

A SIGNATURE OF EUERGIDES

The signature of the potter Euergides is preserved, more or less fully, on eleven red-figured cups. Where the predicate remains, it is a part of the verb ποιεῖν. The eleven cups were all decorated by a single artist, whom we call the Euergides Painter. Many unsigned cups can be assigned to him on stylistic grounds: including fragments, we have nearly a hundred and fifty cups by him altogether¹.

A cup-fragment recently added to the collection in the National Museum, Athens, and reproduced in pl. 1 by kind invitation of Drs. Christos Karouzos and Semni Karouzou, for which I am most grateful², adds a twelfth signed piece which differs from the eleven in several respects. First, in the type of cup (Fig. 1): Type A, of which the signed Exekias in Munich is an early example, is a great favourite in later black-figure and in early red-figure, but has not been represented hitherto among the vases with the signature of Euergides or those ascribed to the Euergides Painter. In Type A the massive single-curved bowl is marked off from the stem by a thick fillet; the stem is short, broad, and thick; the reserved foot-profile is concave and flares downward. Proportions vary: a glance at the many examples figured by Hansjörg Bloesch in his excellent study³ shows that the new vase takes its place among those many eye-cups which are decorated either bilingually (black-figure inside, red-figure outside) or wholly in red-figure. Apart from proportions, there are two respects in which cups of Type A differ among themselves. The first is the treatment of the foot on its underside: we distinguish Type AZ from Type AY. In cups AZ, the older type, the underfoot is broad and nearly flat, meets the inside of the stem at an angle, and is reserved. In cups AY the resting-surface is a mere strip, and is set off from the other part of the underside, which curves gradually up towards the bottom of the bowl; the thin resting-surface is reserved, the other part black. Our cup is AZ.

The second and minor point of difference is in the treatment of the stout fillet between bowl and stem. It may be either fully rounded, or flattened: our fillet retains the full torus profile.

We now turn to the decoration of our cup. Inside, a black-figure picture (Fig. 2), the greater part of which remains. The missing border was probably a simple line, but

1. ARV.¹ pp. 59 - 65 and 950; ARV.² pp. 87 - 97 and addenda.

2. My thanks are also due to Dr Barbara Philippaki who examined the fragment for me and answered several questions. The drawing of the shape is by Mr Alexander Contopoulos, the photographs by Mr C. Constantopoulos: to these also my thanks. Height as preserved 4 cm; of the foot to the top of the fillet 3.5 cm; width of the fillet 3 mm; greatest breadth of the foot-plate 8.9 cm.

3. *Formen attischer Schalen* pp. 1 - 39 with pll. 1 - 5 and 8 - 11.

one cannot be positive. A youth or man runs, naked except for a cloak doubled and worn over both shoulders. The right hand is empty; the left, which is missing, may have held something — a drinking-vessel perhaps, kylix or skyphos. Neat incised lines render the details of body and cloak, and the cloak has a border in red. We




Fig. 1

should like to know whether the outside of the cup was decorated in black-figure like the inside, or, as is more likely, in red-figure.

We now ask whether the black-figure picture is by the same hand as the red-figure work of the other signed Euergides cups and those that have the same style

of drawing as they: in other words, if it is by the Euergides Painter. So far as I can see, it is not. We have indeed no black-figure by him to compare (like other red-figure painters he uses silhouette for details, especially charges on shields; these might have offered points for comparison, but they do not). But if the picture were by the Euergides Painter, we should expect his style to be recognisable in spite of the different technique; and it is not recognisable. Nor can I point to any other work by the same hand.

This may be disappointing, and it is fruitless to speculate whether the lost exterior was decorated by the Euergides Painter or by another. That collaboration, however,



Fig. 2

was familiar to the artist is known from his eye-cup in the Louvre, the outside of which is seen to be by the Euergides Painter, the inside by Epiktetos⁴.

We pass to the signature. Ours is the only cup of Type A that has a signature on the underside of the foot; but there are a few examples in black-figured cups of other types. Fragments of two 'Droop' cups bear the signature of the potter Nikosthenes on the underside of the foot; and two others, that of the potter Antidoros. A potter-signature in a similar position occurs on a few vases of other shapes: fragments of several small skyphoi, of Corinthian type, show the name of Nikosthenes; three phialai, and a fragment from a vase of uncertain shape, the same name; and a fragment of 'a small beaker-like vessel', the more honourable name of Amasis⁵. In all these the writing, as here, runs circlewise.

The last four letters of the signature are crowded, as if the writer wished to keep them well away from the initial, so that the reader would know at once where to begin. Laudable intention, execution imperfect. Why was it not sufficient to write ΕΠΙΟΙΕ or ΕΠΙΟΙΕΙ as in other signatures of Euergides?

After the final *N* there is a second *N* in very light brown — remains of a previous draft?

There is what looks like a sort of graffito, made while the clay was still moist, on the underside of the fillet, but it is probably without significance.

J. D. BEAZLEY

4. CV. b pl. 11, 2—3 and 6; ARV.² p. 94 no. 94.

5. ABV. p. 233 nos. 21-22; pp. 159-60; pp. 233-5; p. 157, foot.