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3. PHRYNOS, PHRYNOS PAINTER, TORGIANO PAINTER, c. 560/40 BC (nos. 93-105; figs. 35-39; pls. 28-31)

Introduction

Three lip-cups bear signatures of Phrynos (95-96, 104).\(^{364}\) Beazley was familiar with \(^{95}\) and \(^{96}\) (pl. 28c-e), which he attributed to the Phrynos Painter, although in the case of the latter he remarked, ‘there is not enough to compare’. In addition, he assigned to this painter a fragment of a Gordion cup (93, pl. 28a), little-master cup fragment (94, pl. 28b), lip-cup (97, pl. 29a-b), merrymouthed cup (Rome, VG 50586), type B amphora (Würzburg L 241) and a Botkin Class neck-amphora (Brussels, MusRoy A 714).\(^{365}\) He designated another lip-cup (103, pl. 31b) as ‘probably by the Phrynos Painter’, which will below be added to the output of the painter himself.

A lip-cup has more recently been attributed by Y. Tuna-Nörelsing to the Phrynos Painter (102, pl. 31a).\(^{366}\) G. Dareggi was undecided as to whether the signed lip-cup in Torgiano (104, pl. 31c-d) is also the painter’s work; however, it is given to another artisan, dubbed the Torgiano Painter.\(^{367}\)

All the Phrynos Painter’s lip-cups are decorated either inside or outside; he is not known to have painted an LIO type cup.

H.A.G. Brödier and B. Iacobazzi assign two band-cups to the Phrynos Painter (99, 101, pls. 29d, 30a-b).\(^{368}\) While not proposing a definite attribution, C. Roebuck noticed some traits of the Phrynos Painter on a very large, fragmentary band-cup from the Acropolis in Athens (98, pl. 29c). The latter cup and a previously unattributed band-cup (100, pl. 30c-d) will below be given to the Phrynos Painter himself.\(^{369}\) Last, J. Frel published a band-cup which recalls the painter (105).\(^{370}\)

Characteristic traits of the Phrynos Painter’s human figures are pointy noses, triangular incising for knees and elbows, and a long, curving incision on the thigh ending in a slight hook at the knee. Especially the exterior decoration of his lip- and band-cups makes fully evident the refined, detailed miniature style for which the Phrynos Painter is well known.

H. Mommsen has assigned a type B amphora in Basel (AntMus BS 496) to the painter who decorated the type B amphora Würzburg L 241 which, as mentioned, Beazley attributed to the Phrynos Painter.\(^{371}\) However, she is a bit sceptical of Beazley’s conclusion because, in her view, the

---


\(^{365}\) ABV 168-70; Parà 70-71. Apart from Brussels, MusRoy A 714, Beazley considered four other amphorae of the Botkin Class (Milan, Storzesce; St. Petersburg B 4464; Boston 98.923; New York 64.11.13; ABV 169.2-4 and Parà 71-ABV 169.4 bis) as ‘probably by the Phrynos Painter’; of the remaining two, Berlin F 1713 and 1714 (169.5-6), he said that they are ‘less careful, but bear a distinct resemblance’ (Parà 71). Two late additions to the Botkin Class are New York, private (BAPD nos. 14 and 7117; Sotheby’s London, 13-14 July 1981, no. 244; previously, MuU, Auction 51, 14-15 March 1975, no. 123; ‘Probably by the Phrynos Painter’) and London, market (Sotheby’s; 5 July 1982; no. 317).

\(^{366}\) Tuna-Nörelsing 2002, 178-79, no. 41.

\(^{367}\) Dareggi 1969-70.

\(^{368}\) Brödier 1991a; Iacobazzi 2004, 74, no. 96.

\(^{369}\) Roebuck 1940, 199-200, no. 134, fig. 31. Roebuck compares band-cup 98 (pl. 28c-e) to a fragmentary neck-amphora with the same subject, Athens, NM Acropolis 2211 (Roebuck 1940, 200; Graef/Langlotz, pl. 94; Moore 1979a, pls. 14-15, figs. 17-18), noting especially the form of the elbow and knee joints which are typical of the Phrynos Painter. Having read a draft of this chapter, H. Mommsen wrote in an email of 4/1/2009 that she has personally examined the fragments of band-cup 98 as well as the amphora fragments Acropolis 2211 and concluded that they are by the painter who decorated the Basel amphora, AntMus BS 496 (see n. 371). ‘Es gibt unzählige Übereinstimmungen wie die Knie, Gewandornamente, Heimischens oder der auffälligen Vogelhelm auf dem Fragment A-P 1643 (Roebuck 1940, 199, fig. 314), der auch auf den Amphoterenfragmenten wiederkehrt (S. Karouzos, OXERA AIE THN AKPOIΩH, AAA 14 [1981] 295 Abb. 2; far lef’).

\(^{370}\) Frel 1994a; unfortunately the published photos are extremely poor, so that the attribution cannot be judged.

\(^{371}\) Mommsen 1989, 134-44; see also n. 369.
Würzburg amphora and the Phrynos Painter’s fine lip-cup London B 424 (95, pl. 28d-e), which illustrate the same subjects, exhibit too little stylistic agreement.

