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2. XENOKLES, XENOKLES PAINTER, MULE PAINTER, PAINTER OF THE DEEPDENE CUP, POTTER AND PAINTER OF LONDON B 425 (nos. 50-92; pls. 13-27)

Introduction

Of the 41 cups and fragments with Xenokles’ signatures, 27 were known to J.D. Beazley, who assigned them to the potter Xenokles and recognized the hand of the so-called Xenokles Painter on most of them. Since then, another nine lip-cups and five band-cups can be added. Moreover, two unsigned lip-cups attributed to the Mule Painter can also be considered products of the potter Xenokles.

The cups and fragments with Xenokles’ signatures are the following types: seven lip-cups with figurework inside and out (LIO type), three lip-cups with figurework outside only and, lastly, nine lip-cups and eleven band-cups without figurework; in eight other instances the type can not be determined because essential parts are missing. Apart from Epitimos, the cups of no other potter are as frequently the rather rare LIO type. As yet, no band-cup with figured decoration has been given to the potter Xenokles nor has any shape other than lip- and band-cup been assigned to him.

The style of the Xenokles Painter, to whom most cups with Xenokles’ signature have been assigned, is very varied and often careless, presenting observers with many difficulties. Schauenburg argues that the Xenokles Painter’s multifigured friezes were directly inspired by Siana cups and agrees, as Beazley previously remarked, followed by others, that the painter clearly betrays the influence of the C Painter or his companions. Beazley seems to recognize this influence in the subject matter. H.A.G. Brijder regards it as originating with the Adelph Painter, who was a member of the C Painter’s workshop, pointing out stylistic links. In my view, however, while some influence on subject matter and composition may exist, there seems to be no demonstrable influence on the style. Moreover, as will be shown below, the painters of larger shapes (i.e. amphorae) very likely left their mark on the Xenokles Painter’s subject matter. Publishing the Baltimore cup (50, pl. 13a-c), D.A.

254 For Xenokles and the Xenokles Painter see Hoppin 1924, 409-32; Beazley 1932, 173, 176, 178, 191, 197; ABV 184-86, 688; Amyx 1962; Blatter 1968; Parf 76-77; Blatter 1981; Haldenstein 1982, 63-66; Blatter 1988; Fellmann 1989, 12; ADF II, 520 (R. Blatter). One of the cups, formerly in the Hope collection in London B 425 (nos. 50-92; pls. 13-27), has been lost and is known only from descriptions and drawings. The oinochoe Athens NM 1045 (ABV 186; Cohen 2000, 360, fig. 13.10) has no connection with the cups and is not further considered here.

255 Additions were made by Blatter (1981, 68-9), Facchini (1977, 66), Wójcik (1989, 88), Heesen (1996, 124-26, with nn. 5, 9) and Iozzo (2002, 139, n. 2). One attribution by Wójcik, Braunschweig AE 559 (1989, 86), can not be accepted. Two new attributions will be introduced here. I thank Mario Iozzo for providing me with information and photos of the cup in the collection of Mrs. Grazzini Becchi (ABV KLA II, 520 (R. Blatter). One of the cups, formerly in the Hope collection in London B 425 (nos. 50-92; pls. 13-27), has been lost and is known only from descriptions and drawings. The oinochoe Athens NM 1045 (ABV 186; Cohen 2000, 360, fig. 13.10) has no connection with the cups and is not further considered here.

256 For Xenokles and the Xenokles Painter see Hoppin 1924, 409-32; Beazley 1932, 173, 176, 178, 191, 197; ABV 184-86, 688; Amyx 1962; Blatter 1968; Parf 76-77; Blatter 1981; Haldenstein 1982, 63-66; Blatter 1988; Fellmann 1989, 12; ADF II, 520 (R. Blatter). One of the cups, formerly in the Hope collection in London B 425 (nos. 50-92; pls. 13-27), has been lost and is known only from descriptions and drawings. The oinochoe Athens NM 1045 (ABV 186; Cohen 2000, 360, fig. 13.10) has no connection with the cups and is not further considered here.

257 Additions were made by Blatter (1981, 68-9), Facchini (1977, 66), Wójcik (1989, 88), Heesen (1996, 124-26, with nn. 5, 9) and Iozzo (2002, 139, n. 2). One attribution by Wójcik, Braunschweig AE 559 (1989, 86), can not be accepted. Two new attributions will be introduced here. I thank Mario Iozzo for providing me with information and photos of the cup in the collection of Mrs. Grazzini Becchi (ABV KLA II, 520 (R. Blatter). One of the cups, formerly in the Hope collection in London B 425 (nos. 50-92; pls. 13-27), has been lost and is known only from descriptions and drawings. The oinochoe Athens NM 1045 (ABV 186; Cohen 2000, 360, fig. 13.10) has no connection with the cups and is not further considered here.

258 For Xenokles and the Xenokles Painter see Hoppin 1924, 409-32; Beazley 1932, 173, 176, 178, 191, 197; ABV 184-86, 688; Amyx 1962; Blatter 1968; Parf 76-77; Blatter 1981; Haldenstein 1982, 63-66; Blatter 1988; Fellmann 1989, 12; ADF II, 520 (R. Blatter). One of the cups, formerly in the Hope collection in London B 425 (nos. 50-92; pls. 13-27), has been lost and is known only from descriptions and drawings. The oinochoe Athens NM 1045 (ABV 186; Cohen 2000, 360, fig. 13.10) has no connection with the cups and is not further considered here.

259 I do not accept M. Iozzo’s reading of a Xenokles’ signature in the very worn and partly lost inscription on side B of Vatican 35020 (Joizzo 2002, 138-39, no. 185, pls. LXXV-LXXXVI). First of all, the best preserved letters – a chi and an iota-epsilon combination – may very well be part of a χαριζομεν inscription; second, there is no explanation at hand for the absence of a final nu, since there is enough space available; third, if this cup is by the potter Xenokles or painters working for him, one would expect a word-divider after XAIPE on side A. A combination of a signature on one side and a χαριζομεν inscription on the other is not unique, though, examples exist by Eucharinos (6, pl. 4c–d), Phrynos (55, fig. 37a-b), Sakonides (170) and Epitimos (235, fig. 89a-b, in chapter nine). Twice Phrynos combines a signature with a χαριζομεν-inscription on one side of the cup (95, 104, figs. 37b, 38). Anakles and Nikosthenes do the same on their combined cup (255, pl. 74b).

260 Amyx (1962, 231): ‘Any attempt to find stylistic unity in the decoration of all these vases seems … to be a lost cause.’


Amyx notes ‘relics of an older tradition that flourished even before the C Painter’, strongly reminiscent of Sophilos.  

R. Blatter sees the possible influence of ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphorae.

Because of the Xenokles Painter’s variability, we might be tempted to give him credit for all or most of the cups signed by the potter Xenokles. However, it is here proposed that also the Mule Painter (84-85, pls. 23c-d, 24) and three assistants, mainly responsible for ornaments, decorated cups potted by Xenokles (57, 80-83, see below sections on inscriptions and ornaments).

Of the lost cup 86, nothing can be said about the potterwork or style. Finally, six cups with ἔποιησεν-signatures of Xenokles (87-92, pls. 26-27) were probably thrown by another potter-painter, named here the Potter and Painter of London B 25.

2.1. XENOKLES, XENOKLES PAINTER, c. 555/40 BC (nos. 50-83; figs. 20-27; pls. 13-23b)

**Shape and dimensions**

The potters work of Xenokles is very consistent, as a development in the shape can hardly be noticed, apart from the edge of the foot’s base which is rounded on the earliest cups and straighter on the later ones.

All of Xenokles’ lip-cups are *extra small* or *small*: diameters 12.1-15.0cm. The lip-cups are thin-walled with a rather low, out-turned lip which is sharply offset inside. The most prominent offset is met inside 64 and 69.

The bowls of the lip-cups are *deep* or *extra deep* (56, 0.40; 66, 0.43). The feet of most lip-cups are *medium*, like the feet of most band-cups. Only one lip-cup (56) has a *high* foot, and one band-cup foot is *low* (81, 0.43).

