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1. EUCHEIROS, EUCHEIROS PAINTER, A SON OF EUCHEIROS, A PAINTER NEAR KLEITIAS, SONDROS, SONDROS PAINTER AND SOKLES, SOKLES PAINTER (nos. 1-49; pls. 1-12)

1.1 EUCHEIROS, EUCHEIROS PAINTER, c. 560/45 BC (nos. 1-13; figs. 3-10; pls. 1-6c)

Introduction

The signature of the potter Eucheiros, who signs as son of the potter Ergotimos, has been (partially) preserved on six little-master cups (2-3, 5-8). His father Ergotimos is best known as the potter who collaborated with the painter Kleitias on the famous François volute-krater (c. 570/65 BC), which they each signed twice, Ergotimos as potter, Kleitias as painter. Their paired signatures are also found on a standlet and two type A Gordion cups. Two other type A Gordion cups preserve the signature of Kleitias, and Ergotimos’ signature appears alone on a footless cup with merrythought handles and a skyphos; a little-master cup can not be attributed to either of them.

In his publication of a lip-cup found in Medellin, Spain (1, pls. 1-a-b, 3-a), M. Almagro Gorbea recognized that the same artisan had painted a lip-cup from Rhodes (2, pls. 1-c-d, 3-b), the latter being signed by the potter Eucheiros; both of them are the LIO type. Almagro Gorbea proposed to name the artisan the Medellin Painter. Here, instead, it is argued that there is no need to separate the two cups of his so-called Medellin Painter from the work of the Eucheiros Painter, and that they date from the same period.

Plain text transcription: 1. EUCHEIROS, EUCHEIROS PAINTER, A SON OF EUCHEIROS, A PAINTER NEAR KLEITIAS, SONDROS, SONDROS PAINTER AND SOKLES, SOKLES PAINTER (nos. 1-49; pls. 1-12)

1.1 EUCHEIROS, EUCHEIROS PAINTER, c. 560/45 BC (nos. 1-13; figs. 3-10; pls. 1-6c)

Introduction

The signature of the potter Eucheiros, who signs as son of the potter Ergotimos, has been (partially) preserved on six little-master cups (2-3, 5-8). His father Ergotimos is best known as the potter who collaborated with the painter Kleitias on the famous François volute-krater (c. 570/65 BC), which they each signed twice, Ergotimos as potter, Kleitias as painter. Their paired signatures are also found on a standlet and two type A Gordion cups. Two other type A Gordion cups preserve the signature of Kleitias, and Ergotimos’ signature appears alone on a footless cup with merrythought handles and a skyphos; a little-master cup can not be attributed to either of them.

In his publication of a lip-cup found in Medellin, Spain (1, pls. 1-a-b, 3-a), M. Almagro Gorbea recognized that the same artisan had painted a lip-cup from Rhodes (2, pls. 1-c-d, 3-b), the latter being signed by the potter Eucheiros; both of them are the LIO type. Almagro Gorbea proposed to name the artisan the Medellin Painter. Here, instead, it is argued that there is no need to separate the two cups of his so-called Medellin Painter from the work of the Eucheiros Painter, and that they date from the same period.
the beginning of the latter’s career.108 Furthermore, these lip-cups may be considered two of the earliest, complete specimens of standard lip-cups which have come down to us.

Beazley, who was unfamiliar with the cup from Medellin, attributed five cups to the Eucheiros Painter (2-3, 5-6, pls. 1c-d, 3a-b, 3b-c, e, 4a-b),109 but recognized that too little comparative material was available to confirm all the attributions. B. Freyer-Schauenburg assigns another cup to Eucheiros, Kiel B 539 (4, pls. 2c-d, 3d), linking it to the signed cup London B 417 (3).110 A.B. Brownlee states that a fragment found in Corinth must be work of a son of Ergotimos (7, pl. 4c).111 Of the six cups which J.T. Haldenstein gives to the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop and to Kleitias in particular, two of them can here be added instead to the output of the Eucheiros Painter (9-10, pl. 5).112 Two others (12-13, pl. 6b-c) may also be his, but without much else available for comparison than the inscription and palmette, it is not possible to be certain.113 Lastly, another cup will here be placed in the Eucheiros Painter’s oeuvre (11, pl. 6a). The unsigned lip-cups 9-11 are given to him and the potter Eucheiros on the basis of various similarities to their other work, including the overall shape and the dimensions of the bowls and feet, the palmettes, the type and position of the inscriptions in the handle-zone, the large lettering and the short tongues of the tondo border. Furthermore, the position of Theseus’ sharply bent right leg (9-10, pl. 5b, d) is comparable to that of Herakles inside 4 (pl. 3d. No band-cup has yet been attributed to Eucheiros or the Eucheiros Painter.

Six cups (14-19, pl. 6d-8d) will here be categorized as in the Manner of the Eucheiros Painter (for which see section 1.2).

**Shape and dimensions**

All of Eucheiros’ cups are of medium, with diameters ranging from 17.2 to 19.0cm. Eucheiros’ cups are delicately shaped, the earliest ones having very thin walls.

The bowl of 1 (fig. 3) is shallow (0.32), whereas the bowls of 3 (fig. 4) and 4 are deep or extremely deep (0.39, 0.43); the lips of the two earliest cups flare the most (1-2).114 The lip of 4 is not sharply offset.115 The handles of 1-2 are rather horizontal (Fig. 3). The heights of the feet range from medium in the earliest phase (0.47, 2) to extra low and medium in the next one (0.45, 0.35, 3-4).

The foot develops from a nearly trumpet shape, with narrow standing surface and thin, rounded base edge, towards the standard little-master type, consisting of flat disk and higher edge.

---


109 Another one is 700 (pl. 172a-b) signed by the otherwise unknown potter Gageos.

110 ABV 162-63 (for ‘A Son of Eucheiros’, on p. 162, read ‘A Son of Ergotimos’). Regarding the Berlin cup (5), Beazley, Almagro Gorbea and others were misled by the alien fragment with a female outline head, painted by Sakonides, which had been inserted by a restorer. Although this would be the only little-master cup decorated on one side only, nobody ever seems to have doubted the restoration. During my visit to Berlin in 1999, I had the good fortune that cup F 1756 had been taken apart for a new restoration, which gave me the opportunity to measure the Sakonides fragment, discuss my findings with U. Kästner and the restorer, and conclude that it was alien. The fragment’s new inv. no. is ‘ex F 1756’ (116).

111 B. Freyer-Schauenburg 1988, CVA Kiel 1, pl. 23.


113 Haldenstein 1982, 4-5.

114 The shape can not be considered, as the cups are either too fragmentary or only known from photos in the Beazley Archive. Cup 12 preserves no more than the inscription, which indeed is very similar to the inscriptions of the Eucheiros Painter; and cup 13 has, judging from photos, an early foot with thin outer edge, short tondo tongues and palmettes and inscription similar to those on cups of the Eucheiros Painter (fig. 8b). Further, the cock with lotuses (positioned like those in the tondo of 19, pls. 6c, 8d) shows some resemblance to the right-hand cock on side B of 4 (pl.2d), but the incisions do not completely correspond, which might have to do with repainting and restoration, but photos are inadequate for definite judgement.

115 It can not be excluded that the modern reconstruction of the heavily damaged cup from Medellin is responsible for a bowl which is too shallow.

116 For a profile drawing see B. Freyer-Schauenburg 1988, CVA 1, p. 53, fig. 21.
Inscriptions

The Eucheiros Painter employed a variety of inscriptions, sometimes placing two different kinds on either side of the same cup: ἐποίησεν and χαίρε and twice another sense inscription (1-2).\(^{117}\)

The inscriptions are well centred in the handle-zone and characterized by large, well-spaced letters (up to c. 0.4cm). The words are separated by two (e.g., 2, Fig. 5) or three vertical dots (3, Fig. 6a) or are written without a divider (5, Fig. 7).\(^{118}\) Two sigmas on the cup from Rhodes (2) are Z-shaped (fig. 5).\(^{119}\) The second hastas of the pis of 1-2 are longer than those seen on other cups.

---

\(^{117}\) The discussion includes the work attributed by Almagro Gorbea to the Medellin Painter. In the concluding remarks of this chapter it is explained why the Medellin Painter’s cups would instead be the earliest output of the Eucheiros Painter.

\(^{118}\) A three-dot word-divider is rare, but also occurs in ἐποίησεν-signatures of Taleides (123-24, 126-27, 130, e.g., fig. 56, in chapter six) and of Anakles (257). Three dots are also placed before or after a few inscribed labels of sphinxes on the Munich cup signed by Archikles and Glaukytes (109, pl. 34a).

\(^{119}\) Immerwahr 1990, 157-58, remarks that the shape of the sigma often varies, even in the work of one painter; see also the different sigmas on Sokles’ Madrid cup (34).
Fig. 5. Signature on side B of 2.

Fig. 6a-b. Signatures on either side of 3.

The signatures, the later ones with a ἐπιγραφή, show variation in the spelling of the name: Euchros (2), Euchers (5), Eucheros (3). These may be examples of a type of mistake so widespread that R. Wachter calls it ‘abbreviated writing’ (Kurzschreibung). Wachter is probably correct that this phenomenon points to someone who spelt out loud while writing. The misspelling on 5, with a second omikron in the verb (ΕΠΙΟΠΟΙΕΙΕΝ, fig. 7), may simply be a case of repetition, in which the fairly similar pi and iota precede the omikrons.

Fig. 7. Spelling mistake on 5.

All the χαίρε- inscriptions conform to the formula ΧΑΙΡΕ:ΚΑΙΠΙΕΙΕΥ. Even when viewed on the printed page, it is easy to understand how a painter could omit, as on 4 (Fig. 8a), the first iota before the pi and iota that follow: in shape, a iota is identical to the first hasta of a pi, and to write correctly the painter basically had to mark out four iotas in a row and then connect the second and third ones with a horizontal line across the top.

Fig. 8a. Χαίρε- inscription with error on side A of 4.

120 Wachter 1992, 25. The principle is that the omitted vowel reflects the (ending) sound of the letter-name of the preceding consonant; in the case of Eucheros the O-sound is omitted after the rho. Depending of the pronunciation of the diphthong ‘ei’, the misspellings Euchrios and Eucheros may also be examples of the same phenomenon. See also, e.g., 106, where the same kind of mistake occurs in the name Archikles, with the I-sound omitted after chi. A different type of mistake occurs on 128, where the epsilon is missing from the diphthong in the name Taleides.

