Methodology, Bibliography, and Commentary for the Painters in the Study


“Print figures” and “print table 1” cited herein refer to figures and the table in the AJA print-published article.

Appendix 1: Methodology

ASSUMPTIONS

This study of the productivity of Attic vase painters begins with three underlying assumptions. First, the attributions made by Beazley and other scholars are in large part reliable, although permitting a degree of uncertainty and occasional mistakes. Second, the chronological framework for Attic vases is accurate enough for individual career lengths to be estimated within several years of the reality. Third, the collection of vases studied by Beazley and his successors is a relatively unbiased sample of the total Attic pottery production from the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. The results of this study suggest that these assumptions are not problematic.

On the first assumption, the validity of attribution as a process is supported by the facts that more than 40 of the most prolific painters produced 7–10 works per year and that many of the less productive hands belonged to potters. Despite past criticism of the method of attribution, it is difficult to imagine how these results could have been attained if the hands examined here were artificial constructs. If attribution were an arbitrary process, each identity would have a random number of works. While this reasoning might sound circular, the confirmation is actually from two independent sources: the lists of attributions and the time span over which these works were produced. Since the chronology has been determined by external evidence—such as archaeological contexts, broader stylistic developments, and parallels with other arts—we can say that the chronology generally confirms the number of attributions for each hand.

This confirmation applies only to the well-defined hands. The results of this study emphasize that Beazley tended to “overdivide” the vases whose authorship is unclear. The methodology of attribution begins with each side of an Attic vase potentially mapping to a different painter—so, for example, 40,000 vases could equal 80,000 painters. Identifying unique stylistic features connects multiple works to an artisanal identity. The linkages within the works of the major painters are well defined, but Beazley’s work was far from complete. The uncertainty in the linkages for the bulk of the Attic material is evident in the hundreds of minor painters and groups, many of whom were “followers” or in the “circle” of a prolific hand. New relationships may be demonstrated with future study, but most of these minor hands will probably remain ambiguous. Beazley also lumped together many low-quality vases, such as more than 1,000 in the manner of the Haimon Painter, which are unlikely ever to be sorted into individual hands. As a result, minor painters have been excluded from this study because we have little reason to believe that any of these designations actually correspond to one artisan.

As for the second assumption of this study, the internal chronological framework for Attic vase painting cannot be tested by comparison with the number of attributions. However, it is of interest that there are no periods when average productivity markedly rises or drops for specialist painters. When working full-time, Attic painters appear to have decorated about the same number of vases each year throughout the 125-year period when specialists were painting in the black-figure and red-figure techniques. There must have been differences for specialists in some types, such as Little Master cups, but as a whole the

1 Beazley employed a Morellian technique to identify individual hands of anonymous painters, describing the method in some detail in two articles (Beazley 1922, 1927) defining the characteristics of the Berlin and Antimenes Painters; see also Kurtz 1985; von Bothmer 1985a, 13; Turner 1996, 26–7. Scholars of the following generations have defended his method’s validity and articulated in detail the characteristics of many painters, especially in response to the controversial hypotheses of Gill and Vickers (Robertson 1976, 29, 32–40; 1985, 19, 25–7; 1992, 4–5; Gill 1988a, 1988b, 1991; Gill and Vickers 1990, 1995; Vickers and Gill 1994, 85–9; Williams 1996; Neer 1997, 16–25, 25–6; Whitley 1997; Oakley 1998; 1999; 2004a, 69–71; 2005, 605–6; Rouet 1999; Boardman 2001, 128–38). Beazley certainly was fallible, but only a small portion of his attributions have been vacated. Most debate has concentrated on pieces about whose attribution Beazley himself was unsure.
industry turned out a relatively consistent product regardless of technique. The only chronological adjustments that might be warranted are in the careers of individual artisans.2

On the third assumption, the collection of about 40,000 published vases and sherds appears to be relatively unbiased. Beazley attempted to catalogue all vases and fragments, regardless of their quality. Most attributed Attic vases are held by museums, especially those vases in Beazley’s lists and the CVA series, with the result that relatively few of the attributed finds are from recent documented excavations. Pots from graves are certainly better represented than pots from any other type of context, because they tend to be better preserved and are more attractive to purchasers. The collection is a subset of the whole body of Attic material, less than half, but it is a sizeable fraction of the vases that can be attributed at all.3 Statistically, it is a very large sample, and it is unlikely that the relative proportions of attributions by each painter in this study would change much even if we had reliable attributions for all known vases and sherds. Only Makron stands out as potentially overrepresented because of the special attention of one collector.

TALLYING SYSTEM

The study depends on a consistent method for counting attributions and estimating career dates for each artisan. All painters with more than 150 possible attributions are included in the study, as are the best-studied individuals with fewer than 150 attributions.

Most of the vases in this study were identified by Beazley himself. However, monographs and dissertations from the past 40 years have refined the attributions for many individual painters and groups and in most cases supersede Beazley’s lists. All other things being equal, a study of an Attic painter published in 2005 will inevitably have more catalogued works than will a similar study from 1975. To level the discrepancies from the time of publication, attributions through 2011 have been included in this study. The richest sources are recent museum catalogues of vases, especially the CVA. Final excavation volumes contain relatively few new attributions and are dominated by the pottery catalogues from the Athenian Agora and the Kerameikos. Because the quantity of material is overwhelming, and some of the newer attributions are disputed, the tallies analyzed here are only approximations.

Almost every painter has some associated works whose authorship is uncertain. Beazley used a variety of phrases to designate uncertainty, such as “near” or in the “manner of” a particular painter, group, or vase. He never wrote a complete glossary, and it became apparent during the compilation of this study that he did not always apply his terminology consistently. For the purposes of this project, the various shades of meaning are less important than whether Beazley thought the vase might be from the hand of the painter himself. Generally these are the works listed as “near” a painter, which Beazley appended to the main list of attributions. The “near” works have been tallied as “uncertain” attributions here, with some exceptions.4

Many of Beazley’s other categories of relationship, such as “related to” or “manner of,” imply that a vase was painted by a different artisan. Of the vases falling under the category “manner of,” Beazley writes:5

[T]he list may include (1) vases which are like the painter’s work, but can safely be said not to be from his hand, (2) vases which are like the painter’s work, but about which I do not know enough to say that they are not from his hand, (3) vases which are like the painter’s work, but of which, although I know them well, I cannot say whether they are from his hand or not. Sometimes I make the situation clear, but more often I do not.

In this study, a vase in the “manner of” a painter has been tallied as an “uncertain” attribution only in the rare cases where Beazley wrote that it fell into his second or third category. Vases in the first category have not been counted.

---

2 Rotroff (2009) recently down-dated the introduction of red-figure to ca. 520 B.C.E. through the analysis of the Athenian Agora contexts, bringing the attribution rates for Oltos and the first three phases of Epiktetos’ career in line with the rest of the specialist painters. If Oltos and Epiktetos had started at 525 B.C.E., as in the conventional chronology, their attribution rates would be slightly above the norm.

3 Beazley catalogued ca. 34,000 vases and fragments, whereas a recent search of the Beazley archive (www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/xdb/ASP/default.asp) returned almost 80,000 records. The new material is dominated numerically by the recent publication of large quantities of context material from excavations. The total numbers of Attic sherds are even higher than half, but it is a sizeable fraction of the vases that can be attributed at all.

4 “Beazley Addenda,” xviii–xix. Throughout his catalogues, Beazley uses “near” to designate the works that he thought but could not be sure belonged to the painter. However, he occasionally used the word “near” to compare separate hands, so “near” works that Beazley clearly believed were by another artisan have been excluded here.

5 ABV, x; Paralipomena, xviii–xix.
Several painters in this study have been affected by the lack of clarity surrounding works classified in their manner. The chapter on Lydos includes numerous sherds that Beazley was unable to attribute specifically but that may have belonged to Lydos himself, his companion the Painter of Louvre F6, or their minor associates. As a result, these two major hands are probably undercounted in this study relative to more distinctive hands.\(^6\) Beazley left the Antiphon, Beldam, Emporion, and Tarquinia Painters all with relatively long “manner” lists or other problematic attributions, and the situation is similar with the recent monographs on the Griffin-Bird, Red-Line, and Niobid Painters. These painters have relatively low attribution rates, ranging from 5.2 to 7.1. The Antiphon Painter would almost certainly have been as productive as a typical specialist if some of the 126 undifferentiated works in his manner could be demonstrated as his own.\(^7\) The low rates of any of these painters could be due to the problem of identifying their works.\(^8\) Nonetheless, a high proportion of “manner” attributions does not guarantee that a painter has been undercounted.

**Preservation Bias**

Despite the assumption that most of the tens of thousands of Attic vases now in museums are a randomized, largely unbiased sample of the production of individual painters, there are several exceptional contexts that appear to have a much higher preservation rate than that of other Attic vases. Although these sherds make up a small percentage of the total, they have introduced a significant preservation bias into the corpus for several painters in this study. Most are from Athens, and there is at least one unusually rich context in Thasos.

**Athens, Kerameikos Deposits**

The foremost example is the collection of more than 160 sherds purchased by the Friedrich Schiller University of Jena in the 1850s. Traced to excavations at Hermes Street near the Kerameikos, the deposit has been interpreted as a stock of vases ready for sale.\(^9\) This single deposit from ca. 400 B.C.E. contains more than half of the known works by the Jena Painter—only a few dozen of his vases come from outside Hermes Street. The almost 100 works from the Hermes Street deposit make the Jena Painter’s corpus statistically unlike that of most Attic painters, whose lists have been assembled from dozens or hundreds of different contexts with no more than a few vases in each. Consequently, any collection of material with a high concentration of figured pottery—in particular, numerous works in a single hand—must be excluded or adjusted.

There are two other contexts from Athens that appear to come from concentrated debris of workshops or pottery merchants. Most of another assemblage excavated at the Thission metro station in Athens, near the Kerameikos, was purchased in the early 1900s by the University of Bonn museum.\(^10\) The collection of more than 460 sherds includes misfires, and the deposit is interpreted as discards from one or more kiln firings between ca. 420 and 400 B.C.E., although there is also a small quantity of earlier material. The Painter of the Athens Dinos is dominant, with fragments from at least 50 vases, yet he has only two attributions from outside this large deposit. Consequently, he and the Jena Painter have been excluded from this study. Both appear to have been relatively minor figures whose works are much better preserved through accidental discovery than those of most other Attic painters. The third concentrated deposit is at Marathon Street 2.\(^11\) Although it includes several sherds by the Brygos Painter, it is a minor percentage of his corpus and has not been treated specially in this study.

**Athens, Sanctuary of Nympha**

The Sanctuary of Nympha, to the south of the Acropolis, may be the richest context of Attic figured vases yet excavated. Hundreds of thousands of sherds, including large numbers of nuptial loutrophoroi, are reported from the 1950s excavations of the unusual deposit.\(^12\) Hundreds of thousands of Attic vases ready for sale.\(^9\) This single deposit from ca. 400 B.C.E. contains more than half of the known works by the Jena Painter—only a few dozen of his vases come from outside Hermes Street. The almost 100 works from the Hermes Street deposit make the Jena Painter’s corpus statistically unlike that of most Attic painters, whose lists have been assembled from dozens or hundreds of different contexts with no more than a few vases in each. Consequently, any collection of material with a high concentration of figured pottery—in particular, numerous works in a single hand—must be excluded or adjusted.

There are two other contexts from Athens that appear to come from concentrated debris of workshops or pottery merchants. Most of another assemblage excavated at the Thission metro station in Athens, near the Kerameikos, was purchased in the early 1900s by the University of Bonn museum.\(^10\) The collection of more than 460 sherds includes misfires, and the deposit is interpreted as discards from one or more kiln firings between ca. 420 and 400 B.C.E., although there is also a small quantity of earlier material. The Painter of the Athens Dinos is dominant, with fragments from at least 50 vases, yet he has only two attributions from outside this large deposit. Consequently, he and the Jena Painter have been excluded from this study. Both appear to have been relatively minor figures whose works are much better preserved through accidental discovery than those of most other Attic painters. The third concentrated deposit is at Marathon Street 2.\(^11\) Although it includes several sherds by the Brygos Painter, it is a minor percentage of his corpus and has not been treated specially in this study.

**Athens, Sanctuary of Nympha**

The Sanctuary of Nympha, to the south of the Acropolis, may be the richest context of Attic figured vases yet excavated. Hundreds of thousands of sherds, including large numbers of nuptial loutrophoroi, are reported from the 1950s excavations of the unusual deposit.\(^12\) Hundreds

\(^{10}\) Maffre 1972, 1982, 1984, 2001; Monaco 2000, 82–5, 211–12. More than 200 fragments were excavated at the outskirts of the Kerameikos, of which ca. 10% are cups painted by the Brygos Painter and his circle. The Brygos Painter has six attributions; removing them would reduce his attribution rate to 9.3 from 9.5 works per year (see appx. 2). Myson, Onesimos, and the Triptolemos Painter each have one attribution.

of the fragments have been attributed by Beazley and later scholars. The Washing Painter is the best represented, with at least 230 secure and 21 uncertain attributions from the sanctuary. The Gorgon Painter, the Polos Painter, Lycos, the Painter of Louvre F6, the Theseus Painter, the Pan Painter, Hermonax, and the Sabouroff Painter also have relatively high numbers of attributed fragments from here (see print fig. 1). Unfortunately, the publication of the material is incomplete, particularly the more numerous red-figure fragments. Although a monograph on the sanctuary’s black-figure material was recently published, Fritzilas subsequently catalogued 86 new black-figure attributions for the Theseus Painter.14

The circumstances of the find at the Sanctuary of Nymphe are unique. The major surviving installation is an Early Classical elliptical peribolos wall, 10.5 x 12.5 m, over an older altar; both were disrupted by Roman houses that must have removed much of the earlier deposit.15 The sherds were concentrated in layers up to 1 m thick inside the peribolos and up to twice as thick outside its walls. Finds were chronologically mixed within the deposit, ranging from the seventh to late third centuries B.C.E.16

The rich deposit is most problematic for the Washing Painter, whose roughly 250 fragments from this single context outnumber the approximately 200 pieces by him from all other places. His attribution rate excluding this context is below seven works per year but jumps to more than 15 attributions per year when the context is included. To look at the problem another way, if these 250 fragments represented only 1% of the original number of Washing Painter loutrophoroi at the Sanctuary of Nymphe, the Washing Painter would have had about 25,000 of the vases at this site alone—and twice as many if the recovery ratio were closer to 0.5%. Including the loutrophoroi by other painters, the original numbers implied by a 1% recovery ratio might be in the millions.

Obviously, the 0.5–1.0% recovery ratio does not apply to this particular context. Unfortunately, it is impossible to develop a reliable estimate for how many actual loutrophoroi are represented by this mass of fragments at the Sanctuary of Nymphe. Many thousands of vases could have been dedicated during the 180 years between the time of the Gorgon and Washing Painters, and the loutrophoroi must have been periodically smashed and the fragments packed into the peribolos to make room for new dedications by Athenian brides. While it is tempting to exclude the deposits from this study altogether, this would introduce a significant bias against the nine painters who, owing to the fortuitous discovery of this sanctuary, are known to have decorated many of these nuptial vases.

To reconcile the Sanctuary of Nymphe with other places, only 20% of the attributed fragments have been counted in this study, as if the recovery ratio were five times the norm.17 Although arbitrary, this adjustment reconciles the fact that the deposit is incomplete and thus may be only a fraction of the total number of vases dedicated at the sanctuary. It is still richer than most contexts with Attic vases. With this compromise, during his three decades the Washing Painter would still have decorated the equivalent of 5,000–10,000 loutrophoroi. If distributed evenly throughout his career, he would have painted on average about 200–400 loutrophoroi per year, whereas the Theseus Painter, the second most prolific painter of the type, would have decorated about 50–100 per year. The 20% adjustment is a necessary compromise if the loutrophoros painters are to be included in the study at all, and it brings the attribution rates for the Washing and Theseus Painters in line with those of other painters.

It is important to point out that most Attic painters have no loutrophoroi from the Sanctuary of Nymphe (fig. 1). Consequently, the exclusion of the nine painters who did decorate the type would have no significant effect on the results of this study. Only the Theseus and Washing Painters have very large numbers of sherds from the sanctuary.

**Athens, Acropolis**

The second place that requires special treatment is the Acropolis itself. Although many of the attributions from the early excavations do not have specific context records, the deposits from the Persian sack of 480 B.C.E. and the subsequent

13 www.ajaonline.org/article/1649; see also appx. 2 on these painters. Beazley (Paralipomena, xvii) was the first to attribute many fragments from the sanctuary.

14 The catalogue by Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou (1997, 193–96, 200–1) includes only four fragments by or “near” the Theseus Painter. See appx. 2 on the new attributions in Fritzilas 2006.

15 See the accounts in Miliadis 1957; Travlos 1971, 361. Because of the later disruptions, the archaic sherds from outside the main sanctuary deposit are assumed to have originated from the sanctuary layers (Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou 1972, 185–87).

16 Miliadis 1957, 26; Orlandos 1957, 11; Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou 1972, 185–87; Tsoni-Kyrkou 1988, 225.

17 For all the calculations, 20% of the attributions to a painter from the sanctuary are counted in his career tally, and all fractional values are rounded up. Thus, a painter with one or two sherds from the sanctuary is still given one attribution.
renovations appear to have contained the preponderance.19 Figure 1 shows that all the best-represented painters from the Athenian Acropolis were active by the time of the sack. The Euergides Painter, the Theseus Painter, Makron, and the Eucharides Painter each have at least 30 attributions from the Acropolis, while the Polos Painter, Lydos, the Berlin Painter, the Kleophrades Painter, the Brygos Painter, and Syriskos each have at least 10. In contrast, more than half of the painters whose careers began after the Persian sack have no fragments identified from the Acropolis, and only the Pan and Calliope Painters have more than 10 attributions.19 Among the painters considered in this study, those active in the Archaic period have eight times as many fragments from the Acropolis as do painters active in the Classical period.

These data indicate that the recovery ratio for vases dedicated on the archaic Acropolis is higher than normal. A correction is a necessary, if arbitrary, measure. Because the attributions are not as dramatically concentrated as at the Sanctuary of Nymphé and because the Acropolis is a much larger and more complex site, only two-thirds of the attributions from the Acropolis have been discounted for painters active before 480 B.C.E. This measure brings the maximum number of Archaic attributions belonging to a single painter, the Euergides Painter, down from 43 to 15, which is still high but is more consistent with the quantities observed after the Persian sack. The attributions for painters who began working after 480 B.C.E. have not been adjusted.

