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INTRODUCTION

This study deals with Athenian little-master cups, a type of drinking cup which was made over a fairly long period by a large number of potters and painters in sixth century BC Athens. Whereas their production extended between c. 560 and 480 BC, they were primarily made between c. 550 and 510 BC. The present author has information about more than 5,100 cups and fragments of this type of cups. Since they are too numerous to be considered in their entirety in this study, a selection had to be made. As the signatures of potters (and painters) are particularly common on little-masters of the first generations — c. 560–55 to 535/30 BC⁴ —, the signed cups as well as the unsigned ones originating in the same workshops are pre-eminently suitable for an examination of the origins and early developments of this Athenian type of vessel.³ Moreover, they are a prime source for the evaluation of little-master cups which could belong to either type (6.5 %)³.

Approach

This study deals systematically with 689 little-master cups.¹ As stated, they include all the known signed little-master cups as well as the unsigned pieces of craftsmen identified by the signatures and their (possible) associates. The attribution of Athenian pottery to individuals or workshops remains, as always, a tricky undertaking, especially in the absence of signatures. Occasionally, we even see considerable differences on one cup.¹ It is not uncommon that, over the years, an attribution is altered or discarded. The attribution of potterwork is often even more problematical.⁵

¹ Abbreviations of the collections follow Add² as far as represented (with the exceptions of Athens, Ceramicus; Baltimore, WAG; and Rome, Vat; here, Athens, Kerameikos; Baltimore, WAM; and Vaticano, respectively).
² In the bibliographies, literature mentioned in ABV, Par², Add³ or CVA is not repeated, apart from publications which offer the best photographic documentation or give the first attribution. The abbreviations of journals, lexicons and standard reference works follow the ‘Instructions to the writers’ of the DAL, with the following adjustments: Add² and Par². For economical reasons, when a CVA-reference is given for a vase, the location is not repeated in the CVA title, e.g., Chiusi 1910 (A. Rastrelli 1981, CVA 1, pl. 25.2). The most frequently used CVA-volumes have been abbreviated (see bibliography). The catalogue numbers are in bold face.
³ The earliest preserved little-master cups with signatures are 2 (Euchoiros), 26 (and possibly 25, Sondros), 107 (Archilco), 261 (Nearchos) and 700 (Kiagros); the latest are 190 (Kaulos/Sakonides), 197 (Thras), 189–99 (Hisschyllos), 454–67 (Tleson).
⁴ Included also are cups in the ‘Manner of’ the discussed painters. For the use of this term see n. 175.
⁵ The 10 (possible) type B Gordon cups in the catalogue (22-25, 27, 34, 39, 93, 106, 131) are not included in this number: Reference date: 22 August 2009. In comparison, the Beazley Archive Pottery Database contains 2,285 of these. Floral band-cups are not included in my database because, in my opinion, they can better be regarded as a different group, nor are fragments without any decoration because they would distort the statistics too much for two main reasons: (1) it is often unclear to which type of cup they belong (lip, band, Cassel, Droop); (2) an unknown number may well be parts of cups whose figured fragments have already been counted. A study of floral band-cups has been announced by Y. Ersoy and Y. Tuna-Nürling, in C. Morgan, Attic Fıtte Pottery of the Archaic to Hellenistic Periods in Phanagoria, Leiden 2004, 205.
⁶ Amongst band-cups, 843 are so-called animal band-cups which show only non-interacting animals. At least 28 other band-cups depict non-interacting animals and mantle-figures, so to speak, quasi-animal band-cups, e.g., Adolphucci 20 (F. Brommer 1956, CVA 1, pl. 18.2, 4).
⁷ A further 49 cups in very small oeuvres and unattributed fragments with partial signatures will not be discussed extensively, but are included in the appendix to the catalogue. A fragment from Marseille on which V. Meirano recognised a partial inscription ἸΩΣΕIΟΥ (V. Meirano, Ceramiche d’importazione a Massalia, Sondros), 107 (Archilco), 261 (Nearchos) and 700 (Kiagros); the latest are 190 (Kaulos/Sakonides), 197 (Thras), 189–99 (Hisschyllos), 454–67 (Tleson).
⁸ Cfn., e.g., sides A and B of 123 (Talesides Painter, best illustrated in Heesen 1996, figs. 80, 82) or 375 (Sakonides, pl. 51b–c). Notable differences are sometimes seen in the palettes on one side of the same band-cup: Amsterdam 8670 (Brijder et al. 1996, pls. 115.9, 116), Jerusalem 91.71.309 (Muscarella White 1974, no. 7).
Chapters one to ten examine the characteristics of the little-masters according to individual painters and potters. Per chapter a single potter and painter will be discussed, or a group of potter(s) and painter(s) whose work is related and who may have worked closely together. As a result of this division in groups, the individual potters and painters can not be discussed in a strict chronological order in this book (e.g., the early potter-painter Nearchos appears in chapter ten, whereas the much later potter Kaulos appears in chapter seven). The topics are varied: shape and potterwork, decorative scheme, drawing and painting style, inscriptions, figurework and motifs, themes, composition and iconography. One goal is to recognize the relationships between the manufacturers of the cups. Although the other shapes which were made or decorated by the same potters and painters are not listed in the catalogue, they enter the discussion to give a more complete impression of the artisan and establish whether he specialized in a particular shape. An examination of the relations between the potters and painters who made little-master cups and their degree of specialization will expand our view of the workings of the pottery industry in sixth-century Athens. The manufacture of fine pottery in Athens can also be better understood by identifying the individual potters who adorned their own cups, that is, the potter-painters. Furthermore, the provenances and export patterns are taken into consideration. If available, excavation data can help date the cups. For each manufacturer, a relative chronology will be proposed, based on his work’s internal development. All this lays the groundwork for the last chapter which will compare the products of the individual potters and painters and, whenever possible, correlate them with other little-master cups listed in my database but not in the catalogue. Here, a closer examination takes place whether and how differences concerning types of cup, dimensions, inscriptions, figured scenes or decorative schemes relate to the various find contexts of the cups.