The band-cups are marked by a deep bowl and a lip which slopes gradually outwards.

With one exception, the band-cups are *extra small*: diameters 13.4-14.2cm. One cup (76) is somewhat larger, but still qualifies as *small*: diameter16.2cm.

As a rule, the band-cups also have thin walls (e.g., 75). The larger band-cup (76) shows a thicker wall and sturdier foot; the lip slopes gradually outwards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date-type</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>foot</th>
<th>bowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>560/55-Lip-cup</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555/45-Lip-cup</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/40-Lip-cup</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/40 Band-cup</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3: Average absolute and relative dimensions of Xenokles’ cups.

---


262 Blatter 1981, 68; see also, Heesen forthcoming.

263 The foot of 81 has been reattached and the stem may be shorter than it originally wax; furthermore, this is the only band-cup with a glazed fillet at the top of the stem, which may be a restorer’s addition.
Inscriptions
The inscriptions read εποίησεν. The majority of Xenokles’ signatures were very likely written by a single hand, that is, the Xenokles Painter’s. The writing is hasty, with an occasional misspelling, and a tendency towards backtrack, while the letter-forms are often blurred and have rounded corners. Furthermore, Amyx notes the spine, curly sigma, the often characteristically distorted nu, the hasty epsilon, with its horizontal bars not clearly drawn, and a tendency to let the brush clog and smear, so that, among other deformations, some omikrons are solid (fig. 21).

Characteristically, the formula of the εποίησεν-signature is ΧΕΝΟΚΛΕΣ:ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ, with a double-point dividing the name and the verb. As a rule, the signature extends pretty much completely across the handle-zone between the palmettes or even finishes above the right palmette, as on 69 (fig. 21). The signature of one cup (67) has the name and verb written separately on either side (pl. 19a-b). Only two inscribed cups of the Xenokles Painter show spelling errors: 66 reads, on one side, ΧΕΝΟΙΕΣΕΙΟ and, on the opposite one, lacks the final nu of the verb due to a lack of space; the script is the same as in the other signatures (pl. 18c). Cup 83 shows a misspelling in one verb, ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ, which, so to speak, swallows part of the name. On 57, errors also mark Xenoklean εποίησεν-signatures that were clearly written by a different hand: on one side, ΧΕΝΟΚΛΕΣ:ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ; on the other, ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ. The script is more upright and much stiffer than that of cups decorated by the Xenokles Painter; the pi on 57 is written as a rho (cf. figs. 21 and 22). Most likely, a Xenoklean signature is intended, but the writer, who was possibly an assistant painter, made the mistakes copying the writing while not properly comprehending it. In only one instance, 80, the word-divider has been omitted; moreover, its signatures have reversed sigmas and, on one side, ΧΕΝΟΚΛΕΣ is written as ΧΕΝΟΚΛΕΣ (fig. 23). Again, these signatures are by a hand different from that of the Xenokles Painter: the letters are upright with sharp, clean angles where the straight lines meet (cf. figs. 21 and 23).

Fig. 21. Εποίησεν-signature of 69 by the Xenokles Painter.

Fig. 22. Signature of 57.

Fig. 23. Signature of 80.

264 Amyx 1962, 231. See also Immerwahr 1990, 53-54.
265 In the reproduction of 86, the first letter is given as kappa. Kretschmer (1894, 179) suggested, however, that the K was maybe a badly drawn X and therefore misread. The double-point acts as a divider between name and verb also in the signatures of Sondros, Archikles, Exekias, Tempolemos, Sakonides, Neandros, Anakles, Charitos and Myspios; Taleides often has three dots instead (124-25, 127-28, 132), as do Eucheiros and Anakles each once (3, 257).
266 This is very rare on little-master cups, but it may be compared to cups 3 and 5 of Eucheiros; it also appears on a band skyphos signed by Klíonis, Princeton 29.180 (Smith 1935, A B 167; F·r·a· 69; Boardman 1974, fig. 133).
267 There is no ‘oddly placed punctuation between the last two letters of the verb’ on one side of 81, as Amyx stated (Amyx 1962, 231).
268 Cf. Immerwahr 2006, 145-46. The writer may also be the painter of the palmettes, which are also different from those by the Xenokles Painter (see below section on ornaments). The involvement of an assistant is more clearly discernible on 80-83.
269 The combinations of chi or phi plus sigma have more often been confused (cf. Kretschmer 1894, 180).
Possibly an assistant, who had especially been hired to apply ornaments, decided to try his hand at a signature. Indeed, collaboration on a single piece of pottery has sometimes been recognized in ornaments, animal friezes or different parts.272 Such organization was perhaps far more frequent than is usually thought; and it is easy to imagine that young apprentices started their training by painting simpler decoration or that, particularly in workshops where both large and small shapes were produced, painters specialized, for instance, in animal friezes or ornaments.271 The theory that assistant painters could sometimes be responsible for ornaments seems all the more likely because handle-palmettes which differ considerably from the Xenokles Painter’s usual type occur in combination not only with signatures written by the Xenokles Painter himself (56, 58-59, 81, 83), but also with those by other hands (57, 80).271

The space below the horse-protome in the tondo of 55 contains the retrograde inscription ΟΡΙΠΩΣ:273 This name ΟΡΙΠΩΣ , is also met on three ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphorae by the Prometheus Painter as well as on a hydria by the Zurich Painter.274

**Interior decoration**

The tondo borders of the Xenokles Painter’s cups consist of either the usual tongues or rings.275 In the tongue borders, a white dot marks the upper tip of each relief-line and, characteristically, the number of tongues is uneven, so that two adjacent black tongues mark the point where the painter began and finished applying added red (54, 56, 57, 59, pls. 15c, 17a-b, 18c). The same irregularity is frequently

---

272 Cf. Scheibler 1986, 790. Note for example, the Siana cup by the Griffin-bird Painter and companion, Athens, NM 533 (Brijder 2000, 648, with n. 432 for literature on the discussion, pls. 202e, 203b), or the amphora Florence 70995 by Lydos and companion (ABV 110.32; Tievros 1976, 36-38, pls. 22-23). See also Kreuzer 1998b for a lekaios in Florence, 9778, where two painters each decorated one part of the vase. Furthermore, H. Mommsen observes collaboration by the BMN Painter and the Painter of Vatican 342 (Mommsen 1989, 124). Note also the calyx-krater (partly) decorated by Euphranoris, Paris, Louvre G 110 (Maras 2005, 153). Beazley 1944, 27-33, mentions various examples in red-figure and on white-ground lekythoi (p. 29, on the Penthesileia workshop: ‘It was evidently not very uncommon for one painter to pass a cup on to his neighbour when it was half-finished, and thus add a little variety to mass-products which often stood in need of it.’) For ornament painters in the workshop of the Schuwalow Painter, see A. Lezzi-Hafter, Der Schuwalow-Maler, Mainz 1976, 23f. For examples on Caeretan hydriai see Hemeirik 1984, 66-70. For Nikosthenes’ workshop see Tosto 1989, 185. Note further the Siana cups potted likely by the Taras Painter and decorated by the Malibu Painter (Brijder 1983, 172, e.g., no. 224) and here lip-cup 502 (and possibly also 503-4), probably potted by Ergoteles and decorated by the Tleson Painter.

273 A thorough study of predellas on vases may perhaps tell us more about workshop connections and even show that little-master cup painters were called in to paint them, which might explain the strange addition of ‘handle-palmettes’ in many predellas. On the other hand, Mommsen remarks that Exekias may be responsible for also the subsidiary animal-friezes of four of his vases (Mommsen 2002b, 229 n. 36).

274 See below the section on ornaments (figs. 24-27).

275 See Kretschmer 1894, 177.

276 ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphora, Berlin F 1705, Rome, Conservatori 85, and Curverii s.n. (Kluiver 2003, 45-46, nos. 8, 9, 17), and hydria, Florence 70994 (P. Bocci 1969, CVA 5, pls. 3.1-2, 5-1-2).

