

D. A. AMYX

A CORINTHIAN KOTYLE IN MAINZ<sup>1)</sup>

There is a conspicuously fine class of Early Corinthian pottery, well defined as to its general characteristics and its approximate place in the ware, which has been nevertheless notoriously hard to allocate more narrowly to individual vase-painters. At last, however, thanks to the beautiful kotyle in the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum in Mainz which Professor Klumbach kindly allows me to publish here (Taf. 29; 30 and Taf. 31,1)<sup>2)</sup>, we are able to bring together seven pieces decorated by one hand, and thus to make at least a first step toward a better understanding of this group. The Mainz kotyle is, indeed, not only an excellent example of its kind but also an important connecting link which helps to establish the stylistic unity of the vases here assigned to the same artist.

The shapes of Early Corinthian kotylai vary somewhat. This specimen, which has a fairly shallow form, but with a gently convex body profile and slightly inturned rim, is characteristic of one type<sup>3)</sup>. Its decoration is also well suited to the Early Corinthian period: an animal frieze of Early type placed in a setting of typically correct subsidiary ornament. In the lip-zone, between two horizontal bands, there is a frieze of neat vertical zigzags; above and below the animal frieze, three-row dicing, already breaking down into round dots; finely pointed rays at the base, and a black foot-ring with a reserved band at its bottom. In the animal frieze, the main side has a symmetrical arrangement of five elements: a tightly constructed lotus cross with leafy fillers in the angles, between griffin-birds, between lions; at the back, a bird standing to right, and a panther facing a stag. The filling ornament is composed of tidy rosettes of various

<sup>1)</sup> Part of the material for this paper was gathered in 1957-59, during tenure of a Fulbright Research Grant to Greece and a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship. Photographic and clerical expenses were in part defrayed by research grants from the University of California (Berkeley). I am indebted to Miss Lucy T. Shoe, for permission to republish the fragment Corinth C-31-03 (Taf. 31,2); to the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, for photographs of the kotyle-pyxis in Brussels and for permission to use them here (Taf. 35-37); and to Miss Patricia Lawrence, my research assistant in 1959, for her valuable services and helpful advice. Others to whom I am specially obligated are named elsewhere in the text.

For the references most frequently cited, the following abbreviations are used: Benson, GKV. = J. L. Benson, *Geschichte der korinthischen Vasen*, Basel, Schwabe, 1953; Cor. Vases = D. A. Amyx, *Corinthian*

*an Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon* (Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Class. Archaeology, I: 9), Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1943; NC = Humfry Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, Oxford, 1931, Catalogue numbers; Payne = op. cit., text (pages) and plates. In the references to CVA., the rubric "III C" is to be understood wherever a classifying symbol is needed.

<sup>2)</sup> Mainz RGZM Inv. O. 2792, from South Russia. Ht. O. 10,4 cm., diam. with handles O. 22,5 cm. Pale clay; generally firm glaze, worn off in some areas, especially on the reverse side. A small piece was broken out of the rim on the reverse side, and mended; otherwise the vase is intact.

<sup>3)</sup> Cf. NC 684 ff. The Middle Corinthian sequel is found in such vases as the Pholos kotyle in Paris, Louvre MNC 611 (NC 941; Payne, pl. 31, 10), and the kotyle Athens N. M. 271 (NC 943).

sizes, the larger ones having single or double centers, and some few of a specifically irregular form (see below), and dots. Red accessory color is applied for certain details in the floral pattern and the animals.

The style of our vase is closely matched on a fragmentary lid of a kotyle-pyxis, Corinth C-31-03 (Taf. 31,2)<sup>4</sup>), which has the remains of a panther facing a stag, and a lion to right behind a sphinx, the last two of which no doubt formed part of a symmetrical grouping like that on the front side of the Mainz kotyle; again we have the fine rays, the three-row dicing, and, in addition, a frieze of dot-cluster rosettes alternating with vertical zigzags in groups of three. Not only is there great similarity in the taste for neatness and order, but the style of the animals clearly shows both pieces to be the work of one artist. In spite of some slight differences, as in the treatment of the shoulder (partly due to a slip of the stylus, on the Corinth vase?) and tail, the lions are especially telling. Most remarkable, perhaps, in the artist's style is a strong fluidity of line, with incised curves almost literally flowing through the still-soft clay: observe especially the toes of the lions. Another detail, small but worth noticing because it recurs on the other vases by this artist, is the rosette of peculiar form which is seen above the lion's nose and again behind the stag's antlers on the Corinth fragment (Taf. 31,2): compare (for example) one between the stag's hind legs on the Mainz kotyle (Taf. 31,1).