History of scholarship
The term little-master cup is a poor translation of the German ‘Kleinmeisterschale’ which was introduced by W. Klein in the late nineteenth century, who distinguished ‘Kleinmeistern’ (painters of miniature images) from ‘Grossmeistern’ (painters of larger work). The two major types of little-master cup are called lip-cup and band-cup after the German names ‘Randschale’ and ‘Bandschale’, which E. Buschor chose in the early twentieth century. They refer to the placement of the figurework, that is, either on the lip or in the handle-zone of the cup. Like Klein before him, J.C. Hoppin catalogued the then-known signed pottery of Athenian potters and painters, including little-master cups, according to the signatures. J.D. Beazley was the first to organize an overview of little-master cups by attributing some to painters and arranging cups in groups according to their decorative scheme: LO, LI, LIO and LP, that is, lip-cups decorated either outside or inside only, those decorated both inside and out, and those without figured decoration, in Beazley’s words ‘plain’. Likewise, for band-cups he used the terms...
BO, BIO, BP; the term BOB stands for band-cups with ‘a brief picture of the same kind as in the lip-cup’. In 1946, F. Villard described and dated the various classes of Athenian black-figure cups. Since then, many scholars have dealt with little-master cups, but only J.T. Haldenstein has systematically attempted to expand Beazley’s analysis. In her dissertation, Haldenstein augments Beazley’s lists, identifies new groups and artisans, and discusses shape, iconography and chronology; however, she pays little attention to the provenances and dispersion of the cups. While sometimes disagreeing with her on points of attribution and supposed links between craftsmen, the present author has made grateful use of her scholarship and often insightful observations.

Other scholars have primarily published little-master cups in the frame of collections, excavations or their specific features. Individual potters and painters have been shown only occasionally. The two Munich CVA s of 1988 and 1989 offered B. Fellmann the opportunity to consider some 170 cups together and provide a kind of more recent survey. However, the CVA organization limits the cups to those held in one institution, which in this case, for the most part, have a common provenance, Vulci. The authors of the exhibition catalogue Kunst der Schale barely widened our perspective because they largely confined themselves also to the Munich holdings. The second Amsterdam CVA, which deals exclusively with Athenian black-figure drinking cups, contains discussions of the potters and painters of cups, including little-masters, although necessarily limited by the scope of the publication. With regard to inscriptions, one specific chaîne type has been examined by R. Blatter. Otherwise, apart from being often cited in discussions of the meanings of ἐποίησεν, particularly in relation to the paired signatures with different names on two cups (109, 255) the inscriptions of little-master cups have not, until recently, received much attention. However, the different formulas for chaîne-inscriptions have now been catalogued and discussed by R. Wachter and the present author.

In addition, H.R. Immerwahr refers to many little-masters in a general study of the script on Athenian pottery, and in an article listing and analyzing the nonsense inscriptions on Athenian pottery. Lastly, special aspects of little-master cups found in central Italy, like their disproportionate amount of signatures, will be the subject of a forthcoming publication.

Types of little-master cup

Shape

As noted above, the term little-master refers to the miniature figures, the two main types being lip-cup and band-cup. Two related types are the Cassel cup and the Droop cup. The Gordion cup is sometimes considered an early kind of little-master, although a distinction must be made between Gordion cups

---

14 Beazley 1932, 387; see also below, p. 15.
15 Haldenstein 1982. In 1971, M.F. Jongkees-Vos (1971, 13) announced her intention ‘to devote a detailed publication to this class of Attic vases in the near future’, which has not appeared.
17 E.g., Gjerstad 1977, 44-48 (Cyprus), Caro 1987 (Pompeii), Athenian Agora XXIII, 300-6, Tuna-Nörling 1995, 10-16, 60-65 (Old Smyrna and Bayrakli), Iacobuzzi 2004, 56-58, 72-157 (Gravisca).
21 Brijder et al. 1996.
24 Immerwahr 1990; idem 2006.
25 Hessen forthcoming.
of type A and type B. As the type A Gordion is differently shaped, it must be treated as an entirely different class. It is hardly contested that the type A Gordion of the so-called Ergotimos-Kleitias Group, made between c. 565 and 560 BC, is derived from East Greek models. Whereas the type B Gordion has nearly the same shape as the early Athenian lip-cup, but retains the older decorative scheme of type A.

The standard lip-cup (Fig. 1) is characterized by a rather straight or slightly concave lip which is set off distinctly from the lower bowl; inside, there is a sharp jog. The foot consists of a high stem and wide base; underneath, the standing surface meets the inner wall of the stem at a sharp angle, forming, as it were, a heel. In contrast, the feet of quite a few early lip-cups are more trumpet-shaped; the contour of the inside curves parallel to the outside (e.g., figs. 3-4 in chapter one). Apart from specific differences that distinguish little-masters made in various workshops, the earliest lip-cups, as a rule, have sturdy, rather wide stems, whereas the stems of later ones are generally more slender. Often the stem, so to speak, sinks into the base, forming a concave contour which dips slightly below the level of the base’s upper edge.

In shape, the band-cup (Fig. 2) differs hardly from the lip-cup. However, the lip is not as clearly marked off and the transition to the lower bowl is more gradual. A lesser difference is the occasional fillet marking the junction of stem and bowl, although the feature is not entirely unknown on lip-cups. Generally, the potterwork of band-cups appears heavier due to thicker walls and, often, handles.
Little-master cups are rarely depicted in vase-painting. Probably the most famous example is an unattributed lip-cup in Karlsruhe illustrating a potter’s workshop, datable around 540 BC; contemporaneous with it is the depiction of a lip-cup in the right hand of a satyr on a lekythos, once in the Basel market. It is often difficult to decide whether a little-master cup is portrayed or perhaps a bronze cup or a red-figured cup, shaped like London 1920.6-13.1. Probably the latest extant picture of a little-master cup in vase-painting is found on a red-figured cup of the Euergides Painter in Athens.


Lip-cup: Karlsruhe 67/90 (C. Weiss 1990, CVA 3, pl. 24.1-3); I can not accept D. Metzler’s attribution to the Manner of Centaur Painter (CVA 3, 54). Lelythos: brochure J.-D. Cahn, TEFAF Maastricht 2005, p. 1, where attributed to ‘Wohl Taleides Maler (Umkreis des Lydos)’; the latter seems more appropriate.

