, R.S. Class; IV-VII. All these oinochoai are Beazley's shapes I and II, but with variations in details of the shape. See ABV 524-33; also Clark, Olpai and Oinochoai, 842-46, nos. 1700-27 (Sèvres Class), 840-42, nos. 1690-99 (Class of London B 630), 832-36, nos. 1649-67 (R.S. Class).

\(^{352}\) London B 516 (ABV 525,5).

\(^{353}\) Harvard 1927.154 (ABV 528,47). It is compared by Beazley to Harvard 1927.143 and Cab. des Médailles 274 (ABV 529,52, 69).

\(^{354}\) Attributed in the sales catalogue Hesperia Art Bull. 45/6, no. A 17.

\(^{355}\) Para 99-100; Beazley Addenda*56.
disk, comparable to the feet of many of the Theseus Painter’s skyphoi. Stem and foot are divided by a moulding.

In shape, the feet of the cups by the Painter of Nicosia C 975 differ only slightly from the Malibu cup. The dimensions of Nicosia C 975 are not reported in its publication.356 The cup once in the Basle market is 8.5 high and 20.0 cm in diameter,357 which is nearly identical to the dimensions of Malibu 96.AE.96 (8.5 and 19.7 cm respectively). Based on this correspondence, as well as on that of the secondary decoration of the three cups, it seems highly probable that the Theseus Painter and the Painter of Nicosia C 975 decorated cups simultaneously in the same workshop or were at least related in some fashion.

Although identical in decoration to the Malibu 96.AE.96 and the cups of the Painter of Nicosia C 975, the fragmentary cup-skyphos Agora P 1383 (Cat. no. 177, pl. 56 d-g, figs. 38a, 69), has a very differently shaped bowl. The vase is heavily restored: the handles and foot are missing, and the foot’s restoration as a ring-foot is solely based on the foot of an unpublished bowl found in the same shaft as Agora 1383.358 Therefore the original overall shape remains uncertain. In any event, the bowl is broad and shallow, with a very wide (0.8 cm), extremely angular rim, which is very different from the shape of any kind of standard cup or cup-skyphos.

The fragmentary cup Agora P 1384 (Cat. no. 172, pl. 56 h, figs. 38b, 70), was assigned by Beazley to near the Painter of Nicosia C 975 because of its ornamentation, and then by M.B. Moore to the painter himself.359 As far as discernible, however (only a small part of the figurework is preserved), the figurework is stylistically more consistent with the Theseus Painter’s (curving line with a curl at the end for the thigh and knee, curving stroke for the calf) and is probably by his hand. In contrast to its secondary decoration, Agora P 1384 differs in shape from the cups of the Painter of Nicosia C 975 and Malibu 96.AE.96 as well as the Agora cup-skyphos P 1383.360 In comparison to the them, Agora P 1384 has a much smaller (restored) diameter of only about 14.0 cm instead of the approximately 20.0 cm of Malibu 96.AE.96 and the market cup by the Painter of Nicosia C 975 or the 24.5 cm of Agora P 1383. In general shape they also differ. Whereas Malibu 96.AE.96 and the cups of the Painter of Nicosia C 975 show a continuously convex curve from the rim to stem, Agora P 1384 is marked by a slight concave curve just below the rim. Agora P 1383, on the other hand, has a deep groove below the rim, similar to skyphoi of Ure’s type A1. In conclusion, Malibu 96.AE.96 and Agora 1383 and 1384 have identical secondary ornamentation and are stylistically consistent, so that all three can be given to the Theseus Painter. Between them, on the other hand, the potterwork differs too much to be the handiwork of a single potter.