277 Only 21 lip-cups with ring borders are known. Five are signed by Xenokles (50, 51, 53, 55, 61, pls. 13c, e, 14b, 15d) and two lip-cups are given to the Mule Painter (54-55, pl. 23c-d), an associate of Xenokles; one fragment, for unknown reasons, is designated by Beazley ‘Compare to the Xenokles Painter’ (Athenaeum, Acropolis 1787, ABV 184). Only one other lip-cup with ring border is signed (Taleides, 123, pl. 40d), and another lip-cup with ring border may be decorated by the Taleides Painter: London, market (Sotheby’s), 14-15 December 1981, no. 269; see n. 573). The others are: 253 (BMN Painter, pls. 75d), Altenburg 226 (E. Biedelfeld 1959, CVA 1, pls. 37.1, 38.3), Berlin F 1777 (Griffin-bird Painter, Brijder 2000, 559, 630, 635, 644, 706, pls. 206, 223b, 272), Bolligien, private (Blatter 1981, pl. 11.2), Copenhagen ABC 42 (C. Blakenberg 1928, CVA 3, pl. 117.1), Edinburgh 1953.23 (E. Moirand 1989, CVA 1, pl. 12.8-9), Munich 9408, 9420 (Fellmann 1988, pls. 3.1-4, 21.6), Paris, Louvre Au 10277 (Schaufenburg 1981, 339, figs. 12-14), Thasos 1234 (Ghilai-Kahl 1960, pl. 33), Witzburg H 3034 (F. Hilscher 1975, CVA 1, pls. 40.4, 41.3). In addition, five band-cups with interior decoration have a ring border: Paris, Louvre F 145 (Psautiert 1938, pls. 88.2, 4.6), Izmir 13753 (Tuna-Nölling 1995, pl. 3.34), Italy, illegally excavated, website of the Carabinieri, ref. no. 03265/039), Vatican 35533 (Ioizzo 2002, 152-3, no. 206, pls. XVII and - if indeed a band-cup fragment - Rome, Forum (Ryberg 1926, fig. 73c),
seen also in tondo borders of Nearchos and the Tleson Painter. The relative dimensions of two medallions (54, 56) are $54:0.64$ and $0.62$, respectively; whereas the relative dimension of the medallion with ring border inside 55 is $55:0.48$.

The interior of 77 is solid black, an unusual feature which occurs in at least 28 other lip- and band-cups, including seven entirely plain ones.

**Mythological subjects**

The girl-cock (51, pl. 13e) is extremely rare in Athenian pottery, being attested on only two "Tyrrhenian" amphorae by the Timides Painter. In other materials, the subject adorns coins and gems. The huge tail-feathers complement nicely the curving shape of the tondo.

A boy riding a hippocrepis (53-54, pls. 14b, 15c), though more common, is also quite rare, these being the earliest known specimens inside a little-master. On the other hand, hippocrepis, though not mounted, adorns the tondos of two earlier Siana cups by the Malibu Painter and a "Tyrrhenian" amphora by the Kyllenios Painter. Lip-cups 53-54 predate the sole representation of a hippocrepis with rider in a Siana cup tondo, assigned to the Painter of Erlangen J 230.

The interiors of little-masters show fairly frequently a seated sphinx. In most cases the sphinx is posed similarly to that of 56 (pl. 17a), raising one leg and looking round (but sometimes facing...
forward). Only occasionally is the creature depicted frontally. Earlier, the subject is rather often found inside Siana cups of the C Painter and his companions. Brijder compares the sphinx of 56 to the one in a Siana cup by the Adelph Painter in Amsterdam. The composition is indeed similar, but the sphinx of 56 is livelier and more comfortably occupies the round tondo field. G. Koch-Harnack maintains that the lotus bud emphasizes the seductive female nature of a sphinx.

A frontal siren, as seen inside 57 (pl. 17b) is highly unusual for a lip-cup. Far more common and much better suited to filling a tondo is a siren, turned either left or right, like those in, for instance, 85 and 89 (pls. 23d, 26d).

Non-mythological subjects

Besides 50 (pl. 13c), only seven other lip-cups with a panther inside are known. The drawing style of 50 is rather old-fashioned: Amyx considers the ‘boxy’ subdivision of the face and the double-incision of the shoulder reminiscent of Sophilos. However, the same features are repeated in the tondo of a Siana cup by the Griffin-bird Painter. The double shoulder incising recurs also on some animals in ‘Tyrrhenian’ work of the Prometheus Painter, Timiaudes Painter and Castellani Painter as well on an early lip-cup of Hermogenes (132, pl. 43a-b), an early, unattributed band-cup fragment in Kiel, and band-cup 14, attributed to the Manner of the Eucheiror Painter (pl. 6c-f). In another Siana cup of the Griffin-bird Painter, we find a parallel to the tail tucked forward between the hind legs.

Inside 50 the curly tail echoes the curve of the tondo. A comparably positioned tail and the double-incision of the shoulder are again seen on the panther of a type B amphora from Rhodes.

The composition is indeed similar, but the double-incision of the shoulder is again seen on the panther of a type B amphora from Rhodes.

The pair of a hen and cock in 59 (pl. 18c) is parallel inside a small number of little-master tondos. Koch-Harnack regards the lotus bud as a symbol of heterosexual partnership and fertility.
qualities which, of course, are most directly expressed by the animals themselves.\textsuperscript{295} As yet, the horse-
protome mounted by a youth in \textit{55} (pl. 15d) is unique in Athenian vase-painting.\textsuperscript{296}

\textbf{Exterior decoration}

The Xenokles Painter greatly varied the exterior. It is especially here that he demonstrates a tendency to
misplace figures and ornaments, for instance, note the off-centre bull on \textit{59} (pl. 18a).

Strikingly, quite a few of his lip-cups have a multifigured representation on the outside, whereas the
overwhelming majority of Athenian lip-cups, of course, feature single figures on the lip.\textsuperscript{296} Twice, the
figurework is spread across most of the lip (\textit{52, 57}, pls. 14a, 16c-d).\textsuperscript{297} Most often, however, the
Xenokles Painter focused the figurework in the middle, leaving some open space on either side (e.g., \textit{54}, pl. 15a-b).\textsuperscript{298} Insofar as known, he never repeated the same scene exactly on both
sides of the same cup, as rather commonly occurs on (later) little-masters.\textsuperscript{299}

\textbf{Mythological subjects}

At present, no other little-master cup is known to combine sirens and swans as seen on three of the
Xenokles Painter’s lip-cups (\textit{53-54, 60}, pls. 14c-d, 15a). On the other hand, the subject is repeated on two
of the Griffin-bird Painter’s Siana cups.\textsuperscript{300}

Also unique amongst little-master cups is the composition of three sphinxes on the lip of \textit{52}
(pl. 14a), which also applies to the three swans on the opposite side.\textsuperscript{301}

Fighting centaurs (\textit{56}, pl. 16a) are scarce, with only two contemporaneous parallels known: a
Siana cup in the Manner of the Red-black Painter and lip-cup \textit{16} (pl. 7a), assigned to the Manner of
the Eucheiros Painter.\textsuperscript{302}

\begin{quote}
market (Casa Serodine 1984, not previously published), the like, but without lotus bud; Milan 11066 (Facchini
1977, 63-65, pls. XLI-XLIII), where hen overlaps cock to left, without lotus bud. Two Siana cups by the C
Painter have cock and hen in the tondo (Kassel T 387; Vienna 200, Brijder 1983, nos. 1, 118; in both instances
the hen overlaps the cock; however, in Kassel the hen faces left and the cock right). See also the exteriors of lip-
cups: Brussels, MusRoy R 385a (F. Mayence 1926, CVA 1, pl. 2.8), Göttingen (Boehlau/Schefold 1942, pl.
55.21), St. Petersburg (from Berezn, publication by T.J. Smith forthcoming), Pompeii 6753 (Caro 1986, 85 no.
548, pl. XLII).