121 R. Wachter (2004, 308-10) summarizes the discussion, which has taken place about the the form ‘τίς’. It is the future indicative of the verb ‘τί’, second-person singular of τίμημα, as already recognized by T. Panotka in 1830. Unlike Panotka, who interpreted it as an equivalent of an imperative (in analogy with γείωσεν), Wachter argues that it originally had its normal future indicative meaning and gradually lost it to the newly developing jussive one (op.cit., 312).

122 A similar mistake, rather than another instance of ‘abbreviated writing’, occurs on 97 by the Phrynos Painter.
The other meaningful inscription (1-2, fig. 9), which reads like a γλυκόνευς and means ‘I am a beautiful drinking cup’, while very rare, appears also on a cup with Gordiom features, related to the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop, and on a Siana cup.123

Interior decoration

The tondos of 1 and 2 are bordered by short, red-and-black tongues between dotted bands. The borders of the other tondos are simpler, consisting of rather short, red-and-black tongues, but without dot-bands. The outer ends of all the relief-lines between the tongues are marked by white dots. The dimensions of the medallions of 1 and 3 are known to me; in relation to the bowls’ diameters they measure 0.6:1, that is, large.

Mythological subjects

According to literary sources, Herakles killed the centaur Nessos (2, pl. 3b) with an arrow when the centaur tried to rape Deianeira, after crossing a river with her. In visual art, however, Herakles and Nessos are often shown in hand-to-hand combat, the killing being carried out with a sword.124 The story is occasionally illustrated in the tondos of Siana cups, in various compositions: Deianeira sits on Nessos’ back, but Herakles is not present;125 Herakles fights Nessos, as inside 2;126 or the three actors are represented.127

The monstrous Chimaera (3, pl. 3c) was a favourite subject of vase-painters, attested as early as before the middle of the seventh century on two Protocorinthian pieces.128 The monster is described by Homer (Iliad VI, 179-82) as having the heads of a lion, goat and snake with fire-spewing capability. In Athenian vase-painting the creature with the three heads facing back is first encountered.

123 London B 601.10/B 601.7, compared by Robertson to 106 (Archikles, pl. 32a-b), dated here around 560/55 BC (ABV 79; Robertson 1951a, 147, 149, no. 14), Siana cup, Paris, Louvre F 66 (Compare the Class of the Taleides Siana Cups, Brijder 2000, 622-23, no. 595, dated 555/45 BC).
124 One of the earliest black-figure examples is the Nessos amphora, Athens, NM 1002, with identifying inscriptions (Boardman 1974, fig. 5.1). On the other hand, see here 19 (pl. 8a), where Herakles has a bow (also Siana cup, Basel, Cahn HC 1474; Brijder 2000, pl. 182c).
125 Inside a Siana cup by the C Painter, Thasos 3974et (Brijder 1983, pl. 18f), and a Siana cup, Paris market (Millon &Associés, 8 December 2008, 550; Reminds of Civico Painter [H.A.G. Brijder]).
126 Inside Siana cups by the Heidelberg Painter: Paris, Louvre A 478, and Toledo, Reichert (Brijder 1991b, pls. 117b, 126d). The same may be the case in Sondros’ lip-cup 32 (pl. 9d-e), as M.H. Bikakis proposes.
127 Inside a Siana cup by the Red-blacks Painter, Athens NM 529 (Brijder 2000, pl. 184e), and an unattributed band-cup with interior decoration, Munich 2240 (Fellmann 1989, pl. 55). For depictions of the story on the exterior of Siana, lip- and band-cups see here 19 (Manner of the Eucheiros Painter, pl. 8a) and n. 1324.
128 Cf. Dunhabin 1953, 1164, n. 2.
around 600 BC, although this did not entirely replace other arrangements.\textsuperscript{129} In addition to \textsuperscript{3}, nine depictions of the Chimaera are found on lip-cups, but the subject is not seen on a band-cup.\textsuperscript{130}

In his third labour, Herakles had to bring Eurytheus the Keryneian stag (\textsuperscript{4}, pl. 3d), with golden antlers, which was a very swift animal dedicated to Artemis. The earliest literary source, Pindar’s 3rd Olympian from 475 BC, dates much later than various vase-depictions, the earliest of which occurs on a ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphora of the Prometheus Painter, assigned by J. Kluiver to 570/65 BC.\textsuperscript{3} Inside \textsuperscript{4}, dating from the 550s BC, the scene is rather dramatically rendered, with the protagonists involved in close body-contact wrestling; one of Herakles’ hands seizes the antlers, the other one the stag’s foreleg. No other little-master with this story is known.

The pictures of Theseus and the Minotauros in the tondos of \textsuperscript{9} and \textsuperscript{10} predate the earliest examples on Sianas.\textsuperscript{131} Despite slight differences, especially regarding the position of the Minotauros’ head, the two depictions are clearly by one hand: note the knee incisions and the hem patterns of Theseus’ short chiton. In the tondos of two other lip-cups the Minotauros tries to flee to the right, but is held back by Theseus.\textsuperscript{132} And in another two lip-cups the Minotauros faces Theseus.\textsuperscript{133}

\textbf{Non-mythological subjects}

The theme of two heraldic cocks as inside \textsuperscript{1} (pl. 3a) is rare for the tondo of a little-master cup and as yet unknown in that of a Siana.\textsuperscript{134} However, as the tail and head are missing, it can not be ruled out that the left-hand fowl depicts instead a hen.\textsuperscript{135} Little remains of the tondo of \textsuperscript{5}: a palmette and what seems to be the tail-feathers of a fowl (pl. 3e). It may represent the same theme as \textsuperscript{1}.

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{LIMC} III (1986) 249-59, s.v. Chimaira (A. Jacquemin). Cf. a Siana cup by the C Painter, St. Louis WU 673, with Chimaera in the tondo (missing the snake-tail), dated by Brijder 570/65 BC (Brijder 1983, pl. 15d). Two other depictions on Siana cups (Chimaera with Bellerophon on the exterior) are by the Heidelberg Painter, are contemporaneous with the lip-cup in question; on them, the head of the lion is turned forward (Basil., market, and Paris, Louvre A 478; Brijder 1991b, pl. 116b, d).

\textsuperscript{130} On the outside of another lip-cup by the Eucheiros Painter, with Bellerophon (\textsuperscript{4}, 2c). A single Chimaera on the outside of New York 27.122.27 (Richter 1953, pl. IX, 11a-b) and in tondos: Basel, market (MüH, June 1956, no. 94), Siena 38440 (Cygiselman-Mangani 1991, pl. XVI, no. 25b), Taranto 4352 (Masiello 1997, fig. 13.14), all three showing a usual lion’s tail; others without preserved tail: Agrigento, Asklepieion 77/85 (Miro 2003, 196, pl. XCI.2), Rome, VG 64221 (Térrā Paratáthtēa (a, 35-36, no. 21; no ill. of interior), Thasos 3949τ and 59.105 (from two different cups, not previously published).

\textsuperscript{131} Kluiver 2003, 148, 229, no. 6, fig. 56; \textit{LIMC} V (1990) 49, no. 218.

\textsuperscript{132} For a full discussion of the Theseus and Minotauros iconography and the literary sources see Brommer 1982, 35-64, Gantz 1993, 262-70 and Servadei 2005, 92-126 (whence \textit{LIMC} III (1986) 249-59, s.v. Chimaira (A. Jacquemin). Cf. a Siana cup by the C Painter, St. Louis WU 673, with Chimaera in the tondo (missing the snake-tail), dated by Brijder 570/65 BC (Brijder 1983, pl. 15d). Two other depictions on Siana cups (Chimaera with Bellerophon on the exterior) are by the Heidelberg Painter, are contemporaneous with the lip-cup in question; on them, the head of the lion is turned forward (Basil., market, and Paris, Louvre A 478; Brijder 1991b, pl. 116b, d).

\textsuperscript{133} On the outside of another lip-cup by the Eucheiros Painter, with Bellerophon (\textsuperscript{4}, 2c). A single Chimaera on the outside of New York 27.122.27 (Richter 1953, pl. IX, 11a-b) and in tondos: Basel, market (MüH, June 1956, no. 94), Siena 38440 (Cygiselman-Mangani 1991, pl. XVI, no. 25b), Taranto 4352 (Masiello 1997, fig. 13.14), all three showing a usual lion’s tail; others without preserved tail: Agrigento, Asklepieion 77/85 (Miro 2003, 196, pl. XCI.2), Rome, VG 64221 (Térrā Paratáthtēa (a, 35-36, no. 21; no ill. of interior), Thasos 3949τ and 59.105 (from two different cups, not previously published).

\textsuperscript{134} Kluiver 2003, 148, 229, no. 6, fig. 56; \textit{LIMC} V (1990) 49, no. 218.