One known cup of the Theseus Painter, in Winchester College Museum, is a type B eye-cup (Cat. no. 176, pl. 56 c). In shape and ornamentation it strongly contrasts with the eye-cups of the Krokotos Group, which are the standard type A for black-figure.361

Finally, the three type C cups of the Theseus Painter. Two of them – London B 446 and Taranto 6515 (Cat. nos. 173-74, pls. 55 d-f, 56 a, fig. 68) – are so-called Preys cups, initially listed and named by H. Bloesch.362 The shape is large, with an off-set lip and a continuously flowing curve from stem to torus foot, sometimes with a ring in between or a ridge on top of the foot. Most of the Preys cups noted by

---

356 E. Gjerstad, Greek Geometric and Archaic Pottery found in Cyprus (Stockholm and Lund 1977) pl. 49.3-94.
357 MuM Sonderliste R, Attische schwarzfigurige Vasen, Nov. 1964, no. 69, where it is said that Beazley assigned another cup, Oxford 1960.1219, to the Painter of Nicosia C 975. However, the latter is a standard type A cup without any of the secondary decoration which is specific to the other three cups; nor is its decoration stylistically very close to them. The only remarkable feature common to the Oxford cup and the other three is the red-ground lower section, without a ground line.
358 Vanderpool, Shaft, 308.
359 Para 100, "somewhat similar cup [...] Two black lines instead of the top-band"; Agora XXIII, no. 1825, pl. 117 "by the Painter of Nicosia C 975?"
360 The ornamentation is probably the reason for Moore’s attribution to the Painter of Nicosia C 975.
361 See Bloesch, FAS. True type B cups are relatively rare in black-figure and occur in substantial amounts only among late black-figure groups like the Haimon Group (ABV 561-62; Para 284; Beazley Addenda1 136) and as the late cups of the Campana Painter (ABV 653-54; Para 315; Beazley Addenda1 146). Type A, Bloesch, FAS, ix: “Die Schalen des Typus A, der ausserlich durch einen zwischen Fuss und Schalenbecken gestecket Fusswulst kenntlich ist [...]” Type B, Bloesch, FAS, ix: “Chachrylion darf als der Erfinder der Schale des Typus B gelten die an Stelle des Fusswulstes zwischen Fuss und Schalenbecken ein kleiner Wulst, in der Regel aber nur einen schmalen Absatz auf der Fusssplatte aufweisen.”
Bloesch were later placed by Beazley in the Haimon Group.\textsuperscript{363} Bloesch listed the Taranto cup, Beazley later identified the London cup as a Preys cup.\textsuperscript{364}

In shape, several cups of the Haimon Group are near to the Theseus Painter's Preys cups; see especially the profile drawing of Heidelberg S 99 in that group (fig. 80).\textsuperscript{365} Even closer is a cup near the Theseus Painter in Paris.\textsuperscript{366} It seems that none of the other Preys cups is as large as the Theseus Painter's London example, whose diameter of 39.0 cm exceeds the Preys cup average. Lastly, the third type C cup of the Theseus Painter, Salerno 158a (Cat. no. 175, pl. 56 b), is not a Preys cup.

Painting and drawing
Malibu 96.AE.96 and Agora P 1383 and P 1384 (Cat. nos. 171, 177 and 172, pls. 55 a-c, 56 d-g) share their secondary decoration with the cups of the Painter of Nicosia C 975: a spiralling volute on the side of each handle, the curving stem of which is attached, below the handle, to a pomegranate joined to a pendent leaf suspended from a straight line (fig. 38).\textsuperscript{367} Insofar as known, this kind of handle motif is typical of cups by the Theseus Painter and the Painter of Nicosia C 975 only. Further, the Theseus Painter's cup Malibu 96.AE.96 and both cups of the Painter of Nicosia C 975 show a broad band around the exterior rim, as does also the Agora cup-skyphos P 1383 which, in addition, has a line below, like Agora P 1384, whose rim band is narrower. In their ornamentation, the cups of the Painter of Nicosia C 975 are also comparable to the cups of the Group of Camiros Palmettes\textsuperscript{368} and several special cups by the Amasis Painter.\textsuperscript{369} Unfortunately, few vases of the Painter of Nicosia C 975 are known and, apart from the Theseus Painter's cup Malibu 96.AE.96, they find no comparisons in the work of another painter or workshop. As far as style is concerned, the two painters seem hardly similar to each other. Whereas the Theseus Painter is associated with a multitude of painters and groups as sketched above, Beazley rather indiscriminately placed the Painter of Nicosia C 975 among makers of proto-A and type A cups who are not apparently related by either style or workshop.\textsuperscript{370}