Regarding the Botkin Class, Mommsen speaks of a ‘Botkin Werkstatt’ where the Phrynos Painter may have decorated some or all the amphorae.\(^1\) She distinguishes five Botkin Class amphorae (Brussels, MusRoy A 714; Milan, Sforzesco; St. Petersburg B. 4464; Boston 98.923; New York 64.11.13) from the four others because they were less carefully painted and probably made later (Berlin F 1713, F 1714; New York, private; London, market). Furthermore, considering the possibility that the four latter amphorae are the work of a second painter, she argues instead that they were most likely made later in the career of the same painter who decorated the first five amphorae. In support, she notes that the figurework of the early Botkin amphora in New York (64.11.13) shows a strong stylistic affinity to the later Botkin amphorae, while having handle ornaments which are closely linked to those of the early Botkin amphora in Boston (98.923). In addition, Mommsen regards an olpe in Athens (NM 18022) as another possible link between the earlier and later Botkin Class amphorae.\(^2\) In my view, although Mommsen’s objections are understandable, the amphora Würzburg L 241 and the first five Botkin amphorae noted above agree stylistically enough with the work of the Phrynos Painter to justify Beazley’s assignment of them directly to him or as ‘probably by the Phrynos Painter’. The other four Botkin Class amphorae are indeed less careful work and therefore can less easily be linked to the painter. Nevertheless, Mommsen clearly demonstrates that a single painter may very well have been responsible for all the Botkin Class amphorae or that, if more than one painter was involved, all of them were undoubtedly manufactured in the same pottery establishment.

A parallel situation emerges in Mommsen’s study of the potterwork of the Botkin Class. Whereas differences in details may indicate different hands, the basic overall agreement suggests strongly that they were fashioned in one workshop. Moreover, as the consistent shape of the lips seems indicative of one potter, the different kinds of feet may be ascribed to the potter’s interest in variation.

### Shape and dimensions

Fragment 93 belongs to a small, delicate cup with Gordion type foot.\(^3\) The two earliest known (complete) lip-cups by the potter Phrynos differ considerably in size: 95, 28.6cm in diameter, is extra large, while 97 is medium (diameter, 19.5cm); 97 has a medium bowl and high foot (fig. 35). The band-cups are medium and large: diameters, 22.7 and 26.5cm (fig. 36). The two later lip-cups (103-4), decorated by the Phrynos Painter and the Torgiano Painter, are medium.\(^4\)

The lips of the lip-cups are very sharply tooled off. The wall of each is very thin at the top of the handle-zone (0.15cm); that of 97 is thicker (0.3cm). The potterwork of the large London cup (95) is quite heavy.

As to the band-cups decorated by the Phrynos Painter, the Amsterdam cup (99, fig. 36) is considerably larger than the one in Atlanta (100); the foot of the former has been lost. The lip of the Amsterdam cup thickens towards a slightly outward-leaning rim, as also seen on other larger specimens, for example, the one signed by Archikles and Glaukytes (see the next chapter, 109), as well as Munich 2240, Bloomington 72.97.4 and a cup in Paris, Niarchos collection A 031.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) I am grateful to H. Mommsen for sending me the manuscript of her article ‘Die Botkin-Klasse’ (cf. nn. 364-65).


\(^3\) Cf. Robertson 1951a, 149.

\(^4\) As I have not been able to examine the Torgiano cup personally and not seen a profile drawing of it, the question remains open whether it was thrown by the potter Phrynos.

\(^5\) For Munich 2240 see Fellmann 1989, Beilage 13.1. The resemblance in shape to Munich 2243 was noted by Brüder (1991a, 26), who viewed the similarity in the context of a possible workshop connection between Phrynos and Archikles and Glaukytes, suggested earlier by Haldenstein (1982, 18-22). The resemblance of Munich 2243 to the Bloomington and Niarchos cups was first observed by Rudolph (1995, 70, n. 13). However, the foot of the Bloomington cup is completely different.
Fig. 35. Profile drawing of 97 (1:2).

Fig. 36. Profile drawing of 99 (1:2; after Brijder et al. 1996, 63, fig. 30).

Chart 6. Average absolute and relative dimensions of cups by Phrynos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date-type</th>
<th>H.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>foot</th>
<th>Bowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 550-Lip-cup</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 550-Hand-cup</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545/40-Lip-cup</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545/40-Lip-cup (104)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inscriptions

The cups bear various inscriptions: ἐποίησεν and χαίρε as well as labels of figures. The inscriptions of the signed cups are the so-called speaking object type, that is, the cup, as it were, presents itself. Once, 96, we see simply ὙΡΥΝΟΣΕΠΙΟΙΣΕΝΝΕΜΕ. Twice, 95 and 104, χαίρε is attached at the end: ὙΡΥΝΟΣΕΠΙΟΙΣΕΝΝΧΑΙΡΕΜΕΝ (Phrynos made me, rejoice; figs. 37b-38). The opposite side of 95 shows a variant of the χαίρε-inscription: ΧΑΙΡΕΚΑΙΠΗΕΙΜΕΝΑΙΧΙ (rejoice and drink [from] me, yeah!; fig. 37a).
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777 The chis of the Torgiano cup (104, fig. 38) are shaped more like kappas. The formula used on 95 and 104 seems to be limited to the Phrynos signatures (cf. Heesen 2006, 59). For another formula joining a greeting to the verb see here 255 with the double ἐποίησεν-signatures of Nikosthenes and Anakles (pl. 74b).
Fig. 37a-b. Inscriptions on sides A and B of 95.