Athens, Agora

Another site of potential preservation bias is the Athenian Agora, where pottery production continued through the Classical period. However, as revealed in figure 1, the material is relatively evenly distributed among all the painters in this study, and few have more than seven secure attributions. Only the Polos Painter, Lydos, the Gela Painter, and the Theseus Painter have more than 10 secure attributions from the Agora. Because most painters have only a few attributions, a general adjustment is not warranted. However, two Agora contexts, both rich in debris associated with pottery production, are potentially overrepresented.20

The first, the Rectangular Rock-Cut Shaft, was a 20 m deep stratified deposit whose upper 12 m accumulated during the first two decades of the fifth century B.C.E.21 The debris included evidence of pottery production, such as misfired vessels and fragments reported to contain pigment. From the current study, only the Gela and Theseus Painters had a significant number of sherds attributed from the context.22 The second problematic context is the Stoa Gutter Well, the richest ceramic deposit in the Agora. Packed with sherds primarily dated to ca. 520–480 B.C.E., a portion of the debris originated from pottery workshops.23 Epiktetos, the Edinburgh Painter, and the Gela Painter are the only artisans in this study who are represented in the well. As with the archaic Acropolis attributions, only one-third of the sherds from these two unusually rich Agora deposits have been counted in the figures in this study.

Thasos, Agora

One context outside Athens has been singled out for preservation bias, the Artemision near the Agora of Thasos.24 Excavations since 1958 at the site recovered tens of thousands of sherds dominated by Attic black-figure imports. The sanctuary accounts for more than half of the attributions from Thasos to painters in this study. Accordingly, only one-third of these attributions are counted for the C, Taras, Heidelberg, Griffin-Bird, Theseus, and

20 If the unusually high numbers of attributions from the Athenian Acropolis for archaic painters are connected to the Persian sack, the Pan Painter’s 15 works might fit the pattern. Although scholars recently have placed the beginning of the Pan Painter’s career at ca. 480 B.C.E., some early works were once dated to ca. 490 (e.g., CVI Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1 [Great Britain] 3, 26, 44). Because the Calliope Painter also has as many fragments from the Acropolis, dating the Pan Painter’s career to well before 480 seems unnecessary, and the lower dating system has been retained in this study. Eliminating 10 of the Pan Painter’s 15 Acropolis attributions would lower his production rate to well below normal (see appx. 2).
21 Monaco 2000, 34–54, 185–86, 242. A third deposit, the rich debris from a public dining area (Pit H 4:5), has not been adjusted in this study. A small pit contained material from 475 to 425 B.C.E., which was in large part broken and discarded ca. 425 (Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 2–10). Although the context included sherds attributed to several painters in the study, the best represented, Hermonax and the Villa Giulia Painter, have only four each. For this reason and because of its wide chronological range, the deposit has not been adjusted, despite the modest potential for overrepresentation. See also the commentary on Myson in appx. 2.
22 Vanderpool 1946; Moore and Philippides 1986, 331–32.
23 Vanderpool 1946, 266, 269. See also the commentary on these painters in appx. 2.
24 Thompson 1955, 62–6; Moore and Philippides 1986, 335; Roberts and Glock 1986, esp. 4. For the painters represented in the deposit, see the respective commentaries in appx. 2.
25 Daux 1958, 808–13; Maffre and Salvat, 1976, 774, 781; Maffre 1979, 11–12.
Centaur Painters. Attributions from elsewhere in Thasos, which was a major importer of Attic vases in the sixth century B.C.E., have been tallied normally.\textsuperscript{25}

**CHRONOLOGY**

Establishing a consistent approach to chronology has been a challenging part of this project. Most of the best-known painters have published career ranges, but scholars often disagree substantially over start and end dates. To resolve discrepancies in published career lengths, monographs and other comprehensive studies of individual painters have been favored. Ideally, an author of a monograph or dissertation has examined the entire oeuvre of a painter and built a chronology from context evidence, comparisons to the monumental arts, datable stylistic features, and vase shapes. Individually dated works then form the framework for establishing a painter’s period of activity.

However, there is probably a delay between when an artisan first began painting and when he reached the full rate of production. The dates favored here represent the beginning and end of major activity for the painter, not the widest range of dates possible. For example, Oakley has identified the decade of 470–460 B.C.E. as the beginning for the Achilles Painter.\textsuperscript{26} There is

\textsuperscript{25} A total of 22 sherds from the Athenaion near the Acropolis of Thasos have not been adjusted.

\textsuperscript{26} Oakley 1997.
substantial evidence that the Achilles Painter was in full production by ca. 460 B.C.E., whereas only a few works could be as early as 470. Because very few of his works are dated in the 460s, the date 465 B.C.E. has been selected as the beginning of his full production, despite the possibility that the Achilles Painter decorated some vases in the years before. Some painters in this study lack any published career range. In these cases, individually dated works, in particular those published in recent editions of the CVA, are the basis for assembling a provisional chronology. Of the painters not studied in an individual monograph or its equivalent, only those for which there are at least 20 dated works have been included in the figures in this study.

While the chronological resolution for individual vases is not higher than 10- or 5-year intervals, it is possible to achieve a somewhat finer resolution when viewing the whole career of a prolific painter. Scholars often describe an artisan as active “a few years” or “some time” before or after a calendar date rounded to 5 years. Evidence for activity before or after a 5-year calendar date has been symbolized with a greater-than or less-than sign in print figures 1, 2, and 4. In the calculations, this is interpreted as 2.5 years. For example, a painter with nine works dated to ca. 470 B.C.E., 10 to 470–460, 12 to 460–450, and two at midcentury was probably active at least 20 years (470–450), but the nine early pieces suggest he may have begun painting regularly as early as ca. 475 B.C.E. The resulting career spans 25 years. If the same painter had only three to five works dated to ca. 470 B.C.E., then he is assumed to have worked for only the final years of the 470s, for a total career of 22.5 years in the calculation of the attribution rate. Print figure 7 presents a more nuanced picture of the chronology by plotting the range of possible beginning and end dates with dashed lines.

This approach is effective for painters with relatively long careers, but it tends to exaggerate the career lengths of painters active for fewer than two decades. For example, a painter with only 20 attributions, all dated within 450–440 B.C.E., would appear to have worked 10 years for an attribution rate of two works per year. However, the imprecision in his chronology makes it impossible to determine whether the painter had actually been active for only three years, which would triple his attribution rate to give him more than six vases per year. The imprecision of the chronology obscures any meaningful assessment of such a painter’s productivity by both blurring his period of activity and depressing his apparent attribution rate. This effect has probably reduced, although more subtly, the apparent productivity of the moderately productive specialist painters (see print fig. 2) with 100–150 works, such as the Painter of London D12 and the Veii Painter.

**STATISTICAL RESULTS**

The statistical analysis reveals a remarkable regularity in the attribution rate. For the prolific hands presented in print figure 1, the attribution rates across the group are very homogenous. Overall, the number of years an Attic painter worked has a strong linear correlation to his number of attributions. The Pearson’s $r$-coefficient, which measures linear dependence, is a very strong 0.94. The group has an average attribution rate of 8.2 with a standard deviation of about 0.68. The latter measurement is close to what should be expected from the uncertainties in the total number of works by each painter, his actual career length, and the rounding to 2.5-year intervals. Simulating these conditions on a set of randomized “painters” produces a distribution with a standard deviation of 0.60.27

The adjustments to counteract preservation bias do not appear to have affected these results. Only two painters have relatively large adjustments to counteract preservation bias. Counting all their works from the Sanctuary of Nymphae and elsewhere would give the Washing and Theseus Painters 14.9 and 12.0 vases per year, respectively. Excluding these two and Makron, whose high annual productivity can be explained by other factors, the adjustments for preservation bias have no significant effect on the results for the remaining 33 painters. The group’s overall attribution rate and standard deviation rise to 8.77 and 0.70, respectively. The modest increase in the attribution rate should be expected, since more vases are being counted. That variance in the data is higher without the preservation adjustments, which have been targeted only at the few contexts that are likely to have been overrepresented, indicates that these corrections are effective.

---

27 The simulation was conducted by the following procedure: a group of simulated painters are assigned random career lengths between 15 and 45 years (rounded to the nearest integer), and each painter’s total number of works is determined by multiplying the career length by 8.2 (vases per assigned year of activity). Next, the career length is rounded to 2.5 years, and the attribution rate is recalculated from these new career lengths (already raising the standard deviation to 0.23). Next, to simulate uncertainty in the chronology and attributions, a ±5 random error is introduced into the career length; a ±15 error is introduced to the total number of vases; and the attribution rates are recalculated. With more than 10 random trials for 50 painters, the standard deviation is ca. 0.60. Although ±5 years may seem large for career error, in practice the career length blurred by random error seldom differs from the original by more than 2.5 years.
The 2.5-year resolution for the chronology is also defensible. If, for the sake of argument, we round the career lengths of the painters in the study to 5-year intervals, the distribution of attribution rates becomes less regular. The linear correlation between years worked and number of vases drops to 0.888, which is still significant; the average attribution rate rises to 8.54; and the standard deviation is a much higher 0.995. The attribution rate increases slightly because most painters have their careers lengthened by the 2.5-year resolution in the study. That the distribution is more regular at the finer chronological resolution indicates that the 2.5-year interval is a legitimate refinement, at least for most painters.

The correlation between years worked and total number of attributions is even stronger when we add the information about a painter’s mode of activity. If we examine only specialist painters, excluding hands with a large number of problematic attributions, there are 38 artisans from print figures 1 and 2 whose annual production ranges from 7.4 to 9.5 vases. The average rate for these specialists rises to 8.3 vases per year, a consequence of filtering out a few underperforming atypical painters like Epiktetos. The standard deviation drops to 0.58, and the linear correlation (r-value) is strengthened to 0.974. When focused only on clear specialists, the data match almost exactly the simulated distribution. We may safely conclude from this analysis that specialist painters worked at consistent rates.

COMMENTARY ON THE INDUSTRY-WIDE ANALYSIS

In print table 1, a critical measurement is the number of vases attributed for each 25-year period between 600 and 400 B.C.E. Although Beazley attempted to include all Attic vases from the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E., the following generations of scholars have significantly expanded his lists of attributions. Thus, an attribution rate of 8.3 for specialist painters is based on publications up to 2011, and so the raw, unadjusted figures from Beazley’s catalogues are inappropriate for comparison with the industry as a whole. Furthermore, the expansion in the corpus of attributed vases varies by period. Since Beazley’s time, more vases have been published from the sixth century B.C.E. than from the Late Archaic and Classical periods.

Thus, for print table 1, the method for counting the total attributed Attic vases has been tailored to match the conditions of the study of individual painters. For each 25-year period, the initial tally begins with Beazley’s catalogues of vases, regardless of the type of attribution. To compensate for the new attributions since Beazley’s death, the tallies from each quartile have been adjusted upward. The adjustment has been determined by the expansion in the corpus of the painters active in each period. That is, the adjustment is based on the ratio of a painter’s final tally in 2011 to his final tally in Beazley’s Paralipomena in 1971. An average expansion of 10–15% is typical among the fifth-century painters in this study, but it often exceeds 50% for those active at the beginning of the sixth century. Thus, 50% has been added to the Beazley counts for the first quarter of the sixth century, stepping down to +25% by the last quarter of the century and +12% for all of the fifth century B.C.E. These adjustments, which have been based on the final tallies of studied painters, also compensate roughly for preservation bias. In other words, the 38,830 vases in print table 1 do not represent a true count of all Attic pots with figure decoration but rather an approximation of the conditions imposed in this study.

A final note on print table 1: the population of specialist painters has been determined by assuming that at least half were prolific enough to be detected in this project. That is, print figure 7 would show us about half of the actual specialist painters active in each period. Assuming an
average attribution rate of 8.3 vases per year for these specialists, we can estimate the number of vases they painted for each 25-year interval. Next, the number of potter-painters is calculated from the extra vases in each quartile that are beyond the productive capacity of the estimated cohort of specialists. While the productivity of a potter-painter is highly variable, an average annual rate of 3.0 for the group is plausible. Because the rate of 3.0 is more of an educated guess based on the limited data considered here, the population of potter-painters is more speculative than that of the specialist painters.

The Population of Attic Painters and the Recovery Ratio

Starting with Beazley’s corpus, Cook proposed two methods to determine the ancient population of Attic painters. First, he noted that about 500 individual painters had been distinguished from the fifth century B.C.E. Guessing an average career of 25 years, he calculated that about 125 painters were active simultaneously each year. Second, Cook estimated that the total number of extant red-figure vessels or sherds was close to 40,000. He argued that, because typically three or four sherds are attributed to painters over each year of their careers, about 70–90 painters must have been active over the 150 years when the bulk of red-figure was manufactured. Cook split the difference of the two estimates and suggested 100 or more painters were active at once. Granting three assistants/potters to every painter, he estimated at least 400 craftsmen were employed during the fifth century B.C.E. in Athens. The lower numbers of sherds from the sixth century, however, indicated to him that no more than 200 craftsmen were active at once.

The first method assumes an average painter had a career of 25 years, yet few of the hundreds of painters appear to have been active over so long a period. As summarized in figure 6, a median Beazleyan hand has fewer than 10 attributions. If each of these hands were a real individual, the career length implied by the attribution rate established in the current project is slightly more than a year for a specialist or less than five years for a potter-painter. Clearly, the 25-year career assumed by Cook is far too high.

The current study has refined Cook’s second method. His initial assumption that typical vase painters generated three or four sherds per year was flawed, and at that time he could not have recognized the critical distinction between potter-painters and specialists. Still, Cook’s study was impressively close to the mark, and the current project would not have been possible without the 50 years of research and publication since Cook’s article appeared in print.

Cook’s study also includes an influential method for estimating the recovery ratio of figural Attic pottery. He used the preservation of Panathenaic prize amphoras as a proxy for Attic vases in general. It is possible to estimate the total number of the amphoras commissioned for the Panathenaic festivals from epigraphic sources, from which the recovery ratio can be determined by comparison with the number of extant amphoras in modern collections. Cook’s estimate has been revisited many times in the literature. Estimates from 0.2 to 10.0% have been proposed, although approximately 1% is the most common. The recent publication of a comprehensive catalogue of Panathenaic amphoras supports a 1% ratio. Several factors may have slightly inflated the estimate, however, and the ratio may have been as low as 0.5%.  

Appendix 2: Bibliography and Commentary for the Painters in the Study

The Attic Vase Inscriptions (AVI) cited below can be found in the AVI database (http://avi.unibas.ch/home.html). See the section “Tallying System” in appendix 1 for a discussion of Beazley’s use of the terms “near,” in the “manner of,” and the like. The entry for each painter includes sources of recent attributions. The numbers in parentheses preceding these sources refer to the numbers of certain and uncertain attributions, respectively.

...
ACHILLES PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 409; ARV², 986–1004, 1677, 1708; Paralipomena 438–39) lists 232 secure and 48 uncertain attributions. Oakley (1997, 114–70) catalogues 307 works by the painter and 23 “near” him (three more attributed either to him or to the Phiale Painter are counted in this group). Another 67 vases “loosely connected” to the Achilles Painter and 36 in his manner are excluded from this appendix.


Recent Attributions (17/8): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 12; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 6 (Russia 6), 51; Bentz 1998, 151; Oakley 2004a, 71–3; 2005, 285; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 484; Phoenix Ancient Art 2006, 76–9; Papili 2009, 242, 247–48 n. 16.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) who dominated a workshop with perhaps four potters and appears occasionally to have painted outside the workshop (Kurtz 1975, 41–3; Euwe 1989, 128; Oakley 1990, 47–57, 65–6; 1997, 73–98, 105–13).

THE AFFECTER

Beazley (ABV, 238–48, 690; Paralipomena 111–12) lists 119 secure and two uncertain attributions. Mommsen (1975, 61–77, 85–115) catalogues 123 works by the painter and four “near” him.


Recent Attributions (7/0): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 1 (Germany 79), 36–7; CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 10 (Germany 56), 39; Kreuzer 1998, 93, 120–21, 168; Iacobazzi 2004, 1:209.


ASCHINES PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 709–20, 1667–68, 1706; Paralipomena 409–10) lists 260 secure attributions and one uncertain attribution, while 39 works in the painter’s manner have not been tallied. Two of the three loutrophoroi said to be from the Athenian Acropolis, but which are actually very likely from the Sanctuary of Nymphae, are excluded from the tally (ARV², 717).

Chronology: CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 4 (Netherlands 10), 24; CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 15 (Germany 87), 19. The painter was active by the mid 470s B.C.E. given the at least seven attributions dated to ca. 470 and contemporary works in two Kerameikos graves (Knigge 1976, 115, 146; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 84). He remained active through the 440s, with at least 10 attributions at midcentury and two in 450–440 B.C.E. (CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 [Germany 81], 59; CVA Laon, Musée de Laon 1 [France 20], 29). He may have worked until somewhat later.

Recent Attributions (29/2): CVA Adria, Museo Civico 1 (Italy 28), 3.1.38; CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 107–8; CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 59; CVA France 36, 44; CVA Marathon, Marathon Museum (Greece 7), 63–4; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 35; CVA Palermo, Collezione Mommino 1 (Italy 30), 3.1.6; CVA Vibo Valentia, Museo Statale “Vito Capialbi” (Italy 67), 34–5, 38; Knigge 1976, 115, 141, 146; 2005, 125; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 88–9; Pollogiorgi 1993–1994, 267–69; Schwarz 1996, 38; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 43, 72, 83–4, 91, 152; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 500; Panvini 2005, 59–60.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (by attribution rate alone).

ALTAMURA PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 589–97, 1661) lists 91 secure and 16 uncertain attributions. Prange (1989, 127, 157–77, 232) catalogues 95 works by the painter and 15 in his manner. Because it is not clear which of the pieces in his manner are possible works of the painter, none is counted, but two uncertain attributions from Beazley (ARV², 597, 1661) not included by Prange are returned to the tally.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (Type 5) in print figure 5. Specialist painter (Type 2/3) in print figure 7 because of his high attribution rate. Philippaki 1967, 73–5; Webster 1972, 36–7; Prange 1989, 35–6, 38; Frank 1990, 197–207. Prange (1989) identifies the Altamura Painter as a potter-painter despite some evidence that he painted for other potters. For example, the Altamura and Niobid
Painters decorated two bell kraters by the same potter, and the Altamura Painter decorated neck amphoras and oinochoai by more than one potter.