The Winchester College cup (Cat. no. 176, pl. 56 c) is a standard eye-cup, with white male eyes. Below the handle-zone there is a zigzag line bordered by lines, a feature which is without parallel in the Theseus Painter's work.\textsuperscript{371} It features the standard motif of ivy-branches below the handles.

The Theseus Painter's two Preys cups, London B 446 and Taranto 6515 (Cat. nos. 173-74, pls. 55 d-f, 56 a), have a black rim, figure frieze in the handle-zone, reserved band around the lower body and inner tondo. Their handle ornament—a large ivy-leaf—is not met on any of the painter's other vases. It can be seen, however, on the Preys cups in the Haimon group. This correspondence, together with the particular shape of these Preys cups, as pointed out above, strengthens the tie between the Preys cups by the Theseus Painter on the one hand and the Haimon Preys cups on the other. Incidentally, the style of the Haimon Preys cups is relatively careful work, which might mean that they belong to a comparatively early stage in the group's development. Alternatively, they may simply have been adorned by the group's better painters. The Theseus Painter's type C cup in Salerno (Cat. no. 175, pl. 56 b) also has a figured tondo, but the exterior is entirely black-glazed.

The figure drawing of Malibu 96.AE.96 and that of the cup-skyphos Agora P 1383 are particularly

\textsuperscript{363} Bloesch, FAS, nos. 1, 3, 5, 9; ABV 560, nos. 514, 516, 519, 522.
\textsuperscript{364} Taranto 6515 (Bloesch, FAS, 29, no. 7); London B 446 (ABV 520,32). Of the other four cups in Bloesch's list, nos. 2, 6 and 8 are unknown. No. 4, Florence 3894, is, in fact, a band cup near the Lysippides Painter (ABV 265,2).
\textsuperscript{365} Heidelberg S 99 (Bloesch, FAS, no. 3; ABV 560,516; CVA 4, pl. 158.1-4, fig. 16 on p. 36). It has a dino under each handle instead of a large ivy leaf as on London B 446 by the Theseus Painter.
\textsuperscript{366} Louvre CA 1924 (Cat. no. N76).
\textsuperscript{367} \textit{Para} 99-100, Nicosia C 975 and once Basle market: "same principle as in the Amasis cups (ABV) 157.87-9"; \textit{Beazley Addenda} 56; ABV 215; \textit{Para} 104. Possibly they are connected to the Group of Camiros Palmettes?
\textsuperscript{368} ABV 215; \textit{Para} 104; Freyer-Schauenburg, \textit{Camiros}, 154, n. 16-17; H.A.G. Brijder, in \textit{Greek Vases in San Antonio}, 102, no. 49.
\textsuperscript{369} ABV 157.87-89; \textit{Para} 65; Freyer-Schauenburg, \textit{Camiros}, 154, n. 16; Bothmer, \textit{Amasis}, 228, no. 63; \textit{Beazley Addenda} 46.
\textsuperscript{370} ABV and \textit{Para}, chapter 13.
\textsuperscript{371} Compare, for example, the black zigzag on a type B cup of the Campana Painter, Louvre F 412 (CVA 10, pl. 119,4; ABV 654,12).
close to one another: they display rather much detail in the incising, comparable to the Theseus Painter's middle-phase skyphoi. London B 446 and Salerno 158a, on the other hand, show what might be called a more mannered style, with less detail and more flowing lines, comparable to the Theseus Painter's latest skyphoi and earliest lekythoi. The drawing of Taranto 6515 is more angular and resembles that of the Theseus Painter's late oinochoai and lekythoi (see especially the anatomy of the dancers of the oinochoai once in Brussels, Cat. no. 169, pl. 54 a). The drawing of the Winchester cup is also rather sketchy.