Fig. 38. Inscription on side A of 104.

The Vatican cup, 97, on the other hand, has the standard formula XIPEKAIPEIIEI in its tondo, inscribed labels identify Achilleus and Ajax. Lastly, tiny imitation inscriptions appear between the figures of band-cups 99 and 100.

On 95-97 the letters are very small, well shaped and arranged in a neat line (fig. 37a-b). The labels of 97 are also very neatly written, but the letters are placed farther apart, filling the space. In contrast, the letters of 104 are very uneven, vary in size and may lean forward or tilt back (fig. 38); a thicker brush was used and it seems unlikely that the two inscriptions of this cup were written by the hand seen in the inscriptions of Phrynos’ other cups.

Interior decoration

The preserved tondo borders consist of red-and-black tongues. Of the two completely preserved medallions, the relative diameter of only 97 can be calculated: 378mm, 0.42.

Mythological subjects

Inside 93 (pl. 28a) the nude man returning from the hunt with his prey has been identified by Beazley and Payne as the giant hunter Orion, who was renowned for his club. In typical fashion, the hunter carries a hare and fox hanging from a stick over his shoulder and holds a club in his right hand. Often, the catch hangs from both ends of the stick, before and behind the hunter, but occasionally it is arranged as on 93. Nudity is exceptional for a hunter, though it could, in this case, indicate heroic status. On the other hand, the man’s nudity might allude to a Dionysian or homoerotic context. As seen above in connection with 11 and 15, homoerotic courting couples are often surrounded by suspended catch, particularly fox and hare, which suggest a direct an association with the hunt.

378 In the inscription of side A, iota has been omitted after pi. This is probably not an example of ‘abbreviated writing’ (for which see n. 120), but rather an understandable confusion in the number of hastas needed for the sequence iota/pi/iota, as seems also to have happened on 4 by the Eucheiros Painter where iota is missing before pi (fig. 8, in chapter one). On side B pi has been left out; pi is also missing on 84 and 85 by the Mule Painter (fig. 29, in chapter two) and on 424 by the Tleson Painter (pl. 116b); in the latter instance the omission of the letters pi and iota would seem another example of the degree of negligence met in the painter’s work of that period.

379 Beazley/Payne 1929, 267.

380 Similar to 93: London B 421 (332, Tleson Painter, pl. 95c); the catch on both ends of the pole: e.g., metope from the Apollo Temple in Thermos (Athens, NM 13409, c. 625; Schefold 1993, 167, fig. 175) and an olpe by the Amasis Painter, London B 52 (Bothmer 1985, 138, no. 26). Similarly, in a Dionysian scene on an amphora Type B by the Amasis Painter, Munich 8763 (Bothmer 1985, 80, no. 4). The subject is not met on Siana cups. For representations of the returning hunter see Schnapp 1997, 236-41, and Barringer 2001, 79-83.

381 For a Dionysian context see the nude youth with a dead hare on a pole over his shoulder on an amphora Type B of the Amasis Painter, Geneva I,4 Gosse coll. (Bothmer 1985, 105, no. 15).

382 See nn. 138-44.
The tondo of the Vatican cup (97, pl. 29b) depicts Ajax carrying the dead body of Achilles. The earliest recorded representations of the story in Athenian vase-painting, where the heroes are definitely identified by labels, appear on either handle of the François krater. Contemporaneous with 97 is the illustration of the scene inside a Siana cup of the Heidelberg Painter. 293 He clothed Achilles in a chiton, whereas Kleitias and the Phrynos Painter portrayed him completely nude, which is exceptional. Possibly the latter painters had an earlier, very similar episode from the Trojan War in mind when Ajax recovers the dead body of Achilles' friend Patroclus who had been stripped by the Trojans. In any event, the nude Achilles remained very rare, as did the rightward direction of the movement. It was probably Exekias who, in two monumental representations of Ajax bearing a fully armoured Achilles, about 540/35 BC, set the standard for movement towards the left. 294

As noted above, Herakles wrestling the Nemean lion was, from about 560 BC on, one of the most popular narratives of Athenian pottery. 295 Inside 102 (pl. 31a) Herakles stands upright, as occurs in many contemporaneous depictions, 296 although a squatting Herakles was also portrayed at the same time. 297

Bellerophon and Pegasos, as inside 103 (pl. 31b), have been met above. 308 Uniquely in Athenian vase painting, it seems, Bellerophon stands behind Pegasos, having just tamed the winged horse. To fit into the tondo form, the Phrynos Painter made Pegasos rather compact and cropped the tail. The cup is here regarded as work of the Phrynos Painter himself because of the characteristic thigh and knee incisions of Bellerophon. In painting style, as observed by Brijder, 103 is closest to the painter’s type B amphora in Würzburg (L 241). 309

Non-mythological subjects
The fragment with a homoerotic courting scene, 94 (pl. 28b), preserves an ἐρωμένος in the up-and-down position opposite an ἐρωμένος. Exceptionally, though repeated in other pictures by the Phrynos Painter, the ἐρωμένος holds a spear with one hand, a garland with the other. 306

