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4. ARCHIKLES, ARCHIKLES PAINTER, PAINTER OF MUNICH 2243, GLAUKYTES, PAINTER OF LOUVRE F 51 (nos. 106-16; pls. 32-37)

Introduction

Eπιτιθησις-signatures of Archikles mark each side of Gordion type B cup in London (106, pl. 32a-b) and a band-cup without figurework, also in London (108, pl. 33c-d). Another one appears below a handle of a large band-cup, Munich 2243 (109, fig. 44a), opposite the eπιτιθησις-signature of Glaukytes below the other handle (fig. 44b). In addition, Glaukytes signs four other cups (110, 112, 114-15, pls. 35a-b, d, 36d, 37a-b). On the basis of the kalos-inscription on a signed cup of Glaukytes (110), two other cups with the same kalos-name, praising Hippokritos, have been attributed to him as well (111, 113, pl. 35c, fig. 47b).440 Beazley gave 106, 108-10 and 113-15 to the potters Archikles and/or Glaukytes.441 He said little about the painters, though. In 1932 he wrote that the three cups with signatures of Archikles (106, 108-9) cannot be connected stylistically to one another; likewise, he said that the painting of the cups with signatures of Glaukytes or the same kalos-name (109-10, 113, 115) could not be connected stylistically to one another.442 In ABV he again expressed doubt that 110 and 113 were by the same hand.443 Immerwahr’s study of the inscriptions supports Beazley concerning the stylistic divergence of the Munich cup (109), but he says nothing about the relation between 110-16.444

It will be argued, especially with regard to the lettering of the inscriptions, that 111-12 and 114-15 were also adorned by the Painter of Louvre F 51. In total, the cups of Archikles and Glaukytes will be attributed to three painters (Archikles Painter, Painter of Munich 2243 and Painter of Louvre F 51). As for potterwork, because of the cups’ small number and differences which can partly be ascribed to varying production dates, it remains unclear if all of them were thrown by the two potters

440 R. Blatter attributed 111 (Blatter 1971, 426-27). For Archikles and Glaukytes see Hoppin 1924, 56-62, 113-17; Beazley 1932, 180, 186-87, 191, 199-200; ABV 160, 163-64, Pára 67-68; Haldenstein 1982, 18-32, 128, 156; Add’ 47; Fellmann 1989, pls. 2.7-6.3; Rebillard 1992; KLA I, 77 s.v. Archikles (P. Heesen), 264 s.v. Glaukytes (R. Blatter); Krause 2007, 12-17; Steiner 2007, 77-79.
441 ABV 160, 163-64, Pára 68.
442 Beazley 1932, 199-200. In addition to 111 and 112, fragment 114 was not known at that time; it was attributed later by Beazley in Pára 68.
443 On Berlin 1799, ABV 164, ‘I cannot persuade myself that the cup was painted by the same hand as the London.’
444 Immerwahr 1990, 49-50; 111 and 116 were unknown to him.
445 Beazley 1932, 199; supported in Immerwahr 1990, 200.
446 Four hydriai, two Panatheniac amphorae, one small neck-amphora; ‘Compare with the Painter of Louvre F 51’, fragments of krater, hydria and large vase; ABV 313-14, Pára 136; Add’ 84-85. According to BAIPD, Beazley attributed another amphora (Montagnola, Purrmann coll., BAID no. 24076) to ‘Near the Painter of Louvre F 51’. G. Koch-Harnack assigns a band-cup, Boston 63.4, to the Painter of Louvre F 51 (Koch-Harnack 1983, cat. no. 60; attribution taken over in Lear/CVA I, 77 s.v. Archikles); he says that the hand of Archikles is uncertain. Finally, Haldenstein adds a hydria with Herakles and Triton, a favourite subject of the painter (and his contemporaries), Boston 99.522 (True 1978, 76) and the famous lip-cup in Tarquinia RC 4194 (G. Jacopi 1956, CVA 2, pl. 21.5-6) to the Painter of Louvre F 51 (Haldenstein 1982, 22-23). She correctly observes that the hands of Herakles and Triton, drawn in a peculiar manner, are nearly identical on both the Tarquinia cup and the Boston hydria. However, I do not think either of them can be given to the Painter of Louvre F 51; the horses in the chariot race on the lip-cup are too different in detail (incising on bodies, mane, etc.) to accept the attribution. The Boston hydria would be about a decade later than the lip-cup and lacks the nose incisions typical of this painter; the trademark under the foot of the hydria is also found under an amphora by the Amasis Painter and one related to the BMN Painter (Johnston 1979, 84, type 29A).
446 Iozzo 2000, 282.
named in the ἐποίησις-signatures.

4.1 ARCHIKLES, ARCHIKLES PAINTER, c. 560/50 BC (nos. 106-8; figs. 40-42; pls. 32-33)

Shape and dimensions
Gordion cup 106 is large, with extra deep bowl and medium foot (fig. 40); lip-cup 107 is medium, with extra deep bowl and low foot. The band-cup of Archikles (108) is medium and has an extra deep bowl and extra low foot.

<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-Gordon Type B cup</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560/55-Lip-cup</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555/50-Band-cup</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 7. Average absolute and relative dimensions of Archikles’ cups.

The lips of 106 are quite high (3.0cm). They are tooled off rather bluntly. The foot of 106 is wide with a flat standing surface, which is reserved and without concentric circles, other than one might expect of such a foot (fig. 40). The edge of the base is thin and rounded; the handles are slightly oblique. The low foot of 107 is similarly shaped.

Band-cup 108 is very heavy. The wall is thick, and the extra low foot has a thick base, the edge of which turns noticeably upwards.

Inscriptions
The ἐποίησις-signatures of 106 and 108 differ somewhat: 106 reads ἈΡΧΙΚΛΕΣΕΠΙΟΕΣΕΝ, where the first τά is missing on one side (fig. 41a); 108 shows the so-called speaking object variant, ἈΡΧΙΚΛΕΣΕΠΙΟΕΣΕΝ, with punctuation of two dots between the name and object (fig. 41b). The third inscribed cup (107) bears a row of nonsensical epsilons, sigmas and upsilons (fig. 41c). The divide between meaningful and nonsensical inscriptions can not be regarded as decisive for the identification.

For a profile drawing of 107 see Brijder 2000, figure at bottom of 561; on p. 604 Brijder compares the shape to that of Athens 534, related to the Red-black Painter (op. cit., 605, fig. 134).

Cf., e.g., the feet of 1-3.

This is an example of ‘abbreviated writing’ (cf. Wachtter 1992, 25), as also seen in at least one signature of Euchairos (5, possibly also 2, 3). For this type of mistake see n. 120.
of a painter’s hand because a few painters who applied meaningful inscriptions occasionally added also nonsensical ones; and both kinds are sometimes seen together on one piece. The letters of 106 are very large and widely spaced, extending completely across the handle-zone between the palmettes, whereas the letters of the two other cups are smaller and closer together, which results in more space between the inscriptions and the palmettes. Here, as can also be discerned in the work of other painters, some change is visible in the inscriptions, ranging from careful, angular letters to looser, more rounded shapes.