AMASIS PAINTER (AMASIS HIMSELF)
Beazley (ABV, 150–58, 68, 714; Paralipomena 65–7) lists 116 secure attributions and one uncertain attribution. Von Bothmer (1985b, 11, 236–39, 243) catalogues several new vases and raises the total attributions to 132. Only three of his nine attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally.

Chronology: Boardman 1974, 54; von Bothmer 1985b, 15, 39, 239; Moore and Philippides 1986, 87; Wölcik 1989, 79; Isler 1994, 94–107; Heesen 2009, 135. Von Bothmer’s (1985b) 560–515 B.C.E. dates for the painter have been challenged, and a slightly shorter career has been adopted here reflecting the Amasis Painter’s major activity as a painter.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Boardman 1958; 1974, 54–5; 1987, 144–49; 2001, 150–51; Webster 1972, 9–11). At least 10 vases by the Amasis Painter name Amasis as poietes; two others signed by Amasis have no figurework; two recently identified pieces probably signed by him are in red-figure; and one lekythos recently acquired by the J. Paul Getty Museum and attributed to the Taleides Painter has an Amasis signature that may be a forgery (AVI, nos. 0077, 0119a, 2067b, 2703, 2704, 3070, 3619, 4335, 4941, 5734, 6090, 6284, 6987, 8079 [the lekythos with a dubious signature is AVI, no. 4926]; von Bothmer 1985b, 34–5, 229, 239; Immerwahr 1990, 36–9; Isler 1994, 94–6; Williams 1995a, 144; Mommesen 1997a, 17–18).

Boardman has made a strong case that Amasis, poietes, threw and painted his own vases, an assertion supported by a correlation between the painting and the vase shapes. However, many have disputed this combination (Freel, 1983, 35 n. 5; Mertens 1987, 180–81; Hemelrijk 1991, 253; Mommesen 1997a, 32; Stissi 2002, 117–18, 133). Others are noncommittal (e.g., von Bothmer 1985b, 37–9; Beazley 1986, 52; Isler 1994, 109). Some objectors have argued that the poietes was given the name “Amasis” at birth and was thus too young to have been the painter, given that the Egyptian pharaoh Amasis did not ascend to the throne until ca. 570 B.C.E. (Isler 1994, 106, 109; Mommesen 1997a, 18–23; Stissi 2002, 118). However, this argument is weak, and it is also possible that Amasis was an adopted trade name (e.g., Boegehold 1983; Immerwahr 1990, 38–9; Pevnick 2010). The same objectors cite another reason for dividing the potter from the painter: the Egyptian, and perhaps Ionian, influence is evident in the potter’s vases, whereas the painting is solidly grounded in the Attic tradition. However, Nikosthenes, widely regarded as both potter and painter, exhibits this same combination of foreign shapes with typical Attic painting (see the entry for Painter N).

A more credible objection to the combination comes from the possibility that the Amasis Painter painted for Neandros. Two vases thrown by Neandros are painted in a style close to that of the Amasis Painter but also related to the styles of Lydos and the Heidelberg Painter (Blatter 1971 [by Lydos?]; 1989 [by the Amasis Painter?]; Brijder 1991, 418–20; Kreuzer 1992, 67–8 [by the Heidelberg Painter]). Heesen (2009, 130–36, 283) takes the argument further by connecting unsigned band cups attributed to the Amasis Painter to the potterwork of Neandros. If this association is confirmed, these vases do not necessarily imply that the Amasis Painter “roved” about various workshops. These early vases might instead demonstrate an apprenticeship of the young Amasis to Neandros, before Amasis became a master potter and painter. Later in his career, Amasis did not paint for other potters, although he seems to have recruited outsiders to paint in red-figure (Tiverios 1976, 56, 61; Boardman 1987, 144; Isler 1994, 96–7; Mommesen 1997a, 18, 23–32).

ANTIMENES PAINTER
Beazley (ABV, 266–82, 691–92, 715; Paralipomena 119–24) lists 158 secure and 70 uncertain attributions. Burow (1989, 79–105) catalogues 132 works by the painter and 16 possibly by him, while seven in his manner have been excluded. Four works attributed to the painter by Beazley but not catalogued by Burow have been added to the final tally.


Recent Attributions (12/6): CVA Adria, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 2 (Italy 65), 17; CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 5 (Netherlands 11), 31, 33–4; CVA Berlin, Antikenmuseum 7 (Germany 61), 26–8; CVA Erlangen, Antiken-
sammung der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität 2 (Germany 84), 27–9; CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 34–6; CVA Taranto, Museo Nazionale 4 (Italy 70), 9; CVA Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois 1 (United States of America 24), 9–10; Moore and Philippides 1986, 112; Shapiro et al. 1995, 108–10; Pacini 1996, 81–104; Schwarz 1996, 19; Bentz 1998, 130; Iozzo 2002, 58, 69; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 416–17; Phoenix Ancient Art 2006, 12–15. There are 15 attributions in his manner that have been excluded.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) (Burrow 1989, 20–9, 52–5, 76).

ANTIPHON PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 335–47, 1646, 1701, 1706; Paralipomena 362–63) lists 104 secure attributions and one uncertain attribution. It is difficult to distinguish the painting style from imitators and Onesimos, and works in his manner are unusually numerous. The list of 126 pieces in his manner contains 22 other possible attributions. Only two of his five attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. If half of the works in the manner of the Antiphon Painter were counted as his own, his attribution rate would rise to about 7.5.

Chronology: CVA London, British Museum 9 (Great Britain 17), 28; Blatter 1968, 651; Boardman 1979b, 135; Williams 1995b, 9; Günzter 1997, 92.

Recent Attributions (0/11): CVA London, British Museum 9 (Great Britain 17), 29; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 8 (United States of America 33), 32–3; CVA Paris, Musée du Louvre 19 (France 28), 18; Blatter 1968, 640–41; 1984, 7; Tamassia 1974, 150; Williams 1986a; 1988, 676, 678, 683 n. 18, 1995b, 9; Cahn 1993, 15. Blatter (1968) rejected nine Beazley attributions, which have been reserved as uncertain attributions.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 37). A vase signed by Euphronios as ποίητες was recently attributed to the Antiphon Painter, and several others painted by him are associated with Euphronios by shape (AVI, nos. 1361, 2344, 2347, 2352, 2707, 3368, 5934, 8113; Bloesch 1944, 35–6; Williams 1991a, 51).

ATHENA PAINTER

To the 141 secure and two uncertain works listed by Haspels (ABL, 254–60), Beazley (ABV, 522–33, 704; Paralipomena 261–63) adds 34 new and 16 uncertain attributions, including some reassignments from Haspels’ lists. Two of his four attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are excluded from the tally.

Beazley and Haspels entertained the possibility that the Athena Painter, who worked in black-figure, was also the Bowdoin Painter, a red-figure hand, although the combination would result in an extremely long unified career (ca. 500–440 B.C.E.) (Kurtz 1975, 16). Besides having an implausibly long 60-year career, a combined painter would have 92 attributed vases per year. Although the overall rate of the 60-year career is not exceptionally high, the combination results in an implausibly high concentration of works in the 470s B.C.E., when both hands were active simultaneously.

Chronology: ABL, 163; CVA Palermo, Collezione Mormino 1 (Italy 50), 3.Y.3; Kurtz 1975, 16, 109–11; Wójcik 1989, 279; Borgers 2004, 74. The end of his career has been moved up slightly here from ca. 470 B.C.E. because he has few attributions dated in the 470s B.C.E. (CVA Palermo, Collezione Mormino 1 [Italy 50], 3.Y.3; Kunze-Göttel al. 1999, 77–8).


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 2). The Athena and Bowdoin Painters decorated some lekythoi of the same shape, perhaps while working for one potter, and both painters decorated other classes of lekythoi (Kurtz 1975, 16, 79, 84, 104–11).

BELDAM PAINTER

To the 77 secure works and one uncertain work of the painter listed by Haspels (ABL, 266–70), Beazley (ABV, 586–87, 709; Paralipomena 293–94) adds 22 new and 12 uncertain attributions.

Chronology: ABL, 187–89; CVA Naples, Museo Nazionale 2 (Italy 71), 34; Kurtz 1975, 135, 153; Nakayama 1982, 24–5; Turner 1996, 12. Though it is often said the painter was active only within the second quarter of the fifth century B.C.E., 10 of his works are dated to ca. 480 B.C.E. (CVA Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 3 [Italy 54], 27; CVA Naples, Museo Nazionale 5 [Italy 69], 45–6;
Borriello 2003, 34). Thus, the painter may have begun during the latter part of the 480s. Four more pieces dated to the 460s suggest he may have worked through the middle of the decade (CVA Prague, Musée National 1 [Czech Republic 2], 78; CVA Zürich, Öffentliche Sammlungen 1 [Switzerland 2], 27; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 71–2). His period of activity is obscured by the many workshop pieces produced during the first half of the fifth century.

Recent Attributions (16/6): CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 3 (Netherlands 9), 60; CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 53; CVA Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 3 (Italy 54), 27; CVA Hannover, Kestner-Museum 1 (Germany 34), 33; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 2 (Netherlands 4), 66; CVA Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum 1 (Germany 42), 71–2; CVA Naples, Museo Nazionale 2 (Italy 71), 34; CVA Naples, Museo Nazionale 5 (Italy 69), 45–6; CVA Prague, Musée National 1 (Czech Republic 2), 78; CVA Silikey Museum (Turkish Republic 1), 2; CVA Turin, Museo di Antichità 2 (Italy 40), 3.H.9; CVA Zürich, Öffentliche Sammlungen 1 (Switzerland 2), 27; lo Porto 1998, 16; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 71–2, 130. Recent attributions to the painter’s manner/workshop are very common, possibly lowering his apparent output.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter(?) (Type 5?). Grounded in the tradition of the Edinburgh, Athena, and Theseus Painters, the Beldam Painter specialized in the BEL Class, which was probably the work of one potter (ABL, 170–71, 176–79, 186; Kurtz 1975, 18, 84–7, 153–54). The distinctive chimney lekythos was another specialty of the painter, but the Emporion and Haimon Painters also decorated the type. The Beldam Painter was at the center of a workshop where numerous unattributed vases were produced for decades after the painter himself ceased any identifiable activity. His mode of activity thus remains obscure. He may have been a potter-painter who eventually turned to throwing vases full-time for later, anonymous painters, but he may also have been a specialist painter within the workshop.

BERLIN PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 408–9; ARV2, 196–216, 1634–36, 1700–1; Paralipomena 177, 344–46, 520) lists 299 secure and 31 uncertain attributions. Cardon (1977, 6–190) catalogues 315 works by the painter and 25 more in his manner, of which only three are tallied as possibly from his hand. Only five of his 13 attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 2) who led the workshop later dominated by the Achilles Painter (Philippaki 1967, 31–42, 150–51; Webster 1972, 32–6; Jubier-Galinier 2009, 51–4; see also the entry for the Achilles Painter). On the vase shapes of the Berlin Painter, see Cardon 1977, 163, 190–200, 218, 224; Pinney 1981.

PAINTER OF BOLOGNA 417

Beazley (ARV2, 907–18, 1674, 1707; Paralipomena 430, 516) lists 226 secure and six uncertain attributions, excluding two others in the painter’s manner.

Chronology: His career range is approximate. His collaboration with the Splanchnopt Painter and at least three vases dated to ca. 460 B.C.E. suggest he was active by the end of the 460s (CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 [Russia 4], 37–8; von Bothmer 1981a, 42). At least eight attributions dated to ca. 440 or later suggest he may have been active through the mid 430s (CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 1 [Netherlands 6], 89–95; CVA Harrow School [Great Britain 21], 19–20; CVA Parma, Museo Nazionale di Antichità 1 [Italy 45], 3.1.9).

Recent Attributions (15/3): CVA Athens, Benaki Museum 1 (Greece 9), 55–7; CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 111–13; CVA Lille 1 (France 40), 128; CVA Mainz, Universität 2 (Germany 63), 65–8; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 8 (United States of America 33), 58; CVA Milan, Collezione “H.A.” 2 (Italy 51), 3.1.5–6; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 37–8; CVA Reading, University of Reading 1 (Great Britain 12), 41; CVA St.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) (see the entry for the Athena Painter).

**BRYGOS PAINTER**

Beazley (ARV², 368–85, 387–90, 1649–50, 1701; Paralipomena 367–68) lists 243 secure and four more possible attributions among the 53 vases in the painter’s manner. These have been counted as 238 and 9, respectively, because five fragments from the Athenian Acropolis may join others in the list. Only seven of his 21 attributions (five uncertain) from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally.

Chronology: CVA London, British Museum 9 (Great Britain 17), 54; Cambitoglou 1968, 14, 36–7; Boardman 1979b, 135; Turner 1996, 36–7; Neer 2002, 205; Stewart 2008a, 404. Start dates for his career range between 500 and 490 B.C.E. A beginning slightly before 495 B.C.E. is preferred here because of the relatively high number of attributions, at least 12, dated between 495 and 490 B.C.E. Similarly, several works are dated to ca. 470, suggesting the painter worked into the early 460s B.C.E.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (Type 3). For works assigned to Brygos, poietes, by signatures or shape analysis, see AVI, nos. 1331, 3553, 4473, 6490, 7018, 8111; Bloeisch 1940, 81–5, 128–29. Given his high attribution rate, the painter is unlikely to have been the poietes Brygos but rather a faithful collaborator (Cambitoglou 1968, 7; Webster 1972, 13 n. 4, 33; Wegner 1973, 5, 8–9, 61; Immerwahr 1990, 98–9; Robertson 1992, 93; Turner 1996, 36–7; Vollkommer 2001, 125).
C. PAINTER (CHEIRON?)

Beazley (ABV, 51–61, 681; Paralipomena 23–6) lists 162 secure and 21 uncertain attributions. Brijder (1983, 139–41, 236–46; 1991, 478–79, 485–86; 2000, 717–19; 2005, 246) catalogues 153 works by him (two in his manner are excluded here) and reassigns many works from Beazley’s lists to a new hand, the Taras Painter. Although eight of the works attributed to the C Painter come from the Athenian Agora, the only two with documented contexts do not represent a significant preservation bias. Brijder lists 51 pieces from Thasos; of these, the 20 from the Artemision are tallied as seven.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Brijder 1983, 23, 110–14; 2005, 246). The correlation of the potting and painting is exclusive—no other hands are associated with the potting style (ABV, 59; Brijder 1983, 237; 2005, 253; Immerwahr 1990, 22; Hemelrijk 1991, 253). The C Painter may have been named Cheiron, judging from an epoiesen inscription on a Siana cup in the manner of the C Painter from the Athenian Acropolis (AVI, no. 1101).

CALLIOPE PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 1259–63, 1688, 1707; Paralipomena 471) lists 95 secure and two uncertain attributions. Lezzi-Hafer (1988, 48–54, 311–57) catalogues 105 works by the Calliope Painter and two possibly by him. There is no adjustment for the 14 Athenian Acropolis fragments.

Chronology: Lezzi-Hafer 1988, 48–57. The painter’s major activity was 440–420 B.C.E., although two cups might be slightly earlier (Lezzi-Hafer 1988, 50, 311).

Recent Attributions (0/1): One fragment from the Athenian Agora is possibly by the painter (Moore 1997, 328).

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2). Although he appears to have worked for different potters, the Calliope Painter remained within the workshop of the Eretria Painter (Hoffmann 1962, 29–30, 47; Lezzi-Hafer 1988, 48–57).

CARLSRUHE PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 730–39; Paralipomena 412, 515) lists 171 secure and three uncertain attributions. Chronology: C VA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 4 (Netherlands 110), 24. The career range in print figure 1 is approximate but reflects that a preponderance of his works are dated to 460–450 B.C.E. Two isolated works have been dated to ca. 470 and 440 B.C.E., respectively, in early publications (C VA Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections [United States of America 8], 34; C VA Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum 1 [Germany 7], 31).

Recent Attributions (12/3): C VA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 109–10; C VA Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum 3 (Germany 60), 81–3; C VA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 35, 60; C VA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 5 (Russia 12), 79–81; C VA Taranto, Museo Nazionale 4 (Italy 70), 18; C VA Vibo Valentia, Museo Statale “Vito Capialbi” (Italy 67), 35–6; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 88; Cahn 1993, 21; Polognaro 1993–1994, 269–71; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 14, 150; Connor and Jackson 2000, 138.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) (ABL, 180; Hoffmann 1962, 19–25, 47; Webster 1972, 36; Kurtz 1975, 19–20, 84, 86, 104, 111–12).

CENTAUR PAINTER (ERGOTELES?)

Beazley (ABV, 189–90, 689; Paralipomena 78–9) lists 28 secure and four uncertain attributions. Heesen (2009, 211–12, 311–24, 331) greatly expands the corpus with 163 works by the painter, while 12 more in his manner have been excluded. One attribution from the Athenian Acropolis has not been adjusted. Only two of the four attributions from the Artemision at Thasos are tallied.


Recent Attributions: No new attributions since Heesen (2009) have been included.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Heesen 2009, 211–14; 227; 302, cat. no. 390 [a possible collaboration of Tleson and the Centaur Painter]). Although the Centaur Painter’s work is unsigned, it is closely related to that of Tleson, as if he worked in Tleson’s studio. Heesen (2009) suggests the Centaur Painter may have been Ergoteles, who is known from a poietes inscription as a son of Nearchos and thus a brother of Tleson.

CODRUS PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 1268–73, 75, 1689; Paralipomena 472) lists 51 secure and 14 uncertain attributions. Avramidou (2005, 15, 19, 21, 271–87; 2011, 25–6, 87–96) catalogues 78 works by the painter in her 2005 dissertation but has reduced the total to 65 secure and 12 possible attributions in her subsequent monograph.

51–2; Avramidou 2005, 15, 19, 21, 251; 2011, 5–6, 23–5, 72–81.