Exterior decoration
A notable trait of his lip-cups is the wide dividing line positioned well below the ridge. 291

Mythological subjects
When illustrating mythological stories, the Phrynos Painter, it seems, tried to link the sides of the cup by repeating figures, motifs, garment patterns (95, 100), or nearly identical pictures (99). Strikingly, the Phrynos Painter chose the same two subjects as on his London cup 95 (pl. 28d-e) for his amphora in Basel, AmMus BS 406. 297 Our earliest representations of the birth of Athena in

---

293 Florence 3893; Brijder 1993b, pl. 112a.
295 As noted above, Herakles wrestling the Nemean lion was, from about 560 BC on, one of the most popular narratives of Athenian pottery. Inside 102 (pl. 31a) Herakles stands upright, as occurs in many contemporaneous depictions, although a squatting Herakles was also portrayed at the same time.
296 Bell...
Athenian painting are found on an kothon by the C Painter, fragments of a skyphos or kantharos by Kleitias, and ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphorae.\(^\text{105}\) The subject was especially popular between 550 and 530 BC, when Group E was responsible for half of all the known representations. According to S. Verhulst, 90 \% of the painted depictions of the various stages of Athena’s birth are in black-figure (Zeus in labour, Athena emerging from his head, Athena standing on his knees, the full-grown daughter in front of Zeus, greeting him).\(^\text{208}\)

As we would expect of a lip-cup, the pictures of 95 (pl. 28d) are reduced to the most important personages: enthroned Zeus, fully armed Athena emerging from her father’s head, and Hephaistos, who has split open Zeus’ head with his axe. As noted by S. Pingiatoglou, this is one of the few representations of the story, in which the Eileithyia are not present.\(^\text{209}\) The throne of Zeus, which is exactly the same as the one on the other side of the cup, where Athena introduces Herakles to Olympus, is rather simply constructed: the backrest ends in swans’ heads, a horizontal strut runs between the legs, the low armrests are supported by short Doric columns. Mommsen cites a nearly identical throne by the Affecter, where Zeus also holds very similar thunderbolts with a kind of heart-shaped spearhead in the centre.\(^\text{205}\)

In Herakles’ introduction to Mount Olympus on 95 (pl. 28e) an energetic Athena eagerly pulls Herakles forward, begging for the attention of the enthroned Zeus.\(^\text{100}\) The earliest preserved representation of Herakles on foot during his apotheosis is by the Cassandra Painter.\(^\text{307}\) The composition with an enthroned Zeus was perhaps designed for the pediment of the archaic temple on the Acropolis, from the 560s BC.\(^\text{308}\) If so, the influence of this monument on vase-painters was short-lived, for very soon afterwards a different treatment gained popularity: Herakles rides to Olympos in a chariot and Zeus is nowhere to be seen.\(^\text{101}\) In addition, Herakles is not fully armed, whereas on 95 he is equipped with his complete ensemble of attributes: lion’s skin, sword, bow and arrow, club.\(^\text{406}\) The arrow has a heart-shaped head like the points of Zeus’ thunderbolt on the cup’s opposite side.

We have already encountered the single figure of Zeus in a reduced version of a gigantomachy by the Eucheiros Painter (L pl. 1a). On 98 (pl. 29c) additional deities can be recognized, deeply involved in battle with the Giants.\(^\text{407}\) On fragment A-P 1953 (a in pl. 29c) Dionysos can easily be singled out; Artemis, wearing a lion’s skin, is less apparent because the white of her face has vanished; and the figure next to her is probably Apollo, as he fought beside her in the gigantomachy. M.B. Moore perceptively identified Poseidon on fragments A-P 2040, 2119 (b and g in pl. 29c) where she saw that the white area behind the helmet crest must be the rock Nisyros with which Poseidon crushed his opponent after first wounding him with the trident.\(^\text{482}\)

\(^\text{105}\) Mommsen 1989, 134-44.
\(^\text{106}\) Kothon, Paris, Louvre CA 616 (Scheffold 1993, 212, fig. 219), skyphos or kantharos, Kleitias, Acropolis 597a-e (ÅBV 77.3), ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphorae, Berlin F 1704, 1709 (ÅBV 96.14-15).
\(^\text{108}\) S. Pingiatoglou, Eileithyia, Würzburg 1981, 15, n. 8, where she also mentions fragments of a neck-amphora by the Affecter, Perugia 91 (Mommsen 1975, pls. 34-35).
\(^\text{109}\) Florence 92167; Mommsen 1975, 67, 86, pls. 22A, 23A; she emphasizes that the similarities can hardly be coincidental.
\(^\text{110}\) The single treatment of the scene recurs a krater fragment from Athens (Orlandos 1932, 28, fig. 2).
\(^\text{111}\) London B 379, Brijder 1983, pl. 24 b-c. A similar arrangement was used by the Heidelberg Painter for Dionysos’ introduction depicted on Heidelberg S 5 and Istanbul 9312 (Brijder 1991b, pls. 12b, 14b, d-e). On the Heidelberg fragment the back of Zeus’ throne also terminates in a swan’s head.
\(^\text{112}\) Shapiro 1989a, 21, pl. 6c.
\(^\text{113}\) Boardman (1972) associates this new arrangement with Peisistratos’ return from exile in a chariot driven by a charioteer impersonating Athena. For his theories on Peisistratean propaganda see nn. 150-52.
\(^\text{114}\) For the various attributes and their sources see Cohen 1994, 696-99.
\(^\text{115}\) On pottery from the Athenian Acropolis representations of gigantomachies (and the birth of Athena) are the most frequent mythological themes in which Athena plays a role (cf. Wagner 2003, 54-55). See also Strawczynski 2003, 57, who demonstrates that a gigantomachy is shown on two or three vases by Lydos from the Acropolis, but not in any of his work from Etruria, whereas his vases with pictures of Herakles’ labours have come to light both on the Acropolis and in Etruria.
\(^\text{116}\) Moore 1979b, reconstruction drawing. pl. III.4.
The hand of the Phrynos Painter is evident from the attention to details and particularly the incising of elbows and knees as well as that of Poseidon’s right thigh.\(^405\) Such a very crowded scene with much overlap, however, is exceptional for him; a possible explanation might be that the cup comes from the Athenian Acropolis where potters and painters seem to have dedicated their largest or most innovative high-quality work to Athena Ergane.\(^407\)