Fig. 41a. Εποίεσεν-signature of 106.

Fig. 41b. Εποίεσεν-signature of 108.

Fig. 41c. Nonsensical inscription of 107.

**Interior decoration**

Unlike other Gordion cups the tondo border of 106 (pl. 33a) consists of tongues, whereas lip-cup 107 (pl. 33b) has tongues with dot band. The lines between the tongues are not painted in relief, but like the concentric rings they are thin and rather vaguely marked. In both tondos the horses’ forelegs and tails overlap the border. Whereas 106 has a relatively medium-sized medallion (0.47), the relative dimension of the medallion in 107 is very large: 0.72. In both tondos the horses’ rumps are held quite high, the tails curve up and hang away from the body. Two horses are pop-eyed.

The single horseman inside 106 (pl. 33a) is probably a jockey. His legs are drawn back, as if to spur on the horse. The subject of two horsemen, as inside 107 (pl. 33b), is very rarely met in the tondos of little-master cups. In the two known examples, once the warrior dismounts, on the other he walks beside his horse, while his squire is still mounted. In 107, the warrior wears a helmet, but is equipped with no additional armour or weapon. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that both the warrior and the dog look round as if they are reacting to a figure out of our view. At present, the representation is unique amongst little-master cups and is not found on Sianas either.

---

Cf. Immerwahr 2006, 139-40; see here chapter eleven.

E.g., 113 by the Painter of Louvre F 51.

For a similar development in the script of other painters see n. 235.

This is relatively the largest preserved medallion in the author’s data base, the closest being a lip-cup of the C Painter, Oxford 1965 120, relation to the bowl diameter, 0.7:1.

For a list of cups with a single horseman see n. 248.

237 (Epitimos Painter; dismounting, pl. 68c) and 247 (BMN Painter, dismounted, pl. 72c); warriors walking beside their horses are also met on a lekanis lid of the C Painter, Naples 152642 (Cassani 2009, 24-25), a Siana cup by the C Painter, London B 380 (Brijder 2005, 248, fig. 2), and three Siana cups by the Red-black Painter (Brijder 2000, 58-59, pls. 183 a-b, 185b). For horsemen with a spare horse see the comment on 116, below.
Exterior decoration
None of Archikles’ cups (106-8) is adorned outside. The single feature that needs to be noted is the exceptionally narrow handle-zone (2.3cm) of 106, especially in relation to the high lip (3.0cm).

Ornaments
On 106 the usual dividing or ground line of the handle-zone of a Gordion cup is not repeated. The inner stem of 106 is black, except for the uppermost 1.5cm. All three cups have large palmettes with many thin leaves (fig. 42a-d).

Fig. 42a-d. Palmettes of 106 (a-b) and 107 (c-d).

Provenance and chronology
The three cups were found in Vulci, probably in funerary contexts. Excavation data are not available. The type B Gordion 106 as well as the elaborate tondo border of 107 place them between 560 and 550 BC. Their uncanonical shape places them in the earliest period of the lip-cup’s development, c. 560/55 BC. Cup 106 must be later, but to judge from the short, wide stem, it was made not after 550 BC.

4.2 ARCHIKLES AND GLAUKYTES, PAINTER OF MUNICH 2243, c. 550/45 BC (no. 109; figs. 43-44; pl. 34)

Introduction
The following band-cup has been widely published and discussed, not in the least because of the many inscriptions between the figures and the paired ἐποίησεν-signatures. In painting style, it differs from other cups with the signatures of Archikles or Glaukytes as well as from any other known little-master.

Shape and dimension
This band-cup, with a diameter of 26.8cm, belongs in the upper range of large specimens. The bowl is deep, the foot medium. Although some similarities to other cups can be noted, particularly the lip which thickens at the slightly, out-turned rim, they are insufficient to recognize the hand of an individual potter.

46a This is without parallel inside the stems of little-master cups; a completely black inner stem occurs on several Siana cups (e.g., Beijer 2008, 616, 618, figs. 145, 146-49).
46b For an extensive list of publications see Fellmann 1989, 3-14, and for subsequent literature see here the bibliography in the catalogue.
46c H. Fellmann compares it to Athens, Agora P 30782 (Fellmann 1989, 15; Camp 1986, 136, fig. 110). The style is indeed similar, but the incising of the ears, the unincised hem of the chiton of the man bending over the board game player and the incisions on his arm and hand under the cloak do not correspond to those of the Munich cup. In a letter to H. Hoffmann, Beazley compared a band-cup fragment in a German private collection (Hombostel 1977, 268, no. 239) to the Munich cup; in my view the style of that fragment seems more detailed than that of the Munich cup.
46d For a profile drawing of 109 see Fellmann 1989, Beilage 1.4.
46e These features are not decisive, as they recur on a number of cups. In the preceding chapter the similarities have been noted to the Phrynos cup in Amsterdam (99, fig. 36, in chapter three). W. Rudolph points out resemblances to Bloomington 72.97.4 and Paris, Niarchos A 031 (Rudolph 1995, 70, n. 13). However, the foot of Munich 2243 is completely different from that of the Bloomington cup. As remarked below, the profile is also similar to two early band-cups of Glaukytes (110, 113).
Inscriptions

Besides the two signatures below the handles, 60 individual (mostly meaningful) inscriptions are written in the figured scenes. They mainly label the figures; there are conversational greetings (XAIPE) and a comment by a participant (Athena to Ariadne, EYTIAAE, "You rolled it up fine"; fig. 43). The meanings of the inscriptions, linguistically as well as contextually, have been extensively treated by L. Rebillard and C. Krause; their findings need not be repeated here.

Labels, which might sometimes seem redundant, particularly for certain animals or objects, are quite rarely seen on band-cups. Far more commonly they show, besides signatures, nonsensical and imitation inscriptions or simply rows of dots between the figures.

Another rarity is the placement of inscriptions below the handles of little-master cups. Of the 13 known examples, five can be attributed to the potters and painters discussed in this chapter. Amongst them, inscriptions turned 90° in vertical lines, as on 109 (fig. 44a-b), are the least common of all.

I adopt Rebillard’s explanation for the inscription, recognizing the aorist ξύτως (‘you rolled it up fine’), which was also accepted by Krause (Rebillard 1992, 522-24; Krause 2007, 13, n. 85); Gerleigner instead, opts for the much less understandable aorist μάλλα (‘you plucked out hair fine’) (Gerleigner 2006, 4-5).

Rebillard 1992; Krause 2007. One inscription deserves attention: the second person from the left on side B, the only bearded male in the group, is labelled ‘ΔΙΜΟΝ’. This anagram for the name Minos led D. von Bothmer (BullMetMus 5, May 1947, 224) to suggest that the painter indirectly referred to king Minos, who is sometimes seen at the killing of the Minotauros. G.S. Gerleigner (2006, 4) adopted the idea which, however, was dismissed by Beazley, who thought that the beard had been inadvertently added (Dev 2, 51). Rebillard is no doubt right to question the need for an indirect reference to king Minos, while remarking that the name Simon is well attested in Attica and on Athenian pottery, including the François krater (Rebillard 1992, 514).