Recent Attributions: No new attributions since Avramidou (2011) have been included.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter(?) (Type 5) (New Pauly, Antiquity 3:504, s.v. “Codrus Painter”; Lezzi-Hafer 1988, 73, 86–97; Avramidou 2011, 22). The profiles of the Type B kylikes by the Codrus Painter are distinct from related cups painted by the Eretria Painter and his associates.

Diosphos Painter

Haspels (ABL, 111–12, 116, 232–41) lists 162 secure and five uncertain works, to which Beazley (ABV, 508–11, 703, 716; ARV², 300–1; Paralipomena 249–50) adds 51 new and 18 uncertain attributions. Only two of the five attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. Jubier-Galinier (2003, 81) has noted at least 280 vases associated with the Diosphos Painter. She will significantly expand the list of attributions to the Diosphos Painter in her monograph on the Sappho-Diosphos workshop, currently in preparation (C. Jubier-Galinier, pers. comm. 2011). Since the enlarged corpus will also extend his career, his attribution rate (ca. 8.0–8.5 vases per year, with 338 works, seven uncertain, from before 500–460 B.C.E.) will not be significantly altered.

Chronology: Kurtz 1975, 135; Wójcik 1989, 277; Jubier-Galinier 2003, 81. At least 11 of his works have been dated to ca. 500 B.C.E., and four more have been dated earlier, suggesting a late sixth-century beginning for his career (CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 [Greece 11], 32–4; CVA Baltimore, Robinson Collection 1 [United States of America 4], 45–6; CVA Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe 1 [Germany 41], 30–1; CVA Lille 1 [France 40], 41–2). He appears to have been largely inactive by the mid 470s (CVA Adolphseck, Schloss Fasanerie 1 [Germany 11], 13–14; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 2 [Netherlands 4], 19–20; Schwarz 1996, 24–5; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 23, 39, 47, 71, 75).

Recent Attributions (30/2): CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 3 (Netherlands 9), 64–5; CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 32–4; CVA Basel, Antikenmuseum 1 (Switzerland 4), 128; CVA Bucharest 2 (Romania 2), 20, 32–3; CVA Fiesole, Collezione Costantini 1 (Italy 57), 12; CVA Finland 1, 39–40; CVA Göttlingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 148–49; CVA Japan 2, 11–12; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 2 (Netherlands 4), 19–20; CVA Marathon, Marathon Museum (Greece 7), 72–4; CVA Palermo, Collezione Mormino 1 (Italy 50), 3.1.3.1.1.14–15, 3.1.3; CVA Prague, Musée National 1 (Czech Republic 2), 78; CVA Zagreb, Musée Archéologique (Croatia 1), 21; Haspels 1972; Hornbostel 1980, 110–12; Guindice et al. 1991, 12; Shapiro et al. 1995, 131–33; Schwarz 1996, 24–5; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 23, 39, 47, 75, 81–2; Barresi and Valastro 2000, 61.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter(?) (Type 57) in print figure 5; specialist painter (Type 2/3) in print figure 7 because of his high attribution rate. He appears to have worked in the same workshop as the Sappho Painter (see the entry for the Sappho Painter), although he decorated a variety of vase shapes, and the study of his corpus is not fully published (ABL, 94; ARV², 301; Kurtz 1975, 80–1, 96, 99–101, 149–50; Jubier-Galinier 1996, 3, 90–3, 95, 117–25, 134–41, 304; 1998, 736–39; 2003, 81–3; 2009, 54–7; Jubier 1999, 181–82). Almost all the lekythoi by the Diosphos Painter belong to one subclass of Type DL; the relationship is exclusive except for several vases painted by two minor identities (designated as separate painters) and unidentified hands in his manner. He also painted a special form of doubleen amphora related to those of the Edinburgh Painter. Although this would be consistent with his potting of the subclass of lekythoi associated with his style of painting, his DL subclass includes more variation in profile than do the lekythoi of the Sappho Painter. The Diosphos Painter also decorated a related type of lekythoi thrown by the Haimon Potter (HL subclass, both categories after Jubier-Galinier 1996), whose group took over the production in the latter years of the career of the Diosphos Painter. His high attribution rate suggests he was primarily a specialist painter.

Douris

Beazley (ABV, 400; ARV², 425–51, 1653; Paralipomena 375–76) lists 286 secure and 46 uncertain attributions. Buitron-Oliver (1995, 1–3, 72–88) catalogues 248 works by the painter and 35 more belonging to two other hands created from his “manner” lists. These have been excluded from the final tally, although Buitron-Oliver (1995, 7) appears uncertain whether these may actually have been late works of Douris; she cites an unpublished project by Robert Guy as the basis for the removed attributions. Returning these as 35 uncertain attributions would give Douris a 7.9 vase per year attribution rate from a tally of 276.


Recent Attributions (10/1): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 41; CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 86; CVA St. Petersburg,
EDINBURGH PAINTER

Haspels (ABL, 50, 216–21) lists 87 secure and five uncertain works, to which Beazley (ABV, 476–80, 695, 700; Paralipomena 217–20) adds 47 new and 25 uncertain attributions. Other works attributed to hands “near” the painter have been excluded. Only one of his two attributions from the Athenian Acropolis is included in the tally. One attribution from the Stoa Gutter Well in the Athenian Agora does not warrant a reduction in the tally.

Chronology: ABL, 86; CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 35; Kurtz 1975, 14; Moore and Philippides 1986, 94; Borgers 2004, 75.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (Type 5). An influential painter emerging from the Leagros Group, the Edinburgh Painter decorated unusual doubleen amphoras and lekythoi recently connected to a single potter, perhaps the painter himself (ABL, 86–9; Jubier-Galinier 2009, 49–51). His high attribution rate suggests he was primarily a specialist (Type 3).

ELBOWS OUT

Beazley (ABV, 248–52; Paralipomena 112–13) lists 43 secure and three uncertain attributions. One fragment from the Athenian Acropolis is counted normally. To date, Elbows Out has about 50 attributions in his manner, primarily Little Master cups distinguished because of their lower quality of painting. Many of these approximately 50 additional pieces may in fact have come from his own hand (CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 2 [Netherlands 8], 96; von Bothmer 1969, 15; Fellmann 1984, 157–58; Heesen 1996, 161; Iacobazzi 2004, 1:92–7). Adding all the attributions in his manner to his other works would raise the attribution rate for Elbows Out to 6.3.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (Type 5). Further study would be necessary to include him in print figure 5. He decorated band cups and a very distinctive shape of neck amphora (von Bothmer 1969, 5). However, he also painted a neck amphora of the Affecter’s type, and lekythoi of various types related to those of the Affecter and the Amasis Painter (see the entries for these painters above).
EMPORION PAINTER

Haspels (ABL, 263–66) lists 48 secure and seven uncertain works, to which Beazley (ABV, 583–86, 708–9; Paralipomena 291–92) adds 28 new and five uncertain attributions (14 others in his manner are excluded).

Chronology: ABL, 165; Kurtz 1975, 135. The Emporion Painter picked up approximately when the Haimon Painter stopped painting. The Emporion Painter must have been active by ca. 480 B.C.E., judging from his attributions in two Kerameikos graves at this time (Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 74, 80). Two works dated to the early fifth century but joined by no others in the 490s and 480s are insufficient reason to extend the painter’s activity earlier (CVA Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections [United States of America] 8, 92; Equizzi 2007, 425). In addition to at least five works dated to ca. 470, two more after 470 indicate activity to the mid 460s (CVA Prague, Musée National 1 [Czech Republic] 2, 78; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 36).

Recent Attributions (19/6): CVA Adria, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 2 (Italy 65), 55; CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 3 (Netherlands 9), 53–4; CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 39–40; CVA Göttlingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 153–54; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 2 (Netherlands 4), 72; CVA Lille 1 (France 40), 46; CVA Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum 1 (Germany 42), 71; CVA Marathon, Marathon Museum (Greece 7), 55; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 1 (Russia 1), 42–3; CVA Nantes, Musée Dobrée (France 36), 35; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 4 (Russia 11), 34–5; Giudice et al. 1992, 148–49; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 36, 74, 78, 80, 83–4, 109; Tuna-Nörling 1999, 60; Equizzi 2007, 425; Madigan 2008, 62.

Mode of Activity: Unknown. Further study is required.

EPIKETETOS

Beazley (ARV 2, 70–80, 1623–24, 1705; Paralipomena 329) lists 111 secure and 16 uncertain attributions, although 14 of these are in the painter’s manner. Paléothodoros (2004, 1, 7–56, 139, 141–70) catalogues 164 works by the painter but does not explicitly address most of the pieces in Beazley’s “manner” list. In a postscript, he adds eight more attributed by other scholars and notes three possibly belonging to the painter. Only three of his eight attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. Likewise, only one of his three attributions from the Athenian Agora—all from the Stoa Gutter Well—is counted.

Chronology: New Pauly, Antiquity 4:1068–69, s.v. “Epiktetos”; Robertson 1976, 40–3; Boardman 1979b, 57, 92; Tolle-Kastenbein 1983, 574; Buitron-Oliver 1995, 57; Neer 2002, 202, 205; Paléothodoros 2004, 6, 116–17, 128–36; Rotroff 2009, 253–56. The start date has been lowered to 515 B.C.E. from 520, following Rotroff 2009. His latest works are dated to ca. 490 on stylistic grounds. However, a late skyphos signed by the potter Pistoxenos has been argued to date after 480 by Robertson (1976, 40–4; 1992, 137–38), who imagines that Syriskos was a slave who changed his name to Pistoxenos, perhaps at the time of the Persian invasion (see also the entry below for Syriskos). As corroborating evidence of Syriskos’ continued activity, Robertson suggests that four late vases with painting related to Epiktetos in fact should be attributed to Syriskos. Paléothodoros (2004, 169, nos. 155, 156) accepts that two of them belong to Syriskos’ latest period. Although Paléothodoros (2004) and Stewart (2008b, 597) hesitantly accept the late activity for Epiktetos, Williams (1995a, 154–55) and Pevnick (2010, 243 n. 99; 2011, 145) point out the problems with the elaborate and largely unsupported scenario of Pistoxenos being the post-480/79 B.C.E. name of a former slave, Syriskos. With fewer than 25 of his attributions dated after 500 B.C.E. and little indication of his activity as a painter beyond 490, this date for the end of major activity by Epiktetos as a painter has been adopted here.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 1/typical late period) (AVI, nos. 1218, 1982, 2281, 4417, 4907, 5789, 5826, 7084, 7284, 7354; Immernwahr 1990, 61–3; Paléothodoros 2004, 6–56, esp. 9, 38–9, 55–6). Although best known for his collaboration with the potter Hischylkos on at least eight to 12 extant vases, Epiktetos also painted vases signed by Nikosthenes, Pamphaios, Pistoxenos, and Python as poietes, and at least five other potters can be associated by shape.

Paléothodoros (2004) separates the painting of Epiktetos into four stylistic phases. There are 143 works in the first three stylistic phases, which extend over about 15–20 years, and 21 in his last phase, which corresponds to about 5–10 years. During the first three phases of Epiktetos’ career, his attribution rate is roughly 8.5 vases per year, but it drops to only about 2.2 (1.1–4.4) vases per year during the final phase. Such a decline in productivity is very unusual among specialist painters. While a slower “early” period is common, every specialist painter who has been the subject of a monograph has similar numbers of works per year in his middle and late periods.
This pattern suggests Epiktetos may have shifted to potting in his late career. He once recorded his name as poies on an unusual plate dedicated on the Athenian Acropolis (AVI, no. 1218; Palêthodoros 2004, 38–9, 166, no. 139). He also painted the plate, and so his name is plausibly restored to the incomplete second signature with egraphsen. This votive is inconclusive on its own but generally supports the hypothesis of a transition in his later activity. He may have developed a specialization in throwing plates (Callipolitis-Feytmans 1974, 212–16; Palêthodoros 2004, 13–14, 39).

ERETRIA PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 1247–57, 1688; Paralipomena 470) lists 108 secure and 12 uncertain attributions. Lezzi-Hafter (1988, 30, 36, 46, 311–57) catalogues 139 works by the painter and describes 22 others that are possibly his works.

Chronology: New Pauly, Antiquity 5:25, s.v. “Eretria Painter”; Lezzi-Hafter 1976, 113–14; 1988, 11–23. His start date has been lowered slightly from 440 B.C.E. because of the very few attributions in the first five years of his career, and his end date has been raised slightly from 415 for the same reason.

Recent Attributions (3/2): CVA Ensêrune, Musée National 2 (France 37), 44–5, 47; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Institutes der Universität 4 (Germany 52), 93; Moore 1997, 242.


EUAION PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 789–99, 1670; Paralipomena 419) lists 158 secure and 16 uncertain attributions, which nine in his manner have been excluded.

Chronology: CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 (Germany 90), 95; Boardman 1979b, 195–97. At least six of his attributions are dated to ca. 460 B.C.E., and three more in the 460s suggest he was active before ca. 460 B.C.E. (CVA Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire 1 [Switzerland 1], 18; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 [Russia 4], 38–9; Heissmeyer 2008, 47). Works of ca. 450 and the following decade are designated “late” or “very late” in the CVA volumes cited above, and, despite two attributions dated to 440–430 B.C.E., the end of the Euaion Painter’s career has been set at ca. 440 B.C.E. (CVA Berlin, Antikensammlung 9 [Germany 74], 48; CVA Ensêrune, Musée National 2 [France 37], 45).


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (by attribution rate alone). He may be reclassified as a potter-painter, if more works in the 430s B.C.E. can be identified in the future.

EUCHARIDES PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 395–98; ARV², 226–32, 1637, 1705; Paralipomena 174, 347–48) lists 151 secure and eight uncertain attributions. Langridge (1993, 343–414) catalogues 199 works by the painter and “close” to him. Only 12 of his 34 attributions from the Athenian Acropolis in Langridge are tallied. None of his six attributions from the Athenian Agora is from a context likely to be overrepresented.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2). The amphoras, stamnoi, kalpides, and pelikai by the Eucharides Painter exhibit links to various potters, especially those working with the Berlin and Nikoxenos Painters, and a cup may have been potted by Brygos (Blesens 1940, 86; Philippakis 1967, 45, 151; Robertson 1992, 119–21; Langridge 1993, 108–49; Jubier-Galinier 2009, 52).

The Eucharides Painter is usually seen as a pupil of the Nikoxenos Painter, another probable specialist with about 75 works spanning at least the decade of the 490s (Langridge 1993, 65, 414–47). It has been argued that at least the black-figure work of the two painters might be combined (ABV, 359; ARV², 220, 226; Beazley 1912, 246; Robertson 1962, 192, 121; Langridge 1993, 3–6, 18–35, 50–64), and Stähler (1967, 31–53) went as far as to assert that most of the two painters’ red-figure vases should also be combined. However, removing the 51 black-figure amphoras would reduce the attribution rate of the Eucharides Painter to 6.0 vases per year, well below the rate typical of a “roving” specialist painter. Thus, the attribution rate supports the traditional
division of the material by Beazley (ABV, ARV; Paralipomena) and followed in Langridge 1993.

EUERGIDES PAINTER

Beazley (ARV; 87–98, 1625–26; Paralipomena 330) lists 144 secure and 24 uncertain attributions, of which 14 in his manner have been excluded. Only 15 of his 43 attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally.

Chronology: Boardman 1979b, 60; Seki 1985, 142, table 6; Maffre 1988, 386. His earliest works are ca. 520 B.C.E. (CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pier- son Museum 1 [Netherlands 6], 9; Padgett 2003, 280–81). His last work is at the end of the century (CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 5 [Germany 554], 15–16; Maffre 2009, 182–83). The start date has been lowered from ca. 520 to 515 after Rotroff 2009, 255–56.

Recent Attributions (14/4): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 36–7; CVA Frankfurt am Main, Universität und Liebieghaus (Germany 66), 37; CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 33, 36–7; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 5 (Russia 12), 12–13; Maffre 1988, 384–86; 2009, 182–83; Moore 1997, 336–37, 1998, 15–16; Padgett 2003, 280–81. Maffre (1998) reports two fragments from the Artemision at Thasos possibly by the painter, and these have been counted as only one in the final tally.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2). Named after the 11 preserved poietes inscriptions of Euergides (AVI, nos. 0783, 1279, 4104, 4174, 4425, 4732, 5308, 6565, 6616, 7705, 8106) and two probable others (AVI, nos. 1285, 4178). The painter can be distinguished from Euergides because of his attribution signed by the poietes Chelis (who typically employed Oltos) (AVI, no. 6392; Bloesch 1940, 121; Boardman 1979b, 60).

Furthermore, the name of the poietes Paidikos appears without a verb on cups attributed to the Euergides Painter or his manner, as well as other works likely by the potter (ARV; 88, 96–8, 102–3; AVI, nos. 2838, 2926, 3380, 4441, 6438, 7031). The Euergides Painter also decorated the exterior of a cup whose interior was painted by Epiktetos (ARV; 47, 71, 94; AVI, no. 6394).

EUPHRONIOS

Beazley (ABV, 403; ARV; 13–19, 1619) lists 24 secure and seven uncertain attributions. The catalogue from a Euphrónios exhibition at the Antikenmuseum Berlin lists 49 works by the painter and three uncertain attributions (Antikenmuseum Berlin 1991, 61–257). The two secure and two uncertain attributions from the Athenian Acropolis have been tallied as only one in print figure 4.

Chronology: Beazley 1944, 36; Boardman 1979b, 32; von Bothmer 1991, 46; Williams 1991a, 50–1; 1991b, 42; Villard 1992, 23; Neer 2002, 202, 205; Rotroff 2009, 255–56. The ca. 520 B.C.E. beginning of his roughly 15-year painting career has been lowered slightly following Rotroff 2009. Although Euphronios appears to have ceased painting by 500, he signed as potter as late as ca. 470, indicating an unusually long career of about 45 years.

Recent Attributions (2/1): CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 8 (United States of America 33), 72; Maffre 1988, 380–84; Williams 1992, 91, 95 n. 60. One fragment from the Artemision at Thasos has been tallied normally.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter eventually shifting entirely to potting (atypical) (Beazley 1944, 34, 36; Webster 1972, 13–14; Immervahr 1990, 63–5; Giuliani 1991; Hemelrijk 1991, 253; Williams 1991a). There are six Euphrónios signatures with egraphsen, from the period when he decorated vases thrown by Cachrylion and Euxitheos, but at least 20 poietes inscriptions on later pots name Euphrónios. He seems to have begun potting by the last decade of the sixth century B.C.E. and employed Onesimos to paint at least 16 vases. Euphrónios appears to have retired ca. 470, with his latest vases painted by the Pisto- xenos Painter (Boardman 1979b, 32; Scheibler 1983, 127–28; Williams 1991a, 50–1; 2005, 281–83; Robertson 1992, 46).