\textsuperscript{295} Koch-Harnack 1989, 38-39, fig. 18: she seems to adjust her theories about the erotic meaning of lotus buds to
every image discussed. We need to be wary of reading too much
into lotus buds, which in many cases seem to have simply been added as filling ornaments, deprived of any erotic symbolism. Cf., e.g., \textit{267} and \textit{341} by the
Teson Painter (pls. 78c, 98a), where space is filled by either a lotus or a bird with a snake in its beak,
respectively, which would seem to demonstrate, in my opinion, that the symbolic meaning of the lotus
disappeared over time or perhaps never existed at all.

\textsuperscript{296} Amyx 1962, 230, n. 5, mentions two Corinthian examples of the subject. On an Athenian amphora, Taranto
20865, attributed by Beazley to the Group of the Dresden Lekanis (ABV 21.2; Lo Porto 1959/60, 181, fig. 156a),
a horse-protome without boy rider appears in an animal frieze. Amongst little-master cups, the only other known
horse-protome (also without boy rider) is found under the foot of a band-cup (Koch-Harnack 1989, 39, fig. 5).

\textsuperscript{297} Similarly, the two cups by the Mule Painter (\textit{84, 85}, pl. 24) and, probably, Amathus 026 and 027 (Thalmann
1977, pl. XX-1.2). On a semi-lip-cup, Grosseto 3549 (Ceccioni 1985, p. 108; Pellegrini 2006, 17, 40-41, no. 7),
the scene is even continued above the handles.

\textsuperscript{298} Also see the seven figures of St. Petersburg B 1412 (A. Petrokova 2006, CVA 3, pls. 10-11) or, slightly off
centre, the eight compact figures on a lip-cup in Rhodes (Lemos 1997, figs. 6-7). Often the scene is flanked by
figures, e.g., Paris, Louvre F 91 (Plousinne 1938, pl. 86.6-8), London, market (ABV 303; Sotheby’s, February
1964, no. 59, Painter of Munich 13797), New York, market (NFA, 11 December 1991, no. 71), San Antonio
86.134.35 (Shapiro et al. 1995, 77, no. 34).

\textsuperscript{299} Repetition may occur on \textit{57}, where side B is mostly lost. However, a slight variation, as on \textit{53} (pl. 14c-d),
seems also a possibility. For repetition on archaic pottery see Steiner 1993 and 2006, but since she mainly relies
on Beazley’s lists of attributed vases, the little-master cups, especially those of later date, are not well
represented.

\textsuperscript{300} Athens NM 21026; Taranto 20127 (Brijder 2000, pls. 205 c-d, 217c-d).

\textsuperscript{301} Unfortunately, I have not seen the side with swans.

\textsuperscript{302} See n. 182.
Non-mythological subjects

While a grazing deer and panther(s), as on the lips of 54 and 56 (plts. 15b, 16b), are commonly combined in the animal friezes of Athenian band-cups, they are much less often portrayed together on lip-cups. 503 The Northampton lip-cup (58, pl. 58c-d) shows them dispersed over either side. 504

In Athenian black-figure the combination of bull and lion (57, pl. 16c) can be considered standard, particularly in animal fights where a pair of lions often attacks the bull and, occasionally, a panther jumps into the fray. 505

On little-masters, bull and stag are not known to appear together on the same side of a cup. However, a single bull or a single stag, as met on either side of the Xenokles Painter’s Seattle lip-cup (59, pl. 18a-b), occurs more frequently on lip-cups, especially in the work of the Centaur Painter. 506

Ornaments

The Xenokles Painter’s handle-palmettes usually have nine narrow, red-and-black leaves, with an elongated central leaf, around a small, red core (fig. 24). The execution is often careless, as is particularly visible in the application of the added red and the incising. Some stems overlap the lower black band (e.g., 75). In most cases, the volute’s tie consists of a short, red stripe or rather a red dot, on 66 once applied under the stem (fig. 24). Twice, the tie is incised (53, 80).

The palmettes of four cups (56-59) are a bit larger and the leaves are more tightly arranged, with all 9-11 leaves left black (fig. 25a-e). The incisions are neater. Another cup has yet different palmettes (80): five red-and-black leaves around a red core and an incised tie, the incisions being rather nonchalantly drawn (fig. 26). Finally, the palmettes of an additional three cups (81-83) differ quite a bit from the usual palmette of the Xenokles Painter: five rounded, red-and-black leaves and carefully drawn stems with neat incising (fig. 27a-c).

Since the noticeable differences between the palmettes can not be explained as a development over time, it is hard to envisage that they were all made by the same painter. As suggested above in the section on inscriptions, assistant (apprentice) painters could have been instructed to add ornaments. In fact, at least three different persons seem to have painted palmettes (one, 56-59; one, 80; one, 81-83).

And as also discussed above, in the case of 81-83, their contribution could be limited to the palmettes, whereas on 57 and 80 they may also have tried their hand at inscriptions. 507

Fig. 24. Palmettes of the Xenokles Painter (66)

503 Panther and deer: Florence 94746-94747 (ABV 232.13) and, by the same painter, Rome, VG 79526 (Hannestad 1989, no. 31), Paris, CabMed 5007 (M. Lambrino 1928, CVA 1, pl. 47.9-11), Munich 9407 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 2.1-5). Panther and deer between goats: 85 (Mule Painter, pl. 24c). Deer between panthers: London, market (Bonhams, 4 July 1996, no. 131).

504 Similarly, Munich 2157 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 16.5-8). For white dots on the necks of panthers on little-masters see Brijder et al. 1996, 96. For walking or standing panthers on lip-cups see n. 560.

505 Hofsten 1997, 20-23, 29-32. For animal fights on little-masters see nn. 771-80, 863.

506 Bulls on lip-cups by the Centaur Painter: 541, 546-47, 555 (the first two with a hunter on the other side; pls. 141b, 142d-e, 145b); and two unattributed fragments, Heidelberg S 33 (H. Groepengiesser 1970, CVA 4, pl. 154.6) and Miletus (Kunisch forthcoming). Villard (1955, 65 no. 2) mentions another fragment by the Centaur Painter with a bull from Pompeii; however, the only fragment from Pompeii that can be attributed to the Centaur Painter has a boar (544, pl. 142a). In a letter, de Caro suggests that Villard may have misread his own notes and, in fact, was referring to the boar.

507 See the section on inscriptions, figs. 21-22.
2.2. XENOKLES, MULE PAINTER, c. 555/50 BC
(nos. 84-85; figs. 28-30; pls. 23c-24)

In 1974, K. Schauenburg introduced the Mule Painter, whose hand he recognized on two lip-cups. On the basis of the multifigured friezes and ring borders, he concluded that the Mule Painter was an associate of the Xenokles Painter.

Shape and dimensions

The two cups are small. The foot of the Cambridge cup (84) is medium, while the bowl is deep (fig. 28). In shape, 84 is very similar to the smaller lip-cups of Xenokles, particularly 66 and 67. It would therefore seem that Xenokles probably potted the cups which the Mule Painter then decorated.

Fig. 28. Profile drawing of 84 (1:2).

309 Schauenburg’s remark (1974, 205) that ring borders only appear in the workshop of Xenokles is not correct. See n. 275.
310 Of the two cups by the Mule Painter, I have been able to make a profile drawing only of the one in Cambridge. However, the dimensions of the cup in the private collection seem to be very close. The edge of the foot of the Cambridge cup seems more rounded.
Inscriptions
Each cup has a chaîne-inscription which diverges from the usual formula by omitting the pi in πικι (fig. 29). With an incomplete inscription on one side and with no knowledge of the second cup by this painter (85), W. Lamb restored the inscription of 84 to χαῖρε κζκι πικι κιοι. But since it might be difficult to accept that the painter would make the same mistake on at least three sides on the two cups, Schauenburg proposes the translation: ‘Sei gegrüßt und lasse es Dir wohl gehen’. It seems more likely, however, as R. Wachter concludes, that the mistake has simply been repeated, as similarly occurs in the work of other painters.312

Figurework, style and decorative system
The Mule Painter decorated two cups of the so-called LIO type with ring border and multifigured frieze. Like the Xenokles Painter, he tended to place figures and ornaments incorrectly: the tondo figures overlap the border and some palmettes are situated too high.