Only four other band-cups have inscribed labels on the exterior: 207 (possibly Stroibos Painter), 210 (Neandros), Athens, NM Acropolis 1632 (Graef/Langlotz, no. 1632, pl. 84), Athens, Agora A-P 1834, 1869 and 2293 (Roebuck 1940, 209-210, no. 135, fig. 32).

Inscriptions under the handles, turned 90° in vertical lines: 258 (Anakles, pl. 75d), 704, unattributed. Similarly, the signature of Anakles under the handles of a black-glazed cup (Rasmussen 1979, 52, fig. 353). Horizontal inscriptions: 110 11, 113-14 (figs. 46-47), 194 (Kaulos/Sakonides, fig. 69a-b below), 223-24 (Amasis, fig. 84a-b, inc chapter eight), 696 (Thyphiodites), 705-7 (unattributed). Beazley suggests that the St 01061 kaloi inscription on 207 (possibly Stroibos Painter) was also written under the handle; however, the drawing in Gerhard 1839 (pl. 190.3-4) instead seems to show that it was written along the edge of the foot (see Beazley 1932, 194). Figurework under the handle of a little-master cup is reported once: Berlin F 1790 (lost; Furtwängler 1885, 299, no. 1790; Kästner 2005, 116, not ill.).
The paired \(\text{επόιεσθαι}\) signatures of \(109\) have triggered much discussion on the meaning of the verb, especially because it is difficult to understand how the actual task of shaping a cup could be shared by two potters. \(^{465}\) A. Steiner states that the parallel character of the signatures suggests 'equivalence of artistic contribution', while not elaborating further on what this specifically meant. \(^{466}\) Whereas she pays close attention to minor differences in other cases, she curiously ignores the inclusion of the object \(\text{ΜΕ}\) in Glaukytes' signature, which could prove significant. \(^{467}\)

The explanation for paired \(\text{επόιεσθαι}\) signatures which finds most support is that one of the two craftsmen signed as painter. The reasoning is that \(\text{εποιεσθαι}\) refers in one instance to the painting, a meaning of \(\text{ποιειν}\) which can be recognized in other signatures, \(^{468}\) or that the writer simply made a mistake. \(^{469}\) But since the painting style of \(109\) seems unrelated to that of any other cups signed by the two craftsmen, \(^{470}\) this explanation cannot easily be accepted, particularly because, as remarked above and as will be further demonstrated below in regard to other manufacturers of little-masters, one potter usually collaborated for a long period of time or even for his entire career with one painter, who is therefore often identified as the same individual as the potter himself.

Above we have encountered the Archikles Painter, responsible for painting \(106-8\) for the potter Archikles. Moreover, if Archikles employed a painter later in his career to decorate the Munich cup \(109\), this painter would hardly have written an \(\text{εποιεσθαι}\)-signature meaning 'Archikles painted' the cup.

Therefore, if one of the two artisans was in fact the painter, Glaukytes would seem the more likely candidate. As discussed below, however, all the other cups signed by or associated with Glaukytes were decorated by the Painter of Louvre F 51 (\(110-16\)). But the Munich cup, with its double-signature, is not stylistically related to any of them. In addition, the sharply angular sigmas of

\(^{465}\) For surveys of the discussions see Tosto 1999, 182-87, and Stossi 2003, 104-11. The only other little-master cup with paired \(\text{εποιεσθαι}\)-signatures is a band-cup signed by Nikosthenes and Anakles (\(255\), pl. 74a-b).

\(^{466}\) Steiner 2007, 77.

\(^{467}\) Steiner states, 'exact repetition is reserved for the two handle-areas...', translating, however: 'Glaukytes made me, Archikles made (it).'

\(^{468}\) Cf. Tosto 1999, 183,186, with n. 849.

\(^{469}\) Immerwahr 1990, 50: the signer mistakenly wrote \(\text{εποιεσθαι}\) instead of \(\text{εγράφησθαι}\); Rosati 1976-77, 67: the signer mistakenly wrote the name of another man working in the same workshop. It's not likely to be discovered because it is hardly visible until the cup has been fired and then it can’t be changed. The existence of another paired \(\text{εποιεσθαι}\)-signatures on one band-cup (Nikosthenes/Anakles, \(255\), pl. 74a-b) makes a mistake seem less likely and urges one to search for another explanation.

\(^{470}\) It is sometimes suggested that inscriptions, especially when placed outside the painted scene, could have been written by someone other than the painter of the figurework, for example, the potter. Immerwahr’s study of the signatures of Pamphaios, which are often found outside the decorated areas, convincingly demonstrates that they were applied by the painter himself (Immerwahr 1984). On the other hand, Tosto’s study of the Nikosthenic workshop argues that Nikosthenes himself sometimes signed vases whose decoration was executed by various painters (Tosto 1999, 185-86); the same seems to apply to the paired potter-signatures on Group E amphorae, Paris, Louvre F 53, and Toledo 80.1022, probably written by Exekias himself, while the decoration was carried out by others (Mommsen 1998, 44-45).
demonstrate that someone else wrote the inscriptions with curving sigmas on 110-15.\footnote{109} Moreover, if the potter Glaukytes was talented enough also to paint a cup as fine as 109, would he then have had the Painter of Louvre F 51 decorate all his other (preserved) cups? Very unlikely.

So both Archikles and Glaukytes can most probably be ruled out as painter. Since the style of 109 finds as yet no parallel, the painter of the cup may be referred to as the Painter of Munich 2243. As argued below, Glaukytes was most likely the potter of 109. If so, the Painter of Munich 2243 becomes the second identifiable painter who collaborated with him, besides the Painter of Louvre F 51.

Furthermore, the addition of the pronoun ME to Glaukytes’ signature but not to Archikles’ seems to express a more personal tie with the actual manufacturing process on the part of Glaukytes, which leads us to another explanation. As V. Tosto shows with regard to Nikosthenes’ σηματον-signatures, they appear sometimes on pottery which was not thrown by him personally: he instructed others in his workshop either to throw, decorate and sign the vase for him or to shape a vase which he, in turn, decorated and signed. In each instance the signature ultimately refers to Nikosthenes as the director of the establishment.\footnote{109}

Since Archikles signed two very early little-master cups (106, 108) which predate the cups with Glaukytes’ signatures, he would seem to have been the older of the two and, thus, very possibly the leading, supervising potter or even the workshop’s owner. Then, Glaukytes, who later signs alone, may well have been second in line and designated to succeed his older colleague. In this capacity he could have potted the Munich cup under Archikles’ supervision; the latter’s σηματον-signature may mean just that.\footnote{147} Probably it is also notable that the contour of 109 resembles that of two early band-cups by Glaukytes, 110 and 112; note how the lip curves nicely up from the bowl, becomes rather straight, and turns out at the rim.

