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ABSTRACT

Little is known about Athenian vase-painting workshops of the 6th through 4th centuries BC. Almost no references exist in ancient literature, and there are few archaeological remains besides the vases themselves.

I examined the technical details of vase-painting “copies”—images of uncommon scenes on vases by painted different painters—and compared the steps in the painting process, (especially the preliminary sketches), to see if these could supply any information about workshop practices.

The research revealed that there are differences in sketches executed by different painters, and that there were often obvious differences in the care exercised in the different steps of the painting process. When the different steps consistently exhibit different levels of skill in execution, this suggests that workshops were organized so that workers with few skills performed the tasks that demanded the least; more-skilled workers painted the less-important borders etc., and the most-advanced painted the figures.

On a few vases the sketch lines were more skillfully executed than the paintings that overlay them. Further, in the case of the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472, more than one pair of vases with replicated rare scenes
exists. This suggests that there may have been a “Master” in the workshop who not only painted vases himself, but drew sketches for other less-skilled workers, perhaps apprentices or pupils, to paint. If the sketches on different vases were all drawn by one draftsman but the paintings were executed by different painters, certainly they must have worked together.

This system would explain the relationship between the many pairs of shared images in the work of the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472, and others who also produced duplicated pictures. The study concludes with a short list of duplicated images as suggestions for further research.
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It should come as no surprise that the systematic study of Greek vase-painting has undergone many changes in methodology since its beginnings in the early 17th century – the sign of a healthy discipline is its ability to grow and change as new facts and ideas are incorporated into previous scholarship. A brief history of vase-painting scholarship, and an examination of current criticism of the methodology of connoisseurship, as exemplified in the work of John. D. Beazley, will be presented here as a preamble to a new approach to the study of Greek vase-painting.

Vase-Painting Scholarship Before 1900

In 1632, Nicolas Claude Fabri de Pieresc, a French jurist and avid amateur of antiquities, wrote to his friend and fellow collector Cassiano dal Pozzo concerning the proper method for studying Greek vases. This “politique de recherche de vases” counselled Cassiano first to exploit the resources of all...
libraries. Next, he should compile a glossary of names for different vases and their parts in all the different Italian dialects, and compare them to each other. Finally, Pieresc urged Cassiano to collect and measure as many vases as he could and familiarize himself with the names of all their various types. Presumably Cassiano followed Pieresc’s “politiqve,” for one of the illustrations for his Paper Museum is a skillful drawing of an Apulian bell-krater.

Pieresc’s letter to Cassiano is notable as the earliest surviving example of a systematic, scholarly approach to the study of Greek painted pottery. He was but one of the many collectors who, in the 17th, and increasingly in the 18th and 19th centuries, fuelled interest in the remains of Classical civilizations. Their desire to learn more about the objects in their collections gave rise to the true scholarly study, rather than the mere accumulation, of Classical artifacts.

Pieresc’s letter is also notable for another reason, for although he cites the shapes, names and uses of vases as worthy of study, he neglects even to mention the pictures on them. The omission of what today is usually considered the most outstanding feature of Greek ceramics is merely one example of the diversity of approaches that have characterized the study of vases.

By the time that M.A. de la Chausse published his Romanum Museum in 1690, collectors and scholars had begun to show an interest in the paintings on vases. Originally prized as mere curiosities or as relics of the antique, painted vases began to be regarded as a new source for knowledge about ancient myths.
and written texts. The publication of Sir William Hamilton’s first collection in 1766-67, with engravings of the vases, became a model for the many volumes issued by private collectors in the 19th century. These publications contained illustrations whose quality varied widely – Lenormant and De Witte’s Élites des Monuments Céramographiques was described as “... entitled to the distinction of having some of the worst and most inaccurate plates ever published” - but they did serve to make pictures of Greek vases available to a much wider audience than a few collectors.

Perhaps influenced by the publication of Hamilton’s second collection, whose publisher Tischbein “interpreted” the supposed subjects of the paintings, the texts of these early volumes were concerned almost exclusively with the iconography of the scenes on the vases. The relationship between vase-painting, myth, and Homeric literature remained the primary focus of interest for scholars well into the 19th century. The focus began to shift only after the discovery of the Etruscan necropolis at Vulci. The major part of the cemetery was owned by Napoleon’s brother the Principe de Canino, whose workmen had unearthed more than 3400 vases in one year of digging. The large number of vases recovered from the Etruscan tombs gave scholars their first opportunity to compare many different examples of vase paintings, and they began to take notice of features besides iconography.
When Eduard Gerhard published Canino’s collections between 1829 and 1831, he needed a system that was more detailed than the earlier mythographic one in order to organize the mass of material. Gerhard classified the vases not just by their subject-matter, but also by the quality of line in the drawings and the style and perfection of the slip-glazes. He also recorded all the writing on the vases. Because of the number of vases that he studied, Gerhard was able to distinguish that some were Greek, but others were in a different style, later to be identified as South Italian.

19th - Century Attribution Studies

In 1764 J. J. Winckelmann had admired the “Schatz von Zeichnungen” which was available on Greek vases, and considered the possibility of identifying vase-painters by their individual styles. In the 19th century more illustrators finally had begun to reproduce vase-paintings faithfully rather than “improving” the drawings to fit contemporary taste, or bowdlerizing them. Perhaps because of this, interest grew in classifying vases by the style of their drawings, and scholars eventually attempted to identify individual painters.

In the introduction to their *Histoire de la Céramique Grecque* of 1888, Olivier Rayet and Maxime Collignon wrote that only in the preceding twenty years had people been interested in the technique and style of vase-painting. Otto Jahn and Adolph Michaelis’ *Beschreibung der Vasensammlung Konigs*
Ludwigs in der Pinakothek zu München (1854) was the first systematic treatment of vase-painting style.\textsuperscript{20} Adolf Furtwängler’s Beschreibung der Vasensammlung in Antiquarium (1885) catalogued the more than 4000 pots in the Berlin Museum using similarity of drawing style, in addition to period and shape, as a criterion.\textsuperscript{21} In 1893, Paul Hartwig laid the real foundation of future attribution studies with Die griechischen Meisterschalen der Bluthzeit der strengen Rotfigurigenstils, in which he identified the works of several painters by analyzing the drawing styles on different pots.\textsuperscript{22}

By the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, many articles and monographs had appeared analyzing styles of drawing and assigning pots to individual painters based on stylistic analysis.\textsuperscript{23} For example an American, Oliver Tonks, revised and added to the list of vases Hartwig had attributed to a painter he called “Brygos” (now known as the Brygos Painter) after an epoisen-signature on several of the pots. In his article, Tonks described the rationale behind his method,

... it has become evident that each artist possesses individual stylistic qualities, by the recognition of which his unsigned works can be gathered together. Every artist by dint of long practice and the dexterity resulting therefrom, is bound to develop certain idiosyncrasies that will recur again and again in his works. It is for these peculiarities, these personal touches, that a student of ceramics looks today in order to differentiate the works of one artist from those of the same period and – one might even say – of the same school.\textsuperscript{24}

It is this assumption, that all painters exhibit certain unique stylistic idiosyn-
crasies that recur and can be identified in their work, that underlies all subsequent examinations of vase-painting style, and parallels similar developments in the study of European painting (see below, page 10 ff.).

**J. D. Beazley’s Methodology**

The work of the archaeologist J. D. Beazley realized the promise inherent in the earlier stylistic analyses of vase-painting. Beazley employed a system of analyzing details of the forms of the human body and drapery to identify the works of individual vase-painters. He believed that combinations of two or more forms which consistently appeared together were identifiable characteristics of particular painters. Since Greek vase-painting is primarily drawing – linear, flat, without shading and with color playing only a minor role – for Beazley the quality of line was of the utmost importance in determining attribution.²⁵

One of his earliest articles, from 1912, shows the working method he employed.²⁶ In the article, he describes and illustrates the consistent way the painter drew different body parts such as eyes, ears and collarbones. For example: “The hands fall into a few types which are repeated again and again;” and he then describes nine different types of hands which appear in the painter’s work.²⁷
In his article “Citharoedus,” published in 1922, Beazley attributed a group of vases to a man he called the Berlin Painter. After studying the drawings on each of the vases, he explained the reasoning behind his attribution:

It cannot be maintained that the points in which these figures resemble one another or one the rest are trifling, few, or restricted to one part of the figure. They comprise both the master lines which in archaic art demarcate the several parts of the body and of the drapery, and the minor lines which diversify the area thus demarcated. We may speak, in fact, of a coherent and comprehensive system of reproducing the forms of the human body naked and clothed.28

Beazley’s method consisted of minute observation of the details of paintings, constant comparison of different ways of rendering forms, and repeated testing of his attributions against other examples. Comparing an amphora in Würzburg which he had attributed to the Berlin Painter29 with a contemporary vase in London (now attributed to the Eucharides Painter),30 Beazley wrote,

This [i.e. the Berlin Painter’s] system of renderings can not be said to be the system universal at this period ... the neck-amphora E 278 in the British Museum [by the Eucharides Painter] belongs to the same period as the vases we have examined ... not later than the latest nor earlier than the earliest. Now the attitude of the Apollo on the London vase is very like that of the Apollo on the Würzburg vase ... but if we place the two figures side by side, we shall hardly find a feature or a line in one body which is the least like the corresponding feature or line in the other. The system of rendering in the London vase is totally different from the Würzburg system [i.e. that of
the Berlin Painter]. Like the Würzburg system, the London system is not confined to one vase, but appears on a good many others.31

And in *Attic Red-Figure Vases in American Collections* (1918) Beazley described how he used his method to attribute the works of previously unrecognized painters:

> The process of disengaging the work of an anonymous artist is the same as that of attributing an unsigned vase to a painter whose work is known. It consists of drawing a conclusion from observations of a great many details: it involves comparing one vase with another, with several others, with all the vases that the inquirer has seen. Enough *egrapse* ["...painted it"] vases have been preserved to show that the Attic vase-painter possessed a highly individual style. However obscure he may be, the artist can not escape detection if only sufficiently delicate tests be applied.32

Once he had determined that a vase belonged with a corpus of others as the work of an individual painter, Beazley assigned the Painter a name, often after an *egrapsen* signature if one existed – Exekias, for instance. If the pot bore a potter’s *epoisen* ("...made it") signature but not an egrapsen signature, the painter might be named “the [Epoisen] Painter, as for example the Brygos Painter.”33 Lacking signatures, Beazley might name the painter after a salient characteristic of his work (the Long-Nose Painter), for a figure or a scene (the Painter of the Woolly Satyrs), by the Museum-number of the pot (the Painter of Athens 1472), or by the collection where it was held (the Cleveland Painter).
Because of the comparative aspect of his method, Beazley never assigned the name of a painter to a vase that was stylistically unique; being unique, it had no compeers against which to test its stylistic peculiarities. Without other examples which shared common combinations of forms (his “systems of renderings”), he could not be sure that the painting was the work of a previously unknown painter. He could determine who had not painted it by comparing it with other paintings, but not who had done so.

In the absence of other evidence, all ideas about workshop associations among painters of Greek vase must be based primarily on stylistic similarities. Logically, those painters whose styles are most similar were felt to have worked together most closely. There is solid archaeological evidence for 5th-century painters working together and sharing their work space at the site of Metaponto in South Italy. However, for Greece proper, the sole evidence linking painters is stylistic similarity, and this can be determined only by comparing their work using methods of connoisseurship.

Beazley’s method of attribution has been attacked on several fronts in recent years. Critics have disparaged the process of connoisseurship itself as outmoded, elitist, or simply untenable. Others have faulted Beazley’s use of the connoisseurial method in particular as somehow flawed. Because I intend to compare the preliminary sketches on vases which share the same scenes, and
the relationship of these vases to workshop organization, it is necessary to deal with those critics who impugn the process (or even the possibility) of connoisseurship, or of Beazley’s use of the method.

A Short History of Connoisseurship before Beazley

Connoisseurship, that is, the discriminating study of stylistic characteristics of works of art, and more specifically the use of these characteristics to identify individual artists, developed in Europe at least as early as the seventeenth century. It was codified as a system in the late 19th century by Giovanni Morelli. Morelli believed that the way painters drew forms was unique to each artist, and in 1880 he published his theory as a means to identify the works of Renaissance painters.

Morelli believed that each artist employed unconscious, recognizable, mannerisms to render often-repeated forms. These mannerisms, utilized by painters so often that they were executed automatically when the artist drew certain forms, were the unique hallmark of each individual. Further, Morelli proposed that these unconscious ways of drawing could be identified in known works of individual painters, and so could be used to identify undocumented works by these artists.

Morelli’s method was adopted by Bernard Berenson, who modified it for his own purposes. Berenson cited those features in a work that he felt could be used to identify a particular artist. These features,
- are not “vehicles of expression”
- do not attract attention to themselves
- are not controlled by fashion
- allow the formation of habit in their execution
- escape imitation by copying either because of the minuteness of the-[ir] peculiarity, or of the obscurity of the artists. 39

Berenson also added, “…such mechanical tasks diminish in value in relation to the greatness of the artist.” 40 That is, he felt that great artists were both less mechanical, and their mannerisms more likely to be copied, than lesser artists. 41

Beazley’s Use of Connoisseurship

The relation between Beazley’s connoisseurship and the work of Morelli and Berenson has provoked much discussion, but little consensus. 42 Morelli’s work was published in English translation in 1892-1893. Berenson’s books on the Italian Painters of the Renaissance appeared between 1894 and 1907. 43 Therefore it is quite possible that Beazley knew the works, although he did not mention either Morelli or Berenson in his own writings.

Berenson was apparently aware of Beazley’s work, for in the preface to Three Essays in Method (1927) concerning the comparative method used in attributing works by an unknown artist, he wrote that “the procedure is one currently and commonly used in classical archaeology, but seldom in the study of Italian painting …”. 44 By this date Beazley had produced many articles and at
least two books which explicated his method. Although Berenson does not name him, it seems that he may have considered Beazley a precursor, or at least a contemporary, in the use of connoisseurial methods for attribution.

The Greek Dark-Age archaeologist James Whitley has accused Beazley of employing Morelli’s method “without acknowledgement.” Bernard Ashmole, Beazley’s Oxford classmate, friend and fellow-scholar, had identified Morellian roots in Beazley’s method: “He was familiar with Giovanni Morelli’s system – itself not completely new – and Bernard Berenson used Morelli’s method widely in Italian painting. Beazley extended it systematically to Greek vase-painting….” Beazley’s pupil Martin Robertson agreed that “Beazley learned both approach and method from students of Italian Renaissance painting.”

But, as we have seen, other scholars in the 19th century were identifying vase-painters using methods that were similar to Morelli’s. In Herbert Hoffmann’s disapproving words, “The cult of attribution … can be said to have been inaugurated by Hartwig, Klein, Hauser and Furtwängler.” To an extent Hoffmann may be correct: in 1764 Winckelmann had recognized the possibility of identifying individual vase painters’ drawing styles, and he was the precursor of a long line of German scholars who applied the connoisseurial method to vase-painting. Dyfri Williams sees Beazley as the natural successor to these German scholars rather than to Morelli and Berenson:

Careful analysis … of Beazley’s earliest essay… “Kleophrades,” published in 1910 … reveals that Beazley
derives directly from Paul Hartwig. The language is the same and there is the same use of drawings, and, of course, acknowledgement is made to Hartwig.\textsuperscript{50}

Hartwig’s \textit{Meisterschalen} had been published in 1893, and Williams and others have compared Beazley’s silence about Morelli to that of the German scholar on the Italian. Williams continues,

\ldots again, in Hartwig’s volume, there is no acknowledged debt to Morelli; rather, references are made to his close friend Friedrich Hauser. I believe Hartwig and Adolf Furtwängler, although they most probably were aware of the work of Morelli, were following rather in a tradition that \ldots goes back as far as Winckelmann, who was the first to realize the potential for attributing Greek vases to masters.\textsuperscript{51}

Beazley’s absolute scholarly integrity has never been doubted; had he felt a debt to Morelli or Berenson, it seems certain he would have acknowledged it. Since he did not, this must mean that he did not consider either of them to have been the source of his method, perhaps because he felt that his work was not the same as theirs.

Beazley’s work was different from that of the Renaissance scholars because they were working from certain given: the existence of a painter called Titian or Raphael, for instance, was never in doubt. Further, there were unimpeachably-documentedit examples of pictures painted by them. For Beazley and the other vase-painting scholars no such certainties existed. There were
literally thousands of pots, undoubtedly painted by many different painters, but there were no pots that could be assigned unequivocally to any painter as a starting-point to define his individual oeuvre.

There are a few dozen pots signed "so-an-so" but whether the signatures indicate that the pots were painted by the signer is still debated. Beazley never took a signature as proof of authorship without attendant stylistic similarity; if a pot signed "X" did not fit the style he had identified as X's, Beazley excluded it from X's oeuvre.

What Beazley did was much more difficult than beginning with authentic autograph works and extrapolating from there to other works, as Morelli and Berenson had done. Vase-painting scholarship was a sort of double-blind test of Beazley's own ability to recognize stylistic details. He began by looking at paintings, analyzing and memorizing their features, comparing them, until he found at least two paintings whose features were more like each other than they were like any others he had seen. In this way he could gradually reconstruct an individual painter's extant body of work. In a sense he was "creating" his own artists, as some of his late-20th century critics have charged, but it was never a case of ex nihil nihil fit. Painted pots do exist, which means that their painters existed. Beazley created painters only in the sense that he gave them names by which they could be recognized by those less-acutely sensitive to visual detail than he was. As the psychologist Elliot Eisner wrote about names as mnemonic
devices, “by virtue of these devices we can remember an array of qualities that we would otherwise find difficult to store and retrieve.”55 It is these stylistic qualities that Beazley used to recognize, in effect, the physiognomy of the individual artist.

Further proof of Beazley’s ability lies in the frontispiece of his *Campana Fragments in Florence*.56 This shows a cup reassembled from fragments that had been dispersed to six museums worldwide, and which had never been seen together. Beazley examined them separately at their different institutions, and even though some of the fragments were very tiny, recognized that they were all from one vessel, a cup by the painter, Oltos.57 The fragments were then photographed, and the cup “reassembled” from the cut-up photos.

That there was a certain circularity to Beazley’s method cannot be denied – one can never be absolutely sure what the “real” style of a painter is except by examining the pots which Beazley has assigned to that painter. There is no system of external checks such as those which existed for Berenson, allowing him to compare a purported Leonardo with *The Virgin of the Rocks*, for example. This absence can lead to uncertainty, which Beazley recognized, about where the dividing line between closely-related styles should be drawn58 – not unlike the debate about whether some Titians are really by Giorgione, or vice versa.

It is also important to acknowledge that Beazley’s method was subjective, the attributions those of one person, albeit one with a superbly trained eye and
memory for detail. Employed by those with less skill, the method is not infallible
- Beazley himself wrote, “I neither expect that all my attributions will be unhesit-
atingly accepted, nor wish that they should be.” He would have agreed with
Martin Robertson’s pithy observation that “there is no place for a Bible in
scholarship.”

Criticisms of Beazley’s Method

I will deal first with those critics who have questioned connoisseurship
itself as a methodology. James Whitley dismisses the whole concept of style as
... peculiarly ethnocentric. It is a modern Western expectation that works of art be distinguished by,
and indeed that they owe their status of art to, the
trace of an artistic personality.

Whitley neglects the fact that Chinese art connoisseurship was well-developed as
early as the 4th century A.D., and perhaps the most famous extant example,
Xie He’s 6th-century Guhua Pinlu (Old Record of the Classification of Painters), is
preserved entire in a 9th century copy. By the 12th century, countless treatises
on connoisseurship existed. The Chinese were not the only non-Europeans who
practiced connoisseurship. It was a pastime of the Mughals of northern India in
the 17th century, when the Emperor Jahangir boasted of his ability to distinguish
the works of particular painters by their style.

Analogous to Whitley, Richard Neer has objected to the very existence of
individual styles in painted Athenian pottery. He contends that all different
painting styles were conscious responses by painters to changes in fashion, hence in buyers’ taste. According to Neer’s hypothesis, vase-painters changed their styles consciously as a means to differentiate their work from that of other painters working at the same time. He writes, “Style is not a generative or expressive system ...,” but rather a marketing ploy to help painters sell their wares: if one style didn’t sell, a painter concocted another one which (presumably) did.

The sheer number of different painting styles makes Neer’s argument unlikely. Further, since there is essentially no evidence for the “marketplace” for Athenian pottery other than the pots themselves, their find-spots (which show their ultimate destinations), and one sentence in Aristophanes’ Ekkleziazusai about “a man who paints lekythoi for the dead,” (l. 995) Neer’s argument fails to convince.

Other scholars have faulted the use of connoisseurship as a primary research method because they believe it is unworkable. One of the main objections of this group was stated succinctly by the art historian Gary Schwartz:

... we still do not know whether the sum total of stylistic and technical features of a work amount [sic] to a fingerprint [of an individual artist] whose works can be properly interpreted by the later observer who knows what to look for.

In other words, connoisseurship can offer no empirical proof that it works, or that it is possible to distinguish individual styles. Yet the ability of persons with
little musical training to identify previously-unheard works by composers with whom they are familiar, even if they are unable to articulate how they know, has been recognized for hundreds of years. Why the ability to recognize visual nuances should be different is not dealt with by critics such as Whitley and Schwartz.