Of Agora P 1384, too little remains to discern any indications of style in relation to development. But the identicalness of its subsidiary decoration to that of Malibu 96.AE.96 and Agora P 1383 lets us assume that it was stylistically comparable.

Related cups and erroneously attributed cups
Contrary to what one might expect, the Theseus Painter's known cups noticeably differ in shape from those of the Krokiotos Group and seem, in this respect, not to be connected to them at all. This is rather strange, as the Krokiotos cups seem to be just as important as the skyphoi and are, moreover, at an aesthetically higher level. One explanation may lie in the chronology. The cups of the Krokiotos Group seem generally earlier than its skyphoi. Possibly the Theseus Painter's career began when the painters of the Krokiotos Group had mostly switched to skyphoi and possibly stopped embellishing cups.

Whereas all the recognised Krokiotos Group cups are type A, the Theseus Painter evidently decorated many of the types of cups known in the late sixth and early fifth centuries B.C. except for precisely type A. Therefore it can be concluded that he turned out only skyphoi when he was attached to the Krokiotos Group, and that he may have switched to cups when he was not very involved with the Krokiotos/Heron Groups anymore.

In style, a type B cup similar in shape to the Theseus Painter's Winchester cup, bears some resemblance to his work (Cat. no. N22). The themes are Herakles reclining and satyrs and, in the tondo, women at a kline. The cup reminds one of the cup London B 446 by the Theseus Painter himself, although it was probably not painted by him.

A cup in Copenhagen (Chr VIII 457) was initially attributed by Haspels to the Theseus Painter, but was soon afterwards identified by Ure, on the basis of reasonable arguments and, according to her, a retribution by Beazley, as belonging to her group of 'Krokiotos Cups'. The reassessment seems correct.

A cup-skyphos of Ure's class K was given by P. Hatzidakis to the Theseus Painter (Cat. no. N102), who also supposes that the White Heron Group produced a series of such cup-skyphoi. As far as Ure's class K cup-skyphos is concerned, the attribution seems unacceptable.

6. Loutrophoroi

Loutrophoroi form a relatively large portion of the Theseus Painter's extant work (Cat. nos. 178-91, pl. 57). Unfortunately, none of them is intact. The best preserved is complete from the shoulder down (Athens 1957 Aa 193, Cat. no. 182, pl. 57 c-d). In another instance a relatively complete part of the neck remains (Cat. no. 178, pl. 57 a-b). All the other specimens are even more fragmentary. Because of their

372 See, i.a., the very large skyphoi of the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. 70-76, pls. 29 e-32 b, 33 c, fig.).
373 ABL 252,77.
374 Ure, Krokiotos, 96. See also Bell, Krokiotos Cups, 7, attributed to the Mask and Siren Painter.
375 Ure, Sixth and Fifth, 68-69, low cup-like bowl, black off-set rim, narrow figure frieze on the body, made narrow by a black band, without ivy or tongues. See also ABV 568-70, 575, 579-81, all related to or in the Haimon Group.
376 Hatzidakis, Cup-skyphoi, no. 420.
377 Hatzidakis, Cup-skyphoi, nos. 406-420.
partial state and very sporadic publication (the published photographs are limited to Cat. nos. 178-182, pl. 57, and Cat. no. 183, which is published in the Beazley Archive Database), nothing can be said about their shape, dimensions, related potters and painters, etc.

Several of the Theseus Painter's loutrophoros fragments depict what looks like processions; others show standard scenes of mourners. The meagre secondary ornamentation that remains, is largely standardised: simple meanders on the rim, net-bands, dots, rays and the like.