EXEKIAS

Beazley (ABV, 143–49, 687, 714; Paralipomena 60–2, 518) lists 29 secure, three possible, and 13 “manner” attributions; several vases “near” the painter are associated with different hands. Mackay (2010, 11–13, 359) catalogues 32 works by the painter, rejecting four attributions from Beazley. Since Mackay (2010) does not include uncertain categories of attribution, four uncertain works left from Beazley’s lists have been retained for consistency with the other painters in the study. Only one of three fragments (two uncertain) from the Athenian Acropolis is excluded.

Mommsen (1997b, 1, 4–5, 8–10, 59, 62–3) catalogues fragments of funerary plaques painted by Exekias from the area of the Kerameikos. These 45 fragments belonged to a minimum of 15 intact plaques among the fragments now in Berlin and four more among those in Athens. Although these plaques are unusual for the vase painters in the study and represent a potential preservation bias, they must have required a significant amount of Exekias’ labor as a painter. They thus have been counted as two more attributions in
print figure 4, one for each of the minimum of two grave monuments they would once have decorated. This number is consistent with the two entries reserved in the lists of Beazley (ABV, Paralipomena) and Mackay (2010) for the plaques. Chronology: Boardman 1974, 56–7; Turner 1996, 42–5; Moormsen 1997b, 1; Mackay 2010, 8, 360–86. His career dates are uncertain; proposals for absolute dates typically fall within 550/540 and 530/520 B.C.E. Mackay’s (2010) chronology is adopted here.

Recent Attributions: No new attributions since Mackay (2010) have been included.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 4). Exekias signed as both painter and maker on three vases and painted three other vases signed only with *poiesen*. Of his remaining *poies* inscriptions, the painting of two is attributed to Group E, and six cups have no figure decoration (AVI, nos. 0741, 2106, 2216, 3191, 4256, 4257, 5206, 5209, 6291, 6292, 6841, 6979, 7202, 7712; Immerwahr 1990, 31–6, 171; Mackay 2010, 4–5). The signature on AVI no. 2106, once on the Basel Market, does not match Exekias’ handwriting (Paralipomena 61; Immerwahr 1984, 342; 1990, 35–6). Exekias is the only potter who appears to have started painting at an advanced stage of his career (Williams 1995a, 145). However, there may have been a different potter named Exekias who was responsible for the six undecorated cups, or Exekias may have worked solely as a potter for the first decade of his career (Moormsen 1998, 44–9; Brijder 2000, 619–21; Heesen 2009, 89–90). Regardless, Exekias is widely accepted as a potter-painter (Webster 1972, 12; Mertens 1988, 429; Cohen 1991, 57; Hemelrijk 1991, 252; Williams 1995a, 145; Moormsen 2005).

GELA PAINTER

Haspels (ABL, 86, 205–15) lists 203 secure and 12 uncertain attributions, to which Beazley (ABV, Paralipomena 473–75, 699–700, 715; Paralipomena 215–17) adds 71 new and 11 uncertain attributions. Of the 16 possible attributions to the Gela Painter in the Athenian Agora, five came from the Rectangular Rock-Cut Shaft, and five more secure and three uncertain from the Stoa Gutter Well (Moore and Philippides 1986, 331–32, 335). The 13 fragments from these contexts have been tallied as four attributions in print figure 1.

Chronology: CVI Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 5, 70; Hemelrijk 1974, 118; Moore and Philippides 1986, 95; Bortolin 2000, 73. Although the painter’s career is generally said to begin between 510 and 505 B.C.E., at least 11 of his works are dated ca. 510 or earlier—in particular, four from Agrigento (CVI Agrigento, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 1 [Italy 61], 23–5). Consequently, the start of his career has been moved up by five years in print figure 1. The end of his career is generally placed at 480 or slightly later, and one of his works was in a Kerameikos grave of the 470s B.C.E. (Knigge 1976, 111).

Recent Attributions (41/7): CVI Adria, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 2 (Italy 65), 18–20, 54–5; CVI Agrigento, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 1 (Italy 61), 25; CVI Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 1 (Germany 79), 47–8; CVI Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 3 (Italy 54), 14; CVI Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 5 (Italy 75), 37; CVI Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe 1 (Germany 41), 44; CVI London, British Museum 10 (Great Britain 20), 42–4; CVI Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 2 (United States of America 25), 14–15; CVI Naples, Museo Nazionale 2 (Italy 71), 26–7; CVI Prague, Musée National 1 (Czech Republic 2), 66–7; Hemelrijk 1974, 157–58; Knigge 1976, 111; Shapiro 1981, 106; Andreassi et al. 1990, 79; Giudice et al. 1992, 93–4; Shapiro et al. 1995, 126–27, Barresi and Valastro 2000, 32; Bortolin 2000; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 435–36; Volioti 2007, 92.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (Type 2). The analysis of his vase shapes is incomplete (ABL, 80–6; Kurtz 1975, 17–18; Volioti 2007, 91).

GORGN PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 8–14, 679, 714; Paralipomena 7–9) lists 39 secure and 20 uncertain attributions, many from the 60 pieces listed in his manner. Despite having few attributions, the Gorgon Painter has been included in print figure 4 as one of the earliest painters catalogued by Beazley. Altogether, 28 of his attributions, 16 uncertain, came from the Athenian Agora. As is the case for works by other early black-figure painters, the Agora fragments are scattered throughout the site in contexts primarily dated within the sixth century B.C.E. No significant preservation bias is evident from these contexts. However, his nine fragments from the Athenian Acropolis are tallied as only three.

Chronology: Scheibler 1961, 18–20, 24; Boardman 1974, 17; Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou 1977, 45–56; Williams 1986b; Jacobazzi 2004, 1:23. He appears to have worked between one and two decades. The career of approximately 17.5 years adopted here also fits the chronological scheme for various works in the CVI (CVI Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 1 [Germany 79], 28–9; CVI Hannover, Kestner-Museum 1 [Germany 34], 18–19; CVI Kassel, Antikenabteilung Der Staatliche Kunstsammlungen 1 [Germany 3], 47; CVI Munich, Antikensammlungen 12 [Germany 65], 13–14; CVI Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 3 [Germany 47],...
was probably active by the middle of the 490s (CVA Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections [United States of America 8], 92; CVA Glasgow [Great Britain 18], 20; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 1 [Russia 1], 49; CVA Palermo, Collezioni Mormino 1 [Italy 50], 3.H.14–15; Moore and Philippides 1986, 246; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 81). That at least 12 works are dated to 480–470 but none is dated to ca. 470 B.C.E. suggests his career may have ended slightly before the end of the decade (CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 [Germany 83], 75–6; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 2 [Netherlands 4], 70; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 1 [Russia 1], 36–7; CVA Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 1 [Greece 10], 124; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 4 [Russia 11], 26–9; CVA Zürich, Öffentliche Sammlungen 1 [Switzerland 2], 27).

Recent Attributions (32/5): CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 3 (Netherlands 9), 49–51; CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 1 (Germany 79), 49–50; CVA Glasgow (Great Britain 18), 20; CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 75–6; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 2 (Netherlands 4), 67–8, 70; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 1 (Russia 1), 36–7; CVA Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 1 (Greece 10), 124; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 4 (Russia 11), 26–9; CVA Zürich, Öffentliche Sammlungen 1 (Switzerland 2), 27.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (Type 2). The Haimon Painter has diverse connections, especially to the workshop of the Diosphos Painter. See the commentaries for the Diosphos and Sappho Painters; see also ABL, 130–41; Kurtz 1975, 81, 150–52.

HEIDELBERG PAINTER

Beazley (ABL, 63–7, 682; Paralipomena 27) lists 69 secure and five uncertain attributions. Brijder (1991, 426–27, 442–68, 727–30) catalogues 155 works by the painter and 21 perhaps by him; 17 others in his manner are excluded. Of the 54 pieces from Thasos attributed to the painter, many are from the Artemision. The 29 secure and 12 possible attributions have been tallied as 12.


Recent Attributions (13/4): CVA Ensérune, Musée National 2 (France 37), 28; CVA Kiel, Kunsthalle,
Antikensammlung 2 (Germany 64), 56; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 8 (Russia 15), 13–14; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 10 (Russia 18), 17–18, 25; Kreuzer 1992, 67–8; Jacobazzi 2004, 1:35.


HERMOCENES PAINTER (HERMOCENES)

Beazley (ABV, 164–66; Paralipomena 68) lists 29 works signed by Hermocenes, poietes, and notes similarities in the style of the 17 vases with figure-work. Heesen (2009, 102) catalogue 36 works by the painter.


Recent Attributions (0/6): Schaeffer et al. 1997, 88–9; Jacobazzi 2004, 1:78–9. Fragments with the signature of Hermocenes as potter, but with no figure decoration, have not been cited.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (Type 5) (Immerwahr 1990, 51). The Hermocenes Painter and the potting of Hermocenes are exclusively associated, although the corpus is very small. Heesen (2009, 127–28) hypothesizes that Hermocenes led a larger workshop group, including the potters Tlepolemos and Thrax and the painter Sakonides.

HERMONAX

Beazley (ARV², 483–94, 1655, 1706; Paralipomena 380) lists 167 secure and eight uncertain attributions. Benson (1999, 311–493) catalogue 213 works by the painter; of the 21 in his manner, 10 are possibly his. Only three of 14 fragments of loutrophoroi from the Sanctuary of Nymphae have been counted in print figure 1 (Benson 1999, 21, 413–23).


Recent Attributions (7/1): CVA Bochum, Kunst- sammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 17; CVA Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 3 (Italy 54), 3.1.7; CVA Giessen, Antikensammlung der Justus-Liebig-Universität 1 (Germany 70), 60; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 11, 48–9; Günther 1997, 112–14; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 498.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 1?) in the workshop dominated by the Berlin Painter (Benson 1999, 277–82; see also the entry for the Berlin Painter). Hermonax signed his name to 10 extant vases with egρpheres, but no poietes inscriptions are known from his corpus (ARV², 483; AVI, nos. 2001, 2708, 2872, 3570, 5822, 6529, 7121, 7122, 7191, 7962; Benson 1999, 20).

KLEOPHRADES PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 404–6; ARV², 181–95, 1632; Paralipomena 176, 341) lists 134 secure and 20 uncertain attributions. Only eight of his 22 attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. None of his six attributions from the Athenian Agora is from a context likely to be over-represented. The monograph on the painter’s place in the Atalante workshop does not expand his corpus (Kunze-Götte 1992).

Some scholars have speculated that the Kleophrades Painter could be combined with less prolific hands. One scenario proposed by Ohly-Dumm (1984), Robertson (1992, 57–60), and Williams (2005, 275) identifies him as the later stages of Euthymides and the Sosias Painter, but this appears incompatible with another theory that the Kleophrades Painter signed as Megakles (Williams 1997, 200; Kreuzer 2009). Beazley (ARV², 192, 821) suggested that the Boot Painter, whose draftsmanship is very close, could represent the latest work of the Kleophrades Painter, although Williams (CVA London, British Museum 9 [Great Britain 17], 73) and Boardman (1979b, 196) reject the combination.


Recent Attributions (15/17): CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 5 (Netherlands 11), 23–4; CVA Berlin, Antikensammlung 11 (Germany 86), 68; CVA Japan 2, 49–50; CVA Kiel, Kunsthalle, Antikensammlung 2 (Germany 64), 59; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 7 (United States of America 32), 13–14; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 2 (Germany 44), 57–8; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 4 (Germany 52), 19; Greifenhagen 1972, 13–21; Robertson 1983, 1992, 134; Kreuzer 1992, 112; Cahn 1993, 8; Bentz 1998, 139–42; Bentz and Eschbach 2001, 184, 191; Venuti 2001, 66–8, 69–70; Iozzo 2002, 60–1.

Mode of Activity: Uncertain (potter-painter?). He is named after the poietes Kleophrades, who signed only one of the painter’s vases. In spite of Boardman’s (1987, 146) doubts, one might expect that Kleophrades, poietes and son of Amasis, was a painter as well as a potter. However, most of the vases thrown by Kleophrades were painted by Douris. Of the four vases with the intact poietes
inscription of Kleophrades, three were decorated by Douris; another cup by Douris must have been potted by Kleophrades based on its shape, and a fifth signature restored as Kleophrades is unattributed (Beazley 1974b, 1; von Bothmer 1981b; 1985b, 230–31; Buitron-Oliver 1995, 17, 60–1, 74–5). The analysis of the potterwork for the painter is incomplete (Bloesch 1940, 86–7; Philippaki 1967, 52–6, 151).

Nonetheless, it is difficult to identify Kleophrades as a specialist painter because of his relatively low attribution rate. The monumental scale in his early painting is insufficient to explain his lower annual production, because most of his later work is simpler and of lesser quality. A combination with the works of Euthymides, Sosias, and/or the Boot Painter would actually lower the Kleophrades Painter’s attribution rate by considerably extending his career length. Further study is warranted before arguing that the Kleophrades Painter was an assistant potter-painter—or Kleophrades himself.

KY PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 31–3, 680; Paralipomena 16–17) lists 34 secure and three uncertain attributions. Brijder (1983, 73, 224–27; 1991, 472–73; 2000, 714–15) catalogues 67 works by the painter and one possible attribution. Only one of the two fragments from the Athenian Acropolis is included in the tally. One fragment from the Artemision at Thasos is counted normally.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Brijder 1983, 27, 74; Alexandridou 2011, 43).

LENINGRAD PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 567–74, 584, 1659; Paralipomena 390–91, 513) lists 103 secure and four uncertain attributions, including two of the 16 works in the painter’s manner.

Chronology: Mannack 2001, 112–13. Recent attributions dated to ca. 470 B.C.E. suggest the painter was active by this time (CVA Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig 3 [Switzerland 7], 24–5; CVA Hannover, Kestner-Museum 1 [Germany 34], 49–50; CVA Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum 2 [Germany 46], 54). His career may have ended ca. 455, since few of his works are dated in the 450s. Two early CVA attributions are dated to the mid fifth century (CVA Munich, Museum Antiker Klein kunst 2 [Germany 6], 32; CVA Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 2 [Great Britain 9], 120).

Recent Attributions (12/1): CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 90–1, 95–7; CVA Chi usesi, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 2 (Italy 60), 7; CVA Prague, Université Charles 1 (Czech Republic 1), 45; CVA University of Missouri–Columbia, Museum of Art and Archaeology 1 (United States of America 36), 30; CVA Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Museum 2 (Germany 46), 54; Giudice et al. 1992, 156–57; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 71; Panvini 2005, 49–50; Wiel-Marin 2005, 113, 140, 145.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (by attribution rate alone).

PAINTER OF LONDON D12

Beazley (ARV², 959–64, 1675; Paralipomena 434–35) lists 122 secure and 10 uncertain attributions. Chronology: Truitt 1969, 91. Two attributions suggest the painter was active by the late 460s B.C.E. (CVA Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 1 [United States of America 28], 46–7; CVA Toledo, Museum of Art 1 [United States of America 17], 37–8). A sherd from a pit in the Athenian Agora dated to 470–450 is consistent with this chronology (Moore 1997, 361 [Pit D 12:4]). He appears to have ceased working ca. 440 or slightly after (CVA Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire 1 [Switzerland 1], 18).

Recent Attributions (7/2): CVA Leipzig, Antiken museum der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 116; CVA Mainz, Universität 2 (Germany 63), 67–9; CVA Prague, Université Charles 1 (Czech Republic 1), 55; Truitt 1969, 74–92; J. Paul Getty Museum 1983, 82; Wehgartner 1983, 66, 140–41.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (Type 3), because of his affiliation with the Penthesilean workshop (see the entry for the Penthesilean Painter).

PAINTER OF THE LOUVRE CENTAUROMACHY

Beazley (ARV², 1088–96, 1682–83; Paralipomena 449–50) lists 118 secure and 12 uncertain attributions. Chronology: The preponderance of his work is dated to the mid fifth century B.C.E. or more generally in the third quarter of the century, suggesting he was active by ca. 450. Only one is dated to 460–450 (CVA Rome, Museo Nazionale di Villa Giulia 4 [Italy 64], 15). Three of his attributions are dated to ca. 430 (CVA Laon, Musée de...
Laon 1 [France 20], 24; Mannino and Rubis 1995, 144; Moore 1997, 192). However, because of the scarcity of works placed at 440 B.C.E. or later, the end of his career has been placed slightly before 430 B.C.E.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (by attribution rate alone).

PAINTER OF LOUVRE F6

Beazley (ABV, 123–29, 685, 714; Paralipomena 51–2) lists 121 secure and one uncertain attribution. Although the painter has 11 attributions and three other possible works from the Athenian Agora, these fragments are scattered throughout the site in contexts primarily of the latter half of the sixth century. No significant preservation bias is evident.


Recent Attributions (29/4): CVA Athens, National Museum 3 (Greece 3), 29–30; CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 56–7; CVA Heidelberg, Universität 4 (Germany 31), 18–19; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 1 (Netherlands 3), 14; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 1 (Russia 1), 11; CVA Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 1 (Greece 10), 47–9; CVA Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum (Greece 5), 22–3; Connor 1981; Moore and Philippides 1986, 158, 166; Tiverios 1988, 94–5; Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou 1997, 152–56. The 10 attributions from the Sanctuary of Nymphae in Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou (1997) have been counted as only two.

Mode of Activity: Unknown. Further study required.

LYDOS

Beazley (ABV, 107–18, 120, 684–85, 714; Paralipomena 45–7) lists 100 secure and 74 uncertain attributions. This list includes 64 fragments with animal figures of uncertain authorship but excludes eight of the 13 fragments in Lydos’ manner with human figures. Attribution is complicated by the fact that the painter’s signed vases and other clear attributions vary widely in quality and the likelihood that he had many imitators (Boardman 1974, 52; La Rosa 2003). Beazley (ABV, 114, 120, 123) distinguished the human figures of two “companions of Lydos,” the Painter of Louvre F6 and the Painter of Vatican 309, from those of Lydos himself but found the vases with only animals to be indistinguishable. Almost 100 vases excluded from print figure 2 are “Lydian,” including about 30 works attributed to the Painter of Vatican 309, and Beazley’s chapter on Lydos includes about 60 more vases belonging to related minor hands or groups (ABV, 119–23, 129–32).