\textsuperscript{135} For a full discussion of the Theseus and Minotauros iconography and the literary sources see Brommer 1982, 35-64, Gantz 1993, 262-70 and Servadei 2005, 92-126 (whence \textit{LIMC} III (1986) 249-59, s.v. Chimaira (A. Jacquemin). Cf. a Siana cup by the C Painter, St. Louis WU 673, with Chimaera in the tondo (missing the snake-tail), dated by Brijder 570/65 BC (Brijder 1983, pl. 15d). Two other depictions on Siana cups (Chimaera with Bellerophon on the exterior) are by the Heidelberg Painter, are contemporaneous with the lip-cup in question; on them, the head of the lion is turned forward (Basil., market, and Paris, Louvre A 478; Brijder 1991b, pl. 116b, d).
Cup 11 (pl. 6a) bears one of the earliest representations of homoerotic courting in a tondo.22 Typically, the knees of the erōmenos are bent and his arms are in the 'up and down' position, as Beazley called it. The erōmenos usually stands still, often grasping the raised wrist of the erastes. In this position, during the early phase of the act of courting, the head of the erastes is usually on the same level as that of the erōmenos; in some instances, however, as inside cup 11 and the one attributed here to the Manner of the Eucheiros Painter (15, pl. 6d), the erōmenos looks up at the erastes, holding his chin lifted and head thrown back.23

The dead hare suspended behind the erōmenos is generally considered a love-gift, while referring at the same time to the hunt.24 In the tondo of a cup by the Epitimos Painter in Bochum (239, pl. 70b) we see a running dog on either side of the couple which more directly symbolizes the hunt rather than serving mainly as a love-gift. The connection with the hunt is even clearer inside the unattributed lip-cup Paris, Louvre F 85B5, where a dog actually chases a frightened hare.25 Sometimes the courting couple is accompanied by nude dancers. A small number of lip-cups and one band-cup depict homoerotic courting in their tondos, while band-cups may also show the subject outside.26

The tondo of cup 13 (pl. 6c) is occupied by a single cock, with lotuses above and before it.27 When only a single cock is depicted, it may face either left (13) or right; once a lone cock looks round (in 340, pl. 97f).28

22 A lekythos from the Athenian Kerameikos, 6159, attributed by Brtijder to the Malibu Painter, 565/60 BC (ABV 58.127 ['Shadow of the C Painter']; Brtijder 1983, 169, n. 492; Barringer 2001, 81, figs. 42-44), is the earliest known representation of homoerotic courting in Athenian vase-painting. A Siana cup by the Red-black Painter, Taranto 22023, dated by Brtijder 560/50 BC (Brtijder 2000, pl. 179c), may be the earliest known representation in a tondo. For the subject see, amongst others, Dover 1978, Shapiro 1981a, Koch-Harnack 1983, Keuls 1985 Hupperts 1987 and 2000 (the latter with extensive literature, in Dutch; an English translation is in preparation), Reinsberg 1993, Dierichs 1993, Barringer 2001, 70-124, Lear/Cantarella 2008. Shapiro (1989a, 123) associates these courtship scenes and their popularity, especially in the third quarter of the sixth century, with the cult of the male eros around the altar of Charmos in the Academy.

23 When only a single cock is depicted, it may face either left (13) or right; once a lone cock looks round (in 340, pl. 97f). For band-cups with homoerotic courting on the exterior of the cup, see, amongst others, Dover 1978, Shapiro 1989a, 239 315.3, Painter of Cambria 340 (Tleson Painter, pl. 28a) in chapter three or 332 (Tleson Painter, pl. 95e) in chapter ten.

24 E. Potter 1935, CVA 8, pl. 79.6

25 Lip-cups: dead catch beside the couple: 15 (Manner of the Eucheiros Painter, pl. 6d), 35 (Sokles, pos. α, pl. 10d), Thasos 1163 (Ghali-Kahil 1960, pl. 32.27); with one or two dancers: 235 (Epitimos Painter, pos. γ, pl. 66c), Athens, NM Acropolis 1761 (Gravat/Langlotz, pl. 86, pos. γ), Athens, Agora A-P 733 (Pears 1935, 268, no. 105, fig. 25, pos. γ; not from the same cup as A-P 386, op. cit. no. 103, as Beazley proposed, which represents more likely position α), Berlin F 1773 (Painter of the Boston Polyphemus, Friis Johansen 1960, 135, fig. 14, pos. γ), Berlin F 1774 (Painter of the Nicias Olpe, Salis 1930, 7, fig. 5, pos. α), Leiden I 4956/1.1 (M.F. Vos 1978, CVA 2a, pl. 59. 5, 7, pos. B), Rome, VG 79872 (Hannestad 1989, no. 65, pos. γ). One fragment preserves only parts of the central couple: 94 (Phrynos Painter, pos. α, pl. 28b). One band-cup has the composition with dancers, but the couple standing in the up-and-down pose (pos. α) consists of a male and female: Palermo, Banco di Sicilia 677 (Giudice/Tusa 1992, 77, no. D 8). For band-cups with homoerotic courting on the exterior see n. 636.

26 Lotus buds are not included on Vatican 35530 (Iozzo 2002, 139-40, no. 187, pl. LXXXVII) and 340 (Tleson Painter, pl. 97f), where the empty space above the cock is filled by a snake and the face of the cock looking round.

27 To the left: 19 (Manner of the Eucheiros Painter, pl. 8d), Copenhagen, NM ABC 42 (C. Blinkenberg 1928, CVA 3, pl. 117.1, interior not ill.), Florence 95044 and 95070 (not previously published), Zürich, market (H.
Exterior decoration
On the Eucheiros Painter’s cups (and those attributed here to the Manner of the Eucheiros Painter, see below) the sides are not thematically linked: a mythological subject is placed opposite a non-mythological one or even an ornamental composition. On other little-masters, however, we often encounter repetition on both sides, a story which continues over the two sides, or themes of similar nature (e.g., mythological, 87, pl. 25c-d).

Mythological subjects
The figure of Zeus hurling his thunderbolt (keraunoboulos) or with both hands two thunderbolts (dipaltos) as on 1 (pl. 1a) - in the struggle of the gods against the Giants is first attested in Athenian vase-painting in the 560s BC and becomes subsequently rather popular. In contrast to the outline representations on so-called head cups, which nearly always show female outline heads, the body of Zeus is positioned frontally, with the left arm stretched forward. The fish-tailed man on 2 (pl. 1c) can be identified as Triton, who replaced Nereus, the ‘Old Man of the Sea’ around 560 BC. Boardman suggests that Herakles’ fight against Triton symbolizes the amphibious expedition against Megara in 566 BC, in which Peisistratos acquired public acclaim for the first time. It is indeed necessary to accept the premise that a vase-painter, as H.A. Shapiro puts it in regard to Exekias, responds to ‘the public activities of the ruling family, such as the founding of new cults, and reflects that awareness in his choice of themes.’ However, one can not be careful enough to assume political propaganda through vase-images, let alone a particular political preference of a craftsman.

Vollmoeller, 17 November 1983, no. 37. To the right: 283 (Tleson Painter, pl. 81f), Bolligen, Blatter (Blatter 1981, 68-69, pl. 11.2), Chianciano Terme 229478 (Iozzo 2006, 129, pl. X.4), Florence 141804 (not previously published), New York, market (Royal-Athena Galleries, August 1992; Wachter 2003, 169, no. 127, pl. 189; previously Sotheby’s, London, 13-14 December 1982, no. 217), Nicosia 1997/IV-301 (Hadjisavvas 1998, 665, fig. 2), Saarbrücken 254 (Straun 1998, 8-10, no. 25, pl. 5-1.2), Syracuse s.n. (not previously published), Vatican 35330 (Iozzo 2002, 139-40, no. 187, pl. LXXVII), Würzburg H 5034 (Simon/Lorenz 1968, 136-37, figs. 20-22).

148 Likewise, the body of Athena on Sakonides’ cup in St. Petersburg and Epitimos’ cup in Copenhagen (171, 225, pls. 50c, 67a). These are the two other lip-cups known to depict a scene from the gigantomachy. Below, the frontal body will be further discussed in chapter nine; and further treatment of head cups appears in chapter seven.


150 Boardman 1972, 59-60. Although the subject of Peisistratid propaganda had been discussed before (e.g., Nilsson 1953, 746-47) Boardman’s article started a series of articles in which he reasons that Peisistratid patronage and propaganda were responsible for a large number of pots portraying Herakles, most particularly Herakles’ apotheosis (Boardman 1972, 1975b, 1978a [Exekias contra-Peisistratids], 1978c, 1982, 1984; 1989a is Boardman’s reaction to some of his critics). This series has lead to many reactions, many of which contra: Bažant 1982, Moon 1983, Osborne 1983/84, Moore 1986b, Cook 1987a, Blok 1990, M. Beard, Adopting an Approach II, in Rasmussen/Spyve 1991, 17-18. The discussion continues: Cavalier 1995 (pro) leading to a reaction from Hannah 1995 (contra). Other scholars have a more positive attitude towards Boardman’s approach: Shapiro 1980, Glynn 1981, Angiolillo 1997, and Brandt 1997 and 2002. Shapiro (1989a, 54-55) however, questions the anti-tyrannical sympathies imputed to Exekias by Boardman.

151 Shapiro 1989b, 55.

152 The find-spots of the vases, often far away from Athens, as well as the chronology of an image always has to be taken into account; unfortunately, these aspects have been neglected too often.
Amongst other little-masters, the confrontation between Herakles and Triton is met in the tondo of one lip-cup and on the exteriors of three band-cups. In contrast, other lip-cups feature a lone Triton outside, whereas the exteriors of band-cups show Triton accompanied usually by Nereids and attendants.

The exterior of 4 (pl. 2c) represents Bellerophon riding a winged Pegasos as he aims his spear at the Chimaera. B. Freyer-Schauenburg draws attention to the base of the snake-tail, which is tightly curled, precisely as in the tondo of 3, noted above.

Non-mythological subjects

The preserved horseman on side B of the Rhodes cup (2, pl. 1d) is off centre. The arrangement suggests that another figure was opposite him, possibly a second horseman as seen on a contemporaneous Siana cup from the workshop of the C Painter. On 1, a restorer has placed the fragmentary horseman in the middle of the exterior (pl. 1b), but to judge from the Rhodes cup, the horseman may well have been situated more to the left.

For a similar knot in the tail of a sphinx by the Affecter on an amphora, London B 152, see Mommsen 1975, pl. 84.

R. Olmos has unsuccessfully attempted to link thematically the horseman on side A of the Madrid cup (1) with the Zeus on the opposite side. In his view, the horseman would be a Giant being attacked by Zeus. However, there is neither a literary nor an archaeological source to support the notion of a mounted Giant. Moreover, the Rhodes cup (2) by the Eucheirios Painter would seem to contradict the suggestion: its nearly identical horseman, as Olmos himself admits, has no connection to the Triton on the other side.

Side B of 4 (pl. 2d) bears heraldic cocks flanking a floral motif. On little-master cups cocks are the most common animals seen on either side of a central lotus-palmette ornament; ram, goat, stag, lion, sphinx and siren occur as well. This type of floral is particularly popular in the Group of Vatican G 61, which also depicts such animals in a heraldic pose without an ornament between them.

The female outline head, once inserted in 5 will not be discussed here because it is alien.

---

153 Lip-cup: Tarquinia RC 4194 (G. Jacopi 1956, CVA 2, pl. 21.5-6); band-cups: 100 (Phrynos Painter, pl. 30c), Rome, market (Franco Semenzato SpA, 21 March 1990, no. 298), Taranto 4958 (Lo Porto 1962, 164-70, figs. 21.e and 22).