Interior decoration
The Mule Painter’s tondos are each surrounded by four rings. Especially inside the Cambridge cup (84, pl. 23c), the rings tend to merge in places. In the Kiel cup (85, pl. 23d) the diameters of the rings are remarkably narrow in relation to the size of the reserved disk, with parts of the siren overlapping the rings, particularly the wings. The relative dimension of the medallion of 84 is medium: 0.51.

Mythological subjects
A siren turned to the right and looking round, as in 85 (pl. 23d), is rather commonly represented in the tondos of little-master cups.313

Non-mythological subjects
In the tondo of 84 (pl. 23c) the hare under the hunter’s horse seems to be anxiously anticipating its fate as prey.314 The hare-hunt usually took place on foot, with hounds driving the hare towards a net.315 Together with fighting-cocks, hares were the most favoured gift of an erastes to an eromenos.316 Therefore the hare may, at a second level, act as a homoerotic symbol which was dependent on the personal interpretation of the cup’s user.

311 W. Lamb 1930, CVA Cambridge 1, p. 25; Schauenburg 1974, 204-5.
312 Wachter 2003, 146. The inscription XAΠΕΚΑΠΕΙΕΙ is also met on a fragmentary lip-cup by the Tleson Painter, (424, pl. 116b). Similar mistakes occur on lip-cups by the Phrynos Painter, (97): XAΠΕΚΑΠΕΙΕΙ and by the Eucheiros Painter (4, fig. 8 above), XAΠΕΞΚΑΠΕΙΕΙΕΥ.
313 For the different compositions see nn. 341-48.
314 Similarly, a hare below a lone horseman in tondos: Gordian cup by Kleitias, Berlin 4605 (Brüder 2000, pl. 258c), and lip-cup, Paris, Louvre F 84bis (F. Pottier 1933, CVA 8, pl. 79.7); note also the hares beneath winged male figures (see n. 191). For a list of a lone horseman in little-master tondos see n. 248.
315 The net is visible on the band-cup London B 396 (Barringer 2001, 98 fig. 58); similar, but without a visible net, is a band-cup by the Centaur Painter (643, pl. 163a-b). For hare-hunting see Anderson 1985, 31-48; Schnapp 1997, 212 ff.; Barringer 2001, 95-98.
Exterior decoration
The multifigured friezes of the Mule Painter extend across the lip. As on the Xenokles Painter’s cups, the subjects are not exactly repeated on both sides. The attack of a bull by two felines on the lip of 84 (pl. 24a) has already been mentioned above in connection with 57. Animal friezes, of course, are much more common on band-cups. Amongst the animals of 84 and 85 (pl. 24a-d), the oxen and mule draw attention because the species are not usually depicted.

Ornaments
The Mule Painter’s handle-palmettes are rather indifferent work, though they consistently have nine, red-and-black leaves around a red core.

Fig. 30a-b. Palmettes of the Mule Painter (85).

2.3 PAINTER OF THE DEEPDENE CUP, c. 555/50 BC (no. 86; pl. 25a-b)

Introduction
Beazley wrote about this cup, ‘the style is of somewhat the same nature as in the last, but the hand is not clearly the same.’ Although it is now lost and known only from old drawings, one can say, like Beazley, with reasonable certainty that the style differs from all recognized work of the Xenokles Painter. Therefore the author suggests naming the cup’s painter the Painter of the Deepdene Cup. It is pointless to speculate about the potter.

Interior decoration (pl. 25b)
The only identifiable figure is Hermes on the left, provided with πετάσος, κηρύκειον and winged shoes, facing three, veiled females, probably goddesses; they stand on a ground line which defines an exergue. He bends his knees and stands shorter than the others, as if he were squeezed into the tondo. Here, most probably, the Judgement of Paris is shown, although Paris himself is absent. The illustrations of the story show a development in which the judge, Paris, becomes more and more reluctant to perform his task. On the Protocorinthian Chigi olpe in the Villa Giulia, about 640 BC, Paris calmly awaits the arrival of the goddesses; however, in the earliest known Athenian depictions

311 See nn. 297-98.
312 For animal fights on little-masters see nn. 771-80, 863.
313 For oxen with similar frontal heads see a Siana cup by the Vintage Painter, Basel, AntMus BS 428 (Brijder 1983, pl. 50d). It is often difficult to distinguish between horse, mule or donkey; a mule seems to have a thicker neck than a horse, but, admittedly, this may simply be a trait of this painter. The horselike animals with thick necks on a Siana cup by the Red-black Painter may also be mules (Brijder 2000, pl. 180a-b, describing them as grazing horses). For the mule, no parallel could be found on little-masters. In the animal friezes of band-cups, grazing horses are also rare: only two can be cited, Rome, VG Min 599 (Mingazzini 1930 no. 599, pls. 91-9, 95.8), and Sydney 48.256. Grazing horses appear in a mythological scene in Amsterdam, RALS 801b (Brijder et al. 1996, pl. 102.2). Cf. also Siana cup fragments by the Vintage Painter: Reading 51.4.6 (Brijder 1983, pl. 51c) and Rome, VG 79889 (Hannestad 1989, no. 3). Donkeys are more frequently seen on little-master cups, esp. ithyphallic, with satyrs and maenads, but only twice in animal friezes: Amsterdam, market (Schulman, October 1979, no. 28; previously, Christie’s London, 21 November 1978, no. 155) and Malibu, Getty 86.AE. 168.1-2 (Clark 1990, pl. 101).
314 ABV 184-85, where ‘the last’ refers to the lip-cup fragment Acropolis 1787, which Beazley compares to London B 428 (87, pl. 25c-d).
315 ABV 184-85, describing the females as ‘Nymphs’. For exergues in Athenian black-figure cups see p. 85.
on two tripod-kothons by the C Painter, c. 570/65 BC, he walks away, looking back at them.323 On two ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphorae of the Castellani Painter and two vases by Lydos, all dating 560/55 BC, Paris has turned away and started to run.324 The painter of the Deepdene cup chose to leave out Paris entirely from the already overcrowded scene, as the story could most probably be recognized by his contemporaries. Depictions of the Judgement omitting Paris are rare.325 Amongst later black-figure painters, the event prior to the actual judgement was most favoured by far, when the three goddesses follow Hermes to Mount Ida.326

**Exterior decoration** (pl. 25a)
The story of Achilles and Troilos is very well represented in Athenian black-figure, the earliest preserved depiction appearing on the François krater.327 The C Painter may have invented the composition in which Achilles has left his ambush position behind the fountain-house and pursues the fleeing Troilos and Polyxena, which became standard for the rest of the century.
The Deepdene cup depicts the complete scene with Troilos trying to escape while he leads a void horse and his sister Polyxena runs away, having dropped her hydria.328 While occurring occasionally on Siana cups, the scene is rarely met on Athenian little-master cups.329 The story of Herakles and Kerberos, on the opposite side, became popular in Athenian vase-painting only during the last three decades of the sixth century. Few depictions date earlier or later.330 The Deepdene cup and a contemporaneous Siana cup of the Red-black Painter are the earliest known Athenian illustrations.331 While the Siana cup presents a rather docile, one-headed Kerberos following Herakles, the Deepdene cup depicts Kerberos in the usual Athenian manner: two-headed, one of them looking round, snakes over the body and snake-tail.332 The identity of the female figure on the left is disputable: she can be either Herakles’ protective goddess Athena, Persephone representing the underworld, or simply an onlooker.333