One fragment from the Sanctuary of Nymphae is included in the tally (Paralipomena 45). However, only eight of his 28 attributions (nine uncertain) from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. Although Lydos has 10 attributions from the Athenian Agora and 11 other possible works, these fragments are scattered throughout the site in contexts of the latter half of the sixth century. No significant preservation bias is evident.

Chronology: CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 2 (Netherlands 8), 34; New Pauly, Antiquity 8:13, s.v. “Lydos”; Boardman 1974, 52; Tiverios 1976, 84–6, 157–58; 1988, 93; Moore and Philippides 1986, 83; Clark et al. 2002, 47. Tiverios (1976) slightly extends the painter’s career beyond 560–540 B.C.E., although in doing so he concentrates on relatively few vases. That Lydos was active a short time before is supported by three early works dated to ca. 560 (CVA Paris, Musée du Louvre 11 [France 18], 3.H.E.106–8; Skarlatidou 1990–1995). Besides one work of ca. 540, Tiverios argues that an eye cup by Lydos should be in a late period of 540–535 B.C.E. Hannestad (1986, 44) identifies another contemporary eye cup by the painter and down-dates both vases to the end of the 530s or even later by comparison with the Andokides and Lyssipides Painters. Eisman (2011, 68, 64–8, 77–9) is preparing a study on Lydos and his workshop, which promises to extend the career of Lydos to more than 40 years and which has the potential of adding a large number of attributions to him and other painters in his group. Without a full publication of the new chronology and works, however, this scheme has not been adopted in the figures in this study. The major period of activity for Lydos from Tiverios and other scholars has been retained, reflecting that most of the vases are dated between 560 and 540 B.C.E.

Recent Attributions (30/24): CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 2 (Netherlands 8), 34–5; CVA Athens, National Museum 3 (Greece 3), 40; CVA Giessen, Antikensammlung der Justus-Liebig-Universität 1 (Germany 70), 41; CVA Gioia del Colle, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (Italy 68), 26; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 1 (United States of America 23), 1–3; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 2 (United States of America 25), 57–8; CVA Mannheim, Reiss-Engelhorn-Museum 2 (Germany 75), 23–4; Tiverios 1976, 93,

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 1). The lead painter in a workshop with hundreds of distinctive vases, he also painted vases with the poieῖς inscriptions of Kolchos and Nikosthenes and perhaps three others (AVI, nos. 3257, 5000, 5637, 5841; Florence, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. no. 98903; see also AVI, no. 6283; Eisman 2011, no. 2). Callipolitis-Feytmans (1974, 87–93, 315–20) also identifies plates from seven alleged workshops by Lydos, although most of these are defined by only one to three examples. At least her Workshops 2 and 6 have enough examples to suggest hesitantly that Lydos painted plates by two or more potters.

Lydos inscribed his name three times as painter. A dinos from the Athenian Acropolis with two inscriptions is thought to name him as both painter and poieῖς (AVI, no. 0975; Tiverios 1976, 15–17; Moore 1979, 99 n. 166; Beazley 1986, 38; Moore and Philippides 1986, 83 n. 92; Immerwahr 1990, 30–1; Cohen 1991, 55–7). The painter inscription is preserved clearly, but only the final three letters of the verb in the second signature survive. Although the second inscription has been restored as “Lydos epoiesein,” it could also have been a repetition of the first eγραφασις signature.

Lydos may have been a slave, according to a lengthy eγραφασις signature naming a Lydos (AVI, no. 7257). The kyathos appears to be too late to identify this slave Lydos as the prolific Lydos, at least under the conventional chronology (Williams 1995a, 142–43). However, Eisman (2011, 64–5, 79 [with further references]) has recently argued that they were the same. If the prolific Lydos included in this study was a slave until the end of his career, his mobility does not appear to have been much restricted.

MAKRON

Beazley (ARV², 458–81, 1654–55, 1706; Paralipomena 378–79) lists 360 secure and eight uncertain attributions. Kunisch (1997, 160–223) catalogues 611 works by the painter without any “near” the painter or in his manner. Only 11 of his 33 attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally; see also von Bothmer 1982.

Makron alone has an exceptionally high annual attribution rate. His huge corpus can be explained by several unusual circumstances. First, Makron has very few uncertain categories of attribution in Beazley’s (ARV², Paralipomena) lists and none in Kunisch’s (1997) monograph. This certainty in attribution exists in spite of the painter’s wide variation in drawing style and reliance on stock figures and scenes (Beazley 1986, 84–97; Kunisch 1997, 3, 40, 75, 158; Hemelrijk 2005, 222–26). Kunisch (1997, 2–3) observes that differences within Makron’s works might have been sufficient to distinguish separate hands, but these variations did not appear together on the same cups: “die künstlerische Identität ihres Gegenstandes wird auch gegen mancherlei Abweichungen des Stils . . . und der Zeichenmanier . . . als Einheit begriffen, während in der gegenwärtigen Forschung vergleichbare Unterschiede häufig genug zum Anlass der Absonderung neuer ‘Malerpersönlichkeiten’ genommen werden.” By the time of his retirement, Makron had several “followers” who painted cups, notably the Clinic and Telephos Painters (ARV², 807–20; Boardman 1979b, 195–97; Robertson 1992, 152–54). The Painter of Palermo 1108 and the Syracuse Painter were also followers of Makron in style, although the two seldom decorated cups (ARV², 298–99, 517–22). Perhaps earlier works of imitators have slipped into the main catalogues for Makron.

Second, Makron’s career dates are difficult to establish because his painting style does not seem to develop much over time (see “Chronology” below). If Makron instead had a 40-year career—corresponding roughly with that of his potter, Hieron, or the Berlin Painter—his attribution rate would drop to about 15 works per year, which is still high but at least closer to the norm.

Third, the most important factor increasing Makron’s apparent attribution rate must be preservation bias. Kunisch (1997, 8–10) speculates that perhaps two or three times as many of Makron’s fragments are preserved than is typical for Attic vase painters. A single private collection known as “Centre Island, N.Y.,” which was assembled by von Bothmer (1982, 33–39), contains a whopping 177 of Kunisch’s 621 catalogued pieces; another 19 pieces come from a collection in Britain (Kunisch 1997, 233–35, 244–46; J. Oakley, pers. comm. 2011). In contrast, the next highest percentage of published works from private collections or the art market is probably that of the Achilles Painter. The 44 such pieces represent less than 13% of the extant corpus for the Achilles Painter and are not concentrated in any one
collection or place (only two by the painter are reported from the collections of von Bothmer) (Oakley 1997, 114–58, 170; 2004a, 71–3; Phoenix Ancient Art 2006, 76–9).

The two large private collections of Makron sherds are unprovenanced, so the preservation bias cannot be determined. If the 196 fragments from private collections are discounted and a fraction of the remaining sherds are reduced (since they may have been produced by imitators), and if a longer career is assumed, Makron’s attribution rate might be adjusted down to about 8–10 works per year.

Chronology: CVA London, British Museum 9 (Great Britain 17), 46; New Pauly, Antiquity 8:104, s.v. “Makron”; von Bothmer 1982, 49–52; Nachbaur 1983, 44–5; Isler-Kerényi 1984, 157; Robertson 1992, 152; Kunisch 1997, 18–21; Benson 1999, 276–77; Vollkommer 2004, 45–6; Hemelrijck 2005, 223–24; Stewart 2008a, 405. The end of Makron’s career is difficult to establish, but given his connections with Hermonax he was likely active past 475 B.C.E. That Makron had a relatively long career is also suggested by details known about his potter, Hieron, who seems to have been active about 40 years and has very few known vessels that were not decorated by Makron (Kunisch 1997, 6; Vollkommer 2001, 319). The Telephos Painter, a follower of Makron active in the 460s, decorated two late works signed by Hieron; a third signature on a vase attributed to the Amphitrite Painter may not be authentic (Robertson 1992, 101, 152).

Recent Attributions (10/0): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 43; Wiel-Marin 2005, 384, 420.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 3) (Bloesch 1940, 77; Immerwahr 1990, 89–90; Kunisch 1997, 6–7, 10–15, 159, 161, no. 4). He is closely associated with Hieron, all but three of whose 59 vases with poiêtes inscriptions were painted by Makron. The potting of an early work by Makron is similar to that of Euphronios, however. Makron is distinguished from Hieron by the presence, from the Athenian Agora have been attributed to Myson. Seven of the secure attributions came from a packing under a cobblestone paving west of the Hephaisteion (Moore 1997, 361 [Pit D 72]). Although Moore down-dated the deposit to ca. 440 B.C.E. based on the presence of a late sherd, it was at first interpreted as debris from a sanctuary burned in 480/79 and an ostraka of the 480s, which had been dumped into hollows in the bedrock near the temple during cleaning (Shear 1937, 344–45; Dinsmoor 1941, 126; Howland 1958, 236; Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 387; Lang 1990, 163). The late sherd complicates the interpretation of the context as cleaning debris from the Persian sack. Besides being fairly heterogeneous in date—with objects ranging from ca. 500 to 440

MYSON

Beazley (ARV², 337–44, 1638–39; Paralipomena 349) lists 95 secure and six uncertain attributions (five of which are from the 19 listed in his manner). Only three of his seven fragments from the Athenian Acropolis are tallied.

A total of 14 works, three of which are uncertain, from the Athenian Agora have been attributed to Myson. Seven of the secure attributions came from a packing under a cobblestone paving west of the Hephaisteion (Moore 1997, 361 [Pit D 72]). Although Moore down-dated the deposit to ca. 440 B.C.E. based on the presence of a late sherd, it was at first interpreted as debris from a sanctuary burned in 480/79 and an ostraka of the 480s, which had been dumped into hollows in the bedrock near the temple during cleaning (Shear 1937, 344–45; Dinsmoor 1941, 126; Howland 1958, 236; Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 387; Lang 1990, 163). The late sherd complicates the interpretation of the context as cleaning debris from the Persian sack. Besides being fairly heterogeneous in date—with objects ranging from ca. 500 to 440
B.C.E.—the deposit contained fewer than 40 red-figure and black-figure vases. Consequently, the seven pieces belonging to Myson have not been reduced for the final tally.


Recent Attributions (9/2): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 23; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 20–1; CVA Parma, Museo Nazionale di Antichità 1 (Italy 45), 3, 1.4; CVA Toledo, Museum of Art 1 (United States of America 17), 27; Pinney 1976, 68–71; Mafire 1982, 203–7; Shapiro et al. 1995, 145; Moore 1997, 165.

Mode of Activity: Unknown. Further study required. Myson’s only name inscription identifies him as both painter and potter but is insufficient evidence to generalize about his career (AVI, no. 1436 [signed “ΜΥΣΟΝ ΕΓΡΑΦΕΝ ΚΑΠΟΙ ΕΣΕΝ”; Robertson 1972, 181; 1992, 18; Boardman 1979b, 112; Williams 1995a, 142).

PAINTER N (NIKOSTHENES)

Beazley (ARV, 216–26, 690; ARV², 122, 1627; Paralipomena 105–6) lists 95 secure and 17 uncertain attributions for Painter N, whom Tosto (1999) identifies as the hand of Nikosthenes himself. Tosto (1999, 12–13, 208–34, 249–51) catalogues 196 Nikosthenic vases and fragments, most signed by Nikosthenes. Of these, 127 works are by Painter N; eight more are by other named painters; 30 are by anonymous hands with only one or two works each; and 21 fragments lack figurework. One fragment from the Athenian Acropolis is counted normally.

Painter N is seen as neither a skillful nor a creative painter (Tosto 1999, 8, 53–8, 96). In the usually taciturn Paralipomena (106), Beazley goes as far as describing the “extraordinary worthless- ness” of the painting. However, we should not assume that Painter N necessarily worked faster than his contemporaries, because his compositions are also fairly elaborate. Most Attic pots have 10–15 figures, whereas Nikosthenic amphorae usually have about 15–35.

Despite the sloppy painting, Nikosthenes’ workshop was involved with innovative new painting techniques (CVA Paris, Musée du Louvre 27 [France 41], 21–2, 47–9, 103–4; Eismann 1974, 49; Williams 1982, 25–7; 2009, 7–8; Grossman 1991, 13; Tosto 1999, 12–13, 46, 49, 87, 118–23, 125–32, 146–47, 221, 227–28; Cohen 2006, 18–23, 45–6, 52, 73–4; Tsingarida 2008). However, the workshop’s role in the introduction of white-ground, the Six technique, and red-figure is debated. Nikosthenes signed two white-ground oinochoai, a Nikosthenic amphora partially decorated in the Six technique, and phialae connected with an anonymous series in the Six and polychrome techniques. However, none of the vases is attributed to Painter N, and it is debatable whether Nikosthenes actually potted them. Most authors see Nikosthenes as having recruited minor potter-painters to produce these vases within his workshop. Toward the end of his career, he also was the poietes of at least 10 vases in red-figure painted by Oltos, Epiktetos, and the Nikosthenes Painter (Tosto 1999, 1, 252).


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (New Pardy, Antiquity 9:74–45, s.v. “Nikosthenes”; Boardman 1974, 65; Scheibler 1984, 133; Hemelrijk 1991, 251; Tosto 1999, 1–3, 8; Vollkommer 2004, 142–43). Although many other painters worked for Nikosthenes, Painter N dominated his production and decorated only Potter N’s vases. Nikosthenes’ poietes inscription appears on at least 139 vases, all but four of which are attributed to Potter N (Tosto 1999, 1–7, 87–8, 173–92, 229–32). The analysis of the potterwork is aided by the fact that Nikosthenes usually signed his vases; only one intact amphora lacks the signature (Tosto 1999, 3, 217). Of the total of 186 “Nikosthenic” black-figure vases, including smaller fragments that do not preserve a signature, Tosto (1999, 11–12, 27–8, 118–19) assigns at least 143 vases and possibly six others to Potter N, two to what he designates as the “Potter of Louvre F117,” two more with distinct potterwork, and 33 others without specific attribution. One pot has two poietes inscriptions, one naming Nikosthenes and the other Anakles, whom Tosto and Heesen interpret as the painter (AVI, no. 2245; Tosto 1999, 3, 186–87, 230–31; Stissi 2002, 105–6; Heesen 2009, 169).

NIOBID PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 598–612, 1661; 1702; Paralipomena 395–97) lists 122 secure and 55 uncertain attributions, nine of which are possibly by the painter. Prange (1989, 26, 127, 180–206, 207–16, 232) catalogues 131 works by the painter and 61 in his manner, but he specifies only two examples from the “manner” list that are possibly by the painter himself. Four of Beazley’s possible attributions are retained, for a total of six uncertain attributions. None of his seven attributions from
the Athenian Agora is from a context likely to be overrepresented. The painter’s low attribution rate may be affected by the many unattributed works in his manner. If half were actually his work, the rate rises to about 7.3.


Recent Attributions (4/1): CVA Berlin, Antiken- sammlungen 9 (Germany 74), 41–2; CVA Bologna, Museo Civico 5 (Italy 33), 3.1.7–8; Cahn 1993, 18; Reeder 1994–1995, 113–15; Tuna-Nörling 1999, 1.7.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Prange 1989, 33–9, 55, 115–16; Frank 1990, 189–90).

OIONOKLES PAINTER

Excluded from the main study but discussed in the print article (print fig. 7). ARV\(^2\), 646–50, 1663; Paralipomena 402.

Chronology: 470s to ca. 460(?) B.C.E. (CVA Adria, Museo Civico 1 [Italy 28], 3.1.41; CVA Capua, Museo Campano 2 [Italy 23], 3.1.3; CVA Cleveland, Museum of Art 1 [United States of America 74], 20; CVA Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 3 [Italy 54], 3.1.7; CVA London, British Museum 10 [Great Britain 20], 48; CVA Los Angeles County Museum of Art 1 [United States of America 18], 40; CVA Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 2 [Austria 2], 13.

Recent Attributions: None.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5 in print fig. 7). According to Euve (1989, 122), the potting of the Nolan amphoras, the painter’s favored shape, is unique. His approximately 55 attributions span at least a decade, for an attribution rate not greater than 5.5 vases per year.

OLTOS

Beazley (ARV\(^2\), 53–69, 1622–23; Paralipomena 327–28) lists 157 secure and 18 uncertain attributions. Only two of his six attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. Beazley had once separated early attributions of Onesimos as those of the Panaitios Painter, whose painting is very close to that of both Onesimos and Euphronios, but the combination with Onesimos is now generally accepted (Robertson 1976, 37–8; 1992, 43–51; Boardman 1979b, 133; Immerwahr 1990, 84–5). Because removing the questionable vases would reduce the tally for Onesimos but also shorten his career, the attribution rate does not appear significantly affected by the uncertainty.


Recent Attributions (12/6): CVA Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum 1 (Netherlands 6), 41; CVA Leipzig, Antikensammlung der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 50, 52; CVA London, British Museum 9 (Great Britain 17), 15; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 8 (United States of America 33), 30–1; CVA Paris, Musée du Louvre 19 (France 28), 21–2, 34; Cahn 1993, 25; Shapiro et al. 1995, 134; Wiel-Marin 2005, 400.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 1) (AVI, nos. 2313, 2351, 3253, 3621, 3627, 4031, 4415, 4453, 4541, 4590, 5456, 6336, 6379, 6380, 6613, 7032, 7083, 7280, 7648, 8162; Boardman 1979b, 56; Immerwahr 1990, 60–1; Robertson 1992, 16, 22). Oltos painted at least 20 vases with poëtes inscriptions of Cachrylion, Chelis, Euxitheos, Hischylos, Nikosthenes, Pamphaios, and Sikanos.