**Exterior decoration**

The Calydonian boar hunt, depicted on side A of 109 (pl. 34a), was a popular theme in Athenian black-figure, particularly c. 570-540 BC.\footnote{112} The earliest extant literary source is Homer.\footnote{472} The painted representations of the mythical hunt usually have a frieze-like, often symmetrical composition with a large boar in the centre, as a rule facing left, attacked on both sides by hunters on foot. A hound (often white) is on the boar’s back, another one bites a buttock. In some pictures, the boar has already caused casualties, like the torn dog and the hunter named Antaios on the François krater.\footnote{474} Variation occurs: the boar is turned to the right, Atalante may be present or absent, the boar’s victims differ, occasionally some hunters have a trident spear (as on 109) and the hunters may be nude or clothed.\footnote{477}

\footnote{109} On 112 one σηματον is partly preserved; 116 has no inscription.
\footnote{106} Tosto 1999, 185.
\footnote{108} Without exploring the matter in detail, both D. Williams and F. Villard hint at a similar explanation for the paired signatures: ‘…or is one man signalling that he is passing on his workshop to a second man?’ (Williams 1995, 146); ‘Celui qui <a fait> le vase et qui le signe,…., ou s’il s’associe, .., à un compagnon qui signe avec la même formule, peut être un patron de l’ atelier, ou même d’ une plus vaste entreprise, comme celle de Nikosthénès.’ (Villard 2002, 781). See also Boardman 1974, 11: ‘we must assume collaboration, but surely not one man passing on his workshop to a second man’.
\footnote{110} The painted representations of the mythical hunt usually have a frieze-like, often symmetrical composition with a large boar in the centre, as a rule facing left, attacked on both sides by hunters on foot. A hound (often white) is on the boar’s back, another one bites a buttock. In some pictures, the boar has already caused casualties, like the torn dog and the hunter named Antaios on the François krater. Variation occurs: the boar is turned to the right, Atalante may be present or absent, the boar’s victims differ, occasionally some hunters have a trident spear (as on 109) and the hunters may be nude or clothed.
In contrast, the non-mythical boar hunt usually takes place on horseback and dogs are not usually included, let alone involved in attacking the prey. The other side of the 109 (pl. 34b) presents Theseus fighting and killing the Minotauros, another popular subject in Athenian vase-painting. Painters introduced the story around 570-60 BC and it became more frequent during the 550s BC, while the number of representations tripled in the following decade. Sometimes the Athenian youths and maidens, whose lives depended on the outcome, are present, as may also be Ariadne, as on the Munich cup. On the other hand, the painters of lip-cups, as can be expected, reduced the story to the two main protagonists. On band-cups the space on either side of Theseus and the Minotauros is often filled with anonymous spectators or even animals. Usually, Theseus kills the creature with a sword. An uncommon rendition is found on a Siana cup with lip-cup features, Berlin V.I. 3755: the Minotauros stands straight like a human being and the positions of the two protagonists are reversed, with Theseus on the right and the Minotauros on the left.

Ornaments

Sphinxes, turned towards the handles and often looking round, serve quite frequently as the handle-ornaments of little-masters, but they rarely stand, as on 109. Instead, they are usually seated, portrayed with trident-boar-spears see, e.g., dinos, Vatican 306 (Barringer 2001, 148, fig. 80), or ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphora, Berlin F 1707 (Dalton 1966, pl. 8).

E.g., the band-cups Baltimore, WAM 48.41 and Basel, Cahn HC 843 (Barringer 2001, 60, no. 10; Krouze 1992, no. 70), Heidelberg S 13 (H. Gropengiesser 1970, CV 4, pl. 156.2), Vatican 17807 (Albizzati 1925-39, no. 332, pl. 36).


Lip-cups: 248 (BMN Painter, pl. 72c), 540 (Centaur Painter, dispersed over both sides, pl. 140c-d), Berkeley 8/358 (H. Smith 1936, CV 1, pl. XV.1a-d); band-cups: Amsterdam 2147 A/B (Painter of Villa Giulia 3559; Brijder et al. 1996, pl. 101.1-2), London, market (Group of Lourve F 81; Sotheby’s, 27 November 1967, no. 125), Naples 81135 (A. Adriani 1950, CV 4, pls. 16.7, 17.1), Paris, Louvre CA 306 (Haldenstein 1982, 59; photo in Heazley Archive), Pointe Lequin 4437, 5030 (possibly same cup, Long/Miro/Volpe 1992, 210, fig. 125), Rome, VG s.n. (Near Painter of Villa Giulia 3559; M. Adriani-Arthtzhuk 1964, 15-16, no. 289), Syracuse 44070 (Orsi 1925 b, 300-1, fig. 53; Zisa 2007, 46, no. 18 for side 15.3), Rome, market (Christie’s 7 December 1994, no. 63; previously, Sotheby’s London, 13-14 December 1990, no. 70), Heidelberg S 13 (H. Gropengiesser 1970, CV 4, pl. 156.2).

E.g., the band-cups Baltimore, WAM 48.41 and Basel, Cahn HC 843 (Barringer 2001, 148, fig. 80), or ‘Tyrrhenian’ amphora, Berlin F 1707 (Dalton 1966, pl. 8).

E.g., the band-cups Baltimore, WAM 48.41 and Basel, Cahn HC 843 (Barringer 2001, 60, no. 10; Krouze 1992, no. 70), Heidelberg S 13 (H. Gropengiesser 1970, CV 4, pl. 156.2), Vatican 17807 (Albizzati 1925-39, no. 332, pl. 36).


Lip-cups: 248 (BMN Painter, pl. 72c), 540 (Centaur Painter, dispersed over both sides, pl. 140c-d), Berkeley 8/358 (H. Smith 1936, CV 1, pl. XV.1a-d); band-cups: Amsterdam 2147 A/B (Painter of Villa Giulia 3559; Brijder et al. 1996, pl. 101.1-2), London, market (Group of Lourve F 81; Sotheby’s, 27 November 1967, no. 125), Naples 81135 (A. Adriani 1950, CV 4, pls. 16.7, 17.1), Paris, Louvre CA 306 (Haldenstein 1982, 59; photo in Heazley Archive), Pointe Lequin 4437, 5030 (possibly same cup, Long/Miro/Volpe 1992, 210, fig. 125), Rome, VG s.n. (Near Painter of Villa Giulia 3559; M. Adriani-Arthtzhuk 1964, 15-16, no. 289), Syracuse 44070 (Orsi 1925 b, 300-1, fig. 53; Zisa 2007, 46, no. 18 for side B, where the Minotauros tries to flee), Taranto 4164, 4579, 20143 (Massiello 1997, 483, figs. 13.17, 6.3, 12.30), Thasos 24835 (Maffe 1979, 61, fig. 35), Thbes R.51.233 (Burrows/Ure 1907/8, 269, no. 233), Vienna, market (Dorotehun, 15 September 1999, no. 21). The fight of Theseus and the Minotauros also appears under the foot of Berlin Sa 488X (Manner Lysippides Painter; Greifenhagen 1971, 94, fig. 17).