H. Bloesch, Formen attischer Schalen von Exekias bis zum Ende des strengen Stils, Berlin 1940, pl. 15a.
(NM Acropolis 166), datable 510–500 BC. A painter is seen decorating a cup placed on the potter’s wheel, but as the cup is undecorated, it can not be determined which type of little-master the Euerghides Painter had in mind.34

Decorative scheme

The standard scheme of both kinds of little-master, especially the lip-cup, is marked by a modest use of decoration. Generally, the exterior decoration of the lip-cup is largely limited, on either side, to one or two figures in the centre of the lip. The band-cup, on the other hand, has frieze-like decoration in the handle-zone; the lip is black. Both types are often adorned with handle-palmettes, connected to the handles by stems. Additional common traits include black outer handles and stem as well as a black lower bowl, interrupted by a narrow, reserved band, the edge of the foot’s base is reserved. Primarily on lip-cups, the inscriptions in the handle-zone act often as essential parts of the decoration. Basically, the interiors of both kinds of cup are black, except for a reserved line at the inner rim and a reserved central tondo marked with one or two concentric circles around a dot.35 However, quite a few lip-cups show a figured medallion in the tondo, most often surrounded by a border of tongues divided by relief-lines which have, in the earlier examples, a single white dot at the outer tip of each.36 Only a few lip-cups, mostly belonging to the first generation, have figurework inside and out (L/O type).37 Band-cups with figured medallions inside are rather rare.38 Lastly, the standard outer scheme of the lip-cup has occasionally been ignored by painters: several bear figures in the handle-zone40 or a frieze of figures on the lip.41

The employment of two basic little-master schemes alongside one another and the continued manufacture of the two types of cup seem to have an aesthetic or artistic basis rather than a functional one. There is no reason to suppose that the two kinds of little-masters had different uses. Both were

34 Beazley 1944, pl. 1.3 (on the left). Other possible painted representations of little-master cups from the last quarter of the sixth century: black-figure eye-cup, London 1908.1.1-1.1 (derivative of Krokokots Group, c. 520; Smith/Praye 1926, pl. 20.2b; Jordan 1988, 79, C 113), red-figured cup, Oberlin 67.61 (Epiktetos and potter Panphatos, c. 520; WMA, Auktion 34, 6 May 1967, no. 145), and bilingual amphora, Munich 2001 (Andokides Painter, c. 520/10; B. Lullies, CVA 4, pl. 56). On images of pottery in Greek vase-painting in general see H. Gercke, Gefässdarstellungen auf griechischen Vätern, Berlin 1970, identifying as a little-master cup only the depiction on Munich 2301 (op. cit., 14, 138, no. 6). For portrayals of painted vases on Athenian pottery see M.S. Venturi, Point and Counterpoint: Painted Vases on Painted Vases, AntK 49 (2006) 29-41.

35 For little-master cups with solid black interiors, see n. 277.

36 Some lip-cups have tondo borders consisting of tongues with a dot-band around the tips and, sometimes, also the bases of the tongues, as discussed below in various chapters. For cups with ring borders see n. 275; ivy border, Munich 9412 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 6.1); ring of dancing girls around the tondo, Tarquinia RC 4194 (G. Jacopi 1956, CVA 2, pl. 21.5-6).

37 See n. 107.

38 For band-cups with interior decoration see n. 495. By exception, the tondo border of one band-cup, stylistically close to the Red-black Painter, is a lotus-palmette chain: Rome, VG s.n. (Vuit. Zittà dell’ ‘Osteria’, Scavi della ‘Hercle’, 104, no. 2, figs. 38, 45; Brüder 2000, 483, n. 132i).

39 Of the lip-cups with figured decoration in the handle-zone are known: Athens, NM Acropolis 1604+ 1605, 1606 a-b (Graef/Langlotz, 170, not ill.); Athens, Agora 3041 (Akritrítai Aíptá XXIII, no. 1687, pl. 110), Basel, market (Cahn Auktionen AG, Auktion 2, 2 September 2007, no. 329); Boston 86.588 (True 1978, pl. 109-7); Cambridge, FitzMus G 66 (W. Lamb 1930, pl. 19.4); Civitavecchia 1297 (Schaubens 1981, 336, fig. 9); Cyrene Sh.278.10 (Moore 1987, 35, no. 208, pl. 37), France, private (mentioned by Maffre, in REG 115, 2002, 245, no. 104), Freiburg, market (Pahre, Katalog 10, 1994, no. 180); twice London, market (Sotheby’s, 9 December 1993, no. 28, ivy on the lip, and Christie’s, 3 July 1996, no. 46b); London, University College N 11 (Beazley 1955a, 475, fig. 1), Munich 2139, 2168, 2170 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 22-78); Naples, Filangieri 1726 (Cano 1987, 53, figs. 3-4), New York, market (Art of the Ancient World XVIII, Royal-Athena Galleries, 2007, no. 117); New York, market (Sotheby’s, 17 December 1996, no. 51, with ivy on the lip as well); Pompeii (Caro 1986, 85-6, no. 551, pls. XXII, LXV), Rhodes 11822 (G. Jacopi 1933, CVA Rhodes 1, pl. 18.1-2), Rome, VG 79597, 79599, 79605-6, 79607 (Hannestad 1989, nos. 32-a-c, 34-41 [not recognizing they join], 40a-b, 42), Taranto 20159 and s.n. (Masiello 1997, 161, fig. 12.28; Beazley 1952, 183, not ill.).
made by the same artisans and discovered in comparable archaeological contexts. Furthermore, the lip-cup was never replaced by the band-cup, as has been sometimes incorrectly suggested. Therefore, the supposedly sloppy table manners of the ancient Athenians can hardly be an explanation for the appearance of the band-cup, as suggested by Villard, that is, the black lip has less chance of becoming soiled during banquets. The lip-cup continued to be at least as popular as the band-cup down to the 530s BC, and the later black-figure eye-cups from the 530s on have a comparably reserved surface at the outer rim. For the same reasons, Villard’s suggestion that the curvature of the band-cup’s lip is better suited to the drinker’s lips must also be dismissed.

As we shall see, the experimental development of the lip-cup shape began in Athens around 565 BC, and production was well under way after 560 BC. Amongst the latest lip-cups are those with silhouette figures, attributable possibly to the Haimon Group and datable to the first quarter of the fifth century. The production of band-cups started a little later, about 555 BC. The latest figured band-cups are those in the Haimon Group which show vines between figures in the handle-zones as well as others decorated in the silhouette style. Besides band-cups of the Haimon Group, many floral band-cups were also made in the first quarter of the fifth century. Cassel cups and Droop cups, which are not treated in this study, are here noted only in passing. The Cassel cup, which is usually small, has the same shape as a band-cup. It is named after a specimen, now lost, which was found in Samos and formerly held in Kassel. Most characteristic of the type are the row of tongues on the lip and rays on the lower bowl around the foot’s stem; the handle-zones show, as a rule, ornamental bands, but very occasionally animals or human figures. An ornamental band also encircles the bowl between the handle-zones and rays.