Another vase by the same painter is the splendid kotyle-pyxis in New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art No. 21. 88. 169 (NC 700)<sup>5</sup>), which has long been known but which has suffered from inadequate publication. Through the kindness of Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer, who cleaned the vase and had it re-photographed from all sides with the lid set properly in place, I am able to present it here (Taf. 32-34) with due regard for its quality. On the vase itself, the animal frieze is set between bands of three-row dicing; in the handle-zone are dot-cluster rosettes and groups of vertical zigzags, as on the lid in Corinth; at the base, rays. The animal frieze has on its main side a symmetrical arrangement of siren to left between sphinxes, between lions, and, at the back, goat facing swan, panther facing stag; and in the field there is neat filling ornament of the kind which we have seen to be typical for our artist. The lid (Taf. 34) has, on its prominent knob-handle, inverted tongues between bands, two-row dicing between broader bands; below the knob are double rays, then an animal frieze flanked by bands of three-row dicing. In the frieze: lotus-palmette cross, between sphinxes, between panthers; panther to left, between stags; and filling ornament as in the body frieze. The style speaks for itself, and we need not insist on detailed comparisons to justify an attribution to the artist who painted the Mainz kotyle and the Corinth lid. The choice and arrangement of animals and the types of filling ornament and subsidiary decoration, as well as the style of the animals themselves, are all completely convincing. We may look, for example, at the side view of the vase (Taf. 33), and

<sup>4</sup>) S. Weinberg, *Corinth*, VII: 1, p. 56 and pl. 27, No. 190. Weinberg associates this piece with NC 700-703.

<sup>5</sup>) Payne, *NC 700* and pl. 22, 9; *BullMMA.*, 19, 1924, p. 99 (not ill.); Benson, *GKV.*, List 72, No. 1

("Gruppe der Hearst-Sphingen"); G. M. A. Richter, *Handbook of the Greek Collection* (1953) p. 37 and p. 296, note 60.

compare the sequence, panther-stag-lion-sphinx, with analogous passages on the Corinth lid and the Mainz kotyle, with special attention to the lion, in which the artist's individuality is most strikingly displayed. In this case, the lion's near hind leg is advanced, causing different markings on the haunch, but other animals on the same vase have the off hind leg advanced, and show the expected markings. The incised line marking off the belly of the lion is exceptional for our artist: contrast the panthers on the lid (Taf. 34), which show the usual rendering. The incisions on the New York kotyle-pyxis may be slightly harder and drier than those on the other two vases, but the identity of style is unmistakable.

The three vases already mentioned lead us safely and surely to the show-piece of this painter, the magnificent kotyle-pyxis in the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels (Taf. 35-37) (NC 703)<sup>6</sup>, which is executed in precisely the same spirit of disciplined elegance as the other vases. The decoration of this grand vase is unusually rich even for our artist, with its double rays on both lid and bowl, a narrow bird-frieze on the lid, two more on the body, and an extra band of (two-row) dicing below the main body frieze, but the same painter is here at work. On the body of the vase, the front side has a siren between sphinxes, between panthers; at the back are a stag to left, panther facing stag, lion facing goat. On the lid are a siren between sphinxes, panther facing stag, swan between lions, stag facing panther. On both vase and lid, we find the same kind of filling ornament as on the other pieces. For the style, compare especially the lions on the lid, or the panthers on body and lid, with those already encountered. Both the richness of decoration and the suppleness of style in the Brussels kotyle-pyxis suggest that it is the latest of the vases by this artist that are thus far known to us.