Stuttgart KAS 73 (human figure and animals; E. Kunze-Güte 1965, CV 1, pl. 17.6). The painter of this cup, easily recognized by the panthers’ faces and his habit of usually leaving a tiny corner of a red area black, is otherwise only known to have decorated animal band-cups: Baltimore, WAM 48.43 (not previously published), Basel, AntMus Kuhn 53 (Haldenstein 1982, 165, not ill.), Florence 141894 (not previously published), Greifswald 203 (Hund/Peters 1961, pl. 17), Rome, VG 79648, 79902/80209 (Hannestad 1989, nos. 92, 190), Sibari 9257/9183 (Notesc 1970 Suppl. III, 150, fig. 152, no. 220).

Brijder 2000, pl. 19c. Other representations of Theseus and the Minotauros on Siana cups: Athens, NM 12996 (Callipoliti-Feytmans 1986, pl. 20), Basel, market (M. Adriani-Arthtzhuk 1964, 15-16 March 1975, no. 122), Thesee R.49.263 (V. Sabatini 2001, CV 1, pl. 32), Athens, Benaki 31131 (M. Pipili, Athletes, trainers and a victor: two new Siana cups in the Benaki Museum, ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟ ΜΠΕΝΑΚΗ 3 [2003] 10, fig. 3); for these see Brijder forthcoming. A portrayal of the story is found on one komast cup, Palazzo 2574 (Brijder 1983, 235, no. K 216).

London BI 387 (Stansbury-O’Donnell 2006, 172, fig. 57), Madison 1981.34 (Haldenstein 1991, 8-9, figs. 5-6), Rome, VG 79609 (Hannestad 1989 no. 33), where their poses are between sitting and standing. Standing sphinxes and handle-palmettes: Cambridge, FitzMun N 140/99 (W. Lamb 1936, CV 2, pl. XX.7), Malibu, Getty 81.AE.201.4 (not previously published), Rhodes 13105 (G. Jacopi 1933, CV 1, pl. 18.6), Thasos T II.3 (Maffe 1979, 99, fig. 21). Rampant sphinxes: 236 (Epitimos Painter, fig. 91a-b), 697 (Typehides).
especially on later band-cups in the Group of Villa Giulia 3559, Group of Rhodes 12264 and Group of Louvre F 81. Occasionally, other kinds of creatures or animals have this function.

Provenance and chronology
Like Archikles’ other cups, 109 comes from Vulci, probably a funerary context. Based on the shape, with deep bowl and medium foot, and this author’s explanation of the double-signature, a date of about 550 BC seems most likely.

4.3 GLAUKYTES, PAINTER OF LOUVRE F 51, c. 550/40 BC (nos. 110-16; figs. 45-49; pls. 35-37)

Introduction
As pointed out above, Haldenstein attributes London B 400 (110, pl. 35a-b) to the Painter of Louvre F 51, hitherto only known as a painter of larger forms. Although this cup diverges stylistically quite a bit from other cups and fragments discussed in this section, sufficient reason exists to give all of them to the same hand. The attribution of 110 to the Painter of Louvre F 51 is mainly based on the central scene on side A showing a fallen horse, which is a miniature version of the picture on a hydria by the same painter in Naples. The subject is extremely rare. In addition, the spokes of the chariots’ wheels are similarly depicted on the shoulder of the Naples hydria and band-cup 110.

The tondo of 113 (pl. 36c) illustrates a frontal quadriga, which is incomplete. The incisions on the chest of the remaining trace horse consist of two concave arcs which curve outwards. Such arcs are extremely rare in Athenian black-figure and recur, insofar as known, on two other Athenian vases, one

484 Cups outside these groups are listed first: Athens, NM 653 (Callipolitis-Feytmann 1986, pl. 35.4-5), Bellagio, Villa Melzi (unpublished, BAPD no. 47083), Munich 2172 (Fellmann 1988, pls. 32, 33.1-4), Oxford 1953.6-7 (Elbows Out, AB 250.30), Rome, Capitolini 140 (G.Q. Gigloli/V. Bianco 1962, CVA 1, pl. 17.3-4), Rome, VG 917, VG 64223 (G.Q. Gigloli 1938, CVA 3, pls. 26.6, 27.1; Tambå Panatela/ca, 35-36, no. 21), Tarquinia C 71 (Painter of the Nicosia Æple, Bonghi Jovino 1986, 134, fig. 137, no. 435), Tarquinia RC 4194 (G. Jacopi 1956, CVA 2, pl. 21.5-6), Taranto 6920 (Lo Porto 1990, pl. XL.1), Thasos 3948rt and s.n. (neither previously published). Remarkably, a cup of unknown whereabouts has seated sphinxes as ornaments on one side only (and no ornaments on the other; photos: D. Widmer, Basel, nos. 8763-8766). Cups associated with the Group of Rhodes 12264: Athens, NM 17531 (Callipolitis-Feytmann 1986, pl. 34.1-3), Bucharest MIRSR 16834 (Alexandrescu 1978, pl. 45, no. 224, 280, fig. 12.28), with winged horses, Rhodes (Lemos 1997, 460-462, figs. 6-7). Addenda of band-cups: with swans, Essen RE 41 (Froning 1982, 148, no. 59), with panthers, Rome, VG 79617 (Hamnestad 1989, no. 149a), with masturbating satyrs, New York, Love BF 5 (Parè 80). I have not observed the pose of the sphinxes on the cup once in Deepdene (86, Xenokles).

of which is a hydria by the Painter of Louvre F 51 in Florence. Another point of comparison consists of the incised lines of the horses’ manes which are nearly vertical on 113, 116 and one horse of the Florence hydria. Furthermore, the racing chariots and horses on the exterior of the London and Berlin cups agree in many details (110, 113). Below, we shall see that the inscriptions are also very helpful for linking these cups and fragments with one other.

Shape and dimensions
In size, the two (nearly) completely preserved band-cups from Glaukytes’ earliest period (110, 113) differ considerably, although both qualify as extra large (diameters, 27.6, 34.7cm). The bowls of both are medium; the foot of 110 is high. The later band-cup (115) is medium (21.6cm), with deep bowl (0.38) and medium foot (0.43). Lip-cup 116 is large (22.0cm) and has a deep bowl (0.39).

In profile, band-cups 110 and 113 are similar (fig. 45); the lip curves smoothly from the bowl, is rather straight, and turns outwards at the top, not unlike the profile of the Munich cup with two ἐποίησιν-signatures (109). The foot of 110 is much higher and sturdier than that of the one in Munich. The handles of both 110 and 113 cups turn up slightly above the rim.

The shape of the lip-cup of Glaukytes in Berlin (113), though a little bit smaller, closely resembles that of the lip-cup in the Ricci collection in Chiusi (116). Both of them were probably thrown by the same potter.

![Fig. 45. Profile drawing of 110 (1:3).](image)

<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. 450 – Band-cup</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 540 – Lip-cup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 540 – Band-cup</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 9. Average absolute and relative dimensions of Glaukytes’ cups.