The Cassel cups were first classified by H.A.G. Brijder, who divided them into four groups based on the decoration. He meticulously demonstrates that the ornamental bands can be linked to those of some Siana cups, but not to Laconian cups, as is sometimes maintained. According to Brijder, Cassel cups were manufactured between c. 540 and 510 BC, for the most part between 530 and 520 BC. J. Boardman places them in “a short period within the last thirty years of the sixth century.” In the view of the present author, however, Boardman’s starting date is too late because of the proven link to Siana cups, dating between c. 565 and 540 BC. The Droop cup is named after the scholar J.P. Droop, who first considered the type in the context of a study on Laconian pottery. He regarded these Athenian cups as direct imitations of

---

42 The locations and excavation contexts where lip- and band-cups have come to light are discussed in chapter eleven.
43 Villard 1946, 167-68; Boardman 1974, 62, who seems to place the end of lip-cup production at about 530 BC, stating that “the band cup does continue after about 530, but no longer Little Master in character as we shall see.” Both statements are incorrect: for later examples, see nn. 45-47.
44 Villard 1946, 167, n. 1.
45 E.g., Athens, NM Acropolis 1588 (Graaf/Langlotz, pl. 82); Cambridge, FitzMus 99, N. 109 (W. Lamb 1936, CVII 2, pl. XXI.16); Candarli no. 19 (Tuna-Nürting 1995, 65, no. 37, pl. 28); Corinth C-62-363 (Corinth XVIII, 141, pl. 35); Nicosia C 645, C 675, C 680 (Gjerstad 1977, pl. 39.4-9).
46 Mater 12307 (Lo Porto 1995, no. 37, pl. 28), Corinth C-62-363 (Corinth XVIII, 141, pl. 35); Nicosia C 645, C 675, C 680 (Gjerstad 1977, pl. 39.4-9).
48 Brijder 1993, 142.
50 Brijder 1993, 129.
51 HS 30 (1910) 1-34, esp. 21-27.
Laconian. The Droop cup resembles band-cups, but differs from them in minor aspects. Inside the lip, which is more offset than in band-cups, the reserved line is situated lower than in little-masters, where it is directly under the edge of the rim. In addition, the high stem is reserved at the top and often grooved.

The main studies on the Droop cup were carried out by P.N. Ure, who initially adopted Droop’s assumption that the type goes back to a Laconian innovation. Based on the decoration, he classified them in basically three groups: I, upright lotus buds; II, lotus-palmettes; III, animals or human figures. In a later article, which enlarges the number of Athenian Droop cups, Ure discussed the possible links between Laconian cups and Droop cups, concluding that ‘the question of precedence as between Laconian and Attic must be left nicely balanced, but with a little more material on each scale’. In Attica, according to Ure, the ‘black cups, at least, with some Droop features went on being produced well into the fifth, the floruit of the series was from about 540-510 BC’. He argued that the production of Athenian Droop cups started shortly before 550 BC, citing Athenian Droop cups of not quite standard type unearthed from three graves at Rithsona which he dated about 550 BC or slightly earlier; the graves had earlier been dated by C.H.E. Haspels to ‘not much earlier than 540 BC.’

In a recently published article, M. Pipili draws attention to two fragmentary Laconian Droop cups from Olympia and Corinth, which can be attributed to the Naukratis Painter or his workshop and dated to the second quarter of the sixth century, the Olympia fragment more specifically around 570 BC. She further notes a Laconian cup from Tocra by the Naukratis Painter, dating about 575/70 BC, which is not a Droop cup, but which already has the grooved upper stem, which was probably not unusual in Laconian pottery of the time as indicated by the fact that many cups have painted rings on their stems which certainly suggest ridges. Moreover, Pipili notes that the successive ornamental zones on the lower part of the exterior are characteristic of most Laconian cups of the second quarter of the sixth century. Her conclusion that the Droop cup was a Laconian invention, possibly by the innovative Naukratis Painter, seems to be correct.

Another point of long-time speculation is whether the little-master cup was invented in Athens or copied from East Greek sources, as a small group of lip-cups found and made in Ionia are remarkably similar to Athenian lip-cups in shape as well as decorative scheme, with which they are generally contemporaneous. The disagreement about which cup may have been the model for the

55 Ure 1932.
56 Ure 1953, 51; the latest Droop cup from Rithsona lay in a grave dated by Ure c. 515 BC. J. Boardman (1974, 62) mentions a Droop cup with ‘Haimonian decoration of the second quarter of the fifth century’, but without any specifics this cannot be checked. F. Villard placed the floruit of Droop cups at 530-520 BC (1946, 180), which seems probably to begin too late and to end a bit too early.
57 Ure 1953, 47-48, 51, dating the graves on the basis of the development of Corinthian aryballoi, black-glazed kantharoi and what he calls ‘Boeotian Kylix ware’, which were found in large numbers, thereby rejecting C.H. E. Haspels’ later dating of the Rithsona graves, regarding Haspels’ as less reliable, he considers it likely that the Droop cup is a Laconian invention of the Naukratis Painter (Stibbe 2004, 10, 26, 53). P. Pelagatti (AAP 33/34 [1956-57] 28) leaves the question open; whereas J.D. Beazley and H.G.G. Payne (Beazley/Payne 1929, 271), E.A. Lane (BSA 34 [1933-34], 152) and E. Homann-Wedeking (Archaische Vasenornamentik, Athens 1938, 69) see no Laconian influence on the Athenian Droop cup. F. Villard (1932) even pointed to the Athenian potter Antidoros as its inventor. Ure (1932, 71) suggested earlier that ‘Antidoros and his associates (or rivals) adopted a Laconian type of kylix to capture the Dorian markets.’
58 Olympia K 2108, Corinth C-1590-93 (M. Pipili, Some Observations on the Laconian Droop cup: origin and influences, in W.G. Cavanagh, C. Gallou, M. Georgiadis eds., Šturiá a Laconía from Prehistory to Pre-Medieval, London 2009, 137-42, figs. 14.3-4). The earliest complete Laconian Droop cup (which Stibbe prefers to call a Doric cup) is Oxford 1935.192 by the Hunter Painter, dated c. 550 BC or slightly later (Stibbe 1972, 142-43, no. 235, pl. 83.3-5).
59 Tocra 943 ( Pipili, op.cit., 140, fig. 14.5).
60 For these Ionia lip-cups see Kunze 1934; Walter Karydi 1973, 22-26, 128-30 nos. 377-474, pls. 43-54; Shefton 1989; Cook/Dupont 1998, 92-94.
other continues today. Occasionally, the possible influence of Laconian on the birth of the Athenian lip-cup has been proposed, as will be explained below. Before we try to answer the basic question of the geographical source of the lip-cup and, subsequently, the band-cup, let us first consider the characteristic traits of each type and try to determine their origins individually.