Validation of Connoisseurship as a Methodology

There have been studies in many different disciplines which show that it is indeed possible to detect individual styles visually, and even to quantify the criteria by which an individual’s style can be determined. It is accepted than an individual’s handwriting can not be disguised so as to be undetectable - this is the idea behind the modern concept of checking accounts, for example. By analogy, since individual drawing styles are based on physical movements similar to those that govern handwriting, one would suspect that they should be equally unique and recognizable.

Graphologists use measurements of angles, slope and letter-forms to identify handwriting. Anthropologists and physiologists use similar systems of measurements to define how individuals’ motor skills differ when they perform repetitive tasks such as those involved in drawing and painting. The anthropological archaeologist James Hill made extensive studies in the differences in performance between individuals using the same fine motor skills in tasks that included both handwriting and pot-painting. Hill discovered that
First, handwriting is largely subconscious, such that the essential motor-performance characteristics of a person cannot be taught to others. In fact, a person’s hand-writing cannot even be copied accurately, regardless of whether or not tracings or other techniques are used. What is more, a person cannot even consciously alter or disguise his own handwriting to the degree that it would not be recognizable as his, even if he uses the other hand ... regardless of the speed or carelessness of the writing, and regardless of just about any other condition. I believe these things are equally true of the motor performance exhibited in pottery painting, or anything else for that matter.\footnote{73}

Hill found that handmade products could be assigned to their individual makers as long as three conditions were met:

1. there must be numerous examples of precisely the same product,
2. the product must be sufficiently complex to make measurement of individual variation possible
3. the product must have been made by more than one person, but by significantly fewer individuals than there are examples of the product.\footnote{74}

Hill subjected painted pots, both whole and fragments, to extensive analyses which included measurements of angles and lines, and he found statistically significant relationships between the works of known individuals. Further, he was able to assign unknown works correctly to both known and unknown individuals whose other works he had studied.\footnote{75}

Hill’s research also showed that there is more quantifiable variation among the works of different individuals than there is among the works of a single individual.\footnote{76} He concluded that those groups of objects which exhibited features
with more similarities to each other than to other examples must have been produced by one person:

The results were equally good using four diverse data sets: 3x5 cards painted by contemporary residents of Los Angeles, pre-historic ceramics from Northern Arizona, [modern] ceramic vessels from Tijuana, Mexico, and personal letters written by 19th century British novelists. I thus conclude that the approach is applicable cross-culturally and is not limited by space-time boundaries. It should work with any data exhibiting style variability, so long as the data meet the requirements set forth.\footnote{77}

Hill’s work proves that it is indeed possible to distinguish individual styles in vase painting with quantifiable accuracy.

Hill’s findings are confirmed by more recent studies that tested the same questions, whether an individual’s handwriting, and the attendant motor-movements that control it, are not only unique, but also sufficiently different that they can be distinguished reliably. A group of researchers at the Center of Document Analysis and Recognition\footnote{78} examined the handwriting of 1500 individuals and concluded that an individual’s handwriting is not only unique, but could be distinguished from that of others with great accuracy. The differences were sufficiently quantifiable that a computer could be taught to distinguish individual hand-writing, and identify it accurately more than 95% of the time.\footnote{79}

In another examination of the possibility of detecting forged artist - signatures, Patricia Siegel writes,\footnote{80}
The arts of writing, drawing, painting – and the act of signing one’s name – all express the individuality of the artist ... Whether by pen stroke or brush stroke, it is this individuality of repeated movements and overlapping motifs which provides the foundation for comparison.

Further, “By evaluating them [signatures] as a composite of varying and habitual motor responses...,”81 the expert can then distinguish authentic signatures from forgeries, because the forger cannot duplicate the necessary, unique movements of a different individual.

In addition, Hill’s findings on variations between works has direct application to Neer’s and Schwartz’s objections. Hill’s work shows, in fact, that there are two kinds of variation in style. The one kind,

...was subconscious, and could not be easily taught or transmitted from person to person. This fact makes it ideal for identification of the works of individuals as opposed to works associated with small groups... on the other hand, some interindividual stylistic differences are clearly conscious and teachable. It seems important to distinguish between these two levels of variation ...82

This second kind of teachable, conscious stylistic variation is related to the definition of style itself as proposed by the art historian Leonard Meyer: [Meyer’s italics]:

*Style is a replication of patterning ... in the artifacts produced by human behavior, that results in a series of choices made within a series of constraints.*83

Meyer goes on to note that these constraints are usually learned and adopted as part of the historical-cultural circumstances of individuals or groups. This would
explain why artistic styles from different cultures, or time-periods within a single culture, can be detected. Unlike individual style-characteristics, this second type can be learned, and presumably will appear in the work of most of those taught during a particular time-period. As cultural/historical constraints change over time, so will this second type of stylistic characteristics.

For example, handwriting, in order to be read, must conform to certain basic parameters of the forms of letters which must be learned, though within these parameters individual handwriting can vary widely. Painters who aim to produce identifiable pictures or patterns, as Athenian vase-painters surely did, must be bound by similar constraints which could be taught, yet which still allowed for the expression of individual style.

This does not prove that all variation is conscious, as Neer would have it. Rather, it shows that variation in style can be conscious or unconscious. Further, Meyer’s definition of style reinforces the idea that those unconscious mannerisms of the individual, which as Hill has shown are impossible to disguise, are the key elements for identifying individual painting-styles, even as Morelli had suggested.

Critics of connoisseurial methodology traditionally have raised another complaint against the identification of artists’ styles, which has also been leveled at Beazley’s work; that is, that the method is not applied consistently. A work may fulfill nearly all the criteria set out in the system, yet for certain seeming undefinable reasons be rejected by the scholar-connoisseur.
Conversely, some works which fulfill few of the criteria may be accepted as authentic. Critics hold that these inconsistencies prove that the connoisseurial method is either non-existent or unworkable, and is employed only if and when it suits the whims of those who employ it. Both Whitley and Neer have been particularly vehement on this issue. Neer calls connoisseurship the “dirty secret” of art history, characterizing it as clandestine and esoteric, and concluding reluctantly that it is a “necessary evil.” Whitley implies that Beazley’s methodology is a sort of fraud, perpetrated to obscure the “real” purpose of his work, (an argument which will be dealt with below).

To the casual observer, a connoisseur’s method might appear unintelligible, or as Max Friedländer believed, spontaneous. There is sometimes an unquantifiable aspect to stylistic attribution. This can give the impression that the connoisseur simply follows a sort of “gut-feeling” about a work that leads to its being accepted or rejected seemingly in defiance of the established criteria for identifying an artist. Martin Robertson has defined this problem very fairly in relation to Beazley’s work:

In his early articles Beazley gives some indication of the criteria by which he distinguished an artist’s style. In a few cases he goes into his method of comparison and testing in very considerable detail.... but in the later list there is a very large number of artists where the list is all one has. Beazley gives no indication of how he arrived at his grouping, and it is often not easy for others to see what the links are. This has led some people to accept
Beazley’s attributions as a matter of fact, others to diminish the whole thing as something of a confidence trick; both, surely, mistaken attitudes.\textsuperscript{88}

Those who, like Whitley, criticize the lack of system in Beazley’s work, have taken Morelli and Berenson’s “science of connoisseurship”\textsuperscript{89} too literally. As David Ebitz has suggested, connoisseurship may equate not with a Positivist idea of science, but with a different kind of science, one without a systematic methodology for solving problems.\textsuperscript{90} Ebitz compares the practice of connoisseurship with Michael Polanyi’s idea of tacit knowledge and non-verbal skill,\textsuperscript{91} which distinguishes

... the articulate contents of science from the unspecifiable art of scientific research. The former is a knowledge of specific data and received hypotheses that can be verbalized and therefore taught. The latter invokes the tacit knowledge of how to do something, a cognitive skill that can only be acquired by guided practice and a process of trial and error. The possessor of this skill is unable to determine the rules which govern his or her performance and is unable to articulate these rules for others to learn and follow.\textsuperscript{92}

And in fact, in \textit{Attic Black-Figure Vase Painters} Beazley noted:

I am conscious that the vases placed under the heading in the ‘manner of’ an artist are not always in the same category ... sometimes I make the situation clear, but more often I do not, for the reason that it would be long and tedious to explain just how much I know about each piece, even if I always know how much I know and do not know.\textsuperscript{93}

I believe the answer to critics who want to debunk connoisseurship as impossible is that those who have immersed themselves in the study of style,
and who have a “good eye” – the ability to detect nuances that are overlooked by the casual or less-trained observer\textsuperscript{94} – build up an unconscious vocabulary of the characteristics of individual styles.\textsuperscript{95} Further, it is this vocabulary that comes into play when talented connoisseurs make attributions that seemingly defy some of their own criteria.\textsuperscript{96}

Hayden Maginnis’ work on the mechanics of visual perception also bears strongly on this question. Maginnis wrote, “Because we look, we do not necessarily see – I may scan one set of features of a work, and you may scan another ...”,\textsuperscript{97} and this results in misunderstandings about what can, indeed, be seen. However, “... failures to see aspects of an object are the simple result of perceivers not having mental schema in which these aspects play a part.”\textsuperscript{98} Maginnis found that perception and connoisseurial ability are learned skills, and with practice can be improved.\textsuperscript{99} Further, Maginnis debunks the idea that the connoisseur possesses some arcane knowledge,

... a special aptitude, a special gift. There certainly are authorities, but the experimental evidence clearly indicates that the designation [of connoisseur] comes through the improvement of perception with practice and inquiry. If the connoisseur is increasingly able to make rapid decisions about questions of attribution, there is no need to appeal to vague notions of intuition or divination for explanation of that phenomenon ... he has simply tuned his sense of sight with practice and developed more elaborate mental schemata that guide a more complex and specific search.\textsuperscript{100}
Although Beazley did not use scientific measurements in determining attributions, he did have a marvelously trained eye and a phenomenal memory.\textsuperscript{101} He was also never loathe to admit that he could make mistakes.\textsuperscript{102} For those without an extremely discerning eye, some of the conclusions of a talented observer might indeed seem inexplicable, but it is important to realize that everyone does not possess the same training, or talent, in the recognition of visual nuances. For critics to attribute some sinister motive to the conclusions of a connoisseur, or to throw out all a scholar’s work because they are unable to recognize subtleties recognized by him, is an overreaction.

Whitley has also faulted Beazley’s use of connoisseurship because it supposedly shows so-called “progressivism,”–the idea that Greek artists were consciously striving toward more-realistic depiction of the human body – linked with what Whitley calls “the classical narrative,” the “desire to view the Ancient Greeks as the spiritual ancestors of Western civilization.”\textsuperscript{103} This “narrative” supposedly relegates earlier Greek works to an undeservedly subordinate position in relation to later (i.e. Classical) works because they are less naturalistic.\textsuperscript{104} Whitley argues that Beazley’s work supports the idea of a “successive realization of potentialities” because he ordered his list of painters so that the most-naturalistic are at the end of the sequence of stylistic development.

This argument implies that Beazley chose fully–naturalistic rendering as the end-point of his list of painters, and ordered the painters backwards from
there, which is merely an instance of *post hoc* reasoning on Whitley’s part.

Human existence is at least serial, and, if not necessarily strictly developmental in the sense of movement from the more- to the less-primitive, later human artifacts to some extent reveal traces of earlier ones, and indeed are often more-developed than earlier ones. It is a simple historical fact that, between the Bronze Age and the Classical period, Greek art moved from less to more skill in rendering natural forms, and Beazley’s lists reflect this.

In a similar vein, but arguing, as it were, on the opposite tack from Whitley, Neer faults Beazley’s connoisseurship because it ignores the question of quality in the vase paintings. Neer quotes Berenson’s “Methods of attribution are merely aids to the more essential considerations of the question of quality” as if it were a given. Neer believes this approach is invalid because it ignores what he calls “authorial intention in form,” an artist’s assumed striving toward perfection in portraying the human form, that Berenson had used as a definition of quality and which Beazley ignored. Beazley treated the works of all painters, whether execrable daubers or great artists, to the same process of scrutiny. Neer has erred here in several ways, first by assuming that “perfection” is a function of art, and second by concluding that bad drawing is not as recognizable as good, an idea he also borrows from Berenson. Hill’s research shows that although the expert writers or painters were most consistent, and therefore their style was easier to identify than that of lesser-skilled writers or
painters, it was still possible to recognize the less-skilled practitioners’ individual work.\textsuperscript{109}

Ironically for one who identifies connoisseurship as a "linguistic system,"\textsuperscript{110} Neer consistently misunderstands Beazley's use of the term "style." For Beazley, style was something unique to a particular individual. Each painter had his own, individual, style, whether excellent or execrable. By definition, one painter could not paint "in the style of" another. In the introduction to \textit{Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters}, referring to misquotations of his attributions, Beazley stated this very clearly:

[I may perhaps be allowed to point out that I make a distinction between a vase by a painter and a vase in his manner, and that 'manner,' 'imitation,' 'following,' 'school,' 'circle,' 'group,' 'influence,' 'kinship,' are not in my vocabulary synonymous. The phrase 'in the style of' is used by some where I should write 'in the manner of'; this has warrant, but I was brought up to think of 'style' as a sacred thing, as the man himself.\textsuperscript{111}]

In "Citharoedus," Beazley wrote that the Berlin Painter's work exhibited an identifiable system of renderings,

a system so definite, coherent, distinctive and in some respects so willful, is most easily intelligible as a personal system ... in part determined by tradition, and communicable or prescribable to others; but the child, above all else, of one man's brain and will. The personal character of the system does not necessarily imply that all the works which exhibit it are the work of one hand.\textsuperscript{112}

That system was composed of the quantifiable characteristics of a given painter's figures, a \textit{system} which could be taught or copied by other painters,
each working in his own unique style. In that case, the system of formulae would be the same, but the individual styles would be different, and equally unique.

In the process of attribution, Beazley posited three possible types of images. First, “substantive” works painted by the man who designed them; second, copies, designed by one painter according to his own system of renderings but painted by another in that (second) person’s style. The third case he called a “translation,” when the executor paints a composition by another artist, using his own or another artist’s system of renderings, but necessarily in his own style. Neer has made the mistake of equating “style,” which is unique to each particular painter, with Beazley’s “system of renderings,” which may be employed by other painters who paint in their own individual, inimitable and unique styles.

Neer also dismisses the argument for the consistency of the vases, by which Beazley identified the style of the Berlin Painter, with “... in other words, the vases are too good to be derivative,”113 once again misconstruing Beazley’s meaning. The proof for Beazley was that the individual style and system of renderings was too coherent in totality not to be the work of one painter, because all the characteristic elements appear together in a number of the works: a copyist or translator could not have maintained such coherency.114 Neer seems
not to understand that *quality* was not a guarantor of attribution for Beazley; *truth to the observed system of representation of an individual painter* was.

In fact, the quality of a work has very little to do with the determination of style. One has only to look at authentic works by a known artist – take Picasso for example – to see that a wide range of quality can occur within a corpus of works that was undoubtedly produced by the same artist. Beazley had a wry comment on this in the second edition of *Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters*:

> A list of vases assigned to a good artist sometimes includes pieces that are unworthy of him. It is my experience that Greek vase-painters were not always at their best, differing in this respect from modern artists.¹¹⁵

The assumption that Beazley’s method was identical to, and shared the same purpose as, Berenson’s also leads Neer astray. For Neer, connoisseurship “conjures up images of collectors and dealers, of snobs, dilettantes and filthy lucre.”¹¹⁶ These comments are perhaps related to the fact that pots attributed to artists have a higher market-value than unattributed ones do. Because Berenson became very rich by attributing works for art dealers,¹¹⁷ obviously it was in his own best interest to emphasize their supposed quality.¹¹⁸ But as Dyfri Williams has pointed out, although many aspects of his method were similar to Berenson’s, Beazley’s acknowledged debt was to the German scholars Hartwig and Pfuhl, and his ultimate purpose in identifying individual painters was very different from Berenson’s.¹¹⁹
Today it is not unknown for scholars to attribute painted vases for dealers. But as Mary Beard, one of the most respected (and vocal) critics of treating ancient artifacts as commodities, has written, “... no one would suggest the he [Beazley] exploited his position,” even though, late in his life, he did provide “…that most saleable of commodities – artists’ names.” The fact that Beazley’s attributions have been used by art dealers to inflate prices (or that dealers have encouraged attributions by others in order to do so) does not negate the value of Beazley’s methodology. Neither does the fact that others have attributed vase incorrectly. As Joseph Hoppin cautioned in 1919, “all students are not Beazleys, and unless they possess similar characteristics [exhaustive study and ‘a wonderful eye for artistic detail’] they had best walk warily in his footsteps.”

The most vocal and widely-publicized of Beazley’s critics is Michael Vickers. At first alone, and then with a small group of followers (most recently David Gill), Vickers has sought to prove that Greek vase-painting never existed as a craft in itself, but was solely an adjunct of metal-work.

Vickers argues that all vase-paintings are merely copies of metal originals, and as a corollary, that no vase-painting artists existed. Vase-painters were only trained hacks who copied the compositions, figures, signatures and inscriptions from metal vessels onto pots, and supposedly created the black- and red-figure painting techniques in imitation of metal vessels that combined gold and silver.
It is nearly impossible to determine the relationship between classical metal wares and painted pottery, and Vickers and Gill must argue largely from later examples and negative evidence. Their ideas are often overstated or their arguments flawed, and their theories have been rebutted to the satisfaction of most serious scholars. As Dyfri Williams pointed out, the mere fact that preliminary sketches on vases are often very different from the finished paintings proves that the paintings were not simply copied from metal precursors.

Vickers’ and Gill’s contentions are based partly on their mistaken conviction that Beazley equated Greek vase-painting workshops with Renaissance painting workshops, and so ranked vase-painting as the equal of Renaissance painting while ignoring metal-work as a minor art. Beazley did use terms that were also used by scholars of Renaissance painting, but as Donna Kurtz has noted, they “had to be adapted to fit the very different circumstances of ancient artists.” Although some later writers have implied that all vase-painters were the equals of Renaissance artists, Beazley himself harbored no such delusions. Consider, for example, his preface to ARV²: “A chapter is devoted to the ‘F. B. [Fat Boy] Group’ – “oinochoai and skyphoi of the lowest description,” or of the Painter of Florence 1B 45, “villainous style.”

Beazley’s method has been faulted as “positivist” by Herbert Hoffmann and James Whitley. That is to say, they believe it to be concerned only with the physical characteristics of the pottery itself, ignoring historic or socio-political
factors that may have affected it. This charge is rooted in the “symbolic
anthropology” of Bronislaw Malinowski, whom Hoffmann quotes:

... all Anthropological research must be based on
painstaking study of concrete societies and their
institutions – including the interrelation of those
institution with custom, belief and technology.\textsuperscript{130} 

Both Hoffmann and Whitley ignore two important facts; first, that any
assemblage of artifacts must first be ordered before any cultural/historical
context (except in the broadest sense) can possibly be determined. Second, in
spite of Whitley’s declaration that “we have a...mine of useful information about
the Attic pottery industry...”.\textsuperscript{131} This is, in fact, precisely what we do not have.
The interrelation of “societal elements” with pottery technology in ancient Greece
is, for all practical purposes, unknown.

Any study of the influences on Greek pottery must move from the study of
the vases to the cultural context, because the vases themselves are the primary
source of such evidence. There is almost no other evidence, physical or textual,
about the Attic pottery industry aside from that offered by the pots themselves.
Beazley laid the groundwork for the subsequent study of other aspects of
Athenian pottery, a fact not always readily grasped by his critics.

Beazley’s work in ordering painters by stylistic similarity has enormous
potential for use in further research. His posited relationships between painters,
“followers,” “workshops” and so on, is the starting point from which new research into the connections between individual painters and potters, as well as other aspects of vase-painting production, can begin.
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CHAPTER 2

MULTIPLE IMAGES IN GREEK ART

This investigation of multiple images in vase-painting began with a mid-4th century Athenian pelike in the Toledo Museum of Art¹ (fig. 1). This vase, which is attributed to the Painter of Athens 1472, is decorated with an unusual scene from the myth of Peleus and Thetis.² Although it is the work of an obscure and somewhat pedestrian painter, the Toledo pot is of primary interest to this study because the scene on it is very similar to that on a well-known pelike in the British Museum. That pot is attributed to the Marsyas Painter,³ (fig. 2) perhaps the best painter working in the 4th century. I believe that the relationship between these two vases, and of many other “pairs” of vases that share scenes, is central to an explanation of the working practices of Attic vase-painters.

Almost all previous research on multiple images on painted vases has focused on replicated images by the same painter, rather than on multiple images painted by different painters.⁴ No one has dealt with similar images painted by different painters in relation to vase-painting technique, or what such
a study might reveal about the organization of painting workshops. It is this relationship between technique and image which will be investigated here. I propose that by studying the technical aspects of similar images by different painters, it may be possible to show that their painters worked together. Further, the network of associations derived from studying these pots with identical or very similar images may suggest associations between painters that otherwise have not been recognized.

The Toledo and London vases, which bear very similar scenes painted by different painters, are just such a pair. I will return to these vases later, but before examining the relationship between multiple images and workshop practices it is first necessary to consider the issues associated with the study of multiple images in ancient Greek art.