ONESIMOS

Beazley (ARV\(^2\), 318–32, 1645–46; Paralipomena 359–61) lists 161 secure and 37 uncertain attributions, of which 29 in the “manner” list are excluded. Only two of his four attributions (one uncertain) from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. Beazley had once separated early attributions of Onesimos as those of the Panaitios Painter, whose painting is very close to that of both Onesimos and Euphronios, but the combination with Onesimos is now generally accepted (Robertson 1976, 37–8; 1992, 43–51; Boardman 1979b, 133; Immerwahr 1990, 84–5). Because removing the questionable vases would reduce the tally for Onesimos but also shorten his career, the attribution rate does not appear significantly affected by the uncertainty.
and potted by Euphrontios (AVI, nos. 0136, 2628, 2700, 2701, 2748, 4457, 4936, 5014, 5024, 5600, 5725, 6021, 6159, 6448, 6449, 6791; Bloesch 1940, 70–3; Beazley 1944, 35–6; Boardman 1979b, 133; Sparkes 1985, 18; Robertson 1992, 44–5).

PAN PAINTER
Beazley (ARV², 550–61, 1659, 1706; Paralipomena 387–89) lists 168 secure and 11 uncertain attributions. Only seven of 33 fragments of loutrophoroi, numbered by Beazley (ARV², 554) without individual descriptions and presumably from the Sanctuary of Nymphae, have been included in the tally. The 14 secure attributions and one uncertain attribution from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally.

Chronology: New Pauly, Antiquity 15:422–23, s.v. “Pan Painter”; Follmann 1968, 25–45; Beazley 1974c, 8; Sourvinou-Inwood 1975, 109; Boardman 1979b, 180–81; Turner 1996, 61–2; Mannack 2001, 112; Smith 2006, 435, 440; Stewart 2008a, 394. While the painter’s earliest work is generally dated to ca. 480 B.C.E., proposals for the end of his career range between 460 and 450. A shorter career is favored here because his latest individually dated works are ca. 460 B.C.E. (CVA Berlin, Antikensammlung 1 [Germany 3], 41–2; CVA Berlin, Antiquarium 3 [Germany 22], 25; CVA Ferrara, Museo Nazionale 1 [Italy 37], 3). The relatively large number of attributions on the Athenian Acropolis could indicate he was also active for several years before the Persian sack, although the Calliope Painter, not active until 40 years later, has a comparable number of fragments from the Athenian Acropolis.

Recent Attributions (15/1): CVA Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwig 4 (Switzerland 8), 19–22; CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 68; CVA Fiesole, Collezione Costantini 1 (Italy 57), 20; CVA Leiden, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden 3 (Netherlands 5), 41; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 5 (Russia 12), 71; Robertson 1986, 88–9; Williams 1987, 640; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 498; Panvini 2005, 42–3; Wiel-Marin 2005, 109. Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 2) (Follmann 1968, 48; Smith 2006, 450).

PAINTER OF THE PARIS GIGantomachy
Beazley (ARV², 417–24, 1652; Paralipomena 374) lists 140 secure and no uncertain attributions.

Chronology: CVA London, British Museum 9 (Great Britain 17), 71. Career dates are approximate. His production appears to have begun ca. 490 B.C.E. or slightly later (CVA Bonn, Akademisches Kunstmuseum 1 [Germany 1], 10; CVA Florence, Museo Archeologico 4 [Italy 38], 3.1.5; CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 16 [Germany 88], 52). Four vases dated to ca. 470 must be at the end of his career (CVA Gela, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 3 [Italy 54], 3.1.4; Panvini 2003, 88–9; Equizzi 2007, 440).

Recent Attributions (8/5): CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 113–15; CVA Bryn Mawr College 1 (United States of America 13), 19–20; CVA Leipzig, Antikensammlung der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 80–1; CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 15 (Germany 87), 49–50; Cahn 1993, 15; Wiel-Marin 2005, 404, 428–29.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 3) in the Brygos workshop (Bloesch 1940, 82–8; see also AVI, no. 2010). Because he did not begin painting until a decade after the earlier poïëtes inscriptions of Brygos (by ca. 500 B.C.E.), the painter is unlikely to have been Brygos himself (ARV², 399; AVI, no. 6180; Beazley 1944, 35–6; von Bothmer 1982, 46; Robertson 1992, 93–4).

PENTHESILEA PAINTER
Beazley (ARV², 879–91, 1707; Paralipomena 428–29, 522) lists 178 secure and 14 uncertain attributions.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 3) at the head of the Pentesilean group, the largest Attic pottery workshop of its time (Beazley 1944, 29–30; Webster 1972, 15, 38, 40; von Bothmer 1981a; Robertson 1992, 60–62). There are almost 40 collaborations—where the interior and
exterior of the same vase was painted by two different hands—connecting at least 10 painters to this workshop, including the Penthesilea, Splanchnopt, and Veii Painters and the Painter of Bologna 417 (ARV, 877–79; CVA 441, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 [Germany 80], 111; Webster 1972, 15; von Bothmer 1981a, 42; Robertson 1992, 161–62, 166; Osborne 2004, 79–81). Although the study of the vase shapes within the group is incomplete, at least the cup and rhyta classes link the Penthesilea, Pistozenos, and Splanchnopt Painters and the Painters of Brussels R330 and London E777 (Bloesch 1940, 103–7; Hoffmann 1962, 33–5, 47).

PHIALE PAINTER


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) in the workshop of the Achilles Painter (see the entry for the Achilles Painter).

POLOS PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 43–9, 681; Paralipomena 20–1) lists 184 secure and two uncertain attributions. Most of the painter’s vases were found in Athens, especially the Agora and Acropolis, which may indicate a preservation bias favoring him relative to other Attic vase painters. Only eight of his 22 attributions from the Acropolis are included in the tally. His 35 attributions and one uncertain work from the Agora are evenly distributed throughout the area in primarily sixth-century deposits. The highest concentration is three sherds from an early well, referenced below in “Chronology.” Thus, although his work is unusually concentrated in the Agora, no individual context indicates a significant preservation bias.

Chronology: CVA Athens, National Museum 4 (Greece 4), 18; CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 105; Hemelrijk 1971, 110; Boardman 1974, 19; Lioutas 1987, 81. Callipolitis-Feytmans (1974, 161–63, 166, 341–49) places his activity over the second quarter of the sixth century B.C.E. and possibly beyond midcentury. However, at least 11 works are now dated to ca. 580 B.C.E. suggesting he was already active by the latter part of the 580s (CVA Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 2 [United States of America 19], 11). CVA Mainz, Universität 1 [Germany 15], 38–9; CVA Prague, Universität Charles 1 [Czech Republic 1], 36–7; CVA Reading, University of Reading 1 [Great Britain 12], 15; Lioutas 1987, 38–40). Because relatively few of his attributions are dated after 560 B.C.E., he may have ceased most painting by the mid 550s (CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 1 [Germany 79], 41–2; CVA Munich, Museum Antiker Kleinkunst 3 [Germany 9], 36; CVA Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesmuseum 1 [Germany 26], 24; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 3 [Germany 47], 45–6). Athenian Agora well contexts are generally consistent with such a chronology. Two of his fragments came from a well deposit dated to 575–560 (Pit A 17:1), one from a 575–550 context (Pit F 12:6), three from a 580–565 context (Pit O 7:9), and one from a 580–560 context (Pit P 8:5) (Moore and Philippides 1986, 329, 331, 334, 335, respectively).

Recent Attributions (51/11): CVA Athens, National Museum 4 (Greece 4), 19; CVA Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 2 (United States of America 19), 11; CVA Erlangen, Antikensammlung der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität 2 (Germany 84), 88–9; CVA Kassel, Antikenabteilung Der Staatliche Kunstsammlungen 1 (Germany 3), 47; CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 2 (Germany 2), 2; CVA Marathon, Marathon Museum (Greece 7), 16–17; CVA Nantes, Musée Dobrée (France 36), 25; CVA Rhodes, Archaeological Museum 1 (Greece 10), 39–40; CVA University College Dublin, University College Cork (Ireland 1), 25; CVA Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois 1 (United States of America 24), 12; Hemelrijk 1971, 108; Moore 1986, 86–7; Moore and Philippides 1986, 255; Lioutas 1987, 38–43; Papadopoulos-Kanellopoulou 1997, 101–10; Schaeffer et al. 1997, 80; Kreuzer 1998, 89, 153. Papadopoulos-Kanellopoulou (1997) attributes 34 new works (nine uncertain) from the Sanctuary of Nymphé, counted as six works in print figure 1.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter(?) (Type 5). Because of his high attribution rate, his mode of activity is shown as uncertain in print figure 7 (Payne 1931, 190; Hemelrijk 1971, 109; Boardman 1974, 19; Callipolitis-Feytmans 1974, 160–61; Moore and Philippides 1986, 82). Both the painting and potting are marked by their poor quality in comparison with contemporary Attic vases, which suggests but does not prove a correlation of painting with potting.

PROVIDENCE PAINTER

catalogues 162 works by the painter; 26 others in his manner have been excluded.


Recent Attributions (6/3): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 11–12; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 2 (United States of America 32), 48; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 33–4; CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 15 (Germany 87), 45–6; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 90, 92.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) in the workshop dominated by the Berlin Painter (Papoutsake-Sermpet 1983, 224–27, 342; Euwe 1989, 121–25; see also the entry for the Berlin Painter).

RED-BLACK PAINTER

Brijder (2000, 569–72, 599, 680–86) first defined the hand, listing 57 secure and seven uncertain attributions. Only four of the 12 fragments from the Artemision at Thasos are tallied.

Chronology: CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 10 (Russia 18), 20; Brijder 2000, 571–72, 596–98.

Recent Attributions (2/1): CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 10 (Russia 18), 20–1; Kreuzer 1998, 177.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Brijder 2000, 573–75, 595–96).

RED-LINE PAINTER

Including the Group of Vatican G30, Beazley (ABV, 596, 600–7, 710; Paralipomena 299, 301–2) lists 110 works; nine more are possibly the Red-Line Painter’s, including six of the 29 attributions in his manner. Taking six of Beazley’s uncertain works as attributions, Holmberg (1987, 59–82; 1989, 61, 75–6; 1990, 7–8) catalogues 118 vases by the painter and 49 in his manner. Holmberg also argues that only 17 vases of the highest quality were actually by the painter, whereas the simpler, repetitive scenes were by copyists in the workshops. Since this division by quality is generally opposed to Beazley’s (Paralipomena, xix) inclusion of works regardless of quality, the original classification is maintained here. The 11 vases attributed after Beazley’s death but not counted among the 17 highest-quality works by Holmberg (1989, 61 n. 6) have been retained as uncertain attributions. Thus, the adjusted tally is 118 secure and 14 uncertain works.

Chronology: Holmberg 1987, 59; 1990, 8. Holmberg’s minimum range of activity is adopted here to reflect the major period of activity of the painter.

Recent Attributions (3/1): CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 41; CVA University College Dublin, University College Cork (Ireland 1), 16; Giudice et al. 1992, 149; Fanvini and Giudice 2004, 462.


REED PAINTER

Beazley (ABV2, 1376–82, 1692, 1704; Paralipomena 486) lists 157 secure and no uncertain attributions. Chronology: Parlama and Stampolidis 2000, 272, 351–53; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 212; Oakley 2004b, 14, 18.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (by attribution rate alone).

SABOUFF PAINTER

Beazley (ABV2, 837–52, 1672, 1703, 1707; Paralipomena 424–25) lists 290 secure and eight uncertain attributions. Kavvadia (2000, 22, 178–215) catalogues 330 vases by the painter; 47 others in his manner have been excluded. The 24 fragments published by Kavvadia (2000, 42 n. 109, 157 n. 14) from the Sanctuary of Nymfe are counted as only five in print figure 1.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) in various workshops, including that dominated by
the Achilles Painter (Bloesch 1940, 87; Kurtz 1975, 34–6; Euwe 1989, 129; Kavvadias 2000, 173–77, 217; see also the entry for the Achilles Painter).

**SAPPHOS PAINTER**

Haspels (ABL, 225–29) lists 60 secure and seven uncertain works, to which Beazley (ABV, 507–8, 702; ARV², 304; Paralipomena 246–47) adds 14 new and eight uncertain attributions. Jubier-Galinier (1996, 9, 85, 109, nos. 1–98) catalogues 89 works by the painter and nine in his manner, which are possibly his. C. Jubier-Galinier’s (pers. comm. 2011) monograph on the Sappho-Diosphos workshop, currently in preparation, includes the 117 vases by the Sappho Painter presented in print figure 2. Only one of the four loutrophoroi from the Sanctuary of Nymphae has been tallied (Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou 1997, 188, 194, 197, 210).


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Kurtz 1975, 80, 97; Jubier-Galinier 1996, 3, 85, 87–90, 93–5, 111–13, 140–41, 144–76, 304; 1998, 736; 2003, 81; Jubier 1999, 181–82). He decorated one variant of the DL Class as well as a unique form of lekythos in the Little Lion Class, and both shapes developed synchronously with the secondary decoration and his phases of painting. Lekythoi of his subclasses are painted by the Sappho Painter primarily, and a few vases are in his manner, but none is by his companion, the Diosphos Painter (see the entry for the Diosphos Painter). Likewise, no examples of the class of white-ground side-palmette lekythoi associated with the Diosphos Painter have been attributed to the Sappho Painter. The Sappho Painter also decorated a range of other shapes, including some large pots, but none is clearly by a different potter.

**SHUVALOV PAINTER**

Beazley (ARV², 1206–12; Paralipomena 463, 518) lists 79 secure and 12 uncertain attributions. Adding eight and dropping one from his list of attributions, Lezzi-Hafter (1976, 88–9, 98–9, 103–9, 113) catalogues 86 works by the painter and no uncertain attributions.

Chronology: *New Pauly, Antiquity* 13:409, s.v. “Shuvalov Painter”; Lezzi-Hafter 1976, 4, 88–9; Boardman 1989, 97. Of the 92 attributions with individual dates, only 21 are dated to 430 or earlier and seven after 420 B.C.E. Consequently, the proposed 440–420/410 B.C.E. activity range has been adjusted to the painter’s main activity in the 420s B.C.E. One sherd came from a construction fill at the Athenian Agora (Pits E–F 12–14) whose contents were dated to 460–450 or earlier, but it seems in this case that the fragment by the Shuvalov Painter should date the context rather than vice versa (Moore 1997, 296–97, 362).


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Lezzi-Hafter 1976, 21–2, 40, 43–6, 95–6, 98–9, 103–13). Excluding fragments and unusual shapes whose potterwork is unattributed, the remaining 71 works of the Shuvalov Painter are associated with the S-Töpfer, or S Potter, and one style of ornament. Roughly 35 other vases by this S Potter were painted by at least seven other hands, including the Eretria Painter (see the entry for the Eretria Painter), but no more than five belong to one of these minor painters. Although Lezzi-Hafter (1976) does not comment on whether the Shuvalov Painter was also the potter, the evidence fits the potter-painter model well.

**SOPHILOS**

Beazley (ABV, 37–43; Paralipomena 18–19) lists 47 secure and 14 uncertain attributions. Bakir (1981, 15–30, 59, 78–80) catalogues 45 works by the painter and three more perhaps his. Bakir’s method of attribution is at variance with Beazley’s. Bakir’s (1981, 39, 43–5) “circle of” Sophilos, which for Beazley would imply a related artist, includes many pieces that might be by the painter himself. Moreover, Bakir demotes 14 of Beazley’s attributions to Sophilos (six of these “near” the painter) to the circle and altogether rejects eight more Beazley attributions (six “near”). That is, Bakir has a much narrower definition of the hand of Sophilos and removes more than a third of Beazley’s list. The two approaches are so incompatible that Beazley’s list has been retained as the basis for this study, in addition to seven new attributions from Bakir. Bakir’s rejected pieces are counted as possible attributions, as are nine new possible attributions from Bakir’s “circle of” list. The resulting tally is 53/25, because two fragments listed separately by Beazley belong to the same vessel, Bakir’s A.17. Together with the recent attributions, the tally here is similar to the list of works recently compiled in Alexandridou 2011, 216. The 10 attributions (six uncertain) from the Athenian Acropolis are tallied as only three. Boardman 1974, 18; Bakir 1981, 49–61; Thomas 1985, 11–16; Clark et al. 2002, 60; Vollkommer 2004, 407–8; Cohen 2006, 161–63; Hiramaya 2010, 164. The painter’s career length is debated; it was as little as a decade according to
Boardman 1974. Bakir (1981) suggests almost 30 years (or 40 with the circle) of activity by giving 10 years for each of the painter’s early, middle, and late phases. The 15-year career adopted here is a compromise of the various proposals.


Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (Type 4). The first Attic painter to leave us his name did so three times with the verb egraphsen (Callipolitis-Feytmans 1965, 54; Boardman 1974, 12, 18; Bakir 1981, 5–7, 60; Mertens 1988, 426; Immervah 1990, 21–2; Cohen 1991, 52; 2006, 161–63; Williams 1995a, 141; Hirayama 2010, 164). Two other inscriptions of Sophilos, on his krater from Me nidi and dinos from Pharsalos (AVI, nos. 0834, 0907), may have had the verb epoiesen, although it has been heavily restored. Since adequate study of his potterwork is not available, he has been omitted from print figure 5.

SPLANCHNOPT PAINTER

Beazley (ARV/, 891–900, 1674, 1707; Paralipomena 429, 516) lists 159 secure and 18 uncertain attributions.

Chronology: His major period of activity was 460–450, but his collaboration with the Penthesilea Painter and at least two attributions in the prior decade suggest he had started by the mid 460s (CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 [Germany 80], 108; CVA Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois 1 [United States of America 24], 22; von Bothmer 1981a, 42). At least seven attributions dated to ca. 450 or the following decade indicate he was active for about 20 years total (e.g., CVA Mainz, Universität 2 [Germany 63], 67; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 5 [Russia 12], 77–8; Wiemar 2005, 275).

Recent Attributions (7/3): CVA Fiesole, Collezione Costantini 1 (Italy 57), 21; CVA Leipzig, Antiken museum der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 109; CVA Mainz, Universität 2 (Germany 63), 67; CVA Prague, Université Charles 1 (Czech Republic 1), 43–4; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 5 (Russia 12), 77–8; CVA Turin, Museo di Antichità 2 (Italy 40), 3.1.5; CVA Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois 1 (United States of America 24), 22; Cahn 1993, 21; Phoenix Ancient Art 2006, 66–9.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (Type 3), because of his affiliation with the Penthesilean workshop (see the entry for the Penthesilean Painter).

SWING PAINTER

Beazley (ABV, 304–10, 693; Paralipomena 133–35) lists 148 secure and six uncertain attributions. Böhr (1982a, 1, 56, 75–109, 115) catalogues 159 works by the painter, while 33 works within his circle are excluded.