Three loutrophoroi have recently been given to the Theseus Painter and one placed near him. Of the three attributions, however, only Athens 1957 Aa 193 (Cat. no. 182, pl. 57 c-d) can rightly be assigned to the painter himself. Stylistically, the other two loutrophoroi and the one said to be near him bear hardly any resemblance to his work (Cat. nos. N103-105). Therefore its is safest to exclude them. An Oxford fragment initially attributed to the Theseus Painter has recently been correctly reattributed by H. Mommsen to her Painter of the Berlin Loutrophoroi.\(^{378}\)

7. Kyathoi

Shape

Several of the Theseus Painter's nine kyathoi (Cat. nos. 192-200, pls. 58-62, figs. 71-72) were attributed by Beazley or Eisman. Omaha 1936.484 (Cat. no. 197, pl. 62) was initially placed near the Theseus Painter but is now assigned by me to the painter himself; note especially the anatomical incising of the central amphora-carrying satyr in pl. 62 c.

In shape, all the kyathoi are comparable: ogive body and inverted ogive foot with a double-ridged plate.\(^{379}\) According to Clark, the two kyathoi in Malibu (86.AE.146-47) must have been fashioned by one potter (Cat. nos. 192-93, pls. 58-59, figs. 71-72).\(^{380}\) Very probably, the Theseus Painter's other kyathoi were also made by this potter. It should be pointed out that the foot of the Omaha kyathos is more echinus- than ogive-shaped, though it has the usual double-ridged plate; but since this kyathos is much restored, the foot may have originally of the other kyathoi. Eisman, however, connects it by shape to the Caylus Painter.\(^{381}\)

In addition, Eisman assigns the Theseus Painter's kyathoi to the Nikosthenic workshop, and to a potter who also worked for the Group of Vatican G. 57 and "possibly for Psiax.\(^{382}\) However, V. Tosto doubts very much that any kyathos without a Nikosthenic signature is from or closely connected to Nikosthenes' workshop, as maintained by Eisman.\(^ {383}\) It would then seem that the workshop affiliations and dating which Eisman proposes for the Theseus Painter's kyathoi cannot be automatically accepted. In shape, moreover, the Theseus Painter's kyathoi are not particularly suggestive of any of those mentioned by Eisman. Especially the feet of the kyathoi in the Group of Vatican G. 57 differ from those of the Theseus Painter's kyathoi. And even though some of them show a double-ridged foot-plate,\(^ {384}\) none has the elegant ogive upper part

---

\(^{378}\) Oxford 1936.609, (CVA 3, pl. 25.8; H. Mommsen, Exekias I, Die Grabstafeln, Kerameus vol. 11, Mainz 1997, 70, no.73, initially attributed to the Theseus Painter by J. Boardman. See also forthcoming, CVA Amsterdam).

\(^{379}\) The kyathos once in the Basle market (Cat. no. 198, pl. 61 c-d) is only known to me from a very poor illustration in Eisman, Kyathos, pl. 33, and only slightly better photographs in the Beazley Archive Pottery Database. As far as visible, this kyathos appears not to have an ogive foot, but is straight with a double-ridged footplate.

\(^{380}\) CVA Malibu 2, 30, 84-85, figs. 18-19.

\(^{381}\) CVA Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, 17; Eisman, Kyathos, 484-85.

\(^{382}\) Eisman, Kyathos, 447-48. See, i.a., Compiegne 1074 (Eisman, Kyathos, no. 71; ABV 612,22); London B 463 (Eisman, Kyathos, no. 77; ABV 613,44); St. Petersburg 4472 (Eisman, Kyathos, no. 106; Gorbunova, Ermitaze, 198-99, no. 174); Munich 1986 (Eisman, Kyathos, no. 113, Para 305,4(3)) in the Group of Vatican G. 57; Milan 482 (Eisman, Kyathos, no. 21; ABV 293,15) Psiax.

\(^{383}\) Tosto, Nikosthenes, 100-102.