**High-stemmed foot with flat, disk-like base**

In both Laconia and Attica the earliest documented cups with high-stemmed feet appeared at about the same time. The earliest Laconian example has been found in Taranto and attributed to the Naukratis Painter, dated around 570 BC. In Athenian pottery, the high-stemmed ‘merrythought’ cups seem to introduce this feature. This small class of Athenian cup is characterized by hemispherical bowl and knobbed handles. One of the earliest examples is Würzburg L 451, which was decorated by the C Painter between 570 and 565 BC. Shortly thereafter, the same painter decorated a high-stemmed cup in about 565 BC which exhibits many traits of the later, standard Athenian lip-cup.

Around the same time, the tendency towards a higher foot on Athenian cups became evident on the Gordian cups: the earliest ones, type A, manufactured between c. 565 and 560 BC still have rather low feet, whereas the foot of the type B Gordian, dating from c. 560-550 BC, is considerably higher and differs little from the lip-cup foot (e.g., fig. 15 in chapter one).}

### Notes

61 H.R.W. Smith (1926, 432-33) was convinced that the decorative scheme of Athenian little-master cups was ‘demonstrably borrowed (I venture to say) from the <black and yellow< Ionic cups’; E. Kauze (1934, 118) leaves the question open: ‘Ob die beiden verwandten Typen hochflüssiger ionischer Schalen...eines Impulses von aussen bedurften, um zu ihrer letzten Vollendung zu gelangen, bleibt vorläufig eine offene Frage’; E. Walter-Karydi (1973, 26) talks about mutual influences: ‘Überblickt man samische Schalen, so zeigt sich, dass sie im ganzen, trotz der mannigfachen Wechselbeziehungen zu Attika und Lakonien, doch ihre Eigentum behalten’; B. Fryer-Schaubenburg, on the other hand, is convinced of Athenian dominance: ‘ionischen Kleinmeisterschalen, bei deren Form und Dekorationsprinzip attische Kleinmeisterschalen deutlich Pate gestanden haben’ (in Christiansen/Melander 1988, 152); B. Shefton (1989, 64-65): ‘It seems natural enough that when Samos entered this new market, the makers should look to the most successful producers of stemmed cups at the time in the Greek world, namely Attica and Laconia... We have, however, noted that there is no slavish copying, but judicious adaptation and everywhere a strong and unmistakably east Greek component’; B. Kaeser (Viemersiel/Kaeser 1990, 56-57) differentiates between shape and decorative scheme: ‘Die attischen Kleinmeisterschalen, und zwar vor allem die Randschalen, waren nun ihrerseits vorbildlich für Werkstätten anderer Landschaften’ and ‘Da die ionische Schalen das schlichte Dekorsystem ohne Figuren seit alters kultivieren, darf man vermuten, dass sie anregend auf die attischen Kleinmeisterschalen gewirkt haben, die ja das schlichte Prinzip aufnehmen’; J. Boardman (1998, 146): ‘the shapes may have been developed in East Greece’; U. Schlötzhauer (2000, 415), talking about the Ionian lip-cups: ‘Schalen, die anders als die verwandten attischen Kleinmeisterschalen ganz in der Tradition der südionischen Keramikbemalung stehen’; Y. Tun-Nöring (2002, 164), regarding the success of Athenian little-master cups in the Ionian market: ‘Die angenommenen Vorbildfunktion ionischer Randschalen für attische Kleinmeisterschalen dürfte bei der Belebtetheit sicherlich eine Rolle gespielt haben’.  
62 Schaubenburg 1974, 211; Jackson 1976, 9. M. Robertson states that ‘the Laconian cups are of similar form and perhaps inspired the Attic potter’s’ (in Shapiro 1995, 38). Laconian influence on the Athenian lip-cup, if any, was ‘très minime’, according to F. Villard (1946, 163). In the present author’s view, the differences with Laconian cups are too significant to suggest Laconian influence.  
63 Stibbe 1972, 14-15, 20-21, Naukratis-Maler, no. 8, pl. 4.5-3.4. He cites and agrees with E. Homann-Wedeking that it is clear that the invention of the high-stemmed foot was purely Laconian, later stating (2004, 10), ‘Damit bestätigt sich die schon in LV vorgetragene Ansicht, dass der Naukratis-Maler die eigentliche Erfinder der später in ganz Griechenland populären Trinkschale auf hohem Fuss gewesen ist. In my opinion, however, simply the fact that, as yet, the earliest preserved Greek cup with high-stemmed foot is by only a narrow chronological margin Laconian is insufficient evidence for Stibbe’s preceding statement.  
64 For the class see Kraiker 1934; Agostino 1939; Callipolitis-Feytmans 1979; Ramage 1983, esp. 453-54; Malagaris 1999, 207-8; Brijder 2005, 252-53.  
65 Brijder 1983, 109, n. 2; Brijder 2005, 252-53, fig. 4a-b; Brijder proposes the date. The foot of another merrythought cup by the C Painter has not been preserved (Rhodes 15369).  
66 Oxford 1965,120; see below, ‘Earliest lip- and band-cups’  
Bowl with offset lip

The Laconian lip-cup is not a potential source for a bowl with offset lip because it diverges too markedly from the Athenian lip-cup, for instance the convex lip.

It has been noted above, however, that a small group of Ionian lip-cups are remarkably similar in shape (as well as decorative scheme) to Athenian lip-cups. E. Walter-Karydi dates the earliest one around 560 BC, which would be just slightly later than the C Painter’s experimental lip-cup which, as we shall see, can be placed at c. 565 BC.

Here, it may again be noted that the type A Gordion from the Ergotimos-Kleitias Group, referred to above, derives from East Greek cups. If so, the awareness of East Greek models on the part of at least some Athenian producers of cups in the late 560s BC had a lasting influence on the course of Athenian pottery. More specifically, the potter Ergotimos, who was the father of Euecheros who fashioned two of the earliest known standard Athenian lip-cups (1-2), would have had first-hand knowledge of East Greek pottery.

Miniature style

Corinth can be considered the birthplace of the miniature style of vase-painting. In Laconia, it appeared first at around 570 BC in the work of the Naukratis Painter. In Athens, it is attested a few years later, 570/65 BC, on the foot of the François krater painted by Kleitias, specifically the depiction of the fight of the Pygmies against the Cranes. Around 565 BC, quite a few Siana cup painters adopted the miniature style, first the Taras Painter and then, shortly afterwards, the Malibu Painter, Vintage Painter, Adelph Painter, Double-palmette Painter, Painter of the Bargon Sianas, Epignote Painter and a painter related to the Griffin-bird Painter. The miniature style was perfected by Nearchos who, at least once, portrayed many tiny figures on an aryballos, a shape which Athenian potters copied directly from Corinth, dated c. 560 BC. Around the same time, this style was adopted by lip-cup painters and, a bit later, band-cup painters.