Still another vase from the hand of our painter is a charming little pyxis of unusual shape, convex-bodied and without handles, but with distinct neck<sup>7</sup>, which was recently in the market in Basel<sup>8</sup>). With Dr. Herbert Cahn as helpful intermediary, the present owner, who lives in the United States, has kindly furnished new photographs and permits me to illustrate the vase here (Taf. 38-39). On the lid: tongues, red and black bands, dicing, a row of dots. On the vase: reversed z's on lip and neck, then tongues, three-row dicing, animal frieze, broad band, three-row dicing, thin rays. The animal frieze contains a goat to right between lions, stag facing panther, and a swan to right with wings raised; usual filling ornament. Again, we need only to look at the lions (e.g., Taf. 39,3) to see the hand of our painter, and the style altogether agrees. This piece adds a new shape, decorated in a slightly less formal manner, to the known repertory of our artist, an asset which should prove very useful for further study of vases in this region.

Having brought these five vases together, we can easily add another lid of a kotyle-pyxis, even though only a fragment of it survives: Aegina 509 (Kraiker, Pl. 38). What remains is the tail

<sup>6</sup>) D. Feytmans, *Les vases grecs de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique*, Brussels (1948) No. 1, pp. 15-18 (with bibliography) and Pls. I-III; NC 703; Benson, *GKV.*, List 72, No. 2 ("Gruppe der Hearst-Sphingen").

<sup>7</sup>) For the shape, compare an example in *Corinth*, *AJA.* 33, 1929, p. 541 fig. 21, second row no. 5; also Lon-

don B.M. A 1368 (68.1-10.766), NC 864 A, which is classed by Payne as Middle Corinthian, but which is very close in style to the (Early Corinthian) Heraldic Lions Painter (see below).

<sup>8</sup>) *Münzen und Medaillen*, A. G., Auktion XVIII, 29 Nov. 1958, No. 79, p. 25 and pl. 21.

of a feline to left, part of a siren to right, and the tail of a bird to right; and, below this frieze, a band of three-row dicing. The filling ornament is sparse, and it contains no dots, but otherwise it is of the kind already seen in our painter's work. For the siren's body, compare those of the griffin-birds on the Mainz kotyle (Taf. 30,1); for the hair and wing, compare the sphinxes on the vases in New York and Brussels (Taf. 32, Taf. 35).

Finally, the unpublished fragmentary open kotyle, Corinth KP 1296, found in the Corinthian Kerameikos<sup>9)</sup>, is of exactly the same type as that in Mainz, and it must also belong. It has, in the handle-zone, below two narrow bands, a frieze of vertical zigzags; then three-row dicing; then an animal frieze; then two bands (the rest missing). In the frieze are most of a siren to left, part of a lion to left; and the expected filling ornament, but with few dots. The body of the siren, which is almost completely preserved, agrees conclusively with that on the lid in Aegina, and what is left of the lion is like that on the lid in Corinth. This addition gives us a second open kotyle by our artist.

Before considering the place of our newly found painter in his setting, it should be helpful to summarize our results by listing briefly the pieces which we have assigned to his hand. We may name him after his chef-d'oeuvre, the kotyle-pyxis in Brussels:

#### THE ROYAL LIBRARY PAINTER

##### Kotylai-Pyxides

1. Aegina. Kraiker, No. 509, p. 81 and pl. 38. Fragment of lid.
2. Corinth C-31-03 (Taf. 31,2). Fragment of lid.
3. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art No. 21. 88. 169 (Taf. 32-34). Complete, with lid.
4. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale (Taf. 35-37). Complete, with lid.

##### Kotylai

5. Corinth KP 1296, from the Corinthian Kerameikos. Fragmentary.
6. Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum No. O. 2792 (Taf. 29; 30 and 31,1).

##### Pyxis (Convex-Sided, Without Handles)

7. Private Owner, U.S.A. (Taf. 38-39). Complete, with lid.

The style of all these vases is Early Corinthian. The latest examples are *ripe* EC, verging on Middle Corinthian, and they should therefore, according to Payne's chronology for Corinthian ware, be dated ca. 600 B.C., or slightly later. It is hard to arrange all seven vases firmly in

<sup>9)</sup> To be published in Corinth, XV: 3, The Potters' Quarter - The Vases, by Agnes N. Stillwell and J. L. Benson.

sequence, but there are some clues. The forms of the animals, which tend to become suppler and more elongated, and the filling ornament, which seems to become progressively thicker and spottier, suggest that Nos. 1-2 may be the earliest pieces (note also the more careful dicing on No. 1). A second stage appears to be represented by the kotylai in Corinth and Mainz, Nos. 5-6, and the convex-sided pyxis, No. 7, but this last may be the earliest of the three. The two kotylai-pyxides, Nos. 3-4, are late, and No. 4 (Brussels) is apparently latest of all. There is not a very long period of development within the series, and a chronological range of less than two decades seems likely.