Today, ancient works of art too often are treated as market commodities, and the existence of multiple examples of an object is often viewed askance. “Copy” is used pejoratively as a synonym for “fake,” uniqueness usually being equated with authenticity. However, as Carol Mattusch has proven definitively for Greek and Roman bronze sculpture, the idea of a unique “original” from which less-desirable multiple “copies” were derived did not exist in the ancient Mediterranean world. Duplicates were made (and valued) for themselves, rather than as lesser imitations of an “original” object whose superiority derived from primacy of origin.
Further, ancient copies were not necessarily identical, and might vary considerably from the object copied. The contemporary concept of a copy tends to be stricter than the ancient one because of our familiarity with modern technology that makes exact replication possible. Representation of the same scene on different pots can be very different. Occasionally, the pictures are similar enough to make one suspect that either both painters emulated a first example, or that there was a working association between them.

TYPOLOGY OF MULTIPLE IMAGES

Single-Painter Duplicates

T.B.L. Webster and Konrad Schauenburg, among others, have discussed different types of repeated images on Greek pottery. One type consists of a scene repeated on more than one pot by the same painter: the Oreithyia Painter’s name-vase with Boreas pursuing Oreithyia has a virtual twin in Munich, and three stamnoi by the Kleophon Painter have identical scenes of a warrior’s leave-taking.

Another kind of duplicate by a single painter has the same picture repeated on both sides of a single pot. A pelike formerly in Joseph V. Noble’s collection with identical scenes of a satyr, maenad and dancing goat on both sides (fig. 3), and the Painter of the Birth of Athena’s two pelikai with essentially identical scenes of gods pursuing women on both sides of both pots, illustrate this type. Duplicated pictures by a single painter obviously reveal
nothing about workshop associations with other painters. However, same-painter
duplicates can confirm that a painter’s technique remains consistent across his
*oeuvre*.

A second type of repeated image occurs on single pots which have the
same scene on both sides (or inside and outside a cup), but the pictures are the
work of different painters. It was not uncommon for two painters to paint on the
same vase.¹³ This kind of repetition is found most usually on bilingual vases,
(one side in black-figure and the other in red-figure technique).¹⁴

It is obvious that two different people who painted on the same pot must
have worked together in the same shop.¹⁵ I believe that is also possible to prove
that some different painters who produced pots with the same scenes also
worked together.

*Repeated Compositions*

Identical compositions and compositional groups can appear on pots by
the same, or different, painters. For example, three cups by Epiktetos with a
single figure in the tondo: the Minotaur holding rocks, (fig. 4) a girl dancing with
*olisboi*, (fig. 5) and a man employing an oinochoe as a urinal; despite the
diversity of their actions, all three figures assume the same posture.¹⁶

The mantle-clad men on the reverse of numberless pots from the late fifth
century onward are the most-pervasive examples of compositional groups that
were repeated by different painters. The groups of men are essentially
interchangeable, and the scenes vary only in having two or three figures, the
attributes (torch, phiale, tympanon), and the presence or absence of an altar between two of the figures. These mantle-men are almost always hastily-painted daubs that function only as space-fillers, and an attempt to link their origin or transmission to a particular workshop would be futile.

Some repeated compositional vignettes whose protagonists differ from vase to vase seem to function as canonical symbols of the action they depict. One such vignette is the group of the “Hero Smiting an Enemy”: the Hero (usually striding in from the left) grasps the enemy with one hand (often by the hair or neck) and prepares to deliver a death-blow with a weapon in his other hand. The group can comprise Herakles and the Stymphalian Birds, Perithous and a centaur, Neoptolemus and Priam, Athena and a giant, Theseus and various enemies, or a host of others. The protagonists in such groups may not even be specifically identified - an unnamed Greek and an Amazon, for example. The identity of the protagonists may, in fact, be less important than the composition itself as representing the idea of “Victory” that could be repeated with new pairs as the need arose.¹⁷

In general, canonical compositional groups are so pervasive in vase-painting that, unless the context or members of the group are unusual, and closely related by style and date, their appearance on pots by different painters is not necessarily a marker for influence or workshop association. These often-
repeated pictures are formulae, representations of a *type* rather than of a specific event, whose subjects were clear *because of* their generic nature and constant repetition.

**Repeated Gestures**

Mourning women who tear their hair, suppliants who beg by touching the chin of those they supplicate and tipsy reclining symposiasts with their arms over their heads recur on pots by large numbers of different painters. However, gestures such as these were part of the basic expressive vocabulary of all Greek vase-painters. If a certain gesture appeared only on pots by a very few, contemporary, painters it might signal some connection between them. However, a particular gesture can almost never be identified as originating with a particular painter, nor certainly copied by another. Therefore common gestures cannot by themselves be used to indicate relationships between painters.\(^{18}\)

**Generic Images**

Tens of thousands of Greek painted pots from the late sixth to the early fourth centuries have survived, so is not surprising that images may occur more than once - Beazley himself remarked that fewer replicas survive than one might have expected.\(^{19}\) However, most recurring images on pots are generic.\(^{20}\) There are literally countless repetitions of athletes, of warriors bidding farewell to loved ones, of men at symposia, engaged in amorous or bellicose pursuits, and scenes of women performing tasks such as washing, preparing their toilettes, or engaged in negotiations for their favors.
Scenes such as these are formulaic representations: their composition and iconography are not distinctive, and their protagonists are almost never named in inscriptions or recognizable from attributes. If the scenes are narrative, it is only in the very broadest sense of the word, as, for instance, warriors fighting over a dead body. The function of these repeated generic scenes is akin to that of Homeric topoi, whose reiteration was meant to generate immediate images in the listener’s mind. When Alkmaon fell to Sarpedon (II.12.457 ff.), “…his fine bronze armor crashed against his corpse;” Hector struck Amphimachos (II.13.223), and “down he went, thundering, his armor clanging round him,” while Patroklos “fell thunderously, and his armor clattered about him” (II.16:822). Though not identical, the three descriptions are recognizable variations on a theme, meant to invoke the picture and sound of any armoured warrior’s fall.21

Like literary topoi, the visual topoi of repeated images on pottery conveyed situations that the viewer could immediately recognize, and that could evoke emotions applicable to any leave-taking or courtship, for example. Because these scenes are generic, their reiteration on (literally ) hundreds of pots almost always reveals nothing about workshop affiliations among their painters: they are also simply part of the common vocabulary of vase-painting, repeated too many times over too long a time-span to be significant markers of any one individual painter’s influence on another.

On the other hand, multiple generic scenes that can be assigned with confidence to the same class - that is, which are all the work of the same potter
although painted by different painters- almost certainly indicate that their painters were working together. With few exceptions, these generic scenes linked only by potters are hack-work. The unfortunate F. B. ("Fat Boy") Group, with its nearly-verbatim scenes (repeated on at least 125 pots) of an athlete between two figures, can serve as a horrible example. I will not deal here with duplicate images linked solely by class.

SOURCES OF MULTIPLE IMAGES

It is necessary to distinguish between repeated scenes which are merely formulae, and those whose similarity can indicate that a working connection might have existed between their painters. Occasionally similar images by different painters, such as those on the Toledo and British Museum pelikai, appear to be closely related because they share unusual scenes or iconography. Sometimes the pictures are so similar that one appears to have been copied from the other.

Traditionally, the existence of vases that bear very similar or identical images has been attributed to their common dependence on an external model which both copied. Any study of multiple images necessarily must consider whether each image might derive independently from a common source without being otherwise related.

The vast corpus of Greek myths and epic poems was universally known, and these oral and written texts were a primary source for representation in all
the visual arts. In his observations on the Chest of Kypselos at Olympia, Pausanias noted that the picture of Herakles shooting at the Hydra had no inscription to identify it because it “can be easily recognized by exploit and attitude.” Further, ancient viewers also recognized particular written sources for works of art: of a scene from Polygnotos’ *Iliupersis* on the wall of the Knidian *Lesche* at Delphi, Pausanias wrote,

Near Helenos is Meges; he is wounded in the arm, just as Lescheos of Pyrrha, the son of Aeschylenos, represented him in *The Sack of Troy*... next to Meges, Lykomedes the son of Keraon with a wound in his wrist. Lescheos says that he was wounded in this way... It is quite obvious that Polygnotos would not have painted his wounds in this way if he had not read the poem by Lescheos.

[Paus. 10.25.1]

Might pots that share scenes illustrate (or imitate) contemporary dramatic performances? Emily Vermeule felt that all images of the murder of Agamemnon that show the King encumbered in a robe dated after Aeschylos’ *Oresteia.* Likewise, A.D. Trendall and T.B.L. Webster believed that pots by several different painters with images of satyrs racing chariots or parodying Prometheus stealing fire from Olympos were illustrations of satyr-plays.

There are also visual, as well as literary, sources for repeated images. The murder of Hipparchos, one of the very rare verifiable historical subjects in Greek art, appears on an unattributed oinochoe in Boston, on a fragment of a skyphos in the Villa Giulia, on an owl skyphos in Agrigento and a column krater in Munich by the Pan-Painter, and as Athena’s shield-blazon on several
Panathenaic amphorae. The Tyrannicides are a rare subject, with distinctive iconography, and most of these pot-paintings derive recognizably from Kritios and Nesioes’ statue of the Tyrannicides in the Athenian Agora, known from still-extant Roman copies.

The Tyrannicides is not the only artwork whose likeness appears on multiple vases. Myron’s sculpture of the satyr Marsyas discovering Athena’s discarded diaulos, mentioned by Pliny (NH 34.57), which survives in at least two Roman copies, is surely the source of the scene on a fragment of an amphora in Athens, an oinochoe in Berlin and two kraters in Ruvo.

J.P. Barron has suggested that the obverse of the Niobid Painter’s name-vase and a krater by the Painter of the Woolly Satyrs both mimic celebrated ancient wall-paintings, the first in the Theseion in Athens and the other in the Knidian Lesche at Delphi. Likewise, the gigantomachy inside the shield of the Athena Parthenos is believed to be the source for a pelike in Athens and a krater in Naples, based on their similarity to Pliny’s description of the shield [NH 36.18-19].

Some multiple scenes appear to have a common source in architectural sculpture. David Robinson believed that an oinochoe with a bull being led to sacrifice copied part of the Parthenon frieze, and the Kleophon Painter’s krater from Spina with a similar picture is even closer to the Parthenon scene. Several pots with horsemen echo the frieze equestrians, and two hydrias, one in the
Hermitage and the other at Pella, showing Athena, Poseidon, the olive tree and snake, may well be a representation the central group from the West pediment.\textsuperscript{39}

A volute-krater found at Spina\textsuperscript{40} shows Greeks fighting centaurs who are holding women. The painting seems to be a conflation of the centauromachy scenes on the South metopes of the Parthenon. The centaur hefting a girl with an outflung right arm duplicates S29, while her would-be rescuer mimics the man on S7. The centaur brandishing a hydria overhead duplicates the centaur on S4, while the Greek charging toward him resembles the Carrey drawing of the man on S11, but reversed. The man’s odd pose on the vase is explained by the Carrey drawing: the figure held a shield that the vase-painter omitted. Two fragmentary vases with similar centuromachies share an identical Lapith, and one appears to have a second Lapith in a “Tyrannicides” pose.\textsuperscript{41} Both these figures are very similar to “Theseus” and “Perithous” (figures K and M) on the west frieze at the Temple of Zeus at Olympia.

Multiple images such as these examples, with either historical scenes or scenes influenced by other art-works, could have been produced by painters working together in the same shop. However, since these scenes reflect monuments or events that were available for \textit{all} Athenian vase-painters to imitate, their painters need not have had any close association that resulted in both producing pots with the same image. For this reason it is those multiple images without known precedents in other arts that will be considered further.\textsuperscript{42}
CRITERIA FOR MULTIPLE IMAGES

If multiples of a scene with specific iconography and named protagonists do occur, the existence of a large number of examples is cause for caution: the more examples of a specific image that exist, the less likely that they result solely from close association among their painters.

For instance, the amphora by Exekias with Achilles and Ajax playing draughts\textsuperscript{43} is but the first (and best-known) of at least 125 surviving black-figure, bilingual, and red-figure examples of the scene, including some duplicates by the same painters.\textsuperscript{44} The long time-span between Exekias’ vase, painted about 550 BC, and the latest example, from the Hephaistos Painter\textsuperscript{45} about 430/20, argues against simple imitation of one vase by different painters. Over that time-span, vast differences in painting style and technique separate many of the examples.

If repeated images do meet the criteria of rarity of subject and iconography, are approximately contemporaneous, and do not imitate some known monument there is a good possibility that they were produced by painters who were closely associated. An examination of the technical details of the replicated paintings could reveal other similarities that could indicate that their painters shared a workshop. Technical details which are shared by pots with the same picture could confirm relationships among painters which are now supported almost solely by similarities in painting style, and might suggest new associations. I believe the Toledo and London pots share such technical details, and that many other “pot-pairs” may as well.
NOMENCLATURE OF MULTIPLE IMAGES

Analogous scenes by different painters can vary quite widely in their degree of similarity. As Brunilde Ridgway noted in relation to sculpture, if ... copy is understood to mean mechanical and exact duplication...in all details and exact dimensions, then very few items, Greek or Roman, qualify as copies. The reproduction of a work to such an extent that its similarity to the prototype is easily recognizable...at least in the intentionality of the maker, [is sufficient that] the two pieces can be considered the same...⁴⁶

A similar lack of concern for exactitude in duplication is characteristic of Greek multiples in all media, therefore very few of them fit the modern sense of “copy” as one object that exactly reproduces another.

Because there are many different types of multiple images in vase-painting, it is not possible to use one single term to describe them all. Here, copy refers to any intentional imitation of another work. A copy may or may not be the work of the same painter, and it may or may not be identical to the thing copied, (which was not necessarily another painted pot.) A precise terminology is required to distinguish the differences between the different types of copies.

Replicas

A few examples of different vases with exact duplicates of pictures do occur. However, to my knowledge replicas that are for all practical purposes identical were always painted by the same painter. For example, the pelike with a satyr and dancing goat on both sides (see fig. 3 above), or the two cups by
Aristophanes with Herakles, Nessos and Deianeira, now in Boston (figs. 15 and 16). Even these duplicates by the same painter are not mechanically-exact replicas: they differ from each other to the extent than any handwork will. For example, though there is absolutely no doubt that he painted both of them, Aristophanes’ signed only one of his cups, and the two have differences in their details.

Although replicas *by themselves* can tell us nothing about workshop associations among painters, they may be germane to the study of associations if they are part of a group of similar images that also includes the work of other painters. Replicas *can* show that the same technical details are recognizable on all examples of an image by the same painter. Thomas Mannack recognized this on a column-krater by the Painter of London 488, where the preliminary sketch on side B is “... identical to the picture on side A.” As I discussed in Chapter 1, identifying individual technical details is basic to the methodology of this study.

**Translations**

Cases where two *different* painters produced the same picture are rather rare. They occur most usually on bilingual vases (see page 50 above). The minor differences in details which may exist in this type of repeated scene affect neither the narrative, nor the composition, of the image. I call these types of repeated images “translations,” a term borrowed from Beazley.
A vase-painting translation is not to be thought of in the sense of an exact rendering of something into another form, or medium. Rather, “translation” is meant as Beazley used it in “Citharoedus” in relation to style: as a copy of a design by one person, executed by a second person (necessarily in that second person’s style) using the second person’s, or another’s, “system of rendering.” The “system of rendering” consists of the details and tricks of a painter’s method which, unlike style, can be emulated by another painter.

The beautiful bilingual amphora in Boston that shows Herakles driving a bull to sacrifice (fig. 14), whose black-figure side was painted by the Lysippides Painter and the red-figure side by the Andokides painter, is an example of a translation. The images on the two sides differ because of the different styles of the two painters, and the technical differences in the way the black- and red-figure techniques render details, but they are translations, a duplicated design by two different painters, each using his own style and technique.

Many red-figure pots with the same scenes but painted by different painters are translations. For example, a fragment from the Athenian Akropolis attributed to the Circle of the Meidias Painter shows a centaur carrying off a woman. (fig. 39) It is so similar to Aristophanes’ two replica-cups with Herakles, Nessos and Deianeira (fig. 15 and 16 above) that the fragment must be considered a translation of the same scene. This similarity suggests that the Meidias Painter and Aristophanes must have worked closely together.
Variants

Other pictures can be unmistakably closely related by narrative subject and iconography, but exhibit more obvious differences than do translations. For example, one might include more figures, or their composition can differ somewhat. I call these types “variants.” They are recognizable reworkings of a similar scene and narrative by the same or a different painter. An example of variants by the same painter can be seen on two column-kraters by the Orchard Painter. One pot shows Jason stealing the Golden Fleece as Athena looks on, but on the comical variant a satyr is grabbing the fleece while Dionysos scurries off to the right.

Three cups with the same subject admirably illustrate the difference between translations of a painting, and variants. One by the Codrus Painter is now in the British Museum (fig. 6); the second is an unattributed cup at Harrow School (fig. 7). These two have nearly-identical tondi that show Theseus dragging the Minotaur out of the Labyrinth. On both, Theseus is nude and moves to the viewers’ left, holding a sword in his right and looking back at the dead Minotaur. He grasps the monster’s head in his left hand – by the horn on the Codrus Painter’s cup, by the chin on the Harrow cup - and pulls it from the Labyrinth. The Labyrinth is indicated by a single pillar supporting an architrave (a fragment with this detail is missing on the Harrow cup), and at the right edge of the tondo an open door patterned with cross-meanders and checkered squares, from which the Minotaur’s torso emerges. Both cups have shallow exergues.
indicating the ground-line. The two cup tondi are translations of the same scene by two different painters. Each tondo is bordered by a pattern of alternating Greek keys and checkered squares, and surrounded by scenes of the Hero’s deeds which, though similar, are not identical.

The third cup, signed by Aison, is in Madrid (fig. 8), and its tondo is a variant of the scene on the London and Harrow cups. Theseus and the Minotaur are essentially the same as on the other two cups (though here the hero’s sword points away from rather than toward the monster whom he is dragging by the ear). The labyrinth is shown as a more elaborate facade with two Ionic columns supporting a pediment. The patterned door is narrower because the scene in the tondo has been shifted slightly to the viewer’s right to allow room for the figure of Athena to be added on the left. She is in full kit, with aegis, spear and plumed helmet, looking down at the dead Minotaur. The scene is bordered by the same Greek-key-and-checkers ring as the other two cups, but the rest of the inside is undecorated, although the deeds appear on the outside of the cup.

Although not duplicating either of the others, the Madrid cup is so obviously closely related to them in theme, composition and relative date that it must be considered a variant, and suggests strongly that Aison, the Codrus Painter and the painter of the Harrow cup were associated. Even if these three all derive from another work, the distinction between their images – variant and translation – still applies. 
Two fragmentary cups in Munich and Basel are also variants of a very unusual subject, Aedon (or Chelidon) murdering Itys.\textsuperscript{61} The Munich cup shows the struggling Itys held down on a bed by a woman who lifts a sword to stab him. On the Basel fragment, although Itys’ pose is the same as on the other cup, the woman dangles him in the air as she dispatches him with a sword. The Basel fragment, unlike the Munich cup, had another female figure standing to the right of Itys. The Munich cup was painted by the Magnoncourt Painter, to whom Dietrich von Bothmer also attributes the cup in Basel; Herbert Cahn, Dyfry Williams, and Brian Sparkes all believe that Onesimos painted it. The very rare subject and close similarity in style surely indicate that, if not the same person, the painters must have been closely allied. As these groups of cups show, in a variant the principal figures or small groups are the same, the narrative is the same, but there can be more or fewer peripheral figures in the scene.

REPETITION WITHIN A FLEXIBLE CANON

In another type of variation, (exemplified by the scenes of the deeds on the Theseus cups) the same figure-groups in a scene can be rearranged into different compositions. The reuse of canonical figures by different painters is not necessarily indicative of any close association between them, as we discussed above (page 50-51). Generic compositional groups are pervasive in vase-painting, and can function as formulae. Compositional groups \textit{can} be significant when their protagonists are specific and unusual, as in the examples cited.
Compositional vignettes that appear *only* on one group of pots that are closely related by date and style might indicate that their painters worked together. Many pots showing the Return of Hephaistos exemplify this reshuffling of canonical *schema* and figural groups to compose scenes that are variants. Further, all the pots with these stock-figures were produced contemporaneously by painters whose styles are related, and most of them belong to the so-called “Group of Polygnotos,” which has been explored thoroughly by Monique Halm-Tisserant and others.\(^{62}\)

I do not believe that variants necessarily lessen the likelihood of the relationship of their painters to one another. Strict adherence to canonical representation is not a rule in either Greek art or myth: consider that no two Doric temples are the same. Further, there was no one solely-accepted version of Greek myths – several versions of a story could exist simultaneously without apparent contradiction. The story of Iphigeneia illustrates this very well. She was either slaughtered at an altar, or saved when Artemis substituted a deer in her place. Euripides even dramatized both versions in his own work, the first in *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, the other in *Iphigeneia in Tauris*. Jocelyn Penny Small has dealt with copies in relation to oral literature, and concludes that “exactitude, the basis of our concept of copy, was rarely of concern.” Rather, “The preeminent characteristic of any Greek or Roman copy, text or art, was the *gist*...” [my italics].\(^{63}\) This kind of preservation of the central idea or scene in the midst of extraneous variation is characteristic of most multiple scenes on pottery.
Having discussed different types of multiple images, and the Greek attitude toward them, it is necessary to ask why they were produced, and so define further their relation to painting-workshop practices.