\(^{384}\) See, for example, once Hillborough Heast (ABV 611,18, Para 305; Beazley Addenda 143); Naples Stg 134 (ABV 613,5; once Basle market, Para 305,7).
which characterises the feet of the Theseus Painter's kyathoi. Only the foot of the Omaha kyathos possibly seems to find parallels in the Group of Vatican G. 57 but, as said, it has been heavily restored.

Eisman proposes that the kyathoi are the Theseus Painter's earliest work,\(^\text{385}\) as based on his chronological sequence of changes in the shape of Attic kyathoi. However, this seems to be contradicted by the style of painting and drawing which looks rather late.\(^\text{386}\) Clark seems to agree with Eisman only in part and dates the Malibu kyathoi to 510-500 and about 500 B.C. (Cat. nos. 192-93, pls. 58-59, figs. 71-72).\(^\text{387}\) For a discussion of the dating of the Theseus Painter's kyathoi, see below, painting and drawing, and development and chronology.

Painting and drawing
According to Eisman, the Theseus Painter, together with the Caylus Painter and the Philon Painter, was one of the first to abandon the common decorative scheme of the eye-kyathos and to surround the bowl with figurework.\(^\text{388}\) He even suggests that possibly the Theseus Painter actually introduced this innovation because he was the most accomplished of the three painters.\(^\text{389}\) Although possibly true, the suggestion is hard to substantiate.

At least two of the Theseus Painter's kyathoi are white-ground: Malibu 86.AE.146 and Erlangen I 522 (Cat. nos. 192 and 195, pls. 58 and 61a).\(^\text{390}\) The Omaha kyathos (Cat. no. 197, pl. 62) is distinguished from the others by a band of alternately black and reserved squares around the rim.\(^\text{391}\) No other special kind of ornament embellishes the kyathoi.

The style of drawing on the Theseus Painter's kyathoi is very basic, comparable to that of the small pelikai and kalpides as well as the alabastra. Anatomical details and folds are indicated by only a few sketchily incised lines. Yet there are some fundamental traits of incising, painting and composition which definitely point to Theseus Painter; compare for example his typical amphora-bearers on skyphoi (Cat. nos. 45-46, 50, pls. 20 a, 21 a, d) with those in Malibu 86.AE.147, Philadelphia, Erlangen and Heidelberg (Cat. nos. 194-96, pls. 59-60, 61 a-b).

8. Alabastra

Five alabastra can definitely be attributed to the Theseus Painter (Cat. nos. 201-205, pls. 63-64, 65 a-c) and one is possibly by or near him (Cat. no. N23). The Havana alabaston stands somewhat apart (Cat. no. 201, pl. 63). It is much more elaborately decorated and, unlike the others, has two protruding knobs just below the shoulder. In shape and dimensions, on the other hand, it hardly differs.

Three of the five alabastra were assigned by Beazley to the Theseus Painter. The more elaborately decorated alabaston in Havana shows, at the top, a narrow frieze of silhouette horsemen in a hunting scene and, below, a prothesis. The secondary ornaments consist of somewhat complex meanders on the

---

\(^{385}\) About 515-505 B.C., Eisman, Kyathos, 443-48.

\(^{386}\) For style see below and compare Malibu 86.AE.147, Philadelphia L 64.540, Heidelberg S 53, etc., with other work of the painter.

\(^{387}\) CVA Malibu 2, 28.

\(^{388}\) This is not surprising, as the Theseus Painter is known to have used the eye motif in only one instance: the cup Winchester, College Museum (Cat. no. 176, pl. 56 c).

\(^{389}\) Eisman, Kyathos, 442.

\(^{390}\) The Malibu kyathos was attributed initially by Von Bothmer to a painter near the Theseus Painter, and later by Eisman to the Theseus Painter himself (CVA Malibu 2, 28), with whose work it indeed has much in common and with which it shares some stylistic elements. Nevertheless, the kyathos shows peculiar traits and, furthermore, stands apart from the Theseus Painter's other kyathoi because of the careful execution of the figure scene.