The presence of Nos. 3-4 (NC 700 and 703) in our list places us in familiar but difficult territory, that of the series of kotylai-pyxides, NC 700-703, which Payne (*Necrocorinthia*, p. 296) attributed to a single workshop, wherein I recognized (*Cor. Vases*, p. 210) the immediate forerunners, in Early Corinthian, of the Middle Corinthian so-called "Delicate Style". J.L. Benson, in his *Geschichte der korinthischen Vasen*, goes still further, and presents a grouping (List 72, "Gruppe der Hearst-Sphingen") which unites several pieces from both periods as members of a single series - not as works of one hand, to be sure, but as representatives of a particular stylistic orientation. The common tendencies of all these vases are clear, but there is danger of claiming too specific knowledge in a region in which the need for *differentiation* is still most urgent - in which, indeed, we have had up to now only isolated pieces, successfully assigned to no individual hand. Several different artists from either period are evidently represented in this grouping, and still others, who worked on vases of different shapes, may yet be brought into the same context. Furthermore, in spite of all evidence of continuity, it is important to recognize the very significant lacuna between the earlier (Early Corinthian) and the later (Middle Corinthian) vases in Benson's list. We can avoid the mistake of running them together into too close a sequence by contrasting the works illustrated in this paper (e. g., Taf. 33-37) with, for instance, Payne, Pl. 28, 10-12 (NC 888, 889, 891). Absolute dates can be disputed, but there is no denying the stylistic gap between the two constellations, which is of a different order from any stages of development which may be detected internally within either group. This break is wide enough to guarantee that - hard as it may be to fix precisely the dividing line between Early und Middle Corinthian - two different periods are represented in the list.

Payne was no doubt right to think of a single workshop for NC 700-703; but Miss Feytmans<sup>10)</sup> was equally right to detach NC 701-702 (Louvre MNC 667, MNC 336) and also the kotyle-pyxis Leyden I 1908/6.1 (NC 706 A; J. Brants, *Beschrijving*, II, pl. 12, 2 below) from the immediate context of the Brussels kotyle-pyxis, NC 703, for in each of those vases the style is recognizably different from that of the Royal Library Painter. On the other hand, Miss Feytmans' doubts about the New York kotyle-pyxis, NC 700, should be set at rest by the present study. There are some few other vases which Payne associated, all very helpfully, with NC 700-703. He referred to the open kotylai NC 678-681 as "perhaps" belonging to the same workshop as NC 700-703, and these vases have in common with NC 700 a narrow frieze of birds (in

<sup>10)</sup> Feytmans, op. cit., p. 17.

one case, owls) below the rim. One of these, NC 680 (Athens, N. M., from the Argive Heraion: AH. II, pl. 61, 9a-9b, and evidently no. 10 also belongs; and cf. *ibid.*, no. 3, from another vase by the same hand), may even be by the Royal Library Painter, but I am not yet sure. Similarly, the Transitional kotyle fragments NC 189 (Athens, N. M., from Argive Heraion), in which Payne sees a style directly antecedent to that of NC 678-681, may be in that sense correctly described, although it is hard to link them directly with the Royal Library Painter, whose forerunners have yet to be determined. Among the Early Corinthian vases in Benson's list (*op. cit.*, p. 45) there is included, besides NC 700, 702 and 703 (already discussed) the concave-sided pyxis Amsterdam APM 1728 (formerly Hague, Scheurleer 1810, CVA. 1, pl. 2,7; NC 647. Benson, List 72, No. 7). In this case, however, the period and the general orientation are apt enough, but the style is different from that of the Royal Library Painter.