69 See n. 60.
70 The sharply offset lip is not yet seen on this cup (Brijder 2000, 560, top figure).
71 See n. 28. Jackson 1976, 9-10, supposes East Greek influence on another, contemporaneous group of Athenian cups, the so-called ST cups. The notion is convincingly rejected in Brijder 2000, 617-19 (literature in n. 298), who shows that these cups have the Siana shape.
72 E.g., the late proto-Corinthian ‘MacMillan’ aryballos, London 1889.4-18.1, dated c. 650 BC (Boardman 2001, 33, fig. 31) or c. 640 BC (Williams 1985, 20).
73 Sobbe 2004, 152-53, pl. 3. He suggests that such cups by the Naukratis Painter may have been the models for Athenian and Ionian lip-cups. This is doubtful, however, as it is hard to believe that the abundant decoration of Laconian cups could in any way have influenced the modest scheme of the Athenian or Ionian lip-cup.
74 There is little consensus about the date of the François krater. E.g., c. 570 BC: Cohen 1991, 52; Clark 2002, 43; Woodford 2003, 44, 181, 192; Iozzo 2006, 125; J. Boardman has slightly changed his opinion over the years: ‘c. 570 could be a trifle early’ (1974, 34) or ‘about 575 BC’ (2001, 52). In addition, c. 570-560 BC, H.A. Shapiro (1989, 11) and L. Rebillard (1992, 504); B. Kreuzer generally assigns the work of Ergotimos and Kleitias to 570-560 BC (KLA I, 214, 419), while not considering individual pieces; and c. 565 BC, Isler-Kerényi (2004, 19).
75 E.g., the band-cup-like animal friezes of the Taras Painter’s early period (dated in Brijder 1983, c. 565 BC, 167, nos. 131-32, pl. 28b); further, the painter’s later cups (op. cit., nos. 181-88).
76 E.g., Brijder 1983, nos. 249-50, 255-64b, 268-69, 272, 290-91, 292-94, pls. 45b-i, 48-51, 54, 56a-c, 58-59; idem 1991b, pls. 163c, 166. Brijder 2000 is largely dedicated to somewhat later Siana cup painters working in a miniature style.
77 New York 26.49. J. Boardman (1988, 424-25) regards Nearchos’ vases as ‘close contemporaries of or little later than the François vase’, but he later (2001, 55) specifies ‘before the mid-sixth century’ (just as he dates the kantharoi of Nearchos). In addition, Isler-Kerényi 2007, 195, dates it ‘about 560 BC’, and Richter, in her first publication of the aryballos (1932, 272), ‘about 550 BC’. As we shall see in chapter ten, however, Richter’s date must be too late because the work of Nearchos after c. 555 BC is much less refined than the aryballos. Therefore c. 560 BC seems most appropriate.
78 The band-cup-like animal friezes of Siana cups by the Vintage Painter, Taranto 4988 and 4484 (Brijder 1983, nos. 131-32, pl. 28b), which Brijder assigns to the 560s, predate the earliest band-cups, whereas those, e.g., by...
Handle-palmettes

Evidently, Laconian painters were the first to adorn cups with palmettes, which they positioned horizontally against the handle, from about 575 BC on.23 In Athens, on the other hand, the horizontal handle-palmette remained a rarity between c. 565 and 550 BC and never became popular.24 Instead, Athenian painters, as early as the experimental lip-cup of the C Painter from c. 565 BC (Oxford 1965.120), ornamented cups with vertical palmettes which are linked to the handle by a stem. The motif was soon used for various shapes: a footless merrymouthed cup and a komast cup of special form, both by the Painter of Athens 533, and, for instance, Siana cups by the Red-black Painter, many of whose palmettes, however, are not completely upright, but rather oblique.25

Conceivably the palmettes imitate the ornamental handle attachments of metalware, such as those of a bronze cup of little-master shape in Amsterdam.26 The handles of metal cups were sometimes attached by means of a simple rivet. Most often, however, the handles required flattened ends to be joined to the bowl, and these functional surfaces were sometimes embellished, for instance, with a wavy contour in the shape of palmettes. As remarked by H.A.G. Brijder and C.M. Stibbe, it would be obviously impossible to determine whether the purely decorative palmettes of fictile cups could have been inspired by the functional, ornamented handle-attachments of metal cups or the other way around.27

Decorative schemes

Both little-master decorative schemes seem to be taken directly from the type A Gordion cup which, in turn, was modeled on Ionian cups.28 The black-and-reserved outer scheme of most type A Gordion cups was continued on Gordion cups of type B and band-cups, whereas the inscription in the handle-zone and the inner medallion of the type A Gordion was adopted primarily for lip-cups.29 However, the figured handle-zone of band-cups was most likely inspired by Siana cups.30 Both Sianas and Gordion cups of type A (and often also of type B) have dividing and ground lines in the handle-zone; on lip-cups only the dividing line recurs, whereas on band-cups dividing lines are very rare and ground lines usually disappear in the black of the lower body, although occasionally parts of it are visible; a completely visible ground line is extremely rare (e.g., 174, Sakonides, fig. 69e).31 The concentric circles which usually adorn the standing surfaces of Gordions and occasionally Sianas, reappear on

the Malibu Painter, Ragona 320 and Taranto 110340, dated by Brijder 560-550 BC (op. cit., nos. 249-50, pl. 45 b-s) are contemporaneous with them.32

80 They appear on a footless merrymouthed cup of Ergotimos, 565/60 BC: Berlin V.I. 3151 (Callipolitis-Feymanns 1979, 196, fig. 2; Cohen 2000, 343, fig. 13.1), Gordion type A cups, 565/60 BC: Berlin 4604, Paris, Louvre Cp 10245 (Brijder 2000, 550, fig. 108a-b, 566, no. G 6; 563, no. G8, fig. 116, no. 6a, pl. 258e), lip- and band-cups in the manner of the Eucheiros Painter, 555/50 BC, 14-16, 19, 14-16, 19; hybrid cup, c. 560/50 BC: Princeton 1998-411 (Padgett 2002, 43-46), Siana cup, c. 550 BC: Basel, market (Brijder 2000, 671, Add. No. 65, pl. 248d). The large, horizontal palmettes on later band-cups of the Painter of the Nicosa Olpe, Manner of the Lyssipides Painter, Group of Villa Giulia 3559, Group of Louvre F 81 and Group of Rhodes 12264 are completely different in form and are not related to these early, horizontal palmettes.