\(^{391}\) CVA Omaha, 17.
neak and below the main frieze,\textsuperscript{392} tongue-band on the shoulder, and a band of squares and dots below. The other two alabastra attributed by Beazley (Cat. nos. 202, 205, pl. 64 a-b) have much simpler representations of athletes and women and far fewer secondary ornaments. The drawing style of the alabastron once in the Basle market is very crude and has very little in common with the style generally associated with Theseus Painter’s skyphoi. Its secondary decoration consists of a black neck, shoulder and base, and a simple meander to the right below the edge of the shoulder. The Philadelphia alabastron (Cat. no. 205) is nearly identical (with cock instead of column) to the one once in the Basle market (Cat. no. 202, pl. 64 a-b), but is in silhouette. It is, as far as known, the only vase assigned to the Theseus Painter that has no incision.

Two alabastra were added subsequent to Beazley. (Cat. nos. 203-204, pls. 64 c-e, 65 a-c). The style of painting and drawing is as crude as that of the Basle alabastron, attributed by Beazley, and it shows similar subjects and secondary decoration.

A few late lekythos painters also produced alabastra. Some of them are by the Edinburgh Painter and the Sappho Painter, but by far the most are by the Diosphos Painter.\textsuperscript{393} The Emporion Painter, connected to the Beldam Painter, also decorated many alabastra.\textsuperscript{394} Stylistically, they recall somewhat the clumsiness of the Theseus Painter’s alabastra. According to J. Mertens, a continuous succession of alabastron painters goes from Psiax to the Emporion Painter.\textsuperscript{395} Maybe the Theseus Painter is linked by the Beldam Painter to the Emporion Painter and therefore started to decorate alabastra late in his career.

9. Single pieces and undetermined shapes

One plate can be attributed to the Theseus Painter: Chicago 1967.115.256 (Cat. no. 206, pl. 65 d). In the plate’s publication, the tondo goat is rightly likened to goats by the Theseus Painter, although the comparison did not result in an attribution. The plate’s shape and subsidiary decoration are comparable to Callipolitis-Feytmans’ type B II,\textsuperscript{396} comprising rather simple, small plates potted and decorated in several phases between 520 and 450 B.C. Many of them have a single figure in the centre, like the Theseus Painter’s plate.

Beazley thought that two unpublished fragments of closed shapes (Cat. nos. 208-209) possibly belong to amphorai.\textsuperscript{397} But as we have no amphora by the Theseus Painter it is safer simply to consider the fragments as parts of unidentified closed shapes. Very possibly, they belong to a pelike or a kalpis, closed shapes which we know the Theseus Painter decorated. Perhaps the theme of the fragment Acropolis 843 (Cat. no. 209) - Apollo and a goddess - indicates that the vase was a kalpis because Apollo seems to be the main subject of the Theseus Painter’s large kalpides (Cat. nos. 159-160). The small fragment in the British School at Athens is even more difficult to place (Cat. no. 207, pl. 65 e).

Lastly, H.A. Cahn has assigned a white-ground krater to the Theseus Painter: (Cat. no. N98). The style seems rather uncharacteristic of the Theseus Painter, however. The collarbone and chest incisions, for example, differ completely from the Theseus Painter’s general manner. In my opinion, the krater can hardly be his work.