In profile, band-cups 110 and 113 are similar (fig. 45); the lip curves smoothly from the bowl, is rather straight, and turns outwards at the top, not unlike the profile of the Munich cup with two ἐποίησιν-signatures (109). The foot of 110 is much higher and sturdier than that of the one in Munich. The handles of both 110 and 113 cups turn up slightly above the rim.

The shape of the lip-cup of Glaukytes in Berlin (113), though a little bit smaller, closely resembles that of the lip-cup in the Ricci collection in Chiusi (116). Both of them were probably thrown by the same potter.

---

688 Florence 3789; ABV 314.4; P. Bocci 1969, CYA 5, pl. 11.2. Moore 1971, 304, knows of only one other example: a neck-amphora that recalls the Painter of London B 76, Basel, market (Moore 1971, no. A 1020, not ill., non vidi). She also mentions a Boeotian example.

689 The attached foot of 113 is alien.
Inscriptions

The London band-cup (110, fig. 46a) has a signature under one handle and a superlative kalos- inscription praising Hippokritos under the opposite one. This kalos-inscription is repeated below a single handle of 111 and 113 (fig. 47a-b). In each instance, the use of the superlative adjective results in two lines of equal length. A signature of Glaukytes also appears under a handle of 114 (fig. 46b), around the animals of band-cup 112 (pl. 35d) and in both handle-zones of lip-cup 115 (pl. 37a-b). The interior and exterior of the Berlin cup (113) show nonsensical inscriptions in the field, as also found on the left side of the Oxford fragment (114, pl. 36d).

On 110-12 the letters are small and rather neat (figs. 46a, 47a), whereas on 113-15 the writing is slightly less careful (figs. 46b, 47b); as seen in the upsilons, which become V-shaped instead of forked, and in the pis, which nearly lose the second hasta; in addition, the line is not as straight. On 113 the first letter of the kalos-inscription has been omitted and the final sigma of the name Hippokritos is barely visible (the final sigma of kalos is missing; fig. 47b).

Despite the differences, which probably reflect (slightly) varying times of manufacture, the overall impression is that the inscriptions were all written by the same hand. For instance, a close look at the kappas reveals that, in every instance, the vertical line barely touches the two oblique arms.


Furtwängler was probably correct when he supposed that a signature of Glaukytes, now lost, must have appeared under the other handle of the Berlin cup (113, Furtwängler 1885, 304). We have already seen above in section 4.2 that inscriptions rarely occur below cup handles. For inscriptions on either side of a figured scene see chapter seven on Hermogenes.

Fig. 46a-b. Epoiesen-signatures under the handles of 110 and 114.

Fig. 46c-d. Kalos-signatures under the handles of 111 and 113.
The inconsistent degree of care becomes most apparent in a comparison of the (larger) signatures of 112 and 115 (fig. 48). On 115 two errors occur in the inscription of side B (fig. 48d): the tau has been omitted and an upsilon added. Was side B simply less important for the painter?494

Interior decoration

The band-cup Berlin F 1799 (113) is decorated inside and out.495 The tondo borders of 113 and 116 consist of many thin, red-and-black tongues (pls. 36c, 37d).

Cf., e.g., the two sides of a lip-cup by Tyleides (123, best illustrated in Heesen 1996, figs. 80, 82). On this phenomenon see also Ahlberg-Cornell 1998, 52.

Besides Berlin F 1799, at least 41 other band-cups have interior decoration. Ten have also figurework in the handle-zone and on the foot’s standing surface (so-called ‘Prachtschalen’): Aegina N.T. 47 (Greifenhagen 1971, 100, fig. 24; Moore 1986, 70-76, figs. 13-16); Basel, Cahn HC 1447 (Greifenhagen 1971, 97, figs. 20-21); Berlin F 1800 (idem, 80-84, figs. 1-6); Cyrus Sh. 411.9 (Moore 1987, 35, no. 209, pl. 37); Himera II 70.129.1 (Danile 2005, 250, 252-53, figs. 1-3); Jerusalem, Israel Museum (Greifenhagen 1971, 89-91, figs. 13-15); Munich 2239 (Fellmann 1989, pls. 58-61); Rome, VG 50712 (ivy under foot, Mingazzini 1930, no. 610); Thera 1773 (Daux 1962, 870-3, figs. 15-17); Toledo 63.25 (C.G. Boulter/K.T. Lackner 1976, CVA 1, pl. 35.2, 36.1-2).

Eight others are too fragmentary to know if they had interior decoration, but do have figurework on the foot’s standing surface: Athens, NM Acropolis 2477 (Graef/Langlotz, pl. 108); Athens, NM B 1631 (Greifenhagen 1971, 99, fig. 23); Berlin Sa 488x (idem, 95, fig. 18); Boston 88.846 (Tse 1978, pl. 109.15); Germany, private (Greifenhagen 1971, 96, fig. 19); London 88.6-1.408 (ivy under foot, Schauenburg 1971, 165, fig. 2); Paris, Cab/Md Froehner 1654 (P Brit 117); Samos (Kreuzer 1988a, cat. nos. 305-6, pls. 47-48); as explained in chapter nine, the fragments of the enormous band-cup 243 (pl. 71a) may also belong to a ‘Prachtschale’. Another 20 band-cups combine interior decoration with figurework in the handle-zone: Aachen, Städelische Kunstsammlungen E 1307 (Sporn 2005, 83 no. 101); Agrigento R 155 (A. Calderone 1985, CVA 1, pls. 33.3, 35.1-2); Athens, NM 12678 (Callipolitis-Fytianos 1986, pl. 37.1-4); Basel, market (Cahn Auctionen 2, June 2000, no. 38); Bucharest 9481 A-C (Dimitriu 1966, pl. 43); Florence 3894, 3904 (A/B 265.2 and 4); Italy, illegally excavated (website Carabinieri, no. 63265/039); Izmir 13753 (Tuna-Nörling 1995, 14, pl. 3.34); Miehle, Getty 76.AE.101.8 (not previously published); Milan, market (Finarte, 13-14 March 1963, no. 64); Munich 2240 (Fellmann 1989, pls. 55-57); Munich 9436 (Painter of the Nicoia Olpe [Fellmann]; Fellmann 1989, pl. 21-22); New York, market (Royal-Atena Galleries, Art of the Ancient World XVIII, 2007, no. 124); Paris, Leouve F 145 (with ships on inner lip, Ploutouane 1938, pl. 88.2, 4-6); Pombins 36762 (not previously published); Rome, VG 80204 (Hannestad 1989, no. 237); Sydney, market (Gallery Xanthos, November-December 1997, no. 29); Taranto 4579, 117189 (Maselli 1997, figs. 6.3, 70.66). Eleven have no exterior decoration (preserved): Amsterdam 13028 (Brijder et al. 1996, pl. 117.2); Basel, market (MÜM May 1961, no. 130); Cerveteri s.n. (Briot 2000, 159, figs. 123, 134); Kiel B 786 (M. Prange 1993, CVA 2, pl. 37-1-2); London, market (Sotheby’s, 8 December 1980, no. 237); Palermo, Banco di Sicilia 677 (Giudice/Tuna 1992, 77,
Both medallions are small in relation to the diameter of the bowl, 0.41:1 (113) and 0.43:1 (116). In the latter lip-cup, the pattern is less refined, lacking the scalloped ring surrounding the tips of the tongues. Nearly all lip-cups lacking a scalloped ring have a completely plain exterior (i.e., neither figurework, inscription nor ornament).\textsuperscript{497} Only two known lip-cups without a scalloped ring are decorated on the exterior as well.\textsuperscript{497} Some band-cups with inner decoration also lack the scalloped ring.\textsuperscript{497} Three cups with this characteristic (lip-cup, little-master fragment, band-cup decorated inside and out) are attributed to the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, none of which can be dated before c. 545/40 BC.\textsuperscript{499}