154 Lip-cups: 289-90 (Tleson Painter, pl. 82f, 83b), Amsterdam 2127 (Brüder et al. 1996, pl. 96.2); band-cups: Athens, Agora P 3853 (Abbattier-Agiria XXIII, no. 1697, pl. 111), Como C 19 (F. Porten Palange 1970, CVA 1, pl. 3.2.a-c), from Marion, now lost (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1886, pl. 13.9), Orvieto, Faina C 3215 (Wójcik 1990, 159, fig. 27), Würzburg L 399 (Langlotz 1932, pl. 111).

155 For a similar knot in the tail of a sphinx by the Affecter on an amphora, London B 152, see Mommsen 1975, pl. 44.

156 Basel, market (MuM, 29 Juni 1986, no. 23);Brüder 2000, pl. 248.d).


158 Only cups with a (floral) motif between are cited here: in the Group of Vatican G 61 (further characterized by the inscription XAIPEKAIHEITEN:ME) Beilaglio, Villa Melzi (cocks, not previously published, known from photo in Beazley Archive, BAPD no. 47083), Florence s.n. (cocks, not previously published), Paris, Louvre Cpp 10254 (panthers, Plautius 1938, pl. 88.7), Sydney 53.14 (sirens, Pàrtà 77), possibly also Hannover, private (sirens, imitation inscription, MuM, June 1983, no. 24.), swans with panther’s head between, Munich 9419 (Fallmann 1988, pl. 20.4). From other craftsmen: cocks, New York, market (Sotheby’s, 11 December 2002, no. 34; previously, idem, June 1983, no. 24.), swans with panther’s head between, Munich 9419 (Fallmann 1988, pl. 20.4). From other craftsmen: cocks, New York, market (Sotheby’s, 11 December 2002, no. 34; previously, idem, June 1983, no. 24.), swans with panther’s head between, Munich 9419 (Fallmann 1988, pl. 20.4).

159 It will be discussed below in chapter seven, Sakonides 186 (pl. 53e).
Ornaments
The handle-palmettes of the Eucheiros Painter are rather uniform and easy to recognize: a rounded shape with seven or, occasionally, nine leaves, alternately red and black with a red volute tie, whose colour has sometimes faded (fig. 10a-b). On 1-2 the leaves are separated slightly more from each other. The volutes are simply formed, drawn with a rather thick brush. Similar to the Eucheiros Painter’s handle-palmettes is the one of a Gordion cup fragment from Naukratis which has the potter’s signature of Ergotimos. The undersides of some feet bear concentric circles arranged in one-three-one order.

Provenance and chronology
Interestingly, the two earliest cups of Eucheiros (1-2) have been found in the East (Rhodes) and the far west (Medellin). In this respect it seems that he followed in the footsteps of his father Ergotimos, whose Gordion cups have also been discovered in the eastern and western Mediterranean (Gordion, Naukratis, Marseille).

Other cups of Eucheiros and the Eucheiros Painter have turned up mainly in Etruria (one each, Chiusi and Vulci; two, an unknown location in Etruria). Additional provenances include one from an unspecified location in Italy and, one each, Corinth and Naukratis. The (suspected) contexts of most of these cups are funerary.

Cup 1 comes from the necropolis of Medellin, which has three recognizable phases: I, c. 650-575; II, c. 575-500; III, c. 500-475 BC. As it was discovered before the beginning of the actual excavations, the precise context is unknown. Almagro Gorbea dates it 560/50 BC, based on both the shape (e.g., form of the foot) and the decoration (e.g., elaborate tondo border). Although the date has found wide acceptance, the shape, especially the trumpet-shaped foot with rounded edge of the base, in my judgement, justifies somewhat closer dating, c. 560/55 BC.

The Rhodes cup (2) was preserved in the cremation area of Drakidis at Ialysos, in tomb 200, together with over 20 other vases, including a kothon with animal friezes and an amphoriskos by the Polos Painter, all assigned to the second quarter of the sixth century. The amphoriskos has recently been dated more precisely by A.A. Lemos about 575/65 BC.

The cups from Medellin and Rhodes (1-2) are probably contemporaneous: their feet are trumpet-shaped, with narrow standing surface and thin, rounded edge of the base. Two of their features are reminiscent of Gordion cups: the circles under the foot and the elaborate tondo border with dot-bands. The inscription KAON/EIMI/EKTYPION of both cups is probably an additional sign of an early date because it is further met only on a cup with Gordion features in the Ergotimos-Kleitias

Robertson 1951a, 145, no. 1. According to Robertson, there are red dots in the centres of the volutes (not visible in the photo), comparable to the red dots in the same position on Kleitias’ horizontal palmette (see drawing in Brijder 2000, 563, fig. 116, no. 6a).

As it was discovered before the beginning of the actual excavations, the precise context is unknown. Almagro Gorbea dates it 560/50 BC, based on both the shape (e.g., form of the foot) and the decoration (e.g., elaborate tondo border). Although the date has found wide acceptance, the shape, especially the trumpet-shaped foot with rounded edge of the base, in my judgement, justifies somewhat closer dating, c. 560/55 BC.

The Rhodes cup (2) was preserved in the cremation area of Drakidis at Ialysos, in tomb 200, together with over 20 other vases, including a kothon with animal friezes and an amphoriskos by the Polos Painter, all assigned to the second quarter of the sixth century. The amphoriskos has recently been dated more precisely by A.A. Lemos about 575/65 BC.

The cups from Medellin and Rhodes (1-2) are probably contemporaneous: their feet are trumpet-shaped, with narrow standing surface and thin, rounded edge of the base. Two of their features are reminiscent of Gordion cups: the circles under the foot and the elaborate tondo border with dot-bands. The inscription KAON/EIMI/EKTYPION of both cups is probably an additional sign of an early date because it is further met only on a cup with Gordion features in the Ergotimos-Kleitias...
Group and on a Siana cup. Both of them are decorated inside and out, and their horsemen are nearly identical. Compared to later cups of the Eucheiros Painter, the drawing style is stiffer, which in my opinion is probably indicative of a less practised hand.

The foot of 3, also marked with circles underneath, is similarly shaped to those of 1 and 2, but with a slightly wider, flat standing surface (figs. 3-4); the dotted band around the tondo is omitted and the drawing style seems to be looser, which would justify a date of c. 555/50 BC. The feet of 4, 9 and 11 are closer to the standard little-master type, with a higher outer edge and wider standing surface, which would place them later in the output. Cup 4, decorated inside and out, may be assigned to about 550 BC. The Corinth fragment (7, pl. 4c), unearthed in the Forum Southwest (Punic Amphora Building, fill under Hellenistic road level below Room 4), is assigned by A.B. Brownlee to about 550 BC. Here, a date of c. 550/45 BC is proposed for 5-11.

It is interesting to speculate as to why Eucheiros decided to start using the patronymikon: Did this happen when he began to export to Italy, where his father’s name had already been established, or when his father retired from the workshop? Either circumstance might explain why one (and possibly both) of the earliest lip-cups is not provided with his patronymikon.

The father-son relationship furnishes additional chronological indicators when the career of his father Ergotimos is taken into consideration. It is well accepted that Ergotimos’ footless cup with merrythought handles and type A Gordion cups should be dated c. 565/60 BC. However speculative, we might imagine that Eucheiros, as a young apprentice who was presumably responsible for the ornamental decoration, painted the handle-palmettes of a Gordion cup of Ergotimos, because of their similarity to those of the Eucheiros Painter’s lip-cups. If correct, this would suggest that Eucheiros’ career began around 560 BC. So, if he added the patronymikon only after his father had left the workshop, it would mean that Ergotimos was still working when Eucheiros threw his two earliest extant cups, which would allow us to place them at 560/55 BC. Unfortunately, the excavation contexts of these two cups provide no additional chronological clue.

Regarding the other cups, their chronology depends entirely on shape and stylistic development, as described above.

Concluding remarks

Is there any sound reason to delete the two earliest cups from the Eucheiros Painter’s oeuvre and give them to a different hand, that is, the Medellin Painter, as proposed by Almagro Gorbea? In my view there is not, despite his attempt to advance stylistic and calligraphic arguments in favour of a second painter.

Importantly, Almagro Gorbea’s comparison of the head of Zeus (1) to that of the female once inserted in 5 is now invalid because the latter has been shown to be alien. Now that the female head fragment no longer distorts our view of the Eucheiros Painter, we can reconsider his two earliest cups. The outline technique of the head of Zeus on 1 is as yet unique in the painter’s work, and the figure is therefore unsuitable for comparison to standard black-figure. Similarly, the Triton of 2 offers little for comparison. However, when the horses of 1 and 2 (pl. 1b,d) are placed beside the Pegasos of 4 (pl. 2c), a remarkable common feature emerges: the rider is very small in comparison to the large horse, although the drawing style of the first two is stiffer. The handle-palmettes of 1 and 2 differ slightly from those of the other cups (more widely separated leaves), but as Almagro Gorbea earlier observed, they all have the same general appearance (rounded shape, thick and simple volutes). With regard to the calligraphic variation, the sigmas and pis of 1 and 2 indeed differ from those of the other cups. The fact that they have two vertical dots separating the words instead of the three dots seen on 3 can not be considered a decisive feature, because two dots are later repeated on 4. Evidently the Eucheiros Painter employed both kinds of word-divider.
In sum, these (minor) differences can be explained by the earlier manufacture of 1 and 2. The stiff drawing style would be evidence of a young, less practised hand, while the tongue borders with dot-bands could simply be an early preference. Finally, the use of two types of sigma and pi is not a reason to propose two hands rather than two chronological periods, especially since different letter types are known to occur in the work of other painters. All this makes it very probable that we are dealing with two stages in the career of one painter. If it is accepted that the work of the so-called Medellin Painter represents the earliest stage of the Eucheiros Painter, the situation arises that one potter collaborated for his entire career with one painter. Therefore it seems most likely that the Eucheiros Painter and the potter Eucheiros were the same individual.

1.2 MANNER OF THE EUCHEIROS PAINTER, c. 550/45 BC (nos. 14-19; figs. 11-12; pls. 6d-8d)

Introduction
Six cups can only be associated with the Eucheiros Painter because they do not resemble his work to the degree that they can actually be attributed to him.