---

323 Paris, Louvre CA 616, and Lille 763; Brijder 2005, 254-55; this became the most popular version depicted in Athenian black figure.
324 ‘Tyrrhenian’: Havana, Lagaminias (Olmos 1990, 24-29, no. 8; Olmos 1993, 114-16, no. 41); Klüver 2003, 162, no. 172), and whereabouts unknown (Klüver 2003, 163, no. 179); Lydos: column-krater London 1948.10-15.1 and the amphora Florence 70995 (Tiverios 1976, pls. 8, 22a, 23a).
325 LIMC VII, s.v. ‘Paridis Iudicium’, 177 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann), mentions only two examples from the Circle of the Antimenes Painter, dating 510/509 BC: Munich J.107 (E. Kunze-Götze 1973, CVA 8, pl. 423.1; probably ‘Group of Toronto 305’ [Kunze-Götze]) and Boston 60.790 (Far 126,126B/1, ‘Group of Würzburg 199’; H. Hoffmann 1973, CVA 1, pl. 45.1).
326 Raab 1972, 27ff. (Type A III).
328 Similarly on a Siana cup by the Vintage Painter (Brijder 2000, 670, Add. No. 5).
329 Sianas: C Painter (Brijder 1983, 130-31, nos. 6, 7, 20, 21), Heidelberg Painter (Brijder 1991b, 360, no. 406, interior), Painter of the Taranto Troilos (K&B 69.1); Masiello 1997, 162, no. 12.12. The Deepdene cup is the only known lip-cup with the scene. Two band-cups, one in a Virginia private collection (not previously published) and the other divided between Amsterdam (once The Hague) and Heidelberg (Haan-van de Wiel 1973, no. 12; Brijder 1975, 164-65, figs. 23-26; Brijder et al. 1996, 67), show the story (note that the classical collection of the Gementenmuseum in The Hague is now on permanent loan to the Allard Pierson Museum, where the inv. no. of the band-cup is 14108). Another band-cup, Amsterdam RALS 8014a-b (Brijder et al. 1996, pl. 102.2), may also feature the story, although most indicators are missing.
330 Brijder 2000, 588, dates the Siana cup, Zürich 3844, to 560/50 BC and correctly rejects H.A. Shapiro’s remark that it ‘is an isolated predecessor, perhaps inspired by Korinth’ (Shapiro 1989, 75, n. 82). Shapiro apparently had no knowledge of the lost Deepdene cup, as he fails again to mention it one year later (Shapiro 1990, 124).
331 On the Red-black Painter’s Siana cup, Kerberos also has a snake-tail (now worn off). Cf. the depiction of a three-headed Kerberos inside the well-known Lakonian cup by the Hunt Painter in the Erkine collection, dating c. 560 BC (Stibbe 1972, pls. 72-73). However, this daring presentation of the subject seems not to have inspired any Athenian vase-painter.
2.4. POTTER AND PAINTER OF LONDON B 425, c. 550/40 BC (nos. 87-92; figs. 31-34; pls.
25c-27)

Shape and dimensions

These band and lip-cups are larger than those of the potter Xenokles. In shape, the band-cups (90-92) are basically the same as Xenokles’ smaller band-cups (fig. 32). In contrast, the lip-cups (87-89) show a more balanced relation between the higher lip and deep bowl (fig. 31) than those of Xenokles, who continued to produce smaller lip-cups with comparatively lower lips.

Due to the differences between the lip-cups as well as to the unlikelihood that a potter would make both smaller and larger little-masters, but let only the larger ones be decorated exclusively by another painter (that is, other than himself), it seems most probable that, despite the ἐποιεῖσθαι-signatures, all these cups were fashioned by another potter, who is here named the Potter of London B 425. With diameters of 20.0 to 21.8cm, the lip-cups are medium and large. The band-cups have diameters of 20.2 and 22.3cm and are medium. Lip-cup 88 has a shallow bowl and high foot (fig. 31). The bowls of the band-cups are deep, the feet medium. Two band-cups, 91 and 92, have a glazed fillet at the top of the stem (fig. 32).

Fig. 31. Profile drawing of 88 (1:2).

Fig. 32. Profile drawing of 91 (1:2).

\(^{534}\) For the meanings of ἐποιεῖσθαι see chapter eleven.
Inscriptions

The signatures of lip-cups 87-89 show, compared to the signatures written by the Xenokles Painter, discussed above, less tendency towards backhand and leave much space between the signature and the handle-palmettes. They seem therefore to be written by a different hand, here dubbed the Painter of London B 425. Two cups, 88 and 89, show a pair of notable features: the name is spelt XENOKAAEX and each has a double-point not only as word-divider, but also after the verb (fig. 33b). The double-point recurs after the verbs of the Vatican and Jerusalem band-cups (90-91), where the lettering is also neat.

On the band-cups attributed to the Painter of London B 425 the letters are larger and the signatures occupy more space across the handle-zone than on the lip-cups.

Interior decoration

The tondo border of 87 (pl. 26c) differs from the Xenokles Painter’s tongue borders in that the tongues are thinner and surrounded by more rings. In 89 the number of tongues is uneven, so that two adjacent black tongues mark the point where the painter began and finished applying added red (pl. 26d).

The relative dimension of the medallion is medium: 0.47. The Painter of London B 425 proves himself to be a more talented and consistent craftsman than the Xenokles Painter.

Mythological subjects

A winged figure, whether male or female, as inside 87 (pl. 26c), appears fairly often in little-master cups. In Stana tondos, winged youths and females are especially popular in the C Painter’s.

54 The spelling 'Xenokles' is seen also on an oinochoe in Athens, NM 1045 (ABV 186). For this phenomenon see Kretschmer 1894, 194-95 (add to Kretschmer’s examples a head-vasse, Berlin F 2202, signed by the potter Prokles; Add’. 386; Schlesier/Schwarzmaier, 196, cat. no. 48). Beazley (Para 177) agreed with H. A. Cahn that the Basel cup (89) can not be attributed to the Xenokles Painter.

A double-point appears after the verb also on a cup by Nearchos, New York 61.11.2 (264). Also in the Xenokles Painter’s cups (54, 56-57, 59, pls. 15c, 17a-b, 18c), see also n. 276.

One Euchairos’ son (20, pl. 8c), one Sokles (38, pl. 12a), one Exekias (117, pl. 38b), one Manter of Lydos (244, pl. 71b), two Tleson Painter (333-34, pl. 95f.g), one Myssios (699). The others number 14 lip-cups and 3 band-cups. Lip-cups: Athens, Acropolis 1787 (Grave/Langlotz, 184, pl. 87; ABV 194, Cf. Xenokles Painter; attribution rejected here). Bucharest 9473C/9573B (Alexandrescu 1978, 73, no. 383, pl. 42), Centre Island, private (not previously published), Cincinnati (Hesperia/Art Bulletin XXII, no. 5; Haldenstein 1974, 29, 31). Florence 71000 (not previously published), Freiburg, market (Galerie G. Puhze, Katalog 12, 1997, no. 181), London, market (Sotheby’s, 13-14 December 1982, no. 216), Malibu, Getty 85.81.AE.100 (not previously published), Palinuro XXV.12 (Naumann/Neutsch 1960, 76, pl. 28.1), Rhodes 12984 (CIRh IV, figs. 311-12),
workshop. Without the help of an inscribed label, however, the identification of such a figure is problematical.

A rather frequent subject inside little-masters is a siren turned to the right, as in the tondo of the cup in the Basel market (39, pl. 26d). Variant compositions were employed: 1, the wings are spread out on either side of the body and the siren faces forward, as in 89, 2, with similar wings, but looking back; 3, both wings are held back and the siren looks forward; 4, with similar wings, but looking round. In one instance, a siren is depicted in flight, landing on a floral (246). A siren facing left or right is much more suitable for filling the round tondo field than a frontal one, as inside 57 (pl. 17b). Variants 1 and 2, with the pendant wings on either side of the body, seem to be the oldest scheme, as they occur not only in three Siana cups of the C Painter, the earliest dating from his middle period (570/65 BC), but also in early lip-cups. A few other Siana cups also feature sirens in the tondo.

Exterior decoration

Mythological subjects

On one side of the name-piece of the Painter of London B 425 (87, pl. 25c) Zeus and Poseidon are

Sydney 56.09 (Gabrici 1913, 494, fig. 185a), Vatican 17818 (Albizzati 1925-39, no. 320, fig. 53). Band-cups: Florence 3894 (ABV 265.4, Related to Lysippides Painter), Taranto 117189 (Masiello 1997, fig. 70.66), Winterthur 418.1960 (J. Metzger/M. Ronzani/H. Bloesch 1979, CVA Osterreich Ticino 1, pl. 18-1-2; Bloesch 1964, no. 19, p. 16). Haldenstein (p. 64) associated Rhodes 12984 with Xenokles, but the only parallels I discern are the palmette leaves which are indeed similar especially to those of the Jerusalem and Milan band-cups of the Painter of London B 425 (91-92, pl. 27c-4), although they lack the spiral volutes which are so characteristic of this painter.


