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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. 1a-b, 3a), M. Almagro Gorbea recognized that the same artisan had painted a lip-cup from Rhodes (2, pls. 1c-d, 3b), 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...

---

104 Four lip-cups and two fragments. For Eucheiros and the Eucheiros Painter see Hoppin 1924, 85-87; Beazley 1932, 169; 175, 178; 200; Robertson 1951a, 149; ABV 162; Parà 68; Almagro Gorbea 1971; Haldenstein 1982, 3-6; Add f 47; KLA I, 221 (B. Kreuzer).

105 For this vase see especially Maetzke 1990 and Torelli 2007. For convenience, the most common interpretation of epoiesen as a potter’s signature is adopted (the meaning of epoiesen for painter is hardly contested); however, as we shall see, the epoiesen-signature has not the restricted meaning of ‘made me personally’. For a further discussion of the meanings of epoiesen see chapter eleven. For the dating of the François vase see n. 74.

106 ABV 77.7, 78.12-15, 79-80; for the new Gordion cup fragment with partial signature of Kleitias, Marseille MCR 11-193, see Denoyelle/Henard 2006, 248, pl. VI.2.

107 Four lip-cups and two fragments. For Eucheiros and the Eucheiros Painter see Beazley/Payne 1929, 265-67; Beazley 1932, 185-86; Delw 24-34; Robertson 1951a, 143-46; ABV 76-80; Parà 29-30; Boardman 1974, 33-34; Maetzke 1980; Haldenstein 1982, 1-6; Stähler 1987; Hoffmann 1987; Add f 21-22; Iozzo 1998; Brijiwer 2000, 549-56; KLA I, 214; s.v. Ergotimos (B. Kreuzer) and 419-21, s.v. Kleitias (B. Kreuzer); see also below, the discussion of 21, attributed to a painter near Kleitias.

108 Almagro Gorbea 1971. The term LIO is used for lip-cups with figurework both inside and out; cf. above, p. 15. In total, 47 lip-cups of this type are known to me: five cups are by the Eucheiros Painter (1-2, 4), or in the Manner of the Eucheiros Painter (16, 19), nine cups from Xenokles’ workshop are of this type (53-54, 58-59, 84-87), four lip-cups from Exekias’ workshop (117), Taliades’ (123), Hermogenes’ (132), Centaur Painter (506), Thopheidas (697) and Myospis (699); one fragmentary cup, Athens, NM Acropolis 1609 (Græf/Langlotz, 171, pl. 82) most likely belongs to the LIO type (the probable figured parts of the lip are lost, but the dot-tongue border of the medallion and the horsemen in the handle-zones, replacing the handle florals, point to figured decoration on the lip). The others are: Athens, NM Acropolis 1572 (Græf/Langlotz 1909-30, 168), Basel, private (Wachtter 2003, no. 56, pl. 181), Bassano del Grappa 59 (Andreassi 1990, 88, no. 15), Berlin F 1773 (Painter of the Boston Polyphemus, ABV 198.1; Parà 89; Friis Johansen 1960, 135, fig. 14), Berlin F 1777 (Griffith-bird Painter, Brijwer 2000, pl. 225b), Copenhagen, NM ABC 42 (C. Blinkenberg 1928, CVA 3, pl. 117.1, late and with short stem), Florence V 34 and V 34b/s (Iozzo 2006, 128-29; pl. IX. 1-5). Germany, private (interior: sirens; exterior: swan; not previously published, known from photos received from K. Schauenburg), Helgoland, Knopatscheck (Hornbostel 1980, no. 54), London, market (Painter of Munich 1379, ABV 30); Sotheby’s, 24 February 1964, no. 99), Malibù, Getty 81.AE.100 (not previously published), Milan 11066 (Facchinetti 1977, pls. XII-XIII, Munich 2171 and 9412 (Fellmann 1988, pls. 1.2-5, 6-17), New York 12.234.1 (reminiscent of Vintage Painter, Brijwer 2000, 558, n. 37, fig. on p. 560, middle, pl. 199), New York, market (Sotheby’s, 17 December 1997, no. 100), Paris, Louvre Cp 10277 (Schauenburg 1981, 339, figs. 12-14), Rome, VG 63556, 63557, 64221 (Ricci 2003, 3-4, nos. 4-5, figs. 11-16, and Tanja Palmströmä, 53-36, no. 21), Tarquinia RC 4194 (G. Jacopi 1956, CVA 2, pl. 21.5-6). I consider the LIO cup sold by Panvini to be a fake (December 2003, p. 31, sine no.; previously, Panvini, June 2001, no. 93).
the beginning of the latter’s career. 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), but recognized that too little comparative material was available to confirm all the attributions. B. Freyer-Schaubenburg assigns another cup to Eucheiros, Kiel B 539 (4, pls. 2e-d, 3d), linking it to the signed cup London B 4117 (3). A.B. Brownlee states that a fragment found in Corinth must be work of a son of Ergotimos (7, pl. 4c). 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). 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. 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 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 extra deep (0.39, 0.43); the lips of the two earliest cups flare the most (1-2). The lip of 4 is not sharply offset. 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’ (186).
111 B. Freyer-Schaubenburg 1988, CVA Kiel 1, pl. 23.
112 Brownlie 1989, 384-85, no. 105.
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 palmette 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 13, 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 repaint 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-Schaubenburg 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: ἔπωσεν 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 ἐποίησε-ignatures 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).
The signatures, the later ones with a πατριώτικον, 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 (ΕΠΟΔΟΕΕΠΕΝ, fig. 7), may simply be a case of repetition, in which the fairly similar pi and iota precede the omikrons.