The fragments of an early band-cup (14) are linked to the others by the same type of horizontal handle-palmette. The tondo of Munich 2133 (15) shows an θρασύς and an ηρομένος with the same otherwise unparalleled composition seen in the courting couple in the tondo of 11: the θρασύς looks up at the ηρομένος, holding his chin lifted and head thrown back, a suspended cloth on the left and a dead hare on the right. In comparison to 11, the bowl is a bit larger, the tongues are slightly longer and the inscription lacks a word-divider. The type of horizontal handle-palmette links the cup with the Ergotimos-Kleitias (and later possibly Eucheiros) workshop, as the same recurs on the footless merrythought cup of Ergotimos, Berlin V.I. 3151. The same traits are again met on 16 and 19; note the type of horizontal palmette, inscription without word-divider, longer tongues and similar dimensions. Furthermore, they combine a mythological subject on one side with a non-mythological one on the opposite side, as met on cups of the Eucheiros Painter. They also depict centaurs with red hair, beard and chest, as repeated on fragments 17 and 18, which are stylistically close to 16 and 19. The bodies of the centaurs are cut off at the jog of the lip, an arrangement with which a painter linked to Kleitias (21) also experimented, as discussed below.

Shape and dimensions
The cups are larger than those of Eucheiros and the Eucheiros Painter. Their diameters range from 22.0 to 22.5cm, which qualifies them as large. Only one of them (16) retains its foot, which is a standard little-master type foot. The height of only one bowl (15) is known; with a relative depth of 0.38, it belongs amongst the deep examples. The lip of 16 is not sharply offset, as also applies to the Kiel cup (4).

Inscriptions
Insofar as preserved, these lip-cups employ the same kind of χαίρε-inscription written without word-divider. The large letters are placed in a straight line and centred well in the handle-zone. On 16, the painter made a repetition error, writing epsilon and iota twice.

---

175 I use the term ‘Manner of’ in the same way as Beazley; see Robertson 1982, xviii. K. Deppert attributes 19 to ‘Near the Phrynos Painter’. A. Mlasowski agrees. In my view, however, it is far from the superb, detailed miniaturist work of the Phrynos Painter (e.g., 95, 99), to which Mlasowski, in the CVA, compares the Hannover cup.
176 Callipolitis-Feytmans 1979, 196, fig. 2; Cohen 2000, 343, fig. 13.1; for horizontal palmettes, see n. 80.
Interior decoration
The red-and-black tongues of the tondo borders are slightly longer than those of the Eucheiros Painter’s cups. The relation between the diameters of 15’s medallion and bowl is 0.6:1, placing it amongst the largest examples.

Mythological subjects
Inside 16, the frontal winged Artemis as Ποτνία Θέρων, Mistress of the Wild Beasts grasping two lions (pl. 8c), may well be inspired by Kleitias’ similar portrayal on a handle of the François krater, which is a relatively more powerful figure. In his lions face outwards, dangling helplessly from the strong hands of the goddess, below her mighty upright, sickle-shaped wings, whereas inside this cup the lions face one another and seem to be still struggling against the grip of the goddess, whose large wings are more protective than imposing.

In other representations of the subject, Artemis holds various animals, like the panther and stag on the opposite handle of the François krater. Only two other lip-cups are known to picture Ποτνία Θέρων; the subject is not attested amongst Sianas.

Non-mythological subjects
As noted, the closest parallel to the courting scene of 15 (pl. 6d) is found inside cup 11 (pl. 6a) by the Eucheiros Painter; note the cloth suspended on the left and the dead hare on the right as well as the ἕφαστος’ raised chin. The cock is one of the most common animals adorning the interiors and exteriors of little-masters. In tondos, like 19 (pl. 8d), they are usually surrounded by two or three ornamental lotus buds which act as space fillers.

Exterior decoration
As on the Eucheiros Painter’s cups, the themes of the two sides are not thematically related.

Mythological subjects
A pair of fighting centaurs (16, pl. 7a) is a very rare subject, only two contemporaneous examples being known on a Siana cup in the Manner of the Red-black Painter, and a lip-cup by the Xenokles Painter (56, pl. 16a). Whereas both centaurs of the Siana cup wield branches, the left-hand centaur on lip-cups 16 and 56 is armed with stones.

Fragments 17 and 18 (pl. 7c-d) preserve the heads and foreparts of centaurs. They share the remarkable πᾶρ τῆς πρὸ τὸ βότο depiction, for which see the Zeus of 1 (pl. 1a) and the centaur of 21 (pl. 9a), further discussed below.

---

177 The epitheton is first given to Artemis in Ιἰλία Ἡ XLI, 470. For a comprehensive treatment of Artemis as Ποτνία Θέρων see Reeder 1995, 303-5.
178 The downward wings may be a concession to the round shape of the tondo.
179 Basel, market (MuM, 21 September 1982, no. 19). The other lip-cup shows a variation of the standard Ποτνία Θέρων, as she holds a mythological creature, a siren (Acropolis 1759, Graef/Langlotz, pl. 86).
180 For the literature and discussion of courting scenes see p. 22.
181 Cf. nn. 287, 295.
182 Siana: Palermo N.I. 2877. See LIMC VIII (1997) s.v. ‘Κενταυροί et Kentauroides’ (M. Leventopolou), 679; Brigger 2000, 606-7, with n. 248, 688 no. 564, pl. 198a, where lip-cup 16 mistakenly is given to Xenokles, based probably on the incorrect assumption in the Karlsruhe CVA that Beazley had previously made this attribution (G. Hafner 1951, CVA 1, pl. 10.4; Beazley 1932, 180).
A single siren (as on 19, pl. 8b) is a common subject of lip-cups, like the many single animals. With spread wings, they form a nice horizontal composition which is suitable for the middle of a lip-cup.183

The identification of the centaur of 19 as Nessos, with Deianeira omitted, can be justified by the weapon with which Herakles threatens him, an arrow, exactly as told in literature and similar to a depiction of the event on a fragmentary Siana cup by the Red-black Painter preserving parts of Nessos, Deianeira and Herakles aiming his bow.184

Non-mythological subjects
A pair of fighting-cocks (as on 16, pl. 7b) is another favourite theme of little-masters, probably partly because of their compact, horizontal composition.185

In friezes, as is well known, animals are typically arranged symmetrically or in pairs. On 14 (pl. 6e-f) the grazing stag faces a panther, as so often in a paired composition, while the siren turns its back towards the other panther on the far right, which would be common in a symmetrical frieze with a central animal. On the opposite side of 14 the same composition is depicted in reverse.

Ornaments
All the handle-palmettes are the horizontal kind, which may still be considered an exclusive trait of little-master cups associated with the Ergotimos-Kleitias/Eucheiros workshop (fig. 12a–d).186

Fig. 12a–d. Palmettes of 14 (a), 15 (b) and 19 (c–d).

Provenance and chronology
The provenances of these cups are widely dispersed: 14, Asia Minor (Çandarlı, funerary context); 15 and 16, central Italy (Vulci, Bisenio, funerary contexts); 17, Megara Hyblaea (settlement); and 18, Athenian Acropolis (sanctuary).

Cup 16 was discovered in the necropolis of Palazzetta at Bisenio, in the same tomb as a band-cup signed by Hermogenes (136, pl. 44c) which, based on its place in his development, as we shall see below, can be dated c. 550/45 BC. Additional excavation data are not available.

Since the six cups and fragments are not all by the same hand, it is difficult to arrange them in a possible relative chronology. The complete bowls are deep, and the single preserved foot is the standard little-master type (16). The band-cup from Çandarlı (14) could be one of the earliest, possibly dating from the late 550s BC, as suggested by the deep bowl, double-incision of the breasts of the sirens with sickle wings and the unusual composition.187 The deep bowls seem to indicate that the lip-cups were manufactured about 550/45 BC.

---

183 In various poses, the lone siren is a particular favourite on the lip-cups of the Tleson Painter (288, 306, 364-67, 401-2, pl. 82e, 88d, 103b-d, 111e-f).
184 Basel, Cahn HC 1474 (Brijder 2000, pl. 182c). For other representations of the story on the exteriors of Siana, lip- and band-cups see n. 1324. For representations of the story inside Siana cups see nn. 125-27.
185 For a list of these on lip-cups see nn. 355-56.
186 For horizontal palmettes on other types of cup see n. 80.
187 V. Tuna-Nörfling’s date of 560/50 BC seems too early, as compared to other band-cups.
1.3 A SON OF EUCHEIROS, c. 550/40 BC (no. 20; pl. 8e)

The son of Eucheiros is known only from a fragmentary lip-cup in the Vatican (20, pl. 8c). Since my knowledge of it is limited to an article by Beazley, which includes a photograph of the interior, his comment is essential.

According to Beazley, the inscriptions with πατέρων ὦνομα show the same spelling for ‘son of’ as Eucheiros used in his signatures: ΗΥΙΟΣΗΥΣ. The tondo depicts a winged, running male and a racing hare behind his extended leg. Too little remains of the figure to allow for a possible identification. Amongst the other portrayals of winged male figures inside little-master cups, the one representing Boreas kidnapping Orytheia, c. 550/40 BC, has a hare underneath.

Because 20 is held in the Vatican, its provenance is undoubtedly Italy. A date of c. 550/40 BC is here proposed, based on the assumption that Eucheiros’ son started working during the latter part of his father’s career.

1.4 A PAINTER NEAR KLEITIAS, c. 560/50 BC (no. 21; pl. 9a)

Beazley associated only one lip-cup with the painter Kleitias: Vatican 35319 (21, pl. 9a), ‘Near Kleitias or by Kleitias himself.’ As the painting of the Vatican fragment seems not to be by the same hand as the François krater, an attribution to Kleitias himself cannot be justified. On the other hand, because some influence of Kleitias can be discerned in the facial features, the painter was apparently influenced by him and may have worked near him.

The loss of all but a lip fragment prevents us from getting an idea of the overall shape. The lip is very sharply offset and the bowl, with an estimated diameter of about 25cm, was extra large.

The figure (pl. 9a) represents probably a centaur, seen from the waist up, holding a club in his right hand and extending his gesticulating left hand forward. The left-hand centaur of a bronze relief from Olympia, depicting Kaineus being pounded into the ground, is similarly posed. But no trace of another figure has been preserved opposite the Vatican centaur. Curiously, the centaur’s body is cut off at the jog, as if the parts which would have overlapped the handle-zone were simply left out. The same device may have been employed on a very large lip-cup in Florence (151056), recalling the Heidelberg Painter.

M. Iozzo compares it to cups of the Eucheiros Painter (1, pl. 1a) and the Epitimos Painter (235, pl. 67a-b), concluding that they are all evidence of an early experiment in πάρσ προ τοτε depictions.