SOME PURPOSES OF MULTIPLE IMAGES

No single factor can account for the production of multiple versions of an image, but certainly contemporary religious ceremonies directly or indirectly generated the production of multiple images as either votives or ceremonial necessities. Panathenaic amphorae are the best example, having been produced by the thousands for more than 250 years. The image on the front was always the same: Athena Promachos, dressed in a long richly-figured peplos, striding out between two columns. The style of painting changes over the years, and sometime around 360 BC the goddess is turned to move right instead of left, but Athena’s pose and iconography are immutable. They were dictated by the role of the amphorae as vessels to hold the oil from the sacred olive trees that was given as prizes at the games, not as the result of workshop associations.

Similarly, little choai (oinochoai) that were made for the Anthesteria ceremony are further examples of multiple images with a religious origin. Most of these small pitchers have very similar pictures of fat babies playing with miniature choai, or with toys, or pet dogs, birds or rabbits. Though often charming, the pictures usually show little skill or care in the painting, and were produced by many different usually unnamed) painters. The repetition of the
scenes is a function of the rôle the little pitchers played in the religious festival rather than an indication of any necessary workshop associations among their painters.

Religious purposes probably also explain some very similar vases found at Brauron. These show running girls in short dresses, figures at an altar, and two fragments with a bear. These vases were dedications at the shrine of Artemis Brauronia, and probably illustrated the religious ceremonies of the Arkteia at the temple. Particular cult-scenes might have been commissioned by buyers as votives, or bought ready-made from a source near the temple precinct, as the small bronze votive figures at Olympia were. A skyphos by the Marsyas Painter (fig. 9) found at Eleusis, has on both sides inscriptions in added gold “dedicated to Demeter by Demetria.” These inscriptions had to be fired onto the cup, so it must have been a commissioned piece.

The idea that matching sets of pottery with the same picture were produced either for symposia, or for the Etruscan market, has often been advanced to explain multiple images. However, there is no evidence that even the idea of matching sets existed in Classical Athens. Although pairs of vases by the same painter have been found in some Etruscan tombs, Richard de Puma (who studied pairs from tombs at Chiusi, Narce and Poggio Bucco) is uncertain whether the finds indicated an Etruscan fondness for matching pairs of vases, or that the tombs held two contemporary burials, or only that the pots with the same pictures had been purchased as a batch-lot bearing the same
“popular” image.\textsuperscript{72} If a particular scene were popular with buyers (for whatever reason) it would seem to make economic sense to produce as many as the market would bear.

Efficiency or expediency may also have played a part in the production of multiples – repeating a scene is easier than constantly inventing new ones, especially if the painters involved were not very skilled. As vase-painting declined in the late fifth, and especially in the 4\textsuperscript{th}, century, repeated images begin to outnumber unique ones. A glance at the work of the Pothos Painter, who produced only satyrs and maenads,\textsuperscript{73} at the FB Group’s endlessly-repeated athletes,\textsuperscript{74} or the works of most 4\textsuperscript{th} - century painters of griffins and Arimasps would seem to supply sufficient evidence for this argument.

I believe that another important reason for multiple images remains unexplored: the repeated images were the means by which vase-painting was taught and learned. For hundreds of years students in both the West and the Orient have learned to paint by copying the works of experienced painters. My examination of the technical details of duplicate scenes suggests that this was also the case in ancient Athens. Certainly potting has to be learned this way.\textsuperscript{75}

J. L. Benson’s study of middle-Corinthian \textit{kotylai} from the potter’s quarter in ancient Corinth noted wide variation in the quality of manufacture and decoration among the pots, and that,

\[...\text{... often the distinguishable groups of works are united not only by a common style of drawing, but also by a common preference for certain tricks in}\]
subsidiary decoration...This gives rise to a workshop concept by which it can be assumed that a leading artist set a pattern for his bench-mates as well as himself. 76

I believe that an examination of some of the replicated images we have discussed earlier will show that a similar process can be assumed for Athenian painting workshops.
1 Toledo, Ohio, the Toledo Museum of Art 1993.49; gift of Rita Barbour Kern in memory of Marguerite Wilson Kern.

2 The vase was attributed by Ian McPhee. The painter was named after a smaller pelike in Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1472, ARV² 1477.1. See Verena Paul-Zinserling, Der Jena–Maler und seine Kreis. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1994), pl. 46.2.

3 The Marsyas Painter's pelike: London: British Museum GR 1862.5-30.1 (E424); ARV² 1475.4, Para 495, Add² 381.

4 Two authors who have dealt with duplicate scenes by different painters are N. Plaoutine, "An Etruscan Imitation of an Attic Vase." JHS 57 (1937): 22-27, and Ricardo Olmos Romero, Coloquio Sobre la Copa de Aison (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1992).

5 Sometimes this attitude is justified: the J. Paul Getty Museum purchased a "Skopaic" head because it was a "copy" of an authentic head from the Temple of Athena Alea at Tegea. Shortly thereafter, the $2.5 million carving was recognized as a modern fake. The authentic head is in Athens, National Archaeological Museum 180; the other, Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 79.AA.I. See Andrew Stewart, Greek Sculpture (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1989) pl. 542-545.


7 One Claudius Saturninus was proud enough of his work to sign an awkward provincial Roman copy of the so-called Venus Genetrix, found in Dacia; see Luca Bianchi, "La Venere Genetrice di Claudio Saturnino." Archaeologia Classica 29 (1979): 128-33, fig. XXXI, and Brunilda S. Ridgway. Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture, The Problem of the Originals (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1984) 33.


The Penthisilea Painter’s workshop includes the most examples of this kind of collaboration. In his *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens*, T. B. L. Webster compiled all the instances cited in Beazley: Webster, *Potter and Patron* 15ff. See *ARV* 2 877-970, noting especially Beazley’s comments on 877.


As must two different painters who decorated two different rhyta made from the same mold: see Webster *Potter and Patron*, 19.


One side of a bilingual neck-amphora from Cerveteri (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches IV 3722, *ABV* 320.11, *ARV* 2 11.3, the Class of Cab. Med. 218) shows
Dike grasping an ugly tattooed woman named ADIK[ ]A - “Injustice”- and about to hit her with an axe. See H.A. Shapiro, Personification in Greek Art, (Zürich: Akanthus, 1993), 39-40, LIMCIII.2, 389 Dike 3. Shapiro notes that Pausanias described the same motif on the Chest of Kypselos. (Paus. 17.2). The Smiting motif was also canonical in Egyptian art: it appears on the pre-dynastic Palette of Narmer, and on the 23rd Dynasty Temple of Horus at Edfu, and there is at least one example with a heroine: on a relief from Karnak, Nefertiti smites a (literal) bunch of enemies; see Donald B. Redford, “The Razed Temple of Akhenaten.” Scientific American (December, 1978) 140.

18 I am indebted to Prof. Timothy McNiven for information on the prevalence and originator of certain gestures.

19 Beazley “Citharoedus” 85.

20 As Gloria Ferrari points out, their meanings could differ: see Gloria Ferrari, Figures of Speech (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2002) 5.

21 In this, their purpose is much the same as that of Homeric similes - in the midst of battle when Sarpedon’s bloody corpse is covered with spent spears “as in a farmstead flies buzz about the full milk-pails” (Il 16:642 Loeb) – but similies are repeated less often.

22 An exception would occur if either the potter or painter were employed in more than one workshop.

23 See ARV 2 1484-1487, Add 2 382. - one wonders if Beazley had Dickens’ Fat Boy in mind when he named the group. I will leave the determination of relationships among their painters to others.


26 See A. D. Trendall and T. B. L. Webster. Illustrations of Greek Drama (London: Phaidon, 1971): 28-9; Boardman, ARVC 321. Satyr-bigas decorate a cup attributed to the Wider Circle of the Nikosthenes Painter (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 37.17, ARV 2 133.4); a skyphos near the Painter of Bologna 228 in Brussels (Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique #11, ARV 2 513 bottom, Add 2 252); see D. Feytmans, Les Vases Grecs de la Bibliothèque Royale Belgique (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Belgique, 1948) XXVI; a cup by the Blenheim
Painter:  (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.342, ARV² 598.4, Add² 265), CB iii pl. LVI; a stamnos by the Painter of the Yale Lekythos (Orvieto, Faina 1044, ARV² 657.1), CVA Italy 16, pl. 10 [Italy 767]. Note also an oinochoe by the Nikias Painter (Paris, Louvre N 3408, ARV² 1335.34, Add² 365), where both the “Nike” charioteer and her “whiffler” wear masks.

27 They cite thirteen vases with a Satyr stealing fire that they believed were derived from the Prometheus Pyrkaeus of Aeschylus; see Trendall and Webster, 31. Beazley mentions that the Pronomos Painter’s volute krater with masked actors as Dionysos and reveling satyrs (ARV² 1337.1, Naples 3240) may derive from a satyr-play; see Simon and Hirmer, fig 228-9.


30 The Pan Painter’s glaux in Agrigento is ARV² 559.147, Add² 259 see ARFV 342; his column krater, Munich 2378 (J 777), ARV² 551.9, Add² 257; see J. D. Beazley, Der Pan-Maler, (Munich: H. Keller, 1931) pl.26.1.


32 Naples, Museo Nazionale G103-4. It is worth noting that the famous sculptors collaborated on the monument. For the Roman copies, see Stewart Sculpture, pls. 227-31. For a list of the Tyrannicides copies then known, see: Sture Brunnsåker, The Tyrant-Slayers of Kritios and Nesiotes. (Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckerei, 1955) 45-6; a plaster cast of the head of Aristogeiton from Baiae is in the Baiae Depositorio, 174.479. A stamnos by the Copenhagen
Painter (Würzburg, Martin van Wagner Museum L 515, ARV 2 256.5, Add 2 204) is a variant that shows the actual murder, with Hipparchos between the clothed Tyrannicides; see Mattusch, *Classical* 60, fig. 2.15.


34 The fragment in Athens: National Archeological Museum Akropolis 632, Near the Phiale Painter, ARV 2 1024.3; the unattributed oinochoe from Vari is Berlin, Antikensammlung F2418, see CVA Berlin 3, 29-30, pl.147 1 (1076). The unattributed bell-krater in Ruvo, Jatta Museum 1708, from the “Circle of the Pothos Painter,” (no ARV 2 number) see LIMC 6.2. pl.185, Marsyas I, 16), and a volute-krater, Ruvo, Jatta 1093 by the Kadmos Painter, ARV 2 1184.1, Add 2 340, derive unmistakably from Myron’s sculpture. See H. Anne Weis, “The Marsyas of Myron: Old Problems and New Evidence,” *AJA* 83 (1979): 214-19.


36 The gigantomachy vases, both near the Pronomos Painter: Athens, National Archeological Museum 1333, from Tanagra, ARV 2 1337.8, Add 2 366; see Erika Simon and Max Hirmer, *Die Griechischen Vasen* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag) 1981. pl. 233. Naples, Museo Archeolgico Nazionale 2045 (2883), from Ruvo, ARV 2 1338 middle, Add 2 366; see Simon and Hirmer, pl. 232, and Robertson AVCA fig. 258.

37 D. M. Robinson, “A Red-Figure Vase Influenced by the Parthenon Frieze.” *AJA* 38 (1934): 45-8, pl.5; Jenifer Neils, *The Parthenon Frieze* (Cambridge: Univ.
Press 2001), 210, fig. 145. Robinson attributed the vase to the “Atelier of the Berlin Dinos Painter.” Compare the vase to Parthenon south frieze Slab XLI. Volute krater by the Kleophon Painter, Ferrara T 57, ARV\(^2\) 1143.1, Add\(^2\) 334, from Spina. Note also the cup in the Manner of the Bull Painter, Cincinnati Art Museum 1884.231, ARV\(^2\) 1351.9, Para 483; Neils, Frieze fig. 143.

38 Equestrians perhaps derived from the Parthenon frieze: Harvard University Art Museums, 1959.129; an unattributed oinochoe from Joseph Veach Noble’s collection: Tampa, Florida, Museum of Art: 86.64, ARV\(^2\) 1006.2, Add\(^2\) 314, see S. P. Murray, The Joseph Veach Noble Collection, Tampa Museum of Art. (Tampa: Museum of Art, 1985) 44, # 5; an oinochoe by the Westreeneen Painter: Michael Vickers, “Golden Greece” AIA 94 (1990) 617, fig. 4. See also a stamnos by Polygnotos: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum AN 1916.68, ARV\(^2\) 1028.6, Add\(^2\) 317; see Vickers and Gill, Artful Crafts 162, fig. 6.3, and Ashmolean Catalogue 48, #36, no. 399. A column krater with two horsemen by the Academy Painter, from Spina: Faenza, Museo Ceramiche 19 (9586), ARV\(^2\) 1124.7, Mannack pl. 47 AC7; the Hephaistos Painter’s column-krater: Syracuse, Museo Nazionale 28923, ARV\(^2\) 1115.18, Mannack pl. 60; A column krater by the Painter of Oxford 529, Syracuse Mus. Arch. 12233, ARV\(^2\) 1119.2, Para 453; Mannack pl. 37.

39 St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum KAB6a, II 1872.130. This hydria was found at Pantikapaion (Kertch) in the Crimea in 1872. A. Stephani, Contes Rendu de la Commision Imperiale d’Archeolgie (1872) 107; E.A. Gardner, “Athené in the West Pediment of the Parthenon.” JHS 3 (1882): 244-55, fig. 1; LIMC 7.2, Poseidon 242. The other is from Pella in Macedonia, Pella Museum 80.514; see J. Boardman, A History of Greek Vases (London: Thames and Hudson, 2001) fig. 139.

40 Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina 5081 (T136 AVP): Arias, Spina 100, fig. 244.

41 New York, MMA 06.1021.140, Painter of the New York Centauromachy, ARV\(^2\) 1408.2 top, Para 488, see FR iii, fig 23, Pl. 13, Hesperia 31 (1962): 107; Athens, Agora P12641, School of Polygnotos, ARV\(^2\) 1043.1 top, Para 444, Add\(^2\) 374. The Agora fragment seems to show the “Tyrannicide” pose.

42 It is always possible to posit the existence of an unknown monumental predecessor, as Kopienkritik does with Roman sculpture. This is a risky methodology, and will not be employed.
Vatican Musem 344, *ABV* 145.13, *Add* ² 40; see Simon and Hirmer, pls. 74, XXV.


Formerly Berlin Antikensammlung 3199, *ARV* ² 1114.9, *LIMC* 2, pl. 100, Achilles 420. This pot shows the heroes and Athena as a statue-group. This might imply that vase-paintings with this version of the scene copy an otherwise-unknown monument, and perhaps also the Athena Parthenos; see Schefold “Statuen,” 31 fig. 1; de Cesare, *Statue* 90, 211, and fig. 41.


Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 00.0344, *ARV* ² 1319.2, and 00.0345, *ARV* ² 1319.3; both *Para* 478, *Add* ² 363. (See figs. 15 and 16).


Beazley “Citharoedus” 83-84.

As we have discussed in Chapter 1, in the case of similar scenes by two painters working in the same technique, *stylistic* differences will always exist.

52 The fragment was found on the Akropolis at Athens: *ARV* 1329.116, *Add* 365. ("May be" by the Painter himself); see *CR* (1869) pl. 413; Ernst Langlotz. "Die Akropolis-Vasen." *Hesperia* 4 (1935): 214-302; M.Z. Pease, "The Pottery from the North Slope of the Akropolis." *Hesperia* 5 (1936): 5, Fig. 5, 17, fig. 10; Real *Studien*, pl 14d. For Aristophanes’ cups see note 49 *supra*.

53 A pair of unattributed late-5th century cups which show Danae in the shower of gold, one in Athens and the other in the Louvre, although the cups are unlike stylistically, differ only in that an oinochoe in one faces right, and left in the other. Athens, National Archeological Museum 12593; Paris, Louvre CA 925. See *LIMC* 3.2, pl. 244, Danae 8, 9.


55 We will meet this second pot again in chapter 4, page 108 and n.21.


See Oakley *Phiale Painter* 31 n. 203.


H. R. W. Smith believed they were grave-offerings for baby boys who died before they could celebrate the festival. See van Hoorn, 24.


A few pots do exist with inscriptions that seem to imply they are commissions. Jenifer Neils believes that the Cleveland Painter’s name-vase, which shows Hera and Hebe in a unique chariot, may have been a commission by a worshipper at the Temple of Hera at Paestum where the pot was found. See Jenifer Neils, “Hera, Paestum and the Cleveland Painter,” AJA 106.2 (April 2002): 293. See also Webster, Potter, Painter and Purchaser 42-62, 126-51.

Athens, National Archaeological Museum 11037, ARV² 1475.8. See Mon Piot 7 (105): 30, and pl.4.


ARV² 1188-1191, Add² 341.

See page 53-4 supra, note 24.

Most of the very few references to pottery in Greek literature refer to throwing rather than painting, and in the Republic, Plato wrote: “... did you never observe in the arts [τεχνας] how the potter’s boys look on and help long before they touch the wheel?” Plato, Republic. 467a. Tr. Benjamin Jowett. Cambridge (Ma.): Harvard University Press, 1977.

CHAPTER 3

VASE-PAINTING TECHNIQUE, MULTIPLE IMAGES
AND WORKSHOP PRACTICES

RED-FIGURE VASE-PAINTING TECHNIQUE

In order to understand how repeated scenes by different painters can offer evidence of workshop association beyond mere shared images, it is necessary to examine the technique of red-figure vase painting. In red-figure, the figures are reserved, and therefore remain the red color of the fired clay body, while the background and inner details are painted in a black slip-glaze. Because painting mistakes are extremely difficult to correct, the decorative scheme had to be planned carefully, and involved a number of steps that had to be performed in a set order.

First, the completed thrown pot was allowed to dry leather-hard, then usually a preliminary sketch was drawn on the surface with a blunt point (perhaps a charcoal stick); as early as 1888, in their Histoire de la Céramique Grecque, Rayet and Collignon had mentioned this “instrument qui écrasait légèrement la terre.”
My first step in examining all the pots was to determine if there were preliminary sketch lines. Often the lines can be seen easily even in subdued lighting inside display cases, especially if viewed in raking light. I examined pots both with the naked eye, and under 8X magnification using a jewelers’ loupe. Some sketch lines are hard to see, and all show up best when illuminated at a low angle. The low-angle raking light throws the impressed track of the sketch-tool into shadow against the surface of the pot. I used both incandescent lamps and a Maglite® flashlight with a fiber-optic cable which could be held parallel to the surface of the pots.

Often sketches are visible even when they are covered over with slip-glaze. They are hardest to detect where relief lines or thick contour outline have been laid directly on top of them (though, being wider than relief lines, they often can be seen). When brush-painted details flake off a pot they sometimes leave a trace on the surface that can appear at first glance to be a sketch-line. Examination under 8X magnification almost always reveals a different texture in these flaked-off details than that of a sketch-line. Flaked-off brush-lines are not depressed below the surface of the pot. They often are a slightly lighter color than the surface, while sketch lines appear slightly darker than the body-color due to the compression of the clay particles by the drawing tool (fig. 10).

A preliminary sketch would indicate at least the positions of the main figures, but could be much more detailed. For example, the Berlin Painter and Niobid Painter’s sketches are extremely spare, and indicate only the bare outline
of the finished figures. Makron drew very loosely, using many fluid overlapping
“sketchy” lines to indicate the basic forms. Rough sketches such as the Berlin
Painter’s or most of Makron’s were merely location markers for the finished
figures. As Richard De Puma noted, “…most of the material preserved shows
that Makron was able to produce figures and drapery with just a few well-placed
sketch lines to direct his painting.” Other painters’ sketches can be carefully-
drawn and detailed, so similar to the finished painting on the pot that one might
reconstruct the final picture quite well from the sketch-lines if the paint were to
vanish. The Kleophrades Painter’s pointed amphora in Munich with a Dionysiac
procession is an excellent example of this type of sketch. It conveys the strength
of the Kleophrades Painter’s drawing style, its “sketchiness,” and also how
closely the finished painting conforms to the sketch.

There are pots without preliminary sketches, but almost all the replicated
pictures I have examined have them. It is very common for the picture on pots
with similar images to be reversed, like mirror-images. This has been explained
as the result of tracing the image from a pattern-book or transferring it to
another pot using a stencil or a perforated pattern. There are no indications on
any pot I that I have examined that would even suggest the use of stencils or
patterns to be traced; all the preliminary sketches I have seen have been drawn
free-hand. Figures that are mirror-images of others could have been reversed
easily by eye, without need for a stencil to trace. Pattern-books may well have
existed, drawn on clay or wood *pinakes*, or on cloth or leather, but given the lack of archaeological or textual evidence, the question remains moot.  

Preliminary sketches could not be changed or removed without damaging the unfired surface of the pot, so traces of them always remain. This can be seen clearly on the Brygos Painter’s Munich kalathos-psykter with Alkaeus and Sappho. While attempting to draw her face in three-quarter view the painter wiped or scraped out the sketch-lines of Sappho’s mouth, probably more than once. Because of this, the top layer of clay, finely-compressed as it was thrown, was worn away, leaving the rougher-grained clay beneath it visible as a slightly darker patch against the smoother surface of the poet’s face.  