The siren is only occasionally turned to the left, e.g., 264. Nearchos (pl. 76e), and the unattributed London B 422 (Smith/Pryce 1926, pl. 11.5a-b).

One by the Male Painter (85, pl. 23d), one by Sokles (43, pl. 12b) and further: Cumae (Gabrici 1913, 486, fig. 84), Florence 3894 (without ill. of tondo, lizzo 2000, 126, pl. IX.1-4), New York, Zoullas (ex Acona, Casa Serodine, not previously published), Samos s.n. (Kreuzer 1998a, no. 327, pl. 49). Inside Munich 9411 the face has been lost (Fellmann 1988, pl. 5.1-7).

338 and 387, Tleson Painter (pl. 97d, 107e), Vatican 16512 (Albizzati 1925-1939, no. 319, pl. 34, fig. 52).

Two by the Tleson Painter (287, 388, pls. 82d, 107d), with signature of potter Tleson but not decorated by the Tleson Painter (493, pl. 123a). In addition: Athens, NM Acropolis 1758 (Graef/Langlotz, 182, pl. 86), Atlanta 2005.52.1 (Winterthur 17.1 [2006], 14, fig. 19), Bayrakh 148 (Tana-Nörling 1995, 16, pl. 4, no. 41), Florence 95063 (not previously published), Malibu, Getty 81.AE.202.18 (not previously published), Marsseille s.n. (Villard 1960, no. 8.2), Munich 2143 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 32.3-4), New York, market (ex Robert Hecht; Sothis New York, 24-25 November 1987, no. 424A), New York, market (ex Ascona, Casa Serodine, not previously published), Samos s.n. (Kreuzer 1998a, no. 327, pl. 49). Inside Munich 9411 the face has been lost (Fellmann 1988, pl. 5.1-7).

338 and 387, Tleson Painter (pl. 97d, 107e), Vatican 16512 (Albizzati 1925-1939, no. 319, pl. 34, fig. 52).

Two by the Tleson Painter (287, 388, pls. 82d, 107d), with signature of potter Tleson but not decorated by the Tleson Painter (493, pl. 123a). In addition: Athens, NM Acropolis 1758 (Graef/Langlotz, 182, pl. 86), Atlanta 2005.52.1 (Winterthur 17.1 [2006], 14, fig. 19), Bayrakh 148 (Tana-Nörling 1995, 16, pl. 4, no. 41), Florence 95063 (not previously published), Malibu, Getty 81.AE.202.18 (not previously published), Marseille s.n. (Villard 1960, no. 8.2), Munich 2143 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 32.3-4), New York, market (ex Robert Hecht; Sothis New York, 24-25 November 1987, no. 424A), New York, market (ex Ascona, Casa Serodine, not previously published), Samos s.n. (Kreuzer 1998a, no. 327, pl. 49). Inside Munich 9411 the face has been lost (Fellmann 1988, pl. 5.1-7).
clearly identified by attributes; the third figure on the left walking towards them, but looking back, may be Hades. E. Vermeule describes the three gods as the lords of the cosmos. Although an obvious relationship exists between Pegasos and his father Poseidon, the meaning of the flanking winged horses remains unclear in this context. They seem not to be involved in the narrative, but serve instead as divine bystanders.

K. Schefold associates the other side of the cup (pl. 25d) with the arrival of Dionysos (and his cult) in Attica, whereas Shapiro more convincingly argues that it could be the earliest depiction of Dionysos’ voyage to the underworld which led to his mothers apotheosis. In the latter case Hermes Psychopompos is accompanying the god and his mother to Olympos, while the female on the left may be Persephone waving farewell to them. Her function as representative of the underworld echoes Hades on the cup’s opposite side.

The unveiled woman opposite Dionysos (pl. 25d) carries flowers and not a wreath, which might be interpreted as a ‘bridal token of love’ carried by Ariadne, who sometimes stands opposite Dionysos in the tondos of Siana cups. In an attempt to identify the woman opposite Dionysos, Isler-Kerényi could not decide between Ariadne or Persephone and recognized associations with the domains of both Aphrodite (flowers) and Hermes Psychopompos (underworld journey); she simply dismissed the female figure on the far left as ‘another woman…who is making a gesture that could be either a farewell or greeting.’

Non-mythological subjects
The fighting-cocks of 88 (pl. 26a-b) are a recurrent theme of Athenian pottery. Cocks were, of course, popular as an ‘erastes’ gift to an ‘eromenos.’ In practice, a hen, here situated in the middle, was introduced to arouse the cocks before and during the fight, as shown on a band-cup in Boston where men holding cocks under their arms squat on either side of a hen. The high frequency of the actual cockfight on little-master cups is probably due, at least in part, to the compact, horizontal composition. The picture on 88 of a hen between cocks is without parallel amongst little-master cups, although on band-cups the cocks are often flanked by hens.

Non-mythological subjects
The fighting-cocks of 88 (pl. 26a-b) are a recurrent theme of Athenian pottery. Cocks were, of course, popular as an ‘erastes’ gift to an ‘eromenos.’ In practice, a hen, here situated in the middle, was introduced to arouse the cocks before and during the fight, as shown on a band-cup in Boston where men holding cocks under their arms squat on either side of a hen. The high frequency of the actual cockfight on little-master cups is probably due, at least in part, to the compact, horizontal composition. The picture on 88 of a hen between cocks is without parallel amongst little-master cups, although on band-cups the cocks are often flanked by hens.

94 Vermeule 1979, 34. Her observation seems rather far-fetched that Hades looks ‘surprised but not displeased’ at his kingdom after drawing the lot deciding which realm he would rule.

95 For a list of winged horses without rider see Brommer 1973, 302-308; Mommens 1975, 18, n. 63, cites additions. A scene of Poseidon Horses, the paint of the C. Painter, Syracusae 49635 (Brüder 1983, 120 with pl. 1840), and two Siana cups by the Heidelberg Painter (probably) depict Poseidon riding Pegasos: Syracusae 7/268 and 7/251 (Brüder 1991b, pl. 127d) and Netherlands, private (Brüder 2000, pl. 248b).

96 For Poseidon riding Pegasos see also Schauenburg 1979, 14.


98 For the problems linked with identifying a female figure opposite Dionysos see Brüder 1991b, 358-59. Note also the discussion of the Amasis Painter’s band-cup 217 (pl. 62a), where the woman is thought to be Aphrodite.

99 Isler-Kerényi 2006, 160-61. But flowers are not necessarily indicators of the domain of Aphrodite, for also Persephone, who was picking flowers when abducted by Hades, and her mother Demeter are sometimes shown holding them, e.g., the amphora Leiden PC 49 (M.F. Jongkees-Vos 1972, CVA 1, pl. 33.2).


101 Boston 63.4 (True 1978, pp. 99.1-3); on a lip-cup by the Epitimos Painter (240, pl. 60c-d) the hens are missing between the squatting men with cocks under their arms. Hoffmann calls such hens ‘Antimtimerenzen’ (Hoffmann 1974, 204).