---

188 ABV 163; Beazley 1932, 179, fig. 11.
189 This cup could not be found when I visited the Vatican Museums to study little-masters.
189 Unlike the πατέρων ὦνομα formula used, e.g., by Tleson (TAEONHONAPXO...); see chapter 10.
190 Once Florence, Museo Bardini/Palazzo de’ Mozzi A 2 (Marzi Costigli 1979, 41–42, fig. 11; also Scheffold 1993, 217, fig. 224). See nn. 242–44; a list of known winged figures in the tondas of little-master cups is found in nn. 338–40. Also note the hare under a pair of winged male figures on a plate by Lydos (Tiverios 1976, pl. 40).
191 That is contemporaneous with the Palazzo de’ Mozzi’s cup (see previous note).
192 ABV 79.4, 682, where Naples, Astariata; Iozzo 1998, pl. LXXIX 1-2 (c. 560 BC); Brijsder 2000, 549, n. 3 (c. 560 BC or slightly earlier); Iozzo 2002, 136–37, no. 184, pl. LXXXIV (560/50 BC).
193 Cf. here 32 (pl. 9d-c), which also shows a resemblance to the painting of Kleitias.
194 Scheffold 1993, 122, fig. 112.
195 Brijsder 1991a, 267, no. 481, pl. 152c; Iozzo 1998, pl. LXIX 3-4. Although the fragments have broken off just above the jog, it seems that too much of the figures are shown on the lip to assume that they continued below the jog in overlap scheme.
196 Iozzo’s inclusion of the lip-cups with female heads by Sakonides is probably based on the misunderstanding that Sakonides worked together with Eucheiros (see the discussion of 186 in chapter seven). However, the head cups by Sakonides (and Hermogenes) are somewhat later (not before c. 545 BC) and may be regarded as deriving only from such experiments as discussed here; furthermore, they usually show both the face and the body in profile with just part of the bare upper arm showing; the exception is Sakonides’ Athena head in St. Petersburg (271, pl. 50c), portraying a profile face and frontal shoulders, just like the Eucheiros Painter (1) and Epitimos Painter (235).
The partial figures of this kind can, in my opinion, be divided into two types: the functional and the form-induced. In the functional type, the partial figure illustrates the action, as it is seen either emerging or sinking, for example, Athena’s birth from Zeus’ head or the pounding into the ground of Kaineus, stories which became popular in vase-painting from the second quarter of the sixth century BC on.\footnote{198}

In the form-induced type, on the other hand, the painter plays with the vase shape, cutting off the figure at an articulation. Iozzo hints at the latter category when he compares the \textit{pars pro toto} depictions of \textit{21} and Florence 151056 to the figurework under the feet of large band-cups where the bodies are interrupted by the hole in the stem.\footnote{199} H.A.G. Brijder discusses an earlier example of the form-induced \textit{pars pro toto} on a so-called stacked cup from Samos, where the figures partly disappear, as it were, behind the lips of the lower cups.\footnote{200} All profile heads of lip-cups, being cut off at the jog, are further examples of the form-induced arrangement.\footnote{201} Both types are combined on two lip-cups depicting a swimming bull carrying Europa, where the jog of the lip acts as the waterline.\footnote{202}

Interestingly, the \textit{pars pro toto} formula was applied in at least three instances to centaurs (17-18, 21, pls. 7-6, 9a) by painters who worked in, or were influenced by, the Ergotimos-Kleitias/Eucheiros workshop.\footnote{203} As these centaurs can not be individually identified, a possible functional explanation can not be advanced; instead, their truncated bodies indicate most likely form-induced \textit{pars pro toto}.

### 1.5 SONDROS, SONDROS PAINTER, 560/40 BC (nos. 22-33; figs. 13-14; pls. 9b-e)

#### Introduction

Whether Sondros ran an independent establishment or was employed in the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop remains unclear.\footnote{204} On the other hand, it is evident that he was strongly influenced by the craftsmen of the latter workshop, as he was the only other major producer of Gordion cups and his painting on a little-master fragment from Naxos (\textit{32}) bears a strong resemblance to Kleitias. But since Sondros signs his cups it seems that he either occupied a prominent position in a workshop or may well have worked independently.\footnote{205}

The Gordion cups signed by Sondros are type B, smaller and finer than most little-masters, but heavier than the Gordion cups of Ergotimos-Kleitias.\footnote{206} Of them, Beazley only knew fragments: \textit{22-26, 28 and 29}.\footnote{207}

---

\footnote{198}{ Cf. Vacano 1973, 102-5, and Laufer 1985, for the Kaineus iconography.}
\footnote{199}{ Iozzo 1998, 253. For such depictions under the feet of these so-called ‘Prachtschalen’ see Greifenhagen 1971, Schauenburg 1971, 162-3, fig. 1, and Damile 2005. Other little-master examples may show the (rare) ‘disappearance’ of parts of a figure behind the handles, e.g., \textit{249} (BMN Painter, pl. 72e) and Basel, Cahn HC 841 (Blosesch 1974, no. 240; Kreuzer 1992, 68-70, no. 70).}
\footnote{200}{ Samos K 1196 (Brijder 1997, 1-5).}
\footnote{201}{ As von Vacano has demonstrated, the motif of a profile head is of Greek origin, the earliest examples occurring in the late eight century on a Cretan vase and a krater from Pithekoussai. On the Greek mainland the development of the painted profile head began in Corinth (Vacano 1973, 17-22).}
\footnote{202}{ \textit{289} (Tleson Painter, even Europa’s feet disappear ‘underwater’, pl. 83a) and Cambridge (Mass.), private (Sotheby’s London, 31 May 1990, no. 364). The painters use the jog, which provides a marked point to cut off the image, to help illustrate the story.}
\footnote{203}{ An unattributed lip-cup fragment, Athens, Agora A-P 1612 (Roebuck 1940, 197, fig. 30), preserves the forepart of a mounted horse (knee of rider and reins visible), which is also cut off at the jog.}
\footnote{204}{ For Sondros and the Sondros Painter see Hoppin 1924, 333; Beazley/Payne 1929, 266; Beazley 1932, 184, 186, 193, 201; Robertson 1951a, 146-48; \textit{ABV} 173; Bikakis 1985, 178-80; Add 49; DeVries 1997, 21-22; Brijder 2000, 549-57; KLA II 406 (P. Heesen).}
\footnote{205}{ See the discussion on the meanings of the signatures in chapter eleven.}
\footnote{206}{ Cf. Robertson 1951a, 146; Brijder 2000, 554-55 (type B Gordion cups).}
\footnote{207}{ \textit{ABV} 173. I have not been able to examine the fragments \textit{ABV} 168 1-2, with partial signatures: the Castle Ashby fragment was already lost in Beazley’s time, and the Vatican one was untraceable during my visit. They are, however, included in the corpus of Neandros, as at least the Castle Ashby fragment, according to Beazley, had no word-divider as seen in three of Sondros’ signatures.}
In the 1990s, a nearly complete type B Gordion cup signed by Sondros (27, pl. 9b-c) came to light in Gordion itself, decorated largely in the usual scheme for the early type A Gordion, apart from the vertical palmettes and the absence of the horizontal line in the handle-zone. Moreover, the tondo tongues have a dot-band around the inner ring only (that is, not also the outer dot-band of the usual Gordion scheme).

A number of fragments may belong either to type B Gordion cups or little-masters. Meagre evidence of the shape remains, nor is the decoration helpful for identification as the features of such cups are not always consistent, for example, the lower handle-zone line is missing on a type B Gordion cup, and lip-cups discussed above (1-2), like Gordion cups, have a dot-band at the base and the tips of the tongues.

The cup from Naxos (32, pl. 9d-e), reduced to fragments, shows a tondo tongue border which precludes it from being a Gordion cup, indicating instead a little-master, most likely a lip-cup. Additional evidence that Sondros made lip-cups is supplied by a fragment from Gravisca (33), which preserves a small part of the reserved lip. Despite the sparse information provided by these small fragments, Beazley and Immerwahr attempted to establish a chronology. Here, however, a different chronology is proposed, which is based partly on new data derived from the cups from Gordion (27) and Naxos (32).

Shape and dimensions
Of these cups, the shape of only the one from Gordion (27) can be reconstructed. It resembles lip-cups in regard to the sharp jog and rather flat standing surface. The foot is medium high (0.47), the bowl shallow (0.33), the wall is very thin and the handles rather horizontal.

Inscriptions
All the preserved inscriptions are signatures, none of which is complete. On three fragments (22, 28-29) the words are divided by a double-point, while on the latter two the object ME is visible. The specimen from Gordion (27) preserves part of a double-point, and the space missing before the verb is enough to accommodate ME.

The inscriptions differ quite a bit. The lettering may be bold, weaker or even rather thin. The sigmas consist of three or four strokes, stand upright or tilt back (fig. 13a-b). We shall return to this point in the discussion of the chronology.

Fig. 13a-b. Sigmas composed of three or four strokes (33, 27).

Interior decoration
The variation in the tondo borders is striking: inner and outer dot-bands (24), outer dot-band with possibly also an inner one (25), inner dot-band only (27) and a mere tongue band without dot-bands (32). On 27, the tongues are short; on 32 somewhat longer.

Mythological subjects
Bikakis identified the centaur in the incomplete tondo of 32 (pl. 9d-e) as Nessos because of the close proximity of the face and body to the tongue border. He argues that if the centaur had been alone, he would stand closer to the centre. Therefore the tondo probably contained one or even two more figures. However, whereas other depictions of single centaurs in the tondos of lip-cups do not

---

208 Beazley 1932, 201; Immerwahr 1990, 52.
209 For a profile drawing see Brijder 2000, 552, fig. 114.
210 Bikakis 1985, 178-79.
support the suggestion,\textsuperscript{211} another observation suggests that an additional figure was indeed included, probably Herakles (as inside \textsuperscript{2}, where his leg is visible): the centaur’s right arm appears to be turned back (towards his attacker?), as on one of the earliest black-figure portrayals of the theme, the Nessos amphora in Athens (NM 1002), with identifying inscriptions.\textsuperscript{212} Bikakis compares the rendering of the nose, half-open mouth and beard to the faces of the centaurs Petraios and Hylaios on the François krater, concluding that the Naxos cup (\textsuperscript{32}) must have been made in the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop.\textsuperscript{213} If so, \textsuperscript{32} is the third known picture of Herakles and Nessos in the work of a painter associated with this workshop.\textsuperscript{214}

As Brijder remarks, the sphinx in the tondo of \textsuperscript{27} (pl. 9c) resembles one by the Xenokles Painter in Boston (\textsuperscript{56}, pl. 17a) and another one inside a Siana cup by the Adelph Painter in Amsterdam (\textsuperscript{215}). It is unclear whether a lotus originally adorned the tondo of \textsuperscript{27}, as in \textsuperscript{56}. The subject is very frequently met in the tondos of little-masters and Siana cups.\textsuperscript{216}

The male foot in \textsuperscript{24}’s tondo, with raised heel, is positioned identically to the right foot of Herakles wrestling the lion inside the Sokles Gordion cup in Madrid (\textsuperscript{34}, pl. 10c) and the cup by Neandros in Paris (\textsuperscript{209}, pl. 60a). However, not enough of the picture remains to determine the story.