Because of the certainty of erasures damaging the surface, sketches that were rejected (for whatever reason) sometimes had a new sketch drawn over them, or simply were ignored by the painters and covered over with the black slip-glaze of the ground. These rejected sketches usually show up under raking light as *pentimenti*, and reveal how a pot that otherwise would have been ruined by a mistake could be salvaged.  

Many examples of this practice exist. The cup by the Epidromos Painter with Hermes leading what is either an extraordinarily hairy pig or a very odd dog has a preliminary sketch that was painted over; it showed a boy holding a pick-ax, upside-down in relation to the finished painting.  

Sketch-lines can also be seen on other types of Attic pottery, although usually not on conventional black-figure. However, the fragments of the black-figure kantharos from the Athenian Akropolis that show Achilles bridling his
horses has the painted inscription ΝΕΑΡΧΟΣΜΕ/ ΓΡΑΦΣΕΝΚΑΙΕΠΟΙΕΣΕΝ in two lines both between Achilles and his horses. Beneath the first line, the signature has been inscribed into the pot with a sharp point. The inscription is clearly visible in a good photograph just left of the KA.... The incised signature is larger than the painted letters, but the M and the long-tailed E are identical in form to the painted letters.

Further examples of sketches on black-figure pots can be seen on a Panathenaic amphora in Detroit, where a sketch of Athena’s girdle can be seen through her shield, and a line that swoops below the painted tail of her helmet-plume indicates where the tail was meant to be, though the painted tail is shorter. All four runners on the back of the amphora also have sketch-lines. The white-ground lekythos by Douris showing Atalanta pursued by Erotes, now in Cleveland, has sketch lines on Atalanta’s headdress, arm, breast and foot, and on the Erotes’ wings. The fact that both the painter of the amphora and the lekythos normally did red-figure probably explains the use of sketches. This cross-over of painting technique may also explain the sketches that sometimes appear on the black-figure side of bilinguals.

For the second step, after the sketch was drawn the painter used thick slip-glaze applied with an unknown tool (probably some kind of squeeze-bag and nozzle) to paint a hair-thin “relief-line” outlining the figures following the sketch-line. These relief-lines did not melt flat when fired, but stood on the surface of
the pot and fired very black and shiny (fig. 11). There are considerable differences in how closely different painters followed the sketch lines while painting the relief-outline.23

When the relief outline had dried, usually a second "contour-outline" about one-eighth of an inch (3mm) wide was painted in thicker slip just outside the relief outline.24 This contour-line acted as a guide for filling in the background, and also as a sort of dam to keep the background glaze from overlapping into the outline of the figures and obliterating fine details such as fingers.25

After the contour-outline was dry, the interior details of the figures were painted. The painter could use the relief-line tool, and/or a brush and thinner slip-glaze, according to the effect desired. The slip could be thinned to different densities so that the painted lines fired to various shades and tints of brown, depending to how much water had been added. Brush lines are very calligraphic, and unlike relief lines, do not project noticeably above the surface of the pot.

The next steps were to paint the decorative floral and/or geometric border motifs, (which may or may not have been sketched in and given a relief outlines),26 although as on the Leningrad Painter’s hydria with vase-painters (fig. 12), sometimes these might be painted before the picture was painted (see note 3). A stamnos with the Birth of Erechthonius, formerly attributed to Hermonax, has at the sides of the picture two Erotes standing on (and one holding onto) elaborate vine-scrolls. These scrolls were obviously painted before the figures, and by the same hand.27
The penultimate step in the process was usually to glaze the inside of forms such as hydriae, amphorae or pelikai by pouring the slip into the pot and then out again. Whether the interior was glazed or not may have depended on how visible it would be; often even the insides of open forms like kraters were not glazed.28

As the final step, the black background was painted, and when it was dry, any inscriptions or details in white, red, purple or yellow slip could be added. If clay relief decoration or gold-leaf were applied, these would have involved additional steps. In the fourth century, other colors such as the blue and green on the Marsyas Painter’s British Museum pelike that were not based on the red clay-body or metal oxides, might also be added. These colors would have burned out at the temperatures needed to fire the pot,29 and so were added after the initial firing, presumably sintered at low temperatures, or mixed with a binder—perhaps pine resin or egg—and not fired at all.30

The painting proceeded in a logical order: sketch, outline, contour, inner details, decorative motifs, and background. The successive steps in the decorating process can be distinguished easily by examining the pots themselves. Sketch lines and relief- and contour- outlines show up clearly in raking light. Overlaps, incisions that cut through the glaze, and details that lie on top of others must have been added after what lies beneath them. For example, if the background slip-glaze covers a pattern band, the band must have been painted
first. Borders that stop beside figures that protrude into them, as Theseus’ foot
does on the Toledo pelike, were painted after the figures (fig. 13).

After having examined many paintings closely, I am convinced that the
different steps in the painting process did not all demand the same degree of
painting skill. Several of the steps could have been performed by workers with
very little painting experience. Careful examination can determine whether the
different steps consistently exhibit differing levels of skill in their execution. Some
painters obviously executed both the picture and the ornamental details on their
pots – Douris for example. However, if the skill-levels in the different parts of
the painting vary, this could imply that the least-skilled workers – those who
were learning the trade - could have been given the tasks that demanded the
least, such as painting the slip-glaze of the background, while better-trained
ones painted the contour outline. More-talented workers could have painted the
pattern-bands, and the most-advanced the relief outline or inner details of the
figures.

To test the methodology, I examined a black figure amphora by the
Lysippides Painter and two duplicate cups by Aristophanes, to see if the painters’
technique was consistent. I then looked at two bilingual amphorae by the Lysippides and Andokides Painters. Because the two sides were painted by different
people, I reasoned that, if there were sketches, they would be different, and not
simply because of the differences between black-and red-figure techniques.
The Lysippides Painter’s black-figure neck-amphora in the British Museum with the Apotheosis of Herakles on the front, and Achilles and Ajax Gaming on the reverse\(^{33}\) has sketches on both sides. Both horses on the front have very clear sketchy needle-thin lines outlining their hind legs and genitals, and on the bridle cheek-piece on the lead horse. The reverse has two unpainted sketch lines approximately 3/4 inch long drawn perpendicular to Achilles’ right arm between the vambrace and his waist or spear-shafts.\(^{34}\) These sketches were also produced with a very thin, sharp needle-like point. They are not incised over the black slip-glaze. P.E. Corbett\(^{35}\) believed that these types of lines were “preliminary incisions” to indicate where the incised details should be made on the finished painting. However, the needle-lines are not under the final incisions, which were made with a blunter point, and usually are outside the painted area.

The bilingual with Herakles driving a bull in the Boston Museum\(^{36}\) (fig. 14) also has sketch lines on both sides. The black-figure side by the Lysippides Painter has a sketch which is identical to the finished painting. It is drawn with a single, sure line that was very carefully incised with a needle-like tool. The line is clearly visible to the naked eye even within the museum case because the figures were painted about an inch to the left of the sketch.\(^{37}\) The line of the bull’s belly and legs is especially obvious. Another line that marked the original right edge of the vertical ornamental band that borders the picture shows that the band was also moved. Although the needle-line is covered with slip glaze, it is still visible. There was no attempt to smooth over the sketch-line before the
figures were painted. This needle-line was not a “preliminary incision” to locate the incised details – they were made with a wider tool with a blunter point, and they are *inside* the painted edges of the finished figures. On the obverse, the Andokides Painter’s red-figure scene of Achilles and Ajax gaming is damaged, but a few sketch lines are visible. They were made with a round-ended tool much larger than the needle used on the bull and Herakles.

Furtwängler and Reichhold illustrated another bilingual by the Lysippides and Andokides Painters, showing Herakles reclining and Athena bringing him a cup, that also has sketches on both sides.\(^{38}\) Reichhold believed that the amphora was the work of Andokides, (whom he felt to be much better at red-figure painting than black), but noted, “Möglich ist indes, daß die roten und die schwartzen Bilder von Verschiedenen Händen im Atelier des Andokides ausgeführt wurden.”\(^{39}\)

Both of Aristophanes’ duplicate cups showing Herakles about to club the centaur Nessos, who is trying to abduct his wife Deianeira, have preliminary sketch-lines\(^ {40}\) (fig. 15, 16). As mentioned before, the painter and potter signed only one of the cups, and the two also exhibit small differences in the details. For example, on the unsigned cup Deianeira’s breasts point to her left, her hair is in a short curly pony-tail, and the lower edge of her chiton has strange tear-drop shapes instead of more naturalistic folds.

Similar slight differences can be found on the outsides of the two cups, in the hair, or in the positions of the arms and legs of the youths and centaurs.
However, these are such minor variations as could be expected in duplicates by the same painter. For all practical purposes the two can be considered identical.

Since the cups are undoubtedly by the same painter, I would expect the drawing technique of the sketch lines to be the same. This proved to be the case: the insides of both cups have the remains of firm preliminary sketches, drawn with a rounded blunt point and very uniform in width rather than calligraphically varied. These are not multiple sketchy lines but single-line drawings, and the painted contour and relief lines follow them closely, often right on top of the sketch-lines.\textsuperscript{41} The character of the sketches and of the paintings on the two cups accords very well, and were clearly the work of one person.

In the next chapter we shall examine the Toledo and London pelikai, and other pots by the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472, for evidence of workshop associations.
1. For illustrations of many of these steps, see: Noble, *Techniques* 2d ed. (1988).

2. This slip-glaze is made from the clay used in the body of the pot, defloc-culated with an alkali (probably wood-ash) to a colloidal suspension of the finest clay particles, which form the actual slip-glaze. Many authors refer to the fired slip glaze as “black gloss,” but this term, though descriptive, is both technically meaningless and too vague to be of use in this discussion. If the slip is applied too thinly, it is anything but black and glossy when it is fired!

3. But as R.E. Jones noted, “…that they normally follow a specified sequence of procedures does not preclude them from making apparently erratic, if temporary, alterations in materials and techniques.” Jones, *Greek and Cypriot* 850. The hydria by the Leningrad Painter in a private collection in Milan (ARV² 571.73, Para 390, *Add²* 261) shows vase-painters who are applying the orna-mental details to column-kraters before there are pictures on the body (fig. 12).


5. Rayet and Collignon, *Histoire* x. Outline sketches can also be found in other types of Greek painting. Nikolaus Himmelmann noted black outlines beneath the painting on a stele from the Kerameikos; “Ein archaische Gemälde vom Friedhof am Eridanos.” *AM* 73 (1958): T. 1, Beitrage 1, 2 for an ultra-violet photograph. The famous marble tablet from Herculaneum with women playing knucklebones shows the technique very clearly, because although almost all the encaustic color has disappeared, the under-drawing survives (Naples: Museo Archeologico Nazionale inv. 9652) See Soprintendenza Archeologica Napoli e Caserta, *National Archaeological Museum of Naples* (Naples: Electa 1996) 199.

6. I also experimented using a laser light, but the beam does not cast a shadow.


De Puma, “Preliminary” 153.

Munich, Staatliches Museen 2344, ARV² 182.6, Para 340, Add² 186. Reichhold’s masterly drawing of the sketch captures this beautifully: see Perseus 1993.01.0271.


Hauser in FR iii, 45.

Note the pinakes hanging on the wall on the Foundry Painter’s cup in Berlin (Berlin 2294; ARV² 400.1, 1651; Para 370; Add² 230; ARVA 262.2); Mattusch, The Fire of Hephaistos (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Art Museums, 1996) 184. Were they votives, as Mattusch believes, apotropaia to ward off accidents? Were they perhaps some kind of trophy, as the pinax held by the prize-winning youth on an amphora by the Painter of Palermo 2315 [Munich, Antikensammlung 2315, ARV² 299.2, CVA Munich 4, pl. 191 #2 (Germany 569)]?. Or could these possibly have been patterns for images?

Munich, Antikensammlung 2416, ARV² 385.228, Add² 228; ARFV 261; Boss, “Preliminary” fig. 14 is an excellent illustration.

This also suggests that at least sometimes the pots might have been more valuable than the paintings.

Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 3691, ARV² 118.8, Add² 174. See Karl Schefold, “Pammachos.” AK 17 (1974): pl. 40.3. One is tempted to believe that a second salvage-operation was also undertaken on the cup, changing the original pig into a black dog as an offering more suitable to Hermes. A cup attributed to Douris shows a man standing between a table and an altar, but in the exergue under his feet is an upside-down sketch of a man’s head. The Douris cup was sold at Christie’s June 2, 2002, lot 82. See Buitron, Douris 77, pl. 50. Inside the bottom of a shallow mug in the Princeton University Art Museum is a sketch of a dancing satyr, completely glazed over, while under the foot is an uncompleted painting of an Amazon on horseback. Unattributed mug: Princeton University Art Museum Y 1987-70. See Russell, Ceramics and Society 40-41. Michael Padgett
assures me that the satyr, though impossible to photograph, is quite visible to the naked eye. (Michael Padgett, private communication). For a list of many pots with abandoned sketches, see: Corbett, Preliminary 25-28.

17 Shields on black-figure pots often have an incised circumference and central dot that reveal the use of a compass.


19 This shows not only that black figure can have sketch-lines, but that Nearchos was both potter and painter of this beautiful fragment.

20 Panathenaic by the Asteios Group: Detroit, Detroit Institute of Arts 50.193, ABV 412.3 bottom; see Detroit Institute of Arts Bulletin 31: 65.

21 Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 66.144, ARV 2 (446.266 bis), Para 376, Add 2 241; see ARFV 294. Under a raking light the sketch lines show very clearly, due to the compression of the clay body by the drawing-tool. They are faint because the white body-slip covers them.

22 Furtwängler illustrated the sketches on both sides of the Amphora by the Lysippides and Andokides Painters with Herakles reclining before Athena (see n. 10 supra).

23 Early on, Rayet and Collignon also commented “...comme elles [les lignes] ne concordent pas toujours avec les contours dessinés au pinceau”. x.

24 It is interesting to note the red contour-outline around the dolphins on Exekias’ kylix with Dionysos in a boat (Munich, Antikensammlung 2044, ABV 146.21, Add 2 41). In this case the contour is the actual outline of the dolphins’ bodies. This can be seen quite clearly in a good photograph: see The Greek World. Ed. G. Pugliese-Caratelli. (New York: Rizzoli, 1996) 202.

25 The contour outline was often omitted on lesser works, especially in the late 5th and 4th centuries. For example, mantle men were almost never outlined or contoured, nor were the figures on many of the little choes for the Anthestheria.

26 Douris’ Atalanta lekythos in Cleveland (see note 21 supra), for example, has both sketch lines and relief-outline on the shoulder palmettes.
27 Munich, Antikensammlungen 2413; ARV$^2$ 495.1, Para 380, Add$^2$ 250. ARVA 350.1.

28 Kraters often have smeared thin glaze-traces on the inside from when the rim was glazed and the drips were sopped up with a sponge or rag.

29 The firing temperature to mature red clay bodies would have been about Orton Cone 06 (1859° F/ 1015° C), but many Attic pots were fired only to about cone 08 (1825° F/945 C°); see R. E. Jones, Greek and Cypriot Pottery: a Review of Scientific Studies. (Athens: the British School, 1986) 804.

30 Noble 140-41, and n. 24.

31 See also page 85 n. 27 supra.

32 Especially on late 5th and 4th century pots it is not uncommon for the pattern-band to be much more skillfully painted than the figures.

33 London, British Museum 1851.8-6.15 (B 211); ABV 256.14, Para 113, Add$^2$ 66. See J. D. Beazley, The Development of Attic Black-Figure 2d. ed. (Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1986), pl. 80, 81.

34 It is difficult to determine what the sketch was meant to be. I think it may have been the right end of Achilles’ striped cloak looped around his arm as it is on the left side. Whatever it was, it is undoubtedly a preliminary sketch.

35 P.E. Corbett,” Preliminary Sketch in Greek Vase-Painting.” JHS 85 (1965), 22.

36 Andokides Painter (red figure) and Lysippides Painter (black figure), Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 99.538. ABV 255.6; Para 113, Add$^2$ 66; ARV$^2$ 4.12, Para 113, 321; Add$^2$ 150; CB iii 115, pl.65, 67. As do some scholars, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts assigns the amphora to the Andokides Painter, believing both sides are the work of one painter.

37 Probably in order to center the picture-field between the handles.

38 Munich, Antikensammlung 2301, ABV 255.4, ARV$^2$ 4.9, Add$^2$ 149-50; FR i, 15, 18, 266, and pl. 4. From the drawing it is not possible to tell the kind of tool used, but the sketches on the two sides are definitely different. See also Corbett, “Preliminary” n. 32.
**FR I, 17.**

Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 00.0344, (with signatures): *ARV*\(^2\) 1319.2, BMFA 00.0345, *ARV*\(^2\) 1319.3; *Para* 478; *Add*\(^2\) 363. *CB* iii, #171, 83-88, pll. CII.1, CIV; and *CB* iii #172, 84-88, pll. CIII.2 and CV show many of the differences between the cups. See also *FR* i, pll 128, 129. See Chapter 2 page 59.

Friedrich Hauser, *FR* iii 45, believed that the two cups had been produced using a "*pause*" or perforated pattern to transfer the design. There is of course no evidence for this; also in addition to the differences in the figure placement, the two tondi are different sizes.
CHAPTER 4

WORKS BY THE MARSYAS PAINTER
AND THE PAINTER OF ATHENS 1472

An examination of the preliminary sketches as well as the finished paintings on pots with shared scenes can further an understanding the workshop relationship between their painters. A study of the technical details of the Marsyas Painter’s pelike and the Toledo pelike by the Painter of Athens 1472 indicates a division of labor in vase-painting workshops, and reveals that almost certainly they were both painted in the same workshop.

THE TOLEDO AND LONDON PELIKAI

The pelike by the Painter of Athens 1472 now in Toledo (fig. 1) and the Marsyas Painter’s London pelike (fig. 2) share very similar pictures of Peleus capturing Thetis. Further, both have preliminary sketches which differ from their finished paintings. As we saw in the discussion of sketch-lines in Chapter 3, this in itself is not unusual, for in the final painting artesis often changed either the size or position of figures in the sketch. However, the changes on the Toledo pelike are interesting for other reasons.
The preliminary sketch lines are clearly visible on both pots. They appear slightly darker red than the unpainted clay, and are lightly indented into the surface of the pots. Neither pot shows any indication of the kind of rough flaking along the edges of the lines that occurs when sketches were made on a pot that was very dry. The lines average about 1.5mm in width, and were made with a blunt-pointed tool, not with a sharp point like a needle. Some of the sketch-lines – for example, the long stroke that sweeps down the spine of the backward-facing nudes, and the ones that outline their left buttocks – appear burnished from the pressure of the drawing stroke.

I photographed the sketch lines using both a 35mm SLR film-camera and a digital camera. I also traced the sketches on both pelikai directly onto transparent mylar sheets held against the pots, using a .7mm permanent marking pen. One mylar sheet could then be laid on top of the other to compare the relative size and position of the sketches – this was especially helpful since some of the figures are mirror-images. I also was able to photocopy the sketches on the mylar both singly and superimposed in order to compare them (fig. 17).

The sketch lines often show a calligraphic variation in width, which suggests that the sketch tool was probably not round like a dull pencil, but had a blunt chisel-shaped point rather like the flat end of an orange stick (fig. 18). When viewed at 8X magnification, the line appears slightly striated, as if the drawing tool were not perfectly smooth. This kind of line is consistent with a tool made either of wood or reed that wore unevenly across its grain or surface.
through abrasion by the fine particles in the clay body. Although Athenian clay is very fine-textured, it does contain small particles of silica that would abrade a tool over time.²

Although the Painter of Athens 1472 is rather pedestrian, the sketch on the Toledo vase, though summary, is noticeably more fluid and better-drawn than the finished painting, which is often shaky and tentative. In fact, the sketch on the Toledo pelike shows a character and style of drawing extremely like that on the Marsyas Painter’s London pot. For example, the crouching nude at the far right on the London vase has a very simple “L”-shaped line with a rounded corner that indicates the position of her chin and nose in the painting. The seated veiled woman on the Toledo vase has the same kind of line to position her face, and the crouching nude has a similar line beneath her painted nose. Both nudes fleeing into the background have an identical fluid sweeping curve that delineates the position of the spine and right buttock. On both pots the lines exhibit the same absolute control of the sketch-tool. They also show the same degree of impression into the clay surface, indicating that the two pelikai must have been just about equally dry - early leather-hardness - when the sketches were made.

One of the obvious differences between the two pelikai is that the Marsyas Painter’s pot has color and gold added. The drape across Thetis’ knees was a bright pastel aqua-green, and Eros’ outer wing feathers show the remains of light blue pigment. Traces of extensive gilded details remain on the jewelry,
diadems and fillets. The stephanos meant to crown Peleus and the inner wing feathers of the Eros were completely gilded, and the gold on their heavy impasto outlines is well-preserved. Interestingly, Peleus’ petasos was also gilded. Small balls of clay were pressed onto the neck of the pot below the upper egg-and-dart border. Although many of these have fallen off, some remain — one can be seen by Eros’ right wing tip — and these dots probably were also gilded. In contrast, the Toledo pot has no traces of either color or gilding.