102 Lip-cups, fighting-cocks: 353 (Tleson Painter, pl. 101a), Cambridge, FitzMus G 66 (in handle-zone; W. Lamb 1930, CVA 1, pl. XIX.43), London B 406 (Smith/Pryce 1926, pl. 14.2), Munich 2351 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 21.1-5). Single fighting-cock: 501 (Manner of the Tleson Painter, pl. 125c-d), 592 (Centaur Painter, pl. 154b), Argina N.T. 50 (Moore 1986a, 76, fig. 13), Çandarlı 21-22 (Tuna-Nörling 1995, 63, pl. 28, no. 38-39) and Munich 2168 (in handle-zone, in outline; Fellmann 1988, pl. 27.1-4). The composition on the lip-cup fragments Oxford G. 137.33, 137.34, 137.36 (from three different cups, not previously published) can not be reconstructed. Fighting-cocks in tondo: Munich 2142 (Fellmann 1988, pl. 32.1-2), Oxford 1884.706 (Haldenstein 1974, 159);
Ornaments
The Florence and Basel cups (88-89, fig. 34c-d) bear quite neat handle-palmettes with five red-and-black leaves; the handle-palmettes of the London cup (87, fig. 34a-b) consist of nine black leaves. All of them have spirally volutes. Comparable volutes recur on the band-cup Amsterdam 8192, attributed to the Phrynos Painter (99, fig. 39a-b, in chapter three). Such spiralling volutes are rather rare and recall the handle ornaments of the Botkin Class.137

![Fig. 34a-f. Palmettes of the Painter of London B 425: 87 (a-b), 88 (c-d), 91 (c-f).](image)

On Vatican 35035 (90) the handle-palmettes have 10 black leaves and a central red leaf, while those of the cups in Jerusalem and Milan (91-92, fig. 34e-f) seem to combine the features of all the others by the Painter of London B 425: many thin, red-and-black leaves in combination with spiral volutes.

Provenance and chronology
Remarkably, a cup with the signature of Xenokles is not yet known to have been found outside Italy. Of the cups with documented (or suspected) provenances, nine come from Orvieto (52, 55, 60-61, 63-66, 78), five or six from Cerveteri (54, 56, 62, 67, 75), four from Vulci (68, 76, 86-87), one each from Chiusi (53), Cumae (80) and Tarquinia (88), and four from unspecified places in Etruria (51, 74, 79, 92). More generally, three are said to be from somewhere in Italy (83, 90-91). The provenance of the unsigned Cambridge cup by the Mule Painter (84) is Vulci as well. In each case, the (suspected) context is funerary.

The focus on the market of central Italy seems to be characteristic of first-generation manufacturers of little-masters.138 Since the Xenoklean cups range over a longer period of time, it seems evident that his workshop had regular, direct contact with the Etruscan market, possibly through a middleman or trader. Interestingly, all of Xenokles’ cups which have come to light in Orvieto can be attributed to the Xenokles Painter.

The find-circumstances of only once cup have been well published. Orvieto 148 (52). It lay in tomb 9 of the necropolis of Crocifisso del Tufo, with a bucchero askos assigned by M. Bizzarri to 550/40 BC.139 As based on the style, it seems probable that the cup belongs to the first half of that decade, c. 550-45 BC. The other cups of Xenokles unearthed in the same necropolis are (traditionally) dated by M.R. Wójcik to the third quarter of the sixth century.140

In shape, the Xenoklean cups show hardly any development over the years and the differences in size have no affect on the shape. Therefore the potterwork provides no substantial chronological markers.

But on the basis of drawing style and features like ring borders as opposed to tongue borders, a relative chronology of the Xenokles Painter’s output can be put forward. As remarked above, the Xenokles Painter seems to have been influenced by Siana cup painters, particularly the Adelph Painter (regarding 56), and painters of ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphorae. Brijder places the Adelph Painter at c. 560 BC for the composition of the last two, cf. a Siana cup by the Red-black Painter, Rhodes 15678 (Brijder 2000, pl. 177f) and lip-cup Palermo N.I. 1843 (with a squatting man between fighting-cocks; Equizzi 2006, 388-89, no. 62, pl. XVII, incorrectly attributed to the Tleson Painter). Louvre F 92 shows no indication of an impending fight between the cocks (Plaoutine 1938, pl. 87.1-4). For cockfights on band-cups, which appear frequently in the work of the Tleson Painter see n. 1174.

137 For the Botkin Class amphorae see introduction to chapter three.
138 On this see Heesen forthcoming.
139 Bizzarri 1962, 73-75, pls. Va (cup) and XVI (askos).
140 Wójcik 1989, 86.
The two cups with panthers by the Griffin-bird Painter, mentioned earlier in connection with Xenokles’ cup 50, belong to the painter’s early period, which Brijder dates 560/50 BC. As also seen, the Xenokles Painter’s panther resembles the one on a type B amphora in Rhodes (10616) that Lemos assigns to 570/60 BC. Kluiver places the ἵππαλόκτυρον by the Kyllenios Painter, mentioned in connection with 53, at c. 555 BC,362 and the girl-cocks by the Timiades Painter at c. 555/50 BC (cf., 51).

Therefore it seems that the earliest output of the potter Xenokles and the Xenokles Painter appeared c. 555/50 BC. The use of ring borders in the tondos supply an additional indication of early manufacture.

With stiff incising, the panther inside the Baltimore cup and the girl-cock of the Bollingen cup (50-51), look stylistically rather old-fashioned. They are very probably the earliest extant cups of the Xenokles Painter, that is, 555/50 BC.

The two pictures of a boy riding a ἵππαλόκτυρον show stylistic differences: the drawing of the ἵππαλόκτυρον of 53 is stiffer than that of 54 where the incisions are finer. In addition, the long, slender torso of the youth inside 54 fills the field better than the slightly bent body of the one inside 53. Therefore 54 seems be work of a more developed painter.

In style, the youth mounted on a horse-protome (55) is more refined; the incisions have been drawn by a steadier hand. The drawing style of the Boston sphinx (56) is smooth, seemingly executed, again, by a more practised craftsman.

The Xenokles Painter’s middle period may be marked by 52 from Orvieto, whose date of c. 550/45 BC is based on style and excavation data; 53 belongs to the same period, whereas the slightly more refined cups belong to a later phase in his career. Although no firm indicator of the painter’s latest work can be cited, his career could have hardly ended much after c. 540 BC. The cups without figurework, which are more difficult to place, were presumably manufactured over a long period alongside the figured cups. Possibly, the sparsely adorned cups, with signature and palmettes only, became popular once the name of the potter Xenokles became established in his export market, central Italy.363

Turning to the Mule Painter, judging from the multifigured frieze without blank space on either side and the choice of decoration, inside and out, his cups would be quite early, c. 555/50 BC. The foot of 84, with thin, rounded edge of the base, seems earlier than that of 85, with higher, straighter edge. The lost Deepdene cup (86), of course, is extremely difficult to assess, although its multifigured friezes and ring border accord with a date of c. 555/50 BC.

Likewise, the dates of the cups by the Painter of London B 425 (87-92) can not be easily determined. However, the choice of interior and exterior decoration, including a simple tongue border, suggests that the London cup was probably made around 550 BC. The two other cups with figurework (88-89) by this painter are probably slightly later, c. 550/40 BC. His cups without figurework (90-92) may stem from the same decade.

Concluding remarks

However speculative, it seems most likely that the Xenokles Painter was the same person as the potter Xenokles because of the continuity between painting and shape throughout the workshop’s operation. This potter-painter would then have been the chief employee of the workshop, if not its owner who hired one extra potter as well as two or three assistant painters. Except for the cups by the Mule Painter (84-85), all cups bear Xenokles’ signature.

A plausible account of the workshop’s history is as follows. Alongside the Xenokles Painter, whose work seems to continue over the whole period of its existence, the Mule Painter was employed during its earliest years. At the same time or shortly thereafter, the Painter of the Deepdene Cup was active. Around 550 BC, both the Painter of the Deepdene Cup and the Mule Painter - for whatever reason - left the Xenoklean workshop. The Painter of London B 425 replaced them as a figure painter

362 The Siana cups with ἵππαλόκτυρα by the Malibu Painter, dated c. 565/60 BC, predate the ἵππαλόκτυρα of the Xenokles Painter. As Brijder assigns the Siana cup with mounted ἵππαλόκτυρον by the Painter of Erlangen J 230 to c. 545/35 BC, it must be later than the those by the Xenokles Painter.
363 On signatures as familiar brand names see Heesen forthcoming.
and worked beside the Xenokles Painter. This new employee was given the task of decorating the larger cups, which he or another (unknown) potter shaped. On 56-59 and 80-83 Xenokles probably collaborated with assistant painters who added the palmettes. Assistants apparently wrote the signatures of 57 and 80.