Ornaments

Two cups preserve (nearly) complete handle-palmettes. The one from Gordion (\textsuperscript{27}, fig. 14a) has a rounded palmette with nine leaves. The partial palmette on \textsuperscript{25} appears to have been similar. The other (nearly) complete palmette, seen on \textsuperscript{28}, though a bit stockier, is undoubtedly by the same hand (fig.14a-b).\textsuperscript{217}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=5cm]{fig14ab.png}
\caption{Fig. 14a-b. Palmettes of \textsuperscript{27} and \textsuperscript{28}.}
\end{figure}

Under its foot’s base, the cup from Gordion (\textsuperscript{27}) is adorned with circles in one-three-one order, reminiscent of Gordion cups.\textsuperscript{218}

Provenance and chronology

Six type B Gordion cups or little-masters with Gordion features (\textsuperscript{22-27}) have turned up in the eastern

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{279} (Tleson Painter, pl. 81b), Edinburgh 1953.23 (E. Moignard 1989, CVA 1, pl. 12.9) and New York, market (Art of the Ancient World XII, Royal-Athena Galleries, 2001, no. 189) where the centaur even overlaps the tongue border. The centaur on a fragment in Kavala (Bikakis 1983b, 79, fig. 5) may have not stood alone.
\item \textsuperscript{212} Boardman 1974, fig. 5.1.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Bikakis 1985, 180; Maetzke 1980, 161, figs. 126-27.
\item \textsuperscript{214} The others being \textsuperscript{2} and \textsuperscript{19} (pls. 3b, 3a).
\item \textsuperscript{215} Amsterdam 9599 (Brijder 1983, pl. 54b); cf. Brijder 2000, 555.
\item \textsuperscript{216} For this see nn. 282-85.
\item \textsuperscript{217} In other work the handle-palmettes of the same cup are sometimes differently shaped. See, e.g., Heesen 1996, 130, figs. 84-85, where, on the same side, the left-hand palmette has stocky leaves (fig. 84) and the right-hand one more rounded, fuller leaves (fig. 85). Large difference on one side of a cup are found on the band-cup Taranto 51357 (Masiello 1997, no. 22.10). The most extraordinary difference between palmettes on the same side appears on an East Greek little-master cup in Riehen (Walter-Karydi 1973, pl. 48, no. 427b). For differences in details on one cup, also note the differences between the centaurs on either side of a cup by Taleides (\textsuperscript{33}, pl. 40b); the two sides are shown in Heesen 1996, figs. 80, 82).
\item \textsuperscript{218} A second foot has been found at Gordion, similar in shape and with concentric circles (letter from K. DeVries, cf. Brijder 2000, 557, no. G 18).
\end{itemize}
Mediterranean (once, Gordion itself; five times, Naucratis), and four others (28-31) have probably been discovered in Cerveteri. Another find from Etruria is the lip-cup fragment from Gravisca (33). Naxos has yielded a lip-cup (32). The pieces from Naucratis (22-26) and Gravisca (33) lay in a sanctuary context, whereas the contexts of 28-32 were funerary.

Similar to the exports of Eucheiros, the earliest production of Sondros was sent to the eastern Mediterranean, while his later output was primarily exported to Etruria.

Both Beazley and Immerwahr have arranged the Sondros fragments known to them in three groups. They agree on the first group, consisting of the Gordion cups 22-24. Otherwise their opinions diverge. In Beazley’s opinion, the second group comprises 25 and 29, which exhibit less bold lettering, and his third category is limited to 28 (‘lettering again bold, thicker and courser than in the first group’).

For the same reason, Immerwahr isolates 28 while assigning it, however, to the second group, and gathers 25, 26 and 29 in the third group which, in his view, ‘seems later than the others’.

Objections can be made to both assessments. Cup 25 has a Gordion type of tondo border and can therefore hardly belong to the latest work. At the same time, the fragments from Naxos (32), unknown to Beazley or Immerwahr, while bearing the same light lettering as 25 and 29, are surely later than 25 (to judge from the tongue border without dots).

Therefore a different chronology must be considered. Perhaps the treatment of the sigmas offers a clue. The sigmas of the Gordion fragments 22-23 are very clearly delineated and stand nearly perfectly vertical. Although fragment 24 has not a sigma, it can be grouped with the Gordion fragments, as suggested by its early tondo border with two dot-bands. The same is true for 25. Cup 26 probably also goes together with these, but the surface is damaged and the character of its sigmas is hard to determine.

A second group is characterized by four-stroke sigmas (27-29). Finally, we see fragments with three-stroke sigmas tilted slightly back (30-31, 33). On the basis of the tondo border, the Naxos fragment (32) can be added, despite the absence of a preserved sigma.

As we see, not the thickness of the brush used but the letter-form of the sigmas might be our main chronological indicator. The backward tilt of the sigmas on cups showing other later features (naming those of lip-cups) can be explained as the writing of a more experienced painter.

As happens so often, there is little we can rely on for the dating. The cup from Gordion was excavated from a large dump deposit on the Western Citadel Mound, including a very large volume of Phrygian coarse and fine pottery, a lesser amount of Lydian, and a still smaller find of mixed Greek pottery. Besides the Gordion cup of Sondros, Athenian pottery was limited to a krater (P 4563a,b/P 5415; YH 51501) attributed to the middle phase of Lydos (according to M. Tiverios, ‘555 to just before 540 BC’), and a black-glaze olpe (YH 54211), dating c. 570-550 BC. Of the Corinthian pottery, an aryballos and two kotyles correspond chronologically to the Athenian pieces.

The type B Gordion cups, which, in time, closely follow the Gordion cups of the Ergotimos-Kleitias group can safely be assigned to c. 560/50 BC. To judge from the differences between the sigmas, 22-26 may date from c. 560/55 BC, and the cup from Gordion (27) as well as 28 and 29 from c. 555/50 BC. It would then follow that the remaining cups (30-33) range from c. 550 to 540 BC, although a final date can not easily be established.

Concluding remarks
Minor variation in shape and painting over a period of 5 to 10 years should not be too quickly accepted as evidence of different painters’ hands when they can as easily be explained as representing different periods of one painter’s career. As has been made clear above in reference to the Eucheiros

---

219 Beazley 1932, 201; Immerwahr 1990, 52.
220 Cf. Devries 1997, 21: ‘the letter forms are from the second stage of his signatures and provide the narrow dating of ca. 555/50 BC’.
221 See also below Sokles Painter, who first used a very angular letter and later a looser, more rounded and smaller script.
222 Tiverios 1972, 85.
223 DeVries 2005, 47.
Painter, whose extant work provides a greater spectrum of comparative material, the same painter, over his entire output, could greatly vary letters like sigma and pi and, handle-palmettes.

Concerning the potter Sondros, the preceding makes it appear most likely that all his potterwork was decorated by one painter only, known as the Sondros Painter. In conclusion, it seems most probable that the potter Sondros and the Sondros Painter were indeed one and the same artisan.

1.6 SOKLES, SOKLES PAINTER, 555/5 BC (nos. 34-49; figs. 15-19; pls. 10-12)

Introduction

Since Sokles made at least one type B Gordion cup and several other cups which closely resemble the Gordion type (particularly with regard to the shape of the foot and the ornaments), he needs to be discussed at this point.224 At the very least, we can suppose he was probably influenced by potters of the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop.225 Like Eucheiros and Sondros, Sokles, as he signed his cups, would have been an established member of that workshop or have run an independent establishment.226

Beazley listed a Gordion cup (34, pl. 10a-c) and three band-cups (44-46, pl. 12d-e) signed by Sokles.227 In his publication of 35 (pl. 10d), K. Schauenburg recognized the same painter’s hand in 34 and 35, whom he named the Sokles Painter.228 Some identifying features of the Sokles Painter’s figures are large eyes, incorrectly placed nipples (too low and too far to the side), hooked incisions for ankles and very strong thighs.

In Para Beazley accepted these attributions and, at the same time, gave a kantharos in Berlin to this painter.229 Additional cups have been added by E. Gjerstad (39), R. Blatter (49, pl. 12f), D. von Bothmer (36, 38, pls. 11a-12a), K. Görkay (47), and C. Campenon (40). Recently, another kind of pottery was added to the painter’s oeuvre by H. Mommsen: a votive plaque in Athens (NM Acropolis 2526).230 Below, fragment 37, which might be part of cup 36, and 41-43 (pl. 12b-c) are newly assigned.

Shape and dimensions

With a diameter of 22.7cm, Sokles’ Gordion cup in Madrid (34, fig. 15) is larger than all other known specimens; only an unattributed one, which measures 21.5cm in diameter, comes close.231 The dimensions of 34 and the large lip-cup in a Swiss private collection, 35, are nearly identical; each is 14.6cm high and they have diameters of 22.7 and 22.8cm, respectively. Sokles’ other lip-cups are small to medium; the diameters range from 14.1 to 19.0cm. With a diameter of 16.3cm, band-cup 44 is small (fig. 16).