A further difference is that the London vase has a second fully-developed scene on the reverse, Dionysos seated between a satyr and a maenad (fig. 19). In contrast, the back of Toledo pelike has three badly-painted mantle-men (fig. 20). There are other indications that less care was exercised in the Toledo pot’s painting than on the London one. When the inside of the pot was being glazed a large drip of black fell on one of the mantle-men, and the worker planted his glaze-covered thumb on the shoulder of the seated veiled woman. Also, most of the contour outlines around the figures have been omitted, which allowed the background glaze to cover parts of the fingers of the Nereids. The sloppy glaze application also obliterated the ends of the ornamental bands above and below the picture. These mistakes and omissions seem anomalous when compared to the quality of the drawing in the sketch.

There are three very small extraneous dots of glaze on the London pot, but in general the Marsyas Painter’s pelike shows much more care in its painting, and, with its added color and gilded details, is altogether a more lavish
production than the Toledo pot. In spite of their differences, the similarity of their sketches and the subject of the paintings suggests that the two painters must have been closely connected.

The story of Peleus and Thetis was a popular subject in vase-painting over a long period of time, and more than three hundred examples are known.\textsuperscript{5} The usual depiction shows the struggle between the two after the gods gave the Nereid to Peleus as his bride--but only if he could hold on to her. Like other sea-deities Thetis could change her shape at will, so that the capture turned into a wrestling-match. In her struggle to escape the reluctant nymph turned into a lion, a fire, and snakes or a ketos sea-serpent.\textsuperscript{6} In the traditional rendition of the capture Peleus contends with either the lion, the serpents or the fire (and sometimes all three) as he holds the struggling nymph. Peithinos’ great cup by in Berlin\textsuperscript{7} (fig. 21) shows the typical iconography: both Nereid and Hero move toward the right. Peleus, clad in a short chiton, grasps the fully-clothed Thetis around the waist while a lion claws his back and snakes attack his neck and ankles.

However, the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472 did not follow this scheme. Instead, they depicted a moment slightly earlier in the story when, as the nude nymph was crouching to bathe by the sea, the Hero crept up behind her and seized her shoulders. A pair of Thetis’ sisters flee in panic around the couple, while a woman seated at the far left look on, but does not participate
in, the action. Significantly, these two pots are the only known examples illustrating this particular moment in the story, rather than Thetis’ struggle to escape the hero’s grasp.

There are eight figures on the Marsyas Painter’s vase, distributed across the field with minimal overlapping (fig. 2). Thetis occupies the center and is the focus of the scene. Her nude body is painted white, and she crouches facing the viewers’ right on an undulating reserved ground-line that represents the beach. To emphasize the sea-side setting, a little dolphin leaps out of the water in front of her. She holds her aqua-blue drape across her knees and looks back over her right shoulder at Peleus. He stands leaning forward, with his weight on his right leg and his bent left leg resting on higher ground that is hidden behind the nymph. He grasps her right arm and stretches it out behind her while he holds on to her left shoulder. He wears only a chlamys and petasos, and a spiky-scaled and spotted ketos has twined itself around his left leg from ankle to knee.

Beside the handle of the vase, above and to the left of Peleus, a woman leans forward and gazes at the struggling pair. Next to her a seated woman, dressed in a himation that leaves her right shoulder bare, turns her head to look down toward the Nereid and Hero. These two women seem to be watching the small white Eros who flutters above Thetis with his arms outstretched to lay a golden stephanos on Peleus’ head.

Three more women complete the composition. At ground level at the far right facing Thetis, a nude wearing a diadem sits back on her heels. She holds a
chiton (identified by the wide stripe on the border) out in front of her, as if she had just offered it to Thetis when Peleus seized the nymph. Between this crouching nude and Thetis, and slightly above (therefore behind) them on a level with Peleus, is a woman fleeing to the right. Her pose is a running contrapposto, and her high-girt peplos and long hair swirl around her as she runs, looking back and down at her sister struggling in the hero’s clutches.

Behind this heavily-draped Nereid and the crouching nude at the right, and above both of them, is a third nude. She is shown in a foreshortened back-view, with her head turned left in profile perdu, wearing only a saccos. Her hands are raised in alarm, and her garment spills away from her left hand and blows in front of her as she runs away.

The composition on both vases is very similar, but the Painter of Athens 1472’s pelike (fig. 1) is a variant of the picture on the Marsyas Painter’s pot. Again, the differences between the two are very interesting. The Nereid and her suitor on the Toledo vase are reversed compared to the Marsyas Painter’s pair, facing left instead of right. In addition to reversing the central pair, the Painter of Athens 1472 also rearranged some of the other figures, eliminating the woman standing at the far left, and moving the crouching nude from the right to the left side. Her hands are still stretched out toward Thetis, but here they are empty. The painter repeats almost verbatim the nude who flees into the right side of the background on the London vase—the difference is that here her face is in full profile, and her left hand is free as she clutches the falling peplos with her right.
The Painter of Athens 1472 also added details that do not exist on the Marsyas Painter’s pot: the seated woman at the left wears a veil that covers her hands and the lower part of her face (fig. 22), a detail that appears elsewhere in the work of both painters. The Marsyas Painter’s richly-clothed running nymph has been replaced by a third nude, who runs toward the left with her drapery blowing aside to reveal her bare body. Although she is now unclothed, this runner and the kneeling nude who was shifted from to the left side retain the same positions relative to Thetis as the nymphs on the London vase (fig. 2).

Though the frontal nude’s left hand is raised in the ἱπποτασσέως-gesture of veiling/unveiling (perhaps to indicate an attempt at modesty), her hand is empty, and there is no painted or relief-line that would indicate that she held the end of her flying garment, and so explain her gesture. However, photographed under raking light, traces of three short lines that extend from her hand to her hair are revealed (fig. 23). These are most probably sketch-lines that were meant to indicate a veil but that were never painted in.

When he stripped the Marsyas Painter’s richly-clothed nymph and turned her almost fully frontal, the Painter of Athens 1472 made her a mirror-twin of the nude who flees to the right in the background on both pelikai. He also created a figure that is nearly unique, and one of the earliest example of a frontal nude in Attic vase-painting. I know of four other examples of a running frontal female nude. The first is on an unattributed pelike in Karlsruhe which is similar in many other respects to the style of the Painter of Athens 1472, although not his.
second nude, similar in style, flees from a centaur abducting a woman on a florid unattributed pelike in the Hermitage, and a nude Thetis, her arm transformed into a huge ketos, runs from Peleus on a coarsely-painted later hydria in the Louvre.

The fourth frontal running nude appears on a hydria in a private collection in Marseilles, (fig. 24) which François Salviat has attributed to the Marsyas Painter. Judging from photographs is always risky, but the painting style seems extremely similar to the Marsyas Painter’s, and the maenad on the Marseilles hydria is beautifully drawn. Her pose is almost identical to that of the nude on the Toledo vase (although, again, reversed) but she carries a torch in her right hand. A comparison of the Dionysos on the Marseilles vase to Apollo on the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase (fig. 26), the Marseilles satyr to the satyr on the reverse of the London pelike (fig. 19), shows how close they all are in style of painting and composition.

Because frontal running female nudes are so rare, and because the Marseilles nude is so similar to the Toledo nude, the Marseilles hydria, like the works of the Painter of Athens 1472, certainly belongs within the very close circle of the Marsyas Painter, and I believe that it may be by the Marsyas Painter himself.

In addition to unexplained actions, other incongruities appear on the Painter of Athens 1472’s Toledo pelike. On the London vase the hovering Eros stretches out his arms to crown Peleus for winning Thetis — remains of the
gilded wreath he held, though very worn, are visible. The Toledo Eros flutters on his skewed wings with his arms outstretched above the fleeing Nereid behind Peleus, but there is absolutely nothing on the surface of the pot to indicate that he ever held anything in his hands. Other important iconographical details that make sense on the Marsyas Painter’s pelike have also been omitted on the Toledo vase. Neither the little leaping dolphin nor the attacking ketos on the London pelike, which locate the scene at the sea-shore, appear on the Toledo pot. In fact, all the details that identify the subject of the scene specifically are missing.

The pictures on both the London and Toledo pelikai were painted over preliminary sketches which do not indicate either the wreath or the presumed veil. A painter, through either ignorance or inexperience, might well have neglected to paint these details that add meaning to the Marsyas Painter’s image if they were not sketched on the pot that he was painting. Omissions such as these are often indications that a painter copied a picture without understanding the subject or meaning, just as the meaningless arm position of the Eros and the frontal nude woman’s lifted hand on the Toledo pot show that the Painter of Athens 1472 either misunderstood or ignored their intended meanings.

The absence of the iconographic details on the Toledo pot also suggests that the picture was not necessarily copied from a finished “original” image, such as a pattern-book or even another pot which included the wreath, the veil and the animals. Leaving aside the question of the necessity for an “original” source
for all the paintings, it is obvious that the Painter of Athens 1472’s works are derived from the Marsyas Painter’s, rather than *vice versa*. The misunderstood iconography and meaningless poses and gestures are absent from the Marsyas Painter’s paintings. This sort of iconographic degradation has long been recognized as a marker for copies in manuscript painting, where copyists were often not cognizant of the texts they copied.¹⁶

Sketches, of course, are meant to be preliminary and subject to change. For example, on the Marsyas Painter’s vase the seated woman has sketches for curving folds on the hem of her drapery that lie a half inch higher than the painted folds. A fluid curving lower edge of Peleus’ himation was sketched in but never painted. The clothed running Nymph’s neckline was changed, and the fleeing nude’s head was positioned farther left in the sketch, and her falling drapery arcs across the face of the crouching woman. The sketch of this crouching nude’s arms is clearly visible, even though they are completely hidden by the garment she holds out to Thetis. A sketch line is also visible running diagonally across her chest from her right shoulder to her left armpit, and on her upper left shoulder. This was intended to be a thin chain or cord. Pictures of women at their toilettes often show such cords, usually in red, but the seated nude fastening her earring on the back of the Marsyas Painter’s name vase wears just such a cord in gold.¹⁷ However, the differences between the Toledo and London pelikai suggest copyist’s errors rather than changes to the details of an original composition.
Despite the differences, the source of the figures and composition on the front of the Toledo vase is unmistakably the picture on the front of the Marsyas Painter’s vase. The Painter of Athens 1472 has painted a variant of the Marsyas Painter’s pelike, and I believe that both pelikai are from the same workshop. The preliminary sketches were drawn by a skilled draughtsman who indicated the figures and drapery, but not all the finer details. The Marsyas Painter obviously understood the significance of the details — the wreath, animals, and gestures — in identifying the scene as the story of Peleus and Thetis, and added these details free-hand. The Painter of Athens 1472 left them out.

Unlike the fronts, the reverse sides of the two pots are entirely unlike. On the London vase (fig. 19), Dionysos sits somewhat precariously on a surface draped in a himation, with just his toes resting on the ground. He wears only an ivy garland, and holds a thyrsos in his right hand. He is flanked on the left by a satyr, and on the right by a maenad standing in three-quarter front view. She wears a chiton with a deep over-fold, and a curly pony-tail falls from the saccos that binds her hair. She rests her right elbow on a large tympanon, and holds a thyrsos in her left hand. This maenad turns her head left so that her face is seen in full profile as she looks at the satyr to the left of Dionysos. The satyr stands easily, resting his bent elbow on some invisible support, with his lower arm and fingers dangling. The details of his face — bald pate, equine ears, loose curly beard and heavy-lidded eye with a high-arched brow — are carefully drawn. There are preliminary sketch lines for all the figures. The satyr has the sketch for
a garment that was probably meant to be a *nebris*, or fawn-skin, the traditional
dress of Dionysiac revellers, across his chest and hanging below his thigh, but it
was never painted in.

This scene reappears as a translation on a pelike in the Hermitage which
Beazley said was “probably” by the Painter of Athens 1472, and accepted as such
in *ARV*². ¹⁹ It shows Dionysos seated, flanked by a standing satyr and a maenad
holding a tympanon. The satyr on the Hermitage pelike leans to the right toward
the god, with his left foot up on a rock, and so differs from the frontal satyr on
the London vase. Dionysos, however is a duplicate of the Marsyas Painter’s god,
and the maenad, though sloppily painted – especially the horrible left hand –
mimics the London maenad, right down to the unsupported tympanon.

In contrast, the reverse of the Painter of Athens 1472’s pelike has three
typical undifferentiated mantle-men standing beside a short column or altar (fig.
20). There are no sketch lines, the painting is very hasty, and the details are
summary – just two angled slashes with a dot between to indicate the eye, a dot
for the mouth, and merely a blob for the hair.

When Beazley discussed the Orchard Painter’s pot with Jason and the
Golden Fleece, he was moved to lament that “the figures of Jason and Athena
are in an abominable style, *as if the painter had left them to a beginner to line
in*”²⁰ (my italics). This seems to be the relationship that existed between the
Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472. The Marsyas Painter was the
experienced artist in the workshop, and perhaps the draftsman for the sketches
on all the pots. The Painter of Athens 1472 painted over the sketches drawn by someone else.

The iconographical omissions in the Painter of Athens 1472’s work would be explained if he were either an apprentice learning the trade, or an uneducated hack. Although he painted over sketches drawn by a master-draftsman, through either inexperience or ignorance he did not paint anything not explicitly indicated by a preliminary sketch, and so omitted significant details of the picture.21

In addition to sharing a very rare version of the story of Peleus and Thetis, and the similarities in their preliminary sketches, the London and Toledo pelikai are extremely similar in both size and shape. The London vase is 17.25 inches (43.7 cm) tall with a lip 11.25 inches (28.1 cm) in diameter. The Toledo pot is smaller, just under 15 inches (37.2 cm) tall and the mouth just over 8.875 inches (22.2 cm) in diameter, but their profiles, handles, and foot- and lip-profiles are nearly identical. The London pelike’s lip is a bit wider proportionally than the other, and its neck is shorter,22 but they are, for all practical purposes, the same shape. Both are thinly-potted, surprisingly light in weight given their size, and were probably thrown by the same, very skilled, potter.

The ornamental friezes on both pelikai are also very much alike. The decoration on the convex surface of the lip has tongues depending from a very thin black line. On the London vase there is a little dot separating the rounded ends of the tongues, but these are absent on the Toledo pelike. On both vases
the rounded ends of the tongues rest on another very thin black line. The neck ornament on both is divided into two registers, the top one about a third the width of the bottom. The top row on the London vase is composed of tongues between two narrow reserved lines, set directly above an egg-and-dart band that is separated from the picture-field by a third reserved line. This border breaks off at the place where the handles are attached, and the border on the reverse is set lower on the vase than the front border.

A similar egg-and-dart band occupies the lower two-thirds of the neck ornament on the Toledo vase, but the narrow upper register is different – a hastily painted reserved countered billet, roughly rendered as a series of dots offset from one another along two thin black lines above and below the dots. This same ornament occurs as the upper border on the reverse side of the Marsyas Painter’s pelike.

The border ornament below the picture on the Marsyas Painter’s vase is composed of a thin black line between two reserved lines, then groups of four clockwise double meanders alternating with 6x6 checkerboards. This lower border continues all the way around the vase. The Toledo vases’ lower border is
simpler—a band of tongues between thin black lines, separated from the picture above and the background below by thin reserved lines. It also runs continuously around the vase.

Elaborate double palmettes and scrolls decorate the space around the handles of both pelikai. On both, the handle ornament was painted free-hand without preliminary sketches or contour outlines. Both upper and lower palmettes spread fanwise from center medallions shaped like Egyptian papyrus-fans: three-sided shapes with a semi-circular top portion connected to a V-shaped bottom composed of two concave arcs that meet in the center. The depending lower palmette is separated from the upper one by S-shaped volute scrolls that sport one or more plumes or petals from their outer tendril ends. Both painters also include doughnut-like circular ornaments unconnected to the tendrils, and repeat the same decorative schemes on many of their other pots.

OTHER WORKS BY THE MARYAS PAINTER AND THE PAINTER OF ATHENS 1472

Other pots by the two painters furnish more evidence that they worked closely together, and that the Toledo pelike is not the only link between them. Perhaps a dozen pots by the Marsyas Painter survive, some quite fragmentary. The Painter of Athens 1472 has an equally small body of work: seven pelikai, including the Toledo vase, another unpublished one said to have been found with it, and another that Beazley considered “probable”; a lekanis-lid, and three
bell-kraters, two of them fragmentary and the other lost. Two of the pelikai are very minor works of no interest, but two of the other pelikai, a fragment and the lost krater are germane to this study.

The lost krater (fig. 25) is of great importance for its link with the Marsyas Painter’s work. Originally the property of Sir William Hamilton, it passed eventually to the Hope collection, and from there to William Randolph Hearst. In 1964 it was sold to an unknown buyer and has never reappeared. Both the lost krater and the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase show the music contest between Apollo and the satyr Marsyas, another subject that is very uncommon in Athenian vase-painting. Further, the version of the subject that shows Apollo kitharoidos with Marsyas and others as spectators is the rarest of the lot. I know of only one other example. The lost krater is, again, a variant of the Marsyas painter’s work, this time of the painter’s name-vase, a pelike now in the Hermitage (fig. 26). The Marsyas Painter’s vase shows Apollo kitharoidos standing on a low bema, wearing an elaborately decorated robe, and being crowned by a small flying Nike. The god is flanked on the viewers’ right by Marsyas, sitting with his knees crossed and his chin propped on his hand, as if he was contemplating Apollo’s performance. On the left, a nude youth in a Phrygian cap, generally identified as the satyr’s lover Olympos, leans back languorously, with his right arm flung over his head. Above this youth is a seated woman holding a scepter.
and wearing a golden crown. This woman is balanced on the other side of the composition by a young woman, wearing a wreath and holding two flaming torches, who is seated above Marsyas.

On the Painter of Athens 1472’s lost krater, the figure of Apollo is nearly identical to the Marsyas Painter’s, but Marsyas and the nude youth have switched places. The torch-bearer is still seated behind the satyr and the little Nike attends the god, but the woman with the scepter on the right side behind the Phrygian youth has been replaced by Athena (identifiable by her helmet and spear), and a young man (perhaps Hermes) wearing a petasos and chlamys.32 This young man is a virtual twin to the Peleus on the Toledo and London vases, as well as a youth on the Painter of Athens 1472’s unpublished pelike with Poseidon and Amymone now in New York (fig. 27).

The Marsyas Painter’s name vase (in spite of being one of his lesser efforts, its painting being notably hasty) was a more lavish production than the lost krater, as is the London pelike compared to the one in Toledo.33 The name-vase is heavily decorated with gilding on both front and back. Apollo’s kithara, the Phrygian cap, all the jewelry and the Nike’s wings, were gilded. The lost krater had no gilding, although Apollo’s elaborate chiton was painted in added white.

The reverse side of the Marsyas Painter’s name vase (fig. 28) with its scene of women bathing and dressing also has much gilt decoration added for the jewelry and ornamental details.34 Moreover, this scene also provides further
evidence of a link between the *oeuvres* of the two painters. In the center of the picture a nude woman crouches down with her unbound hair thrown forward. Standing in front of her, another woman, wearing a peplos, pours water from a large hydria over the crouching woman’s hair and into her hands. At the far left, a third woman lifts the hem of her prettily-decorated peplos away from a tiny Eros crouching at her feet, his pose mirroring the crouching bather. All these figures occupy the same ground line.

To their right, above the bather, a seated woman whose garment has slipped down around her hips fastens an earring into her right ear. Behind the *hydrophore*, another seminude seated woman bends down to tie her sandal, and behind her another seated woman, facing right but looking to the left, covers the lower half of her face with a veil. The Marsyas Painter repeated the central vignette of crouching bather and hydrophore, reversed so that the bather faces left, in another scene of women adorning themselves on a lekanis lid now in St. Petersburg.³⁵

On both the pelike and the lid, the Marsyas Painter depicted hydrias with concave shoulders and patterned sides. This type of water jug is a metal form, not a pottery one, because the concave shoulder could not support the weight of the neck on a clay jar. The raised outline of the hydria on the name-vase retains traces of gilt, and the hydria on the lekanis lid is fully gilded and has elaborate banded decoration very unlike any painted hydria, but similar to repoussé metalwork.³⁶ Granted that gilding does not always indicate material – Peleus’
petasos on the British Museum pelike is gilded, for example – on the vases with bathers the intent seems to have been to show a metal container.  

Hair-washing scenes extremely similar to the Marsyas Painter’s, one with the bather facing right and the other left, appear on the front of the Painter of Athens 1472’s name-vase (fig. 29), and as part of a more elaborate composition set in the *gynaikeion* on another small pelike in the Hermitage (fig. 30). On both of these vases the hydriae mimic the metal form with concave shoulders, and the Hermitage pelike also has looped sides like the one on the Marsyas Painter’s name vase. The dress and position of the pourers also echo the Marsyas Painter’s women.

By the late 5th and early 4th centuries, scenes of women bathing had become common in several media, with similar conventions. Although both painters followed the traditional *schema* of crouching woman and water-pourer, the Painter of Athens 1472 reiterates the details of the Marsyas Painter’s vignette so closely that the association between them seems even more certain.