Recent Attributions (14/0): CVA Adria, Museo Archeologico Nazionale 2 (Italy 65), 9, 11; CVA Böhr, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 1 (Germany 79), 31–2; CVA Göttingen, Archäologisches Institut der Universität 3 (Germany 83), 19–20; Böhr 1982b; Moore 1987, 9, 14.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (Type 5?) in print figure 5; specialist painter (Type 3) in print figure 7 because of his attribution rate (Böhr 1982a, 16, 57; von Bothmer 1984, 82). His high attribution rate suggests he was primarily a specialist.

SYLEUS SEQUENCE

Excluded from the main study but discussed in the print article (p. 503). ABV, 403; ARV/, 245–55, 1639–40, 1701; Paralipomena 350; Robertson 1970; 1976, 38; 1992, 121–23; Boardman 1979b, 113; Pinney 1981, 145; Tiverios 1985, 64–73, 81; Padgett 1997, 213, 224–25, 229 n. 123. It has been suggested that the four hands of the Syleus Sequence were aspects of one artisan, although Tiverios sees at least three distinct personalities in the material. To the 71 vases associated with the Syleus Painter by Beazley (three uncertain), another 29 are connected to him through the other painters of the sequence, and five more by the minor, related hands. Adjusting for recent attributions and nine Athenian Acropolis sherds, the combined total is about 100 vases.

Chronology: Ca. 490 to the latter half of the 470s B.C.E., or approximately 15–20 years. Robertson (1970, 15) suggests a time span of as little as a decade is possible, whereas Padgett (1997) and Tiverios (1985) make it about 30 years.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (?) (atypical). The analysis of his vase shapes is incomplete, although there are a wide range of associations consistent with the unified painters having worked with other potters (Philippaki 1967, 59–60, 98–9, 102, 151). The minor hands have so
few attributions that they are difficult to view as separate personalities. Combined, the Syleus Painter’s attribution rate would be 5.0–6.7 works per year. As such, he may have been a “roving” potter-painter comparable to Syriskos. Without a more precisely determined chronology, it is also possible that the unified painter was a specialist.

SYRISKOS

Beazley (ARV², 256–67, 1640; Paralipomena 351–53) lists 93 secure and seven uncertain attributions for the Syriskos Painter, to which are added the 38 pieces attributed to the Copenhagen and P.S. Painters (one of which is uncertain).


S. Pevnick (pers. comm. 2011) catalogues 182 works by the unified painter and eight uncertain works. Only six of the 19 fragments from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. I thank Pevnick for providing me with a copy of his dissertation. I know of no subsequent attributions.

Chronology: Pevnick 2011, 146–58. Because the painter has relatively few early attributions, the beginning of his career has been placed “slightly after” 490 B.C.E. (S. Pevnick, pers. comm. 2011). His earliest signature as poietes should be the skyphos painted by Epiktetos, who does not seem to have been active as a painter much after ca. 490 (Pevnick 2011, 350–51, no. P2 [AVI no. 4500]). However, see the commentary on Epiktetos for Robertson’s (1976, 1992) controversial dating of the skyphos to ca. 480 or later. Other vases signed by Pistroxenos and/or Syriskos as poietes are dated to the 470s or 460s (Pevnick 2011, 321, no. *141 [AVI, no. 7126]; 334–35, no. 158 [AVI, no. 5130]; 335, no. 159 [AVI no. 5130]; 351, no. P3 [AVI no. 7466]; see also CVA Schwerin, Staatliches Museum 1 [Germany 1], 19).

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter(?) (atypical). The relative chronology for Syriskos indicates that he was a potter at least as early as his first painting. A vase attributed to the Copenhagen Painter is signed with epoiesen by Syriskos, whereas an astragalos from a unique mold attributed to the Syriskos Painter names Syriskos as its poietes (AVI, no. 7128; Pevnick 2010, 2011, 143–46, 230–31, 321 [once Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, inv. no. 92.AE.6, repatriated to Italy in 2007]). Of the six vases he signed with epoiesen as Pistroxenos, one was painted by Epiktetos, another by the Pistroxenos Painter; at least two of the others were painted by Syriskos himself (AVI, nos. 2886, 3625, 4500, 4833, 6608, 7466; Robertson 1992, 138; Pevnick 2011, 144, 203–6, 332–34, 350–52).

Although many vases attributed to Syriskos have unique potter-work that might be his own, there are some indications that Syriskos also painted for other potters. He is associated with a class of 22 stamnoi, 17 of which are attributed to the Copenhagen or Syriskos Painters, although four other hands, including the Triptolemos Painter, are associated with the other five stamnoi (Philippaki 1967, 63–4). Syriskos also painted a rhyton of a class primarily associated with the Brygos Painter and stamnoi of a class associated with the Berlin Painter (Hoffmann 1962, 10–12; Philippaki 1967, 34, 151).

TARAS PAINTER

Brijder (1983, 167–68, 248–55; 1991, 480–81; 2000, 722–23) first defined the hand, cataloguing 149 works by the painter and 12 possibly by him, including vases listed in the manner of the C Painter by Beazley (ABV, 1981, 61–68; 1983, 23–6). Only two of his four attributions from the Athenian Acropolis are included in the tally. Similarly, only two of his four attributions from the Artemision at Thasos are tallied, although 11 possible attributions from the Athenaion have been retained.


Recent attributions (5/0): CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 8 (Russia 15), 15; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 10 (Russia 18), 13–14.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter(?) (Type 5) or perhaps early specialist painter (Type 3) (Brijder 1983, 155–56). Some shapes decorated by the Taras Painter diverge from the norm. Brijder (1983) speculates that he painted for other potters.

TARQUINIA PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 866–73, 1673; Paralipomena 426–27, 516) lists 104 secure and four uncertain attributions; 34 in his manner are excluded. Two cups classified as the Painter of Tarquinia RC1131, which Beazley considers might be early work by the Tarquinia Painter, have been counted as potential attributions.

Chronology and recent attributions (1/1): Moore 1997, 322; 1998, 53–4. The Tarquinia Painter was
active primarily 470–460 B.C.E., but his career likely extends a few years before and after the decade. Two attributions are in the previous and following decades, respectively (CVA Florence, Museo Archeologico 4 [Italy 38], 3.1.10; CVA Vienna 1 [Germany 5], U22). One attribution from the Athenian Agora appears in a well context dated to ca. 520–475 and shortly after (Moore and Philippides 1986, 333; Moore 1997, 365 [Pit M 17:4]).

Mode of Activity: Probably a specialist painter, by attribution rate alone. His attribution rate of 7.2 is just above the threshold, and some of the relatively large number of works in his manner—which were not tallied here—may have been his own.

THESEUS PAINTER

Haspels (ABL, 249–54, 253) lists 77 secure and 22 uncertain works, to which Beazley (ABV, 518–21, 704, 716; Paralipomena 256–60) adds 88 new and nine uncertain attributions. Tallying his attributions has been complicated by the publication of two separate monographs that differ over attributions and chronology for the painter. Neither work engages the other. Fritzilas (2006, 1, 59–212, 239–53) attributes 399 works to the Theseus Painter, more than twice the number attributed by Beazley. Borgers (2004, 66–80, 139, 143–79) catalogues 211 works by the painter and 26 by or “near” him; another 53 “near” the Theseus Painter cannot be counted here because they are associated with minor hands in the workshop that are nonetheless very close to the painter. Borgers (2004, 179–82) also rejects 28 other attributions to the painter or his workshop, most of which were made after Beazley’s death.

The discrepancy between the two recent catalogues arises from two factors. First, Borgers (2004) examined and rejected at least eight vases accepted as works of the painter by Fritzilas (2006), and similarly Borgers placed 13 works accepted fully by Fritzilas as only “near” the painter. However, this leaves up to 167 works catalogued by Fritzilas not by Borgers.

The second factor is the many new attributions published by Fritzilas (2006) from excavations in Greece. Borgers (2004, 182) includes the five loutrophoroi from the Sanctuary of Nympha listed by Beazley (Paralipomena 257), adding one new skyphoi by rejecting three loutrophoroi recently published in Papadopoulou-Kanellopoulou 1997, 193–96, 200–1.1 However, Fritzilas (2006, 69, 73, 176–90, 314) attributes 91 loutrophoroi and three skyphoi from the Sanctuary of Nympha to the Theseus Painter, most of which he publishes for the first time. Relative to Borgers’ lists, 84 of the loutrophoroi and two of the skyphoi are new in Fritzilas 2006. Another problem is that Borgers rejects all three loutrophoroi attributions that he examines, whereas Fritzilas accepts two of the three as from the hand of the Theseus Painter. The Sanctuary of Nympha accounts for 86 of the 167 extra pieces in Fritzilas’ monograph. Only 19 of the pieces from this context are counted in print figure 1.

Second, Fritzilas (2006, 233, 238, 316–17) identifies 38 fragments from the Athenian Acropolis, compared with the 16 for Borgers (2004, 194, 224–25) and 13 in Beazley (ABV, Paralipomena). This has been adjusted to 13 attributions in the figures in this study.

Third, Fritzilas (2006, 233) adds one fragment from the Athenian Agora to the 15 catalogued by Borgers. Although the remainder came from a variety of contexts, eight sherds attributed to the painter came from the Rectangular Rock-Cut Shaft (Moore and Philippides 1986, 331–32). These are probably overrepresented and are counted as only three works in the figures in this study, for a total of 11 from the Agora.

The final major divergence is at Thasos, where Fritzilas (2006, 236, 239, 319–20) examined 29 fragments, whereas Borgers (2004, 194, 232) knew of only five. The 24 new fragments belonged to skyphoi from the Artemision and thus are counted as only eight additional works.

In review, of the new attributions from Fritzilas not catalogued by Borgers, 86 are from the Sanctuary of Nympha, 24 are from Thasos, 22 are from the Athenian Acropolis, and one is from the Agora, leaving only 34 from various locations unaccounted for. Because Fritzilas has not distinguished any attributions as uncertain and Borgers rejects a small number of pieces examined by both, I have distributed the remaining 34 works catalogued only by Fritzilas as 31 new, two uncertain, and one rejected, following the percentages for works in both catalogues.

The final tally adds to the 211 vases catalogued by Borgers an additional 13 from the Sanctuary of Nympha, eight from Thasos, and 31 from various locations. The adjustments for the Athenian Acropolis and the Agora result in a total deduction of seven. The 26 uncertain attributions are increased by two.


Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2) (ABL, 146; Borgers 2004, 13, 61–2, 64–6, 139; Fritzilas
TLESON PAINTER (TLESON)
Beazley (*ABV*, 179–83, 688; *Paralipomena* 74–6) lists 63 secure and 62 uncertain attributions. Heesen (2009, 178–80, 291–311, 331) catalogues 221 works by the painter and nine more possibly by him. This great expansion of the painter’s corpus is due largely to Heesen’s use of ornament and handwriting to identify the painter’s hand. Since the attributions for most painters of the study are based on figurework, only the 118 cups with figures are counted in print figure 2. Only three of the eight fragments from the Athenian Acropolis in Heesen are tallied; see also Fellmann 2002, 111, 117–20; Wachter 2003, 141.

The exclusion of more than 100 nonfigural cups has effectively halved Tleson’s attribution rate. Including these cups would give him more than 10 extant vases per year, although this attribution rate has more to do with his productivity as a potter than the comparison with other Attic painters.

Recent Attributions (11/0): CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 8 (Russia 15), 36; CVA St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum 10 (Russia 18), 25–6, 34–6.

Mode of Activity: Potter-painter (Type 5) (Webster 1972, 9–11; Boardman 1974, 60; Fellmann 2002; Heesen 2009, 178–82, 207–8 [with further bibliography]). Almost 100 *poietes* inscriptions by Tleson, a son of Nearchos, have survived, almost all of which can be attributed to the Tleson Painter, who also appears not to have painted for other potters.

TRIPTOLEMOS PAINTER

Recent Attributions (7/2): CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 (Germany 80), 68, 70; CVA Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 7 (United States of America 32), 4–5; Knauer 1973; Pinney 1976, 46–7; Shapiro 1981, 84–6; Maffre 1984, 118; Madigan 2008, 64.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2). He painted alongside Douris for Python but also numerous other potters (Knauer 1973, 17; Pinney 1976, 165–67; *New Pauly, Antiquity* 14:936–37, s.v. “Tripolomos Painter”). The *poietes* inscriptions are of Charinos and Hermotimos (AVI, nos. 6679, 6928); Brygos, Euphronios, Hieron, and Python are connected by shape (AVI, nos. 2331, 6480, 7706; Bloesch 1940, 85, 97; Beazley 1944, 36). Strengthening the connection to the Python workshop are two vessels attributed to the Tripolomos Painter but bearing a forged egraphsen inscription naming Douris (AVI, nos. 2331, 3122; Immerwahr 1990, 86, 171).

TYMBOSS PAINTER
Beazley (*ARV*², 754–60, 1668–69, 1702; *Paralipomena* 414) lists 107 secure and 11 uncertain attributions. Beazley lists 45 vessels in the workshop and manner of the painter, of which only the nine said to be “near” the painter have been counted in print figure 2.

Chronology: Nakayama 1982, 26; Oakley 2004b, 15. At least five of his works dated to ca. 460 B.C.E. mark the start of his career (CVA Basel, Antikenmuseum und Sammlung Ludwieg 3 [Switzerland 7], 73–4; CVA Berlin, Antikensammlung 12 [Germany 89], 33–5; CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 [Germany 81], 66; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 94–5). He appears to have been active through the mid 440s based on at least seven attributions dated to midcentury, one in the following decade, and another from a grave dating from ca. 440 (CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 15 [Germany 87], 145; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 140). The painter’s career is poorly documented and his end date obscured by the many vessels from his workshop, which continued into the 420s.

Recent Attributions (15/1): CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 66; CVA Czech Republic 4, 16–17; CVA Munich, Antikensammlungen 16 (Germany 88), 145; CVA Prague, Université Charles 1 (Czech Republic 1), 61; CVA Warsaw, Musée National 2 (Poland 5), 26–7; Felten 1976, 76; Pulz 1991, 367; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 46, 94–5, 100, 130, 140.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (?) (by attribution rate alone).

VEII PAINTER
Beazley (*ARV*², 900–7, 1674, 1707; *Paralipomena* 429–30) lists 131 secure and eight uncertain attributions.
Chronology: von Bothmer 1981a, 43. Several works dated to ca. 460 suggest he was active by this time, and only one early attribution is dated to 470–460 B.C.E. (CVA Vienna 1 [Germany 5], U30). His latest works are from ca. 440 (CVA Kassel, Antikenabteilung Der Staatliche Kunstsammlungen 1 [Germany 3], 58; CVA Leipzig, Antikenmuseum der Universität 3 [Germany 80], 110; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 132).

Recent Attributions (2/1): CVA Amsterdam, Al­lard Pierson Museum 1 (Netherlands 6), 104; CVA Japan 1, 31–2; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 132.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter(?) (Type 3), because of his affiliation with the Penthesilean workshop (see the entry for the Penthesilean Painter).

VILLA GIULIA PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 618–27; Paralipomena 398–99) lists 123 secure and nine uncertain attributions.

Chronology: New Pauly, Antiquity 15:420, s.v. “Villa Giulia Painter”; Turner 1996, 69–70. A total of 38 of his works compiled here are dated, of which 34 are between ca. 460 and ca. 450 B.C.E. Accordingly, the beginning of the painter’s career has been lowered to ca. 465 despite two attributions of ca. 470 (CVA Kassel, Antikenabteilung Der Staatliche Kunstsammlungen 1 [Germany 3], 57; CVA Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois 1 [United States of America 24], 21). Likewise, his activity has been extended slightly beyond midcentury because of several works dated to ca. 450 B.C.E. (e.g., CVA Bryn Mawr College 1 [United States of America 13], 47; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 4 [Germany 52], 56).

Recent Attributions (11/3): CVA Athens, Museum of Cycladic Art 1 (Greece 11), 103–4; CVA Kiel, Kunsthalle, Antikensammlung 2 (Germany 64), 58; CVA Prague, Universität Charles 1 (Czech Republic 1), 44; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 4 (Germany 52), 66; CVA Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois 1 (United States of America 24), 21; Vickers 1974; Weghartner 1983, 71; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 73–4, 81, 95; Moore 1997, 225; Panvini and Giudice 2004, 499; Wiel-Marin 2005, 151–52.


WASHINGTON PAINTER

Beazley (ARV², 1126–35; Paralipomena 454, 517) lists 212 secure and 25 uncertain attributions, with 74 loutrophoroi from the Sanctuary of Nym­phe. Sabetai (1993, 1:3–4; 2:3–92) catalogues 156 works by the painter and 26 uncertain works, of which 23 in his manner have been excluded. Another 251 fragments, 21 of which are possibly his, from the Sanctuary of Nym­phe are tallied as 53 total works (Sabetai 1993, 2:22, 94–197).


Recent Attributions (8/5): CVA Berlin, Antikensammlung 9 (Germany 74), 54–5, 68–9; CVA Bochum, Kunstsammlungen der Ruhr-Universität 2 (Germany 81), 27; CVA Giessen, Antikensammlung der Justus-Liebig-Universität 1 (Germany 70), 52; CVA Mainz, Universitäts­museum 2 (Germany 63), 14–16; CVA Moscow, Pushkin State Museum 4 (Russia 4), 16; CVA Tübingen, Antikensammlung des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität 4 (Germany 52), 24–5; CVA Warsaw, Musée National 3 (Poland 6), 9; Schwarz 1996, 61–2; Moore 1997, 292; Kunze-Götte et al. 1999, 150; Heissmeyer 2008, 53–5.

Mode of Activity: Specialist painter (Type 2). Together with Aison, the Eretria Painter, Polion, and the Shuvalov Painter, the Washing Painter decorated pelikai, squat lekythoi, and probably hy­driae by the same potters (New Pauly, Antiquity 15:567, s.v. “Washing Painter”; Lezzi-Hafter 1976, 6; 1988, 218, 277; Sabetai 1993, 20–4, 147–48, 175–76, 203–4, 212, 218). The lebates gamikoi and loutrophoroi by the Washing Painter are also closely connected by potterwork to those of the Naples Painter.
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