The jog is rather blunt inside 34 and 38, but very sharp inside the small lip-cup in Brussels (43).232

224 For Sokles and the Sokles Painter see Hoppin 1924, 330-31; Beazley 1932, 186, 191, 202; ABV 172-73; Schauenburg 1965; Blatter 1968; Para 72; Add 49; Brijder 2000, 554-57; KLA II, 404 (R. Blatter).
225 We have remarked in the Introduction that, within the Kerameikos, the interaction between craftsmen was intense and that successful designs were readily adopted. The direct influence of one craftsman on another is therefore often impossible to demonstrate.
226 See the discussion on meanings of ἐποίησεν in chapter eleven.
227 ABV 172.1, 173.2-4.
228 Schauenburg 1965, 857.
229 Berlin F 1737 (Para 72).
230 Mommsen 2005a, 33, pl. 13.5.
231 Paris, Louvre F 98 (Platouine 1938, pl. 87.10-11). By my negligence Brijder received incorrect information from me that both handles of the Madrid cup are modern: one is definitely original (cf. Brijder 2000, 555, n. 30).
232 I have not examined the cup in a Swiss private collection nor do I have information about the jog.
Fig. 15. Profile drawing of 34 (1:2).

Fig. 16. Profile drawing of 44 (1:2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date-type</th>
<th>H.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>foot</th>
<th>bowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>555/50 - Gordion Type B cup</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555/50 - Lip-cup</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/40 - Band-cup</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2. Average absolute and relative dimensions of Sokles’ cups.

All the Gordion cups and lip-cups have bowls and feet of medium depth and height. The feet of 34-36 and 38 show a thick stem and nearly trumpet-shaped base with narrow standing surface, traits which are reminiscent of the feet of earlier Gordion cups. In contrast, the foot of 43 resembles much more the standard little-master type.

Inscriptions

The inscriptions are limited to signatures which have very clear, widely spaced letters. None of them includes a word-divider and none shows any error. The lettering of 44-49 (fig. 17b; pl. 12d-f) is smaller and more rounded than the very angular letters used on Sokles’ other cups (fig. 17a; pls. 10a-b, 11c-d).233 Whereas the sigma of 34 is nearly perfectly vertical, the sigmas of other cups tend to tilt.

233 The letters of 43 are yet large, though a bit more rounded (pl. 12c).
back (e.g., 49, pl. 12f). As also seen in the work of other painters, the inscriptions seem to evolve from being carefully written with stiff letters to a looser script of more rounded letters (figs. 17a-b).

![Fig. 17a. Inscription of 38.](image1)

![Fig. 17b. Inscription of 44.](image2)

Here, for the first time, we encounter inscriptions in the tondo: 34 (fig. 18) has the name Herakles and 39 a few imitation letters. Remarkably, the name Herakles ends in a reversed sigma, which contrasts with the standard sigmas of the cup’s signatures. Also the lambdas are quite different. Once again we see a painter employing differently formed letters on the same piece of pottery.

![Fig. 18. Interior inscription of 34.](image3)

**Interior decoration**

Two of the tongue borders have two dot-bands (34-35). In Gordion cup 34 the medallion is large (0.56); in lip-cups 38 and 43 the medallions have medium or large relative dimensions (0.54, 0.56, respectively).

**Mythological subjects**

Amongst the earliest pictures of Herakles fighting the Nemean lion in Athenian painting, dating shortly after c. 560 BC, are those by the Vintage Painter and a painter in the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop. Afterwards, the story became a favourite of Athenian pottery painters. For instance, the Heidelberg Painter chose it as his favourite narrative, positioning Herakles either standing upright or, in tondos, in the so-called Knielauf stance.

In contrast, the Herakles of 34 (pl. 10c) more closely resembles the Vintage Painter’s representations: simply by lowering the right knee of the Vintage Painter’s Herakles, as it were, the Sokles Painter easily moved his figure into a squatting position. Otherwise the stances of their Herakles are very similar.

Subsequently, the standing and squatting postures continued to be alternately adopted. Around 530, however, the fight became more of a wrestling match, and the Lysippides Painter showed the combatants locked in a ground hold.

The Herakles of 34 finds an exact parallel inside one signed by Neandros (209, pl. 60a). Both portrayals must be chronologically close, though it is difficult to decide if one may be inspired by the other or if they share a common source. In lip-cups, Herakles and the

---

37

---

Cf. the tilted sigma in later work of the Sondros Painter; see above section 1.5.

A similar development is seen in the inscriptions of Archikles (e.g., 106 and 108, fig. 41a-b), Glaukytes (111 and 113, figs. 47a-b), Excikias (compare the Siana cup Athens 1104 to his lip-cups), Hermogenes (e.g., 138 and 161, figs. 61-62), Sakonides (e.g., 167 and 169, figs. 65-66), Tleson Painter (e.g., 278 and 457, figs. 106 and 115).

See the discussions above in the sections on Eucheiros and Sondros.

Berlin F 1753 (Brijder 1983, 186 pl. 52c); footless merrythought cup by Ergotimos, Berlin V.I. 3151 (ABV 79; interior: Schefold 1992, 95, fig. 105).

Brijder 1991a, 354-55.

Schefold 1992, 97, fig. 110.
lion usually both look to the right, while the lion’s neck twists round to escape Herakles’ stranglehold.240

Winged youths, a common subject of Athenian vase-painting, quite often occupy Siana

Winged youths, a common subject of Athenian vase-painting, quite often occupy Siana

Non-mythological subjects

Above, we have considered two examples of homoerotic courting couples in the tondos of lip-cups

A lone horseman, as in 36 (pl. 11b), is frequently met in the tondos of little-masters.

Figs. 16, 17 (Bottom), Palermo 9474 (Fellmann 1989, pl. 2.3), Palermo (Puhze, Katalog 11, 1995, no. 167), Munich 9409 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 3.7). Clothed: 82 (Mule Painter, pl. 25c), Altenburg 226 (stag under horse, E. Bielefeld 1959, ČV 1, pl. 37.1), Athens NM 12078 (Callipolitis-Feymann 1986, pl. 37.3), London, market (with flying bird, Sotheby’s, 9.10.1974, no. 204), Milan A.10.9.263 (with dot-rosettes in tondo, not previously published), Munich 9412 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 6.1), Paris, Louvre F 84Bl (hare under horse, F. Pottier 1913, ČV 8, pl. 79.7), Pontecagnano (with dot-rosettes in tondo, D’Andrea 1994, 452, pl. IIc), Taranto 20239 (with flying bird, Masiello 1997, fig. 64.4). Unclear whether nude or clothed: Paris, Koutoulakis (Moore 1971, no. 970, not ill.), Reggio di Calabria (from Locri,
Exterior decoration

None of Sokles’ preserved cups has figurework on the exterior.

Ornaments

The palmettes of 34 and 35 are carefully executed: 10-12 rounded, red-and-black leaves, very simple volutes and one or two red ties (fig. 19a-b). Those of 39, 40, 44 and 47 are similar, but less carefully painted (fig. 19c-d), while the one palmette of 48 is conspicuously careless work with stocky leaves and an incised tie. All the palmettes have large red cores bordered by a double- incision, and all are positioned slightly obliquely.

The underside of the feet of 34 and 36 are adorned with circles in one-three-one order.

Provenance and chronology

Sokles’ exports are widely dispersed: six in central Italy (36-37, unspecified locations in Etruria: 34, Vulci; 39, Rome; 48-49, [probably] Cerveteri) and single pieces from each of the following places: France (40), Greece (44), southern Italy (45) and Turkey (47). Some cups are (said to be) from funerary contexts (34, 36, 45, 48-49), whereas one came to light in a sanctuary (39) and two in a settlement (40, 47).

The excavation data of the settlement at Saint-Pierre-Lès-Martigues, where 40 was found, show that its earliest imported pottery dates from the 560s BC. The Athenian black-figure comprises a column-krater attributed to Lydos, c. 550 BC, and a volute-krater and amphora attributed by F. Villard to a painter near the Antimenes Painter, probably from the 520s BC. The production date of Sokles’ lip-cup (40) fits easily between the work of Lydos and that of the artisan near the Antimenes Painter. The fragment of a band-cup from Daskyleion, Turkey (47), has been excavated from so-called ‘Trench A’, the location of which is unclear; curiously, no other object is marked with the name of this trench. K. Görkay assigns 47 to c. 540 BC.

The funerary context of 45 is chronologically informative. It came to light in a tomb on the Via Pitagora, Taranto, together with an undecorated Athenian band-cup, an Athenian black amphora with reserved neck, and a Laconian cup by the Rider Painter, all placed by P. Pelagatti at c. 540 BC. C. Stibbe agrees with Pelagatti and explains extensively why the Rider Painter’s cup, which at first sight looks earlier, was made in c. 545/5 BC.

The work of the potter Sokles can not easily be dated, as he continued using early features of the shape for quite some time (blunt jog, thick stems). Furthermore, the Sokles Painter evidently mingled old and new traits; for example, he combined circles under the foot (36) or a dividing line in the handle-zone (39) with simple tongue borders. His handle-palmettes remain slightly oblique until the end of his career and tend to be a bit less carefully executed over time.

Santuario di Persephone, not previously published; exhibited amongst other fragments from that site), Samos K 6994 (Kreuzer 1998a, pl. 49, no. 331), Syracuse 7/376 (Vallet/Villard 1964, pl. 89.7). A Corinthian cup (Campenon 1999, 385, 389, fig. 7a-b). Campenon 385-86, fig. 1a-b. Görkay, 3 and 37. Pelagatti 1955/56, 35. Stibbe 1972, 172-73.
The script, evolving from very angular to more flowing, rounded and smaller lettering, helps to divide the cups into two periods: earlier, 34-42, and later, 44-49. On 43 the letters are still large, while being a bit rounded, indicating that the cup probably belongs between the two periods.

The earliest period of Sokles’ career seems to comprise two phases. The Madrid Gordion cup (34) can be assigned to the first one due to the type of decoration and bluntly offset lip; being much higher and larger than other type B Gordion cups, it belongs to the final production of such cups, c. 555/50 BC. Other first-phase cups are 35 (note the tondo border), 36 and 38 (note the rather short tongues, shape of the feet and, 38, the bluntly offset lip).

Because of their fragmentary condition and lack of (preserved) figurework, the chronology of 40-42, which show the rather straight script, is hard to establish. However, the very sharp offset of 43 suggests that it belongs to the second phase, perhaps at the very end of the earliest period. To judge from the excavation data, especially of 45, the second period was probably 545/35 BC.

Concluding remarks
The potter Sokles seems to have worked with the same painter throughout his career, although the later cups lack figurework by which they can be compared to earlier ones. The looser style of writing would reflect a better trained hand, as do the differences between the palmettes. However, the general appearance of the script and palmettes remains recognizable as the product of one hand over the years. In short, it can be supposed, with some certainty, that both the potter Sokles and the Sokles Painter were the same artisan.