All the χαιρε-inscriptions conform to the formula χαιρε-καίριεις. 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.

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 Euchers the O-sound is omitted after the rho. Depending of the pronunciation of the dipthong ‘ei’, the misspellings Euchorios 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 dipthong in the name Taleides.

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

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 *glykóneus* and means ‘I am a beautiful drinking cup’, while very rare, appears also a cup with Gordias features, related to the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop, and on a Siana cup.  

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. The story is occasionally illustrated in the tondos of Siana cups, in various compositions: Deianeira sits on Nessos’ back, but Herakles is not present; Herakles fights Nessos, as inside 2, or the three actors are represented. 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. 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.
around 600 BC, although this did not entirely replace other arrangements.\textsuperscript{129} In addition to \textit{1}, 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 (\textit{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{131} Inside \textit{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 seize the antlers, the other one the stag’s foreleg. No other little-master with this story is known.

Whereas outside Attica the story of the killing of the Minotauros by Theseus (\textit{9-10}, pl. 5b, d) was already being depicted from about 650 BC, it was not introduced in Athenian vase-painting until 570-60 BC.\textsuperscript{132} More depictions date from the next decade, and in the following decades the number triples. In most cases the hero uses a sword to destroy the creature, who is armed with stones. Sometimes the Athenian youths and maidens, whose lives depended on the outcome, are also seen and Ariadne may be included, but most often only the two central protagonists are portrayed.

The pictures of Theseus and the Minotauros in the tondos of \textit{9} and \textit{10} predate the earliest examples on Sianas.\textsuperscript{133} 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{134} And in another two lip-cups the Minotauros faces Theseus.\textsuperscript{135}

**Non-mythological subjects**

The theme of two heraldic cocks as inside \textit{1} (pl. 3a) is rare for the tondo of a little-master cup and as yet unknown in that of a Siana.\textsuperscript{136} However, as the tail and head are missing, it can not be ruled out that the left-hand fowl depicts instead a hen.\textsuperscript{137} Little remains of the tondo of \textit{5}: a palmette and what seems to be the tail-feathers of a fowl (pl. 3c). It may represent the same theme as \textit{1}.

\textsuperscript{129} LHM III (1986) 249-59, s.v. Chimaera (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 (Basel, 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 (\textit{4}, pl. 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 (Cygiselim-Mangani 1991, pl. XVI, no. 25b), Taranto 4352 (Maischel 1997, fig. 13.14), all three showing a usual lion’s tail; others without preserved tail: Agrigento, Asklepieion 77/85 (Miro 2003, 196, pl. XCl,2), Rome, VG 64221 (Tzetzes Pantaleon, ca. 35-36, no. 21; no ill. of interior), Thasos 3949 (no ill. of interior), 59.105 (from two different cups, not previously published).