The Amsterdam band-cup (99, pl. 30a-b) illustrates an amazonomachy which includes Herakles. Eight combatants - five Amazons and three Greeks - are involved in intense battle on either side of the cup, arranged similarly in two groups of three figures and one of two. The overlap conveys a strong sense of action. Whereas the Greeks wear full armour (helmet, cuirass, greaves, lance, sword, shield), the Amazons have only short chitons and carry a spear and shield, with only two on each side equipped with a helmet: the Amazon to the left of Herakles wears a pilos-like cap. The painter evidently viewed the battle as extending over both sides of the cup because he represented Herakles only once.

The amazonomachy, variously arranged, is a common subject of little-master cups.\(^409\) Herakles is rarely present,\(^408\) and only on a cup by the Amasis Painter, in Malibu (223, pl. 64a-b), are the combatants divided into three groups as on 99, but their wider spacing, without overlap, reduces the sense of action.

As remarked in chapter one, the fish-tailed creature with whom Herakles wrestles is usually identified as Triton, who replaced Nereus around 560 BC.\(^406\) R. Glynn maintains that the distinguishing trait in the iconography of Nereus is that he mutates, whereas Triton remains constant.\(^407\) J. Gaunt cautions correctly that while a mutating sea monster can not be Triton, it does not necessarily follow that a non-mutating one can not be Nereus.\(^408\) He suggests that the Atlanta cup (100, pl. 30c) represents Nereus because his favourite daughter Thetis appears on the other side of the cup. He may well have a point, especially since the females’ garments are exactly repeated on the other side, which suggests that the two scenes are linked. On one side the Nereids anxiously flee the fight between Herakles and their father, on the other side they rush away from the abduction of their sister Thetis by Peleus. The prominent involvement of Poseidon, as seen on 100, is quite rare.\(^410\)

---

403 See also n. 369.
404 For this phenomenon see n. 1066.
407 For representations of this fight on little-master cups see nn. 153-154. For a full discussion of Herakles and the sea monster see Aliberg-Cornell 1984. See also Mommsen 2002a, esp. 229.
The abduction of Thetis by Peleus (100, pl. 30d) is another frequent narrative in black-figure. Three kinds of action can be identified: stalking, pursuit, struggle. Amongst the earliest portrayals are four Siana cups by the C Painter. Nearly contemporaneous with the Phrynos Painter’s cup is a plate by Lydos showing the struggle. In many versions, including those by the C Painter, the abduction takes place in the vicinity of a sanctuary which is symbolized by an altar. Herodotos relates that Thetis was abducted on the coast of Sepias which belonged to her and the other Nereids.

A number of stylistic traits clearly link this cup with others of the Phrynos Painter. First of all, the incisions on the knees of Cheiron, Peleus and Herakles are characteristic of the painter. Second, the position of Cheiron’s forelegs is nearly identical to that of Herakles on the London cup (95, pl. 28c). Further, on 95 and 100 Herakles’ beard is very similar as are also the incising of the ears. Finally, the tiny imitation letters resemble those of the Amsterdam cup (99, pl. 30a-b).

The picture of a ship from Gravisca (101, pl. 29d), boarded by four large preserved figures (warrior, old man, archer, another figure’s hands only) is puzzling. Amongst little-masters it is unparalleled, and the subject’s significance cannot be easily established. Unusual details include the wavy line indicating the sea and the incised oars which extend down into the black area beneath the handle-zone, creating a notion of perspective.