81 Footless merrymouthed cup in Athens, NM 14307, c. 565/60 BC (Callipolitis-Feymanns 1979, 196, fig. 1), and komast cup of special shape, 565/55 BC (Brijder 2000, 563, fig. 6b). For the palmettes of the Red-black Painter dating from the late 560s on see, e.g., op. cit., pls. 173, 175, 179. A survey of palmettes on Siana, Gordion and lip-cups made between 565 and 540 BC is found in op. cit., 562-63, fig. 116.

82 Amsterdam 13344 (Brijder/Stibbe 1997, 21ff, esp. 23, fig. 4b-c, where discussed in relation to other metal cups).

83 Brijder/Stibbe 1997, 29; Brijder 2005, 252.

84 See n. 28, and Smith 1926, 432-33.

85 Note that a type A Gordion cup in Berlin (4605; Brijder 2000, pl. 257d) has reserved lip and handle-zone, like lip-cups.

86 For such Siana cups see nn. 75-76. Note that many early band-cups have an animal frieze or imitation inscription in the handle-zone; for examples see n. 98.

87 For dividing lines on band-cups see n. 1245. Partly visible ground lines on band-cups on, e.g., 173 (Sakonides, pl. 51a), Munich 2223 and 7414 (Fellmann 1989, pls. 20.3 and 46.4).
early lip-cups, always in one-three-one order (1-4, 36, 38, 132, 238, 262, 264-65, 267, 289).\textsuperscript{86b} The earliest known Athenian tongue border around a medallion is met in the work of the C Painter.\textsuperscript{87}

In sum, the features of little-master cups have a variety of sources. Although the origins of some can be found outside Athens, like the miniature painting style, all of them were already well established or at least employed in Athens during the years preceding the emergence of the little-master cup.

Nevertheless, basic questions remain to be answered below. Were the traits copied individually from different sources and combined by the Athenian producers themselves to create the little-master cup? Or is the Athenian lip-cup based in its entirety on the Ionian lip-cup?\textsuperscript{88} In addition, which pottery establishment began to turn out little-masters?

**Experiments leading to the little-master cup**

As noted, our earliest evidence of experimentation that led to the lip-cup shape in Athens comes from the C Painter’s workshop, Oxford 1965.120, dated c. 565 BC. Besides a high, slender foot, the cup has handle-palmettes, inscriptions in the handle-zone and a black lower bowl with a reserved band.\textsuperscript{89} However, the lip lacks the sharp offset of the standard lip-cup and the decoration borrows traits from Siana cups, including a large medallion, ivy branches with berries on the lip and concentric circles under the foot. Another cup from the C Painter’s workshop is also transitional: a very large lip-cup dated slightly later, c. 560 BC.\textsuperscript{90} In shape, the blunt offset of the lip closely resembles the Oxford cup.

Like the C Painter, other manufacturers of Siana cups experimented with the lip-cup form as well. The evidence comprises a very fine specimen of perfect lip-cup shape with overlap decoration related to the Palazzolo Painter, assigned to c. 560 BC by Brijder;\textsuperscript{91} a lip-cup of the Griffin-bird Painter, decorated in a kind of double-decker scheme with an ivy chain in the handle-zone, dated c. 560/50 BC,\textsuperscript{92} and a lip-cup of the Heidelberg Painter, also from c. 560/50 BC, which has the characteristic shape with sharply offset lip and a decorative, nonsensical inscription in the handle-zone, reserved, unornamented lip and, inside, Siana medallion.\textsuperscript{93}

Similarly, during the period c. 560/545 BC, Siana cups occasionally show decorative features which are characteristic of little-masters. They were sometimes made by craftsmen who are also known for, or more closely identified with, little-masters, like Exekias, Taleides, Hermogenes and the Amasis Painter.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{86b} For concentric circles underneath the standing surfaces of Gordion ups and Siana cups see Brügger 2000, 554, nn. 18-20, 620, n. 313.

\textsuperscript{87} Brügger 1983, 121-23.

\textsuperscript{88} To answer this question definitively, it would first of all be necessary to determine where the Ionian lip-cups were manufactured. The production remained limited. The discussion centres on Samos and Miletus:

Cook/Dupont 1998, 54, Samos, with some doubt; Schaus 1986, passim, potters moved from Samos to Miletus; Schlotzhauer 2000, 415, and 2001, 123-24, at least partly produced in Miletus. Many Athenian little-master cups have come to light in both places, whereas an East Greek little-master has, to my knowledge, not yet been discovered in Attica.

\textsuperscript{89} For a drawing and photo of the exterior see Brügger/Stibbe 1997, 27, fig. 8a-b (drawing also in Brügger 1983, pl. 79). For a photo of the interior see Burlington Magazine, April 1966, 198, fig. 51.

\textsuperscript{90} New York 12.234.1, Reminiscent of the Vintage Painter (Brügger 2000, 558, 560, middle fig.).

\textsuperscript{91} Vatican 17828 (Brügger 2000, 558-59, 560, bottom fig.), 609, fig. 144, 611-12, pl. 191a-b, d). The only other known lip-cup with overlap decoration is Florence 3897, which is unattributed, datable between 550-540 BC (Carpenter 1956, pl. 32).

\textsuperscript{92} Berlin F 1777 (Brügger 2000, 559, 561, top fig., pl. 225b). Two other, unattributed lip-cups with double-decker decoration are Florence V 34 and V 34b5 (Loizzo 2006, pl. IX.1-5). At first sight, another, much later lip-cup also seems to have double-decker decoration, Berlin V.1.4495 (I thank U. Kästner for sending me photos). However, as Beazley earlier supposed (1932, 183), the outline Dionysian heads in the handle-zones and the palmettes must be modern additions; most probably, the handle-zones were undecorated as on three other lip-cups by the same, not very talented painter: Nicosia C 1063 (Flourentzos 1992, pls. 39, 42), Rome, VG 79881, 79884 (Hannestad 1989, nos. 37-38), and, with short stem, Copenhagen NM ABC 42 (C. Blinkenberg 1928, CVA 3, pl. 117.1).

\textsuperscript{93} Bremgarten, Gottet (Brügger 2000, 559, 561, middle fig., 672, Add. No. 20, fig. 185, pl. 252c, e (fig. 186 is erroneously labelled as this cup).