\textsuperscript{131} Kluiver 2003, 148, 229, no. 6, fig. 56; LHM 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 the statistics); see also Tzetzes Teidellid, passim. On a Boeotian relief pithos, about 650 BC, Basel, AntMus BS 617 (Brommer 1982, pl. 26), the Minotauros is in reversed shape (bull’s body and human face), but on a Sicilian stamnos of about the same date, Paris, Louvre CA 3383 (Brommer 1982, pl. 25), the Minotauros has the familiar bull’s head and human body. One of the earliest preserved Athenian examples is found on a hydria by the Prometheus Painter, Leiden PC 47, dated by Kluiver 570-65 BC (Kluiver 2003, 150, no. 32; M.F. Jongkees-Vos 1972, CVA I, pl. 4).

\textsuperscript{133} There is a Siana cup in Berlin, V.I. 3735, dating from c. 550 BC (Brijder 2000, 615-17). However, the exterior of a konast cup of c. 565/55 BC, Palermo 2574, portrays Theseus and the Minotauros (non vidi; Brijder 1983, 104-5, K 216). For exterior depictions on little-master cups, see nn. 480-81.

\textsuperscript{134} Moscow, Pushkin II b 72 (N. Sidirova 1996, CVA I, pl. 56.1-2), Taranto 52146 (Maischel 1997, fig. 69.7).

\textsuperscript{135} The only known parallel is the lip-cup, Würzburg L 408 (Langlotz 1932, pl. 116); possibly also the fragmentary lip-cup.

\textsuperscript{136} Such a composition occurs on one side of the band-cup Sydney 51.11 (ABV 442); where compared with oinochoe, New York 06.1021.64, where on the other side both fowls are cocks. For overlapping pairs of cock and hen in tondos, see n. 294.
Cup 11 (pl. 6a) bears one of the earliest representations of homoerotic courting in a tondo. Typically, the knees of the erōtēs are bent and his arms are in the ‘up and down’ position, as Beazley called it. The erōtēs is usually still, often grasping the raised wrist of the erōstenos. In this position, during the early phase of the act of courting, the head of the erōstenos is usually on the same level as that of the erōtēs; in some instances, however, as inside cup 11 and the one attributed here to the Manner of the Eucheiros Painter (15, pl. 6d), the erōtēs looks up at the erōstenos, holding his chin lifted and head thrown back. The dead hare suspended behind the erōstenos is generally considered a love-gift, while referring at the same time to the hunt. 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 85B15, where a dog actually chases a frightened hare. 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. The tondo of cup 13 (pl. 6c) is occupied by a single cock, with lotuses above and before it. When only a single cock is depicted, it may face either left (13) or right; once a lone cock looks round (in 340, pl. 975).


139 In Tleson Painter, pl. 95e) in chapter ten.

140 Similarly, the amphorese Munich 1468 (ABV 315.3, Painter of Cambridge 47; Vannevis/Kaeser 1990, 145, fig. 21.8) and Vatican 352 (ABV 134.30, Group E; Hupperts 2000, 390, Z 13, ill. 42).

141 On the lekythos by the Malibu Painter, Kerameikos 6159 (Barringer 2001, 81, figs. 42-44), homoerotic courting takes place in the presence of a hunter returning home, represented conventionally by a male with a dead hare and dead fox hanging from a pole over his shoulder; see here also the discussion of 93 (Phrynos Painter, pl. 28a) in chapter three or 332 (Tleson Painter, pl. 95e) in chapter ten.

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

143 Lip-cups: dead catch beside the couple: 15 (Manner of the Eucheiros Painter, pl. 6d), 35 (Sokles, pos. α, pl. 10d), Thasos 1163b (Ghali-Kahil 1960, pl. 32.27); with one or two dancers: 235 (Epitimos Painter, pos. γ, pl. 68c), Athens, NM Acropolis 1761 (Graef/Langlotz, pl. 86, pos. γ), Athens, Agora A-P 733 (Pease 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 Polyphemos, Friis Johansen 1960, 135, fig. 14, pos. γ), Berlin F 1774 (Painter of the Nicosa Olpe, Salis 1930, 7, fig. 5, pos. α), Leiden I 1956/1,1 (M.F. Vos 1978, CVA 2, pl. 59.5, 7, pos. β), Rome, VG 79872 (Hannestad 1989, no. 63, 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.