Non-mythological subjects

Two outline female heads are depicted on the fragments in Boston (96, pl. 28c). Although Beazley thought that there was not enough to confirm an attribution to the Phrynos Painter, the large eyes and profile of the Boston heads, with their pointy noses, ‘pursed’ lips and pronounced chin, are very similar to features of Athena on the London cup (95, pl. 28e) and the woman on the Botkin amphora New York 64.11.13. Furthermore, the very fine details of the necklines and headbands agree closely the Phrynos Painter’s style, while finding no parallel amongst the outline female heads by other painters.
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611 Over a 100 specimens are known; cf. Barringer 1995, 69.
612 Brijder 1994, pls. 9c, 10 (with inventory no. Munich 8954, whereas LIM C and Barringer 1995 give 8966), 12b, 16a; Brijder 2000, pl. 29d), boarded by four large preserved figures (warrior, old man, archer, another figure’s hands only) is puzzling. Amongst little-masters it is unparalleled, and the subject’s significance cannot be easily established. Unusual details include the wavy line indicating the sea and the incised oars which extend down into the black area beneath the handle-zone, creating a notion of perspective.

Every other recorded depiction of a ship on a little-master cup appears on the inside of the lip, so that, as it were, the ship floats on the wine, a device which is repeated inside dinoi. But not any other ship of a little-master cup shows the fine, intricate detail of this representation nor does any evidently relate to a story. On the Gravisca fragment we perhaps see an event off the coast of Troy, as seems to apply to the ship on each of two Siana cups of the Heidelberg Painter. Obviously, the warrior on the left is involved in a fight; the old man is -at the very least - an involved spectator; and the archer would seem to offer potential support. Unfortunately the actual narrative remains obscure because none of the figures can be identified.

Non-mythological subjects

Two outline female heads are depicted on the fragments in Boston (96, pl. 28c). Although Beazley thought that there was not enough to confirm an attribution to the Phrynos Painter, the large eyes and profile of the Boston heads, with their pointy noses, ‘pursed’ lips and pronounced chin, are very similar to features of Athena on the London cup (95, pl. 28e) and the woman on the Botkin amphora New York 64.11.13. Furthermore, the very fine details of the necklines and headbands agree closely the Phrynos Painter’s style, while finding no parallel amongst the outline female heads by other painters.

611 Over a 100 specimens are known; cf. Barringer 1995, 69.
612 Brijder 1994, pls. 9c, 10 (with inventory no. Munich 8954, whereas LIM C and Barringer 1995 give 8966), 12b, 16a; Brijder 2000, pl. 29d), boarded by four large preserved figures (warrior, old man, archer, another figure’s hands only) is puzzling. Amongst little-masters it is unparalleled, and the subject’s significance cannot be easily established. Unusual details include the wavy line indicating the sea and the incised oars which extend down into the black area beneath the handle-zone, creating a notion of perspective.

Every other recorded depiction of a ship on a little-master cup appears on the inside of the lip, so that, as it were, the ship floats on the wine, a device which is repeated inside dinoi. But not any other ship of a little-master cup shows the fine, intricate detail of this representation nor does any evidently relate to a story. On the Gravisca fragment we perhaps see an event off the coast of Troy, as seems to apply to the ship on each of two Siana cups of the Heidelberg Painter. Obviously, the warrior on the left is involved in a fight; the old man is -at the very least - an involved spectator; and the archer would seem to offer potential support. Unfortunately the actual narrative remains obscure because none of the figures can be identified.

Non-mythological subjects

Two outline female heads are depicted on the fragments in Boston (96, pl. 28c). Although Beazley thought that there was not enough to confirm an attribution to the Phrynos Painter, the large eyes and profile of the Boston heads, with their pointy noses, ‘pursed’ lips and pronounced chin, are very similar to features of Athena on the London cup (95, pl. 28e) and the woman on the Botkin amphora New York 64.11.13. Furthermore, the very fine details of the necklines and headbands agree closely the Phrynos Painter’s style, while finding no parallel amongst the outline female heads by other painters.
Unlike the one outline head we have met above by the Eucheiros Painter (1, pl. 1a), the shoulders are placed in profile rather than frontally. Although the ear might at first glance seem extraordinarily shaped, it is more probably (partly) overlapped by a metal ornament on the headband.

In subject, the single cock and single swan on either side of the Torgiano cup (104, pl. 31c-d) are not at all unusual for lip-cups, which very often feature animals, particularly poultry. In details, however, they stand somewhat apart from their counterparts on little-masters: the pattern on the cock’s wing is not incised but consists of red dots, the cock’s tail has alternately red-and-black stripes, and the swan’s tail curves down in a curious manner, spreading unusually widely.

The birds’ colourful patterns complement the handle-palmettes. But since there is no trace of the refined, detailed workmanship of the Phrynos Painter it seems best to separate this cup, signed by the potter Phrynos, from the painter’s output. Additional traits that seem to contradict an attribution to the Phrynos Painter are the execution of the inscriptions, dividing line (see above) and palmettes, discussed directly below. The decoration is therefore assigned to another hand, here named the Torgiano Painter after the cup’s location.

Ornaments
At present, the Phrynos Painter’s extant handle-palmettes are limited to those on the Amsterdam band-cup (99, fig. 39a-b). Curiously, the function of handle-palmettes in the fully decorated handle-zone of a band-cup is less obvious than in the handle-zone of a lip-cup which is usually plain apart from a possible inscription. The palmettes of the Amsterdam cup consist of five large leaves and spirally volutes recalling the handle-ornaments of the Botkin Class amphorae, which the Phrynos Painter probably decorated from c. 550 BC onwards.

The palmettes of the Torgiano Painter (104, fig. 39c-d) are completely different and, in one respect, exceptional for little-master cups: the central leaf is black, whereas other palmettes with

Fig. 39. Palmettes on 99 (a-b) and 104 (c-d).