Our survey of vases in the immediate neighborhood of the Royal Library Painter has yielded, among the pieces for which some degree of proximity has been suggested, a few that stand forth as being particularly close to him, but the extent of likeness varies. The fact is that, although the painters of Early Corinthian pottery have individual stylistic features which - when recognized! - allow us to distinguish one from another, they all have many traits in common. A like stage of development, or a similar pattern of figures, can therefore easily be mistaken for a closer relationship. Our study is hampered, at present, by the fact that too few individual artists are known, from the association of two or more pieces as works of the same hand, for any confident comparison of similar but non-identical styles. Our newly gained acquaintance with the Royal Library Painter tends rather, in a way, to reduce the profit in discussing "schools" and "tendencies" until we have found other distinguishable hands (as opposed to isolated pieces) with which to compare his work. With these precautions in mind, however, it may be instructive briefly to scan the surrounding territory for possibly significant comparisons.

Most of the known Early Corinthian vase-painters are quite obviously remote from the Royal Library Painter in style and spirit. Contrast, for example, the decorators of large oinochoai and neck-amphoras, whose work is heavier and coarser. Outside of his own group, I can think of only two of his known contemporaries who do show, to any notable extent, similar leanings toward tidiness, symmetry and elegance. One of these artists is the Heraldic Lions Painter<sup>11</sup>), whose work is thus far recognized only on round aryballoi and broad-bottomed oinochoai. A good sampling is illustrated in Payne, pls. 22, 1 and 3 and 26, 5 (NC 538), pl. 26, 4 (NC 539) and pls. 24, 2 and 26, 7 (NC 746). This painter has, to be sure, a strong liking for balance and neatness, and in certain features his animals resemble those of the Royal Library Painter (compare, for example, the lions). His career, too, lasts into a late phase of Early Corinthian,

<sup>11</sup>) Payne, p. 289; Benson, GKV., List 38, citing NC 538-539, 746-747, all attributed by Payne. NC 538 is also published in C. Blümel, *Antike Kunstwerke* (1953), p. 15 fig. 7. This artist also decorated a lost broad-bottomed oinochoe, closely similar to NC 746

(Payne, pl. 24, 6), which was formerly in the market in Marseille (Ravel, 1948). I know of this vase from a photograph shown to me by Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer. Add, also, the pyxis lid NC 648 (AH II, pl. 61, 14).

as is shown by his aryballoi with "white-dot" decoration<sup>12</sup>). But his style is firmer and more deliberate, his elegance is heavier, and his use of filling ornament is different. Once acquainted with both artists, we could never mistake the work of one for the other's. The kind of solidity which the Heraldic Lions Painter exemplifies continues into Middle Corinthian in the territory of the Chimaera Painter - who, as Patricia Lawrence has discovered, is also a painter of animal-frieze vases, among them the lidded kotyle-pyxis in the Musée Rodin in Paris (No. TC 607; CVA., pl. 5, 1-5), one of the few Middle Corinthian vases of this shape<sup>13</sup>). In contrast to his studied elaboration, the style of the Royal Library Painter and of its Middle Corinthian sequel (see below) seems to follow a path of progressively developed attenuation.

Likewise neat, symmetrical, and in other ways similar to the Royal Library Painter is the Duel Painter<sup>14</sup>), who is again a specialist in round aryballoi, but whose hand is found also on a fragmentary kotyle and on a broad-bottomed oinochoe<sup>15</sup>). Most of this Painter's vases are still unpublished, but a good idea of the style can be obtained from the following: round aryballoi NC 488 (Payne, pl. 21, 7), 493 (CVA. Hague, Mus. Scheurleer 1, pl. 5, 5-6), 502 (Montelius, Civ. Prim., pl. 298, 8), Rhodes 13008 (CVA. Rodi 2, pl. 6, 2); kotyle Perachora I, pl. 27, 5. We are reminded of the Royal Library Painter by the lightness of touch, the neatness, the symmetrical arrangement of figures, and the character of the filling ornament. Yet here again we find a difference of style, one might almost say of basic outlook, which clearly distinguishes the Duel Painter from the Royal Library Painter. There can be little doubt that the Duel Painter also lasted through to the end of Early Corinthian, for the immediate sequel can easily be found in Middle Corinthian aryballoi<sup>16</sup>). But his drawing, as Payne has remarked (*Necrocorinthia*, p. 288), is "often distinctively archaic" in appearance, and it has a miniaturistic

<sup>12</sup>) Cf. Payne, p. 289, on the aryballoi of the "Lion Group". It seems probable that a good many of these vases were actually decorated by the Heraldic Lions Painter. And have we not excellent grounds for supposing that he painted the two large round aryballoi, each with chimaera to right, Athens N. M. 285 (CC 479, with incorrect description; NC 630, wrongly citing "258") and Heidelberg Uni. 79 (CVA. 1. pl. 11, 8-9)?