The Painter of Athens 1472’s name vase and his Hermitage pelike with a scene in the women’s quarters are important because the Painter of Athens 1472 has excerpted smaller figural groups from the Marsyas Painter’s works. Besides the hair-washing group, the nude woman standing to the left of the hair-washing pair on the name-vase in Athens is another of these figures (fig. 29). Her hair is unbound and she faces fully frontal, holding a conventional mirror in her left hand and raises her right hand to her hair. She has her garment clamped against
her left side with her elbow, but her nude body is fully exposed. A virtual twin of this nude stands to Paris’ right on the Marsyas Painter’s hydria in New York.\textsuperscript{42} Frontal female nudes are rare figures in vase-painting, and they remain rare even after the mid-4\textsuperscript{th} century. These seem to be the earliest known in vase-painting, and their occurrence on both painters’ work reinforces the close ties between them.

At the far left on the Painter of Athens 1472’s very battered Hermitage pelike a woman is standing left, looking right (fig. 30). She is muffled head-to-toe in a himation, with one end drawn over the lower half of her face so that only her eyes and forehead are visible.\textsuperscript{43} Another veiled woman stands frontal on the Marsyas Painter’s beautiful lebes gamikos in the Hermitage,\textsuperscript{44} (fig. 31) and it is this woman’s double, bust-length but wearing the same turban headdress, who peeks through a window into the room on the Painter of Athens 1472’s pelike (fig. 32). Another veiled woman very like her but full-length, reappears on the painter’s unpublished vase with Poseidon and Amymone in New York (fig. 27). An identical figure named Olympias stands at the left on the Panathenaic amphora from the archonate of Theophrastos (340/39 BC), which has been attributed to the Marsyas Painter.\textsuperscript{45} Further, the seated veiled woman at the far left on the Toledo pelike is a mirror-twin of a woman on the back of the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase mentioned above, including the raised hand beneath her veil. Other full-length standing veiled women identical to those of the Painter of Athens 1472 appear on the Marsyas Painter’s lekanis lid in the Hermitage, (fig.
35) and, much-abraded, to the left of Paris on the Athens pelike showing the Judgment of Paris. Like bathers, veiled faces are not uncommon in 4th century scenes of women’s activities. However, the Marsyas Painter’s and Painter of Athens 1472’s women are much more similar to each other in pose and action than they are to any other examples, which usually show veiled women either making assignations or dancing.

To return to the Painter of Athens 1472’s pelike with the scene inside the women’s quarters: another woman is seated just inside the window (fig. 32). Her peplos has slipped down around her hips, leaving her nude to the waist. Her right hand is raised to her hair as she looks into a mirror held in her left hand. This mirror is an unusual shape – instead of circle with a handle, it is shaped like two circles attached at a point on their circumferences so that it could be folded together like a modern powder compact. Ancient mirrors of this type exist – a repoussé bronze one is illustrated in Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmerien. This kind of double-circle mirror also appears on the Marsyas Painter’s hydria in New York, on his fragmentary lebes, on the lekanis lid in the Hermitage, and on a recently-discovered lekanis in Thessaloniki, but not on pots by other painters so far as I have been able to determine.

Clearly, the two painters worked together in the same workshop. The date when the Marsyas Painter was active has been discussed since the painter’s works were first discovered in the 19th century. Traditionally, he was dated to the third or fourth quarter of the fourth century B.C. More recently, Martin Robert-
son and Panos Valavanes have revised the dating, based on the discovery of two Panathenaic amphorae which they each attributed independently to the Marsyas Painter on stylistic grounds.\footnote{51} Both amphorae bear the name of the Archon Kallimedes, who served in 360/59 B.C. Valavanes also assigns the Panathenaic at Harvard with the veiled figure of Olympias, discussed above, to the Marsyas Painter.\footnote{52} This vase has the inscription ΘΕΙΟΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ ΗΡΧΕ, and has been dated by several scholars to the archonate of Theophrastos I, who must have served 340/339 BC.\footnote{53} These attributions would have the Marsyas Painter producing Panathenaics for at least twenty years in mid-century, from 360-340,\footnote{54} and the Painter of Athens 1472’s work certainly falls within this range.

Further support for this mid-century dating comes from a sherd of a bell-krater with a satyr’s head (fig. 33), found at Olynthos.\footnote{55} Beazley noted the fragment, and compared it to the Marsyas on the Painter of Athens 1472’s lost krater.\footnote{56} The two heads are nearly identical, and also very like the Marsyas Painter’s satyr on the London pelike (fig. 2). Olynthos was destroyed by Phillip of Macedon in 348 BC, and the site was never reoccupied. If the fragment was painted by the Painter of Athens 1472, the shard gives a firm \textit{terminus ante quem} squarely in the middle of the period suggested by the Panathenaics attributed to the Marsyas Painter.

It is more than coincidence or shared taste that so many scenes and figures occur in both painters’ work. The duplication of rare scenes and the replication of vignettes and details suggest a close association between them.
Taken together with the similarity of the sketches on the Peleus and Thetis vases, the likeness of the ornamental friezes and the potting, and the time-period when they both were painting, all indications are that the painters must have worked together. This conclusion is reinforced by the similarity of style, subject-matter and shapes of the other vases by the two painters.

In the next chapter we shall examine some more duplicated scenes, and suggest others which should be studied to clarify possible links between their painters.
Unlike the black-figure side of the Boston amphora with Herakles driving a bull, discussed in chapter 3, page 88.

The lines are definitely not traces of grit pulled out of the body itself by the sketch-tool.

The gilded dots are preserved on the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase in the Hermitage, but they were made with the squeeze-bag tool. On the use of such dots see Beth Cohen, “Bubbles Equal Baubles, Bangles and Beads: Added clay in Athenian vase-painting and its significance.” Greek Vases. Images, Contexts and Controversies, ed. Clemente Marconi. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004) 56-71. The Marsyas Painter’s skyphos found at Eleusis (ARV² 1475.8) has an inscription in added gold (fig.9). So far as I know this is unique, as almost all dedicatory inscriptions were incised, suggesting that the skyphos was a commission; see Mon Piot 7 (1900): 30, pl. 14; J. J. Maffre, “Céramique attique à décor mythologique,” BCH Supplement 5 (1979): 68.

The inside is very thinly covered, as if a cloth or sponge had been dipped in slip and swabbed around while the pelike was turned on the wheel.


Pindar, Nemean IV.8, 64-6, mentions fire and a lion, but not the serpent.


For this gesture, see Oakley and Sinos, Wedding 46.

Karlsruhe 75/36, CVA 3, T. 46, 1-3; 47: 1-2 (Deutschland 2992, 2993). LIMC3, pl. 359, Deianeira 4; Rainer Volkommer, “Herakles in the Art of Classical Greece.” Αγαθος Δαιμον, ed. Pascale Lenant de Bellefonds, Janine Balty et al.
(Athens: École Française d’Athènes, 2000), 135.35. J. C. Hoppin attributed a Panathenaic amphora to the painter of the Karlsruhe pelike; see “A Panathenaic Amphora with the name of the Archon Theiophrastos.” AJA 10 (1906): 388-89, 393. Robertson and Valavanis assign the vase to the Marsyas Painter; see page 118, and n. 52 below.

11 Identified as “Eurytion enlève Hippolyte”, St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St.1787; no ARV number. CR 1873, 73 and 87, pl. IV; ABC pl. 53. Stephani said the vase came from Pantikapaion (Kerch). It is contemporary with the Toledo and London vases.

12 A poor later 4th century work, Paris, Louvre CA 2950, no ARV number; see LIMC 7.2 Peleus 59. A Campanian vase of the Lloyd Group also has a very similar running maenad, as well as a second frontal nude: Oxford, OX 1937.383; J. D. Beazley. “Groups of Campanian Red-Figure.” JHS 63 (1943): 93, pl. 8, 1-3; A. D. Trendall, Red-Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1967) pl. 234 #89.


14 Also compare the seated woman (Hera or Aphrodite) on the Marsyas Painter’s pelike with the Judgment of Paris in Athens: Athens, National Archeological Museum 1181, ARV2 1475.5, Para 494; Panos Valavanis. Παναθηναικοὶ Αμφορεῖς απὸ τὴν Ἑρετρία. (Athens: Αθηναίς Αρχεολογικής Ήτταρεία, 1991) pl. 110-13; LIMC 5.2, 240 Hermes 478.

15 Valavanis disputes the authorship of the vase, Παναθηναικοὶ 274-75. The style also recalls the work of the Eleusinian Painter, whom Robertson and Valavanis believed to be the Marsyas Painter in his later years; see chapter 5, 130.

16 In manuscript painting, such omissions and re-use of conventionalized actions in unusual contexts often indicate a copy; see Kurt Weitzmann, Illustrations in Roll and Codex (Princeton: Univ. Press, 1947), especially 151-155.

17 Dyfri Williams and Jack Ogden, Greek Gold. (London: British Museum Press, 1992) 12, shows the woman wearing the golden chain on the reverse of the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase. For a red cord, see a fragment by the Jena Painter, London 1917.7 –26.3. Boardman, ARVC 358.
There are traces of something that was originally below the tympanon, but it is too worn to be recognizable.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum T1874.1, KAB 25n; \textit{ARV}^2 1477.3. When I examined the original photograph sheet at the Beazley Archive I found a note in Beazley’s handwriting: “also compare to Marsyas Painter. attr. to painter of P 17.” P17 is a fragment of a bell-krater by the Painter of Athens 1472 in the Agora Museum in Athens, \textit{ARV}^2 1477.6. Ian McPhee has identified another fragment, P37, as from the same pot.

Beazley, \textit{ARV}^2 524.28; see Chapter 2, page 62 and n. 55.

John Boardman thought this was the painting process in the very large Penthesilea Workshop, “with pots being passed hand-to-hand to complete the decoration.” John Boardman, \textit{History of Greek Vases} (London: Thames and Hudson, 2001) 94. Konrad Schauenburg believed it was conceivable that a workshop owner instructed painters to put the same picture on different vases, probably based on pattern-books. He was unsure about the assumption of workshop association: “...auch bei der Ahnname, daß die verschiedener Maler in derselben Werkstatt arbeiteten, ergaben sich probleme.” Schauenburg, “Repliken” 199, and n. 26. It is also possible that the pots were intended for different types of purchasers, not all of whom cared about the quality of the painting.

The Marsyas Painter’s name-vase has a longer neck – its shape is the same as the Toledo Pelike’s; see Williams, \textit{Greek Gold} 90 fig. 42, and 164 fig. 50.

Where the ornament would interfere with the figures, it is simply dispensed with. Several of the Painter of Athens 1472’s vases have no handle ornament.

The reverse side of the Marsyas Painter’s pelike with the Judgment of Paris (Athens 1181) is in a style unlike his other work, and also has an upper border of horizontal husks or bell-flowers not found on his other pelikai, although similar ornament does occur on the lebes in the Hermitage and the lekanis lid in Thessaloniki. Barbara Philippaki, \textit{The Attic Stamnos} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969) 150-151, felt that stamnoi with the same decorative schemes must have been made in the same workshop, for when the shapes changed so did the decorative borders; she offers no concrete examples. For a similar assumption about workshop practices in Corinth, see J. L. Benson, ”Corinthian Kotyle Workshops,” \textit{Hesperia} 52 (1983): 312 and n. 3; (Benson also noted that he had no specific evidence for the division of labor in workshops). John Oakley felt that the Phiale painter, whom he believes worked in several different shops, painted...
his own ornamental details, (which differ from vase to vase) adding personal
touches to the types of ornament common to the shop where he currently
57.

25 A skyphos unknown to Beazley is in the Michael Carlos Museum at Emory
University in Atlanta. I am indebted to Reneé Stein for this information.

26 Ian Mcphee identified several additional vases not known to Beazley. See
Appendix B.

27 The small pelikai in Paris with a woman’s head (*ARV* ^2^ 1477.3), and in
Cracow with mantle men (*ARV* ^2^ 1477.4), are very poor hack-work.

169, and the Parke-Bernet sale catalog, April 5-6, 1963, 20 # 67. Parke-Bernet’s
successors, Sotheby’s, have no photographs or records of the sale--Dietrich von
Bothmer considers the vase to be lost (D. von Bothmer, private correspondence).

29 See H. Metzger, *Représentations dans la cérámique attique du IV^e^ siècle,*
*BEFAR* 172 (1950): 158-62. Furtwängler had recognized from the drawing in
Tischbein (see Reinach *Repertoire* II, 310 #2), that the Marsyas vase was related
to the lost krater, and believed it also related to the statue of the kitharoidos
from Rhamnous; *FR* ii, 137.

30 St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St 1795, *ARV* ^2^ 1475.3; *Add* ^2^
381.

31 The second example is a different, later version by the less-talented Telos
Painter, formerly in Col. Danson’s collection at Grasmere, now in the Liverpool
Public Museum, #340100; *Para* 491.22 *bis*. The vase retains the basic com-
position of the two others, but without the Nike, and with the Phrygian youth
replaced by Dionysos and two women in decorated chitons. See Tillyard, *Hope
Vases* pl. 169; John Boardman, “The Danson Collection of Greek Vases.”
*Burlington Magazine* 1966.2, 471-3, fig. 44; Boardman, *ARVC* 341.

32 Tischbein, mistaking the badly-drawn petasos for a Corinthian helmet,
identified the man as Ares. This led to some wild speculation about the
iconographic role of Ares in the scene - Graef had even suggested that the figure
was a later addition! See Tillyard 101, 102 n.3. Beazley felt that Overbeck’s
identification of the man as Hermes was correct: J. D. Beazley, *Etruscan Vase-
33 Both the name vase and the London pelike have firm provenances, and in both cases the accompanying grave-goods are quite rich. See Williams and Ogden, *Greek Gold*, 90-91 and 164-6. The lost krater surely came from somewhere in Italy, as Lord Hamilton was its first modern owner. The Toledo pelike’s find-spot is unknown.

34 The drawing is sloppy, especially noticeable in the clothing on the back of the vase. There is also a large lacuna in the background slip-glaze beside the head of the woman fastening her earring, which can be seen very clearly in the detail, Williams and Ogden, *Greek Gold* 12.

35 St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St 1858, *ARV*² 1475.7; *Para* 495; Schefold, *Die Kertscher Vasen* [Bilder Griechische Vasen 3] (Berlin: H. Keller Verlag, 1930), pl. 15; Metzger *Récherches* pl. 37 iv.

36 Schefold, *KV* pl. 15b; and *Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher Vasen* (Berlin: H. Keller Verlag, 1934), Abb. 60 #4.

37 An oinochoe obviously meant to be a clay vessel, but with the same metal form, sits at the feet of the painter honored by Athena on the hydria showing a vase-painting workshop (fig. 12): Milan: HA 278a, ex-Torno Collection. *ARV*² 571.73, *Para* 390, *Add*² 261. See *JHS* 81 (1961), pll. 6 and 7.


40 Amymone holds another concave-shouldered hydria, this one with smooth sides, on the unpublished New York vase (fig. 27).


Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1181, *ARV*² 1475.5. She is either Hera, decently veiled as would befit a married goddess, or Aphrodite if the odd figure behind her who appears to be winged is indeed Eros. For comparison, see the hydria, Munich 2439; Simon and Hirmer GV 160, pl. 240.

For example, see the dancer on a hydria of the Apollonia Group, London, British Museum E 241, *ARV*² 1481.1, *ARVC* 404. Caroline M. Galt. “Veiled Ladies.” *AJA* 31 (1928): 373-93, n. 63, 64. Oakley and Sinos believe that the muffled woman on the Marsyas Painter’s lebes (fig. 31) may be a dancer, citing the position of her foot, but the supposed foot-pointing is due to the angle from which their photograph was taken; see head-on, her foot appears to be flat on the ground; see Oakley and Sinos, 131 n. 6, and their figs. 125 and 126.

Reinach said that Stephani recognized it as “une boîte à miroir,” and gives references to several other known examples; *ABC* 93 and plate XLIII.

The lebes fragments: St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St 1930, KAB 103 P, *ARV*² 1475.2; Valavanes, *Παναθηναϊκοι* pl. 115a; Lekanis lid: St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St. 1858, *ARV*² 1475.7, Metzger *L’imagéries* pl. 37; the new lekanis is Thessaloniki 4880, no *ARV*², Valavanes pl. 120, 121; *Eros Grec.* (Athens: Editions du Ministère de Culture de Grèce, 1989) 103-5.


52 See Bentz, *Panathenaischen* 176, T. 119-120, # 4.081. Martin Robertson believed this amphora was the was the work of the Eleusinian Painter, who is closely allied both stylistically and chronologically with the Marsyas Painter.

53 In 1914 Hoppin had dated the vase, based on the inscription, to the archonate of Theophrastos who served 313/312 BC (see n. 10 *supra*). Several scholars realized that Hoppin (who relied on the meager archon-list available to him at the time) had dated the vase too late. Based on the amphora’s stylistic similarity to a Panathenaic with the name Nikomachos (Alexandria Museum #18238, *ABV* 414.1), who ruled 341/340 BC. Schefold, Beazley and others posited an earlier Archon Theophrastos I, who followed Nikomachos. J. D. Beazley, "Excavations at Al-Mina, Suedia 3." *JHS* 59 (1939): 1- 44; Karl Schefold, *U*. 109, 111-112 and *JdI* 52 (1940): 57; and J. D. Beazley, “Panathenaica.” *AJA* 47 (1943): 462.


55 Martin Robertson stated that “nothing by the Marsyas Painter or his compa-nions” had been found at Olynthos, and commented that “nobody would wish to build on that [fragment].” *AVCA* 283. Given the other evidence, I would at least offer that the fragment has a strong connection with the two painters, and certainly falls within their suggested dates.

CHAPTER 5

OTHER COPIES, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The pelikai in London and Toledo, and the other vases of the Marsyas Painter and Painter of Athens 1472, present a rare opportunity to compare works that are closely aligned by composition and technique. The tiny percentage of Greek painted vases that survive today has not preserved many other copies that are so closely matched. However, other groups of vases survive that demonstrate how similar working practices must have existed in other painting workshops at different times. Some of these will be examined below.

THE ELEUSINIAN PAINTER IN THE MARSYAS PAINTER’S WORKSHOP

The Eleusinian Painter produced vases that should be examined for possible connections with the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472. The Eleusinian Painter’s work is very close in style to the Marsyas Painter, although his existing vases do not repeat scenes from the Marsyas Painter. Beazley attributed three pots now in the Hermitage Museum to the Eleusinian Painter. All three were excavated in the Crimea in 1859 –1860, and all are
lavishly decorated with colored and gilded details. One of these is the Painter’s name-vase, which has an Eleusinian scene with Demeter, Herakles, Triptolemos and several other figures\(^1\) (fig. 35). Its central group of Demeter seated beside a small boy (Ploutos?) holding a cornucopia, is flanked by a female torch-bearer, perhaps Kore.\(^2\) The scrollwork and the borders on the Eleusinian pelike are like those on the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase, (though they differ from those on the London pelike).

Although the Marsyas Painter’s skyphos in Athens\(^3\) (fig. 9) shows the Eleusinian Triad, its composition is completely different from the Hermitage vase, and lacks the subsidiary figures. However, the Eleusinian Painter’s vase is linked both iconographically and compositionally to the Painter of Athens 1472, whose fragmentary lekanis lid in Tübingen has a scene of Herakles among the Eleusinian divinities\(^4\) (fig. 36). The painting-styles are different, but the group of Demeter, boy and maiden on the Painter of Athens 1472’s lid clearly is closely related to the Eleusinian Painter’s group. In both, the seated goddess, adorned with a golden *polos*, necklace and bracelet, holds a scepter in her right hand and her left hand raised in front of her, and she looks over the boy’s head at the torch-bearing maiden. The two groups are nearly identical – the differences between them is that the Painter of Athens 1472’s goddess has her left hand turned palm-inward instead of out, and on the Eleusinian Painter’s vase Kore leans on a column.\(^5\)
A lekanis by the Eleusinian Painter shows preparations for a wedding (fig. 37). On this vase Schefold had observed a herm and noted that it was set up inside the house. On the Marsyas Painter’s lekanis lid in the Hermitage (fig. 38), there is a little herm set on top of a small column beside the woman standing just to the left of the diphros. Henri Metzger stated that these two pots showed the only depictions of such herms known to him that pre-dated the Hellenistic period.

Furtwängler had recognized that the Eleusinian Painter’s two pelikai were the work of the same painter, and believed that the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase was from the same atelier but, “ist zwar nicht so fein...”. Beazley on the other hand, favoring fine drawing over showiness (while realizing that the Marsyas Painter’s name-vase was one of the painter’s lesser efforts), believed the Eleusinian Painter was “connected with the Marsyas Painter, but his work is labored and weak—all the difference.” Martin Robertson and Panos Valavanes both believed that the Eleusinian Painter’s vases, and a Panathenaic Robertson also attributed to him, are so similar to the Marsyas Painter’s style that the Eleusinian Painter must, in fact, be a late stage of the Marsyas Painter rather than a separate person.

Wilhelm Reichhold gave a brief description of the technique on the Eleusinian Painter’s works, in which he mentions the very delicate sketch lines. A thorough examination of the Eleusinian Painter’s pelikai and lekanis to find and analyze the sketches and compare painting techniques to the Marsyas Painter’s
work could help resolve whether they were, in fact, produced by the Marsyas Painter in his dotage, probably in the late 430’s BC, or if the Eleusinian Painter is a separate entity.