Ornaments
At present, the Phrynos Painter’s extant handle-palmettes are limited to those on the Amsterdam band-cup (99, fig. 39a-b). Curiously, the function of handle-palmettes in the fully decorated handle-zone of a band-cup is less obvious than in the handle-zone of a lip-cup which is usually plain apart from a possible inscription. The palmettes of the Amsterdam cup consist of five large leaves and spirally volutes recalling the handle-ornaments of the Botkin Class amphorae, which the Phrynos Painter probably decorated from c. 550 BC onwards.

The palmettes of the Torgiano Painter (104, fig. 39c-d) are completely different and, in one respect, exceptional for little-master cups: the central leaf is black, whereas other palmettes with
alternately red-and-black leaves usually have a red central leaf.\textsuperscript{423} The palmettes, with seven leaves and thick, simply formed volutes, are additional indications that this cup was not decorated by the Phrynos Painter.

Provenance and chronology
The Gordion cup (\textsuperscript{93}) must date from the earliest part of the Phrynos Painter’s career, as would also the other fragment found in Naucratis, \textsuperscript{94}. They both came to light in a sanctuary context.

In the next period, nearly all the cups with recorded provenances come from Italy: Vulci (\textsuperscript{95}, \textsuperscript{97}), Gravisca (\textsuperscript{101}) and somewhere in Italy (\textsuperscript{96}); except for \textsuperscript{101} which was found in a sanctuary, they lay in (suspected) funerary contexts. The exquisite, large band-cup, now fragmentary (\textsuperscript{98}), was found in a sanctuary context, the North Slope of the Athenian Acropolis. All cups of this period show the mature, fine miniature style which characterizes the Phrynos Painter.

Finally, of the two cups from his late period, \textsuperscript{102} and \textsuperscript{103}, the provenance of only the first is known: a settlement context in Phokaia. These cups are a bit less refined than the others, which may help to explain Beazley’s designation of \textsuperscript{103} as ‘probably by the Phrynos Painter’.

With regard to the chronology we have little to rely on. The Gordion cup \textsuperscript{93} can safely be placed in the decade 560/50 BC. Various dates have been proposed for the other cups.\textsuperscript{427} In my view, however, a date as early as c. 560 BC, which has been advanced for some cups, is unlikely because they have the standard type of little-master foot which emerged between c. 555/50 BC.

The best work of the Phrynos Painter (\textsuperscript{95},\textsuperscript{101}) probably dates from that period (c.555/50 BC).

As generally accepted, he most likely started to decorate Botkin Class amphorae c. 550 BC, to which the palmettes of the Amsterdam cup (\textsuperscript{99}) seem to be linked. The Painter of London B 425, who potted and painted in the workshop of Xenokles from c. 550 BC onwards may have been influenced by the spiral handle-ornaments of the Botkin Class as seen on four of his cups (\textsuperscript{87}, \textsuperscript{88}, \textsuperscript{91}, \textsuperscript{92}).\textsuperscript{426}

Mommsen assigns the amphora Basel BS 496, which she connects with the amphora Würzburg L 241, to 550-40 BC. The Würzburg amphora can probably be placed in the earlier part of the decade.\textsuperscript{427} As mentioned above, the style of the Oldknow cup (\textsuperscript{103}) is close to that of the Würzburg amphora. As a result, \textsuperscript{103} may also have been made in c. 550/45 BC. And the Torgiano Painter’s cup (\textsuperscript{104}) would be somewhat later, if we accept that the Phrynos Painter was replaced by the Torgiano Painter as the workshop’s painter of cups; perhaps the Phrynos Painter then limited himself to amphorae.

Hardly anything can be said about the cup which J. Frel published and described as ‘recalls the Phrynos Painter’ (\textsuperscript{105}).\textsuperscript{428} According to him, it depicts an amazonomachy of exquisite workmanship. However, the published photos are so poor that the cup can not be properly evaluated, let alone positively attributed.

\textsuperscript{423} For palmettes with black central leaf see chapter seven below. On Caeretan hydriades some palmettes with alternately red-and-black leaves also have a black central leaf (e.g., Hemelrijk 1984, plb. 138-39, nos. 29, 32-33).

\textsuperscript{424} C. 560 BC: \textsuperscript{97} Wünsche 1998, 202; \textsuperscript{103} Scheffold 1992, 91, fig. 102. C. 560/50 BC: \textsuperscript{95}, \textsuperscript{97}, Brjider 1991a, 26, \textsuperscript{98} Vian 1951, 45; Moore 1979b, 24, Scheffold dates one side of c. 560 BC, the other c. 550 BC; Scheffold 1992, 11, fig. 3, and 37, fig. 35. C. 550/B BC: \textsuperscript{97}, H. Siebertmann, cited in Brjider 1991a, 26, n. 23. C. 555-50 BC: \textsuperscript{99} Brjider 1991a, 26. Shortly before the middle of the sixth century: \textsuperscript{98} Roebuck 1940, 200. C. 550 BC: \textsuperscript{95}, Mommsen 1989, 40-41; \textsuperscript{97} Alldberg-Cornell 1992, 36, \textsuperscript{102} Tuna-Nörting 2002, 178; \textsuperscript{104} Uncini 1991, 86, C. 550/40 BC: \textsuperscript{100} Christie’s London, June 8, 1988, no. 36; \textsuperscript{103} Jacobazzi 2004, 75. C. 540 BC: \textsuperscript{95} Sparks 1996, 116, fig. V.1. C. 540/30 BC: \textsuperscript{100}, J. Gaunt in Padgett 2002, 19, 343; C. 530 BC: \textsuperscript{103} Ars Antiqua, Auktion IV, Lucerne, 7 December 1962, no. 129.