<sup>13</sup>) Cf. Lawrence, *AJA.* 63, 1959, pp. 354-355. Other Middle Corinthian vases of the same shape: NC 974, 974 A.

<sup>14</sup>) This criterion allows us to see that the beautiful convex-sided pyxis without handles in Honolulu (Honolulu Academy of Arts, Tenth Anniversary Volume, 1937, pl. 61), which has some likeness to the style of the Royal Library Painter (cf. *Cor. Vases*, p. 210), is actually closer to the Heraldic Lions Painter, though it is the work of neither. Another piece which shows similarity to both styles is the

large concave-sided pyxis Athens N. M. 908 (CC 560, pl. 23), with two animal friezes on the body, another on the lid. This is an important piece, which cries out for placement.

<sup>15</sup>) Payne, *Perachora I*, p. 96; *Cor. Vases*, p. 231, note 110; Benson, *GKV.*, List 45, "Perachoramaler" - but that name was already preempted: cf. Dunbabin, *JHS.* 71, 1951, p. 67.

<sup>16</sup>) Payne, loc. cit., speaks of the "painter of several aryballoi of the Warrior Group" (cf. *Necrocorinthia*, pp. 288-289), but he does not specify which vases he means. The kotyle is published, *Perachora I*, pl. 27, 5. The broad-bottomed oinochoe, in Patras, is unpublished: two animal friezes, with typical swan, sphinxes, panthers, stags. All four of the aryballoi listed by Benson, loc. cit., including those given under "Manner of" the Painter, are by his hand; also at least sixteen others, most of them unpublished. I hope to publish a fuller list elsewhere.

tendency which recalls Protocorinthian style. General similarities, once more, dissolve under closer examination, and the differences stand out.

The example of these two painters should warn us against over-confidence in dealing with the more isolated pieces. When the hands of individual painters have been better identified and characterized, it will be soon enough to speak of groupings and influences; meanwhile, it is best to be cautious in discussing such topics.

Similarly, the Middle Corinthian successors of the Royal Library Painter and his fellows have not yet been differentiated with much clarity. The line of descent leads, as has been said (Cor. Vases, pp. 210-213), directly into a group of head-pyxides which form the nucleus of the so-called "Delicate Style", NC 888-891. Of this series, Benson includes Nos. 889-891 in his "Gruppe der Hearst-Sphingen" (see above). He places NC 888 in a different context<sup>17</sup>), from which, however, it should be returned to the setting given to it by Payne. A fifth vase of the same class is a fragmentary head-pyxis in Palermo, from Selinus<sup>18</sup>). But although these five vases display the kind of neatness and symmetry and, to a heightened degree, the attenuation, that originates in the general area of the Royal Library Painter, we must observe that their styles are diverse, that in fact they appear to have been decorated by five different hands. Furthermore, it is frustrating but true that, with only one exception, we have thus far found no other vases decorated by any of these artists<sup>19</sup>). There are, too, many vases of different shapes that deserve to be placed in the same general area<sup>20</sup>), and the question of individual hands must be worked out on its own merits. It is enough to say, for now, that most of this task remains to be done.

To return to the line of succession to the Royal Library Painter, there is one vase, NC 889 (Hearst SSW 9985)<sup>21</sup>), in the series of Middle Corinthian head-pyxides which still seems closest

<sup>17</sup>) The style is continued most strikingly in the round aryballos from the Isthmian Sanctuary, Broneer, *Hesperia* 24, 1955, pp. 131-132, pl. 51: a, 1, b, 1 and c.

<sup>18</sup>) Benson, GKV., List 85, No. 9, "apparently by the Geledakis Painter"; the attribution is denied by me, *Hesperia* 25, 1956, p. 74, and withdrawn by Benson, *AJA*, 61, 1957, p. 176.