144 Lotus buds are not included on Vatican 35530 (Iozzo 2002, 139-40, no. 187, pl. LXXXVII) and 340 (Tleson Painter, pl. 975) where the empty space above the cock is filled by a snake and the face of the cock looking round.

145 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.\(^{147} \) 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.\(^{148} \)

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.\(^{149} \) 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.\(^{150} \)

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.’\(^{151} \) However, one can not be careful enough to assume political propaganda through vase-images, let alone a particular political preference of a craftsman.\(^{152} \)
Amongst other little-masters, the confrontation between Herakles and Triton is met in the
ondos of one lip-cup and on the exteriors of three band-cups. In contrast, other lip-cups feature a
ome 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
curved, 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.

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 Eucheiros 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.

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.

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 Eucheiros 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.

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.

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 Eucheiros 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.
21e and 22).

154 Lip-cups: 289-90 (Tleson Painter, pls. 82f, 83b), Amsterdam 2127 (Brijder et al. 1996, pl. 96.2); band-cups:
Athens, Agora P 3853 (Afghanistan-Jëgër XXIII, no. 1697, pl. 111), Como C 19 (F. Porten Palange 1970, CVA 1,
pl. 3.2a-c), from Marion, now lost (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1893, pl. 110.7-5), Naucratis (Flinders Petrie 1886, pl.
13.9), Orvieto, Faina 3215 (Wójcik 1989, 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.
84.

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


158 Only cups with a (floral) motif between are cited here: in the Group of Vatican G 61 (further characterized by
the inscription XAIPXŒKAIHEIΠEINÊMÊ): Bellagio, Villa Mezï (cocks, not previously published, known from
photo in Beazley Archive, BAPD no. 47083), Florence a.n. (cocks, not previously published), Paris, Louvre Cp
10254 (panthers, Plautine 1938, pl. 88.7), Sydney 53.14 (sirens, Pârã 77), possibly also Hannover, private
(sirens, imitation inscription, BÖF, June 1983, no. 24.), swans with panther’s head between, Munich 9419
(Fellmann 1998, pl. 20.4). From other craftsmen: cocks, New York, market (Sotheby’s, 11 December 2002, no.
34; previously, idem, 17 December 1996, no. 25), Tuna-Nörling (Tomba Panatenaica, 55-36, no. 21),
Sydney 31.11 (ABV 442), Turin 5374 (F. Lo Porto 1960, CVA 1, pl. 1.3), rams, Bayrakti 114 (Tuna-Nörling
1993, 13, no. 27, pl. 1.), goats, Corinth KP 1171 (Cöfiffel XV. III, pl. 124, no. 2291), St. Petersburg (from Berezan, publication by T.J. Smith in preparation), Rome, VG 79659 (Hannestad 1989, no.
91), sphinxes, New York, market (Sotheby’s, 17 December 1996, no. 51), Taranto 4391 (Maselli 1997, fig.
26.2). For antithetic animals on lip-cups without a floral motif between, see nn. 588-89.

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 Naucratis which has the potter’s signature of Ergotimos. The undersides of some feet bear concentric circles arranged in one-three-one order.

![Fig. 10a-b. Palmettes of 2 and 5.](image)

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, Naucratis, 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 Naucratis. 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 kotôn 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 ΚΑΟΝΟΙΕIROΣΙΩΠΟΙΟΝ 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 series.

ABV 78.13 (Gordion), Robertson 1951 (Naucratis), Denoyelle/Hesnard 2006, pl. VI.2 (Marseille). Also note the olpe fragment by Kleitias from Huelva (Chamorro 1987, 225, fig. 24; Domínguez 2002, 437, fig. 3).

162 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).


164 The same applies to lip-cup 700, signed by Gageos (pl. 172a-b).

165 CVA Rhodes 1, 39-40, pl. 23.1-4 (inv. no. 10518).
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.

See n. 123.
Robertson 1951a, 145 no. 1.
Excavation data are only available for 7, although they are not very helpful.
Almagro Gorbea 1971, 173-75.
See Sakonides 186 (pl. 53e).
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 hand cup 14 are

The same traits are again met on 18 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 22.5 cm, which qualifies them as large. Only one of them (15) is found in 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 Chaire-inscription written without word divider. The large letters are placed in a straight line and centred well in the handle-zone. Of 14, the painter made a repetition error, writing epsilon and iota twice.
Fig. 11. Inscription with repetition error on side A of 16.