\textsuperscript{425} Chapter 2, fig. 34a-f.

Concluding remarks

Two cups (95-96) signed by the potter Phrynos were definitely decorated by the Phrynos Painter; whether he and the potter Phrynos were the same person remains a matter of speculation, but it would not seem unlikely. It has been shown above that the potter Phrynos, probably at a later stage of his career, worked with another painter, here named the Torgiano Painter. In this case it is unclear exactly what the potter’s signature of Phrynos signifies: Does it refer to him as the actual potter or in another capacity, for example as the workshop’s owner or supervisor?

The resemblance in shape between a band-cup decorated by the Phrynos Painter (99) and one signed by Archikles and Glaukytes (109) cannot, in itself, be accepted as proof of a workshop relationship, especially as the similar profiles of the lips of these cups are repeated in other little-masters by various craftsmen. Nevertheless, J. Haldenstein places Phrynos and the Phrynos Painter in one workshop with Archikles and Glaukytes, not because of the similar shape of the two band-cups (she does not mention the Amsterdam cup), but because of a supposed connection between the Phrynos Painter and the Painter of Louvre F 51 who indeed worked with Archikles and Glaukytes, as we shall see in the next chapter. She identifies ‘a group of cups related to both the Phrynos Painter and the Painter of Louvre F 51.’

However, none of them can be positively attributed to either of the two painters nor are there any clear similarities between their larger shapes to accept that they and the potters are related by workshop. In addition, Haldenstein assigns the Painter of the Boston Polyphemos to Phrynos’ workshop. Yet, despite some stylistic resemblance to the Phrynos Painter, a relation between the two painters seems extremely remote.

Much more significant is the possibility that Phrynos’ workshop was somehow linked to the potter Amasis and the Amasis Painter. Even though a detailed discussion of the Botkin Class neck-amphorae, some of which, if not all, were decorated by the Phrynos Painter, goes beyond the scope of this discussion, they require some attention here. The handle-ornaments of a broad, neck-amphora in Paris with an epoiesen-signature of Amasis must have been inspired by the spiral complexes at the handles of the Botkin Class amphorae. Moreover, in shape and decoration, two amphorae in Boston with signatures of Amasis show strong parallels to the Botkin Class amphorae, one of which even has the same type of foot as one of the Boston amphorae. This similarity then led D. von Bothmer to advocate strongly that the Botkin Class may well be early work of the potter Amasis.

Previously, D.A. Jackson maintained that the Botkin Class owes almost everything to Ionia. An origin in Ionia, a region in ready and direct contact with Egypt, helped J. Boardman to argue in favour of a connection between Amasis, with his hellenized Egyptian name, and the production of these amphorae.

However, von Bothmer’s idea has since been rejected by J. Frel and convincingly refuted by H. Mömmsen. For instance, a time gap separates the earlier Botkin Class amphorae from the amphorae signed by Amasis which have Botkin Class features. It is also notable that this class inspired other craftsmen like the Affecter. Finally, in a recent article Mömmsen clearly demonstrates in detail that the Botkin Class is firmly rooted in an Athenian tradition, specifically Group E.

Returning to the little-master cups, we can not establish a connection between the Phrynos Painter and the Amasis Painter. As remarked above, the Amsterdam cup with an amazonomachy by the Phrynos Painter (99) and the Amasis Painter’s cup with the same theme in Malibu (223) share the compositional division of the combatants into three distinct groups on each side of the cup. In
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428 Haldenstein 1982, 18-32.
429 Haldenstein 1982, 30-32.
431 For the attribution of the Botkin amphorae see the Introduction to this chapter.
432 Bothmer 1983, 125-29, no. 23.
433 The other Boston amphora has a modern foot; Bothmer 1985, 130-37, nos. 24-25.
435 Boardman 1987, 144-45.
436 Frel 1984ab, 13; Mömmsen 1997, 28-29.
438 See n. 364.
addition, some similar details of dress and armour have been noted, and both artisans created three-dimensional shield-devices.

However, these traits are obviously not limited to the work of these two craftsmen, which makes it impossible to accept direct influence or workshop relations. Until new evidence emerges, like a Botkin Class amphora with an ἐποiesen-signature, the similarities between the work of the Phrynos Painter and the Amasis Painter must be simply ascribed to familiarity with one another’s products rather than to the much stronger tie of a working relationship.

On the other hand, the Phrynos Painter seems to have influenced the Affecter more directly. We have seen the remarkable agreements in their depictions of the throne and thunderbolts of Zeus on the Phrynos Painter’s London cup (95) and the Affecter’s Florence amphora 92167. Certainly, the Affecter was very familiar with the Phrynos Painter’s output.