\textsuperscript{392} Mertens, \textit{AWG}, 98, "cyma and almost Dourian stopped meander with crosses"; similar to that below the shoulders of the lekythoi Louvre CA 1837 and Berlin 2005 (Cat. nos. 148 and 145, pls. 44 c-d, 46 c).
\textsuperscript{393} Mertens, \textit{AWG}, 95-96, nos. 4-14, mentions about half of the more than 20 pieces by this painter listed by Haspels and Beazley, in \textit{ABL} 237, \textit{ABV} 510, Para 249-50.
\textsuperscript{394} \textit{ABL} 165-69; \textit{ABV} 524-25; Para 291.
\textsuperscript{395} Mertens, \textit{AWG}, 99.
\textsuperscript{397} \textit{ABV} 519,12-13
\textsuperscript{398} Insofar as visible, as the quality of the photograph does not allow for a detailed analysis.
10. Concluding remarks

As shown, the Theseus Painter, besides the main shapes of the skyphos and the lekythos, decorated different vase-types, most of which seem to link him to various, apparently mutually unrelated workshops. In comparison to the skyphoi, the number of pelikai is relatively small. They can be divided into two groups: the large ones are stylistically associated with his skyphoi. Their shape suggests a relation to the Nikoxenos Painter and the Eucharides Painter, although the extent of the relation is not entirely clear. It seems that the Theseus Painter decorated pelikai produced by a potter who also worked for both of these painters.

His small pelikai, on the other hand, stand apart and have nothing in common with the large ones. The style is, for example, much later, and they also differ in shape. In fact, there seem to be no pelikai by other artisans which are comparable to the small ones by the Theseus Painter. This leads to the conclusion that he collaborated with a potter who fashioned a special type of pelike exclusively for him. The question of whether this potter was the Theseus Painter himself remains answerable.

Like the pelikai, the kalpides can be divided into groups as well. The rather careful style of painting and drawing of the London kalpis is comparable to that of the Theseus Painter's skyphoi. Its shape again suggests an affiliation with the workshop in which the Nikoxenos Painter and the Eucharides Painter decorated their vases.

The Madrid kalpis is very fragmentary, which makes it difficult or even impossible to say anything about its shape except that it differed from that of the London kalpis. Stylistically, it can be connected to at least one of the Theseus Painter's lekythoi by a specific feature: both display what Haspels called 'exaggerated crinkliness'.

The small kalpides, on the other hand, can be less easily placed. They are slightly comparable to the kalpides of the Painter of Vatican G. 49 and the Painter of the Half-palmettes, both linked to the Athena Painter's workshop. Whether they also issued from that workshop is uncertain, however.

In shape, the Theseus Painter's kyathoi, it seems, cannot be convincingly likened to kyathoi of any other Attic manufacturer. As in the case of the small pelikai, one might conclude that the Theseus Painter decorated kyathoi which a potter made exclusively for him, if he was not himself the potter. The style of the kyathoi suggests a very late date in his career.

The two olpai differ from each other in shape. The Athens olpe is red-bodied and footless, by which it resembles several other similar specimens, which are not assignable to one workshop. The shape of the Berlin olpe is rooted in the workshop of the Athena Painters. Whereas the Athens olpe is relatively early and stylistically similar to the Theseus Painter's skyphoi, the Berlin olpe is quite late and more in line with the style of his lekythoi.

Except for Louvre F 342 and London B 513, which seem linked to earlier producers like the Leagros Group, all the Theseus Painter's oinochoai show a relation to the Athena Painters' workshop. While differing in shape from each other, they all fit into an oinochoe subgroup of the Athena Painter's workshop. The Louvre and London oinochoai are rather carefully decorated, both the figurework and the secondary decoration. The style of the other oinochoai is more like that of the Theseus Painter's lekythoi, although their painting has sometimes been slightly less carefully executed.

There are various classes among the Theseus Painter's cups. Most interesting are the cups and the cup-skyphos which, in shape (Malibu 96.AE.96) and ornamentation (Malibu 96.AE.96, Agora P 1383, P 1384), show a relation to the Painter of Nicosia C 975, although its exact nature remains unclear, especially as the Painter of Nicosia C 975 seems stylistically to have nothing in common with the Theseus Painter. London B 446 and Taranto 6515 find comparisons among the Preyss cups of the Haimon Group. Finally, possible links to the Theseus Painter's loutrophoroi and alabastra cannot easily be established.