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 Potnia Theron, 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.177 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.178

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 Potnia Theron; the subject is not attested amongst Sianas.179

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 erastes’ raised chin.180

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.181

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).182 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 παρὰ πρὸ τοῦ 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 Iliad XXI, 470. For a comprehensive treatment of Artemis as Potnia Theron 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 Potnia Theron, 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. “Kentauroi et Kentaurides” (M. Leventopolou), 679; Beijder 2000, 606-7, with n. 248, 688 no. 564, pl. 158a, 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 (Çandarl/g213, funerary context); 15 and 16, central Italy (Vulci, Bisenzo, funerary contexts); 17, Megara Hyblaea (settlement); and 18, Athenian Acropolis (sanctuary).

Cup 16 was discovered in the necropolis of Palazzetta at Bisenzo, 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 Çandarl/g (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.

184 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. K2e, 88d, 103b-d, 111c-1).
185 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.
186 For a list of these on lip-cups see nn. 355-56.
187 For horizontal palmettes on other types of cup see n. 80.
188 V. Tuna-Nörling’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. 8e).\(^{188}\) Since my knowledge of it is limited to an article by Beazley, which includes a photograph of the interior, his comment is essential.\(^{189}\)

According to Beazley, the inscriptions with πατρόνυμικόν show the same spelling for ‘son of’ as Eucheiros used in his signatures: Ὕψύφυς.\(^{190}\) 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.\(^{191}\)

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.\(^{192}\)

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.’\(^{193}\) 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.\(^{194}\)

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 \(\theta 07\) large.\(^{195}\)

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.\(^{196}\) 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.\(^{197}\)

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 ἔπτυσμα depictions.\(^{198}\)

---

\(^{188}\) ABV 163; Beazley 1932, 179, fig. 11.

\(^{189}\) This cup could not be found when I visited the Vatican Museums to study little-masters.

\(^{190}\) Unlike the πατρόνυμικόν formula used, e.g., by Tleson (ΤΛΕΣΟΝΙΟΝΕΑΡΧΟΙ...), see chapter 10.

\(^{191}\) Once Florence, Museo Bardini/Palazzo de’ Mozzi A 2 (Marzi Costagli 1979, 41–42, fig. 11; also Schefold 1993, 217, fig. 224). See nn. 342–44; a list of known winged figures in the tondos 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).

\(^{192}\) That is contemporaneous with the Palazzo de’ Mozzi’s cup (see previous note).

\(^{193}\) ABV 79.4, 682, where Naples, Asturata; Iozzo 1998, pl. LXXIX 1-2 (c. 560 BC); Brijder 2000, 549, n. 3 (c. 560 BC or slightly earlier); Iozzo 2002, 136–37, no. 184, pl. LXXXIV (560/50 BC).

\(^{194}\) Cf. here 32 (pl. 9d-c), which also shows a resemblance to the painting of Kleitias. See nn. 192–94.

\(^{195}\) Schefold 1993, 122, fig. 112.

\(^{196}\) Iozzo 1991a, 267, no. 481, pl. 152c; Iozzo 1998, pl. LXXIX 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.

\(^{197}\) 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 (171, 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textsuperscript{21} and Florence 151056 to the figurework under the feet of large hand-cups where the bodies are interrupted by the hole in the stem.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{200} All profile heads of lip-cups, being cut off at the jog, are further examples of the form-induced arrangement.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{202}

Interestingly, the \textit{pars pro toto} formula was applied in at least three instances to centaurs (17-18, 21, pls. 7c-d, 9a) by painters who worked in, or were influenced by, the Ergotimos-Kleitias/Eucheiros workshop.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 (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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{206} Of them, Beazley only knew fragments: 22-26, 28 and 29.\textsuperscript{207}

\textsuperscript{198} Cf. Vacano 1973, 102-5, and Laufer 1985, for the Kaineus iconography.

\textsuperscript{199} Iozzo 1998, 253. For such depictions under the feet of these so-called ‘Prachtschalen’ see Greifenhagen 1971, Schaumburg 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., \textsuperscript{249} (BMN Painter, pl. 72e) and Basel, Cahn HC 843 (Bloeusch 1974, no. 240; Kreuzer 1992, 68-70, no. 70).