<sup>19</sup>) *MonAnt.* 32, pls. 85 and 86, 10. Cf. Payne, p. 339; Cor. Vases, p. 210.

<sup>20</sup>) On NC 888, see above, Note 18. Hopper, *BSA*, 44, 1949, p. 210 no. 7, has conjectured that the painter of the Hearst head-pyxis, NC 889, may also have decorated the convex pyxis without handles, Boston M.F.A. 24.449 (Fairbanks, No. 483, pl. 47), but the hands are different. By exception, it seems to me that the British Museum head-pyxis No. 1919. 11-19. 77 (NC 890; Benson, GKV., List 72, No. 5, "Gruppe der Hearst-Sphingen"; *BSA*, 23, 1918-19, p. 41 and pl. 5, 4) must be by the painter of the pyxis Hearst

SSW 9500 (Cor. Vases, pp. 223-225 and pls. 30, d-f, 31, c; Benson, GKV., List 86, No. 1, "Maler der edkigen Sphingen"). The painter also decorated pyxides in Amsterdam and Boston (GKV., Nos. 2-3), but I would not give him the pyxis in Bucharest, Coliu, pp. 40-41, fig. 21-22 and pl. opp. p. 136 (GKV., No. 4, "apparently" by the Painter; but see Cor. Vases, p. 224). I would add, tentatively, the pyxis Karlsruhe B 169 (CVA., 1, pl. 40, 9), another in the Athens National Museum, and the kotyle Athens N. M. 939 (CC 542). All these vases are of rather mediocre style, indicating that the "Delicate Style" is not necessarily synonymous with quality.

<sup>21</sup>) Cf. Payne, pp. 64-65, and p. 307, on NC 896. This vase, the pyxis London B.M. A 1377 (Payne, pl. 28, 8; his reference to "A 1375" is apparently wrong) is by the same hand as the pyxides London, B.M. A 1375 (Stobart, *The Glory That was Greece*, pl. opp. p. 112, No. 1) and Boston, M.F.A. 31.637.



to his style. Besides possessing, among the pyxides in question, the greatest refinement of style, this piece has also the closest stylistic links with the work of the Royal Library Painter, especially in his latest phase. There is not merely a likeness in the choice and arrangement of figures, and in the filling ornament, which may be paralleled on other vases of this class; there is also a remarkably close correspondence in the details<sup>22)</sup> of rendering individual figures - compare especially the main complex on the front of the vase with those on the kotylai-pyxides in New York and Brussels. This likeness can only be understood as a direct lineal heritage. There is, to be sure, a chronological gap to be filled. The Hearst head-pyxis belongs to a different generation, and it reflects the taste of the new order in the heightening of the frieze, the greater suppleness of the figures, differences in the filling ornament, and other changes, indicating a lapse of from ten to twenty years between it and the Brussels vase. Lacking the materials to bridge this interval, we cannot say whether the Hearst head-pyxis is a mature work of a pupil of the Royal Library Painter, or by a pupil of a pupil, but the continuity of style is obvious. One worthwhile assignment for future study of the Royal Library Painter is (in addition to the better clarification of his place among his contemporaries) the fuller tracing of his influence. This task will of necessity entail the discovery of other works<sup>23)</sup> by the painter of the Hearst head-pyxis, a vase which, like the Eurytios krater in the Louvre (NC 780) and the Homeric kylix in the Brussels Royal Library (NC 996), stands to this day as a challenge, in lonely splendor.

The Mainz kotyle finds its place, then, as a strategically important work by an Early Corinthian vase-painter of refined taste and notable skill. It is likely, though still to be proved, that its artist was influential in his own circle. That his style was reflected in the next generation is, I think, clear from the testimony of the Hearst head-pyxis. The Mainz kotyle is a work of high quality, which occupies, for the reasons given, a position of real consequence in Corinthian ware. It is a vase which the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum can proudly exhibit as one of its finest and most significant examples of ancient pottery.

<sup>22)</sup> Detail, Payne, pl. 28, 11; Cor. Vases, pp. 207-215  
and pls. 28, 29, a-c, 32, a-b; Benson, GKV., List 72,  
No. 4.

<sup>23)</sup> See above, Note 20.