**Non-mythological subjects**
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Both medallions are small in relation to the diameter of the bowl, 0.41:1 (113) and 0.43:1 (116). In the latter lip-cup, the pattern is less refined, lacking the scalloped ring surrounding the tips of the tongues. Nearly all lip-cups lacking a scalloped ring have a completely plain exterior (i.e., neither figurework, inscription nor ornament).\textsuperscript{497} Only two known lip-cups without a scalloped ring are decorated on the exterior as well.\textsuperscript{497} Some band-cups with inner decoration also lack the scalloped ring.\textsuperscript{497} Three cups with this characteristic (lip-cup, little-master fragment, band-cup decorated inside and out) are attributed to the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, none of which can be dated before c. 545/40 BC.\textsuperscript{499}
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An exergue is very rarely included in the tondos of Athenian black-figure cups. A few Siana tondos show a ground line defining the field of an exergue which, however, is blank; an exception is a Siana cup by the Cassandra Painter where the exergue contains lotuses. A floral motif also decorates the exergue of lip-cup 86 (pl. 25b). One other lip-cup (236, pl. 68d) has a figured exergue where the Epitomes Painter portrayed two fighting-cocks. In yet another lip-cup, by Nearchos (261, pl. 76c), the exergue is painted red and the upper ground line runs between incisions. Two lip-cups have exergues without figurework: Munich 9411, depicting a siren on a double ground line, and Saloniki 7835 with a winged horse standing on a single ground line. Lastly, XAIPE is inscribed in the exergue below the ground line in the tondo of Würzburg L 408.

The tondo of the lip-cup in Chiusi (116, pl. 37d) also depicts horses whose manes are marked with nearly vertical lines, as in 133. The horseman leads a spare horse. M. Iozzo suggests that the subject may be an ἀρματήριος, that is, a cavalryman who normally went into battle with a second horse. In most depictions of a horseman with a second horse, however, he is not equipped with a helmet, although he often carries a spear, which is not included in the tondo of 116. A cloth is suspended behind the man. P. A. L. Greenhalgh proposes that we may be dealing with representations of training by squires who normally attended hoplites’ horses when they were in battle. Obviously they would first need to practise controlling two horses. A Siana cup of the C Painter may indeed illustrate such a military training. The lively scene inside 116 finds a parallel only in the tondo of a lip-cup in Glasgow.

Exterior decoration

As mentioned above, a battle scene including a fallen horse, as illustrated on 110 (fig. 48), is extremely rare in Athenian vase-painting. Conflicts with hoplites and chariots, on the other hand, are a favourite subject of many painters. The fights on side A of 110 (pl. 35a), from a mythological past or not, are exceptionally animated, with much overlap, fallen warriors strewn about, warriors in single combat and chariots storming through the tussle. One warrior, to the left of the grouping with the fallen horse, has a dotted pattern on his left thigh (fig. 48). Such marks, which also appear on animals, have been variously explained as the rudimentary representation of drapery or more often as muscles, body ornamentation, like a tattoo or the scar of an old wound. Although some

502 Apart from the later cups of the Segment Class, e.g., ABV 212.7, 9; 213.11, 13-17, 20, 23, 33; 214.35, 45, 47, 51, 59, and Malibu, Getty 86.AE.184 (Clark 1990, pl. 119.2). Exergues are rather common on Athenian black-figure plates (Callipolitis-Feytmans 1974, passim).
503 Siana cup of the Cassandra Painter, London B 379 (Brijder 1983, pl. 24d). For other Sianas with ground line see Brijder 1983, 149, n. 405, pls. 46d, f, 526; Brijder 1991b, pls. 332 (exergue partly painted black); 334c, 148b, 150c; Brijder 2000, pl. 183c; and Bochum S 481 (Painter of Boston C.A.: N. Kunisch 2005, CVA 1, pl. 48.2). Cleveland 65.68 (Painter of Boston C.A.; C.G. Boeuler 1971, CVA 1, pl. 22.2), Thermi (E. Skarlatidou, Una tomba arcaica in Macedonia, Nuovi dati per un riamento della cronologia della ceramica corinzia, ASAtene 80.2 [2002] 292-93, figs. 25-26). See also the Gordon cup in a German private collection with a floral in the exergue: Brijder 2000, pls. 258-59.
504 Felimmann 1988, pl. 5.1-7, and Vokotopoulou 1985, 154-55, no. 244.
505 Langlotz 1932, pl. 116.
506 See, e.g., the rather calm depictions of the scene by the Affelter (Mommsen 1975, nos. 18, 39-41, pls. 26, 46, 48). On the type B amphora, Munich 1443 (Mommsen 1975, pl. 48) the representation of a second horseman is limited to the feet only.
507 Greenhalgh 1973, 106.
508 This differs from the scene in the tondo of the lip-cup Paris, Louvre F 846b, which might simply illustrate equestrian acrobatics, where a nude boy stands on the rump of the horse behind the horseman who leads a second horse (F. Pottier 1933, CVA 8, pl. 79.7). On an amphora in Paris, Cab Méd 243, a youth with two shields jumps on to a horse (again behind a horseman who leads a second horse) in front of an audience and an aulos-playing man (S. Lambрис 1931, CVA 2, pl. 88.1, 4).
509 London B 380 (Brijder 1983 pl. 25c).
510 Glasgow 19.102 (E. Moignard 1997, CVA 1, pl. 20.5-6).
511 Both explanations in K. Schauenburg, Ein Pylvyker aus dem Umkreis des Andokidesmalers, JdE 80 (1965) 76-104, esp. 80, 82; idem, in Hornbostel 1977, 261; idem, in Hornbostel 1980, 71; all with lists of such marks, mostly on animals.
markings on humans may indeed be tattoos, especially those in the shape of a spiral or rosette, the dotted pattern (as on 110, fig. 48) makes the supposition that they depict old wounds seem rather attractive. Such markings are especially frequent where wounds would have, most often been inflicted: the upper arms and thighs of humans and the back and neck of animals. Boardman remarks, ‘the only creatures so scarred are those commonly shown as prey.’

The battle on side B (pl. 35b) is a bit more orderly; most of the action takes place in the middle where only one casualty is depicted. Coming from the left, two infantriesmen with Thracian caps move forward behind a cavalryman leading a spare horse. In front of them, a warrior is collapsing: Has he just dismounted and been immediately attacked? Whereas on side A two chariots close in from the side, on side B two chariots move away from the centre.