\textsuperscript{200} Samos K 1196 (Brjider 1997, 1-5).

\textsuperscript{201} As von Vacano has demonstrated, the motif of a profile head is of Greek origin, the earliest examples occurring in the late eighth 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).

\textsuperscript{202} \textsuperscript{289} (Tleson Painter, even Europa’s feet disappear ‘underwater’, pl. 83a) and Cambridge (Mass.), private (Sotherby’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.

\textsuperscript{203} No word-divider as seen in three of Sondros’ signatures.

\textsuperscript{204} See the discussion on the meanings of the signatures in chapter eleven.

\textsuperscript{205} Cf. Robertson 1951a, 146-48; ABV 173; Bikakis 1985, 178-80; \textit{Add 249}; DeVries 1997, 21-22; Brjider 2000, 549-57; \textit{KLA II 406} (P. Heesen).

\textsuperscript{206} Cf. Robertson 1951a, 146; Brjider 2000, 554-55 (type B Gordion cups).

\textsuperscript{207} ABV 173. I have not been able to examine the fragments 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.209

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.210 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, another observation suggests that an additional figure was indeed included, probably Herakles (as inside 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. Bikakis compares the rendering of the nose, half-open mouth and beard to the faces of the centaurs Petrairos and Hylaios on the François krater, concluding that the Naxos cup (32) must have been made in the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop. If so, 32 is the third known picture of Herakles and Nessos in the work of a painter associated with this workshop.

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

The male foot in 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 (34, pl. 10c) and the cup by Neandros in Paris (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 (27, fig. 14a) has a rounded palmette with nine leaves. The partial palmette on 25 appears to have been similar.

The other (nearly) complete palmette, seen on 28, though a bit stockier, is undoubtedly by the same hand (fig. 14a-b).

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

Provenance and chronology
Six type B Gordion cups or little-masters with Gordion features (22-27) have turned up in the eastern

...
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 (namely 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, 555/35 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. At least, we can suppose he was probably influenced by potters of the Ergotimos-Kleitias workshop. 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. Beazley listed a Gordion cup (34, pl. 10a-c) and three band-cups (44-46, pl. 12d-e) signed by Sokles. 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. 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. 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). 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. 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).

---

224 For Sokles and the Sokles Painter see Hoppin 1924, 330-31; Beazley 1932, 186, 191, 202; ABV 172-73; Schauenburg 1965; Blatter 1968; Pâra 72; Add f 49; Brjder 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 εποίησε in chapter eleven.
227 ABV 172.1, 173.2-4.
228 Schauenburg 1965, 857.
229 Berlin F 1737 (Pâra 72).
230 Mommsen 2005a, 33, pl. 13.5.
231 Paris, Louvre F 99 (Platonine 1938, pl. 87.10-11). By my negligence Brjder received incorrect information from me that both handles of the Madrid cup are modern: one is definitely original (cf. Brjder 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>22.7</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>

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). The letters of 43 are yet large, though a bit more rounded (pl. 12c).
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.

Fig. 17b. Inscription of 44.

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.

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 back (e.g., 49, pl. 12f).

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), Exekias (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 tondos. Brijder calls them ‘male counterparts of Nike, messengers of victory’ because they are paired, in all but one instance, with sporting or martial subjects on the exterior.241 None of these winged youths is nude, as in 38 (pl. 12a), which seems to be unique in this respect. However, the exterior subjects of the few little-masters with winged youths inside can not be relied on to reveal their identity. The example in the tondo of a Basel lip-cup, attributed to the Manner of Lydos (244, pl. 71b), is named as an inscription as Kastor, one of the Dioskouroi. Inside another lip-cup, once in Florence, the youth carries a woman and can therefore be regarded as Boreas kidnapping Orytheia.242 The two winged figures inside a third lip-cup, Acropolis 1757 by the Tleson Painter (334, pl. 95g), are traditionally said to be Boreadai, although proof is not available.243 Those of two other lip-cups are much too fragmentary to allow for comment.244 Sirens (as in 43, pl. 12b) are amongst the most common subjects in the tondos of little-master cups.245