ARISTOPHANES AND THE MEIDIAS PAINTER

A fragment of a cup now in the Hermitage Museum15 (fig. 39) that shows a centaur abducting a woman replicates the tondo of Aristophanes’ pair of cups in Boston that were discussed in Chapter 3; the fragment is a nearly-identical translation of Aristophanes’ picture (figs. 15 and 16). Beazley assigned the fragmentary cup to the Manner of the Meidias Painter, who was active ca. 420-410, and believed it was “possibly by the Painter himself.” An examination of the fragments might reveal some technical connection between the Meidias Painter and Aristophanes.16 The potter Erginos signed one of Aristophanes’ Boston cups, as well as Aison’s cup in Madrid with the deeds of Theseus (see below). Furthermore, a connection between Aison and the Meidias painter is generally accepted.17 It would be interesting to see if there are technical similarities between the Boston cups and the Hermitage fragment.

THE DEEDS OF THESEUS ON THREE CUPS CA. 430-415 BC

Aison’s cup is one of the three closely related cups with scenes of the deeds of Theseus that I discussed in Chapter 2 to illustrate the differences between translations and variants of a scene.18 The cup in the British Museum
(fig. 6) is attributed to the Codrus Painter, the Harrow School cup (fig. 7) is unattributed, but near the Phiale Painter in style.\textsuperscript{19} Aison and the potter Erginos signed the third cup in Madrid (fig. 8). Theseus’ other deeds circle the tondi on the London and Harrow cups, and appear on the outside of all three of the cups, while the Madrid cup’s tondo has a plain surround. The separate deeds are fitted nicely to the surface of the cups, though the Harrow cup, because of its smaller size, has only four on the outside. There are also other differences among them – some figures are reversed, or seen from the front on one cup and from the back on another.\textsuperscript{20}

The iconography and styles of the three cups, and the relationships between their painters, have been discussed for years. The tondi in the London and Harrow cups have Theseus on the left, holding a sword and dragging the dead Minotaur out through a doorway that represents the Labyrinth. This is depicted as the pronaos of a building whose wall is represented by vertical ornamental band of meanders. On Aison’s cup, Athena has been added as a bystander on the left side of a similar composition. There is no accord among scholars about the relationships among their painters, nor general agreement about whether the London or Harrow cup is older.\textsuperscript{21} In any case, Aison’s cup is the latest by a generation. I compared and photographed the cups in London and Harrow, and examined them for sketches and other details that might help understand the relationship between them.
Though it is only about 7 inches in diameter, the Harrow cup is nicely painted (fig. 7). Although the tondo scene is sadly abraded, some technical details can still be seen in very low-angle light. There are consistent painted contour outlines throughout. On the inside there are double, needle-thin sketch lines from Phaia’s foot up to the Sow that are now covered by the background slip-glaze. The contour outline is *between* these incised lines and the figure. In this same scene there are also sketches on Theseus’ right arm from the armpit through the biceps, and on his ribcage right beside the contour lines. Kerkyon’s pectorals and right buttock have sketches, as do Theseus’ and Sinis’ lower abdomen and lower ribcage arches. I could find no trace of any sketch lines on the outside scenes, even though the surface is better preserved than inside.

The Codrus Painter’s cup is large (fig. 6), and very weathered in parts, but some sketch lines are visible. They can be seen on Prokrustes’ arms, on Theseus’ right leg where Sinis’ leg crosses in front of it, and very freely drawn on the sow’s withers, ribs and snout in the scenes around the tondo. Theseus, seen from the back in the “Tyrannicide” pose as he confronts the sow, has extensive sketch lines that were never painted in. These sketches are only shallowly incised and even in width, as if made with a round, blunted point. On the rock beside Sinis and his pine tree there is an oval relief-outline with two small arcs projecting outward from the upper third of its circumference. The relief-line draughtsman had, by mistake, drew an outline for Skiron’s turtle with its front
legs extended to be painted here. I could not find any sketch lines beneath the relief lines, and the man-eating reptile itself was never painted.

This mistake suggests that the cup was passed from person to person as each painting step was completed, and because there was no turtle sketch, the relief-line painter mistook one villain’s rock for another. Someone else in the workshop knew where the turtle belonged, so the mistake was caught before the wrong turtle was painted, since the animal appears in its rightful place on the rock under Skiron. The mistake also suggests that the workers were not looking at a picture of the scene as they painted.

The differences in the technical details, and their respective styles, make it unlikely that the London and Harrow cups are products of the same workshop, though it is obvious that they are related through their treatment of the common subject. Their model might have been a famous monumental painting, or as some believe, all three cups might derive from another painted cup.\textsuperscript{24} Whatever the ultimate source, two fragmentary cups in Switzerland must also derive from it.\textsuperscript{25} The villain with the extended arm on Rolf Blatter’s fragment in Bern is so similar to Prokrustes on the outside of the Harrow cup – for example, the graceful bow of the clavicles, and use of two arcs with a central line for the pectorals are identical – that I believe them to be the work of the same painter. An examination for any details on the fragment could help determine whether this is so.
PEITHINOS AND ONESIMOS, A WORKSHOP CONNECTION?

One final group that I believe should be examined dates from the first decades of the 5th century. It includes the great cup in Berlin signed by Peithinos (fig. 21). This cup, whose tondo shows Peleus clasping the gorgeously-robed Thetis, has a smaller fragmentary double that was recovered from the debris on the slope of the Athenian Acropolis (fig. 40). Enough of this fragmentary cup remains to show that the scene in the tondo is, though not identical, a very close translation of Peithinos’. For example, Thetis’ robe is less elaborate on the small cup, but the pose and the meander-pattern of Peleus’ interlocked fingers are duplicated, and so is the lion on his back with the flame-like tuft of hair where his front leg meets his body. As on Peithinos’ cup, the zone around the tondo on the Akropolis cup is undecorated.

This fragmentary cup holds even more of interest, for the outside shows an Iliupersis. The scene with Kassandra being dragged from the statue of Athena is nearly identical to that on the great Iliupersis cup formerly in the J. Paul Getty Museum and now returned to the Villa Giulia in Rome (fig. 41). Dyfri Williams has shown that this huge cup is the work of the painter Onesimos. Eleni Manakidou has argued that the Akropolis fragment was the work of Makron, based on the similarity of the figured peplos on Athena.

This type of richly patterned garment was traditional dress for deities, and Demeter wears an himation with friezes of Pegasoi and men on Makron’s skyphos in the British Museum. However Makron’s pattern, though similar, is
not identical to those on the other two cups. Onesimos’ peplos has one row of Pegasoi and one of runners, plus rows of palmettes and drooping buds like those on vase-friezes; the Akropolis cup has two rows of runners, one male and one female, but no winged horses, and two rows of Greek keys and one of countered billets as on vase-friezes. Makron has painted a garment with much wider registers, with fewer rows of figures widely spaced, and with no floral or geometric vase-painting elements.

A comparison of Peithinos’ figures of Peleus and Thetis with Ajax and Kassandra on Onesimos’ Iliupersis cup reveals many stylistic similarities. They all show wing-shaped eyes, long eyebrows, “Roman” noses and slightly down-turned mouths. Thetis’ question-mark-shaped ear reappears (minus the earring “dot”) on Locrian Ajax. Thetis’ extravagantly pleated chiton and himation also appear on Onesimos’ cup, (fig. 42) admittedly a little less lavishly full, but the two large new fragments found in 2004 illustrate this very well. Both Thetis’ and Kassandra’s hair is rendered as a bun with wavy escaping tendrils silhouetted against a reserved curving line. Unfortunately the Akropolis fragment is missing its rim, where the figures’ heads would appear, and nothing above the lower half of Peleus’ face in the tondo survives.

Though the Villa Giulia cup’s tondo is only partially preserved, it shows the same type of tightly integrated composition adapted to the circular field that Peithinos’ cup does. The Akropolis cup’s tondo composition also seems compact, but the losses make it more difficult to judge. The Iliupersis scene on the outside
is tightly integrated, and the vigorous wide-striding legs contrast effectively with
doomed Astyanax’s limp dangling arms. Although it is much smaller than the
other two cups – the tondo is only about 3.5 inches in diameter – the combi-
nation of scenes reinforces the links between all the cups.

Beazley attributed only one other work to Peithinos, a fragmentary cup
that bore the painter’s signature, but he commented that otherwise one hardly
would have thought it belonged to the same painter. A close relationship
among Peithinos, Onesimos and the painter of the Akropolis cup is suggested by
the Akropolis cup’s simultaneous reflection of the scenes on the other two. I
believe that a close examination of the technique of Peithinos’ cup, Onesimos’
cup and the Akropolis cup, and a further comparison with other works by
Onesimos, might help clarify any connection among them. Further, might
Peithinos’ anomalous second cup have been painted by another person from the
posited workshop?
1. St Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum PAV 8 (St. 1792), *ARV*² 1476.1, *Para* 496, *Add*² 381; *LIMC* II.2, pl. 135 Aphrodite 1371 (A), pl. 753 Athena 456 (B).


3. Athens National Archeological Museum 11037; *ARV*² 1475.8; see *LIMC* 4.2, 592 Demeter 397; Valavanes, *Παναθηναίκοι* fig. 118.

4. Tübingen, S/10 1666 (E183); *ARV*² 1477.7, *Para* 496, *Add*² 381; *CVA* Tübingen 4, pl. 50.1, 51.1- 6. This fragmentary lid has remains of the two horses of the Dioskouroi, surprisingly beautifully drawn. The best-preserved horse, with his rider, closely resembles one of the young knights on the Parthenon frieze.

5. The front of the Eleusinian Painter’s pelike with Zeus consulting Themis, has at the far right a rearing horse carrying a woman and led by a young man in a petasos. The woman, identified by Furtwängler as Selene, the Moon, is semi-nude, seated side-saddle on the horse in an attitude very like the seated woman on the back of the Marsyas Painter’s name vase. See Valavanes, *Παναθηναίκοι* pl. 124.


8. Marsyas Painter, lekanis lid. Hermitage State Museum St. 1858; *ARV*² 1475.7.


See chapter 4, notes 51, 52.

“Die Vorzeichnung ist bei grosser Feinheit wenig sichtbar.” *FR* ii 61; see also 44 and 50.

St. Petersburg, Hermitage [St. 928?]. Attributed to the Manner of the Meidias Painter *ARV*² 1329.116, *Add*² 365; *FR* iii 47, fig. 20; Willi Real, *Studien zur Entwicklung der Vasenmalerei in ausgehenden 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr*. D. Ph. diss. Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, Münster, 1973. #224

Or perhaps they both were inspired by the Parthenon’s South metope 29.

Ursula Knigge has argued that Aison and the Meidias Painter were the same person; see “Aison, der Meidiasmaler? Zu einer rotfigurigen oinochoe aus dem Kerameikos.” *AM* 90 (1975): 123-143. Most other scholars do not accept the argument, but many believe that Aison was the teacher of the Meidias Painter.

See Chapter 3, page 62, and n. 59, 60, and 61.

Harrow-on-the-Hill, Harrow School, Gardner Wilkinson Collection 1864.52. I agree with John Oakley’s assessment that its painter is at least near the Phiale Painter. Oakley, *Phiale* #N7 *bis*. See Ch. 2, n. 60.


For example, Lezzi-Hafter believes the Codrus Painter’s is the earliest, c. 430 BC: “Aison-Kylix”, 67 and n.28; Oakley, following Hudeczek, opts for the Harrow Cup as the earliest version, before 450: *Phiale Painter* 203.

Its size is the one impediment to Lezzi-Hafter’s total acceptance of the cup as the work of the Phiale Painter: “The problem of assigning the Harrow cup lies in its relative unlikeness to the other works of the Phiale Painter because of its small size…” (my translation), Lezzi-Hafter, “Aison-Kylix” n. 26.

Olmos noted that Athena’s lance on the Madrid cup had many fine incised sketch lines. Ricardo Olmos “La Copa de Aison. Ficha Tecnica.” *Coloquio*, 50.

Oakley cites Hudeczek’s idea that the Harrow and London cups derive from a common original cup, and the Madrid cup from a second version of that
original cup: Oakley *Phiale* n. 203. I think perhaps a wall painting, or a pattern-book of some kind would be a more likely source, especially because a fairly large number of examples of the same treatment of the Deeds survive.


26 Cup showing Peleus and Thetis, Berlin 2279; *ARV*² 115.2; *Para* 332; *Add*² 174 (fig. 21).


29 And probably of Euphrénios as potter, although only three unconnected letters of the name remain.


ARV² 115 bottom. Beazley thought this very fragmentary cup (Basle, Cahn 52) might be the work of the Thalia Painter. He also compared another cup fragment from the Akropolis to the Berlin cup, *ARV²* 116, *Add²* 174.

The signatures on the two cups are also slightly different; see *ARV²* 115.1.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This study treats the problem of knowing the relationships among painters in Athenian vase-painting workshops in the Classical period. I have proposed that new insight into this largely unknown subject can be gained by studying the relationships between “copies” of paintings. That is, paintings of approximately the same date, depicting the same or very similar images, but painted by two or more different painters on different vases. I have studied not the style or iconography of the paintings themselves, but the technical steps in the processes used to produce them.

I formulated this study after examining the pelike by Painter of Athens 1472 in the Toledo Museum of Art. This vase copies closely a very rare scene on a pelike by the Marsyas Painter: of more than 350 examples of images of Peleus capturing Thetis, only the London and Toledo vases show this particular version. In addition, the preliminary sketch on the Toledo pelike is better-drawn than the painting, which raised questions about the relationship between the two painters. When I compared the painting and sketch on the Toledo vase with the
Marsyas Painter’s pelike, I found that they were close in technique, but the sketches were much more alike than the paintings. The question to be answered was had one person drawn both sketches, and had the two painters worked together.

The number of surviving Attic vases – perhaps 200,000 – is a very small proportion of the number that were originally made, and the number of these that have extremely similar scenes is quite small. Near-duplicates which do not copy some public monument or literary source that would have been known to all Athenian painters are rarer still. The means of transmission of rare images from one painter to another is unknown.

This study began with an overview of the traditional methods for studying Greek painter vases. It was followed by a confirmation of the connoisseurial method as a valid research tool based on archeological, anthropological and forensic studies. The presentation of a new typology for different types of copies or replicated images on vases, and an explanation of the different steps in the red-figure painting process precedes the study of the vase-paintings themselves.

The examination of duplicate images that were painted by the same painters, including amphorae by Andokides and duplicated cups by Aristophanes, revealed that the sketches under paintings by a particular painter were usually consistent in style and technique. Some of these sketches, which are usually easily visible to the naked eye, were drawn with a thin needle-like tool. Others were done with a stylus made probably of wood or reed that produced more
pencil-like or calligraphic lines. The completeness and detail of the preliminary sketch also varied according to the individual draughtsman. Some were summary, indicating only the general positions of the figures, while others were very detailed. I also compared vases with translations or variations of the same scene by many different painters. These included bilingual amphorae whose black-figure and red-figure sides were painted by different painters. Most of these “copies” by different painters had sketches that were different.

These findings the pelikai in Toledo and London even more unusual. Further research on the two painters revealed that, in addition to the rare version of Peleus and Thetis, more than half of the Painter of Athens 1472’s works published by J. D. Beazley in ARV$^2$ repeated scenes on other vases by the Marsyas Painter. Furthermore, another of these, a version of the music contest between Apollo and Marsyas, is also unique to the two painters.

The two also shared figural groups, and included unusual iconographical details rarely found in other contemporary vase-paintings. Among these are frontal nude women and the depiction of an unusual type of double mirror. Additionally, the extremely similar shapes of the London and Toledo vases suggest that they are the work of the same potter.

It seems clear that the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472 worked together, and that one person drew the sketch on both the Toledo and London pelikai. One sketch was then painted by the Marsyas Painter (who was probably also the draftsman), and one by the Painter of Athens 1472.
On many vases, the details of the different steps in the painting process exhibit an unevenness in quality which indicates that some parts of the decoration were done by people with very little skill. This in turn suggests a division of labor in painting workshops. The more important steps in the painting process would have been done by the most-skilled workers, and others, such as filling in the background, left to the ones with little skill or training.

This type of is consistent with a workshop where a “master-painter” sketched the under drawings on pots. This draftsman probably painted some pots himself, but others were done by less-skilled painters using the “master’s” sketch as a guide. The painting of ornamental details, friezes and the background could have been done by others according to their level of competence. These less-skilled workers might have been slaves, or apprentices or pupils working and training with the “master.”

The duplicated images functioned as a way to teaching painting, as well as a means by which the common images were passed from painter to painter. Such a model of workshop organization has been out of favor as anachronistic, but the division of labor suggested by the technical details of the paintings gives reason to re-examine it in the light of this research.

The two pelikai in London and Toledo present a rare opportunity to compare works that are closely aligned in composition and technique. The luck of survival has given us a small corpus of images by different painters that are closely matched, and a few are mentioned. However, there is need for further
confirmatory evidence before a more definite conclusions about workshop operation can be reached. More research – in St. Petersburg, London, Rome, Athens, Madrid, and wherever such “copies” can be found – is necessary before the problems of painting workshops can have definitive answers.

Many other groups of vases in addition to the ones I have studied closely could carry proof of workshop association in the surviving traces of their painting technique. An examination of the technical details could demonstrate that working relationships like those I believe existed between the Marsyas Painter and the Painter of Athens 1472 were common in Athenian vase-painting workshops from the early fifth century onward. This research has the potential to confirm associations between painters which now are based on the stylistic comparison of finished paintings, and determine whether unexpected connections between painters not linked previously might also exist.
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Figure 19. Marsyas Painter; Dionysos seated between a satyr and a maenad (reverse of the Peleus and Thetis pelike). British Museum 1864.5—30.1. Photo © Trustees of the British Museum 2006.
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Figure 27. Painter of Athens 1472; pelike, Poseidon and satyrs accosting Amymone. New York: private collection. Photo courtesy of Kurt Luckner.
Figure 28. Marsyas Painter; women washing and dressing (reverse of Apollo and Marsyas pelike). St. Petersburg: Hermitage State Museum St. 1795. Photo: Valavanes, Panathenaikoi, fig. 107.
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Figure 34. Potsherd with satyr’s head; from Olynthos. Thessaloniki: Archaeological Museum 38.590. Photo: Robinson, *Olynthus* 13, pl. 121j.
Figure 36. Painter of Athens 1472; fragmentary lekanis lid with Eleusinian scene (detail). Tübingen: University S./10 1666. Photo: CVA Tübingen 4, pl. 51.5 (Deutschland 2568).
Figure 37. Eleusinian Painter; lekanis lid with preparations for a wedding, with herm at left. St. Petersburg: Hermitage State Museum St. 1791. Photo: Oakley and Sinos, *Wedding* (1993) page 76, fig. 45.
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Figure 39. Near the Meidias Painter; fragment of cup with a centaur abducting a woman. Compare to figures 15 and 16 above. St Petersburg: Hermitage State Museum. Drawing: FR iii, 47 fig. 8.
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APPENDIX B

VASES BY THE MARSYAS PAINTER AND THE PAINTER OF ATHENS 1472 ILLUSTRATED IN TEXT, WITH ADDITIONAL VASES IDENTIFIED BY IAN McPHEE

The Marsyas Painter

1. Pelike with Peleus and Thetis. \( ARV^2 \) 1475.4: London, British Museum 1862.5 – 30.1 (E424)........................................................................................................2; 10

2. Reverse of London pelike, with Dionysos, a Maenad and a satyr.................19

3. Skyphos with Eleusinian scene. \( ARV^2 \) 1475.8. Athens, National Archeological Museum 11037...........................................................................9

4. Pelike with music contest between Apollo and Marsyas. \( ARV^2 \) 1475.3: St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St. 1795.................................26

5. Reverse of St. Petersburg pelike, with women bathing and dressing..............28

6. Lebes Gamikos with wedding preparations. \( ARV^2 \) 1475.1. St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum 15592..............................................................31

7. Hydria, (detail) a woman looking into a mirror. \( ARV^2 \) 1475.6. New York, Fromboluti Collection.....................................................................................33

8. Lekanis lid, (detail) with wedding preparations. \( ARV^2 \) 1475.7. St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum St. 1858.................................................38

\(^1\) \( ARV^2 \) 1474; Para 495; Add^2 381
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2. Reverse of Toledo pelike, with three mantle men

3. Pelike in Toledo, details

4. Hydria with Dionysiac scene (attributed). Marseilles, Hauger Collection

5. Bell Krater, the Music Contest Between Apollo and Marsyas. ARV² 1477.5. ex-Hamilton, ex-Hope ex-Hearst, now lost

6. Pelike, Poseidon and satyrs accost Amymone. New York, private Collection

7. Pelike with women washing hair. ARV² 1477.1. Athens, National Archeological Museum

8. Pelike with women bathing and dressing. ARV² 1477.2. St. Petersburg, Hermitage State Museum

9. Lekanis lid fragment with Eleusinian scene (detail). ARV² 1477.7. Tübingen University S 1666

Additional Works of the Painter of Athens 1472 Identified by Ian McPhee


12. Pelike, A: seated Dionysos, maenad, and two satyrs attacking a dancing maenad; B: three mantle men. Torcello 1562.

2. ARV² 1474; Para 495; Add² 381