Band-cup fragments (112, pl. 35d) depict a lion attacking a boar. The combination of species is rather common in Athenian representations of animal fights. Both sides of 113, in Berlin (pl. 36a-b), illustrate the fight between Herakles and Kyknos. The story is well known, thanks to the survival of the epic Ἀσπίς, which in antiquity was wrongly attributed to Hesiod, but which is now thought to date from the early sixth century BC, about the time when Stesichoros wrote another, now lost version of the tale. These poems, it seems, inspired many vase-painters to depict Herakles and Kyknos from the second quarter of the sixth century to the first quarter of the fifth. The earliest extant Athenian pictures are found inside a Siana cup of the Vintage Painter in Basel, an unattributed lip-cup in Pomezia and three amphorae, two of which come from the workshop of Lydos, all dating 560/50 BC. In these instances, Kyknos is presented as a giant but he was later given more human dimensions and the fight developed into a divine duel, modeled on the gigantomachy. Often, the two combatants fight in the middle, flanked by deities choosing either side: Athena supports Herakles, while Ares comes to the aid of his son Kyknos and Zeus intervenes by throwing his thunderbolt, wounding Ares. On the only other known band-cup with this subject the deities are replaced with anonymous spectators. The picture of 113 is unusual, in that Zeus is the...
central figure, intervening before the actual fight has begun, and the pursuit in the chariots is shown. In many painted versions, the combatants have already descended from their chariots, driven by Iolaos, for Herakles, and Phobos, for Kyknos. One other representation, seen on an oinochoe probably by the Epitimos Painter, dated c. 540 BC, warrants mention because the painter chose a moment in the story which is not portrayed elsewhere: Herakles and Ares fight over the corpse of Kyknos.\footnote{Berlin F 1732 (Tiverios 1976, pls. 57-59).}

Ornaments
Two of Glaukytes’ cups have handle-palmettes (\footnote{Berlin F 1732 (Tiverios 1976, pls. 57-59).} \ref{112}, \ref{115}; fig. 49). As their palmettes differ quite a bit, it is not easy to imagine that those of both cups were applied by one painter, although we have already seen that in other workshops the palmettes of cups by one painter may vary considerably. Perhaps an assistant was called in to apply the ornaments of such cups, as collaboration on a single vase has sometimes been recognized, for example with regard to ornaments, animal friezes, etc.\footnote{See n. 270.} This practice was possibly far more widespread than is usually supposed, for it is not difficult to envisage that a new painter would begin his apprenticeship by working on the simpler elements or that, particularly in workshops where both large and small pieces were turned out, painters specialized in, for instance, animal friezes or ornaments.\footnote{See n. 271.} It would also seem possible that in a busy workshop colleagues assisted one another to finish an order on time. The inscriptions, however, usually seem not to have been delegated to a new or assistant employee.\footnote{Note, however, two cups from Xenokles’ workshop, \ref{57} and \ref{80}, where the painter who executed the palmettes seems also to have tried his hand at the inscription.}

Provenance and chronology
Three cups come from Vulci (\ref{110}, \ref{111}, \ref{113}), one from an unspecified location in Italy (\ref{114}) and one probably from the Chiusi area (\ref{116}).\footnote{Most pottery of the Ricci collection come from the Chiusi area.} Once again, excavation data about their contexts are not available.

For the dating we are therefore entirely dependent on stylistic and workshop criteria. If the author’s explanation of the paired \textit{epoiesen}-signatures of the Munich cup (\ref{109}) is correct, all the cups with the signature of Glaukytes only must be later than it, that is, shortly after c. 550 BC.

As set out above, the script of \ref{110-12} is rather neat, whereas that of \ref{113-15} is a bit less careful. The phenomenon of one craftsman’s script becoming looser and less orderly over the years is attested for various painters.\footnote{For a similar development in the script of other painters see n. 235.}

None of the larger pieces by the Painter of Louvre F 51 bears an inscription. In subject matter as well as in style and details (like the spokes of the chariot wheels) the painter’s hydria in Naples (81176) agrees most closely with \ref{110}. This hydria has been assigned to 550/30 BC by A. Adriani and to 540 BC by M.B. Moore.\footnote{A. Adriani 1950, \textit{CVA Naples} 1, pls. 38.1, 39.1; Moore 1971, 103.} The style of the painter’s hydria in Florence (3789) is slightly more detailed, as is that of band-cup \ref{113}, which also features a frontal quadriga where the chest of the trace horse shows the unusual detail of incised arcs which curve outwards. P. Bocci dates this hydria c. 550 BC; M.B. Moore, c. 550/540 BC.\footnote{P. Bocci 1969, \textit{CVA Florence} 5, pls. 12.1-2, 14.1-2; Moore 1971, 103.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig_49a-b_Palmettes_of_112_and_115.png}
\caption{Fig. 49a-b. Palmettes of \ref{112} and \ref{115}.}
\end{figure}
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Because of the careless inscriptions of 115 and the execution of the tongue border of 116, these cups may be considered later pieces. Therefore a date of 550/40 BC is here proposed for 110-14, with 110-12 being the earliest. Cups 115 and 116 would be a bit later, around 540 BC.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter a workshop is discussed where two potters signed independently and once together. The explanation given for the paired ἐποιεῖσθαι-signatures of 109 agrees with the proposed scenario in which the elder potter, Archikles, who shaped the establishment’s earliest cups, hires a younger potter, Glaukytes, and has him work under his supervision. Later, the younger potter takes over the operation (similarly to the father-son relationship of other workshops).

The potter Archikles collaborated with one painter during his career who may be identified with Archikles himself. In contrast, the potter Glaukytes worked together with two painters: Painter of Munich 2243 (for 109) and Painter of Louvre F 51, who was responsible for all the cups with the signature of Glaukytes only. As explained, the cups of the Painter of Louvre F 51 are contemporaneous with his larger work and show, in part, the same subjects. It seems therefore quite likely that the larger vases were also manufactured in the same workshop.

Unanswered questions remain, of course. Who potted the painter’s larger pieces? A similar problem arose above with regard to Phrynos and the amphorae of the Botkin Class. Is the Painter of Louvre F 51 the same person as the potter Glaukytes? This seems possible, as they collaborated for a long period of the painter’s career. However, it could also be argued that they were simply different individuals, specializing in their own fields and cooperating closely. Both possibilities need to be kept in mind.

Regarding the Munich cup with paired signatures, which was probably fashioned by Glaukytes, it would not be surprising if one day the painter, his hand having been recognized in other work, turned out to be a painter of mainly larger shapes. If so, it would become more likely that the potter Glaukytes and the Painter of Louvre F 51 were two different craftsmen. In that case, the potter and his painters concentrated on what each of them did best.

---

128 We have seen that the palmettes of 115 may have been added by a different painter.
129 As yet, two other favourite subjects of the painter’s larger vases - Herakles fighting with Triton and homoerotic courting - are not seen on his cups.