Non-mythological subjects

Above, we have considered two examples of homoerotic courting couples in the tondos of lip-cups (11, 15, pl. 6a, 4). The couple inside 35 (pl. 10d) differs from most depictions because the *eromenos* has an erection and the *erastes* is less passive than usual, holding his right arm bent up. Although an *erates* with an erection is seen elsewhere in Athenian black-figure, most commonly neither the man nor the youth is aroused.246 E. Keuls interprets the gesture of the *eromenos* as protest.247

A lone horseman, as in 36 (pl. 11b), is frequently met in the tondos of little-masters. The figure’s activity can not always be easily determined: jockey, light cavalry man or hunter. That the figure might be either nude or clothed is not particularly informative, as a nude horseman is sometimes equipped with a spear.248

240102 (Phrynos Painter, pl. 31a), 209 (Neandros, pl. 60a), 253 (IIMN Painter), Basel, market (MUNovember 1986, no. 182), Bucareste (Domeantiu 1988, fig. 2.6), Freiburg, market (Pulzhe, Katalog 18, 2004, no. 118), London, market (Painter of Munich 1379, ABV 303; Sotheby’s, 24 February 1964, no. 59), Palermo (ABV 675; Beazley 1932, pl. VI), once Rome, Torlonia (Hoppin 1924, 75), once Samos, K 1286 (Kreuzer 1998a, 178, no. 224), Thasos 3952n (Maffei 1979, 21-24, fig. 4). Twice the protagonists look in opposite directions: Berlin F 1772 (Herakles more upright; Furtwängler 1885, 294, pl. 41, fig. 11; also Schefold 1993, 217, fig. 224).

241 Brijder 1983, 117-18; Brijder 1991a, 393-94; without contest or combat on the exterior, Brijder 2000, 666.

242 Once Florence, Museo Bardini ‘Palazzo de’ Mozzi A 2 (Marzi Costagli 1979, 41-42, fig. 11; also Schefold 1993, 217, fig. 224).


244 Cup by Euchairos’s (20, pl. 8e) and Bucharest 9473C or 9573C (Dimitriou 66, 122-23, no. 793, pl. 44 reports inv. no. 9473C, whereas Alexandreus 1978, 73, no. 383, pl. 42 reports inv. no. 9573C). A list of known winged figures in the tondos of little-master cups is found in nn. 338-40.

245 A list of sirens in tondos of little-master cups and Siana is given in nn. 341-48.

246 For a discussion of courting scenes see above, p. 22. If one of the pair has an erection, he is as a rule the *eromenos*, very unusually both figures have erections on a cup fragment in Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology (Hepworth 2000, 248, ill. 51).

247 Keuls 1985, 278.

248 Nuve 55 (Xenosles Painter, horse-protome, pl. 15d), 106 (Archikles, pl. 33a), Bassano del Grappa 59 (Andreani 1990, 88), Elea 7219 (with spear; Neusch 1979, pl. 35.2), Freiburg, market (with spear, Puhze, Katalog 2, 1979, no. 53), Hobart, University GV 61 (rosette under horse, Hood 1982, pl. IXb), Lugano, market (Atelier Amphora, February 1993, not previously published), Munich 9409 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 37), Clothed: 84 (Male Painter, pl. 25c), Altenburg 226 (stag under horse, E. Bielefeld 1959, CVK 1, pl. 37.1), Athens NM 12078 (Callipolitis-Feytmans 1986, pl. 37.3), London, market (with flying bird, Sotheby’s, 9-10 July 1984, no. 204), Milan A.0.9.263 (with dot-rosettes in tondo, not previously published), Munich 9412 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 6.1), Paris, Louvre F 84/6 (bare under horse, F. Potter 1933, CVK 8, pl. 79.7), Pontecagnano (with dot-rosettes in tondo, D’Andrea 1994, 452, pl. IIe), 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, 38
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 33, 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.

Fig. 19a-d. Palmettes of 34 (a-b) and 44 (c-d).

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. 545/35 BC.

The work of the potter Sokles cannot 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. 89, no. 331), Syracuse 7/376 (Vallet/Villard 1964, pl. 89.7).
246 A Corinthian cup (Campenon 1999, 385, 389, fig. 7a-b).
247 Campenon 385-86, fig. 1a-b.
248 Görkay, 3 and 37.
250 Pelagatti 1955/56, 35.
251 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 Gordian 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 Gordian 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.