\textsuperscript{94} Brügger 2000, 615-625, pls. 192-198. For the little-masters by these artisans see the various chapters below.
Lastly, a very unusual, transitional cup deserves attention. It has a high-stemmed, trumpet-shape foot with a very thin base; the rather bulbous bowl is reminiscent of Sianas, and the high lip is turned out in an unparalleled way. The decorative scheme, including dividing and ground lines in the handle-zone as well as a large inner medallion, recalls the Gordian cup, although the miniature depiction of two fighting-cocks in the handle-zone seems more suitable for the lip of a lip-cup. This cup represents the eclectic mix of varied traits and experimentation which characterizes the output of the Athenian pottery establishments from c. 565 to 555 BC.

The earliest lip- and band-cups

Two lip-cups of Eucheiros (1-2, pl. 1), a son of Ergotimos, and a lip-cup signed by the otherwise unknown Gages (700, pl. 172a-b) may be our earliest completely preserved examples of the standard Athenian lip-cup. Apart from their still rather trumpet-shaped feet, they show the main features of the standard lip-cup in both shape and decoration: sharply offset lip, miniature painting style, handle-palmettes and inscriptions in the handle-zones. As argued below in chapter one, they can be dated c. 560/55 BC.

In contrast, the earliest extant band-cups cannot be so easily identified. One of them, in Kiel, is fragmentary; although nearly the entire bowl is missing, the red fillet at the top of the stem marks it as a band-cup. The rather low, wide stem points to early manufacture in the series of little-masters. The interior has a tondo surrounded by a band of tongues without relief-lines between them. Like the low, wide stem, the double-incision on the shoulder of the collapsing bull points to an early date. The cup was probably made around 555/50 BC. Furthermore, several early band-cups showing animal friezes or imitation inscriptions in the handle-zones have rather short, sturdy stems which are reminiscent of Siana cups. These band-cups seem therefore to be products of the late 550s BC.

Conclusions

Considering the open question whether the Athenian lip-cup was modeled on the Ionian lip-cup or vice versa, we can only conclude that an indigenous Athenian development seems most likely, which began with a period of experimentation. Whereas the Ionian production of lip-cups was short and limited, the Athenian pottery establishments have a well-documented record of continuing innovation. The experimental lip-cup of the C Painter, c. 565 BC, closely approaches the later standard Athenian shape. In Ionia, on the other hand, lip-cup production began not until c. 560 BC and experimental precursors are unknown. Of course new finds may reveal an earlier development in Ionia which could shift the balance in favour of that region as the prime source of the Athenian little-master cup. Meanwhile, it must also be kept in mind that interaction between the various Greek pottery centres

95 I. Prange 1993, CVA 2, pl. 37.1-2, c. 560-550 BC.
96 Cf. e.g., the double-shoulder incisions of Xenokles Painter, pl. 13c) and 132 (Hermogenes, pl. 43b), both dated here c. 555/50 BC.
97 With inscriptions: Cp 10251-10252 (Johannowsky 1983, 192-3, pl. 33a), Corinthisches 192-3, 400-3 (C. Strife XII, fig. 22, pls. 27, 31), London 51.5-7.4 (SmithsPrve 1926, pl. 15.7), Paris, CalMéd 5028 (CVA 1, pl. 47.1, 4), Saloniki (Siismanides 1985, pl. 96a), Torcello 2127 (Favaretto 1982, 45). With animal frieze: Chiusi 1809, 1810 (A. Rastrelli 1981, CVA 1, pls. 24-25), Dunedin OMD E 68-44 (by same painter as Chiusi 1810), J.R. Green 1979, CVA 1, pl. 29.5-8), Istanbul 8496 (Tuna-Nöel 1995, 62, no. 20, pl. 25), London, market (Sotzy’s, 20 May 1985, no. 375), Munich 2188 (Fellmann 1989, pl. 1.1-5), New York, market (André Emmerich, 22 April-30 May 1964, no. 12), St. Petersberg B 68-195, B 115 (A. Petrikova 2006, CVA 3, pl. 13-15). Based on the old-fashioned decoration, a partial band-cup in the Louvre (Cp 10251) can be added to these complete, early band-cups; Beazley remarked that it is ‘still in the tradition of the KX Painter’ (Parra 15).
98 Dated by W. Karth, as seen above.
99 U. Schliefrauer hints twice at the possibility, but remains vague: see his contribution, in Krinzinger 2000, 443, and on the website of the Miletus excavations (2002): ‘Hinzu traten einige neue Funde aus speziellen Gattung der Fikellurazeit, die sog. Ionischen Kleinmeister. Mit diesen ist die Diskussion zur Entstehung und Produktion dieser Gattung neu entbrannt.’ In a letter of November 2007, he informs me that Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA) tests of pottery from Miletus have not yet brought us closer to an answer; he is hopeful that new tests planned for 2008 will take us further.
was intensive and that once a new design was introduced in one place, it became very soon known elsewhere and was often copied.

Similarly, the evidence is insufficient to determine conclusively which Athenian pottery workshop began to manufacture little-master cups. The contacts and reciprocal influences of craftsmen in the Kerameikos quarter of Athens would be especially strong and therefore all the more difficult to recognize and disentangle.

But it is tempting to attribute the introduction of the canonical Athenian lip-cup to the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop which from c. 560 BC was probably being run by Ergotimos’ son Euchairos, as explained below in chapter one. Two of his lip-cups are amongst our earliest evidence of the fully developed Athenian type (1-2, pl. 1). Furthermore, a few potters of the lip-cup also fashioned the type B Gordian cup which descended directly from the type A Gordian manufactured by this workshop and which seems to have inspired the Athenian lip-cup. On the other hand, as stated, experimentation took place amongst various Athenian producers and one of the other earliest examples of the canonical Athenian lip-cup is signed by a potter named Gageos (700, pl. 172a-b).

Furthermore, since so little Athenian pottery has survived and finds are subject to chance, it seems almost certain that a considerable amount of transitional work has been lost.291 In short, the invention of the standard lip-cup in Athens remains a matter of speculation. Was it introduced by the C Painter, Ergotimos, his son Euchairos, Gageos or even someone else? Perhaps new evidence and research will supply more conclusive answers.

---

291 The commonly proposed survival rate is about 1 per cent. However, V. Stiri (2003, 26-34) demonstrates that it is probably lower, perhaps 0.25-0.5 per cent. The role played by chance is perfectly illustrated by the unprecedented type of aryballos decorated by the red-figure painter Douris discovered in Athens during the 1990s in the excavations for the metro-railway (City beneath the City, 309-10, no. 311).